UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 113—PART 9

APRIL 28, 1967, TO MAY 11, 1967
(PAGES 11153 TO 12518)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1967

J
11
.R
v.113
pt.9

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, APRIL 28, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

For the kingdom is the Lord's: and He is the governor among the nations. Psalm 22: 28.

Eternal Father of our spirits, we pause in Thy presence once again to listen to Thy voice and to receive the ministry of Thy grace. Thou art ever calling us to work with Thee to keep justice and freedom and good will alive in our world. May Thy spirit be so real to us that we shall continue to erect in this land a temple of understanding and love to which all nations may turn for healing and for a helping hand.

We pray that all the peoples of this planet may be open to the leadership of Thy spirit. We pray for the President of our United States, for our Speaker, and for these Members of Congress who represent our people on Capitol Hill. Guide them and sustain them and bless them with courage and faith.

We pray for our men and women in Vietnam. For their loyalty to duty, for their response to the call of our country, for their courage in the midst of danger and for their willingness to give themselves we thank Thee. We pray that the offering of their lives may not be in vain. Out of their suffering and sacrifice may there come a better nation and a better world for all mankind. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 303) entitled "An act to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The Chair declares the House in recess at this time subject to the call of the Chair.

RECESS

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND, COMMANDER, U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

The SPEAKER of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort our distinguished visitor into the Chamber the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. ALBERT; the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. BOGGS; the gentleman from New York, Mr. CELLER; the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. RIVERS; the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. GERALD R. FORD; the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. ARENDS; and the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. WATSON.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints as members of the committee of escort on the part of the Senate the Senator from Montana, Mr. MANSFIELD; the Senator from Louisiana, Mr. LONG; the Senator from West Virginia, Mr. BYRD; the Senator from Georgia, Mr. RUSSELL; the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. HOLLINGS; the Senator from California, Mr. KUCHEL; the Senator from Iowa, Mr. HICKENLOOPER; the Senator from North Dakota, Mr. YOUNG; the Senator from Maine, Mrs. SMITH; and the Senator from South Carolina, Mr. THURMOND.

The Doorkeeper announced the Governors of the several States of the Union.

The Governors of the several States of the Union entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced Gen. William C. Westmoreland, Commander, the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the great pleasure and high privilege of presenting to you Gen. William C. Westmoreland, U.S. Army, Commander, the U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam.

ADDRESS BY GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND, U.S. ARMY, COMMANDER, U.S. MILITARY ASSISTANCE COMMAND, VIETNAM

General WESTMORELAND. Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress:

I am deeply honored to address the Congress of the United States. I stand in the shadow of military men who have been here before me, but none of them could have had more pride than mine in representing the gallant American fighting men in Vietnam today.

These servicemen and women are sensitive to their mission and, as the record shows, they are unbeatable in carrying out that mission.

As their commander in the field, I have seen many of you in Vietnam during the last 3 years. Without exception, you gentleman have shown interest, responsibility, and concern for the commitment which we have undertaken, and for the welfare of our troops.

The Republic of Vietnam is fighting to build a strong nation while aggression—organized, directed, and supported from without—attempts to engulf it. This is an unprecedented challenge for a small nation. But it is a challenge which will confront any nation that is marked as a target for the Communist stratagem called war of national liberation.

I can assure you here and now that militarily this strategy will not succeed in Vietnam.

In 3 years of close study and daily observation, I have seen no evidence that this is an internal insurrection. I have seen much evidence to the contrary—documented by the enemy himself—that it is aggression from the north.

Since 1954, when the Geneva accord was signed, the North Vietnamese have been sending leaders, political organizers, technicians, and experts on terrorism and sabotage into the south. Clandestinely directed from the north, they and their Hanoi-trained southern counterparts have controlled the entire course of the attack against the Republic of South Vietnam.

More than 2 years ago, North Vietnamese divisions began to arrive, and the control was no longer clandestine. Since then, the buildup of enemy forces has been formidable. During the last 22 months, the number of enemy combat battalions in the south has increased significantly, and nearly half of them are now North Vietnamese. In the same period, overall enemy strength has nearly doubled in spite of large combat losses.

Enemy commanders are skilled professionals. In general, their troops are indoctrinated, well trained, aggressive, and under tight control.

The enemy's logistic system is primitive in many ways. Forced to transport most of his supplies down through southeastern Laos, he uses a combination of trucks, bicycles, men, and animals. But he does this with surprising effectiveness. In South Vietnam, the system is also well organized. Many of the caches we have found and destroyed have been stocked with enough supplies and equipment to support months of future operations.

The enemy emphasizes what he calls strategic mobility, although his tactics are based on foot mobility, relatively modest firepower, and often primitive means of communication. However, his operational planning is meticulous. He gathers intelligence, makes careful plans, assigns specific objectives in detail, and then rehearses the plan of attack until he believes it cannot fail.

Local peasants are forced to provide food, shelter, and porters to carry supplies and equipment for combat units, and to evacuate the dead and wounded from the battlefield.

When all is ready he moves his large military formations covertly from concealed bases into the operational area. His intent is to launch a surprise attack designed to achieve quick victory by shock action. This tactic has failed because of our courageous men, our firepower, and our spoiling attacks.

For months now we have been successful in destroying a number of main force units. We will continue to seek out the enemy, catch him off guard, and punish him at every opportunity.

But success against his main forces alone is not enough to insure a swift and decisive end to the conflict.

This enemy also uses terror—murder, mutilation, abduction, and the deliberate shelling of innocent men, women, and children—to exercise control through fear. Terror, which he employs daily, is much harder to counter than his best conventional moves.

A typical day in Vietnam was last Sunday. Terrorists near Saigon assassinated a 39-year-old village chief. The same day in the delta they kidnaped 26 civilians, assisting in arranging for local elections. The next day the Vietcong attacked a group of Revolutionary Development workers, killing one and wounding 12 with grenades and machinegun fire in one area, and in another they opened fire on a small civilian bus and killed three and wounded four of its passengers. These are cases of calculated enemy attack on civilians to extend by fear that which they cannot gain by persuasion. One hears little of this brutality here at home. What we do hear about is our own aerial bombing against North Vietnam, and I would like to address this for a moment.

For years the enemy has been blowing bridges, interrupting traffic, cutting roads, sabotaging power stations, blocking canals, and attacking airfields in the south, and he continues to do so. This is a daily occurrence. Bombing in the north has been centered on precisely these same kinds of targets and for the same military purposes—to reduce the supply, interdict the movement, and impair the effectiveness of enemy military forces.

Within his capabilities the enemy in Vietnam is waging total war all day—every day—everywhere. He believes in force, and his intensification of violence is limited only by his resources and not by any moral inhibitions.

To us a cease-fire means "cease-fire." Our observance of past truces has been open and subject to public scrutiny. The enemy permits no such observation in the north or the south. He traditionally has exploited cease-fire periods when the bombing has been suspended to increase his resupply and infiltration activities. This is the enemy—this has been the challenge. The only strategy which can defeat such an organization is one of unrelenting, but discriminating military, political, and psychological pressure on his whole structure—at all levels. From his capabilities and his recent activities, I believe the enemy's probable course of action in the months ahead can be forecast.

In order to carry out his battlefield doctrine I foresee that he will continue his buildup across the demilitarized zone and through Laos, and he will attack when he believes he has a chance for a dramatic blow. He will not return exclusively to guerrilla warfare, although he certainly will continue to intensify his guerrilla activities.

I expect the enemy to continue to increase his mortar, artillery, rocket, and recoilless rifle attacks on our installations. At the same time, he will step up his attacks on villages and district towns to intimidate the people, and to thwart the democratic processes now underway in South Vietnam.

Given the nature of the enemy, it seems to me that the strategy that we are following at this time is the proper one, and that it is producing results. While he obviously is far from quitting, there are signs that his morale and his military structure are beginning to deteriorate. The rate of decline will be in proportion to the pressure directed against him.

Faced with this prospect, it is gratifying to note that our forces and those of the other free world allies have grown in strength and profited from experience. In this connection it is well to remember that Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and the Philippines all have military forces fighting and working with the Vietnamese and Americans in Vietnam.

It is also worthy of note that 30 other nations are providing noncombat support. All of these free world forces are doing well, whether in combat or in support of nation-building. Their exploits deserve recognition, not only for their direct contribution to the overall effort, but for their symbolic reminder that the whole of free Asia opposes Communist expansion.

As the focal point of this struggle in Asia, the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces merit special mention.

Before 1954 South Vietnam had no armed forces in being. And there was no tradition of military leadership. The requirement to build an army, navy, and air force in the face of enemy attack and subversion seems, in retrospect, an almost impossible task. Yet, in their determination to resist the Communists, the Vietnamese have built an effective military force.

What I see now in Vietnam is a military force that performs with growing professional skill. During the last 6 months, Vietnamese troops have scored repeated successes against some of the best Vietcong and North Vietnamese army units. Perhaps more important in this total effort is the support given by the Vietnamese military to the Government's nation-building, or revolutionary development program. Nearly half of the Vietnamese Army is now engaged in, or training for, this vital program which will improve the lot of the people. This is a difficult role for a military force. Vietnamese soldiers are not only defending villages and hamlets, but with spirit and energy, they have turned to the task of nation-building as well.

In 1952 there were some who doubted that the Republic of Korea would ever have a first-rate fighting force. I wish those doubters could see the Korean units in Vietnam today. They rank with the best fighters and the most effective civic action workers in Vietnam. When I hear criticism of the Vietnamese Armed Forces, I am reminded of that example.

As you know, we are fighting a war with no front lines, since the enemy hides among the people, in the jungles and mountains, and uses covertly border areas of neutral countries. One cannot measure progress by lines on a map. We therefore have to use other means to chart progress. Several indices clearly point to steady and encouraging success. As an example:

Two years ago the Republic of Vietnam had fewer than 30 combat-ready battalions. Today it has 154.

Then there were three jet-capable runways in South Vietnam. Today there are 14.

In April 1965 there were 15 airfields that could take C–130 transport aircraft. We now have 89.

Then there was one deep-water port for sea-going ships. Now there are seven.

In 1965 ships had to wait weeks to unload. We now turn them around in as little as one week.

A year ago there was no long-haul

highway transport. Last month alone 161,000 tons of supplies were moved over the highways. During the last year the mileage of essential highways open for use has risen from about 52 percent to 80 percent.

During 1965 the Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces and its allies killed 36,000 of the enemy at a cost of approximately 12,000 friendly killed and 90 percent of these were Vietnamese. During recent months this 3-to-1 ratio in favor of the allies has risen significantly and in some weeks has been as high as 10- or 20-to-1 in our favor.

In 1965, 11,000 Vietcong defected to the side of the Government. In 1966 there were 20,000. In the first 3 months of 1967 there have been nearly 11,000 ralliers, a figure that equals all of 1965 and more than half of all of 1966.

In 1964 and in the first part of 1965 the ratio of weapons captured was 2-to-1 in favor of the enemy. The ratio for 1966 and the first 3 months of this year is 2½-to-1 in favor of the Republic of Vietnam and its allies.

Our President and the representatives of the people of the United States, the Congress, have seen to it that our troops in the field have been well supplied and equipped. When a field commander does not have to look over his shoulder to see whether he is being supported, he can concentrate on the battlefield with much greater assurance of success. I speak for my troops, when I say we are thankful for this unprecedented material support.

As I have said before, in evaluating the enemy strategy it is evident to me that he believes our Achilles' heel is our resolve. Your continued strong support is vital to the success of our mission.

Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and coastguardsmen in Vietnam are the finest ever fielded by our Nation. In this assessment I include Americans of all races, creeds, and colors. Your servicemen in Vietnam are intelligent, skilled, dedicated, and courageous. In these qualities no unit, no service, no ethnic group, and no national origin can claim priority.

These men understand the conflict and their complex roles as fighters and as builders. They believe in what they are doing. They are determined to provide the shield of security behind which the Republic of Vietnam can develop and prosper for its own sake and for the future and freedom of all Southeast Asia.

Backed at home by resolve, confidence, patience, determination, and continued support, we will prevail in Vietnam over the Communist aggressor.

Mr. President, Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress—I am sure you are as proud to represent our men serving their country and the free world in Vietnam as I am to command them.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m., Gen. William C. Westmoreland, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from *the Hall of the House of Representatives.*

The Doorkeeper, Hon. William M. Miller, escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President's Cabinet.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargés d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The Governors of the several States of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The purposes of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m., the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS TO BE PRINTED

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess of the House be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED 45-DAY EXTENSION OF THE NO-RAIL-STRIKE PERIOD—COMMUNICATION FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 113)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed:

APRIL 28, 1967.

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: A rail strike would bring industrial tragedy to America. It would disrupt our commerce, cripple our industries, create shortages of food. It would adversely affect the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country.

Such a strike would be a gross disservice to our valiant men in Vietnam, who are making sacrifices greater than any of us are called upon to make.

The public interest demands that every practical step be taken to avert a strike, now scheduled for 12:01 a.m. May 3.

Since my return from Germany on late Wednesday I have consulted with the bipartisan leadership of the Congress, and with ranking members of the Senate Labor and House Commerce Committees. They join with me today in urging that the Congress extend the no-strike period for an additional 45 days. I am submitting herewith a joint resolution to accomplish this.

This additional period will give the Congress time prudently to consider legislation which will protect the public interest in this case.

I shall recommend such legislation to the Congress within a few days.

An additional 45-day period may enable the parties to press forward with their search for accord and reach an agreement themselves.

I hope and believe that, in the interest of all Americans, the Congress will want to act promptly.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, those of us who have the great honor and privilege to know Gen. William C. Westmoreland can attest to his integrity, his professional skill, his sincerity, his concern for the welfare of the men he commands, and his dedication to our Nation.

And the other day in New York City, General Westmoreland demonstrated his courage to speak his mind in such a way that no one could misunderstand how he feels with respect to those who wittingly, or unwittingly, give aid and encouragement to an enemy who is ruthlessly killing American boys.

General Westmoreland has pointed out that more than 53,000 South Vietnamese civilians have been kidnaped or killed by the Vietcong.

Will those who decry our efforts in Vietnam raise their voices in protest against this slaughter of civilians by the Communists?

It is amazing to me that General Westmoreland can report to the American people, as he has, that the morale of our troops in Vietnam is the highest that he has ever seen in his military career.

My heart swells with pride when I think that young American boys in the heat and the filth of Vietnam can appreciate why they are there, suffering as they are, and still be tolerant of those in America who would wittingly, or unwittingly, betray them.

Why those boys are not more bitter toward the do-gooders and the critics, who find fault with our defense of democracy, is beyond me.

When the history of this war is finally written, men such as those who have served in Vietnam, and officers such as Gen. William C. Westmoreland, will stand out as the finest that America has to offer. History will remember them for their accomplishments. I hope, but doubt, that history will be kind enough to forget their detractors.

THE STORY OF A FINE YOUNG MAN WHO WAS KILLED IN VIETNAM ON MARCH 21, 1967, WHILE IN THE SERVICE OF HIS COUNTRY

Mr. BURKE of *Massachusetts.* Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the story of a fine young man who was killed in Vietnam on March 21, 1967, while in the service of his country.

Sp4c R. Michael Cartwright had served 9 months of his enlistment in Vietnam when he was fatally wounded by an enemy grenade fragment while serving as a machinegunner paratrooper with the 1st Cavalry Division.

Known more widely as "Mike," he was a graduate of Randolph High School in 1964, and a member of the school's championship basketball team. He later starred in the Legion and CYO teams in Randolph. After attending the University of Massachusetts for 1 year, he enlisted in the Army.

Mike had visited my congressional office, and left an unforgettable impression with myself and all of my staff. The sincerity, devotion, and love for his country which he demonstrated should provide a model and inspiration for each of us, and renew our confidence in the less vocal but more patriotic sector of this Nation's youth which is its hope for the future.

We have listened here today to a report from our very able military leader in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland. The conviction and commitment cherished by him and all of our brave men there is upheld by the principle of "freedom" which has guided this Nation through generations of challenge. The significance of this tradition is expressed in a few lines written many years ago by Elizabeth Barrett Browning:

Each of the heroes around us has fought for
his land and line,
But *thou* hast fought for a stranger, in hate
of a wrong not thine.
Happy are all free peoples too strong to be
dispossessed;
But blessed are those among nations who
dare to be strong for the rest!

Young Michael Cartwright was a proud and worthy exponent of this tradition, and was held in high personal esteem by his comrades-at-arms. One of the most meaningful testaments which could be paid him is the following letter written to Mike's parents Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Cartwright by his squad leader, Sgt. John S. Scurlock:

Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Cartwright: I don't know if your son Robert had ever written to you about me but I was his squad leader and friend. My name is Sgt. John L. Scurlock.

I had only known Robert six months but here in Viet-Nam it seems like many years, we have fought in the same fox holes, slept under the same shelter and suffered and struggled through the days.

These are the hardships that brought us closer together, but during all of these times Robert never lost his sense of humor, even up to the last moments when he took his last breath of life.

I am sure you would like to know how it all happened. We were given a mission at 10: a.m. the 21 of March to move off our hill to search and secure a village in the Bhin Phin Providence, as we moved into the village we were ambushed and receiving automatic fire from three sides, Robert spotted where one of the enemy positions was and took it under fire with his machine gun, while doing this he exposed himself to the other enemy position where he was shot from. Mr. & Mrs. Cartwright we did everything we could that day to break out of that encirclement to get Robert to medical attention but we were just too outnumbered.

His last words were, "I just don't think I'm going to make it guys." He said this with the casualness of a person just breaking a dinner date.

I have some things that belong to him and I know you would want them.

Sincerely,

Sgt. John S. Scurlock.

P.S.—I only want you all to know we mourn with you at the loss of Robert.

In closing, I would like to include an article from the Holbrook Times of March 30, 1967. I believe that it conveys the feelings of grief and felt by the whole town at the loss of one so well known and loved among them. My staff and I share their grief, and extend our deepest sympathies to the family, I know that I speak for every Member of the Congress in offering our prayers and profound gratitude to this fine young man, Robert Michael Cartwright, who gave to his fellow man his "last full measure of devotion":

Sp.4c. R. Michael Cartwright Is Killed In Combat While Serving In Vietnam

Spec. 4 Robert Michael Cartwright, 21, son of former State Rep. and Mrs. Ralph W. Cartwright, Jr., of 30 Nelson Dr., was killed Tuesday, March 21, in combat in Vietnam, his family was notified last Thursday. His father is also widely known as a funeral director with Cartwright Funeral Homes in Randolph and Holbrook.

The young soldier was a member of the First Cavalry Division.

Spec. Cartwright, more widely known as "Mike" was a graduate of Randolph High School, Class of 1964, and a member of the school's championship baseball team. He also played on St. Mary's CYO and Legion Post teams in Randolph. He attended the University of Massachusetts for a year before enlisting in the Army and requesting duty in Vietnam.

The soldier, having been recently released from an Army hospital in Vietnam and returned to duty, had only three months remaining of his duty there, having already served in Vietnam for nine months.

Specialist Cartwright was with Company B., First Battalion, Eighth Cavalry, First Cavalry Division. He was fatally wounded by an enemy grenade fragment while fighting as a machine gun paratrooper.

Town officials have directed that flags on all town property be flown at half staff.

Surviving, besides his parents, Ralph W., Jr., and Grace (Giguere) Cartwright, is a sister, Patricia, 15, a student at Thayer Academy; his paternal grandparents Mr. and Mrs. Ralph W. Cartwright, Sr., of 419 North Main St., Randolph, and his maternal grandmother, Mrs. Rose Giguere of Connecticut.

A military funeral was held Wednesday from the Cartwright Funeral Home, 419 North Main street, followed by a Solemn High Mass of Requiem in St. Mary's Church at 10 a.m. Interment was in Central Cemetery.

St. Mary's Church was filled to capacity with many standing during the funeral service with friends, relatives, members of St. Mary's CYO, plus town officials and many state dignitaries. Three priests were at the Communion rail for the many who received Communion and offered their prayers for the deceased.

Rev. D. Vincent McCarthy, a former curate at St. Mary's Church, officiated at the services assisted by Rev. James A. Cosgrove and Rev. Eugene V. Dunn, curates of St. Mary's Church.

All branches of the Armed Forces were present and an Honor Guard of the Green Berets attended.

Following the Mass, Fr. McCarthy addressed those in attendance in paying tribute to the young serviceman in which he said: "Mike paid the supreme sacrifice for us, therefore we here should not be sorrowful, but rejoice because this boy has given his life for us by defending his country and people in Vietnam."

LETTER ON H.R. 4467

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I received the following letter from Mr. Ralph M. Besse, chairman of the Cleveland Inner City Action Committee, concerning my bill, H.R. 4467. Under leave granted, I insert it in the Record:

Cleveland Inner City
Action Committee,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 29, 1967.

Hon. Michael A. Feighan,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: We have recently received copies of H.R. 4467, introduced by you in the House of Representatives, which would amend the Social Security Act to permit a state agency to disregard up to $75 per month of earned income for each dependent child, but not more than a total of $225 per month.

We believe this is a much needed piece of legislation, directed at one of the key problems in the present welfare structure. If passed, it will not only help ease the poverty burden in many families, but will also do much to motivate recipients of public aid to move from welfare rolls onto tax rolls.

This Committee, in a forthcoming report to the public on welfare problem areas in Greater Cleveland, is advocating such legislation. On behalf of the Committee members, I wish to commend you for this bill and assure you of our wholehearted support on it.

Sincerely,

Ralph M. Besse,
Chairman.

REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR ROBERT MURPHY

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, at the Harvard Club Dinner last evening the Honorable Robert Murphy, one of the most distinguished of America's Ambassadors, who has had an extraordinarily broad experience during and since the war in the critical areas, and in dealing with the crucial issues of the world, delivered a most thoughtful and significant address in respect to our international position, entitled "Thoughts on our International Position."

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted, I include this able address by

Ambassador Murphy following my remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD, and I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues and my countrymen:

THOUGHTS ON OUR INTERNATIONAL POSITION

(Address by Robert Murphy, April 27, 1967)

When your chairman, and your president, Ned Kavanagh and John Grindle, in a carefree moment invited me to speak this evening, as I understand it, the decision, after eighty-five years, to invite the ladies, Radcliffe and non-Radcliffe, had not been taken. I suspect that had it been taken, they would have searched high and low for a very special speaker instead of contenting themselves with a casual. And in that event I could have attended this precedent shattering occasion and actually enjoyed all of it including this part of the evening.

I have long cherished admiration for the distinguished membership of this club. Years ago you let me stray into your midst and say a few words. For me that was pure flattery.

I am especially happy to be here with my dear friends Ambassador Takeuchi and his charming and talented lady. I doubt that any ambassadorial couple have endeared themselves to the American community more successfully than they. It was even so in Japan when I served there, not so many years ago. I like to believe that they have entered into the American mentality to an extraordinary degree. They symbolize so naturally the solid rapproachement between our peoples—a precious dividend of the recent unpleasantness. I want publicly to wish them every possible success and happiness in their future activities.

When I asked Col. Kavanagh whether I could talk about one or two features of our international situation, he said he regarded the suggestion as blatant provocation. If I insisted it would have to be at my own risk. The management would take no responsibility. Col. Kavanagh is both wise and prudent. At any rate it would be safest to take the Senate route—he said that is, stick to foreign relations, on the ground that age would rule me out of the House version, affairs.

With the variety and intensity of world pressures, it is difficult indeed both for our Government and for individual Americans to maintain a consistent position on many fast-moving issues. We are not like the lady who Sir Alec Douglas Home remembered the other day as appearing in a British court. The judge said to her, "You have just told me that you are fifty years old. But I notice from the record before me that you appeared in this court ten years ago, and then gave your age as exactly the same. How is that?" "Certainly, Your Honor," said the lady, "I'm not one of those people who says one thing today and another one tomorrow!"

Yet, maintenance of a position in the conduct of our foreign affairs is one of the greatest problems of American leadership. I know from personal experience in dealing with representatives of several countries that there was an assumption on their part that if the pressure were put on long enough, and hard enough, the United States position would alter. In the open society of ours conflict of opinion in the ebb and flow of public debate on every major issue is a daily experience. Most of us are convinced that this method is not only the essence of democracy, but that it avoids many an error and pitfall, leading usually to wise compromise and measured judgment. I share that view. Of course, we know that there is also a risk in it because of the present curious state of world affairs. If these conflicts and debates were held just among ourselves and represented only American thought and interest or even friendly outside interest, that would be healthy. The chilling factor of course, is the presence of hostile elements, who do not wish us well. There is no blinking the fact of their existence. The airwaves and the pages of publications around the world teem with attack and subversive criticism. Our open society easily lends itself to subtle effort from abroad to stimulate group action and manifestations in our own country designed to sway our people and our Governmen from positions which are taken to protect our national interest. These influences proceed from the conviction that if they stubbornly and tenaciously push the American side hard enough, and long enough, inevitably we yield. They are usually able to find minority groups and individuals who are swayed through emotional appeal or group interest to pull their chestnuts out of the fire.

We perhaps would have no complaint if this worked both ways and we could promote our national interests by employing similar methods in bloc countries. There we are largely barred by closed societies living under dictatorships. We have little means to counter by influencing the public opinion in those areas controlled and isolated as the people are by a ruthless power structure.

A classic current example is the case of Vietnam. Totalitarian leadership in the sweep of organizations controlled, directed or influenced on a worldwide basis are mobilized to use every channel to weaken the determination of our Government to pursue to a successful conclusion a policy on which it is embarked. U.S. Representatives traveling abroad are subjected to the identical type of verbal garbage and disorder whether in Florence, Berlin or London. This certainly suggests a central organization. The technique is the same, whether here or abroad. Thus in this country both subtle and open effort is made to persuade our students, our faculty members, some of the clergy, our business community and labor leaders to weaken our Government's stand and to defeat our aims. There is reason to suspect an organized effort to weaken and divide American domestic opinion and to promote a revolutionary force within the United States by employing minority groups, some of whom are unconscious of what it is all about. North Vietnamese and Vietcong hopes are encouraged by American minority and foreign forces opposing the present policy of our Government. Hanoi wrongly draws an analogy between the defeatism in 1954 of the weakened French colonial power after Dien Bien Phu, and the United States stand against aggression and for the independence of the Vietnamese people. Our opponents hope that the wise crack may be true that the test of statesmanship is the acceptance of the inevitable.

Perhaps we have not concentrated adequately in our public discussion on Vietnam on the question of what should be done about the Hanoi and Vietcong leadership—that is, the handful of men exercising absolute power who are responsible for the ruthless campaign of terror which in turn is the reason for American presence in Vietnam. Why are we there? In essence because this dangerous group of leaders are inflamed with an ambition to dominate all of southeast Asia, an ambition shared with Peking. American forces are there at the instance of Vietnamese who are determined to be independent, to resist domination, and their stand harmonizes with the national security interests of the United States in Eastern Asia. Long range American security in the Pacific is directly involved.

It is in our best interest to see the hostile Hanoi and Vietcong leadership, dependent as it is on mainland China and the Soviet Union, defeated. That leadership is the key to terrorism and guerrilla warfare.

Just a word about negotiations. Senator PERCY has just made a rather impulsive statement that our Government should make a more intensive effort to negotiate with Hanoi. I take the contrary view. We have shown too great eagerness to negotiate. We have talked peace and have wanted peace so avidly that our adversaries believe our public opinion will force our Government to make every concession, to fold up and quit. The reactions of the other side are not necessarily like our own. In our eagerness years ago to negotiate with the Russians who were coy and played hard to catch, we often considered it something of a diplomatic victory merely to get them to come to a conference. We learned by a process of expensive concession that negotiation by the very definition of the word requires a mutual desire to compromise. It is obvious that Hanoi, still inflamed with the myth of victory, is not yet conditioned to do so. It is idle at present to think in terms of negotiations with this group of ambitious and cold-blooded tyrants. Like Hitler during the last year of World War II, Hanoi tenaciously refuses all compromise or negotiation. We all remember the plot of German patriots to destroy Hitler which failed in July, 1944, when the bomb von Stauffenberg carried into Hitler's headquarters exploded but failed by a hair breadth to destroy Hitler. We know too that if it had succeeded, negotiations would have lead to an armistice by September or October, 1944, and the allied world and the Germans would have been spared millions of useless casualties and enormous destruction of property.

Sooner or later the truth of the present situation will dawn on the Vietnamese people, perhaps a lightning glimpse of the obvious, and they will take measures to shelve Ho Chi Minh, and his key associates such as Pham Van Dongh, General Giap and Le Duan, who seem to be the hard core of the terrorists. As Ernie Bevin, one time British Foreign Secretary, said in his inimitable style, it would open a pandora's box and let out the Trojan horses. Ho Chi Minh at his age and with his record is clearly frozen in a position of non-compromise; it is a waste of time to offer him reasonable terms for negotiation. He is the victim of the same manic mystique and belief in absolute victory which dominated Hitler in 1944.

It is curious to remember that France played a role in both instances. Hitler's sensationally easy victory over France in 1940 finds an analogy in Ho Chi Minh and General Giap's victory over the French at Dien Bien Phu. Ho Chi Minh knows that after Dien Bien Phu the French quit because of discouragement in Paris. They believe Washington will react similarly. They try to forget that the United States is not a weak colonial power seeking to maintain a colonial position. They will learn and I believe they are learning that American designs are not colonial, and that there is a vast difference between a weak colonial power and the United States which is completely uninterested in possessing a square inch of Vietnamese territory.

So I would hope that greater effort will be made by Asiatics to ferret out and deprive from power the hard core Hanoi and Vietcong leadership elements who really are responsible for the prolongation of the terrorism and fighting in Vietnam. It is heartbreaking to see thousands of fine young men and women on both sides uselessly slaughtered because of the paranoiac ambitions of a handful of Vietnamese terrorist leaders.

I haven't mentioned the United Nations. Someone said the other day that to criticize the United Nations is like raising the question of sex in the Vicar's living room.

I have also deliberately avoided the word "communism." Of course I am aware of the party apparatus in Asia. When I was ambassador in Tokyo I witnessed its operation at close hand. Its operations in Vietnam are visible for all to see. That being said, I also see both in Vietnam and mainland China a great deal of old-fashioned power politics and plain expansionism. Just as Hitler used the Nazi movement as a cloak for his brand of geopolitics, we now witness North Vietnamese and Chinese expansionism. On the other hand we can find a reasonable satisfaction in the Sino-Soviet split which restrains, at least temporarily, Peking from aggressive adventures in south Asia. That situation facilitates a settlement of the Vietnamese military action and the foundation of a solid and independent Vietnamese political structure.

In Europe recently I heard considerable discussion of what might be termed the current "in" word "detente." A number of European leaders, not least among them General De Gaulle, seem to bask in a period of pleasant euphoria. As does General De Gaulle, some of them assert a rather disdainful attitude towards what the French President has termed a detestable and ludicrous war in Vietnam, together with a questioning attitude that the United States is losing interest in Europe because of its involvement in Asia. They say that the risk of war with the Soviet Union has become so remote that NATO is really unnecessary. The word detente is seductive. I find in the De Gaulle view of Vietnam something of the psychology of the jilted mistress. It is unbearable I am sure in the general's mind to contemplate that there might be an American success in Vietnam where France failed so miserably. It reminds me again of World War II. I was stationed in French North Africa on the day, June 22, 1941, when Nazi Germany attacked the Soviet Union. It was the view then of some Frenchmen that since Germany in 1940, in one month defeated France with its great military tradition, Germany would defeat Russia just as quickly. In fact a French admiral in Algiers bet me two to one that would happen; that Russia would be defeated by Germany in thirty days. It is always trying to observe somebody else succeed where one has failed. But it is sad to see the French leader go to the emotional extremes of proceeding to Cambodia to make a speech belittling the United States or rushing into an ill-advised French recognition of Red China at least partially to demonstrate independence from U.S. policy. So far the only dividend from Red China seems to have been the humiliation suffered by French diplomats in Peking at the hands of zealous Red Guards.

Whatever De Gaulle and a few European leaders may believe about the current necessity of NATO, many others believe that American policy supporting the alliance is in the best interest of Western security. Detente is an attractive state. Who could be against it? Like the words "peaceful coexistence" it has a seductive ring, much better than "we shall bury you." But what does it mean? None of us here in this room, I venture to say, is in the confidence of the members of the Politburos either in Moscow or Peking. Our Government does not have access to their secret plans and ambitions, nor does it have complete knowledge of their military structure and striking power. For that matter we don't even have an intimate knowledge of Cuba's plans and equipment and Cuba is only ninety miles from our shores. Some time ago we paid a price for innocence in high places in Washington incident to the Bay of Pigs fiasco.

The other day in discussing atomic weapons I was reminded of a reference attributed to Sam Goldwyn. In his inimitable style, referring to the atomic bomb Goldwyn allegedly said—"Why that's dynamite!"

We hear comfortable words now incident to the non-proliferation treaty that perhaps we could relax and just let the Russians catch up or at least reduce the disparity in our favor. We do know that the Soviet Union since World War II has constructed a gigantic military apparatus; it has in being an enormous land army, an impressive air force in addition to an immense arsenal of ballistic missiles, and I suspect is ahead of us in the field of anti-ballistic missiles. It has become a modern sea power with hundreds of submarines including Polaris type nuclear submarines. In any consideration of American-Soviet relationship, the military power of the Soviet Union should be stressed because that is the platform from which its present diplomatic maneuvering is launched and sustained. We are so prone to repeat those sedative words that the United States is the richest and most powerful country in the world. Having said that, the intimation is that we can coast, and because of a surplus margin of security, we should make concessions and even let the Russians catch up on the theory that if there is an even balance of power that would provide a safeguard against all out nuclear conflict.

The recitation of a few sober realities of the current position does not mean that it is all black. I am an optimist. There are favorable factors. There are good trends both inside the Soviet Union and in eastern Europe. I count on Soviet youth, on the second generation, to make the breakthrough. This will take time. In the present as long as the political system from which Svetlana Stalina has escaped because she could not enjoy freedom of expression, as long as that power structure with its secrecy, its powerful leadership backed by a huge arsenal and military establishment, a context which provides opportunity for an ambitious crusader to embark on adventures—just so long are we obliged to be wary. I am fearful only of our own illusions. I emphasize a need not for stale cold-war philosophy but for an appreciation of elementary security.

I prefer to consider our world situation in terms of power politics rather than ideology. It is misleading to regard the war in Vietnam merely as a fight against communism in the ideological sense. If it were only an instance of a peaceful local move to adopt a Communist form of administration, we would not have troops in Vietnam today. Our troops are not there because we want to be a policeman of the world. I regard communism as a smokescreen for plain, old-fashioned power politics, expansion in a word, and communism cloaks it and fortifies it as an idealistic crusade.

So today in the United States and Europe some people regard the Soviet military threat as diminished and any reference to it as outdated cold-war anachronisms. Their reasons relate to ideas of Soviet intentions rather than knowledgeable estimates of actual Soviet military power. These people point to Chinese defiance of Moscow leadership and say that the Communist bloc is no longer monolithic. They hopefully regard the increased autonomy of some East European states and foreign Communist parties as possibilities for settlements with the Soviet Union. They are less willing to admit that the success of the Atlantic Alliance has forced this evolution of Soviet policy which as far as I can see is a tactical resort to "peaceful coexistence" in Soviet strategy.

We are embarked on a policy of promoting East-West trade; of building bridges. Quite apart from the lure of profits, there is an assumption that establishment of trading relationships will promote or guarantee peace between the Soviet Union and this country. I have no doubt that we should trade with the East but illusions are created—illusions both regarding the importance of the amount of trade and profits, but more especially that this development will guarantee the peace. It should be remembered that in no area were trading relations closer than in Europe, among Germany, the United Kingdom and France. Yet this did not prevent both World Wars, nor did similar close trade relations between Japan and China keep the peace in Asia. So I feel we should trade, but on a caveat emptor basis without illusions, of course anyone who has negotiated with the Soviet Union needs no gratuitous advice. They are probably the world's toughest traders.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, as I see it peaceful coexistence means a period of all-out Soviet diplomatic effort to achieve a more favorable balance of power in the most decisive area—Europe. The revival of Western Europe's economic and political structure which fed a natural desire for a role in international affairs independent of the United States, has provided Soviet diplomacy with wonderful possibilities for political maneuver. The war in Vietnam provided an additional handle. Soviet diplomacy skillfully attacked the most susceptible link, France. Able Soviet diplomats have found in the chauvinism, the pride and ambition of General de Gaulle, the perfect instrument. Their objective remains the disruption of NATO and the encompassing of Germany. The old slogan of Molotov still prevails—as goes Germany so goes Europe. Blandishments are the order of the day—whether a visit to the Vatican or persistent contact with European leadership.

The Soviet Union remains an adversary, not an ally. But we should not think of Russia merely as a military threat. The political and diplomatic problems at this stage must be given more attention. Present Soviet policies now are disruptive of the degree of cooperation with our European allies which is necessary to deal with current problems. Our objective must be an eventual framework for a European settlement which will include the reunification of Germany, the establishment of European security guarantees, and the independence and strengthening of the European economy. If these are achieved in the decades ahead, perhaps, then will the Soviet Union find such a settlement in its own best interest.

I suppose it is not always the wise thing to do to so fully enjoy hospitality as I have done this evening before attempting a speech. You remember the story of the young clergyman who was scheduled to preach a sermon before his bishops. He was understandably nervous and induced the verger to give him a good nip of scotch. He went up and preached his best sermon and when he came out he said to the verger that perhaps it was the best anyone had ever preached. Yes, said the verger, but may I make a suggestion or two against a future occasion. There were ten commandments, not twelve. There were twelve apostles, not ten, and David slew Goliath with a pebble, not by a bloody great rock.

I am grateful to you for your hospitality.

"MAGNIFICENT, GENERAL, MAGNIFICENT"

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, everyone of us who today saw and heard General Westmoreland felt more assurance upon the favorable outcome of the war in Vietnam and a deeper conviction that what we are fighting for in Vietnam is worth all the tragedy, travail, and cost of the struggle.

I could not refrain from shaking General Westmoreland's hand as he passed out of the Chamber and saying with deep sincerity of his address: "Magnificent, General, magnificent." That, I believe, is how everyone who saw and heard this great American felt when he had spoken—we felt that we were a little better Americans after this towering American had spoken to us.

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THIS WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], the schedule for the remainder of this week and the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, we have finished the legislative business for this week, and I shall ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday, upon the announcement of the program for next week, which is as follows:

Monday will be the call of the Consent Calendar.

There are four suspensions also listed for consideration on Monday. Those suspensions are as follows:

First. House Joint Resolution 543: To extend period for making no change of conditions under section 10 of Railway Labor Act.

Second. H.R. 6133: Authorizing appropriations for the saline water conservation program.

Third. H.R. 8553: Extending Post Office Department 30-year-lease authority.

Fourth. H.R. 5894: Removing promotion restrictions for women officers in Armed Forces.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Wednesday we have scheduled for consideration the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967.

For Thursday, we have scheduled H.R. 158, the Maritime Administration authorization, with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, this announcement is made with the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Michigan yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Yes, I yield to the distinguished majority leader for that purpose.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I have received reports to the effect that the certificate of election of Adam Clayton Powell may arrive next week.

Mr. Speaker, if that is true, could the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma give to the Members of the House any information with respect to the disposition of this matter?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I am unable to advise the gentleman from Iowa in that regard.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma assure us that there will be ample notification to the Members of the House, before there is any consideration, or whether there may be consideration of this certificate of election?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma can assure the gentleman from Iowa that insofar as the gentleman from Oklahoma is concerned, that assurance will be given, and that was given several weeks ago.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I join the distinguished majority leader in saying that I am sure he will do everything he can to protect all Members if and when the certificate of election appears, so no one will be taken by surprise.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me on his reservation of objection?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to our distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is rather difficult while I am in the chair to participate in the colloquy that takes place on the floor of the House, which I know every Member respects.

I believe the gentleman's inquiry is one that also calls for an expression on my part. The gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from Michigan and I, I can assure the gentleman, have been in conference constantly so that every consideration will be extended to protect the Members in any action taken, whether initiated by the leadership or otherwise. I can say to the gentleman that from the leadership's angle my present impression is that the next move is up to Mr. Powell.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the distinguished Speaker of the House for his remarks on this subject. I appreciate it very much. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the House go over until Monday next, when the House adjourns today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with any business that may be in order under the Calendar Wednesday Rule on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WE ARE FIGHTING FOR A JUST CAUSE IN VIETNAM

Mr. DENNY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state to the House at this time that, as a father and as a Congressman, I will have two boys heading for Vietnam within the next 60 days, one within the next week. I want to tell this House and also my constituency and all mothers and fathers in the First District of Nebraska, and all mothers and fathers throughout the United States, that I feel much more confident and more at ease as a father and as a citizen to know that a man like Gen. William C. Westmoreland is the commander in chief of our forces out in Vietnam.

I am positive that for myself and for my sons our cause is right and just in Vietnam.

THREE-STAR GRUNT

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CONABLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, our fighting men have never been engaged in a conflict in which winning the support of the civilian population was as important to our ultimate success as it is in Vietnam today. Successful leadership there must be attuned to this fact. One of the commanders who has demonstrated his awareness of the importance of civic action as well as military is the commanding general of the Third Marine Amphibious Force and senior adviser to I Corps, Lt. Gen. Lewis W. Walt.

The current issue of Leatherneck magazine carries a report of General Walt's efforts in Vietnam and the spirit he has created among the marines serving there with him. I include this report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

THREE-STAR GRUNT

Lieutenant General Lewis William Walt leaned forward in his leathered swivel-chair.

Lines furrowed his forehead. He spoke slowly. "I can only say that if I didn't believe in what we're doing here, with all my heart, I wouldn't be able to live with the lives that have been taken and the effort that has been expended."

As Commanding General of the Third Marine Amphibious Force and Senior Adviser to I Corps, the northern five provinces in South Vietnam, Walt has seen a lot of lives taken and a lot of effort expended since arriving in that country in June 1965. He has also seen a lot of progress.

He cautions about thinking the war will end tomorrow, or the next day, but there's no doubt in his mind that it *will* end, and that the world will be better because it has been fought.

"It doesn't take a Marine long to find out what we're doing here," he said. "The contrast of communist rule with democracy is very clear to him. And, I think he feels as I do; that if we don't stop communist aggression here, and now, our next generation is going to be fighting a much tougher enemy, much closer to home."

But, more than his belief in the war itself, is his belief in his men, the men fighting the war. Few generals have shared the comradeship that exists between command post and foxhole. To the officer, he's a general's general. To the enlisted, he's a peon's peon, a three-star grunt.

Three years ago, only a handful of Marines could have told you who Walt was. Stars fell on him like they fell on Alabama, but the seven rows of ribbons he wears on his dress uniform stand as mute testimony to an outstanding career. Two Navy Cross Medals, one Silver Star, one Bronze Star with Combat "V", the Legion of Merit with Combat "V", and a Purple Heart record his service since his appointment as a second lieutenant on July 6, 1936.

Walt snapped to his first attention at the age of 16, when he signed up with the Colorado National Guard. He went through the ranks from private to first sergeant. At Colorado State University he majored in chemistry and graduated as honor student in his department with a Bachelor of Science degree. He was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Army Field Artillery Reserve upon graduation, but resigned that commission to accept an appointment in the Marine Corps. He had never heard of the Corps before being offered that commission, and a military career was the farthest thing from his mind. His career plans lay in the field of chemistry.

World War II changed all that, for by the time the Japanese surrendered in Tokyo Bay in 1945, Walt was a lieutenant colonel with enough ribbons above his left breast pocket to stock an exchange.

He received his first star in July 1961. The second followed in May 1965, and less than a year later, in March 1966, Walt was promoted to lieutenant general.

Walt's link with the enlisted men in his command defies the age-old "If the old man wants it done, I guess I'd better get it done," type of military thinking. Today's Marine in Vietnam looks at Walt as a father, and the "Yes, sir" reply to an order comes out of respect and not because it's the required answer.

Lieutenant General Victor H. Krulak, Commanding General of the Fleet Marine Force, Pacific, Walt's immediate superior, brought this out. "Marines have a tendency to inbreed, to act like a family, whether it's a platoon or a division. Walt emphasizes the family idea."

Walt has a tremendous faith in the grunt, and the grunt knows it. "I think the individual Marine, the man who carries the rifle, throws a grenade and uses a bayonet, is the most important man in the Marine Corps," he says. "He's the man who determines how well his unit attacks or defends on any battlefield.

"I am sure that every officer feels very deeply about his men," he continues. "I know that when I ask a man to go into combat he is depending on me to give him all the support I can bring to bear to enable him to come out of that fight alive and unwounded and still accomplish the mission.

"If I'm a fighter down there in the rear ranks; if I'm a private or a corporal, I've got to know that I'm getting the support needed. This is morale. This is esprit de corps. This is confidence.

"What I'm really talking about here is teamwork, the essence of which is our air/ground team in Vietnam. It is the responsibility of the commanding general to have this teamwork developed and executed every hour of the day and night. I have never witnessed closer teamwork than we have here in Vietnam and I have never witnessed a more proficient and effective performance of duty, in all ranks, in both air and ground units, than we have here in III MAF."

More than the teamwork within III MAF is the joint effort of the Marines, the Army, Navy, Air Force and Vietnamese fighting forces. Walt lauds this effort, for while the war is individualistic in nature, it's a culmination of individual effort that's getting the job done.

It's a dirty war in Vietnam. When the dust isn't biting into your nostrils, the mud is sucking at your boots. When the sun isn't cooking your head inside your steel helmet, the rain is turning you into something akin to a piece of soggy bread. And, the guerrilla—he never lets up. In a situation like this, morale of the troops is of prime consideration.

Seldom does a week go by that Walt isn't out in the field with his Marines, shaking hands, advising, cautioning, listening, asking, answering and thanking.

"Are you getting enough food?" he asks one.

"Yes, sir. I'm not gaining any weight, but, I'm not losing any either."

He spots a Marine preparing a foxhole. "Are you going to reinforce the top?"

"Yes, sir."

"That's good," Walt says. "They're probably going to hit you one of these nights and the right planning now will save a lot of lives."

A radioman gets the next question.

"How are your batteries holding up?"

"Fine, General. I've got enough for two more days and we have some on order."

"What are you doing, Marine?" he asks a man neck-deep in a mud hole.

"Diggin' a crapper, sir."

More questions. More answers. He tells them all they're doing a fine job, and before leaving, he turns to the lieutenant colonel in charge and says, "I'd change jobs with you any day."

The officer opens his mouth as if to say, "It's a deal!" but instead he replies, "We need you where you are, sir."

Walt smiles and climbs into his helicopter. "This is the Marine Corps," he says to a distinguished guest making the tour with him. "This is where the war is being fought."

Walt would much rather make his command decisions from a foxhole on the front lines than from his office in Da Nang, but the dictates of war prevent this. His area of responsibility encompasses some two and a half million Vietnamese civilians, on the advisory level, and he has operational control over nearly 3,000 square miles of terrain.

Just visiting the scattering of command posts is a job in itself, a job Walt accomplishes as often as possible. In this venture, he averages around 100,000 air miles traveled each year.

On one such helicopter flight, a VC sniper sent a round through the nose of the general's HU1E. Both he and the pilot escaped serious injury (Walt was hit by fragments) and the chopper was able to continue to its destination.

Perhaps, however, the closest Walt has come to becoming a statistic in Vietnam's minus column was during the political upheaval in Da Nang last year. The only bridge linking downtown Da Nang with the Marines' Marble Mountain airfield had been captured and no traffic was being allowed to pass. The bridge had been mined, and the Marines were told that any attempts to cross it would result in it being blown up. Walt needed that bridge.

Backed up by a team of engineers, he walked to the bridge. When he reached it he told the engineers to disconnect the explosives. He didn't stop. He continued walking toward the center, where a Vietnamese lieutenant stood.

The lieutenant asked Walt to go back.

Walt said he was going to walk it by himself or fight his way across with a company of Marines.

"All right, General," the lieutenant said, "we die together." With that, he brought his arm down as a signal to detonate the explosives. Fortunately, the Marine engineers had disconnected them in time, but Walt had no way of knowing this. He had placed his life in the hands of his men.

At command briefings concerning the activities of I Corps, Walt listens carefully. He understands, perhaps better than most, the implications of a sudden increase in Viet Cong activity in one area. He has been attending these briefings for the past 22 months, and the mind of the chemist he once was, analyzes the situation quickly and responds with the decision of the general he is today.

He chews butts when he sees something he doesn't like and he commends that which he does like.

"The most difficult decisions," he says, "are those having to do with the lives of my men. When I commit them to combat I know that some of them are going to be killed or wounded. A commanding general must look at all facets having to do with the operation. He must evaluate and decide which course of action will be the most effective. He must consider carefully the risks he is taking, as far as his men are concerned, and determine his every means of support in that action.

"The decision is, 'Do I commit them, or do I not? Do I take some other means of accomplishing the objective?' "

This careful weighing of the alternatives accounted for 11,500 VC dead during Walt's first 16 months on the job. But, dead VC alone do not tell the story of the war.

Civic Action programs are doing a wealth of good in bringing the war to an end. More than a million civilians have received medical attention. Another 39,500 have received dental care. More than two million pounds of food has been distributed, along with 220,000 pounds of clothing.

Schools, office buildings, wells, bridges and homes have been built. School supplies and trade goods have been handed out. Working hand in hand with CARE, Marines have distributed more than $67,000 worth of useful items aimed at increasing educational standards, job skills, and in general, a way of life that, in some areas, has remained stagnant for thousands of years.

For the most part, Walt is responsible for the birth of Civic Action as well as its success. He is behind it one hundred percent, but he knows that it alone will not win the war.

"You have to compare the effectiveness of Civic Action and the military," he says. "You can't have Civic Action without military protection. Yet, certainly without both, you can't win this war. One is just as vital as the other."

Walt believes that the guerrilla, the farmer by day and the VC by night, is the biggest detriment to a speedy conclusion of the war.

"If we don't win this battle with the guerrilla this could go on for years," he says. "He's a damned hard man to replace as compared with the NVA (North Vietnamese Army). The guerrilla has a stranglehold on the people. They collect the taxes for the VC. They collect rice for the main forces and the NVA, recruit for the main forces and the NVA, furnish intelligence to the main forces and the NVA, and provide them with working parties. They are also extremely difficult to corner. First, we must find him, then identify him, and then drag him out of his hole."

Winning the support of the civilian population is mandatory in routing out the VC element in the villages and hamlets. One giant step forward in that direction was taken with the birth of Civic Action. The next step, equally as important, was the creation of Combined Action Companies throughout I Corps.

These companies incorporate small units of Marines and Vietnamese Popular Forces personnel. They eat, sleep and fight together. And, the man in charge is a Marine enlisted man, still another example of Walt's faith in the individual Marine.

Working side by side with the people of the villages they live in, these Combined Action Companies, or CAC, for short, are proving more valuable as time goes by. They help protect the villages' rice, prevent taxation by the local VC and, in turn, information on Viet Cong activity in the area is beginning to filter in.

In time, the Marines will leave the Popular Forces units and return to their parent organizations. Their mission will have been accomplished; that is, they will have instilled a confidence in the Vietnamese civilian-soldiers and will have trained them to such a degree that they could fight alongside anyone in the country.

Yet, another part of winning the war is the rehabilitation program for the VC defectors. In I Corps, some of these ralliers are being used as scouts, Kit Carson scouts, as Walt calls them affectionately. (This program was initiated by Major General Herman Nickerson, CG, First Marine Division.) Knowing the country as they do, they are able to caution against possible mine fields and booby traps as well as identify areas used frequently by the enemy.

It's a big undertaking that the United States has set about to accomplish in Vietnam, but slowly, day by day, the effort is beginning to pay off.

"By fighting here now," Walt says, "we're freeing an oppressed people; a country that 10 or 15 years from now, because of its great potential in natural resources, and the people themselves, is going to be the cornerstone of the Free World in Southeast Asia."

Many men have died and many more lives will be taken before that cornerstone is set firmly in place. Meanwhile, Lieutenant General Lewis William Walt will continue to make the decisions and he will continue to weigh each one carefully.

Paramount in his mind will be the safety of his men in the field, his grunts, and his men in the air, his zoomies and mechs. He'll wonder how many lives will be lost on the next operation and he'll think about those lives that have already been lost.

"They didn't die in vain," he'll say. "They died for the cause of freedom just like men died in World War II."

That's Walt. A compassionate man. A man sensitive to the needs of his men. A man who has been described as one of the best tacticians who ever wore a uniform. A man who, despite a college degree and a knack for holding conversations with senators and other dignitaries, will always be remembered as a three-star grunt to the men who served under him in Vietnam.

FORETASTE OF 1984?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, there is the tendency among some to view Federal participation as the panacea of all our earthly troubles. Somehow, with Federal money and know-how, they contend, difficulties will be resolved forthwith. Forgotten is the well-known inefficiency of the Government which devours tax dollars in its relentless operation. Ignored is the age-old fact that relinquishing individual responsibility can turn government from servant to master. Gone is the healthy supervision which demands an adequate return for tax moneys spent.

Unfortunately the following experience is far from the exception in government-sponsored operations. The author of the account, William Henry Chamberlin, is a long-established writer of distinction with an impressive background in governmental and current affairs. His clash with the Federal Goliath as recounted in National Review of April 18, 1967, should suggest to one and all a wariness of oversimplified solutions through recourse to Federal moneys and programs.

I request that the article, "Foretaste of 1984," be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

FORETASTE OF 1984?

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

My wife and I have been engaged in an eight-month tussle, so far futile, with the Cambridge, Massachusetts office of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to obtain the certificates for Medicare to which we are entitled by age, and by the heavy contributions levied by the Social Security system. We hope that no illness, in which Medicare may or may not aid us, will cause as much mental anguish and frustration as the mare's nest of obstructive bureaucracy we have encountered.

I have always been opposed to Medicare and would have voted against it had I been a member of Congress. Twelve years of residence in the Soviet Union, a briefer closeup of socialized medicine in Great Britain ("subsidized hypochondria," a caustic British friend calls it) and various brushes with the ever-expanding brands of United States bureaucracy have implanted in me one firm conviction. That is that, whatever government may undertake, it will be done more incompetently, more wastefully, and more expensively than private initiative attempting to solve the same problem. I would have leaped at the chance to contract out of social security. But of course I had no such option. Medicare had become the law of the land, as everyone knew who received a salary check and noted the much larger bite for Social Security. To acquire Medicare seemed deceptively easy. Everyone who had passed the age of 65 was entitled to its benefits. So in March 1966 we duly applied for it.

In our innocence we thought the only further step would be reasonable presentation of proof of age. We were never more mistaken in our lives. The first hint of troubles to come was the arrival of two bulging envelopes, with what we came to view as the dire initials HEW. These contained enormously long questionnaires, full of impertinent and irrelevant inquiries about income and other subjects which had no bearing on our eligibility. We filled out the questionnaires and waited for something to happen. Nothing did.

Finally, on the eve of leaving for a European trip at the end of July, my wife, knowing my low boiling point in dealing with bureaucrats, decided to beard the HEW dragons in their den. This proved to be a handsome new building, staffed with a horde of witless bureaucrats maintained at taxpayers' expense but apparently regarding as their first duty to obstruct, delay, harass and torment these same taxpayers in connection with their applications for Medicare.

HOW PROVE ONE'S AGE?

Neither my wife nor I had birth certificates handy. In fact my wife's was hopelessly lost, as she was born in Elizavetgrad, Russia before the Revolution. And, like most Americans, I suspect, especially those who have often changed residence, mine had been lost, if I ever possessed one. However, my wife took with her full proof of our ages, to any reasonable mind: sworn statements inscribed on our passports. She had not reckoned with the stonewall obstructionism she was to meet. A female bureaucrat (Desk 5) brushed aside the passports, also the equally convincing evidence that we had proofs of graduation, I from Haverford College, she from Hunter College, at dates which clearly placed us in the over-65 group. No, we must write to the Board of Elections to ascertain when we first voted in Cambridge. What this had to do with our ages was obscure, but we did as we were bid and left for Europe.

We returned to find no Medicare, but three or four more bulging envelopes with repetitious questionnaires. Evidently the HEW motto is: When in doubt, mail a questionnaire or, better, two or three. Wearily and weeks later my wife went again to HEW, to run up against a male bureaucrat (Desk 10). He immediately repudiated everything Desk 5 had told her. He demanded that I produce a certificate from the Board of Health in Brooklyn and that my wife get some document from Washington Irving High School, from which she was graduated.

A letter to the Board of Health produced another questionnaire, and a prospect of indefinite further delay. Then came the cream of the bureaucratic jest. When both of us had been caught in the flypaper of outside red tape I received a form letter under the signature of the District Manager of HEW with the ominous warning:

"If we do not hear from you within ten days we will send your claim to the payment center with a recommendation that it be disallowed." Eight months of inexcusable delay by HEW; then a threat to disallow a claim that had been entangled deeper and deeper in bureaucratic red tape. Some heated representations over the telephone brought a grudging repudiation of the letter, with the admission that the District Manager did not know what was being sent out over his signature.

By a miracle the Board of Health produced a certified copy of my birth certificate with a delay of only two weeks. As for my wife, she is still in a bureaucratic "dark tarn of Auber, in the ghoul-haunted woodland of Weir." Do I now hold a Medicare certificate? Yes. I received it exactly ten months after I first made application for it.

To end on a constructive note, I would briefly suggest the following simple procedural changes, which would make an application for Medicare less of a prelude to 1984 than it is at present.

1) Make a huge bonfire of the questionnaires and form letters that must have made a heavy drain on the nation's paper supply.

2) Substitute for the staggering array of useless questions a simple request for reasonable proof of age.

3) Insist, on pain of disciplinary sanctions,

that every application be settled within a reasonable time.

4) Instill in employees of the Department, if possible, a higher sense of intelligence and compassion.

ARE THERE ALTERNATIVES TO THE PRESENT ESCALATION?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, it was a privilege to join, today, with my colleagues of the Congress and our other distinguished visitors, in extending a hearty welcome to Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commanding officer of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam, and to listen to his factual, down-to-earth report of the military situation now pertaining there.

I first met General Westmoreland several years ago, when he was Superintendent of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, and I was most favorably impressed by him, then—by his personality, by his self-evident capabilities, and by his obvious sense of devotion to duty, to honor, and to country—and his appearance here in this Chamber today has only served to strengthen that first impression.

General Westmoreland is an outstanding military leader, cast in the mold of those other great professional soldiers of the past who have emerged, at other times of national need, to serve at the head of those of our citizens who have been called upon to fight in defense of our country, or to advance its policies in pursuit of freedom for others abroad. As he stood before us today, it seemed to me that he well typified the courage and loyalty of all those other Americans who have served, or are still serving, in Vietnam—men to whom, though mostly unknown and unsung, this Nation owes an eternal debt of gratitude, and of whom [illegible] of us can be justly proud.

This is why I regret, as I am sure so many do, the small storm of protest that preceded his appearance here. As I see it, he had a responsibility to report to us—and to the Nation—and to give us his well-considered views on the military progress we have been making in Vietnam and his analysis of the military and related problems that still lie ahead of us there. I accept those views, coming as they do from undoubtedly the most highly qualified military source we have available to us, and I would point out to those who—objecting to our involvement in Vietnam—have objected to General Westmoreland's appearance here at all, that he is not responsible for the fact that we are at war in Vietnam. That responsibility rests in other hands—and partly in ours, no matter how much some of us may question the wisdom of the policy that brought on that war—and one does not have to fully agree with that policy to understand and sympathize with General Westmoreland's eagerness to bring this tragic conflict to an end.

All of us, Mr. Speaker, share that same eagerness—that same desire to "bring our boys home" as soon as possible.

Thus, as all our efforts to induce negotiations that might bring about a cease-fire and, eventually, a peaceful solution to the problems of the Vietnamese, have come to naught, and as the war drags on and on in an ever more costly state of stalmate, it is again understandable that the President—who can hardly be unaware of his own growing political problems arising out of this stalemate—has decided to gradually increase the military pressure by air and sea on North Vietnam in order to physically limit the amount of aid Hanoi can supply the Communists in the south, and to persuade the Hanoi leadership that the game is no longer worth the candle. And it is equally understandable that General Westmoreland, a professional soldier, both supports and approves such a gradual escalation of the conflict as being necessary and appropriate under the circumstances.

However, Mr. Speaker, not many days ago Gov. George Romney, of Michigan, speaking in Hartford, and commenting on what he termed "a visible groundswell of impatience leading to a mood of 'let's get it over with; let's crush them once and for all,'" suggested that "This simplistic reaction is tempting but wrong."

Governor Romney, in what I thought were carefully chosen words of wisdom, explained that such a reaction was "wrong" because, in his words:

> First, by actions approaching devastation of a non-white Asian people, we would play into the hands of the Communists. They would use this effectively to paint us in their propaganda as ruthless oppressors and militarists—the very opposite of our true role in the world.
>
> Second, from the point of view of stopping the expansion of Communism, we must remember that a devastated Vietnam would not be a buffer; it would be a vacuum, (and)
>
> Third, we must never forget that substantial escalation is still possible on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, I have similarly grave misgivings about the possible consequences of the kind of escalation we are now seeing on both sides of the conflict in Vietnam—misgivings that impel me to speak out even on a day such as this.

I do so as one who has always supported an American presence in Vietnam, and who has always voted for the requisite appropriations to maintain that presence. But I also do so as one who has become increasingly concerned over the turn of events there in recent weeks that leads me to wonder if we still "seek no wider war" there—as the President has so often put it—and if, behind the scenes, perhaps we are still pursuing peace as vigorously as we are now obviously pursuing some sort of "victory."

The best evidence of the current magnitude of that latter effort is provided by the fact that, in March, American planes dropped 77,000 tons of bombs on North and South Vietnam, a total just barely short of the 80,000 tons dropped on Europe during the average month of the peak year of bombing in World War II. Just think of that, if you will, for a moment, and you will understand why Secretary of Defense McNamara—who, until recently has not been an outstanding proponent of the effectiveness of such bombing—has said that the magnitude of our air operations in southeast Asia is "just unbelievable" and "fantastic in size against any previous standards."

Well, Mr. Speaker, in order not to belabor the point, the real question is: Is there still an alternative to so carrying the war to the north?

Probably there are several such, but the one that most appeals to me—and the one I have been suggesting for some time—is the possibility of cutting a swath across the narrow neck of Vietnam, near the so-called demilitarized zone, and running on into Laos a sufficient distance so as to effectively cut the now-familiar Ho Chi Minh Trail and to stop—in a way in which continued bombing apparently has not—the infiltration of men and supplies from the north to the Vietcong in the south.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this idea has great merit; that it is possible of execution, though probably costly; that it would avoid, in that it is basically a defensive measure, the hazards implicit in attempting to put such offensive pressures on Ho Chi Minh, himself, to get him to the bargaining table, that we inadvertently go beyond whatever cutoff point China has set for herself insofar as her active participation in the war is concerned; and, finally, that such a move on our part, with the assistance of our allies, would gradually bring about the end of guerrilla activities in South Vietnam, and the acts of terrorism of which General Westmoreland spoke, that have so far prevented faster progress toward pacification of the South Vietnamese countryside and the development of viable political institutions in the rural areas of that war-weary country.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that this is a constructive suggestion. I offer it again with all due respect for the opinions of those who are more knowledgeable than I concerning its strategic and engineering feasibility, and I include at this point an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for April 26, 1967, making—as such newspaper has editorially before—the same suggestion:

Swath Versus Raids

The United States air raid on two North Vietnamese fighter-plane bases is what many Americans have been demanding, what many others have feared, but what has been long foreshadowed in the Washington policy of slowly but steadily upping the military pressure on the Communists.

It is a clear signal to Hanoi, to Moscow, and Peking, in short to all concerned with the war, that this pressure will almost certainly rise and rise until the North agrees to lift its hand from the South. A similar message was contained in recent raids within Hanoi's and Haiphong's city limits, a step thought to have more diplomatic than military overtones.

The difficulty is, of course, that as yet this policy has not brought the North to withdraw. Hanoi's aggression against the South continues unabated. And, despite the very sharp rise in Communist casualties as well as Communist desertions, no end to the war is in sight.

Thus an already overcharged debate will grow still stronger. How greatly does this increase the danger of a broadened conflict?

Won't this purposefully limited raid inevitably be followed by heavier raids of the same kind? How will the Soviet Union react once the United States begins destroying MIGs on the ground as well as in the sky? Will Hanoi now be tempted to seek airfields across the border in China—and will Washington agree to such a "sanctuary" for enemy craft?

Each of these questions is immediately, and each reflects the continuing peril which the war in Vietnam holds for all. Thus the overriding challenge remains: to find some means of bringing this war to an end which will be consistent with justice and equity, while carefully weighing each step which broadens the fighting.

Periodically, for the past year-and-a-half, we have urged Washington to give greater consideration to the creation of a fortified, mined and garrisoned open swath from the sea right across Vietnam and as far into Laos as is necessary to snip the Ho Chi Minh Trail. If successful, such a swath could end the need to bomb the North; it would permit a more defensive type of action against the North, and it would let both the American and the South Vietnamese get on with the main job—that of pacifying the Southern countryside.

GEN. WILLIAM WESTMORELAND

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, many, many years ago Ralph Waldo Emerson wrote:

> Great men, great nations, have not been boosters or buffoons, but perceivers of the terror of life, and have manned themselves to face it.

Gen. William Westmoreland, in his message to Congress today, epitomized the man of great strength who has the wisdom to temper the power available to him and, thus, give his life meaning and significance.

The United States could not have a better, more able or conscientious man serving in the field. General Westmoreland is both soldier and patriot, the one indistinguishable from the other. With the enormous technical resources at his command, he could issue a war cry that would thunder around the world. He does not, and he will not, for he is a man of peace.

How fortunate we are to have such a man who speaks from a deep belief in the need for restraint, control, self-discipline.

His message to Congress and to his countrymen urged our resolve to hold on, in measured control, until the North Vietnamese are convinced at least we seek no wider territory, nor will we be thrown out of southeast Asia until there are guarantees for the safety of the independent South Vietnamese Government.

The general's presence and his obvious commitment to the causes of the United States are an inspiration to all of us.

In July of last year, I visited South Vietnam and the battlefields with several of my colleagues. We had an opportunity to talk at length with General Westmoreland. I was immediately impressed with his candor and his complete devotion to the cause of bringing the fighting to an end, to securing a negotiated settlement, and to sending American men home again.

In reporting to the President upon our return to Washington after this trip last summer, I urged the President to give serious thought to bringing General Westmoreland home so that the American people could have the privilege of hearing him speak.

Our fellow Americans, in cities and small towns across this vast continent, have had that privilege today. I doubt if any one of us can remain unmoved by the sincerity and firmness of this great man. Gen. William Westmoreland speaks for, as well as to, our Nation. I trust our allies, as well as those who wish us ill, will pay close attention to his words.

SECRETARY GARDNER SPEAKS OUT AGAINST THE QUIE AMENDMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I was privileged to speak in defense of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—one of the truly landmark programs begun by President Lyndon Johnson. This program is now threatened by a blatant Republican attempt to wreck the hard work and sound accomplishments of this Democratic administration.

On the same day, our distinguished Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Honorable John W. Gardner, issued a statement on this Republican proposal that should end all reasonable doubts about its disastrous effects on American education, as a whole. For as the Secretary rightly noted, the Quie amendment would take away Federal assistance from States which most need the aid because of their low economic capabilities and high concentration of educationally deprived children.

I urge all of my colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—to give the Secretary's brilliant and concise statement the closest attention.

If they do, I am convinced that the Quie amendment will be soundly rejected.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record this statement by Secretary Gardner:

STATEMENT BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The substitute that Representative Albert Quie has proposed for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 could, if enacted, undermine and destroy much that the Congress and the Administration have jointly achieved in recent educational legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is now bringing new skills and opportunities to eight million disadvantaged children and new hope and potentialities to every school district in the Nation, would be wiped out.

The proposal by Mr. Quie which threatens to produce this disastrous result has never been considered in Committee, has never been made the subject of hearings, and has been hastily revised three or four times within the past three weeks.

In place of the carefully considered, broad categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—categories which the Congress deems to be in the national interest—the Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs. In the guise of conferring greater freedom on American education, it would scatter Federal financial assistance in such a manner that the American taxpayer would likely receive little for his money.

It would take away Federal assistance from States which most need the aid because of their low economic capabilities and high concentration of educationally deprived children. The Southern and border States would lose $371 million, while the great states of New York, California and Illinois would also suffer substantial cuts in Federal assistance.

Carefully defined and selected targets for educational improvement, now specified as beneficiaries of the ESEA, would suffer. Programs for the children of migrant workers, for foster children, for children in institutions for the handicapped, neglected or delinquent, children in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools, and children in the Territories of the United States would all suffer.

The Quie substitute cannot guarantee that Federal aid will be concentrated in places and in amounts necessary to do the job, rather than merely be dissipated in wide areas and for a wide variety of second-priority activities. It cannot guarantee, for example, that the cities, so sorely in need of Federal assistance, will receive their fair share of aid.

And it is a very unsure instrument for dealing with the gravest problem facing our nation today—the adequate education of children of the slums and rural depressed areas.

Even more serious is the fact that the Quie substitute poses a grave threat to the consensus that was put together with such difficulty in 1965 when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act came into being. For years all forward-looking Americans had known that the Federal Government must eventually provide large-scale support for education—but for years, literally decades, the accomplishment was frustrated by dissension over several key issues, chief among them the Church-State question.

The Quie substitute strikes at the very heart of that consensus, and we are already hearing the return of the old dissension and divisiveness. If it bursts out in full fury, we shall have neither the present Act nor the Quie substitute. We'll find ourselves right back where we were two years ago.

Some proponents of the Quie substitute say it offers flexibility and freedom of decision to the States in place of the narrow categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is misleading in the extreme. The categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are anything but narrow. They are very broad and flexible. Its major titles contain the broadest and most permissive authorizations in American legislative history to strengthen the State departments of education, to stimulate educational expansion and innovation, to acquire the latest and best instructional materials, and, especially, to focus on the problems of educationally disadvantaged children, wherever they may be found, but particularly in our great urban complexes and sparsely populated rural counties.

No one in the Executive Branch or in the Congress has spoken or worked more consistently than I for helping the States to achieve greater flexibility and initiative in administering Federal programs. In the Partnership for Health legislation which we proposed and the Congress passed last year we combined 15 narrow categorical aid programs. In our Education Professions Development bill this year we would replace numerous fragmented training authorities with one comprehensive and flexible training program.

At the same time, I believe that Federal dollars should in broad terms be directed to targets selected by the elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States. They speak for the States and they judge the needs of the States against a background of national priorities.

While we must do everything within our power to strengthen the States—and no Administration has done more than this one to build strength in the State departments of education—I believe that as long as Federal resources in the field of education are limited, they should be used primarily for the elimination of those educational problems which the Congress identifies as the greatest obstacle to the growth and development of our Nation.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Bingham] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I regret that Gen. William Westmoreland has been making public statements in the United States on questions going far beyond his area of responsibility and expertise. As I said on Wednesday, I particularly deplore his condemnation of dissent and debate and his declared opposition to "cease-fire proposals," without indicating any recognition of the fact that a cease-fire may lead to negotiations and a peaceful settlement.

I do not believe that General Westmoreland should have been invited to address a joint session of the Congress. If it had been thought desirable for the Congress to pay its respect to the commander of our forces in Vietnam, this could have been arranged in a brief ceremony as has been the case with returning astronauts. If it had been thought that the general had information to impart, that should have been done in the usual way by having him testify before the appropriate committees. But to invite him to make a full-scale address to a joint session in a manner usually reserved for the President himself or for other heads of state is, in my judgment, to give the impression that the military view of the situation in Vietnam has now become predominant in our Government.

To my mind, there has never been a conflict in which it was more important to maintain civilian supremacy, because this is a conflict in which the long-range political and psychological factors will determine the final outcome. Military successes cannot alone attain the goals we seek in southeast Asia.

In spite of my feelings, I did not absent myself from the Chamber when the general was speaking. I attended, purely and simply as a gesture of respect for the Americans who are fighting in Vietnam, and particularly for those who die there daily.

In announcing this decision, I want to make it clear that I intend no criticism of those of my colleagues who may have decided, for one reason or another, not to attend the joint session. I am sure not one of them intended any disrespect for General Westmoreland or our fighting forces in Vietnam.

AMERICA SUPPORTS OUR ARMED FORCES IN VIETNAM

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Brinkley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, speaking for Third District Georgians, one-half million strong, may I commend and uphold our gallant military, from our most able General Westmoreland to every basic private whose lives are subject to stand in the balance.

There is no uncertainty among us as to our direction in Vietnam; there is no hesitancy among us as to when to begin. We are ready.

Our objective, Mr. Speaker, is victory and we say with General MacArthur that there is no substitute for victory.

Toward that end may we all resolve to afford every assistance, in word and deed, toward the support and protection of our Americans everywhere and particularly in Vietnam.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR OF MEXICO

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, many of us who serve here in Washington have had the pleasure of becoming acquainted and becoming friends with the very able Ambassador of Mexico, the Honorable Hugo B. Margain.

I wish to share with you and my colleagues an address made by Ambassador Margain at Tufts University on April 6 which gives us a brief, but compact and highly interesting, history lesson as well as several special insights about Mexico:

Address by His Excellency Hugo B. Margain, Ambassador of Mexico to the United States of America, at the Tufts University, Medford, Mass., April 6, 1967

As a starting point I would like to refer briefly to the amazing world of our aboriginal ancestors. The vigorous personality of modern Mexico, its unquestionable artistic originality, are largely the result of deep roots in the good earth of ancient Middle America, and its remarkable Indian past.

The great pre-Columbian civilization that flourished on our land is undoubtedly the most important of this continent and the archaeological sites of Mexico are among the most numerous and impressive in the whole world.

The Mayas have been characterized as "the Greeks of America" and there is ample evidence that they were great builders in Sylvanus S. Morley's definitive book on the subject entitled "The Ancient Mayas". The great American scholar identified about 120 different archaeological sites, 5 great metropolises, 19 cities of the first rank, 39 of medium category and 54 of lesser importance. And this does not include all that remains to be uncovered in Honduras, Guatemala, Chiapas, Tabasco and Quintana Roo.

Many examples of the archaeological splendor of Mexico can be viewed in our great National Museum of Anthropology in Mexico City which was inaugurated in 1964. This Museum has been regarded by visiting scholars as a veritable jewel of world culture. It houses, among other treasures, the great "Stone of the Sun", better known as Aztec Calendar, which illustrates the progress achieved by the ancient inhabitants of Mexico in the field of mathematics and astronomy. Another notable evidence of the importance of Mexico's past is the "Tumba de los Años"—Tomb of the Years—where time was buried. According to our Nahuatl ancestors, time is perishable, but the soul is immortal. The objective of life is what really mattered and the death of time, perishable and mortal, meant the triumph of the spirit.

Two extraordinary scholars, Padre Angel Maria Garibay Kintana and Dr. Miguel Leon-Portilla, have made remarkable translations of Nahuatl philosophical and poetic texts. I only wish to mention at this time to the respect for education reflected in reference to teachers and learning. Knowledge was described as "a light that guides and admonishes, a living, smokeless torch."

Our archaeological riches are countless. Among the treasured reminders of our ancient civilization exhibited in the National Museum of Anthropology, mention must be made of Coatlicue, the Aztec goddess of earth and mother of the stars, the moon and the sun. The monumental Olmec heads are also most impressive.

One of the most important of our archaeological cities is San Juan Teotihuacán, whose monuments rival the Egyptian Pyramids. In Tula, one is amazed by the famous Atlantes carved out of stone of colossal proportions. Monte Albán has attracted world-wide attention for its magnificent collection of Mixtec-Zapotec jewels. The Pyramid of Tajín, is a testimony of our Asiatic roots while that of Kukulcán or Castle at Chichén-Itzá is perhaps the one whose dimensions are most beautifully proportioned.

It is a well-known fact that the Greeks planned the dimensions of their beautiful temples in such a way as to give a desirable optical impression. Mayan architects were equally gifted in this respect. In the Castle of Chichén-Itzá, they corrected the perspective of the stairs which permit the ascent to the temple on the top. This was achieved by making the highest steps wider than those below in such a way that the visitor standing before the pyramid gets the impression of a perfect parallel.

The Pyramid of Xochicalco, near Cuernavaca, records the outcome of a scientific congress that took place in the early period of the Christian Era. Corrections were introduced in the method of measuring time in order to mark on the calendar the exact duration of the revolution of the earth in its orbit round the sun. It is generally recognized that the aboriginal calendar was very exact and superior, in that respect, to the European calendar. We must remember that it was not until the year 1603 that the

Gregorian reformation of the calendar was fully completed.

There is reason to believe that some European men of science knew about the exactitude of our aboriginal calendar since the early XVI Century. This fact permits us to say that as far as astronomy is concerned, our pre-Columbian scientists had perhaps reached a higher level of development than that achieved in Europe during the same period.

Quetzalcoatl, known among the Mayas as Kukulcán, is one of the major and truly symbolic figures in the aboriginal civilization of Mexico. He represents the dualism of human life, the double nature of man. The material side, perishable and mundane, is represented by a serpent—a plumed serpent which also symbolizes the detachment of the soul from the earth as it flies into infinite space. The spiritual values are represented by the feathers.

Even in our national coat-of-arms one can observe the dual concept of human destiny. It represents the culmination of a search for a place where the Mexicas, a nomadic tribe, might find a permanent home and build a city. According to the legend, the gods ordered that the founding of Tenochtitlán should take place wherever the weary migrants should discover an eagle perched upon a cactus plant, on a jutting rock, in the middle of a body of water and in the process of devouring a serpent. The great capital of the Aztec empire was built on the site where the eagle and the serpent were found after a pilgrimage that lasted many centuries.

According to some traditions our national coat-of-arms is also a symbol of human destiny. The cactus plant and its thorns represent the harshness of life on earth, and the serpent, as in Biblical symbolism, is the image of evil. The spirit is represented by the eagle which will be free to fly into space after exterminating evil.

A historian, Fernando de Alva Ixtlixóchitl quotes some excerpts of Otomí poetry in which in terms that recall the Spanish classic Calderón, the native poet deplores the apparent and perishable quality of world success:

"Los gustos de esta vida, sus riquezas y mandos, son prestados; son substancia fingida, en apariencia sólo matizados." [1]

This poem, translated into English by William H. Prescott, reads as follows:

"The pleasures which our lives present, its sceptres, and its wealth, are lent, are shadows fleeting by; appearance colors all our bliss."

Another poem is a commentary on the fleeting quality of life:

"Es acaso verdad que se vive en la tierra?
No para siempre en la tierra: tan sólo un breve instante
Si es esmeralda, se rompe,
o si oro, se quiebra,
o si plumaje de quetzal, se rasga,
No para siempre en la tierra: tan sólo un breve instante."

Which translated into English reads as follows:

"Do we really live on earth?
We are not forever on earth: it is only an instant!
If it is emerald, it breaks,
If gold, it turns into dust,
If a quetbal's feather, it tears.
We are not forever on earth: it is only an instant]" [2]

These examples, taken at random, give a glimpse of the ideological content of a civilization that reached the highest manifestations in the realm of thought. It is evident that the "smokeless torch" had a high and honored place in our pre-Columbian civilization.

In the site which is known to-day as the Plaza de las tres Culturas and for centuries as Santiago Tlaltelolco, took place the last battle between the invading conquistadores led by Cortés and the brave defenders of the proud Great Tenochtitlán, commanded by young Cuauhtemoc, the last of the Aztec emperors. A plate commemorating this heroic defense and its profound impact contains an eloquent inscription which reads as follows in the English version:

"On the 13th of August, 1521
Heroically defended by Cuauhtemoc
Tlatelolco fell in the hands of Hernán Cortés
It was neither a victory nor a defeat
But only the painful birth of a Mestizo nation.
Which is the Mexico of to-day."

During Colonial times it was customary to keep native personal names adding to them those given by the Spaniards. Thus Santiago Tlaltelolco acquired the name of the Holy Patron of the Spanish army plus its aboriginal designation. Even to-day it is very common to find in Mexico place names incorporating the Spanish and the aboriginal designations such as San Andrés Totoltepec, San Miguel de Nepantla, San Juan Teotihuacán. They symbolize the union of the Spanish and the Indian, a fusion of their blood and culture. Another example: the great historian Fernando de Alva Ixtlixóxhitl has the name of a Spanish nobleman and that of the King of Texcoco.

Two paragraphs taken from May 6, 1966 issue of "The Cambridge Review" summarize some of the thought that I have tried to express concerning one of the most important characteristics of our Nation: a great reverence and respect for our historic heritage that goes hand in hand with an unshakable faith in our present and future. The first is a statement made by Gillian Jondorff, a scholarly British visitor: "One of the most exhilarating things about Mexico is that this is a country which cherishes its past without refusing its present." The second is a quotation from one of our young and vigorous writers, the novelist Carlos Fuentes: "The coexistence of all the historical levels is but an outward sign of a subconscious decision which one feels so strongly in the people of this land: All time must be maintained." And so it is. We are profoundly devoted to our yesterday, to our to-day, to our tomorrow.

It is inspiring to think that in 1536, only 15 years after the Conquest, one of the first centers for the education of the Indians, the "Colegio de Santa Cruz Tlaltelolco" was established precisely where a battle put an end to the Aztec empire. Educators of the stature of the famous chronicler of the Conquest, Fray Bernardino de Sahagún, who became rector of the young institution, taught Latin, rhetoric, aboriginal medicine, music, philosophy, etc., to eager Indian youths. As Mexico's Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Licenciado Antonio Carrillo Flores remarked in his address at the inaugural ceremony of the new building of our Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, numerous Indians educated in this College mastered three languages: Nahutal, Latin and Spanish—and were capable of teaching the Spanish language to the children born in New Spain of Spanish parents. Thus there were Indian graduates of Colonial schools who were able to teach the language of the Golden Age of Spanish literature and culture, to the Spaniards born in Mexico.

Don José Sarmiento y Valladares, Count of Moctezuma and Tula, Viceroy from 1695 to 1701, was a descendant of Emperor Moctezuma and at the same time was related to one of the most illustrious families of Spain. In the history of Empires there are a few examples like this that shows the rank that could be attained by a Mestizo in a Colonial society.

With this precedent in mind, it is easy to understand why the only differences that we recognize in Mexico are based only on education, never on blood or race. But I must admit that, unfortunately among those of our people who have not yet enjoyed the benefits of education, the aborigines are in the majority. But once they receive an education, there is no one in Mexico who will dare discriminate against them solely on account of their racial origin. And this is an attitude that has characterized our Mestizo society since its beginning in the XVI Century.

I have cited examples taken from the pages of Colonial history. Since we became a Republic, we have also produced towering Indian figures, like Benito Juárez, a full blooded Zapotect who achieved international reputation for his relentless struggle in the defense of our Republican institutions threatened by foreign invasion and civil war. In public service, as well as in literature, the arts, science the Church and the Army, and numerous other fields, no Mexican has been prevented from advancing to the highest positions because of his race.

Many lectures could be devoted to the unquestionable benefits that we derived from the Spanish Colonial system. I have barely mentioned some of the principal fields in which the Colonial authorities showed considerable vision and statesmanship. But in order to interpret later stages in our history, I must refer to two important aspects of the Spanish regime which continued to set back our institutional life even after we gained our independence. I refer to the political and economic monopolies that were characteristic of the period and had their origin in theories that were as erroneous as widespread at the time.

The political monopoly was enforced in the most despotic manner during the three centuries of the Spanish Colonial administration. The native inhabitants of New Spain were not permitted any participation in the government. This prohibition affected not only the aborigines, but also the Mestizos and even the Criollos, that is, persons who were born in what is now Mexico but whose parents had come directly from Spain. All government positions were assigned in Spain to "Peninsulares"—Spanish subjects from Spain itself. This situation created such resentment that it became the principal cause of the movement that culminated in independence. But even more serious as a cause of unrest was the absolute lack of political democratic institutions. The people were neither consulted nor given the opportunity to choose their rulers, or any member of the government no matter how low in rank.

The general policies and trends of the Colonial government were determined without taking into consideration the wishes and aspirations of the people. Obviously, this system of government left Mexico hardly prepared to adopt and operate the democratic institutions that gained so much prestige in the early XIX Century when we won our Independence. In connection with this important situation, our history textbooks often quote a famous proclamation issued by the Marqués de Croix, who was Viceroy at the time of the expulsion of the Jesuits (1767). This event gave rise to disturbances and political unrest because of public expressions of discontent. The Viceroy addressed the people in the following terms: "Once for all, I must remind you that it is necessary for the people to know that they were born to keep silence and to obey, not to express opinions on important governmental affairs." The people protested against such an unjust attitude and demanded freedom from the Spanish rule.

---

[1] Angel María Garibay.—Historia de la Literatura Náhuatl. 1953, volume I, p. 256.

[2] Angel María Garibay.—Historia de la Literatura Náhuatl. 1953. Volume I. p. 245.

After 11 years of bitter struggle our political independence was won in 1821.

As to the economic monopoly, the architects of the Spanish economy of the Colonial period based their blueprints for economic progress on the accumulation of riches, particularly precious metals. According to their theories, the country that had the most gold was the most prosperous. Moreover, they considered that the establishment of industries in the colonies constituted a danger for such production in Spain itself. Thus, in line with a policy that was both oversimplified and erroneous, industrial activities that might have permitted the transformation of raw materials obtained in our country into industrial products were strictly prohibited.

As a result of the determination of the Crown to spare no effort in order to extract the greatest volume of precious metals from the sub-soil, there was organized in Mexico an important mining industry, and one of the most significant institutions for the study of mineralogy and allied sciences was established in 1792. The first director of this notable scientific institution was Don Fausto de Elhuyar y de Zubice, a man of international reputation in European scientific circles, who four years before had arrived in New Spain to head all activities pertaining to the promotion of mining in the country. As Director of the Royal Corps of Mining and a professional in his field, it was natural that he should have planned a center for the training of experts in all aspects of the mining industry.

The importance of the Colegio de Mineria—College of Mines—founded by Elhuyar, may be gauged by the fact that it was there that Baron Von Humboldt gave lectures, talked with scholars such as Elhuyar and Del Rio, and found one of the most dependable sources of information for his famous "Political Essay on New Spain". And it could not be otherwise, for Elhuyar, who in cooperation with his brother had discovered in 1783 a new metal called "Wolframite", the chief ore of tungsten, had succeeded in attracting to the Colegio scientists of the stature of Don Andres Manuel del Rio, who had studied in Germany, where he became a personal friend of Baron Alexander Von Humboldt. Del Rio's name figures in the annals of science as the finder, in 1801, of a mineral called by him "eritrone", which was re-discovered in Sweden in 1830, and named "Vanadium".

Another famous name in the history of mining in Mexico is that of Bartolome Medina who landed on our shores in 1554 and invented a method of processing silver that greatly facilitated and stimulated the production of that metal not only in Mexico but also in Peru. This occurred at a time when chemistry in Europe was just beginning to emerge as a science free from alchemical limitations.

A great impulse was given to mining by the Spanish Crown, but the same cannot be said of other types of industrial development which, as a whole, was not permitted. The promotion of the mining industry was considered indispensable because it served to provide the metropolis with the rich metals which were considered the basic elements of its economy. The Colonies were obliged to send their raw materials to Spain where they were processed. Some of them returned to America in the shape of consumers' goods of various types. Also prohibited was the production in the Colonies of any articles that might compete with those exported by the metropolis. In the Spanish colonies it was not permitted to cultivate the grapevine, the white mulberry tree, and the olive tree, for fear that the wine, silk and oil industries of Spain might be harmed through competition. Such a limitation was a serious impediment to the industrial advancement of New Spain.

After the consummation of its political independence, Mexico was obliged to come to grips with two tremendous problems: the political reorganization and the economic development of a young and inexperienced Republic. Even more important than these gigantic tasks was that of meeting a serious social problem consisting of class differences based upon one of the most unjust systems of land distribution ever devised. Later generations were faced with the necessity of setting the foundations for a modern, democratic state: economic integration of the country and social development for the direct benefit of the people.

These challenges have been met. The liberal Revolution of 1857, established the federal form of government and the most suited to our needs and purposes and brought about the separation of Church and State. In our own time, the social Revolution of 1910 set the firm bases of the economic and industrial development of the country, and opened the way for a social transformation favorable to the people because it declared war on ignorance, poverty and disease as enemies of our land.

Contemporary history of Mexico cannot disassociate itself from three revolutionary movements: The Revolution of Independence (1810–1821), the liberal Revolution (1857–1867) and the socioeconomic Revolution (1910 to this date).

The Independence gave us political liberty with a sense of equality and underlined the unjust bases of the existing social structure. As a reaction against Colonial centralism, the liberal movement definitively instituted the Federal Republic and, in the political order, established the separation between Church and State together with the nationalization of ecclesiastical properties.

The socioeconomic Revolution of 1910 endeavoured to reach industrial integration of the country, to exploit in the benefit of Mexico its natural wealth, with the purpose of offering to all Mexicans a level of education, a social well-being and an economic income in keeping with human dignity, so as to eliminate old injustice. This is the most ambitious and most necessary aspiration of contemporary Mexico.

In the economic order, one of the outstanding reforms has doubtless been the agrarian policy of Mexico. More than 50 years ago began in my country what is now known as the Land Reform. The Revolution of 1910 had a predominantly agrarian tone. The peasants, pigeonholed and lacking in liberty had borne from generation to generation the burdens of accumulating debts due to the system of "tiendas de raya" (Hacienda stores); they were handled by the landlord as mere instruments of slavery and they were nevertheless the social class that made the Revolution and that suffered the greatest losses in the battlefield.

By virtue of the Law of January 6, 1915, even before the promulgation of the Constitution of 1917, the first legal outlines were drafted for the destruction of the feudal large landholdings. The slogan of the oppressed people is clearly revealed by their shout: "land and liberty". It was indispensable for them to have the opportunity to work a piece of rural land property, that would allow them to breathe the air of freedom. In our agrarian centers of the Republic such slogans as: "exploit land and not man", may be read. They represent popular aspirations. The primary economic aspiration: "bread for all" expresses another of the Revolutionary doctrines.

Since 1915, amidst full armed struggle and in the middle of a torment of protests both from within and without the country, agrarian distribution was started in favor of the triumphant peasant. In Mexico, the large landholders united their efforts against the agrarian policy of the Revolution. Abroad, with an incredible unanimity we were condemned by the countries of all continents. Within an anguishing atmosphere of internal and international struggle, Mexico—not without stumble—began its most important and profound social and economic transformation in its history. The burdens of centuries of servitude hung heavily upon the Revolution, a servitude through which our peasant was considered as mere merchandise on the international medium, the remaining fruit of the individual selfishness of the XIX Century, when the redeeming sense of land reform—so much in vogue today—was not yet understood.

Each day that passes more merit is acknowledged to the Mexican agrarian policy. Five years ago, at Punta del Este, land reform for the good of the people was established as the basis for economic development and as one of the instruments for redistribution of wealth in Latin America, there where everything has been concentration in the hands of a few. At that time, Mexico had already lived half a century of land distribution.

This subject is even now a passionate one. On May 1966, Senator Robert Kennedy presented a study of Latin America before the Senate, entitled "The Alliance for Progress: Symbol and Substance." In the third chapter of his document, "Land Reform", while inviting the Latin American countries to study the convenience of an agrarian policy in favor of the distribution of land among their peasants, Senator Kennedy made only one very unfortunate reference to Mexico that does not correspond to the truth. In fact, in the Congressional Record, volume 112, part 8, page 10094, he states: ". . . It would be tragic if we were now to repeat the history of land reform in Mexico, where much land distributed in the 1920's was sold off to large holders within 20 years."

While presenting his study in the Senate, Senator Kennedy was interrupted by various comments. In one of them, Senator Proxmire, supporting the wrong statement of Senator Kennedy, said: "I believe it is most helpful that the Senator referred to what happened in Mexico. There was land distribution, but in a few years the land was repurchased by large estates." (As recorded in the text of the Congressional Record, vol. 112, pt. 8, p. 10096.) That was all that was mentioned about the agrarian reform of my country. It is entirely contrary to the truth.

If you only consider the following official statistics you will be able to note the error committed by Senators Kennedy and Proxmire. From 1915 to 1920, President Venustiano Carranza distributed 132,000 hectares;[3] Adolfo de la Huerta, President from May to November 1920, distributed 34,000; Alvaro Obregón (1920–1924), 971,000; Plutarco Elías-Calles (1924–1928), 3.088,000; Emilio Portes-Gil (1928–1930), 1.173,000; Pascual Ortiz-Rubio (1930–1932), 1.469,000; Abelardo Rodríguez (1932–1934), 799,000; Lázaro Cárdenas (1934–1940), distributed more than twice the surface partitioned to that date, handing over to the peasants 17.890,000 hectares; in the regime of Manuel Avila-Camacho (1940–1946), 5.519,000 hectares were distributed; President Miguel Alemán-Valdés (1946–1952), 3.845,000 hectares; Adolfo Ruiz-Cortines (1952–1958), 3.119,000; Adolfo López-Mateos (1958–1964), 16.004,000. In all, up to 1964, 54.123,000 hectares have been distributed.[4]

These data are irrefutable. At the beginning of the Revolution, Mexican arable land was in the hands of 830 families. Ninety seven per cent of the land belonged to the "Hacienda" (large landholdings), two per cent comprised small properties and only one per cent belonged to the people. There were three and a half million farm workers and farmers.

---

[3] 1 hectare equals 2.471 acres.

[4] Source: Nacional Financiera, S.A.—"La Economía Mexicana en Cifras", 1965, page 49.

With the Revolution, the latifundia was abolished. Since 1915 to 1964, 54.000,000 hectares have been distributed benefiting 2.300,000 heads of family in the *ejidos,* and there are more than a million small proprietors. Thus, old farm workers of large landholdings are now proprietors. It is not then legitimate to assure that what was distributed in the 1920's has come back to large landholdings and that there is no agrarian reform in Mexico.

Permit me to underline the following fact: arable land at the beginning of the Mexican Revolution was only 10% of the total Mexican territory. Thanks to dams and to irrigation and ground-water recovery projects, that surface has been increased to 19%.

Let us examine some of the examples of field productivity that constitute the principal proof and clear justification of the agrarian policy of Mexico.

From 1901 to 1910, 2.300,000 tons of corn were produced annually, as an average. From 1961 to 1965 that same average production rose to 6.750,000 tons. Beans: the average yearly production from 1901 to 1910 was 165,000 tons. From 1961 to 1965 the yearly average production for this grain rose to 700,000 tons. While during the first ten years of this century we produced only an average of 230,000 bales of cotton, from 1961 to 1965 that same average production rose to 2.200,000 bales. Wheat increased from 300,000 tons a year during the first ten years of this century to 1.555,000 tons, from 1961 to 1965. From 106,000 tons yearly average production from 1901 to 1910 sugar increased to 1.700,000 tons from 1961 to 1965. In coffee, before the Revolution, we produced some 50,000 tons; we now produce 130,000 tons. Tomato: before the Revolution we produced 8,600 tons, and now the production is 452,000 tons. From 1961 to 1965, Mexico was the second cotton exporter with an export of 1.6 million bales as a yearly average. In the 1965–1966 season Mexico exported 2.118,000 bales and the United States, the first cotton exporter 2.942,000 bales. These increases have been due to the combined efforts of the *ejidatarios* and small proprietors, made possible through Government land investments and by the undisputable triumph of the Revolution of 1910.

Agrarian reform is not merely attained by the distribution of land. Education of the peasant is indispensable as are the use of fertilizers, insecticides, and other modern means of land exploitation that require modern machinery and, naturally, a source of credit.

In a new experiment and for the first time in this continent, funds from the BID and AID in favor of the *ejidatarios* and small proprietors are being employed in Mexico with success. Recent information from the Bank of Mexico on the "Warranty Development Fund for Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, Cattle Rising and Aviculture", is as follows: during the operation of this fund, from 1956–1966, loans have been made in the amount of 2.686.700,000 pesos. Through these loans 21,376 *ejidatarios* and 56,575 small proprietors have been benefited.

From the total amount of the above mentioned loans, 2.104.400,000 pesos came from national resources, 450.100,000 pesos from the Alliance for Progress and 131.600,000 pesos from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development. The money has been employed to increase productivity for the construction of irrigation projects, on land leveling operations, on the creation of pasture grounds, and for the purchase of machinery, better livestock, etc.

It is convenient to underline here the fact that the program of the Alliance for Progress is dedicated to ejidatarios and small producers of modest income. Frequently, several of them form a group in order to receive credits destined to a project of common use.

Money from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development is loaned to peasants with a greater economic capacity. Technical counsel given in virtue of these financial operations is very important.

In spite of the obstacles that the Mexican agrarian policy may have had to face, the information on the results obtained is eloquently in favor of the economic and social transformation sought.

This agrarian policy lives on in the President Diaz-Ordaz regime, supported by the following information: in 21 months of his government, 1,000 presidential resolutions have been taken; 9,157 peasants have been benefited and 4.022,110 hectares have been distributed.

Selling the land, as is supposed by Senator Kennedy, is an act contrary to law and, therefore, is mandatorily null and void under the law. Whoever has bought *ejidos* does not hold a legal title. On the other hand, the distribution of great landholdings is an obvious fact, known to all.

Thanks to the Mexican agrarian policy, the economic progress of the country has been attained. Political organization of the peasants in Mexico is very strong. They have Senators and Representatives in the National Congress. One of the Ministries of the Government is in charge of continuing the agrarian policy of the Revolution.

The World Bank, in a recent publication "The World Bank Group in Mexico", January 1967, states:

"Mexico's farms produce 95% of its food requirements and more than half the value of its exports, while they absorbed only 52% of the labor force in 1964 compared with 58% in 1950."

"These results must be viewed against the background of a high population growth rate, a rising level of per capita food consumption, and the fact that only 16%"—(I believe it to be 19%)—, "of the country's land area is suitable for farming and much of it lacks adequate water. The key has been an intensive investment program which doubled the irrigated area between 1950 and 1962 and embraced a total of 10 million irrigated acres by 1966. In recent years, the government has also been giving emphasis to the rehabilitation and expansion of existing irrigation systems."

It describes the general situation in my country as follows:

"In two decades, Mexico has more than tripled its output of goods and services and raised the real per capita income of its people by three quarters, despite one of the world's highest rates of population increase."

"With political and financial stability and effectively administered investment programs in the principal sectiors of the economy and in education, Mexico has maintained a high and relatively steady rate of economic growth throughout most of the postwar period."

It is regrettable that in Senator Kennedy's document the only reference to the Mexican agrarian reform should have been so unfortunate. The information mentioned above proves the existence of an altogether different situation that that which he presented with the support of Senator Proxmire. It is to be hoped that, as a result of the real information concerning Mexican agrarian policy, the document of Senator Kennedy will be corrected so as to convey a clear idea of what has actually happened in Mexico concerning this matter.

The XIX International Olympic Games will take place in Mexico City in the fall of 1968. Once again, all the nations of the world, irrespective of race, religion, or political orientation, will compete for victory on the basis of strict equality. It will be an occasion for the rekindling of the spirit of friendship and understanding among all peoples.

At that time we will remember the enthusiasm of the athletes that met in Japan and the good fellowship that was generated by the Olympic gathering among the participating nations. On occasions such as this, humanity enjoys a moment of peace and man proves that he is prepared to live in a peaceful and orderly manner. Thus, each athletic victory is marked by sincere recognition of the effort displayed by the winner as well as by mutual respect. Old differences are forgotten and angry disputes, bitter problems, and the controversies that cast a shadow on the world of our time, are set aside.

The Olympic Games are, once more, a symbol of the unity of mankind and of a common hope for a peaceful co-existence. The truth is that our generation, unlike any other in the past, must learn how to live side by side on peaceful terms with all peoples. Modern systems of communications have done away with distance and in a world inhabited by peoples representing different cultural tradition and ways of life, it is essential to know how to co-exist in order to assure the survival of the human race.

The basis of co-existence is firmly rooted in the indispensable principle of mutual respect. It is necessary to realize and accept the fact that the peoples of different parts of the world are not alike, and thus the principle of mutual respect places us under obligation to also respect the principle of self-determination. Every human being has the inalienable right to determine the direction of his life within the framework of reciprocal respect with his fellow-men.

Taking advantage of a historic opportunity, Mexico is making a determined effort to organise the Olympic Games along the lines which characterized them in modern times and will also, as was the case in ancient Greece, enrich the program with a series of major cultural events. Accordingly, all participating countries will be invited to exhibit the most magnificent examples of their art, including the work of contemporary folk artists. The outstanding composers, folk musicians, singers and dancers, will have equal opportunity to add lustre and enchantment to a fascinating meeting of exponents of cultural contributions of the peoples from all the corners of the globe. Thus, the noble cultural tradition of the Olympic Games will be restored, and Mexico will offer the double attraction of athletic and cultural events.

The lighted ancestral Olympic torch, carried all the way from Athens, will be placed on top of the majestic Pyramid of the Sun in San Juan Teotihuacán. Gathered in the magnificent "Valley of the Gods", near Mexico City, visitors and public from all parts of the world will witness the arrival of the torch which will burn during the Olympic Games.

It is well to recall that in pre-Hispanic times, on a site not far from the Pyramid of the Sun known as the Cerro de la Estrella (Hill of the Star), took place the most impressive ceremony of antiquity: the revival of the Sacred Fire. Every 52 years,—a century according to the Aztec Calendar—fires were extinguished in all dwellings. The people congregated around the hill, and at midnight, when the priests observed that the Seven Pleaiades did not interrupt their course, they considered that life was assured for at least another cycle of 52 years. According to ancestral beliefs, the end of the world was sure to come when on one of those occasions, the Pleaiades would not proceed on their course.

The solemnity of such outlook imposed the necessity of reflection and penance before the rekindling of the Sacred Fire. Fire is a symbol of life and in the Valley of Mexico, at midnight, on the Cerro de la Estrella, it was revived every fifty two years. With flint and touchwood it was lighted in the most complete darkness and absolute silence. The rekindling fire multiplied itself, and there were thousands of fantastic lights to brighten the darkness, as each inhabitant carried home his torch. The beauty of the ceremony and its profound significance marked it as one of the most important events in the pre-Columbian world.

In our time, in the same Valley of Mexico, in the archaeological city of San Juan Teotihuacán, atop the Pyramid of the Sun, next year we will witness the arrival of the symbol of Greek culture: the Fire of Athens, where the Olympic Games originated as a symbol of peace.

Let us hope that the revival of the Olympic Torch on the Pyramid of the Sun will symbolize peace among men and survival of mankind.

EDUCATION BILLS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, our Republican colleagues are about to try one of the fastest end runs in recent legislative history. On the surface their education bill, H.R. 8983, seems to provide for a general kind of aid to education which the Congress has, heretofore, not legislated. But the simplicity of their approach covers up some far-reaching effects on educational capabilities of local educational agencies. And we ought to look at those effects, because in my opinion they would be disastrous for educational advancement in this country.

The disparities between the fiscal year 1969 amounts under H.R. 8983 and those under the committee bill, H.R. 7819, are shocking. For example, using authorization figures for both bills, New York State gets $122 million less under the Republican substitute than it would under H.R. 7819. Mississippi's allocation decreases under the Quie substitute, from $99.6 million to $52 million. Most southern and border States, in fact, receive much greater amounts under the committee bill than under the proposed Republican alternative.

North Carolina would get $101 million under the Republican bill, but $150 million under the committee bill.

Alabama would receive $75 million under the Quie substitute and $107 million under the committee bill.

Arkansas would obtain $39 million under H.R. 8983 and $66 million under the committee bill.

Georgia would increase from $88 million under the Republican bill to $118 million under the committee bill.

Kentucky would receive only $63 million under the Republican measure, but $87 million under the committee bill.

Similar decreases under the Quie substitute are found in Louisiana, a loss of $19 million; South Carolina, down $33 million; Tennessee, $29 million; Virginia, $13 million; and the District of Columbia, a loss of $6 million. In my own State of Oklahoma there will be a loss of $7.5 million.

These are the States with the greatest need for financial assistance in education. Yet the Republican bill would deny them these resources. The effect of the Republican formula is directly contrary, in fact, to the gentleman from Minnesota's own amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act last year. That amendment would have provided for use of the national per pupil expenditure by those States that fell below the average.

In addition, the Republican formula does not guarantee that within each State, school districts with low fiscal capacity will receive a greater than average share of funds. More importantly, the Republican proposal fails to assure that the funds will be used to meet the extra costs associated with the education of children of poverty.

This amendment marks the end of the national priority which the Congress has established in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—to meet the special needs of poor children in our midst who have been deprived of equal educational opportunities. In turning away from this fundamental principle, we shall be turning away from those deprived children who represent a great national source of human potential.

Mr. Speaker, last week Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner released a comprehensive statement on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I include Secretary Gardner's statement in the Record at this point:

Statement by John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare

The substitute that Representative Albert Quie has proposed for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 could, if enacted, undermine and destroy much that the Congress and the Administration have jointly achieved in recent educational legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is now bringing new skills and opportunities to eight million disadvantaged children and new hope and potentialities to every school district in the Nation, would be wiped out.

The proposal by Mr. Quie which threatens to produce this disastrous result has never been considered in Committee, has never been made the subject of hearings, and has been hastily revised three or four times within the past three weeks.

In place of the carefully considered, broad categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—categories which the Congress deems to be in the national interest—the Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs. In the guise of conferring greater freedom on American education, it would scatter Federal financial assistance in such a manner that the American taxpayer would likely receive little for his money.

It would take away Federal assistance from States which most need the aid because of their low economic capabilities and high concentration of educationally deprived children. The Southern and border States would lose $371 million, while the great cities of New York, California and Illinois would also suffer substantial cuts in Federal assistance.

Carefully defined and selected targets for educational improvement, now specified as beneficiaries of the ESEA, would suffer. Programs for the children of migrant workers, for foster children, for children in institutions for the handicapped, neglected or delinquent, children in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools, and children in the Territories of the United States would all suffer.

The Quie substitute cannot guarantee that Federal aid will be concentrated in places and in amounts necessary to do the job, rather than merely be dissipated in wide areas and for a wide variety of second-priority activities. It cannot guarantee, for example, that the cities, so sorely in need of Federal assistance, will receive their fair share of aid.

And it is a very unsure instrument for dealing with the gravest problem facing our nation today—the adequate education of children of the slums and rural depressed areas.

Even more serious is the fact that the Quie substitute poses a grave threat to the consensus that was put together with such difficulty in 1965 when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act came into being. For years all forward-looking Americans had known that the Federal Government must eventually provide large-scale support for education—but for years, literally decades, the accomplishment was frustrated by dissension over several key issues, chief among them the Church-State question.

The Quie substitute strikes at the very heart of that consensus, and we are already hearing the return of the old dissension and divisiveness. If it bursts out in full fury, we shall have neither the present Act nor the Quie substitute. We'll find ourselves right back where we were two years ago.

Some proponents of the Quie substitute say it offers flexibility and freedom of decision to the States in place of the narrow categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This is misleading in the extreme. The categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are anything but narrow. They are very broad and flexible. Its major titles contain the broadest and most permissive authorizations in American legislative history to strengthen the State departments of education, to stimulate educational expansion and innovation, to acquire the latest and best instructional materials, and, especially, to focus on the problems of educationally disadvantaged children, wherever they may be found, but particularly in our great urban complexes and sparsely populated rural counties.

No one in the Executive Branch or in the Congress has spoken or worked more consistently than I for helping the States to achieve greater flexibility and initiative in administering Federal programs. In the Partnership for Health legislation which we proposed and the Congress passed last year we combined 15 narrow categorical aid programs. In our Education Professions Development bill this year we would replace numerous fragmented training authorities with one comprehensive and flexible training program.

At the same time, I believe that Federal dollars should in broad terms be directed to targets selected by the elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States. They speak for the States and they judge the needs of the States against a background of national priorities.

While we must do everything within our power to strengthen the States—and no Administration has done more than this one to build strength in the State departments of education—I believe that as long as Federal resources in the field of education are limited, they should be used primarily for the elimination of those educational problems which the Congress identifies as the greatest obstacle to the growth and development of our Nation.

COORDINATED BARGAINING

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, America's trade unions initiated a new kind of collective bargaining last year—coordinated bargaining. Eleven AFL–CIO unions, in an effort to sit down at the bargaining table on a more equal basis with two of the Nation's largest corporations, General Electric and Westinghouse, joined together in working out and presenting their wage and benefit demands.

This historic effort ended a long period in which the huge companies were able to play off one union against the other. The 11 unions which joined together in this new unity were the Auto Workers, the Carpenters, the International Union of Electrical Workers, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, the Flint Glass Workers, Allied Industrial Workers, the Machinists, the Plumbers and Pipe Fitters, Sheet Metal Workers, Steelworkers, and the Technical Engineers.

David Lasser, assistant to the president of one of the unions, the International Union of Electrical Workers, wrote a report on this new American labor development, entitled "A Victory for Coordinated Bargaining," for the American Federationist, monthly magazine published by the AFL–CIO. Mr. Lasser was chairman of the steering committee of the 11-union committee on collective bargaining.

For the information of all of us, I include Mr. Lasser's article in the Record at this point:

A Victory for Coordinated Bargaining

(By David Lasser)

When negotiations were concluded between 11 AFL–CIO unions and General Electric and Westinghouse, the first phase of labor's most ambitious effort at coordinated bargaining was completed.

Involving nearly 200,000 employees of these two companies, this effort has had a great impact upon coordinated bargaining developments and may influence the future character of labor-management relations in the United States.

The mainspring for the 1966 developments lay in the background and experiences of the 11 unions in the electrical manufacturing industry over the past decade.

There is no other major industry where bargaining rights are fragmented among so many unions. GE boasts, in fact, that it deals with "100-odd unions." Further, the majority of the bargaining units deal on a local basis with the local managements.

The International Union of Electrical Workers has about 120,000, or 60 percent, of the coordinated 11-union membership. The other 10 unions have about 80,000. There are small AFL–CIO units in these companies which are not in the 11-union group, while other small units are outside the AFL–CIO.

This situation was made to order for corporations intent upon "divide and rule."

GE's policy was to keep the unions weak, divided and discredited. "One and only one offer" was made simultaneously to all unions (and to non-union employes). Relentless drives were made to secure acceptances by the weakest of the bargaining units and then to undermine the resistance of any holdouts.

This company policy was aided by staggered expiration dates of various contracts, which had the effect of preventing a massing of inter-union strength.

While not pursuing its policy in such a blatant manner, Westinghouse faithfully followed the GE bargaining programs and main techniques.

Previous efforts had been made, at least by the larger unions, to coordinate bargaining goals and strategy. But the management forces defeated them all, making concessions on some key local issues to break away important units, while maintaining constant pressure on the rest.

GE in particular took every opportunity to exploit old suspicions and divisions among the unions and even within them. Company negotiators in one city often gave false reports on the actions of another local in a city far away. Too often these reports were believed, for there was no easy way to check them.

The results for GE-Westinghouse workers were disastrous. Yearly wage increases and a cost-of-living escalator were lost in 1960 negotiations. Three years later, already-weak arbitration clauses were further emasculated. Intensive company campaigns were pressed for the downward reclassification of job rates, an end to incentive bonuses and institution of speedups. Strikes over unsettled grievances were frequent.

The total six-year wage gain from 1960 was only 10 to 12 percent, although living costs alone rose 9½ percent over the same period. Package gains—wages and fringes combined—amounted to only 6.6 cents an hour each year in GE and a mere 5.6 cents in Westinghouse. In comparable industries, the annual hourly increase was nearly double—10 to 14 cents an hour.

Meanwhile, manhour productivity rose better than 5 percent a year and GE and Westinghouse profits nearly doubled.

The transformation that took place in 1966, resulting in vastly improved contracts, was achieved in a single year of successful coordinated bargaining. But a number of major problems, some of them unique, first had to be met and overcome.

1. BUILDING THE STRUCTURE

There was sober recognition by the participating unions that their undertaking involved a challenge to one of the major citadels of anti-union activity in the United States—General Electric.

This company had loudly proclaimed "victories" over the unions in the past 10 years and had berated other companies for yielding to: "inflationary" and "unsound" settlements.

A new failure would not only fix GE and Westinghouse more firmly on their course, but could lead to defeatism among the employes. And this could have repercussions elsewhere in the labor-management field.

It was also recognized that an adequate organizational apparatus and the full support of the labor movement were essential.

Accordingly, AFL–CIO President George Meany and the presidents of the coordinating unions created a Committee on Collective Bargaining to act on major policies and to coordinate the commitment of the full strength of the trade union movement.

A Steering Committee, composed of leaders of each union, was set up as the administrative arm of the CCB. The Steering Committee, in turn, created a series of subcommittees on economics, collective bargaining programs, pensions and insurance, publicity and education and on law.

Members of the Steering Committee acted as chairmen of the subcommittees. About 50 union officials were involved in these committees. They had a mission and a timetable.

This placed heavy demands on some unions whose interests in GE and Westinghouse were marginal to their whole range of activities. For example, only about 5,000 of the Auto Workers' 1.3 million members are employed by GE. While the percentage of GE and Westinghouse membership is larger for the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers and the Machinists, their major collective bargaining concerns lie elsewhere. For the other eight unions—except the American Federation of Technical Engineers—the proportion of membership was even less.

Yet, by providing staff and resources for the many activities, these unions made a contribution well beyond their direct interest. They made it because they recognized fully the urgent need to challenge these companies to carry on their bargaining in good faith.

No votes were taken in committees since unanimous agreement on all major activities was required. Where differences inevitably arose, they were thrashed out until a consensus developed.

This policy, freely publicized, was used by GE to try to alarm IUE members that other unions might "lock them" into positions not in accord with their interest. In turn, it warned the other unions that the "dominance" of IUE would jeopardize their ability to reach agreements based on their local needs. This strategy failed because the CCB was prepared to meet it.

Meany acted as chairman of the CCB and gave the movement his active support, participating as a major speaker at national conferences, signing statements and securing the enthusiastic endorsement of the AFL–CIO Executive Council and the AFL–CIO convention.

A member of the AFL–CIO public relations staff was assigned to the CCB and the full resources of AFL–CIO departments were made available.

At the first coordinated national conference on March 15, 1966, Many said:

"What you are doing here is very simple and very sensible . . . you are banding together to cooperate with each other for your mutual aims.

"I not only see nothing wrong with that, I see everything right with it. And I believe that the community will see nothing wrong with it. And corporations who mean to bargain in good faith should see nothing wrong with it, either."

Meany appeared again at the critical September 28 conference a few days before the GE deadline and reiterated full support should a crisis occur. He threw labor's weight against the effort of government officials to move on October 1 for a general Taft-Hartley injunction and later chaired the CCB meeting that approved the GE national settlement.

A further practical demonstration of this support came in the offer to IUE of an $8 million loan, with more funds available if needed.

The 1965 convention of the Industrial Union Department also pledged full support and gave unstintingly of technical aid and other assistance.

Thus it became clear that this was no mere ritualistic procedure but a deep commitment, laying on the line the prestige and resources of the entire labor movement.

2. DEVELOPING A BARGAINING PROGRAM

Bargaining with GE and Westinghouse is actually carried on at three levels. IUE, having national agreements with both companies, and the IBEW, with a national agreement for part of its membership in Westinghouse, bargain on national issues. Additional bargaining is carried on by locals on supplements.

The local units of the rest of the unions (and most of the IBEW) bargain out local agreements covering the same issues as both the local and national bargaining where chainwide agreements exist.

To cope with this complex structure, the CCB decided to adopt "national bargaining goals," consisting of the major economic items and a number of non-economic issues where most of the contracts were uniform.

By concentrating on these goals, leaving each union free to pursue additional aims, there could be a focus around which coordination could take place.

Such a program was developed, approved on March 15 and widely circulated to the membership and the public. It called basically for a return to annual wage increases to reflect the increases in productivity; restoration of a cost-of-living escalator; action to eliminate area wage differentials; improvements in pensions, insurance, holidays, and vacations; a better layoff income plan; improved employment security provisions; and action on a number of key contract areas such as arbitration, union shop and subcontracting.

These were matters that had been the subject of previous negotiations, had developed the keenest interest on the part of the membership and were likely to create the firmest support in dealing with the companies.

It is significant that both companies, when they finally made offers, stressed that the terms were in response to the proposals put forward by the unions.

3. RALLYING THE MEMBERSHIP

The General Electric bargaining strategy was based on winning over the union membership.

GE has always looked on bargaining committees as only a legal mechanism to make offers and receive acceptances. Massive propaganda campaigns are mounted to swamp the communities and smash opposition to its "one and only one offer."

Thus, unless the membership could be convinced that the programs of the coordinated group were worthy of full support, labor unity could fall apart in a crisis.

The first step called on the 200 local unions to send delegates to the national conference in Washington March 15 to develop and to ratify the national bargaining goals.

Some 300 delegates attended. From them came a deep and fervent enthusiasm that astounded even the national leadership.

The dozens of local union officers who spoke made clear that—in their view—they at last had an instrument to challenge the arrogance of the companies.

The national bargaining goals and a resolution on unity, adopted at the conference, set the sights for the future.

The unity resolution pledged: "Today, we intend to confront the company-wide policies with a union-wide program." The delegates "pledged to each other our mutual cooperation, our mutual understanding, our mutual support. It is our conviction that if we do stand together, the managers of these corporations will recognize that their best policy is to bargain in good faith toward a just and adequate settlement."

These were words. There was now the job of involving the rank and file members and their families.

A newspaper, Unity, was published monthly and sent directly to the members. Distributed also were thousands of copies of the program, the unity statement, economic material justifying the union demands and suggestions on countering company propaganda.

Seventeen inter-union meetings were held during May and June in cities across the country to bring the issues to the grass roots and involve the local stewards. These meetings required each union to supply skilled staff to arrange programs, develop attendance, participate, handle the meetings, develop publicity and carry out other tasks.

Nearly 3,000 local officials attended these meetings and confirmed the conviction that there existed a powerful determination to stand together for real collective bargaining and an adequate contract in 1966.

One of the major requests raised in the grass roots meetings was for a rapid exchange of information on developments at the hundreds of bargaining tables. All too frequently in the past, the companies utilized their network of teletype machines to spread false and misleading stories on bargaining developments. This led not only to confusion but also, at times, to dismay.

Seventeen regional coordinators were, therefore, appointed from the unions to work on a full-time basis, with teletypes linking them with coordinating headquarters in Washington and the key national negotiation centers (New York for GE and Pittsburgh for Westinghouse). Bargaining developments, company statements, local union actions, were gathered by the coordinators, fed into Washington, then digested and disseminated back to the coordinators and through them to locals.

The complicated nature of the negotiations made this system essential—and the system worked. False rumors were scotched and misleading statements were corrected. News was distributed as fast—or faster—than GE could do it. Above all, the membership had confidence that they now had information to match that put out by the companies. In fact, so efficient and so accurate was the CCB system that some local company officials relied on our news reports for a correct picture of what was taking place.

Another question raised at the grass roots meetings was this: "Are we going to stick together?" Here again, the communications network helped provide the answer.

Naturally, the decision on each settlement lay in the hands of the responsible unions. What was done in concert could be only the result of voluntary decisions. But with respect to local negotiations there were no secrets, either.

The communications network was well established by the time GE, in mid-September, finally announced its "one and only one offer."

Regional coordinators, and through them the local membership, swiftly learned not only the terms of the offer, but how it compared with the national bargaining goals, step by step.

A special issue of Unity was produced and distributed.

One fact was immediately apparent and another became clear very soon.

First, the GE offer was vastly better than the company had predicted six months earlier. Not only was the wage offer in excess of the then-current "guidelines" (which GE had earlier described as too generous), but it also included substantial improvements in pensions, insurance and other fringe terms which legally were not open for bargaining until 1968. There is not the slightest doubt that the unbroken front of the CCB unions was responsible.

Second, in making this much better but still inadequate offer, GE's apparent objective was to preserve its "one and one only" tradition. This offer was intended as its only offer.

As the termination date of most GE contracts neared, CCB decided to call another national conference. Each bargaining unit was asked to poll its own membership on the crucial questions—to accept GE's offer, to authorize a strike or simply to continue bargaining. Each was requested to report to the conference on September 28.

Meanwhile, a revised set of national goals, whittled down to eight issues, was prepared for submission to the conference. These represented an earnest effort to react realistically to the GE offer.

The second conference was even more successful than the first. A unanimous conference statement said:

"We want a settlement, not a strike. But we want to make it clear to GE that the offer now before us is not acceptable; and that we do not accept the Boulware philosophy that it cannot be improved.

"It must be improved—by midnight, October 2."

The conference also authorized a special "action committee" of the CCB "to evaluate any responsible and responsive offers made by GE in the next four days and to make appropriate recommendations."

Thus was created a unanimous determination by the membership of 11 unions to stand firm. If no acceptable agreement was reached by October 2, chainwide strikes would shut down 90 percent of the GE plants.

4. COORDINATION OF BARGAINING

Preceding sections have brought the story up to the October 2 deadline. Now let's go back about six months and see what was going on at the bargaining table.

One of the basic aims of the coalition was to secure coordination at the bargaining table itself. After all, on most major issues the contracts were similar. Company offers were generally identical on economic issues and most important contract matters.

Early in 1966, several opportunities were offered to try out the coordinated approach.

For example, both companies were utilizing the 1965 Social Security Act changes to reduce pensions to many employes. The passage of Medicare had raised problems concerning the benefits of retired employes.

A second opportunity arose from an offer by GE to each bargaining group to join management representatives in prenegotiation subcommittees to discuss some of the important bargaining issues of 1966.

The Steering Committee requested meetings to discuss both these matters. Both requests were rejected by the companies.

A third opportunity arose from GE's attitude toward coalition itself.

GE at first had scorned the united effort, predicting it would surely fail, like others before it.

As it ruefully said later: "Until recently, the coalition seemed to be just so much play-acting on a far off stage."

However, as coalition gained momentum, GE raised cries of alarm that labor was "intent on crisis bargaining to force a strike in the hope of getting the settlement dictated in Washington."

Both companies stated their determination to adhere to the traditional bargaining, dealing only with the usual national or local units.

Following the March 15 conference, a letter to the president of each company, signed by the presidents of the coordinating unions, requested an informal meeting to stop the drift toward crisis.

This request was also rejected.

Since joint meetings were clearly not possible, IUE wrote to GE on April 13, saying it would abandon any further requests.

The letter proposed a meeting with GE to attempt to resolve the overhanging dispute over GE's projected subcommittees and determine if adequate ground rules could be negotiated.

The company had insisted that these meetings consider only a few of the economic issues at stake in 1966 and that both parties be free to publicize any discussions. The unions wanted to discuss all issues and prohibit any statements during such discussions from being used for propaganda. The company charged this was a move for "secrecy" and that by insisting upon ground rules in advance, the unions were "torpedoing" the idea. Actually, GE's anxiety to preserve the

"Boulware" approach, even on this question, ran counter to its desire to get the meetings under way.

Ultimately, a meeting for May 4 was arranged between the IUE negotiating committee and GE.

The IUE negotiating committee that appeared on May 4 included representatives of the other 10 unions. The IUE committee believed that in this way it could utilize the experience of the other unions not only in dealing with GE, but with other companies also.

This procedure had been sanctioned in previous NLRB decisions and upheld by court reviews on the premise that a union could name its own bargaining representatives.

However, GE walked out of the May 4 meeting and a legal battle ensued which has gone to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The NLRB filed charges against GE for refusal to bargain. GE, in turn, filed counter-charges that the 11 unions and the Steering Committee were engaged in an illegal conspiracy to force it to bargain jointly with them. GE further charged that the unions had "locked themselves" into a pact, depriving themselves of the freedom to bargain.

The NLRB dismissed GE's complaints and its general counsel sought a federal court injunction to compel GE to recognize the IUE committee.

This type of injunction, while rarely used, is an important part of the NLRB arsenal when normal board procedures would be too slow and failure to bargain might cause a strike.

On August 18, federal Judge Marvin Frankel granted the injunction.

GE testimony, Judge Frankel declared, showed clearly that "The company offers to the many unions turn out to be substantially uniform in their basic provisions. And the substantial uniformity appears to extend to the agreements eventually concluded."

The court added that, while GE "takes pains to coordinate its own dealings with the many bargaining units, it foresees a danger of national strikes from all approach to similar coordination on the other side of the bargaining table . . ."

Judge Frankel suggested the company should go to the bargaining table and "test the possibility of agreement and the good faith of the IUE."

This was the first injunction issued by a court to compel a company to meet with a union committee which included representatives from other unions.

While GE declared it would appeal the decision, it temporarily accepted the injunction order. When negotiations opened on August 23, the IUE committee included representatives of the other 10 unions and they were accepted.

Some days later, a Court of Appeals panel reversed Judge Frankel. An Alice in Wonderland period set in, during which members of other unions sat as IUE representatives while GE bargainers studiously ignored them.

Supreme Court Justice Harlan then reinstated the Frankel order. With the contract expiration date approaching, GE abandoned its resistance and dealt with the committee from then on.

The NLRB has completed its hearings on the basic case. However, the injunction is still before the courts. The CCB still functions and the Steering Committee has developed a program of activities on contract administration and wage goals on a permanent basis. The Supreme Court has referred back to Judge Frankel the NLRB and IUE requests that the injunction be continued.

When bargaining with Westinghouse began, the company issued a statement of legal objection but did not try to prevent the presence of representatives of other unions.

This practice spread even into local bargaining, adding further cement to interunion unity.

Discussions also were held with non-AFL-CIO unions to develop plans for cooperation. Talks with the UE leadership failed, but those with the Federation of Westinghouse Salaried Employes were more fruitful.

5. HANDLING GOVERNMENT INTERVENTION

The 1966 negotiations brought government intervention, with some ominous overtones.

During the weekend of October 1–2, as the deadline with GE approached, the unions learned that the Administration would request a Taft-Hartley injunction, if necessary, to prevent interruption of GE's defense production.

There was a strong implication that the proposed injunction might cover the entire chain.

Only a few months before, the Department of Defense had expressed no interest in a long strike at IUE's Lynn, Mass., plant, one of those cited as vital to the defense work.

Under an injunction, strikes would be prohibited for 80 days in a number of decisive GE plants, or all of them, with the employes working under the old agreement. A vote on the company's last offer would be taken at the end of 60 days, or in December, with the 80-day injunction expiring just before Christmas.

While GE had insisted the unions would cry for public intervention, it had, nevertheless, assured its customers that Taft-Hartley injunctions might be relied upon to prevent strikes.

While recognizing the need for continued production for Viet Nam, vigorous protests were made by President Meany against the one-sided character of the proposed injunction.

The result was a request by President Johnson that strike action be deferred for 14 days. A presidential panel, consisting of the Secretaries of Defense, Commerce and Labor, would assist the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in arriving at an agreement.

The unions and GE accepted the President's request, negotiations were shifted to Washington and an intensive series of meetings ensued under the guidance of the presidential panel.

GE's bargaining position had been stated categorically on July 20:

"Thus employes—and union officials, too—can be assured that General Electric's initial offer to unions will be full measure and that nothing will be held back for release only when a strike is threatened.

"They can also know that a strike—no matter how long and complicated by intervention—will not change our firm determination to not undermine the long-range interests of the business and the jobs our employes depend on."

GE's first offer had been for a 36-month agreement. Its second proposal was a "rearrangement" for a 38-month agreement with some enlarged benefits but, in the view of the unions, this was less favorable than the original proposal. A third proposal was for a 42-month contract, again in the union's view not as good as the original.

In Washington, the union spokesmen argued that there was a burden upon the panel to secure concessions from GE that might make a settlement possible.

No question was raised openly concerning the presence in panel meetings of the representatives of all the unions. It was recognized that it would be impossible to secure agreements within the 14-day period without their presence. It would not have been possible for the presidential panel to meet with each union separately, nor would it have been acceptable to deal with IUE representatives alone.

The unions told the panel frankly that, in addition to the national bargaining goals, local issues must be solved before agreements could be reached. They stressed the urgent need for GE to move on local bargaining to prevent strikes when the 14-day period ended.

It must be said that the panel worked diligently at its task, meeting with each party, with both parties and holding long sessions itself.

The 14-day period was almost at an end before agreement was reached on October 16. Ahead was the certainty that, unless there was a settlement, the Taft-Hartley injunction request definitely would be renewed.

Even though the IUE agreement was signed and the national bargaining goals issue resolved, the local negotiations of the other unions continued. Many involved local wage rates, unsettled grievances, seniority problems and so on.

As had been warned, strikes involving some 25,000 employes broke out. Their settlement resulted in some substantial gains on the local issues.

Schenectady, one of GE's largest plants, was shut down for 13 weeks by jointly coordinated strikes of IUE, AFTE, Plumbers and Teamsters, and no return to work took place until all agreements had been settled. In Fort Smith, Arkansas, a UAW strike won substantial improvements in badly substandard wages. The Flint Glass Workers in Logan, Ohio, also gained important concessions, as did AFTE in Pittsfield, Massachusetts.

While a Taft-Hartley injunction prohibited the IAM and UAW from striking the jet engine facility at Evandale, Ohio, later negotiations produced local gains in wages and working conditions.

Meanwhile, negotiations had been at a standstill at Westinghouse. While the IUE contract and those of some of the other groups expired October 17, the company had refused to act pending a GE settlement. The government mediation officials made clear that, if necessary, a number of plants heavily engaged in defense work might well be the subject of a presidential request for a Taft-Hartley injunction.

Agreement with IUE and several other unions on national issues, pretty much on the GE pattern, was reached October 26. However, when locals of the IBEW and FGW struck in order to improve their local agreements, the coordinating unions offered their full support to these strikes.

Greatly improved benefits were secured in almost all instances.

RESULTS OF INTERUNION COORDINATION

1. The 1966 agreements were better than the total of the two preceding contracts, covering 1960–1966. Important benefits lost in 1960 were restored. The annual wage increase was won on a more adequate level, a partial cost-of-living escalator was established and inequity adjustments for day, skilled and salaried workers were negotiated. As noted, the pension, insurance and vacation agreements, closed until 1968, were not only reopened but substantially improved.

2. Equally important was that the GE philosophy of "one and only one offer" was shattered. The final agreement for 36 months and 3 weeks increased the value of the earlier offers by 5 to 7 cents an hour.

The "wage guideline" that GE had said was "too high" was effectively destroyed.

3. The most far-reaching result was membership recognition that coordinated bargaining, in spite of its complexities and difficulties, has completely proved itself and must continue as a permanent feature of GE and Westinghouse negotiations. This led to the cooperation, already mentioned, between unions on strike at a given plant; and the support given by nonstriking to striking locals of various unions where companies tried to move production from one plant to another.

While there was only one year to prepare for 1966 negotiations, there are nearly three years to prepare for 1969. With what has been learned, with harmonious inter-union relations and stronger membership support, a much better job can be done.

Among the problems of coordinated bargaining that need continuing study are the following:

Meshing together better the national and local bargaining of the various unions so that more inter-union support can be rallied for local bargaining.

Closer cooperation among the unions dealing with GE and Westinghouse, giving as much attention to coordination in Westinghouse as in GE.

Extending the coordination to cover all unions in AFL–CIO that deal with these companies and working out possible cooperation with unions not in the AFL–CIO.

Further unification of expiration dates. One great advance was made when IBEW secured a Westinghouse expiration date the same as IUE. However, Westinghouse dates are still two weeks behind that of GE.

Meeting the problems arising from threats of Taft-Hartley injunctions.

Intensifying the coordination, begun in 1966, between the International Metalworkers Federation unions representing GE and Westinghouse workers abroad and those in the United States.

Inter-union coordination, meanwhile, is not awaiting 1969. A program on contract administration has been developed, including cooperation in the handling of grievances that the companies refuse to arbitrate; coordinated action area wage differentials, on problems of unemployment and so on. Studies will be made to determine whether cooperative action is possible to organize the non-union plants of these two companies.

With the great wave of mergers and absorption of companies with different union bargaining representatives, there is a vast field for coordinated bargaining which will increasingly influence labor-management relations of the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Tenzer, for Monday, May 1 and Tuesday, May 2, on account of observance of religious holiday.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. Laird (at the request of Mr. Gross), for 60 minutes, on May 3; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Gross) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Laird.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. Pryor) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Philbin.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 602. An act to revise and extend the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, and to amend title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 303. An act to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

703. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Public Law 90–10 by striking out "prior to 12:01 a.m. of May 3, 1967" and inserting "prior to 12:01 a.m. June 19, 1967" (H. Doc. No. 113); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed with accompanying papers.

704. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the request for appropriations for fiscal year 1968 (H. Doc. No. 114); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

705. A letter from the De Facto Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, transmitting a report that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to docket No. 22–B, *The Mescalero Apache, et al., Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* and docket No. 22–G, *The Mescalero Apache Tribe, et al., Petitioner* v. *The United States of America, Defendant,* pursuant to the provisions of 60 Stat. 1055; 25 U.S.C. 70t; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 9481. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 9467. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9468. A bill to amend subsection (c) of section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code by making it clear that the tax exemption of a civic league or organization exclusively for the promotion of social welfare shall not be affected because of income, including subscription and advertising income, derived from carrying on any publication, such as a journal, which is substantially related to the purpose or function constituting the organization's basis for its tax exemption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9469. A bill to prohibit misuse or exportation of the flag of the United States in certain instances and to prohibit public display of the flag of a foreign government engaging the United States in war or armed conflict; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 9470. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9471. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9472. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARMATZ:

H.R. 9473. A bill to amend provisions of the Shipping Act, 1916, to authorize the Federal Maritime Commission to permit a carrier to refund a portion of the freight charges; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9474. A bill to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restriction on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 9475. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9476. A bill to permit a compact or agreement between the several States relating to taxation of multistate taxpayers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 9477. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act in order to provide financial assistance for the construction of solid waste disposal facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 9478. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide legal defense for employees of the Veterans' Administration who are sued for acts or omissions within the scope of their employment; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9479. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to establish the position of Inspector General in the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 9480. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to correct an inequity with respect to the application of postage rates to publications admitted as second-class mail having original entry at independent cities; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 9481. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUIE:

H. Con. Res. 334. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct a study on means of providing for earlier availability of funds for educational assistance programs and of information relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. TAFT:

H. Res. 456. Resolution to condemn persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

162. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, relative to an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to Federal grants; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

163. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to the intrusion by the U.S. Justice Department into the operations of the voter-registrar's offices in the parishes of Caddo, Bossier, and De Soto, La.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

164. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to cooperation by the Secretary of Agriculture with State officials on State laws regulating the grain shipping industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

Friday, April 28, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Blessed and eternal God, from whom we come, by whom we are sustained, and to whom we shall return, look upon us with Thy favor.

To Thee we turn from an unquiet Nation and world. We come with sins that need to be confessed, hopes that need to be renewed, better purposes to be strengthened, and lives to be redirected and reconsecrated.

Remold and remake us in a world where poverty is more prevalent than sufficient needs, where war engulfs us instead of peace, where hope is sought in hopeless strivings.

Grant Thy blessing upon the President and the Congress. Give wisdom and strength to world leaders of righteous conviction and authority. Through these leaders and the peoples, advance the common good for all mankind.

We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 27, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 2508. An act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9029. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 286) to permit duty-free treatment pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 of dicyandiamide and of limestone when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 2508. An act to require the establishment, on the basis of the 18th and subsequent decennial censuses, of congressional districts composed of contiguous and compact territory for the election of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9029. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, despite the previous unanimous-consent request, that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, to expire at not later than 8 minutes after 12 o'clock, and that 2 minutes be allotted to the distinguished Senator from Colorado [Mr. Allott].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights of the Committee on the Judiciary was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 8 minutes after 12 o'clock a quorum call be had, and that when the Senate stands in recess beginning at 12:10 p.m., it stand in recess until 3 o'clock this afternoon.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORATORIUM ON DISCONTINUANCE OF RAILROAD PASSENGER SERVICE AND CANCELLATION OF RAILWAY MAIL CONTRACTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on April 17 I announced my intention of introducing a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Interstate Commerce Commission should declare a moratorium on the discontinuance of railroad passenger service, and that the Post Office Department declare a moratorium on the cancellation of railway mail contracts pending the results of a study, which this resolution calls for, by the new Department of Transportation on the future potential needs for rail passenger and mail service. I rise for that purpose today.

The announcement of my intention to introduce this resolution has resulted in widespread interest, not only in my own State of Colorado—my mail is nearly unanimous in support of the idea—but from many other parts of the Nation as well. The list of cosponsors, which I will announce at the conclusion of these brief remarks, is ample evidence that people from one end of the Nation to the other are most concerned about this problem.

The more I examine this question, the more I am convinced that we must take another look at the long haul and commuter railroad situation as a whole. Passenger train cars in use on class 1 railroads in this Nation have decreased from 43,372 in 1950 to less than 23,000 at present. Passenger train miles have been reduced from 357.5 million in 1950 to about 175 million at present.

As the railroads have been engaged in the rapid process, for various reasons, of getting themselves out of the passenger business, many communities, especially smaller ones, have suffered from the loss of service. Let me emphasize again that I am in no way suggesting that railroads be expected to continue uneconomical passenger operations indefinitely. I am now and always have been an advocate of our free enterprise system. What I am saying is, however, that the time has come for us to examine where we are and what we are doing in light of our future needs for both defense and population mobility.

There is little question that the key issue involved in this controversy centers around our present-day concept of what should be required of private corporations in the public interest. When railroads were almost the only form of long-distance transportation, we required them to provide service commensurate with necessity in the public interest. Sometimes that service was not operated profitably.

Since the emergence of private automobiles and airlines as more dominant means of transportation, the Federal Government, through its policies, has actually encouraged their use, to the detriment of the railroads. I am not judging this policy to be right or wrong. I am merely pointing it out as one of the factors which has caused the posture of the railroad passenger service to be a matter of concern today.

Mr. President, I have drawn no firm conclusions on this matter in my own mind. There is a distinct lack of facts available from which to draw a proper conclusion. It is for precisely that reason that my resolution calls for the Department of Transportation to conduct this in-depth national survey of the situation. Only when we know whether surface rail transportation will be relevant to the developing megalopolis, only when we know if high-speed service with attractive equipment and convenient schedules can attract passengers back to the railroads, only when we are sure that innovations are being tried to keep passenger service in operation, only when the Post Office Department tells us whether or not the time may come when railway post office operations will again be necessary, only when the successful European innovations in equipment and electrification are seriously considered, and only then, Mr. President, will we have the necessary answers from which to make prudent and proper decisions on this vital subject.

Some have suggested that railroad passenger service obviously is not needed because ridership is declining. On the surface that argument appears to be valid. However, I would point out that many urban areas which abandoned their local rapid transit lines no less than 10 or 20 years ago are now busily planning their reconstruction. A careful study, at the time, of the future needs of these urban areas, would have saved millions of dollars and prevented much confusion and congestion.

In addition, I am not at all convinced that present ridership decline is an accurate barometer of the public's acceptance of "good," and I emphasize the word "good," rail transportation. Let me give you an example in just one area. A recent survey by Trains magazine, under the headline "It's True: Steam Pulled Passengers Faster 30 Years Ago," revealed some interesting but seldom heard facts. In 1936, a passenger could travel from Chicago to Denver in 16 hours. Today, 30 years later, with all of our advances in technology, the same passenger must be on the train 16 hours and 45 minutes to make the identical trip. No new stops have been added that would slow the train down. Yet such a fact just does not make sense. Railroads were moving passengers faster 30 years ago than they are today. Something must be wrong. The survey went on to compare additional train times in intercity service between New York and Montreal, New York and Cincinnati, Washington and Cincinnati, Detroit and Chicago, and so forth. In each case the passenger must spend more time aboard the train today than he did in 1936. The report stressed that the survey included the "best intercity train times," so we are comparing apples with apples. I could continue on and on to cite current difficulties with reservations, scheduling, equipment, and the like. But the problem is obvious.

As I stated in my earlier remarks on the subject, I believe that the moratorium by the ICC and the Post Office Department is necessary to the conduct of this study.

Therefore, Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators AIKEN, CANNON, CASE, COOPER, DOMINICK, FANNIN, HANSEN, HATFIELD, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, INOUYE, JAVITS, KUCHEL, MILLER, METCALF, MUNDT, PROUTY, SCOTT, SPARKMAN, TYDINGS, and YOUNG of North Dakota, I send this concurrent resolution to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) was referred to the Committee on Commerce, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 25

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That for the purpose of relieving the ever increasing congestion on the Nation's highways, promoting the spread of population throughout the Nation, and providing relief to an overburdened mail service, it is the sense of the Congress that the Secretary of Transportation should make a full and complete investigation and study of the potential of rail transportation, particularly over existing lines and rights-of-way, for passenger and mail transportation in the United States. Such investigation and study should include—

(1) a determination of the possible future use of high speed passenger trains in the various corridor cities or megalopolis areas of the Nation;

(2) a determination of the possible future use of auto carrier passenger trains for long distance high speed rail transportation;

(3) a determination of the possibilities of developing economical means to continue and provide additional rail service to small communities not located in areas of dense population;

(4) a determination of the possible use of electricity for high speed rail transportation;

(5) in consultation with the Postmaster General, a determination of the possible use of high speed rail transportation for post office operations;

(6) a review of all existing research and development in rail transportation and a determination of areas where future research and development should be concentrated; and

(7) such other matters as would promote such purpose.

SEC. 2. It is also the sense of the Congress that pending the completion of such investigation and study by the Secretary of Transportation—

(1) the Interstate Commerce Commission should exercise such authority as it has under law to prevent any further discontinuance or abandonment of railroad passenger service; and

(2) the Postmaster General should continue all existing arrangements for railroad mail transportation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS TO 3 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 3 o'clock p.m. today.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until 3 o'clock p.m., the same day.

At 3 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia in the chair).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 27, 1967, the President had approved and signed the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 49) to designate April 28–29, 1967, as "Rush-Bagot Agreement Days."

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letter, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE BUDGET, 1968, FOR TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 23)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the budget for the fiscal year 1968, in the amount of $1,361,000, for the Treasury Department (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR VARIOUS DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES (S. DOC. NO. 22)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting proposed additional appropriations, in the amount of $6,159,000, for the fiscal year 1967, and $12,665,000, for the fiscal year 1968, for various departments and agencies (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON CLAIMS OF CERTAIN INDIANS

A letter from the Chairman, Indian Claims Commission, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, that proceedings have been finally concluded with respect to the claims of *The Mescalero Apache et al.* v. *The United States of America*, Docket No. 22–B, and *The Mescalero Apache Tribe et al.* v. *The United States of America*, Docket No. 22–G (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

House Concurrent Resolution I-1

A concurrent resolution applying to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to apportionment.

Be it Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of North Dakota, the Senate concurring therein:

Whereas, the United States Supreme Court has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned only according to population; and

Whereas, for 175 years the people of the various states have had the freedom to apportion their legislatures in the manner they felt best reflected the best interests of the people, recognizing that a system of apportionment that might be best for one state might not necessarily accommodate the needs of another state, but that each should be free to make its own selection;

Now, therefore, be it Resolved that this Legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of submitting a Constitutional Amendment to the States which will secure to the people the right of some choice in the method of apportionment of one house of a state legislature on a basis other than population alone; and

Be it further Resolved that this resolution is rescinded if the Congress itself proposes such a plan to the states for ratification; and

Be it further Resolved that a duly attested copy of this Resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States and to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States.

Gordon S. Aamoth,
Speaker of the House.
G. R. Gilbreath,
Chief Clerk of the House.
Charles Tighe,
President of the Senate.
Leo Leidholm,
Secretary of the Senate.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted, until midnight tonight, to file reports, together with minority, individual, or supplemental views, if desired.

The PRESIDINIG OFFICER (Mr. Baker in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 617. A bill to authorize the State of Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for schools and other public institutions (Rept. No. 198).

By Mr. KUCHEL, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 889. A bill to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California (Rept. No. 199); and

S. 1098. A bill to amend the act of September 26, 1950, authorizing the Sacramento Valley irrigation canals, Central Valley project, California, in order to increase the capacity of certain project features for future irrigation of additional lands (Rept. No. 200).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1652. A bill for the relief of Anastasia D. Mpatzian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of Duk Hwa Kim and his wife, Kyi Bok Han Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. Gruening):

S. 1654. A bill to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bartlett when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1655. A bill to amend the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act to authorize user charges for certain services performed thereunder by the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; and

S. 1656. A bill to amend the marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MORSE:

S.J. Res. 79. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees; placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above joint resolution when reported by Mr. Morse, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

INVESTIGATION AND STUDY TO DETERMINE THE POTENTIAL OF RAILROAD PASSENGER AND MAIL TRANSPORTATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Aiken, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Case, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hansen, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Miller, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Scott, Mr. Sparkman, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Young of North Dakota), submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 25) to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Allott, which appears under a separate heading.)

ALASKA OIL PROGRESS REPORT: NAVAL PETROLEUM RESERVE NO. 4

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, this year is the centennial celebration of Alaska's acquisition by the United States. Much has taken place during the past 100 years in Alaska, but when compared with the promise of the future, it seems truly infinitesimal. We have a great and wonderful State, and we look forward to the challenge of the future. The flag of Alaska most symbolically shows the Big Dipper and the North Star—the star to guide us into the future and the dipper to sustain us, a dipper filled with the treasures that are Alaska's: its forests, its clear and abundant streams, its wildlife, its buried diches, and most of all, its people.

We Alaskans feel we have a lot to brag about, and sometimes we do brag a little—we are the biggest, we are the farthest north, we are the farthest west, we have the longest shoreline, the highest mountain, the largest bears, and so on—but, generally, we do not brag at all. I think we know how good Alaska is, but we also know we can make it better. Careful but imaginative exploitation of our natural treasures is one way Alaskans are working to make their State better.

The face of Alaska is showing the marks of technological change. Where once the environment denied man access, he is now able to survive; and where man formerly went on foot, he is now able to take limited amounts of heavy equipment. Change is the order of the day, and change we will, for we realize our future depends on the recovery and utilization of our natural resources—and the margin of profit is the balance between efficient modern methods and the stern environment.

We have barely begun to develop our resource industries. Untapped reservoirs of gas and oil await the driller's bit; veins of precious and semiprecious ore lie hidden below the surface; great forests stand silent and unproductive; and our waters abound with an immeasurable harvest. More than half the land is farther than 100 miles from the inadequate, defense-oriented system of highways—and the terrain is unaccommodating.

Despite the formidable obstacles that must be overcome, some of our industries are growing at a healthy rate, Mr. President, and one of the fastest growing is the petroleum industry. I would like to take this opportunity to describe that growth so that all Senators will better appreciate the problems that confront us and the great strides we are making in Alaska. This industry is typical of many in the State, and it demonstrates both the drive that is necessary to gain success and the economic benefits that result.

The oil industry is not new to Alaska. The presence of oil seepage has been known for centuries, and native Alaskans understood its importance despite their inability to render it very useful. Oil was found in the Arctic tundra, along the peninsula, in the Cook Inlet area, at Nome, and east of Prince William

Sound at Katalla. "Katalla," in fact, is the Indian word for oil.

The first serious attempts to drill for oil were made at the beginning of this century, but the crudeness of equipment and the limited knowledge available doomed the ventures to failure. Other attempts were made periodically until the 1930's when limited success was achieved in the Katalla area. There, 37 wells were drilled, of which 18 were producers of a high-quality, paraffin-base oil. The operation would be called a "shoestring operation" by most of us today. The difficulties and hardships endured were so great that a fire in the refinery was sufficient to end all work in 1933.

Little more was done until the latter part of World War II when a massive attempt was mounted in the Arctic by the Navy in the hope of locating oil reserves which could sustain the Nation in the event of a long drawn-out war. From a base established at Point Barrow, geophysical exploration teams searched the entire North Slope between the Brooks Range and the Arctic Ocean. This area consisted of 23.6 million acres set aside by President Harding in 1923 as Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4—PET-4—and an adjoining 25.8 million acres set aside in 1943 to insure Government ownership of deposits thought to extend beyond the boundaries of the original reserve.

The exploration and test drilling conducted by the Navy continued until 1953 when, despite promise of major finds, a Government economy drive brought all operations to a halt. Following this decision, the 25.8 million acres adjoining PET-4 were returned to the public domain in 1958.

It is interesting to note that although huge deposits were indicated by the exploratory operations—it is estimated that 57 million barrels of oil can be produced at the Umiat structure alone—at the cessation of operations only a small amount of oil from test wells had been produced. In fact the only actual use of energy from PET-4 has been the supplying of natural gas to Government installations and the village of Barrow under the terms of an act which I sponsored in the 87th Congress.

In 1957, the petroleum industry was reborn in Alaska in the vicinity of Cook Inlet, and this time the infant thrived and is going to reach maturity. The Swanson River on the Kenai Peninsula was the scene of the first major discovery, and the success of this find encouraged a flurry of exploration and drilling that has snowballed into an oil boom.

In 1958 the return of Navy-held land adjacent to PET-4 on the Arctic Slope to the public domain caused feverish speculation and exploration despite the remoteness of the area.

Although exploration and test drilling continued each year with some success, it was not until 1964 that the industry received its second shot in the arm—the one that insured the permanency of the oil industry in Alaska. In that year the tremendous potential of the Middle Ground Shoal in Cook Inlet was discovered. The enthusiasm that greeted that find was summed up by Randolph Yost, president of the Pan American Petroleum Corp., one of the many oil companies established to develop the Alaskan fields, when he described the Middle Ground Shoal structure as "comparable to those found in the Middle East, one of the most prolific oil-producing areas in the world."

Since 1964, the drilling of new wells and the production of oil in the Cook Inlet and Kenai Peninsula areas have been most successful.

Hand in hand with the discovery of oil has been the discovery of gas fields. At the end of 1964 Alaska already had 12 fields, nine of which were in the Cook Inlet-Kenai area. Four of the fields are in continuous production, supplying a high grade of natural gas to consumers in Alaska and soon to supply overseas markets.

Mr. President, the success of the oil industry in Alaska is phenomenal in the light of the difficulties that have had to be overcome. Modern techniques and equipment have accounted for much of the breakthrough, but a large percentage of the credit must be given to the determination of the men involved and the inherent drive of our American free enterprise system. Free enterprise is at its best when vast areas with untapped resources are opened up to production and the local economy benefits from the lifeblood of sustained employment.

Picture, if you will, Mr. President, the Arctic North Slope with its ice and snow and, in the short summer, mile after mile of spongy wet tundra and thousands of lakes and ponds. There tests have shown the presence of gas and oil in huge quantities. The amount at Umiat alone is valued at $150 million, almost three times the total amount spent by the Government on exploration in PET-4. But the lack of suitable transportation from Fairbanks, 500 miles to the south, precludes a wholesale assault on the known reserves. Transportation of equipment to drill one well would cost $1.5 million under present conditions. One industry study estimated a road from Fairbanks would cost $50 million and would reduce the cost of transporting such equipment to $300,000, but still we would need oil and gas collection centers, pipelines and other supporting facilities and access roads. Under these conditions it is extraordinary for private enterprise to keep plugging away in their search for oil. And yet they do. It is ample testimony of their expectation to find rich new fields and their faith in the future growth of Alaska.

Picture, also, the disillusionment that would stem from two unsuccessful wildcat wells, the reward of a handful of valiant, hopeful men after the backbreaking herculean task of trucking heavy drilling equipment across 65 miles of thawing tundra on the roadless Alaska Peninsula. This attempt in 1959 is being matched again by other crews on the peninsula with the same hope—and perhaps this time with more assurance.

The Cook Inlet area, our most productive area, is not without its constant threats from the environment. Platforms like the familiar Texas towers of the Gulf of Mexico have been modified to withstand the barrage of the elements: subzero temperatures; tides rising and falling 30 feet; tidal currents of 5 knots washing away the bottom around the platforms' footings and hurling huge ice cakes against the structures with the fury of runaway boxcars. The life of men on the platforms is no less perilous in the winter as they carry on their work in blizzards driven by winds up to 40 knots. Indeed, the very presence of these undertakings in such an uncompromising environment is a measure of Alaska's potential.

Mr. President, the growth of the petroleum industry in Alaska is most meaningful to the economy of the entire United States as well as of Alaska. As has been stated by the Secretary of the Interior, the United States will use more petroleum energy between 1966–80 than has been used in the entire history of the industry since 1859. But our national discovery picture is not bright; the total wells drilled by our domestic industry declined 29 percent from 1956 to 1965, and the estimated total wells in 1966 was 11 percent below 1965. This will cause an "energy gap" if allowed to continue.

According to the Secretary of the Interior, to maintain our present ratio of reserves versus production and to meet future natural gas needs, we must find 30 trillion cubic feet of new gas between now and 1980. Alaska's contribution is significant when we realize that the average rate since 1955 will provide only 20 trillion cubic feet by that date. In the case of oil reserves, the quantity found in 1965 was encouraging, but in view of the fact that oil production exceeded new reserves found in 3 of the last 6 years, considerable importance must be given to the efforts waged in Alaska.

The direct Federal benefit from the petroleum industry in Alaska is not easily measured; however, in the Point Barrow vicinity alone, Federal installations have used gas from the South Barrow gas field since 1949 at a real saving to the U.S. taxpayer of $9 million. In the years ahead, the military undoubtedly will receive substantial benefits from a major American-owned Alaska oil field lying directly on the great circle air route to Asia and the Orient.

For the State the rewards of our growing petroleum industry have been many. The construction of refineries, pipelines, tank farms, access roads, shipping terminals, and whole communities to support the industry has provided steady, gainful employment for thousands of persons and has introduced hundreds of thousands of dollars into local communities. Direct revenues realized by the State from 1959 to 1964 amounted to nearly $100 million. The income from competitive bids for oil lands is significant despite its variability. Reflecting a new interest in the Middleton Island area of the Gulf of Alaska, last year's 16th competitive sale amounted to more than $7 million.

In addition, isolated communities such as Barrow and Tyonek are now able to benefit from the abundant supplies of natural gas which had been unused below the surface for centuries while the natives fought against the cold for their very survival. Aside from the immediate benefit of the energy itself, secondary benefits to the villages have been far reaching. The very fact that gas is potentially hazardous has prompted modernization programs to lay out streets and rebuild homes and buildings in well-planned, safe, and efficient communities. Tyonek's benefits have been spectacular. Lease of oil land within the Tyonek reservation has brought $12 million to the natives who have shown great wisdom in their use of the money. Investments as well as community projects have been sound and rewarding.

Historically, petroleum prices have been high, too high, in Alaska. They are still too high. However, the cost of petroleum products to Alaskans has decreased in some cases, reflecting the availability of local petroleum sources. The wholesale price of furnace oil and regular gas in Fairbanks, for example, decreased about 3 cents per gallon from 1959 to 1965, despite rising costs of employee wages and benefits which totaled about 10 percent. During the same period, Federal and State taxes rose 4 cents per gallon.

The future of the industry in Alaska is exceedingly bright. The known and predicted reserves are fabulously large. In the Cook Inlet-Kenai area alone the estimated reserves of oil and gas are 1 billion barrels and 4 trillion cubic feet, respectively. As the industry expands and as its products become more widely available, Alaska's other major industries will benefit. The fishing industry, lumbering and forest products industries, and the mining industry will all find increasing use of Alaska's petroleum products, and by mutual stimulation all will benefit.

The development of an overseas market is certain. Already several large contracts have been awarded. In one, the Tokyo Gas Co. will purchase an estimated $25 million of natural gas per year under a long-term contract. This will require the construction of a multimillion-dollar liquefaction processing plant in the vicinity of Kenai. Contracts also have been awarded for two other natural gas processing plants on the Kenai Peninsula. One, the largest of its kind on the west coast, will produce 530,000 tons of ammonia per year; the other, the largest of its kind in the world, will produce 350,000 tons of prilled urea per year. Products from both plants will be marketed throughout North America and the Pacific basin.

As the needs of the State become more complex, and as the transportation system expands in keeping with the demands of a thriving and growing population, the fruits of today's exploration and wildcatting will be harvested, and Alaska's oil production—which has jumped 16 percent since the first of last year to a record 35,000 barrels per day—will multiply manifold.

Mr. President, as evidenced by the number of companies operating in Alaska, prospecting and drilling is continuing at an accelerated pace. In the Cook Inlet Basin alone during July 1966, nine major companies were wildcatting 19 wells—about 50 percent of which could be expected to be productive if Alaska's high batting average prevailed. In addition, in the vicinity of wells already producing, four development and extension wells were being drilled. Geophysical surveys at that time were being conducted near Nome, in Bristol Bay, along the Alaska Peninsula, in the Gulf of Alaska, and in the Cook Inlet Basin.

Even a partial list of companies active in the State is impressive: Atlantic Richfield Co., Hunt Oil Co., Great Basins Petroleum Corp., Pan American Petroleum Corp., Shell Oil Co., Standard Oil Co. of Calif., Texaco Inc., Trinity Canadian Drilling Co., Union Oil Co. of Calif., El Paso Natural Gas Co., Mobil Oil Co., Signal Oil & Gas Co., Phillips Petroleum Co., Marathon Oil Co., Skelly Oil Co., Sinclair Oil & Gas Co., and Gulf Oil Co.

The industry's contribution since the Swanson River oil discovery in 1957 represents an investment of $500,000,000 and a gross value of oil and gas produced of about $125 million. For the Cook Inlet-Kenai area, the only area of commercial production to date, the cumulative production statistics to March 1, 1966, are interesting.

Field	Number of wells	Oil (barrels)	Gas (thousand cubic feet)
Swanson River	53	52,056,467	42,978,131
Middle Ground Shoal	3	178,523	73,866
Kenai	9		18,143,190
Sterling	1		280,221
North Fork (testing)	2		101,965

Mr. President, my purpose today has been to increase the awareness of my fellow Senators to the progress we are making in Alaska. We still have much to do to catch up with the dimensions of our State. I intend to keep doing what I can for my fellow Alaskans by pointing out and submitting legislation for such needs as are the proper concern of the Federal Government.

Mr. President, in this regard I have introduced today legislation to return Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 to the public domain so that it can be opened up for commercial development. The present policy of maintaining "reserves in the ground" is out of tune with the times. In no conceivable way could such reserves as the undeveloped potential of PET-4 be of use during a national emergency. The only practical, realistic reserve is one which has been thoroughly developed and is immediately available as a source of energy. The opening up of PET-4 with its known resources would further stimulate exploration in adjacent areas which have been inadequately explored. Many agree with me that commercial development of the Arctic North Slope would be attractive and feasible under this arrangement.

Legislation is needed, but of course, the greatest role to be played in the development and growth of the State will fall to the people themselves. That is a tall order for only a quarter of a million people—even for Alaskans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill I have introduced be printed in the RECORD at this point and also a sectional analysis of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1654) to provide for transferring from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior jurisdiction over lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4, and abolishing such naval petroleum reserve, introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and Mr. GRUENING), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, located in the State of Alaska, as defined and established by Executive Order Numbered 3797-A dated February 27, 1923, as amended by public land order 289 dated July 20, 1945, shall be, and the same is hereby, abolished and terminated, and the Executive order creating it is hereby revoked, effective as of thirty days following the date of approval of this Act.

SEC. 2. Jurisdiction over all lands of the United States and over leases, licenses, permits, or other agreements covering such lands within the boundaries of such naval petroleum reserve issued by the Department of the Navy, shall be vested in the Secretary of the Interior effective as of thirty days following the date of approval of this Act, and all original records of all leases, permits, licenses, agreements, all files, letters, documents, maps, records, and all surplus property, building, structures, books of account and improvements relating and pertaining to said reserve shall be transferred to the Department of the Interior on or before such effective date.

SEC. 3. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to affect the validity of any lease, license, permit, transfer, or agreement issued or made under authority of legislation relating to the naval petroleum reserves (10 U.S.C. 7421–7438), or any other Act, and in existence at the time this Act becomes effective, or impair any rights or privileges which have accrued under such leases, licenses, permits, transfers, or agreements.

SEC. 4. Deposits of oil and gas underlying lands of the United States within the boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4, after the effective date of this Act, shall be subject to disposition in the form and manner provided in the Act of Congress approved February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), entitled "An Act to promote the mining of coal, phosphate, oil, oil shale, gas, and sodium on the public domain", as amended: *Provided,* That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may lease by competitive bidding, under general regulations to be issued by him, the oil and gas deposits in any area within the present boundaries of Naval Petroleum Reserve Numbered 4 whenever he believes that knowledge of the area gained through exploration conducted by the United States could redound to the benefit of a holder of an oil and gas lease in that area.

Sec. 5. (a) The Secretary of Defense is authorized to continue present operations in the South Barrow gas field including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) to furnish gas therefrom without charge to the other federal agencies that now or hereafter occupy land at or near Point Barrow, Alaska

(2) to furnish gas therefrom for sale to the village of Barrow, and other communities at or near Point Barrow, Alaska

(3) to explore and develop the gas resources of any portion of the South Barrow

field which is not subject to a lease under the Mineral Leasing Act after notifying the Secretary of the Interior of his proposed action. Any such exploration will be limited to the need for reserves to continue the activities authorized under this subsection.

(b) The Secretary of the Interior shall not lease under the Mineral Leasing Act, without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, acting on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, any portion of the South Barrow gas field.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. BARTLETT is as follows:

SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF S. 1654

Section 1 terminates Naval Petroleum Reserve No. 4 in Alaska and the executive order creating it 30 days from enactment of the bill.

Section 2 orders transfer of the jurisdiction of reserve and all records pertaining to reserve to the Secretary of the Interior.

Section 3 protests valid existing rights created under any act in existence when S. 1654 is enacted.

Section 4 makes land within the reserve subject to disposition under federal mineral leasing laws with the proviso that the Secretary of the Interior may lease by competitive bidding any land in the reserve when he believes that federal exploration of the land has resulted in information which could benefit the holder of a lease.

Section 5(a) authorizes the Secretary of Defense to continue such activities in the South Barrow Gas Field as:

(1) Supplying free gas to government agencies.

(2) Selling gas to Barrow community.

Section 5(b) provides that the Secretary of the Interior shall not lease any land in South Barrow Gas Field without consultation with the Secretary of the Navy, acting on behalf of the Secretary of Defense.

HEARING ON S. 1028—SUBCOMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Civil Service of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service will hold a public hearing on S. 1028 at 2 p.m., May 4, 1967.

The bill, introduced by the chairman of the full committee, Senator A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, would provide for salary adjustment and credit for service for employees of county offices of the Agriculture Stabilization and Conservation Service who are appointed to positions in the Department of Agriculture.

Persons wishing to testify on the bill may arrange to do so by contacting the committee at telephone No. 225-5451.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] be added as a cosponsor of S. 612, the Dairy Import Act of 1967, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1308

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 4, and Friday, May 5, 1967, beginning at 9:30 a.m., the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee will hold hearings on S. 1308, relating to equal opportunity in employment, in room 4232, New Senate Office Building.

Persons wishing to testify or to submit written statements should contact the subcommittee staff.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF EXPORTS BY THE SENATE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Select Committee on Small Business and its chairman, the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] have asked me to announce that the committee will conduct a series of public hearings at principle seaports across the country, beginning on the Pacific coast in Portland, Oreg., on May 19 and 20. Other sessions will follow at New Orleans and Mobile on the gulf, the Port of New York on the Atlantic coast, and Milwaukee on the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The sessions "in the field" will be chaired by Senators from these areas. Dates, locations, and witness lists will be released when final arrangements have been made.

The public proceedings are part of an intensive study by the committee of the potentials and problems of expanding American exports and U.S. maritime commerce.

This country has had a persistent balance-of-payments problem since 1958. One authority after another has stated that U.S. exports are the key factor in trying to solve this problem.[1] As a consequence, the executive branch of the Federal Government has adopted some widely heralded programs aimed at expanding overseas sales by American business.

When it comes to results, however, these efforts seem to be something less than a resounding success.

Trade statistics for 1966 indicate that the United States has not fared well in international trade over the past 2 years. While exports grew by 4 percent in 1965 and 10 percent in 1966, imports climbed by 14½ percent in 1965 and 20 percent in 1966. As a result, our trade surplus in 1966 fell $1.5 billion to about $3.8 billion. This was almost 50 percent below the $6.7 billion peak surplus of 1964, and was the lowest trade balance since 1959[2] Depending upon how certain transactions are treated, the 1966 trade surplus could be even narrower.[3] The overall U.S. balance of payments, of course, continued to be in deficit by over a billion dollars,[4] and it is anticipated that it will be "substantially larger" in 1967.[5]

For the past several years, the Small Business Committee has repeatedly pointed out that in terms of percentage of gross national products exported, this Nation compares unfavorably to other industrialized nations. Other countries with similar economies, sell from three to six times as much as their production abroad. This is illustrated by the following table:

Export trade as percentage of gross national product, 1963 (table includes goods and services; native currency in millions)[1]

	Gross national product	Exports	Exports as a percentage of GNP
Belgium	BF608,000	BF208,000	34
Canada	$43,000	$6,800	31
United Kingdom	£25,000	£5,114	20
France	Fr285,000	Fr43,000	15
United States	$585,000	$30,700	5.24

[1] See, for instance, "Expansion of Beef Exports," S. Rep. 939, 89th Cong., 1st sess., Oct. 22, 1965.

Another factor in the balance-of-payments totals which bears watching is the inflow of capital in response to the higher rates of interest which have prevailed in the United States during the past year. Although, according to Robert Roosa,[6] these are "clocked through the established machinery as if they were lasting investment gains," they are actually quite temporary.

Mr. Roosa noted:

> The gap which tight money alone did not and could not close in 1966—will come out in the open. And as last year's inflows (of from $2 billion to $3 billion in short-term capital) should be reversed the statistics deficit may be inflated next year in the same way it was deducted last year.

As a result of these and other international developments, the gold reserves of the United States have declined from $17.8 billion, or about 44 percent of the world's supply in 1960, to $13.2 billion or about 31 percent at the end of 1966.[7] During January and February 1967, these reserves declined further, by $33 million and $41 million respectively.[8]

Under the law, as it now stands, the dollar is defined in terms of the value of gold,[9] the reserves of the Federal Reserve Banks are in the form of certificates representing gold,[10] and the legal basis of our money and credit system in this country is thus the size of our stock of gold.[11] With a 25-percent gold backing requirement for our currency—the same percentage, incidentally, which the U.S.S.R. maintains—about $11 billion of the $13.2 gold reserve is presently committed to backing our domestic currency, leaving a little more than $2 billion free for international transfers.[12]

---

[1] See, for instance, "Exports in Balance," the London Economist, June 12, 1965, page 1230:1, which commented that "(the U.S. merchandise export account) is the rock on which attempts to right the balance of international payments must be built (over the long term)."

[2] "Alternatives to Tight Money Policy for 1967," Congressional Record, Feb. 3, 1967, pp. 2538-2543.

[3] "U.S. Trade Balance Off During 1966," Journal of Commerce, March 30, 1967, page 1:7.

[4] "The Balance of Payments, Fourth Quarter 1966," by W. Lederer and E. M. Parrish, Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, March 1967, pages 14–18.

[5] "Business in Brief" the Chase National Bank, April, 1967.

[6] "Closing the Payments Gap" remarks by Robert V. Roosa, Waldorf Astoria, Jan. 18, 1967.

[7] "Gold Reserves of Central Banks and Governments," Federal Reserve Bulletin, March 1967, page 472.

[8] "Fed Reports Increased Gold Drain," Journal of Commerce, March 30, 1967, page 1:8.

[9] Gold Reserve Act of 1934, 31 U.S.C. 444 (definition): 31 USC 821 (power of President to alter); 31 C.F.R. 55 (most recent modification by Pres. F. D. Roosevelt).

[10] 31 U.S.C. 408.

It has also been pointed out that trade provides employment for about 3½ million American workers, about 4½ percent of the labor force.[13]

The course of international trade and payments is, therefore, intimately connected with our economy, particularly in the coastal areas such as my State of Oregon, where domestic companies are automatically engaged in world trade by virtue of competition from foreign imports.

If the present trends continue, the Congress will be required to take action with respect to these issues for domestic, as well as international, reasons.

This has been understood by the recent pronouncements of two U.S. banks which are experienced in international matters.

The Chase Manhattan Bank, in its bimonthly publication, "Business in Brief" for April 1967 made a fine analysis of the present role of gold in international finance. The publication also observed that the present system has led the United States toward increasing controls and restrictions on capital movements. The continuation or intensification of these controls, as the ranking Republican member of the Small Business Committee, Senator JAVITS, pointed out,[14] "have only one predictable effect: Declining returns on U.S. investment abroad and a lessening role for the United States as world banker."

The president of the Bank of America, Mr. Peterson, expressed somewhat similar thoughts before the New York Chamber of Commerce.[15]

I believe these comments acccurately reflect the mounting concern in the U.S. banking community and on Capitol Hill on these matters. As a consequence of all of these factors, our committee felt that a full investigation of the subject was called for.

All too often these statistics and public comment on overseas activities of U.S. firms are based to a substantial degree upon the operations of what might be called the "Fortune 500." These are the large international corporations which have a tendency to show to foreign countries a picture of the "private enterprise system" which is actually "large-scale corporate enterprise," and which is frequently out of proportion to local needs, the capacity of local businessmen, and the scale of host economies.

Another aspect of holding these hearings before the Committee on Small Business is to emphasize the potential benefits to foreign lands as well as our own of the U.S. firms entering international trade. In numbers, small business constitutes about 90 percent of U.S. manufacturers, and virtually 100 percent of farmers, ranchers, and other agricultural producers and processors. It is my impression that the totality of small firms possesses a great potential that has only been partially tapped in the U.S. effort to improve our exports and the U.S. balance of payments. Further, the enterprise of this small business community can add flexibility and growth to the economics of our trading partners, as well as our own. At the same time, we would be projecting to these countries a more representative view of our society. As Secretary of the Treasury Henry Fowler commented to the Small Business Committee during his appearance on March 22: [16]

> I can see unqualifiedly that . . . the most vital aspect of our whole international balance of payments problem is the development and maintenance of a healthy trade surplus. And that the role of the small business enterprises in this country . . . ought to continue to be one of the most important aspects of our international program.
>
> It would be interesting to know just how many of the products that we take for granted in the United States . . . are actually available in the markets of the world. I would suspect that a great many are not. And these are not necessarily products that are produced by the large enterprises . . . I think we can and must do a great deal more in pressing forward on this point.
>
> I think it is a very real frontier that ought to be pushed.

Another frontier for this Nation is the vast rimlands of the Pacific Ocean. In Asia alone the population is about 2 billion, and when this is added to the other trade areas such as Oceana and western South America, which are accessible from our west coast, the total approaches two-thirds of the human race. Furthermore, the Pacific Ocean area is a region of profound economic need and accelerating development. Our country should recognize these factors and be preparing for the future in relation to these likely markets.

Our committee will be asking witnesses what roles and actions they believe are appropriate on the part of the Federal Government as well as State and local government and private associations to coordinate our enormous and varied public and private resources in order to build export markets for American business. In the committee's view, the country needs to look ahead and plan ahead for the next 5 to 10 years and needs to rebuild its export balance on solid foundations that will make possible enduring expansion of trade.

The committee—and particularly Senator HATFIELD and myself who will be conducting the first sessions—will be looking forward to having a rigorous analysis and constructive discussion of our trade problems and potentials, and what can be done to increase participation by small- and medium-sized businesses.

During the course of the hearings nationwide, the committee hopes to receive testimony as to current and future trade patterns, and their impact on American businesses.

We will be seeking guidance on problems and possibilities arising from emerging trade blocs, developing country trade, the interrelationships between aid, export trade, investment, and foreign U.S. production—including the extent to which foreign production by U.S. multinational companies and affiliates may be contributing to and/or displacing U.S. exports, and even generating imports back into this country.

We will want to evaluate the techniques that have been tried to increase our exports in the past, and to encourage suggestions that may be helpful in the future. We will want to review the history of our trade promotion programs for the lessons they can teach us for the years ahead.

By placing foreign trade in this broad perspective, the committee hopes that Federal, State, and local governments, as well as businesses, labor, and the rest of our private institutions, will be assisting each other in realistic forward planning in the export area. We hope also to hear how all of these bodies can best work together in this cause.

In my February remarks, I stated:

> (Our committee) will be pleased to make (the results of its hearings) available to the Administration. We shall be pleased to cooperate in every way in strengthening (our country's trade) program, in order that the resources in both governmental and business can be fully mobilized in the mutual interest of both.

The President has proclaimed the week of May 21 as World Trade Week. This will come at the time of National Maritime Day, as well as of our Portland hearings.

I hope and invite all concerned to make the most of the opportunities presented by this season of attention to our national trade needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the President in issuing his Trade Week proclamation be included in the RECORD following my remarks to provide for further information.

Associations and organizations wanting to make a contribution to the hearings in Portland and elsewhere, and others wishing to submit material, are invited to contact the Senate Small Business Committee, at room 424, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION 3771, MARCH 24, 1967

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation

World trade joins the United States with other nations in a creative partnership that supports the growth of our free enterprise economy and advances the well-being of all our citizens.

---

[11] See "The Federal Reserve System, purposes and functions," the Federal Reserve System, 1963, page 166.

[12] "Challenge, the Magazine of Economic Affairs," March/April 1967, page 4.

[13] Remarks by the President of the United States in connection with issuance of Proclamation 3771, "World Trade Week, 1967," weekly compilation of presidential Documents, March 27, 1967, page 529.

[14] "Gold and the Balance of Payments," Remarks by Senator Javits, Congressional Record, April 15, 1967, pages 9676–9678.

[15] Congressional Record, loc. cit. page 9678.

[16] The Status and Future Small Business in the Economy, hearings before Select Committee on Small Business, March 22, 1967, Transcript, page 1018.

Last year, total trade among the non-communist countries amounted to about $180 billion. Since 1960, this trade has grown by more than $67 billion, or an annual rate of more than 8 percent. Trade among the nations of the free world should reach the astounding annual rate of $200 billion in the year ahead.

The exchange of goods and services builds a foundation for mutual trust among nations. It sustains our hopes for the attainment of a better world, in which all peoples may live in peace.

Expanding trade with nations around the world accelerates the pace of economic progress at home and abroad.

It enlarges the opportunities for United States businessmen to sell more products and services in world markets. Since 1960, U.S. exports of merchandise have risen by 50 percent. In 1966, they exceeded $29 billion, close to $3 billion more than the year before.

It provides employment for more American workers. About three and a half million Americans are engaged, directly or indirectly, in the production, transport and marketing of our exports. The growth of this trade will create jobs for many more workers in both rural and urban areas throughout the United States.

It widens the range of materials and consumer goods available at competitive prices in the domestic marketplace.

It helps the developing countries make fuller use of their energies and resources.

It encourages the international exchange of ideas, knowledge, and experience.

Vigorous expansion of our export volume is essential. We have succeeded in reducing the deficit in our balance of payments, but we must make still further improvement.

The United States will continue to support the reciprocal reduction of trade barriers to stimulate the flow of international commerce. To this purpose, an early and successful completion of the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations is especially important. There are only a few weeks remaining; by April 30, major issues must be settled and a balance of concessions achieved. The final agreement must be signed by June 30. An historic opportunity to broaden vastly the world's trade horizons is within reach. This opportunity must not be lost.

We are negotiating with other nations on the improvement of the international monetary system. International agreement that will assure an adequate growth of world reserves is a key to the future expansion of world trade.

We believe that trade also offers a means of achieving fruitful cooperation with the Soviet Union and other Eastern European nations. In 1966, U.S. exports to Eastern Europe totalled only $200 million while other non-communist countries sold Eastern Europe goods worth over $6 billion. U.S. ratification of a consular agreement with the U.S.S.R., our various trade missions to Eastern Europe, and our participation in the 1967 food processing fair in Moscow illustrate our effort to build bridges through trade. We must continue to pursue lasting peace by seeking out every possible course to healthy economic and cultural relations with these countries.

The principal objective of our foreign trade policy is to promote the increase of peaceful, profitable commerce among our Nation and others.

World Trade Week reaffirms and supports this objective.

Now, THEREFORE, I, LYNDON B. JOHNSON, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week beginning May 21, 1967, as World Trade Week; and I request the appropriate Federal, State, and local officials to cooperate in the observance of that week.

I also urge business, labor, agricultural, educational, professional, and civic groups, as well as the people of the United States generally, to observe World Trade Week with gatherings, discussions, exhibits, ceremonies, and other appropriate activities designed to promote continuing awareness of the importance of world trade to our economy and our relations with other nations.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

DONE at the City of Washington this twenty-fourth day of March, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred [SEAL] and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

By the President:

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

NOTE.—Proclamation 3771 was not filed with the Office of the Federal Register before the cutoff time of this issue. As printed above, it follows the text of the White House press release.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 28, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be set aside, and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. 1039.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

AN INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE TO PLAN FOR PREVENTION OF OIL POLLUTION OF OCEAN WATERS AND SHORES IS DESIRABLE

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the deep concern of the people of the United States that pollution of our waters be controlled has been expressed by the enactment during the last Congress of landmark legislation providing for stronger measures by responsible agencies to clean up our waterways than have been available before.

The recent tragic breakup of the *Torrey Canyon* off the coast of England and newspaper accounts of serious and increasing ravages of oil pollution of our Atlantic coasts in New Jersey and New England reminded us of the particularly destructive characteristics of oil waste pollution. The careless and uncontrolled release of oil, sludge, and petroleum wastes by vessels plying the seas off our coastline results in relentlessly increasing destruction of wildlife, recreation resources, and fisheries we cannot afford to allow to continue. We find waterfowl incapacitated by oceanborne deposits of oil waste; our lovely beaches dirtied and befouled; waters that should be a source of refreshment impossible to enjoy because of the slime and muck of oil waste; and valuable fishery resources destroyed.

Valiant efforts to control this and other forms of water pollution have been made and are continuing. Our distinguished colleague, the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], whom I am glad to see on the floor at this time, has been a leader in this important field, and we salute his steadfast efforts. Enactment of the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966 during the last Congress demonstrated the particular interest of Congress in the control of pollution resulting from deposits of oil wastes. The act includes special provisions designed to deal with this particular form of pollution, giving Federal authorities stronger measures of control and prevention than have ever been available before.

However, American legislation to control American pollution can do nothing to meet the international pollution problem so dramatically illustrated by the breakup of the *Torrey Canyon* and the resulting destruction of wildlife, recreational resources, and fisheries in England and in France. While the matter of the *Torrey Canyon* was a spectacular example of the potential disaster of oil pollution, it is, unhappily, true that the shorelines of the world are constantly subject to the onslaughts of oil waste and other pollutants discharged by vessels of many nations sailing under many flags.

As any realistic control of this problem must be international in scope, I have addressed identical letters to the Secretary of State and to the Secretary of the Interior urging that an international convention on water pollution control be convened to devise measures enforceable throughout the world which will protect all nations from the ravages of pollution. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my letter to the Secretary of State be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Also, I ask to have printed in the RECORD an excellent editorial on this subject entitled "Tarfoot," which appeared in the April 29, 1967, issue of the New Republic.

There being no objection, the letter and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 28, 1967.

Hon. DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the last Congress and, again, in this Congress, a subject of major concern is that of control and prevention of water pollution. The 89th Congress enacted land mark legislation designed to strengthen powers of the U.S. Government to control pollution in our country. "The Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966" is of special significance for its inclusion of provisions to control the discharge of fuel oil, sludge and oil refuse at such times and places as create conditions deleterious to health, marine life, or constituting a menace to navigation. Enactment of this legislation recognizes the serious threat to persons and property represented by uncontrolled discharge of oil waste by vessels operated in American waters.

The dramatic breakup of the "Torrey Canyon" off the shore of England recently called world attention to the potential immensity of the destruction of shores and beaches of the world. This tragic accident, which has resulted in such terrible loss, spotlights the international nature of the problem of oil pollution of our waters. The "Torrey Canyon" was built in Japan, owned in Bermuda, registered in Liberia, sailed under an Italian master and crew, was on charter to a British corporation, and had been contracted for salvage to a Dutch company. Clearly, this illustrates the necessity that any attempt to control pollution of our beaches and shorelines must be an international effort.

While less dramatic than the "Torrey Canyon" breakup, the seemingly relentless ruination of America's shorelines by oil deposits of ships of many nations goes on. No beach front property and no part of our coastline is now safe from the ravages of waste discharged from ships plying international waters. Not only oil pollution but other waste discharges are a threat of irreparable damage to wildlife, recreational resources and valuable fisheries.

Unless drastic action is taken this pollution will continue to increase unless the inevitable proliferation of population of the world can somehow be halted. The world may expect the transportation of oil cargo and other shipments to be accomplished by ever larger vessels in the future. We may now, realistically, expect the use of tankers with capacities of 200,000 to 500,000 tons of oil, dwarfing the average tanker which now carries cargo in the capacity of 15,000 tons. Other ships of every description may be expected to increase in size commensurately as will the quantity of cargo be magnified.

This traffic will be international in character and the prevention of the pollution it may cause will be a matter of concern for all nations of the world. While the United States may act to protect its shores so far as the writ of our government runs, we are helpless to enforce controls on the trade of foreign nations. This is an international problem and one of concern to all the world.

Therefore, I call upon the good offices of the Department of State and the Department of the Interior to convene an international convention to devise internationally acceptable procedures for preventing the needless pollution of our shores.

With best wishes, I remain

Cordially yours,

Ernest Gruening,
U.S. Senator.

[From the New Republic, Apr. 29, 1967]

Tarfoot

As the *Torrey Canyon* slowly split in two on the Seven Stones, staining British beaches with 120,000 tons of crude oil, many could recall milder forms of pollution on ocean beaches—the oil and tar on bare feet and bathing suits. Each year this contamination increases. What would have been the result had a tanker the size of *Torrey Canyon* been stranded on the shoals of Cape Cod, Long Island or Hatteras? We had a foretaste of that in 1951 when the *Pendleton* was wrecked on Cape Cod. But what greater catastrophes are in store from future megaton oil tankers with capacities of 200,000, 300,000 or even 500,000 tons? (As recently as the last war, a standard tanker carried 15,000 tons.) The *Torrey Canyon* was built in Japan, owned in Bermuda, registered in Liberia, sailed under an Italian master and crew, was on charter to a British corporation, and had been contracted for salvage to a Dutch company. Only international action will meet such a situation.

As the oil drifted onto 100 miles of Cornish beaches and spread toward the West Country and then across the channel to France, it was the waterfowl and marine life that were the first victims. Efforts to lessen the destruction by large-scale use of detergents proved futile; fish and shellfish were further menaced. Oil-soaked birds could not fly. Rescue operations could assist only a few of these, and end the torment of others. Some species were threatened with extinction. French children and teachers tried to rescue stricken birds in sanctuaries on the Brittany coast.

The effect of even small amounts of crude oil upon sea birds is well known. The oil spreads widely upon the water in a thin film that is long lasting. Small amounts are sufficient to mat the feathers and reduce their insulating protection against the cold. Birds are poisoned by oil when attempting to clean themselves.

American eyes were opened to what has long been accepted as routine destruction of waterfowl along our own coasts. In southern New Jersey recently migrating scoters were beached in oil-soaked thousands, to be given first aid by Coast Guardsmen and conservation groups, who reported spending an hour on each duck to get it clean, and the birds were still seriously handicapped when released. Last week, Cape Cod beaches too were hit by a large oil slick.

The disaster has evoked other fears of runaway technology, the pollution of detergents foaming out of sewage disposal plants onto streams and lakes, of chemical pesticides poisoning birds and marine life to say nothing of milk and agricultural products, of sonic booms, clattering helicopters and roaring jets, of power failures and blackouts. The lack of information on the ecological effects of oil and of detergents shocks public confidence. Worst of all is the growing realization of our technological unpreparedness to deal with pollution threats of this size, even by such relatively advanced methods as floating booms or devices to skim surface pollution, and the failure to invoke them promptly.

As criticism of their government's efforts mounted, the British public was dismayed, once the picturesque Admiralty law had been penetrated, to realize how obsolescent and feeble were its powers. No one damaged by the negligence of the *Torrey Canyon* is likely to receive compensation. When the town of Southport in 1954 sued the oil tanker *Inverpool* for damages, the House of Lords reversed the finding of lower courts that shipping could be liable for discharging oil and damaging the shore. Parliament has failed to act on the court's suggestions that further legislation might be especially desirable for the protection of the public in such cases.

In this country, Congress last November passed the Clean Rivers Restoration Act, considerably broadening earlier legislation, and for the first time placing the responsibility for enforcement in the Interior Department. Aided by the Coast Guard, the Corps of Engineers and other agencies, the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration can act to prevent pollution, impose criminal penalties on individuals and on vessels, and where beaches have been polluted take the necessary steps to clean them and recover the cost of such work from those who caused the damage. In principle, the federal government acts for any state or local government that may suffer damage. No occasion to test these new powers has as yet arisen, but there could hardly be a better time to start.

An earlier Oil Pollution Act of 1961 prohibits any dumping of oil within 50 miles from shore lines. This is a nice, round lawyer's figure which might be extended further or revised to reflect some facts of nature.

Led by Shell, Standard of New Jersey and British Petroleum new methods are being used to concentrate oily wastes aboard and dispose of them after landing. Accelerating the adoption of such methods might be an object of public attention. Beyond this, however, what is needed is a stricter supervision of the movement of shipping, especially that with potentially hazardous cargo, and reasonable limits should be imposed on the size of tankers. Such controls will have to be international, but the United States has a clear interest and responsibility to lead. The International Convention of Prevention of Oil Pollution of the Sea is not adequate to disasters like the *Torrey Canyon*, and the machinery of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization is too cumbersome.

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, who has been put in charge of our principal oceanographic activities as chairman of the National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, was in Great Britain during the *Torrey Canyon* disaster and could see at firsthand the anguish of a nation which cares deeply about its natural environment, its recreation areas and its wildlife. It is an appropriate time for him to initiate an international effort to control the creeping pollution of our beaches, and the continuing threat of other marine catastrophes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Baker in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AN APPEAL TO DESIST AIDING THE ENEMY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, General Westmoreland, our commander in Vietnam, today, before a joint session of the House and Senate, made this statement:

> Backed at home by resolve, confidence, patience, determination, and continued support, we will prevail in Vietnam over Communist aggression.

I commend the General on his statement before the Members of the House and the Senate today. I believe it was a courageous and forthright statement, and one which needed to be made.

Recently, General Westmoreland, in a speech at the Associated Press annual luncheon, made some assessments of the war in which we are engaged which have raised much comment.

The Washington, D.C., Post on April 25 reported the text of his remarks of the previous day. The same day, the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., carried an editorial, "Westmoreland's Appeal," commending General Westmoreland for his efforts to isolate the peaceniks and demonstrators by appealing to the patriotism and the good sense of the American people. Elsewhere in the same newspaper, David Lawrence commented on Westmoreland's message in an article entitled "Westmoreland's Frank Address." Mr. Lawrence pointed out that unity at home is essential to the success of the military policy.

These and other writers praised General Westmoreland for his remarks, and expressed hope that his efforts would bring about more solid support of the President as Commander in Chief of our Nation's military forces.

I believe that in the remarks before the Associated Press annual luncheon and in his statement today, before the joint session of Congress, General Westmoreland has expressed the necessity for unity on the part of the American people, and has expressed the need for patience, for understanding, and for continued support to the fighting men in Vietnam.

A careful review of General Westmoreland's recent statement would indicate he was referring specifically to the antiwar demonstrations staged in this country. As my colleagues know, on April 14, I spoke on this floor in protest of the outrageous antiwar demonstrations planned for major cities in the United States, on both the east and west coasts. I pointed out that any thoughtful citizen could only view with disgust the spectacle of an ugly kind of political manipulation which gives rise to such demonstrations, for the spirit fostering them is alien to the basic principles of our Republic.

I do not protest the right of American citizens to disagree with any Federal policy or to debate the issues of our day. Two of the basic rights guaranteed by our Constitution are freedom of speech and freedom of assembly.

I warned that our Nation was being derogated in the eyes of the watching world by actions of demonstrators, and I deplored the obvious fact that such demonstrations encouraged our Communist enemies, prolonged the war, and helped to kill American boys. I stated that, in effect, these "Vietniks" in our midst are helping to "plow American boys under."

Two of the basic rights guaranteed by our Constitution are freedom of speech and freedom of assembly, rights which generations of Americans have laid down their lives to protect.

I do not protest the right of American citizens to disagree with any Federal policy or to debate the issues of our day, but I do protest what is obviously the subversive intent of the anti-Vietnam demonstrations which this country is witnessing in ugly disruptiveness. These demonstrators are not seeking simply to express their own viewpoint, but they seek to coerce other citizens and our Government to adopt their viewpoint. To the extent that these demonstrations incite violence and to the extent that demonstrators intimidate those not sharing their opinions, these demonstrators are infringing on the rights of others. Not only do they infringe on the rights of others, but they have also aided and abetted the enemy by encouraging him to believe that our Government does not have the full support of the American public and that in a protracted war that lack of support will increase to the point that the United States will be forced to withdraw.

As our commander in Vietnam so succinctly expressed it:

> The enemy does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve.

Despite the military defeats which our troops inflict upon the enemy, American protest demonstrations are interpreted by the enemy as an augmenting American discontent with continuation of the Vietnamese war, a discontent which is counted by the enemy as a political gain in his favor. As General Westmoreland assessed the situation:

> Despite staggering combat losses, he clings to the belief that he will defeat us. And through a clever combination of psychological and political warfare, both here and abroad, he has gained support which gives him hope that he can win politically that which he cannot accomplish militarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, aiding and abetting the enemy is inexcusable. Those American boys who daily place their lives in jeopardy in Vietnam to both prevent the Vietnam conflict from turning into the annihilation of the world and to serve in what has been determined a necessary capacity by our authorized executive policymakers as vital to American security—these boys deserve better treatment by the American public. These are our sons, our husbands, our sweethearts, and moreover, our future. I urge every American to examine his conscience before taking actions which demoralize and endanger these boys, and which encourage the enemy to prolong this horrible war in which we are engaged. It is the responsibility of the American public through debate to force the administration to continually reexamine our policy, but it is also our responsibility not to thwart the achievements and make more difficult the hazardous tasks of our boys on the battlefront.

Throughout American history we have been traditionally reluctant to enter into wars, but we have traditionally rallied behind our presidents and our fighting men, despite our opposition to war, despite different political affiliations. I, personally, regret that we ever became involved in South Vietnam. But the fact remains that we are there. Our fighting men are there. Because our Government was quicker to respond to the threat this time, because the situation is highly complicated by the youthful weaknesses of the nation we are assisting to defend, because we are dealing with a highly sophisticated enemy when it comes to the relatively new use of psychological warfare, this war has an aura of ambiguity connected with it which has not existed in previous wars. Nevertheless, we are at war. I add my appeal to that made by General Westmoreland that those who disapprove of our involvement in the Vietnam war refrain from actions, actions which encourage and strengthen the enemy confronting our American soldiers.

Mr. President, I also join with General Westmoreland, as I believe every Senator would join with him, in the statement he made today before the joint session that—

> Backed at home by resolve, confidence, patience, determination and continued support, we will prevail in Vietnam over Communist aggression.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the newspaper articles and editorial, which I have previously identified, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S REMARKS AT ASSOCIATED PRESS MEETING

A COMMANDER'S VIEW OF THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Almost 40 months ago I last visited this hotel just before leaving for duty in Vietnam. I came by to see my friend Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

Gen. MacArthur said to me: "I see you have a new job. I know you realize that this new assignment carries with it great opportunities, but it also is fraught with hazards."

I now wonder whether this occasion is an opportunity or a hazard.

The situation in Vietnam has been accorded the most intensive news coverage in history. As a result, every American should have, by this time, his own image of the war. How accurate is this image? Do most Americans fully appreciate the character of the war and its complexity? Today I hope to contribute to better understanding.

What kind of a war is being fought in Vietnam? How is it being fought? How is the battle going? And what lies ahead? These questions I will address.

The Vietnamese—and we their allies—are involved in a total undertaking—a single, all-pervading confrontation in which the fate of the people of Vietnam, the independence of the free nations of Asia, and the future of emerging nations—as well as the reputation and the very honor of our country are at stake. At one and the same time, we must fight the enemy, protect the people, and help them build a nation in the pattern of their choice.

The real objective

The real objective of the war is the people. If the enemy could take Saigon, or the heavily populated areas of the Delta, or both, the war would be over—without negotiation or conference. He lost this chance two years ago, and I can promise you that his military tactics alone will not win him another opportunity. Yet, despite his staggering combat losses, he clings to the belief that he will defeat us. And through a clever combination of psychological and political warfare—both here and abroad—he has gained support which gives him hope that he can win politically that which he cannot accomplish militarily.

Many myths about the Vietcong still persist—and I hope I can dispel some of them here and now.

The doctrine of conquest in South Vietnam is from the book of Mao Tse-tung. It is the standard three-phase pattern—the combination of subversive political cells, guerrilla units, and conventional military forces.

Between 1954 and 1963, political cells, trained and directed from North Vietnam, were installed throughout South Vietnam. At the same time, Hanoi directed that the Vietcong begin recruiting and organizing guerrillas, and training them in terror tactics.

By late 1964 the combination of enemy political-guerrilla warfare and governmental instability in the south resulted in a decision by Hanoi to enter the decisive, and final, phase. Vietcong companies were formed into battalions, regiments and divisions, and North Vietnamese army units began to infiltrate covertly to the south.

On Hanoi's terms

Never at any time during those 10 years of subversion, terror and attack did Hanoi relax its control over its war against the people of South Vietnam. The goal of this aggression was then, and still is, the conquest of the South—reunification on Hanoi's terms.

What we have is not a civil war. It is a massive campaign of external aggression from Communist North Vietnam.

The political cells have created an enemy pseudo-government that still pervades many villages and hamlets. The guerrillas wage constantly, mostly at night, the cruelest kind of war—terrorism—civilians are shot, bombed and mutilated as examples to those who might resist or defect, or simply because they are leaders.

A typical example of Vietcong terror took place shortly before I left Vietnam. During the early morning hours of April 16th, the Vietcong attacked a hamlet 20 miles north of Saigon. Among the victims were five revolutionary development team members. Three of them were women. Their hands were tied behind their backs and they were shot through the head.

During the last nine years, 53,000 Vietnamese—a large share of them teachers, policemen, and elected or natural leaders—have been killed or kidnaped. Translated to the United States, that would be more than 600,000 people, with emphasis on mayors, councilmen, policemen, teachers, government officials and even journalists who would not submit to blackmail.

At the other end of the war spectrum, we have fought, in the south, during the past year, major elements of eight North Vietnamese regular army divisions. We have captured thousands of weapons and large stores of ammunition and equipment that have been transported from North Vietnam.

In summary: The Vietcong is not a legitimate nationalist movement. It is a movement organized, controlled and supported by the Communist government of North Vietnam. What support it gets from the people of South Vietnam is largely the result of terror, intimidation, and murder of those individuals who oppose it.

Two years ago South Vietnam was on the verge of defeat. The enemy's main force units were attacking with increased intensity from hidden bases and sanctuaries. The government of Vietnam had arrived at a crossroad. It was a question of honoring a long-standing commitment by the Government of the United States to a young nation fighting for its freedom, or defaulting to the aggressor. Our President reaffirmed our commitment and made the courageous decision to stand firm—to stay the course. This meant using whatever military and economic power was necessary.

Once we had major forces ashore we began to look for the enemy, and he was not hard to find. Major battles ensued; they were bitter and bloody. But in them we learned that the enemy has little regard for human life and, for propaganda purposes, will turn losses and defeats into absurd claims of victory.

During the last year and a half we have sought out the enemy, caught him off guard, fought him before he was ready. For a time he stood and fought and we punished him severely. Now he is becoming more difficult to find. We have invaded his elaborate and widely scattered base areas—some of them built over a period of 20 years.

Working closely with the Vietnamese forces we have moved into many of the populated and productive areas which formerly provided supplies and recruits to the enemy.

Infiltration is costly

We have turned the enemy's ambushes against him and we have learned how to draw him into an ambush. We have sent our deep patrols to find him. He has been punished by B52 strikes and unparalleled close support from our tactical air, artillery and naval gunfire. And on land and sea we have made his infiltration costly.

Although the military picture is favorable, I emphasize the fact that we have no evidence to indicate that the enemy is slowing his invasion from the north, or that he is breaking up his major units and scattering them about, or that he has given up his plans to try to inflict major defeat upon us. He is taking great casualties and he does have logistics problems, but his leadership is good and his men are tough and tenacious. He needs a victory for political, psychological and morale purposes, and he will continue to strive for one.

So the end is not in sight. The enemy can hide in the jungles and mountains of South Vietnam where we cannot reach him without major effort. He rests and regroups, trains and replenishes in hidden camps and supply areas in regions along the borders of neutral countries and the demilitarized zone which he overtly violated almost a year ago. He continues to recruit and train guerrillas for use as guides and intelligence agents for his main force units and for sabotage and terror. So we must be prepared for more bitter fighting in days to come.

Before leaving the military situation, I must honestly say that I am concerned about cease-fire proposals. In other wars, a cease-fire was an acceptable condition; but, in this war, inevitably it will be a military advantage to the enemy and a detriment to our side. This is because of the clandestine character and covert methods of the enemy. Traditionally he has used covertly cease-fire periods to reinforce and resupply his units, and to strengthen and realign his political posture.

One of the regrettable facts of war—any war—is that casualties are not confined to the military forces involved. There are civilian casualties in Vietnam and these are of constant concern to me, my commanders and men. But, civilian casualties do not result from indiscriminate use of our firepower. They are caused by mechanical failure or human error. This is in sharp contrast to the Vietcong policy of calculated attacks on civilians.

Never in the history of warfare have so many precautions been taken by men in combat. We cover an enemy-held area with leaflets and loudspeaker broadcasts warning of impending attack. We do not permit an air strike or artillery fire on a moving column of enemy until Vietnamese officials give approval. Every possible precaution is taken to avoid casualties among civilians. Never has a Nation employed its military power with such restraint.

Now a word about the Vietnamese armed forces.

I have worked with the Vietnamese military for more than three years, and I have learned to understand and admire them. A look at their record in combat, as well as in political administration, reveals an exceptional performance, when all is considered. During the last three years I have seen them literally hold the country together. Despite their military background they have taken long strides toward developing democratic processes and institutions. They fought the enemy guerrilla and main forces alone, until our arrival, and, during that time, they were expanding their forces to the limit that their manpower and economy could support. Except for the continental army of our early years, never before in history has a young military force been subjected to such a challenge. In my book, the Republic of Vietnam armed forces have conducted themselves with credit. As I tour the country several times each week, I am encouraged by the obvious improvement in the morale, proficiency and quality of their fighting forces.

Stanch allies

Today the Republic of Vietnam armed forces are working and fighting side by side with their allies—the Koreans, the Australians, the New Zealanders, the Tais and the Filipinos, as well as the Americans, and they have earned the confidence of these stanch allies.

The Vietnamese armed forces and the Vietnamese people are aware of and appreciate our support. They know we have assisted them for 12 years in the development of their military organization.

More important to the Vietnamese, I think, is the fact that our American servicemen are eager to help them build schools, dispensaries, and other things of lasting value to their communities. These civic action projects, voluntarily undertaken by our troops and those of our allies, are inspiring to behold.

A young corporal undertakes the support of a Montagnard family whose breadwinner has been assassinated. An American squad or platoon adopts a hamlet, bringing to its people the material things they need and the spiritual uplift which will help them to self-sufficiency. Many communities in Vietnam are living a better life because of the encouragement and help our troops have given to them. A true missionary zeal among our troops is commonplace and is one of the unique characteristics of this war.

I am constantly impressed by the concern for the lives of others shown by the men of my command. As I travel among them, and I see their courage against the enemy and their compassion toward their friends, I am inspired by their example.

I would like to tell you more about the men of my command. Today your soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines and coast guardsmen:

Are better educated than before.

Are better informed.

Have traditional American ingenuity and initiative.

Are better physical specimens.

Have high morale.

And understand what the war is all about.

They know that they are helping to stop the spread of communism in Southeast Asia and to give the people of South Vietnam a freedom of choice. They have been given a job, and they are doing it well, and with pride . . . and they are dismayed, as I am, by recent unpatriotic acts here at home.

Who are these men? They are mostly youngsters representing every State of the Union—from the farms, the cities, the factories and the campuses. They are the sound product of America's democratic society. They are the sum of our educational system, our medical science and our communications. Their excellent morale results from knowledge of their jobs, sound military policies, professional unit leadership, and unprecedented material support. Their medical care is superb, their food is excellent and their mail is carefully handled. Shortages have been few and of short duration.

Forward with confidence

As an individual, this fighting man is a tough, determined professional in battle one day, and next day, a sensitive, compassionate friend helping the Vietnamese people. He is a fighter, a thinker, and a doer. He has seen—at first hand—Communist subversion and aggression at work; he has acquired a deeper appreciation of the importance of freedom. And from his ranks in the years ahead will come the confident, alert, intelligent citizens and leaders who will make this nation's future greater than its past.

With fighting forces like these, a commander cannot help but look forward with confidence as he views the military situation.

But I am mindful that the military war in South Vietnam is, from the enemy's point of view, only part of a protracted and carefully coordinated attack, waged in the international arena. Regrettably, I see signs of enemy success in that world arena which he cannot match on the battlefield. He does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our brave allies.

I foresee, in the months ahead, some of the bitterest fighting of the war. But I have confidence in our battlefield capability. And I am confident of the support we and our allies will continue to receive from our President and from the Congress.

The magnificent men and women I command in Vietnam have earned the unified support of the American people.

Thank you.

(*Gen. Westmoreland answered written questions submitted at the annual meeting of the Associated Press. Following is a partial text of the questions and answers:*)

Q. Gen. Westmoreland, have you asked the Pentagon for more troops and how many?

A. As commander of our American armed forces in Vietnam, it is needless to say I am constantly studying our troop requirements. I continuously analyze the situation. I submit my requests from time to time, my desires, my estimates to my senior military headquarters. I have been getting troops in considerable numbers during the past year. They are continuing to arrive. The number of troops that will ultimately be needed is a matter that will have to be studied in consideration of many factors—our estimate of the enemy's capabilities and intentions, the economy of South Vietnam. Because as we deploy troops to go ashore we per se put pressure on their economy and this is a factor that has to be considered. These matters and these factors will have to be reviewed at our senior levels in Washington. Needless to say, the discussions that have taken place are privileged and, as a matter of military security, I cannot give you any definitive number as to my estimate of the number of troops that will be required.

Bombing of airfield

Q. Would you comment please on the bombing today in North Vietnam, an airfield there. What happens if the Migs take sanctuary in Red China?

A. I was delighted to learn that the Mig airfields have been bombed, at least two of them today. This was a military target on which was based aircraft that had been used offensively against our fighter-bombers. It is true that Migs could take sanctuary in China, as they did during the Korean War, but the Migs would be at a disadvantage operating from those bases compared with those in North Vietnam. The reaction time would be increased and they would therefore become a lesser threat to our fighter-bombers, and the jeopardy to our very fine Air Force and Navy pilots would be reduced.

Casualty statistics

Q. There are daily statistics of the number of Vietcong killed, but serious doubt about the body count announced of those that have been killed. What is your view please of the accuracy of this count?

A. Over a period of over three years, I have given this matter considerable personal attention. It is my judgment that the casualty figures that we estimate or state that we have inflicted on the enemy are accurate, perhaps conservative. True enough, there could be from time to time some exaggeration. There could be some double counting of casualties, but in my opinion this is more than offset by those enemy troops that are killed by artillery or air strikes that we never know about. Also we do not claim credit, in estimating or assessing casualties on the enemy, those that die of wounds. So all factors considered, I feel that the figures that you receive that are announced by my headquarters in Saigon are definitely accurate and I believe on the conservative side when all factors are considered.

Political aspects of war

Q. Could you run this war without political help and could you win this war if given a free hand in military decisions?

A. As a military man, this is a bit of an awkward question. I think it is impossible in view of the nature of the war, a war of both subversion and invasion, a war in which political and psychological factors are of such consequence, to sort out the war between the political and the military. Political factors must be considered, they must be considered in selecting targets. They must be considered in our actions involving nearby so-called neutral countries. They must be considered in the means that are used in pursuing the war. The reason for this is not only because of the complexity but also because of our national policy to confine this war to that of a limited war, and this means that from time to time the means are limited. And that policy has been made loudly clear: that it is not our intention to expand the war. We want to keep it as a limited war and therefore political factors have to be considered and the decisions involved are necessarily above my levels. Since I deal in military factors, I am responsible only for fighting the ground war in South Vietnam and only that air war in the so-called expanded battle area.

Sino-Soviet intervention

Q. What is the possibility of escalation of the war bringing in Red China and Soviet Russia and how effective would they be if they did come in?

A. This is a very difficult question to speculate on. To a military point of view I think we should be prepared for any contingency. Of course the USSR is providing equipment to North Vietnam primarily in terms of air defense, weapons and systems. The Communist Chinese are providing support in the form of transportation units and some anti-aircraft weapon but primarily infantry-type weapon to support the North Vietnamese army and Vietcong main force units. I think this boils down to whether the USSR and Red China feel that the threat to their formal government and their territory is of such consequence that they could hazard the risk that would necessarily be involved.

Vietcong fighting spirit

Q. The Vietcong are regarded, generally, to have fought well against us for quite some time. To what do you attribute their spirit?

A. The Vietcong, organized, directed and commanded from Hanoi, have placed good emphasis on political indoctrination. As a matter of interest their training program for their unit devotes more time to political indoctrination than it does to military training. This indoctrination is well done. Of course, it is backed up by a ruthless cadre that use strong-arm methods that are required to keep their troops in line.

Now, this so-called cadre, or leadership, are excellent. They have been well trained and indoctrinated and they are committed. However, we have noted a number of recent trends that are encouraging. We are picking up more prisoners, more defectors coming in and the rate seems to be increasing in a very encouraging way. We learn that many of the rank and file of these units would like very much to defect, to come in under the government of Vietnam's amnesty program, the so-called Chieu Hoi program. But the cadre control them so tightly that they cannot get away. We also know that there is considerable friction between the North Vietnamese leadership and the South Vietnamese, the Vietcong North Vietnamese leaders are playing more and more a role in the South. The leadership in Hanoi is by their action putting in their own leadership apparently because they do not trust some of the South Vietnamese leadership, and there is definite friction between these two regional groups.

The number of defectors that we have received has been multiplying by a factor of two for the last couple of months, and, hopefully, this trend will continue.

The number of senior defectors that are coming in is encouraging. Whereas, a year ago defectors were primarily confined to the lower ranks, now we are getting some of the senior officers. I talked to one the other day, a senior officer, and he told me that many members of the large headquarters that he served before defecting would like very much to defect, but they have not been able to find a way. The control by the North Vietnamese leaders was of such consequence that they could not make the break.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

WESTMORELAND'S APPEAL

In his address to the Associated Press managing editors, General Westmoreland was calling for two things—understanding of the war in Vietnam and support on the home front. It was an admirable performance, one which should inspire confidence in the man who is responsible for the direction in combat of some 435,000 Americans.

This general is not a wishful thinker. "The end," he said, "is not in sight. I foresee, in the months ahead, some of the bitterest fighting of the war."

But General Westmoreland also spoke with confidence in our "battlefield capability." The problem as he sees it no longer involves danger of a military defeat. A military victory is beyond the reach of the Communists. He is concerned, however, with the attitude of some Americans.

"The magnificent men and women I command in Vietnam," he said, "have earned the unified support of the American people." But a noisy minority denies them this unified support. And our troops "are dismayed, as I am, by recent unpatriotic acts here at home. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

General Westmoreland knows, of course, that it is impossible to ban anti-war demonstrations in this country. Even as he spoke to the editors, demonstrators were marching in front of the hotel, one of them carrying a placard which read: "Westmoreland Wanted for War Crimes."

What can be done, however, and what General Westmoreland evidently hoped to do, is to isolate the peaceniks by appealing to the patriotism and the good sense of the American people.

The same thing is true of the address to the Economics Club of Detroit by General Wallace M. Greene Jr., commandant of the Marine Corps.

A great many, perhaps most, Americans are uneasy and unhappy with the war in Vietnam. But they also know that there is no easy way out. And as they come to realize that such shameful episodes as the recent demonstrations in New York and San Francisco serve no better purpose than to encourage the enemy and prolong the war, we think they will listen to the General Westmorelands and the General Greenes, not to the shrill, irrational clamor on the American Left.

WELCOME ABOARD

A few months ago Senator Pastore was calling for a halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. Now he has changed his mind.

The Rhode Island Democrat, not unlike Senator Brooke, of Massachusetts, has taken a hard look at the recent evidence and has concluded that, by and large, the President is doing what has to be done.

This is not to say that Senator Pastore has become a hawk in any extreme sense of that overworked word. But he has concluded that it is Ho Chi Minh, not Lyndon B. Johnson, who stands in the way of a just and honorable settlement of the war. Coming from a respected member of the Senate, this is a development to be welcomed. And we are of the belief that there would be more such conversions if many of those who persist in damning the President would put aside their emotions and examine the facts.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

WESTMORELAND'S FRANK ADDRESS

(By David Lawrence)

Someone in the administration certainly made a wise decision in letting Gen. William C. Westmoreland go before the managing editors of the Associated Press at their annual meeting in New York City this week and make such a frank and outspoken address about the Vietnam war.

The only question that arises is why the things he said were not emphasized heretofore by the government of the United States, so that throughout the world it would become known that the protesting groups in this country do not reflect public opinion.

The United States military commander in Vietnam said pointedly that he saw signs of "enemy success in the world arena" which could not be matched on the battlefield. The general stated the case succinctly when he added:

"He (the enemy) does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

For several months now, inside and outside of Congress, criticism of the Vietnam war not only has been disheartening, but has actually played a part in prolonging the conflict and preventing peace negotiations. Scarcely a day passes that some senator doesn't arise to announce that the war is being "escalated" or that America has no business fighting for freedom any more. The impression conveyed is that, when the United States is engaged in a war, it must ask the members of the Senate just what tactics to employ. This not only damages morale but causes confusion in the handling of the war strategy itself.

Whenever the American forces intensify their attack, there is an outcry in Congress. Thus, on the same day that Westmoreland was making his speech in New York, the Democratic leader of the Senate, Mike Mansfield, said that the American air strikes against the MIG bases in North Vietnam represent "further escalation" which, he declared, "will make it more difficult to get negotiations under way."

Another Democratic leader—Vice President Hubert Humphrey—almost coincidentally was telling the Texas state legislature at Austin that it would be "A betrayal of American liberalism" for this country to forsake the rest of the world and fail to use America's strength to preserve freedom. He declared:

"What would be the morality of a nation which devoted its riches only to itself, or regarded freedom in one part of the world as less precious than in another?"

Neither political party has been able to give the President the solid support which the commander-in-chief has always had in past wars in American history.

The Vietnam war is being pursued on the battlefield and in the air more effectively today than ever before. But unity at home is essential to the success of the military policy.

Although the United Nations seems frustrated, individual governments can still perform a useful function in expressing themselves frankly in support of the American position.

In the next few months, world opinion could force the North Vietnamese to the conference table and bring an end to the war. This is not likely, however, as long as there are staged protests as well as criticisms in Congress which indicate that either the United States is afraid of the enemy and will not use its maximum power, or that an artificially developed fear of "escalation" will cause the American government to retreat and eventually withdraw in humiliation.

President Johnson is known to have taken a positive position—namely, that he will follow the advice of the military men and pursue the war vigorously in order to persuade the enemy that it is better for the aggressors to withdraw now from South Vietnam and save themselves from a destructive punishment.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, am I correct that the pending business is S. 1039?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider Calendar No. 146 on the calendar of nominations.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Public Works:

Rear Adm. James C. Tison, Jr., USESSA, Director, Coast and Geodetic Survey, to serve as a member of the Mississippi River Commission;

Brig. Gen. William T. Bradley, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission; and

Brig. Gen. John A. B. Dillard, Jr., U.S. Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? There is no objection, and the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUSH-BAGOT AGREEMENT DAYS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to a very significant event in the United States-Canadian relations—the enactment of a resolution which I sponsored, with the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], our senior minority member, designating April 28 and 29 as Rush-Bagot Agreement Days, in commemoration of the signing, 150 years ago, of the Rush-Bagot Agreement, which provided for a completely disarmed border between the United States and Canada. As this is also the year of the Canadian exposition known as Expo-67, it is even more especially a significant anniversary.

Following the Rush-Bagot Agreement, the principles of disarmament gradually extend from the area covered by the agreement—which included the Great Lakes and Lake Champlain—to the entire borderline between the United States and Canada. So, as the result of the foresight of our then Secretary of State, Richard Rush, and the Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs of Canada, Charles Bagot, we today enjoy, with Canada, the longest unfortified boundary on the globe—5,270 miles long, including Alaska.

This commemorative resolution was signed by the President yesterday. The free boundary between the United States and Canada has become a symbol of what can be accomplished by neighbors, and an example to the rest of the world. I am deeply honored to have been able to sponsor the resolution memorializing the commemoration of that great international event. I think it is an occasion for mutual congratulations between the United States and Canada that our two countries are able to celebrate such an anniversary, and look back upon the successful history of so celebrated a partnership effort in terms of international peace.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a memorandum entitled "Example of Successful Disarmament Treaty," published this month by the Friends Committee on National Legislation.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"RUSH-BAGOT AGREEMENT DAYS," APRIL 28–29, 1967—EXAMPLE OF SUCCESSFUL DISARMAMENT TREATY

The Rush-Bagot agreement, whose 150th Anniversary is celebrated April 28–29, demilitarized the U.S.-Canadian frontier. It remains one of the most successful disarmament agreements of all time. It is therefore most appropriate that this agreement, which has enabled U.S.-Canadian friendship to grow, should be commemorated by the Senate and House—S. J. Res. 49 (Javits and Aiken) and H. J. Res. 468 (Button).

The following extract from *The Arms Race* by Nobel prize winner Philip Noel-Baker gives some background on the treaty. Philip Noel-Baker quotes from three noted historians and then summarizes four points to be drawn from the Agreement:

"The disarmament was effected in the area which was regarded as of vital strategical importance.

"It was opposed by the military advisers of both Governments, and for some years their views prevailed.

"It was only agreed to after 'a sharp struggle' in the British Cabinet (later 'sharp struggles' about disarmament ended differently).

"Those who opposed it said that it left one party (the weaker) 'defenceless.'"

The full text from *The Arms Race,* pages 511–515, discussing the Rush-Bagot Agreement, follows:

UNITED STATES-CANADIAN FRONTIER

As the result of the Rush-Bagot Agreement of 1817 between the British and United States Governments, the whole frontier between Canada and the United States was demilitarised. The story of the Agreement, and of its results, can best be told by extracts from leading historians:

Sir Charles Webster: "The war of 1812 had clearly shown that the *strategic situation on the Canadian frontier depended almost entirely on the command of the Lakes. Wellington had insisted on it as the key to the situation, when invited to take command in 1814.* It was only natural, therefore, that, immediately peace was obtained, both countries should show the keenest anxiety to secure their *position by establishing naval superiority. Castlereagh had from the first, however, desired an arrangement to prevent so dangerous and ruinous a competition. He had in 1814 been overruled by the military advisers,* and the British Government adopted the view that as they were the 'weaker party' in North America they ought to be allowed control of the Lakes as a measure of defence. Naturally the Government of the United States could not agree to a suggestion which would have left them open to attack, while Canada was almost completely protected. Nevertheless, Madison and Monroe were no less anxious than Castlereagh to avoid the construction of rival fleets. . . . In April 1816 he (Castlereagh) reopened negotiations, and at once agreed that no new construction should be begun until the matter had been discussed further. *The shipbuilding race was thus at once stopped.* . . . Monroe . . . made the definite suggestion that naval armaments should be limited to the few vessels necessary for customs and police. Castlereagh obtained the agreement of the Cabinet. . . .

"This was a positive achievement and the greatest contribution to the establishment of good relations between the two peoples during this period." [The Foreign Policy of Castlereagh, pp. 446–477.]

The Cambridge History of British Foreign Policy: "Since complete disarmament would appear to leave the Canadian Colonists defenceless against a sudden American attack, the British Cabinet was somewhat loath to consider the proposal. . . . Ultimately, however, Castlereagh expressed his readiness to enter upon negotiations. . . . It [the Rush-Bagot Agreement] was very short and *provided only for mutual disarmament upon the Lakes. . . . It had the most important effects; for in the temptation to naval rivalry on the opposite shores of the Lakes lay the germ of infinite mischief.* Its removal *set a precedent for the management of the frontier between the United States and British North America which has saved both Powers from great expense in fortifications and military guards and has deprived the frontier disputes of much of the acute danger they might otherwise have caused."* [Vol. II, pp. 223–224.]

G. M. Trevelyan: *"Before Castlereagh's career as Foreign Secretary ended, the fortunes of Anglo-American peace had been established on the sound basis of disarmament along the Canadian border, enabling future generations to weather many fierce storms, and to settle a frontier problem that no other two Great Powers would have been able to decide without war. . . .*

"The problem before Great Britain and Canada on one side and the United States on the other was nothing less than to fix a frontier of four thousand miles, which, except in the region of the Lakes, was not indicated by any natural boundary. It was perhaps the greatest operation that has ever been achieved in the interest of peace, and it took many years and many statesmen to accomplish and perfect it. But the most important stage of the whole proceeding came in 1817, when, after a sharp struggle inside the British Cabinet, the British and American Governments agreed to abolish their navies on the Great Lakes, and forthwith dismantled, sold or sank the warships on Erie and Ontario. These fleets have never been reconstructed. From that moment forward, 'the long, invisible unguarded line' that divides Canada from her neighbour has been successfully defended by the sole garrison of trust and good will, even during the frequently recurring periods of acrimonious dispute as to its whereabouts. *If there had been armaments there would some time have been war."* [British History in the Nineteenth Century, pp. 177–178.] . . .

It was not, as is so often said, the fact of common race, or a common language, that saved Britain and the United States from war throughout the nineteenth century and made war unthinkable in the twentieth; those factors may have helped, but, according to the consensus of opinion among the historians, the vital and decisive factor was the total abolition, and the immediate "scrapping," of the armaments which each of the two parties then felt to be "especially efficacious against its national defence."

Later generations of Britons have owed a great debt of gratitude to Castlereagh and his colleagues for their persistence in their sharp but victorious struggle for disarmament.

[Italics as in original.]

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the week's news carries three major stories: First, that King Constantine of Greece appeared in public in full dress military uniform to express his tacit approval of the military coup d'etat that destroyed the constitutional Government in Greece; second, that retiring Ambassador Henry Lodge believes continuance of the military junta in office in South Vietnam is preferable to a civilian government; and, third, that General Westmoreland returned from the battlefields of southeast Asia to take the case for the war to the public stump in the United States.

The fruits of 20 years of American economic and military aid to Greece have been the destruction of constitutionalism there at the hands of the people we armed to the teeth with the latest of American planes and tanks, and whose armies we feed and clothe with American money. Communism could scarcely have achieved a more complete victory over constitutionalism in that country than did the military dictatorship we spawned there.

The reliance of the United States upon military force in South Vietnam has grown steadily. It has been evident to me for some 3 years now, that force alone could achieve the continuance in office of a pro-American government in that country. Ambassador Lodge's advocacy of the military junta is a tacit admission that civilian government in South Vietnam has not achieved American ends in that part of the world, and cannot do so.

Here at home, we have seen the administration seek to blame the failure of its Vietnam policy not upon its own mistakes, but upon Americans who have warned from the start that the United States should not bog itself down on the mainland of Asia. Those warnings have not come just from a handful of Senators, but from such eminent military leaders as General MacArthur, General Gavin, General Ridgway, and General Eisenhower.

It is in the American tradition to blame other Americans for our reverses abroad. Who does not remember the outcry that it was the American State Department that "lost" China to communism, and not the corruption of Chang Kai-shek and his feudal war lords plus the rise of national unity in every nation of Asia? No, it was someone here in the United States, and someone in high office, who accomplished what the Communists would never be able to accomplish.

So it is not at all surprising to me to hear the advocates of the war in Vietnam blaming Americans for the fact that 3 years of optimistic predictions, 3 years of steady escalation of American military force, and 3 years of repudiation of President Johnson's 1964 campaign promises have not produced victory in South Vietnam.

They have not produced victory because our policy in Vietnam is based upon mistaken premises and seeks objectives that cannot be achieved by the means we are applying—those means being essentially the use of overwhelming military force.

Wrapping a bad policy in the American flag does not improve its chances for success one iota. It only means that more American men will die in the effort to advance it.

No one has more personal respect than I for General Westmoreland, and for the courage and professional competence of himself and the men he commands. But I ask him: "What war, anytime, anywhere, has not been basically a test of resolve? Is it possible that this war is so different from every other war, and especially from every other American war, that it alone will not stand the test of analysis among our own people? War is always a test of the resolve of one group against the other. What has up to now differentiated America from other nations at war has been the assumption that war does not suspend our system of constitutional government."

Perhaps General Westmoreland, and the civilans who brought him to the United States and put him on the public rostrum, have not read the words of Justice Jackson in the case of West Virginia against Barnett, when he upheld the right of an American child to refuse to salute the flag:

> Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be the mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order.

General Westmoreland is a fine man and a fine military officer. But it is not his function in our system of government to enter the political arena until he puts aside his uniform. Nor should he be asked to do so by his civilian supervisors, who are in effect asking him to perform what is their rightful function.

If anything is ingrained in our constitutional freedom under our system, it is that the military are to take commands in respect to carrying out our constitutional system of government, and not seek to give them. That is a lesson of constitutionalism that apparently General Westmoreland seems not to have learned.

I know of no more complete and important answer to the General's appearances and to the administration for which he speaks than that offered at Yale Political Union on April 26 by my colleague from Oregon, Senator HATFIELD, and I ask unanimous consent to have the text of his remarks printed at the conclusion of my own remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in particular, I call attention to his statement:

> The President says we are in South Vietnam to preserve that country's liberty. But what is being done in the name of liberty? Are we not being asked to preserve the liberty of South Vietnam at the expense of our own? Are we not helping the South Vietnamese to write and adopt a Constitution to define their liberties while at the same time we are allowing the President to re-define our Constitution to deny us liberty?

The Westmoreland visit has had the effect of shifting the discussion in the United States away from the merits of the war into a discussion of whether free speech is being squelched. But free speech will not be squelched by generals or Presidents or Secretaries of Defense or Secretaries of State or by anyone else in this country so long as men dedicated to our constitutional system have the courage to dissent and, in dissenting, bring to the American people the facts about this illegal, immoral, and unjustified war that is taking the lives of our youth.

That issue is not going to be silenced as far as the dissenters are concerned by a General Westmoreland, by a President, by a Cabinet member, or by any of my colleagues in the Senate here in this historic debate.

We intend to continue to try to get this Republic to change the ill-fated course of action on which the President is leading us.

It will not be long before new troop assignments to Vietnam, new casualty lists, new bombing targets in North Vietnam, new contributions to the war from China and the Soviet Union, will again compel Americans to assess the cost of what we are doing in southeast Asia with results. More important, these events will also compel the American people to do just what the French people did and reconsider whether military force can achieve a permanent foothold for our country in southeast Asia.

Make no mistake that this is exactly what the war is about. It is a war to make certain that a government we approve of remains in power in Saigon, this military tyranny in the form of the Ky junta, every member of which was a French officer participating in a war against his own people.

The mass of the South Vietnamese people know that Ky and the members of his military junta are responsible for the killing of thousands of fellow countrymen in the Indochina war, when the Vietnamese were in revolt against the French dynasty and colonial power in Indochina.

We are killing American boys today to try to support that tyranny in South Vietnam. As witnesses before the Committee on Foreign Relations have testified, that tyranny will be dependent for its perpetuation upon the maintenance for years of American bayonets in South Vietnam.

Any contest of resolve going on, may I say to General Westmoreland, is no different from the test of national resolves in World War II, or World War I, or the test of intranational resolve in the Civil War.

Mr. President, I appeal once again to the American people to consider what the end is that we seek in Vietnam; to judge whether it can be accomplished with methods and at a price that are in keeping with our international principles and our interests elsewhere in the world.

I regret that General Westmoreland has said nothing that sheds light upon these real issues, for they are going to remain the issues before the American people.

In the words of Adlai Stevenson, in his acceptance of the Democratic Party nomination in 1952, the issues that confront mankind and Americans will not fall before a general's baton.

EXHIBIT 1

ADDRESS OF SENATOR MARK O. HATFIELD AT THE YALE POLITICAL UNION, NEW HAVEN, CONN., APRIL 26, 1967

"Knowledge will forever govern ignorance, and a people who mean to be their own governors must arm themselves with the power knowledge gives. A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it is but a prologue to a farce, or a tragedy, or perhaps both."

These are the words of President James Madison and I find them hauntingly appropriate today as more and more Americans admit to complete confusion regarding our policies and purposes in Vietnam. As this confusion has grown greater, and as it has become more difficult to define and defend a moderate stand, increasing numbers have sought solution in extremes. Louder and more demanding have grown cries for escalation—"let's win and get out." Equally demanding have grown the cries for immediate abandonment. And, in this clamor and confusion, the voices of moderation have been muted.

The solution for Vietnam is not to be found in emotional extremes but in a well-reasoned policy that respects historical fact and that accommodates current realities.

The present course of our involvement has been charted on a distorted map. The mapmakers have deliberately misinterpreted the 20 year history of this conflict to justify our present involvement, and they follow their twisted path with a lack of sensitivity to political realities and priorities.

If we are to reach our destination of a just peace in Southeast Asia, I am convinced that we must rechart our course—first, through an honest interpretation of history and an alteration of our policies to comply with this history, and second, through a recognition of this conflict as a political problem that must be solved through political offensives and not solely by military force.

We must recognize that Ho Chi Minh has been fighting and earning popular support since before the end of the Second World War and always under the primary cause of *nationalism*. And, following the Geneva Agreements, the conflict in South Vietnam was clearly a *civil war* among the Vietnamese people and not a war of aggression initiated by a foreign power. These are the raw facts of history and the true nature of this conflict.

But to justify our role in Vietnam, our gigantic intrusion into the affairs of this small country, President Johnson misrepresented the nature of this conflict as a "war of aggression" conducted by the North Vietnamese. It was on the basis of this deliberately distorted definition that Americans accepted the commitment of 100,000 men to South Vietnam early in 1965. Secretary of State Rusk explained that this escalation, this departure from our role as advisors to the South Vietnamese, was necessary to meet aggression from the North. The 100,000 men, Rusk said, was a response to the movement of the entire North Vietnamese 325th Division into the South at the end of 1964. A State Department White Paper reported that 4,400 and possibly as many as 7,400 North Vietnamese had infiltrated into the South during 1964. In June 1966, however, the Pentagon confirmed Senator Mansfield's report that only 400 North Vietnamese soldiers had infiltrated during 1964. Mansfield concluded, and Secretary McNamara admitted, that it had been the weakness of the South Vietnamese government and the threat of its imminent collapse—and not the strength of the Communists—that had caused the commitment of 100,000 men, in 120 days, in early 1965. Thus on the basis of a misrepresentation by the Administration, the American public allowed the President to send American boys to fight a war he had said should be fought by Asians; to falsely redefine the conflict as primarily a war of aggression; and to seek a military solution to this political problem.

Other misrepresentations and contradictions have created more confusion and further reduced the public's capability to effectively influence the course of the war. The President has misrepresented the nature of the conflict and he has also misrepresented the nature of United States policy. As a candidate for President in 1964, Mr. Johnson stated in August, "Some others are eager to enlarge the conflict. They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions." Yet within three months of his election as President, the decision was made to send Marine combat troops to Vietnam.

This reversal in positions and contradiction in statements is characteristic of Secretary of Defense McNamara also. On March 15, 1962; on May 12, 1962; on January 27, 1964; and on November 10, 1964, he stated that the United States was in South Vietnam to provide training, that he had no plan for introducing U.S. combat forces to South Vietnam, that we were there only to support the frontline troops of the South Vietnamese army, and that the war must be fought and won by the Vietnamese. But today, in absolute contradiction to assurances made to the American people that the war would be fought by the South Vietnamese and not by the United States, American combat troops number nearly 500,000.

Mr. McNamara has made numerous other statements that have been contradicted by fact. Perhaps best known of these is his prediction in October of 1963 that the major part of the U.S. military task could be completed by the end of 1965. This statement is by no means his only inaccurate prophecy or faulty assessment however. On May 12, 1962, he stated "Progress in the last 8 to 10 weeks has been great . . . nothing but progress and hopeful indications of further progress in the future." On July 25, 1962, he said: "Our military assistance to Vietnam is paying off. I continue to be encouraged. There are many signs indicating progress." And on January 31, 1963, he restated his optimism: "There is a new feeling of confidence that victory is possible in South Vietnam." According to McNamara's statements, we have been making great progress. Unfortunately, McNamara's "progress" has brought us no closer to a solution than we were in 1962.

The President has stated that "the only path for reasonable men is the path of peaceful settlement." Yet the President has failed completely to establish peace negotiations. This failure cannot be completely blamed on Ho Chi Minh's refusal to be "reasonable." There are a number of well-documented instances where the United States refused offers from Hanoi to negotiate. In 1964 the United States turned down two tangible and specific proposals to initiate peace discussions. In late July, General DeGaulle called for a Geneva-type conference and Russia asked the fourteen nations of the Geneva conference to reconvene. All major parties to the conflict agreed to the meeting but the United States replied: "We do not believe in conferences called to ratify terror, so our policy is unchanged." And, during September 1964 North Vietnam offered to meet with U.S. representatives in Rangoon, Burma, to discuss terms for ending the hostilities in Vietnam. Despite U Thant's determined efforts to arrange the talks, the U.S. rejected the proposal.

Late in February, 1965, U Thant again tried to set up peace discussions and disclosed at a news conference that he had made concrete proposals and suggestions to the United States and to other powers principally involved in the Vietnam question. But the United States refused to participate and Administration officials confessed several months later that, if they had agreed to peace talks with Hanoi, it might have toppled the Government of Saigon.

A recent dialogue on the possibility of establishing peace negotiations is a repetition of the same old story of the Administration rejecting an offer to negotiate as not "meaningful" or not substantial. On December 4, 1966, a message from Polish Foreign Minister Adam Rapacki stated that Hanoi had agreed to talks at the Ambassadorial level in Warsaw. North Vietnam asked that special representatives be dispatched from Washington for this purpose. But after the American bombing raids near Hanoi December 13 and 14 in which civilian areas were damaged, North Vietnam withdrew its agreement, accusing the United States of bad faith.

The Administration now refuses to seek negotiations under conditions that it would have accepted a year ago. Perhaps the North Vietnamese do not sincerely want peace discussions and, even if negotiations were established, the results might be disappointing. But we must explore every avenue to peace and we cannot afford to second-guess the outcome of a complex political situation.

In fighting a war, our position must naturally be flexible, but this does not mean that the truth must be flexible, that the truth must be subservient to political motives. Every time that truth is distorted or denied us, we are denied a bit of our liberty. When government spokesmen misrepresent international situations and misrepresent our national intentions, they effectively greatly narrow alternatives to their policies. Many feel forced then, out of confusion and on the basis of no clear alternative, to endorse current policy.

Thus is created the tyranny of the "big lie"—a tyranny of "no alternatives," a tyranny that does not allow Americans the liberty of choice and that does not allow us effective voice in directing our nation's course.

Thus, we have an Administration that presents no alternative to escalating the war—to expanding its efforts to solve this basically political and economic struggle with military force.

I am firmly convinced that continued military escalation is destroying the possibility of a negotiated and lasting peace.

The purpose of this escalation, according to the Administration, is to bring Ho Chi Minh to the peace table. What kind of distorted logic leads us to believe that bombing North Vietnam's cities and factories will bring Ho to a conference table to discuss peace. We must take into account the psychology of escalation. The more we escalate the war, the more we bomb North Vietnam, the more going to the conference table becomes surrender. You don't "negotiate" with a man while holding a gun to his head: you outline the terms for his surrender. For Ho Chi Minh to agree to peace talks while we were bombing his country would be a great humiliation and would, in Ho's eyes, be virtual capitulation.

An American professor of psychiatry, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last year, stated that escalation was not an effective method of establishing peace negotiations. Dr. Jerome D. Frank, Professor of Psychiatry at the Johns Hopkins University, stated: "The Vietnam war has assumed an ideological character similar to the holy wars of former times, and this has ominous implications. . . . People fighting for their ideals seldom if ever can be forced into surrendering by punishment. . . . The notion that one can cause people to abandon their ideologies by inflicting pain on them should have died in Rome with the Christian martyrs."

Annihilation of the North Vietnamese will not bring peace to the South. A defeated Ho Chi Minh, with his 50,000 troops returned to the North, would still leave five-sixths of the present enemy forces continuing the war in the South.

This Administration has lost its capacity to lead us to a peaceful conclusion of the war. It is defensively and inflexibly committed to policies which have not worked since they were initiated 20 years ago and show no hint of working now.

Yet our Vietnam policy-makers ask Americans to line up shoulder to shoulder and, in the name of blind faith and national unity, endorse their policies. They attempt to silence their critics by accusing the dissenters of aiding the enemy and of prolonging the war.

This Administration is using political blackmail to eliminate the painful but democratic necessity of giving all views a fair hearing. Those who dare to challenge the Administration's policies do so at the risk of having their patriotism questioned. I want to caution that we must not confuse patriotism with blind endorsement of bad policies.

They have now brought one of the most respected Vietnam policy-makers, the military field commander, to the United States where he is joining in the effort to silence the opposition. I want to contrast this general's statements—denouncing those who disagree with the Administration's policies—with the comment of one of America's great soldiers and statesmen. General George Washington in an address to the officers of the Army in 1783 defended the right and *necessity* to hear all opinions "If men are to be precluded from offering their sentiments on a matter—which may involve the most serious and alarming consequences that can invite the consideration of mankind—(then) reason is of no use; the freedom of speech may be taken away and, dumb and silent, we may be led like sheep to the slaughter."

As much as I oppose our present policies in Vietnam, I *can* attribute them to be the misguided actions of sincere men. I cannot, however, on any grounds, excuse the present vicious attempts by these men to gag the voices of opposition by impuning their patriotism.

What are these powerful and influential men telling the American people? That no one should criticize the war in Vietnam? That no one should voice any protest? That every truly loyal American will in silence accept every Administration decision in the conduct of this war? That it is disloyal and treasonous to dissent?

I am very deeply concerned by this attempt to silence opposing opinions. The President says we are in South Vietnam to preserve that country's liberty. But just what is being done in the name of liberty? Are we not being asked to preserve the liberty of South Vietnam at the expense of our own? Are we not helping the South Vietnamese to write and adopt a Constitution to define their liberties while at the same time we are allowing the President to re-define our Constitution to deny us our liberty?

The President cannot suspend the freedom of speech granted by the Bill of Rights in order to make his administration of the war popular. The Constitutional right of free speech has been upheld to be the same both in peace and in war. Our Bill of Rights is not suspended even in a period of declared war, much less in a time of undeclared war.

The courts have ruled that free speech is always untrammelled unless its exercise creates a "clear and present danger." Only if the words are of such a nature and are used under such circumstances that men, judging in calmness, could reasonably say that they created a clear and present danger that they would bring about the evils which our government has a right to prevent, only then can freedom of speech be curtailed.

The case for freedom of speech should need no restating. But Justice Brandeis has stated it so well and so forthrightly that I believe it bears review at this time. He said, in a 1927 case: "Those who won our independence believed that the final end of the state was to make men free to develop their faculties. . . . They believed that freedom to think as you will and to speak as you think are means indispensable to the discovery and spread of political truth; that without free speech and assembly discussion would be futile; that with them, discussion affords ordinarily adequate protection against the dissemination of noxious doctrine; . . . (they knew) that the path of safety lies in the opportunity to discuss freely supposed grievances and proposed remedies; and that the fitting remedy for evil counsels is good ones. . . . Recognizing the occasional tyrannies of governing majorities, they amended the Constitution so that free speech and assembly should be guaranteed.

"Fear of serious injury cannot alone justify suppression of free speech. . . . Those who won our independence by revolution . . . did not exalt order at the cost of liberty."

What kind of men have we at the helm of government who would deliberately coerce the public into accepting their policies on the threat of being branded traitors. These are the tactics of tyrants with little understanding or respect for constitutional rights of men. They fail to realize that the freedom to stand opposed to the government's policy, the freedom to speak out against government actions which corrupt the basic tenets of our society, that this freedom is not a *privilege* that can be withdrawn when the boat begins to rock. This freedom is the inherent and ultimate *right* of people in a democracy. It is a right that supercedes any ambitions or complexes of men and stands above the gravity of any issue. Our belief in liberty is the foundation of our political system and any encroachment of this liberty—for whatever purposes—threatens our entire democratic structure.

I ask you "where is the conscience of America?" Where are the voices raised against such tactics? Where are the libertarians to denounce this diminishing of liberty for the sake of consensus? Have Americans become so mesmerized by the McCarthy-ite tactics of the Administration—the tactics of indiscriminate insinuation of unpatriotic motives to those that dissent—that they fail to recognize the threat of these tactics to liberty.

We must remember that liberty is not something that is once won and forever secure. In the words of Daniel Webster, "God grants liberty only to those who love it, and are *always* ready to guard and defend it."

I am also very deeply concerned that the Republican Party might become an accomplice in this political pressure to silence opposition. We have heard a number of leading Republicans comment that the Party should remain silent concerning Vietnam and not allow it to become a political issue. I strongly challenge this contention. I believe the Republican Party has an obligation to the fighting men in Vietnam. It must offer alternatives to the Administration's present policy that calls upon these young men to sacrifice their lives without bringing their comrades and country any closer to victory or solution. The Party also has an obligation to the country and the two-party system to offer alternative policies that we feel would better realize our national goal of peace in Vietnam.

Many have offered alternatives to military escalation and the American public deserves an opportunity to study and select or reject these alternatives.

I have, for a good number of months, listed three possible alternatives to our present policy that I believe might make it possible to extracate ourselves with honor from Vietnam.

First, on the military front, I believe that we should take steps to de-Americanize the war. This is essentially an Asian war with Asian interests most clearly at stake. President Marcos of the Philippines has declared that there must be Asian solutions to Asian problems and we should do everything possible to help them to wage their own military action. Asian troops should be *substituted* for American forces on a carefully scheduled program with logistical assistance from the United States. The President has warned us that the conflict in Vietnam could last for another 10 or 15 years and we should not wait another half-decade before taking positive steps to turn this war over to the people who have the primacy of interest in its outcome.

On the diplomatic front, I believe we should do everything we can to encourage the calling of an all-Asian conference. Through such a conference, the conflict could be re-defined as a diplomatic problem to be most realistically negotiated by Asian diplomats, rather than as an American military problem to be solved by guns. An Asian diplomatic offensive might lead to reduced tensions and misunderstandings between adversaries in the conflict and build a bridge of trust between the two sides so that the atmosphere for peace discussions is improved.

Third, on the economic front, we must begin now to prepare South Vietnam for peace and the inevitable transition from a war-oriented to a peace-time economy. We should work for the creation of a Southeast Asian common market based on agricultural economies. Our goal of peace and stability in South Vietnam will not automatically be reached with the conclusion of the present conflict. When the hostilities cease in South Vietnam, the prospects for continued peace will depend to a great extent on this area's ability to progress economically and to meet the rising expectations of its people. None of the countries of Southeast Asia is large enough to support strong and viable economies in the near future. Through tariff agreements and cooperative planning, however, these countries could coordinate the development of their individual and total resources. They should also be able to avoid the initial expense and long-term inefficiency of duplicating basic agriculture-oriented industries necessary to the development of each country.

The alternatives I have just offered join many other ideas worthy of careful consideration in seeking a solution to the war in Vietnam.

But whatever alternative we would adopt or whatever course we would pursue we cannot commit ourselves to a program that destroys liberty in name of some other goal.

As Justice Brandeis counseled us, liberty must be valued as both a means and an end, and he said, "Those who won our independence believe . . . liberty to be the secret of happiness and courage to be the secret of liberty."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I got such a different reaction from the visit and from the speech of our distinguished commander in the field, General Westmoreland, from that which was apparently received by my distinguished friend, the Senator from Oregon, that I can hardly believe that we attended the same affair.

After I left that rather memorable occasion—and certainly it was an inspiring one—I was asked by one of the radio stations of my own State to make a brief statement as to my reactions, and I made it in the following words:

> I thought that General Westmoreland's address was both a thorough factual report and a much-needed inspiration. It is to be re-broadcast to our half million men in Southeast Asia and should have a fine reaction from them. There was not only prolonged applause and general approval by the Congress, but also admirable restraint by the General in that he made no reference whatever to unpleasant differences on the home front.

There was, of course, not a word in the eloquent address of General Westmoreland that referred to differences on the homefront. His report was a factual one, his report was an inspiring one, and his report was a restrained one. It is on the point of the restraint which he used that I wish to make a few remarks.

I recognize, as completely as does any Senator, the right of free speech. I recognize also, however, the heavy responsibility that lies upon public servants, officials, and Senators who represent great States, to be careful about what they say on a question so inflammatory as the one which has been stirred up with reference to the war in Vietnam.

I care not to speak about any other Senator or any other Senator's State, but I should like to refer to my own State, if I may. It so happens that my distinguished colleague, Senator SMATHERS, is himself a marine veteran of World War II. It happens that his two sons are participants in the Vietnam war. One has just returned after 2 years of fine service on a destroyer in the Tonkin Gulf. The other is still serving in an underwater demolition team in Vietnam. Neither of those services is a sinecure.

It happens in my own case—if I may refer to it—that my own two sons saw active service in World War II—one as a marine in combat in Saipan, Tinian, and Okinawa, as a lieutenant, commanding a rifle platoon; the other as a tailgunner in a Navy torpedo plane. My own service was on four fronts in France in World War I, to which I shall refer no further.

The point I make now is that many of

the people of my State of Florida know these facts perfectly well. Most of the people of Florida, I believe, would be rather shocked if they heard Senator Smathers or the senior Senator from Florida attacking the objectives of our Nation or the decent position of our Nation in Vietnam. Thousands of families in the State of Florida have boys or girls in Vietnam. Those boys and girls will gain information of things spoken in the Senate, just as they will hear General Westmoreland's speech when it is repeated over radio to our Armed Forces in southeast Asia. The effect upon such families in Florida and upon such boys and girls from Florida who are serving in southeast Asia is something which we must carefully consider, we two Senators from Florida. If we failed to consider this effect, I believe we would have failed to show the restraint that General Westmoreland showed in his fine address today. I listened with great care. Not a word was spoken by him which indicated in the slightest that there were differences here on the homefront.

With all due respect to the right of freedom of speech, I believe that the question of timeliness, the question of where we say things, the question of what we say, the question of the method and manner in which we say them, the question of the words we use, as to whether they are inflammatory and confidence-destroying or not, are questions of very great importance in their bearing upon our responsibility as Members of the Senate, or in any other official position.

Mr. President, without going into great detail, I simply wish to say that I hope we may think carefully about the restraint shown by General Westmoreland. I hope that we may consider whether or not that restraint will be appropriate for us to show, regardless of what our own thinking may be on the Vietnam affair. There has been much too much fire and much too much smoke about this issue, and I believe that when so raised, it does harm to our Nation. It certainly does harm in the homes that have sent their boys and girls to Vietnam. It does harm in those homes where boys are about to be sent to the Armed Forces, ultimately to go, perhaps, to Vietnam. It does harm—more than anywhere else—in the fact that it gets to those boys at the front, who know something about who represents them and what the records are in public service of those who represent them.

Mr. President, I hope that above everything we may get from the address of General Westmoreland, we will get the idea that restraint is appropriate, restraint is timely, and restraint should be practiced by all of us in what we say with reference to the Vietnam affair.

Mr. President, I shall conclude in a moment. The sole purpose of my speaking at this time is to invite attention, first, to the admirable restraint employed by General Westmoreland today. He gave not a word of recognition, even, of the fact that he is engaged in an activity concerning which there are grave differences of opinion on the home front, and as to which many things have been said and done that are not temperate, are not moderate, are not tolerant. He did not use the occasion to reply to them in any fashion at all.

I express the hope that we in the Senate may be more moderate, more temperate, more tolerant, and less violent in our speeches as they affect the Vietnam war, and that we may realize the enormous responsibility that we have, in that our remarks cannot help having implications upon the thinking of thousands of people in our own States, and perhaps in others, particularly in families whose boys and girls are in Vietnam, or in families from which boys and girls may be soon called to Vietnam.

I think we must practice greater restraint, and we should seize this chance to emulate the lesson given by General Westmoreland, that restraint, even in this difficult time, as to this difficult problem, is possible. It should be practiced by all of us.

I yield the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I agree with the Senator, may I say.

THE DODD CASE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this Senator does not agree that Tom Dodd should be censured, and in view of the fact that the committee has recommended unanimously that censure should take place, I would hope that the majority leader will not insist on voting on this matter until those of us who would care to stand by Tom Dodd's side have had an opportunity to study the matter and adequately prepare ourselves.

I would not be making this request, I might say, if a single member of that committee had stood steadfastly by the side of Tom Dodd. However, in view of the fact that I expect to stand for him, and I have not followed this matter in great detail, I would hope that I would not be asked to debate the matter before I have had an opportunity to study it in greater detail than I would be able to do during the next few days.

The majority leader, I believe, is willing to give me some assurance that the matter will not be called up in the next few days.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had discussed this matter with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], before he became unavoidably absent and I, of course, can give no assurances on my own; but in conjunction with the distinguished minority leader I can give the Senator the assurance that it will not be taken up next week.

The distinguished minority leader and I have agreed that the distinguished Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] should have, as a matter of courtesy, a reasonable length of time in which to prepare himself on the basis of the report which was issued by the Stennis committee on yesterday, and, in that respect, it has always been our intention that the matter would not be called up this coming week. At some time after that, however, the matter will be considered and I hope that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana would allow the distinguished minority leader and me to arrive at a reasonable time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator. I have a high regard for Tom Dodd. I have both a high regard and a deep affection for him. I feel he is being done an injustice. I do not criticize the committee. These are wonderful men. I know their job was a very distasteful task.

I do feel, in some respects, that certain people in the press, particularly two columnists, have exerted great pressure in this matter, but at this time I do not think the case justifies the censure of this Senator. He should not have to plead his own case. Any man who has been a good father, a good husband, and a friend of many of us, as Tom Dodd has been, should have a friend in this body to speak for him. If no one else does, I shall.

I hope I will have enough time to prepare my case before we proceed to judgment on it, because in my judgment there is an important matter involved here. In some respects I fear that this recommendation of the committee may be a case of punishing one man, making a scapegoat of one man, for a practice which may be altogether too prevalent, and which should be corrected, but not by putting all of the fault and blame on one man. It seems to me that the matter should be the subject of an act of Congress to determine what a Senator can and cannot do.

I feel, in general terms, that what is suggested here amounts in some respects to conviction on an ex post facto law; in effect on a law that does not exist at all.

Having had the distasteful task of voting its equivalent of censure on a colleague in years gone by, I personally think it is a sad thing and something that one should do only when it is absolutely necessary.

I think the man committed no crime. Quite to the contrary, those who would injure his reputation and destroy an effective man are more nearly the culprits than he is. In other words, I think that people who engaged in downright theft and burglary have not been recommended for prosecution here. Instead, an honorable and decent man, who is to a large extent the victim of circumstances beyond his control, is being recommended for censure.

I do not criticize the committee. I think they had a very difficult job. I offer apologies to those whom I urged to serve on the committee for the soul-searching task we forced upon them, but I do feel that the man's case should be thoughtfully considered.

I appreciate the majority leader's assurance that we will not vote on the matter quickly. I thank him very much.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, in this connection I had an opportunity a few moments ago to speak to the chairman of the select committee. He wishes to be certain that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] is given every opportunity and ample time to prepare whatever statements and discussions he wishes to have, or that his friends wish to make for him.

We shall yield, certainly, to the wishes of the Senator and we intend to follow explicitly the suggestions of the majority leader, working with the minority leader, with respect to this matter coming up in approximately 1 or 2 weeks. If 1 week is not sufficient it would be agreeable with the chairman to try to accord to the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] the time that would be required.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have no doubt whatever that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the majority leader [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the members of the committee are all fairminded men. I have no doubt that the result will be agreed to.

I wanted to make the statement so that I would not be told subsequently that I should have asked for some small delay. I did not want to wait until the motion was made and then find that it was too late.

ADDRESS BY PAUL A. STRACHAN BEFORE MEETING OF PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, yesterday Mr. Paul A. Strachan made a speech to the meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Physically Handicapped.

Paul A. Strachan is a veteran in the cause of the physically handicapped. He formerly lived in Washington but for a great many years has been a citizen of Florida.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Strachan's speech and also a series of testimonial statements made by distinguished Americans on behalf of Mr. Strachan be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Vice-President, Chairman, Members of the Committee, and friends of the Handicapped, I thank the Chairman, and the Committee for having bestowed upon me the Distinguished Service Award.

As the originator of this movement, I believe all of you would like to know how this Committee came into being, and I shall recall this to your memory by citing the action of Congress on the last day of the Session.

The hands of the clock facing the Vice-President's rostrum in the Senate Chamber moved slowly forward. As said, as it was the last day of the Session, contrary to conditions usual at such times, the Senate had almost full attendance.

"Dear Alben" Barkley, the Majority Leader, and Wallace White, Minority Leader, had a gentleman's agreement that no legislation would be voted on that day, as the House had adjourned the previous day and the Senate Session, therefore, was more or less to clean up odds and ends.

However, "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week," House Joint Resolution 22, (which became Public Law 176) had passed the House, and awaited action by the Senate.

Upon learning of the gentleman's agreement, Sen. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, was pressed by me to call Leader Barkley's attention to the fact that House Resolution 23 had been approved by the House and, anticipating no opposition, the Senate could simply take routine action to enact it.

With the aid of Sen. Pat McCarran, of Nevada, Chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which had charge of the Resolution, we succeeded in getting that Committee to approve action and Senators Barkley and White were so notified.

Sen. Barkley had no objection to setting aside the gentleman's agreement, but Sen. White stated that Sen. Aiken, of Vermont, had objected to the Resolution and that his approval was necessary.

On learning that Sen. Aiken was in Vermont, his home State, we spent considerable time in long-distance phoning to reach him, and finally, when the matter was explained, he stated that he had been under an erroneous impression about the Resolution, and, learning the facts, he waived objection.

We so told Senators Barkley, White, and Kilgore. As stated, the Senate had certain routine business to complete, and action was taken very slowly.

The clock's hands moved slowly toward 4 PM, and then 5 PM, but still, no action on the Resolution. We knew that the Senate intended adjournment at about 5:30 to 6 PM, and were fearful that our measure would get lost in the shuffle and, if so, we would have the same dreary business of having it re-introduced; action by both House and Senate, and we had already spent more than 5 years of hard work on it, and we did not want to spend two years more. So our anxiety was keen.

At 5:30 PM, in order to attend some important business, we returned to our Headquarters, 1370 National Press Bldg., Washington, where we phoned to various Senators to try to speed action on the Resolution.

At nearly 6 PM, we received word that our Resolution had been approved by the Senate and, our nearly 6 year battle to have it acted upon had been capped by a win!

The purpose of "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week" was, and is, to unite Government—Federal, State, County, and Municipal—with all private industries, businesses and organizations, to further employment of what was, then, 23,000,000 (now, 1967, more than 72,000,000 Handicapped, of whom some 20,000,000 are from 60% to 100% Severely Handicapped), which include the Blind, Partially Sighted, Deaf, Hard of Hearing, Arthritics, Amputees, Cardiacs, Cerebral Palsied, Diabetics, Epileptics, victims of Cancer, Muscular Dystrophy, Multiple Sclerosis, Poliomyelitis, Rheumatism, Tuberculosis, and other "chripplers", as well as those having Congenital Defects and Deformities. The Resolution reads as follows:

"Whereas there is now, and shall be for some time to come, a positive necessity for utilizing every available ounce of manpower in America; and

"Whereas the growing and acute problems of the physically handicapped, who number approximately 25,000,000 citizens, who are being augmented by an average of 800,000 citizens injured in industry, yearly—to say nothing of those who have been, or will be, injured or diseased as a result of military service—is engaging more and more attention of the Federal Government and private industry; and

"Whereas rehabilitation and placement of the physically handicapped are among the most important problems in our national *economy, as, if a means is provided to make* such people self-supporting, wholly or in part, the entire Nation will be beneficiary, because of lessening drain upon national finance; and

"Whereas Congress and the Chief Executive have expressed concern and have initiated *constantly expanding programs* on behalf of the physically handicapped, as well as leaders in private industry, Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled*, That, hereafter, the first week in October of each year shall be designated as 'National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week'. During said Week, appropriate ceremonies are to be held throughout the Nation, the purpose of which shall be to enlist public support for and interest in the employment of otherwise qualified, but physically handicapped workers.

"The President is hereby requested to issue a suitable proclamation each year, and the Governors of States, Mayors of Cities, and heads of other instrumentalities of Government, as well as leaders of Industry, Educational; Religious Groups; Labor; Veterans; Women; Farm; Scientific and Professional and all other organizations and individuals at interest, are invited to participate."

The foregoing Resolution was unanimously adopted by House and Senate, and Sponsored by Sen. Harley M. Kilgore, of West Virginia, and Representative Jerry Voorhis, of California, and Signed by President Truman on August 11, 1945, as House Resolution, now Public Law 176. The "week", then, was simply an effort on my part to direct public attention to the problems and needs of our millions of Handicapped.

I pressed my friend, Secretary of Labor, Lewis B. Schwellenbach, to establish this Committee, with President Truman's approval, and that was done.

It has been estimated that operations stemming from the "week" have been the means of affording employment to more than 5,000,000 Handicapped, who earned more than $4,000,000,000 and paid taxes of more than $1,000,000,000 and, its beneficent movement has benefited the Handicapped in many other ways, including Social Acceptance,—far better programs of Rehabilitation and Employment, etc.

I wish to commend all of you for the fine work you have done, in aiding the Handicapped. You have, thus, contributed greatly to the Nation's welfare, by putting many people, hitherto on charity rolls, to work, so that they became tax-payers instead of tax-eaters.

But, the job is incomplete. We must have more study of the problems of the Handicapped, including, medical, educational, counseling, and, above all, employment of handicapped.

I am afraid that still too many of our industrialists and business men are like the Internal Revenue Agent, who said to the Taxpayer, "We sympathize with your problems, but they won't fit into our computer!"

Suitable employment is the key to the whole handicapped program, because, if a man can't work, why? Does he need medical service; counseling, education and training and, above all, proper placement? If so, the answer is to aid such individual by applying the best remedy that will fit him for a job.

Then, too, we need many, many more carefully trained counselors, placement officers, and welfare workers, to say nothing of the great need for more physicians, surgeons, and therapists.

Present plans, involving new legislation, already pin-point these needs, and we hope that Congress will speedily approve such legislation, and the Administration implement it, as it does not pour taxpayer's money down a rat-hole, but utilizes it to help Handicapped to help themselves, thus easing the *strain on the rest of our population in having* to carry these people on Welfare rolls, or charity.

Although the work of the Committee, and other public and private agencies have ameliorated, to some extent, the needs and miseries of the Handicapped, yet, the Handicapped *population* has not *diminished, but*, as is shown by official reports, we still have an increase of some 300,000 Handicapped each year, from accidents, injuries, and diseases. The American Medical Association says there are approximately 72,000,000 or more of our population in some degree handicapped.

One thing I have pounded on, for more than 40 years: That, the Federal Government needs, and must have, a coordinator for the present 57 programs that deal with this problem. At the time this Committee was founded, President Truman, then Secretary of Labor Lewis B. Schwellenbach, and myself, discussed this phase, at length, and it was agreed that, when the Committee got properly organized, say, in a year or so, we would propose to have the Coordinator of all Handicapped Programs in the Federal Service.

This would not mean that present agencies would be abolished, but, their work would and should be integrated. I recommend that the Committee take appropriate action to launch this necessary move. Surely, after 20 years, we have learned enough to qualify it.

Now, I come to the close of my peroration. I just arose from a sick bed, and am weak, but willing. Leukemia is a tough disease to battle, and it may well be that I shall not be around to trouble you, or others, within a year or so.

During my long illness I reflected on what I would do with my remaining time. I decided to resume activities to set up the American Institute for Human Engineering, in Florida, to be the one spot in all the World wherein Handicapped might be treated; trained; counseled and guided, and, by participating in a well-organized Job Referral and Placement phase, become qualified to take their places as full-fledged citizens of our great Nation.

This job is a must! The institute is badly needed, and should have the support of every humanitarian, thinking person.

The Florida location would provide needed climatic advantages to expedite return to health and usefulness—and it is nearer to the most populous States than is the West Coast.

I know this will require brains, money and enthusiasm and boundless energy, and we would welcome all of you as Members of the Institute. If you are interested, write me, Route 1 Box 135, Brooksville, Fla., and I will send you a pamphlet describing the Institute program.

Again, I want to thank all of you for what you have done for the Handicapped, and urge that you redouble your efforts in future. This is one thing you cannot pick up in the morning, and then, lay it down for the rest of the day. No! The great needs and problems of the Handicapped require continual and continuous study and action.

For long intervals over the past 46 years, I have dedicated myself to advancing the program for Handicapped. Now, that my time is limited, I can say, with our late, great Vice-President Barkley, who stated, in effect, "I would rather serve the poor and needy, than sit in the seats of the mighty!"

Then, he fell dead in front of his audience, and I feel the same way about serving the Handicapped.

I thank you.

Many eminent Americans have lauded the work done by Paul Strachan, especially through the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped. Among these are the following:

Sam Rayburn, former Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives: "I think the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped has performed a splendid task, and I wish it well in all the fine work it has done."

Joseph W. Martin, Jr., former Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives: "I shall consider it an honor to have my name included among the Congressional Incorporators of AFPH."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt (While President of U.S.A.): "You are doing a great and necessary work in developing the talents and skills of our Handicapped citizens."

Walter H. Ditmars, former President, Gray Mfg. Co.: "As the AFPH Program is the most business-like approach to the Handicapped problem, I believe that Industry and Business should lend full support to that program."

Hon. Lois Mary McBride, Judge, Court Common Pleas, Pittsburgh: "You are to be commended for your fine program."

Dr. Carlos E. Ward, Vocational Rehabilitation Specialist, Veterans Administration: "Rehabilitation and Employment of Handicapped people are among the most important problems we must meet. Accomplishment of successful and effective rehabilitation of the seriously handicapped depends upon well coordinated teamwork on the part of specially trained workers in several professional fields. I know that the AFPH program is geared to the needs of our times and it should have full support from the public."

Dr. Elena D. Gall, Coordinator, Special Education, Hunter College: "Public and private programs for our 38,000,000 Handicapped, developed by AFPH, have been the means of carrying on a continuous educational campaign that has resulted in great good, and I believe AFPH deserves the support of all good Americans who realize the need for positive action on this great national problem."

Dr. H. C. Byrd, President-Emeritus, University of Maryland: "You have my approval to use my name as a Congressional Incorporator."

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, (now Vice President, USA): "I am happy to give you permission to use my name as one of the many Congressional incorporators of a bill granting AFPH a Congressional Charter."

Jacob J. Weinstein, Rabbi, K.A.M. Temple, Chicago: "I am happy to give you permission to use my name as one of the many Congressional incorporators of a bill granting AFPH a Congressional Charter."

P. S. Litchfield, late Board Chairman, Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co.: "Wishing you and your associates success in your undertaking."

Hon. Mary T. Norton, former U.S. Representative, New Jersey: "This is your authority to include my name in connection with the bill."

Leo Axlrod, Chairman, Committee on Handicapped Placement, Miamia (Fla.) Chamber of Commerce, owner Empire Furniture and Rattan Factory: "Mr. J. N. McArthur, President, Miami Chamber of Commerce, and President of all-Dade County NEPHW Committee, and Mr. Alfred Canel, our Chamber's Manager, will be pleased to have you enter their names as sponsoring your Charter. I will be pleased to be included, as I know the aspirations, hopes, and future ambitions of millions of handicapped depend on full development and application of the AFPH Program."

Harry M. Moses, former President, Bituminous Coal Operators Assn.: "I am in complete sympathy with your aims and ambitions. I have been engaged all my adult life in the problems of accident prevention in the coal mines and know the attendant necessity for rehabilitation."

Dr. John R. Steelman, former Assistant to President Truman: "Use my name."

Arthur Clarendon Smith, Sr., Smith's Transfer & Storage Co., Washington: "As a business man, naturally I am interested in conservation of resources and, certainly, our greatest undeveloped asset is, our millions of handicapped people. The AFPH Program has proven to be the most effective means of utilizing handicapped, and making them producers. Therefore, I support the AFPH and call upon my fellow business men to do likewise."

Dr. Samuel Lewis Fox, M.D., Baltimore: "I shall be happy to join you as one of the Congressional Incorporators."

Hon. G. Mennen Williams, former Governor of Michigan and now Assistant Secretary of State: "The AFPH has always been in the forefront of those seeking to enable this Nation's handicapped people to realize their full potentials as individuals and citizens. This Federation deserves full public support so that we may add to the happiness of those who would be otherwise handicapped, and strength to our economy, by making these people self-supporting."

Hon. Joseph Donohue, former Commissioner, District of Columbia: "I shall be honored to have you use my name as one of the Congressional Incorporators."

Hon. Charley E. Johns, former Acting Governor of Florida: "I will be happy for you to include my name among the Congressional incorporators, I am eager to do anything I can toward helping the physically handicapped."

Arthur Dick, D.D.S., M.D., Washington: "I accept with pleasure the invitation to be one of the Congressional incorporators."

Spyros P. Skouras, former President, 20th Century-Fox Film Corporation: "I will be happy to lend my name as one of the Congressional incorporators for this most worthy cause."

Darrell C. Crain, M.D., Washington: "I am happy to have you use my name as one of the Congressional incorporators of your organization."

Arthur Pardue, Bishop, Episcopal Church, Pittsburgh: "I would be happy to have you use my name as one of the Congressional incorporators of your organization."

George Meany, President, AFL–CIO: (Letter to all Officers of National and International Unions, State Federations of Labor, and directly affiliated Local Unions): "The Convention of the AFL endorsed the program of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped in dealing with the problems of millions of physically handicapped citizens, and particularly its legislative proposal for the establishment of a Federal Agency for Handicapped, and (Tax Exemption) for Those Who Support Handicapped Persons; and called upon affiliated organizations to lend legislative, and if possible, financial support to the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped."

John D. Pennkamp, Associate Editor, Miami (Fla.) HERALD: "It will be a privilege to be one of your Congressional incorporators."

Joseph M. McGrath, Asst. Legislative Director, National Association of Home Builders: "I will be very happy to be one of the Congressional incorporators of AFPH."

John L. Lewis, President-Emeritus, United Mine Workers of America: "In one of our conferences of Executive Officers at Headquarters, Vice-President, John O'Leary, now gone to his eternal reward, paid Paul Strachan one of the most moving and eloquent tributes I think was ever uttered. It was based on his knowledge of Brother Strachan's work, in listening to his talk upon an occasion when he made known the aspiration and the time he decided to dedicate himself exclusively for the rest of his life, to the cause of making a contribution to that countless number of men and women who, in contrast to ourselves, live in daily agony, daily denial of privilege, or in pain and distress. I salute you, Brother Strachan, and trust that Providence will preserve you to carry on this work and give you strength, day by day, to go through the necessary ordeal of making that contribution; and to your loyal and efficient assistant and co-laborer, Miss Mildred Scott, I express the same sentiments, because I have come to have an appreciation of her own contribution as your good right arm, day by day."

Sidney Fishman, Ph.D., College of Engineering, New York University: "I shall be happy to be included as a Congressional Incorporator for the AFPH."

Paul C. Sparks, Vice Pres., I.C.T. Group, Dallas, Texas: "It will be a pleasure to have you list my name as one of the Congressional incorporators."

John Ford, eminent Movie Producer, Hollywood: "It has been said that the Motion Picture is, simply, the mirror of life, and in it we see human nature, in all its guises, foibles, and nobilities. The same can be said of the Handicapped, millions of whom never attain self-sustaining status because they have lacked the essential medical treatment; education; guidance, and placement. Charles Steinmetz; deaf Beethoven; arthritic Clarence Day; Deaf Thomas Alva Edison, to say nothing of the distinguished victim of Polio, F.D.R.! The handicapped program developed and applied by AFPH, deserves universal support."

From CIO Constitutional Convention: "CIO affiliates have supported, both nationally and locally, the efforts of the American Federation of the Physically Handicapped, to secure increased opportunities for disabled citizens thru financial and full moral support from all citizens."

Mahlon S. Tisdale, Vice-Adm., UNC-Ret., Vallejo, Calif.: "A federal program to assist all types of physically handicapped is necessary to our economy. AFPH has proposed and is working constantly to effectuate such a program and should, therefore, have financial and full moral support from all citizens."

J. E. Martin, Jr., M.D., Golden Clinic, Memorial General Hospital Assn., Elkins, W. Va.: "I shall consider it an honor to be one of the Congressional incorporators of AFPH."

Winthrop M. Phelps, M.D., Baltimore: "I shall be glad to have you use my name as one of the Congressional incorporators."

Samuel A. Weiss, Judge, Court Common Pleas, Pittsburgh: "You can certainly use my name as an incorporator for the AFPH Congressional Charter."

William D. Lennox, M., Children's Medical Center, Boston (late foremost specialist of his time on Epilepsy): "I shall be glad to join you as an Incorporator of AFPH."

Murray D. Lincoln, President, Nationwide Insurance: "Our own organization has cooperated to the fullest extent in employment of those physically handicapped who have the ability to work in an office. Consequently, we in the . . . Insurance Companies, will be happy to cooperate with you in any way possible in getting this Congressional Charter."

T. J. Reardon, Jr., Special Assistant to President Kennedy: "Please accept the President's best wishes and appreciation for your continued interest in the welfare of the Nation's Handicapped."

William B. McKechnie, Jr., President, Atlanta Baseball Club: "I am, of course, in accord with your thinking on the (Institute) proposition."

Baynard Kendrick, Author and Historian, Leesburg, Fla.: "I assure you of my support of the Institute which, I believe, would be a wonderful thing for the State and Country."

Hon. Jennings Randolph, Senator, West Virginia: "You may be sure that it has been a privilege to cooperate in this worth-while effort to aid the physically handicapped citizens of the United States."

Warren M. Briggs, Exec. Vice Pres., Alger-Sullivan Lumber Co., Century, Fla.: "I certainly wish you well in your endeavors."

Martin A. Dale, Private Counsellor to her Serene Highness, Grace, the Princess of Monaco: "Their Highnesses have asked me to express to you their hopes that you may succeed in bringing your project to fruition, since it does, indeed, have merit, and is devoted to a most worthy cause."

Ivan A. Nestigan, Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, in letter to Sen. Randolph: "As you know, Mr. Strachan has a long and impressive record in advocating the cause for employment of the disabled. We are all in his debt for the many ideas he has developed some of which are now expressed in the current activities of the "President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped."

Mrs. Grace B. Brown, Oakland, Calif.: "Your work has benefitted suffering humanity and I hope the Institute plan is soon put into function."

Lee W. Minton, President, Glass Bottle Blowers Assn.: "I know how hard you are working on behalf of the Handicapped."

Sister Mary Augustine, S.M.S.M., Marist Missionary Sisters: "I'll always think you are great. Keep fighting and asking God's help."

Michael J. Straight, Author and Publisher: "Your plan for the Institute is thorough and most ambitious."

Robert S. Allen, War Correspondent, Author, and Columnist: "You are constant, persevering, unswerving, and tenacious."

Hon. Robert Ramspeck, former Majority Whip, U.S. House of Representatives; former President, U.S. Civil Service Commission, and former Vice President, Eastern Airlines: "I think you have done more for the Handicapped than anyone I know."

Hon. Richard B. Russell, Senator from Georgia: "The social and economic advantages attained by our millions of handicapped citizens during the past ten years has been one of the great phenomenons of our times. AFPH has taken the lead in developing and applying these plans."

Hon. John M. Carmody, late Consultant, Labor-Management Relations: "I shall be pleased to be one of the Sponsors to incorporate AFPH."

Hon. Albert Rains, U.S. Representative, Alabama: "I shall be pleased to be a sponsor to incorporate AFPH."

Margaret Fraser Webster, late President, Marjorie Webster Junior College: "No greater service can be rendered to our Nation than developing the full potentials of our Handicapped men and women. The AFPH program, basically, provides a continuing means of improvement in education, training, and placement, that is fully in the public interest and should, therefore, have public support, financially and otherwise."

Hon. John W. McCormack, Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives: "AFPH presents a program in the public interest that is both humanitarian and economic in its application, and which should have the full support of all who have sympathy for and understanding of the needs of our millions of Handicapped people."

The late Colonel George E. Ijams, National Rehabilitation Director, Veterans of Foreign Wars: "The great need of our disabled veterans are paralleled in even greater degree by those of our civilian disabled. Fortunately, our veterans have the facilities of the Veterans Administration available to them in their hour of need. Such facilities are not available to the civilian handicapped through any Federal Department. The American Federation of the Physically Handicapped is the one organization which continually improves the programs for the civilian handicapped, based upon experience gained in study and practice in veterans' rehabilitation."

Rep. Bob Sikes, Florida: "Your organization is doing a fine work."

Philip M. Talbot, Sr., V.P. and Secy., Woodward & Lothrop, Washington: "I will be only too glad to be on the sponsoring group to Congressionally incorporate AFPH."

Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, former Governor of, and Senator from, New York: "Since I have been in the Senate, and particular, in my duties on the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I have had occasion to know of the fine work done by your organization in the field of rehabilitation of the physically and mentally handicapped. This field, as you undoubtedly know, has been one of great interest to me, even before I came to Washington."

Norman Gerstenfeld, Rabbi, Washington D.C. Hebrew Congregation: "I will be happy to be included among the Congressional Sponsors."

Perry Faulkner, Former Chief, Veterans Employment Service: "This is your authority to include my name in connection with the bill."

U.S. Senator John J. Sparkman, Alabama: "You have performed a tremendous job in the interest of the handicapped, and I know you will do so as long as you live. All I can say is, "More power to you!' "

Hon. Harry S. Truman, as President of the United States, to Paul A. Strachan, April 16, 1952: "Your activities in behalf of the physically handicapped and particularly your sponsorship of the National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week legislation, are well known. Your part in developing the groundwork for the President's Committee program will always be remembered with much appreciation. For the many year-round state and community programs that you have developed out of all these efforts, you have earned the thanks of all your fellow citizens. Please accept my thanks for the many contributions you have made to the program."

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I know Mr. Strachan well. He has lived a life of dedicated, devoted service to other handicapped persons, he being one himself. He is a very fine executive, one who is dedicated in many respects to the cause of helping other handicapped persons. I am glad that the distinguished Senator from Alabama has seen fit to make the remarks he has. I, too, honor and respect Mr. Strachan for his services.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Senator from Florida.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY, MAY 1, 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the completion of business today, the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am about to propound a unanimous-consent request which has been approved by all Senators concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, immediately after the approval of the Journal, and without the transaction of routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the further consideration of S. 1039; and that debate on an amendment to be proposed by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]; and that debate on any other amendments be limited to 10 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the majority and minority leaders, or whomever they may designate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I renew my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement was subsequently reduced to writing, as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That on Monday, May 1, 1967, immediately after the reading of the Journal, the Senate proceed to the further consideration of S. 1039, to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes, and that debate on an amendment to be proposed by Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and that debate on any other amendments be limited to 10 minutes, to be equally divided between the mover of the amendment and Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND'S SPEECH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments on the speech delivered by the distinguished commander of the U.S. Military Assistance Command in Vietnam, Gen. William C. Westmoreland.

I was interested in what he had to say. He spoke as a soldier, and he acted as a soldier. I approve in particular one paragraph of his prepared remarks which reads as follows:

> Our President and the representatives of the people of the United States—the Congress—have seen to it that our troops in the field have been well supplied and equipped. When a field commander does not have to look over his shoulder to see whether he is being supported, he can concentrate on the battlefield with much greater assurance of success. I speak for my troops when I say we are thankful for this unprecedented material support.

Mr. President, no field commander has ever had to look over his shoulder to find out if he is "supported," because constitutionally, the duty of the military is to carry out policies made by their civilian superiors. They do not make policies. So any military commander, in this constitutional sense and meaning, will always be assured of full support.

I want to commend the distinguished commander of the advisory group in Vietnam for acting in a manner which is consonant with the responsibilities and duties of the military. I want to assure him that so far as the military attributes in this difficulty in which we find ourselves are concerned, the men in the field—who are there not because they have made policy but because they are carrying out the policy made here in Washington—can be assured of full and complete support by the Senate.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, earlier this week, the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN] made a major speech concerning the war in Vietnam. I read fully what he said at that time. I note from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that he was supported by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New York the present occupant of the chair [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], and the Senator from Idaho, my seatmate [Mr. CHURCH].

Unfortunately, I was in New Mexico chairing hearings on the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty and could not be here to participate in the discussion. Had I been here, I would have joined my colleagues in their high praise for the position taken by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN].

Earlier today, we had the privilege of listening at a joint meeting—not a joint session, Mr. President, but a joint meeting—of Congress, to General Westmoreland, the commander of our Armed Forces in South Vietnam.

No one could hear General Westmoreland without admiring his presence, his stature, and the eloquent plea he made for his troops. I was delighted to have heard it. I agree with the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who indicated that General Westmoreland showed great restraint. I agree with him, too, that it is incumbent upon those of us in the Senate to show some restraint in connection with our comments on the war in Vietnam. But, I was delighted to see that General Westmoreland did not repeat, in his address at the joint meeting, the comments which he made earlier before a meeting of the press with respect to dissenters on the policy which is being pursued by the administration on the war in Vietnam.

I should like to use the same restraint myself in dealing with General Westmoreland's speech. I thought the general made an excellent presentation of the military situation in Vietnam as he saw it, but I should like to suggest that he did not deal—indeed he should not have dealt with, and I am glad that he did not—the larger issues of the war which concern so many of us in the Senate and in the country.

The general did not mention Russia. He did not mention China. He did not mention the danger that acceleration of the war has brought, particularly the bombing of the north in recent days, involving those two great powers against us to a greater extent than they are presently arrayed against us, with the chance that it might bring on the beginning of world war III.

The general wisely did not deal with what is happening to our domestic economy as a result of the war. He did not deal with the impact the war is having on the programs of the Great Society, supported so strongly by the Johnson administration, one of which is the war against poverty which I have the honor to be involved in as chairman of the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in the Senate.

Thus, to me, except for the military aspects of the speech, what General Westmoreland said was irrelevant to the main issues which confront us in America with respect to the war in Vietnam.

I suggest, Mr. President, that we must continue to probe, to criticize, and to urge the President to look for a way out of the imbroglio in which we find ourselves, to look for a way to get to the negotiating table, and to look for a way to stop the shooting of American boys, whether they live in Florida, Oregon, Pennsylvania, or New York.

I intend, in that regard, to continue the position which I have heretofore taken. In my opinion, we cannot win a military victory in Vietnam except at excessive cost in American lives and in American fortune.

I believe that this war has got to be settled, in the long run, by diplomats and not by soldiers.

I hope that I have exercised that restraint which was urged on all of us by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Let me close by saying that I have the highest regard for General Westmoreland, who is commanding our troops so adequately in the field, but that, in my opinion everything he said about an early victory is merely a repetition of what Gen. Maxwell Taylor told us 10 years ago.

And, 10 years later, we are no closer to victory than we were then.

I commend General Westmoreland again for the fine appearance he made before the joint meeting.

REACTIVATION OF NAVY BATTLESHIPS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, at the request of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], who is necessarily absent today, I have been asked to make the following statement, which he has prepared:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY, READ BY SENATOR BAKER

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I wish to congratulate the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN] for their conscientious efforts to reactivate one or more battleships in the mothball fleet for use in Vietnam. They have performed a real service in drawing attention to the need for more naval firing power, and I have been impressed with the careful research that went into their arguments and the logic of those arguments.

I have been aware for some time that a "gun gap" exists in our Navy, a deficiency brought about by the emphasis in recent years on equipping ships with sophisticated weaponry to the detriment of standard armament. I personally believe that we went too far, too fast, in making the transition, but it is bootless to dwell excessively on past mistakes and

I have pointed out my concern in that respect on several past occasions.

As for reactivating a battleship, I spoke of that possibility a year or more ago and I wish to associate myself with the remarks of Senator RUSSELL and Senator HANSEN on the subject. I have always felt that the massive firepower of an *Iowa*-class battleship would be invaluable in Vietnam as it was in Korea.

The case for reactivating a battleship rests primarily, in my view, upon one fact: the unique ability of the ship to wreak destruction to inland targets with fine precision, around the clock, in any weather, while remaining far enough offshore to be almost invulnerable to enemy coastal batteries.

The United States now has four battleships in mothballs. These are the USS *Missouri* at Bremerton, Wash., and the *Iowa*, *Wisconsin*, and *New Jersey* at Philadelphia. The Navy has estimated it would cost from $11 million to $25 million to reactivate one of these vessels. This is a substantial sum, but it falls into perspective when one notes that a modern jet aircraft costs some $2 million and we have lost a number of aircraft performing missions that might have been done as well or better by battleship fire.

The cost of reactivation, therefore, becomes insignificant assuming that one can prove the effectiveness of a battleship in a situation such as we have in Vietnam. I believe that such a case can be proven.

Vietnam, in the first place, is ideal terrain for bringing battlewagon power to bear. It is a comparatively narrow country in width with a long coastline facing the South China Sea, and the targets we are attempting to hit lie mostly within the 24-mile range of a battleship's 16-inch guns.

More important, the kinds of targets in Vietnam lend themselves to battleship fire. There are photographs in the Pentagon files showing that a bridge destroyed by an aircraft one day was being rebuilt the next, a road damaged one morning by bombs was being used a few days later. Without taking anything away from the magnificent performance of our aviators in Vietnam, there are occasions when naval gunfire is superior in reducing the chances of a target being reconstructed by the enemy.

As Senator RUSSELL, in his April 10 statement, so eloquently pointed out:

> An aircraft is over the target only a matter of seconds and the moment the aircraft departs, reconstruction of the damaged target begins. But one of these battleships can lie offshore and hurl one of these ton-or-more projectiles on the target every 35 or 40 minutes, regardless of weather conditions and visibility, and permanently interdict any reconstruction operations.

Adding another incentive to reactivation of a battleship is the extreme accuracy that can be obtained from their 16-inch guns. We possess maps of the target areas in Vietnam so that battleship fire could be closely confined to fixed targets such as crossroads and bridges and powerplants. Such pinpoint fire, it goes without saying, narrows the chances of civilians and other noncombatants becoming casualties.

Perhaps the best reason, in my judgment, for taking advantages of a battleship's capabilities in the Vietnamese war is this: the number of casualties among American fighting men can be reduced substantially. It is obvious that North Vietnam has placed great reliance on surface-to-air missiles. These have been effective against our aircraft.

But defending against a projectile from a 16-inch gun on a battleship is another matter. No missile can stop a shell weighing 1,900 to 2,400 pounds as it whistles down upon a target. The sole recourse for an enemy is to strike at the launching platform; that is, the vessel offshore. We, of course, have air control and sea mastery in Vietnam. A battleship thus could be reached only by the heaviest enemy coastal guns, and even then with difficulty for it is a moving target. Adm. Roy L. Johnson, commander of the U.S. Pacific Fleet, has been quoted in the press as requesting "additional firepower" and he has been further quoted as saying that he would like "both" battleships and cruisers. It is my understanding that Admiral Johnson's request is currently under review. The question is whether his needs can be met by reactivating one or more battleships, one or more heavy cruisers, or a squadron of destroyers. Admiral Johnson, avoiding the battleship versus cruiser argument, is primarily interested, and properly so, in simply obtaining more gunpower. I believe, however, that our purpose could best be served by reactivation of a battleship. I hope that the Defense Department will give the Navy the go-ahead to put a battlewagon on the line in Vietnam.

NEED FOR JOB VACANCY STATISTICS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, economic policy can be no better than the statistics on which it is based. Prudent policy requires job vacancy statistics. We do not have them, and this Congress, not the administration, is responsible. The administration has pleaded for the relatively small sum required to fund an adequate program. The Congress has refused to provide it.

We need information on available job opportunities if we are to do an effective job in combating poverty and unemployment—I believe this body will be interested in being reminded of the hearings and report made last June by the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics of the Joint Economic Committee. I was chairman of the subcommittee which included our distinguished economist friend, Paul Douglas, Senators TALMADGE and MILLER, along with Representatives BOLLING and CURTIS.

After hearing Government witnesses and a number of researchers in the field, our subcommittee said:

> Cost estimates can perhaps be put into perspective by calling attention to the magnitude of some of the potential benefits of the job vacancy data. If the $2.5 million program led to slightly more efficient use of the several billions of dollars appropriated to manpower development, the investment for data would pay handsomely. If it enabled unemployed or underemployed workers to find productive jobs, the investment would pay a private dividend to the individuals; it would pay a public dividend in the form of additional tax dollars and lower welfare payments; and it would pay dividends in terms of greater real national output. Job vacancy information, along with manpower retraining, can help to break the bonds of isolation afflicting low income persons in urban ghettos, areas of chronic high unemployment, and subsistence agriculture.

The subcommittee noted that there has been hesitance in some areas about the collection of statistics on job vacancies lest these be misinterpreted and misused. This could arise if some users of the data subtract the number of vacancies from the number of unemployed and attach an oversimplified meaning to the "net" results. Estimates of vacancies can be compared to employment figures only with extreme caution since the characteristics of the unemployed workers may differ greatly from the employers' needs.

The subcommittee is now chaired by my able colleague Senator TALMADGE. He advises that he intends to raise the question of the feasibility of speeding up development of job vacancy statistics during his forthcoming hearings on coordination and integration of government statistics programs. These are scheduled for May 15, 17, 18, and 22.

In spite of this risk that some misuse might arise in matching vacancies with the unemployed without taking into account pay, skills, or location of the jobs, our subcommittee, in endorsing the need, did point out a number of operational and analytical uses which the data would have. These were summarized in the committee's report, as follows:

I. USES OF JOB VACANCY STATISTICS

Commissioner of Labor Statistics, Arthur Ross, testified:

"The lack of vacancy information constitutes the most significant gap in our knowledge of labor market conditions. Statistics on job vacancies would give us a measure of unsatisfied demand for labor which, together with our data on employment, would provide a more complete measure of the demand for labor—something we have never had before."

Operational uses

Job vacancy statistics would have the following operational uses:

(1) Vacancy data would disclose unmet needs for workers in a wide range of occupations, and would indicate training requirements in such programs as those provided by the Economic Opportunity Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act which states that the Secretary of Labor "shall determine the skill requirements of the economy * * *."

(2) Job vacancy information, collected in the pilot studies, has been used for establishing vocational training courses for both adults and high school students.

(3) Vacancy information has also been used in counseling workers and others about to enter the job market as to their opportunities.

(4) Vacancy data would aid the Employment Service in matching unemployed and under-employed workers with available job openings. This would apply both to placements within areas and among areas. In the latter instance, the data would aid in bringing employees in labor surplus areas into contact with employers in labor shortage areas, and vice versa.

(5) Vacancy statistics have been useful in helping Employment Service staff to structure their contacts with employers more effectively.

(6) Job vacancy information can be used by business firms to get a picture of the

area in which they are recruiting workers, and thereby develop more effective recruiting policies. This would be especially valuable to firms considering new plant locations.

(7) The survey of job vacancies might stimulate firms to improve their efficiency through more conscious manpower planning.

(8) Such information could be of equal value to labor organizations in evaluating the demand for the services of their members and in developing policies for training, apprenticeship, and collective bargaining.

(9) Information on job openings is essential for the operation of any program designed to assist in the geographic transfer of workers, as is now provided on a pilot basis by the Manpower, Development, and Training Act.

(10) In addition, such information would enable more effective programs to deal with plant closures.

Analytical uses

In addition to their contribution to ongoing programs, job vacancy data, when used in conjunction with information on employment, unemployment, labor turnover, and hours of work per week, would be useful in analyzing current economic situations and in making major policy decisions dealing with manpower development, unemployment, labor shortages, and inflation. Vacancy information would have the following analytical uses:

(1) Vacancy data could be useful in predicting the occupational needs of the Nation.

(2) Vacancy statistics could serve as a leading indicator of the level of general economic activity.

(3) The Commissioner of Labor Statistics has indicated that vacancy data would aid in the preparation of regular reports to the President on current manpower shortages.

(4) Vacancy data would indicate tight labor markets and thus serve as a signal of imminent wage increases.

(5) Information on job vacancies would be an indication of the ability of the economy to undergo the stress of structural change; for example, rapid defense buildups, or layoffs in employment stemming from shifts in demand or technological developments.

(6) Vacancy data and trends in these data by occupation, industry, and area would be helpful in determining the extent to which aggregate demand could be increased without wage and price inflation. However, it seems unlikely that such information could identify the causes which led to a given stock of unemployment.

It is impossible to foretell all of the analytical uses of the vacancy data since they will be used extensively in research. As in most research, it is to be expected that there will be discussion and argument as to what constitutes "proper" use of the data.

Until a few years ago, many manpower experts were convinced, on the basis of studies of employer records and other data conducted during the 1950's, that it would not be feasible to collect information on job vacancies in the United States—at least not in a form usable for both operating programs such as manpower training, as well as for economic analysis. To be useful for such operating purposes, job vacancy information is needed on the basis of specific opportunities, by areas, occupation, and industry—rather than in terms of overall totals.

Several years ago, however, the Department of Labor decided to reexamine this premise about ability to collect these data. This reexamination was initiated partly in response to the new manpower legislation, such as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which had then recently been enacted. It also reflected the recommendations from a Presidential Committee established to appraise our employment and unemployment statistics. In its report of September 1962, this Committee labeled the lack of job vacancy statistics as one of the most conspicuous gaps in our system of manpower and employment information.

Shortly after the completion of this report, the Department of Labor's U.S. Employment Service, in cooperation with the affiliated Illinois State Employment Service, initiated a feasibility study in Chicago to test the possibility of collecting vacancy data by occupation. The favorable results of this study, conducted in 1963, led the Department to initiate a wider scale experimental program during the following year.

EXPERIMENTAL JOB VACANCY PROGRAM

This experimental program has been underway since the fall of 1964 in about 15 pilot areas. These areas include some of the largest in the country: New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, Baltimore, Milwaukee, Minneapolis-St. Paul, Kansas City—as well as some small and medium areas to assure geographic and industrial diversity. Operated by the U.S. Employment Service and the affiliated State employment services in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, this program has provided information on specific job vacancies in each of the areas for three periods: autumn 1964, spring 1965, and spring 1966. A similar job vacancy experimental survey is scheduled for the spring of 1967.

In its 2½ years of operations, this experimental program has already demonstrated:

First. That the collection of job vacancy information from employers by detailed occupation is both feasible and practical.

Second. That vacancies exist in a broad spectrum of occupations, although heaviest demand is at the highest skill levels.

Third. That differences by area in the nature of vacancies may be quite substantial.

Fourth. That this information is potentially of value for manpower planning purposes and for the operations of manpower training and development programs.

POSSIBLE EXPANSIONS IN PROGRAM

Some of these findings regarding the feasibility of compiling job vacancy information by occupation were already apparent when the Department of Labor budget request for fiscal year 1966 was being prepared. Accordingly, an appropriation request was included in the Department's budget, submitted for that year, to move from an experimental to an operational stage in the implementation of that program. This request envisioned an expansion of the program from its present 15 pilot areas annually, to 150 major metropolitan areas on a quarterly basis. This expansion was expected to cost about $3 million each year, above and beyond the approximately $350,000 now made available for the pilot program.

This appropriation request was denied by the Congress, in acting upon the Department's budget in fiscal year 1966. Again, in fiscal year 1967, the Department requested $2.5 million to finance an expansion in this program. This program expansion was somewhat more limited than requested in the previous year and was designed to cover only 75 of the country's major metropolitan areas—including at least one in every State. Again the Congress did not act favorably on this request. In both years, however, funds were provided to continue the experimental program at about its present level.

FISCAL YEAR 1968 PLANS

The Department's fiscal year 1968 request did not include a request for a further expansion of this program at this time. This omission reflected both program and budget considerations. In terms of program factors, the Department recognized that—in view of the denial by Congress of funds to expand this program in the preceding 2 years—it was unlikely that favorable action could be anticipated until further research and experimentation was completed regarding various technical questions concerning the validity of the information. Accordingly, research under this program in fiscal year 1968 will focus on providing further information regarding the behavior of job vacancies under various phases of the business cycle and in differing seasonal situations, in validating the occupational classification of the data, in identifying hiring requirements related to vacancies, and in providing more precise information on wages offered for available openings.

In terms of budgetary considerations, the omission takes cognizance of the President's directive to limit expenditures on civilian programs wherever feasible, to take account of the added burden of the Vietnam conflict. While the Department still believes job vacancy information could make a significant contribution to the efficient operations of various manpower programs, it believes already existing information sources may be adequate to do the job in the context of the current situation.

One such information source is the data—mentioned in the letter from Secretary Wirtz to Senator PERCY which was cited in Senator CURTIS' April 5 statement—on unfilled job openings held by public employment offices throughout the country. Such openings account for between one-quarter and one-third of the total vacancies in each area. More important, however, is the fact about these openings brought out by the 15-area pilot job vacancy survey; that is, that for most occupations, the Employment Service unfilled job openings are reasonably representative of total demand in the area.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete statement of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS] be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, another new program which will facilitate the operations of job training programs is now being established by the Department of Labor's manpower administration, in cooperation with other agencies. Known as CAMPS—cooperative area manpower planning system—this program is designed to provide for coordinated planning of State and local manpower plans throughout the country. When in full operation it should facilitate the systematic interchange of information regarding training needs and resources of various agencies and assist in coordinating and harmonizing the services of the various manpower programs.

I am confident, on the basis of my review of the situation, that even without job vacancy data these programs provide an effective mechanism for planning and implementing job training activities which can contribute to the continuing economic vitality and employment growth in all sections of the country.

Exhibit 1

Job Vacancies

Mr. Curtis. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a serious administrative shortcoming in the efforts of the Federal Government to come to grips with the unemployment problem through job training programs or by any other means now utilized.

I refer to revelations made by the Secretary of Labor, Mr. W. Willard Wirtz, in a letter to the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy], in response to questions which Senator Percy directed to the Secretary of Labor at a hearing held by the Joint Economic Committee on February 7.

In response to the question "How many job vacancies now exist in our economy?" the Secretary of labor has just advised Senator Percy in writing:

"We do not at present have any figures on total job vacancies in the United States. Such information is now available only for about 15 metropolitan areas, as part of a Department of Labor experimental program initiated several years ago. This pilot program, operated by the United States Employment Service and the affiliated State Employment Services in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics, provided one-time job vacancy estimates for each of these areas for the fall of 1964, for April 1965 and for April 1966. Another such survey will be conducted in these areas later this spring.

"The best available indication of vacancies now at hand is the monthly lists of unfilled job openings held by public employment offices throughout the country. These total about 322,500 at the end of February (but slightly less than the year-ago level of 344,400). Unfilled job openings generally range between a quarter and a third of the total vacancies in the areas included in our pilot program."

Mr. President, it seems preposterous to me for the Department of Labor or any other Federal agency seeking to match unemployed persons with available jobs to keep extensive records on the number and types of unemployed without having any system for accurately measuring the jobs available in our economy. It is incredible, Mr. President, that any agency could operate effectively in the field of finding jobs for people or of training people for those jobs when it has no system for seeking out and finding the jobs that are available.

In the midwestern and western parlance to which I am accustomed, Mr. President, I can only picture the Secretary of Labor trying to make a horse go forward by pulling the animal's tail.

All of us are familiar with the statistical reports that are published regularly by the Labor Department showing the number of unemployed persons. I am shocked to find that the Department of Labor, which keeps such close tabs on the number of unemployed, has no idea really of the number of jobs available and the skills that are needed to fill these jobs. I do not see how the Department can run sensible job training programs without knowing the number and types of jobs available.

I became interested in this aspect of the job training problem when businessmen in Nebraska told me, during my travels in the State over the past 2 years, that they have many jobs available but no one to fill them. The managers of several plants told me they would expand their operations if they could get qualified employees to fill the additional jobs. The head of a trucking company told me that his firm cannot hire as many drivers as it needs, and that the shortage of drivers had become a critical problem.

This whole subject is of special interest to me now, because I am having a bill drafted to try to make Federal job training programs do a better job of meeting the Nation's manpower needs. My bill would give State and local governments, particularly schools, greater responsibilities in utilizing these funds.

I am pleased to report that the city government, the school system, and private organizations in Nebraska's largest city, Omaha, have launched a cooperative local effort to find jobs on a continuing basis for persons who find themselves on the unemployment rolls for one reason or another. This type of local initiative to solve problems is highly commendable. However, I regret to report that coincident with Senator Percy's receipt of Secretary Wirtz' letter a delegation from Omaha, accompanied by a member of my staff, conferred with officials of the Labor Department and found them reluctant to participate in such a practical approach to the unemployment problem.

It is my sincere hope that the Secretary of Labor and his Department will take another look at their untenuous position. Certainly they cannot do a very good job of administering funds to train people for jobs when they do not know what jobs exist. Commonsense dictates that they do as complete a job of keeping track of the available jobs as they do of computing and publicizing the number of jobless. I expect to have more to say in the future about this and related matters.

MAURY MAVERICK, JR., SPEAKS ON "THE VALUE OF DISSENT TO THE CONSTITUTED AUTHORITY"

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the most incisive speakers on contemporary life in Texas is Maury Maverick, Jr. A humane person with a tough, penetrating wit, Maury once convulsed the U.S. Supreme Court in laughter during a search-and-seizure case by announcing to the Court that one of the items seized as tools of crime was a dissenting opinion of the Honorable Hugo L. Black.

Maury Maverick has spoken out again for freedom, this time on freedom of dissent when the freedom is very gravely threatened.

I ask unanimous consent that a sermon delivered by Maury Maverick, Jr., entitled "The Value of Dissent to the Constituted Authority," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Value of Dissent to the Constituted Authority

(Sermon by Maury Maverick, Jr., Unitarian Church, March 1967)

The topic I am to talk on is the value of dissent to the constituted authority.

An equally pertinent topic could be the value of constituted authority to those who would dissent. Professor T. V. Smith put this another way when he wrote:

"It takes radicals to instigate revolutions and to consummate them, but it takes conservatives to found new states and to consolidate them. Hamilton took the independence Jefferson proclaimed and made it into something national and solid; Jefferson took the stability and prosperity which Hamilton engineered and enjoyed the fruits of both."

"What Jefferson really did not see clearly, nor Hamilton either, was that it takes all kinds of motivations to make up the spiritual life. He did not see that it takes one kind of a man to build a polity, to envision justice, to activate the hearts of men and to found a state, and another type of man to effect compromises, to sustain cross purposes in patience, to implement the impulses of creative accommodation. . . ."

This is not to suggest that I think all dissenters are right. As a matter of fact, some are wrong, some are dangerous, and perhaps worst of all—some are bores. Furthermore, dissenters are not the only ones who serve in the vineyard of man. For while society needs people who will raise hell, it also needs people who will haul out the ashes. The imbalance, however, is unfairly against the dissenter who is more important to us than we know; yet, we track him down and destroy or silence him if we can.

Having acknowledged the value of the constituted authority to dissent, I will not dwell on it further. The constituted authority already has more than enough spokesmen who sing its praise at every turn of the road: the newspapers and television stations, chambers of commerce, the usual suburban church, the typical noon day luncheon club—the list is endless. Therefore, let us talk now about the value of dissent to the constituted authority.

As our country becomes more complicated, the threat to liberty comes not so much from the dissenter—be he a Negro reaching out for a better day, or a Bircher, or a Communist, or a Ku Kluxer, or a bearded college boy who throws himself in front of a troop train bound for combat—as it does from those who seek out conformity imposed by the constituted authority at no matter what the price.

The danger, as Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., has pointed it out to be, is not the hard-faced men, but the faceless men, and the threat to liberty comes not so much from those who do not want others to be free as it does from those who do not want to be free themselves. "Conformity," says Schlesinger, "is a greater danger not when it is coerced, but when it is sought."

Let me give you an example of what I mean. It is an example which painfully hurt me at the time it happened and still fills me with despair. During the McCarthy era when I was in the Texas House of Representatives, a bill was introduced to remove all books from state supported libraries critical of religion, the family, American history, and Texas history. A half a dozen of us were leading the fight against the bill and we were making headway, but a day or so before the final vote the professional lobby of the school teachers of Texas laid a press release on the desk of each member of the Texas House to the effect that the school teachers' lobby favored the bill. In the final analysis, we were defeated more by good people I love than by the obvious villain.

In Mississippi or Johannesburg good people look the other way when the Negro is put down. Good people in Texas are indifferent to wage demands of Mexican-American agricultural workers along the Rio Grande. In Israel, good people stood silent when orthodox rabbis caused laws to be passed which bastardize children born of a Christian and Jew, when the marriage ceremony is not performed according to the rites of the Jewish church. Good people told the Irish of Boston not to apply for work. Good people in Germany did nothing when the Jews were carted off to the ovens, and the good people in America are not really having a dialogue regarding the defoliating of crops and forests by chemicals dropped from a plane in an undeclared war.

This is not to suggest that the mass of people are not capable of greatness, but it is to suggest, that it is the dissenter who first protests, and by his protest provides the initial catalyst, which generally expands the visions of mankind.

Christ was an unpopular agitator to the constituted authority—the good people of his time murdered him. In modern times he has been made into something else—a sort of Mr. Good Guy—obviously embarrassed about being a Methodist and secretly longing to be an Episcopalian, since he moved to Terrell Hills from Harlandale, but the truth is he was a contentious radical and an outsider.

Socrates was handed his cup of hemlock by the constituted authority for asking disturbing questions. He described himself, and all dissenters of worth, when he told the jury ordering his death, "I am that gadfly which God has given the State, and all day long and in all places, I am always fastening upon you, arousing, persuading, and reproaching you. . . ."

Two Russian poets, Abram Tertz and Nikolai Arzhak, languish in a Soviet jail because they wrote poetry considered embarrassing by the constituted authority.

Gandhi, as a dissenter, demonstrated the power of love and the strength of communication between dissenters of different generations; for Thoreau talked to Gandhi, who talks to Martin Luther King.

J. Frank Dobie got himself fired from the University of Texas for defending young professors, academic freedom, Dr. Homer Rainey, and student editors against newspaper censorship, but if you visit this dissenter's grave at the state cemetery in Austin, you will sense that his spirit lives on, not because he conformed, but because he stood up to the constituted authority.

John Adams was attorney for the redcoats of the Boston Massacre. Although a revolutionary he dissented against his brother dissenters, and made the point—a man is entitled to his day in court no matter how unpopular.

On March 31, 1861, a crowd overflowed the courthouse in Brenham, Texas. Sam Houston had been invited to give his reasons for not taking the oath to the Confederacy. "Don't let him speak. Kill him! Kill him!" the spectators cried out.

The old man reminded them of the Battlefield of San Jacinto, and then said:

"The Vox Populi is not always the voice of God, for when the demagogues . . . succeed in arousing public prejudice and stilling the voice of reason, then on every hand can be heard the popular cry, 'Crucify Him, crucify him'."

"I have heard the hiss of mobs upon the streets," the old man went on, "but the hiss of the mob . . . cannot compel me to take the oath of allegiance to a so-called Confederate Government."

It was dissenters who wrote the Declaration of Independence of the Republic of Texas, denouncing the excesses of organized religion and the professional military as: ". . . the eternal enemies of civil liberty, the ever-ready minions of power, and the usual instruments of tyrants . . ." Let those Texans who would impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren, or Hugo Black, or William O. Douglas for comparatively tame language on the subject of separation of church and state, first read their own historic documents.

The Grangers, as a dissenting third political party, attacked unfair railroad rates in the South. The Greenbackers demanded a graduated income tax. The Populists called for the popular election of U.S. Senators. The Socialists opposed child labor and advocated public works, old age systems, and unemployment compensation.

Communism, as a dissenting force, has swept across great portions of the world, and has, numerically speaking, acquired more people under its banner since World War I than Christianity has in over a thousand years. This is a lesson in not listening to the voices of dissent, as the Presbyterians pointed out by resolution on October 21, 1953, when they proclaimed, "Many of the revolutionary forces of our times are in great part the judgment of God upon human selfishness and complacency, and upon man's forgetfulness of man."

Now a final word about dissent in terms of Texas history. Since the time a Texan has occupied the White House, I have received more and more inquiries requesting background information on the Lone Star State.

There is some nonsense in every revolution. The Americans came to Coahuila, Texas, talking liberty, but outraged Mexico with their institution of slavery. On the other hand, the Mexican government denied religious liberty, and as the revolution began to surface, Mexico escalated its military control over Coahuila-Texas, by spending half a million dollars building military posts and garrisoning them with 1,300 troops. Stephen F. Austin, sounding like Fulbright of Arkansas, wrote the following to the Mexican government—

". . . I have informed you many times and and I inform you again, that it is impossible to rule Texas by a military system. Upon this subject of military despotism, I have never hesitated to express my opinion, for I consider it the source of all revolutions and of the slavery and ruin of free people."

The Mexicans ignored this plea and with their escalation they largely precipitated their own defeat.

As Americans, the residents of Texas share the glory of the American Revolution, but as Texans they know their people, including Lyndon Johnson's ancestors, walked a second time down the bloody road of revolution—in the face of escalation—past Gonzales, where the first shot was fired. Past the Goliad Massacre, where James Fannin and 342 of his men, prisoners of war, were murdered. Past San Antonio, where 27-year-old attorney at law, Colonel William Barret Travis, Juan Abamillo, Jim Bowie—Englishmen, Scotsmen, Irishmen, men from 18 American states, and an immigrant from Denmark, Charles Zanco, first had a fandango to the tunes of former Congressman Davy Crockett's fiddle and big John McGregor's bagpipes—and then, along with a Negro, remembered only as John, entered the walls of the Alamo to die. Finally, there was victory at San Jacinto where Sam Houston, lawyer, protected the civil rights of the hated Santa Anna.*

On March 12, 1836, at Washington on the Brazos, the Republic of Texas gave the world a Declaration of Independence which magnificently demonstrated the right of a people, even unpopular people such as the Texans were, to express their views against the established government. And this they did in the face of Santa Anna's decree; ". . . seran juzgados y castigados como piratas . . ."—The Texans shall be judged and treated like pirates.

Today, the ultimate in the right of dissent by a person, popular or unpopular, is written into the present Constitution of Texas, as contained in Section 2 of Article I of the Bill of Rights. It is an echo of the Texas Revolution, and it reads:

"All political power is inherent in the people, and all free governments are founded on their authority, and instituted for their benefit. The faith of the people of Texas stands pledged to the preservation of the republican form of government, and, subject to this limitation only, they have at all times the inalienable right to alter, reform, or abolish their government in such manner as they think expedient."

I conclude now as I began. Let this be a nation of stability, but a stability which provides for the freedom of dissent.

Let us have, as an old friend of mine once put it, "a nation of liberty and groceries". Let us have the groceries which flow from a stable society, but let us also have the liberty which flows from a free people.

"All progress has resulted from people who took unpopular positions", said Adlai Stevenson, himself a dissenter.

Let us then have dissent so that we will not become faceless men and women.

U.S. RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS WILL ROB UNFRIENDLY NATIONS OF PROPAGANDA MATERIAL—LXII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the failure of the United States to ratify a single one of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery has not gone unnoticed by nations unfriendly to the United States.

In fact, our failure to ratify a single one of the Human Rights Conventions has presented certain other countries with a major propaganda coup.

An unfortunate example of this opportunity for blatant Soviet demagoguery occurred during a meeting of the U.N. Subcommission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities.

When the U.S. representative advocated the strengthening of the United Nations activity in the human rights field, he was subjected to a sarcastic rebuttal by his Soviet counterpart. The Soviet spokesman alleged American hypocrisy because the United States "had not ratified the Convention on the Crime and Punishment of Genocide or the Convention on Slavery."

A similar incident occurred during the 1966 meeting of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The U.S. representative expressed our support for the creation of a U.N. Commission on Human Rights. The Soviet representative's retort was both acerbic and cynical. Here, in part, is what the Soviet delegate said:

> An objective analysis of the political orientation of the proposal so ardently supported by the United States and its allies soon revealed that the proposal was designed to give world public opinion the impression of active participation in the cause of human rights by States which in practice obstinately refused to fulfill their obligations under the multilateral international conventions in the field of human rights.

---

* Sam Houston is my choice as the greatest Texan of all, past or present. The most readable and exciting book on him is *The Raven*, by Marquis James. The more definitive books on him, also interesting, are: *Sam Houston, the Great Designer*, by Llerena B. Friend and *Sam Houston—American Giant*, by M. K. Wisehart. You won't put The Raven down once you start it, and it could lead to the other books. Houston loved Texas, but he loved the United States more, and he is vastly underrated in American History.

He then proceeded to characterize the U.S. failure to ratify specific Conventions "as hypocritical" and "almost indecent."

Mr. President: We know these charges are false. As well, the Russians know they are false. But what about the new nations in the world—60 of them since 1943? What are they to believe?

The Senate can quite readily destroy this unfair propaganda advantage of the Russians and their satellites by ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

FISCAL POLICY AND THE GOOD ECONOMIC SOCIETY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the able chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means, the Honorable WILBUR D. MILLS, recently delivered an excellent and timely speech on the role of fiscal policy in contributing to the development of "the good economic society." I ask unanimous consent that Representative MILLS' remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FISCAL POLICY AND THE GOOD ECONOMIC SOCIETY

(Address of Congressman WILBUR D. MILLS before the American Enterprise Institute symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation, dinner meeting, Washington, D.C., April 20, 1967)

In the last several years, the significance of fiscal policy for the performance of the American economy has received an unusual amount of attention in the press, in public forums, in the academic community, and in the business world. Very likely this emphasis is attributable to a view which has gained wide currency to the effect that the revenue productivity of the Federal tax system tends to increase so rapidly—withdrawing so much from the income flow of the Nation—that private spending will be unduly constrained if tax rates are not periodically reduced or if public spending is not increased to fill the gap. The fiscal developments of 1962, 1964, and 1965 seem to have established the validity of the view; the changes in the tax structure apparently were associated with a marked increase in momentum in economic activity until recent months. This happy congruence of appealing theory and a pleasing turn of events has resulted, as is so often the case, in a possibly greater enthusiasm for fiscal manipulation than the limited experience with it might warrant, but this is of much less consequence than the fact that we seem to be focusing on fiscal arithmetic rather than on the real aims and significance of fiscal policy in the first half of this decade.

Any public policy can be appraised only in the light of its objectives. There need not, of course, be a consensus concerning the aims of a public policy, and the rating it gets, therefore, may vary not only because of differences in viewpoint about how it has performed but as well because of disagreements about what it was supposed to do. In the following remarks, then, you will find one system of preferences which, hopefully, will prove persuasive.

In very general terms, fiscal policy, just as any other element of political economy, should seek to contribute to the attainment of the good economic society. A good economic society is highly progressive; its members seek to advance their wellbeing and this desire is a strong motive force in their personal lives and is reflected in the performance of the economy as a whole. The progressive spirit leads them to venture, to look for the new, to seek out challenges to do things better—better than they've been done before and better than anyone else is doing them now. It is fashionable in some quarters these days to speak derisively about building better mousetraps and to decry the gadgetry in our lives, as if these individually inconsequential items were in competition with culturally grander things for our interest and energy. But this isn't the case and ignores the fact that our technical progress consists of the aggregation of all such little bits and pieces of better things and better ways of doing as well as the more glamorous and impressive advances.

A society that gives ample play to this impulse is a dynamic one. It is also highly diverse. Because it's dynamic, it's subject to frequent shock, but because of its diversity, relatively few of the adjustments thereto involve widespread or prolonged dislocations. Indeed, the Nation's economic history offers repeated evidence of the fact when the economy is allowed to adjust of itself to such disturbances it does so relatively quickly and smoothly.

The good economic society is efficient. It allocates the various elements of its production capability to those uses in which they will contribute most to total output and to the well-being of its people. It quickly recognizes changes in costs and in benefits and facilitates rather than impedes the rearrangement of production activity in response to those changes.

The good economic society is busy and fully employed. It avoids prolonged, involuntary unemployment of large numbers of its labor force, or their prolonged employment in submarginal uses. It recognizes, however, that the rate of use of labor, capital, and other agencies of production cannot be absolutely unchanging in a dynamic environment, and is prepared, therefore, to accept moderate deviations from "full employment" for short periods of time.

The good economic society grows. It increases its capabilities for satisfying the material aspirations of its members, while accommodating their desires for diversity and change.

The good economic society is fair and humane. It seeks to make the benefits of its advances available to all of its members by making sure that none of them are debarred from being or becoming productive participants in its activities. It recognizes differences among its members in their ability to contribute and seeks to moderate rather than to enhance these disparities, not by constraining the more productive but by increasing the productivity of the less fortunate. But where this is not feasible, the good economic society is not indifferent to deprivation. It mobilizes its resources to discover and apply enduring remedies and avoids relying on ad hoc reliefs.

Finally, a good economic society relies on its members to provide the impetus and the means for achieving these goals. It recognizes that in our highly complex economic, political, and social environment, individuals will frequently encounter problems with which they are unable to cope unaided; there is, in other words, a wide array of problems with which society as a whole must deal. But the good economic society is careful to limit its assumption of responsibility to concerns of this character and seeks always to reserve to private economic entities—individuals, households, companies—the maximum possible scope for decision-making, for initiating activity. This is the essence of economic freedom in our world today. And maximizing economic freedom is a major objective of the good society.

How may fiscal policy contribute to attaining the goals of the good economic society? The basic economic facts of life that come to bear here are (1) that every government purchase involves limiting the availability of production capability for carrying out the plans and meeting the demands of private economic entities and that (2) virtually every government levy impacts on the taxpayer's choices among economic alternatives.

The first of these facts accounts for the traditional liberal concern for limiting governmental programs. This is no doctrinaire indictment of government spending. On the contrary, as the society grows and becomes both more complex and more affluent, the extent and scope of demands for publicly afforded services must be expected to increase as well. But taking a realistic view of the likely course of government activity doesn't justify indifference to the perpetuation of programs that either have proved to be invalid or have outlived their former usefulness. Nor does it lead to ready acceptance of the ad hoc addition of new programs, often overly ambitious and impractical, no matter how glamorously named nor how worthy their objective. Nor, moreover, does it require tolerance for ill-conceived experiments which could pass a rudimentary cost-benefit test only if the benefits are measured in such ambiguous terms as "prestige". Instead, this view calls for continual reevaluation of existing expenditure programs in the light of rigorous, objective measurement of the benefits they convey and the costs they impose and the requirement that any proposed new program meet the same tests. In fact, all proposals for new expenditure programs should be received with a constructive skepticism; we should start with the assumption that the production capability to be allocated to the program would be better left available to meet demands arising in the private sector of the economy and require the program's proponents to persuade us otherwise.

There are, of course, those who are disappointed because government expenditures haven't increased more rapidly, who claim the public sector is "starved", and who assert that great public needs go unmet. It should be clear, however, that such assertions are not objective observations, but expressions of preferences. Moreover, the recent and prospective rates of gain in the magnitude of government expenditures belie the notion of an underprivileged public sector. Between 1960 and 1966, Federal expenditures in the national income accounts increased by 53 percent. In fact, during these years Federal non-defense purchases of goods and services increased twice as rapidly—96½ percent—as gross national product less Federal purchases which increased by 47 percent. And of all the major sectors of the economy, none has increased so rapidly in this period as state and local government spending which expanded by almost two-thirds. Surely these facts should give one pause about some recent, bizarre proposals concerning the fiscal relationships of the Federal and state and local governments.

Fiscal policy for the good economic society will place great emphasis on the manner in which the revenues required to defray government expenses are raised. The tax structure will be submitted to frequent reappraisal to determine whether its burdens are fairly distributed and whether it contributes to moderation of extremes in the distribution of income and wealth. Continuing efforts will be made to identify and to eliminate those elements or features of the revenue system which afford preferential treatment to some taxpayers while discriminating against others. And the same healthy skepticism with which proposals for new government spending programs are received should greet proposals for new tax differentials.

Great importance should be attached to regular, frequent, and significant reductions in tax rates. Virtually all of the objectives of the good economic society are served thereby. Certainly economic growth is enhanced by tax reduction which reduces the constraints on entrepreneurship, on risk-taking, on launching new ventures, and on all sorts of productive effort. Surely the dynamic character of the economy and the efficiency of use of production capability is enhanced by tax rate reduction which moderates the tax advantages or disadvantages of particular groups of taxpayers and thereby reduces tax-induced distortions in the allocation of resources. And beyond doubt, economic freedom is bolstered by general tax reduction which broadens the command of private economic entities over the society's productive resources.

If this view of the good economic society and the fiscal policy which is appropriate thereto is appealing, one can only regret the circumstances which are deemed to forefend a long-range program of periodic tax reduction. Our attention has been called over and over again of late to the growth in our tax system's revenue productivity which accompanies the growth of the economy. There may be competing claimants for this potential increment in revenues, but if the goals presented in this discussion are to be sought, tax reduction should be the preferred course.

A few years ago, it appeared that the Nation was firmly committed to this course. Taxation developments in 1962 made some constructive changes in the revenue structure, and the Revenue Act of 1964 and the excise reductions legislated in 1965 seemed to indicate that the Nation had made a commitment to a long-range fiscal policy stressing tax reduction and curbs on the growth of Federal expenditures. Indeed, this was made explicitly clear, as stated in my press release of September 16, 1963:

"The purpose of this tax reduction and revision bill is to loosen the constraints which present Federal taxation imposes on the American economy. The results of these tax reductions and revisions will be a higher level of economic activity, fuller use of our manpower, more intensive and profitable use of our plant and equipment; and with the increases in wages, salaries, profits, consumption, and investment, there will be increases in Federal tax revenues. Increases in economic activity, in the use of our resources, in personal and business incomes, and in Federal revenues might be also realized if, instead of reducing taxes, the Congress and the Administration increased expenditures of Government. In other words, there are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road. There is a difference—a vitally important difference—between them. The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government—with more labor and capital being used directly by the Government in its activities and with more labor and capital in the private sector of the economy being used to produce goods and services on Government orders. The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity—to a bigger, more prosperous, more efficient economy—with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector of the economy—in the decision of individuals to increase and diversify their private consumption and in the decisions of business concerns to increase their productive capacity—to acquire more plant and machines, to hire more labor, to expand their inventories—and to diversify and increase the efficiency of their production.

"Section I of the bill is a firm, positive assertion of the preference of the United States for the tax reduction road to a bigger, more progressive economy. When we, as a Nation, choose this road we are at the same time rejecting the other road, and we want it understood that we do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time.

"The further meaning of Section I of the bill is that no Government activity is to depend for its justification on the amount it contributes to the total spending of the economy, because we prefer to reduce taxes and allow individuals and business concerns in their own right to make that contribution. On the contrary, any and all activities of the Government have to be justified on their importance in serving other essential goals of the Nation. There is no further justification for an indifferent attitude toward wasteful, inefficient Government activities merely because they incidentally give employment—tax reduction will also create job opportunities and in lines of activity which better satisfy the character and demands of the people for an enriched life. There is no more justification for half-hearted efforts or outright failure to eliminate Government programs that have outlived their usefulness just because they also contribute to the total spending stream of the economy—that contribution will be better realized by increasing the purchasing power of consumers and investors through tax reduction. Finally, there is no further occasion for using the additional revenues which will be generated by the expansion of the economy as a result of tax reduction and revision to finance additional Government expenditures, solely because those additional expenditures might add further to expansion of economic activity. If such additional expansion is desired or needed, tax reduction will achieve it just as surely and through vigorous and progressive forces of the private sectors of the economy."

For a brief period after the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, the pace of expansion of Federal expenditures did indeed appear to have moderated, but only briefly. The increase of military efforts in Viet Nam, of course, accounts for a significant part of the subsequent acceleration of expansion of Federal outlays, but two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the National income accounts—is accounted for by non-defense spending. Moreover, as projectd in the January 1967 budget message, over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in outlays from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 is to be in non-defense programs.

It is, of course, impossible to turn back the clock and one must, therefore, acknowledge that it will be difficult indeed to bring this rapid acceleration of public spending under control. But unless we are prepared to forego the course of tax reduction for an indefinite period into the future, we should at the least attempt to achieve a pause in the current enlargement of Federal spending.

This discussion has focused on the broad, long-term objectives of fiscal policy, and little has been said about using fiscal policy, or more specifically tax policy, to offset short-term fluctuations in the rate of expansion of total economic activity. The emphasis in the past year and a quarter has been on tax changes for short-run stabilization objectives. Questions can certainly be raised as to whether this has been a very happy chapter in the Nation's fiscal history. The request for the suspension of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation last fall and for their reinstatement this spring has been a fiscal experience from which, hopefully, it has been learned that taxes should not be raised and lowered from season to season like the hemlines of women's skirts and dresses. It is also to be hoped that those who have so enthusiastically advocated frequent, short-term tax rate changes have been sobered by the turn in the economic indicators and the question as to whether they have properly discerned the major tendencies in the economy. In my view it is questionable whether the mechanical application of fiscal arithmetic contributes to good public finance.

Fiscal policy has an important assignment, but in recent years its press agents have invested it with more power to determine the size, shape, and character of the economy than it has or should have. Let us hope that fiscal policy will soon be refocused on contributing to the attainment of the good economic society.

UNITED STATES SHOULD EXPRESS CONCERN TO GREECE FOR PAPANDREOU

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today I have dispatched a letter to Secretary Rusk regarding the safety of Andreas Papandreou, of Greece. Among his many accomplishments, he has had a distinguished career as an economist, trained in this country, and served in our Armed Forces during World War II. He relinquished his American citizenship to return to his native land.

I think it is most important for this Government to make known to King Constantine and the present Premier our active concern for the safety of this eminent man. The letter reads as follows:

April 27, 1967.

The Honorable Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Secretary: I write to request that the United States Government should make strong representations, through the Ambassador in Athens, to King Constantine and to Premier Constantine V. Kollias on the concern of people in the United States about the safety and wellbeing of Andreas Papandreou.

The suspension of civil liberties by the military junta in Greece has, I am sure, shocked you as much as it has shocked me. I am aware, too, of the extremely difficult position of the King. But it seems to me that the United States has an opportunity to express its concern about a political prisoner whose abilities are so well known to us. On the intellectual side, he has had a distinguished career as an economist at Harvard and Berkeley and, more recently, in Greece itself. But we ought not to forget that he served during World War II with our naval forces, and that it was to return to his native land that he relinquished his American citizenship.

The basis of my plea is the ground of common humanity and the belief that Greece cannot afford to ignore the talents of Andreas Papandreou. Hopefully, the Greeks will recognise in the active concern of the United States our own abiding detestation of political repression and our resolve to assert human rights.

Sincerely,

William Proxmire,
Chairman.

THE ADDRESS OF GEN. WILLIAM C. WESTMORELAND BEFORE A JOINT MEETING OF CONGRESS—THREATENED RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I listened to the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] with respect and high regard for his views, as I always do. But I stand on every single word I said earlier.

I did not have the privilege of hearing General Westmoreland this afternoon, but I read his speech before he made it. The reason I did not hear it was that I was doing an emergency job for the President of the United States during the period of time General Westmoreland was addressing the session of Congress. It was my duty to present to the Senate Committee on Labor and Public

Welfare the results of the administration deliberations regarding the railway dispute we shall be considering next week. I want to say that I read the general's speech——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon goes into that, will the Senator yield? I believe he was discussing the resolution on the labor difficulties in the railroad industry.

Mr. MORSE. I was going to end by offering that resolution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Very well.

Mr. MORSE. I read the general's speech before the joint meeting of the Congress this afternoon. In light of the statements the general has made, since he has been back in the United States, to private groups, to the press, and to the newspaper publishers, I would characterize his speech this afternoon as a case of the general being on a forensic dress parade. It was interesting that when he got before those of us who have legislative responsibilities, he did not talk in the same terms he talked to the press and talked to the newspaper editors, but when he talked about "resolve"—and it was to that language, the word "resolve," that I addressed the thrust of my remarks—it was perfectly obvious what one of his duties happens to be in this country. It is to sell the American people on this war.

When I refer to those who talk about restraint, I do not refer to the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], because I know of no one who is a greater defender of the right to dissent in this country than the Senator from Florida. He has been on the minority side on too many issues during his service in the Senate not to know the importance of dissent. But some of us in the Senate who from the very beginning—and we have had some new recruits since—have recognized this war as unjustifiable and have had the courage to tell the American people the facts as we find them in regard to its unjustifiability have been speaking with restraint.

However, there are many who, when they use the word "restraint," really mean that those of us who dissent should not really disagree. This crisis is so serious to the destiny of this Republic that I consider it my duty, when a military officer is brought back to the United States and is directed—and we well recognize the consent was had in advance—to make the statements that General Westmoreland has made to the press, in his interviews and formal speech, to say that the situation is exactly as I have described it in my speech.

If General Westmoreland is to become a propagandist for the administration in this war, let him take off his uniform and come back in civilian life. Let him become a candidate for public office. We have a very precious constitutional right that we must maintain. It is that there must be no trespass upon the principle that the foreign policy of this Republic shall be run by a civilian government, and not by the Pentagon Building.

Therefore, I stand on what I have said of General Westmoreland's activities here. I shall continue to reply to him as long as he carries on his forensic tour that obviously the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, and Secretary of Defense have called him back to perform.

It is a pretty precious right in this country that the military stay within its military duties and leave the problems of running the civilian government and the determination of foreign policy to the civilians, and not to the military.

I shall talk about this whenever, in my judgment, the conduct of General Westmoreland or that of any other officer in the Military Establishment, while still in uniform, trespasses upon the constitutional guarantee that the civilian affairs of the Government will be determined by the civilian government and not by the military.

RAIL STRIKE RESOLUTION

I would like to have had the opportunity of hearing General Westmoreland. I have a very high regard for him as a military officer. He is no soldier-statesman, but he is a great soldier. It was impossible for me to hear him because I really was working for the President of the United States at the time General Westmoreland was making his speech, preparing for a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at 2 o'clock.

I did not ask for the assignment. It reveals no secrets to say that the distinguished majority leader, along with the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare sort of entered into a collusive arrangement this morning. They put me in a position where I was fulfilling the function which I began performing in a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. In fact, I performed it without even taking time off for lunch. I ate my lunch in the committee meeting.

At the Cabinet Room this morning the President briefed us on the oncoming railroad strike. He outlined for us the various legislative proposals that could be made by the White House as a solution of the problem. He made clear that no final decision has been reached as yet on a legislative proposal which the administration will send to Congress early next week.

However, typical of the President, I want to say again what I said not so many days ago when I talked about the consultation process. The President, prior to his going to Punta del Este with regard to his obligations to meet with the heads of state at Punta del Este, consulted 40 Members of Congress working in the field of foreign policy, including the bipartisan leadership of both Houses of Congress. This is a policy of President Johnson's that I highly commend. In my judgment, that consultation policy carries out the very important principle in the Constitution of advise and consent.

So again today he consulted before the fact. He consulted with us to obtain our advice about what legislative remedy should be proposed. We reached an understanding among ourselves this morning, Mr. President, that the President should send to Congress a recommendation for a joint resolution. I read the proposed joint resolution:

S.J. RES. 79

Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 90–10 (Ninetieth Congress, S.J. Res. 65), April 12, 1967, is hereby amended by striking out "prior to 12:01 antemeridian of May 3, 1967" and inserting "prior to 12:01 antemeridian June 19, 1967."

As a result of the position taken by the majority leader and the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. HILL]—and I made clear that I thought either one or both of them should take the assignment—they were in no small measure, in my judgment, responsible for the White House asking me to present this resolution to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at 2 o'clock this afternoon. I prepared for that meeting; I presented the resolution; and the resolution was discussed—the present Presiding Officer (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair), who attended that meeting, discussed it for some time—and reported it out.

Therefore, I ask to have this original resolution, initiated by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare this morning, and which was reported out of that committee this morning by a unanimous vote, received at the desk at this time for printing in the RECORD, and that permission be granted to file the committee's report on the resolution before midnight tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported an original joint resolution (S.J. Res. 79) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, and submitted a report thereon, which report was ordered to be printed, and the joint resolution was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at two meetings at the White House this week—one with members of the Cabinet earlier in the week, while the President was in Germany attending the last rites for the late beloved and respected Chancellor of that country, Konrad Adenauer, and the one this morning—the question as to what should or could be done to meet this urgent problem was discussed.

At those meetings, I stated quite emphatically, I must say, that we ought to fall back upon the experience—which stretches back over almost four decades—of the distinguished Senator from Oregon as to procedures which might appropriately be followed.

We must all be aware of the fact that if no action is taken, come 12:01 Wednesday morning next, the strike which is threatened will become a fact. At that time, if there is no agreement between the railroads and the shop crafts in the meantime, the President will be bereft of any means by which he, as the Chief Executive of this country, could face up to the situation and offer possibilities for meeting it.

Therefore, there is no choice but for the matter to be referred to Congress; and as much as I dislike any labor legislation of this kind being referred here, I can see no alternative.

It is my understanding that the Board which was created after Congress agreed to a 20-day extension—a Board headed by a very distinguished retired jurist, Judge Charles Fahey, with two equally distinguished colleagues—was able to bring closer, the area of agreement, but not sufficiently to satisfy at least one particular union. It therefore appears at the moment that negotiations are at an impasse and that something must be done. Something must be done not only to take care of the domestic economy of this country, but, regardless of one's feelings, something must be done because of the situation in which we find ourselves in Vietnam.

I can think of no better guide, adviser, or counselor in the field of management-labor relations than the distinguished Senator from Oregon, who has served as the dean of the Law School at the University of Oregon, who has served on many mediations boards, and whose experience, I reiterate, goes back many years.

So I look to him for——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask that I may finish this first.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator permit me to insert the War Labor Board, so ably headed by the Senator from Oregon, as a very great service?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely; and there have been other boards as well. Unfortunately, I do not have the list at my disposal. But, to repeat, I can think of no better qualified man to advise, guide, and counsel the Senate, Congress, and the unions and management as to the course which should be followed at this time. Because if something is not done, at 12:01 Wednesday morning next, the railroads will stop, and the difficulties which would ensue are too awesome, at the moment, to even contemplate.

I assure the distinguished Senator from Oregon, the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], all members of the committee, and all Senators that as far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, it is his intention to call this resolution up on Monday next. I feel quite certain that in that respect I will receive the cooperation and approval of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the distinguished and able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], and the distinguished and able senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], all of whom have a vital interest in what will be the pending legislation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in the interests of brevity, I associate myself with the remarks of the majority leader in respect to the need for legislation and in respect to the catastrophe that would be created in this country if we do not find a way to prevent that strike at 12:01 next Wednesday morning.

In spite of what the majority leader says, what the Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] says, or what others may say Senator Mansfield heard me explain to the President this morning that I seek to perform my duties only as a member of the team, under the leadership of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Alabama. I will only carry out my obligations as a member of the committee, but as far as the leadership responsibility is concerned, I shall continue to look to them and support their leadership.

Mr. President, the President gave us a letter which he had written to the Speaker of the House and to the Vice President of the United States. I shall close my comments by reading the letter, because it sets forth the unanswerable argument which calls for the legislation which we shall seek.

The letter reads as follows:

> April 28, 1967.
>
> Mr. Speaker.
> Mr. Vice President.
>
> A rail strike would bring industrial distress to America. It would disrupt our commerce, cripple our industries, create shortages of food. It would adversely affect the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country.
>
> Such a strike would be a gross disservice to our valiant men in Vietnam who are making sacrifices greater than any of us are called upon to make.
>
> The public interest demands that every practical step be taken to avert a strike, now scheduled for 12:01 A. M., on May 3.
>
> Since my return from Germany on late Wednesday, I have consulted with the bipartisan leadership of the Congress, and with the ranking Members of the Senate Labor and the House Commerce Committees. They join with me today in urging that the Congress extend the no-strike period for an additional 45 days.
>
> I am submitting herewith a joint resolution to accomplish this.
>
> This additional period will give the Congress time prudently to consider legislation which will protect the public interest in this case.
>
> I shall recommend such legislation to the Congress within a few days.
>
> An additional 45 days period may enable the parties to press forward with their search for accord or reach an agreement themselves.
>
> I hope and believe, in the interest of all Americans, the Congress will want to act promptly.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> Lyndon B. Johnson.

Not only do I associate myself with the statement of the President as to the need for legislation, but I also want to make a plea to the parties in the dispute.

In my judgment the carriers and the unions involved have a grave responsibility, owed not only to the American people but also to our free economy, to proceed to make free collective bargaining work.

There is not the slightest excuse or justification for the carriers and the brotherhoods to put the President and Congress in the position in which they are now placing the President and Congress as a result of the collapse of their collective bargaining negotiations.

The answer for the settlement of a labor dispute should not be found in Congress, but around a collective bargaining table in negotiations participated in by the parties.

I hope that between now and the time that Congress finally comes to the passage of legislation, these parties will live up to their responsibilities of industrial statesmanship and settle this case. For, let me say to both sides that as I have studied the case to date, and as I have listened to their representatives who appeared in public hearings before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, this case involves not only a threatened strike but, in a real sense, also a threatened lockout.

It is perfectly obvious, as we listen to them, that the carriers, from the beginning of the negotiations, have taken the adamant position that unless these six craft unions would go along with the patterns for the most part that the carriers have laid down, they would then seek legislation.

Furthermore, there is no doubt that these carriers have, by design, been seeking compulsory arbitration for quite some time. And as I said to them in the public hearings, and as I said to the President and his associates in the Cabinet room this morning:

> Here is one Senator who will never vote for compulsory arbitration.

I shall always point with pride to the vote I cast in 1963 when I was one of the two Members of the Senate that refused to vote for compulsory arbitration at that time.

How well I remember the chiefs of the railroad brotherhoods sitting in that top row in the gallery after they had made their demands and put on their lobbying pressure upon the Senate for a vote for compulsory arbitration because they had suffered a lapse of good judgment and thought that compulsory arbitration was the answer.

Instead of accepting the sound proposal from President Kennedy that they accept voluntary arbitration, they came along with their political pressure on the Hill and we ended up with that nefarious compulsory arbitration bill. It is rather interesting that in recent days one of those chiefs has put out a report condemning that arbitration and saying that they lost 17,000 railroad jobs among the firemen as the result of that arbitration. However, he was one of the chiefs that pleaded for votes for that arbitration bill.

He did not approve of me at the time. Perhaps now he thinks I do not have the horns that he thought I had at the time.

As I have been heard to say so many times: if we start to set up compulsory arbitration boards or give that authority to what some refined propagandists term labor courts, we will turn the economy of this country over to the discretionary judgment of arbitrators. If they can fix wages and conditions of employment, they can fix prices and rules of management.

That cannot be reconciled with a free enterprise system. That is why I served notice in the committee the other day to the parties, and served notice in the Cabinet room this morning, that if there is any proposal to have compulsory arbitration, you can be sure of one vote against it, because I will not be a party to it. I close with a plea on my lips. I hope that the parties to this dispute will proceed to recognize—and I use a term they may not like advisedly that so long as this war is being fought, there can be no interruption in the shipment of supplies to those men in Vietnam. Nor can there be any interruption in our economy, so vital in maintaining a war economy.

I therefore say to them on both sides in this dispute: "It is your duty to settle this dispute by collective bargaining without making it necessary for Congress to pass legislation and the President to sign it."

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION ENDORSES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Small Business Administration has recently submitted a report to the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. The Small Business Administration strongly favors the objectives of S. 5 and believes the measure is necessary not only to protect consumers but legitimate businessmen as well. As the guardian of small business, it is particularly encouraging that SBA is supporting truth in lending, since many people have felt the bill might have an adverse impact on small business.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the SBA report be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in response to your letter of January 26, 1967, in which you request our comments on S. 5, a bill "To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

On a number of occasions the President has emphasized the need for such legislation. A measure of this kind is necessary not only to protect consumers against deception but also to protect legitimate enterprises against unscrupulous competitors who seek to gain business by misrepresenting credit costs.

Accordingly, we strongly favor the objectives of S. 5. With respect to the technical aspects of the bill, however, we would be guided by the views of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests and of the Federal Trade Commission.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

BERNARD L. BOUTIN,
Administrator.

THE PUNTA DEL ESTE CONFERENCE

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the Punta del Este summit was basically a conference for and by the people of Latin America, in which we participated. I believe that to help to understand the real meaning of this Conference to the people of Latin America a look at recent public and press statements of Latin Americans would be useful. Such a look indicates that the Conference was a very significant success on a number of planes.

I do not wish to imply that the reaction of the press or the public in Latin America has been uniformly positive in glowing terms about the accomplishments of this Conference. Of course, there are many who have expressed dissatisfaction or disappointment of one kind or another. But, the mainstream of Latin American thought has reacted very favorably to the Presidents' actions at Punta del Este, and I should like today to mention a few salient points.

First, there was a general realization of the importance of getting together to assess common problems. This aspect was well summed up by Brazil's O Jornal, which stated:

> Only in this Hemisphere would it be possible to convoke and make effective a conference of this sort. It would not be practicable in Europe, Asia, or Africa for many historical and political reasons. The ideal of continental solidarity does exist here and is perfectly realizable.

President Belaunde of Peru felt that the fact that Presidents were able to come together for such a substantive meeting was in itself a "historical act." He termed the meeting an expression of an optimistic America, not a complaining one in which something positive had been accomplished.

Perhaps the best general summary of the spirit of cooperation which infused the Conference appeared in the communique issued by Brazil's President Costa e Silva on his return from the summit:

> I have already at Punta del Este expressed my satisfaction with the results of our work. I say our work, encompassing all the chiefs of state present, whose viewpoints coincided to such an extent in relation to the vital problems of our countries, that I can affirm the inauguration of a new era for Latin America. We explored objectively our common problems, for each one of which reasonable solutions were at least indicated, to be applied from now on with that sense of urgency perceived and emphasized by the President of the United States.

A general feeling of accomplishment flowed from this meeting: President Frei of Chile issued a statement in which he described the summit as "extraordinarily positive," and described the Presidential talks and bilateral contacts as very profitable.

President Ongania of Argentina told reporters that the Conference had been a "great success" and that his Government would cooperate enthusiastically in the task of Latin American integration.

In Santo Domingo, Listin Diario qualified the Conference as a very important one which would "open new paths for essential progress . . ."

Probably the most important agreement which emerged from the Conference was the determination to work toward a hemispheric-wide common market.

Colombia's President Carlos Lleras Restrepo stated on television that:

> The conference at Punta del Este was a success . . . because the multilateral character of the Alliance for Progress was demonstrated, and given vigorous impetus . . . because the idea of the common market was given official sanction . . . because an atmosphere of international understanding was fostered.

President Mendez of Guatemala characterized hemispheric integration as one of the most visionary steps taken since Latin American independence and asserted that the American nations have now begun to direct their steps toward continental unity. He also emphasized the value of the face-to-face conversations among the chiefs of state which brought about a greater comprehension of our mutual problems. And he saw the summit as resulting in a coordinated plan to spur economic and social development throughout the hemisphere.

In Rio, O Globo published an interview with several leading Rio businessmen supporting the common market. Its headline reads, "Businessmen Support Declaration of Punta del Este and Want Market."

In El Salvador, moderately conservative Prensa Grafica referred to the declaration of the Presidents in a headline as, "An Appointment With the Future of Latin America." To fulfill this major commitment, principles, goals, and objectives had been set which, the paper said, require the full cooperation of all:

> In the declaration, one of its most concrete clauses is concerned with the establishment of a common market. Throughout the world there is a tendency and movement toward forms of integration. An isolated country is one which lives on the periphery of progress.

Perhaps the key reason why the summit was felt by its participants to be a success was the realization of the necessity of self-help which ran through the statements both of the Presidential participants and the press of their countries.

President Trejos of Costa Rica assessed the results of the summit with "greatest optimism" and said the Presidents' declaration had "enormous value." He described President Johnson's speech as "very important and conceptual." Most important is the realization that Latin America must decide its own destiny. He stated:

> We know now that we must act on our own behalf and this is a positive element.

He said the declaration contained goals and indicated means to attain them which are of highest importance for the future of Latin America. Unstated in the document, but universally recognized is the idea that the final results will depend on the willingness of the hemisphere's political leaders to apply the principles and goals of the declaration.

He stressed the remarkable identity of views expressed in the speeches of the Latin American Presidents, notably: need for joint Latin American action; urgency of such joint action; better prices for Latin American commodities; and recognition that the future of Latin

America depends on Latin American actions rather than on external aid.

President Guerrero of Nicaragua termed the conference and the declaration of American Presidents "of transcendential importance," and stated that:

> In general, I am optimistic that great strides can be made in the march toward progress which has begun on this date and which places the American continent on the path of work and prosperity. In short, the Alliance for Progress, a democratic and practical program, has reaffirmed its goal of improvement of living condtions of the Latin American people.

And in this context he continued:

> Nicaragua would need to look to self-help as well as to external aid, and called on all Nicaraguans to work to give meaning to the Punta del Este accord.

President-elect Sanchez of El Salvador stated at an airport press conference held on his return from the summit that he considered the Alliance for Progress to be not just a matter of U.S. aid, but rather a program of joint and cooperative action, success of which depends above all on the effort of each country.

President Leoni of Venezuela noted the importance of the commitments by the Latin American chiefs of state together with the United States to execute programs agreed to at the summit.

This realization was reiterated forcefully in the press. El Mercurio of Santiago judged that:

> The foundations of the Punta del Este declaration rest upon salutary realism—that the Latin American countries should not in the future expect everything from foreign aid, but rather put individual effort to work. President Johnson—

The paper said—

> has also signaled such a new attitude realistically . . . He did not hold out unattainable expectations . . . The principal North American contribution might be to specific projects and mixed-economy enterprises backed jointly by North and South Americans.

Colombia's El Tiempo stated that the most important thing was then "eminently Latin American character" the meeting took.

Buenos Aires left-of-center El Mundo observed that "each President must be thinking of how he can immediately begin the work which will crystalize the agreements and compromises of the action program adopted at Punta del Este."

Brazil's O Jornal, after praising the Declaration of Punta del Este, asserted:

> Latin America should listen to the advice given by U.S. Congressmen, diplomats, and Administration spokesmen that a nation develops only if it decides to use all its energies towards progress without depending on aid from without.

In another issue it wrote:

> The summit has been more than rhetoric, just as the conference which launched the Alliance for Progress created more than words. It is fair to hope that something practical will come from the meeting . . . if not more financial help from the U.S., at least a new kind of experience for those who pin their hopes more on the efforts of others than on their own.

While the Jornal do Commercio concluded:

> No help from abroad, no hand extended can save us unless we save ourselves, unless we collaborate for the good of all. Punta del Este posed a challenge to Latin Americans which they must face.

Similarly, in Mexico, moderately conservative Novedades maintained:

> No matter how the Alliance for Progress refines its efficiency and no matter how plentiful the aid of the Inter-American Development Bank may be, the vices of the Latin American economy will remain unless all governments accept the fact that they cannot solve their problems except from within.

While at the same time, leftist El Dia described the creation of a Latin American common market as "the only solution to the economic problems of our time."

While I believe that it has been rightly said that the conference was a Latin American one, it was, nevertheless, interesting and important to get the latin's assessment of the U.S. role. I believe it can fairly be said that the conference was not only a triumph for the nations of the hemisphere but also a personal one for President Johnson.

Argentina's mass circulation Clarin solicited views of three Presidents on President Johnson's address to the conference and reported as follows:

> 1. Costa e Silva, Brazil . . . "Marvelous, with the necessary measure of discretion and realism."
>
> 2. Lleras Restrepo, Colombia . . . "Showed a great will and desire to give practical meaning to the vague language of the summit declaration."
>
> 3. Frei, Chile . . . "It set forth a large area in which we can work."

In Brasilia, Correio Brasiliense carried the complete text of President Johnson's address and an editorial titled "Support of Johnson."

> It cannot be denied that all the nations of Latin America won a victory at Punta del Este. President Johnson recognized the series of demands which were formulated and which constituted the agenda for the meeting.
>
> Although this does not represent a total victory, . . . nevertheless it serves as a great advance in U.S. understanding of the problems of this continent.
>
> The agreement of President Lyndon Johnson to the principal demands takes on great importance, for without U.S. help and collaboration it will be impossible to satisfy them within the time limits set.

While in Rio, left-of-center Correio da Manha called the speech:

> Undoubtedly positive . . . It can be expected to mark the beginning of effective action that will harmonize the multilateral interests between the U.S. and Latin America.

Perhaps of equal importance were the efforts on the informal plane. President Ongania of Argentina, in a message to President Johnson stated:

> I am convinced that the results of the meeting of chiefs of state, in the preparation for which Your Excellency played such a distinguished role, are of major importance to our countries. I also believe that the holding of conversations in the future, like those yesterday with Your Excellency, will be essential to the success of the common task we have undertaken and to better relations among the American Republics for whose government we are responsible.

El Salvador's President-elect Sanchez described the meeting held between Central America's Presidents with President Johnson as very satisfying.

In Chile, the semiofficial La Nacion ran a front page commentary on President Johnson's "unprecedented" act of leaving his seat to walk over to Frei and speak with him. The paper said:

> In the last two years, meetings have shown a new spirit, culminating in the summit. This new spirit and new style are without a doubt one of the most positive aspects of this meeting because they constitute a psychological climate and a more adequate instrument for building a united Latin America conscious of its peculiar interests and of the role it must play in the history of our times.

And, it is of interest that despite his criticism of the summit as containing shortcomings, Ecuador's President Arosemena, in his speech before the Presidents, praised President Johnson's work on behalf of the hemisphere's progress, and his deep sense of cooperation in the "development of our peoples."

In Argentina, Clarin's correspondent commented:

> President Johnson seems to acquit himself well in these small gatherings.

Such meetings were referred to "as important as the conference itself, if not more so," and claimed positive benefits were derived from them.

And, in Caracas, conservative El Universal saw President Johnson's activities as "breaking the ice," and found "his tone gave birth to growing optimism."

Whether the summit will in fact prove to be a success, of course, remains to be seen. For its future will naturally depend not on rhetoric or expectation, but on the determination of all those involved to carry out the difficult common objectives pledged. Nevertheless, I think it can be said that in Latin America there is a feeling that the first step in an important new chapter in Latin America's development has been taken, that the conference was not merely an event, but rather a beginning.

GREAT SALT LAKE NATIONAL MONUMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, in a few days, the Senate will be asked to consider a bill creating a new national monument in Utah. The bill, S. 25, was introduced by me in early January. It is very similar to a measure reported to the Senate last fall by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, but not finally acted upon due to the lateness of the session.

Mr. President, the bill would establish a national monument on and surrounding a historic island near the southern end of the Great Salt Lake in Utah. The island, known now as Antelope Island because of the antelope which used to graze there, is one of the few areas remaining in Utah which have not been changed by the pressures of a growing, mobile population.

The Great Salt Lake, which surrounds the island, is a unique body of water. Its density supports a swimmer with no effort on his part. The lake is the last remaining portion of the prehistoric Lake Bonneville, which once covered some 20,000 square miles. The Great Salt Lake presently covers about 100 square miles.

Creation of a national monument on Antelope Island will provide tourists, geologists, and others with a platform from which to view and interpret geologic and biologic phenomena of the Great Salt Lake and the Salt Lake Valley.

Antelope Island presently is nearly all in private ownership. In S. 25, I propose that the National Park Service be authorized to purchase all of the island to preserve its scenic and historic beauty and to develop it as one of America's newest outdoor recreation areas.

Over the past several years, the National Park Service has published a considerable amount of information concerning this proposal. I might add, before detailing development plans for the island, that the National Park Service, the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and other interested Federal agencies are in full support of my bill. In addition, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments, at its 48th meeting in 1963, recommended the establishment of a national monument on Antelope Island.

The National Park Service has carefully surveyed Antelope Island so that proper trails, roads, and visitor facilities could be established from which the maximum use could be made of the island without any detrimental effects due to development.

The plan calls for many improvements, including access to the island from its northern and southern tips. On the northern approach to the island, the citizens of Davis County, Utah, have taken the initiative to construct most of a causeway to Antelope Island so that passenger vehicles will someday be able to reach the island. In accordance with this local effort, the National Park Service preliminary plans for facilities on the island show an entrance station and bathing beaches immediately adjacent to the terminal point of the northern causeway.

Other facilities for visitor use would be constructed by the Park Service to best serve an estimated 300,000 visitors annually.

Mr. President, I hope that the Senate can quickly and favorably pass on my bill. The people of Utah have waited for many years for the concrete development of what really is one of our greatest natural resources, the Great Salt Lake. The State of Utah has been severely handicapped by a lack of local funds with which to begin the construction of tourist facilities on Antelope Island or anywhere on or near the Great Salt Lake. We once enjoyed Saltair Resort on the lake, but since the water has receded, the resort lost its appeal and fell into disuse and disrepair. A private group is now attempting to secure financial backing to rehabilitate the resort, but they have met with very limited success.

From Utah's point of view, and in assessing the national interest in preserving the outstanding recreational historic and scientific values of the Great Salt Lake, the Federal Government must enter into a partnership with the State of Utah to provide, for mutual benefit, a new national monument, as called for in my bill.

There is, in my view, limited opposition from those who plead that a delay is needed in any possible Federal action. I say, Mr. President, that those who plead for the delay do so only to prevent the passage of the bill.

The testimony in the hearings on the bill during the 86th, 89th, and 90th Congresses shows wide support in Utah for my position. The Governor of Utah; the Great Salt Lake Authority, which is a State agency charged with recreational and technical responsibilities on the lake; chambers of commerce, newspapers published in Utah, county commissions, municipal officials, and scores of private citizens have all urged quick action by the Congress to establish the Great Salt Lake National Monument.

The opposition, however, says that it is unwise to act at this time. It is unwise, according to the opposition, for the Federal Government to act in the national interest to establish, according to the recognized high standards of the National Park Service, a new national monument which would forever provide for all of the people a singular facility.

I do not imply that the State of Utah would be barred from the development or management of the State's resources in the Great Salt Lake. It is clearly understood that the State of Utah will be granted concession leases by the Secretary of the Interior for certain visitor facilities on Antelope Island should my bill be enacted. The State of Utah has this option, but such an agreement will not be forced on the State.

Mr. President, there is such wide support for this legislation that the Senate should not delay any longer in its consideration and passage.

WEST VIRGINIA NEWSPAPER SUPPORTS VOTE FOR 18-YEAR-OLDS—SENATOR RANDOLPH CITES EDITORIAL IN MORGANTOWN DOMINION-NEWS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I invite the attention of Senators to a recent editorial in the Dominion-News, a daily newspaper published in Morgantown, W. Va., with reference to legislative proposals to gain vote for 18-year-old American citizens.

The editor of this newspaper, Gerard Sherry, comments forcefully on this issue, when he says:

> Eighteen-year-olds are as mature as their talents and resources will let them be. Often they are much more sensible and responsible than their adult counterparts. If they are mature enough to assume legal responsibilities in obeying the law, then they should have the right to vote on such laws.

Mr. President, since Mr. Sherry's editorial, "Let's Give Vote to 18-Year-Olds," expresses so well my own convictions, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in full at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial, "Let's Give Vote to 18-Year-Olds," was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> LET'S GIVE VOTE TO 18-YEAR-OLDS
>
> Senator Jennings Randolph of West Virginia is one of those legislators who has been battling for the right of 18-year-olds to have the vote in federal elections. He's been working at it in Congress since 1942 and has had many of his colleagues join him in the fight.
>
> The war in Vietnam and the other added burdens we put on our young people, has again brought the subject up for serious discussion. If we expect so much of 18 year-olds why can't we give them a right to choose their destiny through the ballot box.
>
> These young people share with their elders the obligation of fighting in the nation's wars.
>
> They have to pay taxes.
>
> They are treated as adults in courts of law.
>
> They are permitted to marry and have the legal responsibilities entailed in the welfare and conduct of the families.
>
> As long as they have the money, they can make out wills, sign for insurance and can be sued for the financial consequences of their own actions.
>
> They are not children and we want to treat them as adults. They are therefore entitled to all the privileges of adulthood, including the vote.
>
> Eighteen-year-olds are as mature as their talents and resources will let them be. Often they are much more sensible and responsible than their adult counterparts. If they are mature enough to assume legal responsibilities in obeying the law, then they should have the right to vote on such laws.
>
> We hope Congress will eventually amend the Constitution and extend the franchise to those 18 years old.

ARTS AND HUMANITIES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, there has been a good deal of discussion recently over the National Endowment for the Arts and the Humanities. The House has slashed the appropriation for the humanities endowment by 42 percent, from the budget request of $6 million down to $3.5 million. This action has come about partly because of objections to an $8,769 grant for a study of the history and political impact of comic strips and cartoons, and partly because of a $12,000 grant for a University of Texas Folklore Archive.

This is exactly the sort of thinking that was anticipated when Congress passed the Arts and Humanities Act in 1965. Indeed, in Senate Report No. 300, 89th Congress, accompanying S. 1483, the bill establishing the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare reported to the Senate that—

> It is the intent of the committee that in the administration of this act there be given the fullest attention to freedom of artistic and humanistic expression. One of the artist's and the humanist's great values to society is the mirror of self-examination which they raise so that society can become aware of its shortcomings as well as its strengths.
>
> Moreover, modes of expression are not static, but are constantly evolving. Countless times in history artists and humanists who were vilified by their contemporaries because of their innovations in style or mode of expression have become prophets to a later age.
>
> Therefore, the committee affirms that the intent of this act should be the encouragement of free inquiry and expression. The committee wishes to make clear that conformity for its own sake is not to be encouraged, and that no undue preference should be given to any particular style or

school of thought or expression. Nor is innovation for its own sake to be favored. The standard should be artistic and humanistic excellence. While evaluation in terms of such an abstract and subjective standard wil necessarily vary, the committee believes such a standard to be sufficiently identifiable to serve the broad purpose of the act and the committee's concern with the cultural values involved.

Mr. Barbary Keeney, the distinguished chairman of the National Foundation on the Humanities, was, so far as I can determine, fully carrying out the legislative intent of the Congress when he made this grant. If there is any artist or humanist who raises "the mirror of self-examination so that society can become aware of its shortcomings as well as its strengths," it is the comic strip artist, the political cartoonist, the caricaturist. Anyone who has read "Peanuts," "Pogo," "Little Orphan Annie," "Little Abner," "Herblock," "Bill Mauldin," or "Jules Feiffer" or who has seen the work of Thomas Nast or Daumier cannot help being aware of the ability of cartoonists to show us clearly and forcefully who and what we are.

As for the importance of folklore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an incisive discussion of the value and place of folklore in a civilization, taken from the introduction to "Folklore Research Around the World," edited by Richard M. Dorson.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By its very nature the study of folklore requires an international breadth of vision. The materials of folklore transcend all barriers of language and culture, traversing continents and spanning oceans in vast leaps and drifting across borders in easy stages. "Cinderella" has circled the globe. The "Shanghai gesture," popular among American schoolboys as a thumb and finger wiggle of derision, roamed all over Europe in the past four centuries. One extended family of water goblins unites the Japanese *kappa* with the Scottish kelpie.[1] In ballad and legend, romance and epos, the same protean hero performs the same sequence of marvelous exploits. Proverbs and riddles glide from one tongue to another to settle comfortably in a new idiom.

Yet in seeming paradox folklore studies have developed most energetically along national lines. Individual scholars of eminence, such as Archer Taylor and Stith Thompson in the present volume, have pursued their researchers in a truly international spirit, following their materials wherever they wander. But the galvanic force behind concerted, subsidized, and firmly organized folklore studies is the force of nationalism. Folklore has served national interests of various sorts: the anxious pride of the small country seeking its cultural identity; the *hubris* of the racist state, glorying in the solidarity of the *Herrenvolk;* the aspirations of an emergent nation, hoping to crystallize its myths; the ideology of the socialist state, extolling the creative powers of the anonymous masses. The same impulses that have led to the self-study of national history and national literature have urged the pursuit of national folklore. Today the well-equipped political state possesses its accredited historical records, its approved literary masterpieces, and its classified folklore archives.

The present collection of essays builds a picture of the international folklore scene through successive comments on the status of folklore research in various parts of the world. At the summer 1958 Folklore Institute of America held at Indiana University, the writer arranged a seminar on "International Relations in Folklore," in which visiting and resident faculty members spoke on folklore scholarship in countries and continents of their special interest. This volume is an outgrowth, with additions, of those lectures.[2] The seminar was designed to pool information gathered by American folklorists abroad, and to examine the character of folklore studies as they have developed on the five continents. Thanks to the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation, Senator Fulbright, and the State Department, American professors, including folklore scholars, have enjoyed unprecedented opportunity for foreign residence, study, and travel, in a dispersion recalling the Victorian age of the British Empire. England's colonial administrators, missionaries, and travelers are now matched by America's cultural attachés, visiting professors, and specialist lecturers. While the Victorians produced many volumes of collected texts, made possible by their long tenures overseas, Americans stay usually one or two years abroad, and cannot undertake comparable fieldwork. Furthermore the situation has radically altered in countries where Englishmen were once pioneer collectors, and the American visitor today is confronted by an impressive pile of publications and a mass of archival manuscripts. The problem now is to locate the folklorists, not the folklore.

International communications among folklorists have improved over the past forty years, from the nadir when scholars in the United States knew virtually nothing of European developments. Stith Thompson tells of the unawareness among his Harvard mentors in 1914 of the Type-Index by Antti Aarne published four years earlier in Finland. Consequently Thompson had to execute his doctoral dissertation and subsequent research on the intrusion of European tales among the North American Indians without benefit of a major tool. When he did establish contact with the Finnish folklorists in 1926, Kaarle Krohn suggested he revise the Aarne index, and the edition of the Aarne-Thompson *Types of the Folk-Tale* published two years later—currently in press for its second expansion—attests the fruitfulness of transoceanic cooperation in folklore scholarship. But the problem of maintaining exchange of monographs, field collections, and journals becomes evermore insistent, particularly with the extension of folklore investigations to other continents besides Europe. The *Internationale Volkskundliche Bibliographie,* valiantly prosecuted by Robert Wildhaber in Basel, lags half a dozen years behind the current year. Exchange of books may well be less rewarding than exchange of persons, for if one knows the dedicated folklorists in a given country, he can become oriented far more readily, and safely, than if he forages for himself in the library. The Irish Folklore Commission is the creation of James H. Delargy, the Japanese Folklore Institute of Kunio Yanagita, the Swedish Folklife Research Institute in Stockholm of Sigurd Erixon.

The plan for the lectures, and the essays into which they grew, called for an account by the American observers of the resources—bibliographical, physical, and human—open to the student of folklore in a given country. References to and comments upon representative works would serve to lead the interested student further into the scholarly literature. Physical resources could include folklore archives, museums, institutes, and libraries. Identification of leading folklorists and their research interests should also assist the outsider. The picture that emerged would reveal something of the character of folklore studies in the national state or culture area.

This character can be viewed from a double perspective: the point reached by folklorists in their progression from field collecting to systematic study of folk materials, and the direction taken by the mature study. On the first score, we may divide the world along the lines roughed out by anthropological and humanistic folklorists. The anthropologists investigate cultures predominantly oral and traditional, cultures in which the concept and self-conscious examination of indigenous folklore (or oral literature) are not yet understood, although the raw materials are present in flourishing abundance. In the following pages, Luomala for Polynesia and Herskovits and Crowley for subSaharan Africa report on such culture areas. Australia presents a special case, neatly divided betwen aboriginal and colonial folk literatures, unlike Latin America where the Indian and the European—with an admixture of the African—have effected a partial blend. Quite appropriately, the commentator for Australia, Greenway, himself is trained both as anthropologist and as humanist. In the countries of Europe, where long established distinctions of social classes have produced a peasant "folk" readily identifiable by scholars, literati, and intellectuals generally, the folklorists delve into the customs and beliefs of their submerged countrymen. Nineteenth century collectors frankly referred to the folk at home as "the lower orders," and the folk of uncivilized (i.e. non-European) societies as "savages." Theoretical schools have waged their controversies to explain the ancestry of folk ideas, but all, whatever their positions—celestial mythologists, Indianists, survivalists, ritualists, Freudians—shared a common premise, that the culture of the folk differed from and trailed behind the culture of civilization, to which it adhered like a picturesque fungus. Even in the United States, with its more mobile population and its democratic doctrine, the same notion of a backward, backcountry folk, dwelling chiefly in the southern mountains, has governed much of the fieldwork. Childlike savages are available both in aboriginal and imported African stocks. French Canada, whose folklore work is described herein by Lacourciere, is a European folk culture transplanted wholesale into the wilderness.

Folklore as studied in Europe and North America embodies a quite different conceptual approach from that employed by American ethnologists in Asia and Africa.

---

[1] See Marian R. Cox, *Cinderella* (London, 1897), and Anna Birgitta Rooth, *The Cinderella Cycle* (Lund, 1951); Archer Taylor, *The Shanghai Gesture,* FF Communications, Vol. LXVI, No. 166 (1956); Eiichiro Ishida, "The *Kappa* Legend," *Folklore Studies,* IX (Peking, 1950), 1–152.

[2] The only seminar lecturer not represented in the present volume is the late R. D. Jameson, who spoke on "Folklore in China."

After the International Congress of Western and European Ethnology held at Stockholm in 1951, I talked with W. Edson Richmond, editor of *Midwest Folklore,* about a series of short surveys on folklore research abroad, to be written by folklore scholars of their respective countries. The following articles have since appeared in that journal: Demetrios Petropoulos, "The Study of Ethnography in Greece," II (1952), 15–20; Eeva Makela-Henriksson, "Recent Folklore Research in Finland," II (1952), 151–158; Brita Gjerdalen Skre, "Folk Life Research in Norway," II (1952), 221–226; Naoe Hiroji, "Post-War Folklore Research Work in Japan," III (1953), 213–222; K. D. Upadhyaya, "A General Survey of Folklore Activities in India," IV (1954), 201–212; Salvatore Nania, "A Glimpse at the History of Folklore in Italy," V (1955), 153–156; J. Podolak, "The Development of Ethnography in Slovakia," VIII (1958), 69–84.

The anthropologists deal with the total culture, and their approach is holistic; the traditions of the unlettered belong to the entire society, for there are no lower illiterate orders. Hence the controversy between anthropological and humanistic folklorists over the content and usefulness of the term "folklore," and its restriction by the ethnologists to the verbal arts. In the nonliterate society the entire institutional structure and cosmogonical system involve traditional "custom" and "belief." Even the intellectual classes of Asia and the Middle East stay close to their folk inheritance; the gulf between industrialized and traditional cultures has not yet riven their societies; the aspiring folklorists from Thailand, Pakistan, India, Indonesia, Egypt are usually informants as well as collectors.

The romantic haze that surrounded the folk in the nineteenth century has given way to pragmatic and political attitudes in the twentieth. The folk serve as repositories of the ancient language and popular traditions of the nation, and this legacy must be firmly recorded and made known to the citizens of the modern state. What kind of Finn is ignorant of the *Kalevala?* What good Norwegian who does not treasure the tales of Asbjornsen and Moe? Publishing the national folklore in the school primers acquaints each youthful citizen with selected hero-tales and hero-songs that glorify the national genius. Recognizing the propaganda potentialities in folklore, the totalitarian states have decreed the erasure of the nineteenth century theory of *gesunkenes Kulturgut* and compelled their scholars to advance the party line through folklore. In Nazi Germany, the folklorists of the Third Reich abandoned the concept of peasant folklore for a racial theory of Germanic *Volksüberlieferung* uniting Teutonic peoples everywhere in a mystic kinship of blood and lore. Instead of dividing Germans into classes, folklore would weld them into a whole. In Soviet Russia, and her satellites, the folk—i.e., the people—have replaced the decadent aristocracy and bourgeoisie as originators of folkstuff, by party decree of 1933. Folklore is the vigorous creative expression of a revolutionary people against the landlords, the tsars, and the factory bosses, and it is the spontaneous hymn of praise—stimulated by prize competitions—to the Red Army generals and Kremlin leaders.

Folklorists from the United States visiting Europe accordingly are faced with a far different situation from anthropologists prospecting in Africa. The reporter in the European country meets an established and honored field of inquriy. Because ties between folklorists in Scandinavia and the United States have been close in recent years, our information about the active scholarship in those four countries is reasonably full and up-to-date. But of developments in, say, Turkey or Spain, neither well represented at the Stockholm and Kiel international congresses of 1951 and 1959, we have received little word, and the papers by Jansen and Gillmor now reveal considerable interest and activity there in folklore research. Contrary to the general impression, Spain is indeed folklore-minded, so much so that Gillmor found the man and woman in-the-street thoroughly conversant with the word "folklore."

Even allowing for the difference in treatment required for countries in different stages of research, the editor has not sought a rigid uniformity in the essays that follow. Some, like those of Simeone for Italy, Richmond for Finland, and Luomala for Polynesia, survey the growth of the field in historical perspective. Others have given impressionistic accounts of their visits. The history of humanistic learning can profit greatly from the autobiographical asides which scholars tend to suppress as unscholarly. Yet the chance encounter, the casual suggestion, the gift of serendipity, may very well determine the destiny of the creative scholar, and particularly of the folklorist who depends so heavily on his associates in his undermanned field. Cecil Sharp learned of the ballad riches in the southern mountains from a bundle of manuscripts brought him on his sickbed in Lincoln, Massachusetts. Thompson began his life's work when Kittredge in a Harvard seminar suggested he examine northeast Indian tales for instances of European intrusions.[3] Rarely indeed does a chatty volume such as the *Memories* of Edward Clodd sketch in the network of personal relationships that give vitality and spark to a field of learning. Any student of the English folklore movement soon appreciates the interdependence of the active London group, but only Clodd actually set down vignettes of his discourse with Lang and Gomme and Hartland. The late R. M. Dawkins of Oxford and André Varagnac of the Sorbonne told me a revelatory anecdote about Frazer. The serious-minded young scholar was accustomed to dine at the same Parisian restaurant with friends; to pull his leg, they informed him that Frazer's gallantries had smitten the waitress, who now believed herself compromised. The courteous Frazer wedded the waitress, but his companions suffered the consequence, for she barred the door to all his soulmates and made him sit at his desk writing his books. Accordingly he never received any new ideas, and while he wrote many books, they were all identical.[4] Like the visible crack in the tale of the tame trout, who fell through a crack in the bridge and was drowned, Sir James's volumes uphold the story.

The present symposium records some personal associations and impressions gained by American folklorists abroad during the past decade, along with more formal facts, and so offers a new chapter to the history of international folklore studies.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, what this attack adds up to is an attempt by a small group to do a hatchet job on the Humanities Foundation. By cutting the budget request by 41 percent Congress supposedly will be expressing its disapproval of the way the Foundation was operated last year.

But what is Congress disapproving? Mr. Keeney first of all carried out the intent of Congress. But he went further than that. He did a brilliant job.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the First Annual Report of the National Endowment for the Humanities be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES—FIRST ANNUAL REPORT, FISCAL YEAR 1966

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 15, 1967.

The Honorable THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have the honor to transmit herewith the Annual Report for Fiscal Year 1966 of the National Endowment for the Humanities for submission to the Congress as required by the National Foundation for the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965. As this is the first annual report of an entity which came into creation largely as a result of your personal interest, I commend it particularly to your care.

Respectfully,

BARNABY C. KEENEY,
Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.

I. FOREWORD

This is the first annual report of the National Endowment for the Humanities. It describes the beginning of an enterprise unique in the history of the United States, and an agency unique in the Federal Government.

On September 29, 1965, President Johnson, bringing to fruition his long-standing interest in the humanities, signed P.L. 89-209, creating the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, containing two separate but closely cooperating entities, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities. On November 18, 1965, Henry Allen Moe, the distinguished former president of the Gugghenheim Foundation, was appointed by the President to serve an interim term as chairman of the National Endowment for the Humanities until July 1, 1966. Shortly thereafter, on January 27, 1966, the President appointed the 26 distinguished private citizens who comprise the National Council on the Humanities. (For list of members see Appendix A.) The Chairman and the Council had their first meeting on March 3-4, 1966, and immediately began planning for programs and staff. When the Endowment's chairman, Barnaby C. Keeney, former President of Brown University, was appointed in early July, some major staff appointments had been made, and the Chairman, the staff, and the Council had developed broad program outlines. By the end of the 1966 fiscal year, a few grants had been made and others were pending, but the bulk of the original appropriation of Congress remained intact. To this was added the Congressional appropriation for fiscal 1967, which comprised $1,800,000 for fellowships, $100,000 for a study of educational television, and $100,000 for a talking books program. The Endowment, therefore, decided to pool the original appropriation with the funds appropriated for 1967, giving it a program budget of $4,500,000 for fiscal 1967.

Thus, an annual report dealing only with the 1966 fiscal year would be largely a report on the Endowment's legislative and administrative beginnings, while a report which dealt with very much of fiscal 1967 would be a prediction of the future, rather than a report on the past. Therefore, this report deals with the 12-month period from September 1965 through September 1966, a point at which the directions of the Endowment were emerging, the staff was operative, and programs were cast into their initial patterns.

The following report of the National Endowment for the Humanities records such matters of fact as should formally be made available in a public document. It shows what the Chairman and his staff, with the approval and cooperation of the Council, and with the advice of many humanists, have accomplished in a period of roughly eight months.

These eight months have been a period of developing, with the scholarly community and those generally interested in the humanities, programs which will achieve both immediate results and suggest long-term directions for Endowment activity. Details of the programs will be found in following sections of the report. It is appropriate here to make some general comments about the importance that the Endowment succeed in its efforts.

A striking point of the last decade of American life has been the growing frustration in public life as realization developed that our wealth, our superb technical and material skills, our undifferentiated desire for the superlative across the gamut of our national existence, created as many, perhaps more, problems than they solved. As though to mock our material progress, darkening problems of urbanization, of lacerating political and social division, and of aimless discontent grow with our progress. It is perhaps not too much of an exaggeration to say that the country is passing through a crisis of confidence in its achievements and its aspirations—indeed; itself.

---

[3] A. H. Fox Strangways and Maud Karpeles, *Cecil Sharp* (2nd ed., London, New York, Toronto, 1955), pp. 129-130; Stith Thompson, "Folklorist's Progress" (1956, typescript, 320 pp., Folklore Library, Indiana University), pp. 59-60.

[4] This pleasantry is supported by the ringing critique of Fraser in Edmund R. Leach, "Golden Bough or Gilded Twig?," *Daedalus* (Spring, 1961), 371-387.

It is in response to this climate that the Endowment faces its most challenging opportunity—to increase the interest in and use of the humanities by our citizens, and to improve their access to them. Other things can make us wealthy and powerful; the humanities are to make us wise, and they lead us to apply our wisdom in ways which can heal both private and public life. It is urgently in the national interest to make available to the broad public as well as the scholarly community the attitudes of mind, the methods of assessing value, the self-knowledge and civic knowledge which are the ultimate contributions of the humanities to public and private life. If a broad public can be encouraged to appreciate and understand the humanities, they may habitually use this knowledge in making their public and private decisions. It is impossible to calculate the beneficial national effect of "being scientific"; but few would question that such an outlook has been of fundamental importance in achieving our present material good fortune at home and our leadership abroad. We are persuaded that "being humanistic," both in our schools and colleges and outside them, is equally necessary for solutions to our national anguishes, to maintain our leadership abroad, and to represent to the world what the quality of human life can be. No less than this is the ultimate objective of the Endowment, and we believe that it was as an expression of such hopes and convictions that the President and Congress established the Endowment. The need, as the President put it, is "not only in enriching scholarship but in enriching life for all people."

BARNABY C. KEENEY,
Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities.

II. THE ENDOWMENT AND ITS YEAR IN REVIEW

Both the newness and the novelty of the Endowment mean that the nature of the agency and its activities is not well known. Therefore it seems appropriate to include in the first annual report a summary of the background of its creation, the tasks with which it is charged, its structure, and its policies and programs.

A. Legislative background

The creation of the National Endowment for the Humanities and its advisory group, the National Council on the Humanities, by the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 represents the first major step by the government of the United States to support research, planning, and programs in the humanities.

The Endowment was not created in a vacuum, however. Several Federal agencies and departments had *programs which included the humanities, or facilities* which scholars in the humanities could use, prior to the creation of the Endowment. The National Historical Publications Commission had been created in 1934 as part of the legislation establishing the National Archives. Originally a coordinating and advisory agency, it has in recent years provided support for editors of major collections of documents relating to American history. Multi-volume collections of the edited papers of the Adamses, Franklin, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Madison are currently under way under the auspices of the National Historical Publications Commission. Since 1935, the Department of the Interior, under the Historic Sites Act, has been able to preserve and maintain historic and archaeological sites and sponsor museums at National Parks. Certain programs of the National Science Foundation, established in 1950, have been open to scholars in some fields of the humanities and social sciences. Several programs administered by the United States Office of Education provide support for the humanities. Chief among them are those authorized by the Cooperative Research Act of 1954, the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and its subsequent amendments, the Fulbright-Hays Act of 1963 (which also enables the Department of State to provide some support for a limited number of scholars in the humanities), and of course the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act, both passed in 1965. Finally, the facilities and services of the Library of Congress and the Smithsonian Institution have been of significant value in humanistic scholarship.

Useful as all these programs were, they shared one of two detriments so far as the humanities were concerned: either they were not designed to provide broad support to all fields of the humanities, or they were designed to provide support to much more than the humanities alone, with the consequent tendency to have a focus which was too diffuse to produce major support for the humanities. In short, the various legislative mandates either covered too little or too much; support of the humanities was either partial or peripheral.

The successful legislative effort to create a unified Federal program of support for the humanities began in 1964, partly in response to a report by the Commission on the Humanities for the American Council of Learned Societies, the Council of Graduate Schools in the United States, and the United Chapters of Phi Beta Kappa. The Commission stressed two fundamental points: (1) that expansion and improvement of activities in the humanities are in the national interest and consequently deserve financial support by the Federal Government; and (2) that Federal funds for this purpose should be administered by a new independent agency to be known as the National Humanities Foundation. The first Congressional proposal came in August 1964, when Congressman William S. Moorhead introduced a bill, on which no action was taken, to establish an independent agency for the advancement of culture. In a speech at Brown University a month later, President Johnson endorsed the idea:

> "The values of our free and compassionate society are as vital to our national success as the skills of our technical and scientific age. And I look with the greatest of favor upon the proposal . . . for a national foundation for the humanities."

In his state of the Union message to the 89th Congress the following January, the President again endorsed the concept of a national agency for the arts and humanities. Three months later, on March 10, 1965, he transmitted the Administration's recommendations for a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to Congress, with the statement that:

> "The humanities are an effort to explore *the nature of man's culture and to deepen* understanding of the sources and goals of human activity. Our recommendations recognize this effort as a central part of the American national purpose, and provide modest support to those whose work offers promise of extending the boundaries of understanding."

The result of Presidential and Congressional interest was P.L. 89–209, creating the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, which passed the Senate June 10 and passed the House of Representatives, with minor amendments, September 15, the Senate agreed to the House version of the bill September 16, and the President signed the bill into law September 29, 1965.[1]

B. Legislative charges

The Endowment has a broad legislative mandate with regard to its activities. The charge is found in Section 7(c) of P.L. 89–209, which authorizes the Endowment to—

(1) develop and encourage the pursuit of a national policy for the promotion of progress and scholarship in the humanities;

(2) initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research potential of the United States in the humanities by making arrangements (including grants, loans, and other forms of assistance) with individuals or groups to support such activities;

(3) award fellowships and grants to institutions or individuals for training and workshops in the humanities. Fellowships awarded to individuals under this authority may be for the purpose of study or research at appropriate nonprofit institutions selected by the recipient of such aid, for stated periods of time;

(4) foster the interchange of information in the humanities;

(5) foster, through grants or other arrangements with groups, public understanding and appreciation of the humanities; and

(6) support the publication of scholarly works in the humanities.

C. Council and staff

To accomplish the functions vested in the Endowment by law, Congress established a Chairman of the Endowment, who appoints the staff, and who is also Chairman of the National Council on the Humanities, an advisory group of 26 distinguished private citizens appointed by the President for staggered terms. Membership on the Council includes university presidents; faculty members; heads of professional societies; and leaders in business, labor, religion, architecture, writing, and journalism.

The function of the National Council is to advise the Chairman and his staff on policy and grants. In fiscal 1966 the Council met with the staff three times, and three meetings will be held in 1967. In order to assure thoughtful assessment of Endowment activity, the Council is subdivided into committees which meet with staff members to discuss policies and grants in the various subdivisions of the Endowment. There are four such committees, corresponding to the staff structure: Committee on Planning and Analysis, Committee on Fellowships and Stipends, Committee on Research and Publication, Committee on Educational and Special Projects.

The chief executive officer of the Endowment is the Chairman. Final decisions upon policy and grants rest with him, after he has received the recommendation of the Council. The Chairman is assisted by a staff divided into three operating divisions, corresponding to the present major activities of the Endowment (Fellowships and Stipends, Research and Publication, Educational and Special Projects), and the Office of Planning and Analysis, which does not operate grant-making activities, but coordinates the overall planning of the Endowment and advises the Chairman on long-range activities and directions. (For list *of staff, see Appendix B.)*

D. Policies and procedures

Programs for the Endowment have come from ideas suggested by the Chairman, by the staff, by the Council, by consultants appointed by the Chairman to make specific recommendations, and by the academic and general communities.

---

[1] The legislative background of the National Endowment for the Arts will be found in their Annual Report. Although by the law the two Endowments are separate but cooperating entities together comprise one agency designated the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities, the legislation also provides for separate annual reports by the two Endowments.

All applications for support are screened by the division staff in the first instance to determine their eligibility for Endowment support, they are then reviewed either by outside consultants or panels of outside reviewers—in many cases both—to arrive at an assessment of their substantive merit; further review follows by the staff, which makes recommendations to the Council; the Council and its committees then review the proposals and make recommendations to the Chairman, who ultimately bears responsibility for commitment of Endowment funds.

Both in regard to development of programs and in regard to support of applications, the Endowment has sought to avoid duplication of Federal or private activity. Therefore, in the development of programs a critical question is the ability of other Federal agencies, or private groups or individuals, to support such activity. In support of applications, joint funding with other Federal or private sources of support is the Endowment's goal whenever possible. A few such joint funding ventures have been undertaken, and the Endowment expects the number to increase in the future.

As a matter of policy, the Endowment has sought close working relationships with other Federal agencies in the field of education. Chief among these are the United States Office of Education, the National Science Foundation, the Smithsonian Institution, the National Historical Publications Commissions, and of course, the National Endowment for the Arts.

Section 11(b) of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 provides for matching with Federal funds gifts made by private individuals and organizations for the purposes of the Endowment. The result is that the private donor is able to double his gift through the matching provision. The Council and staff have as a matter of policy resolved to seek private support to augment the Federal appropriation; but in fiscal 1966 no such gifts were received. Naturally, added funds as a result of private gifts would enable the Endowment to increase the effectiveness of its programs more rapidly than a single source of support permits.

E. Endowment programs

The legislative mandate of the Humanities Endowment is sufficiently broad, and the humanities themselves are so broad, that the chief task of the first eight months has been to identify areas of need, and define methods of dealing with them. The Endowment, in its initial stages, decided to concentrate upon three broad and closely-related objectives.

The first objective is the development of individuals as scholars, teachers, and practitioners of the humanities throughout the country in order that they may more effectively bring what is known and thought to students in schools and colleges and to adults who are not formally registered in educational institutions, and incidentally to increase the store of knowledge and wisdom by their own researchers. The program initially consists of fellowships and stipends. Details of the programs will be found in the following section of this report.

The second objective is the development and dissemination of knowledge of the humanities through research and other scholarly activities in order to increase our national resources in the humanities. Obviously, some of this is done through the award of fellowships mentioned above. A distinction between the development of individuals and the promotion of scholarship is that the primary purpose of the second is the increase in knowledge and understanding, whereas the primary purpose of the first is the development of the scholar who may, in the course of his development, or subsequently, increase knowledge and become more capable of disseminating it through teaching and other activities.

The subjects of the studies supported will cover the whole range of humane studies, and will range from rather restricted and precise studies of particularly important points in the various fields to broad syntheses based in part upon new research, but also based in part upon work already done.

The development of knowledge also includes aids to scholarship which are essential preliminaries to scholarly research. It includes the improvement of means of access to knowledge through encyclopedic compilations, bibliographies, new methods of compiling bibliographies, and of access to libraries. Details of the programs will be found in the following section of this report.

The third objective of the Endowment is the improvement of the teaching of the humanities in schools, colleges, and universities and also among the public at large in order to infuse our present activities with the wisdom that is the product of the humanistic outlook. This is probably the most important of the objectives of the Endowment, since it brings the humanities to bear on important questions; but it is also the most difficult to accomplish. It is necessary that inspiring teaching in schools and colleges excite the initial interest of citizens in the whole subject of man and his activities and their best expression. Initial efforts include programs aimed at the schools, programs aimed at improving teaching in the colleges and universities, experimental programs in developing the humanities in educational situations where they are weak or nonexistent, and programs aimed at the general public through museums and historical societies, television, talking books, and journalism. Details of the programs are in the following section of this report.

III. DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAMS

The programs described below represent the activities of the Endowment frozen at a point in time. New programs which extend the effect of the present ones will be funded in the near future and over the long term. Patterns will evolve and change. Therefore, this report must be taken to indicate methods which the Endowment has chosen to ameliorate some obvious and pressing needs in the humanities, and to sketch in broad outline the general areas in which the Endowment intends to operate.

Each of the three broad objectives mentioned in the preceding section of this report has become the concern of a division of the Endowment staff: development of individuals is supported through the Division of Fellowships and Stipends; development and dissemination of knowledge is supported through the Division of Research and Publication; and improvement of teaching and programs aimed at the general public are supported through the Division of Educational and Special Projects. A description of their activities follows.

A. Division of Fellowships and Stipends

The initial programs to support development of individuals consist of three fellowship programs. The decision to establish these programs was based upon the staff's and the Council's view that one of the most pressing needs in the humanities was to provide a method whereby scholars whose formal training was completed could nonetheless have the time and means to continue their development, and bring it to fruition. Fellowships in the sciences have played a major role in the development of the nation's pool of qualitatively superb scientists; similar efforts in the humanities will produce similar results.

Of the three fellowship programs, one provides support to senior scholars and the other two are directed toward the younger scholar who is not yet in a position to compete with men of established reputation, but whose need is particularly great because he is going through a critical period in his development. One of the programs for younger scholars provides support for a period of six to eight months (that is, for one semester or for a semester and a summer); the other, for a summer only.

The senior fellowships will provide to individuals of already distinguished achievement as humanists a year of uninterrupted study and writing and necessary travel to enable them to make contributions of major significance to their fields. The amount of fellowship support presently available to senior humanistic scholars capable of using it productively falls short of the amount needed, but the Endowment's program will constitute an appreciable increase in the support available and should give a considerable boost to morale and vitality in the humanities. The awards will carry a maximum stipend of $15,000, but may not exceed the individual's current salary. In addition to his stipend, a fellow may receive, when justifiable, a travel allowance.

The critical period in the development of a young scholar-teacher occurs during the first five years after his full entry into professional life. If he has the satisfaction of sustaining his intellectual growth and winning recognition and esteem, he may be expected to exert, as a teacher and scholar, that leadership which flows from substantial achievement. Unfortunately, during these early years teaching assignments are at their heaviest and opportunities for sustained study and writing are rarely available. The Endowment's fellowship and summer stipend programs for younger scholars provide such opportunities. The number of awards to be made during fiscal year 1967 is short of the number needed, but, again, the programs provide recognition of the need and should have important psychological effects beyond helping the recipients themselves. For example, by eliciting applications for summer stipends, the Endowment's program should increase the awareness in the academic community of the need and utility of such awards, and should serve to bring institutional programs into existence or cause their expansion where they already exist.

In administering the programs for younger scholars, the Endowment is taking particular care to seek out worthy individuals in the less prestigious institutions and in geographical locations where the means of scholarly development are less accessible. Application review committees have been established in each region, composed of members drawn from the region's own colleges and universities, so that good applicants from smaller, less well known institutions will not be overlooked. In order to ensure that an applicant have a bright future as a teacher as well as a scholar, he must be nominated by the institution at which he is teaching, on the basis of his ability as a teacher as well as his promise as a scholar.

As in the senior fellowship program, the awards carry stipends intended to match the recipients' current salaries. The stipend for the summer awards will be two-ninths of the individual's current nine-month academic year salary, and the stipend for the regular six- to eight-month fellowships will be the salary actually to be received by the individual for the comparable months during the current year.

The Endowment has budgeted $2,000,000 for these programs during the 1967 fiscal year which will permit the award of approximentely 50 senior fellowships, 100 six- to eight-month fellowships for younger scholars, and 200 summer stipends, if such a distribution seems appropriate in the light of the relative quality of the applications received. Brochures announcing the fellowship programs were published and given broad distribution in August. The deadline *for applying for these first fellowships* was mid-October, 1966, and the Endowment intends to announce the awards shortly after selections are recommended by the Council at its meeting in January, 1967. Most awards will be held during the 1967–68 academic year, but some will probably become effective *as early as the spring of 1967.*

The Endowment's long-range objective in its programs for the development of individuals is to establish a variety of fellowship and other programs which can dramatically increase the national pool of human resources in the humanities. Accomplishment of this objective will entail developing mutations and hybrids of the three basic programs in an experimental way over a period of years; the level of funding of the basic programs must increase sufficiently to permit experimentation. In the near future, it may be desirable for a program to be offered aimed at broadening the competence of the individual by offering support which enables him to study systematically a field tangential to his specialization, thereby strengthening his insights and understanding. Other programs which may be established over a period of time include ones aimed at the faculty members of small colleges, and ones aimed at increasing the contact between university faculties and college and junior college faculties.

The fellowship programs which have been devised during the first eight months of the Endowment's existence aim at providing an initial contribution to the development of the individual scholar; but a major purpose of supporting such development is to enable him to be more effective in his scholarship, and to make a greater contribution to our knowledge of the humanities.

B. Division of research and publication

Programs of support for the development and dissemination of knowledge in the fields of the humanities were given a high priority by both staff and Council during the first months of the Endowment's operations. In part this reflected the very specific language of the act establishing the Endowment: "initiate and support research and programs to strengthen the research potential of the United States in the Humanities." In part it represented the staff and Council view that since knowledge of the humanities has both intrinsic and pragmatic value, the extent and sophistication of such knowledge must grow through increased support for research.

Three programs of support have been established in the initial phase of the Endowment's operations. One is for support of research projects and research aids; the second is for support of international aspects of scholarship; and the third is for support of publication, at present primarily for editions of major American authors.

The program for support of research projects and research aids is aimed at providing an initial contribution to scholarly enterprise in the humanities. Individual scholars and groups of scholars are eligible for support, and while an academic affiliation is usual, it is not required. The support of research projects is open to all fields of the humanities, and can range from rather restricted and precise studies of particularly important points in the various fields to syntheses based in part upon work already done, but also based upon new research. The Endowment is resolved to bear in mind the national interest in the development and strengthening of research potential in the humanities, but it cannot be expected that all such knowledge will be of immediate use any more than all scientific knowledge is of immediate use.

Aids to research (bibliographies, indexes, and catalogues, for example) are essential preliminaries to scholarly research, and the continuous production of these scholarly aids becomes more important as knowledge expands and information multiplies—and, indeed, becomes more important *because* knowledge expands and multiplies. At the present the production of aids to research in the humanities is lagging. The American Council of Learned Societies found in 1966 that approximately 65 major projects for creation of aids to research in the humanities were of immediate use *and in immediate need of funding. The Endowment* expects to contribute to support of research aids in the present year, but limitations of funds make it unlikely that the initial contribution will have a major effect. Both portions of the program for research will have to be expanded in a major way in subsequent years.

Another of the Endowment's initial actions was to devise a program of support for the production of "pure" texts of the major American authors. The rationale for such a program seemed manifest. Emerson is the most revered non-Asiatic philosopher-writer in Asia; in Europe, Whitman is credited with freeing poetry from the shackles of verbal and technical conventions; Twain and Melville are counted among the world's greatest novelists. That uncorrupted texts of the works of such men do not exist is a diminution of their stature and an impoverishment of the American cultural and literary heritage. Their works are monuments; yet the monuments are defaced and eroded. Both staff and Council thought it desirable to support restoration through a program for editions of pure texts. As the 1966 fiscal year progressed, it became clear that there were additional responsibilities in the general area of support for publication, and the Endowment's intentions, though not its funds, were expanded. Athough it has not been possible to fund direct support of publication in the programs for 1966 and 1967, planning is underway to expand the program to support a broader range of needs in subsequent years.

The third program established to support development and dissemination of knowledge is aimed at permitting American scholars to maximize their effectiveness in the international context. In its initial stages, the program has been restricted to a modest level of support for travel and providing partial support for archaeological excavations.

Many American humanistic scholars of international reputation fail to exercise leadership in international scholarly societies simply because they cannot find funds to attend the meetings. A parallel concern is that many international scholarly societies which would like to have their meetings in the United States fail to do so because their American members can find no funds to cover the expenses of serving as host. The Endowment hopes by a program of support to create circumstances in which American scholars and scholarship shine more brightly in an international context, and in which foreign scholars are able to sample the American scholarly climate and bring their particular contributions to the large body of American scholars who can afford to attend international meetings held in this country. The interplay will enliven both groups.

The other portion of the program, which provides partial support of archaeological excavation, springs from the fact that virtually no Federal funds are available for support of classical and European archaeology; yet these areas are the cradles of American civilization. The age of the wealthy private patron is passing. If we have no respect for the remote past, we shall have no respect for the immediate past—nor shall we learn from it. It has been pointed out that to the present generation of college students, Hitler is as dead as Julius Caesar. And if we are loath to learn about Caesar's civilization, we may fail to understand Hitler's aberrations. There were, of course, practical reasons for the Endowment's entry into support of archaeological research; such research is not only important in itself, but is also important in the training of a new generation of archaeologists, classicists, historians, and art historians. Therefore, it seemed a high priority to begin a program of support, even though only modest funding was possible. In fiscal 1967, *funding will be from the general funds for scholarly research and research aids.*

As the 1967 Congressional appropriation was earmarked for fellowships, educational television, and talking books, the staff and Council decided late in fiscal 1966 to allocate $1,500,000 of the funds appropriated when the agency was established to support the programs of research. $1,100,000 was committed to scholarly research and aids to research (including archaeology); $350,000 was committed to suport of publication, primarily for editions of American authors; and $50,000 was committed to support of scholar's travel. Thus, of the Endowment's effective 1967 budget of $4,500,000, one-third is committed to funding of the development and dissemination of knowledge. Initially, the Endowment set a fall, 1967 deadline for applications for support of research; more recently, this policy has been revised to eliminate the requirement that applicants conform to a deadline. The staff and Council view was that administrative efficiency as well as convenience to the scholarly community suggested handling the programs in a continuum rather than peaking them around necessarily arbitrary deadlines.

The long-term objective of the programs for the development and dissemination of knowledge is to increase dramatically the effectiveness and relevance of humanistic scholarship. In the near future, the basic programs which are already in operation will be expanded. Larger funds for their present purposes will be sought; and new purposes will develop. It may prove desirable to establish programs of support for specific fields in the humanities; the needs of American scholars may require funding of American facilities abroad; the computer's role in humanistic scholarship may need exploration, and after exploration, expansion. These activities, or others, will reflect the Endowment's experience in its present programs, the advice of the academic community, and a commitment by the academic community and the Endowment to create a climate in which research in the humanities is a major national resource, and is recognized as relevant not only to the scholar, but also to the student and the general public.

C. Division of Educational and Special Projects

The programs established to support the improvement of teaching in the humanities are intended to deal with education in its broadest sense—to cover formal and informal instruction at all levels of education, and to include those instruments by which the general public is informed and entertained. The nature of the task is formidable, because the variety of possible programs is immense.

The initial months of staff and Council activity were devoted to exploration of the projected fields of operation, with the particular aim of avoiding duplication of activities already supported by Federal, state, local and private agencies. By fall, the structure of the initial programs was determined; they fall into three areas: programs dealing with structured education, programs dealing with extramural education, and a program designed to study the feasibility of a center or centers in which the entire range of the humanities would be included.

In the area of structured education, the Endowment has established a program for curriculum dissemination, a program for teaching internships, and a program to support institutional cooperation. In each program the Endowment seeks to play an innovative, supportive, and evaluative role, and each program places a consistent emphasis upon encouraging cooperation between institutions which traditionally operate at different levels and with different conceptions of their scope and purpose.

Significant public and private financial support already exists for the development of curricula affecting the humanities; consequently the Endowment program is designed *primarily to spread knowledge of these* developments and to encourage experimental applications of new and important techniques in the teaching of humanistic subjects. Ideally, the program will bring the secondary school teacher into a continuing relationship with college and university personnel, so that they will together contribute to the development of new and effective methods of teaching humanistic subjects. The typical vehicle for such an operation is the summer institute or workshop, but as the program develops, support will be given not only for summer contact between professors and teachers, but for mechanisms for continual give and take between the innovator and the practitioner, which also allow for the geographical distribution of successful innovations.

In general, universities tend to excel in research, while colleges tend to excel in teaching. Consequently, a teaching internship program was established which uses the college environment as a training ground for potential university instructors. A small number of colleges will design experimental courses in which a committed younger university teacher can participate for one or two years under the guidance of a master teacher. It is expected that the resident teacher will return to a university department with an increased capacity for imparting his knowledge of humanistic subjects to undergraduate students. An evaluation of this program after its first year of operation is planned for the summer of 1968. If successful, this general program would then be made available to a significantly larger number of colleges and universities.

The program for institutional cooperation is planned to encourage colleges and universities in the same vicinity to take mutual advantage of their respective facilities. In this manner, research interests of college faculty would be kept alive and a cross-fertilization of teaching ideas could take place. The Endowment will make a few small grants to groups of colleges and universities who have experience in joint planning. Exchanges of faculties and students, reciprocal use of libraries, joint colloquia and departmental seminars, joint planning, research, teaching and similar activities will be encouraged as a means to more effective teaching in the humanities.

The Endowment's programs in extramural education deal with television, talking books, the press, and museums and historical societies. The aim is to improve qualitatively those media which customarily bring the subject matter of the humanities into direct contact with the general public, and to deepen the level at which contact between the public and the media takes place.

In recognition of the increasingly important role played by television in education, Congress appropriated $100,000 to the Endowment in 1967 for "the study of educational television and radio." With this mandate, the staff and Council have focused on educational television and have prepared a program encouraging educational broadcasters to produce video-taped models of what may be considered presentations of exceptional quality dealing with humanistic subjects. With model presentations in hand, the Endowment might expand the program in subsequent years. Eventually it may provide support not only in the area of educational television, broadcast over public channels, but also in the area of commercial television, classroom use of video tapes, and instructional films.

Congress also appropriated for the 1967 fiscal year $100,000 for the development of talking books based on humanistic subjects. New legislation enabling the Library of Congress to provide talking books for handicapped persons other than blind, will make it unnecessary for the Endowment to continue the program past this year. The Endowment has designed a one-year program *aimed at encouraging a wider range in the* selection of talking books, and a dissemination of the product to handicapped individuals in institutions not previously covered by similar services. The program includes an emphasis on dissemination and evaluation.

In the field of journalism, the Endowment has devised a pilot program aimed at involving journalistic critics in a deeper appreciation of the humanistic environment and history. As the program develops in subsequent years, its aim will be to improve the quality of critics, thereby providing the public with a more stimulating and informed basis for reacting to activities in literature, the performing arts, scholarship, and education under the purview of journalistic critics.

Recognizing the museums and historical societies of the nation as a major untapped source of humanistic understanding, the Endowment has designed programs aimed at responding to the most critical need in the museum world: the upgrading of the competence of curators and professional staff. The staff and Council agreed to support three categories of activity. Funds were earmarked for existing cooperative programs between universities and museums which were seeking to bring new and better trained individuals into the museum world. Other funds were designated for an internship program which would bring full-time curators from smaller museums into the environment of a larger teaching museum where they could, for a designated interval, deepen their subject matter knowledge and improve the skills necessary to impart this knowledge effectively through collections and exhibits. In order to encourage better communication between individuals presently involved in museum work, the Endownment also established a category of grants which would bring together historical society and museum personnel in a series of institutes and seminars.

The final program presently funded under the objective of improvement of humanistic education is support of a study to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing a center or centers in which outstanding or promising people from the whole range of the humanities and the arts are included. In such a setting, the relationship between the various fields could be explored, and the interplay of disciplines heightened. The center would be an instrument of education by its mere existence. The hope is that such a center would be a place where the relevance of the humanities to public and private life would be displayed both in the interests of its members and in the dissemination of their teaching and scholarship. If a reasonable plan for such a center or centers can be devised, its support may become a major activity of the Endowment in future years.

As in the programs for support of scholarly research and publication, the Endowment initially set a fall, 1967 deadline for applications for support under the programs for improvement of humanistic education. This has subsequently been revised for the same reasons which led to the elimination of the deadlines in the scholarly research and publication programs. The total fiscal 1967 budget for the programs under the objective of improvement of humanistic education is approximately $800,000. Of this, $200,000 was appropriated by Congress for educational television and talking books in fiscal 1967, while approximately $600,000 was allocated by the staff and the Council from the appropriations granted when the agency was established. This is a small portion of the Endowment's total budget of $4,500,000 for 1967; it reflects the Endowment's desire to spend a small amount well in an exceedingly complex area where Federal and other public agencies, as well as private agencies, have large and various programs. It also reflects the staff and the *Council view that experience is the best* guide to expanded programs. However, the Endowment expects to develop that experience quickly—indeed, it began the process in the period covered by this report—and in future years very major increases in funding will be required merely to operate the present programs at an effective level.

At the conclusion of its initial planning of programs, the Endowment saw no need or benefit in drawing a firm line circumscribing future activities in the area of improvement of teaching. Preparations for activity in a number of additional areas are underway, albeit their exact definition cannot be attempted until additional experience has been accumulated and additional funding concretely anticipated. With the general aim of accepting good ideas, wherever they can be found, that will promote the public recognition of the meaning and importance of the humanities, the Endowment is exploring the possibility of programs dealing with the needs of culturally deprived students, interdisciplinary innovation in the humanities, support of junior college activities, the infusion of humanistic content into vocational, professional and adult education, and the development of experimental approaches to particular segments of the population.

When the legislative mandate is to "foster public understanding and appreciation of the humanities," and when the importance of such understanding and appreciation is so great, any neat attempt to draw a line and say the job is done would not only be craven, but criminal. For what is at stake is the attitude of two whole American generations, one of which presently faces national and international complexities which cry out for a broadly humane view, the other, and younger, of which will have to face such problems soon.

IV. THE FUTURE

A Federal agency charged with support of the humanities must have as a primary concern the state of its constituency. The state of the humanities is difficult to read at present. On the one hand, there is more activity and innovation than in any past period in this country; on the other hand, there is considerable discontent with some of the paths which humanists are traveling. There are more teachers of the humanities than ever before (well over 50,000 in the colleges and universities, and growing at the lower levels at the rate of 1,000 new Ph.D.'s a year), but there are increasing doubts as to the quality of their training, and some concern about the direction of their interests. It is said that they are monolithically trained for research, and that such training is not appropriate for many of our college teachers. It is further argued that their training predisposes them to concentrate on research rather than on teaching. The claim is that more teachers are teaching less. Yet counter claims are made that the average mature humanistic scholar is not as productive in research as the average university scientist, and that unless the imbalance between humanistic research and scientific research can be righted, the humanities will decline as vital subjects. Recent Government reports have stressed the massive Federal funds available for scientific research, and the meager amount (less than 0.5% of all Federal funds for support of research in 1965) for the humanities.

There are two contrasting solutions to this dilemma. One solution is to provide funding for programs that will draw humanists away from research and into teaching. Such a solution would be disastrous. If the humanities are relevant to life (they are), our knowledge of them must grow both in extent and sophistication; this means support of research. The other solution is to provide funding for programs that make humanistic research more effective, by developing the individual humanist, by helping humanists to work cooperatively on major research projects, and by encouraging the humanist to emphasize the relevance of his research to the nature of life. Such a solution is incomplete. It ignores the necessary dissemination of his knowledge, whether orally in a classroom, or through works aimed at the general public. However serious the plight of the humanities in the colleges and universities, it is far more serious in the schools and in the public at large. Indeed, it can be said that the one place where the humanities are thriving is the colleges and universities, and that the relative lack of efforts to improve them in the schools and in the broader public context reflects the fact that humanistic excellence has concentrated on the campus. The contrast here with the state of the sciences is instructive. The general public appreciation of science has never been as high as it is today. The science programs of the secondary schools have never been so imaginative, so effective, and so sophisticated as they are today. Since the Second World War, there has been a revolution in the teaching of science at all levels. No such phenomenon can be observed in the humanities.

The Endowment intends to develop programs aimed at improving qualitatively the teaching of the humanities in the schools, and aimed at achieving the same effect on those instruments of the humanities useful in reaching the general public—television, films, the newspapers, the museums and historical societies. Support of basic research in the humanities is the keystone around which such efforts must be built in order to achieve a lasting effect. It serves no purpose to instill a high school student with a driving interest in history, then send him into a college where his history professor has not been able to sustain his own interests. It serves no purpose to create public interest in the humanities, if those who must serve that interest are so poorly trained that they quench what great effort has ignited.

In the next several years, one may hope that new approaches to teaching and research at all levels of the humanities will create the possibility of a genuine breakthrough. It is also entirely likely that increasing numbers of students, competition for funds, and the absence of a focused national effort to up-grade the humanities will cause such an opportunity to be missed. The Endowment expects to encourage as many promising avenues of qualitative improvement at all levels and in all fields as its funds permit. It hopes to serve as a leaven to draw attention to the needs and the satisfactions of the humanities. But it is well aware that the break-throughs must come in the final analysis from the scholars and citizens who labor to understand what the humanities can teach.

APPENDIX A—MEMBERS OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE HUMANITIES

Henry Allen Moe, *Interim Chairman*, November 18, 1965–June 30, 1966.[2]

Barnaby C. Keeney, *Chairman*, July 1, 1966 to present.

Terms expiring in 1968

Gustave O. Arlt, *President*, Council of Graduate Schools of the United States, Washington, D.C.

Robert Goheen, *President*, Princeton University.

Emil W. Haury, *Director*, Arizona State Museum; *Professor and Head*, Department of Anthropology, University of Arizona.

Adelaide Hill, *Research Associate, African Studies Program; Assistant Professor of Sociology*, Boston University.

John W. Letson, *Superintendent of Public Schools*, Atlanta, Georgia.

Robert M. Lumiansky, *Professor of English*, University of Pennsylvania.

G. William Miller, *President*, Textron, Inc., Providence, Rhode Island.

John Courtney Murray, S.J., *Professor of Dogmatic and Sacred Theology, Woodstock* College, Woodstock, Maryland.

Meredith Willson, *Music Director, Conductor and Composer*, Los Angeles, California.

Terms expiring in 1970

Germaine Bree, Institute for Research in the Humanities, University of Wisconsin.

John Ehle, *Writer*, Winston-Salem, North Carolina.

Emily Genauer, *Art Critic*, New York Herald Tribune.

Emmette S. Bedford, *Professor of Government*, University of Texas.

Barnaby C. Keeney,[2] *President*, Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island.

David Mason, *Professor of Law*, University of Montana.

James Cuff O'Brien, *Director*, Committee on Older and Retired Workers, United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D.C.

Ieoh Ming Pei, *Architect*, I. M. Pei & Associates, New York, New York.

Robert Spike,[3] *Professor*, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois.

Terms expiring in 1972

Edmund Ball, *Chairman of the Board*, Ball Brothers Company, Muncie, Indiana.

Kenneth Clark, *Professor of Psychology*, City College of New York.

Gerald F. Else, *Chairman*, Department of Classics, University of Michigan.

Robert Bower, *Director*, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Paul Horgan, *Director*, Center for Advanced Studies, Wesleyan University.

A. W. Levi, *Professor of Philosophy*, Washington University.

Sola Mentschikoff, *Professor of Law*, University of Chicago.

Charles E. Odegaard, *President*, University of Washington.

APPENDIX B—MEMBERS OF THE STAFF OF THE NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES[4]

Chairman: Henry Allen Moe,[5] Barnaby C. Keeney.

Deputy Chairman: Philip S. Broughton.[6]
Wallace B. Edgerton.

Special Assistant to the Chairman: John B. Gardner.

Office of Planning and Analysis: Gladys Keith Hardy, Director; John H. Barcroft, Assistant to the Director.

Secretary, National Council on the Humanities: Anne von der Lieth.

Division of Fellowships and Stipends: James, H. Blessing, Director.

Division of Research and Publication: J. Saunders Redding, Director.

Division of Educational and Special Projects: Robert H. Walker, Director; Stanley S. Ghosh, Program Officer; Joan W. Rafter, Program Analyst.

Staff Members of the National Endowment for the Humanities and the National Endowment for the Arts:

Charles B. Ruttenberg, General Counsel; Robert W. Cox, Director, Office of Administration; Richard H. Hedrich, Director, Office of Grants; Sureva Seligson, Director, Office of Research.

APPENDIX C

Financial report, National Endowment for the Humanities

PART I—FISCAL YEAR 1966[7]

Receipts: Appropriated for fiscal year 1966	$2,500,000
Obligations: Grants made in fiscal year 1966	[8] $39,000
Unobligated balance carried forward	2,461,000

PART II—FISCAL YEAR 1967 (PROGRAM ESTIMATES)[9]

Receipts:	
Appropriated for fiscal year 1967	$2,000,000
Unobligated balance from fiscal year 1966	2,461,000
Total availability	4,461,000

---

[2] On July 1, 1966, Barnaby C. Keeney became Chairman of the Council; and Henry Allen Moe, who served as interim chairman, was appointed by President Johnson to Mr. Keeney's seat on the Council.

[3] Deceased.

[4] Staff as of the date of this report, rather than as at the end of fiscal 1966.

[5] Dr. Moe served until July 1, 1966; Mr Keeney is the present incumbent.

[6] Mr. Broughton served until July 1, 1966; Mr. Edgerton is the present incumbent.

[7] In fiscal year 1966, the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities was appropriated $5,700,000 for the expenses necessary to carry out the functions under Public Law 89–209. Of this amount, $2,500,000 was made available to the National Endowment for the Humanities for carrying out section 7(c) of the Act.

In fiscal year 1966, the funds expended for purposes of administering programs of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities totaled $597,028.

OPERATING COSTS

National Endowment for the Humanities (expenditures from December 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966)	$64,030
National Endowment for the Arts (expenditures from July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966, including obligations by the National Council on the Arts prior to the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, September 29, 1965)	335,277
Shared expenditures of the two Endowments	197,721
Total operating costs of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities	$597,028

[8] The National Council on the Humanities advised approval of eight projects totalling approximately $450,000 at its June, 1966 meeting; however, only two specific grants were negotiated and funded (for a total of $39,000) in fiscal 1966.

[9] At the end of the 1966 fiscal year, the bulk of appropriated funds remained intact (see Foreword). To this was added the Congressional appropriation for fiscal 1967, which comprised $1,800,000 for fellowships, $100,000 for a study of educational television, and $100,000 for a talking books program. The Endowment therefore decided to pool the funds granted by the legislation establishing the agency with the funds appropriated for 1967, giving it a program budget of $4,461,000 for fiscal 1967. This schedule shows the Endowment's estimates of its program expenditures for the current fiscal year.

Financial report, National Endowment for the Humanities—Continued

PART II—FISCAL YEAR 1967 (PROGRAM ESTIMATES) [a]—Continued

Allocations of program funds:	
Development of individuals:	
Postdoctoral fellowships	750,000
Summer stipends	300,000
Senior fellowships	750,000
Additional fellowship funds	200,000
Subtotal	2,000,000
Development and dissemination of knowledge:	
Scholarly research	1,086,000
Scholarly travel	25,000
Publication	350,000
Subtotal	1,461,000
Improvement of teaching and public understanding:	
Structured education	224,000
Extramural education	508,000
Center study	50,000
Subtotal	782,000
Development and planning:	
Subtotal	218,000
Total program allocations fiscal year 1967	4,461,000

Mr. YARBOROUGH. These are not frills, Mr. President. This money has been used for fellowships in history, social science, literature, philosophy, music, classical studies, linguistics, and art, for instructural television, for a talking books pilot project for the blind, for a study program to bring young arts critics to New York for a year of study, for programs for State historians and historical agencies, for an international writing program for research projects, for support of publications, for a program to produce "pure" texts of major American authors, for archeological excavations, for a project to upgrade the competence of museum curators, and for many other worthwhile projects.

We are faced with a blind, unreasoning slap at a program which, in its first year of existence, has performed a most worthwhile service to the American people. A little group now wants to make drastic slashes in this important program because they object to a few grants which amount to only a tiny fraction of the total amount of grants made by the agency. What is more, although they may protest with all the demagogic indignation they can muster, the grants in question seem to have been made in complete concurrence with congressional intent.

Of course, I am not prepared to defend the wisdom of every grant which was made. But neither do I believe that I have the knowledge, the wisdom, or the right to set myself up as the sole arbiter of what is suitable for a grant. I would urge this attitude on others. The fact some things do not strike us as fully justified may indicate a defect in our wisdom rather than justification for attacking those who approve of the grant.

There is another and perhaps a larger issue at stake. That is the question of whether we are a sufficiently mature nation to undertake a program of this kind. I hope that the Senate will reaffirm this Nation's commitment to support for arts and humanities, by appropriating the full amount requested by the National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities.

UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON LAW SCHOOL CELEBRATES 20TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on April 13, the University of Houston Law School held its 20th annual Spring Honors Banquet, commemorating the 20th year of its founding. During these 20 years of its existence, it has grown into a major law school, and stands today as one of the fine law schools of that area.

It was my privilege, as a member of the State of Texas Board of Law Examiners in 1947, when this law school was founded, to pass upon its credentials, and to certify its students for examinations to take the State bar. So I have more than average pride in seeing the success of this school.

The 500 students at the University of Houston School of Law have attended 91 different colleges, and give to the student body of the law school a large and varied background. I ask unanimous consent that a table showing the different schools which were attended by the University of Houston law students be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Colleges represented by students of University of Houston College of Law, 1966–67

Abilene Christian College	1
Alvin Junior College	1
Arlington State University*	8
Austin College	1
Baylor University*	7
Bradley University*	1
Brevard Engineering College	1
Brigham Young University*	1
Contenary College	1
Cornell University	1
Duke University	1
Emory University	1
East Texas State University	1
Georgia Institute of Technology	1
H. Sophie Newcomb Memorial College	1
Harvard University	1
Howard Payne College*	2
Indiana University	1
Iowa State University*	1
Lamar State College of Technology*	16
Louisiana Polytechnic Institute*	1
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College	5
Lubbock Christian College*	1
Marquette University*	1
Midwestern University	1
Millsaps College	1
New York City Community College	1
North Texas State University*	15
Northwestern State College	1
Northwestern University*	2
Oklahoma Baptist University	1
Oklahoma State University	1
Omaha Baptist College	1
Pan American College	1
Prairie View Agricultural and Mechanical College*	1
Rice University*	11
Roosevelt University	1
Rutgers University*	1
Sam Houston State Teachers College*	14
Spring Hill College	1
Southeastern Oklahoma State College	1
Southeastern Louisiana College	1
Southern Methodist University*	7
St. Edward's University*	3
St. Louis University*	2
St. Thomas University*	6
Stanford University	1
Stephen F. Austin State College*	6
Sul Ross State College	1
Tarleton State College*	2
Texas A. & M. University *	26
Texas Christian University*	6
Texas College of Arts and Industries*	3
Texas Technological College*	12
Texas Wesleyan College*	2
Texas Western College*	7
Texas Woman's University	1
Trinity University*	2
Tulane University	4
United States Coast Guard Academy	1
University of Alabama*	2
University of Arkansas*	3
University of Cairo	1
University of Chicago	1
University of Corpus Christi*	2
University of Cincinnati*	1
University of Florida	1
University of Houston*	115
University of Kansas*	2
University of Maryland	2
University of Massachusetts	1
University of Michigan*	1
University of Notre Dame	3
University of Oklahoma	3
University of the South	1
University of Southern Mississippi	1
University of Southwestern Louisiana*	2
University of Texas*	67
University of Tulsa	2
University of Virginia	1
University of Wisconsin*	1
University of Washington	1
Vanderbilt University*	1
Villanova University	1
Virginia Military Institute*	1
Wake Forest College*	1
Washburn University	1
Wellesley College	1
West Texas State University*	5
West Virginia University*	1
University of Missouri*	1

*Represented by new students.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I salute the Houston College of Law on this important milestone in its growth and congratulate Dean John Neibel and the members of the law school faculty on a job well done.

I was afforded the great privilege of delivering an address at the banquet. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from my remarks "Crime in the Streets: What of the Victim?" and a program from the banquet be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CRIME IN THE STREETS: WHAT OF THE VICTIM?

(Excerpts of remarks by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH at the Spring Banquet of the University of Houston College of Law, Rice Hotel, Houston, Tex., Apr. 13, 1967)

Mr. President, Members of the Faculty, Distinguished Guests, Members of the Student Body. It is indeed an honor to have been asked to address this Twentieth Annual Banquet of the University of Houston College of Law. Having been a member of the State Board of Law Examiners for four years (1947–51), I worked often with Dean White and your then young law school. Even in those early years of your law school, you had a high standard of excellence and achievement. I read your papers for four years, so I am in a position to know.

My law school experience having included some work as a quiz-master at the University of Texas Law School, and my law experience having included four years as Assistant Attorney General of Texas and five years as a District Judge, and a Directorship of the National Association of Law Examiners, a brief period as a lecturer in land law at the University of Texas Law School, I have never lost my interest in law school work. Great opportunities came to me in life because of my association with a law school. I took advantage of some of them.

Tonight, I want to discuss briefly with you a subject in legislation, not yet to the stage of litigation or adjudication.

There are, I am sure, many legislative proposals now pending before the 90th Congress which are of significant interest to you as lawyers, and students of the law, dealing with crime, taxes, property rights, civil rights, and transportation.

A legislative area in which I am greatly interested is that of compensation for victims of criminal violence, as proposed in my bill S. 646 now pending before the Congress.

The importance of this bill cannot be read alone in the dollars and cents which it would provide to the victims of crimes of violence—important as this goal is. This bill records for the American people a milestone in the quest for a humane and socially responsible treatment of innocent people brutalized by acts of violence. With this bill, we can demonstrate that a wealthy nation which can spend millions to bring to justice the perpetrators of crime is not indifferent to the plight of their victims.

The innocent victim of crimes of violence has until recently been the forgotten person of our society. The danger today is that as we devote greater attention to crime detection and prevention and the rehabilitation of the criminal, the enormity of our neglect of the victims of criminal violence will be magnified.

In recent years compensation programs have been adopted by the countries of New Zealand and Great Britain, and in this country by the States of California and New York. Several other States and the District of Columbia are reported as having taken some action looking to the adoption of compensation programs. New York City is reported as having adopted, as of December 29, 1965 a so-called "Good Samaritan Law" under which payments may be made by the city to persons injured or killed in the prevention of crimes.

S. 646, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1967, which I introduced on January 25, 1967 is now pending before the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Joining me as sponsors of this proposal are Senators Bartlett, Clark, Dodd, Gruening, Hart, Inouye, Magnuson, and Mondale and Bible.

I first introduced this compensation proposal on June 17, 1965 as S. 2155 of the 89th Congress. This was after the adoption of the New Zealand plan which became effective on January 1, 1964, and the British plan which came into force on August 1, 1964. It was, however, before the adoption of the California plan in 1965, and the New York plan in 1966. I like to think that possibly my bill and the discussion of the subject generally may have made some contributions to the favorable consideration of the proposals adopted by these two most populous states in the Union.

I have made several refinements in my present proposal as compared with the bill as first introduced. These changes appeared desirable after study and consideration extending over a two-year period, during which I circulated the bill to all the law schools of the country. Many law school publications commented on it. I invite your continuing advice and comments on it.

S. 646 the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act of 1967 would compensate the victims of crimes of violence for injuries to the person. It does not cover loss of property. It is applicable only to cases in which the injured person is the innocent victim of a crime and injury. It is applicable only to the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States, including the District of Columbia, American ships on the high seas and international waters, and other areas under the exclusive or concurrent jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

The bill would create a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which would be a three-man tribunal appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for 8-year staggered terms. The chairman, who would be a member of the bar of a Federal court or of the highest court of a State for at least eight years, would be designated by the President.

The principal office of the Commission would be in or near the District of Columbia, but Commission powers could be exercised by an authorized representative in any place.

Injury or death resulting from eighteen offenses which possibly may be grouped under the headings of homicide, assaults, and sexual offenses of violence, occurring in areas where the Federal Government exercises general police power would be compensable.

It is the Commission's function and duty to examine the evidence presented to it both to determine what level of compensation should be granted and whether, in fact, the person making the claim is truly an innocent victim.

The Commission may order the payment of compensation to three categories of persons: (1) to or on behalf of the injured person; or (2) in the case of the personal injury of the victim, where the compensation is for pecuniary loss suffered or expenses incurred by any person responsible for the maintenance of the victim, to that person; or (3) in the case of the death of the victim, to or for the benefit of the dependents or closest relation of the deceased victim, or any one or more of such dependents.

The absence of a criminal intent is not an essential factor for determining entitlement to compensation. A person shall be deemed to have intended an act or omission notwithstanding that by reasons of age, insanity, drunkenness, or otherwise he was legally incapable of forming a criminal intent. The Commission may, however, consider any circumstance it determines relevant, including the behavior of the victim which contributes directly or indirectly to his injury or death. unless such injury or death resulted from the victim's lawful attempt to prevent the commission of a crime or to apprehend an offender. The Commission must find that the act or omission complained of did occur, and that injury or death resulted therefrom.

The authority of the Commission to award compensation dependent on the prosecution or conviction of the accused for the offense giving rise to the injury. The Commission may, however, upon application of the Attorney General or the person or persons alleged to have caused the injury or death suspend proceedings until such application is withdrawn or until a prosecution for an offense arising out of such act or omission is no longer pending or imminent.

The payment of compensation may be ordered for: (1) expenses actually and reasonably incurred as a result of the injury or death of the victim; (2) loss of earning power; (c) pecuniary loss to the dependents of the deceased victim; (d) pain and suffering of the victim; and (e) other pecuniary loss resulting from the personal injury or death of the victim which the Commission determines to be reasonable.

Application for compensation must be made within two years of injury or death and compensation shall not be awarded in an amount in excess of $25,000.

Compensation will not be awarded in two situations: (1) if the victim was at the time of the injury or death living with the offender as his wife or her husband, or (2) in situations when the Commission, at its discretion, feels unjust enrichment to or on behalf of the offender would result.

Any order for the payment of compensation may be made on such terms as the Commission deems appropriate, and any payments received by the victim from the offender shall be deducted from any payments awarded by the Commission.

The Commission may institute an action against a person convicted of an offense giving rise to an award for compensation for recovery of the whole or any part of such compensation.

In the matter of the attorney's fees, the Commission may allow whatever is reasonable under the circumstances.

Orders and decisions of the Commission are reviewable on appeal but no trial *de novo* of the facts determined by the Commission shall be allowed.

Injury is defined to include actual bodily harm, pregnancy, and mental or nervous shock.

The term "victim" means the direct and immediate victim of the offense—a person who is injured or killed by an act or omission of any other person which is within the description of any of the offenses specified in the bill.

The heart of the proposal is found in section 301 which deals with the award of payments of compensation. Where any person is injured or killed by any act or omission of any other person which is within the description of offenses of the bill, the Commission may make an order for the payment of compensation to or for the benefit of the injured person or to any person responsible for the victim's maintenance. In the case of the death of the victim, the payments are to be to or for the benefit of his dependents or closest relations. The Commission has wide discretion in making awards, subject of course to the $25,000 limitation.

The Commission's right to consider behaviour of the victim which contributed directly or indirectly to his injury or death should provide insurance against unmeritorious claims.

It is not intended that any victim should receive double benefits or be better off by reason of the crime than he would otherwise have been, and therefore, in assessing the compensation to be paid, the Commission is required to deduct any payment received by the victim or by any of his dependents from the offender or from any person on behalf of the offender, or from the United States (except those received under this bill), a State or any of its subdivisions, for personal injury or death compensable under this legislation.

In the past year or so, much has been said about the rights of offenders and alleged offenders, and the Supreme Court has handed down a number of extremely important opinions on the subject of due process of criminal law. We must talk about and understand these decisions. But we must not let that discussion obscure an equally important subject which has been greatly neglected—the status of the victim of the crime. The trend of crime statistics in the United States is ever upwards. Year after year the official graph for crime violence inches higher. Collectively, the victims of these crimes and their survivors constitute the largest forgotten minority in the United States. Their attackers, if apprehended, are generally defended by lawyers, examined by psychiatrists, and treated by physicians—all at the expense of the State. If sent to prison they are fed and educated out of the public treasury. As for the victim, his family and those dependent upon him for support, society generally has shown no similar concern. The history of crime and punishment reveals a steadily increasing concern with the treatment of criminals and an almost total lack of attention to the situation of the victim.

My proposal would not, of course, extend to all cases of criminal violence. By its terms it is applicable only to those areas of the country where the Federal Government exercises general police power. I hope that this legislation would encourage States additional to California and New York to adopt similar compensation plans. Of course, I would hope that Texas would be one such state providing compensation for this neglected group, the victim of crime.

Law schools have been the traditional greenhouses that bring to flower our finest developments of law toward more adequate justice for the people. I urge you as you face your existing second 20 years to join in this expansion of legal remedies to the forgotten class of innocent victims of crime.

The Bar Association of the University of Houston College of Law, 20th Annual Spring Honors Banquet, April 13, 1967

PROGRAM

Dinner.

Welcome and Acknowledgments: John F. Nichols, President, University of Houston Bar Association.

Toastmaster: Arthur Terrell, President, Houston Bar Association.

Introduction of Honored Guests: Arthur Terrell.

Presentation of Special Awards to Outstanding Students: John B. Neibel, Dean, University of Houston College of Law.

1. Outstanding Garwood Award.
2. Malcolm McDermott Award.

Howard Pollock Award: Hon. Howard W. Pollock, United States Congressman from Alaska.

Introduction of the Principal Speaker: Arthur Terrell.

Principal Address: Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough, Senior United States Senator from Texas.

Conclusion.

STUDENT BAR ASSOCIATION OFFICERS, 1966–67

President: John F. Nichols.
Vice President: D. Neel Richardson.
Secretary: Homer Price.
Parliamentarian: James Parsons.
Treasurer: Richard Fielder.
Historian: James McRae.
Spring Banquet Co-Chairmen: John T. Schneider, Larry Wynn Bass.

Class Presidents

Senior Day: Joe Glen Thompson.
Senior Night: Steve Peterson.
Midlaw Day: Bill Schaffer.
Midlaw Night: Bob Donaho.
Freshman Day: George Karem.
Freshman Night: Jim McKibben.
Law Senator: John Maurice O'Quinn.

HOUSTON LAW REVIEW OFFICERS, SUMMER-FALL 1966

Editor-in-Chief: John Maurice O'Quinn.
Managing Editor: Alvin Louis Zimmerman.
Articles Editor: Robert Melburn Hopson, Ann Adams.
Comment Editor: Stanley L. Blend.
Note Editor: Tom Miller.
Review Editor: Larry Wynn Bass.

COLLEGE OF LAW FACULTY

Burton C. Agata, Associate Professor of Law, A.B., J.D., Michigan; LL.M., New York.

Newell H. Blakely, Professor of Law, B.A., Ouachita Baptist College; Ph.M., Wisconsin; LL.B., Texas; LL.M., Michigan.

Robert H. Bowmar, Assistant Professor of Law, A.B., M.A., Boston U.; J.D., Northwestern.

Raymond L. Britton, Associate Professor of Law, B.A., Pennsylvania State; LL.B., Southern Methodist; LL.M., Harvard.

James S. Covington, Jr., Assistant Professor of Law, B.B.A., LL.B., Texas.

John L. Cox., Jr., Associate Professor of Law, B.S., LL.B., Houston.

Alan D. Cullison, Assistant Professor of Law, B.S., Chicago; J.D., Iowa; LL.M., Yale.

Richard W. Ewing, Assistant Professor of Law, B.A., Texas A&M; LL.B., Houston.

Joseph E. Hensley, Assistant Professor of Law, and Assistant Dean, College of Law, A.B., LL.B., Kansas.

John Mixon, Professor of Law, B.B.A., Stephen F. Austin State College; LL.B., Houston; LL.M., Yale.

John B. Neibel, Professor of Law and Dean, College of Law, B.A., LL.B., Houston; LL.M., Michigan.

Thomas C. Newhouse, Assistant Professor of Law, B.A., Notre Dame; LL.B., Univ. of Tulsa; LL.M., N.Y.U.

Dwight A. Olds, M.D. Anderson Professor of Law, A.B., LL.B., Kansas; LL.M., Michigan.

Daniel L. Rotenberg, Associate Professor of Law, A.B., LL.B., Indiana.

A. A. White, Law Alumni Professor of Law, B.S., North Texas State; LL.B., Southern Methodist.

James H. Wright, Associate Professor of Law, B.S., LL.B., Houston; LL.M., Michigan.

Larry W. Bass, Lecturer in Law, B.S., Texas Tech. University.

Stanley L. Blend, Lecturer in Law, B.A., Tulane University.

Thomas J. Miller, Lecturer in Law, B.S., Univ. of Houston.

John M. O'Quinn, Lecturer in Law, B.S., University of Houston.

Alvin L. Zimmerman, Lecturer in Law, B.S., University of Houston.

WEST GERMAN GOVERNMENT'S PART IN PROPOSED STEEL PLANT IN COMMUNIST CHINA

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, according to a dispatch to the New York Times from Bonn, the West German Government is deeply concerned over the prospect of the withdrawal of American strike aircraft from Europe.

In a moment, Mr. President, I will ask unanimous consent that the text of this article be published.

Before doing so, however, I would like to make this comment:

More than a year ago the West German Government—by official action—guaranteed the financing of a steel plant for Communist China. As a result of a resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States, this action was stayed. But now talk has been renewed.

Communist China—as Germany knows and as we know—is supplying weapons to the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, which armaments are being used against Americans in South Vietnam.

Yet the West German Government, by official action—I am not speaking about individual businessmen, but I am speaking about the official action of the West German Government—has guaranteed the financing of a steel plant in Communist China.

At the same time, the American people, whose sons are fighting in Vietnam, also have 225,000 sons in Europe to protect the West Germans from communism.

The Germans are upset because there is talk of reducing this European force.

In determining what American aircraft to leave in West Germany, the executive branch of our Government would do well to demand the cancellation of the West German Government's part in the proposed steel deal with Communist China.

By a recorded vote of 56 to 33 the U.S. Senate on August 1, 1966, said that this action of the West German Government "is a grave blow to the common defense of the free world and to the safety of American and allied troops in Vietnam."

The U.S. Senate has done its part; now it is up to the executive branch.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the text of the New York Times article datelined Bonn, April 22.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Bonn Fears United States Will Include Planes in Reduction of Forces

(By William Beecher)

BONN, April 22.—The West German Government is upset over the prospect of the withdrawal of a significant number of American strike aircraft in addition to ground forces.

The Bonn Government first heard of the possible aircraft redeployment last weekend during discussions here with American representatives.

West German officials say that matter is so important that Chancellor Kurt Georg Kiesinger may bring it up when President Johnson comes here next week for Konrad Adenauer's funeral.

Bonn sources said that a two-hour conference is tentatively planned between the two heads of state Wednesday morning. Among other things that are expected to come up: East-West relations, the state of the Atlantic Alliance and the treaty to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, the sources added.

Bonn officials say that the proposed United States Air Force redeployment, which caught them completely by surprise, worries them even more than troop reductions because of the nuclear capability of the fighter-bombers.

HALVING OF POWER REPORTED

"Our military tell us you want to reduce your tactical air power in Germany by one half, more or less, and that really worries us," a senior official said.

German and American sources declined to cite the specific number of aircraft involved in the United States proposal. Some sources fixed the number at 144 planes more.

The total number of American fighter-bombers based in West Germany is classified.

German officials say that they are unhappy about the Air Force cutback because it may diminish the deterrent power of the nuclear strike forces in Western Europe and because they fear it may be a step toward the denuclearization of Germany and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

On the other hand, American planners have long worried about the vulnerability of aircraft on crowded European bases during the early, nonnuclear stages of a possible war. The situation was significantly worsened when France withdrew permission for the use of airbases on its territory.

By removing some aircraft to fields in the United States, and running the planes across the Atlantic often on training exercises, these planners have argued, the aircraft obviously would not be affected by a surprise attack in Europe and could be flown to the battle area quickly. Small forward elements would remain in western Europe.

This procedure, known as dual basing, is currently in effect for certain squadrons assigned to bases in both the United States and Great Britain.

"Your Government says the aircraft would be less vulnerable in the United States and that, if war comes, they can fly back here in a few days or several days" one German official said. "That might be fine in terms of fighting the war. But our point of view is different. We want to deter war, not fight it. How much of Germany will be overrun while you're deciding when to send the planes back here?"

Another official, asked why he was concerned about denuclearization when there are more than 7,000 tactical nuclear warheads in Western Europe, put it this way:

He said the German Government believes a debate is underway in the United States over how many nuclear targets in Europe ought to be covered by Strategic Air Command missiles and bombers instead of tactical bombers and missiles in Western Europe.

For the last year and a half, he said, Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara has been trying to get the West German Government to develop a nonnuclear capability for its F–104G fighter-bombers. This has been looked at by some Germans as a step toward denuclearization since, if the four squadrons of planes were committed in the early, nonnuclear phase of the war, many would be shot down and thus would be unavailable for use in the later, nuclear phase of the war.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate that certain of my colleagues have told me of telephone calls and telegrams which they are receiving, indicating that someone is passing out the information that unless the Long amendment is adopted next Tuesday, the investment tax credit will be in jeopardy. One Senator, within the last hour, told me that he had had a call today saying that they needed only one more vote to assure the passage of the Long amendment and the passage of the investment tax credit bill.

I should like to set the record straight. The bill before the Senate contains only two provisions: First, restoration of the investment tax credit; second, repeal of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966. Without amendment, the bill is ready to be passed, and it would pass overwhelmingly and be speeded to the House of Representatives; and, with an expeditious conference, could go to the President to become law before the week ends. But the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana, not the senior Senator from Tennessee, has offered an amendment to that bill. If this amendment should be withdrawn or if this amendment should be defeated, then the bill would be ready for final enactment.

Who, Mr. President, has procrastinated? Who has been dilatory? Not the senior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from Delaware. We have repeatedly asked for votes, asked for passage of the bill. We have said to the Senate that we will accept the results of the vote next Tuesday, that we will not engage in dilatory practices and procrastination. We are prepared to pass the bill and send it to the House of Representatives. Yet, someone is passing out misinformation in order to mislead American businessmen that, somehow or other, it is the senior Senator from Tennessee and the senior Senator from Delaware who are holding up passage of the pending bill.

The situation is quite to the contrary. Only one amendment is pending. Neither the senior Senator from Tennessee nor the senior Senator from Delaware is the author of that amendment. We will have a vote on that one pending amendment at 3 o'clock next Tuesday. This already has been ordered.

I am glad to report that the Senator who told me of this instance within the last hour said that he carefully explained to his constituent that misinformation had been given him, that a rollcall vote has already been ordered for 3 o'clock next Tuesday, and that this issue could be brought to speedy conclusion.

Mr. President, I shall accept the decision of the Senate.

We debated this issue for a long while, and there comes a time in our democratic society when majority will should prevail. I believe that it will prevail next Tuesday, and I surely am prepared to accept it, whether it is as I wish it or not.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. SPONG. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered today, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m., Monday, May 1, 1967.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 1, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 28, 1967:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Carl E. Bagge, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term of 5 years expiring June 22, 1972 (Reappointment.)

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code; date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Abraham, William D.
Adams, Thomas F.
Albright, John S., II
Arbeit, Ferde P.
Archibald, Alexander M., Jr.
Ardis, David G.
Arnold, Hendrick J., III
Ashbrook, Owen O.
Atkinson, Obbie T.
Badell, Patrick C.
Bailey, Gregory P.
Baker, Robert R., Jr.
Ballard, James R.
Bannwart, James L.
Barhaugh, John H.
Barnes, Judson C.
Barnes, Robert P.
Barnes, William H., Jr.
Barnett, Thomas D.
Barnum, Robert J.
Bartlett, John R.
Bauer, Christian A.
Baxter, Dale E.
Beattie, Charles W.
Beatty, Lyle D.
Bebee, Richard C.
Beck, Larry R.
Bell, William J., Jr.
Berzins, John J.
Besbikos, Charles S.
Bettinger, Sterling P., Jr.
Bettner, Ronald A.
Bissett, Kenneth R., Jr.
Blaha, Frank R.
Bliss, George F., III
Bloom, Michael J.
Blum, Ronald E.
Blystone, John B.
Boettcher, Thomas D.
Boisture, Worth W., Jr.
Boose, John A.
Bosiljevac, Michael J.
Boston, Ronald G.
Bostrom, Stuart G.
Bradley, Ronald G.
Brazil, Douglas L.
Brende, Otis A.
Broadway, Terrance M.
Budinger, Fred W., Jr.
Bunnell, Harold T.
Burbank, Deane A.
Burke, Joseph W.
Burman, Steven W.
Burnett, Paull C.
Burns, Danny R.
Burski, Michael L.
Bush, Andrew K.
Calvanelli, Thomas J.
Carleton, Roger E.
Carlson, Roger T.
Carney, John M., Jr.
Carpenter, Adelbert W.
Carroll, Terry M., Jr.
Cason, Robert D.
Cathcart, Richard J.
Caudle, Joseph E.
Cerak, John P.
Cerny, Leonard J., II
Chace, Harvey D.
Chambless, Rubyen M., Jr.
Chorlins, Richard D.
Chuba, Francis C., Jr.
Clements, Charles L.
Cobb, Charles G., II
Cobb, George N.
Cockrell, Gerald L.
Coffey, Roger K.
Cole, George P., Jr.
Coleman, James E.
Colgrove, Roger T.
Connolly, Robert J.
Cook, Douglas F.
Cormany, Gerrit C.
Cormney, Laney K.
Corwin, Gerald W.
Cox, Sherwood C.
Crandall, Daniel L.
Crane, Barry D.
Crawford, Charles S. Jr.
Croft, David R.
Crosby, Warney L., Jr.
Cunningham, Edward E.
Cunningham, Thomas L.
Czonstka, Steven J.
Daines, Alan R.
Damron, Lynn B.
Daniel, Edward L.
Davies, James D., II
Davis, Daniel R.
Davis, John L.
Deboe, David
Delaplane, William K., III
Dellafiora, Thomas E.
Deluca, Brian L.
Denham, Charles A.
Destaffany, Nelson D.
Deturk, Robin A.
Dimmick, Paul H., Jr.
Don, Bruce W.
Donahue, Morgan J.
Donovan, Brian J.
Dougherty, John L., Jr
Dougherty, Llewellyn S.
Dowling, Emmett P., III
Drabant, Robert E.
Draper, Robert A.
Duggan, Cornelius T., Jr.
Duncan, Lloyd F.
Durbin, James E.
Duross, Thomas P.
Dysart, Christopher J.
East, James R.

East, Wilbur W.
Edgerly, Walter G.
Edwards, Jerry W.
Egan, John J., III
Elliott, George D.
Elm, Stephen R.
Englebretson, Robert E., II
Ennis, Edgar W., Jr.
Ermak, Donald L.
Evans, Thomas F.
Fancher, Richard B.
Faris, William L.
Fedel, Gary A.
Fee, Jerry W.
Felker, Richard I.
Fellows, Ray E., Jr.
Femrite, Ralph B.
Ferguson, Dennis E.
Ferguson, Douglas D.
Fink, Donald E.
Finnegan, Patrick W.
Fisher, Arthur R.
Fite, John L., Jr.
Folz, Eddie J.
Fontaine, Peter A.
Forester, Kenneth C.
Fortin, Robert F.
Francisco, Michael C.
Franck, Raymond E., Jr.
Freeman, Bruce M.
Freix, Greogry D.
Frushour, George V., Jr.
Fry, Howard J., Jr.
Fuller, John H., Jr.
Gable, Howard C., Jr.
Gabriel, Lester D.
Geoghegan, William T.
George, James G.
Gerber, William J.
Gibson, Daniel J.
Gibson, George C.
Giles, Michael N.
Gilmore, James R., Jr.
Gilmore, Robert W.
Gnall, John S.
Grandmason, John L.
Green, Gary J.
Greene, Melville L. Jr.
Gresham, Charles B. Jr.
Griesser, Thomas W.
Grosick, Frederick E.
Grow, Robert A.
Guerrina, Frederick B.
Gunter, Edwin D., Jr.
Hager, Hoyt E., III
Hagey, James F.
Hahn, Bernard L.
Halliday, John M.
Hammonds, Veneble L., Jr.
Hanson, Paul E.
Harkey, John B., Jr.
Harp, Thomas P.
Harris, Gregory J.
Hartley, Gerald G.
Hassemer, Donald W.
Hastedt, Douglas J., Jr.
Hawkins, Douglas S.
Hayner, Michael S.
Haynes, Richard W.
Heckert, Donald W.
Heffron, Charles H., Jr
Heflebower, Charles R.
Heiser, Richard L.
Henderson, Hal K.
Hendrickson, Wylie C.
Henry, George D., Jr.
Henry, Paul F.
Hepner, Thomas C.
Hickman, Donald E.
Hicks, Jonathan L.
Hierlmeier, Glen T.
Hill, Dennis H.
Hill, Roger H.
Hoekstra, Dale V.
Hogarty, James P.
Holbrook, Joseph C.
Hollstein, John A.
Holmen, Gary L.
Holohan, Stephen W.
Hoskins, Charles L.
Houser, Conrad B.
Houston, Charles E.
Howerton, Clarence L., Jr.
Howerton, Glenn F., Jr.
Hudson, Hal C.
Hugdahl, Peter O.
Hughes, Richard L.
Hunter, Allen M., II
Hurley, William C., III
Hurt, Jeffrey W.
Icenhour, James O., Jr.
Imler, David A.
Jackson, Don E.
Jackson, Fred S.
Jackson, John E.
James, Samuel L.
Jared, Roy A., II
Jaszczak, Casmier
Jensen, Leslie C.
Johnston, Ronald A.
Jordan, Henry S., Jr.
Kellenberger, James W.
Kelly, Terry J.
Kent, Jesse H., II
Kirwin, Thomas J., III
Knepell, Peter L.
Knobloch, Robert E.
Knox, David K.
Koldyke, Gary L.
Kornemann, William E., II
Kowalchuk, Charles J.
Kozma, William J.
Kramer, Ronald L.
Kreer, James R.
Kronbach, Henry E.
Kruger, William, III
Kruzel, Joseph J., Jr.
Kunciw, Roman S.
Laetz, Curtis J.
Laforgia, Anthony B.
Lamothe, Richard R.
Landers, John S.
Langston, Michael J.
Lanier, Ronnie D.
Larosa, Benedict D.
Larsen, Paul J.
Lasater, Norman E.
Lawrence, David A.
Leach, Arthur S.
Lee, John R.
Legasey, Edward E.
Lenne, Marshall A.
Leonard, J. R.
Leonard, Michael C.
Leopold, Raymond J.
Leslie, Ralph S.
Letcher, Michael W.
Lewis, John R.
Lhommedieu, Charles S.
Lindahl, Thomas B., Jr.
Lines, Russel W.
Locke, William J.
Lolas, Anthony J.
Lord, William R.
Lorenz, Gary R.
Loser, Gregory A.
Lowe, William B., Jr.
Lumbard, Michael B.
Lund, Glenn W.
Lundberg, Allen B.
Lupia, Eugene A.
MacCarroll, Michael J.
Macur, Roger L.
Magee, Claybourne S., II
Mahaffey, Michael J.
Maleckas, Aldon F.
Mann, Robert W.
Mansell, Dennis N.
Markey, Jeffrey H.
Marquette, Ronald M.
Marshall, Kenneth R.
Mass, Robert C.
May, Gary M.
McAdam, Theodore J., Jr.
McBroom, John M.
McCarty, David C.
McCleary, James E.
McComb, Jack F.
McCrillis, John M.
McCulloch, Robert S.
McDermott, James H.
McDonald, Robert B., Jr.
McFadzean, Bruce W.
McGill, Richard M.
Medeiros, Paul A.
Menza, Thomas F.
Messerly, John A.
Messinger, Jan
Messner, David A.
Midkiff, Richard M.
Milanovich, Fred P.
Miller, Dennis A.
Miller, Jonathan P.
Miller, Richard B., Jr.
Miller, Roy P.
Milne, George P.
Minshall, Billy W.
Mitcham, Robert S.
Moix, Peter P.
Monda, Emil
Mook, Gilbert D.
Moore, Donald R., Jr.
Moore, Michael H.
Morgan, Jesse D., Jr.
Morishige, Ronald I.
Morris, Leonard P.
Mueller, Allan E., Jr.
Mueller, Garry S.
Mulcahy, William F.
Mulch, Gordon L
Muldrow, Robert
Munninghoff, Ivan
Murray, Russell M.
Naguwa, Stanley M.
Najera, Ramon A.
Neate, Richard E.
Nelson, James W.
Nelson, Mervin L.
Nesbitt, Patrick M.
Neyman, Jesse E., Jr.
Nolly, George E.
Nowlin, David V.
O'Brien, Kent J.
O'Grady, Michael E.
Olive, John F.
Orton, Ronald C.
Owen, Don H.
Paajanen, Wayne A.
Page, Lex F.
Painter, Donald T.
Palmer, Ralph B.
Park, Benjamin S.
Parris, Russell E., Jr.
Pastusek, Robert R.
Patterson, William E.
Pawka, Michael H.
Pechek, Phillip J.
Peddrick, Joseph W.
Peterson, Gary G.
Peterson, James F.
Peterson, William A.
Pfeifle, David L.
Pichon, Allen A. Jr.
Pigg, Kenneth E.
Piper, Danny
Pletcher, John H., Jr.
Powley, Herbert W.
Price, Clinton R.
Pritz, Ray A.
Prizner, David J.
Provini, Guerin J.
Pugh, Dennis G.
Pumfrey, Marion A.
Putnam, Robert S.
Quinn, William E., Jr.
Rafferty, Gerald J.
Rathke, Frederick A., Jr.
Ratliff, Larry K.
Ray, William D.
Reid, Jarve G.
Reitan, Richard M.
Resling, Robert A.
Retelle, John J., Jr.
Reynolds, Robert W., III
Riess, Michael T.
Ritter, Donald R.
Roberts, James S., III
Roberts, James S.
Robinson, Daniel G.
Roby, Thomas B.
Rock, Thomas E., Jr.
Rodriguez, Enrique M.
Roper, Daniel L.
Rosen, Max E.
Ross, Alan B.
Rounce, Ronald W.
Rowan, Richard A.
Rowe, Allan W.
Rudiger, Burnley L., Jr.
Ryan, Joseph E.
Ryan, Michael O.
Safford, Steven J.
Sams, Monroe S., Jr.
Sarda, Peter J.
Saunders, William P., Jr.
Savage, William E.
Scheimer, Gary L.
Schlichter, Paul M.
Schmidt, Alan E.
Schmidt, John R., III
Schmitt, Richard W.
Schofield, Jeffrey E.
Schrott, John W., III
Scott, Charles F.
Scott, Michael T.
Seigler, Stephen S.
Seiver, David J.
Seiwert, Raymond M.
Selke, Robert K.
Sellers, Donald P.
Sexon, William R.
Shaw, Frank A.
Shaw, James A., Jr.
Shay, Donald E., Jr.
Showalter, Larry D.
Shriver, Loren J.
Sikora, Charles R.
Simmons, Cleatous J.
Simpson, Tipp
Slusher, Frank B.
Smith, Eugene A.
Smith, Gregory F.
Smith, James L.
Smith, John P.
Smith, Warren W., Jr.
Snow, Johnny R.
Sovitsky, George A.
Sowada, Daniel E.
Spector, Jonathan M.
Spiegelhauer, Milton A., Jr.
Sprague, Christopher B.
Sproul, Kennard B.
Stadjuhar, Edward C.
Stagno, George C.
Stansbury, Bentley P., Jr.
Steadman, James E.
Stelling, Henry G., Jr.
Stickler, Edward A.
Stoval, Dale E.
Straw, William E.
Streets, James B.
Strickland, James R.
Stroud, William P., III
Stuart, Robert K.
Stugart, Mark T.
Svanoe, Kennard E.
Swartwood, Richard V
Sweatland, Keith K.
Szczepanek, Matthew J., Jr.
Tackabury, Paul D.
Tait, Arthur F., Jr.
Tan, Arnold W.
Tashnick, Walter D.
Taylor, William W.
Tebay, Richard D.
Templin, Roger T.
Terry, John R.
Thal, Lawrence S.
Thomas, Robert J.
Thompson, John W.
Thompson, Michael K.
Thompson, William E., III
Thorson, Eric M.
Tilden, Thomas V.
Trapuzzano, Michael P.
Triggs, Dennis R.
Turbiville,Harry P., Jr.
Twomey, Daniel I.
Twomey, Thomas A.
Vance, Harvey J.
Vanhoy, Larry N.
Vanriper, Donald W.
Vanwagenen, George E.
Vernamonti, Leonard R.
Vincent, Randolph C.
Visinsky, Walter L., Jr.
Voight, Ronald O.
Wakefield, Harry A., III
Warren, Robert H., Jr.
Watts, Raymond K.
Weber, Kenneth R.
Weeks, Rodney O.
Weizenegger, Richard E., Jr.
Wells, Charles R., III
Wells, Charles R., III
Wenner, Gerald M., Jr.
Wetzler, Harry P.
White, James H., Jr.
Wiedenmann, Gary N.
Wilbanks, Ronald T.
Willett, Richard M.
Williams, Alan O.
Williams, Earl R., II
Williams, Frederick M.
Williams, Victor, M., Jr.
Willis, Gary N.
Willis, Richard K.
Willke, Theodore L.
Wilson, Lawrence W.
Wingfield, John R., III
Wirth, Michael C.
Withers, Douglas R., Jr.
Wolfe, Richard E.
Wondolowski, John J.
Wood, Stuart B.
Wooddell, Royce G.
Wright, Donald B.
Wright, John A.
Wyman, Stephen S.
Yates, David L.
Young, Clark S., Jr.
Zajac, John J.
Zangri, Alfred G.

The following cadets, U.S. Military Academy, for appointment to the regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code; date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Alverson, Michael E.
Ankener, Richard A.
Biltoft, Christopher A.
Davie, Robert N., Jr.
Foley, William P.
Harmon, George L.
Kline, Richard W., Jr.
Kunselman, Robert A.
Mullane, Richard M.
Nolan, Robert J.
Purcell, Roger J.
Saxon, Vernon P., Jr.
Younkin, Derek L.

The following midshipmen, U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, effective upon their graduation, under the provisions of section 8284, title 1, United States Code; date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Bost, James L.
Buettner, Terry W.
Bush, Frederick E., Jr.
Christensen, James E., Jr.
Cooper, David G.
Daniels, Charles C.
Dash, George H., Jr.
Gautschi, Frederick H., III
Hawes, Patrick C.
Matthews, Douglas G.
Stevenson, Thomas A.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate April 28, 1967:

GOVERNOR OF GUAM

Manuel F. L. Guerrero, of Guam, to be Governor of Guam for a term of 4 years.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Address of the Honorable Wilbur Mills, of Arkansas, at the American Enterprise Institute Symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, April 28, 1967

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on April 20, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Mills] delivered an exceptional speech before the American Enterprise Institute Symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation.

In his address, "Fiscal Policy and the Good Economic Society," Mr. Mills pointed out that fiscal policy should seek to contribute to the good economic society. This good economic society is characterized by a progressive spirit, which leads the citizeny to seek out new challenges, he said.

Perhaps the most thought-provoking remark of the gentleman from Arkansas was the following:

> The good economic society is careful to limit its assumption of responsibility to concerns of this character (those with which society as a whole must deal) and seeks always to reserve to private economic entities—individuals, households, companies—the maximum possible scope for decision-making, for initiating activity.

Mr. Mills rightly notes that—

> This is the essence of economic freedom in our world today. And maximizing economic freedom is a major objective of the good society.

Commenting on the demand for increases in governmental services as the society grows and becomes both more complex and more affluent, Mr. Mills notes that—

> All proposals for new expenditure programs should be received with a constructive skepticism; we should start with the assumption that the production capability to be allocated to the program would be better available to meet demands arising in the private sector of the economy and require the program's proponent to persuade us otherwise.

Noting the expansion of governmental spending, particularly at the State and local levels, Mr. Mills recommends caution about "some recent, bizarre proposals concerning the fiscal relationships of the Federal, and State and local governments." It is here that I must enter a strong reservation to the distinguished gentleman's remarks. Surely, as he so eloquently pointed out, the very essence of our federal system is the principle of subsidiarity; that is, letting the lowest political unit provide the services which are demanded by the citizenry. This is a basic precept of our federal system. Thus, it is certainly consistent with Mr. Mills' call for a "good economic society" which limits its assumption of responsibility to those concerns in its own domain, and not usurp those which can be better performed by lower units of government and of society.

Another noteworthy point which the gentlemen mentioned was that—

> Great importance should be attached to regular, frequent, and significant reductions in tax rates.

The reasons for this are several, as the chairman points out, but perhaps overriding is the fact that—

> Economic freedom is bolstered by general tax reduction which broadens the command of private economic entities over the society's productive resources.

Mr. Speaker, this address is worthy of consideration by every Member of this body. It is thought provoking, and its logic, I think, is convincing. It is another in a long list of outstanding contributions which the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas has made to our understanding of economic policy, and to the well-being of the Nation. I salute him for it, and I include the text of his remarks in the Record at this point:

FISCAL POLICY AND THE GOOD ECONOMIC SOCIETY

(Address of Congressman Wilbur D. Mills before the American Enterprise Institute Symposium on Fiscal Policy and Business Capital Formation, dinner meeting, Washington, D.C., April 20, 1967)

In the last several years, the significance of fiscal policy for the performance of the American economy has received an unusual amount of attention in the press, in public forums, in the academic community, and in the business world. Very likely this emphasis is attributable to a view which has gained wide currency to the effect that the revenue productivity of the Federal tax system tends to increase so rapidly—withdrawing so much from the income flow of the Nation—that private spending will be unduly constrained if tax rates are not periodically reduced or if public spending is not increased to fill the gap. The fiscal developments of 1962, 1964, and 1965 seem to have established the validity of the view; the changes in the tax structure apparently were associated with a marked increase in momentum in economic activity until recent months. This happy congruence of appealing theory and a pleasing turn of events has resulted, as is so often the case, in a possibly greater enthusiasm for fiscal manipulation than the limited experience with it might warrant, but this is of much less consequence than the fact that we seem to be focusing on fiscal arithmetic rather than on the real aims and significance of fiscal policy in the first half of this decade.

Any public policy can be appraised only in the light of its objectives. There need not, of course, be a consensus concerning the aims of a public policy, and the rating it gets, therefore, may vary not only because of differences in viewpoint about how it has performed but as well because of disagreements about what it was supposed to do. In the following remarks, then, you will find one system of preferences which, hopefully, will prove persuasive.

In very general terms, fiscal policy, just as any other element of political economy, should seek to contribute to the attainment of the good economic society. A good economic society is highly progressive; its members seek to advance their wellbeing and this desire is a strong motive force in their personal lives and is reflected in the performance of the economy as a whole. The progressive spirit leads them to venture, to look for the new, to seek out challenges to do things better—better than they've been done before and better than anyone else is doing them now. It is fashionable in some quarters these days to speak derisively about building better mousetraps and to decry the gadgetry in our lives, as if these individually inconsequential items were in competition with culturally grander things for our interest and energy. But this isn't the case and ignores the fact that our technical progress consists of the aggregation of all such little bits and pieces of better things and better ways of doing as well as the more glamorous and impressive advances.

A society that gives ample play to this impulse is a dynamic one. It is also highly diverse. Because it's dynamic, it's subject to frequent shock, but because of its diversity, relatively few of the adjustments thereto involve widespread or prolonged dislocations. Indeed, the Nation's economic history offers repeated evidence of the fact when the economy is allowed to adjust of itself to such disturbances it does so relatively quickly and smoothly.

The good economic society is efficient. It allocates the various elements of its production capability to those uses in which they will contribute most to total output and to the well-being of its people. It quickly recognizes changes in costs and in benefits and facilitates rather than impedes the rearrangement of production activity in response to those changes.

The good economic society is busy and fully employed. It avoids prolonged, involuntary unemployment of large numbers of its labor force, or their prolonged employment in submarginal uses. It recognizes, however, that the rate of use of labor, capital, and other agencies of production cannot be absolutely unchanging in a dynamic environment, and is prepared, therefore, to accept moderate deviations from "full employment" for short periods of time.

The good economic society grows. It increases its capabilities for satisfying the material aspirations of its members, while accommodating their desires for diversity and change.

The good economic society is fair and humane. It seeks to make the benefits of its advances available to all of its members by making sure that none of them are debarred from being or becoming productive participants in its activities. It recognizes differences among its members in their ability to contribute and seeks to moderate rather than to enhance these disparities, not by constraining the more productive but by increasing the productivity of the less fortunate. But where this is not feasible, the good economic society is not indifferent to deprivation. It mobilizes its resources to discover and apply enduring remedies and avoids relying on ad hoc reliefs.

Finally, a good economic society relies on its members to provide the impetus and the means for achieving these goals. It recognizes that in our highly complex economic, political, and social environment, individuals will frequently encounter problems with which they are unable to cope unaided; there is, in other words, a wide array of problems with which society as a whole must deal. But the good economic society is careful to limit its assumption of responsibility to concerns of this character and seeks always to reserve to private economic entities—individuals, households, companies—

the maximum possible scope for decision-making, for initiating activity. This is the essence of economic freedom in our world today. And maximizing economic freedom is a major objective of the good society.

How may fiscal policy contribute to attaining the goals of the good economic society? The basic economic facts of life that come to bear here are (1) that every government purchase involves limiting the availability of production capability for carrying out the plans and meeting the demands of private economic entities and that (2) virtually every government levy impacts on the taxpayer's choices among economic alternatives.

The first of these facts accounts for the traditional liberal concern for limiting governmental programs. This is no doctrinaire indictment of government spending. On the contrary, as the society grows and becomes both more complex and more affluent, the extent and scope of demands for publicly afforded services must be expected to increase as well. But taking a realistic view of the likely course of government activity doesn't justify indifference to the perpetuation of programs that either have proved to be invalid or have outlived their former usefulness. Nor does it lead to ready acceptance of the ad hoc addition of new programs, often overly ambitious and impractical, no matter how glamorously named nor how worthy their objective. Nor, moreover, does it require tolerance for ill-conceived experiments which could pass a rudimentary cost-benefit test only if the benefits are measured in such ambiguous terms as "prestige". Instead, this view calls for continual re-evaluation of existing expenditure programs in the light of rigorous, objective measurement of the benefits they convey and the costs they impose and the requirement that any proposed new program meet the same tests. In fact, all proposals for new expenditure programs should be received with a constructive skepticism; we should start with the assumption that the production capability to be allocated to the program would be better left available to meet demands arising in the private sector of the economy and require the program's proponents to persuade us otherwise.

There are, of course, those who are disappointed because government expenditures haven't increased more rapidly, who claim the public sector is "starved", and who assert that great public needs go unmet. It should be clear, however, that such assertions are not objective observations, but expressions of preferences. Moreover, the recent and prospective rates of gain in the magnitude of government expenditures belie the notion of an underprivileged public sector. Between 1960 and 1966, Federal expenditures in the national income accounts increased by 53 percent. In fact, during these years Federal non-defense purchases of goods and services increased twice as rapidly—96½ percent—as gross national product less Federal purchases which increased by 47 percent. And of all the major sectors of the economy, none has increased so rapidly in this period as state and local government spending which expanded by almost two-thirds. Surely these facts should give one pause about some recent, bizarre proposals concerning the fiscal relationships of the Federal and state and local governments.

Fiscal policy for the good economic society will place great emphasis on the manner in which the revenues required to defray government expenses are raised. The tax structure will be submitted to frequent reappraisal to determine whether its burdens are fairly distributed and whether it contributes to moderation of extremes in the distribution of income and wealth. Continuing efforts will be made to identify and to eliminate those elements or features of the revenue system which afford preferential treatment to some taxpayers while discriminating against others. And the same healthy skepticism with which proposals for new government spending programs are received should greet proposals for new tax differentials.

Great importance should be attached to regular, frequent, and significant reductions in tax rates. Virtually all of the objectives of the good economic society are served thereby. Certainly economic growth is enhanced by tax reduction which reduces the constraints on entrepreneurship, on risk-taking, on launching new ventures, and on all sorts of productive effort. Surely the dynamic character of the economy and the efficiency of use of production capability is enhanced by tax rate reduction which moderates the tax advantages or disadvantages of particular groups of taxpayers and thereby reduces tax-induced distortion in the allocation of resources. And beyond doubt, economic freedom is bolstered by general tax reduction which broadens the command of private economic entities over the society's productive resources.

If this view of the good economic society and the fiscal policy which is appropriate thereto is appealing, one can only regret the circumstances which are deemed to forefend a long-range program of periodic tax reduction. Our attention has been called over and over again of late to the growth in our tax system's revenue productivity which accompanies the growth of the economy. There may be competing claimants for this potential increment in revenues, but if the goals presented in this discussion are to be sought, tax reduction should be the preferred course.

A few years ago, it appeared that the Nation was firmly committed to this course. Taxation developments in 1962 made some constructive changes in the revenue structure, and the revenue Act of 1964 and the excise reductions legislated in 1965 seemed to indicate that the Nation had made a commitment to a long-range fiscal policy stressing tax reduction and curbs on the growth of Federal expenditures. Indeed, this was made explicitly clear, as stated in my press release of September 16, 1963: "The purpose of this tax reduction and revision bill is to loosen the constraint which present Federal taxation imposes on the American economy. The results of these tax reductions and revisions will be a higher level of economic activity, fuller use of our manpower, more intensive and profitable use of our plant and equipment; and with the increases in wages, salaries, profits, consumption, and investment, there will be increases in Federal tax revenues. Increases in economic activity, in the use of our resources, in personal and business incomes, and in Federal revenues might be also realized if, instead of reducing taxes, the Congress and the Administration increased expenditures of Government. In other words, there are two roads the Government could follow toward a larger, more prosperous economy—the tax reduction road or the Government expenditure increase road. There is a difference—a vitally important difference—between them. The increase in Government expenditure road gets us to a higher level of economic activity with larger and larger shares of that activity initiating in Government—with more labor and capital being used directly by the Government in its activities and with more labor and capital in the private sector of the economy being used to produce goods and services on Government orders. The tax reduction road, on the other hand, gets us to a higher level of economic activity—to a bigger, more prosperous, more efficient economy—with a larger and larger share of that enlarged activity initiating in the private sector of the economy—in the decision of individuals to increase and diversify their private consumption and in the decisions of business concerns to increase their productive capacity—to acquire more plant and machines, to hire more labor, to expand their inventories—and to diversify and increase the efficiency of their production.

"Section I of the bill is a firm, positive assertion of the preference of the United States for the tax reduction road to a bigger, more progressive economy. When we, as a Nation, choose this road we are at the same time rejecting the other road, and we want it understood that we do not intend to try to go along both roads at the same time.

"The further meaning of Section I of the bill is that no Government activity is to depend for its justification on the amount it contributes to the total spending of the economy, because we prefer to reduce taxes and allow individuals and business concerns in their own right to make that contribution. On the contrary, any and all activities of the Government have to be justified on their importance in serving other essential goals of the Nation. There is no further justification for an indifferent attitude toward wasteful, inefficient Government activities merely because they incidentally give employment—tax reduction will also create job opportunities and in lines of activity which better satisfy the character and demands of the people for an enriched life. There is no more justification for half-hearted efforts or outright failure to eliminate Government programs that have outlived their usefulness just because they also contribute to the total spending stream of the economy—that contribution will be better realized by increasing the purchasing power of consumers and investors through tax reduction. Finally, there is no further occasion for using the additional revenues which will be generated by the expansion of the economy as a result of tax reduction and revision to finance additional Government expenditures, solely because those additional expenditures might add further to expansion of economic activity. If such additional expansion is desired or needed, tax reduction will achieve it just as surely and through vigorous and progressive forces of the private sectors of the economy."

For a brief period after the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964, the pace of expansion of Federal expenditures did indeed appear to have moderated, but only briefly. The increase of military efforts in Viet Nam, of course, accounts for a significant part of the subsequent acceleration of expansion of Federal outlays, but two-thirds of the $28.3 billion increase in Federal expenditures from calendar 1963 through 1966—as measured in the National income accounts—is accounted for by non-defense spending. Moreover, as projected in the January 1967 budget message, over half of the proposed $37 billion increase in outlays from fiscal 1966 through fiscal 1968 is to be in non-defense programs.

It is, of course, impossible to turn back the clock and one must, therefore, acknowledge that it will be difficult indeed to bring this rapid acceleration of public spending under control. But unless we are prepared to forgo the course of tax reduction for an indefinite period into the future, we should at the least attempt to achieve a pause in the current enlargement of Federal spending.

This discussion has focused on the broad, long-term objectives of fiscal policy, and little has been said about using fiscal policy, or more specifically tax policy, to offset short-term fluctuations in the rate of expansion of total economic activity. The emphasis in the past year and a quarter has been on tax changes for short-run stabilization objectives. Questions can certainly be raised as to whether this has been a very happy chapter in the Nation's fiscal history. The request for the suspension of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation last fall and for their reinstatement this spring has been a fiscal experience from which, hopefully, it has been learned that taxes should not be raised and lowered from season to season like the hemlines of women's skirts and dresses. It is also to be hoped that those who have so enthusiastically advocated frequent, short-term tax rate changes have been sobered by the turn in the economic indicators and the question as to whether they have properly discerned the major tendencies in the economy. In my view it is questionable whether the mechanical application of fiscal arithmetic contributes to good public finance.

Fiscal policy has an important assignment, but in recent years its press agents have invested it with more power to determine the size, shape, and character of the economy than it has or should have. Let us hope that fiscal policy will soon be refocused on contributing to the attainment of the good economic society.

The 175th Anniversary of Westford Academy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 28, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored and most pleased to bring to the attention of the House the 175th anniversary of Westford Academy, the noted school located in Westford, Mass., in my district, which is celebrating this noteworthy birthday event with impressive exercises on April 28 and 29.

In honor of this anniversary celebration, I was privileged to send to the class of 1967 an American flag which has flown over the Capitol, the cornerstone of which was laid 1 year after the founding of Westford Academy.

I know that my colleagues join me in commending the school officials and the citizens of Westford for arranging the special anniversary program to mark the founding of Westford Academy on April 30, 1792, and at the same time extend heartiest felicitations upon this great, historic event along with best wishes for the future.

This anniversary celebration is indeed a most impressive occasion in the life of the Westford community and our State and Nation, and I extend warm greetings to Westford Academy and all those associated with it as well as heartiest congratulations upon the superb contributions of this outstanding school throughout the years toward the education of the young people in the Westford area and in that way strengthening the posture of our national life.

Looking back upon the achievements of this renowned school down through the years since early colonial days, and in the present generation, it is most appropriate that we should express our pride and gratitude for the unselfish service of the dedicated leaders and teachers at Westford and the high-minded citizenship, lofty ideals, and civic interest of the founders and subsequent trustees, directors, and all others associated with this fine institution.

As the U.S. Representative in Congress of the beautiful town of Westford, I am proud on this 175th anniversary to hail and salute in this House, Westford Academy and the Westford community for all they have done to promote the spiritual ideals, moral truths and lofty principles that have helped to make this Nation great.

May the good Lord continue to bring His choicest blessings upon the students and instructors at Westford Academy, so that its superb educational work and achievements may continue to be an inspiration and challenge to all of us for many years to come.

Under unanimous consent I place in the RECORD a letter of congratulations which I sent to the graduating class of Westford Academy:

MARCH 20, 1967.

GRADUATES,
Westford Academy,
Westford, Mass.

MY DEAR FRIENDS: It is with great pleasure that I extend to you—the 1967 graduates of Westford Academy—my heartiest congratulations upon the successful completion of your course and very best wishes for the future.

As you join the many other graduates of your historic, outstanding school, you may well feel a sense of justifiable pride in the fulfillment of your splendid educational objectives.

It is my fervent hope that you will continue with your higher education, because these days the boundaries of human knowledge are truly unlimited, and new horizons are looming up with startling rapidity.

However, the values of our way of life are basic. The principles of freedom, the moral precepts, and the spiritual ideals, which have played such a great part in shaping this nation and projecting our incomparable progress, will always be the cornerstone of our American system.

Whether you enter upon your life's work or continue your education, the opportunities before you are virtually boundless. It will be up to you to embrace them eagerly, and with the same willingness to work hard, the same idealism, enthusiasm, dedication and courage which have marked your years at the Academy.

Your responsibilities as leaders of the future will be great and will require your best efforts. The extent to which you succeed in reaching your goals will depend largely upon yourselves—the way you tackle the tasks at hand, and the firmness of your resolution not to be deterred by temporary setbacks, but to strive with all your hearts, energies and minds until you have reached your chosen objectives.

Your parents and your teachers have done their part and they will continue to counsel, assist and encourage you. The rest will be up to you. The doors of opportunity are open for you. If you remember with our great New England poet that "there is no such word as 'fail' in the lexicon of a bright youth," and order your lives accordingly, you will then be in the best possible position to realize the high goals you set for yourselves in life.

Always remember the lessons you have learned in your homes, in your classrooms, and in your spiritual lives.

Stick tenaciously to your principles and your tasks.

Keep your eyes fixed on the stars and your feet firmly planted on the ground.

Then, as the Bard of Avon said, "It must follow, as the night the day, Thou can'st not then be false to any man."

Above all, remember the duty you owe to those who have made your success to date possible, to continue to follow their precepts and counsel, to recognize that, in the best sense, the greatest rewards you can secure will lie in the realization that you have not lived for yourselves alone, but that you have sought to serve to help your fellow human beings and that you have contributed your full part to making yours a better community, this a better nation, and a better world.

As your Congressman, I want you to know that I am very proud of you and have complete faith that you will go on to higher achievements. I wish for you all, continued, good health, every measure of success in your endeavors, and real happiness and peace for many years to come.

Warm regards and best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

PHILIP J. PHILBIN.

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We bow before Thee, O God, in quest of that still small voice within that speaks in moments of silence. Help us for this minute to be quiet in thought and spirit that we may be aware of the presence of the source of all life.

Come to these hearts and minds in a spirit of peace, that peace may be found and shared.

Enter into the lives of our leaders with the spirit of love for God, for a world in need of love, and for a nation that has been blessed with love.

Give to all the desire for the spirit of truth that new insight, understanding, and solution to problems might be gained from the proceedings of this important day.

Renew us in Thy love, O Lord, our strength and Redeemer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 28, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the call of the calendar under rule VIII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement entered into on Friday last, the Chair lays before the Senate S. 1039, which will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield me 2 minutes?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the nominations in the Mississippi River Commission.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. John A. B. Dillard, Jr., U.S. Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 33 U.S.C. 661).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 187, S. 1649; Calendar 188, S. 423; Calendar 189, H.R. 8363; and Calendar 190, S. 823.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE IN NAME OF CERTAIN WATER RESOURCE PROJECTS UNDER JURISDICTION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1649) authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the proposed legislation is in a sense an omnibus bill, in that it incorporates into one measure several name-change bills that have been referred to the Committee on Public Works for consideration. The committee felt that incorporating these individual bills into one bill would expedite the consideration of these matters.

Several bills have been introduced by Members of this body providing for the change in name of various water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers. I will briefly explain the measures considered by the committee and included in this legislation.

S. 78, introduced by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who has pursued this matter with great diligence, designates a navigation lock and flood control structure of the central and southern flood control project in honor of Mr. W. P. Franklin.

Mr. W. P. Franklin is a retired prominent businessman and pioneer resident of the Fort Myers, Fla., area. He is 96 years of age, and throughout his lifetime has been an ardent advocate of water resource development in central and southern Florida. He was the leading force behind the development of the Okeechobee Waterway, on which the lock and dam to be named in his honor are located.

S. 601, introduced by the distinguished Senators from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN and Mr. FULBRIGHT], designates a pumping plant on the St. Francis River, Ark., as the "W. G. Huxtable Pumping Plant."

William Guirey Huxtable was, from 1935 to 1958, chief engineer of the St. Francis levee district, Arkansas. Upon his retirement he served as a consultant to the levee district until his death in 1960. Mr. Huxtable was for many years active in the development of plans and local support for the project for flood control and drainage in the lower part of the St. Francis River Basin.

S. 988, introduced by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], who was most effective in this matter, officially designates as "Garrison Dam" the dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota commonly referred to by that name, and to change the name of the reservoir above such dam to Lake Sakakawea.

Sakakawea, as students of American history know, was born among the Shoshone Indians in what is now the State of Idaho. At an early age she was captured by enemy indians who sold her to a French-Canadian trader named Toussaint Charbonneau. They later married, and during the early days of November 1804 joined the Lewis and Clark expedition at Fort Mandan, which was located along the Missouri River approximately 18 miles southeast of Garrison Dam. In the spring of 1805, when Lewis and Clark continued their journey to the Pacific Ocean, they took Sakakawea, together with her baby and husband, to serve as an interpreter. She proved invaluable in her dealings with the various Indian nations, and contributed greatly to the success of the expedition. A river, a mountain peak, and a mountain pass have been named after her, and monuments and memorials have been erected in her memory.

S. 1340, introduced by the able Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], who have expressed a great interest in this matter, would designate a portion of the San Francisco-Stockton ship channel as the "John F. Baldwin Ship Channel."

John F. Baldwin, born in Oakland, Calif., on June 28, 1915, was elected to the 84th Congress November 2, 1954, and was reelected to the 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses. He became a member of the House Committee on Public Works on January 20, 1955, and served on that committee until his death on March 9, 1966. At the time of his death he was the second ranking Republican member of the full committee and ranking minority member of the Flood Control Subcommittee.

Representative Baldwin expressed a continuing interest in flood control and river and harbor improvements, and was greatly instrumental in securing the authorization of the project which S. 1340 would name in his honor.

S. 1596, which I recently introduced, authorizes the change in name of certain projects in West Virginia under jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

The purpose of these items in the act

is to eliminate the term "dam and reservoir" in reference to water resource projects located in the State of West Virginia. The term "lake" has been included as part of the project name in each instance in lieu thereof.

Recreation in recent years has assumed an important role in the American economy. The projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers and those planned for future construction offer recreational opportunities, such as swimming, fishing, water skiing, boating, hunting, camping, and picnicking. These benefits and opportunities are offered to the American people through the multiple use of water resource projects.

It is believed that more people will avail themselves of the opportunity to enjoy these recreational facilities if the areas are more closely identified with recreation. The use of the term "lake" in the project title, in lieu of "dam and reservoir" is one means of accomplishing this objective.

Mr. President, I urge the passage of the proposed legislation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 194), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

GENERAL STATEMENT

This legislation is in a sense an omnibus bill in that it incorporates into one measure several name-change bills that have been referred to the committee for consideration. The committee feels that this procedure will expedite the consideration of these matters.

An explanation of each of the bills incorporated into this omnibus measure is as follows:

S. 78: A bill to designate a navigation lock and flood control structure of the central and southern flood control project in honor of Mr. W. P. Franklin

The purpose of this item is to designate the navigation lock and water-control structure known as structure 79 of the central and southern Florida flood control project located on the Caloosahatchee River in the State of Florida as the W. P. Franklin lock and control structure.

The central and southern Florida flood control project, authorized by the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948 (Public Law 858, 80th Cong.), and subsequent acts of Congress, covers an area of some 16,400 square miles, lying generally within the southeasterly 18 counties of Florida. It is comprised of the upper St. Johns River Basin, located in the northeastern section of the project; the Kissimmee River Basin, in the central section; the Lake Okeechobee-Everglades area in the central and southwestern section; and the east coast-Everglades area in the southeastern section.

The project is for flood relief and water conservation. It will provide water control and protection from the recurrence of devastating floodwaters from the Everglades and local sources, for the highly developed urban area along the lower east coast of Florida, and for the productive agricultural areas around Lake Okeechobee (including the towns around the lake), in the upper St. Johns and Kissimmee River Basins, and in south Dade County.

Construction of the project was begun in January 1950. To date, more than 550 miles of levees (including most of the east coast protective levee) have been completed to intermediate or final grades and accepted for operation and maintenance by the Central & Southern Florida Flood Control District. A number of important canals and control structures and large pumping stations have also been completed and turned over to local interests for operation and maintenance. The project as a whole was about 50 percent completed on September 1, 1966.

Mr. W. P. Franklin is a retired prominent businessman and pioneer resident of the Fort Myers, Fla., area. He is 96 years of age, and throughout his lifetime has been an ardent advocate of water resources development in central and southern Florida. He was the leading force behind the development of the Okeechobee Waterway, on which the lock and dam to be named in his honor are located.

S. 601: A bill to designate a pumping plant on the St. Francis River, Ark., as the W. G. Huxtable pumping plant

The pumping plant proposed to be named in honor of W. G. Huxtable is to be located on the St. Francis River southeast of Marianna, Ark., and is an element of the plan for flood protection and major drainage improvement in the St. Francis River Basin, Mo. and Ark., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1950.

William Guirey Huxtable was, from 1935 to 1958, chief engineer of the St. Francis Levee District, Arkansas. Upon his retirement he served as a consultant to the levee district until his death in 1960. Mr. Huxtable was for many years active in the development of plans and local support for the project for flood control and drainage in the lower part of the St. Francis River Basin.

S. 988: A bill to officially designate as Garrison Dam the dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota commonly referred to by that name, and to change the name of the reservoir above such dams to Lake Sakakawea

The Garrison Dam and Reservoir project is located on the Missouri River about 11 miles south of Garrison, N. Dak. It was authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 891), and is operated for flood control, navigation, power production, and other multiple-purpose uses.

Sakakawea was born among the Shoshoni Indians in what is now the State of Idaho. At an early age she was captured by enemy Indians who sold her to a French-Canadian trader named Toussaint Charbonneau. They later married, and during the early days of November 1804, joined the Lewis and Clark Expedition at Fort Mandan, which was located along the Missouri River approximately 18 miles southeast of Garrison Dam. In the spring of 1805 when Lewis and Clark continued their journey to the Pacific Ocean, they took Sakakawea, together with her baby and husband, to serve as an interpreter. She proved invaluable in her dealings with the various Indian nations, and contributed greatly to the success of the expedition. A river, a mountain peak, and a mountain pass have been named after her, and monuments and memorials have been erected in her memory.

S. 1340: A bill to designate a portion of the San Francisco-Stockton Ship Channel as the John F. Baldwin Ship Channel

The San Francisco-Stockton Ship Channel project which was authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 1089), is located on navigation channels extending from the San Francisco Bay entrance to the port of Stockton through San Francisco, Marin, Contra Costa, Solano, Sacramento, and San Joaquin Counties, Calif. It provides for the modification of five completed navigation projects.

John F. Baldwin, born in Oakland, Calif., on June 28, 1915, was elected to the 84th Congress, November 2, 1954, and was reelected to the 85th, 86th, 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses. He became a member of the House Committee on Public Works on January 20, 1955, and served on that committee until his death on March 9, 1966. At the time of his death he was the second ranking Republican member of the full committee and ranking minority member of the Flood Control Subcommittee.

Representative Baldwin expressed a continuing interest in flood control and river and harbor improvements, and was greatly instrumental in securing the authorization of the project which S. 1340 would name in his honor.

S. 1956: A bill authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects in west Virginia under jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers

The purpose of these items in the act is to eliminate the term "dam and reservoir" in reference to water resource projects located in the State of West Virginia. The term "lake" has been included as part of the project name in each instance in lieu thereof.

Recreation in recent years has assumed an important role in the American economy. The projects constructed by the Corps of Engineers and those planned for future construction offer recreational opportunities, such as swimming, fishing, water skiing, boating, hunting, camping, and picnicking. These benefits and opportunities are offered to the American people through the multiple use of water resource projects.

It is believed that more people will avail themselves of the opportunity to enjoy these recreational facilities if the areas are more closely identified with recreation. The use of the term "lake" in the project title, in lieu of "dam and reservoir," is one means of accomplishing this objective.

COST TO THE UNITED STATES IF LEGISLATION IS ENACTED

Enactment of this legislation will not result in any cost to the Federal Government.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee believes it fitting and proper to designate the various water resource projects set forth in this legislation, in honor of outstanding individuals who have contributed so much to our American way of life. In the case of West Virginia projects, the use of the term "lake" in the title should be instrumental in promoting increased recreational use of these projects. Accordingly, early enactment of this legislation is recommended.

VIEWS OF THE FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Department of the Army as well as other interested Federal agencies has indicated no objection to enactment of the individual legislation incorporated in this measure.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 1649) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the names of the following locks and dams, reservoirs, and other navigation and flood control facilities under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, are hereby changed as follows:

The Bluestone Dam and Reservoir, New River West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, to the "Bluestone Lake";

the Sutton Dam and Reservoir, Elk Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Sutton Lake";

the Tygart Dam and Reservoir, Tygart River, West Virginia, authorized by the River and Harbor Act of 1935, to the "Tygart Lake";

the East Lynn Dam and Reservoir, East Fork of Twelvepole Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "East Lynn Lake";

the Summersville Dam and Reservoir, Gauley River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Summersville Lake";

the Burnsville Dam and Reservoir, Little Kanawha River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Burnsville Lake";

the Birch Dam and Reservoir, Elk River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Birch Lake";

Steer Creek Dam and Reservoir, Steer Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "Steer Creek Lake";

the West Fork Dam and Reservoir, Little Kanawha River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1938, to the "West Fork Lake";

the Beech Fork Dam and Reservoir, Twelvepole Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, to the "Beech Fork Lake";

the R. D. Bailey Dam and Reservoir, Guyandot River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1962, to the "R. D. Bailey Lake";

the Rowlesburg Dam and Reservoir, Cheat River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1965, to the "Rowlesburg Lake";

the Panther Creek Dam and Reservoir, Panther Creek, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1965, to the "Panther Creek Lake";

the Stonewall Jackson Dam and Reservoir, West Fork River, West Virginia, authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1966, to the "Stonewall Jackson Lake";

the pumping plant authorized to be constructed by the Flood Control Act of 1950 on the Saint Francis River, Arkansas, Southeast of Marianna, Arkansas, to the "W. G. Huxtable Pumping Plant";

the ship channel from the San Francisco Bar Channel through the San Francisco, San Pablo, and Suisun Bays to the downstream terminus of the Stockton Deep Water Channet, to the "John F. Baldwin Ship Channel";

the navigation lock and water control structure known as structure 79 of the central and southern Florida flood control project located on the Caloosahatchee River in the State of Florida, to the "W. P. Franklin Lock and Control Structure";

the dam, commonly referred to as Garrison Dam, located on the Missouri River in North Dakota, is hereby officially designated as "Garrison Dam"; and

the reservoir, known as Garrison Reservoir or Garrison Lake, located above Garrison Dam to "Lake Sakakawea."

Sec. 2. Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which any such lock and dam, reservoir, or other navigation and flood control facility is referred to by its former name shall be held to refer to such lock and dam, reservoir, or other navigation and flood control facility by the name designated herein.

SMALL-BOAT HARBOR AT MANELE BAY, HAWAII

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 423) authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of a small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "by", to insert "the"; in the same line, after the word "Federal", to strike out "and non-Federal interests" and insert "Government"; on page 2, at the beginning of line 2, to strike out "changed" and insert "unforeseen"; and, in line 7, to strike out "$125,000" and insert "$124,845"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the project for a small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, constructed by the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in accordance with the provisions of section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645), is hereby modified to provide for the assumption by the Federal Government of the cost of certain additional work necessitated by unforeseen project conditions and in excess of the monetary limits authorized by Public Law 86–645, at an estimated additional Federal cost of $172,000: *Provided,* That responsible local interests make a cash contribution toward the cost of such additional work in the amount of $124,845.

Sec. 2. Funds authorized to carry out section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, as amended, shall be available to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill, which was introduced by my colleague and dear friend, the junior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], is to authorize the payment by the United States of $172,000 to defray the cost of certain construction work on the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, which was necessitated by changed project conditions.

Construction of this project was authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, which at the time this project was constructed, provided authority for the Chief of Engineers to develop and construct small navigation projects, with a Federal cost limitation of not more than $200,000.

The original estimate of cost for construction of the project as determined by the Corps of Engineers was $443,000 of which $239,000 was estimated as the local contribution by the State of Hawaii and $200,000 was the Federal share based on the limitation established by Public Law 86–645.

In carrying out the terms of a contract awarded by the Corps of Engineers for the construction of the Manele Bay project, the contractor encountered certain unforeseen foundation conditions which required blasting, resulting in a greater total project cost than originally estimated by the Corps of Engineers. Such additional work, however, was beyond the legal limit allowable by law for payment by the Corps of Engineers and, consequently, the contractor has not received payment for this work.

The Corps of Engineers has reached an agreement with the contractor that the additional work made necessary due to unforeseen conditions resulted in increased project costs of $290,000. This cost would be shared by the Federal Government and the State of Hawaii on the cost-sharing basis of the original project.

Mr. President, the only bar to the contractor's legal entitlement to the amount of such settlement is the lack of authority by the Department of the Army to allot additional construction funds to this project because of the statutory limitation of section 107.

The State of Hawaii now stands ready to make available its share of the additional cost of this project. Enactment of this legislation will provide authority for the Corps of Engineers to make payment on behalf of the United States, which I feel is highly justified and warranted in this case.

The Senators from the State of Hawaii [Mr. Fong and Mr. Inouye], both of whom are valuable members of the Committee on Public Works, have worked diligently for the approval of this bill, and I, accordingly, recommend that it be passed by the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 195), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PUBLIC HEARING

The Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors held a public hearing on this measure on April 20, 1967, at which time it received the favorable views of the Department of the Army and both Senators from the State of Hawaii.

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this legislation is to authorize the payment by the United States of $172,000 to defray the cost of certain construction work on the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, which was necessitated by changed project conditions.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, was authorized under section 107 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960 (Public Law 86–645, 74 Stat. 486). This act, at the time the Manele Bay project was undertaken, provided authority for the Chief of Engineers to develop and construct small navigation projects, with a Federal cost limitation of not more than $200,000.

The project authorized by the Chief of Engineers at Manele Bay consisted of a 400-foot extension of an existing breakwater, an entrance channel 15 feet deep, a main access channel 12 to 8 feet deep, and a maneuvering area 8 feet deep.

Local interests were to provide lands, easements, and rights-of-way for construction and future maintenance; provide and maintain mooring facility and utilities open to all users on equal terms; provide necessary utilities and drainage relocations or alterations; hold the United States free from damages; and provide a cash contribution for costs above the $200,000 Federal limitation.

The original estimate of cost for construction of the project as determined by the Corps of Engineers was $443,000, of which $239,000 was estimated as the local contribution by the State of Hawaii and $204,000 (including $4,000 for aids to navigation) was the Federal share based on the limitation established by Public Law 86–645.

In carrying out the terms of a contract awarded by the Corps of Engineers for the construction of the Manele Bay project, the contractor encountered certain unforeseen foundation conditions. The existence of harder material requiring blasting ultimately resulted in a greater total project cost than originally estimated by the Corps of Engineers.

The Corps of Engineers and the contractor have agreed that $290,000 is the cost of additional work necessitated by changed project conditions. Based on this increase in cost, the total project cost is now estimated at $743,000, of which $372,000 is Federal and $371,000 is non-Federal. The additional cost of $297,000 ($290,000 for additional construction and $7,000 for engineering and design and associated costs) would be shared, $172,000 Federal and $125,000 non-Federal. This is on the basis of the original cost-sharing ratio of 58 percent Federal and 42 percent non-Federal.

There is no disagreement by the Corps of Engineers with the contractor's entitlement to additional compensation arising out of the encountering of changed, unforeseen conditions. The Corps of Engineers has agreed that, subject to the availability of funds and payments before May 23, 1968, the contractor is equitably entitled to, and will accept in full satisfaction of all claims arising under the contract, payment of an additional $290,000 and an extension of performance time to the date of final completion of the work.

The only bar to the contractor's legal entitlement to the amount of such settlement is the lack of authority by the Department of the Army to allot additional construction funds to this project because of the statutory limitation of section 107.

The State of Hawaii, although having expressed less than complete agreement to its legal liability in this matter, has agreed to seek authority to make contributions to the amount of the proposed settlement.

The Governor of Hawaii has submitted a request to the State legislature for an appropriation in the amount of $124,845 as part of its fiscal 1967–68 capital improvements program. This is the exact amount based on the overall cost sharing for the project. Since section 2 of the bill rounds this amount to $125,000, amendment has been made in committee to reflect the exact amount of $124,845.

COST TO THE UNITED STATES IF LEGISLATION IS ENACTED

Enactment of this legislation will result in a cost to the Federal Government of $172,000.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee is of the opinion that both the Federal Government and the contractor acted in good faith in this matter but that circumstances beyond the control of the Corps of Engineers prevented the contractor from receiving full compensation for his work. The committee notes that the only bar to the contractor's legal entitlement to the amount of such settlement as provided for in this legislation is the lack of authority of the Department of the Army to allot additional construction funds to this project due to the statutory limitation of section 107. The committee accordingly recommends early adoption of this legislation in order to satisfy the contractor's legal entitlement in this matter.

VIEWS OF THE FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Department of the Army and the Bureau of the Budget have no objection to enactment of this legislation.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLOOD CONTROL AND NAVIGATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 8363) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the purpose of the bill is to authorize additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans that are under the jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers.

The Subcommittee on Flood Control-Rivers and Harbors, under the able direction of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], held a public hearing on this matter on April 20, 1967, at which time it received the views of the Corps of Engineers and other interested parties.

In the Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1938, Congress approved plans for the development of many of the river basins throughout the Nation in the interest of flood control, navigation, hydroelectric power development, and other allied water purposes. Congressional approval embraced in each case the entire plan, but because of the magnitude of the undertakings and the length of time anticipated for their realization, the Congress limited authorization of funds to the amounts expected to be required for only the ensuing several years.

In later acts, Congress approved plans for additional river basins and also increased the monetary authorizations for those basins previously authorized to the extent needed to provide for further appropriations.

Briefly, there is a total of 20 so-called river basin plans that are subject to monetary limitations. That is, in each instance Congress has approved the entire plan for construction, but has provided only partial authorization for the appropriation of funds. Therefore as the monetary ceilings are reached, it is necessary that additional authorization be provided by the Congress, to cover anticipated appropriations.

The last action taken by Congress in this matter was in the River Basin Act of 1965, Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965, which provided increases in monetary authorization for 13 basins in the amount of $944 million. This included the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway and the Los Angeles River Basin project, which were authorized to be completed and will not require any further increases in monetary authorization. This action made available sufficient authorization to provide for appropriations through fiscal year 1967.

At the present rate of appropriations, 11 basin plans out of the total of 20 will not have sufficient authorization to cover appropriations during fiscal year 1968. The total deficit will amount to $278 million. In addition to this deficit, anticipated appropriations in fiscal year 1969 would raise the total deficit to $878 million, and the number of basins to 13.

Mr. President, the Committee on Public Works was of the opinion that we should authorize funds for fiscal year 1968 at this time, with a small allowance for construction extending into the summer and fall months of fiscal year 1969. This would provide for increases in authorization to cover appropriations for 14 basin plans in the total amount of $472 million.

The action taken by the committee in reporting this measure to cover the period I just mentioned is with the understanding that we will consider the need for further increases in monetary authorization early in the next session of Congress.

Section 3 of the bill modifies the plan of improvement for the Brazos River Basin, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1954, so as to provide that all additional construction costs occasioned by the occurrence of a slide in the embankment of the Waco Dam on the Bosque River during the fall of 1961 shall be borne by the United States.

During the public hearing held on this matter, the committee was informed that on October 4, 1961, a slide was discovered by the Government in the dam embankment due to a failure of the subsurface shales of the foundation.

Prior to construction of the project the city of Waco, Tex., and the Brazos River Authority had contracted to pay for water supply storage in the reservoir based on a percentage of the total cost of the project at completion. This amount was estimated at $5.9 million, prior to the start of construction. It was the opinion of the Government that the cost of repairing the slide would have to be shared by local interests on the same basis as the original cost sharing for the water supply storage. This resulted in an increase of about $1.2 million in the cost of the project to the city of Waco, bringing the overall contribution to about $7 million.

The committee felt that the Federal Government should assume the cost of additional work necessitated by this slide, since local interests did not have any responsibility in regard to the cause of the slide. Also, local interests have indicated that they could have obtained a comparable supply of water from an alternative source if they had reason to believe the storage in the Waco project would have cost more than the original estimate.

I might add, Mr. President, that by acting on the bill at this time we will prevent any disruption in the prosecution of the projects in the various river basin plans. I bring this to the attention of the membership because it is my understanding that if increases are provided later than May of this year, the awarding of continuing contracts by the Corps of Engineers might have to be curtailed in order to keep within the existing monetary authorization.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD several tables prepared by the committee staff which indicate the situation with respect to the various comprehensive river basin plans. I draw particular attention to table 1, which lists all 20 plans, together with pertinent information including proposed funding through fiscal year 1970, and table VI, which lists the basins and the amounts of authorization provided for in this legislation.

I urge the passage of H.R. 8363.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE I.—*Estimated monetary authorization status*

[Cols, (9), (12), and (15) show amounts of monetary authorization required to carry the programs through the fiscal years indicated]

[In millions of dollars]

River basin or project plan	Estimated Federal cost (1)	Available monetary authorization (2)	Appropriated through fiscal year 1966 (3)	Authorization remaining June 30, 1966 (4)	Appropriated in fiscal year 1967 (5)	Authorization remaining June 30, 1967 (6)	Approved budget fiscal year 1968 (7)	Authorization remaining June 30, 1968 (8)	Deficit in monetary authorization June 30, 1968 (rounded) (9)
Alabama-Coosa River Basin	556.6	98.0	46.3	51.7	28.8	22.9	31.2	−8.3	9
Arkansas River Basin	1,353.6	973.3	785.5	187.8	155.2	32.6	155.5	−122.9	123
Brazos River Basin	192.7	105.0	98.3	6.7	6.5	.2	5.5	−5.3	6
Central and southern Florida project	269.0	157.3	137.0	20.3	11.8	8.5	12.4	−3.9	4
Columbia River Basin	2,052.8	1,141.3	988.6	152.7	108.5	44.2	142.3	−98.1	99
Columbia River local protection [1]	(30.7)	(15.0)	(2.8)	(12.2)	(2.8)	(9.4)	(4.8)	(4.6)	
Connecticut River Basin	173.0	97.0	80.5	16.5	.1	16.4	.4	16.0	
Illinois Waterway duplicate locks	167.0	40.0		40.0	.2	39.8	.4	39.4	
Lower Mississippi River Basin	2,404.1	1,690.0	1,426.9	263.1	59.2	203.9	51.2	152.7	
Missouri River Basin	2,133.5	1,442.1	1,342.6	99.5	47.9	51.6	36.9	14.7	
North Branch Susquehanna River Basin	87.5	30.0	2.7	27.3	1.2	26.1	1.0	25.1	
Ohio River Basin	1,295.7	1,012.1	917.7	94.4	58.7	35.7	57.4	−21.7	22
Ouachita River Basin	72.8	32.3	19.1	13.2	7.3	5.9	9.6	−3.7	4
Sacramento River Basin	149.6	49.7	31.2	18.5	2.9	15.6	1.6	14.0	
Sacramento River bank protection [2]	(21.2)	(14.2)	(6.1)	(8.1)	(2.5)	(5.6)	(1.2)	(4.4)	
San Joaquin River Basin	160.3	28.5	22.1	6.4	3.5	2.9	3.6	−.7	1
Santa Ana River Basin	52.3	43.5	41.5	2.0		2.0		2.0	
South Platte River Basin	115.2	26.3	.4	25.9	5.2	20.7	7.5	13.2	
Trinity River Basin	979.8	83.0		83.0	.2	82.8	4.1	78.7	
Upper Mississippi River Basin	174.2	115.3	98.9	16.4	9.5	6.9	8.7	−1.8	2
West Branch Susquehanna River Basin	55.3	44.0	33.1	10.9	8.8	2.1	9.0	−6.9	7
White River Basin	344.5	284.0	282.9	1.1	1.1		.8	−.8	1
Total	12,789.5	7,492.7	6,355.3	1,137.4	516.6	620.8	539.1		
Deficiencies in monetary authorizations								[3] −274.1	[3] 278

River basin or project plan	Funding required, fiscal year 1969 (10)	Authorization remaining, June 30, 1969 (11)	Deficit in monetary authorization, June 30, 1969 (rounded) (12)	Funding required, fiscal year 1970 (13)	Authorization remaining, June 30, 1970 (14)	Deficit in monetary authorization, June 30, 1970 (rounded) (15)	Balance to complete (16)	Authorization required to complete (17)
Alabama-Coosa River Basin	49.5	−57.8	58	26.9	−84.7	85	373.9	458.6
Arkansas River Basin	165.0	−287.9	288	58.8	−346.7	347	33.6	380.3
Brazos River Basin	9.3	−14.6	15	14.6	−29.2	30	58.5	87.7
Central and southern Florida project	15.0	−18.9	19	16.0	−34.9	35	76.8	111.7
Columbia River Basin	180.0	−278.1	279	141.6	−419.7	420	491.8	911.5
Columbia River local protection [1]	(2.0)	(2.6)		(.1)	(2.5)		(18.2)	(15.7)
Connecticut River Basin	.8	15.2		.9	14.3		90.3	76.0
Illinois Waterway duplicate locks	.6	38.8		.6	38.2		165.2	127.0
Lower Mississippi River Basin	107.9	44.8		118.4	−73.6	74	640.5	714.1
Missouri River Basin	84.0	−69.3	70	79.0	−148.3	149	543.1	691.4
North Branch Susquehanna River Basin	2.7	22.4		6.5	15.9		73.4	57.5
Ohio River Basin	63.5	−85.2	86	56.3	−141.5	142	142.1	283.6
Ouachita River Basin	9.4	−13.1	14	8.0	−21.1	22	19.4	40.5
Sacramento River Basin	3.2	10.8		3.1	7.7		107.6	99.9
Sacramento River bank protection [2]	(2.5)	(1.9)		(2.5)	(−.6)		(6.4)	(7.0)
San Joaquin River Basin	9.3	−10.0	10	19.0	−29.0	29	102.8	131.8
Santa Ana River Basin		2.0			2.0		10.8	8.8
South Platte River Basin	30.0	−16.8	17	16.0	−32.8	33	56.1	88.9
Trinity River Basin	9.8	68.9		5.0	63.9		960.7	896.8
Upper Mississippi River Basin	6.0	−7.8	8	0.1	−7.9	8	51.0	58.9
West Branch Susquehanna River Basin	3.7	−10.6	11	.7	−11.3	12		11.3
White River Basin	1.7	−2.5	3	1.0	−3.5	4	57.0	60.5
Total	751.4			572.5			4,054.6	5,296.8
Deficiencies in monetary authorizations		[4] −872.6	[4] 878		[5] −1,384.2	[5] 1,390		

---

[1] Specific monetary authorization within overall Columbia Basin monetary authorization.

[2] Specific monetary authorization within overall Sacramento River Basin monetary authorization.

[3] 11 basins.

[4] 13 basins.

[5] 14 basins.

TABLE II.—*Monetary authorizations required to cover a period of 1 year (fisal year 1968)*

[In millions of dollars]

River basin	Available monetary authorization	Proposed and actual funding through fiscal year 1968	Deficit monetary authorization	Additional monetary authorization required
Alabama-Coosa	98.0	106.3	8.3	9
Arkansas	973.3	1,096.2	122.9	123
Brazos	105.0	110.3	5.3	6
Central and southern Florida project	157.3	161.2	3.9	4
Columbia	1,141.3	1,239.4	98.1	99
Ohio	1,012.1	1,033.8	21.7	22
Ouachita	32.3	36.0	3.7	4
San Joaquin	28.5	29.2	.7	1
Upper Mississippi	115.3	117.1	1.8	2
West Branch Susquehanna	44.0	50.9	6.9	7
White	284.0	284.8	.8	1
Total deficit, 11 basins				278

TABLE III.—*Monetary authorizations required to cover a period of 2 years (fiscal years 1968–69)*

[In millions of dollars]

River basin	Available monetary authorization	Proposed and actual funding through fiscal year 1969	Deficit monetary authorization	Additional monetary authorization required
Alabama-Coosa	98.0	155.8	57.8	58
Arkansas	973.3	1,261.2	287.9	288
Brazos	105.0	119.6	14.6	15
Central and southern Florida project	157.3	176.2	18.9	19
Columbia	1,141.3	1,419.4	278.1	279
Missouri	1,442.1	1,511.4	69.3	70
Ohio	1,012.1	1,097.3	85.2	86

River basin	Available monetary authorization	Proposed and actual funding through fiscal year 1968	Deficit monetary authorization	Additional monetary authorization required
Ouachita	32.3	45.4	13.1	14
San Joaquin	28.5	38.5	10.0	10
South Platte	26.3	43.1	16.8	17
Upper Mississippi	115.3	123.1	7.8	8
West Branch Susquehanna	44.0	54.6	10.6	11
White	284.0	286.5	2.5	3
Total deficit, 13 basins				878

TABLE IV.—*Monetary authorization required to cover a period of 3 years (fiscal years 1968–70)*

[In millions of dollars]

River basin	Available monetary authorization	Proposed and actual funding through fiscal year 1970	Deficit monetary authorization	Additional monetary authorization required
Alabama-Coosa	98.0	182.7	84.7	85
Arkansas	973.3	1,320.0	346.7	347
Brazos	105.0	134.2	29.2	30
Central and southern Florida project	157.3	192.2	34.9	35
Columbia	1,141.3	1,561.0	419.7	420
Lower Mississippi	1,690.0	1,763.6	73.6	74
Missouri River	1,442.1	1,590.4	148.3	149
Ohio	1,012.1	1,153.6	141.5	142
Ouachita	32.3	53.4	21.1	22
San Joaquin	28.5	57.5	29.0	29
South Platte	26.3	59.1	32.8	33
Upper Mississippi	115.3	123.2	7.9	8
West Branch Susquehanna	44.0	55.3	11.3	12
White	284.0	287.5	3.5	4
Total deficit, 14 basins				1,390

TABLE V.—*Comprehensive river basin plans—Deficiencies in monetary authorizations*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

River basin	Fiscal years				
	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970
Alabama-Coosa	0	0	$9	$58	$85
Arkansas	0	0	123	288	347
Brazos	0	0	6	15	30
Central and southern Florida project	0	0	4	19	35
Columbia	0	0	90	279	420
Connecticut	0	0	0	0	0
Illinois Waterway	0	0	0	0	0
Lower Mississippi	0	0	0	0	74
Missouri	0	0	0	70	149
North Branch Susquehanna	0	0	0	0	0
Ohio	0	0	22	86	142
Ouachita	0	0	4	14	22
Sacramento	0	0	0	0	0
San Joaquin	0	0	$1	$10	$29
Santa Ana	0	0	0	0	0
South Platte	0	0	0	17	33
Trinity	0	0	0	0	0
Upper Mississippi	0	0	2	8	8
West Branch Susquehanna	0	0	7	11	12
White	0	0	1	3	4
Deficit	0	0	278	872	1,390
Number of basins			11	13	14

TABLE VI.—*Monetary authorizations required to cover a period of 1 year (fiscal year 1968) plus an allowance for summer construction in fiscal year 1969*

[In millions of dollars]

River basin or project plan	Deficit in monetary authorization, June 30, 1968 (rounded)	Allowance for summer construction season, fiscal year 1969 (rounded)	Deficit in monetary authorization, Sept. 30, 1968 (rounded)
1. Alabama-Coosa River Basin	9	25	34
2. Arkansas River Basin	123	47	170
3. Brazos River Basin	6	3	9
4. Central and southern Florida project	4	10	14
5. Columbia River Basin	99	54	153
6. Missouri River Basin		20	20
7. Ohio River Basin	22	16	38
8. Ouachita River Basin	4	4	8
9. Sacramento River Basin		[1]7	7
10. San Joaquin River Basin	1	1	2
11. South Platte River Basin		2	2
12. Upper Mississippi River Basin	2	2	4
13. West Branch Susquehanna River Basin	7	2	9
14. White River Basin	1	1	2
Total	278	194	472

[1] Monetary authorization needed to complete initial phase of the work authorized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 196), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC HEARING

The committee held a public hearing on this matter on April 20, 1967, at which time it received the views of the Corps of Engineers and other interested parties.

EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

H.R. 8363 provides increased authorizations for the prosecution of river basin plans for flood control and related purposes under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. The appropriations intended to be covered by the increased and completion authorizations are those for fiscal year 1968 and the summer and fall construction season of fiscal year 1969. Allowance is made for the amount of monetary authorization carried over on June 30, 1967. The necessity for these increased authorizations is explained below.

Monetary authorizations first were put into effect by the Food Control Acts of 1936 and 1938. They limit authority to appropriate and expend funds within specified basins or specified major projects, to levels below the total costs of the authorized basin or project developments. In this way they give the Congress opportunity to review and control the rate of accomplishment of the basin plans and major projects to which they apply.

In these plans, the Congress has approved an entire plan for development of a river basin in the interest of flood control, navigation, power, and allied water uses, but limited the amounts of funds to anticipated appropriations for a specified period of years, allowed accomplishment of only part of the plan. Subsequently the Congress has augmented some of the previously approved plans, by authorizing additional projects, or modifications of projects, and increased the monetary authorization to provide for additional appropriations. While the monetary authorization limit of a plan is approached, legislation is required to provide additional authorization so that appropriations can be made to permit the plan to continue. If such legislation is not forthcoming when needed, construction of projects in the basin plan cannot proceed, even if funds have been appropriated for this purpose.

In addition to projects comprising these basin plans subject to monetary authorization, Congress has authorized other projects in the basins for which full monetary authorization for appropriations has been provided under the terms of the authorizing act. Projects in this category require no further monetary authorization action by the Congress.

At the present time there are 20 basin development plans subject to basin monetary authorization limitations. Authorizations provided to date, including the most recent provided by legislation in 1965, are generally adequate for work to be performed through the end of fiscal year 1967. However, the 14 basins listed on H.R. 8363 will run out of authorization in fiscal year 1968, unless additional authorization is provided. The following table gives a list of the basins, the dates of original authorization, and the amount of increased authorizations needed for the work to be performed through the summer and fall construction season of 1968.

Section 1

The table contains 13 basins, as listed in section 1 of the bill, and excludes the Sacramento River Basin which is covered by separate language in section 2 because it requires special wording to close out the completion of the first phase which covers bank erosion control and set-back levees.

Total cost

The total amount of the table in section 1 is $465 million and in section 2 it is $7 million, making a grand total of $472 million.

The committee wishes to point out again that this is additional monetary authorization for projects already authorized.

Basin	Act of Congress	Amount
Alabama-Coosa River	Mar. 2, 1945	$34, 000, 000
Arkansas River	June 28, 1938	170, 000, 000
Brazos River	Sept. 3, 1954	9, 000, 000
Central and southern Florida	June 30, 1948	14, 000, 000
Columbia River	June 28, 1938	153, 000, 000
Missouri River	do	20, 000, 000
Ohio River	June 22, 1936	38, 000, 000
Ouachita River	May 17, 1950	8, 000, 000
San Joaquin River	Dec. 22, 1944	2, 000, 000
South Platte River	May 17, 1950	2, 000, 000
Upper Mississippi River	June 28, 1938	4, 000, 000
West Branch, Susquehanna River.	Sept. 3, 1954	9, 000, 000
White River	June 28, 1938	2, 000, 000
Total		465, 000, 000

Description of basins

A description of the basins and the status of the monetary authorizations involved in H.R. 8363 are given in the following paragraphs. Amounts are rounded to millions of dollars. The specific projects on which these increased authorizations are intended to be used are shown for each basin.

Alabama-Coosa River Basin

The Alabama-Coosa River system drains an area of 22,800 square miles, of which about 130 square miles are in Tennessee, 5,350 square miles are in Georgia and 17,320 square miles are in Alabama. The basin has a maximum width of 110 miles and extends about 320 miles from southeast Tennessee and northwest Georgia diagonally across Alabama to the southwest corner of the State.

The River and Harbor Act of March 2, 1945, provides for the initial and ultimate development of the Alabama-Coosa Rivers and tributaries for navigation, flood control, power development, and other purposes. The act includes authorization for modification of the original plan as may be advisable from time to time in the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers for the purpose of increasing the development of hydroelectric power. This act also authorized the appropriation of $60 million, and additional monetary authorization of $38 million was granted by Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965.

Alabama-Coosa River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$557, 000, 000
Available monetary authorization	98, 000, 000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1967	76, 000, 000
Remaining monetary authorization	22, 000, 000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	56, 000, 000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	—34, 000, 000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Carters Dam, Ga	$9, 000, 000
Alabama River channel improvements, Alabama	1, 000, 000
Claiborn lock and dam, Alabama	5, 000, 000
Jones Bluff lock and dam, Alabama	7, 000, 000
Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama	12, 000, 000
Total requested authorization	34, 000, 000

Arkansas River Basin

The Arkansas River Basin contains an area of about 160,500 square miles. The basin is about 870 miles in length in a west-east direction by approximately 185 miles in average width, and it extends from the Rocky Mountains on the west to the Mississippi River on the east. The drainage basin occupies parts of the States of Colorado, New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Texas, Missouri, and Arkansas.

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Arkansas River Basin was adopted by the Flood Control Act approved June 28, 1938, which authorized an appropriation of $21 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. The plan has been further amended and modified and additional monetary authorization provided by subsequent acts.

The River and Harbor Act of July 24, 1946 authorized construction of a multiple-purpose plan for improvement of the Arkansas River Basin, Arkansas and Oklahoma, for navigation, flood control, and other purposes and authorized the appropriation of $55 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. This plan has likewise been modified by subsequent acts, and additional monetary authorization provided.

The Flood Control Act of July 14, 1960, incorporated the authorized flood control plan and the multiple-purpose plan into a single plan of development and provided that all authorizations made available for the Arkansas River Basin would be applicable to the combined plan of development. Additional monetary authorization of $290 million was granted by Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965.

Arkansas River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$1, 354, 000, 000
Available monetary authorization	973, 000, 000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1967	940, 000, 000
Remaining monetary authorization	33, 000, 000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for construction season of fiscal year 1969	203, 000, 000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−170, 000, 000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Bank stabilization, Arkansas and Oklahoma	$6, 500, 000
Lock and dam No. 1, Arkansas	4, 600, 000
Lock and dam No. 2, Arkansas	2, 300, 000
Lock and dam No. 3, Arkansas	3, 200, 000
Lock and dam No. 4, Arkansas	9, 300, 000
Lock and dam No. 5, Arkansas	5, 600, 000
David D. Terry lock and dam, Arkansas (formerly lock and dam No. 6)	11, 300, 000
Lock and dam No. 7, Arkansas	7, 700, 000
Lock and dam No. 8, Arkansas	8, 600, 000
Lock and dam No. 9, Arkansas	11, 700, 000
Dardenelle lock and dam, Arkansas	3, 500, 000
Ozark lock and dam, Arkansas	12, 000, 000
Lock and dam No. 13, Arkansas and Oklahoma	15, 000, 000
Lock and dam No. 14, Oklahoma	8, 000, 000
Robert S. Kerr lock and dam, Oklahoma	13, 000, 000
Webbers Falls lock and dam, Oklahoma	14, 600, 000
Lock and dam No. 17, Oklahoma	11, 600, 000
Lock and dam No. 18, Oklahoma	15, 000, 000
Keystone Dam, Okla	4, 600, 000
Oologah Dam, Okla	1, 400, 000
7 projects for recreational development	500, 000
Total requested authorization	170, 000, 000

Brazos River Basin

The Brazos River rises in eastern New Mexico and flows southeasterly 1,210 miles to the Gulf of Mexico near Freeport, Tex. The watershed has an overall length of 640 miles and a maximum width of about 120 miles. Its total area is about 44,670 square miles.

The Flood Control Act approved September 3, 1954, adopted the basinwide plan of improvement in the Brazos River Basin and authorized the appropriation of $40 million for partial accomplishment of that plan. The plan includes reservoirs for flood control and allied purposes and projects for local flood protection. Additional authorization in the amount of $65 million has been provided by subsequent acts, including the $14 million authorized by Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965.

Brazos River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$193,000,000
Available monetary authorization	105,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1967	105,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	0
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	9,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−9,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

San Gabriel River, tributary to Brazos River, Tex.	$4,700,000
Stillhouse Hollow Dam, Lampassas Reservoir, Tex.	3,700,000
Somerville Reservoir, Tex.	600,000
Total requested authorization	9,000,000

Central and Southern Florida

The project lies generally within 18 counties of Florida covering an area of about 16,341 square miles. It is comprised of upper St. Johns River Basin in the northeastern section of the project, Kissimmee River Basin in the central section above Lake Okeechobee, Lake Okeechobee-Everglades area in the central and southwestern section, and east coast Everglades area in the southeastern section.

This project provides for modification and expansion of works in an area embracing Lake Okeechobee, a large portion of the Everglades, the upper St. Johns and Kissimmee River Basins, and the lower east coast of Florida. The project was authorized in the Flood Control Act of June 30, 1948, which authorized the appropriation of $16,300,000 for partial accomplishment of the first phase of the plan. Subsequent legislation has increased the monetary authorization and expanded the project to include additional improvement. Additional monetary authorization of $30 million was granted by Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965.

Central and southern Florida

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$269,000,000
Available monetary authorization	157,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1967	149,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	8,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	22,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	—14,00,000

Project and amount on which requested authorization is planned to be used

Central and southern Florida project, Florida	$14,000,000

Columbia River Basin

The Columbia River Basin drains an area of 259,000 square miles, of which 219,500 square miles are in the United States and 39,500 square miles are in Canada. The basin includes most of the States in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho; western Montana; small areas in Nevada, Utah, and Wyoming; and the southeastern drainage at the Province of British Columbia, Canada. The river flows a distance of 462 miles in Canada and 745 miles in the United States, a total distance of 1,207 miles.

The Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Willamette River Basin and authorized $11,300,000 for the initiation and partial accomplishment of the recommended plan. Individual projects were authorized in the Columbia and Willamette River Basins by the Flood Control Act of June 22, 1936, and subsequent acts. The Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950, approved a general comprehensive plan for the Columbia River Basin for flood control and other purposes and authorized the appropriation of $75 million for the partial accomplishment of the plan. This monetary authorization has been increased by later acts, including Public Law 89–42, adopted June 18, 1965, which increased the authorization by $228 million.

Columbia River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$2,053,000,000
Available monetary authorization	1,142,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1967	1,098,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	44,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	197,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−153,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Blue River Reservoir, Oreg	$7,000,000
Cascadia Reservoir, Oreg	800,000
Dworshak Reservoir, Idaho	45,500,000
Gate Creek Reservoir, Oreg	700,000
Green Peter and Foster Reservoirs, Oreg	5,900,000
John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	39,700,000
Libby Reservoir, Mont	47,000,000
The Dalles Dam (units 15 through 22), Oreg. and Wash.	800,000
Willamette bank protection, Oreg	400,000
Columbia River local protection:	
Heise-Roberts extension, Idaho	2,100,000
Portneuf River, Pocatello unit, Idaho	2,700,000
Three projects for recreational development	400,000
Total requested authorization	153,000,000

Missouri River Basin

The Missouri River Basin drains an area of 519,090 square miles, of which 509,375 square miles are in the United States and 9,715 square miles are in Canada. The basin includes all of Nebraska, most of South Dakota, large portions of North Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, about half of Kansas and Missouri; and smaller parts of Colorado, Iowa, and Minnesota. From its source in southwestern Montana it flows for a distance of 2,460 miles to enter the Mississippi River above St. Louis, Mo.

A general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Missouri River Basin was approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938 which also authorized $9 million for initiation and partial accomplishment of the plan. The Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, expanded the general comprehensive plan for the Missouri River Basin to include the coordinated plan of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, and authorized $200 million for each agency. Additional projects and monetary authorizations have been included in subsequent acts, including Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965, which increased the monetary authorization by $116 million.

Missouri River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$2,134,000,000
Available monetary authorization	1,442,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 10, 1967	1,391,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	51,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	71,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−20,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Big Bend Reservoir, S. Dak	$600,000
Fort Scott Reservoir, Kans	200,000
Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, Mo	5,000,000
Lawrence, Kans	500,000
Melvern Reservoir, Kans	1,000,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri	1,300,000
Missouri River-Garrison Dam to Oahe Reservoir, N. Dak	500,000
Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak	200,000
Osawatomie, Kans	200,000
Perry Reservoir, Kans	3,900,000
Stockton Reservoir, Mo	5,200,000
Topeka, Kans	500,000
8 projects for recreational development	900,000
Total requested authorization	20,000,000

Ohio River Basin

The Ohio River is formed by the junction of the Allegheny and Monongahela Rivers at Pittsburgh, and flows in a general southwesterly direction to join the Mississippi River at Cairo, Ill. Its length is 981 miles, and its basin comprising 204,000 square miles lies between the Allegheny Mountains on the east and the Mississippi River Basin on the west. The basin is about 800 miles long along the northeast-southwest axis, and about 500 miles wide along its northwest-southwest axis. Lying in the basin are major portions of Ohio, Indiana, West Virginia, Kentucky, and Tennessee; large areas in Pennsylvania, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, and Illinois; and parts of New York, Maryland, Georgia, and Mississippi.

The Flood Control Acts of June 22, 1936, August 28, 1937, and June 28, 1938, approved a general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ohio River Basin, consisting of reservoirs, levees, floodwalls, and drainage structures for protection of cities and towns. Those acts were amended and supplemented by subsequent acts, which also included monetary authorizations for further prosecution of the comprehensive plan. Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965, increased the monetary authorization by $89 million.

Ohio River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$1,296,000,000
Available monetary authorization	1,012,000,000
Appropriations made available through June 30, 1967	977,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	35,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	73,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−38,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Kinzua Dam and Allegheny Reservoir, Pa	$5,000,000
Big Darby Creek Reservoir, Ohio	800,000
Brookville Reservoir, Ind	2,500,000
Caesar Creek Reservoir, Ohio	700,000
Cave Run Reservoir, Ky	3,300,000
Deer Creek Reservoir, Ohio	3,700,000
East Fork Reservoir, Ohio	900,000
East Lynn Reservoir, W. Va	2,600,000
England Pond levee, Illinois	700,000
Fishtrap Reservoir, Ky	4,500,000
Frankfort-North Frankfort area, Kentucky	500,000
Green River Reservoir, Ky	4,600,000
J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Tenn	4,500,000
Paint Creek Reservoir, Ohio	1,700,000
Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee, Illinois	700,000
Sturgis, Ky	400,000
12 projects for recreational development	900,000
Total requested authorization	38,000,000

Ouachita River Basin

The Ouachita River Basin, comprising about 25,000 square miles within the Red River Basin, is located in the southern half of Arkansas and the northwestern part of Louisiana.

The River and Harbor Act of May 17, 1950, approved the general plan for flood control and other purposes in the Ouachita River Basin and authorized the appropriation of $21,300,000 for initiation and partial accomplishment of the plan. The authorized plan consists of channel improvements for flood control for Bayou Bartholomew, Ark. and La., and Pine Bluff, Ark., De Gray Reservoir, Ark., Murfreesboro Reservoir, Ark., and a floodwall at Monroe, La. Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965, increased the monetary authorization by $11 million.

Ouachita River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$73,000,000
Available monetary authorization	32,000,000
Appropriations made through fiscal year 1967	26,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	6,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	$14,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−8,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Bayou Bartholomew, Ark. and La	$200,000
De Gray Reservoir, Ark	7,800,000
Total requested authorization	8,000,000

San Joaquin River Basin

The San Joaquin River, the only exterior drainage channel for an area of about 32,000 square miles, has its source in the Sierra Nevada about 25 miles southeast of the Yosemite Valley, Calif.

The Flood Control Act approved December 22, 1944, adopted the plan of improvement for flood control and other purposes on the lower San Joaquin River and tributaries, including Tuolumne and Stanislaus Rivers, and authorized the appropriation of $8 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. This monetary authorization has been increased by later acts.

San Joaquin River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$160,000,000
Available monetary authorization	29,000,000
Appropriations made through fiscal year 1967	26,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	3,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1963, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	5,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−2,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Lower San Joaquin levees, California	$500,000
New Melones-Stanislaus River Reservoir, Calif	1,500,000
Total requested authorization	2,000,000

South Platte River, Colo.

The South Platte River rises on the Continental Divide in central Colorado and flows northeasterly to its confluence with the North Platte River at North Platte, Nebr. The drainage area of 24,030 square miles includes a section of the rugged eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, with elevations exceeding 14,000 feet and extensive areas of the Great Plains.

The Flood Control Act of May 17, 1950, authorized a plan for flood control and related purposes in the South Platte River Basin in Colorado. The current plan consists of Chatfield Reservoir and levee and channel improvements at three locations, including the city of Boulder. The act also authorized the appropriation of $26,300,000 for partial accomplishment of the plan.

South Platte River, Colo.

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$115,000,000
Available monetary authorization	$26,000,000
Appropriations made through fiscal year 1967	5,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	21,000,000
Less estimated in funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	23,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−2,000,000

Project and amount on which requested authorization is planned to be used

Chatfield Reservoir, Colo	$2,000,000

Upper Mississippi River Basin

The upper Mississippi River Basin is that portion of North-Central United States containing the Mississippi River and all tributary streams above the Ohio River excluding the Missouri River. The Mississippi River originates at Lake Itasca in central Minnesota and flows approximately 1,366 miles to a point above the mouth of the Ohio River. This basin area covers 188,000 square miles including the larger parts of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Iowa, and reaching into Indiana, South Dakota, and Missouri.

The Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, approved the general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the upper Mississippi River Basin, consisting of reservoirs and $2,700,000 for local flood protection works on the upper Mississippi and Illinois Rivers. Subsequent acts have increased the authorization and modified the plan to include additional projects. Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965, increased the monetary authorizations by $27 million.

Upper Mississippi River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$174,000,000
Available monetary authorization	115,000,000
Appropriations made through fiscal year 1967	108,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	7,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	11,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−4,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorizations are planned to be used

Red Rock Reservoir and Lake Red Rock, Iowa	$3,900,000
1 project for recreational development	100,000
Total requested authorization	4,000,000

West Branch, Susquehanna River Basin

From the confluence of the West Branch and North Branch at Sunbury, Pa., the Susquehanna River flows southeasterly 123 miles to Chesapeake Bay. The West Branch rises on the Appalachian Plateau in central Pennsylvania, and flows for a distance of 240 miles to its confluence with the North Branch. The West Branch basin has a drainage area of 6,990 square miles, all in Pennsylvania.

This project consists of a system of three flood control reservoirs: Alvin L. Bush, Curwensville, and Blanchard in the headwaters of the West Branch, Susquehanna River. The project was approved by the Flood Control Act of September 3, 1954, which authorized the appropriation of $25 million for partial accomplishment of the plan. This was increased by $2 million in 1963 and by $17 million in Public Law 89–42, approved June 18, 1965.

West Branch, Susquehanna River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$55,000,000
Available monetary authorization	44,000,000
Appropriations made through fiscal year 1967	42,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	2,000,000
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season for fiscal year 1969	11,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	−9,000,000

Project and amount on which requested authorization is planned to be used

Blanchard Reservoir, Pa	$9,000,000

White River Basin

The White River rises in northwestern Arkansas, flows northeasterly into southern Missouri, and thence southeasterly back into Arkansas to join the Mississippi River at about mile 580 above the Head of Passes, La. It is about 700 miles long and drains about 27,765 square miles, of which 10,622 are in Missouri and 17,143 are in Arkansas. About 7,000 square miles are within the limits of the Mississippi River backwater. The latter area is included in the plan for the lower Mississippi River (M.R. & T. project).

The general comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in the White River Basin was approved by the Flood Control Act of June 28, 1938, which authorized the appropriation of $25 million for initiation and partial accomplishment of the plan. Subsequent legislation has authorized additional amounts for continuation of the plan, and modified it to include additional projects.

White River Basin

Total estimated cost of projects in plan	$345,000,000
Available monetary authorization	284,000,000
Appropriations made through fiscal year 1967	284,000,000
Remaining monetary authorization	0
Less estimated funding in fiscal year 1968, based upon approved budget request and allowance for summer construction season of fiscal year 1969	2,000,000
Deficit monetary authorization and request for fiscal year 1968	—2,000,000

Projects and amounts on which requested authorization are planned to be used

5 projects for recreational development	$2,000,000

Section 2

Sacramento River Basin

The project for flood protection on the Sacramento River, Calif., was first authorized by the Flood Control Act of March 1, 1917, as amended and modified by subsequent acts of Congress. The most recent modification was authorized by the 1960 Flood Control Act in accordance with the recommendations contained in Senate Document 103, 86th Congress. This document recommended modification of the existing Sacramento River flood control project to include a long-range program of bank erosion control works and setback levees at a total estimated cost of $21,360,000. Congress authorized $14,240,000 to be appropriated for prosecution of the initial phase of this work under a cost-sharing arrangement whereby two-thirds of the total cost would be borne by the Federal Government and one-third by the local interests.

Owing to increased costs for rights-of-way and relocations, rising price levels since authorization, and to inclusion of recreation facilities in the project, the total cost estimate for the initial phase of this work has increased from $21,360,000 to $31,800,000. Although sufficient Federal monetary authority remains to cover construction through fiscal year 1969, the state monetary authority, limited by California State law to one-third of the Federal authorization, will be exhausted in fiscal year 1967.

An increase in the Federal monetary authorization to cover the currently estimated Federal cost of the initial phase would enable an increase in the State's monetary authorization sufficient to permit orderly continuation of the project. Accordingly, an increase in monetary authorization of $7,000,000 is needed to permit completion of the initial phase of the work authorized in the 1960 Flood Control Act.

Section 3

This section modifies the plan of improvement for the Brazos River Basin, Tex., authorized by the Flood Control Act of 1954, so as to provide that all additional construction costs occasioned by the occurrence on a slide in the embankment of Waco Dam on the Bosque River during the fall of 1961 shall be borne by the United States.

The 1954 authorization, together with the authority contained in the Flood Control Act of 1944, authorized the Secretary of the Army to make contracts with States, municipalities, private concerns, and individuals, at such prices and on such terms as are deemed reasonable, for uses authorized by the acts for surplus water that may be available at any reservoir under the control of the Department of the Army. Consequently, a contract was entered into by the Brazos River Authority, granting to the authority the right to utilize storage space for is needs and the needs of the city of Waco.

In consideration of its being granted the use of the storage in the project, the authority agreed to pay an amount currently estimated to be $5,871,050.

On October 4, 1961, a slide was discovered by the Government in the embankment. The cause of the movement has been attributed to failure in the subsurface shales of the foundation. The presently estimated cost of the repair work is in the amount of $7,729,700, of which $1,174,000 is the additional share of the authority according to the terms of the contract, making an estimated contribution totaling $7,045,050, for which the authority would be responsible.

Inasmuch as the repairs made necessary by the slide were unforeseen at the time the project was authorized, the committee feels that it is equitable for the United States to assume the additional cost for such work.

In addition, the committee has been informed that if the city of Waco had any reason to believe, prior to entering into a contract, that water supply storage in the Federal prject would ultimately cost more than $7 million, it would have sought a comparable supply at a lesser cost from a nearby alternate source.

Section 4

This section identifies the bill as the River Basin Monetary Authorization Act of 1967.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee realizes that the existing monetary authorization for several of the comprehensive plans is not adequate to cover the estimated appropriations for fiscal year 1968. In the absence of additional authorization in the very near future, it will be necessary to suspend operations on certain projects and cancel or suspend certain continuing contracts. This procedure will result in additional costs to the Government, contractors, and to local interests. The committee has therefore seen fit to provide increases in monetary authority to cover the needs of 14 river basin plans in fiscal year 1968, together with an allowance to meet the needs during the summer and fall construction period of fiscal year 1969. Inasmuch as the authorization made available in this legislation will only be sufficient to cover fiscal year 1968 and a portion of fiscal year 1969, the committee intends to review the requirements for future years early in the next Congress. Enactment of this legislation is accordingly recommended.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 8363) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELWYN C. HALE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 823) for the relief of Elwyn C. Hale which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior shall receive, consider, and act upon a petition of Elwyn C. Hale, lessee of the terminated oil and gas lease (Las Cruces 063610), for reinstatement of said lease if filed within one hundred and eighty days after the effective date of this Act, together with the required rental, including back rental, accruing from the date of termination of the lease. The Secretary may reinstate said lease in accordance with the provisions of section 31(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 188(*e*)): *Provided*, That it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the failure to pay timely was either justifiable or not due to lack of reasonable diligence. If the Secretary grants a reinstatement of the terminated lease and finds that such reinstatement will not afford the lessee a reasonable opportunity to continue operations under the lease, he may extend the term of the lease for a period not to exceed two years from the date the Secretary grants the petition.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 197), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 823, which was sponsored by Senator Clinton P. Anderson, of New Mexico, would permit the Secretary to do equity to the holder of a Federal oil and gas lease in New Mexico that was canceled as the result of a mistake. The bill does not in itself reinstate the lease, however.

The undisputed facts are as follows: On May 1, 1955, the lease (Las Cruces 063610) containing 1,040 acres, was issued to Elwyn C. Hale for an initial 5-year term; it was extended for an additional 5 years ending April 30, 1965.

On that termination date, active drilling was in progress on the tract, and under the law the lessee was entitled to a 2-year extension. However, payment of rental, in advance, also was required.

At the time, Mr. Hale was absent from his office for several days, and his secretary, believing that the active drilling was in itself all that was required to extend the lease, failed to make the advance rental payment.

Under the law, the lease terminated automatically when the rent was not paid on the date due.

The committee is convinced that the failure to pay rental was an inadvertence, and that Mr. Hale acted in good faith. He has invested nearly $9,000 in drilling the well to a depth of nearly 500 feet, and, if his lease is reinstated, he will resume drilling and test operation.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee's amendment in the nature of a substitute is based on recommendations of the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of the Budget, and of Mr. Hale's attorney, Clarence Hinkle, of Roswell, N. Mex. It differs from the bill as introduced in the following respects:

First, it requires Mr. Hale to submit the back rental with the petition for reinstatement.

Second, it authorizes the Secretary to extend the lease for an additional period of 2 years from the date the Secretary grants the lessee petition for reinstatement.

Also, on the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget, the implied requirement is spelled out that the Secretary must be satisfied that failure to make timely payment was not due to lack of reasonable diligence.

Thus, if the Secretary is convinced of Mr. Hale's good faith and the equities of his position, he may put Mr. Hale in the same position he would have been in but for the inadvertent failure to pay advance rental.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate oil and gas lease Las Cruces 063610."

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the conclusion of the pending business, it is the intention of the leadership to call up Calendar 194, Senate Joint Resolution 79, having to do with the extension of the present joint resolution in relation to a possible railway strike. On that measure there will be a yea-and-nay vote.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION TODAY

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF). Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] is to offer an amendment on which there will be 2 hours of debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be read.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 4, strike out the quotation marks at the end of line 3.

On page 4, between lines 3 and 4, insert the following:

"(g) Nothing contained in this section, or any other provision of law, shall be construed to authorize the Postmaster General to enter into a lease agreement for any building to be erected for postal purposes unless the estimated construction cost of such building, as determined by the Administrator of General Services prior to the making of such agreement, is not in excess of $250,000."

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is in control of 1 hour. How much time does he yield himself?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. President, the amendment would limit the Postmaster General's leasing authority to the construction and leasing of post office buildings which the Administrator of the General Services Administration determines would cost less than $250,000. The amendment would not change at all the provisions of the bill with respect to the authority of the Department to construct post office buildings which would cost below $250,000. All the guidelines contained in the bill would remain intact.

The reason I suggest that the authority be limited to smaller post offices is, as I stated on Friday, that these are one-purpose buildings. When larger buildings, whose cost sometimes runs into several million dollars, are built it is cheaper for the Government to own them outright. Ofttimes when the $250,000 figure is exceeded the cost moves into the multimillion-dollar class of offices. The multimillion-dollar post offices are one-purpose buildings and are extremely expensive to the Federal Government on any leasing arrangement. Those who receive the contracts to build those buildings and then lease them to the Government automatically include sufficient allowances to amortize the cost of the buildings over the 30-year period of the lease. No one disputes that fact.

This means that the Government pays for the buildings in rentals, yet still does not own them at the end of the 30-year period.

The bill before the Senate does have one improvement over existing law; it eliminates the present 10 to 20-year authority of the Post Office Department to lease some buildings and puts them all on a 30-year basis. With that provision I am in complete agreement for it is better than existing law.

The Comptroller General has said that it is better to amortize the cost over 30 years than over a shorter period, but in all the reports that have been submitted to the Committee on Public Works, which handled the bill, he most emphatically added that even those leases are far more expensive than if the Government owned the buildings outright. In fact, the Comptroller General's report, which is in the files of the committee, states that the General Accounting Office audited the costs of four offices—namely, Detroit, Harrisburg, Cincinnati, and Toledo—and found that over the life of the leases the Federal Government will pay $62 million more than it would have paid had it constructed and owned the buildings in the first place. It just does not make sense to have the Government continue a program as expensive as that.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment. If it will, then so far as I am concerned we could proceed promptly to a vote. I believe the amendment would give more protection to the taxpayers than now exists.

Mr. President, how much time have I used?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has consumed 4 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, after using 1 more minute I shall withhold making further comment at this time in the hope that the amendment will be accepted.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope that the chairman of the committee will accept the amendment or state his reasons for not accepting it. I think we are in complete agreement that the Comptroller General has endorsed a program of Government ownership of these particular buildings, rather than continuing the lease-purchase program. The committee report states that the committee unanimously recommended that it would be to the advantage of the Federal Government financially to construct these buildings in every conceivable instance where it would be possible rather than to lease them over the 30-year period.

Mr. President, I withhold the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. How much time does the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] yield himself?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes, or whatever time may be necessary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware because, in my opinion and in the opinion of the Post Office Department, it would render the bill nearly worthless, so far as the Post Office Department is concerned.

It does not matter how big or how small the post office is that is being built under a leasing agreement. Size alone is not the controlling factor. It is true that hundreds of post offices have been built all over the United States since this law became effective, which would not have otherwise been built because of the trouble of appropriating funds and the amount of money that would have been required to build so many post offices. Many small post offices have been built, and a relatively few large post offices have been built.

Both the General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office have recommended this measure. They state that the bill as now written is better than the law now on the books, which gives the Post Office Department authority to lease for a period of 20 years.

Mr. President, I shall read from the report with respect to the position of the General Accounting Office:

> In our opinion, the Postmaster General has need for the authorities contained in section 2103 of title 39 to acquire title to sites and to enter into leases for periods not exceeding 30 years, and we recommend that these authorities be extended.

Mr. President, in a great many cases it is desirable for the Post Office Department to have post offices built on land which is already owned by municipalities or by airport authorities. These authorities do not want to sell the land, but they will build on it and lease the building to the Government. It is a mistake to leave the impression that the rent paid by the Federal Government in connection with post office buildings is far in excess of the amount that it would cost the Federal Government to build the buildings, because it takes money for the Federal Government to buy the land and build the buildings.

In addition, when the building is built by the Federal Government, it becomes a nontaxpaying building. The municipality, or the county government, would then lose that piece of property as tax-producing property. When the building is a leased building, the owner has the responsibility to maintain the building, to pay taxes and insurance, and to meet all the expenses connected with the operation of the building.

When the buildings are to be leased, they are put up for bids. Many times a site is selected by the Post Office Department, and after an option is obtained on the site bidders are told that they can purchase the land for so much money. Sometimes the Government buys the sites and then turns around and sells it to the successful bidder for the price the Government paid. The contractor, in turn, bids against all other contractors who want to build on the specified site. There is no boondoggle involved in the construction of these buildings and the renting of them back to the Government.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina wish the Chair to inform him when his 5 minutes have expired?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I shall speak for 2 additional minutes at this time.

There were some objections in connection with this measure, but they have been removed from the bill. I cannot accept the amendment, and I hope that the bill will be passed in its present form.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, the arguments made by the Senator from North Carolina are not at all pertinent to the question which is now before the Senate. First, the acceptance of this amendment would not in any way affect the right of the Federal Government to lease post office facilities in an airport or on land already owned by the Federal Government. There is nothing in the bill that would affect that situation. Surely, the Senator is not trying to tell the Senate that the Federal Government is going to go out to this airport and have an independent contractor build a building costing $4 million or $5 million on land owned by the Federal Government, and then lease it back to the Government. That would be ridiculous.

If that is their plan, then it is all the more reason for approval of the amendment.

Furthermore, the suggestion is made that in some instances the local community collects taxes. Who pays the taxes? The Federal Government pays the tax because it is included as part of the rent. Certainly it is included as a part of the charges. However, in many of these larger post offices we find that after the contract is awarded, the Government has negotiated with the owner that the Government will assume the local taxes and even guarantee the owner against an increase in taxes over the next 30 years.

If the taxes today are x dollars and they are increased over the 30-year life of the building the Government guarantees the lessor against such an increase for the next 30 years.

The Senator points out the expenses for which many of the owners of the buildings will be obligated in order to maintain the building. That is true in connection with the small post offices, but in connection with most of the large post offices the Government has taken over 100 percent of the responsibility for the maintenance and repairs. The owner has no responsibility except fire and casualty insurance on the building and collecting his rent check.

Last week I referred to one example in Detroit where Mr. McCloskey, of Philadelphia, received the contract on the basis that he would be responsible for all maintenance over the 30-year life of the building. After the contract was awarded and the post office was ready to be taken over they renegotiated the lease whereby the Government agreed to assume 100 percent of the responsibility for all maintenance costs during the entire life of the contract. The Comptroller General criticized them severely for approving this negotiated agreement and said that it was an arbitrary decision by the Government which would cost the taxpayers nearly $3 million. They already had a contract whereby the builder was obligated to maintain the building. They said that this one decision, made on a renegotiated basis, would cost the Federal Government $2,300,000. In other words, by that one renegotiation the Government gave to Mr. McCloskey $2,800,000 more than his first contract called for. Why?

There are many cases where the Comptroller General has said that these contracts have been renegotiated, whereby the Government assumes the entire maintenance cost.

I cite the Comptroller General's audit report on the post offices built in Detroit, Harrisburg, Cincinnati, and Toledo. The Comptroller General's report, which was submitted to the committee, states on page 7 as follows:

> We estimate that if the four facilities included in our review had been constructed for Federal ownership, the total cost to the Government, including imputed interest, would be about $62 million less over the basic 30-year terms of the leases.

Two of these offices were built by McClosky.

Now the Post Office Department does not have $62 million to throw away. This $62 million in extra payments is on these four buildings alone.

Take the following example of the Detroit office which the Comptroller General said was renegotiated, whereby the owner of the building got an extra $2,800,000 from the American taxpayers when the Government gratuitously took over the maintenance responsibility. I was advised that the man who renegotiated many of these contracts with such favorable terms has left the Post Office Department and is no longer with them, but yet they do not seem to know who did it. It is strange they know that Mr. X left, but they do not know who Mr. X is.

Following on with this one office in Detroit, the Comptroller General states that the cost of the office, including land, was $15,807,650.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Department sent a report on one office which claims that the cost was around $24,000,000. This is $7 million or $8 million more that the cost furnished by the Comptroller General. There is no defense for that error. This office, which the Comptroller General said cost around $16 million, is leased to the Federal Government for 30 years at an annual rental of $1,801,473.33 per year. The Federal Government pays all the maintenance costs on the building, including taxes, and so forth, and guarantees to keep it in a good state of repair for the entire 30 years.

At the end of 10 years, after paying $18 million in rent, the Government has the option of buying this Detroit building for $21,700,000, or about $6 million more than it cost when originally built.

At the end of 20 years, after paying $36 million in rent, the Government has an option to buy the building for $17,300,000, or about $2 million more than it cost when originally built.

Remember that in addition to the rent the Government is paying for all the maintenance costs during this period.

At the end of 30 years, if the Government has not exercised its option earlier, it will have paid in $54 million in rent and then would have the option of buying the building for $11 million.

In Buffalo, N.Y., we find a similar situation in that there are vast differences in the statistics appearing in the reports of the Comptroller General, and those of the Post Office Department.

In the Post Office Department report we are told that the Buffalo, N.Y., office is leased for 30 years at $683,479 per year over a 30-year period.

On that basis, they try to justify construction of the Buffalo building on a leasing basis; yet, we have here a report from the Comptroller General, which claims that instead of the Post Office Department's paying $683,479 annual rent for that office, as claimed in the report to the committee, they are actually paying $958,479.76, and the Government is obligated to pay this amount for 30 years.

This is another McCloskey office, and apparently the Government does not know the terms of its own lease.

It is indefensible for the Post Office Department to try to justify the enactment of the pending bill and to try to establish its feasibility by giving such erroneous information to the Federal Government.

If a taxpayer gave that kind of information to the Treasury Department we would find the Department of Justice trying to put him in the penitentiary.

I think it is about time that the Post Office Department gave us the true facts and the true costs—that is, if they know what they are, which I sometimes wonder.

In the Buffalo Post Office, which cost about $10,875,000, the Government is obligated to pay over a 30-year period $958,479.76 as annual rents. Over the 30-year period, it will have paid in $28,754,392.80 and then will have the option to buy the building for $5,900,000. At the end of 10 years, after paying $9.5 million in rent for the Buffalo Post Office, the Post Office Department would have the option of buying the building for $11 million, or about a quarter of a million more than it cost when originally built.

Certainly, that cannot be justified by any line of reasoning.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator from Delaware has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We find that in Grand Rapids, Mich., the post office, another McCloskey building, which cost $6,024,000, has been leased by the Federal Government for 30 years at $429,720 a year. At the end of 10 years, after paying in $4,297,200 in rent, it has the option of buying the building for $6 million.

At the end of 30 years, after paying in $12,891,600, the Government has the option of buying the building for $3,750,000.

Remember that the Federal Government is maintaining these buildings and providing for this upkeep, including the escalation clause for all taxes throughout.

Mr. President, I will not include the report for all the offices in the RECORD today, for the reason that it is so obvious that the report which was submitted by the Post Office Department, under date of September 29, is inaccurate. At a later date and after the figures have been corrected, I shall place them in the RECORD.

Mr. President, there are so many glaring errors in the report furnished by the Post Office Department that it would be futile to place them in the RECORD today. They would be misleading.

The Comptroller General, as I have stated, has strongly recommended that it would be more feasible for the Federal Government to own the buildings outright than for it to construct them on a 30-year leasing basis.

I now refer to page 12 of the Comptroller General's report in which he was critical of the Department for building such elaborate offices for its postmasters.

Here is the Post Office Department's defense to the Comptroller General's office for having built these overly expensive offices for its postmasters:

> When questioned as to the need for providing postmasters with private offices of such size, POD officials informed use that a large office is necessary to impress visiting representatives of labor, industry, and public organizations with the importance and dignity of the postmaster's position. Under POD standards, Postmasters in the top three grades of the Postal Field Service are allowed private offices containing more space than is provided in the Senate and House Office Buildings for private offices of United States Senators and Representatives.

Mr. President, I most respectfully suggest that instead of throwing away this money to build expensive offices to impress visiting dignitaries, it would be well for the Post Office Department to remember that those visiting their offices are taxpayers.

Of course, it could be that the Department is trying to relate the size of its offices to the size of its deficits.

I suggest it may be well to impress upon them the need for some economy. Why are we being asked to raise the postal rates? Perhaps this is the reason the Post Office is operating with such a large deficit. Such slipshod bookkeeping methods would not be condoned in any private industry.

I do not see why the committee insists upon continuing the authority to lease these buildings, in the face of this deplorable record. I fail to find a single example which would justify the continuation of this leasing authority.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

We find that in the files of the Buffalo office was contained a memorandum in which it stated that no information was to be turned over to the Comptroller General's office without first contacting the home office.

Mr. President, it is serious business when we find an agency withholding information from the Comptroller General, who is charged with the responsibility of auditing the accounts.

These are some of the reasons why many of us believe this program should not be extended further, particularly with respect to the large offices.

There will be a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment. I will yield at this time for rebuttal on the part of the managers of the bill, following which I ask unanimous consent that we may have a quorum call, the time not to be charged to either side, in order that we may ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Before the Senator yields the floor, I should like to make the statement that I think the Senator has rendered a real service in calling attention to some slipshod methods in connection with the leasing of these buildings. On the other hand, we are confronted with a real problem with respect to modernization of the Post Office, in order to take care of the great volume of mail. I would be most pleased if we could, somehow, some way, have sufficient funds to have these post office buildings constructed for the Government and owned by it. I think it would be in the interest of our National Government. I would certainly prefer it. But we are in this practical situation. We have not had many large post offices in our State. We have had many new ones, and we need many more in our State. I hope we will get more through leasing them.

This year there will be included an item of $100 million for modernizing and equipping post office buildings to handle the mail; $100 million in an operation like the Post Office, which, to completely modernize it, would, in my opinion, cost $5 billion, is not much. I do not see where we are going to get $5 billion at the present time, badly as it is needed.

So I get to the point of saying that I think the Senator from Delaware has rendered a real service in calling this matter to our attention, so that the Post Office may at least give careful consideration to the suggestions made in handling contracts for these large offices.

There are 83 billion pieces of mail. There has been much criticism of its handling. I know of no better way than the present practice of leasing buildings which are built for Federal post office buildings, in view of our present budget condition and funds to be spent for facilities in those buildings. I would like to see them built and owned by the Federal Government. Until that is done, I think the committee may consider the suggestions made.

I can support the amendment of the Senator relating to the $250,000 buildings. I think it would cover about 90 percent of the buildings. I would not object so much to that amendment.

My main point is to commend the Senator from Delaware for calling attention to this problem; and, second, to say that I know of no way at the present time to put the Post Office in any position to get the mails handled other than the present one. It is proposed to spend $100 million in a multibillion-dollar entity to modernize the Post Office operation. I can see we would be headed for greater trouble. The Senator has rendered a real service.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator from Kansas. The amendment would not affect the smaller post offices, or those costing $250,000 or less. I understand over 90 percent of them would be below that figure.

I agree with the Senator that a modernization of the Post Office Department is long overdue. That is another reason why the Government should own the buildings. The modern equipment being put in these large buildings will cost $5 million to $8 million.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield myself 5 additional minutes. In every instance, the Federal Government owns the equipment being placed in these large buildings. This equipment costs several million dollars and is being installed in a building which it will not own. It will put several million dollars worth of equipment in that building. Then when the time of the lease runs out the Government will be facing a huge loss if it does not renew that lease. After having paid for the cost of that building in rent it will have to move its equipment to another facility.

The Comptroller General was very strong in his position that it would be cheaper for the Government, with respect to these large offices, to construct and own its buildings. That is where his criticism is directed.

I placed in the RECORD figures showing that in the case of four offices alone over the life of the lease the Federal Government will pay in rent $62 million more than it would have if it had owned those buildings outright; $62 million would pay for the construction of a lot of offices. The money that the Federal Government is paying as rent on these large buildings would be better spent if the Government owned those buildings.

Let us review another of these leases. After one of these large buildings was constructed and the lease signed, the Department decided it wanted an adjoining facility for a parking lot. It had an option to buy it for $87,000. The cost of the blacktop pavement and lighting for that parking lot was $30,000, which meant it would cost $117,000. The Government had this option involving a total of $117,000 expenditures for that parking lot needed in connection with the post office. Then it turned the option over to a private company, and the company paid the $117,000. Then the Government entered into a lease with that private company for 30 years at $10,000 a year rent. The Government will pay $300,000 in rent over the 30-year period of the lease for this $117,000 parking lot, and still not own it. This does not make good sense. Certainly it would be far better for the Government to buy these facilities than to pay rent.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I agree fully that we would be better off, but I point out that the deficit will be $1.2 billion on June 30. The President has requested a $700 million increase in postal rates, which would, of course, reduce the deficit from $1.2 billion to $500 million. But if we voted a pay increase for the postal employees, which would probably amount to $300 million to $450 million, depending on what we vote for, it would mean that the deficit would go back to $1 billion or so as of June 30, 1968.

Therefore, my point is only this: That the Federal Government, the Post Office Department, does not have the money. If we provide the money, I favor the principle. If we start voting the funds to build some of these buildings, I would go even further than the large buildings, and suggest that we go down to some of the smaller ones as well.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes, I think we should build and own the smaller ones. The committee itself said it would be more practical to build and own them in every case where possible. I do not endorse any phase of the leasing proposal itself as being economically feasible, but I am by all means trying to correct the glaring abuses with this amendment.

I shall quote just one sentence from another Comptroller General's report. The complete report is available to any Senator who wishes to read it. The sentence to which I refer is as follows:

> Our review of fund requirements for 85 postal facilities under 20- and 30-year leases showed that the total rental costs to be incurred under the lease arrangements substantially exceed the Post Office Department's estimated costs of constructing these facilities.

I have as yet to find a single larger office which the Comptroller General has audited, where he did not report that the cost of leasing exceeded the cost of the Government's building and owning it.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has consumed 25 minutes. His time has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I think the time is long past due when we should put some business management into this Department which so badly needs it. Let us adopt this amendment as a start in the right direction.

Mr. President, I withhold the remainder of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina wish to yield time? The Chair did not rule upon the request of the Senator from Delaware to have a quorum call without it being charged to either side.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I withdraw the request.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. A quorum can be ordered after the Senator finishes?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Yes; after the debate is closed.

The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware has repeated his remarks about the General Accounting Office. I shall read again what he said regarding the present bill, which we are working on right now:

> In our opinion, the Postmaster General has need for the authorities contained in section 2103 of Title 39 to acquire title to sites and to enter into leases for periods not exceeding thirty years, and we recommend that these authorities be extended.

Mr. President, I also thoroughly agree with the distinguished Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] that if the Federal Government had the money to go out and build all the post offices that are needed, the needs for which are constantly being brought to our attention, I do not think there is any question that some economies could be effected. That is recognized in the report.

I also wish to point out another thing, that the Committee on Public Works held hearings on this bill in the subcommittee, it was reported to the full committee, and the full committee acted on it. I believe they considered all of these points very thoroughly, and agreed that the bill should be reported and passed in its present form.

Mr. President, the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware to restrict the leasing authority of the Postmaster General to buildings costing less than $250,000 would render this bill almost useless as a vehicle to assist the Postmaster General in carrying out his responsibilities of moving an ever-increasing volume of mail. Whether it is to the Government's advantage to lease or construct a building is not necessarily determined by the size of the building. Very often it is necessary to have a rather large mail-handling building in the vicinity of a large airport or port where the land belongs to the airport or port authority. These authorities are very reluctant to sell the land but in many cases will construct the facility and lease it back to the Post Office Department at a very favorable rent. It is possible to do this since the authority already owns the land, does not have to pay taxes, and the rental of the building is incidental to their main business of operating an airport or a port. In such cases, it can be clearly demonstrated that the Government will save money by leasing in lieu of purchasing the land and constructing the building with appropriated funds.

Limiting the leasing authority to a building costing less than $250,000 would mean limiting this authority to a building containing approximately 10,000 gross square feet or less. A building of this size normally serves a community of 5,000 to 7,000 people. Thus, this amendment would make it impossible to lease mail handling facilities in growing suburban areas where, due to the rapid change in population density, it is necessary to relocate the post office every 10 to 15 years.

There is another situation that I believe the Senator from Delaware has completely overlooked where leasing authority for buildings containing more than 10,000 square feet is vital. This is the situation where we have natural disasters such as floods, fires, and tornadoes, where the existing post office building is damaged beyond continued occupancy. In order to keep the mail moving the Post Office Department must immediately lease another building which, in many cases, would be larger than 10,000 square feet. With the Senator from Delaware's amendment this would be impossible and there would be a complete breakdown of mail delivery in the area.

As I stated before, the Public Works Committee is in complete agreement with the Senator from Delaware that post office facilities, both large and small, should be provided through Government construction wherever ownership would be advantageous to the U.S. Government and has so stated in the committee report. The Senator from Delaware has also expressed his concern over the excessive size of postmasters' offices in larger leased facilities. The committee was cognizant of this possible abuse and in its report stated:

> Office and administrative space in new postal facilities should be planned on the basis of standards comparable to those established by the General Services Administration for use in determining similar office space needs for other Federal agencies.

Most of the alleged abuse of the leasing authority by the Postmaster General referred to by the Senator from Delaware took place during the last 10 years when it was the stated policy of the Post Office Department to obtain the majority of its larger post office buildings through leasing rather than construction. However, I would point out that this policy has now changed, and these facilities will be provided through Government construction wherever possible, as evidenced by the testimony given by the Acting Assistant Postmaster General before the committee, as follows:

> The General Accounting Office, the Post Office Department, and I might say, the Bureau of the Budget, are all agreed on one proposition, namely, that the larger major facilities required by POD can generally be constructed as Federal buildings more economically than they can be provided as leased buildings. This consensus then is the basis for the future policy of the Department. That policy is that to the extent possible and desirable, including availability of funds, our larger facilities will be constructed as Federal buildings either by the Department under its delegation of authority, or by GSA as combination Post Office and Federal office buildings. Under this policy we believe that a very substantial number of buildings now being planned as leased buildings will be converted to Federal construction. We believe that this policy, unless interrupted by events and forces outside the control of the Department, will result in the great majority of the Department's larger facilities being constructed for Federal ownership.

Mr. President, I emphasize again that the bill reported by the Public Works Committee was given very careful thought and while it gives the Postmaster General the authority he needs to assist him in moving the mail, it contains adequate provisions for limitation and review to insure that leasing will not be used in lieu of Government construction and that every lease for a larger facility will be adequately justified before appropriate committees of the Congress. Therefore, I urge that the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware be rejected and the bill, as reported from the Committee on Public Works, be passed.

Mr. President, I have only one further remark to add. As representatives of the Post Office Department have pointed out, it is their desire and their intention to build every building that they can build, that they can obtain the necessary appropriations to build, and every building that they need, as Government buildings where all the facilities of the Government can be taken care of in one building.

I do not believe it is any secret at all that possibly the offices for the postmasters in some of the buildings heretofore constructed may have been too large. I would not argue that point whatsoever. But that was also brought out at the hearings, and the committee went into it thoroughly. We have been assured that that will not happen in the future.

The GSA and the GAO have no objection to the bill. They recommend it, and I recommend its passage, in its present form.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield to the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I heartily agree with the statements of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. The committee has gone over the bill with a fine-toothed comb. It has discussed the bill with representatives of the General Services Administration and the General Accounting Office. Many of the criticisms which have been leveled by the distinguished Senator from Delaware have already been taken care of. Under the bill, consultation with the General Services Administration will be required, and it is the premise of the committee and the policy of the Post Office Department and the General Services Administration that if the Government can build these special-purpose postal facilities, the buildings will be constructed for Federal ownership, rather than leased.

However, there are certain specific and unique situations in which the leasing authority may be required. For example, there may be a piece of property which is owned by a city administration or a State administration, such as an airport, from which the Federal Government will not be able, except by a leasing arrangement, to obtain the land on which a postal facility can be built. It is necessary for the Post Office Department to have authority to negotiate with the city or State administration, or with a private, quasi-public corporation, to insure the construction of a post office.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] stated the other day that if we limit the leasing of post office facilities to buildings below the value of $250,000, numerous contractors will be able to bid on these buildings. He further pointed out that with respect to buildings costing more than $250,000, there is a present dearth of contractors for such projects.

We think that argument is specious.

The proposed buildings are put out on bids whether the buildings are to be built under lease or for Government ownership, regardless of the cost of the building. All contractors desiring to bid on these buildings are given an opportunity to do so.

The argument, therefore, that only a very few contractors would be able to bid on buildings to cost more than over $250,000 does not hold water. Regardless of who puts out the bid, these are the same contractors who will build the buildings.

Mr. President, we believe that the pending bill is a good bill. We believe that the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware is not necessary and that it would tie the hands of the Post Office Department.

We believe there is great merit in the pending bill. It contains restrictions specifically added by the committee so as to preclude in the future repetition of lease transactions that have occasioned so much criticism.

Mr. President, I ask my colleagues to vote against the pending amendment and support the bill as reported by the Public Works Committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the argument has just been made that the pending bill eliminates many of the abuses which I have pointed out. I disagree with that argument.

The pending bill merely spells out that it is the intention of the committee to eliminate such abuses. The committee bill—and the chairman just read from the report—provides that the Post Office Department should consult with the General Services Administration regarding the required space. All that is provided in the bill is a statement it "should." They "should" have been consulted before. However nothing in the pending measure provides that they "must" have the approval of the GSA. They merely consult with them. The General Services Administration can and did consult with them when these abuses which I have outlined developed.

It has also been pointed out that before a contract is signed the Post Office Department will report 30 days in advance to the committee on its plans. The Senate may be out of session, and none of the members of the committee would see the report. That is no protection.

I am not unmindful of the fact that it was a congressional committee that built the Senate Office Building and the Rayburn Building. Such a provision would not afford any great security.

Let us face the fact that the taxpayers need this protection, and the adoption of the pending amendment is the only way it can be accomplished. At no point has the Comptroller General said it to be more economically feasible for the Government to lease the buildings than to own them outright.

The argument was made by the Senator from North Carolina that the Senate bill was designed to take care of the situation in which the city or State government would own the land and would only lease its facilities to the Post Office Department. Such a situation is not at all involved here.

We are dealing with a group of private individuals or private contractors who negotiate these leases with the Federal Government.

Mr. President, of the 287 examples of projects that cost $250,000 or over and that have already been completed, I have been informed that not a single project involved leasing from a State or city agency. They all involved private contractors.

Mr. President, I shall read excerpts from another of the Comptroller General's reports.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 2 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for an additional 2 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I read an excerpt from the report:

> Our review of fund requirements for 85 postal facilities under 20- and 30-year leases showed that the total rental costs to be incurred under the lease arrangements substantially exceed the Post Office Department's estimated costs of constructing these facilities. Although larger Government expenditures would be required during the period of construction if the facilities were being constructed for Government ownership, over-all fund requirements for the facilities would be substantially less than total rent payments over the terms of the leases. In addition, under the lease arrangements the Government is committed to large annual rental expenditures for long periods of time withut acquiring any equity in the leased facilities.

I read further from the report of the Comptroller General:

> The Department has stated that the leasing program is a valuable instrument in providing postal facilities and that, although the costs of leasing may exceed the costs of Government ownership, the merits of leasing cannot be determined solely on the basis of a cost differential. In support of this position the Department referred to certain economic and bugetary considerations and claimed certain operational advantages in regard to the leasing program. We recognize that there are economic and budgetary considerations which should be weighed in determining the method of acquiring postal space. We believe, however, that the Department has not adequately supported its position regarding the operational advantages of the leasing program.
>
> We are recommending that, in view of the significant savings available to the Government by ownership of postal facilities, the Department consider a policy of ownership except in specific cases where the cost of leasing is clearly justified by other identified factors.

No one can interpret that statement as an endorsement of the 30-year leasing authority contained in the pending bill.

I challenge anyone to contradict these reports or to cite one single example where anyone claims that the Government saved money under this lease-purchase arrangement. It cannot be done.

Mr. President, I will ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment. In order to get enough Senators present so that the yeas and nays may be ordered I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the understanding of the Chair that that request will come after the debate is completed.

Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to yield more time?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, does the Senator from Delaware yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Not entirely. I thought we could get the yeas and nays ordered.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time not be charged to either side.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator yield time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned we could proceed to vote on this bill at this time. I have outlined my arguments as to why I do not believe this authority should extend to offices costing over $250,000, and I have quoted the Comptroller General's report sustaining my position.

Regardless of the outcome of this vote, at a later date I shall incorporate in the RECORD a list of these larger offices showing ownership, costs, and annual rentals along with the terms of the purchase options held by the Government. I shall not place these in the RECORD today because the report furnished by the Post Office Department is found to be in error in too many respects.

I repeat I had intended to put into the RECORD a list of all of the 280 some-odd post offices that have been built over the past 10 years, but the report furnished to me by the Post Office Department contains so many errors that I would not want to put it into the RECORD under my name until I had checked them. I have cited some of those errors, and they are indefensible.

In one case, as I stated earlier, they listed the rent being paid on one office at approximately $600,000 a year on a 30-year contract, and then reviewed that it would take 39 years to amortize that building on the basis of that rent. However, the Comptroller General's report on the same property shows that they are paying, not around $600,000 a year rent, but over $900,000 a year. Therefore, that throws their computation out of line. On that one office alone over $9 million more rent is being paid than the Post Office Department states in its report to the Committee on Public Works. That error is indefensible. I resent very much that we should be given such erroneous information. I do not accept the explanation that it is a typographical error because it has happened too many times.

In another instance they have estimated the cost of one office as approximately $24 million, and they point out, based on the rent that will be paid on that office under the 30-year lease, that it is a bargain for the Government. Yet the Comptroller General says the cost of that office, based upon his audit, is approximately $16 million, instead of the $24 million shown in the Department's records. Again I say it is indefensible that they do not know any more than that about what they are doing.

As Members of the Senate and as a committee we should be able to depend on these reports. I am not unmindful of the fact that when this proposal came up last year I had asked the Department to furnish me an itemized list of every post office costing in excess of $250,000 that had been constructed under this program during the past 10 years. At that time I received a letter from them which I put into the RECORD. The letter contained an alleged list of all those offices, and it showed only five offices. I said then that I had knowledge that there were over 20 offices and that I would not accept that report. When this error was disclosed the Senate postponed action on that bill until we could get the proper information from the Department.

This year the Department submitted the information that was alleged to be correct, but it is still an erroneous report. They have sent a list of 287 post offices that were constructed at a cost in excess of $250,000, together with the alleged cost of each. That report is erroneous in that they have given us the wrong cost figures and the wrong annual rental figures.

I most respectfully suggest to the Post Office Department that this report had better be corrected—and I mean corrected—prior to the time their appropriation bill comes to the floor of the Senate. If not some strong amendments will be proposed demanding to know who is submitting these erroneous reports and why.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

I shall not pursue this debate further at this time. I have made my arguments. I am willing to rest by the decision of the Senate. However, I repeat that the adoption of this amendment would only affect the construction of those offices costing in excess of $250,000. Had this amendment been in effect 10 years ago it would have affected only 287 offices, where the Government would have built and owned outright. These are one-purpose buildings. My position has been strongly endorsed by the Comptroller General. I have put into the RECORD the Comptroller General's report in which he states most emphatically that there would be significant savings if the Government owned and operated the buildings. He states that in all instances it would be better if the Government owned these buildings.

In addition, I refer to no less an authority in support of my position than the committee itself. The committee at no point says that it would be cheaper for the Government to lease the buildings. Under the bill the Government is given the authority to lease them, but the committee report states that the committee believes it would be advisable for the Government to construct and own these buildings outright in every case possible.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield back his remaining time?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Does the Senator from Delaware yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am willing to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. All time has been yielded back, and the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Before we call the yeas and nays—I am perfectly willing to yield back all remaining time—I am wondering if we should not ask for a quorum call, because many of the Senators do not expect the vote before 1 o'clock. I do not know whether they wish to vote before that time. It is immaterial to me. I am ready to vote right now.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has a right to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I shall not suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Yarborough in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senators from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen and Mr. Percy], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke], the Senators from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska and Mr. Curtis], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Cotton] is paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "yea," and the Senator from Colorado would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 44, as follows:

[No. 96 Leg.]

YEAS—23

Aiken
Allott
Baker
Bennett
Carlson
Case
Griffin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Scott
Smith
Stennis
Thurmond
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—44

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gruening
Harris
Hill
Holland
Inouye
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Long, La.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Monroney
Muskie
Pastore
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smathers
Sparkman
Symington
Talmadge
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—33

Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Gore
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Hollings
Hruska
Jackson
Javits
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Murphy
Nelson
Pell
Percy
Spong
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

So the amendment of Mr. Williams of Delaware was rejected.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to inform the Senate that Senator Hollings was absent on official business as a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee when the vote was taken earlier today on the Williams amendment to S. 1039.

I am informed that had Senator Hollings been present, he would have voted "nay" on the Williams amendment and that he wished the Record to so show.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I understand——

Mr. MANSFIELD. May we have order, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators cannot be heard. The Senator will suspend until order is restored.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not have any further amendments, but I understand the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] may have an amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum so that we may determine whether that is true.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his request and yield to me for a moment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Surely.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] proposes an amendment as follows:

On page 3, line 15, strike the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "sixty".

Add the following at the end of line 24: "In the case of buildings the cost of which is in excess of $250,000, such agreement shall not be finalized until approval therefor has been given by both said committees."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the controlled time situation, the Senator from Iowa has 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. President, this amendment seeks to steer a middle course between what the committee has proposed and what was proposed in the amendment of the Senator from Delaware upon which the Senate has just voted.

The committee proposes that at least 30 days before entering into a lease agreement, the Department must come to the appropriate committees of Congress to present to them its proposals. No affirmative action by the committee is required.

My amendment would change the 30 days to 60 days, in line with the recommendation by the Comptroller General, and would provide further that affirmative action by the two committees must be obtained in the case of buildings the construction cost of which would exceed $250,000.

If the construction cost is less than $250,000, no affirmative action by the committees is required.

The Senator from Delaware, I believe, has documented the need for control in the case of buildings costing more than $250,000. My amendment seeks to provide such control by requiring the approval of the two appropriate committees of Congress; but it would minimize the amount of activity required of those committees by requiring approval only in the case of buildings costing in excess of $250,000.

I believe it is a fair amendment. I think it represents a good compromise between what the Senator from Delaware sought to do by the last amendment, and what the committee has sought to do in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MILLER. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I hope the committee will accept this amendment, so that there will be at least some control over this program, and to guarantee that control will be in the hands of the appropriate congressional committees.

As I pointed out in my own arguments, under the bill as presently written, the report from the department could come to the committee during a recess, and the members of the committee know nothing about it until after the 30 days had elapsed. Under the Senator's proposal, which would require affirmative action, there would be a safeguard.

I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, how much time does the Senator from Iowa have remaining?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Iowa has 2 minutes remaining of his 5 minutes.

How much time does the Senator from North Carolina desire?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I was hoping that the Senator would be perhaps receptive to my amendment. I ask the Senator what his intentions might be concerning the amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I cannot accept the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may ask for the yeas and nays?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I cannot accept, on behalf of the committee, the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa is more restrictive than that offered by the Senator from Delaware.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will suspend until the Senator can be heard. Let us have order in the Senate.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the bill does not require that the committees approve it. It does require that the Post Office Department must come back to each of the committees if the proposed building is to be more than 20,000 square feet, the size of which building would cost, I am informed, $450,000 to construct.

If either of the committees objects to the construction of such building, it could be held up. I am certain that the Post Office Department would not want to lease a building, and they have so stated in the hearings, if there were objection from either the Senate or House of Representatives.

I do not think there is any fear about that happening at all.

I have to object to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I regret that my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, apparently does not understand my amendment. If he understood my amendment, he would never have said that my amendment is more restrictive than that of the Senator from Delaware.

The amendment of the Senator from Delaware would entirely close off any lease arrangements involving a building that would cost more than $250,000. How more restrictive can we get than that?

My amendment would not do that. My amendment would leave the matter open so that if the two committees approved the construction of such a building, there could then be a lease arrangement involving a building costing more than $250,000.

My amendment is designed to be less restrictive. I believe it is, and that is why I said I was trying to work out a compromise between what I regarded as the rather restrictive approach made to the problem by the Senator from Delaware and the committee approach.

The committee bill merely provides that the information would be sent to the two congressional committees and there would be nothing further that they could do. They could read the report and that is all. However, under my amendment the committee could say no, and I think that such action would be justified in light of the figures and cases that the Senator from Delaware has brought out in previous debate on the bill.

I hope, therefore, that my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, will recognize that this is a compromise approach and that it is less restrictive than the amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Senator from Iowa is correct. The amendment requires that the authorities report to the committee, and if the committee disagrees with the report, they cannot proceed. Under the bill, the committee can be unanimously against the proposal of the Post Office Department and there is not anything that they can do about it.

The bill merely provides that the authorities will report to the committee. The Post Office authorities can then thumb their noses at the committee and continue with their proposed action. If the committee members agree, the matter would not be delayed. They would simply approve the project. If the committee were to refuse to accept the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, I believe that it would be a reflection of a lack of confidence on the part of the committee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Delaware. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from North Carolina is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I think that anybody that has been in the Senate as long as the Senator from Iowa has been knows that it takes a good while for a committee to get together and act on a measure.

The pending bill has been before the committee for quite some time. We have been trying to get the measure on the floor and get it acted on. The authority under the bill expired yesterday. It is necessary that the measure be acted upon so that the Post Office Department can move ahead.

I do not think it is necessary or proper to include in the bill the restrictions asked for by the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

The committee believes that all objections have been removed from the pending bill. Certainly if there were objections from either of the committees concerning the Post Office Department's recommendations, the Department would not, in the face of such objection, lease the building.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** All time having expired, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum. I do so because some Senators were told there would not be a vote this soon. They have gone downtown, and I would like to get them back.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I was not aware of such an understanding.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, there was no understanding.

Mr. MILLER. I certainly would not want to have a rollcall on my amendment interfere with anybody's planned business.

Would the majority leader be willing to defer action on the rollcall vote for, say, 30 minutes or an hour, and other amendments may be offered and disposed of?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending amendment take place at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, what business is to be disposed of in the intervening time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We want to take up the extension of the Railway Labor Act.

Mr. MUNDT. During the interval?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, could that measure be voted on before 2 o'clock?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I withdraw my unanimous-consent request.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I did not know of any understanding. However, if I were one of the Senators concerned, I would feel aggrieved if a vote were to occur in my absence.

That being the case, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his magnanimous gesture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask for a division on my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

On a division, the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, is there any time remaining on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no time limit on the bill.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask for the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota is recognized.

CEASE—THE COMMITTEE TO END AID TO THE SOVIET ENEMY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in this morning's newspapers across the country—although some daily newspapers may have missed the release because it came out late yesterday—news stories carry the announcement of a new Committee of Americans determined to seek effective action to bring the Vietnam war to an early and successful conclusion without in any way inviting the dangers of an escalating conflict. Senators can be certain that they will hear much from and about this new committee in the days ahead.

This committee is called CEASE, deriving its name from its objective, since it is to be known as the Committee To End Aid to the Soviet Enemy.

The committee will devote its efforts to alerting Americans to the self-defeating and contradictory policies of the Johnson administration, which, while drafting additional men and spending billions of dollars in an announced attempt to win the war in Vietnam, is at the same time encouraging American exporters to profit from our war effort by selling and sending to Russia and other Eastern European Communist countries steadily increasing supplies of badly needed American equipment, raw material, chemicals, metals and other commodities essential to her wartime industry. This, despite the fact it is now publicly known that it is the shipment of war supplies and equipment from Communist countries of Europe to North Vietnam which alone are responsible for Hanoi's continuing determination and ability to prolong the war and to increase our American casualties. CEASE opposes this incredible and indefensible trade policy, and so do I.

With great Americans like Adm. Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and former Gov. John Davis Lodge of Connecticut—brother of Henry Cabot Lodge—heading "Cease—the Commitee To End Aid to the Soviet Enemy"—I predict its size and significance will rapidly expand.

This is the first war in American history in which the Commander in Chief—our President—has urged those who stay home from the war to profiteer at the expense in life and limb of those who wear the uniform and gallantly risk their lives on the battlefield in defense of our country. CEASE seeks to put an end to such a materialistic concept of loyalty and to such a self-defeating management of the war in Vietnam.

CEASE announces it hopes to form a committee of 10 million citizens. Mr. President, since those who profit from this blood traffic with Russia are so few, and since those who suffer from it are so many, I believe this new committee will attain its goals.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point the full text of the news release for this morning's newspapers announcing the formation of CEASE. Those seeking charter membership in CEASE should write to Gov. John Davis Lodge, at Westport, Conn.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

COMMITTEE TO OPPOSE EAST-WEST TRADE ANNOUNCED

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 30.—Formation of a nationwide committee of ten million citizens to oppose trade and aid to the Soviet Union was announced today by John Davis Lodge, former Connecticut Governor and American diplomat.

Governor Lodge announced that prominent leaders in the fields of business and industry, labor and education are associating themselves with him on the Board of CEASE (Committee to End Aid to the Soviet Enemy), along with such military leaders as Admiral Arthur W. Radford, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

In a statement in this connection, Governor Lodge declared:

"At this very moment, American men are being killed and wounded in Viet Nam. They are being killed and wounded by Soviet bullets and explosives fired from Soviet weapons delivered to Viet Nam by Soviet ships and Soviet planes. These weapons are being used against our men by Soviet-inspired and trained terrorists, guerillas and soldiers.

"Concurrently, terrorists are active in the four corners of the world in Soviet-triggered 'wars of national liberation' yet there are those in this country not only trading with the Soviet Bloc, but seeking to expand U.S. trade and aid to Soviet Russia on a massive scale.

"We call upon the President and the Congress to end existing trade and aid, direct and indirect, to the Soviet Union. We call upon the President and Congress to make it clear that we will not help the Soviet Union through trade and aid to achieve its world aims through armed aggression. We speak in the name of the millions of American wives, parents and other loved ones of those now fighting and dying in the remote villages, fields and jungles of Viet Nam, and of the minimum of ten million Americans whom we are enlisting actively to aid these fighting men."

Governor Lodge said that CEASE intends to establish Washington offices later this week and to announce soon further details on the organization and its specific plans.

"We are soliciting the signatures of ten million Americans and their active aid and support in this patriotic effort to back up our fighting men," Governor Lodge added. "We anticipate no difficulty in getting these."

Governor Lodge was a member of the 80th and 81st Congresses, serving on the Foreign Relations Committee. He was elected Governor of Connecticut in 1950 and served as Chairman of the New England Governors Conference from 1953 to 1955. He was sent as a special envoy for President Dwight D. Eisenhower to Panama and Costa Rica in 1953 and was named Ambassador to Spain in 1955, a post in which he served through 1960.

A graduate of Middlesex School, Harvard, and the Harvard Law School, Governor Lodge is married and has two daughters.

AUTHORIZATION FOR POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 1039) was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the

Senate is most grateful to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN]. His splendid handling of this measure which extends the authority of the Post Office Department to enter into 30-year lease agreements was characterized by his typically articulate and forthright presentation. Its adoption by the Senate was assured by his strong support.

The distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG] likewise is to be commended. His highly talented efforts were indispensable to the Senate's overwhelming acceptance of the measure.

And to the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] goes our appreciation for joining to assure swift and efficient action. While urging his own strong and sincere views, he in no way inhibited the orderly disposition of the measure. The same may be said of the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER].

The Senate may be proud of another achievement gained promptly and with full consideration for the views of all.

DEVELOPMENT AND CONSTRUCTION OF SUPERSONIC AIR TRANSPORT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I would urge that the Congress act favorably upon the appropriation of the $198 million requested by the President to commit this Nation to the development and construction of a supersonic air transport.

The issue most simply stated is the determination of whether or not America will lead the world in the air.

Mr. President, I would not urge this appropriation merely to have America be the first, merely to have this Nation build the largest, fastest, and most glamorous aircraft, nor merely for the purpose of prestige, but I believe one can find support for this proposal on most practical grounds.

Indeed there are involved here many advantages for the welfare of this Nation. The cooperation between the Federal Government and private industry is a sound and a good step forward. The recovery of public funds from future sales is a sensible position. The improvement of our international balance of payments is a major factor. The some 50,000 new jobs created will boost our industry and who can foresee the new advances in techniques and scientific research which will emerge out of this adventure.

This is not to say that it is not difficult to commit our resources, our brainpower, and our money for such a project at this time. The demands in Vietnam, the demands here at home weigh heavily upon us.

Nor is this the time, Mr. President, while congressional support may be less than unanimous, to hide the problems involved. The new use of steel and titanium rather than aluminum, the airport noise, the in-flight sonic boom which could result in unbearable noise, and damage to fragile property on the ground are problems which still call for solutions.

Mr. President, because of the aircraft's noise and the in-flight sonic boom which will result in unbearable noises, not only as the aircraft crosses over the Nation, but also in the vicinity of airports across the Nation, it may well be, as the Secretary of Transportation indicated on Saturday, that the final achievement and construction of aircraft of this type will be such that it will only be used on overwater flights or perhaps on flights from New York to Miami, the city of the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] who is now in the Chamber, or on flights from Miami to New Orleans and other over-the-water flights.

No one really knows the destruction which may take place on the ground because of the sonic boom and the tremendous breaking of the sound barrier. The great noise involved is one of the greatest problems in aviation today. Noise associated with modern jets coming into and going out of airports is one of the biggest problems in aviation today.

Mr. President, on Saturday a recent book came to my attention. The book deals very graphically with some of the aircraft safety problems that we have today. The book defines one of those problems as the zoning for housing and construction in municipalities around airports which exist throughout the country today.

There are great problems in going forward with the program at this time. We heard from the distinguished Senator from Mississippi not long ago that the cost involved with Vietnam may be underestimated, to say the least. The history of our experience there is such that the expenses have been underestimated. The demand today of a growing population, national defense, and education of our young are problems that we face. By 1970 I think that over 50 percent of the young people in this Nation will be under 25 years of age. All of these things weigh upon our demands. All of them weigh upon our conscience. It is for that reason that I can foresee a body of argument surrounding that of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], who so ably defends his position, that this is nothing more than a frill, and nothing more than a fancy new gadget. It does, indeed, involve a fantastic undertaking.

This aircraft is 6 feet longer than a football field, and it would have speeds of from 1,800 to 2,000 miles an hour, reducing the time to Paris from 6½ hours to 2½ hours.

Yet the future is bright. I note that some 113 such supersonic aircraft have been ordered and that more than half of these, some 58 in number, have been placed by foreign purchasers. This could mean some $15 billion in our international trade balances.

Mr. President, I note that some $300 million have already been spent in this project. The request of the President for $198 million together with the $200 million previously appropriated and now available can supply the funds through the next fiscal year to proceed, which I am sure will be only another exciting adventure in the panorama of events which started at Kitty Hawk and leads to the exciting unknown.

Mr. President, there was published in the Washington Post of today an editorial entitled "Financing the SST." I recommend the thoughts of this editorial and would comment only on the point therein developed concerning greater participation in the financing by the private sector. This is a point which I feel is premature at this time. At this point, the participation of the private sector is only in the construction of the prototypes. In connection with the development of the two prototypes, the Federal Government would supply 90 percent of the cost and the contracting companies and 12 airlines would pay 10 percent of the cost, or about $10 million apiece.

When the construction of the serviceable aircraft is thereafter undertaken there shall be a new opportunity and, indeed, a new duty to reevaluate the financing form. Yet this is a problem that should not deter us from proceeding now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCING THE SST

President Johnson made the right decision in requesting that Congress appropriate Federal funds for the development of the supersonic transport plane. This country's commanding lead in aeronautical technology would be dissipated if it retired from the race to build a commercial aircraft that travels faster than the speed of sound. But in proposing what it calls "a creative partnership between our Government and American industry," the Administration should provide more adequate protection for the taxpayer who will bear a substantial share of the development costs.

According to the estimates, which are subject to large errors, it will cost about $4.5 billion to get a supersonic transport into production. The Federal Government would supply more than $1.1 billion of that total—and more than 90 per cent of the costs of the prototype plane. What would the taxpayers get in return? When SST sales exceed 300, the Federal contribution would be repaid, and when they exceed 500, the Treasury would get royalties equivalent to about 6 per cent on the risk capital ventured.

Why should not the taxpayers, who are to provide about 25 per cent of the capital required, be permitted to share proportionately in the enormous profits that would be earned by a successful SST? Although it is necessary to launch the SST project with the shortest possible delay, Congress should be concerned with a more adequate protection of the public interest.

THE RIGHT OF DISSENT

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, recent statements by high administration officials linking dissent from administration policy in Vietnam with disloyalty strike at the very essence of our democracy. One of the most thoughtful remarks made in the Senate this year was the statement made recently by the distinguished chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] when he said:

> There is a legitimate difference of opinion as in our best course of action as a nation. It is quite clear, however, that there is a

> growing implication that dissent will lead to charges of disloyalty and muddleheadedness and then finally to implications of treason. This, I fear, is one of the last times that anybody will have courage to say anything else about the war.

My congratulations go to the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] for his very wise statement.

Mr. President, I, and I am sure all Members of the Senate, fervently pray that the day will never come when an American citizen may not disagree with a course of action being followed by his Government and its leaders.

In that regard, Secretary of State Rusk's reaction to the two large peace demonstrations in New York and San Francisco on April 15 was shocking, when he tended to link them with the "Communist apparatus," whatever that phrase means. Of course, he hastened to add that he did not mean to imply that everyone who opposes our involvement in the civil war in Vietnam is a Communist, but merely that he believes the Communists are involved to some extent in the antiwar protests.

When the Secretary of State, one of the highest officials in the land, begins to make such reckless implications, then we are dangerously close to those witch-hunting days of the fifties which we had thought were buried, unwept, unhonored, and unsung. Granting that what remains of the few Communists in this country and that its leaders would encourage such demonstrations, it is appalling that the Secretary of State would use the red brush to smear all those millions of Americans who disagree with his policies in urging escalation and expansion of our involvement in the war in Vietnam. By the way, FBI Director, J. Edgar Hoover, who should know the facts, stated a couple of years ago that communism is at low ebb in this country with a total membership of about 8,000.

Also, General Westmoreland's remarks before the Associated Press managing editors in New York last week implied that dissent here at home is unpatriotic. Such remarks were uncalled for and unnecessary. As I have previously stated, I believe this was an inopportune time for General Westmoreland to return to the United States. General Westmoreland is a fine man and an outstanding officer. It was unfortunate that he was called home by his civilian superiors to perform a function that is rightly theirs to perform. This at a time when we were changing Ambassadors and top civilian officials in Saigon. However, it is interesting to note that he had the time to address newspaper editors and groups in his native South Carolina and the Congress, but refused to appear before important committees of the Congress, in particular the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. President, in the Toledo Blade of April 20 there appeared an outstanding editorial entitled "Mr. Rusk on Dissent," which clearly and concisely rebuts the accusations of the Secretary of State and of our commanding general in Vietnam. The Toledo Blade is one of the great newspapers of the Nation, and its publisher, Paul Block, Jr., is to be commended for his courageous expression of opinion in this editorial. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. RUSK ON DISSENT

> When 50,000 or 100,000 or 150,000 persons turn out to oppose the war in Vietnam, their joint protests tend to prolong that war, in the view of Secretary of State Dean Rusk.
>
> Reacting to the two large turnouts—the exact numbers are in dispute—in New York City and San Francisco last week end, Mr. Rusk tended to downgrade the peace demonstrations and even, regrettably, to link them with the "Communist apparatus." He hastened to add, after having injected the Red herring, that he does not mean to imply that everyone who opposes the war in Vietnam is a Communist; merely that he believes the Communists are involved to some extent in the anti-war protests.
>
> Granted that the Communist apparatus, or what remains of it in this country, would be inclined to encourage such demonstrations, it does not necessarily follow that mass public protests against the war do, in fact, prolong it. To prolong the war implies an extension of the duration beyond the present end. Is Mr. Rusk suggesting that, from his lofty viewpoint in Foggy Bottom, he can perceive a day of peace that is being jeopardized by rising criticism of the war?
>
> He has certainly made no such observations of late, and, indeed, keeps suggesting that peace in Vietnam is as remote as ever. Likewise, he and other top U.S. officials are telling our Asian allies at a series of conferences this week in Washington that the probability of Hanoi agreeing to peace talks in the near future is slim, despite our repeated assertions that we want to end the conflict.
>
> And then there is Gen. William Westmoreland, the U.S. commander in Vietnam. Speaking in Saigon last week, he said. "It is impossible to say how long the war will last. I can't see any end in sight."
>
> If General Westmoreland can see no end in sight from his vantage point in Vietnam, how can Mr. Rusk claim that anti-war demonstrations around the world make that end any more distant? More to the point, is it not as valid to suggest that the escalation of our military effort there, and the continuing rebuffs other world leaders receive when they appeal to the U.S. to halt the bombing of North Vietnam, have as much to do with keeping this war going than any crowd that gathers in Central Park in New York or Kezar Stadium in San Francisco?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, last Friday the distinguished columnist of the New York Times, James Reston, in his article entitled "Blessed Are the War Makers?" wrote:

> The latest theory in this upside-down war in Vietnam is that a hawk is a dove and a dove is a hawk. This is the new gospel according to our embattled masters: the doves are deceiving the enemy into prolonging the killing, whereas the compassionate hawks are trying to bring the killing to a quick and merciful end.

Unfortunately, this lopsided logic seems to be accepted administration position at this time. Very definitely, it is a strange logic which concludes that the main force in prolonging this ugly war are those fervently seeking an end to it. I assert that if there were not one dissenter to administration policy within the United States, the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese would be fighting just as stubbornly as they are today.

I reject the idea that our President and his advisers have no choice but to continue escalating this war. Very definitely it is the President and his advisers who have the power to shorten the war. Indeed they have already had numerous opportunities in which they might have done so. Furthermore, the backbone of Hanoi's resistance is strengthened by increased determination on the part of the North Vietnamese people with each new escalation of the bombing. World War II demonstrated that Hitler's continuing bombing of London and civilian targets in England strengthened Britain's determination to continue fighting.

Mr. President, last week we heard or read the moving testimony of Svetlana Stalin in her first press conference since she came to the United States. The daughter of the late dictator Josef Stalin said she left the Soviet Union and came to the United States in search of freedom of expression, a right which was denied her in her homeland. It is ironic that at almost the same time the Secretary of State of the United States and one of our highest ranking military officers, as well as other top-ranking administration officials, are seeking to silence dissent and curb that same freedom of expression which is guaranteed to every American in the first amendment to our Constitution adopted on the demand of men who won our war of liberation from England.

Mr. President, there will be continuing and, I am sure, growing dissent on our course of action in Vietnam. While I cannot expect the administration, which appears dedicated to total victory in that conflict, to welcome that dissent, I believe that every American citizen has the right to expect that it will at least be tolerated and accepted as a constructive expression of citizens who are as deeply concerned with the welfare and future of our Nation as their leaders.

One hundred and twenty-one years ago Congressman Abraham Lincoln spoke out repeatedly and loud and clear denouncing our invasion of Mexico and the Mexican War that followed. This war, next to our war in Vietnam, was the most unpopular war ever waged by our country. Yet in nearly a century and a quarter I am happy to report no one has ever denounced Abraham Lincoln for his righteous and proper dissent.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. RIBICOFF in the chair). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

FURTHER EXTENSION OF PERIOD PROVIDED UNDER RAILWAY LABOR ACT APPLICABLE IN CURRENT DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 194, Senate Joint Resolution 79.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The **Assistant Legislative Clerk**. Calendar No. 194 (S.J. Res. 79) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. **McCARTHY**. Mr. President, it has been more than a month now since the Committee on Finance reported the measure to repeal the suspension of the investment tax credit. I believe that the Senate has had sufficient time to consider that matter as well as all of the incidental amendments which have been offered to it.

The business community was saved somewhat by virtue of the fact that the House bill was retroactive—or at least partially retroactive—so that anticipating that we would not go beyond at least the date which was recommended by the administration, they have been able to make some plans.

I believe that the situation has run to a point where we should take action, and I suggest that we give consideration to the suggestion that, after the vote tomorrow on the election campaign measure, if debate and discussion and almost irrelevant amendments continue, we look to the possibility of invoking cloture in this matter.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I join the Senator in the observations he has just made.

FURTHER EXTENSION OF PERIOD PROVIDED UNDER RAILWAY LABOR ACT APPLICABLE IN CURRENT DISPUTE BETWEEN RAILROAD CARRIERS AND CERTAIN EMPLOYEES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 79) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator will state it.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, is Senate Joint Resolution 79 the pending business?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The Senator is correct.

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in the presentation of the case in support of Senate Joint Resolution 79. I wish to say that I am presenting the case because of assignment by the President and the majority leader, and by the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. My argument in support of the resolution is really set forth in the brief committee report filed with the Senate by a unanimous Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I wish to stress that again, Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution 79 comes to the floor of the Senate by unanimous vote of the committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 79

Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 90–10 (90th Congress, S.J. Res. 65), April 12, 1967, is hereby amended by striking out "prior to 12:01 a.m. of May 3, 1967" and inserting "prior to 12:01 a.m. June 19, 1967".

Mr. **MORSE**. Mr. President, the committee report is on the desk of each Senator and I wish to read excerpts from it because they constitute the thrust of my argument. I shall add two or three observations which are not a part of the committee report.

The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, having had under consideration legislation to provide for the settlement of labor disputes currently existing between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, reports an original resolution and recommends it do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

On April 12, 1967, the President signed Senate Joint Resolution 65 (Public Law 90–10) which extended for 20 days, until 12:01 a.m., May 3, 1967, the period established under the provisions of the final paragraph of section 10 of the Railway Labor Act, during which no change, except by agreement, could be made by the carriers or by their employees in the conditions out of which their current disputes arose.

The instant resolution would extend this period for an additional 47 days, until 12:01 a.m. June 19, 1967.

In his letter of April 28, 1967, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate, the President indicated that he would submit to Congress within a few days his recommendations for legislation to terminate the current disputes. The purpose of the instant resolution is threefold: (1) to give the President an opportunity to submit promptly such recommendations; (2) to provide Congress with the opportunity to consider the President's recommendations; and (3) to allow Congress to take such action as it deems advisable to protect the public interest.

The text of the President's letter to the Speaker of the House and the Vice President reads:

April 28, 1967.

Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Vice President.

A rail strike would bring industrial distress to America. It would disrupt our commerce, cripple our industries, create shortages of food. It would adversely affect the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country.

Such a strike would be a gross disservice to our valiant men in Vietnam who are making sacrifices greater than any of us are called upon to make.

The public interest demands that every practical step be taken to avert a strike, now scheduled for 12:01 a.m., on May 3.

Since my return from Germany on late Wednesday, I have consulted with the bipartisan leadership of the Congress, and with the ranking members of the Senate Labor and the House Commerce committees. They join with me today in urging that the Congress extend the no-strike period for an additional 45 days.

I am submitting herewith a joint resolution to accomplish this.

This additional period will give the Congress time prudently to consider legislation which will protect the public interest in this case.

I shall recommend such legislation to the Congress within a few days.

An additional 45-day period may enable the parties to press forward with their search for accord or reach an agreement themselves.

I hope and believe, in the interest of all Americans, the Congress will want to act promptly.

Sincerely,
(Signed) Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. President, Senators are already aware of this, but the Record should show the background of the dispute as we set it forth in the committee report.

BACKGROUND OF THE DISPUTE

The background of the disputes through April 10, 1967, is set forth in Senate Report No. 161, which accompanied Senate Joint Resolution 65 (90th Congress, 1st sess.). Upon the enactment of Senate Joint Resolution 65, the President appointed a Special Mediation Panel of Judge Charles Fahy, Chairman, and Dr. John T. Dunlop and Dr. George W. Taylor, members. At a meeting of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on April 24, 1967, testimony was received from the members of this Special Mediation Panel, the Secretary of Labor and the chief negotiators for the parties to these disputes. The committee was advised that the Special Mediation Panel had recommended terms for settling the disputes but that the parties had found the terms unacceptable. On the same day, the committee passed a unanimous resolution requesting the parties to reconsider the proposals of the Special Mediation Panel and to inform the committee of the progress of their negotiations.

The committee has been informed that the parties have been unable to come to an agreement and that no bargaining is presently taking place.

Mr. President, that brings us to this critical hour. Unless Congress takes action, a strike will automatically occur at 12:01 a.m. Wednesday, which means midnight tomorrow night. We have 2 days, really, to decide on this resolution that the President has sent to Congress.

I am of the opinion, and I hope I am right in having the opinion, that there can be no question about the fact that the Senate will take action this afternoon by passing the resolution, I hope, by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. President, I know how delicate this is. I realize that this resolution is not going to make some people in both labor and management happy. Therefore, we have got to come to grips with what I consider to be the major premise that is raised by this resolution, and if a Senator does not agree with me and the committee in regard to this major premise, then I can understand why they will not support the resolution.

What is that major premise? It is the question of whether or not in view of the distress, the disruptions, the catastrophes, that would be caused by a strike starting shortly after midnight tomorrow night, there is not a responsibility on the Congress to place public interest and public welfare first in this country, and make clear, to management and labor involved in this dispute, that while we stand ready and willing, as always, to have them resort to the principle and policy of voluntarism for settlement of their own disagreements, in this hour of great national crisis, no management and unions, or combination of management and unions, have the right to bring to a halt the flow of economic commerce in this country with the dire results that such a course of action would create. That is the major premise.

Oh, I know some labor leaders will say, "Are you saying to us we do not have the right to strike?"

Let the senior Senator from Oregon answer that for himself: Thirty-two years ago this year I arbitrated my first labor dispute. I have been involved in the years since then, year after year, in mediating, arbitrating, and negotiating, sometimes in a private capacity selected by the parties, sometimes as a Government official sitting on the War Labor Board, or various Presidential emergency boards or mediation boards.

I have always said during those 32 years: Yes, it is true that there is not an absolute right to strike or lockout in this country if the exercises of that alleged right destroys or irreparably damages a greater right that we have in this country. The greater right that we have in this country which must be considered in the Congress this afternoon, is the public interest.

The public interest, in my judgment, supercedes any right of the brotherhoods or any right of the management of the railroads to bring the economy of this country to a halt with the devastating result of a work stoppage. I have not been talking about a strike or lockout. I have been talking about a work stoppage, a stoppage of the operation of the railroad industry.

It is my judgment—and I associate no one else with that judgment—that this dispute is not a dispute in which all the responsibilities are on one side. From reading the newspapers, one would think the responsibility is all on the side of the brotherhoods. I say that it is not so. The carriers, in my judgment, also have to assume a fair share of responsibility for the failure of the parties in this dispute to make those precious principles of voluntarism work on which the doctrine of free collective bargaining is based.

In my judgment, this is a stoppage of the operation of the railroads, in which there is mutuality of responsibility on the part of the carriers and the brotherhoods. This is not a fitting place, in my judgment, because I do not believe that it is relevant to the issue before us, to be going into the merits of the substantive issues which have caused the parties not to reach an understanding.

So far as I am concerned, the one controlling issue now is whether the President of the United States is entitled to the support of Congress in passing Senate Joint Resolution 79.

Last week, at the White House conference, the morning of the day that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare unanimously recommended this resolution to the floor of the Senate, the President called in various Cabinet members, the leadership of Congress, and many of us on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as the House Commerce Committee. Those two committees have jurisdiction over the handling of the subject matter of the resolution.

Before we left the Cabinet room, we reached a consensus that such a resolution should be sent up to Congress. No one at the meeting from Congress was in any way committed to cast any vote for that resolution, because it was understood by all that each Member of Congress had the right to consider the resolution, when it comes before the committee and Congress and makes modifications to it.

Freedom of legislative action was reserved by the Members of Congress. But we did come to the conclusion, I think it is fair to say, that the President is right in taking the position that there is only one way now to prevent the stoppage. That is by way of legislation of the kind contained in the resolution, which will postpone a work stoppage for a time, while the President can work out and send up legislation ad hoc in nature in regard to this particular dispute.

I shall have something to say about that in a moment. I shall be very brief about that, too. At the Cabinet room meeting with the President, there was in attendance the Attorney General of the United States. The President called upon him, and he advised us that as a matter of law the administration has exhausted all legal remedies under existing law in its attempt to prevent this stoppage of the operation of the railroads. That is the legal situation in which we find ourselves. That is why I stated 2 or 3 minutes ago that the only recourse, if we do not want the stoppage, is legislation such as S.J. Res. 79 would propose, which will postpone the stoppage for 47 days.

Senators will note that in the letter from the President to the Speaker of the House and the Vice President of the United States which I have already read into the RECORD, the President spoke about 45 days.

Why 47 days instead of 45 days? As my colleagues on the committee know, in the committee room we took out the calendar and took a look at it and noted the date on which 45 days would fall, and it was decided it would be much better to make it 47 days; so we selected 47 instead of 45.

Mr. President, the majority leader and I were at the White House this morning, at breakfast, talking to the President about this matter. He had his administration advisers with him. The 47 days is fully acceptable to the President. He understands the soundness of the position that the committee has taken.

One final word. The Senate must pass this legislation first, to stop the stoppage. Then we have to use the 47 days. I hope that we can draft and pass legislation in much less than 47 days. That is the limit. Whatever that legislation will be, its requirements and provisions will proceed to go into operation at the moment it is passed and the President signs it. That will be ad hoc legislation. By that, I mean legislation will be sent up to deal with this particular dispute.

We had some discussion only this morning, but let me say to the Senator from New York, who is the ranking Republican member of the committee, that there will be other discussions in which the Senator from New York and other members of the committee will be involved. The meeting this morning was more of an exploratory meeting with the President, the Secretary of Labor, and his assistants, together with the majority leader and myself, as to the situation in regard to this resolution.

Of course, discussion of the resolution did go on over into a discussion of legislative policy.

I want the RECORD to show, and I think it will please the Senator from New York, that we made clear that ad hoc legislation should come up at the earliest possible hour. It must be consistent, let me say, with a thorough consideration of legislation which will be proposed by the President. I think that the main thing to do is to proceed to pass this legislation this afternoon, and to stand ready to proceed immediately with committee consideration of the President's recommendations on ad hoc legislation as soon as the recommendations arrive.

Let me say to my friend, the Senator from New York, that I still share his view that ad hoc legislation will not settle the problem of Congress in regard to what to do with other emergency disputes that may very soon be walking across the economic stage of this country. Those disputes might conceivably result in breakdowns, and might again confront us with the problem of having to deal with them on an ad hoc basis.

I agree with the Senator from New York that in some way, somehow, we must find a formula or legislative format, so that we are not going to have to be dealing with each case as it arises. As I said the other day and repeat today, none of us will serve as long in the Senate, or our colleagues in the House, and those that follow us in these legislative halls, without problems periodically coming before Congress dealing with industrial relations arising under our jurisdiction and flowing down from the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution.

It happens to be our obligation, no matter how, sometimes, it may seem to be quite impolitic, to face up to the industrial disjointures that may arise as a result of major nationwide disputes between management and labor. We have that responsibility under the Interstate Commerce Clause to regulate interstate commerce. That is where our jurisdiction springs from. That is why, I say to the Senator from New York, that I was glad to join him last year in the Javits resolution, calling upon the administration at least to give us its suggestions, if it has any, and its proposals, if it has any, as to what it thinks general legislation should be that will amend both the Taft-Hartley law and the Railway Labor Act in the field of so-called emergency disputes.

I want to say, before the Senator from New York starts asking me questions—and, knowing him very well, he probably will be doing that shortly; if not, he will be making a statement of his own—that so far as I am concerned, I shall continue to take the position that this ad hoc legislation should be kept separate and distinct from any proposal for general legislation. I do not think we should mix the two. Again, I do not think it is fair to the President of the United States for us in the Congress to try to mix the two. I think it is a physical impossibility for the President to send up general legislation at the same time he sends up ad hoc legislation on the pending dispute.

Those are my comments, plus one more:

Now I want to say this once again to the parties: to the railroad brotherhoods, to the railroad carriers, and also to the whole house of American labor. It includes the head of the AFL–CIO, for whom I have high regard, with whom I served in World War II on the War Labor Board, when George Meany was the representative—in fact, the head—of the labor group on that board. My remarks are directed to labor and management not only in the railroad industry, but outside the railroad industry. The people who represent employees and the people in management, including all who are not directly involved in this dispute, have a public responsibility to join in support of fair ad hoc legislation that will bring this dispute to a final end.

In World War II, we had a national no-strike, no-lockout agreement. It was administered by the National War Labor Board. There were four members of labor, four members of industry, and four members of the public on that Board. President Franklin Roosevelt obtained the no-strike, no-lockout agreement because he recognized that while we were at war there must be a procedure, there must be a body, that could take jurisdiction over disputes that threatened to disrupt the economy, to the detriment of the war effort.

We are at war again. We are in a major war. If anyone thinks it is a brush fire, he does not know what is going on in Vietnam. This is the biggest, most intensive air war the United States has ever been in. In this war we are dropping more tons of bombs per week than were dropped in any week during World War II over all of Europe plus the north African campaign.

Official figures show that we already have at least 435,000 armed personnel in Vietnam. We have already suffered more than 10,000 fatalities among the brave troops we have sent into this war. We have suffered probably three times that number in wounded. That is no police action. That is a major war. Even the latest reports up to this hour indicate there is no reason to believe there is going to be an early end to that war.

I close by making this statement. I know that some will not like what I am going to say, because they do not like to be told this. The parties to this dispute have a patriotic duty. I think that American labor, particularly American labor involved in a regulated industry vested with a public interest, such as the railroad industry is, and American management especially management involved in such an industry, also have a patriotic duty to reach voluntary agreements in the settlement of industrial disputes which threaten much harm to the superior public interest as would be the result of a railroad stoppage at midnight tomorrow night.

I do not care how much political criticism I get, or how many political threats I get for making that statement. I have taken that position for 32 years in this field, and I do not intend to retreat from it.

I close by saying that the parties to this dispute, and labor and management beyond these parties, have a patriotic duty, as long as the major war in Vietnam continues, to settle disputes by way of free collective bargaining between themselves, or accept the services and advice and recommendations of mediation panels and emergency boards appointed to lead them to a settlement of any dispute which endangers the superior public interest.

Last, may I say that the Congress this afternoon—the Senate now and the House as soon as it gets to it—also has the patriotic duty, in my judgment, to pass this resolution.

Mr. President, I rest my case.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for the information of Members of the Senate, I do not expect to speak for more than 10 to 15 minutes, so I hope very much they will stay and listen to what I have to say, which I think is important in the interest of our Nation.

Mr. President, I shall support this resolution, but I shall support it only because the whole Nation has been put in the position in which it finds itself. I do not approve of the way it has been put in this position.

It is my considered judgment that the reason why we are where we are—to wit, without any adequate remedy in the law—as my beloved friend and colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has said, is that, in the opinion of the Attorney General there is no statute to take care of it. This is attributable to the fact that the President of the United States, notwithstanding that he promised it 2 years ago, has not to this hour submitted legislation which would give permanent protection to the public interest in the event of a work stoppage in a major industry.

No one appreciates more than I do the dilemma that faces the President of the United States. He has a very hard nut to crack.

It is extremely difficult to recommend legislation which will have what the President of the United States always likes to have; namely, a consensus. But general agreement among management, labor, the public, and Congress is impossible in this particular situation. I have borne the heat of the battle—so has the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]; so have other Senators and other Members of the other body. We have all found ourselves in a position where we have had to bail out the President from a situation in which he had placed himself, and us, by not recommending definitive legislation.

We are here, now, because the President has failed to act. It is somewhat our fault, too, but I think more of the responsibility is on the President's shoulders; he promised to send us legislation a long time ago, and he has not done so to this very day. He has now promised it in the next few days, but I hazard the guess that what he will submit to us in the immediate future will be some ad hoc legislation to deal with this particular dispute, leaving the national interest again to be jeopardized when another such labor dispute is upon us, whether it be in railroads, or public utilities, or the New York subways, or some other such situation.

Mr. President, why do I say we are where we are because of our failure to enact some legislation, some law, which will permanently protect the public interest on the books? The reason I say that, is that without such legislation we are left up in the air. The parties do not know what the end will be if collective bargaining fails. So they are sitting around, waiting to find out.

This is clearly indicated on page 2 of the report, which states:

> The committee has been informed that the parties have been unable to come to an agreement and that no bargaining is presently taking place.

It is a fine state of affairs when we learn that a national railroad strike is about to take place, and that labor and management have stopped talking and are doing nothing further about it. Why? Because they do not know what the U.S. Congress or the Government is going to do. If we had definitive legislation on the books, whatever it might be—and I have always made known that I am strongly against compulsory arbitration; I am for limited seizure—the parties would know what they were facing, and would either continue to bargain or would know what the result would be, and their representatives in each case could act accordingly.

As we stand now, we have nothing. It is a confession of the bankruptcy of our governmental system in this respect that we must—there is no other alternative, and I shall vote for it—pass a resolution such as this again, freezing the situation for 47 days.

Mr. President, the people of the United States should be aroused, because they are actually facing what is tantamount to a general strike—that is what striking the railroads would result in. That does not mean the workers have no right to do it; they do, like any other workers, in the absence of legislation giving them some other alternative or giving the public another alternative.

So, Mr. President, without spanking anybody or condemning anybody, or being violent about the matter, I say that we are where we are because we have been shortsighted in failing to enact legislation to deal with the situation. The President promised to recommend such legislation in the state of the Union message before the last one, Mr. President. I can only express the feeling that the people of the United States must demand that it be forthcoming now, in order to deal with this situation and others.

Finally, Mr. President, the parties are not very far apart. They are separated, at the most, between bid and asked, by 1½ percent, on the total wage increase; by 1 year on the contract term; and, in the case of certain especially skilled employees, by the timing and amount of a downpayment or an adjustment which both sides acknowledge should be made. The other matters are minor; nobody even thinks they are major problems.

This is an extraordinary example of where the smallest possible difference is causing the greatest possible danger and dislocation to the people of the United States. Mr. President, I think it is deplorable, but I think it is very definitely our fault.

Let us note that there are some 24 unions involved in the railroad industry. Sixteen of those unions have settled, with a 5-percent increase. Six unions are involved in the disputes with which we are now concerned. Mr. President, these six shopcraft unions have only a very small difference with management. It seemed to me, to the Senator from Oregon, and to the President and everybody concerned, that this is one case where labor and management—both of whom have been obstinate about the situation, could very well have strained to preserve the vitality of the collective-bargaining process in these disputes.

But neither side has yielded, and the governmental authorities, because they have had on the books no law to invoke to provide a final remedy, have been absolutely powerless to bring the parties to agreement. It is an extraordinary failure, Mr. President, of our governmental system. As a Senator, I can only urge what I have urged for some time: legislation designed to achieve finality in these disputes. I think it is the most friendly thing I could do for labor—toward which I am very friendly, as my entire record demonstrates—because if something is not done to achieve finality in these disputes, labor is put in great jeopardy. A work stoppage, after all, is a stoppage by workmen, and places on their backs a burden they should not bear. Mr. President, even in so simple a matter as assuring that a supply of essential foods and medicines could be handled notwithstanding a strike, the question of who is to determine what is essential has not been faced. That, Mr. President, is essentially a legislative failure.

So, Mr. President, there is now nothing else to be done. The 47-day period, although I think it a long one, not justified by the fact that any negotiations are pending or any settlement likely, nevertheless seems inevitable, because in a very real sense, the whole governmental machinery of the United States has been caught in a most embarrassing position. We shall not use curbstone language on the floor of the Senate, but all Senators understand very well what I mean. The Government is caught very short in this matter, and it must have time to turn around. That is what we are giving it.

It is no satisfaction to me, and it should not be to any other Senator or to the people of the United States, that we have put ourselves in this position. I close by urging the President recommend measures to take us out of it. It is uniquely the kind of situation where we are entitled to a recommendation from the executive department.

Mr. President, I for one will oppose any further measures of extension. If the President is not going to come to us with what he thinks we ought to do in this situation, we shall have to collectively devise it ourselves, because we owe nothing less than that to the workers and the people of the United States.

So, Mr. President, for the reasons I have stated, I hope that the Senate will support the resolution, and that Senators individually will make themselves very clear in their demand on the President that at long last this Gordian knot must be cut by enacting a law which gives finality to the power of the United States to protect its people in the event of a work stoppage which imperils the national interest, as this one would, in defense, in food, in essential medicines, and in meeting any emergency which might occur.

Mr. President, I point out that neither the Senator from Oregon nor I contemplate any amendment to this resolution. Though I felt very deeply for a time that an amendment of the kind I have heretofore suggested was essential to force the President to submit a program, I have modified that view because the President has undertaken to do it, and has assured us that he would do it. Without quoting him in any way, which I would not be at liberty to do, I am relying upon that assurance, and therefore withhold my amendment, rather than complicate the resolution with it at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I rise, not to reply to my friend from New York [Mr. JAVITS], because I associate myself with so much that he says, but, as the manager of the resolution, I have the responsibility, I think, to make the following statements in regard to the President's position. I shall not express differences with the Senator from New York, because I remember the other day when he was in the Cabinet Room, he very courageously, forthrightly, and correctly expressed his views to the President in regard to his belief that the President should send up proposed general legislation. With the usual fairness, tact, and sincerity of the Senator from New York—and I am sure he will not mind my saying this—he turned to the President and said, "You know, Mr. President, I love you, but I feel that I must point out to you that we should have had some general legislation heretofore."

I feel the same way toward the Senator from New York. I love him, but I must do what I can to see to it that the record is clear in regard to President Johnson's fair dealing with the Congress.

I wish to say, Mr. President, that there is no doubt about the President's intention to recommend ad hoc legislation as soon as agreement can be reached, at the Department of Labor and other branches of the executive department. I think that when he said a recommendation would be forthcoming in a few days, he meant just that. A few days means this week. I hope it will be early this week.

Also in fairness to the President in respect to general legislation, I am sure the Senator from New York will agree that the President called attention to the fact that it is true that in 1966 he made reference, in his state of the Union message, to his intention to make a report to Congress in regard to general legislation dealing with so-called emergency disputes.

However, the President pointed out further that he proceeded forthwith to appoint a task force of recognized authorities in the field, and submitted the problem to them. They have been at work on it ever since. To give some idea of how complicated and how complex the problem is, there are great differences of opinion among authorities in the field of labor economics as to what should comprise legislation of this kind. In fairness to the President, I want the record to show also that he has stated to us, in essence—I do not quote him, but I believe I paraphrase him accurately—that the task force is about to report to him. He made clear that they will submit their suggestions to him, and as soon as he can study and consider those suggestions and seek supplementary advice—as he should, and not just take the task force recommendation and automatically send it up here, a report from the President will be forthcoming.

I am satisfied that the President will do exactly what he has said he will do and that just as soon as he has something in sufficiently concrete form that he considers to be sound, and to which he wants to add the prestige of his support, we will get such a report. However, I—and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] mentioned this, as he always does because of his fairness—wish to point out that after all Congress is not relieved of its responsibility to pass legislation on its own to pass legislation irrespective of the fact that the President has not as yet found it possible to send to the Congress any recommendations on the subject.

Mr. President, it was not a President at the time of the passage of Taft-Hartley that passed the Taft-Hartley law. At that time President Truman vetoed it and Congress overrode the veto.

Some of my colleagues will remember that I had the assignment over a long weekend, as the leader of the opposition to the Taft-Hartley law, to hold the Senate in session in a series of educational processes which took the form of seminars on the labor economics. My assignment was to speak at length in the hope that we might get some of our colleagues back from Europe so that they could join us in voting to sustain the President's veto.

We would have succeeded in sustaining the President's veto if those Senators had gotten back, because their views were pretty well known as being favorable to the President's position concerning the Taft-Hartley law. Finally it was agreed that my educational seminars conducted on the floor of the Senate had lasted long enough, because the President had come to the conclusion that the absent Senators were not coming back from Europe. So a vote was taken and the veto was overridden.

I voted to sustain the President, but the responsibility for Taft-Hartley is the responsibility of Congress. Likewise, let me say that the responsibility for the Railway Labor Act is not the responsibility of the President. It is the responsibility of Congress. As some of us have pointed out, both of these acts, the Taft-Hartley and the Railway Labor Act, are not adequate in the opinion of many of us for the handling of the very problems we are talking about here this afternoon.

That is why the Javits-Morse resolution of last year and of this year is so pertinent and sound.

Congress is the body that has the responsibility to come forward with the legislation, not the President of the United States. Although, let me make very clear that I think the President should make some recommendations to us and I am confident that in due course of time President Johnson will do just that. However, we have no right to pass this buck to the President. It is Congress that regulates interstate commerce and not the President. The President does not have the authority to regulate interstate commerce, but we do.

May I say, therefore, in fairness to President Johnson, that I stand as a witness here on the floor of the Senate today, saying I know that the President is doing everything he can to hasten the sending of a message here on general legislation, but he is not going to send any message up until he is satisfied that it is sound legislation and will stand the analysis of the committees and the debates in Congress.

How would you like to be President and send up a piece of legislation that you do not really think has been thoroughly worked out and in regard to which you may have reservations? It is not fair to the President in the interest of haste to urge him to place the reputation of his administration on the line concerning such legislation.

It is easy for us as Senators of the United States to say that the President should do this or should do that. I yield to no one as having done that probably as frequently as anybody else in the Senate, but at least I have tried to limit myself to those instances in which it is the President's responsibility to do what I am asking the President to do.

This labor legislation problem is a shared responsibility. I think after reviewing the state of the Union message made by the President in 1966, he did commit himself to sending up a message in regard to this matter, and I am satisfied that he will do so.

However, let us face the fact that even if the President did not say anything about it in 1966, it still would have remained the responsibility of the Congress of the United States to propose some legislation and take action on it.

The best we can say now, therefore, is that only because of a voluntary offering on the part of the President, we are in a sort of shared responsibility position. However, we are still responsible for Taft-Hartley. We are still responsible for the Railway Labor Act, and we have the major responsibility—legally, we have the total responsibility—to modify those laws if we think they are not meeting the emergencies that arise in connection with emergency labor disputes.

I do not want my friend, the senior Senator from New York, to think that anything I have said is in the slightest way uttered in criticism of him. I speak thusly only in the carrying out of my duties as the manager of the resolution and the obligation and responsibility I owe the President in regard to the matter.

If the majority leader were present, I think he would be my witness that the conversations we had with the President this morning leave no room for doubt that I am completely justified in saying everything I have said in presenting this afternoon the resolution recommended by the President and by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in light of the statement made by the Senator from Oregon, I ask whether he has any reason to believe that the President will not send up a message within the next day or two as he promised.

The reason I ask the question is that the Senator from Oregon indicated that the President will not send up a message until he is satisfied that he has developed some legislation which he considers to be sound.

That raised a question in my mind since we were told last week by the President that he would send up a message within a few days. Is there any reason to believe that he will not comply with that promise?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Michigan raised that question. I am sorry if I did not make it clear in my statement. I meant to do so.

If it is not clear to the Senator, I certainly want to supplement what I said. I will state, therefore, for the RECORD the history of what happened in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], will remember that we had a discussion in the committee regarding this very point: What is meant by a few days?

The Senator from Alabama was instructed to find out, and he asked me to join him in going to the telephone and calling the White House to see if there could be any further clarification in regard to the matter.

We got in touch with Mr. Califano, who got in touch with the President who, at that time, was at a state luncheon at the White House in honor of General Westmoreland.

The point was raised with the President and the President said that it was his intention to get it up the early part of the week. I wish the Senator from Alabama would pay very close attention and either correct me or bear me out in what I say.

The Senator from Alabama said to Mr. Califano:

> Do you think we would be accurate if we were to go back to the committee and say it would be the first part of the week and that the expectation is that it will be not later than Tuesday?

Mr. Califano, who was not in the presence of the President then and was not in a position to say whether it would be Tuesday or Wednesday or Thursday, said, as the Senator from Alabama and I interpreted it, that he thought that would be a fair and accurate representation for us to make. However, he made very clear to us that he did not feel he should go back to talk to the President a second time concerning whether it would be Tuesday or Wednesday or some other day.

Speaking for myself and not for the President—and I wish the majority leader were present to hear this because he was with me this morning—in my judgment it will be up here not later than Wednesday. I think there is a possibility that it may be up here Tuesday. I am not so sure that it might not be psychologically a better thing to have this resolution passed by the Congress today or tomorrow and thereby prevent the shutdown of the industry at midnight Tuesday and then have the congressional committees start considering legislation Wednesday or Thursday if at all possible. However, I am in no position to commit the President.

Who knows what may develop at the White House level in regard to a controversy or differing opinions concerning what the ad hoc legislation should be? But I give the Senator my word that it is my honest belief that the ad hoc legislation of the President will be before the Senate the first part of this week, and I still consider Wednesday the first part of this week. If unforeseen conditions develop which make it unfeasible for the President to recommend legislation by Wednesday then I think in fairness to, and out of respect for, the President, we should all want him to take longer if he finds it necessary.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate the statement and the assurance on the part of the Senator from Oregon. The point I should like to make is that while I thoroughly agree with the Senator that the legislative body, Congress, has responsibility in this field, it is altogether understandable, when the Chief Executive makes a statement and indicates that an administration recommendation will be forthcoming in a particular field, and and we have reason to believe that it may be imminent or within a few weeks or shortly, it is natural for the legislative body to delay its processes in order to give due consideration to the administration recommendation. To the extent that the President has made promises—and we have waited and waited for them—perhaps there is some little excuse for Congress not taking the bull by the horns.

If we have the assurance that it will be within a few days—and I assume that now we are talking about this week—it would not be unreasonable for Congress to wait perhaps a couple of more days. But, surely, if we do not have legislation from the White House within a couple of days—this week, surely—I believe we must go ahead and fashion some legislative remedy on our own. It is my opinion that it is long overdue.

Mr. MORSE. In commenting on the remarks of the Senator from Michigan, I should like to call attention to two facets of the situation: We have been talking about ad hoc legislation and general legislation. The Javits-Morse resolution of last year, and again this year, was based upon our opinion, bearing out the point that the Senator from Michigan has made, that because the President in his state of the Union message did make reference to his intention to send up a report on emergency dispute legislation, we should offer the resolution. And the resolution did what? It called upon the Secretary of Labor, representing the administration, to advise Congress what the administration's position was in regard to emergency dispute legislation.

That report—I should like the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] to listen to me carefully—put the Secretary of Labor in the position of advising the Congress as to the intention of the administration in respect to its plans and timetable for sending up a report to the Congress on emergency dispute legislation. What we were saying to the administration was that we wanted to know when they were going to send up a report, what the nature of the report would be, and what they would recommend, if anything. That is what we did again this year in our resolution.

I do not mean to imply that the Senator from Michigan does not share this point of view, but I believe the record is clear that all we are talking about this afternoon is a report from the President in regard to ad hoc legislation dealing with the pending railway case. We are not urging that the President report on general legislation at this time. I do not know when the President will send up a report dealing with general emergency dispute legislation. The Senator from New York knows as much about that matter as I do, as a result of the colloquy that took place between the President and the Senator from New York in the Cabinet Room the other day. My interpretation of that colloquy is that the President is expecting a task force report soon, and as soon as he gets it analyzed, he will state his position by way of a message on the matter.

I yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to confirm the statement made by the Senator from Oregon about the President and the fact that the President will send a message to Congress early in this week, which would be, as the Senator from Oregon has said, not later than Wednesday. The Senator from Oregon is absolutely accurate and correct in the statements that he has made.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the reminiscing by the Senator from Oregon about what happened in 1947 when the Taft-Hartley Act was passed. I well remember the weekend to which he has referred. The Senator from Oregon and I were on opposite sides in that argument, but it was one which I suspect neither of us will forget.

I wish to call attention to the fact that in that instance—and perhaps in instances that lie ahead of us—we were not able to agree with the position of the Chief Executive, the President. The act that we passed at that time, because we thought it took better care of the public generally, was the Taft-Hartley Act. The act that was passed some years ago in a related field, the Landrum-Griffin Act—which, incidentally, bears the name of our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan—was of like kind.

While I am perfectly willing to wait a day or two on the President, as we have been waiting for a long time, I believe that when his recommendation comes, the Senate and the House must decide whether they want to act upon that recommendation or on something else. I wish to call attention in the RECORD to the fact that both the House and the Senate have failed to take action when we had ample opportunity to do so in this and closely related matters.

For example, I have had pending before the Subcommittee on Labor, for the last several years, legislation dealing with threatened stoppages involving the commercial airlines, and I never have been able to get a hearing on that legislation. The Senate will recall that, instead, we waited and we waited and we waited, and we finally had to take ad hoc action in that instance—which meant weak action and action which simply postponed the evil day.

If a recommendation is received dealing with railroads, since they are handled in the same legislation as are the commercial airlines, I hope that the distinguished committee, the Subcommittee on Labor, will consider both of those matters—railroads and airlines—together; and I shall certainly make every effort to see that that is done.

The same committee has had before it, for 8 years or more, legislation offered by me which seeks to restore to the States rights which were taken away from them under the unexpected Wisconsin decision on a certain part of the Taft-Hartley Act. We eventually had one hearing before the subcommittee, when it was headed by our late, beloved President, then the Senator from Massachusetts, Senator John F. Kennedy.

That hearing, held in the fall of 1959, ended with the statement of Senator Kennedy that he expected to have some recommendations out of the subcommittee early in 1960. The Senate knows and the country knows what happened. The Senator from Massachusetts became submerged in a race for the Presidency. I held it not against him at that time, or ever, because he was not able to fulfill what he had stated he expected to do, at the end of that hearing, as shown by the hearing record.

However, the fact remains that that legislation, offering back to the States the right to control, according to their own State laws, threatened stoppages in important local public utilities—power, water, gas, and local transportation; I believe they were the ones named—has never had any action. That legislation is pending right now.

It seems as if we have had an unusual kind of lassitude in this field. It seems as if Senators have not been willing to cope with this difficulty. It is a terrible difficulty locally. The Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has mentioned what happened when the subways in New York were shut down last year. Worse than that has happened to us in Florida, when we had a power strike in west Florida. That is terrible. The same is true when there is a gas shutdown or a water shutdown. In a great number of communities in the Nation, water systems are privately owned. In such cases a terrible emergency at once confronts the local population.

Mr. President, I think we have to get rid of this unwillingness to deal with a problem which is not a pleasant one but which must be dealt with, just as Congress finally dealt with the very weak Wagner Act in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. We are perfectly aware that the emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act were not as strong as they should be. The Senator from Florida made one of the two speeches in the closing of the debate on that act. I called attention to the fact that the provisions were not as strong as they should be, but that it would be very helpful in certain cases and would avert what had happened not long before that when the coal industry was shut down twice during World War II. That provision has been used and was used by the President who vetoed it, but whose veto was overridden by both Houses of Congress.

Mr. President, we have to make up our minds if we are going to deal with a problem as vital as this. I must confess that I have been unable to understand the unwillingness of the Subcommittee on Labor to deal with this problem. I hope that the subcommittee will get over this unwillingness and take affirmative action. If the Senate likes what is presented to it, it can pass it; and if it does not like it, it can substitute something for it, as we did in the case of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I think there is no way to overlook the fact that the appropriate committee, the responsible committee, namely, the Subcommittee on Labor in the Senate, has evaded action on this question for years. Without the slightest anger, I want the RECORD to show that not only the Senator from Florida but dozens of other Senators also feel the same way: that there has been a direct avoidance of any action on this group of questions. I hope that we will have action this time.

There are several ways to proceed. Some prefer compulsory arbitration. In turning back authority to the State, we would turn it back for the State to act. My State adopted compulsory arbitration dealing only with local utilities by the unanimous vote of one house of the legislature, and an almost unanimous vote in the other house of the legislature.

Some prefer a special court, as in the case of Kansas; some prefer seizure, as in Virginia. There are various ways to deal with the problem both locally and nationally, but action that is positive and can best protect the public interest should be offered by that distinguished committee. That committee is where the responsibility lies in the first instance, and where the Senator from Florida simply and earnestly requests that that responsibility be recognized and legislation reported.

I do not think we should wait very long for anything from the President, because we have already shown in the case of the Taft-Hartley Act, the Landrum-Griffin Act, and others, that the Congress does not have to do what the administration wants. It can and must do what its duty makes it believe should be done.

Mr. President, I have nothing further to say on this particular proposal, except that I shall vote for it. However, I feel very much as does the Senator from New York who expressed himself by saying that the 47-day delay should be the last one that we give in this case. I am not saying that this is the last time I will vote for an extension because I do not know what is ahead in the future. We may have further inaction by this distinguished Subcommittee on Labor. We hope not. However, that may be the case, and in that case, we may have to vote an extension rather than see the disaster of a general stoppage of the railroads.

Let us not emphasize too greatly what is going to come from the administration because Congress, in this field, has never shown an unwillingness, heretofore, at least, to deal with these problems according to its own conscience, and not necessarily relying on the views of whoever was President at the time and his advisers. I hope we will all vote for this joint resolution.

I shall vote for it, but I did want to make these references to legislation that has long been requested and has long been urged. We know that ad hoc legislation and the legislation offered by the Senator from Florida is not the only legislation that has been offered. The Senator from New York offered a different type of legislation. The junior Senator from Florida has offered still another proposal in this field. I am sure that others have offered proposed legislation.

The point is that no action has been taken. There has been no willingness to come to grips with the problem. The senior senator from Florida thinks that too much is involved in the way of the general public interest and the right of the public to be protected against such things as a railroad stoppage or an airline stoppage, or on a local basis, the stoppage of important local utilities, for us longer to wait for anybody. We should vote our own convictions and place legislation on the books which is meaningful.

The Senator from Florida has stated how he thinks it should be solved. My bill may not offer the wisest course, but I want anything that has teeth in it and that will protect the public.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

(At this point, Mr. HOLLINGS assumed the chair.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall be very brief and I hope that I shall be to the point.

The reason we have demanded of the President his recommendations is twofold: First, I have legislation before the Subcommittee on Labor, as do Senators HOLLAND, SMATHERS, and MORSE. However, I cannot get a hearing. The reason I cannot get a hearing—and I am the ranking minority member—is that the White House has not pulled the plug on it. Until the White House says it is all right to have a hearing, there will be no hearing so far as I can see. While theoretically we have the power to act, we cannot get a hearing or have a committee report and we are reduced to the necessity of coming here and tacking it onto another bill. I may have to do that but I would not consider it responsible. This legislation, in particular, should be screened—hearings should be held, testimony should be heard from persons representing labor and management and others to get their views, and the matter should be reported.

However, if there is no other way, we may be compelled to tack it onto other legislation and let the Senate work its will. That course is most unwise, but there is almost no alternative.

My second point is that this is not something foreign to the President. This concerns executive power. Whatever we pass will vest power in the President. It is the height of folly to legislate power to the President when there is no understanding from him as to how he will use it and what he will do with it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I shall not yield at this point, but I shall yield in a moment.

Nevertheless, we had to do it, and even in the instance of the Taft-Hartley law we gave the President an 80-day injunction. In that instance I voted to sustain the veto, as did the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. I voted to sustain the veto for many reasons, including the fact, that I did not think it provided finality; and if the President puts us in that position we may be unable to do anything else.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does not the Senator from New York remember that even though he vetoed the Taft-Hartley Act, and it was passed over his veto, President Truman himself found it necessary to use that law in several instances, and very successfully in several instances?

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator is correct.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have just heard the announcement, and I hope that the Senator from Oregon, the Senator in charge of the bill, will work it out so that we can pass it here and send it to the White House today, because I think the country is entitled to know that there will be no railroad strike. I shall join in whatever unanimous consent is required for that purpose.

Now, Mr. President, to complete my argument: I ask the White House either to give us its recommendations or to get off the back of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and let that committee work its will. That is why we have to appeal to the President, because, as we stand now, we can get neither. Until we get one or the other, I think it is impossible to proceed in an intelligent and mature way to perform our responsibilities. Our only alternative would be to offer amendments to legislation here on the Senate floor. We have done it before. The Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] said we have done it on other occasions. We may have to do it now. It is by no means the optimum course.

I close my part in this debate by urging that this should not be our course. Rather, the White House should come through with its recommendations for permanent legislation dealing with situations in which a grave emergency is threatened for the country. What the Attorney General of the United States had to tell us, assembled solemnly in the Cabinet Room of the White House, that there is no remedy and that the Government is powerless, I think is shocking, wrong, and disadvantageous and prejudicial to the interests of the people of the United States. I want to see that everything is done to correct it at the earliest possible moment.

The shoe is pinching. This is the time to correct it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate will approve this resolution. We had quite an extended discussion in the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare at the end of last week, and I believe we finally arrived at a pretty good consensus. The resolution came to the floor of the Senate without a dissenting vote. I was honored to have made the motion within the committee which resulted in its being brought out, after extensive discussion, in which the Senator from New York and the Senator from Florida took a very active part.

One of the ways of handling this was suggested by the Senator from Michigan, who I see in the Chamber, and who was most helpful in working out a method of trying to get this matter under control. The Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is not a monolithic committee. It is a committee where a wide range of the political spectrum on views from right to left is pretty well represented. So that in the end, every member of the committee concluded that since the President has asked for this resolution, he was entitled to have it.

Mr. President, there is no use crying over spilt milk. It may well be that this crisis could have been better handled in the days gone by—indeed, in the months just past. It is easy to say if we had handled this thing better 2 or 3 months ago, the situation would be healthier than it is today. We are faced with a condition, not with a theory.

While 47 days does seem pretty long, the President wants 47 days, he thinks he needs 47 days, so that as the active head of the executive branch who, in the last analysis, is going to have to settle this threatened strike—we are not going to settle it down here—the most we can do is to pass this legislation which may be of some assistance to the Executive in getting this matter settled without a crippling railroad strike.

The suggestion was made for 20 days. There was some argument in committee on that, that if we really had a "gun" in our hands, we could get the legislation more quickly if we did not take so long. I do not buy that myself. We must remember also that the Memorial Day recess is coming on at the end of this month, so, in effect, we will be out of here for the better part of that week during the end of May. Then came this thing, but the 25th of May? I doubt it, with the rules in the House and with committee hearings and everything else that has to go into a Presidential recommendation, which to my way of thinking is certain to be controversial. I do not know what the President will send down—I do not believe anyone else knows what the President will send down—but so far as I am concerned, I should like to have a little time to think about it. I should like to have a little time to see whether we need some amendments. I should like to have a little time to see whether we need a substitute bill.

For myself, I would give the President the benefit of the doubt, unless he did something which was clearly wrong. So that with 45 days to act, and the Memorial Day recess coming along, I hope that the Senate will be governed and will be affected by the unanimous recommendation made by the committee vested with the jurisdiction over this matter. That is the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, chaired by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], who has probably had more experience in this general labor field than any other Member of the Senate. He is behind this resolution. I am behind it. The entire Republican delegation on that committee is behind it. Every Democratic member is behind it.

I hope that the Senate will approve the resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his remarks and support. In regard to the resolution providing for 47 days instead of 20 days, or a lesser period of time the longer period was agreed upon because of recommendations made by House Members. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], together with the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] know that I proposed a 30-day period at our meeting with the President. At the meeting at the White House, the Speaker of the House, Speaker MCCORMACK, and all the Members of the House that were there, said that 30 days, in their judgment, would not be long enough for House action because of some differences in the parliamentary procedure in the House as compared to the Senate. Therefore, we agreed to fix 45 days instead of 30 days. Then later we set an additional 2 days, for the reasons set forth in my opening remarks today on this legislation.

At risk of starting a diversionary discussion, in view of the very sincere statements made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], and the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], I wish to say this in behalf of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, chaired by the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. One cannot serve under a more dedicated public servant and chairman of any committee than the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL].

Also on behalf of the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], who is chairman of the Subcommitee on Labor, I want to say that the Labor and Public Welfare Committee has never avoided discussing the problem of legislation on which we have not held hearings. I should like to see a statistical record of other committees of the Senate that do not hold hearings on a good many bills referred to them. My criticism of bills not coming to hearing would go only to cases where the committee gives no consideration within the committee as to whether to come to hearing or not to come to hearing.

Therefore, I rise as a witness in behalf of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], when I say that although it is true there have been labor bills before our committee, that have not come to hearing, there has been a large, large volume of work performed by the full committee and by the Subcommittee on Labor Legislation and that record is outstanding.

We have had discussions within the committee of whether to have hearings on a whole series of package amendments on Taft-Hartley, or take up one bill at a time.

We have discussed as a committee, time and time again, the matter of holding hearings on the labor bills referred to us and we have tried to select those bills that in our judgment should receive priority treatment.

Those discussions have taken place many times. There has not been any deliberate attempt on the part of the chairmen of the full committee or subcommittee, to bury legislation in committee.

Let me say to the Senator from New York and the Senator from Florida that I am satisfied the discussions we have had here today will be productive. It is good to call the attention of committees to views which are held by Members of the Senate in regard to the work of the committee. I do not need to speak for them. I could not, if I wanted to. But the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee will undoubtedly make this discussion a matter of discussion within their committees. But here again, so far as I am concerned, it is a question of what legislation should come first and what legislation should be laid aside. That is for the committee to decide.

Now, I am delighted to have listened to the message that just came over from the House, that it has passed House Joint Resolution 543, which is identical in language to the pending business of the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 79.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Parliamentarian advised me that it would be in order by unanimous consent to proceed to its consideration. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 543.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I simply ask unanimous consent to include in the Record the text of Senate Joint Resolution 9 with its 18 sponsors in addition to myself, which calls upon the President to give his final plan for dealing precisely with this dispute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 9

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Labor is hereby directed to commence immediately a complete study of the operations and adequacy of the emergency labor disputes provisions of the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act, and to report to the Congress, no later than one hundred and twenty days after enactment of this joint resolution, the findings of such study together with appropriate recommendations for such amendments to the Railway Labor Act and the Labor-Management Relations Act as will provide improved permanent procedures for the settlement of emergency labor disputes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Oregon that the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 543 as a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 79?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have been advised by the Parliamentarian that it is necessary for me now to request the yeas and nays on House Joint Resolution 543. The yeas and nays having been granted on Senate Joint Resolution 79, the Parliamentarian advises me that the yeas and nays must be requested on House Joint Resolution 543, which is a substitute for Senate Joint Resolution 79. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the third reading of House Joint Resolution 543.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator for Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], are necesarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Burdick], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Ervin], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Montoya], the Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senators from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen and Mr. Percy], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick] is absent on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. Dominick], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. Tower] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 2, as follows:

[Nŏ. 97 Leg.]

YEAS—72

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Ellender
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, La.
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

McIntyre
Metcalf

NOT VOTING—26

Bayh
Brewster
Burdick
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Hansen
Hartke
Hruska
Jackson
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Magnuson
McCarthy
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Murphy
Nelson
Pell
Percy
Spong
Tower

So House Joint Resolution 543 was passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate Joint Resolution 79 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is no small task to voice the praises owed the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse] for all of his many contributions to the betterment of labor-management relations. His outstanding record in the area speaks abundantly more than any expressions I can utter at the moment.

I will say, however, that Senator Morse, by steering through the committee and the Senate this latest extension of the cooling-off period in the railway dispute, may well serve to prevent one of the most critical national economic disasters to be witnessed in the past decade. His appreciation of the untold consequences of a railroad strike at this particular time in our history are not excelled by anyone. So we are grateful once again for the expertise of Senator Morse and for his unmatched ability to advise the Senate of the proper course to take in matters of this nature. All of us hope the additional time will result in a successful settlement.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] is similarly to be thanked for offering his own strong and highly articulate support on this measure. Without it, and without his profound expertise in this area, the Senate undoubtedly would not have responded in the swift and effective fashion so vital in these circumstances. Along with Senator Javits we are indebted to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin] and to the other members of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare for joining to assure expeditious action. Particularly, we are grateful for the backing of the distinguished Senators from Florida [Mr. Holland] and Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. Their views and their assistance are always welcome.

Finally, to the highly able chairman of the committee, the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill] goes high praise for making possible the prompt action which was so essential. It goes without saying that Senator Hill has consistently demonstrated in this body his unparalleled capacity to accomplish outstanding legislative achievements. The action on this measure was no exception.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine business, with a time limitation on statements of not to exceed 3 minutes, but that those who wish to exceed the limitation feel free to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REPORT ON MANPOWER REQUIREMENTS, RESOURCES, UTILIZATION, AND TRAINING—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 116)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

In January 1966, 14 young men—high school dropouts—enrolled in a Baltimore Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Eight months later, most of them had returned to school, helped by part-time work and wages received through job training.

Last February in the same city, 29 women—all on the relief rolls—graduated from a federally sponsored course to train nurses' aids. Today they are off welfare, working in hospitals. As they help themselves and their families, they are helping the Nation meet its critical shortage of health workers.

In Chicago last summer, six employment offices were set up for teenagers under the Manpower Development and Training Act—and run by the young people themselves. Through these centers, 750 young men and women got jobs. What might have been empty summers became, for them, a satisfying, productive time.

These examples of progress are the result of programs begun only a few years ago—programs which reflect the Nation's commitment to a positive manpower policy.

By bringing new skills to thousands of Americans, these programs are fueling the ambitions and fulfilling the hopes of many who might otherwise have been condemned to idleness—not by choice but by lack of opportunity.

This manpower report to the Congress, submitted under the Manpower Development and Training Act, surveys the progress we have made in the last year. It also points up the troubling and persistent problems of unemployment in a prosperous economy—and the steps we must take to overcome those problems.

YEAR 1966—A YEAR OF PROGRESS

An effective manpower policy depends on a healthy economy. In 1966, this Nation's unemployment rate dropped below 4 percent—reaching a 13-year low. Seventy-four million people were working, nearly 2 million more than when the year began.

The total production of goods and services in America increased to an historic $740 billion—$58 billion more than in 1965. On the whole, jobs were paying better than ever and were more regular and secure than they had been in many years. More than 98 percent of men in the labor force with families to support were at work. The after-tax income of American families increased, after allowing for price increases, by 3.5 percent.

This economic progress did not occur by chance. It was the achievement of business and labor. It was the result of gradually improving education. Much of it also came from careful efforts by Government to encourage and sustain economic growth—and to carry out humane and positive manpower programs.

Those efforts—even the newest of them—have been remarkably fruitful. Through the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, strengthened by the 1965 and 1966 amendments, and through other progressive measures, we have taken vital steps to assure opportunity to all our citizens.

By the end of last year, for example, under the Manpower Development and Training Act programs:

About 600,000 unemployed and underemployed workers had been enrolled in training;

Three out of four trainees who completed their classroom work had gone on to regular employment;

Nearly nine out of 10 citizens who had completed on-the-job training were gainfully employed;

Thousands of citizens most in need of help—Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and other disadvantaged young Americans—had received training;

Workers by the thousands were being trained to relieve acute manpower shortages in the health fields and in a variety of other occupations.

By late 1966, under the Economic Opportunity Act:

More than 800,000 young people had received a new start through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Thousands of poor boys and girls, many who were at less than a fourth-grade literacy level, had gotten training and jobs through the Job Corps.

Two hundred thousand young men and women, who might have been forced to leave college because of financial difficulties, had continued their education through the college work-study program.

One hundred and thirty-eight thousand needy family breadwinners were given new skills through the work experience and training program.

These programs are helping more than a million Americans each year to gain the knowledge and skills needed for steady productive employment.

THE PARADOX OF PROSPERITY

Our manpower programs have accomplished much. They must be continued—and their momentum increased. For the year 1966 reminded us that expansion of the economy will not, by itself, eliminate all unemployment and underemployment.

Last year the overall unemployment rate dropped to 3.8 percent and the rate for married men to below 2 percent, an impressively low figure. But we have no reason to be complacent. The tragedy of joblessness is not only in the amount of unemployment—but in the kind of unemployment.

Over 12 percent of our young people aged 16 to 19 were still looking for jobs at the year's end.

Among Negroes and other minority groups, the unemployment rate was almost double the overall rate.

In slums and depressed rural areas, joblessness ran close to 10 percent. And one out of every three people in those areas who are or ought to be working today faces some severe employment problem.

Much of this unemployment occurred not because jobs were unavailable, but because people were unable to fill jobs, or, for various reasons, unwilling to fill them.

Often the job is in one place—but the worker in another.

Or the job calls for a special skill—a skill the unemployed person does not have.

The employer insists on a high school diploma—but the jobseeker quit school without this qualification.

An employer demands a "clean record"—but the applicant has a record marred by a juvenile arrest.

A job offers 1 day's work a week—but the worker needs 5 days' pay to support his family.

All these problems have long been with us. In the past, however, they were often obscured by general unemployment: when thousands of skilled experienced workers were searching for work, scant attention was paid to the jobless high school dropout.

Today, illuminated by prosperity, these problems stand out more clearly.

At the end of 1966, about 2.9 million workers were unemployed. But it is estimated that during the course of the year, about 10.5 million workers suffered some unemployment.

About three-quarters of the 10.5 million workers were only temporarily out of jobs—and soon found work. The young worker just entering the labor force belongs to this group; the bank teller who has left his job to seek a better one; the lathe operator who has been laid off while adjustments are made in the production schedule.

We cannot eliminate all temporary unemployment. In a free and mobile society, people must be able to change jobs and get better ones; workers must be able to leave and enter the labor force at will; and the rate of production of particular firms and industries must be free to respond to market forces.

We must seek, however, to minimize the hardships of temporary unemployment:

By making it unnecessary for young men and women to spend long weeks job hunting after they leave school;

By providing greater year-round opportunities to seasonal workers;

By improving job referral services to bring jobs and workers closer together.

Our manpower programs seek to do just those things—and to reduce the waste and frustration that result from even short spells of unemployment.

But our manpower programs must do more. They must reach the workers who are unemployed for long periods and those who are frequently out of work.

Preliminary estimates from our labor force survey show that during 1966 there were 2.5 million American workers who were jobless for 15 weeks or more during the year. Of those, about 700,000 were out of work during more than half of the year. Another one-half to 1 million potential workers had abandoned the search for a job, at least temporarily, and were not even counted as unemployed. Still another 500,000 unemployed were probably missed by the labor force survey. Others were employed at part-time jobs when they needed full-time work.

Some of these workers should not be in the labor force at all, including those too old or too ill to hold steady jobs. These people can be helped by improvements in our health, public assistance, and social security programs.

Others in this group have the skill and experience to find and hold good jobs. They can be helped by improvements in our employment services, and by actions to reduce seasonal unemployment.

But there are many who need special manpower services before they can become fully adequate workers and earners. Precise measurement of the magnitude of the task ahead is difficult—indeed, impossible. But we can estimate that there are roughly 2 million potential workers who can be helped and are willing to help themselves.

These are the dropouts—young men and women who have left school with inadequate education and without skills. Lacking experience, they cannot find work; lacking work, they can never get experience.

They are older workers whose obsolete skills are useless in today's job market.

They are Negroes, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and others barred from jobs by other people's prejudice.

They are the illiterate, the migrants, the mentally and physically handicapped, the young men rejected as unfit for military service.

This is the effort that has to be made—to reduce unemployment to the point where all that remains is the result of inevitable movements within the work force, irreducible seasonal factors, and a small number of people whose disadvantages or circumstances preclude their satisfactory employment.

The remaining problem is formidable and its solution will take time. But it is of manageable proportions.

Never before have we had so great an opportunity—or so urgent an obligation—to bring training and skills to people willing to help themselves.

These Americans need hope, not handouts. They want—and deserve—work and training, not welfare.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MANPOWER POLICY

If we are to proceed in practical ways to assist the unemployed, we must pursue five new directions in manpower policy.

1. WE MUST BRIDGE THE GAP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND WORK

Few nations—perhaps none—can match the achievements of our educational system. None equals the record of our economy. Yet our youth unemployment rate is the highest of any modern nation.

We pay too little attention to the two out of three young people who do not go to college and the many others who do not finish college. As citizens and supporters of public education, we should be as concerned about assisting them in their transition from school to job as we are about preparing others for college.

Too many young men and women face long and bitter months of job hunting or marginal work after leaving school. Our society has not yet established satisfactory ways to bridge the gap between school and work. If we fail to deal energetically with this problem, thousands of young people will continue to lapse into years of intermittent, unrewarding and menial labor.

Our interest in a young person should not stop when he finishes—or drops out of—school. Our concern should become even greater then. It should extend to the point at which every young person becomes self-sufficient. Any other view would not only lack humanity—it would be false economy.

Other nations have developed broad industry training and internship programs, offering education and experience to young people entering a trade or profession. Still others have established close ties between educational institutions and employment agencies at all levels.

We can profit by these examples if we:

Build into our employment system a broader concept of apprenticeship and work experience;

Establish in our educational programs opportunities for students to learn more about the world of work;

Build a system in which education and work experience are brought together to provide the kind of preparation that fits the needs of our society.

To achieve these ends, I am directing the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a thorough study of the relationship between our educational programs and our manpower programs, between learning and earning in America. By more closely relating the two we can reduce the high unemployment rate among young Americans.

In this task, the Secretaries will consult State education and employment agencies, local boards of education, business and labor leaders, and the special Committee on Administration of Training Programs which Congress recently authorized. They will also review such related problems as the difference between laws relating to the school-leaving age and those governing the age for entering certain occupations, and any applications of minimum wage agreements, laws or practices which inhibit experimentation in adding a work content to educational programs.

2. WE MUST CONCENTRATE OUR EFFORTS

Six year ago, general unemployment plagued the country. Nearly seven percent of our workers could not find jobs. Every State and almost every city suffered. The situation was far worse in slums and depressed rural areas than in the suburbs—but unemployment was so widespread that it had to be fought everywhere.

The Nation's employment map shows 150 major labor areas. In March and April of 1961, unemployment in 101 of these areas exceeded 6 percent. At the end of 1963, 38 of these 150 areas still suffered high unemployment.

By the end of 1966, only eight of the major labor areas had an unemployment rate above 6 percent. An expanding economy, strengthened educational programs and public and private manpower training efforts, had created jobs and trained men to fill them.

But 2 million Americans needing employment assistance still remained—Americans who could be helped and who were willing to help themselves. Education, training, swift economic advances somehow had passed them by.

Last year, to develop a body of detailed information about these unemployed citizens and their problems the Secretary of Labor surveyed unemployment in selected slums throughout the country.

This survey concluded that—

Unemployment in the city slums is three times higher than the national average.

One out of three potential workers in those areas is not adequately employed—including those who could be working but are not; those who are working part-time but want full-time jobs, and those who are working full-time but earning substandard wages.

The results of this study show not only where the unemployed are but why they are jobless. The study concluded that despite the spectacular growth of our economy, despite improvements in the human and social conditions of American life, the unemployment rate in many of these depressed areas is as high as it was 6 years ago.

To the extent that the remaining unemployment is concentrated in these areas, our programs also must be concentrated. To scatter our effort now is to waste it.

I have asked Congress to provide an additional $135 million in fiscal 1968 under the Economic Opportunity Act for a new manpower program to provide special assistance to our most disadvantaged citizens.

With these funds, we can:

Focus our services more sharply upon areas and individuals in greatest need.

Tailor these services to the requirements of each individual—counseling, health services, training, and followup assistance on a case-by-case basis.

Enlist the support of local business and labor organizations—the key to any successful employment program.

But the need was too urgent to permit delay. Accordingly, I asked the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the heads of other Federal agencies, to begin this special manpower program immediately with all available resources.

Our manpower programs also must be specially aimed at two other groups: seasonally employed workers and the handicapped.

Thousands of seasonally employed workers lead hard, uncertain lives. For them, employment is determined not by their abilities or opportunities but by the calendar. Among them are construction workers and hired farm laborers—especially migrant farmworkers, who pick a meager living from the soil, "traveling everywhere but living nowhere."

To help these workers, I have asked the Secretary of Labor in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Acting Secretary of Commerce to make a detailed survey of seasonal unemployment and underemployment—and to find ways to deal with these problems.

This study should seek methods by which Federal, State, and local governments, through their contracting procedures and other activities, can reduce seasonal lags in employment, especially in the construction industry. It should explore the feasibility of a migrant manpower corporation and other ways to help regularize the employment of hired farmworkers, particularly migratory farmworkers.

For thousands of mentally and physically handicapped Americans, employment has too long been considered an exclusive concern of charity. Yet, we know that many handicapped citizens can learn important skills, and can become effective workers.

I am directing the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore additional ways in which business, industry, and government can provide more meaningful employment opportunities to handicapped citizens.

3. WE MUST MAKE OUR OVERALL MANPOWER EFFORT MORE EFFICIENT

Our major commitment to an affirmative manpower policy is relatively recent. Many of our manpower programs are new, and we are still building the machinery to carry them out. By a combination of law and delegation of authority, the Department of Labor has primary operating responsibility for manpower programs.

But the problems of manpower development cut across organizational lines. They are closely intertwined with problems of social, economic, and educational development. Accordingly, the Department of Labor has established close working ties with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Economic Opportunity and other Federal agencies having responsibilities in these areas.

Perhaps, the most important of these new working ties is the recent delegation of several OEO adult work and training programs to the Department of Labor. These arrangements link the Labor Department's responsibility in the manpower area with OEO's responsibility for coordinating antipoverty programs. They provide local initiative by the carrying out of local programs through community action agencies wherever this is practicable.

We are working to strengthen those ties: to centralize, consolidate, and streamline our operations.

The task of manpower development, of course, cannot be a Federal task alone. Recognizing this, we are placing greater emphasis on on-the-job training programs conducted by private employers.

As the demand increases for workers with special skills, we should take positive steps particularly to encourage private job training efforts:

First. We must obtain reliable information on which to base our plans. I have asked Congress to provide funds for a systematic study by the Secretary of Labor to answer these questions: What public and private job training programs are now available? Whom do they serve? What needs remain unmet?

Second. I am directing the Secretary of Labor and the Acting Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to establish a Task Force on Occupational Training. This task force, with members drawn from business, labor, agriculture and the general public, will survey training programs operated by private industry, and will recommend ways that the Federal Government can promote and assist private training programs.

Third. I have recommended that Congress provide an additional $5.6 million to enable the Secretary of Labor to aid private industry in experimental projects providing a wide range of services and training to seriously disadvantaged workers.

Fourth. I am asking the Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture to conduct a study to determine both short-term and future manpower needs and the supply of workers in rural America. With this information, we will be able to plan to meet the needs of our workers and of our rural economy.

4. WE MUST MAKE MILITARY SERVICE A PATH TO PRODUCTIVE CAREERS

Members of the Armed Forces have an opportunity to perform vital military service. They can also acquire knowledge and experience to prepare them for civilian careers after their service.

In fiscal 1966, 750,000 servicemen completed specialized training programs. In almost 2,000 different courses, from automobile repair to aerospace technology, these young citizens have gained skills and experience which help them to obtain civilian jobs.

The armed services have also made educational growth possible for thousands of servicemen through the U.S. Armed Forces Institute and other educational programs. Nearly 80,000 servicemen earned the equivalent of a high school diploma last year.

In addition, the Secretary of Defense has launched "Project 100,000" to accept and train thousands of young men who were previously rejected as unfit for military service. Under this program, 40,000 young men are joining the Armed Forces this year. One hundred thousand will join next year. All will receive specialized training to help them become good soldiers—and later, productive citizens.

There are, of course, some military specialists whose training does not lead directly to civilian employment.

To help them, I have asked the Secretary of Defense to make available, to the maximum extent possible, inservice training and educational opportunities which will increase their chances for employment in civilian life.

5. WE MUST WORK TOWARD A MORE COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PROGRAM

If our manpower programs are to reach as many workers as they must, we should strengthen the Federal-State employment service so that it can improve job placement, provide better training and job information, and offer guidance and counseling to all those who need these vital services.

A sound economic and manpower policy also requires effective measures for maintaining the income of the worker and his family when working patterns change.

I urge the Congress to amend the unemployment insurance laws to provide training, guidance, or other services in conjunction with extended benefits to the long-term unemployed. I urge Congress also to extend the protection of the system to additional workers, to establish a more realistic level of benefits, and to correct the abuses which occur within the present system.

Along with the improvements I have proposed in the social security system and our public assistance programs, these steps will enhance the lives of millions of poor families and give them incentives to improve their education and their job potential. Further, I have proposed under the Economic Opportunity Act that Job Corpsmen, Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen, and others engaged in work and training under that act should be given greater incentives to work, by allowing them to earn more without a corresponding loss of welfare assistance to their families.

Our economic system must have adequate "manpower"—but manpower is not enough. The economic system is a means. Its end is the individual.

To better serve the deeper purpose of our manpower programs, we must seek answers to the most fundamental questions about unemployment.

I, therefore, urge the Congress to provide $20 million for a special census of 3 million households in America.

Among other data, this population census will give us vitally needed manpower information about unemployed Americans. It will provide for us a more complete profile of the jobless worker. Where does he live? How much education and training does he have? What are his health and economic problems? What other obstacles must be overcome to find and hold a job?

CONCLUSION

We know that a vigorous economy and an effective educational system are the bedrock of an effective manpower policy.

Our economy is healthy, and our unemployment rate is low. We work with constant vigilance to keep that rate low.

The 18 landmark educational measures I proposed and you in the Congress enacted are symbols of our belief that education is the most important investment we can make in the Nation's future.

Thus, on these foundations—a thriving economy and educational progress—we can shape our manpower policies to:

Prevent the misuse, and nonuse, of our youth.

Meet squarely the problems of the 2 million Americans who need employment assistance and who stand ready to help themselves.

Meet the needs of a burgeoning economy for skilled workers.

Help workers with special employment problems—the handicapped, the migrant worker, the armed services rejectee.

Bring workers to jobs as well as jobs to workers.

Develop a closer partnership with business and private agencies.

We are heartened by the progress of our manpower programs over the past years. This progress is not material for bold headlines: quiet victories seldom are.

One man's struggle to improve himself, to learn new skills and discard old habits, is deeply personal and often painful.

But each day victories are being won—in dozens of neighborhood youth centers, in scores of Job Corps camps, in thousands of training projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Often our progress is measured not by what happened but by what has been avoided. The high school dropout whose name might have been recorded on a police blotter—but was not because he learned a skill and got a good job. The father of five who might have waited in line for his relief check—but did not because he was trained and went on to steady employment.

The yardstick we must use is not what we have accomplished in the past—but what we must do in the future.

We will do our best. We will try and try again. We will never lose sight of our goal—to guarantee to every man an opportunity to unlock his own potential; to earn the satisfaction of standing on his own two feet.

Our goal, in short, is to offer to every citizen one of the greatest blessings: a sure sense of his own usefulness.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 1, 1967*.

INVESTMENT COMPANY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 51

"An enrolled joint resolution memorializing Congress ot direct the Secretary of Agriculture to co-operate with state officials on state laws regulating the grain shipping industry

"Whereas, the Wisconsin Grain and Warehouse Commission was created in 1905; and

"Whereas, this commission since its formation has protected the interests of the grain shipper's in this area by inspecting the grain and weighing procedures relating to grain shipments into and out of this state; and

"Whereas, through its conscientious and diligent efforts the commission has been successful in controlling unethical practices in grain inspecting and weighing and has become known and respected the world over; and

"Whereas, in 1919 the United States Warehouse Act was passed by Congress. This act was passed to complement state supervision over certain industries, including the grain shipment industry, but not to replace this supervision; and

"Whereas, under the provisions of this Federal Warehouse Act, however, grain firms are being allowed to become completely free of state supervision and to conduct their own inspections and grain weighing procedures; and

"Whereas, it has been verified through every day experiences that a disinterested 3rd party inspector is a necessity in grain weighing and inspecting operations for the public welfare; and

"Whereas, this is a proper area for state supervision; and

"Whereas, the Superior area has been classified by the United States government as an economically depressed area and, if the grain firms are successful in coming under the federal act, over 100 people will be out of work; and

"Whereas, the United States Warehouse Act provides that the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to co-operate with state officials charged with the enforcement of state laws relating to warehouses, warehousemen, weighers, etc.; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly, the senate concurring, That the legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to co-operate with state officials and state laws in the area of grain shipments as authorized by the United States Warehouse Act in the interests of public welfare and the economy of this state; and, be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of he House of Representatives of the United States, to each member of the Congress from this state and to the Secretary of Agriculture.

"——— ———,
"Assembly Chief Clerk.
"HAROLD V. FROEHLICH,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
"Senate Chief Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 1013

"Memorializing the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to make national cemeteries available with burial spaces for all United States military service men and women who are entitled to the same, and wish to be interred there

"Whereas, Figures, compiled by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966, show that of the 4,873 servicemen who lost their lives in the fight for freedom in Viet Nam during the period, 873 or 20.4 per cent were buried in national cemeteries; and although one in five were actually interred in national cemeteries, many more would probably have also been buried in a national cemetery had there been available space near the home of next of kin; and

"Whereas, Over the past three years there has been a determined effort on the part of some federal agencies to sharply curtail or do away altogether with any further provision for national cemeteries. The Bureau of the Budget has stated unequivocably, 'We continue to believe that expansion of the national cemetery is undesirable. The Administration firmly believes that funeral benefits now paid by the Veterans Administration and under Social Security are far preferable to the furnishing of interment facilities by the Government. Legislation to this end would not be in accord with the program of the President', and

"Whereas, Present day burial expenses are sufficiently high without placing on the veteran's and serviceman's dependent the added cost of purchasing a burial plot. This cost can run into astronomical figures for the widow who has little income; and

"Whereas, The burial allowances of the Veterans Administration and those provided under Social Security are far too meager to provide for the last rites of most veterans and servicemen; and

"Whereas, The Department of the Army has advised Congress that, 'The Administration has determined that it is opposed to any further expansion of the present national cemetery system with the exception of Arlington National Cemetery,'; and

"Whereas, It is perfectly evident that the present administration is determined to end the national cemetery system just as soon as present facilities are exhausted. This procedure is a rank departure from the longtime precedent that veterans who have served their nation in time of war are entitled to burial sites provided by the United States government; now, therefore,

"Be It Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Forty-sixth General Assembly of the State of Colorado, the Senate concurring herein:

"That this General Assembly strongly urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as necessary to forestall the present plans of the Buerau of the Budget and the administration, and to oppose the position of the Department of Defense which supports the administration's policy of no further expansion of the national cemetery system, with the exception of the Arlington National Cemetery, as many national cemeteries have already exhausted available space and several others are scheduled for closing this year; and

"Be It Further Resolved, That the Department of Defense be requested to establish an adequate and permanent national cemetery system to make national cemeteries available with burial spaces for all United States military service men and women who are entitled to the same, and wish to be interred there; and

"Be is Further Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the secretary

of the United States Senate, and chief clerk of the United States House of Representatives, and to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense; the Honorable Charles L. Schultz, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to the members of the Congress from the State of Colorado: Senator Gordon Allott, Senator Peter Dominick, Congressman Wayne N. Aspinall, Congressman Donald G. Brotzman, Congressman Frank E. Evins, and Congressman Byron G. Rogers.

"JOHN D. VANDERHOOF,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.
"HENRY C. KIMBROUGH,
"Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.
"MARK A. HOGAN,
"President of the Senate.
"COMFORT W. SHAW,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION 43

"A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York memoralizing the Congress of the United States to make Columbus Day, the twelfth day of October, a federal public holiday

"Whereas, For many years the State of New York has accorded recognition to the great discoverer of this land, Christopher Columbus, by providing by law that the twelfth day of October in each year, the anniversary day of his discovery, be a legal public holiday in this state; and

"Whereas, Although many other states have also made Columbus Day a legal holiday, the government of the United States has not provided the same recognition to that intrepid and famous explorer who met and conquered the then as yet uncharted extremities of the endless seas by making Columbus Day a federal legal public holiday; and

"Whereas, It is just and fitting that Christopher Columbus be similarly honored federally for his memorable voyage and discovery of America; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved (if the Assembly concur), That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully memorialized to enact suitable legislation to make Columbus Day, the twelfth day of October, a federal legal public holiday; and be it further

"Resolved (if the Assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Congress of the United States by forwarding one copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate, one copy to the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and one copy to each member of the Congress from the State of New York.

"By order of the Senate
"ALBERT J. ABRAMS,
"Secretary.

"In assembly, March 23, 1967, Concurred in without amendment.

"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
"Clerk."

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. METCALF, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1601. A bill to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior (Rept. No. 204).

By Mr. HANSEN, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 443. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122); (Rept. No. 203).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas (Rept. No. 202).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA):

S. 1657. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ANDERSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1658. A bill to authorize regulations requiring certain vessels to use bridge to bridge radiotelephone communications while operating in certain areas of the navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. CASE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1659. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. SPARKMAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

EXTENSION FOR 1 YEAR THE AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE TO MAKE CERTAIN INDEMNITY PAYMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of Senator MONTOYA and myself, an amendment to section 331(c) of the Economic Opportunity Act *of 1964 to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make* indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets. Such removal, due to unsafe levels of chemical residue in the milk, has resulted in the *threat of bankruptcy to many producers* in west Texas and New Mexico. Farmers in this region are currently dumping thousands of dollars worth of milk every day.

The chemicals involved, notably DDT and its derivatives, are registered and approved for use by the Food and Drug Administration. Yet there is no federally regulated system of laboratory analysis to determine a uniform level of tolerance. As a result, particularly in the cotton-growing sections of New Mexico and west Texas, these chemicals are freely used to dust cotton from airplanes. This has resulted in the contamination of the earth and the air, as well as the cattle feed which is grown in the area and subsequently fed to milk-producing stock.

Prior to March 15, 1967, there was a tolerance of zero parts of DDT residue allowed in milk and dairy products. Upon the application of the Department of Agriculture of California and the department of public health of that State, a hearing was held and the level was changed to 1.25 parts per million. Yet even this level is becoming impossible for the dairy farmers in west Texas and New Mexico to meet. Drought conditions, wind, and other climatic conditions cause the level of absorption to vary considerably. Laboratory tests are also variable and unreliable, showing a low content of residue at one period and a high content at another. No means are currently available to the farmer to enable him to check his milk for safety levels *prior to its being sent out for processing* and distribution. Since milk is extremely perishable, he has no recourse, once his milk is rejected, but to get rid of it. It is easy to see that this is causing an extreme financial hardship on the individual farmer, as well as on the economic vitality of the entire region.

Remedies are available, but they will take time. Though the California hearings showed that levels of 2.5 parts per million are acceptable for human consumption, such an increase would have to be established as the legal tolerance level. *If the tolerance level is not raised,* then adequate Federal testing procedures should be made available to the farmers in advance so that they may protect themselves against unexpected and unforeseen rejection. Perhaps the only solution *would be to bar the use of DDT* and its derivatives altogether.

Until these alternatives become available, the plight of the dairy farmer remains intolerable. Under title 7 of the 1964 Agriculture Act a fund—the milk indemnity payment program—in excess *of $8 million was set aside for producers* caught under FDA enforcement policy. The 1966 version cut this amount to $500,000 and is due to expire June 30 of this year. It is estimated that producers already in trouble could dissipate this *fund in 6 months. The legislation I have introduced is designed to extend the* expiration date for 1 year and to return the fund to its original level of $8 million. This would allow the producers to remain in business while acceptable testing and grading procedures are established.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YARBOROUGH in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1657) to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government, introduced by Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

NAVIGATIONAL SAFETY RADIO ACT OF 1967

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill entitled the Navigational Safety Radio Act of 1967.

This measure is designed to help to assure that ships using America's increasingly crowded waterways operate with greater safety. My bill would seek to accomplish this by requiring most commercial shipping to make more widespread use of bridge-to-bridge radio communications while operating in the navigable waters of the United States.

The provisions of my bill are keyed to making this requirement applicable to large vessels—those which, in a collision, can cause heavy loss of life and get property damage.

My bill would apply to self-propelled passenger ships of 100 or more gross tons—a vessel's enclosed space expressed in cubic feet—to other motorized vessels of 300 or more gross tons and to special purpose craft, such as dredges, when their operations might be a hindrance to regular shipping traffic. The tonnage standards would exempt most tugs, barges and pleasure craft, according to maritime experts, while they would apply to every ship of significant size.

There is a division of opinion in shipping circles whether even the heavier barges, or strings of barges, should be required to use the bridge radio telephone system. I will not attempt to settle that issue here. This is a question that should be explored in committee hearings.

The language of the bill does not cover foreign-flag vessels, as such. But since U.S. navigation laws apply to all vessels of whatever flag when they are in U.S. waters, the effect would be to require that foreign vessels also carry bridge-to-bridge radiotelephones.

At present the master or pilot of a vessel can use two different methods for avoiding collision. These are radar, which tells him only the location of an oncoming ship; or the marine rules of the road, a mandatory system by which two approaching vessels determine which one has the right-of-way.

The chief feature of the rules of the road, prescribed whistle signals, has often been criticized. Seamen complain, for example, that on a windy day, or when there is conflicting noise from other ships, or from onshore, the sound of the whistles may not be clear. Although some deck officers remedy this by watching for puffs of steam that follow the whistles, even this source of information is being cut off as diesel engine vessels are put into service. The whistles on diesels do not emit steam.

The major drawback of both radar and the rules of the road, I am told, is that they tell so little about the intentions of approaching skippers, intentions which, if carried out, could put two vessels on a collision course.

Last year two tankers collided at the lower entrance to Newark Bay, in New York Harbor, killing 33 seamen. Commenting on the moments preceding the crash, when the rules of the road were in effect, the Newark, N.J., News said in a July 10 story:

> From their testimony during the (Coast Guard) inquiry, the pilots and deck officers of the two vessels revealed their confusion concerning the intentions of each other's ships in a close crossing situation.

Although the Coast Guard is still to establish the blame for the accident, some experienced seamen believe the collision might have been averted had the bridges of both ships been in radio communication with each other.

In the case of the liners *Stockholm* and *Andrea Doria*, which collided in 1956 with a loss of 50 lives, maritime experts feel strongly that the crash could have been prevented by the use of bridge-to-bridge radio telephone.

In contrast to the inflexibility of the rules of the road and radar, bridge-to-bridge radio is highly flexible. It can put two skippers into instantaneous, even continuous, touch for the exchange of essential information until their vessels have safely passed each other.

Bridge-to-bridge radio, at present, is mandatory only on the Great Lakes. It is used to a varying degree elsewhere, including Port Philadelphia, New York Harbor, and San Francisco, but only on a voluntary basis. Despite this, the Coast Guard has noted that since the system was instituted in Port Philadelphia, "there has been a dramatic reduction in collision frequency."

In light of apparently successful experience with bridge radio telephones, it would be sensible, I believe, to make much greater use of them than is presently the case. From a cost standpoint there should be no great difficulty in doing this. I understand that the portable radio that would be used costs about $700, a small enough sum to pay for the protection of human life and multi-million-dollar ships.

Further, the Federal Communications Commission has set aside a special radio frequency, known as channel 13, primarily to handle exchanges of navigational information between ships and for use in maritime emergencies. Since transmissions on this frequency typically are of short duration, its flexibility should not be impaired by greater use.

Last July, Adm. Charles P. Murphy, chief of the Coast Guard's Office of Merchant Marine Safety, was quoted by the New York Times as saying:

> We believe it (bridge-to-bridge radio) has to be a mandatory system.

This is the intent of my bill, and I urge that it be enacted in this session of Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1658) to authorize regulations requiring certain vessels to use bridge-to-bridge radiotelephone communications while operating in certain areas of the navigable waters of the United States introduced by Mr. CASE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REGULATION OF INVESTMENT COMPANIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce a bill proposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisors Act of 1940.

This legislation is the result of a series of detailed studies made by the Commission, its staff, and consultants. These studies were made pursuant to section 14(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940, authorizing the Commission, if it finds that "any substantial further increase in the size of investment companies creates any problem involving the protection of investors or the public interest, to make a study and investigation" and to report the results to the Congress. Various aspects of the mutual fund industry have been studied by the Commission, its staff, and the academic community since 1958. The most recent of these, the Commission's "Report on the Public Policy Implications of Investment Company Growth," was transmitted to the Congress on December 2, 1966.

Millions of Americans—many of them of modest means—have invested their savings in mutual funds and in other kinds of investment companies, and many more of our citizens will undoubtedly invest enormous additional sums in these companies in years to come. The amount already invested exceeds $46 billion.

This is a matter of long interest to the Committee on Banking and Currency which has jurisdiction over the securities laws of our country. Today this subject is of special importance in view of the rapid growth of the mutual fund industry. In 1940 when the Investment Company Act was enacted, mutual funds with their 300,000 shareholders and total assets of $450 million were on the periphery of the securities industry. Today mutual funds occupy a central position in our economy, having assets of over $40 billion and over 3½ million investors.

This bill, prepared by the Securities and Exchange Commission, will enable the Congress to take a fresh look at the laws which regulate our Nation's investment companies, and to determine whether existing law adequately serves the present needs of these investors and the national economy. It will, at the same time, provide us an opportunity to assure fairness and equity between these investors and those who manage their money.

The Banking and Currency Committee, of which I am chairman, in addition to considering the specific proposals encompassed in this bill, will seek suggestions and alternate courses of action for dealing with these problems. We shall welcome suggestions from investors and members of the mutual fund community as well as from the entire securities industry. Legislation will be recommended to the Senate only after the most careful consideration of all points of view and of the effect of such legislation on the national economy.

The bill is long and complicated, and the explanation of the bill prepared by the SEC is even longer. Together they add up to 124 pages. For this reason, I am not asking to have the bill and the explanation printed in the RECORD, as is my usual custom with a bill of this sort.

Instead, I am having the SEC's explanation of the bill printed as a committee print, together with a photographic reproduction of the bill, which will make it possible to refer to the bill's pages and lines. This will make a most useful document for the Senators and the industry representatives working on the bill. I expect that it will be available in 3 or 4 days, thanks to the outstanding work of the Government Printing Office.

So that all members of the committee will have an opportunity to hear and question the witnesses, hearings on this bill will be held before the full committee in room 5300, New Senate Office Building, beginning June 19, 1967. Those desiring to be heard may get in touch with Lewis G. Odom, Jr., staff director, telephone number 225-3921.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1659) to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter of transmittal of this legislative proposal from the Securities and Exchange Commission to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit legislative proposals unanimously recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission with the hope that they will be introduced and enacted in this first session of the 90th Congress. They would provide additional protection for mutual fund shareholders in areas where the tremendous growth of the industry since enactment of the Investment Company Act of 1940 has created needs which were either unanticipated or of secondary importance at that time. Between the end of 1940 and June 30, 1966, investment company assets increased from about $2.1 billion to $46.4 billion. Most of this growth was accounted for by mutual funds, whose net assets increased from $450 million at the end of 1940 to about $38.2 billion at June 30, 1966. By the end of 1965 there were more than 3,500,000 mutual fund investors as compared with less than 300,000 in 1940.

The Commission's proposals are the outgrowth of studies made by or for the Commission pursuant to Congressional direction, primarily that contained in Section 14(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 which authorizes the Commission if it finds "that any substantial further increase in the size of investment companies creates any problem involving the protection of investors or the public interest, to make a study and investigation" and to report the results to the Congress.

The first of these studies, which commenced in 1958 pursuant to Commission direction, was made by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania. That report submitted to the Congress in August of 1962 found that the more important current problems in the mutual fund industry involved potential conflicts of interest between the fund management and shareholders and the impact of fund growth and purchases on stock prices. The Wharton School Report was followed by the Report of the staff of the Commission's Special Study of the Securities Markets, which, insofar as mutual funds were concerned, examined sales of mutual fund shares including sales practices and the special problems raised by the so-called front-end load in the sale of periodic payment plans for the accumulation of such shares.

Neither the Special Study nor the Wharton Report was a report by the Commission. Following publication of these reports the Commission undertook to evaluate the public policy questions that they raised as part of an extensive study of its own and to report its recommendations to the Congress. The results of that study are found in the Commission's Report on the Public Policy Implications on Investment Company Growth which was transmitted to the Congress on December 2, 1966 and published as House Report No. 2337, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. The legislative proposals transmitted herewith are designed to carry out the recommendations contained in that report.

Areas of primary concern in the report included the costs of management and sales charges. Mutual funds, although ordinarily organized either as corporations or as business trusts, usually are managed and operated not by their own officers and employees but by separate entities which provide management and advisory services under contract with the fund. Traditionally these contracts have provided for compensation on the basis of a percentage of the assets of the fund. As the funds have grown in size the amounts of management fees have likewise grown and the Commission's report concluded that economies of scale in the costs of managing large pools of assets have seldom been shared equitably with investment company shareholders. The proposed legislation would expressly require that management fees be reasonable and make this standard enforceable in the courts. However, any person attacking the reasonableness of a management fee which had been approved by the fund's directors as required by the Investment Company Act would have the burden of proving that the fee was unreasonable. A requirement that the fee be reasonable would appear inherent in the fiduciary relationship between investment company shareholders and an investment advisory organization which is in effective control of the fund. The existing provisions of the Investment Company Act, however, provide no adequate means by which such a requirement may be enforced.

The proposed legislation would also place a 5% ceiling on charges for mutual fund sales, subject to a power in the Commission to grant exceptions where appropriate. This proposed maximum charge would still be substantially greater than the sales charges generally prevailing in the securities markets such as stock exchange commissions or over-the-counter markups for securities of comparable quality. As a result, in part, of the resale price maintenance scheme provided in Section 22(d) of the Investment Company Act, which the mutual fund industry regards as important for the preservation of the existing pattern of distribution of such shares, competition has not operated to reduce sales loads. Rather the sales charges paid by the average or small investor have tended to increase as investment companies competed for the favor of dealers and their salesmen.

Of particular concern are the sales charges paid by those investors, generally small investors, who accumulate mutual fund shares by monthly payments over a period of years. Under the existing provisions of the statute, up to 50% of the first year's payments may be deducted for sales charges. The Commission's study as well as the Special Study showed that a substantial portion of such investors are unable or unwilling to complete their plans, with the result that up to half of the money that they pay in goes for sales costs. The proposed legislation would eliminate the front-end load feature and require that sales charges be spread equally over all payments, thus reducing the undue risk of loss suffered by those investors who do not complete their plans, as well as making sure that a greater proportion of the money paid by an investor is invested for his benefit.

The proposed legislation would also contain other provisions which are designed primarily to facilitate the administration and enforcement of the Investment Company Act, to eliminate certain anomalous situations, and to update and correct certain provisions.

These legislative proposals recognize as did the Commission's report that on the whole the investment company industry reflects diligent management by competent persons, that the industry has provided a useful and desirable means for investors to obtain diversification of investment risks and professional investment management and that drastic changes in the Investment Company Act of 1940 are not required. We believe, however, that enactment of these proposals would assure fairer treatment for the millions of Americans, including many of modest means, who have chosen to invest many billions of dollars in investment company securities.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of legislation along the lines of this Bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

By direction of the Commission.

MANUEL F. COHEN,
Chairman.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the mutual fund industry, with its 3½ million shareholders and $40 billion in total assets occupies a central position in our Nation's economy. The SEC's 1966 report and proposed legislation will enable the Congress to take a fresh look at this industry and the laws which regulate it—something which has not been done since 1940.

In introducing the proposed legislation and in calling for hearings and executive consideration by the full Banking and Currency Committee, the junior Senator from Alabama, Senator SPARKMAN, our esteemed chairman, has assured the investing public of prompt constructive action by the Senate on this subject. In view of the extreme complexities of this legislation, I am especially grateful that we are to have the skilled and most experienced leadership of Senator SPARKMAN, both at the committee level and on the Senate floor. I, for one, am grateful that Senator SPARKMAN is able to devote his most valuable time and efforts to this legislation.

Hearings by the full Banking and Currency Committee will also enable all committee members to hear and question witnesses so that they may become completely familiar with this most important subject.

PROPOSED CHANGES IN THE PASSPORT LAWS—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 178

Mr. CLARK submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1418) to make several changes in the passport laws presently in force, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 179

Mr. HOLLINGS (for himself and Mr. Thurmond) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed.

BILL REFERRED BACK TO COMMITTEE FOR FURTHER STUDY—S. 1029

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 185, S. 1029, a bill to improve certain benefits for employees who serve in high-risk situations, and for other purposes, be referred back to the Committee on Foreign Relations for further study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR FILING OF CERTAIN REPORTS BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the Committee on Government Operations be extended until May 31, 1967, to file certain reports of its Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. These reports are entitled "Investigations Into Small Business Investment Companies," and "Investigation Into FHA Multiple Dwelling Projects."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEARINGS BY THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS, SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 64 AND S. 1602

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, on June 12 and 13 the Government Operations Committee will hold initial hearings on Senate Joint Resolution 64, which proposes the creation of a Commission on Balanced Economic Development in the United States. This measure was introduced by Senator Mundt and 20 other Senators.

The committee will also consider a related bill, S. 1602, introduced by Senators Mansfield and Metcalf, which provides for the establishment of a Northwest Regional Service Corporation.

To assist in the conduct of these hearings I have asked the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf] to act as cochairman of the committee, and he has graciously accepted the task. The hearings will begin on June 12, in room 3302, New Senate Office Building. Any persons wishing to testify on this legislation may contact the clerk of the committee, room 3308, New Senate Office Building.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] be added as a cosponsor of Senate bill 612, the Dairy Import Act of 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection it is so ordered.

HEARING ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER—S. 915

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce hearings for the consideration of S. 915. This bill would provide for the establishment of a Federal Judicial Center.

The hearings will be held on May 3, 1967, at 2:30 p.m., and May 4, 1967, at 9:30 a.m. in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

OKLAHOMA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS SUPPORT ADMINISTRATION ON VIETNAM

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the debate over U.S. policy in Southeast Asia has become more reasonable and rational in recent days as a result of the excellent reports given to the American people by General Westmoreland. The general has dispelled much of the fog that had been spread over this issue by misinformed persons. At the same time he has helped focus public discussion on the key issues, and on the facts.

Since this Nation began we have survived many dangerous and difficult threats to our security because our people had straight information regarding the issues involved. I am confident the American people will continue their overwhelming support of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia so long as they have the opportunity to hear the facts from honest, levelheaded, and dedicated people like General Westmoreland.

In the past week, I received new evidence in support of this confidence. The Oklahoma Daily, student newspaper at the University of Oklahoma, conducted an opinion survey among students at the university regarding our Vietnam policy. I am indebted to Mr. Richard Hall, chairman of the survey committee, for furnishing the results of this survey to me. They are results that should be of interest to all Americans.

I have reviewed this student project carefully. The questionnaire which was used, was carefully designed to obtain accurate results.

You will be interested to learn that 72 percent of the students who responded believed that the United States should be fighting in South Vietnam, and that 91 percent would oppose withdrawal without negotiations. A total of 2,900 students were checked, and this certainly provides an adequate sampling of opinion at this large educational institution.

It should be mentioned, incidentally, that a strong and healthy tradition of academic freedom, and free expression of student opinion, prevails on the University of Oklahoma campus. I am proud to have been the editor of the Oklahoma Daily in my undergraduate days, and the staff of this excellent undergraduate journal is to be congratulated upon this constructive and enlightening effort in opinion checking.

I truly wish that General Westmoreland could visit the campus at Norman, Okla., and other centers of learning across the Nation and give the students there the direct message that he brought to the Congress last week. The young men and women who have been, who are, and who will be fighting the war, risking their lives, have a special right to know the facts of this situation.

Mr. Hall, in transmitting his survey results to me, points this out and also makes this additional observation which seems most appropriate:

> As you will note from the enclosed summary and article which I wrote for the Oklahoma Daily, our school newspaper, most students participating in the survey favored escalation ("intensification") and an overwhelming majority rejected the much-publicized view for withdrawal of small minority campus organizations across the nation. The adverse publicity which these groups have given college students recently was the motivating factor behind the survey.

I request unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Hall's article concerning this worthwhile survey be published at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the University of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Daily, Apr. 20, 1967]

VIETNAM SURVEY COMPLETED—STUDENTS OVERWHELMINGLY SAY "NO WITHDRAWAL"

(By Richard Hall)

Withdrawal from Vietnam either with or without negotiations was overwhelmingly rejected by 2,629 of the 2,881 students who participated in the recent Vietnam survey on campus. The survey, sponsored by the Student House of Representatives and upperclass men's honors residents, was completed Tuesday afternoon with final compilation of results on IBM card sorters.

The results of the survey followed two months of preparation of questions, finding sponsors, printing of forms, distribution, and manning of the questionnaire booth and transferring of the information to data processing cards.

On related questions not dealing with actual withdrawal, students generally were not as strikingly divided. In most cases, however, there was a definite trend towards increasing the war effort. In addition, men and women agree in about the same percentage on all questions. A total of 1,789 men responded and 1,092 girls turned in the questionnaires.

The greatest spread in response on questions other than withdrawal was on the first question dealing with U.S. presence in Vietnam. Seven out of ten respondents believe that we should be in Vietnam. Eighteen percent said we should not be in Vietnam, and 13 percent were undecided.

Questions 2 and 3, dealing with limited warfare and escalation, were clearly divided between the "Yes" and "No" replies, but there were large numbers of "undecided" answers which could have brought the results closer together.

On the question of withdrawal, 91 percent voted negatively on withdrawal without negotiations. Three percent said we should withdraw without negotiations, and 5 percent were undecided.

On withdrawing with negotiations, 31 percent answered yes, 52 percent no, and 17 percent were undecided.

Subtotals for the various age groups, Greek affiliation, marital status and veteran status were compiled but not totalled.

The survey, which was the first conducted by the SH of R, was organized for one main purpose. That purpose was to either confirm or deny the much-publicized withdrawal view of small campus minority groups. The results clearly refuted the withdrawal view.

Approximately 8,000 surveys were distributed by the Student House, IFC, and Panhellenic and to off campus students through a booth in the Union. Only about 2,900 of the 8,000 were returned, but the survey was closed with this number of questionnaires because it was realized that full response would be very difficult. Many of the surveys have been filled out but remain in the Greek or Independent houses.

In charge of compiling the results of the survey was Steve Doughty, Altus sophomore, and computer math major. He was assisted by other members of the upperclass men's honors housing residents. After the cards were punched they were run through card sorters to eliminate any duplicate ID numbers, and then rerun to add up the results. Compilation took about 2 days.

Approximately 100 of the surveys that were completed could not be counted due to insufficient information. All questions that were unanswered were scored as undecided. The reason for this is that the IBM cards were punched more quickly with an answer for each question. In some instances this procedure increased the undecided totals, but not to a significant level.

The survey results will be distributed to local, state and national news media, as well as the Oklahoma Congressional delegation, Senator Robert F. Kennedy, D-N.Y., and President Johnson. Kennedy is being informed of the results because he showed great interest in the student views on the war during his visit to the campus in March. Although the questionnaire was compiled several weeks before Kennedy's visit, his questions to the audience were in three instances exactly the same as those on the survey.

The 2,900-student response to the questionnaire was about 20 percent of the students on campus, a significant number of active participants in a campus project.

Because of the purpose of the survey, creating either a confirmation or denial of the much-publicized withdrawal view, the method of sampling and projection was not used. The sponsors wished to come up with a concrete number of students as an answer to the withdrawal position of the minority groups.

Although the response was not significant in statistical terms, it does show that most OU students favor the presence of the United States in Vietnam at this time.

Whether or not as large a number would have been favorable at the time of the original confrontation is left in doubt. Many people expressed the view that they did not favor the war, but since we were there we should not leave until either victory or peace is achieved.

The briefness of the questionnaire led to many problems of ambiguity, but the sponsors felt brevity was necessary in order to have a large number of students participate. Most people practiced in the art of surveying advised that more people would respond if the number of questions was kept down. They also said that the results would be less meaningful. However, either meaningfulness or number of responses had to be sacrificed, and the sponsors chose to sacrifice the former.

The questions in their original form were presented to two members of the Psychology Department, Dr. Vera Gatch and Paul Jacobs, to check validity. Both said that, in view of the purpose of the survey, the questions were sufficient. Both warned about the inevitable ambiguity of the questions, but said that little could be done without lengthening the questionnaire.

SURVEY QUESTIONS

1. Should the United States government be fighting in Vietnam?
2. Do you favor a policy of limited warfare?
3. Do you favor intensification of the war effort, including bombing?
4. Should we withdraw from Vietnam pending negotiations?
5. Should we withdraw from Vietnam completely, without any negotiations?

Survey totals

	Question No.				
	1	2	3	4	5
Men:					
Yes	1,316	496	1,357	371	103
No	327	857	317	1,242	1,617
Undecided	146	436	115	176	69
Percent:					
Yes	74	28	76	21	6
No	18	48	18	69	90
Undecided	8	24	6	10	4
Women:					
Yes	760	320	502	342	29
No	185	579	330	565	1,012
Undecided	147	193	170	185	51
Percent:					
Yes	70	29	54	31	3
No	17	53	30	52	92
Undecided	13	18	16	17	5
Grand total:					
Yes	2,076	816	1,949	713	132
No	512	1,436	647	1,807	2,629
Undecided	293	629	285	361	120
Percent:					
Yes	72	28	68	25	5
No	18	50	22	63	91
Undecided	10	22	10	12	4

NOTE.—All unanswered questions have been scored as undecided.

NECESSITY FOR SUPPORT OF EFFECTIVE FEDERAL WEAPONS CONTROL LEGISLATION

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, for those of us who have sought to carry out the will of the vast majority of the American people that Congress pass effective Federal weapons control legislation, but who have over the years been the target of an incessant mail campaign by a small special interest group that opposes such legislation, the past few weeks have been most gratifying. It seems that the average citizen is beginning to realize that if he does nothing to support the principles and proposals he believes in, the loud voices of a small group of opponents may be amplified to the point where they can frustrate the will of the majority.

This growing realization is evidenced by a dramatic change in the mail I and other Members of Congress have received in the past month. Not only is the mail for the first time accurately reflecting citizen support for effective and reasonable weapons legislation, but, perhaps more noteworthy, this mail comes from individual citizens who are not part of any organized campaign, and do not have any special interest to promote, but who feel that their civic duty compels them to speak up.

Typical of these letters is one from a doctor in Maryland. He writes:

> My wife and I wish to applaud your statement to the National Rifle Association (NRA). Your statistic contrasting the volume of mail from NRA supporters with the Gallup survey incited this letter. This is the first letter either of us has ever written to a lawmaker. We have held many opinions in silence which were opposite to those of vested interests, whether it be NRA, AMA, liberty lobby or the oilmen with their depletion allowances. But it is just that silence or less euphemistically, apathy, which encourages the cynical foisting of legislation upon the majority by a minority, or prevents beneficial legislation.
>
> I hope more Americans are awakened from their feeling that "my letter won't make any difference."

There have also been a surprisingly large number of letters from servicemen, sportsmen, and NRA members who participate in legitimate firearms activities but who refuse to go along with the position of the NRA leadership. One of the most thoughtful of these sets out a detailed suggestion for weapons control even more comprehensive than the proposed S. 1, and comes from a Massachusetts veteran who writes:

> I have been a life member of the NRA since 1963, because I believe in the great amount of good that this organization does in such programs as hunter safety and competitive shooting from preteens through the Nationals at Camp Perry, but I *do not* support their present stand on gun legislation now before the Congress.
>
> I do not feel that my right to bear arms, so that I may participate in competitive shooting or hunting during authorized seasons would be taken away by necessary controls.
>
> My particular thoughts re a good gun law would include the following points:
>
> 1. No mail order purchasing of weapons by individuals, but do permit licensed dealers to mail between one another for the purposes of sales, repairs, etc.
>
> 2. No purchaser under the age of 21 be allowed to obtain through an authorized dealer any firearm without the co-signing of the minor's legal guardian. The cut-off being age 16 for those minors that are a member of a licensed shooting club or team, or who have been approved by an authorized hunter safety program.
>
> 3. No firearms to be sold unless they can be reasonably assumed to fall into the category of a hunting or competitive shooting class. Exceptions would include those weapons that are used by public and licensed private law enforcement agencies. NO 20mm cannons.

4. A federal rather than state law requiring that no purchaser be allowed to receive a weapon without first undergoing a 24-hour records check originating with the local police of the purchaser's legal residence. This check would include the state police files and those of the FBI. From my experience, I know that this is no more difficult than a simple telephone call and/or TWX to the various agencies involved. Minimum information should include name, address, date and place of birth (naturalization), and social security number.

5. For the safety of the individual owner of firearms who might lose or have stolen a weapon the requirement that he register with the local police the description and serial number of each firearm, and the requirement that he report any loss within 24 hours of their discovery of being lost.

Though I am a Republican who has recently moved to Massachusetts from California, I feel that you are better able to protect my rights as an individual who enjoys sport hunting and competitive shooting, but who feels that there are too many NUTS walking about with firearms in their possession. Please don't feel that all of the NRA fall within this NUT category, but there are some of us who are concerned.

Some of the letters come from people whom the gun lobby has tried to enlist, but who have refused to assist in obstructing what they believe to be needed legislation. A hardware dealer from my State wrote:

> As a member of the National Wholesale Hardware Assn., I have received several communications from our Managing Director, Mr. Thomas A. Fernley, urging opposition to a stringent Gun Control Law.
>
> By copy of this letter I am informing the Association that I strongly *favor* such stringent legislation.
>
> I wholeheartedly support your efforts to obtain enactment of this much needed legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from these and other letters be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I believe we have reached a turning point in the effort to enact effective Federal legislation to curb the interstate traffic in weapons and to enable the States to enact and enforce the gun controls they want. We have long known from polls, from conversations, from research, and most of all from logic, that the American people want this legislation passed. But now we are getting the proof that this Nation's citizens are tired of waiting, are impatient with the small but vocal group who have delayed and obstructed and misrepresented. The people want, as all of us in this body want, the legitimate interests of sportsmen and hobbyists to be taken into account. I can assure you that over the many years of study and work and compromise which have gone into the proposal now before the Congress, their interests have been thoroughly considered and significant compromises have been made as a result.

But there comes a time when delay serves no constructive purpose, when the Congress must act if it is to meet its responsibilities to the public.

Mr. President, the time for action has come and I am confident that we can achieve enactment of S. 1 in this session of Congress.

Exhibit 1

Sample of Letters Received by Senator Edward Kennedy in Support of Effective Weapons Legislation

Maryland.

Dear Senator Kennedy: My wife and I wish to applaud your statement to the National Rifle Association (NRA). Your statistics contrasting the volume of mail from NRA supporters with the Gallup survey incited this letter. This is the first letter either of us has ever written to a lawmaker. We have held many opinions in silence which were opposite to those of vested interests, whether it be NRA, AMA, liberty lobby or the oilmen with their depletion allowances. But it is just that silence or less euphemistically, apathy, which encourages the cynical foistering of legislation upon the majority by a minority, or prevents beneficial legislation.

I hope more Americans are awakened from their feeling that "my letter won't make any difference."

At any rate, I hope you are right that stiff gun control measures will be enacted. This measure is essential as part of a concerted attack on crime, lawlessness and senseless carnage by temporarily deranged men.

The rest depends upon attacking root causes of crime by education and the correction of social injustices. This can only partially be done by legislation. Much of the rest depends upon renewed emphasis on the importance of the family where teaching of ethics, respect for the rights of others and codes of conduct based on truth and justice is properly inculcated.

Massachusetts.

Dear Senator Kennedy: I have been a Life Member of the NRA since 1963, because I believe in the great amount of good that this organization does in such programs as hunter safety, competitive shooting from preteens through the Nationals at Camp Perry, but I DO NOT support their present stand on gun legislation now before the Congress.

I do not feel that my right to bear arms, so that I may participate in competitive shooting or hunting during authorized seasons would be taken away by necessary controls.

My particular thoughts re a good gun law would include the following points:

1. No mail order purchasing of weapons by individuals, but do permit licensed dealers to mail between one another for the purposes of sales, repairs, etc.

2. No purchaser under the age of 21 be allowed to obtain through an authorized dealer any firearm without the co-signing of the minor's legal guardian. The cut-off being age 16 for those minors that are a member of a licensed shooting club or team, or who have been approved by an authorized hunter safety program.

3. No firearms to be sold unless they can be reasonably assumed to fall into the category of a hunting or competitive shooting class. Exceptions would include those weapons that are used by public and licensed private law enforcement agencies. (I do not include pistol firing distress signals used by yachtsmen as being a firearm as such, but these too should be purchased through an authorized boat dealer.) NO 20mm cannons!

4. A federal rather than state law requiring that no purchaser be allowed to receive a weapon without first undergoing a 24 hour records check originating with the local police of the purchaser's legal residence. This check would include the state police files and those of the FBI. From my experience, I know that this is no more difficult than a simple telephone call and/or TWX to the various agencies involved. Minimum information should include name, address, date and place of birth (naturalization) and social security number.

5. For the safety of the individual owner of firearms who might lose or have stolen a weapon the requirement that he register with the local police the description and serial number of each firearm, and the requirement that he report any loss within 24 hours of their discovery of being lost.

Though I am a Republican who has recently moved to Massachusetts from California, I feel that you are better able to protect my rights as an individual who enjoys sport hunting and competitive shooting, but who feels that there are too many NUTS walking about with firearms in their possession. Please don't feel that all of the NRA fall within this NUT category, but there are some of us who are concerned.

New York.

Dear Senator: As a World War II Infantry officer (seven decorations, 2 Purple Hearts) I agree with your rifle club stand and I admire your courage.

Keep up the good work!

Texas.

Dear Senator Kennedy: I would like to congratulate you on your recent speech before the National Rifle Association Convention. You are quite correct in stating that this well-organized minority should no longer control this aspect of the public welfare.

As an Army officer and the owner of private firearms I am well aware of both the limited advantages and serious dangers inherent in the possession of weapons. I believe that the general public agrees that your efforts to secure sensible gun control legislation is in the public interest.

Massachusetts.

Dear Senator Kennedy: As a member of the National Wholesale Hardware Assn., I have received several communications from our Managing Director, Mr. Thomas A. Fernley, urging opposition to a stringent Gun Control Law.

By copy of this letter I am informing the Association that I strongly favor such stringent legislation.

I wholeheartedly support your efforts to obtain enactment of this much needed legislation.

Maryland.

Dear Senator Kennedy: I would like to commend you on your recent speech before the National Rifle Association. Your vigorous stand in support of anti-gun legislation, S–1, was both courageous and correct.

I would like to add my complete agreement with your position. In fact, a more stringent, all-encompassing law should be promulgated, if possible.

Missouri.

Dear Senator: I am 100 per cent back of your efforts for firearms control legislation.

The writer is 68 years old, combat veteran of both World Wars, the owner of two single shot rifles with fine, hand bored barrels, and a Parker double barrel shotgun. I welcome registration of ALL firearms and believe it is an excellent idea.

I cannot understand the attitude and lobbying tactics of the National Rifle Association. The executive secretary of NRA was interviewed on a national TV program. The way he squirmed, wiggled, and crawfished, was disgusting.

Am enclosing a clipping. Mrs. Landers was in Springfield, Mo., (near where I live in retirement) recently and said many of the letters were unprintable and unquotable. Her suggestion is a good one, and appeared in daily papers all over the country.

I find, mixing with all types in the hinterland, that the real rifleman and the worthwhile hunter do not object to any form of registration and regulation. It is among the semi-literate and unintelligent one hears the cry: "They're gonna take my gun away." These are the persons so easily swayed.

"ANSWERS YOUR QUESTIONS

"(By Ann Landers)

"DEAR READER: In all the years I have been writing this column I have never received such a barrage of vitriolic, abusive and downright nasty letters as was provoked by my plea for tighter gun laws. I printed some of the less venomous letters yesterday and promised that today I would print the best letter in support of my position. I am happy to say it was written by a teenager. Here it is:

" 'Dear Ann Landers: I am a 17-year-old boy who agrees emphatically with your stand on the easy availability of guns.

" 'You asked your readers to write to their senators and congressmen urging them to pass some decent gun laws. If you know anything about human nature, Ann Landers, you know that very few people will take the time and trouble to do it. They may agree with you but that's as far as they will go. I have a suggestion which I hope you will consider worthy.

" 'Why don't you write a letter and print it in the paper and ask your readers to tear it out and mail it to their senator or congressman in Washington? This is to let them know we want a federal law prohibiting the shipment of guns across state lines. Instruct your readers to write the following message across the column: "Please read this column and then forward it to the Speaker of the House in Our State Legislature. This is to let him know we also want state laws strictly controlling sale and registration of all kinds of guns."

" 'If several thousand columns hit the desk of our legislators (both national and state), we will surely get the kind of action we need to make this country a safer and saner place to live. Thank You—R.S.F. of Chicago.'

"Dear Chicago teen: Thank you for an excellent suggestion. Below is the letter which I hope will be torn out of thousands of newspapers and sent to the senators and congressmen in Washington. If you don't know the name of your senator or congressman, call your newspaper and don't forget to follow the boy's suggestion and jot down a request that he forward the column to the speaker of your state legislature.

"Dear Lawmaker: Do you want to buy a gun? Well, go right ahead. Nobody will ask you how old you are, if you are a mental defective, if you have a criminal record, or if you know how to use firearms properly. If you can pay for a gun you can have one—a rifle, a bazooka, a pistol, an anti-tank blaster, any kind of gun your little heart desires.

"If you can't get to a gun store or a pawn shop, fill out a coupon and get a gun through the mail. Lee Oswald did it and nothing has changed since then. You can do it, too.

"If all this sounds unsettling, let me assure you it is. I am writing to you because you and you alone can put an end to this appalling situation. We need a federal law to prohibit the shipment of guns across state lines. We need state laws that make it mandatory for every gun owner to be registered.

"According to a poll taken in January, approximately 75 per cent of the American people want tougher gun laws. We have no paid lobbyists, no organization to espouse our cause, no one to speak for us, so we must speak for ourselves. We ask your help, Mr. Lawmaker, in the name of 17,000 Americans who died last year from gunshot wounds.—Sincerely.

"YOUR CONSTITUENT."

ILLINOIS.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: Congratulations on your stand before the National Rifle Association's Board of Directors.

I sincerely hope you will do everything within your power now to go ahead and make sure that a gun control law is passed this year.

MASSACHUSETTS.

DEAR SENATOR KENNEDY: My husband and I wish to applaud your stand on the gun issue. We fell remiss that we have not expressed ourselves sooner since the NRA has been so vocal in stressing their opposite point of view.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quoroum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HOW THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATION WORKS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, experience over the past 20 years has taught us that the United States cannot singlehandedly support all the nations of the world who need economic assistance. We have learned also that no aid program can succeed without a genuine determination on the part of the developing countries to solve their own economic problems. These two lessons have led us to place greater reliance on multilateral aid and self-help. These are the basic premises of the International Development Association, a subsidiary of the World Bank which makes so-called soft loans to the developing countries.

The details of the way IDA operates were clearly illustrated in a fine speech made by Mr. George G. Woods, President of the World Bank, to the Parliamentary Conference on Development Aid, in Bonn on April 7, 1967. This speech merits careful study in connection with our foreign aid programs. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MULTILATERAL AND BILATERAL AID

(Address by George D. Woods, President, World Bank Group, to Parliamentary Conference on Development Aid, Bonn, Apr. 7, 1967)

I am glad to be one of the participants in this international meeting of Parliamentarians. While the life that an international civil servant leads is not exactly a sheltered one, it does tend to keep him at a distance from the national legislatures on which, basically, the activities of his own organization depend. For that reason, I particularly welcome this opportunity to meet with a select group of legislators from the countries that make up the Development Assistance Committee of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. In one way or another, these countries account for 95 per cent of the international flow of financial resources into the developing countries; and they have a controlling voice in the affairs of the World Bank Group of institutions which I represent. I am especially glad that this discussion is taking place on German initiative. The Federal Republic not only has become a leading source of capital and technical cooperation in support of the efforts of the developing countries to elevate their way of life, but also is one of the leading participants and shareholders in the World Bank Group itself.

The subject assigned to me is "Multilateral and Bilateral Aid." It is one of immediate interest both to the World Bank and to you. Many governments now have before them proposals intended to increase the flow of multilateral assistance. One of these proposals would markedly increase the funds available to the World Bank's affiliate, the International Development Association (IDA). Others would add to the financial resources of the new regional development banks working in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The United Nations Development Programme is also trying to raise the level of the government contributions it receives. Governments must soon decide about these measures of support for multilateral institutions.

More broadly, in the past two or three years, most of the member governments of the Development Assistance Committee have put their own programs of assistance under close examination. A common feature of these appraisals has been the question of what place to give to multilateral aid.

Out of this, I think, a new approach is beginning to emerge. Without necessarily reducing bilateral aid, the tendency is toward a greater reliance on multilateral organizations. This is partly a change of form. Even more, I hope, it is a change of spirit, recognizing a demand that programs of assistance should achieve maximum effectiveness as instruments for economic development. I would not go so far as to say that a new light is breaking over the development business, but certainly there is a slight glimmer on the horizon.

At the present time, net disbursements of international organizations constitute roughly 10 per cent of the total net flow of financial resources to the developing countries. In recent years, these transfers have increased more than threefold. Between 1960 and 1965, they grew from $268 million to $815 million per annum. Some of this flow was derived from governmental appropriations; but the largest single source was the World Bank, which raises well over half of its resources by borrowing in capital markets and from Central Bank reserve funds throughout the world.

The growth of multilateral assistance, I think, should be widely welcomed. This was my opinion while I was still a private banker—and that was not so long ago. It is more firmly my opinion now that I have been directly dealing with questions of development finance for a period of time.

I do not contend that bilateral aid is bad and that multilateral aid is good, and that one should be eliminated in favor of the other. The task which the developing countries are undertaking is both so urgent and so immense that it needs all the initiatives and energies that can be found to support it—official and voluntary, public and private, national and multinational. There is plenty of room for all. The hard fact is that a far greater effort is required—is truly essential—on *all* fronts.

Within the total effort, I believe that multilateral assistance offers certain advantages which ought to be seized by all countries concerned with assisting economic development. I know that some of you are aware of these advantages and believe in them fully as much as I do, but I want to emphasize them nevertheless. I am aware, as you are, of course, that the various international organizations differ in kind and capabilities. In talking about multilateral assistance today, I intend to speak specifically from the experience of the three financing institutions of the World Bank Group—the World Bank itself, IDA, and the International Finance Corporation (IFC).

When I say, "World Bank," I mean that we are *the* World Bank—the only thing of its kind. Our member governments, which is to say our shareholders, girdle the globe;

we borrow in hard-currency countries throughout the world; we finance projects in all quarters of the world; and our Executive Directors, officers and staff are from all parts of the world. No other institution or government department has the experience of the World Bank—that concentration of expertise and know-how embodied in our international staff, chosen and retained strictly on professional merit.

Fundamentally, the strength of multilateral activity originates in a point of view. Our overriding objective is to accelerate the economic growth of the developing nations. We are not trying to do three or four things at the same time: apart from trying to help develop the country, we are not, for instance, trying to promote exports of a particular nation's capital goods, or to create and assist military allies or to win friends for this or that foreign policy.

This gives our assistance a stark clarity of purpose and sharpness of impact. We are under no temptation to accept second-best projects, or second-best engineering, or inferior administrative arrangements, with the thought that if our help does not do all it could to accelerate economic growth, it still may help with some other objective.

We can and do take on the development jobs which are necessary but unexciting. We are not interested in projects that are intended chiefly for display. We *will* be interested in an unspectacular project in a remote province, if we think the prospective economic benefits are high enough to justify the cost and to make it a priority investment.

Our business is development, not politics. It rests, as much as such an effort can, on objective economic measures; and I dare say that the World Bank knows as much as any organization about how to measure the costs, judge the visibility and evaluate the benefits of development programs and projects. This ability to use objective criteria gives us a defense, if we need one, against pressures to finance activities that can only waste time, money and scarce expert personnel.

A multilateral effort also makes available a wide spread of resources. No doubt it is the possibility of sharing the financial effort that has made the United States so keen on cooperative arrangements of various kinds with other nations. But the material and technical resources that an international organization can command also are broad. It was in Japan that methods of rice cultivation were developed that have doubled and tripled yields; Austria is the source of the developments that began revolutionizing steel production a little more than a decade ago; and many other countries have specialties in which their industry and science are pre-eminent. An international effort brings in all the pertinent skills and resources. It makes available a wide choice of technology and institutional forms. It gives an underdeveloped country access to the assistance most suitable for its own stage of development, and in fact, has made it possible, within a multilateral framework, for underdeveloped countries with comparable problems to assist each other.

Against multilateral aid and in favor of bilateral aid, it is often argued that the country which gives assistance should get some commercial return from doing so. With this general proposition, I am in warm agreement, but it is not really a good argument against multilateral finance. If a capital-supplying country's industries are reasonably competitive, they will in the course of time get their full share of the commercial activity resulting from development assistance, even if that assistance is provided on an untied basis through a multilateral organization rather than bilaterally on a tied basis; and this will be sound business for a country's efficient industries, not a crutch for the inefficient.

In the long run the greatest return will come from the generally higher level of trade which the developing countries will support as they become more prosperous. I do not agree that the return must or should come from the aid transaction itself, through tying the use of funds to purchases of goods or services in the country where the finance originates. To try to squeeze this benefit out of the aid transaction holds the possibility of throttling the goose before it has begun to lay its golden eggs. It holds the certainty that the desirable egg-laying process will be delayed.

Borrowers from the World Bank or IDA are not merely free, but in virtually all cases are required to spend the proceeds of their loans where they can get the best value, anywhere in the member countries of the Bank or in Switzerland (in recognition of that country's financial support of the Bank). Our records show wide variations in tender prices from different countries. In a recent case, an Asian country actually canceled a tied loan for a highway program when it discovered that the lowest eligible bid under the loan, some $27 million, was $5 million more than the international, competitive price for the kind and amount of work in question. Variations may be wider than that: in another instance, suppliers from six industrialized countries quoted prices for equipping a cement plant. The lowest price quoted by suppliers in country "A" was $450,000. A company in country "B" got the contract by offering similar—and entirely satisfactory—equipment for only $176,000. Both supplier countries are in Western Europe; the difference in price was about 150 per cent.

There are hosts of other cases which prove the point that untied aid is worth more than tied aid. It leads to a more effective use of resources.

The difference between the purchasing power of tied funds and untied funds is not just a minor matter. A study of the experience of Pakistan, for instance, indicates that the tying of a large proportion of aid received by that country lifted the prices of all commodities financed by aid to a level about 15 percent higher than could have been obtained by international procurement.

There is reason to believe that the extra cost of tied aid is higher than 15 percent in the case of other countries. The amounts involved are very substantial. Total gross disbursements from the DAC countries under official bilateral arrangements—almost all of them from tied funds—have been running at the rate of about $6.5 billion a year (26 billion Deutsche marks) to say nothing of private credit covered by official insurance. This means that the savings to the developing countries as a result of international competition, had that been permissible, would probably have been on the order of $1 billion a year—or, if you wish to put it the other way round, that the same amount of financing could have been used to purchase an additional $1 billion worth of goods and services.

The same amount would have been sufficient to cover all of the repayments of principal due from the developing countries on official debt to the creditor countries of DAC in 1965. But in the present scheme of things, that sum was unnecessarily added to the already heavy debt burden of the developing countries. This $1 billion actually constituted a kind of subsidy from the poor nations to the rich.

It is sometimes argued that the very impartiality of the international organizations is a bad thing. "The U.N.," someone has said, "is politically barren." Certainly it is true that multilateral assistance does not help to win diplomatic popularity contests. It seems extremely doubtful to me, however, that bilateral aid has helped to win very many such contests, either. In fact, we all know about many examples of country-to-country aid which have caused friction, frustration and downright bad will. The very circumstance that many bilateral programs are politically motivated may prevent them from helping the countries they were intended to benefit. When you are pressing people to accept aid because you think it will make them your friends, it is difficult to make them do the necessary to make that aid effective. Any pressure to that end will be bitterly resented as interference with a sovereign state and dictation by a foreign power.

It is easier—although not always easy—for a multilateral lender to influence the economic performance of a developing country. An international organization can work more closely with the country to draw up the policies, the programs and the projects that will foster economic development—measures that may range all the way from finding expert advisers on special problems to comprehensive advice on the size and composition of an investment program. An international organization can more persuasively press the country—whch is one of its stockholders and is represented on its Board—to make effective use of whatever outside aid is available.

While the strengths of multilateral action seem clear enough, it is equally clear that most governments to some extent are going to continue to act bilaterally. This is just as well, for plurality has important virtues, and even in Utopia we should wish to preserve them.

Recognizing this, the Bank, the DAC countries and some others have been carrying on an experiment which lends to bilateral aid some of the advantages of the multilateral approach. This experiment brings together groups of assisting countries and institutions for the purpose of considering jointly all the major problems in providing effective development finance for particular recipient countries.

So far, there are coordinating groups of this kind for 13 countries. The Bank is organizer and Chairman of ten of these, for India, Pakistan, Colombia, Nigeria, Tunisia, Sudan, Malaysia, Thailand, Peru and Korea; and the eleventh is in prospect, for Morocco. All the countries with legislators here today belong to some of these groups, and some belong to all of them.

As Chairman, the Bank assumes several responsibilities: It periodically makes comprehensive reports on the country's development possibilities and economic progress. It helps the developing country to identify and prepare development projects, or to obtain the necessary technical assistance for doing so. It helps the recipient government to devise a development program, and advises on the problems of carrying it out. It makes recommendations about the sectors and projects that seem to deserve priority in external financing, and on the economic policies needed to achieve agreed development objectives.

Finally, the Bank comments on the country's estimate of aid requirements, making recommendations about the amount, types and terms of aid that are appropriate. Actual aid commitments by members of a consultative group, however, are arranged bilaterally.

There naturally are inherent differences in the way that the countries concerned look at the operations of a coordinating group. The potential donors are likely to approach the exercise with a critical eye on the performance of a developing country and on the size of its request for finance. The developing country, on its side, is interested in obtaining the most help it can get, on terms as easy as possible, and for the least painful effort on its own part.

The Bank sits somewhere in the middle. It is very much concerned with encouraging the maximum mobilization of domestic resources in recipient countries and with the steady improvement of their general economic situation. In other words, with performance. It is almost equally concerned with increasing the general flow of development finance on appropriate terms to countries which show they can make good use of it.

The consultative group is a relatively new form of aid coordination. The ten groups led by the Bank deal with ten different sets of problems. It is too early to attempt much in the way of generalization from their experience, although even now they clearly demonstrate some superiority over uncoordinated bilateral aid.

By the simple fact of jointly considering the development needs of a single developing country, the assisting nations achieve certain advantages. They have a defense against the old practice whereby a recipient tries to encourage donors to bid against each other for its support. The exchange of information among themselves has some tendency to make financial terms from various donors more consistent; and it may also discourage individual donors from falling too far behind the rest of the convoy.

The group also gains from the services of the Bank as honest broker and expert adviser, providing a realistic assessment of the recipient country's prospects and performance, offering a guide for the amount and kind of assistance the donor countries might render, and, by carrying the main burden of collecting data, saving both rich and poor countries much duplication or repetition of effort. Above all, the process of consultation can effectively mesh external and internal resources, and can enable the donor countries and the recipient to move in consistent ways toward the same development targets. I believe this is bound to lead to a definite improvement in the quality both of external assistance and of economic performance by the developing countries themselves.

Apart from the recipient countries, 19 nations now are associated with one or more of these coordinating groups. This seems to me to be a remarkable and encouraging circumstance; but surely it is time to go farther still in organizing development finance. If it is a good thing for the DAC countries to give joint consideration to the problems of individual countries, would it not be highly desirable for them to undertake a joint reassessment of the whole field of development assistance?

By coincidence, we are approaching the anniversary of the inception of the European Recovery Program, which 20 years ago led the nations of Western Europe to consider jointly the urgent and pressing economic questions facing them. The Program began a profound transformation in political and economic relationships which has carried the peoples of Europe to heights of productivity and prosperity utterly unprecedented in their history. The crisis which the Program was formed to meet has long since passed, but the sequels of the cooperation on which it was founded can be observed on every side.

I deeply believe that a similarly creative act is needed to help resolve the crisis which now confronts the developing nations. Given the record of achievement in the developing world and given the remarkable and continuing rise of prosperity in most of the industrialized countries, it might be supposed that the curve of development assistance would be rising. But as is well known, assistance from public sources is not increasing; as a proportion of the income of the industrialized countries, it has continued to decline for the fifth successive year.

At what ought to be a propitious moment in economic development, we are slowing down. On the side of the countries providing development finances, to be sure, difficulties exist which must not be minimized. They have real problems—inflationary pressures, heavy internal demands for capital, including heavy military expenditures, and imbalances of international payments—which combine to hamper justifiable increases in development funds. But neither should we exaggerate the obstacles. The national incomes of the industrialized countries have been increasing, in the aggregate, at the rate of $40 to $50 billion a year. If over the last five years, only 1 per cent of that increment had been devoted to additional development support, we should by this time be not very far from a satisfactory level of assistance.

If the momentum of economic growth in countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America is lost, if leaders of these regions lose heart, then the prospect is for deterioration in world affairs that in the end will inevitably be of the highest concern in the industrial countries themselves.

This need not be the future. And it will not be the future if the industrialized countries give development finance a reality priority among their other concerns and responsibilities.

In the case of postwar economic reconstruction in Europe, objectives were jointly defined and plans were jointly made to achieve them. In the case of the attack on underdevelopment, no common plan has yet been formulated, and this is the task we still face. What is now necessary, I suggest, is that the countries whose legislators are here in this room should give joint consideration, at the highest level, to their policies of development finance. After 20 years of experience—and to some extent of frustration—the time has come, I believe, for a thorough examination of the objectives we are trying to achieve in our relationships with the developing worlds, of the importance of those objectives to the national interests of the aid-giving countries, and of the adequacy of the resources, the mechanisms and the techniques which are being employed to attain those objectives.

The kind of examination I have in mind would engage foreign ministers and finance ministers as well as those formally concerned with assistance programs. It would put the worldwide aid effort—which has emerged somewhat haphazardly from the postwar reconstruction program—in a well thought out and agreed upon place in the whole scheme of international affairs.

The industrial countries here represented have been assisting world development for a span of two decades. In that time, science, technology and the means of creating material prosperity have advanced at a rate unprecedented in history. We can say confidently that the knowledge and the means exist to enlarge greatly the resources of the developing world, and to help many millions to escape hunger and to achieve, or at least approach, decent living standards for the first time. What we need is a firm political decision to carry out an intensive, sustained and coordinated attack on underdevelopment, together with the political will and stamina to stay the course.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEABEES

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, a quarter century of history and tradition is celebrated this year by an outstanding outfit—the Seabees of the Navy—the famous construction battalions—so well known for their splendid construction achievements and their stirring motto: "Can Do."

Throughout the last 25 years, the Seabees have become legendary in their ability to overcome seemingly insurmountable construction problems.

Their work in World War II took them from the beaches of Europe to the islands of the far Pacific.

In Korea, they contributed significantly in solving the problems of the dramatic Inchon landing.

Today, they labor unceasingly and with their customary courage and imagination, in Vietnam, where eight battalions are building deepwater ports, fixed and floating piers, roads and highways in jungle and sand, airstrips, storage facilities, bases and camps, water and sanitation systems, field hospitals, and the myriad of other support structures and facilities needed to strengthen and secure this small nation in its time of need.

In these past 5 years, in Africa, Latin America, and Asia, the Seabees have added a new role. They have become the "Navy Peace Corps," sending 13-man Seabee civic action teams—SCATS—into the interior of underdeveloped countries to help the villagers seek and find a better way of life.

To date, more than 40 Seabee teams have served in this people-to-people program worldwide. Today, in Vietnam, the teams are teaching villagers basic construction skills, building and improving local roads, digging water wells, and helping to build, repair and maintain schoolhouses, meeting halls, and orphanages.

In recognition of the 1967 Seabee silver 25th anniversary, Gov. Jack Williams, of the State of Arizona, recently proclaimed Seabee Week in Arizona.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this proclamation entered in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION: SEABEE WEEK

Whereas, twenty-five years ago this country was faced with the prospect of a long struggle on the field of battle in which its men in arms were being drawn primarily from civilian ranks; and

Whereas, the U.S. Navy, in playing a major role in that conflict, was faced with larger responsibilities in the construction of military installations on the battle lines, and for that task had to rely largely upon the volunteers from the ranks of civilians who had the specialized knowledge and training to perform the tasks and the moral courage to do so at constant risk under enemy fire; and

Whereas, there was born from that hardy, patriotic and dedicated group of Americans what has developed into one of the important permanent segments of our Naval-Marine Corps fighting units; the U.S. Naval Construction Battalions; and

Whereas, these battalions, or Seabees as we affectionately know them, are active today in missions of peace as well as war throughout the world;

Now, Therefore, I, Jack Williams, Governor of the State of Arizona, in salute to these gallant men on their twenty-fifth anniversary, do hereby proclaim the week of March 5 through 11, 1967, as "Seabee Week" in the State of Arizona.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused to be affixed the Great Seal of the State of Arizona.

Done at the Capitol in Phoenix this 3rd day of March in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Sixty Seven and of the Independence of the United States the One Hundred and Ninety-first.

JACK WILLIAMS,
Governor.

Attest:

WESLEY BOLIN,
Secretary of State.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND—GREAT AMERICAN SOLDIER REPORTS TO HIS COUNTRY

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, a great American soldier has come home to report to Congress on the course of a difficult war in Vietnam.

He did not come to seek headlines. He did not come to silence voices of dissent. He came only to tell us how it really is in Vietnam, to express his faith in his fighting men, and to thank Congress for its moral and financial support in an effort to turn back external Communist aggression.

It was a thoughtful speech. It is one which we cannot dismiss with a few casual thoughts. It brings close to us the sacrifices and the needs of an Army of brave young Americans who are on the frontlines for Asia, America, and the world.

The Nation is fortunate in having such a resolute and thoughtful general carrying out the orders of the Commander in Chief.

We are fortunate that we are strong enough to support men like General Westmoreland and his troops.

We are thankful for a clear report of his stewardship. And we assure him that the President, Congress, and the Nation stand behind him in the difficult days ahead.

TEXAS CONFERENCE FOR THE MEXICAN-AMERICAN; BILINGUAL EDUCATION WOULD BE PROVIDED UNDER S. 428

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, from April 13 through April 15 the Texas conference for the Mexican-American was held in San Antonio on the subject of improving educational opportunities. The conference brought educational leaders and public officials together to discuss ways of improving educational opportunities for the Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest.

On April 15 I had the honor to address the conference on the subject: "Bilingual Education and Human Development: Plans for the Future." Bilingual education is a development of important potential for American education. For so long we have envied Europeans the fortunate accident which placed so many countries speaking different languages so close together that the people had to learn at least two or three languages. Meanwhile, we Americans struggled along with our one course in French, German, or Spanish—taught as a separate academic subject and not as a means of communication.

Now, though, there are exciting new developments on the horizon. True bilingual education involves the use of language as a means of communication.

I have introduced S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act, to provide funds to further equality of educational opportunity for children whose mother tongue is Spanish and to whom English is another language. Bilingual education programs, team teaching, and other new things could be started. What the schools will be doing with this money is to give to Spanish-speaking students the chance to get as good and as meaningful an education as anyone else in this country. The goal of this new education is a child who is completely fluent in both English and Spanish.

Other provisions in the bill relate to the creation of an Advisory Committee on the Education of Bilingual Children, summer and full-term teacher training, and research.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my prepared remarks to the conference and the program for the conference be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILINGUAL EDUCATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT: PLANS FOR THE FUTURE

(Excerpts from a speech by Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, at the Texas conference on the Mexican-American: improving educational opportunities, Apr. 15, Sheraton Motor Inn in San Antonio, Tex.)

Ladies and gentlemen, it is an honor for me to return home to address such an enlightened audience on a topic which I consider to be so vitally important. It was just six months ago that many of us met in Tucson to discuss the problems of the Spanish-speaking. I am delighted that the symposium held in Tucson planted a seed for this present conference.

As one who was bred and born in Texas and who has taught in the rural schools, then lived in El Paso three and a half years, I have long been exposed to the problems of the Mexican-American. And as a Senator from your State, I desired to do something positive to help eradicate these problems. In January of this year I proposed the Bilingual American Education Act to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet the special needs of the Spanish-speaking. In addition to helping Mexican-American students, this act would also offer hope to children of Puerto Rican descent.

I believe that the teaching-learning process is most exhilarating, but the elation has been absent for too long in the schools of the Spanish-speaking. It is incorrect, I feel, to blame this lack of rapport on the generation gap; since a good teacher, regardless of his age, can create the excitement of learning. Everyone, young or old, delights in new knowledge, but the student must have trust in his teacher in order for learning to be perpetual.

All too often, the students, regardless of their economic or social class, complain that what's wrong with the school is that they can't understand the teacher's attitude. This feeling carries with it an aura of insincerity, and, for the deprived child, the school room becomes a hostile place. When we stack these existing problems on top of a literal communication barrier, the teaching-learning process becomes steeped in problems resulting from a lack of understanding.

I also believe it is unfair to blame this solely on the teachers; for this is a problem to be solved by our entire society. And we in the southwest have closed our eyes too long to our Spanish-speaking neighbors. In fact, the plight of the Spanish-speaking peoples of the southwest is practically unknown to the rest of our Nation, and unless we act quickly to remedy the situation, this denial of equality of opportunity will grow worse.

It has become an almost accepted truism that poverty begets poverty and statistics have shown that the Spanish-speaking families in Texas are among the poorest in the United States. A report published by Texas A&M University last September revealed that more than 50 per cent of Spanish-surname families in Texas had annual incomes below $3,000. And of all the southwestern States, Texas had the highest rate of poverty among Spanish-surname families.

It has also become evident that education can be an antidote to poverty and can possibly break its endless cycle. I believe it is most indicative that the Texas A&M report showed that the median number of years completed by persons 25 years of age and over was lower for the Spanish-speaking than for other ethnic groups. This is a tragic story and one that has continued for too long. I fear that the chains of poverty and ignorance are intertwined and will continue to be linked unless education can dynamically intervene.

And I believe that my proposed bill for bilingual American education can help to dismantle the chains of poverty and ignorance. By amending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, I hope to reach out to the many Spanish-speaking students as well as their teachers. The teachers need help in new materials and ideas so they can better understand their students and appreciate their unique background.

Thomas Jefferson once wrote in a letter: "Bestow great attention on Spanish and endeavor to acquire an accurate knowledge of it. Our future connections with Spain and Spanish America will render that language of valuable acquisition."

I feel that in addition to enacting a bilingual education act on the basis of justice alone, another compelling reason for enacting it is that in future years one of the great testing areas for American foreign policy will be right here in our own hemisphere with our neighbors to the South. Our own fellow Texas President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, has been in South America this week because he recognizes that the time for Latin-American friendship is now.

The existence within our own borders of a sizable group of people who speak the same language and share many of the same traditions and outlook of the Latin American countries has considerable relevance to our future Latin American foreign policy. And by capitalizing on their Spanish language rather than insisting that they repress it, we can possibly gain a better understanding of the Spanish-speaking people of Latin America. This poses a new approach in teaching English; since Spanish is the native language and English becomes the next language. The old problem of not being able to have confidence in one's teacher takes on real meaning when one stops to consider that the teacher is often looked on with suspicion because his language can not be understood by the Spanish-speaking child.

Spanish-speaking children have not been allowed to speak in Spanish in most classrooms, which has resulted in silence since the children were unfamiliar with English. Not only did this contribute to a lack of mutual confidence between student and teacher, but it also created a lack of confidence and pride in the student. However, new teaching techniques make use of Spanish to illustrate certain patterns in standard English.

Similar approaches have been tried with other disadvantaged children residing in the ghetto slums of our Nation's cities. In these cases, the language of the street has been used in the classroom to demonstrate that underprivileged children are not lacking in language skills but are merely deficient in using proper English. When a child's environmental language comes into play, one can observe that the children are not uncommunicative. On the contrary, when they can use language familiar to them and can recognize the differences between their native languages and acceptable English, they are quite verbal.

Consequently, I look with hope to the programs employing Spanish for the Spanish-speaking so that they can perfect their language skills and no longer speak a "pidgin" Spanish. It seems foolish to teach them a second language when the students' native language has not been perfected. I believe that the Bilingual American Education Act holds the promise of innovative ideas toward creating truly bilingual American children. This is an investment which not only will uplift a disadvantaged and neglected people but also will strengthen the quality of citizens of our Nation.

Texas ranks 32nd in education in this Nation, and 34th in the average, daily income of the people. Education and income go hand in hand—one seldom outruns the other.

If we seek to raise the economic level of any group, we must first educate them.

Education opens the door to prosperity and progress. Our Spanish-speaking people in Texas have looked at that closed door too long. It is time to open it now.

That is what I am trying to do with my bilingual education bill.

I know that in your discussion groups and in the addresses by distinguished experts such as Theodore Anderson and Herschel T. Manuel you have thoroughly covered the field of bilingual education. There is little that I can add, except to say this.

There are exciting possibilities ahead. The benefits of bilingualism accrue both to the minority and to the majority. For so long we have envied the Europeans for the geographical accidents which placed so many of them speaking different languages into such close proximity that they simply had to learn to speak two or three. In contrast we struggled through our one course in Spanish, French, or German—taught only in an isolated way as a substantive course in a foreign language and not as a living medium through which one expresses oneself.

The things we will learn from our experiments with Bilingual education here in the Southwest are of great importance to the rest of the country, because if our hopes are borne out, we shall develop a whole new way of teaching languages. And such a development can mean a great deal to increasing world understanding.

The need is obvious. The people are ready. But funds to carry out these new departures in education are in short supply. That is why I introduced in the U.S. Senate, S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act. Additional funds are urgently needed, and only the Federal government can provide financial assistance of a sufficient magnitude.

Upon enactment, my bill would provide money to a school so that it could improve the quality of the education which it offers. The money will be used to put to work the new ideas you have been discussing here this week. Bilingual education programs, team teaching, and other new things could be started. What the schools will be doing with this money is to give to Spanish-speaking students the chance to get as good and as meaningful an education as anyone else in this country.

Other provisions in the bill relate to the creation of an Advisory Committee on the Education of Bilingual Children, summer and full-term teacher training, and research.

The goal of this new education is a child who is completely fluent in both English and Spanish. By doing away with the language barrier we do away with the artificial distinction between Mexican-American and Anglo-Americans. For too long there has been mistrust and suspicion. Let us join hands and work together, for through mutual understanding and cooperation comes mutual benefit.

I believe that only with a national program can bilingual education be fully assured. In the United States education has become a big business, a business that always has many buyers. Learning is an exciting product that should be free to everyone. So far, language has been the only price demanded for the product. But when the language is foreign, then the product is not available. I look forward to bilingualism as the highest bidder and one of the most deserving buyers of the learning product.

Program of the Texas Conference for the Mexican-American: Improving Educational Opportunities, April 13–15, 1967, San Antonio

THURSDAY, APRIL 13

Ball Room, 1:00 to 2:30 p.m.

Presiding: Edwin Hindsman, Executive Director, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Welcome: The Honorable Walter W. McAllister, Mayor of San Antonio; Oscar E. Miller, Superintendent, San Antonio Independent School District.

Plan of Conference: The Honorable Joe J. Bernal, Texas State Senator.

Keynote Address: Nolan Estes, Associate Commissioner for Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Office of Education.

Starlight Room, 2:30 to 3:15 p.m.

Caucus Discussion: Problem Definition by groups.

Ball Room, 3:30 to 4:15 p.m.

Presiding: Dwain M. Estes, Executive Director, Inter-American Educational Center.

Address: J. W. Edgar, State Commissioner of Education and Staff, Texas Education Agency.

Ball Room and Rooms A, B, C, D, E, F, 7:00 to 9:00 p.m.

Dinner.

Presiding: Henry Guerra', Exhibitor Services Supervisor, Hemis-Fair '68.

Address: The Role of State Government in Improving Education—The Honorable John B. Connally, Governor of the State of Texas.

Starlight Room and Ball Room, 9:00 to 10:30 p.m.

Caucus Discussions.

FRIDAY, APRIL 14

Ball Room 8:30 to 10:30 a.m.

Presiding: Dwain M. Estes.

Address: "The Meaning and Implications of Bilingualism for Texas Schools," Severo Gomez, State Coordinator, Regional Educational Agencies Project, Office of International Education, Texas Education Agency.

Commentation by Al Ramirez, Mayor of Edinburg; Theodore Andersson, The University of Texas; Carlos Rivera, El Paso Independent School District.

From 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon

Teaching Demonstrations (repeated at 11:15 a.m.)

1. Language Development for Spanish-Speaking Children through Linguistic Conceptualization (San Antonio, El.): Thomas D. Horn, The University of Texas; Nick Garza, Principal; Hercilia Toscano, Supervisor; rooms A, B, C.

2. Bilingual Education Program (United Consolidated, Laredo, El.): Harold Brantley, Superintendent; Victor Cruz-Aedo, Elementary Supervisor; Olga Bordelon, Teacher; Dolores Earles, Teacher; Guadalupe Cavazos, Teacher; Ball Room.

3. Spanish-to-English Language Instruction (Edinburg, El.): Sam Evans, Director of Personnel; Chris Darnall, Teacher; Imelda Guerra, Teacher; Starlight Room.

4. Language Teaching and Training (El Paso, El.): Marie Esman Barker, Special Project Director, Title III, rooms D, E, F.

Informal caucus discussion (run concurrently with Demonstrations), Terrace Room.

Ball Room, 1:30 to 3:30 p.m.

Presiding: Edwin Hindsman.

Address: "The Spanish-Speaking Child in Texas Schools," Herschel T. Manuel, The University of Texas.

Commentation by Joe A. Cardenas, St. Mary's University; Tony Garcia, Elementary Principal, McAllen, Area 5, Coordinator, SEDL; Teresa L. Long, Governor's Committee on Public School Education.

From 3:30 to 5:00 p.m.

Instructional Demonstrations (repeated at 4:15 p.m.).

5. English Language Instruction Via Closed-Circuit T.V. (Edgewood, El., Jr. Hi., H.S.): H. H. Bobele, Television Coordinator, Sister Mary Arthur, Our Lady of the Lake, Language Consultant; Earle Bolton, Coordinator; June Gueringer, Coordinator; Lizette O'Conner, Coordinator, rooms A, B, C.

6. Texas Project for the Education of Migrant Children (McAllen, PSJA, TEA, El., Jr. H.): Tony Garcia, Principal; Gus Guerra, Director of Federal Projects; Earl Martin, Director of Migrant and Pre-School Programs; Eustolia Perez, Teacher; rooms D, E, F.

7. Learning Laboratory for the Spanish-Speaking Child (Edinburg, El.): Sam Evans, Director of Personnel; Tommy McAffe, Media Specialist; Vicki Yazak, Teacher; Starlight Room.

8. Corrective Instruction in English Pronunciation (El Paso, H.S.): James Burton, Chairman, Social Studies Department; Daniel Anchondo, Student; Leo Rojas, Student; Ball Room.

Informal caucus discussion (run concurrently with Demonstrations), Terrace Room.

Ball Room, 7:30 p.m.

Dinner.

Presiding: Dwain M. Estes.

Address: "The Potential Contribution and Gifts of the Mexican-American People," U.S. Representative Henry B. Gonzalez.

SATURDAY, APRIL 15

Ball Room, 8:30 a.m. to 12:00 noon

Presiding: The Honorable Joe J. Bernal.

Address: "The Time for Action is Now," Armando Rodriguez, Chief of the Bureau of Intergroup Relations, California State Department of Education.

Reports, Resolutions, and Conference Summary: The Reverend Henry J. Casso, Episcopal Vicar for Urban Ministry.

Address: "Bilingual Education and Human Development: Plans for the Future," U.S. Senator Ralph W. Yarborough.

Adjournment.

CONFERENCE GOALS

The four goals of this conference are:

To identify and clearly define barriers faced by Mexican-Americans in schools and communities in Texas.

To show and discuss some of the programs presently underway which are aimed at enhancing the bilingual education of the young Mexican-American.

To focus attention on problems that have not been solved and which require immediate attention.

To develop a plan of action and dissemination of information and statistical data to remove these barriers and find solutions to these problems.

SPONSORS

This conference is being sponsored by the Inter-American Educational Center, the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, the Texas Education Agency.

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Chairman, State Senator Joe J. Bernal.

Members: Rogers Barton, Texas Education Agency; Nick Garza, San Antonio, Independent School District; Joe A. Cardenas, St. Mary's University; George A. Gonzalez, Inter-American Educational Center; The Reverend Henry J. Casso, Archdiocese of San Antonio; E. Oscar Hakala, San Antonio, Independent School District; David W. Darling, Inter-American Educational Center; William Kinniell, Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

COMMITMENT OF AMERICAN BUSINESS TO SUCCESS IN WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the tremendous and unprecedented commitment of American business to success in the war against poverty is among the most significant and far-reaching developments of the past few years. For the first time in history, the prestige and expertise of our great companies and corporations are on the line in behalf of a major national program to overcome the ravages of poverty.

In an outstanding article appearing in the Wall Street Journal on April 19, Mr. Alan L. Otten explores some of the ramifications of the role of business in the poverty war, and discusses in particular the impact of industrial support for the Job Corps program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Otten's article printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 19, 1967]

NEW ALLIES FOR L.B.J.: VARIED MOTIVES IMPEL MANY FIRMS TO SUPPORT GREAT SOCIETY PROGRAMS—JOB CORPS VIEWED AS SOURCE OF LABOR—RENT SUBSIDIES ATTRACT BUSINESS BACKING—A POWERFUL LOBBYING FORCE

(By Alan L. Otten)

WASHINGTON.—"We're in an automobile assembly plant in New Jersey, and I want to tell you about a fellow who's working here now," declares an oft-repeated radio commercial. "His name is Jackson, Ernest Jackson. Ernest is something of a celebrity. He's the one-thousandth graduate of the Kilmer Job Corps Center in New Jersey to be placed. Ernest now earns over $200 a week. Not bad for a fellow who dropped out of school in the 11th grade. At Kilmer, a lot of young men are being changed from untrained dropouts to skilled craftsmen."

The sponsor of this commercial is not the Federal Government's Job Corps program but International Telephone & Telegraph Co. ITT operates the Kilmer center, and its commercials plug both its own success and that of the Job Corps.

By now, the increasing involvement of private business in public welfare-education, housing and other Great Society programs is well-known; less widely noted, though, is the fact that many companies, particularly the big ones, have become public advocates for the programs they're taking part in or may gain by. Thus, business is turning into an important force for pushing embattled domestic proposals through Congress. The Job Corps is only one of these.

BACKING RENT SUBSIDIES

In Pittsburgh, ACTION-Housing Inc., a housing rehabilitation group that is an offshoot of a development fund financed by 24 major banks and businesses, takes a public stand that the new Federal rent subsidy program attacked by Congressional conservatives is essential to provide decent housing for the poor.

Prestigious utility presidents, department store owners, bankers and other businessmen are lining up to lobby for generous appropriations for the Administration's "Model Cities" program, while Congressional conservatives aim to slash the proposed funds.

Sometimes business leaders adopt such stances simply because their companies get direct dollars-and-cents benefits from a program, finding new markets for their products or services—much as many firms have long gained from defense and space procurement. Sometimes the interest is less direct: Learning new techniques, acquiring a source of trained manpower, protecting an investment in a slum neighborhood.

Occasionally the business support may stem from a fatalistic feeling that Federal initiatives can't be blocked anyhow and that it's wise to stay on Lyndon Johnson's good side. Or there may be an "if-you-can't-lick-'em, join-'em" approach that reasons business had better seek a voice in shaping programs likely to move ahead anyway.

Whatever the reason, the business support is eagerly welcomed by the Administration.

At the least, it's taken as a sign that a substantial segment of business will continue to give political sustenance to President Johnson and the Democratic Party.

SWAYING LEGISLATORS

More important, though, it comes at a time when Administration requests for new money and new authority are meeting stout resistance in the more conservative 90th Congress. Businessmen can sway legislators whom union representatives, welfare leaders and Democratic lobbyists can't hope to reach.

"Business is what's going to save us," says a White House man. "Business leaders won't be able to change really conservative Senators and Congressmen, but they surely can have impact on some of the more moderate Republicans and Democrats who might not be for us otherwise."

Moreover, the increased business backing coincides with disarray in the traditional Democratic lobbying alliance. The party's big-city machines have crumbled. The Meany-Reuther split and white protests against Negro gains undermine the unity and effectiveness of labor lobbyists. The increasingly splintered civil rights movement no longer swings much weight in behalf of Johnson legislative goals. "The support from business couldn't come at a better time," concludes one high-ranking Administration official.

KEEPING A LIST

Adds an executive of the Housing and Urban Development Department, which expects to benefit from business support for many of its programs: "Each agency has gradually developed a list of firms interested in its field. The Treasury Department, for example, has a blue-ribbon list of businessmen who supported the President's tax policies. We don't keep them turned on all the time, but we know how to turn them on to write letters or make phone calls or testify when necessary—for our own programs or for programs of other agencies."

Probably the most conspicuous business-backed Great Society venture is the Job Corps, which draws backing not only from large companies running the Corps' camps but also from others getting a crack at workers trained in them.

A parade of corporate executives, including General Electric Co. Chairman Gerald Phillippe and Hotel Corp. of America President Roger Sonnabend, testified for the Corps at last year's Congressional hearings. More recently, in February, antipoverty chief Sargent Shriver summoned executives of corporations and other organizations that operate Job Corps centers to a two-day conference in Texas to study ways of improving the program, which won a new ringing endorsement from the group.

A resolution approved at the Texas gathering declared "that we express our support for the objectives of the Job Corps program and pledge the skills and resources of our organizations to its further progress in creating educational opportunities for the disadvantaged youth of the nation." The signers, sure to impress wavering Congressmen, include top officials of Radio Corp of America, U.S. Industries Inc., Xerox Corp., Burroughs Corp., International Business Machines Corp. and Litton Industries Inc.

"In terms of the economic benefit or payout," said Litton Chairman Charles B. Thornton, "and in terms of savings in the cost of relief, crime and institutional care, there is very much in it for us as businessmen and as responsible members of society."

What's more, a number of business leaders have lobbied with Congressmen on behalf of the Job Corps, some going to Capitol Hill straight from the Texas meeting. And when Nation's Business, the monthly magazine put out by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, recently ran an editorial attacking the Job Corps, the reply defending the program came not from Mr. Shriver but from R. L. Hale, manager of Westinghouse Electric Corp.'s systems operations division; Westinghouse operates one of the Corps' training centers.

A MESSAGE FROM MONTGOMERY WARD

To broaden the business support, leading businessmen have recorded radio ads urging others to back the Job Corps effort. "I am Robert E. Brooker, president of Montgomery Ward & Co., with a message for all American businessmen, large or small," declares one commercial. "Our business is to serve the public. We rely on well-trained employes in many areas of the merchandising industry—retail sales, automotive maintenance, and repairs, warehousing, office management. . . . We at Montgomery Ward have learned that the Job Corps is helping to prepare young people to be productive members of our expanding economy. . . . Remember, when the Job Corps trains, the employer gains."

Similar appeals have been aired by Edgar Kaiser, president of Kaiser Industries Corp., ITT President Harold Geneen; and New York Stock Exchange President Keith Funston.

The Model Cities program now headed for a Congressional appropriations battle also seems to be benefiting mightily from business backing. Last year, just before a crucial House vote, the White House managed to line up 22 leading bankers and businessmen to declare that "America needs the Demonstration Cities Act." The list included such weighty names as Henry Ford II, David Rockefeller, Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. Chairman Thomas Gates, New York Central Railroad President Alfred Perlman and Standard Oil of California Chairman R. Gwin Follis. The White House expects to marshal similar support for the program this year.

HUD Secretary Weaver has been busily reminding lumber companies, paint manufacturers and similar companies of the direct financial stake they have in Federal aid for building and rehabilitating low-cost housing. "Perhaps the most important point we have been making to business and industry," he said in a Washington speech this week, "is that the private profit motive and the national interest can merge at exactly the point of the greatest urban need and that is help for low-income families."

LOOKING FOR BENEFITS

Despite their traditional fervor for economy in Government, individual businessmen have never been reluctant to back Federal programs directly helpful to their own balance sheets: Roads or ship channels to improve their access to raw materials or to markets; airline and shipping subsidies; home mortgage guarantees. In today's business backing of Great Society's efforts, there's often the same sort of direct-benefit expectations.

Thus producers of audio-visual materials lobby for enlarged aid for education. Electric and gas utilities strongly support the Federal-state program to spur Appalachia's economy; a spokesman for them testified before the Senate Public Works Committee recently in support of the Administration's bill to extend and expand the program, and the utility men stand ready to buttonhole key House members if necessary.

Railroads, including the Pennsylvania,

and rail equipment manufacturers such as Westinghouse Air Brake Co. have been influential in starting and expanding Federal aid for development of rail transit for commuters. "Pennsy was able to reach people we never could have hoped to get," a White House man reports.

Many companies are in Government programs to develop future profit potentials. "The key phrase is new markets and new techniques," says one Administration man. "Everyone is looking for these, and they think their involvement in Government programs can help."

Certainly many Job Corps contractors have been diversifying into the educational field; new training techniques developed at the centers can be applied in their private business. Government-aided tenement rehabilitation effort by U.S. Gypsum Co. and other building material companies involve experimentation with new types of wallboard, heating systems and other products that may find private buyers later on.

SEEKING STABILITY

Some firms supporting the Model Cities program have a less obvious stake than selling paint or wallboard; department stores, utilities, banks and transit companies want to protect their large investments in central cities through rehabilitation of slum areas. Many of these companies have a similar stake in job-finding, health care, education and other programs to help Negroes and other urban poor; not only do these programs create or preserve customers, but perhaps they may also avert property damage from rioting and looting by dissatisfied slum-dwellers. "Most big business has a real stake in community stability," a spokesman for one of the mayors' organizations asserts.

Often, business and other groups participate in and support certain Federal programs for fear of more drastic Federal action. Thus, the National Association of Home Builders and National Association of Real Estate Boards support the Administration's Model Cities and rent subsidy programs not only for the obvious reasons—to stimulate building activity and to get more houses for poorer people—but also to help kill off straight public housing.

"The rent supplement program, if adequately funded, can be the most successful approach yet devised to provide badly needed housing for millions of low-income families," the Home Builders told the Senate Appropriations Committee last year.

SAVING THEIR OWN MONEY

Some industries back Government programs at least partly so they won't have to pay the bills themselves. When paper companies back Federal grants to local governments for new waste treatment plants to combat water pollution, they can't help reckoning that if the taxpayer doesn't pay for these new plants, the paper companies themselves may have to.

Certainly, though, the changed business attitude toward Great Society programs must be attributed in part to conviction of the need for Government action. Many large companies are now headed by a new breed of corporate manager—not men owning and running companies they built themselves, but rather production experts, salesmen, lawyers, engineers and other professional types. Many of these men have been in Government or served as Government consultants; they are not terrified that business will inevitably be swallowed up in any business-Government partnership.

Some of them honestly see a Federal role in many areas that business can't fill. Early this year Henry Ford urged businessmen to "support rather than oppose well-considered Government programs to accomplish what Government can do and business can't do."

"There are many tasks that business can't do well," Mr. Ford said, "because it has neither the resources, the abilities, nor the incentives."

OBSERVANCE OF LAW DAY RECALLS UNRATIFIED HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTION—LXIII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today, May 1, all over the United States, we are observing Law Day.

The law in our Nation is accorded a status of unique respect almost approaching reverence.

Americans have striven for almost two centuries to realize the great objecttive John Adams sought:

> A government of laws, and not of men.

But today as we pause to commemorate the special importance of law in our national life, I cannot fail to mention the Senate's failure to ratify the Human Rights Convention on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

These four conventions represent a sincere effort on the part of men of good will to bring the rule of law to international life.

I am grateful and proud that our own domestic law embodies guarantees far higher than the minimal standards of human dignity established by these conventions.

But I am not proud of the Senate's failure in the struggle to achieve the rule of reason and law in the world. The Senate has uninterruptedly ignored these conventions for an aggregate total of 30 years. The Genocide Convention, alone, has been smothered in the Foreign Relations Committee for 18 years and never even considered by the full committee.

Let the Senate resolve on Law Day that we will give impetus and encouragement to universal respect for the law.

Let the Senate really celebrate meaningfully Law Day by ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

FULL OPPORTUNITY AND SOCIAL ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1967

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, earlier this year I introduced with 10 cosponsors the Full Opportunity and Social Accounting Act of 1967.

It would provide for a system of national social accounting, establish a President's Council of Social Advisers comparable to the Council of Economic Advisers in the economic sphere, require a social report by the President, and create a joint congressional committee with full oversight responsibility.

The bill has recently been endorsed by three major newspapers: the St. Paul Pioneer Press, the Minneapolis Star, and the Milwaukee Journal. I ask unanimous consent that the editorials be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul Pioneer Press,
Apr. 21, 1967]

AUDITING THE SOCIAL LEDGER

The federal government has been long on establishing programs to attack social ills of the nation and short on objective analysis of how or whether the programs are achieving intended goals.

There are, for example, some 300 federal programs dealing with education, poverty, physical environment and community development. One estimate is that a third of the federal budget involves spending in those areas.

Is the money invested in these programs being spent wisely? How effective are the Teacher Corps, manpower retraining, slum youth activity programs? What are the social consequences of highway or urban renewal programs that uproot hundreds of residents? What are the nation's unmet social, health, educational needs?

Sen. Walter Mondale is rightly concerned about getting answers to these questions and has proposed legislation designed to seek them out. He recommends creation of a national council of social advisers similar to the council of economic advisers which now helps the President plan and develop fiscal policy.

The new council—composed of three social scientists chosen by the President—would assist in developing national social policies. It would compile and analyze social statistics to determine the impact and overall cost of programs; devise a system of "social indicators" which would help the President tell what approaches are the most effective and suggest program and spending priorities.

The council would not be a program coordinator although the senator hopes it will encourage greater coordination.

Under terms of the bill, the President would be required to submit an annual report on the social "health" of the nation—as he now does on the economy. Congress also would be required to create a joint committee to oversee the report and programs and to make recommendations to the legislators on main issues discussed by the executive.

Previous efforts to analyze and judge the effectiveness of social programs have been feeble and indeterminate. Self analysis by the agencies, bureaus and offices handling the hundreds of programs cannot be unbiased or detached. The Mondale bill could provide the type of in-depth studies required for us to get maximum benefits from our social welfare expenditures.

[From the Minneapolis Star]

CHARTING NATIONAL SOCIAL HEALTH

Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., has introduced a bill, supported by nine other liberals including Sen. Eugene McCarthy, D-Minn., for a "council of social advisers." It would analyze and assess social welfare needs and programs for the President, just as the Council of Economic Advisers charts economic trends.

With reported White House support, Mondale's intriguing proposal is slated for full hearings in April. He concedes social welfare is a loose term, less measurable than economic and business developments. But for that very reason, a central, White House-based "quality control" body might prove useful. Passage of welfare legislation has already exceeded the ability of federal, state and local governments to administer it. To be blunt, it is a mess.

Mondale wants the proposed three-member council to have more inspection power than the Bureau of the Budget. It should, he added, supersede piecemeal, self-serving reports that agencies make on themselves for the White House. It would, he hopes, be the equal of the Council of Economic Advisers in prestige, skill and acuity, backed up by a professional staff as good as the economic council's. If it were, it could influence the whole field of social study and administration.

Mondale concedes that meaningful "social indicators" are scarce; he contends they could and should be developed, as the economic council developed its indicators. He concedes that the social council couldn't legislate reforms or reorganize the grotesque bureaucracy. But he contends it could draw the blueprints for reform of old programs and efficient administration of new programs.

If the council proposed more spending, conservatives could find comfort at least in the hope that it would demand efficiency. Finally, if, as Mondale assumes, the council would force social scientists to substitute plain talk for fuzzy jargon, then, at least, taxpayers will know what is going on.

The proposal deserves serious study.

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

COUNCIL OF SOCIAL ADVISERS

Sen. Mondale (D-Minn.) has introduced legislation which would establish a council of social advisers patterned after the council of economic advisers. The object is to adapt sophisticated methods of analysis to social problems, as has been done in the economic sphere.

The government has enacted much social legislation in recent years. A recent study showed that more than one-third of the federal budget involves investment in people through educational, health, income maintenance and other programs. Efforts to analyze the value of the programs have been feeble. Dozens of pertinent questions have never been thoroughly studied. What is the cost of public health programs in relation to disease prevented? Is money spent for slum youth activities returned in less crime? Is a dollar spent on job training worth several spent on welfare assistance?

Mondale's council—a panel of top social scientists backed by an expert staff—would gather and analyze statistics, evaluate the effectiveness of social services at all levels, spot weaknesses and omissions and advise the president in establishing policies.

The bill would also require the president to send congress an annual report on the state of the Union's social health. It would create a joint congressional committee to review social policies, as is now done in economic affairs.

Ten senators, including both of Wisconsin's, have joined Mondale in sponsoring the bill. An approach such as they outline should help the government get the most value from its investment in social programs.

PROPOSED IMPROVEMENT OF NORTH NEWPORT RIVER, LIBERTY COUNTY, GA.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we in Georgia are proud of the progress that has been made over the past several years in developing our navigable rivers and waterways and in utilizing these valuable assets for our economic and industrial growth.

At the present time, a 9-foot channel exists from the Florida Gulf Coast northward along the Chattahoochee River to the city of Columbus at the fall line. On the opposite side of the State, the Savannah River is now navigable from Augusta to the Atlantic Ocean below the city of Savannah. Another important water artery is the Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway, which runs along the Georgia coast.

We are working constantly to expand and add to our existing system of navigable waterways. Eventually we want to extend the navigation channel on the Chattahoochee to our capital city of Atlanta and to Albany on the Flint River.

Another project recently proposed is to make the North Newport River in Liberty County on the Georgia coast navigable from the Intercoastal Waterway inland to the town of Riceboro, site of a new kraft linerboard mill now under construction by Interstate Paper Corp. The project would involve development of a 9-foot channel a distance of only approximately 10 miles to a point where the river depth is sufficient for barge traffic without further improvement.

At a recent hearing by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, proponents of the North Newport project stated that the improvement would result in substantial economic benefit to the Hinesville-Riceboro area of Liberty County and to a large coastal area of Georgia, northeast Florida and southeast Florida from which the new paper mill will draw its pulpwood supply.

Mr. President, believing that this proposal will mean much to the economy of this part of Georgia, I endorse this proposal and hope that the Corps of Engineers will give favorable consideration to developing this waterway.

Statements supporting the project were presented at the hearing by Fred Mingledorff on behalf of the Liberty County Chamber of Commerce, and by William J. Verross, general manager of Interstate Paper Corp. I ask unanimous consent that the statements be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY WILLIAM J. VERROSS, GENERAL MANAGER, INTERSTATE PAPER CORP., AT A HEARING BY THE DISTRICT ENGINEER, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, HINESVILLE, GA., APRIL 20, 1967

My name is William J. Verross. I am general manager of Interstate Paper Corporation, which is building a Kraft linerboard mill on the North Newport River at Riceboro, Georgia, in Liberty County.

When Interstate begins operations early next year, we expect to produce 400 tons of linerboard per day. For this production, we will require approximately 250,000 cords of pulpwood annually. Our wood supply will be drawn principally from individual landowners and dealers in the coastal sections of Georgia, northeast Florida and southeast South Carolina. We have no company-owned woodlands other than the tract on which our mill is located and will purchase our total wood requirement.

We appreciate the opportunity to appear at this hearing to request that consideration be given to making the North Newport River navigable to our mill site at Riceboro. We believe this improvement could be accomplished at relatively low cost and would result in substantial economic benefits to the three states from which we will purchase pulpwood.

Specifically, we request that consideration be given to the development of a year-round, 9-foot channel from a point on the North Newport River adjacent to our mill site downriver to Half Moon Landing, a distance of approximately 10 miles. Below Half Moon Landing, there is sufficient water depth even at low tide and during dry seasons to accommodate barge traffic the remaining 6 miles to the Intercoastal Waterway where it crosses St. Catherine's Sound.

The Corps of Engineers is aware of the fact that barging offers advantages as an efficient and low-cost method of shipping pulpwood and bulk paper products. The pulp and paper industry has made effective use of these advantages where possible and feasible. Indeed, the U. S. Study Commission for the Southeast River Basins reported that pulpwood, pulp and paper accounted for more than one-third of all traffic that moved on the Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway in 1960.

This in no way minimizes the importance of truck and rail transportation to our industry. Both are indispensible. In our case, Interstate Paper Corporation will continue to utilize both forms of land transportation if the North Newport River is opened to barge traffic to our mill. However, we cannot afford to overlook the advantages and benefits that a waterway would provide as a third mode of transportation.

Movement of pulpwood and other forest products by barge on the North Newport River is not new. Until a few years ago, another paper company utilized shallow-draft barges and the tides to transport pulpwood from a landing on the river approximately three miles downstream from our mill to Savannah by way of the Intercoastal Waterway. A lumber mill that formerly operated near our mill also used the river to transport saw timber. However, the full potential of the river as a waterway cannot be realized without improvements to provide a low tide, year-round 9-foot channel above Half Moon Landing.

The economic benefits of such a channel to our operations, to the landowners from whom we will purchase pulpwood, and the coastal section generally would, we feel, more than justify the cost, I would like to talk briefly abut a few of the principal benefits of the proposed improvement.

First, it would help offset the shortage of railcars for hauling pulpwood. The pulp and paper industry for some years has felt the pinch of insufficient rolling stock, and the problem is likely to get worse rather than better in the future. A barge capable of handling 10 to 15 times the wood volume of a railcar obviously would provide a measure of relief to the car shortage.

Second, barging would also increase the utilization of tree-length pulpwood. Our industry is turning more and more to tree-length wood as the harvesting process becomes more mechanized. Under existing ICC rate regulations, the cost of shipping tree-length wood by rail is 75 percent greater than for the usual five-foot bolt length. Whole trees can be moved over the highway by trucks, but this is feasible only within an area relatively near to the mill and during daylight hours. Barges, of course, are ideally suited for transporting tree-length wood, and the availability of this low-cost and efficient means of shipment ultimately would mean greater return for the landowner and the pulpwood producer.

Third, if the North Newport River is made navigable, we anticipate that we would ship a part of our linerboard production by barge to be loaded directly aboard ocean-going ships at Savannah or Brunswick. This would be particularly advantageous in shipment of large quantities and would reduce handling and warehousing costs.

The channel also would provide a direct barge link between our Riceboro mill and those of our container-making plants in the Northeast, such as the plant in Baltimore, that are located in proximity of the Atlantic Intercoastal Waterway.

Fourth, we believe the greatest benefit to be derived from the proposed navigation channel would be the creation of a new market for pulpwood in remote reaches of coastal Georgia, South Carolina and Florida. The Coastal islands and tidewater areas of our section have an abundance of fine timber, but much of it is largely inaccessible to rail and truck. As a company that will buy its entire wood supply, Interstate cannot compete effectively for the purchase of wood from water-locked stands until we have a barge channel to our mill. Let me assure you that Interstate will compete—and compete vigorously—for the purchase of its share of this wood once we have the means for bringing it from the forests to our mill.

There is also a vast amount of lower-grade hardwood in the marshes and swamps along the rivers of the Southeastern coastal area, such as the Altamaha and the lower reaches of the Savannah. This vast reservoir of wood is largely untapped today because it is economically unfeasible to bring it to the mills except by water. The owners obviously now are receiving a small return from their land. We of Interstate feel these wood resources should be utilized by the pulp and paper industry. As one part of this industry, it certainly is our intention to draw on these resources if our mill is opened to barge traffic.

I have not attempted to discuss all the benefits we believe would result from developing the eight-mile upper stretch of the North Newport River for navigation. We feel there is ample economic justification for the improvement and are confident the benefits would be felt throughout the coastal area of which we are proud to be a part. It is for this reason that we respectfully request the Corps of Engineers to give favorable consideration to this important waterway proposal.

Statement by Fred Mingledorff, Jr., Representing Liberty County Chamber of Commerce at a Hearing by the District Engineer, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Hinesville, Ga., April 20, 1967

My name is Fred Mingledorff, Jr. I represent the Liberty County Chamber of Commerce, and am presenting the Chamber's position in this matter.

The Liberty County Chamber of Commerce is supporting a transportation complex for the eastern end of Liberty County. This area can best be described as the Midway-Riceboro-Sunbury section. This section is served by the Seaboard Airline Railroad and presently by U.S. Highway 17. Interstate 95 is scheduled to run to the east of the railroad line and an interchange on the interstate highway is planned for Georgia highway 38 between Sunbury and Midway. A desirable addition to this complex would be one or two barge channels to give this area access to the intercoastal waterway at St. Catherine's Sound. Thus, all components of freight movement and the economic gain derived therefrom, would benefit this particular depressed economic area.

Our small city of Riceboro, Georgia, located at the head waters of the North Newport River is named for its use as a shipping point for rice and other agricultural products. We can see, therefore, that this area has a long history dating back to the Revolutionary wartime for water borne shipping. We urge the Corps of Engineers to consider the construction of a barge channel from the Riceboro area to St. Catherine's Sound and the Intercoastal waterway.

The Chamber of Commerce is also supporting the Corps of Engineer's plans to drain the western end of the county in such a fashion to develop additional pine timberland to supply the coastal Georgia wood-using industries. It is our understanding that other agencies will speak more specifically to this point.

I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you today to present the Chamber of Commerce position.

FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD URGES TRUTH IN LENDING BE PASSED

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board in a report to the Committee on Banking and Currency strongly urged the enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. The Board's letter indicated that S. 5 would be in accord with the program of the President. In view of the Board's extensive experience in the home construction and home mortgage industry, it is encouraging that the Board sees no insurmountable problem to those creditors in the industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Board's letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Home Loan Bank Board,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.

Hon. John Sparkman,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In response to your request, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board submits this report on S. 5 of the present Congress, relating to the disclosure of finance charges.

As you know, the Board supervises the twelve Federal Home Loan Banks, which provide reserve credit for their member institutions. All Federal savings and loan associations, which are chartered and supervised by the Board, are required to be members, and membership is extended on an optional basis to other savings and loan associations and to savings banks and insurance companies engaged in making long-term home mortgage loans. The Board also administers the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, which insures up to a statutory limit of $15,000 savings in all Federal savings and loan associations and in such state-chartered associations as apply and are admitted to insurance.

The Federal Home Loan Bank Board strongly urges the enactment of legislation along the lines of this bill.

It is desirable that there be clarity as to the effect of the bill on loans by these institutions to individuals where the amount or rate of the financing charge may be uncertain, as in the case of construction loans which are to be disbursed in progress payments that can vary in timing with weather conditions and other factors, or in the case of loans which have an interest-rate adjustment or escalation clause. It is our understanding that the regulations contemplated by section 5(a) of the bill and the reference in that section to methods of calculation will permit sufficient latitude to accommodate these situations.

Advice has been received from the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the program of the President.

With kindest regards, I am

Sincerely,

John E. Horne.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. NAVY SEABEES

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the Seabees of the Navy, those gallant construction men of World War II fame, this year celebrate their 25th anniversary.

These men are among the finest from the building trades of America. Their motto is a famous one: "Can Do."

The spirit of that motto is well represented in the State of Oregon by the members of Seabee Reserve Divisions based in the great cities of Eugene, Salem, and Portland, and by Oregon Seabees presently serving with Navy construction battalions and teams on active duty worldwide.

Today, in Vietnam, the Seabees are building roads and highways, hospitals, deepwater ports, warehouses, and the many other structures and facilities which, when the current conflict ends, will assist the Vietnamese people and Government to progress more surely and rapidly toward a sound economy and a better way of life.

During the past years, and today in Vietnam, Seabee civic action teams have been helping village people in underdeveloped nations of Africa, Latin America, and Asia.

These Seabee teams have provided medical care to the villages, improved sanitation and water systems, taught construction and maintenance skills, built roads where none existed, and helped to raise or repair schools, churches, homes, orphanages, and meeting halls.

Sponsored by the State Department and the Agency for International Development, Seabee teams have become known as the Navy Peace Corps, and the 13-man teams take great satisfaction in their role of advancing the brotherhood of man through helping others to help themselves.

I am pleased to join with Oregon citizens in the commemoration of the silver anniversary of the Seabees.

LARSON AIR FORCE BASE—MOSES LAKE, WASH., PROJECT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. Magnuson] has often talked with me about the way his community of Moses Lake has fought back to overcome the severe setback encountered when the Department of Defense closed Larson Air Force Base.

Until I read the West Coast Airlines magazine article written by Bob Hansen, real estate editor of the Seattle, Wash., Post-Intelligencer, for the March issue, I had not realized the full scope of the combined community and Federal effort brought to bear on the Larson Air Force Base closing. Perhaps more important, I had not fully realized the excellent results of the Moses Lake community efforts.

We, in Montana, are faced with a similar and, in some respects, an even greater challenge with the announced closing of the Glasgow Air Force Base, Glasgow, Mont. We are deeply indebted to our senatorial colleagues, Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson for their leadership in working with the Moses Lake community and for their sharing of ideas and inspiration to help other communities and other States with similar problems. Above all, the fine citizens of Moses Lake merit the highest commendation for their initiative and resourcefulness in devising imaginative and productive uses for their military facility now converted to peaceful purposes.

The Larson Air Force Base-Moses Lake, Wash., project is a splendid example of innovative suggestions by Federal agencies in working with a combination of local, State, regional, and Federal authorities and resources.

It seems to me that the successful closing and conversion of Larson Air Force

Base, Moses Lake, Wash., is an outstanding example of what we read and hear so much about but seldom actually see in operation. Moses Lake, Wash., represents a splendid example of creative federalism for the Nation.

Since the course charted by Moses Lake can undoubtedly be of real value to other communities across the Nation facing problems quite similar in nature, I ask unanimous consent that the West Coast Airlines article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Melodrama at Moses Lake

(By Bob H. Hansen)

It was a cliffhanger, a suspense-filled community melodrama in which no one could bet Our Little Nell would come through the red tape until the last gasping moments.

And yet, in retrospect, it had to work out as it did. Uncle Sam just couldn't let a good thing really go by the board—not if an energized community wasn't going to let it be so.

And though Moses Lake is still left with concern over what will be done with 1,300 federal-owned houses plus millions of dollars worth of airplane production and service facilities, the situation is far less grim than the forecasts of economic peril which hung over the Columbia Basin city when the Department of Defense decided to close huge Larson Air Force Base.

That was in 1965, a year in which a previously complacent community painfully shaped a coordinated effort to spare itself, and has come up believing that the impending doom was a blessing in disguise.

In the first days of political panic Moses Lake community leaders attempted to spread their influence by organizing a countywide action group—an exercise in naivete from which they soon regained the realization that Grant County is a far-famed arena of political infighting in which local issues and national seldom mix.

There was nothing to do then but assemble a local group, omit the rest of the county, and go about organizing the county's tenth port district.

Without a port district there would be no place for Our Little Nell to call home even if local action could keep the airport as an active asset instead of a dormant drag.

Meanwhile, farsighted, aggressive Big Bend Community College moved swiftly on a study which showed what it would do with every barracks and classroom if given an oppertunity to acquire the base cantonment area. It was the comforting type of action which sustained hope while it appeared that no edict from on high was going to make Defense Secretary Robert McNamara change his closure order.

About this time an assortment of federal aides came into the drama for walk-on parts, some of them even sent by the Department of Defense to show their concern for reducing the economic impact of the acts of Their Leader. There were players from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to say that it was OK to give to the college but not to the community hospital. And standing off like semiofficial shadows of coming events were minions of the General Services Administration, Uncle Sam's realty agents who would step in when the Wicked Villain went through with the foreclosure.

There were frequent mentions in action committee dialogue of Senators Warren G. Magnuson and Henry M. Jackson, both of whom had spoken and acted in favor of salvaging the air base with least economic hazard.

Our Hero—the action committee—scored a round while still gripped by puzzling uncertainty. It spearheaded a four-month drive to establish Port District 10, finalized by a resounding ninety-one per cent "yes" vote.

But confusion and uncertainty held the center stage until after the 1965 holidays when little more could be done but swear in the three port commissioners and put them into action.

Through winter the roar of Strategic Air Command continued to pierce the Moses Lake skies day and night as the community neared the fateful day when there would be silence overhead.

One January day, as college and community pleaded for a save list of machines and material lest they be carried off in Air Force cargo planes, Moses Lake came upon a grim peril wrapped up in a hen-and-egg style of red tape.

To save airport operating facilities, including vital tower equipment, they must show a justifiable use and they had to save the gear to get a justifiable user.

About this time a delegation from the Federal Aviation Agency came on the scene to look over the air base and its facilities, no doubt because the three newly-elected port commissioners had gone into virtual around-the-clock action as soon as they were sworn in. While the FAA men were there the action committee suddenly learned that a Boeing Company field party was en route to look over the place.

So those who were now identified in the drama could be those who would save Our Little Nell.

April came and the Air Force flew away ahead of schedule.

During May and June, the Air Force left its operational equipment intact but on June 27, 1966, as the Port was taking over as the new airport owners, the Air Force had a crew on the way to prepare for a flyaway of all transportable operations gear.

It looked like all had gone for naught.

With hours to go the head man of FAA assured Senator Magnuson that the agency could find the $170,000 it would need to keep the airport operational for a year. Boeing and the Port could go ahead on their jet pilot training contract. The college moved its flight school to the base with a taxi strip as home airport. All was bright on the horizon.

The Port, now seasoned to frustration and challenge, expects to be really flying on its own before the FAA deal expires. Why? There's good promise of growing traffic in future moves by GSA. There's open space and utilities and structures all subject to use by air-oriented industry. Moses Lake has the open skies twenty minutes by jet from the Puget Sound region's expanding aircraft industry. Aircraft workers could soon occupy all those vacant houses.

Moses Lake has learned from its schooling in community action that there's reason to stay in there trying all the way.

As one person who was in most of the action summarized:

"It looked in the end like a great but unidentified authority decided the whole plan and may still be calling the turns, but we're not going to relax in that confidence. We're out to build from here until the whole base has become an asset to the region."

REGIONAL FARM POLICY CONFERENCES

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman recently conducted three regional farm policy conferences in Hutchinson, Kans.; Ames, Iowa; and Decatur, Ind.

As in past "report and review sessions," the Secretary invited regional agricultural leaders and the farmer public in general to attend these open sessions. He personally answered hundreds of unscreened questions from the audience and solicited the comments of listeners as he sought the advice and counsel of Midwest farmers and rural people. Secretary Freeman opened each meeting with a brief statement, and then turned the sessions over to the participants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Secretary's opening remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Remarks of Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman at Regional Farm Policy Conferences on April 19, 1967, in Hutchinson, Kans., and Ames, Iowa, and on April 20, 1967, in Decatur, Ind.

We are here—you and I—for the same basic reason. Farm prices have dropped 7 percent from their peak of last August. We are here to search for possible remedies.

Last year was one of the best years in the history of American agriculture. Net farm income climbed more than $2 billion. Net income per farm reached an all-time high. We gained in income in the nonfarm segment of the economy, and we got some relief from the cost-price squeeze because prices rose sharply until August—rose faster than costs.

But for the past 7 months we have turned in the other direction. I am deeply concerned. I can assure you the President is concerned. And it goes without saying that *you* are concerned.

So—I have asked you to come here and advise and counsel with me as to what we can do about it. I know you have ideas and advice and I want you to speak out frankly and clearly. There are no easy answers to our problems, but by working together and by sharing information and ideas I think we can get results.

I'm not going to make a speech. However, let me give you some background about what is going on as I see it. Then I would like to hear from you.

What has happened to change the optimistic picture of progress of a few months ago to a condition of deep concern and distress today? The answer is the same old story: too much production. First, Canada, Russia, and Australia had bumper crops of grain last year, and this cut into our commercial exports.

Second, we have had a big increase in the supply of hogs, cattle, and poultry. We've had an upturn in the supply of milk—and a downturn in price. Yet the cost of almost everything farmers buy continues to rise. The farmer is again caught in the middle—again being punished by the same old cost-price squeeze.

What can we do about it? That's what we came here to discuss. I want your ideas and advice; I need them. But first, let's look quickly at the great changes that have taken place over the past 6 years. If we have clearly in mind where we were 6 years ago and what we have done since, it should help us to decide what we can do now.

In January 1961, when President John F. Kennedy named me Secretary of Agriculture, American agriculture was in trouble. It was almost as badly off as in the depression of the 1930's.

There was a mountainous surplus of 1.4 billion bushels of wheat. The feed grain surplus was just as bad—85 million tons. Farm income had dropped steadily for 8 years to a low of less than 12 billion dollars.

Farm net income was only $11.7 billion—9 percent below a decade earlier.

Farm prices had dropped 17 percent in the previous 8 years. Farmers faced $1 corn and $2 soybeans. Cattle was selling for $20—hogs for $15—and manufacturing milk for $3.25.

And what was even worse—so far as hope for the future was concerned—was agriculture's public image. It was distorted—and untrue. The American public simply did not understand the conflict between the farmer's image and reality. He was the greatest producer in the entire economy, but the American public thought he was hopelessly inefficient—and he was being penalized for it. He was subsidizing American consumers with cheap food and fiber—and consumers thought they were subsidizing the farmer. He was, as always, the foundation of the American economy—but the public thought the economy was holding him up. He made abundance possible—but people blamed him for producing surpluses. He was an amazing success in terms of production—but the public considered him a failure. The derisive label, "surplus-and-subsidy," was plastered on the back of every farmer in America.

We began to tackle all these problems simultaneously in 1961. The first major bill passed by the Congress that year set up the Emergency Feed Grain Program. This program began to cut into excess feed grain production—while maintaining farm income. We rejuvenated the county and community farmer committee system—and made it a workable and effective mechanism for joint action. Later that year the feed grain program was extended and a similar program applied to 1962 crop wheat. Price supports on milk, soybeans, and other commodities were increased. The amount of food made available to children and the needy was doubled. Five new items were added to the list of donated commodities.

And we began a campaign—it has not stopped to this day—to give the American public a true understanding of the place and the contributions of the U.S. farmer in the American economy.

We continued these actions in 1962. We introduced a comprehensive agricultural program aimed at four related goals for the 1960's—Abundance, Balance, Conservation, and Development. President Kennedy said of them: "These are common sense goals, as common sense as A, B, C, D." We urged a mandatory program of allotments and strict controls for wheat and feed grains and a new program to give balance to dairy production. Our proposals for feed grains and dairy were defeated. But Congress passed the wheat program with the proviso that it must earn two-thirds approval in a referendum. Congress also authorized a major program to expand the over-all rural economy.

We thought we were on our way. Net farm income in 1961 and 1962 was almost a billion dollars higher than in 1960. Gross farm income in 1962 was $3 billion more than in 1960. The surpluses of wheat and feed grains were being cut down.

We entered with high hopes. If wheat farmers approved the program for 1964 wheat in the coming referendum, we would have most of the basic tools we needed. But we got licked in the wheat referendum—and licked bad. This was my low point as Secretary of Agriculture. Maybe farmers didn't want commodity programs at all, I thought. If that were so, there was no use for the Secretary to try to sell them on these programs even though he felt they were necessary.

So I did then what I am doing now—I went on tour.

We held Report and Review Sessions all over the United States. After talking with literally thousands of farmers, I concluded that not only were commodity programs necessary, but farmers understood this. The big problem was that there was nothing even approaching unanimity of opinion as to what kind of program there should be.

I had always known and wrestled with the fact that there were strong differences between the farm organizations. But that they went so deep—and that the differences were so great—I did not discover until then.

Here was one of our great problems. Here *is* one of our great problems. Agriculture speaks in a thousand tongues, like the ancients who tried to build the tower of Babel.

But I returned to Washington and went to work again to try to get a program.

We met with the wheat people. They wanted a voluntary program like that of the feed grain producers. We set to work to see what could be done.

Meantime, cotton was in serious trouble. Consumption was falling. Supplies were rising.

We still had no dairy program. I was required by law to drop dairy supports from 83 percent to 75 percent, from $3.40 to $3.15. This hurt, but I had no choice.

One bright spot in the picture was the passage of a feed grain program for 3 years. But 1963 was not a good year from my viewpoint.

Then on November 22, 1963, came the frightful shock of President Kennedy's assassination.

Entirely apart from the horror of that occurrence, it could have meant the end of the quest for sound farm programs.

The new President had much on his mind. Nonetheless, he immediately got behind agriculture as he always had as a Congressman and a Senator. Farmers ought to remember that fact.

In 1964, with the strong backing of President Johnson, we passed a wheat certificate bill and a cotton bill. We put together a working political alliance, actively joining wheat and cotton producers in common cause. The new legislation was temporary, but it kept us going in the right direction.

Then came 1965—the critical year. All the commodity programs were expiring that year. We had to get on solid ground for the future. And we did.

Congress began debate on the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965—a 4-year bill, the first of its kind in our history. It provided a wheat certificate plan with 100 percent of parity for domestic wheat, plus a cotton program and a feed grain program. But still it gave us no real dairy program.

It was a tough fight. One farm organization opposed us. The millers and bakers fought the wheat program. They called it a "bread tax." They ran around Capitol Hill, distributing miniature loaves of bread with large *bread tax* labels on them. Our slogan was, "We will not bow down to the bread trust." We followed them and pinned the truth on them. I personally visited nearly every Congressional office.

Together we made it. At last agriculture had a 4-year farm program. It was not exactly what the President had recommended, but it was close to it. It was not the mandatory bushel-bale-pound approach I favored when I went to Washington. No, it was something worked out in the crucible of political fire. It was a kind of middle ground between a mandatory approach and a do-nothing approach. But it recognized that U.S. farmers possess a gigantic potential to over-produce, and that if we turned it loose the family farm would be threatened and perhaps would perish.

It was, and is, a farm program for a new era in agriculture.

It enables farmers to sell competitively; it sets loan rates at moderate levels so we won't price ourselves out of world markets.

It uses production payments to maintain farm income.

It ties production into acreage diversion when necessary for supply management.

It has a built-in crop insurance feature.

It encompasses government buying programs that will step up sharply when a bumper crop produces an oversupply.

It calls for a minimum of government participation. Government becomes a kind of referee, not a player on the field.

Farmers have more discretion in making their own farm plans than at any time since the early 1930's.

The year 1966 was a good one for farmers. We had new tools. It seemed that we were making the *New Era Farm Program* work as we had planned and hoped.

By late summer the wheat and feed grain surpluses were gone.

Farm gross income in 1966 was the highest in history—$49.5 billion—31 percent higher than in 1960.

Farm net income was $16.3 billion—40 percent above 1960.

Most significant of all, net income per farm reached a new peak of $5,024—70 percent more than in 1960.

Farmers were gaining on the rest of the economy. Their per capita income was still only two-thirds as much as that of nonfarm people. But, remember, in 1960 it was only 55 percent as much.

We were gaining also on the cost-price squeeze.

But now today—suddenly it seems—the bright outlook of last year is beclouded. Farm prices are down. Farm costs are up. Dairy producers are becoming desperate. Other producers are wondering what is in store for their prices—their incomes—their hopes for the future.

So I am here to get your advice—to get your counsel.

What can we do? What are the options?

We know that our options are not unlimited. We operate under certain definite laws so far as government action is concerned. We must work within these laws—or we must work to change the laws.

There are three basic options—three alternatives—before us. One is to swap the present voluntary programs for no program at all. Pending in Congress right now is a bill sponsored by the farm organization I mentioned previously. I point out to you that studies by our Department economists indicate that the "no-program" approach will cut farm income one-third below present levels. I point out further that this conclusion is concerned in by experts from nine Land-Grant Universities.

The second alternative is to return to a high price support program that establishes rigid, mandatory production controls on a pound, bushel, and bale basis. This has a certain appeal to some farmers because they can be sure that the price will remain at a level near, but historically below, the relatively high government loan. In 1962, and again in 1963, a majority of our grain farmers indicated they did not want to go this route. And in my judgment the Congress still would reject it.

The third alternative is to make the present programs—what I have called the New Era Programs—work. Under those programs we have been able to battle our way out from under smothering surpluses to bring the market more nearly into supply balance than it has been in half a century—to give the market more freedom from government influence than it has had for 30 years—to set new farm export records.

Now I want to ask you if the price turndown we have experienced to date in 1967 is enough to make you want to give up on a farm program that worked so well in its first year of trial.

I believe farm prices will strengthen later this year. I hope farm income may come close to last year's records.

We will effectively use purchase programs and other marketing aids to strengthen farm prices and income. Last year we bought more than $1.5 billion worth of wheat, flour, beef, pork, milk, feed grains, and fruits and vegetables to feed needy people at home and abroad. We expect to use the Federal Government's great buying power even more effectively this year.

But I believe that you—you, the farmers—can also do more. Your national and State organizations—general farm and commodity organizations alike—can do more to help you on marketing. They can do more to help the co-ops gain greater bargaining power.

You *need* this "green power" to negotiate with a single voice for the products of your fields and pastures. But *you* must demand it and speak with a common voice to do so.

It is my considered judgment that we now have the major tools to build a bigger, better, healthier American agriculture—if we give those tools a fair test. But perhaps we have overlooked some helpful action that we *could* take under existing law. Perhaps other means have not been used as effectively as possible. Perhaps, in some areas, whole new programs are needed to supplement those already on the books. Maybe new legislation is needed.

I assure you that every comment, every bit of advice, every word of criticism you care to offer will receive my closest attention. This is an action, "can-do" Administration. We are prepared to fight and act for justice to the farmer in 1967 as we have done since January 20, 1961.

AMERICA'S ABLE GENERAL SPEAKS OUT

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to commend General Westmoreland for his frank and eloquent address to a joint session of Congress. The General reiterated our Nation's determination to maintain its commitment to the people of South Vietnam until peace can be achieved.

President Johnson has made it clear that we will not back down in this commitment, and General Westmoreland has declared that we shall prevail until the Hanoi regime is ready and willing to negotiate.

It is clear, I think, that General Westmoreland was speaking not for himself—but for the thousands of brave young Americans fighting in Vietnam—when he asked for the Nation's support and understanding in the weeks and months ahead. I am sure that the President, the general and our forces in the field continue to rely upon the patience and determination of the American people.

It is my opinion that the 90th Congress will continue to support our efforts to provide freedom and security for the Republic of South Vietnam.

OUR SERVICE MEN AND WOMEN

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the current debate concerning the war in Vietnam, most of the discussion has concerned questions of our policies. Although there gratifyingly have been many expressions of support for those men of our military forces who are on the front lines implementing our policies, not too much attention actually has been given to the men and women themselves who compose our Military Establishment today.

An excellent commentary on this subject was carried recently as a broadcast editorial over radio station WNAX in Yankton, S. Dak. The editorial, written by Elmer F. Smith, president and general manager of WNAX, and aired by Bob Hill, WNAX news director, is deserving of public attention, and I request permission to include it in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the broadcast editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[A broadcast editorial of radio station WNAX, Yankton, S. Dak.]

Isn't it deplorable the way we have grown to accept and even ignore our men and women wearing the uniforms of our Armed Forces? All of us have indifferently observed men or women entering or already in the services of their country, assembled or alone in airports, depots, bus stations and other public places. Always it's the same. They stand alone and apart from our citizenry, as without any fanfare, they await their transportation routine. These present members of the Armed Forces, as a group, compare certainly as well, if not better, than their predecessors of a World War II vintage. In general, they conduct themselves with dignity, behave admirably and visit intelligently with the few people interested enough to strike up conversations with them. They are serious-looking individuals, apparently well aware of their possible one-way future pathway to our undeclared war in Viet Nam. Any group awaiting transportation is a composite profile of all races and financial backgrounds from cities, small towns and the farms from all portions of the "land of the free and the brave".

In almost all instances, citizen travelers, people meeting travelers and just miscellaneous others, in passing simply ignore the importance and presence of these protectors of our way of life. They represent the sad sacrifice of human beings, which our way of life continues to tolerate. They represent a noble group dedicatedly doing their duty in our presently, certainly outmoded solutions of solving world problems. While our inner-emotions hopefully reflect much more, our outward actions reflect less interest in our present-day service people than we bestow on the water coolers, the newstands, the refreshment bars, the TV sets or the restrooms! The service man or woman is usually left to his lonely and unsaluted group or self.

This editorial is not intended to dwell on the whys of an undeclared war or the whys, methods or necessities of a perpetual draft. It is concerned with the citizenry ordering these people off to do a dirty, dangerous job without even the recognition they constantly richly deserve. It is concerned primarily to the "why" a citizenry grows indifferent to its servicemen. Do any of us even know or care about their rate of pay? Does it meet the minimum wage requirements we legislatively bestow on our more fortunate selves? Does it have the built-in pensions and welfare plans we expect from civilian employers? So granted, we do not, and possibly will never become concerned with servicemen's plight to that degree. Could we not at least revive the treatment most of us enjoyed as service men or women in a declared war, such as World War II?

It is easy to recollect the 20 some years ago when a vast number of us entered the services in World War II through either the draft or enlistment. The school, the neighborhood, the businesses, the church and others all listing our names on rolls or scrolls of honor as we left. The company, the relatives and the friends were ever present with saluting parties and even farewell and good luck gifts. Remember the proud and appreciative groups that appeared at train stops and the various transportation interval places with coffee, donuts, cokes? Many churches sent out prayer books, and newspapers sent subscriptions as we left. The local newspaper and radio listed our names and followed our progress in the news. These remembered and appreciated actions continued throughout the duration of the World War II period.

Some commendable organizations continue to do good works in this direction . . . but do the rest of us? Once again, it would be great to see the informal, but appreciative, organizations at terminals with coffee, donuts, candy bars and a "good luck, you're appreciated" smile. It is as easy as it is necessary for Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions and other service clubs to host and salute present or future members of the Armed Forces at their regular lunch or dinner meetings. It is fitting and right that again rolls of honor appear in town squares, in businesses and in church and school halls. Radio, TV and newspapers should again search out and keep servicemen's happenings in the news and the public eye, at least to the extent of the coverage of the daily "fender bender" occurrence levels. Emphatically, this coverage should be continued from the serviceman's entrance through to his exit from the service!

Most important, let us hope that all of us as individuals will again do the things that servicemen of World War II vintage grew to expect and always appreciate. Let's again reflect our love and interest, as we share our conversations with our heroes. Let's nudge them a bit ahead of the rest of us in line for seats or reservations. Let's again offer the friendly coke, paper, a bit of conversation and at least a smile.

These service people of today are as big or bigger morally and courageously as their predecessors who wore the uniforms of World War II. Until we, as a world, quit blundering into the mistakes that force them into their military fate, let us at least do all in our power, singularly and in groups, to recognize and honor them as they so richly deserve.

A GALLANT KNIGHT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on April 5 I had the privilege of sponsoring a luncheon in the Vandenberg Room of the Capitol at which a bronze plaque in honor of the late Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg was unveiled. The plaque has been affixed to the wall of that room as a small but constant reminder to visitors to the Capitol of the significance of the Vandenberg Room.

Among the friends and former colleagues of Senator Vandenberg who attended the luncheon on April 5 was the distinguished Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, Dr. Frederick Brown Harris. In an article which appeared in the April 23 edition of the Washington Sunday Star, Dr. Harris recalled the Vandenberg era in eloquent prose. I commend Dr. Harris' article, entitled "A Gallant Knight—The Glory of His Time," to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT: A GALLANT KNIGHT—THE GLORY OF HIS TIME

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

While standing at his desk in the United States Senate on January 1, 1945, Arthur H. Vandenberg delivered an historic proposition. Its majesty echoed around the world! Here it was that he pointed the world towards a new era in American foreign policy. Here, he proclaimed, "I want the oak to stand and I want the branches to grow." Here, with trumpet tones this legislator cried, "Our oceans have ceased to be moats which automatically protect our ramparts. We cannot drift to victory! We must have maximum united effort on all fronts and we must have maximum inner union in our councils and our people." That fervent voice in the Senate did much to cause the nation to change from the symbol of isolationism to internationalism.

Senator Vandenberg played a prominent role in the establishment of the United Nations. He did much to guide through the Senate the Marshall Plan. The implementation of the Atlantic Pact was the subject of his last speech in the Senate. Later the proud son of this illustrious father, who had listened to that address, was to declare, "Here led the emergence of a new and unique figure in the history of American foreign policy."

Now a score of years have elapsed since the death of this towering statesman. And in the current session of the Senate the junior senator from Michigan recently declared, "the name of Arthur Vandenberg is still on every tongue as a synonym for bipartisanship."

There was a sentence that gripped the public and private life of Arthur H. Vandenberg. On his desk always was the motto, "This, too, shall pass." It was a constant reminder that the day's shouting headlines are likely to make a noise out of proportion to their importance. At the screaming vehemence of the hour, this little sign on the desk seemed always to have a sort of knowing Mona Lisa smile as if conscious that the present, with an air of finality, often took itself too seriously.

This gallant knight gazing gratefully at the little motto on his broad desk—over which moved such knotty problems—declared to friends that the almost unendurable pressures and tensions of the present were relieved by the ultimate wisdom of the little words, "This, too, shall pass."

When Senator Vandenberg had gone on out of great tribulation, one of his senatorial colleagues, with moving eloquence, said of him: "I like to think that during his travail at the end, he had the helpful remembrance of that litle motto on his desk. 'This, too shall pass', and that the engulfing shadows would lead to the eternal radiance ahead."

It is a matter of national significance that in the Capitol, the shrine of each patriot's devotion, there has been now erected a memorial remembrance to this great statesman. It is a simple plaque attached to the wall of a room where constant crowds will pass across all the years, from all the states and all the world. The bronze plate announces—

"This room is dedicated to Arthur H. Vandenberg, United States Senator from Michigan, March 31, 1928 to April 18, 1951; President pro tempore of the Senate January 4, 1947 to January 3, 1949."

On April 6 of this year, when it was cherry blossom time in Washington, there gathered at the luncheon table in this designed room, where he had often sat with friends, a choice company who had known and revered this gallant knight. There were Democrats and Republicans from the Senate and the House well known in the Republic's life, and also members of the Vandenberg family. There were also those members from the fourth estate who had known and admired him from the day he became editor of the Grand Rapids Herald at age 22 years. If all who crowded the room had been able to extol with their grateful hearts the one they had come to honor, the occasion would have continued until the day had gone. Praise was meted for his consecration, his courage, his integrity, his boundless energy, his stewardship of human need, his patriotism—as wide as the nation's bounds and the world's need—whose compassion for humanity knew no frontier and who never allowed the lure of things to live with to surpass the glory and glow of the things worth living for.

It was a notable hour, like the sound of a great AMEN, as those so privileged to be there uttered something of what he was, of what he did, and what he said. At last, at that which seems a benediction, the daughters were asked to unveil the plaque memorializing this historical room as the Arthur H. Vandenberg Room in the Nation's Capitol. To this lovely remembrance might well be added, "This, too, shall pass." And, these other winged words of another—

> *"Of weariness and fear,*
> *I made my shining spear,*
> *Of loss and doubt and dread,*
> *And swift oncoming doom,*
> *I made a Helmet for my head*
> *And a Purple plume."*

BISHOP GORDON ASKS SOME PERTINENT QUESTIONS OF VITAL CONCERN TO ALL AMERICANS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an extremely thoughtful address on "The State of the Church" was delivered by the Right Reverend William J. Gordon, Jr., Episcopal bishop of Alaska in the Fifth Clergy-Lay Convocation of the Missionary District of Alaska on April 21, 1967. Bishop Gordon meets squarely the question as to whether the clergy should or should not speak out on matters that may seem not to be directly related to theological issues.

Inevitably, this question leads to a frank appraisal of our military involvement and performance in Vietnam. He says, among other things:

It would seem that before a nation as powerful as ours could justify itself in raining down destruction upon the relatively helpless people of a semi-primitive country on the other side of the world, we should be able to cite clear and convincing proof that such action is unavoidable and necessary to the larger welfare of mankind. Such is not clear to many of our own people and almost none of the other peoples of the world. Second, we have made no real effort to turn the Vietnamese question over to the United Nations for solution. This cannot be for lack of confidence in the United Nations' ability to settle disputes, or police truces, for that ability has been amply demonstrated. It can only be because we know that our position has little support among the other nations of the world, and that the U.N. solution might not be to our liking. These two thoughts lead to a final question. Are we truly seeking to assure to the peoples of Southeast Asia the right of political self-determination, or are we seeking to establish there a *pax Americana?*

This is a most heartwarming and constructive approach to the most vital issue confronting the American people not merely today but perhaps in all our history.

I earnestly commend a reading of the excerpt from Bishop Gordon's address to my colleagues and others. I ask unanimous consent that the except from his address on "The State of the Church" be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE STATE-OF-THE-CHURCH ADDRESS

(By the Rt. Rev. William J. Gordon, Jr.)

One cannot speak of the state of the Church in Alaska without a searching look at the world, and one cannot look at the world without looking face to face at the unholy tensions that face us every hour of our lives these trying days. We hear much these days that the Church should stay out of affairs of state, that we cannot possibly know enough in order to have informed opinions, so we should leave all political decisions to statesmen and those that are in government who have access to more of the facts and figures involved than we do. I agree that the Church cannot in these complex situations very often say "Thus saith the Lord", but I do believe with all my heart that the Church must be involved and has a right to speak in the name of the Lord and in the name of what is right and what is wrong, and what is good and what is bad, and what is true and what is false. We recognize the right of our government to have its advisers on military policy who are primarily concerned with military operations, and to have advisers in economics and political affairs of relationships between states, and those who make the final decisions are all advised by men who represent particularly these areas.

Human beings, being fallible, are also prone to be prejudiced in their own spheres, and to look exclusively from their own point of view, or largely exclusively. And I do believe that it is right and proper that those who specifically represent our Lord and His Church in these days have a commission and a commitment to speak out on what we believe is right and wrong, divorced from political or military considerations or specifically economic considerations in relationships between nations. I say again, we cannot say, "Thus saith the Lord", because we do not know. And we cannot speak for all Christians or any Christians except ourselves, but we can speak to Christians and among Christians, and I passionately believe it is our responsibility to be involved—to seek answers even though we cannot be sure—and then to become involved. I quote Pastor Martin Niemoller:

"In Germany they first came for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came for the Jews, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew. Then they came for the trade unionists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me—and by that time no one was left to speak up."

I believe that we are called to speak so that those who make decisions may also hear a point of view that we believe within our own human frailties and our own doubts and questionings and our own lack of love, is based on the pure Christian ethic of right and wrong as near as we can ascertain it. This leads to the whole problem of our involvement in Vietnam.

This is a political, an economic and a military problem, but above all, and agonizingly so, it is an ethical problem, where there is no clear right and wrong. I do not pretend that I have much wisdom that is not shared by you—that I have any answers to the Vietnam situation—any real answers. But I do not believe anybody else does either. I believe every man is questioning, and I think we all need to seek the other person's point of view. We all need to formulate an opinion realizing that it cannot be final. And so I dare here tonight as your Bishop, to speak—not for you; not laying down a party line; not in any way saying that this is a committed Christian line, because I know that many other committed Christians, who are more committed than I am, would have a differing point of view.

I suspect from what I read from the headlines of the Anchorage paper that Bishop Dean would differ basically from what I believe. And this, I think, is great, because I hope very much that while he is here he will speak from his knowledge and experience, and from his heart, that we may hear this. (If it is another point of view, I am sure the differences are probably basically the same.) Fortunately his jurisdiction is 10,000 miles away from here so it doesn't make any difference if he does disagree! I think it is wonderful and this is what I am trying to say—that we need to say what we believe, not in an argumentative way, not trying to win somebody over, not trying to sell our point of view, but sharing the little bit of insight and knowledge that we have with every man, and then coming to some place where we can take a stand. Because the great tendency in our day, in our world, is to drift because we cannot be sure enough to do anything, and we let other people who may be even less sure than we are make all the decisions. And so I believe that Christian should seek all information and knowledge he can possibly find, and on the basis of this take a stand as a Christian. Not "Thus saith the Lord"; that this is the Christian point of view; that you *have* to do this if you are a Christian—but as one Christian, seeking honestly, selflessly, what God would have me do, and have my country do, with all the knowledge that I know, and really seeking knowledge, saying "On the basis of what I know, this is what I believe".

I don't pretend to tell Alaska's Episcopalians or anyone else how they must stand as a Christian on this issue, but I do feel that we must ultimately make some sort of commitment and not simply stand aside because the issue is too complex. This is something all of us must be, and are, involved in, since it is our country that is involved.

First of all, I think that the Church must deplore the insinuation that all who question our involvement in Vietnam are in some ways lesser citizens, or disloyal in some way to those men who are fighting in Vietnam. Certainly any effort we could make to bring them home on an honorable basis cannot be construed as disloyal and not fully supporting these men who are enduring great privations for us.

Here again, I want to reiterate, I cannot and do not expect to lay down a party line. And *this* is certainly not *the* Christian line. Many, many committed Christians differ widely on the question of our involvement. I do not say in any way that any person is less committed—I say again—because he differs from me. But I do feel constrained to share my views briefly with you.

I think there is serious question about the wisdom of our early involvement in Vietnam following the Geneva Conference more than ten years ago, when many authorities in our country undoubtedly felt that we had, at any cost, to keep Vietnam from going Communist. I am sure that this was an honest decision on their part. And there was obviously a very strong feeling that in free elections the result would be that Vietnam would go Communist, and so I believe we used our influence at that time to prevent this from taking place. This has led eventually to the present escalation in which we are fighting a war against Communism largely with the Vietnamese as the context.

I think a great many people feel now that we should not be in Vietnam in a military way, but since we *are there* they cannot see any way of our getting out honorably, and so endorse our being there. I believe, and here again in my limited knowledge, that we should admit to ourselves that we should not become more involved than we are, and that we should make every effort, possibly through the United Nations and other sources, to become militarily uninvolved; to seek other means of settling the Vietnamese situation, even at the cost of the country *possibly* going Communist.

I feel this way because I do not believe that we can win a military victory, even though we achieve an overwhelming military triumph. We are fighting for an intangible something that cannot be won by force because it must be won within the hearts and minds of men. Even should a military victory be in sight and might be achieved, it could simply be a sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal for all that we cherish and seek in this small but very precious part of God's kingdom on earth.

I simply ask of you, not that you agree with me, but that you honestly ask yourselves what our Lord would have us do as a nation and individually in this tragic, horror-filled situation, and then go forth and stand and seek and wrestle.

I would like to share with you a very brief statement on this subject written by a man that some of you know, who was once rector of this parish, whom I believe is one of the deepest and most penetrating thinkers of our Church at this time, Gordon Charlton.

He asks that we—that his people, and I agree, that they in all this think of two questions. First it would seem that before a nation as powerful as ours could justify itself in raining down destruction upon the relatively helpless people of a semi-primitive country on the other side of the world, we should be able to cite clear and convincing proof that such action is unavoidable and necessary to the larger welfare of mankind. Such is not clear to many of our own people and almost none of the other peoples of the world. Second, we have made no real effort to turn the Vietnamese question over to the United Nations for solution. This cannot be for lack of confidence in the United Nations' ability to settle disputes, or police truces, for that ability has been amply demonstrated. It can only be because we know that our position has little support among the other nations of the world, and that the U.N. solution might not be to our liking. These two thoughts lead to a final question. Are we truly seeking to assure to the peoples of Southeast Asia the right of political self-determination, or are we seeking to establish there a *pax Americana?*

Enough!

MOUNTING TENSIONS IN THE NEAR EAST

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, yesterday the United States began the evacuation of Yemen by American citizens. The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] last week presented a thoughtful and knowledgeable analysis of the dangerous situation in the Near East. He stated that because of the limited effectiveness of the United Nations in the area and the fact that the British are removing their bases of military operations, the United States remains the prime deterrent to war in the Near East. He suggested that a parallel existed between this situation and the French pullout of Vietnam, and said that if war did erupt the United States would be left holding the bag.

I am concerned with the mounting tensions in the Near East and I believe that our Government is not giving sufficient attention to this highly explosive problem. I strongly endorse the request for public hearings by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to focus the spotlight on the following issues:

First. The strategic and political implications of U.K. withdrawal from Aden.

Second. The possibility of the United States, the United Kingdom, and France reaffirming their commitments under the Tripartite Guarantee Pact of 1950 to keep the peace and maintain existing territorial boundaries.

Third. Proposals to the Soviet Union to de-escalate the arms race in the Near East.

Fourth. The future role of the U.N. in Near East peacekeeping operations.

Fifth. Aid to the terrorist Palestine Liberation Organization through UNRWA aid to Arab refugees.

It would be tragic indeed if inaction now led us into a military involvement which could have been settled beforehand at a conference table.

I urge hearings and a general debate in the Senate to explore the issues and alert the Nation to the need for prompt attention to this vital area of the world.

INDIANS APPRECIATE OEO

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the Office of Economic Opportunity has been of particular benefit in Indian country. Many tribal members have told me of the way in which they and their families have been able to acquire new skills, better jobs, and fuller lives through various OEO programs. This appreciation of the agency's role has also been attested by witnesses before the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, headed by the distinguished senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark].

The April 25 issue of the New York Times contains an article written by Joseph A. Loftus on the testimony presented to the subcommittee during one of its recent field hearings. I ask unanimous consent that the article, headed "Indians Acclaim Poverty Agency," be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Indians Acclaim Poverty Agency—Spokesmen Tell Senate Unit Programs Spur Progress

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

Albuquerque, N. Mex., April 24.—An Indian tribal representative told a Senate subcommittee today that the antipoverty program had "brought a sense of dignity, responsibility, enthusiasm and desire to people who were almost completely without hope in the depths of poverty."

The spokesman, Vine Deloria Jr. of the Standing Rock Sioux, and two other tribal representatives said the program had alerted the Bureau of Indian Affairs and other old-line agencies to Indian needs.

The trend began in the early nineteen-sixties, said Mr. Deloria, who is executive director of the National Congress of American Indians. He did not identify the earlier programs but said that the "war on poverty greatly accelerated this trend."

"When Indian tribes became eligible as sponsoring agencies themselves under the Indian desk in the Office of Economic Opportunity," he said, "other agencies who had felt they had 'cornered the market' on Indian programs suddenly found themselves in competition with the Indian community action program.

"WAITING FOR CRUMBS

"For the first time in many years these agencies had to become competitive to survive. No longer would an Indian be required to wait, hat in hand, outside an office of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or Public Health Service waiting for a few crumbs to fall his way. Instead he could form his own programs and get funding through the O.E.O. and begin to make real plans for progress for his people."

Other agencies he criticized were the employment service, which is a collection of state agencies responsible in part to the Labor Department, and the Small Business Administration.

When, he added, "it looks as though they can get additional funds and build additional empires on the state and regional level, suddenly Indians are very important to them. In this past year as the different programs, developed under or original with O.E.O., have been spun off to other agencies, we have had a proliferation of agencies all trying to 'get into the Indian business.' So we are about to be saddled with a series of regional, state and local bureaucracies for every program that we have eligibility for.”

A loan program for poor entrepreneurs has been taken away from the Office of Economic Opportunity, and some training programs have been delegated to the Labor Department.

“The genius of early development of programs under the economic opportunity act,” said Mr. Deloria, “was that Indian people were not required to go to a state office, then a regional office, then a district office, then finally a national office simply to get to the Labor Department.”

NEW AGENCY WELCOMED

Al Spang, a member of the Northern Cheyenne tribe of Montana who is working for his doctorate, said:

“The Indian people, who have lived with, functioned under, and fought with old-line established agencies for years, welcome the opportunity to work with an agency that is not burdened with manuals, regulations, and red tape. We know that these established agencies are project-oriented rather than people oriented, a realization that ought to startle all Congressional Representatives into reality and fight for the continued existence of O.E.O.”

Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania, a champion of family planning programs financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity, encountered the Indian insistence on self-determination when he questioned the wisdom of the reproduction rate of reservations.

“At the moment,” said Ronnie Lupe, an Apache tribal chairman from White River, Ariz., “I would discourage such a program” as family planning.

“Why?” asked Senator Clark.

“I would like the Indians to outnumber the foreigners,” the witness replied. The audience laughed.

Senator Clark, chairman of the Subcommittee, on Manpower Employment and Poverty, conducted the hearing in the spacious lobby of the Civic Auditorium with an audience of about 500. Indian representatives came from South Dakota, Montana, Arizona and New Mexico. Most of the Indians wore conventional clothing, though there was a sprinkling of tribal dress.

Senator Clark had lunch with seven enrollees at a Women's Job Corps center, who gave him a generally favorable report of the center's curriculum and conduct.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

THE RIGHT AND RESPONSIBILITY TO DISSENT

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, events of recent days prompt me to address the Senate today on the subject of “The Right and Responsibility To Dissent.” James Reston, in his column in the New York Times for Friday, April 28, 1967, discusses the importance of the right of dissent within the heritage of American constitutionalism and its guarantees of freedom.

I shall quote part of Reston's article as a fitting introduction to my remarks. Reston wrote:

> When Secretary of Defense McNamara was asked this week whether he agreed with Westmoreland's public observation that the critics of the Vietnam war were “helping the enemy,” he replied: “I have long spoken in favor of free speech in this country. . . . It's what we have fought for for 200 years, domestically and internationally, and I would not like to see any action taken to in any way restrict it.
>
> McNamara carries in his pocketbook a quotation from the late Judge Learned Hand, which reads as follows:
>
> “I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed . . . is a mark of disaffection . . . where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where the faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists to win or lose.
>
> “Such fears as these are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together; they may in the end subject us to a despotism as evil as any that we dread; and they can be allayed only insofar as we refuse to proceed on suspicion, and trust one another until we have tangible ground for misgiving. The mutual confidence on which all else depends can be maintained only by an open mind and a brave reliance upon free discussion. . . .”

I would have those who want to squelch dissent, I would have those in this administration who are seeking to give the false impression that those of us who dare to point out to the American people that this is an illegal, immoral, and unjustifiable war, as we seek, as dissenters, to change ourselves from a minority into a majority, read and reread this great pronouncement of the precious right and the importance of dissent, handed down by the great Judge Learned Hand.

No one in this administration or in the Senate or in the House of Representatives or in the Pentagon, and no one in the American military uniform, will have the slightest influence on the senior Senator from Oregon in dissenting against a foreign policy in connection with the Vietnam war that, in my judgment, threatens the destiny of the Republic. In my judgment, if we continue this escalation in Southeast Asia, we will end up in a massive war in Asia, which can be the prelude to world war III, out of which the United States will not survive.

The historian, Carl Van Doren, tells us that when the printed Constitution was presented to the Convention at Philadelphia, Benjamin Franklin “at once rose with a speech in his hand” and addressed the delegates in these words:

> Having lived long, I have experienced many instances of being obliged by better information or fuller consideration, to change opinions even on important subjects. . . . The older I grow, the more apt I am to doubt my own judgment, and to pay more respect to to judgment of others. Most men as well as most sects in religion, think themselves in possession of all truth, and that wherever others differ from them, it is error (to that extent). . . . A Protestant churchman, Franklin continued, is said to have remarked humorously to a Catholic friend that the only difference between our churches in their opinions . . . is that the Church of Rome is infallible (while) the Church of England is never in the wrong.

Beyond Franklin's wry and wonderful wit, however, was his usual wisdom. The Americans of that age would have been attuned to the gentle reminder that the origins of the word “dissent” can be traced back, as Webster's Dictionary informs us, to differing “from an established church in regard to doctrines, rites, or government.”

The roots of the word “dissent” are in French and Latin: dis-sentire; to think or feel differently. I would aline myself with Franklin's suggestion that the function of dissent is to keep our Government and its institutions open to “better and fuller consideration.”

A more recent statement of this view was contained in an article by Henry Steele Commager in the Saturday Review issue of December 18, 1965, in which he wrote:

> The point is that when a nation silences criticism and dissent, it deprives itself of the power to correct its errors. . . .
>
> It cannot be too often repeated that the justification and the purpose of freedom of speech is not to indulge those who want to speak their minds. *It is to prevent error and discover truth*. There may be other ways of detecting error and discovering truth than that of free discussion, but so far we have not found them.

It is this means of discovering truth that is supposed to distinguish us from all totalitarian forms of government, including Communist forms. To the charge that debate and dissent misleads an enemy into thinking we may abandon a policy, he replies:

> If government, or those in positions of power and authority, can silence criticism by the argument that such criticism might be misunderstood somewhere, then there is an end to all criticism, and perhaps an end to our kind of political system. For men in authority will always think that criticism of their policies is dangerous. They will always equate their policies with patriotism, and find criticism subversive.
>
> And as for the argument that criticism may give aid and comfort to some enemy, that is a form of blackmail unworthy of those who profess it. If it is to be accepted, we have an end to genuine discussion of foreign policies, for it will inevitably be invoked to stop debate and criticism whenever that debate gets acrimonious or the criticism cuts too close to the bone. And to the fevered mind of the FBI, the CIA, and some Senators, criticism always gives aid and comfort to the enemy or cuts too close to the bone.

This is what the Supreme Court was talking about in its free speech case of West Virginia against Barnett. That was the famous flag salute case, and it is appropriate to recall that the Supreme Court upheld the right of the child not to salute the national flag. Justice Robert Jackson spoke for the Court, and he said:

> Freedom to differ is not limited to things that do not matter much. That would be the mere shadow of freedom. The test of its substance is the right to differ as to things that touch the heart of the existing order.

It is for this reason that our infant States adopted the Bill of Rights as the first 10 amendments to the Constitution. They were meant to serve as a guarantee of public freedom to dissent—freedom of speech and of the press. They knew that to assure these freedoms was a bulwark against mistakes on the part of the Government as much as a protection for the personal freedom of individuals.

However, if we refer again to the elements of the word “dissent,” it may be possible to discern another meaning. The dissenter is a person who feels or thinks differently. I venture to suggest that to allow dissent is to foster difference; to criticize dissent is to penalize difference; and to ban dissent is, in the extreme, an attempt to eradicate differences in thinking and feeling.

It seems to me that a society's attitude toward dissent is a pretty good barometer of its regard for the private individual human personality, as well as the public institutions of democracy.

The public expression of views by word, or gesture, or action, represents even a smaller proportion of the thinking and feeling of which we have been speaking. When these feelings rise to the level of group or political action, something remarkable has happened.

The instances of dissent which gain public attention are, of course, the dramatic actions of the political type. Declaring the independence of a band of colonies with a population of some 3 million from the then most powerful nation in the world possesses all the elements of drama. The lives, fortunes, and sacred honor of all of our citizens were at stake. The authority of two governments was placed in direct conflict. The contest would be settled by the clash of arms, with clear benefits to the winners and serious consequences to the losers.

Such action and such drama are rarely equaled, and yet they have their echoes in the conflicts which are associated with every decision of public policy, in every confrontation between our citizens and the rules and regulations of our governments and other institutions and authorities.

INCONVENIENCES OF DISSENT

It may be instructive to take some less stirring but more familiar and current examples and see how these general principles apply to situations in which dissent might be characterized as either a use or misuse.

One reason for opposing dissent is that it is not convenient. I recall one afternoon in 1954 when a bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act came before the Senate. The leadership asked that this bill be passed by unanimous consent that afternoon, a procedure which can greatly expedite consideration of legislation, but which, as the term implies, can be foiled by the objection of any one Senator.

Well, this bill—I remember it so well—was over 100 pages long. Furthermore, I was satisfied that not 12 Members of the Senate had read it. Yet, the proposal of the majority leader was to get a unanimous-consent agreement to pass it that very afternoon.

The House of Representatives had passed it earlier that day with less than 1½ hours of debate. It was not a minor bill. It involved an attempt on the part of the administration to give away practically for nothing an investment of the taxpayers of more than $14 billion in the atomic energy program that had been developed during the war at the expense of the American taxpayer. It was a bill that sought to give to the private utilities of this country an unwarranted and unjustifiable giveaway at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Therefore, it should not have been surprising that the senior Senator from Oregon objected. The then-majority leader, the Senator from California, Mr. Knowland, was not very happy with that objection. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will speak for itself but I wish to paraphrase what happened.

Within the rules, the majority leader was very critical of me. As I recall, somewhere in the course of that colloquy he made the statement that I could either give him that unanimous-consent request or start talking because he was not going to let the Senator from Oregon set up a one-man dictatorship in the Senate.

I suggested to the majority leader that he make a proposal then and there to abolish the unanimous-consent rules of the Senate. "That is what you are proposing, really," I said. "I want to tell the Senator from California—the majority leader—how many votes he will not get."

We then had a membership of 96 Senators, because Alaska and Hawaii were not admitted to statehood. I said, "The Senator from California will not get 95 votes, and if he will reflect a bit he will not get his own vote, because it will finally dawn on him that if it is the Senator from Oregon today it may be the Senator from California tomorrow if you abolish the unanimous-consent rule." I was not going to let this unanimous-consent request go through without adequate debate. I did not convince him.

He made clear that I could give him a consent agreement or start talking. I obliged him. I made my case. Some called my argument a filibuster and were extremely critical of it. That never stopped me from dissenting. As Senators know, I never involve myself in a filibuster without first offering the Morse antifilibustering resolution. I never have takers. The Morse antifilibuster resolution gives the assurance that there will be a final vote on a bill. I will never participate in a filibuster that seeks to prevent a vote from ever occurring, but I will participate in a filibuster to prevent the type of steamroller that the majority leader sought to run through the Senate on that fateful afternoon in 1954.

I started that filibuster. I remember it as though it were yesterday. I had been going on for 2 hours when many of my colleagues started to go by my desk and drop their slips. As we know this happens when one of these prairie fires or unexpected filibusters starts on the floor of the Senate. Senators drop slips saying, "Put me down for 2 hours," or "Put me down for 4 hours," or "Put me down for 6 hours." I can remember the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, now the Vice President, dropped down a slip, "Put me down for 10 hours." He delivered, too.

Before long I had a pile of slips and they made clear to the leadership that we were in for a prolonged debate. The RECORD will show that we debated the atomic energy bill in 1954 for 13 days and 6 long nights. I held down the graveyard shift for two of those nights, as my distinguished friend from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] has just whispered to me.

Mr. President, one of the purposes of this type of dissent is to notify the country of what is going on in the Senate. That is one of the reasons I have been dissenting on the floor of the Senate for three and a half years in connection with what I consider to be an unconscionable war in Vietnam, where not a single American boy should ever have been sent, and in the killing of whom our Government is without the slightest justification because in my opinion we never should have involved the armed services in that war at all.

That is dissent, but it is also a constitutional trust of each and every Senator under the oath that he took that if he is satisfied that a policy that is being followed by his country is not in the public interest, he should dissent from it.

That is why I said earlier in this speech that I am going to continue to dissent in regard to this war until my Government seeks to change its policy, in the hope—and there is growing evidence that my hope is not hopeless—that the American people will finally become fully informed and advised in regard to the shocking and inexcusable mistakes that this country has made in getting into that war in the first place.

The American people are the ones who should control foreign policy. They will ultimately make clear to this Government, as the French people did in 1954, when they warned Mendes France to get them out of that war or they would change their governmental administration.

If this escalation continues, increasing the number of American boys who are slaughtered in Vietnam, I hope that the people will make clear to our Government that they are going to use their votes to change our foreign policy.

Mr. President, dissent of that kind can get results. After the third day of the debate on the atomic energy bill, Senators began to have a change of mind. I shall cite the eloquent and brilliant statement of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] which he made during that debate. After the filibuster started the bill was read and analyzed by every Senator. Senator SPARKMAN had this to say about the effects of the bill:

> In other words, these (few) private power and industrial companies (who would receive the rights to develop atomic energy under the bill) want to determine who should be licensed to receive the benefits of discoveries and inventions financed primarily by the Federal Government also what price they should pay to receive these benefits. This is a tremendous amount of power which could be used to stifle competition by excluding small producers and distributors of electricity. . . . In my mind, this is the meat, the core, of the legislation. . . . There are other issues, but we must not lose sight of the big show—the attempt of these industrial giants to obtain exclusive private patents.

The debate did turn into a big show, and obstructed the business of the Senate for a considerable time. But, when Senator after Senator joined in the opposition to this proposal, it was substantially amended to provide that the Atomic Energy Commission would retain the patents developed by expenditure of taxpayers' dollars and would make the improvements in technology available to all responsible parties.

As a result, our Nation has enjoyed an atomic energy program which has excited the admiration of the world. Less developed countries have sent representatives flocking to our shores to learn how we have managed to advance this resource which is of such importance to world peace and development.

We have even surprised our business community with the speed of its progress. An article in the Wall Street Journal of March 15, 1967, reported:

> In 1966 about half the [electric utility] capacity ordered was nuclear, a far larger proportion than manufacturers had anticipated. General Electric alone has orders equal to ten times the amount of nuclear [generating equipment] currently operating in the United States.

Because of the 1954 dissent, or filibuster, nuclear power has come faster and at lower cost to the people of this country and the world than if a few companies controlled it and could charge monopoly prices.

Many people in 1954 might have characterized the debate as a needless inconvenience. But what was really involved was a question of economic justice.

A second disadvantage of dissent may be that it is often not comfortable. It is universally painful to rethink established premises, especially when the process requires consideration of unpleasant facts.

For a long time, national commitments to medicare and various poverty programs were avoided and delayed, partially because their consideration involved the recognition that there were large numbers of elderly persons or poor persons or minorities for whom our society was not adequately providing.

In the Saturday Review article previously mentioned, Mr. Commager informs us:

> The dominant forces of Southern life, by the 1840's . . . adopted a policy . . . of silencing criticism . . . teachers who attacked slavery were deprived of their posts . . . editors who raised their voices lost their papers . . . clergymen were forced out of their pulpits . . . books were burned. In the end [these forces] got their way: critics were silenced. The South closed its ranks against critics, and closed its mind . . .

Then came the explosion which wracked the Republic and placed in doubt the very survival of our Nation.

It is doubtlessly uncomfortable to hear out the dissenters when cherished myths or institutions or policies are questioned. But often the causes are deeply embedded in questions of social justice.

A third objection to dissent is that it can be distressingly unmannerly. Is there an answer to the men who argue thus? "Even if they have a point, they are dirty and unkempt and their methods are disorderly and disruptive, and they are therefore abusing the privilege."

It is my experience that the well-to-do in society have a variety of respectable organizations through which their protests and their proposals can be refined and presented at the pinnacles of power.

For example, medical societies make a considerable effort on the health issues, businessmen maintain trade associations in Washington, D.C., which are quite alert to legislative developments affecting their economic interests, and do not hesitate to make their views known. It is pertinent to note that these organizations and representatives are supported by funds that are tax deductible to the businesses, and that if a businessman comes to Washington to lobby his Congressman, many of these expenses are deductible.

Mr. President, let me make clear that I have no quarrel with lobbies. On the contrary, I do not happen to be of the liberal group that seems to think there should be some restrictions placed on lobbying. Usually, those restrictions would seek to really prevent lobbying. Lobbying performs a very important function in our legislation system. Although it is sometimes referred to as the third house of Congress, I do not take that attitude toward it. The only question in regard to lobbying representation, of course, is "What are the facts?" Give me the facts to support the claim. If those facts will stand up under my analysis in support of the action they want to take on a bill, for or against it, I will follow where the facts lead.

I have been helped and aided many times by so-called legislative representations by businesses, by labor, by agriculture groups, and by various women's organizations which have come before us and presented their points of view in regard to legislation.

The problem lies with Members of Congress and members of State legislatures who do not follow where the facts lead, but yield to the undue pressure of some economic lobbying groups. That is not the fault of the lobbies. That is the fault of the voters who made such poor selections in electing their legislators.

It goes right straight back to the voters. If they elect men who are so weak-kneed or who find it politically expedient to walk out on what the facts dictate because they think they may get more votes from some lobbying group if they surrender their intellectual honesty, then that is the fault of the voters who elected such men.

There is no doubt about the fact that the rich and powerful—through their ability to make their protests, representations, and petitions known to the Federal Government—have an infinite variety of ways and means to make their wishes known.

The poor, weak, and unorganized—the coal miners of Appalachia, the migratory laborers, the urban ghetto dwellers—do not have as many options. Should we penalize them for their weakness or poverty or lack of sophistication?

One of my duties in the Senate is as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education. We have a great national commitment to the educational process. We are now spending nearly $40 billion on all facets and levels of education in this country—a remarkable achievement. We pin particular hopes for the future on our universities. But, listen to this commentary:

> Education [is] by its very nature an individual matter . . . It does not produce people who instinctively go the same way . . . [yet] our millions learn the same lessons and spend hours before television sets looking at exactly the same thing at exactly the same time. For one reason or another, we are more and more ignoring differences. We seem headed toward what Goethe called "The deadly commonplace that fetters us all."

Does that sound like a rally at Berkeley? It was written by Edith Hamilton, one of our eminent classicists.

Let me read a student's remarks at a recent California Board of Regents meeting:

> We have asked to be heard. You have refused. We have asked for justice. You have called it anarchy. We have asked for freedom. You have called it license . . . You have accused us of failing to use legitimate channels. But you have closed those channels to us. You, and not we, have built a university based on distrust and dishonesty.

Whatever the merits of the controversies, it is impossible to mistake the anguish of that voice—the crying out of individuality against the corporate bureaucracy of the university, where this student alleged human beings do not seem to matter.

Yes, the methods of dissent may sometimes be crude and disorderly, but at the bottom there are basic questions of individual justice.

Now I come to the fourth, and probably the most insidious, objection to dissent—that it is unpatriotic in a time of crisis.

There are persuasive arguments on this score. I will summarize them as fairly as I can. One point is that once American boys are engaged on the field of battle, we owe it to them to back them verbally for morale reasons, as well as materially and in every other way. Another is that dissent may prolong the conflict or a crisis by giving an opponent the impression the American people are divided, so that if they hold out long enough, our country will throw in the sponge.

Let us examine these assertions closely. To begin with, students of history are aware that we have rarely been far from a crisis of sufficient magnitude to call, in the eyes of some zealots, for the suspension of dissent. There was the alien and sedition law of the Adams' administration, the War of 1812, the Know Nothings, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Philippine Insurrection, the Boxer Rebellion, World War I, the Bolshevik threats of the twenties and fifties, not to mention World War II, the Berlin blockade, Korea, and southeast Asia.

It may surprise some of you to know that the United States is still in a "state of national emergency" declared by the President in June 1950.

It therefore seems clear that to suspend debate in every national crisis, or even when any shooting starts, would do violence to our democratic institutions. Congress might find itself periodically out of a job.

As to the allegation that the fighting is prolonged, it seems to me that all a President needs to do is to explain simply that, in a democracy, what counts is votes.

As to the dissenters who have been protesting our foreign policy in southeast Asia which has resulted in our intervention in the domestic affairs of South Vietnam, the point is that we are now conducting a major war with the use of more than 435,000 American military personnel.

In fact, I think the latest figures put the number at close to 450,000.

I wish to quote a dissenter on this

subject who makes a conservative out of me. I refer to Gen. David M. Shoup, formerly Commandant of the entire U.S. Marine Corps. Here is a military man who knows what war is. Here is a great military leader who has led American troops to battle. Here is a great American military leader who also knows what war means in Asia as far as the involvement of non-Asiatic troops are concerned.

He spoke at the 10th annual Junior College World Affairs Day at Pierce College, Los Angeles, on May 14, 1966. Senator VANCE HARTKE, of Indiana, inserted his speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD under date of February 20, 1967, and it will be found on page 3974.

No one can challenge the authoritative qualifications of my witness when I call on General Shoup. He knows men, he knows military strategy, he knows the cause-to-effect relationship of American foreign policy to the security of American troops. Listen to what he said in his speech of May 14, 1966. Throughout his speech he stressed that there is much confusion in regard to our policy in Southeast Asia. In the excerpts I am quoting the words "confusing" or "confused" are repeated by the general because he was relating the points he made to his general thesis concerning the overall confusing nature of our policies in Vietnam.

The excerpts I have taken, I can assure you, are not out of context but only illustrate accurately the general tenor of his speech. Let me quote some of his statements:

> You learn that when military forces are fighting and killing and maiming each other with rifles, cannon, napalm, and bombs, that that's war. There's something of that kind going on now but confusingly enough this isn't war.

Of course, the general was referring to the fact that it was not a declared war. The Senate knows the position I have taken for three and a half years. It is that no President has any right, under the Constitution, to send any boy into battle, unless it is a declared war, except for that period of time in which he, as Commander in Chief, has the right and duty to respond in self-defense of the Republic. But that is a very limited period of time. Then he has a duty to follow that response in self-defense with a war message to the Congress under article I, section 8 of the Constitution. That is why I have been heard in the last three and a half years to say as I did on two occasions, and I will do it again. I have previously referred to the great war message of Woodrow Wilson in April 1917. He was a great American, a great political scientist, a great American historian, and one of the great Presidents in the history of the Republic.

Senators will recall, as I have discussed it before, the great war message of Woodrow Wilson. He pointed out, early in that message to Congress, that he was without constitutional authority to make war in the absence of a declaration of war.

If Senators will read the constitutional debates, they will find that is exactly what the constitutional fathers left as a heritage in regard to the meaning of article I, section 8, of the Constitution. In those debates, they pointed out that one of the reasons for the revolution against the British Crown was that the British King had the arbitrary, capricious power to send British subjects to their death on the battlefield without parliamentary sanction. Those constitutional fathers made it clear that, by article I, section 8, they were giving no such power to a President of the United States.

I speak respectfully but critically. The present President of the United States has no more power than Woodrow Wilson had. He is bound by the same meaning of the Constitution. That is why I have been heard to say so many times in my many speeches in the last 3½ years that I do not find myself happy as a dissenter, in such a completely dissenting position in relation to the position of the President, but I am not going to walk out on this constitutional trust.

That is why I have expressed myself, but not in exactly the same way as General Shoup expressed himself in his criticism of our policy in Vietnam. General Shoup went on to say:

> Everyone talks peace, peace, World peace, while for years our government has sold or approved the sale of hundreds of millions of dollars worth of war material to other countries. Confusing?

He has a question mark after the word "confusing."

> You read, you're televised to, you're radioed to, you're preached to, that it is necessary that we have our armed forces fight, get killed and maimed, and kill and maim other human beings including women and children because now is the time we must stop some kind of unwanted ideology from creeping up on this nation. The place we chose to do this is 8,000 miles away with water in between.

Before I read the next sentence, I want to say that those who know this great Marine general know he is a master of irony and sarcasm and criticism.

The next sentence:

> I believe there's a record of but two men walking on water and one of them failed. Yes, we must fight out there 'cause even this great democracy, so fearful of its world image, just must not stand by in complacency while village chiefs, mayors, farmers, and others are being murdered by day and night by the believers in this terrible ideology. We're told it is creeping dangerously closer and closer to our shores. This must be confusing.

The general continued:

> Surely a decision to get this nation into the predicament we're in, trying to stop these creeps, must have been based on an all inclusive study by those with the greatest of clairvoyance. And there must have been a timetable depicting the untenable position, and irreparable effects upon this nation at the end of 5, 10, 15, 50 years, else our government could not have chosen the present course of action. If such an estimate of the situation was not made, our leaders have been derelict in their duties and responsibilities. If it was done, the public should be informed. I ask you, have you read or been instructed about any timetable of disaster for this nation and her world position if we hadn't done and weren't doing what we are in Southeast Asia today? I haven't—

Said the general. He went on:

> The reasons fed to us are too shallow and narrow for students, as well as other citizens. Especially so, when you realize that what is happening, no matter how carefully and slowly the military escalation has progressed, may be projecting us toward world catastrophe. Surely it is confusing.

Continuing:

> It must be a bit confusing, too, to read and hear about fighting for freedom. Supposedly, we have it, and I don't think anyone is going to take it away from us by playing cops and robbers in Southeast Asia. Even so, we urge others to fight for freedom. There may be a little confusion here. We insist they should sacrifice arms and legs and their lives for freedom. The people we urge this upon in Southeast Asia, South America, and many other places have no idea of our meaning of freedom. In the history of their ancestors they've never experienced what we expect them to understand and fight for. The word or even the idea is not in the mores of their people. Freedom will remain a foreign word and idea to these people until scores of them are brought here for six months or a year and then returned to their native lands to sing to the fellowmen the song of freedom with notes of music they can understand.

The general went on to say:

> I want to tell you, I don't think the whole of Southeast Asia, as related to the present and future safety and freedom of the people of this country, is worth the life or limb of a single American.

I digress to say we have already sacrificed more than 10,000 of them. Returning to the general's speech, he went on to say:

> But maybe the people are and maybe the people of South America are, too, and maybe that's confusing.
>
> I believe—

Said the general—

> that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own. That they design and want. That they fight and work for. And if unfortunately their revolution must be of the violent type because the "haves" refuse to share with the "have-nots" by any peaceful method, at least what they get will be their own, and not the American style, which they don't want and above all don't want crammed down their throats by Americans. . . .

I think it will be agreed that this great Marine Corps general and commandant, now retired, is much stronger in his criticism of our policy than I have been, but he is not alone among our military authorities in criticism of our policy in Vietnam.

General Ridgway, who was the commander of American forces in the Korean war, and who also knows what an Asian war involves, wrote last year in Look magazine that the war could be "won" in the traditional sense by bringing to bear the full force of American air and naval power. But the price would be genocide, he said, Vietnam would be turned into a desert occupied by Marines, a result he believed is not justified by the threat of China and unworthy of American traditions.

General Gavin came before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee this year to repeat what he said last year.

As I have said before on the floor of the Senate, do not forget who he is. He was one of the two or three top military strategists in the Pentagon before his retirement. He is a great war commander, with a brilliant field record in World War II, the former American Ambassador to France, one of the most brilliant men in our country in both diplomacy and military strategy.

General Gavin said:

> In discussing Vietnam, I would like to begin where I left off before this Committee last year. I urged then that we not expand our forces beyond those then committed, which were on the order of 275,000 troops, pointed out that we possessed powerful military enclaves; complexes of sea and air power from which we could conduct operations as necessary to pacify that country.

He also repeated his opposition to air attacks on North Vietnam, and said upon being questioned that he believed the results obtained from them were not worth the cost in civilian casualties, in stiffening resistance, and alienating world opinion, and should be stopped on the merits.

Do not forget that, in 1954, John Foster Dulles, then Secretary of State, sought to involve this country in military intervention in Indochina. This great military strategist, General Gavin, was given the assignment of preparing a review of what it would cost us to intervene in the war in Indochina, a review, let me say, which caused both General Ridgway, then Chairman of our Joint Chiefs of Staff, and President Eisenhower to decide against the intervention.

Some of the other notable dissenters have been equally reputable men in international affairs. One was George Kennan, who was our Ambassador to Russia and then our Ambassador to Yugoslavia, who has performed special diplomatic assignments for several Presidents, and who at the present time, of course, is a well known academic authority, holding a professorship in the field of diplomacy. Our former Ambassador to Japan, Edwin Reischauer, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Relations, and Senators are aware of the testimony that he has given in regard to the great dangers of our becoming bogged down in a war in Asia.

Furthermore, up until the present group of military officers who are advising the President from the Pentagon Building and are giving him very bad advice in following his mistaken course in Asia, are other military officers who in their capacities as generals are on record as having advised against our becoming involved in a land war in Asia: Generals MacArthur, Vandenburg, Collins, Bradley, and Marshall.

A notable general who became President in 1952 also took the view during his administration that the United States should not become bogged down in a land war in Asia. That was President Eisenhower. Although he is quoted today as supporting administration policy, he stood firmly against American involvement in the area of Indochina while he was President, and indeed, forbade the very sort of war that is now being waged in Asia today.

General Ridgway in his "Memoirs" relates how he studied the military problems that would be encountered. He writes:

> If we did go into Indo-china we would have to win. We would have to go in with a military force adequate in all its branches, and that meant a very strong ground force—an Army that could not only stand the normal attrition of battle, but could absorb heavy casualties from the jungle heat, and the rots and fevers which could afflict the white man in the tropics. We could not again afford to accept anything short of decisive military victory.
>
> We could have fought in Indo-china. We could have won, if we had been willing to pay the tremendous cost in men and money that such intervention would have required—a cost that in my opinion would have eventually been as great as, or greater than, that we paid in Korea. In Korea, we had learned that air and naval power alone cannot win a war and that inadequate ground forces cannot win one either. It was incredible to me that we had forgotten that bitter lesson so soon—that we were on the verge of making that same tragic error.
>
> That error, thank God, was not repeated. As soon as the full report was in, I lost no time in having it passed on up the chain of command.

This is the report I talked about a moment ago, prepared by General Gavin, then top strategist of the Pentagon Building, who had been assigned the responsibility of preparing such a review.

Speaking of it, General Ridgway said:

> That error, thank God, was not repeated. As soon as the full report was in, I lost no time in having it passed on up the chain of command. It reached President Eisenhower. To a man of his military experience, its implications were immediately clear. The idea of intervening was abandoned and it is my belief that the analysis which the Army made and presented to higher authority played a considerable, perhaps a decisive, part in persuading our government not to embark on that tragic adventure.

President Eisenhower referred to this decision in a press conference on March 31, 1954, when asked whether direct intervention with American troops was indicated by a recent speech on Indochina by Secretary Dulles.

The President replied:

> Well, I have said time and again that I can conceive of no greater disadvantage to America than to be employing its own ground forces, and any other kind of forces, in great numbers around the world, meeting each little situation as it arises.
>
> What we are trying to do is to make our friends strong enough to take care of local situations by themselves, with the financial, the moral, the political, and certainly only where our own vital interests demanded any military help.

He went on to speak of doing what "our best interests dictate." His decision was not to intervene.

These dissenters on this issue in relationship to the present policy are men with whom I am perfectly willing to stand as a dissenter in opposition to our escalation of this war.

When it comes to voting on requests for funds or other support for U.S. forces in the field, or otherwise questioning our Vietnam policy, we dissenters in the Senate get very few votes indeed. We have a budget of about $25 billion this year for the support of special operations in Vietnam. It will go much, much higher as the war is escalated more and more.

I feel that it would be instructive to make very plain the distinction between the voicing of doubt, or criticism, or dissent, and the firm execution of national policy democratically decided upon.

Within that framework, given the enormous vigor of our economy and the skill and valor of our men in uniform, it seems to me that the country and its institutions are strong enough to stand a freedom of discussion and dissent.

It seems further that the time when there is military action, or the Nation is otherwise in peril, is precisely the time when our Government needs the best advice and the fullest discussion it can get.

All parties to a debate should attempt to be responsible. They should respect the truth and make every effort to obtain all the facts which are available to them. They should make their criticism logical and germane and propose constructive alternatives, to the extent that they have the resources to do so. They should attempt to stay within the bounds of law, order, and good taste, even if one side may appear to use these weapons to perpetuate injustice, because we believe in the rule of law and the eventual triumphs of democracy. We have seen many victories in this country through the use of these methods.

All responsible public servants labor to bring our country closer and closer to the day when there is liberty and justice for all, and imperfections in institutions and people will be reduced. In doing so, I believe we are helped rather than hindered by the dissenter, who suggests new information and consideration for our councils, and keeps alive the conscience of the Nation and the tradition of our free institutions.

Mr. President, I have made this speech today because in the last few days there has obviously been let loose in this country flag-waving propaganda designed to stir up forces to seek to bring to bear upon those dissenters who can be influenced in that way to silence their dissent.

However, this Senator is going to continue to dissent, and may I say to the editors of those newspapers who, in my judgment, are walking out on one of their great freedoms, the freedom of the press, that they are not doing themselves a service when they forget that along with the right of freedom of the press is the precious right of freedom of speech. We dissenters are exercising that freedom and intend to continue to exercise that freedom. We propose to continue to present to the American people the facts as we see and find them in opposition to what we consider to be—as I have said so many times—the shocking, immoral, illegal, and unjustifiable war our country is conducting in Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the order of April 26, 1967, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, May 2, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 1, 1967:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades and branches specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283, 3284, 3285, 3286, 3287, 3288, 3289 and 3294:

To be first lieutenant, Dental Corps

Gares, William M., Jr., OF100691.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps

Sanders, Joe M., Jr., O99055.

The following-named midshipmen of the U.S. Naval Academy for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 541, 3284 and 3287:

To be second lieutenants

Hunt, Robert D.
Nelson, William J., Jr.

The following-named distinguished military and scholarship students of ROTC for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 2107, 3283, 3284, 3287 and 3288:

Baldwin, Michael S.
Chwalibog, Andrew J.
Corning, Bruce L.
Crist, Charles E.
Depue, John F.
Eberhardt, John E., Jr.
Fedok, Edward A.
Giannelli, Paul C.
Gillett, Michael E.
Hamilton, John P.
Hancock, Jeffrey H.
Hopkins, Gary L.
Kennedy, Kenneth H.
Kirby, Robert B.
Kittel, Robert N.
Kurzweil, Robert B.
Kyle, Robert P.
Lancaster, Steven F.
Laney, Solon D.
Lewis, Robert E.
Mackey, Richard J.
Mannix, Robert W.
Marrs, Larry C.
McKenna, Robert B., Jr.
Roe, James T., III
Schmidt, Thomas J., Jr.
Scully, Francis J.
Seibold, Paul M.
Smith, John C. B., Jr.
VerWayne, Henry J., III
Weeks, James L.
Wilhelm, Thomas D.
Worthing, Robert W.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 1, 1967:

MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Rear Adm. James C. Tison, Jr., USESSA, Director, Coast and Geodetic Survey, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission.

Brig. Gen. William T. Bradley, U.S. Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, under the provisions of section 2 of an act of Congress approved June 28, 1879 (21 Stat. 37; 33 U.S.C. 642).

CALIFORNIA DEBRIS COMMISSION

Brig. Gen. John A. B. Dillard, Jr., U.S. Army, to be a member of the California Debris Commission, under the provisions of section 1 of the act of Congress approved March 1, 1893 (27 Stat. 507; 33 U.S.C. 661).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 1, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Donald O. Wilson, St. James Episcopal Church, Baltimore, Md., offered the following prayer:

Psalm 34: 8:

"O taste and see that the Lord is good!
Happy is the man who takes refuge in Him!
O fear the Lord, you His saints,
For those who fear Him have no want!
The young lions suffer want and hunger;
But those who seek the Lord lack no good thing."

God of our fathers, who art the wellspring of life; who art the bedrock of truth, the source of strength, the supplier of wisdom and understanding, we give Thee thanks for our creation and our preservation. Make us to see that without Thee we are nothing and can do nothing. Thus, as men entrusted with the Government of Thy country and people, impart Thy grace in specific ways upon them that their decisions may be Godly ones that wisely plan for the good of this land, Thy people here and the people of all the world.

Bless the President of these United States and all in authority and bring them to the knowledge that they serve best, who serve Thee; who keep Thy commandments and who do Thy will. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, April 28, 1967, was read an approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

STRIKE DELAY NO SOLUTION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, another delay in a threatened railroad strike is being considered by Congress today despite the fact that 16 months ago the people of this Nation were assured by the President that he would recommend legislation to deal effectively with what he called, "strikes which threaten major damage to the national interest." The first delay, now ending, has accomplished nothing.

It was during the New York City subway strike, a labor dispute that affected millions, but was isolated to but one area of our great Nation, that the President made his statement that legislation to prevent such strikes under emergency conditions would come to Congress. In over a year we have not seen that legislation, and now every man, woman, and child in the country, and our men in Vietnam, stand to feel the impact of a crippling, nationwide railroad strike.

Despite my serious misgivings about this additional delay, I support it, so that the trains, carrying our men and materiel for Vietnam will continue to roll.

But, Mr. Speaker, I ask where the President is at this critical time with his promised legislation to deal effectively with not only the impending strike on our railroads, but with legislation to meet such an emergency in any industry which affects the safety and security of the Nation.

In supporting this second postponement I do so with the fervent hope that in the ensuing 45 days the Mediation Board will come up with a proposal which will be acceptable to the union and to the railroad management.

In the meantime, let us face up to the fact that a 45-day extension, in itself, is no solution.

THE POLICEMAN: SOCIETY'S FIRST ARM OF SELF-DEFENSE

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, now is the time for all good men to come to the aid of their policeman.

Over the weekend, a task force of the President's Crime Commission reported 20 cases wherein the language of the report "officers used force where none was clearly required or where its use was plainly excessive." These 20 cases stain the record of law enforcement. They deserve the righteous wrath of every thoughtful American.

Yet, a balanced judgment requires proper perspective. Task force workers observed a total of 5,339 encounters between officers and citizens in a number of cities during the course of 850 8-hour patrol shifts. The 20 cases cited in the report constitute less than four-tenths of 1 percent of the total. Conversely, in 99.6 percent of the cases in the study, police conduct was found proper.

Certainly, not all policemen are paragons of virtue. There will always be the occasional "bad cop," the lawless lawyer, and the irreverent reverend. But the sins of the few should not brand all as bumpkins or brutes.

The policeman is society's first arm of self-defense. In our own self-interest and in fairness to all, let us condemn where we must but commend where we can.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUBBLEFIELD. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Conservation and Credit Subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, I should like to draw to the attention of this body the fact that this week is being observed throughout America as Soil Stewardship Week. This annual observance is sponsored by the 3,000 local soil and water conservation districts, their national association, and cooperating church groups.

This week ministers of all faiths are carrying vital messages to their followers to further God's purpose in the conservation, development, and proper use of soil, water, and related resources.

I salute the thousands of clergy of all faiths who use this observance to remind us that soil stewardship is everyone's responsibility. It is a responsibility of people who live in the towns and cities as well as those who work the land. The subject of this year's observance is "Three-fourths of Our Land." It has to do with the obligation for the care and protection of land in private ownership.

The President of the United States has recognized Soil Stewardship Week with a special statement issued from the White House. President Johnson stated that:

> I can think of no more important task than to be good and active stewards for that part of the earth entrusted to our care.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY—PERMISSION TO SIT TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit today while the House is in session during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 457) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 457

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Standards of Official Conduct: Melvin Price (chairman), Illinois; Olin E. Teague, Texas; Joe L. Evins, Tennessee; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; Wayne N. Aspinall, Colorado; Edna F. Kelly, New York.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 458) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 458

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing Committee on Standards of Official Conduct: Charles A. Halleck, Indiana; Leslie C. Arends, Illinois; Jackson E. Betts, Ohio; Robert T. Stafford, Vermont; James H. Quillen, Tennessee; Lawrence G. Williams, Pennsylvania.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL INCOME TAX EXEMPTION SHOULD BE INCREASED TO $800

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I am again introducing a bill to increase the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from $600 to $800, including the exemption for a spouse and the exemption for a dependent. In addition, my bill would raise from $1,200 to $1,600 the personal income tax exemption for those over 65 and those who are blind. It has been almost 10 years since the present exemption went into effect in 1958. If this figure had a relationship to reality at that time, that relationship has long since ceased, as we all know and particularly those who are providing for a family.

The cost-of-living index is almost half again as much as it was in 1948 according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor.

The present Consumer Price Index, or cost-of-living index as it is more commonly referred to, uses the 1957-to-1959 period as a base equal to 100. With this figure as a base the cost-of-living index for March 1967, the most recent period available, was 115. This means that the cost of living in March 1967 was 15 percent greater than the base period of 1957–59. Said another way, it took $11.50 to purchase what $10 could buy in the 1957–59 period. However, as I pointed out, the present income tax exemption of $600 was adopted in 1948. If we use a base period of 1947–49, as equal to 100, the March 1967 cost-of-living index figure becomes 141.1. This means that in March 1967 the cost of living was 41.1 percent higher than it was in the period 1947–49, when the present income tax exemption was adopted. So it now costs $14.11 to purchase what $10 would buy in the 1947–49 period.

The $800 figure is far from extravagant—in fact it may well be inadequate—it amounts to $66.66 per month for the taxpayer and each dependent, a total of $266.64 per month for a family of four persons.

If we are to realistically approach the cost of providing some of the basic necessities of life for ourselves and our dear ones, and if the personal income tax exemption is to reflect the Government's awareness of this, and I believe that is its purpose, then it is time to adjust the figure to more nearly reflect the actual cost of providing those necessities.

KEOWEE-TOXAWAY PROJECT AHEAD OF SCHEDULE

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the $700 million Keowee-Toxaway power generating complex of Duke Power Co. is already ahead of schedule. Only this morning Duke announced that a third nuclear unit at Oconee Nuclear Station will be installed, bringing the total initial expenditure by Duke on the Keowee-Toxaway project to almost $400 million.

Only 3 weeks ago, on April 11, the official beginning of the Keowee-Toxaway project was celebrated with appropriate ceremonies. Now, Mr. Speaker, this announcement is further proof of Duke's confidence in the dynamic growth and future of this great area, once referred to by a President of the United States as the No. 1 economic problem of the Nation.

Unit No. 1 of the Oconee Nuclear Station will be placed in service in 1971, unit No. 2 in 1972 and unit No. 3 in 1973. The hydro unit at Keowee Dam will be in operation in 1971 and the unit at Jocassee Dam in 1974.

Clearing of the basin and construction of the dams are already well underway. Hundreds of workers are employed adding millions annually to the economy of the area. Additionally, several million dollars for services and supplies are being pumped into the area's economy. Oconee station alone will require a peak construction force of 1,000 men.

Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that the Keowee-Toxaway project is in Appalachia. Duke Power Co. is a great, and responsible, private enterprise company. When its Keowee-Toxaway project is completed, along with the public development at Trotters Shoals, and with the additional Duke development at Middleton Shoals in Anderson County and perhaps by Mead in Abbeville County, the total investment in my congressional district will be well over a billion dollars thus assuring job opportunity, new industry, improved roads, schools and hospitals for the future.

This great project means more abundant and cheaper electricity, fantastic recreation, and a water supply for the entire western area of North and South Carolina. Taxes alone on the Keowee-Toxaway project will, when completed, total, at present rates, approximately $24 million in State and local taxes, and $20 million in Federal taxes.

Mr. Speaker, this Keowee-Toxaway project is without question one of the greatest, if not the greatest, projects of its type in the entire world. It is the answer to the economic problems of Appalachia. It is an expression of confidence in the future of the South and in the future of our great Nation by this dynamic company—Duke Power Co.

IT IS TIME THAT THE U.S. GOVERNMENT STARTED ACTING LIKE A "HAWK" WHEN IT COMES TO AMERICAN STUDENTS ABROAD TAKING PART IN ANTI-U.S. DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, it is time the U.S. Government started acting like a "hawk" when it comes to American students abroad taking part in anti-U.S. demonstrations.

Last week, the largest anti-American demonstration in recent memory took place in Spain, when 1,500 University of Madrid students burned four U.S. flags, denounced U.S. involvement in Vietnam, waved North Vietnamese flags, and demonstrated in front of the American Embassy.

Spanish officials immediately apologized to our Ambassador to Spain, and pointed out that American exchange students were largely responsible for this incident. Two of the participants have already been identified as transfer students from the University of California. One had been active for over 2 weeks, leading a group of U.S. students in distributing posters and antiwar petitions; the other spoke at the demonstration, denouncing the U.S. role in Vietnam, Spain, and the Dominican Republic.

Only a handful of the 1,200 Americans enrolled at the University of Madrid were involved, but they allowed themselves to be used by a bunch of Spanish and Latin American Communists. As a Spanish official put it:

> The hard-core group, including the pro-Peking Communist Student Organization, was happy to hide behind the American students who started the anti-war petitions . . . American student intervention against United States policies in Vietnam handed the Spanish and Latin American leftists at the university a ready-made platform to exploit.

The Spanish Government is considering asking those American students involved in this disgraceful and treasonous incident to leave Spain. The very least the U.S. Government could do in this matter is to revoke the passports of these students, and any more like them, who openly denounce their country and degrade its national flag on foreign soil.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the bill on the Consent Calendar.

DEDICATION OF CERTAIN STREETS, AGUA CALIENTE INDIAN RESERVATION

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3631) to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain platted streets, alleys, and strips of land.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3631

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That within one year from the date of enactment of this Act the Secretary of the Interior, with the consent of the majority of the eligible voting members of the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians, may dedicate to the public for street purposes, subject to prior existing rights and adverse claims, any of the streets, alleys, or strips of land in the west half of section 14, township 4 south, range 4 east, San Bernardino meridian, city of Palm Springs, Riverside County, California, that are shown on the United States Department of the Interior official plats of survey accepted September 7, 1927, June 27, 1956, May 27, 1958, and March 11, 1960.

SEC. 2. All of the right, title and interest of the United States and the Agua Caliente Band of Mission Indians from the centerline of any of said streets, alleys, and strips of land which has not been dedicated and formally accepted by the city of Palm Springs within one year from the date of enactment of this Act shall on that date, subject to prior existing rights and adverse claims, vest in the owner or owners of the closest adjoining or abutting tract or parcel of land in said section 14 and thereupon become a part of said adjoining or abutting tract or parcel of land. Title to land passing under this section shall acquire the same status as the title to the adjoining or abutting property of which it becomes a part.

SEC. 3. Patents or deeds to lands in the west half of said section 14 issued one year or more after the date of enactment of this Act shall convey title to the streets, alleys, or strips of land which become a part thereof pursuant to section 2 of this Act unless the streets, alleys, or strips of land are expressly excluded from the conveyance.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Consent Calendar.

TO FURTHER EXTEND THE PERIOD PROVIDED FOR UNDER SECTION 10 OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT APPLICABLE IN THE CURRENT DISPUTE BETWEEN THE RAILROAD CARRIERS REPRESENTED BY THE NATIONAL RAILWAY LABOR CONFERENCE AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 543

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 90-10 (Ninetieth Congress, S.J. Res. 65), April 12, 1967, is hereby amended by striking out "prior to 12:01 a.m. of May 3, 1967" and inserting "prior to 12:01 a.m., June 19, 1967."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is not opposed to the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], is the gentleman opposed to the joint resolution?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the joint resolution.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is any other member of the committee on the Republican side opposed to the joint resolution?

Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second. I am opposed to the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's demand comes too late.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, the demand of the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is out of order.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 78]

Abbitt
Abernethy
Ashley
Ayres
Baring
Blackburn
Bow
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Bush
Cabell
Celler
Conable
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Diggs
Dow
Downing
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Fisher
Fulton, Tenn.
Gardner
Gray
Griffiths
Hall
Hansen, Wash.
Hays
Hébert
Helstoski
Hungate
Ichord
Jacobs
Karth
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Latta
Leggett
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Meeds
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
Ottinger
Passman
Pool
Purcell
Quillen
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
St. Onge
Selden
Smith, Iowa
Sullivan
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Tuck
Udall
Van Deerlin
Waggonner
Watson
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 354 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

TO FURTHER EXTEND THE PERIOD PROVIDED FOR UNDER SECTION 10 OF THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT APPLICABLE IN THE CURRENT DISPUTE BETWEEN THE RAILROAD CARRIERS REPRESENTED BY THE NATIONAL RAILWAY LABOR CONFERENCE AND CERTAIN OF THEIR EMPLOYEES

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, on Friday of last week the President sent the measure now before us to the Congress, extending for an additional 47 days the 20-day extension we provided on April 11 of the provisions of existing law prohibiting a strike in the railroad industry by the shopcraft unions, and any changes in work rules by the railroads.

The purpose of this legislation, as explained by the President to me and others last Friday, is to allow time for the executive branch to prepare recommendations for dealing with the current dispute. The recommendations which we will receive will very clearly provide for a settlement of this dispute on an ad hoc basis.

That is, simply, what the measure will do. It will give the President and the executive branch time to determine what recommendations they are going to make to the Congress.

Members may ask, and for good reason, why we should drag this matter out any further.

My answer is simple. We want to avoid compulsion. I am opposed to compulsion for anybody. If this is going to be a free country, we have to keep compulsion out of it.

I think it was King Canute some years ago, so the legend goes, who tried compulsion on the ocean tides. He told the tides to keep back. They refused. In the same way we have no power to make free men work in America. Neither have we the power to compel free corporations to operate.

As I said before, the President has simply asked for an extension of 47 days so that they could prepare legislation and send it to the Congress, which he promised in his letter of April 28. The President said that in a very few days he would have this legislation here for the Congress to work on.

Our committee, the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, met this morning and voted out this resolution. I might add that the vote was 22 to 2. Some of the opposition to the resolution was on the basis that there are many inequities in wage rates across the Nation. I agree with that, and I agree that our committee, when the legislation comes to us, should take into consideration wage inequities across the Nation. However, this is not the time to compare wage rates. When we go into the legislation we will find that there are many inequities that we must try to correct as Members of Congress, but we do not have that legislation before us now. I would say now, as I did on April 11, when the resolution for the 20-day extension was here and passed, that a vote for this resolution is not a vote for or against labor nor a vote for or against the railroad management of this country. This is a vote to give the President and the administration the time to send legislation to the Congress so that the committees of the Congress might act on it and get it to the Rules Committee and through them to the floor for debate with action here in both Houses of Congress so that we can get it back to the President to have it signed before the time expires.

It was brought out that perhaps 30 days' time might be sufficient. Then there was the thought that 30 days might not be enough and we would just be back here again asking for another 10, 15, or 20 days' extension until we can get the legislation out. So the request is for 47 days.

This started out as just an ordinary dispute between the railroads and their employees back on last May 17, 1966, when the unions served notices that they wanted a change in wages and work rules. The railroads came back during the month of June with a counterproposal for changes that they wanted to make. On September 28 they asked for the services of the National Mediation Board. That Board started meeting on October 19 and met until January 6. Then they reported that mediation had failed and that they were terminating their services as of January 13, 1967.

On January 28 the President appointed Emergency Board 169. This Board held hearings from February 1 to February 9. for 7 days, and took 1,073 pages of testimony with 36 exhibits in their final findings. Both parties to the agreement agreed that the time for the Board to report would be extended until March 13, at which time the Board reported to the President.

Mr. Speaker, according to the law—the Railway Labor Act—the parties were prohibited from changing conditions for a period of 30 days after the report. This time would have run out on April 13, 1967; however, the Congress of the United States extended the time during which negotiations would continue for 20 days, because the President would be out of the country, and would not be here to participate in any action that had to be taken.

Then, Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States appointed a special Mediation Panel. That Panel reported back on April 21 its recommendations to both groups. Both groups turned down the proposal made by this special Panel.

Mr. Speaker, the time now set in the law is due to run out 1 minute after midnight on tomorrow night.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would hesitate in saying here and now anything with reference to the merits of this dispute, one way or the other. I do not wish to get into that question now. I do not believe that this is the place for the Congress to pass upon the merits of the dispute with reference to one side or the other.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain matters that have to be done. We have but one issue pending before this House at this moment, and that is to pass this House joint resolution, and then after we get the President's recommendations go into the merits of the issues involved; and also go to the parties involved for recommendations as to what the Congress should do.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce yield for a procedural question?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question comes up to the effect of this resolution. You have stated that at this point this action and this resolution are not directed as being either for management or for labor; nor is this resolution proposed against management or against labor.

Actually, the major point involved in this resolution is that the President of the United States shall have time to study and consult with his assistants in the U.S. Department of Labor and U.S. Department of Commerce and then prepare proposals for legislation for this Congress to study and to pass upon. In other words, is that the primary purpose of this joint resolution? Mr. Speaker, Congress is not proposing to interpose itself in collective bargaining as between the parties; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. Speaker, I might say to the membership that I received some calls in my office, as well as some at my home, to the effect that certain Members would not vote for this resolution because, if adopted, it would prolong the period of time during which union members would not be paid wages and that it would cut off the time during which the railroads would have to pay the union men.

Mr. Speaker, this is not true, because the clear intent is that the pay increases of the railroad men will be retroactive to January 1, 1967. So any settlement, I am sure, will provide for the payment of wages back to that date and any such settlement will go back to that period of time and the workers will receive those retroactive benefits.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. STAGGERS. Yes, I yield further to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. So, this resolution is based upon the assumption that the White House will act upon and seek solutions to, and make recommendations thereon, and transmit those recommendations to the Congress and thus give the Congress the opportunity to pass upon the general legislation which is to be sent up here within the period of 30 days; is that correct?

Mr. STAGGERS. In the President's message to the Congress the President stated "in the next few days."

I hope that means this week. I was led to believe that would be the case.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this legislation, if adopted, will not represent a long time postponement, but will grant to the President of the United States time during which to study the basic problems and will give the President that opportunity and accommodation, to send certain specific legislative recommendations to the Congress of the United States for its action thereon? For my part, I believe that the U.S. Congress should grant the President this time and accommodation on his request.

I am glad to give the President this accommodation without partisanship or politics.

I firmly believe that the solution to economic industrial disputes, is by responsible collective bargaining between the parties to reach fair and reasonable contracts that are mutually agreed upon. I oppose the U.S. Congress being used as a collective bargaining agent from time to time on economic industrial disputes as Congress unevitably introduces politics and political pressure into the disputes, and surely destroys real collective bargaining between the parties. Labor and management should realize that this policy leads directly to new restrictions on both labor and management, and the substitution of rigid government controls instead of free collective bargaining which I have always favored.

Mr. STAGGERS. It is my opinion that that is true and that we shall have sufficient time during which to act upon the legislation.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, rarely have I stepped into this well during my 15 years of membership herein with less enthusiasm than I now do at this moment. But, I am opposed to this joint resolution, because it is not the simple type of extension enumerated in the previous discussion.

Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and this House had to face a critical situation which existed in the railway industry. Finally, we mandated a settlement. In the intervening time no attention has been given to fashioning a more permanent and workable vehicle for settlement of these disputes.

One year ago we had the Nation's airlines paralyzed. In the intervening time no action has been taken aimed at seeking a better resolution of these paralyzing disputes.

Twenty days ago, roughly, we granted an extension—which I supported—to avoid embarrassment to the President of the United States and to the United States, because failure to have done so would have forced cancellation of the President's long-scheduled visit to Punta del Este. We are now asked to extend for 47 days. We have not had one word of testimony in the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce from a representative of the Department of Labor, the Department of Commerce, the carriers, or of the employees. We have assurances of the most nebulous nature that something will be submitted—the timetable indefinite.

Our very distinguished chairman—and please let me make it clear that I have the highest regard for the chairman personally, and for his integrity and his courage—has stated that this is not the time to bring in the question of wages.

Mr. Speaker, I say it is the time to bring in the question of wages.

Out in my State and in my community I can take one group of skilled mechanics employed by the railroads who are drawing $3.04 an hour, and in that same community mechanics of equal skill in both private and public employment are drawing between $3.80 and $4 an hour.

It has been alleged this will be retroactive, yes, but what happens in the many paychecks and the pay periods that pass before retroactivity takes effect? The family is faced with the escalating costs of living, with the escalating costs of taxation, which are particularly burdensome at the local level of government, and they have to meet those rising costs, and they cannot draw on that far-distant date when they will have some measure of relief through retroactivity.

I believe it is time, if we have to sit around the clock, to at least now take some testimony and have a better definition of the issues than we have from the hearsay, and only hearsay, which we have benefited from up to this time. This is our responsibility, make no mistake about it. I have gone along each time in the past, but this time my conscience revolts, and I cannot go along and further postpone that day of reckoning.

Oh, I know there are going to be those who say that the issue is simply supplying our military needs in Vietnam—and that is an important thing. I have supported our involvement there. I have supported every effort to implement our policy to meet the needs of our forces that has been made during the entire history of that involvement. I do not want to place any barrier against the supplying of the needs of these men. However, I am not aware that an effort has been made to negotiate with the brotherhoods to see if certain arrangements could not be made to permit the movement of military cargo. I do not know whether that has been done, because I have not had the benefit of any hearings.

Mr. Speaker, since making these formal remarks I have received the following communication supporting the above statement:

The following telegram was sent this morning to Secretary of Defense McNamara. The AFL–CIO Railway Employes' Department, whose president is Michael Fox, negotiates for the six railroad shopcraft unions, representing about 137,000 employes. The RLEA, whose chairman is G. E. Leighty, speaks for the leaders of unions representing nearly all U.S. railroad employees:

"April 28, 1967.

"Hon. Robert S. McNamara,
"Secretary of Defense
"The Pentagon, Washington, D.C.:

"In view of scheduled national strike by railroad shopcraft unions at 12:01 a.m. May 3, we stand ready to meet with you at any time to arrange for continued rail transport of all shipments necessary to our Nation's military effort and the public health. This offer is made on behalf of shopcraft unions and other railroad unions. Cooperation on part of railroad managements would also be needed.

"Michael Fox,
"President, AFL–CIO Railway Employes' Department.

"G. E. Leighty,
"Chairman, Railway Labor Executives' Union."

President Michael Fox of the AFL–CIO Railway Employees' Department made the following statement on behalf of the railroad shopcraft unions after passage of legislation postponing the unions' May 3 strike for 47 days:

"We shall abide by the law.

"Up to now the railroads have not wanted to settle this dispute. That's why they rejected the recommendations of the President's panel of mediators last week. That's why they broke off negotiations with us last Tuesday.

"The railroads want Congress to impose compulsory arbitration on their employees, instead of collective bargaining. What that means is throwing into prison any railroad worker who dares to strike.

"That is a police state system—with some government board using the threat of prison to make workers labor for less pay than they themselves could win, so as to increase the profits of the private corporations.

"Our skilled members suffer a wage lag of 40 to 60 cents an hour, according to the President's chief mediator, Judge Charles Fahy. Our less-skilled members are also lagging. Their only way to win a fair bargain lies in their right to strike.

"New legislation against our members will be proposed in Congress. At the same time Congress is engaged in giving the railroads and other corporations a bigger tax break than ever before.

"Congress is restoring the so-called investment tax credit—but on a new basis that will let the corporations charge off as much as half their total income tax liability, instead of the former ceiling of one quarter of their total tax liability. This will let the railroads pay at least $50 million a year less income tax, and retain at least $50 million a year more profits, than ever before. This will make a nice addition to their net profits, which are now running over $900 million a year.

"We favor this tax credit for the railroads; it will help them acquire badly needed new freight cars and locomotives. But we do ask this question, in the light of the campaign against our members:

"What gets more attention in Congress—the profits of the great corporations or the rights of American working men?

"We repeat what we've said before: if Congress will only affirm our members' right to strike, the railroads will quickly settle with us and no strike will take place."

The six shopcraft unions (seven crafts) include the Machinists, Electrical Workers, Sheet Metal Workers, Boilermakers, Blacksmiths, Railway Carmen, and Firemen and Oilers.

I am flying blind on instruments, if you will—with what guidance we have had—but not with the firsthand information that I feel I require in making an evaluation and in discharging my responsibility to my people and to the people of this Nation.

It is for that reason that I opposed the extension in committee this morning and it is the reason I have taken this most unpleasant and most onerous assignment to oppose this resolution here at this time.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a considerable amount of regret that I do join with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] at this time and as we did this morning in committee in taking a minority position in committee because I, too, have an infinite respect for my chairman and I know that he is faced with an incredibly difficult problem.

One of the reasons for being here is that I think it is terribly important for the House to understand what is occurring in these collective bargaining breakdowns that are unfortunately coming before the Congress with increasing regularity.

We really did not analyze this when the airline strike came before the Congress last year. A great deal of time was spent in committee on that matter. We found that terrible problems occur, because of the linking together throughout the Nation of major unions and major employers. Now nearly every dispute affects the national interest both in area and in jurisdictional scope.

Therefore, we are taking some time today to speak on this.

I, too, supported the 20-day extension before. But we need to bring to the attention of the House the fact that these waiting and cooling off periods do not work. The parties freeze and collective bargaining breaks down because they believe that the inevitable day will be put off.

So what the gentleman from California and I am trying to do, in an effort to try to be helpful as members of this committee and to this House is to alert the House that 20 days ago this matter came forth and none of us said anything. Now 20 days later, we are almost precisely where we were 20 days ago. If we do not speak on this today, Members of the House may well see us 45 days from now in a very similar situation.

Because of this, we have suggested that the time period either be made shorter, as the gentleman from California mentioned or we begin to work on an around-the-clock basis—as was necessary with the airline strike. Remember that during this period of time, you have one party being held and the other party is not. In other words, management can continue its operations in normal fashion whereas the right of the workers to strike is removed.

Now it can be said that a similar prohibition applies in the case of lockouts. But a lockout is not an equivalent type of weapon that the strike is.

I know that we must solve this in the national interest. It is absolutely necessary. I and every other member of the committee and I know every Member of the House of Representatives is ready and willing to bend their efforts to do this. But I think we, today, should point out to both of the parties involved that they had better make the collective bargaining machinery work—and not just wait. Because if they do not, there is sentiment in this House for not just compulsory arbitration—and not just extending the time—that will indicate to the laboring man we are satisfied to hold only them, but we will also apply the status quo truly to both sides. For example the parties involved should consider that seizure will be offered in any congressional action also.

These are the things that are very difficult. I hope the parties to this dispute do understand that as the House begins to work its will, many different proposals will be considered. This will not simply be an extension of the Taft-Hartley system though we will probably suggest such things as public offers and counteroffers being required from both sides.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding to me at this time. This is a terribly difficult matter and it is not a very pleasant task to stand here to bring this matter before the House at this time, but I think it is desperately necessary that we do so.

Mr. MOSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. I insert at this point the following material:

Comparison of railroad shop crafts hourly wages with rates paid in similar jobs in industry and Government

(1) Railroad shop crafts (nationally)	(2) Illinois Bell Telephone	(3) Maintenance and powerplant operations (nationally)	(4) Maintenance and powerplant operations (Chicago)	(5) Chicago machinery industries	(6) U.S. Navy	(7) TVA	(8) Building trades		
							Chicago	New York	San Franci
Blacksmiths, $3.0108.					Blacksmiths, $3.44.	Blacksmiths, $3.56.			
Boilermakers, $3.0108.					Boilermakers, $3.44.	Boilermakers, $3.56.	Boilermakers, $5.40.	Boilermakers, $6.21.	Boilermakers, $5.45.
Passenger car repairmen, $3.0108.		Maintenance mechanics, $3.24.	Maintenance mechanics, $3.41.	Maintenance mechanics, $3.45.	Skilled mechanics, $3.44.				
Carmen, other, $2.9668.					Railroad car repairman, $3.34.				
Electrical workers, $3.0470.		Electricians, maintenance, $3.47.	Electricians, maintenance, $3.67.	Electricians, maintenance, $3.59.	Electricians, $3.44.	Electricians, $3.56.	Electricians, $4.95.	Electricians, $5.32.	Electrician $5.804 to $5.880
Linemen, $2.9054	Linemen, $3.1131.				Linemen $3.44.				
Groundmen, $2.9179.	Line, cable conduit craftsmen, $3.67.								
Coal operators, $2.8286.									
Machinists, $3.0470.		Machinists, maintenance, $3.45.	Machinists, maintenance, $3.65.	Machinists, maintenance, $3.39.	Machinists, $3.44	Machinists, $3.56.	Machinists, $5.10.	Machinists, $6.	Machinists, $5.76
Sheet metal workers, $3.0470.		Sheet metal, workers, $3.44.	Sheet metal workers, $3.52.		Sheet metal workers, $3.44.	Sheet metal workers, $3.56.	Sheet metal workers, $5.35.	Sheet metal workers, $5.40.	Sheet metal workers, $5.35 to $5.62.
Helpers, all crafts, $2.7348.		Helpers, maintenance trades, $2.67.	Helpers, maintenance trades, $2.77.						
Carpenters, maintenance, $3.0108.		Carpenters, maintenance, $3.27.	Carpenters, maintenance, $3.66.	Carpenters, maintenance, $3.29.	Carpenters, $3.34.	Carpenters, $3.47.	Carpenters, $5.50.	Carpenters, $5.95.	Carpenters, $4.875. $5.225.
Painters, maintenance, $3.0108.		Painters, maintenance, $3.25.	Painters, maintenance, $3.86.		Painters, $3.34.	Painters, $3.47.	Painters, $4.60.	Painters, $4.80 to $6.	Painters, $4.97.
Pipefitters, maintenance, $3.0108.		Pipefitters, maintenance, $3.47.	Pipefitters, maintenance, $3.61.		Pipefitters, $3.44.		Pipefitters, $5.40 to $5.44.	Pipefitters, $5.465.	Pipefitters, $5.665 to $7.265.
Laborers, $2.5522		Laborers, $2.44	Laborers, $2.60		Laborers, $2.41 and $2.48 (2 levels).	Laborers, $2.44.	Laborers, $3.76 to $4.60.	Laborers, $4.47 to $5.45.	Laborers, $3.925 to $4.995.
Mechanic, maintenance, $3.0108.	Mechanics, $3.806.	Mechanics, maintenance, $3.24.	Mechanics, maintenance, $3.41.	Mechanics, maintenance, $3.45.					

SOURCES

(1) U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Jan. 1, 1966, wages.

(2) Illinois Bell Telephone Co., report filed Dec. 31, 1966, with Federal Communications Commission.

(3) Table A-7. Maintenance and powerplant occupations, United States, February 1966.

(4) Area wage survey, the Chicago, Ill., metropolitan area, Bulletin No. 465-68, April 1966, U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(5) Machinery industries occupational earnings, Chicago, Ill., U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

(6) 1966 report, U.S. Department of Navy, Office of Industrial Relations.

(7) Tennessee Valley Trades and Labor Council.

(8) Railway Labor Executives Association, July 1, 1966, union scales of wages and hours in the building trades, preliminary reports.

Railroad employees [1]

	Shop craftsmen		Number of executives, officials, and staff assistants	Total employees
	Number	Percent shop craftsmen		
Year:				
1955	180,000	10.62	20,000	1,694,000
1956	177,000	10.75	20,000	1,647,000
1957	168,000	11.12	21,000	1,510,000
1958	152,000	11.51	19,000	1,321,000
1959	144,000	11.59	19,000	1,242,000
1960	136,000	11.56	18,000	1,177,000
1961	129,000	11.84	18,000	1,082,000
1962	125,000	12.05	19,000	1,037,000
1963	123,000	12.26	18,000	1,003,000
1964	120,000	13.23	19,000	982,000
1965	118,000	11.22	19,000	962,000

[1] Table D-16, 1966 Annual Report, Railroad Retirement Board.

Railroad shop craftsmen 1965 (118,100) [1]

	Number	Percent
Completed years of service:		
A. Less than 10	21,500	18
B. 10 to 19	37,700	33
C. 20 to 29	34,700	29
D. 30 and over	24,200	20
Total	118,100	100

[1] Tables D-8 and D-10, 1966 Annual Report, Railroad Retirement Board.

Age on birthday in 1965

Median age, 49.2

Under 20	500
20 to 24	4,100
25 to 29	5,900
30 to 34	7,000
35 to 39	13,000
40 to 44	14,500
45 to 49	16,600
50 to 54	15,700
55 to 59	16,800
60 to 64	16,700
65 to 69	6,400
70 and over	800

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Is there not a serious overall question involved as to whether the Congress should be used on a piecemeal basis for collective-bargaining purposes?

Mr. MOSS. I think there is a very basic and a very serious question involved as to whether we should act, not as an appellate body, because we have not even bothered to read the briefs in most instances, but as a body to postpone. I do not favor that road.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that the resolution before us will be approved. But I fear we do this too easily and without proper consideration of the consequences.

This means of legislating specific compulsory arbitration became precedent in 1963. Now it becomes the practice. It becomes habit, and it is bad habit.

No doubt it is the easy answer, but not a good one. It serves as a palliative to numb our senses to real needs.

Call it what you will, this is compulsory arbitration. Yet we offer no legislative guidelines, policies, or procedures. It is impractical. It is a great delusion. I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of the able and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. Moss]. He has stated the situation as I see it, and I agree with the conclusion he has drawn.

This is not the first time that Congress, at the last minute, has been asked to intervene in and interrupt the process of free collective bargaining. Three years ago we had another rail dispute. A year ago it was the airlines. Some 20 days ago we were asked to extend the time limit under the Railway Labor Act for the present emergency. So this is not a new problem but once again we are being asked to provide a one-time, stopgap solution. I do not think this is the proper way for Congress to proceed.

Neither do I feel, and the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] has made this important point, that Congress should be asked to legislate without knowing all of the facts. There have been no hearings that I know of in the House on this resolution. We have not heard labor, management, or Government witnesses present their arguments.

We can assume that a national emergency is involved, but we do not know to what degree, or whether some arrangements could be made to permit the continued shipment of vital defense and civilian supplies. Under the parliamentary limits imposed by considering this resolution under suspension of the rules we do not have time to get answers to all of these questions, nor do we have an opportunity to consider perfecting amendments.

I do not say that Congress should not grant an extension until June 19, but this is a considerable period of time. We have already extended the time by 20 days, and I voted for that extension. But before we go further we should know a great deal more about what we are being asked to vote on today.

It is quite clear that this resolution is going to pass. But I intend, albeit reluctantly, to vote against it because I do not believe this is an intelligent way to legislate or to run a railroad.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pickle].

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I do not question the need for us to act today to forestall a railroad strike that can do untold damage to this Nation and its citizens. I urge immediate and swift passage of House Joint Resolution 543.

I would, however, like to take this opportunity to reiterate an opinion that I have expressed many times already. I am concerned over the way the Congress allows itself to be brought into disputes such as the railroad strike, and I should think that by now we would have learned our lesson.

Last year during the deliberations on the airline strike, Senator Morse painted a dismal picture on the future of Congress getting involved in individual labor disputes. He said that action such as the airline strike sets the pattern for intervention on an ad hoc basis; and that without a change in the permanent laws of the Nation, we would increasingly become concerned in these matters. I think the fact that we have twice been faced with the current railroad dispute bears the truth of this prediction.

Admittedly, the question of the need for governmental intervention is much stronger in the railroad strike than it was in the airline strike last year. But in my estimation, this is all the more reason to have a permanent law on the books to deal with the problem.

The threatened railway strike is an easy case. There is very little question but that it would meet the test of causing a "national emergency" and this is certainly the minimal area where we should have permanent dispositive legislation. It almost goes without saying that such permanent procedures should be extended beyond the minimum to all cases where there is an interruption of interstate or foreign commerce which substantially threatens to deprive a section of the country of essential transportation services.

I understand that the executive department will submit to Congress within a few days a proposal which will be a general recommendation for a "final" solution to the railroad dispute.

It is my sincere hope that when that business is dealt with, the Congress will take the initiative at least to consider some of the permanent alternatives suggested and pending.

Mr. Speaker, I hardly need to remind the House that I introduced legislation on February 16 that would have offered several alternate solutions to the current dispute.

Repeatedly, I have asked for hearings on my bill and similar legislation. And in view of our work here today, I would hope that hearings will be called to consider legislation to adopt permanent procedures in labor disputes.

I am confident that if the recommendations offered to deal with these problems have as a central theme the preservation and strengthening of collective bargaining—as the principles of my bill, H.R. 5638, embody—that a workable, equitable, national labor policy in this field can be found.

In moments of passion and crisis, such as the current dispute prompts, we are apt to be asked to act on "harsh" legislation. I hope this will not be the case, and I feel that no one—the executive department, the Labor Department, or the Congress—really favors stern and restrictive measures.

Our fears of this highly complicated and technical problem must not be allowed to compound the problem. We, the Congress, must face up to it and act accordingly.

If we do not take action on the legislation before us today, the only alternative is for this Congress to go on and on and on, on a piecemeal ad hoc basis, involving ourselves in this situation. I do not agree that the extension is unilateral, that it would help or hurt only one side. I do say that all parties have dealt in good faith. That includes the carriers and the unions. I do not believe that we are in a position to point a finger to the Justice Department, the Labor Department, or the White House—to the executive department—but, indeed, perhaps we should point it to ourselves because we have not asked for hearings, and if we do not take action, we are going to have much harsher choices facing us.

What I have proposed on this floor is House bill 5638. It is only one of two bills pending before the House. The avowed purpose of it is to try to save collective bargaining. If we do not use this vehicle, or something similar to it, then collective bargaining—as we have known it and which has generally worked well—is a thing of the past.

I call on the Congress to hold hearings on this subject on the solution we are going to try to develop on this ad hoc basis. We should also hold concurrent hearings on this general subject. Time is running out. I believe the American public is entitled to protection and to have hearings start on these things and start immediately.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I believe when I appeared before the House 20 days ago—almost that—and we asked for an extension of 20 days, until midnight of May 3, the President at that time was in a very difficult situation. It was on a Monday, and he was going to Punta del Este on Wednesday. The leadership of both parties were present, as were almost all of the Members of the other body who are on the Labor Committee, and the members of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The President at that time read off some figures on what would happen if we had a strike and the railroads stopped running. I will not go into those in detail, except to say that if it were announced today that the railroads would stop running on Wednesday night, tomorrow there would be no perishable goods forwarded—24 hours before such an event could take place. The Secretary of Defense described what would happen in Vietnam. The Secretary of Transportation described what would happen in steel and in automobiles. The Secretary of Labor went on to describe what would happen in some of the other critical industries upon which Defense depends.

I have had an opportunity this morning to check into this matter a little further, and I find that what was said 20 days ago is just as true today as it was then.

I realize that when we come to a crucial situation such as this, there are only two votes: "Yes" or "No." No one comes to the well of the House and says, "Maybe" or "If you will change it around a little bit, or if you add certain amendments, I will be for it." This is one of the situations where there is no other answer except "Yes" or "No." That is the choice we are faced with at this time.

If you vote "No," you are willing to accept the responsibility of cutting off those services not only needed in this country, but also needed by our fighting men in Vietnam.

There simply is no way of evading this kind of responsibility, regardless of what our philosophic beliefs may be about the whole question of bargaining between labor and management. That is the situation we are faced with today, and we have to say yes or no to that.

May I say, I am not being critical of anyone who may vote no. He may feel his conscience so dictates, and he is certainly entitled to vote as his conscience tells him.

I will admit that the President very carefully limited what he is going to send down here. The President's letter on April 28 to Mr. Speaker and to the Vice President, uses these words:

> This additional period will give the Congress time prudently to consider legislation which will protect the public interest.

And these are the three important words—"in this case."

The President does not say anything about sending legislation pursuant to the recommendations which he had in his state of the Union message in January of 1966.

I believe some Members are under the impression that the President will send down here some general legislation to meet issues on this subject in all instances. By the paragraph I have read in this case, I do not believe that is true. I believe the President will send down recommendations only for a solution which he considers a solution in this particular case.

I may have a statement to issue a little later in the day on this particular point, but I do call this to the attention of Members at this time, and that is my understanding of what the particular paragraph means.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. What will happen if we do not pass this measure? That is the other side of the coin.

There will be a strike, starting tomorrow at midnight.

What effect will that have upon the country, not only internally but also in connection with responsibilities abroad?

I listened to my friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], for whom I have great affection and high regard. I do not see where any of us would disagree with much of what he said, but we are faced with the immediate situation. Most of his remarks were addressed to new legislation, long-range legislation. That takes time.

My friend talks about meeting around the clock. We are practical men. We know it is just impossible between now and tomorrow night at midnight to enact permanent legislation.

So I accept everything my friend from California says as true, and we all can, but it is irrelevant at this particular time with the situation which faces the country.

I urgently urge, in the interest of our country and of our people, the suspension of the rules and the passage of this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLLING). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to my distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting this legislation today only on the basis that we were assured at a meeting at the White House on last Friday that the President would specifically ask for this extension and, in addition, he would submit, I believe either today or tomorrow or no later than Wednesday, his ad hoc solution to the current problem; and with the further anticipation that we would have a general legislative recommendation in the labor-management field rather shortly. The latter is long overdue. The President said his recommendations would be forthcoming in his January 1966 state of the Union message. It is now 16 months later and labor-management problems are mounting almost daily. Something must be done, and the sooner the better.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I say there is nothing in this message that says that, but if my distinguished minority leader says that was his understanding, it is certainly in the record.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRINGER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I listened carefully to the gentleman from West Virginia, the chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I believe he said the President was well aware a year ago in January that a situation of this kind could develop, and at that time said that he would send legislation to Congress dealing with labor and management disputes. For the life of me I do not understand what has happened in the last almost year and a half, that such legislation has not been forthcoming from the White House. This is not to say that I think legislation should necessarily originate in the Office of the President. Far from it, but having told Congress that he would initiate legislation, and with recognition that this problem as well as others in the labor-management field would have to be faced, it is unbelievable that the President failed to act during the last 15 months.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to further procrastination in this matter and I will vote against the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired. All time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS].

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL].

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce for the patient way in which he has approached this very difficult problem, and I want to thank my very dear friend from California for yielding me this brief time, which I know comes very dearly to him under the proceedings we have before us today.

I rise to express great unhappiness over the situation in which we find ourselves today.

I rise to point out something to labor and management in connection with this legislation. We probably are witnessing today the last opportunity for labor and management to get together not only to resolve this strike without the assistance of the Federal Government but also to preserve the system of free collective bargaining which we have in this country today.

I wish to point out to labor and management that we do not know what the legislation which will be coming up from the White House will entail, nor do we know what the legislation that will finally be enacted by the Congress will compel, but I think it is fair to say that certainly some form of compulsive settlement of this dispute is now at hand.

It is not my purpose here today to fix the blame for the evil situation we see in the negotiations. I think it is fair to say it takes two to make negotiations work and that probably there is an abundance of blame to be shared by both sides.

However, I would point out both to labor and to management that I do not think either will be happy with the results that will follow from legislation in this area. I think it is fair to say that if we go to compulsory arbitration, not only will labor have someone tell them what price they will receive for the work of their membership, and collective bargaining thereby suffer with regard to the cost of wages and services furnished, but also I think management will get a new partner to dictate how profits are to be made and ultimately to dictate how management will make decisions in the railroad industry.

I think if we go to seizure, the result will be equally unhappy. I think a high duty devolves on both parties here today to recognize their duty to protect the great system of free collective bargaining which has worked so well for so many years in this great country. It has built the highest standard of living and one of the finest economic systems in the world. This system is in great jeopardy from those who participate in it. They must observe where compulsory arbitration or seizure has come into being in each instance it has been desperately unhappy for all parties concerned.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I command the gentleman for his fine remarks and I share in much of what he is saying, but I am wondering why the committee has not held hearings on this subject. The gentleman and the distinguished members of the committee have gone through this on many another occasion and they know the values involved. Why could hearings not have been held?

Mr. DINGELL. I am glad the gentleman raises this question.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN].

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, with other members of the committee, I was at the White House when the President asked for a 20-day extension because he was to be out of the country at the time the strike deadline was approaching. Certainly, that would have been no time for a strike. We then granted the 20-day extension.

The administration is now asking for another 47 days. I want to call the attention of the Congress to the fact that the President, in the 1966 state of the Union message, stated the following:

> I also intend to ask Congress to consider measures which without improperly invading state and local authority will enable us effectively to deal with strikes which threaten irreparable damage to the national interest.

I think in these 47 days we can have the hearings we all agree we should have to review the merits and demerits of any proposals which may be submitted. As a result of this feeling on my part, I joined with others in voting for this resolution in our committee this morning. Now I hope we will have the recommendations of the President here very shortly so that proper hearings may be held.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virgina [Mr. STAGGERS].

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say again what I did when I first addressed the House. This is an emergency. That is the issue before us. There are many other things we would like to discuss. I will agree, as the Speaker did, that the issues the gentleman from California raised are pertinent and will be taken up by the committee at the proper time. I am certain when 33 Members come out with a bill, it will be fair. We will have threshed it out. I would like to agree with the minority leader as to what took place at the White House last Friday. He very well stated the case. The President said he would come up in a few days with the legislation. That was in his message. I thought it meant this week, I will say. He did point out to us that in over 100 years, no one has yet devised satisfactory permanent legislation in this area. He told us he had several panels of the best minds in America working on this problem, and they have not solved it yet.

Mr. Speaker, I promise the Members of the House that—although we have many other things for consideration which are important to the Nation; we commence hearings tomorrow upon the Comprehensive Health bill—when that legislation comes up from the President we shall cease the other proceedings at that time and take up the legislation with reference to this subject and attempt to get somehing out.

Further, Mr. Speaker, we shall undertake to make the legislation as equitable as we possibly can for the good of the country.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS], and others, for the assurances that we have received today.

However, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact of the intervening period of time during which we had no hearings upon this subject—when we had an opportunity to examine the equities of the issues involved—I continue in opposition to this joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] has expired. All time has expired.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543).

The question was taken.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 302, nays 56, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—302

Adair
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Fascell
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Goodell
Goodling
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Hosmer
Howard
Hunt
Hutchinson
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keith
Kelly
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.

McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Multer
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Quie
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
St Germain
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Ullman
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vigorito
Waldie
Walker
Watkins
Watson
Watts
Whalen
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zion

NAYS—56

Adams
Andrews, N. Dak.
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolling
Brock
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cleveland
Cohelan
Curtis
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Feighan
Findley
Ford, William D.
Gallagher
Gonzalez
Green, Pa.
Gross
Grover
Hawkins
Horton
Johnson, Calif.
Karsten
Kee
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kupferman
Kyl
Leggett
Madden
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Konski
Olsen
Perkins
Price, Ill.
Pucinski
Reuss
Rooney, N.Y.
Roybal
Ryan
Saylor
Scherle
Shipley
Snyder
Steiger, Wis.
Thompson, Ga.
Vanik
Wampler
Wilson, Charles H.
Zwach

NOT VOTING—75

Abbitt
Abernethy
Ashley
Ashmore
Ayres
Baring
Blackburn
Bow
Brown, Calif.
Bush
Cabell
Celler
Conable
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dow
Downing
Evins, Tenn.
Fino
Fisher
Fulton, Tenn.
Gardner
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hall
Halpern
Hébert
Helstoski
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jacobs
Karth
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Landrum
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Morgan
Murphy, N.Y.
Nix
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pepper
Purcell
Quillen
Rees
Resnick
Rhodes, Pa.
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rostenkowski
Sandman
St. Onge
Selden
Smith, N.Y.
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Udall
Van Deerlin
Waggonner
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wydler
Younger

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543) was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Bow.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Conable.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Kuykendall.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Miller of California with Mr. Bob Wilson.
Mr. Rogers of Colorado with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Ronan with Mr. Bush.
Mr. Hull with Mr. Quillen.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Blackburn.
Mr. Waggonner with Mr. Gardner.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Wydler.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Hall.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Diggs.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Fino.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Halpern.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. Conyers.
Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Sandman.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Van Deerlin with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Cowger.
Mrs. Sullivan with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Culver with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Baring.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Brown of California.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Downing.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Cabell.
Mr Abernethy with Mr. Helstoski.
Mr. Abbitt with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Rhodes of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Selden.
Mr. Pepper with Mr. Rees.
Mr. Karth with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Hungate with Mr. Willis.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Jacobs.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8363. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1039. An act to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding thirty years, and for other purposes.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish the record of today's proceedings to show that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] were unable to be here for the vote on the legislation concerning the Railway Labor Act because they are out of the city on official business for the Committee on Armed Services. At the specific direction of the chairman of the committee, they have journeyed to Otis Air Force Base in Massachusetts to conduct an on-the-spot investigation of a series of airplane crashes at that installation.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SALINE WATER CONVERSION PROGRAM

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 6133) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) In section 8 strike out "$90,000,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $185,000,000," and insert "$105,782,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $169,218,000,".

(b) In subsection 2(b) after "laboratory," insert "test bed,".

(c) At the end of subsection 2(b) change the semicolon to a colon and add the following: "*Provided,* That any test bed plant, module or component costing in excess of $1,000,000 shall not be undertaken until specifically authorized by Congress: *Provided further,* That the five demonstration plants authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958 (70 Stat. 1706), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958 (d)), shall hereafter be regarded as test beds subject to the provisions of this Act, but the provisions of sections 3 and 6 of such Act and those provisions of section 4 relating to the method of disposal and disposition of the proceeds of sale shall continue to be applicable to them;".

(d) In subsection 2(c) strike out "demonstration" and insert "prototype".

(e) Add a new section 9 to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. This Act may be cited as the 'Saline Water Conversion Act'.".

SEC. 2. Of the amount of $105,782,000 authorized to be appropriated by section 8 of the Saline Water Conversion Act, the unappropriated balance of $23,282,000 may be appropriated and combined with $3,500,000 heretofore appropriated but remaining unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1967, to carry out the program during the fiscal year 1968, as follows:

(i) Research and development operating expenses, not more than $18,532,000;

(ii) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, not more than $4,298,000;

(iii) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, not more than $2,190,000; and

(iv) Administration and coordination, not more than $1,762,000:

Provided, however, That expenditures and obligations under any of these items except the last may be increased by not more than 10 per centum if such increase is accompanied by an equal decrease in expenditures and obligations under one or more of the other items, including the last.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to authorize additional appropriations for the saline water conversion program and to amend the Saline Water Conservation Act in certain other respects. This is the legislation referred to by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN], last Wednesday, when we had the Interior Department appropriation bill under consideration, in explaining why only $7.5 million was included in that bill for the saline water program. As Mrs. HANSEN stated, only $7.5 million remains of the amount presently authorized to be appropriated for this program, and authorizing legislation is needed before the full program for fiscal year 1968 can be funded. The increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated provided for in H.R. 6133 will make available for appropriation in fiscal year 1968 a total of $26,782,000, which is the amount recommended in the President's budget. If this legislation is enacted without undue delay, the other body can consider for appropriation the full amount recommended in the President's budget and the final amount to be appropriated for fiscal year 1968 can be determined in the conference of the two Houses.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to authorizing additional appropriations, this legislation amends the Saline Water Conversion Act to give the Secretary authority to construct and use test bed plants, which are intermediate-size plants, in the research and development work. With this additional authority, the existing demonstration plants can be integrated into the regular research program in order to permit them to be used as test beds in conducting further research. The basic act also is amended by redesignating as "prototype plants" the large plants which must be recommended to the Congress and specifically authorized by the Congress. They are now referred to in the act as "demonstration plants." These changes in the basic act have the effect of clarifying the definitions for the full sequence in the development of a process and conforming the terminology in the act to that currently in use throughout the industry. One additional amendment to the Saline Water Conversion Act adopted by the committee requires that any test bed plant, module or component costing in excess of $1 million must be specifically authorized by the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizing appropriations only for fiscal year 1968 is an outgrowth of action taken by the 89th Congress in the act of August 11, 1965. The Congress then had before it an administration proposal calling for an extension of the saline water conversion program through fiscal year 1972 and a $200 million increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated. In our consideration of that legislation, we concluded that, while it was appropriate for the Office of Saline Water to be given a firm basis on which to plan operations over a 5-year period, the program should be reviewed annually and that actual appropriation authorization should likewise be sought annually.

Pursuant to the 1965 act, the legislation embodied in H.R. 6133, as introduced, was recommended to the Congress. However, instead of going along with the year-by-year authorization, the Department asked for the authorization of appropriations for 3 years and made its presentation to the committee on that basis. Nevertheless, the committee's position has not changed. We still favor a year-by-year program authorization act, and we are convinced that this can be done without sacrificing management flexibility or research progress. The research and development programs for NASA, the Defense Department, and the Atomic Energy Commission are authorized year by year and we expect to handle this program, which now involves a sizable amount of money in the same way. The very nature of this program makes it quite uncertain from one year to the next what direction the research effort should take and the committee believes that a year-by-year authorization is necessary in order to meet its oversight responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, when the saline water conversion program was first authorized in 1952 it was hoped that the American scientific community would be able to quickly provide desalting processes for furnishing cheap water. Although this goal still has not been attained, there has been progress toward economic desalting and certainly we now have a better understanding of the magnitude of the problem. One measure of progress in this endeavor to develop low-cost desalting processes is the application of the technology attributable to the program. Primarily as a result of this Federal research program, a new and rapidly growing industry has been born. More and more commercial plants are being built each year not only in this country but in other nations around the world. During 1966 alone, U.S. manufacturers sold desalting equipment sufficient to produce an additional 22½ million gallons of fresh water daily. Development progress for one process—the multistage distillation process—has advanced to the point where it will be tested in a large-scale plant in the expectation of showing water production costs of around 22 cents per thousand gallons. This is the metropolitan water district plant which this body approved a couple of weeks ago. We anticipate that, as this new industry expands and new technology is acquired, we will reach the point where the activities of the Office of Saline Water can be phased out until eventually this federally sponsored research program can be terminated.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs has thoroughly examined the program involved in this legislation and I urge approval of H.R. 6133 as amended by the committee.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6133, a bill to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to extend the program, and for other purposes.

The purpose of H.R. 6133, is to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for fiscal 1968, which will make available for 1968, a total of $26,782,000, the amount requested in the President's budget. H.R. 6133, also expands the changes the saline water conversion program by authorizing the construction of "test bed" and "prototype" plants and integrates the demonstration plant program into the regular research and development program.

Mr. Speaker, it is amusing to note that on April 20, 1967, this body passed H.R. 207, a bill to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant. Now, we are here amending the basic act to provide the Department of the Interior with the authority to participate in the construction and operation of "prototype" plants. This "legislation leapfrogging" has already created chaos in the saline water conversion program. And I should like to remind my colleagues that the supposedly related legislation passed by this body less than 2 weeks ago was a grant-in-aid to the Metropolitan Water District of California, which should not have been considered or passed until this bill, H.R. 6133, was considered and passed by this House. If such a procedure had been followed, I think that legislation would have been considered in a much different light by the Members of this House. Such action was a deviation from the saline water conversion program as previously approved by the Congress.

The legislation now before this House, amends the saline water conversion program previously approved by the Congress. I have supported that program and will continue to do so, in the hope that there will be a real breakthrough in the desalting processes to produce potable water at reasonable costs. At the same time, I would ask my colleagues to pay close attention to the saline water conversion program to determine what progress, if any, is being made. After 15 years of research and development and the expenditure of $110 million, it becomes our responsibility to carefully scrutinize the progress of the saline water conversion program.

Because of the House action on the 20th day of April, the House stated we did not need to worry about any planned program of research and development in the saline water conversion program; that we should just "leapfrog" all over everything that had been previously outlined by the Office of Saline Water, and go right ahead and spend $72 million as a gift to the MWD and the people of Los Angeles, and produce 150 million gallons of water a day.

I tried to make the House realize on April 20 that passage of H.R. 207 was the wrong procedure. As I said then and as I reiterate today—the Office of Saline Water has never built a plant to produce 1 million gallons of water per day on a sustained basis. Several Members from California came forward and said there were plants in existence that had produced more than 1 million gallons of water a day—and I do not deny that—but the Office of Saline Water, on whom we have spent $110 million in research and development, has yet to construct a plant which will produce 1 million gallons of water per day on a continuous basis of 365 days.

The only people who should vote for this bill are the 32 Members who voted against the bill on April 20, and the 80 Members who were absent.

This bill H.R. 6133 should be passed. I would hope the President would veto the other one we passed on April 20. H.R. 6133 provides the procedure which the Director of the Office of Saline Water and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior asked for. H.R. 6133, expands the authority of the Office of Saline Water, and the saline water conversion program, by authorizing the construction of test beds and prototype plants, and allows the demonstration plant program to be integrated into the regular research and development program.

This is the bill that should have been brought up first and passed, since it is a good bill and since it says to the Office of Saline Water "we have hope for you—you are taking in this bill the right approach."

The bill provides the money for 1 year, and requires the Office of Saline Water to come back each year to the respective committees of the House of Representatives and submit a progress report.

On the basis of these reports, we may give them additional authorization if they show progress under the program that has been approved. If they do, then I am sure the next year, and in the several years to follow, we will again come before the House asking for additional authorization.

There is great hope that the Office of Saline Water can either use one of the three methods they are working on now, or we hope come up with a new method which will produce large quantities of potable water either from sea water, from brackish water, or minerally charged water in some sections of our country. That is the challenge I think exists for the Office of Saline Water.

Mr. Speaker, once again this legislation provides the authority, flexibility, and changes requested by the Department of the Interior and the Office of Saline Water to accomplish the purposes for which it was established. I support the bill and urge its passage.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Colorado that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 6133, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MANPOWER REPORT TO THE CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

To the Congress of the United States:

In January 1966, 14 young men—high school dropouts—enrolled in a Baltimore Neighborhood Youth Corps program. Eight months later, most of them had returned to school, helped by part-time work and wages received through job training.

Last February in the same city, 29 women—all on relief rolls—graduated from a federally sponsored course to train nurses' aids. Today they are off welfare, working in hospitals. As they help themselves and their families, they are helping the Nation meet its critical shortage of health workers.

In Chicago last summer, six employment offices were set up for teenagers under the Manpower Development and Training Act—and run by the young people themselves. Through these centers, 750 young men and women got jobs. What might have been empty summers became, for them, a satisfying, productive time.

These examples of progress are the result of programs begun only a few years ago—programs which reflect the Nation's commitment to a positive manpower policy.

By bringing new skills to thousands of Americans, these programs are fueling the ambitions and fulfilling the hopes of many who might otherwise have been condemned to idleness—not by choice but by lack of opportunity.

This manpower report to the Congress, submitted under the Manpower Development and Training Act, surveys the progress we have made in the last year. It also points up the troubling and persistent problems of unemployment in a prosperous economy—and the steps we must take to overcome those problems.

1966—A YEAR OF PROGRESS

An effective manpower policy depends on a healthy economy. In 1966, this Nation's unemployment rate dropped below 4 percent—reaching a 13-year low. Seventy-four million people were working, nearly 2 million more than when the year began.

The total production of goods and services in America increased to a historic $740 billion—$58 billion more than in 1965. On the whole, jobs were paying better than ever and were more regular and secure than they had been in many years. More than 98 percent of men in the labor force with families to support were at work. The after-tax income of American families increased, after allowing for price increases, by 3.5 percent.

This economic progress did not occur by chance. It was the achievement of business and labor. It was the result of gradually improving education. Much of it also came from careful efforts by Government to encourage and sustain economic growth—and to carry out humane and positive manpower programs.

Those efforts—even the newest of them—have been remarkably fruitful. Through the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, strengthened by the 1965 and 1966 amendments, and through other progressive measures, we have taken vital steps to assure opportunity to all our citizens.

By the end of last year, for example, under the Manpower Development and Training Act programs:

About 600,000 unemployed and underemployed workers had been enrolled in training;

Three out of four trainees who completed their classroom work had gone on to regular employment;

Nearly nine out of 10 citizens who had completed on-the-job training were gainfully employed;

Thousands of citizens most in need of help—Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, and other disadvantaged young Americans—had received training;

Workers by the thousands were being trained to relieve acute manpower shortages in the health fields and in a variety of other occupations.

By late 1966, under the Economic Opportunity Act:

More than 800,000 young people had received a new start through the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

Thousands of poor boys and girls, many who were at less than a fourth-grade literacy level, had gotten training and jobs through the Job Corps.

Two hundred thousand young men and women, who might have been forced to leave college because of financial difficulties, had continued their education through the college work-study program.

One hundred and thirty-eight thousand needy family breadwinners were given new skills through the work experience and training program.

These programs are helping more than a million Americans each year to gain the knowledge and skills needed for steady productive employment.

THE PARADOX OF PROSPERITY

Our manpower programs have accomplished much. They must be continued—and their momentum increased. For the year 1966 reminded us that expansion of the economy will not, by itself, eliminate all unemployment and underemployment.

Last year the overall unemployment rate dropped to 3.8 percent and the rate for married men to below 2 percent, an impressively low figure. But we have no reason to be complacent. The tragedy of joblessness is not only in the amount of unemployment—but in the kind of unemployment.

Over 12 percent of our young people aged 16 to 19 were still looking for jobs at the year's end.

Among Negroes and other minority groups, the unemployment rate was almost double the overall rate.

In slums and depressed rural areas, joblessness ran close to 10 percent. And one out of every three people in those areas who are or ought to be working today faces some severe employment problem.

Much of this unemployment occurred not because jobs were unavailable, but because people were unable to fill jobs, or, for various reasons, unwilling to fill them.

Often the job is in one place—but the worker in another.

Or the job calls for a special skill—a skill the unemployed person does not have.

The employer insists on a high school diploma—but the job seeker quit school without this qualification.

An employer demands a "clean record"—but the applicant has a record marred by a juvenile arrest.

A job offers 1 day's work a week—but

the worker needs 5 days' pay to support his family.

All these problems have long been with us. In the past, however, they were often obscured by general unemployment: when thousands of skilled experienced workers were searching for work, scant attention was paid to the jobless high school dropout.

Today, illuminated by prosperity, these problems stand out more clearly.

At the end of 1966, about 2.9 million workers were unemployed. But it is estimated that during the course of the year, about 10.5 million workers suffered some unemployment.

About three-quarters of the 10.5 million workers were only temporarily out of jobs—and soon found work. The young worker just entering the labor force belongs to this group; the bank teller who has left his job to seek a better one; the lathe operator who has been laid off while adjustments are made in the production schedule.

We cannot eliminate all temporary unemployment. In a free and mobile society, people must be able to change jobs and get better ones; workers must be able to leave and enter the labor force at will; and the rate of production of particular firms and industries must be free to respond to market forces.

We must seek, however, to minimize the hardships of temporary unemployment—

By making it unnecessary for young men and women to spend long weeks job hunting after they leave school;

By providing greater year-round opportunities to seasonal workers;

By improving job referral services to bring jobs and workers closer together.

Our manpower programs seek to do just those things—and to reduce the waste and frustration that result from even short spells of unemployment.

But our manpower programs must do more. They must reach the workers who are unemployed for long periods and those who are frequently out of work.

Preliminary estimates from our labor force survey show that during 1966 there were 2.5 million American workers who were jobless for 15 weeks or more during the year. Of those, about 700,000 were out of work during more than half of the year. Another one-half to 1 million potential workers had abandoned the search for a job, at least temporarily, and were not even counted as unemployed. Still another 500,000 unemployed were probably missed by the labor force survey. Others were employed at part-time jobs when they needed full-time work.

Some of these workers should not be in the labor force at all, including those too old or too ill to hold steady jobs. These people can be helped by improvements in our health, public assistance, and social security programs.

Others in this group have the skill and experience to find and hold good jobs. They can be helped by improvements in our employment services, and by actions to reduce seasonal unemployment.

But there are many who need special manpower services before they can become fully adequate workers and earners. Precise measurement of the magnitude of the task ahead is difficult—indeed, impossible. But we can estimate that there are roughly 2 million potential workers who can be helped and are willing to help themselves.

These are the dropouts—young men and women who have left school with inadequate education and without skills. Lacking experience, they cannot find work; lacking work, they can never get experience.

They are older workers whose obsolete skills are useless in today's job market.

They are Negroes, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, and others barred from jobs by other people's prejudice.

They are the illiterate, the migrants, the mentally and physically handicapped, the young men rejected as unfit for military service.

This is the effort that has to be made—to reduce unemployment to the point where all that remains is the result of inevitable movements within the work force, irreducible seasonal factors, and a small number of people whose disadvantages or circumstances preclude their satisfactory employment.

The remaining problem is formidable, and its solution will take time. But it is of manageable proportions.

Never before have we had so great an opportunity—or so urgent an obligation—to bring training and skills to people willing to help themselves.

These Americans need hope, not handouts. They want, and deserve, work and training, not welfare.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN MANPOWER POLICY

If we are to proceed in practical ways to assist the unemployed, we must pursue five new directions in manpower policy.

1. WE MUST BRIDGE THE GAP BETWEEN EDUCATION AND WORK

Few nations—perhaps none—can match the achievements of our educational system. None equals the record of our economy. Yet our youth unemployment rate is the highest of any modern nation.

We pay too little attention to the two out of three young people who do not go to college and the many others who do not finish college. As citizens and supporters of public education, we should be as concerned about assisting them in their transition from school to job as we are about preparing others for college.

Too many young men and women face long and bitter months of job hunting or marginal work after leaving school. Our society has not yet established satisfactory ways to bridge the gap between school and work. If we fail to deal energetically with this problem, thousands of young people will continue to lapse into years of intermittent, unrewarding and menial labor.

Our interest in a young person should not stop when he finishes—or drops out of—school. Our concern should become even greater then. It should extend to the point at which every young person becomes self-sufficient. Any other view would not only lack humanity—it would be false economy.

Other nations have developed broad industry training and internship programs, offering education and experience to young people entering a trade or profession. Still others have established close ties between educational institutions and employment agencies at all levels.

We can profit by these examples if we:

Build into our employment system a broader concept of apprenticeship and work experience;

Establish in our educational programs opportunities for students to learn more about the world of work;

Build a system in which education and work experience are brought together to provide the kind of preparation that fits the needs of our society.

To achieve these ends, I am directing the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make a thorough study of the relationship between our educational programs and our manpower programs, between learning and earning in America. By more closely relating the two we can reduce the high unemployment rate among young Americans.

In this task, the Secretaries will consult State education and employment agencies, local boards of education, business, and labor leaders, and the special Committee on Administration of Training Programs which Congress recently authorized. They will also review such related problems as the difference between laws relating to the school-leaving age and those governing the age for entering certain occupations, and any applications of minimum wage agreements, laws or practices which inhibit experimentation in adding a work content to educational programs.

2. WE MUST CONCENTRATE OUR EFFORTS

Six years ago, general unemployment plagued the country. Nearly 7 percent of our workers could not find jobs. Every State and almost every city suffered. The situation was far worse in slums and depressed rural areas than in the suburbs—but unemployment was so widespread that it had to be fought everywhere.

The Nation's employment map shows 150 major labor areas. In March and April of 1961, unemployment in 101 of these areas exceeded 6 percent. At the end of 1963, 38 of these 150 areas still suffered high unemployment.

By the end of 1966, only eight of the major labor areas had an unemployment rate above 6 percent. An expanding economy, strengthened educational programs, and public and private manpower training efforts, had created jobs and trained men to fill them.

But 2 million Americans needing employment assistance still remained—Americans who could be helped and who were willing to help themselves. Education, training, swift economic advances somehow had passed them by.

Last year, to develop a body of detailed information about these unemployed citizens and their problems the Secretary of Labor surveyed unemployment in selected slums throughout the country.

This survey concluded that:

Unemployment in the city slums is three times higher than the national average.

One out of three potential workers in those areas is not adequately employed—including those who could be working but are not; those who are working part-time but want full-time jobs, and those who are working full-time but earning substandard wages.

The results of this study show not only where the unemployed are but why they are jobless. The study concluded that despite the spectacular growth of our economy, despite improvements in the human and social conditions of American life, the unemployment rate in many of these depressed areas is as high as it was 6 years ago.

To the extent that the remaining unemployment is concentrated in these areas, our programs also must be concentrated. To scatter our effort now is to waste it.

I have asked Congress to provide an additional $135 million in fiscal 1968 under the Economic Opportunity Act for a new manpower program to provide special assistance to our most disadvantaged citizens.

With these funds, we can:

Focus our services more sharply upon areas and individuals in greatest need.

Tailor these services to the requirements of each individual—counseling, health services, training, and followup assistance on a case-by-case basis.

Enlist the support of local business and labor organizations—the key to any successful employment program.

But the need was too urgent to permit delay. Accordingly, I asked the Secretary of Labor and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, in cooperation with the heads of other Federal agencies, to begin this special manpower program immediately with all available resources.

Our manpower programs also must be specially aimed at two other groups: seasonally employed workers and the handicapped.

Thousands of seasonally employed workers lead hard, uncertain lives. For them, employment is determined not by their abilities or opportunities but by the calendar. Among them are construction workers and hired farm laborers—especially migrant farmworkers, who pick a meager living from the soil, "traveling everywhere but living nowhere."

To help these workers, I have asked the Secretary of Labor in cooperation with the Secretary of Agriculture and the Acting Secretary of Commerce to make a detailed survey of seasonal unemployment and underemployment—and to find ways to deal with these problems.

This study should seek methods by which Federal, State, and local governments, through their contracting procedures and other activities, can reduce seasonal lags in employment, especially in the construction industry. It should explore the feasibility of a migrant manpower corporation and other ways to help regularize the employment of hired farmworkers, particularly migratory farmworkers.

For thousands of mentally and physically handicapped Americans, employment has too long been considered an exclusive concern of "charity." Yet, we know that many handicapped citizens can learn important skills, and can become effective workers.

I am directing the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to explore additional ways in which business, industry, and government can provide more meaningful employment opportunities to handicapped citizens.

3. WE MUST MAKE OUR OVERALL MANPOWER EFFORT MORE EFFICIENT

Our major commitment to an affirmative manpower policy is relatively recent. Many of our manpower programs are new, and we are still building the machinery to carry them out. By a combination of law and delegation of authority, the Department of Labor has primary operating responsibility for manpower programs.

But the problems of manpower development cut across organizational lines. They are closely intertwined with problems of social, economic, and educational development. Accordingly, the Department of Labor has established close working ties with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Economic Opportunity, and other Federal agencies having responsibilities in these areas.

Perhaps the most important of these new working ties is the recent delegation of several OEO adult work and training programs to the Department of Labor. These arrangements link the Labor Department's responsibility in the manpower area with OEO's responsibility for coordinating antipoverty programs. They provide local initiative by the carrying out of local programs through Community Action Agencies wherever this is practicable.

We are working to strengthen those ties: to centralize, consolidate, and streamline our operations.

The task of manpower development, of course, cannot be a Federal task alone. Recognizing this, we are placing greater emphasis on on-the-job training programs conducted by private employers.

As the demand increases for workers with special skills, we should take positive steps particularly to encourage private job training efforts:

First. We must obtain reliable information on which to base our plans. I have asked Congress to provide funds for a systematic study by the Secretary of Labor to answer these questions: What public and private job training programs are now available? Whom do they serve? What needs remain unmet?

Second. I am directing the Secretary of Labor and the Acting Secretary of Commerce, in cooperation with other Federal agencies, to establish a task force on occupational training. This task force, with members drawn from business, labor, agriculture and the general public, will survey training programs operated by private industry, and will recommend ways that the Federal Government can promote and assist private training programs.

Third. I have recommended that Congress provide an additional $5.6 million to enable the Secretary of Labor to aid private industry in experimental projects providing a wide range of services and training to seriously disadvantaged workers.

Fourth. I am asking the Secretaries of Labor and Agriculture to conduct a study to determine both short-term and future manpower needs and the supply of workers in rural America. With this information, we will be able to plan to meet the needs of our workers and of our rural economy.

4. WE MUST MAKE MILITARY SERVICE A PATH TO PRODUCTIVE CAREERS

Members of the Armed Forces have an opportunity to perform vital military service. They can also acquire knowledge and experience to prepare them for civilian careers after their service.

In fiscal 1966, 750,000 servicemen completed specialized training programs. In almost 2,000 different courses, from automobile repair to aerospace technology, these young citizens have gained skills and experience which help them to obtain civilian jobs.

The armed services have also made educational growth possible for thousands of servicemen through the U.S. Armed Forces Institute and other educational programs. Nearly 80,000 servicemen earned the equivalent of a high school diploma last year.

In addition, the Secretary of Defense has launched Project 100,000 to accept and train thousands of young men who were previously rejected as unfit for military service. Under this program, 40,000 young men are joining the Armed Forces this year; 100,000 will join next year. All will receive specialized training to help them become good soldiers—and later, productive citizens.

There are, of course, some military specialists whose training does not lead directly to civilian employment.

To help them, I have asked the Secretary of Defense to make available, to the maximum extent possible, in-service training and educational opportunities which will increase their chances for employment in civilian life.

5. WE MUST WORK TOWARD A MORE COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER PROGRAM

If our manpower programs are to reach as many workers as they must, we should strengthen the Federal-State employment service so that it can improve job placement, provide better training and job information, and offer guidance and counseling to all those who need these vital services.

A sound economic and manpower policy also requires effective measures for maintaining the income of the worker and his family when working patterns change.

I urge the Congress to amend the unemployment insurance laws to provide training, guidance, or other services in conjunction with extended benefits to the long-term unemployed. I urge Congress also to extend the protection of the system to additional workers, to establish a more realistic level of benefits, and to correct the abuses which occur within the present system.

Along with the improvements I have proposed in the social security system and our public assistance programs, these steps will enhance the lives of millions of poor families and give them incentives to improve their education and their job potential. Further, I have proposed under the Economic Opportunity Act that Job Corpsmen, Neighborhood Youth Corpsmen, and others engaged in work and training under that act should be given greater incentives to work, by allowing them to earn more without a corresponding loss of welfare assistance to their families.

Our economic system must have adequate "manpower"—but manpower is not enough. The economic system is a means. Its end is the individual.

To better serve the deeper purpose of our manpower programs, we must seek answers to the most fundamental questions about unemployment.

I therefore urge the Congress to provide $20 million for a special census of 3 million households in America.

Among other data, this population census will give us vitally needed manpower information about unemployed Americans. It will provide for us a more complete profile of the jobless worker. Where does he live? How much education and training does he have? What are his health and economic problems? What other obstacles must be overcome to find and hold a job?

CONCLUSION

We know that a vigorous economy and an effective educational system are the bedrock of an effective manpower policy.

Our economy is healthy, and our unemployment rate is low. We work with constant vigilance to keep that rate low.

The 18 landmark educational measures I proposed and you in the Congress enacted are symbols of our belief that education is the most important investment we can make in the Nation's future.

Thus, on these foundations—a thriving economy and educational progress—we can shape our manpower policies to—

Prevent the misuse, and nonuse, of our youth.

Meet squarely the problems of the 2 million Americans who need employment assistance and who stand ready to help themselves.

Meet the needs of a burgeoning economy for skilled workers.

Help workers with special employment problems—the handicapped, the migrant worker, the armed services rejectee.

Bring workers to jobs as well as jobs to workers.

Develop a closer partnership with business and private agencies.

We are heartened by the progress of our manpower programs over the past years. This progress is not material for bold headlines: quiet victors seldom are.

One man's struggle to improve himself, to learn new skills and discard old habits, is deeply personal and often painful.

But each day victories are being won—in dozens of neighborhood youth centers, in scores of Job Corps camps, in thousands of training projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Often our progress is measured not by what happened but by what has been avoided. The high school dropout whose name might have been recorded on a police blotter—but was not because he learned a skill and got a good job. The father of five who might have waited in line for his relief check—but did not because he was trained and went on to steady employment.

The yardstick we must use is not what we have accomplished in the past—but what we must do in the future.

We will do our best. We will try and try again. We will never lose sight of our goal—to guarantee to every man an opportunity to unlock his own potential; to earn the satisfaction of standing on his own two feet.

Our goal, in short, is to offer to every citizen one of the greatest blessings: a sure sense of his own usefulness.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 1, 1967.*

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL TO ENTER INTO LEASES OF REAL PROPERTY FOR PERIODS NOT EXCEEDING 30 YEARS

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the bill, H.R. 8553, to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes, is on the Suspension Calendar for today. However, an identical bill, S. 1039, passed the other body earlier today, and is now on the Speaker's table. Therefore, in lieu of calling up H.R. 8553, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1039, to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1039

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the portion of section 2103(a), title 39, United States Code, which precedes paragraph (2) thereof is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Whenever the Postmaster General determines after consultation with the Administration of General Services, that it is not desirable or feasible to construct a postal facility under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended (40 U.S.C. 601–615), the Postmaster General, in addition to the authority conferred upon him by section 2102 of this title may—

"(1) negotiate and enter into lease agreements which do not bind the Government for periods exceeding thirty years, on such terms as the Postmaster General deems to be in the best interest of the United States, for the erection by the lessor of special-purpose post office buildings on lands sold, leased, or otherwise disposed of by the Postmaster General to or otherwise acquired by, the lessor;"

(b) Section 2103, title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(d) As used in this section the term 'special purpose post office buildings' means a building which has the following characteristics:

"(1) it is situated in a particular geographical location to make it convenient for processing mail;

"(2) it is designed in a particular configuration to make it convenient for processing mail; and

"(3) At least thirty days prior to entering into a lease agreement under this section or under section 2102 of this title for a special-purpose post office building having gross floor space exceeding twenty thousand square feet, the Postmaster General shall transmit to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives a report which includes a full and complete statement concerning the need for such an agreement and the facts relating to the proposed transaction.

"(f) A statement in the lease agreement that the requirements of subsections (d) and (e) have been met, or that the lease agreement is not subject to these subsections, is conclusive."

(c) The text of section 2109, title 39, United States Code, is amended to read as follows: "Agreements may not be entered into under sections 2104 and 2105 of this title after July 22, 1964, and under section 2103 after June 30, 1972."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 8553 is extremely important legislation. The bill was favorably reported by unanimous vote of my committee and only after receiving very careful consideration.

The Postmaster General's 30-year leasing authority for acquiring new postal facilities, along with his authority to condemn, purchase, and dispose of land for the purpose of carrying out this leasing program, expired at midnight last night, April 30. Prompt enactment of H.R. 8553 is absolutely essential to the Post Office Department's continued ability to do its job. In fact, the Department has testified that unless this legislation is enacted, the "Postmaster General's all-out effort to avoid catastrophe in handling the mail explosion will suffer a damaging and even a dangerous setback."

Today we have a mail volume that exceeds the mail volume of the rest of the world—over 80 billion pieces a year—but we still have basically the same postal facilities that Postmaster General Jim Farley had back in the late 1930's, when the postal service had only one-third as much mail to carry. According to Postmaster General O'Brien, this is the important factor that has set the stage for "catastrophe."

I would like to emphasize that H.R. 8553 provides for no new authorities. It simply extends for another 5-year period, to June 30, 1972, and subject to certain new restrictions, the authority that the Postmaster General has had since 1954 to enter into long-term leases for postal facilities.

At this point I would like to yield such time as he may require to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] who will discuss the legislation in full detail.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman has stated, H.R. 8553 a bill identical to S. 1039, was reported unanimously by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee. It was also reported to the full committee by the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization by unanimous vote.

Every Member of this House is aware of the crisis that exists in the postal service today. Mail volume will have increased to 83 billion pieces a year by 1968, up 23 percent since 1963. In order to handle the ever-increasing volume of mail, the Post Office Department must acquire 7 to 10 million square feet of additional space each year.

The Department acquires new space three ways:

The lease construction program administered by the Post Office Department;

The Federal construction program administered by General Services Administration; and

The postal building program carried on by the Department under delegation of authority from General Services Administration.

S. 1039 will continue the authority of the Postmaster General tc lease space for up to 30 years and create three restrictions not contained in the act which expired yesterday.

This is the third time in as many Congresses that we have considered this type of legislation. In the 88th Congress the Postmaster General's authority to acquire and dispose of sites and to enter into leases for periods up to 30 years was due to expire on July 22, 1964, and by enactment of Public Law 88-480 we extended this authority until December 31, 1966. In the last Congress, by enactment of Public Law 89-637, the authority was further extended to April 30, 1967.

S. 1039 would extend for an additional 5-year period, through June 30, 1972, the authority of the Postmaster General to acquire and dispose of sites and to enter into leases for periods up to 30 years. In addition, and most significantly, the bills, unlike any previous legislation on the subject, contain three important restrictions not provided in existing law, that are directed at certain criticisms that have been leveled against the leasing program in the past few years. These new restrictions are:

First, as a condition precedent to the construction of a leased building under the terms of the new legislation, the Postmaster General is required to consult with the Administrator of the General Services Administration and thereafter to determine that it is not desirable or feasible to construct a postal facility under the provisions of the Public Buildings Act of 1959;

Second, that the construction under this bill will be only for special-purpose post office buildings. The bill defines a special-purpose building as being one which is situated in a particular geographical location to make it convenient for mail processing, is designed in a particular configuration to make it convenient for processing mail, and is not readily usable or convertible to use as a general-purpose office building; and

Third, that the Postmaster General submit a statement explaining all aspects of the lease for each special-purpose postal facility with a gross floor space exceeding 20,000 square feet to the Committee on Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the House of Representatives at least 30 days prior to executing the lease.

Under the lease construction program, the Department contracts for a building of certain specifications. Usually the land is either under option to or owned by the Department, and depending upon the size of the building, plans may be drawn by a POD-hired architect for buildings over 50,000 square feet, or merely outlined in a document of specifications. Buildings ranging in size from 4,000 to 50,000 square feet are bid on tentative drawings and firm construction requirements. The successful bidder is then required to retain an architectural engineering firm and submit detailed drawings to the Department for approval.

The length of the desired lease term is determined on the basis of foreseeable occupancy needs. Generally this is related to the size and cost of the facility, with a 30-year term being used on the larger facilities, a 20-year term in the medium-size category, and less than 20 years on the smaller buildings. Five-year renewal options are required as follows: four on a 10-year basic term; five on a 15-year basic term; six on a 20-year basic term; eight on a 30-year basic term.

Bidders agree to construct the building called for by the design data and rent it to the Department for the term and the renewal options in the bidding documents. Funds expended by the Department for sites and AE fees are repaid to the Department by the successful bidder so that the project is fully financed by the successful bidder.

Where leasing is desirable and where long-term occupancy can be foreseen, the 30-year lease term is more economical than the shorter 20-year term that the Department would be required to use if this bill is not passed. The larger leased facilities, where the Department needs are firm for 30 years or more and where we have used the 30-year lease term, are special-purpose buildings. They have built-in features, such as abnormally high ceilings for mechanization that severely limit their use for purposes other than mail handling. If the Department is forced to reduce the basic lease term on this type of facility to 20 years, it will increase the annual rental very significantly because the cost of the building must be amortized over a shorter period.

To summarize, Mr. Speaker, the 30-year leasing authority contained in this bill should be continued because—

First. It is the most economical method of procuring space where long-term occupancy is projected and leasing is appropriate.

Second. The 30-year term enables the Department to more evenly match space costs and revenue; thus minimizing Treasury financing.

Third. Even though the Department intends to greatly enlarge its Federal construction program, continued 30-year leasing authority is essential to the development of facilities where Federal ownership is inappropriate.

The land acquisition and disposition authority contained in this bill, including the all-important condemnation authority, should be continued because—

First. It is basic to a competitive lease construction program irrespective of the length of the lease terms.

Second. The condemnation authority protects the Post Office Department against excessive land costs, and its very existence enables the Department to obtain options at fair prices which would not otherwise be obtainable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of S. 1039.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. When there is an opportunity for the Post Office Department to use land which a local community owns and is willing to offer to the Post Office Department, and, through an authority, to build a post office, why is priority not given by the U.S. Post Office Department to such an offer?

As an example, I have objected to a post office being built on private land, and to private land being condemned, when, in one community, the local community, by its governmental authority, is willing to give the land free for the period of the term of the lease, at no cost. Instead of that, the Post Office Department spent $50,000 to $100,000 to buy and condemn land at a place where the local community objected to the post office being. I could not stop it.

How do we get around that? I believe the local community should have an opportunity to say where the post office should go, when it has a civic center and wants it to go in its own civic center.

Mr. DANIELS. There may be many reasons why the Department may reject an offer of land, even if given free to the Post Office Department. Today there is a great increase in the volume of mail. I indicated in my statement only a few moments ago that the volume of mail has increased by 23 percent over the past 5 years. It is estimated that the volume of mail will continue to increase, conservatively, at a rate of about 3 percent or more per year.

The Post Office Department faces a crisis today. Therefore, it is necessary for the Post Office Department to resolve, "How are we going to give American business and American taxpayers better service?"

They propose to erect special-purpose and Federal buildings. These buildings are of tremendous size.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Let me just pose the policy question. When the local community objects to the location of a post office in that community, not only by citizens' petitions but also by local government action, which shall prevail, the national policy or the policy of the local community?

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman, but I wish to make one further statement, since I did not finish my previous statement.

The Department is the best judge as to its needs. I believe it is a question of need. The question is, What is best for the Post Office Department and the American public?

I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CORBETT. I should like to point out to the gentleman that today I cannot—nor can he—know what the thinking of the Post Office Department was in this particular instance.

However, I would point out to the gentleman that the bill, as it is advocated today, has a provision for oversight of all these leases. Hence, if the people of a community—or my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania—have a complaint to make, it would be possible to do so under the new restrictions which are included in this legislation.

Mr. DANIELS. That is absolutely correct. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The point I am making is, the local community decides it wants a civic center, and it wants the U.S. post office put in that civic center.

However, the U.S. Post Office Department, in order to serve certain businesses or certain driveins or certain supermarkets, decides it would rather have a box, which is simply a store front with no decoration and no civic improvements whatever, near those particularly favored businesses. I would not even want to infer how those businesses get so favored. Here is the point: The civic community, the citizens and the government, all want it to go in a civic center, and the businesses then say, "No, just put it over near us in a little box." Of course, that makes this particular supermarket or supermarkets the possessors of a tremendous advantage over the others, which I think is wrong. I have objected to it strongly. So much so that I said do not build the post office at all, and I was very quickly overruled by the U.S. Post Office Department.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. POOL. We had a similar situation in Dallas with technicalities and a hassle about the price of the property. The property being considered for the post office site would cost about $5 million. This went on for 6 or 8 months with nothing being done. Of course, I had originally proposed the post office when I first came to the Congress, and I had been waiting 4 years to get some action. They could not arrive at a proper price for the property and would not pay $5 million for it. I did the very same thing that you are talking about here. I got the city council to resolve to sell to the Federal Government 40 acres at $1 a square foot. Now, that is a real cheap price. Downtown the price has been $18 to $30 a square foot, which was out of the question in this case. Also, this is on an expressway which connects with all of the other expressways and will allow fast transit of the mail from Fort Worth and Dallas and all of the northwest Texas places.

Some of the city fellows there objected to the fact that I was not putting it downtown and that I was putting it out in a community called Oak Cliff, where I was born and raised, which was a part of my district. The fact is, though, I saved the Federal Government $4 million. It is now located on a better facility, and the Post Office Department in this particular case overruled some of the city fellows, you might say. But who is going to determine what the local community wants and who is going to do what?

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. I think the gentleman is making a very good point, but here is a case where the U.S. Post Office Department was going to get the land free in a civic center for putting up a post office even to the point where the local community would establish an authority and rent the building to the post office with no profit. Instead of that the Post Office Department goes in and condemns it and does exactly the opposite; that is, paying the highest price. I wish I was either in the gentleman's party or had his magnetism so I could say myself, as the gentleman did, how you overruled the Post Office Department, and they did what you wanted. They certainly do not do what I want, because I objected to the post office completely, and, boy, that post office is right where they put it.

Mr. DANIELS. I will say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there has been criticism leveled at this program. I have already stated to the House that we have proposed by this bill something new. We are proposing three new restrictions, one of which requires the Post Office Department, before they enter into a 30-year lease on a special purpose building, to file something in the nature of a prospectus outlining all of the details of the lease, not only with this Subcommittee on Post Office but also on the Senate side with the Public Works Committee there, at least 30 days prior to entering into the lease so that we have an opportunity to examine the details. I do not think that the Post Office Department dare ride roughshod over any objections of the Members of this House. As a matter of fact, I asked that question of Mr. Coffman, who represented the Post Office Department at the hearing, and he indicated they would be very reluctant to override the wishes of the Members of this House or the subcommittee which would have jurisdiction of this legislation.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DANIELS. Yes, I yield further to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I hope the author of this bill will show and indicate the legislative intent, that where there is a civic center in the community and the community seeks to protect the civic center, that the U.S. Post Office Department shall not choose between or be affected by the large supermarkets and that one does not have advantage over the other but that the local areas affected shall be consulted.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Also, let the legislative intent show that the Post Office Department should make the surveys and perform the work necessary in order to determine the flow of traffic and the ease of handling large trucks and other necessary equipment used by the Post Office Department, and that the community recognize the necessity of the Department getting the mail out.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with which we are confronted today is a bogged up situation because of too many people wanting special favors from the Post Office Department.

Mr. Speaker, all we can hope to do is to try to help the Post Office Department get the mail delivered and to obtain for it the necessary access roads with which to accommodate these large trucks, and get them out onto the large roads in order to deliver the mail.

Mr. DANIELS. Your subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service does not intend that the local community considerations should be overriden by our Government in Washington, if they decide they want a post office in a civic-type community center or have that judgment overruled by the Post Office Department. It is not my opinion that this is the intent and purpose of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] has expired.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wish to point out the fact that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] has very accurately described the points contained in this proposed bill.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that the restrictions provided in the bill will take care of any legitimate objections such as were just voiced during the recent colloquy.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the bill, S. 1039, should pass unanimously, as the companion bill, H.R. 8553, which bill was reported out of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service unanimously.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to take 1 minute to point out the fact that our new chairman, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], should be congratulated for having brought this bill here to the floor of the House for consideration, with the unanimous backing of the gentleman's committee, which backing has frequently been true in this committee. This reflects the fact that the committee has done its work well and has ironed out the differences as contained in the bill as proposed by the other body and as is presented over here to the Members of the House, which has the unanimous endorsement of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the subcommittee which had jurisdiction over H.R. 8553, a bill identical to S. 1039 now under consideration, I want only to reaffirm my support of the bill and the support of the the other minority members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A review of the testimony submitted to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and to the subcommittee thereof, convinced me and the other members of the subcommittee of its value and need.

I urge my colleagues to act favorably upon the legislation now pending before us.

In additional views to the report on H.R. 8553, a bill which is identical to S. 1039, the gentleman from Illinois and I sought to draw attention to the fact that a continuous review of the longtime leasing program of the Post Office Department is necessary, if we are to provide the efficient and professional postal service which the American public demands and deserves.

The legislation now before us provides a measure of congressional oversight, and though it is not as great as I would like, I feel it is a useful and important feature of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this bill had the unanimous approval of both the subcommittee and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and I recommend its passage, as reported.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first bill I have had the pleasure of working on since I joined the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service of the 90th Congress, and I want to pay my thanks to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Facilities and Modernization, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Joe Pool, who was taken away from us during part of the deliberations on this bill because of a bout of illness.

However, Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the fact he was kept away from actually participating in the hearings the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pool] kept his finger on the legislation at all times and kept control of it from the beginning to the end. I believe the House should take note this is his first piece of legislation as chairman of that very important subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, I recently had the opportunity to visit the city of Dallas, where the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Pool] announced the construction of a $28 million post office. Following that experience, I feel this piece of legislation is certainly much needed to keep the rest of our country apace with Joe Pool's district in Dallas.

Mr. Speaker, all of us are aware that the Post Office Department is being inundated with mail. The U.S. Post Office Department handles more mail per annum than the rest of the world combined—a total of over 80 billion pieces.

We know also, Mr. Speaker, that in order to provide the American people with the postal service they need and deserve, we must modernize mail handling methods and equipment. This means developing fast automated mail distribution factories capable of moving the mountains of mail generated each day.

But before the Post Office Department can create modern mail handling centers, it is axiomatic that the space in which to install the machinery must be available. This is the importance of S. 1039 which we are considering today.

Most urban post offices were built in the time of Jim Farley, and are outmoded structures straddled over moribund rail centers. They are inadequate. They do not meet today's needs, and they must be replaced.

S. 1039 will extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases for special-purpose mail-handling facilities for periods up to 30 years. This bill will enable the Post Office Department's modernization program to continue and accelerate.

Mr. Speaker, this is not new authority; it is simply an extension of power the Postmaster General has had for over 10 years. And if the Department's annual requirements for over 7 million square feet of space are to be met, it is clear to me that S. 1039 must be passed today.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members two issues involving S. 1039 which have received slight notice in the debate today.

The first is the economy involved in this bill. The Post Office Department has permanent authority to enter into 20-year leases. If this bill is not passed, the Department will be forced to use only its 20-year authority and this will cost the taxpayers money. Let me illustrate.

The 30-year lease is used for large postal facilities, where it is almost certain that the need for high volume service will continue. In such cases, the Post Office Department uses the 30-year lease rather than the 20 because the rent is cheaper. The reasonably new post office in Detroit, in my own Wayne County, is an example. The Government pays an annual rent of $1,370,743 under a 30-year lease; the same structure constructed under a 20-year lease would cost the Federal Government $1,518,500 a year, or an annual increase of 11 percent.

Mr. Speaker, another important aspect of this bill which should be emphasized is the authority to condemn land, which this bill will continue.

The fact that S. 1039 will continue condemnation authority now contained in 39 U.S.C. 2103 is very important to the Post Office Department's modernization program, because it frees the Post Office Department from the threat of speculation with land on which they hope to lease a facility. And this condemnation authority applies to the 20-year leases as well as the 30-year. Without the power of condemnation the Department will not be able to acquire much of the land it needs, or it will be subjected to speculation-inflated costs. This alone is reason enough to pass this bill today.

As a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee and the subcommittee which reported this bill, I support and urge its passage today. S. 1039 is identical with H.R. 8553.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Scott].

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill which is being considered by the House today. I would reiterate that it does have the unanimous recommendation of both the subcommittee and the full committee.

However, there were some questions that were raised in the subcommittee hearings that perhaps should be mentioned here today.

One of the questions was the length of time the Post Office gives to the committees having congressional oversight so we may consider the proposals of the Post Office Department. There was some question whether it should be 60 days rather than the 30 days provided in the bill. We were assured, however, by the majority members of the committee that the Post Office Department would give us as much time as possible with a minimum of 30 days.

There was also some question as to whether this bill should be extended for a 5-year period rather than perhaps to 1970.

A question was raised as to whether the Post Office Department should be doing this leasing or whether it should be done under the general authority of the General Services Administration.

The bill was brought up after it had been passed by the Senate Committee on Public Works. We were somewhat under the gun on this. However, the subcommittee unanimously felt that the suggestions that were made should not delay the reporting of the bill to the House for passage, and I urge the passage of this bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, I did wish to mention these reservations.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I was interested in this so-called legislative history which I heard discussed here a moment ago. I am not on this subcommittee, although I am on the full committee. I was on the subcommittee during the last session when we passed this legislation which was changed in the Senate, and that is the reason it is back here today.

Mr. Speaker, I have had good relationships with the Division of Facilities. They are very cooperative. This bill certainly ought to pass without any trouble whatsoever, but the matter of the legislative history should not be left as it is at the moment.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Fulton], seems to indicate that if they have a civic center then they should dictate to the Post Office Department that the Post Office Department should locate the post office at the civic center.

Mr. Speaker, this suggestion is simply unreasonable to me. The Post Office Department has always been cooperative. They will listen to the civic leaders, but after all they have the responsibility to determine in their own minds the best location for a post office. Indeed, that is their responsibility and their duty.

They have to make up their own minds to determine where location of the post office should be to best serve the public. We cannot build post offices to take care of civic centers and to bring or to attract business into the civic center or the shopping center. We have to build post offices where they will best serve the people.

We have a new post office in my district. It is one of the most modern in the country. It is down in the railroad area. That is where the mail comes in and that is where the mail goes out. For many years this post office was in the downtown business district but with our modern means of transportation that have changed so much, that was an illogical place for it to be. It was an old building. So now we have a new post office, but it is way down in the center of our railroad area because that is where they can most efficiently handle the mail that is coming in and the mail that is going out from my district which includes Omaha which is one of the major mail centers in the country.

I do not want to have the so-called legislative history previously mentioned to stand unchallenged—that local leaders shall dictate to the Post Office Department where a post office should be. Again I say they have been very cooperative. They are going to listen to the local leaders but they are going to make the final choice and they are going to determine what location will best serve the people that that post office is built to serve.

I wonder if that would not be the same view that the gentleman from New Jersey and the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Texas would hold?

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DANIELS. I agree wholeheartedly with the view expressed here today. Before the Department chooses a site we have a new Department, which this Congress created last year, which is known as the Department of Research and Engineering, which will go out and make an investigation and find a place or at least try to find a place which will best serve the needs of the Post Office today. It is necessary to do that today in building a large facility and that is the reason we are asking for this 30-year authority to build a special purpose building.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska asked me a question and I want to say I agree with him wholeheartedly and congratulate him on the statement that he has made. I would like the record to so show.

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, S. 1039.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H.R. 8553, was laid on the table.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION OF ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

MAY 1, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: A certificate of election showing the election of ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, JR., as a Representative-elect to the Ninetieth Congress from the Eighteenth Congressional District of the State of New York, to fill the vacancy occurring as a result of the adoption of House Resolution 278, 90th Congress, first session, is on file in this office.

In accordance with 2 U.S.C. 26 and rule III, section 637, Rules of the House of Representatives, this matter is submitted.

Respectfully yours,
W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, if I may with your permission preface my parliamentary inquiry with a very brief statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may do so.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Speaker, I have read with a great deal of interest, as I am sure other Members have, the record of the colloquy that took place between you, Mr. Speaker, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] and our distinguished majority leader and I would like to read this concluding statement of the distinguished Speaker:

> I can say to the gentleman that from the leadership's angle my present impression is that the next move is up to Mr. Powell.

Mr. Speaker, my parliamentary inquiry is, Will the House of Representatives have to take affirmative action in view of the resolution that was passed by the House on March 1 of this year with regard to the possible admission to this body of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell]?

The SPEAKER. When the Member appears, if he is challenged, it will be a matter for the House to decide and for the House to express its will.

Mr. LENNON. The House membership will be duly notified before such consideration is given the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell]?

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated on Friday last in the colloquy that took place on that occasion that I can assure the gentleman that the majority leader, the minority leader, and myself have been in constant touch with one another, and we will do everything within our power to see that the House is given adequate notice, and if it is left within the control of the leadership, the House will be given notice.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the Speaker for his interest in the integrity and reputation of the House.

REMOVING PROMOTION RESTRICTIONS ON WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5894) to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5894

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 123(a) is amended by striking out "3391,".

(2) Section 510(c) is amended by striking out "for service in the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and Coast Guard Reserve"

(3) Section 591(c) is amended by striking out "as nurses or medical specialists".

(4) Section 1006(e) is amended by striking out "3847," and "8847,".

(5) Section 1164 is amended by striking out "male" in subsection (a), all of subsection (b), and "or (b)" in subsection (c).

(6) Chapter 63 is amended by repealing section 1255, striking out the corresponding item in the analysis, and by striking out "1255 or" in section 1263(a).

(7) Section 1405 is amended by striking out "6399(c) (2),".

(8) Chapter 307 is amended by—

(A) amending section 3069 to read as follows:

"§ 3069. Army Nurse Corps: composition; Chief and assistant chief; appointment

"(a) The Army Nurse Corps consists of the Chief and assistant chief of that corps and other officers in grades prescribed by the Secretary of the Army.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army shall appoint the Chief from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above major and who are recommended by the Surgeon General. The Chief serves during the pleasure of the Secretary, but not for more than four years, and may not be reappointed.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall appoint the assistant chief from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above major. The assistant chief serves during the pleasure of the Surgeon General, but not for more than four years and may not be reappointed to the same position.";

(B) amending the text of section 3070 to read as follows:

"(a) The Army Medical Specialist Corps consists of the Chief and assistant chiefs of that corps, other officers in grades prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and the following sections—

"(1) the Dietitian Section;

"(2) the Physical Therapist Section; and

"(3) the Occupational Therapist Section.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army shall appoint the Chief from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above captain and who are recommended by the Surgeon General. The Chief serves during the pleasure of the Secretary, but not for more than four years, and may not be reappointed.

"(c) The Surgeon General shall appoint three assistant chiefs from officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above captain. Each assistant chief is the chief of a section of that corps. An assistant chief serves during the pleasure of the Surgeon General, but not for more than four years, and may not be reappointed to the same position.";

(C) amending the text of section 3071 to read as follows:

"(a) The Women's Army Corps consists of the Director and Deputy Director, other officers in grades prescribed by the Secretary of the Army, and enlisted members.

"(b) The Secretary of the Army shall appoint the Director from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above major. The Director is the adviser to the Secretary on Women's Army Corps matters and serves during his pleasure, but normally not for more than four years.

"(c) The Secretary of the Army shall appoint the Deputy Director from the officers of the Regular Army in that corps whose regular grade is above major. She serves during the pleasure of the Secretary, but normally not for more than four years.

"(d) The Secretary of the Army shall designate the positions that he finds necessary for the training and administration of the Women's Army Corps. He shall fill those positions from officers of that corps who are on active duty and whose Regular or Reserve grade is above captain. An officer holding such a position serves during the pleasure of the Secretary."; and

(D) amending the item in the analysis relating to section 3069 to read as follows:

"3069. Army Nurse Corps: composition; chief and assistant chief; appointment."

(9) Chapter 331 is amended by—

(A) striking out the designation "(a)" in the first sentence of section 3206, and the words "2,500." and adding the words "such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary.";

(B) striking out section 3206(b);

(C) striking out the designation "(a)" in the first sentence of section 3207, and the words "350." and adding the words "such numbers as may be prescribed by the Secretary.";

(D) striking out section 3207(b);

(E) striking out the second sentence of section 3209(b);

(F) striking out column 2 and footnote 3 of the table in section 3211(b) and redesignating column 3 as "Column 2";

(G) striking out "3304," in section 3212; and

(H) striking out the second sentence of sections 3215(a) and 3215(b);

(10) Chapter 335 is amended by—

(A) striking out "Except for officers of the Army Nurse Corps and the Army Medical Specialist Corps, vacancies" in section 3298 (b) and inserting in place thereof "Vacancies";

(B) amending section 3299 by striking out ", except as provided in subsections (f) and (g)," in subsection (a), the last sentence of subsection (c), subsections (f) and (g), and the last sentence of subsection (h);

(C) repealing section 3304 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis;

(D) striking out the last sentence of section 3305(a); and

(E) striking out "other than officers in Army Nurse Corps and Army Medical Specialists Corps" in the catchline of section 3305 and in the corresponding item in the analysis.

(11) Chapter 337 is amended by—

(A) striking out subsection (g) in section 3366;

(B) striking out subsection (d) in section 3367;

(C) striking out the dash and clauses (1)-(3) in section 3370(a) and inserting in place thereof "colonel,";

(D) striking out "field grade in certain cases" in the catchline of section 3370 and in the corresponding item in the analysis and inserting in place thereof in each case "grade of colonel to fill vacancies";

(E) striking out "in a reserve grade below colonel is one that" in the second sentence of section 3383(b); and

(F) repealing section 3391 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

(12) Chapter 362 is amended by—

(A) repealing section 3847 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis; and

(B) striking out "except as provided in section 3847 of this title," and ", and each officer in the reserve grade of major who is assigned to the Army Nurse Corps, Army Medical Specialist Corps, or the Women's Army Corps, who has been recommended for promotion to the reserve grade of lieutenant colonel who is not a member of the Retired Reserve, and who has remained in an active status since that recommendation," in section 3848(a).

(13) Chapter 367 is amended by repealing section 3915 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

(14) Chapter 513 is amended by—

(A) striking out the last two sentences of section 5140(a) and inserting in place thereof the following: "An officer of the Navy, while serving as Director of the Nurse Corps, has the rank of captain unless otherwise entitled to a higher rank or grade. An appointment as Director does not disturb an officer's permanent status as a commissioned officer in the Nurse Corps.";

(B) amending the second sentence of section 5143(a) to read as follows: "While so serving, she has the rank of captain in the Navy unless otherwise entitled to a higher rank or grade."; and

(C) striking out subsections (b), (c), (e), and (f) in section 5143.

(15) Section 5206 is amended by—

(A) amending the second sentence of subsection (a) to read as follows: "While so serving, she has the rank of colonel unless otherwise entitled to a higher rank or grade."; and

(B) striking out subsections (b), (c), (e), and (f).

(16) Chapter 531 is amended by repealing sections 5410 and 5411 and striking out the corresponding items in the analysis.

(17) Chapter 533 is amended by—

(A) striking out subsection (b) in section 5444;

(B) amending section 5444(c) to read as follows:

"(c) The Secretary of the Navy, whenever the needs of the service require but at least once annually, shall compute the number of rear admirals authorized under this section for each corps. The numbers so computed are the numbers of officers serving on active duty prescribed for the grade of rear admiral in the corps concerned. However, if the Secretary determines at the time of making any computation under this section that the number of officers required to meet the needs of the service in the grade of rear admiral in any of these corps is less than the prescribed number as computed, the lesser number becomes the prescribed number for the grade of rear admirals in the corps concerned.";

(C) striking out subsection (c) in section 5449;

(D) striking out the second sentence of section 5449(d);

(E) amending section 5452 to read as follows:

"§ 5452. Navy: women line officers on active duty; Marine Corps: women officers on active duty

"The Secretary of the Navy shall prescribe the number of women officers serving on active duty in the line of the Navy who may hold appointments in each grade above lieutenant (junior grade) and the number of women officers serving on active duty in the Marine Corps who may hold appointments in each grade above first lieutenant.";

(F) repealing section 5453 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis;

(G) striking out "or 5453" in section 5455 and inserting in place thereof "or 5452"; and

(H) amending the item in the analysis relating to section 5452 to read as follows:

"5452. Navy: women line officers on active duty; Marine Corps: women officers on active duty."

(18) Chapter 543 is amended by—

(A) amending clause (1) of section 5702 (a) to read as follows:

"(1) A board for each corps, other than the Medical Service Corps, to recommend captains in each corps and commanders in the Nurse Corps for continuation on the active list or to recommend captains in each corps, other than the Medical Service Corps and the Nurse Corps, for promotion to the grade of rear admiral, each consisting of not less than three or more than nine officers serving in the grade of rear admiral or above.";

(B) striking out "and the Nurse Corps" in section 5702(a)(2);

(C) striking out "captain" in section 5702 (a)(2) and inserting in place thereof "commander";

(D) striking out "and a board for the Nurse Corps to recommend captains and commanders for continuation on the active list, each" in section 5702(a)(3);

(E) striking out clauses (5) and (6) in section 5702(a);

(F) amending the first sentence of section 5702(b) to read as follows: "Each board convened under this section to consider officers in the Medical Corps, the Supply Corps, the Chaplain Corps, the Civil Engineer Corps, the Dental Corps, or the Nurse Corps shall consist of officers in the corps concerned, and each board convened under this section to consider officers in the Medical Service Corps shall consist of officers in the corps indicated in subsection (a).";

(G) adding the following at the end of section 5702(c): "However, in the case of boards considering officers in the Nurse Corps, the Secretary may complete the minimum required membership by appointing as members of the board officers on the active list of the Navy in the Medical Corps serving in the prescribed grades.";

(H) striking out the last sentence in section 5702(e);

(I) amending the first sentence of section 5704(a) to read as follows: "At least once each year and at such time as he directs, the Secretary of the Navy shall convene selection boards to recommend women officers in the line of the Navy for promotion to the grades of captain, commander, lieutenant commander, and lieutenant.";

(J) amending the first sentence of section 5704(b) to read as follows: "The Secretary shall convene selection boards, for each staff corps in which there are women officers appointed under section 5590 in this title, to recommend women officers for promotion to the grades of captain, commander, lieutenant commander, and lieutenant.";

(K) amending the first sentence of section 5704(c) to read as follows: "At least once each year and at such times as he directs, the Secretary shall convene selection boards to recommend women officers in the Marine Corps for promotion to the grades of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, and captain.";

(L) inserting "captain (Navy)," before "commander" and "colonel," before "lieutenant colonel" in section 5707(a)(4); and

(M) striking out clause (1) in section 5711(c).

(19) Chapter 545 is amended by—

(A) striking out "Regular" in the catchline of section 5752 and in the corresponding item of the analysis;

(B) striking out "on the active list" wherever those words appear in section 5752(a);

(C) renumbering clauses (1), (2), and (3) in section 5752(a) as clauses "(2)", "(3)" and "(4)", respectively, and inserting the following new clause:

"(1) Four years in the grade of commander in the Navy or lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps.";

(D) amending section 5753 by striking out "subsections (b) and (c)" in subsection (a) and inserting in place thereof "subsection (b)" and by striking out subsection (c);

(E) amending the first sentence of section 5760(a) to read as follows: "The Secretary of the Navy shall furnish the appropriate selection board convened under chapter 543 of this title with the number of women officers in the line of the Navy that may be recommended for promotion to the grade of captain, commander, or lieutenant commander or the number of women officers of the Marine Corps that may be recommended for promotion to the grade of colonel, lieutenant colonel, or major.";

(F) striking out "on the active list" wherever those words appear in section 5760(b);

(G) striking out "or the Medical Service Corps" in section 5762(a) and inserting in place thereof "the Medical Service Corps, or the Nurse Corps";

(H) striking out subsection (e) in section 5762;

(I) amending the first two sentences of section 5763 to read as follows: "The Secretary of the Navy shall furnish the appropriate selection board convened under chapter 543 of this title with the number of women officers of the Navy in a staff corps, other than officers of the Nurse Corps and women officers appointed under section 5574, 5578, 5579, or 5581 of this title, that may be recommended for promotion to the grade of captain, commander, or lieutenant commander. This number is the product of—

"(1) the number of such women staff corps officers in the promotion zone for the grade and corps concerned; and

"(2) a fraction, of which the numerator is the number of women line officers who are placed on the promotion list pursuant to the report of the comparable board for the selection of women line officers convened in the same fiscal year, and the denominator is the number of women line officers in the promotion zone considered by that board.";

(J) amending the catchlines of sections 5764 and 5765 and the corresponding items in the analysis by striking out in each case "male";

(K) adding the following new subsection in section 5764:

"(d) The Secretary shall establish a promotion zone in each grade for women officers in the line of the Navy in the manner prescribed in this section for the establishment of promotion zones for male line officers.";

(L) adding the following new subsection in section 5765:

"(d) The Secretary shall establish a promotion zone in each grade for women officers of the Marine Corps in the manner prescribed in this section for the establishment of promotion zones for male officers.";

(M) amending section 5766(a) by striking out ", other than women officers appointed under section 5590 of this title," and inserting before the period at the end "or for women line officers, as the case may be";

(N) adding the following new subsection in section 5767:

"(c) Whenever the Secretary determines that there is a position of sufficient importance and responsibility to require an incumbent in the grade of rear admiral or brigadier general, and that there is a woman officer of the Navy or the Marine Corps who is best qualified to perform the duties of the position, he may designate that women officer to hold that position. A woman officer so designated may be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to the grade of rear admiral or brigadier general. Such an appointment is effective on the date the officer reports for the designated duty and terminates on the date she is detached.";

(O) striking out "Regular" in the catchline of section 5771 and in the corresponding item of the analysis;

(P) amending section 5771 by striking out "on the active list" wherever those words appear in subsections (a) and (c) and amending subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) Women officers in the line of the Navy and women officers of the Marine Corps who are on a promotion list for any grade above lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy or first lieutenant in the Marine Corps are, in the order in which their names appear, eligible for promotion to the grade concerned as vacancies occur in that grade.";

(Q) striking out ", other than women officers appointed under section 5590 of this title," in section 5773(a);

(R) striking out "Except as provided in subsection (c), each" in section 5773(b) and inserting in place thereof "Each";

(S) striking out subsection (c) in section 5773;

(T) repealing section 5774 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis;

(U) striking out "a male" wherever those words appear in section 5776(a) and inserting in place thereof "An";

(V) striking out "subject to subsections (d) and (e), an" in section 5776(c) and inserting in place thereof "An";

(W) striking out subsections (d) and (e) in section 5776;

(X) striking out "appointed under section 5590" in section 5778 and inserting in place thereof "selected by boards convened under section 5704";

(Y) striking out subsection (d) in section 5782; and

(Z) striking out clause (1) in section 5786(a). (20) chapter 549 is amended by—

(A) adding the following new subsection in section 5891:

"(g) For the purpose of this section, a woman officer who is eligible for consideration for promotion by a selection board convened under chapter 543 of this title shall be considered to be on a lineal list.";

(B) striking out "commander or lieutenant commander" and "lieutenant colonel or major" in section 5896(a)(7) and inserting in place thereof "captain, commander, or lieutenant commander" and "colonel, lieutenant colonel, or major", respectively;

(C) amending subsections (c) and (d) of section 5899 to read as follows:

"(c) A woman officer of the Naval Reserve, other than an officer in the Nurse Corps or an officer appointed under section 5581 of this title, is in the promotion zone and is eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher grade by a selection board convened under this chapter when any woman officer of the Naval Reserve who is junior to her is in or above the promotion zone established for her grade under section 5764 of this title or when her running mate is in or above that zone.

"(d) A woman officer of the Marine Corps Reserve is in the promotion zone and is eligible for consideration for promotion to the next higher grade by a selection board convened under this chapter when any woman officer of the Marine Corps Reserve who is junior to her is in or above the promotion zone established for her grade under section 5765 of this title or when her running mate is in or above that zone."; and

(D) amending the text of section 5903 to read as follows:

"(a) An officer of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve is considered as having failed of selection for promotion if—

"(1) he is in a promotion zone established under this chapter;

"(2) his name is furnished to the appropriate selection board; and

"(3) he is not selected for promotion.

"(b) An officer of the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve whose name is withheld by the Secretary of the Navy, under section 5899(g) of this title, from consideration by two selection boards for promotion to the same higher grade is considered as having twice failed of selection for promotion to that grade."

(21) Section 5945 is amended by striking out the second sentence.

(22) Chapter 555 is amended by repealing section 6030 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

(23) Chapter 571 is amended by—

(A) amending section 6324 to read as follows:

"§ 6324. Officers: creditable service

"For the purpose of this chapter, service as a nurse in the armed forces before April 16, 1947, is considered as commissioned service."; and

(B) amending the item in the analysis relating to section 6324 to read as follows: "6324. Officers: creditable service."

(24) Chapter 573 is amended by—

(A) amending section 6376 by inserting "(a)" at the beginning and adding the following new subsection:

"(b) This section does not apply to women officers appointed under section 5590 of this title.";

(B) amending the catchline of section 6377 and the corresponding item in the analysis by striking out in each case "or for age";

(C) amending section 6377 by striking out "except the Nurse Corps" in subsection (b), striking out subsection (c), and amending subsection (d) to read as follows:

"(d) If not on a promotion list and if not continued on the active list under section 6378 of this title, each officer serving in the grade of commander on the active list of the Navy in the Nurse Corps shall be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which the officer is considered as having twice failed of selection for promotion to the grade of captain and has completed at least twenty-six years of active commissioned service as computed under section 6388 of this title.";

(D) inserting "women officers appointed under section 5590 of this title or" in section 6379(b) after "apply to";

(E) amending section 6396 to read as follows:

"§ 6396. Regular Navy; officers in Nurse Corps in grades below commander: retirement or discharge

"(a) An officer on the active list of the Navy serving in the grade of lieutenant commander in the Nurse Corps shall, subject to the provisions of section 5777 of this title, be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which the officer

"(1) is not on a promotion list;

"(2) is considered as having twice failed of selection for promotion to the grade of commander; and

"(3) has completed at least twenty years of active commissioned service as computed under section 6388 of this title.

"(b) An officer retired under this section shall be retired—

"(1) in the highest grade satisfactorily held by her on active duty as determined by the Secretary, but not lower than her permanent grade; and

"(2) with retired pay at the rate of 2½ per centum of the basic pay of the grade in which retired multiplied by the number of years of service that may be credited to her under section 1405 of this title, but the retired pay may not be more than 75 per centum or less than 50 per centum of the basic pay upon which the computation of retired pay is based.

"(c) An officer on the active list of the Navy serving in the grade of lieutenant in the Nurse Corps shall be honorably discharged on June 30 of the fiscal year in which the officer

"(1) is not on a promotion list; and

"(2) has completed thirteen years of active commissioned service as computed under section 6388 of this title.

However, if she so requests she may be honorably discharged at any time during that fiscal year.

"(d) An officer on the active list of the Navy serving in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Nurse Corps shall be honorably discharged on June 30 of the fiscal year in which the officer—

"(1) is not on a promotion list; and

"(2) has completed seven years of active commissioned service as computed under section 6388 of this title.

However, if she so requests, she may be honorably discharged at any time during that fiscal year.

"(e) Each officer discharged under this section is entitled to a lump-sum payment equal to two months' basic pay at the time of discharge multiplied by the number of years of active commissioned service as computed under section 6388 of this title, but the payment may not be more than two years' basic pay or more than $15,000.";

(F) amending section 6398 to read as follows:

"§ 6398. Regular Navy; women captains and commanders; Regular Marine Corps, women colonels and lieutenant colonels: retirement for length of service; retired grade and pay

"(a) Each woman officer on the active list of the Navy, appointed under section 5590 of this title, who holds a permanent appointment in the grade of captain and each woman officer on the active list of the Marine Corps who holds a permanent appointment in the grade of colonel shall be retired by the President on the first day of the month following the month in which she completes thirty years of active commissioned service in the Navy or the Marine Corps.

"(b) Each woman officer on the active list of the Navy, appointed under section 5590 of this title, who holds a permanent appointment in the grade of commander and is not on a promotion list for a higher permanent grade and each woman officer on the active list of the Marine Corps who holds a permanent appointment in the grade of lieutenant colonel and is not on a promotion list for a higher permanent grade shall be retired by the President on the first day of the month following the month in which she completes twenty-six years of active commissioned service in the Navy or the Marine Corps.

"(c) Each officer retired under this section—

"(1) unless otherwise entitled to a higher grade shall be retired in the permanent grade held by her at the time of retirement; and

"(2) is entitled to retired pay at the rate of 2½ per centum of the basic pay of the grade in which retired multiplied by the number of years of service that may be credited to her under section 1405 of this title, but the retired pay may not be more than 75 per centum or less than 50 per centum of the basic pay upon which the computation of retired pay is based.";

(G) repealing section 6399 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis; and

(H) amending the items in the analysis relating to sections 6396 and 6398 to read as follows:

"6396. Regular Navy; officers in Nurse Corps in grades below commander: retirement or discharge.

* * * * *

"6398. Regular Navy; women captains and commanders; Regular Marine Corps; women colonels and lieutenant colonels: retirement for length of service; retired grade and pay."

(25) Chapter 807 is amended by repealing section 8071 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

(26) Chapter 831 is amended by—

(A) striking out subsection (b) in section 8206;

(B) striking out subsection (b) in section 8207;

(c) striking out all of section 8208 after the first sentence;

(D) striking out "Except for Air Force nurses and medical specialists, the" in section 8209 and inserting in place thereof "The";

(E) striking out all of section 8215 after the first sentence; and

(F) amending the catchline for section 8215 and the corresponding item in the analysis by striking out in each case "; female enlisted members on active duty".

(27) Chapter 835 is amended by—

(A) amending section 8299 by striking out ", except as provided in subsection (f) or (g)," wherever those words appear in subsection (a) and striking out the last sentence of subsection (c), subsections (f) and (g), and the last sentence of subsection (h);

(B) striking out subsection (d) in section 8300;

(C) striking out subsection (b) in section 8301;

(D) striking out subsection (f) in section 8303; and

(E) striking out subsections (g) and (h) in section 8305.

(28) Chapter 837 is amended by—

(A) striking out subsection (f) in section 8366;

(B) inserting a period after "major" in clause (2) of section 8368(a) and striking out the remainder of that clause; and

(C) repealing section 8370 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

(29) Chapter 841 is amended by—

(A) striking out subsection (b) in section 8504;

(B) amending the catchline of section 8504 and the corresponding item in the analysis by striking out in each case ": limitations; grade".

(30) Chapter 845 is amended by repealing section 8580 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis.

(31) Chapter 863 is amended by—

(A) repealing section 8847 and striking out the corresponding item in the analysis; and

(B) striking out ", except an officer covered by section 8847 of this title," in section 8848(a).

(32) Chapter 867 is amended by—

(A) amending section 8915 to read as follows:

"§ 8915. Twenty-eight years: deferred retirement of nurses and medical specialists in regular grade of major

"The Secretary of the Air Force may defer the retirement of any Air Force nurse or medical specialist in the regular grade of major until the thirtieth day after the officer completes twenty-eight years of service computed under section 8927(a) of this title.";

(B) amending section 8916 (b) to read as follows:

"(b) The Secretary of the Air Force may defer the retirement under this section of any promotion list officer in the regular grade of lieutenant colonel who is a medical, dental, veterinary, or medical service officer, a medical specialist, or a chaplain, but not later than the date on which he becomes sixty years of age."; and

(C) amending the item in the analysis relating to section 8915 to read as follows:

"8915. Twenty-eight years: deferred retirement of nurses and medical specialists in regular grade of major."

SEC. 2. Title 32, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 305 is amended by—

(A) striking out "Except as provided in subsection (b), only male persons selected from the" and inserting in place thereof "The" in subsection (a);

(B) striking out the first sentence of subsection (b); and

(C) striking out "However, to" and "woman" in the second sentence of subsection (b) and inserting in place thereof "To" and "person", respectively.

(2) Section 313(b) is amended by inserting "and" after the semicolon in clause (1), striking out "; and" at the end of clause (2) and inserting a period in place thereof, and striking out clause (3).

SEC. 3. Title 37, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 202 is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(k) While serving under an appointment under section 5767(c) of title 10, a woman officer of the Navy is entitled to the pay of a rear admiral of the lower half."

(2) Section 904 is amended—

(A) by striking out "5774" in subsections (a), (b), and (d) and inserting "5773" in place thereof;

(B) by amending clauses (5) and (10) of subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(5) women line officers of the Navy;

* * * * *

"(10) women officers of the Marine Corps;";

(C) by striking out subsections (c) and (e); and

(D) by striking out "Except as provided by subsection (e) of this section, a" in subsection (d) and inserting in place thereof "A".

SEC. 4. (a) For five years following the effective date of this Act, the Secretary of the Army may suspend the operation of any provision of law pertaining to the mandatory retirement, discharge, separation, or transfer from an active status of an officer of the Army Nurse Corps, Army Medical Specialist Corps, or Women's Army Corps.

(b) The amendments made by this Act to section 6396 of title 10, United States Code, do not become effective with respect to officers of the Regular Navy in the Nurse Corps serving in the grade of lieutenant commander until June 30 of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which this Act is approved.

(c) Notwithstanding section 6396 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this Act, an officer of the Regular Navy in the Nurse Corps who is serving in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) on the effective date of this Act may not be discharged under that section until June 30 of the second fiscal year following the fiscal year in which this Act is approved.

(d) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, an officer of the Regular Navy in the Nurse Corps who is serving in the grade of lieutenant on the effective date of this Act and who on that date has completed more than thirteen years of active commissioned service may not be involuntarily discharged under section 6396 of title 10, United States Code, as amended by this Act but shall, unless sooner selected for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander, be retired on June 30 of the fiscal year in which she completes at least twenty years of active commissioned service. Each officer retired under this subsection shall be retired with the retired grade and pay prescribed in section 6396(c) of title 10, United States Code, as it existed before the enactment of this Act.

(e) For five years following the effective date of this Act, the Secretary of the Air Force may suspend the operation of any provision of law pertaining to the mandatory retirement, discharge, separation, or transfer from an active status of an Air Force female officer, except an officer designated under section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform professional functions other than as an Air Force nurse or as an Air Force medical specialist.

(f) Until July 1, 1972, when the needs of the service require, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Air Force may convene annually boards of officers to consider officers of the Army Nurse Corps, officers of the Navy Nurse Corps, or Air Force nurses, respectively, who otherwise would be required to be retired or separated under this Act within the calendar or fiscal year in which the board is convened. Upon the recommendation of such a board, the Secretary concerned may defer the separation or retirement of such an officer for a term of not more than five years, unless recommended for further deferment by a subsequent board of officers, and in any case not beyond the month following her attaining age sixty or July 1, 1976, whichever may be earlier. Officers whose separation or retirement is so deferred shall be additional to the numbers of officers authorized by sections 3202, 3211, 8202, and 8211, title 10, United States Code.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud, in behalf of our great House Committee on Armed Services, to present this bill, H.R. 5894, to the House.

It constitutes a noteworthy landmark in the history of military, personnel legislation, since for the first time, it affords to women officers in our Armed Forces the opportunity that they have sought and deserved for a long time to rid themselves of onerous, inequitable restrictions on their careers.

For the first time, this bill would permit them, by virtue of demonstrated ability, superlative character traits, attributes of leadership, and faithful, devoted, creditable service, to make their way laboriously up through the ranks of our military forces until they reach the top.

In the sense that restrictions have prevented this result in the past for many worthy, outstanding officers, this bill has been long delayed.

As in civilian life, and indeed in all walks of life, women in the armed services have made truly significant, glorious contributions in adding to the strength, the morale, and the efficiency of our military defense organizations, of which they are such an important part.

Not only in terms of intellectuality, alert mentality, rare, personal qualifications, fidelity to duty, and purposeful, total adaptation to the tasks at hand have women left a deep impress upon our armed services.

Their presence, their eagerness to give of their maximum talents, training, and fitness have brought beneficial results to the armed services in terms of creative zeal, ready response to the stern disciplines involved, and real accomplishment of most exacting duties.

Women have also brought a fine, perceptive graciousness, courtesy, good manners, and consideration for others that have left a deep mark on the entire, overall organization of our military services, wherever they serve.

Our committee feels indebted to those who assisted us in our deliberations. Even though there was never much doubt that we would reach the very favorable results attained by this bill, I think it is appropriate that I should make it officially and publicly known to the House, that officials of the Department of Defense, high ranking officers of the various services, and particularly women leaders of the services and their staffs and their organizations, have gone all out in assisting our committee to try to shape up a satisfactory measure to signalize the emergence of women to fuller opportunities and a far more meaningful, well-rounded role in our armed services.

I am most grateful also, not only to members of our committee, but to Members of the House, for their indulgence, generous, prompt consideration and unfaltering support of this meritorious bill.

Last year, though the House passed the bill, it was late in the session, and there was hardly time for its enactment in the other body.

Since we are enacting the bill this year relatively early in the session, the other body should have ample opportunity now, and I trust that the results will be salutary, speedily arrived at and favorable to the cause of all women in our armed services, who are so worthy of our attention, consideration, and efforts to elevate their status, and provide them with opportunities commensurate with their skills, abilities, and enduring contributions.

I trust that our very able distinguished friend from the great State of Georgia, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body, one of the truly great national leaders of our times, and his outstanding committee, will give this measure early attention, to the end that the aims of military women for total recognition within their high mandate may be fulfilled.

I sincerely hope and vigorously urge that early favorable action be taken by the entire Congress in this vital matter and that the bill be enacted and written into law at the earliest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5894 will remove the arbitrary restrictions presently in law which limit the promotion opportunities and career tenure of women officers. As a result of the removal of these restrictions, women officers will be subject to the same laws applicable to male officers.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5894 is the same legislation that was passed by the House on October 7, 1966, as H.R. 16000. It received no action in the other body and was resubmitted by the Department of Defense again this year.

This is not a promotion bill. It does not guarantee anyone a promotion. The committee received firm assurance from the Department of Defense that the bill would not be used as an excuse for upgrading positions held by women officers. The bill's only purpose is to provide equality of treatment for women in recognizing merit and performance.

The bill makes women officers eligible for the first time for flag and general officer rank. There is no guarantee a woman will be given such rank but if found most qualified for a specific star billet, she will be eligible for selection. The bill contemplates that a woman promoted to flag rank would be advanced to fill a specific billet and would hold the rank only while filling that billet—in other words, what is known in the military as a spot promotion.

In reporting this legislation in the 89th Congress, our committee added one substantive amendment to prevent the forced attrition of military nurses. We did this because the present national shortage and the added requirements of the Vietnam involvement have made it difficult for the services to secure an adequate number of nurses. In submitting the bill again this year, the Department of Defense included this committee amendment of last year and it is part of the present bill.

Mr. Speaker, the women in the armed services have proved that they can make a lasting significant contribution to the Armed Forces. They have proven they deserve equality of opportunity. In his recent message to the Congress, the President noted that the Department of Defense intended to increase the use of women in the military service. The Department presently has plans to increase the number of women in the line components of the Armed Forces by 6,500 including 600 additional officers. The number of nurses in the Armed Forces has increased more than 2,000 in the last year.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to approve this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow morning the House Committee on Armed Services will begin its hearings on the renewal of the selective service law. I believe it should be pointed out at this time that it is a foregone conclusion by all knowledgeable persons that a continuation of selective service is necessary to the national security. Under that system we shall be taking young men out of civilian life and telling them that in the best interests of this country and the national security they must assume a military life. So it stands to reason that the greater the extent of civilian contribution to the military, the smaller the number that will have to be drafted.

It has been proven in recent years that many of the functions of the military cannot only be performed as well by members of the fair sex, but in many instances better. So it is a safe prediction that in the future women will be making ever-increasing contributions to the military services. If they are to do so, then it follows that there must be an increase in the number of women officers.

This bill is a realistic approach to the more important role to be played by women in the armed services. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the pending legislation.

This is the second time this legislation has been brought before the House by our committee.

The bill was approved by the House last October. It is a legislative proposal of the Department of Defense. It has the support of numerous military organizations. I know of no opposition to it.

Since World War II, women officers in

all our Armed Forces have proven their ability to make a meaningful, long-term contribution to the services, but they continue to be restricted by arbitrary limits placed in the law 20 years ago. We had examples presented to our committee where women officers holding billets normally assigned to a male colonel could only be given the rank of lieutenant colonel because of the restrictions in the law. While this bill takes the restrictions off promotions for women officers, it does not automatically give anybody an advancement. There will not be any widespread upgrading of positions held by women. They will compete for promotions in the normal way that male officers do and will only be promoted to those positions for which they are qualified.

I would like to emphasize something pointed out by the committee in its report:

> The Committee on Armed Services is aware that there cannot be complete equality between men and women in the matter of military careers. The stern demands of combat, sea duty, and other types of assignments directly related to combat are not placed upon women in our society. The Defense Department assured the Committee that there would be no attempt to remove restrictions on the kind of military duties women will be expected to perform. Within the framework of this understanding, the Committee believes that women officers should be given equality of promotion opportunity consistent with the needs of the service.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, the bill has widespread support. It provides deserved equality of treatment for women officers and it is not in any sense a promotion give-away bill.

I urge the House to support this legislation.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to voice my wholehearted support of this legislation which removes the arbitrary restrictions placed on women officers. This legislation is past due. The women careerists in the Armed Forces are professionals who have proven they can do many jobs equally as well as men. Our nurses are performing magnificently in Vietnam.

The women's components are growing and the President has called for increased utilization of women in the Armed Forces. If we expect women to make a career of the service we must be prepared to offer them equal advancement opportunity.

This bill does not give advancement to anyone automatically. It is not taking anything away from male officers. All it does is assure that women have an opportunity to compete fairly for promotion and have the same tenure as male officers of the same grade.

Mr. PHILBIN's subcommittee has done an outstanding job, as it always does, in clarifying this legislation and bringing forth a fair bill. This bill makes women eligible for flag rank for the first time. But a women will only be promoted to a flag billet if it is found she is better qualified for that billet than any other officer available. If she is so qualified, she deserves the star.

I support the legislation and I urge the House to do likewise.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 5894 to remove promotion restrictions on women in the Armed Forces.

I was a sponsor of such legislation in the 89th Congress when the House passed H.R. 16000. I have introduced H.R. 1274 in the present Congress to accomplish this purpose and our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], has introduced H.R. 5894, which is before us today.

Since World War II, the contribution of women officers to all our armed services has increased and the number of women officers seeking long-term careers in uniform has grown. But the ceilings on advancement of women officers have remained built into our laws until now they seem highly unrealistic.

A woman Army officer may not rise higher today than the rank of colonel. If she is serving in the Navy, her advancement is limited to commander, and if in the Marine Corps, to lieutenant colonel. The numbers of women officers who may serve at each rank are kept down by discriminatory formulas that resemble those applied to specialists like chaplains and judge advocates.

Women are also given an earlier age for mandatory retirement in some officer categories. The result of all these double standards, now that women are staying longer in the service and pulling their weight in many administrative positions along with men, can only be sagging morale in a still small but nevertheless important part of the Armed Forces.

The Defense Department, by its recommendation of this bill, is recognizing a problem of unequal treatment of women officers that has occupied numerous women's rights and veterans' groups for some years.

Even if there were no hindrance to Armed Forces morale at stake by treating women officers unequally in their advancement opportunities, it would still be a necessary piece of legislation, strictly because it eliminates one more pattern of discrimination against women in American government and national life. As a persistent cosponsor of the proposed constitutional amendment guaranteeing equal rights for women in both State and Federal law, I firmly believe in the merits of this legislation on moral grounds as well.

I would like to conclude by clearing up one more important point about this bill. Although it takes off the ceiling now holding down women officers, it does not automatically move up any woman officer to a higher floor. Some critics feel the bill will open the door, for example, to widespread upgrading of all existing WAC colonels to brigadier generals—upgrading in rank without any increase in responsibility. They argue this could deprive male officers doing "a man's job" in "a man's army" of higher rank. But this bill says nothing of the kind. This bill makes no guarantees of higher ranks, or higher officer numerical quotas, for women. Women officers, like male officers, will continue to get their promotions in the normal way. This bill merely removes limits on women's advancement that may have looked like reasonable long-range objectives in 1947 but act like shackles in 1966.

I urge the adoption of this important legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 5894.

The question was taken and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPEAKER AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House until tomorrow, the Clerk be authorized to receive messages from the Senate, and that the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills and joint resolutions passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has repeatedly stated that the economy can only prosper to the extent that the individuals in our country prosper. In his annual budget message to Congress in 1966, the President stated that government "must always be responsive to human needs."

The President and Congress have endeavored, when requested by the people, to provide services needed to reach these objectives.

One such service is provided by the Small Business Administration—an agency that has as its purpose the finding of ways to assist persons in middle- and low-income brackets who seek to make new careers, or to obtain help with problems in existing businesses.

Colorado alone has benefited from 96 loans from this agency during 1967.

Mr. Bernard L. Boutin, Administrator of the SBA, has related to me the following success story from my home area, and I believe it is worth repeating.

The Tri-State Tool Co., of Grand Junction, was formed in 1954 under the management of Charles H. Dyer. The corporation has been engaged primarily in constructing tractor undercarriages. They also sell parts for tractors and tools to contractors and oil field workers.

The firm faced certain financial problems in 1964 and Mr. Dyer made application for a SBA loan. He had been unable to obtain private financing to expand his business and repay short-term debts.

One local bank offered to participate with the Small Business Administration in loaning Dyer $125,000. Proceeds of the loan were used to pay debts, acquire land and buildings for additional space, increase inventory, purchase machinery and equipment, and increase working capital.

Since the SBA loan was granted, the firm has progressed. The number of employees increased from nine in 1964 to 15 in 1966. Sales more than doubled. The company sustained a loss of $202 in 1964, but a net profit of $56,700 in 1966.

Within 2 years, Tri-State Tool Co. had accomplished the goals which they had projected for themselves. Retained earnings have almost doubled since 1964 and the working capital ratio has markedly improved.

The additional employees completed a training program which ultimately contributes to the high morale found at Tri-State Tool Co., eliminates wasted time and materials, and decreases overhead.

Mr. Speaker, we have here a good example of how a Federal agency—the Small Business Administration—under favorable conditions, can work in partnership with our citizenship for the kind of development and progress that has been the hallmark of America.

LETTER FROM VIETNAM

Mr. **TEAGUE** of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. **TEAGUE** of California. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 20, 1967, we were notified that Lt. Dennis John Breda, U.S. Army, age 24, was killed in combat in Vietnam on March 19, 1967. On March 13, 1967, Lt. Dennis Breda wrote the following letter to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John A. Breda, in California, excerpts of which are as follows:

> Now we are still on the Cambodian Border right in the middle of the Ho Chi Minh trail. We have been here for about a month and one-half. We take our tracks through even the thickest jungle. There are all types of missions: search and destroy, ambushes, blocking forces, convoy security, landing your security, and many others. Most of the time the VC avoid contact with us. We are known to them as the killers. General Westmoreland says we are the best mechanized infantry unit in Vietnam today. Most of the generals are trying to get us attached to their units.
>
> We have been kept pretty busy. After being in the field for so long, we are tired and dirty. I have been wounded twice. Once from a command detonated mine, detonated from Cambodia. Another time from a VC machine gun. The day I was wounded from a VC machine gun, I lost 14 of my men. One was killed instantly, another died later in the hospital. The rest were only wounded.
>
> My biggest gripe is that my platoon is so under-strength. It is a rare day when I go to the field with 30 men. The rest are on Rest and Recreation (R&R) or traveling to or from R&R, and on details for the First Sergeant. I'm getting tired of being under-strength. It is hard on the men because they have to pull twice their normal duty. These things can kill us all.
>
> There are few real fighting units here. Most of the people here are used in a support unit. We need a lot of fighting units here, not people who sit in Saigon with stockpiles of equipment we need and never see, who don't even know that a war is going on.
>
> To win this war they either have to saturate this country with bombs and troops, block the border completely so the VC could not resupply, then start at one end and sweep to the other. Then bomb the hell out of North Vietnam.
>
> We are losing too many good soldiers clearing an area, then moving out only to let the VC move back in. That is what happened to the Iron Triangle. When a truce comes, or the monsoon, the VC move back in and resupply. After that we have to go back and do the job again, only this time we run into the mines and booby traps that the VC put in.

Lieutenant Breda met death in Vietnam, according to the statement from a telegram sent to us by Kenneth G. Wickham, major general, Adjutant General, while on a combat operation and being hit by fragments from a hostile command detonated mine. The letter continues:

> On my latest combat mission, my men and I were without a radio in our track because none were available. I'll be real happy when my 8 months I have left here ends. When I get back I'm going to start job hunting. The way this war is going, it may never end.
>
> I think when one man dies in war that suddenly there should be no half-way effort to end the killing. When anyone dies it is a war and should be crushed with all the ability we have to do so. People, soldiers' lives should cost a hell of a price. With our country's great strength, it is a face-losing thing when we must take so long to crush such a weak, poorly equipped enemy. Well, I've put my two cents worth in your ears. I guess I'll stop screaming into the mighty winds that just blow.

Did this man die in vain? Yes.

As long as we, the U.S. public, do not voice our inner feelings and convictions, our husbands and sons will continue to go into this war understrength, with insufficient supplies, fighting a war with many restrictions, fighting communism overseas while it flourishes on our shores, and with supplies that are mailed but do not reach their destination.

Become aware of the facts, form your opinions, speak out, and let every voice be heard. Only then can we say a life given in this conflict was with cause.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON INTRODUCES THE "AL SKINNER BILL" TO EXTEND SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS TO LOW-INCOME PERSONS OVER 72

Mr. **HORTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HORTON**. Mr. Speaker, one of the most rewarding privileges of a Member of Congress is the privilege of translating the ideas of citizens directly into legislative proposals.

One of the most distinguished public servants I know, and one who is himself a devoted public servant, is Sheriff Albert Skinner, of Monroe County, N.Y.

Two weekends ago, Sheriff Skinner informed me of a serious problem that is faced by many aged citizens over 72 years of age. These people find themselves ineligible for the $35 monthly payment which the 89th Congress authorized for persons over 72, because they are recipients of State or local government pension payments. Under the present provisions of section 228 of the Social Security Act, benefits are reduced based on the amount of other government pensions received by the potential recipient, while some other forms of income are not counted in the benefit reduction formula. Thus, many persons receiving very small amounts of government pension, say $1,000 or less per year, receive reduced social security payments, while others with substantially greater sources of nonpension income continue to receive the full $35 per month.

I have already introduced legislation which would effectively remove the retirement test from social security payments under title II of the act. Instead of the present earned income limitation, I have substituted a $7,000 per year limitation on income from all sources, thus removing the penalty unjustly placed on aged citizens who do not have large investment income to draw on during retirement.

The bill which I propose today would seek to apply the same theory to section 228 benefits. Instead of penalizing low-income recipients of government pensions, my bill would reduce the over-72 benefits only where the recipient has yearly income exceeding $2,500—$3750 for a couple.

This would mean that persons whose government pension income is inadequate to provide a decent level of support would be eligible for the full $35 monthly payment. Those who have adequate income from nonpension sources would not receive the special over-72 benefit, which is paid to persons who have little or no social security covered employment.

Mr. Speaker, Al Skinner, although he serves the people of Monroe County as sheriff, is alert to their problems in many areas outside the realm of his law-enforcement duties. I should like to thank him publicly for communicating this particular problem to me. I know that my colleagues will give this bill full and prompt consideration.

BACK-DOOR AID DERIVED BY ENEMIES OF SOUTH VIETNAM FROM CAMBODIA

Mr. **CHAMBERLAIN**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 26, I again reported to the House my concern over the problem of the back-door aid derived by the enemies of South Vietnam from Cambodia. Since then two news stories have appeared which give alarming new evidence of the nature and extent of this assistance.

One story in New York Times, April 28, 1967, entitled "Sihanouk Trail Big Supply Line," states that:

> The "so-called Sihanouk Trail, a sixty mile truck road from Cambodia eastward across southern Laos to the Ho Chi Minh Trail, has become a major supply route for enemy forces in South Vietnam.

It is reported that some 60 trucks, 2,000 bicycles and 40 Mekong River boats are used to move rice, truck fuel, and ammunition.

The other dispatch in the Washington Post, April 30, 1967, tells of another "gigantic pipeline through Cambodia supplying the Vietcong with arms, ammunition, food, and medicine—operated with the cooperation of senior Cambodian officials." This report states that:

> Intelligence sources have evidence that small and medium arms for 50,000 troops entered Cambodia in the past two and a half years and were diverted to the Viet Cong. In addition to those arms, openly landed in Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Siam as Chinese Communist arms aid for the Royal Cambodian Army, ammunition was smuggled wholesale in coal shipments from Hanoi, and tens of thousands of tons of rice supplied through overseas Chinese and Vietnamese merchants who control that trade.

Mr. Speaker, for a year I have urged that some action be taken to prompt Cambodia to live up to its alleged policy of strict neutrality. Instead our policy has been one of "do nothing" with the result that our troops in the field have had to suffer the consequences.

The time has come for us to use some of the political and economic weapons in our arsenal, such as the closing of the Mekong River to Cambodian traffic, if we are to keep faith with our fighting men.

The news stories follow:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1967]

SIHANOUK TRAIL BIG SUPPLY LINK—U.S. AIDES SAY IT IS MAJOR SUPPLY ROUTE FOR ENEMY

(By Peter Braestrup)

PAKSE, LAOS, April 26.—United States specialists think that the so-called Sihanouk Trail, a 60-mile truck road from Cambodia eastward across southern Laos to the Ho Chi Minh Trail, has become a major supply route for enemy forces in South Vietnam.

Until this month these sources tended to consider the Sihanouk Trail had a minor role as a slow-traffic rice route. Along with reports of increased traffic, Royal Laotian Air Force pilots have found that the Communists now attach some importance to this supply line; newly installed 12.7-mm. antiaircraft guns have shot down one Laotian T–28 fighter-bomber and hit two more in the last 10 days as they attacked the Sihanouk Trail.

In the past, pilots strafing and bombing this route met only small-arms fire from the ground.

Although he has pledged "diplomatic and political" support to North Vietnam and the Vietcong in the war, Prince Norodom Sihanouk, head of state of Cambodia, has long denied assertions that their supplies moved out of Cambodia along the Sihanouk Trail.

A three-hour air reconnaissance today showed plainly the link between a web of trails and truck roads on the Cambodian side of the border and the newer Sihanouk Trail road in Communist-controlled Laotian territory south of the Mekong River.

Map in hand, an observer was able easily to identify the bend in the Mekong where the border leaves the river to go south as well as the Cambodian guardpost on the Mekong 10 miles to the west. Unlike other sections of Cambodia's borders, there were many landmarks.

TRAIL-BUILDING LEVELS OFF

No specialist in this regional military headquarters nor in Vientiane contends he has the exact statistics on either the Ho Chi Minh Trail or the Sihanouk route running across southern Laos. But it is believed in Vientiane that after a major building and maintenance effort in 1965 and 1966, the North Vietnamese activity along the dirt tracks of the south-bound Ho Chi Minh Trail has leveled off in the dry season, which ends next month. On the other hand, similar effort on the Sihanouk Trail has increased, according to competent sources.

According to these sources, the two trails appear to be developing distinct functions. The Ho Chi Minh Trail is used for moving light weapons, weapons parts and ammunition and infiltrating personnel across the demilitarized zone that divides North and South Vietnam, while the Sihanouk Trail is used to move rice, truck fuel and some ammunition, United States sources have received apparently reliable reports that about 60 trucks, 2,000 bicycles and 40 Mekong riverboats are involved on the Sihanouk Trail supply line. The trucks, it is said, take one night to go over the winding 60-mile dirt road from Cambodia along the south side of the Mekong River Valley to link up wtih Route 96, a north-south branch of the Ho Chi Minh Trail. But the rainy season makes large stretches of both trails impassable to trucks.

Today, from a 4,000-feet altitude, there was no discernible activity on bomb-pocked Route 96, as it wound through the narrow western-most gorges of the mile-high Annamite Range. Nor was there any sign of life on the Sihanouk Trail, as it left the tangle of roads and tracks on the Cambodia side and slashed through patchy scrub forest to the east. Craters and charred trees marked a T–28 attack on a truck park and other attacks on fords, ridge crossings, and bypasses.

Although the enemy is apparently installing more antiaircraft guns, including 37-mm. automatic cannon, air attacks will continue, if only to harass and slow the nightly traffic flow until the rainy season takes a hand.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1967]

CAMBODIANS SENT ARMS TO VIETCONG

(By Robert S. Elegant)

HONG KONG.—A gigantic pipeline through Cambodia supplying the Vietcong with arms, ammunition, food and medicine—operated with the cooperation of senior Cambodian officials—appears to be blowing up into a major political crisis in the Cambodian kingdom.

Recent events, combined with analyses by Western intelligence specialists, offer a picture of intrigue and smuggling of quantities of contraband which would do credit to a suspense thriller.

But the specialists make a most convincing case of their reconstruction of the manner in which Vietcong in South Vietnam and Cambodian rebels have been supplied through Cambodia.

FOR 50,000 TROOPS

Intelligence sources have evidence that small and medium arms for 50,000 troops entered Cambodia in the past two and a half years and were diverted to the Vietcong. In addition to those arms, openly landed in Sihanoukville on the Gulf of Siam as Chinese Communist arms aid for the Royal Cambodian Army, ammunition was smuggled wholesale in coal shipments from Hanoi, and tens of thousands of tons of rice supplied through overseas Chinese and Vietnamese merchants who control that trade.

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Prime Minister of the kingdom, has arrested five Cambodian officials and closed the country even more tightly than usual to foreign correspondents. One of the men arrested is Chao Seng, a leftist who virtually controlled the Cambodian economy until late last year, and observers believe Sihanouk is striving to solve a major internal crisis as quietly as possible.

Although information is scant, it appears that Sihanouk is in political difficulties, having gone too far with leftists both within and without the government. He may now be seeking to recoup his position.

MINISTERS INVOLVED

The supply to the Vietcong may be at the heart of Sihanouk's difficulties, since it involves a large part of the Cambodian power structure. Chao Seng, who returned only a month or so ago from semi-exile since November, 1966, in Paris, appears a key figure in the scandal. He was arrested with four others, all of them also former Ministers.

Phnompenh never denied that the Vietcong received food and medicine from Cambodian sources. Sihanouk has in recent months declared that he would like reinforcement of the Polish, Indian and Canadian teams of the International Control Commission, whose function is to investigate allegations that Cambodian neutrality is being violated.

ADMITS UNCERTAINTY

He has admitted that he cannot be certain the Vietcong do not take shelter on Cambodian territory or receive supplies through Cambodia. He has, however, always said that the port of Sihanoukville was open to inspection to prove that no large-scale shipments of Communist arms were entering the country.

It has been apparent that the Vietcong could be supplied across the waterways and jungle which cover most of the Vietnam-Cambodian border. The question was how the supplies entered Cambodia.

Intelligence specialists now are sure they have the answer.

Since 1967, according to Sihanouk, the Chinese Communists agreed to supply the Cambodian army with arms and equipment of various categories, including aircraft and trucks, sufficient to supply 49,000 men. The Cambodian army numbers no more than this.

SHIPMENTS PADDED

As the routes have been reconstructed, there was no covert smuggling. Instead, additional small arms—and a sprinkling of mortars and recoilless rifles adequate for at least 50,000 men were included in the Chinese arms shipments. With the connivance of senior Cambodian officials, those arms were diverted to the Vietcong and to Cambodian rebels who cooperate with them.

Ammunition and smaller items entered Sihanoukville concealed in coal cargoes from North Vietnam. Once within the country the ammunition entered the same supply net which handles the arms openly imported.

An operation of the size projected must

have created a whole new apparatus of power, in addition to involving a substantial segment of the conventional power structure. Specialists believe Sihanouk may now feel himself directly threatened by the expanded influence the Communists wield in Cambodia within and without the normal state apparatus.

PARALYSIS THREATENED BY NATIONWIDE RAILROAD STRIKE

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is threatened with paralysis by a nationwide railroad strike. Some are asking Congress to step in and require both the unions and the railroads to submit their dispute to binding arbitration—something which no other union or industry is presently required to do.

We all believe in arbitration, as well as collective bargaining. We recognize these acts as fundamental principles of labor-management relations. But forced arbitration and forced settlements are repugnant to the free society in which we live.

At best, forced arbitration can only be a stopgap measure, for it does not reach the roots of the problem. The national transportation tieup which faces America each time the railroad unions cannot reach agreement with management, illustrates that the problem is not the failure to reach agreement but the fact that the labor contracts within one industry are increasingly being designed to expire simultaneously. This can cause nationwide strangulation, brought about by industrywide strikes.

It has been my belief for a long time, Mr. Speaker, that the national interest is not served by allowing so many of the contracts between the various transportation companies and unions to expire simultaneously. It is not beyond the realm of possibility for the labor contracts of all of our major transportation companies—rail, truck and air—as well as our communication companies to expire almost at once, thus completely crippling the country.

This, Mr. Speaker, is what must be corrected. It will not be corrected by legislation requiring binding arbitration and settlement between one union and one industry.

The right to strike is, in my judgment, one of the basic rights of the workers of this country. It is one of the few means they have of demonstrating that a grievance exists between them and the management of their company. Yet, I do not believe that this right should be exercised in such a way that an entire country is paralyzed and placed in peril, as will exist with an industrywide strike.

My judgment, Mr. Speaker, is that in the public interest, we should not allow industrywide strikes in the transportation and communication industries. For that reason I am carefully considering legislation which would prohibit the simultaneous expiration of labor contracts with the various companies in any particular segment of industry in the fields of transportation and communications. I believe this is the kind of legislation we need to protect the overall public interest, rather than the one-shot, one-industry proposal for binding arbitration which we can expect to come before the Congress at any time. Let us work for a solution to the problem and not be content to just treat one symptom.

RETURN OF JUNK MAIL TO SENDER

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to enable those who receive unwanted junk mail to return it to the sender at the sender's cost.

Under present regulations, if someone wants to refuse receipt of third-class mail, it is simply hauled off and destroyed by the Post Office. If the sender now marks "return requested" on third-class mail, it is returned to the sender at a charge of 8 cents for return postage. But most third-class mail simply flows on, despite the wishes of the recipient. Even death does not stem the tide of junk mail which keeps on coming long after some people are dead and gone.

My bill has been drafted in response to numerous suggestions and requests from people all over the country who are irritated at the constant bombardment and duplication of unwanted, unread, and unpaid-for junk mail. The taxpayer is already subsidizing a large part of the cost of this mail, and he must pay again for the time of the postal employees who now have to destroy it when it is marked "refused." My bill will require third-class mailers to place their return address on all material, and will empower the Postmaster General to set the return postage rate high enough to pay for the cost of returning the material.

THIRD-CLASS MAIL

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join with my colleague, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, in a proposal we hope will do much to improve present third-class mail operations. The bill I am introducing would provide for the refusal by addressees of unwanted and unsolicited third-class mail. This follows a bill I introduced last week to raise the rates for third-class mail.

Third-class mail is not paying its own way. And the bulk of third-class mail is in the "junk mail" category which individual citizens should not have to put up with unless they so desire.

In seeking to remedy what I believe is an unrealistic postal rate for third-class mail and to stem the tide of unsolicited mail to those who oppose it, I am joining in this concern with my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER]. Each of us, and I am certain others of this body, have received angry complaints from citizens in our widely separated States about the flood of unwanted mail which increases every year.

Criticism of total Post Office operations, of course, has been sounded session after session. I am particularly concerned now with this specific phase. The third-class mail classification primarily covers the direct mail advertising industry—a large and legitimate business segment. However, the third-class postal rates come far from being high enough to meet the cost of delivery. This not only is illogical from a financial standpoint, but it appears to be an unfair subsidy to one facet of the advertising industry not enjoyed by the many others.

My bill would help increase Post Office revenues and maybe lessen the amount of red ink used for so many years on postal ledgers. It would put direct-mail advertisers on more of a par with their competitors.

And, most importantly, it would give individual citizens the opportunity to determine if unsolicited matter in their mail boxes is desired or not. No act of censorship is involved here.

What one person believes to be unwanted mail, another believes to be valid.

While we cannot legislate mailing morals nor manners, we certainly need not subsidize such things as the bulk mailing of pornographic circulars. And further, we can hit directly at the mailing of pornography by allowing citizens themselves to repudiate it by refusing it.

Third-class-mail senders have only to decide if they still want to use blanket mailing techniques and risk the added cost of returned mail from irritated citizens or if they want to use selective mailing lists of more probable customers.

My bill today provides in essence that citizens may refuse unwanted or unsolicited third-class bulk mail by marking on the envelope a request for the return of such mail to the sender. It shall be done at a cost—not less than the cost of handling the return of the matter—to be set by the Postmaster General.

PROPOSED AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration I introduced H.R. 4279, the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967. Since the introduction of that bill, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has issued a report entitled "Air Quality Criteria for Sulfur Oxides." As a result of discussions of problems involving the technology of minimizing the sulfur oxide problem between the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and representatives of the coal and oil industries and other interested Federal agencies, it has been determined that the research program for control of sulfur emissions should be accelerated and the administration has, therefore, asked that I introduce a revised bill increasing the authorization for fiscal 1968 by $15 million to be used for accelerated research. I have, therefore, today introduced a revised bill carrying out this recommendation.

I enclose as part of my remarks the letter and enclosures I received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., April 24, 1967.

Hon. HARLEY O. STAGGERS,
Chairman, Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAGGERS: Please find attached the proposed Amendment to the "Air Quality Act of 1967," along with a copy of Secretary Gardner's letter to the Speaker of the House which explains the reasons for the proposed amendment.

We would be most appreciative if you would introduce this amendment.

If you or your staff desire any assistance with regard to the bill, please call us.

Sincerely yours,
RALPH K. HUITT,
Assistant Secretary for Legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,

Hon. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House, of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The Air Quality Act of 1967, transmitted to the Congress on January 30, 1967 and now being considered by the Congress, is a matter of highest priority, if we are to continue the battle for clean air. It represents our concern for the serious threat to American health caused by polluted air.

Since the transmittal of the President's Message on "Protecting Our National Hertiage," several events have occurred which make it necesary to accelerate the attack on one of the major air contaminants requiring more complete control—sulfur oxide.

The recently published "Air Quality Criteria for Sulfur Oxides," the recommendations of the conferees in the New York-New Jersey abatement action, and other findings and conclusions of prominent scientists, lead us to the inescapable conclusion that we must move more rapidly and effectively in reducing the levels of sulfur now present in the atmosphere over many of our metropolitan areas.

At the same time, it has become obvious that present technology is inadequate to deal fully with all aspects of the sulfur problem.

While it is true that selection of low-sulfur fuels for use in certain critical areas will offer a temporary solution, it is clear that we must substantially accelerate our research and development activities in three major areas: 1) Removal of sulfur from fuels, 2) process removal of sulfur from burning fuels, and 3) control of sulfur gases in the stack. Several promising approaches are available, and more rapid development to full-scale application is necessary.

We have discussed this problem with representatives of the coal and oil industries and with interested Federal agencies. We are all in agreement with the vital importance of an expanded and accelerated research and development program.

I am therefore recommending that the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 be amended to increase the authorization for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, from $84 million to $99 million; the additional $15 million would be made available for research and development in control of sulfur emissions from fuels.

Enclosed is an amendment to the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967 to carry out this recommendation.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of the Air Quality Act of 1967 with this amendment would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,
——— ———,
Secretary.

AMENDMENT TO DRAFT BILL, THE AIR QUALITY ACT OF 1967

In section 7, strike out "$84,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$99,000,000".

MUTUAL SECURITIES LEGISLATION

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing the legislative proposal which today was forwarded to the Speaker by the Securities and Exchange Commission with the unanimous recommendation for the enactment of this legislation providing additional protection for mutual funds shareholders in areas where the tremendous growth of the industry since enactment of the Investment Company Act of 1940 has created needs which were unanticipated or of secondary importance at that time 27 years ago.

I request that there be included at this place in the RECORD the letter of Chairman Manuel F. Cohen to the Speaker, dated May 1, 1967.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit legislative proposals unanimously recommended by the Securities and Exchange Commission with the hope that they will be introduced and enacted in this first session of the 90th Congress. They would provide additional protection for mutual fund shareholders in areas where the tremendous growth of the industry since enactment of the Investment Company Act of 1940 has created needs which were either unanticipated or of secondary importance at that time. Between the end of 1940 and June 30, 1966, investment company assets increased from about $2.1 billion to $46.4 billion. Most of this growth was accounted for by mutual funds, whose net assets increased from $450 million at the end of 1940 to about $38.2 billion at June 30, 1966. By the end of 1965 there were more than 3,500,000 mutual fund investors as compared with less than 300,000 in 1940.

The Commission's proposals are the outgrowth of studies made by or for the Commission pursaunt to Congressional direction, primarily that contained in Section 14(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 which authorizes the Commission if it finds "that any substantial further increase in the size of investment companies creates any problem involving the protection of investors or the public interest, to make a study and investigation" and to report the results to the Congress.

The first of these studies, which commenced in 1958 pursuant to Commission direction, was made by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania. That report submitted to the Congress in August of 1962 found that the more important current problems in the mutual fund industry involved potential conflicts of interest between the fund management and shareholders and the impact of fund growth and purchases on stock prices. The Wharton School Report was followed by the Report of the staff of the Commission's Special Study of the Securities Markets, which, insofar as mutual funds were concerned, examined sales of mutual fund shares including sales practices and the special problems raised by the so-called front-end load in the sale of periodic payment plans for the accumulation of such shares.

Neither the Special Study nor the Wharton Report was a report by the Commission. Following publication of these reports the Commission undertook to evaluate the public policy questions that they raised as part of an extensive study of its own and to report its recommendations to the Congress. The results of that study are found in the Commission's Report on the Public Policy Implications of Investment Company Growth which was transmitted to the Congress on December 2, 1966 and published as House Report No. 2337, 89th Cong., 2d Sess. The legislative proposals transmitted herewith are designed to carry out the recommendations contained in that report.

Areas of primary concern in the report included the costs of management and sales charges. Mutual funds, although ordinarily organized either as corporations or as business trusts, usually are managed and operated not by their own officers and employees but by separate entities which provide management and advisory services under contract with the fund. Traditionally these contracts have provided for compensation on the basis of a percentage of the assets of the fund. As the funds have grown in size the amounts of management fees have likewise grown and the Commission's report concluded that economies of scale in the costs of managing large pools of assets have seldom been shared equitably with investment company shareholders. The proposed legislation would expressly require that management fees be reasonable and make this standard enforceable in the courts. However, any person attacking the reasonableness of a management fee which had been approved by the fund's directors as required by the Investment Company Act would have the burden of proving that the fee was unreasonable. A requirement that the fee be reasonable would appear inherent in the fiduciary relationship between investment company shareholders and an investment advisory organization which is in effective control of the fund. The existing provisions of the Investment Company Act, however, provide no adequate means by which such a requirement may be enforced.

The proposed legislation would also place a 5% ceiling on charges for mutual fund sales, subject to a power in the Commission to grant exceptions where appropriate. This proposed maximum charge would still be substantially greater than the sales charges generally prevailing in the securities markets such as stock exchange commissions or over-the-counter markups for securities of comparable quality. As a result, in part, of the resale price maintenance scheme provided in Section 22(d) of the Investment Company Act, which the mutual fund industry regards as important for the preservation of the existing pattern of distribution of such shares, competition has not operated to reduce sales loads. Rather the sales charges paid by average or small investor have tended to increase as investment companies competed for the favor of dealers and their salesmen.

Of particular concern are the sales charges paid by those investors, generally small investors, who accumulate mutual fund shares by monthly payments over a period of years. Under the existing provisions of the statute, up to 50% of the first year's payments may be deducted for sales charges. The Commission's study as well as the Special Study showed that a substantial portion of such investors are unable or unwilling to complete their plans, with the result that up to half of the money that they pay in goes for sales costs. The proposed legislation would eliminate the front-end load feature and require that sales charges be spread equally over all payments, thus reducing the undue risk of loss suffered by those investors who do not complete their plans, as well as making sure that a greater proportion of the money paid by an investor is invested for his benefit.

The proposed legislation would also contain other provisions which are designed primarily to facilitate the administration and enforcement of the Investment Company Act, to eliminate certain anomalous situations, and to update and correct certain provisions.

These legislative proposals recognize as did the Commission's report that on the whole the investment company industry reflects diligent management by competent persons, that the industry has provided a useful and desirable means for investors to obtain diversification of investment risks and professional investment management and that drastic changes in the Investment Company Act of 1940 are not required. We believe, however, that enactment of these proposals would assure fairer treatment for the millions of Americans, including many of modest means, who have chosen to invest many billions of dollars in investment company securities.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of legislation along the lines of this Bill would be in accord with the program of the President.

By direction of the Commission,

MANUEL F. COHEN,
Chairman.

MOVE OF 5TH ARMY HEADQUARTERS FROM CHICAGO TO FORT SHERIDAN

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article from the Chicago Tribune.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful and embarrassing duty to inform my colleagues who voted to move the 5th Army Headquarters from Hyde Park in Chicago to Fort Sheridan as an economy move that someone in uniform took them for a ride. Charles Mount, an honorable and highly respected staff writer, tells the story in the Chicago Tribune of April 30, 1967.

My colleagues, I think, will recall that in my vain effort to save the Army from the folly that Mr. Mount's recital makes clear and dramatic I predicted in full detail everything that has come to pass. I did succeed, and for that I am grateful to my colleagues, in postponing the removal for 2 years, but after that 2 years the forces of folly, extravagance, and stubborn vanity could not be stopped.

Mr. Mount points out that improvements at Fort Sheridan to accommodate the 5th Army Headquarters will reach $6.3 million. Improvements already made include installation of underground communications cables, extensive remodeling of eight office buildings, erection of 250 more living quarters, new electrical wiring system and heating plant and many other facilities, all of which I predicted and all of which the Army laughed off as fairy dreams.

Mr. Mount says that at least one-third of the civilian force will quit their jobs rather than move into a locality where homes run between $25,000 to $45,000, as reported by Mr. Mount. Mr. Mount quotes Colonel Baldy as saying that among the civilian workers quitting the headquarters are top-rated management and supervisory personnel. I understand it is all but impossible to find qualified and experienced successors.

Mr. Mount, commenting on possible discrimination against Negro personnel, reports "a salesman for one of the largest Waukegan realtors told the Tribune he could not handle any transactions in the move because of the no-discrimination stipulation by the Army."

By unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the full text of Mr. Mount's revealing article in the Chicago Tribune of April 30, 1967, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 30, 1967]

THE 5TH ARMY GEARED FOR FORT SHERIDAN MOVE

(By Charles Mount)

The biggest military campaign in the Chicago area in recent years will begin May 9, most of it under cover of darkness.

After more than 2 years of planning, the nation's second largest army headquarters, 5th army, will move from 1660 E. Hyde Park blvd. to Fort Sheridan, adjacent to Highland Park. The move, which military officials say will cost $2.6 million, will mean relocating, over a 12-year period, the work of 945 military personnel, about 500 civilians, and 500 tons of equipment.

MOVE TO REDUCE COSTS

It also will mean that civilians will be working in a complete military setting for the first time. The headquarters, in a move to reduce defense department costs, will relocate from a former hotel and military hospital to an ex-cavalry post. Many civilians will be leaving a place they have worked for 20 years.

Relocating their homes will be 325 civilians and 140 military families who have found or still are seeking off post housing on the north shore. Most of the personnel are moving from scattered locations on the south side.

Some 136 personnel, 126 of them civilians, plan to commute to the fort on special military buses which will stop daily at the Hyde Park building and at Howard and Paulina streets. Another 80 personnel are seeking car pool partners.

RUN SPECIAL BUSES

The special buses will run for a three-month trial period to accommodate personnel who don't want to move while their children are in school and to encourage civilians who want to work at Fort Sheridan but don't want to move their homes. The army is trying to persuade private bus companies to take up the routes.

About one-third of the civilians are quitting their jobs rather than make the move, said Col. Paul A. Baldy, coordinator of the move as special assistant to the 5th army chief of staff. Other military sources said as many as one-half of the civilians will not make the move. Most are going to other federal jobs.

In order to avoid massive traffic jams, five commercial moving companies will load furniture and other equipment onto about 27 vans after work hours. The vans, to conform with police requests, will leave one at a time at night for the fort, where they will be unloaded shortly after dawn.

DEVISE TRAFFIC PLAN

Military police, on orders of Col. Victor G. Conley, Fort Sheridan post commander, have devised traffic flow plans and special parking areas to avoid confusion.

Each of the 24 sections will move half of their operations at one time, thus leaving the other half to maintain emergency facilities.

Col. Baldy said some of the civilians quitting the headquarters are top-rated management and supervisory personnel. The others are spread thruout the other civil service levels. The army, in order to fill vacancies, has hired 283 people from the north shore in the last two months, he said.

MOST BUYING HOMES

The hiring of local people and the movement of 465 personnel into the area is expected to have a considerable effect on the north shore economy, particularly the housing market. Most of the personnel are buying homes in the $25,000 to $45,000 bracket in the Deerfield-Highland Park, Libertyville-Mundelein, and Palatine-Arlington Heights areas, Col. Baldy said.

The army has conducted housing tours and contacted real estate brokers to help personnel, but many of them still will end up paying from 25 to 100 per cent more in property taxes than on the south side, he said.

IMPROVE FORT SHERIDAN

In a move to help reduce possible discrimination against Negro personnel, the army has held consultations with Negroes stationed at Fort Sheridan who live off post. Col. Baldy said no problems have been reported, but a salesman for one of the largest Waukegan realtors told The Tribune he could not handle any transactions in the move because of the no-discrimination stipulation by the army.

Col. Baldy said the present headquarters building will be turned over to the Federal General Services administration.

Improvements made at Fort Sheridan prior to the move include installation of underground communiciations cables; remodeling of eight buildings to house the headquarters; completion of 250 more living quarters, a new electrical wiring system, heating plant, medical and dental facility, and restaurant; and expansion of the library and enlisted men's barracks. Expansion of the officer's club is under way. Improvements at the fort will total about 6.3 million dollars.

SPEECH OF THE DISTINGUISHED JUNIOR SENATOR FROM GEORGIA, THE HONORABLE HERMAN TALMADGE

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a speech.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, on April 21 Georgia's distinguished young junior Senator, the Honorable HERMAN TALMADGE, spoke to the Georgia Association of Student Councils at Rock Eagle

State Park at which several hundred Georgia high school students were present.

His speech is one that I believe all Members of Congress would enjoy reading and one from which I believe could come a better understanding of the contributions our young people are making and the responsibilities they will be called upon to meet in the future.

I include Senator TALMADGE's speech in my remarks:

It is always a pleasure to meet with young people of Georgia, and it is especially a high honor for me to visit with student council representatives of Georgia's high schools.

You are leaders now at your respective schools, and the State and the nation looks to you for an even bigger leadership role in the future, to help build and shape our State in the years that lie ahead.

Each time I come to a gathering of Georgia young people, of high school or college age, I am exceedingly proud of what I see. I see quality everywhere I go on our campuses. I see it in the many fine young men and women who come by my office in Washington during their vacations. I see it in the Governor's Honors Program, where I have had the pleasure to speak in the last two years, and in all the other programs in the State that encourage scholastic excellence.

Georgia is truly a growing state. It is growing in every respect—economically, socially, and culturally. Our greatest resource is people, and especially young adults like yourselves.

Since the 1960 Census, the State's population has increased to just under 4½ million people. This is a gain of more than half a million in just the past six years.

It is interested to note that of the total Georgia population, almost 2 million are under age 18. And out of every 100 Georgians, 27 are between 5 and 17 years of age.

The fact is, ours is a young nation. The average age is now 33, but next year it will be 25. It is expected that by 1970 ours will be the youngest nation in the Free World with some 50 per cent of our citizens under 26 years of age. To give you a good idea of what I am talking about, 12 per cent of our population today was not alive when John F. Kennedy was inaugurated in 1961.

More than one-fourth of all the population of the United States are in school classrooms. Thus, it is plain to see that when we contemplate the future of Georgia and America, we look to youth.

Youth is exciting. It is naturally full of life, anxious to grow and be doing things. This excitement and exhuberance can work wonders. It can accomplish things not even dreamed of by my father's generation. However, by the same token, if it is misdirected, it can be catastrophic.

American youth is very much in the news today. Perhaps never before in our history have young people, particularly teenagers and college students, been so widely discussed, analyzed, and laid open for public examination. Their manners, morals, and dedication to God and country are subjects for great journalistic and philosophical debates.

I for one try not to set too much store by what we read and hear. All this would have us believe that the young men and women of today are foot-loose and irresponsible and virtually another Lost Generation.

This is not to say I am not concerned. I am concerned that last year arrests of young people increased 9 per cent. I am concerned about the rash of campus demonstrations and street marches which indicate a growing rebelliousness against authority and disrespect for law and order. I am concerned when I read of kids who get their kicks from L.S.D., alcohol and fast cars.

And speaking strictly from a personal standpoint, I am concerned about so-called non-conformity which leads to hair that is too long and dresses that are too short.

Certainly, some of the behavior and customs of young people today leave something to be desired. And in some respects there is much to be deplored.

However, I do not feel that this is the true picture.

It is my feeling that the true story of American youth today is told by the great rank and file of our younger citizens who stand tall and walk straight . . . who believe in their country and all the things it stands for . . . who are unafraid of hard work . . . and who are ready and willing to assume the responsibilities of free citizens.

These are people who go very quietly about their business. They are not always outspoken, and they don't march in the streets, singing and chanting. But when they do speak, they command attention and respect.

These are young citizens who believe in respect for authority . . . in individual integrity and personal honor . . . in decent behavior . . . in constructive thought and responsible citizenship . . . and in loyalty to God and country.

These are people who are more interested in creating than tearing down. The quality of young citizens today is symbolized by the theme you have chosen for this meeting—"Deeds not Words."

So, I am optimistic.

I am convinced that in the young people of America lies the most abundant and promising source of strength we could have.

And this is particularly true in the State of Georgia.

Last February, our State observed the 234th anniversary of its founding. The colonial history of Georgia exemplifies what individual freedom, personal responsibility, honor and courage meant then, and what it means now to our State and nation.

The rich and colorful history of Georgia is a priceless legacy to all of our citizens. It is fitting to pay tribute to the past, for we can greatly profit from the example set by our forebearers.

Almost two-and-a-half centuries separate us from the founding fathers of Georgia. Looking back, we find more than two hundred years of hard work and often lean times. There was destructive war and Reconstruction, and there were years of economic depression.

But there were challenges and determination, and there was opportunity.

Just as there is today.

But most important there were vision and courage.

Just as there is today.

And there were bold men and women of ambition, who by strong will and able bodies were capable of turning temporary adversity into advantage.

And so it is today.

Times have changed. And they are changing still, at a very rapid pace. However, in spite of phenomenal scientific and technological advancement, and the industrial and urban transition taking place in our State—fundamental principles remain the same today as they were two-and-a-half centuries ago.

The same spirit guides Georgians today. Our State is still blessed with a wealth of human and natural resources.

We still need a society of creative individuals.

We still need men and women of vision for, as we are told in the Book of Proverbs:

"Where there is no vision, the people perish." There are still monumental challenges to be met. There are still dangerous problems to be solved. There is yet great opportunity for everyone.

I am reminded of the words of the renowned journalist, Henry W. Grady, when he spoke in New York City in the year 1886. He referred to "The New South" at a time when Georgia was busy rebuilding from the tragic War Between the States. Grady declared:

"The New South is enamored of her new work. Her soul is stirred with the breath of a new life. The light of a grander day is falling on her face. She is thrilling with the consciousness of growing power and prosperity."

These words are as meaningful to Georgia today as they were almost a century ago. And young citizens of our State should find them especially inspiring.

It has been said that this last third of the 20th Century belongs to Georgia and the South. I believe that. We are witnessing an economic boom in our State and region that is unprecedented.

It was only about three decades ago that the states of the South were regarded as the nation's number one economic problem. Today, our region is considered the number one land of opportunity and growth.

And Georgia is situated squarely in the middle of it all. And in many areas of endeavor, Georgia is setting the pace.

Georgia began its tremendous growth is earnest in the years following World War II, and really started moving forward about the time many of you were born. Today, our State, along with the rest of the Southeast, leads the nation in the rate of growth in almost all fields of economic and industrial endeavor.

This is not to say there is not a long way to go. This is where you will come in. And each of you should regard it as all the more challenging, for when we consider what has been accomplished already . . . how much room there is for more growth . . . the resources that are yet untapped . . . then the potential growth of Georgia becomes staggering to the imagination.

So—the last third of the 20th Century belongs to Georgia and the South. In the final analysis, the years ahead belong to you, the young men and women of Georgia.

What is achieved in Georgia between now and the turn of the Century—33 years hence—the gains and the progress that are made—will for the most part be done by people who today are in their teens.

The work ahead will be no easier for you than it was for your predecessors. In many respects, it will be a good deal more difficult. Our society is growing more and more troublesome and complex with the passing of each day. Our present population is around 200 million. By the year 2000, it is expected to be about 340 million. And in just the next few years, about 75 out of every 100 Americans will live and work in or near a large city.

It has been estimated that man's volume of knowledge is doubling every five years.

Material is being taught in colleges that was not even known when today's college professors were students themselves.

All this points to an overpowering need to be prepared for the years that lie ahead of you. It makes education a very big and important business. And it is a costly business, as your parents knew and as you will come to know. However, this is an investment we cannot afford *not* to make. As Poor Richard said in his Almanack:

"The only thing more expensive than education is ignorance."

I am convinced that education and training is now and will continue to be the greatest force in the continued future progress of Georgia. I have already pointed out the high percentage of young people in our country in relation to the total population. This means that whole new generations must be educated and made to understand and appreciate the American heritage and the fundamental principles that made our nation great.

The importance and necessity of education in today's complex world has not escaped our young citizens. The number of high school graduates has increased more than 100 per cent in the past 10 years. More and more each year are banging at the doors of universities and colleges. We are engaged in a race between modernization of industry and business . . . and modernization of manpower.

When I speak of education, I mean an investment that pays returns many times over in terms of increased earnings. Learning and training virtually guarantee the security of the individual and his family.

However, as you are well aware, education is far more than just a bread and butter affair. Education enriches the minds of individuals and enables them to make decisions and act intelligently on the great problems and issues of the day.

And it might be added that in this rapidly changing world, in time more perilous than mankind has ever known before, education has taken on new meaning and deeper significance.

An educated people are more vital to the economic and political security of America and the Free World than all the missiles, planes and bombs we can devise.

It is important to know and understand fully the American way of life.

It is imperative to know why our nation has grown and prospered, and why our people enjoy more liberty and opportunity than any other in the world.

It is vital to our continued prosperity that we know the value of our system of free enterprise.

And we must know the meaning of freedom.

Freedom is difficult to define, especially for a people who have enjoyed it and taken it for granted all their lives. But I can tell you *what freedom is not*.

It is not to be found in a system of government which guns down a man trying to slip over the Berlin Wall. It is not found in the villages of South Viet Nam where peasants are slaughtered by the Communist Viet Cong. It is not found in a totalitarian state where the people know only what the government wants them to know and where there is no recognition of human dignity. It is not found in strong-arm dictatorships where the government rules, not by the consent of the governed, but by armed military force.

Thus, to see and understand what is happening in many other parts of the world enables us to measure and appreciate the freedom that we enjoy—and why it is so important that we insure its preservation for all generations yet to come.

It might be said that the greatest challenge you will face is to leave a better world for your children than was left for you. Unfortunately, you have inherited the perils and problems of domestic strife. International tension and the threat of Communism grip the world. It is well that you feel the weight of the responsibilities that will soon be thrust upon your shoulders.

I am confident that you are up to the tasks that lie ahead. I am certain that each of you, as you complete your studies and go about your chosen professions, will continue your quest for knowledge and improvement. I am confident that you will keep on learning and keep on doing.

Young Georgians are endowed with a sense of responsibility. They are demonstrating a willingness to work hard and to make wise use of their God-given talents.

This is all the guarantee we need for a great and prosperous future for Georgia and the nation.

SILVER DOLLARS FOR HEALTH RESEARCH: PRESIDENT APPOINTS COINAGE COMMISSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, President Johnson announced appointment of the eight public members of the Joint Commission on the Coinage.

The Commission was authorized under the Coinage Act of 1965. With the completion of the membership, the Commission is expected to convene soon to start considering a variety of matters relating to coinage.

Following the President's announcement today, I introduced legislation which would authorize the Treasury to sell its supply of silver dollars to the American Cancer Society and the American Heart Association. The two health societies would be authorized to resell the coins with the proceeds earmarked for research into cancer and heart disease.

The Treasury currently has on hand about 3 million silver dollars, including 2,800,000 which were minted at the Carson City Mint in the late 1800's. The silver dollars are believed to have a numismatic value several times that of their face value. This means that the resale of the coins by the health societies would provide millions of dollars for badly needed medical research.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the new Joint Commission on the Coinage will place this proposal on its agenda for early action.

I place in the Record a copy of the White House release announcing the appointments to the Coinage Commission:

The President today announced the appointment of the eight public members of the Joint Commission on the Coinage authorized by the Coinage Act of 1965. The Commission is expected to convene shortly.

Other members, previously designated, include six from the House of Representatives, six from the Senate and four officials of the Executive Branch.

The Coinage Act of 1965 empowered the Commission to advise the President, the Secretary of the Treasury and the Congress on: the implementation of the coinage program; the needs of the economy for coins; standards for coins; technological developments and other considerations relevant to maintaining an adequate coinage system; minting of silver dollars and official maintenance of the price of silver.

The eight public members named by the President to the 24-member Commission are:

Julian Braden Baird, St. Paul, Minnesota, former Under Secretary of the Treasury;

Amon G. Carter, Jr., Fort Worth, Texas, publisher of the Fort Worth Star Telegram;

William C. Decker, New York, New York, business executive former president of Corning Glass Works;

Samuel M. Fleming, Nashville, Tennessee, president, 3rd National Bank of Nashville, former president of American Bankers Association;

Edward H. Foley, Washington, D.C., attorney, former Under Secretary of the Treasury;

Harry Harrington, St. Louis, Missouri, chairman of the board and president of the Boatmen's National Bank of St. Louis;

H. E. Rainbolt, Shawnee, Oklahoma, president of the Federal National Bank and Trust Company at Shawnee; and

Eugene Smith Pulliam, Indianapolis, Ind., assistant publisher of the Indianapolis Star and Indianapolis News.

The members serve without compensation.

Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler is Chairman of the Coinage Commission. The three other members from the Executive Branch are Acting Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge; Mr. Charles Schultze, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and Miss Eva Adams, Director, Bureau of the Mint.

Congressional members are Senator John Sparkman, Chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee; Senator Wallace F. Bennett, ranking minority member, Senate Banking and Currency Committee; Representative Wright Patman, Chairman, House Banking and Currency Committee; Representative William B. Widnall, ranking minority member, House Banking and Currency Committee; Senators John O. Pastore, Alan Bible, Thomas H. Kuchel, and Peter H. Dominick, and Representatives Ed Edmondson, Robert N. Giaimo, Silvio O. Conte, and James F. Battin.

Prior to the enactment of the Coinage Act of 1965, U.S. dimes, quarters, half dollars and silver dollars all contained 90 percent silver. The 1965 Act eliminated silver from dimes and quarters and reduced the silver content of half dollars to 40 percent. The Act also prohibited manufacturing silver dollars for five years. It directed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase newly minted silver at $1.25 a troy ounce, and authorized him to sell silver in excess of stocks required to be held as reserves against silver certificates, at not less than the monetary value of silver. It also authorized him to prohibit the export, melting or treating of U.S. coins.

The new dimes and quarters are made of clad material—a copper-nickel alloy bonded to a core of pure copper. Half dollars are also clad. They contain silver and copper throughout with a greater proportion of silver in the faces than in the core.

One of the duties of the newly appointed Commission will be to make recommendations for the disposal of some three million rare silver dollars still held by the Treasury. Hearings were held on this last July by the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

WATER AND SEWER PROGRAM FUNDS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I had left the floor briefly last Tuesday when the distinguished Member, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development of the House Appropriations Committee, indicated his desire to raise certain questions concerning the need for H.R. 9066, which will increase the authorization under section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 for basic water and sewage facilities from $200 million to $1 billion, becoming effective in the next fiscal year beginning July 1.

First, let me commend the gentleman for his recognition of the value of this fine program to the future growth of our great nation. Such early bipartisan support for a program that has been in actual operation a little over a year is gratifying to our committee, and I know, to the administration that had the splendid foresight to propose it in 1965. I have no doubt that it will become as popular with Members on both sides of the aisle as Public Law 660, the sewer treatment plant program, commenced in 1956, and now administered by the Department of Interior. This program, beginning with a modest authorization in 1956, has increased to a $3½ billion authorization with the passage of the Clear Water Restoration Act of 1966.

Future growth of both urban and rural America is dependent upon the construction of combined comprehensively planned water and sewage distribution systems as provided by the section 702 program administered by HUD. HUD and Interior, working together with State and local governments with these two programs, will provide the basic structures for our growth for decades to come, the skeleton, if you will, of new developments and even new cities. If we fail to recognize the magnitude of the problem and do not provide adequate authorizations, we perpetuate the construction of competing, inadequate, archaic systems by each unit of government and even worse, actually encourage continued use of "wet" septic tanks, which while serving a present need, make future growth almost economically impossible and in some cases contributes to a dangerous pollution problem.

HUD is indeed to be commended for its prudent administration of the program thus far. The concept of comprehensive water planning, as required by the law for the first time, is now firmly established, with a growing understanding by local communities that combined facilities are necessary, both distribution and treatment. The ultimate savings by the construction of facilities with adequate growth capacity serving an area, rather than a jurisdiction, is now recognized by all. Cities and counties, towns and villages, are now planning together and they are working cooperatively with State and Federal officials. Many of these program are administered by the Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Development in HUD with an eye to the special needs of the small community.

The gentleman from North Carolina must indeed be proud of the fine example set by the officials of Charlotte and Mechlenberg County who have set an outstanding example of complete cooperation in the planning and development of the area's fine water resources. This spirit of cooperation which deservedly entitled Charlotte to one of the first grants under the "702" program, was, I know, in large part due to the leadership of their Congressman, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina. Even with the relatively small amount authorized and appropriated in this beginning program, the story of Charlotte has been repeated throughout the Nation.

In my own district, comprehensive planning has become the rule rather than the exception. These plans are now being finalized, leading to the presentation of approval applications, not just letters of inquiry. HUD has completed its important interdepartmental agreements with Commerce, EDA, Interior, and HEW; all occurring while the Department completely reorganized to provide the coordinated leadership the Congress contemplated by the establishment of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Last fall when the President's budget was being considered and finalized, prudent concern was shown by the President over inflationary effects which led, for example, to a slowdown in the interstate highway program. Many Members on the other side of the aisle urged this type of action and even today, with evidence of a softening economy, continue to urge a domestic slowdown. The gentleman, I am sure, is familiar with my criticism of the actions of the Federal Reserve Board in raising interest rates that have contributed directly to our present situation. But is the gentleman familiar with the effect one of the worst "tight money" periods in our history has had on housing "new starts" and related municipal construction of water and sewer facilities? An already critical backlog of needed water and sewer facilities was greatly worsened by the inability of many communities, particularly small cities and towns, to obtain loans at a reasonable interest rate.

Should the House Appropriations Committee recommend an increase in the President's budget finalized last December for the water sewer program, I would support such action as a real act of constructive bipartisan statesmanship.

Communities all over America are planning together today, as we in Congress directed them to do, to qualify for "702" grant assistance. Let us acknowledge their faith by the enactment of H.R. 9066, so that the administration will have the opportunity to come back with a supplemental request in January, and an expanded request for fiscal year 1969, should economic conditions permit, as I predict will be the case, to move this extremely important program from the planning stage to the action state in every community, large and small, throughout the Nation.

MAKING THE NEXT VIETNAM PAUSE WORK

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, an article by Robert Kleiman in this morning's New York Times reviews the history for negotiations between North Vietnam and the United States since 1964. If the facts contained in the article are true, it is clear that on several occasions Washington and Hanoi were quite close to reaching an agreement for commencement of negotiations to end the war. Unfortunately, for one reason or another, apparently attributable to misunderstanding or mistrust more than anything else, the parties did not take the last step leading to the conference table. Meanwhile, the war goes on at an ever-increasing pace with the prospective commitment of more men and greater force on the part of both belligerents.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot escape the impression from the article that negotiations are within reach and an opportunity to test that conclusion is within reach as well. There will be an upcoming truce on May 23 in honor of the birthday of Buddha. It should be possible for skillful, perceptive diplomacy to bring the conflict on the battlefield to the conference table.

President Johnson said that we seek peace with honor in Vietnam. North Vietnam has indicated it will not agree to negotiate under terms which amount to an ultimatum, the converse of which raises the possibility that it would agree to terms other than an ultimatum. That possibility should be explored in connection with the forthcoming truce.

The alternative, Mr. Speaker, is well stated in the article which I have appended to my remarks.

The May 23 truce—

It says—

> if it occurs, could provide another opportunity to return to the American position of a year ago. Otherwise the outlook is for continued deadlock, further escalation and the likelihood of a much longer—and perhaps a much wider—war.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1967]

Making the Next Vietnam Pause Work

(By Robert Kleiman)

The one or two-day truce and bombing pause now scheduled for the anniversary of Buddha's birth, May 23, could well set in motion another major attempt at peacemaking in Vietnam. For those who hope for such an attempt and want it to succeed, it is essential to be clear about what went wrong in the peacemaking efforts of the past.

The explanation the Administration is encouraging the world to believe is that Washington has been consistently seeking and Hanoi resisting negotiations. But the reality appears to be that both sides have been shifting position repeatedly over the past thirty-two months, alternately blowing hot and cold about peace talks.

Originally, Hanoi was willing to talk. In September 1964 it accepted Secretary General Thant's proposal, relayed by Moscow, for secret contacts with Washington. For four months the Johnson Administration failed to reply, then rejected Mr. Thant's follow-up suggestion of a meeting of the American and North Vietnamese Ambassadors in Rangoon.

Twenty-four hours after word of this rejection reached Hanoi in February 1965 American bombing of North Vietnam began, allegedly in retaliation for a major Vietcong attack on the American base at Pleiku, American marines began landing in South Vietnam a month later, followed by other combat troops. Hanoi responded by stepping up its infiltration, sending regular North Vietnamese Army troops to fight in the South as organized units for the first time.

THE BALTIMORE PROPOSAL

At Baltimore on April 7, 1965, Mr. Johnson suggested "unconditional discussions"—a proposal to talk while the bombing of North Vietnam and fighting in the South continued. Hanoi's response was that the bombing of North Vietnam had to stop first. Meanwhile, in reply to the peace aims President Johnson outlined at Baltimore, Hanoi on April 8 announced its own terms, the highly ambiguous Four Points.

The next shift in positions came on May 12, 1965, when President Johnson for the first time suspended the bombing of North Vietnam—for a "limited trial period." His secret message to Hanoi gave North Vietnam four to ten days to order "significant reductions" in Communist armed attacks in South Vietnam if it wanted the pause extended. A permanent end of the bombing, Mr. Johnson indicated, would require an end to all armed action by the Communists in the South.

Hanoi returned this letter twice, once symbolically unopened. It then rejected it publicly, denouncing the time limit, which gave the message the character of an ultimatum as well as the demand for a military *quid pro quo* in the South. The Soviet Union, active earlier in urging peace talks and forwarding messages, refused even to discuss this one. On May 18, six days after the suspension, bombing was resumed.

Through the next seven months the Johnson Administration resisted pressure for another, more prolonged, pause. Washington insisted on a "clear indication" in advance from Hanoi that there would be "commensurate actions in relation to the infiltration and military action in South Vietnam and the presence of North Vietnamese military personnel."

But in December 1965, with 190,000 American troops in South Vietnam, President Johnson ordered a second bombing pause, this time without setting a time limit or asking advance assurances of a reciprocal military step by the Communists. Washington made it clear that the pause would continue if Hanoi simply agreed to negotiate. The Soviet Union, which had privately suggested this American approach, sent a high-level mission to Hanoi. The Pope, Secretary General Thant and dozens of nonaligned nations urged North Vietnam to open talks.

HANOI'S REJECTION

But Hanoi, apparently believing it was winning the war, failed to return to the pro-negotiation position it had held only a year earlier. Hanoi now advanced demands for a permanent and unconditional halt to the bombing as well as acceptance of its Four Points, which remained wrapped in ambiguity. It remained unclear whether the Four Points were proposals for a settlement, open for bargaining, or preconditions for a negotiation—that had to be accepted before talks began. After 37 inconclusive days of truce in the air and diplomatic probes on the ground, American bombing of the North resumed at the end of January 1966.

TALKS IF BOMBING HALTS

Nine months later, in the fall of 1966, Hanoi's position began to change significantly. There were increasing indications from Russia and Eastern European countries, then Hanoi itself, that North Vietnam was prepared to accept what it had rejected in January—an undertaking to enter into negotiations if the bombing was halted.

Later Ho Chi Minh's letter to President Johnson (February 1967) confirmed that Hanoi was no longer insisting on a "permanent" cessation of the bombing; it was seeking an "unconditional" halt, one that would not commit North Vietnam in advance to reciprocal military measures in the South.

There was another important sign of a shift in Hanoi's position, also later confirmed in the Ho Chi Minh letter. Hanoi clearly was no longer asking acceptance of its Four Points as a precondition for talks. Thus there was no longer any question of a demand for withdrawal of American troops, recognition of the Vietcong or acceptance of the Vietcong program for South Vietnam before negotiations.

Most important, the Ho Chi Minh letter confirmed that Hanoi was not only prepared to defy Peking by opening talks but was proposing to negotiate bilaterally with the United States, leaving out the Vietcong.

These shifts—plus the demoralizing effect they presumably would have on the Vietcong guerrillas once negotiations opened—provided Washington with the opportunity, if it wanted to seize it, to test anew Hanoi's sincerity.

JOHNSON'S CONDITIONS

President Johnson's response in February was to revive a series of conditions similar to those he had proposed in 1965 but had put aside during the January 1966 bombing pause. Once again a brief time limit was attached to the bombing pause—it was to run four days—a period later extended by thirty-six hours because of the Wilson-Kosygin talks in London. The deadline imparted to this third cessation, as to the first in May 1965, the character of an ultimatum. Once again President Johnson called for reciprocal military measures by North Vietnam in the South as the price for prolonging the pause. And for the first time he asked Hanoi not only to agree to a reciprocal military move but to carry it out before the bombing stopped.

In his Feb. 8 letter to Ho Chi Minh, which rejected the suggestion of a bombing halt followed by bilateral negotiations, Mr. Johnson said his concern was that North Vietnam might "make use of such action by us to improve its military position." But he did not limit himself to this concern in making a counterproposal that seemed a step forward but actually was a step backward. He proposed a freeze of American force levels in the South to accompany the bombing halt in the North. But, in return, he asked North Vietnam not only to halt its own manpower build-up in the South, but to stop all infiltration of materiel. This amounted to seeking through a bombing pause what the bombing itself had failed to achieve: a halt in infiltration. And to the North Vietnamese, as Prime Minister Wilson pointed out at the time, it meant "they would be leaving perhaps 100,000 North Vietnamese (troops) at risk in the South, denuded of necessary supplies."

Mr. Wilson, in contact with Hanoi through Premier Kosygin's London visit, felt that a further extension of the pause by Washington and a secret pledge by Hanoi of almost any reciprocal military move would permit negotiations to be engaged. Neither Washington nor Hanoi was willing to make the first move to activate such a deal and the bombing resumed. But this concept still offers the the best chance to get peace talks going.

Other United States proposals apparently were made during the meetings in Moscow early this year between an American and a North Vietnamese diplomat. But this first sustained series of secret contacts led nowhere because Hanoi's representative was only prepared to listen, not talk, prior to cessation of the bombing. And all the American messages, including an inquiry about the agenda for a conference, seemed designed to induce Hanoi either to talk while the bombing went on or to agree in advance to pay a military price in the South in return for suspension of the bombing.

Washington is suspicious that North Vietnam is far more interested in halting the bombing than in genuinely negotiating and would drag out any talks to gain a military advantage. No one forgets Korea, where fighting went on for two years during the Panmunjom talks.

These concerns are legitimate. But there are other ways to satisfy them than to insist that Hanoi back down first on its two-year refusal to talk while being bombed.

TWO ROUTES TO TALKS

One way would be for Moscow, which provides Hanoi with much military and economic aid, to use this leverage to induce North Vietnam to negotiate in good faith and not step up its infiltration during a bombing suspension. But since Soviet action is highly unlikely, the United States could take the initiative. It could suspend the bombing but make it clear after talks open, that negotiations could not continue very long if either side substantially increased its force levels in South Vietnam or the flow of supplies to its troops or allies.

The Pentagon already has laid the groundwork for such a position in the projected May 23 truce. It has announced that it reserves the right to take appropriate military action against abnormally large efforts to resupply Communist troops. If no such abnormal resupply efforts are noted, there would be no reason not to extend the pause and test Hanoi's willingness to negotiate. It goes without saying that prolonged lack of progress in such negotiations just as increased Communist infiltration, could and probably would lead to a step-up in the war.

RISK TAKEN LAST YEAR

There undoubtedly are some military risks in such an approach. Mr. Johnson took such risks a year ago. He suspended bombing for 37 days at a time when neither the military nor the political situation in South Vietnam was as secure as today. Yet Hanoi gained no significant military advantage. He was prepared to open negotiations first, then ask assurances that Hanoi would not obtain a military advantage from further prolongation of the bombing pause.

The May 23 truce, if it occurs, could provide another opportunity to return to the American position of a year ago. Otherwise the outlook is for continued deadlock, further escalation and the likelihood of a much longer—and perhaps a much wider—war.

MAKING THE NEXT VIETNAM PAUSE WORK

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the New York Times for the extraordinarily interesting analysis by Mr. Robert Kleiman of the history of efforts to get peace negotiations started in Vietnam which appeared this morning and which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] has had inserted in the RECORD.

The article reflects the great difficulty that exists in trying to generalize about the course of efforts to secure negotiations.

Mr. Kleiman makes a convincing case for the proposition that, at various times, Hanoi has been more amenable to negotiations than the United States, and that at other times the reverse has been true.

The article, therefore, can be construed as a challenge of the administration's version of the events that have transpired in recent months. I would, therefore, suggest to the administration that, if there are factual errors in Mr. Kleiman's account, the administration should come forth and identify them.

Mr. Kleiman also makes some suggestions with regard to the possibility of avoiding in the future the kind of situation which has prevented in the past all aproaches to negotiations from bearing fruit. These suggestions would seem to deserve careful consideration on the part of the administration.

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNT OF CHICAGO'S BIG TORNADO

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, so many of my colleagues have asked me the details of the recent tornado that ripped Oak Lawn, close to the district I have the honor to represent, that I am extending my remarks to include an article in the Beverly News, Ill., of April 27, 1967, with an eyewitness account. The article, which follows, is by Joe Martin, staff reporter and photographer, and well and widely known as the moving spirit in the American Veterans Press Association of Chicago:

EYEWITNESS ACCOUNTS OF STORM

(By Joe Martin)

Edward Fisher, who resides at 9121 S. Mayfield ave., was resting in a room of Fisher's Motel located at 95th street and Southwest highway and Austin avenue, Oak Lawn, listening to a radio announced broadcasting tornado warnings.

Suddenly, he noted a deep rumbling sound such as thousands of aircraft droning. The noise didn't seem to emanate from his radio so he rose from his chair and opened the door. What he had heard amplified. He saw a huge black cloud overhead and assorted objects including cars flying through the air. He knew it was a tornado and dashed back into his room slamming the door shut.

He crouched down into a corner as the building started to shake and the windows shattered. Rain was driven into the room by the velocity of the wind. In about 30 seconds, the noise receded and Mr. Fisher stood up. He looked at the shambles in the room and noted that the electric clock had stopped at exactly 5:25 p.m.

Unhurt, he opened the door and beheld the devastation of his property. His 12 unit Motel was all but demolished; walls, windows and roofs were missing. Plumbing was exposed and bedding strewn around.

He looked toward the place where his building which had housed a tavern and restaurant had stood. The entire structure was flattened.

The Sherwood Forest Restaurant and tavern were leased to Kenneth Shoot of Chicago Ridge. Some 20 customers were playing pool and listening to music at the juke box when the tornado crushed the building.

Mr. Fisher told this writer that he had operated businesses at this corner for 25 years. In less than half a minute, his little empire had vanished.

He told of the 50 teen-age boys who drove up in a truck shortly after the catastrophe and the help of many adults who within 30 minutes had freed the victims from the wreckage. Ambulances and Fire crews quickly dispatched the injured to hospitals. No lives were lost.

As darkness began to fall and the rain continued to pour down, the air became frigid with near-freezing temperature. Rescue work continued. Twelve persons huddled all night in the one unit of Fisher's Motel that miraculously retained it's ceiling and roof.

Mr. Fisher and his friend, Gregory Mondry of 9120 S. Mayfield ave. told of their work in assisting Mrs. Wilhelmina Dushop as she crawled on all fours from the wreckage of her home just 50 yards from the Fisher Motel.

Mrs. Dushop, age 79, had resided at 5940 W. 95th Street for the past 60 years. Her late mother owned the first farm in the Village of Oak Lawn. Mrs. Dushop, fondly called Minnie, is considered the oldest resident of Oak Lawn in terms of years of residence.

She was assisted by Mr. Fisher to the Motel and then conveyed to the Christ Community Hospital by ambulance. Her injuries included a broken ankle and face lacerations. She is in fair condition.

Her daughter, Mrs. Gladys Ott, 9310 S. McVickers ave. and grand-daughter, Mrs. Norman Nygaard, 8809 S. Melvina ave. accompanied by great-grandchildren Patricia and Gail Nygaard were present Saturday morning picking up papers and pictures in the wrecked home.

When they expressed concern over other valuables and especially Minnie Dushop's pet daschund, Charlie, they were cheered when Mr. Fisher and Mr. Mondry assured them that Charlie was safe in the Oak Lawn Firehouse. Also, that a strong-box had been given to the Oak Lawn Police for safe-keeping.

Mr. Mondry had arrived minutes after the tornado struck and had remained all night helping rescuers and salvaging valuables which were stored in Mr. Fisher's Motel room.

This writer-photographer toured the area afoot and noted firemen from Oak Lawn, Worth, Merrionette Park, Chicago, Evergreen Park, Midlothian, Chicago Heights, Harvey, Park Forest and many other villages hard at work cleaning up debris.

At the place where the Fairway Foods Supermarket had been, firemen were working rapidly, clawing at the muck looking for victims. The body of a teen-age boy was uncovered and taken to the temporary morgue in the Johnson-Phelps VFW Memorial Home.

Walking east on 95th st., my attention was drawn to the garage of the Suburban Transit System, 5800 W. 95th st. Firemen and workers were busy removing debris and wind-blown objects from the tops of damaged buses. 50 feet away, several buses were overturned and smashed.

At 9409 and 9411 S. Menard ave., two of the buses lay on top of each other. The tornado had carried them through the air on an unscheduled trip and smashed them against two houses, totally demolishing one building.

A freakishness was noted in the next block. The Metropolitan Insurance Company office-building at 5702 W. 95th street did not show any visible effects of the tornado, even the windows were intact. Immediately next to it at 5712, two stores were heavily damaged.

In a six foot areaway between the two buildings lay a U.S. Mail Depository box plus concrete blocks and other debris. This was evidence of the freaks of a tornado.

Security was tight to guard against looters. National Guardsmen, State Troopers, Village Police and even youngsters barred pedestrians and cars. Sheriff's Police in cars with amplifiers toured the streets admonishing people to get out of the area.

I wandered back to Fisher's corner and saw the area where Shoot's Tavern and the Sherwood Forest Restaurant wreckage had been. Bulldozers and workers from the Oak Lawn Street Department and the State of Illinois had all but cleaned up the debris.

In exactly 17 hours, all traces of the building had been wiped clean. Chester Kwiatkowski, 6927 W. 95th pl., a worker for the Oak Lawn Street Department informed me that Mayor Fred Dumke had issued orders to clean up the village as quickly as possible.

His orders were being carried out with speed by the hundreds of workers and volunteers, not only from Oak Lawn but from many other villages and cities.

Gerhard Hein, Village Police Chief said the volunteers were strangers. They came to help and their services were appreciated. Teen-agers by the hundreds volunteered and performed many duties. It was heartening to see these oft-maligned youngsters giving aid and assistance so willingly.

Everywhere, neighbors and people who escaped the ravages of the terrible tornado gave shelter, food and clothing to victim of the disaster. Units of the Salvation Army, the American Red Cross, Civil Defense groups and others gave invaluable assistance in this hour of need.

Insurance companies immediately set up centers to handle claims. Hundreds of adjusters worked to help their policy-holders.

As always, there are despicable vultures who prey on victims. Unscruplous individuals are offering to help settle claims for fees ranging from $100 to $450.

Officials issued warnings to people not to sign any contracts nor pay anybody for these services. Deal only with your agent, your Insurance Company and their representatives. There is no charge for adjusting services. Report the names of individuals who offer adjusting services for a price.

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL SUPPORTS REPUBLICAN PUPIL AID PROPOSAL

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the administration the past 10 days has launched an unprecedented attack on my proposed amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to authorize block grants to the States for certain programs beginning July 1, 1968. This attack has dealt in misinformation and outright misrepresentation, as I have pointed out in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 26, 1967. However, a number of newspapers have taken a positive view of my amendment, including the Milwaukee Sentinel for April 27, 1967. As the editorial so aptly states:

> There must be something mighty good about the Republican substitute for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education proposed by Rep. Quie of Minnesota . . . . for the Administration to stage such a sharp counterattack.

The editorial follows:

EDUCATION GRANTS: DOES PLAN WORRY HOWE?

Judging from the negative reaction of the national school commissioner, there must be something mighty good about the Republican substitute for federal aid to elementary and secondary education proposed by Rep. Quie of Minnesota.

In the morning's mail (postage and fees paid by the United States department of health, education and welfare) is a statement from Commissioner Howe raising "serious questions" and calling the proposal "a backward step."

Why stage such a sharp counterattack, particularly by going over the heads of congress to the public, as it were, if one is not worried by the appeal of the substitute? The answer to that question would seem to be that the Quie proposal must have merits that could win it enough support, even in a Democrat controlled congress, to be adopted. What is the Quie proposal? Basically, it would substitute block grants to the states for the present complicated program of allocations to school districts under title I of the elementary and secondary education act of 1965.

The block grant approach would not take effect until July 1, 1968, giving time for the advance planning necessary to any program. For the first year, fiscal 1969, $3 billion would be authorized, about $200 million less than the maximum total authorizations of the program it would replace. However, it could prove to be a net gain, for, as Quie points out, "the block grant program would represent massive savings in administrative costs to the schools. . . ."

"Actually," Quie says, "the distribution of funds within each state would be far more responsive to the most urgent educational needs than under the existing act, which tends to scatter funds into every school district." Remember the fuss last May when affluent Whitefish Bay was found to be entitled to $25,000 in federal funds intended for disadvantaged children.

Under the amendment proposed by Quie, the state plan for the use of the funds would have to contain "assurances that the highest priority . . . will be given to local educational agencies which are experiencing the greatest educational difficulties because of such factors as: (A) heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, (B) rapid increases in school enrollment which overwhelm the financial resources of a local educational agency, and (C) geographic isolation and economic depression in particular areas.

In other words, in Wisconsin, for example, the federal school aid funds could be concentrated in districts where they are most needed, instead of being spread around according to an unrealistic formula that puts dollars needed in Milwaukee's inner core into an affluent suburb.

The promise of relief from bureaucratic red tape and a more sensible distribution of funds is not the only thing to commend the Republican substitute. Another of its appeals is that it would, as Quie says, "significantly reduce the power of the United States commissioner in local school decisions," which may explain Howe's negative reaction.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to include another editorial, this one from the New York Times of April 20, 1967. Titled "School Aid Under Attack," the editorial took issue with my amendment to ESEA. I prepared an answer which was published on April 30, 1967. Because of space limitations the Times could not print the entire letter, which contained four points in answer to the editorial. Only two of the points were included in the abbreviated letter. To keep the record straight, I wish to place in the RECORD the Times editorial and my complete letter:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 26, 1967]

SCHOOL AID UNDER ATTACK

The House Republicans are playing a dangerous game with the program for Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools.

As worked out in the 1965 law, this program managed skillfully to steer around racial and religious antagonisms that had previously killed school-aid bills for a generation. Instead of general school aid, the law provides for assistance to individual school districts based upon the number of their children from families with annual incomes under $3,000. This provision funnels the aid to the districts that need it most.

Under this law the Federal funds remain under the control of public officials, but children in parochial schools are qualified to receive the same kind of supplementary assistance as those in public schools. In practice, such aid means providing them with the services of remedial reading teacher or a guidance counselor or with a hot breakfast program. No money goes directly to any private or parochial school. Naturally, the program involves some fairly detailed Federal requirements including racial equality, but it has worked well because it also elicits cooperation between public and parochial school administrators at the local district level.

In place of this intricate and ingenious compromise, the Republican minority on the House Education and Labor Committee under leadership of Representative Quie of Minnesota proposes the substitution of block grants to the states for educational purposes. The formula of the Quie bill would provide less money for the impoverished rural districts of the South, but it appeals to racist sentiment because state education commissioners in the South could more easily evade Federal desegregation requirements.

The Quie bill attempts to pacify parochial school supporters by including a proviso that one-half of the block grants would have to be used for special programs in which poor children in religious schools could participate, much as they do now. But most states have language in their constitutions forbidding the spending of public money for private schools, and this restrictive language might be held to apply if the states received any genuine discretion in the use of these Federal grants. Moreover, unfortunately, some states have a history of bitter ill-will between their state departments of education and parochial school systems.

If Republicans and Southern Democrats unite to substitute the Quie bill for the simple renewal of the existing law, the effect may be to kill school aid altogether. This is because most Catholic members are likely then to vote against the bill on final passage. In short, there is serious danger that the nasty quarrels of the past will be exacerbated.

It is possible that block grants to the states might usefully be substituted for some existing Federal programs, but such a change would have to be made on an extremely limited, experimental basis and with great caution. The highly charged school aid program is the least promising place to begin.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1967.

Mr. JOHN B. OAKS,
Editor, Editorial Page,
The New York Times,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR MR. OAKS: The author of your April 20, 1967, editorial, "School Aid Under Attack" could not have read the amendment I have proposed to the pending bill (H.R. 7819) to extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It seems to me that a great newspaper has fallen victim either to partisan prejudice or to the propaganda releases of a Federal agency. While there are legitimate issues for debate in my proposal, scarcely one was mentioned in the editorial.

The *Times* is mistaken in fact in the following respects:

(1). "The Formula of the Quie bill would provide less money for the impoverished rural districts of the South."

The facts are that the bulk of the funds in the existing Act are distributed on a basis which allots $393.14 for every child counted in New York, but only $129.64 for a child in Mississippi (a gross inequity which has not concerned the *Times*), which my formula is identical to that used for nine years in the National Defense Education Act, treating all children equally but weighing allotments in favor of low-income States. This is a version of the Hill-Burton formula which is in common use in Federal laws.

(2). ". . . but it appeals to racist sentiment because State education commissioners in the South could more easily evade Federal desegregation requirements."

Any implication that I have or would make such an appeal is untrue, and is an attempt to distort my strong Civil Rights record. The *Times* is also ignorant of the facts of Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools, almost all of which is administered through State plans approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and financed by a single lump-sum payment to the State educational agency. This is the pattern of the NDEA, the Vocational Education Acts, and Titles II, V, and VI of the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I (programs for deprived children) of ESEA does not require a State plan, but requires State approval of all local programs and is financed by a single lump-sum grant to the State educational agency. Can you explain *how* State education commissioners could more easily evade Federal desegregation requirements under my amendment than under identical provisions in existing law?

(3). "The Quie bill attempts to pacify parochial school supporters by including a provision that one-half of the block grants would have to be used for special programs in which poor children in religious schools could participate, much as they do now."

The fact is that my amendment (the first version available to you) continues every single form of participation for private school children, and expands the kinds of help they may receive by adding instructional equipment to textbooks and library materials now loaned to them under Title II of ESEA. I have since improved the language to extend dual enrollment and other possible arrangements for private school children beyond the present Act's requirements for such arrangements.

(4). "But most States have language in their constitutions forbidding the spending of public money for private schools, and this restrictive language might be held to apply if the States received any genuine discretion in the use of these Federal grants."

I must thank you for the inadvertent admission that the States have no genuine discretion in the use of funds under the present Act, but that is not the controlling distinction legally. The distinction which has been made is that State restrictions do not apply to Federal funds which are not treated as State funds. My original amendment authorizes Federal funds only for special programs and contains every single requirement for separate accounting for Federal funds contained in the existing Act, which means that the funds could not be commingled with State funds. However, after discussing this problem with counsel, I have decided to make this clear in the statute and require specifically that these funds will not be commingled with State funds.

In conclusion, I certainly do not agree that most Catholic Members of Congress are likely to vote against a bill containing my amendment. By the time this bill reaches the House Floor every Member will understand that my amendment is completely equitable to private school pupils, and your implication that Members of the Catholic faith are concerned solely with the welfare of private school children is both untrue and undeserved. I for one am confident of a vote on my amendment on its merits with every legitimate issue fully debated.

My amendment will improve the program of Federal aid to students in both private and public schools. Under the present Act, a school system has to draw up a separate application under each title of the Act. This subjects local administrators to an almost incredible burden of forms and questionnaires and results in long delays. In fact, the final distribution of Title I funds for the current school year is just now reaching the classroom level in some states. The average school superintendent must, under the present Act, deal with perhaps a dozen separate Federal bureaucracies, administering separate funds under separate regulations, which change each year.

I am enclosing a copy of my amendment (H.R. 8983) which I sincerely hope your department will read.

Sincerely yours,

ALBERT H. QUIE,
Member of Congress.

FREEDOM OF PRESS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a badly neglected document, clearly sets forth worthy goals for our foreign aid program. It proclaims the universal rights of life, liberty, security of person, and the freedoms from arbitrary arrest, and of movement, speech, press, assembly, and worship. While the Declaration is not binding and is frequently ignored, it still is the ultimate guide and provides perspective for all nations concerned with aiding their less-developed neighbors.

In my view, freedom of the press is the most basic and essential of these rights. A well-prepared article by Raymon B. Nixon in the winter 1965 issue of Journalism Quarterly presents fascinating insights into the relationship between a free press and other factors in the development of free institutions. In his comparative analysis of the press of many less developed countries, Mr. Nixon found significant and direct relationship between the levels of press freedom, gross national product, per capita income, literacy, per capita number, and degree of press circulation. In his conclusion he stated:

> Furthermore, as the level of literacy and education goes up, and as communication among the peoples of the world increases, the difference between the symbol and reality should diminish. As people become more aware of reality, they seem to demand more of the characteristics of a free society—including both a free and responsible press.

I am inserting in the RECORD today, a tabulation in which I compare our aid commitment with the degree of press freedom in the host countries of Latin America and Africa. The first figure is the approximate percentage of our country's assistance program to gross national product. The adjacent figure is a press freedom rating on a scale developed by Mr. Nixon. A country with a number "1" ranking has a free press system. Conversely, a country with a number "9" rating has a completely controlled press system. Various degrees between are described on a scale of "2" through "8."

Name of country	Aid as a percent of GNP 1966	Rating of press freedom
Africa:		
Algeria	0.798	6
Cameroon	.300	6
Congo (Léopoldville)	3.091	5
Ethiopia	5.627	7
Ghana	.440	9
Guinea	2.706	8
Kenya	2.422	5
Libya	.294	5
Malagasy	.253	5
Mali	.888	9
Morocco	2.599	5
Niger	.739	4
Nigeria	.578	4
Latin America:		
Argentina	.215	3
Bolivia	6.123	5
Brazil	1.957	3
Chile	2.576	2
Colombia	2.085	2
Costa Rica	2.199	2
Ecuador	2.782	3
El Salvador	1.190	4
Guatemala	.333	------
Haiti	1.837	8
Honduras	2.728	5
Mexico	.618	3
Nicaragua	3.424	4
Panama	2.075	2
Peru	1.171	3
Uruguay	.587	1

The questions involved in the modernization of less developed countries are more basic than in the ideological struggle of the cold war. Anticommunism is no guarantee of democracy. Basic freedoms such as the central one of the press are the best insurance that countries will not be torn by civil strife and insurrection or undertake aggression.

The findings in this chart are, at the same time, hopeful and dismaying. They are hopeful in that progress in those countries with higher ratings of press freedom is discernible. They are dismaying in that the governments of a number of countries where our aid involvement is great, dominate the press.

Countries, of course, rarely change significantly in short periods of time. To be successful, our foreign aid program must persevere through many frustrations. This does not mean that the administrators should lose sight of the more basic requirements of development. In title IX of the 1966 Foreign Assistance Act, Congress rendered an excellent service in reminding the Agency for International Development of the importance of a total approach to foreign assistance considering political and social as well as economic variables.

In the next few months I intend to watch carefully how our aid program is moving countries toward establishing and protecting the basic freedoms set forth in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights. I will try to be especially aware of how AID, under the aegis of title IX, has attempted to develop specific freedoms such as that of the press. Finally, I hope to keep my colleagues informed by placing in the RECORD analyses indicating to what degrees the basic freedoms are respected by countries to whom we extend great sums of economic assistance.

NEGOTIATE INTERSTATE COMPACTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I introduced H.R. 9476, which would authorize the States to negotiate interstate compacts, affording a measure of uniformity and regulation without violating the independence of the respective States. This bill is far superior to the Willis bill, H.R. 2158, which presently is in the House Rules Committee.

And, speaking of the Willis bill, Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed to it for a number of reasons, but principally because of its adverse effect on the constitutional provisions which bar income tax in Washington State. My State relies heavily upon excise taxation, including a gross receipts tax and a retail sales tax. The productivity of both of these forms of taxation will be substantially restricted by the "business location" standards set out in H.R. 2158. It is estimated that the State of Washington will suffer a revenue loss of $66.5 million per biennium if H.R. 2158 becomes law.

On the other hand, my bill, H.R. 9476, would be a responsible answer for the States to the shortcomings of State tax laws as they affect multistate businesses. My bill is intended, by an interstate compact, to provide means of avoiding or settling multistate tax disputes while preserving intact the taxing jurisdiction of State and local government.

RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, after a long struggle against the Russian, Austrian, and Turkish Empires, on May 10, 1877, the principality of Rumania severed its bonds with the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed its independence. Four years later, Charles the First was crowned King of Rumania, and an independent nation took its place in the world. During World War II Rumania fell under Nazi domination and after the war under the totalitarian rule of the Soviet Union.

Because, here in America, we believe in freedom and self-determination, we join with those Rumanians who have achieved freedom in the United States in the celebration of their independence day on May 10, which helps to continue the flame for those who have been subjugated by a foreign power.

It is our hope that at some date in the not too distant future the Rumanian people, in a free and open election under democratic procedures, will be able to join with other democratic nations in celebration of true independence.

To celebrate this important event, the Rumanian National Committee is organizing a commemoration of the 10th day of May, the traditional national holiday of the Rumanian people, at the Carnegie Endowment International Center in my district in Manhattan on Wednesday, May 10, at 5:30 p.m., under the chairmanship of Constantin Visoianu, president, Rumanian National Committee and former Minister for Foreign Affairs of Rumania.

They have my best wishes for their meeting and for a future free Rumania.

EMERGENCY IN FARM ECONOMY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it is of vital importance that national efforts be increased to rectify the intolerable economic situation currently faced by agricultural producers in this country.

It is a national disgrace that the best fed Nation in the world cannot see its way clear to assure those responsible for our great abundance a fair return for their efforts and investment.

Symptomatic of this blindness is a recent proposal by the New York Times that "impoverished dairy farmers" ought to be put in line with "impoverished slumdwellers" to receive Federal welfare aid through the administration's war on poverty.

It is almost beyond comprehension that a metropolitan, consumer-oriented newspaper such as the Times should fail to see the implications and logical consequences of such thinking. Putting farmers on welfare would do absolutely nothing to solve their problems, and would be an almost certain way to insure that U.S. consumers will someday be faced with real food shortages.

The Times chooses to ignore the fact that, unlike most industries, farmers have virtually no control over the prices they pay or receive. Unless attention is given to the serious price and income problems presently besetting U.S. agriculture, farmers will be forced from the land in ever-increasing numbers, and the efficiency and productive potential of our entire agricultural plant will be severely impaired.

The time for talking is long past. The Department of Agriculture has announced another sharp drop in the parity ratio—this time to a low of 72. I urge the administration to declare that a state of emergency exists in the agricultural economy of this Nation, and to take immediate corrective measures. It has been easy enough for the administration to use our farm program machinery to push farm prices down, but now they apparently cannot get it out of reverse gear.

A strong and healthy agriculture has contributed enormously to the strength of our Nation and to the increasing prosperity and well-being of its citizens. It is high time that some of these same benefits should be enjoyed by farmers—the people who have been making them available to everyone else for so many years now.

PLOWSHARE NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES UTILIZING U.S. DEVICES OK'D BY STATE DEPARTMENT LEGAL EAGLES

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the considerable economic potentialities of peaceful nuclear explosive techniques is not generally understood. Fortunately, some of the countries that might be pressured to sign a nuclear weapons nonproliferation pact are commencing to evidence some small awareness that this proposed treaty should not be permitted to bar them from the advantageous use of these techniques. The Johnson administration, under prodding from myself and others for some period of time, has yet to embrace Plowshare developments as a matter of strong policy. Although it instructed our NPT negotiators to offer Plowshare cooperation when the 18-Nation Disarmament Conference resumed sessions earlier this year, at the same time it canceled Project Cabriolet, an experiment at the Nevada testsite calculated to advance peaceful underground explosives know-how.

I renew my recommendations on this subject. First, that our Plowshare program be intensified, and that it not be turned on and off according to the State Department's treaty-negotiating whims. Second, that a clear and decisive offer be made to conduct Plowshare developments in other countries on a cost basis. The second recommendation should be backed up by definitive AEC procedures-and-cost schedules for the conduct of any and all peaceful nuclear explosive operations within its capabilities.

I also renew my recommendation that steps be taken forthwith to revise existing inhibitions found in the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963 hampering beneficial exploitation of Plowshare. These involve the strict interpretation of treaty clauses prohibiting release of radiation beyond national boundaries. There are many instances in which this arbitrary restriction is utterly pointless. The most glaring example is in connection with the nuclear construction of a second canal to relieve the overburdened, traffic-clogged Panama Canal. Satisfactory arrangements might be made with neighboring countries to accept small amounts of radiation temporarily in isolated locations in order to permit construction to go ahead. Furthermore, such small radiation releases as might emerge over nearby ocean areas beyond the 3-mile territorial limit can be reduced to amounts posing no danger to ocean life. The inhibition which is interpreted to exist by reason of LTBT clauses in this regard is particularly senseless and self-defeating.

There are two alternative means by which this particular situation can be corrected. The first is by formal amendment of the Limited Test Ban Treaty to account for Plowshare activity. The second is by a simple letter. Already the Soviet Union has, in its Plowshare experiments, caused releases of radioactivity beyond its borders. No one has been hurt. President Johnson should write a letter to the Kremlin stating the United States interprets the treaty as allowing what the Soviet's scientist did, congratulating them on their Plowshare progress, and stating that we intend henceforth to do likewise.

Meanwhile, at least, the legality of exploding U.S. Plowshare devices in other countries by cooperative arrangement has been spelled out definitely and clearly in the following State Department letter of April 25, together with its enclosure:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1967.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HOSMER: During the recent hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy concerning the new bilateral agreements with Australia and Colombia, you raised a question about the relationship between the Limited Test Ban Treaty and possible cooperation with other nations in the carrying out of peaceful nuclear explosions.

The Legal Adviser of the Department of State has prepared the attached Memorandum of Law in answer to that question and I am forwarding it for your information.

Please call upon me whenever you think the Department might be of help.

Sincerely yours,
WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

MEMORANDUM OF LAW

During the recent hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on the new bilateral agreements with Australia and Colombia, Congressman Hosmer asked whether it would be possible under the Limited Test Ban Treaty for the United States to make an arrangement with another country whereby we would take a nuclear device to that country and explode it in its territory, assuming the explosion occurred underground and no radioactive debris was caused to be present outside the territory of that country.

The answer is yes.

Article I of the Limited Test Ban Treaty provides:

"1. Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent, and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, at any place under its jurisdiction or control:

"(a) in the atmosphere; beyond its limits, including outer space; or underwater, including territorial waters or high seas; or

"(b) in any other environment if such explosion causes radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted . . .".

Insofar as relevant, this language is the same as that contained in the U.S. draft treaty tabled at the Geneva Disarmament Conference on August 27, 1962. The manifest purpose of the prohibition on explosions which cause "radioactive debris to be present outside the territorial limits of the State under whose jurisdiction or control such explosion is conducted" is to provide a test for determining which underground explosions are permissible and which are not in terms of the radioactivity released into the atmosphere. There is nothing to indicate, either in the Treaty or in any of its negotiating history, any intention to interfere with cooperative arrangements between States for the carrying out of nuclear explosions that meet the criteria established for underground testing. Such an intention would be alien to the purposes of the Treaty. It is hardly conceivable that a treaty which permits the underground testing of nuclear weapons should be construed as prohibiting cooperative arrangements among countries for underground explosions of a peaceful character.

The one limitation which the Test Ban Treaty imposes on cooperation among States in the carrying out of explosions is found in Article I, paragraph 2. The Parties are there prohibited from "causing, encouraging, or in any way participating in, the carrying out of any nuclear weapon test explosion, or any other nuclear explosion, anywhere which would take place in any of the environments described, or have the effect referred to, in paragraph 1 of this Article."

Parties to the Treaty may thus not cooperate with one another, or with nonparties, in carrying out explosions prohibited by the Treaty, but there is no limitation on cooperation in carrying out underground explosions which meet the Treaty's standard on radioactive debris.

It is clear from the *legislative history* of the Treaty *before the Senate* that it was well understood that the language in question merely established a test for determining the permissibility of underground explosions, wherever they occurred, and did not prohibit a country from carrying out an underground nuclear explosion with the cooperation of another country in that country's territory. The President's message to the Senate transmitting the Treaty explained that its provisions permit "nuclear tests and explosions underground so long as all fallout is contained within the country where the test or explosion in conducted." (*Hearings Before the Committee on Foreign Relations,* U.S. Senate, 88th Cong., 1st Sess. on Executive M, p. 2 (1963)).

Similarly, Secretary Rusk explained:

"Underground explosions are permitted so long as the radioactive debris remains within the country where the explosion takes place." (*id.,* p. 13)

An Opinion of the Legal Adviser of August 14, 1963 stated that the Treaty "permits weapons tests and other explosions underground, so long as the radioactive debris is confined within the territorial limits of the State in which the explosion is conducted." (*id.,* p. 77) There is no suggestion anywhere in the legislative history that the State conducting the explosion must conduct it within its own territorial limits.

Chairman Seaborg, in explaining the restrictions on the Plowshare program which the Treaty imposed, referred to the US interest in digging a new trans-Isthmian canal by nuclear means. He stated, "it probably could not be done under the present treaty limitations because of the short distance to territorial boundaries." (*id.,* p. 210) There was no reference to any other inhibition that the Treaty might be thought to contain on the carrying out of underground explosions beyond the United States.

Finally, the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations stated flatly:

"The United States will also be able [under the Treaty] to explode nuclear devices underground for peaceful purposes in other countries at their request, provided, of course, that such an explosion does not cause debris to be issued beyond that country's territorial limits." (p. 21)

DO NOT SAY YOU WERE NOT TOLD

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, in testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee concerning the Consular Convention with the Soviet Union on January 23, 1967, Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated that American tourists and visitors to the Soviet Union increased from 10,000 in 1962 to approximately 18,000 in 1966. As tourism between the United States and U.S.S.R. is evidently big business, consideration should be given to the possible treatment awaiting American visitors in the Soviet Union.

An eloquent testimonial to Soviet duplicity was provided by the Buel Ray Wortham case in which this ex-Army officer was detained on petty charges and asked if he would consent to be exchanged for a Soviet national, Igor A. Ivanov, now serving 20 years in the United States for violating espionage statutes. To Wortham's credit, he saw through the Soviet scheme to exchange a trained espionage agent for a casual American visitor.

The State Department warns possible visitors to the Soviet Union about the hazards of touring that country, and it is indeed ironic that on the other hand, our foreign policy is aimed at instilling confidence among American citizens toward the U.S.S.R. with an increase in trade and various agreements.

The New York Daily News made some wise observations and recommendations on this issue in its editorial of May 1, 1967, entitled, "Yankee, Stay Home." Anyone with even a casual idea of going to the Soviet Union should ponder the fate of some visitors to the Soviet Union in the past. I ask that the editorial be inserted in the Record at this point.

Yankee, Stay Home

—should be the lesson every American learns from the misadventures of Buel Ray Wortham in Russia, as detailed last week in stories appearing in The News. Whortham and Craddock Gilmour, discharged Army officers, made a spur-of-the-moment visit to the Communist police state and got hooked on a couple of petty charges.

The price, for Wortham, was about $10,000 in fines, fees and confiscations, along with almost three months in solitary. He narrowly missed three years in a slave labor camp.

Wortham makes a convincing case that the payment the Soviets really hoped to extort was the release of one of their own spies, Igor Ivanov.

Ivanov was caught buying a bale of hot electronic secrets from an American engineer two years ago and is now doing 20 years in a Federal pokey.

This prisoner exchange bit has become a favorite ploy with the Communists, and in the interests of snagging likely hostages they don't boggle at kidnaping or crude frameups.

For those who take at face value all the hokum about how the USSR is mellowing or relaxing its ruthless tyranny at home, here are examples of how some innocents abroad have fared in the—

LAND OF THE MIDNIGHT ROUST

British teacher Gerald Brooke was given a five-year term in 1965 for handing out "anti-Soviet" literature. He languishes in a labor camp on the Volga and has been dangled in front of the British government as bait for the release of a husband-wife spy team, Peter and Helen Kroger.

The late Newcomb Mott, an American, was driven to suicide (that's what the Soviets called it, at least) when he got 18 months for wandering into Russia across its hazy border with Norway.

Yale Prof. Federick Barghoorn was walking down a Moscow street in 1963 when someone shoved some papers in his pocket seconds before Red security agents "happened along." It took a personal appeal from the late President Kennedy to spring Barghoorn.

Czech-born Vladimir Kazan-Komarket, a naturalized American, was railroaded to the Czechs last fall on a 15-year-old charge of "anti-state activities." The Russians diverted a Soviet airliner to Prague so he could be arrested. He was given an eight-year sentence, but the U.S. raised such a howl he was released.

West German travel writer Martina Kischke wrote gushy articles about the good life in the USSR and even became engaged to a Soviet official. They repaid her on a visit last year by slipping her "espionage photos" (a la Prof. Barghoorn) and held her five months in solitary before using her as part of an exchange for a Red spy.

Our State Department already supplies would-be visitors to the Communist slave nations with a—

YARD-LONG LIST OF "DON'TS"

—but even these are not proof against bugged rooms and the charges Communists can trump up on demand.

To that point, the London Daily Telegraph commented recently on the Brooke case and the U.S. warnings to its citizens:

"Britain should do the same thing. At the moment, there would even be a case for starting with a 'don't go.' "

That should go double for all Americans. There are plenty of exciting and wondrous things to see in our own land—as well as in nations where individual freedom is still honored, and where tourists are treated as kings (and queens), not pawns.

AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY INSURANCE—CONGRESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I have continued to point out the failure of State regulation of the insurance industry to provide the Nation's drivers with adequate liability insurance. Similarly, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Green] has brought to the attention of the House the numerous insurance company insolvencies and the arbitrary cancellation, rejection, and nonrenewal practices which have had disastrous consequence in Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] has indicated that similar, if not worse, industry conditions have had great impact on the people of Kentucky.

The volume of mail which I have received greatly indicates that automobile liability insurance presents a social problem of national dimensions. Subsequent to our comments directed to the House, Maryland's State insurance commissioner, Norman Polovoy, has stated the insurance problem to be common to the State of Maryland. Mr. Polovoy, whose term expires May 1, has accepted appointment as the head of Maryland's newly created office of consumer protection. The commissioner said that a half dozen Maryland insurance companies should be stripped of their licenses for *"intolerable treatment of the public."*

The insurance firms criticized "meet Maryland's capital surplus requirements" but "have not conducted themselves in the best interest of the public."

The commissioner stated that the companies *"have failed to keep their promises* to policyholders and claimants" and that "there is something wrong with a company that makes you eat your heart out to get your money on a legitimate claim." Mr. Polovoy said that the companies, including one which does about *$500 million business in Maryland each* year, issue policies of all types and are not restricted solely to automobile liability insurance. "These companies don't discriminate," added Polovoy, "they treat everybody badly."

I have written letters of inquiry to the State commissioners in all of the 50 States, and responses are nearing completion. As my analysis discloses meaningful and significant aspects of automobile insurance regulation, I shall continue to bring these responses and their import to the attention of the House.

MELVIN R. LAIRD—A GREAT AMERICAN

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday, April 29, marked two very significant occasions. That date marked the 178th anniversary of the inauguration of our first President, George Washington.

April 29 also marked the presentation of the George Washington Award by the American Good Government Society to my Wisconsin colleague, the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD.

It is only fitting that such a distinguished Member of this great body should receive this award. MELVIN R. LAIRD is a great American. We are proud of his accomplishments.

This is the 15th year that the George Washington Award has been presented. The past winners are listed as follows:

GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARDS

1953: U.S. Senator Harry Flood Byrd, of Virginia; U.S. Senator Robert A. Taft, of Ohio.

1954: Former President Herbert Hoover; Governor Allan Shivers, of Texas.

1955: Representative Howard W. Smith, of Virginia; Gen. Robert E. Wood, of Illinois.

1956: U.S. Senator Walter F. George, of Georgia; Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey.

1957: Representative William M. Colmer, of Mississippi; U.S. Senator Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota.

1958: U.S. Senator William F. Knowland, of California; U.S. Senator Richard B. Russell, of Georgia.

1959: U.S. Senator John L. McClellan, of Arkansas; Secretary of Commerce Lewis L. Strauss.

1960: Representative Graham A. Barden, of North Carolina; U.S. Senator Barry Goldwater, of Arizona.

1961: Representative Charles A. Halleck, of Indiana; U.S. Senator Spessard L. Holland, of Florida.

1962: Representative John W. Byrnes, of Wisconsin; Representative Wilbur D. Mills, of Arkansas.

1963: U.S. Senator A. Willis Robertson, of *Virginia; U.S. Senator John J. Williams, of* Delaware.

1964: U.S. Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, of Illinois; U.S. Senator Frank J. Lausche, of Ohio.

1965: Representative Oren Harris, of Arkansas; U.S. Senator Roman L. Hruska, of Nebraska.

1966: U.S. Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., of North Carolina; Representative Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan.

Let me point out that Congressman LAIRD is the second distinguished Wisconsin Congressman to receive this award. In 1962, the Honorable JOHN W. BYRNES of Wisconsin also received the George Washington Award.

Mr. Speaker, in order to more adequately outline the accomplishments of MEL LAIRD, I include as part of my remarks the presentation speech delivered Saturday night by another of our colleagues, the Honorable ROBERT L. F. SIKES, as well as a background paper, "Twenty Years of Distinguished Service to Wisconsin." All Wisconsin citizens are certainly proud of the accomplishments of MEL LAIRD and we look forward to his further years of public service.

CONGRESSMAN BOB SIKES' PRESENTATION OF AWARD TO THE HON. MELVIN LAIRD

This is a rare privilege. It isn't often that the fate of a member of the opposition party is entrusted to my hands in this manner. I have watched Mel perform on many occasions, and normally as a field general his tactics are sound, his position is well chosen, and his flanks well secured. I have never envisioned a situation where both flanks would be open and his rear unprotected.

Now that the opportunity is presented and that I, at least temporarily, am in control of the situation, I don't think of anything mean to say about him. In fact, I happen to admire Mel Laird very much. I have good reason to. I have watched his work with a good deal of appreciation for a long time and somehow I have had a very strong belief throughout that his first interest is in the United States of America and that his political efforts always have been subordinated to his love for his country.

When you sit next to a man in Committee day after day and year after year, as I have done with Mel, you learn much about the measure of the man. For six months out of each year the members of the Appropriations Committee meet behind closed doors . . . digging, digging, always digging . . . into the facts presented to justify the budget requirements of the United States Government. This work is unspectacular but it is most important, for it is here that the course of government is shaped into sound channels, as *much as it is possible for any Congressional* Committee to shape the course of government. There I learned to respect Mel Laird for his work long before he achieved prominence as one of the leaders in Congress.

However, to be on the safe side, I asked his office for some background material on his career. As a result, I have before me four legal-sized typewritten pages, single spaced, which describe Mel's accomplishments to date. I admire him sufficiently that I would like to quote the entire record because it is a most meritorious list of achievements in the career of a man who still must be ranked as a young man. At 44, which is his age, I *had not been able to do much more than to* get my name in the Congressional Directory.

I think I can sum all this up in a very few words when I tell you that Mel Laird, in my opinion, is a man who has his feet solidly planted on sound ground, a man whose brilliant accomplishments I can freely applaud, *a man whose hand I, as an American, can* confidently uphold. I consider him the brightest young star in all the Republican party. Apparently I am not alone in my conclusions, for here is what the Distinguished American Good Government Society says about him.

"*RESOLUTION OF TRIBUTE AND HONOR*

"(From the American Good Government Society)

"*Melvin R. Laird*—statesman, author, leader among men, has served the people of Wisconsin and the United States in war and peace for a quarter of a century—in five Naval battles, six years in the Wisconsin Senate, and now in his 45th year, in his 8th term in the House of Representatives. His rare intellectual gifts, his instinct for governing, his principles and his industry—all guided by his plain, common sense—have given him strong, clear, practical judgment in the whole field of public policy. These qualities have been invaluable in the Committee on Appropriations in allocating funds for national defense, health, education, and welfare, and in shaping Republican platforms and other statements of party policy."

Representative Laird understands the uniqueness of the American political system and its upholding traditions of which the Constitution is the capstone. Steeped in the heritage of justice and liberty, he must be numbered in the smallest society of mortal excellence. I count it a high privilege indeed to present this distinguished award to a great American, who tonight is being honored by the American Good Government Society at its Fifteenth Annual George Washington Dinner.

TWENTY YEARS OF DISTINGUISHED SERVICE TO WISCONSIN

A veteran of seven terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, 43 year old Congressman Melvin R. Laird of Wisconsin's Seventh District is considered an outstanding young national leader. His current position of prestige authority and responsibility, as well as his past achievements both local and national, amply demonstrate this.

Laird is currently Chairman of the House Republican Conference, one of the top leadership positions in the Republican hierarchy. Made up of all Republican members of the House of Representatives, the Conference is the highest policy-making body and is the body which presides over all organizational decisions and leadership appointments or elections.

Last year, former President Eisenhower singled out Laird as one of the 10 United States citizens he considered best qualified to be President of the United States. In 1964, Laird served as Chairman of the Republican

National Convention's Platform Committee. In this position, he had the responsibility for establishing the policy positions of one of the two major political parties in the United States. His position today as Conference Chairman makes him one of the top policy makers in the party.

This year, Laird serves on the recently established Republican Coordinating Committee, made up of representatives from all elements of the Party including all living former presidential nominees. Immediately after the 1964 Presidential election, Laird had called for the formation of this committee to serve as a vehicle for binding up the party's wounds and reestablishing party unity.

In 1964, Laird also served as editor of "The *Conservative Papers" (Doubleday and Co.)* a compilation of fourteen essays prepared by noted scholars on the major issues of our time.

In 1962, Laird wrote a book on the foreign and military policy problems of the United States, "A House Divided: America's Strategy *Gap" (Henry Regnery Co., Chicago).* The book has been reviewed very favorably in many publications. Eugene Lyons of the Reader's Digest called it a "superb job; both as writing and as thinking." Loyal Meek of the Milwaukee Sentinel, in praising the book for offering "both light and inspiration for establishing policy unity," called Laird "well *qualified to expound on United States cold* war strategy." In his book, Laird spells out in clear and compelling prose the major problems facing the United States in the cold war, calls for a reassessment of our policies, and suggests thoughtful guidelines for policy formulation.

Laird is the recipient of the 15th Annual Albert Lasker Medical Research Award. This award constitutes the highest recognition for promotion of medical research. The honorarium received by Laird for doing more to promote our nation's health than any other public official was donated by the Congressman to medical research activities in Wisconsin.

Laird's ability is recognized by Republicans and Democrats alike. Two leading out-of-state Democratic papers, for example, recently praised him: the *Baltimore Sun* characterized him as "brilliant," and the *Washington Post* described him as one of the "best qualified and most intelligent" members of Congress. Time Magazine has referred to the Wisconsin Representative as one of the "most able" and "energetic" members of the House. He has received personal and public commendations from such men as former President Eisenhower; the late Rep. Clarence Cannon, former Democratic Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; Rep. George Mahon, current Democratic Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and Rep. John Fogarty, Democratic Chairman of the Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee, as well as many others.

Committee membership and committee seniority are important to a Congressional District and State. Laird is a top-ranking member of the most important Committee of the House of Representatives—the Appropriations Committee. His Subcommittee assignments include Defense, and Labor, Health, Education and Welfare. In the 84th Congress, Laird served on the House Agriculture Committee. When first appointed to the Appropriations Committee, Laird was the youngest member of Congress ever to have been appointed to that key post.

As a member of what is considered the most important Subcommittee in today's Congress—the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee—Congressman Laird has been active and highly influential. The importance of this Subcommittee stems from its role as the Committee that handles the funding for the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the intelligence activities. Its decisions in executive session are not reversed on the Floor of the House. This Committee has the responsibility for yearly appropriations of more than $50 billion in U.S. tax dollars. It meets daily in executive session from December through June.

As a high-ranking member of the Defense Subcommittee, Laird has time and again demonstrated his insight into military strategy. There are scores of examples of his leadership in national security matters. It was his amendment seven years ago that increased the funding for the Polaris Submarine Program over and above the recommendations of the Department of Defense. The Laird amendment made it possible for our nation to have twenty-one Polaris missile submarines on station at an early date. Laird has sponsored other amendments which have also made substantial contributions toward the establishment of our nation's defense posture today as second to none.

Four years ago Congressman Glen Lipscomb of California and Laird headed an Anti-Submarine Warfare Task Force whose recommendations have been recently put into effect by the Department of Defense. This year, Laird continues to push forward his long-time efforts in the Anti-Submarine Warfare Program. In a national article written by him—THE FUTURE OF ASW—he called for a "much greater emphasis" on ASW research and development. "Outer space today is the center of public and official attention," he wrote. "Inner space (oceanography, ASW research, etc.), though not neglected, has not been adequately funded or explored." As in other fields, Laird's interest in ASW will insure a better program for the defense of the United States against the increased emphasis by the Russians on submarine warfare.

Though increasingly taxed by his Defense Committee work, Laird has been equally active as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee that handles appropriations for the Departments of Labor and Health, Education and Welfare. Since his appointment to that important Subcommittee in the 82d Congress, Laird has become identified as a constructive contributor to the nation's health and welfare. He has supported such agencies and activities as the National Institutes of Health and fostered private as well as public efforts in medical research. Currently, at fourteen universities throughout the country, "Lairdettes" are being constructed to house cancer research facilities. Laird dedicated a new $3 million Lairdette cancer research facility at the University of Wisconsin on September 26, 1964.

That the Wisconsin Republican has been effective in the public sector is easily seen by his appointment as a member of the U.S. Delegation to the World Health Organization by President Eisenhower in 1959, by President Kennedy in 1963, and by President Johnson in 1965. For the promotion of medical research in addition to the Lasker Award received last year, Laird also received the 1960 citations for Man of the Year Award from the American Cancer Society, the National Association of Mental Health, the National Research Foundation to Prevent Blindness, and the American Association of Medical Colleges and Universities. In 1963, he served as a member of President Kennedy's Committee to plan the 50th anniversary of the Department of Labor.

Laird has not only distinguished himself as a national figure but has also amassed an impressive record both in his home state of Wisconsin and as a leading figure in the Republican Party. He is a firm believer in the "grass roots" approach, traveling whenever possible back to his Seventh District to discuss the various issues of the day with his farmer constituents, laborers and business interests, with the old people and the not-so-old, the ordinary wage earners and tomorrow's citizens—today's schoolchildren.

The effectiveness of this approach is seen in the overwhelming support he musters in each election as well as the legislation he has sponsored, or supported. He was instrumental in establishing the school milk programs, in improving veterans programs and unemployment legislation. Often called "Dairyland's best friend in Congress," Laird has consistently supported the dairy farmers' pleas for good representation and friendly support so long as there was a basic compatibility between the views of his constituents and the dictates of his conscience.

On the national level the Laird name has become synonymous with economy in government and fiscal responsibility. A long-time critic of irresponsible spending, Laird has often vigorously questioned policies he considered of doubtful value. In the 2nd Session of the 87th Congress, for example, he deplored the increasing tendency of some Departments (notably the Department of Defense and the recently established Defense Supply Agency) to sacrifice efficiency and reliability in weapons and defense materials in favor of lowest possible costs. He maintained that practices such as these in the long run penalize the tax payer, the United States Government, and American Industry on the grounds that unreliable equipment that malfunctions must be repaired or replaced at additional cost. Last year, he criticized Secretary of Defense McNamara for his insistence on constructing a $300 million conventional aircraft carrier. Laird claimed that this expenditure would be looked back on in future years as a waste of $300 million in constructing an outmoded ship. Recent developments have proved that Laird's criticism was well-founded.

Laird launched his political career at the age of 23 when elected to the Wisconsin State Senate to succeed his father. Having served six years (1946–52) as State Senator, the Wisconsin Republican served notably in such posts as Chairman of the Wisconsin Legislative Council and the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee. He was also an influential member of the Labor and Management Committee, the Joint Finance Committee, and the Legislative Procedure Committee. As Chairman of the Legislative Council's Committee on Taxation, he published the "Laird Report" on Wisconsin's tax system which has since become the "student's Textbook" on the tax system of the state.

Many important Wisconsin statutes bear his name, including the Wisconsin Veterans Rehabilitation and Housing Act, the Wisconsin Civil Defense Act, the Wisconsin Mental Health Program, and the Wisconsin long-range building program.

The year 1957 marked Congressman Laird's selection as the outstanding young man in Wisconsin for Government Service (Junior Chamber of Commerce).

As one of the ablest members of the Republican Party, Laird has served as Vice-Chairman of the Republican National Convention Platform Committee in 1960, having served as a member of that Committee in 1952 and 1956. In addition, he was a member of the Wisconsin delegation to the Republican National Convention in 1948, 1952, 1956, and 1960. He served as Chairman of the Wisconsin Republican Party Convention in 1954 and 1960.

In 1960, Laird was chosen as Chairman of the Joint House-Senate Committee of six Senators and six Representatives to set forth the Republican Party's statement of policy and principle. After three months of painstaking work, Laird's Committee produced a "Declaration of Principle and Policy" that received the unanimous approval of the House and Senate Republicans. Indicative of the overwhelming approval received are the following statements: Former President

Eisenhower complimented Laird, saying, "We ought to use salesmanship in getting it before the public"; Governor Rockefeller said, "The statement embraces the fundamentals on which we all agree"; and Senator Goldwater called it "an outstanding job" and "an invaluable document."

Mr. Laird, a Purple Heart veteran, enlisted in the U.S. Navy in May of 1942. He served aboard the U.S. Destroyer Maddox (DD731), with Admiral Halsey's Third Fleet in the Pacific, and Admiral Marc Mitscher's Task Force 58.

Born on September 1, 1922, Representative Laird attended the Marshfield Public Schools and received his B.A. degree from Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota.

He married his college classmate, the former Barbara Masters of Indianapolis, Indiana. The Lairds have two sons and one daughter—John Osborne, 17, (born January 10, 1948); Alison, 14 (born July 11, 1951; and David Malcolm, 11 (born July 16, 1954).

THE JOHNSON ADMINISTRATION: GOVERNMENT BY CRISIS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, once again the present administration comes to the Congress with a national crisis on its hands asking for emergency action. This is becoming a habit with the leaders in the executive branch. They seem to always wait until disaster strikes before taking action for solutions to national problems.

We are faced today with legislation, requested again by the President, to extend the no-strike period of the Railroad Labor Act—House Joint Resolution 543—for another 47 days. The crisis of a nationwide railway strike is upon us. A strike could seriously hamper the national economy. With the resulting nondelivery of raw materials and finished products workers would have to be laid off. Unemployment would go as high as 15 percent.

The supplies for our men in Vietnam would be hopelessly delayed in boxcars idled across the country. Ammunition, heavy artillery, food, clothing, and fuel would be withheld from our soldiers in southeast Asia, and in fact, around the world. America would be very vulnerable.

A 1-month strike would reduce the gross national product by 13 percent.

This is indeed a serious matter. And I certainly support an extension of the no-strike period.

But, Mr. Speaker, we all know that nationwide railway strikes will seriously affect the Nation's economy, and the war effort. We all know, too, that nationwide or industrywide strikes in trucking, airlines, telegraph, and countless other industries will seriously affect the Nation.

Why must we wait, then, until disaster strikes to do something about the problem? Why has this administration not fulfilled its promise, made by the President in January of 1966, to design legislation that will prevent nationwide and industrywide strikes from crippling the Nation's economy? Why has there been no action by this Congress and its majority leadership to study this problem?

Mr. Speaker, I have joined with many of my colleagues in sponsoring legislation, House Joint Resolution 519, to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide and nationwide collective bargaining and strikes and lockouts. This was a bill which many of us introduced in the 89th Congress, also.

The year 1967 has been labeled "the Year of the Strikes." Many labor contracts expire this year. The time to act to prevent serious difficulties for the innocent bystanders—the people of this Nation—is now. Let us not wait until the disaster is upon us, as is the case now with the railroads, before we act.

This kind of panic-button government and crisis legislation robs the Congress of the opportunity to properly study and evaluate legislative proposals. In a labor-management dispute like this, or the airline strike of last year, it puts the Congress in the position of being an arbitration board. And that is not our function, according to the Constitution.

Let us begin now to evaluate this problem by adopting a resolution creating a joint committee to formulate legislation and study this problem. Only in this way can we avoid the careless and aimless methods of government by crisis.

THE KENNEDY ROUND AND THE FUTURE OF UNITED STATES TRADE POLICY—AN EVALUATION OF PROGRESS AND ISSUES IN THE SIXTH ROUND OF TRADE NEGOTIATIONS UNDER THE GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE—PART III: INDUSTRIAL NEGOTIATIONS: SECTOR TALKS AND DISPARITIES, THE "TECHNOLOGY GAP" AND THE TROUBLED WORLD OF STEEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POOL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point a list of contents covering the text of my remarks:

LIST OF CONTENTS

Industry: The "Sectors."

Sector Discussions a Format for Future Trade Negotiations?

Disparities—Troublesome Tactical Problem in Industrial Negotiations.

Ecretement.

The Search for a Formula for Tariff Disparities.

Disparity Explained.

Crisis in the Ministerial Talks—May 3–4, 1963.

Disparities Reappear.

A note on the "Technology Gap," the "Brain Drain" and U.S. Direct Investment in Europe.

What is the Technology Gap?

The Fundamental Problem—Developing a Dynamic Marketplace Economy.

Inseparable Connection Between Technology Gap and U.S. Direct Investment.

American Direct Investment in Europe Is Not Overwhelming.

Direct and Selective.

A Fundamental European Ambivalence—The Dynamic Role of American Investment.

The Competition Effect.

Some Conclusions About the Problem.

Europeans Are "Taking Steps."

New "East Indies" Companies.

The Capital Markets Problem.

Capital Market Development Is a European Problem, Worsened by U.S. Investment Controls.

What Effective Measures to Help Narrow the Gap?

Is There a Technology Gap?

An Institutional Gap and a Managerial Gap.

European Company Law Inhibits Bigness.

Developing "European" Businesses.

Psychological Barrier.

The Technology Gap and Post Kennedy Round Industrial Relations With Europe.

In the Kennedy Round Context.

Iron and steel.

What can the United States Gain in Steel Sector Negotiations?

The Sector Approach and the Idea of "Harmonization."

Is United States Steel Internationally Competitive?

Is the U.S. Industry Outpriced?

The American Processor's Dilemma.

The Reason for Increased Consumption of Foreign Steel.

A More Balanced View of Steel Imports.

No Damage from Imports.

An Industry Marked by Mill Openings and Frictional Plant Closings.

Imports Had a Healthy Effect.

The Fallacy of the Sectoral Approach.

Why Did Imports Increase in 1965 and 1966—The U.S. Steel Industry Buys Abroad.

The Tradition of U.S. Steel Industry Pricing Policy: Its Effect on Imports and on Exports.

U.S. Steel Export Troubles Their Own Responsibility?

Domestic Pricing Problem.

Pricing Policy and Industry Financing.

The Rich Fruits Investment Will Bear.

Oxygen Furnace—The U.S. Catches Up.

Computerization—America's Technological Trump Card is Applied to Steel.

Pelletization.

Continuous Casting the Biggest Bonanza.

The Problems Posed by Possible Unfair Competition.

Anti-Dumping, Special Marking, and Buy American Requirements.

Anti-Dumping and Countervailing Duties.

The Disruption of European Coal and Steel Markets.

Problems of Corporate Organization.

Facts of World Production: Overcapacity.

Price Drops Affect Profits and Modernization.

Cause—Deterioration of Demand in External Markets.

Coal—A Throttled American Export—A Burden on European Economics.

High Cost Coal Means Lower Demand and Shift to Other Energy Sources.

Is Subsidy a Solution for the Old Age of European Coal?

Steel Production Sharing.

European Private Industry Responds in a Traditional Way.

Some National Responses.

What Good Could a World Steel Conference Do?

Iron and Steel Negotiations in the Kennedy Round.

Reluctant Albion.

Some Elements of Negotiating Strategy.

Conclusion.

Next Sections of Report.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the two previous sections of this review of the major issues of the Kennedy round of trade negotiations now ending in Geneva, I discussed on April 10, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages 8800–8811 and on April 13, 1967, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages 9489–9501, the problems in the agriculture sectors of the negotiations. This discussion dealt more with the future than the present. Most of the agriculture problems I discussed will not achieve any fundamental solution in the Kennedy round. But the Kennedy round can be said to have been a real step forward in agriculture if it results in agreements and institutions for continuous discussion and negotiation on agriculture policies. It will have laid the groundwork for future international cooperation in an area which has hitherto received only national treatment.

INDUSTRY: THE "SECTORS"

In an area where shades of optimism and pessimism are very delicate and very refined, it is hazardous to make declarative statements about the future. But there can be significant tariff cutting bargains on many "industrial" items in the Kennedy round, if some real agricultural bargains are reached. To be sure, there are very difficult problems still to be resolved even in industry negotiations. These difficulties are mainly in the area of the so-called sectors—five industry groups that have been treated rather specially in these, the sixth round of trade negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—because of the special problems in those sectors.

SECTOR DISCUSSIONS A FORMAT FOR FUTURE TRADE NEGOTIATIONS?

The sectoral approach deserves some special notice here. I have been concerned lest the sectoral approach to the negotiations provide the impetus for arranging new types of international cartelization sponsored by governments—a means by which countries could make special trade deals for single product groups that would violate our concepts of antitrust legislation and of Government subsidy, and which might violate some of the essential principles of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

If this were so, the objective of expanding international trade which depends upon greater national and international fair competition, not less, would be defeated. But this initial suspicious reaction to the sector approach requires a second look; the sector approach to negotiations in these difficult industry groups has proven to be advantageous. Essentially it has been an incentive and a forum for much greater study of the economic realities of these specific industries, study that has not taken place in previous trade negotiations.

This extensive sectoral economic analysis has made many realize the possibilities in "harmonization"—a different idea about what the outcome of sectoral negotiations might be. Harmonization means that in industry sectors where the conditions and costs of production are the same there should be an equalization of tariff and nontariff barriers to trade. In the coming sections the idea of world harmonization in certain industry sectors will be more fully explained. Good or bad, it promises to be a future trend in trade negotiations.

In our concentration on better "packaged" sector negotiations in the Kennedy round we tend to forget that items in the five sectors isolated for special negotiation account for roughly 1,500 of the nearly 6,000 items in the U.S. tariff schedules. In "nonsector" items there is the greatest optimism about tariff cuts, but even here there are some special problems. One of these is U.S. adherence to a "linear cut" concept of tariff negotiations, a concept proposed in the Dillon round by the European Community. A fundamental ground rule of these negotiations, the linear cut concept most simply means that all tariff items except those specifically excepted from the negotiations will be subject to an equal percentage cut. The goal of the Kennedy round was that this linear cut be 50 percent "across the board" on all items not excepted.

In previous trade negotiations participants made selective offers. It was possible then for a participant to exclude from negotiations any item in its tariff schedule it might choose. For the United States, this negotiating procedure had left at least 400 items in the U.S. tariff schedule unchanged by negotiation—though about 40 percent of U.S. imports enter duty free. The linear approach would eliminate the old bilateral, item-by-item approach of the previous five negotiating rounds under GATT.

The linear approach was essentially the idea of the EEC itself. In the "Dillon round," or fifth round, in 1960–62, the EEC had in fact proposed an across-the-board or "linear" percentage cut. The United States could not then accept this plan because its legislative authority would not allow it. Having accepted the linear approach in the Kennedy round we found that approach compromised from the outset.

"DISPARITIES"—TROUBLESOME TACTICAL PROBLEM IN INDUSTRIAL NEGOTIATIONS

From the outset of the negotiations the European Economic Community—EEC—has proposed its own negotiating ground rules for both agricultural and industrial negotiations. These have differed from the concepts of the negotiations shared by other linear participating countries. I explained, in the first section of this multipart report, the EEC's idea of the montant de soutien and reference prices for agriculture commodities.

ECRETEMENT

For industrial products, the EEC's proposals have been based on the idea of tariff "disparities." The first concrete EEC proposal based on the disparity idea was called, in French, "ecretement". Ecretement means "depeaking." Depeaking as a negotiating plan, would have established three classes of duties which would be reduced according to certain formulas.

For manufactured products duties would have been reduced by 50 percent of the difference between their existing levels and 10 percent ad valorem. Since the industrial tariff schedules of the United States and the EEC arithmetically average about 12 to 13 percent, adoption of the depeaking scheme for manufactured products would have meant that the largest cuts would have occurred in high duties—peaks. The United States would have had to give most under this plan, because our schedules contain many peaks and many valleys, whereas the tariff schedules of the Community are ranged along a fairly level plateau. There are, for example, over 900 items in the U.S. schedules with rates of at least 30 percent compared to only a handful of such rates in the EEC tariff schedule.

For semimanufactured products the depeaking plan—"ecretement"—would have allowed duties to be cut by 50 percent of the difference between existing levels and 5 percent. And for raw materials the depeaking plan would have allowed cuts by 50 percent of the difference between existing levels and zero.

Ecretement was rejected emphatically by the United States and other negotiants because it would have resulted in an average duty cut of only about 15 percent. Coming early in the negotiations, the ecretement proposal would have meant such a deflation of the American objective to negotiate cuts of 50 percent across the board that it was unacceptable.

It has been argued that the ecretement formulas proposed in 1963 could have been liberalized through negotiation and if so could have meant substantial tariff cutting, perhaps as much as may be obtained through the negotiations as they are developing. But ecretement was in one sense an effort to achieve international harmonization of tariff rates, which was not the purpose for which the United States and other countries entered the Kennedy round negotiations. And there are indications that ecretement was intended by the EEC merely as a negotiating ploy.

THE SEARCH FOR A FORMULA FOR TARIFF DISPARITIES

The ecretement proposal was designed to deal with the problem of disparities. When it was rejected the Community found another means by which to express its concern about the "disparate" differences between its tariff rates and those of other countries. While the United States took a major role in trying to resolve the disparities issue, it was, and is, of equal or even greater importance to other non-EEC countries.

Thus it became important to try to define a tariff "disparity." Broadly, tariff disparities refer to the differences between any two countries' duty rates on similar items. The EEC argued that the linear—across-the-board 50 percent—formula for cuts in all participants' tariffs would be unfair to them for the following reasons.

First, an equal cut in high U.S. and middle-level EEC rates would increase U.S. exports to the Community much more than EEC exports to the United States.

Second, an equal cut would cause imports into the EEC from third countries to increase much more than such imports into the United States. Thus, exports from third countries would be diverted—in relative terms—from the United States to the EEC.

Third, the United States would end up with many more high rates than the Six and thus with greater bargaining power for future trade negotiations with the EEC.

For these reasons, the EEC argued that there should be special rules for cutting tariffs on items identified as disparities. Thus it was necessary to determine precisely what items might be disparate items. The fate of the negotiations could have depended on the rules for determining what tariff items would qualify for disparity treatment.

DISPARITY EXPLAINED

A broad definition of disparity would mean that the linear cut concept, to which the United States devoted so much importance, would be significantly impaired. The disparity concept as conceived by the Community would also mean great damage to the trade interest of third countries.

For example, if the EEC duty on doorlatches was 15 percent, the duty of Denmark was 5 percent and the duty of the United States 50 percent, and Denmark was a major supplier of doorlatches to the EEC but not to the United States—and therefore had great interest in reducing the EEC 15 percent duty by 50 percent to 7.5 percent—the disparities rule would hurt Denmark, not the United States. Under such a disparities rule the U.S. rate would be identified as disparate and special rules would be used. The United States would cut its rate from 50 to 30 percent, the EEC would cut from 15 to 12.5 percent, and Denmark would not have to make a cut. This example does not conform precisely to the EEC disparities concept as it finally emerged, but is a valid illustration of its effects. The United States would not be affected by the partial EEC cut, but Denmark's trade in doorlatches would not be improved. The result would be an "unravelling" of negotiations, wherein Denmark would withdraw its offers to the EEC, which might also have been of interest to the United States.

CRISES IN THE MINISTERIAL TALKS—MAY 3–4, 1963

The ministerial talks of May 1963 were called to try to resolve the problems that had arisen over the negotiating ground rules. The May talks came very near to collapse over the issue of how to deal with disparities. To save the talks a compromise position was agreed, which was expressed in the public ministerial resolutions that were agreed at the meeting. With regard to the negotiation ground rules for industrial items, the ministerial resolution endorsed the linear concept by stating:

> That . . . the tariff negotiations . . . shall be based upon a plan of substantial linear tariff reductions with a bare minimum of exceptions which shall be subject to confrontation and justification. The linear reduction shall be equal.

But the disparities issue was given recognition in the following compromise language that followed the above resolution immediately:

> In those cases where there are significant disparities in tariff levels, the tariff reductions will be based upon special rules of general and automatic application.

It was further specified that the term "significant" means "meaningful in trade terms" and that the purpose of the special rule was to reduce the number of disparities.

After extensive discussion of the disparities problem the GATT Trade Negotiations Committee—TNC—the steering committee for the negotiations, reported in December 1963 the majority of participants' views on the disparities issue. They decided that significant disparities should be only those items where the high duty is not less than a certain minimum percentage, say 30 percent, and is at least 10 percent greater than the same item in the low-duty country. The United States, United Kingdom, and EEC should be the only tariffs used for the identification of disparately high rate items. A disparity is significant only when exports from the high-duty country to the low-duty country are substantial; total imports of the item into the low-duty country from all sources are substantial; there are no substantial imports into the high-duty country. If the low-duty country produces the item and the low-duty country maintains quota restrictions, disparities would not be substantial.

These disparity rules were intended to reduce the problem to manageable proportions, eliminate much of the potential damage to third countries, minimize instances in which disparities might occur, and thereby maximize the use of the linear cut rule.

The Community responded to the TNC criteria with counterproposals, the United States made further counterproposals, and the EEC responded again. Finally, failing any real agreement except that disparities must conform to the language of the May 1963 ministerial resolution, the effort to settle the ground rules problem was dropped, and, by the autumn of 1964, it was tacitly agreed that the issue would be dealt with pragmatically, as it arose during the ensuing negotiations. To put the negotiations in motion, the participating linear countries tabled on November 17, 1964, their "exceptions lists" containing items they would not include in negotiations under the 50-percent "linear" rule. One reason given for EEC and Japanese exceptions was the so-called technology gap, which I will describe below.

DISPARITIES REAPPEAR

In my report to the House of Representatives in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 111, part 9, pages 12360–12365, I discussed the disparities issue in the context of the tabling of exceptions lists. At that time I observed that if the EEC were to introduce disparities at a critical and late point in the negotiations, the success of the round could be severely jeopardized. And were this to occur, the EEC would in fact demonstrate finally its intention that this great trade expansion effort should not realize its full potential.

As I and others suspected, the EEC has again come forward with a list of disparities. This has not been a surprise to our negotiators. Though there has been no purposeful mention of disparities for over a year, several months ago in a negotiating session in Geneva there was an indication by a Community negotiator that a list of disparities would be forthcoming.

That new disparities list was tabled 3 weeks ago. Initially it was feared that the list would be quite extensive and quite damaging to the negotiations. Now it appears that the list is not as damaging as had been expected.

The list submitted contains over 200 "disparate" tariff items, not including those found in the chemicals, steel, and textile sectors, which would be dealt with separately in any case. Many of these disparate items are of interest to third countries, not primarily the United States. Those that are of major application to the U.S. tariff will be subjected to scrutiny to determine whether they are significant in trade terms. It appears that these disparities can be handled in such a way as to minimize their impact on the negotiations and still allow significant cuts even in those items that are determined to be disparate.

It would appear that the United States, through its unyielding resistance to negotiating plans based on the disparity concept, has succeeded in minimizing to insignificance a negotiating proposal that would have meant that the United States would give more in terms of percentage cuts than it received in percentage cuts from the other major participants.

A NOTE ON THE "TECHNOLOGY GAP," THE "BRAIN DRAIN" AND U.S. DIRECT INVESTMENT IN EUROPE

When in Europe in December, I discussed with economists, bankers, businessmen, educators, and officials the syndrome known as the "technology gap," and its symptom, the so-called "brain drain."

The subject is important to this discussion of trade negotiations and international trade relations because it has been used as a reason by several Kennedy round participants, notably the EEC and Japan, for the failure to make offers on certain industrial products. The fears of some Europeans about their industry's competitive ability provides a reason for resisting tariff and trade barrier reductions.

The technology gap, if it really exists, is important to other groups of Europeans and so to the Kennedy round for another possible and countervailing reason. As Europeans lower their tariff and other barriers to trade, an important incentive for American firms to set up operations in the Community is lessened thus leaving competition with American firms on an international rather than a domestic level and so lessening the threat the Europeans see in American capital taking over European production and European brains without exporting them.

Fear of the "technology gap" is also important in the context of British application for membership in the EEC. The technology gap has already become a pawn in the strategy to gain entry. According to the Economist of January 21, 1967:

> The political advantage for [Prime Minister Wilson] of showing his zeal for European technological togetherness is obvious enough. So is the need to catch up with America. This is an article of faith in the six common market countries.

Britain's technological strength appears to be one of its few trump cards in its effort to join the Community. If used without regard to the facts, the issue could be damaging to the interest of the United States, as well as to Britain.

Further, the question of the technology gap and U.S. direct investment in Europe relates to significant monetary policy issues and capital market issues that I will also touch on below.

The technology gap will likely be one of those issues that will remain important for some time to come. Examining European arguments about the technology gap provide an excellent contrast with American attitudes about its own competitiveness in world markets.

WHAT IS THE TECHNOLOGY GAP?

The technology gap is the idea that American industry's competitive strength in the world and particularly in Europe is magnified by the technological superiority of U.S. industry, and that American technological capabilities are growing at a greater rate than the technological resources of European industry.

The "brain drain," or the attraction of European scientists to work in the United States is a symptom of U.S. technological, and managerial, superiority. A scientist of any nationality wants to be where the most exciting developments in his field are taking place but he also wants to be well paid, see his creativity used, and be part of an aggressive, well organized and well supplied research unit. Like the technology gap, the "brain drain" is a highly emotional subject. A British journal compared the brain drain to "the 1970's equivalent of the intellectual suicide to which Hitler's antisemitic policies condemned Germany in the thirties."

The inflated idea of the strength of American technology and the competitive edge it gives American industry has developed mythlike, fairytale overtones. These were described by Bernard Nossiter in his article in the Washington Post on February 13, 1967, in which he said in part:

> In European eyes, the United States is an enormous machine, uniquely geared to exploit the flood of innovations pouring from richly endowed laboratories of industry, universities and government.
>
> As Europeans see us, everything favors the single end of advances in production—a climate that encourages research and innovation and a chain of interlocked institutions . . . This fantastic machine confronts the world's richest market and thus is in unparalleled position to defeat and control any foreign competitors.

THE FUNDAMENTAL PROBLEM—DEVELOPING A DYNAMIC MARKETPLACE ECONOMY

Some fundamental differences between economic competition in Europe and America are one reason why American business competition seems so overwhelming to some Europeans.

At the heart of the differences is the concept of the function of the marketplace. In the United States the markets where goods and services are bought and sold act as laboratories not only for the physical—actual—product but for the techniques that have gone into making that product. In the case of American markets, one of these techniques is how to distribute a product so that it appears in the best markets for the product. It is axiomatic that mass production is not economically feasible without mass distribution.

Another technique in process of constant development in the United States is servicing; the expectation of being able to have an item serviced after it is bought is part of the sales appeal of the article sold. Still another technique in which the United States has been world leader is that of consumer financing; the development of systems by which consumers can afford something today that they would have had to buy later, or perhaps never.

Still another technique is that of financing business expansions which depend upon increasing and pooling the savings of the people, thereby providing ample and flexible capital markets.

Finally, Americans have overwhelming advantage in efforts to perfect management systems, means by which men can operate more efficiently the business organizations that incorporate all the above techniques and also conduct physical research and manufacture products.

Seen in this context, the American marketplace is a unique laboratory where testing different ideas about distributing, servicing, and financing the sale of goods and business expansion, and managing or overseeing all these techniques, takes place. All these competing techniques have their test in the marketplace—and the ultimate test is a consumer acceptance made potent by massive consumer purchasing power. Indeed consumer purchasing power has grown to such proportion in the United States that the economists are singling out a new index called "consumer discretionary purchasing power." This signals the existence of an economy increasingly based upon plenty instead of one based upon scarcity.

Thus the marketplace is a laboratory of the social sciences, the counterpart of scientific laboratories where physical research takes place. Expenditures for new ways of distributing, servicing, financing, and managing are therefore expenditures for research and development in the applied marketplace laboratory. The index of business failures per year becomes an index of a dynamic laboratory because as these "experiments" fail others succeed and new business experiments are started up.

The above is a theoretical conception of the role of the marketplace in a competitive economy. That the American marketplace actually does function this way to a very large extent can be seen in the successful distribution, servicing, and financing techniques that work for us every day, and their continued improvement.

The "inefficiencies of competition" that monopolistic or oligopolistic business organizations seek to avoid are illusory. These seeming duplications of expenditures are different expenditures in the nature of research and development. They may or may not pay off in the applied laboratory of the marketplace, but it is only through this testing that the truth emerges.

CLOSE INTERCONNECTION BETWEEN TECHNOLOGY GAP AND U.S. DIRECT INVESTMENT

The myth of American industrial omnipotence as it is spelled out means that the United States can both "defeat" competition from foreign firms in its own markets and "take over" European industry, particularly the new technology-based industries like computers. In the myth, American corporations buy up "hapless" European companies, preempt European capital markets, and loosen European control over European investment. Such economic arguments are combined with purely nationalistic ones to create the prevailing imagery. And the imagery is fed by examples like the fact that "Belgium's budget could be financed from the profits of America's top four firms," or "the production of the United States Steel Corp. is much larger than the production of all British steelmakers."

Thus the technology gap seems to have become a concern to Europeans as they have experienced direct competition from United States controlled firms in European markets. It may be true that American expenditure for research and development is greater than European expenditure. Certainly it is when we understand that competition in the marketplace is itself research and development. But this fact becomes a matter of direct European concern only when there is immediate, proximate competition from American firms in European markets. In a sense the technology gap arguments seem to be a new expression of old "protectionist" sentiment, or of mercantilism, the economic colonialism of the 18th century which tried physically to stop the "brain drain" by preventing artisans from leaving England. This extreme policy was of course proven worthless by the famous incident of the transfer from England of textile weaving technology, among others.

This picture of American competitive strength and American intentions in European and third markets, and of the size of actual American direct private investment, is an unrealistic picture, as I will show, and it has already had some desirable and undesirable effects. It is taken very seriously—just how seriously is witnessed by an editorial article in the Economist for January 21, 1967, which, in discussing British technological cooperation with Europe as an aspect of British efforts to join the Common Market, asserted:

> European countries risk being squeezed out of the science-based industries, from aerospace all the way down the line to machine tools and scientific instruments. It may be good for Europe to be automated in part, or even largely, by American machinery. But it cannot afford to be overwhelmingly dependent on the Americans.

AMERICAN DIRECT INVESTMENT IN EUROPE IS NOT OVERWHELMING

What are the facts about U.S. investment in Europe, in comparison with the size of total European investment, and with European investment in the United States?

Of total U.S. direct private investment abroad of $49.2 billion at the end of 1965, $13.9 billion was invested in Europe—excluding Britain—and $6.2 billion was invested in the six member countries of the Community. United States direct investment in Britain totalled $5.1 billion.

Since 1961 the portion of the annual total of U.S. direct private foreign investment in Europe—including Britain—has increased over that going to Canada, Latin America, and other countries. The annual rate of new investment increased from about $1.1 billion in 1960 to about $3.5 billion in 1966. U.S. investment in Latin America, by contrast, increased from an annual rate of about $580 million in 1960 to only about $1.25 billion in 1966, far short of Alliance for Progress objectives.

But even though the share of U.S. private investment that is placed in Europe is increasing, in relative terms it is not yet very large. For example, according to statistics in the Economist of December 17, 1966, page 1255, the U.S. share in new investment in Europe in 1966 was on the average only about 6 percent of all new investment in those countries. By the end of 1965 the total of U.S. direct investments in Common Market countries was $585 million in Belgium and Luxembourg, $1.6 billion in France, $2.4 billion in Germany, $972 million in Italy, and $598 million in the Netherlands, according to data supplied by the Census Bureau and published in Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearings on February 27, 1967, page 28.

DIRECT AND SELECTIVE

Compared to total European investment in the United States, U.S. investment in Europe is much less than frightening. In fact, total U.S. private investment in Europe is less than total European private investment in the United States.

At the end of 1965, Western European assets in the United States totaled $34.1 billion compared with total—direct and portfolio—American investment in Europe of $29.6 billion. But there are two essential differences between the two. European investment is primarily in U.S. portfolio securities and it is generalized in a broad range of issues. American investment is direct, and it is selective; that is, it is concentrated in certain industries.

Thus, 47 percent of U.S. investment in Europe was direct—in American-owned plant and machinery on European soil; but only 18.5 percent of Europe's investment in the United States was direct.

The selectivity of U.S. investment is also clear. In France, Britain, and Germany, U.S. investment is concentrated in carbon black, computers, cars, and petroleum. In these three countries, 40 percent of American direct investment is accounted for by three firms, Esso, General Motors, and Ford. In all of Western Europe, 20 American firms account for two-thirds of American investment.

Can American industry really be the ogre it is pictured to be? Most likely not. Especially when one considers the size and wealth of the markets and economies of the six members of the EEC, combined with the eight members of the European Free Trade Association.

A FUNDAMENTAL EUROPEAN AMBIVALENCE—THE DYNAMIC ROLE OF AMERICAN INVESTMENT

There are certain signs also that, at bottom, there is an essential ambivalence in the European attitude about American direct investment. At heart Europeans want exactly what we have achieved, and they know that they can get it from us in several ways. The most effective way to get what they need—technology, capital, distribution, and marketing techniques—is American direct investment. Direct investment thus becomes a way of contributing the best of American industry to European industrial activity. Other ways of gaining U.S. know-how are licensing U.S. patents and hiring the services of our consulting and engineering firms.

Several incidents reveal the essential desire of Europeans to have what we can provide. Belgium has undertaken a concerted effort to increase U.S. investment in its industrially antique former coal-mining regions by means of subsidized loans. The United Kingdom offers handsome incentives to firms that invest in its depressed industrial areas. General Electric Corp. has been allowed to regain control of General Electrica Espanola, which it had helped found in 1929, but which it had to divest when Franco came to power. GE will invest large sums in modernizing its old Spanish affiliate.

In Britain, Chrysler Corp. was allowed to acquire controlling interest in the big auto manufacturer, Rootes, Ltd., in spite of a brooding feeling that Rootes must be "kept British." Had Chrysler not been permitted to acquire control of Rootes it would have folded under the weight of huge losses. Chrysler has helped the British economy, if the reorganization of the company succeeds; the American firm will have invested over £45 million sterling when its capital reconstruction program is complete, a big bailout even for the British Government had it decided to so commit itself.

THE COMPETITION EFFECT

Another factor that leads me to counsel a calmer approach to the technology gap as brought home by U.S. direct investment in Europe are indications that such investment has had a very healthy effect on competition. Profit margins for American companies in Europe have fallen nearer to earnings on capital investment in the United States, which have themselves tended to rise particularly since 1961. This would indicate that European business has become more competitive, that much of the cream has been skimmed off the milk, and that future profits will be fought for. This competition effect cannot but have had a healthy, though perhaps painful, effect on European—including British—industry as a whole.

SOME CONCLUSIONS ABOUT THE PROBLEM

First, it seems that the fear of the technology gap is more a fear of the role U.S. investment in European industrial activity, even though there are disparities between rates of investment in research. Second, it should be clear that U.S. investment has a relatively small place in European industry as a whole, though U.S. interest is concentrated in a few "visible" industries. Third, it would also seem that U.S. investment has provided not only capital but also new technology and new managerial ability, and that the net effect may be a more competitive European industry.

EUROPEANS ARE TAKING STEPS

The European response to U.S. direct investment and the technology gap has been uncoordinated. There have been attempts at joint industrial efforts. The Anglo-French supersonic aircraft Concorde was partly justified on the grounds that it would provide seed-ground for indigenous European research, and there is a joint British-French development contract for large computers. Italian Foreign Minister Amintore Fanfani has proposed a cooperative sharing venture with the United States, somewhat reminiscent of a new technological Marshall plan. Other efforts are being tried, such as the European Launcher Development Organization and the Center for European Nuclear Research—CENR—an effort at joint research in pure science. President Johnson has done his part by appointing an advisory committee under his science adviser, Dr. Horning, an indication of U.S. willingness to give at least token consideration to European complaints.

But the exaggerated awareness of the "presence" of American industry in Europe has led to some rather exaggerated responses in another respect.

In their whipped-up desire to protect their science-based firms, Europeans are taking a deep new interest in their large technologically oriented companies rather as tools of national economic competition. The sensible French Government attitude toward General Electric's acquisition of Machines Bull begins to crack now that it seems to GE that the type of computers produced by Machines Bull will have to be phased out. The threatened disappearance of Machines Bull as an innovative force in the French economy is at best discomfitting to the French. They feel that they could be about to lose a national asset.

NEW "EAST INDIES" COMPANIES

Science-based industries are ever more dependent on Government aid in various forms, and in turn governments depend on them: "in a whole host of major industries, from coal and steel and aviation to nuclear energy and cars and computers, the trend is toward one or two national firms that are treated as national assets: they have become the chosen instruments of their governments. This means that commercial rivalries are in a sense nationalized," said the Economist on page 197 of the issue of January 21, 1967. It would seem that, for different reasons, a breath of the days of the old trading companies royally chartered for the exploitation of foreign colonies, a symbol of the mercantilist era, has returned.

THE CAPITAL MARKETS PROBLEM

One of the big European objections to American investment in Europe is that it has preempted European private capital resources. This is a very telling argument because it has been the policy of the U.S. administration, as part of its justification for programs of voluntary control of U.S. direct and portfolio foreign investment, to try to help develop more adequate European capital markets.

The result of these U.S. programs has not been to help develop more adequate European capital markets, rather the result has been pressure on U.S. firms to discover newer and more ingenious ways of raising the capital they need from foreign sources.

European capital markets will not be developed by American investment control policies, and they cannot for reasons to be found in Europe itself. These reasons were explored in a recent report by Dr. Claudio Segre to the EEC Finance Ministers.

CAPITAL MARKET DEVELOPMENT IS A EUROPEAN PROBLEM, WORSENED BY U.S. INVESTMENT CONTROLS

The Segre study pointed out that the key obstacle to developing more adequate capital markets is the dominance of European public enterprise in many European economies. Subsidized public service force public enterprises to borrow very heavily in Europe's domestic capital markets. Their securities issues are given priority over other new issues, they are subject to favorable tax rates and commission charges. Certain types of investors are required by law to buy these issues.

If European public enterprises were forced to bid competitively in domestic capital markets much more room would be left for filling the capital needs of European industry, and in turn, European private industry would be better able to compete with American industry, which can still invest a lot of capital in Europe, even under the U.S. voluntary control programs.

But essentially Europe must allow—among other measures—privately funded savings techniques, personal or institutional, such as insurance—annuities—and private pension plans, to develop instead of government pay as you go social security programs which generate no real savings.

WHAT EFFECTIVE MEASURES TO HELP NARROW THE GAP?

I cannot expect Europeans convinced of their inequality with American enterprise and at the same time jealous of maintaining ownership of their productive facilities unquestioningly to accept as a solution to the technology gap greatly increased American investment. Neither can Europeans expect Americans to accept their arguments for aid without looking more closely into the causes of the problem.

IS THERE A TECHNOLOGY GAP?

In fact, European science is producing technological advances—according to a report by Miss Alena Wells in the Journal of Commerce of January 31, "A review of basic processes used on both sides of the Atlantic will find that the European contribution in the past decade or so has been sizable. There is every indication that this contribution will increase even faster in years to come." The article cited fundamental advances in chemicals, fibers, glass, and steelmaking. Notably these developments are all in the realm of manufacturing—not in the distributive, marketing, fiscal and managerial skills discussed above.

Where the technology gap is meaningful is in research and development in the skills of distribution, servicing, financing and management, because the marketplace has not been recognized by European businessmen and economists as being a laboratory where research and development in these skills goes on. What is competition but a means for trial and error testing of better distributing, servicing, financing and management methods?

AN INSTITUTIONAL GAP AND A MANAGERIAL GAP

My inquiries in Europe showed that several root causes must be addressed.

The first is in regard to European university systems as they affect pure and applied research. The tenure and authority of university professors is said to inhibit innovation; there is said to be little cooperation, particularly in France, among universities, governments, and industry. Laboratories and other facilities are said to be out of date, and it is therefore hard to keep good men who are enticed both by European industry and by America. In France the shortage is exacerbated by the drain on the best talent of the French nuclear effort.

One of the problems of the technology gap and "brain drain" is an institutional one—creating a proper environment with adequate remuneration for scientists and scientific research. This problem, it would seem to me, is capable of being resolved by imaginative European action. As an institutional problem it has been discussed by a British physicist as a lack of connection between technology and management.

The fact seems to be that, while there is now good European research in progress in many areas, there is little development of research into useful technology, technology that can be sold in the form of consumer products in wide markets. The dearth of European institutions for teaching management techniques symbolizes the idea of a "managerial gap," a problem that the Business and Industry Advisory Committee—BIAC—to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development has sought to remedy. There are now signs that something is being done to mend this gap in the teaching of management techniques.

According to Christopher Layton in an "Atlantic Paper" published by the Atlantic Institute titled Trans-Atlantic Investments, page 94:

> The history of the last fifty years does not suggest that Europe is likely to suffer from a "concentration of "way-out" or "pure" research in the United States. Again and again, European brains have pioneered fundamental discoveries and innovations, which were later developed in the United States. The problem for Europe is to improve and accelerate the practical application of its new ideas. American firms operating on both continents stress that, while their European laboratories are most fertile in ideas, they are frequently applied in one-third to one-half the time at home in the United States.

EUROPEAN COMPANY LAW INHIBITS BIGNESS

Another problem, much more knotty, is the effect of corporate organization on research and development by businesses. If size is prerequisite to large research and development expenditures, which is doubtful as a rule of thumb, then it would follow that with mergers the business organizations of the six EEC countries would become, technologically, more fecund. The whole problem of bigness belongs to another area of discussion, but it is clear that some bigness produces the capacity for effective research, whether or not it produces actual results. In the United States it is estimated that only 4 percent of firms employing less than 1,000 workers do research. About 85 percent of all industrial research expenditure is done by firms with over 5,000 employees.

DEVELOPING "EUROPEAN" BUSINESSES

There are several barriers to the reorganization of European industry of sufficient interest to outline briefly here. Of first importance is the problem of taxation. When a European company goes out of business, in order to merge with another company for example, it must declare a liquidation. Assets that were formerly undervalued have to be revalued and then taxed. The resulting tax payments may act as a major disincentive to such mergers. Capital market controls in some European countries discriminate against foreign companies even if they originate in another EEC member country.

A second reason are the differences among the company laws of the six Common Market members. Historically, European nations did not develop company law in symphony as they did other areas of law, because the Napoleonic Code, which was applied to all of the Six for varying periods, did not provide concepts of corporate personality and limited liability. Efforts are now underway at technical level to draft a uniform company law within the community, but several differing attitudes toward this development now prevent EEC action. One group would prefer a uniform company law adopted as a standard Community regulation. Another group, led by France, would prefer that the six countries each adopt similar national company laws.

The result of the confusion about company law is that very few "European" companies have developed. Instead, there is a frantic movement toward agglomerations of national firms—concentration is therefore taking place within the framework of existing national laws.

PSYCHOLOGICAL BARRIER

Yet a third factor is psychological. Some observers argue that European enterprise has not yet achieved that stage of maturity that would allow it to feel secure enough to forge effective transnational corporate entities.

Though I question this latter theory, it prompts me to my final observation on this subject and to concur with the conclusion of Secretary of Defense McNamara in a recent speech. The technology gap exists to some extent, but is in fact a disguise for what I prefer to call the "managerial gap." The problem is one of transmitting existing and new European technology into products, and then of creating a market for new products by skillful marketing, distributing, and servicing organizations. This requires very highly skilled managers and management systems.

Other nations have managed to obtain industrial technology and thereby attain international competitiveness. Japan has developed a profoundly important self-sustaining industrial technology, and contrary to popular myth, it was not done by stealing and copying U.S. ideas. U.S. technology once patented for public information is available for license. Our managers and their skills are available for hire. Our management training schools are willing to train foreign students. Our advertising capabilities are available worldwide. Hopefully our capital will soon again be able to be invested where it is most needed—where demand for it is greatest. In this context it is difficult not to view with skepticism pleas that we "share" our technology with European industry, much of which is extremely competitive with our own.

THE TECHNOLOGY GAP AND POST KENNEDY ROUND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS WITH EUROPE

If the Kennedy round is successful—that is, if there is a significant lowering of European and British tariffs and trade barriers—U.S. private investment in Europe may prove less necessary than it had previously been. It is in fact expected that one result of a successful Kennedy round will be a diminished incentive to establish operations within the Community. Were this to occur, some of the immediate technological inferiority felt by European industry might also somewhat diminish, but so would some opportunity for obtaining American technology.

But European opinion is now mobilized. Plans are formulated to try to increase the competitiveness of European industry and to promote research. Much as the fear of meaningful Soviet competition in the economic and scientific fields spurred the United States to reexamine its scientific educational institutions and become concerned with maintaining consistently high growth rates and developing space technology, American competition with Europe has already provided a strong incentive for reexamination and change in Europe.

U.S. self-interest should be in seeing that these changes are not misdirected. The tendency toward the mercantilist pampering of a few firms as part of national economic arsenals is not healthy. Developments such as these give real cause for competing American industries, not at all the greedy giants they are pictured to be, to claim that their European counterparts operate under unfair competitive advantages—special incentives provided them by their governments. This in turn makes fair competition on an expanded world scale a more difficult goal to attain.

But I am pessimistic about the future of European technological development because of the direction European efforts have taken. Essentially Europeans have tried to "catch up" with the United States in fields where we are well in advance. They are thus repeating American research already done and outdated. Instead, they should be forging ahead in new areas where American research is lacking—and there are many such areas.

At the same time there are areas where American policy can help strengthen the European scientific and research base, without special programs of cooperation. American firms with European subsidiaries should be willing to carry out research in those European affiliates. In the Stanford Research Institute's Long-Range Planning Report No. 198, R. and D. in Europe, is data that indicate that of 200 firms with European operations, only 4 percent did research in Europe. American firms should reexamine their policies toward doing research in their foreign subsidiaries, to determine whether it may be not only in the interest of their foreign "host" governments, but also in the interest of their foreign operations to engage in more research and actively to attempt to develop that research for market.

The United States can only stand to benefit from a flowering of pure and applied research in Europe. Such original research can only enrich the entire free world economy, including the economy of the United States. We should do nothing to impede the development of European strength in research, and we should take sound steps to encourage it.

Above all, Europe must start doing research and development in distributing, servicing, financing, and management. This it can do only by establishing the laboratories in which this research can be conducted—where new economic ideas can be tested—namely, the fair, competitive marketplace. The political-bureaucratic system, no matter how well structured by the ablest political scientists, and administered by the ablest political pragmatists—the politicians and the bureaucrats, is a sorry substitute for the competitive and honest marketplace where all citizens may cast their economic ballots for or against the goods and services offered by the innovators.

IN THE KENNEDY ROUND CONTEXT

The problem of the "technology gap" has been of interest here from several points of view, not just as it reflects on the Kennedy round. Just as the Kennedy round involves not merely bargaining on tariffs and other trade barriers, but relates to the industrial development of the entire free world, so it must also comprehend problems like the technology gap, especially since the "technology gap" syndrome will, for many Europeans and for many Americans, shape future attitudes and policies of relations with the United States.

In the next sections of this speech I will deal with the first of the sector negotiations discussed above—iron and steel.

IRON AND STEEL

Of the five industrial sectors isolated for special treatment in the Kennedy round, that of iron and steel is one of the most difficult and controversial.

In the United States, the ratio of steel mill product imports to domestic consumption has risen from about 5 percent in 1962 to about 11 percent in 1966. The European Community steel industry is suffering from overcapacity, from costly sources of supply of coking coal and from problems of the organization of its corporate units. In the United Kingdom the future of steel is clouded by the nationalization of the steel industry and by a complex of other problems. Meanwhile, Japan, now the leader in steel technology as applied to steel production, is expanding its capacity in order to supply future export demand.

The pressures that these conditions create on the Kennedy round steel sector negotiations have made steel a sensitive area for negotiations. It may be that these pressures will prevent successful negotiations. But there is still reason both for the United States and other countries to press them to a productive conclusion.

WHAT CAN THE UNITED STATES GAIN IN STEEL SECTOR NEGOTIATIONS?

The conditions of U.S. production and trade in steel mill products are such that some have questioned what U.S. interest in steel negotiations can be. And, because the United States has no real export interest in steel mill products, it is difficult to define exactly our interest in obtaining cuts in other nations' steel tariffs.

One reason for our interest is that, by attempting to "keep steel in the negotiations," we expand the total value of the negotiations and prevent unravelling. Another is that we might extract a quid pro quo in terms of cuts in other nations' duties on our machinery—products made from steel. Another motive is that, by getting significant reductions in other nations' tariffs we might divert Japanese exports to other markets than our own. Finally, by cutting other nations' steel duties the United States may obtain leeway to develop a substantial future export market.

THE SECTOR APPROACH AND THE IDEA OF "HARMONIZATION"

The special circumstances surrounding world trade in steel, clear almost from the start of the present negotiations, were enough to convince the Director-General of GATT, Eric Wyndham-White, to include iron and steel in his industrial sector negotiating scheme implemented early in 1965. Today these special circumstances seem so compelling that there has been thought that, instead of negotiating on rates of duty according to a hypothetical linear or percentage cut concept, there should be an effort to "harmonize" tariff and other barriers to world trade in steel products.

As I pointed out above, harmonization is an approach which when first suggested I viewed with great skepticism. But there is a certain logic to "harmonizing" nations' tariff and other-than-tariff trade barriers in certain industries, like steel, where it would seem that technology, conditions and costs of production could be quite standard.

Such harmonization would not require special sectoral trade deals—it could be accomplished according to traditional multilateral, nondiscriminatory rules for negotiations and should be considered a sequel to present trade negotiations that is worthy at least of exploration.

The following account will show why such an approach is in fact being considered. I will explore below some of the more important aspects of the competitive problems facing the U.S. steel industry. Then I will discuss current problems of production in the European Coal and Steel Community—ECSC—for these have great bearing on the steel sector negotiations. Then I will discuss the negotiations as they reflect and in a sense focus the various elements of national steel sector malaise.

The following analysis of the problems of the U.S. industry is unusually long for this report on the Kennedy round. But the steel industry has asked its government for special help to protect it from imports, and this special request should receive the bright light of open discussion and debate. For purposes of this debate I will discuss candidly some of the problems I see for American steel production.

IS U.S. STEEL INTERNATIONALLY COMPETITIVE?

The years roughly since 1960 have been for the U.S. steel industry a period of great change and internal reexamination. Increased imports most notably in 1965 and 1966 only brought to national attention the problems of this troubled industry. Increased imports were the concrete evidence of what had become widely known and reported much earlier: the industry as a whole had become backward in adopting new technology. A highly concentrated industry which has been called oligopolistic, the steel industry in the period before 1960 had meaningful competition from alternative materials such as plastics and other metals, and no real competition from imported steel. The following table shows imports of steel mill products as a percentage of domestic consumption since 1956. It also shows the attendant decline of exports:

Steel mill products—Domestic producers' shipments, imports, exports, and apparent consumption, 1956–66

Year	Net shipments	Imports	Exports [1]	Apparent consumption [2]	Ratio of imports to consumption
	Short tons	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Short tons*	*Percent*
1956	83,251,168	1,340,746	4,347,903	80,244,011	1.7
1957	79,894,577	1,154,831	5,347,678	75,701,730	1.5
1958 [3]	59,914,433	1,707,130	2,822,910	58,798,653	2.9
1959 [4]	69,377,067	4,396,354	1,676,652	72,096,769	6.1
1960	71,149,218	3,358,752	2,977,278	71,530,692	4.7
1961	66,125,505	3,163,233	1,989,552	67,229,168	4.7
1962	70,552,438	4,100,039	2,012,590	72,639,887	5.6
1963	75,555,142	5,446,326	2,179,638	78,822,030	6.9
1964	84,944,876	6,439,635	3,280,721	88,103,790	7.3
1965 [5]	92,666,182	10,383,021	2,496,039	100,553,164	10.3
1966	89,995,391	10,752,878	1,723,981	99,024,288	10.9
1967:					
January	7,292,000	782,000	205,000	7,869,000	9.9
February	6,531,000	744,000	190,000	7,085,000	10.5

[1] An increasing proportion of total annual exports have been financed by AID. In 1965 probably about half of U.S. exports were in this category.

[2] Represents shipments, plus imports, minus exports, and thus does not reflect changes in producers' or consumers' inventories.

[3] Recession year.

[4] Great bulk of steel industry closed down during 116-day strike.

[5] Strike threat existed for 1st 8 months of the year.

Source: Shipments from American Iron & Steel Institute; imports and exports compiled by American Iron & Steel Institute from data published by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Leaving aside for the moment the reason for the import increases, these data substantiate the following analysis from Fortune magazine's article on steel in the October 1966 issue, page 135:

> In the late 1950s and early 1960s the industry was dying. It prepared itself for dying in the decade 1947–57, when it expanded its ingot capacity by 42,200,000 tons or 46.3 percent. Setting aside the question whether the blame lay with bad management or a cruel fate, the fact is that much of this new capacity was in effect obsolete when it was built. The new plant certainly didn't do much for the industry's productivity. Between 1947 and 1957 it rose altogether only 20 percent, or between 1.8 and 1.9 percent a year compounded; meanwhile employment costs were increasing 105.8 percent, or almost 7.5 percent annually. During that period, steel-mill product prices zoomed up 101.7 percent, as compared with a rise of 21.9 percent for all commodities.
>
> The spiralling costs and prices of steel left an irresistible opening for competitors, and they moved in fast . . . By the end of the 1950s the U.S. was changing from a net exporter to a net importer of steel.

IS THE U.S. INDUSTRY OUTPRICED?

The increased competition of the 1960's brought response in massive capital expenditures for modernization. In speaking of such spending before a congressional breakfast on February 8, 1967, United States Steel Corp. Chairman Worthington said:

> Last year, these capital expenditures exceeded 2 billion dollars; and we expect that they may be as great or greater in the current year. Yet even these enormous outlays are inadequate now to take full advantage of existing technology, and they show little promise of growing at anything like the pace of the increase in our knowledge of steel products and production methods.

In spite of this effort to catch up American steel is generally conceded to be not yet competitive internationally in terms of price, though it is to be proved whether U.S. steel is competitive in terms of cost. International production cost and price comparisons are notoriously difficult to make accurately, though there have been attempts to do so for major industries. One of the problems in the steel industry case appears to be determining what actual transaction prices are, as opposed to published list prices for steel mill products; another is that prices for basic steel products are modified by the addition of numerous "extras" which make it difficult to determine average sale prices.

In spite of these difficulties, it is concluded by at least one study that list prices of both Japanese and ECSC steel products are below those of the United States in all basic products except hot rolled sheets and cold rolled sheets. It has also been concluded that the spreads between actual prices in the United States and Japan and the ECSC are almost certainly greater than those between their list price counterparts. It is believed that ECSC and Japanese actual prices were below list by some 20 to 30 percent, whereas U.S. transaction prices were lower than list by much less, perhaps only 5 percent. It seems fair to conclude on this basis that ECSC and Japanese producers can sell from much lower average transaction price bases.

THE AMERICAN PROCESSOR'S DILEMMA

These conclusions are borne out by the experience of a small American processor of steel products who recently visited my office and whose experience I will relate here.

The firm in question buys mill steel, performs a fairly standard processing operation, and sells the steel to its final bulk users. Because his is a competitive industry, the price of the basic mill steel is extremely important as a determinant of the competitiveness of the processed product.

Pressure on this firm to buy imported steel became intensive during the long strike threat in 1965, but it nonetheless resisted buying imported steel. In the first place, the firm had dealt with nearby U.S. suppliers consistently and was relatively sure of ready supply on request. Secondly, it distrusted the quality of the Japanese product.

However, an inspection visit to Japan revealed very high quality steel production and such great technical skill that the U.S. firm became convinced of Japanese mastery in the art of steelmaking. And this steel could be delivered at 22 percent less than any U.S. corporation's delivered price.

The decision to buy imported steel was therefore unavoidable, and the proportion of foreign steel to domestic steel used by this firm has increased in 3 years to about 50 percent of its total usage of "raw" steel. Imported steel will, however, probably not be used for any more than 50 percent of the firm's needs because it does not wish to become reliant on possibly uncertain foreign sources for the bulk of its raw material needs. But, once having begun to buy imported steel, and having become familiar with the channels of trade in such steel, the psychological and commercial obstacles to purchasing have diminished.

More importantly, the firm's competitors have also begun using lower priced imported steel. It would be almost impossible for the firm in question now to return to purchasing domestic steel entirely and yet remain competitive.

Another visitor to my office has recounted his visit to the works of a very large American steel corporation, and his observations tend to confirm the impression that in terms of applied technology the U.S. steel industry has a few steps to go to catch up. Here the person in question saw one of the most delicate of the steelmaking operations—the tapping of a furnace. He was surprised at the degree of skill this operation required from the workmen. But he was even more surprised to learn that the Japanese have so perfected this operation as to be able to "tap" both sides of the furnace at once, whereas in the United States this is done only on one side.

But there are indications I will discuss below that U.S. industry is in the throes of major technological advance on at least four important fronts.

THE REASONS FOR INCREASED CONSUMPTION OF FOREIGN STEEL

We can conclude from the above that foreign steelmakers are able to make high quality steel and sell it at cheaper prices than American producers. Part of this price competitiveness results from genuine technical achievement. But putting aside for the moment other reasons why foreign steelmakers may be able to underprice U.S. producers, it seems obvious from available data that imported steel had found a market in the United States not just because of price but because of threatened continuity of American supplies.

The above table relating imports to domestic consumption of steelmill products indicated some of the main reasons why imports rose suddenly in certain years. The big rise from a ratio of imports to domestic consumption of 2.9 percent in 1958 to 6.1 percent in 1960 probably was the result of a long strike and the period of hedging that preceded it. The big rise from 7.3 percent in 1964 to 10.3 percent by the end of 1965 seems to have been the result of the strike threat during the first 8 months of that year.

The fact of strike threats may explain sudden rises in imports, but does not explain away the basic competitiveness of the imported steel mill product. Imports may in fact have filled essential elements of demand in this country, without which there would have been higher steel prices, shortages of defense materials, and less competitive incentive. I will discuss below pricing practices that may account not only for the rise in imports but for the drop in U.S. exports.

A MORE BALANCED VIEW OF STEEL IMPORTS—TOTAL OUTPUT MUCH INCREASED

The table above indicates that total U.S. production of steel—net shipments plus exports—has continued to rise. In fact, the record shows that in spite of increased imports, there has been an increase of steel consumption by over a third within only 4 years. This remarkable performance is the fruit of the great effort to invest and innovate that has taken place, and is a sign that the steel industry has more than held its own against competing materials. Thus the facts show that though the portion of the U.S. market taken by imports is larger, the total pie has increased so much that there has been no damage to the industry. Instead there has been growth.

IMPORTS DECREASING

Another reason for a more balanced view is that imports in the first 2 months of 1967 have declined from the high levels of the last 2 months of 1966. Imports in January and February of 1967 are to be sure higher than they were in January and February 1966, but the point is that they have stopped increasing and are now decreasing.

As late as March this year it would have been possible to say that the all-time production records set in 1966 would be repeated. According to data published in February by the American Iron and Steel Institute, the index of production for the final week in February was at 138.6, compared with 132 for February a year earlier. Now, however, because of the uncertain future of the economy and the role of lower automobile consumption in that dimmer economic picture, steel production probably will not match record 1965–66 levels. The variables in such predictions are enormous, but some people have projected that 83 million tons will be shipped in 1967 compared to the 90 million tons shipped in 1966. There may also be the possibility that imports will increase if the construction industry increases its activity, because of the large amount of imported steel reinforcing bars used in U.S. construction. The economic picture ahead is therefore somewhat cloudy at present. But to date, from data now available, there appears to be no damage to the steel industry from imports. In fact, shipments have increased 1 percent to 2 percent over comparable months last year, even though production has decreased about 4 percent.

NO DAMAGE FROM IMPORTS

In his statement to Members of Congress on February 8, United States Steel Chairman Worthington said that "more than 70,000 steelworker jobs alone, and many thousands of additional jobs in supporting industries" were being lost to imports. In fact, during 1966 it is well known that the United States Steel Corp. was unable to employ enough workers in the Chicago area—it is said that that corporation was "going begging" for good labor.

In fact, there have been shortages of workers in an industry where total employment increased from 405,924 in 1961 to 458,539 in 1965, where average annual shipments per production worker—or productivity—increased from 162.9 net tons in 1961 to 202.1 net tons in 1965, making U.S. steel labor productivity the highest by far in the world, in accordance with high U.S. wage scales—which have nonetheless increased less fast than steel worker wages in other countries. In the last month, however, there have been perhaps as many as 2,000 workers laid off as a probable result of decreased auto demand. The exact amount of unemployment seems difficult now to determine exactly.

The data referred to follow:

U.S. steel industry labor productivity

Year	Ingot production (1,000 net tons)	Product shipments (1,000 net tons)	Average number of production workers	Average annual ingot production per production worker (net tons)	Average annual shipments per production worker (net tons)
1961	98,014	66,126	405,924	241.5	162.9
1962	98,328	70,552	402,662	244.2	175.2
1963	109,261	75,555	405,536	269.4	186.3
1964	126,931	84,945	434,654	292.0	195.4
1965	131,181	92,666	458,539	286.1	202.1

Source: American Iron & Steel Institute.

How labor costs compare worldwide—Comparative hourly employment costs in steel industries of selected countries

[Total employment costs in U.S. dollars]

	West Germany		Belgium		France		Italy		Luxembourg		Netherlands		Japan		U.S. steel	
	Amount	Percent of 1952	Amount	Percent of 1952	Amount	Percent of 1952	Amount	Percent of 1952	Amount	Percent of 1952	Amount	Percent of 1952	Amount	Percent of 1952	Amount	Percent of 1952
1966	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	$0.96	300	$4.63	200
1965	$1.81	262	$1.83	223	$1.48	206	$1.61	252	$1.95	199	$1.96	370	.86	271	4.48	193
1964	1.68	345	1.62	198	1.40	194	1.58	347	1.72	176	1.76	332	(1)	(1)	4.36	188
1963	1.59	230	1.45	177	1.30	181	1.43	223	1.62	165	1.58	298	(1)	(1)	4.25	183
1962	1.51	219	1.33	162	1.21	168	1.21	189	1.49	152	1.47	277	(1)	(1)	4.16	179
1961	1.37	199	1.26	154	1.11	154	1.04	163	1.47	150	1.40	264	.68	213	3.99	172
1960	1.21	175	1.22	149	.99	138	.98	153	1.41	144	1.08	204	.57	178	3.82	165
1959	1.12	162	1.13	138	.91	126	.90	141	1.31	134	.95	179	.54	169	3.80	164
1958	1.06	154	1.09	133	.85	118	.86	134	1.32	135	.94	177	.52	162	3.51	151
1957	1.01	146	1.08	132	.86	119	.80	125	1.28	131	.90	170	.51	159	3.22	139
1956	.90	130	.98	120	.96	133	.79	123	1.15	117	.82	155	.47	147	2.95	127
1955	.83	120	.89	109	.85	118	.70	109	1.02	104	.74	140	.41	128	2.72	117
1954	.75	109	.83	101	.75	104	.68	106	.95	97	.63	119	.39	122	2.51	108
1953	.72	104	.81	99	.73	101	.65	102	.95	97	.57	108	.36	112	2.45	105
1952	.69	100	.82	100	.72	100	.64	100	.98	100	.53	100	.32	100	2.32	100

[1] Not available.

Source: European Coal and Steel Community, American Iron & Steel Institute and industry estimates.

In 1966 there were no jobs lost to imports, but it also seems certain that without imports many jobs would have been lost. The 11 million tons of imported steel in 1966 eased production bottlenecks in a strained industry, and allowed many intermediate processors to remain in business by supplying them with raw materials.

AN INDUSTRY MARKED BY MILL OPENINGS AND FRICTIONAL PLANT CLOSINGS

Several steel mills have been closed. But in any industry there must be a turnover of plant just as there is turnover of machinery. Frictional and structural problems are bound to exist and become aggravated during periods of rapid technological change. These frictional problems will arise with or without imports. The plain fact that capital spending in the industry has been so substantial—$2.2 billion in 1966—is proof that this is an industry marked not by mill closings but by mill openings. Where is the evidence of net disruption as the result of imports?

IMPORTS HAD A HEALTHY EFFECT

What has been the net effect of imports? For 1966 it is possible to speculate that imports of steel mill products actually supplied processors with enough steel to continue to meet the demands on their output from a very tightly used economy. Imports of steel mill products, even though only 10.8 percent of U.S. consumption, may actually have helped keep U.S. export items like machine tools and all other products in which steel is an important component, competitive on world markets. Clearly imports are already having a decreasingly important role in the economy currently.

In other words, export markets may not have been lost to U.S. producers because of the price effects of the steel imports in 1966. These price effects may not only have benefited U.S. export markets, they may well have saved U.S. consumers of everything from razor blades to giant lathes a lot of money.

THE FALLACY OF THE SECTORAL APPROACH

We have been discussing U.S. imports, exports and production of steel mill products in isolation. This approach is criticized by those who think it too narrow. They point out that indirect sales of steel in the form of autos and machinery should be included in U.S. foreign trade data, because the strength of the U.S. economy lies just as much in the ability to manufacture products from steel as it does in making the steel, and because the national economy benefits from the value added to the steel by manufacture. In fact, from one point of view we might say that it is to the advantage of the United States not to export basic steel products, in favor of exporting products manufactured from basic steel.

If we take a measure called U.S. foreign trade in steel-containing manufactures, or U.S. indirect foreign trade in steel products, the United States has a significant trade surplus with the rest of the world. The following data, estimated by the American Iron & Steel Institute from data on the dollar value of U.S. imports and exports of steel-containing products, demonstrates this fact.

U.S. trade in steel containing manufactures

[In millions of short tons]

Year	Exports	Imports
1955	2.9	0.3
1956	3.3	.4
1957	3.4	.6
1958	2.9	.8
1959	3.0	1.2
1960	3.2	.9
1961	3.2	.7
1962	3.3	.9
1963	3.5	.9
1964	4.1	1.1
1965	4.3	1.4
1966	4.4	1.9

Source: American Iron & Steel Institute, estimates based on dollar value of exports and imports as reported by Census Bureau.

Still another way of measuring import-export trade in such a way as to escape the narrow confines of measuring steel mill products trade alone, is to examine imports and exports of steel mill products and steelmaking materials and machinery. This form of analysis includes iron and steel, iron ore, iron and steel scrap, bituminous coal, petroleum coke, and rolling mill machinery. For 1965, U.S. imports of all such items were $1.6 billion, and U.S. exports were $1.5 billion, leaving a deficit balance of only $209 million, small in comparison to the U.S. deficit in trade in steel mill products alone.

WHY DID IMPORTS INCREASE IN 1965 AND 1966?—THE U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY BUYS ABROAD

The fact of increasing imports is evident. Above I gave as some of the reasons why imports increased the history of U.S. strikes. There are other reasons relating to very great demand in 1965 and 1966. I have indicated above that processors imported large amounts of steel in 1965–66.

There is also good reason to believe from analysis of commodity, country, and customs district data in reference tabulations of the Census Bureau that steel mills themselves accounted for a large portion of the imports of steel mill products in those years; that is, the very industries whose representatives are opposing imports in Washington may be in fact large purchasers of foreign steel—and for good reason.

Why would U.S. steelmakers import foreign steel? The reason is likely to be found in the strained steel market of the past 2 years. Foreign steel was needed to break bottlenecks in the industry's production chain. For example, if a mill has much more capacity in its rolling plant than it has in its melting plant, and its melting plant is running at full capacity, and there is great demand for rolled steel, this mill has a real incentive to buy steel to supply its rolling operation—wherever it can get this steel.

Rather than admit to old customers that it could not supply the steel, and perhaps lose the customer, the steel company was likely to buy the steel abroad and sell it even at a small markup to its old customers.

One indicator that the above factor was at work during the past 2 years of high imports is the experience of steelmen who have visited my office. Another is data indicating to what areas of the country imports are invoiced. California and Florida have been areas where imports have concentrated for obvious reasons relating to ocean shipping. But there has been a big increase in shipments of imported steel to the Great Lakes regions. This steel could be going to the processors—it could also be going to steel mills from Ohio to Minnesota.

THE TRADITION OF U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY PRICING POLICY: ITS EFFECT ON IMPORTS, AND ON EXPORTS

Another reason for increased imports that must be given close examination is the tradition of U.S. steel industry pricing policy. Pricing policy may also be the reason for decreased exports. A case in point may at the outset illustrate this point.

The table below showing the categories of steel imports from major U.S. suppliers in 1966 shows that the largest single item of imports was plates and sheets. Imports in this category increased from about $200 million in 1964 to $469 million in 1965. Nonetheless, in this area of great import competition, the U.S. steel companies all raised their prices across the board by 5 percent.

U.S. steel imports, 1966

[In thousands of dollars]

	Canada	Sweden	United Kingdom	EEC	Austria	Japan	Total
Pig and cast iron	19,793	--------	--------	3,638	--------	--------	23,431
Spiegeleisen	5	--------	--------	--------	--------	--------	5
Sponge iron; iron or steel powders	896	2,497	88	876	--------	328	4,685
Grit and shot, including wire pellets	30	--------	63	47	--------	183	323
Ingots, blooms, billets, slabs, and sheet bars	31,954	52	2,667	254	--------	188	35,115
Forgings, not processed	1,885	68	13	68	--------	52	2,086
Bars	6,524	3,659	4,396	66,057	3,672	17,861	102,169
Hollow drill steel	733	27	68	--------	2	182	1,012
Wire rods	69	8,976	4,019	36,062	84	54,794	104,004
Plates and sheets not cut, pressed, or stamped	38,356	3,733	46,561	100,573	110	280,219	469,552
Strip, not cut, pressed, or stamped	780	7,935	3,641	6,328	138	3,816	22,647
Plates, sheets, and strip; cut, pressed, or stamped	124	3	1	619	17	1,057	1,821
Plates, sheets, and strip electrolytically coated or plated	7	--------	4	334	--------	--------	345
Wire	1,755	9,702	5,885	31,451	244	39,590	88,627
Angles, shapes, and sections; sheet piling	5,225	69	13,122	87,886	53	31,130	137,485
Rails, joint bars, and tie plates	710	5	--------	1,263	3	3	1,984
Pipes, tubes, and blanks	12,565	1,849	5,683	32,037	31	70,806	131,971
Cast iron pipes and tubes	45	--------	130	382	10	--------	567
Pipe and tube fittings	1,766	20	745	3,893	4	6,491	12,919
Wire covered with textile material	74	11	2	243	--------	57	387
Foil	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	--------

See footnote at end of table.

U.S. steel imports, 1966—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Canada	Sweden	United Kingdom	EEC	Austria	Japan	Total
Articles of iron or steel, n.s.p.f.							
Pipes, tubes, and fittings for use as conduits	15		8	147		534	704
Total	123,320	38,606	87,096	372,158	4,368	516,291	1,141,839
Total U.S. steel imports from all sources							1,233,514

[1] Not available.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

It may well be that U.S. steel prices are unrealistically high. U.S. steel companies' pricing policy may be passive. In other words, they may be meeting the price of competing suppliers in business they want to get but do not attempt to exert leadership in setting prices in international markets.

Perhaps it is not that steelmakers cannot afford to offer lower prices. It may be that they generally do not sell at lower mill nets to foreign markets than they could obtain by absorbing slightly more freight and expanding their domestic sales, especially in cases where the domestic customer's most logical alternative source of supply is a foreign producer.

U.S. STEEL EXPORT TROUBLES THEIR OWN RESPONSIBILITY?

The passive policy if it exists is perhaps defensible. Given the present pricing policy which makes U.S. producers essentially vulnerable to foreign competition especially in the context of today's disorganized, surplus-capacity world production conditions, they concentrate on competition in the domestic market while maintaining the mill nets they consider desirable. The minimal U.S. export effort in steel bears witness to this point. However, I have been told that there are latent foreign markets for American steel, half of whose exports are now AID-financed.

The decline in U.S. exports if looked at in isolation would seem to be evidence that we have actually tried to export in the past. But in the light of our understanding—which I will emphasize now that I consider tentative and subject to rebuttal from any steel industry representatives who care to do so—of industry pricing practices and of the history of international steel trade since the war, the export decline is not surprising.

The United States inherited a certain foreign market for its steel exports at the end of the Second World War. This was natural. We had a highly productive industry stimulated by war when other countries industries were outmoded or damaged. Since the increase in the number of producers in the free and the Communist world—over 30 countries now seriously produce steel—there has simply been increased competition for markets that once we supplied. Pricing policies have not changed, neither has the industry's basic attitude toward foreign markets. The only factor that has changed is the nature of foreign steel production. It has spread, and it can compete. The disruption of European production from overcapacity is ample evidence.

DOMESTIC PRICING PROBLEM

This indifference to price competition has had its impact not only on the international competitiveness of the steel industry but also on domestic consumers of mill steel. That the steel industry is oligopolistic is demonstrated by its domestic pricing practices, based on so-called "dominant firm" price leadership. The United States Steel Corp. has been accepted as the price leader, but there has lately been a certain diffusion of price leadership, other companies taking the lead in certain product lines of which they are strong producers.

One might well ask, "If every steel company sells at the same list prices, how does the buyer have any choice based on price? What is the role of competition?" In normal times of good demand U.S. firms compete on the basis of service, quality and packaging. But in times of lower demand, or when a firm wants to get a certain market or win a certain customer, it competes by absorbing freight costs. This is convenient and possible because freight costs in a product like steel are always an important part of the delivered price. Selective adjustments in those costs are therefore important.

Maintaining mill prices at list but adjusting freight costs means that there is less chance of retaliatory pricing by other firms, thus less chance that price levels will erode. There is also less chance that differential pricing through freight absorption would violate the Robinson-Patman Act, than would differentials in mill prices to different customers.

PRICING POLICY AND INDUSTRY FINANCING

The steel industry has been remarkable in its huge capital expansion program in that it has financed its growth largely from profits, rather than relying on stock issues. Therein may lie a reason why the profit on dollar of sales is such an important measure for the steel industry. Even so, the usual measures of industry profitability for U.S. manufacturing industry are profitability: return on sales and profit as a percent of stockholders' equity. These measures do not show a remarkable decline. In fact, such data show that even when the industry was in trouble at the end of the 1950's it was making acceptable though perhaps below average rates of return on invested capital. The following data present the primary iron and steel industry return on equity in the context of other durable-goods industries and with the average for all manufacturing industries, from 1947 to 1965.

Annual rates of profit on stockholders' equity, by industry, after taxes, 1947–65

[Each rate is the arithmetic mean of 4 quarterly rates, each on an annual basis. In percent]

Industry	1947	1948	1949	1950	1951	1952	1953	1954	1955	1956	1957	1958	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
All manufacturing corporations, except newspapers	15.6	16.0	11.6	15.4	12.1	10.3	10.5	9.9	12.6	12.3	11.0	8.6	10.4	9.2	8.8	9.8	10.2	11.6	13.0
Durable goods industries	14.5	15.7	12.1	16.8	13.0	11.0	11.1	10.3	13.8	12.8	11.3	8.0	10.4	8.6	8.1	9.6	10.1	11.8	13.8
Metals and metal fabricating industries	14.0	15.8	12.4	16.9	13.2	11.4	11.4	10.4	14.1	12.9	11.6	7.8	10.2	8.6	8.0	9.8	10.4	12.0	14.2
Transportation equipment	11.0	16.2	18.0	21.5	13.2	13.6	13.8	14.6	20.2	13.6	14.4	8.8	12.9	11.7	10.6	15.0	15.2	15.8	18.5
Motor vehicles and equipment	16.4	19.8	22.0	25.2	14.4	13.9	13.9	14.1	21.7	13.1	14.2	8.2	14.6	13.5	11.4	16.2	16.7	16.9	19.5
Aircraft and parts											17.7	13.1	8.2	7.4	9.8	12.7	11.3	12.2	15.1
Electrical machinery, equipment, and supplies	19.0	16.1	13.6	20.8	14.0	13.6	13.1	12.4	12.3	11.4	12.6	10.2	12.4	9.5	8.9	10.0	10.0	11.2	13.5
Machinery, except electrical	15.8	16.4	11.6	14.0	13.1	11.3	9.8	8.6	10.3	12.6	10.7	6.8	9.7	7.6	7.8	9.1	9.6	12.4	14.1
Metalworking machinery and equipment											11.5	2.0	5.2	5.3	6.0	8.6	8.6	12.4	14.4
Other fabricated metal products	17.7	17.0	10.3	15.9	13.4	10.1	9.8	7.6	10.0	10.7	9.3	7.2	8.0	5.6	5.9	7.9	8.3	10.1	13.2
Primary metal industries	12.2	14.5	9.3	14.5	12.8	9.5	10.8	8.8	14.1	14.0	10.8	6.8	8.0	7.2	6.4	6.2	7.2	9.2	10.6
Primary iron and steel (blast furnaces, steel works, and foundries)	12.0	14.6	10.0	14.3	12.3	8.5	10.7	8.1	13.5	12.7	11.4	7.2	8.0	7.2	6.2	5.4	7.0	8.8	9.8
Nonferrous metals	12.4	14.2	8.1	15.0	13.9	11.6	11.1	10.4	15.4	16.5	9.3	6.0	8.0	7.1	7.1	7.5	7.6	9.8	11.9
Other durable goods industries	16.4	15.4	10.5	16.3	12.4	9.7	9.6	9.6	12.3	12.3	9.7	8.6	11.2	8.6	8.0	8.8	9.2	10.6	12.2

The capital spending programs of industry are described glowingly in the Fortune magazine article mentioned above. To give the flavor of the extent of this most impressive program, which would tend to belie cries of damage, is the following quote on page 137.

In the three years 1964–1966, Bethlehem has invested more than $1 billion and it expects to go on indefinitely at least at that rate. Finance chief William Johnstone puts these expenditures in three categories: one-third routine on hundreds of items; one-third major expenditures of from $10 million to $50 million on new mills, oxygen furnaces, etc.; and one-third really big projects like Burns Harbor.

THE RICH FRUITS INVESTMENT WILL BEAR

According to Iron Age magazine financial analysis steelmen are betting on the basis of the quality and amount of capital expenditure programs that even in

1967 new equipment "should lower break-even points and also turn out a better product in a competitive market where quality counts. At least, this is what many in the industry have been betting on with their new finishing capacities. Most steel companies should be in a good position to take either a downtrend or uptrend in good strike."

Apart from immediate gain expected in 1967, recent capital investments in four major areas give the future of American steelmaking a bright luster. This "technological revolution" has four prongs: new oxygen furnace capacity; computerization of production; pelletization of ores; and continuous casting.

OXYGEN FURNACES—THE UNITED STATES CATCHES UP

In 1954 the McLouth Steel Corp. introduced the first American oxygen or "LD" furnaces, which had been perfected in Austria in 1952. The American steel industry did not adopt this new technological breakthrough. Other nations' industries did. As a result, by 1960 the United States was last in the world in oxygen furnace capacity in place. Now we are first, with a capacity of 40 million tons, and we expect another 15 million tons LD capacity to be in place in 1968. The difference in production time and cost between LD and the old open hearth—or Siemens-Martin—furnaces is nothing short of phenomenal. An LD furnace can produce 200 tons of crude steel in 50 minutes, and begin immediately to make the next batch. A Siemens-Martin furnace takes 8 hours to produce 200 tons.

A digression may be in order here regarding capacity. As LD furnaces have been put in place, it seems that Siemens-Martin furnaces have not been ripped out. Therefore there probably exists a lot of what can be called standby capacity. There are no official estimates of capacity. The New York Times and Wall Street Journal make their own estimates, but even these estimates, which recently put capacity at about 170 million tons annually, may be inaccurate. In 1966 with new oxygen capacity the steel industry produced 130 million tons of crude steel. The difference between the two could be said to be unused capacity. But how much of this unused capacity is economically usable capacity is unknown.

COMPUTERIZATION—AMERICA'S TECHNOLOGICAL TRUMP CARD IS APPLIED TO STEEL

Europe fears America's competence in computerization. Naturally this is as a result of the application of computer techniques to industry. Where European and even Japanese industry has not begun, or is only beginning to use computers in steel production, American steel producers are way out ahead. Entire plants have been "computerized" to the extent that formerly delicate hand operations can be done without fault. Japan is equally advanced in computerization.

PELLETIZATION

An important American technological development in the 1950's was development of the "pelletization" technique to make weakening American iron ores usable. But it was quickly found that pelletization was applicable to richer ores as well, and that pelletization of iron ore before melting it results in much greater efficiency. The rough-surfaced marbleized ore pellets pack well in the furnaces and mix with other materials. Their rough surface makes them melt more quickly and less coke is required. The outcome is vastly increased production from the same furnaces.

American pelletizing technology is now being used in ore fields around the world, thereby decreasing the shipping costs of the ore.

CONTINUOUS CASTING THE BIGGEST BONANZA

Continuous casting is a process by which the molten steel is poured from huge vat into a tundish, from which it flows directly into special forms to make a long slab about 12 inches thick, which can then be rolled into sheets. McLouth Steel Corp. announced earlier this year that it has so perfected the CC technique that it could shortly promise production of high enough finish CC steel for use in auto bodies. Several auto manufacturers have indicated their interest in using this steel. Continuous casting eliminates five stages in traditional steelmaking procedures, promises large savings and increased efficiency. Continuous casting capacity is now being installed, according to industry specialists, very rapidly.

The above data present a picture of an industry not suffering disruption from import competition but an industry on the verge of technological revolution of unusual depth. These data also suggest that the industry's problems with imports, and with exports, derive from traditional industry pricing practices. Were the industry willing to compete more directly in price terms with imports there might well be fewer imports in 1967.

But the industry's complaints about possible unfair foreign export promotion practices deserve special attention, and serious attention.

THE PROBLEMS POSED BY POSSIBLE UNFAIR COMPETITION

I have dealt with several of the reasons why imported steel mill products have been used in larger and larger quantity in the past 10 years. Some of the reasons was the effect of strikes in creating uncertainty about supplies. Part of the reason may be the unwillingness of U.S. firms to price more competitively. But another reason may be that foreign steel products are subsidized—that they are sold here under conditions of unfair competition. And if the imported steel competes "unfairly," then the industry has got justified complaints.

Steel industry spokesmen stress the idea of unfair competition. But there does not seem to have been a concerted effort to document in thorough detail instances of unfair competition, instead there are some notable cases where the industry supported perhaps shortsighted attempts to deal with the problem of unfair competition. In doing so it took what might be called a shotgun approach to the problem. This was the approach of the industry before the industrywide decision to request that Congress enact some special import surcharge or levy, in the words of Chairman Worthington, "so as to narrow the price differential and create a climate of more equitable competition between domestic and foreign producers who seek a share of the U.S. market."

ANTIDUMPING, SPECIAL MARKETING, AND BUY AMERICAN REQUIREMENTS

The shotgun approach was marked by attempts to enact amendments to the U.S. Antidumping Act of 1921 which would have had a restrictive effect at a time when an international solution to the problem seemed the wisest course. Another was the effort to enact, in the 89th Congress, a bill, H.R. 6775, to require users of steel used in making containers to mark the finished containers so as to indicate the national origin of the steel. Another in a perennial series of special marking bills, H.R. 6775 could have had the effect of making processors of steel not affiliated with U.S. steel manufacturers change inventory practices and go to special lengths to mark the finished product. The result could have been an effective "other than tariff" barrier to trade.

Another demonstration of this shotgun approach are efforts to insist that local governments apply "buy American" rules to their materials purchases. A recent example is the case where a Los Angeles County superior court judge denied a Bethlehem Steel Corp. request for a preliminary injunction that would have prevented the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power from awarding a steel contract to the lowest bidder, a firm offering Japanese steel.

While such shotgun efforts may still be made, the focus of steel industry discontent is now on imports per se. And, even though the guts of foreign competitiveness may simply be greater efficiency, the argument of unfair competition is an important one, and there are certain examples of such practices which give cause for concern, and perhaps for international action.

ANTIDUMPING AND COUNTERVAILING DUTIES

The Antidumping Act of 1921 and the countervailing duty provision of the Tariff Act of 1930 are two principal means of recourse against unfair competitive practices. Another is section 337 of the Tariff Act which, though seldom used, gives the President power to embargo imports that are sold under unfair or anticompetitive conditions in the United States.

A big step forward has now been taken through the negotiation of an antidumping code, an international agreement establishing an agreed definition of what constitutes dumping, the kinds of action taken to stop dumping, and the procedures that must be used in taking such action.

The antidumping agreement will be the subject of a longer discussion in another speech, but it is worth noting here that the anti-dumping agreement holds certain real advantages for the United States and for other countries. For the United States it means that the Canadians and all other signatories must find injury before applying dumping duties. It means that Americans can sell in foreign markets at prices lower than their home market prices in order to meet the prices of foreign competitors, without being slapped with a dumping duty. The antidumping agreement will allow price competition but no cutthroat or unfair price competition. At the same time the antidumping agreement will bring greatly speeded up dumping investigations in the United States so that damaging dumped imports can be more quickly penalized with a dumping duty.

The chief defense against subsidized imports is the countervailing duty provision of section 303 of the 1930 Tariff Act. Though not in conformity with the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, which requires a finding of injury from the subsidized imports before a countervailing duty can be imposed, the U.S. law preceded the GATT and therefore is immune under the GATT's "grandfather clause." There is now a definite indication that a countervailing duty will be imposed on imported steel towers from Italy, which will be announced quite soon. This is an encouraging sign that the U.S. countervailing duty provision is an effective device. When justified, it should be used fully. And it is the responsibility of American steel firms to bring such cases to the attention of their governments, to document them, to press them to conclusion. I have repeatedly expressed my willingness to take up the subsidy issue in Geneva or anywhere else. I repeat that assurance here and am willing to discuss these problems with industry representatives whenever they like.

I should point out that the subsidy issue is a two-way street. Europeans claim that American industry also is subsidized, and they point to the investment tax credit as an element of subsidy that is not available to European firms, although there are special tax incentives in Europe also, as I mentioned above in the section on the technology gap.

THE DISRUPTION OF EUROPEAN COAL AND STEEL MARKETS

Conditions in the steel industries of Europe and Great Britain make U.S. steel industry look like a very healthy hypochondriac. On the Continent of Europe and in Britain there are fundamental problems of corporate organization, overcapacity, weakening demand, and costly raw materials supplies that have caused some very deep concern.

These problems have become so serious as to overwhelm the European Coal and Steel Community—ECSC—itself. The Coal and Steel Community, formed in 1951 by the six countries who later created the Common Market, was a first stepping stone toward European integration. When the EEC was formed it was intended that the Coal and Steel Community, along with Euratom, become a part of the larger Community. This plan for the "merger of the executives," as it is called, was from 1963 to 1965 a major issue at contention among the Six. When the decisions were made how to meld the three executives, the crisis in the Community beginning June 30, 1965, created new obstacles that still remain unresolved. The result is that ECSC is now rather an institution without purpose. The rude shocks to steel production in the Six in 1966 are truly a test of its tenacity.

Nor do solutions to these problems appear to be in sight. One result has been that ECSC has proposed a world steel conference and has been joined by the British Labor Government Minister for Power, the new mogul of Britain's nationalized steel industry, Mr. Richard Marsh. He proposed to the Britain-ECSC Council of Association in February that there be a world conference on steel in an effort to deal with the problem of world steel "overcapacity." It will be well to look into some of the problems of European steel, for they have a profound effect on the Kennedy round steel negotiations, and on free world economic activity.

PROBLEMS OF CORPORATE ORGANIZATION

The steel industries of the Six are composed of small- and medium-size firms organized on exclusively national lines, usually located in inland areas away from the water where the world's cheapest supplies of coal and ore can be landed efficiently.

Comparisons of the degree of concentration of the steel industries in the ECSC, Britain, Japan, and the United States tell an important story about the organization of European steel industry. In the ECSC the percent of total steel production produced by companies that are large enough to produce more than 6 million tons a year is only 5 percent. In Britain no firms produce over 6 million tons, but in the United States about 80 percent of production is by such firms. In ECSC the median firm puts out 2 to 4 million tons, but in the United States less than 3 percent of production is accounted for by firms of that size. In Britain almost 45 percent of production is by such small firms, and in Japan only about 20 percent.

The meaning of these statistics is that small European and British production units are not equipped to compete effectively in a market increasingly open to competition from larger units. Thus there has been a trend toward merger of national steel companies, but not transnational mergers.

Production can become much more efficient within the existing limits of location and raw material supply if the economies of large-scale production and sustained production runs of single items can be achieved. But relocation of plants in port areas to take advantage of cheaper supplies will be a long-term trend.

Behind these important structural problems is the problem of overcapacity and decaying price levels. In the ECSC production has fallen and so have prices. In the United Kingdom prices have held but production has fallen 10 percent from 27.4 million tons in 1965 to 24.3 million tons in 1966, thus bringing to an end a 2- or 3-year period when British steel production and even exports were substantial.

FACTS OF WORLD PRODUCTION: OVERCAPACITY

Estimates of utilizable capacity are difficult at best to make accurately but it is worth trying to gauge the extent of world capacity and production as an indication of the present condition of world steel industry. From 1955 to 1960 world capacity increased 16 million tons each year—except in Communist China and the United States. Since 1960 the total increase of capacity has been 23 million tons a year. This quantative increase has resulted in falling world prices.

Community steelmaking capacity has increased along with world capacity. The European Coal and Steel Community estimates that the percentage of its capacity used since 1960 is as follows:

	Percent
1960	96
1961	92
1962	88
1963	83
1964	90
1965	84
1966	79

At the same time that capacity has increased, Community production and sales have leveled. The following table shows the rates at which crude steel production has increased in the ECSC as opposed to its increase in the rest of the world. In 1962 ECSC production was 82.9 million tons, in 1965 it was 85.9 million tons, and in 1966 85.1 million tons, a decrease from 1965 of 1 percent.

By comparison, ECSC estimates of U.S. ingot production increased from 118 million tons in 1964 to 122.5 million tons in 1965, to 124.7 million tons in 1966, an increase from 1965 to 1966 of 1.8 percent. But British production fell 10 percent from 1965 to 1966, from 27.4 to 24.7 million tons. Japan's production has increased from 39.8 million tons in 1964, to 41.1 million tons in 1965, to 47.7 million tons in 1966, an increase of 16 percent from 1965 to 1966.

In terms of market shares, the United States led with 27 percent of world production, Soviet Union 21.1 percent, ECSC 18.6 percent and Japan 10.4 percent.

The table of world production referred to above follows:

Crude steel production in the European Community and the world

[1952–66]

Country	Thousands of metric tons						Percent, 1966 over 1965	Percent of world steel production					
	1952	1961	1963	1964	1965	1966		1952	1961	1963	1964	1965	1966
West Germany	15,806	33,458	31,597	37,339	36,821	35,316	−4.1	7.4	9.7	8.4	8.8	8.3	7.7
Saar	2,823							1.3					
Belgium	5,170	7,002	7,525	8,725	9,162	8,916	−2.7	2.4	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	1.9
France	10,867	17,577	17,554	19,781	19,599	19.951		5.1	5.1	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3

Crude steel production in the European Community and the world—Continued

[1952-66]

Country	Thousands of metric tons						Percent, 1966 over 1965	Percent of world steel production					
	1952	1961	1963	1964	1965	1966		1952	1961	1963	1964	1965	1966
Italy	3,635	9,383	10,157	9,793	12,680	13,635	+7.4	1.6	2.8	2.7	2.3	2.8	3.0
Luxembourg	3,002	4,113	4,032	4,559	4,585	4,390	−4.3	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0
Netherlands	693	1,978	2,354	2,659	3,145	3,309	+5.2	.3	.6	.6	.6	.7	.7
European Community	41,996	73,511	73,218	82,856	85,991	85,157	−1.0	19.6	21.4	19.4	19.4	19.3	18.6
United Kingdom	16,681	22,439	22,880	26,650	27,438	24,704	−10.0	7.8	6.6	6.1	6.2	6.2	5.4
United States	87,766	90,453	101,477	117,993	122,490	124,700	+1.8	41.1	26.3	26.8	27.7	27.5	27.1
U.S.S.R	34,492	70,751	80,226	85,034	91,000	96,900	+6.5	16.1	20.6	21.2	19.9	20.4	21.1
Eastern Europe [1]	11,225	22,687	25,224	27,131	28,654	29,500	+3.0	5.2	6.6	6.6	6.4	6.4	6.4
Japan	6,988	28,268	31,501	39,799	41,161	47,769	+16.1	3.3	8.2	8.3	9.3	9.2	10.4
Other	14,602	35,391	43,474	47,237	49,266	50,770	+3.1	6.9	10.3	11.5	11.1	11.0	11.0
World	213,750	343,500	378,000	426,700	446,000	459,500	+3.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] East Germany, Bulgaria, Poland, Rumania, Czechoslovakia, and Hungary.

Source: European Coal and Steel Community, Yearbook 1966, table 26.

PRICE DROPS AFFECT PROFITS AND MODERNIZATION

The tendency toward lower prices in the Community was caused by the excess of supply over demand. Instead of cutting it back, producers tried to maintain output at former levels in order to break even if possible. Thus in the Community there has been a deterioration of prices which finds its equal in no other major producing area. This internal trend is reinforced by world price trends. The price effect has endangered modernization programs which are needed now more than ever, risking a decline as compared to other producers. In comparison with European and British steel, U.S. steel has a healthy present and an excellent future.

CAUSE—DETERIORATION OF DEMAND IN EXTERNAL MARKETS

European steelmen tend to lay their capacity-production woes at the doorstep of competition from other countries in third markets. In 1964 total Community exports were 12.8 million tons, in 1965 17.1 million tons. But in the first 9 months of 1966 exports declined roughly 10 percent compared to the first 9 months of 1965. In the opinion of a recent visitor to my office, an official familiar with the European Coal and Steel Community, the greatest problem is the upsurge of Japanese steel exports, and increased production in countries in the developing world. This new output has closed some of Europe's traditional markets. The result was that Belgium and Luxembourg, hit the hardest, diverted millions of tons into Europe: according to the Economist of February 4, page 430, "the proportion of—Benelux—sales going to ECSC partners has risen from 25 percent in 1953 to 46 percent last year." This extra steel supply in Europe was enough to have serious price effects.

COAL—A THROTTLED AMERICAN EXPORT—A BURDEN ON EUROPEAN ECONOMIES

A key element in the troubled world of European steel is coking coal: its availability and cost. Essentially, even the most efficient European coal production is more costly than American coal delivered at steel plants in Europe. High-priced coal mined inefficiently has been a major economic problem since the war, and to deal with it European governments have attempted to phase out their own coal production and retrain miners. But domestic coal markets must be protected in order to sell even their most efficiently produced coal. Otherwise cheap U.S. coal would likely dominate European markets.

Thus Great Britain and all the countries of the Community except Italy and Luxembourg maintain quota and other barriers against U.S. coal. France has state trading through a state agency called ATIC, Belgium and the Netherlands has licensing restrictions, Germany has a tariff quota of 20 marks per ton on quantities imported after 6 million metric tons, and a unique provision that, south of the central Mittelland Canal, no imported coal at all can be sold. The hooker is that the great German coal-consuming industrial complex lies below the Mittelland Canal. Thus the vast bulk of German coal consumption is entirely arrogated to inefficient German mines, Dr. Fritz Berg, president of the Bundesverband der Deutschen Industries, said in a speech at the National Press Club in Washington last year that Germany would not abandon its coal production because the historic strength of German industry rested on a united coal and steel complex. The result of the German Mittelland restriction is that we sell nothing but boiler fuel to West Germany in the amount—in 1965—of only 5 million metric tons.

In the United Kingdom there exists an absolute embargo on imported coal. But in Italy, which in the last several years has developed a highly efficient steel industry located along the coast, there are no restrictions. Having no domestic coal production, the Italians are happy to buy as much cheap American coal as they need. As a result of their waterfront locations, new plant, and access to cheaper coking coal, Italian steel production has, it is reported, become the most efficient in Europe.

HIGH COST COAL MEANS LOWER DEMAND

In spite of protection from imports, the high cost of European-mined coal has resulted in a drop in demand partly caused by a shift to petroleum. Therefore, in spite of tight production controls, stocks have increased in 1966 and early 1967 to about 50 million tons, or about a quarter of the Community's annual production. At this rate, it would seem that 1967 will be a year of shakedown even for highly protected French coal production.

WHAT SOLUTION FOR OLD AGE OF EUROPEAN COAL?

In coal the role of the ECSC is even weaker than in the area of steel. Its job has been likened to that of a geriatric nurse—it does little more than funnel cash into an aged industry to help pay the cost of retraining and resettling miners. The solutions here will be national solutions, but the national solutions do not appear to be, in economic terms, the correct ones. The Six have created a $22 million subsidy fund for coal that will be contributed to by each member of the Six, but the primary beneficiary of which will be German coal.

STEEL PRODUCTION SHARING—AN ABORTIVE COMMUNITY SOLUTION?

Addressing itself to problems of steel production, the high authority of the Community has proposed a system whereby production goals would be accepted by all producers. Thus in December the ECSC published as a guide to industry its steel production forecasts broken down by products for the first quarter of 1967. The high authority's thesis is that overcapacity is not so serious that firms cannot break even, but that present price levels make it more difficult to do so and still carry high amortization costs of newly installed plant and costs of continuing modernization. The high authority therefore argues that only slight curtailment in production will be adequate to raise prices and restore "order" in the market. Thus the high authority estimates that output should be 1.25 million tons lower than during the first quarter of 1966. According to the Economist of December 17, 1966, page 1275:

> The forecast is really an expression of a forlorn hope that the producers themselves will limit their output. Looking further ahead, to the end of next year, the High Authority "forecasts" that total steel production in the community will be down 1 million tons to 84.3 million tons in 1967, assuming a fall in exports of 1.5 million tons, and a run-down in stocks of 700,000 tons. This implies that the European steel industry will be working next year at under 75% capacity, its lowest level ever, with the German producers operating little above 70%.

The alternative to such self-discipline is a scheme of production quotas, but even this course of action is considered doubtful, because it would have to favor the more efficient producers, especially new capacity in Italy. It would therefore not be acceptable to less efficient Belgium and could not therefore be agreed upon by the Six.

The issue remains undecided. The problem is that the High Authority has too little influence and no power. In the meanwhile, the French have been insisting on some type of intracommunity controls to protect their still good domestic markets from "cutthroat" competition from Germany and Belgium. Accession to the French demand, it is said, might mean a final crippling blow to the Coal and Steel Community.

EUROPEAN PRIVATE INDUSTRY RESPONDS IN TRADITIONAL WAY

While the Coal and Steel Community itself cannot seem to mobilize to take effective steps to ease the crisis, the private industry has attempted some solutions along what appear to be rather traditional lines.

The following passage from the February 4 Economist cited above summarizes this activity instructively:

> Cartels are the steelman's traditional answer to a competitive situation that he does not like. The trouble is that in bad times they only work for special products, where it is relatively easy to control the market. Rails have been and still are the subject of discrete conferences in big hotels in London, Paris and Dusseldorf since before the first world war. Building a railway is usually a big deal, so the matter is relatively simple to police by the Paris Club, as the cartel is called.
>
> Anyway, since they might be liable for claims from relatives of rail crash victims if bad rails got sold, the railmakers wanted to maintain direct contact with the users. Safety standards have offered possibilities for cartel action in other kinds of steel: ship's plates, for instance, where shipbuilders normally insist that their plate should be delivered with a certificate of quality from Lloyds or Norsk Veritas or some other certifying agency. The tube cartel organized by the Americans, sanctioned by the American Petroleum Institute stamp of quality, has also been fairly effective.
>
> More unlikely arrangements have survived: for galvanized sheeting, for example, where former French colonial possessions in West Africa are still quoted 4 or 5 pounds sterling more than their ex-British neighbours down the coast. Recently the Japanese have knocked holes in a lot of these arrangements—which is a contributory factor in the present crisis. But the big mass of unspecialized products—heavy plates and sections, reinforcing rods—have always been hard or impossible to control in bad times. The British industry's domestic price arrangements have lasted better than the Continentals although the Heavy Steels restrictive practices court decision in 1964 made them illegal, tacit understanding survived until recently.

SOME NATIONAL RESPONSES

In the absence of effective Community action, in the context of the failure of cartels to "stabilize" markets, national governments have taken certain measures to deal with the present steel disruption. Most notable of these is the system of German sales agencies.

The Germans proposed over a year ago a method of selling steel products called a "carousel." Under this system a central agency would portion out orders to industries with the capacity ready to produce them. But the system never got off the ground. Then last August the Germans announced the creation of four selling agencies. Individual companies can now no longer deal directly with customers. Instead, they receive orders through the selling agency to which they belong. If the system works, its effect will be to rationalize production. Heretofore, because of the modest size of most steel firms, it was not possible to manufacture a single item continuously. Production had to be opened and closed as orders were placed and completed. The sales office will attempt to keep single plants busy manufacturing a few products all the time, thus cutting costs.

In France, National Government action has taken the form of highly subsidized loans to steel companies to allow them to continue with modernization in time of low profits.

WHAT GOOD COULD A WORLD STEEL CONFERENCE DO?

In their desperation to find some way to do something about their problem, the British and the Community have suggested a World Steel Conference. I am not aware of any endorsement of the plan by the U.S. steel industry. The key to a successful conference would of course be Japan, without whom it would be futile.

As explained to me by European steel experts, the World Steel Conference would be for the purpose of setting fair rules of competition in world steel trade. There is a cautious allegation made in such discussions that the Japanese may be using unfair selling practices.

Americans with whom I have spoken have indicated suspicion of a world conference. In the absence of any proof that the Japanese are competing unfairly, what would be the goal of such a conference? The implication from my discussions is clear that European industry would like some sort of meaningful voluntary controls on Japanese steel exports. A world steel conference to examine the conditions of world production and trade and to set rules of competitive practice would seem useful. If it were entered strictly in this light, it might be very useful indeed, as a step toward "harmonization" not only of tariffs but of regulations prohibiting all kinds of restrictive business practices. But if the world conference were called with the subjective motive of simply twisting the arms of third country suppliers including the Japanese, then the U.S. Government should not assist at such a conference.

IRON AND STEEL NEGOTIATIONS IN THE KENNEDY ROUND

The steel sector negotiations opened in earnest last May 4 in Geneva and have been thwarted most of the time since on several key problems that emerged at the outset. These problems are: unification of the steel tariff rates of the members of the European Coal and Steel Community; tariff reduction and perhaps "harmonization" of the tariffs of all the major steel trading countries; the problem of the 1958 British-ECSC bilateral tariff deal and the nationalization of the British steel industry.

The participants in these negotiations are Austria, Sweden, Japan, the six EEC members, the United Kingdom and United States. Austria, Sweden, and Japan are particularly interested in obtaining tariff cuts. As I explained above, the U.S. interest if it cannot obtain reciprocity in the steel mill products sector itself is to obtain at minimum other important advantages.

In my report to Congress on the Kennedy round in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 112, part 10, pages 11859–11860, I explained in detail some of the mechanical problems of the negotiations, including the problem of how the ECSC and the EEC negotiate on steel tariffs. Because ECSC and the EEC have jurisdiction over different steel tariff items, both ECSC and EEC are represented in steel negotiations.

Therefore, a primary objective of the ECSC in the Kennedy round negotiations is to unify its own tariff rates to achieve a CXT and to achieve the longstanding objective of a common external tariff. Thus the ECSC as an organization has a distinct interest in concluding negotiations. But the steel negotiations have been complicated by a tactical maneuver on the part of the ECSC which from the outset has created difficulties and has modified the possibility of obtaining linear 50-percent cuts.

The ECSC-EEC strategy was to choose as the base from which to bargain an average level of tariff rates of about 14 percent and to offer a 50-percent cut in this rate, which would result in a rate of about 7 percent. The 14-percent rate was the legal rate in January 1964 but the effective rate was 7 percent. In February 1964, however, the ECSC unilaterally and "temporarily" increased the effective rate from 7 to 9 percent, where it remains. The United States and others, especially Japan, have insisted that the January 1964 average effective rate of 7 percent be the base for the 50-percent cut. The trade negotiations had, of course, been well underway at that time. Our position was that the offer particularly of the ECSC would have to be improved, though the offers of the EEC were on the whole acceptable.

ECSC recently offered to cut its effective rates to an average level appreciably below 7 percent. This is far from a 50-percent cut but, given the history of the ECSC bargaining position, has meaning. It would mean a definitive binding of an effective set of rates. At the same time the offer is made in such a way as to unify the rates of ECSC members. It also would be the basis for the harmonization of other nations' rates around the same level.

RELUCTANT ALBION

The position of the United Kingdom throughout the steel sector negotiations has been somewhat ambivalent. On the whole one of the most aggressive and forthcoming of the Kennedy round participants, the British position in the steel sector talks has been strongly influenced by two factors, the long anticipation and then the fact of nationalization of its steel industry, and the problems remaining from the 1958 United Kingdom-ECSC bilateral tariff reduction, described above.

Part of the United Kingdom-ECSC agreement was that rates would not be raised without consultation. Britain claims ECSC did not consult it before raising its effective rate to 9 percent in February 1964. Thus Britain claims that it cannot in conscience pay again for a tariff cut that it already paid for. In response, the ECSC says this increase from 7 to 9 percent was no worse than the British 15 percent balance-of-payments tariff surcharge of 1964. The British position was also weakened somewhat because its effective average rate is about 15 percent, and that in 1964 and 1965 it exported a fair amount of steel to the Six.

There is now some indication that Britain may be willing to recognize that the new ECSC offer has trade meaning and that it will make an offer.

It is considered by many that the British position is dictated by the present state of disorganization of its steel industry, now only in the first stages of reorientation of management and policy under national ownership. From one point of view it would seem that the nationization of British steel would be an ideal opportunity to open that industry to the forces of greater competition by lowering tariffs. On the other hand, that there is hesitation to add another element of uncertainty and change in the present situation is also understandable.

SOME ELEMENTS OF NEGOTIATING STRATEGY

To break the deadlock that became apparent in May 1966, U.S. negotiators proposed a "targeting" approach. Targeting was a way of pursuing negotiations pragmatically outside a linear negotiating plan. Targeting seemed to be a good approach. It allowed the ECSC to pursue its goal to unify its members' tariff rates into a common external tariff, and it would also permit international harmonization of rates. For the United States, harmonization of rates in the unique condition of steel sector has a certain appeal. U.S. steel rates vary widely, containing extreme highs and lows, but averaging about 10 percent. It could therefore be in our interest to agree to cut some of our higher rates to bring them more into line with an average tariff level, rather than to stick to an approach of cutting tariffs across the board by a certain fixed percentage.

CONCLUSION

Sector negotiations have been the forum for extensive exploration of the economics of certain key industries for the first time in trade negotiations. The economics of the world steel industry are among the most complex of any sector, and the negotiations have reflected these complexities. In retrospect, we can conclude that the sector approach to steel negotiations was productive.

The steel sector negotiations in the Kennedy round have been a useful means of dealing with the economics of the world steel industry in its present stage of development. Some observers look forward to a time when conditions of world steel production will be the same. But the next several years will be a time of great innovation and change, in which competitive abilities will change significantly as a result of constant innovation in steelmaking technology and in methods of distributing, servicing, financing the sale of steel and managing steelmaking enterprises.

The format of future trade negotiations will be shaped to deal with future economic conditions. They will probably not concern themselves so much with tariffs but with other rules of competition and they will therefore be directed to putting more into focus problems of fairness in international competition. Such negotiations will be based on the present rules in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and will develop the role of GATT in applying such rules. And GATT will continue to be the best forum for such future trade talks.

NEXT SECTIONS OF REPORT

This discussion of steel concludes the third section of the five-part report on the Kennedy round. The other sections will deal with the remainder of the industry sectors—textiles, chemicals, aluminum, and pulp and paper—and with antidumping and certain patent problems.

NATIONAL ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL—A MUST FOR THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HAGAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill providing for a nationwide program to combat this country's fourth largest health hazard and one of our greatest social problems, chronic alcoholism.

On February 27, I introduced similar proposed legislation restricted solely to the problems of alcoholism care and control in the District of Columbia. The bill is now pending before the House District of Columbia Committee.

The District of Columbia bill will, hopefully, serve as a pilot project for the rest of the country. What is desperately needed, however, is a national attack on the problems of chronic alcoholism—a program to assist our communities in developing their own programs to control alcoholism and to care for its 5 to 6 million victims across the Nation.

The proposed legislation I will introduce provides for this long-overdue recognition of the problem of chronic alcoholism in our Nation through a positive, workable program.

Because of judicial decisions declaring alcoholism to be a disease, not a crime, it will not be long before hundreds of American communities will find it necessary to change their methods for dealing with the chronic alcoholic. It is not difficult to foresee the extent of the nationwide crisis this will trigger in our communities and the chaos in already overcrowded public health facilities and courts, unless Congress enacts legislation to meet this fast-developing situation.

Of course, the problem of the chronic alcoholic is an old one—one which should have been acted upon much earlier. And the United States actually has lagged behind other nations of the world in coming to grips with this challenge. But the recent court decisions and prospective ones, the concern of health officials, two Presidential commissions and various law-enforcement and legal agencies—all have given new impetus and urgency to the need for action against chronic alcoholism.

This need was recognized by President Johnson in his crime message to Congress. Pointing out that one-third of all arrests in the country are for drunkenness, the President added:

> Two million arrests for drunkenness burden the police, clog the lower courts, and crowd the places of detention. If, instead of treating drunkenness as an ordinary crime, local authorities chose to create a civil detoxification program, the consequences of that choice would be felt throughout the law enforcement and corrections system.

Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary John W. Gardner has said that the large number of Americans who are alcoholics do not carry their burden alone. He added, it "directly, often tragically, affects between 16 and 20 million members of their families."

This Congress and the Nation, therefore, face a decision. As the richest and most advanced nation in the world, the United States has all but met and mastered the challenge of diseases that only short years ago reaped a tragic toll in human life and health. Our society has advanced to such a high mechanized and technological plane that today we reach for the moon.

Yet, we have ignored the plight of almost millions of Americans who suffer the tragedy, hopelessness, and despair of chronic alcoholism. The legislation which I have introduced today will give national recognition to the seriousness of the alcoholism program in this Nation. It would establish comprehensive pilot programs for States and communities in alcoholism prevention, care, and control. Additionally, one of the important provisions in this legislation is a program of rehabilitation for victims of this disease so that they may return to useful roles in our society.

The problem, although an old one, is urgent. In answer to this national need for action on alcoholism, it is my hope that my colleagues will join me in sponsoring this legislation and that early hearings can be scheduled on this legislation so vital to the health and progress of this Nation.

When I was in the Georgia State Senate, a measure which I introduced passed unanimously in both the house and senate and led to the formation of the Georgia Commission on Alcoholism.

Since that time I have been invited to speak throughout the Nation to describe the Georgia commission and its work.

I began introducing national alcoholism legislation in the 87th Congress and have continued to introduce improved measures in succeeding Congresses.

As I have worked on this problem over the years, I have talked with many organizations and experts in the field of alcoholism and believe that the national bill which I will introduce very shortly is a comprehensive and workable one.

Aside from the humanitarian reasons and the fact that alcoholism is the fourth major health problem in this country, the recent Supreme Court decision of Easter against the District of Columbia, requiring that the chronic alcoholic be transferred from the jurisdiction of our criminal courts and jails to the administration of public health authorities, makes it absolutely and urgently necessary that legislation be enacted as soon as possible to deal with the cause, prevention, treatment, and cure of alcoholism.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the Representative of the State of Georgia, Mr. HAGAN. For the second time in this session, he has brought the attention of the House to the massive problem of chronic alcoholism in America today. I agree completely with his remarks and enthusiastically support his legislative plan to combat the mounting toll of chronic alcoholism in today's society.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POOL). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

THE DAIRY FARMER AND FOREIGN IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the American dairy farmer is a businessman. He is a vital link in the chain of success which this Nation has experienced. Yet the policies of the Department of Agriculture, the Tariff Commission, and the Johnson administration have seriously jeopardized his ability to earn a fair living and feed this and many other nations of the world.

Although today I am specifically concerned with the dairy farmer, the glaring facts show that farming in general has been on the decline as a major segment of the population.

The farm parity ratio continues to fall and now stands at 74, the lowest figure since 1934.

Total farm debt is up 10 percent, or an average of $1,200 per farm, in the last year, but the farmers' income went down. During the year, March 1965 to March 1966, nonagricultural, personal income increased 8 percent, but the personal income of the man we depend on for food and fiber, the farmer, dropped 16 percent—a net loss of 24 percent.

In 1966, 122,000 farms went out of business. In 1967 the USDA predicts that 82,000 more farms will be forced out of business, and today the farmer accounts for only 5.9 percent of the population of the United States.

Since a great many of the farmers in the area comprising the 17th District are in the dairy farming business, and since there are also many cheese processors, I am especially interested in the attempts to tighten up existing dairy import laws. In the interests of these farmers, and others throughout the Nation, I have joined with many other Members of Congress in introducing legislation called the Dairy Import Act of 1967. The reason for this legislation is simple, the present laws have not worked.

Here are a few facts indicating the situation of imports and the farmer:

First. In 1966, imports of milk equivalent increased by 300 percent over the preceding year, 900 million pounds to 2.7 billion pounds.

Second. Dairy imports increased 75 percent in the years from 1953 to 1965, but in 1966 they skyrocketed to 433 percent.

Third. Loopholes in the quota laws are allowing the United States to import 12 times as much milk equivalent as is allowed under the present quotas.

Fourth. Prices paid to farmers for milk and butterfat last reached the parity level in 1952. Since that time they have been considerably below parity and in the last 5 years they have barely been above 75 percent of parity.

Fifth. Estimates for 1967 show a possible import total of 4 billion pounds of milk equivalent.

Sixth. National Milk Producers Federation reports that in the month, mid-December to mid-January, farm product prices, overall, declined 1 percent, while prices paid by farmers for goods used in production and family living went up 1 percent. They attributed the drop in milk prices to the increased imports in milk-butterfat-sugar mixtures coming into this country.

Dairy products is not the only area where the import figures are going up drastically. Here are some figures showing the import increases from 1965 to 1966: Beef, up 27 percent; foreign, fresh, chilled and frozen beef, goat meat, and sheep, up 34 percent; Pork, up 14 percent; lamb up 19 percent; and mutton, up more than 100 percent.

I have been saying for several years that the farmer is getting the short end of the stick—when he gets any of the stick at all. Last fall I pointed out that farmers in the 17th District were being "phased out" of farming because their farms were not of "adequate size," according to officials in Mr. Freeman's Department of Agriculture. Unless farms are of adequate size, USDA says, that is, unless they have more than $10,000 in sales each year, they do not fit in with the Department's policies.

On several other occasions I have shown that problems exist and I have tried to help remedy them. Frequently, I have pointed out that these problems are caused by the ridiculous policies of the USDA and compounded by bungling attempts to cover over mistakes with more mistakes.

The farmers know the problems; mention beef and other meats, cheddar cheese, dairy products in general, eggs and grains, and many farmers can cite cases where administration policies have forced the farmers' backs to the wall.

Mr. Russel Hoar, a resident of Licking County, nationally known dairy farmer, and a director of the American Jersey Cattle Club, brought to my attention a resolution recently passed by the AJCC. It states, in part:

> It is a matter of common knowledge that the national milk production was, for about 15 years, in excess supply. It is likewise a matter of common knowledge that domestic supplies have been brought into balance with demand in the past twenty-four months. This was accomplished in large part by a substantial portion of the dairy farm families of the nation being forced out of dairy production by static milk prices in face of continually rising cost in the operation of their business.

After stating that the dairy farmer cannot get a fair and equitable return unless import laws are changed, the resolution concludes:

> We therefore make special plea that the appropriate authorities take immediate and proper action to prevent any further evasion of the intent of present laws and regulations that establish quotas for importation of dairy products into the United States.

It is interesting to note how the milk supply and demand have been brought into line. I mentioned before that USDA policies were geared to "phase out" the farmer with less than $10,000 in sales. Keeping these figures in mind, let us look at the dairy farmer. In 1945 there were 27,770,000 cows and heifers, 2 years old and over, that were kept for milk. In 1966, the number was 16,607,000, a reduction of more than one third. Keep in mind that while the number of milk cows decreased one-third, the size of the average herd increased. Automation, low prices, and low returns have forced dairymen to milk more cows to boost their gross income and thus maintain their net income. These figures would also indicate that the number of farmers who are no longer farming is greater than the one-third reduction in cows would indicate since the size of the average herd has increased.

Members of the Farm Bureau visiting Washington during the first weeks of March were also concerned about dairy imports. Blake Gerber, of New Concord, a regional supervisor of the Ohio Farm Bureau, explained the methods used to get milk products into the United States through the holes in present import laws. He said:

> First of all, I guess we are all amazed at the inventive minds of the foreign countries who want to import, or export, their own products to the United States . . . Over the years, certain restrictions have been placed on the amount of butterfat and so forth. At one point they had restrictions on importation of butter and then we found that they developed a product that they called butter oil and there are no restrictions on this new product so they brought it in. The next restriction set up, I believe, was that nothing over 45 per cent butter fat could be imported. We then found that they were importing a product containing 44 per cent butterfat and 25 per cent sugar and some filler. . . . They put some restrictions on the sugar, so they (importers) lowered that and added some eggs. So that what we're getting into this country now in the form of an import as a dairy product, is a product, as I understand, which contains eggs, butterfat, maybe some dry milk solids and sugar. It makes a nice cream mix, and I think they call it Junex. This is what we're faced with, we just can't seem to beat them because they are always beating us at our own game.

Now that there is this reasonable balance between supply and demand on the dairy market, the balance mentioned earlier, the farmer is being undercut by imported products. The American dairy farmer is the most efficient and productive in the world. His is not a haphazard business and he is subject to the same pressures on increasing wages, automation, modernized equipment, new production techniques, and other factors, facing any businessman. But foreign imports, many of them heavily subsidized by their governments, are driving our dairymen out of business with tactics such as those outlined by Mr. Gerber.

Now that we have passed the years when the Federal Government had to spend hundreds of millions of dollars each year to subsidize the farmer, we should act rapidly to let the farmer live and prosper without the threats of losing his markets to imported products. In the area of dairy farming, the Dairy Import Act of 1967 is designed to do just that.

This bill would limit the imports of dairy products, on a yearly basis, to the average annual quantities admitted during the 5 years 1961 through 1965. The import limit would be flexible depending on imports during the authorized years.

The issue involved in gaining workable dairy imports is the issue of protecting a vital, broadly based, American industry. All the farmer asks is a fair break.

LAW DAY, U.S.A.

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today, for the 10th year, we pause to commemorate Law Day, U.S.A. Each year this is an occasion for us to pay respect to our splendid system of law and justice, and the protection it assures every citizen. The theme of Law Day this year is from a statement made many years ago by President Theodore Roosevelt:

> No man is above the law, and no man is below it.

This statement is as true as it was then, and in fact it is singularly appropriate today, as the Nation experiences a resurgence of efforts to improve our laws and judicial system in the search for complete equality, justice and safety for all citizens. A fine editorial on Law Day appeared in last week's Advocate, a weekly newspaper published by the Catholic Archdiocese of Newark, and I include it in the RECORD following my remarks:

A TRIBUTE TO LAW

Several years ago, the American Bar Association inaugurated the practice of dedicating one day a year as Law Day—law based on the Anglo-American tradition. It has become the custom to celebrate Law Day on May 1. On that day, bar associations, civic organizations, schools, political clubs and various groups will hold dinners, hear speeches, and attend rallies to talk about law—the state of our civil and criminal law.

Perhaps at no time in American legal history have the American people, stimulated by the mass media of communication been so interested in law. Perhaps at no time have the American people been so aware of current court decisions and opinions, which familiarity undoubtedly has been stimulated by the Supreme Court's widespread impact in the criminal, economic, moral, political and social areas.

Perhaps at no time have the American people been so brutally confronted with the challenge of crime in a free society, as prefaced in the recent Report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice: "There is much crime in America, more than ever is reported, far more than ever is solved, far too much for the health of the nation. Every American knows that."

Law Day is really a day for individual appraisal, personal recognition and appreciation of law as administered in a democracy. The average American knows law and order are essential for an efficient political society. He expects law to conform to reason. He maintains the purpose of law is the common good. He wants respect for law. He abhors lawlessness. He wants security of his legal rights, person and property. He demands better enforcement of criminal laws, mindful of the presidential commission's assessment that "The existence of crime, the talk of crime, the reports of crime, and the fear of crime have eroded the basic quality of life of many Americans."

He desires proper administration of justice, without fear or favor as to race, creed or color, for despite popular opinion, statistics show most assaults and violent crimes are committed by and against persons of the same race. He knows law is the bulwark which ensures and secures his daily freedom and liberty. He is thankful to his country for a legal system which protects his rights as an individual, and respects his dignity as a person.

He is grateful for another Law Day.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LV

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most frequent arguments made against a volunteer army is that it is inflexible, that is to say, in times of crisis, a volunteer force would not be able to produce the necessary numbers of additional combat troops needed to cope with an emergency, particularly if it were an unexpected one.

A pre-Vietnam strength of 2.7 million men should be more than sufficient to maintain America's internal defenses and its overseas commitments during peacetime conditions. We have been assured time and time again by Secretary McNamara that our retaliatory force is great enough to deter any potential aggressor. With regard to limited aggression in other parts of the world, we should rely more heavily upon the military forces of our regional allies than we have in the past, as well as, of course, our superior military technology.

The role of the Reserves in a voluntary program would be a vital one. Instead of the present composition of a large, but partially trained body of men, a situation which I might add, forced Secretary McNamara to reduce draft calls for the early months of 1967 to free training facilities for some of the reservists who had not seen the inside of a barracks, a somewhat smaller but highly developed and sophisticated military body could be forged and could prove to be a valuable complement to the Regular Armed Forces. Through the incentive of greater pay and a program of teaching and developing various occupational skills, voluntary enlistment in a revitalized Reserve could be spurred.

Mr. Speaker, whenever America has been threatened by a foreign power, the patriotism of our young male citizens has been exhibited by a sharp rise in volunteer enlistments into our Armed Forces. This has been true throughout our history and will continue to be so. Yet, in times of war it has been necessary to resort to a draft and I do feel that an adequate draft mechanism should be maintained to go into effect when Congress approves of its need.

UNITED STATES LAGS IN DAY CARE

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today a bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act, so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services.

This legislation was originally introduced in the 90th Congress by my colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURKE], carrying on the work of the late and esteemed John Fogarty.

This legislation provides matching funds to put Federal support of child welfare programs on the same basis as its share of other State welfare programs. Until we end the present discrimination against child welfare services, States will tend to allot their extra funds to other welfare programs yielding a higher rate of Federal return.

The need is vital—for without a significant Federal contribution for child welfare services—including day care, homemaker services and foster care—and for overcoming the present shortage of trained child welfare workers, our child care programs will continue to be weak and inadequate. For day care alone, an estimated 2.7 million children could use facilities similar to those now available for less than 400,000.

Recent testimony on social security revisions before the House Ways and Means Committee was strongly in favor of this bill. Public and private welfare agencies and religious groups in my own State of Maryland have also endorsed this legislation. The Welfare Board of Baltimore County, for example, would make excellent use of increased funds for foster care. Every year, there is an ever-greater number of children in foster care programs; the number is now over 500. But despite the board's efforts, it faces a situation which has its counterpart throughout the country. Many children are in unsuitable foster homes because State and local child welfare funds are not sufficient to pay realistic board rates to foster parents. Increased funds would not only improve foster homes, according to the welfare board, but would also enable more parents to care for their children in their own homes.

Maryland now receives only $774,261 in Federal child welfare funds through title V. The Director of Maryland State's Department of Public Welfare estimates that under the Federal matching system provided by this bill, Maryland would receive approximately $8 million in the first year, and increased amounts in future years.

Support of legislation to improve child welfare services has also come from such groups as the Maryland Council of Churches, the Jewish Family and Children's Service, the Board of Child Care of the Baltimore Annual Conference of the Methodist Church, and the Maryland Conference of Social Welfare.

Increasing the funds available for day care would also improve the effectiveness of another high-priority program—retraining the unemployed so that they might transfer from welfare rolls to payroll lists. Of the total number of persons on welfare, 900,000 are mothers and 3.5 million are children. One of the most striking statistics in a Labor Department report on a job training program for welfare recipients is that women make up nearly half of those being trained. Almost 84 percent of these women are heads of families, and about half of these have at least three dependents. If we want to reduce welfare funds and contribute to the self-sufficiency and dignity of those now on welfare, the United States must make adequate provision—as so many other countries now do—for the care of children while their mothers are working.

I would like to include, as part of my statement, two recent newspaper articles which provide added support for child welfare legislation. The first, from the Washington Post, describes the vastly better day care services provided by Israel and Sweden, and points up the deplorably large-scale child neglect in the United States.

The second article, from the New York Times, describes a report presented to the recent biennial convention of the National Council of Jewish Women. This report underlines the necessity of day care services for working mothers, with special attention to women living in poverty.

Mr. Speaker, in his message to Congress on the welfare of children, President Johnson acknowledged that the social ills of our adult population have their origin in unhealthy childhood development:

> In education, in health, in all of human development, the early years are the critical years. Ignorance, ill health, personality disorder—these are disabilities often contracted in childhood: afflictions which linger to cripple the man and damage the next generation.

This Congress is considering priority legislation to fight crime, improve education, and attack disease. But if improved child welfare services are not made a part of our priority attack on social problems, efforts in these other areas will be incomplete.

I am glad to join my colleagues who have also cosponsored this legislation in urging prompt enactment of this long-overdue program to provide adequate Federal support for child welfare.

The articles follow:

UNITED STATES LAGS IN PROVIDING DAY CARE

(By Carolyn Lewis)

Monday is Child Day Care Day in the Nation's Capital.

It will be a day to take stock of the available facilities for children of working mothers, and to weigh the centers now in existence against the overwhelming demand for more.

Throughout the United States, for example, about one million young children are left unsupervised while their mothers go out to work. Some 38,000 of them are under the age of six.

Of the other 11 million American children under 12 whose mothers are working, a high percentage are supervised by indifferent relatives and neighbors, often hushed-up by a bag of popcorn and a TV set. Some of them go to work with their mothers, while others are looked after by an elder brother or sister who is often a mere child himself.

In the entire United States, there is space for only 400,000 children in licensed day care premises, and all of these spaces are filled.

Day care means more than baby-sitting to the professionals who are involved in it. Day care means creative play, music, art, games, and emphasis on social and mental growth, a high quality preparation for school life.

One fact stands out in the stock-taking: the United States is faced with a critical and tragic shortage of day care facilities.

Why is it that countries like Sweden and Israel provide vastly better day care for children of working mothers than does the United States?

Mrs. Avraham Harman, wife of the Israeli Ambassador, believes it is more a matter of philosophy than finance.

"Ours is a child-oriented government in a community which gives its highest priority to the needs of the child," she said in an interview.

In Israel, where, in 1965, 25.5 per cent of the married women were employed in the civilian labor force, and 25.1 percent of married women working were mothers, there are today sufficient day care centers for all children needing them.

After-school clubs for school children whose mothers have not yet returned home from work, assure that children will be supervised until there is a parent available to take over the responsibility.

Mrs. Harman, whose own children—David, 23, Naomi, 20, and Ilana, 18—all attended kindergarten from the age of 2, said that so popular are the day care centers that even mothers who are not working tend to send their children there.

The Israeli Government realized early that the centers could be used as a means to assimilate different ethnic groups who were migrating to Israel, and to upgrade those from less-advanced cultures.

Israel also has a child allowance which is built into the wage structure. Employe wages increase in proportion to the number of children the employe has.

In Sweden, which has one of the most advanced social welfare systems in the world, the day care picture is not so bright as it is in Israel—but it is still miles ahead of the American achievement.

Mrs. Hubert de Besche, wife of the Swedish Ambassador, and mother of two grown daughters, explained why:

"The first necessity is that the government be interested—and ours is interested," she said.

In 1964, Swedish kindergartens accommodated between 46–48,000 children, that is 20 per cent of all children between 5 and 6 years of age. Day nurseries for children from six months to 7 years (when public schooling begins) took in 11,000 children. The Swedish government is planning to double the number of places by 1970.

Mrs. de Besche said there is still a shortage of day care places in Sweden, where women are urgently encouraged to work because of a scarcity of labor.

"The government is dedicated to tackling the problem, but it will take time," she said.

One of the real innovations in the field is being provided by private industry. A number of large companies have established their own day nurseries on the premises, so that working mothers can bring their children with them when they go to their place of employment.

PROTECTION URGED FOR NEEDY WOMEN—JEWISH UNIT TOLD 14 MILLION ARE OPEN TO EXPLOITATION

(By Irving Spiegel)

ATLANTA, April 10.—A vivid picture of the plight of 14 million American women living in poverty was presented here today in a special report to the National Council of Jewish Women.

Miss Hannah Stein, the organization's executive director, declared that "thousands of working mothers are faced with the desperate choice of leaving their children inadequately cared for while they work, or going on welfare so that they can stay at home with them."

The report, presented to 1,000 delegates attending the council's biennial convention at the Marriott Hotel, was the result of an education-for-action program, called "Women on the Move," conducted in 48 cities in cooperation with many local groups.

Miss Stein, who directed the preparation of the report, said that the women living in poverty needed economic safeguards as well as further social services.

"The most pressing needs found everywhere," Miss Stein said, "were for minimum wage protection for working women, day care centers for working mothers, consumer education and protection from exploitive 'merchants of debt' and reform of welfare regulations that discourage mothers from working."

The report said that Negro women were the "hardest hit of all," adding that "56 percent of all employed Negro women were found in the worst paid, least protected service occupations."

"These are the same women, it was frequently reported, who are forced to be the main support of their families because of the discrimination in jobs against their husbands," the report said.

In citing the need for low-cost day care centers, the report called it "doubly ironic" that the "meager allotments" for mothers under the aid for dependent children program were cut if they sought "to raise their standard of living by working."

The council found that "most women's work is the most menial and the poorest paid." For instance, the report said, survey teams in the poor neighborhoods of Minneapolis found that most jobs open to poor and unskilled women were in intrastate service categories not covered by Federal minimum wage or equal pay laws.

"Discrimination against poor women follows them right into the market place," the report said. "Stores in poor neighborhoods frequently sold poorer merchandise at higher prices—an average of 10 per cent higher than in middle class neighborhoods, reported an official at one forum."

Furthermore, the report said, "few poor families can get credit at banks and department stores—so that many are forced to turn to loan sharks who may charge up to 20 per cent interest on the unpaid balance of a loan."

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF INVESTMENT COMPANY ACT OF 1940 TO PROVIDE SAFEGUARDS FOR MUTUAL FUND SHAREHOLDERS

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 in order to provide additional safeguards for mutual fund shareholders. This legislation is proposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission in order to carry out the recommendations in that Commission's report on the public policy implications of investment company growth which was transmitted to the Congress on December 2, 1966, and printed as a report of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The proposed legislation is the outgrowth of studies going back as far as 1958 and made primarily pursuant to the farsighted congressional direction contained in section 14(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 authorizing the Commission, if it finds that any substantial further increase in the size of investment companies creates any problem involving the protection of investors or the public interest, to make a study and investigation and to report the results to the Congress.

The first of these studies was by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania and was submitted to Congress in August of 1962. It found that the more important current problems created by growth in the mutual fund industry involved the potential conflicts of interest between fund management and fund shareholders and secondly, the impact of the growth of funds and their stock purchases on the securities markets. Next came the report of the staff of the Commission's special study of securities markets. That study was made pursuant to a House resolution sponsored by the subcommittee of which I am now the chairman, the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Insofar as mutual funds are concerned, the special study examined problems associated with the selling of fund shares, including sales practices and the special problems created by the so-called front-end load on plans for the accumulation of mutual fund shares through monthly payments.

Both of these studies were made for the Commission, not by the Commission. Following their publication and at the suggestion of our committee, the Commission itself commenced an extensive study, including an evaluation of the public policy questions raised by the prior studies. As Chairman STAGGERS pointed out when the Commission's study was released, a report of this nature by an agency charged by Congress with the responsibility for the supervision and regulation of the investment company industry is of the greatest significance to that industry and to the public.

One striking and undeniable fact which emerges from all these studies is the tremendous growth and resulting change in the investment company industry since 1940 when the Investment Company Act was passed, and the corresponding increase in the significance of that industry to the American people and to the economy. During the period from 1940 to June 30, 1966, the assets of investment companies increased from about $2.1 billion to $46.4 billion. The mutual funds accounted for most of this growth. Their net assets increased from $450 million in 1940 to about $38.2 billion at June 30, 1966. Presently more than 3½ million Americans own mutual fund shares as compared with less than 300,000 in 1940. It would seem clear that growth and change of this magnitude makes it necessary that Congress undertake a careful review of the Investment Company Act, which has not been significantly amended since it was passed 27 years ago. The studies of the Commission together with the legislative proposals which have been submitted by the Commission as a result of such studies provide a firm foundation for such a review.

We plan early hearings on this legislation at which all segments of the investment company industry and all other interested persons will have an opportunity to express their views and to have them considered. While I understand that the Commission has also received and considered the views of many persons in formulating the legislative proposals now before us, I am sure that the hearings before our committee will further illuminate the matter. Without attempting to predict the precise form which the legislation will ultimately take, it seems reasonably clear, as the Commission's report points out, that the tremendous growth of the industry since 1940 has created certain situations in which there may be a need for additional protection for shareholders. At the same time, the very fact of this growth is convincing evidence that mutual funds provide a valuable medium by which small investors may obtain the benefits of diversification and professional management, and, as the Commission has pointed out in its report, on the whole the investment company industry reflects diligent management by competent persons and the general record of the industry is one of which it can be justly proud.

Against this background, I am convinced that the Congress will develop legislation which will not only better serve the needs of the millions of Americans who have invested billions of dollars of their savings in investment company shares but will assist the industry to continue its growth and prosperity on a sound basis. Certainly this has been the result of the pioneering investment company legislation adopted by Congress in 1940 and in this instance, I think history will repeat itself.

POLICY MEMORANDUM ON "FREEDOM OF INFORMATION"

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I direct to the attention of my colleagues an important policy memorandum relating to freedom of information, issued by Secretary of Defense McNamara today.

In addition to reaffirming the public information policy of the Department of Defense, the memorandum specifically prohibits the calculated withholding of unfavorable news stories from Stars and Stripes and other troop publications, and it prohibits the censorship of news stories or broadcasts over Armed Forces radio and television stations. The Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, who has jurisdiction over these facilities, is specifically directed to take positive steps to assure a free flow of information to our troops.

The Subcommittee on Foreign Operations and Government Information, of which I am chairman, is currently investigating charges of military interference and censorship relating to the European edition of Stars and Stripes, examples of which were placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD recently by the gentleman from Illinois, Congressman RUMSFELD, a member of the subcommittee.

The Secretary is to be commended for taking this positive action to help deter the nonsensical military meddling with the free flow of information to the public and to the members of our Armed Forces. It is an action the subcommittee has been urging for some time. The subcommittee will continue its investigations and general surveillance of military information practices to assure that the Secretary's stated policy achieves its objective.

The memorandum follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, May 1, 1967.

Memorandum for Secretaries of the Military Departments, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, Assistant Secretaries of Defense, Assistants to the Secretary of Defense, Directors of the Defense Agencies.

Subject: Freedom of information.

I want to reaffirm that the public information policy of the Department of Defense demands maximum disclosure of information except for that which would be of material assistance to potential enemies. The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) must take all actions necessary to implement that policy, assuring that nothing inhibits the flow of unclassified information to the American public.

Members of our Armed Forces constitute an important segment of this public. They are entitled to the same unrestricted access to news as are all other citizens. Interference with this access to news will not be permitted. The calculated withholding of unfavorable news stories and wire service reports from troop information publications such as Stars and Stripes, or the censorship of news stories or broadcasts over such outlets as Armed Forces Radio and Television Service, is prohibited.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower) is directed to take all actions necessary to assure a free flow of information to our troops.

News management and meddling with the news will not be tolerated, either in external public information or internal troop information.

ROBERT S. MCNAMARA.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong opposition to an attempt being made in the Congress to water down this Nation's commitment to the education of deprived children.

I am speaking of the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative QUIE's proposed amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which has gained such wide support on the other side of the aisle.

The gentleman from Minnesota's amendment would essentially shift Federal aid away from special targets, such as aid to schools educating large numbers of deprived children, in favor of block grants to States.

Under the present law, at least 80 percent of Federal funds must go to the underprivileged. Mr. QUIE's amendment provides for only a 50-percent minimum of Federal funds to benefit disadvantaged children.

Mr. Speaker, one of the main purposes of the 1965 legislation pertaining to elementary and secondary schools was to focus attention upon this Nation's slum schools. Why should the further progress of these schools, which are in such dire need of our assistance, now be placed in jeopardy by legislation such as that proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]?

Though my own State of Rhode Island would receive approximately the same amount of funds under Mr. QUIE's amendment as it enjoys under the present legislation, such States as New York and Mississippi, with perhaps the largest number of educationally disadvantaged children enrolled in school, would suffer substantial reductions in Federal funds.

These so-called block grants to be made under the Quie amendment would place many large cities at the mercy of State officials who may or may not be sympathetic toward our underprivileged children.

While I recognize that the Quie amendment would substantially reduce the amount of redtape associated with the distribution of Federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I feel that it would undermine the original intent of the legislation and would place our private schools at a distinct disadvantage with respect to participation in Federal aid.

Our commitment to the education of underprivileged children is too great to allow such a compromise as that offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. I ask that my colleagues join me in opposing this dilution of our commitment.

POSTAL SERVICE STUDY MAY BRING REFORM

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the constructive dialog Postmaster General O'Brien stimulated with his bold proposal to permit a nonprofit corporation to take over the delivery of the mail continues to flower across the country. In an editorial, which I insert in the RECORD, the Beaver County Times expressed its belief that the attention to postal problems resulting from Mr. O'Brien's recommendation holds hope for improved postal service in the future.

[From the Beaver County (Pa.) Times, Apr. 18, 1967]

POSTAL SERVICE STUDY MAY BRING REFORM

Maybe Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien has something in his proposal that the Post Office Department be replaced by a non-profit government corporation. The corporation would be operated by a board of directors appointed by the President and confirmed by Congress and the board would appoint a professional manager.

Under Mr. O'Brien's proposal, the corporation would be "given a clear mandate on the percentage of cost coverage for postal services, so that further revisions in rates—should they be necessary—would be on a fixed formula basis." Any deficit between operating costs and revenue would be subsidized by congressional appropriations.

There would, of course, be the danger that appointees to the board of directors would be professional politicians or political hacks. This would result in the inefficient and wasteful management for which government enterprises are noted. But this is not the Postmaster General's concept of how the Post Office Department should be managed.

"The postal service," he said, "should fully reflect the genius of American management and industrial skills . . . If we ran our telephone system the way we run the Post Office, the carrier pigeon business would still have a great future."

President Johnson has named a 10-man commission comprised mainly of business executives to study the postal service as it is presently constituted and determined if it could be improved by a non-profit government corporation. The commission will make recommendations to the President within a year.

It is hoped that the study will result in much needed reform in the methods now used in operating the world's largest postal service.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO KNOW HOW THE CRIMINAL GETS HIS WEAPON

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CASEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, the great unanswered question in the argument over restrictive firearms legislation is this: Where does the criminal obtain his gun?

No one, including the Justice Department or our own great Federal Bureau of Investigation, can give this Congress the answer needed to legislate effectively.

But a little ray of light has been shed on this great unknown factor by a recent survey made by the Los Angeles district attorney's office, and I found the results to be most enlightening. It is indeed unfortunate that this information is not available on a nationwide scale.

A few days ago, in testifying before the House Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5 against the restrictive provisions of H.R. 5384, I told my respected colleagues:

> We are being asked to legislate without facts. We are being asked to enact rigid restrictions on millions of decent Americans without full knowledge of the cause and the source of the problem.
>
> I say to the Attorney General—tell this Congress how many cases have been brought under the Federal Firearms Act, Section 901, where it is illegal for a felon to transport or receive firearms or ammunition that moved in interstate commerce? How many machinegun and sawed-off shotgun bandits have been prosecuted for violation of the National Firearms Act?
>
> I say to the Secretary of Treasury and the Internal Revenue Service—how many prosecutions have been made under the Internal Revenue Code against armed robbers for failure to declare, pay or for other evasion of income taxes?
>
> I say to the law enforcement officers of this Nation—how vigorous is your enforcement of local and state laws on possession and use of firearms by the criminal?
>
> And I say to our own great F.B.I.—give this Congress and the American people the facts on criminal use of firearms. Tell us how and where the criminal gets his weapon. Is it stolen? Does he buy it under the counter in a roadside gin mill? Or from a hock shop? Or by mail order? Tell this Congress how many of the 5,634 homicides during 1965 were crimes of passion—where any weapon at hand would have been used—and how many were cold blooded murders? We cannot enact fair, equitable and effective legislation without these facts, for I am convinced that our problem is the criminal—and I frankly see no provision in H.R. 5384 which will stop him.

Mr. Speaker, when I learned of the survey made by Los Angeles District Attorney Evelle J. Younger, I asked him to send me a copy of it. The facts are startling—and a far cry from what those who advocate restrictive legislation over firearms would have you believe.

I ask my colleagues to look at the facts disclosed by the survey, and by the Los Angeles Times news story of January 8, 1967, which gave details of the 26-day survey made last September. The Times stated:

> A high proportion of guns used in crime in the Los Angeles area are either stolen in burglaries or obtained by criminals from private individuals.
>
> Yet guns are involved in only a fraction of crimes here—perhaps less than seven percent of all felonies...
>
> The study involved an investigation of 4,065 felony crimes which were presented to the District Attorney's office for the issuance of complaints—and it shows that guns were involved in 263 of these crimes.
>
> Of the weapons recovered by the police, the two largest traceable categories were 39 guns that had been stolen and 37 that had been obtained by suspects from private individuals.
>
> The study indicates that one argument, at least, of gun control proponents—that control over the sale of retail weapons should be tightened—would have no effect on most Los Angeles crimes in which guns are used.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the other sources from which criminals obtained their weapons in Los Angeles, according to the district attorney's survey:

Thirty-nine were stolen.

Thirty-seven bought from a private party.

Five claimed they were found.

One got his from his mother.

One got his from a pawnshop.

One rented his gun.

Twenty-seven were bought from local retailer.

Eight were obtained out of State.

Ninety-five the police could not determine the source of the gun, and I am willing to bet that a great portion of these were bought under the counter, or stolen.

But let us continue with the Times story:

> The background of criminal gunmen also was indicated in the study.
>
> Forty-three of the suspects were former convicts. Thirteen of these obtained their guns from private individuals and nine stole them. Police were unable to determine how they got guns in 14 instances.
>
> The remaining seven ex-convicts got weapons from miscellaneous sources, including one who found a gun, one who bought one in another state, and one who purchased one with a forged check.
>
> Eight additional defendants had a history of mental illness. They had all taken their guns in burglaries, with the exception of two cases that police could not trace.
>
> The fact that less than seven percent of the felonies studied involved guns can lead to various conclusions, it was noted.
>
> Many felonies, such as felonious drunk driving, possession of marijuana, and even burglary, would not normally require guns.
>
> It might also be argued that the relatively low involvement of guns in felonies is a direct result of tough penalties.
>
> If a weapon is used in burglary or robbery, for example, the offense becomes first-degree and the offender may be punished more severely, authorities explained.

And that last statement, Mr. Speaker, points the way for this Congress to act effectively to curb the criminal use of firearms—which after all—is the source of our problem. And that, too, is the sum and substance of my bill, H.R. 6137, which is before Judiciary Subcommittee No. 5. It would strike hard at the criminal—not the sportsman, gun collector, gunsmith, or dealer who abides by all laws and regulations. My bill would set a mandatory 10-year Federal penalty for use or possession of firearms during the commission of major crimes of violence, and a 25-year mandatory penalty for any subsequent offense.

Surely, there is need for this Congress to know the full, factual story on where the criminal obtains his weapon, for it is ridiculous to ask us to enact unneeded and unnecessary restrictions on the law-abiding in a useless attempt to control the criminal. Enactment of my bill—plus full and vigorous enforcement of existing Federal and State laws covering firearms—can end the problem our Nation faces.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in this effort.

PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON URBAN GROWTH OPENS TODAY IN HAWAII

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the commencement of an important 12-day conference in Honolulu, Hawaii. Called the Pacific Conference on Urban Growth, it is jointly sponsored by the State of Hawaii, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, and the Agency for International Development. This unusual Federal-State sponsored conference is a forum where officials of East Asia and Pacific nations will exchange ideas on how to relieve the social pressures of mushrooming urban population growth. It advances our President's theme of promoting Asia regional development for the mutual benefit of Asian countries.

I would like to point out that the selection of Hawaii as the site for this conference is another example of the growing role of importance that our insular State is playing as a bridge for social and economic exchange between the East and West. This is a fact to which I point with great pride. Hawaii is uniquely endowed to serve in this capacity, and it is prepared to offer its resources to every effort which will promote greater understanding and cooperation among the nations of the Pacific.

Gathered in Honolulu for the opening of the Pacific Conference on Urban Growth are planning and development officials from Australia, Thailand, Japan, Vietnam, Pakistan, Ryukyu Islands, Singapore, Malaysia, Taiwan, Philippines, Laos, Indonesia, India, Korea, Fiji, and the Crown Colony of Hong Kong.

In addition to extensive meetings on the economic and social aspects of urban growth in Asia and the Pacific, conferees will also participate in open-panel discussions and workshop sessions which will intensively explore specific problems. The conference will close on a progressive note as ministerial-level officials gather during the last 3 days to review the proceedings and to plan for the future.

It has been my privilege to provide continuing support during the months of planning which preceded this conference. I am sure that my colleagues would want to join me in extending every best wish for a successful and productive conference to cosponsors Governor Burns of Hawaii, HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver, and AID Administrator William S. Gaud.

ADDRESS BY DAVID LEE CHERNEY TO 76TH NATIONAL CONGRESS OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. BARING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which impressed me very much and which was given by David Lee Cherney, of Redwood City, Calif., national president of the Children of the American Revolution on the occasion of the 76th National Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution held here in Washington, D.C., early in April of this year.

Young David's speech restores our faith in the young people of America today:

> Greetings to the Seventy-sixth National Congress of the Daughters of the American Revolution from David Lee Cherney, National President of the Children of the American Revolution.
>
> Madam President General, Members of the Daughters of the American Revolution, Distinguished guests, and Friends.
>
> It is with much gratefulness that I address you on behalf of the organization you founded for your children 72 years ago, The Children of the American Revolution.
>
> As you all know from the experience of being parents at one time or another, we young people have a tendency to forget to show our appreciation for those things which help us become better individuals, such as the education, training, environment and love you have provided for us.
>
> In the next couple of minutes besides just expressing our appreciation for all you have done for us I want to show to you that we are really aware of some of the benefits we have obtained through our experience in C.A.R.
>
> As we reach the age where we must realize it is time to say good-bye to C.A.R. and time to transfer to D.A.R. or S.A.R. we also begin to reflect back on our own lives to see if we can discover things that made us the way we are and compare ourselves to those around us. It is this comparison that paints such a striking picture. I do not want to take the time to describe to you what we are like because you know and it is what you are most familiar with and therefore, does not paint a very vivid picture.

But I am going to tell you what we are not like.

There seems to be at the moment a group, quickly increasing in number, of "so called people" who seem to have lost their way. Not only do they lead aimless lives having lost their incentive and ambition but their whole outlook has become selfish and they are interested in little other than themselves. Although their complete disregard for modern sanitation and lack of personal grooming and cleanliness hardly indicates that.

The fact that they believe they obtain worthwhile recognition by their slovenly unconventional dress indicates their total lack of values.

Their disrespect for law and social ethics exhibits the disintegration and lack of morals. And on top of all this they believe they are intellectual because they play the new game called "The Trip" a pretended search through drugs of their inner most minds which are probably as shallow as their skulls are thick. And the most they have to claim for themselves is the title of "Hippies."

I and my peers thank "God" that we have more to claim than that. We are most ashamed and embarrassed to have to admit that this group is a part of our generation. For we DO take pride in the values and morals that have been taught to us and that we have adopted as ours. We are especially grateful to be able to say that we are Americans because that means that we have the right and privileges to defend our standards against those who would like to eliminate them.

As C.A.R. members we realize that to defend our American way of life we must fight against the spread of the attitudes and behavior I just described. We will win, but the more kids we have helping the easier it will be. So I would like to mention at this time that there is an estimated 800,000 possible C.A.R. members, all your children and grandchildren, but that at this time we only have less than ½ per cent, or 17,000 of them in our membership. So I would like to suggest that if you are really interested in seeing us win you will try to get as many of the remaining 783,000 possible members to join our ranks. Remember they are also the future members of your organization.

So from the Children of the American Revolution to our mother or organization we say Thanks "Mom"!, for everything.

THE VIETNAM PAUSE

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to set forth in the Congressional Record an article by Robert Kleiman, which appeared in today's New York Times, entitled "Making the Next Vietnam Pause Work."

This is one of the most comprehensive, thoughtful, provocative, and factual presentations on the situation in Vietnam, which I have been privileged to read.

Because of its excellence and the accuracy of its contents, I would like to give it as widespread dissemination as possible, and make it available to those who have not had the chance to read it in the Times itself.

I therefore include it in the Record at this point.

[From the New York Times, May 1, 1967]

Making the Next Vietnam Pause Work

(By Robert Kleiman)

The one or two-day truce and bombing pause now scheduled for the anniversary of Buddha's birth, May 23, could well set in motion another major attempt at peacemaking in Vietnam. For those who hope for such an attempt and want it to succeed, it is essential to be clear about what went wrong in the peacemaking efforts of the past.

The explanation the Administration is encouraging the world to believe is that Washington has been consistently seeking and Hanoi resisting negotiations. But the reality appears to be that both sides have been shifting position repeatedly over the past thirty-two months, alternately blowing hot and cold about peace talks.

Originally, Hanoi was willing to talk. In September 1964 it accepted Secretary General Thant's proposal, relayed by Moscow, for secret contacts with Washington. For four months the Johnson Administration failed to reply, then rejected Mr. Thant's follow-up suggestion of a meeting of the American and North Vietnamese Ambassadors in Rangoon.

Twenty-four hours after word of this rejection reached Hanoi in February 1965 American bombing of North Vietnam began, allegedly in retaliation for a major Vietcong attack on the American base at Pleiku. American marines began landing in South Vietnam a month later, followed by other combat troops. Hanoi responded by stepping up its infiltration, sending regular North Vietnamese Army troops to fight in the South as organized units for the first time.

THE BALTIMORE PROPOSAL

At Baltimore on April 7, 1965, Mr. Johnson suggested "unconditional discussions"—a proposal to talk while the bombing of North Vietnam and fighting in the South continued. Hanoi's response was that the bombing of North Vietnam had to stop first. Meanwhile, in reply to the peace aims President Johnson outlined at Baltimore, Hanoi on April 8 announced its own terms, the highly ambiguous Four Points.

The next shift in positions came on May 12, 1965, when President Johnson for the first time suspended the bombing of North Vietnam—for a "limited trial period." His secret message to Hanoi gave North Vietnam four to ten days to order "significant reductions" in Communist armed attacks in South Vietnam if it wanted the pause extended. A permanent end of the bombing, Mr. Johnson indicated, would require an end to all armed actions by the Communists in the South.

Hanoi returned this letter twice, once symbolically unopened. It then rejected it publicly, denouncing the time limit, which gave the message the character of an ultimatum, as well as the demand for a military quid pro quo in the South. The Soviet Union, active earlier in urging peace talks and forwarding messages, refused even to discuss this one. On May 18, six days after the suspension, bombing was resumed.

Through the next seven months the Johnson Administration resisted pressure for another, more prolonged, pause. Washington insisted on a "clear indication" in advance from Hanoi that there would be "commensurate actions in relation to the infiltration and military action in South Vietnam and the presence of North Vietnamese military personnel."

But in December 1965, with 190,000 American troops in South Vietnam, President Johnson ordered a second bombing pause, this time without setting a time limit or asking advance assurances of a reciprocal military step by the Communists. Washington made it clear that the pause would continue if Hanoi simply agreed to negotiate. The Soviet Union, which had privately suggested this American approach, sent a high-level mission to Hanoi. The Pope, Secretary General Thant and dozens of nonaligned nations urged North Vietnam to open talks.

HANOI'S REJECTION

But Hanoi, apparently believing it was winning the war, failed to return to the pro-negotiation position it had held only a year earlier. Hanoi now advanced demands for a permanent and unconditional halt to the bombing as well as acceptance of its Four Points, which remained wrapped in ambiguity. It remained unclear whether the Four Points were proposals for a settlement, open for bargaining, or preconditions for a negotiation—that had to be accepted before talks began. After 37 inconclusive days of truce in the air and diplomatic probes on the ground, American bombing of the North resumed at the end of January 1966.

TALKS IF BOMBING HALTS

Nine months later, in the fall of 1966, Hanoi's position began to change significantly. There were increasing indications from Russia and Eastern European countries, then Hanoi itself, that North Vietnam was prepared to accept what it had rejected in January—an undertaking to enter into negotiations if the bombing was halted.

Later Ho Chi Minh's letter to President Johnson (February 1967) confirmed that Hanoi was no longer insisting on a "permanent" cessation of the bombing; it was seeking an "unconditional" halt, one that would not commit North Vietnam in advance to reciprocal military measures in the South.

There was another important sign of a shift in Hanoi's position, also later confirmed in the Ho Chi Minh letter. Hanoi clearly was no longer asking acceptance of its Four Points as a precondition for talks. Thus there was no longer any question of a demand for withdrawal of American troops, recognition of the Vietcong or acceptance of the Vietcong program for South Vietnam before negotiations.

Most important, the Ho Chi Minh letter confirmed that Hanoi was not only prepared to defy Peking by opening talks but was proposing to negotiate bilaterally with the United States, leaving out the Vietcong.

These shifts—plus the demoralizing effect they presumably would have on the Vietcong guerrillas once negotiations opened—provided Washington with the opportunity, if it wanted to seize it, to test anew Hanoi's sincerity.

JOHNSON'S CONDITIONS

President Johnson's response in February was to revive a series of conditions similar to those he had proposed in 1965 but had put aside during the January 1966 bombing pause. Once again a brief time limit was attached to the bombing pause—it was to run four days—a period later extended by thirty-six hours because of the Wilson-Kosygin talks in London. The deadline imparted to this third cessation, as to the first in May 1965, the character of an ultimatum. Once again President Johnson called for reciprocal military measures by North Vietnam in the South as the price for prolonging the pause. And for the first time he asked Hanoi not only to agree to a reciprocal military move but to carry it out before the bombing stopped.

In his Feb. 8 letter to Ho Chi Minh, which rejected the suggestion of a bombing halt followed by bilateral negotiations, Mr. Johnson said his concern was that North Vietnam might "make use of such action by us to improve its military position." But he did not limit himself to this concern in making a counterproposal that seemed a step forward but actually was a step backward. He proposed a freeze of American force levels in the South to accompany the bombing halt in the North. But, in return, he asked North Vietnam not only to halt its own manpower build-up in the South, but to stop all infiltration of materiél. This amounted to seeking through a bombing pause what the bombing itself had failed to achieve: a halt in infiltration. And to the North Vietnamese, as Prime Minister Wilson pointed out at the time, it meant "they would be leaving perhaps 100,000 North Vietnamese (troops) at risk in the South, denuded of necessary supplies."

Mr. Wilson, in contact with Hanoi, through Premier Kosygin's London visit, felt that a further extension of the pause by Washington and a secret pledge by Hanoi of almost any reciprocal military move would permit negotiations to be engaged. Neither Washington nor Hanoi was willing to make the first move to activate such a deal and the bombing resumed. But this concept still offers the best chance to get peace talks going.

Other United States proposals apparently were made during the meetings in Moscow early this year between an American and a North Vietnamese diplomat. But this first sustained series of secret contacts led nowhere because Hanoi's representative was only prepared to listen, not talk, prior to cessation of the bombing. And all the American messages, including an inquiry about the agenda for a conference, seemed designed to induce Hanoi either to talk while the bombing went on or to agree in advance to pay a military price in the South in return for suspension of the bombing.

Washington is suspicious that North Vietnam is far more interested in halting the bombing than in genuinely negotiating and would drag out any talks to gain a military advantage. No one forgets Korea, where fighting went on for two years during the Panmunjom talks.

These concerns are legitimate. But there are other ways to satisfy them than to insist that Hanoi back down first on its two-year refusal to talk while being bombed.

TWO ROUTES TO TALKS

One way would be for Moscow, which provides Hanoi with much military and economic aid, to use this leverage to induce North Vietnam to negotiate in good faith and not step up its infiltration during a bombing suspension. But since Soviet action is highly unlikely, the United States could take the initiative. It could suspend the bombing but make it clear, after talks open, that negotiations could not continue very long if either side substantially increased its force levels in South Vietnam or the flow of supplies to its troops or allies.

The Pentagon already has laid the groundwork for such a position in the projected May 23 truce. It has announced that it reserves the right to take appropriate military action against abnormally large efforts to resupply Communist troops. If no such abnormal resupply efforts are noted, there would be no reason not to extend the pause and test Hanoi's willingness to negotiate. It goes without saying that prolonged lack of progress in such negotiations, just as increased Communist infiltration, could and probably would lead to a step-up in the war.

RISK TAKEN LAST YEAR

There undoubtedly are some military risks in such an approach. Mr. Johnson took such risks a year ago. He suspended bombing for 37 days at a time when neither the military nor the political situation in South Vietnam was as secure as today. Yet Hanoi gained no significant military advantage. He was prepared to open negotiations first, then ask assurances that Hanoi would not obtain a military advantage from further prolongation of the bombing pause.

The May 23 truce, if it occurs, could provide another opportunity to return to the American position of a year ago. Otherwise the outlook is for continued deadlock, further escalation and the likelihood of a much longer—and perhaps a much wider—war.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S RENT SUPPLEMENT PROGRAM ENDORSED BY THE EVENING STAR

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has long been seeking ways to obtain decent housing for America's low-income families. In his message to Congress, the President said:

> With low-rent housing in short supply, it is more important than ever to stimulate construction by private enterprise and nonprofit organizations. The Rent Supplement program authorizes payments that make the construction of low-rent units attractive for builders.

An editorial in the Evening Star so aptly pointed out that the concept of a rent supplement program is "sound, and the initial results are sufficiently encouraging to stimulate congressional enthusiasm, rather than a continuing series of roadblocks." I could not agree more.

There has been a great deal of criticism resulting from misunderstandings about the rent supplement program. The truth is that this program does provide private enterprise with an opportunity to participate in housing for low-income families. The rent supplement program is privately sponsored, privately built, privately managed, and privately owned. In addition, as reported in this editorial, "it encourages a variety of new possibilities for housing low-income families, particularly in existing rehabilitated structures."

Thus, I urge that my colleagues carefully read this editorial published in the Evening Star and consider the points which it raises. The editorial follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 27, 1967]

Strange War

Two years ago a shortsighted Congress gave the administration a paltry $12 million to launch its imaginative rent supplement program. Last year, this promising new housing aid barely survived a bitter floor fight in the House, escaping with a $30 million appropriation. Any day now, acting on the request for this year's funds, the House Appropriations Committee will open the third round in the fight amid indications of renewed efforts to scuttle the whole program.

The $40 million sought on this occasion is extremely modest in view of the program's widespread endorsement in local communities throughout the country. It is not the cost, however, but the concept which is at the root of continued conservative opposition in Congress. And that is what makes this lingering warfare so hard to understand.

In a news analysis the other day, the Associated Press accurately noted that the program is widely supported by such traditionally conservative groups as home builders, bankers and real estate boards—for good reason. The rent supplement approach is a step away from the traditional form of public housing in the direction of private enterprise. It encourages a variety of new possibilities for housing low-income families, particularly in existing rehabilitated structures. Not enough time has elapsed for anyone to know precisely how effective this new tool may be. The concept, however, is sound, and the initial results are sufficiently encouraging to stimulate congressional enthusiasm, rather than a continuing series of road blocks.

MANPOWER PROGRAM

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the manpower report of the President contains striking proof that 1966 was a year of progress—a year when this country took further strides toward its goal of making every man and woman in this country self-sufficient.

Like all reports, it lists moneys and total numbers and percentages—but its impact lies not in terms of thousands and millions but in individuals.

For the manpower program was devised to aid individuals—like the young man in the Baltimore Neighborhood Youth Corps programs whose part-time work enabled him to continue his education. Or the distraught young mother struggling along on relief payments whose on-the-job training under the Manpower Development and Training Act has made her a self-supporting nurse's aid—helping others while she helps herself.

Employers, too, benefit from this program. For the manpower program has provided needed training for thousands of workers to relieve acute manpower shortages in areas ranging from subprofessional hospital workers to highly skilled craftsmen in the tool and die industry.

Society benefits from increased taxes coupled with lessened welfare payments—and from the intangible human values—the pride and increased self-esteem of the illiterate worker who learned to read a newspaper while he was learning to perform his job better.

We have made great progress, Mr. Speaker, but we have not licked all the problems.

Over 12 percent of our young people aged 16 to 19 were still looking for jobs at year's end.

Among Negroes and other minority groups, the unemployment rate was almost double the overall rate.

In slums and depressed rural areas, joblessness ran close to 10 percent, compared to a national average of 3.8 percent. And one out of every three people in those areas who are or ought to be working today faces some severe employment problem.

The seasonally employed workers and the physically and mentally handicapped present special problems for which we must find adequate solutions.

Many of our chronically unemployed and underemployed require special manpower services before they can become fully adequate workers and earners. There are an estimated 2 million potential workers who can be helped and are willing to help themselves.

To give these men and women the help they deserve will require hard work, coordination among the Federal agencies involved, and adequate funds to finance the needed programs.

It needs, in other words, the continued strong support of the Congress. For as the President said, these Americans need hope, not handouts. They want, and deserve, work and training, not welfare.

THE GREAT CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA EDUCATION

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, an article appeared in the Los Angeles Times West magazine of March 26, 1967 by Dr. Simon Ramo which discussed in depth the contributions of California's higher education system to the well being of the State.

I think the article deserves careful reading and will serve to stimulate the continuing discussion of higher education in California.

I ask permission to include this article in the RECORD.

THE GREAT CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA EDUCATION

(By Dr. Simon Ramo)

Higher education in the State of California is suddenly confronted with a grand crisis. Unsettled vital issues which have been simmering for a long time have now bubbled to the surface of public attention and the front page. A cloud of controversy has settled over everything at a time when the visibility of all the issues and clarity of thought are most needed.

The problem and its implications go far deeper than merely budgetary. These aspects involve the following: freedom of expression on the campus; the policy of providing every qualified high school graduate with the opportunity of receiving a free higher education, determining the amount of taxes the citizens are asked to pay or are willing to pay; the reorganization of the management and the improving of relationships among scores of institutions, ranging from the University of California and its many branches through the larger number of State Colleges and the even more numerous Junior Colleges. All these problems must be identified, analyzed and dealt with. Otherwise, the penalties will be great.

First and foremost, neglecting attention to these problems will result in the impairment of the quality of education, and this will touch off a chain reaction of deleterious effects which will undermine the economic and sociological underpinnings of this state. When we speak of the higher educational system in California, we cannot limit this to the school system; when we weaken that system. we weaken everything that that system feeds into. As we know, it feeds into nearly every aspect of our lives—and our future—and, therefore, we must examine the problem in its entirety and its complexity, its breadth and its depth, if we are to deal with it wisely and effectively.

The symptoms for the crisis in California education have existed for a long time, but we have not acknowledged that we had a crisis until recently. As a former trustee of the State Colleges and as a father of students in California's higher educational system, I have seen it developing for a number of years. Unfortunately, because of the inadequacy of our system of organization, communication and approach to total comprehension, we did not promptly recognize the symptoms nor plan for the alleviation of the present crisis. As a result, time has run out, and the state is caught with emergencies—financial, organizational and philosophical. And emergency solutions to any problems, especially profound and complex ones, are rarely satisfactory.

First off, we must relate higher education to the state as a whole. The livelihood of California stems from the state's technological industry. This means the aerospace industry, and electronics and instrumentation, petroleum, chemical, and all other research, development, and manufacturing operations that are closely tied to science and engineering—whether government-sponsored (as in defense, space or atomic energy) or involving commercial or industrial products for the private sector of our economy. These technologically-based industries represent a major portion of our GSP (Gross State Product). They represent the most important single factor in the economic growth and structure of our state. Their existence is the chief reason why California is going entity, while also the most populous state in the union. Weather alone might have caused California to have a high population growth, but without the technological industry, we might well be listed among the most poverty-stricken states in the union—an enormous population favoring the mild weather but with little source of income.

Our income from technologically-based industries is enormous: Our work for Department of Defense and NASA alone totals $7 billion. About 18¢ of every defense procurement dollar and 45¢ of every NASA dollar is spent in California because we have the technological capabilities—facilities and the trained people. A report published by the Security First National Bank not long ago made this statement: ". . . Contracts . . . go where there is the capability—the brains, skill and experience . . . The real task of the business community will be to keep this capability here, providing a business, cultural and educational climate that will continue to attract new industry and the best scientific minds . . ."

Our position in the economic structure of the nation was not reached because of the weather alone. There had to be some additional, very special reasons for the technological industry becoming California's greatest, and for the fact that California now leads the nation in the quantity and quality of technological output. California has the largest concentration of technical degree college graduates. California exceeds every other state in the number of Ph.D's in science and engineering. Nobel laureates, and members of the National Academy of Science and the National Academy of Engineering.

Of course, the State of California doesn't excel in technology, and it did not reach, nor will it hold its position of high competence, based on technical expertise alone. Associated with and matched up with the scientists and engineers in a balanced fashion are all of the other specialized intellectual powers of broadly educated people residing in California.

These human technological and other "higher-education" resources would not conceivably be here in the State of California if it were not for our outstanding educational complexes, both private and public, as represented by the University of California, the State Colleges, Caltech, Stanford, the other private colleges—large and small—and the Junior Colleges. There are many reasons for the truth of this. First of all, industry is heavily dependent for its supply of technological talent on California schools. The largest number of people in the heart of the industry are the products of the state's higher educational system. (To be sure, the industry, like the universities, has attracted outstanding intellects, experienced and creative minds, from throughout the nation and indeed from other parts of the world. But California did not and would not have reached its present position of technological preeminence by relying on imports alone.) In just the southern half of this state (according to the latest figures compiled in the fall of 1965), there are 149 institutions of higher learning with a total enrollment in excess of 560,000; 78.5 of these are enrolled in public institutions and 21.5 in private schools. The national ratio is 67.7 public, 32.3 private. In order that our industrial base will grow—as our oncoming technological society will inevitably encourage it to grow—we must have a good source of high-quality, well-educated California graduates.

The interlocking of the industry with the academic community in the whole range of disciplines is broad and crucial. The graduates fill the jobs and compete with the rest of the nation in the way they perform them. Outstanding faculty members at the university do outstanding research and attract leading pioneering research projects. They provide graduate work and stimulation for the specialists in industry. The industry attracts and holds the exceptional people who originate the products for development and production and whose performance causes the big projects and the new product opportunities to come to the state or be originated in California. This in turn stimulates. trains and attracts more talented people who are here and effective because of the intellectual climate that surrounds them.

The graduates that industry needs are the ones who want an opportunity for growth and challenge. The university stature and breadth in California constitute a promise to them of treasured self-improvement. The best brains prefer an intellectual atmosphere which depends heavily upon intellectual leadership from a strong higher educational system. Finally the kind of people that the industry needs, and that the rest of the country is also after, have preferred to live in California (and this is a very important point) because, by living here, they have had the virtual guarantee that they will be in an exceptional position to provide to their children the higher education that is as fundamental to these folks as housing and food.

What then would happen to the technological industry of the State of California if the University of California and the State Colleges are greatly impaired in the quality and the quantity of graduates which they produce and in the quality and quantity of research work done by the faculties of associated laboratories of this higher educational structure?

There is a direct correlation. Hurt one and you hurt the other; enhance one and you improve the other. State funds used for higher education are investments in the future of this state. For every dollar spent by the citizens of this state to produce qualified college graduates, many dollars will come back in later years in growth of the industry, in jobs, wealth, a higher standard of living, security and economic stability.

Unfortunately, in order to finance the long-term gain, we must match our expenditures and our investments to the amount of money we take in. So, either the citizens of the state have to be convinced that higher education is a capital investment and be able and willing to increase their investment in the future, or else we do indeed have to impair the quality or the quantity of graduates and research produced—spend less for less education, that is—or else we have to find new sources of savings or of funding.

Should we seek to get additional funds from tuition? Let us put aside for the moment the complexity of out-of-state-students' tuitions and concentrate only on the contribution from California residents. The out-of-staters already pay tuition, and while we could consider raising the amount, the total is hardly sufficient to improve the funding problem from severe to acceptable. As to California residents, it appears that no one really wants to deny an education to any qualified youth because he does not have the means. So loans, scholarships, excusing of tuition payments, all these would be expected to apply for the qualified, lower-income students. This is the same as saying that the students, or their parents, with the higher income will be the ones making the contributions to permit the higher educational system to operate at a superior level.

To these students, or their parents, this is precisely the same as increasing the state income tax, so there is nothing new here. If, instead of tuition, we were merely to increase state taxes, this means then every taxpayer will be making a greater contribution to higher education, and not just the students. This is not absurd since the whole state stands to gain by having a higher-educated citizenry: So all citizens benefit, whether they have sons and daughters in the system or not. We have accepted this idea with regard to the lower educational rungs, right up to junior colleges.

It has been a mark of distinction that California has recognized the general benefit to the population of public education at a higher educational level than most states. Perhaps this is a distinction that we cannot any longer expect to retain. However, the fact that these facets and many more exist shows this is a problem needing a great deal of study. If a tuition system is inaugurated without this study, it may end up adding to costs rather than cutting them, and it could add a kind of confusion which is much more penalizing than the hopefully added income.

Imagine, if you will, trying to grade the amount of tuition to be charged, or loaned, or scholarship to be awarded so that it will go properly with the financial need of the individual student, taking account of his parents' income, their dependencies, their capital gains versus losses and all of the other things that we have to put into an income tax form. Imagine the new bureau within the University that would have to be created with clerks and judges following complex rules and criteria, and imagine the effect of the delays, penalties, protests and litigation. Also think of the broad system of demarcations according to place on the financial ladder of individual students as compared with the present, uniform system that recognizes no distinction in income.

Any way you do it, whether by tuition or more taxes, the citizens of the state will have to decide how much they are willing to invest in the future growth of the state and in the expectancy that that investment will come back to them severalfold. Meanwhile, the technological industry has a direct stake in seeing that there continues to be a high-quality educational system. So it cannot really complain if it is taxed; particularly if the tax increase is in proper proportion to the benefits which will be obtained.

Perhaps great savings can come through much greater "efficiency." Of course, there is nothing new here. All organizations, large *and small*, have waste. Where there are human beings, none being perfect, there is mediocrity and incompetence, overlap, laziness, empire building, mistakes, duplication and unnecessary jobs. Presumably the managements have already been trying to minimize the extent of these expected ills. Can they do better?

I can make two comments from personal experience. I know the operation of UCLA rather well. To make its operation more efficient, that is to use its funds in a wiser manner to attain its goals, you will have to go out and get a man smarter at the job than its superb Chancellor, Dr. Franklin Murphy. I think that would be very, very difficult.

The other observation has to do with the State Colleges, even larger in student body and in number of campuses than the University. Here, the entire system for years has been so badly underfunded for its stated mission that it has been forced, long ago, below sound budget assignments for faculty salaries. Its classes are much too large for efficiency. Its libraries are too skimpy. The time of the faculty is below minimum for preparation of the heavy teaching load, to talking to students, for correcting papers, for thinking, exploring and self-improvement. Asking the State Colleges to cut out some of the waste would be like suggesting to a man who has just finished a 100-yard dash in a tough competitive trial that the next time he runs he should be a little more "efficient." The way to go for efficiency in the State Colleges is to increase funds or decrease the student body and the number of colleges.

But there are some things that can be done to save money. They are at the level above what the school administrators and faculty can do and to a certain extent above what the regents and trustees can do now. They would require that the Legislature and the governor be willing to adopt some quite different practices with regard to the operation of the colleges. For instance, believe it or not, the State Colleges are required to present a "line item" budget each year, in which every little expenditure of all of the colleges (virtually down to an increase in the number of janitors and books in the library) is listed and presumably approved, item by item, with neither the trustees nor the individual college administrators being allowed noticeable flexibility to shift funds within the total. The result is sometimes quite ludicrous; no corporation would manage itself in this fashion. Neither the governor's office nor the Legislature has the personnel to dissect, judge and improve upon such a detailed kind of budget authorization.

Throughout the entire higher educational system of the state, greater decentralization is needed—from the Legislature to the regents and trustees and to the individual presidents and chancellors who are running the campuses. The responsibility for understanding and handling such detailed problems as how many students can be accommodated with given funds, and at an acceptable level of quality education, is best done through the people closest to the campus. Authority and responsibility must come closer to being hand-in-hand. The presidency of the University of California appears to be a very prestigious job, but sometimes one wonders if the position is not a kind of glorified secretarial job devoted merely to the gathering of facts for presentation to the board, the governor and to the Legislature for decisions on all important matters. This is not the role of a creative executive, which the president of such a major university complex should be.

The choice between quantity and quality is one in which the technological industry of the state is greatly affected and where a further comment might be in order. The company I am with, TRW (Thompson-Ramo-Woolridge), employs 15,000 people in the State of California alone. Many of these are college graduates and many of those graduates are working for higher degrees in the state's higher education *extension* system. Probably the whole extension operation would have to be disbanded or greatly curtailed in the interests of protecting the basic daytime campus if funds are not adequately made available.

As to the regular daytime students, I would much sooner (if California has to choose between the lesser of two evils because of limitations of funds) that we provide a high-grade, higher education to a somewhat smaller number of the most qualified, rather than to offer a mediocre education to a very large group. California would be better off (at least as far as the technological industry is concerned) with, say, to use just an arbitrary number, 50,000 graduates per year who are well educated than with 75,000 who have spent four or more years in a mediocre system. It saddens me to think of a truly qualified young person who cannot get into the California higher educational system because his grades are below the standard we shall have to set because of the shortage of funds. But for the state, if the choice has to be made, it would be better to let him have just two years, as a beginning for his career, but two very good ones, and leave the higher educational opportunities to the more talented, more gifted other students, so that they can receive the further excellent higher education which they and the state require for the health of the state.

The impairment of quality at the university level can be subtle as well as conspicuous in its detrimental effect on California's technological industry.

Now it may well be—I am sure it is true—that the future of our society and of our state's technological leadership in it is going to be increasingly dependent on our understanding of the impact of science and technology on society. How do we apply science fully for the benefit of mankind? To do it, we need an educated, inspired group of outstanding young people trained in new concepts of thought that depend on the combination of the intellectual tools of the engineer and the physical scientist, on the one hand, and the sociologist and humanist, on the other. We need "techno-sociologists" or "socio-technologists." These and other new disciplines and professions are not likely to evolve out of an educational environment catering to quantity more than quality.

The fact that higher education financing in the State of California is new, a controversial area is undeniable. It should be equally evident that the matter of tuition, organization, the choosing of the fraction of our income that we should invest now in education for expected and improved income later—these issues, just like the matters of freedom of thought and expression on the campus and the role of the student in determining how the campus is run, need a great deal of serious consideration.

We have not provided adequate preparatory time to think and face these problems and resolve them. So we have doubts and a crisis. But there is no crisis of indecision and no doubt about the importance of higher education to the continued health and growth of that industry, the technological industry, which furnishes the largest share of the income coming into this state, compared with any other source.

This industry's health, the state's economy (and the nation's well-being), and the quality of the universities and colleges are inextricably bound together.

A TRIBUTE TO CLAUDE WICKARD

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened, as I know many Americans were, on learning of the death Saturday, April 29, of a distinguished citizen of the State of Indiana and an outstanding public servant, Claude Raymond Wickard, of Carroll County.

Mr. Wickard, who was 74 years of age, served as Secretary of Agriculture from 1940 to 1945 and served as Administrator of the Rural Electrification Administration from 1945 to 1953.

His death in a tragic automobile accident means the loss of a man who had come to be widely respected for his own ability as a farmer and for his leadership in American agriculture.

I came to know Mr. Wickard and to develop a great respect for him during the 1956 campaign when he was the Democratic nominee for the U.S. Senate and I was candidate for Congress.

To both his daughters, Mrs. J. V. Pickard, of Camden, Ind., and Mrs. Robert Bryant, of San Antonio, Tex., I extend my deepest sympathy.

Indiana and the Nation have lost a dedicated public servant.

MUSKIE-RYAN AMENDMENTS TO THE SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, we have all heard a great deal about the Nation's air pollution crisis. We know that air pollution claims thousands of American lives every year. In response to this crisis we enacted the Clean Air Act of 1965, which enables localities to conduct planning, research, and development to find ways to abate air pollution. But in reality the act is a first step in solving this crucial problem. It is time to take the next step.

The distinguished chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air Pollution, Senator Edmund S. Muskie, and I are sponsoring amendments to the Clean Air Act which we believe will take us another step toward the elimination of air pollution.

The Muskie-Ryan legislation—S. 1646 and H.R. 9477—amends that part of the Clean Air Act which is called the Solid Waste Disposal Act. These amendments advance the solid waste disposal program from the research and development stage to the constructive stage.

The amendments provide construction grants to a municipality of up to two-thirds of the cost of a solid waste disposal plant, and grants of up to three-fourths of the cost of a plant serving more than one municipality.

In addition to providing construction grants, it provides planning grants, on the same two-thirds and three-fourths basis as construction grants, for planning waste disposal plants. Under the present act planning grants are restricted to the extent of 50 percent of the total cost.

Beyond planning and construction grants, these amendments provide incentives for the development of regional solid waste disposal programs.

Under the 1965 act only $62 million is authorized for fiscal years 1966 through 1969. The Muskie-Ryan amendments authorize $810 million for fiscal years 1968 through 1972.

I can think of no better investment to protect the health and welfare of our citizens. Disposal of solid waste is rapidly becoming one of the Nation's major problems.

Every year the American public throws away 30 million tons of paper and paper products, 8 billion pounds of plastics, 48 billion metal cans, 26 billion bottles and other glass containers, and more than one-half billion dollars of miscellaneous packaging material. In short, the Nation now discards 160 million tons of solid waste a year—5 to 8 pounds per person per day.

We have reached a point where we may literally choke ourselves by our own waste. For much of our solid waste disposal is accomplished by burning or filling land fills. The burning leads to air pollution. The land fills are all too often nesting grounds for rodents and vermin and are a significant factor in the spread of disease.

Under the present Solid Waste Disposal Act, 25 States have begun comprehensive surveys of their solid waste disposal problems. These States have begun to develop 32 projects. The present act, however, does not provide support for the implementation of these projects. The Muskie-Ryan amendments will provide the necessary financial support for these projects and will provide incentives to other States and localities to develop and implement solid waste disposal programs.

The Muskie-Ryan amendments will help localities to keep our air and water clean and save our lives. They should be supported by all of us. I urge that hearings be held on these amendments as soon as possible. Now is the time to begin the fight against pollution in earnest before it is too late. These amendments and the Air Quality Act of 1967—H.R. 8467—which I have introduced are necessary weapons in this fight. I hope that both will be enacted into law during this session of Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Helstoski (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

Mr. Hall (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of a death in his family.

Mr. Tenzer (at the request of Mr. Yates), for Monday, May 1, and Tuesday, May 2, on account of Jewish religious holidays.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Chamberlain (at the request of Mr. Biester), for 15 minutes, on May 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Biester), for 10 minutes, on May 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Biester), for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ryan (at the request of Mr. Hagan), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rostenkowski (at the request of Mr. Hagan), for 30 minutes, May 2; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McCarthy.

Mr. Machen.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Hagan) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Donohue.

Mr. Bingham in two instances.

Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Fascell.

Mr. Wolff.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on April 28, 1967, present to the President, for his approval a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 286. An act to permit duty-free treatment pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 of dicyandiamide and of limestone when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 2, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

706. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the budget for the fiscal year 1968 for the Department of Transportation (H. Doc. No. 115); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

707. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the

United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

708. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to establish a revolving fund for the Southeastern Power Administration; and to establish a revolving fund for the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

709. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

710. A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, transmitting an amendment to draft bill, the Air Quality Act of 1967; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

711. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

712. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Interstate Pipeline Companies, 1965"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

713. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved, according certain beneficiaries third preference and sixth preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. STAGGERS: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. House Joint Resolution 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SELDEN: Committee on Foreign Affairs. Report of the Special Study Mission to the Dominican Republic, Guyana, Brazil, and Paraguay, 1966; (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 9482. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9483. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 9484. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit payment to the recipient of medical assistance, for physician services furnished under the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 9485. A bill to provide for the establishment and development of the Kenilworth National Capital Park in the District of Columbia for the benefit of the people of the United States and, in particular, children; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9486. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9487. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 9488. A bill to consent to the Upper Niobrara River compact between the States of Wyoming and Nebraska; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9489. A bill to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9490. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 9491. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the refusal by the addressee and return to the sender of third-class bulk mail at a charge to the sender prescribed by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9492. A bill to amend section 228 of the Social Security Act to eliminate the existing reduction in benefits thereunder on account of other governmental pensions, and in lieu thereof to prohibit the payment of such benefits to any individual whose annual income from all sources exceeds $2,500 (or $3,750 in the case of a couple); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 9493. A bill to amend the Internal Security Act of 1950; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9494. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9495. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide for the refusal by the addressee and return to the sender of third-class bulk mail at a charge to the sender prescribed by the Postmaster General; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9496. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9497. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9498. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sales of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9499. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9500. A bill authorizing the sale of standard silver dollars held by the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 9501. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9502. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. REID of Illinois:

H.R. 9503. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 9504. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 9505. A bill to exclude U.S. Route No. 22 from Haafsville to Easton, Pa. from being on the Interstate System and to provide for the designation of an alternative route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. UTT (for himself, Mr. Lipscomb and Mr. King of California):

H.R. 9506. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on certain tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDER JAGT:

H.R. 9507. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 9508. A bill to revise the quota control system of the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 9509. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to improve and expand the authority to conduct or assist research relating to air pollutants, to assist in the establishment of regional air quality commissions, to authorize establishment of standards applicable to emission from establishments engaged in certain types of industry, to assist in establishment and maintenance of State programs for annual inspections of automobile emission control devices and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9510. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself and Mr. Dingell):

H.R. 9511. A bill to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940, as amended, and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940, as amended, to define the equitable standards governing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes; to the

Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9512. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 9513. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9514. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $800 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9515. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9516. A bill to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on certain tobacco products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 9517. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 9518. A bill to amend the Library Services and Construction Act with respect to the extent of the required matching under titles III and IV thereof; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9519. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 9520. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relative to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H.R. 9521. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a tax credit for certain tuition and fees paid by individuals to institutions of higher education and to allow a tax credit for certain contributions made by individuals or corporations to institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEVILL:

H.J. Res. 544. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the employment of subversives in the public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.J. Res. 545. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for popular election of the President and the Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.J. Res. 546. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.J. Res. 547. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H. Con. Res. 335. Concurrent resolution establishing a joint committee to conduct a study on means of providing for earlier availability of funds for educational assistance programs and of information relating thereto; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Con. Res. 336. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of permanent Peace Ambassadors by the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H. Con. Res. 337. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that highway trust funds should not be curtailed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H. Res. 459. Resolution authorizing the Speaker to appoint delegates and alternates to attend the International Labor Organization Conference in Geneva; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

165. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to the Hidden Dam on Fresno River, and Buchanan Dam on Chowchilla River; to the Committee on Appropriations.

166. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to authorizing the establishment of the Sawtooth National Recreation Area and Wilderness; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

167. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to a national minerals policy; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

168. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to apportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 9522. A bill for the relief of Spyridon Geroulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9523. A bill for the relief of Mary Lee and daughter Anna Lee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 9524. A bill for the relief of Paul Anthony Kelly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 9525. A bill for the relief of Mr. Vassilios Kaoyssias; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9526. A bill for the relief of Halina Jefimik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 9527. A bill for the relief of Fotin Petropoulou Gaitano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9528. A bill for the relief of Maria Fernandes Carvalho; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 9529. A bill for the relief of Susana Tomasa Ibay Valdez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

72. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, relative to the conduct of Federal elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Opposition to Quie Amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the proposed Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

If this ill-conceived proposal is passed, New York State would stand to lose a total of $121,903,958 in fiscal 1969.

In 1965, Congress, with great difficulty and dexterity, managed to avoid racial and religious antagonisms that earlier had killed innumerable Federal aid to education bills. In a masterful stroke, the authors of the legislation devised a law that provides assistance geared to pupils rather than schools.

The law provides assistance to individual school districts based on the number of their children from families with annual incomes under $3,000. Under the present law, Federal funds remain under the control of public officials but pupils in parochial schools will qualify to receive the same kind of supplementary assistance as those in public schools. This includes programs such as remedial reading and guidance counseling.

No money goes directly to any private or parochial school.

Such a program involves some onerous and detailed Federal requirements. The present act has obvious imperfections. But until a better plan is devised, I believe we are faced with a choice of either the present act or no act at all.

As a substitute for this delicate and intricate compromise, the Republican minority of the House Education and Labor Committee under Representative QUIE, of Minnesota, proposes the substitution of block grants to the States. It appeals to racist sentiment in some Southern

States because State education commissioners could evade Federal desegregation requirements.

In addition, most States, including New York, have language in their constitutions forbidding the spending of public money for private schools. This could well mean that none of the Federal aid funds could be used for private and parochial schoolchildren in New York State.

If Republicans and southern Democrats unite in support of the Quie substitute, the effect could be to kill Federal aid to primary and secondary education altogether.

VISTA Volunteers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED B. ROONEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged on last Saturday to view a very special film. An inspiring and even moving film, produced for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Those of my colleagues who have seen "A Year Toward Tomorrow" share with me, I know, the conviction that the Academy Award this film received was well deserved.

The story is of three young VISTA volunteers—Volunteers in Service to America—who set aside 1 year of their lives to serve in the very frontlines of our national war on poverty. It is a true story, one that documents the dedicated resolve of a young man at work in an urban slum, and two young women at work on an Indian reservation. It is a story of compassion and hard work that can be repeated wherever our 6,500 VISTA volunteers have put their idealism and energy to work.

This film, like the reality it reports, is no cinematic simplification. It provides us with an immediate sense of the hardships and unhappiness which poverty imposes on too many of our fellow Americans. Through this film we share intimately in the early frustration and final exhilaration of those engaged in a cooperative effort, volunteers and poor alike, to meet and solve the complexities and cruelties of poverty. "A Year Toward Tomorrow" portrays with sensitivity and power the challenge that awaits those of our citizens, young and old, who serve as VISTA volunteers.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is a compelling reminder to us that the determination to wipe out poverty and its collateral difficulties exhibited by these volunteers exemplifies the very best of a national tradition of dedication and resourcefulness. Surely, we in the Congress cannot fail to be inspired to accelerate our own effort and redouble our own commitment in this undertaking. Barely 3 years ago we set for ourselves an ultimate goal of victory in an all-out war on poverty. We have had traced for us in this excellent film about VISTA a very inspiring picture of progress. I congratulate those whose great talent has capsuled for the screen the vitality and effectiveness of our Economic Opportunities program.

I congratulate, too, the man who is directing the war on poverty—the Honorable Sargent Shriver. Through his capable direction and untiring efforts, programs such as VISTA are demonstrating their tremendous worth in giving America's impoverished a new life and brighter future.

The Worcester, Mass., Safety Council Celebrates Its 50th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, the Worcester, Mass., Safety Council, which has been nationally recognized for its extraordinary initiative in effectively promoting life and limb saving programs, will formally celebrate its 50th anniversary at their annual awards meeting on May 25, next.

The safety council was established in 1917 as a single, small committee of business and civic leaders dedicating themselves to the task of preserving life and limb from disabling accidents.

Originally organized to serve only the citizens of Worcester, proper, the council, in later years, expanded its activities to cover the entire central Massachusetts area with more than one-half a million people. A name change from Worcester County Safety Council to Central Massachusetts Chapter, National Safety Council, was instituted in 1961, and incorporated under the laws of Massachusetts. It is New England's oldest safety council. It has always been a vital force in our area whenever a matter of safety was concerned.

Based on past performance, it may be anticipated that the council will continue to become an ever more powerful and vital force in the community as our Federal Government enters the highway safety picture to lead the fight against what has become the Nation's No. 1 killer—the automobile—responsible in 1966 alone for a record-shattering 52,500 human lives from accidents on our Nation's highways.

The present officers of the council are the Honorable Andrew B. Holmstrom, president; Clifford O. Griffith, vice president; David J. Foley, treasurer; and John W. Greene, secretary, who is also the executive director of the council.

I know that all Members of Congress join me in congratulating the officers, directors, and members of the Central Massachusetts Chapter of the National Safety Council in Worcester for their remarkable safety promotion record on behalf of their fellow citizens over the past 50 years and in wishing the council ever-increasing success in their continuing effort to make their neighbors and all Americans safety conscious.

Television Station WCBS, New York, Sponsors Career Guidance Fair

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate television station WCBS—New York—for the active role it is taking in the field of community service in the city of New York.

This morning I attended the opening of a career guidance fair sponsored by this station in conjunction with the New York City Board of Education. During the next 2 weeks, 140,000 New York City high school sophomores, juniors, and seniors will attend this fair, which is being held at the Kingsbridge Armory in the center of my congressional district. The purpose of the fair is to motivate the students to take a serious interest in their future and to show them the numerous possibilities that are open to them. More than 200 exhibits representing industry, commerce, professional groups, and government organizations have been brought together for this purpose. I was deeply impressed with the care, imagination, and planning that went into this project.

In discussing the career fair, Dr. Bernard Donovan, superintendent of schools has said:

> We commend WCBS–TV for its interest in presenting this career guidance fair as a public service to the pupils of the New York City public schools.
>
> Through this Fair, not only those who have already made tentative career decisions but all who need the exposure to career information, will benefit. Businesses and industries will reach the students with a vital display and will provide the means to motivate students to think, talk and see what the future might hold in store for them.
>
> We hope that the leadership shown by WCBS–TV in this project, which will be of immeasurable advantage to our high school boys and girls, will inspire similar working relationships between the schools and other business, cultural and civic organizations.

Commenting on the career fair, Mr. Clark B. George, vice president and general manager of WCBS–TV has said:

> Business today is becoming ever more aware of its growing responsibility in the field of career guidance for our young people. WCBS–TV is delighted to have this opportunity to present the Career Fair, bringing together New York City students with representatives of industry, commerce, government and the professions.
>
> We hope that the Career Fair will encourage students to discover the educational-occupational requirements in fields where they may have a career interest, or in job opportunities completely new to them. We

also hope that the Fair will provide potential dropouts with a positive view of the future and thus encourage them to continue their schooling.

I should like to congratulate WCBS-TV for its decision to hold the career fair at the Kingsbridge Armory in the Bronx. Too often, it seems to me, people assume that a citywide activity of this kind has to be located in Manhattan. The Bronx has many splendid facilities—the Kingsbridge Armory is only one of our borough's assets—and it is gratifying to see a refutation of the proposition that all important events must take place in Manhattan if city people are to attend.

Station WCBS-TV has developed other community projects as well. Last year, in conjunction with the New York City Parks Department, this station sponsored a citywide boys' basketball tournament, which involved more than 500 teams and 6,000 boys from all parts of the city. I understand that plans are now being developed to expand this program into a year-round sports program involving young people as well as adults.

The commitment of this station to community participation is in the highest American tradition and I would like to extend my congratulation to WCBS-TV for its contribution to the life of New York City.

Miami Council for the Continuing Education of Women Celebrates First Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Council for the Continuing Education of Women in Miami, Fla., has just completed its first year in operation and has compiled a most impressive record in this short time.

The program, which is financed partly by Federal funds under title I of the Higher Education Act and partly by individual and community contributions, is designed to encourage women to continue their education at all levels through resources in the community. The council serves as an information and referral center to assist women in availing themselves of educational resources in academic, vocational and self-improvement fields in the community.

The council has already conducted a number of workshops in conjunction with other community groups, including the University of Miami, and has had contact with 798 women interested in improving themselves.

The benefits incurred by the work of the CCEW are two-way. Not only is the individual woman assisted in finding the best way to continue an interrupted education, but these women, in turn, become better equipped to make significant contributions to the community—and in most cases do.

The CCEW is a fine example of what can be accomplished through the joint cooperation of Federal and local agencies and we can look forward to many more years of accomplishment from this group.

President Johnson Dedicates Vocational-Technical School in Prince Georges County, Md.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, the Prince Georges County Board of Education held a dedication on Wednesday, April 26, 1967, to open its new vocational-technical department at Crossland Senior High School in Camp Springs.

The occasion was a momentous one in many respects. It was made memorable because of the presence of President Johnson and because of the excellent thoughts he expressed in his remarks. In praising the distinct progress this Nation has made in the field of vocational education and training, President Johnson modestly neglected to include himself among those national leaders who have been responsible for our progress in this direction.

I believe that President Johnson should be served a large helping of praise for his leadership in this field.

He states that—

> This is a time of testing for American education.

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the President, and I also welcome the time of testing. It gives us the opportunity to reaffirm our dedication to the progressive principles of education and to review and reiterate our commitment that every American must be provided the best education possible.

It is my strong belief that we will pass this test, as will the President, with the highest grades.

For the edification of my colleagues, I offer the President's speech at Crossland High School:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT, AT THE DEDICATION OF THE CROSSLAND VOCATIONAL-TECHNICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE CROSSLAND SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL, CAMP SPRINGS, MD.

Chairman Perkins, distinguished Members of the Senate, Senator Brewster and Senator Tydings, Congressman Machen, Mr. Hrezo, Mr. Dixon, ladies and gentlemen:

It was 55 years ago that the great Kansas editor William Allen White issued his appeal for vocational education in America.

"The end of all schools," he said, "must be life—or public education will fail . . . we must provide for the practical, the vocational."

Five years later, President Woodrow Wilson signed the first great charter in this country for vocational education. That charter was the Smith-Hughes Act passed by the Congress in 1917. That Smith-Hughes Act pledged Federal support to the States for the education of young people in useful work.

This law established an educational partnership which has helped millions of Americans learn vital skills in agriculture, in home economics, and in industry.

So we come here today, in this year, to celebrate the 50th anniversary of that historic step when we passed that historic law. As we dedicate this great new center for vocational education, we also celebrate another step toward another important national goal: that every young American shall obtain as much education as he wants—as much training as he can absorb and use.

There was a time when we thought that merely sending a child to school for a given number of years was enough to prepare him for his future life. Now we know that is not enough.

There was a time when a young man could drop out of school, get a job, and enjoy a reasonably secure future. But now, in an expanding universe of knowledge and change, we know that that is not enough.

Once we considered education a public expense; we know now that it is a public investment.

Once we thought that every man could have a job—if only the economy flourished. We know now that education, not the Gross National Product, is the real key to full employment in our land.

This new building, that we are all so proud of, is an example of what we have been learning about education and the world of work.

Crossland Vocational Center, and others like it that are springing up throughout this nation, are a forge which will shape the lives and the careers of our young people—and through these young people, we will build the America of the 21st Century.

As we approach the next century, every citizen who hopes to play a productive role in American society must have occupational training of a sort—whether he wants to be a brain surgeon, an airplane repairman, an X-ray technician, or an astronaut.

Before the year 2000, we will see startling changes in science and technology: change will simply wipe out hundreds of occupations that exist today. It will create hundreds of others that require new knowledge and new skills.

If we are to step into the future without stumbling, we must produce trained citizens in this country.

We must help the one million students in our land who each year drop out—cutting themselves off from education, when the thing that they need most in this world is education.

We must smooth the transition from school to work. We must help students become employable by encouraging them to combine school with a job.

Four years ago, when I signed the Vocational Education Act of 1963, only 4½ million students were enrolled in Federally-assisted vocational classes in the country. Today, that 4½ million has grown to 7 million.

Four years ago, there were fewer than 400 vocational schools in the country. Today there are nearly twice that number.

Not many people really realize how swiftly times have changed in Federal support for education. Four years ago, your Federal Government was spending a little over $4 billion—$4.2 billion—for education and related training programs. The budget for the coming year calls for $12.4 billion—almost three times as much.

Four years ago, the Office of Education was spending only $700 million to support education. In the coming year, it will spend $4.2 billion—and that is seven times as much.

The Public Health Service, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the National Science

Foundation, the Labor Department, the Defense Department, the Veterans Administration, and the Department of Housing and Urban Development—all of these are giving top billing to education in this land.

It looks easy now, but we spent more than 20 years in the Congress battling for this breakthrough.

There were big roadblocks every step of the way:

The poor States were feuding with the rich States;

The public schools versus private and church schools;

The city schools versus the rural schools;

The integrated schools versus the segregated schools.

During those 20 long years, many members of the Congress despaired of ever passing any kind of Federal aid to education. But finally, we worked out a program which avoided the roadblocks and, we thought, settled the feuds. At long last the Congress put the law on the books and put the money in the schools.

Today, we are confronted with another feud. Some so-called "friends of education" want to go—and believe that we should go—back to where we started. They claim that they know a better way to spend the money. They propose to discard the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 that we put on the books with such great difficulty after 20 long years—to scrap it now before it is two years old—and to substitute in its place a different kind of legislation.

No one can tell for sure just how they plan to change the law. Each day new proposals, new substitutes, and new versions are presented. But already they have accomplished a great deal.

We see a revival of the suspicion of the poor States toward the wealthy States. We see a revival of the ancient and bitter feuds beginning all over again between the church and the public school leaders.

We see the fears of the big city school superintendents being expressed.

We see the same roadblocks which obstructed and halted Federal aid to education for 20 long years being built up again.

I hope that all our people and all of their spokesmen in the Congress will stop, look, and listen before they march down a blind alley.

This is a time of testing for American education.

The gains that we have made so far are only the beginning. We must build on those gains. But we must not lose all we have gained by reckless effort, by rewriting our laws, or by playing for partisan political advantage.

Thomas Jefferson said that "the most important bill in our whole code is that for the diffusion of knowledge . . . No other sure foundation can be devised for the preservation of freedom and happiness."

I think that those words are even more true for the 20th Century and the 36th President than they were for the 18th Century and the 3rd President.

I am glad to come here today, because I am glad of the work that we have done together. The citizens of the nation were supported overwhelmingly in the final analysis by the Congress in establishing these programs.

The young people presented proof that not only the citizens, and the taxpayers, but also the Congress, and the President were right in their hopes.

We can see from those programs great results flowing to our economy and to the individuals who have benefitted from this training.

And there is nothing so important to freedom in the world, to liberty in the world, to the dignity of man than education. I am glad to come here today and to see the foundations that you in Maryland are building, the foundations that you have already laid, the predicates that you have planned for the preservation of freedom and of happiness.

It is a stimulating experience for me to come here with your leading State officials and your wonderful Congressional delegation and see that we are building for tomorrow on a solid foundation, because as a great leader of my country once said, "Education is the guardian genius of democracy. Education is the only dictator that free men will ever recognize and the only ruler that free men will accept."

I think when the history of our time is written and the last three years of our work together with the Congress, the people, the country, and the Executive, the extra tenfold increase of $10 billion that we have spent in the field of education, and the extra $10 billion that we have spent in better health for our people, will pay the greatest returns of any investment that our country has ever made.

At this moment, we are carrying great loads of expenditures because of our efforts to preserve liberty and freedom in Southeast Asia—and to protect it. And in the fiscal year our expenditures for military increases over what they were three years ago when I became President will more than exceed $20 billion.

But during the same time that we are carrying those burdens, we have not lost sight of the needs of the education and the health of our people. We have, accordingly, increased our domestic expenditures, primarily for health, education, and conservation, above those that we have increased for defense. We have increased them to some $25 billion to $30 billion.

And a nation where most of its people are employed, earning the best wages they have ever earned before, enjoying the greatest prosperity with the highest Gross National Product—

Yes, these are burdens, but we can carry burdens to preserve liberty, to provide health and education for our people. And we will. We will persevere. We will prevail. And we will educate our citizens and provide for the health of our nation.

Thank you very much.

Tribute to Giuseppe A. Nigro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, on May 7 one of my most distinguished constituents, Giuseppe A. Nigro, will be honored by the Order of the Sons of Italy for his devoted and outstanding service to the order and to the community. For almost 50 years, Mr. Nigro has unselfishly strived to improve and inspire the Order of the Sons of Italy to the position of respect and esteem presently enjoyed by all. In addition to his being a successful businessman and public servant, he has devoted considerable time to serving worthwhile charitable organizations. Mr. Nigro's family, Louise and their four children, expect to be present at the Wedgewood Club in Glen Cove to share the honors that will be bestowed on this truly fine American citizen who typifies all that can be accomplished by those noble in mind and spirit.

As the recently elected national supreme trustee of the proud fraternal organization, and member of the Glen Cove Lodge 1016, Sons of Italy, Mr. Nigro will be treated to a special showing of a popular Broadway hit, which will be the climax of this night of testimonials to this truly great Italian American Giuseppe A. Nigro.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to add my voice in tribute to this worthy citizen and proud son of Italy.

Oscar Comras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, April 28, 1967, death came to Oscar Comras, one of the most widely respected and beloved members of the Pelham Parkway community in Bronx County, N.Y.

For the services held yesterday, hundreds of friends and admirers filled a large chapel to overflowing. Rabbi Benjamin Brilliant, of the Pelham Parkway Jewish Center described "Ozzie" Comras as a man who brought happiness wherever he went, a man dedicated to making brighter the lives of those around him. State Senator Abraham Bernstein, in a moving address, said he was the kind of man who was for his community what Franklin D. Roosevelt and Winston Churchill were on the national and international level.

"Ozzie" Comras will be greatly missed, not only by his wife and family, to whom he was so devoted, not only by the many organizations he served so well, but by literally thousands of people throughout the Bronx. They will remember his efforts on behalf of countless organizations in the community; most of all they will remember the summer nights under the stars when, through his efforts, great orchestras came to play in the parks of the Bronx.

"Ozzie" Comras was a leading spirit in many organizations, most of all in the Pelham Parkway Citizens Council, of which he was a main founder. In the New York Times, his associates in the council recorded "with profound sorrow the passing of a dear friend and esteemed member." They added:

> His memorable leadership and communal achievements inspired all who knew him. To his wife, Blanche, his children Madelyn and Donald and his family, we offer our heartfelt sympathy.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in those sentiments. It is fitting that the passing of such a wonderful human being should be recorded in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Tribute to John Cope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 1, 1967

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, when civil rights, NAACP, and labor unions are discussed in California, one name automatically comes to mind. It would be difficult to assess progress in the State, and particularly in Los Angeles, without mentioning John Cope, for he has been one of the most dedicated workers in our efforts to obtain equality of opportunity for all of our citizens.

John Cope was born in Kansas and attended the public schools of Kansas City. Upon completion of high school he matriculated at California State College in Los Angeles, earning his B.A. degree. Graduate study at San Francisco State College was followed by military service in the U.S. Army, from which he was honorably discharged.

His many years of membership in the NAACP have been highlighted by his service as newsletter editor, press and publicity chairman, labor chairman, and acting employment chairman for region I; service as project coordinator for voter registration campaigns, attendance at the last six NAACP national conventions, and service as executive board member of the Fresno, Los Angeles, and Watts NAACP branches. He wrote position papers on de facto segregation in Los Angeles public schools, researched and wrote presentation of discrimination in apprenticeship programs, and compiled information for police reports in 1960 and 1961.

On May 5, 1967, the South Los Angeles—Watts—branch of the NAACP will honor John Cope with a testimonial dinner, thus giving his fellow citizens a long overdue opportunity to pay tribute to one who has worked untiringly for the improvement of our community.

I deem it a pleasure and a privilege to join in this tribute to John Cope.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Dr. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

The fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom: a good understanding have all they that do His commandments.—Psalm 111: 10.

O God, our Father, the Creator and Sustainer of all mankind, without whose benediction all our labor is in vain, we pray that we may build our lives not upon the shifting sands of a sacrilegious spirit but upon the eternal rock of truth and love—so we would dedicate ourselves anew to Thee. Keep us restless until we find our rest in Thee; keep us dissatisfied until we find our satisfaction in the doing of Thy will; keep us ever searching until we find the end of our seeking in our devotion to Thee and to the coming of Thy kingdom on earth.

Throughout the deliberations of this day may we be mindful of the altar within our hearts where a constant reminder of Thy presence may save us from cynicism and may lead us to a more creative life in Thee. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes;

S. 823. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate oil and gas lease Las Cruces 063610; and

S. 1649. An act authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army.

RAILWAY LABOR ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on May 1, 1967, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

"That the Senate passed the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543) entitled 'Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.'"

Respectfully yours,
W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on Monday, May 1, 1967, he did on that day sign the following enrolled joint resolution of the House:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Conference and certain of their employees.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK LEGISLATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation, for myself and on behalf of the following members of the House Banking and Currency Committee: Messrs. MULTER and BARRETT, Mrs. SULLIVAN, Messrs. REUSS, ASHLEY, MOORHEAD, STEPHENS, ST GERMAIN, GONZALEZ, MINISH, HANNA, ANNUNZIO, REES, BINGHAM, and KYROS. The bill authorizes a contribution on the part of the United States to the replenishment of certain of the resources of the Inter-American Development Bank.

In substance the bill authorizes the U.S. Governor to the Bank to vote for an increase in the Bank's fund for special operations. The bill provides for a U.S. contribution to the fund of $300 million per year for the next 3 years. This represents a 20-percent increase over the last contribution made to the fund by the United States. However, it should be noted that while our contribution has been increased by 20 percent, the Latin American countries have doubled the amounts of their contribution to the fund—from $50 million per year to $100 million per year. The ratio of our contribution to that of our Latin American partners in progress is thereby reduced from 5 to 1 to 3 to 1. This represents a significant step forward in our policy of fostering self-help.

In addition to ourselves and the countries of Latin America, other countries have made some $70 million in credits available to the Bank for economic development. If bond sales and the purchase of participations in Bank loans are included, the Bank has been able to mobilize a little bit more than $200 million from the following nonmember countries: Canada, Germany, Israel, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United Kingdom. However, the Bank has come to recognize that certain of the capital exporting countries have benefited from Bank-financed purchases but have made either no contribution to the resources of the Bank or have made a contribution that does not bear a reasonable proportion to the benefits received. France, for example, which has consistently demonstrated a lack of sympathy to the balance-of-payments position of the United States, has benefited by Bank-financed purchases in the amount of $23.5 million without having made any contribution whatsoever to the Bank's financing. In the light of such facts, the Bank is currently giving consideration to a proposal that would tie Bank-financed purchases to countries making a satisfactory contribution to the Bank. Hopefully such a program will further reduce the proportionate share that we assume in financing economic development in Latin America.

At the historic meeting of the Presidents of the Americas at Punte del Este, Uruguay, it was resolved that Latin America would create a common market, move toward economic integration through the sponsorship of multinational projects, increase foreign trade earnings, place increased emphasis on the agricultural sector to increase food production, promote education, science and technology, and the condition of health of the peoples of the Americas. In each and all of these endeavors the Inter-American Development Bank must play a fundamental role. Our support of the proposed legislation is the reaffirmation of our pledge to the partnership, that is the Alliance for Progress. As the Inter-American Development Bank succeeds in its efforts, so is the Alliance for Progress strengthened.

The International Finance Subcommittee—under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Wisconsin, HENRY S. REUSS—of your House Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings on Wednesday, May 3, and Thursday, May 4, on this legislation, in the committee hearing room, 2128 Rayburn House Office Building. Administration witnesses will be heard on Wednesday and private parties on Thursday.

THE CERTAIN DRIFT OF THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the certain drift of the Federal judiciary—from the Supreme Court down to the Federal district judge—away from even remote connections with the will of the people of America has long since reached a point where remedies must be taken. Decisions of the Federal courts in matters of social significance and in the area of criminal apprehension and prosecution have rendered the Congress and the various States impotent.

Legislative functions are apparently no longer the exclusive prerogative of the Congress, and in fact the Federal courts have undertaken to legislate the law of the land, with little or no mind to either the people or the Congress. This tendency, in addition to extralegal tactics of the various Federal administrative bodies called guidelines, has today stripped the Congress of its constitutional function and removed government from the reach of the people.

These activities of the Federal courts and the executive branch have been undertaken over the past two or three decades quietly, with almost no opposition from the Congress. However, some Members in the past have objected and proposed remedies. One of the proposals called for a constitutional amendment which would require the election of Federal judges, including the Justices of the Supreme Court.

The oligarchy which is the Supreme Court has, beginning in late years with the 1954 Brown decision through its one-man, one-vote decision affecting congressional reapportionment, acted without any semblance of a mandate from the electorate. It is high time these self-appointed legislators faced the people and gave an account of their stewardship.

The latest court-decreed legislation passed by the coalition with the executive branch is the fifth circuit court's ruling on integration of State-controlled public schools in seven Southern States, which upholds the guidelines laid down by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in defiance of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. This action effectively destroys public education at the State level and superimposes upon the people by executive and judicial decree a Federal school system.

I am convinced that a majority of the people of America feel that the judges and the administrative bodies, rather than the Congress, are making the laws which govern this land, and they want the right to temper their laws without Federal bayonets stuck in their faces.

The alternative is to elect competent judges and jurists to sit in our courts both large and small, so that every ruling of the Federal judiciary will no longer be aimed at merely one section of the country or at one element of our society. The question is, Whose policies are the judges carrying out? If these are the people's policies, then they should not be afraid to face the electorate and run for election periodically, just as other officials must do.

AN EDITORIAL ENTITLED "WHEN COURTS IGNORE REASON, THE PEOPLE MUST RESTORE IT"

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked permission to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point an editorial entitled, "When Courts Ignore Reason, the People Must Restore It." Mr. Loyal Frisbie, editor of the Polk County Democrat, one of the outstanding biweekly newspapers of our Nation, expresses well the problem that occurs when a bad situation created by bureaucracy is compounded by the action of the courts. His editorial is self-explanatory. However, I would like to point out that the county of Polk has an area of 1,861 square miles. All school attendance areas in the county have been abolished because of this court order with the choice of a school to attend being left entirely to the student and his parent. If reason does not prevail, chaos will follow in this ridiculous situation wherein a school will have to accept any and every student whether or not there is classroom space for that student.

The editorial follows:

When Courts Ignore Reason, the People Must Restore It

If there has remained a doubt in anyone's mind that the Federal courts have taken over operation of the public school systems in the various states, yesterday's action by the Polk County school board should dispel that doubt.

After weeks of harassment by petty federal officials, and under the gun of the Federal District Court in Tampa, the school board yesterday abolished all attendance areas in the county. The choice of a school to attend is left entirely to the individual students and their parents.

Provided the school of his choice is not overcrowded, a student must be accepted, whether that school is next door, across town or across the county. And it isn't sufficient for school officials to say "Sorry, we're full." The county board must make an effort to secure enough portable classrooms to care for the overflow, where one develops. And if the distance to be traveled is greater than that already established as reasonable for walking, the board must provide for transportation, or be ready to give a mighty good reason why not.

These ridiculous ideas are not the invention nor the wish of Polk County school officials. They were adopted yesterday in strict accordance with a December ruling of a 12 judge Federal Court panel, meeting in New Orleans.

Although the ruling came in a case specifically involving a county in Mississippi, it applies to all counties within the Fifth Circuit—which includes Florida.

Polk's school board announced promptly after the New Orleans decision that, notwithstanding its Federal Court-approved integration plan, which had another two years to go, it would complete classroom integration in one year. This still wasn't enough to satisfy the Justice Department representative with whom Polk officials tried to negotiate an orderly schedule for completing the changeover.

Finally, in the opinion of the school board's attorney and other top county school officials, there was nothing left to do but to throw the entire county into one huge attendance area, without rhyme or reason.

All that the Federal Courts are interested in, of course, is full compliance with a series of Supreme Court orders requiring complete racial integration—as though that would solve all of this nation's social problems in one massive push. But in the sweeping decision handed down in New Orleans, as in others of similar content, the effect is to go far beyond the outlawing of discrimination based on race.

For instance, under yesterday's school board action, Bartow High School students wishing to take courses offered in the bigger high schools of Lakeland and Winter Haven, but not available here, could choose to enroll in those schools. So could students now attending Fort Meade and Frostproof High Schools.

Absurd? Of course. But a Federal Court order is the law of the land, reasonable or not. Not even the Constitution can stand in the way, if the courts hold that its words don't mean what they have previously been thought to mean.

One section of yesterday's school board resolution forbids the publishing of names or addresses of students who have exercised a choice of what school to attend. This, on its face, denies to newspapers access to public records, and the right to publish those records. To most people, both lawyers and laymen, this looks like a violation of the First Amendment which guarantees, among other rights, the freedom of speech and of the press.

This is a right which Polk school officials have always scrupulously observed . . . until the 12 judges in New Orleans ruled otherwise.

Incidentally, the possible withholding of Federal school funds is not involved in this case. Failure to comply absolutely with the court decree could land the board members and the county superintendent in contempt of court, which can have most unpleasant consequences.

Yesterday's forced school board action could bring utter chaos to the county school system in the 1967–68 school year. It is up to Polk County's level-headed citizens of good will, regardless of color, to see that this doesn't happen.

By all means, let there be end to discrimination and to forcible segregation, but also let there be calm and reasonable use of the carte blanche which the school board has adopted.

L.B.J.: DESPITE HIS CRITICS, HE PROVIDES SOUND LEADERSHIP

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in an excellent editorial, the Abilene Reporter-News of April 26, 1967, cogently sums up President Johnson's leadership in the Vietnam struggle in the face of vicious personal attacks and irresponsible criticism. Says the Reporter-News:

> All the while the President carefully steers a middle policy course, trying cautiously to step up the pressure of war to bring it to an end rather than a nuclear holocaust.

I think most Americans agree that our President is steering us through dangerous waters with sure hands and careful judgment. He is doing so at a time when diverse political factions are hammering at him and loudly berating his policies. I commend President Johnson for ignoring these loud, divisive voices.

I commend him for honoring our commitments to the people of South Vietnam. I commend him for upholding our Nation's commitment to maintain the best possible support for our military forces now in the field.

I think the Abilene Reporter-News speaks for the majority of Americans in supporting the President in Vietnam. I include this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

THE PRESIDENT AND HIS WAR CRITICS—AN ANALYSIS

There has never been a dilemma like it, and because this is so, President Johnson bears burdens and frustrations unlike any of his predecessors knew.

This is not to say he is the only President ever to know crisis. Far from it. But his (they are many) are set apart by the peculiarities of this age.

As Commander in Chief, he must fight a war which was not of his making, which he regrets, but which he is convinced involves America's present and future vital interests as well as those of the free world.

On the one side he is assailed by a large body of critics who want to wade into North Vietnam with our full military force and win the war quickly.

On the opposite pole are the peace demonstrators, the marching agitators, who demand we pull out.

Still a third group, and the one troubling the President most, are the "doves" of the U.S. Senate and intellectual community who clamor for him to seek peace while indeed he is seeking peace.

All the while, the President carefully steers a middle policy course, trying cautiously to step up the pressure of war to bring it to an end rather than a nuclear holocaust.

Let's examine the positions of all three groups of critics.

Sure, we have the awesome power to wipe out the Communist North Vietnamese. But would both Communist China and Soviet Russia, singly or collectively, stand idly by? The coffee cup experts, even senators and congressmen and military men, say they wouldn't dare interfere.

But only one man—the President himself, can make this decision and he must bear the responsibility for it. Only he—not even the best informed men in the Senate and House—have minute to minute access to all the information gathered by our intelligence system all over the world.

Even he is not sure, but it is he who must calculate the risk of whether such action would plunge the world into a nuclear war from which none would rise.

Then, should we pull out and turn South Vietnam over to the Communists, which is what the extreme peaceniks mean? Certainly not, and it is not for so transparent an issue as saving face, but because if we quit on our commitment, then the framework of the whole free world which rests wholly on our word, would collapse. Vice President Humphrey restated this in his speech last Friday to the American Society of Newspaper Editors in Washington.

Finally, to the doves who exhort Johnson to seek peace. Senator Charles Percy of Illinois, for instance, told the ASNE in a Saturday luncheon address that the United States should strive harder for peace, seeking it "with at least as much vigor and invention as we now pursue war."

Where, pray tell, has the senator been these many months, not to know that President Johnson has, indeed, been seeking peace with "at least as much vigor" as he has pursued war? It takes two to make peace, and Ho Chi Minh declared as recently as February he would have none of it.

We close this think piece with some words spoken in New York Monday by Merriman Smith, UPI White House reporter and Pulitzer Prize winner who expressed dismay at the vicious personal attacks on President Johnson. He said:

"Believe me, this is the time for the American public to take some responsibility for its own image and stop blaming everything on either Lyndon Johnson or Drew Pearson. Mr. Johnson—in fact, no president—deserves the indignities being heaped upon him these days in the name of peace or civil rights."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ROADS OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE ON MAY 2 AND 3, 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works be permitted to sit during general debate on May 2 and 3, 1967.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is a Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

ARLINE AND MAURICE LOADER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1971) for the relief of Arline and Maurice Loader.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

WILLIAM JOHN MASTERSON ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2048) for the relief of William John Masterton, George Samuel Konik, and Louis Vincent Nanne.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

E. F. FORT ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2661) for the relief of E. F. Fort, Cora Lee Fort Corbett, and W. R. Fort.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill is passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

DEMETRIOS KONSTANTINOS GEORGARAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1596) for the relief of Demetrios Konstantinos Georgaras (also known as James K. Georgaras).

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

ROSE MINUTILLO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1630) for relief of Rose Minutillo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1630

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to Mrs. Rose Minutillo, of Brooklyn, New York, the amount certified to him by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs pursuant to section 2 of this Act. The payment of such amount shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Mrs. Rose Minutillo for a pension under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration for the period beginning on December 14, 1944, through December 17, 1962, on account of the death of her husband, John Minutillo (Veterans' Administration claim number XC 2–935–738). No part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount that Mrs. Rose Minutillo, of Brooklyn, New York, would have received as pension for the period beginning on December 14, 1944, through December 17, 1962, on account of the death of her husband, John Manutillo, if she had filed a proper claim for such pension on December 14, 1944.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. M. M. RICHWINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3717) for the relief of Mrs. M. M. Richwine.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AGNES C. STOWE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4064) for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4064

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3010 of title 38, United States Code, relating to effective dates for awards, the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is authorized and directed to pay, out of any funds appropriated for dependency and indemnity compensation, to Agnes C. Stowe, of Pensacola, Florida, a sum equal to the amount which would have been payable to her as dependency and indemnity compensation for the period from June 4, 1959, the date of the death of her husband, Ansell M. Stowe, who died as the result of a service-connected disability, through April 27, 1962, the effective date of the award of such compensation, had entitlement to such compensation been allowed from the date of death of the said Ansell M. Stowe: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, strike "in excess of 10 percentum thereof".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUGET SOUND PLYWOOD, INC., OF TACOMA, WASH.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4949) for the relief of Puget Sound Plywood, Inc., of Tacoma, Wash.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

PEDRO IRIZARRY GUIDO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5970) for the relief of Pedro Irizarry Guido.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS and **Mr. TALCOTT** objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DINO J. CATERINI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6445) for the relief of Dino J. Caterini.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and **Mr. GROSS** objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ROBERT M. GILKEY, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 6446) for the relief of Robert M. Gilkey, Jr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. TALCOTT and **Mr. GROSS** objected, and under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PATTERSON, EAGLE, GREENOUGH & DAY, ESQS.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1885) for the relief of Patterson, Eagle, Greenough & Day, Esqs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama and **Mr. GROSS** objected and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

U.S. EMBASSY IN DENMARK PROMOTING DANISH MINK IMPORTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to learn from a recently published report that the U.S. Embassy in Denmark was promoting Danish mink imports into the United States. The report, in the Fur Age Weekly, pictured American mink buyers and the managing director of Danish Fur Sales together at a cocktail party at the U.S. Embassy in Copenhagen. The publication called the Embassy function "an unprecedented gesture by an American Ambassador."

With millions of dollars being lost by American mink farmers due to low prices and increased mink imports, I wonder about the wisdom of the U.S. Embassy in Denmark conducting social activities that encourage more mink imports from that country.

Since increased mink imports from Denmark and other countries are beating down the price American mink farmers receive for their pelts, it is highly questionable for our Embassy to be gladhanding commercial interests who insist on bypassing American mink for Danish mink. That is why I last week introduced the mink import control bill, to restrict mink imports which unfairly compete with domestic producers.

The possible ramifications of the Embassy party in Copenhagen are but another reason why price-depressing mink imports should be curtailed.

NEW HAMPSHIRE CONGRESSMEN URGE INCREASE IN SOLDIERS HOME BENEFITS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today my colleague from New Hampshire [Mr. WYMAN] and I are joining the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] in introducing a bill to increase the Federal reimbursement for care given veterans in State veterans' homes.

Increasing costs have made present reimbursements both unrealistic and sadly outdated.

The Veterans' Administration, under title 38 of the United States Code, now reimburses State soldiers' and sailors' homes for 50 percent of operating costs, but this payment cannot exceed $2.50 a day for domiciliary patients and $3.50 a day for nursing patients.

Obviously, these payments come nowhere near the 50-percent figure. In the case of the New Hampshire Soldiers Home, figures show that it now costs between $8 and $10 a day to provide domiciliary care and $15 to $18 a day for nursing care for patients.

Our bill would increase these Federal reimbursements to a maximum of $3.50 a day for domiciliary and $5 a day for nursing patients, still short of the 50-percent target, but a more realistic figure in view of today's costs.

If some such increase in Veterans' Administration payments is not provided, many States will have no alternative but to curtail their already minimal services to needy veterans, something none of us want.

I therefore call to my colleagues' attention this bill, and urge them to support it.

NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, according to today's New York Times, Secretary McNamara has issued a memorandum to his subordinates stating that news management would not be tolerated in the Department of Defense. It has never occurred to me before that the Secretary has a sense of humor.

Considering past performances, I cannot help but question the credibility of this story. In the first place, it emanates from the Pentagon's Office of Public Affairs. The head of that office from January 21, 1961, to February 3, 1967, was Arthur Sylvester. And Mr. Sylvester is the man who once said:

> It's inherent in government's right to lie to save itself.
>
> When the Administration is on the defensive under our political system, I would always be suspicious of what it said.

On another occasion, he said:

> Look, if you think any American official is going to tell you the truth, then you're stupid. Did you hear that?—Stupid.

The Secretary himself, not his subordinates, is the man who has done more to destroy credibility at the Pentagon than any other individual. Whether this can be attributed to news management or stupidity, I cannot say. However, the continual application of the label "Whiz Kids" to McNamara and those surrounding him would seem to rule out the latter. And that leaves the question of credibility.

In 1963, Secretary McNamara said:

> I have no evidence that Cuba is being used as a base for subversion against other Latin American countries.

Three months later, the Senate Preparedness Subcommittee reported:

> The evidence is overwhelming that Castro is supporting, aiding, and abetting Communist revolutionary and subversive movements throughout the Western Hemisphere.

On November 21, 1963, the Secretary said:

> We are equally encouraged by the prospects for progress in the war against the Viet-Cong.

Two months later, he said:

> The Viet Cong moved in . . . and had many successes during the period of November and December.

It was about this time, of course, that Mr. McNamara said that American participation in the war would be over by the end of 1965.

In early 1964 McNamara told us that the successor to the Diem government "has considerably more popular support than its predecessor." Two days later that government was overthrown.

In early March 1964, he said:

> We are confident these plans point the way to victory.

In late March 1964, he said:

> The road ahead is going to be long, difficult, and frustrating.

In July of 1964, McNamara reported an improvement in the morale of the Vietnamese, but the very next month a state of emergency was declared, and widespread rioting followed.

When American ground forces were sent to Vietnam and the big buildup began in 1965, Secretary McNamara assured us that "they would not tangle with the Vietcong." Shortly thereafter, a military spokesman in Saigon said these troops would render combat support and, if necessary, fighting.

By November of 1965, McNamara could tell the American people:

We have stopped losing the war.

And yet, according to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird], during the time we were supposedly losing the war, Secretary McNamara made optimistic statements as to the war's progress on no less than 14 separate occasions.

About a year ago, the minority leader made a statement to the effect that there was a bomb shortage in Vietnam. Secretary McNamara hastily called a press conference to rebut the charges. But the next day, the Pentagon admitted it was repurchasing bombs that had been sold to West Germany for $1.70 each and now paying $21 apiece to get them back.

Also last year, when Under Secretary of State George Ball said that political turmoil in Vietnam had not affected military operations, McNamara contradicted him 10 days later.

Members of the opposition party have questioned the reliability of the Pentagon's estimate of Vietcong wounded. The Secertary has given estimates of the size of the North Vietnamese army that conflict with General Westmoreland's.

Early last month, McNamara said there would be no need for bombing Mig bases. Last week, those bases were attacked.

I remember that a reporter once asked Mr. McNamara why we were not winning friends to our Vietnamese policy. The Secretary's candid reply was, "The trouble is our credibility was destroyed."

I certainly agree with Mr. McNamara's order that news management must cease at the Pentagon. I only hope that copy of the order was delivered back to the Secretary's Office.

THE COST OF THE DECLINE IN URBAN AND RURAL AREAS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. Roth] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, the cost to America, in human and monetary terms, resulting from the continuing decline of urban and rural areas, is too great for even this richest of nations to afford. The waste inherent in the degradation and shame of our slum dwellers, the cost of deteriorating sections of our cities and towns, these cost the American people staggering sums annually. Recognizing this, I am happy to join with many of my colleagues in sponsoring the National Home Ownership Foundation Act.

This plan adopts a different approach than earlier proposals aimed at remedying the ills of our declining neighborhoods. While the Federal Government plays a vital role as a stimulus and guarantor, the task of accomplishing the rebuilding of local areas will be left with local organizations. In this way, by enlisting the aid of local business, labor, finance, and low-income people themselves, we can make a broad-front assault upon the problems of our declining neighborhoods.

By assisting these lower income Americans to obtain loans with which they may buy their own homes, we will give them a stake in their own neighborhoods, we will encourage them to use their efforts and initiative to rebuild their surroundings, we will restore their pride in themselves. This approach, it seems to me, placing responsibility on the individual's shoulders, rather than making him heavily reliant on Government initiative, effort, and money, will involve and motivate more people than existing programs.

The Foundation created by this plan would be empowered to raise some $2 billion through the sale of bonds to private investors. The Foundation itself, though created by congressional act, would be a private, nonprofit corporation, headed by a board of directors made up of representatives of various sectors of the economy. It would provide technical assistance to local homeownership organizations, and make loans to local organizations and individuals in the event other financial institutions were unable to do so. Under this proposal, the resources, both financial and intellectual, of business, labor, banking, and the people directly affected would be brought to bear on the problems of our declining urban and rural areas.

The approach embodied in the National Home Ownership Foundation Act seeks to bring into the attack on the problems of the cities the full force and initiative of the free enterprise system. This proposal represents a long-range investment in America. I hope Congress in its wisdom will give the plan the consideration it merits.

DEATH TAX ON YOUTH LEADERSHIP TRAINING

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a special order today to call before the attention of the country, and of the Congress, some new regulations that were issued by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue on Friday, April 14, 1967. This date may well be remembered in history as "black Friday" for over 700 of the Nation's cultural, education, scientific, trade, and labor organizations since the IRS, in all their assumed "divine" inspired wisdom, decided to impose a 48-percent "death" tax on the net advertising income—these organizations derive from their publications.

Two organizations that will feel the full brunt of the bureaucratic edict will be the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts.

The national executive director of the Girl Scouts of America, Louise A. Wood has informed me by letter on April 26, 1967, of the following effect of the IRS ruling on their worthwhile organization:

> Ours is an organization chartered by the Congress to bring the Girl Scout program to all girls, seven thru seventeen years of age, wherever they are. Our primary source of income is the $1.00 membership dues from our members. At present we reach three million girls, or one out of every seven in the girl population seven to seventeen years of age. An important service to these girls is the *American Girl* magazine published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. as a companion to our program by translating our Girl Scout purposes and beliefs into magazine form.
>
> Subscriptions do not cover the cost of the *American Girl* magazine. Advertising appropriate to girl activity and magazine content is also sought. The sale of advertising helps to meet the cost, and at present additional subsidy is also required from Girl Scout operations. If our limited advertising revenue were to be taxed in the future, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. would have to reduce its other services for girls accordingly. In fact the question would probably have to be faced whether Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. could continue to publish this important vehicle to youth.
>
> The *Leader* magazine is also published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. It is our major means of communication to our six hundred thousand adult volunteer members, most of whom serve as Girl Scout leaders. There is no subscription to the *Leader* magazine. Advertising revenue only partially supports this magazine. As in the case of the *American Girl* magazine, any tax to be paid on this revenue would result in further reduction of services to our membership.

Mr. Speaker, a similar effect will be felt by the Boy Scouts of America, as indicated by the following communication from the Boy Scout organization:

THE ROLE OF ADVERTISING

> Boys' Life is a specialized magazine reaching a very particular market. There is a limit to the range of advertisers to whom we can make any appeal, and there is a limit on the amount of money these advertisers are willing to spend to reach our specialized audience. These factors introduce restrictions on the specialty magazine not experienced by the general magazine. Advertising rates have been increased systematically. (Appendix A to Enclosure III)
>
> The acceptance of advertising by Boys' Life serve two purposes: 1. It provides a major source of revenue to help meet publishing costs, and 2. it serves to introduce the boy into the competitive economy of which he is rapidly becoming a part. Advertising helps him in the development of brand preference and the ability to buy sensibly.
>
> Advertising revenue is essential to the publication of the magazine, since subscription income averages less than production and distribution costs. The following chart indicates the deficit incurred when productions operating costs per subscription are related to subscription income.

Year and deficit

	Cents
1954	68
1960	67
1964	77
1966	84

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Beside the additional financial burden placed on the Scouting movement by this regulation, I have yet to find any authority giving the IRS such power, and have yet to discover any legislative history conferring such power. The IRS in no way based its new proposed regulation on any new law recently enacted by Congress, but attempts to demonstrate its authority on a 1950 statute. This 1950 amendment to the Internal Revenue Code was passed for the purpose of curbing an abuse on the part of certain tax-exempt organizations that were acquiring regular commercial businesses not related to the tax-exempt organizations. The "cause celebre," which triggered the 1950 law was a New York University's operation of a macaroni factory.

In an extensive review of the legislative history relating to the 1950 amendments neither I, nor my staff, have yet to discover any mention—or congressional condoning—of the presently proposed IRS regulations relating to the advertising income derived from publications of the Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, or other tax-exempt organizations.

There are two references that occurred during both the Senate and House debate, which might shed some light upon this dark and unpleasant situation. First, is a colloquy between the late Senator George and Senator Saltonstall to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 22, 1950, on pages 15515 to 15516:

> Mr. GEORGE. The amendments of the Senate relating to unrelated business activities of tax-exempt organizations, lease-backs, and prohibited transactions between a trust or foundation and the donor or creator, and members of the family was agreed to by the House conferees. The House conferees also agreed to the elimination of the tax on accumulations. However, the House conferees insisted on some provision being written in the bill to prevent unreasonable accumulations contrary to the purposes of the trust and to prevent the investment of accumulated funds in such a manner as to jeopardize the interests of the beneficiary. The House conferees also insisted that the provision should require that the funds must not be used to a substantial degree for other than charitable purposes. This last change was intended to prevent a grantor from setting up a trust accumulating the income, and using it as a credit reserve for his business. I believe that under existing law, such activities would justify the Treasury in holding that a charitable trust did not exist. Similar rules are provided under the House change in the case of private foundations. The Senate conferees agreed to these changes.
>
> It is confidently believed that these provisions may be effectively used to prevent abuses.
>
> Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?
>
> Mr. GEORGE. I yield.
>
> Mr. SALTONSTALL. Does the Senator from Massachusetts correctly understand from what the Senator from Georgia has just stated that the rules concerning ordinary investments of charitable organizations such as hospitals or universities are not changed in any way? They are exempt from taxation as they are now, are they not? The provision the Senator from Georgia has just read does not apply to the ordinary investments of a university, does it?
>
> Mr. GEORGE. No; I do not think it would apply unless there was an unusual withholding or failure to distribute or use the earnings over a longer period of time than might be necessary. I do not think ordinarily they would apply to colleges or hospitals. The Senator was confining his question to colleges or hospitals?
>
> Mr. SALTONSTALL. I was confining my statement to hospitals, universities, or charitable organizations of that kind; organizations exempt from taxation.
>
> Mr. GEORGE. No; it would not apply to them. The Senator is correct.
>
> Mr. SALTONSTALL. These new rules are set up to avoid abuses where an industrial establishment is bought by a charitable institution; and such abuses have occurred in the past.
>
> Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Second, is a statement by Representative Jenkins during the House debate which occurred on June 28, 1950, and is to be found on page 9357 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the same date. This is the only reference which even remotely approaches any reference to the subject at hand:

> There is no question that something should be done about stopping these loopholes and I compliment the committee for having taken action to stop some of this loophole invasion. The principal loophole invasion, I think, comes from what we call unrelated properties. Where somebody dies, for instance, and leaves a hardware store to a college and that college goes ahead and runs the hardware store in competition to another hardware store. In that case they ought to pay taxes on that hardware store. They ought to pay their fair share of taxes. That is what this bill does in that respect, and it does a good job, I think.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite apparent from the aforementioned statements that it was never the intent—or will—of Congress that the 1950 amendments, which the IRS rely upon, were ever intended to apply to the advertising income of tax-exempt organizations. Nowhere in the hearings, reports, nor House debate does the word "advertising" nor the phrase "advertising income" appear. I also think it is quite apparent that the IRS has greatly exceeded its authority by issuing these regulations without first obtaining congressional approval. It further seems absurd, that it has taken some 17 years before that IRS received "divine revelation" so as to apply these new regulations to the statute.

I mentioned previously that this was a dark situation. No one seems to be more in the dark and in a confused state than the IRS themselves. They have yet to come up with any type of list of the so-called 700 organizations or publications that would be affected under their arbitrary ruling, nor have they dared to project the amount of tax revenue that would be generated to the Federal coffers. They are much in the same situation as a blind man trying to walk a tight rope in a pitch black room wearing roller skates.

"ALLEGED" REASONS FOR THE IRS PROPOSAL

There has also been much discussion that the present exemption held by the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts amounts to unfair competition and is discriminatory in regard to commercial publications. In examining the Boy Scouts' official publication, Boys' Life, I discover that there are a great deal of advertisements contained within it that pertain to camping and academic matters, uniforms, and merit badges that are of particular interest to Scouters. Surely Time, Look, Vogue, or even Playboy, do not decry this kind of competition.

The IRS estimates that the total advertising receipts of the publications of this undetermined number of tax-exempt organizations runs in the neighborhood of $100 million per annum. The overall amount spent on advertising in America during 1966 was $15.12 billion according to U.S. Department of Commerce Handbook. That means that less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the total advertising revenue accrued to these nonprofit organizations. I am quite sure that the American people, the commercial publications, and the Federal budget can afford this present exemption that is granted these outstanding organizations.

SERVICES RENDERED BY SCOUTING

What functions do the Scouts perform that the Internal Revenue Service now wish to circumscribe? They are in the forefront of efforts to curb juvenile delinquency, to instill a spirit of patriotism and community service, to encourage good mental, physical, and moral habits, to help youngsters grow in body and mind so as to become better citizens, to provide training for leadership in the world they will one day inherit. One out of every seven girls between the ages of 7 and 17 belong to the Girl Scouts—almost 3 million girls. Over 275 Members of this House have had an association with the Boy Scouts ranging from membership to positions of local, regional, and national leadership. Both organizations have been chartered by Congress which has applauded their work, goals, and purposes. They receive nothing in the way of Federal subsidies. They are voluntary organizations.

THE REAL ISSUE

The real issue is not so much who must pay tax on advertising income as it is who shall decide who must pay the tax on advertising income. Congress has made no such declaration. Yet, 17 years after the fact, and in the absence of any further legislation, the Internal Revenue Service says it was the intent of Congress to tax the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts.

Thus Congress is placed in the ludicrous position of having to pass legislation to prevent something from happening, instead of passing legislation to cause something to happen. This, in my opinion, was never the intent of Congress, but it shows how far we have come along on the road to government by men instead of government by law.

According to the information published in the Federal Register, these organizations have just 30 days to present any arguments, and then the rules contained in the final regulations will be applied to the tax years beginning after the date of their final adoption.

It is my hope that the Congress make clear in no uncertain terms its displeasure with this presumption of power and authority by an agency of the executive branch.

I insert at this point in the RECORD a letter I received from the Girl Scouts of America and a memorandum from the Boy Scouts of America:

GIRL SCOUTS
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
New York, N.Y., April 26, 1967.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is concerned about the possible adverse impact of the proposed regulations of the Internal Revenue Service having to do with the taxability of unrelated income. We are fearful that this proposal, if made applicable to us, would limit future services to our Girl Scouts.

Ours is an organization chartered by the Congress to bring the Girl Scout program to all girls, seven thru seventeen years of age, wherever they are. Our primary sources of income is the $1.00 membership dues from our members. At present we reach three million girls, or one out of every seven in the girl population seven to seventeen years of age. An important service to these girls is the *American Girl* magazine published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. as a companion to our program by translating our Girl Scout purposes and beliefs into magazine form.

Subscriptions do not cover the cost of the *American Girl* magazine. Advertising appropriate to girl activity and magazine content is also sought. The sale of advertising helps to meet the cost, and at present additional subsidy is also required from Girl Scout operations. If our limited advertising revenue were to be taxed in the future, Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. would have to reduce its other services for girls accordingly. In fact the question would probably have to be faced whether Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. could continue to publish this important vehicle to youth.

The *Leader* magazine is also published by Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. It is our major means of communication to our six hundred thousand adult volunteer members, most of whom serve as Girl Scout leaders. There is no subscription to the *Leader* magazine. Advertising revenue only partially supports this magazine. As in the case of the *American Girl* magazine, any tax to be paid on this revenue would result in further reduction of services to our membership.

It is our plea and hope that you can share our message appropriately so that the threat to our program which is implied in the pending Internal Revenue Service regulations will be understood by those responsible for action in this area.

Very truly yours,
LOUISE A. WOOD,
National Executive Director.

BOYS' LIFE

PURPOSE OF THE MAGAZINE

The purpose and policy of Boys' Life shall be to publish a periodical for all boys of Scout age providing wholesome stories and other material of interest and educational value which will stimulate ambition and help character development of boys. All stories and material shall be in harmony with the principles of Scouting as laid down in the Scout Oath and Law. (National Bylaws Article XXIII, Section 2, page 96)

HISTORICAL STATEMENT

The Boy Scouts of America acquired Boys' Life magazine as a program supplement in the early days of the movement (1912). The growth of the magazine has been, until recent years, gradual. The early years of publication were accomplished only by sizeable subsidies from the National Council. Boys' Life magazine is prepared primarily for the membership of the movement, although it is available to all on a subscription basis.

A major emphasis of the program of the Boy Scouts of America is the stimulation of good reading as a means of helping mold character. To this end Boys' Life has been developed and promoted. Future effectiveness of the magazine will be possible only if its quality is continually improved and the highest type of advertising sought to underwrite the costs.

There is evidence of a strong correlation between the lack of reading ability or interests and juvenile delinquency. It is well accepted that the good readers experience increased comprehension and understanding.

If it became necessary to build a case for the specialty publication and its need for non-profit status, considerations should be given to the influence of this publication on the cultural, economic, and social course of the country. Boys' Life magazine is dedicated to good reading and to the support and strengthening of the Scouting program which has as its main aim the building of citizenship in today's youth and tomorrow's leaders. If privileged rating represents an assist to publications of this kind, then it evidences the concern our country feels for those programs that have as their particular emphasis the strengthening and building of citizens of this nation.

Those parents who truly care about exposure of their children's minds to something better than the torrent of trivia in comic books and on the air, depend on these books (Children and Youth Publications). But home budgets are thin for items such as these. (John K. Herbert, President, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc. in a statement before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, United States Senate April, 1962)

During the 1962 Congressional hearings on the proposed postal bill, the Boy Scouts of Amrica presented its concern over the affect of postal rate increases in a letter to Senator Olin D. Johnston. (Enclosure I) During this period certain statements were made suggesting that nonprofit publications should carry a greater proportion of mail expense. The proponents of this philosophy have by and large discounted the values of these publications to the over-all cultural, economic and social growth of the country, an admittedly intangible but highly necessary consideration.

THE ROLE OF ADVERTISING

Boys' Life is a specialized magazine reaching a very particular market. There is a limit to the range of advertisers to whom we can make any appeal, and there is a limit on the amount of money these advertisers are willing to spend to reach our specialized audience. These factors introduce restrictions on the specialty magazine not experienced by the general magazine. Advertising rates have been increased systematically.

The acceptance of advertising by Boys' Life serves two purposes: It provides a major source of revenue to help meet publishing costs, and it serves to introduce the boy into the competitive economy of which he is rapidly becoming a part. Advertising helps him in the development of brand preference and the ability to buy sensibly.

Advertising revenue is essential to the publication of the magazine, since subscription income averages less than production and distribution costs. The following chart indicates the deficit incurred when production operating costs per subscription are related to subscription income.

Year and deficit

1954	68
1960	67
1964	77
1966	84

It is this deficit that is covered through advertising revenue.

A comparison of our page cost per one thousand circulation with those of other specialized audience magazines indicated that ours is only slightly lower.

If operating expenses are proportionately less than regular magazines, it should be remembered that expenses for securing circulation sales are *not* a major expense as they are with general publications. These savings are passed on to the subscriber, again with a view toward making the magazine available to as many as possible.

The magazine industry as a whole points out the dilemma.

"There are people who seem to believe that we can automatically transfer the costs of postage increases to our readers and to our advertisers. As publishers, we know this is not the case.

"Perhaps the best way to convey to you the dilemma the publisher faces is to present the kind of competition that the television set offers today.

"Television uses the public's airways without charge, and pays no special taxes to enter millions of American homes. The entertainment it offers free competes for the leisure time which people also have available for reading the magazines that they buy.

"Now, few families buy only one magazine. Most subscribe to two or three or more. If the price of all goes up, will all these publications be continued or, thinking of the TV-consumed time, isn't it likely that the family cuts one or more from the subscription list? Of course." (John K. Herbert, President, Magazine Publishers Association, Inc. in a statement before the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, United States Senate April 1962)

If the magazine industry at large is limited in its ability to handle increased costs, the Boy Scouts of America is in an even more vulnerable position. To alter or affect the operation of Boys' Life magazine would risk damage to the total structure of the movement. "Net income" from the Boys Life operation is not profit in the usually understood sense, since it is applied to the broader purposes of Scouting. Boys' Life does not provide profit for distribution to owners or stock holders as would be true with general publications.

Approximately 83% (1966) of Boys' Life total circulation is acquired through membership subscriptions. The cost of securing this circulation is extremely low since all subscription sales efforts are carried on by the volunteer leaders and local council offices at no expense to the magazine.

CONSIDERATIONS

When Congress chartered the Boy Scouts of America, it provided that it might conduct its business and affairs and generally do all such acts and things as may be necessary to promote the purposes of said corporation. This excerpt from Section 2 of the Charter together with the stated purpose of Boys' Life should place the operation of the magazine in its proper prospective.

Former Secretary of the Treasury Snyder said when referring to taxation of such organizations:

"Our tax laws have long recognized the principle that organizations operated for worthy public purposes should be encouraged by tax exemption."

The advertising policy of the Boy Scouts of America states that advertisements accepted for publication must not depend on support or endorsement of the Boy Scouts of America. Further, the advertiser is expected to receive a fair return for his advertisement consistent with his expectation of returns from non-Scout advertising media.

No little amount of criticism from "some trade associations" may stem from the debate that has been waged over postal regulations. Boys' Life along with the publications of other non-profit organizations, enjoys a rate not available to "regular publications." It can be said that under proposed legislation the postal rate for non-profit publications will increase nearly 50% in the next three years. At the same time the "for profit" publication will experience a rate increase on editorial matter only of 21%. (Enclosure V) Those increases suggest that the non-profit organizations *are* carrying their proportionate share of the increases based on previously accepted formulas. In reviewing advertising revenue, the industry average income per advertising page has increased 69% since 1956. Boys' Life magazine advertising revenue for the same period increased 86%.

J. K. Lasser reports that in 1963 median profit before federal taxes for magazines, distributed primarily by subscription, with advertising incomes of 20% to 40% of total income was 9%. In the case of Boys' Life 1963 income was 11.1% of the gross. Both the dollar income and the percent of gross have dropped. In 1966 the income was $397,000 or 6.6% of the gross. It should be recorded that the percentage would actually be lower were varying sales promotion efforts charged against the operation of the magazine. This is not done, and therefore it seems justifiable to apply the income to the promotion of the total Scouting program. To do this makes the boy the ultimate beneficiary of the voluntary promotion effort and effective staff management of Boys' Life magazine.

In the last 10 years the magazine industry has experienced a 3% growth in advertising volume (pages) while Boys' Life has had a 3½% decline.

The creation of circumstances that produce income that is in turn put to direct use in carrying out the Scouting program is good management of the assets of the movement directed toward the ultimate extension of Scouting and fulfillment of its chartered purpose. In fact, this income represents no more a drain on the economy and siphoning off of dollars from taxable operations than does the operational economies in any phase of the business operation of non-profit groups.

Wise application of purchasing principles reduces the cost to the purchaser and consequently the income to the supplier. However, no one will question this conservation of money even though it leads to smaller profits for those who do business with the non-profit group.

When a non-profit group uses its assets (terminology, insignia, program) to create circumstances wherein its ultimate purposes are more nearly achieved, this is sound management.

Over the years, first the Congress, later the courts, and more recently the Internal Revenue Service, have all found by their action that Scouting is definitely beneficial to the country to a degree that justifies some consideration of its economic needs. It is essential to the continued growth of the Scouting movement that it be allowed to use its assets wisely in the achievement of its purpose.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield,

Mr. HALL. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. MARSH. I would like to commend the gentleman for taking the floor to discuss this subject today.

I would like to ask the gentleman this question. If this new regulation were adopted, would it not apply to other great professional organizations such as the American Bar Association, the American Medical Association, the American Dental Association, the National Education Association, and the American Nurses Association? Would it not also operate against them?

Mr. HALL. The gentleman has put his finger exactly on the point. It is my understanding that it will be applicable to about 700 tax-exempt nonprofit organizations which are primarily educational and cultural, and which depend upon house organs and advertising therein to pay therefore to carry on the education. It will also apply to labor union publications insofar as education of their union members are concerned, and many others.

We have not been able, I will say to the gentleman before yielding further, to obtain an exact list of these nonprofit organizations from the Bureau of Internal Revenue Service.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would just like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for calling this matter to the attention of the Members of the House. This is a direct outgrowth of a case of IRS against the Sierra Club, when certain people in Congress objected to an advertisement which was run by that organization in certain local papers calling attention of their Members in the Congress to certain bills that were here being considered by the Congress. If this goes unchallenged by the Congress itself, not only the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts but every other tax-exempt organization will have its publications challenged.

I think that you are rendering a tremendous service, not only to the Members of the House, but also to the country in calling this to our attention and to see to it that the IRS is brought back in line, and that the act of 1950 is interpreted as Congress intended it.

Mr. HALL. I certainly thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Speaker, the ranking member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I did not know that the crystallizing factor had been the case which he refers to with proper legal lexicon, but I am glad to have that information, and I submit to the Congress and to the people of the Nation that not only will publications educational and cultural in nature of these tax-exempt organizations be taken off the list with a crack of the whip or by Executive fiat under the Administrative Procedure Act, as amended, but that also the use of technological exhibits at annual meetings will be severely impinged upon as a source of revenue to continue the refresher education and the continuing education of its members.

I think the gentleman has contributed very much indeed, as he does regularly on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, Dr. HALL and commend him for his forthright statement on the disastrous effects the Internal Revenue ruling may have on many worthy organizations.

As one who has long been associated with the Boy Scouts of America I am particularly concerned about what this ruling will mean to scouting. Dr. HALL has covered that area in detail, so I would just like to remind my colleagues of some of the other worthy organizations in America who will find their work seriously hampered if this tax ruling is allowed to stand.

First of all it will hit directly at every labor union in America which has a publication which accepts advertising. In addition it will affect such great organizations as the Shriners Hospitals for Crippled Children, the American Medical Association, the National Geographic Society, the American Association of University Women, and dozens of trade, business, and professional organizations whose contribution to our national life is unlimited.

The Internal Revenue Service has clearly overstepped its authority in this instance and Congress is now in the position of protecting the free associations in this country from an unwarranted attack by the administration through the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee, who is rendering such valiant service to the Congress and to the Nation. I simply want to say in response that I cannot add anything to what he has said here except to say the reason I am addressing myself particularly to the Girl Scout and the Boy Scout situation is because certainly they would not be suspect in any educational or training or cultural effort that they try to impart to the leaders of tomorrow.

My second reason is that I have had 47 years continuous registration as a Boy Scout. I am very proud of that, along with some 278 Members of this Congress. Now I am most delighted to yield to my own colleague from Missouri, a man who knows more about the Internal Revenue Service and who has served on the Subcommittee on Taxation of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I am returning to the gentleman his commendation, because I am so pleased that he has taken the time to expose this problem which has been disturbing a number of us on the Ways and Means Committee.

I call attention to the great service Congressman WATTS has done in this particular area when the Internal Revenue Service first began making noises about changing what I believe is actually the law. The IRS attempted changing the law through the regulatory process instead of coming before the Ways and Means Committee, and so in effect before the Congress, and asking for a change in the law.

It is important, as the gentleman from Missouri is pointing out here, that the Internal Revenue Service, in seeking to correct what they have identified as an abuse—and perhaps there have been abuses in this area of revenue from advertising functions affecting organizations like the Boy Scouts and the National Geographic Society and many others. In fact, all of our fine nonprofit organizations will be seriously affected. If these organizations are to fulfill their functions, they have to communicate with their membership. The way they do this to a large degree is through their inhouse magazines.

I also direct attention to the point that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making. Whether or not the Internal Revenue Service has been motivated by the fact that some of these private nonprofit organizations, who have a legitimate concern in legislation that is before us, really have created an abuse, or whether the Internal Revenue Service is moving in to try to suppress the viewpoints of these private nonprofit organizations, and whether it is the administration using the Internal Revenue Service as a front for this purpose, the fact still remains that this indeed is going to occur.

I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri, because he served with me on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, that one of the things we did not achieve in that committee is that we were unable to zero in on the executive department's lobbying with Federal funds. However, we did achieve a great deal, in my judgment, and I believe the bill we have before the House, which has passed the Senate, has a great many advancements in it.

I have said to the executive department that I would be a little more interested in the concern they have about lobbying by private nonprofit organizations, or anyone else, if there were some discipline exercised by the executive branch of Government in lobbying before the Congress. We have all experienced it. There are two criminal statutes that forbid this. Regarding these statutes I have some correspondence with the Attorney General, that I am about ready to put into the RECORD, wherein I have asked him why he was not enforcing these laws against the operations of the executive branch of the Government.

Certainly when there has been no discipline on the part of the executive, whether it relates to criminal statutes or just the exercise of good sense in not using taxpayers' money to drive through the Congress programs they are interested in, it ill behooves the departments suddenly to become very conscious about the private nonprofit organizations speaking up, as they should speak up, in behalf of their point of view in respect to legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for giving me the opportunity to express myself.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the contribution of my colleague. I am glad he brought out the fact that for two and a half years we served on the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

It is germane that we were not able to get into this committee report, except under the supplemental view which the gentleman published, that the executive branch lobbying is in direct violation of existing criminal statutes.

Would the gentleman not agree with me that we should also commend our colleague, who also serves on the Ways and Means Committee along with the Honorable JOHN WATTS, of Kentucky, the Honorable JOEL BROYHILL, who has submitted legislation—indeed, as the gentleman from Missouri submitted some years ago—to preclude this use of reversing the veto powers of the executive branch?

Does the gentleman not agree with me this is the veto in reverse when, under the Administrative Procedure Act and the Reorganization Act of 1949, the President, or his Cabinet members, may publish in the Federal Register, a new rule, which has the effect of law unless one or the other body of the Congress vetoes it within 6 days?

Mr. CURTIS. It is almost that. It is even worse than that, I would say.

The gentleman pointed out the law of 1950. That was the result of rather extensive hearings in the Ways and Means Committee. I was not here at the time, but I have read the hearings. There was also testimony in the Senate Finance Committee and debate on the floor of the Senate, in an effort to resolve the difficult issue.

Let us consider the other side of the coin. We have magazines for profit, which complain about the competition of these nonprofit magazines. They have a legitimate point, but it is the responsibility of the Congress to resolve it.

Now, as the gentleman points out, the Internal Revenue Service is seeking to change the considered judgment of the Congress through regulation.

I should like to add—and I know the gentleman will be glad to hear this—that Congressman WATTS and I have both been in touch with the Internal Revenue Service, and they have assured us they will not try to put any regulation into effect without referring this back to the Congress. They should not even go so far as they are going, but at least we have this understanding.

Another interesting point is that the Administration is supposed to be sending up a tax reform bill. If this is so, why in the name of Heaven do not they include their ideas on this subject in the tax reform bill and let the Ways and Means Committee and interested Members of the House and Senate zero in on this question. If we need to change the law in some way—and perhaps we do, since it has not been looked at in 16 or 17 years—then it ought to be reviewed in a considered way that will not in any way hamper the very fine nonprofit organizations and their magazines.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. This is indeed the proper place in which this should be considered.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAYLOR. I should like to ask the gentleman whether he believes there is any significance in the fact that the Internal Revenue Service has picked upon the Girl Scouts and the Boy Scouts, two organizations which have no voice except through their leaders, whereas organizations such as the Elks, the Moose, the American Legion, the VFW, and the AMVETS—organizations which might have a positive voice—have not been touched? If the Internal Revenue Service can get a rule and regulation established with respect to the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts, it might be binding upon all these other organizations.

Mr. HALL. I want to make clear to the gentleman, in answer to his question, I do not believe for one moment that only the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts have been singled out by name for the application of this new rule by fiat. Actually, as I said to the gentleman from Virginia, I believe it will be applicable to about 700 organizations. Indeed, it will be decimating in its effect on these two.

As I said in the colloquy once before, I have concentrated my research on them, just as a springboard, so to speak, to bring this situation to the attention of the Nation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. HALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. CURTIS. I would say that there are many organizations such as the ones the gentleman from Pennsylvania named, which are unaware of the fact that it is going to affect them. It will.

It will hit them, and it will hit any organization that uses a magazine as a method of communicating with its membership to the extent that they try to pay for some of the costs through advertising. We need to alert these other organizations so that they can get behind the proper consideration of this measure.

Mr. HALL. That is the whole purpose, and I appreciate the gentleman asking the question.

I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Del Clawson].

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is to be commended for taking this time to focus the attention of the House on the proposal by the Internal Revenue Service to tax the advertising and other income on national publications by educational, scientific, and charitable organizations. Each one of us must deal with this problem within the framework of his own personal experience and relationship with the organizations that fall into the category that are now threatened with a financial obligation that might well be the first step toward the eventual destruction of our free and private institutions as we have known them.

Such rulings should be alarming to every Member of the House of Representatives. National publications by associations and nonprofit organizations and educational institutions are designed primarily to enlighten and inspire the membership as well as provide information so members can better perform their respective duties. A first-class publication can only be achieved on a national basis because of the costs involved. Such publications then serve very important purposes in enabling an organization like the Boy Scouts of America to achieve its basic aims and purposes as outlined in its charter which was received from the Congress of the United States.

While it is not the intent here to discount the value of advertising that is provided in the subject publications by many and various commercial enterprises, it is, I am sure, recognized that money put into such advertising goes far beyond the actual value received in many cases. On the other hand, the value of such advertising should not be downgraded because it does not have real "commercial import." In many cases where there may be a doubt, the advertiser will go along because of the interest he has in the organization involved.

If a regulation as now proposed by the IRS is implemented, what then will be the attitude of these advertisers who may have some doubt as to the commercial benefits of their advertising in the publications covered by such a ruling? Perhaps never before has the need been so great for our free and private institutions that contribute to the character-building functions of the youth of America than today. These organizations should be strengthened at every turn to help them supplement the training in the home toward the building of better citizens. Rather than adopting methods which will weaken the financial structure of these organizations, we should today be engaged in a search for methods to bolster their position in our society. Every effort should be made to open avenues of voluntary financial assistance and to protect them from any movement toward direct Government subsidies. One of the greatest restricting forces of non-profit youth and educational organizations at work in the United States today is their ability to finance their operations adequately. The general exemption from taxation both on a local and Federal level is of great help in enabling an organization to exist in these financially hazardous times.

If the ruling now under study becomes a reality, what would be the next step? How long before local governments who are seeking new sources of revenue and badly in need of additional finances would attempt to tax Boy Scout, Girl Scout, YMCA camps, and so forth, and other properties that are currently a vital part of their operations. I am seriously concerned today as an individual who has devoted many hours of voluntary service and time in the Boy Scouts of America and other youth and adult nonprofit and charitable organizations, and in this concern urge every Member of the Congress of the United States to use his influence to protect the position of these organizations from the imposition of any additional financial burden as a result of the proposal of the Internal Revenue Service.

Today is the day for action for the preservation of our free and private institutions that have contributed to the greatness of America. We cannot permit any encroachment whatever upon their ability to continue in the character-building functions that have been so effective in the past.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Schwengel] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I again view with alarm the policy decision by the Treasury Department relative to new taxes for certain nonprofit organizations. Once again the independent sector of our economy is being penalized. These organizations have served the public welfare by increasing knowledge through extensive research, travel, and studies. They publish publications serving the public interest and all of the people will be handicapped, if the new regulations are not rescinded.

As pointed out already by others, this decision by the Treasury Department could unfairly penalize and handicap great and worthwhile movements.

Mr. Speaker, as further evidence of this public service offered by the independent sector and others already mentioned, I cite the marvelous record of the National Geographic Society. This organization has for over three-quarters of a century had the wondrous task of gathering and diffusing geographic knowledge.

The society shares its growing store of geographic fact with countless millions through its world-famous National Geographic magazine, 24 million color maps a year, its globes, atlases, books, monographs, lectures, bulletins for schools, and its information service for press, television, and radio.

Mr. Speaker, to the young in heart of every age there is magic in the name National Geographic. The very words conjure up images of distant places, of explorers and scientists, sparkling seas and dazzling mountain peaks, strange plants, animals, people, and customs.

Not surprisingly, many of the society's over 4 million members throughout the world regard the organization as a personal friend. A boy of 8 wrote this letter:

> Some other boys and I were thinking about going to Africa to explore. We haven't got veary much money in the bank, so we would like veary much if the National Geographic would like to send us. I was thinking of going when we are 21 year's old that would be 13 year's from now thank you veary much.

An elderly lady came into the society's headquarters in Washington, D.C., to thank the National Geographic for accepting her as a member. She said in all seriousness:

> But I am afraid that at my age I shall not be able to go off on all those expeditions.

Since 1888, when the society was

formed, it has supported more than 200 major expeditions and scientific projects.

For exploration is the essence of geography. Geography is not static, and the study of it merely begins with the configurations and dimensions of the earth's features. This conception is rightly embodied in today's dictionary definition of "geography":

> The science of the earth and its life; especially the description of land, sea, air and the distribution of plant and animal life, including man and his industries, with reference to the mutual relations of these diverse elements.

Mr. Speaker, I can also present testimony to some of the contributions that have been made by the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, which I head. This was done with the invaluable help and encouragement of the National Geographic Society.

The U.S. Capitol Historical Society is an educational organization incorporated under the laws of the District of Columbia. Its membership is open to everyone in the United States who wishes to help the society foster an informed understanding of the inspiration and promise of American history.

The society was founded by a group of devoted, dedicated Americans, in and out of the Congress, who believe that the thrill they derive from the story of the United States can best be communicated and the greatest sense of drama and conviction conveyed, if the Capitol edifice itself were made the focus of the society's program.

Within the walls of this building a free people has expressed its collective will in terms of legislation that has shaken the world. Here we have advanced man's march toward individual dignity and material well-being. With our publications we are trying to tell the story of the United States of America.

The very select group from the National Geographic Society who deserve special attention and for whom I shall never be able to speak as eloquently as I would like and to whom I and the Capitol Historical Society already owe an everlasting gratitude include, Melville Bell Grosvenor, president and editor; Melvin M. Payne, executive vice president and secretary; Lonnelle Aikman, the principal author of "We, the People"; Jules Billard, editorial director for our book; Robert Breeden, design and production director for this publication; James R. Whitney, director of printing and engraving for the book on the Capitol; and George F. Mobley, the chief photographer.

Mr. Speaker, I now present a summary statement of the National Geographic Society's contribution to our own society, the White House Historical Association, the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association and the Washington National Monument Association. In addition, I have a summary statement on some of the other worthwhile contributions made by the National Geographic Society. All of these services are now available to every department of Government and the public and would be curtailed or eliminated if the Treasury Department decision is allowed to stand without amendment. I also want to state I am not against equitable and favorable taxation in every part of our economy, but but I do think these decisions should be made after public hearings are held. It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee would find time to hold hearings and hear testimony on how their decision affects the many philanthropic and volunteer movements.

The material referred to follows:

MEMORANDUM OF PUBLIC SERVICE GRANTS IN CONNECTION WITH PUBLICATION OF EDUCATIONAL BOOKS ON THE WHITE HOUSE, THE CAPITOL, THE SUPREME COURT, AND THE WASHINGTON MONUMENT

White House Historical Association:	
Editorial labor 1962-66 in connection with preparation of "White House" book, "Living White House," and "Presidents" book	$182, 335. 28
Engraving costs on "White House" book, 1962	78, 731. 74
Total direct contribution	261, 067. 02
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made and repaid in 1963	100, 000. 00
U.S. Capitol Historical Society:	
Cash contribution, 1963-62	10, 000. 00
Editorial labor, in connection with preparation of "We, The People" book, 1963-1966	74, 617. 07
Office space donated December 1963 to March 1967	24, 375. 00
Total direct contributions	108, 992. 07
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made in 1963, repaid in 1964	211, 397. 58
Foundation of the Federal Bar Association:	
Editorial labor in year 1965 in connection with preparation of "Equal Justice Under Law," Supreme Court book	95, 301. 08
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made in 1965	180, 353. 05
Less amount repaid to date	30, 386. 43
Balance still unpaid	149, 966.62
Washington National Monument Association:	
Editorial labor in 1965 in connection with preparation "Washington: Man & Monument"	31, 007.52
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital to pay cost of book in 1965	130, 000. 00
Less amount repaid to date	32, 834. 00
Balance still unpaid	97, 166. 00

PUBLIC SERVICE BOOKS PUBLISHED BY THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC SOCIETY

Late in 1961 the White House Historical Association requested the assistance and guidance of the Society in preparing an official guidebook, the first in the 1962-year history of the Executive Mansion of the White House. Mrs. John F. Kennedy had organized the Association to "enhance understanding, appreciation and enjoyment of the Executive Mansion."

The Society pledged its cooperation as a public service and offered the full resources of its staff—editors, photographers, artists and others to prepare the book. On July 4, 1962, little more than six months after the initial request, the book entitled, "The White House," An Historic Guide, became available to White House visitors and, by mail to all the American people through the office of the White House Historical Association.

To produce the 132-page, lavishly illustrated book on the history, the great state rooms, and the furnishings of the White House, the Society's staff devoted more than 6,000 hours of work. The Society also contributed the cost of all photographic materials and printing plates to the Association.

Within a few months the first printing of 250,000 copies was depleted, and the Society prepared a second edition of 100,000 copies which was also sold out by mid-December 1962. By then the Society's combined contribution of editorial assistance and printing plates totaled $121,000. Because the Society assumed so much of the costs, the Association was able to offer the book for the nominal price of $1 for the paper back edition.

Each year the Society's staff has revised the White House Guidebook, making timely additions in pictures and text to reflect the changing White House. The third edition of 250,000 copies prepared by the Society in late 1962 brought the total number printed in the book's first year of publication to 600,000 copies.

A fourth edition of half a million copies followed in May 1963. The Society's staff devoted 1,600 hours to this new edition of the book and increased its size from 132 pages to 144.

As a further public service the Society gave major cooperation in producing "We, the People," The Story of the United States Capitol, for the U.S. Capitol Historical Society. Once again editors, writers, photographers, artists—a complete staff—worked with the Historical Society to produce a 144-page, color illustrated book on the nation's Capitol. By December 5, 1963, when the book was published, staff members had worked 9,334 hours to prepare it. The paper back edition of "We, the People" became available to the thousands of visitors to the Capitol for $1 a copy, a price which would not have been possible if it had not been for the generous contribution of the National Geographic.

The book offered visitors and students an illustrated history of the Capitol and a description of how the legislative branch of the government functions. Among its historic and valuable pictures was the first official photograph of the United States Senate.

Like the White House book before it, "We, the People" became an immediate best seller and the first edition of 250,000 copies was exhausted by the spring of 1964 when the Society prepared a second edition of 440,000 copies, revising and updating text material and photographs.

That same year the John F. Kennedy Memorial Library Committee requested the Society's assistance in preparing a booklet for the many Americans who saw a traveling exhibit of memorabilia of the late President. The Society responded as it had for the previous public service efforts. It produced a 16-page, fully illustrated booklet which helped secure public funds for the memorial to President Kennedy. The booklet, several times reprinted, reached a total of almost two million copies. The Society's contribution: more than 400 hours of staff time—a total cost of $3,072.

The Geographic produced a second book for the White House Historical Association, "The Presidents of the United States of America." A first edition of half a million copies went on sale in November 1964 for 50¢ in the paper back version. The 80-page book contained one-page biographies of each President opposite a color reproduction of the chief executive's official White House portrait. This book had come as a suggestion from President and Mrs. Kennedy at the time the Society was asked to produce the White House Guidebook, and research, production and planning started at that time. In all more than 2,500 hours of staff time went into the book—a contribution of some $18,000.

Shortly after the publication of the book on the Presidents, the same staff produced the fifth edition of the popular White House Guidebook, bringing the total number of books published to 1,705,000. The new edition was expanded to 152 pages. More than 1,500 hours went into the fifth edition, and the Society's cost in producing it amounted to $10,857.

The Washington National Monument Association also turned to the Society for aid in the publication of a long-planned book about George Washington and the Washington Monument. And again as a public service the Society's staff wrote and illustrated a 72-page biography of the first President and history of the Monument. Because of the Society's contribution of almost 5,000 hours of staff time which amounted to some $31,000, the book was made available to visitors to the Washington Monument and Mount Vernon for only 50¢. The first edition of 500,000 copies went on sale July 4, 1965.

Within a few weeks the Society's staff completed work on the fifth major public service book, "Equal Justice Under Law," the first illustrated history of the Supreme Court and its principal cases. In so doing, the Society had produced books on the three branches of government—legislative, executive and judicial.

The Supreme Court book came at the request of the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association. Society employees devoted almost 16,000 hours to the preparation and production of the book—equal to $95,301.

The 144-page book with 268 illustrations, many of them in color, is available to visitors at the Court for $1 in the paper back edition. The Society produced a first edition of 100,000 copies and a second of 150,000 copies, updating the book and making changes brought about by the resignation of Justice Goldberg and the appointment of Justice Fortas.

With the continuing popularity of "We, the People," the U.S. Capitol Historical Society requested another edition in 1965, and the Geographic staff once again revised the book producing a third edition of 350,000 copies for a total printing of 1,050,000 copies.

In 1966, the Society produced "The Living White House," its sixth public service book, which had been in progress since the spring of 1965. In preparing the book for the White House Historical Association, the Society again contributed all writing, editing, photography, layout, quality control and other supporting editorial operations as a public service. Its staff members worked more than 17,000 hours on the book which was published in November in a quantity of 250,000 copies.

This book, a companion to the earlier White House Guide, shows the White House as a home, and tells of each family to live there since John Adams. Like the first White House book, it is profusely illustrated, and has been made available in a paper back edition for the modest price of $1.

The Society also prepared more new editions of public service books in 1966. The White House Guidebook was increased from 152 to 156 pages and required some 1,300 hours of staff time. The publication of 120,000 copies raised the total number printed to 1,825,000. "We, the People" went into its fourth edition of 400,000 copies for a total of 1,450,000 in all editions. The Geographic's contribution on this edition was almost 600 hours.

And this year the Society is once again working on new editions of these two popular books, a service from which all America benefits.

National Geographic Society Cooperation With U.S. Government and Other Public Service Activities—1966

During 1966, as has been the case since the Society's founding in 1888, the National Geographic Society continued its close working relationship with the various departments and agencies of the Federal Government, as well as with many semipublic organizations affiliated with and/or furthering the objectives of the Government.

A broad basis of cooperation arises directly from the composition of the Society's Board of Trustees and its Committee for Research and Exploration.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Of the Society's Board membership of 24, 10 were in active or retired Government service during 1966. They are Dr. Leonard Carmichael, retired Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; Rear Admiral Leo O. Colbert, formerly Director of the U.S. Coast and Geodetic Survey; Vice Admiral Emory S. Land, USN (ret.); General Curtis E. LeMay, USAF (ret.), formerly Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force; Dr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System; Dr. James H. Wakelin, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development; Hon. Earl Warren, Chief Justice of the United States; Dr. James E. Webb, Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Dr. Alexander Wetmore, former Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution; and Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, former Director of the National Park Service.

COMMITTEE FOR RESEARCH AND EXPLORATION

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, retired Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, serves the Society on a full-time basis as Vice President for Research and Exploration and Chairman of the Committee for Research and Exploration. Dr. Alexander Wetmore, also a former Secretary of the Smithsonian, serves as Vice Chairman of this Committee. Other Trustees with Government affiliation serving on the Committee during 1966 were Admiral Colbert, Admiral Land, Dr. Wakelin, and Dr. Wirth. In addition, the following eminent scientists of the Smithsonian Institution are members of the Research Committee: Dr. A. Remington Kellogg, Research Associate and former Director, U.S. National Museum; Dr. T. Dale Stewart, Senior Scientist, Office of Anthropology; and Dr. Matthew W. Stirling, Research Associate and former Director, Bureau of American Ethnology. Thus, of the full Committee of 19, there were 9 who hold or have held positions of responsibility in the Federal Government.

The Chairman of this Committee, Dr. Leonard Carmichael, has been consulted by many Federal agencies and departments concerning scientific and exploration matters. Further, he continues to serve as Chairman of the National Selective Service Scientific Advisory Group.

Other examples of cooperation between this Committee and the Government appear in the following summary of research cosponsored with Federal agencies:

SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN COOPERATION WITH FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Elsewhere in this Information Return is a comprehensive report on the Society's program of scientific research during 1966. Of the 49 grants listed, there were 15 in support of projects either cosponsored by a Federal agency or the Scientific Leader of which was associated with the Government. Briefly, they are as follows:

(1) Expedition to recover meteorites in Saudi Arabia by Dr. Kurt Frederiksson, Curator of Meteorites, Smithsonian Institution.

(2) Study of Seabird Colonies in the Islands of the Aegean Sea by Dr. George E. Watson, Acting Curator of Birds, Smithsonian Institution.

(3) Study of Biology of Deep Sea Fauna by Institute of Marine Science, University of Miami, in collaboration with National Science Foundation.

(4) Archeological Project at Dzibilchaltun, Mexico, by Tulane University in cooperation with National Science Foundation.

(5) Publication research on Russell Cave, Alabama, by Carl F. Miller of the Smithsonian Institution. In addition to supporting scientific research on this archeological site, the Society donated the cave to the National Park Service, which has included it in the National Parks and Monuments System.

(6) Ecological Studies of Fresh-water Turtle in Panama by Dr. John M. Legler of University of Utah in cooperation with the National Science Foundation.

(7) Mapping of Mt. Hubbard-Mt. Kennedy area, Alaska-Yukon border, in cooperation with the Air Force, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

(8) Archeological survey of deep water shipwrecks off Burmuda by Mendel L. Peterson, Chairman, Department of Armed Forces History, Smithsonian Institution.

(9) Ecological study of the Florida Everglades by Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Sr., in cooperation with the National Park Service.

(10) Continued biotelemetry research on grizzly bears and other large mammals by Dr. Frank C. Craighead, Jr., and Dr. John Craighead in collaboration with the National Science Foundation, the Fish and Wildlife Service of the Interior Department, and the State of Montana.

(11) Icefield Ranges Research Project in the St. Elias Mountains, Yukon Territory, conducted by the Arctic Institute of North America, in cooperation with the National Science Foundation and the U.S. Geological Survey.

(12) Alaskan Glacier Study carried out by the Glaciological Institute of Michigan State University, in collaboration with the National Science Foundation.

(13) American Antarctic Mountaineering Expedition of the American Alpine Club. Exploration of a little known area of Antarctica carried out with the support of the Navy and the National Science Foundation.

(14) Study of the Comparative Ecology and Behavior of Tropical Storks in East Africa, Ethiopia, India, and Ceylon by Dr. M. Philip Kahl, Post-Doctoral Fellow of the National Science Foundation.

(15) Physiological study of the Gray Whale off Baja California, Mexico, by the Virginia Mason Research Center with support from the National Institutes of Health, and Bureau of Commercial Fisheries.

In keeping with the Nation's policy of international cooperation, the Society either collaborated with or made direct grants in support of scientific programs of several foreign governments. Examples are the Early Man studies of Dr. L. S. B. Leakey of the National Museum in Nairobi, Kenya; the chimpanzee research in the Gombe Stream Reserve of Tanzania in cooperation with that country's government, and a donation to Tanzania for acquisition of the area so that it can be included in their National Parks System; continued support of the oceanographic and environmental studies of Captain Jacques-Yves Cousteau in cooperation with the governments of France and Monaco; cooperation with the Turkish authorities in archeological programs in Aphrodiasias, Turkey; with the Jordan government in archaelogical studies in Jerusalem; and with the government of Greece in a search for the ruins of ancient Helice. The Vice Chairman of the Committee, Dr. Melvin M. Payne, continues to serve on the Advisory Board of the Ngorongoro Conservation Unit of Tanzania.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: NAVY

In the February 1966 National Geographic appeared an article on the "Water War in Viet Nam." Although of interest to all the Armed Forces, it told particularly the story of the Navy and Marine Corps and their efforts in this aspect of the war. General Wallace M. Greene, Commandant of the Marine Corps, noted that ". . . the text and photos on the water provide an excellent documentation of one facet in our effort in Viet Nam." , while the Assistant Director of Naval History thought it "informative, inspiring and deeply moving."

The Society donated more than 200 Magazines, books, Atlases, and School Bulletins to the Public Affairs Officer of the Sixth Fleet to be presented by the Navy to the Tobruk (Libya) Public Library, as a part of "Project Handclasp." The monetary value of this gift was nearly $400, but the good will engendered is far more meaningful. In the words of Rear Admiral H. L. Miller, Chief of Information of the U.S. Navy, ". . . . such friendly gestures on the part of your organization and our nation will win many friends in the city of Tobruk as well as in the country of Libya."

As in the case with many departments of the Federal Government, the Navy found National Geographic maps important tools in its programs and during 1966 acquired, at special rates, nearly 9,300 of them.

The Society extends its resources to all agencies of the Federal Government, and during 1966 the Navy took advantage of this spirit of cooperation by making extensive use of the Society's photographic files. The Marine Corps on three different occasions requested and promptly received 21 duplicate color slides on each occasion, for research and official lectures on Viet Nam. In the words of the Marine Corps Liaison Officer to the Center for Special Welfare, these photographs "would render a tangible and positive aid in familiarizing military personnel enroute to Viet Nam with the status of amphibious operations there."

The Bureau of Yards and Docks was given five slides for official lectures on Viet Nam, and another five 4x5 transparencies for presentations. An enlarged color print of the USS Skate at the North Pole was donated to that ship. The Office of the Chief of Naval Operations was supplied with three photographs and internegatives of Viet Nam scenes for display and later framing and presentation to the new escort destroyer, USS Meyerkord, named in honor of a hero of the war. The U.S. Naval Amphibious School was given complete duplicate color slides of illustrations from two articles on Viet Nam, "Helicopter War in South Viet Nam" and "Water War in Viet Nam", for training purposes. The USS Monticello was presented with complimentary copies of the September 1966 National Geographic containing an article on Jefferson's Monticello, for which the ship was named, as well as color prints of a photograph of Monticello. The USS Fechteler was given two enlarged color prints. Marine Corps Headquarters was given a transparency of Abu Simbel in Egypt for historical reference. Five prints went to the Interagency Committee on Oceanography for use in its publication on "Opportunities in Oceanography."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: ARMY

The Army Map Service is routinely notified of all new maps published by the Society and all up-dated reprints of old maps in advance of release date. That they are pertinent and valuable in the Army's programs is obvious from the fact that the Department of the Army purchased during 1966, at special rates, more than 31,000 National Geographic maps, globes, and Atlases. In addition, the Society supplied 32,500 reprints of old maps, specially reprinted and made available at special rates to the Government Printing Office for use in the preparation of further volumes on the History of World War II.

The Society freely cooperates in making its photographic facilities, knowledge and files available to the Army. During 1966, for instance, five photographers from the Army Digest spent an entire day in the Society's offices and laboratories receiving detailed briefings on how the National Geographic handles photographs from the time they are received until they are edited and put into magazine dummy form. Eight prints from the "Water War in Viet Nam" article were provided without charge to the Development Engineering Division at the Aberdeen Proving Ground for research purposes; 2 prints of the Amundsen-Scott station in Antarctica went to the Army Map Service; 63 black and white prints and 14 duplicate color transparencies to the U.S. Army Intelligence School at Fort Holabird; two pictures to the Command and General Staff College, Fort Leavenworth, for inclusion in official courses. The Army Night Vision Laboratories at Fort Belvoir was given a selection of 75 slides on laser experiments for scientific study and analysis. Half a dozen to the Command Conference Room. Permission was given to the U.S. Military Academy to reproduce a National Geographic article on Russia in their text on Soviet Geography, and to reproduce a series of valuable paintings for a lecture on "Ancient Mexico" to the Academy's students in Spanish.

The Society's Lecture Division assisted the Army Special Warfare School in preparing an audio-visual demonstration for a special Army Convention by providing assistance and equipment. The Assistant Commandant acknowledged the value of this aid by writing, "The professional and technical advice and assistance provided for the audio-script narration, together with the loan of electronic equipment, resulted in an outstanding demonstration, and reflected most favorably on the Special Warfare School and the United States Army. Without your vital contribution, we could not have achieved the high standards desired for the AUSA Convention."

A supply of the Society's new map of Viet Nam was donated to General W. C. Westmoreland, Commander of the Army Forces in that country and he noted that they would be "put to good use" in our country's effort there.

The Society also gave General of the Army Mark W. Clark, USA (Ret.), rare, out-of-print maps to be used in connection with his official papers.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: AIR FORCE

The Air Force is one of many Government agencies which makes extensive use of National Geographic maps and during 1966 it was supplied with nearly 23,000 maps, Atlases and globes at special rates, which are considerably lower than those offered to the public.

As it has for many years, the Society's Photographic Division cooperated with the annual photographic flying shortcourse, covering a coast-to-coast schedule in nine days. Director of Photography Robert E. Gilka was co-director of the course and Mr. W. E. Garrett, Assistant Illustrations Editor, was a member of the faculty. In addition the Society supplied projection equipment for use at each of the sessions.

The Air Force also took advantage of the Society's liberal policy of assisting the Government through providing photographs of key areas for official purposes and/or giving permission for reproduction of National Geographic material where appropriate—all, of course, without any cost to the Government.

Examples are an enlarged photographic print of a "Surface of the Sun" painting for use in a brochure on the Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories; permission for the Aeronautical Chart and Information Center to photograph the Society's unique 11-foot World Globe in its headquarters building, the resulting continuous-strip photography of the earth to be used in the Apollo space program; 2 Kodachromes to the Air Intelligence Training Center; a copy of a "Flying Arsenal" illustration to Davis-Monthan Air Force Base; 57 duplicate transparencies to the United States Strike Command Headquarters for briefing; another to the Industrial College of the Armed Forces for lectures; 3 color prints for display to the 48th Tactical Fighter Wing; a collection of photographs on hurricanes to the USAF Weather Research Squadron.

One hundred reprints of a National Geographic article on the Air Force were donated to this Department.

The Society also expressed its willingness to assist the Air Force Academy by donating up-to-date maps for its library.

Mr. Luis Marden, veteran of the Society's Foreign Editorial Staff, spent several hours giving detailed information on Pitcairn island to representatives of the Air Force.

As a further example of the Society's interest in and cooperation with the Air Force, the Society's Committee for Research and Exploration administers the General Thomas D. White, United States Air Force Space Trophy, established by Chairman of the Board Thomas W. McKnew in 1961, to be awarded annually to the military or civil service member of the Air Force who has made the most outstanding contribution to the Nation's progress in aerospace during the year. In 1966 the award (for 1965) was presented to Lt. Col. Edward H. White II for his outstanding contributions to the U.S. exploration of space by becoming the first self-propelled human in outer space. The presentation was made at a ceremony held at the National Geographic's headquarters by Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Harold Brown.

Another contribution by the Society both to education and to the Air Force is represented by the establishment in 1960 of the John Oliver LaGorce Award, named in honor of the Society's late, distinguished President. The award is made annually to the outstanding cadet at the Air Force Academy in the field of geography. In addition to the honor, the award carries with it a Life Membership in the National Geographic Society and a silver card tray.

Still another National Geographic award signifies the long standing spirit of cooperation between the Society and the Air Force. In 1966 the Society established the General Orvil A. Anderson Memorial Award, to be awarded annually by the Society to an Air War College Student excelling in politico-military strategy. This is in recognition of the late General Anderson's outstanding achievement as Pilot of the Stratosphere Balloon Explorer II, which reached a world's altitude record of 72,395 feet on November 11, 1935, during a joint Society-Air Corps project. The recipient of this award is given a Life Membership in the National Geographic Society, and the award is also commemorated by a handsome plaque which is permanently positioned in the main auditorium of the College. The Commandant of the Air War College expressed the gratitude of the Air Force for this recognition by stating "The Air War College is most grateful for this continuing memorial to General Anderson, and our selection for this award will be in conformance with the high ideals you have established."

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE: GENERAL

Other branches of the Defense Department received assistance from the Society, as follows:

Industrial College of the Armed Forces was given permission to reproduce the Society's map of South Viet Nam in the form of a Vugraph for use in a lecture presented by the National Security Seminar.

Illustrations from an article on treasure off the Florida coast were provided for publication in "Stars and Stripes."

Arrangements have been made to make the Society's television films available to the

Armed Services overseas upon request from the Government.

The Society has cooperated fully with Civil Defense, first by providing one of the finest fall-out shelters in the Metropolitan Washington area and secondly by conducting several morning-long classes.

Complimentary photographs were provided the Director of Defense Research and Engineering (5); Industrial College of the Armed Forces (9 transparencies) and four on another occasion.

The Department of Defense made frequent use of the Society's photographic collection, with free access given to their liaison officers. On 21 different occasions during 1966, their representatives made selections of photographs of critical world areas needed for study purposes, and a total of 742, many of them color prints, were promptly supplied without charge to this Agency.

Their Liaison Officer expressed the official appreciation of the Agency in a letter stating, "Our office is most grateful to members of the Illustrations Library and the photo lab for supplying these prints on such short notice. It is believed that no other organization in the Washington area had the capability to respond so quickly and competently for this type of information."

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A Geographic map cabinet was donated to the Secret Service.

The Internal Revenue Service was given an enlarged color print for display purposes.

Savings Bond Division. The Society continued its long standing cooperation with the Government's Savings Bond program by providing a convenient payroll deduction plan for employees purchasing Bonds.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Throughout its history, the Society has maintained close liaison with the Interior Department. Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane and National Park Service Director Stephen T. Mather served on the Society's Board of Trustees in the early part of this century. This association continues in the person of Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, member of the Board of Trustees and former Director of the Park Service. Dr. Wirth is Secretary of the NPS Advisory Board on National Parks and Historic Sites established by Congress in 1935, and the Society's President, Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, also serves on this Board.

Other specific examples of assistance to the Department of Interior follow:

Office of the Secretary and miscellaneous bureaus

The Society supported publication of Interior's "Conservation Yearbook" by providing a comprehensive selection of illustrations. NGS staff spent some 30 hours on this project.

The Bureau of Mines was provided with a photograph for official purposes; the Bureau of Indian Affairs with five, for reproduction in literature on Indian Affairs; the U.S. Park Police with 15 color transparencies for training purposes; six to the Geological Survey for projection in connection with lectures on Midway Island; and 39 were given to the Public Information Officer, Secretary of Interior, for booklets in the State Resource Series on South Dakota and Maryland.

The Society donated 40,000 copies of current issues of its School Bulletin to the Bureau of Indian Affairs to assist in educational programs of the Assistant Commissioner for Education.

The Society further cooperated with Interior by lending it a collection of wildlife paintings by staff artist and naturalist Walter A. Weber for exhibit at the Interior building. In addition, the Society provided frames and also prepared literature and invitations in connection with the exhibit.

Valuable advice was given to a representative of the Secretary's office on the preparation of an illustrated book on President Johnson's visit to Samoa.

National Park Service

As noted earlier in this report, the Society continued in 1966 its close cooperation with the National Park Service, Department of Interior, in programs of scientific research and conservation with grants in support of studies at Russell Cave National Monument, Florida Everglades, and Yellowstone National Park.

The Society made a Public Service contribution of $4,500 to the National Park Service Donations Account to be used by the Director of the Park Service in furtherance of its objectives.

Of great interest to the National Park Service were the Society's revised book on the National Parks, "America's Wonderlands," and comprehensive articles on the Parks in the July 1966 National Geographic by former Director Conrad L. Wirth and present Director George B. Hartzog, Jr.

Included with the articles was a new map on this country's "Vacationlands."

The Society also published in its official journal another article of interest to the Park Service, "Mr. Jefferson's Monticello."

That the articles and map were successful in their goal of telling the story of America and its great resources under the protection of the National Park Service is evident in these typical comments:

"I came to the realization that no matter how far a person may travel outside of the United States, no country can offer the beauty or peaceful serenity available to the American people through our National Park System."

"Thanks to the National Geographic we had a most wonderful holiday visiting Yellowstone Park, National Teton Park, . . . and some other places which had caught our imagination through your articles."

"The two articles on Our National Parks are superb."

From a fighting man in Viet Nam: "We have found your July issue most comforting. The beautiful pictures of all the National Parks . . . were a pleasant memory of what is still and will always be the United States we love and miss so deeply."

"The Geographic has come up with as fine a sketch of the purpose and scope of our National Parks as has ever been presented . . . ."

"We found your "Vacationlands of the United States and Canada" map invaluable as a basic reference."

"The map fills the need for all travelling people in the USA."

"Your Vacationlands map is a great idea, well carried out. We've already written to several suggested places for information. . . ."

"I have never before seen such a beautiful and comprehensive map of all the wonderful places to see in our country."

"Your article 'Mr. Jefferson's Monticello' is very informative and enjoyable."

"The article (on Monticello) provided me with much information which I had never heard of before."

The National Geographic School Bulletin also gave editorial support to the National Park Service and other branches of the Department of Interior, with 12 articles in its 30 issues during the school year on such subjects as Friendly Ghost Town, Elk in Redwood Wilderness, Great Sand Dunes National Monument, Canyonlands, National Key Deer Refuge, Key West Refuges, Everglades National Park, Olympic National Park, Statue of Liberty, Washington National Zoo, Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area, Mt. Rainier National Park, Buck Island Reef National Monument, National Wilderness Preservation System, Redwood National Park, Superstition Mountains, 50th Anniversary of Park Service, Forest Service, and National Christmas Tree.

The National Park Service is entrusted with preservation of the White House and therefore appreciates the assistance given by the Society to the White House Historical Association, as is noted fully later in this report. It is also appreciative of assistance given to the National Parks and Recreation Association, which was provided with rent-free office space valued at $3,456 during 1966.

There are many other examples of cooperation during 1966: The Geographic Art Department provided three pieces of copy for reproduction in a new NPS folder on Canyonlands National Park; the Society's Photographic Department gave extensive coverage to a convention of the National Recreation and Park Association at the request of that group; the new Vacationlands map, discussed earlier, was offered to the National Park Service's concessionnaires at greatly reduced prices; 20 National Geographic books were given to the Park Service in connection with a meeting of its Advisory Board; 500 copies of a reprint of National Parks articles and Vacationlands map were donated to NPS and another 1,000 to the Congress; 8 color transparencies of Buck Island Reef National Monument were donated for a Park Service publication on that Monument; color enlargements of seven paintings were given to the Park Service in St. Augustine, Flordia, for display in Park Service centers; a "Kiva Life" painting was made available for reproduction in a self-guiding trail leaflet given to visitors to Chaco Canyon National Monument; 12 slides for a program on the 50th Anniversary observance of NPS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

At the request of the State Department an extensive tour of the Society's Cartographic and Geographic Art Departments was arranged for the Soviet delegation of the Exchange Agreement in Cartography. This was sponsored jointly by State and the Coast & Geodetic Survey. The Society also cooperated with The Geographer, Department of State, by providing without charge maps for visitors to the International Geographic Union Commission on Applied Geography.

Three National Geographic World Globes were donated to the Office of Protocol to be given to Heads of State in connection with the attendance of the Secretary of State at the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization Conference in Australia. Two sets of 42 color transparencies each of scenes from Saudi Arabia were given to the Audio-Visual Services of State in connection with a visit by King Faisal. An enlarged color print of a photograph of Tripoli was supplied to our Embassy there for display purposes. Five color transparencies of Burma were donated for an exhibit in the Diplomatic Lobby of the State Department in honor of the State Visit of General Ne Win of Burma. A print of the Nile Delta was given to State for the Country Director for the United Arab Republic.

Our Embassies and Consulates overseas are supplied with complimentary subscriptions to the National Geographic (some 200, having a normal value of nearly $2,000), as a gesture of international good will, the Society also provides complimentary subscriptions to 93 foreign embassies located in Washington.

PEACE CORPS

Peace Corps Missions throughout the world (49 of them) are supplied with complimentary subscriptions to the National Geographic.

Sixty copies of the Magazine were contributed to the Peace Corps Mission in Ecuador to assist in its educational program in that country.

The Peace Corps, too, had the benefit of use of the Society's photographic materials. The Society contributed 10 black and white negatives and 24 color transparencies of Micronesia for Peace Corps recruitment pamphlets and posters in that area of the world. That this cooperation was valuable is evident in this quotation from the Peace Corps Regional Director for the Far East:

"It (recruiting program) has been an unprecedented success with more than 3,000 young Americans applying for the program in Micronesia. Our recruiting effort was based largely upon the photographs supplied to us by National Geographic. Without them we just would not have got off the ground."

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

The Society has always cooperated closely with NASA in its significant scientific aerospace programs in which the Government, the public, and indeed the entire world have a tremendous interest.

Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, the first Deputy Administrator of NASA, was a member of the Society's Board of Trustees, Executive Committee and Research Committee for many years. After his death in 1965, his place on the Board of Trustees was taken by Dr. James E. Webb, now Administrator of this Agency.

The Society's Photographic Department continued its support through the loan of staff photographer Otis Imboden to cover manned launches for NASA. He also does other photographic and liaison work for NASA at other times, and the result is that he spent about half his time during 1966 working for NASA.

This Department also loaned NASA a great deal of complex and scarce equipment in 1966.

The Society's Geographic Art Department assisted NASA by making available to one of its Apollo suppliers 13 color slides of paintings prepared for "Footprints on the Moon" (March 1964 National Geographic) for use in presentation at aeronautical society lectures.

A Public Service Grant of $5,400 was made to the Hugh L. Dryden Memorial Fund in honor of the late Deputy Administrator of NASA, in cooperation with the National Academy of Science.

From its picture files the Society provided NASA with film positives for the Surveyor Moon Program; a black and white print of the astronauts for use in NASA publications; photographs for a series of exhibits on the Gemini space program; negatives for reproduction of Gemini orbit diagrams for further exhibits; a set of color conversion film positives of moon pictures from the October 1966 National Geographic for publication in an official 3-volume set of Surveyor moon pictures; and six black and white prints and seven color transparencies for a science briefing for the Administrator of NASA. A physiographic map of the world was donated to NASA for astronaut briefings. National Geographic motion pictures were loaned for showing to NASA officials and scientists. An enlarged color print of a hurricane scene was donated to the Cape Kennedy Space Center Headquarters.

Editorially, the National Geographic Magazine reported NASA's efforts with three articles on their programs: "Space Rendezvous, Milestone on the Way to the Moon" (April); "First Color Photographs on the Moon's Rocky Face" (October); and "New Knowledge of Earth from Astronauts Photographs" by NASA scientist Paul D. Lowman, Jr., in November.

The effectiveness of these articles is demonstrated in a letter from a Professor of Aerospace Studies: "You are to be complimented for your excellent research and outstanding contributions to geographic and scientific knowledge." "The photos (in 'Earth from Orbit') were most fascinating and the narrative was exceptionally informative . . . I would like to use this article for instructional purposes. . ."

The articles in October and November were of such particular interest to NASA that they obtained at cost 25,000 reprints of the former and 20,000 of the latter. It is interesting to note that NASA finds National Geographic articles on its programs of such importance in furthering the Agency's official aims that they have obtained reprints of nine articles on NASA projects since 1960, totalling more than 450,000 copies.

The National Geographic School Bulletin also lent editorial airing with six articles on space programs during the year.

In addition, the Society's News Service issued nine comprehensive news bulletins on NASA projects to news media all over the world, giving the broadest possible coverage to the Agency's official activities.

U.S. INFORMATION AGENCY

During 1966 the Society continued its policy of extensive cooperation with the U.S. Information Agency and Voice of America in furthering their important mission of disseminating accurate information about the United States to the peoples of the world.

All of the following were promptly and gladly given without charge:

Four color duplicates of paintings for publication in Topic, a USIA periodical; eight pictures of Saudi Arabian scenes for publication in Al-Hayat, a magazine distributed by USIA in that country; cooperation in USIA's efforts on the U.S. exhibit at the Canadian "Expo 67"; 1 print for Al-Hayat; instruction on photographic processing, print making and extensive tours of the Society's laboratories for the chief photographic officer for USIA in Vienna; permission to use the article "What Was a Woman Doing There?" dealing with the war in Viet Nam in Voice of America broadcasts; 7 color transparencies for the U.S. exhibit at the Canadian World Exhibition; five color transparencies for use in a balloon story in America Illustrated; an additional transparency for another story in America Illustrated; and again three pictures for this periodical; and subsequently three more 4 x 5 duplicates on the Southwest for reproduction in America Illustrated; 10 color pictures on the National Parks for a television series to be produced by USIA for Middle Eastern countries; nine color pictures and two black and white prints for display at an International Asian Trade Fair in Bangkok; a print from original artwork "America's Evolving Spacecraft" for use with informational packets distributed at a New Delhi exhibit on space; two color duplicates for a USIA show on helicopters; a 4 x 5 color transparency of Yuma Valley for use in the "America's Fifty States" series; another transparency for publication in Al-Hayat and later two more for this purpose.

The Agency makes extensive use of the Society's News Bulletins on timely geographic and scientific topics and they are sent without charge, at their request, to 10 departments of USIA. National Geographic maps published during 1966 were freely offered to these departments for background information. The Society's News Service cooperated further with USIA by fulfilling countless requests for information. They also supplied USIA with various illustrations, bird call records for VOA overseas programs, a special feature for the Ceylon newspaper Colombo Observer, additional maps, news releases, and other NGS material, and also arranged for USIA coverage of a visit to National Geographic headquarters of Members of the Parliament of Tanzania who were touring the United States.

The Society's Photographic Department frequently lends its expert assistance to the USIA photographic laboratory.

The value of the Society's many contributions to USIA is typified in this letter from the Project Director for the Bangkok International Trade Fair Project:

"This letter brings the very heartfelt thanks of the U.S. Information Agency for your exemplary cooperation and support for our . . . Project.

"Without the many color pictures supplied to us . . . our presentation in Bangkok would be far less effective. We need all the help we can get in making better friends in Southeast Asia for U.S. policies, and the National Geographic's help has been deeply appreciated."

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

In addition to the cooperative research programs listed earlier in this report and in the Annual Report of the Committee for Research and Exploration, the Society continued its long history of close cooperation with the Smithsonian Institution in many other ways.

Assistance valued at $1,880 was given to the National Gallery of Art for an exhibit on its 25th Anniversary. This consisted of donated National Geographic staff time plus such materials as film positives and composition. The Gallery was also given an NGS illustration for publication in their annual report.

The Division of Cultural Anthropolgy was given a color enlargement for a scientific exhibit; permission was given the Division of Military History to use National Geographic material in a lecture on the Battle of Hastings; 29 color transparencies were donated for underwater studies; historical and rare material on early aircraft was loaned to the National Air and Space Museum; and the Society has offered to cooperate with the Smithsonian's educational television series through use of motion pictures on Geographic expeditions and studies of anthropology in the Society's film archives.

WHITE HOUSE

The Society, of course, has always gladly cooperated fully with the First Family and officials on the President's staff in every way possible.

Continued extensive assistance was given by the Society's Special Publications Division and other staff members in the publication of Public Service Books on the White House, to aid in public understanding and knowledge of the Executive Mansion. This is dealt with more fully later in this report.

The Society's News Service prepared releases and other features, and prepared 80 press kits, including photographs, for the White House for its presentation of the new book, "The Living White House."

The National Geographic Magazine published two articles in 1966 of special interest to the White House: "Profiles of Presidents: Part V" (January) and "The Living White House" (November). The Society has received many letters commending it for these educational and patriotic articles. The value of these contributions is probably best expressed in the words of one Society member who wrote, "The story of The Living White House is . . . a story that every American should have in his home on his bookshelf for future generations to come . . . ."

The Society has cooperated in preliminary plans for the Johnson Presidential Library to be patterned after the Society's own headquarters building.

The Society also presented the White House with two color prints of a Vietnamese landscape for official purposes.

The Society's Photographic Division loaned the White House photographer special equipment for photographs of the President and Mrs. Johnson.

At the specific request of President and Mrs. Johnson, National Geographic photographers covered the wedding ceremony of their daughter Luci in the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception; developed the pictures in its laboratories on a crash, overtime basis; and in its role as still photographic pool, provided copies to all news media. Geographic staff unselfishly devoted more than 700 hours to all phases of this event.

Mrs. Johnson expressed the appreciation of the President and herself in this letter to Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, President of the Society:

"The truly beautiful photograph of Luci and Pat exchanging vows—which appeared on the cover and in so many magazines and newspapers throughout the world—will long live joyously in the memories of us all.

"Most sincerely and enthusiastically, may I express our deep appreciation for the cooperation extended by the National Geographic on this all-important event in our lives. In particular, may we commend Mr. Gilka (Director of Photography) and his entire creative photographic staff for their dedication and assistance."

As a further cooperation with the White House on the American Beautification Campaign, the Society donated 500 maps of the District of Columbia to the White House for distribution at the National Youth Conference on Natural Beauty and Conservation.

OTHER FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The Society has cooperated to the best of its ability in two areas of fiscal concern to the Government: inflation and balance of trade. For the 10th consecutive year it was found possible to maintain dues at the same rate, because of economies and innovations effected by the Society, thus helping in the fight against inflation. As to the balance of trade problem, as a matter of policy all Society staff, who travel extensively all over the world, are required to use American carriers whenever possible.

There were numerous tours of the Society's photographic facilities by various government departments and agencies.

The Federal Aviation Agency was given four pictures for a publication including Admiral Byrd's historic flight over the North Pole.

The Society's Photographic Department gave extensive advice to the chief of the photographic laboratory of the Department of Agriculture on equipment for a new laboratory. Agriculture was also given three photographs for the Department's Annual Report. The Society's museum Staff cooperated with the Information Division of this Department in the construction of a kaleidoscope exhibit similar to one in the National Geographic's own museum, Explorers Hall. Two color pictures were given to Agriculture's Information Office for a booklet illustrating national beautification.

The Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education & Welfare, was given color transparencies for lectures on the subject of smallpox.

The Department of Commerce, Division of Design and Graphics, was assisted by the Society's Illustrations Librarian in setting up the Commerce Photo Library. Two photographs were supplied the U.S. Travel Service of Commerce in its "Visit USA" program.

The National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, Executive Office of the President, was given 37 color transparencies for lectures on Experimental Stress Analysis.

A color print was provided the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration to assist in its official programs.

The Society cooperated fully with the Census Bureau in surveys it conducts on manufacturing and on research.

Nearly 1,500 NGS maps were donated to the Government Printing Office.

CONGRESS

There are many examples of National Geographic Society assistance to the Congress, Members of Congress, and the Library of Congress.

Of prime importance is continuing support of the U. S. Capitol Historical Society, which is dealt with later in this report.

The Society donated reprints of old issues of the National Geographic Magazine to the Library of Congress. Thus, the Library can preserve its originals of this material in its Rare Book Division and make the reprints available to the public in its general collections. The Society also cooperates with the Library's Division for the Blind in its program for making the National Geographic Magazine available in a Braille Edition.

Pictorial and other National Geographic material was supplied to several members of Congress at their request, with the Society's compliments, for official purposes.

COOPERATION WITH STATES, UNITED NATIONS, AND FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The Head Start Program, District of Columbia, was given 10,000 assorted Geographic School Bulletins to assist in its educational campaign. Some 660 copies of National Geographic Magazines were donated to National Library Week, D. C.

The State of Wyoming and the City of St. Louis were supplied with reprints of National Geographic articles on those two areas, for official use, at special prices. Also, the Ministry of State of Ceylon and the Province of Alberta received reprints of articles of particular interest to them on Ceylon and Alberta respectively.

Three pictures were provided the Public Affairs Office, D. C. Government, for a brochure to be distributed to members of the public seeking information about Washington, D. C. and its government.

One hundred copies of the May 1966 Geographic, containing a comprehensive article on Abu Simbel and its preservation, were donated to UNESCO to assist in its effort to preserve this historic Egyptian monument.

Other examples of cooperation with foreign governments are research programs, as noted earlier; complimentary Magazine subscriptions to embassies in Washington, as well as complimentary publications and lecture tickets; tours and receptions for visiting foreign dignitaries, student groups and others; and use of the Society's library by embassy representatives and other foreign officials.

PUBLIC SERVICE COOPERATION—MISCELLANEOUS

There are many examples of National Geographic cooperation with other nonprofit, scientific, educational or charitable organizations, which, although not a part of the government, engage in activities in support of government policies and programs, and which are of interest and assistance both to the government and the public at large. Some examples of donated materials and other aid follow:

University of Hawaii—photograph for an exhibit on "Ocean Engineering"; Universities of Oxford and Cambridge—enlarged color prints for exhibition; Mariners Museum, Newport News, Virginia—three Viking paintings and 100 reprints of an article from the National Geographic on discovery of Viking sites in the New World for a Museum exhibit; American National Red Cross—two illustrations for use in their filmstrip, "All Are Brothers"; color portrait for the Maryland State Bar Association; enlarged Admiral Peary photographs for the Arctic Museum; two photographs for a brochure of the American Society for Eastern Arts, a nonprofit foundation dedicated to the support of performing arts of the Near and Far East; two photographs for a text on Biological Sciences, sponsored by the American Institute of Biological Sciences under a National Science Foundation grant; eight enlarged color prints for the Gorgas Memorial Institute, Panama, to assist in their program of research on tropical diseases; 15 pictures to the nonprofit, educational Ford museum of Greenfield Village; pictures for social studies texts; four photographs to the Catholic University for an encyclopedia; several prints of the old Court of Claims building for judges of that Court; 4,000 "Top of the World" maps and 200 District of Columbia maps to the American Congress on Surveying and Mapping; 12 "America's Historylands" book to the Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge for their annual patriotic awards program; National Conference of Christians and Jews—print for display in connection with Brotherhood Week; Washington Gallery of Modern Art—80 maps of the District of Columbia for use in their Spring Education Program; Educational Television—use of National Geographic material for the "Children Everywhere" series for preschool children; offer to cooperate with the D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency in supplying 5,000 copies of a new map of the District of Columbia to be published in 1967; 500 maps of Far East for "Books for Asia Students"; 20 National Geographic Magazines to the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine (article involving physiological effects of life undersea).

THE NATIONAL GEOGRAPHIC MAGAZINE

The Society's official journal is the main instrument for carrying out the Society's objective, "the increase and diffusion of geographic knowledge." The subjects included in its pages are scientific research, exploration, natural history, travel, and cultures of this and other lands, history, art, and numerous other subjects encompassed in the broad field of geography.

Each year there are many articles which present to the Society's members in an objective manner the activities and purposes of various Government departments and agencies. Already enumerated in this report are the articles on activities of the National Park Service and the National Aeronautics & Space Administration, as well as articles of particular interest to the White House and to the Armed Forces.

Complimentary copies of various issues of the Magazine were given to dozens of agencies on request, and in addition to complimentary subscriptions going to the State Department, Peace Corps, and Embassies as already noted, others are sent to the Post Office, Interior, Congress, NASA, National War College, Department of Defense, Library of Congress, Geological Survey, Navy, Smithsonian, United Nations, Commerce, Agriculture, Coast & Geodetic Survey, Weather Bureau, Multiple complimentary copies are sent to the Arctic Operations Project (11) and Shriners Hospitals (72).

The Government finds the National Geographic of such informative and educational value that, in addition to the complimentary subscriptions and single issues noted, it has more than 6,600 subscriptions for the Armed Forces, Veterans Administration Hospitals, and Department of the Interior. As is the case with all Society publications, they are made available at special rates.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—CARTOGRAPHIC

The scientific and technical staff of the Society's Cartographic Division produces maps and globes of many sizes, scales, and projections for dissemination to its membership.

The maps also fit the requirements of many Government agencies so well that nearly 125,000 copies of maps and 250 World Globes were supplied to the Government at special rates, which are considerably lower than the prices paid by the Society's members. In addition, hundreds of maps were donated to various Government agencies.

During 1966 the Society made available to the Government, well in advance of general publication, a new physiographic map of Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos and Thailand, since it was obvious that the Government would have a great interest in this map and find it valuable for our Armed Forces involved in Southeast Asia. The importance of this contribution is expressed by President Johnson in a letter to the Society's President, in which he says, ". . . It is a splendid work, in keeping with the Society's exceptional contributions to cartography over such a long period. . . . The map, I can assure you, is already being put to good use. I know it will ease our tasks considerably in that part of the world . . ."

Permission was given to various Government and nonprofit groups to use National Geographic map materials for official purposes; examples, the Civil Aeronautics Board, National Institutes of Health, Industrial Hygiene Foundation, and Educational Television.

Special tours of the Cartographic Division were arranged for top personnel and cartographic student groups of the Oceanographic Office, Geological Survey, Board on Geographic Names, Coast & Geodetic Survey, National Parks Service, Wildlife Refuges, Department of Agriculture, Department of State, USAF Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, Armed Forces Education and Information, Army Map Service, Bureau of Public Roads, and National Science Foundation.

The Society owns three valuable, unique 30-inch optical mirrors. For many years they have been, and during 1966 remained on loan to the Government. One is used by the Army Map Service, another by the USAF Aeronautical Chart and Information Center, and the third by the U.S. Navy Photographic Interpretation Center.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—NEWS SERVICE

During 1966 the National Geographic Society's News Service continued to make its services freely available to government agencies, and especialy USIA and the Voice of America as already noted in this report.

The News Service prepares and issues some 300 News Bulletins yearly on geography, natural history, and related science, which in addition to 2,500 newspapers and other media throughout the world, are sent—at their request—to 29 Federal agencies as well as the official press services of several foreign countries.

The News Service continued its policy of using its Bulletins to aid in public understanding of the work of many government agencies. Particular attention was paid to the activities of the National Park Service and the National Aeronautics & Space Administration, but there were others of interest to the Weather Bureau, Smithsonian Institution, Treasury, Bureau of Public Roads, Coast & Geodetic Survey, Bureau of Standards, the Armed Forces, and the Atomic Energy Commission. National Geographic maps published in 1966 were offered to recipients of the News Service feature service. Many map requests from government agencies were filled on a complimentary basis, notably for maps of Viet Nam.

Other examples of cooperation with the Government are as follows:

NGS photos supplied to the Defense Department of Research & Engineering and other Pentagon officials; copies of five releases on peaceful uses of the hydrogen bomb to AEC Public Information Division; material on the Society supplied for USIA's Tehran publication Kazen Guilenpour; handling publicity for NASA on presentation of the White Space Trophy to the 1966 recipient, Edward H. White, II; collaboration with the Director of Information & Education, Forest Service, in that agency's educational work; and handling press announcements and other publicity for the American Antarctic Expedition involving the Navy and the National Science Foundation.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—GEOGRAPHIC RESEARCH

This Division continued its assistance to the Government by answering inquiries on geographic subjects and filling many special requests from a wide variety of departments and agencies.

Members of both houses of Congress continue to ask for geographic and scientific information for guidance in the preparation of legislation and in letters to constituents. Occasionally, at the request of Congressmen, the Division prepares appropriate replies.

The Division forwards to government offices specimens of birds, mammals, etc., collected by staff personnel or sent in by members of the public.

Many queries were answered about official flags, seals and coats-of-arms of countries of the world, and definitions were furnished of geographic terms and relationships. Assistance was given the National Zoological Park of the Smithsonian Institution in answering inquiries and making photographs available. The Smithsonian was also assisted with research on numerous place names and locations. There were countless other inquiries, many from the Pentagon and National Institutes of Health, on distances between points and location of obscure places. The National Park Service called on Geographic Research for information pertinent to animal survival studies and for the names of specialists in various fields of interest to the Service.

Magazines and maps were made available to many agencies and offices on request on a complimentary basis.

Various Government offices were given background data on areas of special interest, such as climatic conditions, vegetation, topography, temperature ranges, area figures, and the like, not available in their own libraries. Frequently this type of information plus other on roads, harbors, and other physical features is requested by and given to government contractors in order to help them fulfill government requirements and projects.

Copy of a rare 18th century French map was donated to the Library of Congress.

At the request of the National Science Foundation a number of South American sites suitable for observing a total solar eclipse were recommended.

The U.S. Information Agency was supplied with comprehensive information on topography, climate, etc., on an area in Africa for use in an official publication. The Department of Labor is regularly supplied with current lists of all the independent countries of the world together with their possessions and status, and an explanation of political terms used.

GOVERNMENT COOPERATION—PHOTOGRAPHIC DIVISION

During 1966 the Society gladly continued its policy of making available to the Federal Government without charge its wealth of color and black-and-white photographs. As has been noted throughout this report, many agencies make use of the Society's photographic files—among them the Army, Navy and Air Force and other branches of the Defense Department; Treasury, Interior, State, Peace Corps, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, U. S. Information Agency, Smithsonian Institution, Agriculture, and Commerce.

More than 2,050 unique photographs and reproductions of paintings, covering areas all over the world, were donated to the Government in 1966. The real value of this contribution to the Government lies in the fact that these illustrations are unique and unobtainable through other sources; they are readily available from the Society; and they represent a sizeable expenditure in salaries and expenses to obtain them.

Other examples of Photographic Department cooperation have been mentioned throughout this report, major examples being assistance to the White House, assignment of a staff photographer to the NASA Gemini Project, and the work of the Illustrations Staff in the Air Force's "Flying Short Course" program.

SCHOOL SERVICE COOPERATION

The public service aspects of the School Service and its National Geographic School Bulletin, which is published under a substantial subsidy, are treated fully in another exhibit. In addition to its educational service to the public, the School Service cooperated with the Government in a number of ways:

During 1966 there were 512 pages published in the School Bulletin, of which 67 pages, or 13%, told the readers of Federal projects, agencies, or preserves and performed an information function usually performed by the Government itself. There were 40 such articles, which included New U.S. Outpost (National Science); Dr. Hugh L. Dryden (NASA); Friendly Ghost Town (Bureau of Land Management); Cuba (Coast Guard); Elk in Redwood Wilderness (National Park Service); Sand Dunes (NPS); Shipping Lanes (Coast Guard); Canyonlands (NPS); Space Models (NASA); Military Miniatures (Marine Corps); U.S. Capitol; City of Washington; Biological Clocks (NASA); Florida Key Deer (NPS); Key West Refuges (Fish & Wildlife); Florida Snails (NPS); High School Geography Project (National Science); Weather Bureau; Olympic National Park; Statue of Liberty (NPS); Peace Corps Training; U.S. Geography (Geological Survey); Washington National Zoo; Seneca Rocks (NPS); Eltanin (Navy); Paradise Glacier (NPS); Buck Island National Monument; Apache Reservation (National Wilderness System); Pathfinding Machines and Space Camera (NASA); Zinjanthropus Artist (Smithsonian); Earthquakes (National Earthquake Center); Redwoods National Park; Superstition Mountains (Forest Service); 50th Anniversary of National Park Service; Rockhounds (Smithsonian); Inter-American Geodetic Survey; Space Age Giants (NASA); Forest Service; Christmas Trees (NPS).

The School Service also provided government agencies with thousands of complimentary copies of School Bulletins and other educational publications during 1966. As noted previously, 40,000 Bulletins went to the Department of Interior and 10,000 to the Head Start Program. Some others were Office of Education, Coast Guard, Peace Corps, Oceanographic Center, Labor, Air Force, Army Map, and Congress. Another 1,500 were donated to the nonprofit conservation group, Appalachian Volunteers.

TELEVISION DIVISION COOPERATION

The public service aspects of this heavily subsidized, educational service are dealt with in another exhibit. The Division cooperated with the Government in several important ways during 1966.

The Chief of the Television Division is a member of the committee of the Capitol Historical Society which is preparing a film planned for the Nation's Capitol. This is to be a carefully prepared film depicting the Capitol's history and promoting interest in the Capitol.

Arrangements have been made to make the Society's film available to the Armed Forces overseas upon request from the Government. In addition, films have been loaned to National Aeronautics and Space Administration to assist in its official functions.

LECTURE DIVISION COOPERATION

This educational service is also dealt with elsewhere. Like all departments of the Society, it assists Government agencies in any way possible. During 1966, for instance, the Association of the United States Army was given aid in technical demonstrations, as reported earlier in this report. Also, film was supplied to the National Film Board of Canada and to a Swiss quasi-government organization for official use. An album of color prints on Mt. Kennedy was given to Senator Robert Kennedy. Approximately 100 tickets to the Society's annual lecture series were given to embassies in Washington.

BOOK SERVICE AND SPECIAL PUBLICATIONS DIVISION COOPERATION

The extensive cooperation given to the Government by the Society's Special Publications Division is discussed more fully later in this report.

The Society's scientific and educational book publications are of such value to the Government that during 1966 more than 2,600 were purchased at special low Government rates. In addition, many copies were donated for various Government purposes.

Among publications during 1966 of special interest to the Government, as well as to all Americans, was "Our Country's Presidents," a lively and colorful account of all American Presidents.

LIBRARY COOPERATION

The Library of the National Geographic Society contains about 45,000 volumes, a periodical collection, and an extensive clipping service, all of which emphasize geography and its allied sciences. The Library is open to the public and numbers among its patrons persons from all branches of the Government, armed services, diplomatic corps, college and university professors and students, and the general public. Many of these used Society materials for extensive research.

Approximately 231 librarians toured the Library to inspect its special facilities and equipment. Of particular note was a large group from the Department of Interior Workshop In-training Program and another from National Security Agency.

The National Geographic Library's facilities and materials were in constant use by Government agencies, among them the Air Force, Army, Bureau of Public Roads, Census, CIA, Agriculture, Federal Reserve, Geological Survey, HEW, FHA, Interior, Library of Congress, NASA, Archives, Bureau of Standards, National Library of Medicine, National Science Foundation, several departments of the Navy (Medical School, Oceanographic Office, Observatory, Research Laboratory, Ships Systems Command, Supplies Systems Command, Surgeon General), Office of Education, Smithsonian Institution, State Department, and Veterans Administration.

PERSONNEL OFFICE

The Society's Personnel Department cooperated with the Federally supported "On-The-Job Training Project" and has hired several people from the program.

Assistant Personnel Director Mahon has been active with the D.C. Department of Public Welfare in their work and training opportunity center, and has also cooperated with and offered employment to deaf keypunch operators through a program sponsored by the D.C. Department of Vocational Rehabilitation. The Personnel Officers have also assisted in recruiting trainees for the Institute for Employment Training, which is supported to large extent by the U.S. Employment Service and United Planning Organization.

The Society also continued its cooperation during 1966 in the "Summer Jobs for Youth Campaign" sponsored by the Vice President of the United States, and the Vice President expressed his appreciation for the Society's assistance in these words:

"Our youth and our nation have benefited by your action, and I congratulate you on the role you played in opening opportunities to youths. I would hope, too, that your satisfaction with your contribution to the future is equal to my pride in knowing that there are people like yourself standing ready to help."

EXPLORERS HALL EXHIBITS

Explorers Hall, a public museum covering the entire ground floor of the Society's headquarters at 17th and M Streets, N.W., Washington, D.C., displays several exhibits resulting from expeditions carried out in cooperation with the Federal Government. They are a cast of a giant Olmec stone head from joint Society-Smithsonian Institution expeditions to southern Mexico, 1938–46; gondola and fittings of the balloon Explorer II, which explored the stratosphere in a joint National Geographic-Army Air Corps project in 1935; reconstruction of an Indian kiva from Wetherill Mesa, Mesa Verde National Park, studied in cooperation with the National Park Service in a five-year program, 1959–63; an exhibit commemorating attainment of the North Pole in 1909 by Comdr. Robert E. Peary, USN; mementos of Comdr. Richard E. Byrd, USN, who, in cooperation with the Society, served on several Arctic and Antarctic expeditions.

More and more, the major exhibit areas of Explorers Hall illustrate the Society's tangible support of scientific projects throughout the world. Visitors are enthusiastic in their praise of the Society's assistance given to such contemporary efforts abroad as Dr. Leakey's search for earliest man in Africa; Captain Cousteau in his oceanographic research projects; the salvaging of ancient Nile monuments and sites; and, at home, in the support given National Parks projects and space research programs of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

Throughout the year Explorers Hall was host to many State Department guests from abroad. Special tours were provided for Members of Parliament of Tanzania, and Ambassadors and staffs from a number of embassies, usually resulting from close cooperation in our exhibits.

Explorers Hall has become one of Washington's most popular attractions and it is gratifying to see these facilities enjoyed so widely by the guests of many Members of Congress, Government offices, and agencies.

TOURS AND RECEPTIONS—GOVERNMENT PERSONNEL

Many representatives or affiliates of Government agencies were given special tours of the Society's headquarters. These included not only tours of Explorers Hall but also of the Society's cartographic and photographic facilities, which are informative and useful in carrying out the official duties of such guests. Among these official groups were representatives of the Air Force, the 87th Congress, Committee on Recreation and Natural Beauty, Navy Civil Engineer Corps, Department of Agriculture, World Bank, State Department, USIA, Naval War College, Parliament of Tanzania, Advisory Board for National Parks, Marine Corps, and NASA.

The Society also offered its hospitality at receptions for such Government organizations as the Naval Academy, Advisory Board of the National Park Service, and the Air Force (General Thomas D. White Aerospace Trophy ceremony).

Explorers Hall is open to the public every day of the year except Christmas Day. During 1966 there were 353,042 visitors and in the three years that this public museum has been in operation there have been 1,091,634 visitors. As many as 5,000 people have visited the Hall in the course of a single day.

PUBLIC SERVICE GRANTS

In the financial statement accompanying the Society's Information Return for 1966 is a complete list of Public Service Grants made in furtherance of scientific, educational, historical, charitable, and other public service goals of many nonprofit organizations engaged in activities which support Government goals and interests.

During 1966 they totalled $1,383,705, including such public service, scientific and educational activities conducted by the Society itself, such as educational television, Explorers Hall, News Service, etc., which are described in detail in other exhibits accompanying the Society's Information Return.

Another $108,031 in salaries of Society staff was contributed for editorial and production support of public service books published by the White House Historical Association and the United States Capitol Historical Society. This contribution is described in more detail under Public Service Books.

The Society made available on a rent-free basis valuable office space in its 16th and M Streets building to several public service organizations during 1966: U.S. Capitol Historical Society, Association of American Geographers, People-to-People Program, Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, and the National Conference on State Parks. Free storage space was also provided for the Washington National Monument Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association. The fair rental value of this space for the year amounted to $67,557.

The Society made a number of direct Public Service Grants in support of a variety of important scientific, educational, and charitable activities, as follows:

United Givers Fund (local charities), $10,000; John Oliver LaGorce Award to Outstanding Cadet in Geography, Air Force Academy (education), $315; International Doll Library Foundation (education), $5,000; Gilbert Grosvenor Memorial Fund at Amherst College (education), $5,000; National Park Service (government), $4,728; Metropolitan Police Boys Club, $200; Anderson Award for Outstanding War College Student (education), $150; Better Business Bureau (civic), $200; Walter K. Myers Lectureship (medical education), $1,000; Wildlife Management Institute (conservation), $104; Hugh L. Dryden Memorial Fund (science and education), $5,400.

PUBLIC SERVICE BOOKS

During 1966 the Society continued its policy of cooperating with several nonprofit, education public service organizations in telling the story of American Government to the people of the country.

Earlier counterparts of this report have outlined the Society's role in assisting the White House Historical Association to produce a book on the White House, "The White House: an Historical Guide," and a book on American Presidents, "The Presidents of the United States of America"; the U.S. Capitol Historical Society to publish "We, the People," a history of the United States Capitol; and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association to produce a book on the Supreme Court, "Equal Justice Under Law." Thus, the Society has had a key part in producing, as a public service, histories of the three principal branches of Government: Executive, Legislative, and Judicial.

As reported in 1965, the National Geographic Society also assisted the nonprofit Washington National Monument Association in publishing a history of George Washington and the Washington Monument.

During 1966 the Society's Special Publications Division produced one new public service book, "The Living White House," and revised two others—"We, the People," and "The White House: an Historic Guide."

The Fourth Edition of "We, the People" was published in May 1966. Geographic staff members devoted a total of 437 regular and 143 overtime hours to its production. 400,000 copies were printed, bringing to 1,450,000 the total number of copies of all editions of the Capitol Book.

The book was revised to the extent of eight new photographs; text changes on 25 pages; and corrections on all plates to improve color.

The sixth edition (120,000 copies) of "The White House: an Historic Guide," was published in June 1966. Geographic staff devoted 1,086 regular and 257 overtime hours to production of the book. A total of 1,825,000 copies have now been printed. Four pages were added to the book, bringing the total to 156 pages. Text changes were made on all pages, and 21 new photographs were included, either as new material or as substitutions. All of the plates were remade, reproofed and corrected to improve color over previous editions.

"The Living White House," the sixth public service book produced by the Society, was published in November 1966 in an edition of 250,000 copies. As its part in producing the book, the Society contributed all writing, editing, photography, layout, quality control, and other supporting editorial operations as a public service. Geographic staff devoted 15,489 regular and 1,827 overtime hours to production of this new book.

In addition to publishing "The Living White House," members of the Society's staff assisted in the publicity work for the book, preparing news releases and photographs. The releases and photographs were incorporated in press kits issued by Mrs. Elizabeth Carpenter, press secretary to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Geographic staff members also made oversize black-and-white and color prints with legends which were displayed at the presentation ceremony at the White House on November 28, 1966.

At the request of the White House Historical Association, the Society prepared posters with photographs of the Association's three books for use at the Sales Desk at the White House.

The Society has agreed to supply the White House Historical Association and the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, at cost, photographs and transparencies taken from material in their respective books. In addition to laboratory time required for this work, at least an additional 80 hours of unreimbursed staff time were involved in filling requests during 1966.

A summary of the hours and their value contributed by the Society as a public service during 1966 in production of these three books follows:

"We, the People" (4th edition):	
Regular hours	437
Overtime hours	143½
Cost	$3,946
"The White House Guide" (6th edition):	
Regular hours	1,086
Overtime hours	254
Cost	$8,775
"The Living White House":	
Regular hours	15,489
Overtime hours	1,827
Cost	$95,310
Total regular hours	17,012
Total overtime hours	2,224½
Total cost	$108,031

The value of the Society's contributions in making these Public Service Books possible is seen in the many favorable comments about them from government officials and the public alike.

The Society continues to assist these organizations in many other ways to carry out their educational and patriotic objectives. As already noted, the U.S. Capitol Historical Society has been supplied with rent-free office space in the National Geographic's 16th Street Building. Permission was given to this organization to publish a unique drawing of the Capitol, prepared by National Geographic staff, in its "Newsletter."

Also, as noted previously, the Society provides free storage space to the Washington National Monument Association and the Foundation of the Federal Bar Association.

In the spring of 1966, at the request of the Supreme Court, the National Geographic Society assisted in setting up an exhibit on the Supreme Court as a unit of the National Law Enforcement Exhibit in New York City. The exhibit featured back-lighted transparencies from the Society's Public Service book on the Supreme Court, "Equal Justice Under Law." The Society's laboratory provided internegatives for the display, and legend material was composed, researched and set in type by Society staff.

The Society made a grant of $40,525 to the Association of American Geographers, a nonprofit educational organization of geography teachers, technical geographers, and other scientists and educations, for editorial assistance in the preparation of a book on the geography of New England to serve as a pilot volume in a proposed six volume series of supplemental reading on regions of the United States. In addition, the Society has contributed editorial, photographic and cartographic assistance as a public service.

A summary of National Geographic Society assistance in the field of Public Service Publications, through calendar year 1966, shows the following direct grants and expenses:

White House Historical Association:	
Editorial labor 1962–66 in connection with preparation of "White House" book, "Living White House" and "Presidents" book	$182,335.28
Engraving costs on "White House" book, 1962	78,731.74
Total direct contribution	261,067.02
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made and repaid in 1963	100,000.00
U.S. Capitol Historical Society:	
Cash Contribution, 1963	10,000.00
Editorial labor in connection with preparation of "We, The People" book, 1963–66	74,617.07
Office space donated December 1963 to March 1967	24,375.00
Total direct contribution	108,992.07
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital made in 1963, repaid in 1964	211,397.58
Foundation of the Federal Bar Association:	
Editorial labor in 1965 in connection with preparation of "Equal Justice Under Law," Supreme Court book	95,301.08
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital, made in 1965	180,353.05
Less amount repaid to date	4,541.43
Balance still unpaid	175,811.62
Washington National Monument Association:	
Editorial labor in 1965 in connection with preparation "Washington: Man and Monument"	31,007.52
Non-interest-bearing loan to provide working capital to pay cost of book in 1965	130,000.00
Less amount repaid to date	32,302.25
Balance still unpaid	97,697.75
John F. Kennedy Library: Preparation of book on President Kennedy Library	3,072.66
Association of American Geographers: Public service grant for New England book (Reimbursable)	40,525.00
Daughters of American Revolution: Preparation of DAR Story	182.84
Grand total	1,125,055.14

In addition to this more than one million dollars in grants and direct National Geographic payroll costs, the organizations concerned have greatly benefited from the expert knowledge of key staff people in the Society's Editorial, Illustrations, Book Service, Special Publications, Color Laboratory, Geographic Art, Photo-typographic, Geographic Research, Photography, and Printing Production departments. No dollar value can be placed on the sharing of this knowledge.

They benefit, too, from the assistance given by several of the Society's officers and Trustees, who serve these public service organizations and give freely of their time and advice.

Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, National Geographic Society President and Editor, serves on the Boards of the White House Historical Association and the Washington National Monument Association. It was through his initiative that this series of public service publications began, and he has served in an editorial capacity on most of them. Dr. Conrad L. Wirth, Society Trustee, is a charter member of the White House Historical Association.

Dr. Melvin M. Payne, the Society's Executive Vice President and Secretary, is a Vice President and Trustee of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society, and it was largely because of his executive and administrative assistance that the Capitol Society was organized and the history of the Capitol brought to fruition. He was also instrumental in publication of the Supreme Court book, serving as Editor-in-chief for this project.

Dr. Leonard Carmichael, Vice President of the Society, serves the White House Historical Association as a trustee and the Capitol Historical Society as an honorary trustee.

Because of the generous grants made to them, and because of the advice, assistance, and labor of the Society's executive, editorial, illustrations, and business staffs, both the White House Historical Association and the Capitol Historical Society have become self-sufficient and are now able to better carry out their chartered educational, historical, and civic purposes. An instance is refurbishing the White House by the White House Historical Association. The Society, however, continues to maintain active liaison with both groups and still renders substantial assistance to them. Hopes are that the Society's public service publications on the Supreme Court and the Washington Monument will bear the same fruit.

As it always has in the past, the National Geographic stands ready in the future to render worthwhile public services in the national interest to the Government and to public service organizations to the best of its ability.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. BATTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and happy to join with my distinguished colleague and fellow Scout, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], in pointing out the sad fact that the proposed Internal Revenue Service regulations would damage the outstanding work of a variety of nationally known groups, including the Boy Scouts and the Girl Scouts.

I happen to be a member of three additional organizations, besides the Boy Scouts, which would be harassed by the IRS, if these proposed regulations are allowed to stand. I am proud to be a member of the Billings, Mont., Kiwanis Club, one of more than 750,000 Kiwanians in the United States, Canada, and several foreign nations who are united in service this year under the goal of

"Quality Leadership—Key to the Future."

As a Kiwanian, I wholeheartedly subscribe to the objectives of Kiwanis International which remain constant. They are:

> To give primacy to the human and spiritual, rather than to the material values of life.
>
> To encourage the daily living of the Golden Rule in all human relationships.
>
> To promote the adoption and the application of higher social, business, and professional standards.
>
> To develop, by precept and example, a more intelligent, aggressive, and serviceable citizenship.
>
> To provide, through Kiwanis clubs, a practical means to form enduring friendships, to render altruistic service, and to build better communities.
>
> To cooperate in creating and maintaining that sound public opinion and high idealism which make possible the increase of righteousness, justice, patriotism, and good will.

These proposed regulations would hit the excellent publication of Kiwanis International, the Kiwanis magazine.

They would also strike at the great humanitarian work of the Shriners' Hospitals for Crippled Children. I am equally proud of my membership in Shrine, and know that I do not have to delineate the much-needed work done by these hospitals. The third organization which I mentioned earlier is the American Bar Association, about which others will have more to say. I take pride in my profession as a lawyer and in the high ethics promoted by this great group, known familiarly to those of us in the legal profession as the ABA.

Mr. Speaker, I not only protest this attempt to hinder the work of these voluntary groups, but I have also introduced appropriate legislation to make it clear that the revenue from these public service publications is tax exempt. My bill, H.R. 9468, is identical to bills introduced by my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means, Mr. WATTS and Mr. BROYHILL.

Under my bill the advertising income in publications of education, charitable, and scientific nonprofit associations, such as the Boy Scouts, Kiwanis, the Shrine, and the American Bar Association, just to mention a few, would be considered to be related to the objectives for which the organizations were established and given tax-free status.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for according me the privilege of joining with him to protest this injustice.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for bringing this important matter to the attention of the House, and I would like to associate myself with his stand.

Mr. Speaker, one has only to look at the Scout's oath to know the type of values Scouting seeks to inculcate in our young people:

> On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and Country and to obey the Scout Law; to help other people at all times; to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake, and morally straight.

A good part of our national time, money, and effort are aimed at trying to impress our young people with the self-respect and attitudes involved in that oath. Now we are witnessing an attempt to tax one of Scouting's main sources of revenue. Surely, we have not reached a point in our national history at which we are forced to tax the income of such organizations.

If any activity is to receive a tax break, it should be the one which turns out individuals who are trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, and reverent.

The approximate $100,000 revenue loss may be considered small indeed when measured against the possible gains.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Missouri yielding to me in this instance.

There are just a few things which I would like to say along the lines of what the gentleman from Missouri has said.

First, a word about the gentleman from Missouri himself.

Mr. Speaker, as a freshman in this body, we watch with very real interest the various roles that are played by different Members of this industrious assembly, which includes the distinguished Speaker, the majority leader, the minority leader, and other individual Members.

I, for one, Mr. Speaker, commend the distinguished gentleman from Missouri for what I consider to be a very valuable role which the gentleman has played in this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I find that there has not been a day during which I have been on the floor of the House that I do not likewise find the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a statement, unfortunately, which can be said about some of our fellow Members.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri is one who spends a great many hours here giving consideration to and careful attention to all that takes place in this body, an attribute which is so badly needed.

I commend the gentleman from Missouri for what I consider a very real, major contribution to the work of this body. So far as the particular subject matter of the day is concerned, I personally approve the Internal Revenue Department very carefully and fairly and uniformly enforcing the law that we of the Congress have written, but at the same time I read in what the gentleman from Missouri has said, and what the other people have said here on the floor today, no criticism of that approach, but I do read a very great deal of criticism over a situation of enforcement which somehow takes a law which has been on the books for an extended period of time, and with this on the books a series of practices have grown up, impliedly perfectly proper practices, and then all of a sudden some 16 years or so after we of the Congress wrote the law upon the books, they suddenly come up with an interpretation which is vastly different than the interpretation which has been followed as those years have marched on, and as the policies have become an ingrained part of the procedures that organizations like the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts have followed.

Any one of us who watches carefully the warp and woof and fabric of America knows the critically important role organizations like these play. Government has a major role to play in America, but so also do the voluntary private organizations like those to which the gentleman from Missouri has addressed his remarks today. And when an action like this, without the direct sanction of the Congress and without the direct approval of the Congress, suddenly appears on the record threatening to do critical injury to organizations like these which are so very important to our American system, then I join in a very real expression and a strong expression of concern and apprehension that this action not be continued without direct action being taken by this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I close with once again commending the gentleman from Missouri for calling the attention of this body to what is a very significant action on the part of the Internal Revenue Department at the present time.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments which, like the lark singing on high, is as beautiful to my ears as is the Rose of Oregon that the gentleman wears in his lapel.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly believe the gentleman has put his finger exactly on the point that we are trying to make here, namely the ubiquitousness of the arrogation of power and the suddenness in doing damage to these outstanding training, educational, and cultural institutions. I appreciate the gentleman's comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAILSBACK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from Missouri for calling the attention of this body to the proposal of the Internal Revenue Service to tax the advertising income of certain professional journals. And I would like to join today with other Members of the House who are concerned by this precipitous action.

While the IRS has without doubt the authority to issue regulations interpreting the laws Congress passes, it also has the obligation to maintain the intent of Congress in those regulations.

For the 17 years that this law has been on the statute books no administration has made proposals to tax this particular form of income. No administration has maintained that such taxation was the intent of Congress.

It is, therefore, my contention that for action with such far-reaching ramifications, the Congress should certainly have been involved.

Furthermore, there are substantive and

policy issues involved in this change which affect organizations of many different types. Action and determinations of such import properly belong to Congress.

The role of Congress must not be taken over by administrative decree. And Congress itself must assert its own authority. I urge that we do exactly that.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my distinguished colleague from Missouri, Dr. HALL, and others in the House in expressing deep concern over the notice of proposed rulemaking issued by the Internal Revenue Service on April 13, 1967, pertaining to the treatment of income from unrelated trade or business.

Although I readily understand the need for constant review of tax regulations as times change, I feel that the ruling in question will have an adverse impact not intended by the Congress when it enacted the 1950 amendments to the Internal Revenue Act. I believe that this regulation, if fully implemented as proposed, would impose serious handicaps on some of our Nation's finest cultural, scientific, educational, and youth training organizations, and that many of these groups would be forced to either drastically curtail their services to a crippling level or cease to operate entirely.

I am particularly disturbed over the implications of this ruling for the scouting movement in America. In these days, all of us are understandably alarmed over the rising incidence of juvenile delinquency in our society—especially when we hear that during 1965, for instance, almost a million and a half juveniles—that is, young people under 18 years of age—were involved in police arrests of some description. We are disturbed, too, over FBI reports that the arrests of persons under 18 for serious crimes increased 47 percent in the 5 years from 1960 to 1965, while the increase of young people in this age group in our population for the same period was only 17 percent. These figures speak for themselves, and I do not think anyone will argue the seriousness of the situation and the problem for the future if this trend should continue. That is why I think we must exert increased efforts at all levels toward the prevention of juvenile delinquency wherever possible.

We in the Congress have sought to provide legislation and funds in an attempt to deal with the growing youth crime problem, and State and local governments have done likewise. But I think, too, that most of us will concede that while public programs can be of great benefit, the most important influences are still in such worthy organizations such as the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America. It seems incongruous, therefore, that the Internal Revenue Service proposes a ruling at this time which could cause these organizations to lose substantial portions of the income which permits them to make such a valuable contribution to American life.

Emerson once said that:

> The true test of civilization is not the census, nor the size of cities, nor the crops—but the kind of man the country turns out.

If we are to continue to have the caliber of young men and young women which the times demand, then we must help, not hinder, those organizations dedicated to the development of leadership qualities, patriotism, self-reliance, and service to others. In this light, it is my hope that the proposed ruling will be reviewed and revised.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] for arranging this time today in order that we might discuss the serious inequities in the surprising action of the Internal Revenue Service in issuing the proposed regulation to tax the advertising incomes of most of America's educational, scientific, and charitable organizations.

As has been pointed out, organizations which would be adversely affected by the proposed action of the Internal Revenue Service would be the Boy Scouts of America and the Girl Scouts of America. I would like to discuss the concern of the Girl Scouts of the United States of America, as outlined by their national executive director, Louise A. Wood, who is fearful that this proposal would limit future services of the national headquarters to their Girl Scout members.

The Girl Scouts of the United States of America is an organization chartered by the Congress to bring the Girl Scout program to all girls, 7 through 17 years of age, wherever they are. The organization's primary source of income is the $1 membership dues from their members. At present they reach 3 million girls, or one out of every seven in the girl population 7 to 17 years of age. An important service to these girls is the American Girl magazine published by Girl Scouts of the United States of America as a companion to their program by translating their Girl Scout purposes and beliefs into magazine form.

Subscriptions do not cover the cost of the American Girl magazine. Advertising appropriate to girl activity and magazine content is also sought. The sale of advertising helps to meet the cost, and at present additional subsidy is also required from Girl Scout operations. If their limited advertising revenue were to be taxed in the future, Girl Scouts of the United States of America would have to reduce its other services for girls accordingly. In fact the question would probably have to be faced whether Girl Scouts of the United States of America could continue to publish this important vehicle to youth.

The Leader magazine is also published by Girl Scouts of the United States of America. It is the organization's major means of communication to their 600,000 adult volunteer members, most of whom serve as Girl Scout leaders. There is no subscription to the Leader magazine. Advertising revenue only partially supports this magazine. As in the case of the American Girl magazine, any tax to be paid on this revenue would result in further reduction of services to their membership.

I share the concern of the national executive director of the Girl Scouts and feel that the pending Internal Revenue Service regulation should be rejected in order not to threaten the commendable program of the Girl Scouts of America.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my support to my colleagues who are speaking out in opposition to a proposed regulation of the Internal Revenue Service which would impose a 48-percent tax on the net advertising income on publications of some of our finest American institutions.

Organizations affected by this arbitrary action would include the Boy Scouts of America, the Girl Scouts, National Geographic Society, and the American Bar Association, as well as many other worthy publications.

I have expressed my concern on many occasions about the administrative subversions of congressional intent; this is another example, in my opinion. The law on which the Internal Revenue Service is basing this action has been on the books for 17 years now, and has never been given the interpretation that it was intended to tax the advertising revenue of public service publications.

It is important for us to realize the uses to which the revenue under consideration is put by the organizations who produce these publications.

This revenue is not profit which is put into the pockets of publishers for their personal gain, or invested into competitive publishing enterprises. Rather, the revenue, as well as the rest of the income of these organizations, is used to carry on the public service efforts of these organizations.

As one who has served as a Boy Scout district chairman, I can tell you from personal experience that the funds of this organization are wisely and prudently spent, and that there is always a shortage of funds for the character building and training program of the Boy Scouts. These programs of citizenship building as well as programs such as the National Geographic's efforts to expand our knowledge of the world are badly needed in these times.

I urge the Congress to act to stop the proposal of the Internal Revenue Service from becoming effective. I offer my assistance in this effort.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Speaker, as an active participant for many years in the Scouting movement, I am concerned about the effect the proposed Internal Revenue Service regulation would have on this organization. The proposed 48-percent tax on the net advertising income of publications such as Boys' Life or American Girl would severely jeopardize the continued availability of their material designed to promote high ideals for American youth.

At this time in our Nation's history when so much is written and reported about the excessive crime rate and various forms of extremism among the young people, it is imperative that organizations such as the Boy and Girl Scouts be encouraged rather than hampered in attempts to reach youth and offer them incentives to better and more wholesome lives. One of the main goals of Scouting is to prepare boys and girls to be responsible citizens, and the role of Scout publications in this program is quite formidable.

Advertisements in these Scout magazines help to meet but do not cover the costs involved in publication. If a tax were to be levied on the income received from advertising, these publications would suffer tremendous losses in revenue which would curtail their ability to maintain current standards of coverage and presentation.

The organizations of the Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts of America are only two of a number of educational, charitable, and scientific nonprofit associations which will suffer if the proposed regulation is issued by the Internal Revenue Service Commissioner. I wish to join Dr. Hall and other Members of the House who today are requesting an examination of the full impact this regulation would have. It is my hope that Congress will take an active interest in quickly determining what is equitable in this situation which concerns future publications of some of our finest national organizations which contribute so much in public services to our citizens.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we are indebted to our esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] for bringing to our attention a proposal by the Internal Revenue Service to impose a tax that may kill off many of our public service publications.

It certainly comes as no surprise to hear "Doc" Hall speaking on behalf of the Boy Scouts, since he has been honored with the Silver Beaver and Silver Antelope Awards—two of Scouting's highest citations for outstanding volunteer service to the movement. This is true indication that he has served long and well the cause of American youth through the program of the Boy Scouts.

A great many organizations exempt from tax under section 501(c)(6) of the Internal Revenue Code are engaged in publishing activities and have been for many years. It is not unusual for those publications to carry advertising. In many cases this advertising reflects directly the interests of the organization or its members. In other instances the content of the advertising may not directly reflect such interests; but nonetheless, it contributes to the public or membership interest in the publication.

In speaking to the third annual American University tax conference earlier this year, Mr. Joel Barlow said:

> Whatever the content or reader interest in the advertising appearing in an exempt organization publication, this advertising is a source of income which becomes available to the organization as a natural by-product of the publication's existence—just as ticket and program advertising income is a by-product of college athletics. Without the publication there would be no advertising opportunity.

If I could continue Mr. Barlow's thought, I would say that without the revenues that accrue from advertising there would be much less opportunity for the tax exempt organizations to perform their worthy services. Publications such as Boys' Life, Nation's Business, and the National Geographic contribute measurably to the knowledge of the interested public. While the American Medical Association does not encourage its members to advertise their services, its membership and the general public certainly benefit by exposure through advertising to new medicinal products and equipment that is afforded by the Association's publications.

It is reasonable to assume that, without advertising income, many of the exempt organization publications would be limited, if not eliminated, in helping to support the functions and purposes of these organizations generally.

I might mention that our esteemed Vice President Hubert Humphrey was featured in Scouting's Boys' Life magazine within the past year, as was General Westmoreland, who attributes to his experience as a Scout, part of his success as a military commander.

Are we going to allow the Internal Revenue Service to undercut the largest youth movement in the free world? A movement that leads our youth to emulate such men as the Vice President and General Westmoreland? An organization that claims the allegiance of most of our astronauts and 328 Members of Congress?

Can we allow the sense of a 17-year-old law to be perverted so as to undermine the effectiveness of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, a group of young men dedicated to the credo that "service to humanity is the best work in life"?

Perhaps we forget how many millions or billions of Federal dollars are being spent annually in an effort—very often a futile effort—to develop the same kind of young man that the Scouts and the Jaycees are internationally famous for developing.

These organizations never ask for Federal dollars. They are self-supporting in a day and age when it isn't fashionable to be self-supporting. Is it really conceivable that the Internal Revenue Service would like to destroy that self-support?

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to participate in and comment on my special order today, and to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES PERMISSION TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CRIME COMMISSION

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the crime-taxed public is understandably trying to figure some way to bypass the Supreme Court and its lesser lights to restore law and order to the streets.

The repeated image and findings of a super National Crime Commission sound impressive even though its findings and recommendations are in left field.

In fact, the pretentious National Crime Commission is but a front to further attack policemen and local law and order. According to the 229-page report—printed at the expense of Mr. and Mrs. U.S. Taxpayer—the only criminal the Commission can find is society, and the police officer. Naturally, as a quasi-National Police Review Board, they could straighten out the crime problem.

The interesting part of the Commission is not what they say, but who it is that is saying it. To understand who is trying to "think for us," I place the names of the members of the Commission, which range from Whitney Young of the Urban League to Adam Yarmolinsky, the infamous Harvard professor, in the Record following my remarks. The report from which this list is taken, "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society," is available from the U.S. Government Printing Office at a price of $2.25.

The names follow:

Appendix A. The Commission and Its Operations

I. THE COMMISSIONERS

Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Chairman: Washington, D.C.; Under Secretary of State; U.S. Army Air Force, 1st Lieutenant, prisoner of war, awarded Air Medal With Three Clusters, 1941–45; Rhodes scholar, 1947–49; attorney, Department of the Air Force, 1950–52; Professor of Law, Yale Law School, 1952–56; Professor of International Law; University of Chicago, 1956–61; Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legal Counsel, 1961; Deputy Attorney General, 1962–65, Attorney General of the United States, 1965–66.

Genevieve Blatt: Harrisburg, Pa., attorney; Phi Beta Kappa; Secretary of Internal Affairs, Member, State Board of Pardons, State of Pennsylvania, 1955–67.

Charles D. Breitel: New York, N.Y.; Associate Judge, Court of Appeals of the State of New York; Deputy Assistant District Attorney, New York County, staff of Thomas E. Dewey, special rackets investigations, 1935–37; Assistant District Attorney, New York County, 1938–41; Chief of Indictment Bureau, 1941; Counsel to Governor, State of New York, 1943–50; Justice, Supreme Court of New York, 1950–52; Associate Justice, Appellate Division (First Department), Supreme Court of New York, 1952–66; Advisory Committee, Model Penal Code, American Law Institute; Chairman, Special Committee on the Administration of Criminal Justice, Association of the Bar of the City of New York; Council, American Law Institute.

Kingman Brewster, Jr.: New Haven, Conn.; President, Yale University; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant, 1942–46; Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, 1950–53; Professor of Law, Harvard Law School, 1953–60; Provost, Yale University, 1960–63, author, "Anti-Trust and American Business Abroad" (1959); "Law of International Transactions and Relations" (with M. Katz, 1960).

Garrett H. Byrne: Boston, Mass.; attorney; District Attorney, Suffolk County, Mass.; Member, Massachusetts House of Representatives, 1924–28; President, National District Attorneys Association, 1963–64; President, Massachusetts District Attorneys Asociation, 1963–64; President, National District Attorneys Foundation.

Thomas J. Cahill: San Francisco, Calif.; Chief of Police, San Francisco; entered San Francisco Police Department as patrolman, 1942; Big Brother of the Year Award, 1964; Liberty Bell Award, San Francisco Bar Association, 1965; Vice President, International Association of Chiefs of Police, 1963– ; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the Governor on the Law Enforcement Section of the Disaster Office of the State of California; Chairman, Advisory Committee to the School of Criminology, City College, San Francisco; Member, National Advisory Committee, National Center on Police-Community Relations, Michigan State University.

Otis Chandler: San Marino, Calif.; Publisher, Los Angeles Times; U.S. Air Force, 1st Lieutenant, 1951–53; Senior Vice President, the Times-Mirror Co.; Member, Board of Directors, Associated Press, Western Airlines, Union Bank.

Leon Jaworski: Houston, Tex.: attorney, senior partner, Fulbright, Croker, Freeman, Bates & Jaworski; U.S. Army, Colonel, Chief, War Crimes Trial Section, European Theater, Legion of Merit, 1942–46; President, Houston Bar Association, 1949; President, Texas Civil Judicial Council, 1951–52; President, American College of Trial Lawyers, 1961–62; President, Texas Bar Association, 1962–63; Special Assistant U.S. Attorney General, 1962–65; Special Counsel, Attorney General of Texas, 1963–65; Executive Committee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; trustee, Houston Legal Foundation; Fellow, American Bar Foundation; U.S. Member, Permanent (International) Court of Arbitration; Member, National Science Commission; Chairman, Governor's Committee on Public School Education, State of Texas.

Thomas C. Lynch: San Francisco, Calif.; Attorney General, State of California; Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1933–42; Chief Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1943–51; District Attorney, San Francisco, Calif, 1951–64; Fellow, American College of Trial Lawyers; Advisory Committee on Prearraignment Code, American Law Institute.

Ross L. Malone: Roswell, N. Mex.; attorney, partner, Atwood & Malone; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant Commander, 1942–46; Deputy Attorney General of the United States, 1952–53; President, American Bar Association, 1958–59; President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee, Southwestern Legal Foundation; Council, American Law Institute; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers; Board of Trustees, Southern Methodist University.

James Benton Parsons: Chicago, Ill.; Judge, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Illinois; U.S. Navy, 1942–46; teacher, Lincoln University of Missouri, 1934–40, city schools of Greensboro, N.C., 1940–42, John Marshall Law School, 1949–52; Assistant Corporation Counsel, city of Chicago, 1949–51; Assistant U.S. Attorney, 1951–60; Judge, Superior Court of Cook County, Ill., 1960–61; Member, Committee on Administration of Probation System, Judicial Council of the United States; Chicago Commission on Police-Community Relations; Illinois Academy of Criminology.

Lewis Franklin Powell, Jr.: Richmond, Va.; attorney, partner, Hunton, Williams, Gay, Powell & Gibson; U.S. Army Air Force, Colonel awarded Legion of Merit, Bronze Star, Croix de Guerre With Palms, 1942–46; Member, Virginia State Board of Education, 1961— ; President, American Bar Association, 1964–65; Trustee, Washington and Lee University and Hollis College; Board of Regents, American College of Trial Lawyers, Vice President, American Bar Foundation; Trustee and General Counsel, Colonial Williamsburg, Inc.

William Pierce Rogers: Bethesda, Md.; attorney, partner, Royall, Koegel, Rogers & Wells (New York and Washington); Assistant U.S. Attorney, New York County, 1938–42, 1946–47; U.S. Navy, Lieutenant Commander, 1942–46; Chief Counsel, U.S. Senate War Investigating Committee, 1948; Chief Counsel, Senate Investigations Subcommittee of Executive Expenditures Committee, 1948–50; Deputy Attorney General, 1953–57, Attorney General of the United States, 1957–61; Member, U.S. Delegation, 20th General Assembly, United Nations, 1965; U.S. Representative, United Nations Ad Hoc Committee on Southwest Africa, 1967; Member, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia, 1965–67; Fellow, American Bar Foundation.

Robert Gerald Storey: Dallas, Tex.; attorney, partner, Storey, Armstrong & Steger; Phi Beta Kappa, Order of Coif; U.S. Army, 1st Lieutenant, 1918–19, Colonel, Bronze Star, Legion of Merit, 1941–45; Assistant Attorney General, State of Texas, 1921–23; Executive Trial Counsel for the United States, trial of major Axis war criminals, Nuremberg, Legion of Honor (France), 1945–46; Dean, Southern Methodist University Law School, 1947–59; President, Texas Bar Association, 1948–49; President, American Bar Association, 1952–53; Member, Hoover Commission, 1953–55; President, Inter-American Bar Association, 1954–56; American Bar Association Gold Medal, 1956; Vice Chairman, U.S. Civil Rights Commission, 1957–63; President, Southwestern Legal Foundation.

Julia Davis Stuart: Spokane, Wash.; President, League of Women Voters of the United States; Governor's Tax Advisory Council, State of Washington, 1958; Chairman, Citizens Subcommittee on School Finance, State of Washington Legislature, 1960; National Municipal League Distinguished Citizen Award, 1964; Member, National Citizens Commission on International Cooperation, 1965.

Robert F. Wagner: New York, N.Y.; attorney; New York State Assembly, 1938–41; U.S. Army Air Force, Lieutenant Colonel, 1942–45; New York City Tax Commission, 1946; Commissioner of Housing and Buildings, New York City, 1947; New York City planning Commission, 1948; President, Borough of Manhattan, N.Y. 1949–53; Mayor, New York City, 1954–66.

Helbert Wechsler: New York, N.Y.; Harlan Fisk Stone Professor of Constitutional Law, Columbia Law School; Assistant Attorney General, State of New York 1938–40; Special Assistant U.S. Attorney General, 1940–44; Assistant Attorney General of the United States, 1944–46; Member, U.S. Supreme Court Advisory Committee on Rules of Criminal Procedure, 1941–45; Oliver Wendell Holmes Lecturer, Harvard Law School, 1958–59; Director, American Law Institute; Reported, Model Penal Code, American Law Institute; Member, New York State Temporary Commission on Revision of the Penal Law and Criminal Code; Member, Executive Committee, Association of the Bar, City of New York; author, "Criminal Law and Its Administration" (with J. Michael, 1940); "The Federal Courts and the Federal System" (with H. Hart, Jr., 1953); "Principles, Politics and Fundamental Law" (1961).

Whitney Moore Young, Jr.: New Rochelle, N.Y.; Executive Director, National Urban League; Dean, Atlanta University School of Social Work, 1954–60; Member, President's Committee on Youth Employment, 1962; Member, President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces, 1963; Member, President's Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, 1965–66; Member, Special Presidential Task Force on Metropolitan and Urban Problems, 1965–66; Member, Advisory Committee on Housing and Urban Development, Department of Housing and Urban Development; President, National Conference on Social Welfare; Member, Advisory Board, A. Philip Randolph Institute; Member, National Board, Citizens Crusade Against Poverty; Trustee, Eleanor Roosevelt Memorial Foundation; author, "To Be Equal" (1964).

Luther W. Youngdahl: Washington, D.C.: Senior Judge, U.S. District Court, District of Columbia; U.S. Army, artillery officer, World War I; Judge, Municipal Court, Minneapolis, Minn., 1930–36; Judge, District Court, Hennepin County, Minn., 1936–41; Associate Justice, Supreme Court of Minnesota, 1942–46; Governor of Minnesota, 1947–51; Judge, U.S. District Court, District of Columbia, 1951–66.

Appendix B. Consultants and Advisers

I. CONSULTANTS

General

Anthony G. Amsterdam, Professor, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jan Deutsch, Associate Professor, Yale University Law School, New Haven, Conn.

Arnold Enker, Professor, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minn.

Daniel Freed, Acting Director, Office of Criminal Justice, Department of Justice.

Howard Heffron, Professor, University of Washington Law School, Seattle, Wash.

Sanford H. Kadish, Professor, University of California Law School, Berkeley, Calif.

Michael March, Assistant to Chief, Education, Manpower and Science, Bureau of the Budget.

Frank Remington, Professor, University of Wisconsin Law School, Madison, Wis.

Arnold Sagalyn, Director of Law Enforcement Coordination, Department of the Treasury.

Donald A. Schon, President, Organization for Social and Technical Innocation, Cambridge, Mass.

Harry Subin, Associate Director, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, N.Y.

Administration of justice

Norman Abrams, Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif., Special Assistant, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Sheldon Elsen, attorney, New York, N.Y.

Gilbert Geis, Professor, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Abraham S. Goldstein, Professor of Law, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Zona F. Hostetler, Consultant, Office of Economic Opportunity.

Louis L. Jaffe, Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Arthur B. Kramer, Attorney, New York, N.Y.

John S. Martin, Jr., attorney, Nyack, N.Y.

Monroe E. Price, Associate Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Lee Silverstein, Research Attorney, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Patricia M. Wald, Commissioner, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

Lloyd L. Weinreb, Assistant Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ASSESSMENT OF CRIME

Albert D. Biderman, Senior Research Associate, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Egon Bittner, Associate Professor of Sociology and Resident, Langley Porter Neuro-Psychiatric Institute, University of California Medical Center, San Francisco, Calif.

Sol Chaneles, Director of Child Sex Victimization, American Humane Association, New York, N.Y.

Karl O. Christiansen, Professor, Det Kriminalistiriske Institute, Copenhagen, Denmark.

Jerome Daunt, Chief, Uniform Crime Reporting Section, FBI, Department of Justice.

Samuel Dunaif, M.D., Supervising Psychiatrist Jewish Family Service, New York, N.Y.

Otis Dudley Duncan, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Philip Ennis, Senior Study Director, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Robert Fogelson, Associate Director, Department of History, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Howard Freeman, Professor, School of Social Work, Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass.

Jack Gibbs, Professor, Department of Sociology, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.

Gilbert Geis, Professor, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Donald Goldstein, Research Assistant, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Leroy C. Gould, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Reginald Lourie, M.D., Director of Psychiatry, Children's Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Jennie McIntyre, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Sheldon Messinger, Vice Chairman, Center for the Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Samuel Meyers, Research Associate, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Kriss Novak, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, Wisconsin State University, Whitewater, Wis.

Fred Powledge, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Albert J. Reiss, Jr., Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Peter Rossi, Director, National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Philip C. Sagi, Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Leonard D. Savitz, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Stephen Schafer, Professor, Department of Sociology-Anthropology, Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.

Kark Schuessler, Professor, Department of Sociology, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

Milton Shore, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

James F. Short, Dean, Graduate School, Washington State University, Pullman, Wash.

Jerome H. Skolnick, Center for Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Irving Spergel, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Ill.

Don D. Stewart, Washington, D.C.

Denis Szabo, Director, Institute of Criminology, University of Montreal, Canada.

Adrianne W. Weir, Research Analyst, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C.

Marvin Wolfgang, Director, Center of Criminological Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

James Woolsey, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

William T. Adams, Assistant Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training Washington, D.C.

Myrl E. Alexander, Director, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Gordon Barker, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

Sanford Bates, Pennington, N.J.

Bertram Beck, Executive Director, Mobilization for Youth, New York, New York.

Alan Breed, Superintendent, Northern California Youth Center, Stockton, Calif.

Bertram S. Brown, M.D., Deputy Director, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Milton Burdman, Director, Division of Parole and Community Service, Department of Corrections, Sacramento, Calif.

Richard Clendenen, Professor, Criminal Law Administration, University of Minnesota Law School, Minneapolis, Minn.

Fred Cohen, Professor of Law, University of Texas Law School, Austin, Tex.

John P. Conrad, Chief, Division of Research, Department of Corrections, Sacramento, Calif.

Thomas F. Courtless, Director of Criminological Studies, George Washington University Institute of Law, Psychiatry, and Criminology, Washington, D.C.

Roger Craig, attorney, Washington, D.C.

LaMar Empey, Director, Youth Studies Center, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

T. Conway Esselstyn, Professor of Sociology, San Jose State College, San Jose, Calif.

Joseph P. Fitzpatrick, S.J., Associate Professor and Chairman, Department of Sociology, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Robert H. Fosen, Research Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Ben Frank, Task Force Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Marcia Freedman, Research Associate, Office of Conservation of Human Resources, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Thomas E. Gaddis, Consultant, Research and Development, Division of Continuing Education, Oregon System of Higher Education, Portland Continuation Center, Portland, Oreg.

Gilbert Geis, Professor, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Daniel Glaser, Chairman, Department of Sociology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Douglas Grant, Program Director, New Careers Development Project, Sacramento, Calif.

Keith S. Griffiths, Chief of Research, Department of Youth Authority, Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, Sacramento, Calif.

David H. Gronewold, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

Edward J. Hendrick, Superintendent of Prisons, Department of Public Welfare, Philadelphia, Pa.

Harland L. Hill, Director, Research and Development, Institute for the Study of Crime and Delinquency, Sacramento, Calif.

Garrett Heyns, Executive Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Barbara Kay, Task Force Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

John T. Kilkeary, Center Director, Bureau of Prisons, Pre-Release Guidance Center, Chicago, Ill.

Charles King, Executive Director, Wiltwyck School for Boys, New York, N.Y.

Barbara Knudson, Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.

Howard Leach, Consultant, New Mexico Council on Crime and Delinquency, Albuquerque, N. Mex.

Robert B. Levinson, Chief, Psychology Services, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Milton Luger, Director, New York State Division of Youth, Albany, N.Y.

Austin MacCormick, Executive Director, the Osborne Association, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Matthew Matlin, Editor, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

John M. Martin, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Fordham University, New York, N.Y.

Malcolm Matheson, Visiting Assistant Professor, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California; Deputy Director of Corrections, Province of British Columbia, Canada.

Boyd C. McDivitt, Deputy Director, Office of Probation, New York, N.Y.

Richard F. McGee, Administrator, Youth and Adult Corrections Agency, Sacramento, Calif.

Roma K. McNickle, Editor, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

William G. Nagel, Executive Secretary, Governor's Council for Human Services, State of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg, Pa.

Sherwood Norman, Director of Detention Services, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

Lawrence Pierce, Chairman, New York State Narcotic Addiction Control Commission, Albany, N.Y.

Barbara Pittard, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, George State College, Atlanta, Ga.

Kenneth Polk, Director, Research and Evaluation, Lane County Youth Project, Eugene, Oreg.

Walter Reckless, Professor of Sociology, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

Milton G. Rector, Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

Ernest Reimer, Chief, Correctional Program Services Division, California Department of Corrections, Sacramento, Calif.

Henry Reining, Jr., Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Mark S. Richmond, Deputy Assistant Director, Community Services, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice

Ted Rubin, Judge, Juvenile Court, Denver, Colo.

Charles Shireman, School of Social Work, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Gerald M. Shattuck, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Fordham University, New York, New York

Clarence Schrag, Professor of Sociology, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Saleem A. Shah, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Louis Tomaino, Director, Southwest Center on Law and the Behavioral Sciences, University of Texas, Austin, Tex.

Robert Trimble, Executive Assistant to the Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency New York, New York

Fred Ward, Southern Regional Director, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Austin, Tex.

Marguerite Q. Warren, Principal Investigator, Community Treatment Project, California State Youth Authority, Sacramento, Calif.

Robert Weber, Institutional Consultant, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, New York, N.Y.

Leslie T. Wilkins, Professor, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Drunkenness

David Pittman, Director, Social Science Institute, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Peter Hutt, attorney, Washington, D.C.

Juvenile delinquency

Ivar Berg, Associate Professor, Department of Business Administration, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Virginia M. Burns, Chief, Training Administration, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Aaron Cicourel, Professor, Center for Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Sanford J. Fox, Professor, Boston College Law School, Brighton, Mass.

Don M. Gottfredson, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, Davis, Calif.

Paul Grams, Research Assistant, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Mich.

Robert F. Johnson, Executive Director, Wieboldt Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Edwin M. Lemert, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of California, Davis, Calif.

Henry D. McKay, Division Chief, Division of Community Studies, Institute for Juvenile Research, Department of Mental Health, Chicago, Ill.

Kenneth Polk, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

Hyman Rodman, Senior Research Associate, Merrill-Palmer Institute, Detroit, Mich.

Margaret K. Rosenheim, Professor, School of Social Service Administration, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Seymour Rubenfeld, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Walter E. Schafer, Assistant Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg.

William H. Sheridan, Assistant Director, Division of Juvenile Delinquency Service, Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Leonard W. Stern, Chief, Demonstration Programs, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Jackson Toby, Professor, Department of Sociology, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Robert D. Vinter, Associate Dean, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Carl Werthman, Research Assistant, Center for Study of Law and Society, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Marvin E. Wolfgang, Director, Center of Criminological Research, University of Pennsylvania Philadelphia, Pa.

Narcotics

Dennis S. Aronowitz, Assistant Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Richard H. Blum, Professor, Project Director, Psychopharmocology Project, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Jonathan O. Cole, M.D., Chief, Psychopharmacology Research Branch, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.

Michael P. Rosenthal, Assistant Professor of Law, Rutgers University, Camden, N.J.

Organized crime

G. Robert Blakey, Associate Professor, Notre Dame Law School, Notre Dame, Ind.

Donald R. Cressey, Dean, College of Letters and Science, University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.

John Gardiner, Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Rufus King, attorney, Washington, D.C.

Ralph Salerno, Central Intelligence Bureau, New York City Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Gus Tyler, Director, Department of Politics, Education, and Training, International Ladies Garment Workers' Union, New York, N.Y.

Police

Richard H. Blum, Professor, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Allen P. Bristow, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

William P. Brown, Professor, State University of New York, Albany, N.Y.

James E. Carnahan, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Edward V. Comber, Project Director, Criminal Justice Information Systems Design Study, California Department of Justice, Sacramento, Calif.

J. Shane Creamer, First Assistant U.S. Attorney, Philadelphia, Pa.

William F. Danielson, Director of Personnel, City of Berkeley, Calif.

Harry Diamond, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

George D. Eastman, Headquarters Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

John Fabbri, Chief of Police, South San Francisco, Calif.

Edward A. Farris, Professor of Police Science, New Mexico State University, University Park, N. Mexico.

James L. Fyke, Field Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

Raymond Galvin, Assistant Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

A. C. Germann, Professor, Department of Criminology, California State College at Long Beach, Long Beach, Calif.

Herman Goldstein, Professor, University of Wisconsin Law School Madison, Wis.

G. Douglas Gourley, Professor and Chairman, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

John Guidici, Captain, Oakland Police Department, Oakland, Calif.

Richard O. Hankey, Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

William H. Hewitt, Assistant Professor and Chairman, Department of Police Science, State University of New York, Farmingdale, N.Y.

Roy E. Hollady, Chief of Police, Fort Collins, Colo.

Norman C. Kassoff, Supervisor, Police Training Unit, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Joseph Kimble, Chief of Police, San Carlos, Calif.

Richard Laskin, Associate Professor, Department of Political and Social Science, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.

G. Stephen Lloyd, Field Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

Joseph D. Lohman, Dean, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Lawrence S. Margolis, Special Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, Department of Justice.

Gordon E. Misner, Visiting Associate Professor, School of Criminology, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Richard A. Myren, Dean, School of Criminal Justice, State University of New York, Albany, N.Y.

David L. Norrgard, Field Representative, Public Administration Service, Chicago, Ill.

George W. O'Connor, Director, Professional Standards Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Bruce T. Olson, Police Administration Specialist, Institute for Community Development and Services, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

J. Kinney O'Rourke, Executive Director, Massachusetts League of Cities and Towns, Boston, Mass.

Margaret G. Oslund, Department of Political and Social Science, Illinois Institute of Technology, Chicago, Ill.

Wesley A. Pomeroy, Undersheriff, San Mateo County Sheriff's Police Department, San Mateo, Calif.

Norman E. Pomrenke, Assistant Director, Institute of Government, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N.C.

Louis Radelet, Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Leonard E. Reisman, President, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, The City University of New York, New York, N.Y.

Gerald Robin, Office of National Analysts, Philadelphia, Pa.

Jewell L. Ross, Captain, retired, Berkeley Police Department, Berkeley, Calif.

James D. Stinchcomb, Supervisor, Police Education Unit, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Patricia M. Wald, Commissioner, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

John B. Williams, Associate Professor, Department of Police Science and Administration, California State College at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Calif.

Science and technology

Mary Ellen Angell, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

James E. Barr, Chief, Safety and Special Radio Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission.

Thomas Bartee, Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Mandell Bellmore, Associate Professor, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Robert Brooking Communications Engineer, City of Burbank, Calif.

Albert Bush-Brown, President, Rhode Island School of Design, Providence, R.I.

Ronald Christensen, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Joseph Coates, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Robert Cohen, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Jerome Daunt, Chief, Uniform Crime Reporting Section, FBI, Department of Justice.

P. A. DonVito, Washington, D.C.

Ronald Finkler, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Saul I. Gass, International Business Machines, Inc., Rockville, Md.

Leonard Goodman, Bureau of Social Science Research, Washington, D.C.

Norbert Halloran, International Business Machines, Inc., Yorktown Heights, N.Y.

Janice Heineken, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

William Herrmann, Police Consultant, Rand Corp. University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Thomas Humphrey, International Business Machines, Inc., Houston, Tex.

Herbert Isaacs, Los Angeles, Calif.

Sue Johnson, Glen Head, N.Y.

Robert Jones, CEIR, Inc., Bethesda, Md.

Vincent Keenan, Paoli, Pa.

Peter Kelly, Kelly Scientific Corp., Washington, D.C.

Jerry Kidd, National Science Foundation.

Ray Knickel, Kelly Scientific Corp., Washington, D.C.

Richard Larson, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Peter Lejins, Professor, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Charles McBride, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Lois Martin, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Robert Muzzy, Research Associate, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Frank Nauta, CEIR, Inc., Bethesda, Md.

Joseph Navarro, Institute of Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

William Offutt, International Business Machines, Inc., Rockville, Md.

Lloyd Perper, Tucson, Ariz.

S. Rothman, TRW Systems, Redondo Beach, Calif.

Thomas Schelling, Professor, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Marsha Smith, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Peter Szanton, Bureau of the Budget.

Jean Taylor, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Claude Walston, International Business Machines, Inc., Gaithersburg, Md.

Herbert Weiss, Litton Systems, Inc., Van Nuys, Calif.

Leslie T. Wilkins, Professor, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Marvin Wolfgang, Director, Center of Criminological Research, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

II. ADVISERS

Administration of justice

Francis A. Allen, Dean, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Richard Arens, Professor of Law, McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

Sylvia A. Bacon, Assistant Director, President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

Gary Bellow, Deputy Director, California Rural Legal Assistance, Los Angeles, Calif.

Charles L. Decker, Major General, U.S. Army (retired), Director, National Defender Project of the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, Washington, D.C.

Richard A. Green, Project Director, A.B.A. Special Project for Minimum Standards for the Administration of Criminal Justice, New York, N.Y.

Lois R. Goodman, Washington, D.C.

Geoffrey Hazard, Jr., Administrator, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

Richard A. Lavin, attorney, Newark, N.J.

Peter Lowe, Professor of Law, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Frank Miller, Professor of Law, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.

Tim Murphy, Judge, Court of General Sessions, Washington, D.C.

Herbert Packer, Professor of Law, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

A. Kenneth Pye, Associate Dean, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

Howard Rothwax, Director, Legal Services, Mobilization for Youth, New York, New York.

Barbara Roffwarg, New York, N.Y.

Murray L. Schwartz, Professor of Law, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Ted Small, Staff attorney, Office of Criminal Justice, Department of Justice.

James Thompson, Professor of Law, Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.

Jack Weinstein, Professor of Law, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Dana Barbour, Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget.

Belton Fleischer, Professor, Department of Economics, Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Donald P. Kenefick, Director, National Association of Mental Health, New York, N.Y.

Gerald Levinson, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

James McCafferty, Research and Evaluation Branch, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts.

Thorsten Sellin, Professor of Sociology, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Pa.

Philip Selznick, Director, Center for the Study of Law and Society, Berkeley, Calif.

Henry Sheldon, Bureau of the Census.

Stanton Wheeler, Sociologist, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, N.Y.

CORRECTIONS

Stuart Adams, Project Director, Prison College Project, University of California, Berkeley, Calif.

Dean Babst, Research Associate, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

James V. Bennett, Consultant, Bureau of Prisons, Washington, D.C.

George Beto, Director, Texas Department of Corrections, Huntsville, Tex.

Harold Boslow, M.D., Superintendent, Patuxent Institute, Jessups, Md.

Donald E. Clark, Sheriff, Multnomah County, Portland, Oreg.

Arthur Cohen, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

John Coons, Professor of Law, Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill.

Joseph B. Dellinger, Correctional Service Federation, Baltimore, Md.

Fred Fant, New York State Division of Probation, New York, N.Y.

Paul H. Gebhard, Institute for Sex Research, Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind.

Paul Gernert, Chairman, Pennsylvania Board of Parole, Harrisburg, Pa.

Howard Gill, Director, Institute of Correctional Administration, American University, Washington, D.C.

Abraham Goldstein, Professor of Law, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Don M. Gottfredson, Director of Research, National Parole Institute, Davis, Calif.

John Grace, Commissioner, Salvation Army, New York, N.Y.

Alfred Hantman, Chief, Criminal Section, U.S. Attorney's Office, Washington, D.C.

Solomon Kobrin, Institute of Juvenile Research, Chicago, Ill.

Belle Lead, Lieutenant Colonel, Volunteers of America, New York, N.Y.

Peter Lejins, Professor, Department of Sociology, University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Arthur R. Mathews, Jr., Director, Project on Mental Illness and Criminal Law, American Bar Foundation, Chicago, Ill.

A. Louis McGarry, M.D., Law and Medicine Center, University School of Medicine, Boston, Mass.

C. F. McNeil, Director, Social Welfare Assembly, New York, N.Y.

Herman G. Moeller, Assistant Director, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

James Murphy, Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice, Washington, D.C.

Abraham G. Novick, Executive Director, Berkshire Farm for Boys, Canaan, N.Y.

Joshua Okun, Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

Emery Olsen, Emeritus Dean, School of Public Administration, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Russell Oswald, Chairman, New York State Parole Board, Albany, N.Y.

Asher R. Pacht, Chief, Clinical Services, Division of Corrections, Department of Public Welfare, Madison, Wis.

Mauris Platkin, M.D., Chief of Service, John Howard Pavilion, St. Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D.C.

Samuel Polsky, Professor of Law and Legal Medicine, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sanger Powers, Director, Division of Corrections, Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare, Madison, Wis.

Ross Randolph, Director, Department of Public Safety, Springfield, Ill.

Ames Robey, M.D., Medical Director, Massachusetts Correctional Institute, Bridgewater, Mass.

Donald H. Russell, M.D., Director, Court Clinics Program, Division of Legal Medicine, Brookline, Mass.

Russell O. Settle, M.D., Director of Law and Psychiatry, Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.

Saleem A. Shah, Center for Studies of Crime and Delinquency, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

E. Preston Sharp, Executive Secretary, American Correctional Association, Washington, D.C.

Charles Smith, M.D., Chief Medical Officer, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

Heman Stark, Director, California State Youth Authority, Sacramento, Calif.

John A. Wallace, Director, New York City Office of Probation, New York, N.Y.

Russell L. Wilson, Board of Control, Des Moines, Ia.

Frederick Wiseman, Department of Sociology, Brandeis University, Waltam, Mass.

Drunkenness

H. David Archibald, Executive Director, Addiction Research Foundation, Toronto, Canada.

Leonard Blumberg, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Sidney Cahn, Institute for the Study of Human Problems, Stanford University, Stanford, Calif.

Michael Laski, Project Codirector, St. Louis Detoxification Center, St. Louis Police Department, St. Louis, Mo.

Rosemary Masters, Attorney, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, N.Y.

Frank Mateker, Captain, Director, Planning and Research Division, St. Louis Police Department, St. Louis, Mo.

Richard Merrill, Attorney, Washington, D.C.

John M. Murtagh, Justice, New York, Supreme Court, New York, N.Y.

Thomas Plaut, Assistant Chief, National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Earl Rubington, School of Alcohol Studies, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.

Irving Shandler, Director, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Thomas Shipley, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Walter Stanger, Philadelphia Diagnostic and Relocation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

Herbert J. Sturz, Director, Vera Institute of Justice, New York, N.Y.

Ralph F. Turner, Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

Juvenile delinquency

Lisle C. Carter, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Individual and Family Services, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Forrest E. Conner, Executive Secretary, American Association of School Administrators, Washington, D.C.

J. Dudley Diggs, Judge, LaPlata, Md.

Orman W. Ketcham, Judge, Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia.

James H. Lincoln, Judge, Juvenile Division, Detroit, Mich.

I. Richard Perlman, Chief, Juvenile Delinquency Studies Branch, Division of Research, Children's Bureau, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

George B. Raison, Jr., Judge, Chestertown, Md.

Aubrey E. Robinson, Jr., Judge, Juvenile Court, Washington, D.C.

Bernard Russell, former Director, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Rosemary C. Sarri, Professor, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

James W. Symington, former Executive Director, President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime.

Philip B. Thurston, Judge, Family Court of New York, New York, N.Y.

Walter G. Whitlatch, Judge, Juvenile Court, Cleveland, Ohio.

Narcotics

David Acheson, Special Assistant to the Secretary (for Enforcement), Department of the Treasury.

Carl L. Anderson, Chief Program Consultant, Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental

Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dale C. Cameron, M.D., Superintendent, St. Elizabeths Hospital, Washington, D.C.

David Deitch, Executive Director, Daytop Village, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Vincent P. Dole, M.D., Senior Physician and Professor, Rockefeller University, New York, N.Y.

John Enright, Assistant to the Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

John Finlator, Director, Bureau of Drug Abuse Control, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

James H. Fox, Acting Chief, Center for Studies of Narcotic and Drug Abuse, National Institute of Mental Health, Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

George Gaffney, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

F. M. Garfield, Special Assistant to the Commissioner for Drug Abuse Control, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Francis Gearing, M.D., Research Unit, School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, N.Y.

Henry L. Giordano, Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

Kenneth R. Lennington, Assistant to the Director for Regulatory Operations, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Dean Markham, Special Assistant to the President, Great Lakes Carbon Corp., Washington, D.C. (deceased).

Aloysius J. Melia, Deputy Commissioner, Trials, New York City Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Donald S. Miller, Chief Counsel, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

Herbert S. Miller, Senior Research Attorney, Institute of Criminal Law and Procedure, Georgetown University Law Center, Washington, D.C.

Henry E. Peterson, Chief, Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Robert Rasor, M.D., Medical Officer in Charge, U.S. Public Health Service Hospital, Lexington, Ky.

Richard J. Tatham, Chief of the Alcoholic and Drug Addiction Program, Development Office, D.C. Department of Health, Washington, D.C.

Organized crime

Julia Benson, Amherst, Mass.

Louis C. Cottell, Deputy Inspector, Central Intelligence Bureau, New York City Police Department, New York, N.Y.

William Duffy, Captain, Intelligence Division, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

Robert Herman, University of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.

George Gaffney, Deputy Commissioner, Bureau of Narcotics, Department of the Treasury.

William G. Hundley, Attorney, Falls Church, Va.

Aaron Kohn, Executive Director, Metropolitan Crime Commission, New Orleans, La.

Eliot Lumbard, Special Assistant to the Governor of New York for Law Enforcement, Albany, N.Y.

Henry E. Peterson, Chief, Organized Crime and Racketeering Section, Criminal Division, Department of Justice.

Virgil Peterson, Director, Chicago Crime Commission, Chicago, Ill.

Alfred Scotti, Chief Assistant District Attorney, New York County, New York, N.Y.

Harold E. Yarnell, Captain, Intelligence Division, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

Police

Claude Abercrombie, Jr., Sheriff, Douglass County, Douglassville, Ga.

Charles R. Adrian, Professor and Chairman, Department of Political Science, University of California, Riverside, Calif.

Douglass W. Ayres, City Manager, Salem, Oreg.

David A. Booth, Associate Professor, Department of Political Science, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Ky.

C. Beverly Briley, Mayor, Nashville, Tenn.

Thomas Brownfield, Special Agent, Supervisor, FBI, Department of Justice.

Robert L. Carter, General Counsel, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, New York, N.Y.

Joseph Casper, Assistant Director, FBI, Department of Justice.

George E. Causey, Deputy Chief, Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D.C.

Ben Clark, Sheriff, Riverside County, Calif.

Donald E. Clark, Sheriff, Multnomah County, Portland, Oreg.

James Cotter, Inspector in Charge, FBI National Academy, FBI, Department of Justice.

John Creer, County Commissioner, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Thompson S. Crockett, Professor of Police Science, St. Petersburg Junior College, St. Petersburg, Fla.

Jerome Daunt, Chief, Uniform Crime Reporting Section, FBI, Department of Justice.

C. D. deLoach, Assistant to the Director, FBI, Department of Justice.

Leonard J. Duhl, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, D.C.

Woodrow W. Dumas, Mayor, East Baton Rouge, La.

Edward L. Epting, Sergeant, San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco, Calif.

Paul E. Estaver, Dissemination Officer, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice.

Rev. Walter E. Fauntroy, Director, Washington Bureau, Office, Southern Christian Leadership Conference, Washington, D.C.

Thomas F. Fitzpatrick, Director, Bureau of Special Services and Intelligence, San Francisco Police Department, San Francisco, Calif.

Arthur Q. Funn, General Counsel, National Urban League, Inc., New York, N.Y.

Charles R. Gain, Deputy Chief, Oakland Police Department, Oakland, Calif.

Robert R. J. Gallati, Director, New York State Intelligence and Identification System, Albany, N.Y.

Bernard Garmire, Chief of Police, Tucson, Ariz.

Peter F. Hagen, Inspector, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

William Harpole, Sheriff, Oktibbeha County, Starkville, Miss.

Patrick Healy, Executive Director, National League of Cities, Washington, D.C.

William W. Hermann, Police Consultant, Rand Corp., University of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.

James C. Herron, Captain, Philadelphia Police Department, Philadelphia, Pa.

Roderic C. Hill, Lieutenant General, Adjutant General, California National Guard, Sacramento, Calif.

William Hollowell, Sheriff, Sunflower County, Indianola, Miss.

John E. Ingersoll, Chief of Police, Charlotte, N.C.

Adolph C. Jacobsmeyer, Major, St. Louis Police Department, St. Louis, Mo.

John J. Jemilo, Deputy Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice.

Herbert T. Jenkins, Chief of Police, Atlanta, Ga.

Mark E. Keane, City Manager, Tucson, Ariz.

John T. Kelly, Deputy Chief of Police, Chicago, Ill.

Hubert O. Kemp, Chief of Police, Nashville-Davidson County, Tenn.

Floyd Mann, former Superintendent, Alabama Highway Patrol, Chambers County Sheriff's Office, Langdale Ala.

Daniel H. Margolis, Attorney, Washington, D.C.

Robert E. McCann, Director of Training, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

William P. McCarthy, Inspector, New York Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Roy McLaren, Director, Field Operations Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Karl A. Menninger, M.D., Chief of Staff, The Menninger Foundation, Topeka, Kans.

Raymond M. Momboisse, Deputy Attorney General, California Department of Justice, Sacramento, Calif.

William Mooney, Special Agent Supervisor, FBI, Department of Justice.

Patrick V. Murphy, Assistant Director, Office of Law Enforcement Assistance, Department of Justice.

Joseph D. Nicol, Superintendent, Illinois Bureau of Criminal Identification and Investigation, Joliet, Ill.

John F. Nichols, District Inspector, Detroit Police Department, Detroit, Mich.

Harvard Norred, Chief of Police, Gwinnett County, Lawrenceville, Ga.

Peter J. Pitchess, Sheriff, Los Angeles County, Los Angeles, Calif.

George H. Puddy, Executive Officer, California Police Officers' Standards and Training Commission, Sacramento, Calif.

Thomas Reddin, Chief, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

Rudy Sanfilippo, Task Force Director, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D.C.

Lloyd G. Sealy, Assistant Chief Inspector, New York Police Department, New York, N.Y.

Carleton, F. Sharpe, City Manager, Kansas City, Mo.

Daniel J. Sharpe, Inspector, Rochester Police Department, Rochester, N.Y.

Robert Sheehan, Professor, Department of Law Enforcement Administration, Northeastern University, Boston, Mass.

R. Dean Smith, Director, Research and Development Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Charles L. Southward, Brigadier General, Assistant Chief for Army National Guard, U.S. National Guard Bureau, Washington, D.C.

Daniel Stringer, Sheriff, Cherokee County, Canton, Ga.

Quinn Tamm, Executive Director, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Carl C. Turner, Major General Provost Marshal General, Department of the Army, Washington, D.C.

William Veeder, City Manager, Charlotte, N.C.

Nelson A. Watson, Project Director, Research and Development Division, International Association of Chiefs of Police, Washington, D.C.

Leon H. Weaver, Professor, School of Police Administration and Public Safety, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.

James Q. Wilson, Associate Professor of Government, Director, Joint Center for Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Minor Keith Wilson, Assistant Chief of Police, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

O. W. Wilson, Superintendent, Chicago Police Department, Chicago, Ill.

Orrell A. York, Executive Director, Municipal Police Training Council, Albany, N.Y.

Science and technology

A. B. Cambel, Director, Research and Engineering Support Division, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

M. U. Clauser, Lincoln Laboratories, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

James Fletcher, President, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah.

Eugene Fubini, Vice President, International Business Machines, Inc., Armonk, N.Y.

Jesse Orlansky, Research and Engineering Support Division, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

Thomas Reddin, Chief, Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, Calif.

David Robinson, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.

Robert Sproull, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.

A. Tachmindji, Assistant Director, Research and Engineering Support Division, Institute for Defense Analyses, Arlington, Va.

James Q. Wilson, Associate Professor of Government, Director, Joint Center for Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Implementation

Seymour S. Berlin, Director, Bureau of Inspections, Civil Service Commission.

Don L. Bowen, Executive Director, American Society for Public Administration, Washington, D.C.

Henry Cohen, First Deputy, Human Resources Administrator, New York, N.Y.

Morris W. H. Collins, Jr., Professor of Law, University of Georgia, Athens, Ga.

Bernard L. Gladieux, Attorney, New York, N.Y.

Ferrel Heady, Director of Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

T. Norman Hurd, Budget Director, State of New York, Albany, N.Y.

Dwight Ink, Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Roger W. Jones, Special Assistant to the Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Herbert Kaufman, Professor, Department of Political Science, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Evelyn Murphy, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

William Pincus, Public Affairs Program, Ford Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Randall B. Ripley, Research Associates, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Herbert Shepard, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

Elmer B. Staats, Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office.

David T. Stanley, Member Senior Staff, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C.

Robert Steadman, Director, Committee for Improvement in Government, Committee for Economic Development.

Frederick Wiseman, Organization for Social and Technical Innovation, Cambridge, Mass.

Adam Yarmolinsky, Professor of Law, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON CRIME AND DELINQUENCY

National officers

Sigurd S. Larmon, President.

Judge Caroline K. Simon, Chairman of the Board.

Jewett T. Flagg, Vice President.

Carl M. Loeb, Jr., Vice President.

Coverly Fischer, Treasurer.

Franklin F. Bruder, Chairman, Executive Committee.

Milton G. Rector, Director.

Board of trustees

Mrs. Julius Ochs Adler.
Myri E. Alexander.
J. David Baker.
Mrs. Curtis Bok.
Goodwin Chase.
Wilson Clark.
Bishop John P. Craine.
Tom Downs.
James E. Fain.
Curtiss E. Frank.
Richard L. Gelb.
Paul J. Gernert.
Judge Thomas D. Gill.
Joseph Griesedieck.
Edward Gudeman.
Miss Elizabeth Hallanan.
Garrett Heyns.
Harold Horvitz.
Peter Howard.
Mrs. Roy A. Hunt, Jr.
Mrs. David Jacobson.
Mrs. James A. King.
Lester K. Kirk.
Walter C. Laidlaw.
Joe E. Levitt.
Austin H. MacCormick.
Pat Malloy.
Mrs. Ellen Pray Magtag.
George F. McGrath.
Louis Montag.
Russell Oswald.
Herbert Patterson.
H. Ladd Plumley.
Elizabeth Glenn Radvin, M.D.
Elmer W. Reeves.
Judge Scovel Richardson.
Mrs. H. M. Rozendaal.
Philip B. Schnering.
Mrs. Hobart A. Spalding.
Heman G. Stark.
Mrs. Maynard J. Toll.
Mrs. Arthur G. Whyte, Jr.
Randolph E. Wise.
Robert B. Wolf.
Hull Youngblood, Sr.

The release of April 30 from the Washington Evening Star follows:

CRIME PANEL WARNS OF CRISIS IN POLICE-MINORITY TIES—ACTION URGED TO AVERT RACIAL STRIFE IN CITIES

(By Ronald Sarro)

Drastic action is urgently needed to improve relations between police and minority groups in America, a National Crime Commission task force reported last night.

Without it, the task force said, there is a good chance that potentially explosive situations that now exist will mushroom and erupt into racial conflicts in a number of major cities.

The situation is being fueled by instances of police brutality, discrimination, and unethical conduct, and lack of public support and understanding of the role of police, the task force said.

Although police are aware of the problem and are beginning to take action to improve the situation, the report said, "progress is not nearly fast enough."

"LIKELY TO ACCELERATE"

"Impatience, frustration, and now violence are growing quickly in minority communities, and these trends are likely to accelerate," the presidential crime commission said.

The task force's findings, in a sense a warning, were reported in a 229-page supplement on police to the main crime commission report, made public earlier this year.

The commission plans to make public other task force reports on courts, corrections, juvenile delinquency, organized crime, science and technology, narcotics, drunks, as well as a general assessment.

Chairman Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, undersecretary of state, commented that "no single task is more urgent in confronting the challenge of crime than breaking down the wall of isolation that surrounds the police.

"To some extent the wall of isolation has been built by the rest of the community around the police; to some extent the wall is of the police's own making," he said.

HOSTILITY TO POLICE

As a result of studies, the commission found "serious problems of Negro hostility to police in virtually all medium and large cities."

"Large numbers of minority group members see the police as their enemy who engage in verbal and physical abuse," the commission said.

The commission said its surveys also show that Negroes, who in Washington are the victims of 8 out of 10 crimes, "greatly desire better police protection.

"Consequently, there is every reason to believe that relations between the police and Negroes can be substantially improved," the task force said. The report added:

"However, the problem may be aggravated unless immediate steps are taken to improve police-community relations while America's cities are becoming more heavily populated by minority groups."

CITIES LISTED

In this respect, the task force listed Washington among cities with potentially dangerous situations. Washington has a population well over 60 percent Negro. Other cities in the category of growing large Negro populations and potentially explosive situations, the task force said, are:

Baltimore, Detroit, Newark, St. Louis, New Orleans, Atlanta, Memphis, Chicago, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Cincinnati.

"The problems inherent in policing such cities by police forces comprised largely of white officers may become even worse if effective action is not taken," the commission said.

The Negro is not the only target of police discrimination and source of hostility. Puerto Rican and Mexican-American communities are experiencing similar trends, the task force said.

Many Negroes "see the police as protectors of the white people, not as protectors of the Negroes as well," the report said.

FEW ON POLICE FORCES

Substantially contributing to this situation, the report said, is the fact that "in every city, county and state where statistics are available, Negroes are underrepresented, usually substantially, on police forces."

In addition to this under representation, the report said, there is a widespread lack of success by Negroes in gaining promotion to supervisory ranks and in acquiring assignments as detectives.

Commission survey teams found instances of brutality, and verbal and physical abuse, in various police departments in which they spent from five to eight weeks riding with officers in high crime areas.

"Commission studies reveal that there are abuses in some cities which range from simple discourtesy to clearly unwarranted excessive use of force against persons of all ages," the report said.

In Washington, for example, the task force said, "offensive terms such as 'boy' or 'nigger' are too often used by officers of the department," often deliberately. Washington police recently banned use of such terms, with the specific exception of "boy".

POLICE VIEW

Police officers themselves view relations with the public as poor, the study showed, and in Washington, over half the Negroes and one quarter of the whites surveyed thought "many police enjoy giving people a hard time."

Yet, 8 out of 10 Negroes and whites believe that "there are just a few policemen who are responsible for the bad publicity."

The survey teams concluded that verbal abuse and harassment through discriminatory field interrogations, enforcement of minor statutes, and discourtesy, is the major police-community relations problem today, rather than physical abuse.

"Observers found that police officers began 15 percent of the interviews conducted by the police on the street with witnesses, victims, suspects, and bystanders, with a brusque or discourteous command," the task force said.

"A survey of officers in several Northern cities found that almost three-quarters of the white officers expressed prejudice against Negroes," it said.

It placed importance on parity of minority representation on police departments, clear policies and leadership by police and political leaders, and all-out support for improvement programs by these officials.

Among remedies proposed were all-out community relations programs, firm commitments and programs to recruit minority members to police departments, development of strong neighborhood advisory groups, more intense police training, and "improvement of police complaint procedures by welcoming complaints. . . ."

The task force hit at unwarranted uses of firearms it found, noting this is a riot stimulus, and criticized use of police dogs for civil rights demonstrations, crowd control, and routine patrol in minority areas.

SURVEY CITED

But even with hostility arising from use of dogs, the task force, citing Negro concern over crime said a survey in Washington showed 46 percent of the Negro men and 60 percent of the Negro women favored more use of dogs, prudently, for routine patrols.

"Public antagonism harms police work, thereby making it more difficult to recruit officers, to keep them on the force and to have them work effectively" the task force said.

THE SEATING OF CONGRESSMAN ADAM CLAYTON POWELL

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon have before it again the vexing question of whether to seat Adam Clayton Powell.

Those who rejected the committee report on March 1 in that memorable 222-to-202 vote and went on to their inexorable expulsion conclusion in House Resolution 278, have seen demonstrated what was forewarned, in that Mr. Powell returns as the overwhelming choice again of his district.

The special election cost the city of New York $93,986, a charge that should be assumed by this Congress.

The community newspaper in my area, Manhattan East, in its well-known column "The Least East" by Rick Friedman, which comments on the passing scene, has analyzed in devastating fashion the situation that now faces us.

Reading this column, which I commend to my colleagues, can only bring home to us the sagacity of the members of the select committee in their House Report No. 27 in which they recommended seating subject to penalties.

The column follows:

The Least East—The House Hunter

(By Rick Friedman)

President Nelson A. Rockefeller, in his State of the Union Message this morning before Congress, pleaded with the House of Representatives to admit Adam Clayton Powell permanently. The move, he said, was imperative to keep his native state from going bankrupt because of the special elections it has been forced to call every three or four months since 1967.

The President, who narrowly squeaked into office this past November over Lurleen Wallace by throwing his full support to the *Seat Powell Bloc,* pointed out that the 14 special elections held by the Empire State since Powell's first expulsion from Congress six years ago has cost New York State millions. Also, that it has seriously impeded the state from full support of U.S. involvement in the Vietnam-Cambodian-Laos-Thailand-Singapore War.

President Rockefeller's plea to the House brought a sharp blast from Rep. Curtis (R-Mo.), leader of the *Keep Powell Out Bloc*. Rep. Curtis denounced Rockefeller, claiming that New York State could easily support both the Vietnam-Cambodia-Laos-Thailand-Singapore War and all the special elections Powell forced on it by merely cutting down on its welfare rolls.

He added that it was totally untrue that the *Keep Powell Out Bloc* has finally run out of candidates willing to run against Powell in New York's 18th Congressional District to which the Harlem Congressman was elected again in November, unseated again in December, and re-elected still again in a special election last week.

Rep. Curtis stunned the press gathered on the Capitol steps by revealing that Count Basie has been persuaded to throw his hat in the 18th Congressional District ring. Curtis said Basie was a top favorite in Harlem.

As with the other 20 candidates (counting special and regular elections) who have lost to Powell since the House unseated him in 1967, Basie isn't given much of a chance of beating the Harlem Oustercrat.

Located later today in a Manhattan recording studio by an Associated Press reporter, Basie said he first considered running against Powell when Powell's fifth straight golden record, *Fiddler on the Floor,* went ahead of his own new record on the national sales charts.

Basie was reminded that Powell never leaves Bimini to campaign and still wins reelection each time by a landside. He responded by revealing for the first time that he has appointed Bob Price as his campaign manager. And that Price has come up with a surefire way to beat the Harlem Oustercrat. If enough campaign funds can be raised from the *Keep Powell Out Bloc,* Price plans to take all the eligible Harlem voters he can to Bimini and set them up two weeks each in store fronts there.

The announcement of Basie's candidacy has sent the country once more into what has become its favorite trivia game: trying to remember the names of all 20 candidates who have run and lost to Powell in the 18th Congressional District of New York since 1967. The more well-known were:

John Lindsey, who gambled in 1968 that a win in the 18th would project him into the national Presidential picture—and lost.

Lester Maddox, who opened a Chicken Delight in Harlem in 1971 after his one term as Georgia Governor. He disappeared about half-way through his Harlem Congressional campaign that year and was never seen or heard from again.

Hubert Humphrey, who in 1971 was brought from the complete obscurity of his Lennox Avenue drug store to make the race against Powell and regain his national image. Humphrey is now back in his Lennox Avenue drug store.

General Dwight D. Eisenhower, who was convinced in 1969 by the *Keep Powell Out Bloc* that Harlem needed him. He found out it didn't.

Richard M. Nixon, who, in the memorable press conference that touched off the Great Harlem Riot of August, 1970, accused reporters from the *Amsterdam News* of giving him the shaft.

William Buckley, who spent his whole 1972 campaign on the beaches of Bimini debating Powell.

Powell, who has been in seclusion the past few days, held his regular Tuesday press conference on the Bimini docks this afternoon. He was reminded by newsmen that the last Congressional vote in December, 1972, was a close 214–211 to keep him out of Congress again. Powell blamed the closeness of the vote on new, young Congressmen from underdeveloped urban areas who have been coming into the House in recent years and siding with the *Seat Powell Bloc*.

He said he agreed with Stokely Carmichael head of the National Negro Renaissance Party, that his [Powell's] *inster* would be a serious blow to Black Power. Also, that such a move would badly upset his daily Congressional routine in Bimini by forcing him to appear occasionally in Washington.

The Harlem Oustercrat revealed that he was even considering the possibility of bringing to light sometime in 1973 a few still-unknown misdeeds he committed before his first ouster from the House six years ago. This, he claimed, could insure his being kept out of Congress until at least 1980.

Regular Bimini beat reporters at the Tuesday conference appeared, as usual, in bathing suits. They expressed the fear that Powell's potential inster could force them all back to covering accidents and fires in the States.

They urged Powell to make the revelations on himself, and then they accepted his standing Tuesday offer to take them fishing on his boat.

INSURANCE AND WELFARE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to see a recent editorial in the Washington Post entitled "Insurance and Welfare." It points out in a very thorough fashion that the social security program today is shot through with problems involving inequity and plain poor financing.

One of the most important points the Post makes is that the old-age and survivors insurance program has become "neither an insurance nor a welfare program but a mixture of both." The drift of social security toward becoming a welfare program is clearly evident today, and the Post does a fine job of emphasizing that a distinction must be made between retirement annuities and welfare benefits.

I call this particular editorial to the attention of the House because it is typical of the scholarly and objective treatment of economic issues which the Post has produced recently. It is a rare commodity in American journalism today.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Record at this point the Washington Post editorial of April 2, 1967:

Insurance and Welfare

Mr. Walter Reuther, the president of the United Automobile Workers, touched off some sparks of controversy when he told the House Ways and Means Committee "that we will never build an adequate social security structure so long as we rely exclusively for the financing of that structure upon the payroll tax." He urges that one third of the costs of the Social Security programs be contributed by the Federal Government from general funds, thus reducing the shares contributed by employers and employes. Unlike most statements on Social Security emanating from the labor movement, Mr. Reuther's points in the right direction. But it fails utterly in getting at the roots of the matter, in explaining what is really wrong with the Old Age and Survivors Insurance program.

The trouble is that the OASI is neither an insurance nor a welfare program but a mixture of both which discriminates against young people in favor of the old, against married women who work and against the working poor. Before these charges can be elucidated, one important point must be made. It is customary to speak of the employer's part of the OASI tax—half of the 7.7 per cent on the first $6600 of income—as if it were a gift to the insured. But that is a delusion. Sooner or later, the burden of the employers' tax is shifted to wage and salary earners in the shape of higher prices or lower wages, fewer jobs or lower dividends.

Viewed as a retirement annuity, OASI is a bad bargain. Prof. Colin D. Campbell of Dartmouth College illustrates the point with the case of the young man who begins work at 22 and continues for 43 years. at the 1966 tax rates and the increases in payments scheduled through 1973, his contributions with accumulated interest at 4 per cent over the 43 years would amount to more than $67,000. When the probable survivors and disability insurance benefits are eliminated, the value of the accumulated taxes for retirement benefits is reduced to about $50,000, out of which the Government will pay $3000 per year for the average life expectance of 14 years. But the same pension or annuity could be financed with accumulated tax payments of only $33,000 or by premium payments to a private insurance company amounting to about $45,000.

What happens to the surplus? Much of it is used to confer windfalls upon the already retired whose benefits far exceed their contributions.

There are other inequities. The poor boy who begins work at 17 instead of 22 receives no more benefits for the extra five years of taxes paid, and since the life expectancy of the poor is lower, he may take less out in benefits. Benefits to the working wives of insured husbands are sharply reduced, even though, they make the same tax contributions. If the Social Security program continues to operate as it does now, there will be sharp increases in the regressive payroll taxes and even greater discrimination against the young and the poor. This disquieting drift can be stopped by recognizing the distinction between retirement annuities and welfare benefits. The former are purchased by workers, and the costs should not exceed the promised benefits. Welfare benefits should be based upon current needs, not past income, and the best way to extend them to the aged is through a negative income tax.

FARM CONTROL SHOULD TAPER OFF

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to see that Life magazine supports my efforts and that of many others to get the Federal Government out of the business of farming.

It has become clear that the world shortage of food—so long predicted—is finally upon us, Life points out. The editorial notes the efforts of the American Farm Bureau Federation to straighten out the mess the Government and the farmer are in.

> In these days of world food shortage, Farm Bureau President Charles Shuman is gaining important allies.

Life reports, and then describes my bill, H.R. 7326, which would, among other things, end grain acreage allotments and subsidies allowing the free market to set prices.

> As the world's needs for food becomes greater—

Life concludes—

> the day is bound to come—and soon—when all of America's farm capacity will be needed. Anticipating that day, our farm programs should be allowed to taper off so that they can be finally eliminated and prices can be set fairly by the open market.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the Record at this point the Life editorial of March 31, 1967:

Farm Controls Can Taper Off

In 25 states, members of the radical National Farmers Organization are dumping milk down the drain rather than sell it for a low of 8¢ a quart.

In a month, 60,000 bred sows and cows have been sold off to slaughter in an attempt to shrink the future supply of meat.

Delegates to the annual convention of the 250,000-member National Farmers Union voted a moratorium on purchases of all new equipment and autos.

In these ways, and a dozen others, farmers are trying to force increases in the prices they get for what they produce. It is impossible to talk about an "average farm" in an industry that ranges from 10 acres and a mule in Appalachia to corporate ranches in Texas. But across the country farm prices are stagnant, expenses are up and, according to Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, "Farm income is far too low." He added, "I won't be satisfied until per capita farm income, now at $1,731, has climbed to nonfarm levels, presently at $2,618 per capita."

The farmers scented a new day coming when, last year, the U.S. reversed a policy that had existed since the 1930s—and called for the first peacetime increase in farm acreage. It had suddenly become clear that the world shortage of food—so long predicted—was finally upon us. A quarter of our wheat crop went to just one country, India, and surpluses whose size had been a scandal seven years ago dwindled below the safe reserve level.

On the farms, expectations went up but prices didn't. American farmers today are paid about the same for their crops as they were in 1956. In the meantime, everything that a farmer has to buy—from mortgage money to machinery—has spiraled up with the cost of living.

Many farmers blame their predicament on the federal government—and claim that the intricate system of subsidies and allotments is geared to keep prices down and housewives happy. The accusation may not be fair, but statistics support the fact that housewives who spent 25% of their family's disposable income on food 20 years ago now spend only 18%.

Secretary Freeman has told farmers that better cooperation among themselves is their one best weapon in the fight to raise their incomes to parity with those of all other Americans. In a speech to the National Farmers Union; Freeman said, "Farmers have power—if they act together." But unity among farmers is probably a forlorn hope—as evidenced by the variety of programs offered by three major farm organizations.

The National Farmers Organization, a brash new group that has signed up an estimated quarter of a million members, would raise prices by decreasing supplies that reach the market. The N.F.O. is behind the campaigns to sell off bred sows and to dump milk. No such campaign can work unless it commands a majority of producers—and the N.F.O. represents a small minority of all farmers. The threat of violence among farmers is implicit in such minority boycotts—as attempts are made to force the majority to join in.

The National Farmers Union, with its greatest support on the smaller family farms, favors most government benefits and would in fact tighten up programs and raise price supports. But the N.F.U. also dreamed up the hapless campaign to put off buying equipment or autos until crop prices rise.

The American Farm Bureau Federation, largest and most conservative of all the farmers' groups, has one simple answer to all its members' ills: get the government out of farming.

In these days of world food shortage, Farm Bureau President Charles Shuman is gaining important allies, Representative Thomas Curtis (Rep.—Missouri) has introduced a bill in Congress that would make the Farm Bureau plan law. Under the bill, grain acreage allotments and subsidies would be ended—and the free market would set prices. According to the Farm Bureau, the wisdom of its members would make such a system work. They would simply adjust their output to the needs of the nation and the world. That would take some doing, considering the vagaries of weather, the world market and the farmers' own past record in not working together.

Secretary Freeman counters Shuman's plan with a projection—supported by economists at nine universities—that the abrupt ending of controls would cut farm income an average of 30%.

But as the world's need for food becomes greater, the day is bound to come—and soon—when all of America's farm capacity will be needed. Anticipating that day, our farm programs should be allowed to taper off so that they can be finally eliminated and prices can be set fairly by the open market.

LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICT DEALT LOW, LOW BLOW BY U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Reinecke] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is faced with the serious decision about continuing the administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs as they are. The administration is exerting a great deal of pressure on Members of Congress to support the programs as they stand. The administration is actively seeking the support of educational lobbyists around the country.

The administration is nervous about passage of its legislation. And well they might be. Experience has proven that the program does not work as well as it was supposed to. Local school districts are suffering under the present Federal education programs.

I have joined with the distinguished Representative from Minnesota, ALBERT QUIE, in supporting significant amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I strongly urge the Members of the House to support the Quie amendments as a means of strengthening education in America.

Let me share with you a letter from a local school district superintendent in my district. This letter was sent several days ago to the U.S. Office of Education in response to their "semiform letter" denying Federal funds for an educational project under title III of ESEA.

Note in the letter that this school superintendent was a supporter of the special, categorical Federal aid to education programs. But, now, with bitter, practical experience in these programs, he has changed his mind. He writes:

> As of now I am firmly convinced that general aid is the only way to go. Only the local board, the local administration, with the help of their respective faculties, can define what needs to be done.

The kind of changes proposed by the Quie amendments, are exactly what this school superintendent is talking about.

I have withheld the name of this courageous school superintendent, for his own protection. Here is the letter:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, OFFICE OF EDUCATION,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ———: Having had advance notice that funds for Title III of the ESEA were to be curtailed, your letter of April 14 comes as no great surprise. Inadequate funding is something that every Superintendent has learned to live with. Had your letter simply stated this fact, I doubt that I would have bothered to even respond to your notification that this District's project had been rejected. The manner in which your office chose to reject this project is, however, offensive and very much resented. In place of your lengthy list of alleged reasons for rejection, you might better have said that we are a bunch of incompetents that don't know what we are doing.

Our project is so fundamental that we should have anticipated that the many psuedo experts doing the proof reading would miss the import of this project for the pupils it was intended to serve. We started with a simple fact, namely, that the terminal students in every school district are woefully deficient in the basic communication and computation skills. These youngsters have been exposed to English and mathematics every year and have still managed to acquire a minimal facility with these basic skills.

Our second premise was equally simple, that expertise exists that could be brought to bear on this problem. Through a systems approach, objectives would be defined and materials developed that would provide a completely new approach to the teaching of these skills.

Ours was no idle dream. We have seen what Lytton Industries was able to do in developing a systems approach to teaching science in the junior high. To state that the objectives would be difficult to measure, that procedures are not adequately stated, that the innovative aspects are questionable, is to expose your ignorance regarding the systems approach to achieving a stated goal.

Prior to submitting this project, this District spent many man hours in researching and developing this project. We consulted with State vocational experts, who saw great potential in this project. We met endlessly with our own LAPACE Committee who endorsed this project as something that needed to be done, and as something that had wide application. After all this, we get a semi-form letter that tells us we don't know what we are doing. We have reached a pretty sad state of affairs where a project that could help 50% of the high school pupils on a nationwide basis is deemed to be "inappropriate."

When I look at the approved projects here in Los Angeles County, my blood boils. Our project did not contain inflated administrative salaries or exorbitant clerical salaries nor did it seek to set up a self-perpetuating empire. I guess we just haven't learned the name of the game yet, for we are still plodding along trying to help pupils.

This District has benefited greatly in past years through the various special Federal programs. When I listened to people debate the merits of general versus categorical aid, I was merely a passive listener. You, however, have made a convert of me. As of now I am firmly convinced that general aid is the only way to go. Only the local Board, and the local administration, with the help of their respective faculties, can define what needs to be done. The multi-bureaucracy being developed at both State and Federal levels seems destined to be staffed by educational misfits that have both feet firmly planted in mid air. With the careful (?) screening given by these various offices to future applications, it is doubtful that a project aimed at fundamental problems or basic needs will ever be approved.

I am not in the habit of writing letters when angry. I purposefully deferred this reply for two whole days after receipt of your letter to allow for a lowering of both blood pressure and temperature. I find, however, that the more I think of this the angrier I get. I feel so strongly about the manner in which I see Title III being administered that I am sending copies of this to both our State and Federal elected representatives. This letter may not change their views regarding Title III, but they will at least know that the 1800 square miles of geography known as Antelope Valley thinks we've been dealt a low, low blow.

Yours truly,

——— ———,
District Superintendent.

THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing feeling that in combating the ills of the poor, there are alternatives to the mere expansion of present poverty programs.

I believe alternatives are possible which can accomplish the desired goals effectively and at less cost to the taxpayer than would otherwise be the case.

I had the opportunity to discuss this point in a symposium titled "A Discussion of Great Society Programs," sponsored by the council of graduate students at the Ohio State University on April 5, 1967 in Columbus, Ohio. I was privileged to share the platform with Senator WALTER F. MONDALE, of Minnesota; Dr. John Kenneth Galbraith, the Harvard economist and former Ambassador to India, and Dr. Seymour Lipset, the noted Harvard sociologist.

For the information of my colleagues, I am submitting for the RECORD the text of my remarks:

THE GREAT SOCIETY—A CRITIQUE AND ALTERNATIVE

I. INTRODUCTION

The United States during the past two centuries has achieved the highest standard of living the world has ever known. Despite this fact, many individual Americans today do not share the fruits of our nation's great economic progress. Thus the problem of improving the living conditions of these underprivileged is, and has been, one of our country's most pressing domestic issues.

Many economists define poverty as income per family of $3,000 a year or less. In this context, using 1964 constant dollars as a standard, it is evident that during the past eighteen years significant strides have been made in the struggle against deprivation. In 1947, 31 percent of the families in the United States had incomes of less than $3,000. By 1964, only 18 per cent of the families fell below this figure. This remarkable decrease was accomplished through the combined efforts of industry, government, and private organizations pursuing the joint goals of economic progress and the elimination of poverty, not by massive employment in the public sector of the economy.

Although substantial economic progress has been made, it is important to examine critically the nature of this progress and the poverty "pockets" which still exist. From this analysis, several facts are evident.

First, the reduction rate of the total percentage of Americans living in poverty has slowed in recent years (only 4 percent since 1956).

Second, overall advancement is further marred by the finding that certain groups of our population have not made any economic advancement and, in some cases, have become even further entrenched in poverty status. The number of families, for instance, with five or more childen who live in poverty has remained constant at about 1.1 million. The number of poor households headed by females actually increased from 1959 to 1964.

Third, although the total number of poor, non-white households declined by 200,000 between 1959 and 1964, it still is important to note that in 1964 almost 48 percent of the non-white families were below the poverty-income level of $3,000.

What accounts for these poverty "pockets" in an era of "plenty"?

Some families—through physical disability or old age—never will be able to earn higher incomes. As a matter of conscience, those without physical earning power deserve a minimum standard of living.

Other poor households have low earning power because their heads lack skills. In other instances, existing skills have not been sufficient to overcome the barriers of prejudice. Women, Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican-Americans, in particular, frequently are paid less than male whites employed in the same occupations.

Unfortunately, low earning power is not the only problem of the poor. Insecurity and dependence although less easily measured, generate an apathy which becomes a major obstacle to the acquiring of skills. This apathy frequently is passed along from generation to generation.

Throughout our history, normal economic progress has diminished the number of poverty-stricken household. However, it seems likely that some of the remaining poor may be unable to extricate themselves without unusual assistance. Families which have lived in our cities on welfare since the days of the Great Depression, or even before, families that have remained on subsistence farms or on meager cash-crop tenant farms in the South or the Great Plains, and families that have migrated to the cities but failed to get ahead—these families have not shared in our nation's growing economic abundance.

Many have lost self-initiative. Instead, they have become accustomed to letting others make decisions for them. Even more distressing, these persons may be too discouraged and apathetic to respond to the rhetoric of outsiders.

Fundamentally, most Americans prefer a wide range of choice for individuals and a carefully defined, limited role for government. Today, however, as in the 1930's the public desires a faster social improvement than self-help and private initiative can give. Again, as in the Great Depression, the present Administration has embarked on an administrative response from Washington.

II. THE GREAT SOCIETY APPROACH

The federal poverty program, initiated with the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (PL88-452, August 20, 1964), was intended to assist in raising living standards for the country's very poor. The purpose clause of the Act states:

"The United States can achieve its full economic and social potential as a nation only if every individual has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of his capabilities and to participate in the workings of our society. It is, therefore, the policy of the United States to eliminate the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty in this nation by opening to everyone the opportunity to live in decency and dignity. It is the purpose of this Act to strengthen, supplement, and coordinate efforts in furtherance of that policy."

The Economic Opportunity Act authorized six major categories of programs: youth programs, community action programs, special programs for rural areas, employment and investment incentives, work-experience programs, and VISTA (Volunteers in Service to America).

Combined with this approach are state and local welfare systems, a farm price support plan initiated more than thirty years ago, and various new programs either administered from Washington or directed locally under terms established by Congress and enforced by federal agencies.

The number of different regulations and agencies involved almost defies comprehension. For example, a recent article in the Atlantic Monthly declared that today no one knows for certain how many federal domestic programs actually exist today. Specific estimates range from one hundred and twenty to two hundred and thirty-six. The Bureau of the Budget does not even try to count them, relying, instead, upon the estimates of the Library of Congress. Thus, the Budget Director, Charles Schultze, recently described his plight when he testified before a Senate subcommittee. He stated that in 1965 and 1966 Congress passed 21 new health programs, 17 new educational programs, 15 new economic development programs, 12 new programs to meet the problems of our cities, 4 new manpower training programs, and 17 new resource development programs.

In an appearance before the same subcommittee, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner, gave a frank picture of the inadequacy of the present governmental apparatus. He spoke in terms of "good management" and of getting "100 cents on the taxpayer's dollar". "In that spirit", he continued, "let's look at our problems candidly. In almost every domestic program we are encountering crises of organization. Coordination among Federal agencies leaves much to be desired. Communication between the various levels of government—Federal, State, and local—is casual and ineffective. State and local government is in most areas seriously inadequate".

Secretary Gardner indicated that reforms in the federal system are necessary in order to attain better administration of domestic programs. "But", he cautioned, "we have a long, long way to go". This observation pin-points the dilemma confronting our nation today. The rational of government action in the poverty problem stems from the private sector's inability to remedy the situation more rapidly. Now one of our most important federal officials properly warns us not to expect too much of the government, either.

III. WEAKNESSES OF THE PRESENT POVERTY APPROACHES

All of us, I am certain, share the Administration's goal of eliminating poverty. Nevertheless, there is a hopeless gap between Administration aims and its ability to achieve them.

Let me cite seven major weaknesses inherent in the present approach. Four of these relate to the adverse effect on the poor themselves. The other three represent general program defects.

First, the present approach restricts the individual's freedom of choice, thus providing the poor with the wrong incentives. For instance, when a person on welfare tries to improve his situation by accepting a part-time or seasonal job, his benefits are reduced by an amount corresponding to the pay he receives. This, in effect, is a *one hundred per cent marginal tax rate*. Thus, the welfare recipient gains nothing by trying to work.

Similarly, the "means tests," commonly imposed throughout the United States, discourages savings on the part of a person who, upon securing temporary employment, leaves the welfare roles. If he loses his job—and it is important to remember that the least skilled are the first to be dismissed in a recession—he must dissipate most of his savings before he is eligible for further welfare assistance. Thus, he gained nothing by trying to save.

Even worse, the family unit, the very basis of our society, is undermined by the so-called "man in the house" provision of our federal Aid for Dependent Children program. Because of this requirement, an unskilled father often can best provide for his youngsters by deserting them.

Still another perverse incentive is found in the approach to poverty by public housing authorities. When an individual receives a pay raise, his family no longer is eligible for public housing. However, this salary increase may be more than offset by the higher rents paid to owners of private housing units. Consequently, unless he can secure an enormous pay boost—large enough to compensate him for higher private rents—the poor person is wiser if he seeks no raise at all.

From the foregoing, it is evident that, under the present system, the low-income person is discouraged from trying to work, from trying to save, from trying to support his family, and from trying to obtain a better job.

Second, the present approach to poverty is limited in its coverage. Professor James Tobin, who was on the Council of Economic Advisers when the War on Poverty was devised, recently described the "bewildering variety of welfare and social insurance programs". He stated flatly: ". . . half of the poor benefit from none of these; and most of the public money spent to supplement personal incomes goes to families above the poverty line".

Another sobering observation was conveyed by the noted economist, Eli Ginzberg. He estimated that Federal poverty programs in 1966 reached only one in ten of the poor.

Third, under present procedures, the beneficiary is personally dependent on local officials. In most programs, the burden of proof is upon the applicant. The deserted mother must *prove* that her children's father has left home for good. The welfare recipient must *prove* that he fails the means test. This puts the fate of the poor person in the hands of specific people against whom there is little recourse, little right of appeal. The psychological effects created by this, personal dependency are adverse, to say the least.

Fourth, because of this administrative approach, uncertainty exists. A program may be undertaken, raise the hopes of the apathetic, and then be cut off without recourse. This recently occurred in my hometown of Dayton (Ohio). Last month, four community action programs, established in 1966, were declared "low-priority" by the Office of Economic Opportunity. The phasing-out of these locally-initiated projects has dashed the aspirations of those whom they were designed to help. It will be difficult to start again at some later date in a poverty-stricken neighborhood which has experienced this kind of discouragement.

These last two problems—dependence and uncertainty—are not personal or partisan. They are inherent in the administrative approach to poverty. To avoid these evils, we will need a new approach, not just new people in charge.

Fifth, as pointed out by Michael D. Reagan, Professor of Political Science at the University of California (Riverside), structural approaches take longer to eliminate the causes of poverty. Thus, as Professor Reagan states: "The full benefit of Project Head Start . . . will not be reaped until the children enrolled in 1965 finish high school in 1978". Professor Reagan concludes by stating: "It is now evident that our greatest immediate need is a way to provide additional income quickly, both as a goal in itself and as a way of enabling the families of the poor to provide an atmosphere conducive to the effectiveness of the programs aimed at helping their children".

A sixth difficulty with our current governmental approach to the problems of poverty is its uneven applicability in different regions of the country. In this connection, two basic weaknesses are evident. (A) The present system relies on the depressed and under-developed areas of the country to support our rural poor. (B) Even when state efforts are largely financed through federal funds, wide differences exist throughout the fifty states. For example, the federal program for Aid to Families of Dependent Children allows the states to determine both local *need* and what percentage of that need is to be met through welfare payments. In 1961, according to a study cited by Professor Tobin, a five-state region extending from Kentucky to Mississippi estimated need at only eighty percent of the need figure established by states in the Middle Atlantic region. Then these five southern states supplied funds in an amount which met only sixty percent of the computed need standard. Since the Middle Atlantic states met their goals, dependent children in the aforementioned five southern states were receiving less than half as such as American youngsters in another region.

This, in turn, instigates another set of perverse incentives. The most energetic people in the poorer regions of our nation tend to migrate to cities in the North and East to obtain better paying jobs. Those transients whose skills fail to meet the requirements of industry, then have two choices. They either can remain in the metropolis, or they can return home. Since urban communities provide higher levels of welfare payments, the former alternative inevitably is selected. Low income families, therefore, tend to congregate in metropolitan centers.

This immobility pattern elevates per capita welfare costs. Support of low-income families residing in urban areas involves higher rent payments, greater food costs, and more costly service expenditures.

Seventh, an administrative response to poverty tends to perpetuate programs beyond an appropriate terminal date. Throughout the United States there are many well-intentioned anti-poverty officials whose salaries exceed those of local mayors and appointed city and state administrators. Their pay, in most instances, is greater than that received when employed in the private sector of the economy. In fact, the Office of Economic Opportunity has a higher proportion of executives with salaries over $10,000 annually than any similar federal agency.

No one wants to lose the best job he ever had. Consequently, it is hard to conceive that this bureaucracy would disband automatically if, for instance, all households attained a three thousand dollar annual income level. In view of this, might it not be safer, faster, and even less costly to establish a system which would bypass this bureaucracy and assist the poor directly?

On July 30, 1966, the highly-respected *Christian Science Monitor* made this evaluation of the "War on Poverty":

"In its first year and a half of chasing after cures for poverty, the administration's 'economic opportunity' program has come up practically empty-handed . . . Most of the approaches have little of substance to show for the $2.5 billion effort. This is especially true of the community-action programs, which require a tenuous cooperation among many groups at the community level".

This failure can be attributed largely to the seven previously-cited weaknesses in our current programs designed to bridge the poverty gap.

IV. WHAT ARE POSITIVE ALTERNATIVES

Action against poverty is a worthwhile national endeavor. Structural programs of proven efficacy, such as Head Start, should be strengthened. Ineffective and marginal programs should be abandoned or overhauled.

Further, President Johnson stated in his February 28, 1967 Message on Education and Health; we should continue to "provide equality of educational opportunity to all Americans—to give every child education of the highest quality, no matter how poor his family, how great his handicap, what color his skin, or where he lives". Likewise, discrimination in hiring and housing must be eliminated if the poverty cycle is to be broken.

However, expanding federal expenditures to erect a new bureaucracy to determine how further benefits should be distributed to the poor merely will compound presently existing errors. Further, it seems to me that this administrative approach, which breeds among the poor dependency and insecurity, is morally wrong.

Instead, it is my conclusion that the Negative Income Tax would be the most effective means by which the federal government can commit further resources in the battle against poverty.

My proposal is simple and direct. In the last few years, millions of our citizens have benefitted from reductions in federal income tax rates. The only Americans who have not gained directly from tax reductions have been the poor—those who pay little or no income tax. Instead of increasing federal spending for the *indirect* benefit of the poor, I propose that they be helped *directly* by a return of federal revenues.

V. WHAT IS A NEGATIVE INCOME TAX?

How would a Negative Income Tax work? It would return federal revenue directly to the poor and give them the same right to spend for their own good that earlier tax cuts gave to American taxpayers. Under our present tax structure, a deduction of six hundred dollars is allowed each member of the family. Additional deductions are granted for old age, disability, and for certain medical expenses. The taxpayer then relates his deductions to his gross income. If this income is greater than permissible deductions, he pays a tax on the net amount.

Suppose, however, that the family's income is less than its total of allowable deductions. In these circumstances no tax is paid. Under a Negative Income Tax system, that family would *receive* from the federal government a percentage of the amount by which income is exceeded by total deductions.

The specific Negative Income Tax plan which I would like to present for your consideration was developed by the Ripon Society, a Republican research and policy organization with chapters across the country. Under the provisions of the Ripon proposal a family of four would receive some degree of assistance if its total income amounted to $5,500, or less, per year.

Let's give a specific illustration. Assume a family of four received a pre-tax income of $2,500 in a given year. This family would receive monthly payments equivalent to *half* the deficiency existing between its $2,500 income and the break-off point of $5,500. One-half of this $3,000 difference is, of course, $1,500 a year. So, after a Negative Income Tax rebate, this family's income would total $4,000 a year—$2,500 plus the $1,500 received from the Internal Revenue Department.

Now let us suppose that the head of this family received a ten dollar per week pay raise. This would elevate total family income to $3,020 a year. The difference between this sum and $5,500 is $2,480. The family's tax refund—one-half of this differential—would be $1,240. This rebate, when added to earned income of $3,020, means a total family income of $4,260. This approach thus provides an earning incentive lacking in present welfare plans.

As just outlined, the Negative Income Tax plan would cost $11 billion a year. There would be $1 billion less taxes collected and $10 billion paid out directly.

I estimate that the budget deficit for fiscal year 1968 will be between $17 billion and $20 billion. Thus, it is not practical at this time to think in terms of expanding this deficit by an additional $11 billion. However, one of the advantages of a Negatve Income Tax system is that it permits gradual implementation.

Therefore, it could be initiated this year at a cost of $2 billion on the basis of the government meeting one-tenth, rather than one-half, of each family's income deficiency. As the weaknesses of the program were observed and eliminated, the percent could be increased. Finally, upon cessation of hostilities in Vietnam, the maximum 50 percent level could be invoked. The $11 billion annually which this would involve, would still be less than one-half that amount now allocated to our military effort in Vietnam.

VI. ADVANTAGES OF THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

I would expect eight major benefits to accrue from the adoption by Congress of a Negative Income Tax plan. First, there would be full coverage. All of those in the poverty category would benefit, not just the few. There would be no leakage to those farmers or senior citizens in the high-income brackets. Poor rural families would benefit as much as poor urban ones. In short, the unorganized poor would be helped as much as the organized.

Second, the dependence of the poor on case workers and other government officials would be greatly reduced. The psychological boost should be tremendous. By freeing the poor from a sense that their lives are ruled by others against whom there is no appeal, we begin to make headway against the apathy which tends to keep people poor.

Third, the insecurity to which I referred in connection with the Dayton poverty programs would also be eliminated. No Congressional dispute, administrative decree, or Presidential budget-cutting would threaten people benefitting from a Negative Income Tax.

Fourth, individual and family incentives would improve immediately. The perverseness inherent in present welfare programs would be minimized. Under a Negative Income Tax system a person about to take a job would know he could keep half of his earnings, instead of losing them all as formerly.

Fifth, instead of promoting a bureaucracy with an open-ended vested interest, the Negative Income Tax would be self-liquidating. As the poor acquire skills and increased earning capacity, their negative taxes would decline.

Sixth, the Negative Income Tax would promote geographical balance, thus alleviating the regional disparities which exist under present welfare programs. Those receiving Negative Income Tax refunds could move anywhere in the country for work or retirement. Unsuccessful migrants to our major cities could return home without being penalized by reduced welfare benefits. The purchasing power thus generated in the nation's distressed areas would attract business investment and create additional jobs.

Seventh, the Negative Income Tax would promote a more balanced federal system. As state and local governments adjust to the new tax, they can shift their general welfare spending to those areas of greatest need. The principal advantage arising from this lies in the fact that needs peculiar to a locality normally are most quickly spotted and most efficiently corrected by local authorities.

Eighth, the Negative Income Tax will promote a better market economy. As an economist and as a Republican, I firmly believe that a market economy is vital to a healthy democracy. It disperses spending power, decentralizes decision-making, and gives the individual a wide range of choices. As stated in the forthcoming April 1967, issue of *The Ripon Forum:* "The experience of buying freely in a money economy is an important factor in developing the self-reliance and confidence that many poor people lack. The Republican Party has long recognized the role the free market can play in enriching people's lives and efficiently satisfying their needs. Must the poor—just because they are poor—be excluded from this part of American life?".

VII. ANSWERS TO ARGUMENTS AGAINST THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

Despite the manifest advantages of a Negative Income Tax, some still express doubts regarding its efficacy. I shall consider two of the most frequently heard objections.

First, some are afraid that the recipients of Negative Income Tax rebates will lose the incentive to work. A respected House Republican colleague of mine stated last December: ". . . it would break the link between income and work. It would perpetuate welfare as a way of life". Unfortunately, the link between income and work has long since been broken for welfare recipients. As illustrated previously, these people have been living in a *one hundred percent* tax bracket for years, sometimes for generations. Under a Negative Income Tax system, they would be entitled to keep at least one-half of their additional earnings, thus, in effect, placing them in a *fifty percent* tax bracket. This, it would seem to me, would effectively *establish a link* between income and work.

The successful functioning of the capitalistic system already has tended to reduce the income-work link. This has been accomplished through capital accumulation by one generation and subsequent capital transfer to an ensuing generation. Let me illustrate. I have four sons. They have never done a lick of work in their lives. This is understandable, for they range in age from eighteen months to seven years. Yet, this year, thanks to stock gifts from generous grandparents, these four youngsters will receive sufficient income to necessitate their paying an income tax.

Professor Michael D. Reagan cites one other piece of evidence in refutation to the "welfare as a way of life" argument. According to Professor Reagan: "General relief roles correlate with the state of the economy. In other words, as more jobs become available, people get themselves off relief. These rolls, which peaked at 525,000 in the 1961 recession, are now below 300,000. The American wants to earn an income when he can, I conclude, and we overrate the necessity of starvation as to a goad to work".

Second, some individuals worry about the possibility of equalizing everyone's income through the device of a Negative Income Tax. This already is possible under present federal statutes. If the Congress wished, it could raise the higher income tax brackets to *one hundred percent*. Yet this has not happened. Americans want to get ahead. They do not want tax rates so high as to stifle individual incentive. They want their children to get ahead.

For all of the talk about "soak the rich," the dramatic increase in income tax rates occurred during World War II, not in the Depression. The Negative Income Tax, therefore, is no more dangerous than the graduated federal income tax which has been in effect since 1913.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In closing, let me re-emphasize one basic aspect of the Negative Income Tax. Some say it would be revolutionary. Actually, it is gradualistic. Implementation by the federal government can be gradual, starting with a low minimum income level and a high tax rate. Then, year by year, the minimum income level and tax rate could be adjusted in response to the results produced.

Concurrently, the response of the poor will be gradual—a step by step process of self-advancement. This, it seems to me, is a sound and sensible way to attack one of the nation's most serious problems.

AN 18TH DISTRICT POLL

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include the results of a congressional questionnaire of the 18th Congressional District of Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report today that we have had an excellent response to our questionnaire circulated throughout the 18th Congressional District of Illinois.

We have tabulated the first 20,000 returns and it shows that the people in my district are taking a realistic look at the war, the National Government and the problems close to home. The poll indicates that people are tired of big spending, big government, and Big Brother in Washington.

They want the war won; taxes cut, not raised; and Federal spending trimmed to a sensible level.

I have asked unanimous consent that the summary of our questionnaire be printed in the RECORD at this point:

SUMMARY OF 18TH CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT QUESTIONNAIRE, 1967

1. Do you approve of the Administration's handling of the Viet Nam war?

	Percent
Yes (6,330)	31.5
No (12,260)	61.5
No answer (1,410)	7.0

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the Viet Nam war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Viet Nam?

	Percent
Yes (12,000)	60.0
No (6,100)	30.5
No answer (1,900)	9.5

3. Do you favor a 6% surtax on your income tax as proposed by President Johnson to provide an additional $5 billion for the war effort?

	Percent
Yes (2,030)	10.0
No (17,220)	86.0
No answer (760)	4.0

4. Would you rather cut back domestic spending $5 billion regardless of how popular or worthwhile the programs?

	Percent
Yes (14,000)	70.0
No (4,580)	23.0
No answer (1,420)	7.0

5. Do you favor a 20% average increase in Social Security benefits with an accompanying increase in payroll taxes?

	Percent
Yes (5,310)	26.5
No (13,790)	69.0
No answer (900)	4.5

6. Should Medicare benefits be extended to disabled persons under 65?

	Percent
Yes (8,680)	43.5
No (10,000)	50.0
No answer (1,320)	6.5

7. Do you favor bussing children to achieve racial balance in our schools?

	Percent
Yes (1,450)	7.0
No (17,730)	89.0
No answer (820)	4.0

8. Do you favor a Federal Open Housing law which also guarantees the individual the right to dispose of his property as he sees fit?

	Percent
Yes (15,540)	78.0
No (3,430)	17.0
No answer (1,030)	5.0

9. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist Bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

	Percent
Yes (6,950)	35.0
No (11,780)	59.0
No answer (1,270)	6.0

10. Do you favor a continuation of the present farm program with respect to price supports, acreage allotment and marketing quotas on a limited number of crops?

	Percent
Yes (4.520)	22.5
No (13,380)	67.0
No answer (2,100)	10.5

11. Do you favor reducing the voting age to 18?

	Percent
Yes (6,700)	33.5
No (12,590)	63.0
No answer (710)	3.5

12. Who is your choice for President in 1968?

	Percent
Nixon (4,960)	24.8
Romney (2,070)	10.3
Percy (1,210)	6.1
Johnson (940)	4.7
Reagan (830)	4.2
Robert Kennedy (490)	2.5
Not Robert Kennedy or Lyndon Johnson (420)	2.1
Any Republican (420)	2.1
Goldwater (419)	2.1
Wallace (244)	1.2
Rockefeller (198)	1.0
Michel (192)	.9
Any Democrat (163)	.8
Hatfield (118)	.6
Lodge (106)	.5
Dirksen (90)	.4
Scranton (42)	.2
Ted Kennedy (42)	.2
Humphrey (34)	.2
McNamara (32)	.1
Kerner (18)	.1
Morton (12)	.1
Ford (10)	.1
Others (602)	3.0
Undecided (6,350)	31.7

1. Do you approve of the Administration's handling of the Vietnam war?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	31.5	61.5	7
Hourly employee	32.0	63.0	5
Salaried employee	38.0	57.0	5
Businessman	33.0	64.0	3
Professional	37.0	57.0	6
Farmer	17.0	74.0	9
Housewife	29.0	61.0	10
Retired	23.0	67.0	10
Other	30.0	53.0	17

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the Viet Nam war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Viet Nam?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	60	30.5	9.5
Hourly employee	55	39.0	6.0
Salaried employee	66	29.0	5.0
Businessman	61	33.0	6.0
Professional	64	31.0	5.0
Farmer	59	26.0	15.0
Housewife	59	29.0	12.0
Retired	55	23.0	22.0
Other	50	31.0	19.0

3. Do you favor a 6% surtax on your income tax as proposed by President Johnson to provide an additional $5 billion for the war effort?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	10	86	4
Hourly employee	9	89	2
Salaried employee	9	90	1
Businessman	12	84	4
Professional	11	85	4
Farmer	10	85	5
Housewife	10	85	5
Retired	12	79	9
Other	11	82	7

4. Would you rather cut back domestic spending $5 billion regardless of how popular or worthwhile the programs?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	70	23	7
Hourly employee	66	29	5
Salaried employee	73	21	6
Businessman	74	18	8
Professional	68	25	7
Farmer	76	18	6
Housewife	68	21	11
Retired	72	17	11
Other	59	32	9

5. Do you favor a 20% average increase in Social Security benefits with an accompanying increase in payroll taxes?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	26.5	69	4.5
Hourly employee	29.0	67	4.0
Salaried employee	23.0	75	2.0
Businessman	22.0	76	2.0
Professional	24.0	69	7.0
Farmer	11.0	84	5.0
Housewife	24.0	68	8.0
Retired	51.0	42	7.0
Other	39.0	56	5.0

6. Should Medicare benefits be extended to disabled persons under 65?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	43.5	50	6.5
Hourly employee	51.0	45	4.0
Salaried employee	42.0	53	5.0
Businessman	42.0	52	6.0
Professional	36.0	56	8.0
Farmer	38.0	54	8.0
Housewife	36.0	52	12.0
Retired	54.0	38	8.0
Other	53.0	41	6.0

7. Do you favor bussing children to achieve racial balance in our schools?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	7	89	4
Hourly employee	6	91	3
Salaried employee	5	93	2
Businessman	7	88	5
Professional	10	87	3
Farmer	8	86	6
Housewife	7	89	4
Retired	7	85	8
Other	11	81	8

8. Do you favor a Federal Open Housing law which also guarantees the individual the right to dispose of his property as he sees fit?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	78	17	5
Hourly employee	80	16	4
Salaried employee	80	17	3
Businessman	71	23	6
Professional	77	17	6
Farmer	77	16	7
Housewife	78	15	7
Retired	76	17	7
Other	76	17	7

9. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist Bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	35	59	6
Hourly employee	31	64	5
Salaried employee	44	52	4
Businessman	37	55	8
Professional	43	53	4
Farmer	29	61	10
Housewife	22	72	6
Retired	20	69	11
Other	35	56	9

10. Do you favor a continuation of the present farm program with respect to price supports, acreage allotment and marketing quotas on a limited number of crops?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	22.5	67	10.5
Hourly employee	26.0	64	10.0
Salaried employee	23.0	68	9.0
Businessman	19.0	70	11.0
Professional	22.0	68	10.0
Farmer	28.0	67	5.0
Housewife	23.0	62	15.0
Retired	13.0	75	12.0
Other	23.0	61	16.0

11. Do you favor reducing the voting age to 18?

[In percent]

Occupation	Yes	No	No answer
Grand total	33.5	63	3.5
Hourly employee	38.0	59	3.0
Salaried employee	32.0	66	2.0
Businessman	32.0	64	4.0
Professional	32.0	65	3.0
Farmer	31.0	64	5.0
Housewife	34.0	59	7.0
Retired	32.0	64	4.0
Other	38.0	58	4.0

1966 AND 1967 POLL RESULTS COMPARED

2. Would you agree to a Korean-type settlement of the war at the 17th parallel (line established at 1954 Geneva Conference dividing North and South Viet Nam)?

[In percent]

	1966	*1967*
Yes	57	60.0
No	36	30.5
No answer	7	9.5

9. Do you favor expanding trade with Russia and the Communist bloc countries, as recommended by the President?

[In percent]

	1966	*1967*
Yes	28	35
No	67	59
No answer	5	6

THE LATE HONORABLE JAMES A. ROE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DELANEY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise today to pay my respects to the memory of one of our distinguished former Members who served on the House Committee on Military Affairs, the Honorable James A. Roe, of Flushing, Queens County, N.Y., who died April 22.

Jim was a man of many talents: a top athlete, who played semi-professional baseball, a successful businessman, an active and astute political leader, and a distinguished soldier in both World War I and World War II. In World War I he was an outstanding pilot with the Army Signal Corps, and volunteered in World War II to serve with the Army Corps of Engineers, rising to the rank of colonel. Because of his experience in our two World Wars, Jim was in a position to share liberally his deep knowledge of military problems with his colleagues on the Military Affairs Committee, where he served with distinction. However, he was probably better known as chairman of the Democratic Party of Queens County, a position to which he so successfully devoted his unparalleled leadership talents for 17 years.

He was a leading and influential citizen, not only in his native town of Flushing, but also in Queens County and the State of New York. He led the Democratic Party with foresight and distinction, and was sometimes referred to as a political leader of the old school. Everyone who knew him was greatly impressed by his deep sense of honesty. He was a true friend.

And Jim Roe had thousands of friends. I am sure a number of my colleagues from New York can recall the famous Roe Clambakes, where he was host annually to several thousands of people at the local Queens County racetracks and later at his gracious Westmoreland Farms estate on Shelter Island.

Jim always fought hard to win, but he always fought fairly. While watching him play baseball on one occasion, I was amazed to see a man of his years race hard from his position at shortstop to field a flyball some distance out in left field. He then turned to upbraid his younger teammate in left field who had not thought it worth the effort to chase the ball.

Although eminently successful in politics, it always remained an avocation with him, as he concentrated the major portion of his immeasurable talents to his varied business interests of insurance, banking, and real estate. He developed Flushing farmland into some of the earliest luxury apartment houses in that area, and helped to develop the Murray Hill section of fine homes.

We who knew him have lost a friend. The Nation has lost a true patriot and a noble citizen. He served well his God, his family, his Nation, and his community. What greater epitaph can a man have?

I join his multitude of friends in expressing my deepest sympathy to his family, his wife Margaret, his daughters, Sister Margaret James of the Maryknoll Order, and Mrs. Elmer A. Kestler, his sons, the Honorable James A. Roe, Jr., judge of the New York State Supreme Court, and John, president of the family insurance business, and his beloved grandchildren.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I was very sorry to learn of the death of our former colleague and my dear friend, Jim Roe.

During his period of service in the House of Representatives, he represented the people of his district in an able and courageous manner—dedicated in his service not only to the people of his district but to the people of the country. His outlook in his service was fine, refreshing, courageous, and progressive.

While his service here was brief, nevertheless he did crowd in a number of contributions that helped to make America a healthier and a better Nation.

His family—his two daughters and

his two sons and his dear wife—set an example for all others to follow in our country.

I join with my friend from New York [Mr. Delaney] and the other Members of the New York delegation in extending to Mrs. Roe and her loved ones my deep sympathy in their bereavement.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the citizens of Queens, N.Y., and for myself, I would like to join in this tribute to the memory of our favorite son, Jim Roe.

Jim Roe's political career spanned three decades. During some of this country's most hectic and trying times, he served his people well as an advocate of stable but progressive government. An idealist at heart, he nevertheless geared his efforts toward solving the tough problems which accompanied the depression and three wars during the last 30 years.

Mr. Roe began as a Queens County district leader and State committeeman in the 1930's. Within 4 years, he was recognized as one of the most influential figures in New York State. In 1944 he ran successfully for a seat in this House. He declined renomination to the same seat after one term in order to return to local politics in New York, his real love.

Public service to Jim Roe was an avocation. Like many other great Americans Mr. Roe was a successful businessman who spent much of his adult life serving his Nation, State, and local community at a considerable financial sacrifice. But public service to the people of Flushing, N.Y., is a strong tradition of the Roe family. Jim's father was clerk of the Old Flushing Court. His grandfather served in Flushing's own infantry unit during the Civil War. Today, that tradition is being carried on by James A. Roe, Jr., a Queens Supreme Court Justice.

Jim Roe enlisted in the U.S. Army during both the First and Second World Wars. In 1917 he became proficient at the new art of military flying and went on to be one of the early instructors in the Army Air Corps. During World War II he served as a lieutenant colonel in the Army Corps of Engineers and renegotiated nearly a half-billion dollars of war contracts for the U.S. Government.

Just last year, at the age of 70, Jim Roe wrote: "It's about time I retired so younger people can take over." It is my hope that those who follow will carry on his great work. The memory of James A. Roe will live in the hearts of the people of Queens, for he was their mentor.

Mrs. Addabbo joins me in extending heartfelt sympathy to his widow, Margaret, and their children. Our fervent prayer is that their sorrow will be enlightened in the knowledge that their loss is shared by Jim's many friends and associates.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DELANEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the eloquent tribute paid to our distinguished former New Yorker, the Honorable James A. Roe, who served with distinction as a Member of this body.

I had the great privilege of knowing Mr. Roe in many ways. As a New Yorker, I knew him as one of the greatest political figures that ever developed in the Democratic Party in our great city. He made magnificent contributions to that party in terms of raising standards for those who sought public office. He sent to the courts, to this body, and the legislature many fine public servants through well-organized and directed campaigns in the great County of Queens.

Jim Roe was man of many, many talents. He was successful in business. He was a giant in terms of his generous contributions to the community. I know that among others he was a steadfast supporter of charities for children. The boys of St. Vincent's Home will miss him terribly because he was one of their finest friends, always giving help in their care and custody.

I also knew Mr. Roe as a neighbor because we summered together in that place that he loved so well at Shelter Island, N.Y. There he maintained a family farm for the enjoyment of his children and the grandchildren of the family and all of those who lived in that beautiful community.

Here was exhibited the quality for which I think Jim Roe will be remembered best, and that is, he was a kind, generous, and loving father and friend to children. Once a year, on the anniversary of the birth of his wife, he had a custom to open the doors of his farm and the fields of his farm—a magnificent place—to all of the children of that community. No matter where they came from or who they were, they were welcomed to the doors of Westmoreland Farm, and at Westmoreland Farm Mr. Roe ran all sorts of recreation and enjoyable pastimes for those children on that day. I can well recall that one of the things the children liked best about him was that he understood what they loved and wanted most. He provided pony and hay rides, a carousel, and every conceivable kind of game and contest.

It was his custom to hire a Good Humor truck, an ice cream truck, and on that day any child coming to the farm would have his choice of any flavor of ice cream he desired. Jim Roe demonstrated he knew how to make children happy and that was his great happiness.

In many ways Mr. Roe was a model and an example to anyone who would serve our country and our community. His service in the World War, so well described by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Delaney], was one example of his patriotic fervor and devotion to this country. He engaged very strongly in the campaign to elect John Fitzgerald Kennedy, our President. In this he was among the foremost to recognize the great qualities and talents of the young Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. Roe supported many fine activities in the community and in his church. With the gentleman from New York [Mr. Delaney], I had the privilege and honor of attending the funeral services for our late beloved colleague. In that church many of the men who walk the paths of distinction in New York City were in evidence paying tribute to a fallen leader. But most memorable to me was the fact that in that beautiful church during those last services, emblazoned above the altar, was a single Latin word inscribed—the word "charity." Here was a man of charity in all of the blessedness and significance of that term being laid to rest.

To his dear widow Margaret, to his sons James and John, and his daughter Frances I extend my deepest sympathy. Finally, to his daughter in religion, Sister Margaret James of the Maryknoll Sisters I ask that we be allowed to join in her prayers. As the father of a missionary sister, James A. Roe was most devoted to the cause of the mission of the poor of the world. I know that their prayers will be for him, in eternity, for the rest and rewards he has so well earned in his life of goodness.

He was a man of charity toward all men, charity toward children, and charity toward all of the pursuits of life in which he engaged. We have lost a great and noble figure in the passing of James Roe. He was a giant who never lost the common touch, and our country mourns this loss deeply at this time.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to add my word of tribute to the late Honorable James A. Roe, Sr., who for most of his life was one of the most outstanding citizens, and an effective civic and political leader in my home county of Queens, New York.

Jim Roe was, above all, a gentleman of his word. He was a notable example of integrity in political leadership, a credit to his party, to Queens, and to the democratic system of government, in the true sense of the word.

These Halls knew Jim Roe as a man who established a highly creditable record as a Congressman, serving Queens and the State of New York with great distinction.

He always had the affairs and the needs of his native Borough of Queens at heart, and he fought relentlessly and successfully for many good causes in behalf of Queens progress, and national welfare. He was a capable, thoughtful public servant and an outstanding political leader.

I am privileged to join my colleagues from Queens and others in this House today in paying my respects to this noteworthy citizen who has passed on, and to express my warm, personal sympathy to his fine family.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleagues this afternoon in paying tribute to the late James A. Roe, Sr., one of the outstanding citizens of Queens County, N.Y., and a former Member of this body.

Jim Roe was a native of Flushing, Long Island, N.Y., and spent over seven decades of his life serving the county and its residents in various capacities.

For over 30 years he was most active in the political arena, and rose to prominence as the leader of the Democratic Party in Queens County—one of the most powerful and influential political figures in New York City's history. He also saw service in the U.S. Army in two World Wars, enlisting in 1917 as a private in the fledgling Army Air Corps. He was promoted to the rank of lieutenant and instructor in advanced flying and was honorably discharged from the service in 1919. While on active duty in World War II he was elected as a Member of Congress, serving in the House of Representatives for a period of 2 years, from January 1945 until January 1947. He was not a candidate for reelection, but returned to his political and business interests in Queens at the completion of his one term in Congress.

He contributed much to the growth and development of the Democratic Party in Queens County; and he will be remembered with admiration by his many friends and associates.

My deepest sympathies go out to his wife, and his children.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a great many of us were saddened to learn of the recent passing of the Honorable James A. Roe, Sr., a former Member of this body, a distinguished colleague and a true friend. I was privileged as were many others here to serve with Jim Roe in the 79th Congress. He was a close friend and I will miss him greatly. A fighter, a man of principle, a dedicated man, Jim was a leader all his life. He served his country as an officer in both World Wars I and II. Raised in a family where public service was a tradition, he more than ably carried on that tradition. It is still being carried on today by his son, the Honorable James A. Roe, Jr., a justice of the New York State Supreme Court.

Mr. Speaker, New York will not be the same without Jim Roe; he will be sadly missed by all who knew and loved him. To his lovely wife Margaret and his four children I extend my deepest sympathy and my prayers.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, a former Representative of the House of Representatives, James A. Roe, Sr., has passed on. I wish to join my colleagues in expressing sorrow to his widow and to his children. I know they have suffered a great loss. I want all to know that not only his family but his friends have suffered a great loss.

James A. Roe, Sr., was a true American. He was a loyal Democrat and for many years a leader of the Democratic Party in New York State. He served his Nation well both in war and peace. The philosophy for which he fought can be expressed in the motto of the United States, "In God We Trust." He practiced this philosophy by expressing his love for his God and his country, and his faith in his fellow man.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the life, character, and public service of the late James Roe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONGRESSMAN CHAMBERLAIN REPORTS ON FREE WORLD SHIPPING TO NORTH VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous materials and charts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep concern over the flow of supplies to the enemies of South Vietnam, I have been for many months seeking to spotlight the trade carried on by free-world-flag ships with North Vietnam. Today I wish to take this occasion to again report to my colleagues and to the American people on the status of this traffic, and to call attention to other facets of the problem of shipping to North Vietnam.

While I am pleased to report that the volume of free world shipping into North Vietnam in the first quarter of 1967 is substantially less than during the first quarter of 1966, it has, in fact, increased over both the third and fourth quarters of 1966. The figures for the first quarter of 1967 indicate that a total of 14 free-world-ship visits to North Vietnamese ports occurred during January, February, and March 1967. The breakdown by month follows:

Free world ships arriving North Vietnam, 1st quarter 1967

Month	British	Maltese	Cypriot	Total
January	6	0	0	6
February	3	1	1	5
March	3	0	0	3
Total	12	1	1	14

Mr. Speaker, I have repeatedly been told by our State Department that these ships are not carrying "strategic cargo." At the same time I have been advised by a most reliable authority that we do not really know everything that these ships are carrying. We do know, however, that of these 14 ships that have called in North Vietnam this year, three carried cargoes that are so highly classified that it cannot be discussed publicly. We can only assume that all of these cargoes are urgently needed by Hanoi. It is useless to pretend that these ships are not helping the enemy when we know that they have the ability to carry an average of 7,600 deadweight tons of unknown cargo every trip. These 14 trips this past January, February, and March could have delivered more than 100,000 tons of cargo to bolster the economy and the war effort of North Vietnam. I say any cargo carried by ships flying free world flags is too much, and that this traffic must not be allowed to continue.

As you can see Mr. Speaker, these figures belie the statements that free-world shipping to North Vietnam is not significant. Nor can it be stated in defense of those vessels flying the British flag that they are simply "Communist shipowners from Hong Kong over whom the British have no control," as I have been told. Mr. Speaker, the British Government has used its warships to prevent trade with the Government of Rhodesia, but it claims an inability to stop these British-flag ships from trading with North Vietnamese. Just what would happen if ships from Hong Kong were to carry cargo to Mozambique for transshipment to Rhodesia? Last year the British stationed a warship off the African coast to prevent just that sort of traffic—yet they say they are unable to do anything at all to stop this trading with an enemy who has committed his entire resources in a major war.

A related point should also be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this trade to Vietnam. As I have pointed out in detail before, a very substantial amount of cargo is being carried to North Vietnam in Polish ships. At the very time that the Polish Government is making this tremendous effort to support North Vietnamese aggression, the U.S. Government announced that it has relieved the Polish Government from the necessity of repaying $17,000,000 coming due this year under Public Law 480 food agreements. What this means is that the United States is picking up the tab on the Public Law 480 food and freeing other Polish assets for use in aiding the North Vietnamese. This is nothing but indirect aid to the Communist war effort. Mr. Speaker, the State Department has expressed a desire that some of this $17,000,000 be used to help teach the Poles English. I suggest that we insist upon this payment in dollars and teach a more practical lesson. How can we ask the American taxpayer to help subsidize the Communist war effort in North Vietnam?

Mr. Speaker, the greatest naval force in the world—the U.S. 7th Fleet—is on station in the South China Sea at this time, striking at only those North Vietnamese targets that are not on the restricted list and collecting statistics on the volume of shipping going into the North Vietnamese ports. We have committed over half a million of our finest young men and more than $2 billion per month to waging this war in Vietnam, but we keep finding excuses for not cutting off the enemy's supplies. We must find some means to stop this flow of materiel that is being used to kill our fighting men. Is it unreasonable to ask that our allies stop helping to supply the enemy? Is it unreasonable to stop giving aid to friends of North Vietnam who are helping them in their war of aggression?

Mr. Speaker, our troops in Vietnam have a right to expect more than our unquestioning acceptance of this aid to the enemy. When in all our history have we tolerated friends that do business with our enemy, and at the same time ask us to support them elsewhere?

Mr. Speaker, if we are ever going to end this war in Vietnam we must do more than we have been doing; I suggest again that the surest way to stop this war is to stop the flow of materiel to the enemy; and the most effective way to stop the seaborne trade with North Vietnam, in my judgment, is to mine the entrances to the North Vietnamese ports. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is time for us to act decisively, and cut off the fuel to the war machine in Hanoi.

Mr. Speaker at this point in the RECORD I insert the most recent so-called blacklist prepared by the Maritime Administration of the free world and Polish-flag ships that have visited North Vietnamese ports since January 25, 1966, and are therefore prohibited from carrying any U.S. Government-financed cargoes from the United States:

LIST OF FOREIGN-FLAG VESSELS ARRIVING IN NORTH VIETNAM ON OR AFTER JANUARY 25, 1966

Section 1. The President has approved a policy of denying United States Government-financed cargoes shipped from the United States to foreign flag vessels which call at North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966.

The Maritime Administration is making available to the appropriate United States Government Departments the following list of such vessels which arrived in North Vietnam ports on or after January 25, 1966, based on information received through April 27, 1967. This list does not include vessels under the registration of countries, including the Soviet Union and Communist China, which normally do not have vessels calling at United States ports.

FLAG OF REGISTRY, NAME OF SHIP:	Gross tonnage
Total, all flags, 40 ships	278, 883
British (11 ships)	61, 311
Ardgroom (broken up)	7, 051
Ardrowan	7, 300
Ardtara (now *Hyperion*, British)	5, 795
Dartford	2, 739
Greenford	2, 964
Hyperion (trip to North Vietnam under ex-name, *Ardtara*, British).	
Isabel Erica	7, 105
Milford	1, 889
Santa Granda	7, 229
Shienfoon	7, 127
Shirley Christine	6,724
Yungfutary	5, 388
Cypriot (4 ships)	28, 852
Acme	7, 173
Agenor (trips to North Vietnam, Greek).	
Alkon (trips to North Vietnam, Greek, broken up).	
Amfitriti	7, 147
Amon	7, 229
Antonia II	7,303
Greek (2 ships)	14, 289
Agenor (now Cypriot)	7,139
Alkon (now Cypriot, broken up)	7, 150
Maltese (1 ship)	7, 304
Amalia	7, 304
Polish (22 ships)	167,127
Andrzej Strug	6, 919
Beniowski	10, 443
Djakarta	6, 915
Energetyk	10, 876
General Sikorski	6,785
Hanka Sawicka	6, 944
Hanoi	6, 914
Hugo Kollataj	3, 755
Jan Matejko	6, 748
Jozef Conrad	8, 730
Kapitan Kosko	6, 629
Kochanowski	8, 231
Konopnicka	9, 690
Lelewel	7. 817
Marceli Nowotko	6, 660
Marian Buczek	7, 053
Norwid	5, 512
Phenian	6. 923
Stefan Okrzeja	6, 620
Transportowiec	10, 854
Wieniawski	9, 190
Wladyslaw Broniewski	6, 919

JOHN BARRY: FATHER OF THE U.S. NAVY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REES). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it seems strange that a nation which has commemorated everything from trees to doughnuts by the proclamation of special days and special weeks, has so far failed to recognize the life and service of the Father of the U.S. Navy.

It is more than strange; it is distressing.

John Barry, an Irish immigrant, went to sea as a youth, and worked his way up to being a well-to-do shipowner in Philadelphia. He became an enthusiastic supporter of the Colonies' fight for independence in the decade before the outbreak of the American Revolution.

When the fighting started, he offered his services to the Continental Congress, and was placed in command of the brig *Lexington*. Under his command, the *Lexington* achieved the first capture of a British warship by any colonial vessel, when it took the British tender *Edward*, on April 17, 1776.

From then on he assumed command of a succession of American men-of-war. The results of his exploits against the British were so outstanding, that he earned General Washington's personal commendation.

As commander of the *Alliance*, a 32-gun man-of-war, he won many valuable prizes. In 1781, he attacked two British vessels, the *Atlanta* and the *Trespassy*, and captured them after a hard fight. He was severely wounded in that battle.

When six frigates were sent to put down the Algerian pirates preying upon vessels of the United States in 1794, Barry was in command of one of the ships.

In 1798, he was named commander of all American naval forces in the West Indies. At the time of his death in 1803, he was the commander of the entire Navy.

Contemporary experts, and historians in later years, have placed him as one of the greatest of all naval commanders of his day, and have given him credit for establishing the great Navy of which Americans have always been justly proud.

The people of the United States owe a great deal to this Irish immigrant boy who became one of this Nation's great heroes.

For that reason, I have today introduced a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue an annual proclamation designating September 13 each year—the date of the birth of the Father of the American Navy—as Commodore John Barry Day.

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL AGRIBUSINESS CONFERENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a meeting which is to be held in Chicago May 10–12 under the auspices of the Chicago Board of Trade, the world's largest commodity exchange.

This meeting is the First International Agribusiness Conference and distinguished leaders in Government and industry, including Vice President HUMPHREY, will be among the speakers and others well known and distinguished will be in attendance. For example, the meeting will be opened by Governor Kerner. Among the speakers on the first day are the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, Eugene V. Rostow, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs, and Herbert V. Prochnow, president of the First National Bank of Chicago.

To give you an idea of the scope of the conference, let me read its "purpose":

> *To direct* the attention of agribusiness and industry to the rapidly developing problem of world hunger.
>
> *To demonstrate* the need and opportunities for employment of private American capital, business methods, and technology.
>
> *To find* ways to overcome the obstacles involved; to develop new approaches to business and government cooperation.
>
> *To obtain* the dynamic involvement of American agribusiness in this, one of the greatest challenges to be faced in the balance of this century.

As Members of the House know, one of the world's foremost problems is the lack of food, particularly in the underdeveloped countries of the world. There are approximately 3.4 billion people in the world and almost half of these suffer from undernourishment, or malnutrition, or both. Almost 12,000 persons die every day of hunger or diseases arising from hunger. Moreover, the situation is worsening steadily because the population growth is outrunning the increase in food production.

The Chicago Board of Trade has been a pioneer in urging that the efficiency and productivity of American agriculture be utilized in helping to meet the challenge of the food crisis. In Denver, Colo., in 1964, the then president of the board, Robert C. Liebenow, outlined a proposed program to deal with the situation which paralleled in many ways the Food for Peace Act passed late in 1966 and which undertook systematically to deal with both the problem of immediate needs on the part of the underdeveloped nations and that of helping the poorer countries modernize their agricultural systems. So great is the need for food that we cannot supply the deficit but must use our productivity to avert famine until countries like India can feed themselves.

The board furnishes an example of enlightened leadership in going far beyond the scope of its own immediate interests to deal with matters of the highest public importance. Mr. Liebenow is no longer president of the board but now heads the Corn Refiners Association, Inc., of Washington, D.C. But the board has carried on the program which he helped formulate under the leadership of Robert L. Martin, chairman of the board, and Warren W. Lebeck, executive vice president, and have broadened its scope.

Recently, a distinguished North Carolinian, Henry Hall Wilson, a member of President Johnson's White House staff, became president of the board. He is an extremely able man and is well known to many Members of the Congress. He has had a distinguished career both in his native State and in Washington. Under his leadership, the Chicago Board of Trade will continue to show the vision and concern with the public good which has made it an asset to Chicago, the Midwest, and the country as a whole.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Board of Trade is performing a public service in bringing together leaders in Government and industry for a conference on the world food problems on May 10-12.

For a number of years the Chicago Board of Trade has interested itself in basic farm problems.

Obviously, the board wants a free market for farm products but it has recognized the existence of Federal farm progams and the reasons for their existence. It has recognized also, what many agribusiness do not take into account, the necessity of a fair return to the farmer for his labor and planning. One of the most unusual speeches made by an agribusiness leader in recent years was an address by the then president of the board, Robert C. Liebenow, at Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind., on October 31, 1960. The title was "The Farmer Needs a Good Press Agent." Mr. Liebenow said, in effect, that the public did not understand the tremendous value of an efficient and productive agricultural system, the best the world had ever seen and that such an understanding was a requisite for sound farm policies.

In 1962, the board of trade held a national agricultural policy forum at which farm policy was discussed by the country's leading agricultural economists.

Over the years the board has undertaken many other projects in the interests of agriculture as a whole. Now it is sponsoring an agribusiness conference to explain the contribution which the agribusiness industries can make to food-for-freedom programs.

The board is to be commended and, in commending the board, we are praising its board of directors and others who help shape policy, including officials of the board.

Robert C. Liebenow was president of the board from 1956 until 1965. He was from an agriculture State, South Dakota, and he knew farm problems at firsthand. He is now head of the Corn Refiners Association, Inc., and his interest in farm problems continues.

Clarence Rowland, son of a former manager of the Chicago White Sox, was chairman of the board in 1960 when many of the policies now in operation were formulated.

James P. Reichmann was chairman of the board in 1961 and 1962 and Bernard P. Carey in 1963, 1964, and 1965. Both were business and community leaders, as was Robert L. Martin, who became chairman in 1966. He had been in the grain business since 1934 and he extended the scope of the board public affairs programs. He was assisted by Warren W. Lebeck, who became executive vice president of the board in 1965, after being its Secretary for a number of years. Mr. Lebeck was at one time an assistant to Sewell Avery, former industrialist who headed Montgomery Ward. Irwin Johnson is a vice president in charge of the board's educational and informational programs and he also is a veteran in the board's service.

The board has done some remarkable things over the past 7 or 8 years. One can only conclude that it has done them because it has had remarkable leadership.

THE QUIE AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the brief time between April 20 and today, my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] has been subjected to the full force of the "Johnson juggernaut," the 1968 version of the famed Johnson "arm twisting" as practiced when the President was majority leader in the other body.

To come under the full blast of the modern Johnson juggernaut is an unsettling experience, to say the least. It all started when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] announced the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, H.R. 8983. It would consolidate four categorical aid programs for elementary and secondary schools into one single grant with each State developing a plan to be approved by the U.S. Commissioner of Education to meet the crying education needs of each State. This would immeasurably improve Federal educational aid.

The present plan for distributing funds is frustrating to school administrators, wastes funds and denies States and local schools the opportunity to plan creatively to improve education.

The Quie amendment would correct this.

The tremendous campaign of half truths and deliberate misinformation which has been mounted by the administration against the Republican-supported measure is almost unprecedented in its intensity.

The chief misrepresentation is the statement made by the Johnson juggernaut time and time again that the Republicans have set out deliberately to cut off benefits to pupils in private and parochial schools. Mr. Quie has tried again and again to scotch this outright untruth. He has issued news releases, statements to his colleagues in the House and Senate, talked to dozens of newspaper reporters and telephoned many, many school and political leaders.

The administration keeps pounding away at this theme: the Quie amendment will deny Federal benefits to students in parochial and private schools. Mr. Quie has presented irrefutable evidence in the Congressional Record, and elsewhere, that his amendment would not discriminate against parochial school pupils. Actually, it would expand the type of services required for private school students in present law.

Yet, the misrepresentation, first launched by U.S. Commissioner of Education Harold Howe II, about April 24—as recorded in a story in the Washington Post for April 25, 1967—has been repeated by so many persons, including the President of the United States, that it has gained the simulacrum of truth.

Also planting the seeds of dissension publicly was Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John W. Gardner, in a speech he made at a reception in his honor by the American Newspaper Women's Club, as reported in the Washington Post for April 27, 1967:

> The Quie substitute, he said, "cannot guarantee that Federal aid will be concentrated in places and in amounts necessary to do the job." Further, it has brought about a return of the "old dissensions and divisiveness" on the Church-State question.

Both statements are false.

While this is the first evidence I have found in the press, I have been told of a flurry of telephone calls which spread the word across the Nation the day after Mr. Quie announced the amendment—April 20. The intent of the telephone calls was to spread the false rumor that the Quie amendment meant the end of Federal benefits to pupils in private schools.

As a result of the telephone calls, the Congress has been inundated with thousands of letters from men and women who have been purposely misled. One Congressman has received over 5,000 such letters.

Mr. Speaker, I might note at this point that I have received very few of these letters from my area, the 38th District of New York. It is apparent that my constituents know that I would not sponsor a measure that would penalize private school children.

The intensity of the attack continued to mount. On Thursday, April 27, the President himself repeated the private school misrepresentation at Camp

Springs, Md. Thus, the biggest gun in the Johnson juggernaut was unleashed at the Quie amendment.

The United Press International wire story—UPI No. 48—was rather lengthy as wire stories go, running to 50 lines. It was widely used. I insert the entire UPI story at this point to illustrate how the Johnson juggernaut operates:

Education

Camp Springs, Md.—President Johnson today accused opponents of his education program now pending in Congress of behaving recklessly for partisan political advantage.

The chief executive made a special helicopter trip to a new vocational training center in this Marlyand suburb of Washington to mount a new attack on opponents of his legislation.

The program would extend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act for two years at a cost of about $6.7 million. The bill has run into trouble in the House, where Republicans are pushing hard for a substitute measure.

The President in his prepared speech accused opponents of his proposals of trying to revive bitterness between church and public school leaders, and between poor and wealthy States.

Speaking of the opposition which he did not identify by name or party, he said, "They are raising the same roadblocks which halted Federal aid to education for 20 long years.

"I hope Members of Congress will stop, look and listen before they march down this blind alley. It is a time of testing for American education.

"The gains we have made so far are only the beginning. We must build on them. But we must not lose all we have gained by this reckless effort to rewrite our laws for partisan political advantage."

The President pointed out that in the past 20 years Congress had successfully developed programs which overcame ancient feuds and wiped out major roadblocks to Federal aid to education, to the general benefit of the country.

Now, however, he said "Some so-called 'friends of education' want to go back where we started."

The administration plan calls for a $3.5 billion extension of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, with the money going to school districts which in turn can make Government programs available to private school students.

Under the House-Republican substitute, the aid would got to the States in lump sums, to do with as they saw fit.

"They claim they know a better way to spend the money," he added. "They propose to discard the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—to scrap it before it is two years old—and to substitute a different kind of legislation.

"No one can tell for sure how they plan to change the law. Each day they trot out a new version."

Describing opposition tactics, Johnson said:

"They have stirred up the suspicions of the poor States against the wealthy States. They are reviving ancient and bitter feuds between church and public school leaders. They have aroused fears of the big city school superintendents."

The site of the President's speech was the new vocational center at Crossland High School in Camp Springs.

Johnson took the occasion to mark the 50th anniversary of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 which originated Federal support to the States for vocational education.

The President, you will note, repeated the misrepresentation:

They are reviving ancient and bitter feuds between Church and public school leaders.

The fact is, as I have detailed in this message, the "revival of the ancient and bitter feuds" was an act of the administration, in a calculated maneuver to defeat the Quie amendment.

So successful was the administration's skillful deception, that last Friday House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford and Mr. Quie called a major news conference to present the truth to the American people.

The news conference itself was a success. Over 100 persons attended. Mr. Quie and his colleagues presented the facts from the Republican point of view. They included, in addition to Mr. Quie, Congressman William H. Ayres, of Ohio, Marvin L. Esch, of Michigan, John Erlenborn, of Illinois, and William Steiger, of Wisconsin.

The questions were penetrating and evidenced a genuine desire by the press to get at the facts.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert the joint statement by Mr. Ford and Mr. Quie, plus individual statements by Mr. Ford and Mr. Quie which were distributed at the news conference. I do this with a purpose, because subsequent operations of the Johnson juggernaut almost buried these statements:

Administration Has Mounted an Attack of Incredible Proportions To Save Its Elementary and Secondary Education Act Bill, First Major Test of Strength in 90th Congress

(Joint statement by Hon. Gerald R. Ford, House minority leader, and Hon. Albert H. Quie, First District, Minnesota, April 28, 1967)

The Administration, in an attack almost unprecedented in its scope and bitterness, has within the past week launched an all-out assault on the Republican amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (H.R. 8983).

Twice the Administration has postponed debate and action on the Administration bill, H.R. 7819. When it will finally be brought up even the Administration will not say. We believe we have the votes to win as of today.

If we win on this vital issue, it could create a pattern for the 90th Congress. That is the reason the Johnson Administration is employing outright misrepresentation against the Republican substitute, known as the Quie amendment.

So widespread has been this attack, so unfair has it been, that we are forced to make this statement to bring the truth to the American people.

Here are the facts on the four major issues raised by the Administration:

1. The President has charged we are behaving recklessly for partisan advantage by opposing the Administration's extensions of the ESEA through the 1968–69 school year.

Answer: It is not the supporters of the Republican amendment who are behaving recklessly for partisan political advantage. It is the Administration. The public must understand that the Administration regards this as the first major test of strength of the 90th Congress. If the Republican alternative should win, as now appears quite possible, the tenor and tone of the entire 90th Congress will change. Other alternatives to Great Society programs may also be enacted. For this reason the Administration has postponed consideration of ESEA. Over the past week, since the Republican amendment was announced, we have been subjected to an attack of almost incredible proportions. This attack has dealt in misinterpretation and fear to such an extent that it is almost impossible to reply to each distortion.

The Administration has marshaled its largest-bore guns—from the President, who attacked the proposal Thursday, to the U.S. Commissioner of Education, the chairman of the House Education and Labor Committee, and individual Members of Congress with statements in the Congressional Record. The magnitude of the attack is truly awesome. Again, the reason for the attack is that the Administration feels it must win this first test of strength in the 90th Congress or it will lose the whole ball game in the 90th Congress.

2. The President has accused opponents of his measure of trying to revive bitterness between church and public school leaders.

Answer: This totally untrue accusation is the most serious, the most regrettable and the most unfair. The widely-disseminated rumor that the Republican bloc grant approach would penalize pupils in private (and parochial schools) is an outright deception. The Quie amendment was announced on Thursday (April 20.) The following Sunday, when scarcely a handful of private school officials had even read the Quie amendment, a false report spread across the nation: "This means the end to benefits for private school pupils." Obviously, a few strategically-placed telephone calls from the Administration caused the unjustified reaction. Private school people were, in truth, victimized by Administration officials.

The Quie Amendment from the very beginning contained the same language as the present act respecting participation of private school children in the benefits of the program. The amendment even increased the types of assistance which could be made available.

We have even gone a step farther by writing in clarifying language to make even more explicit the intent that the Federal bloc grants would not be commingled with State funds to be spent for general educational purposes, but would be funds to be spent for special programs. Secondly, the Republican amendment specifically states that private school children would enjoy the same degree of participation in these programs under the Quie amendment as they now do under ESEA.

In truth, it was the subtle, behind-the-scenes maneuvering of the Administration that tended to "revive the bitterness between church and public school leaders." The Administration has deliberately tried to cause confusion and fear in the hearts of private school authorities, for its own political advantage.

3. The President said we have tried to revive bitterness and distrust between the so-called poor and rich states.

Answer: The allegation that the "poor would get poorer and the rich would get richer" is a classic example of Administration misrepresentation. This is absolutely untrue. Beginning with the 1968–69 school year, under the Republican plan, $3 billion would be available for distribution under a formula used for nine years in the National Defense Education Act which takes into account the ability of each State to support education, and thereby favors poorer States. The main formula in the present Elementary-Secondary Act is so inequitable that it provides a payment of $129.64 for each poor child counted in Mississippi and $393.14 for each child counted in New York.

To dispel any fears of reduced allocations, the Quie Amendment would require that a state's allotment could not be less than its total allotments for the year ending June 30, 1968, under Titles I, II, III, and V of ESEA.

The Republican amendment would assure the states of a continuing authorization of $3 billion in aid, starting with the 1968–69 school year. States would know well in advance what they could expect. On the other hand, if the Administration bill becomes law, states could not know for certain what would be available. It could range as low as $2.3 billion, based on the actual appropriations under the present act.

4. The President said Thursday, this is "a time of testing for American education."

Answer: We agree that this is a time of testing, but not in the sense the President meant. It is a time of testing because America must choose between the path of more and more Federal control over education and the other path, which will assure the states and local communities their rightful control over education. After all, it was America's local schools that built our educational system into the best in the world. It was not control from Washington which produced this superb educational system. This is the one issue before us in the consideration of the Quie Amendment.

We must all understand that the Federal money goes Federal influence. The Republican amendment seeks to reduce the danger of Federal control. It also seeks to greatly reduce the endless red tape which is strangling local school boards in their dealings with the vast bureaucracy in Washington.

Statement by Representative Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, House Minority Leader

President Johnson has made wild and irresponsible charges against the House Republican Leadership and leading advocates of the Republican substitute for the Administration's elementary-secondary school aid bill.

This Administration is playing fast and loose with the truth and has been engaging in such tactics ever since Rep. Quie unveiled his substitute measure on April 20. This further widens the Credibility Gap.

It is the Administration which has revived the church-state issue in connection with elementary-secondary school aid, not House Republicans. Administration officials did this by falsely asserting that aid to private schools would be virtually eliminated under the Quie Amendment. They deliberately fed misinformation about the Quie Amendment to private school officials. The truth is, of course, that the Quie Amendment from the outset has contained assurances that private schools would continue to receive full benefits. These assurances were couched in the same language found in the existing Elementary-Secondary School Aid Act. The truth is on our side.

We have one purpose and one purpose only in seeking adoption of the Republican substitute. That is to cut federal red tape in the channeling of federal aid to elementary and secondary schools and to let state and local educators set priorities. We would do that with bloc sum grants.

The President has falsely asserted that Republicans "trot out a new version" of their school aid substitute each day. The truth is we have made slight additions to the language in our legislation to calm the fears of private school leaders—groundless fears stirred up by the Administration through a scare campaign based on false statements.

The church-state issue actually is not involved in this matter. This is a choice between the Administration's categorical kind of elementary-secondary school aid and the Republican approach of bloc sum grants. The only issue is more local control and less federal influence. The present pattern of benefits for private schools will continue. We are heartily in favor of it.

Statement of Hon. Albert H. Quie, Member of Congress, First District of Minnesota

The President makes charges that my amendment has stirred up suspicions of poorer states against wealthier states and revived the ancient and bitter feud between church and public school leaders.

He reminds me of a pyromaniac who threw a match into gasoline and stood there pumping on the bellows saying "look at those people starting the fire" while he is fanning the flames all the while.

The formula in my bill uses up-to-date census information. The Administration formula uses 1959 income figures. My bill uses the time-tested equalization formula in Federal law such as the National Defense Education Act whereby the poorer states receive more money per child than the wealthier states because of their lower per capita income. To offset the misinformation of the Administration, I will include language in my bill that no state shall receive less money than they did in fiscal 1968.

As any person who can read can tell, my amendment protects private school children better than the Administration bill.

The main issue before us is this: Shall we stop the relentless step by step centralization of education decisions in Washington or trust the knowledge and sensitivity of people on the state and local level to set priorities and the use of Federal money within the guidelines laid down by the present Act.

Mr. Speaker, to further illustrate the power of the Johnson juggernaut, I shall place in the Congressional Record the story about the news conference which was carried by United Press International—UPI No. 99—on April 28:

Education

Washington.—House Republicans and Democrats today swapped charges of "credibility" and "incredibility" gaps in a mounting off-the-floor debate on the administration's education bill.

The exchanges came in separate party news conferences after President Johnson yesterday accused opponents of his education program of reviving bitterness between church and public school leaders.

The $3.5 billion administration bill would extend through fiscal 1969 authority for the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act which provides teaching aids for poverty area children.

Rep. Albert H. Quie, R-Minn., has introduced a GOP substitute bill to provide that aids under the act be given to States in lump sum grants rather than allot money for individual programs.

Minority Leader Gerald Ford, R-Mich., told a news conference Johnson "made wild and irresponsible charges. This administration is playing fast and loose with the truth. This further widens the credibility gap."

Majority Leader Carl Albert, D-Okla., followed with a Democratic news conference at which Rep. John Brademas, D-Ind., sponsor of the administration bill, accused Republicans of an "incredibility gap."

"It's incredible that the Republicans say their bill would do away with Federal red tape and controls," Brademas said. "Their so-called block grant bill is loaded with categories and requirements."

Albert said the Quie bill "would be disastrous for educational advancement in this country. It's a political bill to round up votes. Its jerry-built legislation at its worst."

Quie said at the GOP news conference that Johnson's attack on his opponents "reminds me of a pyromaniac who threw a match into gasoline and stood their pumping on the bellows saying 'Look at those people starting the fire' while he is fanning the flames all the while."

Mr. Speaker, you will note that of the 30 lines, only 12 deal with the news conference called by Mr. Ford and Mr. Quie, compared with the full 50 which the UPI carried on the President's speech of last Thursday.

My purpose is not to compare coverage of this news conference with an address by the President. I want to call your attention to the technique by which the Johnson juggernaut succeeded in burying the joint answer to the most serious charges made by the President on Thursday.

Here is how the administration operates: The morning of the Ford-Quie news conference, Majority Leader Carl Albert called his own news conference in his office, supposedly to answer our news conference. The same morning three other administration supporters either called news conferences or issued news releases, including Congressman Carl Perkins, of Kentucky, chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, Congressman James G. O'Hara, of Michigan, and Congressman John Brademas, of Indiana.

As a result, the UPI story and other stories never did get around to dealing with the hard facts presented in the Ford-Quie news conference which demolished the administration representations.

This, indeed, is a classic example of the awesome power of the Johnson juggernaut. It is the old "arm-twisting" technique of the then Senator Johnson when he was majority leader in the U.S. Senate, magnified a hundredfold. Now the President has at his disposal the entire executive branch. He has at his disposal some $425 million a year allocated to "public information and public relations" by the various Federal departments, first revealed in a story carried by the Associated Press. The nearly half a billion dollars pays the salaries of over 6,800 "public relations" experts, who are naturally expected to justify the expenditures controlled from Washington. In other words, the taxpayers are financing a vast propaganda campaign aimed at taxpayers.

Thus the old "arm-twisting" device, which was extremely effective in the President's Senate days, has a hundred times the power in the fearful form of the sleek, deadly efficient 1967 Johnson juggernaut.

Mr. Quie knows. He was run over by the juggernaut last week. Fortunately, both the Quie amendment and Mr. Quie were not laid low permanently by the juggernaut. Over the weekend he picked himself up, along with the battered but unbowed Quie amendment, and he and those who stanchly support him are prepared for yet unknown assaults. My colleagues who support the block grant approach do know this: there will be other attacks, perhaps even more unfair. I understand the minions in the Gardner-Howe HEW empire are even now laboriously compiling Mr. Quie's voting record on education legislation for the 9 years he has served in the Congress. I should surmise that project alone will consume some hundreds of man-hours at, say, $10 an hour, all charged to the taxpayer, who innocently supposes that all they do over at HEW is try to improve education.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, "a funny thing happened on the way to the forum" of the U.S. House of Representatives. Everyone expected that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act bill would have, some days ago, been debated in that forum. It is apparent the administration even now does not have the votes. The supporters of the Quie amendment have another week or so to get the truth out to the Nation. This will be enough time.

There are hopeful signs the truth about the Quie amendment is getting about the country.

I wish to close this necessarily long address by placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel for June 27, 1967, titled "Education Grants":

EDUCATION GRANTS

Judging from the negative reaction of the national school commissioner, there must be something mighty good about the Republican substitute for federal aid to elementary and secondary education proposed by Rep. Quie of Minnesota.

In the morning's mail (postage and fees paid by the United States department of health, education and welfare) is a statement from Commissioner Howe raising "serious questions" and calling the proposal "a backward step."

DOES PLAN WORRY HOWE?

Why stage such a sharp counterattack, particularly by going over the heads of congress to the public, as it were, if one is not worried by the appeal of the substitute? The answer to that question would seem to be that the Quie proposal must have merits that could win it enough support, even in a Democrat controlled congress, to be adopted. What is the Quie proposal? Basically, it would substitute block grants to the states for the present complicated program of allocations to school districts under title I of the elementary and secondary education act of 1965.

The block grant approach would not take effect until July 1, 1968, giving time for the advance planning necessary to any program. For the first year, fiscal 1969, $3 billion would be authorized, about $200 million less than the maximum total authorizations of the program it would replace. However, it could prove to be a net gain, for, as Quie points out, "the block grant programs would represent massive savings in administrative costs to the schools. . . ."

"Actually," Quie says, "the distribution of funds within each state would be far more responsive to the most urgent educational needs than under the existing act, which tends to scatter funds into every school district." Remember the fuss last May when affluent Whitefish Bay was found to be entitled to $25,000 in federal funds intended for disadvantaged children.

Under the amendment proposed by Quie, the state plan for the use of the funds would have to contain "assurances that the highest priority . . . will be given to local educational agencies which are experiencing the greatest educational difficulties because of such factors as: (A) heavy concentrations of economically and culturally deprived children, (B) rapid increases in school enrollment which overwhelm the financial resources of a local educational agency, and (C) geographic isolation and economic depression in particular areas."

In other words, in Wisconsin, for example, the federal school aid funds could be concentrated in districts where they are most needed, instead of being spread around according to an unrealistic formula that puts dollars needed in Milwaukee's inner core into an affluent suburb.

The promise of relief from bureaucratic red tape and a more sensible distribution of funds is not the only thing to commend the Republican substitute. Another of its appeals is that it would, as Quie says, "significantly reduce the power of the United States commissioner in local school decisions," which may explain Howe's negative reaction.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to quote from the editorial as the final point in this statement:

> Judging from the negative reaction of the national school commissioner, there must be something mighty good about the Republican substitute for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education.

And again:

> Why stage such a sharp counterattack?

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope I have explained why the administration is staging such a sharp counterattack. I also hope my colleagues, armed with this explanation, will resolutely resist the forthcoming "arm twisting" in the Halls of the House, which will probably begin like this: "You know, John—or Tom or Dick or Harry—about that dam—or post office or grant—in your district."

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 543

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I voted for House Joint Resolution 543, which extends the no-strike period for an additional 47 days, because I believe neither the railroads, the unions involved, nor the administration are prepared to deal with the situation that would prevail if this resolution were to fail of adoption.

Nevertheless, I cast my vote reluctantly, because this second extension of the no-strike period represents a kind of nibbling away at the right to strike which I do not feel is in the public interest.

There is no doubt that all concerned—industry, labor, and the public—want to avoid a strike which would have serious impact on the Nation's economy and the movement of defense materiel.

An impasse appears to have been reached, and the parties directly concerned seem to be looking for Government action of some kind, but there is no agreement as to the kind of action that should be taken. The administration has yet to recommend any program.

It is my understanding that the administration will within a few days come forward with its proposals. Hopefully, they will be such as to maintain maximum pressure on both sides to arrive at a reasonable settlement.

Mr. Speaker, I voted for this bill but I would not be inclined to support a further extension of the no-strike period unless it is coupled with some acceptable programs designed to provide a rational and honorable long-range solution to this problem.

WE MUST REDUCE THE BURDENS OF OUR SENIOR CITIZENS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, many senior citizens in our country are being misled as to the proposals offered by the President regarding income taxes imposed on people over the age of 65. For those of low or modest income, these proposals could be a great aid. Only those with larger incomes would have their tax burdens increased.

The President's proposals would, if enacted, relieve about half a million senior citizens, who now pay some income tax, from the necessity of paying any income tax at all. As I understand it, a man and wife, each 65 or older, would pay no taxes unless their social security, plus outside income, were more than $5,777 a year and a single person, aged 65 or older, would pay no taxes unless his or her annual income were more than $3,222.

It is true that social security payments would for the first time be included as income in computing taxable income, and that the double exemption now provided for 65-year-olds would be eliminated. However, in their place, would be a far more generous deduction for senior citizens, as the following example demonstrates:

Assume a husband and wife who get $200 a month in social security payments and who receive $65 a week in other income—private pensions, business investments, and so forth. They would have a total income of about $5,777 a year and would pay no taxes under the President's proposal.

In contrast, under existing law, the same couple has to pay income taxes of about $80. The social security benefits are not taxable income, but the $3,377 of other income would be. The man and his wife each get two personal exemptions—four times $600 equals $2,400. Subtracting the $2,400 and the minimum standard deduction of $400—$300 for the husband and $100 for the wife—from the $3,377 in taxable income, there is left a net taxable income of $577 under existing law, on which the tax is about $80. This is more than the cost of the senior citizens' contribution for doctors' fees under the medicare program.

Mr. Speaker, it is important that all of us make certain that the increasing burdens on our senior citizens are reduced—particularly for those who are caught in the squeeze between low, fixed incomes and rising prices. It appears to me that the President's proposed revisions of the income tax law are a step in that direction.

But tax relief is only one of a number of legislative steps which should be taken. We also need substantial increases in social security payments, improvements in medicare, and programs such as my own proposal for an older Americans community service program, which will enable senior citizens to become active in community activities and earn a little something to supplement social security payments. I have long since indicated my support for each of these actions and

I hope that this Congress will respond to this dramatic need in our society.

WOLFF URGES TAX CREDIT FOR COLLEGE EXPENSES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, while the need for a college education has increased in our technological society to the point of necessity, the expenses incurred in providing such education have grown to be a crippling burden on the American taxpayer. At a time when 1 year of higher education commonly costs in the neighborbhood of $2,000, parents with one or two children in college, or students trying to put themselves through school are suffering severe financial hardships. Yet without this educational preparation our Nation would not have the manpower to maintain its leadership or forge ahead into new areas of progress. It is truly in our national interest to ease the financial hardship incurred by our citizens as they are educated to be future leaders and I urge my colleagues to support the bill I introduce today which would allow a tax credit for these individuals in providing this necessary higher education.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LVI

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, another argument against a voluntary armed force is that such a system will result in a shortage of officers. Since most officers have a college background, opponents of abolition claim that with the absence of a draft, the male college student will not volunteer in sufficient numbers to maintain an adequate officer corps.

Such an argument can be answered in several ways. For example, military service, particularly when serving as an officer, does have appeal to even college students and I assume this will continue regardless of whether there is a draft or not. Another way to attract additional college graduates into the officer corps is to offer scholarships to the young men to enable them to obtain a college education in return for a guaranteed number of years of military service. I might add that under our present system 73 percent of those who receive an officer commission by way of ROTC do not elect to remain beyond their original obligation.

Another avenue which can be opened up to acquire more officers is, of course, to allow for greater accession from the ranks of the enlisted men. Through a stepped-up training program, many of these soldiers would make fine officers.

The facilities of the military academies can also be expanded substantially to take in many more of the young men who desire entrance but have been denied this opportunity due to the limited enrollments at these institutions.

Mr. Speaker, the critics of abolition should first direct their attention to the present draft system for it does not guarantee a sufficient supply of officers. As General Johnson remarked some time ago:

> In fiscal year 1965 it is projected that only 2,523 officers will elect to stay on active duty compared to our minimum requirement of 3,615.

This failure to retain an adequate number of trained, experienced officers is a serious handicap to the operational readiness of our military units. A voluntary armed force will give the military the professional it needs by retaining its skilled officer corps, something our present system has failed to do.

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT—EQUALLY RESPONSIBLE TO THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, there has been, with regard to the railway labor dispute, as indeed there is with regard to all disputes which tend to cause inconvenience to the public or to threaten national interests, a good deal of comment to the effect that labor disputes should not be "permitted" to cause such inconvenience or pose such threats.

This is difficult to argue with, but I do believe it ought to be pointed out, and it very seldom is pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that such inconvenience and such threats are not unilateral actions of the workers involved. Whenever a transportation system or a basic industry experiences, or is threatened with a strike, there is a wide public assumption that the union, or the workers themselves, are being obstinant, that even though collective bargaining is legitimate, the unions and their members have the basic responsibility for deciding whether or not the damage from such a dispute will affect the public.

Mr. Speaker, it seems only fair to point out that this dispute, like almost all such disputes, involves an impasse in which both unions and management are engaged, that the damage or inconvenience which will result from such a dispute is caused at least in equal part by labor and by management—that management in this case is not a helpless bystander, but a force at least as immovable as is labor.

I oppose compulsory arbitration, as I always have, and I do not think it would be a useful solution in this case. I think the damage that is done to a free society by forcing solutions in labor disputes is almost always more severe than the damage that could be caused by any such dispute itself. But I think we should remember that if management is justified in refusing to meet labor demands, then labor is equally justified in refusing to perform its duties on management's terms.

If one contends, as is so often contended, that working men owe an obligation to society not to strike a basic industry or a basic mode of transportation, then he must concede at the same time that management has an equal obligation to society not to refuse to pay wages and meet demands for working conditions which represent the honest and irreducible demands of the labor force.

If, as I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the railroad operators want to argue that they cannot afford to meet the needs of their employees, that their duty to their stockholders requires them to be adamant, then we must also give a ready ear to labor's point that the workingman cannot afford to work for wages which are significantly lower than the wages paid in other industries for similar work. The free market concepts which permit a company to say "thus far and no further" in the course of wage negotiations also permit a workingman to say "that much and no less," and to refuse to work if he feels he cannot work under the terms management will offer. If we are going to arrive at a position where we decide that some industries are so essential that workers in them have an obligation to work, then we must also recognize that management in those same industries has an obligation to pay for the work performed.

I voted for House Joint Resolution 543 because, like most members of this House, I felt there was no alternative but to extend the cooling-off period. But let no one interpret my vote as showing any sympathy for the concept that railroad employees have relinquished their right to bargain for better wages and working conditions, and the absolutely fundamental right—which is absolutely essential to equal bargaining—to withhold their labor if their just demands are not met.

When this cooling-off period comes to an end, I hope that management will have demonstrated some concern for the public interest to which its friends in the Congress so frequently appeal. If not, I think perhaps the Congress should give some thought to considering legislation, not to cripple railroad labor, but to relieving the railroads' management of their obligation to their stockholders—perhaps by making the railroads publicly owned, nonprofit institutions.

LET US MOVE AHEAD, AS FAST AS POSSIBLE, WITH THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged by the broad support in this Congress for a continuation of an economic opportunity program for the poor, but I am somewhat concerned over the tactics my friends across the aisle would use to extend such a program.

I have noted the 1967 amendments that have been proposed to the Economic Opportunity Act by the President and introduced in the House by the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee; and I have taken a look at the alternative proposal that has been offered by several members of the minority of that committee.

It appears to me that the thrust in each case is the same; each party is prepared to wage war on poverty by making it possible for the poor to qualify for the economic opportunity available to other Americans.

It is obvious, however, that my friends across the aisle would wage their war without a headquarters; they would abandon the command post the Office of Economic Opportunity offers and I am convinced that this would be a grievous strategical error.

The present economic opportunity program can be improved. It is being improved. And the early mistakes that were inevitable in a crash attack on a massive problem are now being avoided.

That improvement must be channeled throughout the program in organized fashion, however. This can only be achieved by the Congress if a central headquarters is maintained.

A dispersing of various phases of the antipoverty program to various bureaus throughout government will serve no one. The poor will lose their voice at the national level of Government. The Congress will have difficulty finding what is going on—and where. And the Nation will lose the benefit that comes with the focus on the problem that a concentrated office provides.

The fight against poverty must go forward but not in a disorganized, rag-tag fashion. It is up to this Congress to build on the experience of the Economic Opportunity Act and to consider thoroughly the amendments that have been suggested by the President.

Our cause is good. The groundwork has been laid for continued progress in bringing the poor together with economic opportunity. This is no time to turn back, as some would suggest.

By moving ahead, as fast as possible, we will serve the poor but we will serve the Nation more.

JUDGE KENNEDY STAYS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, there is good news to report from the war on poverty in San Francisco. Judge Joseph G. Kennedy, a competent and dedicated public servant, has agreed to continue as chairman of the economic opportunity council. This means that important progress can be made on the base that Judge Kennedy has helped to build.

I fully share the satisfaction of the San Francisco Chronicle with the unselfish decision of Judge Kennedy and want to include the newspapers' editorial comment at this point in the Record:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 23, 1967]

Judge Kennedy Stays

Municipal Judge Joseph G. Kennedy has elected to stay on as head of the Economic Opportunity Council here. The war on poverty program and the city are fortunate in his having made this decision. Judge Kennedy has had his troubles in running the council through its "period of crisis." Its programs have been much criticized. But the war on poverty is going to go on, and it must have the kind of sound and patient leadership which he can give it—an effort which, as he has said, "requires dedication from many of us."

RECENT EVENTS IN GREECE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, both the San Francisco Examiner and the San Franciso Chronicle have recently printed editorials which give expression to the concern which many of us feel over the recent events in Greece.

The apprehension which is felt can only be heightened by reports of political prisoners being exiled to the islands in the Aegean, rumors of pending executions, the censoring of the press, and the collapse of constitutional government which has been supplanted by military rule.

Let us hope that the nation which gave birth both to the concept and to the term "democracy" will remember its great traditions and its golden age and return to the wisdom of Aristotle and Plato.

The editorials follow:

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 27, 1967]

Greek Tragedy?

The word "democracy" is derived from the Greek words "demos"—the people—and "kratos"—rule. Aristotle defined democracy as:

". . . A state where the freemen and the poor, being in the majority, are invested with the power of the state . . . every department of government being alike open to all . . . the people are the majority, and what they vote is law . . ."

This was part of the great Greek heritage handed down to modern times by the most dazzling era of philosophy in history.

Thus it is ironical and perplexing to read of a takeover of government in Greece by the country's armed forces and the establishment—in the city of Aristotle—of a military dictatorship.

The Greek generals claim that left-wing politicians were leading Greece to disaster. This may be so. But it is disturbing to realize that a military clique has taken upon itself the right to abolish constitutional government, impose martial law and seize "political" prisoners—in the name of the "national interest."

This is not the way of democracy or civilization.

Greece's friends and allies throughout the world await the return of democracy to the land of its birth.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle]

The Ugly, Cloudy Story of Greece

The fact that Greece has for the moment become a military dictatorship is the one certainty that can be gleaned through the censorship that the new regime imposed upon Greece when it suspended the constitution and rounded up several thousand of its political opponents for exile to bleak Aegean islands.

It may be inferred, however, that a threat of civil war overhangs the nation where democracy was born and where another struggle for power has again hustled it aside. Such a war, at a time when Cyprus is still an unresolved issue, might well produce complications of broad dimensions.

Among the major uncertainties of the existing Greek situation are the precise attitude of the young King Constantine and the probable future of his arch opponents, the aged George Papandreou, former prime minister, and his son, Andrea, a former University of California economist who resigned his U.S. citizenship to enter Greek politics.

The King is variously reported as having forbidden the military coup d'etat, as having reluctantly accepted it as a fait accompli, and as approving its design and achievements. The Papandreous, father and son, have been reported as seriously wounded by their captors, as being under arrest, under medical care, and facing trial on grave but unspecified charges.

The King has appeared briefly in public since the coup, but has not spoken out. His silence is credibly explained as prompted by fears that a forthright declaration, for or against the military dictatorship might well stir up public discord that could lead to civil war. It is likewise felt that a similar outbreak would follow proof of harm to George as Andreas Papandreou—a possibility not weakened by the circumstance that leaders of the military coup have specifically attributed it to the growing popularity and influence of these two anti-monarchists.

As of the moment, however, the land of Pericles and Plato is more or less resignedly accepting the kind of despotic rule associated with Mussolini, Franco and its own Metaxas—a rule under which newspapers are censored, radios must not be used, buildings are subject to search without warrant, political offenders are tried by military courts, firearms must be surrendered, and the dress and church attendance of the young are regulated and overseen.

IMAGINATIVE POST OFFICE PROPOSAL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Gallagher] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster General O'Brien's plan to convert the Post Office into a nonprofit Government corporation has been saluted by the Elizabeth Daily Journal as "imaginative" and "worthy of close study by Congress." I know that the proposal has aroused great interest on Capitol Hill and I am sure it will get the serious consideration it deserves from the Congress. I have permission to insert the Daily Journal's comments on the O'Brien plan in the Record:

Imaginative Post Office Proposal

Postmaster General O'Brien is so right in saying that if America's telephone system operated like the Post Office Department does, there still would be a great future for carrier pigeons.

His imaginative proposal for a nonprofit government corporation to take over the mail service is worthy of close study by Congress. The existing operation only gets worse. A new setup could be a change for the better.

The Post Office Department long has been in the stepchild of the government family. Postmasters general have been chief political advisers to presidents, a role Mr. O'Brien fills in the Johnson administration. Congress has played politics both with jobs and with funds. Meanwhile, deterioration of service to the public has been accelerated by a staggering volume of mail, increasing at the rate of three billion pieces annually.

In February, Postmaster General O'Brien told the House Appropriations Committee that the Post Office Department was in a "race with catastrophe. And it is a race that we well could lose, though it is certainly in our power not to lose it."

Recently the House, in the face of Mr. O'Brien's warning, cut $100 million from a postal appropriation bill. And proposed rate increases are running into opposition in Congress.

From predecessors, at least, Postmaster General O'Brien gets sympathy. Speaking with the voices of experience, J. Edward Day, President Kennedy's postmaster general, and Arthur Summerfield, who held the post in the Eisenhower administrations, are critical of penny-pinching by Congress.

Adoption of the corporation idea of Mr. O'Brien could be the means of placing post office operations on a more realistic basis. The management would be headed by a professional executive, working under a board of directors appointed by the president and confirmed by Congress.

Subsidy rates would be set for various postal services. Any deficits would have to be made up by congressional appropriation.

With a corporation taking over, a drastic break with politics and custom would be possible. This could be the salvation of the mail service.

FLORIDA SENATE MEMORIAL 73—A UNIQUE FEDERAL-STATE REVENUE-SHARING PLAN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and honored to submit a memorial passed by the Senate of the State of Florida regarding a unique Federal-State revenue-sharing plan.

This plan was offered by Senator Richard Stone, of Miami. Senator Stone is to be commended for his unique proposal. I have been associated with this idea for some time and have proposed my own legislation in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I place at this point in the Record Senate Memorial 73 so that all of my colleagues and those who read this Record will have an opportunity to consider this tax-sharing program:

Senate Memorial Bill 73

A memorial to the Congress of the United States to provide for amending the United States tax laws so as to rebate and pay to each of the States an amount equal to one-half of the Federal taxes collected on alcoholic beverages and tobacco sold within such State

Whereas, the president of the United States and the congressional leaders of both major political parties have referred approvingly to "tax sharing" and to "creative federalism" under which concepts the taxpayers of each state who also are taxpayers to the federal government regain some of the federal tax revenue at the state level without any interference on the part of federal agencies in the expenditure of these funds, and

Whereas, as one of the fastest growing states in the nation, the needs of Florida for funds for education, for fighting crime and for other urgent requirements of vibrant communities are pressing in on the sources of state and local taxation to the limits of the abilities of the citizens to pay, and recognizing that such needs are of far greater importance to this country than are those of the recipients of foreign aid in similar amounts, and

Whereas, the program recommended herein has its parallel in the remission to the states of a portion of the federal estate tax which benefits Florida to the extent of at least ten million dollars ($10,000,000.00) per year with no objectionable conditions attached thereto, and

Whereas, the collection of the federal excise taxes on alcoholic beverages and on tobacco is accomplished at the source of production or immediately thereafter, and in amounts which, if divided one half (½) to each state in proportion to the sales therein would meet the unsatisfied needs of each state which have resulted from the ebb and flow of population stimulated by national mobility of citizens, now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to amend Title 26 of the United States Code so as to provide that one half (½) of total excise tax collections levied thereunder by the federal government on alcoholic beverages and tobacco shall be remitted and paid to the general fund of each of the several states pro rata as to the amounts of sales of such commodities sold in each state without federal conditions imposed on the expenditure of such funds by the states.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY HEARINGS ON THE MUTUAL EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that on Wednesday, May 3, 1967, a third hearing will be held by the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality on the immigration aspects of the international educational exchange program, beginning at 10 a.m. in room 2141.

At the last hearing a representative of the American Medical Association, Dr. John C. Nunemaker, outlined the role played in the program by hospitals in the United States. He also explained that most of the responsibility for selection of participants and allotment of program numbers lies with the State Department.

Dr. Nunemaker explained that while the program seems to be doing well in most instances, it does in fact have some loopholes. He states:

> While there are many adequate programs of selection and placement as well as counseling and supervision of foreign physicians operating under the Federal Government or related agencies, the majority of foreign physicians come to this country as free agents without the backing of their medical schools or ministeries of health and find their way into internships and resident programs sponsored by private agencies.

Assistant Secretary of State for the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Dr. Charles Frankel will testify at the hearing.

Knowing that the greatest responsibility for the international educational exchange program is in the hands of Dr. Frankel, we on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Nationality look forward to his enlightening evaluation. In past hearings several significant and perplexing questions were posed concerning whether the intent of existing legislation was and is being implemented. The hearings are aimed at defining any existing problems.

FOREIGN POLICY ASPECTS OF KENNEDY ROUND

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee of which I have the privilege to be chairman, the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, has released its findings after several weeks of hearings last fall and again this spring on the foreign policy aspects of the Kennedy round. I would like to make some comment on these findings.

Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee learned that the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 was passed with an excess of optimism about what could be accomplished in liberalizing foreign trade. The act granted the President the power to negotiate an across-the-board reduction, with just a few exceptions, of up to 50 percent. The premise on which it was based was that the European Common Market, with England as its newest member, would be anxious to join the United States in quickening the pace of world trade, for the benefit of producer and consumer alike.

As it happened, England was not admitted to the Common Market. More important, the Common Market showed itself to be more involved with its own internal economic and political problems than with liberalizing world trade. As a consequence, we shall not achieve the goal of 50 percent. Indeed, at this point, it is not at all certain that we will even reach an agreement with the Common Market. Negotiating authority under the Trade Expansion Act expires on June 30 and agreement still seems distant, at best. The question that now arises is how much we can salvage under the act and what are the next steps that we can pursue.

Let me say at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the level of tariff reduction often mentioned as obtainable is 25 percent. I would be satisfied with that amount for several reasons. The first is that such an agreement will maintain the momentum of world trade liberalization, which a deadlock will reverse. The second is that, realistically, 25 percent is a significant improvement over previous rounds of negotiations. I regard 25 percent with a minimum of exceptions as a figure salutary in itself, meaningful enough that it suggests good prospects for continued progress in reducing trade barriers.

I would like to say further that if Europe has had its political problems in presenting negotiable offers to us, then surely it must be admitted that we, too, have had our problems in submitting our offers to the EEC. We went to Geneva determined to protect certain segments of our economy. The feed grain growers was one of them. The chemical industry was another. I am not passing on the merits of these special concerns, but I might observe that if their merit had been weighed against the broader interest then it is possible that we would have an agreement by now. I believe we had tended to forget that there are some 190 million Americans, all consumers, who should have received overall consideration. The sum total of the special interests represented at Geneva does not necessarily equal the national interest.

I regret that our negotiators took the position that they had to look out for this or that area of agriculture or industry and did not properly look out for the 190 million Americans who might have benefited from across-the-board reductions. Had this been the outlook, we would long since have left Geneva with an agreement in our pocket.

Mr. Speaker, I am not unaware of the importance, in human as well as monetary values, to seeing that certain areas of the economy receive some special consideration. But for various political reasons, we find it easier to use tariff barriers rather than other more positive devices to achieve this end. We hear much complaint about Government subsidies—but testimony in our hearings disclosed that certain subsidies could, in the long run, be far more advantageous than high tariffs. We have an adjustment-assistance provision in the Trade Expansion Act but business firms and workers have never been able to use this device. These examples suggest that the protection we have traditionally sought to extend by tariff could far more appropriately be extended by other means.

What this leads me to conclude, Mr. Speaker, is that we ought to look more closely into our own domestic economic practices before we indulge excessively in blame for disappointment in the Kennedy round. It is not the domain of my committee, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that we in the Congress have the obligation to examine some of the practices to which we have become wedded—perhaps they are not justified. I think there are some sacred cows in our economy that exploit the American consumer with the Government's help. I also recognize that there are weak spots in our economy which need further help from the Congress. I would like to see a study made of America's responsibility—quite apart from the responsibility of the EEC—for any failure of the Kennedy round to achieve its potential. These findings would serve as a basis for directing new U.S. policy efforts to stimulate world trade.

What these hearings did reveal to me, Mr. Speaker, was that trade liberalization remains a valid goal, one that is in the national interest. I think it is important to pursue that goal. I would like to get from the administration without undue delay its recommendations for steps to be taken after the Kennedy round. Then I would like the Congress to undertake a thorough study of how we can achieve our objectives in a fashion most equitable to the American people, all 190 million of them. My subcommittee will do its part in examining the foreign policy implications of further changes. There is much work for my distinguished colleagues on other committees.

My final word, Mr. Speaker, contains a plea to Congress and the administration not to let the Kennedy round fail. I recognize, of course, that the bargaining at Geneva is a two-way street and that success or failure depends not on us alone. But if, as we race to the end of this long and tedious session, we see the prospect of a resolution in sight, I trust that we will not let it elude us by a terminal deadline.

I urge the administration to count on keeping its men at the bargaining table as long as the possibility of success remains. For my part, I will do my best to help keep them there.

HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the New York Times magazine of April 30 published an article on Vietnam, by Max Frankel, entitled "How Long Will It Last?" Mr. Frankel, a member of the New York Times Washington bureau, whose regular assignment is the White House, is one of the ablest reporters in Washington. His article is a penetrating analysis of the Vietnam situation. As we seem to move further and further away from a negotiated settlement, Mr. Frankel's article should be read by all of us.

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

HOW LONG WILL IT LAST?

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON.—How long will it last? How could it possibly end? Will bombing Haiphong make them say "Ouch" or "Nuts"? Will grazing Hanoi soften them up or merely annoy? Let's pacify. Let's mortify. Let's escalate so as to negotiate.

In most wars, the armchairs are full of generals refighting every battle, recasting every strategy, second-guessing every field commander. But Vietnam, being different in virtually every other sense as well, has also produced a new kind of kibitzer—the armchair diplomat. The galleries in this war are crowded mostly with mediators who second-guess, not the warriors but the negotiators, and spin many an intricate design not for winning the war but for ending it.

Senator Robert F. Kennedy would end the bombing briefly. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. would stop the shooting unilaterally. Gen. James Gavin would huddle in enclaves. Senator Wayne Morse would summon the United Nations. Senator J. W. Fulbright has eight points. Secretary-General U Thant has three. Walter Lippmann has variations on one. The New York Times editorial page has one after another.

Most of the sideline proposals represent a degree of protest against the war or the military tactics with which it is being waged. Invariably, however, the amateur suggestions have been borrowed, imitated or supplanted by the diplomacies of the belligerents—Ho Chi Minh's four points and Dean Rusk's 14—so that at any one time there are usually more peace plans than bombs in the air.

What is more, a large number of the sideline brokers really abhor the sedentary role. Ministers, journalists, scholars or officials of wholly uninvolved or even uninterested governments periodically leap from their armchairs and fly about the world seeking out the combatants, carrying messages to and fro, adding their own interpretations of what they hear, or think they hear, and propounding yet another formula for peace.

In the spirit of referees everywhere, these intermediaries generally profess objectivity, and often make a good claim for it, thus incurring the wrath of now one side, now the other. Washington has learned to hide its scorn and to speak respectfully even of the once deeply resented U Thant, although President Johnson and Secretary Rusk still mumble contemptuously about all the "self-appointed candidates for the Nobel Peace Prize."

Yet the same kind of peace games are regularly played also inside the American Government and, if recent hints are to be believed, inside the Government of North Vietnam. Both are regularly confronted, it seems, by "scenarios" to step up the war, to step down the war or, in various ways, to interrupt the war—all presented as the quickest way to conclude the war.

So insistent are the discussions of how best to end the war, it is sometimes forgotten that all the active belligerents have a prior interest in *winning* the peace, not simply making it. In fact, the fighting itself is often dismissed by the mediators as a matter quite separate from the quest for a settlement. In some quarters, every new form of military pressure is automatically deemed hostile to peace; in others, every suggestion of striking a bargain is seen as a betrayal of the military cause.

The result of all this is that the prospects of peace are, like the objectives of war, being debated in a semantic jungle as dense as the most overgrown terrain in Vietnam itself. Every day someone is urging one side or the other to escalate or to de-escalate, to de-augment and to disinfiltrate, to pause temporarily or unconditionally and, above all, to negotiate. On paper, at least, it is time to defoliate.

This war, like any other, could end in a dozen different ways, planned or unplanned, the result of the war itself or of some wholly irrelevant development far away. We can only guess how it will end and when, but some sense of the possibilities and probabilities underlies every informed choice of tactics on all sides.

The semantic defoliation might best begin with the genus *neg-otium*, the Latin root of "negotiate," meaning "not easy."

A hawk wanting to sound reasonably dove-ish—Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor while serving as United States Ambassador in Saigon—once said of Vietnam that all wars end by negotiations. Whatever his hopes at the time, the general knew better, of course. Wars do not always end by negotiation. They also end in capitulation or annihilation or both. And if you asked a Vietnamese below the age of 25, he might speak from the fullness of his experience and reply that some wars never end.

If there is any point in speculation about whether this war will ever end, and how, it would help to ban the word "negotiate" altogether. It was once both meaningful and respectable, but of late it has become the catch-all slogan of all too many irreconcilable notions. Men who really dream of total military victory, like Premier Nguyen Cao Ky of South Vietnam, offer to "negotiate" while really imagining only some ceremony of surrender. Men who really wish the United States would get out, like Walter Lippmann, talk of "negotiation" because they deem the word politically more neutral than "withdrawal."

Indeed, for the major antagonists in the war, periodic offers to "negotiate" have been largely extensions of the military conflict—verbal and diplomatic ploys aimed at achieving a more advantageous battlefield position.

In his recent letter to President Ho, President Johnson offered relief from the bombing of North Vietnam and assurances of no further American troop build-ups in South Vietnam if only Hanoi would let the Communist forces of 280,000 men fight unsupplied and unreplenished against the allied forces of one million. And President Ho replied that if the bombing of his country stopped unconditionally, he might consider talking about how the 450,000 American forces are to be withdrawn from the battle as the first step toward a settlement.

One can argue about this or that interpretation of this or that element in the avalanche of peace proposals. But it is no mere coincidence that throughout the war, the most vigorous invitations to "negotiate" have come from the side that saw itself in a militarily superior, or at least potentially superior, position—North Vietnam until February, 1965, and the United States since April, 1965. And the potentially weaker side has been reluctant or downright deaf.

Now one side, now the other, has been only too willing to "negotiate" what amounted to a face-saving retreat by the other, and both sides have clearly understood this, even when the armchair peacemakers around the world have not.

At various times, in fact, both sides have been confident that a mere agreement to "negotiate" by the other would significantly injure the morale of its military forces and allies, so that getting the enemy's agreement to "negotiate" has at times been this war's direct equivalent of his crying "uncle."

Back in the autumn of 1964, when Hanoi was offering peace talks while the Johnson Administration gagged every time it tried to pronounce the word "negotiation," Secretary Rusk once remarked that the anti-Communist forces were then so weak and near to total defeat that he would rather just quit and run than "negotiate" his own humiliation.

And similarly today, as they confidently propose "negotiation" to the Communist side, American officials think that the same logic is probably at work in Hanoi. Deep down, they believe—and also hope—in Washington that when North Vietnam comes to terms with its own predicament it will choose to quit the battlefield as quietly as it arrived rather than sign an agreement that would define the proportions of its failure.

"Negotiation" in its original sense meant "not easy," that is, a difficult process of bargaining in which parties who want something roughly comparable from each other sit down and haggle about the price and the wording of the contract. If ever both sides in a war need peace badly enough simultaneously, then the conflict may well end in a bargain that leaves both equally satisfied or frustrated or both. But we had better call this process "bargaining" to distinguish it from the now debased slogan of "negotiation." The concept of a hard and difficult bargain is useful also because it vividly suggests that a real deal is far from the only possible end of the Vietnam saga.

A bargain requires a coincidence of interest and a balance of power that is only seldom achieved in war diplomacy—and rarely recognized in time even when the coincidence occurs. Americans have not genuinely bargained for the end of a war since 1815, and even that war's settlement with the British merely acknowledged a military stalemate and left most of the real issues for subsequent resolution.

The prospects for a bargain in Vietnam are especially remote because on each side of the conflict there are allies pursuing noticeably different objectives. Thus, the conflict really encompasses two distinguishable—though no longer separate—wars. It is hard to present even to imagine how they could be sorted out in a bargain involving the four principal belligerents.

One war is between the so-called National Liberation Front (N.L.F.) and the so-called Government of South Vietnam, or more accurately Army of the Republic of Vietnam (A.R.V.N.). It is a battle for power—for territory and, above all, direct authority over the people living in the southern half of Vietnam—waged by military, political and economic means.

Unfortunately for those who are trying to design a deal, or even merely to blow the whistle and arrange a standstill, this war has not produced two readily definable encampments between whom the spoils of territory and population might be divided. Neither the N.L.F. nor the A.R.V.N. rules effectively in clearly delineated or contiguous hunks of territory or over divisible groups of people. They hold a town here and a village there, reign in a province there and a district here, control a road by day or a river by night.

Not now, and not in the foreseeable future, therefore, can the fighting between them be ended by any conceivable scheme of partition, as in Laos five years ago.

Nor is there any significant third or neutral force in South Vietnam to which the two rival forces might be persuaded or compelled to submit. The N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. are the only two effective "national" institutions that could even pretend to power in South Vietnam, and their writ rarely extends farther into the countryside than the length of their bayonets.

War No. 2 is between North Vietnam and the United States. Though bloodier than the first, it is nonetheless an ancillary contest in which each side is trying to defeat, or at least to nullify, the power of the other so as to leave itself free to assist its ally in war No. 1. The second war has not only complicated the tactics of the conflict, it has raised the stakes by injecting the prestige of two proud Governments. Moreover, to real interests, it has added issues of principle ("wars of liberation must be defeated once and for all") and ideology ("anticolonial wars are just and thus inevitably successful"). And behind each of the ancillary contestants there now stands a host of allies, involved in varying degrees, with varying stakes in the outcome.

Not only the four principal antagonists but at least a dozen other nations could now rightly claim a seat at a Vietnam peace conference. And even if they ever did manage to come together, the presence of the Soviet Union and Communist China alone—allegedly on the same side of the table—would quickly plunge the meeting into cacophonous chaos.

Those who call for "negotiations" cannot shake off these realties. They may, nonetheless, try to arrange a real bargain but they must deal with the real issues to be bargained about, not merely with the simple notions of finding a time and place for a meeting.

The problem, as they say in professional diplomatic establishments, is substantive, not procedural. There are already ample channels of communication between Hanoi and Washington, direct and indirect through other capitals and governments, as the Johnson-Ho exchange showed. The N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. could probably exchange messages between any two waiters in a Saigon hotel.

Nor is there any shortage of intermediaries, professional or amateur. Besides the wandering minstrels and journalists, there are the Canadian, Indian and Polish members of the International Control Commission for Indochina shuttling around the capitals of the region, including Hanoi and Saigon. There are the so-called co-chairmen of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva Conferences on Indochina, the Soviet Union and Britain; dozens of nonaligned and moderately aligned governments seeking peace or merely self-importance; U Thant, and even the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Their inquiries and invitations to peace talks have produced a record of rejections and conditions by one side or the other that clearly suggests no lack of understanding. Indeed, the record suggests that the belligerents have understood each other only too well. No mere lack of communication and no mere insistence on ceremony has blocked the path to peace. The central issue remains what it was as this war began, and it remains the focus of contest: Who shall hold sway in South Vietnam?

The problem, not some exaggerated sense of protocol or pride, accounts for the celebrated reluctance of the United States to deal directly with the N.L.F. and for the less celebrated but equally firm refusal of North Vietnam to deal with the leaders of the A.R.V.N. If either of the contestants in the second war were to deal with the enemy's ally in the first war, it would be conceding an essential piece of the peace—a share of the power in South Vietnam that both the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. continue to claim exclusively.

Who talks to whom is thus not a minor matter of form but something close to the essence of the conflict.

In this situation, only two types of bargain are really conceivable.

To end the first war by compromise, the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. would have to agree to share power in some kind of genuine coalition arrangement. "Coalition," too, is a tricky word because the virtual defeat of one side or the other might some day be concealed in a clearly pro-Communist coalition such as those that rule in Eastern Europe or a clearly anti-Comunist coalition of the type sometimes seen in Western Europe. But a real compromise in the foreseeable future would require a real coalition of a kind never before effectively constructed anywhere between Communists and non-Communists, even in situations of lesser passion.

The coalition arranged for Laos at the Geneva Conference in 1962 is not an apt precedent. It never worked in fact, and it worked on paper only because a middle-of-the-road, or so-called neutralist, faction could be assigned a central role in the coalition, and because a virtual demarcation line could be drawn between the territories held by Communist, non-Communist and anti-Communist forces on the ground.

The advocates of a bargain in Vietnam must face up to the design of a viable coalition. So far, they have not done so and none of the major parties to the war has given them any ground for hope. The United States Government decided long ago that a coalition was unworkable, undesirable and therefore unacceptable. The military leaders of South Vietnam have said they would never agree to a coalition. The leaders of the National Liberation Front have spoken of a coalition, but never of one that would assign even a minority place to their principal antagonists in Saigon and usually only of a coalition in which they would have a dominant voice.

Senator Kennedy came close to proposing a coalition in his first critical appraisal of the war more than a year ago, when he said the Vietcong would eventually have to be offered a "share" of the power in South Vietnam, but he backed away from suggestions that he meant a Laotian-type of coalition and has let the idea languish without further development. No one else has developed it either.

It has been suggested in many quarters that the political and ethnic and religious factions of South Vietnam might yet work out an acceptable means of governing themselves if only they were left to their own devices or if a Buddhist Government were deliberately installed in Saigon in place of the military and encouraged to bargain directly with the N.L.F.

The trouble with this is that neither the Buddhists nor any other faction has demonstrated any capacity to organize or administer a larger portion of South Vietnam than the A.R.V.N.; on the contrary, the indications are that the A.R.V.N. would forcibly destroy such a movement, if only in the interests of physical self-preservation. Nor have any of the anti-military and anti-Communist groups shown themselves capable of dealing constructively with the N.L.F. or willing to defect to it. There simply is no meaningful third force around which to build.

The United States' answer to this problem has been to encourage the transformation of the present military Government into a more civilian, more legitimate and more charitable regime that might eventually come to resemble a "third force." By encouraging the proclamation of a new Constitution, the holding of national elections and a policy of national reconciliation or amnesty, the officials of Washington and Saigon hope gradually to lure many of the N.L.F.'s political and military cadres to their own ranks, or at least toward more conventional and peaceful political contest.

But such reconciliation is a long-range process. And if it worked, it would really represent a military and psychological as well as political defeat for the N.L.F., resulting in a bogus, rather than genuine, coalition with supremacy assured for the anti-Communist forces.

The only other conceivable bargain that could be struck in the near future would be aimed at ending war No. 2 between North Vietnam and the United States.

Since neither seems willing to leave the South Vietnam battlefield to the other, such a bargain would have to arrange for their simultaneous and genuine withdrawal from the contest, leaving the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N. to slug it out alone. This has been the objective of most of the "negotiating" formulas advanced from the sidelines over the years.

Such a bargain is obstructed, first, by the reluctance of both North Vietnam and the United States to withdraw from the conflict, even in a fair deal, so long as their respective allies, the N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N., would be left to the mercy of the other. Something close to perfect parity between the rival South Vietnamese belligerents would have to exist, or be thought to exist, if Hanoi and Washington are to be persuaded to keep hands off at this late stage.

Even if some prolonged period of delicate balance could be imagined, a second major difficulty would develop around the meaning of "hands off" or "withdrawal."

Would every "Northerner"—that is, even a native Southerner trained in guerrilla warfare in the North and then sent South again to fight—have to retire from the battlefield before North Vietnam was considered to have withdrawn from the war?

Would every C.I.A. agent or other American "adviser" have to sail for home before the United States was considered to have withdrawn?

Could neither side ship weapons and ammunition to its allies in the continuing war No. 1? And if not weapons, uniforms? Or medical supplies? Or rice?

And who, conceivably, could inspect and enforce such unimaginable restraint by two Governments that have already spent so much blood and treasure in their respective interventions?

Yet these are the issues that would have to be resolved in the design of an ancillary bargain to end the ancillary war in Vietnam.

The seed of such a deal was perhaps planted in the Manila declaration of the United States and its allies last October, promising that American forces would be withdrawn "as" the North Vietnamese withdrew and as the level of violence "thus" subsided. The last of the Americans, it was promised after some logistic calculations, could be shipped out within six months after the last of the North Vietnamese had departed.

This declaration, however, was more in the nature of a vague assurance that the United States sought no permanent bases in Vietnam than a serious bargaining position. The horrendous difficulties of defining the proposition and of policing such an arrangement have left Hanoi and Washington equally, and understandably, cold to it.

So much, then, for a direct bargain in which any two or all four of the main antagonists would deal more or less equally with each other in arranging a major reduction or total cessation of the fighting. A "negotiated" or genuinely bargained settlement does not now loom among the more likely prospects. Nor did it ever.

This is a conclusion that can be reached even by those who disagree about the origins of the war, the nature of the war or the wisdom of United States involvement, in it. Barring gross ineptitude by one of the negotiating parties, no conference-table bargain can ever achieve what the soldiers and other men of power have failed to achieve.

In Vietnam today, there is neither a decisive victory by one side nor a stable, well-nigh unbreakable stalemate of the two sides. Each side still expects either its own victory or the enemy's exhaustion and these are not attitudes that can be translated or bargained into a settlement.

The result, as the most sober men on both sides have long recognized, is a bitter and determined war of attrition, a negotiation by fire.

To recognize that fact is not to condone it, but the overwhelming odds are that one of the sides in this war will have to be forced and mightily persuaded to yield effective rule in South Vietnam to the other before the war can end.

Such an end may ultimately be ratified at one or more surrender ceremonies disguised as "negotiations" or it may simply happen through the stealthy retreat of the North Vietnamese and their allies.

Either kind of end could come through an important change in the context of the war—the death of one or more of the most persistent advocates of the war in Hanoi or Washington or their effective political defeat at home or a sudden choking off in the supplies of war due to upheaval in Moscow or Peking or economic depression in the United States.

Any such dramatic event—comparable to the death of Stalin, which seemed to clear the way for acceptance of stalemate in Korea—could lead sooner than anyone now expects to the withdrawal of the United States or North Vietnam, since neither would risk conquest or subjugation even if it quit entirely. But upheavals cannot, by definition, be predicted. Each side maneuvers to be in position to take advantage of such a break, but in the meantime it must reckon on altering the balance of power in South Vietnam by direct and bloody action.

To force an end of the war by direct action, both sides must think in terms of the risks and opportunities of fighting a significantly larger or wider war, a significantly smaller or more limited war, or the kind of war euphemistically called "more of the same."

The N.L.F. and the A.R.V.N are now fighting at virtually peak capacity, militarily and politically. A more intensive war, therefore, could result only from the action of their respective allies.

North Vietnam could send the bulk of its 300,000-man army to join its 50,000 troops in South Vietnam, thus risking the virtually total destruction of its country from much more massive bombing by the United States, a much larger, more or less conventional ground war against a still further augmented allied force in the South and possibly a counterinvasion of its territory.

It would be risking enormous losses and at least eventual military defeat against the rather slim chance that a much bigger war would be suddenly repudiated or abandoned by the United States.

Communist China or the Soviet Union or both could further intensify the war by intervening openly with "volunteer" or regular forces, but they would thus risk retaliation against their home territories while, at best, prolonging the war and denying the United States an outright victory. Only the rapid escalation of such an enlarged war toward a worldwide or nuclear conflict could so frighten all parties that it would increase rather than further injure the chances of compromise.

With every form of Communist escalation certain to be matched or doubled by the United States, it seems much more likely that the Communist tacticians would seek advantages in a smaller war of sporadic guerrilla assault, terror, and political action, aimed not so much at winning or ending the conflict as at prolonging it past the point of American endurance.

Taken to its logical extreme, this strategy could even lead to a North Vietnamese decision to quit the war altogether—though only temporarily—by yielding South Vietnam and somehow bargaining most American troops out of the country while planning to mount a new assault a few years later, when Washington would have turned its attention to other matters and presumably lost all taste *for a resumption of the war.*

There have been some suspicions in Washington that this is precisely what the Russians have urged upon North Vietnam, and that at least a few leading officials in Hanoi have been willing to listen.

To guard against this possibility, the United States *has placed ever more emphasis on the political and economic measures* that could assure the survival of a non-Communist Government in Saigon and arm it to withstand such a future challenge without permanent American occupation. However, having paid so dearly for such a North Vietnamese withdrawal and for such a *respite in the South, it is unlikely that the* United States would soon abandon South Vietnam to its fate until it felt sure of a peace of at least some years.

This leaves North Vietnam and the N.L.F. with only the choice of a major capitulation or "more of the same." By yielding South Vietnam to the A.R.V.N. forces, the Communists could probably buy an amnesty for their own fighters in the South and guarantees of both economic help and physical security from both the United States and the Soviet Union.

But unless their fortunes in war deteriorate rapidly in the next few months—as some Americans insist they will—the Communist leaders are unlikely to seek such an end until they have tested the persistence of the United States through the 1968 election campaign and perhaps even longer.

President Johnson, for one, is convinced that North Vietnam is waiting to win in Washington what it cannot win on the battlefield; that it remains obsessed by the memory of that 100-to-1 shot that scored in 1954 when political collapse in Paris preceded the military collapse of the French forces in Vietnam. The visible unpopularity of the war in the United States, the active opposition of influential men and commentators and the heady notion that conquerors from afar can always be outwaited by defenders of the homeland may indeed sustain the Communist forces beyond all rational military calculations.

The accumulated grievances of two decades, the mistrust of the European white man, the ignorance and suspicion of all Western contracts and of the previous Western-style negotiations in Geneva in 1954 may well endow North Vietnam with the traditional strength of the weak, the sense that survival itself is at stake and that only the enemy has anything left to lose. Hanoi could easily find virtue in the necessity of simply hanging on.

So far, at least, the Johnson Administration has been similarly unwilling to risk a significant enlargement of the war. It has been urged by some of its officials to attack more diligently the routes and even the sources of North Vietnam's military supplies, accepting the risk of harming Soviet ships or a direct Soviet or Chinese intervention.

The larger the war, it has been said, the more decisive the American military superiority. The greater the danger of a Soviet-American clash, it has also been said, the greater the incentive for Moscow to force Hanoi to settle or quit. Such an end may yet be sought by the United States, but less from calculation than desperation. For the moment, Washington does not appear to feel so much pressure that it will rush to that most precipitous brink.

Also before the Administration are proposals for fighting a drastically curtailed kind of war, including a long or indefinite pause in the bombing of North Vietnam and experiments with cease-fires and standstills and retreats to enclaves in South Vietnam.

The answer in Washington to these suggestions is that too many important military battles are being fought and too many political efforts have been mounted now in South Vietnam for the United States to inhibit or *handicap its own troops. Even if gradually* reciprocated by North Vietnam, the Administration argues, such restraint would leave the Saigon regime under guerrilla and terror attack before it has had time to consolidate its rule over significant portions of South Vietnam.

Instead, the United States has decided to continue to wear down the insurgents by bombing them into endless flight around the difficult terrain of South Vietnam, destroying their military installations and secret supply depots, killing or luring into defection as many as possible and thus winning time for the creation of a more viable society and *government.*

That is why the intensified American military action is being accompanied by strong pressure for political evolution, reform and economic stability and development, even in the midst of war.

How, then, will it end? By attrition in South Vietnam or by now unimagined accident in Moscow or Hanoi or Washington or Peking.

How soon? Probably not soon, even if the pace of combat subsides remarkably. For even if the United States is right in thinking itself to be the stronger side now, it cannot hide from the Communist forces what President Johnson knows and concedes.

Though the American military situation is considerably strengthened, he said recently, and though South Vietnam's political maturation will prove helpful, "I think we have a difficult, serious, long-drawn-out, agonizing problem that we do not yet have the answer for."

For the "other side," as it is called, the problem must appear still more difficult, serious, long-drawn-out and agonizing.

LET US GO FORWARD WITH THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, today, as we speak, the Teacher Corps is helping the children of poverty in thousands of local school districts throughout this land to gain new and meaningful educational insights.

I am, therefore, proud and pleased to rise in strong support of the provisions for the Teacher Corps, as amended, in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, H.R. 7819.

Contained in part B of title I of this bill is the authorization for payment of teacher-trainee and team-leader salaries. An amendment to the compensation provisions would pay teacher trainees or "interns" $75 a week plus $15 a week for each dependent or the lowest salary scale of a school district, whichever is the lower of the two amounts. This lower salary payment underscores the dedication of the Teacher Corps volunteers who are willing to give 2 years of their lives in service to the children attending schools in the most deprived areas of our country. The amendment would also bring Teacher Corps compensation into conformity with the stipend rate for other Federal graduate programs. In this manner, the program would allay the fears of my colleagues who think that the young people entering the Teacher Corps are interested more in money and a degree than they are in service to the disadvantaged children of our Nation.

I do not think I need to emphasize the *importance of the authority to pay the* school systems for the team members' compensation. Since the purpose of the Teacher Corps is to supplement the educational staff of schools in poverty areas and to reach the educationally deprived children in those areas, it stands to rea*son that projects will be requested by* the schools which need assistance the most but are least able to afford them.

Therefore, the Federal Government must make it possible for these schools to request and receive the assistance they need.

I believe that the Teacher Corps, which is tied to assisting schools where at least 50 percent of the children come from the lowest socioeconomic families, is one of the most effective methods of providing this assistance. One of the most vital legislative authorities of the program is the Teacher Corps team compensation provision. For those who fear the remote possibility of Federal control which might result from Federal funding, I would point out that the new amendments underscore full local control by local authorities over hiring, firing, and compensation for Teacher Corps teams.

This is a good program; it has proven its merit. It deserves continuation. For these reasons, I support the provisions for the Teacher Corps in the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. I urge that my colleagues support these measures and assure the children now being aided of another full year of meaningful educational development.

CONGRESSMAN ANNUNZIO SUPPORTS H.R. 7819, THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Mr. QUIE has portrayed his "block grant" bill as a boon to State and local school systems, freeing them from the horrors of redtape and Federal control. Unfortunately, on close examination his bill will merely add to the problems currently experienced by our local school officials, not alleviate them.

Section 704(a)(6) of H.R. 8983, the Quie-proposed alternative to the committee-reported H.R. 7819, contains some very interesting language. It provides that any State which desires to receive a "block grant" shall submit a State plan which, among other things, "provides that any local educational agency or other applicant for assistance under this title which is denied such assistance *may have an opportunity for a hearing* before the State educational agency."

What "other applicants" can Mr. QUIE have in mind? Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act which his proposal would replace, only local public educational agencies may apply for and *receive Federal assistance.*

All title I programs are planned by local educational agencies, although they must provide for educationally disadvantaged children attending nonpublic schools.

All textbooks, library books, and other instructional materials acquired under title II are public property and are acquired under the auspices of the public schools, whether they are to be used by public or nonpublic school children and teachers.

All supplementary centers and services planned and operated under title III have as their coordinating agency the local educational agency, even though they may be initially planned by representatives of the cultural and educational resources of the community, public and private.

By allowing "other applicants" for Federal assistance, Mr. QUIE has created potential chaos. Local school systems would no longer have complete control over the education offered to their children. Any organization interested in education—a community action group, for example—could apply to the State education agency for funds to conduct its own educational program, apart from that offered by the public schools. Nonpublic schools—and even profitmaking schools and organizations—could seek direct grants of Federal funds from the States to operate their own educational programs, construct their own facilities, and pay their own teachers. The local school district, at the discretion of the State department of education or the Governor, could be completely bypassed.

Our present system of public education is based on the premise that the control of education in local schools is vested in locally elected school boards who are responsible to the will of the people of the school district. Our present Federal education programs are designed to reenforce this democratic system of education. Every local school board in the Nation is assured that it has exclusive control of all Federal money expended for elementary and secondary education in its school district. This is as it should be.

The proposed substitute would authorize funds for the establishment and operation of competing school systems in any school district where a group—local or otherwise—decided that the public school system did not meet the particular needs of the group. Two years ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] criticized title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act because he thought it would set up competing schools—now he offers an amendment which does just what he warned us against 2 years ago.

The Quie substitute could destroy the whole fabric of local control of education. We must not allow this to happen. Competing school systems must not be allowed to siphon off the funds which *our local school districts need so desperately.* I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to reject this substitute and to support H.R. 7819, the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967, which reflects the dedication of every Member of this House to *the principle of local control of education.*

BRINGING THE BLESSINGS OF THE AUTOMOBILE AGE TO THE U.S.S.R.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask *unanimous consent that the gentleman* from California [Mr. REES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman *from Oklahoma?*

There was no objection.

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, a major battle is now shaping up in Congress concerning the President's desire to "build bridges" to Eastern Europe in an effort to lessen the tensions of the cold war. One facet of the program is to allow the U.S. Export-Import Bank to finance the export of U.S. machine tools to Fiat of Italy, which would then be used by Fiat to develop an automobile plant in the Soviet Union for the production of some 600,000 Fiats a year.

Last December, as a member of the Foreign Trade Subcommittee of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, I went to the Soviet Union to study the Fiat transaction. The members of the subcommittee, composed of both Republicans and Democrats, were generally in favor of the transaction as it would help to move the Soviets toward a more consumer-oriented economy. The CIA reported their approval of the proposal—they are very much in favor of more consumers within the Soviet sphere. Even the Joint Chiefs of Staff liked the idea.

Unfortunately, some of our conservative Congressmen are alarmed and do not want us to participate, although the plant is to be built whether we like it or not, as the United States is not the only country in the world which produces machine tools. My observation is that my recalcitrant colleagues are not aware of the disturbing history of the automobile age. They seem to be blind to what goes on around them. They talk as if they had never financed a car, fixed a flat tire, looked at miles and miles of billboards, tried to get a motel reservation on a Labor Day weekend, breathed in lungs full of foul, smoggy air, spent hours stuck in a freeway traffic jam, or looked futilely for a parking space during the rush hour.

The average Russian has not had to experience any of these "joys" of the automobile age. As a result, he has hours, weeks, and years of leisure in which to contemplate Marx and Mao, Albania and sputnik, and the women's track team.

In Moscow, a city of 6 million souls, there are only eight gas stations and two garages. This is ridiculous; why, I must have 800 gas stations just in my congressional district of half a million souls. And freeways—they do not exist—and I *do not think there is a Russian word* for "parking lot," "downpayment," or "woman driver."

To understand the Fiat proposal is really to love it. The opponents of the project cannot be blamed though—they just do not have truly diabolical minds. *The Joint Chiefs of Staff and the CIA do* have diabolical minds—they are in favor—they hope that the project will bring the U.S.S.R. into the automobile age.

The billion-dollar investment in the *plant is just the starter—the small lump of heady yeast that will swell into the* biggest loaf of questionable progress the world has seen to date.

Just look at highways—they do not have many in the Soviet Union, and what they have are not too good. This will be changed. They must have new roads or the cars will not last. A worker who has sweated and strained years to own a car will expect a road the car will ride on. If the car breaks down the first month there will be hell to pay; the worker will be so frustrated he will not make his quotas. And what about parking lots? Cars must be stored somewhere—especially in Russia or the snow will cover the car and the driver will not be able to find it until after the spring thaw.

And gas stations—there will have to be more than eight in Moscow, or nobody would ever get to work as they would spend all their time in long lines waiting for gas. There would have to be motels along the highways to stay in overnight, and once you have motels, there is no end to the problems that might arise. There will be a new surge of demand for mechanics, and as progress continues, another blessing of the advent of the automobile—the used car salesman—will appear on the scene. As you can see, the true picture of the Fiat deal begins to emerge.

Roads cannot just go along the countryside with no form of visual entertainment for the motorist—so, we have billboards. New radio stations will emerge to entertain—new modes of music since long-winded propaganda programs do little to soothe the harassed motorist. Then we will need sig-alerts to tell the motorist of the latest traffic jams, and helicopters will be pressed into service to spot the traffic jams. There will be more and more traffic jams, more "no parking" areas, and key engineers will be taken away from the moon race to figure out how to coordinate traffic signals.

Suddenly, some Russian engineer will invent the freeway—goodby Kremlin, goodby Gorky Park, goodby Winter Palace—the freeway is coming through.

The smog will get thicker, trash and beer cans will start to accumulate along the vistas of the Black Sea and the Ural Mountains. The teenagers will start borrowing dad's car and there might well be a "Sunset Strip" of discotheques across the street from the Bolshoi. Down the block will be a huge courthouse to take care of cases involving traffic violations and automobile accidents. Across from that will be the emergency hospital for those unfortunates who thought their car was a troika and slammed into a snow bank. The hospital will also take care of ulcers and nervous disorders caused by the financial pressures of not being able to make the car payments or by the frustrations of prolonged traffic jams. The end will be in sight when the Japanese negotiate a license to manufacture Yamaha and Honda motorcycles in Russia.

One can imagine gangs of "Heaven's Angels" with their boots, black leather jackets and top hats emblazoned with gold dollar signs.

Yes, some of us want the Fiat plant to be built in Russia, and are ready to welcome a lot of others—Volkswagen, Cadillac, Reo, Tucker, Renault, Ford, Edsel, Packard, Studebaker, Volvo, and Jaguar. There is no reason why only the United States of America, Western Europe, Japan, and parts of Latin America should experience the joys of the automobile age—we want to export this scourge to all—friend and foe alike. There is no reason on earth why a Russian should be able to breathe fresh air, and see his seashore, lakes, and mountains unencumbered by litter, gas stations, billboards, and car salvage lots. Why should not the Russians have to ruin their cities by allowing the automobile to take over? Do they not deserve the economic poverty brought on by car ownership and the neurosis that has resulted?

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING ON VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the furor which was aroused after the April 4 address at the Riverside Church in New York City by Dr. Martin Luther King is indicative of the stature and force which Dr. King carries in this country. Dr. King's words are of such power and eloquence that I respectfully urge its careful reading by Members of the Congress. We must not let the political debate of superfluous questions—such as the judiciousness of "mixing" the two central issues of our time, civil rights and peace—obscure the depth and wisdom of Dr. King's address.

For anyone who knows the total philosophical and religious view of Martin Luther King knows he could take no other action than to speak out against the role of the United States in Vietnam. In his inspirational remarks, the same quality of compassion, the same ideal of justness, and the same spirit of love which compelled Dr. King to act first in Montgomery and then throughout the South in opposition to laws of segregation and discrimination, prevails.

I have unanimous consent that the remarks of Dr. Martin Luther King, at the Riverside Church, be inserted in the Congressional Record at this point along with an excellent editorial which appeared in the New York Times of April 23, 1967. This column, written by Mr. James P. Brown, an editorial writer for the Providence Journal, concisely and clearly cites the reasoning behind Dr. King's stand and explains why clergymen all over this country are concerned about the war in Vietnam.

The speech and editorial follow:

BEYOND VIETNAM

(By Dr. Martin Luther King)

I come to this magnificent house of worship tonight because my conscience leaves me no other choice. I join you in this meeting because I am in deepest agreement with the aims and work of the organization which has brought us together: Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. The recent statement of your executive committee are the sentiments of my own heart and I found myself in full accord when I read its opening lines: "A time comes when silence is betrayal." That time has come for us in relation to Vietnam.

The truth of these words is beyond doubt, but the mission to which they call us is a most difficult one. Even when pressed by the demands of inner truth, men do not easily assume the task of opposing their government's policy, especially in time of war. Nor does the human spirit move without great difficulty against all the apathy of conformist thought within one's own bosom and in the surrounding world. Moreover when the issues at hand seem as perplexing as they often do in the case of this dreadful conflict we are always on the verge of being mesmerized by uncertainty; but we must move on.

Some of us who have already begun to break the silence of the night have found that the calling to speak is often a vocation of agony, but we must speak. We must speak with all the humility that is appropriate to our limited vision, but we must speak. And we must rejoice as well, for surely this is the first time in our nation's history that a significant number of its religious leaders have chosen to move beyond the prophesying of smooth patriotism to the high grounds of a firm dissent based upon the mandates of conscience and the reading of history. Perhaps a new spirit is rising among us. If it is, let us trace its movements well and pray that our own inner being may be sensitive to its guidance, for we are deeply in need of a new way beyond the darkness that seems so close around us.

Over the past two years, as I have moved to break the betrayal of my own silence and to speak from the burnings of my own heart, as I have called for radical departures from the destruction of Viet Nam, many persons have questioned me about the wisdom of my path. At the heart of their concerns this query has often loomed large and loud: Why are *you* speaking about the war, Dr. King? Why are *you* joining the voices of dissent? Peace and civil rights don't mix, they say. Aren't you hurting the cause of your people, they ask? And when I hear them, though I often understand the source of their concern, I have nevertheless been greatly saddened, for such questions mean that the inquirers have not really known me, my commitment or my calling. Indeed, their questions suggest that they do not know the world in which they live.

In the light of such tragic misunderstanding, I deem it of signal importance to try to state clearly, and I trust concisely, why I believe that the path from Dexter Avenue Baptist Church—the church in Montgomery, Alabama where I began my pastorate—leads clearly to this sanctuary tonight.

I come to this platform tonight to make a passionate plea to my beloved nation. This speech is not addressed to Hanoi or to the National Liberation Front. It is not addressed to China or to Russia.

Nor is it an attempt to overlook the ambiguity of the total situation and the need for a collective solution to the tragedy of Vietnam. Neither is it an attempt to make North Vietnam or the National Liberation Front paragons of virtue, nor to overlook the role they can play in a successful resolution of the problem. While they both may have justifiable reason to be suspicious of the good faith of the United States, life and history give eloquent testimony to the fact that conflicts are never resolved without trustful give and take on both sides.

Tonight, however, I wish not to speak with Hanoi and the NLF, but rather to my fellow Americans who, with me, bear the greatest responsibility in ending a conflict that has exacted a heavy price on both continents.

Since I am a preacher by trade, I suppose it is not surprising that I have seven major reasons for bringing Viet Nam into the field of my moral vision. There is at the outset a very obvious and almost facile connection between the war in Viet Nam and the struggle I, and others, have been waging in America. A few years ago there was a shining moment in that struggle. It seemed as if there was a real promise of hope for the poor—both black and white—through the Poverty Program. There were experiments, hopes, new beginnings. Then came the buildup in Viet Nam and I watched the program broken and eviscerated as if it were some idle political plaything of a society gone mad on war, and I knew that America would never invest the necessary funds or energies in rehabilitation of its poor so long as adventures like Viet Nam continued to draw men and skills and money like some demonic destructive suction tube. So I was increasingly compelled to see the war as an enemy of the poor and to attack it as such.

Perhaps a more tragic recognition of reality took place when it became clear to me that the war was doing far more than devastating the hopes of the poor at home. It was sending their sons and their brothers and their husbands to fight and to die in extraordinarily high proportions relative to the rest of the population. We were taking the black young men who had been crippled by our society and sending them 8,000 miles away to guarantee liberties in Southeast Asia which they had not found in Southwest Georgia and East Harlem. So we have been repeatedly faced with the cruel irony of watching Negro and white boys on TV screens as they kill and die together for a nation that has been unable to seat them together in the same schools. So we watch them in brutal solidarity burning the huts of a poor village but we realize that they would never live on the same block in Detroit. I could not be silent in the face of such cruel manipulation of the poor.

My third reason moves to an even deeper level of awareness, for it grows out of my experience in the ghettos of the north over the last three years—especially the last three summers. As I have walked among the desperate, rejected, and angry young men I have told them that Molotov cocktails and rifles would not solve their problems. I have tried to offer them my deepest compassion while maintaining my conviction that social change comes most meaningfully through non-violent action. But they asked—and rightly so—what about Viet Nam? They asked if our own nation wasn't using massive doses of violence to solve its problems, to bring about the changes it wanted. Their questions hit home, and I knew that I could never again raise my voice against the violence of the oppressed in the ghettos without having first spoken clearly to the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today—my own government. For the sake of those boys, for the sake of this government, for the sake of the hundreds of thousands trembling under our violence, I cannot be silent.

For those who ask the question, "Aren't

you a Civil Rights leader?" and thereby mean to exclude me from the movement for peace, I have this further answer. In 1957 when a group of us formed the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, we chose as our motto: "To save the soul of America." We were convinced that we could not limit our vision to certain rights for black people, but instead affirmed the conviction that America would never be free or saved from itself unless the descendants of its slaves were loosed completely from the shackles they still wear. In a way we were agreeing with Langston Hughes, that black bard of Harlem, who had written earlier:

> "O, yes,
> I say it plain,
> America never was America to me,
> And yet I swear this oath—
> America will be!"

Now, it should be incandescently clear that no one who has any concern for the integrity and life of America today can ignore the present war. If America's soul becomes totally poisoned, part of the autopsy must read Viet Nam. It can never be saved so long as it destroys the deepest hopes of men the world over. So it is that those of us who are yet determined that America *will* be are led down the path of protest and dissent, working for the health of our land.

As if the weight of such a commitment to the life and health of America were not enough, another burden of responsibility was placed upon me in 1964; and I cannot forget that the Nobel Prize for Peace was also a commission—a commission to work harder than I had ever worked before for the "brotherhood of man." This is a calling that takes me beyond national allegiances, but even if it were not present I would yet have to live with the meaning of my commitment to the ministry of Jesus Christ. To me the relationship of this ministry to the making of peace is so obvious that I sometimes marvel at those who ask me why I am speaking against the war. Could it be that they do not know that the good news was meant for all men—for communist and capitalist, for their children and ours, for black and for white, for revolutionary and conservative? Have they forgotten that my ministry is in obedience to the one who loved his enemies so fully that he died for them? What then can I say to the Viet Cong or to Castro or to Mao as a faithful minister of this one? Can I threaten them with death or must I not share with them my life?

Finally, as I try to delineate for you and for myself the road that leads from Montgomery to this place I would have offered all that was most valid if I simply said that I must be true to my conviction that I share with all men the calling to be a son of the Living God. Beyond the calling of race or nation or creed is this vocation of sonship and brotherhood, and because I believe that the Father is deeply concerned especially for his suffering and helpless and outcast children, I come tonight to speak for them.

This I believe to be the privilege and burden of all of us who deem ourselves bound by allegiances and loyalties which are broader and deeper than nationalism and which go beyond our nation's self-defined goals and positions. We are called to speak for the weak, for the voiceless, for victims of our nation and for those it calls enemy, for no document from human hands can make these humans any less our brothers.

And as I ponder the madness of Viet Nam and search within myself for ways to understand and respond in compassion my mind goes constantly to the people of that peninsula. I speak now not of the soldiers of each side, not of the junta in Saigon, but simply of the people who have been living under the curse of war for almost three continuous decades now. I think of them too because it is clear to me that there will be no meaningful solution there until some attempt is made to know them and hear their broken cries.

They must see Americans as strange liberators. The Vietnamese people proclaimed their own independence in 1945 after a combined French and Japanese occupation, and before the communist revolution in China. They were led by Ho Chi Minh. Even though they quoted the American Declaration of Independence in their own document of freedom, we refused to recognize them. Instead, we decided to support France in its re-conquest of her former colony.

Our government felt then that the Vietnamese people were not "ready" for independence, and we again fell victim to the deadly western arrogance that has poisoned the international atmosphere for so long. With that tragic decision we rejected a revolutionary government seeking self-determination, and a government that had been established not by China (for whom the Vietnamese have no great love) but by clearly indigenous forces that included some communists. For the peasants this new government meant real land reform, one of the most important needs in their lives.

For nine years following 1945 we denied the people of Viet Nam the right of independence. For nine years we vigorously supported the French in their abortive effort to re-colonize Viet Nam.

Before the end of the war we were meeting 80% of the French war costs. Even before the French were defeated at Dien Bien Phu, they began to despair of the reckless action, but we did not. We encouraged them with our huge financial and military supplies to continue the war even after they had lost the will. Soon we would be paying almost the full costs of this tragic attempt at re-colonization.

After the French were defeated it looked as if independence and land reform would come again through the Geneva agreements. But instead there came the United States, determined that Ho should not unify the temporarily divided nation, and the peasants watched again as we supported one of the most vicious modern dictators—our chosen man, Premier Diem. The peasants watched and cringed as Diem ruthlessly routed out all opposition, supported their extortionist landlords and refused even to discuss reunification with the North. The peasants watched as all this was presided over by U.S. influence and then by increasing numbers of U.S. troops who came to help quell the insurgency that Diem's methods had aroused. When Diem was overthrown they may have been happy, but the long line of military dictatorships seemed to offer no real change—especially in terms of their need for land and peace.

The only change came from America as we increased our troop commitments in support of governments which were singularly corrupt, inept and without popular support. All the while the people read our leaflets and received regular promises of peace and democracy—and land reform. Now they languish under our bombs and consider us—not their fellow Vietnamese—the real enemy. They move sadly and apathetically as we herd them off the land of their fathers into concentration camps where minimal social needs are rarely met. They know they must move or be destroyed by our bombs. So they go—primarily women and children and the aged.

They watch as we poison their water, as we kill a million acres of their crops. They must weep as the bulldozers roar through their areas preparing to destroy the precious trees. They wander into the hospitals, with at least 20 casualties from American firepower for one Vietcong-inflicted injury. So far we may have killed a million of them —mostly children. They wander into the towns and see thousands of the children, homeless, without clothes, running in packs on the streets like animals. They see the children degraded by our soldiers, as they beg for food. They see the children selling their sisters to our soldiers, soliciting for their mothers.

What do the peasants think as we ally ourselves with the landlords and as we refuse to put any action into our many words concerning land reform? What do they think as we test out our latest weapons on them, just as the Germans tested out new medicine and new tortures in the concentration camps of Europe? Where are the roots of the independent Viet Nam we claim to be building? Is it among these voiceless ones?

We have destroyed their two most cherished institutions: the family and the village. We have destroyed their land and their crops. We have cooperated in the crushing of the nation's only non-communist revolutionary political force—the unified Buddhist Church. We have supported the enemies of the peasants of Saigon. We have corrupted their women and children and killed their men. What liberators!

Now there is little left to build on—save bitterness. Soon the only solid physical foundations remaining will be found at our military bases and in the concrete of the concentration camps we call fortified hamlets. The peasants may well wonder if we plan to build our new Viet Nam on such grounds as these? Could we blame them for such thoughts? We must speak for them and raise the questions they cannot raise. These too are our brothers.

Perhaps the more difficult but no less necessary task is to speak for those who have been designated as our enemies. What of the National Liberation Front—that strangely anonymous group we call VC or Communists? What must they think of us in America when they realize that we permitted the repression and cruelty of Diem which helped to bring them into being as a resistance group in the south? What do they think of our condoning the violence which led to their own taking up of arms? How can they believe in our integrity when now we speak of "aggression from the North" as if there were nothing more essential to the war? How can they trust us when now we charge them with violence after the murderous reign of Diem, and charge them with the violence while we pour every new weapon of death into their land? Surely we must understand their feelings even if we do not condone their actions. Surely we must see that the men we supported pressed them to their violence. Surely we must see that our own computerized plans of destruction simply dwarf their greatest acts.

How do they judge us when our officials know that their membership is less than 25 per cent communist and yet insist on giving them the blanket name? What must they be thinking when they know that we are aware of their control of major sections of Viet Nam and yet we appear ready to allow national elections in which this highly organized political parallel government will have no part? They ask how we can speak of free elections when the Saigon press is censored and controlled by the military junta. And they are surely right to wonder what kind of new government we plan to help form without them—the only party in real touch with the peasants. They question our political goals and they deny the reality of a peace settlement from which they will be excluded. Their questions are frighteningly relevant. Is our nation planning to build on political myth again and then shore it up with the power of new violence?

Here is the true meaning and value of compassion and non-violence when it helps us to see the enemy's point of view, to hear his questions, to know his assessment of ourselves. For from his view we may indeed see the basic weaknesses of our own condition, and if we are mature, we may learn and grow and profit from the wisdom of the brothers who are called the opposition.

So, too, with Hanoi. In the North, where our bombs now pummel the land, and our mines endanger the waterways, we are met by a deep but understandable mistrust. To speak for them is to explain this lack of confidence in western words, and especially their distrust of American intentions now. In Hanoi are the men who led the nation to independence against the Japanese and the French, the men who sought membership in the French commonwealth and were betrayed by the weakness of Paris and the wilfulness of the colonial armies. It was they who led a second struggle against French domination at tremendous costs, and then were persuaded to give up the land they controlled between the 13th and 17th parallel as a temporary measure at Geneva. After 1954 they watched us conspire with Diem to prevent elections which would have surely brought Ho Chi Minh to power over a united Viet Nam, and they realized they had been betrayed again.

When we ask why they do not leap to negotiate these things must be remembered. Also it must be clear that the leaders of Hanoi considered the presence of American troops in support of the Diem regime to have been the initial military breech of the Geneva Agreement concerning foreign troops, and they remind us that they did not begin to send in any large number of supplies or men until American forces had moved into the tens of thousands.

Hanoi remembers how our leaders refused to tell us the truth about the earlier North Vietnamese overtures for peace, how the President claimed that none existed when they had clearly been made. Ho Chi Minh has watched as America has spoken of peace and built up its forces, and now he has surely heard the increasing international rumors of American plans for an invasion of the North. He knows the bombing and shelling and mining we are doing are part of traditional pre-invasion strategy. Perhaps only his sense of humor and of irony can save him when he hears the most powerful nation of the world speaking of aggression as it drops thousands of bombs on a poor weak nation more than 8,000 miles away from its shores.

At this point I should make it clear that while I have tried in these last few minutes to give a voice to the voiceless on Vietnam and to understand the arguments of those who are called enemy, I am as deeply concerned about our own troops there as anything else. For it occurs to me that what we are submitting them to in Vietnam is not simply the brutalizing process that goes on in any war where armies face each other and seek to destroy. We are adding cynicism to the process of death, for they must know after a short period there that none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved. Before long they must know that their government has sent them into a struggle among Vietnamese, and the more sophisticated surely realize that we are on the side of the wealthy and the secure while we create a hell for the poor.

Somehow this madness must cease. We must stop now. I speak as a child of God and brother to the suffering poor of Vietnam. I speak for those whose land is being laid waste, whose homes are being destroyed, whose culture is being subverted. I speak for the poor of America who are paying the double price of smashed hopes at home and death and corruption in Vietnam. I speak as a citizen of the world, for the world as it stands aghast at the path we have taken. I speak as an American to the leaders of my own nation. The great initiative in this war is ours. The initiative to stop it must be ours.

This is the message of the great Buddhist leaders of Vietnam. Recently one of them wrote these words: "Each day the war goes on the hatred increases in the heart of the Vietnamese and in the hearts of those of humanitarian instinct. The Americans are forcing even their friends into becoming their enemies. It is curious that the Americans, who calculate so carefully on the possibilities of military victory, do not realize that in the process they are incurring deep psychological and political defeat. The image of America will never again be the image of revolution, freedom and democracy, but the image of violence and militarism."

If we continue there will be no doubt in my mind and in the mind of the world that we have no honorable intentions in Vietnam. It will become clear that our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony and men will not refrain from thinking that our maximum hope is to goad China into a war so that we may bomb her nuclear installations. If we do not stop our war against the people of Vietnam immediately the world will be left with no other alternative than to see this as some horribly clumsy and deadly game we have decided to play.

The world now demands a maturity of America that we may not be able to achieve. It demands that we admit that we have been wrong from the beginning of our adventure in Vietnam, that we have been detrimental to the life of the Vietnamese people. The situation is one in which we must be ready to turn sharply from our present ways.

In order to atone for our sins and errors in Vietnam, we should take the initiative in bringing a halt to this tragic war. I would like to suggest five concrete things that our government should do immediately to begin the long and difficult process of extricating ourselves from this nightmarish conflict:

1. End all bombing in North and South Vietnam.

2. Declare a unilateral cease-fire in the hope that such action will create the atmosphere for negotiation.

3. Take immediate steps to prevent other battlegrounds in Southeast Asia by curtailing our military build-up in Thailand and our interference in Laos.

4. Realistically accept the fact that the National Liberation Front has substantial support in South Vietnam and must thereby play a role in any meaningful negotiations and in any future Vietnam government.

5. Set a date that we will remove all foreign troops from Vietnam in accordance with the 1954 Geneva Agreement.

Part of our ongoing commitment might well express itself in an offer to grant asylum to any Vietnamese who fears for his life under a new regime which included the Liberation Front. Then we must make what reparations we can for the damage we have done. We must provide the medical aid that is badly needed, making it available in this country if necessary.

Meanwhile we in the churches and synagogues have a continuing task while we urge our government to disengage itself from a disgraceful commitment. We must continue to raise our voices and our lives if our nation persists in its perverse ways in Vietnam. We must be prepared to match actions with words by seeking out every creative means of protest possible.

As we counsel young men concerning military service we must clarify for them our nation's role in Vietnam and challenge them with the alternative of conscientious objection. I am pleased to say that this is the path now being chosen by more than seventy students at my own Alma Mater, Morehouse College, and I recommend it to all who find the American course in Vietnam a dishonourable and unjust one. Moreover I would encourage all ministers of draft age to give up their ministerial exemptions and seek status as conscientious objectors. These are the times for real choices and not false ones. We are at the moment when our lives must be placed on the line if our nation is to survive its own folly. Every man of humane convictions must decide on the protest that best suits his convictions, but we must all protest.

There is something seductively tempting about stopping there and sending us all off on what in some circles has become a popular crusade against the war in Vietnam. I say we must enter that struggle, but I wish to go on now to say something even more disturbing. The war in Vietnam is but a symptom of a far deeper malady within the American spirit, and if we ignore this sobering reality we will find ourselves organizing clergy and laymen-concerned committees for the next generation. They will be concerned about Guatemala and Peru. They will be concerned about Thailand and Cambodia. They will be concerned about Mozambique and South Africa. We will be marching for these and a dozen other names and attending rallies without end unless there is a significant and profound change in American life and policy. Such thoughts take us beyond Vietnam, but not beyond our calling as sons of the living God.

In 1957 a sensitive American official overseas said that it seemed to him that our nation was on the wrong side of a world revolution. During the past 10 years we have seen emerge a pattern of suppression which now has justified the presence of U.S. military "advisors" in Venezuela. This need to maintain social stability for our investments accounts for the counter-revolutionary action of American forces in Guatemala. It tells why American helicopters are being used against guerrillas in Colombia and why American napalm and green beret forces have already been active against rebels in Peru. It is with such activity in mind that the words of the late John F. Kennedy come back to haunt us. Five years ago he said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

Increasingly, by choice or by accident, this is the role our nation has taken—the role of those who make peaceful revolution impossible by refusing to give up the privileges and the pleasures that come from the immense profits of overseas investment.

I am convinced that if we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values. We must rapidly begin the shift from a "thing-oriented" society to a "person-oriented" society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, materialism, and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

A true revolution of value will soon cause us to question the fairness and justice of many of our past and present policies. On the one hand we are called to play the Good Samaritan on life's roadside; but that will be only an initial act. One day we must come to see that the whole Jericho Road must be transformed so that men and women will not be constantly beaten and robbed as they make their journey on Life's highway. True compassion is more than flinging a coin to a beggar; it is not haphazard and superficial. It comes to see that an edifice which produces beggars needs re-structuring. A true revolution of values will soon look uneasily on the glaring contrast of poverty and wealth. With righteous indignation, it will look across the seas and see individual capitalists of the West investing huge sums of money in Asia, Africa and South America, only to take the profits out with no concern for the social betterment of the countries, and say: "This is not just." It will look at our alliance with the landed gentry of Latin America and say: "This is not just." The Western arrogance of feeling that it has everything to teach others and nothing to learn from them is not just. A true revolution of values will lay hands on the world order and say of war: "This way of settling differences is not just." This business of burning human beings with napalm, of filling our nation's homes with orphans and widows, of injecting poisonous drugs of hate into the veins of peoples normally humane, of sending men home from dark and bloody battlefields physically handicapped and psychologically deranged, cannot be reconciled with wisdom, justice, and love. A nation that continues year after year to spend more money on military defense than on programs of social uplift is approaching spiritual death.

America, the richest and most powerful nation in the world, can well lead the way in this revolution of values. There is nothing, except a tragic death wish, to prevent us from re-ordering our priorities, so that the pursuit of peace will take precedence over the pursuit of war. There is nothing to keep us from molding a recalcitrant status-quo with bruised hands until we have fashioned it into a brotherhood.

This kind of positive revolution of values is our best defense against Communism. War is not the answer. Communism will never be defeated by the use of atomic bombs or nuclear weapons. Let us not join those who shout war and through their misguided passions urge the United States to relinquish its participation in the United Nations. These are days which demand wise restraint and calm reasonableness. We must not call everyone a Communist or an appeaser who advocates the seating of Red China in the United Nations and who recognizes that hate and hysteria are not the final answers to the problem of those turbulent days. We must not engage in a negative anti-Communism, but rather in a positive thrust for democracy, realizing that our greatest defense against Communism is to take offensive action in behalf of justice. We must with positive action seek to remove those conditions of poverty, insecurity and injustice which are the fertile soil in which the seed of Communism grows and develops.

These are revolutionary times. All over the globe men are revolting against old systems of exploitation and oppression and out of the wombs of a frail world new systems of justice and equality are being born. The shirtless and barefoot people of the land are rising up as never before. "The people who sat in darkness have seen a great light." We in the West must support these revolutions. It is a sad fact that, because of comfort, complacency, a morbid fear of Communism, and our proneness to adjust to injustice, the Western nations that initiated so much of the revolutionary spirit of the modern world have now become the arch anti-revolutionaries. This has driven many to feel that only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit. Therefore, Communism is a judgment against our failure to make democracy real and follow through on the revolutions that we initiated. Our only hope today lies in our ability to recapture the revolutionary spirit and go out into a sometimes hostile world declaring eternal hostility to poverty, racism, and militarism. With this powerful commitment we shall boldly challenge the status-quo and unjust mores and thereby speed the day when "every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low, and the crooked shall be made straight and the rough places plain."

A genuine revolution of values means in the final analysis that our loyalties must become ecumenical rather than sectional. Every nation must now develop an overriding loyalty to mankind as a whole in order to preserve the best in their individual societies.

This call for a world-wide fellowship that lifts neighborly concern beyond one's tribe, race, class and nation is in reality a call for an all-embracing and unconditional love for all men. This oft misunderstood and misinterpreted concept so readily dismissed by the Nietzches of the world as a weak and cowardly force—has now become an absolute necessity for the survival of man. When I speak of love I am not speaking of some sentimental and weak response. I am speaking of that force which all of the great religions have seen as the supreme unifying principle of life. Love is somehow the key that unlocks the door which leads to ultimate reality. This Hindu-Moslem-Christian-Jewish-Buddhist belief about ultimate reality is beautifully summed up in the first epistle of Saint John:

"Let us love one another; for love is God and everyone that loveth is born of God and knoweth God. He that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love. If we love one another, God dwelleth in us, and his love is perfected in us."

Let us hope that this spirit will become the order of the day. We can no longer afford to worship the God of Hate or bow before the altar of retaliation. The oceans of history are made turbulent by the ever-rising tides of hate. History is cluttered with the wreckage of nations and individuals that pursued this self-defeating path of hate. As Arnold Toynbee says: "Love is the ultimate force that makes for the saving choice of life and good against the damning choice of death and evil. Therefore the first hope in our inventory must be the hope that love is going to have the last word."

We are now faced with the fact that tomorrow is today. We are confronted with the fierce urgency of now. In this unfolding conundrum of life and history there is such a thing as being too late. Procrastination is still the thief of time. Life often leaves us standing bare, naked and dejected with a lost opportunity. The "tide in the affairs of men" does not remain at the flood; it ebbs. We may cry out desperately for time to pause in her passage, but time is deaf to every plea and rushes on. Over the bleached bones and jumbled residue of numerous civilizations are written the pathetic words: "Too late." There is an invisible book of life that faithfully records our vigilance or our neglect. "The moving finger writes, and having written moves on . . . ." We still have a choice today: non-violent co-existence or violent co-annihilation.

We must move past indecision to action. We must find new ways to speak for peace in Vietnam and justice throughout the developing world—a world that borders on our doors. If we do not act we shall surely be dragged down the long dark and shameful corridors of time reserved for those who possess power without compassion, might without morality, and strength without sight.

Now let us begin. Now let us re-dedicate ourselves to the long and bitter—but beautiful—struggle for a new world. This is the calling of the sons of God, and our brothers wait eagerly for our response. Shall we say the odds are too great? Shall we tell them the struggle is too hard? Will our message be that the forces of American life militate against their arrival as full men, and we send our deepest regrets? Or will there be another message, of longing, of hope, of solidarity with their yearnings, of commitment to their cause, whatever the cost? The choice is ours, and though we might prefer it otherwise we *must* choose in this crucial moment of human history.

As that noble bard of yesterday, James Russell Lowell eloquently stated:

ONCE TO EVERY NATION

"Once to every man and nation,
Comes the moment to decide
In the strife of truth and falsehood
For the good or evil side;
Some great cause God's new Messiah
Offering each the gloom or blight
And the choice goes by forever
Twixt that darkness and that light.
"Though the cause of evil prosper
Yet 'tis truth alone is strong
Though her portion be the scaffold
And upon the throne be wrong
Yet that scaffold sways the future
And behind the dim unknown
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above his own."

ANOTHER OPINION—DR. KING'S MORAL STAND

Several months ago I noticed a sign above the desk of a friend who works for the Providence Human Relations Commission. It read:

"If you can keep a cool head in these times, then you just don't understand the situation."

This is as good an answer as I can think of to all the indignant critics, ranging from impassioned civil-rights leaders to pious white racists, who accuse Dr. Martin Luther King of "blowing his cool" because he has spoken out against the war in Vietnam.

Dr. King's critics don't understand the situation. They don't understand Dr. King. They don't understand the civil-rights movement. They don't understand the war in Vietnam. Above all, they fail to perceive the moral thread that ties this man and these causes inescapably together.

Dr. King has been accused of exaggerating when he charged in a speech last April 4 that American firepower in Vietnam may have killed "as many as a million" civilians and when he pointed out a parallel between what Americans are doing in Vietnam today and what the Germans did during World War II.

MINGLING TWO CAUSES

The veteran civil-rights leader is also accused of making a "tactical error" harmful to the movement in trying to mingle two causes which his accusers say "have little in common."

There are elements of truth in these charges. Dr. King apparently took his figures on civilian casualties in Vietnam from a Ramparts magazine article that estimates civilian deaths on the basis of assumptions that are certainly open to question. Dr. King made comparisons between what we are doing now and what Hitler did that could be interpreted by a superficial reader as equating Johnsonian America with Hitler's Germany. The personal involvement of Dr. King, an important symbol of the civil-rights cause, in the anti-Vietnam war movement will certainly mingle the two in the minds of many, to the temporary detriment of the civil-rights cause.

But these are quibbles in terms of the underlying issue. Although Dr. King's estimates of civilian deaths in Vietnam may be exaggerated, there can be no question in the mind of any reasonable person that American forces in Vietnam, no matter how honorable their intentions, are heaping hideous destruction on many thousands of innocent people. Although Americans are not committing the deliberate atrocities that the Nazis committed, our leaders have argued that our ends in Vietnam justify means that are clearly contrary to conscience. We once condemned Hitler for embracing this immoral doctrine.

COMPELLED TO SPEAK OUT

As to the harm Dr. King's unpopular stand on Vietnam may do the civil-rights cause, this is, indeed, tragic. It would have been expedient for Dr. King to keep silent. But Dr. King is not just another Negro fighting for his rights. He is a minister of God, a disciple of the Prince of Peace and of Gandhi. His leadership of the civil-rights movement springs from his moral integrity, not from his skill as a political tactician. As a man of conscience, he is compelled to speak out against the wrong of the Vietnam war just as he has been compelled to stand against the wrong of racial injustice. . . .

Until recently, racial injustice was the central moral issue confronting the conscience of Americans. This issue remains. But it is being overshadowed, and in many ways adversely affected, by the larger moral issue posed by our actions in Vietnam.

There are many for whom it would be expedient not to speak out against the Vietnam war. Politicians, businessmen, teachers, clergymen, editors—all might argue that they have other important tasks that would be compromised if they embraced this unpopular cause. This is no excuse for silence.

Explaining his own strong stand on the Vietnam issue in a recent issue of the Yale Alumni Magazine, Yale Chaplain William Sloane Coffin Jr. wrote:

"If there is such a thing as a just war, then there is such a thing as an unjust war; and whether just or unjust is finally a matter of individual conscience, for no man can properly surrender his conscience to the State. Our Puritan fathers came to these shores because they were committed to this principle. At the Nuremberg trials we faulted an entire nation for not accepting it.

"Now let us suppose that a man has conscientiously done his homework on the war in Vietnam, and that his homework has led him to the following conclusions: that while it is true that we are fighting Communists, it is more profound to say that we have been intervening in another country's civil war; that despite the billions of dollars of aid, the heroic labor and blood of many Americans, the Saigon Government from Diem to Ky has been unable to talk convincingly to its people of national independence, land reform and other forms of social justice; that the war is being waged in a fashion so out of character with American instincts of decency that it is seriously undermining them (which is not to say that the V.C.'s are Boy Scouts, which they clearly are not); that the strains of the war have cut the funds that might otherwise be applied to antipoverty efforts at home and abroad (which is the intelligent way to fight Communism); and finally, that the war would have a good chance of being negotiated to an end were we to stop bombing in North Vietnam.

"If a man's homework leads him to these conclusions, then surely it is not his patriotic duty to cheer or stand silent as good Americans die bravely in a bad cause. . . ."

Like Mr. Coffin, like Rhode Island's Rev. Albert Q. Perry and a growing number of other religious leaders here and elsewhere, Dr. King has answered the call of a higher power. He has put his body on the line.

SUNDAY'S OBSERVANCE OF EASTER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday last in Washington, in Chicago, in New York, throughout the Nation, Americans of Greek blood or descent and other members of Eastern Orthodox churches celebrated Easter as had earlier generations in Greece with singing, dancing, wining, and feasting. There were scenes reminiscent of celebrations in Greek villages with whole lambs roasting on spits over outdoor fires.

The observances of the Greek Orthodox Easter started on Saturday night and will continue throughout Easter week. It is a season of joyous reunion of friends and families. Since the Orthodox Lent began on Clean Monday, March 12, a strict fast had been observed, with all animal and dairy products omitted from the menu. Hence the meal on Easter was truly a feast.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate on this occasion of the Greek Easter week to recall here on the floor of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States how much we and our country are indebted not only to the Greeks of ancient Greece, the birth country of democracy, but as well to the sons and daughters of modern Greece who have been a vibrant part of our American citizenry and in this day and in our land of America have kept as it was done in earlier days the faith with democracy.

I am extending my remarks to include interesting excerpts from an article by Dorothy P. Jones in the Washington Sunday Star magazine of April 22, 1962:

A favorite of the Russians is cheesecake, and the Ukrainians make paska, an Easter bread baked with cheese. The Greeks bake little cheese tarts called tyropeta, and kouloura, bread with a red egg in the center.

When I asked a Greek woman why their eggs are dyed red, she said: "That is a story I remember from childhood. Mary Magdalene was carrying a basket of eggs which turned red at the time of the Crucifixion."

The red eggs are used in a cracking ceremony at the beginning of the Easter meal. The family members tap their eggs together, trying to crack one another's while keeping their own unbroken.

Easter eggs are universal but varied in appearance. The Ukrainians make designs in wax on their eggs before dying them. The designs are characteristic of different regions and look like copies of Ukrainian embroidery.

Local Orthodox congregations—Greek, Russian, Ukrainian, Syrian, Serbian and Carpatho-Russian—are united in acceptance of the doctrine of the ancient church. Their religious observances during the Holy Week will be similar, but will be conducted in different liturgical languages.

The interior of an Orthodox church is different from a Roman Catholic or Protestant church. The altar stands behind a partition called the Iconostasis which has double doors at the center called the Royal Gates.

There is no statuary in their churches, it being too strong a reminder of old pagan idols. Instead, there are flat pictures called icons.

Explaining the icons of Sts. Constantine and Helen Greek Orthodox Church, Father Demetrios G. Kalaris told me: "Icons are meant to render visibly the mysteries of the supernatural world. They do not mean to depict life as it is, but rather are a mystical representation of life as it is in eternity."

The sacred drama of the Orthodox ritual is particularly pronounced in some of the Holy Week services and the Resurrection celebration. Because their church day begins at sundown, some of the evening services commemorate events associated with the next day.

The Reenactment of the Crucifixion will be held in every Orthodox church next Thursday evening. Following the gospel lessons telling of the Lord's Passion, a large crucifix with the icon of Christ will be placed in the center of the church. It will remain there until Friday afternoon when, in the service of the Unnailing of Christ from the Cross, the body, or icon, is removed, wrapped in a white shroud, and placed upon the altar.

Women of the church will adorn the bier, called the Epitaphios, with flowers in preparation for the Service of Lamentations Friday evening. By candlelight, the worshippers will join in procession around the church, kiss the Epitaphios, and pass under it to receive its Divine Grace. The flowers will be distributed among the congregation as sacred talismans.

The Russian Orthodox will begin their Easter Eve midnight service with a procession around the outside of the church. At midnight, the doors of the church will open as the priest proclaims, "Christos Voskrese" (Slavonic for Christ has Risen).

The Greek churches will be darkened before midnight Easter Eve, symbolic of the darkness of the tomb. At midnight the Royal Gates of the Iconostasis will open as the priest comes out to announce, "Christos Anesti" (Greek for Christ has Risen). From the priest's candles light is passed to the candles of the congregation, and each worshipper will attempt to keep his candle burning until reaching home.

Midst the merriment of Sunday's festivities, the people will return to church in the afternoon for the vesper Service of Love. The spirit of love, engendered by their faith, is kindled to a moving climax during the Easter celebrations. There rejoicing for the spread of Christianity throughout the world, and the sharing of God's love among people everywhere, is emphasized in this service when the gospel is read in many languages.

At the close of the service they openly express their joyfulness in sharing God's love when they exchange with other parishioners "the kiss of the Resurrection."

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN BAILEY ATTACKS GOP FOR PLAYING POLITICS WITH EDUCATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, the American tradition is clear on a major point—education and politics do not mix, and that is the way the American people prefer it.

Yet, today, Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, as we know it, is in danger of being destroyed. Therefore, we welcome the opinions, strong as they may be, of political leaders throughout the United States. We are fighting to save a crucial institution which was established only after years of educational neglect and deprivation for too many of our citizens.

The chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the Honorable John Bailey, of Connecticut, on April 25, issued, to my mind, one of the clearest critiques of current efforts to gut Federal aid to public and private elementary and secondary schools. His thoughts bear repeating, especially because he laments the intrusion of partisan politics into an area which has traditionally been nonpolitical.

Mr. Bailey's remarks are highly relevant because he calls Republican efforts by their true name—the "last great stand against educational progress in America."

I include his remarks in the Record at this point:

Text of Chairman Bailey's Statement

We are today witnessing the Republican Party's last great stand against educational progress in America.

For political reasons—and for political reasons alone—the Republican policy makers—by supporting H.R. 8983—have decided to destroy the basic purpose of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; frustrate its intent; confuse its immensely successful programs; and deprive the American people—and their children—of the massive educational benefits of one of the most far-reaching educational opportunity programs in history.

Speaking as a political leader, I must express my deep sorrow and profound regret that Republican politics has intruded itself into an area which is traditionally above politics—education. Our children will be the losers.

The Republicans call their recent efforts an "amendment" to the existing Federal aid to education program. But it is not an amendment at all. It is a very shrewd but blatant and cynical attempt to dismantle the entire Federal aid to education program. It is an attempt to capture votes by using the phony charge of Federal control of education.

What was the intent of the Congress when it passed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and when President Johnson, in a proud moment, signed it into law?

The basic thrust of the Act is "to provide financial assistance . . . to local education agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs . . . which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

Let there be no doubt in anybody's mind that the Republicans are out to kill that section of the Act. Let there be no illusions that there are guarantees in the Republican proposals under which accepted national policy on aid to the educationally deprived will be carried out. The Republicans would have us forget that one of the major reasons why there is an aid to elementary and secondary education program today, is that the nation decided, as a matter of policy, that it had a duty to alleviate poverty, and more specifically, to reduce the terrible educational consequences which poverty breeds. This, the Republicans policy makers would reverse, even though they use polite, catchy phrases to hide their true intent.

The Republican proposal would undo the successes of the first year's operation of Federal aid to local education. Under Title I of the Act, more than eight million children in more than 1,700 school districts across the nation have enjoyed the benefits of Federal aid. They received those benefits in programs ranging from educational television to remedial reading, from summer science courses to hot lunches.

The Republicans would tear asunder the first real Federal, State and local consensus on educational goals in our history. This consensus has already produced unprecedented educational innovation in many towns and cities.

The Republican proposals would undo the spirit of cooperation on educational goals fostered by Federal support for joint public and private use of educational materials and facilities.

The Republicans advertise their proposals as beneficial to the states. On fact and philosophy they are wrong. The Republican amendments would reduce Federal funds to many states, in spite of statements to the contrary. Both New York and Mississippi, to name only two, would receive millions of dollars *less* in Federal aid than they receive under existing law. Other states would also receive body-blow reductions in Federal aid if the Republican bill is successful—and many of them would be those least able to afford it. Virtually every major city in the country would lose funds. Contrary to the impressions fostered by the Republican proposals, there is absolutely no guarantee that school districts with low financial capacity would be given the priority they are given today. This would mark a blunt and unfeeling end to the national priority which the Congress has established—to meet the special needs of children in our midst who had been deprived of equal educational opportunity simply because they are poor or because their towns or cities are poor.

The Republican education measure is economic discrimination at its worst.

Are the states rushing to join the Republicans in their efforts to kill Federal aid to elementary and secondary education? The answer is, no! The states are describing President Johnson's program as an educational revolution and clearly want it to continue.

Are the professional educational organizations joining the thin ranks of Republican diehards to return aid to education philosophy to a bygone era? The answer is, no!

Are the private schools in the United States in favor of the Quie amendments? The answer is, no! The existing Act has already yielded significant benefits to both private and public education.

The technical problems which Representative Quie seems obsessed with are being overcome. Educational innovation and change will test our capacity to perfect our programs. States and localities and the Federal Government are cooperating to achieve a great national purpose. Let us not abandon what is one of the most significant educational programs in American history.

I urge all educators, all educational leaders, all civic and nonpartisan groups throughout the nation to speak loudly and clearly against current Republican efforts to kill Federal aid to education as we now know it. This is a fight I know all Americans will join.

TARIFF ON GLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, on January 12 of this year the President, on the advice from the Tariff Commission, canceled all of the escape clause tariff increases on flat glass except for a few categories of sheet glass. President Kennedy had put the tariff increases into effect in March 1962.

The President has canceled out other escape clause tariff increases, so that all of the actions taken to protect domestic industries and their employees from the destructive effect of excessive imports have now been removed except for two—typewriter ribbon cloth and Wilton and velvet carpets. The Tariff Commission is currently investigating the effect of canceling these, and under the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 these tariff increases will automatically expire in October of this year unless the President takes the initiative of continuing their life.

Mr. Speaker, the General Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor is engaged in an extensive investigation into the impact of imports on employment in the United States. The subcommittee held hearings during the last session of Congress and has spent many days in hearings during the current session. Our subcommittee has heard witnesses from more industries and more labor organizations describing the current impact of imports on jobs in America than any other committee of the Congress.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I believe I am in a position therefore to speak with some authority on the implications of the Nation's full employment policy of the recent actions of the President in canceling escape clause tariff adjustments including, specifically, those on flat glass.

The flat glass tariff adjustments are of great importance to residents of my district. I have devoted countless hours to the matter of securing relief from excessive imports for the workers in the flat glass industry. I personally discussed the case on many occasions with President Kennedy and his advisers when the matter was initially under study. I have also attempted to inform the administration and its advisers of the importance of this matter to the people of my district and to the Nation, but without favorable results.

When the President's action canceling the tariff adjustments on flat glass was announced, I was tempted to take the floor of the House and protest his action because of my knowledge that conditions in the flat glass industry have not so improved as to warrant the lowering of the tariff. I refrained from doing so, however, and set about to renew my own investigation of the situation to be certain that I was up to date on the latest developments affecting employment in the flat glass industry.

I felt it especially important to do this, in view of the fact that the action in canceling the flat-glass tariffs was based upon a Tariff Commission report completed in June of 1965. It was my belief that it was possible that the conditions presented in that report had materially changed since its preparation, and that later occurring events detrimental to employment in the industry might not have been presented fully to the President.

Mr. Speaker, for all of these reasons I have studied the economic data of the flat-glass industry carefully, including foreign trade data, through calendar year 1966—two full calendar years beyond the date at which the information in the Tariff Commission's report to the President stopped. I have also conferred with officials of the labor unions representing the workers in this industry, and with representatives of the companies involved in the domestic production of flat glass. Here, then, is a report of my findings.

EMPLOYMENT

From its high point of 36,500 workers in 1957, the flat-glass industry's employment declined to 29,900 workers in 1961, the last full year prior to the action of President Kennedy in making a partial withdrawal of the tariff concessions on sheet glass in 1962. With the help provided by the stabilizing effect of the tariff adjustment on the flat-glass market, U.S. employment in the industry rose slowly to 32,800 workers in the calendar year 1966—a 9.7-percent increase. By contrast, employment in all manufacturing industries rose at nearly twice this rate—16.8 percent between 1961 and 1966.

Mr. Speaker, the improvement in employment in the flat-glass industry, while encouraging, still left that industry far off the pace of the rest of U.S. manufacturing industry in generating jobs for the growing work force in America.

The high point in the flat-glass industry's employment was reached in November 1965 at 33,700 employees. Then a gradual decline in employment set in, reaching its low in February 1967 at 32,200 workers—a net loss of 1,500 jobs from the peak employment in November 1965. This clearly is a development not reflected in the Tariff Commission's report to the President in June 1965.

PRODUCTIVITY

The flat glass industry and its workers made impressive strides in productivity during this period. In 1961, the last full calendar year preceding the tariff adjustment, the Federal Reserve Board's Index of Production in the "flat and other glass" industry stood at 104.2 based on an index in which the average of 1957–59 equals 100. This production index rose steadily, and for the calendar year 1966, averaged 167.2. Thus, production increased by 60 percent during the 1961–66 period, in comparison with a 10-percent increase in employment.

This sharp increase in productivity gives the lie to those who attempt to justify the President's action on the ground that the industry's problem is one of efficiency in comparison with its foreign competitors. The increased output was brought about, *in part at least,* by the investment in new plants and equipment made by the industry since the time of the tariff adjustment, encouraged by the stabilizing effect of that tariff adjustment on imports.

In June 1965 when the Tariff Commission's report was issued, the Federal Reserve Board's Index of Industrial Production in the flat glass industry stood at 147.5. By December 1966, this had risen to 172.6, a 17-percent increase. Thus, joint and determined efforts of the industry and its workers to increase productivity and to be as competitive as possible with foreign-produced flat glass have continued from June 1965 to date.

The success achieved in these efforts, however, in view of the failure of the domestic flat glass market to grow sufficiently to absorb the increased output of the domestic industry and the increased imports has been erased by the loss of employment to which I have previously referred. This situation has been made more distressing by the depression created in the industries supplying material for the construction of new houses as a result of the impact of the monetary policies on new housing starts. These well-known facts are referred to in the recently published annual report of the Federal Reserve System covering operations for the year 1966. The report states that:

> In contrast to expansion in most other sectors, residential construction activity declined sharply. Nonfarm housing starts, which had shown an irregular downtrend during the previous 2 years, dropped to unusually low levels after midyear and in the fourth quarter were at a seasonally adjusted annual rate of less than 1 million units.

The number of new housing starts in 1966 was the lowest since 1957. As the report indicates:

> The steepness of the drop in housing starts reflected for the most part the restrictive conditions that developed in the mortgage market toward the end of 1965 and the further tightening during most of 1966.

Consider the position of the flat glass industry in the light of these developments. The Federal Government's monetary policy severely damaged the principal market which generates demands for sheet glass. Energetic efforts to increase productivity to become more competitive with imports eliminated jobs as declining demand and a sluggish market failed to provide an outlet for the industry's increased production capabilities. Inrushing imports compounded the felony by further disruption of the domestic market. At this moment of time, the administration cancels President Kennedy's escape clause tariff adjustment, opening wide this distressed American market for flat glass to the surplus production capabilities of the European and Japanese producers.

Mr. Speaker, the distress in the housing industry caused by the monetary policy is another development which took place after the Tariff Commission's report to the President in June of 1965.

PRICES

The excessive import pressures which preceded the tariff adjustment in 1962 contributed to a steady decline in wholesale prices through 1962. From the average of 1957–59 as 100, the wholesale price index for flat glass declined to 97 in 1962. The index returned to 100 in September 1963, under the market-stabilizing force of the tariff adjustment. Thereafter it remained virtually unchanged until September 1966 when the wholesale price index for flat glass stood at 100.6.

During this period, from September 1963 to September 1966, the average hourly earnings of production workers in the flat-glass industry increased 3.8 percent, from $3.40 to $3.53. This modest increase reflects long-continued forbearance on the part of workers in the flat-glass industry to assist the industry during the difficult period of rebuilding a position in markets stabilized by President Kennedy's escape clause tariff adjustment.

In the last quarter of 1966, however, events, including the cost of inflation to workers, forced a sharp upward movement in the average hourly earnings of the workers in the flat-glass industry. In November 1966 they reached $3.68—a 4.2-percent increase in the space of a few months. Prices followed the upward movement of average hourly earnings. By November 1966, the wholesale price index moved to 103.3, where it has remained ever since.

With employment down, average hourly earnings of production workers up, and prices adjusted to meet the added wage costs, the industry is in an especially awkward position for the alteration in the ground rules of competition, and the additional margin of price advantage, which the rescission of the escape clause tariff adjustment creates for the benefit of foreign producers.

Mr. Speaker, the wage and price increases which I have referred to are also a development which has occurred since the June 1965 date of the Tariff Commission's report to the President.

EARNINGS

In 1965 the flat-glass industry's "gross earnings," before taxes and before payment of indirect costs, such as depreciation, interest charges, rents, royalties, and other indirect costs, were equal to 31.6 percent of the value of shipments. In 1961, the last full year before the tariff adjustment, when sharply rising imports were adversely affecting the domestic market for flat glass, the industry's gross earnings were equivalent to 22 percent of the value of shipments. There is little doubt that the economic state of the industry improved considerably during the period 1961–65 with the benefit of the more stable market conditions which the tariff adjustment helped to bring about.

The consumer did not suffer, as until the very recent wage and price increases, the wholesale price index remained virtually unchanged. As we have seen jobs increased, wages were higher, and the industry's earnings improved under the beneficial and more stable market conditions created by the tariff adjustment. A more salutary result of a tariff adjustment could not be asked. But the achievement of these conditions is not the signal to bring back the chaotic market conditions which characterized the era of excessive imports, prior to the tariff adjustment in 1962.

Furthermore, the results which the industry can reasonably expect to achieve in 1967 are not expected to be as good as 1965 because of the impact which the tight money market and the administration's monetary policies have created in *the housing industry, as I have previously* explained. To quote the Department of Commerce in its recent publication U.S. Industry Outlook in 1967:

> Credit stringencies which in 1966 were mainly responsible for the sharp drop in new private housing starts are also likely to have a somewhat delayed effect in 1967 on State and locally owned construction. Private nonresidential building construction will also be affected, since it, too, is somewhat dependent upon raising funds in the money market.

In other words, conditions created by domestic governmental policies and the effort to damp down the inflationary effects of the Vietnam affair are causing distress for the flat-glass industry and its workers in common with other basic industries, the pace of whose activity is sensitive to credit restraints. Therefore, this is a most inopportune time for the Government to precipitate still other forms of economic distress by rescinding the tariff adjustment on flat glass.

FOREIGN TRADE IN FLAT GLASS

Mr. Speaker, it is often assumed and widely proclaimed by free trade advocates that the effect of a selective tariff adjustment through our escape clause procedure is to harm the foreign trade of the United States. Commentators in the press oftentimes refer to tariff increases as though they were an absolute embargo on continued importation of the goods subject to the tariff increase. The Members of this body who have looked into import problems on behalf of their constituents know that this is not so.

Certainly in the case of sheet glass and other flat glass, the tariff adjustment authorized by President Kennedy in 1962 has not had an unduly restrictive effect on imports into the United States. Rather, it has served to stabilize imports at the high volume which they achieved in 1962, the year of the tariff adjustment. Let me illustrate this by a few statistics.

In 1961, the last full calendar year before the tariff adjustment, U.S. imports for consumption of sheet glass were equivalent to 375 million pounds, valued at $27 million. In 1966, under the higher tariffs made possible by the 1962 adjustment, U.S. imports for consumption of sheet glass rose to 465 million pounds, valued at $29 million. The quantity imported was considerably higher than in any of the years 1961, 1963, or 1965, though slightly lower than the quantity imported in 1962 and 1964. The principal source of these imports was the EEC and EFTA countries of Europe, and Japan. About 11 percent of the imports in 1966 originated behind the Iron Curtain.

The significance of these statistics is that the tariff adjustment has not effected any real reduction in the volume or value of imports from the levels achieved prior to the tariff increase.

When we look at the import data for all flat glass, we find that 1966 was the best of recent years. Thus, in 1964 the *total dollar value of flat glass imports* from all countries was $55.6 million and this increased in 1966 to $60.2 million.

Because of the differing classification systems used for imports and exports in the United States, and the somewhat different coverage of our foreign trade *classifications from the classifications* used by other countries, it is rather difficult to get a precise view of the position of the U.S. flat glass industry in world trade.

Making allowances for these differences, it appears to me that, in terms of the classification description used in the United Nations foreign trade statistics, the United States in 1965, the latest year for which full data are available, imported about $40 million worth of flat glass as defined in those statistics while exporting about $19 million worth.

If this analysis is correct, it would appear that we have a significant deficit in our balance of trade in flat glass. Furthermore, it seems that our $19 million of exports represent only 13 percent of the exports of flat glass by the principal producing countries. The EEC countries, for whose benefit principally the President acted to rescind the 1962 tariff adjustment, supplied about 74 percent of total world exports of flat glass in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, the Congress has constitutional responsibilities for the regulation of foreign and domestic commerce. The President has responsibilities in the area of foreign affairs to establish and maintain good relations with other nations, but he also has continuing responsibilities for the general welfare of the American people. It seems to me that the two branches of Government, in the discharge of these responsibilities, must attempt to achieve a form of justice to both foreign and domestic interests. On the one hand, we should provide access to the American market for foreign producers in the interest of our foreign affairs and of U.S. consumers; in doing so, however, we also have the duty to moderate our judgments to the extent that our own people can continue to have reasonable access to the American market. The extent to which our people in their production efforts are limited in their access to foreign markets should moderate the degree of access which we afford other countries.

Now the application of these sensible principles to the flat glass situation certainly requires that we take into account the very minor share which the U.S. flat glass industry has in world trade in flat glass. It also requires that we take note of the fact that the tariff adjustment of 1962 has served both to permit the maintenance of a strong foreign position in the U.S. market and a gradual increase in the volume of foreign-produced flat glass imported into the United States.

Whereas we have limited access to the markets of other countries, they have major access to the U.S. market under conditions brought about by the tariff adjustment which tend to create stability in the U.S. market for the benefit of both the U.S. industry and the foreign producers who are sharing that market.

Justice to the American people also requires that we take note of the fact that *forces* are at work within the American economy which are producing a loss of employment in the U.S. flat glass industry which will be compounded by an inrush of increased imports stimulated by the administration's action in rescinding President Kennedy's tariff adjust*ment on flat glass.*

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the administration's action in rescinding the tariff adjustment on flat glass was inadequately or improperly evaluated by the President's advisers. I see this case as an example of a callousness on the part of the Federal Government to the legitimate interest and needs of American workers and businessmen. I see it as an unnecessary and gratuitous extension of the already considerable trade benefits enjoyed by foreign countries in their access to the U.S. market.

I regret the Government's action and can only conclude that in our compassion for the American workingman and the strength of the American economy we acted upon an insufficient or improper evaluation of the situation by our advisers.

To the Members of this body I commend the flat glass case as an example of the maladministration of the adjustment provisions of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. It is evidence of a type of abuse which we must be certain to remedy in any new trade legislation taken up by the Congress in the future.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Collier (at the request of Mr. Arends) for the balance of the week, on account of illness in his family.

Mr. Gardner (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for May 1 and 2, 1967, on account of the death of his mother.

Mr. Corman, for May 3 and 4, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Goodell (at the request of Mr. Biester), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Dent (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Roybal.

Mr. Teague of Texas.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Biester) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Zwach.

Mr. Erlenborn.

Mr. Mathias of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pucinski.

Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Garmatz.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's *table and, under the rule, referred as* follows:

S. 423. An act authorizing the use of additional funds to defray certain increased costs associated with the construction of the small-boat harbor at Manele Bay, Lanai, Hawaii, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 823. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reinstate oil and gas lease Las Cruces 063610; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1649. An act authorizing the change in name of certain water resource projects under jurisdiction of the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Public Works.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 8363. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section

10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1039. An act to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, May 3, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

714. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the Annual Report of the Comptroller of the Currency, for the year 1965, pursuant to the provisions of section 333 of the United States Revised Statutes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

715. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of pricing methods used by the various States in the purchase of prescribed drugs under federally aided public assistance programs, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

716. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of the acquisition and installation of computers by the U.S. Army, Pacific, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

717. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of the persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

718. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a list of persons involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FISHER: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2082. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize travel, transportation, and education allowances to certain members of the uniformed services for dependents' schooling, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. RIVERS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 9240. A bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MATSUNAGA: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 460. Resolution for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 263, joint resolution relating to the establishment of 1967 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 461. Resolution for consideration of S. 1216. An act to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1967 for use by the Secretary of Defense for acquisition of properties pursuant to section 1013 of Public Law 89–754, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 9530. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 9531. A bill to provide for the establishment and administration of a segment of the Great Prairie Parkway in the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9532. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9533. A bill to provide a program for dairy farmers under which production adjustment payment shall be made to such farmers who voluntarily adjust their marketing of milk and butterfat; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 9534. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 9535. A bill to provide that Flag Day shall be a legal public holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9536. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes by increasing the amount of the payments which may be made by the Veterans' Administration for the care of certain veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9537. A bill to amend chapter 113 of title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the transportation, use, sale, or receipt, for unlawful purposes, of credit cards in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9538. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9539. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to provide pension increases for veterans of World War I, World War II, and the Korean conflict, for widows of such veterans, and for the children of such veterans who are deceased; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9540. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9541. A bill to provide for computation of disability retirement pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 9542. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9543. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to increase the amount of assistance to such academies and to provide a minimum subsistence payable per student; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.R. 9544. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9545. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the detail of Federal employees to States and political subdivisions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9546. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PATMAN (for himself, Mr. Multer, Mr. Barrett, Mrs. Sullivan, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Ashley, Mr. Moorhead, Mr. Stephens, Mr. St Germain, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Minish, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Annunzio, Mr. Rees, Mr. Bingham, and Mr. Kyros):

H.R. 9547. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act in authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 9548. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 9549. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9550. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act to give to employers and performers in the performing arts the same rights given by section 8(f) of such act to employers and employees in the construction industry; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 9551. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ULLMAN:

H.R. 9552. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 9553. A bill to determine the rights and interest of the Navajo Tribe and the Ute Mountain Tribe of the Ute Mountain Reservation in and to certain lands in the State of New Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9554. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 9555. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9556. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 9557. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make it clear that the income tax exemption for interest on State and local obligations does not extend to obligations issued by a private corporation, regardless of their nature or purpose or any approval given or other action taken with respect to them by a State or municipality; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYMAN:

H.R. 9558. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes by increasing the amount of the payments which may be made by the Veterans' Administration for the care of certain veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 9559. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9560. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 9561. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act requiring contracts for the construction, alteration, and repair of any public building or public work of the United States to be accompanied by a performance bond protecting the United States and by an additional bond for the protection of persons furnishing material and labor for the construction, alteration, or repair of said public buildings or public work," approved August 24, 1935 (49 Stat. 793); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 9562. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 9563. A bill to extend for 1 year the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to dairy farmers who are directed to remove their milk from commercial markets because it contains residues of chemicals registered and approved for use by the Federal Government; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.J. Res. 548. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD (for himself and Mr. SCHWENGEL):

H.J. Res. 549. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 550. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the 13th day of September as Commodore John Barry Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.J. Res. 551. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

169. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, relative to the establishment of a permanent national cemetery system; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

170. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to proposed construction of Teton Basin Lower Teton division, Idaho; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

171. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the great disparity between the prices paid to the farmer and the prices paid by the consumer for agricultural products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

172. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota, relative to opposition to increasing the tariff or tolls on the St. Lawrence Seaway; to the Committee on Public Works.

173. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, relative to the Noosack Indians; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

174. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relative to cooperation with State officials on State laws regulating the grain shipping industry; to the Committee on Agriculture.

175. By Mr. PEPPER: Memorial of the Florida State Senate, relative to the distribution of excise tax collections on alcoholic beverages and tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 9564. A bill for the relief of Florentino R. Murillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 9565. A bill for the relief of Kwang Baick Kim and his wife, Jung Ryo Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWNING:

H.R. 9566. A bill for the relief of Francis M. Rogallo and Gertrude S. Rogallo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9567. A bill for the relief of Noel S. Marston; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

H.R. 9568. A bill for the relief of Lucien A. Murzyn; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 9569. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to convey certain land in Leavenworth County, Kans., and to accept other land in exchange therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9570. A bill for the relief of Domenicantonio R. Rotiroti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9571. A bill for the relief of Miss Corazon Chu Cea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9572. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Chen Yuan Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9573. A bill for the relief of Gustavo L. Iraola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHALEN:

H.R. 9574. A bill for the relief of Joseph J. Wojcik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 2, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. ROBERT C. BYRD, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou God of our salvation, to Thee we lift our hearts in prayer, bringing nothing but our need and the adoration of our contrite spirits. From Thy hands we have received the gift of life, the blessings of home and of friendship, and the sacrament of beauty. In the fullness of Thy mercy Thou hast given us work to do and the strength wherewith to do it.

In the vast difficulties confronting the makers of peace in these days so full of tension, restore and strengthen and sustain our souls and lead us in the paths of righteousness: for Thy name's sake.

So distill upon us the dews of quietness and confidence that in simple trust and deeper reverence we may be found steadfast and abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that in Him, and for Him, and with Him, our labor is not in vain.

So send us forth with serenity and calm to meet an agitated world with an unruffled tranquillity which is strength and an inner candor which is the courage of the soul. Hearing and heeding the voice divine, may our compassion help to heal the open sores of the world as we serve the present age, our calling to fulfill.

We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. Robert C. Byrd, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 1, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States, submitting nominations, were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (H.J. Res. 543) to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees, and it was signed by the Vice President.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 191 and 192.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR STATE OF WASHINGTON TO USE INCOME FROM CERTAIN LANDS FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES FOR SCHOOLS AND OTHER PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 617) to authorize the State of Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for schools and other public institutions which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

> That the second sentence of the fourth paragraph of section 11 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the division of Dakota into two States and to enable the people of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to form constitutions and State governments and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States, and to make donations of public lands to such States", approved February 22, 1889 (25 Stat. 676), as amended, is amended to read as follows: "Rentals on leased land, proceeds from the sale of timber and other crops, interest on deferred payments on land sold, interest on funds arising from these lands, and all other actual income, shall be available for the acquisition and construction of facilities, including the retirement of bonds authorized by law for such purposes, and for the maintenance and support of such schools and institutions."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, although the bill has been passed——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was passed be reconsidered.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Although the bill had been passed, I should like to know where the money is coming from. It says "certain lands." Are they Federal lands? As the Senator from Montana knows, I am seeking to find out if this bill——

Mr. MANSFIELD. It does not involve the Morse formula.

Mr. MORSE. That is all I am interested in.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We watch those very carefully, I wish to assure the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. At the same time, I have to make my record.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill (S. 617) was passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "A bill to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 198), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill, S. 617, as amended, would amend the land grant provisions of the enabling act of 1889 (25 Stat. 676) which granted statehood to Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington. Section 11 of the act now states that the revenues from granted lands are available for the "maintenance and support" of public schools and the various State institutions for which the lands have been granted.

This bill, S. 617, makes it clear that timber receipts are expressly covered and that all income from these lands may be used for the acquisition and construction of facilities (including the retirement of bonds authorized by State law for such purposes) for those State schools and institutions which are beneficiaries of enabling act land grants.

NEED

Uncertainty about the interpretation of the provisions regarding expendable revenues arising from public lands has prevented the State of Washington from implementing a 1966 amendment to the Washington State constitution intended to make these revenues available for school construction purposes as well as for current operating expenses.

Amendment 43 to the Washington constitution approved by Washington voters on November 8, 1966, creates a trust fund under the Washington constitution to be known as the common school construction fund. All moneys deposited in the fund are to be used for the purpose of financing the construction of common school facilities. It is the intention of the State to deposit in this fund all expendable revenue derived by it from those lands granted to it by Congress under the State's enabling act for support of its common schools.

While it may be possible for a court to interpret the present language of the enabling act to cover the legal problems raised in the State of Washington, it is important for the State of Washington to limit the possibility of a court test of the 1966 constitutional amendment—because bonds to finance school construction must be sold to the general public, and the price which the public is willing to pay for these bonds will reflect the possibility of a lawsuit.

AMENDMENT

While S. 617 is primarily directed at the Washington State problem, the committee approved an amendment to broaden the bill to apply to the other three States, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana, covered by the enabling act. Senators and appropriate officials of the other three States support this amendment.

SAN RAFAEL WILDERNESS, LOS PADRES NATIONAL FOREST

The bill (S. 889) to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 889

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with subsection 3(b) of the Wilderness Act of September 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 891), the area classified as the San Rafael Primitive Area, with the proposed additions thereto, as generally depicted on a map entitled "San Rafael Wilderness—Proposed," dated October 3, 1966, which is on file and available for public inspection in the office of the Chief, Forest Service, Department of Agriculture, is hereby designated as the San Rafael Wilderness within and as a part of Los Padres National Forest, comprising an area of approximately 143,000 acres.

Sec. 2. As soon as practicable after this Act takes effect, the Secretary of Agriculture shall file a map and a legal description of the San Rafael Wilderness with the Interior and Insular Affairs Committees of the United States Senate and the House of Representatives and such description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act: *Provided, however,* That correction of clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map may be made.

Sec. 3. The San Rafael Wilderness shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act governing areas designated by that Act as wilderness areas, except that any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act shall be deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 199), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

On September 3, 1964, the President signed a bill which created the National Wilderness Preservation System. This act (78 Stat. 891) incorporated 54 national forest areas into the system—preserving more than 9 million acres of pristine beauty.

The act provided that the President should make recommendation for additional areas. This—the San Rafael Wilderness—is the first to be recommended. President Johnson, in his letter of transmittal to the Congress February 1, 1967, said that "in the coming months" he would make further recommendations to the Congress for the inclusion of additional areas in the system.

The proposed San Rafael Wilderness, which is part of the Los Padres National Forest, is located in the San Rafael and Sierra Madre Mountain Ranges in southeastern Santa Barbara County, Calif. It would embrace approximately 143,000 acres of a wooded, brushy, and mountainous terrain and offer a wide variety of creation, including camping, riding, hiking, fishing, and nature study. The area is about 10 miles wide and about 21 miles long. Secondary roads from U.S. Highway 399 and U.S. Highway 101 lead to the boundaries of the proposed wilderness.

NEED

Six million people reside within a 2-hour drive of the proposed wilderness. The area will afford them a unique recreational experience. During the summer and fall it is hot and dry and usually closed to public entry to prevent disastrous fires. But during the late winter and spring, visitors can fish the Manzana and Sisquoc Rivers, photograph a profusion of wild flowers, explore Indian caves that still display ancient, mysterious pictographs; study such unusual geological formations as Hurricane Deck, a formation of perpendicular rocks rising above the surrounding terrain in massive disarray, with a trail along the top, or catch a glimpse of the rare California condor. These giant birds, said to number not more than 40, nest nearby, but also roost and rest in the proposed wilderness area. Deer, bear, mountain lion, raccoon, possum, fox, badger, coyote, bobcat, and many other animals make their homes here. An extensive list of game and other birds, and small mammals, is native to the proposed wilderness.

No storage reservoirs exist or are planned within the proposed wilderness. No active mining or oil and gas operations exist within the area. A mineral survey by the U.S. Geological Survey and U.S. Bureau of Mines indicates a very low mineral potential. The area was withdrawn from oil and gas leasing by order 2714 of the Secretary of Interior January 27, 1953. Prior to that time, oil and gas leases were issued along the Sisquoc River near the Sisquoc condor sanctuary. These have now expired and there are no new leases.

Scattered stands of timber consist of mixed conifers and are generally considered as noncommercial because of small volume and poor quality for processing. There have been no sales of timber and none will be made.

Some portions of the proposed wilderness are suitable for livestock grazing. These are, for the most part, isolated, grassy openings, or patches of browse forage in the river bottoms and on the ridges. Established patterns of grazing use will not be adversely affected by adoption of the wilderness proposal.

PUBLIC REACTION

A hearing by the Forest Service on a more limited proposal—110,403 acres—was conducted in Santa Barbara, Calif., on November 8, 1965. Fifty-seven oral presentations were made and more than 600 letters received. Sentiment was overwhelmingly in favor of the wilderness area, and a majority favored enlargement, particularly to protect "potreros" (isolated, small grassy openings), the condors, Indian pictographs, and other values outside the originally proposed boundary.

The Forest Service, after further study and evaluation of the testimony, enlarged the wilderness proposal to its present size to include some of the recommended area.

Federal, State, and county agency representatives, at the Santa Barbara hearing, expressed support for the proposal. So did spokesmen primarily interested in water, watershed protection, and water yield. They were concerned with adequate fire protection of the area.

The Departments of Defense, Commerce, and Interior all expressed support for the original Forest Service proposal. The Fish and Wildlife Service also endorsed the plan.

The Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee conducted open public hearings in Washington, D.C., on S. 889, providing for a 142,722 acre San Rafael Wilderness, on April 11.

Again, sentiment was overwhelmingly in support of the proposal, and some witnesses urged an additional inclusion of a 4,720 acre area along the southeastern section referred to as Area "F" to protect "potreros," Indian pictographs along the Sierra Madre Ridge, and a condor flyway. The Forest Service testified, however, that it needed this outside area for essential firebreaks that require periodic use of bulldozers and other heavy equipment which could not be used in the wilderness area short of fighting a fire. With assurances from the Forest Service that it can adequately protect the pictographs, flyway, and other values under present authority, the committee decided against immediate inclusion of the area. It points out that such an inclusion can be accomplished later if this proves desirable.

THE LEAST AMONG EVILS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very discerning and worthwhile editorial which appeared in the "Review and Outlook" section of the Wall Street Journal of May 2, 1967, entitled "The Least Among Evils," be printed in the Record. It is a well thought out analysis of a difficult situation which confronts us, and I commend it to the attention of the Senate for its consideration.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I have read the editorial, and agree with the distinguished majority leader's comments. It is a most thoughtful editorial.

One statement in the editorial worries me, however. If we are being given the facts by the Department of Defense, as I am sure we are, only military targets are being attacked.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. I am delighted that he has read the editorial and generally approves of it.

Mr. SYMINGTON. It is thoughtful, and with that exception, to the best of my knowledge constructive.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Review and Outlook: The Least Among Evils

It is time to recognize, we think, that Vietnam has become a sickness without a cure. The best hope now is to choose the least among evils where every course inevitably means further anguish. Unfortunately for the usefulness of the debate, most people on all sides of the argument still talk as though real solutions were possible.

Those for whom the solution is outright and unconditional withdrawal are small in number and smaller in influence, but the implications of their proposal need to be kept in mind.

The U.S. might have pulled out some years ago; by a stretch of the imagination it may have to some years hence. In present circumstances, however, withdrawal would be a disaster for the nation and for the West, spreading demoralization among our Asian supporters and inviting the Communist conquest of all Southeast Asia. Most serious, perhaps, it would encourage Red China to foment other "wars of national liberation" throughout the underdeveloped world.

Far more numerous are those whose answer is to stop the bombing of North Vietnam in the belief that this would lead Hanoi to the conference table. There is no evidence that it would; if it did, no evidence that it would be anything but a Communist play for time in which to rebuild and regroup. Indeed, in view of the intransigence of the North Vietnamese, the talks might go on and on, only to end in deadlock and resumption of the war against a stronger enemy.

At the other end of the spectrum of debate are those who see the solution in a much hotter war in the North: Bring Hanoi to its knees; bomb it to the conference table. Well, the U.S. has been intensifying its attacks and it seems only to harden the foe (granting the possibility that, unbeknownst to us, he has been hurt enough to be on the point of wanting an end).

One important reason for the failure of the bombing so far, it seems plain, is the tremendous amount of materiel the Soviets must be supplying North Vietnam. Our airmen talk of being hit with everything imaginable; if anything, the stuff pouring in from Russia must be steadily increasing. As long as the Kremlin is willing to do that, the North Vietnamese should be able to withstand much more damaging assaults, even with most of their industry destroyed.

Naturally stepping up the pressure on the North aggravates the risk of wider war. Some of the Administration's critics in the Senate charge that the escalation is already setting the stage for World War III. Each fresh intensification, they reason, meets a yet fiercer response, until finally it will be all but impossible for the Soviet Union and Communist China to stay out of the conflagration.

While anything can happen eventually, we suspect that the immediate dangers of constant escalation are considerably less cataclysmic but nonetheless grim enough.

One is the danger of pushing Moscow and Peking back together again. There are signs this process is beginning, although it is going to take quite a bit to fashion a monolithic identity of mind between these two natural antagonists. Still, developments that help heal the rift are not exactly in our interest.

Even less in our interest is the dismaying prospect that the beneficiary of all the fighting might not be the U.S. or South Vietnam but Red China. That regime is not losing any soldiers, or apparently much treasure; the U.S. is, and the drain could become staggering if the war goes on and continues to build up. It can therefore be argued that Peking's present objective is to keep the war going If so, it would be cruelly ironic for the U.S., thinking it had intervened in part to check Chinese-incited aggression.

Can a layman determine which among these alternatives represents the minimum damage? When nobody in the whole world has been able to come up with a workable solution, given the rigidity of the Reds, we are not unduly abashed that we can suggest nothing absolute and dogmatic.

Yet, if the foregoing comments on the various courses have validity, they seem at least to argue against incessant escalation, or perhaps for returning to the earlier policy of limiting the bombing of the North to strictly military targets. Not that such restraint offers any great promise; it is just that the alternatives, and especially indiscriminate intensification, appear worse.

All that we are sure of is that the U.S., with the best intentions but possibly not with the best judgment, has got itself into a frightful maze from which there is no good way out; ugly as it is, that is the nature of the problem. And if it is any comfort, it is a condition with parallels in everyday life—the incurable disease, the unworkable marriage, the barely tolerable job. Except that Vietnam encompasses us all

At any rate, it is little use to keep harping on illusory solutions. Short of a sudden, unexpected Communist collapse, this time of troubles will not end soon no matter what the U.S. Government does. What should occupy us now is trying to find the path pointing to the least tragic results for this nation.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Supplemental Appropriation, 1967 (S. Doc. No. 24)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation, in the amount of $75 million, for the fiscal year 1967, for the Office of Economic Opportunity (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

Report of the Comptroller of the Currency

A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, Treasury Department, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, his report, covering the year 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Inter-American Development Bank Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Lands To Be Held in Trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Police Task Force

A letter from the Executive Director, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration fo Justice, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, its report on the police task force (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Reports on Third Preference and Sixth Preference Classification for Certain Aliens

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to third preference and sixth preference classification for certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Finance:

"S.J.M. 10

"A joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your Memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in Thirty-ninth Session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the development and utilization of Idaho's abundant mineral resources has always been and must continue to be one of the major components of the state's economic structure, providing not only a source of employment and income, but also a sound base for tax revenues and a substantial market outlet of agricultural and manufactured products in mining areas, and

"Whereas, this basic and essential mining industry has for many years been struggling under adverse economic conditions so severe that many major metal mining enterprises in the state, involving the production of antimony, tungsten, cobalt, and other strategic metals, as well as most of our small lead zinc producers, have been forced out of business, and even our large, nationally-important lead and zinc mines were reduced to the status of marginal operations prior to the 1965–1966 period of improved business conditions, and

"Whereas, this serious predicament of our mining industry is directly attributable to policies of the federal government which encourage and stimulate the development and exploitation of foreign mineral resources and through tariff concessions permit the resultant low-cost foreign production relatively free access to U.S. markets,

"Whereas, these policies, if continued, will not only threaten the economic survival of Idaho's metal mining industry, but will also impose a serious handicap on our nation's capacity to provide from domestic sources the basic requirements for national defense, and

"Whereas, the executive department of the federal government and both major political parties, as well as the Conference of Western Governors, have officially recognized the necessity for maintaining a domestic mining industry that is sufficiently vigorous and proficient to assure a minerals mobilization base adequate to national preparedness and security, and

"Whereas, past efforts by the federal government to alleviate the depressed conditions which prevail in various segments of the domestic mining industry by means of short-range programs and temporary expedients, such as stockpiling, subsidies and inflexible quota limitations, have not only proven ineffective and inadequate but have also resulted in the accumulation of substantial government stockpiles of some metals, including lead and zinc, and

"Whereas, some of these stockpiles, including lead and zinc, now loom as an additional market threat to producers, because, under revised government stockpile objectives, they have been declared to be excessive and it is the intent and purpose of the responsible executive officials to dispose of the surpluses through market channels to obtain funds for use in balancing the national budget, contrary to all legislative intent, and

"Whereas, since the fixed quotas on lead and zinc were abolished by executive order in October 1965, imports of both metals have increased tremendously and last year were more than 30 percent and 65 percent, respectively, above the fixed quota levels.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Thirty-ninth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring, that we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States and the executive department of the federal government to formulate and put into effect with all deliberate haste a national minerals policy that will assure the preservation of a sound and stable domestic mining industry by reserving to domestic producers *a fair and equitable share of domestic metal markets.*

"We recommend that the implementation of this policy include as a minimum:

"1. Retention of Congressional control over national stockpiles so as to minimize, if not completely avoid, the adverse market impact to surplus disposal.

"2. Provision for adequate limitations on ore and metal imports when required, with import quotas to be applied when metal stocks of domestic producers exceed normal inventories needed to service domestic consumers and to stabilize these inventories at reasonable levels encouraging the maintenance of a strong and healthy mining industry.

"3. Provisions for effective enforcement of anti-dumping and counter-vailing duty rules and regulations.

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the

President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the senators and representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Resolution 1967-Ex 47

"Whereas, The 1935 Social Security Act with subsequent amendments has always been considered a major guarantee against poverty and want; and

"Whereas, Changing conditions make modernization of the Old Age, Survivors and Disability Insurance Act imperative, through both extension of coverage and increased insurance and retirement benefits; and

"Whereas, Disability provisions under the Act are very restrictive; and

"Whereas, These restrictions are particularly onerous to residents of Washington state, who are injured in industrial accidents and are judged to be permanently and totally disabled and receive under state law a fixed monthly amount of compensation; and

"Whereas, The present law requires that O.A.S.I. payments to recipients of categorical public assistance must be considered as "resources," and thereby may reduce the money grants or other benefits to which such persons are otherwise entitled;

"Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, That the Senate of the state of Washington hereby petitions the Congress to enact legislation authorizing a disability 'freeze,' even though the recipient is not granted a disability pension under the Social Security Act;

"And Be It Further Resolved, That the Old Age, Survivors and Disability Act be amended by the Congress to allow recipients of public assistance grants or other benefits accruing under categorical public assistance programs to retain any O.A.S.I. payments without a concomitant decrease in money grants or other benefits under the categorical programs.

"Be It Further Resolved, That copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted to President Lyndon B. Johnson; the President of the United States Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to each member of the Congress from Washington state."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 'BB'

"A concurrent resolution urging the Congress of the United States not to increase the tariff or tolls on the Saint Lawrence Seaway

"Whereas, North Dakota is the number one cash grain state in the nation and is more sensitive to freight rate increases than states nearer to ports or centers of consumption; and

"Whereas, North Dakota leads in the production of hard spring wheat, including durum, flaxseed and barley and these grains move through various ports for export, two of the most important being Duluth, Minnesota and Superior, Wisconsin; and

"Whereas, there have been tremendous increases in the volume of tonnage hauled on the Great Lakes with vast increases in toll revenues, and increased tolls will tend to a decrease rather than an increase tonnage; and

"Whereas, competition from the Saint Lawrence Seaway has helped to make other modes of transportation more reasonable in their charges that affect North Dakota; and

"Whereas, there is every indication that with a little encouragement, even with the present toll charges, the Seaway would become self-supporting within a few years, and pay off all past due costs, such as interest, and

"Whereas, no other major waterway in the United States has toll charges; and

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, the House of Representatives concurring therein:

"That the Legislative Assembly of the State of North Dakota hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to take the steps necessary to eliminate the toll charges on the Saint Lawrence Seaway completely, or to reduce the toll charges, but in no event to permit increased toll charges to jeopardize this vital transportation artery so necessary to the economic life of North Dakota.

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President Pro tem of the United States Senate and the appropriate committees of the United States House and the United States Senate.

"Charles Tighe,
"President of the Senate.
"Leo Leidholm,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Gordon S. Aamoth,
"Speaker of the House.
"G. R. Gilbreath,
"Chief Clerk of the House."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"S.J.M. 7

"A joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho assembled in the Thirty-ninth Session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the Congress of the United States will soon have before it proposed legislation affecting future management of the present Sawtooth Primitive Area and adjacent lands;

"Whereas, this is a region of incomparable scenic beauty and a rich historical past;

"Whereas, the area is coming rapidly under increasing pressures of public and private use;

"Whereas, uncontrolled housing developments in the Sawtooth Valley, the Stanley Basin and the environs of the Sawtooths, threaten the destruction of the natural beauty of the area;

"Whereas, it is urgently required in the public interest that a definite, permanent plan for the management of the Sawtooths be adopted as soon as possible;

"Whereas, this matter has been the subject of a great deal of study by federal agencies, particularly a very comprehensive joint study by the United States Forest Service and the National Park Service completed in August, 1965;

"Whereas, this was followed by a two day public hearing before the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the United States Senate, on June 13 and 14, 1966.

"Whereas, both the joint study and the vast majority of persons testifying at the public hearing favored creation of a Sawtooth National Recreation Area;

"Whereas, such action would permit continued management of the Sawtooths by the United States Forest Service, allowing the broadest multiple use of the area—for example permitting grazing and timber management where possible;

"Whereas, a national recreation area would permit continued management of fish and game by the Idaho Fish and Game Department;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Thirty-ninth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to enact the necessary legislation to authorize the establishment of the Sawtooth National Recreation Area and Wilderness.

"Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the Honorable President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Resolution 174

"Relative to the appointment of the Honorable John C. Begovich as U.S. Marshal

"Whereas, It has come to the attention of the Members of the Senate that the Honorable John C. Begovich is being considered for an appointment as United States Marshal; and

"Whereas, This distinguished former State Senator was born in Amador County, the heart of the Mother Lode country, where he has lived all his life; and

"Whereas, He married Lorraine Love, and one son, John, Jr., came of this union; and

"Whereas, He served his country with great distinction, was commissioned on the field of battle, was wounded three times, and received 13 decorations, including the Silver Star, the Bronze Star, three Purple Hearts and the French Croix de Guerre; and

"Whereas, He served as Judge or the Amador Judicial Court for five years and was reelected in 1958 without opposition; and

"Whereas, Judge Begovich was subsequently elected to the California State Senate in 1960, reelected in 1964 and was a victim of reapportionment in 1966; and

"Whereas, Senator Begovich served his constituents and California well, being a strong man of convictions who would always fight for what he thought was right; and

"Whereas, Senator Begovich, a great lover of the outdoors and truly a man of the mountains he loves so well, often utters the phrase "Bring me men to match my mountains" and is a match for his mountains; and

"Whereas, The tribute paid him in a poem by the Honorable Gus Garrigus, Poet Laureate of California, describes him well; and

"Whereas, The author, Senator Walsh, and the 39 coauthors of this resolution feel that Senator John C. Begovich would make an excellent United States Marshal and are desirous to expedite the appointment of the Honorable John C. Begovich to the position of the United States Marshal; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of California, That the Members respectfully memorialize the President of the United States to appoint the Honorable John C. Begovich to the position of United States Marshal and respectfully memorialize the Senate of the United States to confirm such appointment; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President and Attorney General of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

"J. A. Beek,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A resolution adopted by the Wisconsin State Council of Machinists, AFL–CIO, favoring the enactment of legislation to raise the present personal exemption of $600 to $1,000 per family member before any tax increase is enacted; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Barnstable County Selectmens Association, of Cape Cod, Mass., favoring action by the Congress to take action establishing responsibility for and prevention of further recurrence of oil pollution on Cape Cod beaches; to the Committee on Public Works.

NDEA TITLE III FUNDS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Prof. John O. Conaway, of the Industrial Arts Division of Indiana State University, Terre Haute, wrote me recently in his capacity as chairman of the legislative information committee of the American Industrial Arts Association. Mr. Conaway called attention to two official resolutions of the association concerning NDEA title III funds. An accompanying memorandum from the AIAA executive secretary, Howard Decker, notes that last year it was proposed to cut title III(a) funds to $54.5 million, but that Congress restored the sum to the amount of the previous year, $79.2 million. This year the proposal is for an even more drastic cut, from $79.2 million to $47 million.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions recently adopted by the delegate assembly of the American Industrial Arts Association be printed in the Record and be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Affairs, as follows:

1. NDEA—Title III

Whereas Title III of the National Defense Education Act has provided broad federal assistance to the majority of elementary and secondary school students, and

Whereas the ability to purchase needed equipment permits creative curriculum planning and the improvement of instruction and

Whereas effective supervision and administration leads to improved instruction and implementation of imaginative curriculum planning.

Therefore be it resolved that the officers and members of the American Industrial Arts Association request that the Congress of the United States appropriate the full authorization of $110,000,000 for NDEA Title III(a) and $10,000,000 for NDEA III(b) for school year 1967–1968 (FY 1968).

2. NDEA—Appropriation

Whereas the National Defense Education Act has been highly successful in providing improved instruction in the elementary and secondary schools of our nation and

Whereas this improved instruction has been achieved through the in-service education of teachers, specialized supervision, curriculum development and the provision for equipment and instructional materials.

Therefore be it resolved that the officers and members of the American Industrial Arts Association encourage the Congress to extend this act for five years and to increase the appropriation to $175,000,000 in fiscal 1969.

Be it further resolved that the Congress be urged to retain the existing administrative procedures including an appropriation of $15,000,000 in NDEA Title III(b) for specialized supervision and administration.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MOSS, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 102. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090) (Rept. No. 205).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1660. A bill for the relief of Douglas E. Kennedy and Alvin V. Burt, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSS (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1661. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist in assuring the availability of both nursing home and alternative noninstitutional services for recipients of assistance thereunder, to encourage the use whenever professionally determined to be appropriate of noninstitutional services for such recipients, to establish basic standards of quality for nursing home and home health services provided to such recipients, and to provide for fair and equitable reimbursement for those providing health care services to such recipients; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Moss when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. Moss, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Young of Ohio, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey):

S. 1662. A bill to limit Federal financial assistance otherwise available for the construction or operation of nursing homes to nursing homes in States which have in effect a program which provides for the licensing of the operators of such homes and which meets certain requirements; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts when the introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1663. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1664. A bill for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1665. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1666. A bill to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Cooper when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

IMPROVING NURSING HOME CARE FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE PATIENTS

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Hart, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio, a bill to require States participating in Federal-State matching programs of medical assistance under title XIX of the Social Security Act to make certain provisions with respect to standards in nursing homes and reimbursement for nursing home care, and to include in their State plans payment for home health services designed to reduce the need for long-term institutionalization of patients. I ask that the bill and a summary of its provisions be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Spong in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, when the 90th Congress convened, the distinguished majority leader pointed out that this session would be an opportunity to review the work we have done in the 89th Congress, to observe the way in which the programs enacted during that extraordinarily productive period are operating, and to make any modifications or improvements in them that seem to be indicated. This bill is offered in that spirit. Title XIX of the Social Security Act, which was a part of the Social Security Amendments of 1965, greatly expands the participation of the Federal Government in the long-term care of the aged. Our experience with public assistance medical care in the past, and recently with title XIX, suggests that some modifications in the program requirements are indicated.

The Federal Government is the largest purchaser of nursing home services in the Nation. Approximately 60 percent of the patients in nursing homes today are recipients of care under old-age assistance, medical assistance for the aged, or medical assistance under title XIX. In the last fiscal year about half a billion dollars was paid to nursing homes for the care of welfare patients. More than $280 million was appropriated Federal funds. As more States develop their programs under title XIX, these expenditures will increase and the proportion paid by Federal funds will be still greater because of the more liberal matching formula in title XIX. Having set this vast program in motion, Congress has a responsibility to assure that the program will provide the appropriate types of care, care of high quality, and care rendered in suitable and safe surroundings. My bill is directed to these objectives.

Federal medical assistance programs have been criticized, and I think with some justice, for emphasizing institutional services to the extent that a bias is produced tending to promote the institutional confinement of public assistance clientele. Sometimes needed services can be provided and paid for only if the person is placed in a nursing home. This is an unfortunate bias both from the point of view of the medical care and economics. In my bill, States will be called upon to include payment for home health services where such services are available and deemed by the patient's physician to meet his needs.

The Subcommittee on Long-Term Care, of which I am chairman, has heard considerable testimony to the effect that many patients are being sent to nursing homes who need not be sent there, while many others could have their nursing home stays shortened, if home health services were available. The value of home health service programs has been recognized and accepted for many years. The medicare program with its home health service benefits will do much to stimulate the growth of home health agencies. The inclusion of these services in public assistance medical care will strengthen still further the economic foundation of home health care services throughout the country, and will provide an alternative wherever these services become available to institutional care for patients who are still able to live independently.

The bill also would call upon States to assure a periodic review by medical and other appropriate professional personnel of the utilization of nursing home care by public assistance patients. Too often patients entering nursing homes are simply left to live there for the rest of their days. There is no evaluation of potential for rehabilitation and discharge and no program of care directed to that end. Months and years pass without thorough revaluation of a patient's condition to determine if the services of the home are still appropriate and needed.

For patients who do require nursing home care, federally sponsored medical assistance programs should assure that the care provided is adequate, professionally supervised, and rendered in safe facilities. Mr. President, it is very clear from my subcommittee's hearings that this is not now the case. A great many public assistance patients for whom care is now being purchased under medical care vendor payment programs are actually receiving little more than boarding home or custodial care. According to the most recent figures we have seen, almost half of the nursing homes in the United States have no registered nurse associated with the institution. The typical nursing home has virtually nothing in the way of rehabilitation or restorative services and no arrangements to provide such services.

Nor can we say that Federal-State cooperative programs are getting what they pay for in many instances. Allegations before my subcommittee and studies conducted by the General Accounting Office in California and in Ohio indicate that State controls over medical services to the aged and over disbursements for such care sometimes are so lax that aged patients suffer neglect while the Government pays for goods and services not rendered. My bill would call upon the States to establish systems of recordkeeping which would permit verification that services had been rendered and payments were due on behalf of the aged recipients.

Mr. President, we must acknowledge that in many States the reimbursement to nursing homes has not been adequate and the basis for reimbursement has not been equitable. My bill provides that payments to nursing homes and home health agencies should be on the basis of reasonable cost of services rendered. This is consistent with the manner of reimbursement in the medicare program. Mr. President, Federal funds must not be used to pay for services not actually rendered. Federal funds must not be used to buy services of poor quality, and Federal funds must not be used to maintain aging citizens in surroundings that endanger their very lives. But if we demand modern facilities and high quality services we must pay their cost. This bill seeks to establish a system for paying fully and equitably for services and at the same time assuring that the aged citizens whom we seek to serve actually get what we are paying for.

Mr. President, the last major item in this bill would make the professional advisory service of the National Medical Review Committee available to the administrators of the public assistance medical care program. The National Medical Review Committee was established in title XVIII as a professional advisory body for the medicare program. Although potentially a larger and more extensive medical care program than medicare, title XIX at present provides no such professional advisory group to periodically review and evaluate its effectiveness in meeting the national objectives.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and summary previously requested to be printed in the Record will be so printed.

The bill (S. 1661) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist in assuring the availability of both nursing home and alternative noninstitutional services for recipients of assistance thereunder, to encourage the use whenever professionally determined to be appropriate of noninstitutional services for such recipients, to establish basic standards of quality for nursing home and home health services provided to such recipients, and to provide for fair and equitable reimbursement for those providing health care services to such recipients, introduced by Mr. Moss (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1661

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Assistance Long-Term Care Amendments of 1967."

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that there is a substantial Federal interest and responsibility in assuring the quality of nursing home services rendered to patients under public assistance programs and the adequacy and safety of the facilities in which such services are rendered; that the national interest is served by fostering professional surveillance of and responsibility for care rendered in such institutions and by promoting the development of services designed to maintain and continue the independence of aged infirm persons and providing suitable alternatives to institutional care; and that to these ends certain additional requirements upon the States for the development and administration of plans under title XIX of the Social Security Act should be made.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XIX OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Sec. 3(a)(1) Section 1902(a)(13) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"(13) provide for the inclusion of some institutional and some noninstitutional care and services, and, effective July 1, 1967, provide (A) for inclusion of at least the care and services listed in clauses (1), (2), (3), (4), (5), and (7) of section 1905(a), and (B) for payment of the reasonable cost (as determined in accordance with section 1905(c) and with standards approved by the Secretary and included in the plan) of (i) inpatient hospital services provided under the plan, (ii) skilled nursing home services provided under the plan and (iii) home health care services provided under the plan;".

(2) Section 1902 of such Act is further amended by (A) striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (21), (B) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (22) and inserting in lieu of such period a semicolon, and (C) by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraphs:

"(23) provide for a regular program of medical review including (A) periodic inspections to be made in all qualified nursing homes within the State by one or more medical review teams (composed of physicians and other appropriate health and social service personnel) of the care being provided in such nursing homes to persons receiving assistance under the State plan and, with respect to each of the patients receiving such care, the adequacy of the services available in particular nursing homes to meet the current health needs and promote maximum physical well-being of patients receiving care in such homes, the necessity and desirability of the continued placement of such patients in such nursing homes and the feasibility of meeting their health care needs through alternative noninstitutional services; and (B) for the making by such team or teams of full and complete reports of the findings resulting from such inspections together with any recommendations to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of the State plan; and

"(24) provide for agreements with every person or institution providing services under the State plan under which such person or institution agrees (A) to keep such records as are necessary fully to disclose the extent of the services provided to individuals receiving assistance under the State plan and the cost of such services, (B) to furnish the State agency with such information, regarding any payments claimed by such person or institution for providing services under the State plan, as the State agency may from time to time request, and (C) to make available to the Secretary (or any of his authorized representatives) and the Comptroller General of the United States (or any of his authorized representatives) for purposes of audit and examination, all books, documents, papers, and records of such person or institution which pertain (directly or indirectly) to services provided by such person or institution to any individual claiming assistance under the State plan or to any claim by such person or institution for payment under the State plan for providing such services."

(b) (1) Section 1905 (a) (4) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(4) skilled nursing home services provided by a qualified nursing home as defined in subsection (d) for individuals (other than individuals who are in an institution for tuberculosis or mental diseases) who are 21 years of age or older;".

(2) Section 1905 (a) (7) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(7) home health care services provided by a qualified home health agency (as defined in subsection (f));".

(c) Section 1905 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) For purposes of section 1902 (13) (B), the term 'reasonable cost' of inpatient hospital services, skilled nursing home services, or of home health care services, includes costs incurred by the hospital, qualified nursing home, or the qualified home health agency for services actually rendered to persons receiving assistance under the plan and includes costs attributable to services of residents-in-training, medical students, student nurses, or other trainees in medical technology, who participate in the provision of such services if their participation therein is a formal part of the educational program of a hospital, school of medicine, or school of nursing. Such term does not include costs attributable to the payment of that part of interest on loans which is payable by reason of a rate of interest thereon which is in excess (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary) of the rates prevailing in the locality for similar loans made during the same period.

"(d) (1) Subject to paragraph (2), the term 'qualified nursing home' means a nursing home licensed as such by the State in which it is located pursuant to State laws which provide that all nursing homes operated within the State must be licensed as such and require, among the conditions of obtaining or retaining a State license, that each nursing home within the State—

"(A) supply to the licensing agency of the State full and complete information as to the identity (i) of each person having (directly or indirectly) a proprietary interest of 10 per centum or more in such nursing home, (ii) in case such nursing home is organized as a corporation, the name of each officer and director of the corporation, and (iii) in case such nursing home is organized as a partnership, the name of each partner, and to promptly report any changes in the information required to be reported under this paragraph;

"(B) keep the State licensing agency fully informed currently as to all outstanding loans made for the purpose of financing the construction, acquisition, renovation, or operation of such nursing home, as well as to the amounts of such loans, and the terms and conditions upon which they were made; except that such reporting need not be required of short-term operating capital loans obtained from commercial banks;

"(C) have a medical consultant who does not have, or a medical committee none of the members of which has, a proprietary or other financial interest (other than the salary to which he is entitled as such a consultant or member) in such nursing home, which consultant or committee is charged with responsibility for—

"(i) developing for such nursing home policies relating to medical, nursing, rehabilitative and other professional health care, including requirements for clinical records to be maintained on each patient of the nursing home;

"(ii) regular review by such consultant or committee with a view to assuring that such policies are properly being carried out, that proper utilization is being made of convalescent and rehabilitative services, and that there is continued necessity for placement in such nursing home of each patient thereof;

"(iii) assuring that each patient in such nursing home is under the care of a personal physician who makes periodic visits to such patient consist with the health care needs of such patient; and

"(iv) assuring that adequate provision is made for medical attention to any patient of the nursing home during emergencies when such patient's personal physician is not available to provide such attention;

"(D) have and maintain an organized nursing service for its patients, which is under the direction of a professional registered nurse who is employed full-time by such nursing home, and which is composed of sufficient nursing and auxiliary personnel to provide adequate and properly supervised nursing services for such patients during all hours of each day and all days of each week;

"(E) employ on a regular basis a qualified dietitian or otherwise make satisfactory arrangements for the planning and supervision of menus and meal service by a qualified dietitian in the case of any nursing home admitting or serving patients for whom special diets or dietary restrictions are medically prescribed; and

"(F) have arrangements with one or more general hospitals under which such hospital or hospitals will provide needed diagnostic services to patients of such nursing homes, and under which such hospital or hospitals agree to accept immediately as patients thereof acutely ill patients of such nursing home who are in need of hospital care; except that the State licensing agency may waive this requirement wholly or in part with respect to any nursing home meeting all other requirements which by reason of remote location or other good and sufficient reason is unable to effect such an arrangement with a hospital.

"(2) The term 'qualified nursing home' does not include any nursing home which does not meet standards of fire safety and protection and other conditions relating to the health and safety of individuals who are furnished services in nursing homes found necessary by the Secretary and set forth in regulations prescribed by him.

"(e) The term 'qualified home health agency' means a public or private nonprofit agency or organization, or a subdivision of such an agency or organization (including a subdivision of a public or private nonprofit hospital) which—

"(1) is primarily engaged in the provision of medical evaluation and surveillance and skilled nursing or other therapeutic or related social services under medical supervision in the residence of the patient;

"(2) has policies, established by a group of professional personnel, including one or more physicians and one or more registered professional nurses, to govern the services (referred to in paragraph (1)), which it provides, and provides for supervision of such services by a physician or registered professional nurse;

"(3) maintains clinical records on all patients; and

"(4) meets such other conditions as the Secretary finds necessary to assure the adequacy of the services provided by such agency and to protect the health and safety of the recipients of such services.

"(f) The term 'home health care services' includes such services provided on an outpatient basis in a hospital, nursing home, clinic, or other health care institution if such services are provided under arrangements between a qualified home health agency and such hospital, nursing home, clinic, or other institution, and if such services can be provided in such a manner more effectively or more economically than they could be provided in the patient's residence."

SEC. 4. (a) The amendments made to title XXI of the Social Security Act by the preceding provisions of this Act shall take effect—

(1) in the case of any State (as defined in section 1101(a)(1) of such Act) which has a State plan for medical assistance approved (prior to the date of enactment of this Act) under such title, on the first day of the second calendar quarter (commencing January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1) which commences after the close of the first regular session of the legislature of such State which begins after the date of enactment of this Act, and

(2) in the case of any other State, on the date of enactment of this Act.

(b) For purposes of subsection (a), the Congress of the United States shall be regarded as the State legislature of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 5. Title XIX of the Social Security Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"SEC. 1906. (a) The National Medical Review Committee established pursuant to section 1868 of this Act is authorized and directed (in addition to its functions provided in section 1868(c)) to review the utilization of care and services provided under State plans pursuant to this title and to make such other studies as may be necessary to:

"(1) advise the Secretary with respect to the provisions of State programs for medical assistance under this title, policies dealing with the broadening and liberalizing of medical assistance as provided in section 1903(e), and coordination of the policies and programs administered under title XVIII and this title.

"(2) make such recommendations as may seem desirable for changes in regulations, guidelines or procedures affecting the scope of services and manner in which services are made available, and for changes in programs established under this title or in this title.

"(b) The Committee shall make an annual report to the Secretary on its work and recommendations pursuant to subsection (a) and such report shall be transmitted promptly by the Secretary to the Congress."

SEC. 6. On and after the first day of the second calendar quarter (commencing January 1, April 1, July 1, or October 1) after the calendar quarter in which the Public Assistance Long-Term Care Amendments of 1967 is enacted, no Federal funds shall be paid to any State as Federal matching under titles I, XVI, or XIX of the Social Security Act for payments made to any nursing home (or to any other person) for or on account of any nursing home services provided by such nursing home unless for the period during which such services are provided such nursing home fully meets all requirements of the State in which it is located for licensure as a nursing home.

The summary presented by Mr. Moss is as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED PUBLIC ASSISTANCE LONG-TERM CARE AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Sec. 1. Citation by short title.

Sec. 2. A declaration of the Federal interest in the quality of nursing home and other long-term care services rendered patients under Federally assisted programs.

Sec. 3. Title XIX of the Social Security Act (sometimes called Medicaid) would be amended as follows:

Additional Service Offered. Payment for home health services would be required where such services are available and prescribed. Where home health services are available and can meet a patient's needs it should be possible to use them as an alternative to confinement in a nursing home.

Additional State Plan Requirements. Comprehensive State plans for medical services under Title XIX would have to include in addition to those features already prescribed—

Provision for periodic medical review of patients' continuing need for nursing home care and of whether the level of care in particular nursing homes continues to be appropriate to the patients' needs.

Certain records, as determined and prescribed by the State, which providers of medical services must maintain and make available to the State and/or to representatives of the Department or GAO when necessary to verify that payments are due for services rendered.

Payment to Providers. Nursing homes and home health agencies caring for Title XIX patients would be reimbursed on the basis of the reasonable cost of services provided. This is consistent with the treatment of hospitals as Title XIX is now written and with the treatment of all providers under Medicare.

Minimum Specifications for Nursing Home Care. While all licensing and inspection functions would be left to the States, the following specifications for qualified nursing homes in States participating in Title XIX would be established—

Full disclosure of ownership;

Disclosure to the State licensing agency of sources and terms of long-term financing;

A source of medical advice on professional policies and procedures;

An adequate and professionally supervised nursing service;

Arrangements for competent supervision of diets in the case of homes serving patients with medically prescribed dietary restrictions;

Arrangements (wherever feasible) for transfer to a hospital when necessary;

Other requirements found necessary by the Secretary for the protection of the health or safety of patients.

Description of Qualified Home Health Agency. As described, an agency qualified to provide the home health services previously added to offered services would be similar to a qualified provider of home health services under Medicare.

Sec. 4. Provides that for States which already have Title XIX programs, these additions do not take effect until the second quarter after the close of the next meeting of the State legislature. Many States could comply with these provisions administratively under their present laws. Some would require action by the legislature.

Sec. 5. Expands the role of the National Medical Review Committee established in Title XVIII as a professional advisory body for Medicare to include the public assistance medical care programs under Title XIX.

Sec. 6. Prohibits the use of Federal funds for matching payments for nursing home care in facilities not meeting licensure standards of the State in which it is located.

DENIAL OF FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR NURSING HOMES TO STATES WHICH DO NOT LICENSE NURSING HOME OPERATIONS

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and Senators Moss, KENNEDY of New York, YOUNG of Ohio, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would deny Federal financial assistance for the construction or operation of nursing homes in States which do not license the operators of nursing homes. This bill is similar to S. 3384, which I introduced last year.

Denial of Federal funds for construction or operation of nursing homes, nursing homes we badly need, is a drastic step. I urge such a drastic step because of information elicited in an important series of hearings in 1965 held by the Subcommittee on Long-Term Care of the Special Committee on Aging, because of information developed by my staff and the staff of that committee, and because of my own personal visits to many nursing homes.

This information has convinced me that the operator or administrator of a nursing home is the key person in assuring that the care received by nursing home patients is of a very high quality. The operator is, after all, the man who hires and fires the staff, the man who orders the food, the man who schedules visits by physicians, and, in general, the man who sets the standards by which each individual nursing home operates.

The care nursing home patients require is considerable, since they are in nursing homes only because they cannot take care of themselves. The typical nursing home patient is 80 years old. More than half of such patients require assistance in walking or are bedridden. Nearly half of the patients are senile or mentally confused at least part of the time. Many patients are permanently disabled and cannot be rehabilitated to a degree at which they could live independently outside the nursing home. The average length of stay in a nursing home is a year or more.

The care of patients in a nursing home is, then, a very large responsibility. The man who must oversee the discharge of this responsibility—the operator or administrator—must be a man of dedication, skill, or experience. The hearings I have participated in, the studies which have been undertaken, and visits I have made have convinced me that, by and large, nursing home operators meet these standards and are conscientious in their efforts to bring the best care and comfort to their patients.

But, unfortunately, not all nursing home operators are so motivated. A survey of nursing and rest home administrators recently conducted in Massachusetts by Dr. Samuel Levy indicated why many members of the medical professions are concerned about the qualifications of nursing home operators. Only 41 percent—428 persons—responded to Dr. Levy's questionnaire. Only 18 percent had completed college; 20 percent were school dropouts; 10 percent had no formal education at all; and of those who had not completed college only 18 percent could cite any special training in their profession. And I draw the unhappy conclusion that had the other 59 percent responded, the statistics would be even more discouraging. While these figures combine rest and nursing homes, the results would not be significantly different if nursing homes were separated out.

I want to make clear, Mr. President, what my bill would and would not do. All States presently require the licensing of nursing homes, and pursuant to this requirement periodic inspections of nursing home facilities are made, usually by personnel of State health departments. But this requirement alone is insufficient to ensure that patients receive the care and treatment the inspectors are led to believe they receive. I have evidence, for example, of an operator who kept meat in a freezer to show the State inspectors, but the meat was never fed to the patients—they were fed spaghetti, Spam, and so forth. It is this type of unscrupulous taking advantage of old, sick people at which my bill is aimed.

It would require States to establish a board of individuals representative of the professions, occupations, and institutions directly concerned with the care and treatment of the chronically ill or infirm elderly, as well as of the public. This State board would develop, impose and enforce standards which must be met by operators of nursing homes before they could be licensed by the State. If the State did not have a licensing program in effect by July 1, 1968, then no further Federal financial assistance would be provided either directly or indirectly, in that State for the construction or operation of nursing homes. The standards to be developed by the State boards are designed to ensure that nursing home operators are individuals well qualified by experience, training and character to operate nursing homes. The bill would establish a small program of matching grants to States for training nursing home operators.

States presently require the licensing of doctors, of dentists, of lawyers, of architects, of engineers, and of other professionals as well. This licensing process ensures that the public interest in receiving services meeting some minimum requirements of quality are met. Since nursing home operators are directly responsible for assuring day to day that their patients receive the medical care they need, it is my firm belief that the operators should be licensed by the States much as doctors, dentists or lawyers are.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates that there are approximately 20,000 homes with 850,000 beds providing nursing and residential care in the United States, an average of about 43 beds per institution. Approximately 85 percent of the institutions and 75 percent of the beds are owned by proprietary nursing home organizations, which is a sharp contrast to the ownership patterns of the hospital industry, where the great majority of institutions are publicy owned. The national health expenditure for nursing home care was $1.2 billion in 1964, the public share of which was over $400 million. The Veterans' Administration, the Department of Health and Welfare and the Department of Housing and Urban Development all finance, in various ways, various costs of nursing homes.

Nursing homes are a big business in the United States today and public funds are heavily involved, as these figures indicate. Licensing of operators of nursing homes is one element in guaranteeing the best possible care to our elderly citizens who are patients in nursing homes. It is an important element, as the hearings in the Subcommittee on Long-Term Care indicated, and as it is framed in the bill I introduce today, it dovetails with the bill introduced by the chairman of that subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr.

Moss], which covers other aspects of problems associated with nursing homes. The Senator from Utah has, by the hearings he chaired in 1965, performed a valuable service to our senior citizens who must be confined to nursing homes, because he brought these problems out for public scrutiny.

The bills introduced as a result of these hearings were carefully drawn to bring patients in nursing homes a higher order of care than they presently receive. My own bill would do it by focusing on the qualifications of the operators of the homes. A recent poll conducted by the periodical Nursing Home Administrator shows that a majority of respondents approve of the licensing of operators. They do so, I think, because the profession wants to rid itself of the small minority of unprofessional operators whose activities detract from the dedication to excellence of the majority of the members of the profession. I seek the support of the experienced and trained operators of nursing homes for this bill, because I know we all want our elder citizens to have the best possible care.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1662) to limit Federal financial assistance otherwise available for the construction or operation of nursing homes in States which have in effect a program which provides for the licensing of the operators of such homes and which meets certain requirements, introduced by Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1662

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF FINDINGS

SECTION 1. The Congress hereby finds and declares that (a) nursing homes are properly regarded as being community health facilities the major purpose of which is to render nursing and other health care services, (b) the public interest requires that the kind and quality of the services provided by nursing homes be adequate to meet the needs of the patients thereof, and (c) of major importance to the assurance that such services will be adequate to meet such needs are the personal character, qualifications, and the administrative competence of the operators of such homes.

LICENSING OF NURSING HOME OPERATORS

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, Federal financial assistance shall not, after July 1, 1968, be provided directly or indirectly, in any State with respect to the construction or operation of any nursing home if there is not in effect, in such State, a State program providing for the licensing, in accordance with the requirements of this Act, of all operators of nursing homes located within such State.

STATE STANDARD

SEC. 3. (a) A State program referred to in section 2 must provide that no nursing home within the State may operate except under the supervision of an operator licensed in the manner provided in this Act and for the establishment or designation of a State Board which has the duty and authority to administer such program. Such Board must be so composed that its members will be representative of the professions, occupations, and institutions directly concerned with the care and treatment of chronically ill or infirm aged individuals, and will be representative of the public.

(b) It shall be the function and duty of such Board to—

(1) develop, impose and enforce standards which must be met by individuals in order to receive a license as a nursing home operator, which standards shall be designed to insure that nursing home operators will be individuals who are of good character, who, by temperament and disposition are suitable, and who, by training or experience in the field of institutional administration, are qualified to serve as nursing home operators;

(2) develop and apply appropriate techniques, including examinations and investigations, for determining whether any individual meets such standards;

(3) issue licenses to individuals determined, after the application of such techniques, to meet such standards, and revoke or suspend licenses previously issued by the Board in any case where the individual holding any such license is determined substantially to have failed to conform to the requirements of such standards;

(4) establish and carry out procedures designed to insure that individuals licensed as nursing home operators will, during any period that they serve as such, comply with the requirements of such standards;

(5) receive, investigate, and take appropriate action with respect to, any charge or complaint filed with the Board to the effect that any individual licensed as a nursing home operator has failed to comply with the requirements of such standards;

(6) conduct a continuing study and investigation of nursing homes and operators of nursing homes within the State with a view to the improvement of the standards imposed for the licensing of such operators and of procedures and methods for the enforcement of such standards with respect to operators of nursing homes who have been licensed as such.

TEMPORARY WAIVER OF CERTAIN REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 4. No State shall be considered to have failed to comply with the provisions of section 2 of this Act because the Board of such State (established pursuant to section 3) shall have granted any waiver, with respect to any individual who during all of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, has served as a nursing home operator, of any of the standards developed, imposed and enforced by such Board pursuant to section 3(b)(1) other than such standards as relate to good character or suitability if—

(1) such waiver is for a period which ends prior to July 1, 1970, and

(2) there is provided by the Board or there is otherwise available in the State (during all of the period for which waiver is in effect), a program of training and instruction designed to enable all individuals, with respect to whom any such waiver is granted, to attain the qualifications necessary in order to meet such standards.

GRANTS TO STATES FOR TRAINING PROGRAMS

SEC. 5. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to make grants to States for the purpose of assisting them in instituting and conducting programs of training and instruction of the type referred to in section 4(2).

(b) No grant with respect to any such program shall exceed 75 per centum of the reasonable and necessary cost, as determined by the Secretary, of instituting and conducting such program.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. As used in this Act, the term—

(a) "nursing home" means any institution or facility defined as such for licensing purposes under State law; and

(b) "nursing home operator" means any individual who is charged with the general administration of a nursing home whether or not such individual has an ownership interest in such home and whether or not his functions and duties are shared with one or more other individuals.

ENFORCEMENT AND REGULATIONS

SEC. 7. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") to determine when Federal financial assistance (otherwise available in any State) should be denied or withheld because of the failure of such State to comply with the requirements of this Act. Whenever the Secretary has made a final determination that such assistance should be denied or withheld in any State by reason of the provisions of this Act, he shall so notify all Federal agencies having the duty or authority to provide any such assistance and all such agencies shall deny all such assistance in such State until such time as they have been notified by the Secretary that such assistance should no longer be withheld or denied.

(b) The Secretary shall promulgate appropriate regulations prescribing the procedures to be employed in determining whether a State has complied with the requirements of this Act, and such other regulations as may be appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Secretary shall not make a final determination that Federal financial assistance should be denied or withheld pursuant to the provisions of this Act in any State until he shall have held a public hearing on the matter, have provided reasonable advance notice to the State of such hearing, the time and place it is to be held, the issues to be considered, and have invited such State to appear, and have otherwise afforded the State a reasonable opportunity to appear and make its views known in such hearing.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

SEC. 8. (a) Any State which is dissatisfied with a final determination of the Secretary under section 6 may, within sixty days after it has been notified of such determination, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of such determination. A copy of the petition shall forthwith be transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his determination as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Secretary, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity. This legislation is requested by the Department of Commerce. I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal, the statement of purpose and need, and the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and statement of purpose and need will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1663) to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1663

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce to the extent he determines to be necessary, and subject to adequate security investigations and such other investigations as he may determine to be appropriate, and subject further to a prior determination by him that no qualified United States citizen is available for the particular position involved, is authorized to employ and compensate aliens in a scientific or technical capacity at authorized rates of compensation without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting payment of compensation to aliens.

The letter, statement and purpose of need, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, are as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 6, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There are enclosed four copies of a draft bill "To authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity," and four copies of a Statement of Purpose and Need in support thereof.

We are advised by the Bureau of the Budget that, from the standpoint of the Administration's program, there would be no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely yours,
A. B. TROWBRIDGE,
Acting Secretary of Commerce.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED FOR LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE TO EMPLOY ALIENS IN A SCIENTIFIC OR TECHNICAL CAPACITY

The proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity without regard to statutory provisions prohibiting the payment of compensation to aliens. Such employment would be subject to adequate security investigations and to a prior determination that no qualified U.S. citizen is available for the particular position involved.

On various occasions, agencies of the Department of Commerce engaged in scientific or technical work have found that the only persons qualified and available for certain highly specialized positions are not citizens of the United States. However, in many cases these individuals cannot be employed by the Department due to provisions in appropriation legislation which prohibit, with certain stated exceptions, the compensation of aliens from appropriated funds. The current prohibition is contained in section 502 of the Public Works Appropriation Act, 1967 approved October 15, 1966 (P.L. 89-689) and applies to all appropriations for the current fiscal year.

The need to utilize the services of these talented foreigners is due in part to the general shortage of scientists and engineers in this country. More significant, however, is the fact that some of the Department's technical programs are outside the popular or currently fashionable areas of modern science, and, therefore, are not particularly attractive to American students and scientists. In many such fields, the supply of talent is much more plentiful abroad.

For example, the National Bureau of Standards has experienced great difficulty in recent years in recruiting physicists trained in atomic spectroscopy. At the same time, the demands upon NBS for precise data on atomic properties, obtainable through spectroscopic studies, have increased sharply. Such information is essential in interpreting astrophysical data associated with the space program, in measuring and understanding plasmas such as those involved in thermonuclear fusion research, and in understanding the physical processes involved in rocket propulsion.

Though American universities have been producing few trained personnel in this field, spectroscopy has continued to be an active field of study and research abroad. Among the major producers of atomic spectroscopists is Sweden; however, Swedish nationals may not be employed by the Bureau under the present statute.

A similar situation exists with respect to applied mathematics, where the general shortage of trained mathematicians is aggravated by the lack of individuals interested and qualified in certain specialized branches of mathematics. The Bureau of the Census, for example, recently was denied the services of an exceptionally well qualified statistical consultant with extensive experience in censuses and surveys because the individual was a citizen of Sweden. The National Bureau of Standards has been unable to recruit persons skilled in numerical analysis. This is a relatively new mathematical field in the United States, but is increasingly important because of the applicability of these techniques to the analysis of extremely complex problems in science and technology. One of the most valuable sources of trained personnel in this field is Switzerland, but NBS is precluded from the employment of Swiss nationals.

The varied programs of the Weather Bureau frequently require unique combinations of talent that are extremely rare. For example, the Weather Bureau recently needed physicist-meteorologists with specialized experience in the measurement and analysis of atmospheric ozone. Two well qualified candidates were found to be available—one from Switzerland and one from India. Neither could be employed under the present statute. Sweden, which has produced world renowned meteorologists and has an International Institute of Meteorology, also is "out of bounds" for recruitment to fill the highly specialized needs of the Weather Bureau.

Numerous other cases might be cited, ranging from a Swedish specialist on the rheological properties of paper, who would have been ideally suited to a position at NBS to an Egyptian oceanographer, who had exceptional qualifications for general circulation research with the Weather Bureau. The proposed legislation would enable the Department to take full advantage of such unique and long-sought combinations of talent and experience from abroad whenever suitably qualified U.S. citizens are not available.

Authority similar to that here sought was granted by the 88th Congress to the Smithsonian Institution. In earlier action the Congress exempted the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Department of Defense from the prohibitions against employment of noncitizens. The Department of Agriculture, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and the Public Health Service also are among the various agencies authorized by the Congress to employ aliens for certain necessary purposes.

REMOVING SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS LIMIT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am offering a bill to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving social security benefits.

Action is needed, as it has been over these years, to remove a longstanding inequity. There is no penalty for those who in retirement receive investment income. It is possible to have $5,000, $10,000, or any other amount of income so long as it does not come from earnings, and still receive the retirement benefits of the social security system. But for many and many a worker, particularly those whose lives have been spent in low-paid employment resulting in no savings and investments as they struggle daily to make ends meet, there is a need so long as health and circumstance permit, to continue working. Social security alone is insufficient to meet the need for income in retirement, yet many have no other resources. In fact, a study by the administration on aging shows that those over 65, with 9 percent of the population, comprise 16 percent of all our poor. Put another way nearly a third of all retired persons fall in the poverty class.

It is my hope that the sums available after we conclude consideration of changes in the social security law in this Congress, will be substantially increased. But there will still be many who have paid over the years into the retirement system, yet whose benefits are in whole or in part denied them because they continue in gainful employment on a wage. The recommendations of the administration for a small further relaxation of the penalties for continuing to work after retirement age are insufficient. The restrictions should be removed entirely.

The purpose of the social security program is to provide security, and particularly, the security of an income after retirement. So long as the limitation remains, we give that security in greater degree to those who are already the most secure in their accumulation of resources. We must extend it also to those who find they must continue to work.

The President's proposal changes the amount of earnings allowable by only 12 percent—instead of $1,500, a retired person would be generously allowed to keep $1,680 without penalty. From there until his earnings reach $2,880 rather than the present $2,700 the beneficiary could keep $1 of his benefits for every $2 he earns. But I see no reason, Mr. President, why the clippers of coupons, the recipients of interest and rents, the beneficiaries of income from all other sources except honest paychecks should be a favored group, with no such penalty upon their receipts from social security.

My previous bills—S. 578 in the 87th Congress, S. 1877 in the 88th, and S. 1490 in the 89th—embodied the same point of view which I express today and in the present bill. I sincerely hope that this time its principle of equity for the retired will prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1665) to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SCENIC DEVELOPMENT AND ROAD BEAUTIFICATION OF THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY SYSTEMS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, and ask that it be appropriately referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The bill would establish a scenic road system, consisting of primary and secondary Federal-aid highways designated by each State as scenic roads, and would require effective control of outdoor advertising and junkyards in areas adjacent to the interstate and scenic road systems. It would do so by amending the Highway Beautification Act of 1965—Public Law 89-285—principally by substituting for the "primary system," controlled with the Interstate System by that act, the new "scenic road system" which would be established by this bill.

The 1965 act has not yet been implemented with respect to the advertising and junkyard controls. While the Department of Commerce issued on January 10 standards as a basis for negotiating agreements with the States, no State has agreed to standards defining unzoned commercial and industrial areas, and the size, lighting, and spacing of signs to be permitted within unzoned and zoned commercial or industrial areas. Meanwhile, the House Subcommittee on Roads has held 3 weeks of hearings, continuing this week, on the proposed standards and has received nearly 2,000 pages of testimony. Few State legislatures could meet before January 1, 1968, when the 10-percent reduction in Federal-aid highway funds was to apply to States failing to secure effective control.

So I think it is agreed that there are problems in administering the 1965 act, and that amendments to that act may well be considered by the Congress.

Beyond the unresolved question of the standards for outdoor advertising "consistent with customary use" permitted to remain in the commercial and industrial areas, is the question of cost of the removal of advertising required by the 1965 act—estimated in the report of the Secretary of Commerce at $558 million—and of how much beauty would result from this expenditure. For while the 1965 act reaches the entire Federal-aid primary system, it omits the Federal-aid secondary system which traverses many truly scenic areas, makes no distinction between scenic and other areas on the primary system, and permits advertising under the proposed standards in thousands of stretches already built up.

I know that interest has been expressed in the scenic areas approach—both by conservation groups and by those who depend on outdoor advertising. It may offer a more orderly method of achieving highway beauty in areas selected by each State as the most beautiful—could result in concentrating our efforts for beauty in a way that would better justify Federal, State, and local expenditures. A number of State highway departments have also expressed support for a proposal to control advertising on scenic roads, rather than on the entire primary system.

The bill I have introduced today is not complicated. It proposes strict advertising and junkyards controls in the truly scenic areas selected by each State on all, rather than part, of the Federal-aid highways—and to leave controls within city limits to effective local zoning.

Under the bill, each State could designate up to 25 percent of its total mileage of primary and secondary Federal-aid roads as scenic roads—and must by January 1, 1970, so designate at least 10 percent of its Federal-aid mileage. In this way more than 200,000 miles of roads concentrated in the scenic areas of each State could be protected and preserved—compared to about 225,000 miles of the primary system to which the 1965 act is directed.

The bill would permit signs on the scenic roads giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public, under standards and limitations established by the Secretary of Transportation, in the same way authorized by the 1965 act for roadside businesses along the Interstate System.

It would permit exclusion of scenic roads within municipalities, so that advertising in these areas would continue to be handled by local zoning. It would not make an exception for unzoned commercial and industrial areas within the segments designated by each State as scenic roads.

It would require the signs for which a State pays compensation—with 75 percent Federal matching—to be removed within 2 years. Signs for which a State did not pay compensation would be amortized over a period of 5 years, but must be removed before the end of the sixth year.

The bill has other provisions which I believe would be helpful, but these are its main features. I ask unanimous consent there be printed in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a summary of the provisions of the bill.

Mr. President, I do not know whether the 1965 Highway Beauty Act will be amended by the Congress. It may be that it can be administered; that standards can be evolved which can be accepted by outdoor advertisers, roadside businesses and conservation groups; that the States will agree to such standards; and that it will prove workable. But as I have said, a House subcommittee has already held extensive hearings, the Senate Committee on Public Works on which I serve is expected to hold hearings, perhaps before June 30 when the authorization for appropriations for the act expires, and I believe there is growing interest in the scenic areas approach.

I know the subject is controversial, and it may at times appear difficult of solution. But I am introducing this bill in the hope that it may provide a basis for discussion, and in order to place the scenic areas concept before our Senate Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the summary will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1666) to provide for scenic development and road beautification of the Federal-aid highway systems, introduced by Mr. COOPER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The summary presented by Mr. COOPER is as follows:

SUMMARY OF S. 1666

The bill would—

1. Establish a scenic road system, consisting of primary and secondary Federal-aid highways designated by each State as scenic roads.

2. Require effective control of outdoor advertising and junkyards in areas adjacent to the Interstate and scenic road systems.

In carrying out the above purposes, the bill would—

a. *Scenic road mileage:* Require each State, by January 1, 1970, to designate not less than 10% of its total mileage of primary and secondary roads as scenic roads on which advertising and junkyards shall be controlled. Permit each State, by January 1, 1975, to designate an additional 15% of primary and secondary mileage as scenic roads, eligible for the 75% Federal matching for the removal of billboards. (10% about 87,000 miles; 25% about 217,000 miles; primary system in 1965 Act about 228,000 miles.)

b. *Within cities:* Exclude from control under the Federal act (PL 89-285; Sec. 131 & 136 title 23 USC), segments of the scenic road system within municipalities having property zoning adjacent to the roads since Sept. 1, 1965. Permit the Secretary of Transportation to exclude from control other segments of the Interstate and scenic road systems.

c. *Roadside businesses:* Permit each State to provide areas within the rights-of-way of the Interstate and scenic road systems for signs giving specific information in the interest of the traveling public—which shall conform to national standards and limitations promulgated by the Secretary. (Such signs for roadside business are now authorized along the Interstate system by the Highway Beautification Act of Oct. 22, 1965.)

d. *Super signs:* Permit, but not require, each State to control signs beyond 660 feet from the right-of-way of the Interstate and scenic road systems, and to utilize the 75% Federal matching for the cost of removal of such signs.

e. *Compensation:* Provide Federal reimbursement of 75% of the cost of compensation paid by any State for the removal of signs lawfully in existence along the Interstate system on October 22, 1965, along any highway made a part of the Interstate system after that date, and along any highway when it is made part of the scenic road system.

f. *Timing:* Require that each State secure effective control of signs and junkyards along the Interstate and scenic road systems by January 1, 1970 (under penalty of 10% reduction of Federal-aid highway funds, imposed by 1965 Act). Existing signs and sign locations (d, above) for which the State pays compensation shall be removed or taken within two years after they become nonconforming. Existing signs not removed with the Federal assistance of 75% of the cost of compensation, may not be required to be removed before 5 years from the date they become non-conforming.

g. *Junkyards:* Provide generally similar provisions for the control, screening or removal of junkyards along the Interstate and scenic road systems.

h. *Miscellaneous:* Require that scenic roads be designated in segments of at least 20 continuous miles (including the portions within municipalities, excluded from Federal control but subject to local zoning), except for shorter segments specifically approved by the Secretary. Authorize each Federal agency administering any program which may affect the value of the scenic road system to cooperate in protecting the scenic values and developing the recreational uses of lands adjacent to the system. Give priority to the scenic road system in use of the 3% bonus funds for landscaping and roadside development provided by section 319 (title 23, USC). Provide 1% bonus funds for new construction designated as scenic road mileage. Authorize appropriations for fiscal 1968 and 1969 to begin the removal of signs and junkyards on the Interstate and scenic road systems. (Authorization in Act of 1965 expires June 30, 1967.)

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 180

Mr. CLARK (for himself, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Pell) submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H.R 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he submitted the above amendment, which appear under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED TO CLEAN AIR ACT TO EMPHASIZE RESEARCH RELATING TO FUELS AND VEHICLES AND TO SET UP AIR QUALITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE AND INDUSTRY GROUPS—TWO COMPLETELY NEW SECTIONS PROPOSED BY SENATOR RANDOLPH TO S. 780 AND BASIC ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 181

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967. My amendment would add two sections to the Clean Air Act of 1963 as it would be amended by the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967.

The first provision of the amendment which I now introduce would establish a new section 104 on "research relating to fuels and vehicles" which would specify the emphasis of Federal research in air pollution abatement efforts, expand the authority for such research, and increase the funds available.

It is becoming increasingly evident that the effort to improve the quality of air that we breathe will require a greatly intensified Federal program. It is also becoming increasingly evident that such a program will have a potentially heavy impact on the national economy, American industry, and the schedule of investment in capital facilities in industry. For these reasons, Mr. President, as I have indicated at other times, I am deeply concerned that the air pollution abatement effort proceed on the basis of the best technological knowledge available. It is with this consideration in mind that I introduce the provision to extend and expand the research authority of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to authorize funds of $100 million for fiscal 1967, $125 million for fiscal 1968, and $150 million for fiscal 1969.

The other section of the proposed amendment would add a new section 305 on "advisory committees" to the Clean Air Act. These committees would be established for the purpose also of broadening the foundation of technological knowledge on which the air pollution control program would be based. Subsection 305(a) would establish an interdepartmental air quality advisory committee composed of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as chairman, and the Secretaries of Commerce Defense, the Interior, and Labor, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission to enlist the resources of the departments which have primary interest in some aspect of the air pollution control program—either in terms of the program itself, or dealing with the economic and manpower aspects of the administration of such a program.

Subsection 305(b) would establish industrial advisory committees for each of the major industrial groups which are significantly concerned with improved air quality, such as the fossil fuels industry, the pulp and paper industry, the metallurgical industry, and others. The purpose of these advisory committees—and I emphasize that these are purely advisory committees—would be to augment the knowledge of the executive branch with respect to the particular technological developments and economic considerations within each of the industries which are involved in this critical national question. It is my hope, Mr. President, that such committees, reporting to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as well as to the Congress, would facilitate the kind of Government-industry cooperation that is essential in solving the critical problems of air pollution that confront the American people today.

DETAILED SUMMARY OF AMENDMENT

Mr. President, a summary in detail of the amendment submitted by me to S. 780, the Air Quality Act of 1967, adding two sections to the Clean Air Act of 1963, as it would be amended by the proposed Air Quality Act of 1967, follows:

In the amendment for research relating to fuels and vehicles, the proposal is that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall give special emphasis to research and development into new and improved methods, having industry-wide application, for the prevention and control of air pollution resulting from the combustion of fuels. In this emphasis the chief administrator of the Clean Air Act shall:

Conduct and accelerate research programs directed toward development of improved, low-cost techniques for control of combustion byproducts of fuels, for removal of potential pollutants from fuels, and for control of emissions from evaporation of fuel;

Provide for Federal payments to public or private agencies, institutions, or persons of part of the cost of acquiring, constructing, or otherwise securing, for research and development purposes, new or improved devices or methods of preventing or controlling discharges into the air of various types of pollutants;

Determine, by laboratory and pilot plant testing, the results of air pollution research and studies in order to develop new or improved processes and plant designs to the point where they can be demonstrated on a large and practical scale.

Construct, operate, and maintain—or participate in the construction, operation, and maintenance—of new or improved demonstration plants for processes which have promise of accomplishing the purposes of the Clean Air Act;

Study new or improved methods for the recovery and marketing of commercially valuable byproducts resulting from the removal of pollutants; and

Establish technical advisory committees composed of recognized experts in various aspects of air pollution to assist in the examination and evaluation of research progress and of all research proposals and contracts and to insure the avoidance of duplication of research.

In carrying out the provisions of this section on research relating to fuels and vehicles, the Secretary of HEW shall—

Conduct and accelerate research and development of low-cost instrumentation techniques to facilitate determination of quantity and quality of air pollutant emissions;

Utilize the facilities of existing Federal scientific laboratories;

Establish and operate necessary facilities and test sites at which to carry on the continuous research, testing, development and programing necessary to effectuate the purposes of this new section on research and development;

Acquire secret processes, technical data, inventions, patent applications, patents, licenses, land and interests in land, plants and facilities, and other property or rights by purchase, license, lease, or donation; and

Cause on-site inspections to be made of promising projects, domestic and foreign, and, in the case of projects located in the United States, cooperate and participate in their development in instances in which the purposes of the Clean Air Act will be served thereby.

Federal payments under the new section on research and development shall be subject to these limitations: no grant shall be made in excess of $1.5 million, and no grant shall be made for more than 75 percent of the cost of the project.

There would be authorized to be appropriated for the purposes of the new research and development section: $100 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and $125 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968; and $150 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969.

The advisory committee facet of the amendment submitted provides that there would be established the Air Quality Advisory Committee, which shall consist of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as Chairman, and the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense, Interior, and Labor, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and such other officers of the Federal Government as the President of the United States deems appropriate. Each member of the Committee may designate an officer of his agency to act for him as a member of the Committee. The Chairman may invite the participation of officers of other agencies of the executive branch.

At the request of the President, the Air Quality Advisory Committee shall review the policies and programs of the Federal Government that relate to air quality and shall advise the President on such policies and programs. The Committee shall give full consideration to the purposes of the Clean Air Act and to the maximum utilization of the Nation's industrial resources.

The Secretary of HEW, as Chairman of the Air Quality Advisory Committee, shall encourage the continued efforts on the part of industry to improve air quality and to develop economically feasible technology for the abatement of air pollution. For this purpose, the HEW Secretary shall establish industry advisory committees, with a separate advisory committee for each industrial group which is significantly concerned with improved air quality, including, but not limited to the pulp and paper, chemical, fossil fuels, metallurgical, mining, and utility industries. Each such committee shall consist of a chairman, who shall be the Secretary of HEW or his designee, and no more than 14 nor less than six additional members appointed by the HEW Secretary. Committee members shall be selected from among the persons engaged in such industry who are knowledgeable concerning air quality, or the economics or technology of the industry as they relate to air quality.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall consult with the appropriate advisory committees appointed concerning criteria or standards which the Secretary intends to propose or put into effect, or has promulgated prior to the appointment of the advisory committees. It shall be the duty of the advisory committees, when consulted, promptly to furnish to the Secretary comments concerning criteria or standards consistent with the purposes of the Clean Air Act and the maximum utilization of the Nation's industrial resources. Whenever an advisory committee furnishes its comments in writing, and so requests, the Secretary, upon publication of criteria or standards, also shall publish the comments made thereon and make them available to the general public, together with the criteria or standards promulgated or proposed to be promulgated.

Each advisory committee—the interdepartmental and the industry groups—shall meet from time to time at the call of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to evaluate progress in the development of technology for improved air quality and to recommend research programs which could lead to improved air quality.

One year after the enactment of the proposed new section on advisory committees, and annually thereafter, each advisory committee appointed shall transmit a report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare concerning progress toward the achievement of improved air quality and the Secretary shall transmit such report to the Congress.

Members of any advisory committee who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on the business of the committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and, while serving away from their homes or regular places of business, members may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of any advisory committee and he shall, in addition, make available to any such advisory committee necessary secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as may be required by the advisory committee to carry out its functions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment (No. 181) will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARINGS BY THE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIMINAL LAWS AND PROCEDURES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and other interested persons, I announce that the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures of the Committee on the Judiciary will resume hearings on a number of proposals to combat crime on May 9, 1967, at 10 a.m. in room 3302, New Senate Office Building. Attorney General Ramsey Clark will continue his testimony on that day.

The testimony will be directed primarily to the following bills which are before the subcommittee:

S. 64, S. 1194, and S. 1333, relating to the admissibility in evidence of confessions.

S. 675, to prohibit wiretapping other than by duly authorized law enforcement officers engaged in the investigation or prevention of specified criminal offenses.

S. 798, to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officials killed while apprehending persons committing Federal crimes.

S. 917, to assist State and local governments in reducing the incidence of crime—"Safe Streets and Crime Control Act."

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Don D. Andrews, of the District of Columbia, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Leo P. McCann, resigned.

Frederick M. Strader, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Melvin H. Friedman, resigned.

George A. Gorecki, of Maryland, to be an examiner in chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Manuel C. Rosa, resigned.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Tuesday, May 9, 1967, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearings which may be scheduled.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 2, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

THE RAILWAY DISPUTE

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, neither by negotiation, nor by mediation, nor by acceptance of the recommendations of the Emergency Board created by the President, have the six railroad shop craft unions and the major rail carriers resolved their dispute.

This collective bargaining process began 50 weeks ago, when the representatives of the 137,000 railroad shop workers served notice of changes proposed in their collective bargaining agreements with the carriers. Subsequently, the carriers proposed changes in the work rules.

All the procedures for settlement provided under the National Railway Labor Act were exhausted last April 12, when Congress, at the request of the President, extended the no-strike period for 20 days.

It was hoped that during that period the unions and the management would resolve the issues. It proved, however, a vain hope.

Congress is now advised that negotiations are at an impasse and requested once again to extend the no-strike period for another 47 days. That extension has been granted.

This was the unanimous recommendation of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; and the President has advised that within the next few days he will propose legislation to protect the public interest in this case.

It would appear that this 47-day extension may well not serve as a period of time during which union and management will work toward settling this dispute. Nevertheless, during this period there will be various pressures to bear on Members of Congress to "pass a law."

This process of repeating the no-strike period is but a war of attrition on free collective bargaining; one which could result in the Government determining wages and conditions of employment as well as prices and profits.

We are told that because of the serious impact on the Nation's economy, on the public at large, and on defense production, a strike should not be permitted at this time.

Much as I deplore such hardships, along with inconveniences that invariably result from such work stoppages, if the only alternative is Government domination of labor-management relationships, that would appear to be a heavy price.

MONETARY REFORM—U.S. POSITION

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, a general plan for monetary reform is expected to be presented at the International Monetary Fund annual meeting next September in Rio de Janeiro. Last week, in Washington, representatives of the IMF Board and the group of 10 held negotiations to work out the form of such a plan.

In connection with these negotiations, an interesting article appeared in the Wall Street Journal which sounded an encouraging note for a strong U.S. position. It reported that although the United States has a great interest in monetary reform in order to assure that world trade is not hindered because of a future shortage of gold or foreign-owned U.S. dollars, the administration is not willing to accept a plan that might be acceptable to others but would fall "too short of U.S. goals."

It seems to me that the development of a plan for monetary reform is important, but only if it has a relatively beneficial effect on all countries concerned.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire article "U.S. Says It Will Spurn Monetary Reform If Its Goals Aren't Met in General Plan," from the Wall Street Journal of April 28, be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SAYS IT WILL SPURN MONETARY REFORM IF ITS GOALS AREN'T MET IN GENERAL PLAN

(By Richard F. Janssen)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. appears to be toughening its stance on international momentary reform in preparation for a possible showdown with France.

Despite the great efforts the U.S. has been making for years to attain reform, a high Johnson Administration official asserted that this country would reject a plan acceptable to others if it fell too short of U.S. goals.

The consequences of a bad plan, the official stressed, are perhaps about as great as the risks of reaching no agreement at all. In what some analysts viewed as an effort to strengthen the U.S. bargaining position in crucial meetings in coming months, the official said that turning back if the talks go badly would be better than swimming 10% of the way across a river.

Tempering the optimism voiced earlier this week by Pierre-Paul Schweitzer, managing director of the 106-nation International Monetary Fund, other U.S. and foreign strategists suggested that there are still very grave risks that the negotiations will deadlock or take a turn the U.S. couldn't accept. This is true, they say, even though a majority of the 20 IMF board representatives and the group of ten key industrial powers that met here this week favor a U.S.-style liberal plan.

While a possible compromise exists that would be satisfactory to most nations, they explain, the U.S. and France have diametrically opposing views on some of its major features.

ROLE OF COMMON MARKET

No plan could succeed without U.S. participation, it's agreed. Authorities believe reform could be made workable without French participation, but there's growing fear that Paris might persuade several more of the six Common Market countries to be aloof. This too, would doom the effort.

The basic objective of the negotiations is to assure that world trade isn't restricted because of a future shortage of the traditional reserve assets of gold and foreign-owned U.S. dollars. Reserves are used to tide countries over balance-of-payments deficits, which occur when more money leaves a country than is returned in all transactions.

At least temporarily, the focus has swung away from the first preference of the U.S.—creation of an entirely new unit of reserves to supplement the traditional ones. Attention currently is centering on an increase in rights to draw or borrow existing foreign currencies from the IMF, an approach espoused by the finance ministers of the Common Market at a meeting April 18 in Munich.

The drawing-rights approach could be made so liberal as to be almost as effective as a whole new monetary unit, U.S. officials say. But France is said to oppose each way this could be done.

The U.S., for instance, wants nations drawing currencies under such a plan to be free from any obligation to ever repay them, which would make the new rights more like money than credit. France favors an obligation to repay.

The U.S. or France still could edge far enough away from their current positions on this and other more technical issues to have a generally agreed-upon plan ready for action by the IMF annual meeting in Rio de Janeiro next September, analysts say.

BOTH SEE SERIOUS MISTAKE

But because both countries seem to believe strongly that the world would be making a serious mistake to adopt the other's points, each is expected to stand fast as long as possible.

Underlying the technical disagreements, participants say, is the U.S. conviction that the non-Communist world will require quite a liberal outpouring of new reserves to prevent fresh restrictions on trade and capital flows by countries striving to safeguard their limited holdings of current reserves. But the French and other Continental sympathizers are understood to fear that excessive creation and use of any new kind of international money would invite increased inflation across the world and tempt nations to delay taking actions needed to halt persistent payments deficits.

Negotiators also are uneasy that France could thwart the talks by insisting that voting procedures within the IMF, which would dole out any new kind of reserves, be changed first. The U.S. wouldn't object to a general increase in the voting power of the Common Market countries, but there are rumblings that France may propose more controversial reforms. One of these theoretically would make it easier for a majority of members to push through a simultaneous devaluation of the dollar and all other currencies, a prospect anathema to the U.S.

SOME VIEWS OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Fidel Castro has called the Alliance for Progress "An alliance between one millionaire and 20 beggars."

Ronald Steel has used that description for the title of a treatise on the Alliance and its relationship to the Castro movement which gave rise to it. Mr. Steel's article appears in the current issue of Harper's magazine. It is part of his forthcoming book, "Pan Americana," to be published by the Viking Press.

His article bears out one of the premises of the Alliance—that its success or failure will be the success or failure of all the partners.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at the conclusion of these remarks, followed by the column by Walter Lippmann which appeared in the Washington Post of April 27 and May 2, and the James Reston column from the New York Times of April 28.

There being no objection, the columns and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MILLIONAIRE AND TWENTY BEGGARS

(By Ronald Steel)

Fidel Castro: "The Alliance for Progress is an alliance between one millionaire and twenty beggars."

It has become a truism, and a tired one at that, to say there are no easy solutions for what ails Latin America. The problems caused by political feudalism, social repression, and economic stagnation are so deep and their effects so widespread that chances for orderly and peaceful change in Latin America are not encouraging. It is not simply that conditions are barely tolerable for the vast majority of Latin Americans—they are getting worse. Today food consumption per inhabitant is less than it was twenty-five years ago. Much of the continent is plagued by severe undernourishment, and, as the population bomb takes its toll, prospects for the future are blacker still. With the highest birth rate in the world, Latin America is expected to double its population within thirty-five years, creating twice as many mouths to feed on the same inadequate resources. Figures like these transform abstract terms like "population explosion" into a social catastrophe.

The uncontrolled rise in population, disturbing enough in itself, is aggravated by the scarcity of accessible farmland. Throughout much of the continent, most of the arable land lies either in the hands of a few wealthy proprietors or else is parceled out into thousands of minuscule plots too tiny to be farmed productively or to earn their peasant owners a decent living. Between the big estates and the tiny plots is little on which to build a stable agricultural base capable of feeding and supporting the continent's population. Land distribution is largely based upon feudal patterns inherited from the Spanish and Portuguese, and except for Cuba, Bolivia, and Mexico, there has never been comprehensive agrarian reform. The United States has urged the Latin-American governments to push through land-reform programs, and a few are attempting to do so on a limited scale. But in much of Latin America the government is run by a landowning oligarchy which has no intention of relinquishing its land, because land is the basis of its political and economic power, not to mention social prestige. To ask it to share some of its wealth is to seek a degree of social responsibility and political awareness which is rare in any oligarchy, and virtually unheard of in Latin America.

Shackled by a rigid social structure, a feudal land pattern, and the demands of a galloping population, the nations of Latin America also have underdeveloped or lopsided economies. Like other countries of the Third World, they are usually dependent on a primary product, whether it be a crop or a raw material, for their livelihood. The product varies from country to country—bananas in Panama, coffee in Brazil, copper in Chile, oil in Venezuela, tin in Bolivia—but the problem of a one- or two-crop economy is the same. These products account for the bulk of the foreign currency they earn—currency they need to feed their population, buy essential imports, and industrialize themselves. Yet such products are subject to wild fluctuations in price, depending on the size of the crop, the foreign competition, and the demands of the market. Sugar, for example, during a single period in 1963–65 fell from twelve cents a pound on the world market to three cents a pound. Such fluctuations spell catastrophe for nations trying to achieve orderly economic development.

The economic crisis faced by many Latin-American nations has served to reinforce a social crisis resulting from the breakdown of the feudal order. Virtually every Latin-American society is going through a period of sustained social tension that inspires searches for radical solutions. The oligarchies feel the rumble of popular discontent, and even the democratic governments face social and economic ordeals they may not be able to surmount. It is generally assumed that Latin America is ripe for a social revolution. Whether or not the communists will benefit from such a revolution is difficult to say. But some kind of revolution—whether it be inspired by Castroism or by fascism—seems likely in a number of countries.

It is wishful thinking to imagine that private enterprise will stave off such a revolution by gradually raising the standard of living over the decades. Latin America will not wait. It may even be asking too much of democratic government to channel such a revolution. Unless a way is found to feed undernourished masses, provide jobs for the unemployed, introduce radical agrarian reform, redistribute income, and achieve a meaningful degree of political equality, democracy is likely to be rejected for one of the totalitarian formulas which are exerting an increasingly powerful appeal. Indeed, it is surprising that democracy has fared so well, considering the fact that, to the landless peasant and the slum-dwelling urban proletarian, political democracy as practiced in much of Latin America has not meant much more than the freedom to starve. To sacrifice that kind of freedom is not going to be a difficult choice, particularly when almost any alternative seems better.

WHY THEY ADMIRE CASTRO

Although Latin America has had hundreds, if not thousands, of revolts, coups, and insurrections, only three times has a fundamental change in the social order been achieved: In Mexico in 1910, in Bolivia in 1952, and in Cuba in 1959. All the rest—the uprisings, the coups, the interchangeable caudillos—was simply a change of characters within the same basic plot. Only these three revolutions destroyed the power of an oppressive oligarchy, redistributed the national wealth, and achieved a system of social equality. And in each case, the revolution was achieved by violence. Considering their own history, and looking at the stagnation and paralysis around them, it is not surprising that Latin-American reformers are becoming increasingly pessimistic about peaceful change and are turning toward the extremes. In a continent where military coups are the norm and where elections have been little more than charades, even the best-willed reformers think in terms of revolution.

The Latin-American radicals are virtually a class unto themselves. Rarely having experienced a viable democratic government, they are less concerned with formal constitutional guarantees than with breaking the grip of the oligarchy and launching a social revolution that will remake their societies. In this effort they have been inspired, in a limited but important way, by Fidel Castro. That Castro has turned his revolution into a political tyranny is not quite as significant as the fact that he has remade Cuba from top to bottom. Moreover, to have smashed the Batista dictatorship and broken the power of the Cuban oligarchy with Uncle Sam's big stick only 90 miles away—that is a source of inspiration for many Latin Americans. Even those who have little sympathy for Fidel admire his defiance of Washington, for when confronted with the power of the United States, they cannot help thinking of themselves in Cuba's shoes.

Reformers are impressed by Cuba's domestic gains. While other Latin governments form committees to discuss new housing, schools, and hospitals for the poor, the Cubans have already built them; while the others muse over the problems of agrarian reform, the Cubans have put it into practice. Even with the American embargo, they have achieved a formidable 8 per cent growth rate in recent years—an enviable record by any standards. It is not in his domestic policy that Fidel has lost support among the Latin-American radicals, but in a foreign policy which has become almost totally dependent on the Soviet Union. He is frequently criticized for turning Cuba into a Russian dependency—but then most Latins are convinced that the United States drove him to it against his will.

The Cuban example is one, although not the only, violent alternative open to Latin America if peaceful reform does not come fast enough. Another is the possibility of an insurrection by younger army officers determined to push through social reforms opposed by the oligarchy and by their own generals. This could lead to a military dictatorship, perhaps with vaguely democratic aspirations, rather like the rule of Nasser in Egypt or of Ayub Khan in Pakistan—authoritarian, radical, but noncommunist. In Latin America, as in many other parts of the Third World, younger military officers are imbued with a desire for economic progress, and they resent a feudal social order which provides no outlet for their ambitions, or any future for their country but economic stagnation. A third possibility is a national socialism of the kind espoused by Juan Perón during his heyday in Argentina: a fascist dictatorship. A fourth choice of status quo does not exist. Even in the most repressive and primitive backwaters of Latin America, such as Paraguay, Haiti, and Nicaragua, the archaic and dictatorial one-man states cannot indefinitely hope to survive the ferment that is sweeping the rest of the continent, any more than Batista survived it in Cuba or Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

HOW TO BUY A REVOLUTION

The question of whether Latin America will have bloody or peaceful revolutions is one in which the United States has a serious and abiding interest, but far from a controlling one. What we do or don't do can have an enormous impact on the future of Latin America. But in the long run what happens to these countries depends upon the people themselves—what they are willing to fight for and what they are willing to endure. And they are becoming less and less patient. The facts are in harsh contrast to the official pieties from Washington on the glowing prospects for orderly change. Although the Cuban revolution dates all the way back to 1959 and the Alliance for Progress to 1961, there has been little improvement in the Latin-American social structure. Nearly everywhere the oligarchy remains in tight control; indeed, the democratic process has broken down in a number of countries. Except for Chile and Venezuela, there has been little reform in the key areas of land holdings, tax revision, and income redistribution. Yet it is precisely in these areas that the architects of the Alliance for Progress placed much faith.[1]

It was neither charity nor a guilty conscience, but Fidel Castro who provided the inspiration for the Alliance for Progress. By bringing the Cold War into the Western Hemisphere, by forcing Washington to realize that it could no longer take Latin America for granted, he galvanized U.S. policy makers and terrified Congress into voting $20 billion over a ten-year period for the economic development of Latin America.

Castro's brand of revolution was exactly what the Alliance was designed to prevent. The Alliance sought to do with dollars that which Castro had done with rifles and communist manifestos—it was constructed to buy a social revolution. By a combination of U.S. political pressure and financial aid, the Latin-American governments would be encouraged to make essential reforms, and the need for violent revolution could be eliminated. *Fidelismo* would be discredited by being made to seem irrelevant.

This analysis mingled its idealism with a heavy dose of realism. "Political freedom," President Kennedy told the Latin-American ambassadors in the spring of 1961, "must be accompanied by social change, for unless necessary social reforms, including land and tax reform, are freely made—unless we broaden the opportunity of all our people—unless the great mass of Americans share in increasing prosperity—then our alliance, our dream will have failed." To bring about this social change, U.S. officials counted heavily upon the reform-minded elements of the middle class—the journalists, the professors, the students, the lawyers, and the liberal intelligentsia. These are the most outspoken voices for change in Latin America, and these, it was assumed, would be the natural allies of the Alliance. They, in the name of self-interest even more than idealism, would make its cause their own, because its aims were theirs.

Frighten the oligarchy, woo the intelligentsia. Yet neither the bogey-man nor the bait worked. The Latin-American reformers—and particularly the left-wing radicals, who are most outspoken against the oligarchy—proved incapable of swallowing any program that bore the fatal stamp, Made in U.S.A. The fact that it might be for their own benefit, that through North American help the oligarchy's power might be broken, was less important to them than that it was Yankee in inspiration. Their traditional anti-*yanquismo* was too strong, their own demogoguery too compelling, their inbred suspicions too overwhelming, and their preference for talk over action too inbred, to permit them to adopt the Alianza.

If the reformers turned their back, the oligarchy proved to be indifferent or even hostile. In most countries the landowning rich were less worried by *Fidelismo* than by the loss of their privileges through Alianza reforms. Washington's gory picture of imminent revolution seemed exaggerated, while its prescription for reforms horrified them. If revolt were to break out, they were convinced that the army would quickly suppress it—and the army, or so they thought, was in their pocket. As for Washington's bribes, they were convinced that the United States would have to keep pumping dollars into Latin America anyway—not to encourage reforms, but to protect the economic investments of its own private corporations. American business, they reasoned, would never allow the Administration to tolerate another Cuba. And even if Wall Street were willing to write off its investments as a bad gamble, Congress could surely be counted on to oppose any revolution which could be labeled, rightly or wrongly, as communist-inspired. The oligarchy's assessment turned out to be more or less correct.

---

[1] At this writing, it looks as if the hemispheric summit meeting scheduled to be held at Punta del Este in April 1967 will only dramatize how little progress has been made since the launching of the Alianza para el Progresso six years ago.

Faced with the hostility of the business groups, the conservatism of the urban middle class, the refusal of the oligarchies to be frightened or bought off, and the reluctance of the radical left to have anything to do with the *Yanquis*, the Alianza has been politically paralyzed. It has had to dispense aid on the basis of promises offered rather than on performance rendered and content itself with the usual jobs of technical assistance: building roads, hospitals, and schools. Worthy projects all, but a far cry from its original intentions, and also precisely the sort of projects the Latin Americans can and should be carrying out for themselves. The Alianza, while it has stimulated economic advancement, has almost totally failed as an instrument of social reform because it never was able to project a mystique that inspired the Latin Americans.

DISABLED BY OUR FEARS

Though much of the blame must fall on the Latin Americans themselves, and particularly on the left-wing reformers who often prefer the pleasures of anti-*yanquismo* to the harsh realities of social change, the Alianza was also hobbled by U.S. preoccupation with communism, which the oligarchies and generals exploited. Encouraged by Washington's fear of communism and by its preference for verbally anticommunist regimes, would-be caudillos—usually trained and equipped by the U.S.—moved in to depose a number of legally elected governments. Their charge: civilian reformers were weak on communism. Within the first four years after the Alianza was launched at Punta del Este, civilian governments were overthrown by the military in no less than seven countries: the Dominican Republic (twice), Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, Peru, and Brazil.

The record shows that the kind of government that creates a favorable climate for business investments under the Alliance for Progress and that can be counted on for anticommunistic votes in the Organization of American States and the United Nations is not the kind of government that has popular support. President Kennedy realized this and tried to back the democratic progressives. But in the end, his determination to punish, and if possible to topple, the Castro regime, led him to align U.S. policy with the very oligarchies he detested, and served to neutralize his enlightened attitude toward reformers. Because it needed their votes to expel Cuba from the OAS and enforce economic sanctions, the Administration found itself wooing dictatorships such as those in Paraguay, Haiti, and Nicaragua, while at the same time declaring its allegiance to reforms that such regimes had no intention of undertaking. The result of this policy was a double failure; it neither brought about the weakening, let alone the downfall, of the Castro regime, nor did it succeed in instigating social change in Latin America.

The Cuban revolution thus is in the anomalous position of having fostered the Alianza, and also in large degree having been responsible for the failure of its reformist ambitions. Without Castro there would have been no "vast, cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health and schools," as President Kennedy described the Alianza to Congress in March 1961. Without Castro, however, there might also not have been the assumption that insurrection in Latin America automatically involved the danger of a communist takeover—and thereby required direct military intervention by the United States. The equation Insurrection = Communism = Peril to the United States is rooted in the tragicomedy of the Cuban revolution.

Whether Castro jumped into Russia's arms, or whether he was pushed by Washington is a point likely to be argued for years to come. Some believe that Fidel sprang, like a bearded Venus, full-blown from the brow of Karl Marx and was determined to turn Cuba into a communist state ever since he was old enough to tell the proletariat from the bourgeoisie. Others assume that, like Topsy, he just grew into a communist, a little bit more every day, until the old agrarian reformer was transformed into the militant Red revolutionary. Perhaps Castro was determined to lead Cuba into the communist camp from the beginning, and thus he would not have been amenable to compromise after seizing power. Yet in an interview with Herbert Matthews in October 1963, Castro said that in outlining his plans for "a very radical revolution" he initially "thought it could be done under the Constitution of 1940 and within a democratic system." His conversion, he explained, was "a gradual process, a dynamic process in which the pressure of events forced me to accept Marxism as the answer to what I was seeking." It was, he said, the American reaction to his "agrarian reform" of May 1959 that "made me realize that there was no chance to reach an accommodation with the United States. So as events developed, I gradually moved into a Marxist-Leninist position. I cannot tell you just when, the process was so gradual and natural." Perhaps Castro was fabricating an elaborate story in explaining his conversion to Marxism-Leninism. But since there is no convincing reason for doing so, it is equally possible that he was telling the truth.

WHERE WE DREW THE LINE

Even had the United States been more cooperative in the months following the Cuban revolution, Castro and his followers probably would have been very suspicious of American friendship. Latin-American radicals are instinctively anti-*yanqui*, just as they were instinctively anti-British during the nineteenth century. Blaming America for their national ills, they tend to favor whatever foreign power is America's most effective opponent. During the second world war many radicals, particularly in Argentina and the Caribbean, were drawn toward fascism. Today their anti-*yanquismo* is expressed in an admiration for communism. During the heyday of the Cold War, they were attracted toward Russia. Now in an era of "peaceful coexistence" between Washington and Moscow, they are drawn toward a belligerent Peking. Had Castro won his revolution in 1939 rather than in 1959 he might have been a Nazi sympathizer rather than a communist; had he won it in 1966 instead of 1959, he might have turned first to Peking rather than to Moscow.

Moreover, Castro drew a connection between the U.S. and the hated Batista regime which was not entirely fanciful. Batista served American business interests well, and Washington found the regime expedient, however distasteful its internal politics. Politically and economically, Cuba was an American dependency, with its fate decided in Washington and New York. President Kennedy, in an interview shortly before his death, indicated a deep awareness of the causes that inspired the Cuban revolution. "I believe there is no country in the world," he told a French journalist, ". . . where economic colonialism, humiliation, and exploitation were worse than in Cuba, in part owing to my country's policies during the Batista regime."

Despite its high per capita income for Latin America, Cuba before the revolution was the very model of economic colonialism. Every light bulb that was bought, every kilowatt of electricity consumed, every telephone call that was made, every razor blade that was used, and even nearly all of the food that was eaten could be traced back to some American corporation and to American shareholders. As Wall Street financiers controlled the Cuban economy, so Miami racketeers ran the elegant gambling casinos in Havana that catered to North American vacationers; the Pentagon supplied the Cuban army with its military equipment; and the State Department instructed it in the diplomacy it was to follow. As an economic colony of the United States, Cuba did better than most of the Caribbean republics. Or at least those Cubans on the top of the social pile did well, while the others lived in the misery which is taken for granted throughout most of Latin America.

Once Castro took power, Washington showed a considerable forbearance, and seemed willing to put a good face on what it saw as a rather dubious turn of events. Even after the seizure of U.S.-owned investments in Cuba, it is far from certain that Washington would have tried to intervene. The nationalization of foreign business is nothing new in Latin America. The United States accepted Mexico's nationalization of her oil industry and Bolivia's seizure of the tin mines without trying to overthrow their governments, even though heavy American investments were involved. The Bolivian revolution which occurred in 1952 even managed to win economic support from the Eisenhower Administration.

Yet the *Fidelistas* assumed the hostility of the United States, and by behaving as though intervention were a foregone conclusion, tended to encourage the very reaction which they feared. Had Castro been content with nationalizing U.S.-owned property and pushing through social reforms within Cuba, he could probably have had his revolution and, if not American friendship, at least American acquiescence. But being ideologues, the Cuban revolutionaries were not content with being simply Marxists. They had to make a dramatic spectacle of leading Cuba into the communist camp. Fidel had to declare his undying faith in the secular dogma of Marxism-Leninism and embrace Soviet Russia as the guide and defender of the Cuban revolution.

It was here that Washington drew the line, for while it was willing to tolerate a revolutionary Cuba isolated within the safe confines of the U.S.-dominated Caribbean, it was outraged at the prospect of Cuba as a center of subversion and as a Soviet outpost in the Western Hemisphere. The former involved a matter of pride; the latter seemed to entail the very security of the United States. By failing to recognize that difference, the *Fidelistas* not only lost the American good will they enjoyed at first, but unleashed a complex of Cold War emotions in the United States that has made any accommodation between the two countries exceedingly difficult.

FIDEL'S OWN BRAND

Why did Fidel do it? Why was he not content to fashion a Tito-style communist dictatorship in the Caribbean, one which would proclaim all the half-truths of Marxism-Leninism, but which would avoid, carefully, entanglement with the United States? Above all, why did he allow (or persuade) the Russians to turn Cuba into a missile site directed against the United States? The answer is open to speculation, but it may be more practical than ideological. It may be that the Cubans turned to Russia because, once having decided to defy the Yankees and become the paladins of Latin-American revolution, they needed Soviet protection. To be anti-Yankee and vaguely communist, would be to suffer the fate of Guatemala in 1954. But to be a protégé of the Soviet Union is to enjoy a prominent role in the duel of the giants—and thus to put the Russians in the position where they would have to defend a fellow communist regime. Cuba may have ostentatiously made itself a Soviet-supported communist state because this appeared to be the only way of safely defying the United States.

Yet it is a tribute to Castro's political skill that despite a near-total dependence on the Soviet Union, he has managed to avoid having the island turned into a Russian satellite. He has cleverly used the Sino-Soviet split to his own advantage, blackmailed the Russians into furnishing far more foreign aid than they would like, and has given virtually nothing in exchange. Not only has Fidel resisted satellization, but he has twisted the Cuban communist party to his own purposes—using it in 1961 to set up a new Castroite political party, and then expelling the communist party organizer from the country the following year, leaving the party, in Theodore Draper's words, "dismembered, dishonored, and discarded." Castro's Cuba is a communist state because Fidel has declared it to be so. But it is a communism that bears more of a resemblance to traditional Caribbean *caudillismo* than to Moscow-organized conspiracy. It is Latin-American authoritarianism with a Marxist veneer, anti-*yanquismo* enveloped in the protective armor of communism.

This is why the real problem of the Cuban revolution is not communism as an ideology. The kind of government the Cubans live under is their business: President Kennedy said so, and President Johnson has concurred. Whether this pledge would be honored in the case of "another Cuba," remains open to speculation, and after Santo Domingo there is good reason to be dubious. But it has become an American dogma that every nation has the right to self-determination—even in the Caribbean. The Cubans, therefore, presumably have the unalterable right to practice communism, cannibalism, or nudism at home. They do not, however, have the right to let their island be used as a Russian base against the United States, nor as a center of subversion against other governments. Professional revolutionaries may consider this unfair, but it is a fact of life within the sphere of influence of any great power.

Yet, as far as American security interests are concerned, a communist regime in Cuba is basically irrelevant. It may be a nuisance. It is certainly an embarrassment. But it is hardly a threat to our safety. It became so only when Khrushchev committed the folly of trying to turn the island into a missile-launching platform. The Russians had their fingers burned badly, and are unlikely to make the same mistake again. President Kennedy's demonstration that the United States would not tolerate a Soviet sphere of influence in the Caribbean was an impressive and restrained use of American power. Not only did it bring to an end an adventurous phase in Russian foreign policy, and thereby pave the way for the present détente, but it also caused a sharp drop of Russian and Cuban prestige in Latin America. It was a turning point of the Cold War and, had it been wisely exploited, could have put relations between the United States and the Latin republics on a better footing.

Instead, Washington has remained mesmerized by the communist orientation of the Cuban revolution, and has exaggerated Cuba's role as the cheerleader of world revolution out of all proportion to its real importance. Isolated within the Western Hemisphere, only 90 miles from the shores of the most powerful nation in the world, and 5,000 miles from their nearest ally, the Cubans are bound to search for and encourage political friends wherever they can find them. Considering the troubles it has at home and the perils it faces abroad, a Trotskyite Cuba is virtually inevitable. To expect it to preach "communism in one country" is asking too much of an island bobbing precariously in America's inland sea. But so what? The United States has been preaching democracy at the Latin Americans for two hundred years with infinitely greater resources and rewards to offer, but with little notable success. The Cubans, for their part, have been at it since 1959, yet their prestige and their influence have dropped precipitously over the past few years. Fidel Castro is unlikely to talk any government out of existence.

Indeed, among younger Latin radicals one can now begin to see a sharp disenchantment with the Cuban example and a turning toward Maoist extremism—and even beyond that, toward a vague left-wing anarchy that seems to defy external direction. Latin America may be ready for revolution, but it is exceedingly unlikely that Fidel will lead it, or even play any major part in it. Cuba is too small, its record too shabby, and the price it has had to pay—economic and military dependence on the Soviet Union—too high.

We can afford to let Fidel talk. The Egyptians, the Algerians, and even the Albanians preach revolution as the cure for all ailments; yet we have managed to contain our anxiety about them. The reason is that we know it is little more than talk—helpful for keeping the crowds at home in a high state of agitation, and for demonstrating one's revolutionary credentials, but not particularly useful for stimulating real insurrections. Considering our strength and Fidel's unimpressive record of conversion, we can afford to be as indifferent to his propaganda as he is to ours. If we did so, then we might discover not only that the influence of the Cuban revolution on the Latin Americans is a good deal less than we imagine, but also that the lingering obsession with ideology is impeding our understanding of the real problems facing Latin America.

"ANOTHER CUBA"?

These problems were not created by Castro and will not disappear even with his eventual demise, for they are rooted in the nature of Latin-American society. Castroism has merely brought them to our attention. But it has also given them a new focus, and therein lies its greater importance. Whatever the fate of the regime that today rules Cuba, Latin America is unlikely ever to be the same again. The old despair is no longer being borne with the same spirit of resignation, and the search for change has opened up a far wider range of alternatives. The conditions that kept much of Latin America in a state of political and social stagnation have now begun to break down. In countries such as Chile and Venezuela, where a relatively enlightened middle class is willing to pursue reforms over the opposition of the oligarchy, a nonviolent transfer of power may be possible. Throughout much of the continent, however, such conditions do not yet exist. In such cases it may be that violence offers the only means by which an oppressed majority may be able to overcome the monopoly of power held by an entrenched minority.

This spells revolution—a word that is anathema to American policy makers. We seem to look upon it as a repudiation of the values we believe in—even though our own society was founded upon revolution. To stave off the danger of revolution we launched the Alliance for Progress and are today training and equipping Latin-American armies for "counterinsurgency"—that is, the suppression of peasant revolts. We are doing so partly because, as an essentially conservative society, we are not really sympathetic to revolutions—except for anticolonial ones directed against European imperial powers. More importantly, we are engaged in the abortion of revolutions because we see them as inspired and directed by communists. And communism, we believe—despite the disintegration of communist unity and the open clash between Peking and Moscow—is a threat to American interests regardless of where or how it is practiced.

If we allow ourselves to become associated with discredited regimes the inevitable turbulence to which Latin America seems doomed will be directed against us. This need not be so. Even should there be "another Cuba," a nominally Marxist regime, it would not necessarily be hostile to the interests of the United States—as we have seen in the case of Poland and Yugoslavia—unless we help make it so by confusing labels with the realities of power.

As a millionaire amidst twenty beggars we can afford to remain calm as the Latin-American nations work out their own internal problems, have their revolutions if they will, and espouse the ideologies they find congenial. We may not always be happy with their choice. But one of the virtues of power is that it can afford to tolerate diversity. This is also one of its responsibilities.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 27, 1967]

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE INTERVENTION OF THE GENERAL

(By Walter Lippmann)

The President's bringing Gen. Westmoreland home in order to explain the war reminds me of an instructive afternoon spent during the Second World War. The country and the Congress were divided on the question of whether to strike first against Hitler or first against Japan. Churchill and Roosevelt had agreed on the policy of Hitler first. But there were large and powerful groups in the country, many of them former isolationists in the sense that they were anti-European, who wanted to concentrate American forces on winning the war against Japan. Even the American chiefs of staff were divided on this question of high strategy.

Churchill had come to Washington, accompanied by the British chiefs of staff, to work out with President Roosevelt and the Administration the general plan of the global war. One morning I had a telephone call from Sen. Austin, who was a strong believer in the Churchill-Roosevelt line. He said in effect "I know you are seeing the Prime Minister this afternoon and I wish you would ask him to tell his chiefs of staff to come to Congress and testify in favor of our strategical policy." Quite innocently I said I would do this, and when Churchill received me that afternoon I began by saying that I had a message from Sen. Austin. "Would the Prime Minister instruct his chiefs of staff to go to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee . . ." I never finished the message. For the old lion let out a roar demanding to know why I was so ignorant of the British way of doing things that I could dare to suggest that a British general should address a parliamentary body.

As I remember it, what he said was "I am the Minister of Defense and I, not the generals, will state the policy of His Majesty's government."

No one who ever aroused the wrath of Churchill is likely to forget it. I certainly have not forgotten it. I learned an indelible lesson about one of the elementary principles of democratic government. And therefore, I take a very sour view of a field commander being brought home by the President to educate the Congress and the American people.

There is, of course, no argument about Gen. Westmoreland's tribute to the valor of his troops. The argument, which he does not seem to understand very well, is about whether the President is committing those brave and competent men to a mission which serves the honor and the interests of the United States and of the worldwide community of nations of which the United States is such a powerful member. This is the most unpopular war in American history. Even those who have conformed and support the war are not all of them inspired to feel that their sons are being asked to fight a just and necessary war.

Gen. Westmoreland will not be able, any more than are the President and the Secretary of State, to silence the doubts and the misgivings of our people. The real feeling of the country about the war is expressed by something much deeper than the protest marches, the draft card burning and the heckling, the speeches of the Senators and the articles of the editorial writers and the columnists. That deeper expression of the real feeling of the country is in the fact that in this war for the first time in the memory of man it is taken to be quite normal, it is almost fashionable, for the leading families in Government and business not to send their sons to war. This abstention, this attitude of sitting it out, is much more eloquent than anything that is said openly against the conduct of the war.

There is no denying that our adversaries take comfort from the evidence that the country is not United behind President Johnson. They will no doubt find in Gen. Westmoreland's mission in the United States confirmation of the fact that the President knows he is not leading a united country. And no doubt this will help Hanoi and the Vietcong to endure the terrible punishment which they are undergoing.

But Gen. Westmoreland is quite mistaken if he thinks he could win the war if only Sen. McGovern and Sen. Fulbright and Sen. Kennedy decided to remake themselves in the image of Hubert Humphrey. And the President is mistaken if he thinks he can light a bon-fire in Vietnam that will rid him of his enemies abroad and of his opponents at home.

The President is indeed playing with fire. If there are any plain-spoken men to whom he still listens, they should speak before it is too late.

[From the Washington Post, May 2, 1967]

Today and Tomorrow: An Insoluble War?

(By Walter Lippmann)

At the moment, the official theory about the war is that it is a contest to see which side will crack first. As Gen. Westmoreland has told us, the conflict is now a war of attrition.

Hanoi, according to the official line, believes that if it holds on, the dissenters will become so powerful that Washington will be compelled to give in, to stop the fighting and withdraw its forces. This illusory hope can be dashed by a silent unanimity in this country and by an unceasing increase of military pressure in Vietnam. The official theory is that if we hit hard enough our adversary will reach that breaking point which exists for every country where it will accept a dictated peace.

On this conception of the war—that Hanoi is waiting for Washington to break, and that we can cause Hanoi to break first—the war is now becoming wider and fiercer. From correspondents who are very close to the White House, the Pentagon and the State Department, we are now hearing that the conflict has become such that there is no way of negotiating a settlement of it.

They may be right. There is no denying that the military power of the United States is so formidable that if fully employed it ought, by normal calculation, to bring our adversary to his knees. They may be right, too, in that as the war has been escalated by both sides, the stakes have been raised and compromise by negotiation has become ever so much more difficult. Nevertheless, to accept the theory that a solution is not negotiable is to declare that political control of the war has been lost and there is nothing to do but to let her rip.

Is that the best we can do? If it is, then everything depends upon the ability of our military forces to put Hanoi past the breaking point before the Chinese and the Russians are drawn into it. Perhaps the military men can do this. But not even Gen. Westmoreland thinks that the breaking point can be reached in any foreseeable near future. Thus what the General foresees is an indefinable war of attrition. There can be no doubt that the longer and fiercer the war becomes, the greater the chance of intervention by the Communist powers.

There is another way of interpreting the situation. It is possible, I myself think it is probable, that Hanoi is not adverse to a negotiated solution which accepts the autonomy of South Vietnam with the issue of Vietnamese reunification put off to the future. Such a solution is entirely consistent with our formal commitments and with the verbal declarations of the President. But it is probable, I think, that Ho Chi Minh and his associates are determined not to negotiate with the men who have attacked and are destroying their country. It seems unlikely that Hanoi is really under the illusion that the American dissenters can reverse the President with his enormous powers over war and peace.

What seems much more probable to me is that Hanoi, advised by Moscow, is studying the polls hoping that Johnson will not be re-elected.

Face-saving has become the main preoccupation on both sides: Hanoi's preoccupation may be that the bomber attack shall not decide the war in Johnson's favor; Johnson's preoccupation is that at the end the casualties and the costs shall be discounted by the enthusiasm of victory. It seems to me a plausible idea that Hanoi is persisting not because of an illusion that the United States will crack and give in, but because it is waiting for a new administration, free to negotiate without being bound by so many considerations of personal prestige.

This is, I realize, only an hypothesis. And while reasoning by analogy in international affairs is notoriously uncertain, we should at least compare the situation in Vietnam in 1967 with the situation in Korea in 1952. Then as now, the Administration in power was engaged in a land war in Asia that it could not win at any tolerable cost and risk. The Democratic Party was hobbled by its escalated commitments and by its political enemies at home so that it could not negotiate peace without victory. There was no solution then except through the election of a Republican President. And that may well turn out to be the only solution now.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 28, 1967]

Washington: Blessed Are the War Makers?

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, April 27.—The latest theory in this upside-down war in Vietnam is that a hawk is a dove and a dove is a hawk. This is the new gospel according to our embattled masters: the doves are deceiving the enemy into prolonging the killing, whereas the compassionate hawks are trying to bring the killing to a quick and merciful end.

The awkward thing about these two propositions is that there happens to be some truth in both. No doubt the Vietnam doves are inadvertently helping perpetuate the illusion in Hanoi that our divisions here at home will lead eventually to our defeat. And no doubt the hawks genuinely believe they can smash their way to peace, even if they have to smash that tragic country to do it.

THE STRANGE LOGIC

It is not difficult to understand the conflict between the doves who want to reach a compromise by negotiation, and the hawks who want to compel a compromise by force of arms. It is even easier to understand General Westmoreland, the magnificent commander of the American Expeditionary Force in Vietnam, who naturally thinks primarily about the men who have to do the fighting. What is harder to understand is the argument of President Johnson, Secretary of State Rusk and Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, who don't seem to mind giving the impression that they would gladly violate the right of dissent rather than put up with it.

Obviously, they are not all suddenly suggesting that dissent is almost unpatriotic in order to defend the right of free speech. They cannot really be advocating what they seem to be arguing: My country 'tis of Thee, Sweet land of conformity, Of Thee I sing.

They are themselves too much in the American tradition to advocate such nonsense and they couldn't get away with it if they tried. It is not only that the press and Congress would object, but that prominent members of the President's own Cabinet would object, no matter how irritating their critics might be.

M'NAMARA'S VIEWS

When Secretary of Defense McNamara was asked this week whether he agreed with General Westmoreland's public observation that the critics of the Vietnam war were "helping the enemy," he replied: "I have long spoken in favor of free speech in this country. . . . It's what we have fought for for 200 years, domestically and internationally, and I would not like to see any action taken to in any way restrict it."

The habit of resigning on principle has almost vanished from the political world of Washington. Nobody goes out and slams the door these days, but the corruption of gentle conformity has not reached the point of limiting free debate.

Secretary McNamara carries in his pocketbook a quotation from the late Judge Learned Hand, which reads as follows:

"I believe that that community is already in process of dissolution where each man begins to eye his neighbor as a possible enemy, where nonconformity with the accepted creed . . . is a mark of disaffection . . . where orthodoxy chokes freedom of dissent; where faith in the eventual supremacy of reason has become so timid that we dare not enter our convictions in the open lists to win or lose.

"Such fears as these are a solvent which can eat out the cement that binds the stones together; they may in the end subject us to a despotism as evil as any that we dread; and they can be allayed only insofar as we refuse to proceed on suspicion, and trust one another until we have tangible ground for misgiving. The mutual confidence on which all else depends can be maintained only by an open mind and a brave reliance upon free discussion."

Secretary McNamara has his critics, but nobody should mistake him on this point, and he is certainly not alone in Washington in feeling this way. The question, therefore, is why other leaders of the Administration have allowed themselves to get in the position of seeming to want to shame their critics into silence, and the answer is that the pressure of war are doing what the pressures of war usually do. They are distorting and corrupting the priorities of many men and leading them to say things under emotion that they do not really believe and probably would not act on even if they could.

THE RIGHT TO DISSENT

But the main point is fairly clear. The present fuss about silencing the dissenters on Vietnam only strengthens the spirit of dissent. We are in trouble here on a lot of things. The dissent on Vietnam is much greater in private than it is in public, as the wives of most influential men here know better than anybody else, but the right of dissent itself is not in danger.

MINNEAPOLIS TRADE MISSION TO THE SOVIET UNION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce is sponsoring a trade mission to the Soviet Union, Poland, Romania, and Yugoslavia. This mission is the first private trade mission to the Soviet Union to have the official backing of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

The mission is principally exploratory. Members of the mission are interested in meeting with representatives of these nations and learning what products they are interestd in buying and selling.

The members of the mission left for Moscow yesterday for the 20-day tour. They were in Washington last week and I and several other members of the Minnesota delegation met with them.

It is my view that the decision of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce to sponsor this trade mission represents an important step in East-West trade relations. I ask unanimous consent that the names and a brief biographical sketch of the members of the group be printed in the Record, together with an article about the mission by Brendan Jones entitled "Minneapolis Group To Bid for Trade With Soviet," published in the New York Times of yesterday.

There being no objection, the matter requested was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

J. Patrick Kittler will serve as Chairman of the Trade Mission and will represent Economics Laboratory, Inc.

Mr. Kittler attended the University of Michigan, United States Naval Academy and the University of California, and received his Bachelor of Laws degree from Stanford University. He is Chairman of the World Trade Committee of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce; a director of the Minnesota World Trade Association; a member of the United States Department of Commerce Upper Midwest Regional Export Expansion Council, as well as other law and civic organizations. The firm of Kittler and Hedelson specializes in private international law and foreign trade and investment counseling.

Economics Laboratory, Inc., manufactures and markets chemical products for institutional, industry and home use in cleaning and environmental sanitation, and is a leader in detergents for warewashing in restaurants, hotels, hospitals and schools. The firm also serves dairy plants and farms, food processors, breweries, packing and bottling plants; the metal marine, paper and pulp, printing, petrochemical and construction industries.

Orin T. Hanson will serve as director of the Trade Mission and also as advance man. He will precede the Mission by about one month, accompanied by an official of the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Hanson attended the University of Minnesota. He has a strong background in agriculture. He is part owner of a farm in western Minnesota and spent nine (9) years with the U. S. Department of Agriculture. He is a member of the National Association of World Trade Secretaries, the Agricultural Relations Council of the United States, an alternate member of the Upper Midwest Regional Export Expansion Council and the American Chamber of Commerce Executives.

Fred Bieber is principal stockholder and operating head of Acrometal Products, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., and President of two wholly-owned subsidiary companies—Continental Non-Ferrous Foundry and Acrometal Products, Inc., of New Jersey. Mr. Bieber also is responsible for the overall management of K-B Engineering Company of Minneapolis, Minn., a partnership in which Acrometal owns half interest.

Mr. Bieber is a graduate mechanical engineer and has spent his working career in the mechanical field serving in various capacities of executive management, engineering and sales principally in connection with machinery, mechanical equipment and production.

Acrometal's principal business activities are devoted to building machinery and accessory equipment for packaging, processing, handling and enameling all types of ferrous and non-ferrous wire. The firm operates plants at four locations in the United States.

Jim Bormann is director of news and public affairs for WCCO, the only clear-channel radio broadcasting station in north central United States.

Mr. Bormann supervises the preparation and broadcast of all news and news-related programs, and prepares or supervises the preparation of all public service programs such as documentary broadcasts. He is a former President of the Radio-TV News Directors Association, a member of the Regional Export Expansion Council, former President of the Minneapolis Press Club, and Director of the Associated Press, the world's largest news gathering organization.

Mr. Bormann plans to gather information on tape recordings for use in a documentary broadcast which could be heard by as many as 3 million Americans.

Station WCCO is one of the most dominant radio stations in America, attracting more listeners than the other 17 stations in the market combined. WCCO, a pioneer American station which has been broadcasting since 1923, is affiliated with the Columbia Broadcasting system.

Louis R. Brewster is Vice President of Wellens & Co., merchandisers of various protein ingredients used in the manufacture of animal formula feeds, and various edible soy products for use in the baking and sausage industries.

During World War II, Mr. Brewster served in the 69th Army Division, which made first contact with the Russians in Germany in 1945. In 1947, he earned a degree in Business Administration from the University of Minnesota. He joined Wellens in 1964 to organize, develop and manage the International Division.

Mr. Brewster has traveled extensively abroad on business, including two trips representing jointly the U.S. Food for Peace committee and the Soybean Council of America.

In addition to selling Wellens' products, Mr. Brewster will survey the feed industry and its interest in U.S. ingredients, and also will investigate the interest of the baking and sausage industries in the use of edible soybean flours and grits.

A. J. d'Ailly, Manager of International Operations for Farmhand, Inc., was born in Makassar, Indonesia, where his father was with the Netherlands government. He is currently President of the Minnesota World Trade Association.

Mr. d'Ailly, who joined Farmhand in 1959, speaks and writes English, Dutch, French and German, as well as understanding Spanish, Italian and Japanese. In 1966, he was awarded the Exporter of the Year Award for the State of Minnesota.

Mr. d'Ailly is responsible for the marketing and manufacturing of Farmhand products outside the United States and Canada.

Farmhand, Inc., is a leader in the development of materials handling and grassland farming equipment. On this Trade Mission trip, Mr. d'Ailly plans to introduce Farmhand's feedmobile and also the multi-row beet harvester. He also will discuss Farmhand's complete lines of specialized farm machinery and material handling systems.

Richard H. Donaldson is Vice President of Sales and Engineering and also a Director of the Donaldson Company, Inc. Mr. Donaldson is a graduate of the University of Minnesota and has been associated with Donaldson since 1936. He began as a factory employee and subsequently was promoted to foreman and Chief Inspector. He also has had experience in the Engineering and Sales Departments and served as Personnel Director.

The Donaldson Company, Inc., manufactures and sells heavy-duty air cleaners and air cleaner accessories as well as heavy-duty mufflers and silencers for internal combustion engines and gas turbines.

While on the Mission, Mr. Donaldson hopes to obtain trade contacts for follow-up by the firm's European sales and service company in Belgium. He desires to meet with personnel involved in the manufacture and sales of farm tractors and other self-propelled farm machinery; heavy-duty construction, oil field and mining equipment (dozers, scrapers, heavy track laying tractors), and heavy trucks, ore carriers and portable compressors.

Harold Fischbein, President of the Dave Fischbein Company, has been a life-long resident of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. He is a graduate of the University of Minnesota.

The Dave Fischbein Company manufacturers sewing machines and allied equipment designed especially for closing filled bags used by the chemical, seed and animal feed industries and various food processors. Although the company has for many years sold its equipment in many countries of the world, including those to be visited by the Trade Mission, it is hoped this personal contact will expand sales opportunities.

In addition to visits to countries on the Mission itinerary, Mr. Fischbein will spend several days attending the INPRODMASH–67 Fair in Moscow where Cie. Fischbein S. A., the firm's Belgium company, is exhibiting equipment.

Donald B. Palmer, Jr., is a Special Sales Assistant for Pioneer Engineering, a Division of Poor & Company, Inc.

Mr. Palmer has been employed by Pioneer Engineering for 22 years and has had extensive experience with the firm areas of engineering, field service, sales and sales management. He majored in engineering and business at the University of Minnesota and during his career has been an active member of many industry organizations and service clubs.

Pioneer Engineering was founded in 1928 as the Pioneer Gravel Equipment Manufacturing Company, a manufacturer of portable gravel plants. Today, Pioneer Engineering engineers and manufacturers a wide variety of equipment used in highway heavy construction, gravel, quarry, mining, cement, lime, bituminous and other basic industries.

J. Thomas Sample, Jr., is Manager of the International Service Department of the American National Bank and Trust Company, fourth largest commercial bank in the Upper Midwest.

Mr. Sample has been International Services Manager since 1965 and a member of the bank's staff since 1962. Previous to that he was associated with the Cleveland-based M. A. Hanna Company.

Mr. Sample is a member of the Advisory Council of the Foreign Credit Interchange Bureau of New York City, a director of the St. Paul Art Center, a trustee of Children's Service, Inc., a member of the board of governors of the University Club, as well as being active in other civic organizations.

A firm believer in increased East-West trade, Mr. Sample is anxious to aid efforts to find new markets for Upper Midwest products and services in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. His department specializes in trade development foreign financing and foreign exchange.

John H. Graflund, Vice President of Deere & Company, is in charge of administration for John Deere's overseas operations.

Mr. Graflund has had wide experience in the farm equipment business, both in the United States and overseas. He has been Comptroller of Deere & Company, General Manager of the John Deere Harvester Works, and more recently has been responsible for overseas manufacturing. He is a member of the Board of Directors.

The company, founded by John Deere in 1837, is headquartered on the banks of the Mississippi River at Moline, Ill. The firm's annual sales exceed $1 billion.

Deere today manufactures a complete line of farm machinery, industrial equipment, and lawn and garden equipment. Fourteen factories are maintained in North America and nine in other nations of the world. Products are sold through branches, distributors and dealers worldwide.

Eugene Larson is vice president of the Marketing Division and a director of the E. J. Longyear Company, Minneapolis, Minn. Mr. Larson, who earned an engineering degree from Iowa State College, joined Longyear in 1953. He was employed by the William H. Ziegler Company from 1933–53, Armco Steel Corporation from 1930–33, and the U.S. Engineers from 1925–30.

Mr. Larson is a member of the National Association of Manufacturers, National Foreign Trade Policy Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, and served as a vice president and director of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce.

E. J. Longyear Company supplies geological and mining engineering consulting services and contract drilling for mineral exploration, as well as manufacturing and selling specialized drilling equipment for the mining and industrial markets. The firm is represented in 75 countries, with affiliated or subsidiary corporations in Canada, Mexico, Japan, Holland, France, Germany, India and Australia.

David A. Koch attended the University of Notre Dame and was graduated from St. Thomas College where he majored in Business Administration. He is a member of the Young Presidents' Organization (YPO) and The American Management Association.

Harry A. Murphy, Sr., past president of the Gray Company, Inc., is the senior consultant on international trade and also a director of the firm. He has been associated with the Gray Company for 37 years and previously was in the grain business for 15 years.

The Gray Company manufactures (under the trade name Graco) pumping equipment and accessories to transfer, spray and extrude materials which vary in viscosity from lightweight oils to heavy, viscous semi-solids. This includes the pumping and spraying of all forms of paints and coatings, and the fields of lubrication and pressure cleaning devices.

The firm's products are manufactured in Minneapolis and under license in Japan and France. Gray Company markets throughout the United States and in approximately 75 other countries, both on an export basis and through a network of sales subsidiaries and distributors.

Paul C. Sharp, General Export Sales Manager for Honeywell, Inc., has been involved in the growth of his firm's international business for 33 years.

Mr. Sharp studied engineering at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute and Drexel Institute, foreign trade at the University of Pennsylvania, and business and management at LaSalle University.

He was the first President of the Minnesota World Trade Association and is a member of the Instrument Society of America, the Export Expansion Council, and People to People. He is past chairman of the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce World Trade Committee.

Honeywell's products involve automatic controls for air conditioning, heating and all light and heavy industrial processes; MICRO SWITCHES, scientific indicating and recording equipment; tape systems, medical equipment, sonar and radar devices; business and industrial computers; automatic pilot controls for aircraft and guidance systems for space vehicles. Honeywell employs 64,148 and maintains 37 manufacturing plants in the United States, Canada, England, France, Holland, Japan, Mexico and Brazil.

Kermit H. Wilson, who began his career in 1935 as a clerk with Cargill, Inc., is now owner-president and founder of SICO Incorporated, manufacturer of mobile folding table-seating and staging.

After holding numerous positions in Cargill's Mechanical Division, Mr. Wilson was appointed a shore captain on the Erie Canal and soon after became part of Cargill's shipbuilding project.

In 1945, he co-originated WACO, a steel scaffolding company. Seeing a need for multiple use of room space, he later formed SICO. Mr. Wilson is now engaged in exporting his ideas of cost efficiency and room versatility.

SICO Incorporated is the service arm of Wilson's versi-room benefit concept, as well as the manufacturer of table-seating and staging equipment. Recognizing the importance of space economy, SICO disseminates a program of methods and materials for the most efficient use of rooms. Mr. Wilson is interested in investigating the possibility of licensing his products and systems.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1967]

Minneapolis Group To Bid for Trade With Soviet

(By Brendan Jones)

From Minneapolis to Moscow. This is to be the direction of the newest in "bridge-building" efforts recently urged by President Johnson to increase trade between the United States and the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

The trade-promoting bid will be made by a 15-member mission sponsored by the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce. The group, including top executives of several nationally-known companies, will be the first private American trade mission to Soviet Russia having United States Government backing.

The mission is scheduled to leave New York for Moscow tomorrow after a stopover in Washington last week for briefings by State and Commerce Department officials. The Minneapolis businessmen will spend six days in Russia and will also visit Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia in their 20-day tour.

Preparations for meetings with Soviet trade officials and those of the other countries have been made by an advance group that left a month ago.

WIDE PRODUCT RANGE

Fields represented by the group cover a wide range of agricultural, industrial and consumer products and equipment to which current Soviet planning has given high priorities. Among them are specialized farming machinery, agricultural packaging and processing equipment, animal feeds, industrial control and computer systems, chemicals and mining and highway construction machinery.

In addition to seeking direct export sales, the Minneapolis mission will explore opportunities for licensing of manufacturing processes, according to J. Patrick Kittler, who will head the Moscow-bound group. Mission members, he said, will also be interested in importing products made in Russia and the East European countries.

Mr. Kittler, a senior partner in the Minneapolis law firm of Kittler & Hendelson, which specializes in international law, trade and investment, is chairman of the Minneapolis chamber's world trade committee.

POTENTIAL CUSTOMERS

"As with the first investigation of any potential new market," he said, "the prime interest of mission members will be in meeting potential customers, getting to know them, and finding out what products they are interested in buying and selling. The mission will attempt to obtain orders—members will have their order books handy—but this is not the primary motivation.

"The main objective is to learn how to sell products in these countries. On the buying side, it is probable that mission members may also place some orders, possibly for metals. And they will have an open mind on the possibilities of sales on a barter basis that will overcome the present difficulties of credit and payments with the East European countries."

Mr. Kittler said that he expected some of the Communist trading officials to be well informed on the companies and products represented by the mission. The group's advance team, consisting of Orin T. Hanson, manager of the chamber's agriculture and world trade department, and Jack Smith Jr., Commerce Department representative, has already prepared the ground for negotiations, he noted.

CONTROLS REDUCED

Planning of the Minneapolis mission, Mr. Kittler said, began early last year following the considerable reduction of this country's strategic controls on exports to Eastern Europe.

From the businessman's point of view, he said, decisions on trade policies were a responsibility of the Government, but the decisions about selling or buying with particular countries were entirely a matter of business initiative.

"On the question of whether we should do business with Communist countries," Mr. Kittler commented, "individual companies have to work out their own decisions. Many of our chamber members had mixed feelings, but over-all the increase of trade and other exchanges represents a non-violent way of resolving conflicts that can serve the interests of everyone.

"Except for a few crank letters to the newspapers, there has been little adverse reaction to the mission. Whether it is in Russia or elsewhere, increasing trade can lead to better understanding, and, even though sales may not be big to start with, the effort adds another straw to the pile."

Mr. Kittler added that he did not agree with the view that Western Europe held an edge in trade with the Eastern bloc because of proximity and traditional patterns.

"There is a market for American products there, as there is everywhere," he declared.

Among companies represented on the mission are Deere & Co., general farm equipment; Honeywell, Inc., industrial process and air-conditioning controls; Economics Laboratory, Inc., chemicals; Farmland, Inc., farm equipment; the Gray Company, industrial pumping systems; the E. J. Longyear Company, mineral exploration equipment; the Pioneer engineering division of Poor & Co., rock crushing and processing equipment; Wellens & Co., animal feeds and related products; Sico, Inc., hotel and school equipment, and Acrometal Products, Inc.

Besides being the first Government-backed private trade mission to Russia, according to a Commerce Department official, the Minneapolis group represents the first in a series of similar eastward trade-building efforts planned this year.

CALIFORNIA MISSIONS

Some others are a private California food-processing equipment mission and a recently announced private apparel and textile mission. Both will participate in Moscow trade fairs. A United States Government-sponsored exhibit also is being prepared for a tour of Russia.

In addition, during the fall an Illinois state-sponsored mission representing the agricultural and construction industries will visit Eastern Europe and a United States Government-sponsored industrial machinery mission will visit Czechoslovakia.

SERVICEMAN'S PRAYER

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, there has come to me a poetic prayer written by a West Virginia serviceman in South Vietnam. This young American soldier, Pfc. Terrance L. Wiseman, serving in the area of the outside central highlands, Pleiku, Vietnam, has affirmed his faith in a Supreme Being.

In these days when one sees so many who do not believe in the power of prayer, who do not believe there is a living God—preferring instead to claim that "God is dead"—and who follow some leaders who, under the guise of ministers of the Gospel, preach near-anarchy, it is encouraging to see evidence of a strong faith in spiritual values.

This prayer poem, titled "My Friend," states a belief that being able to commune with the Almighty through prayer is a blessing, one in which its author takes pride and comfort.

I ask unanimous consent that this poem on prayer be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the prayer poem was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

My Friend

(By: Pfc. Terrance L. Wiseman, March 24, 1967, outside central highlands, Pleiku, Vietnam)

I am lonely over here
  In this war infested country,
But I am free of fear,
  For a Friend looks after me.

Tho' there is constant danger,
  And some have to die,
You can always find comfort,
  By focusing to the sky.

Yes, God is our protector,
  In all that comes our way,
He will be our resurrector,
  Come that happy, glorious day.

When this life is ended,
  And the world is free from sin,
And we gather up in Heaven,
  Where all will be called Friend.

No more wars will be fought,
  No more tears to be shed,
Not even immoral thoughts,
  Nor weeping for the dead.

For in this war torn land,
  We have done our very best,
Tho' this would tire any man,
  And we think we need a rest.

Just look back at how Jesus
  Was crucified that day,
And you will have the reason,
  Why we must fight today.

Being able to pray is a blessing,
  And I cherish the Almighty above,
And I accept his wonderful message,
  And receive his wonderful love.

Yes, I am very lonely,
  In this land of war and sin,
But I have an "overseer",
  And I call him, "My Friend".

PUNTA DEL ESTE—THE MEXICAN VIEWPOINT

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Potpourri," written by Bob Thurston, and published in the Colony Reporter of Guadalajara, Jalisco, Mexico, on April 22, 1967, dealing with the subject of the activities which occurred at the recent Punta del Este meeting in Uruguay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Potpourri

(By Bob Thurston)

"Punta del Este," said Paco, "was a very fine thing for us Mexicans, anyway."

"Not much money involved," we replied, perhaps a little cynically.

"Who mentioned money?"

"Well, we read a lot in the papers about how the U.S. senate had sent President Johnson off to the conference without his checkbook, and it looked like all the money was spent on armed guards," we said.

"Money! There are other things than money, amigo!"

"Then why was the meeting so good for Mexico, Paco?" we asked.

"Because, precisely, it showed there are some things almost as good as money—maybe better."

"And what is better than money?"

"Well, as you know I am a very modest man and I dislike getting into discussions such as this one, but I will point out that while you have your glut of really beautiful new cars and refrigerators, of topless waitresses and color television, and certainly a booming business in making bombs to drop over Vietnam, and while we Mexicans have chiefly our troubles in building enough schools, in getting running water into our villages, in even teaching people how to read and write, and while we feel we can afford only five centavos in every tax peso for the military because we must spend thirty centavos of that peso on education, and—am I boring you?"

"No, of course not. Go on and tell us your troubles."

"Who mentioned troubles? I am saying only that some troubles are not as bad as other people's troubles. That is all."

"Like?"

"Well, I was thinking of all those guards and battleships and FBI and CIA and the good Dios knows how and many others it took to keep someone from killing your president at Punto del Este. I have nothing against your president, señor. I was just stating what was in the news. Do I offend?"

"Certainly not. We raised the point about the guards, ourselves."

"As I said, then, I was thinking about all those guards, and then I was thinking of our our President Diaz Ordaz who slept so well in his quarters with only one drowsy guard out in front and the Mexican flag.

"I haven't offended you?" Paco asked.

"No. Go on," we said.

"Well, someone once said that the president of México could sleep alone and unguarded even on the park benches of any city of the world without being molested, and—well, Punta del Este seemed to exemplify this.

"That is what I had in mind when I said that the conference was a good thing for México," Paco continued. "It showed us Mexicans that we have something that you don't have, if you don't mind my saying so.

"It seemed pretty good to us—our president there and only that sleepy guard and the Mexican flag and all. I hope I haven't offended you by speaking so frankly. I just wanted to say that it was good for México to see for once that there are some things as fine as money—well, almost as fine, don't you agree?"

"Yes," we said. "We agree very much."

SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 180

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to H.R. 9481, making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes. This amendment is cosponsored by the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the junior Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell].

I ask that the amendment be stated and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

At the end of chapter VI insert the following:

"EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

"Office of Economic Opportunity

"Economic Opportunity Program

"For an additional amount for expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as amended, $137,500,000, to be available for expenditure for programs under such Act in such amounts as the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity may determine."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to restore the cuts made in the poverty program authorization by the Appropriations Act last year.

The amount appropriated was $137,500,000 less than the amount authorized by Congress on the recommendation of President Johnson.

The Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] the ranking minority member of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and also a member of the Subcommittee on Manpower, Employment, and Poverty, which I chair, joins me as a cosponsor of this amendment, as do Senators Randolph, Pell, Nelson, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Kennedy of New York, and Morse.

Last year the President's budget allocated $1.75 billion to the antipoverty programs under the Economic Opportunity Act. That amount, if appropriated, and expended in accordance with the recommendations of the administration, would have enabled the Office of Economic Opportunity to continue funding ongoing community action programs which had been funded in fiscal year 1966.

The administration said $1.75 billion was "a conservative request"—"the minimum necessary to sustain already existing programs."

Although both the House and Senate authorized the full $1.75 billion requested by the President, the Congress appropriated only $1,612,500,000.

The Congress' failure to appropriate the full authorized amount has crippled many antipoverty programs in more than

1,000 communities throughout the country.

While it is impossible to assess the total impact of this cutback and to trace the precise effect on each community engaged in the war on poverty—I have been given figures by OEO for 27 of the Nation's larger cities.

Those 27 cities had a total of $19.4 million less available to them in fiscal year 1967 than in fiscal year 1966, and their programs were in far greater need in fiscal 1967 than they were in fiscal 1966, because in fiscal 1966 OEO programs were just getting underway in many areas.

The total funds available, as compared with fiscal 1966 funding levels, in these communities, however, is not the only effect, and probably not the most important reason for my urging that the full $1.75 billion authorization be appropriated for economic opportunity programs.

The hallmark of the war on poverty, I believe, is local initiative. Most OEO programs are funded through community action agencies. These agencies are designed to mobilize every available local institutional and human resource to plan and administer antipoverty programs.

They were told by the Congress and the administration, when the Economic Opportunity Act was passed in 1964, that it was their job to initiate and design, with guidance from Washington, their own programs to fight the war on poverty in their home communities.

Last year, however, the Congress in passing the authorization bill, insisted on earmarking specific amounts of money for particular programs.

Thus, of the $856 million authorized for community action programs last year, Congress earmarked $484 million for programs such as Headstart, health services, legal services, family loans, and adult basic education.

While all these programs are needed, the earmarking of funds for them has hamstrung other programs which were developed, and planned locally, and in operation in fiscal year 1966.

Thus, local initiative has been stifled in two ways:

First, the earmarking of specific amounts of money for Headstart, legal services, health services, and other programs has forced some local communities to spend extra money on programs they may neither need nor want.

Second, those earmarked funds are unavailable for other programs such as Upward Bound, foster grandparents, for the operation of neighborhood centers, and family planning, and for the planning, demonstration, and operation of new programs.

Every major city faces this problem. Every major city has been forced in fiscal year 1967 to cut back on locally developed programs which they were operating in 1966. Thus, for example:

New York City will have $6.8 million less than the minimum necessary to carry on existing locally developed programs.

Philadelphia will have $2.9 million less.

Pittsburgh $1.8 million less.

Los Angeles $9.8 million less.

Chicago $4 million less.

In 49 of our larger cities, locally developed programs amounting to a total of $72.8 million have had to be eliminated entirely or substantially curtailed.

More than 900 other smaller communities have similarly been forced to eliminate and cut back programs that were funded last year.

Perhaps, equally important, no funds are available this year to start new community action agencies in other cities, towns, and rural counties. And there are no funds to begin new programs in ongoing community action agencies.

I do not believe that more money alone is the answer to the problem of poverty. Money alone will not wipe out poverty in the United States.

But many of our constituents, particularly those who go to bed hungry—and, may I say, there are thousands of American citizens going to bed hungry tonight, and a great many of them are in the delta of Mississippi—sleep in cold houses, and roam the streets in search of employment each day, feel that the war on poverty is a package of empty promises.

Restoration of the full authorization under the Economic Opportunity Act will go a long way toward fulfilling these promises and toward enabling local communities throughout the country to carry on programs which were successfully operated in 1966 but which cannot be funded this year.

Mr. President, there is one particular problem created by inadequate funding of Economic Opportunity Act programs which is of immediate and crucial importance with the approach of summer.

Last year OEO spent a total of $35 million on special summer programs. Of these funds, $12.5 million was transferred by OEO from community action funds to the Neighborhood Youth Corps for summer work and training programs for 16- to 21-year-olds.

Twenty million dollars was spent through community action agencies in 28 cities throughout the country. These funds enabled many youths and adults who would otherwise have been roaming the streets of our cities to participate in summer work training and recreation programs. I believe a good case can be made to substantiate the fact that in many of those 28 cities a long hot summer, with all that that entails in terms of potential riots, was averted because of OEO's foresight in making available $20 million for summer projects.

Yet, because of a lack of funds, and specifically because Congress failed to appropriate $137.5 million of the total $1.75 billion authorized last year OEO has had to eliminate all special summer programs.

These summer programs, moreover, are not merely stopgap measures or palliatives. An effective summer program involves the establishment of neighborhood organizations in which parents and children alike help to plan and operate their own recreation facilities and activities. The people themselves not only participate in the programs but fill jobs necessary to operate them. Provided an opportunity, and sufficient funds, program participants can, at the end of the summer, be channeled into year-round work training education and other programs. If the neighborhood organization is an effective one, it can continue, with financial help, to conduct the kinds of neighborhood activities which help poor people in target areas bring themselves out of poverty. Last year's summer projects, involving as they did, only 28 cities, were a mere drop in the bucket in terms of the needs for such projects in urban areas throughout the country.

We have already read of disturbances in Nashville, Tenn., and Louisville, Ky., this spring. Neither of these cities participated in special summer projects last summer, nor did Jacksonville, Fla., Waterloo, Iowa, or Omaha, Nebr., which are just a few of the cities in which there were disturbances last summer.

I am proud to say, however, that Philadelphia which did have summer projects costing more than a million dollars had no riots last summer. I hope that without this program we will have no riots this summer.

The senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and I intend to appear before the Appropriations Committee on Thursday to press our case for restoration of this appropriation.

I hope when that time comes that the Director of the OEO, Mr. Shriver, with the approval of the President of the United States, will support again what they supported last year, which is the full appropriation with which to meet the authorization for the economic opportunity program.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I shall confine my statement to the poverty program, as I assured the Senator from Louisiana I would.

I join with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] in this effort to get some money for the war on poverty with a very deep understanding of what is going on in the big cities.

I am a product of the city of New York. I was born there. I spent my life there, and I think I understand the problems pretty well.

One of the things which is agitating the poor of this country is the fact that we are carrying on a war in Vietnam at their expense. I have supported the commitment of the President in Vietnam as recently as noon today. But I do not believe we are in any position where we have to have millions of Americans convinced that their urgent needs are going to be unsupplied because we are fighting a struggle in Vietnam. We know very well that we can afford to do what needs to be done on both fronts

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has pointed out, what is required is $137,500,000. We can certainly find that amount of money for a matter as necessary and as urgent, in terms of the elementary public order, as this.

I can testify to Congress that if we do not want real trouble this summer, we absolutely must have money for summer programs, and we do not have it. The best prescription of the Office of Economic Opportunity is to take funds from programs which exist now to finance summer programs. But that is just robbing Peter to pay Paul. It will do no good, because you create as many difficulties as you cure. Nothing less than new money will do it.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania has already said—and I do not wish to be redundant—the funding which we gave last summer of $20 million to 28 cities did not include some of the hottest spots we have today; and he named them—Jacksonville, Nashville, Louisville, and other cities.

In the city of New York, as an elementary matter, there needs to be an expansion of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, which provides employment for teenagers; and yet, this summer the Labor Department has contracted for only 177,000 slots, nationwide, as opposed to 209,000 last year. I believe it would be really shameful to turn loose that many teenagers, with the explosive potentials which I see in my own city and which are present, according to the investigation of the committee chaired by the Senator from Pennsylvania, in so many other cities.

The most shortsighted kind of judgment, in my opinion, would be to fail to supply some money for these summer programs. The $137,500,000 is a reasonable figure. I believe we should have it. I agree thoroughly with the Senator from Pennsylvania that there is no use thinking about alternatives until we see whether Congress really intends to deal justly with the poor of the United States.

Lest it be thought that the only ox being gored is that of the big cities—though that is bad enough, with 70 percent of the population in these cities, and the possibility of disorder high unless the necessary programs are implemented with money. I should like to point to the fact that there is actual hunger—indeed, starvation—in a number of States. Our committee personally investigated conditions in Mississippi, and we came back convinced that there was actual hunger and deprivation among a very large number of people there. We reported that to the administration.

We urged the administration to take measures to deal with that hunger, and we pointed out precisely how it could be dealt with. We have been turned down by the Office of Economic Opportunity, according to a story which appears today in the New York Times, based on a statement by my colleague, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark]. I ask unanimous consent that this news report, headed "Food Aid Barred for Mississippi," be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is inconceivable to me that our Government, with its tremendous resources and the way in which it has the ability to allocate funds from program to program, cannot find the money to deal with the hunger in Mississippi, which we ourselves saw, or with hunger in any State.

The Senator from Pennsylvania has called a meeting of our subcommittee for tomorrow, which I welcome, in the effort to deal with this, in my judgment, repudiation by the administration of its solemn responsibility in respect of hungry people, right here in the United States. It is just beyond understanding how this could be so.

On these two grounds alone: on the essentiality of continuing the summer programs which the Office of Economic Opportunity mounted last year—giving us some surcease from the tension-ridden atmosphere in big cities like my own—and on the ground that we are tolerating—it is a ghastly confession to make—actual hunger and the Government saying it cannot relieve it; I deeply feel that we must make some provision for this purpose in the supplemental appropriation bill now going through.

It is rather fortuitous that the Senator from Pennsylvania and I are joining in this matter. I have been working on it since last December, when I first announced that I would do my utmost to get the President to request supplemental funds for the antipoverty program. I am deeply disappointed that he has not done so. I believe he should do so.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark] is chairman of the committee investigating the poverty program. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I shall move the matter in that committee. The Senator from Pennsylvania is moving it with me, as the chairman of the committee which is familiar with the actual situation on the ground, and can represent that it is urgently needed.

Finally, Mr. President, I wish to point out that the mayors of New York City, Detroit, St. Louis, and Atlanta have recently met with the Vice President of the United States to report the critical nature of this problem. They have been assured of help by the Vice President. I believe that his heart and his goodwill are certainly manifest in this area. But the administration can help us the most, and in its default—I deeply feel that it is defaulting in this situation—we must try to help ourselves through the appropriation process.

I am therefore pleased to join with the Senator from Pennsylvania in this effort, which I will push in the Committee on Appropriations by the necessary amendment. I know that we will make an ironclad case on the merits. I appeal to the conscience of the members of the Committee on Appropriations and of all Members of Congress not to let our Nation be disgraced by widespread disorder, which we can do something to avoid, or by actual hunger among thousands of Americans in States like Mississippi.

Exhibit 1

Food Aid Barred for Mississippi—Administration Bans Extra Aid Urged by Senators

(By Joseph A. Loftus)

Washington, May 1.—The Administration has turned down an appeal of a Senate subcommittee for emergency action to feed hungry families in Mississippi and wherever else similar needs exist.

The appeal was made in a letter from a nine-member bipartisan panel. The White House passed the letter on to the Office of Economic Opportunity, the antipoverty agency, with a request that it respond.

The agency responded by issuing a news release that did not use the name of its director, Sargent Shriver.

The response in effect was this:

There is a crisis caused by poverty in Mississippi and in many other places; the answer is to provide more funds for the antipoverty program.

Further, it is unlawful for the Department of Agriculture to issue food stamps without cost to the recipients; also, the department said it could not authorize emergency action under the Food Stamp Act.

Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat of Pennsylvania, who is chairman of the subcommittee that petitioned the President, said:

"The O.E.O. release completely misses the point. We are not talking about poverty, we are talking about hunger, perhaps starvation.

"I know there is poverty in Pennsylvania, but is there hunger? It seems incredible that the Federal bureaucracy is so tied up in knots that it can't do anything. I don't believe the legal opinion that Secretary [of Agriculture] Freeman is relying on [with reference to free food stamps] is correct.

"Our lawyers researched this question. The least the President can do is to put this up to the Attorney General. We are the richest nation in the world and they are saying we can't feed hungry people. That is a bureaucratic answer."

PROJECT CREATED TENSION

The subcommittee did not mention a political factor that could be involved in the situation—the fact that the Mississippi delegation in Congress has not asked for the declaration of an emergency and Gov. Paul B. Johnson Jr has denied there is a hunger problem in his state. For the Administration to push a program that the political leaders of a state finds undesirable would be unorthodox politics.

A Head Start project, the Child Development Group of Mississippi, has been creating tensions between the Administration and the regular Democratic organization in the state for 18 months because the organization does not want the project.

Senator John Stennis, Democrat of Mississippi, has been the principal critic of the antipoverty program in that state. An aide said that he was "collecting his own information" and probably would have something to say later about allegations of hunger there.

. The poverty agency's statement said that "fortunately, all the recommendations made by the committee are planned, or have been executed with two exceptions," those two dealing with Federal food stamps.

One recommendation is that the authority for emergency family loans be used to subsidize the purchase of food. The poverty agency said that such loans were being planned for 20 south-southwest counties, four of them in Mississippi. The law setting up the agency authorized loans at 2 per cent interest to low-income families to meet "immediate and urgent family needs." The outstanding balance of loans made to an individual can not exceed $300.

A second recommendation that is getting executive action said that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare should consider invoking its authority to extend supplementary welfare assistance, on a demonstration basis, and seeking the required matching funds from private nonprofit sources.

Secretary John W. Gardner said his department was trying to raise private funds, and has already asked the Ford Foundation, because its own funds for that purpose are exhausted.

AFTER VIETNAM—WHAT?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a speech entitled "After Vietnam—What?" delivered by Mr. Edward Lamb, at the Center for the Study of

Democratic Institutions, at Santa Barbara, Calif., Friday, March 24, 1967.

Mr. Lamb is a very prominent Democrat in the State of Ohio. He is a brilliant lawyer. He has played a very active part in the affairs of the Democratic Party for years. He went to Southeast Asia, and this speech is an account of his observations in Southeast Asia. I believe it is a very objective, cogently reasoned speech.

I offer the speech for the reading of the Senate for that purpose, but also for the additional purpose that it sets out the facts concerning what he observed and his conclusions relative thereto. It is a speech that seeks to urge the Democratic administration to change its course of action in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AFTER VIETNAM—WHAT?

(A talk by Edward Lamb at the Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions at Santa Barbara, Calif., Friday, Mar. 24, 1967)

Friends: This Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions is making a significant contribution to the future of the world. The Geneva *Pacem In Terris* Convocation is important in that it provides a forum where men of all nations can sit together and talk out programs which may lead to peace.

Vietnam will be discussed at Geneva. Indeed, the basic issue confronting the world today is Vietnam. There is much worried talk, vast death and destruction—and very little direct dialogue or confrontation among the principals.

Obviously, the importance of such discussions is dependent upon the quality and diversity of the participants. The Center sent Harry S. Ashmore and William Baggs to Hanoi, North Vietnam and there they had conference with Ho Chi Minh and others. Representatives of North Vietnam visiting Geneva will once again be able to sit down with spokesmen for South Vietnam, including the National Liberation Front, as well as with leaders of other nations from around the world. If such a confrontation of these leaders is arranged, this private institution at Santa Barbara may well have accomplished a step forward which could not have been arranged under any governmental auspices.

My own trip to Southeast Asia and around the world sought to bolster the invitations already extended by President Robert M. Hutchins to political and economic leaders to come to Geneva.

I met with Thailand's Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, one of the participants in the Geneva Conference. He was enthusiastic about the trip made by representatives of this Center to North Vietnam, and while he had misgivings about the willingness of Hanoi's representatives to make agreements, he enthusiastically endorsed the theme of attempting some confrontation of world leaders. This whole theme of "Let's try something" also prevails among the leaders in India, Iran, and Israel, with whom I had discussions. If there is hesitancy on the part of the sponsors of the meetings, it must be realized that the stakes are so very great. We'll then resolve that the effort, expense and risk involved are more than justified.

When I went to South Vietnam, it was for the purpose of inquiring, "After Vietnam—What?" With hundreds of reporters presently covering every phase of the military action, it is obvious that Americans daily read casualty lists, get a box score on the number of American bombing raids on North Vietnam, and the size of the latest landing of United States Marines. In our affluent America, we also note the hourly dollar cost of this adventure in Southeast Asia. In spite of such reportorial detail, a credibility gap has developed—and we wonder how much is fact and how much is fiction.

My own haunting question has been, "Is there anything we are doing in Vietnam under the guise of pacification or rehabilitation which we can count as affirmative steps in building a decent social order?" If President Lyndon B. Johnson has his promised military "victory" over the people of this particular section of Southeast Asia, will the poverty and hunger and disease still remain? Does his "pacification" means subjection, or rehabilitation of the people?

I visited military and civilian hospitals in Saigon and there saw the ravages of our weaponry. As a sidelight, I also visited a foster home which is sponsored by PLAN and services 6,000 families in South Vietnam. This Center has been under the direction of Miss Elizabeth Brown, a veteran of more than half a dozen years of service in Saigon. She attempts to stay out of the political activities and crosscurrents, but it is obvious that anyone watching the marauding of foreign troops and armaments notes the human tragedies involved, and develops bitter feelings. Miss Brown is most skeptical about the nobility of our objectives. More important, she doubts the effectiveness of our efforts to build a better society in Vietnam. She and many other seasoned workers on the scene insist that when the U.S.A. will depart after conquest, or by request after negotiation, that it will leave few friends behind.

BOMBS, RICE, AND THE OPEN-ARMS SURRENDER

The press section of the United States Army was kind enough to let me have a helicopter to explore my areas of interest. I saw Viet Cong killed and hamlets starved into submission.

I watched an outlandish "County Fair" extravaganza. I soon became aware of the possibility of a military "victory" due to the unleashing of fantastic American firepower and the smart use of psychological weapons. The United States is waging an electronic war with history's most sophisticated weaponry—and once again the possessor of the gun could rule a society. The Viet Cong crossbows, captured rifles and weapons from friends abroad, are fighting B–52 bombers 50,000 feet in the sky. American strategy also recognizes that the capture of a bag of rice may more quickly assure military victory than the killing of another Viet Cong.

And after the *Chieu Hoi* "Opens Arms" safe conduct pass is distributed, what is done with the human beings who surrender or submit to "pacification?" I traveled by helicopter to several of such areas. The Viet Cong who surrenders gets some 500 piasters —about $4.50 for the gun he turns in. But what in tangible items are given him for his continued sustenance?

By helicopter I went to Phu Coong, some 50 miles north of Saigon. Here, more than 7,000 people had been taken out of the Iron Triangle and housed in a refugee camp consisting of possibly 100 tents and shacks. Adults, children, pigs and chickens all were herded into these few temporary buildings. While their worldly possessions were dumped into the camp, the bombers and bulldozers leveled thousands of acres in the Triangle. Water buffaloes, bags of rice and children of the refugees were scattered about. Under the watchful eye and guns of the South Vietnamese Military Police, this vast collection of refugees somehow survive. For good or ill, many are seeing movies for the first time. While sanitation facilities were almost nonexistent, in the first month of the settlement there was only one death and 25 births.

In this Revolutionary Development Center, a refugee is paid 10 piasters, or 10¢ a day for food. A single school has been opened and the military provided 12 men and women teachers. There were three social workers and five draftees among the teachers. Books were somehow gathered together from the Saigon schools. One of the civilian leaders of the Revolutionary Development Center said that the camp had 84 tents, each housing at least 60 people. There were 530 returnees who had accepted the "Open Arms" safe conduct invitations—the others were more or less forcefully gathered together to clear the Iron Triangle. Then, the bombers and bulldozers went to work. In the course of time, each of the inhabitants of the Center was told that when the area was "secured," he could return to his own hamlet. However, when I visited the place, a heavily guarded armada of trucks moved out of the camp. At least a hundred passengers were in the busses as they took off for a remote village which had just been secured. As I left this hamlet to go back to get my helicopter, I got my signals confused and I couldn't find the right opening in the woods. I was left alone to find transportation back to Saigon—and all of this countryside was under the control of the Viet Cong.

My Filipino guide, Jess Grefalda of Quezon City, the Philippines, a professional adviser to the Center, kindly volunteered to drive me back through the Viet Cong country to Saigon. We left around two o'clock in the afternoon, knowing the road would be completely closed after four o'clock. We were partially delayed by a bus breaking down on the highway. It had a lot of plump Vietnamese girls who were going up to an American military camp next to Phu Coong to tend bar, etc. The tragedy of it appeared to be that the bus also had to get off the road before four o'clock in the afternoon. My guide told me that the outposts all along the road were tended in daytime by South Vietnamese soldiers who are collected by jeep and driven back to their own military base before nightfall. However, in the village of Bong, mostly inhabited by Roman Catholics, it was said the Viet Cong have not been able to move into the village during the day or night, and it, therefore, appears as an island somewhat apart from the rest of the V.C. country.

The outstanding Revolutionary Development Center in South Vietnam is the Tuy Hoa in Phu Yen Province. This is largely under the guidance of the Office of Civilian Operations with Daniel L. Leaty of Williamson, New York as director. His deputy is Jesse L. Snyder of San Fernando, California. Although there are at least 100,000 American soldiers in the province, there are only 38 workers on the civilian projects. They sign up for two year's service and get home for a month twice a year. However, the volunteers, like John Taylor of Ojai, California, are not so fortunate. They are members of the International Volunteer Service and many are Quakers. They are unpaid and they act as sort of an unofficial Peace Corps. These splendid, young American men work with the Saigon government, the Ministry of Revolutionary Development, and they are the basis of the so-called pacification and counter-insurgency movement. The Ministry under General Tang seems to be relatively free of the usual South Vietnamese government racketeers, and there is general agreement that the population has a degree of confidence in the South Vietnamese government's cause. Their programs comprise a wide range of civil activity starting with the development of self-defense forces in the hamlet, economic and social instruction, the establishment of communications between villages, and even training and leadership in community affairs.

A budget for the entire province resulting from meetings between representatives of the villages is put together. At least 50 percent of the amount expended is donated by the American government. In 1965, contracts to build schools were given to local contractors, but only three out of 33 scheduled were completed. Funds and contractors just disappeared. In 1966, the policy was changed to one of self-help and the 33 planned school construction projects were all completed—the people involved did the work themselves. The old payola to government officials and contractors was eliminated. Thus, with only three dozen civilians, including the volunteers, the entire provincial refugee service, many worthwhile projects, like dams, roads and sanitation projects, got completed. I visited a dozen hamlets with these volunteers, many of whom came from the Asian-Christian Service Bureau.

This Revolutionary Development Center consists of approximately four buildings, the largest of which is the Indoctrination Center where the refugees are housed for some 60 days. After political lectures and a pledge to switch allegiance to the South Vietnamese government, laudatory letters describing their treatment to relatives are written and dropped to their home hamlet by helicopter. These letters plead with their former associates to come on over, become converts, and get good food, clothing and shelter. Then, the refugee, presumably cured of his former attachments and beliefs, is permitted to leave the camp.

He is given a new identification and hopefully he has been given some skill, such as in carpentry or farming. Indeed, many American firms have hired these "reformed" Viet Cong upon their release. All are presumably returned to their native hamlets after the places are "secured." Basically, these Development Centers are designed to give *immediate* aid to people; medical care, food, clothing, sanitation facilities, education, as well as some minimum amount of actual cash. Our military leaders hope that out of the 66,000 refugees taken into the Redevelopment Center in 1966, a large percentage of these may be considered now "pacified" and converts to a new cause.

THE SAIGON PROPAGANDA MILL

In Saigon, there are on an average of 500 reporters from around the world. Each is there generally for a short term of duty. We correspondents always fancy ourselves as overseas news analysts—although generations of other foreign visitors have found themselves rather quickly disabused as experts on the ways of the oriental mind. Our television networks, national magazines and newspapers do have sizable staffs available and do good pictorial reporting of this bizarre war. Everyone recognizes that in South Vietnam, the Viet Cong are not a closely knit political or military unit—the action is necessarily a series of sporadic, even terrorist operations. An analysis of the effectiveness of our super-weapons against a modernized opponent is therefore difficult.

At Juspoa headquarters, a military briefing is given at five o'clock every afternoon. Major Jack Stuart, the Chief of the Press Office, directs the press conference. He comments on the number of refugees who come over to our side, hands out casualty lists, and announces visits of important guests. War pictures and press releases are distributed. At these formal briefings, there are several reporters who attempt to ask searching questions, but Major Stuart has developed artful sidestepping methods and more often than not merely refers questions to others. However, Joe Freed of the Mutual Broadcasting Company, Bryce Miller of UPI, among others, have become real hair-shirts in asking questions. The United States Information Service, in spite of its lofty pronouncements concerning free access to news, is bothered by such persistent questioners. Pressures to get the agitators removed from Saigon are common.

After these briefing sessions, I met several times with Major Stuart and his staff. He, like most everyone else, insists that he'd like "to get the hell out" of Vietnam. These press people in Saigon think that they're the fall guys for the faceless, anonymous brass in the Pentagon. At one of the sessions, the entire press corps jumped on Stuart and his military briefers when he piously announced that the United States has assumed control over all foreign persons, including civilians, in South Vietnam. The reporters had done their homework on the legal implications of such a decree, and several reporters from Britain, France and Australia vehemently asked how the United States, a recent arrival itself, could possibly exercise control over foreigners in a foreign nation. One Brazilian reporter said that he thought he was a guest of Saigon and certainly under the tolerence of the government of South Vietnam. Major Stuart, sweating heavily, sought to shunt the question off to the unnamed men back in Washington. Always he'd go back to telling his tormentors that "The Pentagon will clarify your status in due course." Every reporter in the hall knew that the American assumption of authority over all people in South Vietnam was ridiculous and that any such control would be upset by the courts. However, the reporters also knew that in a military theatre of action, it doesn't help much to know that a court may ultimately free one from jail. It's a case of the prisoner being dead right—and vice versa.

Correspondents sit around Saigon sometimes for months looking for a newsworthy story beyond the press handout. The official press section of the United States Military has more than 300 employees in Saigon and many of its members are skilled public relations specialists. Anything for the folks back home. The hotel lobbies are full of reporters interviewing local boys for the papers back in the States. The mimeograph machines of Juspoa turn out tens of thousands of pages of "information" every day. It is not difficult to feed stories to an anxious American public, especially now that the Pacific satellite, Lani Bird, transmits pictures across the Pacific almost instantaneously.

On one of my visits with the National Broadcasting Corporation people, I chatted with Howard Tucker who had just been mauled by the guards outside General Westmoreland's home. It happened at 8:05 that very morning. The Viet Cong had aimed a mortar shell at General Westmoreland's headquarters, but it passed over his roof and strangely enough hit an ammunition truck standing in the street outside. Twenty-two persons were killed and naturally there was a lot of excitement around the place. When Tucker tried to take a picture, a combination of American and Vietnamese soldiers beat him up. In this case, the pictures of his roughing up were relayed to Hong Kong without delay and actually appeared on the network of the National Broadcasting System within three or four hours. Because of the touchiness of this subject, no censorship was exercised. And the story of the shelling of Westmoreland's headquarters was pretty much minimized.

Most correspondents are indebted to the military for assistance in getting a story. So there are amenities followed, all in the "cause of security," even though the reporters may not always be actually under wraps in forwarding their material. If anything really substantial develops outside of the usual press handout, it is sometimes desirable to file the story out through either Bangkok or Hong Kong. Since this is a terrorist war, there is an adequate daily quota of local stories. The reporters do suffer some personal danger. Anyone can go down on the harbor front or travel any street of Saigon and obtain human interest material which is of vast interest to the folks back home. The U.S. Military Press Corps spends a great majority of its time getting a favorable image back into the nation's press, and names of local people are always at the top of its priority list. After all, the American people are pretty bored with general casualty lists, but they always hope that one of their neighbors or friends will not be included. The usual material on the number of bombing raids on North Vietnam isn't believed anyway. It was two years after the big bases were opened in Thailand that American officials acknowledged their existence.

The reporters themselves are doing a magnificent job in getting the facts and feeding it back. Americans at home, especially on the campus, have revolted against the news from Vietnam. Few believe that the coverage is always complete, adequate or unmanaged. The U.S. Military Press Section is following out its directives from the Pentagon. The stories, like history itself, follows the course of the gunfire. Again, bombing, capture of rice and the psychological war, provide the news—and determine the results!

In the background there is the small, very small number of civilian workers toiling to build a better society out of the ashes. The constructive nature of their activity is the brightest sight in an ugly episode.

REPUBLICAN POLICY ON AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I am not used to giving advice to political parties, but at this time I feel that the Republican Party may be in need of some advice.

The Republican Party—and many of its candidates for the presidential nomination next year—is struggling for a rational statement of policy toward American involvement in Vietnam.

Almost every day one finds press statements by prominent Republicans.

Indeed, there is almost as much divergence of view among prominent Republicans as among prominent Democrats.

The fact is, however, the Republicans do not know the details of the advice the President receives from his Secretaries of State and Defense.

We do not know what advice he receives from the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or what intelligence he gets from the CIA.

What we do know is that half a million Americans are in Vietnam and that under present policy this number must be greatly increased.

We know, also, that the monthly cost of the war is nearing $3 billion per month; that American casualties are increasing; that pacification is in trouble; that we have no significant allied support; and that with few exceptions Americans think it was a mistake ever to get so deeply involved in South Vietnam in the first place.

We know, as the Mansfield report stated 18 months ago, that we are in open-ended conflict, with the end not yet in sight.

We know that the Vietnam conflict has split this country to a depth and with an intensity not experienced within this century.

I know the President wants to bring this conflict to an honorable end. So do I.

But, the President predicates peace on the capitulation of the enemy and that solution seems far in the distance, if at all.

As time passes, I come more and more to believe that the present administration cannot achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam.

This administration is too bound by its own vague criterion, its own predictions its own predilictions, its own conceptions and emotional commitments to see the interest of the Nation except in terms of its own survival as the government in power.

The significance for the Republican Party of this brief analysis is that American policy in Asia requires a new look—a fresh appraisal which can only come from a Republican administration.

New faces and new ideas and a fresh analysis of the national interest is required.

No potential Republican candidate for President can say with certainty what course he would pursue if he were elected President.

A new administration must first become acquainted with a large body of information which is now only available to the President and his immediate advisers.

I wish all Americans could know what goes on in the secret recesses of the State Department and the While House.

We might then give outright support to the President or criticize him with facts.

But, we do not have this information.

What I am certain of is that the confidence of the American people on the course this Nation pursues has been shaken.

A renewed confidence is our aim and the national interest requires what might be called fresh judgment or a fresh appraisal.

I do not present these comments as either condemnation or support of the present administration and its policies in Vietnam.

Rather, this is a plea that the Republican Party promise a new look at U.S. policy in Asia—that we promise the American people a careful examination of where we have been, where we are, and where we are going.

APPOINTMENT OF WILLIAM W. SHERRILL TO FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as further evidence of the widespread support for the appointment of William W. Sherrill to the Federal Reserve Board, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial published in the Wednesday, April 26, 1967, issue of the Houston Chronicle, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. The editorial sums up the feelings of everyone in simply saying:

> President Johnson made an admirable choice when he picked Houstonian William W. Sherrill for membership on the Federal Reserve System's Board of Governors.

I heartily agree.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHERRILL APPOINTMENT A GOOD ONE

President Johnson made an admirable choice when he picked Houstonian William W. Sherrill for membership on the Federal Reserve System's board of governors.

Sherrill's appointment is loaded with significance. He will be more than just another board member. Because of the four-three, conservative-liberal split on the seven-member board, Sherrill's vote may very well determine the future policies of the Fed.

He will replace the board's staunchest conservative, Charles N. Shepardson, a former agriculture dean at Texas A & M who is retiring at the age of 70. Shepardson has been a supporter of the high-interest, tight-money policies of Chairman William McChesney Martin Jr., which at times have been in conflict with the Johnson administration.

A good many economists think Martin has been too conservative in managing the nation's monetary system. But he is so highly regarded in banking circles that President Johnson recently reappointed him to a new three-year term as chairman.

In choosing Sherrill to replace Shepardson, Mr. Johnson obviously expects to get a man more sympathetic with administration views on fiscal matters.

Sherrill's appointment undoubtedly will be approved by the Senate. He brings to the new post a rich background in banking, business and governmental experience. He is a graduate of the University of Houston and the Harvard School of Business Administration. He served as city treasurer of Houston, port commissioner and chief administrative aide to Mayor Lewis Cutrer.

When Mr. Johnson chose him last year for a six-year term as a director of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corp., Sherrill was president of the Homestead State Bank, executive vice-president of the Jamaica Corp., a land-development firm, and vice-president of Colonial Savings and Loan Assn.

Rep. Wright Patman, the Texan who heads the House Banking Committee and an arch foe of Martin's high-interest policies, says he thinks Sherrill will be a "fine member" of the board. The American Bankers Assn. also is pleased. And reportedly so is Chairman Martin.

Miracle of miracles! As Sen. William Proxmire said, "Anyone who gets the support of the ABA and Wright Patman is an extraordinary man."

The Wall Street Journal notes that one of Sherrill's most vital criteria is a negative one—he isn't an economist. The board already is dominated by four economists. And Chairman Martin long has sought to balance their skills with those of someone with practical business or banking experience.

In every respect, Sherrill fits the bill.

THE REPUBLICAN STAFF STUDY OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, a historical review of the war in Vietnam has been prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee. This review was released to the press media yesterday. It has been made clear by the distinguished chairman of the Republican policy committee that this document is merely a research study, designed to present an accurate, chronological review of the historical events, policies, and statements from the latter part of World War II to the present.

No conclusions are drawn in the review. The reader is free to draw his own conclusions. What is important, however, is that whatever conclusions may be drawn rest on an accurate understanding of the facts.

Over the last 3 years, and particularly with my Senate speech on the war in Vietnam of February 25, 1966, following my return from Vietnam and the Far East, I have made many public statements on both the policy of the war in Vietnam and the conduct of the war. With a view to bringing the principal points of my statements all together in summary fashion, I am repeating and reemphasizing them today. I do so at this time not so much to indicate that these points rest on the results of the Republican staff study as to emphasize that the study lends support for my positions long held and previously stated.

First. I support the commitment of the United States, pursuant to the SEATO Treaty, to help defend the territorial integrity and political independence of the Republic of South Vietnam so that the people of that country may freely determine their own destiny.

Second. I have nothing but praise for the valor and spirit of unselfish dedication of our men and women in uniform and for those of our allies, who are fighting to win the cause of freedom in South Vietnam.

Third. I urge the President and his administration to persevere in their efforts to bring about a negotiated settlement of the war—in line with their oft-repeated objective of preventing Communist aggression from paying off.

Fourth. I support the stated goal of avoiding a widening of the war, while at the same time urging, as I have repeatedly done, that the duration of the war be shortened through the more effective application of our air and sea power.

Fifth. I fully recognize that a just and lasting peace in South Vietnam cannot be achieved without both security for the people, resulting from military victory or—preferably—peaceful negotiations, and a rebuilding of the social, economic, and political structure of the country, with special emphasis on the establishment of a government in Saigon with popular support through free elections. In these tasks, the United States should assist and support but not control, because this, after all, is a matter which primarily affects the people of South Vietnam.

Sixth. Debate of the issues of this war on their merits is one of the hallmarks of a "free society." However, freedom of debate should not be confused with license to distort the facts or partake of irresponsible speech and actions. I would condemn those who would equate responsible debate with disloyalty. At the same time, if criticism lends aid and comfort to the enemy and tends to prolong the war, the critics should not object if our military commanders so advise them. If it is their son or husband who might die because the war was prolonged 1 minute more, this realization should accompany their decision on whether and in what manner to publicize their criticism.

Seventh. I repeat my call for the administration to most actively encourage a Far East Nations Peace Conference—a call which I sounded in my speech of February 25, 1966. This Conference should include all members of the Asian Development Bank which I specified in that speech. It should take a form not unlike that of the Organization of American States. It should be calculated to use political, economic, and social pressures on Hanoi to cease its aggression and on both sides of the conflict to move to the conference table to settle their differences. I am convinced that such a Conference, with leaders of Asian nations taking the initiative and leadership, has the greatest potential for bringing hostilities to a peaceful conclusion and for maintaining peace in the Far East. A good start was made with the Manila Conference, but progress to bring in neutral nations, such as Japan and India, should be actively sought. Surely if these nations can join together to operate a bank for their economic development, they ought to be willing to join together to seek peace in their area and to further the objective of a free South Vietnam.

Eight. Much has been said about a credibility gap between this administration and the American people. I have stated that this "gap" has arisen more from what the administration's spokesmen have not said than from what they have said. For example, there has been a great silence on the reasons why we have not taken steps to deny the port facilities at Haiphong to the enemy. The American people should be told the reasons; and if they do not agree with the reasons, perhaps the administration will conclude that these reasons are not valid. The administration's silence has caused widespread confusion and dissatisfaction, and it is this type of reaction which frequently manifests itself in criticism of a credibility gap. I should add, in all fairness, that reports of casualties in Vietnam have, to the best of my knowledge, been accurate. At the same time, I would not wish to imply that there have not been some inaccurate or misleading statements attributed to administration spokesmen and carried in the press. There have been. These have been aggravated by "trial balloons" which have appeared to test the public reaction to certain possible administration moves. But it is the silence and failure to fully inform the people on some very important matters which, in my judgment, has laid the foundation for uncertainty and mistrust.

These are statements of policy and attitude which I have consistently adhered to. There will be some among my colleagues who may honestly disagree with some of them; but I have the feeling that they represent pretty much the views of the great majority of the Members of Congress and, in turn, of the American people.

HENRY CABOT LODGE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, twice during the last few years, Henry Cabot Lodge has gone to South Vietnam and occupied and fulfilled in a most distinguished manner the dangerous and difficult post of Ambassador. In all, he has served more than 28 months in that city. In the course of his tour of duty he has developed a very real rapport with the Vietnamese, a rapport that is equaled by few of our representatives there and surpassed by no one.

It is not easy to coordinate the enormous responsibility shouldered by the American Ambassador to Saigon. He is the President's personal representative to the Government of Vietnam; he is also the President's on-the-spot adviser for affairs in that beleaguered country. And, finally, he must coordinate the vast U.S. commitment there, which includes ceaseless activity on the military, economic, political, propaganda, and diplomatic fronts.

Ambassador Lodge has done these things tirelessly, skillfully, tactfully, and with a remarkable amount of success. His contributions to implementation of this country's difficult policy are considerable. I think the Ambassador has earned his country's gratitude for his patriotic leadership and achievements.

His duty in Vietnam has involved not only danger, including the ever-present threat of assassination, but also has been in a most disagreeable climate with arduous working conditions. Mrs. Emily Lodge has shared these conditions with him and brought the finest of American charm and grace to her role as the Ambassador's wife.

Now that his Vietnam assignment is over, I understand that our Government is going to continue to benefit from his talents. Apparently, Ambassador Lodge has offered to make himself available for more work and our administration has chosen to take advantage of his willingness.

I wish him success in his new job and extend to him on behalf of so many of us Americans, whether we be critics or advocates of the administration's policy on Vietnam, a warm and well-deserved word of congratulations. As an old family friend, I am doubly glad to offer these words as a matter of public record.

CIVILIAN CASUALTIES IN VIETNAM

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the April 21 issue of the New York Times carried an article datelined Saigon and entitled "Toll of Civilians Rising in Vietnam." This is a subject which has been of great interest to me for several years, and I note that the article, which reports on a survey made recently by Major General Humphreys, the Director of the U.S. aid mission's Office of Public Health, observes that—

> Before the survey, no reliable statistics were kept by either South Vietnamese or United States authorities. Civilian casualties were not distinguished from other hospital cases. The change is generally attributed to criticism from opponents of the Johnson Administration's position in Vietnam.

The article notes that while the highest number of civilian casualties recorded for a single month in 1964 was 1,400, in December 1966 and in January and February 1967, the figures were, respectively, 2,500, 4,150, and 3,920.

Civilian casualties are, of course, inevitable in a war as severe as that being waged in South Vietnam. There is no point in contending that they are negligible, as the administration has argued in the past. There is every reason to reduce them to the absolute possible minimum, and it is impossible to do so unless a constant and careful survey is made.

I do not believe that the United States is morally justified in arguing that we cannot spare the men to conduct such a constant and careful survey. General Humphreys is quoted by the New York Times as saying that "we need medical workers more than we need recordkeepers" and that "something on the order of 300 full-time medical statisticians" would be needed to cover every civilian hospital around the clock.

I certainly agree with General Humphreys that more effort should be placed on medical relief than on statistics gathering and I would be the last to advocate a special company of 300 medical statisticians. We do, however, need some reasonably accurate estimates that we should be able to work out, continuing the helpful work which General Humphreys' office has already done. We need this information not only to evauate the progress, or lack of progress, of our military effort, but, of even more importance, we need this information so that we can make some accurate judgments about the will and capacity of South Vietnam to continue its struggle. So it is in our best interests to continue at least modest efforts to gather these statistics.

For whatever peaceful arrangements among governments finally emerge from the war in Vietnam, it is the South Vietnamese civilians with whom we will have to make peace if American men are not to have fought and died in vain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article of April 21 from the New York Times be inserted in the RECORD at this point, as well as an article of today's date confirming the correctness of General Humphreys' estimate of civilian casualties.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 21, 1967]

TOLL OF CIVILIANS RISING IN VIETNAM—FIRST OFFICIAL U.S. FIGURES ON WOUNDED IN THE SOUTH SHOW A 3-YEAR CLIMB

(By Jonathan Randal)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, April 20.—United States officials have disclosed that the number of civilian casualties in South Vietnam is rising as the tempo of the war increases.

About 50,000 civilians may be treated for war-related injuries in Government hospitals this year, according to an estimate by Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys, director of the United States aid mission's Office of Public Health.

In an interview, the Air Force general disclosed the first major American statistical effort to keep track of civilian casualties in South Vietnam.

Before the survey, no reliable statistics were kept by either South Vietnamese or United States authorities. Civilian casualties were not distinguished from other hospital cases. The change is generally attributed to criticism from opponents of the Johnson Administration's position in Vietnam.

ARTICLE RESENTED

General Humphreys disclosed his estimate at a time when American military and civilian officials were voicing concern over such criticism. In particular, there is bitter resentment of an article in the January issue of Ramparts magazine, which asserted that allied weapons had caused "at least a million child casualties since 1961."

Barry Zorthian, director of the United States public-affairs office here, has called the article "a fantasia of numbers" with no evidence to support it.

Another high-ranking American official said:

"We've been taking a licking on civilian casualties. It has been a major cause of criticism of our effort in Vietnam. But in Vietnam you can prove almost anything you want. No one is happy about civilian casualties. The figures in Ramparts will not stand up under examination."

But the American statistics, based on tabulations made in 150 military and civilian hospitals and dispensaries in all 45 South Vietnamese provinces, are also considered open to question.

There is no way to gauge the numbers of civilians killed or wounded within Vietcong-controlled territory; they are never brought to hospitals and dispensaries in Government-held towns.

In addition overworked American and allied medical staffs are described as too busy to record the cause of injury among hospital patients in all cases.

The Allies and the enemy have each caused about half the civilian casualties in the South, General Humphreys estimated. The rule of thumb used in the statistics held the enemy responsible for casualties caused by booby traps, mines and the sharp, poisoned sticks known as punji stakes; South Vietnamese or allied forces are assumed to be responsible for casualties due to bombing and artillery.

"If you want absolutely honest, valid statistics and reliable information on civilian casualties," General Humphreys said, "you would need something on the order of 300 full-time medical statisticians to cover every civilian hospital around the clock."

"Frankly," he added, "we need medical workers more than we need record keepers." The general noted that his medical staff was short 188 of its authorized 390-man contingent.

The steady increase of civilian casualties was reflected in statistics furnished by General Humphreys.

In 1964 the highest number of civilian casualties recorded for a single month was 1,400, among the 38,000 hospitalized patients, or 3.7 per cent of the total.

In 1965 the highest number for a month was 1,566, among the 37,600 hospital patients, or 4.2 per cent.

Last December, when civilian casualties became part of a regular monthly report, some 2,500 of the 33,500 hospitalized cases, or 7.5 per cent, involved civilian casualties.

In January, 4,150 war-related cases were reported among the 37,500 civilians hospitalized, or 11 per cent of the total.

In February, there were 3,920 civilian casualties, 11.5 per cent of the 34,050 Vietnamese admitted to hospitals.

TOTALS ARE ANALYZED

The first report breaking down civilian casualties by age and sex disclosed that of the 4,150 war-related cases recorded in January, 1,742 were women and 894 were children aged 13 or under.

Corresponding statistics for February showed 1,153 women and 873 children under 13 among the 3,920 civilian casualties.

The increased military tempo is causing increased civilian casualties despite precautions taken by the United States command.

Although errors involving civilian casualties still occur, the command has issued strict orders governing situations in which heavy firepower can be used in South Vietnam.

For example, forward air controllers—the Air Force pilots who fly small observation aircraft and call in fighter-bomber strikes—often rule out such targets as villages for fear of inflicting civilian casualties, even in areas where the Vietcong are known to be.

As a further restraint on American air power, the approval of the South Vietnamese province chief must be obtained for every air strike on each sampan, village or fortification. American officers have complained that this cumbersome system often allows the Vietcong to escape before the permission is granted.

A CASE OF DISTORTION

General Humphreys was asked to comment on the charges of civilian casualties in the Ramparts article, which was written by William F. Pepper, a 29-year-old instructor at Mercy College in Dobbs Ferry, N.Y., who spent six weeks in Vietnam in the spring of 1966.

General Humphreys said of Mr. Pepper and his article: "It's a case of distortion. He says a lots of things and leaves out just enough. I question his figures, but I have no way of proving he is wrong."

Others have expressed concern over the conclusions drawn in the Pepper article.

Terre des Hommes, a Swiss organization that is providing medical care for Vietnamese children, was mentioned favorably in the article. But after the article appeared, the organization's secretary general, Edmond Kaiser, wrote to the management of Ramparts:

"A little more human intelligence and a little less political bad faith would have stood a better chance of really helping us save our children. The persons accused and the interpretations of the truth can only harm this work of rescue and safeguarding. And if, because of you, because of Mr. Pepper's errors, we find new obstacles in our way, we will hold you, Mr. Pepper and Ramparts personally responsible for the suffering of children whom your clumsiness will have separated from us."

[From the New York Times, May 2, 1967]

PANEL NEARS END OF VIETNAM TOUR—FINDS FEW CIVILIANS WHO NEED U.S. TREATMENT

(By R. W. Apple, Jr.)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, May 1.—A four-man investigating team sent to South Vietnam by a private organization to search for civilian war victims who would benefit from treatment in the United States was reported today to have found few such cases.

The team, composed of a plastic surgeon, an internal medicine specialist, a resident in pediatrics and a former journalist, has been here for three weeks. Its members will return to the United States this week. They will make a report to their sponsor, the Committee of Responsibility, this month.

The committee, of about 200, most of them physicians or surgeons, was established early this year. A number of its members are avowed opponents of the war in Vietnam. Among the prominent figures on the committee are Dr. Albert B. Sabin, who developed the oral polio vaccine, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the author of best-selling books on child care.

According to sources close to the investigators, the report will indicate that casualty statistics recently compiled by the South Vietnamese Ministry of Health and the United States foreign-aid mission are reasonably accurate, considering the difficulties in gathering statistics.

CASUALTIES ARE ESTIMATED

Team members are also said to consider an estimate of 50,000 civilian war casualties so far this year, advanced last week by Maj. Gen. James W. Humphreys, director of the aid mission's office of public health, to be as good a projection as possible.

The team has traveled extensively through the provinces, visiting 37 of the 40 or so government hospitals, numerous village dispensaries and other facilities on a 12-hour-a-day schedule. Several of the members plan more visits before leaving Vietnam.

It is unlikely that such a painstaking survey has ever been undertaken here by outsiders.

So far, the team has identified about 600 war casualties in the hospitals it had visited. Allowing for the places they have not seen, the four investigators are reported to have concluded that 800 is a reasonable figure for the number of such casualties in the hospitals at a given time. This figure tallies closely with the official estimates.

FIND 40 BURN CASUALTIES

Because its mission is nonpolitical, the team has not attempted a breakdown between casualties caused by the allies and those caused by the enemy. But some of the investigators are said to feel that 50–50 is a plausible division, with many cases impossible to classify.

The team has found fewer than 40 burn casualties, almost half of them at Danang on the central coast. A large proportion of these are children.

In an article in the January issue of Ramparts magazine, Dr. William F. Pepper, a political science instructor at Mercy College in New Rochelle, reported widespread cases of burns from napalm and phosphorus shells. He asserted that allied weapons had caused "at least a million child casualties since 1961."

Of the civilian casualties they have seen, the team members are said to feel that only half a dozen could be treated better in the United States than in Vietnam.

This Judgment is based on the presumption that transportation to another country is justified only if medical facilities here are completely inadequate.

The three doctors on the team, according to the sources, found Vietnamese hospitals "minimally adequate," with the worst conditions in the mountains and lowlands of II Corps area north of Saigon.

Although some of the team members were said to have been upset by the sight of two patients in a single bed, with straw mats instead of sheets and families squatting over cooking pots beside the beds, others with more Asian experience were not.

COMPARISONS ON ISSUES

The issue—whether to judge hospitals in Vietnam on the basis of minimum standards of medical care in underdeveloped countries or to compare them with the American norm—has colored much of the prolonged debate about civilian casualties.

Many doctors with experience in Asia and Africa have spoken of the "cultural shock" experienced by those observing conditions outside Europe and the United States for the first time.

The half-dozen patients who assertedly would benefit from treatment in the United States, the sources said, are those requiring complex surgery. One example cited was a youth who has lost his right hand and all but two fingers on his left hand.

With modern equipment and techniques, an operation known as a pollicization could be performed. This may make a substitute thumb of one of the remaining fingers and give the patient a rudimentary hand. Such surgery is not performed in Vietnamese hospitals.

The members of the investigating team are Peter Franklin, a former reporter and former member of the Peace Corps, who has handled the administrative details, and Dr. Henry Mayer, a Redwood City, Calif., internist who teaches at Stanford University Medical School and who was a West Coast cofounder of the Committee.

Also, Dr. Theodore Tapper, a resident in pediatrics at the University of Pennsylvania Hospital in Philadelphia, and Dr. John Constable, a leading plastic surgeon who is an instructor at both the Boston University and Harvard medical schools.

Their interpreter was a Vietnamese-speaking American not connected with either the South Vietnamese or United States governments.

The investigators walked through the wards of all the hospitals they visited. They are reported to have found few attempts to pass off civilian war casualties as victims of accidents unrelated to military operations.

The sources said the doctors had agreed that too many amputations were being performed here and had concluded, because they saw so few patients with really extensive burns, that many of the seriously burned had died before they could get to hospitals.

But the team was also said to feel that, at most, the number of casualties that failed to reach hospitals in Government-controlled areas was about equal to the number that did.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 11 o'clock and 41 minutes a.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 12:02 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. SPONG in the chair).

NEW YORK TIMES URGES LIMITATIONS ON SST FINANCING

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, I was distressed to learn of the administration's decision to proceed with the development of an SST prototype as announced this past weekend by the President. In my estimation, the taxpayer should not be asked to foot 90 percent of the bill for this strictly commercial venture without a scintilla of military value; and the Secretary of Defense has many times indicated that it has no military value whatsoever.

The SST would be primarily of value—in fact, entirely of value, so far as I can see—to people who want to fly overseas either for commercial or for pleasure reasons, and who would like to be able to fly from, say, Washington or New York to Paris in 2½ hours instead of 7. While this is a laudable ambition, I cannot see that it really contributes anything to our economic strength.

Although it is true that France and England are still experimenting on supersonic planes, they are nowhere near commercially feasible. The problems are still vast and very costly to overcome. Since the SST would be strictly for commercial purposes, it is hard to see the advantage of it.

I am happy to say that the New York Times, in an editorial this morning, sharply questioned the SST development program. In the Times' words:

> The cost could well be ($3 to $4 billion) without any assurance that the Treasury will get a return on its investment.

The Times goes on to say:

> Since the contractors are getting what amounts to a monopoly, there is no reason for Washington to pay for the production stage. . . . Congress has a responsibility to establish guidelines to keep the administration's investment in the SST from getting out of hand.

As my colleagues know, I would go further in this regard. I would not appropriate any funds for prototype construction in view of the insurmountable technical difficulties facing the SST developers. If we can judge by industry's willingness to foot the bill for SST development, the plane has a 10-percent chance of success. This would be the industry stake in development costs. This is no time to establish the principle that the taxpayer can afford gambles that private industry feels are too risky.

In any event, I commend the Times editorial to my colleagues. It is moderate, balanced, and makes eminently good sense. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIMITS ON THE SST

> In requesting Congress to appropriate $198 million for development of a commercial supersonic plane President Johnson has made clear his intention to proceed with the project. But he has not revealed just how much the Administration's commitment will cost.
>
> Mr. Johnson acknowledged that the building of an American SST "carries high technical and financial risks." Yet in his anxiety to get on with the job he has increased the potential hazards to the taxpayer. As a minimum, the Government will be spending $1 billion to build two test models of the proposed plan. But the cost could easily be three or four times that amount without any assurance that the Treasury will get a return on its investment.
>
> The aero space industry has emphasized its reservations about sharing in the risks by refusing to put up 25 per cent of development costs as sought by the Administration. So the Administration has agreed to pay 90 per cent, unless expenditures exceed $1.1 billion; if that happens, the Government's share goes down to 75 per cent of any additional outlays, which is still very generous. The Federal Aviation Agency says that Federal aid will cease with the end of the development phase. However, the project will still require about $3 billion for production costs; the two prime contractors seem confident that the Government will continue to foot most of the bill.
>
> Since the contractors are getting what amounts to a monopoly, there is no reason for Washington to pay for the production stage. If the prototypes overcome the technological problems, the private sector should take over the financing. The Government's participation should be restricted to the development phase, to limit its potential losses—and the plane's price.
>
> Congress has a responsibility to establish guidelines to keep the Administration's investment in the SST from getting out of hand. It should see to it that the Government does not write any blank checks and become overly involved in what is supposed to be a commercial venture. And industry, too, should recognize that if it asks Washington to shoulder the costs, then Washington may well end up running the entire operation.

BAR ASSOCIATION NOT TO OPPOSE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—SENATE RATIFICATION APPEARS NEAR—LXIV

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, today the advocates of Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery—among whom I count myself after 64 daily speeches urging Senate ratification—are greatly encouraged.

Ratification of three of these conventions, which seemed only the remotest possibility in January, now appears almost probable.

At the hearings on the Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery held before the subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, no witnesses testified in opposition to Senate ratification.

However, the American Bar Association's committee on peace and law had requested additional time to file supplementary views.

In spite of the fact that the three conventions had been before the Senate for almost 4 years—which would seem sufficient time to study them in depth—the able chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DODD] generously granted the ABA group until late May to file a report.

Last weekend, in Washington, the executive council of the International Law Section of the ABA defeated a resolution to place the association on record against the conventions.

I congratulate Edward D. Re, chairman of the international law section, for his leadership in the successful fight to defeat the resolution.

It is now my hope that the subcommittee will speedily report these three conventions favorably to the full Foreign Relations Committee.

These three conventions were submitted to the Senate on July 22, 1963, by our late President, John F. Kennedy.

Almost 4 years have elapsed without any Senate action, but prospects for ratification have now brightened considerably.

I believe now that the Senate will ratify the Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery before July 22, 1967.

Mr. President, I earnestly hope that the Committee on Foreign Relations and the full Senate will seriously consider ratifying the Genocide Convention at long last. This convention has been in the committee for 18 years. It is a convention that has been ratified by virtually every other major country in the world—indeed, by the overwhelming majority of all the countries in the world—and this country is long overdue.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Our failure to ratify the Genocide Convention indicates that the United States is laggard in pressing its leadership in human rights in the international field. It seems to me a serious indictment of a country that has made such splendid progress, that has a constitution which features human rights in its Bill of Rights.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S CRITICS: MAKE LOVE NOT HATE

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, peace marchers are a very old story in this country. Each week some group is marching somewhere for some reason. Most recently, however, there were large rallies for peace marchers in San Francisco and New York.

I have read many editorials condemning these protest marchers for aiding and comforting the enemy. I believe that while this may be true, this does not preclude the right of any American to demonstrate his feelings in a peaceful way on any matter of policy affecting the people. Not only should we permit this right, but in my view, we also should encourage people who are conscientious and feel strongly about their convictions. It is the only way we can change policy which may or may not be correct.

But one of the best points to be made about the nature of these protestors was made in a recent editorial by the San Francisco Examiner. This paper points out that President Johnson has led the fight for most of the programs that most of these marchers have long wanted.

The President has launched new programs such as medicare, civil rights, education, and the war on poverty—among others. These are the very causes that most so-called "peaceniks" have long wanted.

But instead of supporting the President and commending him for his unparalleled accomplishments on the domestic scheme, the marchers revile him, as the Examiner puts it:

> . . . the marchers condemn the President in crude terms for a war that was begun by Hanoi and is continued by Hanoi, in the face of repeated American attempts to negotiate a settlement.

I ask unanimous consent to insert this excellent editorial into the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PEACE MARCHERS TO NOWHERE

The "peace marches" held during the weekend in San Francisco and New York certainly provided much encouragement in Hanoi. North Vietnam's leaders have always considered "antiwar" sentiment in the United States to be their ace-in-the-hole, and are convinced that this will one day cause the U.S. to "Get Out of Vietnam," as the paraders' banners demand.

The tragedy of this is that Hanoi is hypnotized by the world-wide propaganda generated through such marches, and believes they represent the wishes of the majority of the American people. This is simply untrue, unless every sampling of public opinion on the subject is inaccurate, which is unlikely. Hanoi's ace-in-the-hole, therefore, is a grim joker.

Unquestionably, most of those who marched are convinced they are acting in their country's interest. And they have the right to such a view. The marchers might consider the fact, though, that "protest" marches such as are freely undertaken in the U.S. would not be permitted in Hanoi or Peking or Moscow, although there are surely persons in those cities who disagree with their government's policies.

An inexcusable aspect of the marches is their total lack of objectivity. None of their banners or chants includes demands that Hanoi or the Viet Cong "Stop-the-War." The demands are solely for a unilateral U.S. cessation of hostilities, as if only the U.S. were doing the shooting in Vietnam. Communist attacks on Vietnamese civilians are ignored.

Some of this one-sided attitude could be rationalized if the marchers consisted solely of youthful, uninformed and unwashed beatniks. But the parades included several contingents of professional people, from whom more thoughtful judgment can be expected.

Perhaps the greatest tragedy of the marchers, though, is in the invective they hurl at President Johnson. The marchers ignore the fact that President Johnson has engineered the greatest program of social legislation in the nation's history. Most of the measures he has sponsored—among them Medicare, civil rights, education and the War on Poverty—find vociferous champions among the marchers themselves.

But the marchers revile LBJ, and condemn him in crude terms for a war that was begun by Hanoi and is continued by Hanoi, in the face of repeated American attempts to negotiate a settlement. In doing so, the marchers display a pathetic lack of political maturity.

BETTY FURNESS' FINE PLEA FOR TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we have recently concluded hearings on the truth-in-lending bill before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

One of the most effective and enthusiastic proponents of truth-in-lending legislation is the President's new Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, Miss Betty Furness.

The Banking and Currency Committee recently received a report from Miss Betty Furness, the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs. In the report, Miss Furness recommended the passage of S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. Miss Furness believes the bill not only will protect consumers, but also will safeguard the great majority of businessmen who are willing to compete fairly and will separate them from the questionable vendors whose credit charges are deceptively concealed.

The report by the President's special assistant indicated S. 5 would be in accord with the program of the President. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Executive Office of the President, President's Committee on Consumer Interests,
Washington, D.C., March 28, 1967.

Hon. John J. Sparkman,
Chairman, Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: This report is in reply to your request for the comments of this office on S. 5, 90th Congress, a bill, "To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

The purpose of S. 5, known as the "Truth-in-Lending" bill, as stated in Section 2, is to enhance the economic stabilization of the country and to foster competition among lenders of money and credit vendors by requiring disclosure of the true cost of borrowed money or credit extended and thereby promoting the informed use of credit.

Section 3 defines the terms of the bill including an important prescription or method by which annual percentage rate is to be computed on the total of all of the charges for credit individually itemized for each transaction. It also provides coverage for almost all kinds of consumer credit transactions (including loans, mortgages, conditional sales contracts, installment purchases, and department store revolving credit) in which credit is extended to individuals by business firms, associations, governments and other organizations requiring, in the granting of credit, the payment of finance charges.

Section 4 prescribes the full disclosure requirements, providing that each person to whom credit is extended, prior to contracting for debt, be given written information apprising him of all finance charges (above the cash price or the net proceeds of a loan, as applicable) with such charges to be stated both in terms of dollars and cents and the percentage that the finance charges bear to the total amount to be financed, the latter to be expressed as an annual percentage rate on the average outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation. With some necessary variation as to technique of application, the same disclosure principles apply equally to revolving or open-end credit plans.

The remaining provisions of the bill provide for: (a) authority for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to prescribe necessary implementing rules and regulations, to elicit the views of other Federal agencies in the exercise of its regulatory functions, and to establish a representative citizens' advisory committee, (Sec. 5); (b) accommodations where necessary with existing laws of the several States (Sec. 6); (c) civil and criminal penalties for violations (Sec. 7); (d) exemptions extended to business firms, governments, and securities transactions (Sec. 8); and, (e) an effective date 180 days after enactment except that the duties required by Section 5 will begin immediately (Sec. 9).

The primary thrust of the bill aims at full disclosure by methods that would enable consumers to make meaningful comparison of the varying costs of credit as offered by different vendors. It avoids the regulation of credit and places no limitations on interest rates. Hopefully, the free play of competition for business among credit vendors will operate to reduce the higher interest rates.

Today more than ever, the consumer negotiates a loan or sales agreement with less information and skill than that possessed by the lender. The bill will place the consumer on a more equal footing, in selecting and then in negotiating, with the lender. It would go a long way toward assuring two of the basic rights of the consumer as enunciated by President Kennedy and reaffirmed by President Johnson: "The right to be informed—to be protected against fraudulent, deceitful, or grossly misleading information . . . [and] the right to choose—to be assured . . . of . . . competitive prices . . ." Enactment of S. 5 would accord with two other statements by President Johnson: In his Consumer Message of 1964 he stated, ". . . The antiquated legal doctrine, 'Let the buyer beware,' should be superseded by the doctrine, 'Let the seller make full disclosure'. . . "

More recently, and directly applicable to the disclosure provisions of S. 5, the President said in his Consumer Message to the Congress on February 16, 1967, that full disclosure is ". . . a matter of fair play to the consumer . . ." He added that the consumer should ". . . be presented with a price tag that will tell him the percentage rate per year that is being charged on his borrowing . . ."

Much has been said and written in recent years about the need for this legislation. Credit disclosure is needed by all consumers, whether poor or of median income or better than median income, and letters to the President's Committee have spelled out the need in dramatic terms.

A widow from Deatsville, Alabama, told us, for example, of the trouble she encountered after borrowing $1,200 from a finance company. The woman said she was led to believe the interest was four per cent after reading "an add (sic) in the paper (that) read like it might treat a poor person right." After illness forced the woman to refinance the loan, the total obligation rose to $2,700, she said. She professed a complete inability to meet this obligation.

A young mother of three from Dayton, Ohio, told how she and her husband were mired in debt despite a net income of $120 a week. The couple is committed to paying $408 a month on 12 credit accounts and loans and has $366 in outstanding medical and hospital bills. The woman said she and her husband didn't know what they were getting into. She saw garnishment as imminent and urged the use of her case history "as an example to show people what too much credit buying can do. We could be living quite comfortably and enjoying our family—instead of watching anxiously for the mailman with a handful of duns and feeling both physically and mentally 66 instead of 26."

A Junction City, Kansas, man wrote: "I just discovered that I paid $171 in interest each year. I could have bought a new washing machine for that. When you are getting a loan they do not make this clear to everyone, especially when I don't understand interest anyway."

This sampling of consumer comments makes it clear why a number of Congressional polls have shown voters overwhelmingly in favor of full credit disclosure. That "truth in lending" has wide support is also demonstrated by the views expressed by consumer organizations and other voluntary and professional groups with a consumer concern.

We have been receiving reports that similar legislation recently enacted at the Sate level and in Canada is proving to be workable and acceptable by businessmen as well as consumers.

First, in a letter dated February 17, 1967, the Honorable John P. Clair, Deputy Commissioner of Banks and General Counsel, State of Massachusetts, wrote us:

"I am happy to report to you that the implementation of the legislative purpose expressed in the new Massachusetts statute on Truth in Lending has met with an unusual and unexpected measure of success. The allegations made by those who opposed the principle of truth in lending, on the ground that it was completely unworkable, have been proved beyond doubt to have been in error. We are encountering no difficulty from the lending agencies of this Commonwealth. As a matter of fact, the reverse is true. I think it a fair statement to say that the banking interests at every level are cooperating in every possible way, and that as a result thereof, the public interest is being substantially served.

"I am sure you are also cognizant of the fact that we have, in addition to this law, another one (Chapter 255D, G.L.) which requires full disclosure in annual percentage and dollars in all retail sales of goods or services on time. The normal disturbances, which any new regulatory statute creates, have been resolved through the full co-operation of the great majority of retailers in this Commonwealth."

Second, in a letter dated January 18, 1967, the Honorable F. C. Burton, Registrar of Credit, Province of Nova Scotia, stated:

"Our legislation is now in force and we feel that we have an easily workable system for the disclosure of the cost of credit to consumers not only in dollars and cents but also as an annual percentage rate . . .

"Now that our legislation is in force and operating, we have concluded that the opposition of the credit granting industry was largely illfounded. Once the ground rules have been laid down by government with the active cooperation and assistance of the industry representatives, and careful explanations and warnings have been given to industry regarding compliance, it seems to us that there is relatively little difficulty on the part of the credit grantors making disclosure to the consumers in the form that they have been demanding for many years . . ."

In summary, this office supports S. 5 because it will: (a) provide for full disclosure in the credit transaction; (b) safeguard the great majority of businessmen who are willing to compete fairly and to separate them (by the identification this bill will make possible) from the questionable vendors whose credit charges are deceptively concealed; (c) promote price competition; and (d) encourage the consumer to shop advantageously for credit and with the money saved provide him with more funds to buy additional goods and services.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that enactment of S. 5 would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely,
(Miss) Betty Furness,
Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs.

CONSUMER EXPERT ENDORSES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 20, Prof. Richard L. D. Morse, a prominent economist, endorsed the truth-in-lending bill. In a most impressive statement, Dr. Morse outlined the history of previous congressional hearings on truth in lending and enumerated the numerous changes which have taken place over the years to meet the objections of the credit industry.

As a professional economist and head of the department of family economics at Kansas State University, Professor Morse is in an excellent position to testify on the bill from the viewpoint of the consumer. His testimony makes it abundantly clear that the average consumer will benefit greatly by the passage of this long-delayed reform.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Morse's excellent statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Richard L. D. Morse, Professor of Family Economics, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kans., Before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on S. 5 (Truth in Lending Act of 1967), Thursday, April 20, 1967

I am honored to be asked to testify today on Senate 5, Truth in Lending. I appear in my private capacity, although I do reflect the position of my profession; namely, the American Home Economics Association and the Kansas Home Economics Association of which I am President. In fact, it was in the fall of 1959 that the Executive Committee of the Kansas Home Economics Association adopted a resolution for disclosure of credit costs, and each year since this Association has reaffirmed its position. (A copy of the original Resolution is attached together with its current form as embodied in the KHEA 4-point consumer legislative program.) Also attached is a resolution adopted by the American Home Economics Association in 1961, and I am pleased to refer to it for the record. (Page 1021, 1961 Hearings on S. 1740.) Mr. Chairman, you will be interested to know that the American Home Economics Association, because of its primary concern for family well-being, has chosen to hold a national workshop on "Consumer Credit and Family Financial Management" to be held in Madison, Wisconsin, October 9–12, 1967.

Since 1955 I have been Professor and Head of the Department of Family Economics at Kansas State University and have been teaching Family Economics since 1947 when I accepted the position as Professor of Family Economics at Florida State University. Most of my teaching experience is with young college students. We have emphasized consumer credit out of recognition that credit would be very much a part of their lives for many years to come, and that for most there are greater economic rewards from buying credit services wisely than from investing.

I appreciate Senator Bennett's concern that we be practical and not theoretical in these hearings, for this is the way in which I like to teach and learn. Much of what I know about credit I have learned by asking practical questions. The results of our studies of car financing and revolving account operations are a matter of record.

It is, therefore, as a consumer educator that I appear today. And as consumer educators, we are interested in telling consumers *not* how to behave but how to obtain the facts needed to choose intelligently between the many alternatives that are available to them today. This will enable them to make better use of their limited resources in pursuit of the quality of life they desire. The number of credit service opportunities available has been increasing at perhaps an even faster rate. I need not take time to detail the variety of credit services that consumers have available, for this is a matter of record. But I do want to emphasize the thrust of our teaching; namely, to help consumers get comparable facts about alternatives so their decisions may be informed ones and in accordance with their values.

The question then becomes, "What information does a consumer need to make an intelligent choice about credit?" There are four basic pieces of information in a credit contract or credit statement that a consumer needs before entering into a closed-end consumer credit contract and for using opened contract prudently. These "pieces" are incorporated functionally in Section 4(a) of S. 5 for contract credit and in Section 4(b) of S. 5 for revolving credit. These provisions correspond directly with the recommendations of the first Consumer Advisory Council. There they receive the benefit and counsel of your able colleague Senator Walter F. Mondale, then Attorney General of the State of Minnesota and a member of the Consumer Advisory Council. These recommendations are listed in detail and discussed in Pamphlet No. 17, "Truth in Lending," supported by two companion pamphlets, No. 16, "Shopping for Credit," and No. 18, "Consumer Credit Computations." This series was published by the Council on Consumer Information, a nonprofit organization whose membership consists primarily of persons interested in consumer education. I have been president of this organization.

Twice before, it has been my privilege to testify before this committee. I testified in 1960 on the S. 2755 (pages 583–639), and again in 1961 on S. 1740 (pages 303–369; and 1085–6). Also, a copy of my statement before the Assembly Committee on Finance and Insurance of the California Legislature, January 23, 1964, appears in the recorded hearings of the 1963–64 (pages 1366–1377). I do not wish to take time today to review my previous statements, but I do want to reiterate a portion of my 1962 testimony which Senators Bennett and Proxmire will remember. I presented four parts of finance charge quotations, and we played a game of choosing the better of each pair. We noted how choices changed or became more definite as I revealed more information: first, the amount of the down payment and monthly payments; next, the number of months; then, the total finance charge; and finally, the approximate annual rate. I have played this game with other groups. We learn from it two basic things: First, with more information, the player becomes more confident. Full credit disclosure, therefore, can be expected to increase confidence in the use of credit. The testimony we have heard from Massachusetts' experience bears this out.

The second lesson to be learned from this experience is that among a variety of people there is not unanimity among them as to which is *the* better to buy: Some go for the low down payment, and others for the low monthly payment. The number of months of obligation is a major consideration for some people, and the amount of finance charge influences others. Finally, others are influenced by the annual rate of charge. Based on this experience, it would indicate that the disclosure of rate will not greatly influence consumer behavior, for it is only one of the several factors consumers need to consider and will consider in their wise use of credit. The prediction that disclosure of rate will trigger a rush for low interest rate credit is not well founded.

If it is agreed that consumers need this information, the question is: Who is primarily responsible for supplying it? The answer can be either the man who sells credit services or the shopper-user of credit services. On balance it would seem that the creditor is best equipped to supply this information accurately. This is his business. He knows credit as it relates to his specializied area—cash lending, retailer of hard goods, car dealer, real estate broker. He does not need to know the variety of credit forms that consumers confront. He need only know how to apply the standards of full disclosure to his type of business operation. He has his trade association to help him learn how. On the other hand, the consumer is without the benefit of a trade association, uses a variety of credit services, some occasionally and others regularly, is unspecialized in dealing with credit, and is not performing accounting functions regularly. Furthermore, the consumer must assemble the variety of facts and reduce them to standard comparable form if they are to be useful and meaningful.

At the present time, creditors are either unwilling or unable to supply credit information in a meaningful and comparable manner to consumers. I cite our own experience to document this, namely the experience of students who have received reports within an accuracy range of six percentage points from only 26% of the banks and 17% of the car dealers (Pamphlet No. 17, p. 9). Educational efforts to help consumers sort out the present array of credit terms have been tremendous, but relative to the task have been inadequate and expensive.

I believe sincerely in consumer education, but know the burden that present jumble of credit terminology places on the educator. I take courage from Mr. Menton's testimony of April 17 relating the observation of the Massachusetts Department of Education that "never before could they set up such an instructional bulletin (for use in the junior and senior high schools) because of a lack of true meaning to word interest. Our truth in lending statute has corrected this." How much longer must we burden as a nation conscientious teachers, *at the taxpayers expense,* with explaining the intricacies of consumer credit computation? If credit lenders and vendors were required to make full disclosure, educational efforts could then be directed toward helping consumers make wise use of this credit information.

The argument has been advanced that a requirement of full disclosure would burden the merchant with an added cost. I suggest that this added cost should be balanced against the cost to the consumer and the economy of the consumer's reliance on his own inadequate skills to compute costs and rates and the resulting tragedy and misjudgment.

The question I previously posed as to whose responsibility it is to disclose the essential credit information was answered in the declaration of President Kennedy and reaffirmed many times by President Johnson in their consumer messages. I am referring to the four rights of the consumer, and particularly the right to be informed—*the right to be given the information needed to make an informed choice.*

As a consumer educator, I conclude: Provide the consumer with the facts in clear, unambiguous, standardized and easily comparable terms, then they will be able to make credit decisions efficiently and appropriate to their needs and thereby stimulate desirable competition and give responsible direction to the credit economy.

II. LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF TRUTH IN LENDING

The years since 1960 when Senator Douglas first introduced the *Consumer Credit Labeling Bill* have been productive. The result has been fruitful. The new bill (S. 5) introduced by Senator Proxmire January 11, 1967, builds on the criticism of earlier bills, and meets the tests of workability and simplicity, and it is both fair and informative.

The published Hearings number 4,378 pages and are of tremendous value in understanding the strengths and weaknesses of S. 2755, the original S. 1740, and its committee print which became S. 750. However, since no hearings have been held since 1964, the significant changes incorporated in S. 2275 have been without the benefit of open debate, thus the printed record of Hearings relates to a bill as it was first printed in 1962, five years ago.

Attached is a comparative print of the six bills which preceded S. 5, showing the development of the concept of full disclosure. These seven drafts will be reviewed to highlight the major criticisms of earlier ones and relate how S. 5 meets the criticism.

1. *Interest and Time-Price Differential.* Initially, the bill failed to distinguish clearly between interest and other components of the finance charges. Opponents were particularly sensitive about this because most states have usury laws limiting the interest rate, and the rate quoted under the original bill would frequently exceed the usury rate. Thus, the critics were understandably concerned at the outset because S. 2755 required rate disclosure in terms of *simple annual interest*. Although simple interest was changed to *simple annual rate* in the Committee Print dated May 3, 1960, the concept of interest continued to be feared and to be construed as an expression of the simple annual interest.

S. 5 relieves this anxiety by referring to the rate as the *annual percentage rate* and defines it precisely. Treasury Under Secretary Joseph Barr was quite specific on this very point in his testimony: "Finally, the required disclosure of an annual percentage rate of finance charge would in no way prejudice lenders under the usury laws of the state in which they operate. S. 5 covers only the rate of finance charge and does not deal with interest rates, which are properly regulated by the states."

2. *Recognition of Two Forms of Credit.* It was not until 1962, after the second of the four *Hearings*, that the critics' plea for separate treatment of revolving or open-end credit from contract credit was recognized. This took form in the Committee Print of S. 1740 dated April 21, 1962, and is continued in S. 5 as Section 4(a) for contract credit and Section 4(b) for open-end credit.

3. *Contract or "Close-End" Credit.* Most critics recognized that all of the facts required by the bill could be disclosed and should be known to both parties *before* they enter responsibly and informedly into a contract agreement. These facts include: the amount of credit extended, the finance charge, a repayment schedule, and the rate. These are the four parts of the elementary equation I=Prt.

COMPARISON OF TRUTH IN LENDING BILLS

Disclosure of finance charges

S. 2755, 86th, 2d (original bill), Jan. 7, 1960	S. 2755, 86th, 2d (committee print), May 3, 1960	S. 1740, 87th, 1st, April 27, 1961
Section 3. Any person engaged in the business of extending credit shall furnish to each person to whom such credit is extended, prior to the consummation of the transaction, a clear statement in writing, in accordance with rules and regulations which the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall prescribe,	Section [3.] 4. Any [person engaged in the business of extending credit] creditor shall furnish to each person to whom [such] credit is extended, prior to the consummation of the transaction, a clear statement in writing, *setting forth, to the extent applicable and* in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by [which] the Board [of Governors of the Federal Reserve System shall prescribe,] *the following information—*	Section 4. Same as 2755.
(1) setting forth the total amount of the finance charges to be borne by such person in connection with such extension of credit, and	*(1) the cash price or delivered price of the property or service to be acquired;*	(1) Same as 2755.
(2) stating the percentage that such amount bears to the outstanding principal obligation, or unpaid balance, expressed in terms of simple annual interest.	*(2) the amounts, if any, to be credited as downpayment and/or trade-in;*	(2) Same as 2755.
	(3) the difference between the amounts set forth under clauses (1) and (2);	(3) Same as 2755.
	(4) the charges, individually itemized, which are paid or to be paid by such person in connection with the transaction but which are not incident to the extension of credit;	(4) Same as 2755.
	(5) the total amount to be financed;	(5) Same as 2755.

COMPARISON OF TRUTH IN LENDING BILLS—continued

Disclosure of finance charges—Continued

S. 2755, 86th, 2d (original bill), Jan. 7, 1960	S. 2755, 86th, 2d (committee print), May 3, 1960	S. 1740, 87th, 1st, April 27, 1961
	(6) *the finance charge expressed in terms of dollars and cents; and*	(6) Same as 2755.
	(7) *the percentage that the finance charge bears to the total amount to be financed expressed as a simple annual rate.*	(7) the percentage that the finance charge bears to the total amount to be financed expressed as a simple annual rate *on the outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation.*

Contract credit

S. 1740, 87th, 2d, committee print, April 21, 1962; S. 750, 88th, 1st, January 15, 1963	S. 2275, 89th, 2d, July 12, 1965	S. 5, 90th, 1st, January 11, 1967
Section 4. (a) *Except as provided in subsection* (*b*), any creditor shall furnish . . . Same as S. 1740.	Section 4. Same as S. 750 with *and ascertainable* inserted after the words: "extend applicable."	Section 4. Same as S. 2275.
(1) Same as S. 1740.	(1) Same as S. 750.	(1) Same as S. 2275.
(2) Same as S. 1740.	(2) Same as S. 750.	(2) Same as S. 2275.
(3) Same as S. 1740.	(3) Same as S. 750.	(3) Same as S. 2275.
(4) Same as S. 1740.	(4) Same as S. 750.	(4) Same as S. 2275.
(5) Same as S. 1740.	(5) Same as S. 750.	(5) the total amount to be financed; (*the sum of the amounts set forth under* (*3*) *and* (*4*), *above*);
(6) Same as S. 1740.	(6) Same as S. 750.	(6) the finance charge [expressed] in [terms of] dollars and cents; [and]
(7) the percentage that the finance charge bears to the total amount to be financed expressed as a simple annual rate on the *average* outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation.	(7) Delete—[average outstanding]. Insert—*periodic.*	(7) *the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate to be computed as set forth in section 3(5);*
		(8) *the time and amount of payments scheduled to repay the indebtedness; and* (9) *the terms applicable in the event of advanced or delayed payments from those specified in* (*8*) *above.* Section 3. As used in this Act, the term— (5) *"Annual percentage rate" means the percentage rate per period expressed as a percent per annum. It shall be computed by multiplying the percentage rate per period by the number of periods per year.* (6) *"Percentage rate per period" means the percentage ratio of the finance charge for the period for which the charge is made to the unpaid balance of the total amount to be financed.* (7) *"Period" means the time interval between the payments specified in the credit agreement for repayment of the total amount to be financed.*
Sec. 5. Regulations provided for the Board to describe "the methods which may be used in determining the 'simple annual rate' or 'simple annual percentage rates' for the purpose of Sec. 4."	Same as S. 750.	Section 5. Regulations. Rephrased giving the Board duty to describe "the methods which may be used in determining the annual percentage rate.

Revolving credit

S. 1740, 87th, 2d, committee print, April 21, 1962; S. 750, 88th, 1st, January 15, 1963	S. 2275, 89th, 2d, July 12, 1965	S. 5, 90th, 1st, January 11, 1967
Section 4. (b) *Any creditor agreeing to extend credit to any person pursuant to a revolving or open-end credit plan shall, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Board and in lieu of the information described in subsection* (*a*)—	Same as S. 750 with amendments as noted:	Section 4. (b) Any creditor agreeing to extend credit to any person pursuant to a revolving or open-end credit plan shall, in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Board [and in lieu of the information described in subsection (a)]—
(*1*) *furnish to such person, prior to agreeing to extend credit under such plan, a clear statement in writing setting forth the simple annual percentage rate or rates at which a finance charge will be imposed*[1]; *and*	[1] Insert: *on the monthly balances*	(1) furnish to such person, prior to agreeing to extend credit under such plan, a clear statement in writing setting forth the [simple annual percentage rate or rates at which a finance charge will be imposed on the monthly balance; and] *following information:* (*i*) *the periodic dates of the balances against which a finance charge will be imposed;* (*ii*) *the percentage rate per period of the finance charge to be imposed; and* (*iii*) *the periodic rate of finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate.*
(*2*) *furnish to such person, at the end of each monthly period* (*which need not be a calendar month*) *following the entering into of any such agreement, a clear statement in writing setting forth—*[2]	[2] Insert: *to the extent applicable and ascertainable*	(2) furnish to such person, *as of* the end of each [monthly] period [which need not be a calendar month] following the entering into of any such agreement, a clear statement in writing setting forth to the extent applicable and ascertainable—
(*A*) *the outstanding balance in the account of such person as of the beginning of such monthly period;*		(A) Same as S. 2275 with "monthly" deleted.
(*B*) *the amount of each extension of credit to such person* (*including the cash price or delivered price of any property or service acquired by such person*) *during such period, together with*[3] *the date thereof and a brief identification of any property or services so acquired;*	[3] Delete: [together with] Insert: *and unless previously furnished*	(B) Same as S. 2275 with "monthly" deleted.
(*C*) *the total amount received from, or credited to the account of, such person during such period;*		(C) Same as S. 2275 with "monthly" deleted.
(*D*) *the finance charge* (*in dollars and cents*) *required for such periods;*		(D), (E), & (F), From S. 2275 deleted
(*E*) *the outstanding balance in the account of such person as of the end of such monthly period; and*		

COMPARISON OF TRUTH IN LENDING BILLS—CON.

Revolving credit—Continued

S. 1740, 87th, 2d, committee print, April 21, 1962; S. 750, 88th, 1st, January 15, 1963	S. 2275, 89th, 2d, July 12, 1965	S. 5, 90th, 1st, January 11, 1967
(F) the simple annual percentage rate of rates providing a yield equal to the finance charge imposed.	(F) Delete: [providing a yield equal to the finance charge imposed] Insert: *at which a finance charge has been imposed on the monthly balance.*	*(D) the outstanding unpaid balance in the account of such person as of the end of such period;* *(E) the annual percentage rate used to compute the finance charge for such period;* *(F) the balance on which the periodic finance charge was computed; and* *(G) the finance charge (in dollars and cents) imposed for such period.*
As used in this subsection, the term "revolving or open-end credit plan" means a credit plan under which the total amount of credit to be utilized, the dollar amount of the finance charge to be assessed, and the amounts and times of repayment are not specified at the time an agreement to extend credit pursuant to such plan is entered into.	Definitions same as shown under S. 5	As used in this subsection, the term "revolving or open-end credit plan" means a credit plan *prescribing the terms of credit transactions which may be made thereunder from time to time and under the terms of which a finance charge may be computed on the outstanding unpaid balance from time to time thereunder.*

---

a. *Prior Disclosure Impossible.* Some argued that making full disclosure for contract credit was impossible because the manner in which a contract would be repaid *after* the signing could not be predicted *before* the signing. This argument is fallacious. It changes the basic precepts of a contract. *S. 5* continued to assume that responsible parties to a contract should know and understand the terms of the contract as well as their rights and responsibilities under the contract *before* signing. It sets up a special section for open-end credit for under that form of credit the finance charge is not shown until *after* the credit is used.

b. *Which Rate Method?* There has been much concern expressed in the Hearings as to which method should be used to compute the rate.

In my opinion, a most useful discussion of the eight rate methods is presented by Botts and Garlock in an article which appeared in *The Accounting Review* of October 1965 and which was reprinted in the 1961 *Hearings,* pp. 1359–1368. They make three major points:

1. For a buyer who wants to compare terms of seller A vs. seller B, it makes little difference which method is used—provided the same method is used throughout.

2. Of the eight methods described, the actuarial (small loan) and direct-ratio (or rule of 78ths) give a monthly rate that is, for all practical purposes, equivalent. Further support of this is supplied from page 151 of M. R. Neifeld: *Neifeld's Guide to Installment Computation.* (attached)

"INSTALLMENT PAYMENTS

"Elsewhere, it will avoid confusion to say the rate is x% per week, or per month, or whatever the rest period may be and at the same time to add information about which method of distributing the cost of credit is used.

"A comparison of cost rates obtained by distributing the cost of the credit in the five different well-known types of amortization schedules for the same transaction will help to emphasize the importance of precision in rate statements. Computations were made to find the rate for a cash advance of $94, repayable in 12 monthly payments of $8.33+ each.

"Ranked by size, the rates obtained to the fourth decimal place are:

"Method of charge distribution	Action of the principal	Monthly rate (percent)	Annual rate (percent)	Difference from actuarial rate (percent)
1. Maximum yield	$578.04	1.0380	12.4560	+0.8760
2. Constant ratio	611.04	.9819	11.7828	+.2028
3. Actuarial yield	621.80	.9650	11.5800	…………
4. Direct ratio	622.05	.9646	11.5752	−.0048
5. Minimum ratio	644.04	.9316	11.1792	−.4008

"Computations were carried to the fourth decimal place to bring out the numerical difference between the rates computed by the actuarial and the direct ratio method.

"The actuarial yield is intermediate between the maximum yield and the constant ratio yield on one hand and the direct ratio and the minimum yield on the other.

"The direct ratio yield is very close to the actuarial yield.

"Under ideal investment conditions, rarely found in the business world, earnings would be invested without expense or delay at the same rate, and the annual rate would be an effective rate because of the monthly compounding.

"Operating expenses eat up most of the earnings, delinquency cuts into the investment time periods and regulatory laws prohibit compound interest levied against debtors. The effect of all of these on the several methods of charge distribution is unknown.

"For purposes of these comparisons the annual rate is 12 times the monthly rate without compounding.

"Another illustration: A finance company pays $1,200 to an automobile dealer for a note of $1,278 face which is to be repaid by 12 equal monthly payments of $106.50 each by the buyer of the car."

3. The annual rate quoted is a nominal one, or 12 times the monthly rate. Note that Neifeld also refers to the annual rate as 12 times the monthly rate without compounding.

S. 5 defines the rate method; the actuarial method. It builds the rate concept from the rate applicable to the basic time unit, the period. The percentage rate per period is the ratio of the finance charge for the period to the amount of credit for the period.

The period need not be a month. It may be a week, day, quarter, or a year—that is, whatever time unit best accommodates the consumer and creditor. The annual rate expresses the periodic rate multiplied by the number of periods in a year.

The annual percentage rate is, therefore, but an equivalent expression of the periodic rate. For example, milk at 20¢ a half pint is at a quart-rate of 80¢. While milk sold by the quart may be selling at 60¢, the half-pint container is selling at the quart-rate of 80¢. Likewise, credit quoted at 18% per year applied monthly is 1½% per month. The annual rate expresses in annual terms the periodic rate as it actually applied.

If the periods are irregular, it is reasonable to assume that the typical period of the contract would be selected. Furthermore, if data processing equipment can better utilize for accounting purposes a daily rate, no violence is done the actuarial rate concept by using the daily rate provided. There is no compounding within the period. I wish to submit for the record a page of quotations I have taken from *Neifeld's Guide to Installment Computation* in support of my position.

c. *Which Rate? Nominal vs. Effective.* Much confusion has resulted from a failure to distinguish clearly between nominal (in name only) rate and a rate that yields an amount that is actually earned or collected. This difference in rate concepts is frequently evident in bank and savings loan association advertisements. Since the effective or yield rate exceeds the nominal rate, they have been tempted to give greater promise to the yield rate in advertising for savings. On December 16, 1966, four Government agencies jointly announced a new set of standards aimed at outlawing "misleading claims," in which the yield achieved through compounding should not be stated in greater prominence nor without also stating the nominal rate, which they refer to as the simple interest rate. (Attached is a copy of the directive and a letter from Mr. Sherman explaining the meaning of simple interest). This distinction is discussed in greater detail in my Pamphlet No. 17, pages 34–5, and definitively in Pamphlet No. 18, pages 48–53.

It is important that the terms be clear for effective communication. For example, a bank collects a higher yield from savers who deposit toward the first of the month rather than toward the close of the grace period. They also collect more from depositors who withdraw their savings before the end of the quarter and forgo their accumulated interest. The nominal rate is the same; the effective rate is different. Another example would be the credit unions which collect at a rate of 1% a month, but because February has 3 less days than March, collects at a 10% higher rate in February than it does in the month of March.

To use both concepts interchangeably does violence to truthful communication; to use them in their proper context, each is equally truthful.

Truth in lending, under terms of S. 5, relates directly to the percentage rate per period; the nominal annual rate expresses the periodic rate multiplied by the number of periods in a year.

The annual rate is 12 times the monthly rate, 52 times the weekly rate, 4 times the quarterly rate, 365 times the daily rate.

The equivalent annual rate, so conceived, is just as informative and real as the motorist's knowledge that he is traveling at a rate of 60 miles per hour by looking at the speedometer, regardless of whether he travels the full hour at this rate or goes the full sixty miles.

S. 5 is abundantly clear on this point both as applied to the contract credit and revolving credit.

d. *On What is the Contract Rate Based?* The problem of how best to express the base is reflected in the successive amendments to subsection (7). Under the 1960 bill, S. 2755, the base was defined as: "the outstanding balance or unpaid balance." This was considered too ambiguous for installment credit because by the very nature of installment credit a sequence of balances is involved. Without further clarification, it was felt this wording could be misconstrued to mean a dollar-add-on rate. This is a popular term of rate disclosure currently used, giving the finance charge per hundred dollars per year of the initial amount of credit extended.

In S. 1740 a second effort toward clarification was attempted by adding: "on the outstanding unpaid balance of the obligation." However, this was considered inadequate by the Council of Economic Advisors. And at their suggestion the word "average" was inserted in Committee Print of S. 1740 so it read: "The average outstanding unpaid ballance of the obligation." This was replaced in S. 2275 by the word "periodic," but not until S. 5 was the periodic concept fully developed.

d. *Dollar vs. Percent time rate disclosure.* There still prevails the argument that consumers "think in terms of dollars and not percentages." For example, such a statement appears in the Spring issue of the Personal Finance Law Quarterly Report. (p. 47)

And Mr. Gardner, Deputy Manager of the Installment Credit Committee of the American Bankers Association wrote in private correspondence last November 1966, "We have always felt that an expression of rate in terms of dollars per hundred per year is the type of truth-in-lending that the man in the street can understand and the type that will enable him to quickly and easily arrive at the dollar cost of his borrowing." Also, the Committee's draft of a proposed Uniform Consumer Credit Code uses the dollars per $100 per year disclosure form.

More is involved that an expression in dollars rather than percentages; otherwise the difference is but a matter of choice between the English or Latin form of expression.

As Secretary Barr has said, the proponents of the dollar form of disclosure are really proposing a rate form that is one-half the magnitude of the actuarial rate. He then raises the question of why a double standard? He might also have asked why should teachers be burdened with explaining to students: When you deposit savings with a bank, the bank pays you percent interest; when you borrow from a bank, the bank charges you dollar interest." He suggests that should the proponents be correct in their assertion that consumers do understand dollar rates more clearly, then to achieve a single standard a bank currently paying 4¾% on savings would be required to advertise: "Our dollar add-on-rate on savings is $2.59." He dismisses the whole issue as ridiculous.

e. *Irregularities in Payment.* Another argument made against disclosure of the annual rate is the horrendous task required to compute the rate in the case of deferment, skip, balloon or other irregularities in payment.

These have not proven to be a problem in Massachusetts or a concern reflected by the Department of Defense survey.

Secretary Barr has presented tables for determining the annual percentage rate generally within ⅛ of a percentage point and within ⅒ of a percentage point with interpolation for any type or form of regularity. He concluded, however, that the regulatory authority should be able to find ways to accommodate most of the irregularities, and still preserve the objective of the bill. He estimates that a one page Department of Defense table could handle all but a small minority of contracts, leaving the detailed tables for use if greater accuracy is desired.

I wish to point out that there has been too much attention given to how to find the rate. Actually it may be far easier in complicated contracts to start with the rate and develop a schedule of payments to find the finance charge. An example of this is found on page 20 of Pamphlet No. 18. I started with the rate of 1% per month on the unpaid balance. The Government Actuary has selected the same problem and demonstrated the adaptability of the *Annual Rate Tables* in his selection of problem number 3. If you will try both methods, I believe you will agree that it is easier to start with the rate.

The purported simplicity of the dollar add-on-rate for figuring finance charges for irregular payments is a mystery to me. Failure of Mr. Gardner to respond to this question in private correspondence suggests that there is no established procedure for handling them. If irregularities are to be dismissed, as I must assume in most cases, tables for translating dollar-add on to actuarial rate and vice versa are readily available, so it is but a matter of indifference or taste and not laborious computation as to which rate is fastest to use.

f. *Rate or Rates.* It is commendable that the bill has dropped the possible inclusion of disclosing several rates. Steps or graduated rates are very popular in state laws regulating the maximum permissible rates. Although such rate quotations may be useful to the creditor in arriving at his finance charge, there is no question but what such quotations present the consumer with an impossible task if he is to reduce them to a single rate. The problem is discussed in detail on pages 12–19 in my Pamphlet No. 18 wherein I recommend use of either the rule of 78, with which most creditors are already familiar, or the actuarial method for arriving at a single annual percentage rate.

g. *Summary in Regard to Contract Credit.* S. 5 provides for a defined method of expressing the annual percentage rate. This is not necessarily an interest rate. It is meaningfully applied to the periodic balances. It complies with the U.S. Rule. It is a rate far more familiar to consumers than other rate forms. It is used regularly and satisfactorily in the home mortgage field, by financial institutions for paying interest on savings deposits and shares in savings and loans associations. It is the rate which credit unions even in the early days in which their help consisted of untrained volunteers were able to use successfully. It is adaptable to irregular payments. It is unambiguous. It reflects clearly the time rate of credit use.

4. Revolving credit

Responsible critics of S. 2755 and S. 1740 requested that special recognition be given to open-end or revolving credit. Under this form of credit arrangement both parties know before entering into an agreement the maximum amount of credit that can be extended, the rules of repayment of whatever credit is extended, and the rate of charge to be applied to an unpaid balance of credit to compute the finance charge. But not until *after* the credit has actually been extended would either party know the amount of credit used, and, therefore, the amount of finance charge. Thus, pleaded the critics with justification, any bill which required prior disclosure on all forms of credit was unrealistic with regard to revolving credit.

The problem was partially remedied in May, 1962 by creating in the Committee Print of S. 1740 (which became S. 750) Section 4(b) for revolving or open-end credit. The effort was only partially successful because of the world "yield" in Section 4(b) (F): "The simple annual percentage rate or rates providing a yield equal to the finance charge imposed."

The yield concept was deleted in S. 2275, but no hearings were held on S. 2275. Thus most of the objections to revolving credit disclosure, as recorded in the Hearings are irrelevant. Furthermore, many of the objections raised against S. 2275 and S. 750 do not apply to the provisions of S. 5. I prepared a critique of Dr. Vancil's testimony against S. 750 on this point. I concluded: "In summary, Dr. Vancil presents a good case for S. 5: (1) He illustrates the horrendous task of computing average daily unpaid balances, which S. 5 would not require. (2) He declares in favor of information operationally useful to the consumer, which S. 5 would provide. (3) He distinguishes interest from service charges, and S. 5 uses neither term. (4) He prescribes by implication only one method of figuring the service charge: 1½% of the previous month's ending balance with no allowance for credits or returns unless the balance is fully paid. S. 5 is much more liberal, requiring that the retailer only declare the period, the periodic rate and the base to which it is applied. So S. 5 frees retailers to accommodate their customers, their accounting system, and their concept of good merchandising, yet gives the consumer the operational information needed for decision making. (5) Vancil makes a good case for not yielding to requests that S. 5 be amended to disclose the actual rate on some average of daily unpaid balances. If such were made, Vancil and a host of other NRMA friends would be ready to testify against it. Their motive is not to improve the bill, but to set a noose for hanging S. 5."

I hasten to apologize publicly to Dr. Vancil for implying that his motive was not to improve the bill. But in fairness to him I should say to him that in the earlier part of this critique I made a prediction "If Vancil were to testify on S. 5, he would favor it." This prediction has come true. A copy of Dr. Vancil's letter in support of S. 5 was entered in the record the first day of these Hearings.

In my judgment, those who declare S. 5 to be misleading or uninformative do not do themselves or the many responsible retailers and financial institutions justice. Many of these institutions are now quoting monthly rates. And since the annual rate is merely 12 times the monthly rate it is a matter of simple arithmetic and not a matter of substance as to what the rate reveals. Thus one who argues that the 18% disclosure is misleading is also arguing that the prevailing practice of quoting monthly rates is misleading. S. 5 requires no change in present bookkeeping or accounting procedures! It presents only a printing problem, and then only until present forms are out of stock. If present practices are deceptive or misleading, S. 5 will not correct them.

There have been prepared very sophisticated arguments and papers in defense of the present wording of S. 5. They meet all of the arguments that have been advanced in opposition. They are satisfactory in my judgment. They have not been totally successful. I should like to submit another form of reply to the critics of S. 5 and focus my attention specifically on Mr. Batten's testimony. I call it *The Penny Way.* A toll road situation is assumed wherein distance corresponds to time in a revolving credit account situation. We have rolling down this superhighway a vehicle with two cars. The two cars enable me to distinguish between the credit which obtains a "free ride" and the credit upon which the charge is assessed. Through this demonstration I intend to prove that S. 5 does provide meaningful and useful information for the consumer wishing to make rational decisions. Furthermore, I intend to indicate that there are two rates involved, namely, the *notification rate* which corresponds to the disclosed rate in S. 5, and the *collection rate* which corresponds to the yield received by the toll keeper. There is a third rate that is relevant, but which I do not give much emphasis to, namely the *consumer's opportunity cost rate* which expresses the rate the consumer would be willing to pay for money needed to avoid paying service or finance charges. You will recall that this is the type of question which Secretary Barr suggested be asked of each witness testifying on revolving credit.

Before I introduce my problem I should like to repeat what Secretary Barr said: "It is not important that the consumer buys a shirt on the third of April, is billed on the 17th of April, and has until the 17th of May to pay without incurring any credit charges. This is a cash transaction up to that point. The point at which it becomes a credit transaction, so far as the purpose of this bill is concerned, is the point at which the consumer becomes subject to credit charges. This is the only thing that concerns him. He surely is not going to borrow elsewhere to pay off his revolving credit, unless it is to avoid paying service charges. This is why I say that revolving credit is the simplest kind of credit to handle for the purposes of this bill. If the store charges 1½% per month, the annual percentage rate is 12 times 1½% or 18%."

III. ALTERNATIVES

I wish to conclude this testimony by pointing out the alternatives for public policy. If you pass the bill in essentially its present form, you will provide a standard of disclosure that will be universal throughout the common market of these United States. It will expedite the excellent work of the Committee preparing the Uniform Consumer Credit Code by relieving them of what is, for them, a most difficult decision. Consumer education can become much more effective once the terms of credit are defined and made meaningful.

The rates will stimulate a more price competitive market. And as the market comes to recognize the legitimacy of the rates up to 36% and 42% there will be greater opportunity for differentiation by loan customers. The administering agency can proceed directly in accordance with Section 5(c) to establish an advisory committee. With their advice and counsel it can exercise its powers to prescribe reasonable tolerances of accuracy, and to make rules and regulations consistent with the bill. I feel certain that with the bill passed the experts of the finance industry will be extremely helpful in developing workable procedures.

The alternative is to maintain the status quo. I hope this will not prevail. I can best tell you why if you allow me to share some of my experiences. As a conscientious consumer, student, and teacher, I have taken time whenever I could to learn about credit. This has taken much time. Unlike many of my consumer friends I can justify the investment cost that persistent inquiry involves because I need to know about such matters to keep informed as a teacher. Nevertheless I wish to emphasize that there is a tremendous cost in being a responsible consumer, and I feel this bill would reduce that cost.

1. In my 1960 testimony I told of my efforts to help my secretary understand her car refinancing terms. She was dealing with a large reputable national car financing firm. This resulted in 15 letters, long distance calls, and a 100 mile trip. Had S. 5 been in effect at that time, none of this expense would have been necessary. Incidentally, as the facts were made known, an error in arithmetic was discovered.

My second experience was in regard to revolving credit. I wanted to learn how it worked, so I sent students to find out. We developed a billing sequence so we would have comparable data. One large chain refused to work out the problem, and their literature was not clear with respect to such words as "small service charge" or the "unpaid balance". I had a credit card with this company and knew the credit manager, so I made inquiry and was also told it was policy not to supply such information. So I bought some shirts, charged them on my revolving credit account, allowed my bill to accumulate, and sent the problem along with my payment. The letter ended up not at the regional office, but was answered by the national office. Had S. 5 been in effect then, I would not have been such a nuisance. The information they would supply as a standard procedure would have enabled me to get the information *as a Right* and not a courtesy.

My last example is less pleasant. Dr. Johnson writing in a journal article had raised a question concerning the legality of a situation Miss Courter and I hypothesized in our article, "Are Credit Terms Quoted Accurately?":

"And, often this dollar add-on is not advertised in dollars, but deceptively as a percentage. Only the very sophisticated consumer can recognize an advertised 5% car loan to be the equivalent of 9.5% simple interest."

I referred the matter to the Attorney General of Kansas who in 1964 advised that the advertisement of a dollar add-on-rate as a percentage or percentage discount is clearly misleading within the meaning of Kansas statute. Furthermore, he invited me to advise him if I knew of any such instance.

A month later I noticed a billboard advertisement of the bank 5% car loan. I sent him a picture of it. Last August, over two years later, I noticed this same bank was advertising an offer to borrow at 5% and lend at 5%. I took a picture of this situation and used it for the cover of Pamphlet #17.

Now, it is not my proper role as a professor to engage in policing the market, so it seemed inappropriate for me to institute legal action. However, this is not an isolated case. In the June 29, 1964 issue of *U.S. News and World Report* page 85–6 there was a feature article on a report of the Consumer Advisory Council. In the course of this interview I struck boldly at the bank advertisements of 3% car financing then current.

Although this bill makes no provision for the regulation of advertising, it does establish a standard appropriate factual disclosure. As such it will create an attitude of expectation that will make such advertising less likely.

In conclusion, it seems to me that your choice is to allow the present system to endure with its 50% or 100% error, or, pass this legislation which narrows this error to a workable tolerance.

MILWAUKEE HAILS HAACK CHOICE TO HEAD NEW YORK STOCK EXCHANGE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the New York Stock Exchange has made a topflight selection in electing Robert Haack as its new president to succeed Mr. Keith Funston.

For 24 years Mr. Haack was a brilliant investment expert in Milwaukee, Wis. A few years ago he became head of the National Association of Security Dealers. He did this at a time when the NASD had a series of tough problems.

Mr. Haack handled them with such effectiveness—with such a high regard for the public interest, as well as the interest of the industry, that he became a logical man for one of the biggest jobs in American finance.

Mr. President, the Milwaukee papers have hailed the selection of Robert Haack by the New York Stock Exchange. I ask unanimous consent that editorials from the Milwaukee Journal and the Milwaukee Sentinel praising Mr. Haack's election be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Milwaukee Journal]

Top Man on the Exchange

It is quite a leap from Milwaukee's financial district to the nation's financial heart on Wall Street in New York. And former Milwaukeean Robert W. Haack has accomplished the feat with amazing speed. His accession to the presidency of the New York Stock Exchange, less than four years after having left the investment business here, is strong tribute to his ability. In his new post, Haack will head the largest securities exchange in the world. The challenge is great but if Haack's past performance is any indication the New York Stock Exchange will be in capable hands. His home state and community wish him well.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel]

Worthy Choice

Congratulations are in order to the New York Stock Exchange for having the perspicacity to elect Robert W. Haack, 50, as its president.

As his host of friends and associates in the Milwaukee area can testify, Haack will bring to the nation's biggest securities exchange the exact qualifications needed—sound and extensive knowledge, a high level of administrative ability, and, above all, integrity of the highest order.

His former home community became well aware of his qualifications during his 24 years in the investment business with the Milwaukee firms of Robert W. Baird & Co., in which he was a partner, and Robert W. Baird & Co., Inc., in which he was a vice-president.

We join in wishing Haack a long and successful administration.

WISCONSIN SALUTES U.S. NAVY SEABEES ON 25TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the gallant men of the U.S. Navy construction battalions—the "Can Do" Seabees of the Navy—this year celebrate their 25th anniversary.

Led by officers of the Navy Civil Engineer Corps, the Seabees have earned a well-deserved place of honor in the history of America and the hearts of our people this past quarter century.

Their feats of construction in World War II are legendary. In the Pacific alone, the list of Seabee accomplishments included 111 airstrips, 441 piers, 2,558 ammunition magazines, 700 square blocks of warehouses, hospitals for 70,000 patients, tanks for storing 100 million gallons of gasoline, and housing for 1½ million men. Later, in Korea, the Seabees built and fought against Communist attack upon a friendly, free people.

Today, in Vietnam, Seabee battalions again are applying their imagination, ingenuity, and courage to the construction challenge of jungle terrain, sandy beaches, and enemy action.

Their work goes forward, daily and

without respite, despite difficulties and danger.

Seabee civic action teams—SCATS—today are serving deep in the interior of Vietnam, teaching basic building skills to the villagers; helping to construct schoolhouses, council halls, and churches; creating farm-to-market roads; providing medical treatment; improving village sanitation. These 13-man teams are adding a new chapter to the fine records of Seabee service, and this people-to-people program has come to be known as the Navy Peace Corps. In the past 5 years they have brought their technical skills and human interest to peoples in Africa, Latin America, and Asia.

In recognition to the Seabee silver 25th anniversary, Gov. Warren P. Knowles, of the State of Wisconsin, recently proclaimed Seabee Day in Wisconsin.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this proclamation printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISCONSIN SALUTES U.S. NAVY SEABEES—A PROCLAMATION

Whereas, on March 5, 1967, the United States Naval Construction Battalions, known as the Seabees, will observe its 25th anniversary, and on March 2, 1967, the United States Naval Civil Engineer Corps, which commands the Seabees, will mark its 100th birthday; and

Whereas, today in Southeast Asia the Seabees are expanding their heritage of defending freedom by working on numerous large construction jobs, supporting military operations and by bringing technical skills to the village level in order that those indigenous to the country can learn to do the same technical jobs for themselves; and

Whereas, this aid and spirit of cooperation is a vital factor in building a desire for freedom in Southeast Asia; and

Whereas, the observance of this anniversary year is in recognition of those Seabees who have fought and given their lives for our country during World War II, during the Korean Conflict and presently in Southeast Asia; and in recognition of those who now stand ready to fight for the peace and freedom of the world;

Now, therefore, I, Warren P. Knowles, Governor of the State of Wisconsin, do hereby proclaim March 5, 1967, as Seabee Day in Wisconsin, and I urge that this observance serve as a reminder to the citizens of our State of the contributions and sacrifices these "fighting builders" have made to preserve the American way of life.

WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor.

THE IMPORTANT WORK OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Raymond A. Brighton, managing editor of the Portsmouth Herald in Portsmouth, N.H., has recently returned from an overseas mission with the 157th Airlift Group of the New Hampshire Air National Guard.

In a two-part series, written shortly after his return, Mr. Brighton pointed out the little publicized, but highly important work being performed today by the New Hampshire Air National Guard and Air National Guard units throughout the country.

His series, Mr. President, speaks for itself—and speaks highly of the Air National Guard; and I ask unanimous consent that his two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW HAMPSHIRE AIR NATIONAL GUARD: FREIGHT AIRLINE AT PEASE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Few people in the Portsmouth area know the major role being played by the Air National Guard in keeping American forces all over the world supplied in a day when the military is becoming increasingly dependent on airlift. One of the units doing a heavy portion of this work is the 157th Military Airlift Group NHANG, at Pease AFB. Herald reporter Ray Brighton accompanied one of these busy crews in a swing around Western Europe and tells of its work in the following articles.)

(By Ray Brighton)

Some forward looking people in Portsmouth have long been casting speculative eyes toward Pease AFB and wondering about the possibilities of utilizing part of the base as a civilian air freight depot.

The thought is reasonable enough. For all of its size and the noise that is being made about expanding Logan Airport, Boston, the fact remains that Logan is near the saturation point in air traffic and the nearest decent airfield to Boston is Pease.

What many persons don't realize is that there is already at Pease one of the busiest little freight "airlines" in the country.

These freight haulers are the men and planes of the 157th Military Airlift Group, New Hampshire National Guard, which transferred into Pease from Grenier AFB more than a year ago.

Since their arrival, the crews have logged millions of air miles and toted millions of pounds of freight to remote spots around the globe. Several times a week the tough, dependable C97s flown by the 157th leave Pease for ports of call ranging from Saigon to Athens, Greece.

The men who make up the crews are civilians who go on active duty to fly the missions, which may take from a week to two weeks, depending on destination and how trouble-free the flight is.

The 157th, if called to active duty as an entire unit, would muster more than 700 men and officers but its permanent detail, all civilians even when uniformed, is a few over a hundred. The difference in the numbers lies, of course, in what the Air National Guard itself calls the "weekenders," men who are available for part-time duty.

Confusion sometimes surrounds the men who make the permanent force at Pease. In order to get the administrative personnel needed to run even an outfit of weekenders, the government has found it necessary to put the men on a different pay status than what their ranks might call for. Their pay grades as civilians in uniform have equivalents in the GS numbers familiar to Civil Service but, and it's a bone of contention, the men do not have Civil Service standing.

The base detachment commander is Col. Paul R. Smith of Derry, a veteran airman with thousands of hours as a pilot in almost any kind of aircraft but multi-engine jets. If the 157th was put on active duty, the colonel would serve as chief of staff.

Group commander is Col. William J. Hamilton, of Winnicut Road, Stratham, whose civilian function is as director of operations for the 157th.

Federally paid and maintained the Air Guard, along with the "ground pounders," are part of the military forces of the state with Maj. Gen. Francis B. McSwiney, the adjutant general, in overall command.

The 157th had its beginning 20 years ago at Grenier Field as a fighter outfit attracting to its rank, men such as Col. Smith, who had served in World War II and who still wanted to fly.

After years as a fighter unit, the changes so often made by the military came to the 157th. The fighter aircraft were taken away and it was reassigned to C97s, a plane familiar in form to the people in the vicinity of Pease as the KC97, and known to commercial travelers as the Stratocruiser.

This four-engine plane was intended to function in the airlifting of men and supplies wherever the need existed, and so it has operated ever since.

The pressures of Vietnam have brought about a situation where the 157th, and units like it in other states, are absolutely vital to the service of supplies to troops both overseas and in the United States. Increasingly, the unit is being called on to fly freighter missions on short notice and, because most of the pilots and crews for the planes have jobs in the civilian world, it is becoming harder for the unit to carry out its mission.

Employers are understanding, up to a point, about letting men go away for a week or two at a time but as the number of missions has nearly doubled in a year the burden is falling more and more on the few who can get away.

In what seems, at least to an outsider's eye, a neat bit of footwork the Pentagon gets around actual activation of outfits like the 157th by labeling its flights training missions.

The fact that the 157th lugs millions of pounds of real live freight all over the world each year can't help make the outsider again wonder when training stops and actual military work begins.

For example, in 1966 the 157th airlifted 2,467,672 pounds of freight to Southeast Asia or Europe and an additional 281,892 pounds to points in the Zone of the Interior, for a grand total of 2,749,564 pounds.

In hauling that amount of goods, the unit flew 140,040 miles in the Zone of the Interior and 937,868 miles overseas, adding up to 1,077,908 miles. It took 5,124 hours to fly the 124 missions it was assigned last year.

Ports of call in 1966 included Da Nang AB, Vietnam; Kadena AB, Okinawa; Prestwick, Scotland; Rhein Main, Germany; Tachikawa AB, Japan; Tan Son Nhut, Vietnam; Mildenhall, England; Taipei AB, Formosa; Kimpo AB, Korea; Keflavik, Iceland, and Naples, Italy.

Also, Athens, Greece; Harmon AFB, Canada; Torrejon AFB, Spain; Cam Ranh Bay, Vietnam; Goose AB, Canada; Ramey AFB, Puerto Rico.

Not to forget missions to Australia, New Zealand, Norway, Guam, The Philippines, Hawaii, Wake Island, Kwajalein Island and the Azores.

The cargoes run the gamut of all the goods needed by military forces, whether at home or abroad. Ammunition to Vietnam, generators to Germany, toilet paper anywhere; CARE packages, mail, troops and sometimes animals are even airlifted. This was the case with some cattle that were airlifted to the Azores after disease wiped out the island's herds.

Many of the pilots flying the missions are taking "busmen's holidays" from their regular jobs as airline pilots. Other crewman occupations spread over the whole list of civilian jobs.

Albeit that they are civilians, these men strike an air of quiet professionalism in their approach to flying.

Those one talks to have different reasons for being in the Air Guard, and they never bring it up, but one gets the feeling that they are proud of what they are doing to help the effort in Vietnam.

NO LUXURY, PLENTY OF HOSPITALITY, WITH AIR GUARD—THEY CALL IT "TRAINING" ALTHOUGH MISSION IS REAL

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the last of two articles on the work being done by the 157th

Military Airlift Group of the New Hampshire National Guard, stationed at Pease AFB.)

(By Ray Brighton)

If you get the chance to fly on a freight hauling mission with the 157th Military Airlift Group of the New Hampshire Air National Guard, don't expect to have your meals served by comely stewardesses or to see in-flight movies.

However, you will find the crewmen a hospitable and congenial bunch of people, which more than makes up for the missing amenities of luxurious commercial flight.

That was the way it was with the crew of 30334, the 157th's C97 that was on a mission to Athens, Greece, last week.

The order setting up the flight described it as a "training mission" in the hauling of freight, but that seems a bit of misnomer. Somehow the word "training" conjures a picture of military forces working on a drummed up problem that has only some connection with the real thing.

But the purpose of this mission was real enough. There was freight for Athens and way points waiting at Dover AFB, Del., and it was 30334's job to get it there.

Even the hour—7 a.m.—to report at the unit's Pease headquarters was early enough to show that the outfit meant business.

The plane left Pease without cargo, and was simply an Air National Guard flight down to the loading station at Dover. Once the wheels touched the ground at Dover AFB, the plane and its crew passed from the control of the NHANG and became another of the many planes flying under the direction of the Air Force's Military Airlift Command.

Dover is one of the key points in warehousing supplies for American forces on the other side of the Atlantic. (When the 157th's aircraft are on a mission to Viet Nam they usually go to Travis AFB, Calif., for loading.)

Planes from Air Guard units around the country, besides regular Air Force MAC aircraft and Air Force reservists, were spotted along the loading ramp. The tails or fuselages of the planes bore in black letterings the names of their states: N.H. on the tail of 30334; California on the fuselage of a dumpy C124; Tennessee, North Carolina and Oklahoma on others.

Col. Paul R. Smith of Derry, aircraft commander on 30334, had put the plane gently on the ground after being balked in his first landing attempt when a C135, a four-engine jet freighter, banked sharply in front of him on the approach and went right in for a landing.

A veteran of thousands of hours in the air, Smith merely shook his head over the 135's maneuver and his first pilot, Maj. Donald J. Maynard, a civilian who runs a fish hatchery at Laconia, said "You can expect anything here."

Old 30334 was carrying a full complement of personnel on her mission to Athens. In addition to Smith and Maynard as pilots, she had Capt. George D. Cooper of Portsmouth, who recently resigned from the Air Force as a KC135 pilot to take up a career in civil aviation but who enrolled in the Air Guard immediately in order to keep up his military proficiency.

The senior navigator, a man who takes a lot of kidding from the pilots who pretend they are more handicapped than helped by him in transocean flight, was Maj. Eugene A. Welenteichick of Peace AFB. Maj. Welenteichick is one of the few men flying with the Guard who is at the same time on permanent duty with the Air Force. The major heads the Pease weather detail and so comes directly under MAC, rather than Strategic Air Command, hence his opportunity to fly with Guard planes to keep his proficiency.

Backing up Welenteichick was Capt. Malcolm S. Beaton of Seabrook, who is a math teacher and line coach at Saugus High School in Massachusetts. Bay State schools were on vacation last week so Beaton took the opportunity to make a flight to Europe.

School teachers like Beaton will be useful to the 157th this summer when other men, whose occupations keep them the busiest in the summer, will be unavailable for missions.

Two other key men on the mission were the flight engineers. The senior of them was M. Sgt. Bertrand J. Paradis of Manchester who spends most of his working life in the air. The other was S. Sgt. John C. White of Meredith, whose real estate business is quiet in the winter and leaves him free for a lot of flying.

Not to be overlooked in a listing of important crewmen are the loadmasters, whose job it is to see that the cargo is correctly stowed, in-flight meals provided, and a myriad of other details.

On 30334, these two were T. Sgt. Donald R. Whitten of Londonderry, another man who spends much of his time on MAC missions, and A. 2.C. Kevin N. Hawkes of Nashua, who is a flight instructor in single-engine aircraft in civilian life.

Three other men were on the crew roster: Capt. George W. Pate, a hospital administrator in Springfield, Mass., who heads the 133rd Air Medical Evacuation, NHANG, at Pease and who was going to Rhein Main, Germany, for two weeks' active duty; SM Sgt. Nicholas W. Pournaras, NHANG, of Manchester, on a special assignment; and one civilian.

Col. Smith had already passed out the detailed itinerary for the flight, with the first stop after Dover to be Lajes AFB in the Azores, a 10-hour flight. Eating and loading at Dover took only the allotted two hours. But that did not mean immediate take-off. The No. 3 engine had developed an oil leak which had to be fixed, and the radar was not working properly.

Under the critical eyes of the crew, with the flight engineers taking particular notice, ground personnel labored to get things corrected. When the aircraft commander was finally satisfied 30334 finally took off, and once over the Atlantic the crew settled down to the deadly monotony of flight across the ocean.

Those without any immediate flight assignment quickly took advantage of a chance to sleep. The loadmasters went over the fastenings on the cargo one more time to make sure it was secure in case of rough air, although the three heavy generators destined for Rhein Main looked as though it would take a lot to move them. There were also CARE packages in the cargo and other boxes filled with items that could only be guessed at.

The mission had also picked up its first passenger at Dover, an airman headed "home" to Lajes AFB where his father was commanding officer, before being re-assigned to a base in California.

By 10 o'clock, the in-flight lunches bought and paid for by the crew members at the commissary, had been eaten and still there were five long hours left before Lajes. There was a time when 30334's time across the Atlantic—as passenger-carrying Stratocruiser—would have been a modern marvel but the jets have long since taken on that glamor, leaving 30334 and her plowhorse sisters of the air to do the workaday tasks.

The Island of Flores, most westward of the Azores, came into view on the radar and was soon underneath the wings. Touchdown at Lajes was within 40 minutes and the crew quickly fell into the drill that would become routine in the next few days.

Everyone fell to in off-loading the personal baggage and putting it on a waiting crew bus, and then the short ride through the quiet streets of the base to special quarters for visiting air crews.

It was breakfast—or was it lunch or dinner?—that was next on the agenda. It must have been dinner, because the crew sipped Vin Rose with their steak and eggs. By now an hour had passed of the 15-hour crew rest, mandatory under MAC flying procedures, and so to bed. At 4 p.m., the crew would be alerted for a 7 o'clock takeoff to Torrejon AFB, outside Madrid, Spain.

Sleepy heads had barely touched pillows, it seemed, before the "alert" call came for the crew of 30334. One final play on the slot machines at the Officers Club and back to the aircraft.

The cargo had been shifted around, some taken off and new items added, but takeof was delayed as the aircraft commander waited for two passengers.

They were an Air Force staff sergeant and his daughter. Little Velda, only nine and the middle of five sisters, was going to Torrejon for surgery in the base hospital there that could not be performed at Lajes. Her dad had been put on temporary duty at Torrejon so one of the parents could be with the youngsters during her hospital stay.

Velda brightened the grind to Torrejon, amusing crewmen with her wide open "love affair" with her father, and to her went the honor of sitting in the jump seat behind Capt. Cooper, who was then flying the airplane, as 30334 passed over the glittering lights of Lisbon, Portugal.

Although gay Madrid is only 14 miles from Torrejon there was only time for refueling, eating, re-checking the aircraft, loading and unloading cargo and then pushing on to Athens. Two other passengers had taken the places of Velda and her father, a young married Air Force couple named Smith, both in uniform and wearing the stripes of airmen, first class. They were on leave and going to Athens to see the sights.

Much of Spain was crossed in the darkness, and a hazy dawn revealed the Mediterranean below, its blueness a shimmering background for the many islands. Maj. Maynard, who had the controls over the Atlantic to Lajes, was back in the left-hand seat and dropped the plane onto the bumpy runway at Athens.

Now there was real haste in getting the bags off: The orders called for 48 hours in Athens, which is now one of the most eastern "turnarounds" for the airlift crews. Col. Smith headed the contingent of navigators, pilots and flight engineers into base operations to clear his arrival. The inevitable bus transported the crew to its hotels just outside the city limits of Athens.

Within a few minutes, uniforms were put aside and civilian clothes donned, then the crewmen could not be told from the thousands of other "tourists" who throng the streets of Europe's newest "in" city—Athens.

For 30334's crew, the 48-hour stay in Athens passed far more quickly than any 10-hour flight as members did the tourist round: Climbing the Acropolis to pay homage to Greek builders who lived more than two thousand years ago; to the Agora, where the Athenians of old met to trade, talk and politick; having beer or wine in a sidewalk cafe; wandering along the beaches to look at the many luxury yachts at their moorings; eating; giving the slot machines a play; being amazed by the fact so many Greeks understand, if not speak, English—a fact that eludes many Amercian tourists who persist in criticizing what they see, thinking no one around will understand them.

All too soon it was alert time again and back to the Athens Municipal Airport where the United States has facilities. Two nurses on leave from Ankara, Turkey, asked for passage to Rhein Main, the next port of call, along with a native-born Greek who is now a lieutenant colonel in the USAF. But they were out of luck despite the bitter anger of the nurses. The Airlift Command Post had discovered that acid from one of the batteries in the generators has leaked out and the cargo was now rated as dangerous, which barred passengers.

The flight to Rhein Main AFB, near Frankfort in West Germany, could be a couple of hours shorter, but the Swiss do not allow foreign military aircraft to overfly that mountainous nation and so a long swing must be made across Italy and then up over France.

The French Alps rear snowclad heads above the clouds as 30334 wings her way over the heartland of France. The DeGaulle government gives special dispensation for military overflights, but allows no landings except in case of emergency. The radio crackles constantly with the busy air traffic of Europe. English is the international language of the airways but nationals of a country may use their native tongue over their own country.

Up the long valley of the Rhone, over Dijon for a turn at a checkpoint over Luxemburg. By now, despite the beauty below, it had become very obvious that the ground crews at Athens hadn't bothered to empty the chemical latrines and the plane had stood for two days in the warm sunshine. The odor penetrated the remotest nook of the aircraft and a timely arrival at Rhein Main was the only escape from it.

Maj. Maynard turned the airplane at Luxemburg and soon the Rhine, here its valley is steeply hilled, was below. River traffic teemed on one of the world's most useful waterways, and the smoky haze of that great industrial region rose high in the air.

After landing, the C97 was guided to place on the ramp and the crew was off with its baggage in a matter of minutes. Another 15-hour crew rest was in prospect, which meant there would be time enough for a quick visit to Frankfurt.

A shower, dinner on base, a pass or two at the slot machines and then it was off to Frankfurt by civilian bus. Immediately it jumped to the attention that the State of New Hampshire's highway engineers should be sent to West Germany to learn how to mark a highway with directional signs. German thoroughness makes riding along the autobahns easy even for foreigners.

The men who were to do the flying next day—the alert was for 6 a.m.—were not along on the trip into Frankfurt. The crews, particularly the aircraft commanders, are careful how much pleasure they mix with business.

As one of them said, after nine hours at the controls, "I'm pooped. All I do is sit there between takeoff and landing and let the auto pilot do the work, but you can't forget you're always on the brink of disaster when you're in the air."

No visit to Frankfurt, however fleeting, would be complete without a call at one of its famous beer halls with a real live German band providing the entertainment. An elderly newsboy flashed the headlines of his wares, "Adenauer Ist Tot," but few of the patrons paid him any heed. It was 1 a.m. when the band played its last number, and it was a three-dollar cab ride back to the base.

Sleep had just come when someone pounded on the door to announce the hour of rising. Breakfast and out to the plane, where the loadmasters had already been busy for two hours checking in the new cargo. The manifest showed Class B explosives as part of the load, mail and three human bodies, ("Quiet ones" the crews call them, because they don't cause the commotion ordinary passengers do), being returned to the United States.

One item on the manifest particularly caused caustic comment. The 30334 was hauling back to the United States 4,300 pounds of paper bags, the name of the Long Island manufacturer proudly emblazoned on the cartons.

"Makes you wonder," one crewman commented, "if anybody knows what the hell they're doing."

"You know what'll happen," another remarked. "We'll fly them to the States and someone else will fly them right back again."

There was a bit of a wait at the end of the runway while a B57 took off in a black cloud of exhaust, scooting skyward almost as fast as the eye could follow. Rhein Main has two parallel runways and it needs them, as a heavy swirl of both civilian and military air traffic is constantly coming and going.

Off the ground, 30334 swung her nose westward toward France and to the pleasure of all aboard it was now obvious that the ground crew at Rhein Main had done its duty by the latrines.

The countryside of West Germany, Luxemburg, Belgium and France flowed beneath the wings while overhead were the contrails of the fast-flying jets heading toward Orly Airport at Paris. Col. Smith studied the terrain with special interest; he had flown over it in World War II as a fighter pilot backing up Patton's 3rd Army. The fields below had seen men shed their blood over many centuries, and here where the Marne ox-bowed its way along, had been fought the bloodiest battles of the First World War.

Distances seem short in Europe and soon Rheims Cathedral was in view, with Paris only minutes away. The flight plan called for a crossing of Paris about three miles north of the Eiffel Tower and the Arc de Triumphe. They were not yet in sight in the morning haze as the plane passed over Le Bourget, the airfield where Lindbergh landed in his puny Spirit of St. Louis 40 years ago next month.

The Eiffel Tower was a black finger poking upward against the industrial smoke of Paris as the plane made a turn southward over its Paris checkpoint.

Once again the crew settled down to the grinding monotony of the flight; a lot of France and part of Spain had to be crossed before the plane would head out over the Atlantic toward Lajes AFB.

The pilots listened carefully to the radio conversations between a plane disabled somewhere off the Azores and rescue aircraft that were hovering near it. The plane, one of its two engines out, was trying to limp into Santa Maria, the Azores, and eventually made it.

Lajes AFB seemed a familiar place but the few aircraft around recalled days nine years ago when it was one of the busiest airports used by the Air Force. Then passenger traffic streamed through it day and night, but the cutback in our forces in Europe and the change to jets for passengers is almost making it a "ghost" field.

A welcoming committee awaited 30334 once she was on the ground. The "Follow Me" truck provided escort to one of the remotest spots on the ramp—word of our explosive cargo had gone ahead. Arriving at the secluded parking place, the baggage was off-loaded for another 15-hour crew rest with the alert set for 4 a.m.

For the crew, the Lajes stop on the return meant a chance to visit the PX, where some of the biggest bargains in the world wait on the shelves for eager customers. Only the military can shop there but the prices on the items makes everyone all too conscious of the tremendous taxes the consumer pays on merchandise offered in the open market.

The sun was still in hiding when the crew went out to the plane, and flight engineer White kept saying, "Going to be a long day today." He was right.

Lajes ACP offered the word that some rough weather lay ahead over the Atlantic and the estimated flight was set for 12 hours as Col. Smith picked up the flight plan. At every field the pilots and navigators are given a briefing on weather, lanes of travel before taking off, and they can deviate from the plan only with the permission of the airways center that is controlling their flight.

The plane was five hours out from Lajes when a newscaster at St. John, Newfoundland, reported on the Army's takover of Athens.

South and West of Newfoundland the Russian trawler fleet could be seen busily making their heavy hauls of fish from the ocean depths. Off Cap Cod, some of the recently reported oil slick was evident on the water.

A little over 12 hours out from Lajes, Col. Smith brought the C97 into the flight pattern for Dover, Del., where those 4,300 pounds of paper bags and the rest of the cargo had been consigned. He had to fight his way through the wash of a C141 before settling the "beast" down on the runway.

At Dover, 30334 was given the same bum's rush it had received at Lajes. Her parking spot was out in the boondocks so far that the Customs people refused to even come out to the plane. After delays the explosives were offloaded, (somebody left part of them on board), and then Smith taxied the plane back to the warehouse area.

A bustling Customs man came aboard and began checking the forms filled out by crew members. The crews from the 157th play this straight up the middle declaring everything they buy. (Being caught trying to smuggle is one of the surest ways there is of never getting another trip.)

The offloading was quickly under way, the human remains being the first of the cargo to be removed, and on special pallets. At Lajes the night before, they had also been removed from the plane and taken to the base mortuary until the flight was ready.

Loadmaster Whitten's manifest showed that the plane had carried a total of 37,328 pounds of freight, about evenly split outward and inward bound, plus five passengers.

While the plane was being unloaded, the crew, except for the loadmasters, grabbed a bite to eat. The loadmasters had to get their meal on the fly later, although they needn't have hurried because things were hung up again. A valve, damaged in refueling at Lajes, could not be opened so the wing tanks had to be filled individually, a task that took time.

The latrine tank truck came out but the operator managed to foul up the valve and dump the contents on the ramp all of which had to be washed down, but finally the plane was again ready and its status changed to that of an Air Guard plane on its way home. MAC was through with it for the time being.

Lightened of its freight, old 30334 made a fast climb to 12,000 feet and headed for Pease and home. Heavy clouds gave the plane its roughest ride of the trip through the final hour and a half, with ice forming on the wings and props. When the load of ice became a little heavy, control gave permission to drop to 8,000 feet.

The runway lights at Pease were a real homing beacon as Maj. Maynard came in over the Newington end of the runway and a quick taxi to the 156th's parking apron.

Just one of the many flights the 157th will make this year for the Military Airlift Command was over after 53 hours, 55 minutes in the air.

The crew scrambled faster than it had ever done to get the baggage off and head homeward and yet, when their headquarters calls again, if they can get away they'll be ready to go.

Why do they do it? Hours of monotony in the air, hours more spent on ramps all over the world, all this for a few brief hours of liberty in some foreign place.

Some of the motivation has to rest, of course, in the excitement of seeing different places, no matter how fleetingly; for some, it means supplementing their incomes in slack periods; but underneath it all, there's an air of pride in doing a job that has to be done, in a way that only professionals can do it.

It makes one wonder when Col. Smith might have another flight going out.

AIR POLLUTION—FUME-FREE CAR

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I wish to invite attention to the fact that Ford

Motor Co. and Mobil Oil Corp. have announced plans for a cooperative research project to develop a gasoline-powered, fume-free car.

It is encouraging to see private companies demonstrating their public responsibility in this way. If the study can produce positive solutions to the plaguing problem of air pollution, the whole country will be indebted. I hope the Ford-Mobil experiment will inspire others in the American business system to exert similar efforts.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement and an article published in the April 30 issue of the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FUME-FREE CARS

Ford Motor Company and Mobil Oil Corporation have announced plans for a cooperative research project aimed at early development of virtually emission-free, gasoline-powered vehicles.

The project, to begin May 1, will supplement long-established, emission-control programs at both companies. It will continue for at least three years unless its goals are reached earlier.

An estimated $7 million will be spent over the term of the study, one of the largest joint research efforts undertaken by private industry. Provision is made so that others may participate in the project. All participants will have full access to and free use of results of the research for anti-pollution purposes.

Ford will serve as project manager in a "systems approach" study of a wide range of combinations of engine designs and fuel. It is expected the study will lead to development of a fuel-engine system that will virtually eliminate automotive emissions, with minimum cost to the consumer and minimal effect on car performance.

Building on the automobile and oil industries' substantial achievements in anti-pollution research, the Ford-Mobil project will concentrate on studies principally in these areas:

All elements of the basic engine, including the induction, combustion and ignition systems.

A catalytic exhaust system capable of working with leaded gasoline.

A catalytic exhaust system capable of working with unleaded gasoline.

Thermal afterburner exhaust system (non-catalytic) for use with leaded gasoline.

Methods for removing nitrogen oxides from the exhaust or preventing their formation.

Methods of controlling evaporative losses from the fuel tank and carburetor.

Studies of a duel fuel system for reducing octane requirements and hence the cost of producing gasoline.

Studies of fuel and lubricant composition that would be required to minimize emissions from any of the above systems.

Chief executives of each of the two companies commented on the project's significance.

Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Company, said:

"The solution of any problem of this sort requires close and meaningful cooperation among the parties involved. We think this program can and will lead to the kind of progress that no one company is likely to achieve independently. More importantly, it shall lead to quick and long-lasting benefits for the customers of both the automotive and petroleum industries and for the public generally."

A. L. Nickerson, chairman of the board of Mobil Oil Corporation, said:

"We are putting both resources and determination into a strong effort to bring this part of the nation's pollution problem under control. We think this project will help demonstrate that American business knows its public responsibilities and can meet them voluntarily and well."

[From the New York Times, Apr. 30, 1967]

FORD AND MOBIL SEEK A FUME-FREE CAR

(By Jerry M. Flint)

DETROIT, April 29.—The Ford Motor Company and the Mobil Oil Corporation are beginning a $7-million research program designed to develop fume-free gasoline-powered automobiles.

These auto emissions, including unburned hydrocarbon or gasoline fumes, oxides of nitrogen, and carbon monoxide are considered major air pollutants, and in some areas, a heavy contributor to smog.

A Ford statement said, "It is expected the study will lead to development of a fuel-engine system that will virtually eliminate automobile emissions, with minimum cost to the consumer and minimal effect on car performance."

If Ford and Mobil could develop fume-free gasoline engines, it could eliminate the need for an electric-powered automobile, which Ford also has been promoting as a possible cure for auto-fume pollution. Last fall, Ford's president, Arjay Miller, announced that Ford was working on an electric car and he predicted then that a practical model would be available within five to 10 years.

"That's the inexorable march of science," said one Ford executive. "Six months after we re-invented the electric car, it's obsolete."

A Ford spokesman, however, said, "The project will have no effect on Ford's long-term interest in the development of electric cars. The company's electric prototype and battery research program will continue unabated.

The company continues to see a possible market in the United States and elsewhere for a special-purpose electric vehicle designed initially for use in cities and suburbs. Both Ford and Mobil expect that emissions from gasoline-powered vehicles can significantly be reduced before a really practical electric car can be developed.

Other automobile companies did not share Mr. Miller's faith in the electric car and said they did not think a practical electric automobile could be developed in the near future.

All auto makers have vowed to try to reduce the auto emissions, but Ford is the first auto company to say it expects to develop a system to "virtually eliminate" such air pollutants at a low cost and soon. The Ford-Mobil study will continue for at least three years unless the goals are reached sooner, Ford said. Supplement emission control programs are planned at both companies.

In California, new cars made in the United States already carry anti-emission systems, and all 1968 models sold in the United States will carry such systems.

The General Motors Corporation has said that before any effort at fume control was made, cars averaged 1.25 pounds of hydrocarbon or unburned gasoline emissions per day. With new systems on California cars, this has been reduced to 0.46 pounds per day.

California law also requires that the hydrocarbon level be dropped to 0.20 pounds per day by 1970. Auto makers have not been able to cut the hydrocarbon fumes by this much as yet. Carbon monoxide fumes average 5.19 pounds per day for each car, but the antifume system on 1968 models will cut this to 2.05 pounds per car for each day, G.M. says.

Ford said its new study was one of the largest joint research efforts undertaken by private industry and said that other participants are welcome.

"We think this program can and will lead to the kind of progress that no one company is likely to achieve independently," Henry Ford 2d, the chairman of Ford, said.

The Ford-Mobil study will concentrate on all elements of the engine, fuel and lubricant composition; catalysts and afterburners that could help oxidise unburned gasoline; methods of removing nitrogen oxide from the exhaust, and methods of controlling evaporation from the fuel tank and carburetor.

LAW DAY

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, yesterday marked the 10th observance of Law Day in the United States. Across this great Nation, citizens from all walks of life joined members of the judiciary and legal profession in ceremonies appropriate to the occasion.

The theme of this year's observance was "No Man Is Above the Law, and No Man Is Below It." These are the words of Theodore Roosevelt. They are profound in their simplicity. Translated into action, they form the cornerstone of a democratic society.

They seem especially fitting at a time when the cancerous growth of crime has become the single most important domestic problem before the Nation. Never has there existed a more urgent need for Americans to demonstrate by word and deed their respect for the law and support for those who enforce it.

Our Nation can endure as a citadel of freedom only so long as our people retain faith in the law as an effective and impartial instrument of justice. The genius of democracy is in its fragile framework; a delicate fabric of ideals serves where other societies need guns and jackboots. This makes it imperative that our ideals remain above compromise or corruption. It is the reason why the law must be administered fairly but firmly to punish the wrongdoer while vindicating the innocent.

Yet, in the years of this decade, we have been witness to astonishing events which mock the law and subvert the ends of justice. We have watched helplessly as the crime rate has increased six times faster than our population. We have noted with mounting apprehension the alarming rise in homicides, aggravated assaults, attacks on women and other crimes of violence. And, confronted with this crisis in our society, we have seen hardened criminals turned loose through labored interpretations of the law or because of technical errors committed by law enforcement authorities at the time of arrest.

Mr. President, justice is not served if known predators on society remain at large while obscure and frequently irrelevant points of legal procedure are endlessly debated. Such practice serves only to encourage disrespect for the law. It undermines public confidence in the inevitability of justice.

The 90th Congress is considering legislation to strengthen our laws in a great many important areas. I believe we should assign the highest priority to these proposals. We cannot abrogate our responsibility. We must squarely face a problem that is rapidly assuming catastrophic proportions.

I am not suggesting that the constitutional guarantees of criminal suspects be compromised. But I strongly feel that recent court decisions have created an imbalance wherein the rights of the accused frequently jeopardize public safety and the rights of the victims of crime. The Congress has a clear mandate to rebalance these scales of justice.

On this 10th observance of Law Day, let us pay tribute to the thousands of American citizens who will demonstrate their faith in our institutions by participating in ceremonies throughout our States and Territories. And let us hope that today, particularly, they will not become the victims of crime, for that would be the ultimate irony.

POLITICAL EVENTS IN GREECE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the new military regime in Greece has taken into custody ex-Premier George Papandreou and his son Andreas. News reports indicate that the younger Papandreou has been charged with treason and is in great danger of being executed. The tragic situation in Greece would be compounded if he is tried, and the outcome is what one would normally expect from a military regime which strongly opposes the political views of the accused. The inevitable result of any hasty, politically motivated action against either father or son could only be disastrous for that unfortunate country.

I do not know the details of the charges against the Papandreous, but the charges are somewhat beside the point if drumhead justice prevails. It will be a sad day for Western civilization if the motherland of democracy attempts to silence those whose political philosophy runs counter to the established order by convicting them of treason.

The world is watching closely the actions of the military regime. The manner in which the allegations against the Papandreous are handled will evidence far better than mere words the true philosophy of the new leaders. I hope that the traditional judicial rights accorded to all citizens in a democracy will be guaranteed to both father and son, and I hope that U.S. officials will make strong representation to the military regime to this effect.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article written by Mr. Bernard Nossiter and published in the Washington Post of April 30. The article provides some interesting background information on the political events leading up to the coup.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Greek Officers' Power Plots Revealed

Paris, April 29—An old-fashioned military dictatorship has been clamped down on Greece.

For the moment, the army's control is complete in Athens and Salonika, the biggest cities. A wave of arrests, officially acknowledged to number 5000 and perhaps in fact several times that, is rolling across the country, seizing political leaders of all complexions.

The law is what the soldiers say it is, and they are backed by bayonets, tanks, armored cars with machine guns, and jet planes.

Partly from fear of military force, partly from the tradition evolved under 400 years of Turkish occupation that Greeks react slowly and beneath the surface rather than by immediate eruption, and perhaps partly from indifference or despair—no one is ready to stick his neck out in opposition to the new junta. Political crimes, to be defined by the military, are punishable by death.

But on Crete, there are reports of an uneasy tolerance between the small garrison there and the traditionally independent citizens, who have not turned in their arms. In the mountains to the north, the peasants are presumed to have hidden their rifles, too.

Unlike some other countries that have suffered coups recently, Greece has an economy that is one of the genuine successes in the developing world. Over the past five years, real output per person has grown an extraordinary 6.3 per cent annually. Industrial production has shot ahead at a 9 per cent rate. Average income levels are now nearly half those of affluent Western Europe.

To be sure, the peasants have failed to gain much from this and the new junta is promising to improve their lot. But the advance in the rest of the Greek economy, accompanied by remarkably little price inflation, makes it difficult for the junta to justify its action on economic grounds.

The new dictators instead are busily manufacturing tales of how they saved the nation from the Communist takeover. But after the bloody civil war that drove the Communists out 20 years ago, few Greeks took seriously the possibility of a Communist takeover by political manipulation.

SEIZURE INSPECTED

To bolster its stories, the government urged newsmen yesterday to inspect a "hidden arms cache" it had just seized. The cache turned out to be a Nazi helmet, a rusted and unworkable German machine gun, two old German rifles and several dozen rounds of ammunition. They were found in the home of a former aide to a politician from the center of the Greek political spectrum. They were being preserved by his mistress.

Those who seek to make the coup plausible dismiss Greece's economic successes. The highest level of the American Embassy in Athens—where the economic advance used to be acclaimed—is among the sources pointing to the political paralysis that gripped the nation from July, 1965, as the cause of the coup. The major movement during the paralysis was the discreditable antics of the politicians who turned legislative sessions into desk-pounding, fist-fighting circuses.

But the paralysis was not caused by the politicians alone. An equal share in its creation must be attributed to young King Constantine, who drove from office the first postwar Greek government with a clear majority, the Center Union regime of George Papandreou.

Papandreou was forced to resign in July, 1965, when the King would not let him take over the Defense Ministry at a time when his son Andreas was accused of leading a plot against the Crown that involved left-wing military officers. Andreas Papandreou wanted to retire key Army officers whom he suspected—and others concur in the suspicion—of planning to establish a military dictatorship.

Constantine then naively regard the Army as the untouchable and devoted instrument of the throne, and some U.S. Embassy officials have admitted they did, too.

ELECTIONS DELAYED

After Papandreou's dismissal, the King, the Army and right-wing politicians bent their efforts to delay new elections in Greece, a delay that American sources indicate had U.S. Embassy approval. They feared, with some reason, that the Papandreous would be returned to power, the monarchy would be reduced to a figurehead role, and the Army would be made subject to control by civilians independent of the King.

Andreas Papandreou, once an American professor of economics, was regarded by the right and the military as the devil incarnate. He not only wanted to control the military; he also worked with the Greek left and questioned the continued usefulness of Greece's attachment to NATO and the need for the U.S. military and political presence.

Time was running out. Elections had to be held and were finally scheduled for May 28—with the concurrence of the conservative National Radical Union party, which was temporarily in power and in control of the electoral machinery.

The generals and the King, according to the best informed sources, secretly prepared a plan for a military takeover that was to be set in motion if the elections provided the occasion for a Communist coup or if a Center Union victory threatened the established order. American officials in Greece were informed of the plan's existence, though there are conflicting reports of how much detail they knew.

UNSATISFACTORY SOLUTION

Whether a Center Union victory of any kind would have been acceptable is not known, but it is understood that U.S. Ambassador Phillips Talbot regarded a Center Union triumph as an unsatisfactory solution.

In any event, some ambitious colonels—not Constantine and his generals—pushed the button that worked the coup plan. This caused the King and the generals some momentary discomfort. Neither the circumstances nor the leadership was appropriate. But in a few days, all these forces began smoothing over their differences and working toward an accommodation. Greek and American sources indicate this had the blessing of the U.S. Embassy.

The top level of the Embassy apparently believes Greeks are so attached to life that they will accept the suppression of their liberties without a struggle. An equally knowledgeable but less-involved ranking diplomat thinks the Greeks have also demonstrated a willingness to fight for their freedom since they threw off Turkish rule in 1832.

If the latter is right, both the monarchy and the United States may have a limited future in Greece. The Communists are likely to play a leading role in any resistance, with their underground organization and an estimated 90,000 Greek Communists waiting to cross the border as guerrillas from neighboring Balkan states. The coup could provide communism with a new lease on life in Greece.

If the military dictatorship is shattered without Communist leadership, the throne and the United States may still suffer. Many Greeks identify both with Greece's new dictators and with attempts to put a facade on Greece's new garrison state. (One reason is that the United States has supplied Greece with arms for 20 years, some of which were used by the coup plotters.) These Greeks are not likely to thank King Constantine or America for the shadow of freedom if they finally win back its substance.

THE WORK OF THE BERTRAND RUSSELL TRIBUNAL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I desire to have appear in the Record the reply from President de Gaulle to a letter from Mr. Jean-Paul Sartre dated April 13 concerning the Bertrand Russell Tribunal. The text of the reply, as given in the French Embassy's Press and Information Service Release No. 972, was as follows:

In your letter of April 13, you asked me to examine the case of Mr. Vladimir Dedijer and, more generally, that of the persons called on to take part, in one or other capacity, in the work of the Russell Tribunal.

The sponsors of this tribunal propose to criticize the United States' Vietnam policy. There is nothing in this to cause the Government to restrict their normal freedom of assembly and of expression. Besides, you know what the Government thinks of the Vietnam war and what I myself have said about it publicly and unequivocally. Regardless of the fact that, in our country, freedom of the pen and of expression exist, it would, therefore, not be a question of restricting private individuals whose theses on this subject are, moreover, close to the French Republic's official position.

In any case, it is a question neither of the right to assemble nor of the freedom of expression but of the duty—all the more binding on France since she has taken the stand she has on the substance of the matter—to make sure that a State with which she has relations and which, despite all their differences, remains her traditional friend, be not the subject on her territory of proceedings that greatly overstep international law and customs.

Now, this would seem to be the case of the action being undertaken by Lord Russell and his friends, since they intend to give a legal appearance to their investigations and the semblance of a verdict to their conclusions. You are well aware that all justice, in its principle as in its execution, belongs to the State alone. Without questioning the motives that inspire Lord Russel and his friends, I must note that they are invested with no power nor do they have any internatonal mandate and that, therefore, they could not carry out any act of justice.

That is why the Government is bound to oppose the holding of our territory of a meeting which, by the form it would take, would be contrary to that very thing for which the Government is bound to enforce respect.

I will add that, to the extent that some of the people gathered around Lord Russell may have moral credit, lacking a public jurisdiction it does not seem to me that they give more weight to their warnings by wearing robes borrowed for the occasion.

Mr. President, I invite attention to the sentence in President de Gaulle's letter regarding French-American relations in which he says that it is France's—

> duty—all the more binding on France since she has taken the stand she has on the substance of the matter—to make sure that a State with which she has relations and which, despite all their differences, remains her traditional friend, be not the subject on her territory of proceedings that greatly overstep international law and customs.

THE PROBLEMS OF FARMERS

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, few people realize the difficult straits in which farmers find themselves. The tremendous Federal spending as a result of the war in Vietnam and for many domestic programs—some of which are not necessary—has resulted in considerable inflation.

Farmers are heavy purchasers of such important items as steel, rubber, petroleum, and fertilizer. Their costs of operation are mounting year by year.

Inflation—which has meant increased prices of industrial goods year after year—has the opposite effect on farm commodities. Most farm prices are lower today than they were 5 years ago, and commodities such as beef and wheat are lower than they were 20 years ago.

Mr. President, few people seem to understand the real problem that farmers face. They are in a truly desperate situation. A letter I have received from Mr. Ed Walz, a farmer from near New Rockford, N. Dak., explains their problems exceptionally well.

Mr. President, this is a letter that I hope every Member of Congress will read. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ROCKFORD, N. DAK.,
April 25, 1967.

DEAR SIR: There still seems to be a lot of people who don't fully understand the cost-price squeeze that is making it impossible for a farmer to remain in business. Because of what I want to share with you some figure that I can give you from my own personal experiences—and I'm sure other farmers have found their situation the same.

On December 14, 1966, I delivered a bull weighing 2015 lbs. to a sales ring. Price bid for him was only $16.60 a hundred so I took him home. February 22, 1967—two months later—I took him back to the same sales ring. He weighed 2010 lbs. this time and the price bid was $21.20. During that two months there was no change noticeable on meat over the counter.

December 14, 1966, I delivered three cows to a sales ring. For the one weighing 895 lbs. I received $12.50; the one at 1,000 lbs. went for $12.20; the one at 975 lbs. went for $11.40. Selling charges came to $11.05.

March 6, 1967, I delivered two cows to the NFO center at Ellendale. One weighed 1230 lbs. and brought $14.50; the other at 1050 lbs. brought $14.50. Total selling charges were $3.88. That's quite a difference in handling charges for the two locations.

Taxes—that's another story. I have three quarters in Eddy County and the taxes in 1947 were $100.49; in 1966 they were $421.20 and this February I paid $703.21. That's the same three quarters!

In 1962 we received $2.43 per bushel for wheat including the premium for sedimentation test; in 1963 we got $1.99 with no sedimentation test premium allowed; in 1964 it was $1.33, in 1965 $1.35 and in 1966 $1.25. Starting in 1964, of course, we received a certificate on part of our wheat production used for domestic consumption. In 1964–65 we also received a small export certificate which helped some but it is now discontinued.

These figures, from my own records, tell you why more and more farmers are being forced off the land. Every resident of the agricultural areas of our nation have stake in a profitable agriculture. The situation is more serious than many realize—or care to admit.

Yours very truly,

ED WALZ.

THE 100 MILLIONTH GENERAL MOTORS VEHICLE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on April 21, 1967, General Motors celebrated the building of its 100 millionth vehicle in a ceremony at the Chevrolet and Fisher Body plants in Janesville, Wis.

Janesville is proud to be the home of the plant which has been connected with the parent company for 44 years. In the words of one official:

> This is a high quality plant . . . one of the best in the country.

Over 6 million vehicles have come off the line there. In other words, one out of every 10 Chevrolets ever made was produced in Janesville.

This is a business that employs 5,600 local persons, injecting $42 million in payroll into the Janesville economy every year. Half of the people employed in Janesville work for Chevrolet and Fisher Body divisions. It is quite evident that what is good for the company certainly is quite good for the community.

Janesville is typical of the impact which is made by the world's biggest company on 70 other "Janesvilles" scattered throughout 18 States, Canada, and the rest of the world. The success stories of these towns are written on the balance sheets and profit-and-loss statements of General Motors.

In spite of the ominous shadow cast by having all one's eggs in one basket, I am happy to say that since 1922 the economic benefits have added up to making Janesville one of the richest per capita communities in the State.

I ask unanimous consent that two articles which discuss the event, published in the city's very fine newspaper, the Janesville Daily Gazette, and one article from the Christian Science Monitor be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LOOK FROM OUTSIDE AT GM IN JANESVILLE

(By John Green)

JANESVILLE.—"This is a town, a small Wisconsin town—color it rosy."

The words are part of a promotional display in a local bank and for this community, straddling a deep bend of the Rock River in Southeastern Wisconsin, they ring true.

Here on a 114-acre stretch of flat land, dominated by a huge blue and white Chevrolet emblem on a chimney, General Motors Corp. next week will mark its 100 million passenger car milestone to the accompaniment of all of the hoopla involved in such corporate celebrations.

Occupying the industrial acreage to the south of the river bend is a Chevrolet assembly plant adjacent to the Fisher Body facility. Together, they employ half of the people in Janesville who work for industry. The emblem means more to them than the make of an automobile. It represents earning power, relatively low tax rates and stability—which most people consider the good life. It is also symbolic of a change from a rural community into a bustling "plant city" and with all of the attendant industrial plusses and minuses.

Janesville in many ways is itself symbolic of the gigantic economic impact of the world's biggest company on the entire country, even the world. There are 70 "Janesvilles" scattered strategically in 18 states with others in Canada and abroad, parts of an industrial success story which a few decades ago would have been dismissed as a psychedelic dream or the wild imaginings of science fiction.

Gauging the impact of General Motors on the economic health of Janesville, Alan Dunwiddie Jr., president of one of four banks here, says cryptically:

"General Motors IS the economic health of Janesville."

Robert Westfall, energetic secretary of the Janesville Chamber of Commerce, puts it another way and in more ominous tones.

"When the plant shuts down, it's like turning off a water faucet," says Westfall.

Since 1922, the faucet has been on more than it's been off, and Janesville has drunk deep of the economic benefits, emerging today as one of the richest per capita communities in the state.

An economic profile of Janesville is shown in these statistics:

Of the total work force of about 12,000, GM employs 6,000. The next biggest employer is the Parker Pen Co. (1,300). There are two smaller manufacturing concerns with employment of about 600 each. Significantly, these are followed closely by the Janesville Auto Transport Co. with just under 600 on its payroll.

In most of the other American cities where GM cars, trucks, appliances or parts are produced, the corporation is one of the top *three employers.*

GM's Janesville payroll last year pumped $42.5 million into the local economy, with purchases from area suppliers totaling another $30 million.

As many as 1,000 other workers in Janesville draw paychecks from smaller supplier firms here that owe a part of their livelihood to the fact that 45 years ago, this small, rich-loamed farming community fit into the corporate plans of an industrial empire. Here, cotton mills produce batten for car seats, small chemical plants produce cleaning chemicals used in factories, an automation-oriented concern produces equipment *for assembly lines.*

Businessmen here like to draw comparisons with nearby Beloit (pop. 35,000) where retail sales in 1966 totaled $59 million compared with Janesville's $80 million.

In addition, GM plants and equipment make up about 20 per cent of Janesville's $111.5 million tax base. Janesville's $53 per *$1,000 tax rate (schools and city) is the lowest* of any Wisconsin city of 20,000 or more population.

For Richard McCann, 30, an assembly plant worker, the month-to-month activities of the industrial giant have an immediate impact. McCann supports his wife and four *children with the paycheck he brings home every Friday from the Chevrolet plant.* He has 12 years of seniority and, like 85 per cent of his co-workers, is buying a home here.

He felt the effect of a seven-day shutdown in February caused by an unscheduled walkout at a key Mansfield, Ohio, parts plant. But he's learned to live with layoffs.

"You figure every year you have model changes and every three years the contract expires. You set yourself accordingly." (A local radio announcer said the GM layoff here was greeted with some skepticism among folks who thought the Mansfield shutdown was merely a good excuse to cut back production in the face of slumping car sales).

Whatever the reason, an automotive layoff in Janesville was no different than in any of the other GM plant cities, and the Janesville layoff of seven days was marked by a noticeable drop in retail sales.

As in other communities across the country, people in Janesville often live from paycheck to paycheck. Committed to heavy installments, their lives have become inseparably linked to America's credit binge.

GM adopts an "understanding" policy, according to one Janesville businessman, dovetailing vacation pay schedules into annual model change layoffs.

Nonetheless, callbacks bring broad smiles along Janesville's Main Street and Milwaukee Street. And not many people in Janesville are inclined to "knock GM."

The roots of Janesville are buried deep in the first half of the 19th century, but like most other GM cities its blossoming is a 20th century story.

"When Horace Greeley said, 'Go west young man,' he was talking about Janesville," declares one resident.

Janesville really was an accident of nature. Settlers bent on traveling to the lead mines in the western part of the state were blocked by the Rock River. Ferrying became a local industry for those who remained. Others found rich loam which today still produces some of the highest per acre corn volume in the state. The settlers were of Scandinavian and northern European stock and many Janesville residents today are the third and fourth generation descendants.

In this way Janesville mimics many other GM cities as GM drew on the industry and technical background of European workers during its expansion years. In Flint, employe ranks were filled with those of Polish and southern European extraction. In Rochester, N.Y., where the company still operates a Delco Products plant, employes have been *of German extraction.*

In Detroit—specifically the Detroit Gear and Axle plant in Hamtramck—workers have been largely Polish.

Until GM arrived, the biggest single development in sleepy little Janesville was the Parker Pen Co., which today, despite the overpowering impact of the world's largest business enterprise, is a hallowed tradition.

There are several stories, some apocryphal, about how Janesville and GM joined forces. One of them relates how W. C. Durant "picked out the site for the plant in 1922 from the window of a passing railroad car." This same syndrome has cropped up in *dozens of other GM cities, and is not seriously* accepted.

Actually, Janesville became a GM plant-city by much the same process as did scores of other American communities—a combination of geography and shrewd selling.

In 1918, the corporation, under Durant, *its president*, was buying up companies with an impulsiveness that was to bring his ultimate downfall in GM. Janesville, through efforts of an enterprising local citizen, convinced Durant that here would be a spot to begin production of farm machinery. The next year, the Samson Tractor Co. of Stockton, Calif., purchased by Durant and *relocated on a vacant Janesville factory site,* began producing.

Durant and GM misjudged the dimensions and timing of a revolution in farm mechanization and the venture failed after a few years.

While the corporation has had an enviable survival rate where it has decided to locate, *Janesville was not the only community that* saw dreams of automotive wealth fade in the harsh light of economic reality.

Muncie, Ind., became the site for a GM plant building the Sheridan car in 1920. The car, assembled in a single plant at Muncie, had a modest dealer organization. The operation was sold the next year.

But for Janesville, there was a happier decision—to locate a Chevrolet assembly plant here in 1922.

The first year gave an indication of the proportions of Janesville's windfall. Car and truck production totaled 42,509. The 661 employes shared a $636,000 payroll. The rural town awoke and population more than doubled to 18,000.

Except for two Depression years (late 1932 to early 1934) when there was a stillness south of the river that matched the quietness in scores of other plants across the nation, Janesville's pulsations have been dependent on the strength of the auto industry.

Today's population is 43,000. Chevrolet's and Fisher Body's 6,000 employes turned out 271,000 cars and trucks in 1966—57 passenger cars and 15 trucks an hour for every hour of every working day. Since 1923, more than 6 million of them have rolled off assembly lines here.

The manager of the Janesville plant is Frank J. Fessenden. He's been with GM for 38 years, and his rise with the company parallels that of dozens of other plant managers who began close to the bottom of the corporate ladder. He joined Fisher Body in 1929 as a machinist, but moved to Chevrolet a year later. He's been with Chevrolet ever since. (Since this article was written, Fessenden has been transferred to Los Angeles).

GM frowns on "cross-breeding" within its corporate structure. A Chevrolet Division executive stays "Chevrolet" throughout his career as do other divisional executives. The rule breaks down when they attain corporation status.

This divisional identity with an accompanying "local autonomy," GM says, forms the key to success for its $30 billion enterprise. Despite its size, GM operates on rather simplistic theories that are applied to GM plants around the world.

The founding of GM (in 1908) was itself *the result of simplistic logic on the part of* Durant. More than a thousand small carmakers had attempted to tap the promising consumer demand to be put on wheels and almost as many had their brief days in the sun, then failed.

Durant surmised correctly that a grouping of companies would provide enough capital and strength to survive long after the smaller ones had been forgotten. Even today, you'll find scattered across the country towns whose histories bear mere asterisks to denote the rise and fall of the small, unsuccessful car companies.

But Durant, the thinker and organizer, fell *short as an administrator and it was left* for later GM executives to refine the theory of an "organization of organizations" of "Janesvilles" around the world.

One of them, Alfred P. Sloan Jr., described what direction the refinement was to take. His thought was "to divide it (the massive *holdings of scattered enterprises) into as many parts as consistently can be done.*

"Place in charge of each," he said, "the most capable executive that can be found. Develop a system of coordination so that each party may strengthen and support each other part."

A religious adherence to this golden rule *has given GM a squad of executive five or six* deep, making possible, for instance, the replacement of men on a moment's notice from any one of a number of its plants across the country.

Five of Janesville's "alumni" are now managing plants in Atlanta, Ga.; Lordstown, Ohio; Kansas City, Mo.; Framingham, Mass., and *Russelsheim, Germany.*

A recent shuffling of a regional sales managership led to a typewritten listing of shifts in personnel seven pages long entailing many thousands of miles of travel by men across the country to new assignments. It's a general rule that a man gets two offers to move from a location. Then it's considered that he's not interested in moving up.

Fessenden had spent 10 years as plant manager in Janesville, having served in several other plant cities. In an unplanned twist of corporate history, Fessenden happened to be plant manager at Chevrolet in Flint when the corporation rolled off its 50 millionth passenger car in 1954.

Like other GM executives in other plant cities, Fessenden has learned to live with community leaders. He belongs to the Rotary Club, where he can feel the pulse of the city. He's past president of the Chamber of Commerce, and like his counterpart at the Fisher Body plant, has taken his turn as chairman of the local Community Chest drive. He's seen other GM officials enter public life as members of councils, school boards, police and fire commissions and planning units.

GM does not discourage such activity. The mayors of both Flint and Pontiac are GM people.

In Janesville, overriding pressures or strains between the plant and the city, seem to be minimal.

"Hell," said one GM man here, "Parker Pen wields more political pressure than GM does."

A spokesman in GM's Detroit headquarters explained the civic philosophy, as it applies to Janesville or Anderson, Ind., (where GM also is the top employer) or anywhere else.

"I'd say about 85 per cent of the local decisions are made at the local level. If there's a particularly big gift or contribution involved, or some basic policy is at stake, like pollution, for instance, it will come up for review here. But, by and large, the local executives run their own show."

Here, too, the process is simplicity itself. For each of the 70 GM cities (there are no exceptions) there is the "plant-city committee" consisting of the plant manager, the personnel director, the comptroller and a regional public relations director. Monthly meetings are held to decide such issues as the firm's contribution to a Community Chest or whether the company should help pay for a Little League team's dugout. (GM did in Janesville).

"GM brings in a $1,000 speaker for our annual chamber meeting," says Westfall. On alternate years, Parker Pen pays the shot.

Bowling leagues, golf tournaments and other activities usually start among worker groups, but they are fostered by the company, which, if approached, more likely than not will shell out for the bowling shirts.

In larger plant cities, the activity extends into broader fields with such things as choral groups getting the plant-city committee nod of approval and financial backing.

No matter what the size of the city, the difference is only in degree, not in basic policy. Where the firm's community chest donation in Janesville may be measured in tens of thousands of dollars, in Detroit it would be hundreds of thousands. The 1966 corporation Torch Drive contribution was $562,000.

Janesvillians cling to a heritage of independence from their pioneering forebears and they are proud that millions of Americans are riding around in cars produced there.

You'll hear comments like "we build the best Chevrolets of anyone else."

One Chevrolet executive admits there might be some truth in this boast. He said that car dealers as far away as California seek out the "J" buried in the middle of the string of serial digits indicating the car was built in Janesville.

But at least 80 percent of all the cars that roll off the Janesville lines end up in the Chicago sales area.

GM learned as early as 1922 that assembly points must be close to sales markets. With other auto firms GM discovered it was cheaper to ship parts than automobiles.

Robert Bliss, co-publisher of the Janesville Gazette (circ. 26,000) says there have been few conflicts between GM in Janesville and his newspaper. Bliss belongs to a publishing family that began printing the Gazette in the 1870s.

One of the Gazette's continuing crusades is to clean up the Rock River, whose condition he describes as "terrible." "We've really prodded the hell out of them," he says of attempts to get both industrial and state cooperation for a major cleanup drive.

Bliss says there was some apprehension in the postwar years, most of it concerning the plans of GM in the city. From 1942 through 1945 no cars or trucks were produced in Janesville. Oldsmobile converted the plant for production of 105 millimeter shells for the war effort.

Car production was resumed in 1946 and by 1953, the company had added a second shift, an event marked in Janesville as a milestone along with the 1922 first production year.

Janesville shows a remarkable worker stability. In the nearly half-century of the location of GM plants here, there has been a total of 25,000 payroll names, small turnover considering the 6,000 employment figure today. Strikes have been rare.

From its 70 divisions and subsidiaries scattered here and abroad, GM sold $20.2 billion dollars of goods last year on which it achieved a net income of $1,793,392,000. Of this worldwide operation, about 90 per cent was concentrated in the United States and Canada, the rest in smaller divisions and subsidiaries in a growing list of foreign holdings.

If Janesville feels the effects of a seven-day strike in Ohio, so do 3,185 Chevrolet workers in Bay City, 8,600 in St. Louis, Mo., 2,095 in Kalamazoo, 10,500 in Kansas City or the 86,096 drawing paychecks from Detroit area GM facilities.

The 1,837 workers and businessmen in Elyria, Ohio, watch the fortunes of the giant corporation with as much interest as do people in Sao Caetano do Sul and Sao Jose dos Campos, Brazil, where 4,400 of the workers earn and spend paychecks with the same consistency as the Richard McCanns of Janesville.

The corporation, often criticized as being "too big," is watched with suspicion in Washington antitrust circles.

But here the question is moot. For Janesville folks GM is just big enough.

JANESVILLE-GM TEAM HAS PROSPERED 44 YEARS

World War I, which revolutionized America's modes of transportation, had just ended when General Motors staked out an industrial claim here.

But it was not until a few years later that any GM cars were produced at what is now the Chevrolet-Fisher Body assembly plant.

Long since recognized as one of the finest in the GM family, the Janesville facility first was geared to produce Samson tractors and trucks on the site of the old Janesville Machine Co.

The year was 1918 when William C. Durant, financial wizard and then president of GM, decided the time was ripe for GM's entry into the farm machinery field and chose Janesville as the place to do it.

After purchasing the Janesville Machine Co. and merging it with the simultaneously-acquired Samson Tractor Co. of Stockton, Calif., GM set up shop on a large tract of land in the south section of town.

Chevrolet, organized in 1911 by Durant, became a member of the GM family at about the same time.

Samson tractor and truck production began in Janesville in 1920 after proper plant facilities were installed. Janesville's population at that time was about 13,000.

But the tractor-building venture was short-lived, and the plant was closed for "economic reasons" in 1922.

IDEAL LOCATION

Considered an ideal location for a Chevrolet assembly line, the plant was reopened a short time later and a Fisher Body plant was built adjacent to it.

The first Chevrolet rolled off the line in February, 1923, signaling the beginning of a long "partners in progress" relationship between Chevrolet and Janesville.

The plants quickly became two of the three chief "bread and butter" sources for many Janesville area residents.

Chevrolet alone had 543 hourly workers and 118 salaried employes in its first year of operation at Janesville. This compares with about 2,400 hourly workers and 500 salaried workers today.

In its first year of operation, Chevrolet-Janesville produced 42,509 vehicles—a mere fraction compared to the record output of more than 316,000 units in 1965.

Plant expansions and modernization programs have continued through the years to help boost production capabilities and raise the quality of output rarely matched elsewhere.

By June 3, 1925, just over two years after entering the passenger car field, Chevrolet-Janesville had produced its 100,000 vehicle.

Other production milestones soon followed.

The plant produced its 500,000th vehicle in 1929 and the 1 millionth in 1935. Had it not been for the Great Depression and a forced shutdown, the million-milestone would have been reached even sooner.

After the two sister plants closed on Sept. 17, 1932, many of the employees got interim jobs producing cars before the eyes of spectators at a model plant at the Chicago World's Fair.

When the truck line was opened again on Dec. 5, 1933, the community celebrated. Passenger car production followed.

Except for a six-week-long strike in 1937, operation of the two plants continued normally until America's entry into World War II.

MADE SHELLS

The plants produced cars until the existing stock supplies were exhausted in January, 1942, and they could be converted to shell production under the direction of GM's Oldsmobile division.

More than 16 million shells were produced at Janesville during the war, with employment at times as high as 2,500.

The plants were reconverted after the war to produce cars and trucks, but another strike that began Nov. 21, 1945, kept them closed for 112 days.

After accord was reached, the plants resumed normal production, and soon achieved another production milestone.

The 2 millionth Chevrolet produced at Janesville rolled off the line in 1948, followed five years later by the 3 millionth.

Meanwhile, a night shift had been added in 1953, adding many workers to the GM payroll. A second shift was added to truck assembly operations in 1963.

The 4 millionth vehicle was produced in 1959 and the 5 millionth was made in 1963.

Annual production figures at the Janesville plant have enhanced its industrial stature.

More than 267,000 cars and trucks were built at the plant in 1966, boosting its production since 1923 to more than 5,960,000 units.

Production was 316,000 in 1965, 268,000 in 1964, 302,000 in 1963 and 263,000 in 1962.

Chosen to produce GM's 100 millionth United States-built vehicle on April 21, 1967, Chevrolet-Janesville attracted the eyes and ears of the world. Not bad for an ex-tractor builder.

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Apr. 22, 1967]

THE 100 MILLIONTH VEHICLE BUILT BY GM IN WISCONSIN

It was almost a holiday in Janesville, Wis.

General Motors was building its 100 millionth vehicle in the United States—not a solid gold Cadillac but a blue Chevrolet Caprice custom coupe.

In honor of the occasion, some of GM's top-drawer officials were on hand April 21, including James M. Roche, president.

The Chevrolet assembly plant, a tractor producer for a couple of years in the early 1920's, held a day-long open house, and thousands of people pushed past the lines to see firsthand how to make a car.

Organized in 1908, the automotive giant took more than 10 years to build its first million vehicles, passing that milestone in March, 1919. Ten years later the growing complex produced Vehicle No. 10 million.

In early 1940 it reached the 25 million mark. In 1954, les than 13 years ago, the company produced No. 50 million. Only five years ago it touched 75 million.

Of the 100 million, more than 58 million were Chevrolets. Nearly 3.5 million carry the Cadillac nameplate. And, says GM, almost 40 million are still on the road.

"Incidentally," Mr. Roche reminded his listeners, "we've also produced more than 18 million vehicles in other countries."

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, so far as the consumer is concerned, one of the most important pieces of legislation now pending before this Congress is the truth-in-lending bill.

The AFL–CIO has taken a strong stand on this proposal and has restated its reasons for such support in a recent editorial in the AFL–CIO News. So that all of us may have an opportunity to consider the trade union federation's position, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Credit Jungle

As far back as 1960, then-Sen. Paul H. Douglas of Illinois introduced a truth-in-lending bill in the 86th Congress. He kept trying in the next three Congresses, but the bill never emerged from the Senate Banking & Currency Committee. Now Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin has taken up the fight anew.

Bankers, small loan companies, retail merchants and their various trade associations have violently opposed truth-in-lending from the beginning.

They have called it an attempt to hamstring private enterprise. They have described it as a move toward federal regulation of interest rates and credit charges. They have pleaded that it would be impossible to administer, because salesmen and sales clerks couldn't compute the finance charges they are asking the customer to pay.

These arguments are nonsense.

Truth-in-lending imposes only two conditions on credit establishments and money-lenders. It would require them to tell their customers the total amount they are paying for credit:

In dollars and cents.

As an annual percentage rate on the loan or credit involved.

This is not regulation; it is simply disclosure. It does not tell anyone how much he can or should charge for credit; it merely makes him tell how much it is.

A lender or credit house that is unwilling to do this must feel that it has something to hide. This, of course, is the point.

The credit houses and the loan companies know to the third decimal point exactly how much they charge for credit and at what annual rate. They have to know; it's how they make their money. They could provide their personnel with little tables—like the sales tax tables that perch on so many cash-registers—that would give instant answers.

The worst sufferers from excessive credit charges are those who can least afford them—the lower income groups. They have less cash, and greedy sellers can more easily exploit their need for credit. In addition, members of minority groups are often charged higher rates regardless of their personal credit standing.

But these are not the only victims. The well-to-do are also duped. The true rate of interest on one of the more popular college tuition loans was found to range from 26 to 54 percent a year.

Servicemen are among the favorite targets, too. The Defense Dept. has sought to rescue them with a truth-in-lending directive of its own, requiring lenders to disclose finance charges and actual charges and actual interest rates in transactions with men in uniform.

Truth-in-lending can become law only if the people—the consumers and the borrowers—speak louder than the lenders.

Write to your senators and your congressman and demand action on Proxmire's bill, S–5. Tell them about your own experiences, and those of your neighbors, in the jungle world of credit.

A REPORTER'S GUIDE TO TOURING MICRONESIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, one of Hawaii's best-known newspaper columnists recently returned from an extensive tour of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Bob Krauss, who writes for the Honolulu Advertiser, provides informative details of life in Micronesia in a summary article. The article is especially useful for anyone contemplating visiting these scattered islands in the western Pacific.

The trust territory is an insular area with which more Americans should become acquainted. It represents a strategic area placed under U.S. administration by agreement with the United Nations Security Council. As such, the United States is responsible for promoting the development of the trust territory people toward self-government, and the Micronesians are assured the right of self-determination as to their future status.

Because of our Government's responsibility for the well-being of the trust territory, I introduced a concurrent resolution last week proposing a comprehensive congressional study of the present and future relationship with the United States of the trust territory, as well as other insular areas under U.S. administration.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the text of Bob Krauss' article titled "Krauss' Guide to Touring Micronesia," in the April 30, 1967, edition of the Sunday Star-Bulletin & Advertiser.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Krauss' Guide to Touring Micronesia

(By Bob Krauss)

A few days after I returned from Micronesia sport fisherman Bruce Carter stopped by the office and said, "I'd give my eye teeth to take the trip you did."

I answered, "It just so happens you can."

The truth is, anybody with a little adventure in his soul can visit this unique part of the world. Hawaii is the logical jumping off place. Today I'd like to tell you exactly how you can do it, how much it will cost and what you'll find when you get there.

Here, then, is an informal Bob Krauss Guide to Touring Micronesia.

GENERAL

The first thing to remember is that the Trust Territory is not yet geared to tourists. You'll be a pioneer. Once you leave Guam you'll find no beauty parlors, hardly any barber shops.

You'll find no professional tour guides. You'll carry your own bags. Don't even expect to be able to buy film for your camera once you leave Guam. Language is a problem because few people in the countryside speak English.

What you get out of your trip will depend very much upon yourself: your ability to make friends, your resourcefulness in getting around.

The advantage to all this is that there is nothing phony about the Trust Territory. The shabbiness, the dust, the heat are as real and authentic as the magnificent beaches, the graceful palm trees and the amazing characters who seem to come out of the woodwork.

It will be something like touring Hawaii in 1920.

Your starting point at Guam—with its 150 hotel rooms, a growing number of interesting shops and good restaurants—compares with Waikiki 45 years ago. The other island centers—Saipan, Yap, Palau, Truk, Ponape and Majuro—compare with the Neighbor Islands of 1920 in hotel accommodations and other visitor facilities.

GETTING THERE

Pan American World Airways schedules four flights per week to Guam and return from Honolulu. Round-trip fare is $476.90 economy, $818.90 first class. Flying time one way is about eight hours.

From Guam you will fly on the Trust Territory Air Service, a government owned airline operated by Pan American; two second-hand propeller-driven DC–4s and two SA–16 flying boats similar to the old "Clippers" which operated across the Pacific in the 1930s.

From Guam this airline flies in three directions to take passengers and cargo to all major points in the Trust Territory.

You will fly north to visit Saipan; $18 round-trip, six flights a week, less than an hour one way. (Recommended)

Starting from Guam again, you will fly west to visit Yap and Palau, $106 round-trip, about half a day one way, two flights a week. (Recommended)

Starting with Guam again you will fly east to visit Truk, Ponape and Majuro. Round-trip fare to the end of the line at Majuro is $315. The trip, with an overnight stop at Kwajalein, takes a day and a half. Ponape is accessible only by flying boat from either Truk or Kwajalein because the island has no airport. (Not recommended at this time)

Stewards on these airplanes serve coffee but no food. If you don't want to go hungry on long flights, bring along your own lunch.

Your bags will be delivered on a Trust Territory supply truck to the hotel when you land. But it will be up to you to check in your bags at the supply depot on the day you leave.

ENTRY, TICKETS

You can't buy a ticket on the Trust Territory Air Service in Hawaii. You can do that only in Guam and then only after you have been issued an entry permit. This you must do in person.

When you get to Guam go to the Trust Territory Liaison Office (in the same building as Pan American World Airways) in downtown Agana. Getting an entry permit is mostly a formality but you MUST do it in order to travel in the Trust Territory.

You will also need your passport and shot card.

After you've received your entry permit, you can buy your airplane tickets at the same place. For more information write to Capt. Gordon Findley, Trust Territory Liaison Officer, Agana, Guam.

HOTEL

You can get help with hotel reservations on Guam from Pan American, a travel agency or the Guam Tourist Commission, Agana (Rex Wills, director).

In the Trust Territory, you won't get any advance help because commercial tour agencies don't make a profit from Trust Territory hotel bookings. You will make your hotel reservations when you buy your tickets on Guam.

Hotels in Micronesia are an experience in themselves. Several are of Somerset Maugham vintage. When you register, your name goes up on a blackboard behind your room number.

Each closet is equipped with an electric light bulb that is always kept on to prevent mildew. Most of the hotel rooms have baths but don't count on it. Sometimes it's down the hall.

Some of the hotels actually look like hotels. Others look like warehouses or barracks. You'll find air conditioning (that works) only in Guam. But there are always electric fans to stir the air.

While the accommodations aren't fancy, neither are the rates—$4.50 per night throughout the Trust Territory.

MEALS

Each hotel has a dining room where guests eat family-style. There's no menu. You just take what is prepared. Prices are standard; 75 cents for breakfast, $1.25 for lunch, $2.50 for dinner.

I found hotel meals in Micronesia rather dreary, and on Yap if you didn't get to meals on time you went hungry. However, on each island I found a greasy spoon or two (and sometimes not so greasy) where you can eat at less rigid hours at low prices.

Liquor in Micronesia is as cheap as the food; 30 cents for a beer, 35 cents for a cocktail.

TOURING

Here's where your ingenuity will be put to the test.

There just isn't anything like tour companies in Micronesia. Some islands have taxis and you might be lucky enough to rent a dilapidated auto for $8 a day. The exception is Saipan, where U-Drive cars are in fairly good supply. And on Palau the hotel has boats available for hire. Guam also has U-Drives.

Mostly, however, you'll have to go out and drum up your own transportation. This can lead to all sorts of adventures if you have a sense of humor.

CLOTHING

During two months in the Trust Territory, I never once wore a suit. In fact, I can't remember seeing one.

Informality is the word. Everything you take along should be sturdy and washable. And cool. You will perspire a lot in the blazing sun during the day. Walking shorts are just about perfect.

I found sneakers very handy because I could wade ashore in them from a boat and wash them in the shower after walking in mud.

RECOMMENDED

Anybody in Hawaii with an adventurous spirit and two to three weeks of free time can have himself (or herself) a completely different kind of vacation in Micronesia.

Remember, however, that the entire area is as big as the continental limits of the U.S.

For that reason, I would recommend that you try at this time to see only Guam, Saipan, Palau and Yap. This will give you a look at the best Micronesia has to offer in a minimum of time, expense and effort

Airplane service to other parts of the Trust Territory is on a once-a-week basis, distances are long and connections are a headache. This will probably change before long. Until it does only travelers with lots of time should plan to see Eastern Micronesia.

GUAM

Your first look at Guam's hodge-podge of quonset huts, used car lots, unfinished buildings and vacant lots may be a disappointment. But there's a very interesting island behind that hodge-podge.

I'd plan to spend one day on a drive around the southern end of Guam to explore the bay where Magellan landed on March 6, 1521. The village is called Umatac and the houses are painted in gay yellows, oranges, blues, pinks and greens.

Farther along at San Dimas Rectory (built in 1856) you'll find Father Timothy, a priest who wears a goatee and go-aheads, full of island lore.

All along the way you will find evidences of early Spanish influence that give tropical Guam its unusual charm: cathedrals, arched bridges made of stone, quaint houses.

You can spend at least another day (on your way back is better) in Guam shopping. This is a free port. Here you can buy jade, cameras, tape recorders, watches, thai silk and other fabrics, and liquor at Hong Kong prices.

If you can arrange to be on Guam on a weekend or on a holiday you will also be able to attend the cockfights. Guam is the only place on U.S. soil where this colorful sport is legal.

You may also be interested to know that Guam is one of the most important United States military bases in the Pacific. Polaris subs operate from here and bombers take off from here to blast North Vietnam.

SAIPAN

This tiny island, headquarters for the Trust Territory, is loaded with fascinating reminders of World War II. Rusty American tanks are still stalled in the lagoon where they were blasted during the invasion.

You can drive to an old Japanese command post located in a natural cave and to Suicide Cliff where defeated Japanese soldiers and their families jumped to their deaths rather than give up.

One of the most poignant scenes on Saipan is Our Lady of Lourdes Shrine where, under a towering cliff, bomb fins are used as planters and shell casings as vases as a reminder of the horror of war.

Other scenic attractions are the Grotto, a jungle-enclosed pool fed through a mysterious cave, and Bird Rock, a picturesque little island off the coast.

From Saipan it's only a short distance to Tinian, the island from which the Inola Gay took off to drop the atom bomb on Hiroshima. A one-plane airline flies to Tinian from Saipan once a day. The hotel on Tinian is run by Henry Fleming, an old copra trader whose father knew Bully Hayes and His Majesty O'Keefe.

Sight-seeing Saipan and Tinian takes two full days.

The biggest drawback to both islands is the haole koa which chokes the roads and blocks the view. The Navy planted it after World War II to stop erosion.

PALAU

Now you're getting deeper into old Micronesia. And the best way to see it is by boat. Dr. Minoru Ueki, owner of the Royal Palauan Hotel, a former warehouse, has several boats available to guests.

You can spend several days on the water exploring this fascinating fleet of islands.

To the north of Koror, where the hotel is located, you'll find the North Rock Islands, many of which were fortified by the Japanese during World War II. Ask to see the seaplane resting on the lagoon floor. There's also an island where Yapese stone money was mined. A huge, 10-foot specimen remains as proof.

These Rock Islands are a curiosity; islands in miniature, like toys, forming a maze of water passages that make for endless exploring.

There's another complete day to be spent in the South Rock Islands where there must be 50 miniature South Sea beaches waiting for their amateur Robinson Crusoes. Sea shells abound here.

And the coral formations! A face mask and a snorkle will provide hours of entertainment among the colorful reef fish.

You can also spend some time shopping for curios on Palau. There's considerable variety—wood carvings, story boards, black coral jewelry, Palauan stone money.

YAP

You can see most of this picturesque island by car. And it IS picturesque: enormous thatched houses, stone foot paths leading through the jungle, villages by the sea, men in loincloths and women in grass skirts.

Probably, when you approach a village you'll find nobody at home. That's because Yapese women, especially, keep out of sight of strangers.

Don't give up. Move slowly and keep smiling. If you are patient, you'll be able to make friends. Above all, don't be in a hurry! This island abounds in sights that delight the appreciative eye.

At the moment there are two wheezy U-Drive cars for hire on Yap. To rent one of them, or to try to hire a boat to visit the other islands, see Jim Sherer, manager of the Yap Cooperative Assn., the island's biggest trading company.

When you come to a stone path leading off through the jungle, get out of the car and start walking. It will lead past taro patches, thatched houses, canoes, pigs and chickens, kids and, maybe, a friendly native in a grass skirt.

There is also shopping here: for grass skirts, outrigger canoe treasure boxes, stone and shell money, wrap-around skirts used on the atolls.

SUMMARY

This tour is not for travelers who are primarily concerned with comfort. But if you are interested in the authentic, in the REAL south seas, there is no better place to see it than in Micronesia today.

CAMPAIGN MONEY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, in an excellent editorial yesterday, the Baltimore Sun called on Congress to reform present laws governing the reporting and disclosure of the sources and uses of campaign funds before providing Treasury subsidies to candidates. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Campaign Money

The 1966 campaign funding law the Senate has been struggling with during the past month claims one redeeming feature: by providing presidential candidates with adequate money from the Treasury, it would lessen their dependence on contributions from vested interests. As election costs soar, a way of financing campaigns without *quid pro quo* contributions becomes an increasingly pressing concern. Still, the 1966 law is worse than nothing. It puts undue financial power in the hands of just the presidential candidates, or the national committees, and it does it without adequate safeguards. It puts the bandwagon before the horse.

Before providing clean Treasury funds to political candidates at any level, Congress ought to require full reports of contributions received and expenditures made in all elections, including primaries; limit individual contributions; abolish or raise current spending ceilings. Those things are the minimum needed to close existing loopholes in the law—and all were proposed by President Johnson in election reform legislation last year.

Congress ought also to find some way to reduce the cost of campaigning—for instance some new formula that would allow television networks and stations to provide free time to bona fide candidates; television executives say they would like to do this but are prevented by existing law.

It would take half this page to list all the election reforms that have been suggested in recent years. Congress made a mistake last year in opening up the Treasury to the politicians. That may be advisable some day, but first there must be safeguards.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, the time to be not later than 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3631. An act to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain platted streets, alleys, and strips of land; and

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1039. An act to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 8363. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for floor control, navigation, and other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 3631. An act to provide for the dedication of certain streets on the Agua Caliente Indian Reservation and to convey title to certain platted streets, alleys, and strips of land; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 5894. An act to amend titles 10, 32, and 37, United States Code, to remove restrictions on the careers of female officers in the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the Senate will not stand in recess beyond the hour of 1 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to, and at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 12 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m., the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair).

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, during the period of April 30 through May 7 local communities throughout the United States are observing Soil Stewardship Week. I pay tribute to the soil and water conservation districts of America and cooperating church and civic groups who sponsor this annual observance.

The theme of this year's observance is "Three-fourths of Our Land." It is designed to emphasize that private citizens own or manage three-fourths of the land that makes up the United States. From these lands come the food and fiber that every American depends on for daily living.

I pay tribute to the 18,000 soil and water conservation district leaders who have inspired this annual observance. In my home State of New York these are the directors of the 55 soil and water conservation districts organized under New York State law. I also salute the thousands of clergy of all faiths who use this observance to remind us that soil stewardship is everyone's responsibility. It is a responsibility of the people who live in the towns and cities as well as those who work the land.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain excerpts from a booklet entitled "Three-fourths of Our Land," published by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREE-FOURTHS OF OUR LAND

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP MUST ACCOMMODATE PRODUCERS AND USERS

The dimensions of the steward's task are not measured alone by the production of food, fiber, and timber—basic as this purpose is now, and will continue to be in the future. The great store of natural resources God has placed at our disposal was meant to do more. It was meant, surely, to enrich all our lives with the inspiration, the serenity, and the re-creation of spirit which can be found through association with His gifts in the out-of-doors. The resources were meant to provide all of us with an inviting environment of clear air, pure water, and fruitful soil—a place where we can live in dignity as each of us, in his way, contributes to the fulfillment of God's purpose for our being.

There was a time when most Americans lived close to the land, but that has changed. Now increasing numbers are concentrating in the great metropolitan areas where vision runs to steel and glass rather than trees; and where concrete and asphalt have taken the place of grass. Here, far from the green countryside, is the workaday world of a hundred million of us, more or less—and with millions more to come.

Coming, too, is a reaction—a reaction against overlong confinement in the labyrinth of the cities, and even against the compromise of suburban developments with their brave strivings for lawns and trees. There is a new yearning at hand—and it is growing—to see more of the real countryside; to spend more time with nature.

With more leisure time, more spendable income, and greater mobility than any previous generation ever enjoyed, millions of Americans are finding ways to satisfy their desires. A day at a time, during week-ends, and for longer holidays, they are travelling from the cities and suburbs to the countryside—to the highways and farms, the parks and forests, and to the shorelines of clean water wherever they can be found.

Not all of America's demand for recurring visits to nature will be satisfied by publicly-owned places. The government cannot buy enough of the forest and park lands, the shore lines and mountain sides, to meet the requirements of a nation soon to exceed 200 million. Even if this were possible, it would not be the answer, for not all Americans want to spend their leisure time on government property.

It is privately-owned land, again, that must meet a large share of the need. On the three-quarters of our land in private ownership there is room for the users as, well as the producers—for the fishermen and hunters as well as the wheat growers; for the family on a picnic as well as the dairyman. Stewards of the soil, recognizing that the earth is the Lord's, know this—and increasingly see it not only as a responsibility, but an opportunity.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP AFFECTS THE WATERS AROUND US

The Nation's victory in the race for adequate supplies of fresh water—where we want it and when we want it—is no sure thing. Our annual replenishment in the form of rain and snow holds generally constant, but from coast to coast and from year to year it is most unevenly distributed. Over much of the semi-arid West, the supplies are severely limited and the situation grows steadily more critical. Droughts strike without warning in the more humid regions and, when they are prolonged, strain over-taxed distribution facilities to the point of crisis.

While our replenishment is steady, we are annually using much more water. This year we are using over 325 billion gallons a day. In a dozen years, we will be using about 600 billion gallons daily; and by the year 2000, probably more than 900 billion gallons.

To date, we have been far less than responsible stewards of God's supply of water. Clearly we have been guilty of both short-sighted planning and reckless waste.

Already we are taxing the capacities of many of our rivers to meet our mounting needs. In some areas, we are seriously depleting the underground supplies. We are building reservoirs, but not fast enough—and we do not protect most of those we have. The fouling of our rivers and lakes, which has steadily worsened for a century, has now become too expensive—not only in terms of economics, but of aesthetics. A nation-wide anti-pollution program is being launched to restore at least minimum levels of purity.

Aside from pollution control, vast efforts will have to be made, over a broad front and at great cost, to meet our coming water needs.

Part of the job ahead centers on the three-quarters of our land in private ownership. Here is where landowners, by extending the operation of responsible soil stewardship, can make at least four basic and massive contributions to improved water supply and distribution.

By their conservation treatment of the land to halt soil erosion, they can materially reduce the little-publicized but exceedingly prevalent and damaging pollution of rivers by silt.

The same conservation treatment is the necessary and only effective force that can cut down the reservoir silting which is destroying water-storage capacity at an alarming rate in many parts of the country. Similarly, this is the force necessary to halt the destructive shoaling of our river and lake bottoms, and our harbors.

It is conservation treatment over the vast three-quarters of our land that will block the wasteful, rapid run-off of rainwater, slow it down, and take much of it into the earth where it can finally recharge underground supplies.

And throughout 8,000 watersheds, probably, there is sound basis to proceed with broad, combination programs of land treatment and upstream reservoir construction. These, in the aggregate, can provide the people of thousands of communities not only with vital protection against flooding and water shortage, but with welcome new supplies for industry, recreation, fish, and wildlife.

To the growing brotherhood of stewards, wakening to the grand design of their Maker and His plans for their future, these tasks appear not only right, but imperative.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP DESERVES REVALUATION

God has provided us with a vast treasury of natural resources, including the lands and forests, the rivers and oceans, and all that dwell therein. It is a universal gift to all of us for all our generations and He set no boundaries other than those imposed by sun and rain. The Lord established no "private" land nor did He ordain a "public" class. These divisions, for good and sufficient reasons, we have made ourselves. There is evidence that they have helped, rather than hindered, in meeting our obligations as stewards under God.

Now we arrive at a time in our country when it can be fairly stated as a proposition, if not as fact, that the three-quarters of our land in private ownership merits new and more careful attention. Equally, the owners—as stewards for a while of the Lord's good earth—warrant greater encouragement, wider recognition, and more positive help in their vital role.

This is not to suggest that publicly-owned lands should be diminished in importance, but rather to revalue and elevate the privately-owned land of the countryside from its relatively low estate as a maneuverable adjunct of the "farm problem" or as a mere expanse of "undeveloped" space separating our cities.

The privately-owned lands deserve a higher valuation.

Here, in the aggregate of this ownership, God has spread forth the largest single expanse of productive land on Earth. There is nothing else like it and there is no substitute for it.

Here is where our food production gains of the future must be registered, where most of the wildlife can be produced, and where most of the nation's outdoor recreation needs should be met. Here is where timber will be grown and where the God-given beauty of the landscape will be preserved and enhanced—or lost.

Here is where we can influence, in a significant way, the quality and management of our water supplies. And here is where we will shape for most of our country, if not for most of our citizens, the quality of the environment in which America will grow.

Was there ever a richer opportunity or a more exacting challenge? How well the owners rise to their responsibilities—how much they are able to accomplish—will determine in large measure how well we as a nation can cope with the formidable demands of the future.

Under our institution of private property, which shuns absolute and detailed regulation by government, we depend on the voluntary participation and active cooperation of landowners for the wise use of resources. We depend on their initiative, their skills, and their willingness to work together for common goals. We ask them to invest, to accept responsibility, and to forego the costly profits of exploitation. We ask all this of them, and much more.

Is it too much to ask, on behalf of the landowner, for the recognition and the environment in which the brotherhood of stewards can spread and achieve?

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP CALLS FOR A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY AND PURPOSE

No one of us lives alone. Each of us awakes, sooner or later, to the realization that he is living as part of the Lord's world of people. In this knowledge we recognize that the validity of our lives will be measured; at least partially, by our service to others.

The stewardship of a piece of God's earth calls for a special sense of service. The landowner knows that the land entrusted to him is unique. It is not duplicated anywhere in precisely the same form and characteristics. It is vulnerable to damage and misuse, but it is responsive to care. It can be fruitful or poor, beautiful or ugly, serviceable or useless. How each bit of land is tended—and all the resources associated with it—affects neighbors and neighboring land alike, near and far.

How fortunate that in our country most of our land is held—piece by piece and farm by farm—by men and women who call it their own! They are the stewards who have the reason—and hopefully the will—to focus on each differing acre the special attention it requires.

The work of stewardship is the prime responsibility of private ownership. It is a responsibility to God and to family, to the community and the nation, and not least, to the steward himself.

This is not an abstract responsibility. It is purposeful. God asks and expects each steward to use the gifts He has given us in the considered ways which will contribute to His plan for a more fruitful, better world. It must be our purpose, then, to plan, develop, serve, and foster those values and qualities which will advance this design. In turn, this requires the identification of goals to be accomplished, the reason for them, and the stages by which they will be reached.

Across the country, some two million landowners are confronting their responsibilities and identifying their purposes, in varying degree, through participation in the programs of 3,000 soil and water conservation districts.

Locally organized and locally managed, these districts are dedicated wholly to the principles of stewardship—and to the proposition that individual landowners are ready, willing, and able to work together effectively, farm by farm, and district by district, in meeting their responsibilities to their neighbors, to the resources which support all of us, and to the commandments of God who created us.

With their districts, landowners are demonstrating that men can join forces constructively, under God, to meet the compelling challenges of stewardship for three-fourths of a nation.

PRIVATE OWNERSHIP CARRIES AN OBLIGATION TO THE COMMUNITY

It is less than profound to observe that a good community can be produced only by good men—or that we get out of life about what we put into. Yet men of good will and their efforts are, indeed, essential ingredients of a useful, civilized community.

There are more such ingredients, of course: faith, skills, and determination—sacrifice, vision, and planning—encouragement, investment, and the opportunity for self-expression and accomplishment.

To these, add two others which are basic and particular obligations of the landowner; the obligation to become involved in the community's well-being and future, and the obligation to engage responsibly in group action, even at the expense of immediate self-interest.

The era of raw frontier independence in the management of natural resources has generally passed. Land ownership is no longer a clean permit or green light for exploitation, despite some remaining isolated examples to the contrary.

Increasingly, private ownership in the last half of this century is being influenced by an acceptance of community standards and community aspirations. There are still rugged individualists and "loners", but their numbers are decreasing—not as victims of an abhorrent process of thought control, but in the spreading realization that constructive involvement with neighbors and the community brings with it a special sense of personal dignity and worth.

More and more, landowners recognize the rights of the community. They join in the necessary community-wide efforts for soil erosion control, for water supplies, for beautification, and for community amenities.

Organizations sponsor community development programs. Paint-up, fix-up campaigns are regular events. There is an evident willingness of neighbors in many communities to join together for community benefits in watershed development, fire prevention, cooperative marketing, research, and education.

The accelerating demands of our time place a premium on effort, which is basic to soil stewardship. For the active stewards of God's resources, there are now unlimited challenges to accomplishment. They respond most effectively to God's purpose, however, as they blend their own goals with those of the community and join in the attainment of those larger objectives which cannot be achieved by individuals working alone.

THE PUBLIC QUARTER

One-fourth of the mid-continental United States is owned by the federal government. Most of this land is the unclaimed remainder of our country's original expanse of public domain stretching westward from the Rocky Mountains, across the Sierra Nevadas and Cascades, to the Coast Ranges tightly bordering the Pacific. Predominantly this is semi-arid and arid land of high elevation marked by sections of magnificent raw beauty.

Interspersed in this public land of the West are large tracts reserved from the public domain as National Forests. And within these public forests are the protected Wilderness Areas, among the last of the unaltered, primeval sections of the country.

Here, too, and all the way eastward to the Atlantic, are National Parks, National Monuments, wildlife refuges, and military lands. Additionally, there are the sizeable tracts of National Grasslands in the Great Plains region, and the few, newly-acquired stretches of National Seashore.

These are truly the lands and resources of all the people—owned and managed on their behalf by the federal government. In some instances the tracts have been acquired for particular purposes, such as military proving grounds, waterfowl refuges, and parklands of unique scenic value. In other instances, they represent lands that have been held in government management to prevent excessive use, exploitation, or ruin. It is because of the protective aspect of government management that federal lands are sometimes loosely and erroneously referred to as *the* "conservation" lands of the country—although this is not an invariably accurate description and scarcely does justice to the more extensive practice of conservation on private properties.

It should be well-recognized, however, that the federal lands, like the private lands, are a vital part of the earth which is the Lord's. They represent unique, vulnerable, and frequently fragile resources, deserving the best of care and intelligent understanding.

As often as not, the federal lands are intermingled with privately-owned lands, requiring comprehensive resource management programs encompassing both ownerships. In this undertaking, the professional stewards acting for the government have demonstrated an exemplary dedication to their task and a healthy willingness to work with their citizen neighbors.

Let it be emphasized, finally, that the federal lands belong to all of us, collectively. Though their stewardship is one step removed, these lands, like those more immediately under our control, are part of the trust we have accepted from the Lord. What is done poorly, is our responsibility; even as we take pride in the gains.

THE ORIGIN AND OBSERVANCE OF SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

At a time when pressures grow on the land, it is useful to remind ourselves of the origins and history of the Soil Stewardship observance. They stress the allegiance of all men to God and their dependence on His grace for all good things.

Throughout the ages, men have offered humble thanks to their Creator for the priceless gifts of air, soil, water, and sunshine which make all living things possible.

The custom of setting aside special days—Rogation Days—for this purpose began more than 1,500 years ago in the neighborhood of Vienne, France. Bad weather and earthquakes had brought crop failures and widespread hunger. The Bishop of Vienne called for prayer and penance on the three days preceding Ascension Day. The people responded and implored God for help in their suffering and privation.

Word of what had happened in Vienne spread throughout France—and then to other countries. The supplication filled a need in the hearts and minds of the people, and as the years went by Rogation Days were widely observed as an annual custom. By the end of the eighth century, the Church formally adopted the custom. Now, the world over, people on Rogation Days beg the mercy of God and ask that He spare His children the evils of soul and body—and give good increase to the plants of the field.

In our own land it has met an evident need of the people to set aside a week each year to acknowledge before God our gratitude for his gifts of soil and all the bountiful resources associated with it. The week has become a special time to remind all people that these gifts warrant their best in Christian stewardship.

In America, the soil stewardship observance has always traced its origins to the Rogation Days. Throughout parts of the South, earlier in this century, churches and their congregations began to set aside the fifth Sunday after Easter as Soil and Soul Sunday.

Subsequently, this became Soil Stewardship Sunday when, in 1946, the publishers of Farm and Ranch magazine suggested to religious leaders in a few southern states that one Sunday be set aside each year to remind their congregations of man's duty to be a good steward of the land.

The response of clergymen and laymen was so warm and widespread that observance of Soil Stewardship Sunday spread steadily to additional states. In 1954, the publishers of the magazine suggested to the officers of the National Association of Soil Conservation Districts that a still wider observance of Soil Stewardship Sunday could aid significantly in bringing about a national awakening and recognition of man's obligations to the Lord's earth. The publishers offered to relinquish their limited sponsorship of Soil Stewardship Sunday to the Association.

The Association accepted, and beginning in 1955 undertook to encourage a nation-wide observance—a mission to which it has dedicated itself ever since, under the guidance of a special Soil Stewardship Advisory Committee of clergymen representing many of the country's religious denominations. In 1956, recognizing possible conflicts with the observance of Rural Life Sunday, which was on the calendar of many churches, Soil Stewardship Sunday was changed to Soil Stewardship Week—beginning with the fifth Sunday after Easter and continuing through the sixth.

REDUCTION OF AMERICAN MILITARY FORCES IN EUROPE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, press reports this morning carry the news that the administration has announced a reduction of 35,000 men in deployment of American military forces in Europe. As I understand it, both ground and air units will be involved in the withdrawal, and they will be returned, together with their dependents, to the United States.

In my judgment, this development is most timely and desirable. It involves considerations of costs and the balance of payments. More important, in my judgment, however, it involves a sound foreign policy decision on the part of the administration. It involves what I hope will be an initial step in the adjustment of our NATO commitments to accord with the changes in Europe and with the attitudes and efforts of the Europeans themselves with respect to that organization.

I wish to commend the executive branch officials who, working under President Johnson, have been able to negotiate this adjustment in our commitment. I would hope that this same group which has been successful in this instance would continue to explore the possibilities of further reductions in the deployment at an appropriate time.

Insofar as the special joint group of the Senate committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services is concerned, its responsibilities, of course, are to the Senate directly. The group will carry out its responsibilities by making a thorough study of the resolution of 44 Senators and other resolutions dealing with Western European and NATO policies, which have been referred to it. In due course, it will make such recommendations to the Senate as it deems appropriate. As chairman of the group, it would seem to me that the announcement of the executive branch would be welcomed by most Senators. In my personal judgment, the announcement indicates that a good first step has been taken toward the substantial reduction which the resolution of the 44 Senators calls for, and which would appear to me to be entirely warranted by the current situation in Europe.

CONTINUING EDUCATION—OUR MUTUAL CONCERN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MILLER

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on April 25, our distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] delivered a timely and informative speech on the subject of continuing education at the 52d annual convention of the National University Extension Association which was held at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONTINUING EDUCATION—OUR MUTUAL CONCERN

(By U.S. Senator Jack Miller of Iowa)

Novelist Thomas Wolfe once wrote:

"So, then, to every man his chance—to every man regardless of his birth, his shining, golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him . . . is the promise of America."

I can think of no other quotation more applicable today to the program of adult education on the American scene.

For a citizen of this great nation today, the "promise of America" is encompassed in the development of the human resource through education. The shaper of our environment is man, who unquestionably must seek to serve the unlimited goals of the human spirit.

Education today is the key, the essential prerequisite, to economic and social progress of the United States.

Therein lies the rationale for Congressional enactment in the past few years of some of the most progressive education legislation in history—legislation covering the entire spectrum from preschool through graduate school, to the awakening of our dormant human resources in adult and continuing education programs.

Because of the recognition that we must tap the whole man through educational development and the progress we are making toward this goal, other nations—especially those of Europe—are observing more and more a widening technological gap between their economies and those of the United States.

But the European fails to appreciate that the reasons for America's growing lead are complex and many, including more than the nature of our internal market and our attitude toward technological innovation, consumption and plant investment; that high among the complex of reasons lies this nation's commitment to ever-broadening educational opportunity.

This is not to deny that our educational systems harbor shortcomings. But all the evidence indicates significant progress in recent years.

While the education of its children and youth is of paramount importance in the nation's technological and social progress, this alone is insufficient to explain the levels of U.S. achievement. The nation's breakthroughs in space exploration and nuclear energy, its advances in health, and its advances in the social sciences are due in significant measure to an enlightened view of education, including vocational and occupational training, as a life-long process. Since World War II, adult and continuing education have grown at a rate unknown in any other nation. And although inadequate public recognition has been given its growth and development, the continuing education effort of this nation is second in the rate of participation, only to its elementary and secondary education effort.

Adult education in America has really never been mere citizenship education for immigrants newly arrived upon these shores. It has included the Chautauqua Movement, starting in the 1870's; and, with the establishment of the Land Grant Colleges after passage of the Morrill Act of 1862, it has included cooperative extension, which blossomed into the Federal Extension Service of the Department of Agriculture. It has also, of course, included adult vocational education, and in the post World War II period an accelerated emphasis on continuing education.

Today, adult and continuing education includes rapidly expanding university extension programs, manpower training, adult basic education, public school extension, independent study and correspondence, formal on-the-job training, adult high school, religious education, professional seminars, and a host of other learning institutes and activities involving the adult population of the nation.

At least 25 million American adults annually take part in some kind of structured continuing education activity. The participants include all income levels and practically all ages.

Although some Administration officials are calling for renewal of higher education through special college level arrangements for persons over 60, typically, the adult participating in continuing education is under 40, white collar, a suburbanite and middle income. But the emphasis upon manpower development and the welfare of the disadvantaged is bringing more of the lower income group into the educational stream through adult education.

It is reported that fewer than a fifth of Americans who take part in continuing education do so for college credits or to obtain high school diplomas. This nation can be proud that so many of its adult population studies or takes part in education activities because they want to learn. The largest single group taking part in adult education does so for a reason entirely consistent with the American tradition of personal advancement on the job through extra individual effort. This group represents approximately one-third of those participating in adult education, and its motivation is improved professional, agricultural, or nonprofessional occupational competence, to learn a new trade or for related economic reasons. The second largest group is engaged in education activity as a hobby or form of recreation, as might be expected in a nation which seeks the fruitful use of leisure time. Other major reasons for participation include self-improvement through general education, spiritual and religious learning and development, the desire to become better husbands and wives and parents, a sense of community responsibility, and keeping abreast of public affairs.

University extension is carried on in most tax-supported institutions of higher education and in many private institutions as your membership attests. Enrollments continue to grow and figures in my own state of Iowa are typical. The University of Iowa, during the school year 1965–66, enrolled 3,377 students through extension classes for college credit alone. In some states, cooperative and university extension have been combined or are operating closely together. It will require a trial period to determine which approach is best. Extension offers study for credit or non-credit within the university complex itself, or independent study and correspondence. It is unique in that it can marshal resources from not only the entire university but from outside as well.

The federal government today supports a great variety of adult educational programs. Out of the understanding of the role of education in combatting poverty, added emphasis is being placed on adult education at the basic and remedial levels; and the national commitment to do so was spelled out in the Adult Basic Education Act of 1966.

The Manpower Development and Training Act represents an upgrading effort of great potential in adult education and training. By the end of 1966, training opportunities had been approved under this Act for 838,000 persons since the beginning of the program in August 1962. Of this number, over 567,000 had been authorized for institutional training and 270,000 for on-the-job training. By the end of 1966, 337,000 had completed their scheduled course and roughly four-fifths of these MDTA "graduates" were employed at the time of last contact with them. As of last December, there were 98,000 persons training under the program.

Federal support of institutes through NDEA augurs well for new breakthroughs in education.

In-house training dedicated to the missions of the various federal agencies concerned is an obvious and essential activity. I myself took some courses in advanced tax accounting when I served in the Chief Counsel's Office of the Internal Revenue Service, and these courses had been devised and programmed for many years by the Treasury Department, and are still being given.

The armed services conduct the largest and one of the finest independent-correspondence study programs.

Cooperative extension and other programs of the Department of Agriculture now reach the urban, as well as the rural population.

The President's recent message on Education and Health in America called for expenditures of $763 million to train 224,000 health workers in fiscal 1968 to meet the nation's health manpower needs. Enactment of the Medicare and Medicaid programs found us in such a short supply of health personnel that we cannot presently meet the requirements of these programs.

Recent studies show that some 44 programs, many involving universities, called for expenditures of more than $1.4 billion for federally aided adult education activities. An additional 88 programs are supported for in-house adult and continuing education.

Research conducted by the National Association of Public School Educators three years ago obtained information on programs offered by 480 public schools in nearly every state. Projections based on this information indicate that there were then 110,000 part-time and 7,600 full-time adult education teachers in the public schools. Earlier statistics compiled from an Office of Education study disclosed that some two million adult students enrolled in public elementary and high school adult courses. Despite increasing stress on basic education for the 25 million Americans with below eighth-grade literacy levels, the great majority was enrolled at the high school level, chiefly in vocational courses or in high-school diploma or equivalency courses. While the importance of vocational and academic high-school adult education cannot be overstressed, the nation's continuing serious poverty problem and its still appallingly high adult illiteracy rate suggest greater support for adult basic education.

Private industry has stated, with good reason, that the nation's greatest occupational training ground is the industrial or business establishment. Most of American industry has learned that investment in training and occupational education is as important as plant investment. And the reason is clear: It does little good to invest in computers or other sophisticated devices unless a skilled work-force is available to operate them. A 1963 Department of Labor survey revealed that nearly 1.5 million workers engaged in formal programs within industry—and I am certain it is much higher today. Many non-employees take part in business-sponsored education activities, such as conferences and workshops.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce claims that between 80 and 90 per cent of all vocational and technical training is supported by business and industry, and some 32,000 private trade and technical schools provide technical and occupational training with support from the private sector.

The major portion of vocational training is on-the-job training. Smaller enterprises often cannot afford such training, and many suffer serious problems as a result of an inadequately trained labor force. The federally supported on-the-job training program, which includes reimbursement to employers for added training expenses, represents a significant, although limited, step forward in this area. Proposals to extend tax credits to private firms for costs of on-the-job training have been made in Congress, and this approach has quite a number of supporters.

Speaking of computers, I am sure whether this will be called by historians "the computer age", but all of us know that it is an age of increasing automation. From the standpoint of a Member of Congress, I am not too much interested in the definition of automation, nor in the loose commingling of the concept of automation with technology, mechanization, and economic change. I am concerned about unemployment, and particularly concerned over the means available for the federal government to do something about it. The harsh social consequences for the individuals and families affected are bad enough; the debilitating effects on the moral fibre of our nation and the waste of our country's productivity from unemployment are even worse.

Professor Charles Killingsworth of Michigan State University makes the point that it is a major source of error to assume that the markets of our mass-production industries will grow at the same prodigious rate in the second half of this century that they achieved in the first half; and he says that without such a growth rate, the doctrine that "machines make jobs" will be invalid. Thus, he adds, when a major labor-saving invention is introduced in an industry which is in its rapid growth stage, the invention may help spur further rapid growth, especially through price cuts, and total employment in the industry may increase substantially. But the fact is that when an industry reaches maturity, it is just not possible to achieve further dramatic increases in sales, even with large price cuts. Under such circumstances, the improved productivity made possible by labor-saving machines simply enables the industry to keep up with the normal growth of the market while employing fewer production workers. This is what happened to a number of major industries in the 1950s, such as coal, and it should serve as a warning that continued automation will likely bring about an even greater need for adult retraining and education to avoid unemployment.

Education today has become a major industry. It could be said that it is a "growth" industry—since the $4 billion we spent on it at the end of World War II has grown to over $50 billion today. As a result, private industry increasingly depends upon it to insure future prosperity through a better educated work force, and as a market for its know-how. Generally speaking, the new private sector initiatives have come in the formal elementary and secondary and higher education areas. But private enterprise has demonstrated its education and training interest and capacity in many areas, and has provided experts for university extension and other adult education activity.

The new technology developed by private industry may have significant application in adult education, but needed funds to determine its worth are often lacking. Under some circumstances, the Manpower Development and Training Act now employs the know-how of private proprietary schools. However, there is need to use private industry in greater measure within the massive adult education effort which the nation's changing technology and life patterns are demanding; and this calls for study and innovation both from industry and educators.

Despite its massive proportions, adult and continuing education continues to be the step-child of the education system. In most institutions of higher education, extension alone is called upon to be self-supporting. This prevents the admission of many low-income adults who would seek self-improvement through university extension if they could afford it. Extension is an area in which there are few, if any, scholarships. Even within the public school system, extension comes last, since the education of the children must be the first concern. Adult education also suffers from an insufficient number of trained educators, inadequate information regarding opportunities, duplication of federal efforts, and state and local neglect, as well as financial malnutrition. The Foundations which stress educational achievement have tended to overlook the adult education area. There is need for Congressional study to determine how best to recruit and train the adult educators the nation needs, how to harness the know-how of the private and foundation sector to the broader adult education needs beyond the individual establishment or company, and how best to encourage greater public and private support to the continuing education effort. Pending in Congress is the Education Professions Development Act, which is designed to meet this need.

Title I of the Higher Education Act of 1965 will play an increasingly important part in the whole gamut of adult education. University extension educators have informed me that it is creating a new spirit of cooperation among universities in their states. Title I grants are dedicated to harnessing the resources of the university for community service, at the problem-solving level, through extension. Such grants, although relatively modest, can and are being employed to improve adult education opportunities, particularly for the disadvantaged. Title I moves forward in the entire field of adult and continuing education through its National Advisory Committee which is mandated to review and report on problems and progress in solving them. The Committee has already undertaken to compile an inventory of federally-supported programs with a view to establishing better coordination and eliminating duplication. While the Title I appropriation is small by present-day standards, its programs have important implications for improvements in adult and continuing education.

Just as there is need for innovation in elementary and secondary education and in higher education for our youth, so is there a need for new approaches to adult and continuing education. For example we need more programs of independent study which, combined with short residency on the campus, will lead to degrees. Also, there is a need to find ways to incorporate university-level work experience into degree requirements, both at the bachelor and advanced degree level, for adults who have held positions of high responsiblity or possess special skills. And there is a compelling need for experimentation and innovation in adult basic education. Some have proposed establishment of an adult education laboratory to develop new approaches to all levels of continuing education, and this merits consideration.

The debate on public television now before the Congress has important implications for continuing education. Such a system, properly conceived and administered, can bring new continuing education and cultural experience to millions. The President has directed a study on the potential of Instructional Television—and I would urge that the application of the media to adult education problems should be included.

With today's technology and its implications for change, affluence and leisure, education has become a way of life for our people. For millions growing up, education cannot stop, even with an advanced degree. Our nation is fortunate in the measure of development of its adult and continuing education, whatever the shortcomings may be. The challenge now is to build upon the system we have developed to meet today's needs, so that those of tomorrow will be met even better.

It has been a high privilege and a personal pleasure to speak before this fine association at its 52nd annual convention.

I say this especially because your officers and members are the well-spring of knowledge, wisdom, and the courage to serve which are needed to meet this challenge.

WATER AND POWER RESOURCES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR ALLOTT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this morning the Water and Power Resources Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs began hearings on the complex and crucially important Colorado River Basin project legislation.

The distinguished senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] addressed his colleagues at the opening of our meeting with as scholarly, as lucid, and as persuasive a statement on the problem, its history, and its best possibilities of fair and equitable solution as I have ever heard.

The distinguished Senator spoke in terms of a regional solution to the problem of water shortage which plagues every State through which the Colorado River wends its way. He urged a comprehensive long-range solution which would help solve the water shortage problem of every Colorado River Basin State.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the remarks of the distinguished Senator be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, we have before our Subcommittee today an array of bills, all of which propose to further develop the water resources of the Colorado River Basin. I believe, without a doubt, that the Colorado River is the most controversial body of water in the western hemisphere, if not in the world. Those of us who have been close to its problems have come to realize that the Colorado River may soon be the first major river in the world to have its entire water supply controlled by man and put to use in such a way that not one drop will ever again be discharged to the ocean. On any river system, water resource problems, like any other commodity in limited supply, tend to become increasingly complicated as the water resource becomes more scarce. Increasingly complex decisions are required. The Colorado River is no exception.

The Colorado River Basin is an important segment of this great nation. Its area, which embraces parts of seven states, is rich in mineral and land resources—and in space. Its area is about one-twelfth that of the 48 contiguous United States. Due to the great imbalance that exists between the water supply and other natural resources, the people of the region have always had to face greater difficulties than in other sections of the country in bringing their resources together for the creation of wealth, homes and the means of making a living. Those who are familiar with the great southwest can attest to the fact that the results of their efforts are staggering. But the surface has only been scratched, if we can continue to make water available in the region at the time and in the places where it will be needed for further constructive development of the other vast resources, past accomplishments will seem pale by comparison. Aiding in the accomplishment of this task is the responsibility of this Committee and the Congress, not only for the State of Arizona, but for the entire Pacific Southwest.

Mr. Chairman, in an effort to place a few of the problems pertaining to the proposed legislation before us in their proper perspective, I wish to briefly review a few pertinent informational details. The Colorado River has probably been the subject of more interstate compacts, interstate litigation, and interstate and intrastate disputes than any other river in history. For many years the waters of this river have been the subject of innumerable court battles within my own State of Colorado. Most of the flow of the Colorado River originates in Colorado. In fact, according to the records of the Upper Colorado River Commission, over 70% of the virgin flow as measured at Lee Ferry, Arizona, the point of delivery to the Lower Basin, is produced on the high mountains of Colorado. In spite of this apparent picture of abundance, Colorado through the medium of interstate compacts has shared large portions of her water resources with her neighbors and is now attempting to put to beneficial use some of the last components of water available to her under compact apportionments. This situation has been brought about by the vagaries of nature that deceived the negotiators of the Colorado River Compact into believing that there were 18 to 20 million acre-feet of water annually available from the river instead of less than 15 million as determined by later more accurate and reliable studies. In 1953, the firm of Leeds, Hill and Jewett made a study of the availability of water for the State of Colorado. That report disclosed that in contrast to the 7.5 million acre-feet believed by the Colorado River Compact negotiators to be available to the Upper Basin, there are only about 6.2 million acre-feet of water that can be consumptively used in the Upper Basin if 7.5 million acre-feet are allowed to annually pass Lee Ferry. In 1965, under the sponsorship of the Upper Colorado River Commission, the internationally operating firm of Tipton and Kalmbach, Inc., prepared a report entitled "Water Supplies of the Colorado River Available for Use by the States of the Upper Division and for Use from the Main Stem by the States of Arizona, California and Nevada in the Lower Basin." This report shows that with all existing or authorized storage reservoirs, and providing for deliveries to the Lower Basin of 75 million acre-feet in every period of 10 years, only 613 million acre-feet of water per year remains for consumptive use in the Upper Basin. Colorado's share of this figure would amount to 3,234,000 acre-feet, including reservoir evaporation, as contrasted with 3,855,000 acre-feet, if there were 7.5 million acre-feet for Upper Basin use as apportioned by the Compact. When we objectively analyze these conditions in the light of past river history and the increasing demands for water by our downstream sister States we find it most difficult to support any further downstream water development unless certain other measures are included in the same or concurrent legislation.

I am citing these facts to show that Colorado and the other States of the Basin have water problems as well as does Arizona. We, in Colorado, have the strongest sympathy for our neighbors in Arizona—but the problems of the Colorado River Basin are not the problems of Arizona alone. They are the problems of seven states. Therefore, a single state approach to their resolution is out of the question. The approach must be regional in concept and physical scope. Nothing but a broad, regional plan has any chance for success because on this water deficient river which is rapidly being depleted to the last drop, there are too many interrelated problems, involving too many states, too many interests, and too many people. Each is vigorously protecting its present and future welfare. A single nail is not sufficient to hold a house together. Single-phase legislation, although it may be a step forward in a long journey, will not suffice to meet the national responsibility to provide a region-wide solution to the water problems of the Pacific Southwest.

The Secretary of the Interior met the issue head-on in his 1963 report entitled Future Water Resource Development in the Lower Colorado River Basin, when he said: "The inadequacy of the Colorado River system to meet this region's continuing and rapidly growing water needs is already evident." From personal observation of the Colorado River Basin I can tell you that the Secretary at that time knew what he was talking about. The Secretary's further conclusion that the availability of additional Colorado River water to Arizona, "is no solution at all to the regional water problems (because)" it merely temporarily moves the shortage from one place to another is also valid.

Due to the extremely serious nature of the many interstate facets to the regional problems, since 1963 my colleagues in Congress have been urging the water people in the Upper Basin to work with their counterparts in the Lower Basin to develop a truly comprehensive basin-wide plan to alleviate the southwest's water problems. Although we did not agree with all of it, we were encouraged by the Secretary of the Interior's report entitled, "The Pacific Southwest Water Plan," of late 1963 because it incorporated a regional approach. I know from personal contact with many of them, that since 1963 representatives of the seven basin states, the Upper Colorado River Commission, and many water and power agencies have worked many thousands of man-hours and travelled thousands of miles in attempting to develop the terms of legislation that could be supported by all seven basin states. The results of their agreements and compromises were supported by all states last year before the House of Representatives in H.R. 4671. This bill did not reach the Senate in the 89th Congress. However, in the 90th Congress, my bill, S. 1242, which is before this Committee, and H.R. 3300, which is sponsored by my colleague Congressman Aspinall, and is now pending in the House, incorporates a regional approach to a southwest problem and contains the basic elements of the seven-state compromise of last year.

Mr. Chairman, it should also be pointed out that S. 861 and S. 1409, introduced by my esteemed colleagues Senator Kuchel of California and Senator Moss of Utah, respectively, and my bill, S. 1242, while there are differences in some minor details which I believe can be adjusted, also incorporate the basic elements of the former seven-state compromise achieved during the 89th Congress. In fact, all of these bills are very close to H.R. 3300, except that my Senate colleagues and I have omitted the creation of the National Water Commission, since, as you know, S. 20 has already been passed by the Senate.

Since last year we in Colorado have continued to review our position with respect to two major problems that may have contributed to the failure of Congress to enact a Colorado River Basin Project law last year. The first of these problems was the proposed authorization of Marble Canyon and Hualapai Dams. The second was the proposed feasibility study of a plan to import water from outside sources into the Colorado River system. On these two points, after much sober reflection, and in spite of serious disagreement among the citizens of Colorado and the Upper Basin States, we have again modified our position. We now agree to the elimination of Marble Canyon Dam from this legislation, but Hualapai Dam must be retained since it is the rock upon which the regional approach rests.

Congress must recognize the serious water problems of the entire southwest and authorize a meaningful, early study of possible ways to augment the water supply of the Colorado River, and that provision for such a study must be included as part of legislation to authorize a Colorado River Basin Project.

The construction of Hualapai Dam is extremely important to the resolution of the impending, region-wide water crisis of the seven southwest states. The excess revenues from the sales of Hualapai hydroelectric energy will permit the establishment of a development fund which will (1) doubly insure the repayment of costs of the Central Arizona Project, (2) insure repayment of the costs of the Dixie Project in Utah, (3) provide for repayment of costs of essential water saving enterprises, such as channelization of the river, phreatophyte control, canal lining, project rehabilitation, etc., and (4) assist in augmentation of the water supply of the basin whether it be by importation, weather modification, desalination, or other means. A Colorado River Basin Project without Hualapai Dam and a basin fund may be likened to a cart without a horse. Any proposal to defer construction of Hualapai in the face of existing facts and circumstances is begging the issue. The construction of Hualapai Dam and the changing of the boundaries of the Grand Canyon National Park to include the Marble Canyon area, as first proposed by Congressman Wayne Aspinall, Chairman of the House Interior Committee, is a sensible and reasonable solution to the Hualapai Dam problem. Enactment of Senator Dominick's bill, S. 1243, which I am cosponsoring, in conjunction with the terms of S. 1242, S. 861 or S. 1409 will accomplish the same purpose.

It has recently been called to my attention that the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles has suggested and will submit testimony on the construction of pump-storage, peaking power facilities in conjunction with Hualapai Dam. I understand that the proposal also includes a partnership arrangement under which the public and private utilities of the southwest would pay for installation of the generating facilities and provide transmission service at great savings in capital cost to the Federal Government. The plan will also increase accruals of revenues to the development fund. Although I realize that all details of this proposal cannot be known at this time, I believe it may constitute one way of maximizing the benefits to be derived from the damsite and water resource. Therefore, I have submitted an amendment to my bill which will permit the construction of Hualapai Dam and direct the Secretary of the Interior to study all aspects of the proposal of the City of Los Angeles including marketing agreements, engineering feasibility, economics, etc., and to report back to the Congress before construction of the electrical generating works is initiated.

In view of all the prevailing circumstances and implications surrounding this legislation, I cannot support any Colorado River Basin Project legislation that does not incorporate the authorization of a meaningful study of water importation and the Hualapai Dam. These two features are the pillars upon which rests the success of a regional plan for the southwest's water future.

Other basic elements of S. 1242, S. 861 and S. 1409 are of vital importance to my state of Colorado. At this point I wish to briefly examine some additional features of S. 1242 that are essential parts of a regional approach to the solution of the problems either present or imminent in the seven states of the Colorado River Basin.

1. Title I explains the objectives of the bill. These objectives are region-wide—not localized to one State. Congress recognizes that there are water problems in the *entire* basin and directs the National Water Commission and the Water Resources Planning Council to give highest priority to plans for their relief.

2. Title II provides for planning and investigation in the southwest. Estimates of water availability and water needs of both areas of use and areas of origin would be made. The Secretary of the Interior is directed to prepare a reconnaissance report of a staged plan of development to meet the needs defined in the investigations. The plan for the first stage should, among other things, include provision for 2.5 million acre-feet of water to meet the burden of the Mexican Water Treaty as a national obligation and make up losses of about a million acre-feet in the Lower Basin associated with the delivery of that water to Mexico. The Mexican Treaty obligation of 1.5 million acre-feet per year has become a bitter bone of contention as the available water in the river has been reduced by added uses every year. Colorado has insisted that uses of water from the Gila River in Arizona should be counted as part of the Lower Basin's apportionment. The Lower Basin States disagree and place a different interpretation upon the Compact. We have considered that a clarification of this issue is necessary before any new Lower Basin projects are constructed in order to protect ourselves against any imposition of claims for water to fill the Mexican Treaty requirements. As negotiations with the Lower Basin States progressed it became apparent the internal conditions in Arizona were such that it was impossible for her representatives to reach agreement with the Upper Basin concerning accounting for waters used from the Gila River. If, under an import scheme, 2.5 million acre-feet can be brought into the river this dispute will dissolve in the imported water. If even a study of such a plan is not possible, there will be another major lawsuit on the Colorado River commencing at the first occasion that terms of the Mexican Treaty are invoked by the Secretary and development in the Upper Basin is precluded. This is as inevitable as night following the day.

Only after reporting back to the Congress and finding that certain very stringent criteria are met can the Secretary proceed beyond a reconnaissance report on an import plan. Furthermore, the strongest and broadest criteria possible are provided to protect areas of origin which also will benefit materially from any plan that may be ultimately adopted.

3. Title III would authorize construction of the Hualapai Dam about which I have already commented. It would also authorize the Central Arizona Project, including Hooker Dam in New Mexico. The aqueduct for the Central Arizona Project would be capable of transporting 2500 cubic feet of water per second which is more than adequate to deliver the necessary supply. This part of the bill also includes a priority for 4.4 million acre-feet of water per year from the Lower Basin supply for the State of California. There is some disagreement as to whether this obligation would fall upon the Upper Basin in years of shortage. This is not the intention of the bill because it is strictly a matter of agreement between Arizona and California. As added insurance, however, I have included a provision to make it clear that any benefits of Section 4(a) of the Boulder Canyon Project Act that the other States now possess shall not be disturbed in any way by the priority for 4.4 million acre-feet granted by Arizona to California under the terms of the bill.

Under this title the Dixie Project in the State of Utah would be integrated into the lower basin development fund.

4. Title IV would create a Lower Basin Development Fund and provides for cost allocations and repayment. As I have emphasized previously this development fund is the heart of the entire regional program. Without the development fund the regional program cannot exist.

5. Title V is of paramount importance to my State of Colorado and the entire Upper Basin development program. Five reclamation projects would be authorized for construction in western Colorado. These are the Animas-La Plata, the Dolores, the Dallas Creek, the West Divide, and the San Miguel projects. These five projects are participating projects of the Colorado River Storage Project and have been on drawing boards for many years. Their water supply is well within the apportionment of water by the applicable compacts to the State of Colorado. Payout studies by the Department of the Interior show that repayment of costs from the Upper Colorado River Basin Fund is well within Colorado's share of that fund. Department officials will supply engineering, financial, and economic details with reference to these projects. Needless to say, I support them wholeheartedly.

Senate Document No. 80 of the 75th Congress has long been the causative agent of many intrastate disputes between the east and west slopes of Colorado. Representatives of both sides of the Continental Divide, after seemingly endless negotiations, have agreed upon an interpretation that is included in Section 501(e) of my bill.

Another subject of bitter dispute between the Upper and Lower Basins of the river is laid to rest in Section 502. This section provides for a method of repayment to the Upper Basin fund of money that has been diverted therefrom to pay for diminutions in generation at Hoover Dam attributed to the filling of reservoirs of the Colorado River Storage Project. This section is the result of long and detailed negotiations between representatives of the Upper and Lower Basin States.

6. Title VI is another very important part of the bill so far as relations among the seven basin states is concerned. It took many months of detailed computations, studies, and negotiations by some of the most able water engineers and lawyers in the West and in the Department of the Interior to formalize the reservoir operating principles of Section 602. I wish to thank and congratulate all of these capable people who participated in this most difficult task. The operating criteria are fair and reasonable to both Basins. They do not violate any of the principles of either the Colorado River Compact or the Upper Colorado River Basin Compact. They do, however, provide direction to the Secretary with respect to how to operate storage reservoirs under the terms of the compacts and yet allow for sufficient flexibility that extraordinary changing conditions can be successfully met.

Mr. Chairman, in the above six enumerated items I have briefly mentioned those basic elements that are absolutely essential to a sound and reasonable approach to the resolution of the water problems of the Pacific Southwest. Without them I cannot support this legislation, because, if a regional approach is not to be had when all seven individual states either have serious problems now or on the horizon, then all states should wait until a program of sufficiently broad scope can be developed to assure them that some are not to have the water resource problems rectified at the expense of the others.

By now, the committee has probably ascertained that I cannot support the Administration's proposal as expressed in S. 1004, or S. 1013. After suggesting a regionwide remedy for the ills of a water-deficit river in his Pacific Southwest Water Plan in 1963 and then supporting a seven-state agreement in H.R. 4671 in 1966, it is beyond comprehension why the Secretary of the Interior suddenly suffered a blackout of foresight and reverted to a one-state approach a year later. With a clear conscience I could not join this about-face maneuver. The Secretary's proposal will not even cure the water problems of his own state of Arizona, because it will not supply enough additional water to replace all that is being "mined" from the ground. Arizona and the Southwest deserve better treatment than this. The Administration plan does not provide for a Lower Basin Development Fund that would be adequate to aid in paying for other essentials of a regional program. Besides its inadequacy the proposal is not in the best national interest because it places the Federal government in the business of thermal generation of electric energy. In spite of what you may be told by other witnesses, keep in mind that if the Federal government is to prepay $92 million for a share of capacity in a power plant, the government is in the thermal power business and is going to have a great deal to say about its operation and control. The government would be getting into the thermal power business by the back door.

I concur in the views expressed by Colorado's Governor John Love, with respect to this year's Administration plan at the House hearings on March 17, when he said: "Contrary to what was stated to this committee a few days ago, the Administration's proposal does not constitute a basis on which a comprehensive long-range solution to the many, varied and complex water problems of the basin can be developed and carried forward. The proposal advanced by the Secretary is actually a short-fused time bomb which will lead to destructive competition among the States of the Colorado River Basin. It proposes a piecemeal solution to a part of the problem of only one State."

I wish to thank my colleagues on the committee for this opportunity to express my views on the legislation now before it. I am sure that if this committee can endure the rigors of negotiating in the same constructive spirit as has been exhibited by the representatives of the water and power interests of the seven states in arriving at that seven-state supported compromise bill of last year, we can develop regional legislation of which the southwest and the nation can be proud.

THE DESECRATION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I received a number of letters last week from Ohio citizens concerning the recent activities in New York at which the U.S. flag was burned and draft cards were placed in a can containing inflammable material and burned. I take this occassion to read excerpts from some of these letters. I believe that Congress has not given adequate attention to this grave problem confronting our country.

I shall not identify the names of the senders of the letters, but I shall quote from them. A letter from a citizen of Reading, Ohio, reads, in part:

> As a citizen of the United States, and one who feels that love of flag and country are among the most important things in life, find it very difficult to understand the outrageous defiance that is allowed to take place and little done about it.
>
> What has happened to loyalty, love of country and flag, the unification that has made our country great and given it the strength to be the most advanced and greatest country on earth?

Attached to that letter is a clipping from the Cincinnati Enquirer. The picture shows the U.S. flag attached to a staff. Surrounding the flag, which is being held in the air, are quite a number of beatniks. The flag is on fire, and the beatniks are standing there laughing, obviously in great joy at what has been done.

Another clipping from the Cincinnati Enquirer, also attached to the same letter, shows another group of beatniks, one of whom is holding a can which has flame coming from it. The title beneath that picture is: "Antiwar Demonstrators in New York's Central Park Burn Their Draft Cards in Coffee Can Held by One of Their Group."

Mr. President, a letter received from a citizen of Toledo, Ohio, reads in part as follows:

> I don't know how just to put my feelings as I feel that after what I seen in the Toledo Blade on April 16, 1967. I have no feeling short of complete dismay. I was in World War 2 and if needed again would not argue one bit in taken part in standing up for this country and flag. It is about time our people wake up and find out why this type of people are let loose to do this act of treason.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, a letter received from a citizen of Cincinnati, Ohio, reads, in part, as follows:

> Over recent years, I have watched these groups commit one atrocity after another against my native land in the name of "rights," either presumed or imaginary. And all the while I have watched their influence erode the laws of the land via "liberal" courts, educators and clergy.
>
> All that is required for evil to triumph is that good men will remain silent.

I received an interesting letter from a citizen of Cincinnati, Ohio. The letter enclosed articles and pictures from Ohio newspapers. The letter reads in part:

> I am in sympathy with the civil rights movement when it is channeled within the framework of existing laws. For that reason I have supported Dr. Martin Luther King's efforts to raise members of his race to first class citizenship. However, when he becomes part of a demonstration in which the American flag is disgracefully defaced, my support must be withdrawn or severely curtailed.

A letter received from another citizen of Cincinnati, Ohio, reads:

> All loyal Americans must certainly be shocked and angered to see the published pictures of our Flag being burned during the protest demonstrations this past weekend.
>
> While the right to protest within the law must be protected, I am at a loss to understand why arrests are not made when the law is flagrantly and publicly violated.
>
> It is high time strong action was taken to stop these disgusting treasonous spectacles.

A letter received from a citizen of Springfield, Ohio, reads, in part:

> I read and saw in the evening paper a group of people setting fire to the American flag. I was under the impression that this is a crime and punishable by fine or imprisonment. Yet I did not find anything in the paper where action was taken by the enforcement officials against the perpetrators of the desecration of our flag.

Mr. President, a letter received from a citizen of Cincinnati, Ohio, reads, in part:

> The flag of the United States has been burned in New York.
>
> Slackers and beatniks have burned draft cards on the streets.
>
> A thing posing as a man has referred to the President of the United States and Sec-

> retary Rusk as "buffoons" and "fools" over the publicly regulated television air waves.
>
> Is it not possible to enact legislation requiring demonstrators to register, at least demonstrators that seek that the Federal Government adopt a course of action?

Another letter received from a citizen of Cincinnati, Ohio, reads, in part, as follows:

> Enclosed you will find a photo taken from the April 16 issue of the Sunday Cincinnati Enquirer, it is a hideous testimony to the success of the communist party in America today. I learned that a professor in a University in the State of Indiana burned the American flag in his classroom Friday, April 14, 1967.
>
> When the American flag was burned in France recently on the Vice President's visit we sent an official protest, when the flag is burned in this country the news media gives the hoodlums publicity and a pat on the back for a big story.

That letter also contains a picture of the American flag being burned in the recent demonstration.

A letter received from a citizen of Galena, Ohio, reads, in part, as follows:

> I am sick and tired of reading and seeing pictures of the dirty scum of these United States, trampling, spitting on, *and burning my Country's Flag.*
>
> I am also sick of semi-educated students protesting (violently) everything that does not conform to their personal thinking.

Mr. President, one man involved in the demonstration in New York was dressed in the uniform of an American soldier to create the impression that military men were demonstrating. The man was not a soldier. He was pretending to be a soldier in order to lend dignity to what was happening.

The distinguished minority leader [Mr. Dirksen] introduced a bill to make it a crime, punishable under Federal law, to burn the flag of the United States. I am a cosponsor of that bill. I hope that the committee to which that bill has been referred will conduct hearings and promptly report the bill to the Senate.

WISCONSIN YOUTHS CITED FOR SAFETY PATROL HEROICS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 11, Secretary of Transportation Alan S. Boyd will present AAA Gold Lifesaver Medals to nine school safety patrol heroes who have saved human lives in traffic while on duty near their schools.

We from Wisconsin are very proud to have two of the nine national recipients as residents of our State—Jay R. Jansen, 12, of Rawson School, Milwaukee, and Bruce Haase, 14, of Brookwood School, Genoa City.

Jay's heroic act took place in heavy traffic at Rawson Avenue. Children had started to cross on the "walk" light when a vehicle approached the 14th Avenue intersection. The driver of the vehicle passed a stopped car and entered the intersection and went through a red light. Three small kindergarten children had started to cross the street. They did not see the oncoming car. Noting the imminent danger and without thought of self, Jay ran into the street and pushed the three children to safety. An adult who witnessed the occurrence said the children surely would have been hit if Jay had not acted quickly and effectively.

Bruce was on duty at Mill and Walworth Streets when the door of a passing car making a left turn flew open and 3-year-old Russell Sumner was thrown out. Bruce ran into the street in front of several cars and picked up the youngster, carrying him to safety on the sidewalk to prevent a car from running over him. Russell had been sitting in the front seat with his mother, and unintentionally released the door handle.

These courageous young men are only two of more than 900,000 school safety patrol members serving voluntarily in 40,000 schools in 15,000 communities in every State in our Nation. On each and every schoolday, they protect the lives of more than 19 million of their fellow students.

I have asked the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff] to allow me again to be a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 72, which will provide for the designation of the second week in May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week." I believe that approval of this joint resolution by Congress would be a well deserved tribute to the fine work of our school safety patrols across the country.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEABEES

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the U.S. Navy construction battalions, the Seabees, the famed "Can Do" builders of World War II, this year celebrate their 25th anniversary of service to our Nation.

The Seabees spring from the great building trades of America. They are utilities men, electricians, heavy equipment operators, steelworkers, mechanics, surveyors, and builders, and they command an infinite variety of skills.

The Seabees have become a living legend since their formation in 1942. Ther labors and accomplishments during a quarter century of war and peace have written a proud chapter in the history of the American serviceman.

Today, Seabee battalions are building in Vietnam at a tremendous rate, and the product of their effort will provide that little country with a strong footing for economic recovery when the current conflict finally is over.

The Seabees are building ports and piers; landing fields, storage structures; camps and housing; water, sewage, and electrical systems; roads and highways; communications centers; hospitals and all types of facilities that a nation needs to stand on its own feet and to progress. To the Vietnamese, the work of the Navy construction battalions today promise a finer future in the coming days of peace.

Worthy of special note, Mr. President, is the fact that the Seabees have added new laurels to their reputation for warm hearts and ready, skillful hands.

They have become the "Navy Peace Corps."

These are the 13-man Seabee teams; a Navy Civil Engineering Corps officer and 12 Seabees, one of them a medical corpsman.

Seabee teams work deep in the jungle interior of Thailand and Vietnam, helping and teaching the villagers. The Seabees are building rural roads, putting up small bridges, constructing village halls, schools and orphanages, digging fresh water wells, improving sanitation facilities, and creating rock quarries and stone crushers.

Perhaps most important, the Seabee corpsman is providing medical treatment to adults and children who seldom, if ever, see a doctor in their remote village areas.

In recognition of the Seabee Silver 25th anniversary, Gov. Roger D. Branigin, of the State of Indiana, recently proclaimed Seabees Month in Indiana.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the proclamation be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Proclamation—Seabee Month, March 1-31, 1967

To All to Whom These Presents May Come, Greeting:

Whereas, the twenty-fifth anniversary of the U.S. Navy Construction Battalion, known as the Seabees, will be celebrated on March 5 and on March 2, the Navy Civil Engineers Corps, which commands the Seabees, will celebrate its one-hundredth anniversary; and

Whereas, the Seebees' first mission for this country was in March 1942, when they assisted in the reconstruction of Pearl Harbor and continued through World War II, the Korean Conflict and the war in Vietnam by constructing and maintaining bases for the armed forces; and

Whereas, by bringing technical skills to the village level in Southeast Asia, the Seabees are exhibiting their "Can Do" motto by teaching others the spirit of cooperation essential in building a desire for freedom:

Now, therefore, I, Roger D. Branigin, Governor of the State of Indiana, do hereby proclaim the month of March 1967, as Seabees month in Indiana and urge all Hoosiers to join in appropriate recognition of this organization.

By the Governor:

Roger D. Branigan,
Governor of Indiana.
Edgar D. Whitcomb,
Secretary of State.

IMPROVEMENT OF FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONSHIPS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Honorable Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, has been traveling throughout the country during recent months, meeting with hundreds of State officials, helping them to understand the many ways in which the Federal Government and the various States can work together to enhance the quality of American life.

Governor Bryant and his staff are aware of the many problems which naturally arise in Federal-State relationships and have used their trips throughout the country to provide answers to many of the problems which State officials have encountered.

On April 25, Governor Bryant and his staff visited my own State of New Hampshire; and, in his address of welcome to the group, Gov. John W. King made clear the promise and hope of better Federal-State relationships resulting from these conferences.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Governor King's speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech by Gov. John W. King at the New Hampshire Governor's Conference on Federal-State Relations, April 25, 1967

I am genuinely pleased to be here today to praticipate in this Conference that is indeed most important to all of us who work in State Government. Its purpose is simple but of vital significance.

We have here a group of high Federal officials who have taken time out of their own busy schedules to be here to listen and learn from our New Hampshire State officials what your problems and difficulties are in implementing Federal grain-in-aid programs and to promptly establish steps to resolve these problems.

These people are here at the direction of President Johnson and, as Governor, I am deeply grateful to him. I am sure these Conferences will be most welcome in every State and I am certain they will do much to improve the relationships between the Federal and State Governments.

I am also deeply grateful to Governor Farris Bryant, Director of the Office of Emergency Planning, and his team of distinguished Agency officials, for this sincere effort to improve our Federal-State relationships.

We warmly welcome you here and look forward to the fruits of this Conference.

Twenty years ago there would have been little need for such a conference because of the limited scope of Federal activity within the States.

But today the State of New Hampshire is involved in over one hundred Federal programs that provide over one hundred and thirty million dollars in Federal funds.

In the past two years we have witnessed a dramatic proliferation of Federal programs. All of these programs have laudable objectives—or else the Congress would not have approved them.

However, at times difficulties are encountered in the actual implementation of these programs on the State level.

The Federal officials here this morning want to know of the difficulties and problems you have encountered so that improvement can be initiated.

We are not here to articulate criticism. These Federal officials have a mandate to execute those programs that the Congress approves, just as you State officials have a mandate to implement those programs that the Legislature approves. We are here jointly to explore ways and means of attaining the goal that is common to all of us—the promotion of the general welfare of all our people.

I want to express my appreciation to Al O'Connor who is the New England representative for the National Government and his staff for making all the arrangements for this meeting.

And I want to warmly welcome to the State of New Hampshire a former fellow Governor of the great State of Florida, the Honorable Farris Bryant, the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning in the Executive Office of the President and a man who has been most helpful to me and the State of New Hampshire in my relations with the White House.

We are delighted to have you here, Governor Bryant, and I am sure you have some remarks to make as we step up this Conference.

ALICE IN POLLUTIONLAND

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, two remarkable young ladies in Milwaukee, Wis., have written an unique satire called "Alice in Pollutionland." They have undertaken to show the great harm which can be done by air pollution. They have used the tongue-in-cheek "Alice in Wonderland" format to show how poorly Alice fared when she found even "Wonderland" to be a place of eye-smarting, clothes-disintegrating air.

Twenty-one-year-old Patricia and 16-year-old Kay Bonneau both suffer from respiratory diseases which their mother believes are caused by air pollution. Both young women will be undergoing special treatment in the Netherlands this summer at the Bio-Meteorological Hospital. I sincerely hope a cure can be affected for them.

I believe Members of the Senate will be interested in reading the results of their work. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Alice in Pollutionland

Alice sat on the bank of a little stream watching the little fishes flit in and out of the cold clear water. Above, the sky was blue and the sun was brightly shining. Suddenly, Alice saw a curious thing. A white rabbit was running across the field muttering to himself, "Oh, I'm late, I'm late." The rabbit was looking at a gold watch and was carrying a gas mask. Alice laughed because he looked so funny.

"Wait, Mr. Rabbit, Wait. Where are you going?"

But the rabbit wouldn't stop.

Alice, filled with curiosity, ran after the rabbit. Suddenly he disappeared into his hole and Alice tumbled after him. She fell down, down, down. Finally she settled down in a large room. In the room was a large table with two bottles on it, and next to the table was a door just big enough for a rabbit.

Alice went to the table. She took a bottle in each hand. The bottle in the left hand said "Orange Drink", and in teeny letters underneath it said artificial orange flavor and many preservatives added.

"What a queer recipe for orange drink," Alice said.

The other bottle said, "Cherry Drink" and the teeny letters underneath said that it was artificial flavoring, too.

Alice uncorked the orange drink, with the funny label, and tasted it. Instantly she began to feel funny, and the bottle seemed to be getting heavier as she drank from it. She found that she was shrinking rapidly in size, until she was only 10 inches high!

Alice ran to the little door and crawled under it, and found herself in a lovely woods, much like the forest near the farm on which she lived. There was only one distinct difference. All the forest seemed enshrouded in a heavy, gray fog. There were little smog rings filtering through the light patches of fog. Alice laughed and clapped her hands, "Rings of Fog, how cute," she said. She followed the rings until she came upon their source.

Seated on a large mushroom lay a caterpillar, smoking

Alice climbed on a mushroom and said, "Hello".

The caterpillar rose to his full height, blowing smoke rings all the time into Alice's face.

"Goodness," she said, "you are smoking like a Chimney."

"And what is wrong with that, "demanded the caterpillar.

"Nothing, I guess," replied Alice politely, "only the smoke tickles my nose and stings my eyes."

"Nonsense," said the caterpillar. "It does no such thing!"

Alice started to cough. "I do wish you would stop blowing my way!"

"I'll do as I please," snapped the caterpillar.

"Very well," said Alice, as politely as she could, between coughs. "You certainly aren't very considerate."

"I have a permit," Screamed the caterpillar. "I'm the mascot of all factories and chimneys. Just try to stop me!"

Alice slipped away quickly. "Whatever does he mean?" she said shaking her head. "Oh, goodness, I forgot to ask him if he saw a white rabbit!

Through the gloom of the forest, Alice heard the sound of excited chatter. She peered from behind a dandelion stem and behold a shaggy garden with many flowers just her size. She ran into the midst of the flowers. They were all talking excitedly. And when they saw her they held out their arms imploringly.

"Please, can you help us?"

Alice noticed for the first time that their petals and stems and leaves were covered with holes, and that some of the flowers were wilted. All the flowers had tears in their eyes.

"Ever since IT came, all the flowers have been dying," moaned the tallest flower.

"Since *what came?*" asked Alice sympathetically.

"Why, the SMOG," said the tall flower sadly. "All the dirt and fumes from the factories settle on us, and our soft petals begin to die."

"Oh, how terrible!"

"Yes it is," said a young flower. What kind of flower are you? Why aren't you dying, too?"

"I'm not a flower," said Alice laughing, "but I should think that if I stood out here all day in the smog, I might get sick, too."

"Yes, she would," nodded a tear stained flower, "I daresay she might."

"By the way have you seen a white rabbit?"

"Oh, yes, he went that way," said a wilted flower.

"Thank you," said Alice. She started walking in the direction that the wilted flower had pointed. Then she looked back at the dwindling garden and winked a tear from her eye.

Bit by bit as she walked along she began growing taller until she was her normal size.

"Hello," said a voice from above.

Alice looked up and on a branch above her head lay a fat cat with a *big* smile.

"Hello, my name is Alice and I'm following a white rabbit."

"Oh, you follow the book perfectly," sneered the cat, "I've been watching you."

"I beg your pardon?" said Alice.

"Never mind, said the cat lazily, *He* went that-a-way," and he pointed the direction out to Alice.

"Oh, thank you," sighed Alice sadly.

"Why so glum?" asked the cat.

"I feel so sorry for the flowers, they're all dying you know."

"So what," said the cat.

"I think it's awful," said Alice, Why should smog kill them?"

"Who cares? As long as the smog doesn't hurt me why should I care about the flowers?"

"I should think that it would be your duty to do something about it," said Alice staunchly, "don't you like flowers?"

"Oh, they're always complaining," grumbled the cat and he disappeared.

Alice shook her head quite puzzled. From where she stood she could hear the clank of dishes and she could smell food. She crept through the woods toward the sounds.

Parting a branch, Alice came upon a party in the woods. A table was set, and there sat the white rabbit, sitting next to a man saying, "It's late, it's late. It's almost too late! The Red Queen is finally having a meeting, but it's almost too late! I only stopped in to see if you were coming."

"Sit down and have some tea. It can wait," said the man, "the meeting can wait. I've only stepped in for a coffee break, then I must get back and supervise my factories."

"No, no, you must come. Many citizens will be there. They are all going to complain about the pollution problem. The Red Queen has ordered it, and you must come!"

"No," the factory owner said, pounding the table, "If I go they will take down my smoke stacks and shut down my factories. All the nice cars I make will be taken off the market. If I go out of business my children won't eat."

The white rabbit's face grew red, "If you don't come to the meeting your children won't breathe!"

At this moment Alice entered. She had been listening quietly before, now she spoke, "Mr. Factory Owner, I think that what the rabbit says is right. Why, I only just saw the flowers dying and I think . . ."

"Young lady," the Mad Factory Owner interrupted, "I don't care what you think. . . . Oh, would you care for a bite to eat? We've got soup with Colloidal Beta Carotene, Fumaric Acid, and Artificial Flavoring, and oat cereal with BHT and BHA added.

"Don't you have plain bread and jam?"

"Oh certainly," replied the Mad Factory Owner, Here's home white bread with calcium propionate, and mono-giglyerides and some strawberry jam with artificial strawberries.

"Thank you, I'd rather not," replied Alice, "We don't have queer food like that on our farm," she mused.

The white rabbit looked at his watch, "Oh, it's so late. I must be going." He adjusted the gas mask on his face and raced away from the table.

The Factory Owner abruptly stood up and ran in the opposite direction.

"Wait, wait!" Alice yelled after them. But the two had disappeared into the woods. "Oh, I shall never get to the meeting!" she sobbed.

Suddenly the big, fat cat appeared again and pointed to the path the white rabbit had taken.

"Thank you," said Alice and she started walking down the path. Soon she met two men going in the other direction. They had the words "doctor" and "politician" printed on their caps. Alice asked them if they were going to the very important meeting. But they said that it was none of their business.

Alice wagged her finger at them, "You must go to the meeting and help the people get rid of smog. That *is* your business!"

But they only looked at her slyly and went on their way.

"Well, that wasn't very nice of them," said Alice, If *they* won't help the people, who will?"

Alice then continued to follow the path for a long, long time. She found herself coughing more and more as she walked along. Soon she heard a low mumbling sound, but since she could hardly see the path because of what appeared to be the smog, she could only follow the sounds. Her eyes started to sting and water. Soon she saw hundreds of people standing around a large platform, and behind the people was a large city. Many of the people wore gas-masks and since it was so hard to see through all the pollution, a loud speaker system voiced directions.

By this time Alice could neither breathe nor see because the smog was getting into her eyes and her throat, but she still continued to push forward hoping to to find the white rabbit.

Alice hardly recognized the white rabbit when she found him, because he was all sooty and grey from the city's smokestacks, and he was organizing workers and passing out gas masks, so that everyone could breathe and see. He handed a mask to Alice, and gently pushed her into a group of people that were waiting for the meeting to start.

Finally, the queen of the city appeared. Alice thought that it must be the queen, because she wore a large crown on her head. But Alice couldn't see her face because she wore a gas mask, too.

The queen spoke, "It has been called to my attention by the citizens of my city that something must be done about the smog, and this is the reason why we are having a meeting. You people wish to make a complaint and I have promised to listen."

Then a long line of people got up to complain about the smog:

"My wash gets dirty if I hang it on the line."

"I had a X-ray taken yesterday, and my lungs are black."

"My eyes sting and smart."

"I cough and sneeze when smog is in the air."

"The old people and children grow sick when smog is in the air . . .

"Our food is contaminated from the black, polluted air . . ."

"The people are *Dying* from pollution!"

Then the queen got up, "Now you have made your complaints, what can I do to help you?"

"It is easy," said a man, "We must prevent factory smoke from coming out of the chimneys. We must stop exhaust coming out of cars. We must prevent all types of pollution in the air so that all children can see the sun, and blue sky again, and can breathe fresh air that will not make them sick. All politicians and doctors must help fight, too. Then we shall be able to breathe free again!"

Then the white rabbit got up and said that all this must be done before it was too late.

The crowd of people started clapping and shouting "Hurrah" and the queen promised to help the people to do these things.

Alice was very happy and was clapping hard, too. Suddenly, all was quiet, and Alice looked around to see why everyone had stopped cheering. And there she was laying on the bank on the river near her very own farm. Above, the sky was blue and the sun was brightly shining.

"I must have been sleeping. Oh, what a terrible dream I had! I hope that such a horrible thing never happens here," she said out loud to herself, and then she spied something in the grass next to her. She picked it up and held the strange shape in her hands. It was a gas mask!

REPORT TO THE TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on April 17, in response to a legislative resolution, I had the honor to address a joint session of the Legislature of the State of Texas on the subject of my work on behalf of the people of Texas and the Nation during 10 years in the U.S. Senate. This was a great honor for which I am deeply appreciative. In response to requests that it be printed, I ask unanimous consent that my report to the Texas Legislature, entitled "Two Parliaments: A Legislature and a Congress," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Two Parliaments: A Legislature and a Congress

(Speech of Ralph W. Yarborough, U.S. Senator from Texas, to a Joint Session of the Texas Legislature in the Texas State Capitol, Austin, Tex., Monday, April 17)

Mr. Speaker, Governor Smith, Fellow Legislators, Friends, and Visitors:

It is a great personal pleasure and a high privilege to visit with you today in this Legislative Hall in the State Capitol Building of Texas, to accept your invitation so generously extended by Joint Resolution to address this Joint Session of the Legislature of Texas, a body recently certified by the United States Ambassador to Australia (Edward Clark) to be the greatest deliberative body in the world.

This is no mean invitation. Presidents and Prime Ministers are proud to come here and address you. Cabinet officers and Ambassadors make a virtual parade, insofar as you open the door, and Vice-Presidents wait in the wings.

And well they might because two of your former members have become powerful Speakers of the United States House of Representatives (John Nance Garner and Sam Rayburn), and one of them, John Nance Garner, served eight years as Vice-President of the United States. A former page boy in the Texas Legislature, who learned his first politics here, Lyndon Baines Johnson, now resides in The White House as President of the United States of America.

About half of our Texas Representatives in Congress served here first, and learned the legislative process in this body before moving on to the national Legislature. The tendency grows among the voters of Texas to send to the national Congress men with previous legislative experience in this body.

We in the Senate of the United States have a closer historical connection with the Legislature than do members of the House in Washington, because until the adoption of the 17th Amendment in 1913, United States Senators were elected by State Legislatures. Of the twenty-five men who have served Texas in the United States Senate since Texas entered the Union more than sixscore years ago, fourteen were elected to that body by the Legislature of Texas. Four were appointed by the Governor, and were not elected by the Legislature or the people. Only nine of the United States Senators from Texas have been elected by the people, two of those nine, Charles A. Culberson and Morris Sheppard, having been first elected by your body. Included among those elected to the United States Senate by you were such giants as Sam Houston, John H. Reagan, and Thomas J. Rusk, the only Texan ever elected President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate.

Many able men have served in the Legislature of Texas. Their capacity has a double importance for the State. The more able your Legislature, the better laws Texas will have, and the more able will be your representatives in Washington, so many come from this body.

My treasured visits with the Legislature of Texas began when I was a student in the University of Texas, and came to the floor of the House to visit Ben Woodall, Representative from Harrison County, who was my deskmate in the Law School.

But my first official service to you came in 1931, as an Assistant Attorney General to James V. Allred at a time when the Attorney General's offices were on the ground floor of this Capitol, just under the House of Representatives. There I worked for four years, closely with the Legislature in many fields, drafting many bills or amendments for members.

You returned the aid manyfold.

In 1935, when Governor James V. Allred appointed me as one of the original members of the Board of Directors of the Lower Colorado River Authority, the Senate confirmed me.

When an appointment as District Judge in Travis County by Governor James V. Allred followed in 1936, the Senate confirmed me again.

On April 2, 1957, the people of Texas elected me to the United States Senate. The Pool Bill was pending in the Senate, efforts were made to jam it through, change the laws, hold up my certification, and attempt by the new law and a mandamus suit in the courts, to force me to run another race. The Senate of Texas blocked that scheme. Sworn in on April 29, 1957, this month completes ten years of service by me in the United States Senate. My thanks go particularly to the Senate of Texas. All the Governor's horsemen and all the Governor's men couldn't railroad the Pool Bill into immediate effect in the Texas Senate in 1957. It is a genuine deliberative body.

It is a real pleasure to come here to express my triple thanks to the Senate of Texas for three times confirming my appointment or election to office. Three times the action of the Senate of Texas had a major effect on my life.

In the old days, when Senators were elected by the Legislatures of the States, it was customary for Senators to come back between terms and give an accounting for their services. Though Senators are now elected directly by the people, it seems not amiss, due to the close cooperation needed between the legislative bodies of the State and Nation for the most effective and efficient government for all the people, for your Senators to come before the Legislatures now and give some account of what they have done or tried to do for the State. This response today is to your invitation, to give some accounting of my stewardship, some report of some of the fields of my endeavors for the past ten years, though time will not permit the touching of all of these.

For ten years in the Senate, conservation has been one of my chief interests; conservation of land, soil, water, wildlife, and above all, conservation of human resources, the greatest of all. In these ten years in the Senate, my legislative goals have been conservation and improvement of all natural and human resources.

In the field of land conservation, in addition to all the usual and conventional land conservation measures, the expansion of the National Park system in Texas has been one of my chief areas of effort. Ten years ago, Texas had one National Park, The Big Bend. To expand this National Park system in Texas, my efforts have been concentrated on three areas, the Padre Island National Seashore Park Recreation Area, the Guadalupe Mountains National Park, and the proposed Big Thicket National Park.

Three times in these ten years your aid has meant the difference; twice it has meant whether or not we obtained national park (Padre Island and Guadalupe Mountains), and in the third case, in whether a proposed park (Big Thicket) moved out into the realm of potential passage.

My authorship of the first Padre Island National Seashore Bill ever introduced in the Congress resulted in passage four years and four months later, after much bitter opposition. But the battle wasn't over.

Much of the Padre Island Park land was State submerged land. Unless the Legislature of Texas passed enabling legislation, the Padre Island dream for the longest National Seashore in America was dead. The Texas Legislature, against a stiff lobby, passed the bill, and Padre Island Seashore Area will last as long as this nation as a great National recreation area.

After three years of effort the Congress passed the Guadalupe Mountains National Park Bill last year, sponsored by me in the Senate and very ably sponsored by Congressman Richard White of El Paso in the House. But again much of the land in Guadalupe Mountains National Park was State land, and without action by this Legislature, there could be no Guadalupe Mountains National Park. You passed the Guadalupe Mountains National Park Bill overwhelmingly this year.

Last year, the third National Park Bill for Texas was introduced by me in the Congress of the United States, this one for a park in my native East Texas, very close to my heart—the Big Thicket National Park Bill. It was re-introduced by me this past January. At first, support for the Big Thicket Bill was stand-offish—some were wary as to whether sufficient support would be forthcoming. This House of Representatives answered all the doubting Thomases in Washington with your sweeping Resolution No. 20 of January 20, 1967, by Glenn Vickery, endorsing the Big Thicket National Park Bill.

Never before had a House of the Legislature of Texas given such a sweeping endorsement of any work of mine. By your vote of 139 to 0, you endorsed the proposed Big Thicket National Park. I placed your resolution in the Congressional Record, mailed it to those in high places, and paraded it on a legislative flagpole. It was read in high places, and it is having a great beneficial effect in marshalling support for the Big Thicket National Park.

So here this morning, my heart is full of gratitude to the Texas Legislature for three times confirming me in office, and for three times putting your stamp of approval on National Park projects to which years of my efforts have been devoted.

We can be proud of that joint conservation record, fellow legislators. This Legislature of Texas might justly be called the Conservation Legislature.

We jointly have much to be proud of, but we must not sleep on our laurels. We must push forward together on the greater tasks that lie ahead in the fields of human opportunity.

As one who taught three years in Texas public schools, represented the State Superintendent and the Permanent University Fund and Permanent School Funds for four years as Assistant Attorney General (1931–34), represented the Texas State Teachers Association for four years as its General Counsel (1947–51), taught briefly in the University of Texas Law School, and served on the Texas Board of Law Examiners for four years (1947–51), I believe that education is the greatest need in Texas today. Unfortunately it is an area of our greatest governmental lag.

As of now, we stand 32nd among the States in education, not nearly as high as we were a year or two after the Gilmer-Aikin Bill passed in the late 1940's.

The educational system of Texas has seen much improvement the past ten years, but not as much as most states. We are far behind the average state rate of improvement for the past ten years, and rate only 43rd among the States in the rate of improvement of our teacher pay in these past ten years. That is one reason why we have sunk to 32nd place nationally in education.

As a member of the Senate Education Subcommittee these past nine years, a co-author of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, a staunch advocate of all the Federal educational legislation since that time, I have helped pump many millions of federal dollars into Texas education these past nine years. These federal dollars have helped every state improve its educational systems these past nine years, but they have helped most those states, of which Texas is one, which lag behind the national average of advancement in education.

Among the many Federal educational acts of the last ten years which have aided Texas vastly, the following are some of the most important:

The National Defense Education Act of 1958.

The Higher Education Facilities Act.

The Medical Education Act.

The Dental Education Act.

The Vocational Education Act of 1965.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The Veterinary Education Act of 1966.

The educational section of the Mental Health Act of 1963.

The Cold War GI Bill of 1966.

One act calling for a fuller report is the Cold War GI Bill, which was first introduced by me in 1959. It drew the immediate opposition of the Defense Department, the Veterans Administration, the Bureau of the Budget—all the executive agencies. It was the most prolonged, bitter, and difficult legislative fight of my lifetime.

Those who drafted men into service were not willing to let them have a fair chance in life after they came back. I believe that the men who are fighting our country's battles on the far-flung battlefields of the world are entitled to readjustment and an education on their return.

After seven long years the Cold War GI Bill was signed into law in March, 1966. Already nearly five million veterans have been discharged and are eligible to go to school under its provisions, to high school, college, trade, or vocational school. Over a quarter-million of these discharged Cold War veterans are right here in Texas. Encourage them to go back to school. They are not receiving as much encouragement to use these benefits as they should receive. Encourage these veterans to get that education so essential to their success in life.

But the opposition to the GI Bill scored too: they cut out flight training, on-the-farm training, and on-the-job training, and reduced the amount of time credits, and the amount of monthly payments, below the level of the Korean Veterans GI Bill entitlement and payments.

This session my revised Cold War GI Bill, S. 9, of this 90th Congress is pending, to give our veterans coming out of service all the educational opportunities a veteran of the Korean War received. The Cold War GI Bill last year obtained for the Cold War Veterans about 75% of the benefits veterans of the Korean Conflict received. It's time now for Congress to give these Cold War Veterans the rest of their deserved educational opportunity.

What do all of these Federal education acts means to Texas? In benefits to students, the aid is incalculable. In dollars, Federal aid to Texas in education increased from $15,000,000 in 1957 to $180,000,000 in 1966. Under the National Defense Education Act, approximately 100,000 students have gone to college in Texas with NDEA loans. Colleges all over Texas are building classrooms, libraries, and laboratories under the Higher Education Facilities Act. A new medical school has been constructed at San Antonio, partly with Federal aid, and other medical schools, badly needed in Texas, are being considered by this Legislature. Many thousands of school teachers have gone to summer institutes under the National Defense Education Act of 1958.

But one of the greatest advantages of the Federal education acts of the last nine years has been the equipment of high schools and junior colleges with laboratories for teaching of science, engineering, foreign languages, and other subjects. Equipment of the electronic age has been brought into the classroom through Federal grants and loans, and the quality of education has been increased very, very much faster than ever could have happened without these Federal grants.

Tens of thousands of Cold War GI veterans are in school today in Texas because of the Cold War GI Bill of 1966.

There is an old myth in Texas, formerly often repeated in the press, that when we send our Federal dollars to Washington, only 10 cents on the dollar travels back, that 90 cents was eaten up in Federal salaries by "tax eaters." That is a myth for those who still believe in witches and hobgoblins.

You are referred to page 676 of the Dallas News Texas Almanac for 1966–67, where it is shown that Texas paid into the Federal government $4,240,000,000 in 1964, and received back $4,419,000,000 the same year. But this nearly 4½ billion dollars received back in cash in Texas in 1964 from the Federal government was not all the benefit that Texas received in Federal payments. In addition, we received our proportional share of all the Federal money spent overseas on our armed forces deployed abroad, our diplomatic and ambassadorial services, our foreign aid expenditures, all of the things for which the greatest nation on earth spends money abroad. In addition, we receive our proportional share of the expense of educating those youths from Texas in schools abroad, and in the Army, Navy, Air Force, Coast Guard, and Merchant Marine Academies, in Gallaudet College for the Deaf in Washington, and many other federal schools to which students from Texas go on payments from the Federal government.

Fellow Texans, we can only receive all of this payment in excess of taxes that we pay in, because we are a low per capita income state. If our level of income in Texas were to go up to the national average, of course we could not receive more money than we pay in. We receive back more money than we pay in because we are a low income, low wage, depressed income State.

Our chief problem in Texas has been low wages, and a below national level of educational attainment. We are 34th in the Nation in average annual per capita income despite the fact that we are 6th in the Nation in gross resources. California, New York, and New Jersey, and other industrialized states have an annual per capita income of over $3,000 a year; the national average is over $2,500 a year. Our Texas average is $2,339 per person per year. Texas is not a poor state, but it is a poor-income-for-the-people-of-Texas state.

So fellow legislators, first and foremost, Texas needs better education and a better lot for all our people. In fact, Texas needs more education, not more intoxication.

Texas has 688,000 families in the poverty bracket, more by far than any other state, regardless of the population of the other state. These approximately 700,000 families represent 3½ million people, one-third of Texas' total population of 10½ million. With our vast resources, it is a disgrace and a shame that a third of the people of Texas live in the poverty bracket of the Nation, while the national average is about one-fifth of the people of the nation living in the poverty bracket of income achievement and level of productivity and earnings.

Earnings and education are the prime needs of Texas. So it is time to report on the Federal Minimum Wage Law of 1966, achieved after many days of hearings before the Senate Labor Subcommittee, of which I am Chairman, with four volumes of printed testimony, with weeks of executive meetings of the Subcommittee on Labor and the full Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and with days of debate on the floor of the United States Senate, where some amendments were adopted by one vote, and some were lost by tie votes—the bill was so carefully considered and so hard fought—line by line.

You have had experience in such matters with billions of dollars a year at stake. The third house was in the galleries, fighting the 1966 Minimum Wage Bill which was floor managed by me in the United States Senate.

But we won, and for the first time in history, the protection of the Federal Minimum Wage Law was extended to workers in laundries, hotels, motels, restaurants, hospitals, and nursing homes.

For the first time in history the Federal Minimum Wage Law was made applicable to farm labor. Back in 1938 before the first Federal Minimum Wage Law of 1939 was passed, Franklin D. Roosevelt recommended that the protection of the Minimum Wage Law be extended to those who labored "on the farm and in the factory." But until 1966, no minimum wage protection had ever been given to native domestic farm labor.

Under the 1966 law, those who have as many as seven full-time laborers working on a farm during any one quarter of a year come under the provisions of the Minimum Wage Law. Thus, the law covers only about 1½% of the farms and ranches of the United States, but it covers 40% of the farm labor. A majority of the farms of the United States hire no farm labor; the work is done by the farmer and his family or others living with him. A vast number of farmers in the United States hire only one or two or three farm laborers; only a small percentage of the farms of the United States hire over three farm laborers, and this law does not apply unless a farmer hires at least seven farm laborers during a full quarter in the year. But it covers the big corporation type farms as shown by the fact that 40% of the hired farm workers of America work on 1½% of the farms.

This Minimum Wage Law will aid the small farmers of America, because when the big corporation type farm pays farm labor 40 cents to 70 cents an hour the family farmer must compete with that corporation-type low paid labor, and he is putting his labor and his family's labor in the fields on the block at 40 cents to 70 cents an hour. In addition to this labor the family farmer has his capital invested in land and equipment. A low wage to farm labor means that all these family farmers are working, and their families are working, at the lowest wages in the state, and they will ultimately be driven off the farm, unless the competition of the low wage laborer on the big corporation-type farm is brought up to some reasonable figure.

The Federal Minimum Wage Law covering the big corporation-type farms will help the family farmers of America. We in Texas have a bigger stake in this law than any other state, because we have over 300,000 farm operators in Texas, most of them small family farmers. Now they will be in a fairer competitive position and have a fairer chance to survive than they had before the Federal Minimum Wage Law was passed.

The Federal Minimum Wage Law cannot cover everything. It should not cover everything. It was not intended to cover everything. It was intended mainly to cover the large operations that have a traceable effect on inter-state commerce. That is why there are exemptions for most employers, dependent upon the size of the operation, the small employer generally being exempt.

Local conditions can be covered only by State minimum wage laws. Thirty-seven states have minimum wage laws. All of the industrial states have minimum wage laws, except Texas. All states in the higher income brackets of the Nation have minimum wage laws. Recently a Belden Poll showed that an overwhelming majority of the people of Texas want a state minimum wage law.

More people were aided in Texas by the new Federal Minimum Wage Law than in any other state, because Texas was the only large population state without a minimum wage law, and it is a low wage state. This new Federal Minimum Wage Law is sometimes called the widows law, because it protects people working in laundries, hotels, motels, and restaurants, many of whom are widows supporting children, working to hold their families together. Our investigations showed that some laundries in Texas were paying 33⅓, 40, 42½, 45, 47½, 50, or 70 cents per hour, to women working in them. Why should any man object to paying a nickel more for having his shirt laundered in order to let those women draw the minimum wage of $1.00 per hour for that hard laundry work?

It is my belief that the overwhelming majority of the people of Texas desire that Texas move forward in education, income, standard of living, in the enjoyment of the good life by all of our people—and the advancement of Texas into the third quarter of the 20th century.

My immediate ancestors and family have lived in Texas for 120 years. There were Yarboroughs, a branch of our family, in Houston's army at San Jacinto. Texas is my home, and its history and traditions are my life. The evidences of that history line the walls of this historic room in this great Capitol Building. They stir me as they stir you, and as they have stirred Texans for generations.

I grew up in Henderson County, steeped in the traditions of John H. Reagan, O. M. Roberts, and Jim Hogg. John H. Reagan went to this Legislature from a district including Henderson County, then became District Judge and Congressman from my old Home District, Postmaster General of the Confederacy, United States Senator, and Railroad Commissioner. One of the all-time greats of Texas, O. M. Roberts, was elected to office first in that district and served as District Judge in that district including Henderson County. Jim Hogg was elected District Attorney by a district that included Henderson County, before he came on to his great fame as one of the all-time giants of Texas in public service. To John H. Reagan, O. M. Roberts, and Jim Hogg public service was a public trust. To them honor and integrity were dearer than life itself. It was a part of the mores of the country in which I grew to manhood. Public office was not held for the enrichment of the pocketbook, but for the ennoblement of man.

On this bedrock of integrity and effort we will be judged. As Abraham Lincoln said:

"We cannot escape history. We will be remembered in spite of ourselves. No personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the last generation."

The burdens upon a legislator are heavy. The pitfalls through which he must steer a good measure are many, if he is to bring it into the law and help educate, elevate, and ennoble the people. His actions will be misinterpreted by his enemies and efforts will be made by selfish interest to mislead his constituents, to try to make them believe that he has not represented their best interests, when that was his sole aim.

To accomplish your dreams, to accomplish what legislators should accomplish, to do for the people what a representative democracy should do, we must with the poet be ready:

"To dream the impossible dream,
  To fight the unbeatable foe
 To reach the unreachable star,
  To go where the brave dare not go."

Fellow legislators, the quest is ours. God bless you.

THE ISAAC MURPHY LEGEND

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, we are on the eve of another Kentucky Derby week in the blue grass country. The one which impends will be marked by a memorial and dedication ceremony honoring the memory of Isaac Burns Murphy, a 19th century jockey who is a legend in turf history and who was the first to ride three Kentucky Derby winners.

The remains of Isaac Murphy are being exhumed from a nearby abandoned cemetery and reburied in famous Man O'War Memorial Park near Lexington, Ky. On May 4, 2 days before the 1967 running of the Kentucky Derby at Churchill Downs, Louisville, dedication ceremonies will be conducted at Man

O'War Park where a suitable marker will be unveiled at the gravesite of the famous former jockey.

The honors arranged to the memory of Isaac Murphy were in part initiated and sponsored by Stuart F. Bloch, of Wheeling, W. Va., an officer of the Mail Pouch Tobacco Co. and its Kentucky Club division.

Walter Haight who writes of "Horses and People" in a Washington Post column, recently devoted commentary under the heading, "Side by Side," to the Isaac Murphy story and to the May 4 dedication ceremony to be held in Man O'War Memorial Park.

Mr. President, the Walter Haight column is interesting and enlightening and I request unanimous consent to have it, along with a brief summary of Ike Murphy's career, printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and summary were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIDE BY SIDE: HORSES AND PEOPLE

(With Walter Haight)

Although the high points of their careers were separated by almost a half century, two of Kentucky's greatest racing products soon will be resting side by side under waving blue grass.

With the consent of the heirs and the approval of the courts, the remains of Isaac Murphy will be moved from his burial place of 70 years to a spot close to Man O'War—and fitting it is for one of the greatest of jockeys and one of the greatest of horses.

The scene is the Man O'War Memorial Park, a roadside plot near Lexington which features a twice-lifesized statue of the famous thoroughbred. It was deeded to Fayette County by the Samuel Riddle (owner of big Red) estate.

Born in Lexington in 1861, Murphy died of pneumonia there in 1896 and was buried in a nearby now-abandoned cemetery. Papers of that period described the block-long funeral procession and noted that 500 persons attended the rites.

Only a wooden marker was placed on the grave. Later several Kentucky horsemen thought a more fitting marker was warranted and arranged for a head stone anchored in place by a metal stake.

The reburial of the famous little Negro jockey is scheduled for May 4, two days before the Kentucky Derby, a race in which he was the first jockey to ride three winners. A plaque listing the jockey's accomplishments will be dedicated during the ceremonies.

Isaac Burns Murphy (his full name) was described by publications of his era as a gentle and honest lad who earned the respect of owners, trainers and fellow riders—so fond of horses was he that he used the whip sparingly.

In 1956, when Murphy was enshrined in the Jockeys Hall of Fame at Pimlico Race Course, he received 432 votes of a possible 500. He was more than a legend. His record of 44 per cent winners during his career still stands—628 winners on 1412 mounts.

Murphy, who plied his trade for 20-odd years, scored five times in the Latonia Derby, equally important then to the Kentucky Derby he won three times. His record of having ridden four American Derby winners was only broken in 1956 by Eddie Arcaro.

The 97-pound Murphy was the regular pilot of Salvator, the most famous racer in this country until Man O' War came along. His best-remembered victories were on Salvator over Tenny, riden by Ed (Snapper) Garrison in two match races at Sheepshead Bay and Monmouth Park in 1890.

Murphy had visions of riding horses in races early in his youth, and often did chores for the reward of getting a chance to ride, old hardboots will tell you. He not only learned well the foundation of his trade, but it is said practiced as few jockeys ever have and became regarded as the shrewdest judge of pace (time) in the history of racing.

By the mid-1890s, the cheerful, soft-spoken lad was riding for nearly every important owner in the East. E. J. (Lucky) Baldwin, the fabulous horse owner and plunger of those years, gave Murphy $10,000 just to guarantee first call on his services—an unheard of sum at the time.

He won numerous other stakes still famous, including the Alabama, Monmouth, Oaks, Suburban, Swift, Travers, Saratoga Cup, Dwyer and Kentucky Oaks.

Isaac Burns Murphy made many a move in his career—and none more fitting than this last one.

ISAAC BURNS MURPHY, 1860–96

Ike rode 628 winners in 1412 races, a 44 percent winning average which has yet to be equalled.

He won three Kentucky Derbies and came in the money on three other occasions.

Murphy's record in the Kentucky Derby was not equalled until 1930 when Earl Sande won his third. It was not broken until 1948 when Eddie Arcaro won the fourth of his five Derby victories.

Murphy also won four American Derbies, five Latonia Derbies and four Clark Stakes.

He was named to the Jockey of Fame at Saratoga, N.Y. and Pimlico, Md.

Murphy was one of the most admired and best liked riders of his day, because he combined his exceptional skill with exceptional fidelity, absolute honesty and true modesty.

On the first count, he was an unrivaled judge of pace, had the power to inspire a horse with his own determination, and the patience to call upon a mount to make its last effort for victory.

On the second, he had a happy, intelligent disposition, a bright and sunny temperament and a steadfast refusal to yield to the temptations of riding a dishonest race. In fact, he once gave this advice to a fellow jockey: "Just be honest and you'll have no trouble and plenty of money."

He was so unrelenting in his honesty and dedication to the Sport of Kings that he refused to ride for anyone who had ever accused him of infidelity or dishonor to his profession.

He rode nearly every famous horse on the turf at the time.

It was about Murphy that a contemporary said, according to The Thoroughbred Record: I have seen all the great jockeys of England and this country for years back, but all in all, Isaac Murphy is the greatest of them all."

SENIOR CITIZENS MONTH

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, the month of May has again been designated by our President as "Senior Citizens Month." The theme this year is: "Meeting the Challenge of Later Years," and I cannot think of a more appropriate reminder to the Nation.

As chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, I have good reason to be fully aware of the many problems facing older Americans but I also become more aware each year of the many gifts they offer our Nation. We are blessed with their wisdom, their perspective on issues that perplex us, their memories of other days, and—from a growing number of the elderly—a willingness to serve others in worthwhile programs sponsored by private organizations or public agencies.

President Johnson, in his proclamation on Senior Citizens Month, gives a good summary of the many challenges facing us, and I think that he expresses a very positive purpose when he says that we need greater awareness to fulfill "our hope of bringing to all older Americans the opportunity to live full and rewarding lives in our communities." I ask that his proclamation be made part of this RECORD.

Much the same positive tone is taken in the "Senior Citizens Month Highlights" distributed by the Administration on Aging in its very helpful Senior Citizens Month information kit. I direct your attention, particularly, to the joint venture sponsored by the AOA and by the Girl Scouts of America. It is easy to agree with AOA Commissioner William Bechill that, by bringing young and old together, we can expect rich benefits to all who participate in the program; and I submit the AOA statement for the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Our society has made a commitment to enrich and improve the lives of the senior citizens among us.

A great part of that commitment to the 19 million Americans who are 65 or over has been advanced during this Administration.

Through Medicare, the often crushing burden of hospital and doctor bills has been eased.

The Older Americans Act, with its emphasis on community services, gives direction and meaning to lives that might have been spent out in frustration and purposelessness.

Other programs provide assistance to senior citizens in housing and nursing care, public welfare, and special training programs.

Recommendations now before the Congress will make the older years of life even more productive and more comfortable by:

Increasing the benefits under Social Security;

Raising the level of public assistance for those who must depend on such welfare for the essentials;

Extending the benefits of Medicare to more people, and expanding its services;

Increasing the educational, recreational and health services under the Older Americans Act;

Eliminating income tax discrimination against those over 65 who continue to work;

Prohibiting discrimination because of age in employment.

The Nation needs these programs in order to move closer to realizing the goals which we have set out as the objectives in our Bill of Rights for Older Americans—an adequate income, a decent home, and a meaningful retirement.

But to make good fully on its commitment, the Nation needs more than legislation. There must be an awareness in the heart of every citizen of the duty we all share in this abundant land to the elders whose lives have contributed to the development of the society we enjoy.

There must be a general awareness that it is within the power of us all to discharge that duty—to bring light to the lives of those who are lonely or in despair, better care to those who are ill or disabled, greater benefits to those who are impoverished.

The greater this awareness is, the greater will be our hope of bringing to all older Americans the opportunity to live full and rewarding lives in communities throughout the Nation.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, do hereby designate the month of May 1967 as Senior Citizens Month.

I call upon all Federal, State and local governments, in partnership with private and voluntary organizations, to join in community effort to give meaning to the theme of this special month: "Meeting the Challenge of the Later Year."

Let each citizen help, in whatever way he can, to make this month memorable by working to provide within each community those benefits and opportunities which will add satisfaction and dignity to the lives of older Americans.

I also invite the Governors of the States, the Governor of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and appropriate officials in other areas subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to join in the observance of Senior Citizens Month.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington this thirtieth day of March in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and sixty-seven, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and ninety-first.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

By the President:

Dean Rusk,
Secretary of State.

[From Senior Citizens Month, 1967, News]

Senior Citizens Month Highlights

Highlighted by the Administration's priority status for aid to older people, Senior Citizens Month 1967 marks an important milestone in this nation's commitment to its goal of a life of dignity and honor for older Americans. May has been designated as Senior Citizens Month for the fifth consecutive year.

The theme of this year's Senior Citizens Month, "Meeting the Challenge of the Later Years", is based on the President's proposals for an adequate income for the aged, tax reform, extension of nursing and health care, job opportunities, and "enriching the later years".

In addition, the Senior Citizens Month program this year has embarked on a project to help bridge the "generational gap", which has become a national concern of parents, grandparents and social scientists.

In the first joint venture of the U.S. Administration on Aging and a world-wide movement, 3.5 million Girl Scouts and Girl Scout leaders will launch a national older Americans program in connection with the observance of Senior Citizens Month 1967.

In a statement on this important venture, U.S. Commissioner on Aging William D. Bechill said:

"I welcome this opportunity to work with the Girl Scouts of U.S.A. Our joint efforts can enrich the lives of both the young and the old. Through this association, we can make it possible for the Girl Scouts to learn more about the values and heritage of the past, and we can give our elderly the satisfaction that comes in helping to build the future."

The joint program is a partnership for the benefit of both the old and the young. Girl Scout projects will provide a wide variety of useful services to senior citizens, both individually and in groups, and will involve programs for all age Scouts—from 7 to 17.

The projects will also include programs in which senior citizens can participate to provide meaningful outlets for them, and useful instruction or assistance for the Girl Scouts.

Several departments and agencies of the Federal Government are actively participating in the observance of Senior Citizens Month. In addition, business, labor, national associations, religious groups, and voluntary organizations throughout the country are cooperating.

SILENT NATIONAL HOLIDAY FOR POLES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on May 3, commemorative programs will take place all over the United States marking the silent national holiday of Poles still longing for freedom and independence in Poland.

That day in 1791 marks the birth of the Polish Constitution and many other noteworthy events throughout the 1,000 proud years of the history of that nation.

Ten million Americans of Polish ancestry will mark by silent vigil the continued occupation of their motherland by the Communist regime. Today that country needs our encouragement and support.

This year's observance is the more significant since it is the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the 50th anniversary of the death of Henry Sienkiewicz, and the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Charles Burke, Washington representative of the Polish-American Congress, short biographies of these great Poles, and a short evaluation of the May 3 Constitution of 1791 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter, the biographies, and a short evaluation of the Constitution of 1791 were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Polish American Congress, Inc.,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1967.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Commemorative programs in Congress marking Poland's May 3rd Constitution of 1791 and other significant events in one thousand years of the history of the Polish nation, have become a proud and cherished part of the ethnic heritage of ten million Americans of Polish ancestry. They are gratefully aware of the fact that these commemorative programs in Congress form a continuation of the golden thread of friendship, understanding and mutual pursuit of the ideals of freedom and independence that is woven into the fabric of the history of the American and Polish nations.

On the threshold of the second millennium as a nation born of its baptism and reared in Christian precepts of the West, Poland today needs our encouragement and help. Suffering under communist tyranny as the result of diplomatic confusion among the allied powers, the Polish nation, once called by a former President of the United States "an inspiration of mankind" for its heroic deeds in World War II, today fights with courage and rectitude to save its millennial heritage of Western culture from the encroachment by atheistic communism and its tyrannical disregard for human rights and the dignity of man.

May 3rd is the silent national holiday of the Poles longing for freedom and independence in Poland. Silent—because the communist regime is utilizing all its powers to force the nation to forget the democratic glory of the May 3rd Constitution.

This year's observance draws our attention to other significant anniversaries in Polish history. Namely: the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko; the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz and the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie.

I am taking the liberty of enclosing short biographies of these great Poles and also a short evaluation of the May 3rd Constitution of 1791.

The Polish American Congress which represents approximately ten million Americans of Polish origin, sincerely appreciates your past participation in the May 3rd programs in Congress, and appeals for your assistance in making the coming observance as impressive and memorable as in previous years.

With highest regards, I am

Sincerely,

Charles Burke,
Washington Representative.

Henryk Sienkiewicz

Last Fall Polish American communities marked the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, one of the great lights in world's literature. Through his immortal novel of universal appeal, Quo Vadis, Sienkiewicz personifies Poland's contribution to the growth and development of Western culture. The tribute to Sienkiewicz has been a part of the Polish Millenium Observances.

The greatest novelist Poland produced was Henryk Sienkiewicz, born at Wola Okrzejska in the province of Podlasie, on May 5, 1846. He acquired his secondary and university education in Warsaw. He was seventeen at the time of the Uprising of the Poles against Russian domination. Like other youths of the period, he was filled with enthusiasm and self-sacrifice for the Polish cause, and true to his Polish heritage, he never overlooked any opportunity in later life for bringing that cause to the attention of the world.

Sienkiewicz studied medicine, history and philology at the university. He was an average student, but excelled in composition. His writing career had its beginnings as early as 1870, when he entered the field of journalism. His columns and chronicles appeared in the Warsaw "Polish Gazette" under "Humorous Sketches from Worszyllo's Portfolio". His first stories, "In Vain" and "The Old Servant", indicate the author's uncommon literary talent, his gift of observation, and an unusual sense of humor. These short stories place him at once in the first rank of the writers of the period and gain him a wide circle of readers. It was during this period that he wrote "The Lighthouse Keeper", a wistful, pathetic tale of an old man on a lone islet in the sea, far away from his homeland, who comes upon some old papers written in his native tongue. It is the first time he has had any contact with his native language in many years, and the written words rouse nostalgic yearnings and a deep sorrow for the land of his youth.

Chafing in the suffocating atmosphere of an enslaved, partitioned Poland, Sienkiewicz and a small group of patriotic Poles migrated to the United States in 1876. Helena Modjeska, the famed Shakespearian actress was among them. Sienkiewicz returned to his homeland in 1878 and wrote, "Letters from America". America as described by him consisted of prairies and big cities. Today it sounds like a charming tale of bygone times. However, all that which constitutes the American character, which forms the essence of this country's culture, its changeless soul, was felt with admirable intuition and thoroughly comprehended by him. He rendered an enthusiastic and simultaneously unusual tribute to the American people for their diligence, spirit of progress and true democracy.

As a result of his stay in America, Sienkiewicz saw life in a wider, more exuberant and richer scope. Partly in America and partly after his return to Poland, he wrote his most outstanding short stories such as: "Charcoal Sketches", "From the Diary of a Poznan Teacher", "Birtek the Conqueror", which are proof of the unusual development of his talent. Sienkiewicz again is harassed by the dullness of life under the restrictions of foreign rule. His aspiration as an artist and a Pole are balked. He delves into Poland's past history, perceives the powerful, creative instinct of a great nation, its will to greatness, heroism and sacrifice in the service of great ideas. He digs deep into the sources relating to XVIII century Poland, studies the language of the period, peruses memoirs and documents, transfers himself in spirit from enslaved Poland to the old times, stormy, difficult but free.

The product of this research was Sienkiewicz's remarkable "Trilogy", covering the period of the Tartar invasion. The three volumes: "With Fire and Sword," "The Deluge", and "Pan Wolodjowski" (1883–88) have been translated into various tongues, yet they possess a Polish quality that is really untranslatable. There is a piquant touch of localism in the terminology that is homely, picturesque and even endearing. The "Trilogy" is based on the Cossack wars in the reign of King John Casimir. It is impossible to describe the impact of these books on the minds of the readers, one might say on the soul of the Polish nation, for they were literally read by everybody and the papers that printed them passed from hand to hand, awaited in every home as good, yearned for tidings.

The Polish Nation, tormented by its fate, recovered under the influence of the picture created by Sienkiewicz of its own strength. It was a picture of struggle for the homeland, unbounded sacrifice and removal of all obstacles. It electrified the Poles into renewed hope. Nowhere in the world has there been such a writer of his inexhaustible imagination, capable of rousing such interest for the events described, for the fate of the characters invented. To the reader, they became as close as family and friends. Most beloved were Pan Wolodjowski, Longinus Podbipieta and Zagloba, "The Three Musketeers" of Polish literature. In "The Trilogy", Sienkiewicz wrote of an abandoned Poland, who won her freedom by stubborn resistance, and the Polish people understood the lesson of these books, and the fighting spirit was reawakened in them. They were the Polish soldier's favorite reading matter.

The psychological study, "Without Dogma", was written in 1890 to 1891. This is a portrayal of a Pole, so typical of many others, who all his life is a searcher for something undefinable, a will o' the wisp that brings him to nothingness and a heartrending anguish in being unable to find solid support and emotional relief in these eternal uncertainties and hopeless yearnings. In 1892 he wrote a book on his travels in Africa, that was read with great interest. In 1895–96 his monumental "Quo Vadis' was written, translated into dozens of languages and read the world over. If Sienkiewicz had written no other work, this book alone would have brought him fame. Its background is the early Christian era, in the days of Christ, and has a universal appeal, for it is the story of Christ. It is a living epic, a panorama of historical events mingled with colorful fiction. He reconstructed the world of ancient Rome and Christianity, rising out of martyrdom and sacrifice, and created an absorbing, vibrant, deeply interesting story.

In 1897–1900 Sienkiewicz's last great book, "The Knights of the Cross", appeared. Here again Sienkiewicz's talent shone forth as a painter of countless battle scenes, encounters, hunts, love trysts, and of German atrocities, which today indeed seem prophetic. Like the "Trilogy" and "Quo Vadis" this work also had a lesson. It pointed to the mortal danger not only to Poland but to the entire world. It is not surprising that Lord Vansittart wrote in the preface to a new edition of the "Knights" in London, that the world should be on guard before the constantly renewed power of Germany.

In 1905 Henryk Sienkiewicz was awarded the Nobel Prize for Literature for his "Quo Vadis". Scholars experts on antiquity, declared that "Quo Vadis" presented a picture of Rome of hitherto unexisting scientific accuracy. All the important literary institutions and learned academies of the world, including that of St. Petersburg, extended their membership to Sienkiewicz. For many years Henryk Sienkiewicz was the most popular and widely read novelist of the world.

Sienkiewicz's last efforts of the pen dealt with the Polish Napoleonic legions. Like many other Poles, he was brought up in the Napoleonic tradition. His own grandfather was an old legionary. But the great war broke out, when he had completed but a few chapters. Because of the war Sienkiewicz went to Switzerland together with Ignace Paderewski and Antoni Osuchowski, and organized the Relief Committee for Poland. His sudden death on November 15, 1916 prevented his ever completing his last book.

Time has not diminished Sienkiewicz's importance among Polish writers. His peasant stories have been surpassed by others, his social novels at least equaled, but as a master of historical romance he still stands unrivaled in the literature of Poland, and in the forefront of that of the world. When in 1926 his remains were transferred from their temporary grave in Vevey, Switzerland, to the cathedral in Warsaw, they were accompanied by an outburst of unanimous homage that proved what Sienkiewicz had stood for to the Polish nation.

Politically, Sienkiewicz was an "ambassador of Poland". It was he, who pleaded before the bar of Europe for his forgotten country. He addressed open letters to governments and prominent men of Europe protesting against the injustice rendered Poland. In 1901 he drew public attention to the miguitous Prussian Law of Expropriation. He spent the remaining years of his life pointing the way to his compatriots for good citizenship in their reborn country. But he did not live to see its rebirth.

By his works Sienkiewicz testified to the vitality of the Polish nation, its strength, its striving for freedom. By showing in his masterpieces the splendour and power of Poland, when she was independent, he awakened in the Poles faith in the future and hope for the rebuilding of their homeland. He aroused the admiration of the entire world for his literary genius, and proclaimed before the world that Poland lived, that she was one of the nations, who not only fought for their freedom, but also played a leading role in culture and in the arts, and that therefore independence and an honorable place among free peoples should be restored to her.

Henryk Sienkiewicz rendered his country an immeasurable service, for he made the name of Poland famous throughout the world. When he spoke, the world knew that the Polish nation spoke through him. As her spokesman he paved the way to her independence after the first world war, for the world listened and upheld the suffering, martyred Poland in her quest for freedom. Today, when Poland has been engulfed by a night of bondage even worse than that in the XIXth century, the lesson derived from Sienkiewicz's life and work should be brought to the mind of all Poles to awaken their hope, and to all free nations to awaken their conscience and sense of obligation towards Poland, heroic, leading in culture, and so cruelly wronged.

War-torn Poland today is again struggling for that same freedom, for which Henryk Sienkiewicz so eloquently battled in his times. But just as no power was strong enough to hold her enslaved then, so no power on earth can keep her in bondage now. The spirit of Sienkiewicz and other great Polish patriots lives on in the world of Poland's sons, and the day will come when she will again be freed from the shackles of the Soviet usurper and enjoy her rightful freedom.

Sienkiewicz's last unfinished historical novel "The Legions", ends in Rome to which the Polish legionaries have come after fierce fighting, and view the cupola of St. Peter's, the mother of churches, before their march from Italy to Poland. This last picture created by Sienkiewicz moves us deeply today, when we think of the Polish Army which, having conquered Monte Cassino again opened the road to Rome, again appeared on the age-old track in defense of Christianity and civilization.

Sklodowska-Curie Centennial

In June of 1921, the then President of Harvard University, A. Laurence Lowell, spoke during a scholarly convocation of three outstanding scientific discoveries of all times:—the Copernican theory of heliocentric universe, the Newtonian law of gravitation, and the discovery of radium by Madame Marie Sklodowska-Curie. Thus, he stated, up to that time, two of the three discoveries that changed the course of scientific thought were made by scientists of Polish birth.

This year the Polish nation together with scientific communities throughout the world will observe the hundredth anniversary of the birth of Mme. Sklodowska-Curie.

Poland's contribution to the knowledge and use of physics is personified in two geniuses who unlocked the secrets of macrocosm and microcosm.

Mikolaj Kopernik (Copernicus) founded modern astronomy when he "stopped the sun and set the earth in motion."

Marie Sklodowska-Curie discovered and defined the fundamental properties of atom. In the words of Soddy:

"The brilliant generalization, at once clarifying and simplifying the whole subject, was made quite early, in the face of much apparent evidence to the contrary. . . . In spite of discovery of new phenomena, at first sight quite out of keeping with it, it has survived and remains the central pivot on which the whole science turns."

As early as 1900 Sklodowska suggested that, if the energy evidence by the radiation did not come from an external source, it must result from the breakdown of the atom, since radioactivity is an atomic property.

In 1903, Rutherford and Soddy announced their theory of atomic disintegration, thus giving corroboration to the theory advanced by Sklodowska-Curie.

Marie Sklodowska-Curie, one of the greatest scientists of all time, was born in Warsaw, Poland, on November 7, 1867, the youngest of the five children of Wladyslaw and Bronislawa (nee Boguska) Sklodowska.

Her childhood destined her for scientific research; she spent much time in the laboratory of her father, who was a professor of physics. At the age of nine she lost her mother.

The Sklodowskis suffered many tribulations under the Russian tyranny. Young Marie, like other Polish youth of her time, followed intellectual pursuits in the firm belief that through hard work and cultural eminence rather than through futile fight against the overwhelming force of the occupying power they would gain victory.

Completing her early education in the schools of Warsaw, she graduated from Gymnasium at the age of 15. She earned a very modest living doing private teaching, while preparing herself for the University by self-instruction.

In 1891 she was finally able to undertake the study at Sorbonne, thus realizing one of the fondest dreams of her youth.

In 1893 she graduated with first rank as "licenciee es sciences physiques," and the following year with second rank as "licenciee es sciences matematique."

In her own words, these were the years "entirely absorbed in the joy of learning and understanding." Poverty was of no concern.

"It was a familiar experience of many Polish students whom I knew," she wrote in later years. "The room I lived in was a garret, very cold in winter, for it was insufficiently heated by a small stove." There was a time when she became ill through lack of food.

Marie Sklodowska was 24 when she went to study in Paris.

In 1894 she met Pierre Curie, a very promising physicist, Professor of Physics in the School of Physics and Chemistry in Paris. Their mutual scientific interests drew them together. In the following year they were married—she at the age of 28, he at 36.

Those were the years of pioneering discoveries in physics.

In 1895, Roentgen discovered the now familiar x-rays. In 1896 Becquerel discovered that a compound of uranium affected a photographic plate in the same manner when it had been kept in dark as it did after it had been exposed to the sunlight. Thus radioactivity had been discovered though not yet defined or named.

In 1897, Madame Curie determined to make a study of the phenomenon and had chosen radio-activity as the subject of her doctoral thesis. Professor Curie followed suit, abandoned his study of crystals and joined his wife in the new pursuit, the completion of which was to bring them world-wide recognition and lasting fame.

Using a variety of compounds of uranium, Madame Curie ascertained that they emit the same rays and the intensity of radiation depended only on the quantity of the uranium in the compound. From these observations she reasoned that the radioactivity in the uranimum compound was a fundamental property of the uranium atom.

For further investigations, the Curies chose an ore of uranium known as pitchblende. With the progress of purification, the chemical identity of pitchblende components became apparent.

In July, 1898 the Curies announced the existence of Polonium, named for Marie's native Poland, and a search of the second new element was pressed. In December of 1899, the existence of Radium had been announced.

Evidences for these two elements were conclusive but it still remained to separate them from bismuth and barium and to obtain them in free forms.

This was accomplished in a shed with a leaky roof and the most primitive equipment.

"Yet it was in this miserable old shed that passed the best and happiest years of our life, devoting our entire days to our work. I shall never be able to express the joy of untroubled quietness of this atmosphere of research and the excitement of actual progress with the confident hope of still better results," wrote Mme. Curie in her memoirs.

In 1900, Pierre and Marie made a general report on Polonium and Radium to the Congress of Physics in Paris.

In 1902 Mme. Curie succeeded in preparing a decigram of pure uranium and in 1903 she completed her doctorial thesis on this subject.

In 1903 the Curies jointly with Henri Bequerel received the Nobel prize in Physics.

During these years of research, two children were born to the Curies—Irene in 1897 and Eve in 1904.

In 1906 Pierre Curie died in a traffic accident.

In tribute to his memory and in recognition of his scientific status, Prof. Curie's chair at the Sorbonne was offered to his wife. Thus Marie Sklodowska-Curie has been honored as the first woman in history to hold the chair of Professor of Physics at the Sorbonne. However, the full Professorship was not granted to her until 1908.

In 1912 Marie was again awarded the Nobel prize, this time alone, for her preparation of pure uranium and defining its atomic weight. That same year a Radium Institute had been established in her honor in Warsaw and in 1913 Marie returned to her homeland to receive a heroine's welcome.

Similar institute had been founded that same year in Paris and Madame Sklodowska-Curie devoted much time to its direction and organization.

During the World War I she and her daughter Irene worked tirelessly in setting up radio-logical ambulances for the purpose of taking x-rays of the wounded.

Although she never lived in Poland after 1891, her interest in her beloved native land never flagged and she rejoiced that she lived to see her dream of a united and free Poland come true. Her loyalty and her love for the land of her origin were deep and abiding.

In 1921, Madame Sklodowska-Curie came to the United States and American women presented her with a gram of radium and with a fund for her private use. Marie used the money for the rental of another gram of radium for the laboratory in Warsaw. When she visited the United States again in 1929, to dedicate the Hepburn Hall of Chemistry at St. Lawrence University, American friends presented her with money to purchase the gram of radium for Warsaw, thus freeing the original fund for her use.

In 1932 she paid her last visit to her beloved Poland to attend the dedication of the Radium Institute of Warsaw.

Marie Sklodowska-Curie died on July 4, 1934, in Paris.

Marie Sklodowska-Curie is one of several women Nobel laureates. But she is the sole recipient of these highest rewards for her attainment in two disciplines—chemistry and physics. Other great honors came to her from all parts of the world—from learned societies, universities and colleges.

It is somewhat ironic that she was refused admission to the French Academy of Science solely because she was a woman. And the medical faculty in Paris hesitated for a long time to nominate her Professor of Physics because she was not a Frenchwoman by birth.

A deeply moving and forever memorable tribute to this great scientist and humanitarian was paid by President Sykes of St. Lawrence University when he conferred the honorary degree of Doctor of Science on her. He spoke of Mme Sklodowska-Curie:

"Self-effaced and devoted scientist, teacher and author, exemplar of the art of living while directing to beneficent ends powerful forces of nature, single and persistent in purpose, triumphant in research, hastening the march of civilization by the discovery of radium, inspired and inspiring idealist, practical dreamer."

Thaddeus Kosciuszko

In this first post-millennial year, Poles in Poland and abroad will mark the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko who passed away in Switzerland on October 15, 1817 after rendering illustrious and enduring service to his native land and the American Revolution. Thomas Jefferson paid eloquent tribute to Kosciuszko's greatness when he described him as "the purest spirit of liberty".

Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Poland's great patriot and national leader and America's Revolutionary War general and aide to Washington, was born February 12, 1746, at Siechnowicze, Poland. He passed his early childhood on his father's estate, then attended the school of the Piarist Fathers, in Lubieszow, from where he went to the Warsaw Cadet School, to graduate with highest honors. The King of Poland, impressed with Kosciuszko's natural ability for engineering and proven brilliance, sent him to France to pursue further studies.

After seven years in the leading French military schools, he was commissioned a captain in charge of Krakow's fortifications. But under the conditions prevailing in Poland shortly after the First Partition, 1772, there was little opportunity for his talents; a commission in the reduced army was to be had only by purchase, and Kosciuszko was without funds.

Observing no chance to serve his country, Kosciuszko again left Poland, pledging his share of the parental estate, as security for the loan which enabled him to journey to Paris. Here the news of the outbreak of hostilities in America kindled his imagination, and he determined to go to the aid of America—a Polish knight in the cause of liberty.

KOSCIUSZKO IN AMERICA

In the summer of 1776, Kosciuszko arrived in America at his own initiative and at his own expense. Pending the decision of the Board of War upon his application, he found employment at Philadelphia, in the construction of fortifications against the expected attack by the Delaware. This gained him his commission from Congress, October 18, 1776, as an engineer in the Continental service with pay of sixty dollars a month, and the rank of colonel. In the spring of 1777, he joined the Northern Army, where his ability as an engineer was of invaluable use in the campaign against Burgoyne. His fortification at Van Schaick and elsewhere, his able judgment in the choice of battlegrounds, contributed much to the skillful retreats and the firm stands of the Continental Army before Burgoyne's rash advance. He was ordered by General Gates to erect the fortification in the defense of Saratoga, and his task was accomplished with great brilliancy and speed.

With justified pride Poles regard the role played by their national hero in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a campaign but France's recognition of her independence.

FORTIFIED WEST POINT

For long the question of the defense of the Hudson had been of paramount importance; the brief respite gained by the defeat of Burgoyne rendered this a favorable moment to render it impregnable. West Point was chosen for its commanding position, and its fortification was finally conferred, over the head of the French engineer, Radiere, upon the Pole. "Mr. Kosciuszko," wrote McDougall now in command of the Northern Army, to Washington, "is esteemed to have more practice than Colonel Radiere, and his manner of treating the people is more acceptable than that of the latter." Little is now left of the fortifications, but the monument erected to his memory at West Point by American Youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciuszko who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

THE SOUTHERN CAMPAIGN

In the summer of 1780, General Gates requested Washington to transfer Kosciuszko to the South, where the army was now under his command. But before the Pole was able to reach him, his old friend had been defeated at Camden and deprived of his command. General Nathaniel Greene—after Washington the finest general in the Continental service—had been appointed his successor. While awaiting Greene's arrival, Kosciuszko spent some time in Virginia among the planters. There he saw the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negroes in slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro which seventeen years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciuszko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas and was regarded with strong affection and admiration by General Greene. True to his ideals at the battle of Eutaw Springs, he restrained a carnage which outraged his feelings, and he is said personally to have saved the lives of fifty Englishmen. When the campaign changed to one of guerrilla warfare, he fought as a soldier, not as an engineer. At length Charleston fell. And on December 14, 1782, the American army entered the town in a triumphal procession, in which Kosciuszko rode with his fellow-officers, greeted by the populace with flowers and cries of "Welcome."

Peace soon followed.

Kosciuszko had fought for six years in the American Army. Nathaniel Greene best sums up what the Pole had done for America and what he had been to his brother-soldiers. "Colonel Kosciuszko belonged"—wrote Greene—"to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems, nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never mainfested desires or claims to himself, and never let opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others." Congress, in 1783, belatedly conferred upon Kosciuszko the rank of Brigadier-General with an acknowledgment of its "high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service."

KOSCIUSZKO RETURNS TO POLAND

In the fall of 1784 Kosciuszko reached his native country. A great wave of effort—a nation's magnificent effort to save herself by internal reform, which culminated in the democratic Constitution of the 3rd of May, 1791—was sweeping at that time over Poland.

After the second partition, in 1792, a further wave of patriotic ardour swept over Poland. General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the hero of the American War of Independence, hastened to Krakow, summoned the people to arms, proclaiming new decrees in favor of the peasants. Hosts of peasants armed with scythes answered Kosciuszko's call. On April 29, 1794, Kosciuszko attacked the Russians at Raclawice. Ill-disciplined and poorly equipped, the peasants took by assault batteries of Russian field guns and routed the enemy. After this battle Kosciuszko wore a "Sukmana," a coat of homespun cloth such as the peasants wore.

Infuriated, Catherine of Russia sent a large army to fight Kosciuszko, and at Maciejowice in the south of Poland the two forces met on the 10th of October. Kosciuszko dashed into the thickest of the fight. Three horses were killed under him, and bleeding from many wounds he was taken prisoner. With him fell the independence of Poland, and as the poet, Campbell, says "Freedom shrieked when Kosciuszko fell." Kosciuszko was cast into a dungeon in Petersburg, and only after Catherine's death her successor Paul I liberated the Polish hero.

KOSCIUSZKO REVISITS AMERICA

On the 19th of December, 1796, Kosciuszko left St. Petersburg with his friend and fellow-prisoner Juljan Ursyn Niemcewicz and a fellow officer, Libiszewski, who offered to serve the maimed Kosciuszko on his trip to America. By way of Stockholm, Gothenburg, London and finally Bristol, Kosciuszko and his party sailed for Philadelphia on June 18, 1797.

For 2 months the ship carrying Kosciuszko and his companions tossed on the Atlantic, on one occasion near shipwreck. They reached their destination on August 18, 1797.

Yellow fever prevailed at Philadelphia at this time, so Kosciuszko with his poet-friend Niemcewicz, journeyed on to New Brunswick, the home of General Anthony Walton White. Later he proceeded to New York, where he was the guest of General Gates at Rose Hill, where he remained until September 29, 1797. Before leaving New York, he received from Congress a grant of five hundred acres in recognition of his military services. This property was located on the extreme western border of the United States military lands, on the east side of the Scioto River, in Perry Township, Franklin County, Ohio, the site of the present City of Columbus.

After a short visit in Elizabethtown, he returned to the home of General White in New Brunswick where he remained until November 28. Kosciuszko, whose convalescence was slow, spent nearly all his time reclining on a sofa, sketching and painting in water color and India ink. From General White's home Kosciuszko returned to Philadelphia and took residence on 2nd Street. Bevies of visitors and admirers again surrounds him, and Kosciuszko drew into great intimacy with Thomas Jefferson, at this time Secretary of State. Jefferson wrote to Gates: "I see Kosciuszko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known, the kind of liberty which extends to all, not only to the rich." On January 23, 1798, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to issue to Kosciuszko a certificate of indebtedness of $12,260.54 with interest at 6 per cent, from January 7, 1793 to December 31, 1797. The final settlement of the account was made by a payment amounting to $15,227.87.

Some time in March, 1798, a packet of letters from Europe was handed to Kosciuszko. His emotion on reading the contents was so strong that, despite his crippled condition, he sprang from his couch and stepped without a helping hand to the middle of the room. "I must return at once to Europe," he said with no explanation. Jefferson procured his passport to France under the name of Thomas Kanberg and with only Jefferson's knowledge, with no word either to Niemcewicz or to his servant, Stanislau, for both of whom he left a roll of money in his cupboard, he sailed for France. Before embarking at Baltimore he gave Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will in which, more than half a century before the Civil War, the Polish Patriot advanced the cause of emancipation:

KOSCIUSZKO'S WILL

"I, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

"T. Kosciuszko,

"5th day of May, 1798."

There was difficulty in putting this testament into effect as Jefferson was of advanced age at the time of Kosciuszko's death. It was never carried out; but in 1826 the legacy went to found the Colored School at Newark, the first educational institute for Negroes in the United States and which bore Kosciuszko's name.

BACK IN EUROPE

By the end of June or early in July, 1798, Kosciuszko reached Paris. His arrival centered upon him the gaze of the whole world. Sympathy with himself and the Polish cause he heard expressed upon all sides. At the news of his return the Polish Legions awakened to renewed life. He negotiated at length with the Government of France for France's help in the restoration of Polish independence. This was promised him many times, but his cautious request for guarantees was never complied with. When Napoleon was proclaimed First Consul, Kosciuszko, mistrusting him, commenced to withdraw from relations with him or his officials. After the disastrous expedition of the Polish Legions to San Domingo, Kosciuszko severed all relations with him.

Napoleon, in 1806, from Berlin, now summoned Kosciuszko to assume the leadership of the revolting Poles. But the former Polish Commander-in-Chief had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call, and remained in Paris.

In May, 1815, Russia, Austria and Prussia signed an agreement for a new partition of Poland. An autonomous Kingdom of Poland was, it is true, to be formed, with the Tsar as King, but it would be but a small part of the true Poland. Kosciuszko refused all offers of office and honor in the newly partitioned Poland. He felt that his very presence even, would lend sanction to the New Partition. He chose therefore a voluntary exile. Not desiring to live in a Bourbon France, he settled in Switzerland with his devoted friends the Zeltners in Soleure.

LAST DAYS AND RESTING PLACE

Here, in serene communion with nature, among eternal mountains, in unceasing meditation upon the future of Poland, he spent the last two years of his life. And here, on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his Motherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciuszko died. Even in his loneliness he was faithful to Poland—her purest soul and the greatest of Poles. And his greatness was greatest in that it was not his own personal greatness merely; it was the greatness of Poland.

Kosciuszko's body now rests in the Wawel Cathedral in Krakow, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead; but his heart is in the Polish conquerors. To his memory, three years after his death, the nation raised a monument perhaps unique of its kind. Outside of Krakow towers the Kosciuszko Hill, fashioned by the hands of Polish men, women and children, bringing earth from the battle-fields where Kosciuszko had fought. The act is typical. To this day the name of Thaddeus Kosciuszko lives in the hearts of the Polish people, not only as the object of their profound and passionate love, but as the symbol of their dearest national aspirations. His pictures, his relics, are venerated as with the devotion paid to a patron saint. Legend and music have gathered about his name.

MAY 3RD—THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

On May 3rd Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises through the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3rd in 1791, barely two years after the adoption of its Constitution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May Third Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism systems of naziism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the Third of May Polish constituiton leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Mediation on the anniversary of May the Third deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

GENEVIEVE BLATT IN MAJOR NEW ROLE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last year the Senate Special Committee on Aging reported on the war on poverty as it affects the elderly. Its major recommendation called for establishment of an Office of Economic Opportunity Assistant Director specifically concerned with OEO programs that affect older Americans. Congress concurred with the committee recommendation and created the position as an amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act late in last year's session.

A few days ago, Mrs. Genevieve Blatt took the oath of office in the new Office created by Congress this year, and I can think of no finer choice. Mrs. Blatt knows people; she knows government; and she knows how to make people listen to her. I am sure that she will, as Sargent Shriver said at the swearing-in reception, give valuable leadership in a reevaluation and perhaps shifting of priorities by the Office of Economic Opportunity, which has concentrated much of its attention to youth. Mrs. Blatt, however, will not seek to cut promising programs in order to begin new ones. We must simply find ways to accomplish more.

Mr. President, an excellent article by Isabelle Shelton in the April 14 issue of the Washington, D.C., Evening Star gives an illuminating account of the course Mrs. Blatt intends to follow. I ask unanimous consent to have it reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHE'LL HELP THE ELDERLY

(By Isabelle Shelton)

Yesterday marked "the beginning of the feminine touch in the war on poverty," said Sargent Shriver, chief of the Office of Economic Opportunity, at the swearing in yesterday of Miss Genevieve Blatt as assistant director of OEO.

Miss Blatt's appointment also marks a re-evaluation and perhaps shifting of priorities by the poverty agency, which to date has concentrated much of its attention on the young, Shriver said.

The new assistant director will be in charge of programs aimed at helping the elderly poor, Shriver said. It is a new post at the agency, created last year by Congress in an amendment to the OEO Act offered by Sen. Edward Kennedy, D-Mass.

The post is on a level with the chiefs of the OEO Job Corps, VISTA and Community Action programs, all of whom are presidential appointees.

ASKED BY PRESIDENT

Miss Blatt, a widely-known Democratic political figure in Pennsylvania who lost election to the U.S. Senate seat of Republican Sen. Hugh D. Scott by a narrow margin in 1964, said she took the poverty post "because President Johnson asked me very specifically to."

An articulate, vital-looking woman, the new appointee is the first woman ever elected to statewide office in Pennsylvania. She served four terms as secretary of internal affairs of the state "revolutionizing" that office during that period, Sen. Joseph Clark, D-Pa., said yesterday in remarks at the swearing-in.

The Pennsylvania senator was one of about 200 friends and well-wishers who attended the ceremony at OEO headquarters. Several members of the state's House delegation also were present and had to depart hastily when they got word that the House was about to take a roll call vote on the ethics question.

Thomas Z. Minehart, Pennsylvania Democratic State chairman, and Vice Chairman Louise M. John headed a delegation from that state.

Asked at a press conference after her swearing in if she intended to remain active politically—particularly in support of Sen. Clark whose term expires next year—Miss Blatt said she "would like to" but has not yet had a chance to discuss it with Shriver.

She "certainly would not want to do anything that would jeopardize the poverty program; this comes first." She "would abide by" what Shriver thinks, she added.

Miss Blatt said she takes on her new assignment "aware of the many problems it involves, but happy to undertake one of the most exciting and interesting challenges in government today."

CITES BURDEN OF AGE

One of five persons living at or below the poverty level are aged 65 or over, she said.

"In fact, slightly over half of those who are 65 or more have yearly incomes of $1,000 or less. This means that 5.4 million men and women are living out what should be the 'golden years' in drab conditions which many of them never had to suffer before and which they should not have to suffer now.

"The burden of age is one which we all must inevitably face," she said. "But, in our Great Society, our people should not have to face the double burden of age and poverty."

She is aware that "much fine work for the aging poor has already been done by federal and local governments and by private groups, Miss Blatt said. "Otherwise the picture would be much worse."

But all this together "has only scratched the surface," she said. "President Johnson wants much more to be done. So does Congress, and so does OEO Chief Shriver," she added. "Certainly much more must be done. Today we begin doing it!"

MUST FIND NEW WAYS

Asked if the reshuffling of priorities meant cutting back such OEO programs for the young as the Head Start program for preschool children, Miss Blatt said she did not think so, and certainly hoped not.

"I think it would be a dreadful shame to cut back on Head Start and others of these programs that have been so helpful," she said.

Ways will simply have to be found to accomplish more, she declared. One way she hopes to help the aged, without drawing too much money away from other OEO programs, she said, is to try to bring about a greater involvement of private persons and groups.

"I feel there are many people, including many of the older people themselves, who would be able to carry on helpful programs with a little direction and training."

This, in turn, would give those older persons "a feeling of doing something helpful of having a reason for living," she declared.

The feeling of being "no longer useful and needed" is one of the greatest burdens of old age, even for those who have enough money, the new OEO assistant believes.

"Retirement at 65 often is traumatic for someone in good health," and "I am inclined to think" is unrealistic, she said in answer to a question. Partial retirement might be the answer, she believes.

CAPT. DAVID PARKER SPEAKS AT FIRST NEBRASKA TRANSPORTATION SYMPOSIUM

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on April 14 and 15, the first Nebraska Transportation Symposium was held in Omaha. The meeting was sponsored by the Professional Engineers of Nebraska and Nebraska Office of State Technical Service.

As Nebraska celebrates its centennial year, it is fitting to recall the important role that transportation played in our development. In committing ourselves to the tasks we must face in the next 100 years, it is imperative that the role of transportation be examined in the light of future needs. A proper transportation mix is undeniably our goal. The push and pull of the marketplace will define its composition.

A participant in the symposium, Capt. David D. Parker, president, Sioux City-New Orleans Barge Co., Houston, Tex., discussed the economics of bargeline operations. Captain Parker properly stressed that a fundamental reason for the success of Nebraska's economy was the Missouri-Mississippi River system.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Captain Parker's interesting and thought-provoking address "Water Transportation Is a Stimulant to More Intensive Regional Development" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER TRANSPORTATION IS A STIMULANT TO MORE INTENSIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(Remarks of Capt. Dave Parker)

The celebration of the Nebraska centennial this year permits a brief look backward for valuable perspective, always a benefit in a fast-changing world. The contrast of Nebraska a century ago with the state of today will serve to highlight numerous important advances and changes. There are also some things that do not change in importance. Then, as now, the Missouri-Mississippi river system serves a function that is central to the success of Nebraska's economy.

If it had not been for this remarkable waterway, Jefferson's great stroke in purchasing Louisiana in 1803 might have had a less happy result. Historians tell us of a move to separate the western territories from the tiny eastern seaboard states shortly after the purchase of Louisiana. The move failed, chiefly because the invention of the steamboat made possible efficient communications and ended the isolation of the western pioneers.

It was the steamboat which brought the first flood of millions of western settlers. These men and women, spreading out over the great prairies, made a certainty out of a dream that the United States would dominate the continent.

Even as late as 1867, Nebraska was rugged country for freight lines. In his "History of Steamboating on the Upper Missouri," Professor William E. Lass reminds us that exactly 100 years ago, a major problem of river transportation was attack by Indians. Let me quote a paragraph:

"Steamboating on the Upper Missouri was risky from yet another standpoint. Navigators never discounted the possibility of attack from renegade Indians. The Indian menace was particularly severe from the time of the Sioux Uprising in 1862 to the conclusion of the Laramie Treaty of 1868. At any point above Fort Randall, boats were likely to be attacked by Sioux war parties. In 1865, George Merrick, the mate of the *St. Johns*, was killed near Fort Rice by a small party of Sioux who fired directly into the pilot house while the boat was running close to a bend. In 1867, a band of Sioux fired into the *Silver Lake* forty miles above Fort Rice, wounding a son of the captain. During the same month, the *Antelope* was completely riddled with bullets by a Sioux war party. Many boat owners resorted to armoring the pilot houses, and all boats were equipped with weapons."

The difference in the freight rates is also interesting. In 1867 the steamboats charged 70 cents a hundred pounds for service between St. Louis and Omaha. Today grain is shipped at eighteen and a half cents a 100 pounds over the same distance.

When Jefferson paid twelve million dollars for Louisiana, which included what is now Nebraska, the country was at the full tide of successful experiment. So successful indeed were early experiments in using government to stimulate economic expansion that a basic pattern emerged which, with little change in principle, has guided American economic development ever since. Private enterprise, personal pioneering, willingness of individuals to take business risks are the main reliance of the nation. But it is recognized that there are times when the government can move the nation into a new dimension. Such an opportunity faced Jefferson's administration in 1803 when the French offered to sell Louisiana. His administration seized the opportunity and every administration since has followed Jefferson's example. The land grants to the railroads were in the same tradition. Whatever the contemporary controversies over this program, no one can deny that they accomplished their purpose of opening up the west.

In recent years, highway construction has rescued the farmer from isolation, brought new standards of mobility to the American family, stimulated both the auto and oil industries and the trucking industry. Federal investment in airlines had a similarly constructive result; a vast and important new industry was created as a result of government foresight in aiding a new technology. Atomic energy and space exploration are even more recent examples.

Among the oldest programs which seek to develop new economic dimensions for the nation is the multi-purpose water resource development program. Albert Gallatin, Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury, a thrifty Swiss who almost paid off the national debt of that day, was an early believer in the national benefits of river development.

Out of small beginnings have come far-reaching river basin development plans, many of which look ahead thirty to fifty years. Most of us think in day-to-day terms, but with its water resource program, the Congress is shaping the basic framework on which to hang the regional development plans of the future.

By themselves, these plans have little meaning. They rely for their success on the extent to which they stimulate private investment. On the basic foundation of water resource development, private enterprise is expected to build the economy of tomorrow.

This principle has been followed since Jefferson's time. The Louisiana Purchase stimulated a movement of people westward to take up lands and develop the country. The land grants brought out railroad investment in needed new services. Highways, airline subsidies, atomic energy and space developments are bringing out huge new private investments as the years go by.

Today, there is a new urgency about regional development. Much government effort is currently going into helping to solve the problems of overcrowded cities. A parallel and rapidly expanding program calls for more intensive development of relatively lightly populated regions of the country as one part of an effort to decentralize an overconcentrated economy. It was the late Senator Robert S. Kerr's vision that canalization of the Arkansas would lead to a rush of industry into the Arkansas basin that would rival the land rush of the last century.

It is similarly the vision of those urging improvement of navigation on the Missouri that the states bordering the river will develop in the same way as the Ohio and Tennessee River basins. The same basic principle applies: government investment in sound foundation facilities attracts private investment to build a healthy expanding regional economy.

Some idea of how this works in the Missouri basin is suggested by two sentences from the current Congressional justification of the Missouri project and I quote: "Stabilization of the banks of the river from Sioux City to the mouth will insure protection against erosion to agricultural areas totaling over 1,800,000 acres and to municipalities, industries and other installations with a value of about $3 billion. These installations include major railroad and highway bridges which receive vital protection against being flanked by the meandering river."

A river is a national resource developed and improved to serve a variety of public interest objectives of which navigation is only one. It is the barge line's job to translate a potential economic asset into a reality by producing an extremely low cost form of transportation. Water transportation has long been a most reliable stimulant of economic growth, helping to create new traffic for rail and highway carriers in the process of stimulating industrial and agricultural activity.

The nation's economy generally has been doubling about every 18 to 20 years. The fastest growing industries, such as the electric utilities, are growing at about seven or eight per cent a year.

The rate of growth of barge transportation has averaged 4.7% over the past five years. But, the response of agriculture in the Missouri Valley to improved barge transportation in the past nine years has been quite remarkable. Ton-miles of service grew sevenfold, from 151,691,000 in 1956 to over 1,100,000,000. Wheat shipments have increased 15 times in the period, soybean shipments seventeen times, corn shipments six times and many products new to the Missouri River achieved heavy volume.

In response to such public demand, barge lines have invested large sums of money in new and improved equipment. In 1965, the last year for which figures are available, investment in nearly 1,000 new barges and 64 new towboats topped $150,000,000. This annual expenditure has grown in recent years. The river industry is composed of many small companies. Very few have annual revenues of more than ten million dollars. These companies have nevertheless invested more than half a billion dollars in new equipment since 1950.

Even more remarkable has been the change in river technology. In 1950, towboats on the lower river were capable of pushing about 10,000 tons or about the capacity of a Liberty ship. Today, grain barges leaving Omaha or Kansas City join others from the Upper Mississippi and the Illinois to form flotillas of up to 50 barges capable of carrying 40 to 50,000 tons or the equivalent of some of the largest bulk steamships in the ocean trades. The modern towboat of 6,000 to 9,000 horsepower is highly automated thus helping to create new efficiencies for the shipper. With increased productivity, the barge lines have been able to absorb increases in the cost of labor and materials and at the same time have been able gradually to reduce rates.

Students of transportation will be interested in a legal snag which now threatens the continued use of the revolution in power of the last ten years. Under a new interpretation of a section of the Interstate Commerce Act defining exemption from regulation, barge lines could be required to break up the large, economical tows into smaller units and thus lose the efficiency of volume movement.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, who has introduced a bill to cure the problem, called attention to the fact that the exemption section was passed in 1940—and I quote Senator Magnuson—"when barge transportation was in its infancy and when few legislators realized its great potential. Today this transportation has reached such magnitude that the definitions cited above are now both archaic and restrictive."

The bill, S. 1314, would permit mixing of regulated and unregulated commodities and enable barge lines to continue to tow each other's barges and thus make possible the accumulation of the large tows. If someone were suddenly to interpret a statute to forbid airlines from carrying more passengers than the standard of 1940—the DC-3—the effect would be as absurd as the present situation.

Everybody is agreed that we must somehow avoid cancelling out the efficiencies of the big towboat. No one wants to see increased freight rates which could result if the big tows are broken up into small units.

We are hung up on an obsolete law which must be changed. Opposing the change would be a little like favoring feather-bedding. We did not advocate feather-bedding for the railroads and we do not expect the railroads to advocate cancelling out the benefits of improved river technology.

If anyone here wants to strike a blow for encouraging continuing technological advance, support for S. 1314 would be appreciated by the water carrier industry, by shippers, by the general public which benefits directly, for example, from low electric rates founded on river-borne coal, by farmers, by maritime labor and by all those who are patiently planning the more intensive economic development of the river basins.

Water transport is today at the threshold of new technological advance. It seems only yesterday that our most frequently used barge was an open hopper vessel capable of carrying 500 tons. Today these barges are disappearing. The modern grain barge will carry 1,800 tons. Every year a new specialized barge is added to carry some exotic new chemical under pressure, or at high temperatures or at very low temperatures. Increasingly, the barge is a link in a highly sophisticated production process rather than a simple means of transportation.

Increasingly, too, industry is producing products which are too big to go by highway or rail. Atomic reactors for the new nuclear powerplants are going by river. We hope the bridge clearances of the future will be sufficient for king-size products as yet unimagined. It is an awesome responsibility to take an atomic reactor or an inter-planetary missile down the inland waterways. A mishap can mean huge financial losses, but, perhaps more important, can waste three years' work on the part of some of the most highly skilled teams in the nation.

Looking to the future, a major improvement in water transport efficiency will result from the development of a 12-foot channel on the Mississippi and Ohio and a nine-foot channel for the Missouri. For the 980-mile length of the Ohio, the 12-foot channel will soon be a reality. Barges today are being built with 12-foot depths in mind. On the Lower Mississippi it is thought that little would be needed to conform the river to a 12-foot minimum channel depth. Studies are already in progress and the benefit to the economy appears to be very great.

We are now told that in the decade ahead, the economy will demand more transportation per capita than ever before. In 1941, for example, 5,800 ton-miles of service were required per capita. Today, that requirement has grown to 8,900 ton-miles of service per head and may, by 1970, increase to 10,600. By 1980, every man, woman and child is expected to need 16,000 ton-miles of service a year.

This means vast expansion of every mode and tremendous changes in the techniques of doing business. It means a new situation in which, as the I.C.C.'s annual report has noted, surplus capacity in transportation no longer exists.

Private enterprise, responding to prudent and far-sighted public policies, has created the most advanced and efficient system of transport in the world. This system is a major factor in the quality and level of the nation's economic power.

The country is blessed with a tremendous network of water highways, of railroads, pipelines, airlines and truck lines which must now be rapidly expanded in response to public demand. Increasingly, and inevitably, the network must be considered as a single system. It is clearly sound public policy, sound economic policy and sound business policy to make sure that the new investment in expanded capacity is applied in service that is economically the most productive.

Advancing technology and expanding demand are both powerfully influencing thinking of both carriers and shippers on the question of coordination of service between the various modes. As transportation becomes a larger part of the production process, shippers are becoming more sophisticated in their demands for the most economical service. Where large savings can be achieved, for example, by water movement or by combined rail and water movement, they will either force coordination or move their factories to rivers to take advantage of the lower cost service. Competition gives them no choice.

Accommodation of demands for coordinated service can best be accomplished by voluntary cooperation on lines of sound economics. What is sound economics is usually also enlightened self interest. Islands of special interest will not be allowed to stand in the way of such important public programs as more intensive regional economic development. Wendell Berge, a former Assistant Attorney General in charge of anti-trust enforcement—and a Nebraskan—in a book entitled "Economic Freedom for the West" stressed that transportation rates make the difference between success and failure in regional development. He wrote that without artificial barriers or discrimination in rates, capital in Maine, California or Nebraska will have equal opportunities for investment in new industry.

Everyone prefers the voluntary route, but if serious artificial obstacles are placed in the way of coordination of water and rail service, for example, the new Department of Transportation, the ICC and the courts will insist on better coordination. I think it is inevitable that the new unit train service by rail will be coordinated with large capacity steamship service on the Great Lakes and modern barge tows on the rivers. Such coordination represents a better way of doing the job. Far-reaching economies will result which will be most important to future regional development. Railroads will find it impossible to refuse to sell their new technologies at river, Great Lakes and coastal ports. Successful new technologies cannot be isolated and selectively withheld from general public application.

We are beginning to hear again suggestions that better coordination could result if single ownership were allowed of different means of transportation. But none of the advocates of single ownership has so far answered the objection that single or common ownership would seriously damage competition to the disadvantage of the shipper and the public. Nor is there an answer to the simple fact that all the advantages cited for common ownership can be obtained through cooperative coordination of service without risk to the competitive process. Healthy competition is basic to the sound futuer development of our transport system. Experience with the department store theory of transportation has not been encouraging in the past. In the absence of competition, the well-known evils of monopoly have developed and the government has had to take a hand to reestablish competition.

I can recall that the entire Mississippi Valley opposed the proposal of the Southern Pacific and the Illinois Central to buy a barge line some years ago. The argument that such a merger would reduce or destroy competition prevailed. Nothing has changed since except perhaps the fact that the railroad merger trend is diminishing competition among the railroads and making the competition of independent water carriers more cherished than ever.

There is one final concern I would like to share with you. In the expansion ahead, a major objective should be to make sure that there is an adequate flow of capital available for new and improved transport capacity. Transportation companies must compete with all other segments of a rapidly expanding economy for money at reasonable terms. In our industry we are now talking of specialized chemical barges costing $750,000 compared to covered hopper barges at $60,000. Towboats are costing $1,500,000 where once a price of half a million was considered high. The same trend is true in every mode of transportation. The jet costs more than the piston plane, the bigger freight car more than the old standard boxcar, the modern truck more than the old one. However, it is through investment in costlier but more efficient equipment that the shippers achieve lasting benefits. Increasing efficiency in improved economic productivity of equipment, better use of capital, and better coordination of service are the *only* means of offsetting continually rising costs.

Transportation pricing must produce the earnings necessary to replace and improve equipment for the low cost water carrier no less than the airline in a profit-oriented free enterprise system. So far all modes have demonstrated confidence in the future by heavy investment in new and improved equipment. An important objective of the Department of Transportation and of the ICC should be to maintain this climate of confidence and the present healthy rate of new investment.

CAB CHAIRMAN MURPHY DELIVERS ALPHA SIGMA NU LECTURE OF 1967

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Omaha chapter of Alpha Sigma Nu, the National Jesuit Honor Society, each year sponsors a lecture by a distinguished personality in the fields of government, diplomacy, religion, and the arts. In previous years the list of lecturers has included former President Truman, Paul Cardinal Marella, and Gen. Albert Wedemeyer.

This year's lecture was by the Honorable Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, who spoke on "The Significance of Air Transportation in the Years Ahead."

The Creighton University chapter of Alpha Sigma Nu in its 45-year history has honored more than 690 students by election to its ranks. Two candidates are named each year by their respective deans from each of Creighton's seven colleges and schools. Graduate memberships are similarly conferred upon distinguished alumni. In all instances, election is based on scholarship, loyalty, and service to the university.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD the text of Chairman Murphy's remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY CHARLES S. MURPHY, CHAIRMAN, CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, AS ALPHA SIGMA NU LECTURER FOR 1967, AT THE CREIGHTON UNIVERSITY, OMAHA, NEBR., APRIL 30, 1967

I am greatly honored by the invitation of Creighton University to speak to you here today. As I look at the list of past Alpha Sigma Nu lecturers, I find myself in company that is at once humbling and heady—ambassadors of great nations, renowned generals, a spokesman for American medicine, a former President of the United States, a Prince of the Church, and most recently a charming woman of stature in both the world community and the dramatic arts.

The former President of the United States, of course, is Harry S. Truman—on whose staff I had the privilege of serving for six years. And that was a very great privilege indeed. My first visit to Omaha was with President Truman in June 1948 on the trip that he later came to call his "non-political campaign trip." This was a trip of about two weeks on a special train that went from coast to coast with a number of intermediate stops. It did, in fact, turn out to be an extremely useful "shakedown cruise" for the Presidential campaign that fall. It was on that trip in June that President Truman developed his famous "whistle stop" technique. The very valuable appellation "whistle stop" was a gift from Senator Robert Taft, who said the President was going across the country speaking at every whistle stop.

Omaha was one of the earlier stops on that trip. The President's World War I Division—the 35th—was having its annual reunion here. For me, the day we spent in Omaha was a very memorable day in the most memorable trip of my life. I'm sorry to have to say to the airlines that the most memorable trip of my life was made on a train, but that's a fact.

I never dreamed at that time that I would be back in Omaha under the happy circumstances of this visit. I am most grateful to you.

I want to ask you to join me today in looking for a little while at the industry which is my special area of responsibility these days—air transportation. At the Civil Aeronautics Board, it is our job to regulate and *promote* air transportation. We emphasize the promotional part of our job. This makes us somewhat unusual among the so-called regulatory agencies. I do not propose here to discuss at length the nature of the Board's relationship and dealings with the industry. However, I do believe that for persons who are interested in the subject of industry-government relationships, it presents a fascinating and productvie field for study. The Board is an unusual example of a government agency that make a positive effort to foster the growth and prosperity of the industry which it regulates so that industry can best serve the needs of the traveling and shipping public and the needs of our nation as a whole.

Air transportation is not one of the nation's largest industries. In fact, its total volume of business is much less than that of one of our large automobile manufacturers. Nevertheless, air transportation has added a special quality to our life and times. This special quality is the nearness of people and places that were once far away.

I am sure you sense this very keenly here in Omaha. No matter how strongly you may feel that your airline service should be better than it is, you must admit that what you have today is a far cry from the wagon trains you outfitted here not so many years ago for the long, long, journey to the far West. Perhaps that thought will be a comfort to you the next time you are sitting in the O'Hare terminal at Chicago waiting for a connecting plane. At least it's not a covered wagon.

Looking beyond the present, let me say that we at the Civil Aeronautics Board are enthusiastic about the prospects for improving Omaha's airline service in the route case we have recently instituted. We cannot tell, of course, what improvements will be possible until the case has been heard. And I'm afraid the examination of all the issues which will be raised in that case will be a more difficult and time-consuming task than you might think. But we will do our best to make those covered wagons an even more distant memory.

Air transportation is not a thing separate and apart unto itself. It is part of a total transportation system, which includes trains and motor vehicles and water borne vessels. And this total transportation system, in turn, has meaning for us only as it affects our lives as human beings.

Thomas Macaulay, the English historian, described the significance of transportation in these terms: "Of all the inventions, the alphabet and the printing press alone excepted, those inventions which abridge distance have done most for the civilization of our species. Every improvement in the means of locomotion benefits mankind morally and intellectually as well as materially, and not only facilitates the interchange of the various productions of nature and art, but tends to remove national and provincial antipathies, and to bind together all the branches of the great human family."

In our own country, we have known the eras of water transportation, of rail transportation, and of automotive transportation. We have seen each of them, in turn, grow in size and in usefulness in binding our people more closely together as a nation. They have been highly successful in welding us into one people. But even with our highly developed modes of surface transport, air travel is adding a new dimension to life within the United States. This is illustrated by the fact that 60% of all our intercity travel by common carriers now moves by air.

By far the greater significance of air travel, however, is the promise it holds out for us to strengthen our ties with other peoples all around the world. Today, we can think of so many people from so many countries exchanging visits that the concept of the brotherhood of man takes on new vitality. We are just at the threshold of this era. But we can see enough of the shape of it to know the opportunity is there—even though it be a shore dimly seen.

We know, for example, that the number of people who travel between the United States and Europe has increased by ninefold within the past 20 years, and that this has been made possible because almost 90% of them can and do go by air. We know that thousands of Americans—just regular, decent, friendly Americans—are making friends for us in the far corners of the world on their personal travels. I know this because I have been there and have seen it. I firmly believe that most Americans are good ambassadors and that we are far more warmly liked and respected in other countries than our news media would lead you to believe.

Thus it is that the great challenge and the great promise of air transportation span the oceans where man, who once could travel only as fast as the wind that filled a sail, will soon be traveling faster than the speed of sound. A poem called "High Flight" by John Gillespie Magee, Jr. captures the wonder of it all far better than I could:

> "Up, up the long delirious, burning blue
> I've topped the wind swept heights with easy grace,
> Where never lark, or even eagle flew;
> And, while with silent, lifting mind I've trod the high untrespassed sancity of space,
> Put out my hand, and touched the face of God."

Air transportation as we know it today has developed from scratch in the lifetime of many of us in this room. It was little more than 60 years ago that Orville and Wilbur Wright performed man's first powered flight at Kitty Hawk. Commercial aviation did not have its real beginnings until after World War I. It was still only a fledgling industry in the 1930's. Its real impetus, and growth into a major system of transportation has been since World War II. I expect that very few of us here today had done much airline traveling before that time.

Now, what do we have? A network of airlines that reaches into every corner of the nation. Dependable—last year U.S. airlines completed 98% of the flights their schedules called for, and completed about 75% of these within 15 minutes of the scheduled time. Safe—you are far safer on an airline than you are in your own automobile. We have a statistic by which we measure this. In 1966, U.S. scheduled airlines had a passenger fatality rate of .07 per 100 million passenger miles. At that rate, you could fly over 1.4 billion miles without being involved in a fatal accident. At an average speed of 500 miles an hour, it would take you more than 300 years flying continuously day and night. The accidents we do have are tragic—and I would not minimize them. But in relation to other activities, airline travel is incredibly safe.

Then there is speed. This is the magic ingredient that makes air travel something special. From Omaha to Chicago for a business appointment and back in the same day. From San Francisco to Los Angeles for dinner and back the same evening—I'm told that many people do it. From coast to coast in 5 hours. To Europe in less than 7. Around the world on a regular airline schedule in 55 hours. How long ago was it that a trip around the world in 80 days was only adventurous fiction?

How widespread is the use of this marvelous means of travel? None of us knows precisely. We estimate that more than 60 million Americans have traveled by air. Our domestic airlines carry about 100 million passengers a year, but many of them are repeaters. Indeed, once you try it, it's awfully easy to get to be a repeater.

The industry is growing very rapidly. The big strike last summer disrupted this growth, but it is still in the order of 20 to 25% a year. This rapid growth brings with it some severe growing pains and a host of problems. Notable among these is the problem of congestion at some of our busier airports. Did you know that during the peak traffic hours at O'Hare airport, a plane lands or takes off on the average of every twenty-two seconds? Or that during the busy hours at John F. Kennedy airport at New York this summer, planes will frequently have to wait a half hour or more at the end of the runway for their turn to take off?

But this rapid rate of growth also brings with it some wonderful opportunities to improve airline service to cities throughout the country. This is because the quantity and quality of service which it is possible to provide for any city depends upon the amount of traffic that uses the service. There must be enough business to make it possible for the airlines to pay their expenses and earn a reasonable return on their investment. Perhaps you would like to tell me that you cannot use the service unless it's first put there for you to use. There's something to that. Let's say that improvement in service and growth in traffic must go hand in hand. In that vein, it's the increasing use you have already made of the airline service here in Omaha, and the additional increases we expect in the future, that will make it possible for us to authorize improved service.

Airline travel has one advantage which I have not yet mentioned—economy. On a straight cents-per-mile basis, air travel is usually somewhat more costly than surface travel; but when the time saved is of some value, it is frequently more economical. Furthermore, the airlines are offering a number of bargain fares these days. These fares are usually not available every day of the week, and they have various conditions attached to them. But if money makes a difference to you, it will pay you to shop around to see if some of these fares will fit your travel needs. Sure, it's a bit of trouble to find out about all these fares and which one suits your need best. But if you were going to pay $100 or $200 for a rug or a dress or a suit of clothes, you'd probably shop around a bit and think it foolish not to. And the reasons why it makes good business sense for merchants to offer special bargains sometimes in rugs and dresses and suits are basically the same reasons why it makes good sense for the airlines to offer bargain fares sometimes.

Take my word for it. It's a good deal all around.

With the current level of airline fares, and the increasing levels of personal income, it has become possible for great numbers of people to take long journeys.

The motor trucking industry has a commercial that says "If you've got it, a truck brought it." I guess it would not be accurate for me to say, "if you're here, an airplane brought you." It may have been the stork. But there are getting to be a number of places in the world where almost all visitors arrive by air—Hawaii and the Virgin Islands, for example.

Last year, Hawaii had 520,000 visitors who came by air from the United States mainland. Think what this means. Think what it means in terms of building ties of understanding and affection between Hawaii and her sister states—of making us all parts of the same nation in fact as well as in name. Think what it means in developing the economy of Hawaii. Think what it means by way of enriching the lives of those half a million persons who were able to visit these beautiful islands.

It is not in the United States alone that things like this are happening. In Europe, for example, inclusive tour charters have brought the entire continent within reach of the average working man and his family. These charters combine the economies of a full passenger load on the airplane and large-scale purchasing of land accommodations to bring about a remarkably low total price for a vacation. These services began virtually from scratch in 1955. Less than ten years later, about one and a quarter million people were flying from Northern Europe to bask in the Mediterranean sun. These are people who would not ordinarily be among air travelers. They are the Britishers, for example, who had always gone to Blackpool or Brighton, because this was about the limit which their two-week holiday and bank account would permit. Again, think what this means by way of rewarding and exciting new experiences, and by way of greater exchange and understanding between peoples. As a matter of fact, we at the CAB have been so struck with the benefits of these package tour services—both to the traveling public and to the air carriers—that we have taken a leaf out of Europe's book, and have granted similar authority to some of our own air carriers.

The world's airline business is by no means an American monopoly—nor should it be. One hundred and thirteen nations belong to the International Civil Aviation Organization, the specialized agency of the United Nations having to do with air transport. This does not include the Soviet Union whose airline system is among the world's largest. As you may know, the United States has recently concluded an agreement with the Russians to authorize the first direct air service between our two countries. We expect that this service will begin this summer.

Many of the less developed countries of the world are far more dependent upon aircraft to meet their internal transportation needs than we are because they do not have our highly developed systems of railroads and highways. For these countries, providing the capital and the skills to establish and operate an air transport system, including airports and other ground facilities, is a tremendous challenge in itself. In a number of places, the United States is providing financial and technical assistance for these purposes. Substantial progress is being made. However, the needs are far from being met and much remains to be done.

Other industrialized nations have air transport systems whose state of development is comparable to our own, although none of the others is as large as ours.

The international air transport system is comprised of the airlines of many nations. One of the tasks of the CAB is to participate in the development of this international system. Along with our Department of State, we participate in negotiations with the governments of other countries to make agreements establishing international air routes to be served by United States and foreign flag airlines. We now have such agreements with more than 60 other countries. Then, subject to the approval of the President, the CAB selects the United States airlines to serve these routes and issues operating permits to the foreign airlines that come to the United States.

At present, the 129 airlines of 49 other nations are authorized to operate to and from the United States. Of all international air travel reported to the International Civil Aviation Organization, about half in terms of revenue passenger miles consists of travel to and from the U.S. Almost two-thirds of this traffic is attributed to U.S. citizens, but a little less than half of it is carried by our own airlines.

Manifestly, the functioning of this international air transport system, with its many airlines of many nationalities, presents many complicated problems. The fact that it functions extremely well is a marvelous achievement and a testimonial to the devoted efforts of many men and women from all these different lands. It is an outstanding example of practical, constructive international cooperation. The opportunity to participate in the activity is one of the most satisfying and thrilling aspects of the work at the CAB.

The international air transport system, taken as a whole, is not as highly developed as our domestic system. This means that both the needs and the opportunities for further development are greater. In this field, we can hope that better and more economical aircraft, accompanied by rising levels of income at home and abroad, will bring international travel within the reach of literally multitudes of persons. Can any of us doubt the efficacy of this in helping us to learn to live together better?

I spoke earlier of my belief that most Americans make good ambassadors abroad. This it not just a one-way street. We receive impressions from travels abroad, as well as giving them. We can learn from others as well as tell them something about ourselves.

I had an opportunity last fall to visit Southeast Asia for the first time. I learned many things—most significant perhaps, that the people there are human beings much like you and me. In Hong Kong, we had a native guide who told us about the people there, and their religion. He told us that over 90% of the people in Hong Kong were Buddhists, but that they also had some Catholics and some Protestants and some Presbyterians. Now, I probably never would have learned this without actually going there.

And Bangkok was a most surprising place. I don't suppose I really expected to see elephants in the streets and, of course, I did not. Neither did I expect to be able to walk into a grocery store and buy Vicks' cough drops in English, but I found that I could do just that.

Neither of these two cities will ever seem like a far away place to me again; nor will I think of their people as strangers. Because I have been there and seen them, and talked with them, they are now a part of me. If we can just get enough people making visits like this—in both directions—surely great good will come of it.

I cannot think of places and people in Southeast Asia without thinking of a subject that is much on the minds of all of us these days—the war in Viet Nam. Neither can I think of the significance of the airplane and its powerful commercial uses without thinking also of its significance as a weapon. These thoughts remind us of the great dilemma posed by the progress of science and technology.

We face this dilemma in its most acute form with respect to nuclear weapons, whereby mankind now has the power to destroy civilization as we know it. It is an awful thing to develop these weapons, but we dare not do otherwise for reasons of self-protection. At the same time, we believe the development and use of nuclear energy hold much promise for improving the condition of mankind if we can devote it to peaceful means.

So it is with aircraft. By the same token that they can be dreadful instruments of war, they can be even more marvelous vehicles of peaceful trade and commerce. How will the peoples of the world use their increasing mastery over the forces of nature? Will it be to make the earth a better place to live—or will it not? I wish I could tell. In our time, it seems that the answer is not clear. Just as there is so much good in the worst of us and so much bad in the best of us, we find technological progress being used today for both warlike and peaceful purposes.

With all the diverse interests among the nations of the world, with their various national needs and different political systems, with the temptation to seek personal power and aggrandizement—there are strong forces at work to use whatever means may be at hand for disruptive purposes. To counter these forces and keep them in check, require the utmost wisdom and patience and courage on the part of our statesmen. And, if I may say so, it requires these same qualities of citizens everywhere.

Mistakes will be made. No man is perfect. Infinite wisdom was not given to human beings. But there are some basic principles upon which our nation was founded, and by which it has lived. I would not abandon them now. Among these basic principles, is freedom. Freedom is at stake in the world today just as surely as it was in the days of the American Revolution.

One thing our improved means of transportation have done is to bind the peoples of the world even closer together. More and more we have reached the condition where we will sink or swim together. We have long thought of ourselves as an indivisible nation. Now we must recognize that we are part of an indivisible world. Viet Nam is closer to Omaha today than California was a hundred years ago.

I do not believe we can afford to let Southeast Asia be overrun by aggression. If it were, no one knows where the wave of aggression would end. The choice in Viet Nam today is the same kind of choice President Truman faced in Korea. And although the geography is different, the fundamental issues are the same he faced with respect to Greece and Turkey twenty years ago. Indeed, I would suggest to you that there may be more similarity in Viet Nam to the issues President Roosevelt faced at Pearl Harbor than many of us realize.

Today, President Johnson bears the same awful responsibility those earlier Presidents bore. Can he take the responsibility for yielding to aggression there? We know he cannot. No one knows where the consequences would end. That is a risk the President of the United States simply cannot afford to take.

Would that there were some easy way to stop the war in Viet Nam without yielding to aggression. But I'm afraid there is not. The way will yet be long and difficult. More men will die. Our leaders will make some mistakes along the way. But if we start to chastise them, we might ask ourselves how much we are adding to the difficulty of this job that cannot be abandoned.

There are millions of people in Southeast Asia who love liberty just as we love it here. There are millions of people there who are committed to our cause in this struggle, and who support our efforts. We cannot abandon them, for their sake or for our own. That part of the world is rich in natural resources and in its cultural heritage. Its great need is for economic development, which is now gathering momentum. There are many hopeful signs that, throughout Southeast Asia, the tide is turning toward peaceful development in partnership with the free world. We have much reason to hope, and certainly every reason to try, to make that part of the world a bulwark of freedom with justice.

I would not want to conclude our discussion here today of the airplane, and what it has meant and will yet mean to civilization, without referring to a familiar poem which is so aptly related to this subject and so remarkable in its foresight. This is a part of Tennyson's *Locksley Hall*, which, incidentally, President Truman has carried in his pocket since he graduated from high school. The poem was written in 1842, long before airplanes were used either for war or for peaceful commerce.

"For I dipt into the future, far as human eye could see.
Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonder that would be;
Saw the heavens fill with commerce, argosies of magic sails,
Pilots of the purple twilight, dropping down with costly bales;
Heard the heavens fill with shouting, and there rain'd a ghastly dew
From the nation's airy navies grappling in the central blue;
"Till the war-drum throbb'd no longer, and the battleflags were furl'd
In the Parliament of Man, the Federation of World.
There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

We dare to hope that in God's own time we will at last reach the happy state-of-being which was envisioned by Tennyson in those words.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The **ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK.** Calendar No. 80, a bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The pending question is on the motion by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to strike section 5 of the substitute amendment.

Under the previous unanimous consent agreement, the time of 2 hours, equally divided, is controlled by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to put in a brief quorum call, to last no longer than 1 minute, the 1 minute to be charged against the time controlled by the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time to be equally charged against both sides.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection?

Mr. **WILLIAMS** of Delaware. I ask that the time not be charged to either side.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the time for the quorum call not be charged to either side.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 98 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily absent.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** A quorum is present.

Who yields time?

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield myself 5 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. Mr. President, it seems to the Senator from Louisiana that the big question before the Senate really is: How do we go about providing capital for financing campaigns to reduce the influence of contribution of money, particularly the influence of large contributions, on decisions that this Government makes in the future?

The proposal that we passed last year would permit every taxpayer to put up $1 by simply marking a "Yes" answer to a question, on his income tax return, as to whether he desired $1 of his tax money to go into a presidential campaign fund to finance both major party campaigns. In other words, under the proposal, up to 60 million Americans would be privileged to contribute $1 each in such a manner that 50 cents would go to the Republican candidate and 50 cents to the Democratic candidate. Possibly $30 million could be available to each of the parties, eliminating the need of any candidate's making any commitment that would separate him from his conscience. It would leave a candidate in a position where he could advocate what he thought was right for the country, and would not have to worry about whether he could finance his campaign.

If he came out for a lower rate of interest, he would not have to worry that he might displease those on Manhattan Island or its environs. Nor would he have to worry that he might displease some major corporation president or executive if he should oppose paying for private patents with Government moneys.

That is not to say that he would have to take one position or the other, but he would be free to do so without any fear that he would be unable for lack of money to communicate with the American people and tell his side of the story.

In years gone by, those of us on the Democratic side of the aisle have seen good Democrats outgunned in some races by 10 to 1 from the standpoint of the money that was available to the other side for radio, television, and newspaper advertising, transportation for the candidate, and other expenses of running for office.

What we have on the statute books now does not prevent private contributions where one is so anxious to see a particular candidate elected that he wishes to put up more money for that candidate, even though the candidate would be adequately financed from the fund. But it does make it possible for a candidate to finance an adequate campaign without making any commitment that his conscience did not entirely dictate. In my judgment, Mr. President, that is the first step and the most important step toward taking corruption out of government.

It is one thing for a Senator or a Representative to have an erroneous opinion, or to do something that might not square with his conscience; he is only one of 100 in this body, or one of 435 in the other body. Even if he were successful in pushing a bad law through the Senate and the House of Representatives, it would be subject to a Presidential veto, if the President were seeking to protect the public interest. Very few Presidential vetoes have been overridden. We overrode hardly any under President Eisenhower—only about one or two. We have not overridden any Presidential veto under President Johnson.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

We can keep down corruption in government if we can prevent the executive—the President—who has a part in the lawmaking function and who is in charge of making all the appointments in the executive and judicial branches of the Government and in the quasi-legislative agencies from being subject to commitments that lead to mischief. The President would then be in a position to protect the Government from improper influence.

It has been suggested by some that $30 million is too much for a candidate to use. Mr. President, it is my judgment that $30 million, multiplied by 2, for a grand total of $60 million, is less than the major parties are spending now. I say that as one who has helped raise money for his party and has discussed the problem with those who have raised money for the opposition party.

The fact of the matter is that there is a great deal of money raised in campaigns that is not reported. No one knows where it comes from, or where it goes. In my opinion there is more money raised which is not reported than there is that is reported. Much of it is raised locally, and then, when it comes to the matter of spending it, there is a great deal of spending that does not get recorded. As a matter of fact, even in the report of the Gore committee, which sought to investigate the money that was coming in and going out of campaign treasuries, the report's author stated that he only found part of the revenue; he did not begin to find it all. In that committee's report, there was an item of expenditures classified as "other"; and that item, "other," accounted for about 40 percent of all the funds spent. That item accounted for about 40 percent of all expenditures by both parties.

I have tried to discover what comes under the item "other." Certainly it does not have to do with printing, publications, and other such matters, which seem to be well documented. I confess that I do not know. If any Senator knows the answer, I wish he would stand up and tell me what is included in the item "other." For example, can the Senator from Tennessee tell me what that 40 percent of the expenditures would be, what items it would include?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

The Senator indicates he cannot. The reason I asked that question was that the other evening a business friend who had been a generous benefactor of both major parties remarked that he wondered if that item "other" included "keeping money"—that is, money that somebody raises locally through a fund-raising effort in support of a candidate, with the intention to keep it at home.

I have seen some of the reports to the national committee which were submitted when I asked the national committee, "What's with this State? I was out there campaigning for the candidate, and none of the funds raised there were available to pay my expenses in campaigning there." How that local committee could have spent all that money is a challenge to my imagination.

Suppose a report from a State or local committee should contain an item, to pick a name, of "public relations, Joe Blow." Well, I know that Joe Blow is a politician down on his luck, who has not been elected to anything for years, a politician turned public relations man, and there he is, charged with 40 percent of the money. From the point of view of my business friend, who has contributed very liberally to campaigns in the past, he wanted to know if that "other" included the keeping money. I suppose it does include the keeping money—what somebody raises and keeps and does not turn in.

It has been proposed that the money made available under the provisions of this act should not be controlled by the candidate for President and should not be controlled by the national committee, but should be controlled locally. I do not agree that some State committeeman or some State treasurer should have the discretion to say what is done with the money raised for presidential candidates. My experience has been, in trying to campaign for a candidate out of my own pocket, that no matter how diligently the man works or how much money he collects, in the end he will ask the national committee for more money, perhaps after disposing of the other funds under the item "other." That looks, to this Senator, like keeping money raised, but not spent in the campaign.

There could not be any keeping money under the law as it now stands on the statute books. One would have to document every item of expense; he would have to have a voucher and receipts, and give them to the General Accounting Office to show how the money was actually spent. In addition to that, expenditures would be subject to review by a bipartisan board of Republicans, Democrats, and independents who would study the figures to see if they indicated any improper activity.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In about 2 minutes I will.

Mr. President, from the beginning I have been willing to consider and, if it is meritorious, support any proposal that any Senator wanted to write into the law in order to guarantee that this money which was being spent from $1 contributions of citizens would not qualify as keeping money, but that it would actually be money that was legitimately spent for proper campaign expenditures. I was asked by the junior Senator from Maryland [My TYDINGS] if I would be willing to accept and support an amendment that would limit expenditures to television, radio, and newspaper advertising, and the transportation of the candidate himself.

I said, "Yes, that is all right with me." I think if those expenses are covered, and we also say in the law that a person cannot accept or spend money for those purposes that was received from any private contributor, that it would be a long stride in the right direction. If Senators want that safeguard in the law, I would be happy to support it. What I am opposed to is wiping off the statute books the one thing we now have which does move toward better financing of presidential campaigns and instead bringing back the old, corrupt setup that has existed hitherto, where the candidate does not know where his financing is coming from.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 1 more minute.

He does not know where the money is going, and he does not know what commitments have been made in return for it.

Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The Senator has spoken at some length about keeping private contributions from being improperly used.

I inquire of the Senator what limitations, what regulation, what control in that respect does the Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966 possess?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 42 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator is building a strawman of big campaign money and corruption and the keeping of campaign money as if the act of last year did something to correct those practices.

The only thing that act did was to pour more money into the pot and commingle public money with private money from whatever source, however questionable it might be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator is badly in error.

I have contributed to presidential campaigns. I have worked hard to raise money for presidential campaigns as most other Senators have done, and as the distinguished occupant of the chair has done.

When we go out to try to help somebody get elected President and when we put up our hard-earned cash, one of the real difficulties we have is to make sure that somebody between us and that candidate does not keep the money. One of our real difficulties is to see that, instead of its being spent frivolously or pocketed by somebody somewhere along the line, the money is actually spent effectively to help a candidate.

When we say that we are going to provide $30 million, as the law now stands, to pay essential expenses, we mean that the candidate must certify his expenses. He will present a bill. He will have to certify that it is for a legitimate campaign expenditure and he will have to identify the person to whom the money was paid.

The General Accounting Office, which is the biggest accounting office in the world, will check the items, and that Office must be satisfied that the money was spent for legitimate, correct, proper political purposes for the election of a President. Otherwise, the distribution will not be made for such an expenditure.

We seek to amend the existing provision, and we will do so if we are permitted after this vote, to limit it to radio, television, newspaper advertising, and the transportation of candidates.

If someone were to come to me or to someone a little richer than I am and say: "I want you to put up more money," I would say: "Why? What do you want it for? What expense do you have that would require me to put up more money to help elect this Democratic candidate, or any other candidate for that matter?"

The man would say: "Well, perhaps we will not need it for transportation. Maybe we will use it for some other purpose."

What we would do, if I had my own way about it—and if the Tydings amendment prevails, which I will support—is to further tighten up the requirements and say: "As far as expenses for radio, television, newspaper advertising, and transportation of candidates are concerned, the candidate must elect to finance them entirely from the campaign fund, or be denied any money from the fund." That being the case, it would make it easier to work out the budget for the other expenses.

The candidate could then decide whether he wanted to spend money for some campaign paraphernalia, straw hats with his name printed on them, little costumes for the girls to wear, or a brass band for a parade. These are some things that he could raise private contributions for. However, he would have to agree that the money made available from the campaign fund would be all that would be coming to him for these communication expenses, and that no more could be spent by him for them or by anyone that seeks to serve him, represent him, or to advance his candidacy.

That procedure would avoid the commingling of funds. The candidate would present bills for his expenditures of money for these purposes. He could use any privately raised funds for other purposes.

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has a good idea. I would go along with him.

As far as I have been concerned, from the very beginning, I would have been willing to say that when we make this money available that is all that will be available to either side. The difficulty with that approach, however, is that I would certainly expect much vehement Republican opposition if we tried to do that, because in years gone by the Republicans have been so much better financed than have the Democrats.

Rowland Evans wrote an article in the Sunday Washington Post explaining what happened at the first bipartisan meeting on this matter. A Republican Member immediately said to a Democratic Member: "If we are to cooperate on this program, you must understand that nothing herein will prevent parties from getting private contributions in addition to what is made available here." The reason for that statement is that the Republican candidates have been historically so much better financed than the Democratic candidates—in some cases by as much as 10 to 1.

Another reason why I believe we need the type of financing which I advocate is that it should not be possible only for a person of great wealth or one who has inherited great wealth or one who is the darling of those possessing great wealth to be a candidate for the Presidency of the United States.

Any mother's son born in this country should be eligible to be considered for the office of President of the United States, if that person's service to his country and his talents, or her service or talents, prove that person to be worthy of serving us in the highest office in the land. It should not be necessary for that person to sell his soul or to make commitments he would rather not make in order to obtain some assistance and necessary financing to present his case for the highest office in the land.

I am told by those who financed the Adlai Stevenson campaign that it was necessary to cancel a television program because of lack of funds. I know as a Democrat who had some doubt for whom he wanted to vote, even on election eve, that when I wanted to hear what Harry Truman had to say, I had to listen to that Dewey bandwagon for 11 solid hours before I could listen to Truman for 10 minutes. Harry Truman had only 10 minutes in which to make a very brief appeal. He won in spite of it all. However, it should not have to be that way.

Both candidates should have an adequate hearing before the American people so that the American people, being fully and adequately informed on both sides, can be in a position to make a proper judgment as to which person is better qualified to lead the Nation in the years ahead.

If we prevail in this effort to keep what we presently have, those of us who are seeking to eliminate corruption from government and provide an honest way to finance the presidential campaign with $1 contributions, propose to go forward and improve on what we have succeeded in doing.

We propose to do that in this very act by taking the Tydings-McGovern amendment. We then propose to conduct hearings with the full benefit of all the discussion and advice which we have had in the past year on this subject and all the debate on the floor during the last month. We propose to take the best suggestions and the best advice that any Senator has been able to come up with to improve on our handiwork this year.

Having done so, we propose to improve on the measure next year. I would say that after 3 years of hard work on the subject we would just about have taken care of everybody's problems.

Mr. President, this is the biggest stride we will have made in this century toward eliminating improper influence and corruption from government.

Some people are just beginning to realize that the little amendment involving a potential $60 million is about 50 times as important to this Government as the pending bill which involves $1 billion itself.

While it is true that we have about 20 times as much money involved in the bill to restore the investment credit as we have involved in this single amendment, the issue on which we will be judged by history is: Were we willing to move to clean up corruption or did we want to retain the old corrupt system carried over from the past.

We have made a strong stride toward honest, clean government. This is a good law so far as it goes. It does provide that the biggest accounting office in the world, the General Accounting Office, will check on every bill that is paid. In addition, there will be a bipartisan board composed of Republicans, Democrats, and independents, to watch one another and see that nothing goes awry with the money that is spent. In the event somebody wishes additional safeguards over these funds, I shall be glad to consider the matter on its merits, and I shall be glad to support the ones which are judged meritorious after having been given a most thorough study.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. RIBICOFF. I have listened to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Tennessee and the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. Is it not true that the questions raised by the Senator from Tennessee will be brought out at the hearings and at the markup of the bill in the Committee on Finance?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes; they will be.

Mr. RIBICOFF. And is it not true that the Senator from Louisiana intends to hold hearings forthwith on this entire subject matter, to attempt to correct some of the matters to which the Senator from Tennessee objects?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I certainly intend to do so.

May I say, Mr. President, that no other Member of this body has shown greater genius at finding flaws in existing laws or in proposed laws, and in correcting those flaws, than the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF].

On some of our social security bills, he has introduced many amendments to prevent little things that would go wrong with the program or that would go wrong with the bill, calling upon his magnificent experience as Governor of his State, as a Member of the House of Representatives, as a Senator, and as a member of the President's Cabinet when he served as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Senator from Connecticut is a great lawyer, and the type of talent that he brings to our committee makes it possible for us to find defects and correct them.

I have been somewhat dismayed that the Senator from Tennessee, an able lawyer and a very good legislator, has been so completely negative, only seeking to find fault and not to come up with answers. Usually, the job of a lawyer is not only to find the problem, but also to draft an answer which will prevent that problem from creating any mischief.

Mr. RIBICOFF. May I say to the Senator that, having followed the entire debate, I am in agreement with many of the proposals of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. It is my intention to support those two Senators in many of the amendments that will be necessary to perfect the entire Long financing proposal.

To me, the great tragedy would be to wipe this proposal off the books and to fail to give the Senate an opportunity to perfect the entire proposal. It would be my hope that we would go along and vote with the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, because I take in good faith the assurance of the Senator from Louisiana that he will hold immediate hearings, and that there will be ample opportunity to go over this bill in committee; and I believe that all of us will have an opportunity to perfect this law and for the first time come up with a really good law to finance presidential campaign expenses. I would also hope that it would be the start of a method to finance senatorial and congressional campaigns. The Long proposal is the vehicle, and I should not like to see that vehicle destroyed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, although this vehicle may be imperfect, it does guarantee that we will move ahead, that something will happen. That is one reason why those who want no change, those who seek to preserve the old system of favoritism and corruption, do not want this law to remain on the statute books. If this act remains on the statute books, although it is a mere authorization and does not appropriate 5 cents for the Republican candidate, the Democratic candidate, or anybody else, it does offer the taxpayers—60 million of them—a chance to mark off on their returns whether they would like to have $1 go to finance the campaign—50 cents to each party.

That is what they fear, I suppose: that the people would be given a chance to say on their tax returns, in the most thorough poll ever taken, whether they would rather substitute a system of $1 contributions for the old system of corruption that has existed up to now. My guess is that the opponents of this legislation are afraid to have that poll taken. I welcome it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Louisiana. He has taken a tremendous amount of criticism throughout the country. He is conducting a hard and effective fight against what I believe is the most corrupting force in American life today.

Not only is it irking, annoying, and demeaning for candidates to have to go out and seek money in this way; it also is corrupting. The Senator from Louisiana and I know that when a contributor makes a contribution of $5,000 or more to a presidential campaign—and many big contributions are made—in many cases such a contributor believes he is buying something with that contribution. Anybody with a brain to think knows that that is true. Many idealistic people make contributions. But the fact is that a great deal of this money is for the purpose of buying an interest in the Government.

Is it not true that so long ago as 1907, 60 years ago, Theodore Roosevelt foresaw this problem and asked for exactly this kind of arrangement, so that the people would pay for it out of general appropriations or pay for it in a way similar to that proposed by the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is correct.

Mr. PROXMIRE. From my experience in the State Legislature in Wisconsin and during the 10 years I have been in the Senate, when we have tried over and over again to reform the Corrupt Practices Act, I am convinced that this method will provide a far more equitable method of paying for campaign contributions. But in past years we never got to first base. We never got close to it. We never got a Corrupt Practices bill that would regulate primaries, let alone one that would go as far as the Senator from Louisiana has gone.

I agree with the Senator from Connecticut, the Senator from New York, the Senator from Tennessee, and the Senator from Delaware that a number of the proposals that have been made are good and represent amendments and changes that should be approved, and I would certainly support them.

We definitely should limit—I understand that the law does not now do so—any other contributions to the presidential campaigns, and the Senator from Louisiana agrees. I believe that the present law provides too much power for a few centralized party officials.

What is important is that this proposal starts the process that Theodore Roosevelt recognized years ago. Regardless of the eloquence and the sincere arguments of the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from Delaware, and the Senator from New York, if we do not approve this proposal today, if we vote against the Long amendment today, I am convinced that it will be 15, 20, or perhaps 30 years before we will again have any real chance for a law that will begin to end this very serious corrupting force in American politics, before we can provide an opportunity for candidates to run for office on an equitable basis.

The need for these changes has occurred rapidly in the last 15 years, with the advent of television and with the effective campaign that candidates can conduct on television. As an example, anyone who studies the huge amounts of money spent on behalf of Governor Rockefeller when he ran for reelection in New York last year and considers the remarkable effect of that TV campaign can imagine what a big advantage would be created by a heavily unequal division of money in a presidential campaign in 1968 or 1972. It can mean that money will spell the difference. And all the experience we have had in the past will be dwarfed by what is likely to happen in the future unless we act now. Keeping the Long law alive is by far our best hope.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for his fine fight. I shall support him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, to anyone who finds something wrong or some possible miscarriage of good intentions in the act that is on the statute books, I say, "Bring up your amendment."

I recall what former majority leader of the Senate Lyndon Johnson told me one time when I came to him and said:

> Here's something going on that's just terrible. What are you going to do about it?

He said:

> Don't bring me any more problems. I have all the problems I can say grace over, the way it is now. If you have some answers, bring me some answers, not just problems.

And I say to those who find minor fault with the act when we are trying to make a major correction—to do more to clean up corruption than has happened in a hundred years in the history of this country—do not come in with some piddling amendment, or some petty fear.

Show us how we can correct what might be wrong in this act, and let us talk about it. We will work with you.

I see the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] on his feet. He has ideas about what is wrong with the proposal, and he has been constructive. He said, "Here is what I think we should do about this matter." He has been very helpful.

Mr. TYDINGS. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Connecticut.

Of course, if any of us had the ability to simply press a button to incorporate the election reforms we would like to have into law we would certainly tighten and broaden those laws to include many of the amendments and suggestions made by the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. I intend to support them at any time I can.

The fact is that we have had such opportunities before, when the Senate passed the strong anticorrupt election law, only to see those bills die in the other House. No one knows better than the Senator from Tennessee, who conducted weighty and thorough research into the 1956 election campaign, the effect of the tremendous contributions made by a few individual families in the outcome of a presidential election.

It is just not morally right when four, five, or six major families contribute over $1 million to one party, while the other party goes along with perhaps $100,000. Elections can be influenced. That is not right.

Three weeks ago I offered an amendment to the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act to limit application of that act in the case of the presidential election of 1968. I did so because I believe we should gain some meaningful experience, but carefully limited experience, with the campaign fund idea before the act's provisions become fully effective. The Senate accepted that amendment on a rollcall vote.

Subsequently, that amendment was eliminated, as were all the other amendments to the investment credit bill, when the Senate recommitted the bill with instructions to report back only the investment tax credit bill, with a provision to repeal the campaign fund bill as of July 31, 1967.

The distinguished junior Senator from South Dakota and I feel that the Campaign Fund Act would be materially strengthened if the provisions of that amendment I offered 3 weeks ago, which were adopted by the Senate, could be, subsequent to this vote, agreed upon by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana and restored to the Campaign Fund Act.

I think everyone knows the cost of

modern campaigning has skyrocketed, especially in the case of presidential elections, where candidates must campaign coast to coast.

The question is: How shall these advertising and other campaign expenses be met? Traditionally, before enactment of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act last fall, the many millions of dollars necessary to pay for a presidential campaign had to be begged and borrowed from private sources.

As the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] said, this procedure is to be charitable, demeaning, at best. In many instances it tends to place the presidential candidate under tremendous obligations which he should not be under.

Prior to the enactment of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act, Congress had long considered proposals for freeing political parties from financial dependence on special financial interests. Countless proposals to broaden public participation in the financing of political campaigns have been offered. I certainly support them wholeheartedly.

If we had on the books today a law which would provide a tax credit for the $10 contributor and the $100 deduction, we would not be confronted with this debate. In the $1 checkoff we are taking a step in the right direction.

Not until the Senator from Louisiana secured the enactment of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act did Congress act to cut the financial tie between presidential candidates and special interests by providing a basis for massive but reasonable public participation in the funding of presidential campaigns.

The time was long overdue. I am confident that the Campaign Fund Act revisions which the Finance Committee will suggest will vastly improve the measure.

Nonetheless, it seems to me that the value of a trial run experience, limited to 1968, which the Senate approved in the Tydings amendment to the Presidential Campaign Fund Act 3 weeks ago, is so clear that it should provide the point of departure for the entire campaign fund bill.

(At this point, Mr. MCINTYRE assumed the chair.)

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The Senator from Maryland has spoken a number of times, as did the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] about the fact that this law cuts off special contributions from individuals or families, or anybody who might want to buy an election. President Kennedy suggested this in proposed legislation in 1961 and President Johnson has suggested it since that time.

Can the Senator from Maryland tell the Senator from New York where in the Long Act there is any provision which would stop a family from doing that in the kind of situation described? Where in the legislation which we are considering today does it prevent the kind of situation described?

Mr. TYDINGS. When a presidential candidate starts out from scratch after he has been nominated, assuming that the Long campaign fund bill, as amended, remains the law, that presidential nominee would have, if my amendment is subsequently adopted, $12.5 million with which to pay his television bills, printing bills, radio bills, and traveling bills, which constitute the basic costs of a presidential election. He would not be involved in running all over the country, attending special dinners with special groups, and special parties, and spending at least half of his time worrying about how he is going to beg or borrow enough money to finance that last television program which is scheduled on the last day of the election.

There is no limitation in the act against contributions for other purposes. But the fact is that the main burden of fundraising, borrowing, and soliciting, many times from special interests, will be lifted from his back. That is the main and sole purpose of this Election Campaign Fund Act: to free the presidential candidate.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Would the Senator answer my question? Where in this bill, in this legislation, would it prevent the situation where the family which the Senator describes gave $1 million to a presidential candidate? Would the Senator answer that question? Where in the legislation is it prevented?

Mr. TYDINGS. Where is what prevented?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. The kind of situation that the Senator from Maryland described.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is nothing in the legislation which makes it illegal for one family to give more than another.

But the fact is that the necessity for the presidential candidate himself to go up to New York or to some city in the West, or to some other place, and to sit down and try to get the money from one source, or two or three powerful sources, is eliminated. It is the necessity of this kind of thing which is lifted. Nothing in the law says that one family cannot contribute more than another.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I cannot yield further. I have only 12 minutes remaining. I am willing to yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator from New York ask questions on his own time?

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I shall wait.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator is most kind.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield the Senator from Maryland 1 more minute. I have only 12 minutes left; the other side has 60 minutes.

Mr. TYDINGS. In the event the motion of the Senator from Louisiana prevails, would he agree to accept the amendment of mine which was adopted by the Senate 3 weeks ago which would, in effect, in the election of 1968, limit the amount to $12.5 million and limit the type of expenses to those incurred for advertising media—including radio and television—and to traveling and related expenses for the presidential and vice presidential candidates?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In answer to the Senator's question whether I would accept the amendment which was adopted by the Senate, yes, I would. However, my impression is that it would be better to let the Senate vote on my motion to strike; otherwise the Senator's amendment would be stricken.

Mr. TYDINGS. I understand that. My amendment would be applicable only if the Senator from Louisiana should prevail.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to permit me to address a question to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to me that we will be wasting time if we take further amendments.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senator from Maryland will withhold the amendment he has spoken of, and will allow the Senate to pass the important tax credit bill without encumbering it with further amendments. The Senator from Louisiana is under a mandate from the Senate to hold hearings and to report a bill in much more perfect form, if, as I believe, the committee can put it in more perfect form. So far as I am concerned, I am weary of having all these amendments offered. I have voted against all of them and shall continue to vote against them.

I ask the Senator from Maryland not to offer his amendment, because to offer it may affect the position of the Senator from Florida on the whole matter.

Mr. TYDINGS. In answer to the Senator from Florida, I shall withhold my amendment at this time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield to permit me to ask a question of the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, how much time remains to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 30 seconds to the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that whenever the Senator from Maryland decides to offer his amendment, I be listed as a cosponsor. I wish to associate myself with the position taken by the Senator from Maryland. I am sure all of us have had some apprehension about the bill as it was originally introduced by the Senator from Louisiana, but the amendment which he has agreed to accept will go a long way toward relieving much of that apprehension, in my opinion, I hope that at the proper time the amendment will be adopted.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask that the time be charged to both sides.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, can we understand that, having done so, we will not insist on a live quorum, but that we will call it off after a few Senators have come into the Chamber?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] as he may wish.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, a great deal has been said today, and efforts have been made heretofore, to picture the Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966 as operating, in some manner not yet explained, to curb improper influence of money upon the body politic. There is no limitation or restriction whatsoever with respect to private contributions in the law which I seek to repeal. There is no regulation. There is no prohibition. There is no discouragement of private contributions. None whatever.

Some people appear to regard merely pouring more money into a political campaign as election reform. That is not the kind of election law reform which we need. Let us be candid and acknowledge that there is a danger to our system of self-government through the undue influence of money in elections.

If I believed that the law which we passed so hastily last year contributed to election law reforms, if I thought it moved in the direction of cleaner elections, if I thought it in some manner restricted undue influence of money in elections, then I would feel differently.

But, Mr. President, the law we so hastily enacted makes the situation worse instead of better.

The able junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] makes the point that if, by the existing law, sufficient finances are provided from the Public Treasury for the presidential camapign, then there would be more private money for senatorial campaigns.

Does that operate to lessen the influence of money?

To begin with, political campaigns have an insatiable appetite for money. I suppose I have studied this question as much as anyone in the Senate. I have never known of a campaign in which there was enough money. There is always another television program which appears necessary, another worker to be hired, another way to seek to bring influence to bear in a candidate's behalf.

The act of 1966 would in no way limit private funds for a presidential campaign or any other campaign.

We have had the law now since last fall. Has the President's Club been disbanded? Is there any diminution of efforts to raise private funds? I know of none.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. Not just now.

But even if this act should have some salutary effect upon raising private funds for the presidential campaign, which I deny, I think it would still make the situation worse, particularly because it would commingle public money with private money from all of the questionable sources to which reference has been made here. It would make more difficult the disclosure of the use of private funds obtained from improper sources or in questionable amounts.

It would tend to cloak all of the campaign fund with the aura of public finance, making segregation and identification more difficult, and all of this would be done without any safeguards whatsoever. All of the money could be used in one State or in a few States. It could be used to reward or punish candidates for the Senate or candidates for Congress. It would tend to restructure our whole political party system, concentrating power in two political bosses in Washington.

But, Mr. President, even if the 1966 act had a salutary effect upon the presidential campaign, are the candidates for President the only candidates for public office? Candidates of the two major parties for President of the United States have generally been able to raise sufficient funds. How does a poor man run for the Senate? What would this law do for candidates for the Senate? The Senator from Louisiana says it would make more private contributions available for candidates for the Senate. Is that necessarily good?

What we need is election law reform, genuine, thoroughgoing reform. And it must consist of two parts. One part is the provision of public funds to assist in attaining the goal of the conduct of honest elections; but the second part, equally important, if not more so, is to safeguard the ballot box from the undue influence of money, whether public money or private money.

The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 is a hindrance to genuine election law reform. I think we will have the most fortuitous situation, since I have been in public life, to enact an honest election law if we can repeal the unsound measure we enacted last year. That act stands as an obstacle. Election law reform, if we are to achieve it, must go hand in hand, in the same package with a measure providing public funds.

I believe this debate has focused public attention upon this problem as it has never been focused before. I think there is sentiment in the Congress—particularly in the Senate—to write a genuine election reform law. For the first time the whole Senate has, by a vote of 64 to 22, mandated a legislative committee to report a bill within 6 weeks. But the Senate, by that same vote of 64 to 22, directed the Senate Finance Committee to report a bill back to the Senate with only two provisions—one, restoring the investment credit, and, two, repealing the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

Now the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana has offered an amendment to undo what the Senate directed by a vote of nearly 3 to 1. And we are advised that, if this amendment is adopted, the Senator from Louisiana will accept and vote for other amendments. Thus would we start the Christmas tree building again.

We have just heard the distinguished Senator from Maryland offer a long and technical and complicated amendment. On the mimeographed document that has been passed around to Senators is the language, in parentheses, "To be offered by Senator TYDINGS if Senator LONG's amendment to strike the campaign fund repeal date carries."

Thus, the Senate is on notice that, if the pending amendment is adopted to the committee bill, then others are in the wings waiting—not only the Tydings amendment, but perhaps the livestock amendment and others. Who knows how high such a Christmas tree might grow?

Mr. President, I know that a number of persons have been concerned with the restoration of the investment tax credit. How may we achieve that quickly? We may achieve it by passing the bill reported from the committee, which the committee was directed to report by a vote of 64 Senators. If we vote down the pending amendment, and all other amendments, then we can, as soon as possible, in a matter of hours, send this bill to conference with the other House.

I personally think this issue has been debated too long. I was prepared to vote last week. I was prepared to vote yesterday. I am prepared to vote today. And though I hope to win, I am prepared to accept the will of the Senate as expressed in this vote. There comes a time, after full debate and full consideration, when majority will should prevail in this body.

I have no amendments to offer, no points of order to make; neither, insofar as I am advised, does the senior Senator from Delaware. We are prepared to vote. And what is the issue? It is simple. Repeal or retention of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966—not as one would propose to amend it, not as one might wish it to be, but as it is. That is the issue. It is simple.

When I first came to the Congress, succeeding to the seat so long and honorably held by my fellow townsman, the late Secretary of State Cordell Hull, upon arrival in Washington I went to him hoping to get a little advice from one who had been a playmate of my father. He gave me but one brief piece of advice:

> Young man, stay on the floor and learn the rules. They might come in handy some time.

The consideration of this issue in the Senate has been in some ways instructive in parliamentary procedure. We have an unusual parliamentary situation prevailing now. We have an amendment pending which is neither subject to perfecting amendments nor to substitute amendments. And a rollcall has been ordered. Thus, the issue is simple, and it cannot be changed. The issue is repeal of the act that we passed hurriedly in the closing hours just before adjournment last year, or retention of it, with all its admitted faults.

This is the issue on which we are to vote in a very few minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator stated that the President's Club still exists. I was under the impression, first, that we have not appropriated a single nickel to help either side, up to now; and, second, that the Democratic Party still has a deficit which we have been trying to pay off ever since the last election. If we still have a deficit that we are trying to pay, I would assume that the Senator from Tennessee would not object too much to our trying to pay our honest obligations.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I did not raise any objection to the President's Club. Both parties are still undertaking to raise funds in many ways. That is the only point I was making. It may well be, as many Senators now seem convinced is the case, that we need to move in the direction of providing public funds for election to public office. If that be so, Mr. President, then we must do so with adequate safeguards. In doing so, we must also free the ballot box from the undue influence of money. That was the point I was seeking to make. It is a goal I desire to achieve. The existing law is, in my opinion, a hindrance to the achievement of that goal.

But be that as it may, the question now is the repeal of that law or the retention of that law just as it is—not as it would be if various amendments were adopted. They are not in order now. They are not before the Senate. We have this unusual parliamentary situation under which we shall vote on repeal or retention of the law as it is, unamended, unadorned, unimproved.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator talks about this being a so-called Christmas tree bill. Of course, that name has been used in this Chamber to refer to a bill that had irrelevant and extraneous amendments on it.

Mr. President, what was the first irrelevant and extraneous amendment offered to this bill? In my view, it was one offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]—the one for which he is still fighting. I would be willing to strip this measure down to a bill to restore the investment tax credit, and keep it that way. Why would not the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, that does not happen to be the situation. The Senate, by a vote of 64 to 22 recommitted th bill, with instructions to the committee to report out a specific bill. That committee bill is before the Senate, and the able chairman of the committee is undertaking to undo what the Senate directed his committee and him, as chairman, to report back to the Senate.

That, of course, is within his rights as a Senator. I do not question that. I am only stating what the situation is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. The vote of 64 to 22 was rather decisive, and this was the second vote by which the Senate has taken a position to repeal the 1966 act. The first vote for repeal was 48 to 42. Then there was this vote of 64 to 22. And now, after the whole Senate has acted, by a vote of 64 to 22, the able junior Senator from Louisiana is undertaking to undo what 64 Senators have directed be done, and, in addition, he has agreed to accept other amendments that will be offered later if his amendment is agreed to.

Mr. President, I say that those who wish to see this bill go to the President for signature, and restore the investment tax credit, had better vote nay when the time comes to vote on the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.,

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Senator recall, that at the time we had that vote upon which the Senator places great emphasis, that we had a very unfortunate situation, that there had been a failure of communications between the majority leader and the assistant majority leader, who was manager of the bill and who happend to be me?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to go into that.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Oh, the Senator does not want to discuss it; is that right? He does not want to talk about that?

Mr. GORE. I do not wish to discuss that episode. The fact is, the Senate voted and knew what it was voting on, 64 to 22.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a question.

Mr. GORE. I yield time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator would not really want to mislead the Senate, would he?

Mr. GORE. Not unless I expected to gain immeasurably from it. [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does not the Senator recall that the junior Senator from Louisiana, even though that motion was against his best interests, voted for the motion, that he sat there and advised at least 15 other Senators to vote for the motion, because a confusing situation had arisen which caused the majority leader to feel that his own leadership was at stake—and the junior Senator from Louisiana would not challenge his leadership for the world?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing for the junior Senator from Louisiana, on his own time, to discuss that situation. I am pointing out what the parliamentary situation is now, and I shall stand content with that.

The question is whether we will pass this bill as the Senate, by a vote of 64 to 22, has directed, or whether we shall adopt the Senator's amendment, and be on notice that the chairman of the committee has already agreed to vote for and accept at least one other amendment; I do not know how many he may agree to accept.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Not just now. The Senator may take his time.

The junior Senator from Louisiana has said he will not accept the will of the Senate unless we vote his way. Well, there is such a thing, I suppose, as a leader who may be without followers. I believe the Senate feels we have debated this issue long enough, and I believe this will be the eliminatic vote, and will end the battle, whichever way it goes.

I just do not think the Senate is going to be very patient with the prospect of another several weeks of debate on this issue. At least I am prepared, and the Senator from Delaware says he is prepared, to yield now to the will of the Senate. I hope that it is the will of the Senate to repeal this unsound, unwise bill that we passed in such haste, under such duress, in the adjourning hours last year.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. GORE. I believe the Senator from New York asked me to yield first. I yield first to him.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I ask the Senator from Tennessee, Is not this legislation we are considering now essentially the same legislation we considered 4 weeks ago, with all the imperfections that existed in the original Long bill?

Mr. GORE. The vote to be held in a few minutes is on the same issue on which we voted once before, 48 to 42, except that we have had an intervening 3 weeks, that there is uneasiness, now, throughout the business world, about the restoration of the investment credit, and that we are now on notice that another effort may be made to erect another Christmas tree through this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, I have sat here for a good deal of the time during the course of the debate these last few weeks. I have heard the bill discussed in various ways. If the bill were as it has been described this afternoon and would accomplish all of the things that it is stated it would accomplish, I would vote for it, because we need legislation badly in this area.

Some legislation in this field was sent up by President Kennedy in 1961 and by President Johnson in 1964 and 1965. I would vote for and support all of that legislation.

I am a cosponsor of legislation sent up by President Johnson and of an amendment proposed by the Senator from Delaware. However, the legislation we are considering today, which bears the name of the Senator from Louisiana, does not accomplish any of the things that are proposed in the other bills I have mentioned.

There would still be a commingling of funds and the use of private funds, even with this legislation.

As I believe the Senator from Tennessee pointed out, there would still be a demand on private donors to give money to the candidates. Even if each side were given $15 million or $20 million, each side would be competing with the other to raise more money so that they could spend more on television, radio, advertising, or election day expenses.

We would still have to go to the large donors under this legislation and ask them to contribute money.

As the Senator from Maryland mentioned, six or eight people in a family could and would still combine to give $1 million. We would still have to go to those people.

The pending measure does not rectify the kind of conditions and imperfections which exist in the law at this time.

The pending measure would not help a senatorial, a congressional, or a gubernatorial candidate. Those candidates would still have to go to private donors for private donations. It would not help that situation at all.

The Senator from Louisiana mentioned Frank O'Connor in the State of New York running for Governor. It would not help him one single, solitary bit.

The pending measure does not improve the reporting provisions as they exist at the present time. It would not help in any of these areas.

Yet, we are asked to vote for this legislation on the ground that it is a beginning.

When we voted 64 to 22 last week, we were saying that a congressional committee had to hold hearings and report back to the Senate in 6 weeks on a good election reform bill. That is what we need.

This measure is worse than the existing law. I do not see how anyone can support it as a beginning, or for any other reason.

It would give $30 million to an individual Republican candidate and to an individual Democratic candidate for President. I can understand how they would be in favor of it. However, it would not help a senatorial, congressional, or gubernatorial candidate. It would not help to provide the election reform that is needed in the United States.

I have not heard one argument directly in favor of the actual measure that bears the name of the Senator from Louisiana. I have heard arguments that it might do something in the future because we will correct the bill and bring it up to date.

I do not think that is the kind of legislation we want. We are being asked to pass legislation that all Senators, even those who advocate the pending measure, admit is a very bad piece of legislation. We are told that if we pass this legislation, we will get reforms and changes in the legislation when we have hearings. I do not think that is a sensible way to proceed.

For all of these reasons, I support the position taken by the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from New York.

I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, in my opinion, this is a thoroughly unsound amendment, and I hope it will be defeated.

What we are trying to get in the Congress of the United States is a fair and clean election law.

The pending amendment makes little, if any, progress in that direction. I voted for it reluctantly last year. I am sorry that I did. I think I made a mistake.

The debate which has taken place in the Senate during the last few weeks, to my way of thinking, has constructively demonstrated the inadequacy of the pending amendment.

The pending amendment has no provision to deal with the vexing question of free radio and television time. It has no provision dealing with an adequate accounting for campaign contributions.

It makes no effort to reform the Corrupt Practices Act which badly needs overhauling.

It has no provision whatever for dealing with congressional or senatorial elections, much less gubernatorial elections.

It has no adequate campaign financing arrangements.

Student of this problem have made reports for many a year, and I go back to the days of that great Senator from Missouri, Tom Hennings, who put through the Senate in 1957 or 1958 one of the best clean election laws which has ever been proposed. We could well take a leaf out of the book of Tom Hennings.

This is a half-baked effort to get a large amount of money to be spent by the two major political parties next year in the presidential elections.

What we need to do is what the majority leader got through the Senate by an overwhelming vote—to hold comprehensive hearings on a clean election law and bring out a good bill after such hearings, as the result of which witnesses will be heard, and there will be a printed transcript. The Senate can then consider the measure as it should be considered.

I regret that the majority leader decided to put the whole matter in the Finance Committee. To my way of thinking, the Finance Committee has jurisdiction only over such changes in tax law as are necessary to insure clean elections.

The Commerce Committee has jurisdiction over the problems of radio and television and their impact on campaign financing.

The Committee on Rules and Administration, on which I serve, has jurisdiction over the Corrupt Practices Act and disclosure of campaign financing.

In that committee there are already bills pending which I hope will be shortly scheduled for hearings.

I urge the Senate to reject this unsound amendment and give the members of the Committee on Rules and Administration and the Commerce Committee an opportunity to deal with the aspects of this problem which are within the jurisdiction of those committees. They can then go over to the Finance Committee and let their views be known.

I have three bills pending to cover these matters.

I introduced President Johnson's election reform bill last year at his request. That bill has been ignored by the pending amendment.

Mr. President, I hope very much that the Senate will support the position taken by the able Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], one of the greatest authorities on fair election campaign financing, and reject this amendment and let us go back to the committee procedures and report a sensible bill which has been thought through.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, a great deal has been said about the vote by which the Senate gave instructions to the committee. I voted for the motion. I advised at least 15 other Senators to vote for the motion.

I did not want to embarrass my majority leader. There had been a very unfortunate misunderstanding that made it necessary for me to vote for the motion, even though I was really opposed to it.

Those of us who voted for the motion then proceeded to ask a parliamentary inquiry. We asked the Chair whether we had the right to amend the bill, and the Chair advised that the bill was open to amendment. I offered the amendment we are going to vote on in a short while.

A motion was made to table that amendment, and the motion to table failed. It failed by four votes. It was clearly the decision of the Senate that it wanted to vote on the amendment, that it wanted to go ahead and legislate and consider this particular amendment.

If we agree to the pending amendment, it will make this a clean investment credit bill. The Senator from Tennessee is very much concerned that the investment credit might not pass. I am glad that he has changed his mind. In his minority views, which are in our report, he advocates that the whole bill be defeated, that we throw the whole thing in the trash can. Perhaps he has changed his mind and does not mean that we should defeat the whole bill.

There has been some talk about how this bill would not solve any of the various problems that have been raised. The Senator from New York has said that he would be in favor of the $100 deduction plan. That would not solve any of the problems, not a one of them. The problem of commingling of money would still exist. The problem of who would put up the money would not be solved.

My amendment solves more of the existing problems than does the deduction alternative. My amendment makes it possible for every taxpayer to put up $1 of his tax money. It encourages him to put up $1, because it would cost him nothing from his own personal account to put up that $1.

Everybody agrees that small contributions are a good thing, because nobody could possibly buy a candidate or influence him improperly with a single $1 contribution. We have provided for $1 contributions. We then proceed to say divide the dollars people care to put up 50–50 between the two major parties.

It is better to do it that way than to have people contribute to the party of their choice. Why? In the first place, how would you know which party you want to contribute to if you are an independent voter and want to hear what both sides have to say before you make up your mind? In the second place, it may be that a $1 contribution to the candidate of your choice might be self-seeking in some instances, because the man might be seeking some particular thing he wants that candidate to do. But if a taxpayer puts up $1 equally divided between both sides, that $1 can be considered a contribution to good Government and not in expectation of an advantage one way or the other.

Mr. President, this arrangement would help both parties. Suppose I vote for the Democrat, and the Republican wins. I should like to have it so that the Republican did not have to make any commitments. Suppose I were a Republican but the Democrat wins. I should like to have it so that the Democrat did not have to make a single commitment in order to finance his campaign. I should like to have it so that both men can say what their consciences require.

I should like to have it one more way—so that a man does not have to be the son of a millionaire in order to have a chance to be elected President of the United States. Yes, Mr. President, I have said it before and I say it again: If I had my way, any American citizen born in this country could be President of the United States, be he a child who was abandoned in the bullrushes or one born in a manger; anyone who has the right qualities of leadership to lead this great country could be eligible to run for the Presidency.

We heard a Senator say, "I can understand why this man would vote this way, and I can understand why that man would vote that way." And I can understand why some people would vote against this amendment. They want to keep the law the way it is, so that only the rich can run for the Presidency of the United States. If I had my way, those people would have to compete with 190 million other American citizens to lead this country, because all these young people have much to offer. They are being given fine educations—even sons in the most humble homes. We may even see the day when a person of any race or creed in this country will be considered for President of the United States—even if he is a person of humble bearing and no wealth—solely on his merits, because he is qualified, has performed great service for his country, has served loyally in time of war and sincerely in time of peace. And what is wrong with that?

It has been said that we do not amend the Corrupt Practices Act. The Senator from Delaware has some amendments to that act which he previously put on the bill. He told me he was going to offer them again and hoped I would not oppose them. I shall not oppose them.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 1 more minute.

We have tried to do things about the other campaign financing schemes. For example, at one time we passed a $100 deduction plan. I call it the "fat cat plan." A poor man cannot afford to put up $100. Under the "fat cat plan," $100 deduction would be worth $70 in savings to a rich man and only $14 in savings to a poor man. To some poor person living on social security, who pays no income tax, the "fat cat plan" would be worth zero. The House would not accept it, for good reason.

Mr. President, I am willing to accept the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS]. He seeks to improve on what the Senate agreed with me on last year, and I am willing to go along with any constructive suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 1 more minute.

I am willing to go along with any constructive suggestion to fix it so that we improve this Government, to fix it so a man need not accept corrupt money, to fix it so that both sides—the Republican and the Democratic sides—can parade truly as parties of the people and their candidates can march in that light. We could then say that we will no longer have a system by which large contributors have a great deal to say about what happens after the election, but that we will have a system by which $1 contributions, given to both parties on an equal basis, will give both sides an equal opportunity to be heard. We could then be assured that the public would decide the issue, having heard both sides adequately and fully, no side having had any advantage over the other.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall take a half minute to call to the attention of the Senate, particularly those who wish to end this issue, that the able junior Senator from Louisiana has just advised the Senate that if his motion prevails he is going to start accepting amendments of this Senator or that Senator, and also that he will accept any other constructive suggestion to correct defects in the 1966 act. Well, it needs correcting. The best way to start is to vote down the pending amendment, and then this bill could go to the President for his signature before the week is over.

I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time—it is 7 minutes after 3—and vote, if the Senator is ready.

Mr. LONG of Lousiana. I am not ready yet. I have 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. President, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has been opposing me every step of the way with regard to the Long Act. He did offer two amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act. They have been applauded by the press around the Nation. He has indicated to me that regardless of the vote on this amendment, he intends to offer his amendments, and I told him that I would accept them, regardless of the outcome, because the Senate has already voted in favor of them on other occasions. We voted for those amendments twice, and I see no point in opposing them at this time.

I have also indicated that I would accept an amendment, which the Senate has already agreed to, which would reduce by more than one-half the money available under the Long Act and would limit the use of the funds to the payment of expenses for communication with the voter by radio, television, and newspaper, and the transportation of a candidate. Those are amendments that the Senate voted, and so far as I am concerned, they need not hold up this bill.

The Senate will have another chance to vote on this amendment, if I have my way, and we will have a chance to vote on the amendment after we have considered everybody's ideas, everybody's suggestions or problems. I hope that when we do vote again, we will have constructive thinking from those on this side of the aisle, rather than negative thinking; and I hope we will have good advice and good suggestions from those on the other side of the aisle, so that we may resolve this difficult problem in a way which will do the greatest service to all and the greatest justice to this country.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was agreed that we would have a quorum call and then the vote.

Mr. GORE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana to strike section 5 of the substitute amendment.

A quorum call has been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 99 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] to strike section 5 of the substitute. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the

Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is necessarily absent, and his pair has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 52, as follows:

[No. 100 Leg.]

YEAS—46

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—52

Aiken
Allott
Baker
Bennett
Boggs
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Russell
Scott
Smith
Spong
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—2

Gruening
Murphy

So the amendment of Mr. LONG of Louisiana was rejected.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have the floor. I was recognized. I know what my rights are. I want to discuss the matter.

Mr. President, I have seen some pressures brought to bear on Senators in this Chamber. I had hoped very much I would have the courtesy of at least one or two votes from the opposing side of the aisle. Certainly, I had reason to think that at least one or two Senators on that side thought I was right in this matter. I have seen what pressures can be brought to bear when one has a great Republican leader who says he desires to have a solid party-line vote. I notice that he had a solid party-line vote. Would that we could do that on the Democratic side and vote every man, to a man, on an amendment, with the Senators giving the benefit of doubt to the leadership on their side of the aisle.

I regret to say that the Senator from Louisiana had the experience of seeing Members on the floor vote who never even heard the debate for a moment. He would like to discuss this matter with some of them, because he believes that if they had had all the facts available to them, they would have voted with the Senator from Louisiana on the last rollcall.

Some persons seem to have the idea that the way to get the investment credit is to keep the Campaign Act repeal amendment on the bill. I said before that is not the way to get the investment tax credit. It is irrelevant. It has nothing to do with the bill. It encourages other irrelevant amendments.

The President, when he sent the bill down and recommended its passage, recommended that it be passed substantially as it was, without adding extraneous amendments to it.

That is how the House acted. The House passed an investment credit bill and sent it to us. The Senate Committee on Finance reported the investment tax credit bill with only one amendment. That amendment was germane to the bill. That amendment was an investment tax credit amendment. It was entirely germane. It had to do, 100 percent, with the subject matter of the bill.

With regard to the principle behind the amendment just voted upon the idea that no candidate would have to make any commitment, when he runs for President, be he a Republican or a Democrat. I am led to believe that it was felt by those who advised the President, and the President himself, to be the finest move toward honest government and the biggest step toward eliminating corruption that has been made by Congress to date.

So I am glad to have a chance to be heard by some Senators who were not here before.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Well, I would make one rather pleasant observation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I will yield for a question, if the Senator can make it in that form, because a Senator must protect his rights to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. My friend, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, does not believe for a moment that I do not entertain an affection for him that is as high as the highest summit and as deep as Mohole?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I love the distinguished minority leader. I have great regard for him.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It is not only a question of having affection for him, but it is also a question of whether I love Caesar more or love Rome less. Of course, it had to be the other way around. It is because I love Rome more—because of my love for my country—that I felt that the Senator should be defeated on this issue. Is there anything particularly illegal or unethical about going to those on one's side and asking them to show their party devotion and to stand by?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not point the finger of scorn at the Senator from Illinois. I only wish those of us who have responsibility for leadership on this side of the aisle were so effective. I do not complain of what he did. He had a right to do it, and I think he is very effective at it. I do not chastise him. I salute him. He left no stone unturned.

May I say that those of us on this side of the aisle have some rights in the matter. I personally feel this bill could best be stripped of these extraneous amendments. If we cannot do anything about that, then I should like my colleagues to consider a few matters.

It was stated that we were going to be given an opportunity to vote on the Corrupt Practices Act. I should like to know if the Senator from Delaware desires to offer a corrupt practices amendment.

Mr. President, throughout the several weeks that debate has taken place on the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966, I regret very much that no member of the minority party has seen fit to speak out in support of the act. The unanimity of the Senate Republicans in opposition to last year's act would lead one to believe that a firm party position has been taken against public support of political campaigns and for the traditional method of soliciting large private contributions for such purposes. As I have said before, it is not hard to understand the position of the Republican Party on this subject. Traditionally, that party has had easy access to most of the sources of large campaign contributions. Larger contributors, wealthy persons, by and large have associated themselves with and supported the Republican Party as a means of protecting their wealth.

Therefore, it is a pleasant surprise that former Vice President and former presidential candidate Richard M. Nixon, in an article published last Sunday, recited some of the bleak facts about the costs of political campaigns.

I would commend to the Republican Members of the Senate the April 30 edition of This Week magazine, in which a gentleman who was their presidential standard bearer in 1960, and who could well be again in 1968, is interviewed on the question, "Do You Have To Be Rich To Be President?" Mr. Nixon's answers to a number of questions concur with what I have been saying for the past several weeks, that political campaigning, particularly for the Presidency, is getting to be so expensive, it is almost impossible for one to get elected unless he is rich or unless he can lay his hands on large sums of money.

Mr. President, at the conclusion of this statement, I shall ask that the entire This Week interview with Mr. Nixon be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but I want to recite briefly a few of the questions and answers printed in that interview.

First of all, Mr. Nixon was asked whether he thought it is possible today for a poor man to become President. He replies that such a man would "have to have an awful lot of breaks."

He was asked, considering this need for money, what did he think was going to happen in the years to come. He said:

> Well, it is more likely that when you have two men of equal abilities a rich man will be elected president over a poor man. It is also possible that a rich man who is less qualified could defeat a poor man who was more qualified by spending more money on television, mailings, research, image-making, all of the things that go into a modern Presidential campaign.

Mr. President, Mr. Nixon is saying in effect what I have been stressing for the last several weeks, that a President will not be elected necessarily because of his ability, but rather because of how well he has gotten himself across to the public, and that a rich man will be better able to do that than a poor man.

In response to a question as to whether the Presidency eventually will become the private preserve of the rich, Mr. Nixon replied:

> Because of the increased costs of campaigning there is going to be a trend where in the House, the Senate, governorships, and, of course, the top office, more men of wealth will be in office than previously. It is already happening.

The next question was whether the voter does not lose when only rich men are candidates. Although Mr. Nixon was careful not to cast aspersions on a race between two rich presidential candidates, he did say:

> I think that ideally the system should be one in which the country would be able to select the man who is best qualified. Sometimes he may be a rich man, and just as often he may be one who is not wealthy.

Mr. Nixon, who knows better than perhaps any Republican in the Senate what the costs are of election campaigns, stated that in 1946, when he first ran for Congress and when there was little, if any, television, he needed $25,000 to campaign for his House seat. He estimated that that same House contest today would cost from $75,000 to $100,000. He said that the total expenditure for his first Senate campaign in 1950 was roughly $500,000, but that today a Senate race in California could run anywhere from $2 million to $3 million. He estimated that campaigning for the Presidency in a primary in a State like New Hampshire cost as much as a half million dollars for Senator Goldwater and Governor Rockefeller in 1964, or a quarter of a million dollars apiece. And in a presidential campaign, between the Democratic and Republican candidates, Mr. Nixon guessed that the costs would not be the approximate $30 million reported in 1964, nor the $60 million as would be shared equally under last year's Long Act between the Republican and Democratic candidates. Instead, he said for such a race the sky is the limit.

When he was asked what the poor man with political ambitions could do in view of these fantastic costs of campaigning, the former Vice President said that such a man has to be successful in moving up the ladder of public service through the years or else he does not have a chance.

> If he does reach a pre-eminent position—

Mr. Nixon went on—

> then he has to convince the party's financial chiefs that he is the best candidate.

I particularly like Mr. Nixon's answer to the question:

> And there aren't that many men around with $100,000 to run for office?

He said:

> It isn't a question of the man having to be worth $100,000 himself, but it is a question of his being able to get others who will be willing to put it up. Apart from any amounts you would spend on television, radio, advertising, direct mail, any candidate has to put together a staff. A man running for the Presidency has to write articles, answer his mail, prepare speeches and the like. To maintain a minimum staff of, say three stenographers, one press man and one research man, you are talking in the neighborhood of $50,000 or $60,000 a year, right off. And this is, believe me, a minimal staff.

Mr. Nixon was refreshingly candid when the question was put to him as to whether the candidate himself had to worry about day-to-day financing. He responded:

> Unless he is independently wealthy, he does. Most candidates spend a full third of their time wondering where the money is going to come from, speaking to potential contributors in meetings, on the telephone, etc.

And finally, the interviewer asked him what would happen to a fellow like Abe Lincoln who didn't have a fortune. Mr. Nixon answered simply:

> Well, he might make it today—I say might—if he could get adequately financed.

I would hope that my friends on the other side of the aisle would re-read this question-and-answer session with Richard Nixon. He is a political pro who has been through the campaigning process, campaigning himself for Congressman, Senator, Vice President, and President, and he has worked tirelessly in the campaigns of others for every conceivable office.

He knows the ins and outs of what it takes to finance a successful campaign, and I think his answers to the questions put to him in This Week indicate as well as anything how unhealthy it is when candidates for public office in the United States must rely on personal wealth or on the personal wealth of a few individuals to get elected. Unwittingly or not, Mr. Nixon's answers support widespread public financing of presidential candidates such as can be found in the $1 per taxpayer checkoff plan enacted by Congress last year.

Mr. President, I think I should like to read this article in its entirety, because if I do say it, here is a man who has served as Vice President of the United States, as a Senator from the State of California, as a Representative. Certainly Mr. Nixon would be one man who would well know what the problem is.

I now read the questions and answers.

> Q. *Do you think it is possible today for a poor man to become President?*
>
> A. He'd have to have an awful lot of breaks. First of all, he couldn't start without the base of some kind of public office, like the governorship of an important state or the office of U.S. Senator. In my own case, the reason I had the chance to become President was that I first was elected to the Congress. By getting elected to the Congress, I obtained a public forum. I also obtained a staff—a small one—but one at least which could answer my mail, get out my press releases, and do research for me.
>
> Once an individual goes into public life and is successful, he can acquire somewhat equal ability to compete with somebody who is much wealthier. Even then it is an advantage to be a man of wealth. I can't emphasize too strongly, however that the major need of a candidate is to get his qualifications known.
>
> Q. *What are the expenses of getting your qualifications known?*
>
> A. If you are attempting to campaign in a primary in a state like New Hampshire, like Goldwater and Rockefeller did in 1964, I would guess as much as a half million dollars, $250,000 each. The candidate either has to have a great deal of independent wealth or he must have access to major campaign funds. And a man can't get campaign funds until he already has acquired a national reputation so that people think he has a chance and are willing to bet on him.
>
> Q. *With this need for money, what is going to happen in the years to come?*
>
> A. Well, it is more likely that when you have two men of equal abilities a rich man will be elected president over a poor man. It is also possible that a rich man who is less qualified could defeat a poor man who was more qualified by spending more money on television, mailings, research, image-making, all of the things that go into a modern Presidential campaign.
>
> Q. *Do you think that eventually the Presidency will become the private preserve of the rich?*
>
> A. Because of the increased costs of campaigning there is going to be a trend where in the House, the Senate, governorships, and, of course, the top office, more men of wealth will be in office than previously. It is already happening.
>
> Q. *Doesn't the voter lose when only rich men are candidates?*
>
> A. Well, I wouldn't go so far as to say "lose," because the country has had some good Presidents who were wealthy—Theodore Roosevelt, for example, was considered to be a man of much more than average means. My point is this. I think that ideally the system should be one in which the country would be able to select the man who is best qualified. Sometimes he may be a rich man, and just as often he may be one who is not wealthy.
>
> Q. *What are the costs for other election campaigns?*
>
> A. Well, in 1946 when I first ran for Congress, we didn't have the staggering television costs that exist today. We spent $25,000 in my first campaign. The House contest today in that same district would run any place from $75,000 to $100,000. When I ran for the Senate in 1950 we were talking about a total expenditure of roughly $500,000. Today, a Senate race in California—and of course the population has increased—but a Senate race can run anywhere from two to three million dollars. As for the Presidency, the sky is the limit.
>
> Q. *What about the poor man with political ambitions? What can he do?*
>
> A. He either has to be successful in moving up the ladder of public service through the years or he hasn't a chance. If he does reach a preeminent position, then he has to convince the party's financial chiefs that he is the best candidate. For anybody to suggest that, for example, a college president or a newspaper editor or somebody of that type would be Presidential timber and could start out because of his immense qualifications and put on a campaign which would win primaries and get seriously considered as a Presidential candidate—this is utterly naive! This isnt possible in the United States today.
>
> Q. *And there aren't that many men around with $100,000 to run for office?*
>
> A. It isn't a question of the man having to be worth $100,000 himself, but it is a question of his being able to get others who will be willing to put it up. Apart from any amounts you would spend on television, radio, advertising, direct mail, any candidate has to put together a staff. A man running for the Presidency has to write articles, answer his mail, prepare speeches and the like. To maintain a minimum staff of, say, three stenographers, one press man and one research man, you are talking in the neighborhood of $50,000 or $60,000 a year,

right off. And this is, believe me, a minimal staff.

Q. *Do big contributors demand favors?*

A. Much less than the public would imagine. It is hard work running for any office and most Congressmen and Senators—Democrats and Republicans—work hard after they're elected. You take so much of a beating that if somebody comes up and tries to throw his weight around you just tell him to go to the devil.

Q. *What about that old axiom, "I think we ought to have a rich man as President because we know he won't steal."?*

A. No. It's a bromide. When you look at the Presidents of the United States, rich and poor, you have no examples of thievery on the part of the President himself. There have been some people around our Presidents who have been corrupt, but none of the Presidents themselves.

Q. *But does the candidate himself have to worry about the day-to-day financing?*

A. Unless he is independently wealthy he does. Most candidates spend a full third of their time wondering where the money is going to come from, speaking to potential contributors in meetings, on the telephone, etc.

Q. *What happens to a poor fellow named Abe Lincoln who lives out in Illinois and doesn't have a fortune?*

A. Well, he might make it today—I say might—if he could get adequately financed.

Mr. President, eminent political scientists have long been concerned over the unwholesome effects of reliance upon a *relatively small number of contributors* to finance presidential election campaigns.

One of the distinguished political scientists who has written on the threat to democratic government posed by the dependence upon large campaign *contributors is Prof. Pendleton Herring, of* Harvard University.

Professor Herring in his book, "The Politics of Democracy," quotes the "poet of democracy," Carl Sandburg, on the significance of money as political currency. *Sandburg wrote a poem which goes like this:*

> The first question is, where do we raise the money, where is the cash coming from?
> The mazuma, the jack, the shekels, the kale, the velvet,
> The you-know-what, the what-it-takes, a roll, a wad,
> Bring it home boy. Bring home the bacon. Start on a shoestring if you have to. Then get your first million.

As Herring put it:

> Of what use is the ballot if it is outweighed by the wallet?

He said that—

> Experience clearly indicates that different "men of promise" make different kinds of promises to various interests and that money does not adhere so generously to candidates whose policies are unsympathetic to the interests of wealthy men.

Herring continued:

> Where so much of the goods of society is for sale you never know the limits upon the power of money until you dicker. If the talents of the artists can be bought in the open market, why not those of the legislator? . . . The influence of wealth permeates governmental as well as commercial relationships. Money is needed to run political parties and the support of party politicians is often needed for success in business.
>
> In a society wherein money talks, its voice is bound to be heard in politics whether or not we like its crude accent. *Here is a language more universal than Esperanto and infinitely more eloquent.* . . . The danger to popular government lies not so much in the use of money itself as in the lack of balance between political groups of wealth and those of poverty.

I should like to repeat that last sentence:

> The danger to popular government lies not so much in the use of money itself as in the lack of balance between political groups of wealth and those of poverty.

The objective of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 was pure and simple—to correct that "lack of balance between political groups of wealth and those of poverty." That law will enable presidential candidates to forego coseying up to big money. Our presidential candidates will no longer have to limp along leaning heavily on the shoulders of those who come to them with open wallets and checkbooks. Those who write checks should not write policy. An open wallet should not necessarily mean an open door. We all know what I mean. For example, as Professor Herring put it:

> Ambassadorships . . . while highly useful as rewards for favors rendered, also require men of ability. Generosity alone is far from being the optimum qualification for a diplomatic career!

Professor Herring said that the danger did not lie so much in the use of the money itself as in its sources. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 solves the tremendous problems now involved with the sources of *presidential campaign money.*

Last year's act goes far toward taking care of the above-described difficulties. And, as I have repeatedly stated, we will be willing to add whatever additional safeguards may be required in the future *to make sure that the funds provided under the act are properly spent.*

Professor Herring concluded:

> Our failure successfully to reconcile the inequalities of private wealth with democratic doctrines of political equality is reflected in campaign abuses, corrupt practices in politics and the unsatisfactory tone of public life.

Mr. President, the repeal or gutting of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act would simply perpetuate that "failure to reconcile the inequalities of private wealth with democratic doctrines of political inequality." Our act of statesmanship last year demonstrated a firm commitment to democratic government. It would be the height of folly—indeed tragic—if we overruled our commonsense of last year and once again forced a presidential candidate to stand before us with one hand outstretched to the American people and the other hand outstretched behind his back to the few.

Another top political scientist who has concerned himself with the problems connected with campaign financing is Prof. V. O. Key, of Harvard University. In his book, "Politics, Parties, and Pressure Groups," Professor Key has some insights which we should consider before we determine whether we are willing to turn our backs on the progress we made last year in enacting the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. Perhaps Professor Key's observations will serve to refresh our memories regarding some of the reasons for passage of the presidential election campaign fund law.

Here is what Key has said:

> In the calculus of the average man about all that the figures on campaign costs mean is that it takes a lot of money to finance the election of the representatives of the people, but even that conclusion may be of profound significance for the workings of a democratic order. *Competition for control of the Government comes to be limited to those candidates and groups who can command considerable sums of money.* Money does not necessarily win campaigns, but in contests for offices of importance no mean sums are essential to make a decent showing. *The pecuniary necessities of parties and candidates give great strategic advantage to those with money to spend on politics.*

Continuing, Professor Key stated:

> It is certain, however, that the democratization of campaign finance remains to be accomplished. The finances of neither party are dominated by the contributions of the small giver: both still rely in large degree on people who can afford to give $100 or more . . . .
>
> The dependence of the national parties on large gifts may create obligations to large contributors as a class, whereas the gift of the individual donor bulks so small in the total campaign fund that his importunities may be resisted, given the will on the part *of the victorious candidate.*

Then, Professor Key asked:

> Why do men contribute to party funds?

His answer:

> In national campaigns the motivation behind *the mass of contributors is usually* not mysterious. In elections in which great issues are at stake the cleavage has been fairly plain. The bulk of the money from men of wealth has been on the side of the party that promised least disturbance of the status quo.

Professor Key had another interesting *comment which sheds light on one more interesting aspect—and problem of campaign financing:*

> Fund solicitors avoid goldfish bowls, furthermore, the insidious effect on candidates and party committees of the need for raising money should be kept in mind. In the positions they take *and in the questions they avoid* they must find it difficult to avoid being influenced by the fact that some course of action would certainly cut off contributions in the future.

In other words, the problem is not just what you might do for a campaign contributor, but also that which you do not do—refraining from doing something which might be harmful to his interests. We are speaking here of the large contributor's interests. What about the public interest which may not be as well financed nor identified.

The threat to democratic government was laid out quite clearly by Professor Key:

> The fact that both parties draw most of their income from an infinitesimal proportion of their following certainly gives to the financial supporters a voice in party affairs far disproportionate to their numbers.

Mr. President, we all know these hard facts of life. I cannot for the life of me understand those who would want to put our presidential candidates right back into the financial straitjackets from which we liberated them without enlightened legislation of last year.

Now, Mr. President, I wish to discuss for awhile an editorial published in the Washington Post on May 1, 1967, which I thought was a rather truthful, well-considered editorial.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, before getting into that item, will the Senator yield, with the understanding that he may do so without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. LONG of Lousiana. Mr. President, I should be glad to yield for a question. Is the Senator trying to make a Record insertion, or make a speech?

Mr. MORTON. No, I did not intend to make a speech. I should like to speak for about 1 minute on a subject that is very much apropos of the grave matter that the Senator is discussing so well.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Well, Mr. President, I do not feel like yielding for a speech at this time. I should like to conclude my statement, and then, in due course, perhaps we can get around to the Senator's speech. Then I will be happy to hear him, after he has heard my statement.

Mr. MORTON. It is not a speech. I have requested that the Senator yield 1 minute, with the understanding that he may do so without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have an amendment which I——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Muskie in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object to the Senator holding the floor and yielding for the purpose of anybody offering an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has been recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I send to the desk my amendment No. 147.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. Who has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana has yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin has been recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I said I would object to the Senator from Louisiana parceling time on the floor. If the Chair recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin in his own right, that is all right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to me?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say I yielded the floor to the Senator from Wisconsin. The Senator wanted to call up his amendment. I said, "Go ahead and address the Chair." He addressed the Chair, and called up the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the Chair understood the Senator from Louisiana yielded to the Senator from Wisconsin. At that point, the Senator from Wisconsin was recognized by the Chair, and the Senator from Louisiana took his seat. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized, and offers an amendment, which the clerk will report.

Mr. MORTON. Do I understand that the Senator from Wisconsin has the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin now has the floor.

The Legislative Clerk. The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire] proposes an amendment, No. 147——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 147) of the Senator from Wisconsin is as follows:

After section 5 insert the following new section:

"Sec. 6. (a) section 46(b)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the effect of net operating loss carryback) is repealed.

"(b) The second sentence of section 6411 (a) of such Code (relating to tentative carryback adjustments) is amended by striking out '12 months from the end of such taxable year,' and inserting in lieu thereof '12 months from the end of such taxable year (or in the case of a portion of an investment credit carryback from a taxable year attributable to a net operating loss carryback from a subsequent taxable year, within a period of 12 months from the end of such subsequent taxable year),'.

"(c) Section 6501(j) of such Code (relating to limitations on assessment in the case of investment credit carrybacks) is amended by striking out 'assessed.' and inserting in lieu thereof 'assessed, or, with respect to the portion of an investment credit carryback from a taxable year attributable to a net operating loss carryback from a subsequent year, at any time before the expiration of the period within which a deficiency for such subsequent year may be assessed.'

"(d) The first sentence of section 6511(d) (4)(A) of such Code (relating to special period of limitations on refunds with respect to investment credit carrybacks) is amended by striking out 'such carryback,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'such carryback (or, in the case of a portion of an investment credit carryback from a taxable year attributable to a net operating loss carryback from a subsequent taxable year, the period shall be that period which ends with the expiration of the 15th day of the 40th month, or 39th month in the case of a corporation, following the end of such subsequent taxable year).'.

"(e) Section 6611(f)(2) of such Code (relating to interest on refund overpayments) is amended by striking out 'arises.' and inserting in lieu thereof 'arises, or in the case of a portion of an investment credit carryback from a taxable year attributable to a net operating loss carryback from a subsequent taxable year, such overpayment shall be deemed not to have been made prior to the close of such subsequent taxable year.'

"(f) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to net operating losses occurring in taxable years ending after the date of enactment."

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, this amendment to the bill was originally suggested some weeks ago. It is an amendment which is relevant and pertinent. It is an amendment which involves the investment credit.

The amendment was accepted at that time, and it became a part of the bill by voice vote.

As I recall it, at that time the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance, agreed that the amendment was good.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is also familiar with the amendment and accepted it as a good amendment.

As far as I know, there is no objection to the amendment. It is an amendment which would cost a negligible amount of money, if any.

The amendment would correct an inequity in the law, due to the interaction of the carryback of the net operating loss and the carryback of the investment credit.

The amendment provides, in effect, that a firm—which subsequently lost a substantial amount of money and, therefore, had a net operating loss carryback—will not have its investment credit, in the year to which the loss is carried, wiped out.

Under the present law, the investment credit would be wiped out because the investment credit carryback is not available now for an investment which cannot be used in a year because of a net operating loss being carried to that year.

I think this is the kind of complicated procedure that can best be explained by an example. For instance, if a firm had taken its investment credit in 1965 and were to suffer a substantial loss in 1967, it would then carry the loss back to 1965. That loss would wipe out the investment credit for 1965, and under the present law in such a case this investment credit cannot be carried back and used in an earlier year before 1965.

The amendment would permit the investment credit to be carried back to 1962 where its disallowance in 1965 results from a net operating loss carryback.

Frankly, for firms which are in difficulty and need help to stay alive, this particular provision would be enormously helpful.

It is my understanding that there is no opposition by the Treasury Department to this amendment.

The amendment has been carefully studied by the staff available to the Committee on Finance, and I hope that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana can accept the amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, as far as I am concerned and I have looked at the amendment, the amendment has merit.

If we could agree to it tonight, it would be all right with this Senator.

If Senators want to study the amendment and think about it and come back tomorrow and vote, it is all right with me.

It is more or less up to the Senate as to how they would like to act on the matter. If they want to think about it overnight, they may do so. Otherwise, as far as I am concerned, the amendment can be agreed to.

I think the amendment has merit. The Treasury Department has studied the matter and does not object.

The amendment is entirely germane to the bill.

It is the kind of amendment that I had hoped we could have held the bill to in the beginning. It is an entirely germane amendment and has to do with investment credit, but covering an area the committee did not have an opportunity to consider. I have all the confidence that we would have agreed to the amendment had it been brought up and studied in committee.

I regret that I was not there at the time. If I had been at the committee session when the bill was voted on, I would have offered it myself because it has merit.

It might be well to determine how some of the other members of the committee feel about the matter. If the Senator from Wisconsin wants to do so, he might suggest the absence of a quorum while we discuss the matter.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I think the substance of this amendment can be really accomplished in conference.

I feel that if we start amending the bill again, as we did 4 or 5 weeks ago, we will be in the same dilemma in which we found ourselves last week and in the weeks before.

The economy of this country is in some way dependent on what we do with the pending bill, yea or nay. We have got to fish or cut bait.

I think the amendment has merit. I think we can achieve that end, but I also think that if we open the floodgates here to amendments to the pending bill, we will be here for another 3 or 4 weeks.

I think we have a simple tax bill before us, a bill that the administration wants. Let us send it to conference and get it over with.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it seems perfectly appropriate to me that a good amendment which has the support of the Treasury, which no one would find any reason to object to, which is strictly a germane amendment on an investment tax credit bill, should be considered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the amendment is very important. I know as a matter of fact that a number of businesses are most concerned about this. I have talked to people in various industries.

As I understand it, the amendment would not be in conference because it was not in the bill to begin with.

I wish the conference committee could consider it. However, I do not see how the conference could do so and extend the carryback of the investment credit in the example I gave to 1962 or 1963 without having the amendment adopted.

If they could have done that, I would not have taken up the time of the Senate. I was not interested in anything except in getting out the investment credit bill originally, as I am sure the Senator from Louisiana was.

For months I have been pleading for the restoration of the investment credit. I voted against the suspension. In the Joint Economic Committee I have said over and over again that I think it ought to be restored.

I want to act on the bill as soon as we can, but I think this situation creates a very serious inequity for a firm in my State, and I know that there must be others.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, if I were the Senator from Wisconsin, knowing that the amendment involves a large number of workers, a large investment, and perhaps the economic future of a substantial segment of the great State represented so ably by the Senator from Wisconsin, I would fight for the amendment to the bitter end, because the amendment is right.

Nobody has any good reason to oppose the amendment. The amendment should be agreed to.

So that we might have an opportunity to discuss the matter and see what the general sentiment seems to be about the matter, I urge the Senator to suggest the absence of a quorum and we can determine what the general situation seems to be.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHILDBEARING DELAY URGED TO AVERT FAMINE IN ASIA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Baltimore Sun today carried a news story in which the director of the Population Service of the Agency for International Development expresses his belief that widespread famine in Asia can be averted if women can be persuaded to avoid having children until they are out of their teens. Dr. R. T. Ravenholt believes that teenage women may be interested in delaying marriage and in practicing birth control if they are offered special incentives or educational benefits.

He points out that various forms of birth control are not always equally accepted or acceptable or successful. For example, India has had to scale down its program for distributing intrauterine devices.

Some people feel that the population explosion has passed the point of no return and that man cannot solve what is a growing problem. I do not agree. Man has created this problem, and I am confident that man is smart enough to solve it.

What is urgent and desirable is to find new ways to solve the population explosion. If women would like to be better educated and if they have no objections to delaying the age at which they marry, then we should not object to this type of relief if it is offered. The choice should be there for people to consider, and if they wish, to accept.

We know that at least half of the population of the developing countries is under 15. Man does not have to be very smart to know what this portends for the very near future.

Dr. Ravenholt deserves our thanks for looking to new ways to solve the multiplying problems of the multiplying population, for as he looks he is trying to implement the 31 public mandates which President Johnson has made in the population area.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the article, entitled "Childbearing Delay Urged To Avert Famine in Asia," by Mr. Joseph R. R. Sterne, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From, the Baltimore Sun, May 2, 1967]

CHILDBEARING DELAY URGED TO AVERT FAMINE IN ASIA

(By Joseph R. L. Sterne)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—The director of the Population Service of the Agency for International Development expressed hope today of averting widespread famine in Asia if women can be persuaded to avoid having children until their twenties.

Dr. R. T. Ravenholt said in an interview that India, Pakistan, and other overpopulated countries might seriously consider giving teen-age women special incentives and educational benefits if they delay marriage or practice birth control.

FOOD FOR PEACE SALES

He saw such a program as one possible use for some of the funds the United States has accumulated by sales of food for peace commodities abroad.

It would be part of the aid agency's new war on hunger program headed by Herbert J. Waters.

If such funds were released, at least in part, to provide annual stipends for childless women between the ages of fifteen and twenty, Dr. Ravenholt said, significant and rapid progress could be achieved in curbing population growth.

Not only would there be greater spacing between generations, he said, but women once schooled in the social and personal advantages of family planning might tend to have fewer children.

QUICK IMPACT

Dr. Ravenholt described the financial incentives as a means of enhancing the effectiveness of the recent decision by William S. Gaud, AID administrator, to make birth control devices and oral contraceptive pills available on request.

Pills have been shown in this country and elsewhere to have a quick impact on delaying the start of a woman's childbearing years and on curtailing birth rates, he said.

If pills, along with other material, are widely distributed in southern Asia as part of a massive family-planning program, Dr.

Ravenholt said, the race between food and population can be won.

LESS THAN SUCCESSFUL

He pointed out that sterilization and intrauterine devices (IUD) have been less than completely successful in India and Pakistan because they have been used by persons who already have had as many children as they wanted—"and perhaps one or two more for good measure."

Sterilization was accepted in India, he said, by persons with an average of 5½ children. Women who accepted IUD loops had had a average of 3½ children.

Dr. Ravenholt said the loops had not proven successful with young women who had not yet had children. He further noted that more Indian women in recent months have discarded than accepted them.

PLAN SCALED DOWN

As a result, he reported, India's plan for the distribution of 6,000,000 loops in the year ended April 1 had to be scaled down repeatedly and only 900,000 inserted.

Dr. Ravenholt said the oral contraceptive has been the best method yet developed to delay the onset of reproduction.

It can be administered to teenagers. It is less needful for a woman to report to a clinic—an act likely to be noticed by her family and her community. And it is considered quite safe by most authorities in the field.

The 42-year-old public health specialist said Communist China quite significantly has recognized that the quickest way to bring population under control is to delay the onset of reproduction.

COERCION IN CHINA

To this end, the Chinese, by a combination of coercion and education, have encouraged women to postpone marriage until their twenties. A year ago, the suggested age was 20. Now, he said, it is 25.

India, as a democratic nation, does not have the means of coercion available to China, the AID official stated.

But by offering financial incentives and by a massive public education program, Dr. Ravenholt said it can make substantial advances.

THE REALITIES OF THE U.S. AID PROGRAM UNDER THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS IN LATIN AMERICA

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, as we approach the annual congressional debate on our foreign aid program, it is to be hoped that a more realistic attitude toward this annual vast expenditure will develop. There has been justification for our aid program. In the 20 years of its existence it has accomplished much good. But, as in so many instances of major governmental undertakings as they age and become routine, its shortcomings and errors have increasingly contributed to its lack of effectiveness, to the minimizing of the desired and proclaimed results and to a corresponding lack of enthusiasm and support for it in the Congress.

Despite the fact that the program has now been going on for two decades, many lessons of past mistakes have not been appreciated and rectified by those who administer it. Almost invariably criticism of these shortcomings is shrugged off as having happened under different administrators and no longer valid, and we are told that they no longer exist. Unfortunately, those who have studied our foreign aid programs in depth, as I have, regrettably cannot share this optimism.

These studies have been published as Senate documents. They are "Report of a Study on U.S. Foreign Aid in 10 Middle East and African Countries," page 472, 88th Congress, first session; and "U.S. Foreign Aid in Action: A Case Study," page 229, 89th Congress, second session. This is a study of our foreign aid in Chile.

The concept in administration circles, that the beneficial results are proportional to the amount we spend is not valid. Less money, more effectively administered, would achieve better results. Our lavish spending produces counterproductive inflation. Moreover, one of the administration-propagated delusions which should cease is that the program annually presented by the administration to the Congress—somewhat in excess of $3 billion for each coming year—and is presented as a "bare-bones" program, is nothing of the kind. Indeed it represents substantially less than half the amount expended for foreign aid. The greater part, which is not presented to Congress in this so-called bare-bones program, consists of loans, most of them so-called soft loans at negligible interest rates with long periods of deferment before any repayment of principal is due, which are indeed loans in name only and will never be repaid. Then there are all kinds of additional spigots of foreign aid which are not included in the so-called bare-bones presentation.

Two extremely perceptive articles on our foreign aid program in Latin America, one from an American source and one from a Latin American, are pertinent to this problem. The first, by Ronald Steel, which appears in the May 1967 issue of Harper's magazine, is entitled "One Millionaire and 20 Beggars," with the subtitle "Why Violent Revolutions Probably Are Inevitable in Most of Latin America—In Spite of Anything the United States Can Do."

The other is an article in the April issue of the distinguished quarterly American review Foreign Affairs, published by the Council on Foreign Relations. It is by Eduardo Frei Montalva, the able President of Chile, and is entitled "The Alliance That Lost Its Way." In this article President Frei, who can be counted as an enlightened elected public official with strong democratic leanings, a friendly disposition toward the United States and deep concern for the progress of his country along the very lines which the United States has urged in its pronouncements at Punta del Este and subsequently concerning the Alliance for Progress, points out:

> The problem is that what was fundamental to the Alliance for Progress—a revolutionary approach to the need for reform—has not been achieved. Less than half of the Latin American countries have started serious programs of agrarian reform. Drastic changes in the tax system are even scarcer, while the number of genuinely democratic regimes, far from increasing, has actually declined. In other words there has been no strengthening of the political and social foundations for economic progress in Latin America. This is the reason why the ultimate objective of the Alliance—the formation of just, stable, democratic and dynamic societies—is as distant today as it was five years ago. Several experiences indicate that economic progress alone does not suffice to ensure the building of truly free societies and peaceful international coexistence. The problem does not stem solely from the inadequate flow of internal financial resources. What has been lacking is a clear ideological direction and determination on the part of the political leaders to bring about change. These two factors are intimately related and they involve the collective political responsibility of all the members of the Alliance.
>
> Many Latin American governments have used the Alliance as a bargaining lever to obtain increases in U.S. aid precisely so as to avoid changing their domestic situation. These governments have committed themselves to internal reforms which later they knowingly allowed either to become a dead letter, or worse, to be completely controlled or used for the benefit of those in power.

This is a valid criticism and a challenging indictment, by one of Latin America's statesmen.

The painful reality is that practically all Latin American countries need a revolution. Our evolutionary efforts by way of the Alliance, however praiseworthy, will not obtain their objectives for reasons some of which President Frei sets forth. There are also other reasons. However, recent history, since our aid program began, has shown that while giving lip service to the need of revolutionary reform in other countries, as in South Vietnam, the United States has, both in Latin America and elsewhere, supported rightwing dictators whose only justification for such support from us is that they allege they are anti-Communist.

There is, of course, the danger that Communists will inevitably try to infiltrate revolutions and if successful substitute their brand of dictatorship and oppression, but it is not unnatural and indeed logical that they, too, should join in movements to bring about long overdue reforms and abolition of the feudal systems which continue to prevail and thwart real progress. Nevertheless, such revolutions should have our sympathetic support as they—and perhaps only they—can achieve such results as have been so well achieved in Mexico, where an indigenous revolution beginning in 1911 rejected communist or other exterior infiltration and worked out through revolution the basic reforms that stemmed from that country's own experience.

But we should not forget that all through these revolutionary years in Mexico the United States violently opposed those revolutionary reforms of our southern neighbor. Even after "the Revolution," as it is known in Mexico, had emerged from its violent stage, and peace and reconstruction came after a decade of violence, the Harding administration refused to recognize the postrevolutionary regime of President Obregon, and of his successor, President Plutarco Elias Calles, which were in conformity with basic democratic principles. Later it was with the utmost difficulty and only because of the enlightened attitude of our American ambassador, Josephus Daniels, in the 1930's, that Mexico was able to avoid armed intervention by the United States, a course strongly urged by reactionary interests and largely supported by forces within our Government, although not by President Roosevelt, who was wisely guided by Ambassador Daniels.

All this is pertinent to our present policies in Latin America, which need a new orientation both by the United States and Latin America, as both President Frei's and Ronald Steel's articles point out.

I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Harper's magazine, May 1967]

ONE MILLIONAIRE AND 20 BEGGARS—WHY VIOLENT REVOLUTIONS PROBABLY ARE INEVITABLE IN MOST OF LATIN AMERICA—IN SPITE OF ANYTHING THE UNITED STATES CAN DO

(By Ronald Steel)

"The Alliance for Progress is an alliance between one millionaire and twenty beggars."
—Fidel Castro.

It has become a truism, and a tired one at that, to say there are no easy solutions for what ails Latin America. The problems caused by political feudalism, social repression, and economic stagnation are so deep and their effects so widespread that chances for orderly and peaceful change in Latin America are not encouraging. It is not simply that conditions are barely tolerable for the vast majority of Latin Americans—they are getting worse. Today food consumption per inhabitant is less than it was twenty-five years ago. Much of the continent is plagued by severe undernourishment, and, as the population bomb takes its toll, prospects for the future are blacker still. With the highest birth rate in the world, Latin America is expected to double its population within thirty-five years, creating twice as many mouths to feed on the same inadequate resources. Figures like these transform abstract terms like "population explosion" into a social catastrophe.

The uncontrolled rise in population, disturbing enough in itself, is aggravated by the scarcity of accessible farmland. Throughout much of the continent, most of the arable land lies either in the hands of a few wealthy proprietors or else is parceled out into thousands of minuscule plots too tiny to be farmed productively or to earn their peasant owners a decent living. Between the big estates and the tiny plots is little on which to build a stable agricultural base capable of feeding and supporting the continent's population. Land distribution is largely based upon feudal patterns inherited from the Spanish and Portuguese, and except for Cuba, Bolivia, and Mexico, there has never been comprehensive agrarian reform. The United States has urged the Latin-American governments to push through land-reform programs, and a few are attempting to do so on a limited scale. But in much of Latin America the government is run by a landowning oligarchy which has no intention of relinquishing its land, because land is the basis of its political and economic power, not to mention social prestige. To ask it to share some of its wealth is to seek a degree of social responsibility and political awareness which is rare in any oligarchy, and virtually unheard of in Latin America.

Shackled by a rigid social structure, a feudal land pattern, and the demands of the galloping population, the nations of Latin America also have underdeveloped or lopsided economies. Like other countries of the Third World, they are usually dependent on a primary product, whether it be a crop or a raw material, for their livelihood. The product varies from country to country—bananas in Panama, coffee in Brazil, copper in Chile, oil in Venezuela, tin in Bolivia—but the problem of a one- or two-crop economy is the same. These products account for the bulk of the foreign currency they earn—currency they need to feed their population, buy essential imports, and industrialize themselves. Yet such products are subject to wild fluctuations in price, depending on the size of the crop, the foreign competition, and the demands of the market. Sugar, for example, during a single period in 1963–65 fell from twelve cents a pound on the world market to three cents a pound. Such fluctuations spell catastrophe for nations trying to achieve orderly economic development.

The economic crisis faced by many Latin-American nations has served to reinforce a social crisis resulting from the breakdown of the feudal order. Virtually every Latin-American society is going through a period of sustained social tension that inspires searches for radical solutions. The oligarchies feel the rumble of popular discontent, and even the democratic governments face social and economic ordeals they may not be able to surmount. It is generally assumed that Latin America is ripe for a social revolution. Whether or not the communists will benefit from such a revolution is difficult to say. But some kind of revolution—whether it be inspired by Castroism or by fascism—seems likely in a number of countries.

It is wishful thinking to imagine that private enterprise will stave off such a revolution by gradually raising the standard of living over the decades. Latin America will not wait. It may even be asking too much of democratic government to channel such a revolution. Unless a way is found to feed undernourished masses, provide jobs for the unemployed, introduce radical agrarian reform, redistribute income, and achieve a meaningful degree of political equality, democracy is likely to be rejected for one of the totalitarian formulas which are exerting an increasingly powerful appeal. Indeed, it is surprising that democracy has fared so well, considering the fact that, to the landless peasant and the slum-dwelling urban proletarian, political democracy as practiced in much of Latin America has not meant much more than the freedom to starve. To sacrifice that kind of freedom is not going to be a difficult choice, particularly when almost any alternative seems better.

WHY THEY ADMIRE CASTRO

Although Latin America has had hundreds, if not thousands, of revolts, coups, and insurrections, only three times has a fundamental change in the social order been achieved: in Mexico in 1910, in Bolivia in 1952, and in Cuba in 1959. All the rest—the uprisings, the coups, the interchangeable caudillos—was simply a change of characters within the same basic plot. Only these three revolutions destroyed the power of an oppressive oligarchy, redistributed the national wealth, and achieved a system of social equality. And in each case, the revolution was achieved by violence. Considering their own history, and looking at the stagnation and paralysis around them, it is not surprising that Latin-American reformers are becoming increasingly pessimistic about peaceful change and are turning toward the extremes. In a continent where military coups are the norm and where elections have been little more than charades, even the best-willed reformers think in terms of revolution.

The Latin-American radicals are virtually a class unto themselves. Rarely having experienced a viable democratic government, they are less concerned with formal constitutional guarantees than with breaking the grip of the oligarchy and launching a social revolution that will remake their societies. In this effort they have been inspired, in a limited but important way, by Fidel Castro. That Castro has turned his revolution into a political tyranny is not quite as significant as the fact that he has remade Cuba from top to bottom. Moreover, to have smashed the Batista dictatorship and broken the power of the Cuban oligarchy with Uncle Sam's big stick only 90 miles away—that is a source of inspiration for many Latin Americans. Even those who have little sympathy for Fidel admire his defiance of Washington, for when confronted with the power of the United States, they cannot help thinking of themselves in Cuba's shoes.

Reformers are impressed by Cuba's domestic gains. While other Latin governments form committees to discuss new housing, schools, and hospitals for the poor, the Cubans have already built them; while the others muse over the problems of agrarian reform, the Cubans have put it into practice. Even with the American embargo, they have achieved a formidable 8 per cent growth rate in recent years—an enviable record by any standards. It is not in his domestic policy that Fidel has lost support among the Latin-American radicals, but in a foreign policy which has become almost totally dependent on the Soviet Union. He is frequently criticized for turning Cuba into a Russian dependency—but then most Latins are convinced that the United States drove him to it against his will.

The Cuban example is one, although not the only, violent alternative open to Latin America if peaceful reform does not come fast enough. Another is the possibility of an insurrection by younger army officers determined to push through social reforms opposed by the oligarchy and by their own generals. This could lead to a military dictatorship, perhaps with vaguely democratic aspirations, rather like the rule of Nasser in Egypt or of Ayub Khan in Pakistan—authoritarian, radical, but noncommunist. In Latin America, as in many other parts of the Third World, younger military officers are imbued with a desire for economic progress, and they resent a feudal social order which provides no outlet for their ambitions, or any future for their country but economic stagnation. A third possibility is a national socialism of the kind espoused by Juan Perón during his heyday in Argentina: a fascist dictatorship. A fourth choice of status quo does not exist. Even in the most repressive and primitive backwaters of Latin America, such as Paraguay, Haiti, and Nicaragua, the archaic and dictatorial one-man states cannot indefinitely hope to survive the ferment that is sweeping the rest of the continent, any more than Batista survived it in Cuba or Trujillo in the Dominican Republic.

HOW TO BUY A REVOLUTION

The question of whether Latin America will have bloody or peaceful revolutions is one in which the United States has a serious and abiding interest, but far from a controlling one. What we do or don't do can have an enormous impact on the future of Latin America. But in the long run what happens to these countries depends upon the people themselves—what they are willing to fight for and what they are willing to endure. And they are becoming less and less patient. The facts are in harsh contrast to the official pieties from Washington on the glowing prospects for orderly change. Although the Cuban revolution dates all the way back to 1959 and the Alliance for Progress to 1961, there has been little improvement in the Latin-American social structure. Nearly everywhere the oligarchy remains in tight control; indeed, the democratic process has broken down in a number of countries. Except for Chile and Venezuela, there has been little reform in the key areas of land holdings, tax revision, and income redistribution. Yet it is precisely in these areas that the architects of the Alliance for Progress placed much faith.*

---

*At this writing, it looks as if the hemispheric summit meeting scheduled to be held at Punta del Este in April 1967 will only dramatize how little progress has been made since the launching of the Alianza para el Progresso six years ago.

It was neither charity nor a guilty conscience, but Fidel Castro who provided the inspiration for the Alliance for Progress. By bringing the Cold War into the Western Hemisphere, by forcing Washington to realize that it could no longer take Latin America for granted, he galvanized U.S. policy makers and terrified Congress into voting $20 billion over a ten-year period for the economic development of Latin America.

Castro's brand of revolution was exactly what the Alliance was designed to prevent. The Alliance sought to do with dollars that which Castro had done with rifles and communist manifestos—it was constructed to buy a social revolution. By a combination of U.S. political pressure and financial aid the Latin-American governments would be encouraged to make essential reforms, and the need for violent revolution could be eliminated. *Fidelismo* would be discredited by being made to seem irrelevant.

This analysis mingled its idealism with a heavy dose of realism. "Political freedom," President Kennedy told the Latin-American ambassadors in the spring of 1961, "must be accompanied by social change, for unless necessary social reforms, including land and tax reform, are freely made—unless we broaden the opportunity of all our people—unless the great mass of Americans share in increasing prosperity—then our alliance, our dream will have failed." To bring about this social change, U.S. officials counted heavily upon the reform-minded elements of the middle class—the journalists, the professors, the students, the lawyers, and the liberal intelligentsia. These are the most outspoken voices for change in Latin America, and these, it was assumed, would be the natural allies of the Alliance. They, in the name of self-interest even more than idealism, would make its cause their own, because its aims were theirs.

Frighten the oligarchy, woo the intelligentsia. Yet neither the bogey-man nor the bait worked. The Latin-American reformers—and particularly the left-wing radicals, who are most outspoken against the oligarchy—proved incapable of swallowing any program that bore the fatal stamp, Made in U.S.A. The fact that it might be for their own benefit, that through North American help the oligarchy's power might be broken, was less important to them than that it was Yankee in inspiration. Their traditional anti-*yanquismo* was too strong, their own demagoguery too compelling, their inbred suspicions too overwhelming, and their preference for talk over action too inbred, to permit them to adopt the Alianza.

If the reformers turned their back, the oligarchy proved to be indifferent or even hostile. In most countries the landowning rich were less worried by *Fidelismo* than by the loss of their privileges through Alianza reforms. Washington's gory picture of imminent revolution seemed exaggerated, while its prescription for reforms horrified them. If revolt were to break out, they were convinced that the army would quickly suppress it—and the army, or so they thought, was in their pocket. As for Washington's bribes, they were convinced that the United States would have to keep pumping dollars into Latin America anyway—not to encourage reforms, but to protect the economic investments of its own private corporations. American business, they reasoned, would never allow the Administration to tolerate another Cuba. And even if Wall Street were willing to write off its investments as a bad gamble, Congress could surely be counted on to oppose any revolution which could be labeled, rightly or wrongly, as communist-inspired. The oligarchy's assessment turned out to be more or less correct.

Faced with the hostility of the business groups, the conservatism of the urban middle class, the refusal of the oligarchies to be frightened or bought off, the reluctance of the radical left to have anything to do with the *Yanquis*, the Alianza has been politically paralyzed. It has had to dispense aid on the basis of promises offered rather than on performance rendered and content itself with the usual jobs of technical assistance: building roads, hospitals, and schools. Worthy projects all, but a far cry from its original intentions, and also precisely the sort of projects the Latin Americans can and should be carrying out for themselves. The Alianza, while it has stimulated economic advancement, has almost totally failed as an instrument of social reform because it never was able to project a mystique that inspired the Latin Americans.

DISABLED BY OUR FEARS

Though much of the blame must fall on the Latin Americans themselves, and particularly on the left-wing reformers who often prefer the pleasures of anti-*yanquismo* to the harsh realities of social change, the Alianza was also hobbled by U.S. preoccupation with communism, which the oligarchies and generals exploited. Encouraged by Washington's fear of communism and by its preference for verbally anticommunist regimes, would-be caudillos—usually trained and equipped by the U. S.—moved in to depose a number of legally elected governments. Their charge: civilian reformers were weak on communism. Within the first four years after the Alianza was launched at Punta del Este, civilian governments were overthrown by the military in no less than seven countries: the Dominican Republic (twice), Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, Peru, and Brazil.

The record shows that the kind of government that creates a favorable climate for business investments under the Alliance for Progress and that can be counted on for anticommunist votes in the Organization of American States and the United Nations is not the kind of government that has popular support. President Kennedy realized this and tried to back the democratic progressives. But in the end, his determination to punish, and if possible to topple, the Castro regime, led him to align U.S. policy with the very oligarchies he detested, and served to neutralize his enlightened attitude toward reformers. Because it needed their votes to expel Cuba from the OAS and enforce economic sanctions, the Administration found itself wooing dictatorships such as those in Paraguay, Haiti, and Nicaragua, while at the same time declaring its allegiance to reforms that such regimes had no intention of undertaking. The result of this policy was a double failure: it neither brought about the weakening, let alone the downfall, of the Castro regime, nor did it succeed in instigating social change in Latin America.

The Cuban revolution thus is in the anomalous position of having fostered the Alianza, and also in large degree having been responsible for the failure of its reformist ambitions. Without Castro there would have been no "vast, cooperative effort, unparalleled in magnitude and nobility of purpose, to satisfy the basic needs of the American people for homes, work and land, health and schools," as President Kennedy described the Alianza to Congress in March 1961. Without Castro, however, there might also not have been the assumption that insurrection in Latin America automatically involved the danger of a communist take-over—and thereby required direct military intervention by the United States. The equation Insurrection=Communism=Peril to the United States is rooted in the tragicomedy of the Cuban revolution.

Whether Castro jumped into Russia's arms, or whether he was pushed by Washington is a point likely to be argued for years to come. Some believe that Fidel sprang, like a bearded Venus, full-blown from the brow of Karl Marx and was determined to turn Cuba into a communist state ever since he was old enough to tell the proletariat from the bourgeoisie. Others assume that, like Topsy, he just grew into a communist, a little bit more every day, until the old agrarian reformer was transformed into the militant Red revolutionary. Perhaps Castro was determined to lead Cuba into the communist camp from the beginning, and thus he would not have been amenable to compromise after seizing power. Yet in an interview with Herbert Matthews in October 1963, Castro said that in outlining his plans for "a very radical revolution" he initially "thought it could be done under the Constitution of 1940 and within a democratic system." His conversion, he explained, was "a gradual process, a dynamic process in which the pressure of events forced me to accept Marxism as the answer to what I was seeking." It was, he said, the American reaction to his "agrarian reform" of May 1959 that "made me realize that there was no chance to reach an accommodation with the United States. So as events developed, I gradually moved into a Marxist-Leninist position. I cannot tell you just when, the process was so gradual and natural." Perhaps Castro was fabricating an elaborate story in explaining his conversion to Marxism-Leninism. But since there is no convincing reason for doing so, it is equally possible that he was telling the truth.

WHERE WE DREW THE LINE

Even had the United States been more cooperative in the months following the Cuban revolution, Castro and his followers probably would have been very suspicous of American friendship. Latin-American radicals are instinctively anti-*yanqui*, just as they were instinctively anti-British during the nineteenth century. Blaming America for their national ills, they tend to favor whatever foreign power is America's most effective opponent. During the second world war many radicals, particularly in Argentina and the Caribbean, were drawn toward fascism. Today their anti-*yanquismo* is expressed in an admiration for communism. During the heyday of the Cold War they were attracted toward Russia. Now in an era of "peaceful coexistence" between Washington and Moscow, they are drawn toward a belligerent Peking. Had Castro won his revolution in 1939 rather than in 1959 he might have been a Nazi sympathizer rather than a communist; had he won it in 1966 instead of 1959, he might have turned first to Peking rather than to Moscow.

Moreover, Castro drew a connection between the U.S. and the hated Batista regime which was not entirely fanciful. Batista served American business interests well, and Washington found the regime expedient, however distasteful its internal politics. Politically and economically, Cuba was an American dependency, with its fate decided in Washington and New York. President Kennedy, in an interview shortly before his death, indicated a deep awareness of the causes that inspired the Cuban revolution. "I believe there is no country in the world," he told a French journalist, ". . . where economic colonialism, humiliation, and exploitation were worse than in Cuba, in part owing to my country's policies during the Batista regime."

Despite its high per capita income for Latin America, Cuba before the revolution was the very model of economic colonialism. Every light bulb that was bought, every kilowatt of electricity consumed, every telephone call that was made, every razor blade that was used, and even nearly all of the food that was eaten could be traced back to some American corporation and to American shareholders. As Wall Street financiers controlled the Cuban economy, so Miami racketeers ran the elegant gambling casinos in Havana that catered to North American vacationers; the Pentagon supplied the Cuban army with its military equipment; and the State Department instructed it in the diplomacy it was to follow. As an economic colony of the United States, Cuba did better than most of the Caribbean republics. Or at least those Cubans on the top of the social pile did well, while the others lived in the misery which is taken for granted throughout most of Latin America.

Once Castro took power, Washington showed a considerable forbearance, and seemed willing to put a good face on what it saw as a rather dubious turn of events. Even after the seizure of U.S.-owned investments in Cuba, it is far from certain that Washington would have tried to intervene. The nationalization of foreign business is nothing new in Latin America. The United States accepted Mexico's nationalization of her oil industry and Bolivia's seizure of the tin mines without trying to overthrow their governments, even though heavy American investments were involved. The Bolivia revolution which occurred in 1952 even managed to win economic support from the Eisenhower Administration.

Yet the *Fidelistas* assumed the hostility of the United States, and by behaving as though intervention were a foregone conclusion, tended to encourage the very reaction which they feared. Had Castro been content with nationalizing U.S.-owned property and pushing through social reforms within Cuba, he could probably have had his revolution and, if not American friendship, at least American acquiescence. But being ideologues, the Cuban revolutionaries were not content with being simply Marxists. They had to make a dramatic spectacle of leading Cuba into the communist camp. Fidel had to declare his undying faith in the secular dogma of Marxism-Leninism and embrace Soviet Russia as the guide and defender of the Cuban revolution.

It was here that Washington drew the line, for while it was willing to tolerate a revolutionary Cuba isolated within the safe confines of the U.S.-dominated Caribbean, it was outraged at the prospect of Cuba as a center of subversion and as a Soviet outpost in the Western Hemisphere. The former involved a matter of pride; the latter seemed to entail the very security of the United States. By failing to recognize that difference, the *Fidelistas* not only lost the American good will they enjoyed at first, but unleashed a complex of Cold War emotions in the United States that has made any accommodation between the two countries exceedingly difficult.

FIDEL'S OWN BRAND

Why did Fidel do it? Why was he not content to fashion a Tito-style communist dictatorship in the Caribbean, one which would proclaim all the half-truths of Marxism-Leninism, but which would avoid, carefully, entanglement with the United States? Above all, why did he allow (or persuade) the Russians to turn Cuba into a missile site directed against the United States? The answer is open to speculation, but it may be more practical than ideological. It may be that the Cubans turned to Russia because, once having decided to defy the Yankees and become the paladins of Latin-American revolution, they needed Soviet protection. To be anti-Yankee and vaguely communist, would be to suffer the fate of Guatemala in 1954. But to be a protégé of the Soviet Union is to enjoy a prominent role in the duel of the giants—and thus to put the Russians in the position where they would have to defend a fellow communist regime. Cuba may have ostentatiously made itself a Soviet-supported communist state because this appeared to be the only way of safely defying the United States.

Yet it is a tribute to Castro's political skill that despite a near-total dependence on the Soviet Union, he has managed to avoid having the island turned into a Russian satellite. He has cleverly used the Sino-Soviet split to his own advantage, blackmailed the Russians into furnishing far more foreign aid than they would like, and has given virtually nothing in exchange. Not only has Fidel resisted satellization, but he has twisted the Cuban communist party to his own purposes—using it in 1961 to set up a new Castroite political party, and then expelling the communist party organizer from the country the following year, leaving the party, in Theodore Draper's words, "dismembered, dishonored, and discarded." Castro's Cuba is a communist state because Fidel has declared it to be so. But it is a communism that bears more of a resemblance to traditional Caribbean *caudillismo* than to Moscow-organized conspiracy. It is Latin-American authoritarianism with a Marxist veneer, anti-*yanquismo* enveloped in the protective armor of communism.

This is why the real problem of the Cuban revolution is not communism as an ideology. The kind of government the Cubans live under is their business: President Kennedy said so, and President Johnson has concurred. Whether this pledge would be honored in the case of "another Cuba," remains open to speculation, and after Santo Domingo there is good reason to be dubious. But it has become an American dogma that every nation has the right to self-determination—even in the Caribbean. The Cubans, therefore, presumably have the unalterable right to practice communism, cannibalism, or nudism at home. They do not, however, have the right to let their island be used as a Russian base against the United States, nor as a center of subversion against other governments. Professional revolutionaries may consider this unfair, but it is a fact of life within the sphere of influence of any great power.

Yet as far as American security interests are concerned, a communist regime in Cuba is basically irrelevant. It may be a nuisance. It is certainly an embarrassment. But it is hardly a threat to our safety. It became so only when Khrushchev committed the folly of trying to turn the island into a missile-launching platform. The Russians had their fingers burned badly, and are unlikely to make the same mistake again. President Kennedy's demonstration that the United States would not tolerate a Soviet sphere of influence in the Caribbean was an impressive and restrained use of American power. Not only did it bring to an end an adventurous phase in Russian foreign policy, and thereby pave the way for the present détente, but it also caused a sharp drop of Russian and Cuban prestige in Latin America. It was a turning point of the Cold War and, had it been wisely exploited, could have put relations between the United States and the Latin republics on a better footing.

Instead, Washington has remained mesmerized by the communist orientation of the Cuban revolution, and has exaggerated Cuba's role as the cheerleader of world revolution out of all proportion to its real importance. Isolated within the Western Hemisphere, only 90 miles from the shores of the most powerful nation in the world, and 5,000 miles from their nearest ally, the Cubans are bound to search for and encourage political friends wherever they can find them. Considering the troubles it has at home and the perils it faces abroad, a Trotskyite Cuba is virtually inevitable. To expect it to preach "communism in one country" is asking too much of an island bobbing precariously in America's inland sea. But so what? The United States has been preaching democracy at the Latin Americans for two hundred years with infinitely greater resources and rewards to offer, but with little notable success. The Cubans, for their part, have been at it since 1959, yet their prestige and their influence have dropped precipitously over the past few years. Fidel Castro is unlikely to talk any government out of existence.

Indeed, among younger Latin radicals one can now begin to see a sharp disenchantment with the Cuban example and a turning toward Maoist extremism—and even beyond that, toward a vague left-wing anarchy that seems to defy external direction. Latin America may be ready for revolution, but it is exceedingly unlikely that Fidel will lead it, or even play any major part in it. Cuba is too small, its record too shabby, and the price it has had to pay—economic and military dependence on the Soviet Union—too high.

We can afford to let Fidel talk. The Egyptians, the Algerians, and even the Albanians preach revolution as the cure for all ailments; yet we have managed to contain our anxiety about them. The reason is that we know it is little more than talk—helpful for keeping the crowds at home in a high state of agitation, and for demonstrating one's revolutionary credentials, but not particularly useful for stimulating real insurrections. Considering our strength and Fidel's unimpressive record of conversion, we can afford to be as indifferent to his propaganda as he is to ours. If we did so, then we might discover not only that the influence of the Cuban revolution on the Latin Americans is a good deal less than we imagine, but also that the lingering obsession with ideology is impeding our understanding of the real problems facing Latin America.

ANOTHER CUBA?

These problems were not created by Castro and will not disappear even with his eventual demise, for they are rooted in the nature of Latin-American society. Castroism has merely brought them to our attention. But it has also given them a new focus, and therein lies its greater importance. Whatever the fate of the regime that today rules Cuba, Latin America is unlikely ever to be the same again. The old despair is no longer being borne with the same spirit of resignation, and the search for change has opened up a far wider range of alternatives. The conditions that kept much of Latin America in a state of political and social stagnation have now begun to break down. In countries such as Chile and Venezuela, where a relatively enlightened middle class is willing to pursue reforms over the opposition of the oligarchy, a nonviolent transfer of power may be possible. Throughout much of the continent, however, such conditions do not yet exist. In such cases it may be that violence offers the only means by which an oppressed majority may be able to overcome the monopoly of power held by an entrenched minority.

This spells revolution—a word that is anathema to American policy makers. We seem to look upon it as a repudiation of the values we believe in—even though our own society was founded upon revolution. To stave off the danger of revolution we launched the Alliance for Progress and are today training and equipping Latin-American armies for "counterinsurgency"—that is, the suppression of peasant revolts. We are doing so partly because, as an essentially conservative society, we are not really sympathetic to revolutions—except for anticolonial ones directed against European imperial powers. More importantly, we are engaged in the abortion of revolutions because we see them as inspired and directed by communists. And communism, we believe—despite the disintegration of communist unity and the open clash between Peking and Moscow—is a threat to American interests regardless of where or how it is practiced.

If we allow ourselves to become associated with discredited regimes the inevitable turbulence to which Latin America seems doomed will be directed against us. This need not be so. Even should there be "another Cuba," a nominally Marxist regime, it would not necessarily be hostile to the interests of the United States—as we have seen in the case of Poland and Yugoslavia—unless we help make it so by confusing labels with the realities of power.

As a millionaire amidst twenty beggars we can afford to remain calm as the Latin-American nations work out their own internal problems, have their revolutions if they will, and espouse the ideologies they find congenial. We may not always be happy with their choice. But one of the virtues of power is that it can afford to tolerate diversity. This is also one of its responsibilities.

[From Foreign Affairs, April 1967]

URGENCIES IN LATIN AMERICA: THE ALLIANCE THAT LOST ITS WAY

(By Eduardo Frei Montalva)

Jacques Maritain, the French philosopher whose thought has inspired the development of the Christian Democratic movement, maintains that history moves simultaneously in opposite directions: while the energies of society are debilitated by inaction and the passage of time, the creative forces of freedom and the spirit tend inevitably to revitalize the quality of those energies.

The evident historical importance of the Alliance for Progress, both as a human activity and as a conceptual program, makes it impossible for it to escape the workings of this general principle; thus, the generous initial concepts, the commitments and the hopes which arose after the early success of some of its programs have gone hand in hand with the renewed attacks against democracy, the loss of markets for Latin American primary commodities, the decline of foreign investment, the consolidation in power of unjust regimes and the acceptance of alternative, evolutionary processes which only retard the revolutionary changes that so many of these countries need.

The Alliance for Progress is committed to the achievement of a revolution which, as a political instrument, should be placed at the service of democratic ideas and the interests of the majority so that it will bring forth a substantial change in the political, social and economic structures of the region. This change must be swift, and the responsibility for bringing it about belongs not just to a group of leaders or to a technocratic élite but to the whole of society. The Latin American origins of the Alliance for Progress were specially evident in the non-Marxist political parties which had no links with the national oligarchies and were strongly opposed to the traditional Latin American Right.

The Latin American revolution, as a force for rapid and substantial change, has been germinating for the last decade; it is now a permanent and dynamic torrent which is weakening the political and social institutions of the continent. The form taken by this drastic change will depend on the time which elapses before the forces of revolution are finally released. The greater the delay, the greater will be the accumulated pressure and the greater the violence of the eventual explosion.

The Latin American revolution has clearly defined objectives: the participation of the people in the government and the destruction of the oligarchies; the redistribution of land and the ending of the feudal or semi-feudal régimes in the countryside; the securing of equal access to cultural and educational facilities and wealth, thus putting an end to inherited privilege and artificial class divisions. Finally, a main objective of the revolution is to secure economic development, coupled with a fair distribution of its products and the utilization of international capital for the benefit of the national economy.

These are precisely the same objectives as those of the Alliance. Obviously a revolution thus defined is not the only means whereby rapid change can be achieved in Latin America, but it is the one with which the Alliance has been identified from its very beginnings.

The immediate goal of those who support the Alliance should not be the achievement of perfect inter-American coöperation and solidarity; their task is rather to accelerate the liberation of the forces of freedom, justice and solidarity among peoples who are hindered in their advance by the intellectual limitations of those unwilling to adapt to anything new, and by the material limitations retarding development. The task is to construct a dynamic image of the Alliance on the basis of facts and not to permit it to become a mere formula. The responsibility for the success of the Alliance is that of the whole hemisphere, because, as John F. Kennedy said, "Those who make peaceful revolution impossible will make violent revolution inevitable."

International coöperation is essential to secure these objectives. However important the internal effort of the developing countries may be, it will inevitably be insufficient in view of the enormous requirements of economic development and structural change. It would not be difficult, under a totalitarian régime, to arrange for the rapid accumulation of resources and thus advance economic development by sacrificing democracy; but neither the permanent values of the people of Latin America nor the international community as a whole would really benefit from such a solution. This is why international coöperation as established by the Alliance for Progress is absolutely necessary.

There are two basic positive aspects of the Alliance as it was originally proposed: first, it established principles for hemispheric coöperation with a clear ideological orientation expressed by its forthright support for a democratic revolution in Latin America; second, it represented a change in the hitherto prevalent concept of financial and economic assistance given by the United States. In future, this assistance would cease to be given haphazardly or lent to this or that country to face emergencies, and it would no longer be designed to solve problems solely in a form determined by the donor. According to the terms of the Alliance, donor and recipient nations coöperate. Foreign aid is only part of a program of common achievement previously agreed on by countries which subscribed to the Charter of Punta del Este. Such arrangements for multilateral mutual coöperation were certainly new in the history of economic relations within the hemisphere. If we concentrate on these two basic characteristics and ascertain whether they have led to the achievement of concrete results during the last few years, we shall have a clear understanding of the evolution of the Alliance and the reactions it has elicited in Latin America.

II

At Chapultepec in 1945, the countries of Latin America laid great emphasis on the economic problems which industrial development and the instability of their external markets would engender in the postwar era. They suggested to the United States the advisability of making formal arrangements for concerted action in the economic field. At that time the prevalent doctrine was based on the acceptance of the notion that the free market is a final arbiter in all questions regarding international prices and movements of capital. An agreement on such matters was therefore considered superfluous.

In 1948, at the Bogota conference, this attitude was maintained by the representatives of the Washington government. The United States was too concerned with the reconstruction of Europe and aid to Asia to pay attention to her southern neighbors, who, according to Secretary of the Treasury George H. Humphrey, had only to open their frontiers and grant facilities to investors from the United States for their troubles to be at an end.

In the years immediately following the Second World War, Latin America did not have to face excessively grave problems, because the foreign assets saved during the war and the bonanza created by the Korean conflict were sufficient to alleviate short-term pressures. But serious difficulties were accumulating for the future. The Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) repeatedly pointed out that there were structural failures which could lead the Latin American economies into a period of stagnation. The economic recession at the end of 1953 and 1954 showed clearly how disadvantageous the situation of these countries really was. It was on the basis of this position that at the Petropolis conference Latin America searched for a solution grounded on greater coöperation with the United States. On that occasion it was agreed, with the United States abstaining, to form a Commission of Experts who were given responsibility for preparing a draft proposal for the creation of an Inter-American Bank.

The notorious failure of the 1957 Economic Conference of the Organization of American States marked the beginning of a period of evident deterioration in hemispheric relations culminating in the lamentable events which marred the visit of Vice President Nixon to Latin America in 1958. That same year, President Kubitschek of Brazil addressed a letter to President Eisenhower on the need to reformulate inter-American relations, and soon after announced his now famous *Operación Panamericana*. Two months later Secretary of State John Foster Dulles replied, advising the younger nations of Latin America to implement reforms and step up their internal effort to solve their economic problems.

In spite of the disproportion between the original conception of the *Operación Panamericana* and the response of the Secretary of State, the attitude of the United States was already changing. Two years later, in the Act of Bogota, Latin America obtained the United States' formal acceptance of the idea of the interdependence of social and economic development and also succeeded in weakening the former insistence of the United States that private capital should be the principal instrument for financing the region's economic development. At that time, too, the Special Fund for Social Development was created, with a contribution of $500 million from the government of the United States.

The Bogota meeting marked a change in inter-American politics and opened the possibility of realizing Latin American aspirations as to the direction hemispheric coöperation should take. The seeds of the Alliance had been sown and on March 13, 1961, President Kennedy announced his decision to carry out an Alliance for Progress. In August of that same year the Charter of Punta del Este was signed.

Latin American public opinion received the Alliance with enthusiasm; it was regarded as the beginning of a period which would open enormous possibilities for the economic and social development of Latin America. At the same time it marked the end of an unhappy period in which, as President Kennedy said, North Americans had not always grasped the significance of the Western Hemisphere's common mission. In fact, the Alliance was essentially a Latin American conception which became reality because it was accepted by the United States and specially by President Kennedy, who understood it and injected new life into it.

In spite of its limitations, the Charter of Punta del Este had an immediate and significant impact. In the first place, from a political point of view it was clearly seen that the United States supported basic change. As a result, economic and political interests became active in opposition. An unholy alliance of the extreme Right and Left took form to prevent the Charter's implementation. The reactionaries, mindful of their vested interests, maintained that the Alliance was a utopian and unrealistic program; the Marxist groups described it as an instrument of imperialism, useless for bringing about the needed change. Though using different reasons and channels, both were in accord—neither for the first time nor for the last. The victims have been the Latin American people, because this collusion prevented the reforms necessary for instituting a rapid and authentic democratic process in the hemisphere.

Thus started a long controversy on the nature of the Alliance. Its ideas have been interpreted and reinterpreted; its objectives, principles and achievements have been openly and covertly distorted. Moreover, governments which had accepted and wanted to put the Punta del Este program into operation were either overthrown or found themselves threatened by the reactionary forces of the continent or by the violence of the extreme left.

This has resulted in many divergent opinions being formed about the Alliance. Some regard it as a scheme to finance corrupt governments uninterested in reforming anything; others think of it as a program to make the rich richer. To the landed, industrial and financial oligarchies, the Alliance represents a danger because, by placing an exaggerated emphasis on social revolution, it deters foreign investors. To others, emergency aid is only a way of propping up a false stability which in turn prevents the working class from truly understanding its situation and opportunities, thus retarding the real revolution. Many others, especially those representing governments, complained that the work of the Alliance was being slowed up by the requirement that planning and reform precede the granting of aid.

If we compare the speech made by Secretary of the Treasury Dillon at Punta del Este with the text of the Charter itself, we will see that certain clear definitions presented in the speech were expressed much more ambiguously in the Charter. On the other hand, those who attended the meeting of Punta del Este will surely remember the efforts made by some Latin American delegations to diminish the force of the *Declaración de los pueblos de América* in order to obscure the need for implementing basic structural reforms. The decisiveness and skill with which Richard Goodwin of the United States delegation acted at the time secured a final text which, though weakened in some respects, was sufficiently clear to be considered a true interpretation of the real situation in Latin America.

Other criticisms have been made, but the ones that really matter have come from those effectively committed to the ideals of the Alliance—those who have expressly given it their backing or have supported national or international policies which coincide with the objectives of the Alliance.

Has the Alliance achieved these objectives? Has it preserved democracy and helped to implement substantial changes? Unfortunately the answer is negative; the Alliance has not achieved the expected success. It cannot be said that since 1961 there has been a consolidation of democratic regimes in Latin America. On the contrary, various forces have threatened democratic governments, seeking either to overthrow them or to prevent the implementation of their programs. Nor have structural reforms taken place at the expected rate.

This does not mean that the Alliance has failed. It has brought about many beneficial changes. Under its auspices there have been advances in education, in public health services, in communal improvement, in the development of rational economic programs and in better understanding between Latin America and the United States. But these constructive achievements could have been secured simply with the financial assistance of the United States, plus, of course, the demand that these additional resources should be used rationally by the recipient countries. The problem is that what was fundamental to the Alliance for Progress—a revolutionary approach to the need for reform—has not been achieved. Less than half of the Latin American countries have started serious programs of agrarian reform. Drastic changes in the tax system are even scarcer, while the number of genuinely democratic regimes, far from increasing, has actually declined. In other words there has been no strengthening of the political and social foundations for economic progress in Latin America. This is the reason why the ultimate objective of the Alliance—the formation of just, stable, democratic and dynamic societies—is as distant today as it was five years ago. Several experiences indicate that economic progress alone does not suffice to ensure the building of truly free societies and peaceful international coexistence. The problem does not stem solely from the inadequate flow of internal financial resources. What has been lacking is a clear ideological direction and determination on the part of the political leaders to bring about change. These two factors are intimately related and they involve the collective political responsibility of all the members of the Alliance.

Many Latin American governments have used the Alliance as a bargaining lever to obtain increases in U.S. aid precisely so as to avoid changing their domestic situation. These governments have committed themselves to internal reforms which later they knowingly allowed either to become a dead letter, or worse, to be completely controlled or used for the benefit of those in power.

For some of those who signed the Charter of Punta del Este, the important fact was the promise of the United States to help find $20 billion for Latin America. The reforms and the structural changes were regarded only as marginal conditions, clearly less important than the increase in financial aid. That is why the meaning of the Alliance was distorted and its origins often forgotten. To avoid compulsory reforms—in other words, to avoid revolution—the Latin American right wing willingly cooperated with the Marxists in regarding the Alliance as a creation of the United States exclusively. From this position they made unfair demands on the United States, destroying the true meaning of the national effort to accomplish the tasks of the Alliance. The Alliance ceased to be mentioned or studied in Latin America except when it involved a commitment on the part of the United States, while in the United States the Executive, Congress, the intellectuals and even public opinion accepted it as a vital task—but a distorted task because, unfortunately, the United States also fell into the trap.

It is unnecessary to point out names or dates, but at some stage the imaginative, dynamic commitment of countries united by a common ideal was gone. The name, Alliance for Progress, became yet another label for all forms of aid. Uncoordinated emergency loans became "Alliance loans;" technical and financial aid freely given to dictatorships was also "Alliance aid." The Alliance in fact became just one more source of assistance instead of a concerted program of mutual cooperation. Even though the aid retained its financial value, its ideological significance was completely lost. The flow of dollars given by the United States was carefully watched, but there was no equivalent effort on the part of Latin America to reform and become more democratic. Hence the Alliance has not reached the people of Latin America for whom it was created.

This is one of the most serious criticisms made of the Alliance: that the people have not been able to participate in it. Could it have been otherwise? The people are grateful for the assistance received, but they have no sense of belonging to the scheme. The revolutionary awareness of the Latin American people has evolved in such a way that it can now be considered as a norm—giving direction to their principal activities. The Alliance has failed to channel this awareness, and it has not provided the needed leadership; in fact, it does not belong in this revolutionary mainstream.

The Latin American institutions which collaborate with the Alliance do not include trade unions, student federations, peasant leagues, coöperatives, etc., yet it is vital that such organizations should take part in an enterprise which is essentially popular and whose success depends fundamentally on its capacity to satisfy the demands made by the community. From a political point of view this is one of the weakest aspects of the Alliance; its task is to carry through a revolution which will bring about economic and social development, and for this it is absolutely necessary that the people as a whole be committed to it. The loyal participation of the community in this effort to build an egalitarian society is the only way in which the objective can be achieved. This is why the Alliance must incorporate all sectors of society in its work of transformation.

III

Another grave problem of the Alliance is its inability to promote the integration of Latin America. The process of integration lacks speed and direction; it is hard to avoid the conclusion that it has stagnated. This is certainly the case with the Latin American Free Trade Area. The number of approved concessions declines annually; even now there is not a single product enjoying preferential treatment in all the LAFTA countries. Although the Treaty of Montevideo has been in operation for only five years, the rate of increase of the intra-zonal trade has actually started to decline.

Faced with this frustrating experience, one is inclined to look at the success of the Central American Common Market. Yet the objective of the Alliance is a *Latin American* common market which means that integration must be successful in both groupings. Again, we come up against the absence of a political decision on the part of each individual country and a lack of leadership in the Alliance as a whole. The forces of nationalism, and of those committed to the status quo, have been stronger than those representing the real interests of these countries. Noisy voices are raised to decry the more advanced schemes of integration as utopian. But what is really utopian and illusory is to pretend that the countries of Latin America will be able to develop and achieve their destiny in the world of the future if each is locked up in its own isolated compartment.

The alternatives are clear: either the Alliance achieves one of its most important objectives by giving integration the needed vital impulse, or in a few years it will become evident to all that in the 1960s a great opportunity was lost because of petty nationalism.

The United States has only recently decided to support the integration of Latin America; previously its position seemed to be rather negative. The United States has an important responsibility to discharge if the Alliance is really going to achieve one of the fundamental objectives of the Charter; the strengthening of the economic integration agreements, in order to build a common market which will widen and diversify trade among the countries of Latin America. In addition to liberalizing the trade of these nations, it is necessary to arrange stabilization schemes for the prices of some primary commodities to ensure that the income they produce does not go below certain acceptable levels.

The armaments race also conspires against the strengthening of the Alliance. The annual expenditure of the Latin American countries on armaments has reached $1.5 billion. Yet the average yearly sum made available by the United States to Latin America in the period 1961–65 was $1.1 billion. The two figures clearly show that present arms purchases seriously undermine the objectives of the Alliance. A Latin American country in 1965 had, in proportion to population, approximately the same number of men under arms as the United States. India, with twice the population of Latin America and having had two armed conflicts in recent years, has fewer soldiers than Latin America.

Nobody can possibly suppose that these

weapons and armies are going to deter an aggressor from outside Latin America. Equally, the assertion that to stop subversion these countries must purchase fifty-ton tanks, supersonic aircraft and battleships defies belief. The armaments race encourages distrust and nationalism and these in turn are among the chief enemies of integration. It also diverts important resources which should be utilized to satisfy the urgent need for economic and social development. It is therefore essential that a decision be taken at the highest levels of the Alliance to establish a quantitative limitation on arms purchases.

IV

Over a year has elapsed since President Johnson showed his determined support for the Alliance by announcing an extension of the period during which it will be in force. The commitments undertaken in 1961 will not now lapse in 1970, but only when the desired objectives have been achieved. Washington's various expressions of dedication to the Alliance have certainly kept hope alive, but the substantial decisions needed to inject life into this cooperation enterprise are still waiting.

The first and most important decision involves the restoration of the original character of the Alliance as a common enterprise solidly based on the needs of its member countries. For this to be achieved, its concept as a multilateral undertaking must be revived; this in turn demands a greater delegation of technical and political responsibility to the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress and the Committee of Experts. This is not just a doctrinaire need; it has a direct practical purpose, namely, the integration of the people into the work of the Alliance. This integration will take place when the Alliance identifies itself with Latin American interests, concepts and purposes. On the other hand, the need to bring about change, and the intimate relation between this and the securing of foreign financial aid, implies the adoption of decisions which, as a matter of principle, can only be taken by each nation independently. It is inadmissible that the mere fact of making available financial aid gives any nation the right to demand that another implement specific types of structural changes. This would constitute an intolerable infringement of national sovereignty. That is why, in this situation, it is necessary to use multilateral channels for the supply of foreign assistance. Any other system might lead to new forms of scarcely veiled paternalism.

It is also important that the Alliance should openly become identified ideologically with the more progressive groups in Latin America. The future of this continent will not be contained within well-worn political and economical channels, as was so often and unsuccessfully tried during the last few decades. The Alliance must regain its essential popular character by participating in and supporting the organizations and activities of all sorts of social groups, and by granting technical and financial aid for cooperatives and for community projects in matters of health, housing and education. In general, it must support the work of the basic popular organizations within each community. The best way to show the real meaning and direction of the Alliance is to give a decided impulse to the really important transformations such as agrarian reform. The social and political impact of this reform is so great that if the Alliance were really to support it, it would vastly strengthen the collaboration of the progressive forces of Latin America.

The salvation of the Alliance depends on the implementation of all these measures: the support of integration, the discouragement of the armaments race and the finding of a cooperative solution for the problems of external trade. The problem is not one of financial resources only, though at certain times these have been scant when compared with the legitimate needs of the region. It is essentially a political problem requiring the expression of the will to change, together with the acceptance of the measures needed to bring about this change. People do not support governments because they have dutifully complied with directives from this or that international organization; they support them when they offer a promising political and economic alternative to present frustrations, and the hope of moving into a better future.

The necessary measures can be secured only by overcoming age-old resistance and destroying privileges which have remained unassailed over the years. To achieve this will also return to the American continent its true revolutionary mission. This is both possible and necessary because, as Toynbee said, "If America can bring herself to go this far, she will, I believe, have worked her passage back to a point at which it will become possible for her to rejoin her own revolution." The American Revolution was a truly glorious revolution. It was glorious for two reasons. The basic issues that it raised were spiritual, not material; and, even if this may not have been the intention of some of the Founding Fathers, it was, in effect, as Jefferson perceived and Emerson proclaimed, a revolution for the whole human race, not just for the people of the Thirteen Colonies.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the provisions of Public Law 86-42, the Chair appoints the following Senators to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference, to be held at Ottawa, Canada, May 10 to 14, 1967: Senators HICKENLOOPER, FONG, and BIBLE.

The Chair appoints the following Senators to attend the Intergovernmental Committee for European Migration, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, on May 15 to 19, 1967: Senators EDWARD M. KENNEDY and HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

The Chair appoints the following Senators to attend the 20th Assembly of the World Health Organization, to be held at Geneva, Switzerland, May 8 to 27, 1967, in lieu of Senators YARBOROUGH and JAVITS: Senators EDWARD M. KENNEDY and HOWARD H. BAKER, JR.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 2, 1967:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT

Hyman A. Friedman, of Pennsylvania, to be Assayer of the Mint of the United States at Philadelphia, Pa., vice Paul J. Dowd, deceased.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. Hugh McClellan Exton, O19780, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. James Dyce Alger, O19848, U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Vice Adm. Ignatius J. Galantin, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Sgt. Kenneth A. Schuneman, USAF

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Sgt. Kenneth A. Schuneman of Rice, Minn., retired from a long and distinguished career in the U.S. Air Force.

Sergeant Schuneman served for 2 years in the U.S. Navy aboard a destroyer, being honorably discharged in 1948. In 1949 he joined the U.S. Air Force. Two years later he married Mable M. Petersen of Princeton, Minn.

Sergeant Schuneman served two tours of duty in Alaska. Later he was selected to serve as an Air Force recruiter, and was graduated from the Air Force Recruiting School. From August 1962 until May 1966, Sergeant Schuneman served in Japan. Since that time he has been assigned to McGuire Air Force Base in New Jersey.

He has been commended many times, the most recent being at McGuire Air Force Base in connection with his duties as supervisor of a priorities section, base supply office. He was also commended for service in the Air Force cost reduction program during his tour of duty in Japan. His efforts enabled the U.S. Air Force to realize annual savings amounting to over $50,000 in supplies.

Sergeant Schuneman has also been active in Boy Scout work, and in many other community programs.

He is to be commended and congratulated on his outstanding service to his country.

Cinco de Mayo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT B. (BOB) MATHIAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of California. Mr. Speaker, Cinco de Mayo, or the 5th of May, is a very important day in the history of our great neighbors to the south. Each year, in Mexico and various communities throughout the United States, the 5th of May celebrates a great Mexican victory over the French in 1862. On that day, a gallant band of Mexican patriots defeated a numerically superior French force and thwarted the greedy designs of Napoleon III upon their homeland.

I would like to bring particular attention to a Cinco de Mayo celebration taking place in the 18th District, in Delano, Calif., this weekend. A group of outstanding public-minded citizens each year promote this significant event which includes a beautiful parade and a number of enjoyable festivities.

Let us look briefly at Mexican history in the 19th century in order to understand more fully the significance of the battle of Puebla. After emancipation from Spanish control in 1822, Mexico experienced many difficulties. Changes of government were often accompanied by bloodshed and violence. Several European nations continued to cast greedy glances upon the struggling young nation.

In October 1861, Britain, France, and Spain agreed to joint action which took the form of occupation of Veracruz. Spain and Britain, however, had no such far-reaching designs as France, and, in 1862, they withdrew, leaving the French to pursue their grandiose schemes alone.

About 6,000 French soldiers set out from Veracruz to Mexico City to the victory they were sure would be theirs. Yet their confidence was unwarranted, for on May 5, 1962, they encountered a courageous band of Mexican patriots at Puebla, a strategic city halfway between Veracruz and Mexico City. When the French general reached Puebla, he chose to send his men into the center of Mexican fortifications, over a ditch and a brick wall and up the steep slopes of the Cerro de Guadalupe. Led by the great leader, Ignacio Zaragosa, the Mexicans flung the French back to Orizaba and the coast. Their valor in the face of superior odds and their heroism led to the creation of Cinco de Mayo as a national holiday for Mexico.

Although halted momentarily by the courageous Mexicans at Puebla, the French ultimately were able to capture Mexico City and to install Archduke Maximilian of Austria upon the throne.

Yet, as we know, Maximilian never commanded the allegiance of the Mexican people. What control he did have was limited and totally dependent upon the French troops in Mexico. I am glad to say that with the conclusion of the Civil War, the United States was able to come to the rescue of its southern neighbor. Our Nation refused recognition of Maximilian and demanded that the French recall their expeditionary force. Left to rule on his own, Maximilian was captured by the Mexicans in June 1867, and soon executed.

The message which was written into history that day at Puebla is of great significance to all the world. The defenders of Puebla and the people of Mexico stand out as one of the great champions of freedom, self-determination, and independence.

It is a tribute to these people that they were not led astray by those among them who sought to deliver their country into the hands of a foreign invader. Their perseverance and silence had betrayed a burning ardor in their hearts for freedom and justice. An ardor which was to erupt 43 years later into a demand for fundamental transformation of the Mexican society.

Mr. Speaker, as one scans through the many chapters of Mexican history, he cannot but be instilled with a deep pride and admiration for the great Mexican people and their Republic. They have overcome countless obstacles and continued on to forge a new society for themselves, and the example they hold forth to the world is enviable to all.

We in the Southwestern United States are extremely proud of the many Mexicans who chose to settle in this country.

The 5th of May thus commemorates a day upon which courage and love for their homeland enabled Mexicans to triumph over troops of a foreign power. It is with real pleasure that I join with our Mexican friends in paying tribute to the strength, valor, and patriotism of those men who fought so bravely and so well on the day in Puebla more than 100 years ago. In so doing, we also pay tribute to all the citizens of Mexico in whose hearts burn the selfsame love of country. In memory of that great day, we extend greetings and warmest best wishes to the great neighbor to the south of us—Mexico.

Quie Amendment to School Bill Would Reduce Federal Aid in Almost Every City in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in a few days the House is going to be confronted with a substitute to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act being offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

I have had the Office of Education prepare for me an analysis of how the Quie amendment would affect the major cities of America, and I am today submitting for the RECORD a table which shows that in almost every instance, the cities of this Nation would suffer substantial losses in Federal aid if the Quie amendment were to be adopted.

I hope my colleagues whose districts are in these cities, or in whose districts these cities are situated, will study carefully the effect of the Quie amendment and, in particular, reflect how much this proposed amendment would reduce the Federal contribution to their cities, in comparison to the funds that would be made available in 1968 if the bill approved by the House Committee on Education and Labor becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, the table follows:

Comparison of fiscal year 1967 and estimated fiscal year 1968, allotments under provisions of the House Committee Report and H.R. 8983, title I, ESEA, for selected cities

City and State	Fiscal year 1967 allotments	Fiscal year 1968 estimated allotments	
		House committee report	H.R. 8983 Mr. Quie
Phoenix, Ariz	2,031,966	2,291,246	1,869,037
Long Beach, Calif	1,704,196	2,031,442	1,594,199
Los Angeles	14,745,945	17,676,578	13,871,911
Oakland	2,508,484	3,009,976	2,273,802
San Diego	2,211,481	2,653,498	2,202,746
San Francisco	3,242,965	3,889,430	2,934,122
Denver, Colo	2,269,930	2,743,595	1,803,722
Washington, D.C	5,397,367	5,574,031	5,330,624
Honolulu, Hawaii	1,598,665	1,858,123	1,474,836
Chicago, Ill	23,515,414	28,316,433	19,986,567
Peoria	536,270	646,133	538,707
Indianapolis, Ind	1,590,325	1,916,276	1,584,995
Des Moines, Iowa	782,341	860,758	584,835
Wichita, Kans	1,170,722	1,229,455	939,784
Baltimore, Md	7,213,627	8,688,202	5,709,568
Boston, Mass	3,672,679	4,420,604	3,258,075
Detroit, Mich	10,199,141	11,601,624	8,739,415
Minneapolis, Minn	2,380,044	2,864,864	1,807,231
St. Paul	1,138,306	1,371,237	878,876
Kansas City, Mo	1,797,902	2,106,570	1,792,549
St. Joseph	238,783	279,612	276,569
St. Louis	4,363,577	5,111,084	3,907,405
Omaha, Nebr	734,555	905,675	782,820
Jersey City, N.J	1,407,002	1,681,824	1,489,295
Newark	4,686,645	5,605,258	3,882,806
Buffalo, N.Y	4,892,854	5,870,955	4,588,442
New York City	70,874,805	84,994,240	65,676,526
Rochester	1,772,557	2,125,227	1,828,982
Akron, Ohio	1,044,632	1,112,649	936,480
Cincinnati	2,898,348	3,088,764	2,653,959
Cleveland	4,890,683	5,212,545	3,929,278
Columbus	2,081,384	2,217,818	1,815,641
Dayton	1,305,468	1,391,016	1,192,131
Toledo	1,438,606	1,533,028	1,208,326
Oklahoma City, Okla	1,764,669	1,748,184	1,552,889
Tulsa	1,352,207	1,338,459	1,284,742
Portland, Oreg	1,621,776	1,811,174	1,350,323
Philadelphia, Pa	11,848,056	13,620,767	9,815,006
Wilkes-Barre	339,190	390,883	386,012
Norfolk, Va	1,927,038	2,327,559	2,272,692
Seattle, Wash	1,542,984	1,636,825	1,357,357
Milwaukee, Wis	2,636,828	3,173,654	2,199,820
Pittsburgh, Pa	3,239,945	3,722,132	2,795,949

Tribute to Dr. Arthur D. Pickett

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, on March 23, 1967, seven American educators, studying advanced learning in Vietnam under a program sponsored by the Agency for International Development, lost their lives in a plane crash, and our Nation and pacification efforts in Vietnam suffered a tragic and untimely loss. On this team was Dr. Arthur D. Pickett, an outstanding leader in education and an honored and respected citizen of the

14th District of Illinois. Dr. Pickett devoted much of his life to the field of education, and we in the 14th District are grateful for the privilege of having called this dedicated, learned man our neighbor.

Time Magazine Insults 5 Million Americans of Mexican Descent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Mexican American community of Los Angeles was shocked by the recent insulting and distorted article, "Pocho's Progress," which appeared in the April 28 issue of Time magazine.

I was surprised and disappointed to learn that a major national publication would print an account of the life of a people, rich in heritage and culture, by generalizing from an unintelligent observation of a few examples.

The article is replete with the kind of coded, but easily identified, ethnic slurs well-calculated to stir latent prejudice in an unsuspecting reader—a regrettable example of a vicious type of free-wheeling journalistic license unworthy of the high standard of factual reporting we have a right to expect from any reputable magazine.

It is an insult to more than 4 million U.S.-born Americans of Mexican descent, called "Pochos" by Time magazine—a term long considered most derogatory and degrading. It is degrading, also, to our younger generation who are struggling to improve their condition by more active participation in their community affairs.

Those who take their position in the lifestream of our Nation, raise a family, buy a home, and strive for an education in the schools, colleges, and universities of California deeply resent being branded "Agringados" by Time magazine because they were neatly dressed and had "adapted to Anglo style."

And, most of all, Mr. Speaker, it is an insult to Mexico and to the "newly arrived" from our great Republic to the south whom Time magazine calls "Cholos," the most insulting term of all. It is no wonder that Time magazine caused raised eyebrows in Latin America where the article was first brought to my attention.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what Time magazine would call Pvt. Daniel Fernandez, recently awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously by President Johnson. Would Time call him and his fellow American soldiers of Mexican descent—those 17 Medal of Honor winners and the many who died for their country in Europe, the Pacific, Korea, and Vietnam—"Pochos," "Pachucos," "Cholos," or would they just be "Agringados" because, like all other Americans, they were fighting in the uniform of their country?

The bigotry and bias of the writer is clearly evidenced in the article, "Pocho's Progress," and is an affront and insult to persons of Mexican descent in both Mexico and the United States.

I realize it was probably written by a prejudiced individual with a preconceived misconception of Mexican culture. The writer also could have written his article in the "cantinas" which he describes so well, but the truth of the matter is that the second largest minority in the United States has been deeply hurt by Time magazine's attempt to perpetuate profound misunderstanding about the Mexican-American community, its culture, its aspirations, and its contribution to the United States.

As a Member of Congress, and on behalf of some 5 million Americans of Mexican descent, I urgently request Time magazine to issue an immediate apology for this gratitious affront and calculated ethnic slur against the Spanish-speaking community of our Southwestern States.

I believe such action is required not only in the interest of domestic harmony among our own people, but particularly because of the unfortunate effect this article may well have on our longstanding "good neighbor" relationship with the citizens of Mexico, our fellow American Republic with whom we share a common border nearly 2,000 miles long.

Dwindling Partnerships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that a needed Headstart program in Huntington Beach, Calif., will not be operative this summer because the Federal bureaucracy could not make a decision in time. The group sponsoring the Huntington Beach summer Headstart program could no longer wait for a decision from the Office of Economic Opportunity. The program was scheduled to begin July 10, but by the middle of April the Christ Presbyterian Church of Huntington Beach, the agency sponsoring the program, had no definite word on the disposition of its proposal, first submitted in October of 1966.

I wonder how many other needed programs throughout the Nation have had to be canceled because the decision-making machinery of Government could not produce in time? I wonder how many children will not have available a wide variety of authorized and funded programs because of the ponderous Government machinery not being able to make timely decisions?

Let me stress that when we enter into a program such as Headstart, or a program authorized under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, or any of the myriad of other programs that require local implementation, we are participating in a partnership. In order for the partnership to be successful in achieving its purpose, all participants must work in concert. This simple thesis is the core of President Johnson's vision of creative federalism.

The Federal Government cannot uphold its responsibilities as a partner unless it is capable of the necessary flexibility to act in a situation when such action is timely and relevant. A decision that is no longer relevant to the problem it seeks to effect is worthless. The bureaucracy's record is making timely decisions has never been one to evoke elaborate praise. Increasingly, however, the ponderosity of Federal decisionmaking has been thwarting the effective implementation of important programs authorized by Congress.

If the President is serious about creative federalism, may I humbly suggest that he take a long hard look at the workings of the administrative machinery. He will find they are in need of a good oiling. Until this is done, the other partners in creative federalism will continue to face frustration and missed opportunity. Sadly, the ones who suffer are those most in need of help. This summer youngsters in Huntington Beach, Calif., and undoubtedly children throughout the Nation, will not have Headstart programs available because of the disillusioning reason that the bureaucracy was unable to make a funding decision in time.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I include a recent letter that illustrates the point I have made.

CHRIST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Huntington Beach, Calif., April 10, 1967.

MR. HARRY HOLMBERG,
Fullerton, Calif.

DEAR MR. HOLMBERG: It is with regret that I must inform you the session of Christ Presbyterian Church has decided to withdraw the proposal for a Head Start program this summer using our facilities.

When the proposal was submitted last October, we were assured the grant would be announced by the end of February. As the grant has not been announced and there has been no firm assurance of government money to implement our proposal, the session does not feel able to assume full responsibility for the program.

To carry out the proposal as submitted, would take more time than remains before the starting date of July 10.

We wish to thank you for the help you have offered and trust you will understand this decision. Our concern for the people who would have been helped by Head Start remains, and we hope to offer them some alternate program.

Sincerely yours,
EDITH TARZIAN, *Coordinator.*

Junior High School Students on Draft

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Armed Services begins hearings today on the renewal of the selective service law. In this connection, I recently asked the views of a large group of junior high school students in my district on the draft—students who in the not too distant future will be faced with serving their country in the military. Members of Congress who have the difficult decision of any changes in the law will be interested in the views of these young Americans. And, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am including, following these remarks, the complete results of that questionnaire.

Most of the replies, 24 percent, supported the present law and system of selective service. The remainder was divided between five alternatives to the draft, but it was interesting to note that only 10 percent of these students at Chinook Junior High School in Bellevue, Wash., favored the President's proposal on selective service. These students also overwhelmingly disapproved of President Johnson's proposal for a lottery draft. Eighty-six percent of the 641 students responding turned down the President's suggestion. The majority of these young people also felt persons should become eligible for the draft at age 21.

Mr. Speaker, these are the views of junior high school students whose thoughts on the selective service must be taken seriously as their lives enter the threshold of the effects of the draft.

The tabulation of the answers to my questionnaire follows:

CONGRESSMAN THOMAS M. PELLY REQUESTS YOUR VIEWS

Very shortly legislation revising selective service regulations will come to the floor of the House for consideration. So that I may have the views of those most directly affected, I would be pleased if you would check the proposal which you believe to be most equitable with regard to student deferments:

Check below	Present system and alternatives	Student deferments	Nonstudent deferments
( )	Present law and system (154/24 percent).	Granted by local boards on basis of judgment of each board. Deferments only for full-time students, with guidelines provided for consideration of local board by Selective Service Headquarters.	Granted on judgment of local board within statutory limits of required exemptions and deferements and guidelines on occupational deferments furnished by Selective Service Headquarters.
( )	President's message (63/10 percent).	None in future for postgraduate work except in case of medical and dental courses; decision on whether to curtail undergraduate deferments after more public discussion.	Firm rules to be applied uniformly in the country.
( )	H.R. 5017 (84/13 percent)......	Continued for both undergraduate and graduate work, with binding national guidelines for local boards. No family deferment permitted after end of student status. Students, after deferments expire, enter pool of 18½-year-olds and remain liable as others for 4 years.	Departments of Labor and Commerce set national guidelines on critical jobs which will become binding on local board classification. Repeal statutory provision that gives local boards autonomy from guidelines.
( )	S. Con. Res. 12 (135/21 percent).	Service liability postponed until end of undergraduate work, but no longer than 4 years. Does not apply in time of war or national emergency.	Eliminate all but extreme hardship.
( )	Civilian Advisory Panel (136/21 percent).	Automatically granted for accepted full-time study. Liable on equal basis with nonstudents at end of student status, receipt of undergraduate degree, or age 24. No further deferments except extreme hardship or certain postgraduate programs.	Deferments for occupations determined by National Security Council to be critical. Judgment to grant left to local board.
( )	National Advisory Commission (36/6 percent; NA 33/5 percent).	No further deferments, but those presently deferred would complete degree work and join draft eligibles; others later not taken until end of sophomore year. (A minority favored continued deferments.)	None except for apprentices finishing present training, and extreme hardship in future cases.

2. At what age do you feel persons should become eligible for the draft? (Circle One): Age 19, 175, 28%; age 20, 88, 11%; age 21, 244, 38%; age 22, 53, 8%; age 23, 31, 5%; age 24, 34, 5%; age 25, 7, 1%; age 26, 8, 1%.

3. Do you approve of President Johnson's proposal for a lottery-draft? (Circle one): Yes, 90, 14%; no, 551, 86%.

Remarks of Congressman Alton Lennon at Christening of U.S. Coast Guard Cutter "Durable"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 29, marked another red letter day for the U.S. Coast Guard yard in Baltimore, the christening of the Coast Guard cutter *Durable*. This is the ninth of the new class of ships designed by the Coast Guard for search and rescue duty to be christened and launched. Powered by two 2,500-horsepower diesel engines, this 210-foot, twin-screw ship is capable of a sustained sea speed of 18 knots. Of special interest is the fact that this class of ship does not have the traditional smoke stack. Instead, exhaust gases are discharged from the stern. This allows a much larger helicopter landing deck for servicing such craft while on long range or extended search missions.

The keel was laid on July 1, 1966, and commissioning is scheduled for early January 1968. The *Durable* will be assigned to the Eighth Coast Guard District and will replace the *Legare* at Freeport. Her home port will be Galveston, Tex.

The welcoming remarks were made by Capt. A. B. Engel, the commanding officer of the yard. The Commandant of the Coast Guard, Adm. Willard J. Smith, was over for the occasion and introduced the sponsor and presented the gift.

You will be interested to know that Mrs. Alton A. Lennon, the wife of our very able colleague, was the sponsor of the cutter, assisted by Mrs. John E. Campion, the matron of honor.

It was my privilege to attend the ceremony and to say a few words in behalf of the speaker, the husband of the sponsor, Congressman LENNON, a very valuable member of our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and chairman of the Subcommittee on Oceanography. As a staunch advocate of our Coast Guard, his address will be of interest to all Members of the Congress, and, therefore, I am inserting it for their perusal:

REMARKS OF ALTON LENNON, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, CHRISTENING-LAUNCHING OF THE U.S. COAST GUARD CUTTER "DURABLE," CURTIS BAY, MD., APRIL 29, 1967

Admiral Smith—other distinguished officers and men of the Coast Guard—distinguished guests—ladies and gentlemen.

Mrs. Lennon—"Kay" to many of you—and I will always remember with deepest gratitude and pride our part in this christening-launching ceremony. I must admit I have shared the thrill and excitement that has been here as this hour approached.

Upon my assignment—in January, 1957—to the Committee on Merchant and Fisheries—my first request was that I be appointed a member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee.

Since that time—it has been my great pleasure and privilege to work with and to assist in every way I could those who have the responsibility for the continuing development of the Coast Guard. I have sought determinedly that our Coast Guard have the proper means and equipment for its vital role of protection and defense.

The launching of the *Durable* is—therefore—a great thrill to me—because I know the significant need for this ship—and others like her—to perform the important mission of the Coast Guard.

The *Durable* is the third in a series of five medium endurance class cutters scheduled for construction here at the Coast Guard yard. She will be commissioned in January next year and is to have a crew of 60 men.

This 210-foot cutter has the latest electronic navigation and communication equipment—and will afford her crew modern and comfortable living quarters—complete with airconditioning—wall to wall carpeting—and oil paintings! As we observe—there is a helicopter flight deck located aft—which will aid immeasurably in search and rescue operations. The *Durable* is then—a combination of the newest innovations in liveability and serviceability.

The *Durable* is designed primarily for search and rescue work—and secondarily for law enforcement. Her area of operations will also include—policing coastal marine traffic—oceanographic and marine research—patrolling and guarding our shores against infiltration or challenges to our fishing and national interests.

The Coast Guard has many missions in peacetime and in wartime. The valiant men of the Coast Guard—whose motto is *Semper Paratus*—are *always ready* to risk their lives to save others and to protect our country in peacetime and wartime emergencies.

Our Coast Guard is doing an invaluable job in Vietnam. Their versatile vessels are suited for patrol duty in the area waters—and for blockading the Viet Cong supply boats and barges.

As we launch the *Durable* today—we are acutely aware that she may have a future combat role for the service of our Nation and the cause of freedom—yes—even the Vietnam conflict.

This possibility leads our thoughts to the hope that the name of this vessel is symbolic—that we seek a *Durable*—firm—lasting—permanent—and enduring peace.

Our Nation desires and works toward an end to present hostilities and an honorable—*Durable* settlement. Our President has repeatedly stated America's intention to work ceaselessly to bring peace to Vietnam.

As the SEATO Council recently affirmed—aggression increases the danger to free societies everywhere.

We are determined to uphold our firm commitment to the peoples of Southeast Asia—to halt the advance of aggressive world communism—and to defend the principles of freedom and democracy.

We must continue to demonstrate to the world that we are proud of the freedom we have obtained—and that we are determined that those to whom we are committed will have the same privilege and the right to shape their destiny.

Those in our country who preach discord and demagoguery do a grave disservice to the policy objectives of their Government. The draft card burners get the headlines—and not enough is said about those who sacrifice—and those responsible—solid citizens who endorse and support their country's policies. Our brave men of the Coast Guard—and other services on the Vietnam front—believe it is worth the price to defend this Nation—and our allies in the cause of principle—commitment—and freedom.

Firm containment is our objective—it increases the chance that the Communist world will generate co-operation in peace. Our action in the Vietnam area is defeating expansionist ambition—for the aggressive forces have received the message that the United States does not ignore her commitments.

Our presence in Vietnam is justified—we are there—but let there be no doubt that the American people—as a majority—persevere toward honorable negotiations. Our efforts are dedicated to a *Durable* victory—and to international justice and peace.

It is a high honor to participate in this significant occasion—and I would offer a prayer of godspeed for all who have had a part in the planning and construction of this vessel—for the outstanding leadership of our Coast Guard service—and for the future crews who will man the *Durable*.

Loyalty Day, 1967

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, our good friend and colleague, Congressman Ancher Nelsen, delivered a thoughtful speech before the Veterans of Foreign Wars Loyalty Day program in Shakopee, Minn.

I have read with great interest the text of that speech, Mr. Speaker; it is an outstanding statement of what loyalty to America means in these troubled times. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] has forcefully stated the position of the United States in Vietnam and I commend him for clearly and concisely outlining the history and nature of our commitment to the cause of freedom in southeast Asia.

The text of the speech follows:

Speech of Congressman Ancher Nelsen, at VFW Loyalty Day, Shakopee, Minn., April 29, 1967

Friends and members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I wish to congratulate you on your worthwhile effort in sponsoring this Loyalty Day celebration, and in honoring our fighting men in Vietnam. I would like to pay special tribute to the Vietnam veterans present. Those of you home from Vietnam have our gratitude and thanks for your dedication to American ideals and principles. Be assured your sacrifices are honored by the vast majority of your fellow citizens, and we are all glad to have you back home.

There seems to be increasing recognition of the fact that we, as Americans, are losing some of the traits that are fundamental to the greatness of our country. We need to analyze the word loyalty, what it means and whether it is something we expect only from the other fellow. Sometimes this appears the case. And so, on this Loyalty Day, perhaps we, as citizens, need to give thought to a little self-examination.

The story is told of the critical housewife who, while visiting with her pastor, looked out her kitchen window and observed her neighbor's wash on the line. Said the lady to the pastor, "Look how dirty the clothes are on my neighbor's line." The minister looked as directed. His answer was "Lady, it's not your neighbor's wash that's dirty, it's your window."

What brings this to mind is the fact that, short days ago, we witnessed in our own country noisy demonstrations which ridiculed America before the world. A fantastic assortment of Vietniks and peaceniks, pot smokers and banana peelers, pacifists and Communists, assembled to degrade and belittle American efforts in Vietnam. The American flag was burned, to the anger, dismay and shame of millions of Americans. Numerous draft cards were burned. Inflammatory signs were thrust before the television cameras. One read "I don't give a damn for Uncle Sam." Another extolled "Draft beer, not boys." Angry slogans were chanted, and bitter speeches were made. Our President was called a buffoon, our Secretary of State a fool, and our Secretary of Defense a racist. Our nation was denounced as "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world."

It is ironic to most of us that these sorry things happened almost within the shadow of the Statue of Liberty.

But it was not the Statue of Liberty, but the demonstrations themselves, which made headlines around the world. And nowhere were those headlines more welcome or useful than to our enemies in Communist North Vietnam.

Clearly, it is time for some interior window-washing. Clearly, there is a vital need to present the real American picture to our friends, as well as our enemies, in the world. Tonight, I hope to touch on both these matters.

Taking the window-washing task first, perhaps some of us do not take time to understand and appreciate the fundamental reasons for basic loyalty to America. For some years I have kept a little definition of American freedom which I would like to read. It goes this way: "Freedom is a man at the lathe, or at the desk, doing the job he likes to do, and speaking up for himself. It is a man in the pulpit, or on the street corner, speaking his mind. It is a man puttering in his garden in the evening, and swapping talk with his neighbor over the fence. It is the unafraid faces of men and women and children at the beach on Sunday, or looking out of the car windows speeding along a four-lane highway.

"It is a man saying, 'Howdy, stranger,' without looking cautiously over his shoulder. It is the people of the country making up their own minds. It is a soprano singing the Star-Spangled Banner off key, and meaning every word of it.

"Freedom is the air you breathe and the sweat you sweat. It is you, and 190 million people like you, with your chins up daring anybody to take it away from you."

My good friend Al McIntosh of Luverne, one of the finest country editors in the nation, has also been doing some thinking about loyalty. Here is part of Al's case, taken from a recent editorial:

"If any man or woman can point his finger at any other nation on the face of the earth and truthfully say:

"This nation is a greater nation than the United States.

"No other nation offers greater freedoms to everyone regardless of race, religion or color.

"No other nation offers greater opportunity to achieve the good things of life in a material or spiritual way.

"No other nation has such willingness to succor those oppressed, to empty its purses for those in need.

"No other nation has so much concern for the welfare of the sick, the elderly, the poor.

"If any man can look me in the eye and tell me *that*, with proof of a better nation than America, then we'll join a 20th century expedition of modern day Pilgrims to sail away to that New World.

"Come to think of it—on second thought—we don't think we'd go. We'll stay here just as long as a merciful Lord lets us . . . to work in our own tiny way for a better United States and a Happier World. My country—may she ever be right; But right or wrong—my country." End of quote.

Such knowledge, for the vast majority of us, explains why loyalty is not just a phrase for the frontline soldiers in Vietnam who are risking their lives on behalf of our country. Such a mighty heritage means we have an obligation to our forebears and to our fighting men of past and present to meet our homefront responsibilities with equal loyalty and courage.

And here, we realize we have not met our obligations as well as we should.

Sometimes we grow indignant at the evil in the world, while not even paying proper attention to raising our own children.

Sometimes we denounce the actions of our churches or ministers, when we will not even venture inside the church doors on Sunday and have not in years.

Sometimes we castigate our schools and teachers, while preferring TV to the PTA, the pro football game to the school board meeting, the sewing circle to the school open house.

Sometimes we complain about government, while refusing any citizen responsibility whatsoever for making it good government.

Sometimes we ask for far more than we're willing to give to anyone or anything.

All too frequently, we selfishly demand more and more handouts from our government when war, debt and inflation have made such a course dangerous.

All too frequently we have avoided our responsibility to carefully reflect on national proposals of far-reaching consequences, accepting at face value cheap political slogans.

All too frequently, we sit back napping while George does it, awakening to find our personal or economic or political liberties have been infringed, our Constitution squeezed.

All too frequently we have neglected preserving for our grandchildren and theirs the American way of life. We have neglected fostering certain characteristics which have made that way of life possible—qualities like integrity, self-reliance, morality, industry, ingenuity, vision and the courage to take risks.

Perhaps some of the basic breakdowns in this country, involving morality, crime, racial and labor strife—even loyalty—result from failures that start right at our own front door. Perhaps there is greater need to recognize that liberty and license are not now and never have been synonymous; that with our freedoms come obligations and responsibilities which cannot be shunned without national peril.

And perhaps we have failed to properly and responsibly instruct some of our young people about these obligations. I recall how shocked so many people were, a year or two ago, to read the results of a survey taken in several leading colleges. It was taken by the United States Jaycees organization. The survey among college students showed the following: 84% do not think patriotism is vital or plays an important part in American life; 71% do not believe an accused person has the right to face his accuser; 41% do not believe in freedom of the press; 40% would deny certain groups the right to assemble peacefully 34% believe certain persons should be denied the right of free speech; 62% believe a worker should not produce all he can; 61% do not think the profit motive is necessary to the survival of free enterprise; 62% think the government has the responsibility to provide jobs.

My friends, unless our children receive instruction in the basics of our democracy, the whole purpose of our educational system becomes a failure—no matter how much money we spend on our schools or where the money to run them comes from.

Let us remind ourselves and our children of the real American coin: the American coin universally stamped In God We Trust; the American coin, whether a Lincoln penny, an FDR dime or a Kennedy half dollar, bearing the proud word Liberty; the American coin ever proclaiming our national loyalty in the words E Pluribus Unum.

If we do our part to wash off our dirty windows here at home, revealing these American fundamentals more clearly, we will better serve our nation.

Without question, our great present test of American will and loyalty is Vietnam. There are legitimate disagreements about this tragic war, and no one considers responsible dissent to be disloyal. Many feel we should never have become so deeply committed to an Asian land war in the first place. Many of us are concerned when sound military advice about purely strategic matters is reported overruled by Washington. The lives of Americans may be hanging in the balance.

A great many of us feel it has been a grave mistake to conduct the war on what appears to be a consensus or opinion poll basis. There is no way of telling how many American casualties or costs might have been avoided had the responsible use of American and allied power been brought to bear far earlier than has been the case.

In my judgment, Vietnam shows us that a firm policy delayed is an invitation to an escalated war later. I well recall a few years ago when the entire Middle East threatened to explode. President Eisenhower immediately sent Marines ashore in Lebanon, and the fight was over. I remember well how Chinese shelling of Quemoy and Matsu threatened a major conflict in the East. Again, President Eisenhower sailed the Seventh Fleet right up the middle, between the beseiged islands and mainland China. The shelling stopped. The way the Russians were stopped in Cuba is still another example of the effectiveness of early, firm action.

In any case, the 1964 campaign promise that no American boys would fight an Asian war has left a feeling of disillusionment. The pledge that the major part of our military task would be completed by the end of 1965 has caused skepticism. Great concern has grown up over the Administration's lack of candor about casualties, about costs of the war, and about peace feelers. So there have come to be many different views and many reservations about Vietnam.

But, my friends, it is well to remember this: We cannot go back to 1960 when we had only 700 military personnel stationed in South Vietnam to train South Vietnamese. Today, more than half a million Americans are stationed in Southeast Asia, and thousands more are to be sent.

We cannot go back to 1960 when no Americans had been killed in combat. Today, more than 5,000 have died defending that little country and our national interests, and more than 30,000 have been wounded.

An effort costing about $250 million in 1960 has become a major war costing between $20 and $24 billions of dollars annually.

In men, in casualties, in dollars, in honor, compassion and national interest, this nation has been committed to halting Communist aggression in South Vietnam. We cannot withdraw. We must win an honorable peace.

To appease the Communists now would be to invite the death of millions in South Vietnam who have struggled for their freedom for more than a decade. To appease the Communists now would insure the decimation of every country in Southeast Asia siding with us. To withdraw now would surely encourage Communist aggression closer to our doorstep, and increase the likelihood of worldwide nuclear war.

Some doubt that these disasters would follow. However, we have the word of the Communists themselves on this point. General Giap, the Commander in Chief of the North Vietnamese forces, has made the following comment:

"South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time. If the special warfare that the United States imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, then it can be defeated anywhere in the world."

Many Communists have made the same point. Premier Kosygin of Russia told an American reporter a couple of years ago "We believe that national liberation wars are just wars and they will continue as long as there is national oppression by imperialist powers."

Clearly, South Vietnam is the testing ground for the war of liberation. If it is successful there, it will be used widely around the world.

We have learned, through long and bitter experience, that appeasement of the Communists never works.

It seems crystal clear that Ho Chi Minh and his cohorts in China and Russia have no present desire for a peaceful settlement. During the most recent four-day truce in February, it is estimated the Communists moved 23,000 tons of supplies and equipment into more strategic locations. Their shipments on water were 26 times the daily norm. Their shipments by trucks were 22 times the daily norm.

They have stepped up their campaign of terror against the civilian population because of the elections now going on in South Vietnam. So far in this election period 40 people have been killed, 10 wounded and 103 kidnapped, including many candidates for office. This war by intimidation is an old story in Vietnam. It has been reported that total civilian deaths since 1957 run to 25,000 people, with 60,000 civilians kidnapped. The amazing thing is this coercion still doesn't always work. In one South Vietnam village this month, the Viet Cong killed or kidnapped every single candidate. The people of the village had to be advised there could be no election because there were no candidates left. Twelve people stepped forward, volunteering to run.

Consideration should also be given to the sincere efforts of the United States to obtain an honorable peace settlement. Since 1964 there have been more than 25 major peace probes initiated or supported by the United States. The Communists have rejected peace proposals from U Thant of the United Nations, from Pope Paul, and from many heads of state as well.

And consideration should also be given to the number of important leaders who have visited South Vietnam, and come away solidly backing our commitment there. Senator Brooke of Massachusetts is just one dramatic example.

Few of us have all the answers about Vietnam, but we all have questions about what lies ahead in this brutal conflict. At this time, peace or victory or stability seem most remote, according to most observers. We are faced with the prospect of prolonged war, of the spread of conflict to Thailand and other parts of Southeast Asia, and of Communist China becoming equipped with nuclear weapons.

It has been estimated a five-year war in Vietnam would, at the 1966 rate, involve the frightful cost of 125,000 American casualties. This high cost is dwarfed by the catastrophic losses which South Vietnam would suffer in five more years of fighting. To the South Vietnamese and other threatened people of Asia, this type of limitless war may come to be an unattractive alternative to Communist domination.

Given such sobering news, many of us believe the urgent immediate question facing the nation is how to end this war more speedily, at smaller cost, while safeguarding the independence and freedom of South Vietnam. The answer of many loyal Americans is: to resolve to win.

Thank you.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 1967

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 28, it was my pleasure to address a group of people in Fort Worth, Tex., and I chose as my subject, our commitment in Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the speech which I gave.

VIETNAM

So many people have spoken and written about Viet Nam by this time, that there really isn't anything new that anyone can say about it. Surely, every thing that can be said, has been said.

But, on the other hand, so much has been said—and so much of what has been said has been so wrong—that perhaps it would be helpful to us all if we got back for a while to first principles and re-examined our basic thinking on the subject.

I want to start out by making one point perfectly clear: I support—on principle—the position of the Johnson Administration, on Viet Nam.

I have some reservations about the way the war is being conducted, which I shall go into a little later. I feel we should step *up* our military effort in Viet Nam, not decrease it. I believe we should do everything within our power to bring this dismal and degrading war to a quick and successful conclusion.

I say this advisedly, and from experience. I hate war with all my heart. I have been a soldier—I have seen it close up—and anyone who has had that experience must hate everything about war.

I wish with all my being that there were an easy, cheap and honorable way to get out of Viet Nam. There simply is no such thing. The only way we can get our soldiers out of Viet Nam is to *win* our way out—fight our way out—bomb our way out.

And—despite all the agonized protests of the peaceniks and the bearded pickets—I never came across a single soldier in Viet Nam who did not wholeheartedly agree with this point of view.

I talked with a lot of our fighting men—from General Westmoreland to the cooks in the field messes—the whole spectrum of our military commitment. They all hated the war. That's natural and normal. But even though they hated what they were doing—*every single one of them agreed that what they were doing was right and unavoidable.* Everyone to whom I spoke had faith in the righteousness of our cause, and in the absolute necessity of victory.

And—at the risk of sounding intolerant—I want to say that I am far more inclined to accept their testimony than to accept the testimony of a bunch of bearded pickets in front of the White House.

My view on Viet Nam is this.

We are there because we have a moral commitment there. That's point one. The United States of America is one of the few nations left in the world capable of feeling the force of having a moral commitment toward those weaker than ourselves. And I am proud of that. I wouldn't want it to be any other way.

If we were to abandon Viet Nam tomorrow we would find ourselves in moral bankruptcy throughout the entire world. Our influence for the good would be destroyed entirely. No other nation could ever feel again that they could depend upon our word or our honor.

But, even more compelling is the global reason for our being there.

The battle against Communist tyranny in Southeast Asia—and all Asia—and all the world—is being fought today in Viet Nam. We are not looking for temporary results, we are looking for permanent results. We are engaged in a battle to stop Chinese Communism just as cold as we have stopped Russian Communism in the Western world.

If you think back to all the areas of the world where Russian Communism was a living threat to our own security and resistance 20 years ago, and think objectively about what has happened since that time, you have to admit that—with all its manifold and manifest faults—the system has worked.

We think of ourselves as competitors with Soviet Russia now, but the old gun-on-the-hip hostility has abated and, more and more, Communist Russia is not only adopting some Western democratic capitalistic ideas, like the profit system, but it is making overtures to find ways of becoming our allies against the menace of Red China.

We have faced the Russians down in many areas—in Greece, in most parts of Africa, in Latin America—and in strategic parts of the Far East as well. It is a continuing fight, but we are winning. We are even winning in India—and I cannot think of a more unlikely place to win.

This has taken a full twenty years, and it will take many years more before we can claim victory, but I feel it is worth it.

This is by no means a full endorsement of our foreign aid program. It is an acknowledgement that—despite its waste and its frequent foolishness—it has achieved peace in many areas of our troubled world.

I am convinced that we are now using the same techniques against Red China that we have used against Red Russia. Viet Nam is not an isolated battle ground. It happens to be the place where we have drawn a line in the sand and have said we will not retreat one step further. It happens to be the place where we have decided to fight for the freedom of the entire East. It may take us another 20 years to achieve the political impotence of Red China—but if we can achieve this without creating a major world holocaust, I think the goal is well worth the effort.

One thing is for sure: If the United States were to be so short-sighted as to abandon the fight we would unwillingly and helplessly witness the spread of Communist despotism in ever widening circles throughout all Asia to a point where the freedom and the security of the entire world were threatened. If we were to abandon our crusade in Viet Nam we would see the entire balance of power tilt irrevocably against us.

If we win our struggle—and I am sure we shall win—South Viet Nam will become a successful bastion of democracy in the Asiatic orbit, just as South Korea has become—and we don't have a more successful product of our international policy of idealistic self-interest than South Korea. Or—I might say, than the prospect of what Laos or Thailand might become with a little more time.

Surely we have learned by this time—in such bitter classrooms as Munich and Yalta—that peace cannot be bought cheaply, and whenever we attempt to buy peace foolishly at a basement bargain price, we end up by paying a price we cannot afford to pay.

The issue in Viet Nam is further muddled, in my opinion, by some people—many of them with the best intentions in the world—who talk about "peace" and "negotiations" as if they meant the same thing, and without any reference to our real objectives in Viet Nam.

If our *only* aim was peace—peace at any price—peace in our time—peace according to the Munich formula—we could have had that long ago, *on Hanoi's terms*—without sending a single soldier overseas.

But, to argue for peace without reference to our ultimate goals is to show a complete lack of concern for the safety and future of the people of South Viet Nam, who would certainly, without our protection, fall prey to the Communists and, after them, all Southwest Asia would fall in the same way.

We hear a lot about negotiation and compromise these days—but those who do the talking never specify with *whom* we should be negotiating, or what *kind* of compromise we should be willing to make.

Now, really, can there *be* a compromise? Our *minimum* goal is to prevent the Communists from controlling Saigon. The enemy's *minimum* goal is to achieve the control of Saigon.

This doesn't leave very much room for negotiation.

If we have learned anything from our contacts with the Communist world, it is that it is disastrous to attempt to negotiate with them from a position of weakness, or even, from a position of equality.

Of *course,* Hanoi wants us to talk about peace—under its own terms. The Communists would *love* to have us stop the bombings while we talked and talked and *talked* with them about the advantages of peace. Of course, while we talked with them of peace, they would be infiltrating troops into South Viet Nam and—in the middle of the peace talks—they would confront us with a position of strength that they couldn't achieve in any other way.

Some of you may think I'm exaggerating. Let me say this: We have captured documents—instructions to Viet Cong and North Viet Namese commanders—telling them to disregard any talk of negotiations but to take advantage of any lull in the fighting by advancing when opposition ceased.

The Communists have always, in the past, tried to use peace negotiations as a *tactic of war*—and there is absolutely no reason to believe they have any intention of doing otherwise in this case.

We must not give them that opportunity.

In Korea we conducted peace talks with the Communists at Pommunjon for two years and during all that time there was no truce, no suggestion of a cease fire. Some of the bloodiest fighting of the war took place while we spoke of peace. As a result, South Korea was saved and it is today just about the most solid and most reliable ally we have in the entire East. If we had soft-headedly agreed to a cease-fire at that time, I am convinced that there would be no South Korean Republic today.

The most frustrating point about Viet Nam is that this is a war we could win any time we wanted to, if we were only willing to take the steps necessary for victory. I am not a bloodthirsty man, or a vengeful man, or even a reckless man—but I cannot agree with a policy of fighting a limited war when that policy is extending the hostilities and costing the lives of our young men in uniform.

I am not talking about atomic bombing. We can win without that.

I *am* talking about giving our military commanders the authority to go out and demolish every worthwhile target in North Viet Nam—air bases, hydroelectric power plants, the works.

With ordinary, conventional weapons we could close up the port of Haiphong as tight as a drum and stop the flow of war materiel by doing so.

If we were to do this—and I sincerely hope we do—the Communists would come running to the peace conference and we would be calling the shots at the negotiating table. That is the only way we can effect a meaningful peace.

As of now, the government of North Viet Nam and of the Viet Cong are convinced that the United States has neither the patience or the fortitude to carry the war to a successful conclusion. They are confident that the American will to resist will collapse—and they overestimate the influence and the validity of the loud-mouthed minority which opposes and derides our efforts and our intentions in Viet Nam.

These oppositionists are, in fact, prolonging the war. The Communists read all the publicity they create and are actually convinced that we are poised on the brink of an enormous political division on the war which will make our continued effort impossible.

And I might say that we have also captured documents on dead Viet Cong and North Viet Namese soldiers assuring them that the United States is on the verge of revolution because of the war in Viet Nam—and urging them to hold on and fight on because it is just a matter of time before the political structure of the United States collapses under the pressure of the peace-at-any-price faction within our borders.

We may not take the bearded pickets seriously, but the enemy does.

As a result of all this, Ho Chi Minh has shown absolutely no sincerity in his mouthings about peace talks. He has not budged an inch from his insistence that we must withdraw our troops before such talks can begin. His program for negotiations is to achieve a position of impregnable strength—and *then* to discuss a cessation of hostilities. In short, he will talk of peace only when we have abandoned every goal for the attainment of which we have spent billions of dollars and thousands of lives. If we yielded to such a proposal we would be absolutely *through* as a world power. Every non-committed nation in the world would immediately look eastward for protection and support—since we would have proved ourselves morally undependable and militarily incapable of subduing a third rate power in a minor war.

The Communists—and particularly the Communists of the Orient—understand only power. They understand only strength. It is incomprehensible to them that a great power like the United States should refrain from exerting its entire strength in a war because of our national talent for compassion. Compassion is something they do not understand; they equate it with weakness.

Personally, I feel that we have misdirected our compassion. In my opinion, it would be *more* compassionate if we were to strike at the north swiftly, effectively, totally and bring the war to an end, rather than prolonging the agony.

We are sick of war. We have had enough of it and we are a peaceful people. The rest of the world is sick of war. Every day we continue to fight in Viet Nam gives our enemies, even in friendly nations, the opportunity to attack us and to misinterpret our intentions. The faster we put an end to the whole depressing—but necessary—business the better, not only for us, but for both the North and the South Viet Namese, and for the rest of the free world.

The one thing we must not do, in my opinion, is to continue to fight the Communists in Viet Nam on a man to man basis.

The one thing the Communists have in abundance is manpower. Their leaders have no respect for the individual. They use men like shells. Every soldier is simply an expendable weapon.

To us, every soldier is a precious human commodity who must be protected and preserved as much as possible even under the grimmest circumstances of war.

The Communists think this attitude is sentimental nonsense. They are perfectly willing to swap us two, three, five or ten dead soldiers for one dead American soldier. They will keep doing this until they wear us down.

Every day the radio and television commentators read off a kind of grisly box score of Americans killed versus Communist killed. On the average day the score is in our favor, by about three to one. This makes everyone feel encouraged—but it is really nonsense. We are not going to make any significant headway in Viet Nam until we exploit to the full our technological advantages—our air power—our naval striking power and destroy the enemy's capability of making war.

Then and only then can we sit down with the Communist leaders and discuss peace on our terms—which must be a peace without any compromise on principle.

It's a nasty war—even nastier than most—but it is a necessary war, and it is a war that must be won. The future of freedom in the East and eventually the entire world can be won or lost right where we are fighting today.

Negotiation is not synonymous with peace. The Communists use negotiation as a military tactic. If we agreed to stop our bombing of North Viet Nam, they would interpret this as weakness and would achieve a military build-up which would make our efforts at negotiation futile. If we step up our bombing and make it impossible for North Viet Nam to continue the war, we can then sit down and put our feet under the same table with the Communists, serene in the knowledge that we were bargaining from a position of strength, not weakness.

And most important, our role in Viet Nam is not sinful, it is heroic. We are fighting for the freedom of humankind. We are making enormous sacrifices for an unselfish principle. Our position is worthy, not of scorn, but of pride. And it's about time that more Americans treated this ordeal with the respect it deserves.

Thank you and God bless you.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we are grateful for the sweet time of prayer, that calls us from a world of care, and bids us at our Father's throne make all our wants and wishes known.

At this altar of devotion we would be sure of Thy presence ere pressing duty leads us back to a noisy, crowded way.

May the great causes that in these agitated days concern Thy human family, and especially the crusade to preserve threatened freedoms for all Thy children, the selfless ministries that help to heal the world's wounds and rebuild its waste places, the attitudes that create good will and make possible at last a just and righteous peace, command the utter allegiance of our labor and our love. whose truth shall make us and all men free. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 2, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROHIBITION OF THE BUSINESS OF DEBT ADJUSTING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of the acquisition and installation of computers by the U.S. Army, Pacific, Department of the Army, dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of pricing methods used by various States in the purchase of prescribed drugs under federally aided public assistance programs, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 13

"A joint memorial to the Honorable President of the United States; to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled; to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission of the U.S. Government, and to the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife of the Department of the Interior

"We, your Memorialists, the members of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the Thirty-ninth Session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, appointed by the Congress of the United States, has set aside 17,000 acres of land in Bear Lake County, Idaho, for a national wildlife refuge; and,

"Whereas, it has been proposed that the refuge shall be named the 'Bannock National Wildlife Refuge'; and,

"Whereas, the site is not located in Bannock County, Idaho, which county is quite some distance from Bear Lake County, and the proposed name of 'Bannock National Wildlife Refuge' therefor causes considerable confusion; and,

"Whereas, concern has been expressed by the chambers of commerce, the county officials, sportsmen and numerous citizens of Idaho Legislative District No. 32, comprising the counties of Bear Lake, Caribou and Franklin, over the proposed name of 'Bannock National Wildlife Refuge' and the perplexity that would ensue therefrom; and,

"Whereas, it has been recommended that it would be suitable and proper that the wildlife refuge located in Bear Lake County be named the 'Bear Lake National Wildlife Refuge';

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Thirty-ninth Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, that the President and Congress of the United States, the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, and the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, be respectfully petitioned to authorize that the national wildlife refuge in Bear Lake County, Idaho, be given the name of Bear Lake National Wildlife Refuge.

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this Memorial to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America; to the members of the Migratory Bird Conservation Committee as follows: Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, Orville L. Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, John T. Connors, Secretary of Commerce, Roman L. Hruska, United States Senate, Lee Metcalf, United States Senate, Frank M. Karsten, United States House of Representatives, Silvio O. Conte, United States House of Representatives, F. G. Spoden, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; to Dr. Stanley A. Cain, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Fish and Wildlife and Parks; to John S. Gottschalk, Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; to Paul T. Quick, Regional Director of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife in Portland, Oregon; to Liven A. Peterson, Boise representative of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife; to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho in the Congress of the United States, and to John R. Woodworth, Director of the Fish and Game Department of the State of Idaho."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"House Joint Memorial 18

"To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas, on April 30, 1965, Congress appropriated $52,383 to the Nooksack Indian tribe of Washington State as a result of a claim made by the tribe for $3,735,600 in settlement for certain lands taken from the tribe in 1855; and

"Whereas, After various necessary deductions the amount of this sum remaining for distribution among the Nooksack Indians was less than $43,383; and

"Whereas, This sum was in settlement of Nooksack rights to 80,590 acres of land, whereas the plaintiffs claimed ancestral rights to 400,000 acres formerly occupied by the Nooksack tribe; and

"Whereas, The payment for the 80,590 acres was made on an estimate of an 1859 value of sixty-five cents an acre; and

"Whereas, There is much evidence to show that the land was worth at least one dollar and twenty-five cents an acre and probably more; and

"Whereas, The award made to the Nooksack Indians must therefore be regarded as grossly insufficient;

"Now, therefore, Your Memorialists respectfully pray that the Congress of the United States review the settlement of the Nooksack claims with a view of adjusting them by appropriate legislation if necessary; and

"Be it further resolved, That copies of this Memorial be transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each member of Congress from the State of Washington."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"A joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, and the Honorable President of the United States

"We, your Memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho assembled in the Thirty-ninth Session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas, the Eighty-eighth Congress of the United States of America, by an act, approved September 7, 1964, entitled Teton Basin Reclamation Project, Idaho, and known as Public Law 88–583; 78 Stat. 925, authorized to be appropriated for the construction of the Fremont Dam and other facilities of the lower division of the Teton Basin federal reclamation project, the sum of $52,000,000 plus or minus justifiable amounts for ordinary fluctuations in construction costs and for operation and maintenance costs; and

"Whereas, said project received the overwhelming support of Congress and all persons in the affected areas, of both political faiths, as being necessary and within the public interest to arrest the flooding waters of the Teton river and its tributaries by the construction of a dam and reservoir to use the impounded water, most of which in high runoff periods in the past has gone rushing down through the lower valleys eroding valuable farm lands and damaging and destroying homes and other properties, for the irrigation of some of the richest and most fertile arid and semiarid lands in the country, the development of river power opportunities, the providing for recreation facilities and the conservation of fish and wildlife, and

"Whereas, Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, recommended in his 1967 budget message to Congress that it approve, among other projects, $1,125,000 for the construction of Teton Basin Lower Teton Division.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Thirty-ninth Session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring, that the Congress and its respective committees and subcommittees and the President of the United States in this session of Congress be respectfully petitioned to give the very earliest consideration, approval and authorization to the making of an appropriation of $1,125,000 for construction of Teton Basin Lower Teton Division, Idaho.

"Be it further resolved, that the Secretary of State of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to immediately forward certified copies of this Memorial to the Senate and House of Representatives and the President of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this state."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 33

"Senate joint resolution—Memorializing the Congress to take the necessary steps to apportion to the State of Nevada its fair share of public lands highways funds

"Whereas, The Congress of the United States has periodically appropriated funds for the construction of highways across public lands; and

"Whereas, Since the inception of the program, the State of Nevada has received the sum of $1,695,058 with only $900,000 being received in the last 10 years; and

"Whereas, In the past, a large portion of such funds has been allocated to nonpublic land states; and

"Whereas, The State of Nevada ranks first among the 48 contiguous states in the percentage of federal lands within its borders but only ranks 18th out of the 23 participating states in the amount of funds received under the program; and

"Whereas, It therefore appears that the State of Nevada has not received its fair share of the funds apportioned to the several states under such program; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of Nevada, jointly,* That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to take such steps as are necessary to insure that the State of Nevada receives its rightful share of funds provided for public lands highways; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the legislative counsel is hereby directed to prepare and deliver copies of this resolution to the members of the Nevada congressional delegation, the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Mobile, Ala., favoring the issuance of a commemorative stamp to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Alabama territory, in 1967; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of a resolution from the Massachusetts General Court memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the amounts of minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Increasing the Amounts of Minimum Monthly Payments Under the Social Security Act

Whereas, The cost of the necessities of life in this country has risen to an all time high; and

Whereas, A substantial portion of the people of this nation depend to a large extent if not entirely upon the monthly payments received by them under the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, The current minimum monthly payments under said program have now become grossly inadequate for their needs; and

Whereas, An increase of such minimum payments to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple would tend to relieve such conditions; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

[SEAL] Norman L. Pidgeon,
Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Attest:

Kevin H. White,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Brooke] and myself, I send to the desk a certified copy of a resolution from the Massachusetts General Court memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation changing the designation of "Old-Age Assistance" to "Senior Citizens Assistance."

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION CHANGING THE DESIGNATION OF "OLD-AGE ASSISTANCE" TO "SENIOR CITIZENS ASSISTANCE"

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation changing the designation of Old-Age Assistance to Senior Citizens Assistance; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

[SEAL] NORMAN L. PIDGEON,
Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. PELL, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution (Rept. No. 206).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

H.R. 3399. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 88-240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission (Rept. No. 207).

REPORT ENTITLED "REVISION AND CODIFICATION"—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 208)

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I ask unanimous consent to submit a report entitled "Revision and Codification," pursuant to Senate Resolution 203, 89th Congress, and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports on treaties were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Executive G, 88th Congress, first session, convention concerning the exchange of official publications and Government documents between states and the convention concerning the international exchange of publications (Ex. Rept. No. 9);

Executive A, 90th Congress, first session, amendment to article 109 of the United Nations Charter (Ex. Rept. No. 10); and

Executive G, 90th Congress, first session, Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, open for signature at New York, March 3, 1961, to October 1, 1961 (Ex. Rept. No. 11).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Case, and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 1667. A bill to prohibit more effectively discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Clark, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Smathers, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1668. A bill to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Scott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1669. A bill to amend section 805(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to salaries for personal services paid to a director, officer, or employee; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. Lausche):

S. 1670. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to increase the penalty for persons who, in violation of such act, refuse induction into the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Eastland when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1671. A bill for the relief of Bernard J. Campbell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COOPER:

S. 1672. A bill for the relief of Kwang Sun Yi and Edgar Lee Martin; and

S. 1673. A bill for the relief of the estate of Charley Conley; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERVIN:

S. 1674. A bill to provide for holding terms of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of North Carolina in Roanoke Rapids, N.C.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1675. A bill to amend section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pearson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. Bartlett, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hart, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1676. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1677. A bill for the relief of Maj. Robert G. Smith, U.S. Air Force; and

S. 1678. A bill for the relief of American Petrofina Co. of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1679. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a deduction for expenses of preventing destruction of trees from disease of infestation and of removing infected or infested trees; and

S. 1680. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Presidential Commission on Simplification of the Income Tax Laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Carlson, Mr. Church, Mr. Clark, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Eastland, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Hill, Mr. Hollings, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Montoya, Mr. Morse, Mr. Moss, Mr. Morton, Mr. Mundt, Mr. Murphy, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Pell, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Scott, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, Mr. Yarborough, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1681. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1682. A bill to amend chapter 7 of title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals from two to five, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1683. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of Delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BAYH (for himself, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Dodd):

S.J. Res. 80. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bayh when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTIONS

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1671 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. ERVIN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 113); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1671) entitled "A bill for the relief of Bernard J. Campbell", now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report thereon to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such finding of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2

Mr. BAKER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 114); which was referred to the Committee on Government Operations:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 9, 1967.

(See the remarks of Mr. Baker when he submitted the above resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

IMPROVING THE ENFORCEMENT PROCEDURES OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill introduced for myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], and the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] to amend the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 concerning the enforcement powers of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the Record.

This bill is similar to the bill, S. 3092, which I and Senators Case and Kuchel introduced last year, concerning the same subject. This year I am pleased, also to be the cosponsor, with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], of S. 1308, which embodies, as a separate bill, the amendments concerning the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission proposed in title III of the administration's civil rights bill, and which is one of those bills that have resulted from the splitup of the administration civil rights bill. We are hoping this splitup will facilitate the passage of the bills separately, as they go to different committees and will have different fates.

Mr. President, S. 1308, good as it is, does not go quite far enough. The problems which the EEOC has encountered in handling its caseload are well known. Its performance so far has been excellent—within the budgetary and staff limitations which have been imposed on it. But because of these limitations it has been forced to spend far too much time handling individual cases, and this has not been able to turn its efforts toward sponsoring affirmative programs to end racial discrimination in employment. The recently published first annual report of the EEOC describes the plight of the Commission well. It states:

> Budget and staffing for the new Commission was predicated on estimates that 2,000 job discrimination complaints would be received in the first year. By June, 1966, the Commission had been deluged with 8,854 individual complaints—more than twice the number all state fair employment practice agencies receive in a year.
>
> This dramatic response to the new law reflected the confidence of civil rights organizations and minority persons in this new avenue to relief from discrimination. It also almost swamped the small Commission staff. In the midst of establishing investigation procedures and organizing the new agency, thousands of hours of uncompensated overtime were devoted to the flood of charges. Despite these dedicated efforts—and co-operation of charging parties and parties charged—the Commission's first year ended with many hundreds of unreached cases. Even though this backlog bore heavily on limited resources, the Commission and staff, nevertheless, did accomplish noteworthy results with the new law—many of which were far-reaching and precedent-setting.

A major feature of the bill which I am now introducing which is not included in S. 1308, is the strong link it would provide between the EEOC and the nationwide resources of the Department of Labor, particularly the investigative manpower of the vast existing network of its Wage-Hour Division. That division now handles compliance surveys of over 30,000 companies each year. By allowing the Commission to utilize the manpower of the Labor Department for investigatory work, the bill we are introducing would increase its resources immeasureably. The Commission's staff would then be able to concentrate more on its primary role of developing a general, affirmative antidiscrimination program. To aid the Commission even further in this respect, the bill would also authorize the Commission to accept volunteer assistance, particularly from business and industry.

The bill also goes further than S. 1308 in several other ways. It would, for example, extend the coverage of the law to all employers having eight or more employees. S. 1308 would leave present coverage unchanged, present law, at its widest, will cover only employers with 25 or more employees, and even that coverage will be delayed until July 1, 1968. Existing law will cover only 259,000 employers, only 8 percent of the total, and 29 million employees, only 40 percent of the total. Extending coverage to all employers with eight or more employees would expand the coverage of the law to 700,000 employers employing 40 million employees, or 21 percent of the Nation's employers and 54 percent of its employees.

The present bill will also extend coverage to employees of State and local governmental units. S. 1308 neglects entirely the highly important area of coverage of State and local government employees. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in its 1965 report on law enforcement in the South, made the following recommendation:

> In order to help assure that justice is administered in a nondiscriminatory manner, employment in law-enforcement agencies should be available to all persons, regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, providing for equal employment opportunities, does not cover public employment. Although discrimination in public employment can be challenged in private lawsuits, administrative and judicial remedies also should be provided. The Commission recommends that Congress consider amending title VII to extend its coverage to public employment.

The bill also goes further than S. 1308 in providing speedier, and more effective relief for violations of the act, or the orders of the Commission. The time which may elapse between the filing of a charge and the issuance of a complaint is limited to 30 days. Temporary injunctions may be obtained prior to the entry of a final order. The Commission is given power to issue final cease and desist orders which may require the establishment of on-the-job training programs, and to award damages. A civil penalty of $5,000 may be levied upon persons who violate Commission orders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the following is a summary of all the major changes in present law which would be effected by the bill. It would:

First. Give the EEOC the power to issue cease-and-desist orders which all other regulatory agencies have, but also retains the power of the Attorney General under the existing title VII to initiate civil suits against patterns or practices of discrimination in employment.

Second. Expand the coverage of title VII to employers and labor unions which have eight or more employees or members.

Third. Require the EEOC to conduct a continuing survey of apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs and to report quarterly to the Congress its findings.

Fourth. Give the EEOC the same investigatory powers which the Federal Trade Commission had under section 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act.

Fifth. Expand the coverage of title VII to employees of State and local governments, including State employment agencies.

Sixth. Limit precomplaint investigation and conciliation to not more than 30 days after a charge has been filed with the EEOC. This would prevent dilatory tactics on a respondent's part from prolonging the precomplaint proceedings. Other regulatory statutes do not require such precomplaint proceedings, and in this field particularly there is a need for rapid relief if it is to be at all effective.

Seventh. Authorize the EEOC to order affirmative action including the establishment of on-the-job training for anyone discriminated against. This is a significant remedy particularly where the defense is that there have been no qualified minority group applicants.

Eighth. Authorize the EEOC to order the payment of damages. This is needed particularly where no other relief is available to a particular grievant found to have been discriminated against.

Ninth. Authorize the EEOC to utilize the services of the Labor Department in conducting investigations, seeking voluntary compliance, conducting hearings, and coordinating training programs. This would help to overcome the serious limitations upon the EEOC's ability to handle its caseload, which has far exceeded expectations, by utilizing particularly the nationwide network of the Labor Department's Wage and Hour Division local offices and staff, and the staff of the Manpower Administration.

Tenth. Authorize the EEOC to receive donations of services and funds as so many other Federal agencies are authorized to do. This could be a highly useful source of expertise from the private sector.

Eleventh. Authorize the EEOC to obtain interlocutory relief, a temporary injunction, or restraining order, in the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals prior to a final order to avoid dilatory practices or repeated violations of the law or to afford relief where otherwise there would be irreparable injury.

Twelfth. Authorize the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals to order a civil penalty or no more than $5,000 in appropriate cases. The Federal Trade Commission Act provides a similar remedy.

Thirteenth. Make judicially reviewable findings of "no probable cause" by the EEOC and require that notice of such findings be given to complainants.

Fourteenth. Make consent agreements enforceable in the courts as EEOC final orders.

Fifteenth. Require complainants' consent to a finding of voluntary compliance prior to a hearing. It is now required only during a hearing.

Sixteenth. Permit a Commissioner who files a charge to participate as a witness in the hearing upon it, as is now authorized generally under the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. President, we are seeking to correct centuries of injustice with respect to discrimination in employment. The three major types of discrimination which we must eradicate are discrimination in employment, discrimination in education, and discrimination in housing.

This bill would go all the way in one area—employment—as is essential if we are to cope with the serious situation, which still finds millions of workers unprotected by antidiscrimination laws. It has been shown that these laws can work well. For example, in New York we have had such a law for 20 years, and it has been remarkably successful. Many other States of the Union have had similar success. Such laws are an essential and basic tool in our continuing war against poverty and racial injustice.

It is shocking that we still have widespread discrimination in employment. We have had it in the trade unions, such as the building trade unions. We have had it elsewhere, and we still have it, wherever we find it we must fight it.

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission is a great weapon for that purpose. We should give it the power it needs to do the job.

Mr. President, the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare begins hearings tomorrow on S. 1308. It is my hope that this year, at least, we can enact legislation to put some teeth in the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That act was the beginning; now it is up to us to finish the job.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill be received and appropriately referred, and printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1667) to prohibit more effectively discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1667

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 701(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by inserting "a State or political subdivision of a State or an agency of one or more States or political subdivisions and" after "includes".

(b) Section 701(b) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'employer' means (1) a person engaged in an industry affecting commerce who has eight or more employees for each working day in each of twenty or more calendar weeks in the current or preceding calendar year, and any agent of such a person, and (2) a State or political subdivision of a State, or an agency of one or more States or political subdivisions, but such term does not include the United States, or an Indian tribe: *Provided*, That it shall be the policy of the United States to insure equal employment opportunities for Federal employees without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin and the President shall utilize his existing authority to effectuate this policy."

(c) Section 701(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "or an agency of a State or political subdivision of a State,".

(d) Section 701(e) of such Act is amended by striking out "(A)" and all that follows down to and including "thereafter" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "eight or more."

Sec. 2. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by deleting section 706 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"PREVENTION OF UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

"Sec. 706. (a) The Commission is empowered, as hereinafter provided, to prevent any person from engaging in any unlawful employment practice as set forth in section 703 or 704.

"(b) Whenever a written charge has been filed by or on behalf of any person claiming to be aggrieved, or a written charge has been filed by a member of the Commission, that any employer, employment agency, or labor organization has engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall notify the employer, employment agency, or labor organization charged with the commission of an unlawful employment practice (hereinafter referred to as the 'respondent') of such charge and shall investigate such charge. If the Commission shall determine that there is not probable cause for crediting such charge it shall state its determination and notify any person claiming to have been aggrieved and the respondent of such determination. Each such determination shall be deemed to be a final order of the Commission. If the Commission shall determine after such preliminary investigation that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, it shall endeavor to eliminate any unlawful employment practice by informal methods of conference, conciliation, and persuasion. Nothing said or done during and as a part of such endeavors may be used as evidence in any subsequent proceeding.

"(c)(1) If within a period of thirty days after a charge is filed with the Commission, the Commission fails to secure an agreement between the parties for the elimination of such unlawful practice on mutually satisfactory terms, approved by the Commission, the Commission shall issue and cause to be served upon the respondent a complaint stating the charges in that respect, together with a notice of hearing before the Commission, or a member thereof, or before a designated agent, at a place therein fixed, not less than ten days after the service of such complaint. Whenever the Commission is required to endeavor to secure voluntary compliance with this title and it determines that circumstances warrant an early hearing, the Commission may issue a complaint, in the same manner as provided in the preceding sentence, prior to the expiration of such thirty-day period. No complaint shall issue based upon any unlawful employment practice occurring more than one year prior to the filing of the charge with the Commission unless the person aggrieved thereby was prevented from filing such charge by reason of service in the Armed Forces, in which event the period of military service shall not be included in computing the one-year period.

"(2) The respondent shall have the right to file a verified answer to such complaint and to appear at such hearing in person or otherwise, with or without counsel, to present evidence and to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

"(d)(1) The Commission or a member or designated agent conducting such hearing shall have the power reasonably and fairly to amend any complaint, and the respondent shall have like power to amend its answer.

"(2) All testimony shall be taken under oath.

"(3) The member of the Commission who filed a charge shall not participate in a hearing thereon, except as a witness.

"(e)(1) At the conclusion of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, such member or agent shall transfer the entire record thereof to the Commission, together with his recommended decision and copies thereof shall be served upon the parties. The Commission, or a panel of three qualified members designated by it to sit and act as the Commission in such case, shall afford the parties an opportunity to be heard on such record at a time and place to be specified upon reasonable notice. In its discretion, the Commission upon notice may take further testimony.

"(2) With the approval of the member or designated agent conducting the hearing, a case may be ended at any time prior to the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission by agreement between the parties for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms.

"(f) If, upon the preponderance of the

evidence, including all the testimony taken, the Commission shall find that the respondent engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such respondent and other parties an order requiring such respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice and to take such affirmative action as will effectuate the policies of this title, including, but not limited to, establishing on-the-job training for any persons aggrieved by such unlawful employment practice, or payment of damages, or reinstatement or hiring of employees, with or without backpay (payable by the employer, employment agency, or labor organization, as the case may be, responsible for the discrimination): *Provided*, That interim earnings or amounts earnable with reasonable diligence by the person or persons discriminated against shall operate to reduce the backpay otherwise allowable. Such order may further require such respondent to make reports from time to time showing the extent to which it has complied with the order. If the Commission shall find that the respondent has not engaged in any unlawful employment practice, the Commission shall state its findings of fact and shall issue and cause to be served on such respondent and other parties an order dismissing the complaint.

"(g) From the time a hearing is held before the Commission, or in the case of a hearing before a member or designated agent of the Commission, from the time of the transfer of the record thereof to the Commission, until a transcript of the record in a case shall have been filed in a court, as hereinafter provided, the case may at any time be ended by agreement between the parties, approved by the Commission, for the elimination of the alleged unlawful employment practice on mutually satisfactory terms, and the Commission may at any time, upon reasonable notice and in such manner as it shall deem proper, modify or set aside, in whole or in part, any finding or order made or issued by it.

"(h) (1) The proceedings held pursuant to the preceding subsections of this section shall be conducted in public sessions and in conformity with the standards and limitations of sections 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(2) In addition to the authority conferred upon the Commission by the other provisions of this title, the Commission is authorized, in carrying out its functions under this title, to—

"(A) receive money and other property donated, bequeathed, or devised, without condition other than that it be used in furtherance of the conditions of this title; and to use, sell, or otherwise dispose of such property for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title; and

"(B) accept and utilize the services of voluntary and uncompensated personnel and reimburse them for travel expenses, including per diem, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 736–2) for persons in the Government service employed without compensation.

"(3) For the purposes of the preceding subsections of this section the Commission is authorized to utilize the available services of the Department of Labor and the employees thereof, with the consent of the Secretary of Labor, in (A) conducting a preliminary investigation wtih respect to any charge filed with the Commission, (B) endeavoring to secure voluntary compliance with this title, (C) conducting a hearing resulting from the issuance of a complaint by the Commission, and (D) obtaining advice and pertinent information concerning any occupational training programs financed in whole or in part by the Federal Government. Within the limitation of funds appropriated to the Commission, it may make agreements, with the Secretary of Labor, establish such procedures, and make such payments, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, to the Department of Labor or the employees thereof, as the Commission deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this paragraph. For the purposes of this paragraph, the Secretary of Labor is authorized to cooperate with the Commission and to provide such services as the Commission may request. Nothing contained herein shall be construed to authorize the Commission to delegate any of its authority to make determinations with respect to charges filed with it, to issue complaints, or to make final orders and findings of fact.

"(i) (1) Whenever the Commission makes a finding that any respondent has engaged in any unlawful employment practice and issues an order requiring such respondent to cease and desist from such unlawful employment practice or whenever the Commission has probable cause for belief that any respondent is not in compliance with the terms of any voluntary agreement for the elimination of an unlawful employment practice entered into pursuant to subsection (b), (e) or (g) of this section, the Commission shall have power to petition any United States court of appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation, any district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for the enforcement of such order or voluntary agreement and for appropriate temporary relief or restraining order and for the entry of an order directing the respondent to forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for any violation of such order of the Commission, and shall certify and file in the court to which petition is made a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding, including the pleadings and testimony upon which such order was entered and the findings and the order of the Commission or a true copy of such voluntary agreement. Upon such filing, the court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(2) Upon such filing the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon such respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction of the proceeding and of the question determined therein and shall have power to grant such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper and to make and enter upon the pleadings, testimony, and proceedings set forth in such transcript a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission or the voluntary agreement between the parties, or directing the respondent to forfeit and pay to the United States a civil penalty of not more than $5,000 for any violation of the order of the Commission, which penalty shall accrue to the United States. For the purposes of this subsection, each separate violation of such a final order shall be a separate offense, except that in the case of a violation through continuing failure or neglect to obey a final order of the Commission each day of continuance of such failure or neglect shall be deemed a separate offense.

"(3) No objection that has not been urged before the Commission, its member, or agent, shall be considered by the court, unless the failure or neglect to urge such objection shall be excused because of extraordinary circumstances.

"(4) The findings of the Commission with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole shall be conclusive.

"(5) If either party shall apply to the court for leave to adduce additional evidence and shall show to the satisfaction of the court that such additional evidence is material and that there were reasonable grounds for the failure to adduce such evidence in the hearing before the Commission, its member, or agent, the court may order such additional evidence to be taken before the Commission, its member, or agent, and to be made a part of the transcript.

"(6) The Commission may modify its findings as to the facts, or make new findings, by reason of additional evidence so taken and filed, and it shall file such modified or new findings, which findings with respect to questions of fact if supported by substantial evidence on the record considered as a whole small be conclusive, and its recommendations, if any, for the modification or setting aside of its original order.

"(7) The jurisdiction of the court shall be exclusive and its judgment and decree shall be final, except that the same shall be subject to review by the appropriate United States court of appeals, if application was made to the district court or other United States court as hereinabove provided, and by the Supreme Court of the United States as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"(j) Whenever a written charge has been filed pursuant to subsection (b) alleging that any respondent has engaged in any unlawful employment practice and, after preliminary investigation, the Commission has determined that probable cause exists for crediting such written charge, the Commission may petition any United States court of appeals or, if the court of appeals to which application might be made is in vacation. any district court within any circuit or district, respectively, wherein the unlawful employment practice in question is alleged to have occurred, or wherein the respondent resides or transacts business, for appropriate injunctive relief pending the final adjudication of the Commission, or the securing of a voluntary agreement between the parties under subsection (b), (e), or (g) of this section, with respect to the matter in question. Upon the filing of any such petition the court shall cause notice thereof to be served upon the respondent and thereupon shall have jurisdiction to grant such injunctive relief or temporary restraining order as it deems just and proper. Such respondent shall be given an opportunity to appear by counsel and present any relevant testimony. Notwithstanding any other provision of this subsection, a temporary restraining order may be issued without notice if a petition alleges that substantial and irreparable injury to the alleged aggrieved party will be unavoidable and any such temporary restraining order shall be effective for no longer than five days and will become void at the expiration of such period.

"(k) (1) Any person or party aggrieved by a final order of the Commission may obtain a review of such order in any United States court of appeals of the judicial circuit wherein the unlawful employment practice in question was alleged to have been engaged in or wherein such person or party resides or transacts business or the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, by filing in such a court a written petition praying that the order of the Commission be modified or set aside. A copy of such petition shall be forthwith served upon the Commission and thereupon the aggrieved party shall file in the court a transcript of the entire record in the proceeding certified by the Commission, including the pleadings and testimony upon which the order complained of was entered and the findings and order of the Commission. Upon such filing, the court shall proceed in the same manner as in the case of an application by the Commission under subsection (i), and shall have the same exclusive jurisdiction to grant to the petitioners or to the Commission such temporary relief or restraining order as it deems just and proper, and in like manner to make and enter a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified or setting aside in whole or in part the order of the Commission.

"(2) Upon such filing by a person or party aggrieved the reviewing court shall conduct further proceedings in conformity with the standards, procedures, and limitations established by section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

"(l) The commencement of proceedings under this section shall not, unless specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Commission's order.

"(m) When granting appropriate temporary relief or a restraining order, or making and entering a decree enforcing, modifying, and enforcing as so modified, or setting aside in whole or in part an order of the Commission, as provided in this section, the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity shall not be limited by the Act entitled "An Act to amend the Judicial Code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes", approved March 23, 1932 29 U.S.C. 101–115).

"(n) Petitions filed under this title shall be heard expeditiously."

SEC. 3. The second sentence of section 709(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by striking out "and under which no person may bring a civil action under section 706 in any case or class of cases so specified,".

SEC. 4. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by deleting section 710 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"INVESTIGATORY POWERS

"SEC. 710. (a) For the purposes of any investigation provided for in this title, the provisions of sections 9 and 10 of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 16, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50), are hereby made applicable to the jurisdiction, powers, and duties of the Commission, except that the attendance of a witness may not be required outside of the State where he is found, resides, or transacts business, and the production of evidence may not be required outside the State where such evidence is kept.

"(b) The several departments and agencies of the Government, when directed by the President, shall furnish the Commission, upon its requests, all records, papers, and information in their possession relating to any matter before the Commission."

SEC. 5. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SURVEY BY COMMISSION OF APPRENTICESHIP OR OTHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

"SEC. 717. (a) The Commission shall conduct a continuing survey of the operation of apprenticeship or other training or retraining programs, including one-the-job training programs, to determine if the employers, labor organizations, or joint labor-management committees controlling such programs are engaged in unlawful employment practices with respect to the operation of such programs.

"(b) Notwithstanding any provisions of section 709, in conducting such survey the Commission shall at all reasonable times have access to any records maintained by an employer, labor organization, or joint labor-management committee pursuant to (1) the regulations prescribed by the Commission under the second sentence of section 709(c), or (2) any fair employment practice law of a State or political subdivision thereof.

"(c) The Commission shall make a full and complete quarterly report to the Congress, containing the results of such survey during the preceding three months, and such report shall be made available to the public upon request."

SEC. 6. The provisions of this Act shall not affect suits commenced prior to the date of enactment of this Act by an aggrieved person pursuant to section 706(e) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or by the Attorney General pursuant to section 707 of such Act, and all such suits shall be continued by such aggrieved person or the Attorney General, as the case may be, proceedings therein had, appeals therein taken, and judgments therein rendered, in the same manner and with the same effect as if this Act had not been passed.

FEDERAL CHARTER FOR POP WARNER JUNIOR LEAGUE FOOTBALL

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce legislation to grant a Federal charter for the purpose of incorporating the nationwide Pop Warner Junior League football program under the name "Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc."

I am particularly pleased to have the opportunity to sponsor this bill in the Senate because it was in Philadelphia, Pa., that the first Pop Warner football program was founded in 1929. Today, Philadelphia remains the headquarters for all Pop Warner activities, and its Junior League football program, now in its 39th year, stands as the Nation's oldest and largest, with an estimated 600,000 youngsters in most of the 50 States and several foreign countries, participating last fall.

Especially worth noting are the cardinal rules of the program—safety and equality of competition. Five basic age and weight divisions—peewee, junior midget, midget, junior bantam, and bantam—encompass all pre-high-school youngsters ages 9 through 15 with strict adherence to the basic safety standards of teams evenly matched by age and weight. Further underscoring the emphasis on safety are rules and regulations covering standards for football equipment, fields, and games. Coaches, business managers, and game officials also must adhere to conduct governed by Pop Warner rules. Wherever pre-high-school football is played according to such standards, it is probably Pop Warner football, whether called by that name locally or not.

Equally noteworthy is the emphasis which Pop Warner gives to competitive athletics as a means to both physical and scholastic achievement. It is the aim of the program to extend physical fitness to all American youth, and not just to those involved in football. By permitting on Pop Warner teams only those boys maintaining at least a C average in their schoolwork, scholarship and scholastic improvement are encouraged. The success of this endeavor can be measured by last year's Pop Warner All-America Team of Little Scholars. Of the 32 outstanding young scholar-athletes named to this team, 20 carried an A grade average while 27 attained a combined scholastic-football rating of A or better as compiled by Pop Warner headquarters.

It is this emphasis on the two—athletic and scholastic achievement—that has earned Pop Warner Junior League football the wide national support which it enjoys today. In communities from coast to coast, Pop Warner teams and leagues have received not only the acclaim of parents and educators, but the financial support and sponsorship of local service clubs as well.

Pop Warner Junior League football owes its inception to Joseph J. Tomlin, a native Pennsylvanian and outstanding lineman in his undergraduate days at Swarthmore College, who now serves as president of the program's Little Scholars division. Mr. Tomlin and his early associates originated the idea of exposing pre-high-school youngsters to organized safety-first football governed by high standards of equipment, coaching, and officiating.

To achieve this end, they received permission to use the name of the late Glenn Scobie "Pop" Warner, famous for his own football at Cornell University, his coaching at Pennsylvania's Carlisle Indian School, the University of Pittsburgh, Stanford University in California, and Philadelphia's Temple University, and his tutoring of Olympic Gold Medal winner, Jim Thorpe.

Fittingly, Pop Warner Junior League football takes as its major goals: "To inspire youth, regardless of race, creed, or color, to practice the ideals of sportsmanship, scholarship, and physical fitness as reflected in the life of the late Glenn Warner," and "to bring area youth closer together through a common interest in sportsmanship, scholarship, fellowship, and athletic competition."

Mr. President, Congress, in 1964, saw fit to grant a Federal charter to Little League Baseball, Inc., another fine Pennsylvania-based youth-sports organization. Like Little League baseball, Pop Warner Junior League football exemplifies the good character, responsibility, and moral integrity which it seeks to build in its members. I urge early consideration of the bill which I am introducing today so that youthful participants of the Pop Warner Junior League football program may be covered in the same fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1668) to incorporate Pop Warner Little Scholars, Inc., introduced by Mr. SCOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SALARIES PAID TO DIRECTOR, OFFICER, OR EMPLOYEE UNDER TITLE VI OR VII OF THE MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936, AS AMENDED

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill, for appropriate reference, to amend section 805(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to salaries for personal services paid to a director, officer, or employee. Introduction was requested by the Committee of American Steamship Lines.

This bill is intended to increase from $25,000 to $50,000 per annum the limitation of salaries for personal services paid to a director, officer, or employee by a contractor, its affiliates, subsidiary, or associates that is taken into account in determining the rights and obligations of a contractor under a contract authorized by title VI or title VII of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended.

As originally enacted section 805(c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 provided that no director, officer, or employee could receive from any contractor holding a contract authorized by title VI or title VII of the act, and its affiliate, subsidiary, or associate, directly or indirectly, wages, salary, allowances, or compensation in any form for personal services in excess of $25,000 per annum. By 1952 it was apparent that this provision of the act was imposing a serious competitive disadvantage to the steamship industry in that, because of the tremendous rise in salaries and wages that had occurred since 1936, it was becoming increasingly difficult for shipping companies to attract or retain able personnel, particularly at the executive level.

In recognition that this situation was inimical to the purposes of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 and in acknowledgment of the drastic increase in the scale of compensation that had taken place during the 16-year period since 1936, the Congress amended section 805(c) of the act by Public Law 586, 82d Congress, 66 Stat. 765, approved July 17, 1952. This legislation removed the absolute prohibition against the payment of salaries and all other forms of compensation to a director, officer, or employee in excess of $25,000 per annum, but retained this same amount as a limitation in determining any rights or obligations of a contractor under a contract authorized by title VI or title VII of the act. In effect, therefore, this amendment legalized the payment of compensation for personal services in excess of $25,000 per annum, but established $25,000 per year as the amount of salaries and all other payments or allowances of compensation in any form for personal services that would be considered as "fair and reasonable" under operating-differential subsidy contracts and charter agreements between private contractors and the Government. Section 805(c) as thus amended in 1952 has remained unchanged since that date.

During the 15-year period since 1952, the level of salaries and other forms of compensation has continued to rise to the extent that it is currently clearly inequitable to maintain this same maximum as the measure of "fair and reasonable" compensation to be taken into account under contracts executed under title VI and title VII of the act. Accordingly, the bill I am introducing proposes to update section 805(c) of the act by increasing the limitation on salaries and other compensation chargeable as fair and reasonable to the operations under the contract to an amount of $50,000 per annum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1669) to amend section 805(c) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to salaries for personal services paid to a director, officer, or employee introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENT OF DRAFT LAWS TO PROVIDE FOR IMPRISONMENT OF ANY PERSON CONVICTED OF WILLFULLY REFUSING TO BE INDUCTED INTO THE ARMED FORCES AFTER HAVING BEEN ORDERED TO DO SO

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill for appropriate reference.

Everyone is aware that there has been a concerted effort recently on the part of certain individuals and organizations to disrupt and destroy the effective operation of the Selective Service System.

We know that Stokely Carmichael, Martin Luther King, and others of their ilk have publicly urged our young men not to serve in the Armed Forces. We have witnessed the spectacle of a few men heeding this seditious advice and refusing to be inducted.

Mr. President, in my judgment this conduct constitutes a clear and present danger to the security of our Nation. It is calculated to impede the operation of our draft laws in a time of national emergency, with the result of weakening our gallant Armed Forces.

Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill which would amend our present draft laws to provide that any person convicted of willfully refusing to be inducted into the Armed Forces after having been ordered to do so shall be punished by imprisonment for a term of not less than 10 years. The maximum penalty under the law at present is a prison sentence of up to 5 years or a fine of up to $10,000, or both. It is my hope and thought that the increased punishment provided by this bill will deter the commission of these cowardly acts.

A young man who is inducted into the Armed Forces will serve a minimum of 2 years. A person who volunteers will serve a minimum of 4 years. Under our parole statute, a prisoner may be released from the penitentiary after serving as little as one-third of his sentence. We know that in most cases which involve a first-offense conviction, and in which the prisoner has a good record in prison, the criminal is, in fact, released after serving one-third of his sentence. As a result, a person who willfully refuses to be inducted can reasonably expect to spend no more than 1 year and 8 months in the penitentiary, even if the present maximum sentence is imposed. We also know that judges seldom impose the maximum punishment, especially for first offenses. If a judge sentenced a person convicted of refusing to be inducted to serve 2 years in prison, that person could reasonably expect to be released after only 8 months.

A person who wishes to avoid military service, using some high-flown principle as his outward excuse, but, in fact, committing an unpatriotic and cowardly act, faces very little actual inconvenience upon being convicted.

In my judgment, a person who willfully flouts the draft laws in this respect should do so with the certain knowledge that, if convicted therefor, he will spend more time in the sanctuary of prison than the vast multitudes of patriotic young men will spend risking all for their country.

Mr. President, I hope that every Member of this body will join with me in attempting to remedy this terrible situation.

Mr. President, a young man who enlists in the Armed Forces of the United States accepts a minimum of 4 years of service. A man who accepts induction must serve at least 2 years, but the convicted draft dodger faces only 16 months of imprisonment, at most, and the comforting knowledge that he is excused from any future military service. Conviction of a felony makes the felon ineligible to be inducted into our armed services.

It appears to me that those cowardly individuals who wish to enjoy the fruits of our country and the American way of life which are being purchased for him with the blood of our American boys on the battlefields deserve sterner measures.

Let there be no question that we are willing to allow freedom of speech and legal tests of our laws, because this is a free society founded on such principles, but it also should be known that those duly convicted will not escape a just punishment for their crime.

The passage of this bill will guarantee to our patriotic American young men and the valiant members of our Armed Forces that draft dodgers and shirkers will not be rewarded.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. EASTLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask that I may be permitted to become a sponsor of the Senator's bill.

Mr. EASTLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] be added as a cosponsor to the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1670) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to increase the penalty for persons who, in violation of such act, refuse induction into the Armed Forces of the United States, introduced by Mr. EASTLAND (for himself and Mr. LAUSCHE), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

AMENDMENT TO THE HOUSING ACT OF 1949

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, we are all aware, I am sure, that the growing demand for Federal assistance for urban renewal projects across the country has far outstripped the Federal funds available for this purpose—to the point that the whole future of urban renewal effort in many communities is at stake.

I am advised that as of April 1, 1967, the Department of Housing and Urban Development had applications on hand for new renewal projects considerably in excess of $1 billion, while funds available for allotment for the rest of the current fiscal year totaled about a hundred million dollars. Despite additional authorizations by Congress for the next fiscal year, it is apparent that at the rate applications are now being submitted, the backlog will continue to mount.

The result is that applications for new projects are stacking up with little or no prospect that they will be approved for planning and the renewal grant earmarked at any time within the next several years.

Mr. President, a situation exists in the Kansas City area which is exemplary of the growing problem. Presently, applications are pending for three new projects in the Kansas City area, and several new applications will be filed within the next few months. However, Kansas City officials have been advised by the Department that since two new projects were only recently approved for the area, they can expect that no further pending applications will be approved for this fiscal year, and that, under present circumstances and prospects, they can expect approval of not more than one in each of the next several fiscal years, if that. In other words, it appears that any applications for a new project filed at this time would not be funded and approved for at least 4 or 5 years.

Obviously this situation is threatening to grind the renewal program to a halt in Kansas City, Kans. and Mo., and, ironically, just at a time when the area's progress to date has gained an amazing local support for the program, and when such support has developed sufficient momentum to make a real impact upon the area's problems.

Mr. President, as important as the long delays in funding new projects might be to the continuity and future of renewal plans, the current situation involves an indirect problem which is being created by these delays which may be even more serious.

Mr. President, the local matching grant which a city must provide for renewal projects can be either in the form of cash, or in the form of public facilities which benefit the project, provided the construction of such facilities was commenced within 3 years prior to the "authorization by the Administrator of a contract for loan or capital grant for the project." This means, in effect, that construction of the facility must have started within 3 years prior to the time the local authority is ready to carry out the project after the formal plan has been prepared and approved locally, as well as by the Federal Department.

In most cases renewal projects are initiated and planned in coordination with certain public facilities to be installed by the city or other local public body to benefit the project, with the idea that a noncash credit will then be available, rather than payment of the same amount in cash for the local grant-in-aid. As an example, in at least two of the proposed new projects for which Kansas City, Mo., officials have submitted applications, the city has provided for extensive street improvements with the understanding that the cost of such construction would make up a major portion of the city's share of the project cost.

Once such facilities are planned, a community finds it expedient in many cases to proceed with construction at an early date, often prior to the time application is made to the Department for Federal funds to plan the renewal project. In the past, when Federal funds were available for new projects, this caused no particular problem. The plans for the project could be completed and the "loan and grant" stage reached well within the 3-year period. However, under the present circumstances, it is obvious that the 3-year period would run before any new project is even approved for planning, much less reaching the point of undertaking the plan.

Mr. President, I have mentioned the difficulties that the present 3-year limitation is causing for the renewal efforts in Kansas City, Kans., and Kansas City, Mo. Much the same type of situation applies to the city of Fort Scott, Kans. Fort Scott city officials anticipate that they will be able to proceed with urban renewal plans only if funds expended for street and parking lot development in 1965 will qualify as noncash credit toward the planned renewal project. However, under the present conditions it would appear virtually impossible to secure a grant within the 3-year time limit for noncash credits. Dozens of other cities around the country find themselves in the same situation.

Mr. President, the point is that the long delay in funding new projects is wiping out many noncash credits which would otherwise be available for such projects. The 3-year rollback provision in the law becomes meaningless as it is presently worded, even though valid applications for new projects are on file and the local agency is anxious to get on with them, complete the planning and reach the point where the provision applies.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am proposing an amendment to the Housing Act of 1949 which I feel would be only fair and equitable under the circumstances. My amendment would make the 3-year rollback provision apply to the date upon which an application for a new project is accepted by the Department, rather than the date of authorization of a loan and grant contract following the planning period.

Mr. President, such an amendment is only logical in light of the present circumstances regarding the availability of Federal funds for urban renewal projects. I hope that this bill can be studied very soon by the committee and passed by the Congress in order that communities all across the Nation do not lose local grant-in-aid credits to which they are rightfully entitled.

Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference my bill to amend the Housing Act of 1949 and ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1675) to amend section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. Pearson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the next to last paragraph of section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended by striking out "to the authorization by the Administrator of a contract for loan or capital grant for the project" and inserting in lieu thereof "to the acceptance by the Department of an application for a loan or capital grant for the project".

WHAT THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IS NOW DOING IN THE FIELD OF POPULATION CONTROL AND WHAT IS NEEDED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, since I first introduced S. 1676 on April 1, 1965, the world's population has increased by 120 million or the approximate combined populations of Laos, Brazil, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, and Ethiopia.

The population of the United States has increased by 4,521,977 since April 1, 1965.

According to the Bureau of the Census population clock here in Washington, D.C., our numbers have risen from 194,102,850 on April 1, 1965, to 198,624,827 as of 8 a.m. this morning.

We have in the past 763 days added to the population of the United States the equivalent of the population of the State of Missouri or the populations of the States of Arkansas and Iowa combined.

In his state of the Union address before Congress on January 10, President Johnson said:

> Next to the pursuit of peace, the really great challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. That race tonight is being lost. The time for rhetoric has clearly passed. The time for concerted action is here, and we must get on with the job.

Thus, for the 27th time President Johnson publicly expressed his deep concern about the worldwide population explosion. He has subsequently commented on it four additional times in his food for India message to the Congress on February 2 and in his foreign aid message to Congress on February 9.

In his encyclical "Populorum Progressio," released on March 28, Pope Paul VI wrote that it is proper for government to take an interest in the population crisis. For the first time in history the head of the Roman Catholic Church said that government has the right to concern itself about birth control and that officially, the government has a legitimate interest in the field.

"Populorum Progressio," in part I, entitled "For Man's Complete Development," in the portion devoted to "programs and planning," contains paragraph 37 on "Demography." In this paragraph His Holiness has taken a most important step forward in meeting the population problems of the world.

Pope Paul says that it is proper for government to take an interest in the population crisis.

Let me quote the complete text of the encyclical paragraph on demography.

> It is true that too frequently an accelerated demographic increase adds its own difficulties to the problems of development. The size of

> the population increases more rapidly than available resources, and things are found to have reached apparently an impasse. From that moment the temptation is great to check the demographic increase by means of radical measures. It is certain that public authorities can intervene, within the limit of their competence, by favoring the availability of appropriate information and by adopting suitable measures, provided that these be in conformity with the moral law and that they respect the rightful freedom of married couples. Where the inalienable right to marriage and procreation is lacking, human dignity has ceased to exist. Finally, it is for the parents to decide, with full knowledge of the matter, on the number of their children, taking into account their responsibilities toward God, themselves, the children they have already brought into the world, and the community to which they belong. In all this they must follow the demands of their own conscience enlightened by God's law authentically interpreted, and sustained by confidence in him.

The extended public hearings held on S. 1676 and the population crisis during the 89th Congress demonstrated the growing worldwide approach to consensus for family planning assistance. Ninety-eight distinguished men and women contributed to the dialog developed during the course of the 28 public hearings held by the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures. I ask unanimous consent that the names of those who testified appear as exhibit 1 at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. On previous occasions I referred to the men and women who testified as pioneers and suggested that their names comprise an important honor roll which historically bears an analogy to other famous lists: The signers of the Declaration of Independence, those who ratified the Constitution of the United States and others whose names were appended to and made possible some of the great turning points in history. Some did not endorse S. 1676, but none ignored the population problem.

The total number of hearings volumes, 15, when the 1966 appendix and index are printed, encompasses nearly 5,000 printed pages. The hearings are comprehensive. The Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures is in the process of having the hearings indexed so they will be as useful as possible to people interested in the population problem.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I receive almost daily indications that the hearings are helpful at home and in other countries. For example Mrs. Gertrude Newman, of Goettingen, West Germany, this week wrote to tell me that she had passed on her copies to a doctor who is a professor of the university there and that he had used the information in a series of birth control lectures presented to his students and to the public. Space is not unlimited in West Germany, Mrs. Newman wrote, and she cited the growing need in that country for living quarters for persons returning to their native country from nations behind the Iron Curtain.

At my request, 9 months after hearings began, executive agency spokesmen reported to the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures concerning their activities and efforts to implement President Johnson's mandates. Their reports were disappointing and in no respect implemented President Johnson's mandate for "new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources." They revealed that progress in implementing any programs was painfully slow and that existing programs were inadequately funded and staffed. For example, the subcommittee found that while 1.100 persons in the Agency for International Development worked on food problems, no more than 11 worked on population problems. Nevertheless, there has been some slight progress.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk named career State Department employee Philander P. Claxton, Jr., as his Special Assistant Secretary for Science and Pop-Education, and Welfare Under Secretary Wilbur Cohen announced the appointment of Dr. Milo D. Leavitt as Deputy Assistant for Population Matters. Health, ulation. President Johnson recently announced the establishment of the Office of the War on Hunger to consolidate AID activities relating to hunger, population problems, and nutrition, including a Population Service which will have a staff of 28. For the first time in history the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Agency for International Development compiled and released reports of their activities in the family planning field. During this fiscal year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has held regional family planning conferences.

These improvements are desirable, but they mean little if the personnel lack authority and funding and if offices are understaffed. Regrettably, this has been the case. The men and women charged with responsibility in the population field must have full-time responsibility.

The governments of the world must have an administrative cadre in the population area. Young men and women must be trained properly. Governmental knowledge must be shared—not hoarded or put away in neat files.

In this 90th Congress important bills authorizing the funding of family planning activities in this country and in friendly foreign nations, as such activities are requested, have been introduced by Senator JOSEPH TYDINGS, of Maryland, and Senator J. W. FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas. Both bills, S. 1264 and S. 1503, have bipartisan support. I am a cosponsor of both and support them heartily.

Senator FULBRIGHT's bill would authorize the expenditure of $50 million each year for 3 years to provide specific support for voluntary family planning programs in friendly foreign nations.

Senator TYDINGS' bill would authorize Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs for a 5-year period. Authorized funding for the first year would be not more than $20 million with the yearly amount authorized increasing as follows: $30 million; $45 million; $60 million; and rising to $75 million in the fifth year.

Let us insure that these bills are passed. Let us also make certain that such authorized funding is properly used. Our Federal Government needs a much better defined organizational structure to handle family planning requests.

I had hoped that the spirit of S. 1676 would, by now, have been carried out and the 31 public mandates of the President in the population field implemented properly. Such is not the case.

More than ever before in our history we need coordination.

We should establish high-level offices in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which will deal with population problems and coordinate and disseminate information related to the problem within Government and in our States and territories and with other nations. Such offices must be adequately staffed and properly funded.

Equally important, in my opinion, is the desirability of calling a White House Conference on Population.

Last fall with the assistance of the Bureau of the Budget the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures compiled a summary of Federal financial participation in birth control and/or family planning activities. The summary was released to the public. It showed that Federal participation is growing. Although some figures were uncertain or unavailable because the information requested had not been assembled previously, the summary showed that in the areas of first, information, counseling, and services, second, training; and third, research and demonstration a total of $2,361,000 had been obligated for family planning in fiscal year 1965, $14,702,000 in fiscal year 1966, and $25,281,000 in fiscal year 1967 by six Federal departments and agencies: the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Office of Economic Opportunity, the National Science Foundation, the Department of the Interior, the Department of State and the Agency for International Development.

Obviously such expenditures require adequate, trained staff.

At the request of the subcommittee earlier this year the Bureau of the Budget agreed to coordinate the updating of the October 19, 1966, report to determine if the fiscal 1967 figures had altered and to look at the fiscal year 1968 projections. Some change in the fiscal year 1967 figure was expected since the Department of Defense had announced that military dependents were eligible to receive family planning services if they wished. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the updated summary the Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures has received from the Bureau of the Budget be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal financial participation in birth control and/or family planning activities (based on agency estimates as reported to the Budget Bureau, April 1967)—Obligations

[In thousands of dollars]

Agency	Information, counseling, and services		Training		Research and demonstrations		Total	
	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968	1967	1968
HEW	9,688	13,200	2,290	2,504	6,130	7,859	18,117	23,563
AID	6,480	10,100	454	7,300	1,966	2,600	8,900	20,000
OEO	4,750	10,500					4,750	10,500
Department of Defense	[1] 348	849					[1] 348	849
NSF					444	530	444	530
State	[2] 246	[2] 246					[2] 246	[2] 246
Interior	58	105					58	105
Total	21,570	35,000	2,753	9,804	8,540	10,989	32,863	55,793

[1] Part year obligations. Formal implementation for civilian dependents, October 1966; for military, January 1967.

[2] In addition, $402,000 represents the U.S. contribution to the U.N., WHO, and the U.N. development organizations which are involved in population statistics and human reproduction.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the summary shows the revised fiscal year 1967 figure to be $32,863,000 or $5,587,000 in excess of the funding previously announced with most of the increase occurring in the budget of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and with the addition of the new Department of Defense program for military dependents. Additionally, the National Science Foundation figures, not available last fall, are included. Some changes occur in the other agency budgets.

The April 1967 summary also shows that the budgeted amount for fiscal year 1968 is $55,793,000 with the principal increases occurring in the budgets of HEW, AID, and the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Need I express again my hope that the Federal Government programs will be properly staffed?

Mr. President, at this time I reintroduce proposed legislation to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request at home and overseas for myself and on behalf of my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. MONDALE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG].

A companion bill in the House of Representatives will be introduced later.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill (S. 1676) be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1676) to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the application of public health measures and the introduction of modern medical life-saving and life-prolonging techniques have contributed to a doubling of the annual rate world population growth within the past eighteen years, and may be expected to continue to increase rates of such growth in the future;

(2) population growth is a vital factor in determining the extent to which economic development and political stability will prevail in any country, especially in countries which are in the early stages of economic and political development;

(3) at present, because of the rapid and continued growth in population, hundreds of millions of parents are unable to provide adequately for themselves and their children;

(4) those nations in which population growth is most extreme and where the problems arising from such growth are most acute are, because of economic, technical, and other considerations, also the nations least able independently to cope with such growth and the problems connected therewith;

(5) past and present efforts on the part of the United States in cooperating with and assisting nations desirous of dealing with urgent population problems with which they are confronted have not been sufficiently effective; and

(6) the President of the United States, in his 1965 state of the Union address, announced that the United States should expand and intensify its efforts to contribute to the solution of the problems connected with rapid world population growth.

(b) It is therefore the policy of the Congress that—

(1) there should be made within the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government such organizational and other changes as may be necessary to enable the United States more effectively to deal with rapid population growth throughout the world and the problems arising from or connected with such growth; and

(2) the United States, in dealing with such problems, should, to the maximum extent feasible, cooperate with and assist other nations, the United Nations and other international organizations, and private institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals in their efforts to cope with the problems arising out of rapid population growth.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE; DUTIES OF SECRETARY WITH RESPECT TO POPULATION PROBLEMS; CREATION OF AN OFFICE FOR POPULATION PROBLEMS; CREATION OF OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POPULATION PROBLEMS

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) to—

(1) develop and coordinate the United States positions on the international aspects of population growth and the problems connected therewith;

(2) maintain liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with international population problems;

(3) make policy recommendations in the field of population growth to appropriate officials of the Government;

(4) organize and direct a program for the utilization of demographic attachés in embassies and other appropriate diplomatic establishments of the United States abroad;

(5) cooperate with and utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the United States Information Service in carrying out his various duties with respect to population problems;

(6) coordinate and maintain current data on all foreign population programs whether or not instituted or assisted by the United States;

(7) transmit such information and other data to United States diplomatic personnel, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Government, as may be necessary to keep them advised of the policy and programs of the United States with respect to population problems and of their duties in implementing such policy and programs;

(8) devise and recommend to the Secretary of State areas wherein demographic research may more effectively be utilized in formulating and carrying out programs to cope with population problems;

(9) make available, in all countries with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, information (through publications and other means), with respect to the grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available in the United States to foreign students desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related problems;

(10) make available to recognized scientific and medical authorities in foreign countries, upon the request of the governments of such countries, information and assistance pertaining to medical and other aspects of population growth problems; and

(11) cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations, and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to international problems of population growth and control.

(b) The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress with respect to the preceding year a report—

(1) identifying and describing all programs which foreign governments have carried on in dealing with population and related problems;

(2) containing a complete summary of United States activity in the field of foreign population problems, including, with respect to such problems, reports on all programs instituted or participated in by the United States and on all conferences, symposiums, seminars, or other meetings in which the United States participated; and

(3) containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform Congress of activities, needs, and developments in the area of population growth problems.

(c) There is hereby created in the Office of the Secretary an Office for Population Problems to which the Secretary may delegate such of the duties and functions set forth in section (2)(a) of this bill as the Secretary may determine to be necessary and desirable. Under the direction of the Secretary, the Office for Population Problems shall be under the supervision and control of an Assistant Secretary for Population Problems, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and who shall be compensated at the same rate as are other Assistant Secretaries within the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: CREATION OF OFFICE FOR POPULATION PROBLEMS; CREATION OF OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, MEDICAL SERVICES, AND POPULATION PROBLEMS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) to—

(1) review continually the health and medical programs of the Department insofar as they relate to the problems of population growth and health with a view to coordinating and improving such programs, as well as to determining the need for additional programs which relate to population growth and health;

(2) collect and disseminate such data and material, and to perform such functions as may be necessary most effectively to serve as a liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with domestic population problems;

(3) make policy determinations in the field of population growth to appropriate offices within the Department;

(4) coordinate and maintain current data on all domestic population programs instituted or assisted in the United States;

(5) keep the personnel of the Department, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Federal, State, and local governments, advised with respect to the domestic policies and programs of the Government with respect to population problems and with respect to their duties in implementing such policies and programs;

(6) publish and distribute to interested persons a list of grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available to students and others desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related problems in the United States and abroad; and

(7) cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to problems of population growth.

(b) The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress with respect to the preceding year a report—

(1) containing a list of all official indications to the Department of interest and requests for assistance from State and local governments in problems of population growth;

(2) containing a complete summary of United States activity in the field of domestic population growth and control programs; and

(3) containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform the Congress of activities, needs, and developments in the area of domestic population growth problems.

(c) There is hereby created in the Office of the Secretary an Office for Population Problems to which the Secretary may delegate such of the duties and functions set forth in section 3(a) of this bill as the Secretary may determine to be necessary and desirable. Under the direction of the Secretary, the Office for Population Problems shall be under the supervision and control of an Assistant Secretary for Health, Medical Services, and Population Problems who (i) shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; (ii) shall be compensated at the same rate as are other Assistant Secretaries within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and (iii) in addition to the duties set forth herein, shall assume the duties discharged by the Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), which latter position is hereby abolished.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON POPULATION

SEC. 4. (a) A White House Conference on Population to be called by the President of the United States in January 1968 in order to develop recommendations for further research and action with respect to population problems shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall have the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate.

(b) For the purpose of arriving at facts and recommendations concerning the needs for further research and action with respect to population problems, the Conference shall bring together professional and lay people working in the field, and of the general public.

(c) A final report of the White House Conference on Population shall be submitted to the President not later than ninety days following the date on which the Conference was called and the findings and recommendations included therein shall be immediately made available to the public.

GRANTS

(d)(i) There is hereby authorized to be paid to each State which shall submit an application for funds for the exclusive use in planning and conducting a State conference on population prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations and preparing a report of the findings for presentation to the White House Conference on Population, and in defraying costs incident to the State's delegates attending the White House Conference on Population a sum to be determined by the Secretary, but not less than $5,000 nor more than $15,000; such sums to be paid only from funds specifically appropriated for this purpose.

(ii) Payment shall be made by the Secretary to an officer designated by the Governor of the State to receive such payment and to assume responsibility for organizing and conducting the State conference.

ADMINISTRATION

(e) In administering this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) request the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate in carrying out the provisions of the Act;

(2) render all reasonable assistance to the States in enabling them to organize and conduct conferences on population prior to the White House Conference on Population;

(3) prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the White House Conference as he may deem necessary and shall prepare and distribute such report or reports of the Conference as may be indicated; and

(4) in carrying out the provisions of this Act, engage such additional personnel as may be necessary (without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act) within the amount of funds appropriated for this purpose.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES

(f) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish an Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Population composed of professional and public members, and, as necessary, to establish technical advisory committees to advise and assist in planning and conducting the Conference. Appointed members of such committees, while attending conferences or meetings of their committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

(g) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this section.

EXHIBIT I

LIST OF WITNESSES WHO TESTIFIED ON S. 1676 AT HEARINGS HELD DURING THE 89TH CONGRESS BY THE GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID EXPENDITURES

June 22, 1965

Representative PAUL TODD, Democrat, of Michigan (Kalamazoo), a U.S. Representative from the Third Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

Representative MORRIS K. UDALL, Democrat, of Arizona (Tucson), a U.S. Representative from the Second Congressional District of the State of Arizona.

Senator JOSEPH S. CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia), a U.S. Senator from the State of Pennsylvania.

Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah (Salt Lake City), a U.S. Senator from the State of Utah.

Representative D. R. MATTHEWS, Democrat, of Florida (Gainesville), a U.S. Representative from the Eighth Congressional District of the State of Florida.

Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas (Austin), a U.S. Senator from the State of Texas.

June 23, 1965

Dr. Frederick Seitz, Washington, D.C., president, National Academy of Sciences.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, Democrat, of Maryland (Havre de Grace), a U.S. Senator from the State of Maryland.

Representative JAMES H. SCHEUER, Democrat, of New York (New York City), a U.S. Representative from the 21st Congressional District of the State of New York.

Representative O. C. FISHER, Democrat, of Texas (San Angelo), a U.S. Representative from the 21st Congressional District of the State of Texas.

Robert C. Cook, Washington, D.C., president, Population Reference Bureau.

June 29, 1965

Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., Palo Alto, Calif., Chairman of the 1959 Draper Committee which dealt with military and economic aspects of foreign aid.

Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, Cambridge, Mass., special assistant for science and technology to former President Eisenhower and professor at Harvard.

Dr. John Rock, Brookline, Mass., distinguished Catholic gynecologist and author, a major contributor to the development of the oral contraceptive pill.

July 9, 1965

Dr. Alberto Lleras Camargo, former president of Columbia and president of the editorial board of the Latin American magazine Vision and Progreso.

Ben H. Bagdikian, Washington, D.C., author of "In the Midst of Plenty: The Poor in America."

July 21, 1965

Hon. Kenneth Keating, New York City, national chairman of the Population Crisis

Committee, former Senator from New York State.

Hon. John Martin, Grand Rapids, Mich., State chairman of the Republican Party of Michigan, attorney.

Mrs. Gladys Avery Tillett, Charlotte, N.C., U.S. Representative to the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women.

George J. Hecht, New York City, publisher of Parents' Magazine and chairman of the American Parents Committee.

Gertrude S. Friedman, Ph. D., Washington, D.C., representing the Unitarian Universalist Association.

Representative John Conyers, Jr., Democrat of Michigan (Detroit), a U.S. Representative from the First Congressional District of the State of Michigan.

July 28, 1965

Hon. Chester Bowles, U.S. Ambassador to India.

John D. Rockefeller 3rd, New York City, chairman of the board of the Population Council.

Dr. Frank Notestein, New York City, president of the Population Council and demographer.

Dr. Joseph L. Fisher, Washington, D.C., president of Resources for the Future, Inc.

August 10, 1965

Hon. Stewart L. Udall, Washington, D.C., Secretary of the Interior.

Senator Peter H. Dominick, Republican of Colorado (Englewood), a U.S. Senator from the State of Colorado.

Dr. Alan F. Guttmacher, New York City, gynecologist and obstetrician, president of Planned Parenthood—World Population.

Dr. Ernest M. Solomon, Chicago, Ill., gynecologist and obstetrician representing the Commission on Social Action of Reform Judaism.

August 11, 1965

Hon. Walter N. Tobriner, Washington, D.C., President of Board of Commissioners.

Mrs. Fred A. Schumacher, Washington, D.C., executive director of Planned Parenthood Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Dr. Robert B. Nelson, Washington, D.C., gynecologist and obstetrician, medical director of Planned Parenthood Association of Metropolitan Washington, D.C.

Dr. Murray Grant, Washington, D.C., Director of Public Health, District of Columbia Department of Health.

August 17, 1965

Dr. Andre Hellegers, Baltimore, Md., associate professor of obstetrics and gynecology, Johns Hopkins University Hospital.

August 18, 1965

Hon. Marriner Eccles, Salt Lake City, Utah, former Chairman of Board of Governors, Federal Reserve Board.

Dr. Ernest Lyman Stebbins, Baltimore, Md., dean, School of Hygiene and Public Health, Johns Hopkins University.

Dr. Leslie Corsa, Jr., Ann Arbor, Mich., director, Center for Population Planning, School of Public Health, University of Michigan.

August 24, 1965

Rev. Dexter L. Hanley, S.J., Washington, D.C., director, Institute of Law, Human Rights and Social Values, Georgetown University Law Center.

Mrs. Birgitta Linner, Uppsala, Sweden, author, family counselor, and teacher.

Mrs. Gabrielle Edgcomb, Washington, D.C., Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

Mr. William B. Ball, Harrisburg, Pa., general counsel, Pennsylvania Catholic Welfare Committee.

August 31, 1965

Senator Milward L. Simpson, Cody, Wyo., U.S. Senator from Wyoming.

Dr. Mary Calderone, New York City, executive director, Sex Information and Education Council of the United States (SIECUS).

Henry Caulfield, Washington, D.C., director, Department of the Interior's resources program staff.

James V. Bennett, Kenwood Park, Md., former director, Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice.

Dr. Virgil M. Rogers, Washington, D.C., director, automation project, National Education Association; former dean of education, Syracuse University.

September 8, 1965

Clifford C. Nelson, New York City, president, the American Assembly, Columbia University.

September 15, 1965

Rep. John Brademas, South Bend, Ind., U.S. Representative from Third District of the State of Indiana.

Mr. Harold W. Swank, Springfield, Ill., director, Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Mr. George Wyman, Albany, N.Y., commissioner, New York State Department of Social Welfare; chairman, American Public Welfare Association Committee on Public Welfare Policy; former director, California State Department of Social Welfare.

Mr. Wallace Kuralt, Charlotte, N.C., director, Mecklenberg County Department of Public Welfare.

September 22, 1965

Oscar Harkavy, Ph. D., New York City, director, population program, the Ford Foundation.

Bernard Berelson, Ph. D., New York City, vice president, the Population Council.

Irene Taeuber, Ph. D., Washington, D.C., senior research demographer, office of population research, Princeton University.

Dr. Jack Lippes, M.D., Buffalo (Kenmore), N.Y., inventor of Lippes Loop, an Intrauterine device.

LIST OF WITNESSES—1966

January 19, 1966

Dr. E. L. Tatum—New York City, biologist, 1958 Nobel Prize winner for medicine and physiology.

Dr. Dickinson W. Richards, Jr.—New York City, physician, 1956 Nobel Prize winner in medicine and physiology.

Dr. Albert Szent-Gyorgyi—Woods Hole, Massachusetts; physician, 1937 Nobel Prize winner in medicine.

Dr. Polykarp Kusch—New York City, physicist, 1955 Nobel Prize winner in physics.

January 26, 1966

Mrs. E. T. Chanlett—Chapel Hill, N.C., U.S. delegate to the Inter-American Commission of Women.

Dr. Philip M. Hauser—Chicago, Illinois, director, Population Research and Training Center and Chicago Community Inventory, University of Chicago.

Dr. Luigi Mastroianni, Jr.—Philadelphia, Pa., primate research with intra-uterine devices.

Dr. Roger Lincoln Shinn—New York City, professor of applied Christianity and dean of instruction, Union Theological Seminary; adjunct professor of religion, Columbia University.

February 6, 1966

Mrs. Theodore F. Wallace—Shawnee Mission, Kansas, former national president, United Church Women, National Council of Churches.

Mr. James MacCracken—New York City, executive director, Church World Service Department, Division of Overseas Ministries, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States.

Dr. Raymond Ewell—Buffalo, New York, vice president for research, State University of New York, professor of chemistry and chemical engineering, consultant on research to AID, consulting on fertilizer industry for Government of India and for the United Nations.

Dean William E. Moran, Jr.—Washington, D.C., Georgetown University School of Foreign Service; president, Catholic Association for International Peace.

February 16, 1966

Mr. Richard W. Reuter—Washington, D.C., Assistant Secretary of State for Food for Peace, former executive director of CARE.

Mr. Edwin Harper—Fairfax, Virginia, guest scholar, The Brookings Institution Center for Advanced Study.

March 2, 1966

Dr. Donald B. Barrett—Professor of Sociology, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana, Director of the Notre Dame Institute for Latin America. Population Research, and a member of the Papal Commission on Population and Birth Control.

Prof. Albert P. Blaustein—Professor of Law and Law Librarian, Rutgers University, Camden, New Jersey.

Dr. Andre J. deBethune and Mrs. deBethune—Author and professor of Chemistry Boston College, Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts.

Dr. Joseph D. Beasley—Obstetrician and Gynecologist, Department of Child Health and Pediatrics, Tulane University School of Medicine, New Orleans, Louisiana.

March 3, 1966

Hon. Orville L. Freeman—Secretary of Agriculture.

March 9, 1966

Mr. Ernst Michanek—Director General of the Swedish International Development Authority, Stockholm, Sweden.

Dr. Ulf Borell—Professor of Gynecology and Obstetrics, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden.

Mr. Carl Wahren—Deputy head of the planning division of the Swedish International Development Authority, Stockholm, Sweden.

March 31, 1966

Dr. Kermit E. Krantz—Kansas City, Kansas; professor and chairman of the University of Kansas School of Medicine's Department of Gynecology and Obstetrics; specialist in anatomy and genetics.

Mr. Arthur Watkins—Piermont, New York, a writer and engineer who has written extensively on various aspects of housing and building construction.

Dr. Leonard J. Duhl—consultant on urban affairs for Secretary Robert C. Weaver, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Dr. Donald N. Michael—social psychologist, resident fellow at the Institute for Policy Studies in Washington, D.C.

April 6, 1966

State Senator John Bermingham—Denver, Colorado, author of birth control bill which was approved by Colorado State Legislature.

Dr. Joseph Martin—Cleveland, Ohio, Medical Associates, who with other medical doctors is working to make birth control information available to the poor who wish to have it; participant in the 1965 White House Conference on Health.

Dr. William Vogt—New York City, ecologist, author, secretary of The Conservation Fund.

Mr. Arnold Maremont—Chicago, industrialist, lawyer, president of the Maremont Corporation, former chairman of the Illinois Public Aid Commission.

Dr. Stephen Plank, director, Public Health, Harvard School of Public Health.

April 7, 1966

Hon. John W. Gardner, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

April 8, 1966

Hon. David E. Bell, Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

April 11, 1966

Hon. Thomas C. Mann, Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs.

June 15, 1966

Mrs. James Robinson—Richmond, Va., housewife and mother.

Mrs. E. A. Rennolds, Jr.—Richmond, Va., corresponding secretary, Virginia League for Planned Parenthood, Inc.

Dr. William A. Albrecht—Columbia, Mo., emeritus professor of soils and former chairman of the Department of Soils, University of Missouri College of Agriculture.

Dr. Otto Hakon Ravenholt, Chief Health Officer, Clark County District Health Officer, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Dr. Frank J. Ayd, Jr.—Baltimore, Md., psychiatrist, lecturer, author.

Dr. William A. Lynch—Brookline, Mass., gynecologist-obstetrician, lecturer on marriage, author of "A Marriage Manual for Catholics."

AMENDMENT OF THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE—DEDUCTION FOR EXPENSES OF PREVENTING DESTRUCTION OF TREES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a deduction for expenses of preventing destruction of trees from disease of infestation and of removing infected or infested trees. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 1679) to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit a deduction for expenses of preventing destruction of trees from disease of infestation and of removing infected or infested trees, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1679

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Tree Conservation Tax Deduction Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 218 as 219, and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"SEC. 218. DAMAGE TO TREES FROM DISEASE OR INFESTATION

"In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction the amounts paid or incurred during the taxable year to prevent the destruction of trees from disease or infestation and to remove trees infected or infested with disease or insects."

(b) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 218. Damage to trees from disease or infestation.

"Sec. 219. Cross references."

SEC. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SIMPLIFICATION OF THE INCOME TAX LAWS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to create a commission to be known as the Presidential Commission on Simplification of the Income Tax Laws, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 1680) creating a commission to be known as the Presidential Commission on Simplification of the Income Tax Laws, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1680

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that the income tax originally contemplated by the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution has become so complex and cumbersome, through the numerous statutory enactments, amendments, rulings, and regulations, that it is an undue burden on the taxpayers of the United States, the professional people who serve them, and the Government officials who administer the law. This burden has become increasingly worse and if permitted to continue there is danger that our system of income taxation will collapse. It is the responsibility of the Federal Government to carry out its powers under the sixteenth amendment in such a manner as to enable taxpayers to comply with the law and to determine their liabilities without the expenditure of excessive time, effort, and money.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION FOR SIMPLIFICATION OF THE INCOME TAX LAWS

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a commission to be known as the Presidential Commission for Simplification of the Income Tax Laws (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 3. (a) NUMBER AND APPOINTMENT.—The Commission shall be composed of nineteen members, appointed by the President, without regard to political party affiliation, as follows:

(1) Two members from the Senate;

(2) Two members from the House of Representatives;

(3) One member from the Office of Legislative Counsel of the Treasury Department;

(4) One member from the Internal Revenue Service;

(5) One member from a State tax commission engaged in State income tax administration;

(6) Three members of the American Bar Association, of whom one shall be engaged primarily in tax law practice, including the preparation of tax returns, and the others shall be engaged in the general practice of law, including the preparation of tax returns;

(7) One member of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants whose practice includes the preparation of tax returns;

(8) One member of the National Society of Public Accountants whose practice includes the preparation of tax returns;

(9) One member of the National Association of Accountants whose practice includes the preparation of tax returns;

(10) Two farmers;

(11) Two small businessmen; and

(12) Two wage earners.

(b) VACANCIES.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) CONTINUATION OF MEMBERSHIP UPON CHANGE OF STATUS.—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

SEC. 5. Ten members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 6. (a) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) MEMBERS FROM THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) MEMBERS FROM PRIVATE LIFE.—The members from private life shall each receive $50 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 9. (a) INVESTIGATION, ANALYSIS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to analyze the Federal income tax laws and to determine how they can be simplified in a manner consistent with equity and protection of the revenue; and

(2) to formulate and make recommendations for legislative action determined to be necessary and desirable to simplify the income tax laws and their administration.

(b) REPORT.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than July 1, 1968. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

SEC. 10. (a) HEARINGS AND SESSIONS.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, or such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) OBTAINING OFFICIAL DATA.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

IMPROVED DISABILITY INSURANCE FOR THE BLIND

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I introduce a bill to improve disability insurance under social security for the blind. I am highly gratified that there are joined with me as cosponsors on this bill, from both sides of the aisle, no less than 56 other Senators whose names are listed, including a majority of the Finance Committee members.

This measure has already been passed twice by the Senate, and there can be no doubt of its adoption once more by this body when we have the opportunity to vote upon it. When I offered it as a floor amendment to the social security bill of 1965, H.R. 6675, the vote was 78–11, but after the House-Senate conference there was left only a very minor improvement affecting an extremely small number of the blind. In the 88th Congress, when Senator HUMPHREY presented it as a floor amendment to H.R. 11865, it was adopted without dissent—but it will be recalled that in that year the social security bill ended in deadlock. With the strong support of the Senate as shown by those two votes, and by the very large number of cosponsors this year, there is reason to expect that this improvement for the disabled by reason of blindness will become law.

First, the bill incorporates in the law the standard accepted definition of blindness, which is that vision is 20/200 or less in the better eye with the use of correcting lenses. This is the definition commonly used in State workmen's compensation laws and in the Internal Revenue Code. But at present the social security law has no such automatic definition. Rather, blindness is lumped with all other disabilities under the general requirement that disability insurance qualification depends on having a disability which prevents employment. Many blind do not meet that definition, but under the proposed standard definition there would be no question about qualification.

The second change involved is to relax the requirements for the blind person to secure disability benefits. At present, as in all other disabilities, to be covered he must have covered employment for 5 years out of the last 10—20 quarters of the last 40. But by virtue of their blindness, many who find work secure only temporary jobs; or jobs which are being automated out of existence as factory assembly work, for instance, declines; or work which requires very little skill—all of which contributes to the frequent impossibility of meeting the 20-out-of-40 quarters demand.

Under the present law, if a disabled person secures work he is considered to have shown employability and so is ineligible for disability payments. Under this bill, after six quarters of covered employment the blind person who meets the definition is allowed disability payments without regard to whether or not there is further employment.

Mr. President, I am sure there is not one among us who would regard blindness as anything other than a disability. Yet among those handicapped there are many who are eager to make their own way in the world, as many do. By giving a modest floor of security to them, we can give encouragement for them to undertake training and useful work even more than at present, with the knowledge that we will apply to them a reasonable standard of expectation, taking due recognition of the manner in which blindness differs from many other disabilities.

There are other changes which are needed in reference to our laws concerning treatment of the blind, and I shall later offer some suggestions in other bills, continuing the work in this area which I have sponsored ever since coming to the Senate. But while the other changes are also desirable, this is the one which deserves top priority in our consideration of the blind in their relation to our social security laws.

The bill is being cosponsored by Senators BAYH, BIBLE, BOGGS, BREWSTER, BURDICK, CANNON, CARLSON, CHURCH, CLARK, COOPER, COTTON, CURTIS, DIRKSEN, DODD, DOMINICK, EASTLAND, FANNIN, FONG, FULBRIGHT, GRUENING, HART, HATFIELD, HILL, HOLLINGS, INOUYE, JACKSON, JAVITS, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MCCARTHY, MCCLELLAN, MCGEE, MCGOVERN, MCINTYRE, METCALF, MILLER, MONDALE, MONTOYA, MORSE, MOSS, MORTON, MUNDT, MURPHY, NELSON, PELL, PROUTY, RANDOLPH, RIBICOFF, SCOTT, SMITH, TYDINGS, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of North Dakota.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1681) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

TO ENLARGE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT OF APPEALS FROM THREE TO SIX ASSOCIATE JUDGES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, justice delayed is too often justice denied. In searching for ways to improve judicial operations and the speedy disposition of both criminal and civil cases in the local courts of the District of Columbia, the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Congress have recognized the ever-present need for adequate judicial manpower to combat calendar congestion in the courts and expedite justice.

The legislative bill I am introducing today meets a critical need for additional judges on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and is a further necessary step toward equipping the judicial machinery of the District so that it can cope in a timely way with a constantly growing volume of business.

The District of Columbia Court of Appeals was created as a three-judge court in 1942. It was formerly known as the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. Its name was changed in 1962. The court is an intermediate appellate court with both civil and criminal jurisdiction. The great bulk of its cases originate in the District of Columbia court of general sessions, which handles by far the major part of all criminal and civil cases filed in the District—and all of the domestic relations cases. This small appellate court also hears appeals from the juvenile court and from decisions of a dozen or more administrative agencies of the District of Columbia government, such as the Director of Motor Vehicles, the Real Estate Commission, and the Board of Pharmacy.

Since 1949, the Congress has approved legislation raising the civil jurisdiction of the court of general sessions from $3,000 to $10,000, and increasing the number of judges in that court from 10 to 21. The juvenile court has been increased from 1 to 3 judges. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals has not had its membership increased since 1942—a period of 25 years.

The addition of judges in the lower courts has increased the workload of this small appellate court. One hundred and fifty-nine cases were filed in the court in fiscal year 1959. The number rose to 295 in 1966, and during the first 10 months of the current fiscal year, 262 appeals have been filed. The indications are that more than 300 appeals will be filed in the court before this fiscal period ends.

The workload of the court has also increased because of higher court rulings concerning the rights of indigent defendants in criminal cases to appeal, have counsel appointed, and to have transcripts at Government expense. In 1964, the court had 56 criminal appeals. In 1966 there were 112, and in the first 10 months of this fiscal year there have been 140 such appeals.

In addition—and not reflected in the figures I have mentioned—the court hears many time-consuming special matters: applications for appeal from the small claims branch of the court of general sessions and in criminal cases where a fine of less than $50 is imposed, and a wide variety of motions, including motions for special relief, such as writs of mandamus, and motions to proceed in forma pauperis.

Mr. President, until recent years the three judges of the District of Columbia Court of Appeals were able to keep the work of the court current. Now, however, the calendar has become so heavy that it is impossible for them to do so. As of April 30, 1967, there were 196 cases pending and unheard. Sixty-eight were criminal cases and 128 were civil matters.

The court gives preference to its criminal calendar, and this is as it should be. As I have said before, speedy disposition of criminal cases is a strong deterrent to crime—an essential element of the continuing effort to curb lawlessness in the Nation's Capital.

The bill I introduce today is already pending before the other body. It would increase the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals from three to six. The added annual cost for judicial salaries plus secretarial and law clerk services would be $117,792.

To enable the court to eliminate the present backlog of appeals and keep its docket current, the bill would also authorize the court to have appeals heard by three-judge divisions of the court. Instead of requiring the entire court to hear every case, the bill would permit the establishment of two panels which would sit on and dispose of appeals separately. The court's capacity to dispose of its cases would be doubled. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia uses the division system to keep up with its work, and recently the U.S. Court of Claims has been authorized to sit in divisions.

Mr. President, on April 13 last, as the opening salvo of a renewed campaign against crime in the District of Columbia, I introduced 16 separate anticrime bills. Adequate capacity in our courts to deal with criminal cases, and at the same time meet their responsibilities for the heavy volume of civil litigation, is a necessary part of that effort. This legislation is overdue. The District of Columbia Court of Appeals seriously needs these additional judges. I look upon this bill as another step forward in our fight against crime, and as essential for the adequate equipment of the judicial system in the District of Columbia to meet overall present requirements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1682), to amend chapter 7 of title II of the District of Columbia Code to increase the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia Court of Appeals from two to five, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Bible, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DELEGATE ACT

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, on May 3, 1802, Congress granted the first charter to the city of Washington, and under this charter, the city's first government was formed, consisting of a mayor, appointed by the President, and a city council, elected by the people of the city. Today marks the 165th anniversary of the establishment of the city of Washington in the District of Columbia.

During this long period, the Federal city has been represented in the Congress only once—by a nonvoting delegate—from 1871 to 1874—and when such representation was abolished in 1874, the District ceased to have any representation whatever in the Congress.

The President of the United States and the Senate have for many years repeatedly stated their support for a system of government that would be more directly responsible to the citizens of the District of Columbia. In his message on the Nation's Capital, the President recommended a three-point program to achieve a better government for the District of Columbia: home rule, reorganization of the District government, and representation in Congress.

Legislation to amend the Constitution to authorize a voting representative for the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives has been recommended by the President. Because of the timelag in amending the Constitution, the President has recommended that the District be provided some voice in the interim period.

For this purpose, I am introducing today, upon request of the President, a bill which will restore to the District the right to be represented in Congress by a nonvoting delegate. The same bill is being introduced in the House of Representatives concurrently. Under this bill, the voters of the District would elect the delegate for a term of 2 years. While the delegate would have a seat in the House and be allowed to participate in debate, he would not be permitted to vote. Assignment of the delegate to committees would be determined by the House under its rulemaking power. The bill would require the delegate to be at least 25 years old—the same as a Representative—that he shall have lived in the District for at least 3 years prior to his election, and that he shall continue to live in the District during his term of office. The bill would preclude the delegate from holding any other public office during his term.

The bill makes provision for a general election, and for nominations of the delegate by party primaries or by petition. Provision is also made for a runoff in the event that there are more than two candidates in a primary or in the general election and no one candidate receives as much as 40 percent of the total vote.

Other changes are made, chiefly of a technical nature, for the purpose of modernizing and improving the election machinery.

Mr. President, let 1967 mark a renewed effort to provide that the residents of the District of Columbia shall enjoy the rights of all other American citizens.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter of transmittal requesting introduction of this proposed legislation and explaining its purpose be printed in the Record immediately following my remarks.

The letter presented by Mr. Bible is as follows:

Executive Office of the President,
Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., March 9, 1967.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: In his message on the Nation's Capital, the President recommended a three-point program to achieve a better government for the District of Columbia: home rule; reorganization and strengthening of the District Government; and representation in Congress.

I enclose herewith for Congressional consideration a proposed "District of Columbia Delegate Act" which would implement the third of the recommendations made by the President. It would authorize election by the voters of the District of Columbia of a nonvoting delegate to the Congress. In addition, it would make certain changes in the District Election Act.

The citizens of the District of Columbia deserve and need representation in the Congress. To achieve this, the President, in his message on the Nation's Capital, recommended that the Constitution be amended to authorize one voting representative for the District of Columbia in the House and such additional representation in the House and the Senate as the Congress may from time to time provide.

On March 3, 1967, the Acting Attorney General transmitted to the Congress legislation which would implement that recommendation. Enactment of this amendment, ratification by the required number of States and implementation by the Congress will, however, take some time.

As the President stated in his message, "District citizens should not be left completely without a voice during this vital interim period." The proposed "District of Columbia Delegate Act" would meet this present need. Its passage does not necessitate an amendment to the Constitution.

The proposed legislation would establish the right of the people of the District of Columbia to be represented by a delegate in the House of Representatives. The delegate would be elected by the voters of the District, and his term would be for two years. He would have a seat in the House with the right to participate in debate but not to vote. The committees to which he would be assigned would be determined by the House under its rule-making power.

A precedent exists for this proposal. The Organic Act of February 21, 1871, provided that the District of Columbia should have in the House of Representatives an elected delegate with the same rights and privileges as those of delegates from Federal territories. Pursuant to this Act, the District of Columbia was represented in the House of Representatives by a nonvoting delegate until 1875. Provision for a nonvoting representative was repealed by the Temporary Organic Act of June 20, 1874.

This proposed bill is designed to assure that the District's delegate will have an interest in the District of Columbia as a resident, and a knowledge of its pressing problems. The District delegate would have to be at least 25 years old as must a Representative. In addition, he would have to have lived in the District for at least three years immediately prior to his election, and he would be required to continue to live in the District during his term of office. While serving, the delegate would not be permitted to hold any other paid public office.

The bill provides that any party which polled at least 7,500 voters in a general election would be entitled to conduct a primary for the next general election. Provision is also made for direct nomination of candidates for a general election by petitions signed by two percent of the total number of registered voters or 5,000 such voters, whichever is less.

The delegate would be elected by the voters of the District of Columbia in a general election, usually after first winning a primary election. Provision would be made for a runoff election if no one candidate in a primary election received as much as 40 percent of the total vote of his party in that primary. Provision would also be made for a runoff election in the general election for delegate in the event that no one candidate received as much as 40 percent of the total vote cast for all candidates in that election. This could occur in cases where more than two parties qualify to hold primaries, or where additional candidates are nominated by petition. The candidates in any runoff election would be the two persons who had received the most votes in such primary or general election.

In addition, the bill would provide a delegate with compensation and other benefits which are granted by law to Members of Congress. At the same time it would subject a delegate to the same restrictions and regulations as Members of Congress.

The bill would also make a number of technical and other changes in the District Election Act and related laws. These changes would modernize and improve the election machinery. They would make it more responsive to the needs of the community. They would also provide a transition to the electoral system which will be needed when the District is granted voting representation in the Congress.

As the President stated in his message on the Nation's Capital:

"A delegate from the District in the House of Representatives would be of benefit to both the Congress and the District in providing a more adequate line of communication on District matters. A collateral benefit would be the opportunity for District citizens, through the experience of biennial elections, to develop additional local leadership and more effective political organizations responsive to the citizens who live here."

We urge early consideration and action on this proposed legislation.

Sincerely,

Charles L. Schultze,
Director.

VOTING REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, today marks the 165th anniversary of the city of Washington, D.C. I have chosen this historic occasion to introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for voting representation from the District of Columbia in Congress.

My joint resolution, which I am presenting at the request of the administration, would implement the President's recommendation in his message to Congress that the Constitution be amended to provide for one Representative from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives; and such additional representation in the House, and the Senate as Congress may from time to time prescribe by law.

This is without doubt a most essential step to effective and meaningful representation for 800,000 residents of the District who are still governed by Congress. It is consistent with the 23d amendment to the Constitution, which provided for participation by the voters of the District in the election of the President and Vice President. In my judgment, it is a measure long overdue.

This measure rests wholly on the equitable principle that the citizens of the District should have the same privilege, in fact the right, enjoyed by citizens of the 50 States, to be governed by laws voted on by a representative of their own choice. It would not make the District of Columbia a State, it would not give it the sovereign powers of a State, or constitute a foundation for statehood. It would merely give citizens of the United States living in the District of Columbia a voting voice in Congress—the body which helps establish national policy as well as serves as the city council for the Nation's Capital.

Briefly, this is what my proposal would do:

Section 1 would assure the District of one voting Representative in the House of Representatives. Section 1, moreover, would authorize Congress to extend that representation in either or both Houses of Congress, up to the representation to which the District would be entitled if it were a State.

Section 2 would empower Congress to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. Thus, under both sections 1 and 2, adjustments of the representation for the District could be made by Congress to keep pace with population changes, and Congress could also make other necessary changes in related laws.

Section 3 makes the article inapplicable to the provision in the 23rd amendment for determining the number of electors for President and Vice President to be appointed for the District. Accordingly, regardless of changes made in the size of the District's congressional representation as authorized by this measure, the District's minimum electoral vote in Presidential elections would be left intact. If changes are to be made in the District's influence in Presidential elections, it seems to me more desirable that they be effected as an integral part of reform in the electoral college system.

Congress does not, and should not, lightly invoke the process of constitutional amendment. But it is most incongruous, to say the least, that the citizens residing in the Federal district constituting the seat of government—one which ought to represent a model for the world to follow—should be denied the basic right of government—voting representation in Congress.

I note and welcome the broad and active community interest in this measure. I call particular attention to the consideration being given this matter by the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative Emanuel Celler, and urge my colleagues in the Senate to give this matter earnest consideration and favorable action.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 80) to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress, introduced by Mr. Bayh, for himself, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Scott, and Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 80

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"Article —

"Section 1. The people of the District constituting the seat of Government of the United States shall elect at least one Representative in Congress and, as may be provided by law, one or more additional Representatives or Senators, or both, up to the number to which the District would be entitled if it were a State.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

"Sec. 3. This article shall have no effect on the provision made in the Twenty-third article of amendment to the Constitution for determining the number of electors for President and Vice President to be appointed for the District."

RESOLUTION EXPRESSING DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution expressing disapproval of Reorganization Plan No. 2 transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 9, 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 114) was referred to the Committee on Government Operations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate does not favor the Reorganization Plan Numbered 2 transmitted to the Congress by the President on March 9, 1967.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, the President's plan would transfer to the Chairman of the Tariff Commission a number of functions—described as "routine"—which are performed today by the six-man Commission acting as a group.

These functions include: First, hiring and firing of Commission personnel; second, distribution of the workload; third, direction of supervisory, and other Commission personnel; fourth, communication of Tariff Commission policies personnel are to follow; fifth, overall management, functioning, and organization of the Commission and its staff; sixth, functions of the Commission under the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921; seventh, allocation, use, and expenditure of Commission funds; and eighth, calling of special sessions of the Commission.

Testimony at hearings on the plan conducted this morning by the Executive Reorganization Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations reflected dissension within the Tariff Commission itself on the merits of the proposed reorganization. The two dissenting Commissioners believe that the functions proposed to be transferred are substantive, not routine, and that strengthening the role of the Chairman could diminish the Commission's traditional independence and objectivity and thus lessen its value to the Congress and to the President.

There seems to be general agreement that the Tariff Commission is in need of some improvement in the area of administrative efficiency, and I, of course, would encourage such efforts. But I fear that the plan's zeal to accomplish administrative efficiency would also radically change the character of the Commission, jeopardize its traditional independence, and create the possibility that it might become a ward of the executive branch. I believe that this is an example of the use of "overkill," of the use of too much effort to accomplish a limited purpose. The results of such a reorganization would, on balance, do much more harm than good.

I should point out, Mr. President, that the Committee on Government Operations and the Senate itself must act almost immediately on this plan if we are to have the opportunity to act at all. Unless one House of Congress rejects the proposed reorganization plan by May 19, 1967, it becomes effective on that date. In the House of Representatives, I am told that the Committee on Government Operations has in effect recommended that the reorganization plan be approved. It appears, then, that any initiative to kill the plan will have to come from this body.

Finally, I want to emphasize that my opposition to this particular plan should not be interpreted as blind opposition to any reorganization of the Tariff Commission. Improvements in administrative efficiency, in particular, may be very much in order. But that may, and perhaps most properly should, be accomplished through legislation specifically directed to the subject.

GENERAL REVISION OF THE PATENT LAW—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENTS NOS. 182 THROUGH 186

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, a number of suggested amendments to S. 1042, the general patent law revision bill, have been brought to my attention. While I claim no expertise in the patent law field, I have discussed these amendments with persons who are quite knowledgeable in the field and am convinced they raise responsible issues that deserve full exploration and discussion during Senate consideration of this legislation. None of these amendments affect the basic objectives of the bill.

The first amendment establishes a 6-month grace period for filing a complete patent application after public disclosure. Under current law, there is a 1-year grace period, but under the bill it is totally eliminated.

The next amendment spells out the nature of the property right in a patent, particularly with respect to licensing.

The next amendment strengthens the protection of a patent against imported items by making it an infringement whether or not the process could be patented in the exporting country.

The fourth amendment would provide a highly restricted form of "prior user rights." Because the first to file rather than the first to invent is now entitled to a patent, such protection may be advisable to insure equity.

The last amendment would allow a more liberal continuation-in-part practice.

As I indicated earlier, I am not at this time committed to any of these amendments. However, I believe they are worthy of full consideration. It should be noted that two of these amendments are contained in the recommendations of the President's Commission on the Patent System.

Mr. President, I send the five amendments to the desk for appropriate reference and ask that they be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF BILL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 1028) to extend certain benefits of the Annual and Sick Leave Act, the Veterans' Preference Act, and the Classification Act to employees of county committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, and for other purposes, introduced by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney], the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of my bill, S. 1626, which would prohibit the desecration or improper use of our country's flag, the name of the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy] be added as cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEARINGS ON RETIREMENT AND THE INDIVIDUAL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, earlier this year the Senate Special Committee on Aging under the leadership of its able and distinguished chairman, Senator Williams of New Jersey, established a Subcommittee on Retirement and the Individual. Its assignment, as expressed in the official description of its jurisdiction, is "to inquire into and report on the institution of retirement and its impact on the individual, especially as regards the problems of adjusting to a new role in life and his need for meaning and fulfillment in the retirement years." The subcommittee will concentrate its attention on such areas as the present and future dimensions and nature of retirement, the consequences of trends toward earlier retirement and longer life, the effect of attitudes toward retirement and older people in general, psychological and social problems involved in the loss of job and job status, and ways of promoting constructive and meaningful use of free time.

To begin its work, the subcommittee will conduct a survey hearing on May 22 and 23 in Washington, D.C. Main purposes of this hearing will be to gather information on retirement as it is now and as it will probably become and to pinpoint major problem areas or themes that should be developed by the subcommittee.

As chairman of the subcommittee, I am happy to report that establishment of this new subcommittee has stirred much friendly interest both within and outside of Government. And I and my fellow members of the subcommittee—Senators Edward Long, Edward Kennedy, Young of Ohio, Yarborough, Prouty, Fong, and Miller—are looking forward to a most informative and productive hearing.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1630. An act for the relief of Rose Minutillo;

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe; and

H.R. 6133. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, as indicated:

H.R. 1630. An act for the relief of Rose Minutillo;

H.R. 4064. An act for the relief of Agnes C. Stowe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6133. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

WILL OF THE SENATE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in today's issue of the Washington Post appears an editorial recommending that the Senate proceed to dispose of the 7-percent investment credit bill. As this editorial points out, the Senate has expressed its opinion that the decision of the Senate to repeal the Presidential Campaign Act should be sustained.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Will of the Senate

The Senate's vote yesterday for repeal of the Long campaign-financing act could be interpreted as a bid for chaos. Senator Long had pointedly warned his colleagues that if they insisted on attaching a repealer of his act to the investment tax credit bill he would load the measure with other amendments and continue the debate. In other words, the Senate would face a re-run of the futile course that has plagued it in recent weeks. Apparently the Senate resented the implied threat and voted accordingly. But the major problem of getting that body back on the legislative track remains.

In our view, Senator Long would be well advised to swallow his defeat and get on with the business of passing the tax credit bill and revising the Presidential Campaign Fund Act. He fought vigorously to avoid a humiliating defeat, and we thought there was much to be said for his demand that the tax bill be stripped of all extraneous amendments. But now the vote has been taken. There would be no point in multiplying his reverses or in merely tying the Senate into knots.

The two objectives to be sought remain as clear as they ever were. First, the tax credit bill ought to be passed without further delay. One reasonable course would be for the Senate to complete its action and leave to the House the fate of the rider to repeal the Long Act. Second, hearings looking toward revision of the Long Act ought to begin at the earliest possible moment. The Senate has given the Finance Committee six weeks to bring back to the floor corrective amendments or a substitute measure. That is a big order. It would be a grave misfortune if the chairman of the Committee should fritter away the time that should go to this task for the sake of continuing a futile fight on the floor.

The entire Senate as well as the country has an interest in resolving the conflict at the earliest possible moment. The best course may well be to fall back now on Majority Leader Mansfield's suggested compromise which would leave the Long Act on the books but prevent funds from being spent under it until perfecting amendments have been adopted. That compromise should now look good to the Long forces, and the victorious Senators on the other side can afford to yield something for the sake of getting the Senate on the rails again.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR WILLIAMS OF DELAWARE

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on Nonessential Expenditures issued its report last Saturday, pointing out the increase in personnel. I wish to discuss that matter later today, and I ask unanimous consent that on the disposal of the Proxmire amendment I be recognized for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CELEBRATION IN HONOR OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, one of the guiding lights of European democracy. That Constitution encompasses many of the principles of a free society that we in the West hold true today: the sovereign power and will of the people, the rule of law, and the protection of the individual from the smothering influence of an all-powerful state.

How tragically ironic that this nation should now be the subject of those evils from which it has so eloquently striven to defend itself.

Yet despite the history of oppression and inhumanity that has troubled this country, Poland has been able to make a profound contribution to the cultural development of Europe and the world. We shall ever be indebted to the Poland of Copernicus, Marie Curie, Chopin, Paderewski, Henryk Sienkiewicz, and countless others; and its courage with Kosciusko and the heroes of the Warsaw ghetto.

To what can we express our appreciation for this great contribution in human talent? It is to the spirit and determination of the people of Poland, to those who have acquitted themselves with the honor and courage that is so characteristic of a freedom-loving people that we give our thanks.

America owes a great deal to the heritage Poland has sent to its shores. As a measure of appreciation let me join in saluting Poland's often glorious past, and in looking forward to a hopeful future of greater understanding and cooperation between our two nations, and in building toward that day when Poland can once again live under the principles of the original Polish Constitution.

GROWING MEN WHILE GROWING TREES

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, across our Nation there is now an unprecedented awareness of the problems of the disadvantaged. And there is an increasing willingness among the more favored to join in the drive to open opportunities to all Americans for a full, productive, and satisfying life.

In this regard, Government has contributed vitally to the understanding of where we have fallen short and has taken bold initiative toward solutions. But, I believe it is important to remember that Government is not the author of compassion, nor by any means the sole architect of opportunity.

The crusade for opportunity is truly a national effort—a partnership involving all sectors of society. In speaking of this crusade, it seems to me that the initiative of the private sector is too often underemphasized.

Recently there came to my attention an article which underscores how private enterprise is responding to our national concern for opening new avenues to fulfillment. I am sure we would all agree that the mentally retarded are among the most severely disadvantaged. I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a story appearing in the April edition of the quarterly magazine published by Potlatch Forests, Inc., which tells how several mentally handicapped young men learned in the forests of north Idaho to perform a vital job and in so doing succeeded in breaking personal barriers. In helping to rehabilitate a forest, these men were also building themselves. I find this a most impressive and encouraging story. The experience of these few point to the beginning of what may become a new life for many.

I ask unanimous consent that the article "Growing Men While Growing Trees" be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Growing Men While Growing Trees

Rehabilitating handicapped young men while restoring a devastated forest is the story behind the recent planting of Potlatch's Washington Creek Burn in the Clearwater country of north central Idaho.

The program to grow men while growing trees is indeed unusual, but the results are warmly rewarding.

The story goes back to a recent summer when a number of lightning strikes ignited a fire that reduced nearly 2,500 acres of Potlatch timber to ugly black char.

PFI foresters knew that surrounding timber would naturally reseed the perimeter of the burn in a few years. However, in the center of the burn it was a different story. No seed trees were left to revive what was once productive forest lands.

For this area, a program of seeding and planting was started to assure adequate restocking. Seed was scattered by hand and by helicopter. These methods, however, were only partially successful. The only course left was to collect seeds, grow seedlings, and transplant them where they were needed.

As the planting season was near at hand, PFI's usual planters, the woods crews, were busily logging. And as any gardener knows, there are times when you can plant and times when you cannot. So Potlatch foresters turned to Supervised Occupational Enterprise in Spokane, Washington, an organization that was attempting to broaden the horizons and expand the opportunities for mentally retarded young men. One of their methods was forest replanting.

Soon a camp was pitched, seedlings were delivered, and ten eager young men arrived on the scene. Their mission was to plant 52,000 trees as quickly as possible.

Work was soon underway to return 230 acres of badly scarred land to productive forests. Over a three-week period, the boys repeatedly filled their bags with seedlings of either Douglas fir, ponderosa pine, or white fir. Their instructions were to walk parallel to lines laid out by PFI foresters. After every four or five steps, they were to stop, open the soil, plant a seedling, tamp the earth, and move to the next spot.

The task was not easy because the terrain was mountainous and steep. To add to the challenge, only three of the boys had previous planting experience. Moreover, two crew members could not count.

Yet their desire to achieve, their will to excel, gained momentum. Soon they were each planting from 300 to 1,000 seedlings a day according to their individual abilities.

Of the 52,000 seedlings, 31,000 were planted by hand, and the rest were planted by auger. In hand planting, the lads carried mattocks. One solid swipe would open the soil deeply enough to plant the seedling. In auger planting, the more capable boys would use motor-driven boring devices to drill holes in which others would place seedlings.

Before the planting project was finished, the boys showed a world of improvement. Their limited achievements had grown dramatically.

Those who previously had little faith in their own abilities found that their new accomplishments had reaped new confidence. The most heart-warming feat was attained by the two boys who could not count. The necessity to pace the distance between seedlings had brought them to a major milestone in their lives. They started to learn how to count. In their eager desire to be good planters, they had hurdled one of the barriers surrounding their lives.

All of the boys on the planting crew seemed to respond to the outdoor environment. Living, working, and camping together appeared to give them greater social and emotional development than they might have found in sheltered workshop rehabilitation.

Another illustration of the good that this work does can be found in one young man who had been with the planting crew for three years. Before he was given this opportunity he had no confidence in himself. He did not care to work, he would neither talk nor participate in group activities. Today he is a gregarious, outgoing leader. He now heads one of the planting crews. He drives a truck into town to pick up mail, groceries, and laundry. The other boys look to him with admiration and cheerfully follow his example.

While the boys are out in the forests working on planting programs they are under the care of Dale and Carmen Funk. Dale is not only experienced in planting know how, but he also has the talent to challenge and encourage the boys to develop fully their limited abilities.

Carmen adds the maternal ingredient which is so important for the boys, many who are away from home for the first time. She rules her outdoor kitchen with a firm but tender hand. Besides preparing three hearty meals a day on her camp stoves, she launders, mends, helps the boys write letters home, and nurses scrapes and scratches.

Within the context of their limitations the boys are ideal workers. They are not bored with the repetitive nature of transplanting seedlings. They work cheerfully and honestly. They are paid on a piece work basis, and yet there has never been an instance where a boy would wander off, throw away a few bundles of seedlings, and relax when he should have been working.

The excellence of their work is becoming well known. When the boys completed their work in PFI's Washington Creek Burn, Dale and Carmen took the six best planters to western Washington. Supervised Occupational Enterprise had been contracted by another forest products company to plant seedlings. The six boys were to form a nucleus to train and lead others to plant 2,000,000 seedlings in two months.

It's just the beginning. But now in a certain sense, PFI's seedlings mean more than trees, forest products, wildlife, and public recreation. They have helped a few handicapped boys to help themselves. In addition to restoring our forests, these seedlings have restored productive young men to society.

VIETNAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the past several days many stories have appeared in the press which sharply point up the very difficult and agonizing problems presented by the war in Vietnam. That is especially true of newspapers of today and yesterday.

The headline on the one story proclaimed with stark tragedy, "49 Marines Killed in Bitter Fighting for Vietnam Hills."

The headline on another column stated, "Senate GOP Study Calls U.S. War Role Error by Democrats."

A third column headline informed us that "Rusk Lists 28 Bids on Vietnam Peace Spurned by Hanoi."

These separate, but directly related and closely entwined news stories, symbolize and point up the anguish, frustration, confusion, and tragedy which stem from this conflict.

One story tells the unhappy story of brave and valiant Americans fighting and dying in a far-off land halfway around the world.

Another report today shows photographs of U.S. Marines dying while taking a stragically important hill.

Still another involves the political implications of the war and, possibly as a trial balloon, raises, without answering, the question of whether in next year's presidential campaign politics should stop at the water's edge.

Still another tells of our many and repeated efforts to bring the war to an end by honorable negotiations, and how these efforts, just as repeatedly, have been scorned by Hanoi.

These things—fighting and dying, rejected peace overtures, and political overtones—are almost inevitable ingredients of any modern war. Political considerations and criticism and distrust of national policy are perhaps more dominant in this one because of widespread uncertainty and doubt as to how and why we became involved and equally widespread confusion and lack of knowledge of our objectives.

Yet, Mr. President, the hard, cold, and inescapable fact is that we are now involved in the third largest war in our history. American boys are fighting with almost incredible magnificence, bravery, and valor under the most difficult conditions one can imagine. Our military leaders tell us that much hard, bitter, and bloody fighting lies ahead.

Under no circumstances, Mr. President, should this war be made a political football by any group or either political party.

Mr. President, I have lived very close to this matter for the last 2 years.

Allowing for honest differences of opinion within both groups, I think it has been truly magnificent the way the two major parties have kept their shoulders to the wheel. It is a strong factor in the thinking of our adversaries. The breaking up of that solidarity on our part would be the most unfortunate thing that could possibly happen. I sincerely hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle will continue to show a high sense of responsibility and regard for the overall public good, and a sense of national duty with respect to this war.

Mr. President, these remarks are certainly not addressed to any individual, but to the whole concept of the problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the Senator ask for 5 minutes, because I should like him to yield to me on the point which he has just made.

Mr. STENNIS. May I finish my statement?

Mr. JAVITS. On this subject?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

We simply cannot afford to stop in the midst of a shooting war and take time out to debate whether we have been wise or unwise and whether our past actions were sound or unsound. At this critical time, we need unity and a sense of national purpose not disunity and divisiveness. Our brave fighting men have the right to expect this and more; we can afford to give them no less.

It is not my purpose, Mr. President, to criticize or to deny anyone's right to constructive dissent. My purpose instead is to support and uphold our country and its flag, and those men in uniform who defend them so bravely.

I fear that even more trying days lie ahead. Recent events clearly indicate an intensification of the war in scale and violence. More American blood will be shed. All Americans should face these hard realities squarely.

In view of the fact that our flag and national honor and integrity have now been committed, I believe that we must be firm and resolute and meet increased force with increased force. I shall continue to give support both to our efforts to achieve an honorable settlement and to our resolution to stand firm and persevere if that proves to be unattainable, I hope my fellow Americans will follow the same course.

Let there be no mistake in the minds of our adversaries that they think America is divided.

America is not divided. Our people are not divided. We are united. We will remain that way.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am happy to yield to the Senator from New York briefly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator from Mississippi have expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator from Mississippi has made a statement obviously directed to the staff study which was presented to the Republican conference yesterday.

Let me assure the Senator that, in my view, our national unity is not shattered. Unity does not mean blindness. National unity will be strengthened and affirmed when the results of this very fair and very distinguished factual summation of the historic situation is fully digested, fully discussed, and fully considered by Senators on the Republican side of the aisle.

Let me say to the Senator that there is room for creativity in this situation. The American people who are, I agree with the Senator, thoroughly unified in honoring their commitment in Vietnam—as we are as Senators. This goes for every Senator in this Chamber and on this side of the aisle.

In my judgment, the American people feel that this is a struggle which will have to be settled some day, and they want it settled at the earliest possible time. They get no joy in blood being shed. All that we are saying on this side of the aisle is not to be blind, but to be creative. I think that we will turn out to be creative. We cannot control what the papers say about the situation—divisiveness, and everything else. They write the headlines. We do not.

But we can discuss the basic facts and the basic merits. As one Senator who is a party to this, I feel deeply in my heart that there is no reason for suspecting, intimating, or being concerned about disunity. We have voted as a group and we will vote as a group for every commitment to back up our troops. I think they are the most valorous men on earth. We back the aims of the President in Vietnam, but we speak up in order to be creative as to what can be done about the situation, and so we are preparing ourselves in this way for that purpose.

In this world, and in the Senate, everything is public so that even the process of thinking and of factfinding becomes public. We cannot help that. But I can assure the Senator from Mississippi that, as the effects of the Republican staff report come out, they will come out strengthening the Nation, not weakening it. No Communist dictator will ever get any comfort from it. If he thinks he will, he is going to be rudely disappointed.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his remarks. I made clear that I was not directing my remarks to any individuals, but I just do not want to see any growth or movement made on a party basis. I do not believe it will be intended by the minority party.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I just want to echo the sentiments expressed by my good friend from New York, and to invite the attention of my good friend from Mississippi to the statement which I made which appears on page 11437 of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which I am sure will reinforce the statement that has been made. I am quite sure that reading my statement on yesterday will indicate to the Senator there is complete unity of commitment and support in this regard.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. That was in yesterday's RECORD. I thank the Senator, and I shall certainly read his valuable statement.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, during the course of the remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi, he read a statement indicating that someone deplored the Republican study, and that this idea has been called an error by some Democrat spokesmen. He quoted a headline to that effect.

Mr. President, I should like to address myself to that statement, because some additional light might well be thrown on the purpose and the purport of the study conducted by the staff of the Republican policy committee.

It had its genesis, I might say, in an amendment, suggestion, or motion offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], which I seconded. This was at our policy conference luncheon. The motion was that there be a Republican policy staff study made of the background on undeclared wars, such as the Vietnamese war and the Korean war, and that there be a position paper prepared showing all the historic developments.

It was not to be, and it was not, a position paper reflecting conclusions about what should be done in this war. It was the original thought of the Senator from New York, I am sure, and I know it was mine, too, as I seconded the motion, that this would become the basis for some informative discussion in the policy conference.

That was not an error but a constructive move, and has served the purpose well.

Unhappily, there was some misunderstanding about what was done with the policy staff report when it was completed. It was released before the members of the Republican conference had had an opportunity to arrange a meeting and discuss it, analyze it, and relate it to each other's opinions. I see no particular harm in that. That was an honest misunderstanding. We did not switch signals some place along the line; ultimately, it was certainly going to be made public, at all events.

Let me emphasize that it was not an error to make the report; that it does not in any way denote a division of opinion along party lines so far as the conduct of the war is concerned; that the same great degree of unity between Republican Members of the Senate still prevails. We have, rather gratifyingly, been consistently behind the war effort, and will continue to do so.

I only wish that my distinguished friend, the Senator from Mississippi, could direct his remarks to our colleagues on his side of the aisle, where there has not been that degree of unity and support which has been provided over here on the Republican side of the aisle.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield?

Mr. MUNDT. If I can have extra time. I have only 3 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that whatever time he needs be allowed the Senator from South Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is the Senator making a distinction between the factual study, as I understand it, and the conclusions——

Mr. MUNDT. By the policy staff.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. After all, the conclusions which have been made by certain members of the administration seem to me to be based upon an erroneous, factual background—upon the constant repetition, finally by military leaders, that there is no element of civil war in this case and that the war is solely, clearly, and exclusively—1,000 percent—aggression by North Vietnam. This is a factual statement by our military leaders—or so they state.

If the study reveals the facts, the truth, about this, obviously it brings the theory the administration has erected upon it tumbling down. I do not know how the Senator can make a distinction between fact and opinion, if that study—I say, if it does—although I am reluctant to get into this argument; I had better stay out of it——

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is never reluctant to get into an argument.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. These are historical questions. The question is whether or not this was a clear-cut military aggression without provocation. It is not just a matter of opinion as to what the Senator from South Dakota or I think about it. There are criteria by which one can judge the accuracy of such a statement. I assume the staff has done that. But this is very significant when it comes to the conclusion by the Secretary of State, for example, with respect to the reiteration of the 28 proposals to which we have said "Yes" and they have said "No." The fact that he makes that statement does not necessarily make it so. If the study shows that in 1964 there was a proposal and the "No" came from the Secretary, and not the other side, this is a fact in the matter.

I submit this report makes a contribution to the factual situation of the background.

Mr. MUNDT. I appreciate the Senator's comment for the RECORD. He has, however, interpreted it differently from what we have. This report represented a digging up of evidence by a bright young staff, a report which was made to us without recommendations.

I happen to agree with Secretary Rusk's conclusion about its not being a civil war. I happen to agree with Secretary Rusk that, one way or the other, 28 different proposals were made to somebody, somewhere, about peace in Vietnam. Whether they were followed up as much as the Senator from Arkansas would like to have had them followed up, I do not know, but I come to the conclusion that there were at least these 28 efforts. But this is unrelated to the staff study, which was that and nothing more.

Unhappily, some newspaper people have interpreted it one way and some the other way. I think if we were to do it differently, we should have accompanied the study with a news release providing guidelines on its purpose and contents. But this is helpful information on the whole war background. It is useful information. I do not think it is going to cost the support on the part of one single Republican in his determination to bring the war to an early and successful victory which was there before the report was issued.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator was granted such additional time as he might require.

Mr. MUNDT. I yield now to the ranking Republican member of the committee.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I want to say that I have read the documentary which has been referred to. So far as I can see, it is absolutely factual in every respect. The only trouble with it happened to be that there were not enough copies to go around. I think it ought to be made available to everybody in the Nation, so they can get the facts running from 1946 up to the present time regarding our involvement in South Vietnam. We are accused of disunity in this body, and in order to demonstrate absolute unity, I would suggest that the majority side of the Senate join with the minority in seeing to it that enough copies of this document are prepared so that everybody in America can have it.

Mr. MUNDT. A very interesting suggestion.

Mr. AIKEN. That would be unity. That would be a good demonstration of solid unity.

Mr. MUNDT. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who has already commented on it, might want to join in that suggestion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would join the Senator in making it available. This is the most fruitful and promising movement on the part of the minority party that I can remember. I had always thought it was one of the functions of the minority party to offer some kind of alternative rather than to be a rubber-stamp to any administration, and that, no matter how they may vary on a subject, there should be some of a different view. It had never occurred to me that, under our system, the minority party was under pressure or had a duty to the United States to absolutely echo the views of the administration, whichever party it might be.

Mr. MUNDT. May I say to the chairman of the committee that I agree with the Senator that the minority party is not under any mandate or precedent which holds us to unanimously agreeing and reechoing the position of the administration, even on the conduct of the war; but it was not the purpose of this report, in the first instance, to try to provide a Republican solution to the war, or to have a Republican viewpoint about the war or about the conduct of the war, or, in fact, to make the war a partisan issue in any way. The purpose was to acquaint us, and I hope the public, with what the background of the war actually was. The report speaks for itself in that connection. It raises a couple of rhetorical questions, which we have not answered, and which we should not answer as a party. Those questions should be answered by individual Senators and individual citizens.

May I read a couple of sentences from what I consider to be a very objective and reasoned interpretation of this report as expressed in our conference meeting yesterday by Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, our minority leader, in which he said:

> The sudden, extreme, and completely unwarranted interpretation of the Republican policy staff report by some commentators is, to say the least, rather astonishing. I got no such impressions and came to no such conclusions.

May I say this was written by Senator DIRKSEN while he was in the hospital and had more time than many of us to read the report without distraction and with due contemplation. Without talking to anybody, he wrote his views and read them to us yesterday at our policy luncheon.

He said further:

> In a capsule, it is a complete, authentic, well-documented, historical report on our involvement in Vietnam—

The distinguished ranking Republican member of the Foreign Relations Committee has just reaffirmed that fact. I read that again.

> In a capsule, it is a complete, authentic, well-documented, historical report on our involvement in Vietnam, a recital of Republican positions in the past—

That is correct—

> and two basic questions concerning the party commitments in the future. The questions do not suggest what position, if any, the party should take.

Certainly, the questions do not imply the answers.

I read further from what Senator DIRKSEN said:

> The only suggestion is that the party might agree to seek answers to the two questions of our national interest in Southeast Asia and how far to go in support of that interest.

Speaking for myself, I hope the party does not seek a party answer, but it is well to raise these questions with individual citizens in our country, to reflect upon them, and to have them arrive at their own answers.

There are other questions, it seems to me, if we are going to go in that direction, to which Republicans had better direct themselves; namely, to its position and the procedures whereby these obligations in Vietnam were undertaken. This is something which the Senator from Illinois says in his statement and about which there should be some reflection throughout the country.

Continuing with what the Senator from Illinois said, he said:

> The report makes no suggestion that (1) we modify our support of the President (2) that we increase or diminish our troop strength; (3) that we escalate or de-escalate the conduct of the war (4) that we retreat or withdraw (5) that we disavow our obligations under the SEATO Treaty (6) that we pressure Vietnam into a course of action which it might be reluctant to take.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire statement of the minority leader appear in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The sudden, extreme, and completely unwarranted interpretation of the Republican policy staff report by some commentators, is to say the least, rather astonishing. I got no such impressions and came to no such conclusions. In a capsule, it is a complete, authentic, well-documented, historical report on our involvement in Vietnam, a recital of Republican positions *in the past*, and two basic questions concerning the Party commitments in the future. The questions do not suggest what position if any, the Party should take. The only suggestion is that the Party *might agree to seek answers* to the two questions of our national interest in Southeast Asia and how far to go in support of that interest.
>
> It makes no suggestion that (1) We modify our support of the President (2) that we increase or diminish our troop strength (3) that we escalate or de-escalate the conduct of the war (4) that we retreat or withdraw (5) that we disavow our obligations under the SEATO Treaty (6) that we pressure Vietnam into a course of action which it might be reluctant to take.
>
> The basic questions have been and are being raised in many quarters by many people and many organizations are indeed a proper field of inquiry and exploration at any time.
>
> There is an over-riding fact which the report does not dispute or ignore. It is the fact that we are in Vietnam, 400,000 strong, and that our peace efforts through many approaches, in the utmost good faith, have proved abortive. Nor does it hint that the position which the Republican Party should take, should be altered, regardless of what a further examination of our national interest or further involvement might disclose.
>
> Preserving wholly the right of full and fair inquiry and criticism we reiterate our wholehearted support of the Commander-in-Chief of our Armed Forces. We affirm our position of standing four-square behind him and our field, air and sea commanders in Southeast Asia as, with our superb fighting men, they fight to win this struggle against Communist aggression.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, that summarizes it. It is a fair and faithful consensus of the discussion at the policy luncheon yesterday. I think it stands as a clear-cut analysis of what we were trying to do and what was done yesterday.

I might say as a caveat that, speaking for myself, I would not go quite as far as Senator DIRKSEN went in saying that we in no way added to or modified our support of the President. I wish to add something to that. Certainly, the report did not do it; but, speaking for myself, it is pretty well known among my fellow Senators that I very strongly oppose President Johnson in one aspect of his conduct of this war. I am not an admiral or a general or a chief of staff, and I do not believe Senators, either Republicans or Democrats, should try to call the shots in the day-by-day conduct of the war. That is the job of the President, his Chiefs of Staff, and his military experts.

However, I have opposed and will continue to oppose the President's diplomatic and economic blunders which are prolonging the war and escalating our casualties by insisting that American exporters continue to ship additional supplies to Russia, at the very hour when Russia is supplying all of the petroleum, all of the Migs, all of the antiaircraft weapons, all of the other modern weapons, and most of the other equipment required by Hanoi to prolong the war and to escalate our casualties, thus giving the North Vietnamese the confidence and the muscle so that they could say "No" 28 times—if in fact they did—to our various peace proposals.

On that issue, I shall continue to oppose the President, because I think it is a completely wrong policy to follow in time of war. Mr. President, history is on my side on that issue. No other Commander in Chief, no other President in the history of America, has ever authorized, to say nothing of encouraged, the shipment to the enemy of war supplies—and that is being done, because everything you sell your enemy in this day and age is directly or indirectly a war supply.

The shipment of supplies to the war machine in Russia, when she is fabricating the weapons which enable Hanoi to prolong the war and kill additional American boys, that kind of self-defeating policy, that kind of self-contradictory policy, that kind of totally and completely indefensible policy I shall continue to oppose, not on a partisan basis, because many Democrats share my point of view, and many people around the country share it. On Monday of this week, a national committee calling itself CEASE was organized by prominent Americans, which shares this point of view that we should give no aid or comfort to Ho Chi Minh, because we are seeking to make his situation worse, not better. I placed in Monday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the news release announcing the organization of CEASE. We are trying to stop a diplomatic, economic, political procedure which is enabling Ho Chi Minh to be stronger when we want him to be weaker. In that connection, I shall oppose the President in this unwise and unproductive policy.

But I do point out in conclusion that the Republican policy paper does not denote in even a remote way that the President, insofar as his announced determination to bring this war to an early and successful conclusion is concerned, will lose one syllable of support from a single Republican Senator who, up to this point, has supported his main thrust in the war effort. We reserve our right to criticize some of his approaches and actions in connection with his direction of the war and its associated policies. But we applaud and support him in his determination not to be defeated by our Communist enemies in this war.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I rise merely because, as the Senator from South Dakota has said, I put forward this idea for a policy committee staff report on Vietnam, to underline and emphasize a number of points which the Senator from South Dakota and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] have made. This was not done with any thought that it would represent the Republican position on Vietnam. The press tomorrow, Mr. President, might very well say that since Senator FULBRIGHT, whom I honor and respect, has said that this is a good, factual report, therefore the report carries out his point of view, and that all the Republicans have joined him. He would be first to say that that is ridiculous, and so would we all. I am glad that he says it is a fine report, and suits him in terms of its factual analysis. He says the facts shine through it. If that is true, I am glad they do. We may, however, draw very different conclusions. The fact that the Senator is satisfied with the facts as stated in the report does not mean that the report supports his particular point of view. Neither does it mean that there are no differences of point of view on this side of the aisle. Differences unquestionably exist. There are 36 Republican Senators; and there are bound to be at least two or three or five or six who will have very different points of view from the majority.

But, Mr. President, I am convinced, after yesterday's conference, that the overwhelming majority of Republican Senators will have a remarkable identity of views as soon as they have had a full opportuinty to consider and discuss this report. Mr. President, I predict that the public will exercise, as it should, a little patience, because, while the newspapers must find something to write every day about this subject, it is too profound, too complicated, too difficult—it is the number one subject of concern for the whole Nation, indeed, the whole world—to expect final conclusions by thinking, responsible men and women, like those who serve on this side or on the other side of the aisle, after a discussion of 2 hours or an hour and a half. If the public will have patience with us, and will not draw its conclusions finally from the observations and considerations which the daily press must report, as is its duty, it will find that this revealing document will lay the facts on the line, will quiet many arguments, and will result in a consolidation of position which will represent true unity, because it is based on the facts. What is even more important, it will enable a bipartisan approach to foreign policy, as envisioned by the late Senator Vandenberg, to make a constructive contribution to the debate. After all, President Johnson is not the only one with the answers. Unity does not require that he be. He is not a man, and his is not an administration, free from mistakes. Unity does not require that. I think he made a terrible mistake early this year in passing up an opportunity for unconditional cessation of the bombing, which I am convinced would have made it possible to bring the parties to the conference table.

But the American people expect something of the 36 Republican Senators. They expect us to develop the facts, and we are developing them, as it is our duty to do. This is a marvelous report from that point of view. They expect us to give the President our backing and support for the U.S. commitment in Vietnam, and that obligation carries with it also the responsibility to make recommendations and suggestions as to how, with honor, this war may be brought to a final conclusion.

I believe, Mr. President, that that is what will happen, that the majority of Republicans will stand behind such a policy, and will be able to present constructive alternatives which will bring the war to an honorable conclusion, as all of us—including, certainly, the President of the United States—devoutly wish.

THE 176TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Congress and the American people to this 176th anniversary of the May 3 Constitution in Poland. This constitution was adopted in 1791. It created one of the first constitutional governments on the continent of Europe. The significance of this holiday should be understood by every American.

The history of the Polish people has not been one of continued individual freedom. They have been subjected to numerous invasions and tyrannous foreign dictatorships. Their struggle has often been silent. They are still fighting to regain the natural rights and liberties which have been denied them by the tyranny of communism.

But their belief in the will of the people as the source of political power in civil society has survived even under Communist domination. The ideals of local government and judicial autonomy, of private ownership and free enterprise, of religious freedom, of access to public office and the responsibility of elected officials, are still valued highly by the people of Poland. These are the concepts of government which the Polish people first wrote into their constitution in 1791, and which they have continued to uphold since that time.

Loyal Polish citizens have aided the peoples of other countries to achieve and express their freedom. Thaddeus Kosciusko, who fought valiantly in our own Revolution, is one such citizen. Statues in his honor stand in many States, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts among them. The literary works of Henryk Sienkiewicz have long represented the free voice of the Polish people.

Poland is a nation which has fought for freedom, and which has played a leading role in culture and the arts. Its independent and honorable place among free peoples should be restored.

It is only fitting that on this day we honor the Polish people, their courage, and their faith, which has sustained them in their struggle for freedom.

REPORT ON VISIT TO ISRAEL AND GREECE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I have recently returned from a 10-day visit to Israel and Greece. The purpose of my trip was purely personal: I was being honored by my good friends in Israel, and had gone to that country to be present at the laying of the cornerstone of the aeronautical wing of the Amal Comprehensive Trade School in Beersheba, which had been named for me. I am grateful to the people of Israel, and to my friends in Histadrut who made this trip possible, for a most enlightening and enjoyable experience. The opportunity to see the Holy Land, and to participate in the moving and traditional Passover service in the homeland of the Jewish people, is one which I will long remember.

On the way back from Israel, I had planned to stop in Athens for a few days of sightseeing. It happened quite accidentally that this scheduled visit coincided with the recent military takeover in Greece. At first there was some question whether conditions would even permit me to enter the country. But by last Thursday, April 27, the situation had stabilized to the point where I could pursue my original plans.

While in Athens, I was of course curious to learn as much as possible about recent events. But I was in the difficult position of being the first elected American official to visit Athens since the coup. In view of the informal and unofficial nature of my visit, I was quite reluctant to meet with members of this or of previous governments.

Thus, while I conferred with American Embassy officials, I spent the majority of my time talking with private Greek citizens of all political persuasions, representing views both favorable and unfavorable to the new regime. I did not seek meetings with members of the Government, with King Constantine, or with former political leaders, though the opportunity was offered, and though many of the new leaders had expressed a desire to discuss the situation with me. I refused all of their invitations; I did not want my trip to assume a diplomatic significance which it most certainly did not have.

I placed many self-imposed limitations on my conversations in Athens, and my knowledge of the situation is necessarily incomplete. But I have formed some impressions which I would like to share with the Senate and the American people in the belief that it may prove helpful to our Government in developing its own policies toward this new regime.

Mr. President, few knowledgeable persons accept the claim of the new rulers that they acted to prevent an imminent civil war or an attempted coup d'etat by the leftist forces. This claim is widely regarded as a pretext to disguise the real aim of the military, which was to prevent the probable election of a government whose sympathies did not lie with the military, or even with the monarchy. Regardless of what the outcome might have been, the coup of late April has denied the people of Greece the right to a free choice at the polls.

Fears of a leftist political victory had agitated the Greek armed forces for many months. In fact, long before last month's crisis, the country's highest-ranking military officers had devised plans for a takeover of the government. They had tried to enlist the support of King Constantine for the creation of a military dictatorship capable of maintaining order and forestalling the inauguration of a left-wing government. But the King would not agree to their plans.

When the coup actually came, it was a complete surprise to the King and to the senior officers who had originally conceived it. Officers of lesser rank had acted in their stead.

The American Ambassador, Mr. Phillips Talbot, informed me that our Government also failed to anticipate this turn of events. And though our lack of intelligence as to the realities of the Greek political situation is surely not comforting, nevertheless, I was relieved and pleased to discover that the U.S. Government was not implicated.

The military group which has taken control of Greece has presented that nation and the world with a fait accompli. In such a situation, the task for progressive elements both within Greece and among her allies is to recognize the constructive possibilities which remain and to try to develop them.

For the United States, the issues are many and delicate. This country has a profound interest in the past, present, and future of Greece. That interest is rooted not only in intellectual kinship but in a political comradeship which has progressively developed since the Second World War. One measure of our interest is the several billions of dollars in economic and military assistance which the United States has supplied to Greece since 1945. It is obvious that this country has a major interest in the independence and political development of the Greek people.

The United States has neither the aspiration nor the capacity to dictate the form of government which shall prevail among our allies. We cannot compel an immediate return to parliamentary democracy in Greece. But our influence, though limited, is not insignificant. We must make certain that it is carefully and appropriately utilized.

It is one of the great ironies of Greek politics that the restoration of democratic institutions may be greatly dependent upon the efforts of the monarch. The cause of constitutional government may best be served by lending assistance to King Constantine, whose distress at recent events is undisguised.

The King has been quite obviously displeased with the actions of his subordinates. But faced with the accomplished fact, he has apparently decided that the course of wisdom is to work with the new regime in an attempt to lead it on to a constitutional path. In order to avert further struggles and possibly even civil war, King Constantine has given Greece's new ruling junta his reluctant, implied approval, and has taken every opportunity to encourage it in the direction which he feels it should take.

Mr. President, I found considerable hope on the part of persons of all political persuasions in Athens that despite many of its recent pronouncements, the new military government would soon begin to restore civil liberties. General Pattakos, the new Minister of Interior and Security, has said that "although strict discipline is necessary at present, the time is not too far off when there will be greater freedom of speech and expression." Such assurances should be emphasized. The new Government should be constantly reminded that it has made such promises, and it should be encouraged in every way to put such promises into effect. It should know that world judgment will be based upon its actions and not upon its promises.

The Government of Greece should not delay the restoration of civil liberties. It is a deplorable situation when scholars and political leaders in the land where democracy was conceived now live in fear of arbitrary arrest and imprisonment. It is little consolation to them that political prisoners have been well-treated, that there has been no bloodshed, or that many members of the political and intellectual community now have been released. The threat to free speech and expression is ever-present. There is no guarantee the new Government will not continue to exercise its powers to stifle dissent in the interests of stability.

The Government of Greece should take immediate steps to restore the confidence of its own people by releasing the arrested intellectual and political leaders. If there are legitimate reasons for suspecting their loyalty, or if some evidence exists that they were indeed involved in plots against previous governments, then they should be given a civil trial as soon as possible. There is no justification for the military to conduct these trials, for the alleged crime of treason is against the Government, the King, and the people of Greece, not against its armed forces.

Mr. President, this consideration applies most fully to the case of Andreas Papandreou. The 49-year-old son of the ex-Premier has been the focus of much attention both in Greece and in the United States. He lived here for many years and was educated at Harvard University. He taught at the University of California at Berkeley, became chairman of the department of economics there, and married an American. He was a Member of the Parliament, and a leader of the Center Union Party. He has been accused of being a leftist, a Trotskyite, a Communist agent. He is alleged to have been involved in the ASPIDA plot to overthrow the Government of Greece nearly 2 years ago.

I did not meet with Mr. Papandreou during my stay in Greece, though I was offered the opportunity to do so. But my conversations in Athens with Greek and American citizens of all political persuasions and interests, and my previous knowledge of the man and his associates, convinced me that he is not a Communist, and that he is genuinely interested in social and political reform. While Papandreou is extremely ambitious, he is regarded by many Greeks as being somewhat out of touch with the real situation in his homeland as a result of his many years outside the country.

Andreas Papandreou may have been involved in the ASPIDA plot—or he may not. The lack of public evidence on this matter does not permit anyone to speak conclusively. If he was not involved in any treasonous acts, he deserves to be released and to have his name cleared. If there is some truth to the allegations, then he deserves a speedy, public, civil trial. Either way, I believe the government should take immediate steps to deal with Mr. Papandreou in a fair and legal manner. Failure to do so can only further discredit the military government both at home and abroad.

Mr. President, there are two extreme directions which the present situation in Greece can take: civil war or military dictatorship. Obviously, it is not in the interests of the Greek people, or of world peace, that either of these courses be followed. The best course demands a relaxation of military control, and a restoration of civil liberties and political freedom. In this process, the United States can play a most constructive role.

Our Government should make known our condemnation of the actions of the coup, and our conviction that a military takeover represents a serious setback in the political development of Greece. At the same time, though painfully, we must realize, as has King Constantine, that the existing government is, for the time being, in firm control, and is unlikely to revert simply and instantly to the previous system. We should therefore encourage the king in his apparent efforts to persuade the military to restore civilian government.

As a practical matter, we must take steps to work with the new regime as we have with previous interim governments of Greece. But we must make it clear that our support is conditional support. We should be prepared to withdraw or curtail economic and military assistance should the government fail to meet its commitments to reestablish representative political institutions. It must be clear that we will not support a regime which puts its own interests ahead of those of its people.

If the present government of Greece hopes to earn the sympathy and support of the Greek people and their allies, they must demonstrate without delay their sincerity by allowing the people of Greece to have a free, stable, and democratic republic.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I congratulate the Senator from Massachusetts on his fine report to the Senate. He has done his duty as a Senator extraordinarily well.

I am the chairman of an international committee of parliamentarians, dealing with economic development in Greece and Turkey, which has made great progress, and progress has momentarily stopped because of what has happened in Greece. I hope progress will resume promptly.

I believe that all Americans will hear the fine words of the Senator from Massachusetts with the deepest interest and, on the whole, with real approval.

Mr. BROOKE. I thank the distinguished senior Senator from New York.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUEST TO WITHDRAW PREVIOUS ORDER—OBJECTION

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the unanimous consent given the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I did not hear the request.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the unanimous consent given the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS OF INVESTMENT ACTS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Monday, May 1, I introduced a bill (S. 1659) proposed by the Securities and Exchange Commission to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940.

I pointed out that the bill is long and complicated and the explanation of the bill prepared by the SEC is even longer. Together they add up to 124 pages. For this reason, I did not ask to have the bill and the explanation printed in the Record, as is my usual custom with a bill of this sort. Instead, I am having the SEC's explanation of the bill printed as a committee print, which should be available within the next 2 or 3 days, together with a photographic reproduction of the bill which will make it possible to refer to the bill's pages and lines.

In the meantime, I have received a press release from the Securities and Exchange Commission which explains some of the more important provisions of the proposal.

Mr. President, this is a very long, complex, and controversial bill. I am sure Senators will be interested in reading the press release and in examining the committee print when it becomes available.

I ask unanimous consent that the Commission press release be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[Release No. 4942 from the Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967]

SEC Submits Legislation Proposals to Congress on Investment Companies—Investment Company Act

The Securities and Exchange Commission announced today that it had submitted to Congress legislative proposals unanimously recommended by the Commission to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940. They would provide additional protection for mutual fund shareholders in areas where the tremendous growth of the industry since enactment of the Investment Company Act of 1940 has created needs which were either unanticipated or of secondary importance at that time. Between the end of 1940 and June 30, 1966, investment company assets increased from about $2.1 billion to $46.4 billion. Most of this growth was accounted for by mutual funds, whose net assets increased from $450 million at the end of 1940 to about $38.2 billion at June 30, 1966. By the end of 1965 there were more than 3,500,000 mutual fund investors as compared with less than 300,000 in 1940.

The Commission's proposals are the outgrowth of studies made by or for the Commission pursuant to Congressional direction, primarily that contained in Section 14(b) of the Investment Company Act of 1940 which authorizes the Commission if it finds "that any substantial further increase in the size of investment companies creates any problem involving the protection of investors or the public interest, to make a study and investigation" and to report the results to the Congress.

The first of these studies, which commenced in 1958 pursuant to Commission direction, was made by the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce of the University of Pennsylvania. That report submitted to the Congress in August of 1962 found that the more important current problems in the mutual fund industry involved potential conflicts of interest between the fund management and shareholders and the impact of fund growth and purchases on stock prices. The Wharton School Report was followed by the Report of the staff of the Commission's Special Study of the Securities Markets which, insofar as mutual funds were concerned, examined sales of mutual fund shares including sales practices and the special problems raised by the so-called front-end load in the sale of periodic payment plans for the accumulation of such shares.

Neither the Special Study nor the Wharton Report was a report by the Commission. Following publication of these reports the Commission undertook to evaluate the public policy questions that they raised as part of an extensive study of its own and to report its recommendations to the Congress. The results of that study are found in the Commission's Report on the Public Policy Implications of Investment Company Growth which was transmitted to the Congress on December 2, 1966 and published as House Report No. 2337, 89th Cong., 2d sess. The legislative proposals transmitted herewith are designed to carry out the recommendations contained in that report.

Areas of primary concern in the report included the costs of management and sales charges. Mutual funds, although ordinarily organized either as corporations or as business trusts, usually are managed and operated not by their own officers and employees but by separate entities which provide management and advisory services under contract with the fund. Traditionally these contracts have provided for compensation on the basis of a percentage of the assets of the fund. As the funds have grown in size the amounts of management fees have likewise grown and the Commission's report concluded that economies of scale in the costs of managing large pools of assets have seldom been shared equitably with investment company shareholders. The proposed legislation would expressly require that management fees be reasonable and make this standard enforceable in the courts. However, any person attacking the reasonableness of a management fee which had been approved by the fund's directors as required by the Investment Company Act would have the burden of proving that the fee was unreasonable. A requirement that the fee be reasonable would appear inherent in the fiduciary relationship between investment company shareholders and an investment advisory organization which is in effective control of the fund. The existing provisions of the Investment Company Act, however, provide no adequate means by which such a requirement may be enforced.

The proposed legislation would also place a 5% ceiling on charges for mutual fund sales, subject to a power in the Commission to grant exceptions where appropriate. This proposed maximum charge would still be substantially greater than the sales charges generally prevailing in the securities markets such as stock exchange commissions or over-the-counter markups for securities of comparable quality. As a result, in part, of the resale price maintenance scheme provided in Section 22(d) of the Investment Company Act, which the mutual fund industry regards as important for the preservation of the existing pattern of distribution of such shares, competition has not operated to reduce sales loads. Rather the sales charges paid by the average or small investor have tended to increase as investment companies competed for the favor of dealers and their salesmen.

Of particular concern are the sales charges paid by those investors, generally small investors, who accumulate mutual fund shares by monthly payments over a period of years. Under the existing provisions of the statute, up to 50% of the first year's payments may be deducted for sales charges. The Commission's study as well as the Special Study showed that a substantial portion of such investors are unable or unwilling to complete their plans, with the result that up to half of the money that they pay in goes for sales costs. The proposed legislation would eliminate the front-end load feature and require that sales charges be spread equally over all payments, thus reducing the undue risk of loss suffered by those investors who do not complete their plans, as well as making sure that a greater proportion of the money paid by an investor is invested for his benefit.

The proposed legislation would also contain other provisions which are designed primarily to facilitate the administration and enforcement of the Investment Company Act, to eliminate certain anomalous situations, and to update and correct certain provisions.

These legislative proposals recognize as did the Commission's report that on the whole the investment company industry reflects diligent management by competent persons, that the industry has provided a useful and desirable means for investors to obtain diversification of investment risks and professional investment management and that drastic changes in the Investment Company Act of 1940 are not required. The Commission believes, however, that enactment of these proposals would assure fairer treatment for the millions of Americans, including many of modest means, who have chosen to invest many billions of dollars in investment company securities.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of legislation along the lines of the Commission's proposals would be in accord with the program of the President.

The principal legislative proposals other than those relating to management fees, basic sales and front-end loads are as follows:

1. *Insider trading in portfolio securities.*

A new section 17(j) would be added to the Act to empower the Commission specifically to adopt rules and regulations with respect to trading in securities held or being acquired by investment companies by persons affiliated with such companies. This proposal would fill the need for better definitions of standards and codes of ethics with respect to insider trading in investment company portfolio securities.

2. *Capital gains distributions.*

Section 19 of the Act would be amended generally to prohibit investment companies from distributing realized capital gains to shareholders more than once a year. This proposal would require all investment companies to conform to the practice now followed by the majority of investment companies.

3. *Disciplinary proceedings.*

Section 9 of the Act, which presently disqualifies from association with an investment company persons convicted or enjoined on the basis of specified acts of misconduct, would be amended to conform to the corresponding provisions of the Securities Exchange Act and the Investment Advisers Act and the Investment Advisers Act by authorizing administrative proceedings before the Commission to determine whether or not any person connected with an investment company has willfully violated the federal securities laws and if so what sanctions, if any, should be imposed in the public interest.

4. *Breach of fiduciary duty.*

Section 36 of the Act, which presently permits the Commission to seek an injunction against investment company managers alleged to be guilty of gross misconduct or gross abuse of trust, would be amended to authorize action against such persons for breach of fiduciary duty to the investment company and to give the court greater flexibility in choosing remedies.

5. *Disinterested directors.*

Sections 2(a), 10, 15 and 32(a) of the Act would be amended for the purpose of requiring that persons acting as so-called independent directors of investment companies be entirely independent of and disinterested in the management. This would exclude among other things persons having close family, business or professional relationships with management from being classified as independent directors.

6. *Transfer of investment advisory contracts.*

A new Section 15(g) would be added to the Act to prohibit the transfer of investment advisory or management contracts with investment companies on terms which are burdensome or inequitable to the investment company.

7. *Fund holding companies.*

Section 12(d)(1) of the Act would be amended to prohibit the creation of new fund holding companies or the acquisition of additional securities of registered investment companies by existing fund holding companies. At present only one such organization, the Swiss based Fund of Funds, Ltd., has attained substantial size.

There would be numerous other amendments to the Investment Company Act most of which are designed to up-date its provisions to eliminate inconsistencies and to delete certain exemptions which have been found to have been unjustified.

AMENDMENTS TO THE INVESTMENT ADVISERS ACT

The Investment Advisers Act would be amended to conform its provisions for disciplinary action to the 1964 Amendments to the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and to eliminate the exemptions from the Act for investment advisers serving investment companies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I again call attention to the fact that hearings on this bill will commence in the rooms of the Committee on Banking and Currency on June 19. We have hearings scheduled for 5 days that week, and undoubtedly it will be necessary to have a continuation of them beyond that point.

BANK PARTICIPATION IN SBA LOANS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on April 24, 1967, Mr. Sam Morgan, president of the Opelika National Bank, addressed the Alabama Small Business Advisory Council at Birmingham, Ala.

Mr. Morgan pointed out the benefits that accrue to a small bank and to the community it serves when the bank participates with the Small Business Administration in making loans to small businesses. He referred to the SBA program as a great "money stretcher" by pointing out that a 25-percent participation with SBA stretches $1 million to $4 million for business expansion or working capital. Mr. Morgan emphasized that "this puts the country back in business."

Many sincere and active bankers shy away from the SBA because of their fear of Government redtape. I would hope that these bankers would give the SBA a try. Many bankers have had excellent cooperation. Mr. Morgan is one of them. He said:

> In our relations with the S.B.A., we have met with the fullest cooperation. We, as a policy, try to find out the information that the S.B.A. desires and get it. We do not find that the information required by them is anymore than would be normally required by any large lending organization. The S.B.A. has been as prompt in their actions on our request for commitments as our correspondent banks or any of the mortgage brokers. We might say that in our latest commitment for $160,000.00 for the commercial building, it took only six days to obtain the commitment.

Mr. Morgan's experience can be repeated many times throughout the country. The simplified bank loan participation and bank guarantee programs of the SBA offer excellent opportunities for small local banks to provide the money small concerns in their communities need to expand and to contribute to the national economy.

I believe Mr. Morgan's address will be of interest to all Senators. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Morgan's speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> Our nation is made up of small businesses or businesses that were once small. In fact, in operation in the nation at this time there are about 4,600,000 businesses classed as "small businesses." These businesses employ about 30,000,000 people, so small business is important business to us Americans. Not only is small business important to the community, the state and the nation, because of its impact on the economy, but small business is also important to our bank and to me. Consequently, it is to our best interest to see that these small businesses in our area grow and prosper, for if they grow and prosper our bank will share in their prosperity and our chances of a raise in pay are better.
>
> Most of us, including small businesses, have money or capital problems. Generally, the larger firms go to the public with stocks, bonds, or debentures for their long term credit. The small business which is usually a proprietorship, partnership, or corporation, come to us for obvious reasons. These businesses are often well managed, can produce the goods, and have the market, but cannot obtain the capital even though "credit worthy." The reason for this is that commercial banks must remain reasonably liquid, therefore, cannot make too many long term loans. Consequently, there is seldom enough money to satisfy the needs of small business. This to us is where the Small Business Administration fits into our economy. The Small Business Administration is a great "money stretcher". For example, by taking the 25% participation in the loan, the bank may stretch one million dollars to four million dollars in loans. With a 10% participation by the bank, the amount loaned will be multiplied tenfold. In addition, this type of loan may also serve to increase the amount of money that may be loaned to one customer, because of legal loan limits.
>
> Our bank is in a fast growing and developing area of the state. For years it has followed an aggressive loan policy with the feeling that one of the best ways to get a "new industry" is to grow one. We would welcome the opportunity to show you examples of this. When we made our first loan of this type, it was with the old Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Our attorney, also one of our largest stockholders, made the remark at that time that, "This puts the small bank in business." Since that time we have participated in numerous loans with the R.F.C. and the S.B.A., which loans were made to our local small industries. We have never asked the S.B.A. or its predecessor to participate with us in a loan that we did not feel was safe and adequately secured. We can say with considerable pride that neither our bank nor the S.B.A. has ever lost a dollar in one of our participating loans.
>
> At the present time we have four loans outstanding with the S.B.A. and our bank. These loans in their original amount total $531,000.00. In addition to this, we now hold a commitment for $160,000.00 for a new commercial building yet to be constructed. Let me tell you a little of the history of some of the loans now in existence. One of them is to a sheet metal fabrication plant. This loan began just after World War II when one of the owners came back from the Service and found his business in dire shape. At that time we made him with R.F.D. participation what was called a "slip" loan of $12,500.00. This industry has grown steadily from that date until it now employs about 200 people with annual sales of approximately 1½ million dollars. Incidentally, we might say that this industry is continuing to expand and is now seeking additional funds for this purpose.
>
> Another of the loans was originally a "tin shop". In 1946 this business was blown away by a tornado and he had no insurance. Our loan with him began at this time and his business has gradually developed to heavier metal business and employs approximately 50 people with annual sales of about $750,000.00.
>
> Another one of the businesses is a concrete business that began about 1945 with a loan by our bank of $1,500 to the owners, which loan was secured by his wife's diamond bracelet. This business has grown into one of our nice local industries with the assistance of S.B.A. loans and now has annual sales of about $1,000,000 and employs about 75 people.
>
> In addition to this, we can cite you other instances where S.B.A. participation loans have been of help to our community. Due to the shortage of money, all of these latter loans in which S.B.A. has participated have been on an immediate participation basis with our bank taking from 10% to 25% of the loan and with the S.B.A. taking the balance with cash immediately.
>
> In our relations with the S.B.A., we have met with the fullest cooperation. We, as a policy, try to find out the information that the S.B.A. desires and get it. We do not find

> that the information required by them is anymore than would be normally required by any large lending organization. The S.B.A. has been as prompt in their actions on our request for commitments as our correspondent banks or any of the mortgage bankers. We might say that in our latest commitment for $160,000.00 for the commercial building, it took only six days to obtain the commitment.
>
> Certainly, to our bank and to our community the participation by the S.B.A. both on an immediate and a deferred basis has been the answer to lots of our needs for capital and it certainly bears out the remark that was made in the beginning of our relationship by our attorney in which he stated, "This puts the country bank in business."
>
> Thank you.

CONSTITUTION-MAKING IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, adverting momentarily to the dialog which occurred earlier regarding the Republican Policy Paper on Vietnam, issued yesterday, and to the comments by the distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and by the distinguished senior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], I report that in 1965, from September 28 to October 19, I visited Southeast Asia on a mission for the Committee on Armed Services. During that time, I visited every Air Force base in Vietnam and also spent a number of days in Thailand.

Before I visited Vietnam in 1965, I had believed implicitly the statements of the Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, that we were engaged in Vietnam because of Communist aggression from the north. I believed that even though I had known, because I had read the Geneva accords, that historically there never were any such countries as North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and that the Geneva agreements, which the United States approved but did not sign, specifically stated that the separation of Vietnam into North Vietnam and South Vietnam was not to be regarded as a boundary but as a temporary demarcation line. Nevertheless, I was taken in by the repeated statements of the Secretary of State about aggression from the north, until I talked at some length with General Westmoreland in Saigon.

In the course of our conversation, General Westmoreland told me that the bulk of the Vietcong who were fighting us in the Mekong Delta, south and west of Saigon, were men who had been born and reared in the Mekong Delta.

Following that, when I was in Thailand, I was informed by Gen. Richard Stilwell, at that time, and perhaps at the present time, second in command, of the American forces in southeast Asia, that 80 percent of the Vietcong fighting us in the Mekong Delta were born and reared in the Mekong Delta.

I said to him, "General, this, then, is a civil war in which we are involved."

He replied, "It is an insurrection."

If there remains any doubt as to the nature of the regime we are supporting in south Vietnam, recent developments should dispel them. Very definitely, Premier Ky, who was born in Hanoi, is a Vietnamese "tory," having fought on the side of the French during the war in Vietnam following World War II, when France sought to reestablish her lush Indochinese colonial empire. Our forefathers would have called him a tory because he fought on the side of the French. Now, through his performance as Premier of South Vietnam—a position which he obtained not through elections but through a military coup engineered by 10 generals, nine of whom were born in North Vietnam and had fought on the side of the French colonial oppressors against their own nationals seeking independence—he proves daily that his interests lie closer to those who have oppressed the Vietnamese people for centuries than to any real desires and needs of the people he rules.

The United States has furthered this travesty on democracy by giving it an appearance of respectibility. Whom are we trying to fool by advertising the regime we are defending as "free" or "democratic"? Whom can we convince that South Vietnam is on its way to becoming a representative democracy since the constituent assembly made public its constitution?

Let us examine this proposed constitution more closely. First of all, who are its authors? As the result of a discriminatory election law, not only members of the National Liberation Front but also neutralists, so-called, and militant Buddhists were prohibited in last fall's election from running for election to the constituent assembly. The fact is, the constituent assembly is composed primarily of representatives of the landowning and wealthy classes and close supporters of the military junta that now rules South Vietnam. To illustrate this fact, when a genuine agrarian reform law was proposed earlier this year, only three out of 117 members of the assembly voted in favor of it. A number of these "representatives" are themselves military men. They can hardly be expected to put up a strong opposition to the Ky dictatorship.

As for the new constitution itself, the provisions which appear to guarantee basic human rights are granted with one hand and taken away with the other. For example, article 12, section 2 reads:

> Censorship will be abolished except for motion pictures and plays.

Yet, section 3 of article 12 states:

> Press regulations will be subscribed by law.

According to article 12, section 1:

> The state respects freedom of thought, speech, press and publishing as long as it does not harm personal honor, national security or good morals.

Who will decide what constitutes a danger to personal honor, national security, or good morals? The answer is, of course, the same rulers who until now have shown little or no respect for fundamental civil liberties.

Article 9 guarantees religious freedom to all citizens "as long as it does not violate the national interest and is not harmful to public safety and order or contrary to good morals." This gives the government virtually carte blanche authority to restrict the free exercise of religion. Is this the sort of religious freedom we would consider adequate in our country? This provision in the South Vietnamese constitution makes a mockery of the phrase "freedom of religion."

Similarly, the rights to join labor unions and to strike, to organize political parties, and to meet and form associations are guaranteed "in accordance with conditions and procedures prescribed by law." What sort of bill of rights is this? It sounds more like the fiat of a medieval monarch.

On one point, at least, the Constitution is straightforward: Article 5 prohibits "every activity designed to propagandize or carry out communism." As we have seen in the past, this type of prohibition could be extended to almost any form of political opposition to the government whether from Communists, neutralists, or militant Buddhists. More than likely it would apply to any political group whose thinking did not coincide with that of the ruling regime.

Interestingly, the one right which is guaranteed unconditionally is the right of private property in article 19. The Constitution bears the stamp of the landowners who drew it up, and assures that their interests will remain secure. In effect, article 19 promises them that no thoroughgoing land reform could be carried out without complete compensation to those who have for centuries prospered at the expense of the landless peasants.

Mr. President, very definitely I do not consider this to be a document which is even a step toward democracy or toward a republic in South Vietnam. Indeed, how can there be any progress while a war disrupts civilian life and while we support and perpetuate a military dictatorship in Saigon? What can the Vietnamese peasant expect from Western democracy when it is presented to him through our collaborators in Vietnam—the dictatorial Premier Ky, who was serving in the French Air Force in Vietnam during the years 1946 to 1954, seeking to help restore French colonial oppression of its Indochinese empire, and an oligarchic constituent assembly?

Administration leaders would do well to heed the advice of retired Marine Commandant, Gen. David Shoup, one of the Nation's great military leaders. General Shoup said:

> It must be a bit confusing, too, to read and hear about fighting for freedom. Supposedly, we have it, and I don't think anyone is going to take it away from us by playing cops and robbers in South East Asia. Even so, we urge others to fight for freedom. There may be a little confusion here. We insist they should sacrifice arms and legs and their lives for freedom. In the history of their ancestors they've never experienced what we expect them to understand and fight for. . . .
>
> These masses of people and their ancestors have always lived where the few have everything. Everything that is produced by the burdensome labor of the many. And the many have nothing except for the barest subsistence and not always that. . . .
>
> I believe that if we had and would keep our dirty, bloody, dollar-crooked fingers out of the business of these nations so full of depressed, exploited people, they will arrive at a solution of their own. That they design and want. That they fight and work for. And if unfortunately their revolution must

be of the violent type because the "haves" refuse to share with the "have-nots" by any peaceful method, at least what they get will be their own, and not the American style, which they don't want, and above all don't want crammed down their throats by Americans.

Mr. President, if real and honest elections were to be held I doubt whether those elected would choose to prolong the civil war that is now raging and has been raging since 1946 in Vietnam when the French commenced to reestablish their empire. If the real voice of South Vietnam could be heard it would be asking for peace, not military victory.

NASEBY RHINEHART HONORED BY THE HELMS HALL OF FAME IN LOS ANGELES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Helms Hall of Fame in Los Angeles was instituted in 1962 to honor athletic trainers who have been outstanding in their profession. One of the five appointees this year is Naseby Rhinehart, an old friend of mine, representing the University of Montana at Missoula.

Originally from Milwaukee, Wis., Naseby Rhinehart was an outstanding nine-letter athlete at the university. He graduated in 1935, shortly after I became a professor there, and he immediately became athletic trainer. For 32 years, he has been friend, teacher, and doctor to countless hundreds of University of Montana athletes.

Mr. President, when Naseby Rhinehart was told of his selection to the Hall of Fame he said:

> Something like this is hard to believe. Such a wonderful honor could have happened to a lot of people rather than myself. This has to be one of my greatest moments.

Mr. President, I salute Naseby Rhinehart as a friend, as a great athlete, as a good scholar, and as a man.

I commend the Helms Hall of Fame for the wisdom of its selection.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article on the award, from the Great Falls Tribune, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Naseby Rhinehart Named to Hall of Fame

Missoula.—Naseby Rhinehart, University of Montana athletic trainer for 32 years, is one of five renowned trainers elected Thursday to the Helms Hall Athletic Trainers Hall of Fame.

The former Grizzly three-sports star is joined in the 1967 selections by James Henry "Little Doc" Johnston, Howard E. Waite, William F. Linskey and Werner Joshua "Dutch" Luchsinger. Each will have his name developed upon the Hall of Fame trophy in Helms Hall, Los Angeles, international sports shrine.

Selections were approved by the Helms Hall Board—Bud Furillo, Alex Kahn, Robert Myers, Rube Samuelsen, Al Santoro, Sid Ziff, Paul Zimmerman, Maxwell Stiles and Paul Helms Jr., chairman—following nominations which were submitted by the Helms Hall Recommendations Committee, headed by George Sullivan of the University of Nebraska.

Rhinehart is the second University of Montana graduate to be elected to the Helms Hall of Fame. Harry F. Adams was admitted in 1961 for achievement in track and field.

The Trainers Hall of Fame was instituted in 1962 and this year's selections bring the total to 49 members.

Rhinehart became the "tape and liniment" specialist for Grizzly teams following graduation with honors in 1935. Starting from almost nothing the ex-Grizzly great athlete built up one of the best equipped training rooms in the nation.

As trainer numerous honors have been given Rhinehart.

He was a nominee for the Silver Anniversary football team in 1959 selected by Sports Illustrated magazine. In 1960 he received the Ray T. Rocene Award as Missoula's sportsman of the year.

The National Athletic Trainers Association presented him the 25-year award in 1960, and he was reappointed chairman of the NATA membership committee for three years in 1965.

He received a special award from District 7 of the NATA in 1960. That region includes Colorado, Idaho, Utah, Wyoming, Arizona, New Mexico and Montana.

Last year the Inland Empire Sports Writers and Broadcasters Association in Spokane gave Rhinehart the 30-year Service Award for outstanding service to the world of sports.

Told of his selection to the Hall of Fame, Rhinehart said, "Something like this is hard to believe. Such a wonderful honor could have happened to a lot of people rather than myself. This has to be one of my greatest moments."

The Grizzly trainer came from Lincoln High School in Milwaukee, Wis., where he played football on the city championship teams of 1928 and 1929. He was selected All-city end in 1928, the first Negro to receive that honor in Milwaukee. In track he won the state discus title in 1930.

During his undergraduate days at UM, Rhinehart won nine letters in football, basketball and track. He still is considered one of the best football ends to ever play there.

He was the 1935 winner of the Grizzly Cup, awarded annually to the athlete who contributes outstanding sports participation, scholastic achievement, and loyalty to UM during his undergraduate career. Rhinehart's eldest son, Naseby (Pete) Jr., won the same award 23 years later.

Indicative of the high regard in which he is held was a 1956 "Naseby Rhinehart Night," during a Grizzly basketball game in his honor by former lettermen and the Missoula Junior Chamber of Commerce. An estimated 350 lettermen and friends contributed to a fund for purchase of additional training equipment and gifts for Montana trainer.

Nase and his wife, Evelyn, have four children—Naseby Jr., Milwaukee; Mrs. Ted (Vodie Ann) Bates, Los Angeles; Sidney, Columbia Basin Junior College, and Penny, eighth grade in Missoula—and three grandchildren.

SHIPS FLYING FOREIGN FLAGS SAILING INTO NORTH VIETNAM PORTS

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I am concerned about the amount of shipping going into enemy ports in North Vietnam.

Under date of April 18, I addressed a letter to the Department of State inquiring whether any official protests had been made by our Government to the Governments of Poland and the Soviet Union whose flags are flying on ships carrying the largest amount of cargo into those ports.

I also asked whether any official protests had been made to the Government of Great Britain on ships flying the British flag, those ships carrying commodities and materials into North Vietnamese ports.

On yesterday I received a reply to my letter of April 18, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Department of State,
Washington, April 28, 1967.

Hon. Harry F. Byrd, Jr.,
U.S. Senate.

Dear Senator Byrd: Thank you for your letter of April 18, 1967 in which you ask whether the United States Government has sent official protests to the Soviet Union, Poland, and Great Britain concerning their shipping to North Vietnam and request the date and text of any such messages.

The United States Government has not sent official protests to either the Soviet or Polish Governments concerning their shipping to North Vietnam. Both governments openly oppose U. S. efforts to assist the Republic of Vietnam resist aggression from the North, and there is no reason to believe that either government would be responsive to U. S. protests concerning their shipping to North Vietnam unless we were prepared to back up our words with force. On the other hand, in public statements as well as in discussions with officials of the USSR and other Eastern European countries we have made clear our position that their action in providing supplies to North Vietnam needlessly prolongs the war and is in conflict with their protestation of a desire for peace.

The United States has made repeated vigorous representations to the British Government on the question of British shipping to North Vietnam. While no official diplomatic protests have been conveyed to the British, Secretary Rusk did write a personal letter to then British Foreign Secretary Michael Stewart calling his attention to this problem. The British have been responsive to these approaches, and there has been a dramatic reduction in visits by British-flag shipping to North Vietnamese ports. We are continuing to discuss this problem with the British, nevertheless, and are hopeful that additional actions may be possible to reduce further the handful of remaining ships.

If the Department can be of any further assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,
William B. Macomber, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, in essence, the reply states that our Government has made no official protest in regard to any of this shipping.

The facts disclose that during the month of March—that one month alone—100,000 tons of cargo went through North Vietnamese ports.

As everyone knows, we have been engaging on the ground in bitter fighting in South Vietnam with a commitment of 440,000 American troops.

The casualties we are suffering there are severe. For the first 3 months of 1967, they total 16,000 men. On an annual basis, if that rate continues as it has for the first 3 months, that will mean the casualty total for 1967 will be more than 65,000 Americans who will have been killed or wounded in South Vietnam.

All of us who read the newspaper this morning know what severe casualties our Marines took just yesterday and the day before in attempting to take hill 881 south of the demilitarized zone.

Mr. President, I believe very strongly that our Government should begin now to make protests particularly to those allies who are continuing to permit ships flying their flags to go into Haiphong and other enemy ports in North Vietnam.

I cannot understand the British. They have been our friends for many, many years. We are now friends. We now have mutual defense agreements. Yet ships flying the British flag still go into North Vietnamese ports.

I cannot understand why our Government fails to make an official protest to the British.

Incidentally, one was hit the other day and the State Department is investigating a British complaint that one of their ships, the *Dartford*, was hit during an American attack on a cement plant in the Haiphong area on April 25. The British Government made an official protest to us and our State Department is investigating it.

It is significant, however, that the British Government made no protest when one of its tankers, the *Amastra*, was mined and sunk near NaTranh, in South Vietnam on April 11, presumably from Vietcong mines. While it made no protest in that regard, it is making a protest to our Government because one of its ships—which should not have been in Haiphong anyway, or near any of the North Vietnamese ports carrying cargo to our enemy—happened to get hit at a time when American forces were attacking a cement plant near Haiphong.

Mr. President, I think that many people in this country are becoming deeply concerned over the lack of support which the American Government is receiving from our allies. We have mutual defense agreements with 44 nations.

Yet we are getting virtually no support from these other nations.

I have in my hand, which in a moment I shall ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record, an editorial from Newsday, published on Long Island. It has one of the largest newspaper circulations, 440,000. Its editorial, captioned "Our Absent Allies," points out how little support the United States is getting in this very difficult struggle which our country is facing in South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the Record the editorial from Newsday be inserted in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Absent Allies

The United States has mutual defense agreements with 44 countries. Our nation is pledged to collective action in Southeast Asia with the seven other members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. But in Vietnam, where the struggle between the Communist world and the free world is being put to the test of arms, many of our allies are conspicuous by their absence.

South Korea and the SEATO nations of Australia, New Zealand, Thailand and the Philippines have responded with spirit to the threat posed by North Vietnamese aggression. France is a member of SEATO, but since Dien Bien Phu the realities of aggression in Southeast Asia have been ignored by the French. President de Gaulle refuses to lend even his moral support to the more than 435,000 American men committed to a struggle the French abandoned. Britain is also a member of SEATO. The British give us moral support but that is all.

Outside of SEATO, the U.S. has many free world allies in Asia and Europe. Though they have not yet joined us in Vietnam, they all have a great stake in the outcome of the struggle in Southeast Asia.

Last year, the battle casualties suffered by U.S. forces totaled more than 35,000. This year, Americans have been wounded or killed at the rate of 1,300 per week during the first three months of the year. Quite clearly, the U.S. is living up to its commitment to protect South Vietnam. We are meeting the Communist challenge, and our allies in the free world will reap the benefits. Continuously, President Johnson has sought greater support from our allies. He has sent such outstanding men as Averell Harriman and Vice President Humphrey to far capitals to argue the importance of Southeast Asia and the importance of a common defense with our friends.

The U.S. has remained patient. But some of our allies in Vietnam show less patience. Speaking to the SEATO ministers, Australian Foreign Minister Paul Hasluck put it bluntly: "Lack of interest in Asia today," said Hasluck, "is isolation in its most feckless form. The phrase, 'peace is indivisible,' was true when trouble was most likely to break out in Europe. It is no less true when the most immediate threat to world peace is in Asia."

At the same meeting, Thanat Khoman, the foreign minister of Thailand, said that SEATO had two types of members, the active and the selective. Asked Thanat: "How can an organization based on unequal rights and obligations adequately continue to function?"

What of the Communists? Do they dismiss Southeast Asia? Far from it. Russia and China are hardly on speaking terms. There is tension along their borders; they harass each other's diplomats, and they argue bitterly over ideology. But on Vietnam, they have managed to put aside their differences long enough to agree on a common aid policy toward Hanoi.

This week, Soviet Communist Party Leader Leonid Brezhnev called upon the world's Communists to unite in support of North Vietnam. He said all Communists countries, including China, should unite "for planning and for practical aid to the fighting Vietnamese people."

Brezhnev has put the challenge clearly. The U.S. and a small band of allies are meeting it alone. It is time for our absent allies to pay their dues. In a recent Senate speech, Sen. Harry F. Byrd, Jr., (D-Va.) put it this way: ". . . total American effort must be directed toward the objective of securing more military aid in Vietnam from the Asians themselves and from our allies throughout the world." We concur.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I end by saying that, in my judgment, one of the great failures of the administration in the handling of the Vietnam war has been its inability to obtain effective support from other Asian nations, and effective support from other countries throughout the world who have been, and presumably now, are allied with the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Is there any further morning business?

TRIBUTE TO PROF. ROLLA F. WOOD

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on April 22, former students and friends of Dr. Rolla Franklin Wood, professor emeritus of history and political science of Central Missouri State College, joined together at Warrensburg, Mo., to pay tribute to him for his dedicated service. Unfortunately, another commitment prevented me from being with Dr. and Mrs. Wood for this memorable banquet which was organized by the Dr. R. F. Wood Fund Committee.

The chairman of the committee, Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., president, Sioux Empire College, Hawarden, Iowa, spoke eloquently of Dr. Wood and his contributions to his fellow citizens. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the remarks of Dr. Reuter.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

And Everybody Said "Amen"

(An address by Dr. George S. Reuter, Jr., president, Sioux Empire College, Hawarden, Iowa)

INTRODUCTION

A charming bit of rhyme is attributed to Robert Burns. While the original meaning of the rhyme related to an entirely different situation, it is appropriate here. Burns wanted to provide his sister a suitable retort when her youthful swain derided her for her small stature. It is used in this illustration to indicate the size of mankind in relation to God's world, and the moral is that a gem is small but mighty. Burns wrote:

"Ask why God made the gem so small
  And why so huge the granite?
Because God meant mankind should set
  A higher value on it."

Mankind is indeed small in God's world but extremely important. We recognize that every nation needs her heroes. Every nation needs her men of courage and daring for the battlefield. Every nation needs her men of discretion and integrity to sit on the seats of the bar of justice. Every nation needs her men who are filled with deep religious faith and conviction, men who will stand for God, men whom God will use as the prophets and the teachers of that nation in the days ahead.

We recognize the greatness of our beloved country. America is one nation, one people. Yes, it is one blood![1] The welfare, progress, security and survival of each of us reside in the common good—the sharing of responsibilities as well as benefits by all our people. Democracy in America rests on the confidence that people can be trusted with freedom. Peace must be the first concern of all governments as it is the prayer of all mankind. Our task is to make the national purpose serve the human purpose; that every person shall have the opportunity to become all that he or she is capable of becoming. The variety of our people is the source of our strength and ought not to be a cause of disunity or discord.

The American free enterprise system is one of the greatest achievements of the human mind and spirit. The roots of our economy and our life as a people lie deep in the soil of America's farm land. America's bountiful supply of natural resources has been one of the major factors in achieving our position of world leadership, in developing the greatest industrial machine in the world's history, and in providing a richer and more complete life for every American. Our future must rest upon a national consensus.

---

[1] George S. Reuter, Jr., August M. Hintz, and Helen H. Reuter, One Blood (Exposition Press: New York, 1964).

We should praise the Lord for the progress witnessed in our time. By almost any measure the 20th Century has been a time of dynamic technological and economic change. Since the turn of the century, we have witnessed a 200-fold increase in the speed at which man can travel. Over the same time span, such break-throughs as radio, television, and the communications satellite have revolutionized man's ability to communicate. Advances in such fields as medicine, psychology, and chemistry, to name a few, have been so striking as to defy the comprehension of the average layman. And the development of nuclear energy has placed at man's disposal a source of power which could result in either unlimited good or immeasurable mischief.

Science and technology are, in the United States today, a part of the fabric of life itself. We have, in the past twenty years, entered a new phase of the great American adventure. Throughout the world, technology, and the science which supports it, have provided new means of education, new sources of power, new ways of processing data, and fast, reliable transportation and communications. Man is extending his reach beyond this earth and into the vast reaches of space.

These developments have been accompanied by substantial advances in economic welfare. Since 1914, the average weekly earnings of our workers have increased from about $10 a week to almost $110 a week. At the same time, the leisure of America's workers has been enhanced by a 20 percent cut in the average work week.

It has been predicted that by 1975 some three-fourths of our labor force will be producing goods and services that have not yet been developed. Unless educators—and other public and private policy makers—demonstrate unusually keen foresight, our future economic and technological achievements could be tarnished by a large and growing reserve of inadequately or inappropriately prepared workers.

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES AS GUIDEPOSTS

Dr. Rolla Franklin Wood, Professor Emeritus of History and Political Science of Central Missouri State College, has been honored many times and in many ways. One example was the article "Professor Wood and Missouri,"[2] which appeared in 1958, and which reviews his life and many of his educational and governmental achievements. As a salute to the R. F. Wood Memorial Fund and Dinner at Warrensburg, Missouri, on April 22, 1967, and the Committee I chair and the members—as follows: Hon. James C. Kirkpatrick, Secretary of State of Missouri; Dr. Earl O. Harding, Executive Secretary, Missouri Baptist Convention; Dr. Perry G. McCandless, Professor of History and Political Science, C.M.S.C.; Dr. Homer Clevenger, Vice President and Academic Dean, Lindenwood College; Dr. Ann C. Pfau of Whitewater, Wisconsin; Mrs. Iris W. Sturgis of Warrensburg, Mo.; and U.S. Senator Edward V. Long of Missouri—I will attempt to review Dr. Wood's career and its influence on mankind as viewed as fundamental principles. It is to be hoped these principles will become common guideposts. These are:

1. There is dignity in hard work and virtue in achievement.

A little sod house sheltered the James M. and Laura Rader Wood family from the extremes of hot and cold weather of the Nebraska prairies and Professor Wood was the eldest child. Yes, Dr. Wood symbolizes many characteristic American traits, perhaps most obviously the driving force to pull himself up by his bootstraps. His career reflects the central issues of the times. Like other men of mark in history, he had much to overcome, because great men are not gods—they have been gripped by the same all-too-human passions, repressions and encumbrances which afflict every other mortal—but they have achieved greatness because they fought through to their goals. The New Testament phrase, "He that overcometh," is personified in Dr. Wood.

To say that Professor Wood's career was strewn with obstacles is to put him in the general class of achievers. Regardless, he became the well-rounded and high principled educator with a spacious outlook. He has been a learner because of his desire to increase his effectiveness as a reformer and to improve the quality of life itself. The sense of personal responsibility is great. He did not believe in waiting for things to take a turn for the better. He has not advocated a policy of "go-it-alone," but he understands what it is to become one's own spokesman.

2. There is opportunity for zealous Americans of all ages and in all seasons.

John Adams found the meaning of America in the scope it gave for the opportunity to excel—which, he said, "next to self-preservation, is ever the great spring of human action." Let us encourage the "rising generation in America," as Professor Wood would classify them; the brightest, best-educated, most highly-motivated generation of young people we have had since the founding of the Republic—when the 32-year-old Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence, Henry Knox built an artillery corps at 26, Alexander Hamilton joined the independence fight at 19, and Rutledge and Lynch signed the Declaration for South Carolina at 27. Thus, there must not be conflict on the road to success because of age.

3. There is rejoicing in the pioneer educational progress of our country, but the urgent need for further and greater governmental participation in public education at all levels is now.

On March 2, 1867, the Act to establish a Department of Education was signed into law by President Andrew Johnson, and Henry Barnard was appointed to serve as the first head. As prescribed by the bill, the first executive assumed office at an annual salary of $4,000 with a staff of three clerks under the aegis of the National Government. Barnard's administration, which lasted only 3 years, nevertheless set a high level of purpose and performance for the new Office of Education for the 100 years that have followed.

Dr. Wood realizes that the growth of public facilities and public services in America has not measured up to the needs of a steadily growing, increasingly urban population. Despite a stepped-up effort in recent years, there is still a sizable backlog of unmet needs. In a real sense, the pressure for expanded public facilities and public services stems from technological progress.

Not only does a substantial backlog of sorely needed facilities exist, but population must be considered. The population, which totalled under 195 million in 1965, is expected to reach 230 million by 1975 and the proportion of the population crowding into urbanized areas will continue to increase. And, finally, by 1975 the total output of the nation's economy, assuming continued high levels of employment, will be in the vicinity of $1,250 billion per year—as against $680 billion in 1965.

In the postwar period, there has been a tremendous upsurge in enrollments in public elementary and secondary schools. In contrast to the 25 million pupils who attended public schools in 1947, enrollments in 1965 reached 42 million. The estimate for 1975 is 48 million.

4. There is recognition of the need of large and small institutions of higher education that will provide quality education.[3]

The economics of small scale education may be against us now; the idea that an educational experience is only acquisition of knowledge, a form of social and private capital to be received like an injection, the sheer weight of the numbers of people who must have more knowledge than they can gain in high schools has released forces that work against small colleges. Because of training and experience, Professor Wood knows that if the small colleges should fall before these pressures, it could only mean we no longer cared about the development of the total individual personality which must be held sacred.

5. There is need for academic freedom for the entire academic community.

Academic freedom is a modern term for an ancient idea. The struggle for freedom in teaching can be traced at least as far back as Socrates' eloquent defense of himself against corrupting youths of Athens.

Dr. Wood realizes that by ousting Dr. Clark Kerr as President of the University of California, Governor Reagan and the Board of Regents have taken a long step toward effecting what two years of disruption by Mario Savio and his fellow-wreckers of the New Left failed to accomplish—the undermining of one of the country's most distinguished institutions of higher education.

6. There is need for recognizing the shifting of status and population in our world.

There has been a steady movement of people off the farms and into the growing industrial and commercial areas. The growing numbers that first crowded into the cities have overflowed into the suburbs—into one suburb after another, stretching the urban area far beyond the boundaries of the central city and leading to the suburban sprawl. A major step in closing this gap has recently been taken. Thanks to the efforts of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, there now exists a solid blueprint—projected to 1975—of state and local public facility needs.

It might have been Professor Wood but it was Lewis Mumford who wrote: "What makes the city in fact one is the common interest in justice and the common aim, that of pursuing the good life." He drew in turn upon Aristotle, who wrote that the city "should be such as may enable the inhabitants to live at once temperately and liberally in the enjoyment of leisure." If we add the objective of rewarding and satisfying work, we have a goal worthy of the efforts and work of this entire generation of Americans.

7. There is need to encourage greater American leadership in the world community.

"One of the great phenomena of the human condition in the modern age," Walter Lippmann said recently, "is the dissolution of the ancestral order, the erosion of established authority . . . . Because modern man in his search for truth has turned away from kings, priests, commissars and bureaucrats. He is left, for better or worse, with the professors." Yes, much of our idealism came from Professor Wood.

America today occupies a most unique position, one that has perhaps never before been conferred upon any other world power. On the one hand, America is the leading power, the world leader in a hundred different fields of human endeavor. In terms of national prosperity, in terms of individual productivity, in terms of international philanthropy and commitment, in terms of concrete contributions to the advancement of mankind the world over, we stand alone, unmatched, unrivaled by the achievements or the capabilities of any other nation.

---

[2] George S. Reuter, Jr., Professor Wood and Missouri (daily Congressional Record: Washington, May 12, 1958), pp. A4355–A4356.

[3] George S. Reuter, Jr. and Helen H. Reuter, Democracy and Quality Education (Educational Research Association of the U.S.A.: Cambridge, Mass., 1965).

But to that story there is a parallel. In our determination to protect the national interests of South Vietnam, we also stand virtually alone. A mere handful of the world's free nations has stepped forward with tangible and moral support. And what of the rest of the world? They have chosen to follow one of two courses: the politically safe course of neutrality or the easy course of outright opposition. This is to be regretted.

8. There is need to make government service more inviting.

Dr. Wood inspired many of us to devote a part of our lives in government service, and the United States Civil Service, like the old French Foreign Legion, is an excellent place to lose one's identity, but its other virtues are less easy to discover. In the vast Sahara of government service the worker is beset by deadly conformity, conflicting loyalties and sniping from unseen enemies.

9. There is need for maintaining a sane dialog in life.

People have cited this to illustrate the problems one encounters in cross-cultural adaptation and the unwillingness of even the most scientifically oriented people to rely on empirically established fact. To Professor Wood a sane dialog is possible if the person maintains an open mind and operates in a democratic fashion.

CONCLUSIONS

Dr. Wood has stood for the important principles of life that have relevance for our times. His social insights are remarkable. He recognizes that America's dedication to freedom and equality can not be taken for granted. I shall always treasure the memory of the years that he was my teacher. I feel I can say with Kipling:

"I have eaten your bread and your salt
I have drunk your water and wine
That death shall die once beside
The lives you lived have been mine."

Also, just before Adlai Stevenson died, he was in New York prior to embarking for Geneva and London. On his bedside table was found a printed page which he had marked. It was entitled Desiderata and was found in Old St. Paul's Church, Baltimore, dated 1692.

I can think of nothing more appropriate for you of this generation, three centuries later, than this passage from Desiderata:

"Go placidly amid the noise and the haste and learn what peace there may be in silence . . . . Speak your truth quietly and clearly; and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they too have their story . . . . If you compare yourself with others you may become vain and bitter; for always there will be greater and lesser persons than yourself.

"Enjoy your achievements as well as your plans. Keep interested in your career, however humble; it is a real possession in the changing fortunes of time. Exercise caution in your business affairs; for the world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals; and everywhere life is full of heroism.

"Be yourself. Especially do not feign affection. Neither be cynical about love; for in the face of all aridity and disenchantment it is as perennial as the grass. Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth. Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness. Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gentle with yourself. You are a child of the universe no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here. And whether or not it is clear to you no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should.

"Therefore be at peace with God, whatever you conceive Him to be. And whatever your labor and aspirations in the noisy confusion of life keep peace with your soul. With all its sham, drudgery and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world."

In his beloved Walden, Henry David Thoreau must have had Dr. Wood in mind when he wrote many years ago a statement which I treasure and which I hope is one you will recall throughout your lifetime:

"I know of no more encouraging fact than the unquestionable ability of man to elevate his life by conscious endeavor. It is something to be able to paint a particular picture, or to carve a statute and so make a few objects beautiful, but it is far more glorious to carve and paint the very atmosphere and the medium though which we look, which morally we can do. To effect the quality of the day, that is the highest of arts."

I have always found it stimulating to turn my attention to Dr. Rolla Franklin Wood, a great educational statesman, and it is especially gratifying to do so now. He is a figure of heroic proportions in education, one who contributed notably in making American democracy a visible force. He is destined to cast a long shadow. "And Everybody Said 'Amen!' "

SUPER SNOOPERS

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, there recently appeared in Senior Science an excellent article on electronic eavesdropping entitled "Super Snoopers."

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Super Snoopers

(By Michael Dadin)

Next time you go to the dentist, watch out! He might replace one of your teeth with an artificial one concealing a tiny radio transmitter, less than one one-hundredth of a cubic inch in size. You'd never know the difference, but anyone with a suitable radio receiver would be able to listen to your conversations—"straight from the horse's mouth!"

Sound fantastic? It isn't. Dental scientists are already using "talking teeth" to measure pressures on the teeth during chewing and swallowing. They hope to eliminate tooth loss due to abnormal chewing. The radio teeth are equipped with pressure detectors, but they could just as easily be hooked up to a microphone no larger than a pinhead.

Such a minature eavesdropping device can be concealed in a cuff link, tie clip, pen or pencil, or wrist-watch. Even smaller devices are now possible, thanks to the development of microelectronics. A complete microphone and radio transmitter could be etched out of a chip or silicon crystal smaller than a pinhead. It might even replace the head of a real pin sneakily stuck in your lapel.

One problem of these minimicrophones is low power. The power delivered by batteries is directly related to their size. Radio signals energized by microscopic batteries could not be detected more than a few feet away. For this reason the pencil-sized radio that can transmit thousands of miles must remain fiction.

For the professional snooper, the telephone is still the easiest way of monitoring a private conversation. The simplest telephone tap is a direct connection to the two-wire phone cable at any point between the telephone and the central switching station. The two-wire tap can be wired directly to an earphone, or to an amplifier and tape recorder. Since direct line taps can be detected, an *induction coil* is often used. This is simply a coil of wire placed next to the telephone or its wires. It works on the principle of electromagnetic induction: The current in the telephone wires varies according to the sound picked up by the microphone, and sets up a fluctuating magnetic field in its immediate vicinity. If the magnetic field crosses a conductor, such as a coil of wire, it will induce currents in the coil. These currents correspond exactly to the voice currents carried by the telephone wires. The coil can be wired to a listening post or it can act as the "microphone" of a radio transmitter.

A most ingenious phone-tapping device uses a harmonica! First, an electronic device no larger than a couple of cigarettes is hidden in the base of the telephone. To tap the phone, all the eavesdropper has to go is dial its number (from anywhere in the United States, thanks to direct dialing). The moment the connection is made, he blows a single note on a harmonica. The implanted device responds to the correct pitch, cuts the ringing circuit, and connects the telephone microphone to the line, even though the phone is still in its cradle. A person talking near the tapped phone has no idea that his conversation is being overheard miles away. To break the tap the snooper just hangs up.

You may have heard of the tap-proof "red phone" given to high-level government officials, including the President. Once the phone is installed, a sensitive detector determines the *capacitance* of the circuit. Capacitance is the ability of the wires and components to charge the insulator between them. If additional wires or components are added to the circuit, the over-all capacitance is increased, and the difference is detected. Linemen then trace the wires in search of the tap.

The cables and junction boxes of the "red phone" may be filled with an inert gas under pressure. If the cable is punctured or the boxes are opened, the pressure falls, touching off an alarm. The wire itself may be a *triaxial* cable, in effect a central wire surrounded by two conducting sheaths, one within the other. High-level electrical noise is carried by the outer sheaths, thus jamming any induction devices. The voice signal is carried by the central wire and inner sheath, protected by their shield of noise.

Scrambled speech can also foil telephone tappers. Scrambling is done by a battery-operated device no larger than a pencil box, held against the telephone mouthpiece. The scrambler chops the normal range of voice frequencies into many narrow bands. Some or all of these bands are then "mixed" with pure tones so as to produce "beat" notes. High frequencies may become low frequencies, and vice versa. The result sounds like Donald Duck talking backward. A similar device at the other end of the line unscrambles the speech and makes it intelligible. Scramblers have been used for years on international radiotelephone circuits to prevent shortwave listeners from monitoring private conversations.

Listening devices can be placed anywhere—in walls, lamps, heating ducts, electrical outlets. If they operate via radio, their radio waves can be detected by simple devices. If they relay their information by wire, the room must be searched meticulously with induction devices that pick up the signals in the wire or detect the presence of metal parts. For years, the Russians listened to conversations in the U.S. Embassy in Moscow, thanks to microphones placed in wooden pegs built into the embassy walls. Induction searches failed to detect the nonmagnetic wooden pegs.

One of the simplest listening devices is no more than a large parabolic reflecting dish. The dish gathers sound and energy and focuses it on a microphone, just as a telescope mirror focuses starlight on a photographic plate. Conversations held in an open field can be detected hundreds of yards away by aiming the dish at the speakers. Refinements of this concept have led to "shotgun" microphones, long tubes resembling gun barrels. These mikes also must be aimed directly at the speakers. Shotgun mikes have been used at football games to pickup the quarterback's calls directly from the playing field.

DOPPLER EFFECT

More advanced sound-pickup devices use the *Doppler effect,* first analyzed by Austrian mathematician and physicist Christian E. Doppler (1803–1853). The effect can be noticed whenever a fast-moving automobile, with its horn blaring, passes a pedestrian. The pitch, or frequency, of the horn heard by the pedestrian rises as the car approaches him, then drops as the car moves away. Doppler snooping devices use a radar or laser beam aimed at the room in which a conversation is taking place. The invisible infrared laser beam may be reflected from a window to a light-detector hundreds of yards away. If the window vibrates with the sound of conversation, the frequency of the reflected light is changed as the window moves in and out. The detector picks out only the frequency changes, which correspond directly to the original sound waves.

The radar beam method is identical, except that it must use a vibrating metal surface as a reflector. One such metal vibrator was hidden in a wooden carved replica of the Great Seal of the United States given by Soviet diplomats in 1945 to W. Averell Harriman, then U.S. Ambassador to Moscow. The shield was hung in a place of honor in the ambassador's study. Across the street, Soviet agents had aimed a radar set at the steel strip, and were able to translate the minuscule vibrations of the metal into intelligible speech. The Soviet snoopers were able to hear every word spoken in the ambassador's study for seven years, until the bug was discovered.

To foil this kind of eavesdropping, one Washington lawyer checks into a hotel room with his client when they must speak privately. He chose both hotel and room at the last possible moment. He then inflates a double-walled plastic bubble into which he and his client enter and converse. The wall of "dead" air acts as an effective sound insulator.

Military intelligence requires a great deal of information about enemy radio and radar installations. This involves the use of "ferrets"—airplanes, missiles, or satellites equipped with radio and radar receivers. Their job is to fly over enemy territory so as to locate and monitor radio and radar signals. Ideally, they should monitor the entire band of radio-radar frequencies, ranging from a few thousand cycles (kilocycles) to many thousand million cycles (kilomegacycles). In fact, this is next to impossible, because radio receivers cannot listen to the whole band at once.

UNDERWATER SPYING

In 1951, Navy intelligence heard reports of a Soviet radio station using a very low frequency—eight kilocycles—to communicate with patroling submarines. The Navy was unable to verify the story immediately, because they had no receivers capable of detecting such low radio frequencies. Later, it was discovered that very low-frequency (VLF) radio waves can travel long distances *underwater*. The Navy now has several powerful VLF radio stations, which enable U.S. submarines to maintain communications without surfacing.

As you read this, American (and Russian) satellites are continuously photographing each other's territory. Ultrasharp lenses of secret design enable U.S. satellites orbiting overhead to identify a two-foot-long object on the ground, many miles below. Infrared sensors aboard the satellite can detect the heat of a rocket the moment it lifts off the launching pad.

High-flying airplanes are sampling the stratosphere for traces of krypton-85, a gas produced whenever uranium or plutonium atoms are split in the atmosphere. To detect underground nuclear explosions, delicate seismographs are monitoring pressure waves in the Earth. In combat in Vietnam, enemy radar signals are detected and mimicked by electronic countermeasures (ECM) equipment so as to confuse or jam the pattern of radar echoes.

Electronic eavesdropping is limited only by man's ingenuity. Whenever information is conveyed, some kind of physical energy must also be transmitted, and this energy can always be detected. A private person has very little protection against a determined snooper, whether the bugging is done by the government, by corporations, or by individuals. Lawmakers are now considering curbs to restrict such eavesdropping, which can destroy the privacy of the individual.

The need is urgent. Scientists are already developing methods to detect the electrical activity of the brain at a distance. Will thought-tapping be next?

AMERICAN SUCCESS STORY IN ASIA

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, many of our European allies and fellow Americans have been seriously questioning the extent of our concern and involvement in Asian affairs—some have even gone as far as belittling and ridiculing it. These people have felt that our presence in Asia, coupled with financial, economic, and military assistance, has not produced sufficient tangible benefits to justify such a great outlay of material and human resources.

While some Americans are protesting against our involvement in Vietnam, many Asian leaders prefer to look at the positive achievements of our efforts in Asia—a success story filled with many chapters of Asian accomplishments—economic advancement, political stability, and military preparedness.

Mr. President, an article entitled "A Success for the United States: The Story in Non-Communist Asia," appearing in the May 8 issue of U.S. News & World Report, gives an excellent summary of the impressive victories that are being scored by the United States and her friends in many areas of Asia.

I highly recommend this short but perceptive article to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the above-mentioned article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Success for the United States—The Story in Non-Communist Asia

Impressive victories that go far beyond the war in Vietnam are being marked up by America and its friends in other parts of Asia.

A vast area is beginning to move with a surge of economic advancement. And its leaders give a major share of the credit to the U.S.

Old fears of Red China are forgotten. It is non-Communist Asia that is making the strides.

(Reported from Washington, Bangkok, Tokyo)

While Americans at home argue among themselves about the war in Vietnam, leaders in Asia, more and more, are pointing to what they see as a great American success story in their part of the world.

Today, many of the countries of non-Communist Asia—aside from war-torn South Vietnam—either have "taken off" economically or give signs of moving into the status of burgeoning, fast-developing nations.

The role of the U.S., extending back to the time of the Korean War, is credited with making this surge possible.

The U.S., in World War II, fought Japan in a conflict that was costly in lives and treasure to block that country's conquest of China and of Southeast Asia. Then, after winning, the Americans withdrew their power from most of the area. Old colonial empires broke up, and new, untested nations appeared.

A drift toward chaos followed the U.S. withdrawal.

China, saved by the United States from Japanese conquest, fell to the Communists. Indonesians fought the Dutch for their independence. All of French Indo-China was engulfed by an anti-colonial war, led by Communists.

Asian Communists, emboldened by what appeared to be U.S. weakness, attacked in South Korea, and the United States fought another war to stop them.

THE PAST

Now, Asian leaders say, look back 15 years or so—

Japan at that time still was in trouble, its future uncertain, its people dazed by defeat and occupation.

South Korea was flat on its back, a country being ravaged by war and apparently to be a burden on the U.S. indefinitely.

Taiwan—known then as Formosa—was shaky, a drain on American resources. Doubts were strong it could ever make its own way.

Indonesia, under Sukarno, was beginning to slide into a decline. A take-over by the Communists seemed inevitable.

Communists were still fighting Britons and Malays for control of Malaya.

France was in trouble in Vietnam and Laos, and the U.S. was uncertain about what to do. There wasn't anything to be cheerful about in either country.

Thailand at the time was wobbly and weak.

Communist China, by contrast, was shaping up as the "wave of the future" in Asia. The world was marveling at reports from Peking of phenomenal development that would catapult this newest Communist nation into the top level of world powers.

THE PRESENT

Then, the Asians say, glance at their part of the world today—

Communist China, no longer soaring into the top league, is in a state of political and economic chaos, its future uncertain.

Japan, aided by and responsive to American guidance, ranks fourth among the world's great industrial powers. Leaders in Asia say they shudder to think what the situation would be now if Japan in the early 1950s had become Red China's partner instead of looking toward the U.S.

South Korea has undergone remarkable recovery, economically and politically. The Koreans now have an army of 45,000 combat troops in Vietnam, besides keeping large forces at home to block a possible attack by North Korea. Major differences with Japan have been settled, and today the Koreans are on the way to better things.

Taiwan is one of the show places of Asia, a thumping success story of what can be done in an underdeveloped country. The Taiwanese now earn their way in the world, enjoy a high living standard, in Asian terms, and no longer need economic aid from the U.S.

Indonesia still is deep in economic and political trouble, but its military leaders have reversed direction, crushed the Communists and ousted President Sukarno. This change in course was made possible by the U.S. military stand in Vietnam. Without that, Asians say, it is doubtful the Communists could have been blocked from a take-over.

Thailand is self-sufficient, paying its own way, taking off economically, and is aiding the U.S. in the Vietnam war.

India remains the one dark spot. The Asian view: It is questionable whether any policy the U.S. pursues can solve that country's problems. Yet India, in spite of continuing domestic crises, has switched from a pro-Red China, anti-U.S. stand to a more genuine middle-of-the-road neutralism.

VIETNAM: THE KEY

Now, as leaders in Asia see it, if South Vietnam can be saved and Communism blocked there, the American success story in Asia could be called dramatic and highly significant for a vast area that contains three fifths of the people of the world.

The war in Korea, in which the U.S. decided to fight rather than submit to a Communist take-over of the South, is described in Asia as the turning point in the history of the 1950s.

That war, though it failed to unite Korea or destroy the image of Communist China's rising might, "saved" Japan. It brought American military power back to the Western Pacific and assured Japanese moderates they would not become sacrificial lambs for a resurgent China.

U.S. expenditures for the Korean War indirectly helped to rebuild Japanese industry that had been devastated by World War II. Most Asian observers are sure that this development would have come sooner or later—given Japan's pre-war industrial know-how and the drive and energy of its people. But it was the 3 billion dollars' worth of U.S. aid and spending in Japan after 1945 that made the comeback trail easier and shorter.

JAPAN'S ROLE

In doubt in the decade 1945 to 1955 were the answers to these key questions: Would Japan's new industrial might be harnessed to the burgeoning Communist empire in East Asia? Or would the Japanese instead look to the South and West for their allies and trade partners?

Asians now say the outlook of today's world would be vastly different if Japan had aligned itself with the Communist rulers in Peking.

To Asians, the second turning point in the history of the 1950s was the test of U.S. determination in the Strait of Taiwan five years after the Korean War had ended.

The U.S., without being forced to go to war, denied Taiwan and the offshore islands to the Communist Chinese. This was a clear signal to Asians that the U.S., even though it had failed to win the war in Korea, intended to hold the line against Communist aggression.

That action, together with the violent convulsions inside China itself in later years, was important in convincing the 12 million Overseas Chinese in Southeast Asia that they could go on living their largely nonpolitical lives, free of interference by Peking's leaders. The tight hold the Overseas Chinese have on the commerce of the entire area makes their role crucial in any attempt to stabilize Southeast Asia.

It has become fashionable in Washington's political circles to belittle the theory of John Foster Dulles which held that South Asia was like a stack of dominoes: If one country tumbled, it would bring down the remainder, one after another.

Westerners oversimplify the domino theory, but in Asia this version of Mr. Dulles's idea is generally accepted: Military and political actions in one country will have some big repercussions on other countries.

It was the American effort in South Vietnam that made possible Indochina's successful blocking of a Communist takeover in 1965.

Indonesia's anti-Red military leaders and politicians made their moves confident that the U.S. would continue to hold the line in Vietnam.

Just bear in mind that one third of Japan's exports normally are sold to nations in South Asia. Japan, with no natural resources and little arable land, must export if its people are to live. If the markets of South Asia were dominated by Communists, Japan certainly would be forced to trim its sails to the new wind.

HOW ABOUT OTHER NATIONS?

Then, too, there are complicated relations among countries that the maps of the domino theory do not bring out.

Large numbers of Chinese in Malaysia and Singapore, for example, come from Fukien Province, on the China mainland, and from the nearby offshore islands. It was the successful U.S. show of force in this area in 1958 that gave, psychologically, the last blows to Chinese guerrillas leading the Communist insurgency in far-off Malaya.

Or look at Laos and Cambodia: Both have large Vietnamese minorities that with the Overseas Chinese make up the middle class in each country. If all of Vietnam should go to the Communists, Laos and Cambodia almost certainly would fall, too, probably without the firing of a shot.

THE FUTURE

Yet for all of the successes the U.S. can look back on, observers in Asia feel that horrendous crises still lie ahead.

Most of the Asian countries have rapidly expanding populations. Economic-growth rates must be at least 3 per cent a year just to keep up with the increase in hungry mouths. As an observer says:

"Even if someone in the next five years comes up with a new and effective contraceptive, we can't cope with the population explosion. It's like driving a car 80 miles an hour. If you apply the brakes, you can still crack into a wall."

Americans eager to help, find themselves blocked off by 300 years of economic and scientific stagnation among people who only a few centuries earlier had been far more sophisticated than pre-Industrial-Revolution Europeans.

The American is expert in farm mechanization and use of pecticides and fertilizer. In Asia, he finds farmers milking cows by hand and using oxen to drag a stick that serves as a plow. Still, there is progress, as in U.S.-Asian development of high-yield strains of rice, and rapid expansion of fertilizer plants.

Asia still is only a geographical concept, not a part of a single world linked by common bonds and aspirations.

There is almost as much difference between Koreans in the North and Javanese in the South as between Japanese in East Asia and Portuguese in Europe.

There is talk of economic co-operation, even a common market. But the countries that produce copra, rubber and tin—all subject to world price fluctuations—have little in common with such highly industrialized countries as Australia and Japan. With prices of industrial products rising, earnings from the sale of raw materials are dropping.

Asian leaders often appear to be confused, frustrated and embittered by their problems. At times they doubt that anything short of totalitarian rule can bring order out of chaos.

WHAT ASIANS SEEK

Those Asians want to be part of a liberal nondogmatic world. Ask them if the American expenditure in lives and money in Asia since 1945 has been worthwhile, and the answer is an unqualified "Yes."

An expert who has lived much of his life in Asia makes this comment:

"This is one large part of the world where the U.S. is not asked why it fought in Korea and why it is fighting in South Vietnam. People here know why. They are involved themselves. No one talks much about it, but they know their future is at stake in what the U.S. does in Asia."

CONFUSION AMONG SUPPORTERS OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, to illustrate the incredible confusion among supporters of the administration's policy in Southeast Asia, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "The Limits of a Policy," published in the Washington Post of May 1, 1967. The editorial speaks for itself in an uncertain manner.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Limits of a Policy

It is the cruelest of ironies that the Truman Doctrine—bedrock of our involvement in Vietnam and of all our postwar foreign policy—should have its genesis in Greece. For it would not require much stretching of that Doctrine to land Marines in Athens today "to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities."

True, today's threat to Greece does not come from international Communism and the people are not "resisting" openly. But this is largely because they can't. An "armed minority" of wilfull, arrogant, irresponsible military officers has fastened a viselike grip on the populace, jailing all dissidents, governing with tanks and guns. The coup-makers are a particularly sleazy band, invoking a wildly exaggerated Communist threat which their very actions may make real. They are making a mockery of a collaboration between our two countries—and between both of us and the rest of the Atlantic Alliance—which had the noblest of origins. They are debasing the glory that was Greece.

Yet the Truman Doctrine will not, and should not, be invoked. Doctrines are for defining causes and for summoning a nation to large undertakings. They are dangerous only when they are applied too literally, for too long. The coup in Greece is a timely reminder that no doctrine can confer upon even the most powerful nation in the world either the absolute authority or the ability to impose its will on the internal workings of another society. President Johnson has wisely observed that in the business of final pacification and nation-building in Vietnam, "we can help, but only they can win this part of the war."

The same, quite obviously, applies to Greece. Our influence and aid could not teach a people to insist with one voice on their rights, or teach their politicians not to fritter away their constitutional freedom by endless quarreling, or prevent a royal family from meddling in politics, or restrain a ruthless gang of army officers from resort to strong arm methods in their lust to rule.

So the Administration is probably well-advised in its decision not even to cut off military aid to the new government, but to "review" it, which means to use it for whatever leverage it may yield. Greece remains a NATO member, after all, and has responsibilities in the common defense. There is no point trying to tear down a government when there is no visible alternative and the only result might well be civil war. Better to work behind the scenes, in hopes that the King, together with more responsible elements in the military, can help nudge Greece back toward moderation and the system of self-government which first was hers.

The prospects are not bright. But where the will of nationhood does not exist, we cannot create it. We can only try, whether in the Mediterranean, or the Caribbean, or in Southeast Asia, to foreclose conquest by force. We can only help to create the conditions under which a country can choose of its own will to live free. What has befallen

Greece reminds us that we cannot guarantee, of our own will, what the choice will be.

THE GROWTH OF AWARENESS: OUR NATION'S LAW AND LAW AMONG NATIONS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, a fellow Wyomingite who has distinguished himself in the practice of law in and out of government and in politics as well, delivered a truly remarkable Law Day speech last month at Valparaiso University.

Mr. Thurman Arnold, ignoring Horace Greeley's advice, went east at the height of the great depression and distinguished himself as Assistant U.S. Attorney General of the Justice Department's Antitrust Division. Before his eastward odyssey, he was a member of the Wyoming House of Representatives and served as the mayor of Laramie, Wyo. He later served as professor of law at Yale and the dean of the West Virgina University Law School.

In his law day address, Mr. Arnold developed an international law thesis with particular relevance to Vietnam. He proclaimed the most important aspect of international law to be the restraining of "lawless international behavior" and the "prevention of aggressive wars."

He asserted with respect to Vietnam that "what we are fighting for is to preserve a principle of international law, without which there is no security for America in the lawless world."

Mr. Arnold dismissed with trenchant logic and cutting phrase the "alienated intellectuals" who oppose our efforts in Vietnam without proposing a constructive alternative:

> Today, they are bending every effort to prevent the enforcement of the principle that Nuremberg announced to the world ... that aggressive war is in itself an international crime regardless of the way it is conducted.
>
> Our alienated intellectuals do not have the courage to say we should withdraw, a position I would respect however wrong it may be. Instead they think it is their function to stir up all the dissatisfaction and dissent they can and to do their best to portray the United States to the world as a stupid and brutal power unnecessarily killing thousands of people and burning villages. Their military advice is to stop shooting the enemy on the theory that if we did, the gratitude of the enemy would be so great as not to take advantage of us.
>
> It may be true that generals are not safe political advisers. But that does not mean that alienated intellectuals are safe military advisers.

Mr. Arnold asks:

> Is it arrogance for the United States to enforce international law not for our own selfish interests, but in the interest of world peace? We are the only nation in the world capable of that task.

He quite correctly points out.

Noting the often heard Delphic pronouncements emanating from U.N. headquarters in New York, he asks:

> Is it arrogance when we permit ourselves to be lectured by a Burmese citizen named U Thant, and instead of resenting this criticism encourage and cooperate with him in all his plans for a settlement in the hope that they are not as futile and impractical as they seem to be?

Mr. Arnold does not deny the right of dissent, but he points out that in a democratic society, dissent is not sacred; only the right to dissent is sacred.

> Much as I abhor the days when Senator McCarthy was in power, we did not in those dark days have to hear such nonsense from college professors. Now that they can safely publish their dissenting views without retaliation they have advanced a new doctrine of dissent based on the premise that dissent deserves special consideration, immunity from criticism and the right to shout down persons who disagree with them. . .
>
> There is no use arguing with such people. They have no feeling for the fundamental legal principle of freedom of speech; they have no sense of reality. I prefer to dismiss them with a verse from Kipling who was the poetic spokesman for British international policy:
>
> "The poor little street bred people who vapor and fume and brag;
> They are lifting their heads in the stillness to yelp at the English flag."

Mr. Arnold speaks eloquently and with force:

> This much is clear: America cannot afford to adopt an irresolute and vacillating policy in international affairs. If we do our enemies can never be convinced that we mean what we say. Harry Truman was forced to risk a war with Russia in order to convince the Russians that we meant what we said about Berlin. Kennedy had to risk an atomic war in order to convince Russia that we meant what we said about Russia maintaining atomic bases in the Western Hemisphere. The war in Vietnam, disheartening and bloody as it is, has far fewer risks. The greatest risk is to apologize and back down.

I ask, Mr. President, that Mr. Arnold's speech be printed in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GROWTH OF AWARENESS: OUR NATION'S LAW AND LAW AMONG NATIONS

(Law Day speech delivered by Thurman Arnold)

Each year American lawyers and American law schools join together on Law Day to celebrate the great ideal of Western civilization, that there are fundamental principles of law and justice that must be observed and also must be enforced against those who will not observe them, if free democratic society is to survive. On these occasions we think of law not as a set of rules but as a way of thinking about our society which, if followed, assures us of orderly progress in the face of industrial and social change. We do not celebrate real estate law, or administrative law, or the rules and regulations of the Securities and Exchange Commission. The kind of law we celebrate on Law Day is not a set of rules or specifically defined principles. At home it is a way of looking at society and the relations between individuals and their government. Abroad its most important aspect today is to restrain lawless international behavior and to prevent aggressive wars.

I. FROM SOCIAL DARWINISM TO THE WARREN COURT—GROWTH OF AWARENESS AND RESPONSIBILITY IN DOMESTIC LAW

In the happy days of the 1920's, before the great Depression, every one was certain what the fundamental principles of law which we respected were. So far as international law was concerned, we assumed that we had made the world safe for democracy by winning the First World War—a war to end all wars. We had saved England and the British fleet. We could safely draw back into our shell and assume that international law would take care of itself. Later I will talk about the consequence of that decision.

At home we assumed that we had at last achieved a perfect society that operated automatically provided that our legislatures did not interfere with certain automatic rules by passing radical social legislation which violated our past traditions of the proper function of legislatures. We knew that if private property was protected the automatic rules of something referred to as "Capitalism" would assure us permanent prosperity and the elimination of poverty and social discontent. Private property meant in those days the freedom of great corporate empires to do as they pleased. If these great empires were not interfered with, individual human rights would take care of themselves. Darwin's law of the survival of the fittest would solve the problem of weak and underprivileged individuals by eliminating them. The Constitution of the United States was there to save us from the folly of legislatures in the event that they were seduced by demagogues into an undue interest in human rights as against property rights.

These were the attitudes and ideals which were implicitly read into the Constitution of the United States and molded the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States before the great Depression.

But, unfortunately, the great Depression did not respond to our old traditions of constitutional law. It soon became apparent that social legislation of a kind heretofore unknown in our traditional thinking about the Constitution of the United States was essential to meet the desperate economic situation which confronted us. A conservative and embittered majority on the Supreme Court saw in that legislation a threat to every freedom that Americans cherished. The American Bar Association denounced as unconstitutional all efforts to put human rights above property rights.

By 1937 there was such a cloud of unconstitutionality cast by a bitterly divided Court over every New Deal measure that the administration of the New Deal program became impossible. Principles which are taken for granted today were then denounced by all right thinking persons as socialistic. The fog of unconstitutionality which enveloped the whole New Deal was so thick that no regulatory law could be enforced until it had passed the scrutiny of the Supreme Court, a process which threatened to take years. Roosevelt was thus forced into a direct attack on the Supreme Court of the United States—the Court packing plan. I remember those days well. The fury of the educated citizens in the United States rose to incredible heights. Roosevelt was booed as an apostle of lawlessness by the students when he visited Harvard.

The Court packing bill came so near to passing that Chief Justice Hughes, who had been a constant dissenter from the decisions that had paralyzed the Government, was able to frighten the irreconcilable majority of the Court. Justice Van Devanter retired. Justice Roberts abandoned his extreme position and declared a new Agricultural Act constitutional. It became no longer necessary to pack the Court. Out of the Court fight a new constitution emerged.

But its emergence was gradual. Over 30 years has passed, and the new constitution is not yet respected by a number of vociferous groups. For a period until the appointment of Chief Justice Warren a majority of the Court, under the influence of Justice Frankfurter, decided to play it safe. The Supreme Court stopped vetoing social and economic legislation. But the Court became a purely negative body concerned more with its own safety from public criticism than with the protection of the liberties of the individual citizen. Under this protection Senator McCarthy rose to power. He frightened both the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations into establishing procedures by which citizens were tried and condemned as subversive on secret evidence without the American constitutional right of confrontation and cross-examination.

Dorothy Bailey's conviction for disloyalty by a loyalty board on secret evidence was affirmed four-to-four by an equally divided Court. From then on McCarthy had carte blanche. The Supreme Court had miserably failed in its duty. Every government official, indeed every teacher or writer, was made to realize that his career might be ruined and a badge of infamy pinned on him on secret evidence by faceless informers.

It was not until the appointment of Earl Warren as Chief Justice of the United States that our new Constitution began to be a positive force dedicated to the principle of human rights. I believe that Chief Justice Warren will go down in history with Marshall as one of the two greatest Chief Justices. As a result of the Court's decisions during his tenure, public servants can no longer be forced to take vague loyalty oaths which may later bring them into trouble because they hold unpopular opinions. The government's vast "security" programs have been widely reformed and procedures substantially improved. The law has made us a more civilized nation.

We have also been made a more civilized nation as a result of the racial segregation cases. Out of the bitter struggle which followed Chief Justice Warrent's decision on school segregation the South is today beginning to accept the hitherto unpleasant fact that Negroes are citizens of the United States.

But perhaps the boldest and most successful principle ever to emerge through a Supreme Court decision is that voters in rapidly developing urban areas shall have an equal influence with voters in rural areas in determining state legislation. Had the Supreme Court timidly refused to enforce the principle of One Man, One Vote—had it continued to declare this to be a political problem which could be solved only by an amendment to the Constitution—we would have been caught for the next twenty years in a rotten borough system where a minority could veto legislation adapted to the needs of the majority. State legislatures dominated by a reactionary minority of rural voters could never have solved the explosive problems of a growing urban society.

And with respect to the civil rights of individuals accused of crime the Warren Court has an equally great record, though often by five-to-four decisions. No longer can the police use a confession elicited from an indigent and mentally retarded person under arrest as a result of days of insistent questioning. No longer can convictions be obtained where the accused is not represented by counsel.

Thirty years have passed since Roosevelt introduced his Court packing plan. During that period the Supreme Court had first changed from a frustrating force hampering all government legislation to a purely negative institution which gave free rein to McCarthyism. Today a new Constitution has emerged protecting the civil liberties of citizens from the power of intolerant bigots, defending the right to a fair trial of indigent and ignorant persons accused of crime, and guaranteeing the right of a majority of our voters to prevail over a minority in an election. The Constitution today resembles more closely the vision of the Constitutional fathers than it did before the Warren Court.

Nevertheless, this emerging Constitution has not yet been accepted by important minority groups who still want to impeach Earl Warren. Nor are the decisions of the Supreme Court universally respected by many of the intellectual elite who sit on law school faculties. Articles have been written by instructors at Harvard, Yale and the University of Chicago complaining that the Supreme Court is not enunciating what they call neutral principles of constitutional law. On the other side we have the anguished cries of police chiefs and other citizens who want to suppress crime by denying certain procedural rights to criminal defendants.

Finally, we have the embattled minority of those who want to preserve the power of rural minorities to govern state legislatures through the rotten borough system. In 30 States resolutions have slipped past the legislatures to repeal the reapportionment decisions of the Supreme Court by calling a new constitutional convention—something that has not happened since the original Constitutional convention. If such a constitutional convention is called it will be an advertisement to the world that there is a struggle in America between those who believe in majority rule in a democracy and those who repudiate that principle under the doctrine of States' rights.

We need such a new constitutional convention about as much as we need more riots in our cities. And so I optimistically predict that even though enough States' resolutions are passed to present the matter to Congress, Congress will refuse to take the ruinous step of calling a new convention in these troubled times. Certainly there are enough constitutional infirmities in these resolutions to justify Congress in ignoring them.

II. FROM ISOLATIONISM TO VIETNAM—GROWTH OF AWARENESS AND RESPONSIBILITY IN INTERNATIONAL LAW

It is in the field of international law where the greatest danger lies. We are living in a lawless world, a world where small and relatively impotent nations can nevertheless start brush fires which may spread to our own shores. We have seen it happen twice—the First World War and again in the Second. But the world is even smaller today than it was in the Second World War. It has become a world so small that lawless aggressive action by any nation against another can threaten world peace. It is also a world where poverty and misery in the crowded nations which cannot feed themselves threaten revolutions which upset the balance of power. In such a world we need some sort of a world constitution ever more desperately than the Thirteen Colonies needed the Constitution of the United States after the Revolutionary War. And the keystone of that world constitution is the principle that no nation must be permitted to expand its borders and its power through an aggressive attack upon its neighbors. We are today attempting to enforce that principle in Vietnam.

It was our feeling of desperate need for a principle of international law against aggression which led us to abandon our distaste for the League of Nations and become a leader in the formation of the United Nations. But this action we felt was not enough. We wanted some judicial sanction for that fundamental principle on which all international law must rest—the outlawing of aggressive war. And so, after Hitler's defeat, the United States joined with the victorious nations, including the Soviet Union, in the first Nuremberg trial to prosecute the national leaders of Hitler's empire. The paramount purpose of that trial was to declare that an aggressive war was an international crime which justified imposing the death penalty on the leaders of the nation which started it. The trials for German atrocities represented no novel principle. The great principle of international law announced for the first time at Nuremberg was that aggressive war is in itself an international crime regardless of the way it is conducted.

At the time of the Nuremberg trials those who write the think columns in our press, such as Walter Lippmann, and independent organizations of intellectuals, such as Americans for Democratic Action, and liberal professors on our college campuses, acclaimed the principle of the outlawing of aggressive war as a great step forward in international law. Today they are bending every effort to prevent the enforcement of the principle that Nuremberg announced to the world. They are giving every aid and comfort to the enemy that they can in the light of their limited numbers. They are encouraging Hanoi to believe that if it will only hang on the United States will abandon its attempt to enforce the Nuremberg principle in Asia. They proclaim that America cannot and must not be a world policeman.

One only has to go back to the First World War to show the cost of American blood and treasure which has resulted from that attitude.

In the 19th Century and until the First World War England was the world's policeman. At tremendous cost the British fleet was kept to a strength larger than all the other navies in the world combined. In those happy days sea power was equivalent to world power. From the time of the Monroe Doctrine on we have been protected by the British fleet. But in the First World War we discovered that sea power was not what it once was. America had to be sworn in as deputy world policeman and go to the rescue of the chief. In fact, the necessity of assuming the role of world policeman had descended on us, but we were completely unaware of it.

When the First World War was over we decided that our obligation to enforce some form of international law in the world was over and done with. One of the favorite songs of the 26th Division, in which I served, went as follows:

> "We have paid our debt to Lafayette
> Who the hell do we owe now.
> We don't want any more trenches,
> Lordy, how we want to go home."

We reduced our army from nearly 5,000,000 men to 200,000. We left a garrison of a few thousand men in the Philippines. By winning the First World War we had made the world safe for democracy. Germany had been taught her lesson. Japan had been our ally. To provide an adequate force to protect the Philippines might seem an offensive move against Japan. It might even lead to war. The United States should never commit an army to Asia, for the mere purpose of stopping aggression in the Orient.

Even in the 1930's when it became apparent that Japan was boldly embarking upon a course of aggression in the Orient, we refused to put any military obstacle in her path by reinforcing the Philippines. After all, we were not the world's policemen with responsibility for enforcing international law. Once attacked, the Philippines fell in only a few months and Japan was free to go on. Think of the cost of American lives that resulted from our attitude.

Even after the defeat of France by Hitler, the intellectuals who now are condemning our efforts to enforce the international principle outlawing aggressive war failed to understand the role in international affairs which destiny had imposed on the United States.

A leader in that group was Walter Lippmann. His message today is that the United States has no responsibility in international affairs. It is not our duty, having announced the Nuremberg principle against aggressive war, to see that it is carried out. The President should admit before the world that our policy in Vietnam is morally wrong.

Mr. Lippmann believes in the futility of enforcing international law by American military force. His military advice is to use the army in Vietnam only for defensive purposes. He thought the same in 1940. I read from the Biography of General Marshall by Forrest Pogue:

"General Marshall was alarmed in late September when Walter Lippmann, in his widely read column, suggested that 'All popular doubts, political confusions, all ambiguity would be removed by a clear decision to shrink the Army and concentrate our major effort upon the Navy, the Air Force and lend-lease.' . . . 'Today,' he argued, 'the effort to raise such a large army so quickly is not merely unnecessary but undesirable. . . .' He believed that the 'complex of circumstances' that centered on 'the great expansion of the Army' had become 'the cancer which obstructs national unity, causes discontent which subversive elements exploit, and weakens the primary measures of our defense, which are the lend-lease program and the naval policy. I think that a surgical operation is indicated—an operation to shrink the Army which will at the same time increase its efficiency.' "

This was after Hitler's successful invasion and conquest of France. Had Mr. Lippmann's advice been followed Hitler might have won the war. Yet the group led by Mr. Lippmann was so influencial that the universal draft in 1940 passed only by a majority of one vote in the House of Representatives. What he was saying in 1940 before Pearl Harbor, he is still saying today.

Mr. Galbraith, of the ADA, is quoted in the *New York Times* as saying that the generals in Vietnam have not considered the political situation they are putting the Democratic Party in. He says: "But for the rest of us there is no excuse for innocence. This disaster (i.e., a long war in Vietnam) could mean the death and burial of the Democratic Party." In other words, the Democratic Party is more important than the enforcement of international law.

Professor Feuer, who left Berkeley for the University of Toronto, refers in the *New York Times* Magazine to the vociferous group of intellectuals who are now giving advice on military strategy and reaching for political power through the ADA as the "alienated intellectual elite." He says:

"Among other elites or professions—engineering, law or medicine—mistakes of high magnitude would undermine the practitioner's standing. Not so among the intellectuals. The Intellectual Elite is least answerable for its mistakes, which tends to corrupt it. The mistake is hidden in the bibliography, lost among the footnotes."

Henry Steele Commager, another of our alienated intellectuals, testified at the Senate hearings before Fulbright in support of Fulbright's position. He said:

"It is my feeling that we do not have the resources, material, intellectual or moral, to be at once an American power, a European power, and an Asian power . . . It is not our duty to keep peace throughout the globe, to put down aggression wherever it starts up, to stop the advance of communism or other isms which we may not approve of. It is primarily the responsibility of the United Nations to keep the peace . . . If that organization is not strong enough to do the job we should perhaps bend our major energies to giving her the necessary authority and the tools."

Does Mr. Commager mean what he says that we should give the United Nations the necessary authority to keep the peace, that we should make U Thant our deputy Secretary of State and provide the United Nations with the tools to keep the peace? In the Council of the United Nations Russia has an absolute veto. In the Assembly over a third of the votes are cast by impotent and infinitesimal sovereignties whose knowledge of world affairs is in rough proportion to their size. Does Mr. Commager want us to turn our armies over to that disorganized group?

Senator Fulbright, another alienated intellectual, has written a book accusing the United States of arrogance. Is it arrogance for the United States to enforce international law not for our own selfish interests but in the interest of world peace? We are the only nation in the world capable of that task. Must we allow aggressive power to build up until it thinks itself strong enough to attack us as Japan did at Pearl Harbor? Is it arrogance when we permit ourselves to be lectured by a Burmese citizen named U Thant, and instead of resenting this criticism encourage and cooperate with him in all his plans for a settlement in the hope that they are not as futile and impractical as they seem to be? Our alienated intellectual elite have no realization that international law, like domestic law, can only exist if there is force behind it. For example, Reverend Eugene Carson Blake, General Secretary of the World Council of Churches, in attacking our attempts to enforce international law in the Orient, comes out with this gem:

"The more force we use the weaker become our best ideals."

These people think we are engaged in a useless fight to establish a democracy in Vietnam.

This is like saying that when the police put down a riot in Watts they are trying to establish democracy in that suburb. What we are fighting for is to preserve a principle of international law, without which there is no security for America in the lawless world.

Below the level of the more prominent group of alienated intellectuals we find those in academic circles who are not happy unless they are expressing their hatred of America. The following appeared in the *New York Times* Magazine of March 12, 1967. It was signed by seventeen members of the faculty of a respected institution, Western Reserve University:

"The appalling fact is that, by its actions in Vietnam, the American Government has forfeited any claim to moral superiority over the barbarism against which we are supposedly defending Western civilization. Messrs. Johnson, Rusk and McNamara—not to mention General Westmoreland—stand convicted, by their own words as well as their deeds, of crimes of war and crimes against humanity; and they do not even have the defense of the Nazi leaders at Nuremberg that the international laws against those crimes were ex post facto."

In a letter published in *The New Republic* by a visiting professor at the respected Stanford University, where students apparently encouraged by faculty members did everything they could to insult the Vice President of the United States because he expressed his views before them, we find the following:

"I received calls from faculty members who, before the visit, had been unwilling to endorse the walkout, but who felt after that the only proper protest would have been for 1,700 of us to have stood in the auditorium and chanted 'Shame!' for the full hour."

Here we find a new phase of disrespect for law among our alienated intellectuals, the abuse of the right to dissent and the abuse of the freedom of speech. Much as I abhor the days when Senator McCarthy was in power, we did not in those dark times have to hear such nonsense from college professors. Now that they can safely publish their dissenting views without retaliation they have advanced a new doctrine of dissent based on the premise that dissent deserves special consideration, immunity from criticism and the right to shout down persons who disagree with them. In a democratic society dissent is not sacred. Only the right to dissent is sacred. Yet this simple principle of law has not yet been learned by some of the alienated intellectuals on our college faculties.

There is no use arguing with such people. They have no feeling for the fundamental legal principle of freedom of speech; they have no sense of reality. I prefer to dismiss them with a verse from Kipling who was the poetic spokesman for British international policy:

"The poor little street bred people
Who vapor and fume and brag,
They are lifting their heads in the stillness
To yelp at the English flag."

I used this quotation before another college audience some time ago. At a small group meeting afterwards I was accused of interfering with freedom of speech of those who sincerely believe that the Vietnamese war was a moral atrocity and an international crime. I replied that I would defend their right to say it was but they ought to defend my right to say they were yelping at the flag. Did I get my point across? The answer is, No. Freedom of speech to them meant more than the right to speak, it meant freedom from harsh criticism; it also included the right to obstruct traffic.

Returning to the principle of international law that I am defending here tonight, i.e. the duty of the United States as the richest and most powerful country in the world to enforce the law against aggressive war, it is my belief that the majority of American citizens of both parties believe in that principle. I think they have learned the lesson that—in our present age—it is the function of a dominant world power to take the lead in establishing world order and enforcing international law, and that a disorderly consensus of bickering lesser powers such as the United Nations cannot now do the job. This role imposes a costly burden in lives and money. But how much more costly we found it not to defend ourselves against the aggressive attempts of Japan to dominate the Orient until, encouraged by our lack of defenses in the Philippines, Japan felt confident enough of our weakness and irresolution to attack us at Pearl Harbor!

Gilbert and Sullivan were no doubt right when they composed the song "Taking One Consideration With Another, a Policeman's Lot is Not a Happy One".

But we have been forced as the result of the inevitable march of events to choose Vietnam as the place to demonstrate to the world our adamant policy in favor of peace against the uninhibited building up of empires by outside aggression.

I am one of those who believe that if we had not taken our stand in Vietnam, then Korea, which we have built up as one of the few strong economies in the Orient, would have become disillusioned and felt itself in danger. I believe we saved Malaya and Thailand. I believe that the present disorder in China and the growing weakness of the Chinese, heretofore aggressive, would not have taken place had China's onward march through Asia not been stopped in Vietnam.

But whether I am right or wrong, this much is clear: America cannot afford to adopt an irresolute and vacillating policy in international affairs. If we do our enemies can never be convinced that we mean what we say. Harry Truman was forced to risk a war with Russia in order to convince the Russians that we meant what we said about Berlin. Kennedy had to risk an atomic war in order to convince Russia that we meant what we said about Russia maintaining atomic bases in the Western Hemisphere. The war in Vietnam, disheartening and bloody as it is, has far fewer risks. The greatest risk is to apologize and back down.

Our alienated intellectuals do not have the courage to say we should withdraw, a position I would respect however wrong it may be. Instead they think it is their function to stir up all the dissatisfaction and dissent they can and to do their best to portray the United States to the world as a stupid and brutal power unnecessarily killing thousands of people and burning villages. Their military advice is to stop shooting the enemy on the theory that if we did the gratitude of the enemy would be so great as not to take advantage of us.

It may be true that generals are not safe political advisers. But that does not mean that alienated intellectuals are safe military advisers.

Since the days of Secretary Dulles and the McCarthy era we have made one giant step toward the establishment of international law. In those days we felt it was our duty to oppose Communism with a big C. We were afraid of the infiltration of ideas. We encouraged wars of liberation in East Germany and in Hungary which were in essence revolts against the established sovereignty. Then when the citizens of a communist country did revolt, as they did in Hungary, we promptly let them down.

It is not the function of international law to reform independent sovereignties and to conduct war on Communism or any other ism. For the first time since the World War we have affirmatively recognized that principle. We are bending every effort to establish relations with communist powers. We conceive it today as our duty to get along with them. We are willing to recognize a communist government in Vietnam if it is not achieved by aggressive military force from the outside. We have stopped our policy of trying to inhibit the flow of radical ideas. This is a far cry from 1950 when the Government spent hundreds of thousands of dollars to convict Owen Lattimore because he had pointed out that the Chinese revolutionary government was a force to reckon with and to get along with. Neither an international policeman nor a local policeman should be concerned with arresting people because they had false ideas of government. If we succeed in outlawing aggressive war, then we need not be concerned with whether or not communism spreads by non-violent means.

The function of law, both domestic and international, is to suppress disorder and aggressive conduct which disrupt the processes of peaceful change and adjustment. If international law fails in this function there is no limit to the spread of disorder and violence and eventual war.

Our responsibility as guardian of the principle of international law will be a costly burden to us but it is nonsense to say that we do not have the resources to carry it. The burden on England in the 19th Century was infinitely more costly in terms of the economy of that time. To say that we do not have the resources to enforce international law against aggression and at the same time take care of poverty at home is nonsense. We not only had the resources to fight the Second World War, but we actually got rich in doing so. We went into the war in a period of depression; we came out of the war richer in terms of productive capacity than we had ever been before.

It is, after all, productive capacity that is the real wealth of a nation. Since World War II our economy has grown in terms of goods and services to produce $547 billion in 1960 and thence up to $750 billion in 1966. It is predicted that in 1970 our national product will amount to over a trillion. In terms of percentage of the gross national product our defense budget was costing us as of January of this year less than it did in 1960 when there was no Vietnamese war. The defense budget was 9.1 per cent of our gross national product in 1961. It had fallen to 8.9 per cent at the beginning of 1967. We have today, in spite of the war in Vietnam, more production—and a greater share of our production—to allocate to the war on poverty than we did five years ago.

There is no reason why we cannot carry our international burden and at the same time promote economic progress at home. We must do both. Today there is no safety at home in a lawless world. If we allocate the tremendous power of productive expansion with which the modern scientific revolution has endowed us to these two ends, the international law of the 20th century will be the gift of the United States to the world.

TORNADOES IN ILLINOIS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, recently the State of Illinois was subjected to an unfortunate disaster as April tornadoes swirled through the State leaving hundreds of Illinoisans homeless.

However, this tragedy demonstrated the great spirit of the people of Illinois as they banded together in this time of crisis.

In an article of April 24, the Christian Science Monitor pays tribute to this great public spirit. I ask unanimous consent that this article be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EVERYONE HELPED IN ILLINOIS

(By Lucia Mouat and John Allan Long)

OAK LAWN AND BELVIDERE, ILL.—Aid for tornado-ravaged towns in northern Illinois was overwhelming.

Standing in the midst of Oak Lawn's West-end Shopping Center, now smashed into twisted, muddy debris by the slamming April tornado, one saw volunteer rescue teams from miles around.

They came early and worked through the chilly, wet evening, moving trash and smashed cars from within the devastated buildings in search of survivors.

Firemen, police, rescue squads, Civil Defense, National Guard, sheriff's deputies, Salvation Army, village volunteers, Civil Air Patrol, Red Cross.

They brought dump trucks and tractors and scoops and cranes and shovels and winches to tear into the piles of broken buildings.

ORDER PRESERVED

There was a certain order and design about it all, despite the immensity of rescue operations.

The same was evident farther north in Belvidere, Ill., a pleasant middle-class community supported by the huge Chrysler plant.

Donald Saari, a former alderman, said he thought "every town within 50 miles is helping us."

"Everyone pitched in and helped beautifully," exclaimed a nurse aiding some of the hundreds injured in Belvidere. "The world is not so bad after all."

Indeed, it took an all-out effort Friday night to clear the damage left by three tornadoes which touched down in several towns in a line across northeast Illinois from Wisconsin to Michigan.

It was a day for tornadoes. A family of them skipped from west of Kansas City across northern Missouri and Iowa. They gained momentum once across the Mississippi River and swirled their fury against Illinois. Then moved across the lake and faded in Michigan and Indiana.

SCHOOL CHILDREN CAUGHT

Chicago observers said it was one of the worst disasters here in 50 years. There were an estimated 47 fatalities in Belvidere, Oak Lawn, and South Chicago. More than 1,000 were injured.

Nine high-school children were killed when one tornado struck their school in Belvidere as they boarded buses for home. Sections of the Chrysler plant were leveled as were more than 100 homes.

Another 100 homes were damaged in Lake Zurich to the east.

Half the casualties came in the small village of Oak Lawn where another tornado literally exploded through the village. A trailer park, high school, supermarkets, motel, gas stations, restaurants, shops, and at least 200 homes were destroyed. In some buildings, insides were blown out, and in others windows were pushed in.

The tornado then cut a path through South Chicago and across Lake Michigan to Rapid City, Mich., smashing dozens of other structures.

GUARD AGAINST LOOTING

It touched down on the Dan Ryan Expressway in South Chicago during the rush hour and left at least a dozen trailer trucks and cars wrecked. Traffic was backed up for 10 miles for hours.

The force of the storm was such that a wet marriage license belonging to a Belvidere couple was found 70 miles away in South Milwaukee, Wis.

Despite the thousands of volunteer helpers, there were tinges of ugliness as looting was reported in all the towns.

Cook County Sheriff Joseph Woods moved his police force into Oak Lawn and at 10 p.m. ordered his men to shoot to kill if looters were spotted.

The entire village was cordoned off with police armed with carbines. Only residents and rescue workers were allowed inside.

A reporter has to flash his identification card eight times even moving around within the disaster area so rigid were attempts to enforce the blockade.

The job of hunting survivors possibly buried in the strewn wreckage was huge. Viewed from the intersection of 95th Street and Southwest Highway in Oak Lawn, destruction was total.

WORKERS CLEAR DEBRIS

It looked like a battlefield. The tornado tore through during the evening rush hour.

By midnight, the bustle of shoppers and businessmen had been replaced by the eerie whine of ambulance sirens and the flash of red and blue lights atop police squad cars and the clatter of bricks and mortar landing in steel trucks.

Laborers shouted commands at truck drivers hauling off debris. The air was chilly, but beads of sweat trickled down their smudged faces.

"Get that truck outa here. Move it."

"Clear that stuff offa that car."

"Get off the streets of Oak Lawn, please."

"Have they brought the coffee yet?"

"Get another cat up there. Switch a lamp over here."

Those hundreds of Illinoisans whose homes were destroyed were not alone either in picking through the rubble. They found rest with neighbors or in makeshift dormitories in town buildings.

But most spent the night with friends and relatives sitting and gathering their soggy belongings and stuffing them into bags, and the bags into their cars.

People to people, towns aiding towns, Friday night after the tornadoes brought out the best in these urban dwellers—much like that record blizzard 2½ months ago.

AAU–NCAA CONTROVERSY

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I noted with interest this morning the stories carried in the Washington Post and the New York Times concerning a possible agreement in the longstanding controversy between the AAU, the USTFF, and the NCAA.

The results of the latest meeting of the Sports Arbitration Board, headed by Mr. Kheel, are encouraging. However they in no way constitute a final solution to the basic issues which are at the heart of the controversy. What is needed, more than anything, is a coordinated, good-faith effort on the part of all parties involved to settle the matter with only the best interests of the amateur athlete and the sport of track and field in mind. I am hopeful that the agreement announced this morning, which I understand is still subject to ratification by the executive boards of the respective groups, shows a beginning of this full-fledged cooperation which is so urgently needed.

However, Mr. President, as I have said earlier, I feel that yesterday's order by the board is by no means conclusory, and that legislation may still be required. I have followed this matter closely since being directly involved in the 1965 Senate Commerce Committee hearings, and I have recently introduced three separate pieces of legislation which I feel should be considered as a possible solution. I intend to cooperate very closely with the committee chairman in an effort to schedule hearings on these bills in the near future. The Pan American and Olympic games are fast approaching, and a solution must be reached.

Mr. President, let me emphasize again that legislation should be enacted only as a last resort. But while the announced agreement is encouraging, there are points which lead me to believe that it will result in only another interim truce between the parties, and not a satisfactory solution. The coordinating committee which is to be reestablished is essentially the same as a committee which was previously established by the board on November 16, 1966, and which has not functioned since that time. Second, the agreement which has been reached on sanctioning procedures, as I understand it, is to apply only to the USTFF meet which is to be held in Albuquerque, N. Mex., on June 9 and 10 of this year. It does not appear to be a long-term agreement. Third, while the reestablished coordinating committee has been granted jurisdiction to handle all disputes that come up in track and field, it has not been specifically agreed that they can issue decisions which will be binding on the parties.

Mr. President, let me applaud the efforts of the parties and of Mr. Kheel on the current agreement. However, let me also say that, in my opinion, nothing short of all-out cooperation by all concerned, or legislation, is going to settle the controversy satisfactorily. I am hopeful that hearings on my legislation can be scheduled in the near future so that Congress can provide their leadership which may be necessary to reach a solution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article from this morning's Washington Post be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Committee Reestablished—NCAA, AAU Settle Three Points in Feud

New York, May 2 (UPI).—Labor mediator Theodore Kheel and his sports arbitration board made some progress today by obtaining an agreement on three points from the National Collegiate Athletic Association (NCAA) and the Amateur Athletic Union (AAU) in their running dispute.

The two groups, at war over the control of amateur athletes in the United States for six years, agreed to reestablish a coordinating committee for track and field, giving the AAU, NCAA, United States Track and Field Federation (USTFF) and National Association of Intercollegiate Athletes (NAIA) an equal voice, one vote each.

COMMITTEE GETS DISPUTES

The NCAA and AAU also agreed to empower the coordinating committee to handle any dispute that comes up in track and field "before they get out of hand," said Kheel. "No group shall suspend athletes or take any other action without submitting the matter to the coordinating committee," Kheel emphasized.

The third point concerned the sanctioning of events. Kheel said the AAU conceded that it only has to sanction an event—not an entire meet, such as those run by the USTFF.

RYUN ISSUE TABLED

The four-man board, headed by Kheel, wound up its two-day hearing on the squabble today. Another meeting may be held next month to clear up several more points.

The main argument raised by the Rev. Wilfred H. Crowley, president of the USTFF, which is an arm of the NCAA, was the board's failure to make some decision on the AAU's lack of submission of Jim Ryun's world half-mile record—accomplished in an USTFF meet last year—for international approval.

But Kheel called Father Crowley's point out of order. They agreed it would come up later.

Another point of issue is the open and closed meets. Another meeting with the board is anticipated before the USTFF outdoor championships at Albuquerque, N.M., June 9–10, since the USTFF needs AAU approval for foreign-born students to participate.

THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I have read with interest the study paper on Vietnam done by the staff of the Republican policy committee in the Senate.

I understand that, as a staff study, it has no status as a statement of policy. In fact, the chairman of the Senate Republican policy committee is reported to have said that the document does not draw conclusions, and that he neither approves nor disapproves of it in that sense.

I submit, then, that we should review the document as one which has no official status, one which draws no conclusions, and one which many people are now increasingly reluctant to accept responsibility for. It should be read in that light.

If we ever reach the point that no one claims this report, I would like the record to show that it was not prepared by a Democratic policy committee.

It is, for the most part, a review of certain historical and policy developments related to our involvement in Vietnam. And it provides useful reminders of a number of most important events.

But I would underline that it is a most incomplete document. It deals with some matters in considerable detail. But other matters—some of the greatest significance—are either ignored completely or passed over with hardly a glance.

I want to call the attention of my colleagues to two major omissions, though there are many more.

First, let me say that I find it amazing that a paper that professes to deal with the American commitment in Southeast Asia would devote no more than a few lines to one of the foundation stones of that commitment—namely the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, commonly referred to as the SEATO pact.

That treaty—negotiated by a Republican administration, supported by a Republican administration, and resoundingly approved by the Senate with the support of both parties—reflects the primary national interest of our country in keeping Southeast Asia from being dominated by any single nation. More recently, that threat has come from mainland China, but it could come from other sources as well.

It was not the personal correspondence of Presidents that defined our commitment there. It was not the statements of Cabinet members or other officials that determined the source of our support for peoples in that area who were being subjected to aggression.

Our commitment and the source of our support for Vietnam and other neighbors is set forth clearly in the solemn treaty obligations—approved by this body—of the Southeast Asia treaty.

Let me remind you of the wording of that pledge.

Article IV reads, in part:

> Each Party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the Parties or against any State or territory which the Parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes . . .

And I would remind you, too, that in the protocol to the treaty, the parties unanimously agreed that "the free territory under the jurisdiction of the state of Vietnam" was part of the treaty area under article IV.

What I am saying is:

Let the record be complete, not partial.

If we are to be given a historical review, let it truly reflect the history of the period and of the problem it professes to deal with.

I would point out a second major omission in this treatment of the Vietnam question.

This paper seeks to emphasize that our commitment to Vietnam under President Eisenhower was limited to small-scale assistance and advice—that it expanded only under Democratic Presidents.

I would note, first, that our Nation's policy and its action at any given time must cope with the situation prevailing at that time. What is adequate in 1955, for example, may not be adequate in 1965.

And I think a report that bases itself so strongly on the position of a distinguished Republican President must, in fairness and in accuracy, address itself to the total position of that President.

It is true that President Eisenhower decided not to involve American forces in support of the French effort in 1954 to retain its colonial hold over Vietnam.

But President Eisenhower did send American military advisers and a training mission to help the Vietnamese. In his judgment that was sufficient to hold the line.

He did agree with President Diem, in 1957, that—

> Aggression or subversion threatening the political independence of the Republic of Viet-Nam would be considered as endangering peace and stability.

He did say in 1959:

> Unassisted, Viet-Nam cannot at this time produce and support the military formations essential to it or, equally important, the morale—the hope, the confidence, the pride—necessary to meet the dual threat of aggression from without and subversion within its borders.

And he added:

> We reach the inescapable conclusion that our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Viet-Nam the morale, the economic progress, and the *military strength* necessary to its continued existence in freedom.

And who is to say what President Eisenhower would have done—what he would have determined was absolutely essential to the purposes he so clearly set forth—if he had faced the problem of steadily increasing Communist subversion and aggression from the north as it developed sharply between 1959 and 1961?

What we do know is what the former President said yesterday, namely:

> America doesn't have to apologize for her part in the war—she can be proud of it.

And President Eisenhower added:

> I hope America will wake up to the fact that our soldiers are dying for something we believe in.

This is no time for the loyal opposition to be playing political games with Vietnam.

ON THE WAY TO 1984

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article entitled "On the Way to 1984," written by Prof. Henry Steele Commager, the dean of American historians, and published in the April 15 issue of the Saturday Review. Professor Commager's thought-provoking comments deserve the attention of every Member of this body, to whom I commend the article, and to the readers of the RECORD generally.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE WAY TO 1984

(By Henry Steele Commager)

George Orwell's Oceania had a vast and efficient information agency; its name was the Ministry of Truth and its purpose was to make every citizen of Oceania think the right thoughts. "The past is whatever the records agree upon," was its motto and it wrote, or rewrote, the records. Now the information agencies of our own State and Defense Departments, the USIA, and the CIA, seem bent on creating an American Ministry of Truth and imposing upon the American people a record of the past which they themselves write.

It is the CIA whose activities have been most insidious and are most notorious, but the CIA has no monopoly on brainwashing. Consider, for example, the film *Why Vietnam*. It is "one of our most popular films"; it is distributed free to high schools and colleges throughout the country, and to other groups who ask for it—as hundreds doubtless do. Its credentials are beyond reproach; it was produced by the Defense Department and sponsored by the State Department, and President Johnson, Secretary Rusk, and Secretary McNamara all pitch in to give it authenticity.

The USIA is not permitted to carry on propaganda within the United States, and the reason it is not is that the American people do not choose to give government authority to indoctrinate them. Government, they believe, already has every method of communication with the people that it can properly use. The President, members of the cabinet, the armed services—these can command attention for whatever they have to say, at any time. There is therefore no necessity, and no excuse, for government propaganda, no need for government to resort to subterfuge in its dealings with the people.

What we have always held objectionable is not overt publicity by government, but covert indoctrination, *Why Vietnam* is, in fact both. It is overt enough, but while it is clear to the sophisticated that it is a government production and therefore an official argument, the film is presented not as an argument, but as history. Needless to say it is not history. It is not even journalism. It is propaganda, naked and unashamed. As the "fact sheet" which accompanies it states, it makes "four basic points," and makes them with the immense authority of the President: that the United States is in Vietnam "to fulfill a solemn pledge," that "appeasement is an invitation to aggression," that "the United States will not surrender or retreat," and that we—but alas not the other side—are always "ready to negotiate a settlement."

Government, which represents all the people and presumably all points of view, should have higher standards than private enterprise in the presentation of news or history. But *Why Vietnam* is well below the standards of objectivity, accuracy, and impartiality which we are accustomed to in newspapers and on television; needless to say, as scholarship it is absurd. In simple, uncritical, and one-dimensional terms it presents the official view of the war in Vietnam with never a suggestion that there is or could be any other view. When Communists sponsor such propaganda, we call it "brainwashing."

Let us look briefly at this film, for it is doubtless a kind of dry run of what we will get increasingly in the future. It begins—we might have anticipated this—with a view of Hitler and Chamberlain at Munich, thus establishing at the very outset that "appeasement" is "a short cut to disaster." Because the free nations of the world failed to stop aggression in the Thirties, they almost lost their freedom and had to fight a gigantic war to survive; if we fail to stop aggression now we, too, may lose our freedom. For "we have learned at terrible cost that retreat does not bring safety and that weakness does not bring peace, and it is this lesson that has brought us to Vietnam."

Here, then, is the first distortion of history and it is a preview of what is to come throughout the film. The aggression of the great totalitarian powers in the Thirties in fact bears little analogy to the civil war in Vietnam, nor is the Geneva Agreement of 1954 to be equated with appeasement. The fact is almost precisely the opposite of that implied by *Why Vietnam*. One of President Roosevelt's objectives in the Second World War was to get the French out of Indochina; the Eisenhower objective of the Fifties was to keep them there. The French are out now and we are in, playing the role that the French played before Dienbienphu—and still fighting Ho Chi Minh.

But now the scene shifts to Vietnam. In 1954, says our narrator, "the long war is over, and the victorious Communists are moving in." It is a statement which has only the most fortuitous relation to reality. The long war was indeed over—the war between the Vietnamese and the French. But to label the Vietnamese who fought against the French "Communists" and to assume that somehow they "moved in" (they were already there) is a distortion of history. Yet there is worse to come. For next the camera is turned on to the Geneva Conference. It was, so we learn, "a victory for the Communist world," and there is no hint that we ourselves accepted the results of the Conference. Vietnam, we are told, was "divided at the 17th parallel" and there is no suggestion that the division was to be a purely temporary one. Nor is there any reminder that the Geneva Agreement called for an election, that President Eisenhower himself said that in such an election 80 per cent of the vote would have gone to Ho Chi Minh, and that we were chiefly responsible for putting off the election. No, what school children and students are given here is a one-dimensional story of a Communist conspiracy to destroy the peace of 1954. Worse yet, they are presented with the spectacle of a "reign of terror" in which "children are killed in their sleep." Clearly only Communists kill children; we don't kill children.

Now we are bemused by a scene of peace and plenty, liberty and reform, in South Vietnam. It is Eden before the fall. But staggered by the success of the South, the Communists launch "a furtive and remorseless war against the people," and Secretary Rusk is dragged in to denounce this "cruel and sustained attack." Attack by whom? Presumably by Ho Chi Minh, though this is left, safely enough, to the imagination. Nowhere is there any mention of the Vietcong, nowhere any suggestion of a civil war, and nowhere any hint that until we began a substantial military buildup in Vietnam—in violation of the Geneva Agreement—there was no invasion from the North. And, as part of that corruption of the vocabulary familiar to students of Newspeak, words like North Vietnamese and Vietcong give way to the generic word, "Communist."

But still worse is to come. What is it the "Communists" want? Shadowy hints conjure up terrors that even the narrator is reluctant to name. "The prize the Communists are after . . . South Vietnam . . . standing at the gateway to Burma, Thailand, Cambodia, East Pakistan." The imagination reels as it is, of course, meant to. For here, looming up before us, is the menace of China. Says our narrator, "Spurred by Communist China, North Vietnam's goal is to extend the Asiatic dominion of Communists." No wonder that in this phantasmagoric scene American "advisers" somehow become "fighting men," helping the outnumbered South Vietnamese resist Communist aggression. And if there are still any lingering doubts about the justice and the necessity of American participation, here are both President Johnson and Secretary McNamara to set the record straight.

Now we have a new theme: peace. "Fifteen times," no less (it is doubtless thirty by now), we have tried to open negotiations and each time we have been rebuffed. All we want—there is a note of plaintiveness here—is free elections; curiously enough, just what the Geneva Agreements called for back in 1954. All we want is to limit the war. And how do the recalcitrant Communists meet our appeals? They attack us with "high explosives aimed at American air bases." They kill little girls (picture of little girl cruelly destroyed). They even attack the United States Embassy, clearly the crowning infamy. There is a kind of inarticulate assumption that we don't do anything as unsporting as using "high explosives."

Now we are invited to take a more philosophical view of the war. Why are Americans risking life and limb in this distant jungle? That is easy. To keep American promises—indeed, "to fulfill one of the most solemn pledges" in our history, a pledge made by three Presidents, no less. Needless to say, this is nonsense. President Eisenhower refused to make such a pledge; President Kennedy insisted that the Vietnamese should fight their own war. It is President Johnson who made the pledge (though not, it might be remembered, in the campaign of 1964), and who is now busy conferring retroactive solemnity upon it.

But there is still another reason why we are in Vietnam—self-defense. For if freedom is to endure in Chicago, Birmingham, and Dallas it must be vindicated in South Vietnam. What is more it must be vindicated by us, for the non-Communist countries of Asia cannot, by themselves, resist the grasping ambitions of the Communists. What we have here is pretty clearly a rationalization of intervention against Communism everywhere, for Communism is, by definition, "grasping and ambitious." And the reason we must take on this heavy responsibility is because "there is no one else." How does it happen that there is no one else? How does it happen that except for Thailand the other members of SEATO are not taking on any responsibilities? Deponent saith not.

There is one final reason for fighting in Vietnam and it is given us, again, by President Johnson. "We intend to convince the Communists that we cannot be defeated." This has, at least, the merit of frankness; we are fighting a war to prove that we can't be defeated. It is all a bit like William James's Italian woman who stood on a street corner passing out cards saying that she had come over to America to raise money to pay her passage back to Italy, but not nearly so amusing.

We are almost through with *Why Vietnam*. Once again the audience is assured that we long for peace; once again that "as long as there are men who hate and destroy" we must keep on fighting. Perhaps even high school children are mature enough to wonder who it is who is doing the destroying. But are they mature enough to resist hate?

The dissemination of *Why Vietnam* in high schools and colleges is no isolated episode in the manipulation of public opinion by government, but part of a larger pattern. We must view it in connection with the publication program of the USIA, the clandestine activities of the CIA, and the vendetta of the Passport Office against travel to unpopular countries, or by unpopular people, as part of an almost instinctive attempt (we cannot call it anything so formal as a program) to control American thinking about foreign relations. We had supposed, in our innocence, that this sort of thing was the special prerogative of totalitarian governments, but it is clear that we were mistaken.

Forbidden by law from carrying on propaganda in the United States, the USIA has managed to circumvent this prohibition. Not only does it sponsor books that give a benign view of American policies, it cooks up the books, finds the authors, provides the materials, and subsidizes the publication. "We control the things from the very idea down to the final edited manuscript," said Reed Harris of the USIA, his contempt showing through by the use of the term "things." The CIA—it, too, is forbidden by law from operating as an intelligence agency at home—engages in much the same kind of hanky-panky; thus the article in the distinguished journal *Foreign Affairs* defending the American role in Vietnam, by George Carver—an employee of the CIA who did not bother to make that connection known to the editors of the journal or to the public. How many other articles of this nature have been planted or insinuated in American magazines we do not know. One of the worst features of this clandestine activity is that it exposes the entire publishing and scholarly enterprise to suspicion.

It is, needless to say, not the sponsorship, but the secrecy that is the pervasive and irremediable vice. If books and articles sponsored by government agencies were openly acknowledged for what they are, they could be judged on their merits, which are often substantial. In the absence of such acknowledgement they are a fraud upon the public. What is needed is a Truth in Packaging Act for the United States Government.

What is perhaps most surprising is that many of those involved in these subterranean activities seem unable to understand what is wrong about them. They defend them on the ground that, after all, the Communists use deception, too, and we must fight fire with fire. They seem, many of them, wholly unable to grasp the essential point: the corruption of the democratic process. All of these attempts to control the minds of the American people in order to win the cold war violate the two great Kantian moral imperatives: to conduct yourself so that your every act can be generalized into a universal principle, and to regard every human being as an end in himself, never as merely a means to an end.

Consider the first imperative. We can generalize the particular policies which the CIA, USIA, and Defense Department have adopted into three principles.

First, and most elementary, if government can indoctrinate schoolchildren, and their parents, about foreign policy it may, with equal logic, indoctrinate them about domestic policy. If the USIA and the CIA can sponsor books and finance organizations to fight Communism they may, with equal justification, sponsor books and finance organizations to fight "socialism" or the "welfare state" or anything else that they think odious. Congress has quite deliberately withheld such powers from these and other organizations; if they circumvent these prohibitions will we not have an end to genuine freedom of choice in American politics?

Second, if government can carry war propaganda into the classroom—even without a formal war—may it not with equal logic carry any other propaganda into the classroom? And if it has this power, what will happen to the American principle that the national government has no control over the substance of what is taught in the schools? If the principle of indoctrination of schoolchildren is once firmly established, may we not end up with the Napoleonic philosophy of public education—that the overarching purpose of schools is to produce loyal patriots?

Third, if government can control the thinking of its citizens it can control everything else. Americans pride themselves on their tradition of "free enterprise," and some of them go so far as to equate free enterprise with "the American system." But the only free enterprise that counts, in the long run, is intellectual enterprise, for if that dries up all individual enterprise dries up. A government that can control the thinking of its citizens can silence criticism and destroy initiative, and a government that is exempt from the pressures of criticism and of political initiative is one that is in training for tyranny.

Governmental malpractices of thought control violate, just as clearly, the second categorical imperative: to treat all men as ends, never as means. For to exploit the integrity of school and university, science and scholarship, to the dubious ends of ideological conflict, is to subvert the very foundations of our civilization and our moral order.

The reason we are trying to win the contest with Communism, and indeed with all forms of injustice and oppression, is because we believe in the virtue of freedom, of the open mind, of the unimpeded search for truth. These are not only our ultimate ends; they are, equally, the indispensable means whereby we hope to achieve these ends. If we corrupt all of this at the very source we may indeed win the immediate contest with "Communism" and lose the cause for which we are fighting. If we triumph over the enemy with the weapons of deceit and subversion we employ his weapons, embrace his standards, and absorb his principles.

Without intellectual freedom—uncontaminated, unimpeachable, and categorical—we cannot achieve the ends to which our society is dedicated. This is ultimately why we cannot tolerate activities of governmental agencies which, whatever their alleged justification, repudiate and paralyze the principles of freedom.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT AND MASSACHUSETTS SENATE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to present, on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Massachusetts, a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts General Court and a resolution adopted by the Massachusetts Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the two resolutions be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from fifteen hundred dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars

Whereas, Under present regulations, those persons receiving social security benefits are not permitted to earn more than fifteen hundred dollars in any one year without a decrease in payments received by them; and

Whereas, Many of the persons receiving such payments are almost totally dependent upon them for their living expenses; and

Whereas, The cost of living has increased substantially so that the benefits referred to are now totally inadequate; and

Whereas, An increase of allowable annual earnings from fifteen hundred dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars will enable such persons to retain their self respect; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from fifteen hundred dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

Norman L. Pidgeon,
Clerk.

House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Resolution

Memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing a tax credit for college tuition payments

Whereas, The cost of a college education has increased markedly in recent years; and

Whereas, The burden of paying for such education is becoming increasingly difficult to bear; therefore be it

Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing a tax credit for college tuition payments; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the

United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

House of Representatives, adopted, April 11, 1967.

William C. Maiers,
Clerk.

Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 13, 1967.

Norman L. Pidgeon,
Clerk.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, and the American Constitution of March 4, 1789, both recognize the sovereignty of the people as the cornerstone of their respective governments. In the United States, democratic principles have been upheld as the single most important element in the political composition of this country, whereas in Poland, they have been stifled, not by Poles, but by alien power.

No doubt the Polish patriot, Tadeusz Kosciuszko, who fought in America's Revolutionary War as an aide to General Washington, would echo the words of Thomas Jefferson if he were to witness the contemporary scene in Poland:

> The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

It is especially pertinent to refer to these principles of freedom and liberty as we honor the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution. The Poles had written democratic reforms into the law of the land as a first step toward constitutional democracy. Although these courageous efforts were to be short-lived, they remain a testimony to the farsightedness of the Polish patriots. History may yet witness the fulfillment of thwarted Polish goals. To this end, we lend the Poles our support and encouragement. May the ideals and the spirit of the Constitution of May 3 become a fact and not merely a hope.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, free citizens of Polish origin throughout the world today are celebrating the anniversary of the Polish Constitution, adopted on May 3, 1791. It is an outrage to all who cherish freedom and independence that those who live in Poland under Communist rule today must observe their national holiday in obedient silence.

Poland was one of the earliest pioneers of constitutional government in Europe. On this day in 1791, Poland provided constitutional rule to substitute for an earlier system which deprived its citizens of the way of life they desired. Since then, many foreign invaders threatened the Polish people and their Constitution, but representative government prevailed until communism dominated the country after the Second World War.

America, in giving voice to the aspirations of free Poles, must dedicate itself to preserve and protect the freedom of all countries. I join the 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry in reaffirming our faith in the right of all people to have a representative form of government.

COMMEMORATIONS OF POLISH HISTORY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Polish history has been rich in its contributions to the cultural, educational, and political progress of the world.

This year marks the historic anniversaries of three outstanding Polish citizens: the 50th anniversary of the death of Henry Sienkiewics, author of the immortal novel "Quo Vadis"; the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, discoverer of radium; and the 150th anniversary of the passing of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, outstanding Polish patriot whose vibrant leadership abilities aided the American victory in our Revolutionary War.

I recognize all of these outstanding landmarks in Polish history, as well as the commemoration of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791, a national holiday of those Poles who long for a free and independent Poland.

My best wishes are extended to the Polish-American Congress, which represents approximately 10 million Americans of Polish origin, for their continued success in preserving the hopes for a free and democratic Poland, ever reminding us of the outstanding contributions their forebears have made to the world.

CAPITOL PRESERVATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Houston Chronicle of April 28 published a cogent editorial in support of the preservation of the U.S. Capitol and of comprehensive planning for the space needs of Congress in the future. The bill discussed in the editorial is S. 1590, introduced by me on April 20. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress Can Benefit From Planning

Texas Sen. Ralph Yarborough has wisely introduced a bill to curb the plans of those who wish to tear down the west front of the U.S. Capitol and extend the building.

The scheme came to light at the tail end of the last session of Congress when the architect of the Capitol urged that $43 million be spent to rip off the front which faces the mall in Washington, add three dining rooms and office space.

The plan was temporarily stalled but under present congressional rules it can be approved by a commission consisting of the vice-president, three members of Congress and the architect. Yarborough's bill provides that any project to alter the proportions, change the size or modify the Capitol in a substantial way must be specifically authorized by Congress.

The bill would also create a Capitol Building Commission to make a study of the future space needs of Congress and recommend a detailed and comprehensive development plan.

Both of the bill's major provisions make good sense. As Sen. Yarborough pointed out, the Capitol is an architectural masterpiece and one of the most important historical buildings in the nation. Any changes should be carefully considered.

The senator says the proposed changes would not satisfy Congress' need for space in the future, so action should be taken now to provide the means for sensible, rational planning. He's right.

JOSEPH KRAFT'S OBSERVATION ON VIETNAM

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. Joseph Kraft has recently returned from Vietnam. He is one of the very few observers having the intelligence and background to understand what is taking place in that unfortunate land, and to have the courage to express his conclusions publicly, in writing, for all to see.

After the rousing, cheering ovation given to General Westmoreland last week by everyone from the President to the Governors to the Members of Congress and their clerks, it takes a very brave man indeed to discuss objectively and dispassionately the situation as it really exists in Vietnam.

As he so often does, Mr. Kraft directly and clearly describes the situation as it exists, without confusing the issue with irrelevancies.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Kraft's article entitled "The Organization General," published in the Washington Post, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Organization General

(By Joseph Kraft)

To return from Vietnam and find Gen. William Westmoreland being treated as a conquering hero is a staggering experience.

For in blaming the continuing war on American public opinion, Gen. Westmoreland has covered up a true failure in Vietnam—a failure of which he is certainly mindful, and, perhaps, a chief author.

I mean the failure to make the South Vietnamese army a fit fighting force.

This failure finds expression at every level. The ordinary Vietnamese soldier, for example, has as his chief task the maintenance of security in the countryside.

But for a complex of reasons having to do with low pay, poor morale, little sense of duty, most ordinary Vietnamese soldiers are unequal to that task. Despite years of highfalutin' talk about "civic action" by American advisers, the Vietnamese soldiers are still to be found stealing chickens and abusing the peasants they are supposed to protect.

At the command level, Vietnamese officers are supposed to contest Vietcong control of the countryside at night. But most of the officers are city boys with little knowledge of the areas they patrol.

Many Vietnamese units do not dare to spend nights in villages they are assigned to protect. Even when the villages are attacked, protecting forces venture forth in pursuit only after daybreak. It is a mark of combativeness that only one general in the Vietnamese army, Chief of Staff Cao Van Vien, has been wounded in action in the course of his career.

At the very highest level, the Vietnamese army is still organized as it was when it was set up by American advisers back in 1954 to oppose a Korean style invasion. Its structure features units such as army corps and divisions which put a premium on large scale operations with heavy equipment. It is typical that, not a guerrilla fighter, but an air force pilot, Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, would emerge as the leader of a military government.

These shortcomings are an open secret in Saigon and even in Washington. To remedy them, indeed, there is under way a major shakeup in the American military command. Gen. Creighton Abrams is going out to Saigon as deputy to Gen. Westmoreland with the special mission of shaping up the South Vietnamese forces.

As to Gen. Westmoreland's responsibility for their present condition, I cannot speak with any first-hand knowledge. But his critics in Saigon make no bones about the matter.

They see Westmoreland as a product of the modern army—half soldier, half executive. They say that his approach to a problem is to develop a staff to handle it. They think of him as "the organization general," "the Fearless Fosdick of the U.S. Army," "a square among squares."

The positive side of these traits is logistical. Everybody gives Westmoreland full marks for carrying out a remarkably large and rapid build-up of American forces without any of the usual military goofs.

But the orthodox mangerial qualities so useful in deploying American forces have nothing to do with the spirit of innovation and sociological engagement required to reform the forces of a backward nation. Gen. Westmoreland, according to his critics, has shown no talent, and little interest, in the matter of the Vietnamese army. It is said to be typical that it is the Marine Corps, not the Army, which is working closely with the Vietnamese soldiers in the combined action companies, or CAC.

The point at issue, of course, is not the caliber of Westmoreland as a commander. The point is that in searching for the source of trouble in Vietnam, it does no good to look abroad to this country, or the allies, or China, or Russia.

That is only a kind of excuse-making, a sort of alibi-hunting. The true trouble lies in thousands of unrighted wrongs on the ground in South Vietnam. And the sooner that point is understood, the better.

CHILD OF A REVOLUTION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, the Communists in China and elsewhere have had the opportunity to educate a new generation; to imbue them with a hatred of the West, hostility to free speech and private property, and with a desire to serve in the cause of communizing the world.

In fact, many in our country point to the success of Communist education as though it were final. We frequently hear it said that while in our own society young men and women believe in nothing, the young people in Communist countries are dedicated and committed.

It is especially interesting, therefore, to consider the material contained in a recent book entitled "The Thought Revolution" which was written by a young Chinese, Tung Ch-Ping, with the assistance of Humphrey Evans.

In May 1964, Tung fled from the Red Chinese Embassy in Burundi and asked for asylum in the United States. He was only 24 years old and was a child of 9 when the forces of Mao Tse-tung took over Shanghai.

Mr. Reed J. Irvine notes in a review of this book that this young man was "not one of the irreconcilables from the old regime, but had been educated by the Communists almost from the beginning of his school career." If the Communists were as effective in molding the minds of the young as we had been led to believe, how did it happen that this young man seized the first opportunity he had to defect?

Many incidents in his education led Tung to the conclusion that Communists and communism were not what they pretended to be. His favorite teacher in high school, for example, was an elderly lady named Miss Pan. She voiced criticism of teachers' salaries during the Hundred Flowers Campaign in the spring of 1957. Criticisms were being invited, and Miss Pan had pointed out that previously teachers had received regular salary increases, but that now such increases were rare. When the crackdown came, Miss Pan was declared a rightist and was sent to work on the Amoy railroad as a coolie. She died within a few months.

Other things contributed to his new understanding. One of his classmates, Sun, thought that he was doing his duty to the party by exposing one of its members as a vicious intriguer. The result:

> The tables were turned, and it was Sun who was put on trial for having brought false charges against a party member. The students found themselves forced to "struggle against" Sun, which meant heaping abuse and denunciation upon him in a marathon meeting.

Tung writes of Sun's bewildered reaction in this way:

> He had participated frequently in these hate orgies but he had always believed that the victims deserved what they got. This was the first time he had endured the torment, and he knew that it was unjust. He refused to accept the criticism; he pleaded with us to stop lying and to tell the truth of what originally had been told to him . . . we were encouraged to hit him with our fists and to spit on him. When we left him, he was sprawled on the floor, face down, sobbing.

Tung was one sensitive young man who came to understand the duplicity inherent in communism, and on his first night at the Red Chinese Embassy in Burundi he escaped to the American Embassy and found freedom in the West. His story is the story of many young Chinese, and of many other young men and women who suffer under communism.

To those who hold that communism involves no more denial of freedom to the people of China than did previous Chinese governments, Mr. Irvine states the following:

> What the authors of these superficial observations on the Chinese scene do not realize is the tremendous importance of freedom from being compelled to engage in offensive, nonsensical and hypocritical activities, not to mention the freedom from compulsion to say that black is white. A regime can be authoritarian and still permit people to retain their integrity and self-respect. It can permit those who find that they cannot stand the restraints imposed on them the freedom of existence.

This review appeared in the March-April issue of The Intercollegiate Review. The author is advisor to the Division of International Finance, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

I wish to share this review with other Senators, and therefore ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Child of a Revolution

(By Reed J. Irvine, Adviser, Division of International Finance, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, with responsibility for economic research on Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The views expressed in this essay do not necessarily represent those of the Board of Governors.)

"The Thought Revolution," by Tung Chi Ping and Humphrey Evans. New York: Coward-McCann, 1966. $5.)

In May 1964, the story that a Communist Chinese diplomat had fled from the Red Chinese embassy in Burundi and had asked for asylum in the United States was front-page news. The defector was only 24 years old, and only a child of nine when the forces of Mao Tse-tung took over Shanghai. He was not one of the irreconcilables from the old regime, but had been educated by the communists almost from the beginning of his school career. If the communists were as effective in molding the minds of the young as we had been led to believe, how did it happen that this young man seized the first opportunity he had to defect? And why did he choose to flee to a country that had been portrayed to him daily as the most evil land in the world.

The young defector, Tung Chi-Ping, with the able assistance of Humphrey Evans, has provided us with the answers to these questions and to a good many more in his book, *The Thought Revolution*. Tung's story is both fascinating and moving. It gives us for the first time a detailed, eye-witness account of how the communists in China went about trying to mold the new communist man from the youthful clay that fell into their hands when they seized control from the demoralized Nationalist regime. Moreover, it casts considerable light on China's newest scourge, the Red Guard.

Tung Chi-Ping's story offers some reason to believe that we have tended to overestimate greatly the effectiveness of the "educational" efforts of the totalitarians. It is not just that the communist techniques failed to make a devoted communist of Tung; what is most interesting and encouraging is why they failed to work.

Tung obviously considers himself to be reasonably representative of the young people that he left behind in Communist China, and the reader of his book comes away agreeing with him. The reason is that Tung shows that nearly all the Chinese, even the dullest-witted peasants, sense that they have been tricked and deceived by the Communists. Nothing stirs greater resentment than those who victimize, and one cannot read Tung's account of the victimization of the Chinese people without a feeling of deep revulsion toward those responsible.

Tung concedes that he and his people were at first impressed by the communists, believing that they were well disciplined, tolerant and just. At first their behavior appeared to confirm this, but before long people began to realize the communists' hypocrisy. Those who did not realize this soon got into trouble.

One of the most important lessons that had to be learned in the "new China" was that truth was subjective, not objective. To discover the "truth" one had to be clever about divining the thoughts of the Party leaders, and this was complicated by the fact that the words they spoke did not always represent their actual thoughts.

For example, Tung tells of the great tragedy that befell one of his classmates, Sun, who was the only person he knew who actually believed the Party propaganda. Sun took seriously the claim that the Party leadership was responsive to the will of the masses. Knowing that Sai-li, the chairman of the class branch of the Youth League, was a vicious intriguer who was universally disliked by the other students, he thought it his duty to expose this fact and have her unseated. He gathered testimony from all the students and had a meeting convened to hear the charges. Unfortunately he failed to take into account the fact that Ssi-li had just been admitted to membership in the Communist Party, and when the chips were down, the students who had poured out their complaints to Sun were afraid to admit that they had ever said anything against her. The tables were turned, and it was Sun who was put on trial for having brought false charges against a Party member. The students found themselves forced to "struggle against" Sun, which meant heaping abuse and denunciation upon him in a marathon meeting. Tung writes of Sun's bewildered reaction as follows,

"He had participated frequently in these hate orgies, but he had always believed that the victims deserved what they got. This was the first time he had endured the torment, and he knew that it was unjust. He refused to accept the criticism; he pleaded with us to stop lying and to tell the truth of what originally had been told to him concerning Ssi-li. Finally, we were encouraged to hit him with our fists and to spit on him. When we left him, he was sprawled on the floor, face down, sobbing."

The experience literally drove Sun mad. Sun knew that he was right, and he had good reason to believe that the Party officials knew it also. He could not reconcile this knowledge with his naive faith in the Party propaganda. His mind snapped under the strain. The other students had no difficulty understanding why the Party protected Ssi-li, Tung explains,

"They (the Party leaders) would have been suspicious of her if she had been genuinely liked; this would have indicated that she sided with the masses against the communists."

Tung himself had learned early that it was dangerous to tell the Communists the truth even when they asked for it. His favorite teacher in high school, an elderly lady named Miss Pan, had ventured to voice a criticism of teachers' salaries during the Hundred Flowers Campaign in the Spring of 1957. Criticisms were being invited, and Miss Pan had pointed out that previously teachers had received regular salary increases, but that now such increases were rare. When the crackdown came on those who had ventured to criticize, Miss Pan was declared to be rightist. She was sent to work on the Amoy railroad as a coolie and she died within a few months.

Another of Tung's teachers quoted in class an early poem of Mao Tse-tung's in which Mao boasted that his accomplishments would be greater than those of China's best hero-emperors. A "progressive" student reported that the teacher had read this sarcastically, with the result that this teacher also was declared to be a rightist and was sentenced to manual labor on a cooperative farm.

But it was not enough just to refrain from criticism. One also had to be enthusiastic. One of Tung's teachers was subjected to the "struggle" process because he was guilty of doing his work competently but without enough feeling. He was subjected to hours of public criticism until he confessed his supposed errors, praised the Party and Chairman Mao for showing him his mistake, and swore to reform. Tung says it was like beating a man for not smiling, beating him until he did open his lips and show his teeth.

Another personal experience in high school taught Tung the grave danger of uttering an objective truth. His high school class had been assigned to work picking cotton in a commune. The students hated the work, and the peasants hated the students, but the night before they were to return to the city, a commune official announced that the students had unanimously demanded to be allowed to work another two weeks, and the authorities were bowing to their will. Both the students and the peasants protested this "unanimous" decision, with such vigor that the extra period was cut to one week. However, at the end of the week the students were compelled to hold a "struggle meeting" to criticize each other. They made the mistake of including in the criticism a classmate whose father was a general in the People's Liberation Army. He was very lazy and took full advantage of his father's position to avoid work and study, and all the criticisms made of him had the distinction of being true. But it was intolerable that the truth should be told. The Party showed its displeasure by ordering an intense struggle against the class leader.

"The cadres would accept nothing less than screaming frenzy from us. We also were encouraged to strike the ex-class chief with our fists and to spit on him. We were permitted to stop only when we were exhausted. Thereupon the cadres accepted the "will of the masses" and our classmate was sentenced to be expelled from the school and was sent to manual labor in clearing virgin land on the northwest frontier. Everyone in the class was sick with revulsion."

Tung later received another valuable lesson from one of his classmates in how to succeed in the topsy-turvy world in which he found himself. The students were working in another commune, and one of their jobs was to interview the peasants to find out what they were thinking. Tung worked with a student who was a very experienced informer. They found that the bitterness and animosity of the peasants seemed limitless. Everywhere they were told that the Communists had broken their promises, had robbed them, cheated them and lied to them. Tung was amazed that they dared be so critical, but they apparently spoke out because they felt that things could not possibly be made any worse; they had nothing to lose but their chains. Tung's more experienced colleague wrote their report. It read,

"Having talked to our quota of families, we can say without any hesitation that the Party's rural policies are warmly welcomed by the peasants. In every household, enthusiasm of unmistakable sincerity was expressed for the commune system."

The Party considered this a "brilliant" report. The fact that Tung was co-signer was interpreted as evidence of his progress in heightening his political consciousness.

This is reminiscent of an incident that occurred in the Soviet Embassy in Rangoon, Burma, recounted by Aleksandr Kaznacheev in his book, *Inside a Soviet Embassy*. An Embassy officer wrote an accurate report on the visit to Rangoon of Poland's President Cyrankiewicz, saying that the Poles had ignored the Soviet Embassy, had failed to mention the Soviet Union in their speeches and in general demonstrated black ingratitude to the Soviets. This report almost ruined the officer's career. A more experienced officer was ordered to revise the report, and it came out praising the visit as a great success and ended with this statement, "All attempts on the part of native reactionary elements to spoil the close relations established between the visiting Polish delegation and the Soviet Embassy have ended in complete failure.[1]

The Chinese and Russian Communists may not see eye to eye on many things, but they share a preference for twisting the facts to fit their conception of what reality ought to be. Tung discovered that this was the key to survival, and though it necessitated doing many things that went against the grain, he preferred survival to martyrdom. He was aided by the communist doctrine that the children of the lower classes were inherently superior to those of the upper classes.

Tung was from a proletarian family, but he received valuable guidance from a brilliant classmate, Hu. Hu was given rough treatment and low grades by the teachers, which he explained saying, "I have a loathsome, incurable, hereditary disease. My father is—was—a rich industrialist." Hu found that he could survive only by pretending that the communist environment was changing his nature and was gradually making him into the perfect communist man. This pleased the Communists immensely since it appeared to prove that environment determined human nature, one of their articles of faith. Hu had no hope of escape, because of his background. He could never be trusted to leave the country. But Tung was able to get an assignment to the Chinese Embassy in Burundi, where he spent one night before making his break for freedom.

There was no doubt in Tung's mind where he should go to seek freedom. It was to the embassy of that country that had been most fiercely reviled in all the propaganda of the communists that he had been subjected to since 1949. The enemies of his enemy, the communists, had to be his friends.

What kind of freedom was he seeking?

Western intellectuals are all too often inclined to think of freedom only in terms of electoral machinery and the right to express dissenting political views. This is why they frequently argue that it is meaningless to talk about the communists depriving the people of their freedom because most people in Asia have never known freedom. For example, two books on China, whose authors had been much impressed by the evidence they saw that the people of China were enthusiastic, dedicated supporters of the communist regime, inspired a *New York Times* reviewer to make this comment.

The sacrifice of a freedom the Chinese never had in any effective sense—the freedom of individual dissent—and of an economic system based on profit (which benefited very few Chinese), does not in China seem a high price to pay for the sense of unity, dedication and identification which, both writers testify, runs through every governmental official.[2]

What the reviewer and the authors of these superficial observations on the Chinese scene clearly do not realize is the tremendous importance of freedom from being compelled to engage in offensive, nonsensical, and hypocritical activities, not to mention the freedom from compulsion to say that black is white. A regime can be authoritarian and still permit most people to retain their integrity and self-respect. It can permit those who find that they cannot stand the restraints imposed on them the freedom of exit. The communist regime is the first in China that has had both the will and the means to eliminate these most essential freedoms—the freedom from forced irrationality, the freedom to be silent and the freedom to leave.

Being compelled to do what is shameful or ridiculous, such as inventing false charges to hurl against associates to prove one's devotion to the Party, or working oneself to the point of exhaustion to feed a backyard steel furnace that produces only worthless metal, is tolerable only to one who has neither sense nor character.

Tung is confident that the Chinese people still have both sense and character. In commenting on an American columnist's remark that the Chinese people are possessed by revolutionary fervor, he wrote:

"The Chinese people are possessed by revolutionary fervor about as much as the prisoners in one of your penitentiaries. Their keepers can put them through the motions, but if they could throw their keepers out, there would be dancing in the streets, just as there was in Ghana when they got rid of Nkrumah."

---

[1] Aleksandr Kaznacheev, *Inside a Soviet Embassy* (Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1962), p. 45.

[2] *New York Times*, May 18, 1966.

What are the possibilities that this may happen? Tung gives a very good description of the conflict between the "leftists" and the "rightists" that has been going on within the Chinese Communist Party for the past decade. He writes,

"The group of top leaders could be viewed as divided into two groups, the 'reds' and the 'experts.' The reds were the old revolutionaries. Few of them were well educated, but they were fanatic about Marxist theories. The members of the other group, while politically pure enough, were essentially specialists in such fields as agriculture, say, or administration, foreign affairs, and industry. In the process whereby national policy was decided, the reds were rigidly doctrinaire; they followed a literal interpretation of Marxist-Leninist dogma, and they therefore were generally more 'leftist.' The 'experts' however, tended to look at a situation more realistically (instead of seeing it as Marx or Lenin had said it ought to be) and to react to it in a more logical way; because they tended to adapt theory to the situation instead of interpreting the situation on the basis of theory, they were comparatively 'rightists.'"

What we are seeing today is an intense struggle between these two factions. The "leftists" are endeavoring to crush the more pragmatic wing of the Party. The Red Guards are being used in much the same way that Tung and his classmates were used in the "Two Anti Campaign" of 1958, when they were herded out of the classrooms to demonstrate and shout frenzied slogans.

"We would not know what it was about until the next day. We would learn that we had risen 'spontaneously' to protest some imperialist affront or some comment by an imperialist leader."

Today it is the leaders of the "rightist" faction of the Party who are the target of the denunciatory slogans.

The surfacing of this conflict in the dramatic form it has taken the past several months stands as confirmation of the accuracy of Tung's observations about the tensions that have long been concealed within the fabric of the Chinese communist regime. These developments have clearly shown how foolish and naive these visitors to China were who saw nothing in the eyes of the people but "the sense of unity, dedication and identification which . . . runs through every strata of Chinese society." These writers were inclined to caution us not to think that the Chinese people share our value system, that we should not think that what was reprehensible to us was necessarily distasteful to them.

What Tung tells us has the truer ring. For one thing, nothing he has written has been made to look foolish by the events that have transpired since his words appeared in print. To be sure, the Chinese value system differs from that of the Western countries in many important respects, but the Chinese people share with people everywhere a deepseated need to harmonize their ideas and actions with reality as they see it. Even the leaders have this need, as is evidenced by their preference for false reports telling them that reality conforms to what their ideas say it should be.

At the moment, those who are farthest detached from reality appear to have the upper hand, and the leaders of the more pragmatic wing of the Party are confessing their past sins. The schools, which devoted little enough time to academic pursuits in Tung's day, have now been closed completely for a year, with the dubious aim of making the students "redder."

There is no reason to think that the young people are happy about this situation any more than Tung's classmates were happy about the cruel and senseless way in which they were treated. The Red Guards in Peking are reported to be "cold, hungry and visibly bored . . . they sleep in unfinished buildings and spend their days wandering aimlessly through the city, gathering at intervals to recite Maoist aphorisms."[3]

Badly needed is someone who can lead the people out of the Maoist wilderness and into a world where objective truth is honored and at least a minimal degree of freedom is restored. No such leader is now in sight, but certainly if he emerges, he will not lack for followers.

SUMMER PROGRAMS FOR YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I want to commend President Johnson for his decision to seek an additional $75 million for use by the Office of Economic Opportunity in the current fiscal year to support summer programs for young people throughout the Nation. I call on the Congress to support his request.

It is important that the President's request for a supplemental appropriation be kept in proper focus. This is not a grab for additional money to carry out the overall strategy against poverty.

It reflects, instead, the need for even greater antipoverty effort among young people in the summer.

Out of school and out of work, these young people from impoverished families are rich in only one thing—time. They have the time to do almost anything they want.

This appropriation will support programs designed to see that they use that time wisely; that they will reap from this summer's experience a knowledge and an awareness and an uplifted spirit that will enable them to battle the causes of poverty that bind them.

The appropriation will provide training and jobs for 75,000 more young Americans than are now being assisted in the economic opportunity program. It will permit more than 1 million to enjoy new recreational opportunities. And in many areas it will provide the funds necessary to keep schools, libraries, and playgrounds open, to build swimming pools, and to light basketball courts and baseball diamonds.

Much is being done in this Nation by State and local governments and by private organizations and citizens to make the summer meaningful—in a long-term way—but more must be done and that extra push must come from a Congress prepared to show its concern.

I am concerned and I hope that others in this body are also.

EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM ON ROSEBUD SIOUX INDIAN RESERVATION

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, so often we are reminded that the American Indian is the forgotten man in our society. Tribal officials from all over the country have come to Washington to attest to the appalling conditions existing on our Indian reservations and to ask for help from the Federal Government in solving some of these problems. Our record for giving this much needed help has not always been adequate.

However, I am delighted that we have a new experimental program on the 900,000-acre Rosebud Sioux Indian Reservation in south-central South Dakota, which is helping a great deal. This program is being conducted jointly by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Public Health Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs in cooperation with the Rosebud Tribal Council.

The objective is to transfer Indians from tents, shacks, and other substandard housing into simple low-cost houses equipped with electricity, water, and bath fixtures. Also, it is an attempt to determine if low-cost prefabricated housing made available to the needy at a nominal cost offers a solution to housing problems.

This type of experimental program is long overdue, and I commend the cooperative efforts of these Federal agencies in such a worthwhile program. At this point, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an excellent article in the April 13, 1967, National Observer by Tom Allen which describes this program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDDING HOPE AND THE ROSEBUD INDIANS

(By Tom Allan)

ROSEBUD, S. DAK.—*"Anpo wicharpi,"* an Indian expression meaning dawn of a new day, is the motto adopted by the Rosebud Sioux Indians for the new project now under way here on their 900,000-acre reservation in south-central South Dakota.

The program involves the transfer of Indians from tents, shacks, dirt-floored log huts, and even discarded ranch chicken coops to simple yet low-cost houses. The houses come complete with electricity and, for the first time in the life of many reservation Rosebud Sioux, tap water, bathtubs, and indoor toilet facilities.

A HOUSING EXPERIMENT

The experiment is being conducted jointly by the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Department of Housing and Urban Development, the Public Health Service, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs in co-operation with the Rosebud Tribal Council. The program is an attempt to discover if low-cost, prefabricated housing, given or made available to the poor at nominal cost, offers a solution to the housing problem faced by the poor in any area.

Each house, specially designed for Indian needs, is a 22-foot by 28-foot, prefabricated, plywood-paneled structure with two bedrooms, a kitchen, living room, and a bath. Each has a total of 620 square feet of living space. Heat is furnished by wood, oil, or propane-gas stove, according to the resident's preference.

The $1,893,000 experiment has a twofold impact on the area. The 375 homes are being prefabricated in a tribal plant at the reservation headquarters here. On-the-job training in building crafts and employment is provided for 17 tribesmen in the plant and another 53 in field-construction crews.

Officials say the experiment involves a first in Government housing programs. Instead of being built in a complex, the homes are built where residents want them throughout the reservation. However, in communities such as Two Strike and Spring Creek, deep in pine-studded valleys, the Rosebud Sioux are having their houses built as close to each other as were their shacks and tents. The new homes nearing completion there are in marked contrast to the hovels and "squaw coolers" nearby. A "squaw cooler" is a pavilion with a pine-bough roof, open on all sides, into which the squaw moves her family and chores during the hot summer months to escape the heat of the usually windowless huts and shacks.

---

[3] *Washington Post*, January 1, 1967, p. 1.

One of the program's requirements is that the old shacks, tents, and cabins must be removed within 30 days of occupancy of the new home. Planting and landscaping is included in the completed units.

The Indians will furnish their own homes. Although the homes, which cost an average of $3,200, are a Government grant, residents are required to pay a $5-a-month fee to a tribal housing authority for five years. The money will be used for playgrounds and other community developments.

Last week 50 of the 375 units were nearing completion and 12 families have already moved into their strange new homes, where they are receiving instructions from a special tribal education committee on the use of indoor facilities.

ANTICIPATING DECENT HOMES

Chosen by the Indians to be chief administrator of the transitional homes experiment is the Jesuit parish priest here, the Rev. Richard Pates, a former assistant high-school principal in Omaha, Neb.

"We chose the *anpo wicharpi* motto for the project because for these people this housing means a breakthrough," says Father Pates. "They now are looking forward to living in a decent home with ordinary conveniences. This provides them with a new image of family life and gives them a new place in society."

Says Bernard T. Craun, director of the demonstration program: "We cannot say definitely at this time whether this program will spread throughout the nation to other poverty-stricken areas. But I can assure you that we certainly do not institute a demonstration program unless it is applicable to other areas."

AN ADJUSTED PARITY INDEX

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in 1964 the Department of Agriculture began issuing its adjusted parity ratio index on an annual basis. Beginning this month they are issuing a monthly adjusted parity ratio index. They will continue the regular parity ratio index, of course, just as they have done in the past.

I for one am glad to see the adjusted parity ratio issued on a monthly basis. It gives farmers—and the public—one more yardstick with which to measure their well-being or lack of it.

What the adjusted index does, in essence, it to add to the basic parity formula various direct Government payments that farmers receive. This year these payments will total roughly $3 billion and will equal some 7 percent of the farmers' total market receipts. These payments are not included in the regular parity price formula, and to this extent the formula does not give a true picture of the farmers' position compared to preceding years, before payments were used, when returns came almost exclusively from the marketplace.

The reason the adjusted index was devised, back in 1964, is that a basic shift in farm commodity legislation had occurred. There has been a further shift in the past 3 years, with enactment of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

Under the new programs, American farm products are priced to compete in world markets. Direct payments are used to adjust production and bolster farm income. As one consequence, our total commercial exports for dollars exceeded $5 billion last year. Feed grains became the No. 1 dollar earner among all American exports, including industrial products.

The programs we operate under today are vastly different than the programs of the thirties, forties, and fifties. Because of the differences, the old, unrevised parity index did not give a complete picture of conditions.

The two figures were released at 3 p.m. yesterday afternoon. The parity index on the old basis for April is 72. The preliminary adjusted parity index for the same period, which includes program payments, is 77.

Both figures are valuable as benchmarks and for this reason, I believe the new monthly adjusted parity index will be useful.

THE MOST IMPORTANT WAR

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, I recently wrote an article for Look magazine on the world food problem which stimulated a great deal of correspondence. I wish it were possible to share a considerable part of that mail with members for it reflects the deep feeling with which many Americans support our food-for-peace program. My faith in my fellow men is always kindled anew by the humanitarianism—the sincere desire of the average American citizen to help his fellow men—which is evidenced in my mail.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks just one letter out of hundreds which I have received. It is from a 19-year-old girl who is in Honduras with her father, a doctor, helping to operate a clinic and a children's nutrition hospital. Aileen was unknown to me until I received her letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. McGOVERN. It is a letter from an obviously wonderful young citizen describing very simply and directly, as she sees it daily in real life, the problem we face not only where she is working, but around the world, and some of the very real complications involved in solving it.

I have unbounded admiration for Americans like this young lady's father, Dr. Stephen Youngburg, who has elected to move away from our affluent society here at home and use his talents to help build a little better society in an unfortunate, depressed land. I am sure you will admire Aileen, the young author of the letter, when you have read it.

I hope that you will wonder—as I do—when you have read the letter why we do not escalate the war against hunger, and send reinforcements to Aileen and her father and others like them around the world, at least as readily as we reinforce our Armed Forces. Reinforcement and escalation of the war against hunger can avert wars which must be fought with arms at a high cost in human lives.

Exhibit 1

San Pedro-Sula, Honduras,
March 29, 1967.

Dear Senator McGovern: May I introduce myself—Aileen Youngburg is my name. I am nineteen. For the past six years I have lived with my parents in Honduras—when not in school. Your article in Look, March 7, struck forceably home to me. I know too well the results of hunger, malnutrition, and ignorance, for in a "jungle hospital" just a few yards from my home are housed about ninety young victims of these horrors. We have felt the results of the losing race against hunger in the past year, since our milk supply from CARE, Inc., has been cut off.

A small non-profit corporation, Pan American Health Service, (of which my father is a doctor, was co-founder) owns about two hundred acres of land in one of the most underdeveloped areas of Honduras, and even Central America. We have an outpatient clinic, about eighty or ninety acres under cultivation. And the children's nutrition hospital. There are about fifty girls and women whom we employ and give practical nurse's instruction. They care for the children (which includes washing clothes by hand and cooking and baking with wood fires), and help in the clinic. We have a Peace Corps Volunteer, an L.P.N. helping with the teaching, and the clinic. The work is very rewarding, but also heartbreaking sometimes, especially when you look at the problem on a world wide basis, and realize that if the present trend continues, there is no hope.

The "we" in the title of your Article, indicates that we of the United States are in the race to save the world from mass starvation. The trouble, as you pointed out, is that the average U.S. citizen doesn't comprehend the horrors of chronic hunger and malnutrition created by the world's food shortage. We were lulled into a confident sleep by our surplus. Most still have that confidence and are not startled or even seriously interested in the world's situation. This compounds the difficulties of immediate and adequate action. I am deeply grateful for your article, and I could only wish as I read it that everyone would read it and demand action by the government and cooperation by the citizens for meeting the challenge which it sets forth.

But, as you pointed out, we for all our agricultural strength cannot feed the world. We must do our best to stimulate other governments around the world to cooperate in emphasizing agriculture. The trouble in Honduras is that farming is largely left up to the uneducated backward peons. Those who are able to gain an education seem to shun getting their hands dirty and want to get an office job in town. Most of the people who have the intelligence and capabilities don't care about agriculture. This, in my opinion, is the basic problem. I wish we would encourage and support programs aimed at getting more of the middle class interested in agriculture. We need to get them to realize that farming is not below their level. Credit facilities must be made available to enable them to meet the initial cost and costs of expansion. If we by educational programs could raise the prestige of the farmer and provide suitable credit facilities, many nations could start feeding themselves. This is essential if mass starvation is to be averted.

Thank you for your stimulating article, and receive my best wishes for your success in getting Congress to take appropriate action. I wish each member could see the listless eyes, the emaciated bodies of innocent babies and children who have known only hunger. I wish they could see the longing in the faces of the parents who want to provide decently for their families, but who are too tired out to do a real day's work. Somehow we must break the vicious circle which you so vividly and correctly described.

My desire is to dedicate my life to the task of breaking this circle. What private citizens like me can do is small, yet it is something. Since I have seen the crying need, I feel I must do my part small though it be. I wouldn't be content living in complacency enjoying the blessings of America. For the sake of our own America's security we must help the masses of underprivileged, and we must do it *now,* before the Communists arrive with their promises. This is absolutely necessary if our way of life is to ultimately survive.

I thank you for listening to this monologue which comes straight from my heart. I know you will continue to do what lies within your power to make this a better world to live in.

Sincerely, one of your backers,

AILEEN.

THE DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY ENDORSES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Banking and Currency Committee has received an impressive report from the Department of the Treasury strongly recommending the passage of S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. The report indicated that S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program. As the agency most familiar with our financial and capital markets, the Department is in a particularly good position to judge the economic impact of the bill. The Treasury Department believes the bill is in keeping with our competitive market system and follows a long line of essential and effective measures to assist the American consumer in the wise use of his economic resources.

The Department also points out that S. 5 would be only a supplement to State laws on consumer credit and would be confined only to the relatively narrow field of disclosure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Treasury report be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1967.

HON. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on S. 5, "To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

The proposed legislation would require any person engaged in the business of extending credit to furnish potential borrowers or credit plan purchasers with a clear written statement of essential credit information, including not only the total amount of the finance charge, but also the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate. A creditor agreeing to extend credit pursuant to a revolving or open-end credit plan would be required to furnish a statement setting forth the finance charge in terms of the percentage rate per period, as well as the periodic rate of finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate.

In his message to the Congress on February 16, 1967, on consumer protection, the President said:

"I recommend the Truth-in-Lending Act of 1967 to assure that, when the consumer shops for credit, he will be presented with a price tag that will tell him the percentage rate per year that is being charged on his borrowing.

"We can make an important advance by incorporating the wisdom of past discussions on how the costs of credit can best be expressed. As a result of these discussions, I recommend legislation to assure Full and accurate information to the borrow, and Simple and routine calculations for the lender.

This legislation is urgently needed to close an important gap in consumer information, protect legitimate lenders against competitors who misrepresent credit costs.

"The Truth-in-Lending Act of 1967 would strengthen the efficiency of our credit markets, without restraining them. It would allow the cost of credit to be freely determined by informed borrowers and responsible lenders. It would permit the volume of consumer credit to be fully responsive to the growing needs, ability to pay and aspirations of the American consumer."

The Treasury Department fully endorses the principle that the total cost of obtaining consumer credit should be clearly disclosed to a potential user, both in terms of dollars and annual rate, to enable the consumer to make a meaningful comparison of the cost of credit available from various sources. We are confident that such disclosure will substantially promote the selective use of credit by which the consumer can obtain the most benefit from his financial resources.

Testimony presented to your Committee over the past several years on various truth in lending bills amply supports the conclusion that most consumers enter the credit market without the basic information necessary to compare credit costs intelligently. Although some States require disclosure of consumer credit information, the fundamental need for an adequate basis for comparison has not generally been met. Federal action in this area is, therefore, imperative.

The case for truth in lending, we believe, is clear and unassailable on the basis of four points, the significance of which with respect to both the well-being of the general consuming public and the health of our economy is far-reaching:

First, credit plays a role of vast and growing importance in our national economy. In addition to the rising volume of mortgage cerdit, consumer credit is used to finance a large proportion of automobile purchases and consumer purchases of other durable goods. Credit for these purposes is available from several sources. It is a matter of substantial public interest that consumers be furnished the information necessary to pick the credit source most suited to individual needs. The informed use of credit will also help to assure a better allocation of resources and will, in this way, contribute to both economic stability and growth.

Second, the variety of ways in which finance charges are stated, even where no deception is intended, makes it extremely difficult for the consumer to be certain what he is paying for credit. One lender, for example, may state a percentage rate of finance charge in terms of the annual or monthly rate on a declining balance. Another may state the rate of finance charge as a percentage of the original balance, even though the loan or installment purchase account is repaid in regular installments. Still other lenders quote no rate of charge, but only the amount of the downpayment and the installment payments. Often, the number of installments is not stated. Moreover, the borrower may be charged various fees which are not itemized and which are not included in the stated rate of finance charge. There may be other undisclosed charges, such as the required purchase of credit insurance, which serves primarily to protect the lender, thus adding to the cost of credit.

Third, the purpose of the bill is simply to assure the advance disclosure of the dollar amounts and percentage rates which the potential credit user would have to pay for the use of credit. Although the consumer credit industry provides a variety of credit plans which are designed to meet the different needs of different consumers, it is difficult to see how the average consumer can make a cogent comparison of credit costs and thereby make an intelligent choice as to alternative sources of credit. Without a meaningful basis for comparison, we must question whether there is effective competition in the credit field.

It should be emphasized that the proposed legislation is intended only as a supplement to State law. It would neither limit, nor otherwise control the rate or amount of finance charges. The contractual or other rights and obligations of both lenders and borrowers, vendors and purchasers, would not be impaired by the enactment of the truth in lending bill. These are matters left to regulation by the States and to the interplay of competitive forces in the market place.

Fourth, it is the traditional and proper responsibility of the Federal Government to take steps to assure the effective operation of our competitive market system. Examples of legislation to preserve free and fair competion are plentiful, beginning with legislation to protect consumers from mail fraud, from excesses of monopoly, from false advertising, and from confusing methods of labeling and packaging. The truth in lending proposal, therefore, follows a long line of essential and effective measures to assist the American consumer in the wise use of his economic resources.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your Committee and that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

FRED B. SMITH,
General Counsel.

RELIGIOUS GROUPS STRONGLY SUPPORT SENATE RATIFICATION OF THE HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—LXV

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as a convinced advocate of Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery, I am deeply grateful for the invaluable support in behalf of ratification provided by American churches and religious organizations.

Among the American religious organizations which have worked long and hard for Senate ratification of these four conventions are B'nai B'rith, the Episcopal Church, United Church of Christ, Unitarian-Universalist Association, National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, General Board of Christian Social Concerns, the Methodist Church, American Friends Service Committee, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Spiritual Assembly of the Bahai's of the United States, Catholic Association for International Peace, American Baptist Convention, American Jewish Congress, and Hadassah.

What a remarkable ecumenical display.

These groups with literally millions of members share one basic tenet—a belief in and a dedication to the real dignity of man.

I urge the Senate to heed the wise message of these millions of men and women of good will.

I urge the Senate to ratify the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and

Slavery and thereby put the United States squarely on record on the fundamental question of human dignity.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GEN. ANASTASIO SOMOZA

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, last weekend I had the pleasure of attending the inauguration of Gen. Anastasio Somoza as President of our good neighbor to the south, Nicaragua.

I have known this gentlemen for sometime, and he is, for a fact, one of the most forward-looking leaders in Latin America.

He is the prototype of this new kind of leader; the type we have needed to see in this area for so long. He understands the need for total economic development in his country, hand in hand with free enterprise.

He believes in offering a chance to rise to all citizens of his country, and has shown his willingness to open the doors of opportunity to all who are able.

His opposition to communism and determination to offer a real alternative to it is sincere and absolute. Here is not the heavyhanded man of the past, but the enlightened moderate of today.

During the election campaign he stumped his nation vigorously, visiting all areas of the country and speaking to all segments of the population, presenting a progressive program that offers hope to all, a program for tomorrow and a new era in the history of this land.

He was elected by an overwhelming popular vote; sent into office by people who truly believe he will govern with their interests uppermost in his mind.

A graduate of West Point, he understands our way of life, and can deal effectively with our Nation on behalf of his countrymen. Twenty-five of his West Point classmates attended the inaugural, presenting an impressive picture to the assembled notables from all over our hemisphere.

Mr. President, President Somoza is a true alternative to the Castro-type dictator we have already seen too much of. Moderate in thought and belief, imbued with the desire to upgrade his people, educated and experienced, he offers leadership of the first order to his country.

Schooled in the lessons of the past and conversant with the problems of today and challenges of tomorrow, he has no wish to exploit or enslave his people, but to lead them to a new day in partnership with our country.

In his inaugural address he voiced many of these thoughts most eloquently, offering to the hopeful throughout his land and the hemisphere, a choice, one that rejects the grey sameness, exploitation and oppression of communism. I offer this speech now for insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS OF GENERAL ANASTASIO SOMOZA D., MAY, 1967

Honorable Members of Congress: the enthusiastic reception that has been accorded me, honors the aspiration of my brother, Luis Somoza Debayle, the great liberal leader who labored so tirelessly for the welfare of the people of Nicaragua. Though he has now passed on, his successful work, which made history before his death, will always keep his memory alive in the hearts of the people. Now that he rests in the peace of our Lord, he will enjoy our fond remembrance. In consideration of his patriotic actions and wise laws, allow me to ask that we honor his memory with a moment of silence.

It is with great satisfaction that I respectfully welcome the Honorable Members of the Legislative, Judicial and Electoral branches of the Government of Nicaragua, all persons of renowned integrity. Within these three constitutionally established branches of government, I will look for the sources of wisdom and cooperation with which to fulfill my aims of leading Nicaragua in democracy, peace, liberty and prosperity.

For the People and the Government of Nicaragua, it is very gratifying to have present the Special Missions which friendly governments have cordially accredited, thus demonstrating their solidarity with Nicaragua. Such a friendly gesture calls for my appreciation and strengthens even further the traditional relations Nicaragua has maintained with the peoples of the free world who are guided by ideals of democracy, peace, justice and international friendship.

With due respect, I welcome also the important Dignitaries of the Roman Catholic Church, the religion professed by the majority of the Nicaraguan people.

Also satisfying to me is the presence of internationally renowned personalities who, as honored guests, are showing their appreciation of our Country.

As a graduate of the Military Academy of the United States of America, I warmly welcome my classmates who, in demonstration of their friendship to the people of Nicaragua, are present today at the Inauguration of the third graduate of West Point to be elected to the Presidency of his Nation. They, as myself, have been inspired by, and live by, the motto of our Alma Mater: "Duty, Honor, Country".

This Transmission of Power is of the greatest importance in national life. Because having exercised representative democracy by means of the popular vote, and with the participation of all political parties, Nicaragua continues to march firmly forward along the paths of peace, democracy and constant progress, guided by the Nationalist Liberal Party.

Let us celebrate, the Nicaraguans, without distinction of political color, the triumph of our Country, which in this election has ratified his faith in democracy as the only method of government of the civilized peoples.

Now I wish to express my gratitude to that person who has no more identity than that of being a Nicaraguan citizen, to that person who has the privilege of having been born in Nicaragua—a rich country, a beautiful country, a country forged by a noble and virile people.

On proclaiming that the triumph of Nicaragua has been the triumph of Democracy, I wish to declare to my countrymen that I have always believed the vote is worth more than anything else in the world. With his vote the Nicaraguan citizen expressed the confidence that he has in his Country and has confirmed his faith in its system of government and leaders. I shall therefore know how to honor the trust that has been bestowed upon me by my fellow citizens.

By confirming their faith in democracy, Nicaraguans have shown that the vote is stronger than the rifle, that the vote is a more determining factor than the execution squad, that the vote is more convincing than forced exile.

This vote for which I thank from the bottom of my heart all the persons who had that conviction and went to the polls to ratify their faith in the ideals of the Nationalist Liberal Party; this vote which is the fundamental law in the free and democratic countries will inspire me to carry out my program and to apply the laws that will strengthen democracy and augment the economic and social development of Nicaragua.

I have arrived at the Presidency with a popular support unparalleled in our political history. It is very gratifying to me and heartening to the members of the Nationalist Liberal Party that the government program that I proposed to the Nicaraguan people at my party's convention on July 30th, and during the election campaign, from which I will permit myself shortly to quote, coincide fundamentally with the six points of the Agenda which became "the Declaration of the Presidents of the Americas", signed the last 14th of April in Punta del Este, Uruguay.

At the convention I declared: "I am one of the color bearers of Central American Integration, not only for reasons of idealism, but also for practical purposes. Practical purposes, because I know that Central American Integration will bring direct benefits to our population. Before the integration of Central America the installation of industries depending on a local market was doubtful, but now that the opportunity is before us, I will support existing industries in order to raise them to the Central American Market level, and encourage the establishment of all those industries that will consume raw materials from our natural resources". This declaration reflects the aims of the first resolution announced at Punta del Este, which is: "The Economic Integration and Industrial Development of Latin America".

On October 2nd, 1966, in the department of Rio San Juan, I said: "If Nicaragua and Costa Rica coordinate their efforts and finances to canalize adequately the San Juan River, Central America would have its own seaway similar to the St. Lawrence Waterway". This is in accord with the second resolution at Punta del Este, which contemplates: "The Multi-national action for Infrastructural Projects".

At the Liberal Party Convention I said: "Nicaragua finds itself between two markets: the world market and the preferential market of Central America. But the market that must be our yardstick is the world market and therefore each and everyone of the actions of the government will tend to place our people in the best competitive position". What I announced then is in accord with the third resolution of the agenda signed by the Presidents of the Americas, which is: "Measures to improve the conditions of the International Latin American Trade."

On September 4th, 1966, to the people of Masaya, I stated: "Accustomed as you have been to the generosity of the land and climate, very little consideration has been given to modern methods of cultivation", and I affirmed my determination "to guide them towards increased production and employment".

Similarly, at our convention I stated: "Within the capitalistic system under which we live, I will see to it that the Nicaraguan common man enjoys such credits and facilities as the nation can offer in order to stimulate his existence and adequate participation in the national wealth. I understand that for this purpose banking entities play a roll of great importance, and therefore, I hereby commit myself publicly to change the mentality and the attitude of those banks in the sense they shall be at the service of the people and not the people at the service of the banks".

On September 25th, 1966, at Esteli, I emphasized: "It is necessary to produce more food for the people and the livestock selling the oversupply to the local market, the Central American Common Markets and finally the World Market". And on July 30th, 1966, at our party's convention I stated: "It is of manifest urgency to legalize the right of possession of those who, because of their misfortune or because of their pioneer spirit have been pushed toward virgin land, and who because of their precarious possessions, cannot enjoy the facilities offered by the state to increase their production and therefore to improve their standard of living".

On January 29th, at the end of my campaign in Managua, I stated: "The national programs to modernize our agriculture, require the use of improved seeds, fertilizers *and insecticides; the increasing of production* through the installation of grain dryers and granaries; the establishment of mobile units for rural credit, the opening of agricultural schools in those places where they are necessary, so that our children can learn to develop agriculture with increased efficiency. Wherever it is economically feasible, through the expansion of electrical power networks, my administration will establish irrigation systems in order to make agriculture a year round industry, assuring permanent employment to the great majority of Nicaraguans.

The above mentioned quotations, are in complete accordance with the fourth article in the Agenda of Punta del Este, referring to the "Modernization of rural life and increase in agricultural productivity".

At my party's convention, I stated: "our children deserve a basic and practical education. Therefore, I hereby solemnly pledge that by the year 1972 there will be enough classrooms and teachers to educate our children. And to complete our industrial development I will create more technical vocational Schools and apprenticeship schools thus starting a real industrialization and at the same time readily fulfill the needs of our present industries".

On August 28th, before an audience of three thousand school teachers I expressed: "Only through a good education that stimulates the social and economic transformation in our country; only through an educational reform which promotes the training of the individual in the technical advances of the modern world, and that makes possible the socio-economic revolution that we are determined to accomplish, only then can we win the battle against poverty, ignorance, disease and prejudice".

Along the same lines, in Masaya, I pointed out: "We are in the midst of a dynamic, modern world in which we all have a transistor radio. I am going to use this system to establish through our State Broadcasting System an understandable technical assistance, to allow the farmers to cultivate their land by methods that will yield better crops". As I stated before at my party's convention: "I declare that the sacrifice of the urban population during the highway building process was not in vain, because with the present infrastructure the social economic development of Nicaragua is assured".

I refer to the cities and villages located in different farm districts: "for this reason it is of great importance for the voters of the municipalities to elect councils capable of administrating their municipal corporations in such a way that will permit the central government to cooperate with them in the installation of water supply, sewerage and fluvial systems, electricity, pavements and schools".

These statements reaffirm the fifth article of the Punta del Este Agenda, which pertained to "the educational, scientific and technological development and improvements of health programs".

In reference to the sixth article of the Agenda concerning the "elimination of unnecessary military outlays", I announced at our party's convention: "The National Guard deserves a very special consideration from all Nicaraguans, because it is this armed corps that has maintained the peace for us, has respected the laws that guarantee our public liberties, and has remained conscious of its historical mission in this country by cooperating unconditionally in the socio-economic development of our people".

The aforementioned presentation of my ideas to the Nicaraguan people during the campaign is in accordance with the basic purposes of the "Declaration of the Presidents of the Americas", which was signed on behalf of our Country by the outgoing President and prominent member of the Nationalist Liberal Party, Dr. Lorenzo Guerrero, to *whom I wish to express again my congratulations* for his patriotic efforts at Punta del Este.

In this manner I affirm that my administration will endorse the said Declaration and my words bear evidence that the principles of the great Nationalist Liberal Party have interpreted well, before the Presidents meeting *at Punta del Este*, the wishes of political and socio-economic evolution of the people of Nicaragua, which are now the same throughout Latin America.

Because of this I am proud to be a liberal. And today I am proud to be the President of the people of Nicaragua, since with complete freedom, in a peaceful and democratic environment, all the citizens without political discrimination can forge their own future and cooperate to the greatness and security of our own Nation.

When the principles of a political party are not consequent to the people's attitudes and realities, economic chaos is unavoidable. Hence, I want to announce today to the people of Nicaragua that in order to maintain unchanged our monetary stability with development of my administration will be within the possibilities of our productivity.

Because of the plans formulated and the governmental programs initiated under the administration of Luis A. Somoza Debayle, Nicaragua has been an example of economic growth and development in Latin America.

However, the fall in the export product prices has altered the rhythm of our economic growth in the last two years. My administration for the first two years will devote its efforts to readjusting state expenditures, in order to prevent an unbalance in our national life. The conditions of international trade and two unfavorable cotton crops, did not allow us to have the necessary revenues for our budget in these last years.

That is why it is my firm decision to maintain a program of governmental austerity, so that free enterprise, the worker and the farm hand may maintain a climate of confidence and faith in the future endorsed by the Nationalist Liberal Party for the welfare of our Nation.

The government I have received today has appropriated sixty percent of its budget for administrative expenditures and forty percent for development purposes. We shall change this. In the first two years of my administration the logical proportion will be reached by changing these figures: Sixty percent of the national budget will be for development and forty percent for administrative purposes.

My administration will be one of constant evolution. In order to continue our development, and to insure our production growth, the necessary changes in the structure of Ministries will be accomplished and my Administration will look for adequate financing for its program through a just taxation system and international cooperation. These measures will allow us to continue our economic growth, even higher than the goals established in 1961 at Punta del Este, thus fulfilling our aspirations of better standards of living, and to give the youth greater opportunities in the future.

I will advocate all liberties that our laws and Constitution contemplate and will support them with all my democratic convictions. By doing so, we will continue strengthening the great barrier against the penetration of communism. Because under these circumstances the well known violent actions of the communists will find no echo; and I am positive that the Nicaraguan people will back me up to keep and maintain the order which is the basis of any government. If any persons or isolated groups, would ever start violence this would evidently be a product of those who do not wish to live within the laws of democracy, and especially under the protection of a government that has proved to have the largest popular backing in our history.

The present labor and social welfare laws, all of them a product of the liberal governments, shall not be left shelved in official publications, but should become effective and sound as an essential part of our nation's daily life, not only for labor but also for capital. And I hereby declare that based on the labor's legislation, I will join the representatives of *labor and management*, to see this become a reality. Let us all comply with our labor legislation. On my part it will be my pleasure to support all the working men that will do so.

By constitutional mandate my Inauguration coincides today with the International Labor Day. Work is a function that dignifies mankind. The Social Legislation of Nicaragua, one of the most advanced in the continent, is the realization of the governments of the Nationalist Liberal Party whose philosophy considers the worker, the laborer as one of the most essential elements of society.

The National Guard of Nicaragua is a democratic corps that guaranteed us to exercise our voting right freely and indiscriminately. It is an institution whose organization, discipline and loyalty to the Constitution, is our best insurance of security in peace.

The National Guard of Nicaragua has suffered many times for being loyal to the principles of our Constitution. It is an institution that deserves the support of all citizens of good will of our country, in order to see our nation continue living and progressing in peace and enjoying all constitutional guarantees. Therefore with our hand on our hearts all Nicaraguans should render special tribute to this institution.

Because of my knowledge of the many years of sacrifice that the soldiers have lived, I will take steps in order to establish the living conditions in their barracks according to a dignified manner.

It gives me great pleasure to declare that, during my Administration, Nicaragua will continue its support of the Organization of the Central American States, the Organization of the American States, the United Nations and all the world organizations that are vigilant for the development of a free mankind, for the maintenance of peaceful international relations. I will make the Free Determination of nations a banner of Nicaragua's foreign policy.

Honorable Congressmen, gentlemen, I am essentially a man of peace; I am essentially a man respectful of the law; and I am also a man that has full conscience of the values of the human being.

Therefore, here in the presence of God and of the People of Nicaragua I declare that during each day of my Administration there will be within me a guardian to prevent injustice to anyone, to assure that no one evades the law nor tampers with it. I pledge today and always to maintain myself on the side of justice as it corresponds to a man of good will who loves his country dearly. I am determined to guarantee all people of Nicaragua the freedom to exercise their rights, liberties and opportunities that can be enjoyed in our country.

People of Nicaragua, the responsibility of casting a ballot does not end with the act of depositing the vote at the polls, but it extends also to the efforts that I require of each citizen, through the backing of all Government programs that I proposed to you during the political campaign, so that Nicaragua may truly become a more progressive country, a country where all may enjoy a better way of life, a country where any man can develop his life in complete liberty and happiness.

Now that the wishes of the members of the Nationalist Liberty Party and all persons of good will, have become a reality, I solemnly want to confirm that as a Nicaraguan and as a President of the Republic elected by the free, just and democratic popular vote, I fully *assume the responsibility imposed* upon me by our constitution: I will be the President not of one sector but of all Nicaraguans and at the exclusive service of all Nicaraguans!

I want you to know, my beloved countrymen, that I have no ill feelings toward anyone; that I do not have, nor wish to have, enmity towards anyone; that justice is the goal of my government and it will be administered with equity, understanding and righteousness.

In order to better serve you, it is necessary that each and every Nicaraguan assumes with integrity their responsibilities as good citizens. I ask all Nicaraguans, with their democratic fortitude and conviction, to be with me during my administration so that peace may reign in our country and dialogue becomes the best road to the solution of all our problems.

I want you to know that I will exercise authority with righteousness as chief of state. I want you to know that I am determined to build the future, a future of happiness, well-being and hope for all Nicaraguans.

No one can doubt the sincerity of my purposes. Because all and everyone of my acts have been based on the law and on a life dedicated to work, justice and liberty.

Under the guidance of the Divine Providence, and with the support and understanding of each and every Nicaraguan, we shall start to march in peace, to strengthen our republican system of government and to enhance even more the greatness of our country.

On this historical day for our country; on this glorious day for the Nationalist Liberal Party; on this day of Hope for all Nicaraguans, I fervently invoke the protection of God.

MANAGUA, D. N., *May 1st, 1967*.

A. SOMOZA D.

FINANCE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A TIME FOR DECISION—ADDRESS BY GEORGE D. WOODS, PRESIDENT OF THE WORLD BANK

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Mr. George D. Woods, president of the World Bank, delivered the annual Gabriel Silver Lecture Devoted to World Peace at Columbia University on April 13, 1967. His remarks, I believe, contain much of interest to those of us who act on foreign aid legislation each year.

Mr. Woods does not allow us to sit back in complacent satisfaction with our past foreign aid efforts, but rather presents a rugged self-examination of our aid program since the Marshall plan and suggests new directions based on the experience gained during this formative period. He says:

> What is now necessary, it seems clear, is that industrialized countries should give joint consideration at the highest level to their policies of development finance. After 20 years of experience—and this includes many frustrations—the time has come, for a thorough examination of the objectives they are trying to achieve in their relationships with the developing world, of the importance of those objectives to their own national interests, and of the adequacy of the resources, the mechanisms and the techniques which are being employed to attain those objectives.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Woods' address "Finance for Developing Countries: A Time for Decision" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FINANCE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES—A TIME FOR DECISION

(By George D. Woods)

President Kirk, Dean Cordier, ladies and gentlemen, it was an act of bravery for Dean Cordier to invite a banker to come here this evening to deliver the annual Gabriel Silver Lecture Devoted to World Peace. It has been the misfortune of bankers to be recorded in history more often in connection with panic than with peace; and I can hope to reward the Dean's audacity only in a modest way. Nevertheless, I was delighted to accept his flattering invitation to speak here at Columbia University. Since then I have been emboldened by Pope Paul's recent encyclical, according to which "The new name for peace is development."

We are now approaching the 20th anniversary of the inception of the Marshall Plan—the date when Secretary of State Marshall, at a time of deep economic and political crisis in Europe, spoke the sentences which launched the great cooperative effort of the European Recovery Program. Secretary Marshall's initiative began a transformation. The creative genius of Europe awoke. American aid began to flow out steadily to the sixteen countries which had united in the Recovery Program. Those countries, later joined by others, worked their way back to productivity; they formed new habits of collaboration which, as is now apparent to all, opened the way to an economic revolution.

Today, there is another such crisis in the world. It is big, it lacks focus; most of us do not even think of it as a crisis. But food riots in Asia, government coups in Africa, student violence in this Hemisphere and elsewhere, are among the symptoms of it. It is the crisis of a new world trying to be born—the crisis of the developing countries in their struggle to achieve economic viability, national unity, and the respect of other nations.

This new world contains about two billion people—about two-thirds of humanity. Most of it is hungry most of the time. Average calorie consumption is on the order of 2,000 a day—an intake which in Europe two decades ago, we regarded as being dangerously near the famine level. Between the income of an ordinary citizen in western Europe and that of an ordinary African or Asian, the disparity is 10 or 15 to one, with the contrast that implies between standards of shelter and education, work and enjoyment. In the case of the United States, the figure would be 20 to one.

Thanks to modern medicine, underdeveloped countries enjoy a 20th century death rate; but they still are experiencing a 19th century birth rate. As a consequence, five-sixths of the population growth in the world is occurring in the less developed countries. Of the 60-million increase which we can expect in 1967, 50 million will be in countries with per capita incomes of less than $250 a year. Such a rate of population growth has never before occurred over such a wide part of the globe.

The existence of hundreds of millions of destitute human beings in the world is a threat to peace. We see every day how it may create vacuums of authority into which the great powers may be drawn in uneasy confrontation. The chances of disagreement and disaster can be magnified by what happens in places of Africa, Asia and Latin America that many of us had not even heard of ten years ago.

Over the years, rich nations have been engaged in extensive but largely unconcerted efforts to help the poor. The pattern is different from that of the Marshall Plan: instead of one principal country trying to help a dozen there are now more than a score of countries engaged in various efforts to help about a hundred others. These activities have grown haphazardly, for the most part from former colonial responsibilities, in some part from humanitarian or diplomatic or commercial motives. They have not—and I want to emphasize this—they have not been the result of conscious commitments to a coherent, cooperative attack on the problems of world poverty and disorder. This has not been tried.

The task of development assistance has proved to be one of almost infinite complexity. The process of growth, whether of people or countries, is intricate, and when its intricacy is compounded by all the difficulties of relationships between sovereign nations, problems seem to arise in a limitless number of permutations and combinations.

The effort of some countries to help others has been freighted with irony and paradox. The very economic strength that gives rich countries the means to help the poor also opens up a gap between them: the capital-intensive technology of the industrial countries is not all suited to the problems of the low-income nations.

It is a paradox, too, to speak of development assistance as "foreign aid." In fact, as we all know, in the past much development assistance has been given in forms designed to benefit the immediate self interest of the giver—forms rather different from those which would have been followed had economic development been the prime objective, and rather different also from those which would have been followed if performance by the developing country had an important consideration.

Most providers of aid, sooner or later, and in one form or another, have used overseas assistance as a subsidy for their own industries—as a way of exporting goods and services at higher than world prices. It is estimated that the donor countries put a value on their annual aid about $1 billion a year higher than the same goods and services would bring in competitive world markets. And it goes without saying that when development finance has been used to protect spheres of political and commercial influence, or to serve strategic military purposes, it has been to some extent of help to the donor countries themselves.

To win for aid programs the support of legislators with many vexing problems of their own—including poverty pockets and other high-priority domestic demands for public funds—all these motives of self-interest have been proclaimed publicly and often in donor countries. Small wonder, then, that development assistance has not infrequently failed to stir feelings of gratitude or to encourage the performance that was expected from the recipient countries.

The paradoxes have not all been on the side of the rich. Not a few developing countries, for instance, have asked for help from abroad at the same time as they have been practicing forms of nationalism that make international cooperation impossible. While governments and leaders have proclaimed economic development to be high on their list of goals, they often have failed to take the action and adopt the policies necessary to achieve it. Despite the popularity of the phrase, "revolution of rising expectations," the somber truth is that in many countries, the population lacks the ferment of aspiration and determination without which economic development is impossible. In some countries, deep-seated political instability has undermined the hope of steady economic progress.

Some paradoxes have trapped both donor and recipient. Consider the irony that development assistance, instead of hastening the day when the poor countries could make their own way, may in some cases actually have postponed it. Exports of American food surpluses have fed the hungry overseas; in their time they have saved the United States Government several hundred million dollars a year which otherwise it would have had to spend on crop storage and price support operations; but food aid programs have not always been administered so as effectively to stimulate increases in production in agricultural sectors overseas. Aid programs have helped recipients, on occasion, to defer or avoid the hard measures they should have been taking on their own behalf. Aid has given donors an excuse—although not a good one—to defer liberalizations of their own commercial policy which might enlarge the trade earnings of developing countries and thus lessen their reliance on development aid.

Despite its contradictions and paradoxes, in two decades, development assistance has accomplished much good. I think, indeed, that this period since the Second World War will be remembered in history as the period when the engineering of social and economic progress in the developing world first became a universal, preoccupation of governments. There has been planted, literally and figuratively, seeds whose fruit the developing countries will be harvesting for many years. For millions of human beings, the development effort has been the difference between life and death; for millions more, it has been the beginning of hope; and for some it has been the beginning of prosperity.

Installed power capacity in developing countries has more than doubled in the last dozen years. Cement production has more than doubled; the manufacture of steel has tripled; mining production is rising at a rate of almost 10 percent a year. Commerce is growing: freight moved by rail has been increasing annually by 10 percent in Africa and 12 percent in Asia. The expansion of education, that vital springboard of economic advance, is proceeding significantly faster than the growth of population. All this began, however, from a low starting point, and much more needs to be done.

Today the capacity of developing countries to grow is greater than it has ever been. The most important single accomplishment of the development effort over the past 20 years is that peoples throughout the developing world have acquired skills, adopted attitudes and built institutions that greatly increase their ability to use capital productively. Many developing countries are attaching greater importance to fiscal and monetary policies, and even to market incentives. It is slow, hard work, but many are building more adequate frameworks of administration. Investment and savings rates have moved upward. However, given the heavy expenditures on education—and in other sectors which give a return in increased production only after a long waiting period—it is hardly surprising that growth has been spectacular only in a few countries.

Despite many errors of commission and omission, despite the instability of political institutions, the growth potential is there. The developing countries are ready and able to continue progress at a faster rate.

On the side of the countries and institutions engaged in development assistance, experience has brought progress also. The quality of aid, while it still leaves much to be desired, has consistently improved; and the givers of aid have acquired growing understanding of the problems they face.

In the past two or three years, most of the aid-giving countries of the world have put their programs of development assistance under close examination. This scrutiny has resulted in a shift toward the greater use of international organizations, as one way of filtering some of the contradictions out of aid and of directing a larger flow of assistance to countries where economic performance justifies it. Since 1960, the participation of these multilateral organizations in the net transfer of financial resources to developing countries has increased threefold, although it still accounts only for a modest fraction of the total.

Development functions are being more effectively carried out, either by the established multilateral agencies or by new regional organizations which have been created. New combinations of bilateral and multilateral assistance are being worked out, to such an extent that *in the next fiscal year, an estimated eighty-five per cent of United States aid, for instance, will be given either through multilateral channels or as part of a multi-national effort coordinated by international agencies.*

* * * * *

The World Bank group of institutions is in the mainstream of these developments. This Group, as most of you know, is a cluster of three institutions. At the center is the Bank itself. It is *the* world bank—the only thing of its kind. Our member, shareholder governments are spread over the world; our financial resources come from all over the world; we finance projects in all quarters of the world; our Executive Directors, officers and staff are from all parts of the world. No other institution or government department has the experience of the World Bank—the concentration of expertise and know-how embodied in our international staff, chosen and retained strictly on professional merit.

The Bank is now 21 years old, and has lent some $10 billion, mostly in developing countries. Its loans are long term, at more or less conventional rates of interest, for projects of high economic priority. About a third of its lending has been for electric power development, a third for the development of transportation, and the rest for agriculture, industry and education.

Flanking the Bank on one side is the International Development Association, engaged in the same kind of business, but on much easier conditions of repayment. *IDA*, as we call the Association for short, lends to the poorest countries in the Bank's membership—those not able to borrow and service on conventional terms all the capital they can effectively use for development. So far, *most of its financing has been done in Asia;* and more than 70 per cent of its $1.6 billion of commitments have been made there. The purposes of IDA's lending reflect some of the most pressing problems of these client countries: the Association has been particularly active in financing agricultural and education projects.

Flanking the Bank on the other side is its other affiliate, the International Finance Corporation, or IFC. IFC works exclusively in the private sector. It does several things the Bank does not do: it makes loans to private borrowers without government guarantee; it invests in share capital; and it underwrites offerings or placements of securities by new or expanding enterprises. IFC operates in countries with a reasonably high level of savings and entrepeneurship; and more than half its $200 million of commitments are for enterprises in Latin America.

The operations of the three institutions, although each has its own separate financial assets, are closely integrated. This year, I expect that they will disburse well over a billion dollars on their loans and investments, mostly for projects in the developing countries.

Many of the founding fathers of the Bank have had the opportunity of seeing their child grow up; otherwise they would not know their offspring today. Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then the American Under Secretary of State, expected in 1945 that the World Bank would be a quite limited enterprise. He explained to a Congressional committee: "In the normal case, a country will borrow from private bankers; but where private banks, because of the risk, cannot make the loan on terms which are possible for the borrower, both the borrower and banker may need the assistance of the . . . Bank. The Bank's function will be to investigate the soundness of the projects for which capital is desired, and if it agrees they are sound, it will guarantee the loans made by private banks." In fact, of course, this never happened; the Bank, under the successive presidencies of Eugene Meyer, John McCloy and particularly Eugene Black, became a borrower and a lender on its own account.

While they may not have been good forecasters, the founders nevertheless gave the Bank a priceless gift in the form of an extraordinary charter, called the Articles of Agreement. This charter endowed the Bank with three faculties.

First, it gave the Bank an aptitude for cooperation. In fact, the Bank is a true cooperative, deriving its resources from its members and using these resources for their benefit. Its member governments are not only its principal debtors, but also its shareholders and large creditors.

Second, the Bank was given the opportunity to be independent. It was not to rely solely on paid-in capital from governments; in addition, it was enabled to provide the larger part of its resources by borrowing in the world's capital markets. It was cast in corporate form, and was given the capacity to earn a profit and become self-supporting.

Third, the Bank was given a fundamental policy. It was commanded to base its operations on economic factors, and to stay out of politics. The Bank was thereby given a hunger for facts, and a desire to develop the expertness needed to understand and interpret the facts.

All three of these faculties converged on one objective: the economic growth of the Bank's member countries.

The Bank did not learn to exercise these faculties all at once. As far as cooperation is concerned, some member countries, including Cuba under Castro and Indonesia under Sukarno, decided that the Bank was not the kind of cooperative they wanted to belong to, and they left—although Indonesia has now come back. In dealing with its borrowing shareholders, the Bank has moved carefully from problem to specific problem, elaborating its own policies and marking out its own trails. The Bank has worked hard during nearly all its twenty years to establish and maintain its high standing in the money markets of western Europe, Canada and the United States.

The instrument the Bank was given for dealing with its member countries was capital. This capital, to use the words of the charter, was to be applied to "projects, large and small alike." But one of the first things the Bank found out was that many of its clients did not know how to prepare projects. We had proposals, to mention a few, for dams that would be starved for water, for electric power systems that would lack customers, and for highways that would not fit local traffic and terrain.

In these circumstances, it seemed plain that if the Bank were to help finance any considerable number of projects, it would have to offer advice about how to prepare them as well. The Bank therefore not only closely examined proposals through studies of documents and visits to the field; as cooperator and expert, it also developed the practice of suggesting modifications or further study whenever necessary. It quickly found itself playing—and has since continued to play—an advisory role of considerable scope and variety, concerned with economics, engineering, administration and other factors bearing on project execution. We discuss with the borrower what kinds of technical services are needed, we advise on how best to obtain these services and, if necessary, we draw up terms of reference for the consultants.

For countries least able technically to prepare projects and least able to bring in the necessary outside help, we bear some of the cost; and we organize and supervise similar project studies financed by the United Nations Development Programme. We have also established cooperative programs whereby the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization work with us and our member countries to identify and prepare projects in agriculture and education. To help meet the especially urgent needs of African countries, we have established in that continent two regional offices of our own to work directly with local authorities in preparing agricultural and transportation projects.

At about the same time the Bank was discovering that projects often were inadequately studied, we were also finding out that they were planned without sufficient regard for their setting in the economy as a whole. We early concluded that any developing country would benefit from having some kind of program as a framework for development, relating projects to each other, taking account of the availability of financial resources, and giving thought to policy and administrative measures as well as to physical projects that would accelerate economic development. We have therefore developed a practice of organizing expert missions to visit individual countries and to draw up comprehensive recommendations that serve as a basis for working out a detailed development program.

The long range solution to the need for economic expertise, however, is for the developing countries to produce their own experts. The Bank has tried to help them do so by establishing an Economic Development Institute for the training of senior officials concerned with economic affairs. The Institute was set up as a sort of staff college where these officials could come together for periods ranging from three to six months, to study, to read, and to discuss practical development problems among themselves and with the best experts available from the Bank and elsewhere. The Institute began its work in 1956, and 700 officials have been through it. Many have advanced to posts of critical responsibility.

What we want, in a word, is to encourage constantly improving economic performance by our developing member countries. Not every country can have, or even profit from, a detailed development program, but every country can aspire to have a well-thought out set of policies which will provide the conditions and motivations conducive to economic growth. This is more and more what we find ourselves talking about with our member countries—fundamental policies to govern their day-to-day economic decisions. We are able to talk about policies and policy changes not as interlopers but as collaborators—and sometimes we give agreed policies the final measure of support they need to tip the scales in their favor in the councils of government.

In the Bank, we sometimes sum up our interests by saying, "The *country* is the project." That being so, we take an interest in the total assistance effort, including what others are doing to assist development in the country. In pursuit of this total view, we are helping to conduct an experiment intended to lead to a better coordination and use of external resources. This experiment brings together groups of countries and institutions, engaged in one form or another of development finance, for the purpose of considering jointly all the major problems in providing effective development assistance for particular recipient countries.

So far there are *coordinating groups of this kind for 13 recipients*, and in the next few days, we expect to be establishing a group for a fourteenth. The Bank is organizer and Chairman of ten of them, soon to be 11. As Chairman, the Bank assumes several responsibilities: It periodically makes comprehensive reports on the country's development possibilities and progress. It helps the developing country to identify and prepare projects, or to obtain the necessary technical assistance for doing so. It helps the government to devise a development program, and advises on problems of carrying out this program if it is asked to do so. It makes recommendations to the recipient government and to the members of the consultative group about the sectors and projects that seem to deserve priority in financing, and on the economic policies needed to achieve agreed development objectives.

Finally, the Bank comments on the country's estimates of aid requirements, making recommendations about the amount, types and terms of aid that are appropriate. The consultative group, nevertheless, is an example of what Dag Hammarskjold used to call "freedom in unity," because actual aid commitments by members of a consultative group are arranged directly between a donor and the recipient.

While the *consultative groups* are a relatively new form of aid coordination, they *already clearly demonstrate some superiority over uncoordinated bilateral aid*. The coordinating group gains from the services of the Bank as honest broker and expert adviser, providing a realistic assessment of the recipent country's prospects and performance, offering a guide for the amount and kind of assistance the donor countries might render, and—by carrying the main burden of collecting data—saving both rich and poor countries much duplication or repetition of effort. Above all, the process of consultation can effectively mesh external and internal resources, and can enable donor countries and the recipient to move in consistent ways toward the same development targets. I believe this is bound to lead to a decisive improvement in the quality both of external assistance and of economic performance by developing countries themselves. Coordinating groups with which the Bank is associated are now concerned with about half of all development assistance from official sources.

One would suppose as the performance of developing countries goes on improving, and as the techniques for development assistance become demonstrably more effective, that the support of industrialized countries for international development would increase. In fact, this is not happening.

Most of the financing of development—about three-quarters of it in fact—comes from the developing countries themselves, and it is right and proper for them to be carrying the main responsibility for investing in their own future. But the industrial countries are not doing enough to enable the less developed nations to earn their own way. The export earnings of the developing countries are not keeping up with the general growth of world trade, and formidable barriers in the form of tariffs, quotas and other kinds of hurdles stand in the way of their achieving a higher share of this trade. *The effective tariffs on imports from developing countries are commonly from 20 to 40 per cent*—a high margin in any case, but extremely so since this protection is being afforded to mature economies from economies which in many cases are still in their infant years.

The seriousness of these barriers can be seen from the fact that only six developing countries have markets larger in monetary terms than the State of Connecticut. Almost 100 developing countries have populations of less than 15 million, and of these, two-thirds have less than five million. These small markets effectively limit the possibility of development based on production for the local market, yet up to now this has been the most common policy aim, and I think the resource growth of both developed and underdeveloped countries has suffered as a result.

Not only is the trade potential of less developed countries being frustrated but the amount of development finance flowing to these countries is considerably less than they could effectively employ; and it is considerably less than the industrialized countries could reasonably afford—even by their own standards of what is an appropriate basis for sharing a small part of their increasing wealth with the poor countries.

Six years ago, the official net flow of financial resources from the industrialized countries reached a level of about $6 billion a year. Today, after five years of unprecedented prosperity in the donor countries, *the figure is about the same. Of the $200 billion by which the production of the industrialized countries has grown in that interval, none has been put at the disposal of the developing countries through programs of assistance.*

At a time when we should be making full speed ahead, development assistance is in the doldrums. There is discouragement that after 20 years of promise and exhortation, most of the world's poor are only a little less poor. There is widespread skepticism about the self-advantage to be had from aid; and there is a general tendency to greatly underestimate the ability and capacity of the developed to help the underdeveloped world. In truth, finance for development abroad has no constituency to influence the executive and legislative branches of governments.

Nevertheless, it is a happy and fortuitous circumstance that humans are humanitarian. As Adam Smith said, "How selfish soever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it. Of this kind is . . . compassion, the emotion which we feel for the misery of others, when we either see it, or are made to conceive it in a very lively manner . . ."

But there are other strong motives for helping less developed nations: the knowledge that more production in all developing countries will mean more trade for everyone; the hope that to make aid more effective now will more quickly bring the necessity for it to an end; above all, the trust that in the long run, rising income in developing countries may provide more room for the orderly evolution of their political institutions and make more likely the emergence of some sort of stable international order. "The new name for peace is development."

There is no danger that development assistance programs will be abandoned. That is not the issue. The issue is whether the industrialized countries will do enough, do it in the right way, and do it in time.

If the momentum of economic growth in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America is not speeded up, if leaders in these regions lose heart, then the prospect is for a rapid deterioration in world affairs that will inevitably become a matter of the highest concern in the United States and other industrial countries. Twenty years ago, when the crisis was faced in Europe, objectives were jointly defined and plans were jointly made to achieve them. In the case of the crisis in the developing world, no common plan has yet been formulated.

What is now necessary, it seems clear, is that industrialized countries should give joint consideration at the highest level to their policies of development finance. After 20 years of experience—and this includes many frustrations—the time has come, for a thorough examination of the objectives they are trying to achieve in their relationships with the developing world, of the importance of those objectives to their own national interests, and of the adequacy of the resources, the mechanisms and the techniques which are being employed to attain those objectives.

The kind of examination I have in mind would engage cabinet ministers concerned with foreign policy and finance as well as those more directly concerned with assistance programs. It would seek to move the worldwide aid effort from its somewhat tenuous and uncertain posture to a well thought-out and agreed-upon place in the whole scheme of international affairs.

Since the beginnings of that effort, science, technology and the means of creating material prosperity have advanced at a rate unprecedented in history. We can say confidently that the knowledge and the means exist to enlarge greatly the riches of the world, to help many millions to escape hunger and to achieve, or at least approach, decent living standards for the first time. What is needed now are firm political decisions to carry out an intensive, sustained and coordinated attack on underdevelopment, together with the political will and stamina to stay the course.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE CONGRESS INVEST IN THE YOUTH OF AMERICA

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, a country is often judged not by its power or prestige, but by what it does for its youth—those who will lead it tomorrow.

Today, the President has asked us to continue our investment in the youth of America. He has asked for a $75 million supplemental program to help the Office of Economic Opportunity make the summer months a time of promise and progress for hundreds of thousands of young Americans.

The Congress has a real opportunity to extend the helping hand of the Nation to our sons and daughters this summer.

The Members of this body are already fully aware of the successes of the administration's opportunity programs.

Millions of deprived schoolchildren have been given a new chance through Federal aid to public schools.

Thousands of young people are attending college or working at school because of the economic opportunity program.

Hundreds of thousands are enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps and the Job Corps getting job and vocational education training.

Millions of young people who might otherwise be out on the streets, out of work or out looking for "kicks" are now doing helpful, hopeful, constructive things—with Federal aid and help.

This is a record to be proud of. It is our record as well as President Johnson's record. We have succeeded, to a large extent, in persuading the young people of our country that their Government cares for them. A sense of indifference has been replaced with a sense of urgent national commitment to youth.

The President's letter informs us that there are many cities across the country with summer programs just waiting to be inaugurated, if funds can be found.

But the President is not asking us for a blank check. He clearly enumerates the summer programs already being supported with $600 million in Federal funds. He has enumerated the kinds of summer programs now needed in recreation, education, job training and for which he has requested an additional $75 million.

The meaning is clear. The money involved is substantial but not too much for this country. We are being asked to support our faith in youth. This new investment will place a solid floor of support under efforts to give America's young people renewed faith in their future, in their government, in their society, and in their country.

Let us respond to the President's clear and urgent call.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, speaking with respect to the principal issue that has been before us for the last 4 weeks, I have concluded in my own mind that the Senate should end the discussion that has been prevalent with respect to that measure.

Three times the Senate voted to repeal the subsidy of $60 million to the two political parties. The last vote was overwhelming and the strongest of the three votes cast.

The Senate thus has spoken three times, stating that this subsidy program should not be allowed to come into existence. However, there are forces that insist it shall continue to be the law. They disregard pronouncements made three times by the Senate. For 4 weeks we have been discussing the subject.

The majority leader moved to recommit the bill with instructions that two items only should be included in the bill to be considered by the Senate. When that motion was made, it was understood that the bill would be clean and that the debate that had been in progress would come to an end. The end, however, has not come. We do not understand how long the debate will continue. But 4 weeks have already passed.

The question arises: Shall the will of one individual be done, supported by others, some of whom have given token support or complementary support, or shall the will of the Senate as a whole be put into effect?

Mr. President, I shall vote against every amendment that is offered, except any new amendment, other than those submitted in the past, indicating that it is of immediate need in the interest of serving the country.

I might be asked why I shall vote against every amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. May I have 3 more minutes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I shall do so because it has been indicated that unless we accept the presidential election subsidy proposal, the bill will be loaded down so as to insure its final and absolute defeat. I, for one, cannot subscribe to that type of maneuvering and manipulating on the floor of the Senate. The Senate has become a laughingstock to all who are familiar with what has happened here in the last month. We constantly proclaim that the Senate is the greatest deliberative body in the world. But if some objective person had sat in the gallery for 1 month and observed what has taken place, he would vigorously repudiate any such arrogation of dignity by this body.

We have been on again and off again; we have been on the merry-go-round for 1 month. We have gone in circles, starting at one point, going to the other side of the circle, and returning to where we started. We have been on a treadmill, seemingly acting vigorously and making progress, but finding ourselves still in the same position day after day. Four weeks have passed. What progress have we made until today?

We occupy the identical position we occupied 4 weeks ago. I say the time has come when that situation should be brought to an end. I respectfully appeal to those Senators who have felt that the presidential election subsidy is sound that they permit that issue to come up in a separate bill, where all of the election laws may be considered together. We cannot go on interminably with this discussion, stopping the work of the Senate and, in a measure, subscribing to the idea that there must be a capitulation by the majority in favor of the minority.

I repeat that I shall vote against every amendment that will be offered, except any new one which may clearly indicate that it is needed in the interest of the security of the country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, every Senator has a right to judge the Senate however he wants to judge it. That is a right of which the Senator from Ohio avails himself, and I salute him for doing so.

May I say, Mr. President, that no Senator loves this body more than I do. My father was a Senator. I watched him here as a boy. My mother was a Senator. I think the Senate is the greatest legislative body in the world.

Mr. President, I would not have the great love I have for the Senate if we tried to pretend that we are something we are not. We recognize that we are politicians—better than average, we hope—representing the people of the States. We recognize the fact that we are mortal beings; that though each of us may be perfect in some respects, we all have areas of imperfection. We recognize that though we do our humble best, we make mistakes from time to time, for which, in due course, we are genuinely contrite in our hearts. But if we recognize that we are here on the earth, which is a testing place, to see whether we should be consigned to some place better or some place worse when we leave here, if we concede that perhaps some of us might not make it to the place toward which we would like to be heading, then we can, with proper perspective, judge the Senate.

The Senate is not supposed to be a place where we all agree. It is the finest place on earth to disagree. Though I disagree with the Senator from Ohio, I respect the Senator's judgment.

Unfortunately, people sometimes get carried away with a sense of their own righteousness and the soundness of their own logic, so that they seem to think that all that they say makes sense, and what the other fellow says makes no sense at all.

Senators who oppose me on this issue say that the Senate voted on the matter three times, and every time it voted the same way. Had they told the whole story, Mr. President, they would have gone further and said, "We have voted on this matter four times, and we have voted two times one way and two times the other way. In addition, there was the recommended motion, which really was not a clear indication either way." The issue is whether a taxpayer should be permitted to contribute $1 in a way that would cost him nothing, so that any mother's child could run for President of the United States, either on the Republican ticket or on the Democratic ticket, without having to make any commitment he did not want to make to any big contributor. If we look at the votes on the issue, and not the votes on the amendment to the amendment or on the motion to table, it will be found that when we voted the first time the opposition, with its very adroit leadership, caught the Senator from Louisiana with his troops out of town, so I lost by six votes. I should not have lost by six, but some of the Senators, seeing I had lost already, proceeded to give pairs, and we lose by more than we should have. I love the custom of giving pairs.

The next time we had a unanimous-consent agreement, and I worked very hard to have my troops in town, and won by four votes. The opposition had too many absentees.

That made it 50–50. I do not blame the opposition for being dissatisfied with that result. If I had looked around and seen I had as many absentees as they had that day, I would have said, "We are not going to settle for that at all, we are going to fight this matter until we get our troops back in town." And they did.

Then we came back up, and the very unfortunate situation occurred that, because of a failure of communication between me and the majority leader—and I am willing to accept the lion's share of responsibility for that failure of communication—an unfortunate motion was made at a time when I was winning. And from my point of view, no worse motion could have been made.

When we got together and understood the problem and the lack of communication, the majority leader tried to rectify the mistake. However, he was not afforded the opportunity to do so. The majority leader then went ahead, made his motion, and voted against his own motion. In that confused situation it looked like the opposition won. However, I do not think in the confused status that existed that this was a real win for anyone.

I then offered an amendment to strike the proposal from the bill. A motion was made to table my amendment. That was my turn to win. I won by four votes. That made it 2 to 1 in my favor. Then we had the vote this last Tuesday which I lost. That made it even, 2 to 2.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, how long will we continue with this?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. A standard ball game consists of nine innings. We have only had five innings. I do not know how we will finally settle the issue.

I do know how I would like to settle the issue. If I had my way about it, we would have the bill in committee, conduct hearings, and study what people suggest. A lot of people said that we ought to have reform and find some method to provide for honest financing of these presidential campaigns.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may continue for an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. People have said: "I do not agree with this method, and I do not like this method. There ought to be more safeguards provided. There ought to be a provision for a third party."

The way to work that matter out is to let the committee members work on the issue. The contestants in this controversy in the main have been members of the Finance Committee—Senators GORE, WILLIAMS of Delaware, SMATHERS, and myself. Others have been involved and have made speeches. However, for the most part those who have been making speeches and fighting the battle have been members of the Committee on Finance.

Logically, the best way in which to settle this is to put the measure in the committee for study and recommendations. However, we are not that smart. We do not do the right thing that quickly. We think about it for a while and meditate and consider less satisfactory answers before arriving at the most satisfactory solution.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from Louisiana will recall that at the end of the first battle, which he lost, I paid him tribute for his tenacity. I said that I admired him for the fight he had made. He was down. He was out. However, he did not recognize it.

I am today compelled to change the word "tenacity" to "obstinacy."

What I thought was a virtue 3 weeks ago, I now describe as a vice.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I appreciate the first statement of the Senator to the effect that I am tenacious. He did not know how right he was.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator is correct on that.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, as a matter of record and so that all of the opprobrium which is now being developed is not directed solely and completely at the Senator from Louisiana, I remind my distinguished friend, the Senator from Ohio, and other Senators, that on April 13 when the matter was first being debated, I tried to inform the Senate that if we agreed to the amendment which was sponsored by the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware, we would be here in 3 weeks debating the very same thing.

I said at that time that what would happen would be that rather than facilitate consideration of the campaign law and its improvements, we would find that we would be getting ourselves into a hassle if we adopted the amendment, and that we would then have neither one of them. And such has been the case.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself an additional 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for an additional 3 minutes.

Mr. SMATHERS. I am sure that while none of us likes the fact that we are here on a treadmill, going around and around, I think in fairness that we should not direct all of the criticism occasioned by this fact toward the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it does not make any difference how long it takes. If it takes from now until Christmas, or from now until New Year's Day, we ought to do what we are paid to do: give the people some good legislation for their money.

Everybody agrees that something should be done about corruption in government. We all agree that something ought to be done to try to make it honest and make it clean and make it fair for everybody and good for the public.

The President submitted recommendations on what he thinks ought to be done. What happened? Every committee, except the Finance Committee, took a bill, talked about it, and conducted hearings. Yet nothing happened. However, in the Finance Committee—if I may boast for a moment—under the leadership of the junior Senator from Louisiana said: "We will bring in a bill." We did that. We voted on the bill, and the bill was passed.

The Finance Committee was the only Senate committee to approve a bill and carry out the recommendations that had been made for clean and honest elections.

What sort of thanks did I receive for being the only committee chairman to bring in a bill to try to clean up corruption in government? After the law was placed on the statute books, I was told that it must be repealed. I then said: "Fine. Let us repeal it. You give me something better and I will vote to repeal my own act. However, I will not vote to take off the statute books what we now have before we have something better. What do you have to offer? Bring in your bill and let us see what it is." As far as I am concerned, far from taking off the statute books what little we have done to clean up corruption in government, we ought to put more laws on the statute books to bring about clean government.

If the Finance Committee had had jurisdiction over the relevant parts of the Corrupt Practices Act, there would have been a lot of recommended improvements reported by the committee—which has been an action committee in recent years, if I do say so—and brought to the Senate. And we could have voted them up or down, or amendments could have been offered to improve upon them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator from Louisiana said that we will stay here if necessary until Christmas or until the snow falls.

The Senator said that we would be doing the right thing by doing so. However, he arrogates unto himself the belief that his judgment is right and that the judgment of the other Senators is wrong.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I will not yield. I have listened to the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator can now listen to me.

I refuse to concede to the Senator from Louisiana that his judgment is infallible and that only he knows what is right.

Other Senators have a concept of decency and righteousness. I do not propose to be denigrated by the Senator from Louisiana in my purpose to cleanse elections of corruption.

The Senator from Louisiana—I marvel at his pride. He says to others, "You know not what you are doing. You listen to me. The Senator from Louisiana is right. The majority is wrong."

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the morning hour is concluded.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the Senator from Ohio certainly misunderstood what I said. I said that, if need be, we ought to stay here until Christmas or until New Year's to do for the people what they are paying us to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What Senator Long wants done.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The RECORD should show that I shook my head when the Senator shouted that from his seat. The fact of the matter is that I did not say that and did not mean that. All I said was that we ought to stay here until Christmas or New Year's, if need be, to do what we believe is best for the people of this country. I did not say that you ought to do what I want to do. It is just the opposite, so far as I am concerned. I believe that you ought to do what your conscience tells you that you ought to do. You ought to pass the best laws you can pass, and you ought to give the public the best return you can for their money, for sending us here, whether you are winning or losing.

I simply said that it seemed to me that we have made a move in the direction of clean, honest elections. I explained that having made some headway in that area, it seemed to me that we should not move backward, that we should move forward. If the Senator from Ohio does not like what the Finance Committee was able to place before Congress, the Senator from Ohio should bring in his amendments to improve it. I was just suggesting that it would be a better approach to improve on what we have, rather than to back down on what we have achieved.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concede that the Senator from Louisiana is absolutely right, that we have to reform our laws; but I believe we should do it in one package, before hearings that will cover the whole gamut.

I admire the Senator from Louisiana for taking that position, but I respectfully submit to him, as the majority whip—that he should recognize that we have been in progress for 4 weeks and have gotten nowhere, and we should end this merry-go-round, this treadmill operation.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I shall not suggest to the Senator from Ohio that he should ever depart from the dictates of his conscience, unless he really in his heart decides that he just wishes to engage in a little mischief for a change.

I consider the Senator from Ohio a great Senator. I am proud to serve with him. I am proud to serve with every Senator, for that matter, but he is one of the great Members of this body.

I believe everybody should do what his conscience tells him is right and what he believes is right under the circumstances. I shall be glad to consult and discuss matters with the Senator. I would suggest that from time to time it might be a little more productive if the Senator would give me his advice in the closeness of the cloakroom, rather than on the floor; but I will accept it wherever he wishes to offer it, because I know he is entirely sincere.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, on yesterday I claimed recognition to discuss the campaign election problem. It was fairly obvious to those who were in the Chamber that I did not wish to vote on that matter immediately, that I desired to think about it overnight and to confer with a number of Senators about the parliamentary situation and what my rights would be in the event that such a motion were agreed to.

I have thought about the matter overnight, and I have concluded that I do not care to resist the motion to reconsider, and I would make it if I had the power to do so; but since I voted with the side that did not prevail, I do not have the power to do so.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be in order at this time to move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate agreed to the——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I object. We should proceed in orderly fashion. The Senator from Louisiana was a little arbitrary in demanding the floor yesterday after other Members had sought to obtain the floor prior to his asking for recognition. In the interest of orderly procedure we should now proceed in order, without unanimous-consent agreements for the time being.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator can do what he wishes. I notice the Senator came in and asked for a unanimous consent——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If we have a filibuster the best way to break it is to have a man talk himself out. I am interested in hearing what the Senator from Louisiana has to say; his remarks are always interesting, and I hope they will give us some enlightenment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I appreciate the Senator's statement.

Let me say to the Senator from Delaware that I enjoy hearing him talk, because I disagree with him so frequently that I know I am at least hearing an opinion other than my own when he is speaking. That is perfectly satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, before I discuss my amendment, which I intend to do in a few minutes——

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I respectfully suggest that, in fairness to the Senate, before we begin discussing amendments, there should be a quorum call.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I agree.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. I thank the able Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me for a moment. I requested that he do so simply because I have to leave the floor for a few minutes, and I wanted to be sure that there would not be some motion to recommit or to lay on the table that would bring to a close further debate on the Senator's amendment.

I do want to get the following statement in the RECORD. I have examined the amendment offered by the able Senator from Wisconsin. I am convinced that it is a good amendment, and the Senator from New Hampshire would ordinarily vote for it. However, in view of all that has happened, and in view of the imperative need to dispose of the central issue before the Senate, I wish to say to the Senator from Wisconsin that if there is a rollcall, with regret the Senator from New Hampshire will be compelled to vote against his amendment, even though the Senator from New Hampshire feels that it has much merit. Even if the amendment of the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from New Hampshire which was offered previously to this bill should be called up, the Senator from New Hampshire would be compelled to vote against the amendment he offered before. It is the intention of the Senator from New Hampshire to vote against every amendment until this issue has been brought to a conclusion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator, I would suggest that it is rather an arbitrary position to take. We have put an irrelevant amendment on this bill, which threatens the fate of the bill, itself. Now, a Senator rises to offer a relevant amendment, which has the support of the Treasury, which the manager of the bill is willing to accept, and which the objector says that he favors it on its merits. To say that while we have put an amendment on the bill which threatens the fate of the bill itself, we must now decline to consider all good and relevant amendments, which are more or less noncontroversial, appears to be an unreasonable position to take.

When I started out with this bill, and when the Gore-Williams rider was offered in the beginning, I said that I was willing to hold the bill to an investment tax credit bill if that was what the Senate wanted to do. I said, "If you are going to put this rider on, in my judgment it is extraneous to the bill." I said, "If you are going to put this irrelevant rider on it, others should be able to put their amendments on, and they should be considered on their merits."

Having made that statement we proceeded to vote on other amendments. Many of them, may I say, were totally irrelevant and had nothing to do with the bill. We did vote on all of them on their merits.

As to whether I have been seeking to load this bill down, let me say this: I voted on those amendments on their merits. I defeated a number of amendments and I voted in favor of those I thought were good amendments. I think we defeated as many as we took. However, we have had a number of amendments offered which had not been considered before, but the majority of the Senate thought that they were good and agreed to them.

If the Senate had gone along with me in my original proposition when I said that I was willing to hold this to the investment tax credit, and if the Senate had gone along with me in my position as chairman of the committee and floor manager of the bill, and if we had held this to the original purpose of the bill, this amendment is still one of those we would have taken because it is an investment tax credit amendment. It is fully relevant to the bill. It is an amendment that we would have agreed to in committee, I say to the Senator, if it had been considered. Nobody called it up. I was not here at the time the committee voted to report the bill. Nobody called it up and there was no conversation about it and we did not vote on it.

Mr. COTTON. Just a minute. Is the Senator from Louisiana asking for a quorum? He has characterized my statement. He has criticized me. I should like to have the floor yielded to me, so that I may answer him. I have not troubled the Senator from Louisiana for 6 long weeks, but I am not going to be walked upon. I will answer him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from New Hampshire is in error. I was not about to ask for a quorum. I spoke to the Senator from Wisconsin concerning something I thought he ought to know about the parliamentary situation. The Senator from New Hampshire guessed quite incorrectly if he thought I was about to suggest the absence of a quorum. I did not have that in mind at all.

I completely respect the right of the Senator from New Hampshire to respond to me. I would not cut him off for the world. But the Senator was in error in assuming that I was seeking to deprive him of some parliamentary right. I was not.

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator from New Hampshire is in error, he apologizes, but he wants to be heard. The Senator from Louisiana has certainly criticized the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from New Hampshire will answer, if the Senator from Wisconsin will yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, the Senator from New Hampshire has not addressed the Chair nor lifted his voice nor interfered in this prolonged debate for the last 6 weeks. Senators who serve with the Senator from New Hampshire will testify that it is rarely the Senator from New Hampshire enters into a debate unless it is on a bill that has been reported by a committee on which he serves, a bill which he has reason to believe he has some background to discuss carefully and intelligently.

This debate has been going on for 6 weeks, and the Senator from New Hampshire has not said one word, on or off the floor of the Senate, about the way it has been conducted by the assistant majority leader, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished and able Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from New Hampshire rather enjoyed and admired the remarks of the Senator from Louisiana a few minutes ago when he gave, I thought, an interesting, whimsical, and, at the same time, penetrating comment on the U.S. Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana said he liked the Senate because we do not claim to be something we are not; because we do not claim to be statesmen; because we do not claim to be speaking without error. I enjoyed his remarks. He was humble, penetrating, and whimsical, characterizing what I agree is a reason why I like the Senate.

But then what happened? The Senator from New Hampshire believes he has the right to express his own convictions just as much as do Senators who engage more extensively in debate. The Senator from New Hampshire believes that the time has come to vote against all amendments.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] has offered what the Senator from New Hampshire believes is a meritorious amendment. The Senator from New Hampshire believes, though, that he must vote against it in spite of that fact. So in courtesy to the Senator from Wisconsin, he felt that a simple statement, one which would last about half a minute, should be placed in the RECORD as to why he shall vote against an amendment that he believes is meritorious. What happened?

The distinguished assistant majority leader, chairman of the Finance Committee, and Senator in charge of the bill, got up and characterized the Senator from New Hampshire as being arbitrary. A pretty arbitrary attitude to take, says the Senator from Louisiana, to have the audacity to get up and explain courteously and in perfectly mild terms to the Senator from Wisconsin why the Senator from New Hampshire felt that he could not vote for his amendment. That is described as arbitrary.

Well, Mr. President, if that is arbitrary, I would hate to try to find the words to express the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire as to whether the conduct of the man who has been holding the Senate in a vise for 6 weeks is arbitrary or not. Oh, no, probably that is not. However, when one silent Senator who has listened silently all through this painful experience, which should not be interpreted to mean that he had any lack of opinion or conviction about it, he ventures to make one statement out of courtesy to the Senator from Wisconsin, he is labeled arbitrary.

Now that this subject has been raised, I want to trespass on the patience of the Senate for about 4 more minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield briefly there? I hesitate to interrupt him, but there is an announcement which the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS] would like to make at this moment, and then I shall be glad to yield once more to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Certainly.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DELEGATION OF MEMBERS FROM THE BRITISH HOUSES OF PARLIAMENT

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am very pleased today to have escorted onto the floor of the Senate a group of Members of the Houses of Parliament from Great Britain, who have come to the United States to confer with Senators and Representatives on an annual exchange basis, in which we discuss various problems affecting our two great countries as well as other areas of the world.

These gentlemen are now in the Chamber, having been given the courtesy of the floor, and are seated in the rear of the Chamber.

I should like to ask the members of the British delegation to please stand up and be recognized by the Senate.

[Applause, Senators rising.]

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I appreciate this opportunity. I hope that Members of the Senate will take occasion to introduce themselves to members of this delegation. These gentlemen are engaged in the same sort of legislative process in Great Britain that we are undertaking here today in the Senate.

I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for yielding to me.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I do wish to thank the Senator from New Hampshire for yielding at this time, and apologize to him for having interrupted his remarks. However, as the Senator can see, this was a situation which I felt should be taken care of immediately.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield once again to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, in view of the——

May we have order, Mr. President?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me in order to ask for a 2-minute recess?

Mr. COTTON. I will say but two sentences, if that does not trespass on the patience of the Senate. In view of the fact that these distinguished and honored guests are with us, and notwithstanding the fact that for the first time in 6 weeks the Senator from New Hampshire desired to talk only 4 more minutes, and has been completely interrupted in what he was saying—the Senator from New Hampshire will terminate his remarks and express his thanks to the Senator from Wisconsin for his courtesy. He will not trouble the Senator from Wisconsin or the Senate again during this debate, unless someone tries to "tramp" on him.

RECESS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have a 2-minute recess in order to meet the British delegation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Senate will stand in recess for 2 minutes.

At 2 o'clock and 28 minutes p.m., the Senate took a recess.

The Senate reassembled at 2 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m., and was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair).

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, yesterday, I briefly discussed this amendment. Today I would like to explain why the amendment is a necessary, vital amendment in my State, and I am sure in a number of other States.

The amendment is of great importance to any firm which is having a hard time, which is struggling along, which is losing money, or which may have lost money for 2 or 3 years, but which has made money in the past.

Let us take as an example a firm in a highly competitive industry, struggling to stay alive, which loses $10 million in 1967. It carries that loss back to 1965. That year, though it had just about broken even, having confidence in the future, having confidence in the industry, it engaged in a big expansion program and had taken a $10 million investment credit. By carrying back the $10 million loss to 1965, as all firms can, the investment credit taken in 1965 is wiped out.

Unlike its competitors, this firm cannot carry back that unused investment credit, but can carry it forward. That may be useful in 6 or 7 years from now, but this firm is struggling to stay alive now.

Under present law it cannot carry that investment credit back to a year when it made money. If the 1967 loss had occurred earlier, the firm might under those circumstances, have been able to carry back its investment credit as well as its net operating loss.

This amendment would enable that firm, if it had its investment credit wiped out in 1965 by the 1967 loss carryback, to in turn carry the 1965 investment credit back to an earlier year.

This would help a struggling company, a company which is involved in competition, stay alive. That kind of struggling company is the kind that makes a big investment and takes a big risk. We passed the investment credit for exactly that kind of company, one that was struggling, or just about breaking even, but wanted to make an investment. That was the purpose of the investment credit proposal when it was before us.

It is precisely that kind of struggling company, in a tough, competitive situation, that is handicapped by the present law.

As I have said, this proposal is one the committee chairman has already agreed to. The distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] agreed it was a meritorious amendment and supported it. It was adopted by the Senate a few weeks ago. It is one to which the Treasury has no objection. It is one that would cost very little money.

I believe it is very important, in our competitive industries, to keep alive those companies having a hard time.

That is why I think it is necessary for a Senator from a State which has this problem in the biggest employing industry in his State to make as strong a fight as he knows how for this amendment. It is why it is necessary for me to go into some detail as to why this amendment should be accepted.

Under present law, a technical provision results in discrimination against taxpayers who have income in one year which is subsequently offset by a net operating loss carryback to that year. In cases of this type, the taxpayer may be deprived of the tax benefit of the investment credit, a result which would not occur had the taxpayer initially had no income in the year in question rather than having this income subsequently wiped out by a net operating loss to that year.

Under present law, a taxpayer claiming the investment credit loses the benefit of the credit which he has already obtained if he incurs a net operating loss in a subsequent year which is carried back to the year in question. In this case, to the extent the net operating loss carryback wipes out or reduces the taxpayer's tax liability before the allowance of the investment credit, the benefit of this investment credit is lost unless the taxpayer can use this as a carryover to a subsequent year.

And because he can use it as a carryover to a subsequent year under present law, my proposal would not cost the Treasury anything in the long run, but it is of great importance to those individual firms to have this money available now, if they are to stay alive. This is true not simply as to the automobile industry but as to the equipment industry and other industries which have struggling units which are having difficulty.

The carryback of the investment credit is denied under present law where tax liability in a given year is wiped out or reduced by a net operating loss to that year. While it is true that this investment credit can be used in a subsequent year, this, of course, does a taxpayer no good unless he has taxable income in the subsequent year.

This result is incompatible with the achievement of parity among similarly situated taxpayers—discriminating against the taxpayer who has income in one year which is offset by a loss in a subsequent year—even though the taxpayers in question may have the identical income when their income for the 2 years in question is consolidated and looked at together. This is true because a taxpayer claiming the investment credit who does not incur net operating losses in later years has an investment credit carryback available to him and, therefore, is not forced to surrender the benefit of the investment credit even though he has no income in that year.

In the cases I have cited, both taxpayers are in the same position in that their aggregate income for the 2 years is the same. Although each taxpayer in these cases committed himself to acquire property eligible for the investment credit, only one is permitted to retain the benefit of the credit under existing law. My amendment is designed to remove this discrimination against the taxpayer with fluctuating income.

The difficulty is that under present law a company in a cyclical industry or a company in an industry which is so competitive that some of the units lose money is very seriously handicapped as compared with a company in an industry which has steady income.

There was no evidence of any intention on the part of the Congress to penalize those firms that first, are in cyclical industries where income varies greatly and in some years they lose money; or second, are smaller firms which are up against giants and which may lose money and have bad years and have to engage in all kinds of extraordinary action in order to keep alive.

One of the great difficulties in this country is that we have a number of industries in which a very small number of giant firms dominate. We know that is a defect of our economic system. We have done a great deal to try to help those firms. We have tried to use antitrust legislation. We have found it is ineffective. We have tried to use provisions in the Small Business Act to assist them. While it is promising, it is something that has not had results, at least to date, which are as helpful as they should be or must be.

This is a provision which, as I have said, is fair, is equitable, is not opposed by the Treasury, was adopted to the bill before, and is essential to a major industry in my State, and, it seems to me deserves approval now.

Let me show by two specific cases the discrimination I am referring to. Assume that in case 1 the taxable income of the taxpayer as shown on his return for 1966 is $2 million. I have charts in the back of the room which spell out the effect in these instances I am giving. In case 1, the case at the top, the net income of the taxpayer, as shown by his returns for 1966, is $2 million. Let us assume for ease of illustration a flat 50-percent tax rate. In this case, his tax due before any investment credit would be $1 million. Let us assume that his investment credit for that year is $200,000, as I do in this particular case. Since this is less than 25 percent of $1 million, the whole amount would be initially allowable as a credit in that year, reducing the taxpayment to $800,000.

Let us assume now that this taxpayer has a net operating loss carryback from 1967 to 1966 of $2 million. That is chart No. 1, the top chart on the easel. This would mean that his taxable income for 1966 would be wiped out in the recomputation which would be made after applying the net operating loss carryback. This would also mean the disallowance—that he would lose, have to give up—the $200,000 investment credit which had been allowed the taxpayer in that year. Under existing law, this $200,000 investment credit could not be carried back to a year earlier than 1966. It would be available only as a carryforward to a year after 1966. This, of course, would do him no good if he had no income in the subsequent 5 years or, if he was struggling to keep his head above water, would do him very little good insofar as his credit status was concerned because of the uncertainty as to whether he would have income in a subsequent year.

Everybody who has been in business knows the very great importance of having that $200,000 in the hand—not something you might be able to get back, if you make money, 5 or 6 years in the future.

So in this case, in case 1, the firm would lose its $200,000 investment credit.

In case 2—which I now put on the easel—let us assume that in the year 1966 he had no taxable income to begin with. The taxpayer in this case, if he makes an investment resulting in an investment credit of $200,000, could carry this back to a year before 1966, offset tax liability in the earlier year, and obtain a refund of $200,000. For this taxpayer the money would be in hand in 1966 and could be used to improve his financial position for subsequent years. He would not have to wait to determine whether this $200,000 could be used as an offset to tax liability in a subsequent year.

Therefore, in the two cases I have given, even though the income for the two taxpayers in the years 1966 and 1967 was zero in both cases, and even though the tax liability in these 2 years was also zero in both cases, nevertheless the taxpayer who had the net operating loss in 1967 which wiped out his income in 1966 would not have the $200,000 investment credit carryback from 1966. On the other hand, the taxpayer who initially had no income in 1966 would have the $200,000 investment credit carryback which could result in a refund of up to $200,000 through the reduction of an earlier year's tax.

What equity is there in this? These taxpayers are in virtually the same position. One can keep the $200,000 investment credit, the other cannot.

The difficulty, of course, is that the firm that is in tough, hard competition, or is in a cyclical industry, is penalized.

One may well ask why is the investment credit carryback denied to a taxpayer whose income is wiped out by a net operating loss carryback to that year while the investment credit carryback is generally available to other taxpayers. Actually, I have not been able to find a good reason for this discrimination in existing law.

As I say, this amendment was up before. It was discussed before, it was accepted before, there was no objection to it by any Democrat, by any Republican, by any member of the Committee on Finance or by the Treasury. Nobody can see anything wrong with the amendment, and certainly there is great merit, and it does provide greater equity.

After discussing it with staff personnel who were here at the time, I have concluded that the investment credit carryback in the case that I have cited was denied simply because it was thought that some administrative problems might develop because of the number of years which could conceivably be involved. A net operating loss carryback could wipe out tax liability 3 years back. In turn, an investment credit carryback which arises because of the wiping out of the income in that third year back may in turn decrease tax liability 3 years before that. In other words, it is conceivable that this provision could have an effect in the tax liability for a period 6 years back from the year in which the net operating loss is incurred.

While this is true, a taxpayer could not claim the investment credit carryback unless he could establish what his tax liability was in the earlier year. Therefore, if neither he nor the Internal Revenue Service had a record of the tax liability in the earlier year, I do not see how it would be possible for him to establish his claim for the refund. This is the only reason I have been able to find for the denial of the investment credit carryback where it interacts with a net operating loss carryback. This does not seem to me to be a valid reason for discriminating against these taxpayers with fluctuating incomes.

The Treasury Department agrees with that, and, as I say, members of the committee, including the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Florida, and the Senator from Louisiana also agree.

My amendment, therefore, makes the investment credit carryback available where the investment credit allowable for a year has been wiped out by reason of a net operating loss carryback to that year.

Mr. President, this amendment certainly is germane to this bill since it deals only with the investment credit. It perfects a deficiency in the present law which has been overlooked in the past. Moreover, the Treasury Department has stated that it has no objection to this proposal to amend the investment credit provisions to permit the carryback of a used investment credit which arises by reason of a net operating loss carryback.

The investment credit bill which is now before the Senate not only deals with the restoration of the investment credit but also contains a perfecting amendment making the investment credit available in the case of aircraft registered with the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, if it is operated outside of the United States pursuant to a contract with the Government. In addition, the bill which is before the Senate also contains an amendment dealing with the effective date for a provision increasing from 25 to 50 percent the proportion of the tax liability which may be offset by an investment credit.

The amendment that I am offering is the same in character as these amendments which are already in the bill before the Senate—amendments which were made to the bill by the Finance Committee itself. In fact, the provision relating to the 50 percent limitation, with another effective date, actually was in the bill sent to the Senate by the House. As a result, I think it is clear that there can be no question that the amendment that I am offering is germane to the basic subject matter of this bill.

My amendment is also essential to removing discrimination against taxpayers with fluctuating incomes.

It is particularly important, I believe, that we remove discrimination against taxpayers of this type. These are taxpayers with substantial losses which wiped out income in earlier years. Taxpayers in this status frequently cannot be sure of their financial status in the future, and their creditors cannot be sure of their future financial status, either. Therefore, it seems to me that these taxpayers are the very last ones that we should deny an investment credit to. They need cash. They need money. They are having trouble getting money from banks, when they are in this kind of situation.

Obviously they would lose a substantial amount of money. They would have had to break even in 1 year and lose money in a subsequent year to come under these provisions contained in the amendment. Certainly, they should be eligible for investment credit carrybacks on at least an equal basis with other taxpayers.

PURPOSE OF CARRYBACKS

Mr. President, it impresses me as highly inequitable to force a corporation to choose between carryback losses and investment credit that it had previously taken. Let us consider for a moment the purpose of the investment credit. It is to stimulate investment; to encourage corporations to invest in new productive capacity. Let us now imagine a corporation that a few years ago, motivated by the investment credit, and its confidence in its future and its industry and its desire to compete more effectively with its competitors. Let us imagine also that it is a company—as are so many companies—in an industry characterized by large units. This is a struggling company. It undertakes a substantial investment and improves its capital formation and capital facilities.

It then applies this credit to the earnings of the next few years. So far, this is fine—this is exactly what the legislation is supposed to accomplish. But now let us say that this corporation—enterprising, willing to take risks—runs into a bad year and sustains a loss. Normally, a corporation can apply losses to prior years' profits retroactively, if it is advantageous for them to do that rather than carry forward the loss. Again this tax provision has a very laudable purpose: to permit companies to surmount the ups and downs of our complicated market economy and, in effect, to even out their earnings. Such a provision performs a very useful role of promoting stability in our economy. By offsetting losses against prior year gains, a corporation feels that it has some cushion to fall back on and that it will, therefore, be more capable of sustaining a bad year without lethal defect on its operations.

Now, consider the inequity of denying a company both of these remedies. The enterprising company that invests and then sustains a loss is placed at a real disadvantage compared with the company that did not invest, that did not have confidence in the future, that did not want to improve its competitive position, that did not want to challenge the giants in the industry.

This is because the investing company would lose its investment credit by so doing—as I have explained earlier. This runs counter to the very purpose of the investment credit which is to stimulate investment. Should such companies be placed in a more vulnerable position than companies who have not invested in recent years?

As I say, if there is one continuing thread running through the hearings of the Joint Economic Committee and the economic discussion on the floor of the Senate, it is that what we do should not create economic and financial chaos in this very serious problem in America of overconcentration in industry.

None of us wants to see a situation develop in which the efficient are penalized for being efficient.

We can make an argument in favor of antitrust action. However, we know on the basis of our experience that antitrust action is unlikely to get as far as we would like to have it.

I do not think there is much need to dwell on the importance and validity of carryforward and carryback losses, but let me just give an example: Take a firm A which earns $5,000 in each of 2 successive years, with firm B which loses $10,000 one year and makes $20,000 the next.

Certainly we ought to write tax laws that are impartial, that are equally fair to the firm making $5,000 year after year and the firm that loses $10,000 one year and makes $10,000 or $20,000 the next year.

There is no reason why one company should be better than the other or should be preferred to the other. As a matter of fact, if any firm deserves and needs preference it is the firm that is struggling over the years and has its ups and downs because of the nature of its industries.

The two firms realize the same income in a 2-year period. But without carryforward and carryback, the firm B would be liable for tax on twice as much income as would firm A. Thus, the carryforward and carryback provisions, by equalizing the two, have a stabilizing effect and encourage risk taking.

The principle of allowing the loss of one year to offset the profits of other years has been recognized by Federal tax statutes since 1918, with an intermission from 1932 to 1939. Other countries, too, have incorporated the loss carryover feature in their tax laws. At the present time Canada and Great Britain have the same offset allowance as we do, namely, a 1-year carryback and 5-year carryforward. The Netherlands permits losses to be carried forward for 2 years; Japan and Germany, 3 years; Argentina, 4 years; France and Uruguay, 5 years; and Australia, 7 years. Most of these allowances are of relatively recent origin.

The inequity of a tax system which does not allow the losses of one year to be offset against the profits of other years is traceable to the annual computation of income. True earnings of a business enterprise are not usually demonstrated by the result for 12 months. The true profit or loss of a concern can be determined with accuracy only over its entire existence. If a company is taxed in years of profit without allowance for losses in other years, its tax burden is out of proportion to the income actually earned over the period. Taxpaying ability does not exist or, at the least, is overstated if a substantial portion of a year's profits is required to cover losses of a prior year.

Annual assessment of income tax does not harm the firm with a consistent record of profits, but the firm whose income record is interspersed with losses suffers discrimination. With respect to the payment of taxes, the latter firm is not in an equal position with the former. Indeed, the intermittently profitable firm may have less ability to pay, even with the same net income, since irregularity of income may require greater liquidity and other undesirable business adjustments.

All of us know, who have had any experience with banks or with banking, that banks are far less concerned about firms that have regular earnings, even if the losses are heavier than those of firms that do not have steady incomes.

Almost any bank, on the basis of the fact that a steady earner is one who can show a regular record of steady income, is going to prefer the firm that has the same income year after year, and will do everything it can to help it. On the other hand, a firm which has an erratic income will have more trouble getting the kind of credit it needs. This is not academic; it is something very real and very threatening to firms throughout the country.

I know about such a firm which is vital to the economy of Wisconsin, but I am sure that other firms in virtually every one of the 50 States are in the same position.

As is generally recognized, there is nothing sacred about the 12-month accounting period. Accountants recognize the difficulty of trying to determine the exact income of a particular period. There is a continual overlapping of business transactions from one period to another. Each taxable year of a business does not stand entirely by itself, unassociated with the results of other years.

The use of a single year as the taxable period, without providing for the offset of losses against profits, may convert the income tax into a capital levy. The reason is that the firm whose net income becomes negative is deprived of the right to deduct all the expenses of earning income. In particular, depreciation charges may be wasted during loss years; since depreciation allowances cannot be deferred, the taxpayer may be denied full tax-free recovery of investment in the depreciable asset. So far as the income tax base is concerned, a depreciation charge which merely adds to a loss—computed without the depreciation allowance—is fully wasted.

At the other extreme, an income tax which provides for unlimited offset of losses virtually assures the taxpayer that all expenses will eventually appear as deductions, and it equalizes the treatment of intermittently and consistently profitable firms. An unlimited allowance, however, is both impractical and unnecessary. Income tax administration necessitates the periodic closing of a taxpayer's books, and, as the quantitative evidence below suggests, most firms would achieve complete offset of losses with a fairly brief carryover period.

I am not asking for an unlimited carryback, either of the investment credit or of losses; I am simply asking for a very moderate adjustment to a situation which would treat firms equitably and treat firms that have precisely the same income under the present law, but pay different taxes, so as to provide that firms that have their investment credit wiped out by a loss carryback could in turn carry that investment credit back 3 years.

In most instances, provided that tax rates remain relatively constant, it matters little from the equity standpoint whether losses are carried back against previous profits or forward against subsequent earnings.

What is important is that a firm's tax liability be dependent on its true net income, the algebraic result of a period of years, rather than on the haphazard result of strictly annual determination. Both carrybacks and carryforwards satisfy this requirement since either type of offset lengthens the accounting period for tax purposes. However, in order to accommodate two special cases, a truly equitable carryover provision should permit both types of offset. Firms undergoing liquidation are benefited only by a carryback, and new firms can obtain relief for early losses only if the offset arrangement contains a carryforward element. For going concerns the equity problem is solved by either type of allowance.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin has offered a very meritorious amendment. Anyone who is familiar with tax legislation knows that this—in my opinion, at least—is an amendment that should be a part of the tax laws. There is no question in my mind about it.

I am a little embarrassed about its being offered at the present time, for this reason: I believe the time has come when we should get to the business of restoring the 7-percent investment tax credit. Much as I favor the proposed amendment, if there is a rollcall, I cannot vote for it.

I make the Senator this definite commitment, as a member of the Committee on Finance: At the first opportunity in the committee, this amendment will be offered, or it will be offered on the floor and I shall support it.

I get back to the fact that the investment tax credit should be approved. Not only is this a carryforward and a carryback in the instances mentioned by the Senator from Wisconsin, but also, it should be a part of the tax laws. I regret that I cannot support the amendment this afternoon, for only one reason: We have wrestled long enough on this piece of legislation. I believe the Senate itself and the country as a whole should get this matter behind it.

I have not spoken on this matter during the debate. I have hesitated to do so, because I believed that we should get back to the basic bill, and I am hopeful that we can do so soon.

I do wish the Senator to know that I certainly am in favor of his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas. No Member of the Senate is more fair, more understanding, or more helpful than is the Senator from Kansas. He has been a member of the Committee on Finance for many years, and he is a man of his word. I appreciate the support that he gives this amendment.

I hope the Senator from Kansas will understand my position. My position is embarrassing because I favor, as he does, the prompt restoration of the investment credit. I did my best last year, when the investment credit was suspended, to oppose the suspension. As the Senator from Kansas knows, I spoke many, many times on the floor in opposition to the suspension of the investment credit.

I desire to have this bill passed as soon as possible The suspension is hurting American industry in Kansas, in Delaware, in Wisconsin, and all over the country. It might mean that we will have a recession if we do not act. I believe it is most important. At the same time, however, I believe I have a duty to my constituency and to my strong feelings on the merits of this matter to make a strong fight.

Mr. CARLSON. I was associated with the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin in opposing the suspension of the 7-percent investment tax credit. I believe time has proved that we were correct; and if I had my way, we would restore it as of the date it was suspended. That will have to be determined, of course, in the conference. We voted on it in the Senate. It did not go back. The House provisions are somewhat better, and I would be pleased to accept them.

But let us get underway. If this were the only amendment, I would have no objection. But what may happen, in my opinion, if we start opening up this bill to amendments, is that we may be here another 2 or 3 weeks. I do not believe that would be good for the Senate, and I know it would not be good for the country and for industry.

I appreciate the Senator's position. I am with him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I am interested in the remarks of the Senator from Kansas because I, too, am somewhat in the same position. I believe that there is some logic to the argument being made by the Senator from Wisconsin.

If we had any assurance at all that after the action on this amendment we could move to the third reading of the bill I would feel somewhat differently about it, I would then be perfectly willing to take this amendment to conference to see if we could work out a solution to the problem that the Senator presents. But under the circumstances, where this may be interpreted as just the forerunner of a vast number of other amendments, some of which may or may not be meritorious, I am a little fearful of its adoption at this time.

As a member of the committee I say this to the Senator from Wisconsin: In the event his amendment does fall as a result of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves at this time, I would be glad to give it sympathetic consideration at a later date when the committee will be working on another tax proposal.

As I stated earlier, if we could have some understanding that we were going to move to the third reading after this amendment many Members would be willing to act now on the Senator's amendments on its merits. He is correct that it is an amendment that is germane to the subject, and it should not be characterized as a loading amendment. It is not of that character.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware. I appreciate his characterization of the amendment as one which is germane, one which should not be characterized as a loading amendment, and one which he believes has substantial merit.

I must say that I am certainly not party to any understanding that this would be the forerunner of a whole group of amendments. So far as I know, this is the only amendment pertaining to the investment tax credit which was offered from the floor and adopted. I do not believe that we develop any precedent by accepting this amendment. First, it is germane; it pertains only to the investment credit. Second, it has been adopted before, and any other amendments that come in cannot meet those qualifications. It was adopted before, a few weeks ago, when we were dealing with the same bill before the Senate.

So the understandable argument of the Senator from Delaware that this would let down the floodgates, that it would mean that we were going to be swamped with a lot of other amendments, would not be true. The proposed amendment is germane, and it has been accepted before, with the support of the Senator from Delaware. I believe a very strong case can be made against some of the other amendments, although they have merit.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If the Senator from Wisconsin could get unanimous consent that this would be the only amendment offered several Senators would feel much differently about its adoption, and I believe the results might be much different. I leave it to the Senator as to whether or not he will present such a request.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Delaware.

It is difficult to obtain unanimous consent for anything in this body, especially on something that is as controversial and as hard fought as is this particular bill.

Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Kansas said that we have wrestled long enough with the investment credit, and that we should pass the bill and get on our way, and I agree wholeheartedly. I should like to say something about the investment credit and why I believe it is so important.

Frankly, I opposed the investment credit in 1962, when it was first put on the books, because I thought it was discriminatory and unnecessary. I noted that a number of prominent businessmen opposed it. As a matter of fact, the firm which got the greatest benefit from it, American Telephone & Telegraph, which got a $75-million-a-year benefit—much bigger now—was against it.

They said it should not apply to utilities because it would provide no real incentive for them. There were a number of other able businessmen who said it would be disruptive and they would prefer improvement of our depreciation allowances, and so forth. However, it has gone on the books, and I think that the attitude of American business toward the tax is that it should not be taken off, put back on, taken off, put back on, changed, and modified so that there is uncertainty. They do want a certain tax law. Of course, the law has to be changed from time to time and it should be changed from time to time, but the changes should be gradual and they should be carefully and thoughtfully studied.

I believe the greatest mistake we have made in recent years was the action taken by Congress last year in suspending the investment tax credit. I hope that this will represent the last time the investment tax credit will be used for the purpose of short run economic policy.

It is interesting that of all the provisions in our tax laws, this provision is probably the worst provision to use as a means of stabilizing our economy. In March of last year, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler appeared before the Joint Economic Committee. He said at that time that he opposed suspending the investment tax credit. Later, he changed his position. Nevertheless, at that time he was opposed to suspending the investment tax credit. Why? He said there is a great lag in the impact of the investment credit because there is a variation in how long it takes to produce equipment which would benefit from the investment tax credit. He said that some equipment takes 2 or 3 months to produce, and that some equipment takes as much as 2 to 3 years. On the basis of a study which was made by the Treasury Department, it takes an average of something over 1 year. On this basis, Secretary of the Treasury Fowler and economists in the Treasury stated that they estimated the impact would not be felt until a year later.

If there is anything we know for sure about economics, it is that long-range economic forecasts have been inaccurate and disappointing. The National Bureau of Economic Research not long ago made a study. They found that forecasts for 2 or 3 months are reliable, but that forecasts for a period a year from now may be right, but, if so, they are lucky. There are as many bad forecasts as there are good forecasts.

For this reason, when we suspend the investment credit, as we did in October of 1966, we should recognize it will have its economic impact 1 year later. In October of 1966 we did not know what situation we would have in 1967. In 1966 the situation looked as if it might be inflationary and certainly we had to take the steam out of the economy and slow down the impact of heavy business equipment spending, which had been growing at a fast rate. However, it could not be slowed down effectively for a year. For that reason suspension of the investment credit was most unfortunate.

There is another aspect of the suspension of investment credit which deserves consideration and that is what it does to particular industries which produce equipment. The State of Wisconsin is a State that has a great deal of machine tool production. Machine tools are purchased by industry and they usually qualify for the full investment credit. Business is much less likely to purchase a machine tool at a time when they cannot take advantage of the investment credit. They are especially unlikely to purchase machine tools if they know that if they wait 2 or 3 months the law will go back into effect.

Last October we provided that it would go into effect in January of 1968. Therefore, if we leave the present law on the books and do not act on this bill it will mean in September, October, and November of this year the machine tool industry will virtually close down; they will not get orders. Why should businessmen place orders?

For example, consider a large airline. Sometimes they will order $400 million worth of equipment. If they order $400 million of equipment in December of 1967, and the present law is on the books and we do not change it, it will mean that they will be surrendering 7 percent of $400 million or throwing away $28 million in net profits. Any corporation executive who made that decision would not have his job long. That figure represents $28 million that he could get if he waited a few months, weeks, or possibly days.

This is why top executives in the machine tool industry said that they might as well take a vacation next fall if we were to leave this law on the books. They would have to close their shops, unemployment would increase, and hundreds of thousands of people would be out of work.

I agree with the Senators from Delaware and Kansas that this is a bill which should be acted on as promptly as possible. At the same time, as a Senator from a State with not one but several firms—one very large and important firm—that would be punished and punished badly unless the amendment which I propose is agreed to—and it is acceptable to the Treasury, Republicans and Democrats, and has been on the bill once—I do not see that I have any alternative except to talk in connection with the amendment and plead for it as long and as effectively as I can. I hope the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] will relent.

I appreciate that the Senator from Delaware made an interesting proposal that if I could get unanimous consent that there will be no other amendments that will be taken on the bill after this amendment is adopted he would support it. The Senator from Delaware knows I would have no chance whatever to get that kind of unanimous consent agreement and he puts me in the position of having to continue to fight for this amendment although he and I agree that we should vote and have it accepted. If the Senator from Delaware can make a more realistic proposal I would be happy to entertain it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Perhaps I am overly optimistic. I am always inclined to be optimistic. I would try it. Maybe the Senator would be surprised at the result. Perhaps he can get unanimous consent; at least I would try.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I hope that a little while later the Senator from Delaware will make that unanimous-consent request after discussing it with the leadership because I know the leadership wants to do the same thing that he and I want, and I would be delighted to support his unanimous-consent request.

At this time, when we are considering reinstatement of the investment tax credit, I think it is important to review the arguments which were made for and against the adoption of the investment credit and for and against its use as an anticyclical tool. This perspective is important because experience with the investment credit has invalidated many arguments against making it a permanent feature in our tax structure. I know that I, for one, have changed my views.

DESCRIPTION OF THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

THE TAX CREDIT AS ORIGINALLY PROPOSED

In 1961 President Kennedy proposed an investment incentive tax credit as part of his overall tax program. His tax message to Congress included the following statement:

> Specifically, therefore, I recommend enactment of an investment tax incentive in the form of a tax credit of 15 percent of all new plant and equipment investment expenditures in excess of current depreciation allowances.
>
> Six percent of such expenditures below this level but in excess of 50 percent of depreciation allowances; with . . . 10 percent on the first $5,000 of new investment as a minimum credit.
>
> This credit would be taken as an offset against the firm's tax liability, up to an over-all limitation of 30 percent in the reduction of that liability in any one year. It would be separate from and in addition to depreciation of the eligible new investment at cost. It would be available to individually owned businesses as well as corporate enterprises, and apply to eligible investment expenditures made after January 1 of this year. To remain a real incentive and make a maximum contribution to those areas of capital expansion and modernization where it is most needed, and to permit efficient administration, eligible investment expenditures would be limited to expenditures on new plant and equipment, and on assets with a life of six years or more.[1]

THE TAX CREDIT AS MODIFIED IN H.R. 10650

The original administration proposal made in April 1961, was modified in a bill, the Revenue Act of 1962, introduced in the House on March 12, 1962. A brief summary of this bill as introduced stated:

> Under the bill a business can subtract from its tax liability 8 percent of its new investment in tangible business assets other than buildings. This tax credit is an out-right subtraction from the tax and is in addition to the full allowable depreciation of the cost of the asset. The amount of the credit that can be taken in any year is limited by the amount of tax. The limitation involves the figure of $100,000 of tax liability. For a taxpayer whose tax (before the credit) is not over $100,000, the credit can offset his tax dollar for dollar. Where the tax is larger than $100,000, the credit is limited to $100,000 plus 50 percent of the part of the tax over $100,000. Any dollar amount of credit which is not usable (because of this limitation based on the tax) may be carried over and used against tax of the following 5 years.

THE TAX CREDIT AS PASSED

An amendment to the bill, adopted by the House on March 29, 1962, reduced the $100,000 figure to $25,000 and the 50 percent of the part of taxes over $100,000 to 25 percent. Further, the 8-percent credit was reduced to 7 percent. The tax credit in substantially this form was enacted as a part of Public Law 87-834 and continued in effect for 4¾ years before it was suspended in 1966. It enabled business firms to deduct from their tax liabilities 7 percent of the cost of investments in depreciable machinery and equipment used in the United States. The allowable credit for certain public utilities was 3 percent. Investments in new buildings were excluded from this credit.[2] The amount of the credit that could be taken in a given year could offset the firm's tax liability dollar for dollar up to $25,000 and 25 percent of its liability above $25,000. A 3-year carryback and a 5-year carry forward were provided for any dollar amount of the credit which was not usable.

---

[1] "Message From the President of the United States Relative to Our Federal Tax System," p. 6.

Mr. President, it is exactly this provision that I am now trying to amend, to provide that the 3-year carryback can be made available when the credit in the year taken is wiped out by a loss carryback. I have provided a specific example showing that the present law is discriminatory against the firm which has a regular income, is a struggling firm, one trying hard to be competitive.

The total cost of eligible assets with a useful life of 8 years or more qualified for the total credit; if the useful life of an asset was 6 to 8 years, two-thirds of its cost qualified, if the asset's useful life was 4 to 6 years, one-third of its cost could be used in the credit computation. Property with a useful life of less than 4 years did not qualify.

The original tax credit enactment required that the depreciable basis of the property be reduced by the amount of the credit allowed. If the full 7-percent credit was taken on an eligible asset, its depreciable basis was reduced to 93 percent of its investment cost. The Revenue Act of 1964 repealed this requirement.

THE MAIN ARGUMENTS MADE AT THE TIME THE CREDIT WAS PROPOSED

WAS THE INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT PROGRAM NECESSARY?

PROPONENT'S VIEWS

The main spokesman for the administration in support of the investment tax credit program was Secretary of the Treasury Dillon. He expressed his views in hearings before the Senate Finance Committee in April of 1962. At the outset of his statement he related the tax credit to the Nation's balance-of-payments problem and cited similar tax incentives abroad which were considered instrumental in making foreign producers more competitive in world markets. Regarding the proposed tax credit the Secretary stated as follows:

> It will stimulate investment in modernization and expansion of our industrial capacity, strengthen our whole economy, contribute to economic growth, and substantially increase the competitiveness of American products in markets at home and abroad.

It is interesting that the need to increase the competitiveness of American industry was a point well taken by the then Secretary of the Treasury Dillon, but, obviously, there will be a much more favorable effect on competition if the amendment which I propose is adopted. For the reasons I have mentioned, it will make the small, struggling firm continue to stay alive and continue to challenge the dominant giants of the various industries.

I continue reading:

> Our balance-of-payments position, as well as our standard of living in the long run, can be improved or even maintained only if we can increase our efficiency and productivity at a rate at least equal to that of other leading industrialized nations. These nations . . . are providing effective tax incentives designed to accelerate investment and growth. We cannot, therefore, afford to stand by and do nothing, or put off the affirmative action to a later day.
>
> We cannot hope to achieve the increased rate of capital formation necessary to more rapid economic growth and full employment unless we bring our tax treatment of capital investment into line with the standards which our European competitors have used so successively over the past decade.[3]

The investment tax credit program was proposed by the administration in a tax package which included a revision of bulletin "F" to bring about reductions in the guideline lives on depreciable assets. The overall purpose was to permit firms to recover their investments in depreciable property over a shorter period of time. However, Secretary Dillon cautioned that the guideline revision alone could not close the gap between depreciation practices here and abroad:

> Realistic depreciation cannot be expected to produce depreciation chargeoffs equal to the special incentive provisions in general use abroad. Nor can it provide the additional incentive which the experience of other industrialized countries has demonstrated is needed to broaden and deepen the flow of investment into new, more efficient equipment. The combination of both the forthcoming modernization of depreciation guidelines and a special incentive such as the investment credit contained in the bill before you is required if U.S. business firms are to be placed on substantially equal footing with their foreign competitors in this respect.[4]

The relationship between the tax credit and depreciation reform was one of the principal reasons why the Secretary stated that the credit "must be a permanent part of our tax code" as opposed to "a temporary remedy for recession."[5]

Secretary Dillon, in 1962, at the time the proposal was made, was the principal advocate of the proposal in the administration. He said that it should be a permanent part of our tax law and should not be taken off and put back as a means of trying to stabilize the economy.

His successor, Secretary Fowler, had the same view until he, somehow, changed his mind and decided that it could be used as a means to try to stabilize the economy. As we all know, he successfully persuaded Congress to go along with the suspension which was, in my judgment, most unfortunate, because it has increased the uncertainty in business and has resulted in a situation which has slowed down the economy in the past 3 or 4 months.

A substantial segment of the business community supported this position of the administration, and the following statement of a corporate executive is indicative of this support:

> The tax incentive credit is a necessary and primary step in the overall revision of depreciation rates, which revision is vital to the maintenance of our competitive position with our oversea counterparts operating in highly modern and efficient plants and in countries whose depreciation policies are far more favorable than ours.[6]

PREFERENCE FOR ADDITIONAL DEPRECIATION REFORM

A number of business groups supported tax reform to encourage investment but were wary of tax credit approach. It was maintained that the overall objective of the credit proposal was "to establish a precedent for the manipulation and direction of our economic and social institutions," and it was stated that the credit sought "to introduce the subsidy principle into the tax law" thereby increasing the Government's control over business.[7]

This segment of the business community preferred the alternative of additional tax relief via depreciation reform which it maintained was divorced totally from the investment credit.

It has been interesting to me, in the years I have been on the Joint Economic Committee, that when we have had testimony on the investment credit, both conservative and liberal economists have seen it as something to experiment with. I can understand these views of the economist, but I must say I deplore them, because of the impact on business, and the impact on the lives of hundreds of thousands of our people who may be thrown out of work as a result of this experimentation, and because businesses may go bankrupt as a result. It seems to me it is too serious a matter for Congress to proceed on this basis, especially when the record shows so clearly that the investment credit is just not the kind of provision in the tax law which lends itself to economic stability.

To refer to a quotation from a business executive on the tax credit:

> It (the tax credit) is not in form or substance a part of, or in substitution for, or in addition to, or a companion of, depreciation reform. It would simply provide reduction in the effective tax rates for taxpayers who use their income, or other funds, as the Government thinks it best for the economy at a particular time.[8]

When the investment credit program was first presented in April 1961, it met with considerable adverse reaction from businessmen who considered it a substitute for depreciation reform, particularly that which would provide for a revaluation of assets to account for inflation. This initial opposition tended to dissipate upon continued assurances from the Administration that enactment of the credit would not preclude reform of the depreciation tax laws, and gradually the tax credit approach gained support. Nevertheless, significant business opposition to the credit continued since it was feared that it might be subject to adjustment or suspension—which is what happened—and since the opinion persisted in some quarters that its passage would reduce the possibility of thorough depreciation reform including asset revaluation.[9] This position is indicated by the following statement made before the Senate Finance Committee:

---

[2] Rapid depreciation for commercial and industrial buildings is covered by another part of the Internal Revenue Code.

[3] U.S., Congress, Senate, Revenue Act of 1962, "Hearings before the Committee on Finance, United States Senate," 87th Cong., 2d Sess., April 3, 4, and 5, 1962 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962), pp. 80-81. (Hereafter referred to as Senate Finance Committee Hearings).

[4] Ibid., p. 83.

[5] Ibid., p. 85.

[6] Ibid., p. 1058.

[7] Ibid., p. 524.

[8] Ibid., p. 525.

> If the proposed incentive credit becomes law, there is a distinct possibility that it will be regarded as providing tax depreciation reform, and true reform will be long deferred.[10]

OPPONENTS OF THE TAX CREDIT

Foremost among the groups which opposed the tax credit outright at the time it was proposed was the AFL-CIO. Its views were expressed before the Senate Finance Committee by Stanley H. Ruttenberg:

> It is being argued by the Administration that this costly credit is vitally needed to stimulate capital investment and, particularly, to increase our ability to compete overseas. It is our view that this super-billion-dollar permanent subsidy . . . will do little to help achieve these desirable ends.[11]

It was maintained that the problems of industrial obsolescence and foreign competition were being exaggerated by investment credit enthusiasts; that an across-the-board tax credit subsidy was not needed to help pay for new investment since ample resources were already available to the business community; and that it was unlikely that significant additional investment would result from the credit that would not occur without it.[12]

> Thus, it is evident that the tax credit would neither guarantee a significant net addition to private investment nor would it selectively stimulate these forms of capital outlay that most serve the Nation's needs. Furthermore, over the years it would impose a burden of billions upon the public for subsidies totally unrelated to the financial need of the business beneficiaries.[13]

It was stated that the most appropriate tool to stimulate capital investment was not the tax credit but an increase in effective consumer demand which would serve to raise utilization rates on existing productive capacity.

> The major prerequisite for increased and sustained business investment is high-level use of existing plant and equipment and the expectation that sales will continue to rise.
>
> With much of our already existing productive capacity still idle for lack of orders, further tax benefits for business should be given the lowest priority. For this reason, and the additional fact that the productivity of new capital investment constantly is rising and multiplying the potential output of goods and services which must be sold, highest priority today should be given to tax policies which broadly stimulate consumer demand.

This was back in 1961 and 1962, when we had a different industrial situation and when Mr. Ruttenberg was testifying against investment credit. Let me read from one additional statement from Mr. Ruttenberg. This was in 1961:

> The kind of spur business needs most is the durable stimulus of rising family spendable income, which lower income taxes for the middle and lower brackets could now help provide. Instead of squandering the revenue from loophold closing on an unwarranted tax credit scheme, it would be far wiser to it to cut personal taxes and raise consumer demand.

Consider what happened to business investments in plants and equipment between 1961 and 1966. In 1961, business plant and equipment spending totaled $34.4 billion. In 1962, it increased by 8 percent to $37.3 billion, and in 1963 it increased by another 5 percent to $39.2 billion. And this was before the real boom in capital spending. That boom took place in 1964, 1965, and 1966.

In 1964, plant and equipment spending jumped by $5.7 billion, or about 15 percent, and in 1965 it rose by approximately 16 percent, or $7.1 billion. During 1966 the increase was even larger, up 17 percent.

The years 1964, 1965, and 1966 were unusual. We know those were years of boom and growth, but I think the really important, driving, stimulating, and unique part of it was business investment in plant and equipment. This was the element that, more than any other, in the view of virtually all economists, provided the kind of employment we had and the kind of increase we had in our gross national product. And, most important of all, it provided in the long run greater capacity by business. When business is investing in its own plant and equipment, that investment produces more, and far more efficiently, with lower manpower and labor costs.

Certainly, there were dramatic results. I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD at this point a table which shows the dramatic increases in expenditures for new manufacturing plant and equipment from 1958 to 1966. The percentage increase for this 8-year period is an amazing 136.8.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Expenditures for new manufacturing plant and equipment

[Dollar amounts in billions]

Period	Total	Percent increase
1958	$11.43	
1959	12.07	5.6
1960	14.48	20.0
1961	13.68	−5.5
1962	14.68	7.3
1963	15.69	6.9
1964	18.58	18.4
1965	22.45	20.8
1966	27.07	20.6
Total percentage increase		136.8

Mr. PROXMIRE. Incidentally, that percentage increase of 136.8 means that during that period we invested so much in plant and equipment that it not only doubled plant and equipment, but it increased it by almost one and a half what it had been before. While there was some retiring of equipment and plant, it means that, in a very real sense, this country in 1967 can produce twice as much as it produced in 1958.

Now for the administration views.

Secretary of the Treasury Fowler, testifying on the pending suspension bill, told the House Ways and Means Committee that the Johnson administration regards the tax credit "as an essential and enduring part of our tax structure." The current proposal, he said, is for "suspension and not repeal." After referring to his support of the tax credit in 1962, Mr. Fowler testified as follows:

> Since then industrial production has increased three times as fast as in the previous decade, real business fixed investment has increased nearly four times as fast, and our economic growth generally has far surpassed its previous rate. This remarkable achievement is not due solely to the investment credit, but I firmly believe the investment credit has contributed substantially to it. Moreover, looking to the long-term future I am convinced that the encouragement provided to business by the credit to modernize and expand its use of capital equipment is essential to maintaining full employment with stable prices, and to keep our industry competitive with foreign goods. The President and his Administration fully share these views.

To continue with Secretary Fowler's testimony:

> Not only do I regard the investment credit as a permanent structural component of our tax system but also one that should be suspended only in times of active hostilities at least on a scale such as characterizes the present situation. Even under such circumstances I would, as past attitudes have made clear, be chary of suspending the investment credit unless the combination of a rapidly expanding civilian economy and increasing and special defense needs made this course compelling. I would be opposed to treating the investment credit as one of many countercyclical devices to be suspended and restored with the normal ups and downs in our economy.

The present situation, Mr. Fowler testified, "is unique and was quite unforeseeable when the credit was adopted." At that time, he said "thoughts of a country engaged in hostilities on the present scale were far from our minds."

Here is a summary of the arguments for the bill.

In his recent testimony before the House Committee on Ways and Means, Secretary Fowler summarized his basic arguments for the tax credit suspension bill as follows:

> (1) It will contribute to a restraint of inflationary developments that are proving disruptive of the financial markets and placing excessive strain on the capital goods industries.
>
> (2) It will promote a more sustainable rate of balanced economic growth in the next sixteen months and thereafter.
>
> (3) It will suspend special fiscal stimulants to investment, and thereby support a policy of monetary restraint without incurring the burdens and without running the risks of excessively tight money and high interest rates.
>
> (4) It will complement other measures enacted by the Congress or pending before it and being undertaken through administrative action to reduce upward pressures on interest rates and minimize discrimina-

---

[9] Ibid., p. 727.

[10] Ibid., p. 897.

[11] Ibid., p. 632.

[12] Ibid., p. 632–634.

[13] Ibid., p. 634.

> tory impact of tight money and high interest rates on the housing sector of the economy.

Secretary Fowler told the House committee that the economy and financial system is strained by at least three clearly discernible pressures which he described as follows:

> In the money and financial markets, excessive demands for credit and monetary restraint together have created severe tightness and a sharp rise in interest rates, with highly selective impact on several sectors, particularly single-family housing.

Mr. President, this argument by Mr. Fowler was one that concerned me a great deal, because if one looks at the capacity of industry to buy plant and equipment without resort to borrowing, he cannot but be very much impressed. The fact is that the cash flow of our corporations has, in every single year, including these years of enormous investment exceeded—and usually exceeded by billions of dollars—the amount invested.

What I am saying is that if you take the undivided profits of these corporations, together with their depreciation reserve, those figures exceed the amounts they have invested in plant and equipment.

The reason I raise this point is because the argument of the Secretary of the Treasury that the investment credit persuaded businesses to go out and borrow money, drive up interest rates, and drive up the price of money by borrowing so they could invest in plant and equipment, does not stand up, because the corporations were able to buy all the plant and equipment they needed on the basis of the depreciation and undivided profits they had available—in other words, their cash flow.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to ask the Senator about the situation in connection with his amendment. I was told that when I was away from the Chamber, that in addition to the Senator from New Hampshire, other Senators indicated that even though they thought the amendment was right, that it is germane to the bill, that it has the approval of the Treasury, and that it should be agreed to, that they, nevertheless, intend to vote against it because they do not want any more amendments on the bill.

(At this point, Mr. Byrd of West Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. The distinguished Senator from Kansas, who is one of the finest Senators in this body and a man of great ability in the tax field, said, I understood, that he favors this amendment, that it is a good and meritorious amendment and should be passed; but, he said, under the present circumstances if it should come to a rollcall vote he would be compelled to vote against it because this matter had gone on long enough.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That does seem to be a strange position for the Senator to take. I started to use the word "arbitrary." I am not going to use that word. It never occurred to me that a Senator would be offended and outraged because I would refer to his position as being arbitrary when he said he was going to reject everything. It did not occur to me that he would find great fault with me and be seething with anger because the Senator from Louisiana suggested that his position was arbitrary. I am not going to say it is arbitrary. I am going to say it is unusual to find this parliamentary situation. We report a bill and someone offers an amendment that is not at all germane to the bill. The manager of the bill stands up here and says, "Look fellows, if you want to keep this to an investment tax credit bill, I am willing to do that."

That is what I said, "If you want an investment tax credit bill, that is what we will have. I will vote against good amendments that I would have voted for, if you want to keep amendments off the bill."

This amendment is relevant to the bill. It is a proper amendment to the bill. It has not been objected to by the Treasury.

So the Senator comes out with an amendment that has nothing to do with the bill and the floor manager says, "Let us understand each other. If this amendment is agreed to, I am prepared to tell Senators that if they have some amendments which are meritorious, bring them in and we will take a look at yours, too."

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] is a very fine man. I respect him. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] is a fine man. I respect him. But they are not the only two Senators in the Senate.

We say, "All right, if you Senators insist on putting this completely nongermane amendment on the bill, then I am going to tell other Senators that that is their privilege, too, and I will not fight their amendments because they are not germane. If it is a good amendment I shall vote for it."

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] comes in with his amendment which I voted for and fought for in committee. He submits his amendment. The Senator from Louisiana says that it is a good amendment.

I was against the Gore-Williams rider and I am still opposed to it. If the Senate votes on it and it becomes a part of the bill, it is my position that if they are going to put a bad amendment on the bill, why not consider a good amendment? Having put the Gore-Williams rider on the bill in two out of four votes, I would not be surprised if it lost the next time.

But now we are going to put this thing on here. If we are going to do that, we are not going to accept anyone else's amendment, even though it is germane, even though it could be agreed to by a unanimous vote. We are not going to accept it.

Mr. President, when I first came to the Senate, inexperienced as I was, I suppose someone could have said that to me and gotten away with; but I am frank to say, having been around this body for awhile, when someone says we are going to have the bill just this way and are not going to consider anyone else's ideas, we are not going to think about it, not even going to consider it, why, Mr. President, to me, that is just not how we should operate in this body. It could very well be that the Gore-Williams rider could kill the bill.

I said it. I said it publicly on the floor, that I would ask the President to veto the bill if that rider stays on there and survives the conference. But, at the same time, the Senator's amendment will not kill the bill. No one is quarreling about the Senator's amendment. It would make it an even better bill. I am prepared to vote for it and to support it in conference. If the House will not take it, they will not take it and we will have to do without.

Take the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], to help the aged people who seek to retire. That amendment will not kill the bill. I have been in conference on that matter before and we have had to yield to the House, may I say, as much as I was saddened to have to yield, for two reasons: one because it was a good amendment which would have benefited a million aged people who need some help; and, two, because it has as its sponsor one of the finest men in the Senate. One of the finest men, period. Why, it broke my heart to have to yield on that amendment, but at the same time we were compelled to yield on it. We did. We came right back from the conference and took it like men.

When that conference threw my amendment out, I took it to the floor of the Senate and spoke for 3 days against the conference report.

I kept the Senate in session all day Friday, all of Saturday and late into Saturday night, when people wanted to go somewhere, just because I did not appreciate one bit the effort the Senate conferees had made to throw out my amendment. I felt that they had not shown it the consideration I thought it should have. We fought hard for the Byrd amendment on that occasion so that it might prevail. I wanted to go back and try all over again so that we might make a nobler effort.

The Senator will recall that we stayed in session for a great period of time and inconvenienced a great number of Senators at that time. But let me say to the Senator that, having made that fight, I eventually prevailed. What I was fighting for on that occasion was that we should try to do something about mental health. It is now the law.

Let me say to the Senator that I think he is performing a great service. He is just being a Senator, declining to be told that the decision has been made by a number of people that they are going to put the ax on his amendment no matter what the merits are, that they are going to try to prevent him from putting on the bill the amendments that should be there.

I salute the Senator for his courage and his determination to make the Senate aware of what he is trying to do. I agree with him so much that I have asked my office to prepare a speech for me on the merits of the Senator's amendment and, in due course, I think that I will address myself to it as well, because it is a good amendment and it should be agreed to. If it is not agreed to, the Record should show that this was something that the Senate should have voted for.

I was not for the Gore-Williams amendment. If I recall correctly, the Senator from Wisconsin also was not for the Gore-Williams amendment. On one rollcall, we got almost 50 votes against the Gore-Williams amendment.

My guess is that if we try to take it on again, we will have more than 50 votes against that amendment. That being the case, it does seem rather amazing to me that people should say, "Well, now, we want this thing here which we have mustered on a bare majority. We want it so badly that we are going to insist that this be put on the bill, and nothing else."

That is the kind of thing which is a good way not to get what you want, in my judgment.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I am delighted that he favors my amendment and that he supports it that way so that he may speak for it.

It is beyond my understanding why we do not simply put the amendment on the bill. I cannot understand it. I really cannot. After all, everyone has said it is fine and good. The Treasury wants it. The Republicans want it. The Democrats want it. The committee members want it. It was accepted before.

The only argument is that this would open the floodgates. I do not see why because, first, it was accepted; second, it pertains to investment credit and is the only amendment that meets these qualifications—that is, it is completely germane. It has been accepted before. If they will accept it, then we can get on with our business. I just cannot understand why there is any opposition. It is beyond me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As chairman of the Finance Committee, I have gone to conference with that same group of conferees headed by one of the greatest men in Congress—in fact, I think he is the greatest Member of the House, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS. From my point of view he and the other conferees for the House are reasonable men who will listen to the amendments we adopt here.

From my point of view, of all the amendments that were put on this bill, there was only one that endangered the chances of that bill's surviving a conference, and that was the Gore-Williams rider. There was only one that would ultimately cause a veto by the President, and that would be the same rider.

So here we have the odd situation presented by those who would imperil the bill. There are in the offices of Senators, wire after wire from business people saying, "Please do not put irrelevant amendments on the bill that might kill it." There is only one way to kill the bill, and that is by insisting on this amendment, which could kill the bill. And yet with reference to one amendment that would not possibly offer any difficulty in conference, the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], they say, "Oh, no; we must not have this amendment. Oh, no; we cannot vote for that." Having put on this bill the one amendment that threatens it in conference, they do not want an amendment that looks after the interests of the business people who have invested their money with confidence in the great State of Wisconsin.

The Senator from Wisconsin is told, "I am sorry, Senator. I know you are right about this thing. Everybody knows you are right. The Treasury says you are right. The committee thinks you are right. The manager thinks it is right"——

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Republicans think I am right.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes. They think he is right. Yet, notwithstanding that it is important to the working people in that State, their jobs and existence, and notwithstanding that it is enormously important to the people who have had confidence in the State of Wisconsin, and who invested their money, notwithstanding that it is important to a corporation that needs some fair and equitable tax consideration, the Senator from Wisconsin is told that his amendment cannot be considered on its merits; that it has to be voted down even though he has every right to have his amendment voted on the bill. It does not jeopardize the bill.

Those who have had their amendment taken as a rider, one that does not have any relationship to the bill, now say, "We will vote on no more amendments." They say they will now take the guillotine approach, and anytime some Senator offers an amendment, on which he has worked hard, which he has cherished, one that is needed by suffering people, one that has been approved by the Treasury, that has been approved by the manager, they will put his head on the block, and down will come the blade and they will cut it in two.

I salute the Senator from Wisconsin for his courage in offering the amendment and in not accepting the answer of a few who think they have a better right to have their amendment considered than others, and hope that he will make a fight for his amendment. In days gone by, I have done it, myself, and I will do it again. It is not just the right of a Senator, it is the duty of a Senator; and I admire the courage, as well as the patriotism, honor, and consistency of the Senator from Wisconsin. He is a great Senator, and a great Member of this body, and the fight he is making for his amendment I think proves it.

Having expressed my great admiration for the Senator from Wisconsin, I should say that I do not always agree with him. On the inflation problem, the figures I have read indicate that investment in plant and equipment had risen from around $39 billion a year in 1963 to around $60 billion in 1966 and would have risen to perhaps almost $70 billion a year had we not suspended the investment credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some time earlier, before I engaged in colloquy with several Senators, I was discussing the reasons why the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury said that the suspension of the investment credit should be adopted last year. The first reason he gave was the situation in the capital markets. He indicated that so long as business was borrowing substantial sums to invest in plant and equipment, and was doing so because of the incentive of investment credit, there was pressure on the credit markets and a tendency for interest rates to rise. The high interest rates that were experienced in the first part of last year were a result of this.

Many things could be blamed for high interest rates. One thing which was blamed was the investment credit, because the cash flow of American corporations has exceeded the amount of investment in plant in every year from 1964 to the present.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It had jumped ahead by $9 billion in a single year, and it might have jumped ahead by $12 billion in 1966, had we not suspended the credit. I know the Senator voted against the suspension; he differed with me on that issue. But my figures indicated in the previous year we had an increase in investments in plant and equipment at the rate of about——

Mr. PROXMIRE. 17 percent, $9 billion.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That sounds right; about $9 billion.

So it looks very much to this Senator as though, with the war in Vietnam absorbing a great deal of our productive capacity, our manpower, and our ability to meet the demands for goods and services, that this investment credit was more or less the straw that was breaking the camel's back. It was the extra push that was destroying our economic health.

Mr. PROXMIRE. May I say to the Senator from Louisiana that one can make that argument, perhaps, in some respects, but one cannot make it in the respects that the Secretary of the Treasury did. The Secretary argued, first, that interest rates were higher because of the fact that corporations were borrowing money in order to buy equipment. There may have been a few corporations that had to do that. Most corporations did not have to do it, and as a generality, they had more money than they needed, in undivided profits and depreciation reserves.

In the second place, he said this is inflationary. Well, if it is inflationary, one would think we would have had inflationary prices in the plant and equipment area; in other words, that machine tool prices would rise, that prices of equipment would increase, and so forth.

But that is not where we had the inflation. The inflation was in services, in food, and in many other areas, but not in the equipment industry.

So I do not think one could make the argument very convincingly that interest rates were being forced up or prices were being increased by investment in plant and equipment.

The estimate I saw indicated, by October of 1966, that we would have this fall-off in the increase in investment in plant and equipment in 1967, before we suspended the investment credit. That is why I thought it was a mistake.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator believes that, I am sure. But may I say that the impression I gathered was that the investment credit was such a good deal that companies were taking all the advantage of it they could. This appeared to be extending their lines of credit, particularly the small businessmen; and when they would go to seek credit, here would be the larger companies, standing there at the door ahead of them and also looking for credit.

The fact that the housing starts went down in 1966 while the investment in plant and equipment went up, that same year, by $9 billion, would certainly suggest to me that that tremendous growth in plant and equipment was one of the factors we needed to slow down. We did not intend to stop it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. McGraw-Hill estimates, as I understand, that it will expand this year about 3 or 4 percent.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask the Senator to keep in mind that the investment in plant and equipment went up from about $34 billion in 1961 up to $60 billion in 1966, the year we suspended the credit.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The biggest expansion was in 1966, when it increased by $9 billion. As you said it rose from about $34 billion to about $60 billion over the period from 1964 to 1966.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was expected, however, to increase substantially above the $60 billion in 1966 if we had not—we suspended the investment tax credit.

With the suspension, the investment in plant equipment has still increased to an estimated $63 billion, at an annual rate, in the first quarter of 1967. However, the increase has been at the rate of approximately 4 percent instead of a jump of perhaps the $12 billion which would have been the case without the suspension.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Is it not true, however, that partly because of many other factors, the economy slowed down and slowed down too much? In November, December, January, and February, as a matter of fact, we had a dropoff in industrial production for the first time in 6 years.

We had a very serious reduction in automobile sales. We had a number of other elements in the economy which suggested that the situation was slowing down rapidly.

The statistic which usually precedes unemployment—a diminution in the hours of work—revealed a decrease from approximately 49.1 hours a week to approximately 43 hours a week.

I asked the Joint Economic Committee to check all of these statistics. They told me that of the 30 indicators that had been reliable in the past, in February and March about 19 of them were not moving at all, down or up. Of these 19, 15 were pointing down and only four were pointing up. One of those was the stock market which is a true reflection of what happens to interest rates in such a time. People get back into the stock market.

The indicators by and large suggested that the economy was moving downward. It was at this point that President Johnson on March 9 suggested that we restore the investment credit.

It seems to me that this was a confession that the investment credit, among other things, had had too sharp an effect on slowing down the economy and that there was a real danger of unemployment developing and increasing and that under those circumstances it would be wise to restore the investment tax credit.

I would agree with what the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] said earlier today, that this was a confession and admission that we should not have suspended the investment tax credit last year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator knows there is always room for argument. That is the reason that we have 100 Senators. If men always agreed, it would not be necessary to have 100 Senators.

These differences of opinion are healthy because they help us to consider all aspects of problems and arrive at the proper conclusions.

The Senator is aware of the fact that in his minority views the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] said this about the idea of even restoring the investment tax credit:

> The "nervous Nellies" in the White House and the Treasury Department have evidently decided that a threatened slowdown in the economy requires a disorderly retreat from a previously adopted plan of fiscal policy action. It is disquieting to note that all too many currently in the tax policy kitchen cannot stand the slightest suggestion of heat from the business community, particularly big business.

The Senator from Tennessee went on in his minority views to indicate that really there was no real need for the bill at all.

I ask the Senator if it is not correct that actually, while the bill had been pending, business had made some recovery and that the economy right now appears to be improving.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the statistics available are really too limited to say. I think that they are encouraging. They are better than they were before, but I would not say on that basis that the economy is moving ahead or is in good shape.

It is much better to look at it from the viewpoint of the past 6 months. If we do that and view it from that light, we will see that the economy is not moving ahead as it should.

I think there is a lot of room for improvement.

If the Senator will look at the corporate profits, for example, and see what happened to the profits of General Motors, Chrysler, and Ford, he will note that they all dropped very sharply.

General Motors' profits dropped one-third in the first quarter of this year. Ford profits dropped more than 50 percent, I believe, and so did Chrysler's.

These are among the most important elements in our society. Regardless of how one feels about the level of profits, we must recognize that because of the fall in profits, business is less optimistic and less likely to invest. The outlook is less promising.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am told that the automobile industry situation in the period to which the Senator referred was likely the result of the poor sales in the fall of last year which appear to have resulted from the confusion over the safety standards. That situation having been ironed out, the automobile sales are moving ahead now as we had hoped.

Mr. PROXMIRE. During the first quarter of 1967, in January, February, and March, sales dropped greatly compared to the same quarter of the prior year.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The first quarter sales were bad. However, the indications are now that they are improving.

I refer the Senator to some of the indicators, which indicate this.

The index of net business formation, with 1957–59 being the base year, shows that November was 100.6; December, 101.4; and January, 102.2. In other words, things are looking up. The rate is picking up.

With relation to new business incorporations in numbers, the indicators reveal 16,206 for November, 16,583 for December, and 16,703 for January. That is a nice indication for January.

The indicator for stock prices, 500 stocks, with 1941–43, as the base, shows 80.99 for November, 81.33 for December, 84.45 for January, and 87.36 for February. That gives us no cause for alarm.

Mr. PROXMIRE. These are very interesting statistics, but they are very limited. If we take the really big statistics, and take them from October up to date, we will find that industrial production, which is the major statistic used by the Federal Reserve Board, has not been good. It has been down. Retail sales have not been good. They have been a little better in the last few weeks. They are, nevertheless, still poor when compared with October.

We will find that the relationship between inventories and sales is discouraging.

A basic industry like the steel industry is producing less.

I think it is hard overall to be so optimistic about the economy as to believe that the pending measure should not be passed. I think it should be.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Retail sales are moving up now. I will come to those in a moment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. However, he should compare them over the last 6 months.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The latest figures are good. Let us look at other indicators which are rising. Personal income in billions of dollars, seasonally adjusted, shows the figure for December to be 601.8, January, 607.5, and February, 609.9.

Let us then look at the average hourly earnings, manufacturing, all industries, in dollars.

We see that the figures are, for December 2.77, for January 2.77, and for February 2.78.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think that is very discouraging in a country in which productivity is increasing. We have 3 months in which there is no improvement at all to speak of.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is a little improvement in February, not much, but slight.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Very slight. The figures indicate that during those 3 months the cost of living did go up slightly, and the compensation actually went up less than one-third of 1 percent. The Senator has given me the hourly compensation. The hours worked declined.

I am sure that even the money income went down, let alone the real income.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The indicator for nonagricultural employment shows for December, 69,882 people; for January, 70,240 people; and for February, 70,247 people.

Estimated weekly sales of retail stores, sales for the week ending, in billions of dollars:

February 11, 5.12.
February 18, 5.38.
February 25, 4.51.
March 4, 6.50.
March 11, 5.51.
March 18, 5.68.
March 25, 6.06.

Commercial banks, total loans and investments, billions of dollars; seasonally adjusted:

November, 308.4.
December, 310.7.
January, 314.5.
February, 316.2.

Total new construction, billions of dollars; seasonally adjusted:

December, 69.9.
January, 71.1.
February, 71.7.

So that indicator seems to be in pretty fair shape.

Selected liquid assets held by public, billions of dollars; seasonally adjusted:

December, 601.
January, 604.7.
February, 604.8.

Money supply—average of daily figures, millions of dollars; seasonally adjusted:

December, 170.3.
January, 169.6.
February, 170.5.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The money supply is a function of the action of the Federal Reserve Board, very largely, and the Federal Reserve Board has been trying to stimulate the economy. All they have to do is to buy Government securities, and the money supply increases—regardless of the pessimism that people have toward the economy. It does not mean the economy itself is improving.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Any expansion helps no matter who brings it about.

Merchandise exports—billions of dollars; seasonally adjusted:

November, $2.486.
December, $2.415.
January, $2.620.

That is a very optimistic and hopeful figure.

Contract construction employment—millions of workers; seasonally adjusted:

November, 3.20.
December, 3.29.
January, 3.30.
February, 3.36.

So I would say that, on the whole, those figures are hopeful, and I would point out that they have improved since that time. They are still improving.

Mr. PROXMIRE. April has been a pretty good month.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator that I heartily approve of the magnificent speech that he has been making this afternoon. I am happy to be debating investment credit again, because we have been off it for 3 weeks. I just glory in being back on the investment tax credit again and in hearing somebody discuss it who knows something about economics and the reasons for the investment tax credit.

It is a joy to discuss investment tax credit for a change, and to get back on the bill that we started out with. It seems like a memory from happy days to be back on the investment tax credit, and I revel in the Senator's speech.

It is a real joy to hear a man discuss it who understands what the real bill is, and to talk for a change about an amendment that is germane to the investment tax credit bill. I find great joy in that, and I am pleased to see that the Senator has such a depth of understanding of the investment tax credit.

May I say that it all the more proves how right he is about his amendment; that not only does he have a good amendment, but also, he understands the bill, and knows why we passed it. Even though we might differ on some minor aspects of the bill, when I read off the facts which indicate that we should reinstate the investment tax credit, the Senator understands what those figures mean and what their significance might be.

So I salute the Senator, and I want him to know that it has been a joy for me to hear his speech on the investment tax credit today. This is the first we have been back on the track for some time since the Gore-Williams rider came up, and irrelevant riders have been hung on the bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He is very flattering, and I appreciate his comments.

Mr. President, the Secretary of the Treasury gave the reasons that I have elicited, and I should like to once more state what he said as the second point:

> In the market for capital goods, the ever mounting flow of new orders by business firms coming on top of an unprecedented rate of outlays for plant and equipment is generating rising prices, rising wage rates and shortages of some skilled labor, and is augmenting the large demands for capital from banks and the securities market.

The Senator from Louisiana and I have discussed the impact on the capital market, and we disagree on this. But I believe that our cases have been made.

So far as the influence on rising prices was concerned, a little later I shall refer to some material documenting the fact that the particular industries affected by the investment credit did not have inflation, their prices did not go up, they were not responsible for the sharp increase in prices which we suffered from January 1 of last year until about September.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I should like to know the Senator's wishes, and I shall try to cooperate with him. It seems to me that it is a sad situation when a Senator speaks for a meritorious amendment which would be of great significance to the Nation and to the people of his State, with only a few people present who seem to share the view that his amendment should not even be considered on its merits.

I would be happy to make the effort to bring a quorum in and to make Senators stay to hear the speech and to realize how completely right the Senator from Wisconsin is. But it is now 7 or 8 minutes after 5, and it would be difficult to get all Senators to the Chamber, much less keep them here.

May I suggest to the Senator that he permit me to move for adjournment at this time, and the Senator finish his speech tomorrow, when more Senators may be available to hear him?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I am perfectly happy to go on now or do whatever accommodates the acting majority leader.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Tennessee with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No, Mr. President. Just a moment, please.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? There being no objection, the Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, out of comity, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Wisconsin that the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] had a speech prepared on a matter on which he has been concerned for some time, and the speech has already been released to the press for delivery today. I would not think that our distinguished colleague would wish to foreclose a Senator from making a brief statement.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No. May I say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I did not know about that. If the Senator from Wisconsin desired to yield the floor, with the understanding that he would yield the floor reserving his right to continue his speech tomorrow so that he would not lose the right to make the speech——

Mr. GORE. I did not make any such request. I had made a suggestion.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Delaware with the understanding I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin that he yield to the Senator from Delaware without losing his right to the floor? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I have no objection to the

Senator from Wisconsin taking the time to explain his position, but I think it would be better if he were to finish his speech tonight and yield the floor, and tomorrow get recognized in his own right. I am not going to oppose his being recognized. However, some of us have been here for days and cannot get recognized at all. We are getting a little impatient at this farming out of time.

I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin would not finish another chapter of his speech. I would be glad to yield to him. If he wants to come back tomorrow, I would be glad to listen to him tomorrow. But in the interest of orderly procedure, we should stop farming out the floor this way. Some of the Senators on this side of the aisle have been waiting a long time to speak for only 5 minutes.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Suppose I go ahead and in 10 minutes or so I will stop at an appropriate point in the speech and then get unanimous consent to be recognized tomorrow after the morning hour to complete my speech. It would take quite a while tonight and I do not want to stand in the way of the Senator from Delaware, who has an important speech, the Senator from Tennessee said, and he should be able to deliver it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I would not hesitate about saying who can have the floor tomorrow. How long would the Senator speak tomorrow?

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator knows, nothing is more flexible than a speech in the Senate Chamber. It depends on the colloquy. I would hope that we can finish and vote on the amendment, and that it might be concluded, but I have had colloquy today with a number of Senators.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate that. I have a speech that I could limit to 15 minutes. I can wait to dispose of it. I think that it would be better to finish this speech tonight, which would give us a good round tomorrow.

If the Presiding Officer recognizes the Senator from Wisconsin tomorrow it is all right. I am not quarreling with that. I do question one man holding the floor for 2 or 3 days. After all, a 5-hour speech is a fairly long speech.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Under the circumstances, I yield the floor.

ACKLEY WARNS OF FURTHER INFLATION

[The following colloquy occurred during Mr. Proxmire's speech, and by unanimous consent, was ordered to be printed in the Record at this point.]

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in today's Wall Street Journal, on page 5, is an article entitled "Intensified Price Inflation Likely Soon, Ackley Warns—Guideposts Revival Urged." This article relates to a statement by Gardner Ackley, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, and it portends what I have been warning for some time; namely, a continuation and even an aggravation of the serious inflation from which this country has been suffering over the last 15 months.

Mr. Ackley indicates that the situation is likely to grow worse, and well might he do so, in the face of the impending multibillion-dollar budget deficit. I disagree with some of the reasons he advances for price inflation and his forecast cf more serious price inflation. I think Mr. Ackley could have saved a lot of time of his readers if he had pointed out that such a situation may be expected as long as a majority of the Members of Congress persist in voting to run our Federal Government billions and billions of dollars deeper in debt.

I might add that not only could Mr. Ackley forecast intensified price inflation, but, along with it, continued high interest rates, because when we have inflation, we can always expect high interest rates. The only way we are going to stop that, Mr. President, is to put a stop to this multibillion-dollar deficit spending; and I hope my fellow Senators will sooner or later—and preferably sooner—realize that it is they who are causing this serious problem in our economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 3, 1967]

Intensified Price Inflation Likely Soon, Ackley Warns—Guideposts Revival Urged

(By a Wall Street Journal staff reporter)

Washington.—President Johnson's top economic adviser warned that price inflation is likely to intensify again soon, and said steps to revive the voluntary wage-price guideposts "must be and will be taken soon."

Gardner Ackley, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, told the Society of American Business Writers meeting here that the relative relaxation about prices lately has been possible because "an upward trend in costs has been masked by declining prices for food and raw materials."

Many of the prices that have been declining "will soon stabilize or even move back up," he forecast, adding that "last year's price increases have still not worked their way fully through our cost and price structure." As they do, he said, it could "set the stage for still further price pressures" that could mount "painfully" before reasonable stability is finally restored.

NOT OPTIMISTIC ON OUTLOOK

It is also possible, Mr. Ackley said, that price pressures could diminish rather quickly, but he cautioned that the "outcome is far from assured."

The nation, he said, has "definitely not returned to the complete stability of wholesale prices which we knew from 1958 through 1964," even though the rise between March 1966 and March this year was only 0.3%, compared with the 3.8% bulge between August 1965 and August 1966. Nor will consumer prices, he said, "return immediately to the nominal 1.3% a year pace that we saw" from 1959 through 1965. "In fact," Mr. Ackley emphasized, "we cannot expect to do as well in the months ahead as we have done in the past six months," when consumer prices rose by 0.8%.

The guideposts were deliberately deemphasized early this year when it appeared that the 3.2% annual wage increase pattern they prescribe would be embarrassingly exceeded by many unions eager to make up for the rising cost of living; the percentage figure withdrawn from active use was intended to reflect the national average trend in productivity, or output per man-hour, in recent years. The guidepost concept also holds that prices can be stable if wage costs don't rise more than productivity.

DECLINES PREDICTION ON POLICY

Mr. Ackley declined to predict what the next step in guidepost policy would be, but declared: "I only know that something like the present guideposts will be with us for a long time to come." New techniques for "consultation, persuasion and information" relating to their application to specific wage and price situations should be considered, he said. He emphasized that the council takes "an extremely cautious view of all proposals that in any degree tend to move the guideposts closer to the status of direct controls—or that even appear to have that result."

While the voluntary restraint they seek to foster can never be fully effective, Mr. Ackley said, he maintained that business, labor and Government leaders reject the alternatives of "operating the economy with a wasteful, costly and inhumane margin of slack;" of "burdensome, inefficient and ultimately unsuccessful direct controls," and of attempts to atomize private concentrations of power by breaking up business and unions into smaller, weaker units.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Iowa yield to me?

Mr. MILLER. I am very happy to yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Would not the Senator agree that if we are going to stop this huge deficit which threatens us—and this year it could be, as I am sure the Senator realizes, $15 billion, $20 billion, or even more—the only way to do it, or in my judgment the only effective way to do it, is to reduce spending? Is it not true that if we are to reduce spending, we will have to start, and start immediately, with programs like supersonic transport, and seek the elimination of such proposals?

The Senator from Iowa very wisely, I think, voted against the Appalachian authorization, which would have spent hundreds of millions of dollars, particularly in roadbuilding, for a State which already has had an enormous amount authorized and appropriated for its benefit.

Is it not true, in general, that Congress will have to take a most serious look at appropriations measures when they come before us, and do our best to hold them down as much as we possibly can?

Mr. MILLER. The Senator from Wisconsin, as the distinguished chairman of the Joint Senate-House Economic Committee, well knows that a good many members of the Committee, including himself on many occasions, have advocated what we refer to as Federal expenditure control.

Federal expenditures have got out of control in the last few years. However, from an economic standpoint, I would say that a reduction in spending is not the only way in which to handle this.

The decision that has to be made by a majority of the Members of Congress concerns whether purchasing power is to be taken away from the American people by inflation or by taxes. Either way, the Federal Government can take purchasing power away.

Up until now, the decision has apparently been made to take it away by means of inflation. However, there could be a combination of a reduction in spending and an increase in taxes.

It is only the Members of Congress who have this power. It is not the President of the United States. It is not the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court.

The President in his budget message this year attempted to steer a somewhat middle course between inflation and increased taxes. He called for a 6-percent increase in income taxes which would take some purchasing power away from the people.

Unfortunately, however, he did not call for a cutback in spending and, as a result, the bulk of the additional purchasing power to be taken away from the American people will be taken away by inflation.

I for one have said that I was opposed to any increases in taxes until the situation is in the control of Congress to reduce spending. Then, if there were a realistic and solid reduction in spending and we still could not stop inflation without a tax increase, I would be the first one to go along with a tax increase. However, there must be a willingness on the part of the majority of the Members of Congress to reduce spending.

I am not prepared to say whether it is going to be in Appalachia or the war on poverty or the SST or Great Society programs or how much.

However, I will guarantee the Senator from Wisconsin that if he scrutinizes the budget he can find ways and means to reduce spending by approximately $4 billion to $5 billion without really harming the economy and the advance in progress that we wish to make.

This means not necessarily cutting out certain programs, but slowing them down and stretching them out. If we are ever going to do it, is now not the time to do it when we have a war on our hands?

I regret that the President—and apparently those in control of Congress—has seen fit to try to get along on a guns and butter approach by having the war in Vietnam and having all kinds of additional Federal spending for domestic products at the same time.

It cannot be done without inflation. That is why Mr. Ackley, the Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is now in a position in which he has to reluctantly forecast a worsening of this situation.

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

The Senator from Iowa was one of the members of the Joint Economic Committee, along with a substantial majority—I think 15 out of 20 members, and perhaps more—who agreed that we should cut spending by $5 billion to $6 billion this year.

Since the Senator raised the point, I agree that there are all kinds of ways in which we could do it, and many places in which we should cut. Supersonic transport is one of my top candidates for a cut. I do not know how many others would agree with that view.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. President, I am not convinced that the SST or the supersonic transport should be cut entirely.

Mr. PROXMIRE. There was a cut of $198 million in the amount that was requested.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, if we are not careful, the United States could lose the race on the SST. However, I share a great concern over the inflation that is taking place in this country.

If we are not willing to increase taxes to make up for the SST, assuming that we have prudently combed the budget as far as other expenditures are concerned, I think that we must say to the American people: "We are sorry, but we must put additional taxes on you so that the United States will not lose the SST race."

Nobody here seems to be willing to tell the American people the facts of fiscal life. They want the people to believe that we can fight a war and have all kinds of spending and still not have to worry about the budget. They believe that if there is inflation the people perhaps will not understand who is causing it.

It is, of course, the majority of the Members of Congress who are causing it. The Senator from Wisconsin knows that, and I respect the fact that he has on several occasions, pointed this out. However, I am afraid that it is going to take more warnings by people like Mr. Ackley to get Congress concerned enough to do something about it.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, if we are going to lose the SST race anyway, we must realize that the British and French will have an SST which will be slower than ours. It will be capable of a speed of mach 2 instead of mach 3.

Those countries are incurring tremendous expenses in this project. They do not have the knowledge that we possess. They cannot possess such knowledge at this time.

A big risk is involved in whether the project will be commercially feasible. It may not be commercially feasible for many years. In the meanwhile, we are spending hundreds of millions of dollars in very similar research in space and supersonic flight.

If we postpone this project for a number of years, we will save a great deal of money. I think that with our unrivaled production facilities we will have no difficulty in swamping the British and the French who do not have anything like the production facilities that we possess.

I am convinced that if we simply wait on the supersonic transport until we solve the technological problem, we will save a great deal of money.

If we develop the supersonic transport, it would provide a thrill for a fraction of 1 percent of the American people who fly overseas. When they do fly overseas, what advantage will they receive from the SST? It would merely mean that they would go from New York to Paris in 2½ hours instead of 7 hours. What kind of an advantage is that that we should spend $4 billion for a tiny fragment of the American people to get this kind of benefit?

The proponents of our development of the SST say that we would have to buy British and French planes. We can buy them.

Once Britain and France make the SST feasible, American industry will come in with a rush. They will find a way to finance the project with private money and not with public money and without running the various risks that we are being asked to take in this matter.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator pointed out the competition over the SST. While we may be spending hundreds of millions of dollars in various types of research, we are spending about $2 billion a month for the war in Vietnam. France is spending nothing. The Soviet Union in their assistance to North Vietnam is spending only a very small fraction of the amount that we are expending. This puts us in a position of having to make a choice of priorities.

Mr. PROXMIRE. That is another good argument for not investing in something as irrelevant as the supersonic transport.

Mr. MILLER. I will reserve my judgment on the supersonic transport pending the pruning of this budget by, I hope, our Appropriations Committee, so that we can see whether we can come up with a $4 billion, $5 billion, or $6 billion reduction in spending.

If we have to have an increase in taxes then in order to put a stop to inflation, I will then vote for an increase in taxes.

If we at that point have to have an increase in taxes to have the SST and prevent a serious loss to the United States, I think that then we ought to put it up to the American people as to whether they will be willing to have an increase in taxes with respect to that.

As the matter stands now, we are getting requests for the SST and for many other projects, and nothing is being said about the need to balance the budget or stop inflation.

I think that we are just adrift on a sea of helplessness right now. In fact, the inflation situation seems to be even more hopeless than the situation that the Senate is in right now with respect to handling the investment tax credit bill.

Mr. PROXMIRE. We have to look at the facts. The fact is that we have not been able to stabilize prices for the last 4 or 5 months. I agree that Ackley's warning may be significant. But if over the last 5 months, since October, the consumer price index has risen an average of only one-tenth of 1 percent a month, about 2 percent a year, it would be the best performance in the last 2 years.

I believe the Senator from Iowa is right, that if we are going to have a vast deficit of $15 billion or $20 billion, we can anticipate that we will have inflationary forces that may have to be counteracted by a reduction in spending.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Wisconsin has spoken about the spending problem. As the Senator spoke, I could not help thinking that he is a member of the Joint Economic Committee. Do I understand correctly?

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. What is the Senator's present position in that committee?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am chairman of the committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. That was my understanding. I was afraid to ask, for fear that WRIGHT PATMAN might be chairman now.

Mr. PROXMIRE. As the Senator knows, it alternates back and forth. There is only one reason why I am chairman. Two senior Senators on the committee have other chairmanships. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] is chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am the next in line, and although I am a junior member, I am chairman.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Senator FULBRIGHT is also on the committee.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Senator FULBRIGHT is also on the committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Wisconsin has made some studies—at least, his committee has made some studies—in areas that touch the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance. May I say to the Senator that I believe he is doing a fine job, and I do not find fault with him. I simply say that some of the studies he has been making have been in areas that involve the jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance. I am sure that he knows that to be the case. He has been making some studies about the debt structure and about the credit structure, and even in the field of taxation, which, may I say, is appropriate. I do not quarrel with that for a moment.

In the Subcommittee on Small Business, we have for years done things of that sort, studied some of the proposals which in our judgment made good sense; and we eventually suggest to the Commitee on Finance that it should act in certain areas.

Does the Senator recognize, and has his committee recognized, that the great prosperity—the continued upward rate of prosperity—during the last 6 years has been related to the increase in the debt structure?

For example, if you look at the personal and private debt figure, it has been increasing on an overall rate by about $2 for about every increase of $1 in the gross national product. Has the Senator noticed that fact?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Yes, that is a fact. That is true.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. In other words, we have been increasing our gross national product by about $50 billion a year recently, and it is a growing rate. It has been growing about $50 billion a year. But a $50 billion increase in the gross national product for the past 20 years, on the average, has usually been accompanied by an increase of twice that figure in the overall public and private debt—involving Government, individuals, and corporations.

Mr. PROXMIRE. The Senator is correct. It is interesting to note that there is a disparity in the increase in the public debt and the increase in the private debt.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. May I say to the Senator that this increase in the debt structure, in the case of some, has been absolutely necessary; that we simply could not have had this increase in the gross national product without an increase in the credit structure. People think of debt as a bad thing; they think of credit as a good thing. Credit is something you have.

Mr. PROXMIRE. This is a very interesting area. Frankly, our committee has not conducted the kind of studies in this area that the Senator's suggestions and questions would suggest. I believe we should try to find out the correlation and the importance of private debt, and so forth, to economic progress. I do not believe that there is necessarily a correlation between Federal debt increase and the increase in the gross national product.

As I understand it, between 1920 and 1930, for example, our Federal debt was substantially decreased. This was a period of national growth, of prosperity, and so forth, and subsequently we had a depression.

Nevertheless, this was a period when we grew very well, and we reduced our Federal debt.

I do not believe there is necessarily a connection showing that there must be a growing national debt in order to have an expansion or growth of the economy. I hope not.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have gained the impression that if we are going to expand our gross national product and continue to do so, as we have done, with full employment, we will find it absolutely necessary to live with a continued increase, a continued growth, in the public and private debt structure. As I see it, there is only one way out. In the absence of a depression or a recession which would wipe out much of the debt structure—a really big debt structure would wipe out a great deal of it, because people would go bankrupt—in the absence of that, it seems to me that we will have to have a steady increase in our overall public and private debt structure; and the debt will have to go somewhere to continue to provide the money supply to permit the Nation to grow as it has been growing.

Does the Senator see any reason to believe that that situation cannot continue indefinitely?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I do not see any reason why you cannot have an increase in the money supply and an increase in growth and an increase in prosperity without necessarily any corresponding increase in debt.

It may be that I am wrong about this. I am not aware of any economic studies, that are convincing, which show that it is necessary to have regular and substantial increases in debts—public, private, and governmental—in order to grow and expand. That would be an interesting area of study, but I have not seen such a study.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. As things stand now, if one more Cadillac automobile were to be produced this year than was produced last year—that is, in order to produce as many as have been produced and to increase the number by one—it would be necessary to build one more $5,000 Cadillac automobile, to increase the debt structure by about $10,000. Here is how that would work. The man who bought the automobile would borrow the money to buy it. Let us say he would owe the money to General Motors Acceptance Corp. Then GMAC would borrow that amount of money from an insurance company. So the money would be borrowed twice. The man who bought the automobile would owe General Motors Acceptance Corp., and General Motors Acceptance Corp. would in turn be indebted to the insurance company.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I think I see what the Senator from Louisiana is getting at. What we must recognize is that we are putting it in a negative way when we say we have to increase the debt. What we must increase are our savings. Savings are represented by what people invest in insurance and what they invest in banks. Those savings investments can be borrowed.

On the average, we save about 7 percent of our income. Those savings are available for investment. If we do not have savings, we cannot very well induce this kind of investment without inflation. It is savings that are fundamental. Savings can be borrowed from people who are spending less than their income by people who want to have, for instance, Cadillac automobiles but do not have the income at the time, but who will repay what they have borrowed to the people who have provided the savings. The savings are fundamental.

While the country is constantly growing, I suppose it is proper to assume that our savings are growing correspondingly. Otherwise, it would be necessary to obtain the savings through inflation, which is punishing and cruel.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The ivory tower economist likes to use a happier phrase. He uses the phrase "debt or credit." That is an important aspect of our operation. It has much to do with our discussion of investment tax credit. But the ivory tower economist would like to have us say that in order that the gross national product on an annual basis may expand by $1, the money supply must be increased by $2. That is probably how they would say it. But in doing so, they recognize that there is no difference in the money supply; that there is really no difference between money and credit. Both of them serve the same purpose.

When I first started to take courses in banking and currency in college the first thing I was taught was that money and credit are added together. Money and credit are the same things. They serve the same purpose. I can do the same thing with credit as I can do with money. If anyone is willing to give me credit, I can use it for that purpose. Our money supply on the one hand is our debt structure on the other. They are the same. If we expand our tremendous economy we find it necessary to increase this tremendous money and credit structure in order to expand our gross national product. I find myself wondering if it is possible to do it any other way. The other ways that occur to me would involve confiscation, which I do not favor and I do not think that anybody here favors; denouncing our just debts and obligations; or some sort of huge depression that would cause a great number of people to declare bankruptcy and wipe out debts that exist through organizations and voluntarily surrender certain assets to get people to work and pay off what they can.

I wanted to know if the Senator from Wisconsin knew of any way that we can expand this great debt economy of ours without increasing the money supply.

Mr. PROXMIRE. No, the money supply has to be increased, and all economists, both liberal and conservative, agree on that. Mr. Freedman, who was an adviser to Mr. Goldwater in the last presidential campaign, said we should increase it 3 percent to 4 percent a year.

The point I make is that there is no question that in a growing economy, with more people, we are going to have more debt. Debt is the opposite of savings. The people earn more than they spend and in turn they lend it. When they lend it, it is borrowed by somebody, thus creating a debt. This keeps the economy healthy and proper but it does not mean that we have to have a constantly and a rapidly growing Federal debt. I am not sure it means we have to have a private and local debt that would grow any more rapidly than savings.

The essential action that must be taken if we are going to get by without a depression is to save enough to invest and not have the Federal Government try to come in to move it more rapidly than it would ordinarily.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Father Walter Wilczek, principal, Gordon Technical High School, Chicago, Ill., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, source of all goodness and joy, author of liberty and truth, we humbly beg Your blessing.

Coming from a diversity of backgrounds but united by a simple faith in Your divinity, a deep appreciation for our democracy, and a common electoral ideal, we unite today in humbly acknowledging our dependence upon You in achieving those goals which ennoble our hearts and strengthen our principles.

Today, together with freedom-loving people throughout the world, we ask you to help the Members of this elected body grow in a mutual trust that will join them in works of great achievement. Make them alert to the needs of others by creating in them that sensitivity of soul which is the key to Your kingdom. Prune from their lives the habits and attitudes that lead only to dead ends and lost opportunities. Make them ever dissatisfied with what they have achieved and ever quick to seek new goodness. Grant them an insight into the depth of Your concern for the needs of others. Grant them an integrity and dedication that is a reflection of Your concern for all Your children. Let their service be professionally good, morally correct, and humanly helpful. Give them the prudence and insight to fulfill their duties with a good conscience.

May they be honorable in their dealings, pursuant of the common good in all their deliberations, motivated by principles in all their actions. Give them the grace and courage to say what they mean and to mean what they say. May they be ever ready to endure the hate and calumnies of their opponents without wanting to pay them back with the same coin. Lastly, Heavenly Father, may they be ever conscious of this one truth: that in a profession where one is expected to satisfy so many, it is most important that they first try to satisfy You.

We ask these blessings through the intercession of Your Divine Son. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 617. An act to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions; and

S. 889. An act to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. FONG, and Mr. BIBLE to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, May 10 to 14, 1967.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that Rev. Father Walter Wilczek, principal of Gordon Technical High School, located in my district, and which, next year, will be the largest parochial technical high school in Chicago, with an enrollment of 2,400 students, was able to appear before us, at the invitation of the Speaker, to offer the opening prayer today, May 3, 1967, a day upon which we commemorate the Polish National Holiday.

ELECTIONS IN SUNFLOWER AND MOORHEAD, MISS.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Sunflower and Moorhead Townships, two small towns in Mississippi, were the scene of very important elections. Usually local elections in small towns receive little special attention, but in these elections Negroes for the first time had the opportunity to vote for Negro and white candidates. In spite of economic and other pressures, a substantial number of Negroes voted for Negro candidates for mayor, for councilman, and for supervisor.

These elections were unusual in other respects. The Negro candidates were supported by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party, which has worked so hard to bring the franchise to Mississippi Negroes. In addition, the Department of Justice took necessary action to protect the integrity of these elections. In a reversal of previous policy the Department of Justice on Monday, May 1, designated Sunflower County under section 6 of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 for Federal examiner, making these two townships, Sunflower and Moorhead, eligible for Federal observers.

Federal observers were present yesterday for the elections. Attorney General Ramsey Clark and Assistant Attorney General John Doar deserve commendation from all those who are committed to the exercise of the franchise by all citizens. There action is providing a Federal presence was necessary to instill confidence in the voters, and to prevent violence. Now that the elections are over, the Department of Justice should assign Federal examiners under the authority given to the Department by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to expedite registration for the fall elections. These registrars should do everything they can to insure that Negroes have the free opportunity to register.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday marked a good beginning in Mississippi. The time when all citizens in Mississippi and elsewhere will have the free and equal opportunity to participate in the democratic process cannot be far away.

DESIGNATING OZARK LOCK AND DAM IN HONOR OF JAMES W. TRIMBLE

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which will attempt to honor a Member of this body who served until 1966. In the 22 years James W. Trimble served the Congress of the United States, he did many worthwhile things for the country and the people of his district. Among his efforts was a continued devotion to the Arkansas River development project.

For this reason, I would like to see the Ozark Lock and Dam renamed in honor of James W. Trimble. My bill to this effect is as follows:

H.R. 9594

A bill to designate Ozark Lock and Dam (lock and dam No. 12) on the Arkansas River as the "James W. Trimble Lock and Dam".

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Ozark Lock and Dam (lock and dam No. 12) now under construction on the Arkansas River, Arkansas, authorized by the Act entitled "An Act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved July 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 634; P.L. 525, 79th Congress), shall be known and designated hereafter as the "James W. Trimble Lock and Dam". Any law, regulation, map, document, or record of the United States in which such lock and dam is referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such lock and dam as the "James W. Trimble Lock and Dam".

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on General Education may be permitted to sit this afternoon for the purpose of taking testimony during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman inform the House if this has been cleared with the minority members?

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to inform the gentleman from Missouri that this has been cleared with the minority members, and it is agreeable with them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1967

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 9481, with Mr. O'Hara of Michigan in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon] will be recognized for 1 hour and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 1 hour.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this is the second "regular" supplemental appropriation bill for the current fiscal year 1967. There was a general supplemental bill in the closing days of the last session, dealing with fiscal year 1967, in which it was necessary to provide additional funds for a number of agencies, including the Veterans' Administration, for benefits to veterans of the war; for mass transportation; for urban renewal; and so on. In addition, that bill was used to fund the elementary and secondary education program and the poverty program inasmuch as the basic authorizing bills for those programs came along too late to permit inclusion in the regular bills for fiscal 1967.

Earlier this session, the House approved a Southeast Asia supplemental appropriation bill for fiscal 1967 for further financing of the war.

The bill before us today is based upon the recommendations and the budget requests made by the President as reflected in House Documents Nos. 83, 91, and 109.

This bill, as reported from the committee, carries total appropriations of $2,047,606,133. It is $87,326,700 below the budget estimates of $2,134,932,833 from the President, a reduction of about 4 percent. There is a summary of these totals by the various chapters in the bill on page 3 of the committee report which is available at the Clerk's desk.

The largest single object funded in this bill is military and civilian pay increases voted in the last session. The last Congress increased the pay of civilian workers in all the agencies and branches of the Government and also increased the pay of all military personnel. There is roughly $1,000,000,000, plus, in the bill on that account. This is not the total cost. The committee report points out that approximately $262,000,000 or 24 percent of the total additional cost in 1967 will be absorbed by the various agencies with available funds. Military requirements in Vietnam prevent a comparable absorption rate by Defense agencies, and the Post Office Department is unable to absorb a significant amount because of costs resulting from an extremely large unanticipated rise in mail volume. Aside from these two exceptions, 53 percent of the total costs for the executive branch will be met with funds previously appropriated.

I should add that funds to finance these pay increases were not requested of the Congress in the last session, and were not then considered. We are now considering the amounts necessary to pay the additional scales of compensation agreed to last year and are now in effect.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the gentleman's opening remarks he said that this is the second regular supplemental appropriation bill. I wondered if the gentleman used the word "regular" in the context that it has become regular from the standpoint of practice, or whether supplemental appropriation bills are a regular procedure.

Mr. MAHON. The bill is actually the third supplemental appropriation bill which has been considered for fiscal 1967. Earlier this session a supplemental appropriation for the war effort in Southeast Asia was considered. It is true that, generally speaking, there are supplemental bills to finance programs that were approved by Congress in the previous year but which had not been provided for in the previous year; and to supply urgent requirements otherwise.

For example, the $1 billion item we are now discussing grows out of the action of Congress in providing additional pay for military and civilian personnel. If we had provided the additional funds last year, very probably we would not have been in the position of getting the agencies to absorb as much as they have otherwise done.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I do not wish to pay any disrespect to the gentleman from Texas, but I wonder if we should anticipate a third regular supplemental bill this year. Can I assume there will be one?

Mr. MAHON. I would not so assume with respect to fiscal 1967. Usually, near the end of a session there is a so-called cleanup supplemental bill, and that is another one which may be included. But that would be with respect to fiscal 1968, not 1967. One reason that there will probably be such a supplemental appropriation bill is that some of the regular authorization bills have not been approved and will not be approved in time—

such as the poverty program and some of the programs in Health, Education, and Welfare. It may be that we shall have supplementals for those programs, but they would be supplementals for fiscal 1968 rather than fiscal 1967.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for a question?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. On page 17 of the bill, under chapter VIII, "Military construction, family housing," there is provided $5,500,000 which, it seems to me, is clearly subject to a point of order. I would ask the gentleman from Texas or some other member of the committee if there is any reason for leaving that provision in the bill in view of the fact that the authorization bill is expected to be considered in the next few days.

Mr. MAHON. That item could go out on a point of order. I understood that on yesterday a rule was requested on the authorization bill.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. Of course, the funds could be added in the other body if the item should go out of the bill today, but these funds have been considered necessary to implement the legislation enacted by the last Congress. The gentleman from North Carolina, who is standing near you, might have a comment to make in regard to it; he serves on the subcommittee that considered the matter.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, this item is indeed subject to a point of order. The original legislation was included in the demonstration cities bill, but it provided that funds will be appropriated only on the basis of authorizations from the Armed Services Committee. This is not to provide housing for men in the military service. It is to pay the losses incurred by service personnel and civilian employees of the services in the sale of properties they own around military bases that are being closed. This is a new program. It is not to provide housing for anybody, but it is to pay individuals the losses they incur in the sale of houses they are forced to sell because of military base closures.

The original request before the Military Construction Subcommittee was $11 million. They want to begin this program right away, because many of the people who have incurred these losses are in need of their money, and they want to get started before the new fiscal year begins in July. The subcommittee did not think they could properly expend $11 million, so the item was reduced by 50 percent, and that is why the amount in the bill today is $5,500,000.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, another major item in the bill relates to grants to States for public assistance. Last year, there was a miscalculation by the Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget as to the amount of funds necessary for public assistance grants to the States, so we have provided in this bill the sum of $470,000,000 for additional grants to States for public assistance. It is a matching formula proposition and it is virtually mandatory under terms of the basic legislation.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add to the comments made by the gentleman from Texas that, as far as the House is concerned, we did accept the estimate of the Executive, and I do not believe there was any miscalculation on the part of the House of Representatives or the House Appropriations Committee on this item. The amount we allowed was the full amount that was requested.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is correct. What I mean is that we failed to provide the amount of money needed because we did not know the precise amount. We gave all the money requested in the House version of the bill. That was the best information we had, as the gentleman well knows, but had we known all the facts we now know, we could have then provided the necessary additional funds. The executive branch could have then sent up a revised estimate.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I would hate to make that commitment now, because we know the facts as far as 1968, and we know they have underestimated in the 1968 budget, on the basis of the testimony before our committee. They have underestimated the budget on public assistance at least a quarter of a billion dollars. I would hate to add that money now. I think it is up to them to send up a supplemental request. I did not want to be in the position of committing the House and the committee to appropriate the amount needed under the best estimate, because we know the budget is underestimated now. I think it is incumbent upon the executive branch to send up a proper budget.

Mr. MAHON. It is, of course, incumbent upon the executive branch to send up a proper budget, and there would be no absolute need for Congress to take the initiative for providing money above the budget for public assistance. There is very little discretion involved in it. It must be provided under the law. I believe the committee is correct in providing the funds requested in the bill before us today.

Another cost funded in the bill, Mr. Chairman, is about $152.3 million roughly, for the Post Office Department, largely associated with an unprecedented growth in the volume of mail.

In the bill there is also $91,100,000 for payments to the health insurance trust fund. This must be done. We have no discretion under the law.

Then, some $98,000,000 is in the bill for the increase in veterans compensation and pension caseloads.

Also, some $40,200,000 is provided for emergency expenses of fighting forest fires and disaster relief.

There are other items, Mr. Chairman, which are covered in the report, but I have, I believe, mentioned the largest amounts included in the bill before us.

As I mentioned, this bill is $87.3 million below the President's budget estimates, a reduction of about 4 percent. There was relatively little latitude for making reductions. Highly urgent items are involved. The committee did the best it could to provide the funds necessary without providing funds that could be done without.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I heard the colloquy engaged in by the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, concerning the supplemental or deficiency appropriation bill, and I appreciate it.

My inquiry, is whether or not this additional amount will accrue to the administration's planned deficit for fiscal year 1967 or for the planned deficit for fiscal year 1968?

Mr. MAHON. This will to some extent, of course, affect the budget and the deficit for fiscal year 1967 and for fiscal year 1968. The exact amount, of course, for each cannot be calculated at this time.

This does not mean that the estimate of the deficit for fiscal year 1967, which is $9.7 billion, will be increased by the $2 billion included in this bill, because these supplemental funds were anticipated in the budget when the deficit estimates referred to were arrived at.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I especially appreciate the part of the comment wherein he says it will accrue to the fiscal year 1967 estimate, but I have a copy of the distinguished gentleman's letter dated March 14 in front of me, in which he makes the very point he has just now reiterated; that the planned deficit of the administration budget for fiscal year 1967 is $9.7 billion, and I believe he lists five additional areas which might make it more than that.

Is it not true that these deficiency bills or supplemental appropriation bills usually, with a minimum of notice to the public, revert back and accrue to that which was originally planned when the budget was first submitted? I believe this is a point of public information which ought to be brought out, so that we will know and finally can go back and total up the various deficiencies and the various supplementals, and add them on to the original planned deficit, to see what it finally will become.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit these funds recommended for appropriation in this bill were taken into account in the January budget and were taken into account in arriving at the estimated deficit for fiscal year 1967 of $9.7 billion. This is not something above and beyond the $9.7 billion. I read from the supplementary budget message in House Document 83:

> All of the 1967 requests for appropriations for the executive branch contained in this document were listed as specific items proposed for separate transmittal in the 1968 budget document, or are covered in the allowance for contingencies within the 1967 totals as shown in the 1968 budget document.

There is a similar statement in House Document No. 91.

Mr. HALL. I believe that makes it very clear.

If we do not have such contingencies as the gentleman mentioned in the second paragraph of his letter—namely, continued economic growth, enacting a 6-percent surtax proposal, a postage increase, acceleration of corporate income tax collection, approval of $5 billion participation certificates, and other actions not yet approved by the Congress asking for more money from the Federal Treasury—he believes that the fiscal year 1967 "planned" deficit will remain at around $9.7 billion; is that correct?

Mr. MAHON. The items referred to by the gentleman from Missouri, including the surtax of 6 percent, and so forth, would relate more specifically to the fiscal year 1968 budget and not, of course, to the fiscal year 1967 budget. If we do not increase revenues as recommended in the budget, then the deficit in fiscal year 1968 undoubtedly will be far above the $8.1 billion estimated in the budget last January.

The deficit for fiscal 1968 might very well be $15 billion or more for fiscal year 1968, depending on actions by the Congress, depending on the Executive, depending on the state of the economy, and depending on the state of the war and on any additional costs that might arise.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman so clearly distinguishing between the 1967 deficit and 1968 planned deficit, and I thank the gentleman.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. With further reference to the colloquy which just ended, it is true that maybe not in all instances but in many of the instances in this bill the money has already been spent and the Department has been, with authority, operating on a deficiency basis. So the mere fact that this amount is appropriated will not necessarily mean that it will involve that much in additional spending over and above what was expected to be spent last January.

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman's point is well taken. All of the amounts were anticipated, either specifically or in the normal contingency allowance.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, insofar as we know now, the second supplemental appropriation bill, which we are now considering encompasses the last appropriations that Congress will be called upon to approve for the current fiscal year.

Since this bill is the last one for fiscal 1967, I think it might be appropriate for us to take a moment to review our appropriations record for the fiscal year 1967.

During the second session of the 89th Congress, we considered appropriation requests—excluding permanent appropriations—of $114.1 billion. From these requests, Congress cut less than six-tenths of 1 percent. Let me repeat that. From these requests the Congress cut less than six-tenths of 1 percent, or not quite $672 million, and appropriated $113.5 billion.

I would like to point out to some of my friends who like to discuss the 5-percent amendment with me that they say they are going to preserve to the Congress the prerogative of appropriations and they are going to see that the Congress will have the opportunity to do this appropriating. So, when you take a look at the record, the Congress has done just about exactly what the President wanted them to do. They exercised no independent judgment. Their independent judgment represents less than six-tenths of 1 percent of exactly what the President asked for. Now, where is the independent operation of the Congress? Where have we shown any real effort to do what we say we are going to do in order to economize and try to cut down on the spending in this country?

In January of this year, the administration requested $12.3 billion in the defense supplemental. Congress reduced this request by six-tenths of 1 percent also and appropriated $12.2 billion.

Now, in this bill we have been asked to appropriate another $2.1 billion and the Committee on Appropriations has recommended $2 billion which is 4 percent—and this is getting a little better—or $87.3 million less than the request.

If no changes are made in the bill before us either by the House or the other body, Congress will have considered $128.6 billion of appropriation requests for the current year and we will have reduced them by less than seven-tenths of 1 percent, or $838.2 million and will have appropriated $127.7 billion.

Of course, to this $127 billion must be added the $14.6 billion of permanent appropriations which are approved automatically. That gives a grand total of $142.3 billion in appropriations for fiscal year 1967.

Mr. Chairman, a cut of less than seven-tenths of 1 percent in requested appropriations for this year is a pretty sorry economy record for this Congress.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, if I may just say one further thing: The agencies, we know, when they send these budget requests up here, pad them a little and expect a cut of a little better than seven-tenths of 1 percent. Now I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to exchange views here with the gentleman from Ohio.

There is a popular belief in the country that budget estimates are often padded, and in some cases they are; I would say they probably are. But in many cases they are not.

For example, in this bill there was no padding in the aid to States for public welfare. We appropriated a little less than was requested last year. The request was about $400 million lower than it should have been. So, there was not any padding in this request. It was too lean. Many of the budget requests are subject to almost exact calculation. For example, the pay increases that are pending before us now are in the amount of about $1 billion. There is not too much room in that field in which to pad these requests.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do think the executive branch in recent years has performed a better job in making precise and realistic figures available to the Congress with which to carry out the programs which are recommended.

It is true that we do not always agree with the programs that are recommended.

With respect to the impact of the Congress upon this matter, last year the Congress, without the use of the Bow amendment, worked its own will with respect to legislation.

For example, in Defense, we went above the budget request last year in the sum of $403 million, in exercising the judgment of the Congress. Of course, that was not enough, in a sense. We have already had to provide $12 billion in additional funds this year, against the opposition of a number of Members.

Mr. Chairman, the Departments of Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare appropriation bill last year was $380 million above the President's budget. So, this goes up and down.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, it would seem to me that Congress does exercise considerable judgment in acting upon these various appropriation bills.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when it comes to rounding off the figures or totaling the figures, there may be widespread divergence, percentagewise.

But, there was not too much room in which to cut the pending bill. However, I would estimate and hope that my friend, the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], would concur in this evaluation of the situation.

However, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman, if he does concur in the estimate that in the appropriation bills this year reductions will be made to a greater degree than was true last year?

Mr. BOW. Well, I would say to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, that I sincerely hope there will be greater reductions this year than last year. Further, I would like to say I agree that the gentleman from Texas has been making a great effort to do that. The great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Mahon], has been attempting to do that. I hope the House of Representatives will follow the gentleman from Texas and the gentleman from Ohio in some of the reductions which we hope to make in these appropriation bills, and that we can make a better record than we did last year.

May I say to the gentleman from Texas, however——

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Ohio will yield further, one of the problems involved——

Mr. BOW. The examples we have given of not padding—well, actually, we saw last year where the executive branch reduced the budget in order to make it look better in areas where they knew Congress would have to put the money back into those programs.

You talk about welfare, for instance. Of course, when you get into the question of welfare Congress should not let people who are needy be hurt.

The gentleman from Mississippi had a request here that would have curbed the free school lunch program. The budget looked pretty good but when Congress examined it, Congress readily exercised its independent judgment in putting the money back for the school lunch program. I am sure there was no one downtown who did not know the Congress was going to restore the free lunch and special milk programs.

But I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that in many, many instances when they get these budgets ready downtown they do kind of just push them up in the top areas, in the areas where they think they might have a little problem with the Congress, they just push them up a little so that when it comes up here Congress can take a good look at it and say "Well, we cut so much out of it."

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will yield further, I would just like to ask the gentleman if he does not believe we all ought to do everything in our power, reasonably within our power, during this session of the Congress, to hold expenses to the lowest practicable level in view of the fact we are confronted with a heavy deficit this year, a deficit perhaps of as much as $15 billion for fiscal year 1968?

It does seem to me we can all agree—and I know the gentleman from Ohio and I agree—that we must do a workmanlike job in trying to hold spending in line as far as reasonably possible.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I quite agree with the gentleman from Texas; indeed I do.

Let me say further, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe any Congress ever cut less in a session than we did in the last Congress. I am not sure of this, of course, but from what I have been able to find out in checking on this, that this was probably the poorest record that Congress has made.

I do not believe this can be attributed entirely to the fact that the administration's 1967 budget was a particularly tight one.

Except for the 1968 fiscal year, no budget offered greater opportunities for reasonable and responsible cuts than does the budget this year. The evidence, I believe, proves the fact that it was not a tight budget. That is reflected by the President's unilateral action last November when he ordered budgetary cutbacks of $5.3 billion.

After we had exercised our independent judgment up here, and only cut a very small portion, the President was able to find $5.3 billion which he froze. So he sort of said to us, after that, "Maybe I sent you too much, and we had better just not spend this $5.3 billion."

By its actions with respect to the 1967 budget, Congress has certainly won, I believe, the indisputable right to be called a rubber stamp for the administration on appropriations.

With respect to the appropriation bills for fiscal 1968, again I agree with the gentleman from Texas that he has done an excellent job in some of these areas, because we have improved somewhat, as is evidenced by the fact that the District of Columbia budget was balanced by the committee. The Treasury-Post Office bill was cut about 1.5 percent below budget requests, and the Interior bill was cut about 6 percent below requests.

Mr. Chairman, on that point I would like to pay tribute to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington, the chairman of the Interior Subcommittee, for the work she did on that bill when the committee cut it 6 percent. I tried to cut it more, but I still believe the gentlelady from Washington did an excellent job in her subcommittee by cutting it 6 percent.

So apparently in 1968 we are moving in the right direction. I hope we can do better; we must exercise a much greater economy effort on the 10 remaining bills if we are to avoid a 1968 budget deficit of some $18 billion to $20 billion. That is what it will be, a budget deficit of between $18 billion to $20 billion unless we do a better job.

The bill before us includes some $90 million in appropriations which were cut from the regular bills last year. These restorations are: $12 million for the crop land adjustment program, $700,000 for the conservation reserve program, $75,000 for the Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel, $16 million for public housing, $15 million for vocational rehabilitation, and $46 million for public assistance.

As disturbing as it is to be called upon to restore these modest cuts that were made last year, it is even more discouraging when we find that they have asked and the committee has agreed to fund 11 new programs to the tune of almost $28 million.

May I say now, I hope this House, will make it a point not to finance new programs in supplemental appropriation bills. We have been slipping into this practice over the past years. This is not the purpose of supplemental appropriations and I hope that we will use extreme care in the future on this question.

I think the initial funding of these programs should have been considered in the regular bills for 1968.

The current fiscal year will be almost over before this bill becomes law and a delay of a few weeks in the funding of these programs would make no material difference in their operation. But a delay would have given the committee a chance to consider the relative importance of these programs to other programs in the pyramiding of Federal spending.

Often I think, when I stand here in the well to take up these minutes of your time, that every time the minute hand goes around that clock just once—every minute—you are spending $29,000 in interest on the national debt—$29,000 every minute in interest on the national debt. That is a figure that everybody can understand.

Since we have practically no choice other than to fund most of the items in this bill, I reluctantly support its enactment. But I shall not have this attitude, however, with respect to the remaining bills for 1968. If they are not cut substantially by the committee, I shall continue my efforts on the floor to reduce them.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the distinguished gentleman, the ranking minority member of the full Committee on Appropriations yielding to me.

I simply have a question concerning the committee report on this second supplemental appropriation bill for 1967.

On the top of page 25, there is a paragraph with the heading "Payment to Trust Funds for Health Insurance for the Aged."

In this paragraph, it states that this includes over $91 million, most of it necessary because of the original 1967 appropriation based upon 15 million aged persons voluntarily enrolling in the supplementary medical insurance program whereas over 17.5 million actually did enroll.

Then it goes on to say that other moneys are needed in addition to that to pay the $3 per month enrollment premium on those extra numbers due to the increase in the workload of the Social Security Administration.

I would like to ask the gentleman, with that background in mind, whether this additional workload involved moneys spent for the teams that went around the country enticing our elderly people to sign up for medicare and including the prepared movie films which were shown to them—or whether that money came out of the OEO funds, as was purported at that time.

Mr. BOW. I regret to say to the gentleman from Missouri that I cannot respond to his question directly because I am not familiar with that item. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] who serves on that subcommittee and who is present perhaps can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. MICHEL. In answer to the gentleman, I am sure some of this money requested here can be attributed to the fact that there was a Madison Avenue propaganda carried on. But to break it out into specific figures here, I am afraid I could not do that without a reference to our hearing record and then I doubt whether I could give the gentleman a meaningful figure.

Mr. BOW. Perhaps a Member on the majority side may answer the gentleman's question. Perhaps the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD], the chairman of the subcommittee, can answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FLOOD. Of course, both groups were engaged in this, both OEO and the Social Security people. That is true. The purpose was to exert every effort to advise people who had a right to know and who should know what the benefits, that Congress had voted for them, might be. This was done. I find no fault with that. It was done by both the OEO and the Social Security Administration.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will yield further, I thank the gentleman for his response. I respect his belief that this was a "right" that was being propagandized and perhaps oversold. But I am not in agreement with that belief that it is a "right." I think it is a tax. I think it is a benefit perhaps—but a right to tax funds—no.

I wonder if the gentleman does not feel that this is misappropriation of funds, before the fact, in order to sell a program, whether it be a right or a benefit? Certainly I for one believe, that this is where the Congress is expected to exercise restraint in appropriations, that is, in not making up funds that are used against the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act and other laws of the land to propagandize, to make movies, and to sell as a right or as a benefit or any other measure by supplemental appropriations, as badly as it may have been needed.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman's opinion is always interesting, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not agree. All of the funds under this heading in the bill are required to be appropriated by the Social Security Act, and the committee agreed with the law.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I would simply say there is no provision of the social security law that requires that the participants be propagandized; therefore, I would object to this portion of the appropriation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has consumed 20 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS].

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I would remind the members of the committee today that while this is a substantial supplemental bill, involving $2 billion, it is not all of the supplemental funds that are going to be asked of Congress. In fact, yesterday the President bypassed the House and its Committee on Appropriations and sent straight to the Senate another supplemental request that is not even included in this bill, and it is for $75 million of additional funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity.

This procedure eliminates any opportunity for Members on the House side to raise questions about the need for these funds or to consider the justifications. My guess is that the $75 million will be put in the bill by the other body, and the first time we will be confronted with it is in conference.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget tried to get in touch with me on Monday, but he was unable to do so. I did talk to him yesterday. He wanted to notify the Appropriations Committee that this additional supplemental of $75 million would be required. He explained that the question of whether additional funds would be required had been before the executive branch for some time.

These additional funds, in the sum of $75 million, are being requested for the purpose of providing employment for youth, in cities principally, during the summertime when they are not in school, to provide them with employment opportunities, for swimming pools, for recreational assistance, and so forth, in order to stimulate stability and profitable utilization of time by the youngsters of the country, who, too often, find themselves out of school with no chance to get a job. This is the kind of request that came up.

I believe the request is well founded and I, myself, expect to support it.

I would say further, the administration felt so strongly about this matter that it apparently has breached its tentative January budget totals of new obligational authority to some extent in order to request these funds for the summer program for youth in the congested areas of the Nation. I am referring to new obligational authority requested, as shown in the January budget.

Of course, may I add that we have reduced the NOA requests for 1967 in this supplemental bill, and in the defense supplemental bill, by considerably more than what we are talking about here. So that overall, the totals will not have been breached, I would say.

I should have told the gentleman from North Carolina, and particularly the gentleman from Ohio, previously. But we have been so engaged in hearings and otherwise that I just have not had an opportunity to do so.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the statement of the distinguished chairman of the committee, but I would say that if the Director of the Bureau of the Budget undertook to get in touch with him about this item on Monday of this week, he was several days too late in doing so, because we marked up this bill in the various subcommittees days ago and the full Committee on Appropriations approved this bill on April 28, 1967—last Friday.

I do not know why it took the Director of the Bureau of the Budget all this time to advise the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House that he was going to ask for this $75 million in the Senate and thereby bypass the House altogether.

I do not believe they suddenly decided to ask for this money between the time the House committee acted on this supplemental bill last Friday and Monday when the Budget Bureau Director sought to communicate with the gentleman from Texas. I do not believe it is dealing fairly with the House side of the Congress for the President and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to ignore us and send requests of this nature to the other body, because we have an equal right and a responsibility to hear the testimony, to examine the witnesses, and to find out something about these programs.

Mr. MAHON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in every session, when we have a supplemental request, as the experienced gentleman from North Carolina knows, we have to have a cutoff date on the submission of supplemental requests. Therefore, if there are other supplemental items, they have to go to the other body—and there usually are some last minute supplemental requests that go directly there.

I believe the executive branch has been perfectly fair and correct in its actions here. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has advised the Committee on Appropriations of the House that this matter has been discussed over a period of weeks. But the President was very reluctant to ask for additional funds, especially funds that would breach his January budget. Finally it was determined that this should be done, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget called me, as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and said he realized that they preferred to send a supplemental request to the House and realized that the House felt very keenly about this matter, and asked if it would be satisfactory with the House for the request in this instance to go to the Senate. So I told the Director of the Bureau of the Budget it was perfectly appropriate to send it to the other body, and that I would certainly have no objection to that procedure in this instance.

This will not preclude our having hearings on the matter, and the House working its will. It can reduce these funds or eliminate them, if it so desires. I do not believe the House will desire so to do. But I do believe we should recognize that the executive branch acted in absolute good faith in dealing with this matter.

Mr. JONAS. I do not charge that the President or the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, had ulterior motives in bypassing the House as they are doing in this instance. I am now merely calling attention to the fact that notwithstanding this is a $2 billion supplemental bill for funds that are asked to be appropriated over and above the tremendous sums we appropriated last year, it does not tell the whole story. I am not so sure that, as I stand here today, this additional supplemental request for $75 million that just went over to the Senate yesterday will be the end of the requests. It is very likely that additional funds will be requested in other supplementals before the current year is over.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, there is no assurance. I, myself, anticipate there will be additional supplemental requests. There were last year, and the year before that, and the year before that, and the year before that. There always is a closing supplemental in the session, but as I indicated earlier, it will deal with fiscal 1968, not fiscal 1967.

Mr. JONAS. I brought this subject up today because I believe the members of the Committee here today are entitled to know that this supplemental request for an additional $75 million was sent over to the Senate yesterday. You will never hear of it again until it shows up in a conference report. It will be in the conference report on this bill but there will be little opportunity for Members to debate or discuss it in a conference report.

I just do not believe this was an emergency which suddenly developed and believe this item should have been sent to the House as the other items in the bill were sent to us on March 13, 1967.

If this $75 million is so essential, I cannot understand why it was not included in the request which came up to the House in the regular way on March 13. Then we could have considered it in the hearings, and it could have been incorporated in our bill today, and there could have been discussion of it in the written report and on the floor today, instead of having it go to the Senate and be put in the bill over there. This procedure will preclude any meaningful consideration or debate on it by Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. I am a little disturbed over the unhappy frame of mind of my friend from North Carolina.

Speaking for what I believed to be the view of the Appropriations Committee, I told the executive branch—I told Mr. Schultze, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget—to hold these supplemental requests down to the lowest possible figure and not to send supplemental requests to us that were not highly urgent and needed. I said something to the effect, "Insofar as possible, do not send down these new programs to be initiated in a supplemental appropriation bill."

It could have been sent down earlier, but I urged that they wait until the last minute and squeeze every bit of water out of these requests that they possibly could. I believe that is the way we ought to do business. We do not want to encourage supplementals. We want to discourage them.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will permit me to say so, I am 100 percent in agreement with his last remark. If the gentleman believes I am complaining about squeezing all the water out of these requests, he misunderstood what I said or else I am not making myself clear.

I am not suggesting that they send down more supplemental requests. I am complaining about their sending this one to the Senate and bypassing the House. The members of this Committee of the Whole sitting here today will never have an opportunity to do anything about this request when the conference report comes back. Am I correct in that?

Mr. MAHON. We will have every opportunity.

Mr. JONAS. What opportunity?

Mr. MAHON. We can veto the whole amount, or we can agree to a portion of it, in the conference with the other body.

Mr. JONAS. I do not believe we ought to deny the members of the Committee an opportunity to consider this request. When I say "committee" I do not mean the Committee on Appropriations, but I mean the Committee of the Whole House sitting here today, as well as the entire House membership.

I believe an important item of $75 million ought to be in a bill that can be debated on the floor of the House. There will not be any way for that to be done, under the limited procedures and time available for discussing a conference report.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further.

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. With respect to the essentiality of the $75 million, everyone in this country knows that we have problems in the rural areas and we have problems in the cities. There are teeming thousands of unemployed youths on the streets of our cities. We are trying to give some of them jobs in the Congress, as interns, and various agencies are trying to do so.

Hundreds of thousands of requests have gone out from the Government to private enterprise, urging them to employ youths.

I would say that there is a high degree of urgency to the objective for which the $75 million is being requested. Whether or not the money is needed may be another question, but the urgent need for doing something about the unemployed youths who roam the streets of the cities in the summertime without jobs is a matter of very great consequence, it seems to me.

Mr. JONAS. If my friend will permit me, he is making an argument that is not even directed to the point I make. I am not discussing the merits of this $75 million. I am not questioning the need to provide employment for the youth of the land. I am not questioning now the necessity of building swimming pools for them. That is not the point of my mentioning this. My point is that I do not think the procedure being followed with respect to this request for $75 million is a proper way to function. I think that the Members of this body ought to have a chance to consider this particular.

I insist that if this is a matter of such urgency, it did not suddenly come to light on May 2, 1967. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the President certainly should have been aware of this need on March 13, when they sent the regular supplemental appropriation bill up to the House on which we conducted our hearings and which we are considering today. I am not arguing that this is an unsound or unwise item, but merely that this branch of Congress should have an opportunity to consider, debate, and act on it, and we will not have such an opportunity under the procedure being followed.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. The Government has many millions of dollars available for utilization in the poverty program and in the Headstart program. Some of this $75 million will be for the Headstart program. The Government has a lot of money available for some of these programs, and they are making a study and a survey of this matter. There has been a great deal of concern and interest in it. It was finally decided to send this request down. It was hoped that it would not be necessary, but finally that request was sent down.

What could they do other than call it to the attention of the House Committee on Appropriations? Would it be agreeable to send it to the other body? If they did not send it down now and get it in the pending bill, summer will be upon us and they would not have the necessary funds to accomplish this. This is the only logical vehicle that we can use in order to give consideration to the request. It is true it is unusual but not an unprecedented thing. It is not a technique which is ordinarily used, but to some extent it is used every year. Last year a number of items were sent to the Senate because the House closed their hearings on certain portions of the bill. So I believe that we are handling this matter in the best way possible under the circumstances.

Mr. JONAS. I will conclude by repeating what I have said many times; namely, I am not debating the merits of this proposition, but am merely calling to the attention of the Members of the House that by following this procedure they will be denied any opportunity to strike this item or to reduce it if they want to, or to even consider it or to discuss it at reasonable lengths. I am not referring now merely to the members of the House Committee on Appropriations but to this body itself. I think any item as important as this and which is as critical as the gentleman from Texas indicates it is, that the facts on it should have been known to the President before last Monday. They surely must have been known to him in March when he sent the items up here which we are debating today. I for one, not because I am jealous of the prerogatives of the Committee on Appropriations, because goodness knows we have plenty to do without asking for more work, but I do not think it is fair to the membership of this body to have this kind of a procedure used because it denies to them any opportunity to give this request for $75 million any real consideration.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] in protesting as a nonmember of the Committee on Appropriations the including in the conference report on this bill—and that is the way we are apparently going to get it—the $75 million to provide for the employment of youths during this coming summer and construction of the Lord knows how many swimming pools. That program ought to come before the House on a regular legislative basis instead of installing it in a conference report without the benefit of hearings and without the benefit of any evidence from the House Committee on Appropriations in justification for this program and the spending of $75 million.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I would like to say to the gentleman from Iowa that for once I am in total agreement with him. Most of this money will be directed through the Labor Department and the community action program and the city work program. I am not satisfied, for instance, that in New York City we have done a great job of finding where all of the Federal money is that is up there right now.

I am not inferring in any way that the Office of Economic Opportunity has more funds than are required on a national basis, but I know for a fact that there is a sum of $5.5 million in New York City which the city is unable to spend because there has not been the sufficient and proper planning for its expenditure.

It is asking until next October, in order to obtain additional time during which to spend the money required to be spent by July 1.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say that if they do not know how the money which they have now is going to be expended, I would like to know how they will spend $75 million next year that may be appropriated by our committee in charge of this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, working with what they do, and in working to find a place in which to spend this money—a place in which to expend it that is not being expended—they complain about lack of sufficient size and recruiting conditions in order to bring into being the big administrative staff, one with which to draw up new strategies and so on.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] for his statement.

I really arose, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of asking the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] a question to be found on page 40 of the bill, line 19, entitled "Missions to International Organizations":

> $70,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations."

Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would describe briefly what is proposed to be done here?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from Iowa yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is the method whereby we use part of the sum of about $23 million standing to the credit of the State Department unspent, entitled "Loan to the United Nations," which was appropriated a few years back and not used, for the purpose of paying these increased pay costs of employees. In other words, instead of appropriating fresh dollars in this bill, we are making use of part of a fund which is lying idle and probably will not be used.

Further, Mr. Chairman, we have used another part of this fund at another place in this bill. I believe the gentleman will find that it is also used at page 18, line 16, of the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman tell me why the appropriation of $70,000 on "Missions to International Organizations"?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is Pay Act money for employees. The gentleman from Iowa probably voted for it last year.

Mr. GROSS. Voted for what?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Employees' Pay Act money. You voted for the Federal employees' pay raise last year; did you not?

Mr. GROSS. I do not remember. I have voted against them and I have voted for them but I do not recall how I voted on this particular one.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman from Iowa has always been a great friend of the Federal employee and particularly the Post Office worker. That fact stands out clear in my mind after all these years. I thought that surely the gentleman from Iowa would be one who would vote with me to give them a slight increase in pay last year. This is part of the bill for it.

Mr. GROSS. I have not always voted for them. The gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney], I am sure, has always voted for them.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will please yield further, I would say that the gentleman from Iowa has voted for them so often that he has colored my mind to the point that it seems that the gentleman is the greatest friend of Federal employees here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. GROSS. Not on the basis of having voted for and against pay bills, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York has also been here a few years. The gentleman may recall that I was one of the few who voted to sustain President Eisenhower's veto of a pay bill and the gentleman from New York did not.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, if the distinguished gentleman from Iowa will kindly yield further, there were very few Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle who had the nerve in those days to stand up and defend President Eisenhower and Secretary Dulles.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa such additional time as he may consume.

Mr. GROSS. On page 31 of the bill—and I do not know which subcommittee handled this matter—there is this item:

> "Export control," $43,000, of which not to exceed $20,000 may be advanced to the Bureau of Customs, . . .

What is this? Is this also for pay increases, or does this in any way affect the export control on the boycott of Rhodesia? That is what I am really trying to find out.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It has nothing to do with Rhodesia or Timbuktu. It has to do with the wages of Federal employees, the same as the previous item to which the gentleman referred. This is Pay Act money, but here we use good, clean, new cash rather than the use of that fund that is lying dormant, the so-called loan to the United Nations.

Mr. GROSS. The next item: "Environmental Science Services Administration."

Mr. ROONEY of New York. That is the new name, if the gentleman will permit me to explain, for the combined Weather Bureau-Coast and Geodetic Survey, and a former part of the National Bureau of Standards.

I would admit to the gentleman that this new outfit has not advanced very far in success, and has been able to spend more money than when we had the three items separately. The Weather Bureau was bad enough prior to this, but now that it is part of this trio, oh-oh.

Mr. GROSS. Then on page 27, under "Funds appropriated to the President: Economic assistance: 'Administrative expenses', Agency for International Development $1,194,000, to be derived," and so forth and so on.

What is this expenditure about? I could not find anything in the hearings.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is not an item that my subcommittee handled. I would suggest to the gentleman that all of the items he has referred to which begin at page 23 of the bill are included under title II, and are for one purpose, increased pay costs of employees.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Increased what?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Increased pay costs, as a result of the increases in wages and salaries that were enacted by the Congress a year ago.

Mr. GROSS. Can the gentleman tell me this: Does this item, "Higher education for international understanding," represent a new agency in Government?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will try to explain.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FLOOD. I would say to the gentleman that that is not in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. Was it stricken, or what happened to it?

Mr. FLOOD. The committee in its wisdom decided it was a new program, and it was not in the bill.

Mr. GROSS. What is "higher education for international understanding"? I thought we already understood international understanding.

Mr. FLOOD. If the gentleman will yield further, it is not before the committee at this time; it is a separate bill.

Mr. GROSS. But it is still kicking around; it will probably be in the regular bill?

Mr. FLOOD. When this subject comes up later we will deal with it.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder if the gentleman would give me an adequate explanation of what "Higher education for international understanding" is?

Mr. FLOOD. I would suggest the gentleman read the report. Whatever is in this bill is in the report, and is very eloquently stated.

Mr. GROSS. I thought we all had a complete understanding that "international understanding" means all we have to do is provide the money. I did not know we had to understand anything else, and I did not know we had to have higher education to go along with that understanding.

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman can be sure at least the committee will.

Mr. GROSS. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. FLOOD. The gentleman can be sure at least the committee will. I am not sure about the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Michel].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, following up the question of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], relative to several of these items having to do with pay costs, I would say as a matter of fact $1,080,000,000 of this $2 billion bill is in increased pay costs that came as a result of what we did here last year by way of authorizing legislation.

That brings me to another point. There was a dialog or a colloquy here earlier about $470 million needed in grants to States for public assistance.

It is obvious to me that this is one of those areas where the budget when it is presented to us always has room for a half-billion-dollar cushion in the administration's favor.

If we go back to last year, we were asked for a supplemental appropriation, I think, of $460 million for grants to the States for public assistance. This year it is $470 million in a supplemental. That brings the total for grants to States for public assistance in this fiscal year to $4,200,000,000. In the 1968 budget we see an item for the fiscal year 1968 of $4,200,000,000 for public assistance.

Since we are already at this level, you can bet your bottom dollar that when we are back here a year from now, it will be to come up with a supplement for another half billion dollars. Because that is what has happened over the last 4 or 5 years in grants to States for public assistance. They have gone up a half billion dollars each year notwithstanding all the claims during the course of debate on medicare that with its enactment we would see these grants to States for public assistance go down decidedly. Just the opposite has proven to be the case.

Now for the Post Office Department, you have $373,800,000 in additional money requested because of the increased volume of mail. We cannot tell the people that they should not mail what they are mailing. Maybe we should increase postal rates to make up the difference. But this is one of those items again where we are locked in.

With reference to the new Office of Transportation or Department of Transportation, there is $65 million here in the supplemental appropriation to get it on its way. That will be increased—you can bet your bottom dollar—each year subsequently.

We have not funded, in this supplemental appropriation, any programs which have not been authorized. I think this is a good tack for us to take. I do not think we ought to be funding in these supplemental appropriations anything that did not come to us in a budget request from the administration. If there is any move today to put in money that is not budgeted and which is not authorized, I think it is completely uncalled for.

You have heard several of the gentlemen here talking of what we are facing by way of a deficit in this coming year and by the President's own admission it will be $9 billion provided a 6-percent surtax is imposed to raise $4.5 billion.

How many of you are going to vote for a tax increase in this session of the Congress?

I just got my poll back from my congressional district yesterday and I put it in the RECORD. The results on that particular item alone show that 89 percent or 90 percent of the people in my district say, "No, we do not favor a 6-percent surtax."

But conversely on the question, would you prefer to have Federal spending cut back $5 billion regardless of the popularity of the program, the figures were practically reversed percentagewise. The people in my congressional district overwhelmingly favor our cutting down on the level of Federal expenditures rather than raising taxes.

Sometime in this session of the Congress, we are going to have to face up to our dismal financial plight. Look at it. A predicted $9 billion deficit that can be raised to $14 billion without a tax increase and with some faulty budget estimates it can easily grow several billion more. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] predicted earlier in this debate, it could very well be $18 to $20 billion.

So I say, we have to firmly resolve here and at least I have to as a Member of this House and I am sure the other 50 members of our Committee on Appropriations will have to take the position that we just cannot be funding unauthorized programs and unbudgeted items in these bills unless we want and unless we are ready to vote for a tax increase.

I for one would much prefer a reduction in spending over an increase in taxes, but we better do one or the other pretty soon because we are plunging deeper and deeper into debt and heading for the biggest deficit ever except for the World War years.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I cannot agree more, that we ought to cut back seriously in certain areas of nonessential spending—notably farm subsidies and some areas of public works—and through a stretchout of certain aspects of the space program.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is a serious mistake, however, not to appropriate one penny of the $12.5 million supplemental requested by the President for the Teacher Corps for fiscal year 1967.

The Teacher Corps has limped along on an appropriation of $7.5 million in fiscal 1967 out of a total authorization of $65 million.

To date, the Teacher Corps has trained some 1,207 corpsmen who now serve in 275 schools in 111 school systems in every State but Alaska.

There are two projects in New York State, one in New York City and the other in Buffalo. There are 93 Teacher Corpsmen in the New York City project, serving in 16 schools. Buffalo has four veteran teachers and 19 interns working in five innercity schools.

However, Teacher Corps personnel now in service represent only about one-quarter of the anticipated size of the program which had to be cut for lack of sufficient funding. The Appropriations Committee has now denied the $12.5 million in supplemental funds that the Office of Education has requested to expand the program this year.

Commissioner Howe testified before the Education and Labor Committee recently that it was his hope that, with this $12.5 million and the $36 million requested by the President for fiscal year 1968, the enrollment of the Teacher Corps could be increased to 6,000.

Mr. Chairman, this is a creative and farsighted program that we cannot permit to wither away for lack of adequate financing. It is a unique approach to meeting the special educational needs of the disadvantaged child—an approach that has proven itself successful even on this limited scale. It would be a serious omission to fail to provide this supplemental appropriation of $12.5 million now and the full authorization for fiscal year 1968 that is necessary if the Teacher Corps is to recruit and train new members, as well as permit present corpsmen to make plans for the coming academic year.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute to bring a little history back to this body. I recall that last year the House appropriated no funds for the Teacher Corps. We went to conference, and the conference agreed to put $7,500,000 in the bill, but we came back from conference with the understanding at that time that the $7.5 million was to phase out the Teacher Corps. We came back and made that announcement to the House, and I hope we stand by it because that was the conference agreement. I hope those who were the conferees and those who agreed to the conference report here in the House will stand by that position.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I would like to call the attention of the Committee to the bottom of page 2 of the supplemental appropriation bill. Set forth there is an item as follows:

> For an additional amount for "Cropland adjustment program", $12,000,000.

My curiosity was aroused when I saw that printed item, and I called the Department of Agriculture, talking to the official that deals with this program. I asked him if it is true that our Government is still signing contracts to rent land to take it out of production. It seemed very curious to me that that should be the case in a period of history in which the demand for food is on the rise and our Government has seen fit to cut back some 20 percent on the amount of food that will be programed under Public Law 480 because, according to Government officials, the level of stocks is getting too low.

I found, incredibly, that since the first of the year contracts in excess of $35 million have been signed under this program.

I would like to ask anyone who would like to respond if there would be objection to an amendment, assuming the amendment is proper, which would have the effect of shutting off any further contracting under this program for the balance of the fiscal year. To me it seems almost beyond belief that we would use tax dollars to rent land which could be planted to corn and wheat.

I would be glad to yield to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to my

learned friend in regard to these programs that I have a somewhat similar record along this line, too. I opposed the renting of land under Secretary Benson.

I have opposed it under the present administration, believing that other solutions are better than the renting of land and paying to keep it out of production. That is no solution to the farm problem.

However, insofar as the immediate situation is concerned, the moneys that are now in this bill are to make payments on past-due obligations on contracts that are already entered into. The reduction of a half-million dollars that was made there was so they might hold this a little more closely than otherwise.

Insofar as what the gentleman seeks, I might tell him it has not been realized. In our hearings this year I raised the serious question as to whether we should proceed to enlarge this type program under present conditions. It is my belief—and I am not the Speaker nor the Parliamentarian—that any amendment offered would be subject to a point of order.

Those administrative funds which are used to carry out this program were appropriated last year and are not in the request for funds in this bill, so I do not believe that would be reachable by any amendment at this time. I would be compelled to make the point of order if the amendment were offered.

But I can assure the gentleman that I have raised this same serious question in the hearings this year, and doubtless the committee may take that into consideration in the determination of what they will recommend in the regular bill.

Mr. FINDLEY. The same department that has been signing these contracts for land rent has been urging wheat farmers to plant millions of additional acres in wheat this year. So it seems to me the appropriate time for Congress to take action to end this sort of thing is now. I thank the gentleman for his interest to that end.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I might say to my friend from Illinois that on this crop adjustment program the appropriation for this current year was $50 million. We did know that the request indicated they really needed the $62.5 million, as I recall the history of this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FINDLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding further.

As I said, the problem, I believe, came up from the other body, recognizing that they wanted to make some cuts in conference. We were more responsive in trying to fund fully what was requested of us at that particular time.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I realize we will have to pay this.

Mr. MICHEL. In the budget request for 1968 for this same item, there is an item calling for $90 million, as against this total in fiscal year 1967 of $62.5 million. As the chairman indicates, we are going to take a close look at this when we take up the regular bill for 1968.

I may say I have voiced my opposition to this program. In the last few weeks, as I recall, one farmer in my own district will realize a payment of $18,000 for his land put into this program. He just decided that it is a lot easier to go into town and to retire and get the big Government check than to work for it as he would normally do.

Mr. FINDLEY. Is it the gentleman's understanding that there were no funds for salaries under the ASCS in this bill? I thought I saw it transcribed here, but at the moment I cannot spot it.

Mr. MICHEL. I am sorry I cannot come up with the figure at the moment but will be happy to dig it out for you.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman explain to me why there is an item of $246,000 for a Federal Crop Insurance Corporation? I thought the fees charged the farmers for this crop insurance were adequate to meet all expenses of the program. Can the gentleman shed any light on that, or can the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. WHITTEN. I do not have the exact figures, but as the gentleman will recall through the years the crop insurance program failed and was started up again on an experimental bill. The program's administrative expenses were paid by the Federal Government under the new act. Our subcommittee has recommended, and Congress has approved, passing over to the corporation more and more of the burden of administrative expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MAHON. The Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WHITTEN. As time has passed we have gradually pushed more and more of the total request for administrative costs on the corporation, but still a considerable portion is paid by the Government.

Mr. FINDLEY. Can the gentleman tell me if it is the intention of his subcommittee to seek to place this entirely on a self-financing basis in the near future; and, if so, when

Mr. WHITTEN. The words "near future" trouble me, because I do not know how soon that could be. I hope that sooner or later the administrative costs may be covered.

I would say at this point that the program has proved to be much more economical to the Government than the amount of relief the Government voted for these areas now taken care of by crop loss claims insured by the Corporation. I believe the program is a very vital one. We must not carry over the administrative costs to the point of jeopardizing a program which is far more economical than the previous practice, in my opinion.

We are working toward that end. How soon we can reach that objective I would not want to say.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, chapter VII of title I of the pending bill contains several items for legislative branch housekeeping. The total is $2,845,600. In addition, $1,980,560 is in title II for the legislative branch for increased pay costs along with the rest of the Government agencies generally. I should say that, in accord with custom, these figures do not embrace amounts relating solely to the other body; they will be inserted as amendments over there.

The various items are delineated in the committee report which is here at the desk, and in the printed committee hearings. Briefly, Mr. Chairman, there is the customary provision for the widow of the late Honorable John E. Fogarty, of Rhode Island.

There are funds for furniture and furnishings for the Cannon Office Building now being remodeled, as Members know. We understand that the first phase of the remodeling—roughly half of the job—will be substantially completed this summer so that, barring any complicating factors, about half of the 138 renovated and enlarged suites should be ready for occupancy at that time. The second half should be ready about a year or so later. When funds were appropriated for remodeling, including conversion of Members' suites from two rooms to three rooms, no provision was made for any furniture or furnishings other than carpeting for the enlarged suites. Even under the best of expedition, all the new furnishings cannot possibly be delivered in time for initial occupancy. The Clerk's plan of outfitting is patterned generally after that followed in the Rayburn Building but with certain deletions for items that he thinks can be salvaged from the old furniture and for several items more appropriately chargeable to Members' stationery allowances.

All procurements are to be made on an open, competitive, bid basis.

There are funds included to help meet the added expense of enlarged telephone allowance provisions approved by the House last June, in House Resolution 901, and continued in the present Congress. The amount, $450,000, as the report states, is somewhat of a guess until more cost experience is available.

Then there is $261,600 to replace funds earlier drawn from the contingent fund to credit to Members the additional stationery allowance authorized by House Resolution 112 of the present Congress.

There is a small additional allowance of $5,000 for the physician's office for emergency medical equipment and for supplies and drugs.

We have also included funds to engage outstanding experts to restore the four valuable paintings, including the beautiful "Signing of the Constitution," that were damaged when a man ran amuck here in the House wing last December. It is delicate work, requiring expert talent, and it is costly. But the paintings cannot be permitted to remain in their present condition.

And there is $150,000 for added volume of work at the Office of the Superintendent of Documents.

Taking into account all phases of the bill dealing with the legislative branch, Mr. Chairman, a total of $4,826,160 is in the bill. Leaving out all the complicated ins and outs, that amount, as the committee report shows, is below the formal budget requests by the net amount of $66,700; it is below the official requests—formal and informal—by $2,045,700.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 9481, the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal 1967.

I am particularly pleased that the Appropriations Committee has seen fit to include in the measure $643,000 for the expansion of five national cemeteries, including Fort Rosecrans in my own city of San Diego.

If approved, the money will provide much-needed—though temporary—relief for Fort Rosecrans and the other national burial grounds.

The House should know that Fort Rosecrans, once one of the most active national cemeteries in the country, was closed last September to new applications. The 10-acre addition that is now proposed would reopen the cemetery for about 15 months, according to testimony given the Appropriations Committee by a representative of the Army's Office of Support Services.

Obviously, longer range solutions must be sought to the many built-in problems of our national cemetery system. We Californians are painfully aware of the inherent injustices in the system as it is now constituted. Only five of the 98 national cemeteries are located in the seven westernmost States, and of these, only three are in California, the most populous State in the Nation.

I believe that the most equitable answers could be provided by a Site Selection Committee on National Cemeteries, with membership from both the Government and major veterans organizations. The panel also should determine eligibility for burial in such cemeteries—a matter which up to now has been largely left to the judgment of military officials.

In the meantime, I fully support the temporary reprieve for Fort Rosecrans which H.R. 9481 would provide.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas have any further requests for time?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk now read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. Seventy-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 80]

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Ayres
Baring
Barrett
Battin
Belcher
Berry
Betts
Blackburn
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Mich.
Broyhill, Va.
Button
Byrnes, Wis.
Cederberg
Collier
Conable
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Dickinson
Diggs
Edwards, Ala.
Esch
Eshleman
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Pa.
Galifianakis
Giaimo
Goodell
Griffiths
Gude, Md.
Gurney
Halleck
Hardy
Harsha
Hays
Hébert
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Jacobs
Keith
Kuykendall
Lipscomb
Lukens
McCulloch
Mcdonald, Mich.
McEwen
MacGregor
Madden
Meeds
Meskill
Miller, Calif.
Minshall, Ohio
Mize
Murphy, N.Y.
Passman
Pettis
Pike
Pirnie
Pollock
Pool
Price, Tex.
Railsback
Reifel
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Ronan
St. Onge
Schwengel
Selden
Shipley
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Steiger, Wis.
Teague, Tex.
Utt, Calif.
Vander Jagt
Watts
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Wilson, Bob
Younger

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 9481, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 334 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", as follows: "Research", $2,595,000, and "Plant and animal disease and pest control", $2,077,000.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, let me express my appreciation and extend my compliments to the Appropriations Committee for the work they have done in connection with this supplemental request. What I have to say is in no sense any criticism of the work and effort that committee has carried on.

I do want to make just a few very brief comments with reference to the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture. I wish to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], for his kindness in answering questions from time to time that I have asked with reference to some of the programs that fall under the jurisdiction of his subcommittee.

Today, I would like to make some comments particularly with reference to the Farmers Home Administration. Many of us are concerned with the FHA programs, because we feel they have been doing a good job. We all hear a great deal of criticism today, as indicated in some of the earlier debate, from many of our constituents who are concerned with Federal expenditures, and who are desirous of cutbacks in those programs which many people class as give-away or grant-type programs.

First of all, I want to comment on one of these FHA programs—self-help housing, which frankly I feel is meeting a very great need. It is not a giveaway program, as only 4 percent direct loans are available to those willing to help themselves.

The demand for these direct loans has exceeded the amount available; therefore, during February 1967, the Farmers Home Administration had to decide whether it would discontinue making loans to families participating in self-help housing, or meet their credit needs with insured loans. Since the agency had the capacity to meet the credit needs of these families with insured loans, it decided to do so. This has created a hardship for these families because the interest rate on insured loans is 5 percent. This difference of 1 percent may appear small, but it actually rules out a substantial number of those individuals now eligible. Because, as you are aware, eligibility is determined by this group's ability to repay as the floor, and their maximum income as the ceiling.

The people in this category who are in the rural areas of our country have some very serious problems particularly in connection with their need for better housing. I believe we all recognize it. It has always been my contention that if there could be a way found whereby the individual would have some of his own work, his own effort, and his own initiative in a home, he would tend to take care of it, protect it, and keep it painted and cleaned up in a way which I believe we all feel a home should be.

Unfortunately, many of our programs are in the category of what some people refer to as handout or giveaway programs. We have seen some of our public housing wrecked and destroyed apparently because of lack of any particular interest or concern on the part of the occupant.

My own particular experience with the self-help housing program, as it operates in California, has been one of creating a very favorable climate, because the people who are finally approved for loans in this program are investigated carefully, and they have to meet very narrow and rigid qualifications. Also, they have to indicate real initiative.

They put a great deal of their own effort, initiative, and motivation into these homes, before they are placed in the position of moving in.

I feel that under this program a great many low-income people could be given better and improved housing. It represents a step out of poverty, while at the same time providing an inspiration to these people to develop self-dependence and a willingness to do those things necessary to lift themselves above the poverty level.

I would urge, and I express the hope that the Committee on Appropriations, and particularly the subcommittee of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], in consideration of the regular appropriation, will give real consideration to some increase in the appropriations for this program. I am informed that an additional $2.5 million is needed for the remainder of the present fiscal year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SISK was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, I should like to conclude by commending the Subcommittee on Agriculture of the Appropriations Committee for discretion in keeping the appropriations for this program quite small to start with, because this was an innovation. Frankly, because the funds provided were limited, a great deal of care has been used in the selection of areas as well as the selection of people who would qualify under this program.

There has been a great deal of care and a great deal of interest by many very responsible people in seeing to it that this program got off to a good start and that it did not get involved, as some people would say, in some of the giveaway programs.

In my own particular area—and, as is true of all, we have a little self-interest in our own districts—there is a large population of Mexican-American people who have been making a great deal of use of this program. It has done much for these people, giving them good, improved, clean housing, and they have pride in that housing, compared to the old type of so-called public housing. The progress is really outstanding, and this is an example of what happens when the individual has a direct interest and concern in some of his own labor and in his home. I hope we can continue to make this program really work.

I might point out also, Mr. Chairman, that the need for additional direct rural housing funds to repair or replace buildings lost or damaged as a result of a natural disaster has become critical. I am informed that as a result of the tornado last weekend in Minnesota and by earlier windstorms in Illinois and Iowa, that there is a need of an additional $2 million.

Direct loan assistance to other low-income families also had to be discontinued when the available funds were committed. This includes the elderly families whose incomes are so low that they need a cosigner to make their payments on the loan. In order to meet the urgent credit needs of these people an additional $3 million is needed for the remainder of this fiscal year.

In conclusion, I appreciate the opportunity to present my views on these matters, and I hope the committee and my colleagues will give them every consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

EDUCATIONAL IMPROVEMENT FOR THE HANDICAPPED

For an additional amount for "Educational improvement for the handicapped", for planning grants to States under title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (20 U.S.C. 871–880), and not to exceed $50,000 for salaries and expenses in connection therewith, $2,475,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be allotted in such equitable manner as the Commissioner of Education may determine, but the allotments for each of the States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia shall not be less than $20,000, and the allotments for each of the territories of Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be not less than $10,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ST GERMAIN

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ST GERMAIN: On page 12, after line 6 insert the following:

"PAYMENTS TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS

"For an additional amount for 'Payments to school districts, $20,000,000.

"ASSISTANCE FOR SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

"For an additional amount for 'Assistance for school construction', $48,000,000."

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, in 1950, after its Education and Labor Committees held hearings throughout the Nation, the Congress recognized its responsibility to communities where its activities imposed special burdens on local schools and enacted Public Laws 874 and 815. These now famous laws provide financial assistance for maintenance and operation and assistance to construct facilities needed because of Federal impact.

The rationale of this legislation is that while the Federal activities create additional school enrollments, Federal properties do not contribute property tax revenues. Thus Public Laws 874 and 815 were designed for the Federal Government to accept the responsibility of the normal citizen in a community.

We have a definite obligation, Mr. Chairman, to the impacted communities. We should and must live up to our responsibility by providing to these communities the funds to which they are entitled.

Last year an attempt was made to reduce allocations to impacted communities by 12 percent. Fortunately, through the vigorous leadership of my friend and colleague, the beloved late John E. Fogarty, the Health, Education, and Welfare Appropriations Subcommittee restored these funds in a supplemental appropriations bill which was later approved by the House.

Much to everyone's dismay, John Fogarty is not with us today and neither are the necessary funds to fully compensate the impacted communities for the burden placed on them by the presence of Federal installations.

Frankly, I am greatly disturbed to see so much money expended by this Government to help other nations and yet, in a matter as crucial as education and one in which a heavy burden is placed upon local school districts by the impact of Federal activities, we fail to appropriate sufficient funds to meet the demands of impacted areas.

Why, Mr. Chairman, do we persist in our attempt to deprive impacted communities of funds necessary to meet the cost of educating children whose parents live and/or work in Federal installations?

We must live up to this commitment and to the intent of Public Laws 874 and 815.

Appropriations for 1967 are $48 million less than what is needed to meet entitlements under Public Law 815. With respect to Public Law 874, we have failed to appropriate $20 million needed to meet entitlements under that legislation.

That simply means that a multitude of school districts across the Nation will not receive what is due to them under Public Laws 874 and 815 which, I would like to mention again, were designed to relieve the burden placed upon local school districts by the presence of Federal activities.

In the State of Rhode Island, it means that the city of Providence will have to do without $150,000 for maintenance and operation under Public Law 874 and that North Kingstown and Tiverton will not get the $589,000 and $117,000 respectively for construction purposes.

Mr. Chairman, we have a definite commitment to the impacted areas which must be met.

Therefore, I would now like to offer an amendment to the second supplemental appropriations bill for fiscal year 1967 which would provide an additional $48 million needed under Public Law 815 and an additional $20 million needed for Public Law 874.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendments offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Ordinarily, Mr. Chairman, my distinguished friend is with me and I am with him on the many amendments which have been presented here in the House of Representatives and under different colors and a different war and a different day, I would probably be with him.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is a supplemental bill.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that my distinguished friend realizes that by the time this bill passes the Congress and reaches the President of the United States, it will be far, far late in the fiscal year. My friend is speaking in a nice, round, fat number of $68,000,000. It so happens that from the $416.2 million in the 1967 bill $9 million is being held in reserve because the Office of Education missed in their estimate that this would be required for New York and Houston. If and when that is released, the latest estimate we have is that they will have sufficient funds to pay all entitlements except to those large cities and some others that did not qualify until the amendments that became law last November, well after their school budgets were set up.

Mr. Chairman, under this new legislation the large cities would qualify for the amount of $17 million and some other school systems for the amount of $3 million, except for the action of the Congress, Mr. Chairman, in placing a restricting amendment in the 1967 appropriation bill which prevented these applications from being funded in 1967. Mr. Chairman, one must realize that these school districts had set up their budget months before these amendments were enacted.

Most of you have represented school districts—I have. But, now, when the school year is almost over to suggest that you give them, to their utter amazement, a $17 million and $3 million windfall, which they really cannot use for the current year's expenses I do not think is right.

Mr. Chairman, under Public Law 815 the gentleman's amendment would add the sum of $48 million and those would carry over to 1968 if the estimates of the Department are right. You will find about $17 million are available now, and because the terminal date for the filing of applications was so late this year—February 20—they are not going to finally approve and fund enough applications to use all of these funds by the end of the fiscal year. In a letter dated yesterday the Department estimated they will have $6 million unobligated on June 30, 1967.

Mr. Chairman, these districts have hundreds of applications filed. There is no question about that. And by the end of next fiscal year you will probably be short of funds to the extent, likely, of $50 million if we do not appropriate more than is in the budget for 1968. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that this committee has completed its hearings on the regular bill. I would not be at liberty to divulge what the subcommittee's recommendation will be, even if we had met to make such decisions, which we have not, but I can suggest to the chairman and to my friend, knowing the concern of this House on this very delicate problem, he should not be unduly alarmed. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, for this purpose, for the purpose of this supplemental bill, this is the wrong time and the wrong place.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FLOOD. Of course I will yield.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. There is always a question—and I have to disagree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the chairman of the subcommittee, as to the time and place being wrong, because the amounts that I use and have in my amendment, according to the information I received, are on applications that came in that were timely, and that have been approved. Our big problem is which communities are we going to cut out?

Mr. FLOOD. Let me say this to the gentleman: that by law applications that are filed in 1 year and eligible and approved must be the first applications that are funded under the next appropriation bill.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The next appropriation bill is short another $50 million already, the gentleman knows that, and I am at liberty to say it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman from Rhode Island, my distinguished friend, will withdraw this amendment from consideration at this time.

I do not believe this is the proper time to consider this amendment. We have asked the administration to send an estimate as to what would be needed in order to fully fund the applications under these two public laws, and as of this time—and I have here a letter in my hand from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dated yesterday—we are unable to come up with any estimate from the executive branch of the Government in regard to any shortage of funds for this fiscal year, except for those covered by the amendments that became law last November, and, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania put it, a supplemental appropriation for them would be a windfall.

This matter is under active consideration in the executive branch of the Government. I believe that an estimate will be forthcoming by the time this bill is considered in the other body, if it appears that any other shortage exists. I believe it could very well prejudice this case to have action today.

We went into this in some detail. It is true that these two public laws are funded at the level of 90 percent, or less, for fiscal 1968—that is in the President's budget, which we have not acted on yet. I would assure the gentleman that as one member serving on this committee for a good many years, ever since this department was created, we have never shortchanged these school districts on any funds that they had good reason to anticipate because of legislation on the books before they made up their school budgets.

I can also assure the gentleman the same thing will happen this year. No school district in that category will be shortchanged by this Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I would hope the gentleman would withhold his amendment with that assurance.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. The figures I inserted in the amendment I received from the Department late yesterday afternoon. In addition to that, I received word there were three communities in Rhode Island. I did not follow up on them because I did not have time to compile the figures on all the communities.

Mr. LAIRD. I have the communities listed here, and the estimates that have been given. I assume it is the same list because we also received it late yesterday.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. They were $48 million and $20 million.

The gentleman asked to defer action until the bill goes to the Senate. By the same token, I believe the House is very competent, and if and when the bill goes to the Senate, they can change it if they find these amounts are too heavy and too high.

Mr. LAIRD. I would say to the gentleman that the amounts in his amendment would provide for those covered in the November amendments to Public Law 874 and funds that the Office of Education would not use until next fiscal year under Public Law 815. I support the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. I certainly wish to thank my colleague from Wisconsin for his statement and assurance that he will see to it that we fulfill our obligations under Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 this year by adding in the Senate and in conference once accurate figures are in. And most important his pledge that the necessary funds will be included in the next appropriation bill for Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 in fiscal 1968.

However, on the basis of all the information I have now, this money is needed this year and I trust my amendment will be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Ryan: On page 12, after line 6, insert the following:

"GRANTS FOR ADULT EDUCATION

"For an additional amount for carrying out the Adult Education Act of 1966, as authorized by Public Law 89–750, $10,000,000".

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, in 1966 we enacted the adult education act and authorized $40 million for the fiscal year 1967. Unfortunately, only $30 million out of the $40 million was appropriated.

The amendment which I have offered and which is now before us would restore the cut by appropriating an additional $10 million for the fiscal year 1967. It is similar to H.R. 4779 which I introduced on February 2, 1967.

The adult education program has proven its value—with over 500,000 adults benefiting from the program in all 50 States. The response from the States and in the communities has been an enthusiastic one. The money has been more than well spent. In fact, what better investment can we make than in upgrading education?

Adult basic education teaches those who did not graduate from the eighth grade to read and write. It enables them to get better jobs and to have a greater chance in life.

The money spent on this worthwhile program will be returned to us in value many times over.

The New York Times stated:

> For those who cannot read and write, the promise of literacy represents a negotiable share in the affluent society—not just a promissory note to the dream of a Great one.

For many, however, their opportunity to have a share of the affluent society has been curtailed—it was curtailed by the cutting of this authorization to $30 million last year. The shortchanging of the program has produced severe cutbacks.

This important program began late in 1965, and as a result, many States were not able to use their full 1965 allotment. Therefore, in some cases, a substantial remainder was carried over and used during 1966 in addition to the 1966 allotment. Moreover, during 1966 several upward adjustments were made in the allotments to some States through the redistribution of unused funds.

Thus, the amount of money available for the adult education program during fiscal year 1966 was greater in some States than the amount which otherwise would have been the State's share of the adult basic education funds for that year.

To give a brief example of how this has worked—in New York State—there was the following sequence of events:

New York State's original allotment

for fiscal year 1966 was $1,290,000. In February the Office of Education allotted New York State an additional $1,290,004 out of released funds. In June it again allotted an additional $250,000. This made a total adjusted allotment of $2,830,004 for fiscal year 1966. In addition, New York State had the remaining unused portion of its 1965 funds which amounted to $868,057. The total of real funds available to New York State in fiscal year 1966 then amounted to $3,698,061.

On the basis of this assistance, New York was making real progress in the attack on illiteracy among its adult citizens.

Now under the cutback for the fiscal year 1967, the amount for New York is $2,415,744 which is $1,282,317 less than the real amount received and used in the previous fiscal year, that is the fiscal year 1966. So New York cannot sustain the program at the level to which it has already grown.

As a result, classes have been suspended and students have been turned away. Teachers, many of whom were specially trained, have been dismissed and have not been paid.

Carefully made plans have been cast aside and, above all, once again the hopes of many people have been dashed.

People do not understand the administrative reasons for this curtailment. They only see the cutbacks; they see the reductions, and their disappointment is keen, and resentment that some hold is understandable.

I recognize that the program, if we adopt my amendment, will operate only 2 more months. Nevertheless, this supplemental appropriation now would enable it to continue, and when the fiscal 1968 appropriation is approved, it will be able to expand as it should.

The adult basic education program offers hope to the hopeless. It rehabilitates a sizable number of American citizens who by increased earning power will pay back the Government many times over.

Mr. Chairman, we are constantly investing billions of dollars in military programs and in space programs. Only this morning the House Committee on Science and Astronautics recommended the start of a program which will cost us $2 billion over the next 10 years for the development of space hardware. It seems to me that we must assess our priorities. It is not asking too much to invest the $10 million in this program, which was authorized, but not appropriated, last year. We must look at this question as an investment in human renewal if we are going to really meet our needs in this country.

I hope that this amendment will be approved. I believe it is important. I stress again the fact that programs already underway have been cut back because of a lack of funds and will be cut back further unless this money is appropriated to meet the authorization which was included in the law last year.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. As the gentleman from New York knows well, I am distressed to be in this position where I must oppose an amendment with merit, except for the timing. I have admired the great courage and integrity of the gentleman since he came to this House. So, I repeat, I am distressed at this moment to have to say this to you, Mr. Chairman.

In the 1967 bill the complete budget request of $30 million was voted by the Congress. The gentleman now asks for another $10 million. That amount has not been requested by the executive branch. It is not in the budget. This $10 million is one-third in addition to what the Congress voted for 1967, the full budget request. I repeat, it is one-third, $10 million, in addition.

Contrasted with that only about one-tenth of the year in which these funds would be spent will remain after this bill becomes law. I think that makes the situation very clear.

This is a program with great merit, as the gentleman has stated, but I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that despite my feelings for my friend, this is not the proper time, on a supplemental bill, for this kind of amendment, and I suggest that it be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER VIII

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

Family Housing

HOMEOWNERS ASSISTANCE FUND, DEFENSE

For the Homeowners Assistance Fund, established pursuant to section 1013(d) of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–754, approved November 3, 1966), $5,500,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall be effective only upon enactment into law of S. 1216, Ninetieth Congress, or similar legislation.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a point of order asking the Chair to strike chapter 8 of the second supplemental appropriation bill, to be found on page 17, lines 6 through 16 thereof, for the reason there has been no authorization of this appropriation and that it is contrary to rule XXI (2) of this body. Consideration of S. 1216 is now before this body's Committee on Rules, it is controversial, it has mixed jurisdictional parentage, and it came out of the Committee on Armed Services with eight or more opposing votes. It can be defeated on the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida seek to be heard on this point of order?

Mr. SIKES. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, as the bill states and as the report states, there is a requirement for the enactment of authorizing legislation. The bill which is before the House clearly requires that appropriations for the acquisition of properties must be authorized by a military construction authorization act, and that no moneys in the fund may be used except as may be provided in an appropriation act, and it would clearly protect the Congress and fulfill the requirements of the law.

What we are seeking to do is to put into operation an immediate program. If we do not provide funds now for people who need money for losses in their property as a result of base closures, it is going to be some months before it can be done, probably, in the regular appropriation bill.

Of course, the language is subject to a point of order. We concede that. If the gentleman insists on his point of order, that is the story, but the homeowners will be the ones who suffer unnecessarily.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. As the gentleman from Florida has conceded, the language objected to by the gentleman from Missouri is subject to a point of order in that no authorization has been enacted into law. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER X

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Administration of Foreign Affairs

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $3,900,000, to be derived by transfer from the appropriation for "Loan to the United Nations".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Findley: On page 18, after line 17, insert the following:

"No funds appropriated by this act shall be used to pay salaries or expenses in connection with the consummation of a treaty on nuclear proliferation."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, this is an effort to use the power of the purse to make a bit of foreign policy, one which I feel is most urgently needed at this time.

What will the amendment do? It will withhold the use of any appropriation for salaries from the act of completing negotiations on a Treaty on Nuclear Proliferation between the enactment of this bill and July 1.

It is well to bear in mind the limited duration of the amendment's effect.

As background, I am sure the Members are aware that at Geneva negotiations have been proceeding off and on in regard to a Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. At the present time negotiations are in recess. During this recess period, our administration has been applying heavy pressure upon our allies in NATO to get acceptance of the treaty. It is very plain that the effort has been only partially successful.

To illustrate, German concern continues, yet our Government has given no promise to Germany that we will not sign a treaty against German wishes.

I recall that about 2 years ago a Telstar debate occurred in which the junior Senator from New York, Mr. Kennedy, participated, and Franz Josef Strauss spoke for West Germany. Mr. Strauss raised a very searching and fundamental question at that time which is still appropriate in connection with the Nuclear Proliferation Treaty. He said, "Which comes first, NATO or Geneva?" That is, on which do we place the highest priority? Is it the viability, the strength, the unity of the family of NATO nations which have worked together for military defense purposes all these years? Is that our top priority? Or is our highest priority, instead, even at the expense of NATO, what amounts to a bilateral deal with the Soviet Union which would have the effect of bargaining away for an indefinite period legitimate rights of our valued allies, including Germany.

To me the answer to Mr. Strauss' rhetorical question is very easy. Of course we want to halt proliferation of weapons. We should do what we can to that end. But we have to rate our priorities. In my view, the very highest priority must always be given to strength within the Western alliance; that is, NATO.

It is very clear to anyone who has studied this subject that West Germany in particular is quite concerned about how the treaty will affect that nation in the future, and not only in regard to military affairs. Germany is exposed to the tremendous military power brought along the frontier by the Soviet Union. It is concerned about that threat, of course, but also it is a nation of great competence and technology, a nation which actually fathered the technology which resulted in nuclear affairs.

Can we reasonably expect a people with that competence, with that progressive instinct and with that desire to move ahead, to foreclose forevermore participation in this most essential technology?

I do not believe we wisely can. I do not believe that even this treaty would accomplish that or be very effective in foreclosing nuclear proliferation elsewhere.

But if we should give a higher priority to the consummation of this treaty on nuclear weapons, and by doing that cause concern and perhaps resentment within the German nation or within the Italian nation or other NATO nations, I might add, it would be at too great a cost.

For that reason I ask support for this amendment, which would give us an additional 3 months to explore fully in the public arena and in this Congress, all the matters involved, and would also enable other interested parties to explore fully the very complicated and the very vexing questions which arise in connection with this treaty.

I hope there will be broad support for this proposal. This is an effort to make foreign policy. I am sure those of us who have the feeling that we should uphold constitutional processes recognize the right and responsibility of this House to use its influence on foreign policy.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the distinguished gentleman, my friend from Illinois, realizes that as recently as April 25, 1967, there was a vote in the other body—and the other body is the body which passes upon international treaties and not this body—there was a vote there of 88 to nothing approving a treaty entitled "Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, Including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies," which contained this provision:

> Paragraph (1) of Article IV obligates the treaty parties "not to place in orbit around the earth any objects carrying nuclear weapons or any other kinds of weapons of mass destruction, install such weapons on celestial bodies, or station such weapons in outer space in any other manner.

Now, this action was taken in the other body on April 25, just past. And there was an approval vote of 88 to nothing. We are here and now concerned with an amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois with respect to an amount of money carried in this bill not $1 of which has a thing to do with a treaty of any sort at all.

The amount of money contained in this bill at line 16 on page 8, $3.9 million, is made up of $3 million in increased pay costs as the result of the pay increases voted by the Congress last year for Federal employees. The remaining $900,000 is for use in three countries in Southeast Asia, to wit, Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. It is in those unsettled countries that we are adding the additional employees for the Foreign Service—and I will frankly use the word—to "beef them up" in this critical area of the world to the extent of 70 American and local employees. There is also included in this $900,000 moneys for standby generators that are vitally necessary out there.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. FINDLEY. Thank you for yielding. You are not under the impression that my item would seek to strike this item? Its only effect would be to withhold the money——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The gentleman at the outset of his remarks said he was going to use the power of the purse to make foreign policy.

Mr. FINDLEY. That is correct.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We are in awful shape if that is the way we are going to run this Government and this Congress. Under the Constitution of the United States, the matter of foreign policy, when it comes to a treaty, is peculiarly only within the hands of the other body and not this body.

Mr. FINDLEY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I yield further.

Mr. FINDLEY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I am sure he will acknowledge that if we wait until the Senate approved a treaty to which the President has already pledged the prestige of his office——

Mr. ROONEY of New York. They have already passed the treaty that I have described by a vote of 88 to nothing, which does the opposite of the thing that the gentleman is trying to do with this hamstringing amendment. The other body passed it by a vote of 88 to nothing. Not even a Republican in the other body voted against it.

Mr. FINDLEY. What did that treaty have to do with the proliferation of nuclear weapons?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I have already read to you what it had to do with nonproliferation of nuclear weapons and gave you the section and paragraph. If you do not understand this, I am sorry, but the main point is that this is no way to consider an appropriation bill. This supplemental bill carries vitally needed money that the gentleman's amendment seeks to restrict, all of which is for Southeast Asia and for increased pay costs. These increased pay costs are mandatory. If they are not paid, any employee of the State Department can go to the Court of Claims and get his money that way, because the increased pay has to be paid.

Mr. FINDLEY. But this amendment, if adopted, would encumber that pay going only for an unwise purpose.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Actually, this amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from Illinois is futile. It is an exercise in frustration. But I am thoroughly opposing it for the reason that it represents an improper manner in which to do business here in the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. The committee held hearings on this matter and on this item, and we know exactly what it means. Apparently the gentleman from Illinois does not know what it means.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment which has been offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley], which amendment has nothing in the world to do with the space treaty which has already been negotiated and confirmed by the other body, but which applies to the underway negotiations of a nuclear nonproliferation treaty. We therefore look to a treaty under negotiation.

It is said that there is nothing as powerful as an idea whose time has come.

It also should be said that there is nothing as dangerous as an idea whose time is passed.

When the United States possessed its nuclear monopoly two decades ago the idea of nuclear nonproliferation was a powerful one. It became embedded in our national policy where it remains today. Despite the withering of the monopoly, despite changes in all parts of the world during these past 20 years, we still cling to the fictions that the spread of nuclear weapons can be stopped and that a nonproliferation policy still serves the national security interests of the United States.

Perhaps these are not fictions, although some respectable and thoughtful people think so. Whether they are or not is basic to the future survival of the United States. Yet we are rushing headlong into a nuclear nonproliferation treaty without any real and intelligent examination of the proposition that it may be the worst possible course for the country. We are doing so without examination or public discussion of alternatives to nonproliferation under today's circumstances of the world and those projected for tomorrow and beyond.

That discussion, and the evaluation of alternatives which it involves, must occur before we recklessly pursue just one single alternative in the Johnson administration's haste to negotiate a nonproliferation treaty for treaty's sake.

Secretary McNamara has established in the Defense Department the technique of systems analysis by which national defense problems before the Department are minutely analyzed. Every possible alternative solution is evaluated to determine the one which is most effective for the United States. Yet, no analysis whatever has been made in connection with the vital problem of what, in the security interest of the United States, is the best alternative policy on the spread of nuclear weapons to select from a wide spectrum of alternatives ranging from absolute nonproliferation to total and complete accelerated proliferation.

We have maintained a hypnotic focus on one alternative only. It is an alternative at one extreme end of the spectrum, namely no proliferation at all. This is despite the fact that the policy has failed not once but four times already. First with the British, second with the Soviets, third with the French, and fourth with the Red Chinese.

Before we paint ourselves into a corner for the indefinite future by signing a nonproliferation treaty, good sense and sound defense planning requires at least a look along the spectrum at all the alternatives. The Johnson administration completely ignores this wise course. It rushes for a treaty, making the most extravagant and dangerous concessions along the way. Again and again I have asked the Disarmament Agency to make studies of the alternatives to the nonproliferation monomania. It refuses to do so. Secretary McNamara has even prevented such studies from being made by the Defense Department.

For example, the policy of selective transfer or sharing of nuclear weapons technology, a sensitive issue, but an increasingly important alternative, is a case in point. In April 1965, the Army Research Office released a formal request for a proposal entitled "Selective Nuclear Transfer," designated to be a study of "the feasibility and desirability, in the 1970 time frame, of providing selected U.S. allies a significant nuclear defense capability without the necessity for maintaining U.S. control or custody over weapons systems of their employment." Within 2 months thereafter the contractors who submitted proposals were notified that "it was determined to be in the best interest of the Government to cancel the project as presently proposed." It was suggested that Department of Defense would rewrite the work statement, "assume overall responsibility for the project," and resubmit it, but nothing since has been heard of the study.

Indeed, such a study is very vital. Contract studies have been made which indicate the feasibility of inserting in nuclear warheads what I choose to call "controlled action plugs." These CAPS would, for instance, limit the use of a nuclear warhead to purely defensive purposes. The warhead could not fire except in a defensive envelope over the allied territory involved if fitted to an antiballistics missile defense rocket. It would not fire at all if removed from the rocket.

With ever widening worldwide defense responsibilities it may become quite important in the near future that United States manufacture and supply under strict CAP controls ABM warheads, to certain allied nations for strictly defense purposes, as an alternative to U.S. loss of strategic control and influence in vital areas of the globe.

Such a system might even prevent uncontrolled and indiscriminate proliferation of nuclear weapons on a national basis. India, as an example, with nuclear-armed Red China on its borders might, with the availability of such a defense system, forgo acquisition of nuclear capabilities on its own.

The foregoing merely hints at circumstances in which controlled and selective proliferation might better serve U.S. interests than a nonproliferation treaty which would absolutely bar the United States from selecting such an alternative, no matter how important it might become to our own national security.

I rise in support of the amendment before us in an effort to slow down this plunge into a treaty and to plead for proper U.S. evaluation of alternatives before we chance freezing ourselves into a posture which could lead to great danger.

The only purpose of a treaty such as the nonproliferation treaty is to create a situation of less danger after its signing than before. Before signing we should be sure that it would decrease dangers, not increase them. We should not sign blindly, without first determining with positive assurance that less, not more, risks will ensue.

It is time the people in our State Department and at the Disarmament Agency be put on a rein, be made to do their homework, be required to prove that the courses they take are wise, and be made to determine with intelligence the actual best course for the United States. Otherwise we risk signing away our future capability to defend ourselves and to maintain our independence.

Our world stands no risk of nuclear holocaust from the delay involved in so doing. Rather, the delay may avoid such an actual risk if it is used intelligently to think out the maximum policy of assurance to the peace of the world and the security of our country, which two goals are inexorably intertwined.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. Hosmer was allowed to proceed for an additional 5 minutes.)

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time in order to yield to the gentlemen who were standing.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

With all due respect to the gentleman from Illinois, who has offered this amendment, I find myself in strong opposition. There was no subject that I was aware of that President Eisenhower was more concerned with than nonproliferation. He felt very strongly we must make progress in this area if the world was to move meaningfully toward peace. I believe he still does. Obviously we always should consider alternatives but to take this action in an appropriation bill would be a mistake.

Our Government is presently involved in very delicate and very important negotiations. It would undermine them. I believe that Bill Foster, our Disarmament Director, is one of the ablest Americans we have in this field. He is trying to negotiate safeguards. I believe it would be a serious mistake to preclude any reasonable and sound opportunity to formulate meaningful safeguards so we can proceed to negotiate a sound nuclear nonproliferation treaty. This is important in many parts of the world, including Asia, and Red China, and certainly the Near East. Indeed this treaty should be a matter of highest national priority. Should negotiations falter and prospects for a treaty darken we could see a world in a few years where perhaps some 10 to 15 nations could be atomic powers. This would be an uncertain world and not the best legacy to leave our children.

I would merely ask the gentleman whether he wants to cut off a thoughtful continuation of negotiations looking towards a sound nonproliferation treaty?

Mr. HOSMER. I would answer the gentleman by saying in the first place my whole thesis was dedicated to the proposition that this is not a thoughtful negotiation, that the United States has recklessly gone into a nonproliferation kick without any attempt whatsoever to evaluate the alternatives, and discover if any of them offer a better position for the protection of our country.

I will also say to the gentleman when former President Eisenhower became President, there were only three nuclear powers, the United States, the United Kingdom, and the U.S.S.R. France did not attain nuclear power until the tail-end of the Eisenhower administration in 1960, and Red China did not attain it until 1963.

I submit that later developments have outmoded our policy of nonproliferation, and it is up to us as courageous Americans to face up to the facts as they are, and not as we would wish they would be, and face up to a world in which there is proliferation. We cannot rationally, and should not quixotically involve ourselves in trying to stop the progress of technology, which no one has been able to accomplish. They could not stop the invention of the wheel, they could not stop the advancement of knowledge in the Dark Ages, and they cannot stop proliferation in the last half of this century in which we live. So in order to protect us we had best do the things that are necessary to see that when it does get into other hands it gets into sensible hands.

It is necessary to see that it gets into hands under which circumstances impose controls in order that nuclear aggression can be forestalled, if, indeed, it is at all possible to forestall it.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I had planned to take a little time on this on my own, but I will try to discuss this in this colloquy with the gentleman.

I do not want to get into any argument

as to whether we ought to have a proliferation treaty or not. But I do not think it makes much difference whether this amendment is passed or it is not passed.

It will not accomplish what the gentleman from Illinois intends it to accomplish, if I understand it correctly.

Mr. HOSMER. I suppose that is right, because in these matters the State Department, like the Defense Department, gets into discussions with the Congress and gets some advice from the Congress and then goes out and does exactly what it wants to do anyway.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I think it is fine to carry on this foreign policy discussion. However, this amendment will not accomplish what the gentleman from Illinois intends.

That is all I have to say. I have no argument with the gentleman's position one way or the other, but so far as this amendment on this appropriation bill is concerned, I just do not think it will work.

Mr. HOSMER. I understand all it will do is to cut off the amount of pay raise and to personnel assigned to the nonproliferation treaty negotiations.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Does not the gentleman from California understand that this is not only an idle gesture but a dangerous gesture as well that would, if successful, set a precedent for interfering in responsibilities of the other body. There is not one dollar in these funds that has the slightest thing to do with what the gentleman has said.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield further to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I will say to the gentleman, I yielded to him when I had the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $3,700,000.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROONEY OF NEW YORK

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which has been approved by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROONEY of New York: On page 20, line 4, strike out $3,700,000" and insert "$3,420,000".

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, this is a committee amendment endorsed by both sides of the subcommittee dealing with this particular Agency and it would reduce the amount in the printed bill by $280,000 and bring it down to $3,420,000.

The budget estimate for this item as contained in House Document No. 83 was for $4,700,000. In testimony before the subcommittee on Friday, April 7, 1967, the witness for this Agency agreed that the request could be reduced by $940,000 to a new total of $3,800,000. This was based on the assumption that the bill would be approved by May 1.

Realizing that the bill would not become law by May 1, the committee reduced the request by an additional $100,000 and recommended $3,700,000.

On Friday last, the same day that this bill was reported, a budget revision was submitted to the other body in which this Agency and the Bureau of the Budget now say that their request is to be changed to $3,620,000.

So we have a situation where they originally requested $4,740,000. On April 7, 1967, they agreed to a reduction of $940,000 or a total of $3,800,000.

On Friday, April 28, the request was again revised by the Agency and/or the Bureau of the Budget to $3,620,000.

Inasmuch as they have now changed their request at least three times, we feel that we should change our recommendation as well and therefore are recommending the new figure of $3,420,000.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an affirmative vote on this amendment.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, we have no objection to this amendment. It is a good amendment. We are reducing the amount to be appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF THE PUBLIC DEBT

ADMINISTERING THE PUBLIC DEBT

For an additional amount for "Administering the public debt", $1,900,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to inquire as to the total amount that we are spending each year to maintain the Bureau of Public Debt. If anyone has that figure at hand I would like to have it. Apparently it is going up all the time as the debt goes up.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. I am advised that it is approximately $50 million.

Mr. GROSS. Fifty to fifty-four million dollars?

Mr. BOW. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. When the gentleman from Ohio and I came to Congress some years ago, if I remember correctly, the amount was around $20 million to $25 million. Now the Bureau of the Public Debt is costing over $50 million a year and this is another $2 million supplemental for that purpose.

I hope that it comes through clearly to some people around here that this is just another expenditure to administer the huge debt that we have—$336 billion, or approximately that.

I remember a few days ago when Secretary of Defense McNamara, in response to a question before the House Foreign Affairs Committee, said he hoped that Congress had advanced beyond the stage where it believes it is necessary to retire the Federal debt. Can it be that Mr. McNamara is right that Congress does not care about the huge Federal debt, whether there is any retirement of it?

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HALEY. Of course, the gentleman from Iowa must recognize that the debt continues to grow and grow and grow. It takes that additional personnel to figure out the huge interest that we pay.

Mr. GROSS. My friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], has offered the best explanation yet for this supplemental appropriation to the Bureau of the Public Debt.

While I have the floor and a little time remaining, I would like to ask a question concerning the next item, which is the U.S. Secret Service, and the $1,003,000 of supplemental funds for that Service. It is my understanding that the original request was for some $500,000, and I wonder if someone can tell me why that amount has been nearly doubled. Silence indicates that apparently no one knows why it has been increased by nearly 100 percent.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. If the gentleman will be patient, he has asked the best question of the afternoon and I am sure the answer will be forthcoming.

Mr. GROSS. You know, those of you who voted for so-called daylight saving time borrowed an hour out of my life last Sunday. I will have to live until next fall to recapture that hour. I do not think I can waste any more time waiting for the answer to my question. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I will be glad to give the gentleman some of my time for I have trouble using all of it.

Mr. MAHON. If the gentleman will permit, I would like to refer him to page 473 of the hearings which rather clearly sets out the facts in connection with this requirement. While it is true that the January budget did carry an estimate of $545,000 for the Secret Service, other requirements have since developed which could not be accurately forecast at that time. This includes items such as increased Presidential travel and moving costs pursuant to legislation enacted last session.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

CHAPTER XIII

CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS

For payments of claims settled and determined by departments and agencies in accord with law and judgments rendered against the United States by the United States Court of Claims and the United States district courts, as set forth in House Document Numbered 109, Ninetieth Congress, $10,978,173, together with such amounts as may be necessary to pay interest (as and when specified in such judgments or provided by law) and such additional sums due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in foreign currency: *Provided*, That no judgment herein appropriated for shall be paid until it shall become final and conclusive against the United States by failure of the parties to appeal or otherwise: *Provided further*, That unless otherwise specifically required by law or by the judgment, payment of interest wherever appropriated for herein shall not continue for more than thirty days after the date of approval of the Act.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. MAHON (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, the remainder of the bill deals with pay increases heretofore provided by Congress. I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the remainder of the bill be open for amendment at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the remainder of the bill?

The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'Hara of Michigan, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and the amendment thereto to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 391, nays 6, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 81]

YEAS—391

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bow
Brademas
Brasco
Brinkley
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McDonald, Mich.
McFall
McMillan
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
St Germain
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—6

Brock
Davis, Wis.
Gross
Hall
Rarick
Zion

NOT VOTING—36

Baring
Barrett
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bray
Brown, Calif.
Collier
Corman
Culver
Dickinson
Diggs
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Ford, William D.
Fulton, Pa.
Hébert
Herlong
Jacobs
Keith
McEwen
Madden
Meeds
Murphy, N.Y.
O'Neill, Mass.
Passman
Pool
Ronan
St. Onge
Selden
Shipley
Vander Jagt
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Younger

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts with Mr. Keith.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Collier.

Mr. Shipley with Mr. Bray.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Ronan with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Passman with Mr. Dickinson.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Vander Jagt.

Mr. Watts with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Blatnik with Mr. William D. Ford.

Mr. Baring with Mr. Selden.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Everett.

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Meeds.

Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. Herlong.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Corman with Mr. Pool.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that chapter VIII of the bill just passed was eliminated from the bill on a point of order, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct the subsequent chapter numbers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the second supplemental appropriation bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

INTEREST RATES SHOULD BE ROLLED BACK TO AVOID ANOTHER FEDERAL RESERVE DEPRESSION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. **PATMAN**. Mr. Speaker, we do not need another manmade depression.

The Federal Reserve is dragging its feet and is not doing what is necessary to roll back interest rates to the levels existing before December 6, 1965. The Federal Reserve, unless it changes its ways quickly, may create a full-blown recession in the midst of a wartime economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reserve, amid much fanfare, lowered the discount rate from 4½ percent to 4 percent on April 6. This lulled many people into thinking that interest rates would come down across the board, but these hopes have proven false. The Federal Reserve has allowed a few interest rates to inch downward, but it is delaying an across-the-board rollback to levels existing before the 1965 increases.

The Federal Reserve's postponement of a full rollback is creating a "wait and see" attitude in much of the economy. Many are waiting to see what will happen to interest rates before they invest their money. This is creating a dangerously unstable condition in the economy.

The housing industry, and the construction business generally, are still lagging badly as the country waits for the results of the foot-dragging policies of the Federal Reserve. This is delaying a return to normal, stable, and reasonable interest rates and is creating the danger of recession throughout the economy.

We need stable and reasonable interest rates now—not some distant day in the future. The rollback should be immediate.

As a first step, I urge the Federal Reserve to lower the interest rate that banks may pay on time deposits. On December 6, 1965, the Federal Reserve raised the interest rate on time deposits—regulation Q—to 5½ percent—a 37½-percent increase. This was one of the principal causes of the high interest, tight money policy which plagued the Nation throughout 1966.

This interest rate should be rolled back to the December 1965 levels. This would mean that banks could pay no more than 4 percent on time deposits of 30 to 90 days and 4½ percent on time deposits of 90 days or more.

As long as the Federal Reserve pegs regulation Q at its current record level, the temptation will be strong for the banks to keep interest rates high. With regulation Q at 5½ percent, the temptation is strong for another round of costly, unnecessary, and wasteful interest rate wars among financial institutions. If the Federal Reserve is sincere about its desires to bring about a rollback of interest rates to the 1965 levels, then regulation Q must be lowered.

Mr. Speaker, I also urge that other steps be taken to assure lower interest rates throughout the economy. In particular, the interest rates on FHA- and VA-insured mortgages should be lowered without delay.

During 1966, FHA was forced to raise interest rates from 5½ percent to 6 percent—the statutory maximum. During this period, VA-insured mortgages increased from 5¼ percent to 6 percent, also the statutory ceiling.

Now that there has been an easing in the money markets, there is no reason for FHA and VA to maintain these extremely high rates. Lowering of these interest rates would help millions of homebuyers and would stimulate the housing industry.

During 1966, housing starts slumped more than 20 percent due to high interest rates and we should do everything possible to reverse this trend in the current year. A rollback in the VA and FHA rates to the December 1965 levels is a necessary beginning and one which should be taken without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, despite the slightly easier conditions and the slightly lower interest rates of recent weeks, we must do more to bring about truly normal conditions in the money markets. We have not yet reversed the trend of high interest rates.

We must demand that the Federal Reserve roll back regulation Q to the levels existing before December 1965. We must also demand a rollback in the FHA and VA rates.

Mr. Speaker, two articles in the Wall Street Journal of Tuesday, May 2, illustrate the unstable conditions in the money markets and plainly show that the Federal Reserve is not keeping its promises to lower interest rates. These two articles show that the interest rates on certificates of deposit are on their way up again as well as the interest rates on short-term Treasury bills. Most important, the facts contained in these Wall Street Journal stories point to the need for stable interest rates. They point to a need for an immediate rollback of interest rates to a reasonable level—the level existing before December 1965.

This rollback should be accomplished with a single stroke of the pen and not through the inch-by-inch, stop-and-go tactics employed so far by the Federal Reserve. Only a full, concrete rollback will put the economy on a firm footing and let everyone know where we stand on interest rates.

Mr. Speaker, I place the two articles in the Record:

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 2, 1967]

Yields on Treasury's Short-Term Bills Rise As Demand Is Diverted

Washington.—Yields on the Treasury's latest issues of short-term bills rose as investors started diverting funds into the Treasury's higher-yielding new notes.

The average interest rate on the latest 13-week bill issue rose to 3.770% from 3.715% the week before, but remained well below the 3.905% of the auction two weeks before.

The return to investors on the companion issue of 26-week bills, rose to 3.907% from 3.772% the week before, but remained below the 3.950% of the auction two weeks before.

Dealers in New York attributed the declining demand and thus rising yields on the new bills partly to the effect of the Treasury's refunding operation for which books are open from Monday this week through tomorrow. The 15-month 4¼% notes in particular are proving more attractive, they said, since they are priced at a discount to yield 4.29%.

Yields are determined by the difference between the purchase price and face value. Lower bidding widens the investors' margin of return. The percentage figures are based on the discount from par and are calculated on a 360-day year rather than the 365-day year on which yields of bonds, certificates and other Treasury securities are figured.

Accepted bids on the 13-week issue ranged from a high of 99.060 (3.719%) to a low of 99.043 (3.786%), and an average price of 99.047 (3.770%). Of the amount bid for at the low price, 98% was accepted, the Treasury said.

Applications for the latest 13-week issue totaled $2,102,943,000. The Treasury accepted $1,300,686,000, including $234,306,000 offered on a noncompetitive basis and accepted in full at the average price.

These bills are in addition to those dated Feb. 2, 1967, and mature Aug. 3, 1967.

On the 26-week issue, accepted bids ranged from a high of 98.038 (3.881%) to a low of 98.016 (3.924%), and an average price of 98.025 (3.907%). Of the amount bid for at the low price, 3% was accepted, the Treasury said.

Applications for the latest 26-week issue totaled $1,812,100,000. The Treasury accepted $1,000,102,000, including $90,107,000 offered on a noncompetitive basis and accepted in full at the average price.

These bills are dated May 4, 1967, and mature Nov. 2, 1967.

[From the Wall Street Journal, May 2, 1967]

Commercial Paper, CD's Short-Term Interest Rates Move Upward—Four Companies Make Increases on 30–to–89 Day Paper—One New York Bank Lifts Top CDs

New York.—Short-term interest rates turned upward in two key sectors of the money market.

Several finance companies raised the rates they pay on certain maturities of commercial paper they issue and place with investors, and at least one major New York City bank, it is understood, has raised to 4½% the top rate it is willing to pay on certain maturities of negotiable certificates of deposit. Previously New York banks were quoting CDs in a range of 4% to 4⅜%.

The commercial paper rate boost was the first increase in paper rates following more than two months of steady declines.

At least four companies—Chrysler Credit Corp., Commercial Credit Co., G. E. Credit Corp. and Pacific Finance Corp.—raised to 4½% from 4⅜% their rates on 30-to-89 day paper. They left unchanged, however, at 4½%, their rates on 90-to-270 day maturities.

Money market specialists said the boosts came at a time when finance companies were aggressively seeking funds to replace a heavy volume of commercial paper that falls due early this month. They also noted that rates on other money market instruments that compete for short-term investment funds have risen somewhat in recent days.

Yields on certain issues of Treasury bills, for instance, have risen by more than 1–10 percentage point in the last two days of secondary trading.

The CD-rate increase, specialists said, is in line with contentions of some bankers that loan demand is still high and will pick up further with an acceleration of the economy toward the end of the year.

THE INADEQUACY OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

Mr. **THOMPSON** of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. **THOMPSON** of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, according to accounts in the New York Times of yesterday's date, a collision occurred between two aircraft making a landing at La Guardia Airport in New York. One of these aircraft was a small single-engine private airplane in which three persons were crushed to death by a twin-engine air taxi airplane which landed on top of it. Nine persons in the air taxi airplane were injured.

Apparently, the control tower had authorized both aircraft to land.

Mr. Speaker, this crash did not make the headlines, but screaming headlines would have been generated had a fully loaded jet airliner been involved and burned.

A situation such as occurred at La Guardia can be related to two cars colliding at an intersection after both had been motioned forward by the policeman at the corner.

Mr. Speaker, how long can situations such as this be tolerated when it has been acknowledged, by many, that air traffic control is inadequate? When will we realize that the FAA needs to do a more effective job than is being done in air safety? And when will the FAA realize that they must institute a policy of training for proficiency rather than checking for proficiency? Are we going to be satisfied with halfway measures and closed committee hearings into air safety matters?

Mr. Speaker, it is my considered judgment that the interest of the people is so great in the matter of air safety that we must have open hearings into the entire realm of air safety wherein the companies can present their case, the pilots can present their case, and the FAA can present their case, with each having the benefit of knowing what the other is testifying.

I would further call the Speaker's attention to the fact that the U.S. Government is already liable for millions of dollars in judgments against it as a result of aircraft accidents. We do not here anticipate determining the probable cause of this accident from the sketchy information furnished in the newspaper account. Nor do I anticipate at this time a determination of Federal liabilities in this instance. However, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a serious consideration in these matters and the truth of the situation will again be borne out in the Federal courts of this Nation. Would we not be prudent to modify and update the inadequate air traffic control system and institute other air safety measures?

Mr. Speaker, I again call for a thorough and searching congressional hearing, open to the public, into air safety and would like to again emphasize that while this collision at La Guardia involved smaller aircraft, it could just as well have involved two airliners with hundreds of lives lost. This is the only way that public interest can best be served.

GENERAL WESTMORELAND RECEIVES SCOUTING'S HIGHEST HONOR

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 28, 1967, General Westmoreland was honored by the Boy Scouts of America with the Silver Buffalo Award for distinguished service to American boyhood. The Silver Buffalo Award represents Scouting's highest adult honor and there certainly is no one more deserving than General Westmoreland, who today commands American forces in Vietnam. Those who serve in Scouting know the significance of this award in terms of contribution to youth leadership training. Under unanimous consent, at this point, I insert in the RECORD the press release issued by the national office of the Boy Scouts of America:

GENERAL WESTMORELAND RECEIVES SCOUTING'S HIGHEST HONOR, SILVER BUFFALO AWARD

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 28.—General William C. Westmoreland was honored here today by the Boy Scouts of America with the Silver Buffalo Award for distinguished service to American boyhood. Presentation of Scouting's highest adult honor was made in the office of Gen. Earle G. Wheeler by Charles B. McCabe of New York City, Chairman, National Court of Honor, Richard W. Darrow, of Scarsdale, N.Y., and Gen. Bruce C. Clarke (U.S.A., ret.) of Arlington, Va., members of the national executive board of the Boy Scouts of America. The citation read:

"William Childs Westmoreland, General, United States Army, and Commander of all the United States forces in South Vietnam.

"As a young man in Spartansburg, South Carolina, you demonstrated your characteristic determination and drive by becoming an Eagle Scout with Silver Palm and were chosen a member of the United States contingent to the III World Jamboree at Arrowe Park, Birkenhead, England in 1929. Though oriented towards medicine, a meeting with naval officers on the return trip turned you toward service to your country. You received an appointment to the United States Military Academy at West Point where you graduated first captain of cadets and won the coveted Pershing sword. You were to return to the Point later as its second-youngest superintendent and leave your marks on its curriculum and future design.

"Rising steadily with a distinguished career of combat and command, you have served your country in the best traditions of your profession. In World War II and the Korean conflict you faced death on the beaches and in the air. You jumped with your men as commanding general of the famed "Screaming Eagles", the 101st Airborne Division. Fitness, discipline, bravery and personal integrity have always been your personal hallmarks. You have been decorated for valor by your country and by others.

"You are well known to the people of your country. You were named Man of the Year by an influential news magazine and we have seen your face near the faces of the men under your command in the hinterlands of Vietnam. We have heard your voice encouraging them, congratulating them, and inquiring of their needs. We know you are concerned with The Other War in that tragic land.

"Yet, somehow, with the normal stresses of a military career and the turmoils of wars, you have maintained a steadfast covenant with Scouting and a faith in American youth. You have shown your concern as a man and a father by serving through Scouting whenever possible—as a Scoutmaster in Oklahoma when a young officer, as a committeeman for Scout troops in Pennsylvania and Hawaii, as a member of the Occoneechee Council Executive Board in North Carolina, chaiman of that council's Together Plan, and as an active member of Region Two Executive Committee, Boy Scouts of America. You served as a panelist at the 1963 Annual Meeting of the Boy Scouts of America. Within the influence of your commands, you have encouraged Scouting for American boys in many places.

"For your distinguished service to boyhood, you were awarded the Silver Beaver by your local council of the Boy Scouts of America in 1964."

MAN OF THE YEAR: COMMISSIONER OF IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION RAYMOND F. FARRELL

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, each year the Rhode Island State Society of Washington presents to an outstanding Rhode Islander its "Man of the Year Award."

The 1967 recipient of this coveted award is the distinguished and highly esteemed Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, Mr. Raymond F. Farrell, and I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some interesting facts concerning his background.

Commissioner Farrell, a native of Pawtucket, R.I., is a graduate of Georgetown University and the Georgetown Law Center. He has served in various governmental agencies, among them the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of the Interior, and as special counsel to the joint committee in Congress investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

In 1941 Mr. Farrell became associated with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. His career with the Immigration and Naturalization Service was interrupted in May of 1942, at which time he went on active duty in the U.S. Army. Mr. Farrell's tour of duty with the U.S. Army was marked by exemplary devotion and rapid advancement. He was the recipient of the Bronze Star Medal for outstanding duty in the Rome-Arno campaign, and at the time of his separation from military service in November of 1945 he was a lieutenant colonel.

Shortly after his discharge from the service, Mr. Farrell returned to the Immigration Service and was named chief of investigations at New York City. In 1949 he was named Assistant Commissioner for Research and Education, and in 1952 he became Assistant Commissioner for Investigation. In 1958 Mr. Farrell was promoted to Associate Commissioner in Charge of Service Operations.

The late President Kennedy nominated Raymond Farrell to the post of Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and he was unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate on February 5, 1962. Mr. Farrell's record as Commissioner since 1962 has been recognized as a new era of compassion and understanding in administering the Nation's immigration and nationality laws. In 1964 President Johnson described Ray Farrell's administration as an example of "Government with a heart."

Mr. Farrell has been honored by Georgetown University's Alumni Achievement Award in 1961 and by the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, with its certificate of appreciation.

The State of Rhode Island is indeed proud of the many accomplishments of Commissioner Farrell. His career in public service has been one of devotion and, its inevitable result, success.

As a close friend of Commissioner Farrell, I deem it both an honor and privilege to know him. As a Rhode Islander and Member of Congress, I am most grateful that a man such as he has devoted his life to public service and has brought such honor to his native State and country.

OEO INTERFERENCE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Economic Opportunity has injected itself into the governing makeup of the Greater Chester Movement and caused such havoc that the success of every war-on-poverty program in the city of Chester and the county of Delaware is threatened.

When the OEO came into existence, it turned to the Greater Chester Movement, organized to deal with the human, educational, economic, and physical problems of the city, to serve as the "umbrella" agency for all poverty programs throughout Delaware County, a community of over 600,000 people.

Now, the hierarchy of the OEO has turned on the very group from which it sought help, and forced the resignations of GCM members from the steering committee. The forced resignations of the mayor of Chester, the Honorable James H. Gorbey, and his six appointees to the steering committee, has stripped this agency of the leadership of some of the finest, civic-minded individuals it has ever been my privilege to know and to represent.

From the time the GCM became the OEO's local agency, it has been subjected to harassment and attack repeatedly by the very Federal agency which turned to it for help—the OEO.

This situation continued until last week. At that time, Mayor Gorbey and his appointees to the steering committee resigned. And yet, it is the Federal Government which best attests to the tremendous job undertaken by these seven men. The GCM has been the recipient of numerous commendations, from the office of the Vice President on down, for its work in this untried field of human endeavor.

I should like to note here that a recent evaluation by the OEO cited the GCM's efforts as among the finest in the Nation, and perhaps disappointingly for the OEO, could find nothing wrong with the fiscal management of the agency—this in the face of shortages of funds turning up in many other places throughout the country.

Now, why has the OEO forced Mayor Gorbey and his appointees to resign? They claim these seven men represented political control over the war-on-poverty programs in my district.

To show how ridiculous this claim is, I need only point out that these seven men represented only 20 percent of the 36-member steering committee, and that although Mayor Gorbey is a Republican, his appointees came from both political parties and included the former Democratic chairman of the city of Chester.

To illustrate the caliber of the men forced out by the OEO, let me list them by name and profession: James H. Gorbey, mayor and prominent attorney; Dr. Clarence R. Moll, president, Pennsylvania Military College; Dr. Robert Stanley, gynecologist, and also chairman of GCM steering committee at time of resignation; Leroy F. Wright, president, Delaware County National Bank; William J. Coopersmith, businessman and former Democratic city chairman; Andrew J. Schroeder, vice president of Scott Paper Co.; and H. A. MacNeilly, administrative assistant to Mayor Gorbey.

I say without hesitation that individually, each of these seven men are recognized community leaders who put their own reputations and careers in jeopardy to accept the responsibility for reversing the tide of the underprivileged in Chester when tempers ran high and community feeling was not in sympathy with any program which aided the poor.

Oddly enough, President Johnson recently called on "political activists" to involve themselves in such programs in order to insure their success.

Today, the fight against poverty is in a hopeless mess in Chester and Delaware County. In the wake of the forced resignations of the mayor and his appointees, several staff members, including the executive director, also resigned.

And, I charge here and now, that the Washington bureaucracy of the OEO is solely responsible.

Where the poverty program in Chester goes from here is anybody's guess.

It is my guess that Mayor Gorbey and his appointees will continue to work for the good of Chester. That they will lend their experience and guidance in an effort to reconstruct the shambles that has been caused by the unwarranted interference of the OEO.

There is much more I could say on this situation. I thought long and seriously of calling for a congressional investigation into this situation. But, perhaps the case is best set forth in a letter sent by the seven maligned men to the President. I do not know if he will bother to read it, but I urge my colleagues to read it, to absorb it, and to remember it as we are asked to put more and more power into the hands of those operating the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The letter follows:

CITY OF CHESTER, PA.,
April 27, 1967.

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: One cannot help but be appalled by the continued harassment of the Greater Chester Movement for having on its Steering Committee the Mayor of Chester and six of his appointees. You and others within OEO, even more than the local action agency, are aware that there would be no Greater Chester Movement in Chester had it not been for the Mayor, the Governor of Pennsylvania and the citizen leaders whom you question and practically malign as politically dominated. They were GCM before there was an OEO. They are the community leaders who put their own reputations and careers in jeopardy to accept responsibility for reversing the tide of the underprivileged in Chester at a time when tempers ran high and community feeling was hardly in sympathy with any program which responded to the needs of the poor, especially the Negro. Aware that Chester's problems were much deeper than the educational system which was at the center of the Negro demonstrations, GCM was organized to deal in an interrelated way with the human, educational, economic, and physical problems of the city. It set out to involve every community agency and every community leader, public or private, black or white, in one singular effort to make Chester a model city of its size. Chester has in microcosm every problem of the large megalopolis, but because of its size the problems are nearer to the surface and easier to reach. Chester's GCM could well be the prototype for correcting the problems which besiege every old, port, or industrial city in America.

No more dedicated or devoted or selfless group of public citizens ever worked on such a responsibility. They raised and borrowed money to hire a staff; they started a community-action center in the ghetto before there was an OEO. They, with the help of ex-President Eisenhower, raised $30,000 to start an economic renewal program. The Ford Foundation showed interest. The city, the state, the county, gave us unqualified support and help.

As the founders we have a comprehensive picture of GCM's development and its struggle for survival. Few people know the hours, the meetings, the travel which many of us invested in this program, or the heartaches that were ours. For more than twelve months we met six days a week with the Steering Committee, the director, officials of OEO, local Civil Rights leaders and committees. It was not unusual to spend sixteen hours a day on GCM, to have five breakfast meetings a week and meetings every night going on into the morning. So much of our own time went into GCM that we became full time staff members of GCM without compensation. Politics never entered into a decision or an order, either from the standpoint of the Mayor or the members of the Steering Committee until OEO got into the picture. GCM was started with both Republicans and Democrats, but political labels meant nothing when it came to achieving our objectives, namely improving living conditions in Chester. The Mayor was behind the non-partisan, non-political approach from inception. He never interfered with a Steering Committee decision, even though in some cases they jeopardized his political position.

When OEO was in the making, a member of President Johnson's task force on poverty who visited GCM encouraged our original organization as the type that would be needed to run the poverty programs in cities, once a program was established.

Once OEO was founded, GCM's Steering Committee immediately found itself under continual harassment and attack for not being representative of the people, for not involving the civil rights leaders, for not being representative of the County, for including the Mayor, for including members of the "power structure", for being politically documented. No sooner was one aspect cleared up than another objection came to the fore. Because of OEO's interference, because OEO haggled continually over the subject of GCM Steering Committee membership, the Committee spent so much of its time on organizational matters, that it (1) had no time for anything except OEO problems, (2) spent almost all its time on organizational trivia rather than on program development and in solving Chester's problems, (3) had to give up its broad-based objectives of dealing with economic, physical and educational problems to become nothing more than the agency for administering poverty programs. In short, it became so bogged down in meaningless details that it lost sight of its original objectives—specifically dealing with the problems of a total city.

Because of OEO's program of harassment, a potentially great community action agency must now operate without the leadership of those who gave it origin, strength and support. Now GCM is another bureaucratically run government agency with the veneer of a community Steering Committee whose authority, effectiveness and importance are emasculated through OEO rules and regulations—rules that are more often than not poorly defined and even more inexactly implemented.

It would be wrong to say that Chester has not benefited from OEO funding nor that GCM did not make progress with the help of OEO, but had OEO given the GCM Steering Committee any opportunity to exercise its own effectiveness, community progress in Chester would be well ahead of where it is now and more importantly, aspects of Chester's problems, especially the economic one, would have been advanced to a point where it could have complemented the Community Action and Training Programs of OEO so as to give them lasting, instead of temporary, significance.

The attitude of OEO officials toward the GCM Steering Committee members appointed by the Mayor has been little short of character assassination. We as founders of the movement, were ready and willing to withstand opposition, criticism, and slander within our own community, but also to become the continual target of OEO leaves us with no choice but to remove ourselves from the Steering Committee in order to permit an orderly continuity of the important community action.

Therefore, the Mayor and his appointees move that the Greater Chester Movement divorce itself from the Poverty Program, permitting its present Steering Committee less the Mayor and his appointees to organize as the official poverty council for Chester and Delaware County, and that the Greater Chester Movement in order to achieve goals over and above human renewal for the city concentrate on the economic growth and development of the city to complement the human renewal benefits of the poverty program.

The group sincerely regrets that one of the outstanding and successful efforts to develop an ongoing relationship between the Mayor, the community leaders and the poor has been hampered and made ineffectual through the policies of the Federal Government which are directly in opposition to the needs of the community which it set out to help.

Mayor James H. Gorbey, city of Chester; Dr. Clarence R. Moll, president of Pennsylvania Military College; Dr. Robert Stanley, Chairman, GCM; Leroy H. H. Wright, President, Delaware County National Bank; William J. Coopersmith, businessman; H. A. MacNeilly, administrative assistant, city of Chester.

(NOTE.—Andrew J. Schroder, Vice President Scott Paper Co., concurred in the action taken but did not see the letter.)

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I direct the attention of my colleagues in the House to the fact that we are commemorating today Polish Constitution Day, which, prior to the Communist takeover of Poland, was their national holiday. The principles of the constitution of May 3, 1791, have lived in the hearts of the Polish people throughout their history of oppression and foreign domination and they are alive today. Our participation in the observance again this year dramatizes the support and interest of the U.S. Congress in the Polish nation and the other peoples who are oppressed captives of communism.

We must continue to support the Polish people's hopes for restoration of their freedom until the day when their rightful aspirations are realized. It is especially tragic that the people of Poland and the other Eastern European nations were delivered into Communist hands by the wartime agreement between President Roosevelt and Soviet Dictator Stalin. It is our obligation to rectify that tragic error.

Although the Polish people have been suffering under Soviet-imposed rule for 22 years now, they are still vigorous in their personal opposition to the Communist system and have shown the courage which will enable them to overcome their Communist oppressors someday.

As they did during the many years of the partition of Poland, the Poles continue to retain their national heritage and distinctive traditions under the cruel Communist tyranny which plagues them. I know that their fortitude is strengthened by the knowledge that they are supported by the thousands of Poles and other exiles among the captive people of Eastern Europe who are thriving in the free world and working for the common goal of restoration of freedom for their homelands.

As we in the Congress pay tribute today to the brave Polish people on their national holiday, we reaffirm our determination to help them achieve the legitimate independence which they have been denied for so long. We who enjoy life in a free country must rededicate ourselves to the philosophy of self-determination of people in order that justice will someday triumph over Communist tyranny and the principles embodied in the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, will once again serve the people of Poland.

In accordance with our desire to dramatize the centuries of progress of the Polish people in their achievements which cannot be suppressed by the present oppressive regime, I am introducing a bill for the issuance of a special commemorative stamp honoring Madame Marie Sklodowska-Curie. I have introduced this bill today and urge other Members to join me in a concentrated effort to obtain the approval of Postmaster O'Brien and his Advisory Committee.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP WEEK

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the citizens of this great Nation enjoy a heritage unique in the annals of history. We are endowed with a land abundant in natural riches and the freedom to reap its vast harvest. Unfortunately, it is all too easy to live for today and become indifferent to the responsibilities associated with this legacy and our obligations to pass it on to our children and our children's children.

We cannot afford to squander our natural resources and soil. We need to push ahead with planning and conservation efforts. The hard facts of a sharply rising population, economic growth, and widespread indifference toward resource management suggests an unacceptable trend. In this era when we blight the soil with refuse, our streams with sewage, and the air with noxious gases, the call to enter a stewardship of careful husbanding of our basic soil and its resources is a refreshing voice to be heard.

I commend the efforts of the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts and all others who are similarly laboring to preserve this most vital part of our national heritage. The National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts is a private association of more than 3,000 districts encompassing 49 States. The association has set aside the period of April 30 through May 7 to express gratitude for the gifts of our soil and the bountiful resources associated with it.

The stewardship proposed primarily rests with private citizens who own and manage the bulk or three-fourths of America's land. But we all share this high responsibility.

I am especially pleased to note that the Honorable George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, has also proclaimed April 30 through May 7, 1967, as Soil Stewardship Week in my beloved Michigan. With your permission to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I commend to the careful reading of all our citizens the Proclamation of Governor Romney issued April 26, 1967.

SOIL STEWARDSHIP PROCLAMATION

The wise use and management of our soil and water resources are imperative today. In Michigan we are blessed with some of the Nation's most productive soils. Our lakes and streams have insured the residents of our State an abundant water supply. However, in a world facing a food shortage, qual-

ity, as well as quantity, of our resource base is important.

Each of us have a responsibility to use our natural resources so they will serve mankind to the fullest extent. Waste, pollution and mismanagement cannot be tolerated as long as our Nation and world so urgently need the bounty of Michigan's farm and forest lands.

Through soil and water conservation, each of us can contribute to the welfare of our community, State and Nation. Michigan's ability to assume leadership is often reflected by the development and management of its most basic resources.

Therefore, I, George Romney, Governor of the State of Michigan, do hereby proclaim the period from April 30 to May 7, 1967 as Soil Stewardship Week in Michigan, and request all persons and organizations to unite with Michigan's 82 Soil Conservation Districts in an effort during this week to stimulate among our citizens a full realization of stewardship responsibilities for the conservation of soil and water resources.

EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER THE RAILWAY LABOR ACT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr Speaker, on Monday the House passed House Joint Resolution 543, providing for the future extension of time under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act. This resolution, in effect, intervenes in the current dispute between the railroad industry and certain employees.

Last month the President asked the Congress to support a resolution to prohibit for 20 days a nationwide rail strike by six shopcraft unions. The President at that time requested emergency legislation to forestall "the threat of a crippling and paralyzing nationwide railroad strike," making the appeal after the unions and carriers failed to reach agreement. It was intimated that the additional 20 days—added to the 60-day "cooling-off" period—would allow time to bring forth a settlement.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dispute between the railroads and their employees—and it should be settled by them without persistent Government interference.

The Railway Labor Act contains certain machinery for assistance in solving these problems. The President and the administration have been allowed certain prerogatives in dealing with critical situations. But Government interference should clearly end at the bounds of the law. Indeed, that is why we pass legislation and outline the rules.

I question the belief that the National Legislature should be called into action every time that a dispute is not settled. It should be a matter for the parties involved to decide.

I am sorry to see that the President asked the Congress to intervene again. I did not support this resolution, and I hope that the Congress will not go along with the President in upsetting the bargaining process indefinitely. Such action must only be taken in the most dire circumstances involving national security and emergency.

FARM INCOME

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ZWACH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, for the past 2 weeks I have been examining the returns on a questionnaire on some of the many large issues facing the Congress.

As of today, nearly 18,000 returns have been received—over one-half of which have additional comments. While I have not as yet read every comment, I would like to report that the most emphatic overwhelming comment relates to farm income.

Thousands of citizens—be they farmers, employers, truckdrivers, mail carriers, or urban families—plead endlessly, "Please do something about farm prices before it is too late."

Mr. Speaker, low milk prices, low fed cattle prices, impending disaster from a large spring pig crop, and faulty estimates on the number of cattle and on the corn supplies by the Department of Agriculture have produced a near hopelessness and frustration "down on the farm."

Hundreds of bills have been introduced to immediately curb the flood of dairy imports; dozens have been introduced and await a hearing on the meat import law. Still there has been no action. Yet each day of delay on the part of the administration and the Congress causes a deeper mortgage on farm real estate and chattels.

In light of this situation, Mr. Speaker, and in light of the widespread feeling of economic and political frustration, the three major farm organizations in Meeker County have jointly sponsored a petition seeking immediate help. These three organizations got over 1,100 farmers to sign this petition in the one county in Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, this petition is the result of a joint leadership conference of April 6, 1967, to discuss a common solution to the immediate problems of beef and dairy imports. They seek our assistance in alleviating the price problems that are magnified by the near record imports of these two categories. The leadership of these organizations are to be commended for their united efforts.

It is duly reported that in the calendar year of 1966, we imported almost $300 million of beef and veal, while we exported only $13,517,000. On cheese alone, State importers brought in over $60 million worth of products, while exporting only 5 percent of that amount.

MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. SCHERLE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, in the March 14, 1967, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I spoke out against the rising tide of meat imports into the United States. Since that time, many of my colleagues have done the same. At that time, I called attention to several defects in the Meat Import Act of 1964, including the following: First, the extremely liberal quota; second, the 10-percent overrun factor for triggering imposition of the quota; third, inaccurate estimating by the Secretary of Agriculture, and; fourth, the omission from the quota of certain prepared and processed meat.

Today, Congressman ROBERT DENNEY and I have introduced legislation designed to eliminate the defects in the existing statute. Our proposal, which would repeal the Meat Import Act of 1964, is patterned after that introduced in the other body by Mr. HRUSKA of Nebraska (S. 1588), but with some significant modifications.

This bill, like the Hruska proposal, would eliminate the extra 10 percent of imports now permitted before the quotas become effective. Similarly, the quota would be imposed based upon actual imports rather than estimates by the Secretary of Agriculture, and it would be applied quarterly rather than annually. Finally, offshore purchases of meat by the Defense Department for use of our troops abroad or otherwise would be charged off against the applicable quota.

When the 1964 act was passed, the base quota was derived from the average annual imports for the years 1959–63. However, 1963 was the highest year on record and resulted in a base quota of 725 million pounds. The legislation here proposed would use the years 1958–62 as the base years, with the resulting base quota being 585.5 million pounds.

The differences between my proposal and Mr. HRUSKA's emerge at this point. While the base quotas and the base years are the same, the measure which we have introduced would include prepared and preserved beef, veal, and mutton within the quota, without increasing the base quota. The remaining difference relates to the provision in both bills, authorizing the President to impose quotas on pork and lamb. While the Hruska bill authorizes the imposition of quotas on pork and lamb to "prevent unwarranted imports," my bill would authorize quotas when imports of these items are tending to interfere with the purposes of the Meat Import Act.

I urge my colleagues to consider this bill and the others which have been or may be introduced. But most of all, I urge you to consider the problems which led to their introduction. The agricultural segment of our economy is being ignored and while farm prices are at 72 percent of parity, costs soar higher and higher. Among the hardest hit are the meat producers. They need an import law that will in fact restrict imports. The existing one does not do the job.

MEMPHIS BOARD OF EDUCATION WINS RECOGNITION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Kuykendall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I am able to announce the honor paid to the board of education of the city I have the privilege to represent, Memphis, Tenn. The Memphis Board of Education has been recognized by the National Education Association for outstanding leadership in the field of education for cities over 100,000 population. The fine school system of Memphis is a tribute to the untiring and unselfish service of these civic leaders.

Members of the Memphis Board of Education are: Hugh H. Bosworth, president; Edgar H. Bailey, vice president; and commissioners, Mrs. Lawrence Coe, Mrs. Arthur N. Seessel, and John T. Shea.

INCREASE TAX EXEMPTION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McDonald] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation which would increase the personal exemption for Federal income taxes from $600 to $800 beginning in 1968, and to $1,000 by 1970. My reason for introducing this legislation is that the present $600 exemption is grossly inadequate to meet the needs of the average person attempting to provide for himself and his family. The basic reason for this is that, since the enactment of the present $600 exemption in 1948, prices have continued to rise at such a pace that today it takes $822 to purchase what one could buy for $600 20 years ago. For a family of four this means they now need $3,288 to buy the same goods that cost them $2,400 in 1948.

An independent study conducted by the AFL–CIO Department of Research in October 1966 reveals the essential income for a family of four in the 20 major cities of the United States. In June 1966, that requisite income was $6,797. In the city of Detroit, the figures reveal the necessary income to maintain a family of four in a "modest but adequate" family life as $6,629. These figures, published by the AFL–CIO include an allowance for increased Federal income and social security taxes. Obviously, then, an increase in the personal exemption allowed would reduce the amount of required gross earnings per family.

It is estimated that an increase of $200 per year in the allowed personal exemption will cost the U.S. Treasury receipts of $6 billion per year. A review of gross Federal receipts during the past 5 years reveals an average annual increase in receipts of more than $7 billion. Hence, the diversion of $6 billion into the hands of the taxpayers to care for their own needs could easily be absorbed by the yearly increase in Federal receipts. It is further estimated that the contemplated increase in the personal exemption to $1,000 after 2 years would result in an additional loss of $5.4 billion in Federal receipts. This sum could be absorbed in the same manner.

The effect of diverting these Federal receipts into the hands of the consumer would definitely not result in a loss to the Federal Treasury of the total amount diverted. An increase of $6 billion in purchasing power will undoubtedly have the effect of increasing the growth of our economy. This happened with the decrease in tax rates in 1964 and would inevitably occur again.

Our economy has been sluggish for some time. And certainly an added boost to the consumer would help to stimulate the economy. But, that aside, I believe it is time for the tax structure to keep pace with the cost-of-living index and urge that colleagues give favorable consideration to this bill.

The text of the bill follows:

A bill, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, for 1968 and 1969, the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from $600 to $800, and to provide that for taxable years beginning after 1969 such exemptions shall be $1,000

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) the following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "$600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$800";

(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);

(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

(b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "$1,200" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,600":

(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

Sec. 2. (a) The following provisions of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 are amended by striking out "$800" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,000":

(1) Section 151 (relating to allowance of deductions for personal exemptions);

(2) Section 642(b) (relating to allowance of deductions for estates);

(3) Section 6012(a) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(4) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

(b) The following provisions of such Code are amended by striking out "$1,600" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$2,000":

(1) Section 6012(a)(1) (relating to persons required to make returns of income); and

(2) Section 6013(b)(3)(A) (relating to assessment and collection in the case of certain returns of husband and wife).

Sec. 3. (a) Section 3(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to optional tax if adjusted gross income is less than $5,000, in the case of taxable years beginning after December 31, 1964) is amended—

(1) by striking out "After December 31, 1964" in the heading and inserting in lieu thereof "In 1965, 1966, and 1967";

(2) by inserting "and before January 1, 1968," after "beginning after December 31, 1964,"; and

(3) by striking out "After December 31, 1964" each place it appears in the tables and inserting lieu thereof "In 1965, 1966, and 1967".

(b) Section 3 of such Code is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(c) Taxable Years Beginning After December 31, 1967.—In lieu of the tax imposed by section 1, there is hereby imposed for each taxable year beginning after December 31, 1967, on the taxable income of every individual whose adjusted gross income for such year is less than $5,000 and who has elected for such year to pay the tax imposed by this section, a tax determined under tables which shall be prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate. The tables prescribed under this subsection shall correspond in form to the tables in subsection (b) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various adjusted gross income brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined under section 1 for the taxable year if the taxable income were computed by taking the standard deduction."

(c) Section 4(a) of such Code (relating to number of exemptions) is amended by striking out "the tables in section 3" and inserting in lieu thereof "the tables in section 3(a) and 3(b) and the tables prescribed under section 3(c)".

(d) Paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 4(c) of such Code (relating to husband or wife filing separate return) are amended to read as follows:

"(2) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection, in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return, the tax imposed by section 3 shall be—

"(A) for taxable years beginning in 1964, the lesser of the tax shown in Table IV or Table V of section 3(a),

"(B) for taxable years beginning in 1965, 1966, or 1967, the lesser of the tax shown in Table IV or Table V of section 3(b), and

"(C) for taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967, the lesser of the taxes shown in the corresponding tables prescribed under section 3(c).

"(3) Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) shall not apply in the case of a husband or wife filing a separate return if the tax of the other spouse is determined with regard to the 10-percent standard deduction; except that an individual described in section 141(d)(2) may elect (under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate) to pay the tax shown in Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) in lieu of the tax shown in Table IV of section 3(a), Table IV of section 3(b), or the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c), as the case may be. For purposes of this title, an election made under the preceding sentence shall be treated as an election made under section 141(d)(2)."

(e) Section 4(f)(4) of such Code (cross references) is amended by striking out "and Table V in section 3(b)" and inserting in lieu thereof ", Table V in section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c)".

(f) The last sentence of section 6014(a) of such Code (relating to election by taxpayer) is amended to read as follows: "In the case of a married individual filing a separate return and electing the benefits of this subsection, Table V of section 3(a), Table V of section 3(b), and the corresponding table prescribed under section 3(c) shall not apply."

SEC. 4. (a)(1) Section 3402(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage method of withholding income tax at source) is amended by striking out the table and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Percentage method withholding table

Payroll period	*Amount of one withholding exemption*
Weekly	$17.30
Biweekly	34.60
Semimonthly	37.50
Monthly	75.00
Quarterly	225.00
Semiannual	450.00
Annual	900.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	2.50".

(2) Such section 3402(b)(1) is further amended by striking out the table inserted by paragraph (1) of this subsection and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Percentage method withholding table

Payroll period	*Amount of one withholding exemption*
Weekly	$21.20
Biweekly	42.30
Semimonthly	45.80
Monthly	91.70
Quarterly	275.00
Semiannual	550.00
Annual	1,100.00
Daily or miscellaneous (per day of such period)	3.00".

(b)(1) Section 3402(m)(1) of such Code (relating to withholding allowances based on itemized deductions) is amended by striking out "$700" and inserting in lieu thereof "$900".

(2) Such section 3402(m)(1) is further amended by striking out "$900" (as inserted by paragraph (1) of this subsection) and inserting in lieu thereof "$1,100".

(c) So much of paragraph (1) of section 3402(c) of such Code (relating to wage bracket withholding) as precedes the first table in such paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"(1)(A) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee after December 31, 1967, a tax determined in accordance with tables prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a). The tables prescribed under this subparagraph shall correspond in form to the wage bracket withholding tables in subparagraph (B) and shall provide for amounts of tax in the various wage brackets approximately equal to the amounts which would be determined if the deductions were made under subsection (a).

"(B) At the election of the employer with respect to any employee, the employer shall deduct and withhold upon the wages paid to such employee before January 1, 1968, a tax determined in accordance with the following tables, which shall be in lieu of the tax required to be deducted and withheld under subsection (a):".

SEC. 5. (a) The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967, and before January 1, 1970.

(b) The amendments made by section 2 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1969.

(c) The amendments made by section 3 shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1967.

(d) The amendments made by subsections (a)(1) and (b)(1) of section 4 shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 1967, and before January 1, 1970. The amendments made by subsections (a)(2) and (b)(2) of section 4 shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 1969. The amendment made by subsection (c) of section 4 shall apply to remuneration paid after December 31, 1967.

PARITY DROP AND THE AMERICAN FARMER

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the stage has again been set to make the American farmer the scapegoat of future rises in food prices.

We on the House Republican task force on agriculture have noted the latest Department of Agriculture report that showed the farm parity ratio had dropped another 2 points between March 15 and April 15, to a depression-year low of only 72. Little attention is being paid to this drop in parity and the resulting drop in food prices. We also note that the latest reported cost of living figures reveal a consumer price index rise of two-tenths of 1 percent from February to March. The cost of living rose even though the cost of food actually dropped due to a coincident decline in the index of prices received by farmers and a rise in the index of prices paid for commodities and services by our farmers. With living costs rising at a time when food prices are declining, we can only imagine the flood of complaints later on when and if farm prices reverse themeslves and rise to the already-low levels of a year ago.

It is strange that such a significant drop in parity can take place without any discernible concern being expressed by the Secretary of Agriculture or anyone else in the administration. It should have elicited a prompt call for immediate and coordinated action for dairy and other commodity import controls, beef import legislation, and emergency action by every appropriate agency of Government to muster every available force to protect the farmers' income. But no such concern or request for action has been forthcoming, making earlier warnings by our task force even more pertinent and prophetic.

We warned that American agriculture could expect little help in the fight to share equitably in the Nation's economy, and this latest drop in parity confirms our fears. As the task force pointed out, while estimated annual personal income from nonagricultural sources rose 8 percent from the March 1966 rate to the March 1967 rate, estimated annual personal income from farming dropped 16 percent.

The tragedy of the situation is the strange silence when farm income keeps dropping, forcing more and more of our rural people into the overcrowded cities. But the cries of anguish will again be heard in the land if and when the farmer even recaptures the level of income he had as recently as a year ago, which even then was unconscionably far below the rest of the Nation. His income could rise a great deal and still be tragically low, far below parity. But the temptation will be to blame the farmer, a maneuver far easier to perform than to identify the real beneficiaries of the consumers' grocery dollars.

This is why we on the Republican task force on agriculture are renewing our determination to see that there is a more appropriate consideration for American agriculture when the prices of food are tallied.

MINERAL LEASING ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. KLEPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced an amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act which would permit railroads to lease lands containing coal deposits.

Similar legislation has been approved by the Senate three times in recent years but the House has never acted on it.

Whatever justification there may have been for this prohibition against coal leases by railroads disappeared with the change to diesel-powered locomotives. In its present form, the law serves only as a hindrance to the economic development of the vast coal resources of North Dakota and other Western States.

Land grant railroads such as the Northern Pacific were given alternate sections of land along their rights-of-way at the time they were built. This resulted in an artificial checkerboard pattern of coal and mineral ownership. It is not economically feasible for the railroads to mine these coal deposits unless they are permitted to lease intervening tracts of land or to enter into joint ventures with other owners.

A survey sponsored by the Federal Power Commission predicts the Nation's use of electricity will treble by 1980. It estimates that coal consumption by electric utilities will increase from a little more than 200 million tons a year now to 500 million tons in 1980. If the REA cooperatives and the private power companies of the West are to meet tomorrow's greatly increased demands, present coal production must be increased enormously.

The coal deposits are there. One way to help get this vast reservoir of fuel out of the ground would be to remove the restrictions which now prevent the railroads from developing their coal lands.

CONGRESSMAN JOHN M. ASHBROOK ANNOUNCES RESULTS OF 1967 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF OHIO'S 17TH DISTRICT

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, for the seventh time in as many years, it has been my honor to conduct a public opinion poll of the 17th District of Ohio, the eight-county area which I represent. The results to the poll are truly gratifying, and the questionnaire seems to become more popular each year. Well over 20,000 persons participated in the poll, including persons from various States in the Union who were sent polls by friends from the 17th District, and high school students in nearly every school in the area.

The sampling of opinion again was taken from all of the 628 voting precincts in the district and the poll was distributed to persons of all political leanings. In addition to the printed questionnaires which I sent out, various newspapers published copies of the poll and many persons cut these out, answered them and sent them in.

While by some standards this attempt at opinion sampling was not scientific, every effort was made to reach as many people as possible, on a variety of issues, through questions which allowed a full spectrum of answers.

It was particularly gratifying to note the number of persons who not only took the time to fill in the questionnaire, but also took time to add a note or letter elaborating on one or more particular points.

The primary areas of concern, as expressed in the letters, were the war in Vietnam and the military draft. Near the top of the list, and running the war and resulting problems with the draft a close second, was the ever-growing concern with the increasing size and control of the Federal Government.

A poll of this magnitude takes time and effort, but it is well worth it for me to keep up to date with the thoughts of the people I represent. The poll does this in a way that is invaluable in determining the opinions of the people—opinions which I do not have time enough to find out individually.

The tabulated results of the poll are included but I would like to point out several areas where the voters overwhelmingly took one side of an issue or another.

Starting with the issue which headed the list of concern, Vietnam, the greatest response indicated that we should go all out to win. Nearly 90 percent of the responses indicated that they thought the war on poverty had been a failure and 85 percent were against the President's proposed surtax.

The war on poverty and foreign aid were the two areas where the people said expenditures should be cut back.

In the vital area of East-West trade and President Johnson's plans for "building bridges" to Communist nations to increase trade, the people of the 17th District were more than two to one against such proposals.

In the results below, the various percentages do not always add up to 100 percent. This is because some people did not answer some of the questions or, on the multiple choice questions they answered two choices, indicating that there were two areas which they thought applied.

7th annual public opinion poll of the 17th District

	Percent	
	Yes	No
1. Do you believe the $2,000,000,000 war on poverty has been successful?	7	89
2. With a $15 to $20,000,000,000 deficit imminent in the next fiscal year, President Johnson has proposed a 6-percent additional surtax and some expanded Great Society programs. Do you favor the tax increase?	10	85
3. If you do not favor the tax increase, would you reduce the expenditure of the following programs?		
(a) War in Vietnam	24	
(b) War on poverty	64	
(c) Foreign aid	80	
(d) Federal aid to education	22	
4. Do you think the fiscal predicament of the Federal Government is urgent enough to merit across-the-board cuts of 5 or 10 percent in all programs?	60	28
5. Do you believe that public employees such as teachers, firemen, and policemen should have the right to strike?	33	62
6. The President has suggested a 20-percent increase in social security payments with added payroll taxes to help finance these increases. Do you favor this proposal?	22	58
7. Which proposal more nearly expresses your opinion regarding financing social security benefits? (Check only 1.)		
(a) When cost-of-living increases are granted, payroll taxes should be increased to cover the cost of the additional benefits paid out of the social security fund	37	
(b) Some of the cost of increased benefits should come out of general tax revenues	53	
8. President Johnson has proposed a new program to increase trade with Communist bloc countries. Do you favor a relaxation of present trade restrictions with Communist countries?	30	63
9. The war in Vietnam has caused many questions to be raised about the military draft.		
(a) Do you believe the present draft system should be changed?	44	
(b) Are you in favor of a lottery system of selecting draftees?	13	
(c) Do you favor universal military training where all young men would serve a predetermined length of time in the military?	51	
(d) If universal military training is adopted, should women also be included?	17	
(e) When a young man is drafted, should he be free to choose a civilian service, such as the Peace Corps, in place of military service such as the Army or Navy?	28	
(f) Would you favor eliminating the draft entirely and raising the pay and benefits of military men, in the hope that enough men would choose this career to fill the ranks?	23	
10. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson indicated he wanted to continue our efforts in Vietnam at the present level. What do you think? (Check only 1.)		
(a) Expand the war into North Vietnam and go all out to win	43	
(b) Continue current policies of support without expanding or reducing our efforts appreciably	6	
(c) Work toward a negotiated settlement through a conference of concerned nations or the U.N. and agree to abide by their decision and withdraw U.S. troops when a settlement has been reached	31	
(d) Withdraw U.S. troops and let the Vietnamese solve their own problems	13	
11. Do you approve of the concept of tax sharing—that is, a set percentage of Federal tax receipts would be returned without strings to State governments for education and other services?	67	15
12. Do you believe that schoolchildren should be "bused"—that is, transported from one school to another to maintain a racial balance?	5	89
13. There is great debate about food prices. Which one of these factors do you think is most responsible for these high prices? (Check only 1.)		
(a) Middleman profit	23	
(b) Government spending and taxing policies	35	
(c) Union wage demands	26	
(d) Business profits	7	
(e) Prices paid to farmers	½	

ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL ACT OF 1967

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am joining a number of colleagues in introducing today the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967.

This legislation has already been sponsored in the other body by my distinguished colleague, the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and by Senator Moss of Utah, in addition to some 34 other Senators.

This bill would launch a concerted attack against the Nation's fourth most serious health problem. Alcoholism affects about 5 to 6 million Americans, and ranks in number behind only heart disease, mental illness, and cancer.

Our measure would attempt to deal with this problem on four fronts:

First, it would establish a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control within the Office of the Surgeon General to coordinate and direct Federal alcoholism programs.

Second, it provides grants for demonstration projects for detoxification centers, court-supervised projects for alcoholics, programs in correctional institutions and aftercare for alcoholics, as recently recommended by the President's Crime Commission. For fiscal year 1968, some $20 million is authorized for this purpose.

Third, it provides for a special study project on personnel practices and current and projected needs in the field of alcoholism. The bill authorizes $500,000 for fiscal year 1968 for the study.

Fourth, it establishes a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism Care and Control.

Mr. Speaker, this measure implements the areas of concern and the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission on this matter as well as those of the National Conference on Alcoholism sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1963. The provisions I have outlined will also help the States to meet their new responsibilities under recent court decisions which have held that chronic alcoholics must be treated not as criminals, but as patients with medical and social problems.

This is the approach that the Congress endorsed in 1966 with the passage of the Narcotics Addict Rehabilitation Act and, in my judgment, we have already let the costs of alcoholism mount far too high without taking similar action. Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that we will act on this legislation during the present session of the Congress.

EXPO 67

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, as Members are aware, Expo 67 opened in Montreal on April 28. By all accounts, it is an exciting and creative fair.

Further, Ambassador Stanley R. Tupper, a former distinguished Member of this House, is the U.S. Commissioner General at Expo. We are fortunate that a public servant of his caliber is representing our Nation at this important international event.

The New York Times commented on the opening of Expo in an editorial on April 28. I think that Members will find this piece of interest, and under unanimous consent, I am including it in the Record.

Expo 67

> Canada and the United States both have hits in Expo 67, which opens in Montreal today. The fair bids to be one of the great international shows of the century, and the United States Pavilion is a standout—a joyous distillation of the best American art, science and culture, no less profound for its easy wit and beauty.
>
> A world's fair, of course, should be all fun, or at least painless instruction. But there are serious lessons to be learned in Montreal. These lessons are pertinent because several cities are already vying for the international exhibition to mark the United States bicentennial in 1976. After New York's sad fair of two years ago, Expo 67 is sheer delight.
>
> The facts of fairs, as demonstrated in Montreal, are going to be hard for American cities to grasp, since most of them consider it gospel, as New York did, that all money invested must be returned at a conventional percentage, and the national culture is best symbolized by massive doses of chrome-plated commercialism.
>
> Expo expects no profits. It is a frankly deficit operation. The money is 50 per cent federal, 37½ per cent provincial and 12½ per cent municipal. The bookkeeping is considered fully balanced in terms of visitors and business attracted, municipal improvements completed, and luster added to the Canadian reputation. Commercialism is rigidly controlled, under the bureau's explicit rules. The 63 national pavilions are there as "ambassadors," according to a fair official, "not as hucksters."
>
> Expo is a designed fair. Every element, starting with the basic site plan, has been controlled by the fair's chief architect and staff. Every pavilion was subject to review. Even with controls, the variety of form, shape and style is stupendous and exhilarating, and the whole is woven together with theme buildings, services and public spaces of a design quality that would permanently grace any city in the world.
>
> The demonstration is clear. Expo is in the tradition of great world fairs. Each country is making the most striking and extravagant statements possible of its architecture, arts and sciences. Fortunately, the United States has finally recognized, in its glittering Buckminster Fuller "skybreak bubble," that its best cultural exports are its dynamic young talent and its innovative masters. The combination steals the scene.
>
> There are more lessons in the shining new subway that combines art and function, on the ride back to Montreal, and in the city, where massive skyscraper blocks are being joined underground by efficient and elegant multilevel planning. There are more good new buildings in the heart of Montreal than in almost any equivalent acreage in Manhattan. New York can learn about other things than fairs from this Canadian jewel city.

URGENT NEED TO REGULATE EXCESSIVE MEAT IMPORTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Denney] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, today the gentleman from Iowa, Congressman Scherle, and I are cosponsoring and introducing legislation to tighten controls on the import of beef into the United States.

I am pleased to cosponsor this bill with Mr. Scherle for several reasons. First of all, this is one of the first cosponsorships of legislation pursuant to the amendment to the House rules which was accomplished last week. Second, his district adjoins mine. But most important of all, I believe this bill to be an effective and realistic solution.

Mr. Scherle, myself, and our staffs for several months have been working closely with Senator Hruska of the other body. For that reason, our bill is similar to S. 1588—Hruska bill—but it does have a significant difference as far as the quota is concerned.

Like S. 1588, the base period is changed to 1958–62, or 585.5 million pounds, so as to delete the effect the high imports of 1963 had on the quota established under the Meat Import Act of 1964.

Mr. Speaker, since the gentleman from Texas, Congressman Price, and those who joined with him the other day ably outlined the main features of the Hruska proposal, I will not take up my colleagues' time by reiterating them or the supporting figures showing the need for this legislation. However, I do feel that our bill, to be known as H.R. 9616, closes a big loophole. Our bill includes canned, preserved, and processed beef and veal under the quota.

Mr. Speaker, myself and a number of my colleagues have been forced to introduce legislation to plug just such a loophole in the area of dairy imports. With the ingenuity and flexibility possessed by importers, I feel it is imperative that in order to provide effective relief, they be prevented from circumventing the quota by importing beef in other forms.

In closing, let me say that I was pleased last Friday when the gentleman from Arkansas introduced similar legislation. Knowing the concern of him and a number of my colleagues, I am hopeful that hearings will be held on these bills within the next few weeks.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have spoken several times in recent days concerning the incredible lengths to which the administration has gone in attempts to misrepresent my proposed amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These attempts—including the extravagant remarks of President Johnson—have gone too far.

All of us in representing our points of view may occasionally err in the direction of overstating our case; but if there is one thing this House demands it is a straight set of facts. A straight set of facts, as Members in both parties increasingly recognize, is often the single most difficult thing to obtain from the present administration. Yesterday one of my valued colleagues erred in inserting into this Record—in all good faith—a table supplied to him by the U.S. Office of Education purporting to show "allotments" for selected major cities under the House committee bill, H.R. 7819, and my bill, H.R. 8983, for fiscal year 1968.

The only thing wrong with the chart is that the figures shown for my bill have no relationship to it in the form in which it will be submitted as an amendment. When I introduced H.R. 8983 for discussion purposes, I clearly stated that it would be offered as an amendment to the committee bill. It will amend title III of the committee bill, which extends authorizations of the present act through fiscal year 1969. Accordingly, it would have absolutely no effect on the other provisions of the committee bill which alter the title I formula by suspending the "Quie-Perkins amendment" of last year. Therefore, the figures attributed to my bill by the Office of Education chart have no application to the amendment I shall offer. Rather, they show estimated allotments in the present act as they would stand without the changes made by the committee bill.

The Office of Education easily could have ascertained all this by calling either me or our minority committee counsel. They did not. Instead, they assumed that my amendment would replace the entire committee bill, which it will not do, and let my respected colleague release figures which are inapplicable and misleading in the extreme.

To repeat: The figures shown in the chart inserted on page 11503 of the RECORD for May 2 have absolutely no relationship to the amendment I shall offer to the committee bill, H.R. 7819.

Under my amendment, which will not be effective until fiscal year 1969, it would not be possible to estimate allotments for individual cities, as these will be determined in accordance with priorities of need established by the State. Therefore, the chart is completely misleading.

I do not make this statement to embarrass my colleague, whom I respect, because all of us must rely upon these Federal agencies for data. When the assumptions of the agencies are wrong, or their data is wrong, we are wrong. However, in the interests of fairness, I do feel compelled to set the record straight.

I also want to add the note that the Office of Education included with a table they sent up on the cities mentioned:

> NOTE.—The estimated amounts for FY 1968 are based on estimated State amounts indicated on the attached table. Using State totals of children estimated to be counted, amounts per child were calculated for the respective States, estimates of children to be counted were made for counties, and these were multiplied by the State amounts per child. Ratio estimates based on previous allocations were applied to the county amounts to obtain the figures for the various cities. Details of this method differ slightly from methods employed previously to estimate amounts for cities; however the figures probably are no more accurate because the data used which included some from the *County and City Data Book, 1962,* may not reflect the criteria which will be used by the State offices when they make sub-county allocations. Amounts shown are those estimated to be available for *local* programs only—differences between amounts shown here and those on State tables represent the funds estimated to be available for programs which are State operated or State supported. Amounts shown for the Committee Report are slightly higher than could be expected because calculations have not been made by program. It is impossible to estimate the extent of this error.

REALISTIC MEAT IMPORT QUOTAS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to join the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE] and many of our colleagues in introducing a bill to establish realistic meat import quotas.

Passage of this bill will help ease the great economic strain that is being placed on farmers from competition with cheaply produced foreign meat products. This is occurring in many of our domestic industries, but I think we can agree that agriculture has been most severely affected and that it most needs our support.

This bill we are introducing, along with a bill relating to import quotas for dairy products which I introduced recently, will help the farmer get back on his feet. The past few years have seen prices paid to farmers decline even while the purchasing power of the dollar is also decreasing. The result has been that per capita farm income decreases drastically at the same time the rest of society enjoys a rising per capita income. Further, many farmers have been forced out of business. This is not a healthy situation for the farmer or the Nation.

The policy of reciprocal trade is certainly excellent and I do not believe we are advocating the elimination of it. We are, however, urging that the interests of U.S. farmers come before those of foreign producers. We are not advocating significant trade barriers. The bill provides for substantial and realistic meat imports as well as allowing the import quota to increase at the same percentage rate our domestic production increases.

The bill will, however, use the realistic 1958–62 period for determining the base quota. It will include Defense Department offshore purchases of meat as part of the quota. It will eliminate the requirement that imports must reach 110 percent of the quota before the quota may be imposed. And, it will eliminate the need for the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate in advance the expected beef imports which estimates have proven to be so unrealistic.

The farm parity ratio has now reached its lowest point in 33 years. The agriculture policies of the present administration are most responsible for this decline and the Congress must act to prevent any further ruin of this important segment of our economy. I hope the Ways and Means Committee will proceed rapidly to consideration of the problems of both meat and dairy imports and I hope we can see early passage of legislation to end these problems.

TROOP REDUCTION IN EUROPE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support the administration's announced reduction of 35,000 men in deployment of American military forces in Europe. As I understand, this means that both ground and air units will be involved, and they will be returned, with their dependents, to the United States.

I have been in favor of such a move for some time on account of considerations of costs, but especially because of the effect on the balance of payments. In my judgment, this decision is sound militarily and from the standpoint of foreign policy. It is to be hoped that this will be the initial step in an adjustment of our NATO commitments to accord with the changes in Europe and with the attitudes and efforts of the Europeans themselves with respect to that organization. After all, our troops in Europe are actually a token force to make evident U.S. determination to resist Communist aggression.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that administration officials have been able to negotiate this adjustment in our commitment. I am hopeful that they will continue to work in this area and explore the possibilities of further reductions in the future.

AUTOMOBILE LIABILITY INSURANCE—A JOB FOR CONGRESS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, each week that goes by, additional facts uncovered make the case for a congressional investigation of automobile liability insurance more persuasive.

In an article recently published in the Hartford, Conn., Times by Robert W. Lucas, of the Gannett News, are cited additional factors necessitating this congressional inquiry. Mr. Lucas quotes Joseph D. Thomas, California's chief assistant insurance commissioner, as saying:

> The problem of unfair cancellation or nonrenewal is probably the hottest problem in the state at this time.

I have heretofore pointed out problems as they affected Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Maryland.

This statement and Mr. Lucas' article shows that not only California, but almost every other State in the Union has similar difficulties in the field of automobile liability insurance.

I am convinced that no individual State can do the job that must be done.

It requires national effort and the Congress is the only appropriate investigative body that has the legal jurisdiction, the adequate funds, and the competent staffing to do the job. As Mr. Lucas says in his article:

> This is the only way the facts may be ascertained.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, 176 years ago today King Stanislaw II rose before the Polish Diet and led the deputies in swearing allegiance to a new Constitution. This document of May 3, 1791, was so significant that ever since it has been hailed as a landmark of liberalism in Europe. The Polish people, in adopting a new Constitution, sought to modernize their governmental institutions, giving the towns representation in the lawmaking bodies, clarifying and limiting the power of the monarchy, creating a system of ministerial responsibility, and establishing absolute religious toleration.

Poland, however, was not left alone to pursue her peaceful development. Russia and Prussia invaded Poland, divided much of her territory between them and reinstituted the harsh and oppressive measures of foreign domination. Yet the Poles kept alive their devotion to freedom and to democratic institutions and, whenever remotely possible, they attempted to break away from their oppressors. In 1831 they gained their freedom by armed insurrection for nearly 10 months; in 1846 the Poles again revolted against their captors and still again in 1848, and in 1861, and in 1863. After each revolt the Russians took more severe measures to enslave the Polish people; their Russification practices even included conscription in World War I, forcing Poles to fight Poles.

After World War I, the Polish nation finally gained its opportunity to become independent—after 125 years of captivity. The Republic of Poland was proclaimed on November 3, 1918, and a permanent Constitution was adopted in March 1921. But while the names of Poland's neighbors had changed, the motives of Germany and the U.S.S.R. had not. Poland was again overrun. Today, Poland is once more under the heel of Russia and while some liberalization trends are apparent, Poland is far from realizing the ideals set forth in the 1791 Constitution. Mr. Speaker, today I am happy to recognize the valiant struggle for independence made by the Polish people and add my voice to those of my colleagues in proclaiming our dedication to their fight for freedom.

ANALYSIS OF SCHWEIKER DRAFT REFORM ACT OF 1967

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, I introduced H.R. 5017, the Draft Reform Act of 1967. This is the first comprehensive draft reform legislation to be introduced in the 90th Congress.

With hearings on this subject starting today before the House Armed Services Committee, on which I have the honor to serve, I felt it would be helpful for our colleagues to have a section-by-section analysis of H.R. 5017.

I am, therefore, setting forth below a summary analysis of my bill, prepared with the assistance of Mr. Albert Stillson, analyst in national defense, for the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress:

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF PROVISIONS OF H.R. 5017

(A bill to provide for a more effective and equitable draft system by amending the Universal Military Training and Service Act, introduced in the House of Representatives, 90th Congress, first session, on February 7, 1967)

SECTION 1

Establishes the short title of the Act as the "Draft Reform Act of 1967."

SECTION 2

Amends various provisions of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (UMTSA) that relate to the age period of liability for induction.

A. Section 2(a) reduces from 18–26 to 18–22½ the age period during which the time for registration is fixed.

B. Sections 2(b)(2) and 2(b)(5) reduce the age period from 18–26 to 18–22½ with respect to establishing minimum standards for physical acceptability that are no higher than those applied to men inducted in January 1945, and with respect to registrants volunteering for induction.

C. Sections 2(b)(1) and 2(b)(4) reduce the age period from 18½–26 to 18–22½ with respect to persons liable for training and service, and with respect to the opportunity registrants are given to enlist in the regular army.

D. Sections 2(b)(3), 2(c)(1), and 2(c)(2) reduce the upper age limit from 26 to 22½ with respect to induction without consent, with respect to enlisting or accepting appointment in the Ready Reserve, and with respect to induction liability if obligations of service in the Ready Reserve are not met.

E. Section 2(d) substitutes 18–22½ for 18–26 in defining specifically the terminology applied to age groups that are referred to in UMTSA.

SECTION 3

Deals with priority for induction and selection for induction from a national manpower pool. Section 3 amends UMTSA in the following ways:

A. Section 5(a)(1) sets down provisions for the transmission of data from local boards to the Director of Selective Service. [This is part of the centralization of the Selective Service System that the bill would accomplish.]

B. Section 5(a)(2) provides that registrants shall be liable to induction for 4 years, unless a registrant has been exempted or deferred, in which case his liability will terminate whenever he has been liable for 4 years or has become 35 years of age. [This alters the present 19–26 age span of liability, or liability to age 35 if deferred or exempted before age 26.]

C. Section 5(a)(3) establishes 4 age-priority categories in a national manpower pool of registrants who are not exempt or deferred, from which pool 18½-year-olds will be called first. "The first priority category shall consist of (i) men between the ages of 18 years and 6 months and 19 years and 6 months [19½–20½, 20½–21½, and 21½–22½ in the second, third, and fourth categories, respectively] who have not been exempted or deferred from induction under the provisions of this Act, and (ii) men not presently so exempted or deferred who are less than 35 years of age and with respect to whom, if the aggregate of all periods they were so exempted or deferred were subtracted from their age, the difference would be less than 19 years and six months [19½ or more but less than 20½, 20½ or more but less than 21½, and 21½ or more but less than 22½ in the second, third, and fourth categories, respectively.]" [This section is designed to serve the objective of centralizing draft calls and avoiding regional variations in their size and nature. Present policy is to take the older men under 26 first. This section reverses present policy by providing that 18½-year-olds not exempt or deferred be called first. In addition, it "returns" an older man to the manpower pool if he was deferred or exempt during all or part of his years from 18½ to 22½ and ceases being deferred or exempt any time before he is 35. The older man "returns" to the age-priority category corresponding to his age at the time he first became deferred or exempt. Under present draft policy, men taking deferments incur liability up to age 35 but men over 26 are not called by a local board until it has taken all those under 26 and over 19.]

D. Section 5(a)(4) establishes procedures incumbent on the Director of Selective Service for placing in the first age-priority category the name of each registrant who, on the date the Act becomes law, is 19½–26 years of age and who has not received an exemption or deferment, or who "on such date was not exempted or deferred and was between the ages of 19 years and six months and 35 years and had received an exemption or deferment under this Act after attaining the age of 19 years and 6 months but not before attaining such age.

"While he is not exempted or deferred under this Act and before he attains the age of 35 years, insofar as possible, each person shall, after remaining in the first priority category for one year, be placed in each succeeding higher priority category established under paragraph (3) for a period of one year."

E. Section 5(a)(5) provides that each registrant who, on the date the Act becomes effective, was exempted or deferred, was between 19½ and 35, and had not been exempted or deferred between 18½ and 19½, shall, upon the termination of his exemption or deferment, be placed in the first age-priority, "remain in such category for one year and in each succeeding higher category established under paragraph (3) for a period of one year; except that such person shall not be in any such category during any period while he is exempted or deferred from selection for induction or after he attains the age of 35 years." [Sections 5(a)(4) and 5(a)(5) prevent this legislation from giving any windfall draft benefit to draftable men who are over 19½ at the time the act becomes effective. Many of these men will be too young to have been reached by the draft under the present system. Yet without these special provisions assigning them to the 18½-year-old, first-priority category, the new law would pass them by with its emphasis on drafting men at 18½. These sections prevent men who waited until 19½ to take a deferment under present law from "counting" that year of draft eligibility (between 18½ and 19½) as a basis for their "returning" to the 19½-year-old pool under this legislation. If allowed to count that year, they would escape the top-priority (18½-year-old) draft pool under the new system while having been too young to be reached under the present system.]

F. Section 5(b) provides that the Director of Selective Service shall select inductees at random in the order of the age-priority categories in which their names are entered. Before random selections are made from within a category, every man available for induction from a lower numbered priority category must have been drafted. [Random selection of draftees would be a major change in the Universal Military Training and Service Act.]

SECTION 4

Establishes uniform national standards for occupational and educational deferments.

A. Section 4(a) amends UMTSA so that section 6(2) provides that the President shall set forth specific rules and regulations governing the bases of deferment from induction. Rules and regulations pertaining to occupational deferments "may incorporate any listing of critical skills and industries prepared by any department or agency of the Federal Government." Rules and regulations pertaining to educational deferments "shall set forth standards of performance in . . . [college level] courses of instruction, scores on tests conducted under the supervision of the Director, and other necessary criteria which must be complied with in order to qualify for such a deferment." Every registrant shall conform to these rules and regulations "in every respect" before a local board can grant him a deferment. [Present system is changed in that local boards would be required to apply national standards.]

B. Section 4(b) amends UMTSA so that a registrant deferred to pursue a full-time college-level course of instruction may not be deferred subsequently "on account of a marriage contracted or a child conceived after the date of enactment of the Draft Reform Act of 1967." [Under present system an educational deferment can be followed by a deferment based on marriage or fatherhood.]

C. Section 4(c) repeals an express provision of Section 6(h), UMTSA, that local draft boards and appeal boards cannot be bound by any Federal guideline in the granting of student and occupational deferments. The repealed language reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government."

SECTION 5

Makes certain procedural provisions. Section 5 amends UMTSA so that:

A. Section 6(n)(1) requires local boards to reopen the cases of men classified I–A whenever new information comes forth which, if proven, would entitle them to a deferment or exemption. The Director shall not induct such men while reconsideration is being made. [Local boards now reopen cases at their discretion, unless the State or National Director of Selective Service orders them to do so.]

B. Section 6(n)(2) provides that a registrant has at least 15 days in which to appeal an action taken with respect to him. [Lengthens by 5 days the minimum period during which a registrant can appeal.]

SECTION 6

Pertains to the extension of UMTSA by amending subsection (c) of section 17 of that act so as to extend induction authority to July 1, 1971.

SECTION 7

Sets effective dates for the Act by stating that "except for section 6 which shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act, this Act shall take effect on the ninetieth day after the date of its enactment."

THE STRATEGIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES RESERVE ACT OF 1967

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] may extend her remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, in the House of Representatives, legislation to establish a strategic agricultural commodities reserve for the United States.

The subject of national food reserves has been debated both in and out of Congress for a number of years. Recently, however, the entire question has taken on a new urgency in light of the growing world food and population problem.

Unlike other countries, the United States has been blessed with a highly efficient agriculture and an abundance of food. We have never been faced with widespread food shortages, and it is hard for most of us to imagine a combination of circumstances that could place us in a position to make strategic national food and fiber reserves necessary. Yet, when we examine the issue closely under the cold light of logic, we must conclude that food shortages in this country are not an impossibility—it can happen here.

American agriculture over the years has become increasingly mechanized. The time when U.S. farmers were virtually self-sufficient is long past. Modern farms are as dependent as many factories on the availability of fuel, spare parts, transportation, electricity, and manufactured goods. This mechanization and resultant dependency have made U.S. agriculture vulnerable as never before. Without question, the effect of a nuclear attack on our agricultural production would be disastrous, but aside from that, any situation which would restrict the availability of fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, spare parts, and other such items necessary for present-day farming operations could result in greatly diminished food production. Even a conventional conflict could have serious effects on our productive capabilities. Already, the current war in Vietnam is being felt in many ways both by agriculture and by other industries.

But this is only one facet of the need for a national reserve of strategic agricultural commodities. The possibility of widespread crop failure due to weather conditions has been forcefully thrust upon our awareness in recent months. While it now appears that prospects for the new wheat crop in the Great Plains are improving, the situation has given us pause to reflect and consider just how dependent we really are on good weather for our agricultural bounty.

In the past, we have tended to look upon agricultural surpluses in this country as an evil, rather than a blessing. This, perhaps, is one of the most important reasons why we have not been sufficiently concerned with the need for strategic national food and fiber reserves. In addition, the fact that Government storage bins have been bulging with excess has given us a false sense of security. But, this has changed, and with it our thinking must also change. Our past surpluses are gone, the world is crying for food, and our domestic carryover of wheat and feed grains is dropping to what could be dangerous levels.

One year of widespread crop failure, such as occurred in the middle thirties, could put us in an extremely tight supply situation unless we cut back on our commitments abroad. More than 1 year of inclement weather could cause worse problems. We are assured that we have sufficient crop acreage in reserve to supply our growing food needs in the future, but even if this is the case, reserve acreage will be of little immediate value in case of a general crop failure due to bad weather conditions.

The need for a national reserve of strategic agricultural commodities is well documented, and I have only superficially touched some of the major reasons for the establishment of such a stockpile. We are now maintaining reserves of many other strategic commodities—is food or fiber any less important?

Under the terms of my bill, farmers would receive the prevailing market price for commodities sold to the Commodity Credit Corporation for reserve stocks. It would be grossly unfair to ask that they receive less. I must frankly concede, also, that in considering the creation of national agricultural reserves, I have been concerned over how such a stockpile might be used—or misused—as an instrument of market price manipulation.

My bill would minimize the effects on the marketplace by placing safeguards on both the purchase and sale of the strategic agricultural commodity reserve inventories. Commodities in this reserve would be effectively insulated from the market, with a specific formula to be followed for sales, and another set formula to be used for purchases. In rotating reserve stocks which are in danger of going out of condition, sales may be made, but the bill requires immediate purchases to offset such sales. These provisions and safeguards will allow producers and the trade to know exactly how the reserve inventories will be handled, and under what conditions they can expect purchases and sales. Only in this way, I feel, can we be sure that farm prices will be sufficiently protected, and the normal channels of commodity trade will be least disrupted.

The bill which I am introducing today would authorize and direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserve inventories of wheat, feed grains, and cotton—our basic food and fiber crops.

Wheat reserves would be maintained at 300 million bushels—a level equal to approximately half our annual domestic consumption. Feed grain reserves of 25 million tons would be stockpiled—an amount equal to about one-seventh of our current total annual domestic consumption. Cotton stocks of 3 million bales would be held in reserve—enough to supply roughly one-third of our domestic needs. These amounts should provide an adequate and satisfactory reserve for potential emergency needs, taking into account our annual domestic consumption and the stocks which will ordinarily be carried by private trade.

Immediately upon enactment of the bill, at least one-half of the existing uncommitted Commodity Credit Corporation inventories of wheat and feed grains, and one-third of the existing uncommitted CCC inventory of cotton would be designated as reserves under the act.

The remainder of the reserves would be purchased on the open market at the prevailing market price by a formula outlined in the bill. The formula provides that the total annual amount of a commodity to be purchased shall be evenly divided into 52 parts, and one part is to be purchased each week of the year. This will even out the effects of such purchases on the marketplace.

The bill provides a maximum 5-year period in which to build the reserve inventories up to the desired levels, and authorizes the CCC to purchase the lesser of the following each marketing year:

First, the amount of the excess of anticipated domestic production and imports of wheat, feed grains, and cotton over anticipated domestic use and exports of such commodities; or

Second, the amount by which the stocks of wheat, feed grains, and cotton in the reserve inventories fall short of the reserve level requirements.

In any case, however, not less than 20 percent of the reserve level requirement of each commodity shall be purchased in any 1 year, unless the reserve inventory of the commodity is over 80 percent of the requirement.

This formula would insure the steady buildup of the strategic reserve inventories, and would have a stabilizing effect on the market. It would minimize the threat of market manipulation, and would bring supply and demand into better balance. The producer will benefit from strengthened prices, the private trade will benefit from a more stable market, and the consumer will benefit from the assurance of a reserve supply of food and fiber, available when needed.

Commodities may be withdrawn from the reserve inventories only in cases of genuine emergency, or when the domestic market price of a commodity reaches 110 percent of farm parity, at which time 10 percent of the commodity may be released for sale. When prices reached 120 percent of parity, another 20 percent could be sold; at 130 percent of parity, another 30 percent could be released; and if market prices reached 140 percent of parity, sales of the reserves would be left to the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. This formula would serve as a consumer protection and effectively insulate the reserve from the normal market as well.

The Commodity Credit Corporation would be required to make an annual report to Congress and the President of its administration of the reserve inventories, and a provision is included which would place the expenses of such reserves where they belong—in the category of national defense.

Briefly, these are the major provisions of the bill which I submit for the consideration of my colleagues today. The need for strategic agricultural commodity reserves is becoming increasingly apparent. The world food and population problems are steadily becoming more severe, and we are squarely in the middle of those problems whether we like it or not. As our carryovers of wheat and feed grains drop, the possibilities of emergencies, whether they be man made or acts of God, become more threatening. The time to plan for these future contingencies is now, while we still have the opportunity.

THE FORGOTTEN FARMER

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSEN] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from Aldwin Strassburg, of Magnolia, Minn., in the Second Congressional District, commenting on the sad plight of farmers today. It certainly sums up the feelings of many rural Americans at the present time, and I include it in the RECORD at this point in my remarks for the benefit of my colleagues. I might add that Mr. Strassburg's analysis first appeared in the Nobles County Review published in Adrian, Minn.

The letter follows:

THE FORGOTTEN FARMER

At the present time the American Farmer is the most unpopular, unwanted and unprotected individual in the world. Yet he is expected to struggle through a drastic era of rising prices on items he has to buy and with no price protection or support on the products he has to sell. When a farmer needs machinery parts, seed, feed, or fertilizer he is told what he has to pay, but when he has something to sell he is told what he will be paid for it. He has no negotiating power whatsoever. Yet, he is expected to sustain his existence and feed the world. He also has to gamble with all the hazards that are inflicted upon him. Crop losses through hail, frost, storms, floods or drought, and disease may ruin him in a single season. Yet he is expected to prosper and exist.

Labor, railroads, trucklines, manufacturers and practically every other business has protection in some form or another. The majority of them have unions that are protected by the government. A manufacturer has a set price on what he will receive for his product. The transportation line knows just what he will receive after delivery is made. The laborer knows the size of his check after a week's work, plus benefits. The farmer works without any of this protection.

We have the Department of Agriculture in Washington, D.C. which we pay taxes to support, but due to inadequate personnel, this department has done more to hinder the farmer than to help him. This office has not been without adequate jurisdiction for only the last five years. Its affairs have been mishandled for many more than that. I don't believe lawyers and politicians are capable of handling the business of the farmer. It would take someone more experienced and familiar with agriculture. At the present time, the welfare of the farmer and small business man is one of the greatest problems facing us.

If you needed an emergency operation, would you go to a lawyer to have the job done? I am sure you wouldn't. You would go to someone with the knowledge and experience to do the job. Yet a lawyer has no more knowledge and experience in agriculture than he would in performing minor surgery.

True, we have farmers organizations; four major ones in fact—each one with some good points and also some darn poor ones. In fact, we have too many of them. They spend all their time trying to ruin each other instead of working with and for the farmer. Each one is too conceited to join the other. Their good points could be put together to form one good strong union. So far, the only service any farm organization has given the farmer is to collect his dues.

In a recent Minnesota Agriculture publication, Orville Freeman stated that the average, per farmer income was up 16 percent over 1965 and averaged out to $4,900 per year per farmer. He didn't state how many less farmers we had in 1966 than in 1965. Many young farmers quit after 1965, to go into a more profitable business. Many more were forced to quit. If we had as many people on the farms to share the income from agriculture as we had in 1965, the amount received per farmer and the percentage gain would have both declined sharply.

In the latest issue of Post magazine, on page 28, it is stated that psychiatrists refuse to go into mental and sexual hospitals because they can't earn more than $18,000 to $22,000 a year and can make two or three times this much as private practitioners. The psychiatrist has no overhead, no equipment to buy and have depreciate in value, yet he isn't satisfied. This is a far cry from the $4,900 Freeman expects the farmer to be satisfied with. President Johnson talks big about war against poverty. If we had family sized farms and a program so a farmer could make a living on a family size farm we would be making a great stride forward on the war against poverty. Many of the farmers that are forced to quit become a direct government liability.

As we look back through history, we find that many years ago in Israel the farms were divided into large tracts of land which they called "Kubbutz" after a few years Israel saw that this didn't work and again put their vast population back on small farms so they would have a means of supporting themselves. Russia also divided their agricultural land into large farms which they call "commons". Now they are, again, turning them back into private, individual farms. Today we are following that same pattern in this country. We are calling them "cooperates". This is forcing thousands of farmers off the land.

Are those in Washington so blind that they cannot see what is happening? Don't we look back in history and see what other countries have experienced by this. Can't we profit from their experiences? Do we think we are so far superior to them that we can succeed where they have failed?

Let us wake up before it is too late. Let us once again restore reliable, experienced, and capable personnel in the Department of Agriculture and let it function to the full extent of what it was orginally intended.

Although agriculture has slipped far from being our leading industry, let us "in Washington" not forget it entirely. Food is still a valuable and essential commodity.

ALDWIN STRASSBURG.

IMPORTATION OF FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FROM MEXICO—U.S. GROWERS NEED PROTECTION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, several years ago the administration and the Congress terminated the importation of supplemental agricultural workers from Mexico.

Today, with accelerating rapidity, Mexico is exporting cheap fresh fruits and vegetables into the United States.

Whereas, previously our Federal Government permitted the direct importation of labor—paid at the identical wage rate as U.S. residents—now in the form of food products imported into the United States, the Federal Government is permitting, and even encouraging, the importation not only of cheap foreign labor, but also of cheap foreign water, cheap foreign fertilizer, cheap foreign seeds, cheap foreign financing, and cheap foreign materials of all sorts, together with the additional ingredients of cheap foreign land and taxes.

Our farmers and food processors cannot possibly compete with the cheap foreign labor and supplies without lowering our standard of living.

American farmers and food processors will have no alternative to closing down their higher cost operations and moving their families and processing plants to Mexico in order to compete favorably. Such a movement would jeopardize the principal industry in California and would adversely affect many allied industries—such as, fertilizer and seed production, farm machinery manufacturing, food processing equipment manufacturing, trucking, railroading, package manufacturing, advertising and sales.

To illustrate the growing problem, I quote from the April 24, 1967, report of the Federal-State Market News Service of Sacramento, Calif.:

> FRESH FRUITS AND VEGETABLES FROM MEXICO
>
> Fresh fruit and vegetable shipments to the United States from Mexico during 1966 totaled 21,544 carlots, and continued the upward trend of the past decade, according to the Federal-State Market News Service. This was early 2½ times the volume of ten years ago. Shipments to the United States from Mexico are principally during November to May, when domestic production is at a low ebb. Value of the imports into the United States from Mexico now is about $50 million.
>
> Fresh market tomatoes were the leading commodity, with the equivalent of nearly 10,000 carlots shipped into the United States from Mexico in 1966. Cantaloups were second, with over 3,200 cars. Other major volume items for fresh market from Mexico included strawberries, watermelons, cucumbers, onions, peppers, and oranges.
>
> Frozen strawberry imports into the United States from Mexico zoomed to a record high of over 82 million pounds in 1966, a whopping 60 per cent over 1965. Nearly ten years ago frozen strawberry imports from this source totaled only 14 million pounds. Fresh market strawberry imports from Mexico during 1966 were more than double those the previous year.
>
> Winter vegetables can be grown in all irrigated coastal valleys of the west coast of Mexico, from Guaymas to Culiacan, according to reports of the Foreign Agricultural Service. These coastal valleys are only a few feet above sea level. Practically all the commercial production of strawberries, however, is further south, concentrated in the states of Guanajuato and Michoacan, at an elevation of 5,000 to 6,000 feet.

Total U.S. imports of fresh market fruits and vegetables from Mexico by rail, truck, or boat—Car and carlot equivalents

Calendar year:	*Amount*
1955	5, 999
1956	8, 168
1957	8, 843
1958	14, 778
1959	16, 682
1960	16, 638
1961	12, 598
1962	16, 492
1963	19, 786
1964	19, 892
1965	20, 878
1966	21, 544

Source: Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Shipments, annual reports issued by USDA, C. & M.S. Fruit & Vegetable Division, Market News Branch, Washington, D.C.

Strawberries present an acute problem. Approximately one-fourth of all the commercial strawberries in the United States are grown in my district. The following figures may interest all Members of the House:

U.S. imports of frozen strawberries from Mexico

Calendar year:	*Pounds*
1959	14,063,000
1960	25,017,000
1961	29,817,000
1962	32,281,000
1963	34,550,000
1964	39,720,000
1965	51,846,000
1966	82,826,000

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce.

U.S. imports of fresh strawberries from Mexico (season November–May)

Season:	*Pounds*
1958–59	51,000
1959–60	540,000
1960–61	387,000
1961–62	966,000
1962–63	2,449,000
1963–64	3,794,000
1964–65	5,183,000
1965–66	9,778,000

Source: Foreign Agricultural Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.

This growing problem affects all fruit and vegetable production in the United States; but because strawberry production is most adversely affected, I have introduced some corrective legislation, H.R. 9070.

This bill will impose import limitations on prepared or preserved strawberries not to exceed 20 percent of the average annual consumption in the United States.

I hope all Members will recognize and appreciate the problem facing the strawberry growers throughout the United States now, and which can affect all farmers in the immediate future—unless some reasonable balances are achieved quickly. Your support for H.R. 9070 will be appreciated.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

THE ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am certain that the Members of this body are vitally concerned about the problem of the disease of alcoholism in America today.

On April 13, 1967, Senators JAVITS, of New York, and MOSS, of Utah, together with 34 other Senators, introduced S. 1508, known as the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967. Their statement on it can be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 13, commencing at page 9322. I believe that their bill is worthy of support, and that a united nonpartisan effort should be made for it in the House.

I am joined in this behalf by 21 of my colleagues here in the House.[1] We are taking advantage of the new provision under House Resolution 42 adopted April 25, 1967—see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, pages 10708 through 10712—which allows joint sponsorship by up to 25 Members. I am, therefore, pleased that sponsoring the House version of S. 1508 today we have Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. FINO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. TENZER, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WALDIE.

We sponsor this legislation, Mr. Speaker, in recognition of the need to deal effectively and on a nationwide basis with the country's fourth most serious health problem, alcoholism.

The current Javits-Moss bill is similar

---

[1] Congressman Hagan has introduced a comprehensive alcoholism bill for the District of Columbia, H.R. 6143. His statement on his most recent bill of national implication is found at Page 11335 of the Congressional Record of May 1, 1967. Representative Gude has introduced his own bill, H.R. 8523.

to the bill I introduced in the 89th Congress on alcoholism.[2] There are, however, significant improvements in the Javits-Moss bill, including provision for dealing with the alcoholic on medical, instead of criminal terms, in view of recent court decisions which recognize the need for a modern approach to the alcoholic problem. In addition, this legislation calls for a special study project to conduct a coordinated program of research and study of personnel practices and current and projected needs in the field of alcoholism, the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics, and the prevention of alcoholism. The special project also would be concerned with the availability and adequacy of education and training resources of persons entering the alcoholic rehabilitation field, as well as physicians and law enforcement officials who deal with alcoholics.

Our bill, which I include in full at the end of this statement, would establish a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control within the Office of the Surgeon General, to coordinate and direct Federal alcoholism programs. The Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control would provide and administer, through its secretary, grants to fund programs including: demonstration projects for detoxification centers; court-supervised programs for alcoholics; programs for alcoholics who are inmates in correctional institutions; and post-institutional care for alcoholics.

This legislation is designed to implement the recommendations of the President's Crime Commission concerning alcoholism and follows the recommendations of the National Conference on Alcoholism sponsored by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1963. It has the approval, among others, of the North American Association of Alcoholism programs, the parent organization for State and local government groups dealing with alcoholism, as well as independent authorities on alcoholism.

In addition, this bill takes cognizance of recent court decisions in the field of alcoholism, and addresses itself to practical considerations which arise as a result of these decisions. For example, the recent and celebrated decision of the U.S. District Court of Appeals in *Dewitt Easter* v. *District of Columbia,* 361 F. 2d 50 (D.C. Circuit 1966) reversing 209 A. 2d 625 (D.C. Ct. App. 1965) and subsequent decisions, including *Driver* v. *Hinnant,* 356 F. 2d 761 (4th Circuit 1966) reversing 243 F. Supp. 59 (E.D.N.C. 1965) are strong evidence of the increasing acceptance by the Judiciary of the attitude that habitual alcoholics must be treated medically and socially.[3] October 17, 1966, the U.S. Supreme Court refused certiorari in ***Budd* v. *California,*** 385 U.S. 909, 17 L. ed. 2d 138 (1966), where the California Supreme Court refused to deny application of a State statute to an alcoholic as violative of the eighth amendment of the Federal Constitution which prohibits cruel and unusual punishment. The California statute provides, in part, that any person "found in any public place under the influence of intoxicating liquor, in such a condition that he is unable to exercise care for his own safety or that of others" is guilty of a misdemeanor.

Justice Fortas' dissent, however, may be interpreted as a red flag warning that eventually the holdings of Easter and Hinnant can receive nationwide application. Addressing himself to the facts in Budd against California, Justice Fortas said in his dissent at page 909:

> The trial record squarely presents the issue whether alcoholism is, as a matter of law, a defense to the charge.
>
> It is time for this Court to decide whether persons suffering from the illness of alcoholism and exhibiting its symptoms or effects may be punished criminally therefor. The Court has already held that a State may not punish for narcotics addiction, that to do so would violate the constitutional prohibition of cruel and unusual punishment. Robinson v. California, 370 US 660, 8 L ed 2d 758, 82 S Ct 1417 (1962).
>
> . . . We should hear argument in the present case to consider whether it presents a situation which commands similar constitutional proscription.
>
> Each of the 50 States has some sort of noncriminal procedure for dealing with alcoholics, and in each State some procedure exists or can be provided for intelligent, purposeful handling of the various aspects of the problem.
>
> The use of the crude and formidable weapon of criminal punishment of the alcoholic is neither seemly nor sensible, neither purposeful nor civilized.
>
> Justice Douglas joined Justice Fortas in the dissenting opinion:
>
> . . . believing that being an alcohol addict, like being a drug addict, is beyond the reach of the criminal law for the reasons stated in his separate opinion in Robinson v. California, 370 US 660, 668, 8 L. ed.. 758, 764, 82 S. Ct. 1417.

As a result of these decisions new responsibilities have been placed upon the States and communities, as well as the Federal Government, to deal with the alcoholic as a sick person in need of medical treatment by doctors, rather than as a criminal by law enforcement officials.

While more than half the States have taken the legislative step of recognizing alcoholism as a medical problem, and have appropriated some money for treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics, the magnitude of the problem has simply been more than the States can individually handle. The bill we have introduced today authorizes $20 million in fiscal 1968 for implementation of the programs previously outlined. In addition, the special study project on personnel practices and current and projected needs in the field of alcoholism mentioned earlier is funded at $500,000 in fiscal 1968 and $800,000 in fiscal 1969.

These expenditures are modest when one realizes that to some 5 million Americans, drinking alcoholic beverages has become enough of a problem to substantially interfere with their leading successful happy lives, and that, in addition, some 250,000 persons become alcoholics each year. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, John W. Gardner, in a report to the President on alcoholism, October 20, 1966, said that the burden of the approximately 5 million Americans who are alcoholics is not carried by them alone. He stated:

> It directly—and often tragically—affects between 16 and 20 million members of their families.
>
> In other words, as many as 25 million Americans—one out of every eight of our citizens—live with the problem of alcoholism, either as alcoholics or as members of their family.

Alcoholism, in addition to being the country's fourth most serious health problem, ranking behind only heart disease, mental illness and cancer, produces disastrous effects which are not easily reflected or appreciated by a perusal of alcoholic statistics. For example, it is a well recognized fact that alcoholism, unless arrested, can drastically shorten lives. Alcoholics generally suffer a death rate of two-and-one-half times that of the normal population.

Alcoholism is regarded as a progressive disease. Before health is completely destroyed, chronical drunkenness on the part of the mother or father, or both, usually leads to the loss of a job. Shortly thereafter, although statistics often fail to show it, there occurs an entire breakdown of the family unit.

Aside from the social and health aspects of alcoholism, the public bears an increased tax burden as a result of the plight of the alcoholic. The President's Commission on Crime recently issued a report entitled "The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society" which stated that in 1965 one out of every three of the some 2 million arrests in America were for public drunkenness,[4] thereby placing a burden on the courts, police and penal system to bear the administration expenses occasioned by the alcoholic problem. Moreover, alcoholism can be traced to many of the auto accidents in the United States, according to Dr. Philip R. Lee, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs. Alcoholism is also extremely costly, considering the loss of valuable business and industry personnel and about $432 million annually as a result of absenteeism, inefficiencies and industrial accidents due to alcoholism. The list of detrimental effects of this dreadful disease is great.

This bill speaks to the present need for a nationwide program requiring Federal, State and local action. It presents a challenge to this body to take urgent action to deal effectively with an extremely serious national health problem. Last year this body accepted its responsibility by enacting legislation to combat the problem of narcotics. Now the time has come for the Congress to deal with a problem even more severe in terms of the number of our people detrimentally affected. The bill we join together today to introduce is realistic and sound. I strongly urge its immediate and thoughtful consideration.

---

[2] In the 89th Congress, I introduced a bill, H.R. 14197, for an "Alcoholism Control Act of 1966," and my statements in connection therewith will be found, among other places, in the daily Congressional Record of June 13, 1966, Page A3173; June 16, 1966, Page A3262; July 26, 1966, Page A3939; August 8, 1966, Page A4166; August 22, 1966, Page A4437; October 4, 1966, Page A5115; February 8, 1967, Page A548; March 7, 1967, Page A1115; March 23, 1967, Page A1524; April 6, 1967, Page A1669, and April 10, 1967, Page A1695.

[3] For an analysis of these and other recent decisions in the field, see the daily Congressional Record of March 23, 1967, at Page A1524, containing, among other things, an article entitled "Is the Alcoholic Immune from Criminal Prosecution?" by Peter Barton Hutt and Richard A. Merrill, which appeared in the December 1966 issue of the Legal Aid Briefcase, Volume XXV, No. 2, at Page 70.

[4] President's Commission on Crime Report, *The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society,* Chapter 9, Page 233, February 19, 1967.

There follows a copy of the bill we have introduced today:

[In the House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 1st Session]

H.R. 9643

(By Mr. Kupferman (for himself, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Bell, Mr. Button, Mr. Conte, Mr. Daniels, Mr. Fino, Mr. Gonzalez, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Hanley, Mr. McClory, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Reifel, Mr. Reinecke, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Ryan, Mr. Shriver, Mr. Tenzer, Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin, Mr. Vander Jagt, and Mr. Waldie) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on ———.)

A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that alcoholism is a major national health problem which requires action by and cooperation among Federal, State, and local governments.

(b)(1) In view of (i) the recommendation of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, (ii) recent court decisions holding that habitual alcoholics must be treated medically and socially which place new responsibilities and burdens upon the States and communities as well as upon the Federal Government, and (iii) demands for increased numbers of specialized personnel to deal with problems of alcoholism and alcoholics, the Congress further finds and declares that both new and improved techniques must be developed and put into operation with respect to problems posed by alcoholism, its prevention, its treatment, and its control.

(2) The Congress further declares that, in addition to the funds provided for in this Act to combat that problem of alcoholism, it is the policy of the Congress that funds available to carry out other Federal legislation providing for Federal or federally assisted research, prevention, treatment, or rehabilitation programs in the fields of health and disease shall also be utilized to help eradicate alcoholism as a major health problem.

(c) Therefore it is the policy of the Congress and the purpose of this Act to assist in devising and placing in operation both new and improved approaches to the problem of the prevention and control of alcoholism and the treatment, care, and rehabilitation of alcoholics, by providing for the conduct of appropriate study, research, experimentation, and the creation of appropriate demonstration projects.

BUREAU OF ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby authorized to be established, within the Office of the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Bureau"), to be headed by a Director.

(b) It shall be the duty and function of the Bureau to—

(1) administer the grant programs authorized by this Act;

(2) direct basic research and studies on the causes, prevention, and treatment of alcoholism;

(3) serve as a clearinghouse for information and data related to alcoholism;

(4) coordinate activities carried on by the various departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with respect to alcoholism;

(5) assist the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare in the discharge of any of his responsibilities which are concerned with or relevant to alcoholism, the prevention or control thereof, or the treatment, cure, or rehabilitation of alcoholics; and

(6) provide technical assistance to State and local governments with respect to the establishment and implementation of programs and procedures for dealing effectively with alcoholism, and for providing for the treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics.

GRANTS FOR DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

SEC. 4. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations for the purpose of assisting such agencies and organizations in establishing and operating, as demonstration projects—

(1) detoxification centers;

(2) treatment and rehabilitation centers for alcoholics which are authorized under State or local law to receive, treat, and rehabilitate, individuals who have been charged with an offense, under State or local law, and have been ordered or paroled by a court of competent jurisdiction to undergo treatment and care at such centers;

(3) treatment programs for alcoholics who are inmates of correctional institutions; and

(4) programs for postinstitutional services for alcoholics.

(b) Grants made under this section shall be made so as to—

(1) accord preference to those projects which have the greatest promise of a substantial contribution to combating the problems of alcoholism;

(2) insure an equitable distribution of the funds available for such grants throughout the various geographic areas of the United States, considering the relative populations of each such areas as compared to that of all such areas, the relative extent to which alcoholism and problems stemming therefrom exist in each of such areas as compared to that of all such areas, and the relative need of each of such areas for assistance in combating alcoholism and the problems stemming therefrom in each of such areas as compared to that of all such areas.

(c) For the purpose of enabling the Director to make the grants authorized by this section, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and $45,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971.

GRANTS FOR SPECIAL STUDY PROJECTS IN ALCOHOLIC REHABILITATION

SEC. 5. (a) The Director is authorized to make grants for carrying out a coordinated program of research and study of (1) personnel practices and current and projected personnel needs in the field of alcoholism (including its prevention, control, treatment, and the rehabilitation of alcoholics), (2) the availability and adequacy of the educational and training resources of individuals in, or preparing to enter such field, and (3) the availability and adequacy of specialized training for persons, such as physicians and law enforcement officials, who have occasion to deal with alcoholics, and the extent to which such persons make the best use of their professional qualifications when dealing with alcoholics.

(b)(1) Such grants may be made to one or more organizations, but only on condition that the organization will undertake and conduct, or if more than one organization is to receive such grants, only on the condition that such organizations have agreed among themselves to undertake and conduct, a coordinated program of research into and study of all the aspects of the resources, needs, practices, and other matters referred to in subsection (a).

(2) Any grant made under subsection (a) shall be made on the condition that the research and study for which such grant is made must be completed not later than two years from the date the coordinated program referred to in subsection (a) is commenced.

(3) As used in paragraph (1), the term "organization" means a nongovernmental agency, organization, or commission, composed of representatives of leading professional associations, organizations, or agencies active in the fields directly related to dealing with alcoholism or the problems stemming therefrom (directly or indirectly).

(c) Upon completion of the research and study authorized by subsection (a), the Director shall, on the basis of such research and study, prepare and submit to the President and to the Congress a full and complete report setting forth the findings revealed as a result of such research and study together with any recommendations of the Director with respect to how the problems brought about by alcoholism may be dealt with more effectively.

(d) For the purpose of enabling the Director to make the grants authorized by this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $800,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970.

(e) In addition to the amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (c) for the purpose of making grants under this section, the Director is authorized to accept and utilize, for such purpose, any other amounts which may be contributed by public or private sources to assist in carrying out such purpose.

PROTECTION OF PERSONAL RIGHTS OF ALCOHOLICS

SEC. 6. In making grants, entering into contracts, or in engaging in other activities to carry out the purposes of this Act, the Director shall take such steps as may be necessary to assure that no individual shall be made the subject of any research which is carried out (in whole or in part) with funds provided under this Act unless such individual explicitly agrees to become the subject of such research.

NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ALCOHOLISM CARE AND CONTROL

SEC. 7. (a)(1) There is hereby established a National Advisory Committee on Alcoholism Care and Control (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Committee") which shall consist of eighteen members, to be appointed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service. Members of the Advisory Committee shall be selected from persons who are not otherwise in the full-time employ of the United States and who are skilled in medicine, psychology, government, law enforcement, social work, public health, or education, or who have demonstrated particular interest in the special problems of alcoholism. At least three members of the Advisory Committee shall be persons who are involved in State or local government programs related to alcoholism and at least three members shall be persons who are involved in programs of local government agencies or private, nonprofit agencies which are related to alcoholism.

(2) Each member of the Advisory Committee shall hold office for a term of three years, except that any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and except that the

terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment, six at the end of the first year, six at the end of the second year, and six at the end of the third year, after the date of appointment. A member shall not be eligible to serve continuously for more than two terms.

(b) Members of the Advisory Committee, while attending meetings or conferences thereof or otherwise serving on business of the Committee, shall be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime, and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

(c) It shall be the function of the Advisory Committee to advise and consult with the Director with respect to the administration of this Act, to review and approve grant programs authorized by this Act, and advise with and consult appropriate persons with respect to any other program carried out or supported by the Federal Government with respect to alcoholism and the problems related thereto.

(d) The Advisory Committee shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress a report containing its findings and recommendations with respect to programs related to meeting the problems of alcoholism, and the adequacy of such programs. In addition, the Advisory Committee shall submit to the President and to Congress such interim reports as it considers appropriate.

(e) The Advisory Committee is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out its functions, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Advisory Committee such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance as such Committee may require to carry out its functions.

REQUIREMENTS FOR CONSULTATIONS WITH STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES PRIOR TO MAKING GRANTS

Sec. 8. In order to assure that Federal efforts in combating the problem of alcoholism will be properly coordinated with like efforts on the part of State and local governments, no grant under this Act for any project or study to be carried on in any State shall be made until any State and local public agency officially concerned with the problem of alcoholism in and for the area within which such project or study is proposed to be carried on shall have first been advised of, and consulted about, such grant. The views and recommendations of any such agency with respect to any grant shall be accorded full consideration by the Director in determining whether, when, and under what conditions, such grant will be made.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 9. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) The term "alcoholic" means any person who chronically and habitually uses or is dependent upon alcoholic beverages to the extent that he has lost power of self control with respect to use of such beverages, or who by reason of alcoholism endangers the health, safety, or welfare of himself or others.

(b) The term "alcoholic beverages" includes alcoholic spirits, liquors, wines, beer, and every liquid or fluid, patented or not, containing alcoholic spirits, wine or beer which is capable of being consumed by human beings and produces intoxication in any form or in any degree.

(c) The term "alcoholism" means any condition of abnormal behavior or illness resulting directly or indirectly from the chronic and habitual use of or dependence upon alcoholic beverages to the extent of loss of power of self-control over their use.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I commend the gentleman for bringing this matter to the attention of the House and for the legislation which he and other Members, including myself, have introduced today.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to lend my support to a Federal legislative program on alcoholism, and to serve as a sponsor of the proposed Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967 which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] has discussed.

In addition to being a major health problem, the intemperate use of alcohol contributes substantially to the death toll on our highways and to the high incidence of crime in our Nation. Studies have also revealed that excessive use of alcohol contributes to many of our broken homes and to the high divorce rate.

Alcoholism with its complex and always disastrous effect on our society is indeed a national problem which requires a national solution.

I do not believe that Federal action will disclose a single or simple answer. The physical and psychological effects of alcohol on individuals suggest a many-sided approach to the problem.

It is interesting to observe that one of the most successful programs against alcoholism is Alcoholics Anonymous. Basic to the program, as I understand it, is an innate belief in a higher power—and a reliance upon this power as an unlimited source of strength to release the addicted individual from his reliance upon alcohol.

In cosponsoring a new Federal approach to the problem of alcoholism, we should not lose sight of the value of existing private programs, including Alcoholics Anonymous. We should also take note of the many religious and nonprofit agencies working earnestly to heal many alcoholics of their addiction.

Mr. Speaker, recently in my home district in Illinois, the Lake County Council on Alcoholism was formed. The establishment of this organization in the Lake County area is made necessary because of the increase in alcoholism. Many public-spirited citizens have interested themselves in the Lake County Council on Alcoholism and some have become officers and members of the board of directors of this organization—Mr. R. Bruce Wight is its president, Mrs. M. E. Amstutz serves as secretary, and Mr. Cyril J. Rakauskas is executive director. I am proud to be a member of the board of the Lake County Council on Alcoholism.

The council has already begun its work which includes discussions of the problem of alcoholism on radio programs and in the press. The organization is also conducting a pilot educational program in one of Waukegan's industrial plants.

The enactment of the legislation which has been introduced today would greatly increase the opportunity for service of the Lake County Council on Alcoholism.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that early hearings can be held on the legislation which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Kupferman] and I, and many others are sponsoring; and which he so eloquently described in his remarks on the floor.

In seeking through legislation to help develop better communities and a better Nation, I can think of no measure of greater importance than the bill which has inspired this discussion on the floor of the House today—the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. I appreciate the gentleman's joining in this nonpartisan venture. I know of the work the gentleman has done in the field of narcotics. I hope that some of his ability which was given to that field will be available to us in connection with the subject of alcoholism.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend our honorable colleague from New York for his efforts in establishing ways this country can better control the problems of alcoholism.

Since 1955 Arkansas has had a Commission on Alcoholism. The Arkansas Commission is composed of seven members. One member is a clergyman, one is a wholesale or retail dealer in alcohol beverages, one is a doctor, two are cured of the disease, and the others are outstanding citizens known to have an interest in the problem.

Dr. Ed Wheat, the member of the Arkansas Commission with the greatest tenure said:

> Education about the seriousness of this problem is the most important problem we have on the state level.

The doctor also said that a serious problem for State commissions was in convincing people suffering from the disease that they are sick. He also feels that the increased amount of leisure time will see an increased incidence of this disease.

These comments by the doctor also show that this problem is very serious and is likely to become more serious.

At the present time, Alcoholics Anonymous appears to be the best tool we have for combating this problem. But, as has been observed here today and as Dr. Wheat has observed, we must expand our educational effort in terms of teaching people about the possible and likely adverse effects of alcoholism.

Arkansas has realized the seriousness of this problem and has been working to combat the disease. The approach has been practical and has been helpful. But, like many other programs it has been limited by a lack of funds to do the job properly. The desire to meet this need is present in Arkansas. I appreciate this opportunity to participate in this discussion and acknowledge the leadership my friend from New York has shown in bringing this matter before the House.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON—THE GRAND OLD CAMPAIGNER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of a close and dear friend, a man whom I have known and respected through all my political career, a man who devoted his life to the Republican Party and whose service in that party spanned four decades.

Mr. Speaker, the passing of my good friend Victor A. Johnston leaves a gap that will be difficult to fill in the Republican Party. An adopted son of my own State who came to Wisconsin initially in 1944 to run Harold Stassen's presidential delegate campaign, "Vic" soon thereafter became executive secretary of the State voluntary Republican committee under our mutually good friend, the late and beloved Tom Coleman.

As executive secretary, "Vic" helped me as a freshman State Senator right after I had been elected to fill the seat left vacant by my own father's death. "Vic" was a great teacher and I will always remember and appreciate the help he gave me at the beginning of my political career.

"Vic" Johnston originally came from North Dakota where he got his start in politics. It was in that State that he got his first political assignment, as manager of Herbert Hoover's campaign in the eastern half of North Dakota in 1928.

In the early 1930's Victor Johnston migrated to Minneapolis, Minn., where he wound up working for Harold Stassen's campaign for Governor in 1938.

After Tom Coleman drafted "Vic" as executive secretary for Wisconsin's voluntary Republican committee in 1944, he served in that capacity for exactly 2 years and then joined freshman Senator Joseph R. McCarthy in Washington as his administrative assistant.

Soon thereafter, "Vic" became staff director for the Republican senatorial campaign committee here in Washington, a post he held for most of the next 20 years until shortly before his death in Miami in March 1967.

Mr. Speaker, Vic Johnston was a Republican's Republican throughout his more than 40 years in GOP politics. As Dave Broder, the noted political commentator and columnist for the Washington Post put it so well:

> He served an incredible variety of people—Harold Stassen, Bob Taft, McCarthy, Barry Goldwater, Thruston Morton and Dick Nixon—and if he had a political philosophy of his own, he never argued it.

Mr. Speaker, all who knew Victor Johnston during his long and distinguished career of service to the Republican Party knew a man who was a good technician, a sound advisor, a successful fundraiser, and, above all else, a real teamplayer.

The highlights of "Vic" Johnston's life are contained in several brief articles which appeared in the Nation's press. Dave Broder, in his column of March 21, faithfully captured, in my opinion, some of the true flavor of the man who, in Dave's words, "was probably not known even to the careful newspaper readers of the past two decades, but he was prized by the men in politics and those of us who cover them."

Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks, I ask that the Dave Broder column of March 21, the Milwaukee Journal article of March 16, the Milwaukee Sentinel article of the same date and the New York Times account of March 17 be placed in the Record.

Mr. Speaker, Victor Johnston was known to most politicians on both sides of the aisle not only in the Senate where his formal duties lay but also in the House of Representatives where many of us have had occasion to consult with him, to socialize with him, and in general to enjoy the pleasure of his company.

I was privileged to serve as a pallbearer at Vic's funeral at the request of his beloved wife, Margaret. Although Margaret and her three children know of my deep sympathy at their loss, I would once again like to take this public opportunity to express my sincere condolences at the loss of a beloved husband and father.

The articles referred to above follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1967]

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON

(By David S. Broder)

This space is borrowed today from matters of conceivably greater consequence for a personal reminiscence. A good friend, Victor A. Johnston, died last week and he deserves more than the inadequate farewell this column affords.

Vic was probably not known even to the careful newspaper readers of the past two decades, but he was prized by the men in politics and those of us who cover them.

Probably it was because of his unending delight in the infinite variety of human beings—and the damned-fool, unexpected things they say and do in the stress of political campaigns. Vic saw and knew more of the political figures of the past generation than most of us did. He was 66 when he died. He came out of North Dakota in the 1930s, got involved in Republican politics in Minnesota and Wisconsin, came to Washington with the late Joe McCarthy and for most of the last 20 years had been running the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee.

He served an incredible variety of people—Harold Stassen, Bob Taft, McCarthy, Barry Goldwater, Thruston Morton and Dick Nixon—and if he had a political philosophy of his own, he never argued it. Politics to Vic was not the struggle of good against evil; it was the best of all indoor and outdoor sports, one which demanded the greatest skill of the contestants and one which guaranteed the spectators both thrills and laughs.

I cannot testify as to his political skill. He probably elected some Republicans over the years who could never have made it by their own meager talents, and his advice probably helped defeat some others.

He raised a whale of a lot of money for the Republican Party, some of it by means and from sources that were his exclusive knowledge and which his principals on the campaign committee were just as glad not to know about.

Though his services and loyalties were to the GOP, his friendships were bipartisan. Encountering Hubert Humphrey outside the Senate before the 1964 convention he offered to help Humphrey win the Democratic vice presidential nomination, because "I'm getting dammed sick and tired of trying to beat you for Senator." He was immensely delighted when President Johnson—an old friend from Senate days—invited him to the White House one day for a bill-signing ceremony in the Rose Garden. When Vic told the story, he always noted that he had never made it to the White House during the eight years President Eisenhower was there. Like most professional politicians, Vic was able to control his enthusiasm for Mr. Eisenhower.

He was a superb storyteller. At Republican National Committee meetings or political conventions, he loved to gather his reporter and politician friends in his room for a spread of Wisconsin cheese, beer and booze—and hours of yarn-swapping. It is a tragedy that no one ever strapped him into a chair, turned on a tape recorder and forced him to set down his reminiscences for history. But as long as his friends survive, his tales will be a part of the political talk.

I last saw him at the $500-a-plate Republican Gala at the Washington Hilton two weeks ago, going down the line at the somewhat skimpy and improvised buffet that had been set up in the press room. It was characteristic of Vic that, though he had sold as many tickets as anybody for the million-dollar affair, he chose to scrounge his own supper with the press, rather than sit with the "fat cats" next door.

It was typical, too, that he had a quip designed to mock the Republicans' own stuffiness and at the same time to deflate any sense of injured dignity the reporters might be suffering by their exclusion from the dining hall.

"We're willing to put up with you -------s at the reception," he said, "but we're not so hard up we have to let you eat dinner with us rich folks."

Vic could abide almost anything in a human being except a solemn ass. He knew the politicians and Presidents of his era—to say nothing of the reporters—far too well to think that any of them were made of anything but very common clay. But if he was cynical enough not to take any of them at their own evaluation of themselves, he was charitable enough to let the worst of us know that we were not beyond redemption in his eyes.

He would take the newest cub reporter on the beat into his confidence—as he did this one—just as easily as he would tell the most self-exalted party potentate to go to hell.

An old friend of Vic, Jack Mills, tells me that Vic met H. L. Mencken at least once. I think he would have liked the epitaph Mencken suggested for himself:

"If, after I depart this vale, you ever remember me and have thought to please my ghost, forgive some sinner and wink your eye at some homely girl."

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1967]

VICTOR JOHNSTON OF G.O.P. DIES; SENATORIAL CAMPAIGN UNIT AIDE

MIAMI, March 15.—Victor A. Johnston, field director of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee, died in Mercy Hospital Wednesday night after a heart attack. His age was 66. He had become ill in Washington on Sunday and flew to Miami the next day to join his wife at their Key Biscayne home.

ACTIVE BEHIND THE SCENES

For most of his adult life, Mr. Johnston was a behind-the-scenes professional politician. He aided the political careers of Harold E.

Stassen, Joseph R. McCarthy, Robert A. Taft, Dwight D. Eisenhower and Barry Goldwater.

Mr. Johnston, who was given much credit for the strong support won by Mr. Stassen in the 1948 contest for the Presidential nomination, was appointed campaign director of the Republican's National Committee in 1949.

He had worked his way up in the party, becoming well-known in Minnesota and Wisconsin in the 1930's and 1940's.

Mr. Johnston was born on a farm near Inkster, N.D. He was on the debating and baseball teams at the University of North Dakota, which he left before receiving a degree. He served with the Army in France during World War I.

Mr. Johnston moved to Washington in 1922. There he served on the Capitol police staff and, for five years, served as Washington correspondent for Editor and Publisher, the newspaper industry trade paper.

Later he worked for the Northeast Grain Association in Minneapolis and as publicity director for the Minnesota Republican Committee. He managed Mr. Stassen's campaign for Governor in 1938, and when Mr. Stassen was elected he became state publicity director.

In 1946 Mr. Johnston joined Senator McCarthy's administrative staff in Washington, but in 1948 he took a leave to direct Mr. Stassen's campaign for the G.O.P. Presidential nomination, which was won by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey of New York. Mr. Johnston then served as director of volunteers for Mr. Dewey and his running mate, Gov. Earl Warren of California.

In 1951 he organized Senator Taft's drive for the Republican nomination, but when General Eisenhower became the delegates' choice he worked for his election.

In 1954, Mr. Johnston again worked for Senator McCarthy in Minnesota, in a campaign noted for its excortiation of the then Senator Hubert H. Humphrey. In 1961, he planned speaking dates for Senator Goldwater, who was then an "unofficial" candidate for his party's Presidential nomination.

From 1949 until his death, Mr. Johnston held the title of field director of the Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee.

He leaves his wife, the former Margaret Wilbur Landt; a son, Robert, and two daughters, Mrs. Lucky Somers and Miss Judith Ann Johnston. A funeral service will be held in Washington Saturday.

[From the Milwaukee Sentinel, Mar. 16, 1967]

Johnston, GOP Aide, Dies

Miami, Fla.—Victor A. Johnston, 66, field director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and former party official in Wisconsin, died in a hospital here Wednesday night after a heart attack.

Johnston, who became ill in Washington, D.C., Sunday night, flew to Miami Monday and was taken from the plane by ambulance to Mercy hospital.

He regained consciousness, but did not survive a second heart attack.

Mrs. Johnston, who had been staying in their Key Biscayne home, and members of the family were at Johnston's bedside.

Funeral services for the veteran political strategist of the GOP are expected to be held in Washington, D.C., Saturday.

Johnston gained national attention during the 1948 presidential campaign when he was delegated by the Republicans to follow President Harry S. Truman around the country, to report what Truman was saying in his speeches and the kind of crowds he was attracting.

At one point, Truman invited his "shadow" to come up on the stage with him and be introduced to the Democratic audience, but Johnston declined.

Born in Inkster, N.D., Johnston was a student at the University of North Dakota from 1921 to 1923. On leaving the university, he became editor and publisher of a weekly newspaper, the Red River Valley Citizen, in Grand Forks.

He got his first official GOP position in 1944 when he was named executive secretary for the Republican party of Wisconsin.

Two years later, he went to Washington to become administrative assistant to Sen. Joseph McCarthy.

In 1949, Johnston became campaign director of the national Republican senatorial committee, a position he held until his death.

Besides his widow, Johnston is survived by two daughters, Mrs. Peggy Somers and Judith Ann Johnston, and a son, Robert.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Mar. 16, 1967]

Victor A. Johnston

(By Laurence C. Eklund)

Washington, D.C.—Victor A. Johnston, 66, one of the Republican party's shrewdest professionals, died Wednesday night in Miami after suffering two heart attacks.

The white maned Johnston, known as the "silver fox" of Wisconsin and national politics, had flown to Miami after appearing, apparently in good health, at the Gridiron dinner here Saturday night and the Gridiron reception Sunday evening.

He became ill here and was removed from an airplane in Miami and taken to Mercy hospital there for treatment. Funeral services will be held here Saturday.

The veteran of many Republican campaigns in Wisconsin and throughout the nation, Johnston held the official title of field director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

OPTIMISTIC ON 1968

He was a grass roots campaigner and a familiar figure at the national conventions of his party, for whom Johnston's principal job was to elect and re-elect Republican senators. With his customary enthusiasm, he had talked confidently Saturday night of increasing the Republican representation in the Senate in next year's elections.

Johnston, who liked to refer to himself as a political "technician," was one of the deadliest sharpshooters in politics. This stemmed from his intimate association with the biggest names in the business.

A native of North Dakota, Johnston got his start in politics as the 19 year old manager of the campaign of Maude Adams, whom he succeeded in having elected as register of deeds at Grand Forks.

In 1928, Johnston handled his first big political assignment—managing Herbert Hoover's campaign in the eastern half of North Dakota. He went to Washington with a North Dakota congressman and was on the Capitol police force for four years.

Returning to Grand Forks, he was editor and publisher of the Red River Valley Citizen.

Migrating to Minneapolis, Johnston handled publicity for the Northwest Grain association and then drifted into political press agentry. He worked for Harold Stassen when Stassen ran for governor of Minnesota in 1938 and became press agent for the state of Minnesota as well as for Stassen.

Johnston was introduced to Wisconsin politics when he ran Stassen's presidential delegate campaign in 1944.

DRAFTED BY COLEMAN

This threw him into contact with the late Thomas E. (Boss) Coleman, then the state voluntary Republican chairman of Wisconsin.

Coleman quickly recognized Johnston's talents and drafted him to help run state Republican politics as executive secretary of the voluntary committee.

When Joseph R. McCarthy was elected senator in 1946, Johnston went to Washington as his administrative assistant. This placed the boy from North Dakota squarely in the middle of big time politics.

In fact, with his distinguished shock of white hair, he looked more like a senator than McCarthy and was mistaken for the senator by the late Sen. Robert A. Taft when Taft met the two for the first time.

In 1948, Johnston returned to Wisconsin to handle another Stassen presidential delegate campaign. Stassen won a majority of the Wisconsin delegation, and when Thomas E. Dewey won the Republican nomination, Stassen offered his organization to the New York governor.

Dewey took only Johnston, placing him in charge of the Dewey-Warren clubs.

In that campaign, Johnston trailed President Truman by plane to the far west and back. Making sarcastic allusions to the Republican sleuth in his audience, the president made Johnston nationally known by pointing him out in the crowds and inviting him to board the presidential campaign train if he paid his fare. Johnston turned down the invitations.

HEADED GOP COMMITTEE

After Dewey's defeat by Truman, Johnston was named director of a revitalized national Republican senatorial campaign committee. Returning temporarily to presidential politics in 1952 at Coleman's request, he was field manager for Taft.

Johnston was successful in winning Taft delegates in Wisconsin, South Dakota and Nebraska, but Dwight D. Eisenhower won the nomination, and Johnston went back to his old job with the senatorial committee.

Johnston was a participant in the presidential campaigns of his close friends Richard Nixon and Barry Goldwater.

Johnston is survived by his wife; a son, Robert, and two daughters, Mrs. Peggy Somers and Judith Ann Johnston.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, all of us on Capitol Hill have lost a friend, a man who made an unusual imprint on Washington and the country. Victor Johnston was not well known to anyone but the professional politician and those who are drawn into the political orbit. But he possessed in great abundance the most desirable of human qualities—the natural ability to make friends and influence people. He also exhibited rare ability to raise party funds.

Vic Johnston was executive director of the Republican senatorial committee. In that role he became invaluable to his party's officeseekers and officeholders, and to the newsmen who covered their activities. Vic moved among the political figures of two generations. He was highly regarded by men in both political parties and by the press. He was savvy, and he leveled with the press. There can be no greater tribute for a party professional.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, there is little that I can add to what has been said here in tribute to the late Victor A. Johnston. Unfortunately, it is not until we lose a friend or colleague that we are brought to an awareness of his true worth. Unfortunately, too, it is not until the hour has become too late that we express our appreciation. This is particularly true for those, like Vic Johnston, who work behind the scenes and seek no glory for themselves but give unselfishly of their talents helping others to positions of glory and fame.

Vic Johnston devoted his life to our Republican Party. He may be said to be a professional politician. We have all too few like him; skilled and experienced in political affairs, and loyal to our party. No one that I know, in or out of public office, has contributed more loyally and more substantially to Republicanism.

It should be emphasized that he who serves his political party likewise serves his country. The success of our form of government depends upon the people making decisions as between competing party leaders, and as between political party policies and principles. Vic Johnston devoted his life in this competition seeking to clarify issues and to advance his party's principles in which he sincerely believed.

He never stooped to conquer. His adversaries admired and respected him. He will long be remembered by all of us.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged indeed to join my colleagues today in paying tribute to one of the finest gentlemen who ever graced our Capital City—Vic Johnston—a stalwart fighter for the Republican cause.

Loyal, dedicated, hard-working, Vic Johnston relentlessly fought for basic Republican principles of free enterprise, individual initiative, and human dignity. He strove for these ideals and labored mightily to direct them to the best national interest.

A gentleman of integrity and outstanding character, he won the respect of all who had the privilege and honor of coming into contact with him. He will be missed.

I offer my deepest sympathy to his bereaved family.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the late Victor Johnston, whom I have had the pleasure and honor to know closely over the years.

Few men have had the opportunity to participate in the Nation's political history as did Vic. Few men have grasped the opportunity, met head-on the challenges, and retained the respect and admiration of those in politics on both sides of the aisle as he did.

Our Republican Party is deeply indebted to Vic Johnston for his many years of faithful service. He was dedicated, tenacious, inventive, and tough. He carried a powerful weapon at all times—a devastating sense of humor and a perspective that helped place the problems of the present in the context of the political past.

Vic Johnston served the Republican Party in several capacities. He knew the quiet satisfaction of triumph and the cold ashes of defeat. He was a realist and transmitted this sense of reality to those he met and dealt with. From coast to coast, his corncob pipe and flying shock of snowy hair were a hallmark of the Senate Republican campaign committee.

Vic's stories were legendary—and most carried the bite of truth. He was effective in his own quiet way, extremely witty, and above all, a gentleman. We can but express appreciation for having him among us—and the gratitude of our Grand Old Party for his career in its behalf.

We will all miss the grand old campaigner in the years ahead and in the battles yet to be fought.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1967, I lost a valued friend and counselor, and my party lost an extremely qualified, dedicated, tireless, professional worker. Victor A. Johnston never held elective office, but devoted many years of his life rendering service to those in office or aspiring to public office. Vic was a modest, self-effacing gentleman who shunned the limelight.

In 1949, Vic Johnston took over as director of the Republican Senatorial campaign committee. He worked diligently and effectively in that post. Vic served as director-organizer of my father's "Taft for President Committee"—1951–52. He went on to support every Republican candidate and to do his utmost for his party's candidates. Vic Johnston was above all—loyal, to himself, to his party, and to his country.

I join my colleagues in the House and Senate who are paying tribute to the late Victor A. Johnston.

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation and the Republican Party lost a loyal and dedicated servant with the passing of Victor Angus Johnston on March 15.

His long and faithful service to his country and the party ranged from duty with the Capitol Police force in 1923 to director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee; the position he held at the point of his untimely death.

In the interim, Mr. Speaker, Vic Johnston's distinguished career included attendance at the University of North Dakota, service with the Army in France in World War I, a newspaper editor and publisher, director of the Minnesota Tourist Bureau, publicity director of the Federal Farm Board, executive secretary of the Republican State committee in Wisconsin, and administrative assistant to the late Senator Joseph McCarthy.

In addition, he held key State and national positions in numerous presidential campaigns, including those of Harold Stassen, Thomas Dewey, Bob Taft, Dwight Eisenhower, Richard Nixon, and Barry Goldwater. At the time of his death, he was actively serving the Republican Party as director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

A man of dedication and strong convictions, Vic Johnston's loyalty to the Republican Party and to Republican principles was unbending in both good times and bad. He possessed those unique political qualities of loyalty, driving energy, and a keen mind, and the results of his efforts were always a tribute to his desire to do the best job possible. His beloved family, his friends, and those who knew him mourn his passing.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my distinguished Wisconsin colleague, Mr. LAIRD, in paying tribute to Vic Johnston.

The political parties of this country have suffered a great loss with the passing of Vic Johnston. While it is true that the Republican Party is the party to which he devoted many years of dedicated service, both parties are the better for his high-minded, honest dedication.

His service both to the Republican Party of Wisconsin and the senatorial campaign committee will be long remembered.

I join my colleagues in extending my deepest condolences to Mr. Johnston's family.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to associate myself with those who are taking this time to pay tribute to Vic Johnston.

Most of us on the Republican side of the aisle felt a keen personal loss when Vic Johnston left us. It was my privilege to work closely with Vic in the 1964 senatorial campaign, and I shall always appreciate the opportunity it gave me to know him.

Vic had a combination of rare talents that are seldom found in individuals in any field of endeavor. He brought to the political arena a combination of technical competence, a great sense of humor and an understanding of his fellow man.

Although for the many years he labored in the political vineyard, the Republicans did not enjoy very many periods of majority leadership in Congress, some of the victories for which he was responsible have added luster to the pages of history.

The Republican Party will miss him. His friends in the Senate, on both sides of the aisle, will miss him, and America loses a fine political leader.

Perhaps the following lines sum up, in some small measure, the creed of men like Vic Johnston whose lives are devoted to serving.

Calvary, the shadows hastened the end of day
And those near the Master heard Him say,
"It is finished," He bowed His head,
The soldiers muttered, "He is dead."
Now I, trying to follow in the Master's way,
Lift up my eyes and to my Father say,
"My life is thine, take it, Oh God,
That another's path may be less hard to trod."
If I can stoop to lift or ease one single pain,
Or utter one word of beauty that shall live again,
Then I may say, when at last I stand alone,
"It is finished, Father, I am coming home."

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] in paying tribute to our friend, the late Vic Johnston.

His 18 years with the Republican senatorial campaign committee constitute a fitting climax to an illustrious lifetime of service to his Nation. Prior to coming to Washington, Vic was the executive director of the Republican Party in Wisconsin. We in Minnesota have a claim on him, too. Vic Johnston used his energies and considerable talents in developing the tourist industry in our beautiful and scenic State. It was really but a short jump from his farm home in North Dakota to the city life in neighboring Minnesota.

Vic Johnston was a personal friend to many of our Nation's great citizens, and many of them became great through the effective efforts by Vic, who had a knack for offering just the right advice for young politicians on the way up.

The party has lost a tireless and faithful worker. The Nation has lost a devoted servant.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleagues in paying a special tribute to the late Vic Johnston, director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and a former executive director of the Republican Party in Wisconsin. In the years that I have known Vic Johnston, I admired his political acumen, his integrity, and his personality. His personal sacrifices of time and seemingly inexhaustible energy for the well-being of this Nation are widely known, and Americans everywhere mourn the loss of one of its finest citizens.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I join my Republican colleagues today in expressing sorrow at the passing of Victor Johnston, field director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee. Few persons in public life were as knowledgeable as he was in the fields of government and politics. Yet, because he worked behind the scenes, serving officeholders and officeseekers in a dedicated but unassuming manner, Victor Johnston was little known, even to those who were followers of the American political scene.

He served a cross section of Republican Party leaders for over 20 years, and served them well. Both the men and women in politics, and the members of the press, valued him as a friend.

If it is in the best interest of American democracy to have a strong, responsible two-party system, and I believe it is, then Victor Johnston contributed greatly to this goal. My party will miss his dedication and his wise counsel. My personal sympathies go out to Mrs. Johnston, his family, and friends.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to join with many of my colleagues in remembering Victor A. Johnston, a noble member of the Republican Party, and, in his own right, one of the powerful denizens of Capitol Hill. Vic was powerful because of his meaningful contacts with leaders in Washington, many of whom owed him homage for their successful elections. But Vic never chose to use this power. More than anything else, he is remembered for his unostentatious air and his preference for remaining behind the scenes.

It has been said that a man gets to heaven through the virtues of his wife, but a politician must say, if he is humble, that he achieved office through the virtues of his campaign manager. Mr. Johnston worked for and loyally supported all of the present Republican leaders in the Senate. And he gave Members of our party in the House of Representatives his constant advice and, whether we thought we needed it or not, his sympathy. Vic was a friendly port during political storms and a veritable lesson in American history.

Here was a man who could give a running account of the strengths and foibles of nationally acclaimed or defamed politicians. Vic Johnston came to Congress with Senator Joe McCarthy and he left service of Republican Senators during the leadership of the respected Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN. He served the party for more than a quarter of a century, and never during that time was known to have said an unkind word about the people he tendered.

Mr. Johnston never personally worked in my campaigns, so my tribute to him is only as a friend, who was proud to know him. I learned much about the business of politics from Victor, not how to win an election, but the human side of this hectic business. His flowing white mane was a well-known sight here in Washington. He added a flavor that visitors expect to see in the Nation's Capital.

And so I add my salute to Victor Johnston, a true gourmet of life.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Victor Johnston's service to the Republican Party and to American politics was long, dedicated, and constructive. During times of triumph and times of difficulty alike, he worked hard and patiently to promote the party's candidates and to advance its principles. Although he did not seek personal limelight, he was well known and well liked throughout the Nation, and his sudden death shocked and saddened us all.

I would like to add my voice to those paying deserved tributes to Vic Johnston today, and express my sincere condolences to his family, associates, and friends.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all those who knew Vic Johnston must be saddened by his loss. A fine gentleman, a loyal Republican, and a good friend to us all, Vic will be sorely missed by our party. I extend to his family my sincere sympathy.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice to those who arise here today to pay tribute to the late Victor A. Johnston. It was my good fortune to meet Vic Johnston in 1951 when I was just beginning my service in this body. Mr. Johnston at that time was an aid to my fellow Ohioan, the late Senator Robert A. Taft. Despite the great demands on his time, he gave me the benefit of his counseling, and that counseling was of great aid to me in the performance of my congressional duties. No man ever went to Victor Johnston for help and left unsatisfied.

Victor A. Johnston was a politician. It is true that he was a rarity amongst those who have chosen to serve in the political arena for he chose a life of anonymity—but because of his work, many men rose from that field of anonymity to great national recognition.

The Republican Party was indeed fortunate that it had such an astute, dedicated servant. The campaigns directed by him were wise and hard fought but always conducted with the integrity that was so ingrained in the man himself. Those with whom he contested went to him with outstretched hand when the campaign was over.

Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us mourn the passing of this great American. Those of us who had the privilege of his friendship were indeed fortunate. His passing has left an irreplaceable void in our lives.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in connection with the tribute to Victor A. Johnston, former staff director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of 1791 is a benchmark in the struggle of men to form governments guided by the consent of the governed.

When Poland adopted this constitution 176 years ago, the world was filled with assorted monarchies, tyrants, dictatorships. Total dominion over hundreds of thousands of people was the order of the day.

Under the provisions of this great constitution, however, protection was extended to the peasantry, the townsmen, and the people of Poland, regardless of their station. Law was finally on their side.

That such a document, modeled after our own great American Constitution, could be adopted in a continent seething with intrigue, power plays, and total disregard for human life and human integrity, is an indication of the intellectual depth and political courage of the Poles themselves.

By that modern and farsighted decision, Poland emerged from medieval times and stepped into the enlightened age of reason.

By this single stroke, Poland's Government was transformed from absolute monarchy to one of limited monarchy with guaranteed protection for all the people.

The obsolete, tyrannical features of the old system were abolished. Class distinctions were virtually eliminated. People were free to worship as their conscience guided them. The electorate was enlarged. Many of the economic barriers between the nobility and the merchants were removed.

As the world knows, Poland was invaded immediately after the enactment of the Constitution and suffered eventual extinction as an independent state.

So great was the historical imperative of that great Constitution, however, that May 3 has continued to be acclaimed as a day of celebration and joy and remembrance for Poles around the world.

The flame that flickered so bravely on that day 176 years ago lit fires of freedom in the hearts of honest men the world over. That such a document could be promulgated and so wholeheartedly accepted speaks eloquently of the quest for liberty that has endured through all the ages.

Men were not meant to live in bondage to other men. With the help of men of good will, the chains that even today bind millions of people to tyrannical oppressors will be broken. The people of the captive nations of Eastern Europe know that we in America will not forget their brave history and their fortitude in the face of overwhelming odds.

Mr. Speaker, there are those who at this late date still wonder what we are doing in Vietnam. Among these people are some who cannot understand that the great struggle for human dignity is going to inspire men, whether it was in 1791 in Poland or in 1967 in Vietnam.

This continues to be the mortar that holds men's dignity together. Still there are those of us and all of us who pray with all our hearts that we can bring to an early end the conflict in Vietnam. The fact of the matter remains that the very principles for which we are today fighting in Vietnam are the principles that men have fought for from the beginning of time.

We find in the Polish Constitution an example of the kind of bravery that can link men together to fight for an ideal and a cause. We find that same linking together today in Vietnam. So, as we pause to pay tribute to a document that was too revolutionary in 1791 for the continent of Europe and just as the people of Vietnam today are trying to carve out for themselves an island of human freedom and dignity, so these Poles 176 years ago tried to carve out for themselves a nation of dignity and freedom. Just as 176 years ago there were powers, dictators, men who could not understand the great force of freedom, who tried to extinguish the spirit of the Polish people, there are people today trying to extinguish that same spirit in the people of South Vietnam. We as Americans have paid tribute to these gallant Poles for these many years, and today we pay tribute to the great people of South Vietnam for the two instances are identical and parallel to each other.

Freedom has never been an easy commodity. Just as 176 years ago today the people of Poland dared to bring upon the continent of Europe a new concept of human dignity, so today millions of people are struggling for that same concept in Vietnam. We are certain that the day will come when tyranny will have to give way to freedom. This is why it is important for us to pause here in this Congress as we do once a year to pay tribute to the gallant Polish people. For their gallantry and stubborn belief in the dignity of man they have written their own page of inspiration. Similar pages have been written by other people in the past. We as Americans who are willing to pay the supreme price for our own human dignity and our own freedom always nurture and cherish those moments of history when people had the courage to stand up and fight for human dignity and freedom.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to stand with my colleagues in this Chamber today in commemoration of one of the great moments in history. Just as in 1791 the Polish people would not accept tyranny over the people of Poland, today I would hope, as I have said in previous years, that those who report the activities of Poland would make a distinction—Poland today continues to be Communist dominated, but Poland's people will never be Communists. One hundred seventy-six years ago they proclaimed the principle of human freedom and of human dignity and respect for the rights of the individual when they adopted the new Constitution that we honor here today. That principle and that spirit lives on in Poland today.

While the Communists impose on the people of Poland great restrictions in free speech and religious freedom and educational freedom, and on all of the other freedoms, the fact remains that the spirit of freedom burns as brightly today among the 34 million Poles as it did in 1791 when they adopted this Constitution.

I know this: So long as we pause in this busy Congress as we do on various occasions, including the Polish Constitution Day, we will serve as a reminder to these people behind the Iron Curtain that this country has not forgotten their plight, and that we stand behind them in their fervent hopes and prayers that some day they will be able to join the family of free nations and free people, for indeed the good Lord intended man to be free.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of rich privilege that I join in tribute to the people of Poland and the giant contribution they have made to the welfare and the moral and cultural advancement of our country and of the world. I thank my good friend and able colleague from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] for having set aside this time for observance here in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

During the many years that my constituents in the second district of Illinois, in their gracious generosity, have kept me in the Congress, never once have I been silent on Poland's proud anniversary. Chicago owes so very, very much to men and women of Polish birth or descent that silence on the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791 would be nothing less than a disservice to my constituents. The heart of the Polish people is part of the heart of the second district of Illinois.

Generals Kosciuszko and Pulaski fought beside Washington in our War for Independence. And long before that, in the earliest colonial days, the strength and courage and dedication of the Polish settlers supported John Smith in the perilous days at Jamestown in Virginia.

During our Civil War, Polish officers and troops fought for the preservation of the Union, while Polish nuns cared for the dying and the wounded on our battlefields.

In World Wars I and II, in Korea, and in Vietnam, American boys of Polish blood answered their country's call to make the world safe for democracy.

Lt. Julian Olejniczak, son of a steelworker from the 10th ward in Chicago, whose story of heroism was told in the Saturday Evening Post, is one of many heroes of the war in Vietnam whose forefathers came from Poland.

Ten of our colleagues from the Middle West in the House are of Polish blood: four from Chicago, the Honorable Edward J. Derwinski, the Honorable John C. Kluczynski, the Honorable Roman C. Pucinski, and the Honorable Dan Rostenkowski; two from Wisconsin, the Honorable Alvin E. O'Konski and the Honorable Clement J. Zablocki; and two from Michigan, the Honorable John D. Dingell and the Honorable Lucian Norbert Nedzi.

I think it is not inappropriate, Mr. Speaker, to point out that the distinguished gentleman to whom we are indebted for this special order [Mr. Pucinski], has a war record that is second to that of none. He was one of our first flyers over Japan when the risk was great and the danger ever present.

May 3, 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own Constitution, Poland adopted a Constitution which marks that country as a pioneer of liberalism in Europe. It eliminated with one stroke the fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. It proclaimed the sovereignty of the people, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany.

The Polish Constitution of May 3 proclaimed:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Over a thousand years ago Poland linked her destiny with that of the West. During a period equal to one-half our Christian era, Poland linked her destiny with that of the West, and became an integral and creative force in its culture.

Today, Polish Americans have set their purpose to the ultimate liberation of their homeland. In their hopes and in the attainment of their prayers all Americans join.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank my distinguished colleague from Illinois.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON on Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman in the well upon the very fine statement which he has just made.

Mr. Speaker, all of us must remember that the Polish people are a people as a nation who have been good friends of the United States of America through many years. While the United States does not agree with policies of the present Government of Poland, nevertheless those of us who have been to Poland recently know of the real good will of the people toward America. It is good to send our U.S. greetings to the people of Poland.

We American friends of the Polish people know what good friends they are and how the Polish people have expressed their friendship over the years to the people of the United States. I join with my many U.S. friends of Polish descent in sending our friendship and best wishes on the occasion of Constitution Day.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join our colleague from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] in this tribute to the Polish people.

In this day when much is said of change in Eastern Europe, we would do well to recall the most important feature of national sovereignty; that is, the right of a people to determine their own destiny.

What the Polish people yearn for today is not dissimilar to the ideals envisaged in the Polish Constitution of

May 3, 1791. Here was the kernel of constitutional democracy. Ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments were established; the liberum veto was abolished. The towns were given full administrative and judicial autonomy; special privileges of the gentry were abolished; serfs were placed under protection of the law, with a view to the complete elimination of serfdom.

The Constitution itself underscored the mainspring of the Polish state, the will of the people:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

There is little doubt, therefore, that the seed of democracy might have ripened if Poland had been given the chance. Unfortunately, this was not the case. In 1795, Poland was partitioned for the third time by Russia, Prussia, and Austria, and disappeared as an independent state until after World War I.

Today, 176 years since the Constitution of May 3 was signed, we take the opportunity to commemorate the brave reforms of the Polish Constitution. As Americans who have experienced the war of independence, we extend our heartfelt support to the Polish people in their quest for freedom and liberty in their own land.

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, Congress once again pays tribute to a people who for more than a thousand years have endeavored to follow the path of peace and freedom, the people of Poland.

We are all acquainted with their struggles over the centuries, and that a Communist regime is utilizing all its power to force them to forget the democratic glory of the May 3 Constitution of 1791. This they will never do. It has become a cherished tradition that has sustained them in spite of the heavy yoke of Communist rule. It is not merely a document in history's archives, but a vital symbol of assurance that Poland will once again stand in full freedom and liberty. The Communists have suppressed freedom of expression in many areas, but they will never extinguish it in Poland.

Toward the end of World War I, the people of Poland proclaimed their independence once more, and for the next 20 years the history of Poland was one of reconstruction and revival. They took their place among the sovereign, independent states of Europe, and became a power in Eastern European affairs. However, in 1939 Poland was marked for destruction by the joining of the two forces of Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. During World War II the fate of these brave people was most uncertain and, unfortunately, their sufferings did not end with the conclusion of that conflict. They have been under a Communist regime since 1945 that has been as oppressive as any of their former foreign foes.

For more than 20 years they have suffered under totalitarian tyranny, and while there is a continued effort by the Communists to throttle communication between the citizens of Poland and the West, the bonds of friendship cannot be wiped out.

We, in America, owe much to our fellow Americans of Polish extraction who have enriched our culture and defended our Nation in its time of need, and on this anniversary of Polish Constitution Day, we join with them in the ardent hope and prayer that Poland will soon again be truly free and independent.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we take time today to observe one of the most important events in the annals of democratic government. On May 3, 1791, the people of Poland proclaimed a new constitution that included the rights of free speech, free press, and the guarantees of democratic institutions we have in our own heritage.

This remarkable document of a nation with whom many associate, at least geographically and historically, non-Western traditions actually reaffirmed Poland's position as one of the forerunners of what we call the Western Community of Nations. Some 800 years before, when Poland embarked on the first millenium, the British nation with whom is identified democratic society and parliamentary government had barely begun its modern history. It was 100 years before William the Conqueror and his Normans moved into the British Isles.

Although Poland's experience with liberalism based on the fundamentals of human freedom and national sovereignty was shortlived as a result of its partioning, its heritage has served well the Western World. Moreover, the seed of liberal democracy that was planted in 1791 has sustained the Polish people, withstanding both the test of time and the periodic onslaught of alien domination.

The tenacity of Polish nationalism is evidenced by the fact that from time to time since the partioning in 1795, the Polish will has been heard and felt despite the suppressive measures that have been brought to bear.

It is inevitable that Poland's identity will be renewed again. Its strength and power will not be denied; for Poland's history is filled with the presence of patriots, authors and scientists, individuals with inquiring minds ready to challenge old myths because their respect for truth and quest of knowledge could not be stifled.

During this commemoration of Poland's National Liberation Day, we should draw attention, also, to anniversaries in the lives of several individuals of that character. This year marks the 150th anniversary of the death of the great Polish patriot, Thaddeus Kosciuszko, to whom our Nation owes so much for his help during our own struggle for independence. We observe, too, the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienikiewicz, the renowned author who gave us the moving novel, "Quo Vadis." And this is the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium, who uncovered and defined the fundamental properties of the atom.

It is readily understandable, Mr. Speaker, why we join the 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry to commemorate this day, the threshold of the second millenium. Not only are we eternally grateful for the lasting contributions of the three distinguished individuals I have mentioned, but we are forever indebted to the Polish nation as a whole for its legacy of liberal democracy.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to address the House today in commemoration of the Polish national holiday. I call to the attention of my colleagues the significance of this historic moment in Poland's history, when on May 3, 1791, they adopted a Constitution where—

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It was an assertion of democracy by the Polish people of that era, who recognized the need for individual freedoms so that man may fulfill his desires by his own initiative and choice rather than by dictation and force. This great rebirth by the Poles followed by 2 years the action of the people of the United States, who adopted a constitution whereby the government would be of the people, by the people, and for the people. We, in this Nation today, enjoy the privileges of this declaration and we have grown in strength and stature as the result of this action. However, in Poland today, the people are not that fortunate, for they are again in the throes of forceful direction by a power which rules their destiny not by their own choice but by tyranny. But whatever the Government of Poland may be, the spirit of liberal democracy and independence remains strong in the hearts of the Poles. It is their will to return to the principles of their Constitution and fulfill its objectives.

Because Poland took the initiative in 1791 to gain their independence, they have been a symbol for democracy in Eastern Europe. However, they have never had an opportunity to move forward as a free nation, because the forces of anarchy, which have dominated Eastern Europe, will not permit them to gain a stronghold as a free nation. Just 2 years after they declared their independence the Imperial Russian forces overran their country placing them in bondage. It was not until World War I that Poland was able to again claim its right as a free nation. Their independence was short lived for in 1939 the forces of nazism attacked them and with overwhelming might again placed them under bondage. With the Allied victory in World War II the Polish people were hopeful that they would regain their Government, however, the forces of communism which occupied their territory refused to give them this privilege and today they are under the rule of the Soviet Union. However, the people of Poland have not lost faith in their desire for freedom. With each passing day the people become more determined to win their cause.

But their struggle is not isolated for this same struggle is taking place in other parts of the world. Unless we, as the leader of the free nations, continue to support the strong cause of freedom, liberty will not triumph. If we can continue to encourage the oppressed people, they will seek their place and gain their individual independence.

A change toward a system of individualism is being forced on the Communist regime, and in time, the people will again rule themselves. I know we all look and hope for that day.

So let us speak out in observance of Polish Constitution Day and show the world that we intend to make every effort to see that tyranny and atheism are wiped out. Let us not discourage but encourage the peoples of the world to join us in the enjoyment of independence. By encouraging those under Communist rule to work for democracy we can one day enjoy a democratic society in a free world.

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, which is thus barely 2 years younger than our own great document. The similarities do not stop there, however, for the same spirit and belief in freedom which inspire the American Revolution and the U.S. Constitution were equally felt by the Polish people. This is well seen in the following quotation from the Polish Constitution:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of Society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

This democratic philosophy was considered a threat to Poland's totalitarian neighbors from its first pronouncement to the present day. Foreign armies, taking advantage of the lack of natural protective boundaries, have repeatedly violated Polish soil, but have been unable to quench the spirit of Polish liberty. We may anticipate with confidence that the day is not far off when Poland will again be free of all foreign domination and the Polish people will be able to determine their own destinies.

It is appropriate on this very important anniversary that we take note of three other significant events in Polish history. This year marks the 50th year since the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the great Polish novelist and winner of the Nobel Prize in literature, whose famous trilogy dealt with Poland's 17th century struggle for national independence.

The year 1967 is also the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the noted scientist and Nobel Prize winner in physics, as well as the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the Polish hero of independence.

In observing these important events, we should not only do honor to the memory of the departed great, but we should also recognize the invaluable contributions made to our Nation by the 10 million Americans of Polish origin. They have infused the traditional Polish love of democracy, and the invaluable gift of the Polish genius for creativity into the American culture. On this anniversary I extend greetings to all Americans of Polish descent and assure them of the moral support of the American people in their efforts to attain the liberation of Poland from Communist domination.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 176th anniversary of Poland's Constitution. On May 3, in 1791, Poland adopted a liberal Constitution, similar in many respects to our own American Constitution. But, unlike ours, it was never tested by time. The ink was barely dry when Poland was overrun and partitioned by her neighbors—Russia, Austria, and Prussia.

It is to Poland's lasting credit that she lit the torch of freedom and human rights those many years ago. She had a Senate and a House of Representatives as early as the 14th century, and she had local assemblies where representatives were chosen.

Poland extended freedom and religious tolerance to all within her boundaries. Her representative government was founded on the principle that the right to govern rested primarily with the people, and that the people were entitled to a voice in government.

While the Polish Constitution was written nearly two centuries ago, it is apparent that the love of freedom expressed in that document still lives and thrives in the heart of the Polish people. Americans who have traveled in Poland recently tell me that the love of liberty and independence has not been stifled by the brutality of Poland's oppressors these many years.

Our ties with Poland are broad and deep, and they go as far back as Thaddeus Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski, both of whom were great freedom fighters in our country as well as in their native land. America is indebted to Poland for giving us these military leaders at a time of need. America is just as greatly indebted to Poland for the sons and daughters she has given us who have contributed so much to the development of our Nation's culture, industrial might, and the professions—from the hardest and most menial kind of labor to the highest levels of achievement. Over 7 million Polish-Americans are an integral part of the American mainstream.

As we salute the brave and gallant Polish people on this anniversary today, we hope and pray that the day will come soon when Poland will be liberated and again take her rightful place in the family of free nations.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in the House of Representatives to commemorate a day which is dear not only to persons of Polish extraction but to all people throughout the world who love freedom.

Today, May 3, 1967, marks the anniversary of the adoption of the great Polish Constitution of 1791. Unfortunately, the love of liberty which can never be crushed in the Polish soul has not been allowed to be made manifest in that unhappy nation because today Poland suffers under the yoke of Soviet imperialism. This has been the tragic situation almost consistently since 1795. Today, as then, the ancient and proud people of Poland are suffering under a campaign of forced Russification. Yet, there is something in the Polish national character which can never be crushed and despite the tyranny and foreign oppression which has been Poland's unhappy lot, the nationalistic spirit and the Christian faith of the Polish people remain strong and resolute.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote to this House just one paragraph from the Constitution of 1791:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal and on a lasting foundation.

While the Constitution of 1791 was not a lasting document because of foreign oppression, its words ring down through the years and its meaning is as clear today as it was almost two centuries ago.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, when we glance at this great document, that Americans of Polish extraction are model citizens and exemplifiers of the splendid American dream. Hard work and honesty have been the distinctively Polish contribution to this United States and in my own 14th Congressional District, it is well known that neighbors of Polish extraction are universally good neighbors and on this great day all of the people of the 14th District, and I have the honor to represent a wide variety of ethnic and ethnoreligious groups, join together to say a silent prayer that once again the people of Poland will know the blessings of liberty and will have a chance to be the masters of their own destiny.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of Poland, by action of its Parliament on May 3, 1791, adopted what historians believe to be the first constitution embodying the basic tenets of human dignity and liberty, and established the basis for real democracy and democratic development of that nation. Laboring under the tremendous strain and stress of surrounding dictatorships, with Russia, Prussia, and Austria carving out or attempting to appropriate huge areas within its rightful boundaries, the Polish leaders of that day stood firm in their resolve to give to the people of Poland a form of government founded on the same democratic principles which later became the foundation stone of our great Government. Those were dark days for the liberty-loving Polish people, with dictators on all sides threatening to obliterate all Polish culture—yes, even the Polish language—and replacing them with the cultures and languages of these autocratic neighbors. But the National Diet stood firm in proclaiming the new Constitution, thus giving to the world this new concept of orderly, humane government.

Unfortunately, the adoption of this new form of government did not end the trials and tribulations of this great land and its people. The sinister influences of greed and aggression which has characterized her neighbors throughout the centuries and her inability because of her geographical and physical makeup to ward off the constant encroachment and attacks by her neighbors, brought about the further partitioning in 1836. Notwithstanding the continuing burdens of foreign oppression, the stalwart Poles never gave up their quest for freedom and independence.

There has remained within the heart and minds of Poles throughout the years the undying belief and determination that their culture, their patriotism, their democratic principles would ultimately triumph and that they would be permitted to live within their rightful borders in peace and tranquility. That hope and that belief is still fervently alive in the present population of Poland, crushed as it has been by present-day Communist dictatorship.

During the oppressive years of the 19th century many of the cultural and political leaders were forced to flee their homeland taking refuge in France, in England and in our own land of the free. Chopin fled to France, and there gave to the world his immortal works. Earlier Kosciuszko and Pulaski, fired with the spirit of independence and liberty, came to our shores to contribute immeasurably to our successful struggle for freedom.

After many years of foreign rule and domination, Poland again became a free nation as a result of our intercession following World War I. Its leaders were then faced with the struggle of establishing democracy after the tortuous years of autocratic rule. Great progress was being made, at times against almost insurmountable obstacles, but again, before their dreams had been fulfilled the iron heel of conquerors and oppressors took over their fair land in 1939, and the all too recurrent struggle for freedom and liberty has been renewed. To the eternal credit of the Polish people everywhere, the light of liberty remains undimmed. It is being carried and preserved by the faithful and determined Poles throughout the world. The struggle for freedom will not end until Poland has once more been returned to the circle of free nations, its people assured of the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. They rightfully look to our Nation for this relief; they know that the triumph of liberty and justice throughout the world for which we are expending our all will be shared by her brave people.

On this 176th anniversary date of their adoption of the first constitution of democracy I want to urge the Polish people to continue their faith in the ultimate triumph or right over might. The day is not far distant when they will again breathe the air of freedom, when their nightmares will have been forgotten and the joys of liberty and constitutional democracy will return to their beloved land.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to place into the RECORD a letter from the Polish American Congress on the subject of the observation of Polish Constitution Day and the several observances which occur in 1967 which are of great interest to the Poles throughout the world.

The letter follows:

POLISH AMERICAN CONGRESS, INC.,
Washington, D.C., April 18, 1967.

Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELSTOSKI: Commemorative programs in Congress marking Poland's May 3rd Constitution of 1791 and other significant events in one thousand years of the history of the Polish nation, have become a proud and cherished part of the ethnic heritage of ten million Americans of Polish ancestry. They are gratefully aware of the fact that these commemorative programs in Congress form a continuation of the golden thread of friendship, understanding and mutual pursuit of the ideals of freedom and independence that is woven into the fabric of the history of the American and Polish nations.

On the threshold of the second millennium as a nation born of its baptism and reared in Christian precepts of the West, Poland today needs our encouragement and help. Suffering under communist tyranny as the result of diplomatic confusion among the allied powers, the Polish nation, once called by a former President of the United States "an inspiration of mankind" for its heroic deeds in World War II, today fights with courage and rectitude to save its millennial heritage of Western culture from the encroachment by atheistic communism and its tyrannical disregard for human rights and the dignity of man.

May 3rd is the silent national holiday of the Poles longing for freedom and independence in Poland. Silent—because the communist regime is utilizing all its powers to force the nation to forget the democratic glory of the May 3rd Constitution.

This year's observance draws our attention to other significant anniversaries in Polish history. Namely: the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko; the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz and the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie.

The Polish American Congress which represents approximately ten million Americans of Polish origin, sincerely appreciates your past participation in the May 3rd programs in Congress, and appeals for your assistance in making the coming observance as impressive and memorable as in previous years.

With highest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

CHARLES BURKE,
Washington Representative, Polish American Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I have also introduced legislation this afternoon which would authorize and direct the Postmaster General to issue a commemorative stamp honoring Mme. Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium, which permitted us to enter the atomic age, on the centennial of her birth which occurs on November 7, 1967.

Without Mme. Sklodowska-Curie's discovery we could not perform the scientific experiments and enter into the atomic age—an age that we could exploit in terms of the peaceful use of atomic energy for the benefit of all mankind.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of May 1791, drafted and adopted on May 3 of that year is marked as a revolutionary move without bloodshed. By its liberal, democratic and progressive provisions Poland's governmental machinery was immensely improved and made more efficient. It placed a real check on the absolutism of the king. Irresponsible council type of government was cast aside and ministerial responsibility was introduced in its place. The king still retained many of his prerogatives, but these were to be exercised through a council. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old system were abolished, and class distinctions were wiped out. Personal privileges formerly enjoyed by the few were made available to all townsmen, and the peasantry was placed under the protection of the law. All these progressive features represented definite advances over anything yet known in that part of Europe.

It is almost tragic that Polish people could not enjoy the benefit of their Constitution of 1791, for they lost their freedom a few years after its proclamation. In observing the aniversary of that Constitution we in the free world echo the genuine patriotic sentiments of the Polish people.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to participate today in the commemoration of the 176th anniversary of the adoption of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Polish descent throughout the United States, over 30,000 of whom live in my own Seventh Congressional District of Illinois, will pause to observe this significant anniversary.

It gives me great pleasure to join them, and my distinguished Colleagues of Polish extraction in the Congress, Hon. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, of Illinois; Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL, of Michigan; Hon. THADDEUS J. DULSKI, of New York; Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI, of New Jersey; Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI, of Illinois; Hon. LUCIEN N. NEDZI, of Michigan; Hon. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin; Hon. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, of Illinois; Hon. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI, of Illinois; and Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, in celebrating Polish Constitution Day. My colleagues have afforded able and patriotic leadership, not only to Polish-Americans, but to all the American people. I commend and compliment the gentlemen for their dedicated public service and for their continuing efforts to sustain the hope for a Poland free from Communist bondage.

The adoption of Poland's Constitution of May 3, 1791 was a milestone in the history of Poland for it established a limited monarchy supported by a Parliament; privileges of land ownership and holding of public office were given to the townsmen; the peasants were placed under protection of the law; the first steps toward complete abolition of serfdom were taken; class distinctions were done away with; and absolute religious toleration was established.

The Polish Constitution of 1791 was thus a milestone in the struggle of mankind to establish representative and democratic governments with the full protection of law and equal justice extended to all of the people.

That these judicial and political reforms were instituted at all is an accomplishment worthy of note, but that they were accomplished without bloodshed or domestic violence is indeed awe inspiring. On May 3, 1791, Poland demonstrated to the world what could be done when a nation dedicates itself to the ideals of democracy and liberty for all its people.

May 3 has thus rightfully become a national Polish holiday. While the Poles did not have the privilege to live for long under this Constitution, the true spirit of the Constitution lives on in their hearts, and one day soon the dream of freedom for which they have struggled over the turbulent centuries will be realized.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, today, this House has set aside time, as it does every year on May 3, to commemorate the Constitution proclaimed by Poland in 1791.

As Americans who cherish the freedoms guaranteed by a Constitution born in the same era, we should be particulary mindful of the problems of the Polish people—a proud people, whose history as a nation has survived tragedy in every century since its founding in the year 966.

America's geographic isolation has long been one of our Nation's strengths. Poland, on the other hand, has been the victim of geography—a battlefield on which the rising and descending powers of Europe and Asia tested their strength at the expense of the Polish people. And yet, despite the long years of subjugation, the strong will for freedom has never weakened, their quest for independence has never faltered.

Neither the Mongol hordes, nor the Swedes, nor the Hapsburgs, nor the Russians, nor the Nazis were able to extinguish the burning desire of the Polish people or the democratic spirit of the Polish Constitution. Nor will the present ruler succeed. Even in the world of monolithic communism, Poland is the strongest renegade—the Polish tradition, strongly steeped in freedom and religion—defies full domination by a foreign power.

The Polish link to American independence is a testament to this yearning for political rights and liberty. It was established early in our history when the first group of Polish settlers came to the New World in 1608 to help settle Jamestown and were praised for their industry by Capt. John Smith. Many sons of Poland fought in General Washington's Army during the American Revolution. The best known among them were Kosciuszko and Pulaski.

Today Americans of Polish descent fight side by side with Americans whose ancestors came from nations around the world. They fight for our freedom, so it is fitting that we in America remember Poland by marking the 167th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, and we pay tribute to a people whose free spirit will one day throw off the yoke of tyranny to give an indomitable nation its rightful place among other nations.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to preserve the democratic glory of the May 3 Constitution of Poland, I would like to insert into the RECORD a statement that I have received from the Polish American Congress pertaining to the May 3 Polish national holiday.

This statement eloquently manifests the greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution and serves to remind us that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

We are deeply indebted to the Poles and should never forget their great contribution toward the betterment of mankind.

Though the Polish nation now lies within the confines of communism, I am certain that a strong national spirit still prevails and that one day soon this great nation will once again enjoy its freedom to pursue the democratic way of life.

The statement follows:

MAY 3D—THE POLISH NATIONAL HOLIDAY

(By the Polish American Congress, Inc., Washington, D.C.)

On May 3rd Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

In the United States, wherever Americans of Polish descent live, in cities and towns from coast to coast, this holiday is observed with appropriate exercises through the month of May to pay tribute to the Polish nation and to remind fellow Americans that Poland was one of the first pioneers of liberalism in Europe.

It was on May 3rd in 1791, barely two years after the adoption of its Constiution by the United States in 1789, that Poland without a bloody revolution or even without a disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline. But this great rebirth and assertion of democracy came to the Poles too late and did not forestall the third partition of Poland in 1795 by Russia, Prussia and Austria.

POLAND PIONEERED LIBERALISM IN EUROPE

The greatness of the May Third Polish Constitution consisted in the fact that it eliminated with one stroke the most fundamental weaknesses of the Polish parliamentary and social system. The Poles raised this great moment in their history to the forefront of their tradition rather than any one of their anniversaries of glorious victories or heroic revolutions.

We Americans who have been reared in the principle given us a birthright by the founders of our great Republic, the principle of the sovereignty of the people in the state, which is the primary postulate in the 1791 Polish Constitution, can see how this truism cut off the Poles and the Polish political tradition completely from both the Germans and the Russians, who have been reared in the principle of state, and not national, sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then, as it has been throughout the years that followed and even unto today, a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795 Russian and Prussian soldiers were sent to Poland to partition and rape her. In 1939 Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the obsolute totalitarianism systems of naziism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

In the Polish Third of May Constitution this liberalism was formulated in these words:

"All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation."

AMERICAN AND POLISH CONSTITUTIONS SIMILARLY INSPIRED

The philosophy of government discernible throughout the Third of May Polish constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

Meditation on the anniversary of May the Third deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and of every American of Polish origin. It reminds all Americans of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind, and prophesies the ultimate triumph of justice, even though Poland once more has been deprived of her independence, sovereignty and her territory by one of our former allies, Soviet Russia, with the consent of other United Nations.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, few events in the glorious history of man's struggle for democratic ideals are more significant than the promulgation of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. Today, 176 years later, the world remembers and hails that momentous victory for democracy.

Throughout this month, Americans in cities, towns, and villages from coast to coast will pay tribute to the Polish nation as a pioneer in the spirit of liberalism. In an age largely characterized by autocracy, the courageous Polish patriots set forth a document embodying great liberal, progressive, and democratic ideals. Their constitution laid the foundation for a form of government, which, if adhered to faithfully, could have brought a large measure of genuine democracy to the people of Poland. It provided for ministerial representation, eliminated invidious class distinctions, paved the way for the eventual abolition of serfdom, established full religious toleration, and made way for further governmental reforms. In some ways it is strikingly similar to our own American Constitution, set forth 2 years earlier; for example, in the words of the Polish Constitution:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is a great tragedy of Polish history that the great Third of May Constitution was never allowed to be realized. Its promise was destined to go unfulfilled, for Poland was forced to endure the terrible Second Partition in 1793. Yet exterior forces could never really mar the significance of Poland's great stride toward democracy taken on that great day in May, for Poland had proclaimed irrevocably and for all time that her people were on the side of liberty and democracy.

Today, then, Mr. Speaker, we join in paying tribute to a great people and a great nation. I send greetings to my many friends of Polish ancestry in my own Third District of Pennsylvania, as well as throughout the United States and the world. By commemorating this glad occasion we pledge ourselves once again to the glorious ideal that one day all men shall be free.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the Polish nation, although partitioned and suppressed many times throughout its history, has not fallen into oblivion or obscurity. Rather, it has amazed the family of nations with its capability to muster strength and courage, to rebuild its fallen walls, and to produce men whose stature and significance are respected by all.

A chronicle of the sciences, for example, would not be complete without mention of Mme. Marie Sklodowska-Curie. Together with her husband, Pierre, Mme. Curie defined the fundamental properties of the atom and discovered radium. For outstanding achievements in physics, the Curies received the Nobel Prize in 1903 and 9 years later, in 1912, Mme. Sklodowska-Curie was awarded the Nobel Prize again, this time for her preparation of pure uranium and for defining its atomic weight. On this 100th anniversary of her birth, we laud the famous Polish scientist and her contribution to the field of physics.

Literature, too, bears the mark of Polish endeavors, and today, we would do well to single out Henryk Sienkiewicz for distinction. Truly great literary works withstand both the test of time and the limitations of nationality. Last fall recorded the 50th anniversary of the death of Mr. Sienkiewicz but there can be no doubt that "Quo Vadis," the masterpiece of this Polish author, has been established as a permanent and universal contribution to world literature.

Perhaps the most noteworthy efforts of the Poles lie in the political realm, for these constitute the backbone of a state. This year we commemorate the 150th anniversary of the birth of Tadeusz Kosciuszko, well known as a freedom fighter, both to the Polish and the American scene. Kosciuszko had served in the Continental Army for about 6 years during the Revolutionary War. He knew and understood the struggle for a nation's independence; he hoped the same could be achieved for Poland. In 1784, when news of impending internal reforms in Poland reached Kosciuszko, he hastened home to offer support and encouragement.

On May 3, 1791, Polish patriots instigated a written revolution in the form of a Constitution. The reforms provided for in the Constitution were far reaching in their initiation of democratic principles. The paralyzing liberum veto was abolished, while ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments were instituted, both of which showed promise of being effective instruments of government. Furthermore, suffrage was extended, and the peasants were placed under protection of the law.

Unhappily, neither the ardor of the reformers nor the armed battle of men like Kosciuszko sufficed to withstand stronger foreign powers. Poland was partitioned at the beginning of 1793 by Russia and Prussia, and then again in 1795 by Russia, Prussia, and Austria.

Though the brave attempts of the Constitution of May 3 were suppressed, the ideals have been revived and passed on through generations of Poles. Just as Poland continues to produce men and women of outstanding abilities, so it will perpetuate the struggle for liberty. The Polish spirit cannot be vanquished: determined in character, courageous of heart, it will yet see the dreams of Kosciuszko realized; it will inspire more Sklodowska-Curies and Sienkiewiczs; it will resuscitate the democratic principles of the Constitution of May 3.

Mr. **KLUCZYNSKI**. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in commemorating the anniversary of the May 3 Constitution of Poland. That great Polish document was an outstanding landmark in the rich history of that nation, and, indeed, in the history of mankind's striving for democracy.

Set forth in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of our own American Constitution, the May 3 Constitution contained an undeniable promise of democracy for Poland. Contemporary observers hailed it for its progressive, liberal, and democratic spirit. The great British statesman and political theorist, Edmund Burke, exclaimed that it "contained the seeds of continuous improvement, being built on the same principles which make our British constitution so excellent."

Let us look briefly at some of the outstanding features of that great document. The May 3 Constitution converted Poland into a hereditary limited monarchy with ministerial responsibility and biennial parliaments. Ministerial responsibility was an extremely important part of the constitution, for herein lay the seeds of a British type of constitutionalism. Moreover, the Constitution abolished the obstructive machinery of the antiquated system of government and eliminated class distinctions. Peasants were placed under the protection of the law. Absolute religious tolerance was established. Yet, regrettably, this glorious blueprint for Polish democracy was destined to be discarded only 2 years later as a "dangerous novelty," in the terrible Second Partition of Poland in 1793.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the May 3 Constitution was set aside on September 23, 1793, when Poland was reduced to one-third of her original size, having lost all her eastern provinces to Russia and much of her territory on the west to Prussia. Yet, long after the destruction and evil of those conquering powers have been forgotten, mankind will preserve the memory of the great May 3 Constitution. In commemorating this great occasion of May 3, we help preserve the sacred memory of one of man's most significant acts.

Mr. Speaker, commemoration of the great Polish anniversary of May 3 deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole, of every American of Polish origin, and, yes, of every man everywhere who believes in democracy. It is thus a very meaningful and heartwarming occasion, not only in my own fifth district of Illinois, but throughout our great land, and all over the free world.

Mr. **FLOOD**. Mr. Speaker, on this 176th anniversary of Poland's pioneering Constitution of 1791, I want to join with many of my colleagues in remembrance of Poland's great contributions in the struggle to advance human freedom and the level of attainment by civilized man. And I am honored to renew my pledge to do all I can to help bring about the achievement once again of true Polish freedom and independence.

No nation on the face of this earth has been more dedicated than Poland, throughout its long and frequently tragic history, in the cause of human freedom and national independence. And no nation has been a greater beneficiary of that dedication than these United States, where we owe so much in our own Revolutionary War to the gallant Polish heroes who adopted our cause as their own.

No nation, Mr. Speaker, has done more to advance the cultural level of our civilization. And no nation has contributed a hardier and more loyal stream of immigrants to our shores. It is significant that the Constitution of 1791 which we honor today was, like our own Constitution of 1787, a source of inspriation to those who cherish freedom throughout the world.

During the past year, in which the millennial anniversary of Christianity in Poland was celebrated, many hopes for the full reintegration of the Polish people into the free community of nations were aroused. The spiritual achievements of this anniversary celebration will have lasting influence. By comparison the implacable hostility of the Polish Government to freedom of worship, made manifest in mean and jealous restrictions, will someday pass and be forgotten.

Yet with all President Johnson's commendable efforts to improve our relations with Poland, it must be observed that the Communist government's attitude still apparently remains unchanged. Only last month President Ochab, of Poland made a 3-day state visit to Rome. Although such calls are a tradition for visiting heads of state, the Polish President omitted any call upon Pope Paul VI. The New York Times reported the belief of Vatican experts that the last chief of state to shun a meeting with the pontiff was Adolf Hitler, during his visit to Mussolini in May 1938. It is a parallel that should give the Polish Government pause.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is appropriate to call attention to a very practical, concrete step which the House of Representatives can take to advance the cause of individual and national freedom in Poland as well as other captive nations. A special committee of this chamber could conduct an inquiry and study of all the captive nations including those in Eastern Europe, in the Soviet Union, in Asia and elsewhere. Particular reference should be made to the moral and legal status of Communist totalitarian control over these nations, and to the conditions existing there. Emphasis should also be placed on the means by which our own country can best assist them by peaceful processes in their present plight and in their aspiration to regain their freedoms.

In this 90th Congress and in the three preceding ones, I have sponsored, along with other Members, a resolution to achieve these purposes. House Resolution 14, to establish a Special Committee on the Captive Nations, which I introduced, is now before the House Rules Committee, along with resolutions for the same purpose sponsored by a dozen of my colleagues. Our resolution would establish a committee of 10 Members of the House from both parties, appointed by the Speaker. It would make such interim reports to the House of Representatives as it deemed proper. It would file its first comprehensive report, together with its recommendations, by January 31, 1968.

I feel confident that the facts brought to light through these studies and hearings would themselves focus a powerful searchlight on an empire too shrouded by darkness. They would lend strength and encouragement to those who may feel they are struggling alone to advance the cause of man's dignity and freedom, in Poland and elsewhere among the captive nations.

And so, Mr. Speaker, as we mark this anniversary of Polish freedom under law, I hope each of us will resolve to do all we can to speed the day when Poland will once again be a wholly independent member of the international community of nations. And I believe we can speed the day when the friends of liberty in Poland can feel that their individual freedom and dignity have at last become secure.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, and in doing so, we celebrate and honor the deep ties between our country and the people of Poland.

These ties are rooted in the principles we share, principles which were strikingly enunciated by the Constitution of May 3, 1791: liberty, representation, protection under law. They originated in the valiant participation of Polish soldiers and patriots in our own revolution and have been nourished by the rich gifts the Polish people have brought to our life and culture.

We all know how greatly Poland has suffered since it fell to inviding Russian Armies shortly after 1791. Repeatedly, it has borne oppression, partition, denial of religious and political freedom. But its people have never been without hope for the restoration of their freedom, never without faith in the ultimate triumph of their hope.

In my judgment, the finest tribute we can offer them on this anniversary is to rededicate ourselves to the achievement for all men of the ideals they espoused so nobly, so tragically briefly in the Constitution of 1791.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, May 3 marks the occasion of one of the most important Polish national holidays: the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. It was on this date 176 years ago that Poland adopted the Constitution through which the country transformed itself into a modern state. The Constitution was adopted at a critical time in Polish history. In 1772, the absolute rulers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria had taken away large sections of Polish territory. Facing possible annihilation, all forces in Poland united behind the new Constitution which was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France.

Regrettably, the Polish people have not been as fortunate as these other peoples, for the aggressive policies of bordering countries have time and again violated the sovereign territory of Poland. It is ironic, today, that this historic Polish date is not even mentioned in Poland under the present Communist dictatorship, but is observed by the many Polish communities in the free world, especially in the United States.

The support of both American and Polish citizens for the same principle of freedom can be described in similar historic events. It was on May 3 in 1791, barely 2 years after the adoption of a constitution by the United States, that Poland without a bloody revolution or any disorder succeeded in reforming her public life and in eradicating her internal decline.

The greatness of the May 3 Polish Constitution lies in the principle it embraced: the sovereignty of the people in the state. We Americans often take this principle for granted, for we have been reared in it as a birthright by the founders of our great Republic. The Polish people, however, were pioneers in a Europe beset with dictatorships and the principle of absolute state sovereignty.

The light of liberalism coming from Poland was then a threat to tyranny and absolutism in Russia and Germany. In 1795, Russian and Prussian soldiers met again on Polish soil, as the absolute totalitarianism system of nazism and communism again felt the danger of true liberalism coming from Poland just as in 1791.

The natural geographic protection of oceans and friendly neighbors has allowed the United States to nurture the growth of its system of government based upon a belief in the sovereignty of the people. The Polish people have not been offered the same opportunity. But this reality does not negate the importance of this occasion. The May 3 Polish Constitution was based upon a principle that citizens of Polish ancestry living anywhere in the free world can proudly support and join in celebrating. The principle is one men of all nationalities can actively support.

To the 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry and to the many other citizens of the free world who are descendants of that land, we can pay no greater tribute, we can make no greater wish, than to urge their continuing support for the principle so clearly stated in their May 3 Constitution:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, today citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate a Polish national holiday—the Polish Third of May Constitution Day. In the United States, alone, reside 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry.

It is highly significant that the "free Poles" have chosen as their day of national celebration the anniversary of the Constitution of Poland of May 3, 1791. It is not the day celebrated by the Communist government which today dominates Poland. For the Constitution of 1791—a truly remarkable document—epitomized the soul of a free Poland, the spirit of a people who, remembering a glorious past, were emerging from domination, and were confident of a future of freedom.

Long had Poland been the victim of her stronger neighbors, Russia and Prussia, both of whom used her as a buffer to their own military might, as well as a sphere of compensation for gains by the other on battlefields elsewhere. When Frederick the Great of Prussia died in 1786, relationships between Russia and Prussia deteriorated. Russia became involved in a war with Turkey. This involvement drew their attention from the Polish "problem," giving the leaders of that country sufficient security to embark on a reform of the Constitution, to bring it into line with the liberal thinking then current in Western Europe as manifested in the American Declaration of Independence and Constitution, and the stirrings of the French Revolution. A meeting of the Polish Parliament was called in 1788 to set about drafting these constitutional reforms, and the patriotic liberals, with the encouragement of King Stanislas, were hopeful that their propositions would be given immediate and careful consideration.

As often happens when the forces of change meet the forces of reaction, progress was considerably slowed—the discussions dragged on with opposition to liberalism and moderation being led by the military and landowning aristocracy. Nevertheless, with patience and awareness of every opportunity offered for progress on May 4, 1791—3 years since the original draft had been presented—the proposed constitution was placed before the Parliament for ratification and became the law of the land.

That Constitution paid tribute to a noble past. It was designed for a then free Poland. Yet it looked to the distant future as well as to the contemporary scene—the theme of that Constitution was the love of liberty, the respect for individual freedom, and the granting of the rights of the individual on the basis of equality. This Constitution was, moreover, to be the standard for all the laws and statutes of all future legislatures of Poland. Provision was made for religious freedom, for the civil liberties, for personal liberty, and the guarantee of these liberties by common defense.

In remembering their manifesto to those liberties as framed in the constitutional reforms of 1791, let us salute all those who sacrificed so much for what all of us hold so dear.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the 18th century is best remembered for giving birth to democratic ideas and institutions. In that age of revolutionary fervor the Poles wanted a new governmental machinery, more efficient and progressive than the one they had. In 1791 their democratic leaders prepared a constitution that was to meet their needs.

That historic constitution placed a real check on the absolutism of the king. A constitutional form of government was established, one with a cabinet of ministerial responsibility. The powers of the upper legislative chamber were curtailed, and those of the lower chamber were considerably enhanced. The electorate was enlarged and the peasants were brought under the protection of the law. Many class distinctions and privileges were abolished and the arbitrary power of local landlords over the peasantry was eliminated. Religious toleration was guaranteed, and the provision was made for the periodic amendment of the Constitution. With all these sweeping changes the Polish Constitution of May 1791 was rightly regarded as a momentous document; as such it was hailed by the champions of freedom everywhere. The Poles have always looked back at this constitution as their charter for freedom, and have observed its anniversary with due solemnity. On the observance of the 176th anniversary of Polish Constitution Day I am delighted to join my Polish-American friends.

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to commemorate the 176th anniversary of the proclamation of a Polish Constitution. On May 3, 1791, a short 2 years after our fledgling Nation promulgated its Constitution, Poland issued the first national declaration of liberalism Europe was to witness.

Their Constitution gave voice to the same aspirations for freedom and individual rights, breathed life into the same national longing for liberty that inspired our early patriots.

But unlike us, the people of Poland were not long able to enjoy the fruits of an enlightened Constitution. She fell victim to one, then another, of her mightier neighbors' ambitions for conquest and territorial gain.

Even now she bears the heel of an oppressive dictatorship; and the Communist ideology of an absentee landlord seeks to smother the atmosphere of freedom bravely born on that May day in 1791.

On this day we commemorate, as well, the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, that great Polish patriot, who fought for the cause of freedom in these United States when we sought our independence. Let us note, too, the 100th anniversary of the birth of Madam Curie, born Marie Skoldowska in Warsaw, Poland, in 1867. Her contributions to the world of medicine secure her a lasting place in history and are a particular source of pride to her native countrymen.

That this kindred nation, which has given so many of her sons and daughters to enrich our country and strengthen the bonds between us, is not yet free, stands as a challenge to all free men. Let today's commemoration be not only a tribute, but a solemn pledge to help Poland rejoin the brotherhood of independent nations.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that in the celebration of Poland's Constitution Day in the United States we hark back to the Polish Constitution of 1791. That document, forged only 4 years after our own Constitution and in the era of our Bill of Rights, like the latter, places strong emphasis upon the rights of the individual. In this respect the Polish Constitution reflects strongly the spirit of the times, which reached a climax a few years later in the French Revolution.

The theme of the Polish Constitution of 1791 is the love of liberty, the respect for individual freedom, the granting of equality to all its people. The courage and determination to achieve these goals for country and for the individuals who constitute it seem to emanate from this document. The note of freedom is recurrent as provision is made for the scheme of government. In it is expressed the determination to guard "liberty, and our natural rights" with "zeal and firmness," prizing this liberty and these rights "more than life, and every personal consideration" not only contemporaneously but for "future generations."

These clauses strike a note of sympathy in the United States. How like our own ideals and expressed principles, they make us reflect, too, upon our greater good fortune. For us throughout the ensuing century and a half there has been preserved for us a government which has respected that spirit of individual liberty and been able to maintain its independence as a country. Poland has been less fortunate. During that time its independence has been trampled, annihilated, restored, only to be trampled again. But the independent spirit of the Polish people has never been extinguished. In recent years it has found renewed expression to a certain extent, and there is further hope for the future.

Our sympathy extends beyond the formal barriers to Poland's freedom. We recognize the indomitable soul of Poland which through the ages has triumphed and maintained its faith in individual liberty and the dignity of man.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by my colleagues in our observing this 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, a truly great and historic document adopted on May 3, 1791.

The harmonious unification of the diverse elements of our free society has led the people of the United States to possess a warm understanding and sympathy for the aspirations of peoples everywhere. It is, therefore, fitting that we clearly manifest to the brave Polish people the historic fact that the people of the United States share with them their just aspirations for the recovery of their freedom and independence.

President Woodrow Wilson, in his January 1918 message to Congress, included in his famous 14 points the declaration that an independent Polish state should be erected. Ignace Paderewski organized thousands of Poles in America as volunteers to fight in support of that cause.

Poland, suffering under Communist tyranny today, still fights with courage and rectitude to save its ancient heritage of Western culture from the encroachment by atheistic communism and its ruthless disregard for human rights and the dignity of man.

Through coincidence, this year's observance also is the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko who rendered great service to the American Revolution. He was a military aide to George Washington and President Thomas Jefferson paid eloquent tribute to him as "the purest spirit of liberty."

This year also marks the centennial of the birth of a world renowned scientist who was born in Poland; namely, Madam Curie. Maris Sklodowska Curie discovered and defined the fundamental properties of the atom from radioactivity that changed the course of scientific thought. The entire world owes this citizen of Poland everlasting gratitude for her great contribution to science.

The year 1967 is also the 50th anniversary of the passing of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the greatest novelist Poland produced. Through his great novel of universal appeal "Quo Vadis," Sienkiewicz personified Poland's contribution to the growth and development of Western culture. Politically, Sienkiewicz was an "ambassador of Poland." It was he, who pleaded before the bar of Europe for his forgotten country.

The United States is the great Nation it is because of the ideals and industry of its people. There are today 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry who have done so very much for our own country and in recognition of this fact, one of our main highways is known as the Pulaski Highway, which is part of U.S. 40.

Despite the fact that Poland still suffers under the enslavement of Soviet communism, the flame of freedom which Paderewski lighted remains alive and burns brightly.

The United States can do much to aid freedom in Poland and the restoration of independence to that ancient country is a purpose that will ever be near my heart and to the heart of all good Americans. We look forward to a bright new day when once again Poland will be a truly free and independent land in the community of the free world.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, once again I am pleased to join with my colleagues to commemorate a major event in the historical battle for freedom and the right of people to establish their own form of government.

On May 3, 1791, Poland adopted a liberal constitution, patterned in many respects after our own revered American Constitution which had been written only 4 years before.

The Polish Constitution called for the separation of powers between the executive, the legislative, and the judicial branches of Government. As in the case of the American Constitution, it was based on the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people, that sovereignty resides in the citizenry, not in the state itself.

Unlike our own Constitution, the Polish Constitution of May Third was never tested by time. Shortly after its adoption, Poland was overwhelmed and partitioned by the three neighboring empires: Russia, Austria, and Prussia. In spite of the fact that Poland was more advanced and enlightened than any of those three states, their combined power proved too strong.

Yet Poles in the homeland and around the world have never ceased to honor that golden moment in Polish history. Thus we too today turn our thoughts to the May 3 Constitution in this millennium year, plus one.

For us at this point in time there is an important lesson to be learned, a lesson in geopolitics. For despite the fact that two nations adopted constitutions of a progressive nature, one nation grew and prospered, the other was carved up among its neighbors.

Was it because of some superior morality which infused the Founding Fathers of this Nation? Was there some flaw in the Polish character which meant its doom? I think not.

The most significant difference, it seems to me, was geography. The United States occupies a large portion of a continent with friendly nations. Poland, on the other hand, is a small part of its continent and historically has been surrounded by great powers.

The United States has been fortunate in being bounded by the great oceans and protected by strong naval forces, first the British and then our own U.S. Navy. Poland lies on a broad plain and is easily invaded.

Since we can be certain that these facts of geography will remain constant, we in America must try to understand how Poland's place in Europe has shaped the thinking of her leaders and her people. With such understanding we may be better able to see why recognition of the Oder-Neisse Line as Poland's eastern boundary is so important to the Poles. We may be better able to perceive what has happened—and why—since the 1956 October Revolution.

Understanding, it seems to me, is a better starting point for policy than condemnation.

Since 1960 I have had several opportunities to view conditions in Poland firsthand. As my mission reports have indicated, there is much which disturbs me in current Polish Government policies and society.

The Government has taken repressive actions against the church, which are inimical to man's freedom of religious practice.

Freedom to speak and to publish and to assemble are circumscribed.

Adherence to sterile Communist economic doctrines have, in fact, stunted Poland's economic growth and development.

Dependency upon the U.S.S.R. has required Poland to take actions and positions in international affairs which are in conflict with the interests and welfare of the West.

We certainly must not overlook these difficulties. At the same time, however, they should not be the cause for immediate condemnation and outright rejection of the Polish people. Rather, we should seek through diplomacy to foster forces of enlightenment within the Polish state.

In that regard, I applaud the recent agreement between Poland and the United States to postpone the payment of $17 million which were to come due this year under past Public Law 480 surplus sales agreements.

In my study mission report of August 1965, following a visit to Poland, I noted:

> The Poles have been meticulous in paying their obligations to the U.S. Government. These obligations arise from the settlement of our immediate post-World War II aid to Poland; Export-Import Bank loans extended during the late 1950's; settlement of claims of American nationals whose property in Poland was nationalized; and payments for Public Law 480 sales. Currently, the Poles are paying us, in U.S. dollars, $13 to $14 million annually under these various agreements. By 1967, however, these payments will double.
>
> In the meantime, Poland has been put in a double squeeze by the action of the Congress last year (1) in making Poland ineligible for further sales under title I of Public Law 480 (sales for Polish zlotys), and (2) in providing that sales under title IV of Public Law 480 (sales for U.S. dollars) would have to be paid for in 5 years—as against 20 years for other countries. Their difficulty is compounded by the fact that under the terms of the last Public Law 480 sales agreement, the Poles consented to purchase $30 million worth of U.S. farm commodities on straight commercial terms, and another $30 million worth on terms involving payment in U.S. dollars, in three annual installments.
>
> Poland's purchases of U.S. surplus farm commodities under title I have averaged approximately $50 million a year. By not being able to make additional purchases under title I, Poland is now forced to lay out increased amounts of very scarce hard currency earnings in order to meet its food and fiber needs. At the same time, as I already pointed out, her payments to the United States, in U.S. dollars, are about to double.
>
> In order to meet both her commitments to the United States and the basic requirements for food of her people, Poland has to increase her hard currency earnings, obtain credits, or solve her problem through a combination of both.
>
> Polish exports to the United States—approximately $54 million last year—cannot increase fast enough to meet Poland's hard currency needs. It would seem to me, therefore, that the one area where some compromise may be possible involves the terms of trade under title IV sales (sales for U.S. dollars). In my view, the United States should be prepared to negotiate these terms in return for some specific concessions. Lack of forward planning in this field may lead to some undesirable consequences.

The agreement which subsequently has been worked out with the Polish Government by our very able Ambassador, the Honorable John Gronouski, is fully in keeping with my recommendations at that time.

Further, the United States has proposed to accept the payment in zlotys instead of dollars, with the money to be used to finance English-language teaching in Poland.

This provision will help insure that future generations of Poles will have an opportunity to learn to read and speak the language of Shakespeare, of Milton, of John Stuart Mill, of Thomas Jefferson, of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, and of the U.S. Constitution.

Through the medium of language the young people of Poland will be able to learn of and understand the great Western concepts of man's dignity, his inalienable rights, including his right to liberty. Surely, such a program serves the interests of peace and freedom.

Mr. Speaker, Poland's future will not be an unbroken march toward Western ideals. There will be steps forward, and steps backward.

Through the element of an able and skilled diplomacy, we should try to maximize progression and minimize regression. In this effort our goal should always be that Poland overcome its geopolitical disadvantages in order that its people may live once again under the kind of enlightened government envisioned by the May 3 Constitution.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 176th anniversary of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791. This remarkable document established for the first time in Europe a constitutional monarchy and a responsible cabinet form of government. It reflected the ideals of a courageous people devoted to freedom. Tragically, this new form of government was never given a true test, as the Russian Army occupied Poland shortly after the ratification of the Constitution.

Throughout periods of oppression, and frequent invasion and occupation, the Polish people have maintained a fierce desire and appreciation for freedom. Today, we who live in the free world are able to celebrate and applaud those wise individuals who framed the May 3 Constitution. However, in a Poland which is once again subjected to occupation and external control, celebration of the May 3 Constitution must be carried on in a secret manner, because the Soviet-controlled government has abolished the holiday. Despite this ban, the 3d of May remains a symbol to the people of Poland—a symbol of the free and independent life they long for.

Mr. Speaker, we are all well aware of the many scientific, political, and cultural contributions of the Polish people to our country, and to the free world. Their efforts have added significantly to the intellectual and economic development of Western civilization. This year marks the 150th anniversary of the death of a Pole who contributed greatly to the freedom of our own country. Thaddeus Kosciuszko loved liberty so much that he came to this country in 1776 to help us in our fight for independence in the Revolutionary War. Shortly after his arrival here, he was commissioned a colonel and served as an engineer in the Continental Army. The following year he became a part of the Northern Army, and supervised the construction of the outstanding fortifications at Van Schaick, Saratoga, and West Point. As both an engineer and fighter, Kosciuszko performed brilliantly with the American forces, serving with great distinction for over 6 years. Eventually, he was promoted to the rank of brigadier general. Throughout the Revolutionary War, and afterward, he impressed all who knew him with his devotion to the cause of liberty. Thomas Jefferson described him as "the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known, the kind of liberty which extends to all, not only to the rich."

Thaddeus Kosciuszko remains the symbol of the freedom-loving Polish people. Today, as we recognize the achievements of Thaddeus Kosciuszko and the framers of the Constitution of May 3, we must not forget that there is a nation of Poles subjected to the will of an oppressing external government and deprived by their own government of the basic rights of man as set forth in the Declaration of Human Rights of the United Nations Charter. Our only consolation for this can be a feeling of confidence that these determined people will someday be free to develop a responsible and democratic government that will reflect their deep devotion to human rights.

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank you for this opportunity to join my colleagues in tribute to a country and a people who have fought and endured foreign invaders throughout most of their history. I salute the gallant Poles, and people of Polish origin everywhere, on this anniversary of their mighty Constitution of May 3, 1791, which symbolizes for them the hope of all mankind for a government of their choice, free of terror and oppression.

I take pride in the many citizens of

Polish blood in my own district, who contribute to the life of my area the strength, vitality, and sheer joy of living so characteristic of their race. I share with them their prayers for the freedom of their fellow Poles across the sea, and the fulfillment implicit in the beautiful words of a document as great and as inspired as our own:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

They will recognize this stanza from a familiar Polish hymn, which expresses far better than any words of mine the longing in their hearts:

Boze cos Polske przez tak liczne wieki,
Otaczal blaskiem potegi i chwaly,
Cos Ja ochranial tarcza Swej opieki
Od nieszczesc ktore pognebic Ja mialy,
Przed Twe oltarze zanosim blaganie,
Ojczyzne wolna racz nam zwrocic Panie.

O God, who, for so many centuries
Has granted to Poland the splendor of might
and glory,
Who, with the shield of Your protection,
Saved her from the misfortune designed to
destroy her;
Before Your Altars, we offer our prayers:
Return to us, O Lord, our free fatherland.

May that prayer be granted.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 176th anniversary of the adoption in Poland of the Constitution of 1791. Poles everywhere observe today as a national holiday, but those in Poland itself must do so silently.

The 3d of May Constitution was a flash of brilliance in Polish history, but did not save that country from further partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1795. Not until this century was Poland to again regain its independence—liberty that was to be again crushed—first by the planes and tanks of Nazi Germany in 1939 and then by Soviet tyranny.

The hopes of the Polish people, however, have never diminished and the spirit of liberalism which dictated this phrase from the 1791 Constitution, that "all power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people," continues to inspire Poland's true patriots in the struggle for freedom.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that today, the 3d day of May, marks a significant occasion, that of commemorating the 73d anniversary of the constitutional history of Poland.

We are well aware of the Polish role in history—courageous in war—and dedicated to the arts and sciences in peace.

Today, another May 3, we find this occasion to be a silent national holiday. Silent, because the Communist regime is utilizing all its power to force the Polish people to forget the democratic glory of their history. The Polish people, nevertheless, despite oppression, are aware of their heritage.

Here in America we are grateful to have over 10 million citizens of Polish origin. Their presence needs no silence. Therefore, on this occasion I wish to salute the Americans of Polish origin and all Polish people throughout the world. They are admirable people. They cherish and maintain the importance of the family institution. They possess energy for industry. Moreover, they retain their religious convictions. America is fortunate to include the people of Polish ancestry who have and are contributing immeasurably to the growth of our Nation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3, 1967, Polish Constitution Day, we pause to honor the courageous people of Poland. The Constitution which they created 176 years ago today stands as a symbol of the democratic spirit which dwells yet in the hearts of the East Europeans. This is a day when we, as free American citizens, should rededicate ourselves to the principles of liberty and justice for all humanity, principles for which our own precious Constitution stands. All too often, we of the United States take our democratic society for granted. In paying tribute to the suppressed people of Poland, we become aware that many societies on this earth are not free, that many peoples are held in bondage, subject to governments whose doctrines they do not believe in. When we recall the tragedy of the Polish people, whose great Constitution was not permitted to stand, who suffered the tyranny of the czarist occupation, the devastating divisions of their great homeland, and eventual subjugation by the powerful Communist state, we are filled with sadness for them and their fleeting dream of democracy.

History tells us that scarcely had the great Constitution been signed before threats came from St. Petersburg to destroy all it stood for. A little army of 46,000 volunteers did all that was possible to defend their precious homeland. Against great odds they held back for a time the czarist invaders. The infinite courage and dedication of this small force brings back to us our feeling of inherent pride in our own ancestors, whose patriotism and unbending determination for America's liberty won for us forever the right to be free.

The U.S. Constitution and the 1791 Constitution of Poland were inspired by a like dream. Each expresses the same ideals of liberty and justice for all mankind. Each expresses the principle that man should be free to develop his personality, to fulfill his promise as an individual, and to realize his own aspirations. Like our Constitution, the Polish document was intended to create a favorable environment, a land of liberty, that this principle might be realized. To accomplish this, both provided for government by the will of the people, parliamentary representation for all citizens, like privileges for men regardless of birth, protection by law of the individual rights of the people, civil liberty and destruction of the barriers of class distinction, and absolute religious toleration.

Poland's May 3 Constitution was abolished as a "dangerous novelty." American citizens will never believe that the concept of man's inherent right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness is a dangerous novelty. One hundred seventy-six years have passed and still the spirit of freedom lives in the hearts of the captured people of Poland. Through the years, the democratic tradition established in 1791 has evidenced itself many times in Polish history. Today, that document still stands as a precious symbol of liberty to the people of Eastern Europe.

On this May 3, we pledge to the people of Poland our faith in their will to freedom. Their dream of nationalism and their desire to create a land of liberty for all is not dead. The ideal of liberty dwells deep in the Polish soul and that spirit shall one day triumph. For, Mr. Speaker, what power on earth can stop a man, or a nation of men, that truly believes in freedom?

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, again this year I am greatly honored and privileged to join with my colleagues today in this commemorative program in the House marking Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791, as I have done every year since coming to Congress.

This Nation and the world are greatly indebted to the Polish people for their outstanding contributions and unstinted service and devotion to the cause of freedom down through the years. In our own country, persons of Polish descent can well recall with pride the heroic and illustrious service of Thaddeus Kosciuszko whose exploits in the American Revolution, particularly at the battle of Saratoga, helped to win French recognition of our independence.

Truly, this Nation owes a great debt going back to revolutionary days to people of Polish descent for their heroic service in our Armed Forces in time of danger and for their progressive citizenship, devoted support, and outstanding contributions in time of peace to well-being of our beloved country.

Many vicissitudes, trials, and tribulations have been visited upon the Polish nation since the May 3, 1791, Constitution, but always has the Polish zeal for freedom triumphed over cruel, relentless persecution. Today, the valiant Polish people are the victims of Communist oppression, but their consecrated belief in God and dedicated love of freedom shall again one day lead them to freedom and independence.

The Polish people do not seek to impose their wills upon any other peoples. They only pray and wish to be liberated from the iron grip of Marxist communism, which holds them in cruel serfdom. They strive and seek in every way to prevent the Communist tyranny from continuing its relentless will on them, their families, their communities, and their nation.

In a word, the Polish people are seeking to be released from bondage, to be permitted to resume their free way of life, to be rid of the oppression and cruel dictates of Communist oppression, which denies them in so many ways the right to life, liberty, and happiness and deprives them of their God-given rights as free men and women.

Americans have a special duty to the people of Poland and to their fellow citizens of Polish descent. This Nation must make it clear that it stands with the freedom-loving Polish people in every word and act designed to bring about independence and freedom to this unhappy land. We, in Congress, mindful of the origins of our Nation and opposed as we are to tyranny, bondage, and oppression, should resolve to do everything in our power to encourage and sustain the Polish people, to strengthen them in their purpose to be free again, and to help them in every way we can to reach that dearly-sought goal of liberation and self-determination.

Mr. Speaker, I have received from His Excellency, Aleksander Zawisza, Prime Minister of the Polish Government-in-Exile in London, a copy of President Zaleski's special message on the occasion of Poland's National Day, the 176th anniversary of the Constitution of May 3, 1791. I include this inspiring and informative statement along with my remarks, and heartily congratulate his Excellency, the President, upon his very impressive speech, and his able, courageous, effective leadership of the sacred cause of freedom which he represents:

Message of the President of the Republic of Poland to the Polish Nation

His Excellency August Zaleski, legitimate President of the Polish Republic, addressed the following message to the Polish nation on the occasion of Poland's National Day this year:

"On 3rd May 1791, the Polish nation enacted a new constitution based on the principle that "all authority in human society derives from the will of the nation," /art. V/. With a constitution founded on this principle, Poland became one of the most progressive countries of those times. But it also aroused the fears of her neighbours that she might introduce reforms to modernize her armed forces. Russia was the first to forestall this circumstance and her troops invaded the Polish Commonwealth. This was the signal for the further partitions of Poland.

"The same happened in 1939, when Russia again approached Germany with the proposal of yet another partition of Poland. Disregarding the differences between their socio-political systems, both these most imperialistic countries in Europe again concluded an alliance to which Poland fell victim.

"When Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia ultimately fell out over the division of their spoils, Russia willy-nilly found herself on the same side as Poland's western allies. The outcome was the joint victory over Germany for which Russia was paid with the freedom of eight independent countries in central Europe, including Poland.

"This severe blow at the ideal of justice and freedom cannot force the Polish nation to forgo its indubitable rights to independent existence. After all, world history for centuries past has shown that every lawless deed usually sooner or later ends up in disaster for those whose policies depend solely upon the exercise of power.

"Thus, there will be no real peace in the world until mankind acquires the conviction that lasting peace can be built only upon the tenets of justice and freedom.

"AUGUST ZALESKI."

LONDON, *May 1967*.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in observing today the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 3, a landmark in the thousand years of the Polish nation and a symbol of the spirit of liberty and democracy which continues to inspire and encourage both the people of Poland and freedom-loving persons around the globe.

This year we have special cause to commemorate this day, for 1967 is the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the great Polish patriot, a hero of the American Revolution, and a champion of liberty throughout his life. In those stormy years, when many Western countries were racked by the struggle between the defenders of autocracy and the advocates of freedom, Kosciuszko's constant devotion to the cause of national independence and democracy was an inspiration to his own people, to Americans, and to like-minded men throughout the Western World. In our own time, his example should encourage us to recommit ourselves to serve the great principles to which he gave his best.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the Polish nation has been a long, stirring struggle for national independence, and individual liberties. On this anniversary of the May Third Constitution, I want to join so many of my colleagues in paying tribute to the heritage of Poland, in sending sincere greetings to the Polish people, and in expressing our heartfelt hope that they will soon gain the increased freedom which they have sought with so much courage and fortitude.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, each year we in the Congress join with Polish-Americans throughout this country in commemorating the anniversary of Poland's Constitution of 1791. Today marks the 176th anniversary of that Constitution, whose traditions sustain the Polish people even under Communist rule. But there is much to celebrate today in addition to the anniversary of the Polish Constitution.

Last year Polish people everywhere celebrated the millennium of Poland's identification as a nation. They also hailed the millennium of the birth of their Christian faith. Few nations can boast similar anniversaries. Both these anniversaries demonstrate that Poland has continued to live in spite of the many misfortunes of her long life.

Poles and Polish-Americans have made tremendous contributions to mankind in the arts and humanities, religion, science and government, and this year marks significant anniversaries of Polish individuals who have won fame in these fields.

This is the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, a patriot and national leader of Poland, one of America's Revolutionary War generals, an aide to George Washington and a friend of Thomas Jefferson. It is with justified pride that we recall his part in our struggles as a new nation. This year is also the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, who contributed to mankind's knowledge and use of physics through her pioneering work with radium.

As they enter the second year of their second millennium as a nation, Polish people everywhere can look back with pride on a long and impressive history and a record of significant contributions to world civilization. And they can look to a future made hopeful by their continuing faith and strong ideals.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 176th anniversary of the adoption of the May 3 Polish Constitution. The Polish people's possession of their cherished democracy did not long endure. In 1795 the third partition of Poland ended the right of the Polish people to self-determination. Since that time, the Polish people have sought to exercise their love for freedom and democracy, but have been prevented from doing so by many unfortunate circumstances, including the presence of the Soviet Union at this time.

It is appropriate that this commemoration of the May 3 Constitution of 1791 should coincide with the observance of three other significant events in Polish history. Today marks the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the great Polish patriot who served not only his native land, but also the efforts of his Nation to win its independence; the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the brilliant Polish novelist whose works are a significant part of Western culture; and the 100th anniversary of the birth of Mme. Marie Skoldowska-Curie, whose discovery of radium is considered to be one of the most important scientific discoveries of all time. The citizens of the United States acknowledge the great debt that they owe to the Polish people for the many contributions they have made to this country and to the world.

It is important that we who are so abundantly endowed with freedom take this opportunity to encourage and sustain the Polish people in their struggle to assert their national identity and to exercise their right of self-determination and love for freedom. Let us all honor the memory of the May 3 Polish Constitution and hope that at some future day the principles and spirit it embodied will again be the basis of government in Poland.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, on this May 3d I am proud to pay tribute to the Polish people. The 1791 Constitution was enthusiastically received—both by Poles, who welcomed this opportunity to modernize their Government—and by friends of Poland who rejoiced at the peaceful undertaking of King Stanislaus and of the Polish Diet. Unfortunately, Poland was not to enjoy the "civil liberty and the good order of society" proclaimed by this document. She was quickly overrun in 1792 by the Russians and Prussians and subjected to a devastating partition. While the Russians threw out the 1791 Constitution they did not and could not take away from the Polish people the spirit of freedom and courage of conviction which inspired that charter.

Even today Poles express, whenever possible, their desire for freedom from domination and love of liberty. During last year's celebrations of Poland's millennium as a Christian nation, the Communist government realized that the Polish people would take this occasion to demonstrate their deeply religious fervor for their country and desire for its progress as a Christian nation. Not to be outdone, the Polish Government scheduled state celebrations to be held in competition with the church celebrations. But the Polish people continued to reject communism by supporting Cardinal

Wyszynski and other church leaders in Poland.

Mr. Speaker, we in the U.S. Congress join with our countrymen throughout the United States in anticipating a bright future for the Polish people, with every hope for the reinstatement of the ideals of the May 3 Constitution, so that Poland will once more be a voice of freedom in the world.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today the people of Poland commemorate their Constitution of May 3, 1791. The cornerstone of Polish independence and freedom was laid shortly after the promulgation and adoption of our own Constitution of 1787. Unfortunately, while the United States has enjoyed over a century and three-quarters of constitutional government, the Poles have, except for the period between the two World Wars, spent these years under the successive tyrannies of the czars and the commissars. Today while scores of new nations dot the continents of Africa and Asia, Poland is but another of the numerous colonies that comprise the Soviet Empire.

I am reminded, on this historic occasion, of the contributions to American independence that were made by two Polish soldiers who loved freedom so much that they crossed the Atlantic and helped the infant United States in its struggle against Great Britain. For a few minutes I want to discuss the achievements of Kosciuszko, who built the Military Academy at West Point, and Pulaski, who founded the U.S. Cavalry.

Tadeusz Andrzej Bonawentura Kosciuszko, who was born in Poland February 12, 1746, was known as the hero of two worlds. In August 1776, he arrived in America, where his military and engineering ability was immediately put to use in the service of the new republic. He constructed fortifications at various points, including Saratoga. The victory at Saratoga turned the tide for the Americans and led to France's recognition of the independence of the United States. Kosciuszko's contribution to that victory was recognized by his superiors and he was entrusted with the task of constructing the fortifications at West Point. It was the Polish volunteer who first suggested that a national military school be established there.

Altogether, he fought for 6 years in the American Army. In 1783 the Congress acknowledged his "long, faithful, and meritorious service" by conferring upon him the rank of brigadier general. The gallant soldier died October 15, 1817.

While there was triumph for Tadeusz Kosciuszko in America, there was only sadness for him in his native Poland, which was doomed to remain under the Russian despotism. Today America continues to enjoy her freedom while Poland remains subjugated by her giant neighbor. Although the tyranny bears a different label than it did in Kosciuszko's day, it is nonetheless a tyranny.

Another famous Polish soldier, Casimir Pulaski, was born 1748 and arrived in America in 1777. Pulaski, a brigadier general, founded the U.S. Cavalry. He led both the American Cavalry and the French Cavalry during the siege of Savannah. Pulaski did not live to witness the triumph of American arms, as he was wounded at Savannah on October 9, 1779. He died 2 days later.

Mr. Speaker, we who live in the United States today owe an unpayable debt to those brave early Americans who fought for independence from Great Britain. While we honor these men for the part they played in securing freedom for America, let us also salute the gallant soldiers who came here from other lands to help light the torch of freedom. High on the roll of distinguished foreigners who aided us in our struggle for independence we must place the names of Tadeusz Kosciuszko and Casimir Pulaski.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today is Polish Third of May Constitution Day and wherever there are citizens of Polish descent across the world, they are silently observing this national Polish holiday. I wish to join with my Polish brothers in this remembrance.

One hundred and seventy-six years ago this day, Poland adopted the Constitution that is still quietly followed by Poles everywhere.

In the face of the Communist tyranny now ruling their homeland, the Poles strengthen and renew their national fervor this day.

Their courage is increased by the memory of the strong years before: The Poles ask that once again their land be made free and independent.

This year's observances are fourfold. In addition to the day itself, three salient anniversaries of Polish-born heroes are being observed: The 150th anniversary of the death of Count Thaddeus Kosciuszko, America's Revolutionary War hero and aid to George Washington; the 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, great man of literature and author of "Quo Vadis"; and the centennial of the birth of Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the woman who discovered and defined the fundamental properties of the atom.

I ask that all Americans take several moments to meditate on the importance of this day with our Polish brothers.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have this opportunity to pay tribute to the stalwart Polish people on this Polish 3d of May Constitution Day.

It was on this day in 1791—not long after the adoption of our own Constitution—that Poland succeeded in reforming her public life by adopting a Constitution which declared that "all power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people." Unfortunately, this light of liberalism emanating from Poland was viewed by her Prussian and Russian neighbors as a threat to their absolutist form of government, and in 1795 these two nations sent their military forces to partition and plunder freedom-loving Poland.

As we reflect on this momentous historic event, we are reminded, once again, that tyranny cannot coexist with freedom, and that freedom will ultimately prevail. This anniversary also calls to mind the common bond between the American and Polish peoples who share a deep dedication to the cause of liberty and the rights of man.

On this occasion let us join the thousands of Polish-Americans, who have contributed so magnificently to the growth and security of our country, in reaffirming our hope that the courageous, liberty-loving Polish people may soon have a government entirely of their own choosing which will permit them to live again in peace and freedom.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, I am glad again to have the honor of participating in these ceremonies commemorating the Polish Constitution of 1791. Once again, I pause to reflect upon the long and glorious history of a people long devoted to those principles of individual freedom and democracy which we in America hold so dear. Once again, I am reminded of the oppression and tyranny which have subjugated those proud, free people, almost continuously during the last quarter century. First, there was the terror of Adolph Hitler which haunted the land from 1939 to the end of the Second World War. Then, there were the Communists, who still hold the country in their grips. Once again, I am profoundly saddened.

I am saddened that Poland and so many other captive nations, in Eastern Europe and elsewhere in the world, still are not free to determine their own destinies. It is an ugly fact that there are hundreds of millions of people on this unhappy globe, clamoring for freedom, yearning to live without fear and intimidation, and struggling to keep alive the spark of hope that one day they shall truly enjoy the sweet fruit of their fondest aspirations.

To the people of Poland I say: Do not abandon hope. To the millions of other subjugated people in this world my plea is the same. With a conviction at least as strong as the Communist resolve, we in this country are dedicated to halting the spread of this menace and bringing back to the persecuted peoples of the world the freedom for which they yearn. With unswerving confidence that the cause to which we are committed is a just one, we are prepared to be unrelenting in our struggle. And, we shall prevail. Freedom, truth, and justice, the principles which are the bulwark of popular democracy, shall not be permitted to die.

To the gallant people of Poland I say also: Persevere in your resistance. You persevered even when the ominous shadow of Hitler had spread over so much of Europe. Warsaw in 1944 stands as a shining example of your heroism. There is excellent reason for you to continue your perseverance.

On this 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution, we here in this Congress join te people of Poland in a rededication to the ideals which we mutually cherish. It is our fervent prayer that Poland once again shall be free.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your permission to take these few moments to mark the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791.

Through the adoption of the Constitution in 1791, Poland was transformed into a modern state. The Constitution was adopted at a critical time in Polish history. In 1772, Russia, Prussia, and Austria had taken away large sections of Polish territory. Facing possible annihilation, all forces in Poland united behind the new Constitution which was greatly influenced by the liberal movements in America, England, and France.

History has recorded the sad and dismal events which have taken place since that date and the anniversary of the Polish Constitution is not mentioned in Poland today. It is, however, observed by the many Polish communities in the free world, especially in the United States, and I wish to take this opportunity to call this date to the attention of all of the wonderful people of Polish extraction in order that they may know this important holiday is not forgotten.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, this week we mark the anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791. While we are free here in the United States to speak out publicly in commemoration of this triumph of liberty, those who live in Poland today must mark it as a silent holiday. The democratic impulse of the 1791 Constitution has been silenced by the oppression of a Communist regime, but it has not been stilled. Millions of Poles join with us in rededicating ourselves to the pursuit of freedom for Eastern Europe. As we observe this anniversary, we are reminded also this year of the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the Polish patriot who gave so much to American liberty. His spirit gives courage to us all in the struggle for freedom.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I wish to pay tribute today to those of my colleagues who are of Polish descent, to the millions of Americans with Polish ancestors, and to loyal Poles everywhere.

On May 3, 1791, just 2 years after the United States adopted its Constitution, the people of Poland adopted the first democratic Constitution to be recognized by a European nation. Their proclamation of liberalism was formulated in these words:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Since then, Poles everywhere and citizens of Polish origin in many countries celebrate this birth of European liberalism as a Polish national holiday. But the celebration goes beyond the boundaries of one nation or the ties of a common ancestry. Free men everywhere, and those who would be free but for the domination of an oppressive power, all share a common dedication to the cause of liberty; they look to the Polish Constitution of May 3 as a symbol of that liberty and as a source of inspiration, for it gives reassurance to the free and hope to the oppressed.

Unfortunately, Poland was and is surrounded by powerful, acquisitive neighbors, and her periods of freedom have been short. Just 4 years after adopting the Constitution, Poland was partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria for the third time. In this century Poland has been devastated twice by war and has been dominated by Communist regimes for the past 22 years. In this context the Polish Constitution assumes a special significance; it represents not the government of a free country but the spirit of a people who desire to be free.

Successive generations of Poles both at home and abroad have continued to dream and struggle for liberty. We all remember the heroic fight waged by the Poles in exile during World War II; Franklin D. Roosevelt called it, "an inspiration to mankind." We in America owe them a special debt for the dedication of the Polish patriots who joined us in our own fight for independence.

Therefore, we should take this opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to Polish freedom. As long as the light of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Polish people we must not abandon their cause. Their unconquerable spirit is a guarantee that Poland, although presently burdened with a Communist imposed regime, will one day throw off its oppressive chains and once again claim its place among the free nations of the world.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, the modern history of the Polish people is full of tragic events. That was particularly true during the late 18th century when their country was parceled out three times, and finally they lost their independence and freedom. Before its final partition a group of patriotic statesmen did something that is remembered not only by them alone, but also by other lovers of democracy and independence. In 1791 they drew up and adopted a constitution which, for its liberal and progressive features, made a grand landmark in Poland's political history.

By that Constitution, Poland emerged from medieval times and stepped into the modern age. By one stroke Poland's Government was transformed from absolute monarchy to one of limited monarchy. A cabinet form of government, with parliamentary responsibility, was established. Religious toleration was guaranteed. The electorate was enlarged, and the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law. Many intricate and obsolete features of the old and unwieldy system were abolished, and all class distinctions were wiped out. In short, this was a liberal-democratic constitution, something quite new in that part of Europe until then.

The Constitution of 1791 was never put into force, and the Poles never had the joy of living under it, for immediately after its promulgation, Poland was faced with invasion and final extinction as an independent state. But the spirit of that Constitution has lived on, and today it lives in the hearts of freedom-loving Poles. On the observance of its 176th anniversary we pay tribute to the memory of the framers of that great and imperishable document.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it is right and proper that all Americans join in observing this 176th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution, that noble document modeled after our own Constitution. The national commitment to free and democratic institutions, as proclaimed in the Constitution of May 3, lives still in the hearts of the Polish people in the mother country and in other lands throughout the world.

In the words of the Constitution:

> All Power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

It is tragic that the gallant Poles have been so cruelly thwarted in their persistent efforts to move forward as a free nation, first by partition by the empires of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, and later by the totalitarian forces of nazism and communism. The United States championed Poland's right to freedom at the end of the First World War and gladly witnessed the rebirth of the new Poland which tragically was engulfed by the forces of nazism in 1939. At the end of the last war we did our very best to see a free and independent Poland, but unfortunately we were not successful. Today we hope and pray that the indomitable will and brave spirit of the people of Poland will sustain them until their longed-for liberation into a free and independent country can be achieved.

On this the 176th anniversary of the Constitution, I am happy to send sincere greetings to the people of Poland and also to express the genuine appreciation and immense debt which the United States owe our citizens of Polish ancestry. The dedication of the Polish people to the principles of their Constitution is the best assurance that one day their land will again stand in full freedom and independence.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on Polish Constitution Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the vote on passage of the supplemental appropriation bill, H.R. 9481, of a few minutes ago, my plane was delayed in arriving and I was stranded at the airport and further delayed due to heavy traffic.

Had I been present I would have voted "aye," on final passage.

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have been very much impressed by the outstanding accomplishments of the Ford Foundation in Central America and Mexico.

Recently, I received a report on this work from Elihu Bergman, an old friend of mine, who is now doing a remarkable job as assistant representative of the foundation's Mexico office. Many of my colleagues in this House will remember him in his former association with the VISTA program.

I commend this report to the attention of my colleagues, as evidence of important work in a vital field.

The report follows:

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN MEXICO AND CENTRAL AMERICA

The Ford Foundation is a private, nonprofit institution whose purpose is to advance human welfare.

The Foundation seeks to strengthen society by identifying key problems and issues, and by underwriting efforts—by institutions, communities, government agencies, and individuals—toward their solution. Within its fields of concern, the Foundation grants funds for experimental, demonstration, and developmental programs designed to achieve progress.

The Foundation was founded in 1936 by Henry Ford and his son Edsel. Until 1950 it made grants largely to charitable and educational institutions in the state of Michigan. In 1950 The Ford Foundation became an international philanthropy, and nearly all its grants have been made since then.

The Foundation is an independent institution; independent of the Ford Motor Company and its affiliates; and independent of the U.S. government.

The Ford Foundation is the largest private philanthropy in the world. To date it has granted nearly $3 billion to more than 5000 institutions in the United States and 78 foreign countries. In the fiscal year that ended on September 30, 1966, the Foundation distributed $341.6 million, including $59.0 million to programs in 78 countries outside the United States.

INTERNATIONAL PROGRAMS

The Ford Foundation has devoted increasing attention to the process of human development outside the United States. In its international programs the Foundation typically supports efforts to accumulate, transmit, and utilize knowledge that will penetrate barriers to national and regional progress.

The Foundation most frequently provides grants to accelerate and expand the work of universities, research institutes, public and private institutions, and individuals, directly related to the critical needs of developing societies. These needs are reflected in fields where the Foundation has supplied resources: Expansion of educational opportunities; increasing food production; problems of expanding population; teaching and application of science and technology; creation of managerial skills; urbanization; and improved comprehension of social and economic processes.

In allocating its resources for international programs, the Foundation responds to initiatives from local individuals and institutions. Generally, the Foundation seeks a partnership in which the local institution shares the cost of a new enterprise. The Foundation is concerned that an enterprise for which it grants initial support becomes self-sustaining; that after termination of Foundation support the institution or program is assured of local support.

Outside of Latin America, The Ford Foundation has field offices in: Turkey, Lebanon, Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, Algeria, Nigeria, the Congo, Kenya, Pakistan, India, Malasia, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

LATIN AMERICAN PROGRAMS

The Ford Foundation supports developmental programs in Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Peru, Colombia, Venezuela, Dominican Republic, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, the West Indies, and Mexico.

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN MEXICO

The Ford Foundation has functioned in Mexico since 1962. To date, the Foundation has provided 29 grants totaling 110 million pesos ($8.8 million) to support programs directed toward meeting priority Mexican social and economic developmental objectives:

1. Development and implementation of a modern agricultural technology through education, research and extension; expanding food production for improved quantity and quality; development of economic research as a basis for agricultural policy.

National School of Agriculture, Chapingo

Architectural services for campus development.

Construction of administration and extension buildings.

Modernization of the library and establishment of a Statistics and Computing Center.

Fellowships in agricultural extension; agricultural economics; and related fields.

Creation of an integrated program of agricultural education, research, and extension.

Provision of visiting faculty members from Iowa State University for graduate programs in agricultural economics and statistics.

Establishment of a Center of Agricultural Economics at the Post Graduate College.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Initiation of an instructional program in agricultural extension.

Development of a new program in food technology and marine sciences.

University of Coahuila

Development of a secondary school to produce agricultural technicians; provision of consultants from Texas A&M University for the school.

Secretariat of Agriculture and Livestock, United Mexican States

Creation of a more effective nationwide production oriented system of agricultural extension to transmit research results to farmers, and farm production and management problems to the laboratories.

2. Expansion of educational opportunity throughout the country; enlarging the capacities of institutions of higher learning.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Establishment of educational television facilities for oncampus instruction, and use by primary schools and adult education programs in the Monterrey area.

National Autonomous University of Mexico

Establishment of a multipurpose language laboratory for regular language instruction; training of secondary school teachers; demonstration; and linguistic research.

Inter-American center for scholarly books

Creation of a regional facility in Mexico for the interchange of books among the academic communities of North and South America.

Academic administration internship program

One year non-degree program of study and experience at several U.S. universities for young Mexican academic administrators.

3. Meeting the challenge of vigorous economic growth and profound social change; production of trained manpower to deal effectively with these phenomena.

University of Nuevo Leon

Strengthening of the undergraduate program in economics through fellowships, use of visiting faculty, library development, faculty training, and the creation of research facilities.

El Colegio de Mexico

Creation of a Center for Economic and Demographic Studies, with teaching, research, and library physical facilities.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Development of a Graduate School of Management to produce skilled managerial personnel for public and private enterprise, and for teaching.

4. Responding to the technological requirements of a rapidly advancing society by cultivating an appreciation of science in the educational process, and by assisting institutions to improve educational programs in the science and engineering disciplines.

Academy of Scientific Research

Enhancement of the role and potential of science in Mexican life by a system of postdoctoral fellowships; prizes for scientific achievements; lectures, seminars, and conferences; and the provision of short courses in provincial universities.

National Polytechnical Institute—Center for Research and Advanced Studies

Creation of high quality departments of electrical and chemical engineering through faculty development, fellowship opportunities, and the availability of research facilities.

National Autonomous University of Mexico

Elevation of the quality and capacity of the Graduate School of Engineering, with emphasis on 1) Encouraging students to enter the teaching profession; and 2) Providing opportunities for students from the provincial areas of Mexico.

Monterrey Institute of Technology

Development of a superior Faculty of Science and Engineering through the provision of opportunities for faculty improvement; fellowships for advanced study abroad; and research facilities. Simultaneous creation of a fellowships program designed to further train faculty members from provincial universities.

National Association of Faculties and Schools of Engineering (ANFEI)

Improvement of the calibre of professors of engineering through a fellowship program that will provide short graduate level courses in fields where their training is not adequate for progressing teaching requirements.

5. Exploring the social, medical, and economic problems of a rapidly expanding population.

Mexican Institute of Social Studies

Accomplishment of a nation-wide survey of prevailing knowledge, attitudes, and practices of family planning.

Mexican Institute of Social Security

Establishment of a teaching and research program in reproductive biology emphasizing a study of the epidemiology and control of abortion.

Woman's Hospital, Mexico City

Creation of a teaching, research, and demonstration program in reproductive biology, involving physicians, graduate and student nurses, health aides, and medical students from the Federal District and provincial areas.

Hospital of Nutritional Diseases, Mexico City

Establishment of a research department in human reproduction, including clinical and laboratory facilities for research on reproduction, and a post-doctoral program in reproductive biology primarily for physicians from provincial universities.

THE FORD FOUNDATION IN CENTRAL AMERICA

Since 1962 the Ford Foundation has granted $2.35 million for 12 projects directed toward meeting educational development goals of the Republic of Central America.

Guatemala

The American School

Expansion of a university-level admissions and achievement testing program for use by Central American institutions of higher learning.

Honduras

National Autonomous University of Honduras

Creation of an integrated general studies program designed to upgrade the quality of undergraduate education, the provision of visiting faculty, and improvement of facilities.

Nicaragua

National University of Nicaragua

Installation of a liberal arts curriculum, comparable to the general studies program at the University of Honduras, to better prepare first year undergraduates for subsequent work in the specialized professional schools of the University. Provision of visiting faculty and improvement of facilities.

University of El Salvador

Development of an undergraduate basic sciences program as the first step in an integrated general studies curriculum. Provision of visiting faculty and laboratory facilities to backstop the enterprise.

Costa Rica

University of Costa Rica

Strengthening of an existing general studies program by the provision of resources for additional full-time faculty, visiting faculty, development of central library facilities, and augmentation of the administrative capacity of the institution.

Development of a high quality program for training secondary school teachers designed to serve as a model for Central America, and involving students from other Central American countries, with emphasis on the substance and teaching of the natural sciences and mathematics.

Central America Regional

Higher Councils of Central American Universities (CSUCA)

Equipping of the Higher Council to meet its responsibilities for the integration of Central American higher education—the provision of guidance and support to the participating universities for an organization of their educational resources that will produce the most effective regional pattern.

Production of a model survey of current and long range Central American needs for university trained manpower.

THE SIERRA CLUB—DEFENDER OF OUR NATURAL HERITAGE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the Diamond Jubilee of an organization that has become one of the most important forces in the conservation movement in this Nation today: the Sierra Club. I am proud to rise in tribute to the founders, officers, and members of this group for the great public services they have performed, and for the courageous leadership which has earned them the respect of all who are concerned with conserving our rich natural heritage.

The Sierra Club was founded 75 years ago this coming June 4, by the great naturalist and pioneer conservationist John Muir, who gathered with him 26 like-minded men.

Dedicated at the outset to the exploration, enjoyment, and protection of the mountain regions of the Pacific coast, particularly of Yosemite and the Sierra Nevada, the Sierra Club has since broadened its mandate to include the scenic resources of the entire Nation.

The club's conservation goals often place it at cross purposes with powerful commercial interests—and sometimes, with governmental policy. But it is universally admired and respected, I believe, for the courage with which it fights for what it believes is right and for the energy with which it musters public support for important conservation issues. Even those who oppose the club's efforts to defend scenic and other national resources must recognize and respect this great fighter for conservation.

Opponents of Sierra Club programs, who often have vast economic interests at stake, have accused the club of impeding progress or of self-interest in its efforts to preserve resources for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations.

If progress means massive and wanton destruction of irreplaceable resources, then let us impede it. I do not call this progress at all. Even from a strictly economic point of view squandering of natural resources makes no sense.

The Sierra Club makes no profit. It gains nothing except deficits, hard words, and the satisfaction of helping to preserve and improve utilization of our dwindling forest land, wildlife, waters, and other precious natural resources.

When it was first founded, the club drew its membership almost entirely from the San Francisco area. But the growing public interest and concern over conservation, which the club itself spurred, had wider appeal and soon had members in every State of the Union.

Traditionally, from the time of John Muir to the present day, the Sierra Club has drawn much of its strength from the devotion of its unpaid volunteer leadership. Officers and directors of the club have always served without remuneration, contributing generously of time borrowed from their busy professional careers. I take pleasure in according well-deserved public recognition to Dr. George Marshall, president; Edgar Wayburn, vice president; Frederick Eissler, secretary; William Siri, treasurer; Lewis Clark, fifth officer; and directors Ansel Adams, Paul Brooks, Nathan Clark, Pauline Dyer, Jules Eichorn, Richard Leonard, Martin Litton, Charlotte Mauk, John Oakes, and Eliot Porter.

Fifteen years ago, the officials of the Sierra Club recognized that the growing workload required a permanent paid staff to carry out the programs to which the club is dedicated. Happily, they selected as their first executive secretary, Mr. David Brower, who had served as a volunteer for 18 years.

Members of the Sierra Club and, indeed, all concerned with sound conservation, have reason to be pleased with the choice of David Brower, for the record of the past 15 years is impressive. Club membership, which numbered a little more than 7,000 when Mr. Brower was appointed, had swelled to 50,000. Over the past 3 years, the membership more than doubled. Of course, opinions will vary upon this achievement. Those who in the past have plundered our natural resources—those who have a vested interest in exploiting them in the future—must regard such growing strength in the conservation movement as a grave threat. Those who would prefer to enjoy what has been saved and who fear the battle to save more, must be discomfited. But those of us who believe that we must fight to preserve our natural heritage and prevent ruthless despoliation can only be grateful.

There is another and even more important achievement represented in this phenomenal growth: the ability of the Sierra Club, through Mr. Brower, to stimulate a broad public awareness of the importance of conservation. As many opposed interests know to their sorrow, a conservation issue is now a national issue, and when the Sierra Club speaks on an issue, that voice is heard and heeded in Congress and throughout the land. For this accomplishment alone, the club, its directors, and Mr. Brower, have earned our gratitude and the thanks of future generations.

One of Mr. Brower's most notable efforts in behalf of the Sierra Club over the past 6 years has been to edit, design, and produce a series of more than a dozen of the most beautiful books ever published in this country, such works of art as "Time and the River Flowing"; "Grand Canyon"; "In Wilderness Is the Preservation of the World"; "Summer Island"; "Penobscot Country"; "This Is the American Earth." Through these books, millions of Americans have been awakened to the beauty of our natural heritage and have learned the important lesson of conserving it under wise stewardship. There are many who believe the Sierra Club's much-honored exhibit format series rivals the finest work of European craftsmen. Indeed, in 1964, the series won for the club the book industry's highest honor, the Carey-Thomas Award, as the most distinguished example of creative publishing in the United States.

Because the Sierra Club has become such an effective adversary of many powerful interests, both public and private, it is inevitable that the club's principal spokesman should be a target for criticism and abuse. I understand the inevitability of this, and I am sure that Mr. Brower understands it too. But I believe that, when the heat of the battle is over and issues laid to rest, even his fiercest opponents would join in honoring the great achievements and services of Mr. Brower and the organization he serves. He is a man who represents a growing body of public opinion, and represents it exceedingly well.

Looking back over what the Sierra Club has achieved over the past 15 years, I feel sure that even those who have opposed the club can join in saying the quality of American life would be poorer without the Sierra Club, and the Sierra Club would be poorer without David Brower. I congratulate both and wish them many more years of public service.

THE QUIE AMENDMENT WOULD END EDUCATIONAL INNOVATION IN OUR LOCAL SCHOOLS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BURTON] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, for years the greatest need in education at the local level has been for resources to solve new and traditional problems of education and learning. In many instances local schools, because of a lack of financial ability, have not been able to incorporate new programs and new services into their curricula.

Title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has provided local school districts with the resources to initiate new programs and to supplement existing programs and practices.

Title III provides funds for supplementary education centers and services which help to translate the latest knowledge about teaching and learning in widespread educational practice.

Its success has been based on the results of unique cooperation between Federal, State, and local educational agencies.

H.R. 8983, the Quie amendment, would put an end to title III and destroy a living example of creative federalism in education.

Educational innovation and experimentation is desperately needed today. We are trying to change the kinds of education offered our children, and we are also trying to make certain that full equality of educational opportunity is achieved. Funds from title III have permitted local school agencies to move ahead in these areas. But local school districts and boards of education need more help than State agencies can supply. They need the help and national expertise which the U.S. Office of Education has been able to supply.

Abolition of title III, as we know it today, would assure that innovation in local schools will decline. Without Federal funds, local school districts will simply not have the adequate resources to look beyond the horizons to seek answers to tomorrow's problems.

I urge the defeat of H.R. 9883, because it would return a provincial attitude toward education, when education has become, in reality, a national concern.

EXTENSION OF THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to introduce today legislation to amend and extend the provisions of the Older Americans Act of 1965. As the President said in his recent message on Older Americans, passage of this bill in 1965 marked a major commitment by the Congress "not merely to prolong our citizens' lives, but to enrich them."

Today, over 19 million Americans—about 10 percent of our total population—are aged 65 or over. This figure represents both a triumph over disease and illness and a challenge to the future. For many of our elderly are doomed to be poor, to be lonely, to be purposeless, in their post-productive years:

5,300,000 older Americans have yearly incomes below the poverty level.

Only one out of five has a job, often at low wages.

Over 2 million elderly citizens are on welfare.

Nearly 40 percent of our single older citizens have total assets of less than $1,000.

Because we have enacted the Older Americans Act, we have established a new agency with special responsibility, competence, and compassion for the problems of the elderly. The Administration on Aging, ably headed by William Bechill, tries to effectively channel existing resources and programs into developing services and programs for the elderly.

To carry out these responsibilities, in addition to its coordination activities at the Federal level, the Administration on Aging administers three grant programs which are designed to encourage the development of programs on aging in States and local communities, to conduct research into new techniques, for improving services for older people, and to train professional and other technical personnel in the field of aging.

By the end of 1966 some 39 project grants had been awarded to agencies and institutions in 25 different States to conduct research into different areas, including special kinds of demonstrations of new ways to deliver services to older people. During the program's first year, nearly 200 local community projects for older people had been funded which included community planning activities, programs for older people in senior activity centers, counseling and referral services, programs in senior housing projects, recreation programs, and consumer information and guidance programs.

The amendments I am introducing today would extend the Older Americans Act from 1972 through 1974. They would also extend the separate grant provisions through 1972 instead of allowing them to expire, as presently written, in 1970. By raising the authorization levels for the State grants program from $8 million in fiscal 1967 to $10,550,000 for fiscal 1968, the States would be able to fund from 250 to 300 new projects.

An increase from $3 million to $6,400,000 in authorizations for the research, demonstration, and training grants programs would provide for the continuation of about 49 projects which were started in 1966 and 1967. This authorization would also fund some 70 to 80 new projects, as well as provide for a major new nutritional program to test new methods for meeting the nutritional needs of older people.

Mr. Speaker, I think that the Older Americans Act has already well proven its effectiveness and need, and that it deserves a vote of confidence to extend its life and increase its funds.

FINANCE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the annual Gabriel Silver lecture devoted to world peace, at Columbia University, was delivered this year on April 13 by Mr. George D. Woods, President of the World Bank. In his address entitled "Finance for Developing Countries: A Time for Decision," Mr. Woods offers a frank and objective view of foreign assistance since the Marshall Plan—the motivations, goals, achievements, and mistakes of our foreign aid program. He does not present a sugar-coated version of foreign aid history, but rather points out where the program has not been as effective as anticipated, why, and how this experience can be applied constructively toward new directions in the aid program.

Mr. Woods recognizes the great need for foreign assistance and stresses our ability to help underdeveloped countries. He says:

> We can say confidently that the knowledge and the means exist to enlarge greatly the riches of the world, to help many millions to escape hunger and to achieve, or at least approach, decent living standards for the first time.

I include Mr. Woods' address as part of my remarks:

FINANCE FOR DEVELOPING COUNTRIES: A TIME FOR DECISION

(By George D. Woods)

President Kirk, Dean Cordier, ladies and gentlemen: It was an act of bravery for Dean Cordier to invite a banker to come here this evening to deliver the annual Gabriel Silver Lecture Devoted to World Peace. It has been the misfortune of bankers to be recorded in history more often in connection with panic than with peace; and I can hope to reward the dean's audacity only in a modest way. Nevertheless, I was delighted to accept his flattering invitation to speak here at Columbia University. Since then I have been emboldened by Pope Paul's recent encyclical, according to which "The new name for peace is development."

We are now approaching the 20th anniversary of the inception of the Marshall Plan—the date when Secretary of State Marshall, at a time of deep economic and political crisis in Europe, spoke the sentences which launched the great cooperative effort of the European Recovery Program. Secretary Marshall's initiative began a transformation. The creative genius of Europe awoke. American aid began to flow out steadily to the sixteen countries which had united in the Recovery Program. Those countries, later joined by others, worked their way back to productivity; they formed new habits of collaboration which, as is now apparent to all, opened the way to an economic revolution.

Today, there is another such crisis in the world. It is big, it lacks focus; most of us do not even think of it as a crisis. But food riots in Asia, government coups in Africa, student violence in this Hemisphere and elsewhere, are among the symptoms of it. It is the crisis of a new world trying to be born—the crisis of the developing countries in their struggle to achieve economic viability, national unity, and the respect of other nations.

This new world contains about two billion people—about two-thirds of humanity. Most of it is hungry most of the time. Average calorie consumption is on the order of 2,000 a day—an intake which in Europe two decades ago, we regarded as being dangerously near the famine level. Between the income of an ordinary citizen in western Europe and that of an ordinary African or Asian, the disparity is 10 or 15 to one, with the contrast that implies between standards of shelter and education, work and enjoyment. In the case of the United States, the figure would be 20 to one.

Thanks to modern medicine, underdeveloped countries enjoy a 20th century death rate; but they still are experiencing a 19th century birth rate. As a consequence, five-sixths of the population growth in the world is occurring in the less developed countries. Of the 60-million increase which we can expect in 1967, 50 million will be in countries with per capita incomes of less than $250 a year. Such a rate of population growth has never before occurred over such a wide part of the globe.

The existence of hundreds of millions of destitute human beings in the world is a threat to peace. We see every day how it may create vacuums of authority into which the great powers may be drawn in uneasy confrontation. The chances of disagreement and disaster can be magnified by what happens in places of Africa, Asia and Latin America that many of us had not even heard of ten years ago.

Over the years, rich nations have been engaged in extensive but largely unconcerted efforts to help the poor. The pattern is different from that of the Marshall Plan: instead of one principal country trying to help a dozen, there are now more than a score of countries engaged in various efforts to help about a hundred others. These activities have grown haphazardly, for the most part from former colonial responsibilities, in some part from humanitarian or diplomatic or commercial motives. They have not—and I want to emphasize this—they have not been the result of conscious commitments to a coherent, cooperative attack on the problems of world poverty and disorder. This has not been tried.

The task of development assistance has proved to be one of almost infinite complexity. The process of growth, whether of people or countries is intricate, and when its intricacy is compounded by all the difficulties of relationships between sovereign nations, problems seem to arise in a limitless number of permutations and combinations.

The effort of some countries to help others has been freighted with irony and paradox. The very economic strength that gives rich countries the means to help the poor also opens up a gap between them: the capital-intensive technology of the industrial countries is not all suited to the problems of the low-income nations.

It is a paradox, too, to speak of development assistance as "foreign aid." In fact, as we all know, in the past much development assistance has been given in forms designed to benefit the immediate self interest of the giver—forms rather different from those which would have been followed had economic development been the prime objective, and rather different also from those which would have been followed if performance by the developing country had been an important consideration.

Most providers of aid, sooner or later, and in one form or another, have used overseas assistance as a subsidy for their own industries—as a way of exporting goods and services at higher than world prices. It is estimated that the donor countries put a value on their annual aid about $1 billion a year higher than the same goods and services would bring in competitive world markets. And it goes without saying that when development finance has been used to protect spheres of political and commercial influence, or to serve strategic military purposes, it has been to some extent of help to the donor countries themselves.

To win for aid programs the support of legislators with many vexing problems of their own—including poverty pockets and other high-priority domestic demands for public funds—all these motives of self-interest have been proclaimed publicly and often in donor countries. Small wonder, then, that development assistance has not infrequently failed to stir feelings of gratitude or to encourage the performance that was expected from the recipient countries.

The paradoxes have not all been on the side of the rich. Not a few developing countries, for instance, have asked for help from abroad at the same time as they have been practicing forms of nationalism that make international cooperation impossible. While governments and leaders have proclaimed economic development to be high on their list of goals, they often have failed to take the action and adopt the policies necessary to achieve it. Despite the popularity of the phrase, "revolution of rising expectations," the somber truth is that in many countries, the population lacks the ferment of aspiration and determination without which economic development is impossible. In some countries, deep-seated political instability has undermined the hope of steady economic progress.

Some paradoxes have trapped both donor and recipient. Consider the irony that development assistance, instead of hastening the day when the poor countries could make their own way, may in some cases actually have postponed it. Exports of American food surpluses have fed the hungry overseas; in their time they have saved the United States Government several hundred million dollars a year which otherwise it would have had to spend on crop storage and price support operations; but food aid programs have not always been administered so as effectively to stimulate increases in production in agricultural sectors overseas. Aid programs have helped recipients, on occasion, to defer or avoid the hard measures they should have been taking on their own behalf. Aid has given donors an excuse—although not a good one—to defer liberalizations of their own commercial policy which might enlarge the trade earnings of developing countries and thus lessen their reliance on development aid.

Despite its contradictions and paradoxes, in two decades, development assistance has accomplished much good. I think, indeed, that this period since the Second World War will be remembered in history as the period when the engineering of social and economic progress in the developing world first became a universal preoccupation of governments. There has been planted, literally and figuratively, seeds whose fruit the developing countries will be harvesting for many years. For millions of human beings, the development effort has been the difference between life and death; for millions more, it has been the beginning of hope; and for some it has been the beginning of prosperity.

Installed power capacity in developing countries has more than doubled in the last dozen years. Cement production has more than doubled; the manufacture of steel has tripled; mining production is rising at a rate of almost 10 per cent a year. Commerce is growing: freight moved by rail has been increasing annually by 10 per cent in Africa and 12 percent in Asia. The expansion of education, that vital springboard of economic advance, is proceeding significantly faster than the growth of population. All this began, however, from a low starting point, and much more needs to be done.

Today the capacity of developing countries to grow is greater than it has ever been. The most important single accomplishment of the development effort over the past 20 years is that peoples throughout the developing world have acquired skills, adopted attitudes and built institutions that greatly increase their ability to use capital productively. Many developing countries are attaching greater importance to fiscal and monetary policies, and even to market incentives. It is slow, hard work, but many are building more adequate frameworks of administration. Investment and savings rates have moved upward. However, given the heavy expenditures on education—and in other sectors which give a return in increased production only after a long waiting period—it is hardly surprising that growth has been spectacular only in a few countries.

Despite many errors of commission and omission, despite the instability of political institutions, the growth potential is there. The developing countries are ready and able to continue progress at a faster rate.

On the side of the countries and institutions engaged in development assistance, experience has brought progress also. The quality of aid, while it still leaves much to be desired, has consistently improved; and the givers of aid have acquired growing understanding of the problems they face.

In the past two or three years, most of the aid-giving countries of the world have put their programs of development assistance under close examination. This scrutiny has resulted in a shift toward the greater use of international organizations, as one way of filtering some of the contradictions out of aid and of directing a larger flow of assistance to countries where economic performance justifies it. Since 1960, the participation of these multilateral organizations in the net transfer of financial resources to developing countries has increased threefold, although it still accounts only for a modest fraction of the total.

Development functions are being more effectively carried out, either by the established multilateral agencies or by new regional organizations which have been created. New combinations of bilateral and multilateral assistance are being worked out, to such an extent that in the next fiscal year, an estimated 85 per cent of United States aid, for instance, will be given either through multilateral channels or as part of a multinational effort coordinated by international agencies.

The World Bank group of institutions is in the mainstream of these developments. This Group, as most of you know, is a cluster of three institutions. At the center is the Bank itself. It is *the* world bank—the only thing of its kind. Our member, shareholder governments are spread over the world; our financial resources come from all over the world; we finance projects in all quarters of the world; our Executive Directors, officers and staff are from all parts of the world. No other institution or government department has the experience of the World Bank—the concentration of expertise and know-how embodied in our international staff, chosen and retained strictly on professional merit.

The Bank is now 21 years old, and has lent some $10 billion, mostly in developing countries. Its loans are long term, at more or less conventional rates of interest, for projects of high economic priority. About a third of its lending has been for electric power development, a third for the development of transportation, and the rest for agriculture, industry and education.

Flanking the Bank on one side is the Internationial Development Association, engaged in the same kind of business, but on much easier conditions of repayment. IDA, as we call the Association for short, lends to the poorest countries in the Bank's membership—those not able to borrow and service on conventional terms all the capital they can effectively use for development. So far, most of its financing has been done in Asia; and more than 70 per cent of its $1.6 billion of commitments have been made there. The purposes of IDA's lending reflect some of the most pressing problems of these client countries: the Association has been particularly active in financing agricultural and education projects.

Flanking the Bank on the other side is its other affiliate, the International Finance Corporation, or IFC. IFC works exclusively in the private sector. It does several things the Bank does not do: it makes loans to private borrowers without government guarantee; it invests in share capital; and it underwrites offerings or placements of securities by new or expanding enterprises. IFC operates in countries with a reasonably high level of savings and entrepreneurship; and more than half its $200 million of commitments are for enterprises in Latin America.

The operations of the three institutions, although each has its own separate financial assets, are closely integrated. This year, I expect that they will disburse well over a billion dollars on their loans and investments, mostly for projects in the developing countries.

Many of the founding fathers of the Bank have had the opportunity of seeing their child grow up; otherwise they would not know their offspring today. Mr. Dean Acheson, who was then the American Under Secretary of State, expected in 1945 that the World Bank would be a quite limited enterprise. He explained to a Congressional committee: "In the normal case, a country will borrow from private bankers; but where private banks, because of the risk, cannot make the loan on terms which are possible for the borrower, both the borrower and banker may need the assistance of the . . . Bank. The Bank's function will be to investigate the soundness of the projects for which capital is desired, and if it agrees they are sound, it will guarantee the loans made by private banks." In fact, of course, this never happened; the Bank, under the successive presidencies of Eugene Meyer, John McCloy and particularly Eugene Black, became a borrower and a lender on its own account.

While they may not have been good forecasters, the founders nevertheless gave the Bank a priceless gift in the form of an extraordinary charter, called the Articles of Agreement. This charter endowed the Bank with three faculties.

First, it gave the Bank an aptitude for cooperation. In fact, the Bank is a true cooperative, deriving its resources from its members and using these resources for their benefit. Its member governments are not only its principal debtors, but also its shareholders and large creditors.

Second, the Bank was given the opportunity to be independent. It was not to rely solely on paid-in capital from governments; in addition, it was enabled to provide the larger part of its resources by borrowing in the world's capital markets. It was cast in corporate form, and was given the capacity to earn a profit and become self-supporting.

Third, the Bank was given a fundamental policy. It was commanded to base its operations on economic factors, and to stay out of politics. The Bank was thereby given a hunger for facts, and a desire to develop the expertness needed to understand and interpret the facts.

All three of these faculties converged on one objective: the economic growth of the Bank's member countries.

The Bank did not learn to exercise these faculties all at once. As far as cooperation is concerned, some member countries, including Cuba under Castro and Indonesia under Sukarno, decided that the Bank was not the kind of cooperative they wanted to belong to, and they left—although Indonesia has now come back. In dealing with its borrowing shareholders, the Bank has moved carefully from problem to specific problem, elaborating its own policies and marking out its own trails. The Bank has worked hard during nearly all its twenty years to establish and maintain its high standing in the money markets of western Europe, Canada and the United States.

The instrument the Bank was given for dealing with its member countries was capital. This capital, to use the words of the charter, was to be applied to "projects, large and small alike." But one of the first things the Bank found out was that many of its clients did not know how to prepare projects. We had proposals, to mention a few, for dams that would be starved for water, for electric power systems that would lack customers, and for highways that would not fit local traffic and terrain.

In these circumstances, it seemed plain that if the Bank were to help finance any considerable number of projects, it would have to offer advice about how to prepare them as well. The Bank therefore not only closely examined proposals through studies of documents and visits to the field; as cooperator and expert, it also developed the practice of suggesting modifications or further study whenever necessary. It quickly found itself playing—and has since continued to play—an advisory role of considerable scope and variety, concerned with economics, engineering, administration and other factors bearing on project execution. We discuss with the borrower what kinds of technical services are needed, we advise on how best to obtain these services and, if necessary, we draw up terms of reference for the consultants.

For countries least able technically to prepare projects and least able to bring in the necessary outside help, we bear some of the cost; and we organize and supervise similar project studies financed by the United Nations Development Programme. We have also established cooperative programs whereby the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization work with us and our member countries to identify and prepare projects in agriculture and education. To help meet the especially urgent needs of African countries, we have established in that continent two regional offices of our own to work directly with local authorities in preparing agricultural and transportation projects.

At about the same time the Bank was discovering that projects often were inadequately studied, we were also finding out that they were planned without sufficient regard for their setting in the economy as a whole. We early concluded that any developing country would benefit from having some kind of program as a framework for development, relating projects to each other, taking account of the availability of financial resources, and giving thought to policy and administrative measures as well as to physical projects that would accelerate economic development. We have therefore developed a practice of organizing expert missions to visit individual countries and to draw up comprehensive recommendations that serve as a basis for working out a detailed development program.

The long range solution to the need for economic expertise, however, is for the developing countries to produce their own experts. The Bank has tried to help them do so by establishing an Economic Development Institute for the training of senior officials concerned with economic affairs. The Institute was set up as a sort of staff college where these officials could come together for periods ranging from three to six months, to study, to read, and to discuss practical development problems among themselves and with the best experts available from the Bank and elsewhere. The Institute began its work in 1956, and 700 officials have been through it. Many have advanced to posts of critical responsibility.

What we want, in a word, is to encourage constantly improving economic performance by our developing member countries. Not every country can have, or even profit from, a detailed development program, but every country can aspire to have a well-thought out set of policies which will provide the conditions and motivations conducive to economic growth. This is more and more what we find ourselves talking about with our member countries—fundamental policies to govern their day-to-day economic decisions. We are able to talk about policies and policy changes not as interlopers but as collaborators—and sometimes we give agreed policies the final measure of support they need to tip the scales in their favor in the councils of government.

In the Bank, we sometimes sum up our interests by saying, "The *country* is the project." That being so, we take an interest in the total assistance effort, including what others are doing to assist development in the country. In pursuit of this total view, we are helping to conduct an experiment intended to lead to a better coordination and use of external resources. This experiment brings together groups of countries and institutions, engaged in one form or another of development finance, for the purpose of considering jointly all the major problems in providing effective development assistance for particular recipient countries.

So far there are coordinating groups of this kind for 13 recipients, and in the next few days, we expect to be establishing a group for a fourteenth. The Bank is organizer and Chairman of ten of them, soon to be 11. As Chairman, the Bank assumes several responsibilities: It periodically makes comprehensive reports on the country's development possibilities and progress. It helps the developing country to identify and prepare projects, or to obtain the necessary technical assistance for doing so. It helps the government to devise a development program, and advises on problems of carrying out this program if it is asked to do so. It makes recommendations to the recipient government and to the members of the consultative group about the sectors and projects that seem to deserve priority in financing, and on the economic policies needed to achieve agreed development objectives.

Finally, the Bank comments on the country's estimates of aid requirements, making recommendations about the amount, types and terms of aid that are appropriate. The consultative group, nevertheless, is an example of what Dag Hammarskjold used to call "freedom in unity," because actual aid commitments by members of a consultative group are arranged directly between a donor and the recipient.

While the consultative groups are a relatively new form of aid coordination, they already clearly demonstrate some superiority over uncoordinated bilateral aid. The coordinating group gains from the services of the Bank as honest broker and expert advisers, providing a realistic assessment of the recipient country's prospects and performance, offering a guide for the amount and kind of assistance the donor countries might render, and—by carrying the main burden of collecting data—saving both rich and poor countries much duplication or repetition of effort. Above all, the process of consultation can effectively mesh external and internal resources, and can enable donor countries and the recipient to move in consistent ways toward the same development targets. I believe this is bound to lead to a decisive improvement in the quality both of external assistance and of economic performance by developing countries themselves. Coordinating groups with which the Bank is associated are now concerned with about half of all development assistance from official sources.

One would suppose as the performance of developing countries goes on improving, and as the techniques for development assistance become demonstrably more effective, that the support of industrialized countries for international development would increase. In fact, this is not happening.

Most of the financing of development—about three-quarters of it in fact—comes from the developing countries themselves, and it is right and proper for them to be carrying the main responsibility for investing in their own future. But the industrial countries are not doing enough to enable the less developed nations to earn their own way. The export earnings of the developing countries are not keeping up with the general growth of world trade, and formidable barriers in the form of tariffs, quotas and other kinds of hurdles stand in the way of their achieving a higher share of this trade. The effective tariffs on imports from developing countries are commonly from 20 to 40 per cent—a high margin in any case, but extremely so since this protection is being afforded to mature economies from economies which in many cases are still in their infant years.

The seriousness of these barriers can be seen from the fact that only six developing countries have markets larger in monetary terms than the State of Connecticut. Almost 100 developing countries have populations of less than 15 million, and of these, two-thirds have less than five million. These small markets effectively limit the possibility of development based on production for the local market, yet up to now this has been the most common policy aim, and I think the resource growth of both developed and underdeveloped countries has suffered as a result.

Not only is the trade potential of less developed countries being frustrated but the amount of development finance flowing to these countries is considerably less than they could effectively employ; and it is considerably less than the industrialized countries could reasonably afford—even by their own standards of what is an appropriate basis for sharing a small part of their increasing wealth with the poor countries.

Six years ago, the official net flow of financial resources from the industrialized countries reached a level of about $6 billion a year. Today, after five years of unprecedented prosperity in the donor countries, the figure is about the same. Of the $200 billion by which the production of the industrialized countries has grown in that interval, none has been put at the disposal of the developing countries through programs of assistance.

At a time when we should be making full speed ahead, development assistance is in the doldrums. There is discouragement that after 20 years of promise and exhortation, most of the world's poor are only a little less poor. There is widespread skepticism about the self-advantage to be had from aid; and there is a general tendency to greatly underestimate the ability and capacity of the developed to help the underdeveloped world. In truth, finance for development abroad has no constituency to influence the executive and legislative branches of governments.

Nevertheless, it is a happy and fortuitous circumstance that humans are humanitarian. As Adam Smith said, "How selfish soever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature which interest him in the fortune of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it except the pleasure of seeing it. Of this kind is . . . compassion, the emotion which we feel for the misery of others, when we either see it, or are made to conceive it in a very lively manner . . ."

But there are other strong motives for helping less developed nations: the knowledge that more production in all developing countries will mean more trade for everyone; the hope that to make aid more effective now will more quickly bring the necessity for it to an end; above all, the trust that in the long run, rising income in developing countries may provide more room for the orderly evolution of their political institutions and make more likely the emergence of some sort of stable international order. "The new name for peace is development."

There is no danger that development assistance programs will be abandoned. That is not the issue. The issue is whether the industrialized countries will do enough, do it in the right way, and do it in time.

If the momentum of economic growth in the developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America is not speeded up, if leaders in these regions lose heart, then the prospect is for a rapid deterioration in world affairs that will inevitably become a matter of the highest concern in the United States and other industrial countries. Twenty years ago, when the crisis was faced in Europe, objectives were jointly defined and plans were jointly made to achieve them. In the case of the crisis in the developing world, no common plan has yet been formulated.

What is now necessary, it seems clear, is that industrialized countries should give joint consideration at the highest level to their policies of development finance. After 20 years of experience—and this includes many frustrations—the time has come, for a thorough examination of the objectives they are trying to achieve in their relationships with the developing world, of the importance of those objectives to their own national interests, and of the adequacy of the resources, the mechanisms and the techniques which are being employed to attain those objectives.

The kind of examination I have in mind would engage cabinet ministers concerned with foreign policy and finance as well as those more directly concerned with assistance programs. It would seek to move the worldwide aid effort from its somewhat tenuous and uncertain posture to a well thought-out and agreed-upon place in the whole scheme of international affairs.

Since the beginnings of that effort, science, technology and the means of creating material prosperity have advanced at a rate unprecedented in history. We can say confidently that the knowledge and the means exist to enlarge greatly the riches of the world, to help many millions to escape hunger and to achieve, or at least approach, decent living standards for the first time. What is needed now are firm political decisions to carry out an intensive, sustained and coordinated attack on underdevelopment, together with the political will and stamina to stay the course.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LVII

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in our conscription policies, Congress has always provided an accommodation for the objector whose opposition to war derives from religious beliefs. The present Universal Military Training and Service Act provides exemption from military service for any person "who, by reason of religious training and belief, is conscientiously opposed to participation in war in any form. Religious training and belief in this connection means an individual's belief in a relation to a Supreme Being involving duties superior to those arising from any human relation, but does not include essentially political, sociological, or philosophical views or a merely personal moral code."

Conscientious objectors represent one of the smallest groups in the Selective Service System. At the present moment, there are somewhat more than 3,300 of these young men, and most of these are performing their noncombatant services in civilian hospitals. Despite the meaningful work that they are doing, General Hershey is conscious of the extra administrative costs caused by these objectors.

> The CO per individual will be more expensive to us than anything else we do—

Says General Hershey.

> And maybe it is not worth it, but as long as we are a rich country I think that we can give some consideration. I tell my friends—and I have a great many of them who are conscientious objectors—that they are a luxury, and if we ever get in the lifeboat where everybody has to pull an oar, they will have to pull an oar or we will have to throw them overboard.

Congress has never recognized and has regularly rejected the claim for exemption of the objector whose conscience forbids him to participate in war, but who cannot assert any religious basis for his opposition to military service.

In 1965, however, the Supreme Court, in the United States against Seeger, interpreted the definition of "religious" broadly enough to embrace those moral pacifists who, though not affirming belief in a deity, hold a belief which takes the place in their lives that a belief in a Supreme Being takes in the life of a more conventionally religious person. Justice Clark said:

> The test of belief in a relation to a Supreme Being is whether a given belief that is sincere and meaningful occupies a place in the life of its possessor parallel to that filled by the orthodox belief in God of one who clearly qualifies for the exemption. Where such beliefs have parallel positions in the lives of their respective holders we cannot say that one is "in relation to a Supreme Being" and the other is not.

Justice Clark held that the local draft boards "are not free to reject beliefs because they consider them incomprehensible. Their task is to decide whether the beliefs professed by a registrant are sincerely held and in his own scheme of things, religious." General Hershey, however, is unmoved by such statements and bolsters his views by referring to the fact that "Congress told me they did not want philosophy, or economy, or sociology, or something else, they wanted religion."

It is my opinion, however, that the present statutory requirement in the draft law should be broadened so as to give equal consideration to the dictates of human conscience. I would call to the attention of my colleagues a policy statement issued by the general board of the National Council of Churches:

> The highest interests of a free society are served by giving to conscience the greatest freedom consonant with a justice, public order, and safety. Although we may have created confidence in a conscience that is rooted in a religious tradition, we believe that ways and means should be provided so that the validity or sincerity of another's conscience may be recognized. Even though the majority may consider decision based on such a conscience to be mistaken in a particular instance, or may be uncertain of its sincerity in another, our nation shall protect the right of conscience in such cases for the sake of a greater good. Coercion of conscience can recruit no more than an unwilling body, while mind and spirit and a willing body are likely to serve society more fully in alternative tasks not repugnant to conscience. Therefore we urge the greatest possible respect for conscience and the greatest possible protection for its free exercise.

If the religious objector exemption figures can be used as a guide, then the numbers who would object to all wars on moral grounds would be insignificant. Furthermore, the sincerity of an individual who requested such an exemption from military service would be very carefully scrutinized, probably more so than the appeal of a religious objector. The opposition to war because of moral reasons should be respected. I do not, however, support selective objection to war. Moral opposition to war means a revulsion against war under all, and not just some, circumstances. I do not believe that one can pick and choose which wars to fight and which ones to sit out.

THE 176TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this time to direct the attention of the House to the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution which was adopted on the 3d day of May 1791, and which provided the people of Poland with their greatest thrust toward freedom. This Constitution, which was adopted just 2 years after our American Constitution, resulted from the same spirit of freedom which swept the world at the moment when our own Nation was born. This desire for liberty was a "shared" experience throughout the world.

The adoption of the Polish Constitution did not insure the freedom which it promised. Geography and the circumstances of history have not been kind to the freedom-loving spirit of the Polish people.

Today, in spite of the forces of restraint which endeavor to suppress, the people of Poland have courageously made clear their right to the freedom of worship and the human dignity which it motivates. They have insisted on these rights in the face of government protests and restrictions. In Poland, the light of freedom has not been extinguished and will not be put out so long as this spirit continues.

Polish Americans throughout the United States have distinguished themselves as defenders of the American Constitution, defenders of liberty and the highest American traditions. From their heritage, they have developed a real appreciation of the significance of liberty and free institutions.

As Americans, we must renew our hope that our concepts of freedom and liberty will be extended to the Polish people.

COMPREHENSIVE STATE EDUCATIONAL PLANNING

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest needs the Nation has faced during recent years of economic, social, and technological change, has been the need for more comprehensive planning by State educational agencies.

Where States had the initiative and the desire to engage in such long-range planning, they often lacked the financial resources to do so. That is why the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is so valuable for the States, and why the act must be continued and expanded.

Title V of the act has provided State educational agencies with necessary financial assistance to develop, organize, and implement a variety of programs designed to strengthen their capacity for educational leadership and technical assistance.

One of the ways a State department of education could assert such leadership is in the development of a comprehensive educational planning program. But as a result of the heavy burdens already carried by many States, they have been unable to mount as effective a statewide educational planning program as they deem desirable. To overcome these difficulties, H.R. 7819 creates a new part B to title V earmarking funds for comprehensive educational planning.

Systematic educational planning must be encouraged if State departments of education are to utilize effectively all available resources and strengthen and improve education at all levels of government.

State education agencies should be responsible for developing statewide education goals, the analysis of these goals in terms of resources, establishment of priorities among goals, ways and means of achieving them, and the evaluation of the entire process from goals to achievement. The bill presently under consideration would provide Federal assistance for precisely such activities.

Title V–B, as set forth in H.R. 7819, would establish in State education agencies a program of comprehensive educational planning for elementary and secondary education. If a State wishes to include higher education in its program of long-range planning, it may do so. Either the State department of education or a coordinate higher education planning agency may undertake the function.

Seventy-five percent of the funds authorized for this provision will be allotted among the States according to the following formula: 40 percent would be allotted equally among the States; 60 percent would be allotted on the basis of the State's population. The remaining 25 percent of the authorization would be reserved to the Commissioner of Education for special project grants and contracts which might be of a multistate or regional nature.

H.R. 7819 provides for a total authorization for title V of $65 million for fiscal year 1968 and $80 million for fiscal year 1969. Of this sum, 70 percent would be spent for programs designed to strengthen State educational agencies—the present title V—and 30 percent would be available to the State educational agencies for comprehensive educational planning.

I do not believe anyone in this Chamber will dispute the value of prior planning in assuring the wisest possible use of funds for education. H.R. 7819 provides the vehicle for assuring that our States are able to plan, by making Federal assistance available to them for such a purpose. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment to title V.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 176 years ago today the people of Poland adopted a constitution which to this day is a model of democracy and liberalism. Like our own, which was adopted just 2 years before, the document draws its strength from a basic belief in the people. The Polish Constitution states simply:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

However, such thoughts in 1791 were dangerous ones in Europe and less than 4 years later Poland was overrun and partitioned by Russia, Prussia, and Austria. Liberalism, as embodied in the Polish Constitution, was not to be tolerated by the rulers of 18th-century Europe.

And once again we see this spirit of freedom and liberalism that is Poland held in check. Today as Poles the world over celebrate their Constitution Day, there will be no such celebrations in Poland. It is a silent holiday in Poland because just as 18th-century Russia, Prussia, and Austria could not abide the ideals expressed in the Polish Constitution, so today's Communist regime is obligated to try to stamp out these same ideals if it is to survive. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, it will not survive. People, nations, even continents may be held in captivity for periods of time, but, eventually, the will to be free will not be denied. Poland will be free again just as she has before regained her freedom from would-be conquerors. The Polish people still fight for their freedom, as they always have, and always will. Though harassed by their unwanted leaders, the Polish people maintain their dedication to their Christian heritage of freedom and equality as they so well demonstrated during last year's observance of the Polish millennium. Despite official threats and interference, Poles by the hundreds of thousands publicly demonstrated their steadfast faith to the principles which marked the first thousand years of that nation's Christianity.

Mr. Speaker, Poland needs our support and the Polish people need our encouragement and help as they struggle to rid themselves of the foul weight of atheistic communism. And as we salute those gallant people we must also salute their friends and relatives here who make up the many loyal Polish-American societies. Their work means much to their loved ones in Poland just as it adds to the finer traditions of this country.

CONDUCT OF WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, certain Members of Congress have made impassioned speeches deploring the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

I had hoped that they would be more temperate in the way they escalated their opposition to the administration's policies. Surely to say that we are engaged in "a policy of madness" borders on the irresponsible.

I do not believe that it is "madness" to bomb military installations and strategic targets belonging to the enemy in time of war.

I do not believe that it is "madness" to disrupt the flow of men and materials that resupply enemy forces engaged in ground action with American and South Vietnamese troops.

What would be "madness" in my view is to allow enemy military power to function unimpeded and unchecked at the source of its power.

I believe that no American President —and certainly not President Johnson— has wanted to involve the Nation in war.

There is no greater burden to a President than ordering young Americans into battle. There is no greater anxiety facing a President than the possibility of involving America in a costly and bloody war.

We did not start this war nor did we seek involvement in it. Our involvement occurred because, as the leading power of the free world, we simply could not remain indifferent to the fate of others who asked for our help and support.

And the people of South Vietnam sought America's help and support.

President Johnson is ahead of everyone else in wanting to find peace in Vietnam. But he also must persist in the struggle until the possibilities of negotiations are realized.

To date, there have been 12 separate peace initiatives from the United States to Hanoi. And all of them have been curtly rejected.

We know from the exchange of correspondence between President Johnson and Ho Chi Minh, made public recently by Hanoi, that it is not the United States which seeks to prolong the war.

As far as I know, Ho Chi Minh's position is still the same.

He demands a halt to the bombing.

He demands a complete withdrawal of all U.S. forces in South Vietnam.

He demands American recognition of the Communist Liberation Front.

If these harsh demands are met—and if bombing against the north were completely halted—talks could begin. In other words, if the United States completely withdraws from Vietnam and initiates a total cease-fire on land and in the air, then the possibility of talks could be said to exist.

This, I submit, is truly a policy of madness.

There can no longer be the slightest doubt about who wants peace and who wants the war to continue.

For his part, President Johnson has emphasized our Nation's determination to continue to press for negotiations. We will not be discouraged; nor will we be deterred from this quest to find a formula that will bring Hanoi to its senses and to the negotiating table.

The onus for peace rests squarely with Hanoi. The world is watching and waiting for a reasonable response.

Our President will continue to press the cause for peace through an honorable settlement of differences.

He will continue to insure a strong but measured U.S. military response to meet aggression.

And most important of all, he will continue to count upon the support and understanding of the American people during the difficult weeks and months ahead.

No impassioned speeches against this war—from whatever source—can negate one basic fact: We want peace. And our Government is led by men who have only one objective for Vietnam—a peaceful and honorable settlement.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I want to insert in the RECORD a sampling of editorials regarding the eloquent speech made earlier by Gen. William C. Westmoreland. General Westmoreland put into perspective America's goals in Vietnam and what we must do to win the peace:

[From the New York World Journal Tribune, Apr. 25, 1967]

THE MAN WHO KNOWS

An eloquent answer was delivered by Gen. William C. Westmoreland to the Kings and the Carmichaels, the Fulbrights and the fulminators, the Spocks and the sheep, the marchers and the well-meaning about what is going on in Viet Nam, and why.

Gen. Westmoreland, more than any other person, knows—for he has been the commander of U.S. forces there for more than three years—and his talk before the nation's newspaper editors and publishers was a lesson in compassion as well as national purpose.

Our side, Gen. Westmoreland said, is "involved in a total undertaking—a single, all-pervading confrontation in which the fate of the people of Viet Nam, the independence of the free nations of Asia and the future of emerging nations, as well as the reputation and very honor of our country, are at stake."

That says it.

Gen. Westmoreland spiked some of the myths:

Cease-fires: "In this war, inevitably it will be a military advantage to the enemy and a detriment to our side."

Bombing of civilians: "Never in the history of warfare have so many precautions been taken by men in combat."

Speaking of war against civilians, Gen. Westmoreland said that "during the last nine years, 53,000 Vietnamese—a large share of them teachers, policemen and elected or natural leaders—have been killed or kidnaped. Translated to the United States, that would be more than 600,000 people . . ."

Of terrorism, the man who knows cited "a typical example":

"During the early morning hours of April 16, the Viet Cong attacked a hamlet 20 miles north of Saigon. Among the victims were five revolutionary development team members. Three of them were women. Their hands were tied behind their backs and they were shot through the head."

Enough to persuade the stop-the-bombing crowd, the draft card burners and the peaceniks? If not, perhaps Gen. Westmoreland's allusion to "recent unpatriotic acts at home" will.

The enemy, he said "sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve" and, "encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Viet Nam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north"—which "inevitably will cost lives."

The general's appeal to the national will was as incisive as the words of any editorial:

"The magnificent men and women I command in Viet Nam have earned the unified support of the American people."

They have indeed.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

WESTMORELAND'S APPEAL

In his address to the Associated Press managing editors, General Westmoreland was calling for two things—understanding of the war in Vietnam and support on the home front. It was an admirable performance, one which should inspire confidence in the man who is responsible for the direction in combat of some 435,000 Americans.

This general is not a wishful thinker. "The end," he said, "is not in sight. I foresee, in the months ahead, some of the bitterest fighting of the war."

But General Westmoreland also spoke with confidence in our "battlefield capability." The problem as he sees it no longer involves danger of a military defeat. A military victory is beyond the reach of the Communists. He is concerned, however, with the attitude of some Americans.

"The magnificent men and women I command in Vietnam," he said, "have earned the unified support of the American people." But a noisy minority denies them this unified support. And our troops "are dismayed, as I am, by recent unpatriotic acts here at home. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

General Westmoreland knows, of course, that it is impossible to ban anti-war demonstrations in this country. Even as he spoke to the editors, demonstrators were marching in front of the hotel, one of them carrying a placard which read: "Westmoreland Wanted for War Crimes."

What can be done, however, and what General Westmoreland evidently hoped to do, is to isolate the peaceniks by appealing to the patriotism and the good sense of the American people.

The same thing is true of the address to the Economics Club of Detroit by General Wallace M. Greene Jr., commandant of the Marine Corps.

A great many, perhaps most, Americans are uneasy and unhappy with the war in Vietnam. But they also know that there is no easy way out. And as they come to realize that such shameful episodes as the recent demonstrations in New York and San Francisco serve no better purpose than to encourage the enemy and prolong the war, we think they will listen to the General Westmorelands and the General Greenes, not to the shrill, irrational clamor on the American Left.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

Westmoreland's Frank Address

(By David Lawrence)

Someone in the administration certainly made a wise decision in letting Gen. William C. Westmoreland go before the managing editors of the Associated Press at their annual meeting in New York City this week and make such a frank and outspoken address about the Vietnam war.

The only question that arises is why the things he said were not emphasized heretofore by the government of the United States, so that throughout the world it would become known that the protesting groups in this country do not reflect public opinion.

The United States military commander in Vietnam said pointedly that he saw signs of "enemy success in the world arena" which could not be matched on the battlefield. The general stated the case succinctly when he added:

"He (the enemy) does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies."

For several months now, inside and outside of Congress, criticism of the Vietnam war not only has been disheartening, but has actually played a part in prolonging the conflict and preventing peace negotiations. Scarcely a day passes that some senator doesn't arise to announce that the war is being "escalated" or that America has no business fighting for freedom any more. The impression conveyed is that, when the United States is engaged in a war, it must ask the members of the Senate just what tactics to employ. This not only damages morale but causes confusion in the handling of the war strategy itself.

Whenever the American forces intensify their attack, there is an outcry in congress. Thus, on the same day that Westmoreland was making his speech in New York, the Democratic leader of the Senate, Mike Mansfield, said that the American air strikes against the MIG bases in North Vietnam represent "further escalation" which, he declared, "will make it more difficult to get negotiations under way."

Another Democratic leader—Vice President Hubert Humphrey—almost coincidentally was telling the Texas state legislature at Austin that it would be "A betrayal of American liberalism" for this country to forsake the rest of the world and fail to use America's strength to preserve freedom. He declared:

"What would be the morality of a nation which devoted its riches only to itself, or regarded freedom in one part of the world as less precious than in another?"

Neither political party has been able to give the President the solid support which the commander-in-chief has always had in past wars in American history.

The Vietnam war is being pursued on the battlefield and in the air more effectively today than ever before. But unity at home is essential to the success of the military policy.

Although the United Nations seems frustrated, individual governments can still perform a useful function in expressing themselves frankly in support of the American position.

In the next few months, world opinion could force the North Vietnamese to the conference table and bring an end to the war. This is not likely, however, as long as there are staged protests as well as criticisms in Congress which indicate that either the United States is afraid of the enemy and will not use its maximum power, or that an artificially developed fear of "escalation" will cause the American government to retreat and eventually withdraw in humiliation.

President Johnson is known to have taken a positive position—namely, that he will follow the advice of the military men and pursue the war vigorously in order to persuade the enemy that it is better for the aggressors to withdraw now from South Vietnam and save themselves from a destructive punishment.

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, Apr. 25, 1967]

General Westmoreland's Blunt Talk

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of the U.S. forces in Vietnam, foresees some of the bitterest fighting of the war in the months ahead. And in his speech to the annual meeting of the Associated Press in New York, he was unusually frank in pinpointing where he thinks much responsibility for this lies.

The enemy, he said, "does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the North. This inevitably will cost lives—American, Vietnamese and those of our other brave allies."

This is a blunt statement that many will find hard to swallow; nevertheless it puts before the American people in specific form a dilemma of democracy. General Westmoreland did not suggest that debate be curbed, but he expressed his dismay, and that of the men doing the fighting, over "recent unpatriotic acts here at home."

It has long been apparent that Hanoi sees in the protest movements in this country confirmation of its preconceived idea that eventually the United States will simply pull out.

It may well be that the country will tire, but it is a tragic miscalculation to assume that this will lead to withdrawal pure and simple. What Hanoi should be considering is that the impatience might lead to unleashing of this country's power, which has been held back with remarkable restraint.

This is the dangerous factor that could result in a widening of the war beyond Vietnam with catastrophic consequences. It is far from a remote possibility, and it ought to be seriously pondered by those in this country who exercise their right of protest, as well as by Hanoi.

QUIE SUBSTITUTE WOULD TAKE CONGRESS OUT OF THE EDUCATION BUSINESS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, one of the true ironies of the Quie substitute for the elementary and secondary education amendments is the apparent willingness of its supporting Members to surrender all congressional control—save that of the purse strings—over Federal aid to education. The distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] would be unwilling to take this step for farmers, for postal clerks, for veterans.

He would tell the American taxpayer that Congress is willing to turn over $3 billion a year of his money to State and local agencies with no congressional controls whatsoever. We would not know whether the funds were spent wisely or poorly. We would not know whether we were doing our job properly or not.

Now, I am in favor of local control of education. Power to make educational decisions has rested at that level, and should continue to do so. But we have a national interest in improving the capacities of our young people, and the Congress is responsible for legislating in the national interest.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the national interest is best served by Congress if it retains the power to set priorities in the use of Federal aid and to make sure that national needs are being met. This is the approach we took with the National Defense Education Act—now almost 10 years old and flourishing. And this is the approach we took in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

There is no question that, in addition to the categories the Congress establishes as national priorities, there may be a need to provide supplementary tax support for State and local efforts in education. But Mr. Quie's proposal would not do this. It would retain all the categories set up under Elementary Secondary Education Act and National Defense Education Act. At the same time, however, it would surrender our congressional prerogative to expand public funds for top-level Federal priorities.

This approach may make our job easier, Mr. Speaker, but that is not what we are here for. It would be a sorry day, indeed, if every time the Congress were faced with a national problem, it virtually turned its back on it. What the Republican substitute does in effect is say to the American public: "Okay, we'll provide the money, but we want no part of the problem. You work it out, and we'll pay your bills."

Mr. Speaker, this is a power we would not give our wives. It is not legislating; it is abdicating.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, an unaccountable number of deaths and injuries of our schoolchildren at road crossings are prevented every year by a well-organized and dedicated group of young people protecting each other as school safety patrols. These children who rise early in all kinds of weather to police dangerous corners, preventing their classmates from darting in front of cars rushing to and from work, provide an invaluable but unsung service to the entire community. By endorsing the second week in May as National School Safety Patrol Week as I propose in the bill I am introducing today, we can give these exemplary young people the recognition they richly deserve and inspire them to make their organization even more effective.

GREATEST CHALLENGE FACING THE AMERICAN MERCHANT MARINE TODAY IS THE CONCEPT OF CONTAINERIZATION

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BYRNE] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the greatest challenge facing the American merchant marine today is the concept of containerization. It affects every phase of the shipping operation from the banker who finances export transactions to the longshoremen on the piers. Hitherto, ocean transportation has started at the shoreline. As containerization develops, the ocean transportation will be moved backward until it originates at the shipper's place of business and terminates at the receiver's.

The concept of financing ocean shipments by means of the bill of lading will require extreme modification because it is likely in the future that the bill of lading will be so changed that it will be useless as a commercial document for financial purposes. The customs system will require modification since it will necessitate the presence of customs officials at the place of original loading and final discharge of the container, and the ship will be merely one element in the overall transportation system. The longshoremen will be relegated to the job of attaching clips to containers and will have no other or further duties. While this will unquestionably relieve the heavy physical burden upon these men, we must face the facts—it will require far fewer numbers of them.

As for the ports, those who hesitate in providing space and equipment to handle increasing numbers of containers will find themselves in the back waters of commerce. This will require very substantial investments even in the best of our ports and it is important that the appropriate port authorities recognize this fact so that they can take advantage of the new technology. In some cases it will require radical relocation of port facilities so that they can be integrated with trucking lines and railroads to permit the unimpeded flow of containers. As far as the ship operators themselves are concerned, many problems remain to be solved. Among those in the North Atlantic for example, there are some 10 new vessels which will be placed in service in the course of the next year or so. In view of the far higher productivity of these vessels, both by reason of their larger size and higher speed and faster turn around, it is probable that this route will be overtonnaged for the next few years.

It may well be that the new port facilities required will be in advance of requirement, but it is essential that the facilities both by way of ships and port facilities be provided so that maximum advantage can be taken of the new system.

We in the Philadelphia area are particularly fortunate by reason of our geographical location and land transportation facilities to be in a position to make maximum use of the new concept. However, we must not hesitate to devote the necessary thought and capital to keep ahead of developments. In the light of expansion of this concept, it may well be that the entire future of our port is dependent upon proper development in this direction.

I am particularly conscious of this problem both as a representative of our great port and as a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee of the House. I have actually observed the major developments in other areas, and I am fully convinced of the necessity of expansion of facilities in our port. While I recognize that the merchant marine has many other problems, notably lack of replacement of ships, I feel that from our own selfish viewpoint this must be our major consideration.

MODEL CITIES BILL OFFERS HOPE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important byproducts of the President's model cities program is the encouragement and hope it has offered to cities and to the mayors all across the Nation.

This hope and encouragement was so eloquently expressed in a recent article by Mayor John F. Collins, of Boston. In speaking of the President's model cities program, he said:

> It provides all of society, not merely the cities and their residents, with the opportunity to demonstrate that we have the knowledge, the capacity and the will to improve substantially the quality of urban life.

He continued to say that:

> The most demanding challenge which Model Cities places before our cities is that they demonstrate the capacity to manage and organize their resources, and the capability to alter existing organizations or to help create new organizations which can effectively deal with technology and change.

Mayor Collins is a man who is intimately involved in trying to solve the problems of urban blight. He is not sitting on the sidelines just dreaming what should be done. He is working to see that it is done. I urge that we listen to what he has to say.

Mayor Collins' article, appearing in the April 23 issue of the Boston Sunday Globe, presents one of the more persuasive arguments to why Congress should appropriate the full $412 million requested by the President.

Therefore, I would like to share this excellent article with my colleagues by including it at this point with my remarks:

MODEL CITIES BILL OFFERS HOPE

(By Mayor John F. Collins)

With the Model Cities legislation our cities have been asked to demonstrate that they have the purpose and the understanding to develop programs which will substantially improve the living environment and general welfare of people living in blighted neighborhoods.

The accomplishment of this task demands a comprehensive attack on social, economic, and physical problems through the effective and efficient allocation of all our resources, public and private.

It provides all of society, not merely the cities and their residents, with the opportunity to demonstrate that we have the knowledge, the capacity and the will to improve substantially the quality of urban life. Further, we must prove that we can efficiently manage change.

Manage change we must!—for only in this way can we do a far better job than we have in the past of assuring that the burdens of change, beneficial to society as a whole, are not borne disproportionately by a few individuals.

Despite our present efforts, the strength and vitality of our older cities continues to wane. Our older cities, in many instances, have been unable to compete with the attractive suburban green and the age of the motor car, although here in Boston the flight to the suburbs has at least been arrested.

Into our older cities come the new immigrant, the farmer, the Negro, the Puerto Rican, almost penniless, inexpert and unknown. Today he is destined to live in slums or to generate new slums through simple overcrowding. Here he finds himself unable to gain adequate employment. Here he must pay the price imposed by poverty, limited skills, ignorance and deprivation.

The passage of Model Cities legislation is itself an expression of our society's long delayed recognition that the persistence of widespread urban slums and blight, the concentration of low-income families in our older urban areas, and the unmet needs for additional housing and public facilities have resulted in a marked deterioration in the living environment of large numbers of people.

The concern of Model Cities is not with what to do to improve urban life, for hopefully we have learned something in over 20 years battle with our environment but rather —how to do it.

The orientation of the program is prevention rather than cure. Our major emphasis must be towards preventing social problems from developing.

The most demanding challenge which Model Cities places before our cities is that they demonstrate the capacity to manage and organize their resources, and the capability to alter existing organizations or to help create new organizations which can effectively deal with technology and change.

Corporate institutions have demonstrated such a capacity. One reason is, perhaps, that they did not cling to erroneous ideas about themselves and their environment. They realized that progressive societies outgrow organizations as children outgrow clothing.

If the Model Cities program is to be successful our cities must begin to state their objectives by action. We must begin to engage in a continuing progress of decision-making concerning the nature of what is public responsibility and how we go about meeting that responsibility. Local leaders must take the initiative in experimenting with new ideas and patterns of government for meeting their needs.

If we are to improve substantially urban life, we need inventiveness in the democratic process. We need a fruitful combination of public and private initiative and the involvement of the neighborhood in their affairs at City Hall.

Each of us, public official, technologist, teacher, businessman, housewife, and citizen must demonstrate that we can deal effectively with the social and economic issues of today—that we can restore in the less fortunate a sense of purpose—that we can secure for our children, the jobless, the aged, the deprived, the fruits of a good life. We must liberate the poor from the chains of poverty and liberate the aging from the bonds of boredom, illness and idleness. Only in this way can we realize our dreams of great cities as the foundation for the Great Society.

Finally, and most important, if Model Cities are to succeed we must have as a minimum the $412 million which the President of the United States has asked the Congress to appropriate this year. The Model Cities program, is also a recognition that cities do not have enough money themselves to even begin to undertake such ambitious programs. We have the purpose. The Congress must now make available the money.

STATE REPORT EVALUATES COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the status of the community action programs and their role in the program of the Office of Economic Opportunity is a subject of widespread interest.

For this reason I believe the information in the two following editorials, both taken from the Oklahoma Journal, Oklahoma City daily newspaper, are worthy of attention, and I therefore enter them herewith:

How the War Goes on Poverty

Although there has been some disillusionment with the war on poverty in America, a recent report by the coordinator of the Division of Economic Opportunity in Oklahoma, Robert L. Haught, provides solid evidence that some important battles are being won. In Oklahoma, at least.

In his report to the Governor and to members of the Oklahoma Congressional delegation and the state legislature, Haught shows the scope of the Economic Opportunity Program to be a surprisingly large one, beginning with 10 basic programs and branching out into a number of lesser ones.

The Economic Opportunity coordinator confines himself to one segment of the overall program in his report called "Communities in Action," and concentrates on the program called "Community Action."

"Community Action," he reports, "has become a moving and vibrant force in Oklahoma in a relatively short span of time. In county after county over the state, citizens have banded together in a common effort to expand opportunities and bring about overall community improvement."

The Community Action program began in Oklahoma county in April of 1965 and spread to Pawnee county the following month. By the end of the year, a total of 23 counties were engaged in it.

During the first six months of 1966, Haught reports, the total rose to 54 counties with funded Community Action Agencies. Five more counties had submitted applications for funds and an additional five counties had formed Community Action organizations.

The funded CAAs include one which covers three counties and two which cover two counties each, for a total of 50 operating agencies. These 50 agencies are serving more than 90 per cent of the low-income population of the state. The remaining counties have access to individual programs like Head Start, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Adult Basic Education and Rural Loans.

Thousands of Oklahomans of all ages, with varying ethnic, cultural and economic backgrounds, have involved themselves in these local efforts to help low-income citizens help themselves.

Governing the activities of the 50 Community Action agencies are around 1,200 board members—local citizens who contribute their time and talents without compensation. Of the total, some 350 are representatives of the poor. About one-fourth of the board members come from minority groups.

Local Businessmen Help

Probably one of the best testimonials to the effectiveness of the Community Action program as one prong of the war on poverty, is supplied by an employee.

Among the CAA staffs are many from the low-income group who have become employed as directors, assistant directors, secretaries or neighborhood workers. One of these expresses what the program means in the following terms:

"In the time I have been in the CAP office, I have felt a deep feeling of accomplishment as I feel anyone must feel who works with impoverished people or with people who are striving together to help themselves and their neighbors. I know the feeling of going to bed hungry and the embarrassment of going to school without a decent pair of shoes to wear. Because I have experienced the sufferings of the poor, I feel very deeply toward their problems.

"Also since being with Community Action I have found that the people in the big offices downtown have more feeling and desire toward the poorer class than I ever dreamed it was possible."

This is a heartening expression from one who deals closely with the program and it speaks well for the manner in which it is being operated.

The Division of Economic Opportunity is located in the Sequoyah Office Building across the street from the state capitol and persons who would like to learn more about its operations would do well to make application there.

BETTER POSTAL SYSTEM OVERDUE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, in Perth Amboy, as in thousands of other communities across the Nation, Postmaster General O'Brien's plan to establish a nonprofit postal corporation has fallen on receptive ears. The Perth Amboy Evening News contends that Mr. O'Brien only said aloud what millions of Americans have known for some time: that the Post Office Department cannot continue to operate under its present system. An editorial in the Evening News of April 7, 1967, called for a study of Mr. O'Brien's recommendation and consideration of other alternatives, including turning the postal service over to private industry. I insert this editorial in the Record at this point:

Better Postal System Overdue

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien has said out loud what millions of Americans have known for some time: The Post Office department cannot continue to operate under its present system.

To stress how outmoded the present arrangement is, O'Brien said that if the telephone system were operated the way the Post Office Department is, "the carrier pigeon business would still have a great future."

The comparison may seem funny, but the ills confronting the Post Office Department require a solution.

O'Brien's suggestion that it be replaced by a non-profit government corporation has considerable merit.

The government should also study the possibility of having the postal system operated by private enterprise with government supervision of rate schedules.

If the current debate over the Post Office Department involved a federally-operated telephone system, there probably would be some hesitation about turning the operation of the telephone system over to a private enterprise.

Private enterprise, however, does operate the telephone systems profitably, despite strict government supervision and regulation.

If private enterprise could provide the nation with a superior postal system, why should it not be permitted to start operations?

It would be unthinkable for the management of any large American corporation to settle for anything less than the most efficient methods of operation possible. Yet, the nation has for years endured a postal system that costs more than ever and yields a minimum of services.

What the Post Office Department needs is a touch of corporate genius if it is ever to provide better postal service on a more stable monetary basis. The new system may require larger rate increases, but certainly the O'Brien plan should be studied.

To overcome what he called "a jungle of restrictive legislation and custom" now strangling the department, O'Brien urged that the non-profit corporation be operated by a board of managers appointed by the President and confirmed by Congress. At the head would be a professional executive.

Last week the House of Representatives cut $100 million from the $6.6 billion appropriation requested for the Post Office Department. This action, it was reported, may have prompted O'Brien to call for something better.

If the House decision produced the O'Brien recommendation, the congressmen who voted for the cut in appropriations may have done the American people a big favor.

The nation needs a vastly improved postal system to replace the battered one it now puts up with a staggering cost. The O'Brien plan deserves careful examination without delay.

QUIE SUBSTITUTE NOT GENERAL AID

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the irony of the substitute offered from the other side of the aisle is that, if anything, it is more restrictive, more categorical, and gives less freedom to the States and localities of the Nation than anything that has yet come to pass under the name of Federal aid to education.

In fact, the only real differences between it and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act titles it is supposed to replace are that it gives less money than the administration bill for the educationally disadvantaged children who need it most, and more authority—not less—to the Commissioner of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I am for general aid to education, not a categorical package. True and complete general aid would establish no categories. It would give every State total freedom to set its own priorities.

But the substitute bill which has been introduced would not provide this freedom.

On the contrary, the proposed substitute would continue all the categories now found in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, earmarking funds for certain types of programs. But these are small matters compared with the overwhelming power given the Commissioner of Education.

Who would approve how each State uses its funds? The Commissioner of Education.

Who would pass on whether the funds are equitably distributed? The Commissioner.

Who would decide whether private schoolchildren are getting their fair share of programs? Again, the Commissioner of Education.

Under the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Commissioner's powers to monitor the great bulk of the funds are greatly limited. Title I is not a State plan program. All a State has to do is assure the Commissioner that funds will be used in accordance with the law. As far as distribution of funds go, it is the Congress which assures each school district its fair share.

Under the so-called general aid approach in the proposed substitute, however, the States would have to account to the Commissioner for how money would be spent.

The substitute measure is a bad version of what we have already got. Rather than taking us down a genuine general aid path, it hauls us back a few steps from where we already are.

Let us not kid ourselves about what we are being offered in the proposed substitute. The proposed substitute is not an unrestricted general aid bill.

For these and other reasons the proposed substitute should be rejected and the committee's bill supported.

COMMUNIST INVESTMENT IN MARTIN LUTHER KING IS PAYING OFF AGAIN

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Waggonner] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert here in the Record two items for the benefit of those who still do not want to believe, in spite of the record, that Martin Luther King has been prompted over the years by two driving forces, his own personal aggrandizement and his dedication to Communist goals. His lengthy record of "hit and run" in the agitation of Negro unrest has pretty well dispelled by now any belief that he acted in the civil rights movement out of unselfish motives. Looking back on his career as an agitator, it is now clear to see that his role consisted entirely of stirring up protests, grabbing headlines and television coverage, and moving on, having contributed nothing to the legitimate cause of the Negro; having driven wedges between the races that reasonable Negroes and whites have found difficult and sometimes impossible to mend.

Now that the civil rights movement has lost its glamor, his earlier training at such gatherings as the Communist Highlander Folk School has called him on to another field, to serve another Communist end, mobilizing support for Peking and Hanoi in their war against South Vietnam.

The first item I would like to include is the Washington Post story on General Westmoreland's statement on April 24, that such protests as King is stirring up provides encouragement to the Communists in Vietnam and are paid for with the lives of American servicemen.

The second item is the Post's story on the plans King has developed to protest the U.S. war against the Communists.

The administration is, I am sure, appalled that King has turned against it after years of servility on their part, but it is no surprise to anyone who sees King for what he is. His hand-in-hand association with the convicted draft dodger and convicted homosexual Bayard Rustin should have indicated years ago his views on military service to the Nation.

Is all this coincidence? Reason and commonsense tell us not.

King's activities represent subversion and anarchy in the pristine sense of the words. I know that he will not be punished for what he has done and is doing in support of Communist ends for the simple reason that he is a Negro, but his pejorative behavior must be recorded, against the day when we are asked why we allowed this man to do what he has done.

The articles referred to follow:

WESTMORELAND SAYS PROTESTS ENCOURAGE ENEMY IN VIETNAM—NO EARLY END OF WAR SEEN BY COMMANDER

(By David S. Broder)

New York, April 24.—Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of U.S. forces in Vietnam, said today that anti-war protests in this country are encouraging the enemy and costing American lives.

Westmoreland told the annual meeting of the Associated Press the "only alternative to the war of attrition" now being waged in Vietnam "is a war of annihilation, and we have ruled that out."

"I do not see any end to the war in sight," the gray-haired, 53-year-old commander told a rapt audience of newspaper executives at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. "We are going to have to grind him [the enemy] down."

"But," he continued, "we are in a stronger position to win such a war than the enemy, so long as we retain our resolve."

Anti-war demonstrations in the United States, Westmoreland said, undercut the efforts of the troops and encourage the enemy to "hope that he can win politically that which he cannot accomplish militarily."

ADVANTAGE TO ENEMY

Westmoreland also said that any cease-fire before clear-cut victory is achieved would "inevitably be a military advantage to the enemy and a detriment to our side."

In a nationally televised address, the first since his return from the battlefront, the General warned that "the bitterest fighting of the war" may come in the months ahead. His tone throughout was somber. He explained why he thought the anti-war demonstrations were dangerous to the hopes of victory in these terms:

"The enemy does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeat but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the North.

"This inevitably will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our other brave allies," the General said.

DEMONSTRATORS OUTSIDE

While he spoke, about 100 anti-war demonstrators marched and chanted outside. Police halted their attempt to burn an effigy of Westmoreland.

DR. KING ANNOUNCES BIG ANTIWAR DRIVE

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., April 23.—The Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. announced today a "Vietnam Summer" drive "against the war and against U.S. interventions elsewhere."

The civil rights leader also said he will have an announcement within 24 hours as to his political plans. There have been reports he will run for President in 1968.

Dr. King also said he supports Americans who refuse to serve in the armed forces "including Muhammad Ali (Cassius Clay), the heavyweight champ who has vowed to go to jail rather than be inducted into the Army Friday.

Dr. King said the "Vietnam summer" drive will include anti-draft activities, sponsorship of peace candidates in local and state elections and referendums in municipal elections asking for an end to the war.

Dr. King called for 10,000 volunteers to spend the summer organizing peace movements in communities across the Nation. He said he expected to use a trained field staff of about 200 workers from the civil rights and peace movement.

"We throughout the nation who oppose this war must reach others who are concerned," Dr. King said. "It is time to move from demonstrations and university teach-ins to a nationwide community teach-out."

Dr. King was joined at a news conference by pediatrician Dr. Benjamin Spock and Robert Scheer, editor of Ramparts Magazine, in calling for a "Vietnam Summer" that would use techniques of the civil rights movement to apply pressure upon the Johnson Administration to end the Vietnam War.

A pamphlet distributed at the conference said the long-range aim of the organizing effort is creation of a vocal, strong anti-war bloc by 1968.

"We aim at more than changing a vote or two in Congress," the pamphlet said. "We seek to defeat Lyndon Johnson and his war."

CONNECTION NOT TOLD

The pamphlet was signed by "New Politics for Peace in Vietnam" and listed a Cambridge post office box number. Its connection with Dr. King, if any, was not disclosed.

Chester Hartman, a Harvard professor acting as executive director of the summer project, said Harvard students and faculty, headed by Prof. Gar Alperovitz, would begin fanning out across the Nation in a few weeks to recruit volunteers.

Telegrams endorsing the project were received from Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.), Harvard Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith, the new head of Americans for Democratic Action, and others.

SEEKS $700,000

Dr. King said he hopes to raise $700,000 to finance the work.

"We view the Vietnam Summer project as a major organized follow-up to last week's massive peace demonstration," he said. "It will offer a constructive channel for all those who ask, 'what can I do?' "

"Perhaps 35 per cent, perhaps a majority of the people are deeply worried about the war," Dr. King said. "We hope the organizing efforts will translate this concern into effective political power against the war and against U.S. interventions elsewhere."

He said a central organization to coordinate the program would be formed, but he said the project would follow the pattern of the civil rights movement in that it would have no central control.

Dr. King said the civil rights movement had shown that "arrogant power can be made to yield to organized protest," adding: "Now we must turn that same dedication, work and courage to the fight for peace."

Earlier, Dr. King told a news conference at Brown University in Providence, R.I., that anyone whose conscience told him the Vietnam war is wrong should declare himself a conscientious objector and avoid the draft.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE WOONSOCKET CALL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 16, the Woonsocket Call will join two other Rhode Island daily newspapers, the Westerly Sun and Pawtuxet Valley Daily Times, in celebrating their 75th anniversary.

Being a native of the city of Woonsocket, I have had the honor of knowing many of the people who have played a significant role in the development of the Woonsocket Call. Now I would like to share in their pride as they observe their 75th anniversary in the vital field of journalism.

The life of this newspaper and the lives of the people of Woonsocket are closely woven together and, therefore, all of us in the city of Woonsocket joyfully share in the growth which this newspaper has realized.

I am pleased to note that this great newspaper received its start from a group of Democrats, who, displeased with the coverage given to their activities in the Evening Reporter, joined together to form a new local newspaper in 1892. This paper was named the Evening Call. In 1908 it acquired the Evening Reporter and in 1917 was renamed the Woonsocket Call and Evening Reporter.

For the most part, this newspaper has been a family operation with members of the third and fourth generations of the original families presently in charge of publication operatives.

The residents of Woonsocket and surrounding areas are proud of their newspaper and with good reason. It has served them well and has gained an enviable reputation in the field of journalism.

Newspapers such as this embody the very spirit of Americanism. They have made and continue to make a significant contribution toward the greatness of this Nation. For this we are most grateful.

I am sure that my colleagues in this body join me in saluting the Woonsocket Call, one of the fine local newspapers of our land.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Rumanians have lived in the eastern half of the Balkan Peninsula for an untold number of centuries. There they have tilled their productive land and at times made it the breadbasket of Eastern Europe. These sturdy and hard-working peasants have also lived in freedom, and have done their utmost to safeguard their independence. But they have not always been successful. Early in modern times the Ottoman Turks overran the country, making it a province of the Ottoman Empire. Until the mid-19th century the Rumanians lived under the rough and cruel Turkish regime, but they worked ceaselessly for their liberation. On numerous occasions they revolted against their oppressors, but were never successful until late in the last century.

In the 1870's the Balkan Peninsula was in political ferment; uprisings were taking place in many parts, and peoples were rebelling against the once-powerful Turkish regime there. Rumanians began their revolt, and, on May 10 of 1877, they proclaimed their independence from the Turks. During the ensuing Russo-Turkish War of 1877–78 they were victorious with the effective aid of Russia, and the subsequent peace treaty guaranteed Rumania's freedom and independence. Thus May 10 of 1877 marked the Independence Day of Rumania.

Since those distant days the Rumanian people have had their joys and their woes, and today they are again deprived of their freedom in their homeland. Fortunately, the Communist totalitarian dictatorship there is not as oppressive today as it was until recently, and today it is claimed by "some" that these people enjoy a certain amount of freedom, though they are not allowed to observe their independence day.

However, Mr. Speaker, in December 1966, I visited Rumania with the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Subcommittee on Europe of which I am chairman. I have, and will continue to have, love and respect for the people of Rumania. I am deeply concerned over the rule of the strong nationalistic aggressive Communist regime.

It is true the Ceausescu regime has attempted to project a "new image" but the new image is not evident on domestic policy. The rights of the individuals are denied to them.

We all look forward to their full freedom from Communist dictatorship and on the observance of their independence day we wish them peace in their homeland.

A PIONEER MATRIARCH AND COMMUNITY BUILDER

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of the Members of the House join me in extending condolences to our colleague the gentleman from Tennessee, Representative Joe L. Evins, upon the passing of his mother earlier this week.

Mrs. Evins, the widow of the late James Edgar Evins and a member of a pioneer De Kalb County family, was, at the time of her death, the oldest native of her hometown of Smithville. Her late husband was the founder of Consolidated Bus Lines, the pioneer bus transportation company in the area. She was a lifelong member of the Smithville Church of Christ and had been active in Red Cross activities. She served as secretary of the World War I selective service board in Smithville and had been most active in community affairs over a span of many years.

The passing of Mrs. Evins is not only a great loss to our colleague and her entire family—her brother, seven grandchildren, and 15 great-grandchilren—but to her community and, indeed, all of De Kalb County. She and her husband, through work and industry, had done much in building the local community.

Mrs. Evins possessed in abundance those traits of strength, honesty, and undeviating devotion to the Christian ideal and a firm belief in the importance of hard work. The true foundation of America's present greatness is the accomplishments and the strength of character of our pioneer generation of which Mrs. Evins was such an outstanding example.

A NONVOTING DELEGATE IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 9634, a bill which will implement the President's recommendation to provide a nonvoting Delegate from the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives. I have introduced this bill today—May 3, 1967—to coincide with the 165th anniversary of the city of Washington, D.C.

This is an interim measure which would be effective until Congress proposes, and the States ratify, House Joint Resolution 396, the proposed constitutional amendment to provide the District with voting representation in the Congress.

While a Representative under my proposal could not vote, he could be heard. Such a voice, even as a minority of one, is essential to bring home to Congress the critical needs of the District. Moreover, in voting for such a Delegate, residents of the District will reflect their views at the ballot box. Certainly, such representation is the very least that should be granted by Congress to a city with a population of about 800,000 residents.

There are many precedents for a nonvoting Delegate in Congress, some of which go back to earliest days. From 1789 until recently, when Alaska and Hawaii achieved statehood, the territories were represented in Congress by nonvoting delegates. Almost a century ago—from 1871 to 1874—the District had a nonvoting Representative in the House. In 1874 this position was abolished when Congress voted to end all forms of electoral franchise for the District of Columbia.

In the short span that the District was represented in Congress by a nonvoting delegate, the role played by him was impressive. He introduced many bills; he was appointed to the Committee for the District of Columbia, where he participated actively in its deliberations; and he engaged in debate. In 1874, the District delegate was regarded so highly as to be named chairman of the Select Committee on the Washington National Monument.

The bill introduced by me is consistent with prior precedents. It would provide that the nonvoting delegate shall be elected by the voters of the District for a term of 2 years. The delegate would have a seat in the House, with a right to participate in debate but not to vote. The House, under its rulemaking power, would determine the committees to which he would be assigned. In order to assure a delegate with both the necessary interest in, and knowledge of, the District's affairs, my bill requires that the delegate shall be at least 25 years old, as is required of a Representative; that he shall have lived in the District for at least 3 years prior to his election, and that he shall continue to live in the District during his term of office. He would be barred from holding any other public office during his term.

The bill would provide for a general election, and for nominations by party primaries or by petition. A runoff would be held if there are more than two candidates in a primary or in the general election and no one candidate receives as much as 40 percent of the total vote.

Technical and other changes are made in the District Election Act and related laws, designed to improve the election machinery. Enactment of this bill will thus also help lay the foundation for an orderly transition to the electoral system which will be required when voting representation for the District becomes effective.

This bill is not a home rule measure. I am a strong proponent of home rule; I believe the people of the District of Columbia should be given the right to elect their local officials and control their schools, welfare, police, and other services. But this bill will only provide that District of Columbia citizens have a voice in the National Congress.

The bill I am introducing today is similar, though not quite identical, to the bill introduced earlier by the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative Nelsen. I am hopeful that hearings on these two bills can be held in the near future, and that we will receive strong bipartisan support in the District of Columbia Committee and in the full House.

This bill represents a modest beginning toward the goal of effective and responsive government for the District's residents. It is in the American tradition. I urge your wholehearted support.

RACE BY DECREE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, a brief item in this morning's Washington Post described another example of the unspeakable apartheid policies of the Republic of South Africa. Under the headline "Race by Decree," the article told of an 11-year-old girl who has been classified as colored although the rest of her family is classified as white. The article follows:

> Pretoria.—South Africa's highest court upheld a Race Classification Board decision listing Sandra Laing, 11, as colored (of mixed blood), although her parents and their other children are listed as white. The girl, who formerly attended a school for white children, was reclassified in February, 1966, under South Africa's race laws. Justice Oscar Galgut, while upholding the board's decision, noted it created "an impossible situation" within the family, and suggested the Secretary of the Interior might be able to change her classification.

FIESTA FLAMBEAU

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to eulogize and mourn the passing of an event of high excitement and community spirit in one of the most historic cities in the country, San Antonio, Tex. I refer to the extravagantly beautiful night parade, Fiesta Flambeau. More than 20 years ago, this parade was added as the fitting climax to the annual fiesta week celebrating the anniversary of the famous Battle of San Jacinto, and no single event has been engaged in with more affection by San Antonians since that time.

It was my distinct privilege to have a grand marshal of Fiesta Flambeau, and barely 4 years ago I accompanied our President, then Vice President, as the honored guest of the fiesta and the city. This year, as always, the verbal outbreak of the seasons naturally turned the energies of the entire San Antonio community into producing a pageant rivaling the beauties of nature herself. I must pay tribute to the guiding light behind Fiesta Flambeau, Mr. Reynolds Andricks, and acknowledge our debt to him and his lovely, charming wife for another celebration that exceeded even our high expectations.

I trust that many of my colleagues will be attending Hemis-Fair 1968, which begins next spring, and I urge them to attend next year's Fiesta Flambeau for a truly marvelous experience.

COL. JAMES A. GUNN III

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to an extraordinary combat commander, Col. James A. Gunn III, who retired last Saturday in a fitting ceremony, complete with parade and reception, at Lackland Air Force Base, Tex., where he had been vice commander of the Lackland Military Training Center. My district of San Antonio is honored that Colonel Gunn and his lovely family are making their home with us. Colonel Gunn has already given of his talents to many San Antonio civic activities, so we are both honored and beneficiaries.

Col. James Gunn began his military career in 1939, completing pilot training. In December 1943 he was assigned to the European-African-Middle East theater where he served as a bombardment group deputy commander and commander. He flew 165 hours on 32 combat missions, and was shot down near the Ploesti oil fields in Rumania on August 17, 1944. He remained a prisoner of war only 10 days, however, before being repatriated. He flew from Rumania to Italy in the fuselage of a Rumanian ME-109, to present plans for liberating hundreds of prisoners of war.

We are so familiar with our debts to our servicemen of the present, that all too often we forget the exploits and heroism of even the recent past. Mr. Speaker, I include at this point an account of Colonel Gunn's clearheaded patriotism, as printed in the Aerospace Historian in their autumn 1966 issue:

ESCAPE FROM RUMANIA

(By Col. James A. Gunn, U.S. Air Force)

Beginning in the early part of World War II the major bombing effort of the Army Air Forces was aimed toward reducing the effectiveness of the Nazi war machine by striking at its industrial back-up. Factories producing war materials, assembly plants, and refineries became the objects of systematic hammering by the bombers of the 15th, 8th and 9th Air Forces.

Petroleum refining capability was early singled out as an important part of this effort. In addition to refineries in Austria and Germany, those in Rumania were singled out for their importance to the Nazi war effort.

The first bombing of the 13 major complexes surrounding the city of Ploesti was the famous low-level raid on Aug. 1, 1943, and during the ensuing years these refineries were struck again and again by bombers of the 8th and 15th Air Forces.

The RAF also made a few night sorties against Ploesti during 1944. The final bombings of the Ploesti area came in August 1944, after an intensive series of bombings beginning on Aug. 17 and continuing until the announcement of Rumania's capitulation on Aug. 23.

On Aug. 17, 1944, only a month after assuming command of the 454th Bombardment Group at Cerignola, Italy (upon the departure of Col. Horace D. Aynseworth), it fell my lot to be shot down on one of the Ploesti missions. On that particular day a new tactic was being tried. Because of the smoke screens being put each time the Rumanians received an air raid warning, we had resorted largely to radar runs and accurate strikes had become more and more difficult to achieve.

It had long been accepted that the more individual aimings the better the final results. As a consequence, on this day, the 454th Bomb Group and several other B-24 and B-17 Groups of the 15th Air Force were making runs on the target in a column of squadrons rather than in the usual pattern of group formations. I had led the formation to the target area, but dropped to the number two position in the squadron for the bomb run because of an inoperative radar, and turned the lead over to Capt. John E. Porter.

During the run in from the initial point and just prior to releasing our bombs, we were struck by unusually accurate flak, with the result that four of the eight aircraft in the lead squadron were shot down, including mine.

Our bomb run had been at 24,000 feet and we had abandoned the aircraft at a rather high altitude because of an aircraft fire. Consequently, I was blown quite a distance from the target area. Upon landing I was soon captured by a mob of Rumanian civilians who took me into the small town of Cornul. There I was treated well and, after a period of time, learned that I was about to be sent to the city of Ploesti under guard.

The trip was made in a commandeered civilian vehicle. Upon arriving in Ploesti, I found that all but one of my crew members had survived and had been brought to the Rumanian Army headquarters in Ploesti. A few crew members from other groups were there too, but it was some time before I found that there had also been four survivors from Captain Porter's aircraft, including Captain Porter himself.

After two days at the temporary Ploesti confinement facility (where we slept in bedbug-infested accommodations), we were taken by truck to an interrogation camp on the outskirts of Bucharest, where we were interrogated for two days. Then we were taken to the permanent prisoner of war camp in Bucharest, where I found that I was the senior officer.

There were over 1,100 American prisoners of war in Rumania. Some 400 officers were in a schoolhouse on the south side of Bucharest. Most of our enlisted men were in a camp on the opposite side of the city, and approximately 100 survivors from the initial August 1943 raid were in a camp at Timisul de Jus, just to the south of Brasov (in the Transylvania Alps).

Our prison experiences were similar to those to be found in dozens of other stories until Aug. 23. There was a coordinated effort by a party of several teams to dig out underneath the schoolhouse. At the time I entered the camp a hole big enough to accommodate a man's body had been chiseled about halfway through a four foot concrete abutment.

Work was slow because tools were poor and work could be done only when no guard was within hearing distance. The prison fare was austere and course but prior to my arrival the officers had made an arrangement to buy supplemental food.

On Aug. 23 the routine aspect of POW life changed drastically. A radio had been procured somehow. It was kept hidden in a fireplace chimney during the day and brought out each night to listen to the BBC news broadcasts. That night we learned from the news broadcast that King Michael of Rumania had announced his nation's capitulation to the Allies. Later we learned of the overthrow of Antonescu, the Nazi puppet, and the establishment of an interim government under Dr. Maniu.

Upon receipt of this joyous news the camp went wild. Many of the POW's had been there for months, and a few had been there more than a year. The prospect of liberation was exhilarating.

The next morning we were visited by a Rumanian Army colonel who assembled us and spoke favorably of the turn of events. He advised us to remain at the prison camp until further instructions were received. However, the fences were opened and we were no longer restricted to the area of the camp. Soon after his departure we were visited by Princess Catherine Caradja, now well known in this country, who asked for an opportunity to speak to us. I assembled the officers.

She did not speak with the joy shown by the Army colonel. As a matter of fact, this lady showed great distress because she feared the day would come when her country would be overrun and occupied by the Russians. With unusually clear perception and foresight she went on to tell us in rather positive terms that imposition of such a Russian Communist regime was probably the worst thing that could happen to her little country. This very forceful talk was received rather strangely by some of our young officers because, after all, the Russians were our allies in this effort to beat down the Nazi war machine.

At approximately 9 a.m. on Aug. 24, only a few hours after King Michael's announcement, we were greeted with the sound of air raid sirens, which shortly were to be followed by the bursting of bombs. For more than two days and nights the Germans bombed the city of Bucharest almost incessantly. The formations of *Stukas* and the HE 111's were small, and the bombs they were dropping appeared to be about the equivalent of our 250 pound HE bombs.

As soon as the bombing began, what had been mere disorder became chaos. This situation continued in Bucharest as long as I was there. After the visit of Princess Caradja I had been unable to locate a single Rumanian individual in authority. On visiting the enlisted men's camp, I found the same situation there. I did not restrict the POW's at either camp to the confines of the prisons, but instructed them to stay within the city and take refuge in shelters or basements during bombings.

Rumor had reached us that the Germans intended to single out the camps as targets. Most of us doubted this and I asked that the POW's keep in touch at the schoolhouse for further instructions.

Several of us began to search for any Rumanians with authority. I planned to make two requests: first, that our prisoners of war be removed from the city of Bucharest to somewhere in the country in order to be away from the area being so severely bombed by the Germans, and, second, I wanted some means of getting in touch with the Allied authorities in Italy to begin arrangements for evacuating the prisoners.

I soon learned that all of the major means of communications in Bucharest had been bombed by the Germans and there was no operative radio or wire service through which I could communicate with the Allies. The telephone building in downtown Bucharest had received several direct bomb hits. The War Department building was in a shambles, and had been completely evacuated. For a considerable period of time, I could locate no one ranking higher than a staff sergeant. The hierarchy of authority had collapsed. Finally, through the services of a sergeant on a motorcycle (who spoke English), I was put in touch with an officer and, ultimately, was taken to a temporary War Department headquarters which had been established in some recreational buildings in a woods several miles outside Bucharest.

I soon found that the senior man present was the Secretary of War, Lieutenant General Racovita. He saw me almost immediately. When I described the miserable circumstances of our POW's, General Racovita immediately agreed to arrange for the evacuation of American and Allied prisoners to another camp a few miles away.

Once this agreement had been concluded, I broached the subject of borrowing an airplane so that I might fly to Italy to arrange for the evacuation of our prisoners of war. I also promised to arrange for a strike against the German bombers which were dumping bombs on Bucharest around the clock. The airfield from which the Germans were operating was the Banasea Airfield, less than 15 miles north of Bucharest. At this suggestion General Racovita for the first time began to look with some favor upon my suggestion.

I was anxious to get started right then and there. I asked for an airplane that very night, but was told that it was not that simple, that approval of several high level officials must be obtained.

Somewhere along the way I had previously met a Mr. Rico Goergescu, Rumania's Secretary of State and Minister of National Economy. At the conclusion of my conversation with General Racovita, and with the assurance that I would hear from him again soon, Mr. Georgescu appeared on the scene and I was invited to spend the night at his residence.

Incongruously, that night we had a beautifully prepared steak dinner in a downtown restaurant—with the sound of ground fighting between the Germans and Rumanians on all sides. This was punctuated by the occasional wail of sirens followed by the German bombings.

Throughout the night there were many telephone calls on what appeared to be a "field phone" system at the Georgescu residence and several visitors came to discuss my proposed departure for Italy. They wanted to know just what type of strike I could arrange against the German-held airfield. I told them that it would be either a bomber strike or strafing by our fighters but gave reasonable assurance that the effectiveness of the German bombing unit could be effectively decreased if not eliminated.

We retired about 4 a.m. I was awakened early to be taken by Mr. Georgescu for an interview with the Secretary of the Rumanian Air Force. Through an interpreter, he told me that arrangements had been made for me to be flown to Italy in a Savoia Marchetti (an ancient model of an Italian twin-engine aircraft). Soon we were on our way to Ploesti Airdrome for the takeoff.

There I found that a Rumanian commander and a crew of two enlisted people were to fly me to Italy. I later was told that the enlisted men, who were wearing sidearms, had been put on board to guard me. Everyone seemed to be suspicious of me and feared that I might attempt to murder the pilot and take over the aircraft. I had no such thought.

Unfortunately, some 20 minutes after the takeoff, the pilot, who spoke no English, returned to Popesti Airdrome. I was told he said he had engine trouble although I detected none. Either he had no stomach for the mission or he was called back by radio.

As I stepped out of the aircraft I was met by a Rumanian captain by the name of Constantin Cantacuzino. He proved to be a royal Rumanian family member and a commander of the fighter group in Bucharest. He spoke to me in excellent English, saying, "If you will ride in the belly of a Messerschmidt, I will take you to Italy." I agreed without hesitation. The Germans were still bombing and, as far as I knew, the American POW's were still in the prisoner of war camps within the city limits. (I was told later, that they had actually been evacuated on Aug. 26, in accordance with General Racovita's promise.)

As Captain Cantacuzino and I began talking about the preparations for the trip to Italy, Secretary of State Georgescu again showed up, saying that the Interim President of the new government wished to see me. So I was taken to Dr. Maniu, the Interim President, who, through an interpreter, made a most impassioned plea that upon arriving in Italy I immediately make recommendations in the name of the Rumanian government for occupation of that country by either British or American forces.

On every side there was evidence of terror at the prospect of Russian occupation, and President Maniu was no exception. I promised to carry out his request, and did so upon returning to Italy.

I was eager to be off and somewhat perturbed by the insistence of Captain Cantacuzino in planning the flight with great and meticulous care. He continued to point out that I would be buckled inside the fuselage and in the event of being shot down or a crash landing, my lot would be none too good. We sifted through the store of maps and to my dismay there was not a single useable map of Italy to be found. So I sat down with pen and ink and drew a detailed map of Italy on a piece of cardboard. From this I briefed Cantacuzino. Then I sketched a smaller and more detailed map, about the size of a shirt stiffener, on which I noted the barrage balloon locations and AA gun positions, together with outstanding landmarks which would be used for pilotage after crossing the Adriatic.

I advised crossing the Adriatic at minimum level in order to avoid radar detection, but Cantacuzino objected. After considerable discussion, I reluctantly went along with Cantacuzino's plan, which was to begin the crossing at the maximum altitude.

As I would have no source of oxygen, we agreed on an altitude of 6,500 meters, which approximates 19,000 feet. His plan was to proceed at this altitude to a point approximately one-half way across the Adriatic and then nose down into a long shallow dive but with enough power to make the last portion of the flight as fast as possible, thus reducing the possibility of interception by American fighters.

On the cardboard map I drew in the details necessary to find the San Giovanni Airfield near Cerignola, which was my home base. As I had flown in and out of this base many times, I was able to rely on my memory to give him precise distances and headings from known landmarks.

Another part of our plan was the painting of an American flag on each side of the ME-109G in order to lessen the possibility of an attack by American interceptors upon reaching Italy. While the painting was being done, Captain Cantacuzino pulled me aside and expressed some alarm over the fact that the plans for our proposed flight were now quite widely known. We were in the heart of an area where allies and enemies intermingled and on some occasions it was difficult to tell one from the other. Captain Cantacuzino understandably feared that we might be shot down by German fighters soon after take-off.

He cleverly suggested that we broadcast the news that we would be leaving at dawn the next morning, Aug. 28, but we actually would leave that afternoon as soon as the painting of the flags was finished. I agreed to this and only Mr. Georgescu, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Air Force were given information of the true takeoff time.

I was outfitted with heavy leather flying clothing and the radio equipment was removed from the belly of the Messerschmidt to make room for me. Means of access into the fuselage was an inspection plate about 18 inches square on the left side of the fuselage which was held in place by four snap type fasteners.

When the painting of the American flags was almost completed, according to prearranged plans between Cantacuzino and myself, he fitted me into the fuselage on the pretext of just trying out the space. However, once I was inside the fuselage, he slipped the cover on, jumped into the cockpit, and in a matter of moments we were on our way to Italy.

The flight to Italy was uneventful and according to plan. Just opposite my head in the fuselage I discovered that by pulling on a spring I could open a small kickplate which was used as a stirrup by the pilot to enter the cockpit. By pulling this plate open, I was able to peek through the hole and see when we were over water and when we had crossed the shoreline of Italy.

In accordance with my instructions, Captain Cantacuzino (who was a superb pilot with 54 fighter victories to his credit), followed the plan I had put on cardboard with great precision. As I had directed him, he followed a stream until coming to a specific landmark on the left side, which I was able to see out of my peephole, and then turned to the right to a heading of 340°, which took him directly over San Giovanni Airstrip, home of the 454th and 455th Bomb Groups.

In view of the fact that we had British-manned 40mm guns around the perimeter of the airport, I had instructed Cantacuzino to lower his gear and flaps upon approaching the airstrip and make a slow, straight in approach while rocking his wings slowly.

I felt sure that no one would fire at even a Messerschmidt coming in in this manner. However, upon reaching the airstrip, Cantacuzino made the decision that a straight-in approach would be too great a risk because of a tail wind. Consequently, he circled the airdrome with gear and flaps down and nose high, rocking his wings slowly as I had instructed him to do.

I was told later that the AA gunners followed us around the pattern with their 40mm's but not only did they recognize the friendly type of approach, they were able to see the American flags painted on the sides of the aircraft. I felt a great sense of relief when I felt the aircraft rolling down my home runway.

Upon being pulled from the fuselage of the aircraft, I found that I was hypoxic and dizzy. As soon as I gained my equilibrium, I telephoned 15th Air Force headquarters at Bari, asking for Gen. Nathan F. Twining. In his absence, I spoke to Brig. Gen. Charles Born, the chief of operations. Following that, I called Col. Fay Upthegrove, commander of the 304th Wing, advising him I was back and had already called 15th Air Force.

As soon as we had a hasty bite to eat, Cantacuzino and I were hustled off to Bari, which was about an hour's drive. Planning was begun that night for fighter strikes against the German bombardment unit at Banasea Airdrome, and for evacuation of the prisoners of war in Rumania.

A strike was made against Banasea the next day by the 99th Fighter Group, which was followed on subsequent days by other fighter and bombardment units of the 15th Air Force. By Sept. 3 a total of 1,161 prisoners of war had been evacuated from Ploesti Airdrome by B–17.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1967—AMERICA'S KEY TO THE FUTURE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, it was a dramatic day in American legislative history when President Johnson signed into law on April 11, 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. He said then:

> The House of Representatives, by a vote of 263 to 153, and the Senate, by vote of 73 to 18, passed the most sweeping educational bill ever to come before Congress. It represents a major new commitment of of the Federal Government to quality and equality in the schooling that we offer our young people.

Apart from the nationwide impact of the President's remarks, I recall their very personal impact on me. As a first-term Representative in Congress, I felt proud to be included among the 263 Representatives supporting that historic bill, and prouder still to have been a member of the House committee which favorably reported out of committee the measure which became the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I have gone through the "growing pains" with this far-reaching legislation since becoming a Congressman from Maine only a few months before the act was signed into law. And, as proud, and as apprehensive, as any parent, I have closely watched the progress of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am proud to tell you today, based on reports, and on testimony I have heard before the House Committee on Education and Labor after more than 1 full year of its operation, that the success of various programs made possible by the act has been outstanding. These programs have injected new quality and opportunity into the education offered to America's young people.

An excerpt from the evaluation report from my State of Maine on the first year's operation of title I illustrates the impact that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has made:

> For the first time . . . school personnel have been able to provide special attention to the educationally disadvantaged children, and to concentrate their efforts in an attempt to meet the needs of these children. The reported results have been most rewarding. . . . Thousands of children have been helped.

H.R. 7819—the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 as reported—will allow these programs to continue, and to reach additional thousands of schoolchildren.

I urge my colleagues to support the amendments proposed in H.R. 7819. These amendments will further strengthen, extend, and improve education programs for elementary and secondary school children begun under authority of the act passed in 1965. For example, the participation of Indian children and children in overseas Department of Defense schools will be extended through fiscal year 1969. The National Teacher Corps program will be amended and extended. Provision will be made for comprehensive educational planning. Educational and related services for handicapped children will be extended and improved. The assistance provision for schools in federally impacted areas and areas suffering a major disaster will be amended.

I view the adoption of all of these amendments as necessary to continuing and improving upon the commitment made by the Federal Government to our Nation's schoolchildren 2 years ago, and I should like to outline some of their important provisions.

"Title I: Education of Children From Low-Income Families," has truly proven to be the "chance for a change" for thousands of school systems serving millions of schoolchildren. Over 17,000 school districts have taken advantage of the opportunities provided under this title to provide services ranging from remedial reading, hot meals, health services, summer science programs, and student-parent night classes to over 8 million disadvantaged schoolchildren who would not otherwise have received such services. Compensatory educational services were provided to children in densely populated urban centers, as well as to children in isolated rural areas.

The majority of the title I projects were directed to reading and language skills, skills without which it is becoming increasingly difficult for a person to function in our increasingly complex society. Correcting communication deficiencies at an early age, will prove to be of inestimable value in later years.

This is one type of the more than 22,000 projects carried out under title I, a number which indicates the need for such a Federal program and the desire and ability of State and local educational agencies to utilize title I funds. H.R. 7819 would provide authorization to continue to meet the obvious needs served by title I, and would further amend this title to meet the educational needs of disadvantaged children by:

Extending title I authorization for 1 year;

Allowing the participation of Indian children on reservations;

Increasing the dollar limitation on State administrative expenses to $150,000;

Using AFDC data for January of the preceding fiscal year in computing the allocation formula;

Requiring that all projects using education aids provide a joint coordinated program of training for such aids and the professional staff they assist;

Providing that allocations beyond the amount used by the local education agency be used within the State to remedy inequities caused by population shifts and economic changes, before being reallocated among the States;

Counting for allocation purposes a child of a migratory agricultural worker even if he remains up to 5 years in a school district, and by requiring the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to study the burden imposed on a school district by low-rent public housing and to report the findings to the Congress before January 10, 1968.

H.R. 7819 further amends title I by adding a new "Part B: Utilization of Teachers From the National Teacher Corps." This part would make corps members available to areas having high concentrations of low-income families. Teacher Corps members would be allocated among the States according to their number of low-income children. For this purpose $21 million is authorized for fiscal year 1968, $25 million for fiscal year 1969 and sums necessary to complete practical and academic training for enrollees in 1970. The Commissioner of Education would be authorized to enter into arrangements with local education agencies, on approval of the appropriate State agency, to furnish Teacher Corps teams—an experienced teacher and teacher-interns—and to pay part or all of their compensation.

The experienced teacher would receive a salary agreed to by the local educational agency and the teacher-intern would receive the lowest rate paid by the school system or $75 per week plus $15 per dependent, whichever is lower. The corps teachers would not be used to replace regular teachers.

Control over the corps members would rest completely with the local agency. Thus, this highly successful program, designed to attract and prepare teachers of disadvantaged children, created and authorized under part B of title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965 would be continued and appropriations for part B of title V would also be used.

Before January 10, 1968, the Commissioner of Education and the Secretary of Commerce shall report to the Congress on ways to establish entitlements under part A—the original title I—on the basis of data later than 1960, and to make recommendations for necessary legislation. The 2-year combined preservice and inservice program incorporating year-round academic instruction with practical classroom experience has served to meet a very real shortage of qualified teachers in urban slums and in depressed rural areas. It has also served as a stimulus for curriculum changes at teacher training institutions throughout the Nation. On the basis of testimony I have heard, I am sincerely committed to its continuance as proposed in H.R. 7819.

"Title II: Textbooks, Library Books, and Other Instructional Materials," appropriated $100 million during fiscal year 1966 to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and outlying areas. Over 43 million students and 1.8 million teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools benefited from this appropriation. Prior to 1965 more than two out of three public elementary schools had no library at all. Title II has made possible the establishment of over 3,400 new public elementary school libraries and 200 new public secondary school libraries, and the expansion of over 41,500 public elementary school libraries and 66,600 public secondary school libraries. Forty-five States authorized more than 50 percent of their allotment for school library resources—an indication of the dearth of such materials previous to the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Nineteen States, six for the first time, added school library supervisors to their staffs, in addition to providing for 112 new positions in 48 States.

These statistics give evidence of the fact that title II has met a very real need. To meet another great need, provision was made last year for the participation of Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and children in overseas dependents schools of the Department of Defense. H.R. 7819 extends this provision through fiscal year 1969, as well as the authorization for the whole title II program.

"Title III: Supplementary Educational Centers and Services," offered the opportunity to teachers, administrators, and community representatives of various interests to seek innovative solutions to the unique educational problems of a particular community. Since April 1965 over 4,000 proposals for title III projects have been submitted. Almost 1,500 projects costing over $108 million have been funded, including projects recently approved during the second approval period of fiscal year 1967 and announced on April 12. For example, title III project in Wells, Maine, was approved during this period: A cultural enrichment program for fifth- and sixth-grade students in a rural, low-income area will include field trips, youth concerts, special movies, visiting artists and authors, naturalists and historians, and the Portland Children's Theater.

Title III programs such as this have affected and enriched the educational experiences of over 10 million persons—preschool children, school dropouts, teachers, parents, and other adults and elementary and secondary school children in public and nonpublic schools throughout the United States. Reports made directly to me, presented before the committee, indicate that the project approval procedure now operating has proved very successful.

H.R. 7819 provides for extension of the participation of Indian children in BIA schools and children in DOD overseas dependents schools through fiscal year 1969, and the extension for 1 year of the other provisions of the title. I certainly hope that the projects which have truly advanced creativity in education, and which have involved the cooperation of representatives from all of the groups which make up a whole community will be allowed to continue and to improve.

Authorization of all of the above titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, have necessarily made great demands on the State educational agencies responsible for administering them and for coordinating all of the other educational activities within a State. To many State departments of education, already understaffed and unable to meet leadership, planning, and administrative demands prior to passage of the act, "Title V: Strengthening State Educational Agencies," has proved to be a most welcome, indeed necessary, part of the whole Elementary and Secondary Education Act legislation.

Eighty-five percent of the $17 million appropriated for the first year of operation was available to the States in the form of basic grants. These grants were used to study, plan, develop, and evaluate education programs and research. To carry out these functions, 1,000 personnel were added to the State departments of education. Under the 15-percent special projects portion of title V, 15 major projects to improve the leadership capabilities of State departments of education were funded, employing 126 professional and 82 nonprofessional personnel, with 48 States participating to some degree. Many States pooled their resources and engaged in cooperative projects of mutual, regional, interstate concern.

Two years ago, in enacting title V the Congress responded to President Johnson's statement that—

> State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education.

Today we have the opportunity to respond again to meet State educational agencies' leadership needs. H.R. 7819 extends title V eligibility to the Trust Territory of the Pacific. The apportionment formula for grants to strengthen State departments of education is amended to provide that 40 percent of the funds apportioned be allotted among the States in equal amounts and the remaining 60 percent be allotted on the basis of public school enrollment. This will correct the inequitability of the current formula which apportions funds among the States strictly on the basis of public school enrollment.

To allow the States to conduct systematic, comprehensive, long-range planning at all levels, something that is essential to future educational development, but for which few States have the resources now, a new part B would be added to title V. This addition would authorize funds for comprehensive and continuing planning at the State level, with 25 percent of the funds reserved to the Commissioner for special project grants and contracts to be conducted on an interstate, regional, or metropolitan basis. Of the remaining funds, 40 percent would be allotted among the States equally and 60 percent on the basis of population. To be eligible for planning grants, the State educational agency shall be the planning agency responsible for submitting an application to the Commissioner of Education setting forth the States' educational goals. If a State so chooses, higher education planning may be included, handled by a separate, coordinating planning agency.

Finally, H.R. 7819 provides that $65 million be authorized: 70 percent for "Part A: Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education," and 30 percent for "Part B: Grants for Comprehensive Educational Planning and Evaluation." Approval of these proposed amendments to title V presents to us the opportunity to add another dimension to the State educational agencies' leadership and planning capabilities.

Last year Congress added a new title to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. "Title VI: Education of Handicapped Children," promises when funded, to provide the assistance necessary to meet the personnel and program support needs for the handicapped children in our country. On January 12 of this year, in accordance with title VI provision, a Bureau of Education for the Handicapped was established in the Office of Education. This Bureau, by centralizing all federally supported educational programs for handicapped children, promises to provide administrative and coordinating capabilities which should be of great benefit to our handicapped school-age children.

To provide further assurance that these children will be provided quality educational opportunities, H.R. 7819 adds a new part B to title VI. Recognizing that early identification and educational evaluation of a handicapping condition is an essential first step in the optimum development of every child, $7.5 million is authorized to establish regional resources centers for: testing and educational evaluation of handicapped children; development of education programs to meet special needs of handicapped children; and assistance to schools and other agencies in a region to provide educational programs for the handicapped child.

Part B would also authorize $1 million for fiscal year 1968 and 1969 to be used for nationwide recruitment of special education personnel to help meet the urgent demand for over 200,000 such personnel within the next decade. Part of this $1 million would be used to disseminate information to prospective personnel, parents, teachers, and other interested persons concerning educational opportunities for handicapped children. The highly successful captioned films for the deaf program is authorized to be expanded to include all areas of the handicapped, and is funded by $1 million for fiscal year 1968 and 1969. In order to utilize the benefits of research and demonstration conducted by private agencies and organizations contracts as well as grants for research in education of the handicapped are authorized. The inclusion of Indian children in BIA schools and children in DOD overseas dependents schools is extended to title VI in keeping with the provisions in the other titles of H.R. 7819. Finally, the definition of "handicapped" in title VI, cited as the "Education of the Handicapped Act," is amended by striking "seriously" from the term "emotionally disturbed." I sincerely feel that the adoption by the Congress of part B to title VI, in addition to the funding of part A, will provide the assistance needed to enable the States to provide equitable educational and related opportunities to the children in this country handicapped to some degree by a mental or physical health impairment.

In conclusion I would like to mention that Public Law 81–815 and Public Law 81–874—federally affected areas—are amended by H.R. 7819 to clarify the definition of "Federal property" and to extend and broaden the provisions for assistance for school construction and current expenditures in major disaster areas through fiscal year 1972.

As I mentioned when I began, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been of personal and continuing interest to me. I have followed and supported, after careful scrutiny, all of its provisions as originally passed and as amended last year. I consider the amendments of 1967 contained in H.R. 7819 to be both necessary and wise and I wholeheartedly urge you to support this bill.

CRIME REMAINS A CAUSE FOR PUBLIC CONCERN

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HUNGATE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, this administration has given clear notice that crime will neither be tolerated nor ignored in the United States. And it has moved with great resolution in drafting the Safe Streets and Crime Control Act now before Congress.

This measure would enable the Federal Government to give badly needed financial support to local police agencies throughout the country. There could be a more effective campaign waged immediately against crime and the criminal.

In addition, the administration has proposed programs that would be equally effective, for they would remove many of the causes of crime. We can achieve substantial results only if both approaches are used.

It is plain that crime is a foremost concern among our people today. One of the most interesting assessments of the problem came recently from the Kansas City Star. In an editorial, the Star asked:

> What is the use, for instance, of building new parks if people are afraid to use them.

I have unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks, as follows:

[From the Kansas City Star, Mar. 31, 1967]

CRIME REMAINS A CAUSE FOR PUBLIC CONCERN

Crime and public safety continue to occupy the country's attention. President Johnson emphasized his concern this week by an unexpected appearance at the national conference on crime control. The President spoke for his anti-crime bill (350 million dollars in federal aid for various state, county and city programs) and he painted a rather bleak picture of the institutions which many of the delegates represented.

Mr. Johnson said that "many police forces are inadequately trained and organized"; that "prison facilities themselves sometimes are major breeders of crime" and that "congested courts can produce assembly-line justice which sometimes is no justice at all." Police, prisons and criminal courts primarily are state and city responsibilities. We are sure that many of the prosecutors, police chiefs and judges in the audience would agree with the President. The Jackson County prosecutor must have wished that members of the Missouri Legislature could have heard the words and applied them to his prosecutor's bill.

The same is true of the Citizens Conference on Missouri Courts which has withdrawn its court-reform measure because the Legislature couldn't get to it in this session.

Thus the federal government continues to move actively into fields where the states have performed beneath public expectations. In the case of crime, we believe the public will welcome the federal assistance.

For there can be no question that people increasingly are preoccupied with worry over the crime increase that is blighting this society. It is tragic when government builds parks that people sometimes are afraid to use; that elevators in shining apartment buildings are places of danger, and that a storekeeper or service station attendant must wonder whether a man is a customer or a robber.

The President reiterated a basic conclusion of his commission on law enforcement, that the long-range struggle against crime must cover all aspects of social dislocation: Poverty, mental illness, discrimination and poor education. Yet he did seem to place some insistence on dealing with the immediate crisis which means improved law enforcement and more efficient courts. Most Americans, we believe, concur with the proposition that slums, ignorance and hunger breed crime. And most of them will appreciate the rather urgent tone of the President's remarks that seems to call for decisive action now. Long-term programs aren't enough.

SPEECH BY MR. BENSON FORD, VICE PRESIDENT OF FORD MOTOR CO.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, today the 70 millionth vehicle built by the Ford Motor Co., in the United States rolls off the assembly line at the company's plant in Norfolk, Va.

I have been gratified by the confidence of Ford Co. officials in the growth of Virginia's largest city, which, coincidentally, is in my district, by its expansion of its Norfolk operation. This is an excellent plant with as outstanding a group of employees as can be found. In view of the occasion which is being celebrated in Norfolk this week, it is appropriate that Mr. Benson Ford, vice president of Ford Motor Co., was the guest speaker at the annual banquet and congressional dinner of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce on Monday.

Mr. Ford's remarks follow and I commend them to my colleagues:

REMARKS BY BENSON FORD

I want to start off with a word of reassurance for all of you who wage the daily struggle with the intricate problems of government and business. Sometimes you may wonder whether there really is such a thing as an easy decision to make. I can tell you the answer is "yes." I know because I had the experience myself only a few weeks ago. I was asked whether I would like to address the combined Annual Banquet and Congressional Dinner of the Virginia State Chamber of Commerce.

I had at least four good reasons, some personal and some business, for readily accepting the invitation.

The first one is completely personal. I am highly honored at being asked. In fact, since this is a combination of two outstanding events, I am doubly honored.

My second reason is that Ford Motor Company is proud to call itself an industrial citizen of Virginia. Through some excellent—if coincidental—timing, on the day after tomorrow we are taking special cognizance of Virginia's contribution to our company's progress when the 70 millionth vehicle built by Ford in the United States rolls off the assembly line at our plant in Norfolk. We hope that many of you will be there for our observance of this significant milestone.

My third reason for accepting the invitation for tonight veers back toward the personal. It's not often these days that an automobile man gets to talk before this many members of the Congress on a subject of his own choosing.

And that brings me to my fourth reason. The recent Virginia Trade Mission to Europe makes world trade a timely subject for this occasion, and it is one in which Ford Motor Company shares a very vital interest.

I understand the mission was unusually successful, which is a tribute both to the quality of Virginia products and to the abilities of the Virginians who made the trip. It is not an easy job to sell abroad, and tonight I want to discuss a few of the obstacles and why it is important that they be surmounted.

Ford Motor Company's involvement with the world market goes all the way back to 1903 when my grandfather founded the company. Of the handful of Ford cars made that year, one went to England and one to the Far East.

Today, we sell cars, trucks, tractors, household appliances, radios, television sets and many other products throughout the world. In the automotive field, aside from our U.S. and Canadian product lines, we manufacture a complete British Ford line of cars and trucks, nearly as complete a line of cars and a light truck series in Germany, and Australian Falcons and Fairlanes derived from their North American namesakes. We manufacture and assemble motor vehicles in 18 countries and have sales companies in 11 more. In addition, we supply dealer-assemblers in seven countries, and operate 10 overseas district sales offices which supply dealers in 94 more countries.

I offer this brief and incomplete sketch of our worldwide operations to indicate that we have a full appreciation of the problems and difficulties of entering new markets. We don't pretend to have found all the answers yet, but there is tangible evidence that we have found some of them. For the last two years in a row, we have led all world auto manufacturers in retail sales of cars and trucks outside North America.

The world auto market illustrates one of the big changes in the world trade picture in recent years. After World War II, America's goal was not only to strengthen the American economy through expansion of trade, but to assist the economic recovery of the rest of the free world.

Although much remains to be accomplished among developing nations, how well our industrialized friends have succeeded is reflected in the fact that car and truck sales outside the United States have more than doubled since the late 1950's. In the mid-Fifties, the U.S. market accounted for two-thirds of all motor vehicle sales, but now more cars and trucks are being sold outside the United States than within.

This is all the more remarkable because, as you know, the U.S. market has not been standing still by any means. Even the current market slowdown is a relative matter. This year is still shaping up as the third best we have ever known, exceeded only by the nine million and more new car sales of 1965 and 1966.

For the next decade, we expect car sales in the United States to increase at a compound rate of 3.4 per cent per year, which would mean normal sales of 11½ million new cars by 1975.

Exciting as that prospect is, the rest of the free world market is moving even faster. Our most conservative estimates look for a compound growth rate of at least 5½ per cent until 1972, tapering to somewhere between 4 and 4½ per cent for the following five years.

The ability to buy automobiles and trucks is only one indication of the comeback made by many of the world's economies. Japan, now the showplace of free enterprise and democracy in the troubled Far East, has become an industrial power to rival West Germany, Great Britain and France. In fact, Japan expects to rank right behind the United States and the Soviet Union in five years.

The economic resurgence of other countries, so ardently desired by us in those lonelier days of the Cold War, has been largely owing to the initiative and hard work of their peoples, to be sure. But in very large part, it has been the growth of world trade that allowed them to put their energies to fruitful use. The lowering of trade barriers and easing of currency restrictions stimulated competition, permitted more economical production through enlarging their markets, and resulted in cheaper sources of supply for producers and consumers alike.

Within the European Common Market, where internal tariffs for industrial products will be abolished completely by next year, industrial production increased by 58 per cent from 1958 to 1965. By creating a closely knit market of some 180 million people, the six countries have been able to make a more rational use of their resources, manpower and technological knowledge.

For all the prosperity greater world trade has brought, however, it is still running a rocky course. Trade barriers and protectionism are still too strong to permit maximum economic benefits from trade among developed nations or an adequate rate of growth among many developing nations.

Although the European Common Market's regional trade represents progress on one side of the coin, there is another side. As the Common Market's internal tariffs drop, its external tariffs automatically become more effective barriers to outside nations trying to compete within the walls. Meanwhile, Britain has renewed her interest in joining the Common Market, but continues to meet resistance both at home and among the Common Market countries. Europe continues to be divided into three trading blocs: the Common Market, the European Free Trade Association and the Communist nations.

The protectionism sentiment has been reflected in the hard sledding of the "Kennedy round" of GATT negotiations, into which we entered so hopefully four years ago. It is strongly reflected in the less developed countries where import quotas, local content requirements and numerous other restrictive devices are employed to nurture budding local industries. Yet progress toward free trade areas in Latin America and other developing regions, where industrialization could be speeded up through lower costs and prices of integrated manufacturing and marketing, has been painfully and haltingly slow.

When the international exchange of goods and capital investment demonstrably works so well in improving the lot of the human race, why is there still so much resistance? A root cause, it seems to me, lies somewhat paradoxically in the very developments that make more international exchange possible—the improved communications and transportation that make this what we are often pleased to call "a small world."

It seems entirely logical to assume that more contact between the various peoples of the world should promote better international understanding. Traffic congestion problems in Calcutta, Turkish teenagers listening to rock 'n roll on their transistor radios and European homes equipped with the latest household appliances look like common denominators between us all.

The problem is that in our fascination with the similarities, too often we overlook the far more important differences between cultures. If a small world offers more opportunities for understanding each other better, it also offers more opportunities for grating on each other more.

As the richest and therefore the most-envied people in the world, we Americans are particularly apt to touch raw nerves abroad unless we establish a two-way communication which makes us both understanding and understood.

This was underscored by *The Times* of London in commenting on the anti-Americanism encountered by Vice President Humphrey on his recent trip to Europe. Said *The Times:*

"The Americans are rich, strong and omnipresent. They make as much noise about their failures as about their successes. Their enormous capacity for coping and their energy leave the rest of the world breathless.

"Only a close contact with them reveals their idealism, their generosity, their intense sense of responsibility, their desire to do good, even if at great cost to themselves.

"Viewed from a distance they can far too often appear at once a ruthless machine and an uncoordinated agglomeration of self-seeking individuals. The sheer scale of American activity can be alarming to inhabitants of smaller and quieter countries."

I am not suggesting that American businesses and businessmen reduce their "capacity for coping" or their energies in order to smooth the way for better human understanding and expanded world trade. Those are qualities we need even more of, if anything. I do suggest the obvious: that part of the energy be devoted to adapting to the local customs and mores of the particular market in which we are competing. Harmonious trade relations will come from tolerance and adjustment, not from the homogenization of differing cultures and social structures.

Closely related to all this is a second obstacle to world trade and a second paradox of our times. The obstacle is nationalism, and the paradox is that the tide of nationalism has never run higher than in our age of internationalism.

It is a particularly unfortunate circumstance that, generally speaking, nationalistic fervor seems to run in inverse proportion to economic ability. The countries that most need the benefits of international trade and investment are frequently the most fearful of being dominated by foreign business or dependent on foreign goods.

This dilemma is not going to be resolved by doing away with nationalism. Nationalism is here to stay for a long time to come and we are going to have to live with it. The truth of the matter is that nationalism—which goes far beyond patriotism or sheer pride in country—gained one of its earliest footholds right here in the United States. As you Virginians know, the colonists were a pretty rambunctious group who guarded their hard-won independence fiercely.

In bringing today's nationalism and internationalism into accord, we need first of all to avoid the mistakes made by King George III, Lord North and their colleagues. In the British view of the time, the colonists seemed to have all the best of it. Britain provided a protected market for American exports and paid the duties on foreign produce flowing into the colonies. Even that tea that got dumped into the harbor up north was cheaper, tax included, than it was at home. But the British government's fatal mistake was failing to recognize that the colonies felt capable of managing their own affairs, and were unwilling to be managed for the benefit of the mother country.

Today's emerging nations feel the same way and, for starters, we need to convince them that neither their economic nor political independence is necessarily jeopardized by entanglements with foreign businesses; that on the contrary, foreign trade and investment are their best and perhaps only means of achieving the economic development that will assure continued political independence.

This is a trust that business must earn by demonstration. We must make the best use of every available opportunity to prove that the self-interest of an international business is not to drain its host country but to help build it into a better market. The more often we succeed in contributing to the productivity and economic development of these countries, the more new opportunities will be opened to us.

It goes without saying that selling on the international market also requires buying on the international market. Nothing can be more axiomatic than the fact that world trade is a two-way street. And right here is the third basic reason for resistance to the free flow of goods across national borders—namely, the reluctance of existing industries and businesses to share their markets with newcomers. In theory, free competition is the heart and soul of free enterprise. In practice, the instinct for self-survival keeps businessmen from welcoming into their own markets competitors who are *too* successful.

When the successful competitor is a foreigner, the instinctive desire for protection is reinforced by nationalism and a dislike for foreign ways. This, again, is a two-way street—it is as true when an American industry succeeds abroad as when a foreign industry invades our domestic market. Naturally, therefore, there are always strong pressures for *more* protection.

On the other hand, it is always hard to reduce trade barriers because somebody always gets hurt, or at least is given a harder row to hoe. The benefits of free competition, great as they are, undeniably come at a cost.

As an example of how the wheel turns, Japanese businessmen—whose low production costs have been a traditional thorn in the side of U.S. business—are reported to be worrying over an influx of cheap products from less-developed countries, like rayon shirts from South Korea. The Koreans, with their lower wage rates, can sell the shirts at a dollar and a quarter where the comparable Japanese made product runs nearly five dollars.

Closer to home, the automotive trade agreement between Canada and the United States is incurring criticism on both sides of the border. Certainly, in its early life it has required numerous and often difficult adjustments by automotive manufacturers and their suppliers in both countries. But we believe it is working out to the best interests of all concerned—including car customers—through more efficient integration of the North American automotive industry. Given time, it will yield even greater benefits in strengthening Canada as a trading partner for the United States as well as stimulating a faster rate of growth in automotive sales and employment in our country and theirs

All progress toward freer trade depends on the conviction that the overall benefits for the many will outweigh the costs and dislocations to the few. World trade is no place for the short-sighted view of short-range difficulties. The eventual result of mutually prospering trading partners is a greatly expanded market for the goods they want to sell each other.

Those of us who believe that a liberal trade policy is better than a protectionist policy have only one way to prove the strength of our conviction—by showing that we are willing to open our own markets to foreign competition.

At Ford Motor Company, for example, we want access to those fast-growning world markets I described earlier. We know we can do it only by giving foreign automobile manufacturers access to our own domestic market, and they are taking advantage of the opportunity to the extent of more than 600,000 cars a year.

As long ago as 1930, my grandfather spoke out against the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill in these words:

"Business thrives on competition. Nobody does his best if he knows no one is competing with him . . . Instead of building up barriers to hinder the free flow of world trade, we should be seeking to tear existing barriers down. People cannot keep on buying from us unless we buy from them, and unless international trade can go on, our business will stagnate here at home."

The course of history since 1930 has confirmed this view. It is no time now to abandon the path toward freer trade that has brought us and the rest of the world so far.

This does not mean, of course, that we can knock down all our barriers at once. We can't give away the store. But it does mean that the United States must be willing to concede at least as much as it demands in return—and not be too meticulous in adding up the exact balance, especially in dealing with the nations who are still struggling for a firm foothold on the economic ladder.

International commerce is—or can be—a decisive influence in relieving world tensions and paving the way for a peaceful and fully prosperous planet. The United States must negotiate in a spirit which leaves no doubt of our determination to reach those goals through a freer and expanded world trade.

We cannot allow ourselves to be deterred from our larger aspirations for the sake of industries that might be placed at a competitive disadvantage. As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has observed, anti-dumping legislation must not be allowed to "impair the healthy expansion of trade or invite damaging retaliation by other countries." Neither, of course, should we expect particular industries to shoulder the entire burden of dislocations caused by our broader interests. Our internal policies should include provisions for helping affected industries adjust to their new conditions.

To pursue the liberal trade policies we and the world need, we must have the kind of grass roots business support that chambers of commerce can generate. The Virginia Trade Mission has laid a firm foundation for increasing Virginia's participation in world trade. I urge you all to continue your support of that effort.

BRITISH GUIDELINES CONTROL U.S. STATE DEPARTMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. RARICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a desire for fairness toward the people of Rhodesia, to give them an opportunity to show their problems and aims are more like us in the United States than dislike prompt me to extend my remarks to include an analysis by Mr. J. H. Howman, Rhodesia's Minister of Information:

RHODESIA CORRECTS STATE SECRETARY PALMER

In an address given by the Hon. Joseph Palmer to the California Institute of Technology Faculty at Pasadena, California, on 28th February, 1967, the Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs took the opportunity to make a virulent and biased attack upon the policies and principles of the Government and peoples of Rhodesia, and obviously sought to bring, not only the present Government of Rhodesia, but also its predecessors, into disrepute. His statement clearly indicated a most careful consideration of the circumstances and therefore presumably it reflects official State Department opinion. In the following analysis, Rhodesia's Minister of Information, the Hon. J. H. Howman, corrects some of the inaccuracies in Mr. Palmer's address.

Mr. Palmer attempts to destroy the parallel between the American Declaration of Independence and the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence, and he starts off by commenting upon omissions in the Rhodesian Declaration of Independence of certain what he termed "ringing words contained in the American Declaration", namely, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights. Amongst these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness; that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." Here, he says, is the heart of the difference—that such words were omitted from the Rhodesian Declaration. What he seems to be unaware of or to conveniently forget, is that these "truths" are incorporated in a constitution which has for a number of years existed in Rhodesia—that there was no necessity therefore, as there was at the time of the founding of the American independence, for an assertion of principles relating to the rights of men—for these principles had already been entrenched and incorporated as "declaration of rights" which forms part of the Constitution of Rhodesia and which remained incorporated in the Constitution upon its assumption of independence.

What is of greater moment, however, is that Mr. Palmer goes on to suggest that the Rhodesian case is a narrow one and that it constitutes an obstinate defense of narrow privilege, based upon racial bias and minority rule. Contrast with this, he says, the decisive difference between the American experience, where there has over the generations been bold imaginative and liberating influences and a "built-in dynamic for the achievement of the American promise". Thus, he points out, Jefferson crusaded for a more equitable distribution of land, the expansion of limited educational opportunities, the reform of the penal code, broadening of the franchise and the abolition of slavery.

FALSE SUGGESTIONS

Apparently he suggests that none of these principles have animated Rhodesia, either in the past or the present. But no more startling evidence of the falsity of the suggestion can be found if it is realized that the very occupation of this country by the white man led to the abolition of slavery—that the whole moving stream of Rhodesian policy for the past 75 years has been the creation of greater opportunities—the expansion of educational opportunities, the reform of the penal code, the broadening of the franchise—all these things have been part and parcel of Rhodesians and their way of life since they ever began. So that it is utterly untrue to suggest that the Rhodesian declaration charts no course for its people and seeks no creative progress.

Mr. Palmer goes on to examine in detail certain aspects of the situation in Rhodesia and he deals firstly with the Land Apportionment Act which he says divides the land roughly equally between the white and the African communities, despite disparity in numbers—that the acreage for the white minority consists of the best land, much of which lies unused—that he recalls when he lived in Rhodesia that the African population was required to destroy a part of its cattle wealth because the pasture land was overgrazed, meanwhile a white farmer was burning off his grazing land. Could you, he asks, look more deeply for a basic cause for discontent? What an utter misrepresentation of events!

Is he quite unaware that by the terms of our Constitution we set aside something like one half of the total acreage of land comprising Rhodesia for the African people—for their sole and exclusive use. In doing so we have merely done rather more than what the American founders also did—set aside a certain proportion of the land in order to preserve to the indigenous people the opportunity to continue their traditional style of living, free from incursion or intrusion by persons of any other race. Had we not done so for very humanitarian reasons, the African people might well have been without any land whatsoever.

Precisely this policy was followed by founders of America. The Indian reservations were created and are to this day maintained for basically the same reason as that which animates the people of Rhodesia. But does the American Government, for instance, set aside a proportionate acreage of its land for occupation by its Negro population or its Indian population or for that matter for occupation by any particular race? Is not the cardinal basis for the use of land its best use in the national interest? No country can afford to set aside an ever-increasing proportion of its land wtihout regard for the return to be derived from that land, and one of the major problems in Africa is not to make more land available for the African people, but to ensure that that land is adequately and properly used and brought into productive operation.

The fact that it became necessary to reduce the cattle population held by the Africans was because basically cattle represent prestige symbols—status symbols—they are not used in the economic interests of the nation as a whole. What possible future could there be for a country which merely set aside further and further acreages of land without regard for the preservation of the soil which over-stocking drastically destroys.

To condemn a white farmer for burning off his surplus grazing displays only ignorance. To anyone familiar with the problem, this is merely good farming practice. It has been recognized for a long time that it is essential from time to time to burn off the surplus grasses in order to permit the growth of new grasses which are so necessary for animal life. Could anyone see a more basic cause for gross misrepresentation of a situation?

LAND

The Land Apportionment Act has been used by our critics to castigate the white man and to prove his intransigence in giving the African a "square deal," but it must be remembered that in 1920 a British Order in Council stated that the land assigned to Africans as reserves "shall be secured for the sole and exclusive use and occupation of natives and that this assignment of land shall, subject to the provisions of this order, be taken to be a final assignment to the natives inhabiting Southern Rhodesia. . . ."

In 1925 a Land Commission was set up under Sir Morris Carter, a former Chief Justice of Uganda and Tanganyika. In order to meet the situation as viewed by Carter, the proposals of his Commission were adopted resulting in a division of the land as follows:

	Acres
Areas for future determination	17,793,300
Native Reserves	21,594,957
Matopo National Park	224,000
Mission lands	406,200
Urban areas	149,033
Forest areas	670,000
Native Purchase Areas	6,851,876
Semi-neutral areas	80,329
Land alienated to Europeans	31,033,050
Remainder (available to Europeans)	17,423,815

On the basis of the recommendations, out of a total of just over 96 million acres: the European areas would amount to 48,605,896 acres; the Native areas would amount to 28,933,362 acres; the undetermined areas would amount to 17,793,300 acres.

Today the position is:

	Acres
Total Tribal Trust Land (African)	40,123,200
Native Purchase Areas (African)	4,279,500
Unreserved Land (all races—including 779,993 acres of titled land held by Europeans voluntarily transferred to that area since provision was made to do so in the amendment of August, 1961)	5,878,900
National Land, i.e. National Parks, Game Reserves, etc.	10,524,800
European Land (this includes African townships where these fall in European areas)	35,713,100

Quite clearly the picture portrayed by these figures shows that successive governments have been very liberal in their reapportionment of land and they cannot be criticized for entrenching the rights of the European under the Land Apportionment Act—quite the opposite has been the attitude.

Over and above this, it should be well noted that the so-called "European Area" is populated by far more Africans than Europeans, so it is quite wrong to visualize the European area as land set aside solely for white usage, whereas the Tribal Areas provide for the sole use and occupation by Africans.

EDUCATION

Mr. Palmer's next attack is on education policy and here he says that Rhodesia spends equal amounts on the education of white children and African children although the latter greatly outnumbers the former; that upper secondary and college education is available to more whites than Africans; that although a higher proportion of Africans receive education in Rhodesia than in African-controlled countries, the fact remains that relatively few Africans are permitted facilities to complete the highest secondary grade or to go to college—"they are trained for a place in a society determined by the ruling minority, not by themselves". He then draws on statistics, the effect of which shows disparity in that there are a greater number of African schoolchildren than white children in primary school, yet there were a lesser number of African children than white children in secondary school. Thus, he says, only 2⅕ per cent of the African children continue to receive elementary to secondary schooling as compared with 62½ per cent of white children. Nor, he suggests, does this tell the whole story, since many white children are educated outside the country. These he describes as "circumscribed educational opportunities and obviously designed to the political expression in a country where the franchise is severely limited on the basis of property, wages and educational qualifications". Thus the direction of the Rhodesian governments he says became increasingly oppressive and racially motivated. All this, of course, is no more or less than a gross distortion and indeed almost an obscene libel on the people of Rhodesia. Let us look, therefore, at this problem of education in rather more detail than the somewhat superficial analysis of Mr. Palmer.

Three features of the educational system of Rhodesia are often commented upon, as alleged discrimination between Europeans or whites on the one hand and Africans on the other and it is necessary to understand them clearly and concisely. They are—

(a) that European education is compulsory up to the age of 15, whereas African education is not;

(b) European primary education is provided by the State whereas African primary education is largely in the hands of Missions, and policy is to the effect that this will progressively become a responsibility of local government;

(c) there is a gross disparity between per capita State expenditure on European primary school and African education.

We have stated the distinctions or the discriminations as they are alleged to be. Let us now explain and justify them. If, of course, one is a believer, as Mr. Palmer obviously is, that Africa is a place that should be inhabited by blacks and that a person of a white skin has no part to play, then the explanation will fall on deaf ears, but if, as the people of Rhodesia believe, they not only have a right to be here historically and for other causes, but their removal would be the grossest betrayal of progressive responsible development in Africa, then the explanation will be understood and accepted. It is this basic difference in approach that underlines the whole issue.

The justification for compulsory education is that it is the ideal and that in the long term there should be an increasing measure of compulsion for all children regardless of race. So far as the white man is concerned, he has been long accustomed to compulsory education. It is a part of his way of life and prosecution for failure to comply is extremely rare. To depart from this target would mean a serious lowering of accepted standards and for the African a lowering of targets. It is an example to which one hopes the African will aspire and a retreat would mean a serious backward step with dire consequences for all.

It is only since the last war that a massive demand for education manifested itself amongst Africans. Before that time, many decades were spent in trying to persuade the African of the value of education and to encourage his attendance at school. There are still large numbers steeped in this frame of mind and to apply compulsory attendance to such people or to four out of every 10 pupils who at present drop out before reaching Standard 4 would be a harsh, unwelcome and indeed an inexplicable penalty as well as a complete disruption of the traditional African way of life. Moreover, it is extremely doubtful if "education" under such compulsive conditions would be absorbed. Furthermore, of course, the disproportionate cost of enforcement would leave far less funds available for those who sought to be educated.

DELIBERATE POLICY

Therefore as a matter of deliberate policy, education for the whites remains compulsory while education for the black continues to be voluntary. However, as the Africans establish and take a more effective and responsible part in local government and which itself assumes a greater responsibility for education, then they will be at liberty to introduce compulsion by the application of local by-laws.

On the second criticism, it must be remembered that primary education for the Europeans has from its inception been provided by the State. It must be appreciated that educationists, particularly teachers, are emphatically opposed to any transfer from Government to local authority service. In view of the world demand for teachers, any obduracy on the part of Government in refusing to take note of their views might well lead to an exodus of teachers which, in view of the world demand, would leave Rhodesia poorer for any change.

This apart however, it is a basic fact that pupils in primary schools are drawn from all over the country and that the schools are, for the main part, of a national rather than a provincial or communal nature. European rural areas were sparsely populated, with vast tracts in which there were no primary schools. Therefore the children were either accepted at boarding schools, or in the case of younger ones, enrolled in national correspondence schools where parents supervised the curriculum. Such schools were for the most part brought into being having regard to a healthy environment or to such fortuitous reasons as the availability of former military or other camps which were left over from the last war. Furthermore, a high degree of pupil migration is a constant problem to the educational authorities. Figures of pupil withdrawals and admissions in a year reveal a turnover sometimes as high as 49½. This arises by reason of migration of parents from one center to another, with boarders tending to migrate less than day scholars. With the existing educational system, teachers can be moved with changes of population and to meet demand in a necessarily growing and developing country. Anyone familiar with Rhodesia will be aware, for instance, of the enormous development which has taken place in areas which a matter of five or 10 years ago, had been regarded as almost uninhabitable because of the prevalence of heat, disease, and the lack of water—a position revolutionized by the introduction of irrigation. All this means a change of population and the necessity therefore of a central government system of education that enables the position to be met.

Contrast, on the other hand, African primary education. Here by reason of the development of the country, the school is virtually a community institution, built by the local people as an expression of their interest in education or as happened in early days, as a prestige symbol and it serves only the children living within walking distance. The comparatively dense population meant that boarding facilities are not in such urgent demand and indeed a three-mile limit had to be imposed to prevent unnecessary duplication or overlapping caused by the evangelizing zeal of the missions. Peasant life is a fairly stable life and there was little of the pupil migration so characteristic of parents employed by railways, mines, churches, government, business and individual concerns.

In a highly complex technological and competitive society with a cash economy, there may be some justification for claiming that primary education is a right of the people and not a privilege. Without it a person could not live, but in a subsistence peasant economy and mode of life, education has not got this indispensable quality and the development of education must go hand in hand or slightly in advance of the development of the community and its productivity.

A noted Commission (appointed, incidentally, by the predecessors of the present Government of Rhodesia) which investigated this problem of education, expressed it thus—"policy must be to encourage an attitude of mind so that they (the African) will readily recognize their responsibilities and accept opportunity to participate actively and imaginatively in programmes to add to their amenities and increase their productivity. It is in the field of education that this conscious involvement finds a ready expression". The Commission went on to urge that the future of primary schools must be regarded as a matter for the people, adequately supported by central government grants.

The position of the African in urban areas is, of course, very different. Here the economic environment approximates to that of the European. The traditional economic system and the subsistence mentality which goes with it is changing, and this being the case, African education in urban areas is and has at all material times, like European education, been regarded as a function of the central government.

FINANCE

The third line of attack is on the disparity of costs, and this, of course, was a feature which Mr. Palmer delightedly highlighted. On the face of it, the disparity is of course particularly easy to attack. Thirty-three thousand pupils in one system cost £2½ million in 1965/66—647,000 pupils in another system cost £4.8 million, a per capita ratio in one case of £75.7 and in the other £7.5.

Boarding costs inflate the per capita figure of the European education but the facts are that £59.1 per annum is the cost to the government of a white pupil and £13.8 of a black urban pupil and £6.8 of a rural African, leaving out of account all overheads, headquarters, capital and boarding costs.

This disparity of costs must be appreciated in this context—

(a) the European system is a fully developed one of a standard comparable with that available in England, Australia, Canada, or the United States and without it, no European will come to or remain in Rhodesia without educational opportunities for his children comparable to that which he can receive elsewhere. In order to maintain the economy and the professional standards, Rhodesian education practice must move forward and keep pace with these more developed countries. It is no answer to destroy one system for the theoretical principle of equality;

(b) African primary education is as we have indicated, an emerging and developing system. The first aim was to achieve vernacular literacy, a rudimentary command of spoken and written English and simple arithmetic—functional literacy for a modern social and economic environment, urban or rural. The standards of teachers to cope with this rudimentary education have been raised over the years. In 1928 the average African teacher was educated to standard 1 or 2, but in 1936 it was standard IV—Standard VI in 1939, Primary Teacher (Lower) in 1947, Primary Teacher (Higher) in 1950. It is continually being improved. The rates of pay of teachers of humble level are much lower than those teachers of standard qualification, and it is the salary of these latter teachers that accounts for almost 70 per cent of the expenditure on European primary education.

Mr. Palmer seems to be one of those theorists whose conception of social justice is an equal sharing-out of the financial resources regardless of the consequences. This being so he might consider the overall effects of an equal sharing-out of the financial resources upon the educational system in Rhodesia. If the total financial resources available for education were shared out on a per capita basis equally between the European and African population of Rhodesia, the amount available would be £10 7s. per pupil. In fact, it would give no significant improvement in the level of African tuition and it would utterly destroy the European system. This would mean a lowering of standards rather than an improvement which African education is aiming at, and it would certainly not leave any funds available for secondary or university education. Put another way, if the African pupil were allocated a per capita cost equal to that of the European pupil, then African primary education alone would cost £38.2 million per annum in a country whose total estimated revenue is £74 million. However much nationalists, extremists or Mr. Palmer himself might urge, this is utterly impracticable. It will be remembered that the oil revenues of Iraq were used for just such a purpose when schools were built to meet political pressures and then stood empty.

Whether we like it or not, even now in Rhodesia four out of 10 pupils do not go beyond vernacular literacy because they do not wish to.

Extending far beyond all this is the fact that of the African population in Rhodesia approximately one half is under the age of 17 years so that in effect there is one adult paying taxes or fees to sustain the education and health and other costs of a child, whereas in Britain and indeed in the United States, there are three adults to sustain the upbringing of each child. What is more, in these developed countries the adults are highly productive and cannot be compared with the dominant subsistence mentality of the African adult. The heavy drag of a subsistence peasant population largely content just to feed itself and to enjoy its leisure, contributes extremely little to the economy. This is an enormous problem bearing on the financial resources of the country to provide the resources available for African education.

This peasant sector draws off large funds devoted to development and extension services which have been established to induce them to change their mode of life. And all this has been developed and attempted in a country in which the white man has sought to help the African to advance in a myriad of ways without begging one penny from either Britain, United States or any other country.

PROUD RECORD

We have reason to be proud that we have achieved a quality of education from primary schools to university which, apart from the Republic of South Africa, is the best in Africa and that the percentage of Africans being educated in Rhodesia is easily the highest. We have done this out of our own resources, out of our own savings and we have not had one penny piece in support—compared with the £150 million that has been paid to African régimes in countries to the north of us. Even with the assistance of these millions of pounds, the armies of experts and magnificent plans developed by the United Nations and other advanced nations, no country in Africa has yet found the means to bridge or check the widening gap between the developed and undeveloped societies and at the same time promote sustained economic growth.

On this aspect, let it be stressed that at full secondary level the systems of education in Rhodesia are entirely equated. Once the pupil has reached the top of the primary school system, he moves into a field where such "discrimination" as is alleged falls entirely away. Comparative tuition costs are £101.3 per European pupil and £81.1 per African pupil. Against this the European pupil pays £24 or nearly 25 per cent of this cost in fees, whilst the African pupil pays £9 or approximately 11 per cent.

Above this, at university level we have discrimination in reverse. For it has been the practice for many years in Rhodesia's urgent endeavor to raise the standards of its people, that every African pupil leaving school who has acquired the necessary qualifications to enable him to enter university and who wishes to do so, has been assisted to the full extent by the full cost of his courses. In contrast, in the European, Asian and Coloured field, the award of scholarships and grants is highly competitive and only the very best of the scholarship candidates receive assistance at this level. Is it to be wondered at that Mr. Palmer's slighting references to all that we have sought to achieve in this country over the years can, at the best, be described as an obscene libel?

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

Lastly, Mr. Palmer goes on to cast doubts upon the *bona fides* of our attitudes by suggesting that we do not favour a multi-racial society or majority rule or accept full integration. Naturally enough, Rhodesians are chary of expressions such as "a multi-racial society" with all the connotations which modern parlance tends to give to it, but there is no Rhodesian alive who does not recognize that we live in a country with a plurality of racial societies and it is necessary to create and preserve conditions so that all peoples can flourish and progress. It is true that we have grave reservations about "majority rule" meaning black rule and blatant racialism. Have we not good reason? The policy of Rhodesians has been consistent, namely that it accepts that all persons can advance according to merit, ability and competence and if these be the criteria then they alone should determine in whose hands government should be established. To argue that those hands should necessarily be black because they are in the majority and irrespective of the competence and ability of the persons concerned is a travesty of democracy. To suggest that unless full integration is accepted as a national policy then that country is doomed or reactionary is also a travesty. Problems of race and culture contact are world-wide and have no more been resolved in Rhodesia than they have in America and other countries in the world, but it is abundantly clear that racial prejudice and consequential friction is a feature of human society which should be avoided at all possible costs and it is certainly not relieved, avoided or overcome by a policy of forced social integration.

Never has Rhodesia experienced, for instance, the bitter race riots such as those which occurred in Los Angeles and never have our soldiers been called upon to intervene in the wholesale fashion that was required to quell that revolt, for revolt it was—the Negro black power movement against domination by the whites.

FRANCHISE

Consistent policies in Rhodesia have held to a qualitative franchise on the grounds that persons who have a moderate educational achievement have presumably acquired the qualities of mind, sufficiently trained and disciplined to enable them to judge the policies of political parties; that if they earn a moderate income or have property of a reasonable value, then they must at least have moved beyond the subsistence level and be making a contribution to the national good. It is on the basis of ensuring that those who exercise the vote have adequate knowledge of what is implied, that has governed political thinking in this country. Is it not time for people like Mr. Palmer to pause and consider whether the ideologies that they would pursue in the United States, which may or may not have been followed elsewhere, are necessarily good for all other countries. Unless and until they are satisfied that this be so, they should desist from imposing their will upon other countries—upon other states who have a very real conception of the problems facing them, who make no claim to infallibility, who recognize their weaknesses and the weaknesses of human nature in particular, but who seek above all to create a country in which all men can live in dignity and community of purpose and take their place amongst the community of nations as a whole.

For these reasons, Rhodesians oppose the policies of the State Department toward them, and find it difficult to understand how the State Department can continue to be so ill-advised as to follow blindly British policies aimed against a true and natural right to independence which Rhodesians share in common with the peoples of the United States.

It is shocking indeed that Mr. Palmer should, in his attitudes, show himself to be subservient to a British sovereignty which seeks to continue to keep an unwarrantable jurisdiction over people who no longer are content to be treated as children, but who demand and have assumed the right to resolve their own problems in their own way within their own borders. If Rhodesians go wrong, the consequences will be severe and they will have to bear them. If Mr. Palmer is wrong, Rhodesians will likewise have to bear the consequences. One hopes that he may come to realize that he is not necessarily and infallibly right.

THE JOHNSON DOCTRINE

Perhaps, however, Rhodesians can take comfort in the remarks said to have been made by President Johnson during a recent visit to Asia when he explained his Government's policy as: "to help other people make modern societies, but societies true to their own traditions, their own culture, and their own ambitions. There will be growing pains of diversity, but from them will emerge mutual progress that does not ask of any of us to surrender our most vital principles."

Such comments show a deepening awareness of human relations. Who knows but a Presidential understanding may yet come to cast a light upon our affairs?

"THE PRESIDENT I NOW KNOW"

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, recently some of my constituents had the opportunity to visit Washington and learn how our Government operates. The highlights of the day was a meeting with President Johnson.

Miss Helen Bloom, who is a reporter for the Times Herald Record, of Middletown, N.Y., was there while the President answered the questions put to him by ordinary American citizens who are concerned about the world they live in. Miss Bloom's article, "The President I Now Know," which was printed on the front page of the newspaper, revealed in simple and touching terms her reactions to this meeting with the President.

I am inserting this article into the Congressional Record so that all Americans can know the reaction of one American reporter meeting and speaking with her President:

The President I Now Know

(By Helen Bloom)

I visited President Johnson Thursday, and I was impressed.

Not by the White House, for I'd been inside its offices several times before. And not by shaking the Chief Executive's hand, because to me one handshake is like any other.

I was impressed by the man and the way he spoke—not at you, but to you—as if he were saying: "It's your country as much as mine, and you have the right to ask for explanations about what I am doing with it and why I choose the way I do."

I entered the side entrance to the White House with 29 other members of the region's press led by Rep. Joseph Y. Resnick, D. 28, who had invited us to the Capital that day to learn more about national government.

Our appointment with Johnson was scheduled for 6 p.m., but we had to wait 30 minutes because the President was closeted with General William C. Westmoreland, commander of allied forces in Vietnam.

I wasn't that excited about the appointment. I had seen President Johnson at the White House several times before during media conferences, and I doubted whether Thursday's meeting would be more than a lot of "hellos" and 30 quick handshakes and smiles.

During the wait, two presidential aides repeatedly explained that our conference with the nation's leader would be entirely off the record. We would not be allowed to disclose the topics the President covered, nor what he said, because Johnson wanted to feel free to say what he pleased and speak "off the cuff," they said.

At 6:30 the aides ushered us into the cabinet room with its long table and big black leather chairs, each bearing a plaque on its back to signify the cabinet member who sits in it.

Resnick took the seat to the right of the President's empty chair, and motioned me to take the one beside his.

In a few minutes, President Johnson entered the room, surrounded by Secret Service men. He went around the table shaking everyone's hand, as I expected.

Then he sat in the huge chair designated for him, and welcomed us to the Capital and his home.

He explained once again that the meeting was to be off the record because he had not expected to hold a press conference and just wanted to talk with us.

Then the President opened himself to questions, and he got five of them. They were not easy. Resnick flinched noticeably when I asked mine.

But the President did not react angrily, and he did not rush his answers, as I expected him to do.

He considered each question carefully and took a great deal of time to painstakingly explain his positions, thoughts and feelings. The meeting everyone had expected to last 10 minutes, took one hour.

As the President spoke, he looked directly at the questioner. The sagging cheeks and deep worry creases in his face seemed to recede as his pointed features and dark olive eyes reached out.

He was the President of the United States; he was commander and chief of the U.S. Armed Forces; he was husband, father, fellow citizen, and fellow human being. All sides of the man appeared as he answered the questions.

His voice grew in intensity and volume, as he took pains to describe what he is doing. His hands moved with the rises and falls of his voice.

And I thought to myself, this man, this President of the United States, whom so many people refuse to believe, is being very honest with us.

He said nothing different than he has said before, but he was saying it directly to us, with no interception by the White House press corps, and he was saying it simply: "Man to man."

The side of Johnson that people term "wheelerdealer" was not in the cabinet room during that hour. At least, I didn't see it, and I was looking for it.

Instead, I saw a man who is very conscious of the 190 million Americans, whose lives are affected by his every word and action.

Watching him painstakingly answering our questions, I thought to myself, that tall, tanned man does not sit in his oval office for Lyndon Baines Johnson alone. He is there for the 190 million Americans.

I looked at his expensive, finely tailored gray suit and thought President Johnson does not need Project Headstart, the Teacher Corps, Medicare, Social Security benefits, urban planning, and all the other programs his administration proposes.

He does not need to deepen the creases in his brow over crime in New York City, pollution of the Hudson River, tornadoes in Illinois, or loans to college students all over the country.

But the 190 million Americans need these programs and they need someone to crease his brow to get them.

Watching President Johnson Thursday evening, I could not help but think to myself, whatever political and psychological ambitions put that tall man in the leader's chair, the overriding reason he is there is that he cares what happens to me, to my family, the people at the cabinet table, and everybody else in this nation.

I went into the cabinet room a severe victim of "the credibility gap."

By the time I left, President Johnson had bridged it.

As I trod the deep, rich red carpets from the office to the door, I wished to myself that everyone I know could sit with the President the way I had just done, asking him about the policies that perturb them, and having him explain his actions without worrying about glaring television lights, microphones, and popping flash bulbs.

If they could, perhaps "the credibility gap" would be no bigger than a crack in the sidewalk.

A BILL TO PROVIDE INCENTIVES FOR THE CREATION OF NEW OR EXPANDING JOB-PRODUCING INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL ESTABLISHMENTS IN RURAL AREAS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Blanton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill which will provide incentives for the creation of new or expanding job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in rural areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes. Rural America has many problems. Most of these, in my opinion, can be solved by job-producing industries located in areas of low income and high unemployment. The decline of jobs in rural areas has caused a forced migration of ill-prepared people to the cities, resulting in transfer of poverty from rural America to city slums. As a result, the cities have high social costs, poverty pockets, and congestion in housing and transportation. A dollar of public expenditure to encourage businessmen to provide jobs in areas of rural and urban poverty might save more than a dollar in social costs in these areas. This great exodus to the cities has got to be reversed. The only possible way is to create jobs at home.

The 1960 rural people comprised about 30 percent of the Nation's population. If we use the $3,000 income level as the poverty line, we find that 46 percent of the families with incomes below this level lived in rural areas. About 16 percent of this 46 percent rural aggregate was accounted for by families living on farms. In 1964, farm families comprised 6.5 percent of all families in the Nation. It is estimated that they accounted, as in 1960, for 16 percent of all families having incomes of less than $3,000 per year. While there have been several programs since 1950 in an effort to aid in rural development, they have not been successful. Programs such as investment loans, technical, and other assistance from the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; the various manpower training programs; the expanded loan authority of the Farmers Home Administration for water facilities, nonfarm business capital, and recreational enterprise; improved educational facilities encouraged by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and by enlarged authorization for vocational education; and many other programs have failed to substantially improve the economic plight of rural America.

One excellent example is that the Economic Development Administration of the Department of Commerce has informed me on several occasions that they cannot award grants to communities under 2,500 population or give a high priority on the waiting list to any community that is not presently acquiring an industry. We are failing to get at the problem, the problem being that we need industry in rural America.

This bill will give a 14-percent tax credit to qualifying industry that expands or opens a new facility. The 14-percent credit will be acknowledged up to $50,000 and 50 percent of that portion of the 14 percent remaining after the $50,000 is deducted.

It is not the purpose of this bill to give tax credits. The purpose of this bill is to get new and expanded industry in rural America, in general, and in the Seventh Congressional District of Tennessee, in particular.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AWARDS THE MEDAL OF HONOR TO PETER S. CONNOR OF SOUTH ORANGE, N.J.

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Minish] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the President of the United States awarded the highest medal this Nation can bestow on one of its fighting men—the Medal of Honor.

For me there was great significance in that event, because the young man so honored, posthumously, was S. Sgt. Peter S. Connor of New Jersey, a resident of my own congressional district.

With our President we mourn the loss of this young man to his family, his friends, and his country. He died for his buddies and for his beliefs.

This young man represents the valor of the American soldier in Vietnam. He represents the American commitment in Vietnam. He represents that "time of testing" which President Johnson spoke about as he awarded the medal to the bereaved family.

We are relearning lessons in Vietnam every day—that no nation or people can be secure when aggression is ignored; that those who can resist aggression bear the heaviest responsibility to do so; that resistance cannot be made without pain and sacrifice.

These are the lessons we must take to heart. This is why Sgt. Peter Connor died.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record the remarks of President Johnson on the occasion of the award of the Medal of Honor to S. Sgt. Peter S. Connor, and the citation as read by Secretary of the Navy Paul H. Nitze.

Remarks of the President at the Medal of Honor Ceremony (Posthumously) for S. Sgt. Peter S. Connor, the Rose Garden, the White House, May 2, 1967

Mrs. Connor and members of the Connor family, Secretary Nitze, Members of the Cabinet, Members of Congress, distinguished businessmen, distinguished labor leaders, ladies and gentlemen, once again we meet to honor the memory and the name of a very brave man.

For his family, and for his comrades in arms, his memory is imperishably alive.

For his fellow Americans, his name has joined those who also gave the highest measure of manhood to the land that they love: "Who gave their lives in acts of selfless courage, so that others might live."

Peter Connor, Staff Sergeant of the United States Marine Corps, was mortally wounded in Quang Ngai province, Vietnam, on February 25 of last year.

He was the platoon sergeant of a unit moving forward under enemy fire. Preparing to charge an enemy emplacement with a grenade, he discovered that it was defective. It would explode in a matter of seconds—long before he could get close enough to use it on the target.

His men were dispersed all about him. If he threw the grenade in any direction, it would kill or wound some of his men.

He had only a moment to make a decision. But in that moment, the values of centuries and the training of years, came to bear upon him.

He held the grenade against his own body. He absorbed its terrible violence in himself. He spared the lives of all of his men.

Eleven days later he died of his wounds.

Who among us would have done the same?

We say, and we believe, that the lives of many out-weigh one life. That is the teaching of the prophets and philosophers; it is at the heart of our democratic faith, and of our religion. But at the moment of testing, when the decision between life and death rests in the palm of the hand, who can say with confidence that he would hear that teaching, and respond to that faith?

There are men in Vietnam at this hour who do say it and can say it. Like Peter Connor, they have accepted the primacy of those ancient values. Selfless valor has become as much a part of them as the blood and bone of which they are made. They are prepared to sacrifice, not because they love life any less than the rest of us do, but because they treasure, even more, what gives it meaning—the power to rise above self for their brothers' sake.

Sergeant Connor died at a time of testing, not only for himself, but for the land that he knew and loved. Thousands of miles away from the battlefield on which he fell, his countrymen debate the course of the war he fought in.

Many of them are genuinely concerned to find the wisest course for their country. Some of them have never learned, or have forgotten, the lessons of this country.

That no nation or people can be secure when aggression is ignored;

That those who can resist aggression bear the heaviest responsibility to do so;

That resistance cannot be made without pain and without loss and without great sacrifice;

But that the cost of ignoring the aggressor is to the integrity—and to the soul—of a whole people.

The debate will go on—so long as we are a democracy, so long as men like Peter Connor shoulder their packs and face—not hostile placards and debating points—but the bullets and mortar shells of marching aggressive armies. The debate will go on, and it will have its price. It is a price our democracy must be prepared to pay, and that the angriest voices of dissent should be prepared to acknowledge.

We give thanks for our freedom—and for the brave and selfless men who have preserved that freedom for us for two centuries or more.

To them be honor and praise. To us is the responsibility for redeeming their sacrifice. And though the bravery of Peter Connor is beyond most of us, it was built on a faith that we share with him; and we can see, in his example, something of what we might be ourselves.

Mrs. Connor, in sorrow, and in pride, I present this nation's highest award for valor. It is awarded posthumously, in the name of the Congress of the United States, to your gallant husband—Staff Sergeant Peter S. Connor, of the United States Marines.

Secretary Nitze will now read the citation.

Secretary Nitze. The President of the United States takes pride in presenting the Medal of Honor posthumously to Staff Sergeant Peter S. Connor, United States Marine Corps, for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity in action against enemy Viet Cong forces at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty while serving as Platoon Sergeant of the Third Platoon, Company F, Second Battalion, Third Marines, First Marine Division (Reinforced), Fleet Marine Force, In Quang Ngai Province, Republic of Vietnam on 25 February 1966. Leading his platoon on a search and destroy operation in an area made particularly hazardous by extensive cave and tunnel complexes, Sergeant Connor maneuvered his unit aggressively forward under intermittent enemy small-arms fire. Exhibiting particular alertness and keen observation, he spotted an enemy spider hole emplacement approximately fifteen meters to his front. He pulled the pin from a fragmentation grenade intending to charge the hole boldly and drop the missile into its depths. Upon pulling the pin he realized that the firing mechanism was faulty, and that even as he held the safety device firmly in place, the fuse charge was already activated. With only precious seconds to decide, he further realized that he could not cover the distance to the small opening of the spider hole in sufficient time, and that to hurl the deadly bomb in any direction would result in death or injury to some of his comrades tactically deployed near him. Manifesting extraordinary gallantry and with utter disregard for his personal safety, he chose to hold the grenade against his own body in order to absorb the terrific explosion and spare his comrades. His act of extreme valor and selflessness in the face of virtually certain death, although leaving him mortally wounded, spared many of his fellow Marines from death or injury. His gallant action in giving his life in the cause of freedom reflects the highest credit upon the Marine Corps and the Armed Forces of the United States."

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the problem of steel imports has lately become very pronounced in all economic discussions. The domestic steel industry is now feeling the gradual impact of foreign steel, and has appealed to the Congress for assistance.

I will not now discuss the pertinent facts of the problem, because I have often done so and will again in the future. I will say, however, that representatives of the industry will testify at hearings being held by my labor subcommittee on the impact of foreign imports on American employment. They will appear on

Thursday, May 18, and I hope many Members will be present to hear another tale of woe by an American industry injured by low-wage foreign competition. In this case, however, that industry happens to be among the most fundamental to our economic health.

I commend the following resolution of the Senate of Pennsylvania to the attention of my colleagues. Quite obviously, the steel industry and the labor it employs are vital to Pennsylvania.

RESOLUTION BY THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Whereas, Imports of foreign steel have increased from more than one million tons in 1957 to eleven million tons in 1966; and

Whereas, In 1966 these imports accounted for eleven per cent of the total domestic steel market; and

Whereas, The current world excess steel producing capacity of approximately seventy-five million tons and projected facility additions for Western Europe and Japan indicate that imports will account for an increasingly greater share of the domestic steel market in the years to come; and

Whereas, The current high level of importation is largely due to the many actions of foreign governments to encourage their steel industries to export, coupled with the significantly lower employment costs in those countries; and

Whereas, If present trends continue, the loss of volume caused by the rapidly increasing imports will pose a serious threat to the profitability of the steel industry; and

Whereas, A healthy domestic steel industry is vital to our National security, is instrumental in maintaining a high level of employment in Pennsylvania and other steel producing states, and it is a significant factor in stemming the drain on the United States balance of payments; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the United States Congress to take all necessary steps to provide the domestic steel industry with temporary relief from the increasing inflow of foreign steel imports until equitable and fair competition is established; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two United States Senators from Pennsylvania and to each member of the House of Representatives from the Commonwealth.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary.

AMERICAN INDIAN CHILDREN

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, American Indian children are among the most disadvantaged in our Nation. The Congress recognized this last year when we were considering amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. In order to assure that Indian children are reached by educational programs that are vital to their future, and for many other reasons of merit, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 7819, the committee-reported bill which includes provision for Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.

There is currently much discussion of the so-called Quie substitute, H.R. 8983. This bill does not make provision for the participation of Indian children in schools conducted by the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the block grant programs proposed for fiscal year 1969. The educational results of this omission could be tragic. Actually, nothing in the proposed H.R. 8983 or in the so-called laundry list of things that the States could use the funds for, indicates any awareness of the educational needs of Indian children on reservations.

The heart of the question here is this: Will we exclude some of the Nation's neediest children under the guise of attempting to "reduce the amount of paperwork, justifications and negotiation" or lose the opportunity to serve this neglected segment of the public while proclaiming it to be our legislative intent to be "broad, rather than narrow" in our interpretations? All of us abhor paperwork. All of us seek quick, easy, and broad approaches to our national problems. But not, I submit, at the price of needy children.

In considering this legislation there is an opportunity for dialogue, discussion, and contemplation. To assist in this process I urge my colleagues to consider the following:

In fiscal year 1965, there were 134,064 Indian students between the ages of 6 and 18 enrolled in schools—public, Federal, private, and mission schools. More than half of all Indian children of school age were attending public schools; they were eligible to participate in Elementary and Secondary Education Act programs conducted by their local educational agencies. But those enrolled in Federal—Bureau of Indian Affairs—schools were ineligible to participate in special programs for the educationally disadvantaged under Elementary and Secondary Education Act as it was originally enacted. We corrected this inequity last year by adding a special provision assuring participation of children in schools operated by the Department of the Interior. Here are just a few of the justifications for including these children:

Approximately two-thirds of the Indian children in Bureau of Indian Affairs schools come from families with an annual income of less than $2,000.

A majority of these children enter school speaking no English or, at best, limited English.

Of those Indian children who attend school—nearly 16,000 do not—50 percent drop out before they complete the 12th grade.

On the reservations, young adults—those under 45 years of age—average an eighth grade education, compared to a national average of almost 12 years of school.

Lack of education breeds poverty; chronic unemployment on reservations runs six or seven times higher than the national average, and the average income for reservation dwellers is one-third to one-fourth the national average.

For all of the reasons set forth, I urge my colleagues to reject the Quie substitute, H.R. 8983, and to support H.R. 7819, the committee-approved bill.

AMERICAN EXCHANGE STUDENTS LEAD IN FLAG BURNING

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BRINKLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRINKLEY. Mr. Speaker, Maj. Gen. P. E. Gallagher, retired, of Columbus, Ga., has brought to my attention a newspaper article which appeared in the May 1, 1967, Columbus Enquirer newspaper. I was shocked and dismayed to learn that a few American exchange students apparently organized and led anti-United States demonstrations in Madrid, Spain, in which four U.S. flags were burned.

Mr. Speaker, such students do not represent the feelings of the vast majority of American youth, and they should not be sent abroad as representatives of this great Nation. The exchange student program has been very successful and it is most regrettable that a few misguided individuals have acted in such a manner as to bring discredit on such a worthy program.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon the Department of State to determine which American exchange students were involved in these demonstrations, and if they are receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Government, such assistance should be terminated immediately.

I am inserting the newspaper article in the RECORD, in the hope that all of my colleagues will read it.

ABOUT 1,500 MADRID STUDENTS BURN FOUR U.S. FLAGS

MADRID, SPAIN.—In wild anti-American demonstrations, about 1,500 Madrid University students have burned four U.S. flags and caricatures of President Johnson on the campus.

They denounced U.S. involvement in Vietnam, waved North Vietnamese flags, and chanted "Yankee go home." Among them were some U.S. exchange students. Then protest squads moved into downtown Madrid and to the U.S. Embassy.

Security police ringing the embassy chased away about 100 students, who were pursued by foot and jeeps into wide streets and scattered again when they tried to reform. Some students were heard singing the U.S. civil rights hymn "We Shall Overcome."

Spanish officials said students, including a pro-Communist Chinese group, had helped to organize the demonstrations. They also blamed U.S. students.

Immediately after the burning incidents, university Rector Enrisue Gutierrez Trios phoned U.S. Ambassador Angier Biddle Duke to apologize for what he called "this most regretful incident on our campus."

His action apparently headed off a formal U.S. protest to the foreign ministry against the insults to the flag and the President.

Spanish officials were quick to place some blame on U.S. exchange students at the sprawling university, which has more than 25,000 regular students and half as many special students, for the sudden wave of criticism of U.S. participation in the Vietnamese war and support for Communist North Vietnam.

They pointed out that for more than two weeks a group of U.S. students headed by Karen Winn of Walnut Creek, Calif., a University of California student here, had been distributing posters and seeking antiwar petitions among both foreign and Spanish students.

The demonstrations opened with a meeting at the school of political and economic sciences, where students critical of U.S. policy ran into loud opposition from other students.

One irate student shouted: "You are supposed to be pacifists and you have Viet Cong flags. How can you have two banners?"

Such taunts were answered with "We are for Ho Chi Minh's peace, not for American wars."

Roberta Alexander, 20, of Los Angeles, a University of California exchange student, drew an ovation when she told the meeting: "I am a pacifist and I support the world movement against U.S. intervention in Vietnam."

Miss Winn also addressed the meeting. But neither she nor any other recognized American student took part in the burning of the U.S. flags—three paper flags and one of cloth. But she and others marched from the meeting with those carrying the flags to the area where the burnings occurred.

Police on riot duty at the edge of the university campus watched the flag incidents from a distance but did not interfere.

A Spanish official commented: "They—the organizers—have put us in an awkward position. If we send the police in to break up this campus demonstration the American students as well as the Spanish will shout police brutality. If we don't, others will blame the Spanish government for permitting this to happen."

CITIZENSHIP FOR YOUNG ALIENS WITH AMERICAN PARENTS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the bill I have introduced today is designed to insure full rights of American citizenship to children born in foreign lands and brought to this country by adoptive parents. This legislation would bring the protection of American law to the many children legally adopted and presently living in the United States, but who remain virtually without the rights and protection that native-born American children enjoy. There is insufficient protection against child abuse and abandonment. As stated in my bill:

> An adopted child, whose adoptive parent or parents are citizens of the United States, becomes a citizen of the United States upon fulfillment of the following conditions:
>
> (1) The child was lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.
>
> (2) The child was adopted before attaining the age of 16 years.
>
> (3) The child has resided continuously in the United States in legal custody of the adoptive parent or parents for one year after being lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

Since the foreign children most in need of adoption in this country have suffered serious hardships and deprivation, the psychological advantage to them of being accepted here as citizens without undergoing naturalization could significantly enhance their successful adjustment to a new way of life as well as to a new family. In specific instances which have been brought to my attention by constituents, the questionable treatment of some of these children and the anguish caused to all concerned might have been prevented had the children enjoyed the right of American citizenship.

While under present law these children are eligible to be naturalized as citizens after 2 years' continuous residence in the United States, if they are under 18 years of age they must first obtain the written consent of their adoptive parents. I firmly believe this law should be made consistent with the current emphasis on total acceptance of the adopted child in the family by total acceptance of him as a citizen in our country. Our responsibility toward each adopted child is to further his best interests by guaranteeing that he, as a citizen, will benefit from, and be subject to, whatever State and Federal laws may be passed in the future to protect American citizens.

As a country, we have welcomed these children for many years, but I urge that now we make this welcome complete by enacting the proposed legislation providing them with the right to full citizenship with the privileges and responsibilities this includes.

FOR THE EARLIEST POSSIBLE RETURN OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT TO GREECE

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, like most Americans, I was deeply distressed by the military coup which resulted in the overthrow of the Government of Greece only a few days ago.

As an American of Greek origin, I have been particularly saddened to see the legitimate government of the birthplace of democracy removed by a group of army officers.

Two decades ago the United States helped Greece throw off the threat of a totalitarian government. At that time the Greek people were struggling to rebuild their nation after being held captive and ravaged for 5 years by the Nazis, and our assistance made the difference between freedom and tyranny for the Greeks.

Today the democratic and constitutional processes we did so much to help the Greeks restore have been thrust aside by a group of army officers who decided they must act to prevent what they described as a threatened Communist takeover.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that the recognition of the U.S. Government extends not to the army or any other group but to King Constantine, and I trust that, in the present circumstances, we shall continue that recognition.

I want to express, however, some grave reservations about the present political situation in Greece for the consideration of my colleagues in both the House and Senate and for the executive branch of our Government.

First, I hope that at the earliest possible moment there will be a return to the processes of constitutional, parliamentary democracy in Greece.

In this respect I was very glad to see King Constantine's statement of April 26, 1967, in which he declared:

> . . . my ardent wish is also for the earliest possible return of the country to parliamentary government.

I also, Mr. Speaker, was most pleased to see that our own Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, has made clear that the U.S. Government officially supports the earliest possible return of democratic institutions in Greece. I include at this point in the RECORD Secretary Rusk's statement of April 28, 1967:

STATEMENT BY SECRETARY OF STATE DEAN RUSK

We have followed closely the situation in Greece since the military take-over there last Friday.

I am encouraged to see that King Constantine in his first public statement since last Friday has called for an early return to parliamentary government. We are now awaiting concrete evidence that the new Greek government will make every effort to reestablish democratic institutions which have been an integral part of Greek political life. I am gratified that Greece will continue its strong support of NATO.

I also note that Minister Papadopoulos at a press conference yesterday is quoted as saying that the detained persons connected with the political leadership of Greece will be set free in a few days. I trust that this step will indeed be taken.

Ambassador Talbot has made unmistakably clear to the new government our concern for the safety of all political prisoners. He has received repeated assurances that they are well.

I also hope that the Greek people will be able at the earliest possible moment to enjoy the personal freedoms of speech, the press, and assembly.

Second, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the military officers now running the Greek Government will be especially watchful of the dignity and safety of all political prisoners, including former Premier George Papandreou, and his son, Andreas Papandreou, who has many friends in the United States and who is married to an American citizen.

Third, I hope that we will not see carried out what I understand is a plan to operate military courts to try civilians.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the U.S. Government, which presently has a military assistance agreement with Greece, should suspend any further major shipments under this agreement pending a review.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me reiterate the hope that the day will not be long when free and democratic elections will again be conducted in Greece, and a legitimate, popularly elected government returned to office. The early restoration of democratic institutions to the cradle of democracy is the most effective way to insure that the people of Greece will not have to endure a dictatorship of either the left or the right.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, May 3 is a commemorative day in the history of the Polish people. The adoption of Poland's Constitution on May 3, 1791, marks a historic moment in the development of constitutional democracy, and greatly affects the history of Poland. Embodied in this model of progressive legislation were the principles of representative self-government and justice for all. At a time when most of Europe, including Poland's powerful neighbors, was still in the grip of autocratic rulers, the Polish Constitution represented an advanced and enlightened system of government.

Poland was transformed into a hereditary constitutional monarchy, townspeople were given judicial autonomy and a degree of parliamentary representation, the peasantry was brought under the protection of the law, and religious toleration was established. The Poles rejoiced over these progressive measures—from the enlightened King Stanislas Augustus to the humblest citizen.

Less than a year after the Constitution was proclaimed, Poland was invaded by Russia. The Poles were defeated before they were able to strengthen themselves and were forced to see their country completely dismembered by Austria, Prussia, and Russia in 1793 and 1795.

Today, the Poles are still subjected to the controls of a Communist state. However, it is a tribute to the indomitable spirit of the Polish people that they have maintained their belief in, and commitment to, the principles which inspired their Constitution. They are still dedicated to reclaiming their heritage of freedom and national independence.

On this day, May 3, we Americans can honor Polish Constitution Day, which affords the opportunity for freedom-loving men everywhere to join with the Polish people and those of Polish descent throughout the world in reaffirming Poland's just aspirations as a nation.

All Americans share in the great hope for liberty which the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791, symbolizes for the Polish people. Let us hope the day shall soon come when the people of Poland will have full intellectual and political freedom in their own independent state, established in the spirit of their great Constitution.

TEACHER CORPS ENDORSED

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star recently joined educators, newspapers, and others all across the Nation who have looked carefully at the operation of the Teacher Corps and found that—

> The threat of a cutoff, or block to the modest expansion the administration proposes for next year, has no justification whatever.

The Star points out that the 1,200 young dedicated corpsmen serving in 29 States and the District of Columbia "have thus far drawn widespread praise."

In this regard, the Star editorial comment is no more than an accurate reflection of the testimony of educators from all sections of the country as to their own support of the Teacher Corps.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the editorial by the Washington Star at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 25, 1967]

The National Teacher Corps is one experiment of the Great Society which might logically have expected to receive the support of everyone. Instead, its brief two-year relationship with Congress has been a constant uphill struggle for appropriations barely sufficient to sustain life. And now Republican leaders reportedly want to kill the corps altogether by permitting its present authorization to run out in June.

This attitude is simply incomprehensible. The corps' function is to bring young college graduates into slum schools to work, under the guidance of experienced teachers, directly with deprived children. The corps members are channeled through 50 participating universities, where at the same time they continue studies leading to master's degrees. They are assigned only at the invitation of local school systems.

The 1,200 dedicated young people who are serving in school districts in 29 states and the city of Washington this year have thus far drawn widespread praise. After an analysis this month, the National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children issued a report asserting that the program's abolition or curtailment would be "a serious and wasteful error." That is surely the case. The benefits which accrue from this service to individual disadvantaged children in overcrowded classrooms is of course the value which springs first to mind. It may be, however, as the council suggests, that there is an even greater value in "harnessing the idealism of an unusual group of young people who, but for the corps, would never have been drawn to the teaching profession."

More tangible results should of course be awaited before anyone proposes the sort of massive program expansion which seems to us to be a distinct possibility in the future. But even now that is the direction which long-range thinking should be taking. The threat of a cutoff, or a block to the modest expansion the administration proposes for next year, has no justification whatever.

NATIONAL PTA OPPOSES QUIE SCHOOL BILL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the National Congress of Parents & Teachers recently expressed its opposition to H.R. 8983, the most recent of the Quie substitutes for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The PTA states that the proposal raises very serious questions, among which are:

First. Lack of a public hearing.

Second. Inadequate funding.

Third. Not enough funds to poorest States—the Southern and border States—or to the States with large inner-city populations, such as California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas.

Fourth. State departments of education not yet strong enough for effective administration.

Fifth. Potential resurgence of church-state problems.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this statement from those most directly concerned with education—teachers and the parents of the children they teach—to my colleagues, and insert the statement at this point in the RECORD:

NATIONAL CONGRESS OF
PARENTS AND TEACHERS,
Chicago, Ill., April 27, 1967.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We in the National PTA have long looked forward to general federal aid to public education. Nevertheless, we are deeply concerned that a proposal for general aid to education may be substituted for the present federal aid program without an opportunity for public discussion and public testimony.

Enclosed herewith for your consideration are the observations on this proposal which are going to our own membership, and we would invite your interest in the points of our concern.

We appreciate very much your past support of our children's schools and look forward to your future constructive measures.

Sincerely yours,
MRS. EDWARD F. RYAN,
National Chairman for Legislation.

PTA STATEMENT

To: State Chairmen for Legislation, Members of the National Board of Managers.

From: Mrs. Edward F. Ryan, National Chairman for Legislation.

Re: *H.R. 8983, Elementary and Secondary Block Grants Amendment Act of 1967.*

H.R. 8983, introduced on April 20 by Representative Albert R. Quie (R-Minn.), proposes to substitute "block grants" to the states for the greater part of the present Elementary and Secondary Education Act, to take effect July 1, 1968. PTA policy has looked forward to general federal aid to public schools, but this proposal raises very serious questions.

1. The proposal has not been given a public hearing, nor will there be such an opportunity. It will be offered on the floor of the House as a substitution for the Committee Report on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967. This is now scheduled tentatively for Wednesday, May 10.

2. Under the Block Grants Amendment total authorization for the year 1968–69 would be cut back from $3.3 billion to $3 billion. As you know, appropriations might be different.

3. Reallocations of aid under the proposed formula would cut back states with the highest number of disadvantaged children—all the Southern and border states, except for Maryland, and industrial states with large inner-city populations, such as New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey, and Texas. Twenty-five states are cut back in all.

Also, the overseas dependents schools and the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools are excluded. The National Teacher Corps would be ended, also aid for migrant, handicapped, and delinquent children. The National PTA supports all of these programs.

4. Many state departments of education have not yet been strengthened to the point of being able to administer such large sums effectively. The proposed grants would be used however the states saw fit, except that 50 percent would be used for educationally deprived children (as against 75 percent under ESEA) and 7 percent for library resources, textbooks, and equipment. No local entitlements would be established.

5. If we move into a general aid program before the church-state issue has been resolved in the courts, it seems inevitable that the previous great bitterness in these matters will not only be revived, but—what is worse—be transferred to separate state battlegrounds. It has been our view that orderly decision in the courts offers the only way to resolve these very divisive questions, and that they should be resolved nationally, on a constitutional basis, before we move into the general aid program.

It would be most helpful if you could bring these considerations to the attention of your own Congressmen, asking that they *postpone this step until a general aid program can be introduced on a nonprofit or bipartisan basis after appropriate study.*

RAYMOND F. FARRELL

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, this evening the Rhode Island State Society of Washington will honor U.S. Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization Raymond F. Farrell with its Man of the Year Award. Ray Farrell has had more than 30 years of Federal Government service and his record of excellence as a career official would be quite difficult to match. He is a fair and understanding man, and an efficient and objective administrator. I wish to take this opportunity to thank Commissioner Farrell on behalf of all Rhode Island citizens for his splendid accomplishments in government. Rhode Island can well be proud of this native son. Mrs. Tiernan and I wish him many future years of rewarding governmental service.

At this point, if there is no objection, I wish to include a biography of Commissioner Farrell in the RECORD:

COMMISSIONER RAYMOND F. FARRELL

Commissioner Raymond F. Farrell, a native of Pawtucket, Rhode Island, is a graduate of Georgetown University and The Georgetown Law Center. He has served in various governmental agencies among them the Civil Service Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of the Interior, and as special counsel to the Joint Committee in Congress investigating the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Since 1941, Mr. Farrell has been with the Immigration and Naturalization Service.

Mr. Farrell's career with the Immigration and Naturalization Service was interrupted in May, 1942, when he went on active duty in the United States Army. He received the Bronze Star Medal for outstanding duty in the Rome-Arno campaign and was separated from the service in November, 1945, with the rank of lieutenant colonel.

Shortly after his discharge from the service, Mr. Farrell returned to the Immigration Service and was named Chief of Investigations at New York City. In 1949, he was named Assistant Commissioner for Research and Education, and in 1952, he became Assistant Commissioner for Investigations. In 1958, Mr. Farrell was promoted to Associate Commissioner in charge of Service Operations.

The late President Kennedy nominated Raymond Farrell to the post of Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization and he was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate on February 5, 1962.

Mr. Farrell's record as Commissioner since 1962 has been recognized as a new era of compassion and understanding in administering the nation's immigration and nationality laws. In 1964, President Johnson described Ray Farrell's administration as an example of "government with a heart."

Mr. Farrell has been honored by Georgetown University's Alumni Achievement Award in 1961 and by the Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers with its Certificate of Appreciation.

Commissioner Farrell is married to the former Charlotte M. Griedel of Mather, Pennsylvania.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK AT PATRICK HENRY BOYS PLANTATION ON APRIL 29, 1967

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, our good colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, the Honorable WILLIAM M. TUCK, made a splendid address at the Patrick Henry Boys Plantation in Virginia on April 29.

I have read his remarks with keen interest and have delighted in the many historical references which he has included therein.

Representative TUCK has the distinction of having served as one of Virginia's finest governors and is a keen student of the history of the Commonwealth of Virginia as well as of the history of the United States.

Some of the references made in his address are of such genuine interest that I wish to include his remarks at this point in the RECORD. I commend his address to the reading of the Members of the House.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM M. TUCK, DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA, AT PATRICK HENRY BOYS PLANTATION ON APRIL 29, 1967

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a genuine joy and pleasure for me to be here on this occasion and to have the opportunity of again visiting these historic grounds and to meet and mingle with so many wonderful people who have devoted themselves to such a worthy cause as brings us here today.

I commend the Alice Kyle District of the Federation of Women's Clubs for arranging, in cooperation with the Patrick Henry Boys Plantation, this assembly. It provides for all of us an opportunity to renew acquaintances and to reappraise the work that is being done. Too much cannot be said in praise of these ladies, as well as of the members of the American Legion Auxiliary, the Colonial Dames, the Daughters of the American Revolution, and other contributing organizations and persons for their work in the establishment of this home and training center for the benefit of our youth.

There come to mind today the names of so many prominent persons who have made contributions of incalculable value to the acquisition and establishment of this memorial. One of them, the late Honorable James S. Easley, has gone to his final reward. His contributions, as well as those of a number of others, need not be detailed because the knowledge of them is so widespread. His name and those of others have become indelibly inscribed and will long live in the hearts and minds of all who cherish the history of our nation and who have an understanding and appreciation of the value of youth.

I must also mention the name of Eugene Casey, the great friend and philanthropist who has made the work here possible and who, with his beautiful lady, has honored us with a visit today. I know that we also think of the contributions of great value made by the Honorable Robert S. Chamberlayne, Honorable D. Q. Eggleston, Dr. James D. Hagood, Mrs. Lucy Page Williams, and others.

I regret that circumstances have been such that I, myself, could not take a more active part, but I can assure you that from the very beginning I was glad to give at least a small part of my time to the establishment of a living memorial to the great Virginian who once looked out with pride on these acres, where stands his last home and wherein lie his mortal remains.

The purpose of the Patrick Henry Boys Plantation is to make a home for young men and to educate and train them to become useful citizens. One of the great early American moralists, Charles B. Fairbanks, who himself lived only thirty-two years, once said, "The genuine boy may, I think, be safely set down as the noblest work of God." Alongside this thought we can add the truism that to save a boy is to save a man.

The Boys Plantation program has been carefully projected. It is designed to provide a home for neglected and dependent boys who through no fault of their own are homeless, to inculcate in them a feeling of security, to make them aware of high morals and spiritual steadfastness, but, above all, to teach them law and order and to give them training which will make them useful citizens.

The importance of the individual in this country cannot be over emphasized, and it is hoped that each boy here may be encouraged to think of himself as an individual whose duty it is to participate in the events of his time.

Statues of cold marble are built for the purposes of honoring patriots and heroes. A lifeless museum has its place, but this Plantation is a living memorial. It is dedicated to the memory of one of our greatest Americans. Patrick Henry's influence upon this nation has been tremendous, and those of us who still espouse the fundamental principles which he so eloquently stated and advocated can well wish that the nation had strictly adhered to his advice and counsel. Let us hope that even now the inspiration and teachings of this patriot may serve to revive a renewed interest in the doctrines which guided him and the founding fathers in the establishment of this republic.

Patrick Henry was an individualist. He was also a man of extraordinary ability and courage. He originated in a backwoods section, and when he first appeared at Virginia's capital, then at Williamsburg, his rough clothes drew much attention, but it was not long before he was being looked at and listened to for another reason: his voice was rising in oratory and crying out for freedom and liberty in terms that had not before or since been heard in this country.

It was Henry's voice that sparked the Revolution. The ideals of democracy found vocal expression in his flaming oratory. But in the formation of the government chosen for the new republic, things did not go to suit him, and he raised his voice in stubborn protest.

After breaking away from England, the colonists settled on a government under the Articles of Confederation of 1781. This failed to command appropriate respect, and the government did not function effectively. As its collapse was imminent, a general Constitutional Convention was called in May, 1787, and out of this came the United States Constitution, which, in order to become effective, had to be ratified by the original thirteen states.

Patrick Henry was among those who opposed ratification because of fear that too much power would be vested in the central government. He fought for states' rights, and it was largely through his efforts that we have the first ten amendments to the Constitution, known as our Bill of Rights. The Bill of Rights places restrictions on the Federal Government, and undertakes to reserve rights and powers to the states and to the people thereof.

The condtions of the present day clearly establish that the fears and the predictions of Patrick Henry were justified, for much of what he predicted has come true. More and more the government is being centered in Washington and the power of the individual states is lessened. Henry stood firmly in opposition to this usurpation of the states' powers and tried repeatedly to give warning of the consequences. The time has come now when we should return to his way of thinking in order to keep us from moving over the brink into senseless socialism.

There are so many events in the life of Patrick Henry that may be adverted to on such an occasion as this, but I like to think of the Virginia Constitutional Convention of 1788 in which Henry took so prominent a part and in which he so vigorously and ably presented his sentiments and fears—to a large extent the same sentiments and fears which envelop many among the thoughtful populace of America of this generation.

The profound historian, Dr. Meade, has benefited us with his talent by publishing the best works available on the life of Patrick Henry. I commend his volumes to every American.

Some years ago I read the life of John Marshall by the great historian, the late Senator Beveridge of Indiana. Likewise, I commend these books to students of American history. I refer today to Beveridge largely because he lived in a distant state and devoted his works to John Marshall, who was opposed to Henry, and even this opposite view portrays Henry as the outstanding delegate at the Virginia Constitutional Convention.

In his matchless volume on the subject of Marshall, Beveridge devotes 161 pages to the Convention which convened in Richmond on June 2, 1788, and undertakes to describe some of the participants. He leads off with Patrick Henry, prematurely old at fifty-two; Pendleton, walking heavily under the burden of his years and a cripple; then Randolph, Monroe, Marshall, and Richard Henry Lee, who were young men barely past the age of thirty.

Mr. Beveridge described in some detail these men and James Madison, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Harrison, signer of the Declaration of Independence and destined to be the father of a President and the great-grandfather of another. The presiding officer of the convention was Virginia's first law teacher and able chancellor, the aged and white-haired George Wythe. There came also from Gunston Hall the aristocratic and brilliant, but gouty, George Mason.

Throughout the entire proceedings the great influence of Washington for the adoption of the Constitution hovered over the convention. Mason and others of almost equal brilliance had come to unite with Patrick Henry to oppose the adoption of the Constitution unless it was amended to embody the principal provisions of the Virginia Bill of Rights. For the first time in American history a shorthand reporter was present to report the debate and the proceedings which continued for twenty-two days.

It was a great display of talent and patriotism. Senator Beveridge says that the array of ability, distinction, and character on both sides was notably brilliant and impressive. He added that seldom, if ever, in any land or age had so gifted and accomplished a group of men contended in argument and discussion at one time and place.

Beveridge also stated that the debates of the Constitutional Convention of Virginia constituted the only full and genuine discussions of the Constitution of the United States which took place anywhere, even including the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787.

For what were Henry, Mason, Monroe, Grayson, and others contending? They were seeking to guarantee the very principles for which we contend today, the preservation of the individual and state's rights, and to take care that certain imperishable truths should be embodied in the fundamental law of the land.

As set forth in the Virginia Declaration of Rights, they believed that all power is vested in and consequently derived from the people, that magistrates are their trustees and servants, and at all times amenable to them. They believed, among other things, that each state had a right to maintain a well-regulated militia, that no soldier shall in time of peace be quartered in any house without the consent of the owner, that the people have a right to be secure in their persons and to be protected fgrom unwarranted searches and seizures. They contended that the freedom of the press is one of the great bulwarks of liberty and can never be restrained but by despotic governments; and any citizen may freely speak, write, and publish his sentiments on all subjects, being responsible only for the abuse of that right.

And importantly, too, they believed and contended that in criminal prosecutions a man has the right to demand the cause and nature of his accusation, to be confronted with the accusers and witnesses, to call for evidence in his favor, and to a speedy trial by an impartial jury of his vicinage without whose unanimous consent he cannot be found guilty, that none shall be deprived of life or liberty, except by the law of the land or the judgment of his peers; nor be compelled in any criminal proceeding to give evidence against himself, nor be put twice in jeopardy for the same offense.

They were joined by the great Roger Williams of Rhode Island and his band of hearty followers who established that state, small in area and population, but at that time great in its determination and rocky strength of character.

Rhode Island was the last of the colonies to adopt the Constitution and so zealous were the followers of Roger Williams to maintain and preserve the autonomy of the states and to guarantee complete and absolute separation of church and state that the adopting resolutions of Rhode Island contained on this subject substantially the language of Jefferson's Virginia Statute of Religious Freedom, also incorporated in the Bill of Rights, and I quote directly therefrom: "That religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator as well as the manner of discharging it can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forbearance, love and charity toward each other."

No religion is worthy or has a right to exist which has to depend for its support upon government or law.

There is another provision in the Virginia Bill of Rights which every thoughtful American, and particularly those in public life, should take to heart today, to the effect "that no free government, or the blessings of liberty can be preserved to any people, but by a firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality and virtue, and by frequent recurrence to fundamental principles."

As a result of the debates led by Patrick Henry in the Virginia Convention of 1788, the people of other states were aroused to such an extent that they were determined to see that the Bill of Rights, as contended for by Henry and Mason, should be incorporated in the Constitution of the United States; and Congress at the very next session submitted the first ten amendments which constitute the Bill of Rights, and these amendments were promptly ratified by the requisite number of states.

It is of interest to observe also that the principal provisions of the Virginia Bill of Rights have been incorporated into the Constitution of nearly all of the states of the American Union.

I hope that we of the present generation do not take as commonplace our rich heritage and the priceless privileges which we have enjoyed for so long. We must never be unmindful of the sacrifice made by our founding fathers and their struggles to secure these blessings. It behooves us ever to be vigilant in our determination to preserve these blessings. It has been truly said that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Disregarding the Constitution and the Bill of Rights and the principles for which Henry contended, the Federal Government is about to absorb all of the powers of the states. The right of the states to control their own affairs lies at the very heart of what has made this nation great.

The decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States rendered in the last few years, together with the acts of the Congress and the complete disregard of our constitutional rights by the Executive Department of the Federal Government, have been such as to alarm all thoughtful and patriotic citizens and students of history. These governmental actions have served to abridge the powers of the states and to invade the rights of the individual.

In addition to the horrendous domestic situation in which we find ourselves, we face a most dangerous problem in world affairs, particularly in Vietnam. I listened yesterday to the gallant General Westmoreland, the Commanding General of our American forces in that beleaguered area, when he spoke to us in the hall of the House of Representatives at Washington.

There are elements in this country creating a problem almost if not indeed equally as serious as the troubles caused by our enemies in the Vietcong. A number of the so-called leaders in both our national political parties, in order to gain the support of certain minority groups, have catered to these evil forces. As a result, there has arisen to power and influence a lot of despicable characters. You know their names. I will not soil my lips or offend your ears by calling them. They would destroy us from within and from without.

I have advocated legislation to make it unlawful for these incendiarists to go from one state to another to spread their poison for the purpose of inciting to riot or to engage in the violation of any law. There is ample legislative precedent for such an enactment, such for instance as the transportation of stolen property across state lines and crossing of state lines to promote vice or to avoid prosecution.

As we all know, our Bill of Rights guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of assembly, and freedom to criticize and petition our government. I oppose the abridgement of these rights. I contend that they should be strictly upheld. They may be and should be, under appropriate conditions, freely exercised.

But the Constitution does not confer upon any person or group of persons the right to band or weld themselves together in such a fashion as to impede the police in the exercise of their powers to enforce the law and suppress public mischief. Nor does the Constitution give to these elements the right to hamper American citizens in the lawful pursuit of their business and avocations.

In other words, there is no right in our Constitution that permits these lawless groups to lie down in the streets or otherwise group themselves in such a fashion as to block traffic and commerce. In my judgment, it is the duty of the police to use such force as is necessary to arrest and remove such people. Some call this police brutality. I do not.

As I understand the Constitution of the United States, it was never intended to permit thousands of people, led as some of them now are, to gather as they did recently in New York in celebration of what these pro-Communists called "Vietnam Week."

They denounced our foreign policy in such a manner as to give strength and comfort to the enemy, which will result in the prolongation of the Vietnam war and will result also in the loss of many of our young men who constitute the flower of the manhood of America.

Methods must be devised and scales adjusted by which to deal firmly and resolutely with these beatniks, peaceniks, and flagburners who would destroy our Constitution, shatter our Bill of Rights, and deliver us into the hands of world Communism, the most horrible enemy of mankind that ever existed.

We can now take courage from the knowledge that this motley crew constitutes only a small percentage of the people. They represent the same tiny element which advocates the abolishment of the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives. They are to a large extent the same people who would destroy sacred American institutions and would change our way of life so that we would no longer know our government as it was formulated by the founding fathers of America, such as Patrick Henry.

In these times we can be heartened by the knowledge that the overwhelming majority of our citizenship remains patriotic and ready and willing to make such sacrifices as may be required to support to the fullest extent our boys as long as they remain in Vietnam or any other foreign land, wearing the uniform of our country and following the flag of America.

In the long saga of history, America has been blessed with a citizenship determined in time of peace or peril to uphold the priceless principles and privileges which we enjoy. Our national banner has never trailed in the inglorious and ignominious dust of defeat. It never will.

POCHO'S PROGRESS

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROYBAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Mexican-American community of Los Angeles was shocked by the recent insulting and distorted article, "Pocho's Progress," which appeared in the April 28 issue of Time magazine.

I was surprised and disappointed to learn that a major national publication would print an account of the life of a people, rich in heritage and culture, by generalizing from an unintelligent observation of a few examples.

The article is replete with the kind of coded, but easily identified, ethnic slurs well calculated to stir latent prejudice in an unsuspecting reader—a regrettable example of a vicious type of freewheeling journalistic license unworthy of the high standard of factual reporting we have a right to expect from any reputable magazine.

It is an insult to more than 4 million U.S.-born Americans of Mexican descent, called "Pochos" by Time magazine—a term long considered most derogatory and degrading. It is degrading, also, to our younger generation who are struggling to improve their condition by more active participation in their community affairs.

Those who take their position in the lifestream of our Nation, raise a family, buy a home, and strive for an education in the schools, colleges, and universities of California deeply resent being branded "Agringados" by Time magazine because they were neatly dressed and had "adapted to Anglo style."

And most of all, Mr. Speaker, it is an insult to Mexico and to the "newly arrived" from our great Republic to the south whom Time magazine calls "Cholos" the most insulting term of all. It is no wonder that Time magazine caused raised eyebrows in Latin America where the article was first brought to my attention.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what Time magazine would call Pvt. Daniel Fernandez, recently awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously by President Johnson. Would Time call him and his fellow American soldiers of Mexican descent—those 17 Medal of Honor winners and the many who died for their country in Europe, the Pacific, Korea, and Vietnam—"Pochos," "Pachucos," "Cholos," or would they just be "Agringados" because, like all other Americans, they were fighting in the uniform of their country?

The bigotry and bias of the writer is clearly evidenced in the article "Pocho's Progress," and is an affront and insult to persons of Mexican descent in both Mexico and the United States.

I realize it was probably written by a prejudiced individual with a preconceived misconception of Mexican culture.

The writer also could have written his article in the "cantinas" which he describes so well.

But the truth of the matter is that the second largest minority in the United States has been deeply hurt by Time magazine's attempt to perpetuate profound misunderstanding about the Mexican-American community, its culture, its aspirations, and its contribution to the United States.

As a Member of Congress, and on behalf of some 5 million Americans of Mexican descent, I urgently request Time magazine to issue an immediate apology for this gratuitous affront and calculated ethnic slur against the Spanish-speaking community of our Southwestern States.

I believe such action is required not only in the interest of domestic harmony among our own people, but particularly because of the unfortunate effect this article may well have on our longstanding "good neighbor" relationship with the citizens of Mexico, our fellow American Republic with whom we share a common border nearly 2,000 miles long.

TWO CLEVELAND CLERGYMEN HONORED BY CIVIC AND NATIONALITY LEADERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, recently in Cleveland a testimonial dinner was held to honor Msgr. Joseph C. Feghali, of St. Maron Catholic Church, and Rev. Daniel Rodriguez, of Wesley Methodist Church.

These clergymen were honored for their continued application of religious precepts to community problems. In honoring them, observers at the dinner said they found the inspiration to emulate them.

The Spanish American peoples with whom Reverend Rodriguez lives and works, and to whom Monsignor Feghali has pledged support, are making a valiant effort to help raise themselves to economic security. They need the help of the some 60 persons who attended the dinner and others, if they are to succeed. Participants at the dinner were representatives of many ethnic groups, plus the Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religions. Through the efforts of such men and agencies as Reverend Rodriguez, Monsignor Feghali, Father Gabrial Hannan, of the Spanish Catholic Mission, Jose Rodriguez, of the Spanish American Betterment Committee, of Mosises Maldonado, and others, the Cleveland Spanish-Americans are making progress. But they need the continued cooperation of influential church and civic leaders. No people can find a responsible place in a society without the cooperation of that society. Monsignor Feghali has made notable contributions to his ethnic community and to the greater Cleveland area.

Through the testimonial dinner mentioned, and other programs, responsible Clevelanders are informing the Nation that the nationality groups of Cleveland will not allow one group of people to remain in isolation. Together, church and other civic leaders are now working jointly to make life in our country better for all Americans and those people in our Nation who desire to be citizens.

To be commended are Daniel L. Mausser and his wife, Dr. Ellen Vaugh Mausser, who were the hosts of the dinner meeting. Mr. and Dr. Mausser have worked for and with minority groups and ethnic groups for many years in Cleveland and elsewhere. Their tireless efforts to help bring mankind together in harmony to solve problems should be an example for all of us who consider ourselves good Americans.

H.R. 478 AND H.R. 479—FOREIGN IMPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a rising tide of imports in all branches of the U.S. economy.

Recently the mushroom growers and canners of my State, and the Tanners Council of America, Inc., sent me the following information:

Re H.R. 478 and H.R. 479.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As members of the Steering Committee of the Pennsylvania Congressional Delegation we wish to advise you of our deep concern over the adverse effect increased imports from Taiwan have had on the domestic industry and its workers.

It is our understanding that on May 10, 1967 representatives of the American Mushroom Canners Committee of the Pennsylvania Canners and Food Processors Association, who represent over ninety percent of the domestic producers will appear before your Committee in hearings concerned with the above bills.

Since they are its most important single agricultural cash crop, mushrooms are of very great importance to the State of Pennsylvania. Three-fourths of the nation's growers and more than half the canners are located in Pennsylvania, employing over 10,000 people and producing a gross income of approximately $50 million a year.

In this connection, speaking for the members of the Pennsylvania delegation we urge consideration of the fact that within the short space of six years, imports of canned mushrooms from Taiwan have increased dramatically and now amounts to 25 percent of domestic consumption and one third of domestic sales. In 1960/61, Taiwan exported only 317,000 pounds of mushrooms to the United States, whereas in 1966/67, that country will send in the unbelievable quantity of 14½ million pounds. There is no limit in sight as Taiwan is rapidly increasing its production each year.

The sharp increase in imports of canned mushrooms from Taiwan is due directly to differences in growing and processing costs in the United States and Taiwan. And differences in costs between the two countries can be traced primarily to differences in wage rates rather than to major differences in growing methods or processing practices. In both countries, growing and processing of mushrooms are labor intensive operations. For example, harvesting of mushrooms is a hand operation in both countries. Similarly, canning operations in both countries require handling of individual mushrooms during initial stages of processing. Similarities in technologies of growing and processing accompanied by wide differences in wage rates between the two countries result in higher costs per unit of product in the U.S. than in Taiwan.

We are advised by representatives of the Mushroom Canners Committee that not only are wage rates in Taiwan from 3.5 to 5 cents an hour but that a significant number of the workers are under U.S. age requirements and work more hours than allowed under U.S. Wage and Hour Laws. Most of this child labor is made up of young girls who are used in the peeling, washing, sorting, slicing, trimming and labeling operations—all of which are done by hand.

We believe that these labor conditions are detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency and general well-being of workers. The unregulated importation of canned mushrooms produced under these conditions in Taiwan constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce. We commend the efforts of your Committee to investigate this important matter.

TANNER'S COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.,
New York, N.Y.

IMPORTS OF LEATHER, SHOES AND OTHER LEATHER PRODUCTS

Imports of leather, shoes and leather products have reached record proportions. This trade is one sided and non-reciprocal. The direct result is an unprecedented invasion of the U.S. market, an invasion which clearly threatens the future of American industry. The scope of the invasion and its danger are apparent from the following summary figures.

Imports of shoes. The shoe imports recorded below include only leather types. In addition, millions of pairs of vinyl, canvas and non-leather types were brought in during 1966, enough to make the gross import total equal 16 percent of aggregate U.S. footwear production.

Leather footwear

[In thousands of pairs]

	Imports	Exports
1952	1,216	4,825
1953	1,235	5,159
1954	1,049	4,750
1955	1,785	4,642
1956	2,996	4,532
1957	4,956	4,398
1958	16,099	4,225
1959	11,057	3,505
1960	12,980	3,244
1961	15,078	3,035
1962	21,106	2,867
1963	26,162	2,843
1964	27,557	2,836
1965	34,723	2,491
1966	[1] 46,036	2,737

[1] In 1966, there were also imported more than 46,000,000 pairs of vinyl shoes and 35,000,000 pairs of rubber-canvas types, making a grand total of 132,187,600 pairs.

Foreign trade in leather. The traditional relation of leather exports and imports has been completely reversed. Last year imports far outweighed exports from the U.S. and accounted for a substantial proportion of domestic consumption. The pertinent facts by types of leather were:

Imports of leather

[Thousands of square feet]

	Finished cattle hide leathers [1]	Other cattle hide [2]	Calfskins		Goatskins	Sheep and lambskins
			Linings	Other		
1952	3,193	(3)	2,655	4,962	4,537	1,715
1953	5,022	(3)	4,595	3,909	5,424	5,237
1954	4,011	(3)	4,390	4,085	4,548	4,936
1955	6,204	(3)	4,398	6,667	7,133	7,748
1956	8,365	(3)	5,181	8,546	7,739	9,652
1957	9,653	(3)	8,262	11,996	9,666	9,667
1958	9,472	(3)	7,184	15,639	9,574	9,518
1959	16,624	(3)	11,876	18,610	14,789	16,198
1960	10,542	(3)	10,597	15,705	12,114	11,363
1961	11,649	(3)	10,055	17,357	13,761	11,241
1962	12,016	(3)	11,264	19,830	12,404	9,747
1963	14,649	(3)	10,461	17,404	12,080	7,991
1964	14,428	18,024	10,531	19,651	11,348	4,977
1965	21,894	36,474	9,645	18,867	16,096	6,516
1966	20,801	49,827	10,156	21,255	16,503	8,460

[1] Except sole, belting, and harness.
[2] Bovine leather, not specially provided for, including all crust and rough tanned.
[3] Not available.

Exports of leather

[Thousands of square feet]

	Cattle hide upper and patent	Calfskins	Goatskins	Sheep and lamb skins
1952	18,467	2,296	6,148	7,219
1953	26,741	2,717	6,025	8,249
1954	30,491	2,219	5,278	7,003
1955	29,155	2,424	4,348	9,704
1956	26,024	2,797	4,124	9,264
1957	24,585	2,155	4,013	11,989
1958	26,373	1,738	3,713	15,208
1959	18,272	1,790	4,942	21,827
1960	18,746	2,886	5,150	38,941
1961	22,674	3,406	6,309	68,040
1962	12,967	2,227	3,385	48,254
1963	14,499	2,328	7,442	55,227
1964	14,027	2,215	6,219	43,276
1965	16,113	2,265	8,456	42,924
1966	16,827	1,682	4,974	42,015

Leather products. Included in the import tide are huge quantities of handbags, gloves, personal leather goods, baseball gloves and leather novelties. For example, leather handbag imports in 1966 reached almost 2 million pieces, more than 35% of domestic usage.

Glove imports of more than 1,500,000 pairs exceeded production in the U.S. Both of the foregoing products demonstrate what could happen in shoes and even in leather if present policies of the U.S. government are not changed. By the end of 1966, it may be noted, imports of shoes, leather and leather products represented the equivalent of at least two months operations by the U.S. tanning industries.

The cattle hide position

[Thousands of hides]

	Total domestic supply	Net exports	Available for domestic consumption	Domestic wettings
1960	27,590	6,568	21,022	20,896
1961	28,012	7,351	20,661	21,424
1962	28,516	6,708	21,808	21,511
1963	29,800	7,612	22,188	20,843
1964	33,262	11,226	22,036	21,918
1965	34,550	13,019	21,531	22,492
1966	35,520	14,031	21,489	23,091
1967 (estimated)	34,100			[1]23,091

[1] Requirements.

TANNERS' STOCKS

[Thousands of hides]

	Raw	Process	Finished	Total
Dec. 31, 1960	1,706	4,249	2,038	7,993
Dec. 31, 1961	1,535	3,899	1,845	7,279
Dec. 31, 1962	1,659	3,800	2,024	7,483
Dec. 31, 1963	1,712	3,933	2,096	7,741
Dec. 31, 1964	1,811	3,801	1,962	7,574
Dec. 31, 1965	1,847	3,547	1,723	7,117
Nov. 30, 1966	1,878	3,422	1,829	7,129

The calf and kip position

[Thousands of skins]

	Total domestic supply	Net exports	Available for domestic consumption	Domestic wettings
1960	8,611	766	7,845	7,620
1961	8,081	1,127	6,954	7,324
1962	7,854	613	7,241	6,754
1963	7,198	−48	7,246	6,791
1964	7,625	388	7,237	7,401
1965	7,778	1,419	6,359	6,774
1966	6,870	1,914	4,956	4,750
1967 (estimated)	6,500			[1]5,500

[1] Requirements.

TANNERS' STOCKS

[Thousands of skins]

	Raw	Process	Finished	Total
Dec. 31, 1960	750	1,560	837	3,147
Dec. 31, 1961	932	1,475	776	3,183
Dec. 31, 1962	885	1,345	847	3,077
Dec. 31, 1963	864	1,621	900	3,385
Dec. 31, 1964	908	1,722	950	3,580
Dec. 31, 1965	592	1,570	717	2,879
Nov. 30, 1966	530	1,052	460	2,042

U.S. export destinations

CATTLE HIDES

[Thousands of hides]

	Japan	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Western Hemisphere	Other	Total
1960	2,392	468	2,498	1,158	372	6,888
1961	3,174	658	2,088	1,246	479	7,645
1962	3,008	847	1,816	1,170	277	7,118
1963	3,405	914	1,962	1,138	551	7,970
1964	3,811	680	4,250	1,895	868	11,504
1965	3,777	1,821	5,070	1,968	673	13,309
1966	3,994	2,621	4,140	2,594	867	14,216

CALFSKINS AND KIPS

[Thousands of skins]

1960	445	58	965	649	11	2,128
1961	600	69	1,225	630	23	2,547
1962	709	58	926	356	6	2,055
1963	735	41	787	232	64	1,859
1964	857	7	1,125	339	63	2,391
1965	438	98	1,414	460	40	2,450
1966	594	221	1,190	550	27	2,582

Mr. Speaker, in line with other industries, the food-producing industry is being swamped with import damage.

We have closed our eyes to the serious threat to the present and the grave danger of complete collapse of our economy in a few short years.

It started with glass, coal, ceramics, and later shoes, bags, textiles, steel, and hundreds of other products.

Now it has reached the U.S. food locker. The end is in sight, our time is running out.

The only consolation if one can enjoy such a consolation is that all other countries will collapse with us.

Mr. Speaker, hearings of my committee definitely show effects of imports on jobs reaching a stage of real concern for the U.S. economic future.

It seems that no industry is import-damage proof. Apparently, there are only two outs for industry, automate and eliminate labor, join the importers by importing their products from abroad and selling to their own established markets, or just go out of business.

I quote from testimony given by Eugene Stone, head of the largest U.S. producer of apparel:

Jobs for an estimated 100,000 workers in the U.S. apparel industry do not exist today due to the importation of apparel goods into this country, according to Eugene E. Stone, III, president of the Stone Manufacturing Company, of Greenville, South Carolina, speaking in behalf of the American Apparel Manufacturing Association, the major trade association for the U.S. apparel industry.

Stone pointed out in his testimony before the subcommittee that—

> The developing countries of the East, the rebuilt countries of Western Europe and countries of South America have established new, modern and efficient apparel plants which provide many more clothes than these countries need themselves. This excess comes into our country to compete with the output of our own apparel industry which has not generated sufficient earnings to build all new plants and install today's most efficient machinery.

Tracing the history of the U.S. efforts to help these underdeveloped countries, Stone cited figures showing that from 1958 until 1961, cotton apparel imports increased 34 percent. From 1962 until 1966, under the long-term cotton textile arrangement—LTA—cotton apparel imports increased 37 percent. Wool and manmade fiber apparel imports are not regulated under the arrangement with the greatest growth in apparel imports recently coming in the manmade fiber products. Manmade fiber apparel imports were 49 million equivalent square yards—SYE—in 1962, and jumped to 230 million SYE by the end of 1966, an increase of 370 percent.

Total apparel imports have increased 63 percent since 1962, with the total dollar value of these imports amounting to $518 million. And this does not include leather, rubberized goods, silk, linen or other apparel, Stone pointed out.

He explained to the subcommittee that labor is the second most important cost of production in the U.S. apparel industry, accounting for about 31 percent of sales revenue in 1965, while the cost of raw materials, mostly fabric, was 43 percent. He said:

> Labor, not capital, is the expensive productive element in making apparel.

Citing examples, he explained that the average hourly wage paid to apparel production workers in the United States in 1965 was $1.83, rising to $1.90 in 1966. In addition, the average employer paid 25 to 30 cents per hour for non-income-type benefit payments for each employee. Total compensation to all apparel employees in 1966 is estimated at close to $6 billion, Stone reminded me.

He compared the U.S. wage standard with the labor picture in Hong Kong, where the average woman apparel production worker was paid the equivalent of 17 cents an hour in 1965.

Refuting the traditional argument that lower wages do not necessarily mean lower labor costs, Stone pointed out that the average Hong Kong apparel worker received only one-tenth as much as the average American apparel production worker, and then asked:

> Are we 10 times more efficient? Absolutely not!

He pointed out that in many instances, with modern plants, modern machines, and modern methods, foreign production is as good as in any American apparel plant.

He then went on to picture the number of U.S. apparel workers it is estimated are displaced by imports. Assuming that the average apparel employee works 2,000 hours per year, it is possible to estimate that some 62,600 workers are displaced by cotton apparel imports; 15,100 displaced from wool apparel imports; and 22,300 from the imports of manmade fiber apparel items.

Stone also pointed out that the nature of the apparel industry is such that it could, if given a fair chance to grow, hire many semiskilled workers—people who could join the 1.2 million production workers already in the industry. He said:

> Currently, 89% of our labor force are production workers.

An international agreement covering textile and apparel products of all fiber including manmade, was called for by Stone. He said:

> An agreement of this type must allow the American apparel industry to have a share in the growth of domestic demand.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the issue is so serious that I include certain testimony before my committee:

STATEMENT BY DON MAHON, BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, HON. JOHN H. DENT, CHAIRMAN, MAY 1967

My name is Don Mahon, I am President of the National Brotherhood of Packinghouse and Dairy Workers and Executive Secretary of the National Federation of Independent Unions.

I appreciate your invitation and the opportunity to appear before this Committee. At this hearing, I am accompanied by Mr. Ralph Frey, President of the American Watch Workers Union. Mr. Frey will be pleased to answer your questions and will elaborate further on problems facing many union members and their related industry.

The workers we represent are all greatly concerned with the problems and competition resulting from foreign imports. The impact of these foreign imports on American industry and employees is becoming an increasingly serious threat. We wish to stress that we do not believe in isolationism. At the same time, we do not believe that preservation of the American standard of living necessitates that our labor, industry and agriculture have adequate insurance against unfair foreign competition.

For this reason, I wish to endorse H.R. 478 and H.R. 479 in behalf of the organizations I represent. We feel that adoption, and proper administration of these amendments when adopted, would provide a more effective means whereby the blindspot now existing with regard to determination of the holding of hearings on the Fair-Labor Standards Act could be eliminated. Under the existing law, the right to be heard or to get a hearing when needed is severely restricted since it is left almost entirely at the discretion of the Secretary and thereby the whims of current administration policy.

My first reference will be to the food industry. In essence, the adverse effects of the import of large quantities of meat and dairy products is a heavily contributing factor to the low farm prices that plague the American farmer. This results in less production and under employment for meatpacking, dairy and related food industry workers. The standard of living of both is thereby threatened.

Such imports also constitute an additional drain on United States dollars and promotes more inflationary pressures.

This causes the economy of our country to be weakened at a time when we should be combating inflation and utilizing our own manpower and superior production facilities in every manner possible.

In the meatpacking, dairy and related food industry, due to automation, there is a constant reduction in the number of workers gainfully employed when considered from the standpoint of volume produced and the ever increasing population with its ever increasing food requirements. In connection with the future impact of foreign imports, we must project the results on this basis. If permitted to continually increase, it will be disastrous both to the industry and the workers involved.

Much of the processing in the meatpacking and dairy industry is eliminated when these imports are brought in already processed or even partially processed. Our concern is not limited to the processing workers because we realize that the initial source of the raw material is equally important. Thereby, all American workers have a close community of interest with the American farmer. Mistakes in judgment and unrealistic management by the present administration has resulted in a serious situation affecting agriculture and the dairy industry in this country. When the American farmer cannot afford to produce the raw material due to cheap foreign competition our members jobs are eliminated, too. At the present time, the farmer is in a deadly price-cost squeeze. Unquestionably, part of this problem results from unfair foreign competition.

From one year ago, according to Agriculture Department figures, hog prices are down from 25 to 30%, beef cattle down 10.4%, lambs down 19.8%, eggs are down 16.9%, and chickens are down 17.9%. The parity ratio currently stands at 74 and is expected to drop even lower as production costs continue to rise. Farm debt is on the increase rising some 4.2 billion dollars in 1966. Total beef and veal imports were up 27% in 1966 over the previous year; meat under the Meat Import Quota Amendment (Public Law 88–482) was up 34%; pork imports were up 14%; lamb imports up 19%, mutton imports up 102% and present indications are that meat imports will continue to increase in 1967.

Ingredients of ice cream sold in this country are increasingly being imported from countries such as Australia, Belgium, Canada and Denmark. There are strong indications that sugar and butter fat contained in the imported ice cream mixes may come in large part from Cuba and countries behind the iron curtain. There they are produced by the equivalent of slave labor. More than 100 million lbs. of sugar-butter fat mix, commonly called Junex, entered the United States last year as these importing countries cleverly found loopholes in the tariff regulations. If, in fact, these ice cream mixes contain Cuban sugar or Eastern European butter fat, then the mixes are coming into the United States illegally. Present law forbids the importation of any product from Cuba and severely limits those imports from Eastern Europe. It is significant to note that about 36 million pounds of this ice cream entered the United States from Canada in 1966 alone. And Canada does import substantial amounts of sugar from Cuba thus raising the question whether this Cuban sugar is not used by Canadian processors to make the ice cream mix. Foreign importers have also found a lucrative market in supplying ice cream mix to the United States because they can buy the raw ingredient sugar-butter fat cheaper in foreign markets than in the United States. Obviously, the cheap slave labor that goes into preparing these products is in direct competition with our farmers and process plant workers in this country.

There are many other facts about the dairy situation in particular that should be considered. With a 2 and 7/10 billion lbs. of dairy imports (whole milk equivalent) entering our country in 1966, it is no wonder the markets for domestic producers are being usurped and prices they receive held down. In fact, last years dairy imports equalled the milk which would have been produced by over 300,000 cows or the milk production of more than 6,000 dairy farms with 50 cows each. Think what this would mean from the standpoint of labor and additional equipment required. Processing and manufacturing plant workers would have benefited accordingly.

Also, remember that it was only last spring that the President followed the Secretary of Agriculture's advice in raising the cheddar cheese import quota for the fiscal year 1966 from 218 million pounds to 317 million pounds.

We call to your attention, a case where a shipload of Colby cheese was brought into Green Bay, Wisconsin. This is the heart of the dairy processing industry in this country. Such tariff protection as presently in existence did not apply to the exact type of cheese that was imported although it is comparable to cheddar. It is significant to note that the President asked the tariff commission to investigate last spring with regard to raising the cheddar cheese import quota even further to 9.6 million pounds.

Other agricultural imports adversely affect a large number of livestock raisers and all those who proces the livestock after the *farmer sells* it.

I wish to call to the attention of the Chairman, that the meatpacking plant at Hallstead, Pennsylvania is scheduled to close on June 10, 1967. This plant was primarily engaged in the slaughter of veal that were produced by dairy cows in the big milk shed that serves New York. This is just another casualty in the continuing trend that is at least partly resulting from foreign import of dairy and meat products.

On the subject of import and dairy products, Secretary Freeman was quoted as saying recently that he was confident action would be taken to cut imports within sixty *days, and added that if action had been taken* before now, it would have been thrown out of the courts. This claim that the administration does not have authority to act is ridiculous. A year ago (March, 1966) the President evoked an emergency provision of the Agricultural Adjustment Act and increased *imports of certain dairy products.* He could take the same emergency action today to cut imports. If the President and Secretary of Agriculture have a sincere interest in effectively curbing such imports, we cannot understand why the administration is opposing the dairy imports act of 1967 which is sponsored by some 53 Senators and 100 members of the House. In our opinion, it would constitute more effective insurance for the future welfare of those dependent on this industry.

Accurate information is not available, as to the total effect in man hours lost due to imports, so far as meat packing, food and dairy processing workers are concerned. However, it is obvious that it would be substantial.

We believe that the provisions of H.R. 478 and H.R. 479 would permit us to take such action and thereby benefit the general public as well as protect the interests of American workers, agriculture and related industry.

At this point, Mr. Frey, President of the American Watch Workers will explain the serious problem confronting this important industry.

IMPACT OF IMPORTS ON JEWELED WATCH INDUSTRY AND RELATED WORKERS

(Statement by Mr. Frey)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the impact of imports over the past 25 years has reduced the American jeweled watch industry to a minimum level of operations. Unless the Congress acts, a recent tariff reduction on watches means the elimination of watch production in the United States, the transfer of high precision watch skills and jobs overseas, and our reliance on foreign sources for skills and industrial capacity we now possess. What you are considering has already happened to us. But our experience may furnish some insight as to what can happen to an efficient domestic industry and its employees when they become engulfed in a flood of imports. Serious injury is a fact of life for us—not a future fear.

Back in 1936, concessions on import rates on jeweled watches were granted by our Government in a trade agreement with Switzerland. At that time, we had about 10,000 people employed on watches at four major jeweled watch companies; Elgin, Hamilton, Bulova and Waltham, some 3 million movements were produced, and our share of our own market was better than 40%. By 1954, due to imports, employment had dropped to 5,000. Our Government then increased rates *of duties on articles on which rates had been* been reduced in 1936. Despite that action and the efficient operations of the industry, further severe injury from imports has occurred. To make matters worse in January, 1967, the 1954 rates were reduced to those existing in 1936, placing the domestic industry at the mercy of unfair imports generated *by Switzerland and Japan with cheap* labor rates with which we cannot compete.

Today, there are about 2500 people employed on watches and our share of our own jeweled watch market has shrunk to approximately 12%. Production in the industry is back where it was 50 years ago when we had *half the population* we have today. In the past 7 years alone, Waltham went out of the watch business, the Elgin plant at Lincoln, Nebraska, shut down, the Elgin plants at Elgin, Illinois, ceased to exist as integrated watch operations and an attempt (with questionable results) has been made to make watches at a new location at Elgin, South Carolina, and Precision Time went out of business. For all practicable purposes, only Bulova and Hamilton remain as integrated domestic watch companies. But for the advanced technology and the electronic and electric watches developed by Bulova and Hamilton, they would have followed the others out of the watch business. The domestic industry is now at a rock bottom level of operations—a point at which our Government is forced to decide whether it is needed or not and act accordingly.

The economic effect of imports on this industry has been documented by the U.S. Tariff Commission which has reviewed the situation annually. From 1936 to 1952 the build-up of imports and the accompanying injury to domestic production became increasingly evident. In 1952 the Commission found that as a result of the 1936 trade concession, the domestic industry had been seriously injured and recommended increases in duties. It repeated this warning in 1954. In that year, the President restored a substantial part of the reduction made by the trade concession. But that adjustment was insufficient to stem the flow of imports and, in effect, that action was nullified by the Swiss who reduced prices and practiced up-jeweling (permitting importers to attack domestic production with movements containing more than 17 jewels without paying the applicable duties). Other related economic factors worsened the situation—lower domestic production resulted in higher unit costs—the domestic companies started importing themselves to make more money—and the Swiss control of their labor *costs maintained* their rates at ⅓ of ours (labor accounting for 85% of the cost of a watch movement). The economic effect of imports since 1954 may be summarized as follows:

	Year	*Amount*	*Percent*	*Percent increase (+) or decrease (−)*
Domestic production	1953	$2,365,000	....	−38
	1964	1,400,000	....	
Employment on watches	1953	....	20.0	−55
	1964	....	12.0	
Share of U.S. market	1953	....	20.0	−40
	1964	....	12.0	
Idle capacity	1953	....	45.0	+23
	1964	....	58.0	
Sales of domestic watches as a percent of total watch sales	1953	....	67.0	−25
	1964	....	50.0	
Profits after taxes	1953	....	4.1	....
	1964	....	2.2	....

Recently, our Government made another thorough investigation of this situation. In March 1965 the Tariff Commission, after hearing, found that the probable economic effect of a further tariff reduction would be still more imports, a further shrinkage of our share of our own market, still further idlying of facilities and more unemployment. It is now obvious to all that operations cannot be maintained in the United States without the minimum level of production that now exists.

This economic deterioration has been constant despite the recognized efficiency of the domestic industry. Bulova operates an integrated plant in Switzerland and certifies that the domestic plants are more efficient than those overseas. Our industry is the technological leader of the world. Battery-powered watches developed and marketed by Bulova and Hamilton have been the most startling development in the watchmaking art for the past 300 years. With better technology and working skills, the domestic industry has been able to compete with modest tariff protection. This is not a case of an inefficient domestic industry being unable to meet overseas competition. On the contrary, it has an international reputation for competence and technical progress. Its problem has been unfair imports generated by Switzerland and Japan with labor rates ⅓ and ⅙th of ours, respectively.

As for employment, the reduction of our skilled labor force to ¼ of what it was in the post World War II period has been accompanied by developments which make it certain that the skills will disappear if our Government does not take action to prevent further deterioration. The remaining domestic managements have been induced by imports competition to import movements themselves. They have developed the practice of moving selected watch lines from domestic manufacturing to importing as soon as the item becomes less unprofitable. With each such move there is pressure to keep costs down on the lower production schedules of the remaining manufactured items. Grievances become constant. People with established piecework rates producing a fair hourly wage find themselves doing several new and different jobs for less money under reduced production schedules. Not only are less people employed but the work becomes less attractive as domestic production drops. There is always the tendency to drop complete product lines when more money can be made by importing. It is difficult for any young man to see a career in such a picture and the future of these skills in the economy is questionable unless something is done to improve the situation. Today, employment on watches is 45% of what it was in 1952 when the Tariff Commission first found serious injury. There has been a substantial shift from manufacturing to importing. There is no place for displaced employees to go and still maintain their high skills. It takes very few people to prepare an imported movement for sale. The importation of complete movements and watches is in sight. The steady downward trend and dissipation of the skill is reflected in the attached table.

The essence of watch skills is the capability of applying extremely close tolerance to very small pieces on a mass produced basis—constantly improving the state of the art. This reservoir of skills will exist only so long as operations continue. It takes a long time to build the combined research, design, tooling, and production skills into integrated operations but they can disappear very quickly if not used. It took Bulova more than 15 years to put together an integrated watch operation in this country. Some of the higher skills require 10 years or more of training and experience before proficiency is reached. Once gone, it takes a long time to reestablish this industrial capability. As stated in the Staff Study of this industry made by the Department of Labor in 1957: ". . . It is reasonable to believe that it would take years to establish watch manufacturing organizations comparable to those now operating in the United States even if workers with requisite skills were available."

The importing community can be expected to ask the Congress to continue to free up trade but our Government can also expect them in turn to be fair. Where the objective is destruction of an important domestic capability, we must be on our guard, care must be taken to insure that we do not lose something we need as we negotiate trade agreements with our friends in the free world. Unfortunately, in the watch case, the prime force generating watch imports has not been well motivated.

The Swiss Cartel wants to eliminate our domestic production capability. The U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York found that the Cartell has been seeking since 1931 to cripple U.S. production (U.S. v. Watchmakers of Switzerland et al.) and that its purpose is to eliminate our more progressive technology which is a threat to their world monopoly objectives. The Cartell has the support of the Swiss Government and even today continues to press for tariff reduction and the scuttling of what is left of our domestic production. They learned nothing from this suit which established their violations of our anti-trust laws. They still seek by trade negotiations to obtain a monopoly of our home market—something which our Department of Justice sought for 8 years to prevent. By contrast with our situation, Switzerland leads the world in the production of watches, supplying 45% of the world's needs. It has a severe labor shortage and must import 25% of its labor overall and 10% of its watch labor force. It does not need the 12% of the American Market which we hold, yet it pushes for 100% of our market with the obvious objective of monopoly.

Our experience prompts us to suggest that whenever there is a serious economic condition caused by imports, the Government should take a good look and determine on the basis of national interest factors whether we need that particular industrial capability or not. Once gone, it is difficult and expensive to rebuild it and, if national defense interests are involved, there may be no time to re-establish it. There may be skills and technology which we want to preserve. We should know what we are doing before we let an important industrial capability disappear through imports. Domestic manufacturers can readily convert themselves into importers and can usually make more money in doing so, but the jobs, skills and technology are thereby exported overseas. If what we are about to lose is important, we should not hesitate to protect it. National defense interests, as well as general economic factors must also be evaluated in cases of economic illness due to imports. In 1964 the Senate Armed Services Subcommittee investigated the defense interest in this industry as it had done before in 1954. It found that the industry is making a very special and substantial contribution to our military, space and missile programs; that it is constantly improving the state of the art; and that it contains a reservoir of skills which we should preserve. As stated in part in the Subcommittee report:

"The domestic watch industry contains a unique pool of skilled workers for the sort of microminiaturized precision work involved in specialized timing devices. These workers are particularly skilled and essential in the engineering and tool and die categories. Many of the workers require 10 or more years of training and experience in order to become skilled in their lines of endeavor. There is a need, therefore, for preserving these skills within the borders of the United States for the purpose of our national defense program."

The Subcommittee emphasized that all major powers of the world have supported the growth of their watch industries and that we should not permit ours to disappear; that these skills cannot survive on defense work alone which does not provide a sufficient flow to maintain essential productive capacity; that these skills cannot be mothballed and that non-watch operations have neither the time nor the funds to develop this combination of skills required for defense needs and improvement of the state of the art. It concluded that all doubts should be resolved in favor of retaining this industry and that we should be self-sufficient in the skills we need. On the basis of tariff and defense findings, it is apparent that recent tariff reduction will mean elimination of this industry which we need. Jobs and facilities will be transferred overseas and in times of emergency we will have to rely on foreign sources for skills we now possess.

The watch story also demonstrates how complex our Government has become and how at times our well-intended programs conflict. For many years we have provided for duty-free entry of goods through certain of our own possessions. Section 301 of the Tariff Act of 1930 has permitted entry of goods from the Virgin Islands free of duty so long as the landed value in the United States is not less than twice the value of foreign parts used in the Virgin Islands production. The rub is that assembly is considered manufacture and some unexpected problems have recently arisen from the application of that long-standing policy.

For example, if watch parts imported into the Virgin Islands cost $3.00, assembly can be completed in the Islands and the watch sold to a U.S. importer or distributor for $6.00 with no duty required. In the last 6 years, watch imports from the Islands have grown from 5,000 per year to more than 5 million movements (mostly of Japanese origin). All imports hurt and can cause injury whether they come from our own possessions or directly from a foreign country. We must re-examine our duty-free arrangements in the light of these developments.

The Congress has no responsibility to the Swiss Cartel and its world wide monopoly. The Cartel needs no help from the Congress, and it has taken the fruits of our market while violating our laws.

The people of the United States rely on the Congress to protect their interests and do not expect to lose something which is needed. It is in the interest of the people that we retain what is left of this efficient industry that is important to our interests.

U.S. employment on jeweled watches, 1950 to 1964

1950	9,872
1951	8,379
1952	6,561
1953	5,951
1954	4,199
1955	4,072
1956	3,955
1957	3,621
1958	2,598
1959	3,517
1960	3,448
1961	2,688
1962	2,508
1963	2,685
1964	2,476

We suggest that adoption of proposed amendments H.R. 478 and H.R. 479 would permit and help insure that interested parties could obtain necessary hearings and relief when needed. It is evident that further investigation of the cases we have cited, and many others of comparable nature, would be in the best interests of all concerned in this country.

We cite these facts because it is often difficult for our organization to obtain hearings that will bring all the facts before members of Congress and the public. Unless a fair hearing is obtained in a timely manner, the damage is already beyond repair.

I wish to thank the Committee for its consideration.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Meeds (at the request of Mr. Foley), for May 1, 1967, through May 5, 1967, on account of illness.

Mr. Keith (at the request of Mr. Arends), for the balance of the week, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Biester), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Biester), for 20 minutes, on May 4; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Waldie) to address the House and to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Feighan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Dent, for 1 hour, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Biester) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pelly.

Mr. Mathias of Maryland.

Mr. Reinecke.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Waldie) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Holifield.

Mr. Hagan.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 617. An act to authorize the States of North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, and Washington to use the income from certain lands for the construction of facilities for State charitable, educational, penal, and reformatory institutions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 889. An act to designate the San Rafael Wilderness, Los Padres National Forest, in the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on May 2, 1967, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 8363. An act authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 4, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

719. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Acting Secretary of Commerce, and President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies on U.S. participation in a proposed increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and on a proposed modification of provisions for the election of the Bank's Executive Director (H. Doc. No. 117); to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

720. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

721. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of savings available through the use of formal advertising in contracting for automotive tires and tubes, General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

722. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of potential savings in costs of transporting food donated for distribution abroad, Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Operations.

723. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copy of an order entered in a certain case, pursuant to the provisions of section 13(c) of the act of September 11, 1957; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

724. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated March 6, 1967, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on Caliente Creek stream group, California, requested by resolutions of the committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted January 31, 1946 and March 22, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5702. A bill to remove the 5-acre limitation on the amount of tobacco allotment acreage which may be leased (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. POAGE: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 8265. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to authorize the transfer of tobacco acreage allotments and acreage-poundage quotas; with amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 463. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 9240, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BIESTER:

H.R. 9575. A bill to exclude U.S. Route 22 from Haafsville to Easton, Pa., from being on the Interstate System and to provide for the designation of an alternative route; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLANTON:

H.R. 9576. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H.R. 9577. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9578. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for a liberalized child-care deduction as a trade or business expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 9579. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 9580. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL (by request):

H.R. 9581. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to encourage investment in the independent American Great Lakes merchant marine by providing a program of assistance in the construction of vessels, to correct inequities, to stimulate the domestic commerce of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 9582. A bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDMONDSON (by request):

H.R. 9583. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana:

H.R. 9584. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit payment to the recipient of medical assistance, for physician services furnished under the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9585. A bill to establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program of grants and fellowships to improve the education of students attending institutions of higher education in preparation for entrance into the service of State, local, or Federal governments, and to attract such students to the public service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9586. A bill to prohibit age discrimination in employment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9587. A bill to permit officers and employees of the Federal Government to elect coverage under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9588. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of the monthly benefits payable thereunder, to raise the wage base, to provide for cost-of-living increases in such benefits, to increase the amount of the benefits payable to widows, to provide for contributions to the social security trust funds for the general revenues, to otherwise extend and improve the insurance system established by such title, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 9589. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOLEY (by request):

H.R. 9590. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9591. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide payment for physical therapists' services under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9592. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide that independent laboratories which meet State licensing requirements may participate in the supplementary medical insurance benefits program without having to meet additional Federal conditions or requirements; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 9593. A bill authorizing the Great Lakes Commission to appoint a member of a river basin commission for the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT:

H.R. 9594. A bill to designate Ozark Lock and Dam (lock and dam No. 12) on the Arkansas River as the James W. Trimble Lock and Dam; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 9595. A bill to regulate and prevent burdens upon commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of money earned outside of a State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9596. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9597. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9598. A bill to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring Madame Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI (by request):

H.R. 9599. A bill to amend section 41(a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 9600. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Commitee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. KELLY:

H.R. 9601. A bill to assure nondicrimination in Federal and State jury selection and service, to provide relief against discriminatory employment and housing practices, to prescribe penalties for certain acts of violence or intimidation, to extend the life of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KYROS:

H.R. 9602. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H.R. 9603. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act with respect to limitations on the leasing of coal lands imposed upon railroads; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9604. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONALD of Michigan:

H.R. 9605. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase, for 1968 and 1969, the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer from $600 to $800, and to provide that for taxable years beginning after 1969 such exemptions shall be $1,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9606. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society of the Colonial Dames of America in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (for himself, Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania, Mr. Corbett, and Mr. Holland):

H.R. 9607. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enlarge and improve the research facility near Bruceton, Pa., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9608. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 9609. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9610. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9611. A bill to provide for the payment of supplemental annuities under section 3(j) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to certain additional individuals; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9612. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 9613. A bill to establish a Commission on Trading Stamp Practices to provide for the regulation of trading stamp companies and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9614. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ROTH:

H.R. 9615. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHERLE (for himself, and Mr. Denney):

H.R. 9616. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9617. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 9618. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9619. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9620. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. VIGORITO:

H.R. 9621. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 9622. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to recognize the high public service rendered by Major Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever," approved February 28, 1929, with respect to the widows of certain such persons; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9623. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purpoees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H.R. 9624. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9625. A bill to amend section 204(a) of the Coinage Act of 1965 in order to authorize minting of all new quarter-dollar pieces with a likeness of the late General of the Army Douglas MacArthur on one side. and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9626. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a deduction from gross income for certain nonreimbursable expenses incurred by volunteer firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 9627. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9628. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 9629. A bill to transfer the Sequoia National Game Refuge to Sequoia National Park; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9630. A bill to provide that nonprofit hospitals shall be subject to the National Labor Relations Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 9631. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private, nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 9632. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.R. 9633. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9634. A bill to establish, in the House of Representatives, the office of delegate from the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Election Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 9635. A bill to authorize additional funds for research and development of noise suppression in connection with jet aircraft engines; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9636. A bill to exempt a member of the Armed Forces from service in a combat zone when such member is the sole surviving son of a family, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9637. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the effective date of award of certain claims for disability compensation; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 9638. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that children adopted by U.S. citizens shall acquire U.S. citizenship automatically upon the fulfillment of certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9639. A bill to amend title 18 of the United States Code to prohibit travel or use of any facility in interstate or foreign commerce with intent to incite a riot or other violent civil disturbance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9640. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the 100th anniversary of the birth of Madam Marie Sklodowska-Curie, the discoverer of radium; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 9641. A bill to assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GROVER:

H.R. 9642. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN (for himself, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. BELL, Mr. BUTTON, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. FINO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HALPERN, Mr. HANLEY, Mr. McCLORY, Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. REIFEL, Mr. REINECKE, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SHRIVER, Mr. TENZER, Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. WALDIE):

H.R. 9643. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9644. A bill to authorize and direct the Commodity Credit Corporation to establish and maintain reserve supplies of agricultural commodities for national security, consumer protection, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SNYDER (by request):

H.R. 9645. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9646. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEVINE:

H.J. Res. 552. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to the offering of prayer in public buildings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.J. Res. 553. Joint resolution to establish a National Advisory Commission on Fire Prevention and Control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.J. Res. 554. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.J. Res. 555. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.J. Res. 556. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide that the right to vote shall not be denied on account of age to persons who are 19 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.J. Res. 557. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 462. Resolution authorizing the printing of extra copies of "Activities of Ku Klux Klan organizations in the United States," 89th Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

176. By Mr. BARING: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to a proposal that would provide that voting polls close simultaneously across the Nation; to the Committee on House Administration.

177. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to a proposal to approve and fund a new multipurpose building at the Stewart Indian School, Nevada; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

178. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to a proposal that legislation be introduced to allow deviations from the Uniform Time Act of 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

179. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada relative to a proposal that legislation be enacted limiting imports of butterfat and nonfat milk solids; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

180. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to the State of Nevada receiving its rightful share of funds provided for public lands and highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9647. A bill for the relief of Evripides Thomas Kofos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9648. A bill for the relief of Rosa Binetti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9649. A bill for the relief of Paolo Giannetto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9650. A bill for the relief of San Lutfrya; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 9651. A bill for the relief of Peter Tsandilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9652. A bill for the relief of Reverend Vito Francesco Brancatella; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KARTH:

H.R. 9653. A bill for the relief of Yang Ok Yoo (Maria Marguirita); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 9654. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Miri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9655. A bill for the relief of Vuong Thi Bick Tuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 9656. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain mineral interests of the United States in approximately 263.2 acres located near Columbia, South Carolina, to Rockie Realty, Inc., and Robert F. Lindsay, the joint owners of such property; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9657. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Huat Nio Tjio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Concern Expressed About Irresponsible Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am seriously concerned about recent events involving irresponsible persons. In my opinion, draft-card burning, draft evasion or the encouraging of draft evasion are seditious acts and should be punished under the law. If our present statutes are not sufficient, we must strengthen the laws on draft evasion.

I am sick and tired of the Justice Department stretching the first amendment to cover up these acts of sedition. The Cassius Clays, the Stokely Carmichaels, and the Martin Luther Kings continually commit these crimes against their country on the pretext that we are not formally at war, and because the Justice Department refuses to prosecute them. We are just as much at war as we were in World Wars I and II and Korea.

These contemptible creatures are apparently willing to accept all the benefits of American citizenship, without lifting a hand to help protect and preserve this country.

National School Safety Patrol Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a joint resolution today to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week."

Mr. Speaker, the lifesaving efforts of the school safety patrols play an increasingly important role in the nationwide campaign to reduce traffic accidents, and I believe all Americans should be reminded of the fine work these young people are performing.

The school safety patrols, since their organization on a national scale in the early 1920's, have played an important role in the reduction of highway accidents involving school-age children. There are more than 900,000 safety patrol members now serving 40,000 schools in all 50 States, protecting 19 million children. Mr. Speaker, I urge public attention and citizen support for the school safety patrols.

SBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the story of the growth of America's industrial might is the story of the growth of hundreds of thousands of small businesses into large and successful enterprises.

Small business has been ably described as the "seedbed of American industry." Virtually all firms started as small businesses, including the giants of today's industrial world.

It is essential that this seedbed for the growth and development of new industries be kept healthy. America is the industrial leader of the world. To maintain that position it must be aware of new products and new ideas that enterprising small firms have to offer.

SBA has the responsibility of assisting small firms. It not only provides financing when they are unable to obtain loans from other sources, but it also helps them sell their products or services to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to call my colleagues' attention to the help SBA's Los Angeles regional office provided to American Electric Inc.

This small firm was organized in 1961 by Norman Fuller as a subsidiary to the Atlas Manufacturing Co. with only three employees. Fuller assigned it the task of designing an electrical mechanism to remove the door from silos housing Minutemen missiles.

In 1963, American purchased the assets of the Alfred Hofmann Co., a producer of practice bombs, and a short while later purchased Metatronics Division of Texas Metals and Minerals Corp. With this new production capacity, American was now able to produce for the Government, tanks and fire bombs as well as practice bombs and its original electrical devices.

In 1964, American acquired a plant in Spring City, Tenn., and sought a contract to manufacture for the Air Force a new type of fire bomb. Although American's bid on the contract was low, the company was disqualified by the Air Force because its production facilities were not considered to be adequate.

American appealed to SBA for help and SBA's procurement specialists made an independent survey of the company's facilities. They found that the tools for the production line had been acquired and were ready to be operated at American's California plant.

SBA, therefore, determined that American had the requisite capacity to produce fire bombs along with its other product lines. A certificate of competency was issued and American was awarded the Air Force contract.

A certificate of competency is a device by which the Small Business Administration assists a small firm to win a Government contract when it is low bidder, but the Government purchasing officer rejects the bid because he questions the ability of the firm to produce the item satisfactorily.

In such instances, if the small firm takes its case to the SBA, SBA will survey the company's plant and if it determines that the company is capable of producing the item in accordance with its guidelines, it then issues a certificate of competency and the contract is awarded to the firm.

Two benefits result from the issuance of a certificate of competency. The low-bidding small firm wins the contract, and secondly, the Government saves money because otherwise the contract would automatically be awarded to a higher bidder.

Since winning the 1964 Air Force contract with the aid of SBA, American made truly astounding growth. But growth causes problems and SBA assistance was still required.

Two additional certificates of competency were issued by SBA to help this firm obtain Government contracts on which it was low bidder. In two other cases it helped the firm obtain defense contracts by persuading the contracting officers that the company could perform the contracts satisfactorily.

SBA's total assistance enabled American to win $7 million in Government contracts, all of which were essential to the company's continued growth.

The company decided to centralize its operations in 1966. It established its present headquarters in La Mirada, Calif., consolidating there its operations formerly carried out at five different locations. In addition to its main plant the company still operates two plants in Tennessee.

American Electric, Inc., is no longer a small company. It has grown from three employees in 1961 to 1,650 employees at the present time. In 1966, it obtained $68.6 million in Defense Department contracts. It ranks 66th among all companies in the United States producing defense-oriented products.

Vincent Fortuna, American's vice president in charge of sales, credits the Small Business Administration's help in the company's early days for much of its success.

Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration deserves much credit for successes such as that experienced by American Electric. The President is a strong supporter of the Small Business Administration as part of his program of promoting "creative federalism."

By working together, business and Government gain great advantages. In his state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

> Federal energy is essential but it is not enough. Only a total working partnership among Federal, State, and local governments can succeed.

The President includes in this "working partnership" the Nation's businessmen. He has said that the Nation faces—

> a tremendous job of reorganization, of systematic management, calling upon all of our public and private resources at all levels of our national life.
>
> The closer we can work together—

President Johnson has stated—

> the sooner, the better, and the more economically we can get the job done.

When President Johnson appointed Bernard L. Boutin as head of the SBA a year ago, he urged that small business be made one of the greatest growth industries of the Nation.

The assistance the Small Business Administration has given to American Electric is an example of "creative federalism" at work.

By giving American Electric assistance at a critical time in its development, SBA started this firm on its way to becoming a large, successful enterprise accomplishing vital projects for the Defense Department.

Under Administrator Bernard L. Boutin, the Small Business Administration is adhering to its mission of keeping the "seedbed of the American economy" vigorously growing and seeing to it that small firms have a chance to grow and prosper.

Tribute to David S. Seeley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government will be losing one of its finest young public servants when David S. Seeley goes to New York City to assume a new post as director of the office of educational liaison there.

Since he joined the Office of Education in June 1963 as a special assistant to Commissioner Keppel, Dave Seeley has been a vital and creative influence in the shaping and administering of Federal educational programs and policies. During the past 2 years, he has had primary responsibility for implementing in public education the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and despite continuing controversy, he has carried out this challenging assignment with insight, patience, and tact. The progress toward meaningful school desegregation which has been made since passage of the 1964 act is, in large part, due to Dave's untiring and energetic work.

At the age of 36, Dave Seeley has already made his mark in the public service. A graduate of Harvard Law School, he studied at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, then served as a director of the Peace Corps teacher training program in Nigeria and as an attorney in the office of the general counsel at HEW before joining the Office of Education. For the past year he has held the title of Assistant Commissioner of Education for Equal Educational Opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor John V. Lindsay and the city of New York are gaining a man of intelligence, dedication, and administrative skill. I am confident that Dave Seeley will serve American education and government as well in his new post as he has here, and wish him all good fortune in this new chapter in his career.

Mount Gleason Junior High School Students Beautify Their City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 3, 1967

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more in keeping with the traditional American habit of community action than the work of the students at Mount Gleason Junior High School in Sunland, Calif., in beautifying their city. Under the sponsorship of Mr. Ephraim Donitz, agriculture teacher, and Mr. J. P. Dyck, sponsor of the student leadership class, the students have planned and executed a "Sunland-Tujunga Beautiful" contest. The student chairman is David Honjio.

The students have enlisted the aid of the local chamber of commerce, Mr. Walter Oates of Walt's Nursery, and the Sears Roebuck Co., to contribute trophies and awards for winners of the beautification contest. This is the first time that students in the Los Angeles area have conducted a community-wide beautification contest. They say that the slogan "Keep America Beautiful" should first start on a community level.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the outstanding citizenship demonstrated by these students at Mount Gleason Junior High. Their actions are proof that real progress is made at the local community level. This effort to make Sunland-Tujunga more beautiful costs the taxpayers nothing. It comes from the basic spirit of community service which motivates every good American. It is in sharp contrast to the Federal beautification program which will cost taxpayers nearly $800 million. Americans should follow the excellent example of the students at Mount Gleason School.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Cleanse Thou me from secret faults.—Psalm 19: 12.

O God, our Father, facing the demanding duties of this day and conscious of our pressing problems we feel our need of Thee—so we come lifting our hearts unto Thee in prayer. Make us ready for every responsibility, equal to every experience and adequate for every activity. May we be more than a match for the mood of this moving moment.

Remove from us any resentment which may be ruining our disposition, any bitterness that may be blighting our lives, and any animosity which may activate ill will in us. Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee, worthily magnify Thy holy name, and truly serve our Nation well this day, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 2, 1967, the President approved and signed a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 543. Joint resolution to further extend the period provided for under section 10 of the Railway Labor Act applicable in the current dispute between the railroad carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title.

H.R. 3399. An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 88-240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

ADVERSE EFFECT OF TARIFF REMOVAL ON SHEET AND PLATE GLASS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I have obtained this brief time to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania, our colleague, the Honorable JOHN DENT, for the excellent speech he delivered on May 2, 1967, on the floor of the House commenting upon the unfortunate development in the removal of tariffs that had been established on sheet glass and plate glass in 1962.

This action which was taken by the administration on January 12 is having a most unfortunate and disastrous effect upon the domestic sheet glass industry. It is contributing to unemployment and hardship in a number of communities in the Nation where we have been trying very, very hard to improve economic opportunities and to provide better job conditions for the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. DENT, delivered an outstanding message on May 2. It will be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 2, 1967, page 11407, and I commend it to the attention of all Members of the House.

NASSER REFUSING TO PAY DEBT TO UNITED STATES

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a UPI article which says United Arab Republic President Gamal Abdel Nasser now is refusing to repay $200 million in debts to the United States. Typifying the type of gratitude expressed by despots, Nasser ranted and raved against the United States and accused this Nation of wanting to rule the globe. Then, in a real touch of irony, he said he would not pay back what he owes us until we extend him more credit.

In January 1965 I proposed an amendment to an appropriation bill that would have cut off any further Public Law 480 shipments to Nasser. There was evidence at that time that the program was being abused, that foodstuffs were not being used to feed Egyptians but as barter for Nasser's Mideastern schemes. Nasser was also telling us to "go drink from the sea" at the time.

My amendment was adopted with 77 Democrats joining a unanimous Republican vote. But then President Johnson got busy, arms were twisted, and within 10 days 42 Members switched their vote when I offered a motion to instruct the conferees to stand by the House position.

Since that time we have shipped $83½ million worth of agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic and today we are reaping the harvest of this pressure play on behalf of Nasser by the White House. I say it is high time we call a halt to any further shipments to Nasser under this program.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may sit today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may be permitted to sit during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SENATE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON VIETNAM

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Republican policy committee has prepared a staff report on our involvement in Vietnam.

Interpretations of this report have been all over the press.

I have tried to obtain a copy of this report. I have gone to the policy committee staff for a copy and to individual Senators.

It is either out of print or unavailable.

I have asked that it be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but cannot get an affirmative response. On the House side, we have no copies.

However, with no trouble at all, I can get the statement by the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] answering or explaining the report.

The Republican Party has a duty to point out the errors of this administration on Vietnam, and when it begins to do its duty it is smothered.

I ask that the report be made freely available.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following message from the President of the United States——

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in order to arrange a quorum for the House to hear the President's message, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 82]

Ashley
Barrett
Bingham
Blanton
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Celler
Collier
Conyers
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Dent
Diggs
Downing
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Findley
Fisher
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Gettys
Gibbons
Green, Oreg.
Hanna
Hansen, Wash.
Harrison
Harvey
Hébert
Holifield
Irwin
Jacobs
Karth
Keith
Kyl
Landrum
McEwen
Mailliard
Meeds
Miller, Calif.
Montgomery
Moorhead
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Passman
Pool
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Riegle
Rivers
Ronan
Rosenthal
St. Onge
Scherle
Scheuer
Shipley
Taft
Teague, Tex.
Tiernan
Utt
Watts
Williams, Miss.
Younger

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 362 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE RAIL SITUATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 118)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

INTRODUCTION

On Monday, at my request, the Congress acted to protect the country for 47 days against the intolerable injury of a nationwide railroad strike.

This additional period affords the parties to the current dispute another opportunity to settle it by agreement.

The time has come, however, to insure that by public action we guard the public interest against a continuing failure of private responsibility in this case.

We cannot leave ourselves vulnerable, as a people, to the dangers of—

A disruption in the flow of arms and material to the 500,000 valiant men in Southeast Asia who are making sacrifices greater than any of us are called upon to make;

Food shortages and health hazards in our cities;

The paralysis of our economy;

A rising tide of unemployment, as factory doors close for lack of raw material.

I reviewed this situation in detail in my message to the Congress on April 10. Only a summary is necessary here.

The dispute is between virtually all of the major railroads and six shopcraft unions representing 137,000 railroad employees who inspect, maintain, and repair locomotives and other rolling stock. Without the continuing service of these workers, the Nation's railroads cannot operate.

The disagreement in this case is mainly about wages.

There have been 8 months of collective bargaining and mediation in the current round of railroad contracts.

During these months, the process of collective bargaining has produced settlements between the railroads and 11 other unions, representing over 70 percent of the Nation's railroad workers.

THE SEARCH FOR SETTLEMENT

There have been diligent and extended efforts to achieve settlement of the shopcraft dispute. This record is important, and I urge you to consider it carefully:

During the summer and fall of 1966, private collective bargaining between the parties proceeded, first at the local level and then at the national level, as the parties pursued their search for settlement.

From October 1966 through early January 1967, the National Mediation Board worked with the parties. The issues were refined, the differences narrowed.

On January 6, 1967, the National Mediation Board advised the parties that its mediation efforts had been unsuccessful and offered arbitration. The railroads accepted but the unions declined.

On January 19, 1967, the National Mediation Board advised me that the services of an Emergency Board were necessary in this case.

On January 28, 1967, under the Railway Labor Act, I appointed such a Board, chaired by David Ginsburg, a distinguished Washington attorney; John W. McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire, and Frank J. Dugan, professor of law at Georgetown University.

The Emergency Board conducted an exhaustive inquiry into the facts of the case. It compiled a record of over 1,000 pages. On March 10, 1967, it made a series of recommendations on the basis of that record.

These recommendations provided a new centerpoint around which further negotiations could revolve. They were accepted by the railroads but not by the unions.

The full cycle under the Railway Labor Act ran out. A strike was called by the unions for 12:01 a.m., Thursday, April 13.

I proposed to the Congress on April 10 an extension of the period of statutory restraint under the Railway Labor Act for 20 additional days. The Congress promptly enacted that proposal.

THE FAHY PANEL

As soon as the Congress extended the no-strike period for 20 days, I asked three distinguished Americans with long experience in the field of labor management relations to serve on a Special Mediation Panel. They were: Charles Fahy, recently retired judge of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as Chairman; Dr. John T. Dunlop, professor of economics at Harvard, and Dr. George W. Taylor, professor of industry at the University of Pennsylvania.

For 10 days the Special Panel worked patiently and with great skill, seeking to close the gap which separated the parties by encouraging a voluntary resolution of the dispute through collective bargaining.

Then, drawing upon the parties' own proposals, the work of the Emergency Board and their own experience of 10 days of intensive mediation, the Special Mediation Panel developed a proposal. In their judgment, this proposal represented the conclusions the parties themselves could very well have reached if the give-and-take of collective bargaining had resulted in agreement. As the Panel stated to the parties in its report to me:

> We ask the parties to agree now to our suggested basis for settlement of this dispute. The matter is one of dollars and cents alone, and the real differences between the parties in our judgment are not great. We cannot say our proposals contain precisely the correct figures; but we can say our terms are reasonable and not unjust. There is no way in which perfect precision about a matter of this kind can be reached. To carry the dispute further, in light of the consequences of doing so, would not be justifiable, especially after so much consideration has been given to the matter.

Despite this plea, both parties declined to accept this basis for settlement.

On April 24, after hearing testimony from the Panel and the parties to this dispute, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare called upon the parties "to seriously reconsider as the basis for settlement the recommendations of the Special Mediation Panel."

This summons went unheeded.

Monday, the Congress acted again, at my request, by extending the no-strike period for an additional 47 days, until 12:01 a.m. on June 19, 1967.

TO BRIDGE THE GAP

This is a record of a free society going to the very limit to permit private responsibility to play its part.

It is a record of risking everything except national catastrophe on free collective bargaining.

It is also a record of collective bargaining almost doing its job—narrowly failing—but coming close enough to offer clear guidance for the completion of the task.

The remaining dispute is principally about narrow differences regarding the amount of the general increase, about the amount—but not the principle—of an "inequity adjustment" covering journeymen and mechanics, and about the length of the contract period.

What is called for now is a procedure to complete collective bargaining, not to replace it—to bridge the remaining gap this bargaining has not closed.

Nothing here warrants resort to a compulsory arbitration procedure which would disregard all that collective bargaining has accomplished and substitute the unfettered discretionary decision of others.

The situation does not warrant seizure by the Government of the railroad properties. President Kennedy well defined the difficulties of such a course of action when confronted with a similar situation in July 1963. He rejected seizure of the railroads "as creating complex legal and financial problems for the Government, and as merely postponing the day of reckoning." Seizure of these properties would also be offensive to the equities involved in the present situation.

The solution here is one which:

Assures the Nation the continued availability of railroad transport.

Gives full effect to the record of collective bargaining in this case and builds on the negotiations which have taken place.

Looks toward the ultimate resolution of this dispute by agreement.

Provides only the means to bridge the remaining gap between the parties.

This solution is supplied by the recommendations of the Special Mediation Panel and the advice I have received from leaders of the Congress and my top advisers in the executive branch.

THE PROPOSAL

I propose a joint resolution authorizing the establishment, for a 90-day no-strike, no-lockout period, of a five-member Special Board to be appointed by the President. All will be "public members." But I intend to appoint one member with a management background and one member with a labor background.

The functions of the Board will be these:

For the first 30 days after enactment of the joint resolution, the Board would engage in intensive mediation with the parties to encourage and stimulate a final resolution of the issues in dispute.

Beginning on the 31st day, if no agreement has been reached, the Board would be authorized to hold hearings to determine whether the Special Mediation Panel proposals of April 21, designed to implement the collective bargaining contemplated by the Emergency Board recommendations meet the following criteria:

Are in the public interest,

Are a fair and equitable extension of the collective bargaining in this case,

Protect the collective bargaining process, and

Fulfill the purposes of the Railway Labor Act.

By the 60th day, if there is still no agreement, the Board would file, with the Congress and the President, its determination concerning the Special Mediation Panel proposals, and whether any modification of these proposals is necessary to insure that they meet these criteria.

If by the 91st day there is still no agreement, the Special Mediation Panel proposals, with any modifications which the Board finds necessary to insure conformity with these criteria, would take effect. They would continue in effect until the parties reach agreement or until such time, not to exceed 2 years from January 1, 1967, as the Board determines to be proper.

For the period after that, and until final agreement is reached or the time specified by the Board expires, the Board's determination would have the same effect—including the preclusion of resort to strike or lockout—as though it was arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act.

A final agreement reached by the parties at any time would supersede the Board's determinations and would apply retroactively, if the parties so agree.

CONCLUSION

I urge the Congress to act on this proposal.

At the same time, I urge these railroads and unions to finish this job themselves. The only completely successful conclusion of this case will come not from an act of necessity by the Congress but from an act of responsibility by the parties.

It is within their power to close the gap in this case by heeding the call of their country to reason together. Their taking the last few steps to settlement will show the world the industrial statesmanship which is the pride of America.

All Americans believe in the right of management to healthy profits. All Americans believe in the right of workers to a just and bountiful wage.

All of us realize our progress in labor relations in this country. We recognize—and take pride in—the significant strides we have made in improving the condition of the workingman, while at the same time improving the profits of the employer.

We have met many of the problems of poverty, of substandard working conditions, of depression and business failure. But each step forward has brought us new problems—problems of prosperity, of technological progress, of sharing the affluence that is our blessing.

All Americans recognize that there is a management interest and a labor interest. But there comes a time when the interest of management and the interest of labor must be the public interest—a time when people must be fed, when soldiers must be supplied, when water must be kept potable, and when factories must not be allowed to close down for lack of materials.

I believe the action I propose to be in the public interest and in the interest of management and labor. It represents the slightest possible intrusion upon the process of collective bargaining. Indeed, in the long run I believe it will preserve the collective-bargaining process in the railroad industry.

This proposed joint resolution will not solve all the difficulties prosperity brings to labor relations. But we must take this action now, as we continue and renew our search for a just and general solution to emergency strike or lockout problems in our country.

I urge the Congress to act promptly on this joint resolution.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1967*.

STRONG SUPPORT FOR THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL TO EXTEND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN THE RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ALBERT.** Mr. Speaker, President Johnson has just proposed an effective—and I believe equitable and enterprising—formula to help bring about settlement in the railroad dispute.

The President has rightly noted that the two sides in this dispute are close to an agreement through free and unfettered collective bargaining. The Presidential proposal will build upon what has already been accomplished without compromising the integrity of either side or abusing the process of collective bargaining.

I commend the President for studiously avoiding such extreme measures as seizure of the railroads or restoring to compulsory arbitration.

The arrangement proposed by the President is a reasonable solution to a very difficult situation. We cannot afford a railroad strike that would cripple our economy and impair our national security. But neither can we willingly sacrifice the principles of collective bargaining.

Fortunately, in my judgment, President Johnson has found a workable, practical formula for remedying the outstanding differences between management and labor in this dispute. For this I applaud the President.

I know that the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will give the joint resolution recommended by the President speedy and thorough consideration. This joint resolution involves a responsibility which none of us can escape. The situation which confronts the country demands that we meet this responsibility to the American people.

We trust that when the Congress has acted upon this matter the parties will quickly settle their remaining differences and arrive at an agreement which will satisfactorily resolve this troublesome problem.

CASH AWARDS MADE DURING FISCAL YEAR 1966 TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES FOR SUGGESTIONS, INVENTIONS, AND SCIENTIFIC ACHIEVEMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the reports of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation on cash awards made during fiscal year 1966 to members of the Armed Forces for suggestions, inventions, and scientific achievements.

This Government continually strives to increase the efficiency and economy of its operations. The cash awards incentive program is a vital part of that effort. By rewarding ideas and accomplishments which help to lower costs and improve effectiveness, we improve the operations of Government and encourage the search for new solutions and better methods of operation.

Incentive awards have been available to civilian employees of the Government for many years. In 1965, the Congress extended these benefits to our men and women in uniform.

The reports I am transmitting today clearly confirm the value of the contributions which members of our Armed Forces are making toward the goals of economy and efficiency:

More than 141,000 suggestions were submitted during fiscal year 1966.

Some 25,700 of these suggestions were adopted and cash awards totaling about $378,000 were made.

The saving to the Government and the American taxpayer resulting from these ideas, in the first year of the program, was more than $33 million.

Many intangible benefits not directly measurable in dollars, such as improved safety in operations, have resulted from the suggestions.

Many individual ideas produced sizable benefits. An Air Force sergeant, for example, eliminated the need for a large procurement of new gyroscopes by suggesting an inexpensive modification of gyroscopes already on hand. This saved $275,400. In the Coast Guard an enlisted man proposed a modification of helicopter test equipment, making it unnecessary to purchase new test equipment which would have cost an estimated $72,000.

Equally important, however, is the fact that the $33 million saving to American taxpayers resulted from the efforts of many thousands of individual service men and women. In this fact lies the real importance of this program. For, if we are to have true economy and efficiency, it must be the business, not just of a few, but of all the men and women serving in government.

These reports provide further evidence of the great service being rendered to the American people by the members of our Armed Forces. They man our defenses with unsurpassed skill and courage. They also, as these reports document, bring new economy and efficiency to the operations of their Government.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1967.*

MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. **O'NEILL** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 438 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 438

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 158) to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. **O'NEILL** of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 438 provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of H.R. 158, a bill to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration.

The purpose of H.R. 158 is to require that after December 31, 1967, only such sums as the Congress may specifically authorize by law may be appropriated for the use of the Maritime Administration for the following categories of activity:

First, acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of vessels;

Second, construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction, or reconditioning of ships;

Third, payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy;

Fourth, expenses necessary for research and development activities—including reimbursement of the vessel operations revolving fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations;

Fifth, reserve fleet expenses;

Sixth, maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York;

Seventh, financial assistance to State marine schools; and

Eighth, the vessel operations revolving fund.

Enactment of the bill would place the Maritime Administration on a basis comparable to that now in effect with regard to principal activities of the Department of Defense, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Atomic Energy Commission, the National Astronautics and Space Administration, and other major programs within the executive branch.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 438 in order that H.R. 158 may be considered.

I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LATTA].

Mr. **LATTA.** Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to require future authorizations for funds for the Maritime Administration.

This is done to place it on the same footing as other agencies within the executive department; the Coast Guard, the Atomic Energy Commission, and NASA. The new language replaces section 209(a) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which grants authority to use appropriated funds "as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

The committee report states that changing circumstances since World War II have necessitated a closer watch on the annual operations of the Administration and its functions; thus the change in language. The committee believes an annual review will be of great value. No additional cost is foreseen by going from the general language and subjecting the Maritime Administration to an annual review of operations by the committee.

The Department of Commerce, the Bureau of the Budget, the Navy Department, and the Comptroller of the Currency do not oppose the legislation, which was reported by the committee unanimously.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 158) to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration.

The **SPEAKER.** The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Maryland.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 158, with Mr. GIAIMO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the first bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this bill is to require that, after December 31, 1967, only such sums as the Congress may specifically authorize by law—may be appropriated for the use of Maritime Administration for its major program activities.

Enactment of this bill would place major activities of the Maritime Administration on a basis comparable to that now in effect with regard to the principal activities of the Department of Defense, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration within the executive branch.

When the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 was originally enacted, the administering agency was the U.S. Maritime Commission, an independent agency responsible to the Congress.

The law stated in broad terms our national maritime policy and set forth statutory directives and guidelines as to specific programs, and how the authorized programs should be implemented on a long-range basis.

Under the law, the Commission was authorized to enter into contracts on behalf of the United States, and make such disbursements, as in its discretion were deemed to be necessary to carry on the activities authorized by the act, in the same manner that a private corporation may contract within the scope of the authority conferred by its charter.

The act established a revolving fund, called a "construction fund" to be available for expenditure by the Commission in carrying out all provisions of the act.

It also incorporated continuing authority for the appropriation of such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of the act.

The availability and use of the construction revolving fund minimized the need for seeking specific annual authorization for appropriations for activities within the major program categories.

Since shortly after World War II, however, such matters as the transfer of the administration of maritime functions to the Department of Commerce, the denial of availability of the construction revolving fund, and other self-imposed limitations have had the practical effect of placing the operations of the agency on a strictly annual basis.

Our committee—and I know a great many other Members of the House—have become increasingly concerned over the decline of the American merchant marine in recent years—at a time when our overseas foreign trade is expanding.

For example, in 1956, when our total seaborne trade—exclusive of military cargoes—was 223 million long tons, American-flag ships were carrying 20.4 percent.

In 1966, the volume of cargoes in our foreign trade was 339 million long tons, and American participation was down to 7 percent.

As our merchant marine has continued to decline, it has become increasingly clear to our committee that, if it is to properly discharge its legislative responsibilities, it must have statutory authority to review maritime programs annually so as to measure the effectiveness of both the programs and the policy which they serve to implement.

Annual review and authorization by our committee will be a genuine service—both to the Congress and in our national interest.

The situation presently existing with respect to the Maritime Administration is similar to that obtaining with the Coast Guard prior to 1963.

At that time the Coast Guard followed a procedure similar to that presently followed by the Maritime Administration in going directly to the Appropriations Committee.

Since enactment of the legislation covering the Coast Guard, an annual presentation must be made to the legislative committees—and this has proven extremely effective in presenting and pointing up Coast Guard needs.

In fact, Treasury Secretary Fowler wrote to me last summer, after enactment of the Coast Guard authorization and appropriation bills, expressing his complete satisfaction with the operation of the authorization legislation and stated that he felt that it had proven extremely helpful to the Coast Guard.

The bill H.R. 158 is identical in purpose, and similar in form, to H.R. 18176, upon which hearings were held and a rule was granted late last year.

Further hearings have been held this year, to which all interested parties were invited.

Maritime labor and management witnesses, representing all segments, were in full accord with the objectives of this legislation.

The Department of Commerce stated that if we felt this approach were desirable, it would have no objection to favorable consideration of the bill.

The General Counsel of the Maritime Administration assisted in drafting clarifying amendments to the bill as introduced.

It is believed that enactment of this legislation—requiring annual review and authorization by the Congress—will prove to be of value to the Congress in pointing up our maritime requirements. It will give additional focus to our maritime problems, and assist in their solution, without unduly burdening the legislative process.

The bill was unanimously reported by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

I strongly urge its passage by the House.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARMATZ. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, Mr. Chairman.

Do I understand from the report as well as the bill under consideration itself that there is no significant additional cost authorized in this legislation and that the only cost referred to is that for administering the line item review which will come back from the Commission to the distinguished gentleman's committee for annual review?

Mr. GARMATZ. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. HALL. Is there in any sense, I would ask the gentleman, an open end context to this authorization implied other than just the act of bringing jurisdiction back under the committee chaired by the gentleman?

Mr. GARMATZ. There is none. That is all.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I notice that the Bureau of the Budget has a departmental report in here in opposition to this action. Is it the considered opinion of the gentleman and his committee, realizing that this is a legislative matter and not one to be determined ultimately by the executive branch, that that objection is only pertinent insofar as control of subsidies and their estimation in advance of the year the line items will be considered is concerned?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the distinguished chairman of the

Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries yielding to me at this time and for giving to me his straightforward answers.

Further, Mr. Chairman, I just want to say as a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as a member of the Subcommittee on Airlift-Sealift, I commend the gentleman and his committee and wish to further state that I am in strong support of this legislation.

Mr. GARMATZ. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked by the distinguished ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MAILLIARD], of our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to express his regrets at being unable to be here today during consideration of the bill, H.R. 158. Unfortunately, the scheduling of the bill for consideration by the House presented a conflict with an engagement of long standing, and there was insufficient time for making alternate arrangements. However, he has requested that I convey to you his full support for the passage of the bill, H.R. 158.

This legislation is to me one of the most important and most significant to have been considered by our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. It will serve to correct a longstanding weakness in the jurisdiction of our committee to which the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] referred while managing the consideration by the House in the last Congress of the Department of Transportation bill. This bill, H.R. 158, would accomplish this by requiring authorization of the funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration to precede appropriations.

As pointed out by the chairman of our committee, the effect of H.R. 158 would be to overcome the open-ended authorization provided for in existing law in carrying out maritime promotional programs under the provisions of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The vital and continuing interest of our committee in effectively discharging its legislative responsibilities for the American Merchant Marine dictates that this current deficiency be corrected.

Hearings were held on a similar bill during the last Congress in September 1966 and again on the present bill under consideration in March of this year. All of the witnesses except one at both these hearings supported the legislation without reservation. The singular exception was the Maritime Administration which, although not opposing the legislation, expressed concern that it might burden present procedures by requiring an appearance before two additional congressional committees—our Committee on Merchant Marine and the Senate Commerce Committee.

H.R. 158 is not intended to either hamper or impede the legislative process of appropriation. Rather, it is to assist in this process with as little burden as possible.

The bill, H.R. 158, would not affect the appropriation procedure for the forthcoming fiscal year of 1968. Authorization is not required until after December 31, 1967, so that, if enacted, the legislation would not be effective until next year when considering the budget request for fiscal year 1969.

In addition, the legislation was so drafted as to require authorization for only eight items enumerated in subsection (b) of the bill, and which can be broken down into the following four principal promotional functions: vessel construction; vessel operations and associated research and development; readiness of reserve shipping capability; and training of licensed maritime personnel.

The bill would not require authorization for such items as salaries and administrative expenses of the Maritime Administration; Federal ship mortgage insurance fund; the war risk insurance revolving fund; or various advances and reimbursements to the Maritime Administration of intragovernmental funds.

Such items were excluded from the provisions of the bill with the view of limiting our committee's review only to those items considered essential for the promotion of the industry and with the view of minimizing the effect of our committee's review upon the appropriation process.

I do not believe the allegation that this legislation would burden the present legislative process will stand up under close scrutiny. As a matter of fact, during the hearings on a similar measure in the last Congress, I questioned the Maritime Administration witness at some length on this matter and received the admission that currently an appearance before the House Committee on Appropriations by the Maritime Administration requires only from 4 to 6 hours. As I remarked on that earlier hearing:

> Four to six hours, and you are complaining about the amount of work involved and the burden?

It seems apparent, therefore, that the concern over burdening present legislative procedures is not well-founded. Moreover, failure to enact this legislation could prove to be a disservice to both the Congress and to the American taxpayer by not taking advantage of the expertise of our committee in providing guidelines for certain key maritime promotional programs. As I once remarked concerning similar legislation:

> It just seems to me that in fairness to the needs of our maritime affairs that if the Merchant Marine Committee could invite outside witnesses from agencies of Government to express views freely, we could come up with a more knowledgeable justification for the spending of a lot of taxpayer's money.

To further refute and to assuage the fears that this bill would impede the appropriation process, I am attaching to my statement under permission obtained earlier in the House an appendix which tabulates the timetable in handling Coast Guard authorization bills, which has been the responsibility of our committee since 1963. Since assuming jurisdiction over the Coast Guard authorization legislation, our committee has considered five such bills. Significantly, the average elapsed time from date of introduction of the legislation to the date of its being reported to the House has been only slightly more than 4 weeks, evidencing the expeditious manner in which our committee has handled such legislation so as not to hamper the legislative process.

Furthermore, I wish to note to my colleagues in the House that I have brought this concern of burdening the legislative process to the attention of both the chairman and the ranking minority member of our committee. I have been assured by both of these gentlemen that if our committee is vested with this legislative authority provided for in H.R. 158, subsequent authorization legislation for the applicable maritime programs will be handled in an expeditious and timely manner so as not to impinge upon the timetable of the Committee on Appropriations.

In conclusion, I should like to point out and make crystal clear to my colleagues in the House that we in the Committee on Merchant Marine look upon the bill, H.R. 158, as a two-edged sword. As I admonished one industry witness on an earlier occasion, and I quote:

> This is not necessarily a scheme to build up the merchant marine but also to tighten up and to provide the checks and balances of Government so necessary to protect our taxpayers. I think there are two arguments in favor.
>
> One is to get better understanding of the needs and allow the industry to express its opinion and to reflect that in authorizing legislation, and the other is to tighten up on agencies of Government.

Accordingly, in the national interest and in the interest of the well-being of the American merchant marine, which time and time again has proven itself to be a vital national asset, I strongly urge that the bill, H.R. 158, be favorably considered and passed by the House.

Mr. Chairman, America today has fewer merchant ships than she did in 1936 when Congress passed a law designed to provide an adequate American-flag service for peace and for war.

Passage of this bill will help get the necessary facts to Congress and the American people. Its passage may well point up why the percentage of U.S.-flag ships in the world is one-half of what it was three decades ago. Its passage should point up why the percentage of U.S. goods moving overseas in American bottoms is now the lowest in modern history. Its passage may find the reasons why the United States has dropped to fifth among the nations of the world in size of its active merchant fleet, and why it is down to 14th in shipbuilding. Its passage will bring to light why 70 percent of U.S. ships are 20 years or older and due for layup within the next few years.

But more than all this, Mr. Chairman, passage of this bill could well, and I believe would, provide answers and solutions to these vital problems that so deeply touch our national security and our national economy.

I do urge, Mr. Chairman, passage of H.R. 158.

The table referred to follows:

Timetable of Coast Guard authorization bills

Congress	Bill No.	Date introduced	Hearings	Reported	Passed House	Approved	Public Law No.
88th, 1st	H.R. 79	Jan. 9, 1963	None	Feb. 21, 1963	Feb. 27, 1963	June 21, 1963	88-45
88th, 2d	H.R. 9640	Jan. 15, 1964	Jan. 22 and 23, 1964.	Feb. 1, 1964	Feb. 19, 1964	Mar. 11, 1964	88-281
80th, 1st	H.R. 4527	Feb. 8, 1965	Feb. 18 and 24, 1965.	Mar. 10, 1965	Mar. 18, 1965	Apr. 20, 1965	89-13
89th, 2d	H.R. 12762	Feb. 10, 1966	Feb. 17, 1966	Mar. 2, 1966	Mar. 7, 1966	Mar. 30, 1966	89-381
90th, 1st	H.R. 5424	Feb. 15, 1967	Feb. 21, 1967	Mar. 21, 1967	Apr. 12, 1967		

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. LENNON] who is a valuable member of our Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, we hear a lot in the news media about the American merchant marine. It has been a subject of rather intense discussion, not nearly as much in the Halls of the House of Representatives and in the Halls of the Senate as it has been downtown in the Bureau of the Budget and on Pennsylvania Avenue.

I think irrespective of our individual knowledge of and interest in the problems confronting the American merchant marine today, we must all agree that the absence—and that is what we have now—of the requirement for legislative review on an annual basis of the American merchant marine program of construction and operations and improvements—and I might add even more problems—limits the Congress and therefore the American public in the scope of its understanding and presentation of the American merchant marine program.

How do you get the attention of the public through a public forum? Over the years I have been privileged to be a member of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Since the committee has been denied authorizational authority during that period of time we have not been able to attract to such hearings as we have had—and we have not had enough—the news media which would probably publicize the conditions—yes, the deplorable condition—that our American merchant marine is in today.

That was brought rather forcefully to our attention, early last year, because we must remember it is the fourth arm of our national defense. There was under consideration last year, and I think it is significant, the transportation reorganization bill which established the Department of Transportation and which was handled so effectively on the floor of the House by our good friend, the gentleman from California, CHET HOLIFIELD, who in conscience and in good faith, as he saw it, resisted the efforts of those of us—and it turned out to be a perponderant majority of this House—to put the Maritime Administration in the Department of Transportation. His salient objection was that the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries does not have, and has not had for a long period of years, the annual legislative obligational authority for capital improvements in our merchant marine.

I chatted with CHET a few days thereafter and he said, "When are you going to make an effort to bring a bill to this floor that will give your committee this authorizational authority?"

He said, "Let me remind you of the fact that for a period of years, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy did not have the authorizational authority—but we have it now."

I said, "Well, my good friend, I take it then that you will support this legislation when it comes to the floor." This was late last fall.

He said to me, "AL, in equity and in justice, I would have to support any legislation which would give a legislative committee the authority to make an annual review of a program which means so much—and which would mean more than it does now, to the people of America."

I think you gentlemen are conscious of the responsibilities of the General Accounting Office. A branch of the executive? No. It is a creature of the Congress of the United States, a specialist in the field to advise and counsel the Congress. It is the right arm of the Congress with respect to this matter. Their views on this legislation were solicited.

I now quote from a letter received from the Comptroller General with respect to this bill:

> The procedure contemplated by the proposed legislation would strengthen the control of your committee and that of the Senate Commerce Committee over maritime policies by enabling and requiring the committees to annually express their views and recommendations concerning the Maritime Administration budget request and by approving authorizing legislation.

That, my friends, is a crystal-clear message to this branch of the Government, the legislative branch. We do not anticipate any difficulty with respect to this legislation at all.

The distinguished gentleman from Washington, a long-time member of this committee, has called your attention to the fact that up until 3 years ago this same committee did not have the legislative authorizational process for capital improvements in the Coast Guard, ships, planes, onshore or offshore installations. It has been a very satisfactory arrangement, and we have in our files letters in which the Coast Guard has said that it never has had more splendid, helpful cooperation during this period of time.

We ask the members of this committee to support this legislation because it will strengthen your position. For the first time, you will have brought to the floor of this House legislation in which you will participate and which, by your vote, you will make the determination as to what extent your Federal Government and the taxpayers whom you are here representing will participate in construction subsidies, operational subsidies, and research and development for the merchant marine.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENNON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I rise to join my colleagues in support of H.R. 158. In my opinion this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been reported out of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee during the 13 years that I have been a member.

The purpose of this bill is to require that after the end of this year, only such sums as the Congress may specifically authorize by law may be appropriated for the use of the Maritime Administration as provided by the bill. This would place the Maritime Administration on a basis comparable to that now in effect with regard to principal activities of the Coast Guard.

I speak with authority for as a member of the Coast Guard Subcommittee, I have seen from actual experience how effective such an authorization program can be by having an annual review of a program as provided by the Coast Guard authorization law.

Since its passage in 1963, it has given my subcommittee complete oversight and review over the needs and future requirements of a department so vital to the national interest and defense of our country.

The enactment of this legislation will be most helpful to our full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries when reviewing the annual programs of the Maritime Administration and should be most beneficial over maritime policies.

This legislation is most essential to the future of the American merchant marine.

I call attention to the Members of this House, the language in the report submitted by the Comptroller General of the United States which is as follows:

> The proposed legislation would strengthen the control of your committee and that of the Senate Commerce Committee over maritime policies by enabling and requiring the committees to annually express their views and recommendations concerning the Maritime Administration's budget request by approving authorizing legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I urge prompt enactment of H.R. 158.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

I rise in support of my distinguished colleagues on our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in urging that the House pass the bill H.R. 158, which would require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration.

As a member of our Subcommittee on Coast Guard, I have had some experience with comparable authorization authority with respect to the U.S. Coast Guard. As our committee report on the authorization legislation for the Coast Guard stated:

> By requiring legislative review and authorization prior to appropriations for major

> facilities and equipment, construction, and procurement programs on an annual basis, your Committee believes a genuine service can be rendered to both the Congress and the agency in evaluating and carrying out such plans. Your Committee has felt a serious lack in responsiveness to the Coast Guard needs, due to the absence of authorization authority as provided for in this bill.

This same need exists with respect to the American merchant marine.

Unfortunately, under present law our committee which has legislative jurisdiction over the merchant marine is almost powerless. It has neither a voice nor any control whatsoever over the future direction of maritime programs. It is in this regard important.

Currently, the best our committee can seek to accomplish is to review Maritime Administration programs after the fact. The committee's views and those of experts in the American shipping industry are generally denied to the Congress. Perhaps the Comptroller General of the United States best summed up what we are seeking to accomplish with H.R. 158, when he observed concerning earlier and similar legislation the following:

> The procedure contemplated by the proposed legislation would strengthen the control of your Committee and that of the Senate Commerce Committee over Maritime policies by enabling and requiring the Committees to annually express their views and recommendations concerning the Maritime Administration's budget requests by approving authorizing legislation.

Some of my colleagues have referred to the concern expressed by the administration about the alleged burden that this bill would impose upon the legislative process. But, Mr. Chairman, the terrible plight of the American merchant marine cries out for a solution. If it means an added burden on the legislative process, then so be it. We must find logical and proper answers to the problems of the merchant marine. Our fleet has deteriorated to the point of embarrassment; the average age of our ships is unbelievable. Unless strong affirmative action is taken now, it is not inconceivable that some of our ships are going to be 40 or 45 years old before they are replaced. In fact we have testimony to this effect from an administration witness.

The number of overage ships in the American merchant marine reflecting an adverse and cumulative slippage in our vessel replacement program adequately demonstrates the need for passage of the bill H.R. 158.

Concerning the fear that passage of this bill would serve to burden current legislative procedures, I only wish to point out that similar fears were expressed by the Department of Treasury in 1963 concerning authorization legislation for the U.S. Coast Guard. However, subsequent experience with the Coast Guard authorization legislation proved that these fears were unfounded. Only last year, the Secretary of the Treasury wrote to the chairman of our committee noting the following:

> One of the concerns which we in Treasury had at the time of the legislation requiring authorization prior to appropriation for Coast Guard's capital outlays was that the additional requirement might result in a later appropriation bill.
>
> However, this has not proved to be the case. We are sincerely appreciative of the efforts your Committee has made in taking prompt action on the authorization bill each year.

Accordingly, in light of the persistent and continuing decline of the American merchant marine, I most earnestly solicit the support of all my colleagues in the House for the bill, H.R. 158. The time is long overdue for this remedial action and the restoration of the views of Congress in the formulation of our Government programs designed to promote the American merchant marine.

I strongly urge that the House do pass H.R. 158.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support and ask my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 158, not because it is an answer to our maritime dilemma or a solution to a national problem caused by the general erosion of our merchant marine. However, if followed up in the years to come by an aggressive Congress, this bill, when it becomes law, could well mean a point in time when the condition of our merchant marine ceases to deteriorate, and we begin the long and tortuous climb toward the important national goal of a strong, prosperous and effective merchant marine.

Establishing broader congressional authority over the Maritime Administration to a marked degree will interject the will of the Congress, the initiative of the Congress, and thereby the desire of the people to create a new and dynamic maritime policy for our country. In fact, this legislation stands out in marked contrast to a trend which has been going on for the last several decades—a trend to transfer the responsibility for initiative, the responsibility for policy development, from the Congress to the Executive.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that with the enactment of this legislation goes a responsibility of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the House, of its counterpart in the other body, and in fact a responsibility of the Congress itself to assume more initiative in the oversight of the Maritime Administration.

With the enactment of this bill, we share to a greater extent than before a responsibility to the people of this country to join all elements of the private sector, where appropriate, to bring forward a new program of ships, a new level of maritime activity as part of our basic economic growth and as part of our relative position with other nations with whom we compete throughout the world.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN], a member of the committee.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Chairman, in urging enactment of this legislation, I would like to emphasize that the effect of this bill would be to extend to the Maritime Administration the same rule that exists in the case of the Committee on Armed Services, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, the Science and Astronautics Committee, and, of course, the Coast Guard.

I do not feel that I need urge favorable action on this bill by the members of those committees who have had experience with the beneficial effects of the authorizing legislation within their jurisdiction.

It enables the members to keep themselves informed of the activities of the agencies toward which they have responsibilities and further enables them to arise and do battle on the floor for the interests of their particular agencies.

I can speak with some authority on this subject as a member of the Merchant Marine Committee since I have had opportunity to observe how the Coast Guard authorizing legislation has operated. Prior to its enactment we had the happy experience of reading about projected Coast Guard installations in the newspapers, unless by chance we had been fortunate enough to question the Coast Guard on the particular subjects at some earlier time.

Following enactment of the Coast Guard legislation authorizing their needs for the year, presented to the House by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the Coast Guard presented us with a clear and concise program for the coming year and we were able to act with greater background knowledge when it came to voting on the appropriations for that agency.

While I realize that the Appropriations Committee has the interests of our charges at heart, nevertheless, I also recognize that we also have a responsibility as members of the Merchant Marine Committee to see that the U.S. merchant marine holds its position on the seas.

I strongly urge prompt enactment of H.R. 158.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DELLENBACK].

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me everybody here today, and probably every Member of this body really, in truth, is in agreement that there is a problem that exists in connection with our merchant marine. The question is not whether we as Members of Congress should concern ourselves with this problem.

The question is how best we can concern ourselves with this problem.

The matter of legislating is a committee procedure. We all know this. We all recognize the great responsibilities this system under which we operate places on the Appropriations Committee. In no wise does this measure seek to reduce or to eliminate the key appropriation function or to take that away in any fashion from the Appropriations Committee.

This bill, in simple essence, seeks to relieve the Appropriations Committee of a portion of its burden—of that portion of its responsibility which relates to a broad scale and continuing study of the merchant marine, that will and should require a considerable amount of committee time. The Appropriations Committee, with all its other burdens and all its other load, just does not have sufficient time to give to this problem.

This seeks to make sure that the problem of the merchant marine will be given a thorough, continuous, and continued annual study by a committee which does have the time to give to it. It will be a study and constant surveillance that very definitely needs to be given to this problem.

I join today with our committee chairman, Mr. Garmatz, and the ranking Republicans, Mr. Mailliard and Mr. Pelly, and the other members of the committee who have spoken here today in urging passage of H.R. 158.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Murphy], a member of the committee.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished chairman of the full committee in endorsing H.R. 158. I believe he very adequately stated the case.

The gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly], further emphasized the need for an annual review of the U.S. merchant marine, particularly as to the authorization for its appropriations.

Last year, in two overwhelming votes, the House voted to keep the Maritime Administration in the Department of Commerce and not transfer its functions to the Department of Transportation. This was an acknowledgment by the House of its concern for the future of the U.S. merchant marine.

At the present time there are more than 86 bills which have been submitted by Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to make an independent agency of the Maritime Administration. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz], made reference to this in his original remarks.

I believe we all realize that the present situation, with the Maritime Administration under the Department of Commerce and under an Under Secretary of that Department, is that we have the U.S. flag on the seas being represented at a third level of Government. It is high time that an independent agency was created so that a direct voice to the President can be heard in resolving the very serious problem jeopardizing this industry.

I believe this legislation is a step toward that recognition, and in this year 1967, with changing technology in all our industry and particularly in the maritime areas, this step needs to be taken.

I heartily endorse H.R. 158, and I urge its passage.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock].

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of our distinguished colleagues on the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in advocating passage of H.R. 158, and point out to the Congress that the measure has the unanimous support of the members of the subcommittee and full committee. The legislation will strengthen the effectiveness of the merchant marine and fisheries by requiring authorization of funds for specific programs of the Maritime Administration by the committee to precede appropriation of the funds by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chairman, we are all vitally concerned with the serious condition of the maritime industry. It is of such significance I feel compelled to quote herein the provisions of a statement by the Republican policy committee concerning the major crisis in the American maritime industry:

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE WARNS OF MAJOR CRISIS IN AMERICAN MARITIME INDUSTRY

Due to neglect, confusion and a general inability to meet the mounting problem, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has permitted the American Maritime Industry to drift into a major crisis.

Today, the United States has fewer privately owned seagoing merchant ships than in 1936. The percentage of United States flagships in the world's merchant fleet is one-half of what it was three decades ago. The percentage of American goods moving overseas on American ships is now the lowest in modern history. The United States has dropped to fifth among the nations in the size of our active merchant fleet and presently ranks fourteenth in shipbuilding. This national disgrace is heightened by the fact that 70% of our ships are twenty years or older and will be due for layup within the next five years.

More than two years have passed since the State of the Union message in 1965 when the President promised ". . . a new policy for our merchant marine." To date, that promise remains unfilled. Moreover, in recent testimony, the Secretary of Transportation noted that he "would not seek (the President's) concurrence in the new program until I could assure him that it had general support within the maritime field. However, I must now report that we do not have the kind of agreement which will make such a program a reality." Thus, rather than decision, we have experienced indecision. In place of action, there has been near paralysis in federal leadership. While we are in a continued state of decline, the other maritime nations of the world have been building up their merchant fleets. Last year marked the third successive annual record for world merchant shipping launched.

The seriousness of this situation is graphically reflected by comparing the American maritime industry with that of Soviet Russia. "A 1966 Survey of Russian Merchant Shipping" prepared by the University of Washington, discloses that:

"In 1963 the Russians constructed 115 ships while America launched 31. Between 1959 and 1963 the American fleet increased by 20 fewer ships than the Russians produced in the single year 1963. Moreover, the amount of American seaborne commerce carried in American ships has declined from an already low of 11 per cent in 1960 to around 7 per cent today. The Russians, in contrast, have increased the amount of freight carried in their own bottoms from 33 per cent in 1955 and 45 per cent in 1962 to around 85 per cent in 1965."

There are indications that this country's sea transportation forces have been stretched to the limit to support the massive military operations in Vietnam. In order to meet our obligations there, a large number of old ships have been pulled out of the mothball fleet. These vessels, from 20 to 27 years old, have had a breakdown rate more than double the privately owned commercial fleet under charter for Vietnam service. Although faced with these dismal statistics, the Administration now proposes to modernize more of our aging reserve fleet while only increasing the new merchant ship construction in American yards from 13 to 15 ships a year.

Last year, the Administration attempted to transfer the Maritime Administration into the new Department of Transportation. Under Republican leadership, this move was defeated and a plan was advanced that would establish an independent Maritime Administration. The proposed transfer would have done little more than shift the maritime problem to a new department. There was no sense of urgency or a call for a redirection of effort. Rather than meeting and solving the problems of the maritime industry, they would have been swept under a bureaucratic rug.

In this session of Congress, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is continuing to display a dangerous disregard for the very serious problems of our maritime industry. The present situation has been described by the *Journal of Commerce* as follows:

"It is one thing to attempt enticing the shipping industry into the new Department of Transportation with vague promises of a totally new policy. It is quite another to display by current actions a curious indifference to the problems of merchant shipping and to indicate—when discussing the subject at all—not what ought to be done, but what the administration is unwilling to do or keep on doing."

In addition to its failure to develop a meaningful maritime policy, the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has undercut, if not scrapped, the forward-looking ship replacement program that was implemented during the Eisenhower Administration. At that time, it was clearly apparent that unless a program of this type was carried forward, the United States would face, in the foreseeable future, a maritime crisis of major proportions. The Administration's abandonment of the Eisenhower program has triggered just such a crisis. Its current indecisiveness and failure to mount anything more than a minimal program, have escalated the crisis to a point where it is bordering on a national catastrophe.

This Country needs and must have a modern merchant marine. We must revitalize and modernize our shipbuilding industry if the demands of the future are to be met. The need to develop a reasonable and defensible maritime program presents a challenge and an opportunity. 1967 is a year of decision for the American Maritime Industry. Unless our shipbuilding effort is increased our defense commitments throughout the world will be in jeopardy. Indeed, our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should now be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration has scuttled.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POLLOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation because I believe that the U.S. merchant marine will be strengthened by it. It is high time this House does all it can to bring our Nation to the forefront as the leading nation in the field of shipping. Our future is closely related to the position we hold among the community of nations on the seas. This legislation is an important step in the direction of accomplishing this goal.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Leggett].

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time to congratulate the great chairman of the Merchant Marine Committee, the gentleman from Maryland, for pioneering the development of H.R. 158, a measure to confirm the rather natural and appropriate function on that committee of formal oversight and authorization of the merchant marine annual budget.

Were it not for the requirements of section 412 of Public Law 86-149, 1959 Military Authorization Act and subsequent amendments thereof, our great Armed Services Committee might be similarly without a well defined scope and purpose. Through the exercise of the power of our Armed Services Committee under the referenced legislation, we have provided the broad leadership for our current nuclear Navy and many of the important parts of our current defense system.

While the Constitution imposes on the Congress the duty to support and raise armies and navies and to provide for defense, the Constitution also provides that Congress has the duty to regulate commerce and how better could this mandate be carried out than to enact the pending bill vesting broad power of oversight in the Merchant Marine Committee.

I am concerned that the United States move ahead in the field of merchant shipping. We should not be satisfied to carry 8 percent of our commerce while the Soviets carry in excess of 90 percent of their own. If it is worth spending $20 billion to meet the Soviet Union on the moon for a disavowed military purpose, it is also similarly worth while to spend a few billion dollars each year in the form of ship construction and operation differential funds to meet the Soviets on four-fifths of the earth's surface.

I find many people and new agencies are trying to solve the dilemma of a 20-year decline in our merchant ship program without adequate thought, study, or budget in mind or appreciation of the enormous support in the Congress for an adequate program.

I personally think that since the Maritime Administration has not had either the initiative or administration support in the past that it is now up to the Merchant Marine Committee to postulate a new five-year program of development to get the United States back into the international shipping competition.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DOWNING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWNING. Mr. Chairman, at the outbreak of the Revolutionary War, the Thirteen Colonies had a seapower capability that surpassed the British fleet.

Our colonial leaders recognized that ships, both merchant and military, would be the controlling factor in the gathering Revolutionary conflict.

It was supremacy on the high seas as much as any other factor that enabled our forefathers to develop a new nation. America ruled the waves in the 1770's and America became the mightiest nation on earth because our power on the high seas enabled our early settlers to take full advantage of our Nation's great resources without fear of aggression from other world powers.

Today, 200 years after we established this Nation as a mighty seapower, the U.S. seapower capability is, or certainly should be, a source of embarrassment to the mightiest nation on earth. To me, it is inconceivable that we in the Congress will continue to watch our fourth arm of defense wither away. We must reverse the declining trend in our American-flag merchant marine and, Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, one of the first steps we should take is the passage of H.R. 158.

The House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee must have statutory authority to review maritime programs annually. Existing law does not require annual legislative review of Maritime Administration programs and it is simply impossible for our committee to assist in the development of maritime policy or to measure the effectiveness of administration policy and programs.

Our Nation desperately needs a more effective merchant marine and the Congress of the United States can contribute to maritime effectiveness by carefully analyzing Maritime Administration needs on a year to year basis. The war in Vietnam and the importance of shipping to our military posture in southeast Asia dramatize the importance of an annual presentation to a legislative committee. Communication between a branch of the administration and the Congress of the United States is difficult in times of conflict and the Congress and the American people can never hope to be informed on our merchant marine's contributions to the war in Vietnam so long as the law fails to require annual legislative review of Maritime Administration programs. Mr. Chairman, there are no precedents involved in H.R. 158. This bill would simply place the Maritime Administration in the same category as the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Coast Guard, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. The activities of the Navy Department on the high seas are subject to annual legislative review; the activities of the Coast Guard on the high seas are subject to annual legislative review, and I believe the American-flag merchant marine's activities on the high seas should similarly be made subject to annual legislative review.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not going to cure all of the ills of the American-flag merchant marine but passage of this bill will be extremely helpful to our Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee membership. We are all concerned over the deplorable state of our merchant fleet and we would like to be able to take part in the evolution of policies and programs that will restore our merchant fleet to a dominant position on the high seas. We cannot legislate effectively without knowledge and understanding of the Maritime Administration. This bill will make it possible for us to acquire the knowledge and understanding that we must have. I strongly urge my colleagues to give this bill overwhelming support.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS].

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has a sound background in its support of this legislation.

A similar situation with respect to Coast Guard activities existed prior to 1963. During that period the Coast Guard went directly to the Appropriations Committee with its requests for money under a blanket and continuing authorization, and the committee charged it with its oversight—our committee—had no knowledge of its needs or requests.

In order to keep abreast of Coast Guard activities it was necessary for the committee to conduct hearings—usually on a biennial basis, regarding Coast Guard activities and these furnished a very poor substitute for a presentation to the committee with authorizing power.

We have found that since the Coast Guard is required to present its requirements with respect to hardware to our committee, that both the Coast Guard and the committee have benefited, since it has caused the Coast Guard to be more specific and informative concerning its needs.

It is our earnest hope and expectation that a similar effect would be achieved with the Maritime Administration if this bill becomes law.

The only objection that we have heard to the proposal is that it might entail more work for the Maritime Administration.

If the present state of the American merchant marine is any indication, it could well be that more work by the Maritime Administration is strongly recommended.

It is my feeling that this bill is a most important one and will be one large step toward the rehabilitation of our merchant marine.

U.S. oceanborne foreign trade carried in dry cargo ships, 1921–63

[Millions of long tons]

Year	Exports			Imports			Total		
	Total	United States	Percent	Total	United States	Percent	Total	United States	Percent
1921	34.9	11.5	33.0	12.4	5.4	44.0	47.2	16.9	35.9
1922	29.1	9.9	34.0	20.8	7.3	35.0	49.9	17.2	34.4
1923	31.2	9.9	32.0	23.1	7.1	31.0	54.3	17.1	31.6
1924	32.6	10.3	31.6	21.9	7.1	32.4	54.5	17.4	31.9
1925	32.6	9.3	28.6	24.9	7.1	28.4	57.4	16.4	28.5
1926	47.9	10.2	21.3	27.3	8.1	29.6	75.3	18.3	24.3
1927	33.7	10.5	31.2	25.4	8.1	32.0	59.1	18.7	31.6
1928	32.2	10.2	31.7	26.3	8.1	30.8	58.5	18.3	31.3
1929	32.3	10.4	32.1	29.1	9.1	31.2	61.3	19.4	31.7
1930	25.9	8.1	31.1	25.5	7.8	30.5	51.5	15.8	30.8
1931	20.9	6.7	32.1	19.9	5.8	29.4	40.7	12.5	30.8

U.S. oceanborne foreign trade carried in dry cargo ships, 1921–63—Continued

[Millions of long tons]

Year	Exports			Imports			Total		
	Total	United States	Percent	Total	United States	Percent	Total	United States	Percent
1932	15.8	5.2	32.7	14.9	4.1	27.7	30.7	9.3	30.3
1933	16.0	5.4	34.1	16.5	4.8	29.0	32.5	10.2	31.5
1934	18.0	5.9	33.2	18.1	5.4	30.1	36.1	11.3	31.4
1935	18.5	5.9	31.9	21.3	5.8	27.1	39.8	11.7	29.3
1936	17.9	5.3	29.7	23.9	6.7	28.0	41.8	12.0	28.7
1937	25.3	7.4	29.1	28.8	8.2	28.5	54.0	15.5	28.8
1938	23.4	5.5	23.4	20.6	6.1	29.8	44.1	11.6	26.4
1939	24.4	5.8	23.9	23.1	6.1	26.3	47.5	11.9	25.1
1940	28.5	7.1	25.0	22.6	8.9	39.5	51.0	16.0	31.4
1941	25.5	(1)	---	25.9	(1)	---	51.6	(1)	---
1942	26.1	10.2	39.3	17.7	11.2	63.0	43.8	21.4	48.9
1943	27.6	16.2	58.7	19.7	15.4	78.3	47.4	31.7	66.8
1944	28.2	16.5	58.5	18.6	14.6	78.4	46.8	31.0	66.4
1945	36.9	24.7	66.9	19.4	15.2	78.5	56.3	39.9	70.9
1946	50.5	34.1	67.4	19.4	11.8	61.1	69.9	45.9	65.7
1947	80.8	44.2	54.8	25.3	15.0	59.3	106.1	59.3	55.8
1948	47.5	21.4	45.1	29.7	14.9	50.0	77.2	36.3	47.0
1949	40.8	15.6	38.2	31.0	11.7	37.8	71.8	27.3	38.0
1950	28.9	9.9	34.3	37.2	12.6	33.8	66.1	22.5	34.1
1951	71.9	30.3	42.0	38.0	15.3	40.2	109.9	45.5	41.4
1952	61.7	19.4	31.5	37.8	14.3	37.9	99.5	33.7	33.9
1953	42.6	9.9	23.2	43.3	13.1	30.2	85.9	22.9	26.7
1954	46.2	10.8	23.3	44.9	13.2	29.3	91.1	23.9	26.3
1955	73.1	14.1	19.3	52.6	15.8	30.1	125.7	29.9	23.8
1956	95.7	16.7	17.4	60.9	16.7	27.4	156.7	33.4	21.3
1957	108.1	18.2	16.9	67.4	15.6	23.1	175.5	33.9	19.3
1958	80.5	11.9	14.9	65.1	10.9	16.8	145.6	22.9	15.7
1959	72.1	10.8	15.0	79.5	10.5	13.3	151.7	21.3	14.0
1960	80.4	12.4	15.5	76.4	9.9	13.0	156.8	22.4	14.3
1961	86.9	12.7	14.7	67.2	7.5	11.1	154.0	20.2	13.1
1962	92.1	13.0	14.1	79.4	7.9	10.0	171.6	20.9	12.2
1963	107.8	14.1	13.1	78.9	6.9	8.8	186.7	21.1	11.3
1964	117.5	15.2	13.0	90.7	8.2	9.0	208.1	23.4	11.2

(1) Not available.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may use to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS].

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Chairman, today the House is considering H.R. 158—the Maritime Administration authorization bill. The views that the honorable chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the gentleman from Maryland, and the views expressed by our colleague from Washington, reflect very well the views I hold on this question.

On April 15 of this year, in my Capitol Report to my constituents in the Third Congressional District of Arkansas, I discussed the topic that faces us now. The views I expressed in that report are as follows:

CAPITOL REPORT

(By John Paul Hammerschmidt)

I usually try to make observations about matters indicated in your letters.

At first glance, the subject of this report might seem of distant interest, even though vital to the nation's economy.

I, too, have to shake my head and blink my eyes when I realize that, in a very short time, within our own District, we will have several ports which give access to the seven seas.

This has caused me to take a closer look at the overall effect of world shipping on our own economy. This closer look discloses clearly a problem with which we have all been at least vaguely familiar.

The United States is losing out in shipping. Our Merchant Marine fleet is shrinking and decaying.

Yes, Uncle Sam still has the largest number of ocean-going ships of 1,000 tons and over—about 2,300 of them. But more than half of these ships are in the Reserve Fleet and are very, very old. Less than 1,100 are Active in world trade.

Every other major nation in the world is outbuilding us in the shipyards.

For example, last year the Soviet Union had 556 merchant ships under construction or on order. The United States had 48 ships.

The Soviet Union is adding to its trading fleet 8 times faster than the United States. At this rate, by 1970 the Soviets could become a truly dominant maritime power.

Already they possess one of the world's modern fleets. Four out of five Soviet merchant ships are less than 10 years old; four out of five U.S. ships are more than 20 years old.

But this isn't merely a question of Soviet or U.S. dominance in international trade. Other nations, small and large, are surpassing us in shipbuilding.

In 1966, the United States trailed eleven other countries in number of ships on order or building: Japan, Sweden, Great Britain, West Germany, France, Norway, Poland, Denmark, Yugoslavia, Spain, and The Netherlands. And both East Germany and Italy were in the process of passing Uncle Sam.

In 1970, when the barges move along the Arkansas River, part of the cargo will wind up in foreign commerce. I'd much rather see U.S. ships and seamen handling the goods, but prospects are not too bright.

Mr. Chairman, this action I hope the House takes today favorable to this bill will brighten those prospects immeasurably.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, due to neglect, confusion and a general inability to meet the mounting problem, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has permitted the American maritime industry to drift into a major crisis.

Today, the United States has fewer privately owned seagoing merchant ships than in 1936. The percentage of U.S.-flag ships in the world's merchant fleet is one-half of what it was three decades ago. The percentage of American goods moving overseas on American ships is now the lowest in modern history. The United States has dropped to fifth among the nations in the size of our active merchant fleet and presently ranks 14th in shipbuilding. This national disgrace is heightened by the fact that 70 percent of our ships are 20 years or older and will be due for layup within the next 5 years.

More than 2 years have passed since the state of the Union message in 1965 when the President promised "a new policy for our merchant marine." To date, that promise remains unfulfilled. Moreover, in recent testimony, the Secretary of Transportation noted that he "would not seek—the President's—concurrence in the new program until I could assure him that it had general support within the maritime field. However, I must now report that we do not have the kind of agreement which will make such a program a reality." Thus, rather than decision, we have experienced indecision. In place of action, there has been near paralysis in Federal leadership. While we are in a continued state of decline, the other maritime nations of the world have been building up their merchant fleets. Last year marked the third successive annual record for world merchant shipping launched.

The seriousness of this situation is graphically reflected by comparing the American maritime industry with that of Soviet Russia. "A 1966 Survey of Russian Merchant Shipping," prepared by the University of Washington, discloses that:

> In 1963 the Russians constructed 115 ships while America launched 31. Between 1959 and 1963 the American fleet increased by 20 fewer ships than the Russians produced in the single year 1963. Moreover, the amount of American seaborne commerce carried in American ships has declined from an already low of 11 per cent in 1960 to around 7 per cent today. The Russians, in contrast, have increased the amount of freight carried in their own bottoms from 33 per cent in 1955 and 45 per cent in 1962 to around 85 per cent in 1965.

There are indications that this country's sea transportation forces have been stretched to the limit to support the massive military operations in Vietnam. In order to meet our obligations there, a large number of old ships have been pulled out of the mothball fleet. These vessels, from 20 to 27 years old, have had a breakdown rate more than double the privately owned commercial fleet under charter for Vietnam services. Although faced with these dismal statistics, the administration now proposes to modernize more of our aging reserve fleet while only increasing the new merchant ship construction in American yards from 13 to 15 ships a year.

Last year, the administration attempted to transfer the Maritime Administration into the new Department of Transportation. Under Republican leadership, this move was defeated and a plan was advanced that would establish an independent Maritime Administration. The proposed transfer would have done little more than shift the maritime problem to a new department. There was no sense of urgency or a call for a redirection of effort. Rather than meeting and solving the problems of the maritime industry, they would have been swept under a bureaucratic rug.

In this session of Congress, the Johnson-Humphrey administration is continuing to display a dangerous disregard for the very serious problems of our maritime industry. The present situation has been described by the Journal of Commerce as follows:

> It is one thing to attempt enticing the shipping industry into the new Department of Transportation with vague promises of a totally new policy. It is quite another to display by current actions a curious indifference to the problems of merchant shipping and to indicate—when discussing the subject at all—not what ought to be done, but what the administration is unwilling to do or keep on doing.

In addition to its failure to develop a meaningful maritime policy, the Johnson-Humphrey administration has undercut, if not scrapped, the forward-looking ship replacement program that was implemented during the Eisenhower administration. At that time, it was clearly apparent that unless a program of this type was carried forward, the United States would face, in the foreseeable future, a maritime crisis of major proportions. The administration's abandonment of the Eisenhower program has triggered just such a crisis. Its current indecisiveness and failure to mount anything more than a minimal program, have escalated the crisis to a point where it is bordering on a national catastrophe.

This country needs and must have a modern merchant marine. We must revitalize and modernize our shipbuilding industry if the demands of the future are to be met. The need to develop a reasonable and defensible maritime program presents a challenge and an opportunity; 1967 is a year of decision for the American maritime industry. Unless our shipbuilding effort is increased our defense commitments throughout the world will be jeopardy. Indeed, our national survival may depend upon the shipping that should now be under construction but which the Johnson-Humphrey administration has scuttled.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1119), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 209. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

"(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, beginning with the fiscal year 1968 and for each subsequent fiscal year, there are authorized to be appropriated or made available to or for the use of the Maritime Administration for—

"(1) construction and repair of vessels;

"(2) payment of construction differential subsidy;

"(3) payment of operating differential subsidy;

"(4) maritime training (including Federal aid to State marine schools);

"(5) maintenance and operation of vessels of the National Defense Reserve Fleet;

"(6) the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund; and

"(7) research and development activities; only such sums as the Congress may specifically authorize by law for each fiscal year."

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1119), is amended to read as follows:

" 'Sec. 209. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

" '(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act or any other law, there are authorized to be appropriated after December 31, 1967, for the use of the Maritime Administration for—

" '(1) acquisition, construction or reconstruction of vessels;

" '(2) construction-differential subsidy and cost of national defense features incident to the construction, reconstruction or reconditioning of ships;

" '(3) payment of obligations incurred for operating-differential subsidy;

" '(4) expenses necessary for research and development activities (including reimbursement of the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund for losses resulting from expenses of experimental ship operations);

" '(5) reserve fleet expenses;

" '(6) maritime training at the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York;

" '(7) financial assistance to State Marine Schools; and

" '(8) the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund;

only such sums as the Congress may specifically authorize by law.' "

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Giaimo, Chairman of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 158) to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration, pursuant to House Resolution 438, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the Polish Constitution of 1791 marked a grand and glorious landmark in Poland's turbulent history. That remarkable instrument proved to the world almost two centuries ago that the Poles were capable of fashioning their own governmental machinery without causing bloody revolutions, without upsetting the monarchical system of government. Equally significant was the fact that in that instrument Poland's leaders showed their full appreciation of popular and democratic process of legislating and governing.

Late in the 18th century the Poles had already lost heavily to their autocratic neighbors in the first partition of Poland in 1772. This was a bitter lesson for them. They learned that without allies they could not resist their implacable foes—Austria, Prussia, and Russia. They felt that with an improved, efficient, and popularly supported government they could fare better in their next struggle against these foes. Late in 1788 a group of patriotic, able, and liberal Members of the Diet—the Assembly—formed a committee for the specific purpose of drafting a new Constitution. This band of statesmen worked diligently for almost 3 years, and finally early in 1791 their work was submitted to the Diet for adoption. On May 3 of that year it was adopted, and the King as well as the Parliament took their oath under the new Constitution.

In itself the Constitution was a liberal and progressive instrument, a rather revolutionary document for those days, for heretofore no such advanced steps were taken in that part of Europe. By its provisions the monarch's power was curtailed and his executive authority was to be exercised through a Council of Six, "Guardian of the Laws," made up of the Primate of Poland and the heads of five departments. The King retained most of his prerogatives, but the Council was to act as a check in the exercise of these prerogatives. There was to be a legislature of two chambers of elected members. The nobles of the country retained many of their privileges, but they were to share these with ennobled townsmen. The agreements made between the peasants and their landlords were brought within the purview of the law, thus extending legal protection to the peasantry. Poland remained officially Roman Catholic, but religious toleration was guaranteed to other religious sects. In short, by the adoption of this Constitution Poland stepped out of medieval times and emerged as a land of limited monarchy with a constitutional government.

At the time this Constitution was rightly regarded as the advance guard of liberalism in Central and Eastern Europe. It was hailed by public figures in the West, and won the admiration of England's foremost liberal statesman, Edmund Burke. However, while the Constitution won the approbation of friends of freedom everywhere, it was bitterly disapproved and denounced by the autocratic regimes of Austria, Prussia, and Russia. Fearing that the birth of liberal and progressive ideas in Poland may spread to their lands, and also ready to rob unhappy Poles of what was left to them, the Governments of Austria, Prussia, and Russia made war on Poland. Thus, before the Constitution was really put to the test, and before the Poles could taste its benefits, they found themselves under attack. Under the circumstances, and against the superior forces of their foes the Poles could not resist effectively. In the end they lost. Soon came the almost inevitable second partition of Poland. Meanwhile the Constitution of May became a dead document. A few years later and after another partition of the country, independent and sovereign Poland was no more. It was totally parceled out among its three foes.

Thenceforth, for more than 100 years Poland lived on in the hearts and minds of patriotic and suffering Poles. Yet in misery, even in servitude, they did not give up the hope of regaining their national independence and reviving the spirit of the Constitution of May 1791. That spirit was very much active when Poland became independent at the end of the First World War, and that spirit kept Poland free during the two decades of the interwar years.

Unhappily, since the fall of 1939 the history of the Poles is marked by successive tragedies. Outmaneuvered and often outnumbered, the brave Poles did all they could to save their homes and their independence. They fought against forbidding odds in defense of their homeland, but in the end they were crushed by superior forces of ruthless foes. During the war their country was once more partitioned; at the end of the war they were robbed of a third of their territory. Then a Communist puppet regime was imposed upon them by the Kremlin, which has ruled over them with an iron hand for two decades. Today's Poland may be likened to a vast concentration camp in which some 25 million Poles are more or less imprisoned, and are not even permitted to celebrate their Constitution Day. We in the free world echo their genuine patriotic sentiments in observing the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of May 1791. I am indeed glad to join all freedom-loving Poles in this anniversary observance.

TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION OF ALCOHOLISM ADDICTS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, for more than 8 years as a Member of this House, and in many previous years as a New York State senator, I have sponsored legislation to further the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts.

I have addressed myself to this problem because of its great importance to my home State, and to the entire Nation.

Through the years, there have been many improvements in methods of handling narcotic addiction. One of the most recent was the start of New York State's enlightened program of compulsory commitment, which went into effect April 1.

It has been highly gratifying to see these changes, but at the same time, I have been deeply troubled by evidence that, as concern over narcotic addiction becomes the "in" thing, concern for the problems of alcoholism seems to be fading out.

It is important that we do not lose sight of the fact that alcoholism is not only still with us, and still a pressing social, medical, and economic problem, but that it engulfs vastly greater numbers of our people.

We have often cited the fact that narcotic addiction is a kind of epidemic disease, which spreads through a community. Many of the Federal and State efforts in that field have been justified by their need in behalf of public health.

We must not lose sight of the fact that the scourge of alcoholism often has the same effect, especially among the families of the afflicted ones. The children of alcoholics frequently become delinquents, and too often they become alcoholics themselves.

Some States have done a little, but far too little, to help solve the problems of alcoholism. All of the States need help, in the form of centralized research and grants-in-aid, if they are to combat the problem with any effectiveness.

New York State has one of the bigger programs among the States, yet New York's budget for work in that field totals only $1 million—and it must be remembered that there are an estimated 700,000 alcoholics in the State.

My own city of New York, unhappily, has the largest number of alcoholics in the country—an estimated total of more than a quarter of a million, and the number is growing each year. Most of them are receiving no treatment at all.

These are some of the reasons why I am glad to have the opportunity to serve as a cosponsor of the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1967, which is being introduced in this House today by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN]. I wish to commend my able colleague for initiating this legislation and for his outstanding efforts in this field.

I am honored to be in the company of the bipartisan cosponsors of this bill in this House, and to join in this vital effort with the sponsors of a similar bill in the other House, spearheaded by the esteemed senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS. I trust the bill will receive overwhelming approval by this Congress.

ABOLISH THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, in the past few years, a number of possible solutions have been offered to offset the powerful role played by the National Labor Relations Board in usurping the right of Congress to legislate. Originally conceived as an impartial agency to carry out the intent of Congress, I fear that the NLRB has become so partisan in its decisions that its very existence threatens orderly labor-management relationships.

Upon examining the Board's decisions of the past 5 years, I am convinced that it is bent on a course to destroy existent labor law enacted by Congress by handing down decisions so ambiguous that no one will be able to understand the law. In my opinion, the NLRB is purposely arrogating the intent of Congress in order to create a situation in which international labor unions will be able to trample over the interests of both employees and employers. Justice Holmes once said:

> The tendence of the law must always be to narrow the field of uncertainty.

I am sure that, if Justice Holmes were alive today, he would be appalled over the uncertainty created in the law by the NLRB. Many of the decisions are so completely baffling to both labor and business until it leads one to assume that the Board is totally amateurish in its approach to labor law.

It appears that the only way to provide for some semblance of predictability in labor law is to just abolish the National Labor Relations Board altogether. Consequently, today I am introducing a bill to do away with this agency. This is the same bill introduced in the Senate by the junior Senator from Michigan.

The bill would establish in the place of the NLRB a 15-judge U.S. Labor Court. Each judge would be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate for 20-year terms with the exception of original appointees, who would serve staggered terms. In addition, the General Counsel of the NLRB would be replaced by an Administrator appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate. Also, a total of 90 Commissioners appointed by the court would replace the present NLRB trial examiners.

Despite the fact that the NLRB is supposed to be a judicial body, in reality two of the five present members of this agency are not even lawyers. It is obvious that Federal judges would be more carefully selected than NLRB members and would certainly be less likely to bow to political pressure and harassment. A separate Federal court would have much more prestige than the present Board, since it would be more predisposed to decide cases on the basis of prior decisions and those laws enacted by Congress.

GENERAL ELECTRIC TO BUILD SST ENGINES

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, the President's recent decision to request funds from the Congress to finance the next phase of development of the supersonic transport was very welcome news indeed to me and other Members of Congress who have attempted to secure financing for the program for some time now.

This program will not only keep the United States in the forefront of world aviation, but will result in many other benefits to the Nation as well.

I am most happy and proud that the congressional district I am privileged to represent will play a prominent role in the new era of supersonic passenger transportation which we are now approaching. The General Electric Co., at its plant in Evendale, Ohio, has been selected by the Federal Aviation Agency to develop and ultimately produce the engine which will power the U.S. supersonic transport.

I would like to take this opportunity to praise General Electric for the tremendous contributions they have made to aviation and the leadership they have displayed in the most important program. The GE people have worked very diligently on the design, development, and testing of the engine which will power the SST. The engine, which has a designated thrust of 60,000 pounds, has already undergone more than 130 hours of testing, and is now in the advanced testing phase.

The prospects of a supersonic transport in commercial airline operation are both exciting and unique. Perhaps equally unique, however, is the development approach which has been worked out. Because of the sheer magnitude of the program, private industry cannot undertake the task alone.

I believe a fundamentally sound arrangement has been worked out by the FAA, and I congratulate the Agency, the manufacturers, and the airlines on this point. Boeing, who will build the airplane, and General Electric, together with the airlines, will share the development expense on a commercial risk basis. The manufacturers will make substantial investments in the next phase of the program, which is to build and fly two prototype aircraft. In addition, it is my understanding the airlines will contribute by investing $1 million risk capital for each aircraft on order.

Finally, and perhaps most important of all, the Government's investment will be recovered on a successful program through a royalty on the aircraft and engine sales to the airlines. Specifically, the royalty agreements will provide full recovery of all Government funds by the sale of the 300 aircraft, and a return on the investment will result from sales beyond 300 aircraft.

To me, the development of the supersonic transport is necessary from a national viewpoint, and I believe the plan for proceeding with the next phase is sound. If it were not, it is extremely unlikely that Boeing and GE would be willing to risk more than $200 million of their shareholders' funds for the building of prototype aircraft and engines. Also, the willingness of the airlines to make substantial contributions to the development of the aircraft would indicate a belief that they can operate a supersonic transport at a profit and that it makes economic sense.

If the United States fails to keep pace with the demands of the air traveler and of the industry, the French-British Concorde and even the Russians with their Tupolev 144 will meet these demands. Both of these supersonic transport airplanes are now under development and have a 3-year headstart on the U.S. supersonic transport.

I am confident that early approval of the request for funds will permit us to exceed the achievements of other nations and thus maintain our leadership in the field of aviation.

We cannot stress enough the importance of this program as far as our gold supply is concerned.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON ADDS TWO KEY BILLS TO HIS POSTAL PAY PACKAGE: URGES SUPERVISOR RECLASSIFICATION AND SICK LEAVE REIMBURSEMENT

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the Congress and the public are increasingly interested in fashioning a modern and efficient postal system, I am pleased to introduce two bills which take major steps toward insuring that our post offices are manned by loyal, skilled, and fairly remunerated employees.

The first of these bills provides a general 5-percent increase in postal pay rates, and in addition, provides for the pay reclassification of a major portion of employees in each pay level, including supervisory levels.

This bill also reduces the intervals between steps in each salary level above step 7 from the present 3 years to 1 year each. This will help postal employees with several years of service to reach higher pay levels more quickly.

The reclassification and salary increase measure is a followup to my earlier bill, H.R. 6933, which provides for reclassification to one higher level of all employees in levels 1 to 5. H.R. 6933 also provides for elimination of steps 11 and 12 in each pay level. I heartily support reducing the number of intralevel steps to 10 throughout the postal pay schedule.

The second bill I am submitting today would give an option to civil employees who retire with a substantial amount of unused sick-leave time. Presently, no credit or remuneration is provided those employees who have exceptional attendance and reliability records in comparison with those who use all sick-leave time allowed them. Under my bill, which I also sponsored in the 89th Congress, either the employee may elect to receive one-half of the amount of accrued sick leave at retirement in cash as severance pay, or he may elect to have the entire number of whole days of unused sick leave added to his length of service for retirement computation purposes. In the event of the employee's death before retirement, his beneficiaries shall receive a cash payment equal to half of the cash value of his unused sick leave.

I am pleased to add these two bills to H.R. 6933 and H.R. 2108, which provides a fairer overtime rule for postal substitutes. I am confident that these four postal pay bills, in addition to others introduced by my colleagues, will mean that the 90th Congress will make a fair postal pay structure one of its primary legislative goals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the prompt consideration and adoption of both of these bills. Only by insuring that the pay and fringe benefits available to postal employees are comparable with those offered by private industry, can we hope to build in an adequate measure of efficiency and loyalty among the members of the postal field service.

CONGRESSMAN HORTON'S RESOLUTION SEEKS NEW EMPHASIS ON THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FLAG IN OUR HERITAGE, ADDS RECOGNITION OF FRANCIS BELLAMY TO FLAG DAY RITES

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when patriotic Americans are shocked by the dishonor shown the American flag by a few extremists, I think it would be appropriate for the Congress to rededicate America to the honoring of our flag, and to the recognition of its high place in our country's heritage.

Last week, I submitted a bill which seeks to punish those who maliciously deface the Stars and Stripes. Today, I propose a positive measure, which would enhance the ceremonial importance of Flag Day, which falls on June 14 of each year.

The bill I propose provides for appropriate recognition to be given on Flag Day each year, to the Pledge of Allegiance and to its author, Francis Bellamy. The words of the Pledge, which are recited daily by millions of American schoolchildren, are too often forgotten by adults. By including appropriate recognition of the Pledge and its author in the annual Flag Day celebration, I feel we can rejuvenate respect for the flag and all it symbolizes for all Americans.

Francis Bellamy wrote the Pledge of Allegiance in 1892, 75 years ago. There could be no more fitting way to commemorate the 75th anniversary of his authorship than to provide for the yearly recognition of his accomplishment as part of Flag Day.

As a means of familiarizing my colleagues with the life of Francis Bellamy, I would like to include in the Record an excerpt from a letter I recently received from Mrs. David Bellamy, my constituent, who is the daughter-in-law of this famed patriot:

> Francis Bellamy, the father of the writer's late husband, was born in Mount Morris, N.Y. May 18, 1855, the son of a Baptist minister. The family soon moved to Rome, N.Y. where young Francis had his early schooling. He then attended the University of Rochester where he was graduated in the class of 1876. After being graduated from the Rochester Theological Seminary in 1879, he spent about ten years in the ministry.
>
> Eventually, Francis Bellamy resigned his pastorate at the Dearborn Street Baptist Church in Boston, Mass. and joined the staff of the Youth's Companion, a popular magazine of that era. He became assistant to the Editor in Chief, James B. Upham, and was soon made Chairman of a National Committee of School Superintendents to make nationwide plans for the first celebration of Columbus Day in October of 1892. The program as planned was carried out simultaneously in every schoolhouse across the country with the raising of a flag over each schoolhouse. It was also used at the dedication of the Chicago Columbian Exposition which celebrated the 400th anniversary of the discovery of America. As an important part of this program, the Pledge of Allegiance was written and has survived the years with a few additions made by Congress. It is now used daily in the schools and by many patriotic and civic organizations.

STATEHOOD FOR PUERTO RICO

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I have always held that the growth of this great country has derived, fundamentally, from the opportunity which our system of government gives the people to express their personal, individual desires—the essential procedure of freedom which comes down to us from the Original Thirteen Colonies.

A veritable miracle was wrought in 1787, when from a loose confederation we fashioned a permanent union with a central government—but a central government under which the principle that the people shall express their desires and these desires shall govern our Nation, remained wholly unimpaired. From that day to now, this system has been the foundation on which our Nation has expanded from its Original Thirteen States to 50.

None of the 37 geographic areas which have achieved statehood in the United States since colonial days was in any manner forced, or by any outside force even persuaded, to seek statehood. They became States because the people who lived in these areas wanted to become a State.

Today, one of the territories under the American flag which I believe has reached the potential for full statehood in the United States is the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. And today, as a duly elected Representative of the people, I join with colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives in saying to our American citizens who live in Puerto Rico:

If you desire full American citizenship; if you desire the privileges and responsibilies of participating in our Government not merely by voice but by vote as well; if you wish to become a State of the United States, we stand with our door open to give you welcome.

With these brief remarks, I join today with my Republican and Democratic colleagues—Representatives James A. Byrne of Pennsylvania, James C. Cleveland, Thaddeus J. Dulski, Joseph M. McDade, Charles McC. Mathias, Jr., of Maryland, Rogers C. B. Morton, Robert N. C. Nix, Richard L. Ottinger, Ogden R. Reid, Richard S. Schweiker, Bob Wilson, Jim Wright, and Wendell Wyatt—in cosponsoring a bill which looks forward to statehood for Puerto Rico.

This legislation, of course, provides for Puerto Rican statehood only after the people of Puerto Rico express their desire for statehood. It is a basic bill, and I am quite aware that passage, when and if it comes after Puerto Ricans express the wish to become a State, will not be achieved in the exact language of this measure. The House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will presumably hold hearings, and subsequently write into final legislation the procedure to be followed in making Puerto Rico a State. But this process will take considerable time even after Puerto Ricans declare their wish to become a State.

The time to begin this process is immediately after Puerto Rico has spoken in favor of statehood. My colleagues and I want our fellow Americans in Puerto Rico to know that our ears are cocked to hear the Puerto Rican voice, and that whenever this voice speaks "We want to be a State," they will find a welcome here.

INCREASE IN THE PRICE OF THE FEDERAL DUCK STAMP

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to H.R. 497, which, if it becomes law, will increase the price of a Federal duck stamp from $3 to $5.

As a duck hunter myself, I know that an increase, such as is proposed in H.R. 497, will do far more harm than good to the sport of duck hunting.

I feel that an increase in duck stamps will tax the poor and middle-class hunter completely out of the sport, because they are the ones who are being taxed out of everything else.

If revenue is the reason for the proposed increase, then I disagree completely. According to the Department of the Interior, $139 million was collected in 1966 from all hunting and fishing permits and stamps. Even though the number of permits and stamps decreased in numbers purchased, the revenue increased by over $211,684 from 1965 to 1966. However, I feel that with an increase such as is proposed in H.R. 497, our sportsmen will be taxed to the extent that a great number will drop the sport and thus the Department of the Interior will suffer instead of gaining an increase in revenues.

Our duck hunters in Louisiana called on me last year to voice their opposition to a proposal by the Interior Department to cut the number of mallards that could be taken on a day's hunt in our State. I urged the entire delegations from the Mississippi Flyway to join with me in demanding defeat of the proposal. We succeeded. I now urge my fellow colleagues to once again stand up and voice their differences to an unsound bill such as H.R. 497.

I would like to insert the following article in the Record. This was written by one of the Nation's outstanding sportswriters, Mr. Grits Gresham, of Natchitoches, La.:

Bayou Browsing

(By Grits Gresham)

> A five dollar duck stamp is in the works, and will become law if a bill introduced in Congress by Rep. John Dingell becomes law. It would replace the current duck stamp which costs $3.00, which replaced the one before it which cost $2.00, which replaced the original one which cost $1.00.
>
> I've had it! For my money the well has run dry. I'm against this further increase in the price of a duck stamp.
>
> The sportsman has stood still for increase after increase in his cost of doing "business", even when the tab he was footing benefited a whopping lot of people who weren't interested in hunting and fishing, and who never buy hunting or fishing licenses. He has even asked that he be taxed a bit more to insure that wildlife be properly cared for.
>
> He pays a 10% tax on all fishing tackle he buys, knowing that it goes for fisheries management and research. He pays 11 percent tax on all arms and ammunition he buys, knowing that it goes for game management and research. He has even protested that this tax be left alone when suggestions were made that they be abandoned.
>
> The sportsman, in short, doesn't mind footing more than his share of the cost of protecting our wildlife resources. But there should be a limit. I think we've reached it, for now, where duck stamps are concerned. I hope Dingell's bill will be defeated, and am writing my congressman to that effect.
>
> It is past time that the big, vast, vague "federal government" put many millions of dollars into wetlands acquisition and preservation. The same outfit caused much of the wetlands shortage by encouraging and paying for their drainage. With your money. This is the same incredible complex which has been paying land owners to drain land so it could be put into production, paying them not to plant agricultural land, and paying them a guaranteed price for the products if they do plant it . . . all at the same time.
>
> The waterfowl resource is a national resource. Let's let the public at large foot some of the bill for its restoration.
>
> Two more dollars, please, for a federal bird stamp for hunting other migratory birds—such as doves, snipe and woodcock. That's the other little gem in Dingell's proposal, and I'm firmly against it, too.
>
> Without any such "dove" stamp, the

states have done more research work on doves than the federal government ever thought about doing. Not that I don't think that's the way it should be, for I do, but it underscores the fact that there is no excuse for saddling hunters with another two buck fee.

If Dingell's delightful little plan goes through, your cost for Louisiana hunting licenses will be $2.00 for a state license, $2.00 for a big game license, $5.00 for a duck stamp, and $2.00 for a dove stamp, for a total of $11.00. Then you can pay $5.00 to license your boat, and $7.00 for a "Golden Passport" which will let you picnic and camp and launch your boat at federally developed recreation areas which your tax money has already paid to build.

The guy who loves the outdoors may be a good horse, but I think he's being ridden to death.

Write your congressman. All the address you need is his name and: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEVELOPMENT OF A POLLUTION-FREE, GASOLINE-POWERED VEHICLE

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was most encouraged to read that Ford Motor Co. and Mobil Oil Corp. have undertaken, on their own, a campaign to develop a pollution-free, gasoline-powered vehicle.

As we all know, air pollution is one of the major problems we now face in keeping our environment safe. For that very reason the Government has taken steps to study this problem with the goal of coming up with an answer that will allow us to again enjoy clean air.

But I am most impressed that these two companies have also decided to pursue a similar goal for the good of the public. Private industry should take note of the involvement of Ford Motor Co. and Mobil Oil Corp. in a national problem. I would also hope that other distinguished men of industry would answer the invitation of these two companies to join in with the research in developing pollution-free fuels and vehicles.

I would only like to add that Ford makes note of its intentions to continue the development of an electric automobile, thus attacking the problem from two fronts.

I would like to insert into the Record the article concerning this matter taken from the Wall Street Journal of May 1, 1967, so that my colleagues might also be aware of this activity:

Ford, Mobil Oil Begin Work on Pollution-Free Gasoline-Powered Cars—Research on Wide Range of Fuel, Engine Design Combinations Set; Ford Also Studies Electric Cars

Detroit.—Ford Motor Co. and Mobil Oil Corp. said they are undertaking a $7 million co-operative research project to develop essentially pollution-free, gasoline-powered vehicles. If successful, the development could sharply reduce the incentive for Ford and others to develop electric cars.

The Ford-Mobil project, to start today, will stretch over three years "unless its goals are reached earlier," the companies said. The companies said "others" will be free to participate in the project, with all participants having "full access to and free use of results of the research for anti-pollution purposes."

A Ford spokesman said the unspecified "others" would have to be "in a position to make a meaningful contribution and be willing to share equally in the costs" of the project. He added that Mobil may discuss the project with other petroleum concerns, but that Ford "doesn't intend presently to approach any other automobile firms."

FORD TO BE PROJECT MANAGER

Ford said it will serve as project manager for a "systems approach" study of a wide range of combinations of engine designs and fuel. "It is expected the study will lead to development of a fuel-engine system that will virtually eliminate automotive emissions, with minimum cost to the consumer and minimal effect on car performance," the companies said.

At present auto makers are using either air injection systems or a series of engine modifications to help control emissions. Air injection systems, which pump fresh air into the hot exhaust to fully burn lingering hydrocarbons, are costly—about $50 in most cases. Engine modifications are cheaper—about $25—but in both cases engine performance can suffer unless engines are carefully-tuned and well maintained.

Ford and Mobil said their research would cover several basic areas of the automobile, starting with "all elements of the basic engine, including the induction, combustion and ignition systems." It would also extend to examination of exhaust systems, incorporating catalysts which would neutralize exhaust gases on their way out of the tailpipe, and investigation of a "thermal afterburner" which presumably would re-burn exhaust gases before they left the tailpipe, consuming any unburned pollutants.

OTHER FACTORS IN STUDY

The companies said they would also study ways to remove or prevent formation of nitrogen oxides in the exhaust gases, methods for controlling evaporative losses from the fuel tank and carburetor, and the composition of fuels and lubricants. They also indicated a dual fuel system, which would lower octane requirements of gasoline and hence the cost of gasoline, would be examined. Although the companies didn't explan such a system, it presumably could involve blending of two types of fuel within the auto as various loads were placed on the engine.

Ford has been in the forefront of those discussing the possibility of an electric car. As recently as 10 days ago, Arjay Miller, president of Ford, told a symposium at the University of Illinois in Chicago that a "fully practical" urban-suburban electric car could be only 10 years off. "We have a firm basis for believing that such a vehicle can and will be produced, and we have set no limit on our expenditures for this purpose," Mr. Miller said.

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Howard], made a very learned address on May 2 at Rutgers University on the subject of lowering the voting age to 18 in the United States. Representative Howard on the opening day of the 90th Congress introduced House Joint Resolution 18, appropriately numbered—a constitutional amendment to lower the voting age to 18. Along with many Members of the House and the other body, I have also sponsored a constitutional amendment designed to achieve the same objective.

I hope that my colleagues will review the fine arguments which Representative Howard has made for this worthwhile legislation. Every day that passes adds new support for this amendment, and I trust that early action may be taken to enable voting at the age of 18 throughout the Nation.

The address follows:

Lowering the Voting Age to 18 in the United States

(By Representative James J. Howard, Democrat of New Jersey, May 2, 1967, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, N.J.)

Ladies and Gentlemen, I thank you for your kind invitation to join with you tonight to discuss the vital subject of lowering the national voting age to 18.

Young men and women, such as you here at Rutgers tonight, attain by your 18th birthday a degree of education, experience and practical knowledge much more advanced than was the case in earlier generations. This is because your schools are better and more of you have completed high school by the time you become 18 than other such persons in recent years.

You are also better qualified to vote today because radio, television, periodicals and newspapers expose you to the affairs of your communities, State, Nation and the world to a degree impossible in earlier generations.

Today young people such as yourselves, are the best informed in all history. You are fully prepared for the responsibilities of citizenship and, in my view, entitled to assume those responsibilities which I have no doubt you would discharge with great distinction.

Naturally, there are persons who disagree with me on this subject, possibly even some of you here tonight.

Yesterday, while working on the draft of this speech in my office, one of my aides brought in a column from the Washington Post, authored by Mr. John Chamberlain whose philosophies on most subjects are much more conservative than mine.

Mr. Chamberlain, in discussing the proposal to lower the voting age, had this observation: "This doesn't mean that it is necessarily a good thing to lower the voting age. Since liberals are usually for change for the sake of change if they can find no better reason for it, one would expect to find a clearcut division between liberals and conservatives on the issue."

I not only disagree with Mr. Chamberlain but I would point out that on the Conservative's side, former U.S. Senator Barry M. Goldwater has supported an 18-year-old voting age in his own State of Arizona. On the other side of the coin, the late President John Fitzgerald Kennedy supported an 18-year-old voting age throughout the country.

Mr. Chamberlain also asks, "But what about the bottle breakers who take the family's second car to Fort Lauderdale for the Easter puberty rite? Do they know how to run the State?"

Following this argument to its logical conclusion, I can only assume then that we must lay the blame for all the problems in the world today on persons 18 years old and younger.

Surely then, history must be in error when it tells us that Adolf Hitler was older than 18 when he began his march for world conquest which resulted in the annihilation of more than 6 million Jews, as well as the destruction of Europe.

Again, I can only conclude that our newspapers must not be telling us the whole truth when each day we read of crimes in the street, embezzlements in business, and proposals that we should impeach Chief Justice Warren. According to these newspaper stories, persons over 18 have some accounting to do for themselves.

Maryland does not have an 18-year-old voting law, but its adults almost elected a man Governor whose sole contribution to the campaign was a racist slogan titled, "A Man's Home is his Castle." It was geared to an open housing controversy in that State.

When the question comes up whether a person as young as 18 is qualified to vote it reminds me of the statement once made by the late and beloved Speaker of the House of Representatives, Mr. Sam Rayburn.

Said Mr. Rayburn: "It makes me tired to hear all this talk about the young generation going to hell in a hack. They are a lot smarter than I was at their age."

I concur with Mr. Rayburn's fine statement.

In 1962, a national Children's Preference Study by the American Hobby Federation pointed out that 78% of our young people read a newspaper every day—a 10% increase from the previous survey; that 80% reported reading ten or more books a year—a 7% increase over the 1960 tabulation, and that 84%, compared with 73% in 1960, said they read weekly and monthly magazines. These figures are surely higher now.

Thirty years ago, only 32%, or about ⅓ of adults in the United States between the ages of 25 and 34 were high school graduates. In 1962, according to the Bureau of the Census, the proportion of high school graduates in the same age group had risen to 64%, or about ⅔ of the population.

Thirty or more years ago, the argument might have been made that experience should make up for lack of education in qualifying young people to vote. This argument no longer holds. The great majority of young people in the age group of eighteen to twenty-one have completed secondary education, have studied American History and political institutions, and are, on the average, far more qualified to vote at eighteen than their predecessors of thirty years ago.

And I believe that the combination of education and real political responsibility would engender in young people a deep sense of obligation to participate in the electoral process and a tremendous enthusiasm regarding public affairs.

In other words, by the time young people reach the age of eighteen they are well read and, as has often been pointed out, very politically minded. Educators have stressed that—and I quote: "The real value of education comes not from its acquisition but from its association with responsibility."

For many Americans, high school represents their last formal education. Having just completed courses in American History and government, they are enthusiastic about politics and they are informed. Yet we deny them access to the ballot.

The use of 21 as the voting age in forty-six of our States dates from Medieval England and knight's service. Those Dark Ages are over—long over—and its makes no sense to suppose that 21 is a relevant determinant of majority today. In fact, the quality of our education has rendered it obsolete.

Lowering the voting age has almost become one of those comfortable, perennial issues that, like the weather, everybody talks about but no one does anything about.

And so it will be in New Jersey as well as most of our States unless you people—*right here tonight*—decide to move into action.

How, then, can this be accomplished?

The New Jersey State Legislature in 1966 and 1967 was not only one of the more productive and effective legislatures in the history of New Jersey but it has been one of the most constructive in the United States. It has worked hard, waging a constant fight against air and water pollution; it has made giant strides in the field of education as well as in the area of civil rights.

On March 20 of this year, I flew from Washington to Trenton in order to testify before the Judiciary Committee of the New Jersey State Assembly. On that day a public hearing was held on two bills which would reduce the voting age in New Jersey to either 18 or 19.

Unfortunately, this session of the New Jersey Legislature will soon be coming to a close and passage of such legislation is almost impossible this year.

But that very reason should give you time to galvanize campus teams throughout New Jersey to prepare a massive campaign for a lowering of the voting age when the new Legislature returns in 1968.

I would suggest a slogan such as "Eighteen in '68" or some similar variation.

Quite frankly, I do not feel that the voting age in New Jersey will be lowered to eighteen unless persons between 18 and 21 join together throughout New Jersey, inundate their Assemblymen and State Senators with letters and form groups of representatives to meet with the elected State officials and petition them to make this one of the first orders of business in the 1968 Legislature.

We should also urge both parties to include this in their legislative platforms for next year.

The coordinated campus effort should become as well organized and effective as any organized labor group or any Chamber of Commerce. Were it not for such organized groups, much of the pro-labor and pro-business legislation on the books throughout the country would never have become a reality.

Legislative committees should be set up to keep a close watch on who introduces legislation of this type. Then you should begin a letter writing campaign to the Chairman of the Judiciary Committee and to each member of that committee.

An elected official will be much more impressed when he receives a letter from a person who resides in his district rather than one from someone who does not. This is important to remember.

Your coordination should be made with other colleges throughout the State through similar or identical student groups.

At present, I have tentatively accepted speaking engagements at several colleges and universities throughout the United States to discuss my bill. Schedule permitting, however, I will be more than glad to join with you and any other group to plan for more effective ways to accomplish our goals in the State of New Jersey.

In the near future, I hope to sit down with the officers of the Young Democrats and Young Republicans both nationally and in New Jersey to plan meetings to bolster our campaign.

Support for an 18-year-old voting age is gaining steady acceptance throughout the United States as is evidenced by the latest Gallup Poll of April 2, 1967.

According to the Gallup Poll, public support for lowering the voting age requirement to 18 has reached an all-time high.

Nearly two adults in every three (64%) think persons 18, 19 and 20 years old should be permitted to vote; only 17% held this view in 1939 when the first national Gallup survey on this issue was conducted.

Briefly, I want to tell you just how support for lowering the voting age has steadily increased since the first survey. As I mentioned a minute ago, only 17% of the population supported an 18-year-old minimum voting age in 1939. In June, 1943, the percentage was raised to 39% and in April, 1943, it had reached 42%. Between April, 1943 and February, 1947, the support dropped off from 42% to 35%. In September, 1951, a total of 47% of the population supported an 18-year-old voting age and by March, 1954, this proposal had the support of 58 percent of the people. In August, 1965, a total of 57 percent of the people supported this and in March of this year an all-time high of 64 percent of our population said they favored an 18-year-old voting age throughout the United States.

It is also important to point out that support for passage of such legislation is being well received in the halls of Congress. On the first day of the 90th Congress, January 10, 1967, I introduced House Joint Resolution 18, well aware of the fact that similar legislation had failed to get much sympathy or support in the past. In February, 1967, I wrote to each of my colleagues in the House, urging them to support such legislation and asked them to join me when, under Special Orders, I addressed the House of Representatives on this subject on February 21, 1967. At that time, I was able to report that a total of 54 Congressmen and Senators had introduced legislation similar to mine in the less than six weeks the 90th Congress had been in session. This was more support than we had mustered in the entire two years of the 89th Congress. And since February 21, a number of other persons have introduced similar or identical legislation.

The age of compulsory education is not above 18 in any of the States. In almost every State and the District of Columbia persons 18 and above must stand trial in criminal court. The law no longer considers them juveniles.

In a number of States persons between the ages of 18 and 21 are permitted to enter into contracts. Half the States permit the execution of a will for personal property at the minimum age of 18. Twenty of the States permit a will of real property at the same age. Life insurance companies recognize an adult as anyone 18 years of age or older.

The Child-Labor Provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act do not apply to one 18 or older. Welfare aid cannot be given to one 18 or over unless he or she is handicapped.

Why indeed are all the above noted privileges and responsibilities deemed appropriate to 18, 19 and 20 year-olds but not the privilege of voting?

Those who study voting behavior have noted that persons in the age bracket of 21–30 have one of the lowest voting participation percentages in the electorate. I contend that one cause of this is the denial of the vote between the ages of 18 and 21. Enthusiasm wanes too often because of the three-year cutoff from the political process. Studies of 18–21 voting in Kentucky have indicated that this unfortunate trend is to some degree offset by permitting younger citizens to vote.

Democratic government is rendered viable and enduring only by an electorate which accepts its responsibility for the course of public affairs and which is capable of prudent judgment.

Eighteen-year-old voters would be fresh from the study of our struggle for political liberty and of the institutions which render this liberty effective. Their study would have become really meaningful for them because they would have realized while in school that political responsibility would be given them at the same time as the other responsibilities of adulthood. And they would be still habituated to the discipline of reasoned and logical thinking imparted to them in school.

And 18 year-old voters in general would offer the country other qualifications as well as vivid understanding of representative government and capacity for political judgment.

Our schools try to inculcate a sense of responsibility in students by impressing them with possibilities for the immediate future after graduation and by preparing them to fulfill these possibilities by encouraging them to undertake achievement on their own. Such achievement generates self-confidence which, in turn, makes future possibilities seem really possible.

But think of the sense of responsibility for the public state of affairs which could be imparted to high school students if they were given real responsibility for political judgment and choice at the age of eighteen. Anticipation of really taking part in the electoral process would combine with studies of history and civics to bring about in young people the feeling that government belongs to them and that they must answer for the quality of that government.

Eighteen-year-old voters would, I am convinced, measure up to the qualifications required of the electorate in a democratic country—the capacity for judgment and a strong sense of responsibility.

Young people, in spite of being deprived of the right to vote, have demonstrated their pressing concern with America's future by taking part in organized, political activity.

Both the Young Democrats and the Young Republicans accept eighteen-year-old members. Both of these groups take part of our political life. Both of them conduct political workshops or committees in order to study contemporary issues. Both of these groups write and publish and distribute political literature. Both offer rewarding opportunities for political experience to young men and women under twenty-one as well as older. Both of them demonstrate the enthusiasm with which young people confront the nation's tremendous problems.

The educational attainment of young people today combined with the irrepressible hopes for the future which characterize youth would render them responsive to the real responsibility of political choice. But take away the chance to exercise real responsibility, and many young people, I am afraid, never acquire interest, or lose whatever interest they had, in public affairs. During what I would call the dormant citizenship years, the years from eighteen to twenty-one, America loses many potentially well-informed voters. And those who have lost interest by the time they are twenty-one are added to the number of Americans who rarely if ever vote.

I do not deny that lowering the voting age would create a tremendous new impact at the polls on Election Day. I also am not unaware that, because of this very reason, there are some persons who feel this is politically unwise. But I think it would be healthy because it would expand the number of persons able to participate in elections, and it would necessitate us to further lend our ear to the voice of our younger voters.

In New Jersey, for instance, I checked the 1960 census figures to determine what sort of impact an 18 year-old voting age would have in the State. According to the 1960 census, there are 195,558 New Jerseyans between the ages of 18 and 21. While there are no definite figures available on the number of persons between 21 and 30. I know that there would be a great increase of voter participation in this age group also if we had an 18-year-old voting age.

In conclusion, I want to say to you people here at Rutgers tonight, that it is time to start this state-wide campaign. As a graduate of this fine university, I am aware that many of you are hard-pressed for extra time. But this is vitally important. Persons under 21 cannot make the fine contributions to their State and Nation unless they have the right to vote.

You know you should have that right. I know you should have that right. And the vast majority of people throughout the United States know you should have that right.

Let us join together, shoulder to shoulder, in every way possible to make our dream become a reality.

Thank you.

POSTAL REFORM

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, two excellent editorials on postal reform appeared in the Washington Post on April 30 and May 1. Imaginative and fresh new ideas are contained in these two editorials.

I am personally gratified that the second editorial, dealing with the subject of postal rates, endorses the concept of my bill, H.R. 99, to raise the rates on third-class mail so this class of advertising mail pay its own way. I have also repeatedly indicated my support of raising second-class rates, particularly for those large-circulation magazines making great profits from the low second-class rates. I would be in favor of a surcharge to be collected by the Post Office Department on large-circulation magazines, a proposal which was talked about but not included in the rate recommendations recently submitted by the President.

The postal system, as pointed out in the second editorial, is severely burdened by an excessive amount of mail which only gets into the system because some classes of postal service are priced far below cost. The central reason why I am concentrating so heavily on third-class rates is because third-class mail serves many profitmaking businesses which can fully afford to pay the cost of delivery, but are now being subsidized by the taxpayers.

These two fine editorials follow:

POSTAL REFORM—PART I

Why should an affluent, technologically progressive country be concerned about the imminent breakdown of its postal service? Men who can land an intact vehicle on the surface of the moon are surely capable of transporting objects over a small area of the earth's surface. But the goal of postal efficiency remains elusive, a disquieting reminder of the widening gap between the potentialities of technology and the social organization required for their realization.

The Post Office now handles about 80 billion pieces of mail a year. In the last 20 years the volume has almost doubled, and at the present rate of growth it will double again in only 14 years. Yet much of the mail is still being sorted and transported much as it was a century ago. An army of 700,000 is required to move it, and one gloomy postal authority, taking note of the diminishing efficiency of operations, predicted that if present trends continue to the year 2000, every man, woman and ambulant child will be delivering mail.

But we need not become a nation of mail carriers. As a result of experiments conducted by the Post Office's Department of Research and Engineering since 1956, a great deal is known about how to increase efficiency. With optical scanners and a number of less sophisticated devices, the process of sorting and moving the mountains of paper can be mechanized. But the modernization of the system will require a large capital outlay, $5 billion according to the estimate of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien. At the moment $100 million is being spent on a crash mechanization program. Whether or not the Post Office continues to be operated as a Federal agency, or is transferred to a nonprofit corporation as Mr. O'Brien proposes, there is no way of escaping from the need for a massive infusion of capital.

Unfortunately, the problem of postal efficiency involves much more than capital equipment. Efficiency is hampered by the political appointment of postmasters. And for years the postal workers' unions have hampered the growth of productivity by using their political influence to legislate restrictive work rules. Public Law 89301, passed by the 89th Congress, provides that workers with seniority are to be given preference in the assignment of Monday-through-Friday schedules "to the greatest extent possible." As a consequence of the inflexibility in scheduling for a 7-day-a-week operation, postal authorities claim that they are compelled to hire 45,000 additional workers.

It should, however, be noted that the obstructionist tactics of the postal unions stem from bitterness and frustration. The hours are inconvenient; the work is dull; and the pay, despite recent increases, is poor. Some 85 per cent of all postal employees are in the four lowest grades, and the highest income to which they can aspire after 21 years of service is only $7257. Limited opportunities for advancement breed resistance to the very technological changes that would create higher paying and more interesting jobs.

Mr. O'Brien is right in insisting that the managers of the postal system must have effective control over labor policies. But there must also be radical changes in the structure of postal rates, a subject that will be discussed in the concluding editorial.

POSTAL REFORM—PART II

When governments persist in selling services at far below costs, they create what John Stuart Mill described as "intractable problems." Suppose that Congress were to establish a flat, $70 ceiling on domestic air flights in excess of 150 miles, irrespective of the distance traveled, but permitted increases in the rates for shorter flights. The nightmarish results are not difficult to envisage. Airlines would be deluged with business between such points as Honolulu and New York or Washington and Los Angeles. The excess demand would create a "shortage" of the larger jets, and the airlines would rightfully claim that the lack of profits made it impossible to purchase more equipment. And at the same time, short-distance flight fares would increase sharply with a probable deterioration in the quality of service.

Congress would not be so irrational as to impose such a ceiling on long-distance flights, but for more than 110 years it has committed similar errors in setting postal rates. By pricing some classes of postal services at far below cost, it creates excess demand which tax the capacity of the postal system. First-class air mail revenues exceeded the costs of delivery by 21 per cent in 1966. But the percentage of costs covered for second-class mail—magazines and newspapers—was a little more than 21 per cent, and for third-class mail—principally direct mail advertising—it was less than 63 per cent.

Why is the structure of postal rates so irrational? Prof. Jane Kennedy of Houston University, in a penetrating historical analysis, concludes that "postal rates are used to accomplish all sorts of social and political objectives extraneous to the delivery of mail." A desire to win favor with the press caused Congress to provide second-class subsidies in the Jacksonian era. (By withdrawing second-class mailing privileges, the Post Office can exercise dangerous powers of censorship.) In 1851, the Post Office discontinued its policy of abandoning unprofitable mail in order to assist rural communities through subsidized service. Third- and fourth-class mail rates were set with an eye to helping the mail-order industry.

In addition to the subsidies granted by virtue of class rates, there is a category of "public service" subsidies, paid for out of general funds at a cost of about $600 million a year. In 1966, $110 million of the "public service" subsidies represented the cost of special, low rates for "nonprofit publications," periodicals such as the *National Geographic*, the *Journal of the American Medical Society* and *Nation's Business*, none of which pay income taxes on large advertising revenues.

Rather than perpetuate this peculiar patchwork of subsidies and the resulting misallocation of postal resources, Congress should wipe the slate clean. There need be only two classes of mail, air and surface, and if possible all rates should reflect both weight and distance. The practice of charging a flat rate for first-class mail, irrespective of the distance carried, began in the early 19th century when the Post Office feared that it would lose its letter-carrying monopoly. Its perpetuation should hinge only on whether it would be inconvenient to establish zone rates.

In summing up, three reforms are required for an efficient postal service: the modernization of physical facilities; the elimination of restrictive labor practices; and the rationalization of the postal rate structure. Whether or not the system continues to be run by the Government, Congress and only Congress has the power to institute these reforms. These and a host of other issues should be studied by the Commission on Postal Organization, a group of distinguished citizens recently convened by President Johnson.

A GREAT PRESIDENT: HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, May 8 marks the 83d birthday of one of our greatest Presidents of the United States, Harry S. Truman.

Recently, an incisive appraisal of the qualities of greatness of President Truman was made by Charles S. Murphy, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board. In an address at the Harry S. Truman Library in Independence, Mo., on April 1, Mr. Murphy analyzed from a very personal standpoint Mr. Truman's approach to the Presidency.

No person is better equipped to make such an analysis than Mr. Murphy. Serving as assistant legislative counsel of the U.S. Senate, Mr. Murphy first came in contact with the man who was then a Senator from Missouri and was destined in 1945 to succeed to the crushing burdens of the Presidency. President Truman summoned Mr. Murphy to the White House and tapped him as an administrative assistant, and later elevated him to the position of special counsel. It was my great honor to work for Mr. Murphy and President Truman during this historic period.

In this brief paper, Mr. Murphy has shown us why those historians are eminently correct who have classified Mr. Truman as one of our truly great Presidents. Under unanimous consent, I include the text of Mr. Murphy's address on the measure of greatness of the man whose birthday we honor next Monday:

REMARKS OF CHARLES S. MURPHY

I wish to talk to you about the way Mr. Truman approached his job as President of the United States. I believe it is now generally agreed that Mr. Truman was a great President. I accept that appraisal enthusiastically as a premise for this talk. I do not propose to deal particularly with *whether* he was a great President, but rather with *why* he was a great President.

Some biographers and commentators have spent much time trying to explain how Mr. Truman turned out to be a great President in spite of not being a great man. I do not have this problem for the simple reason that I regard Mr. Truman as a great man as well as a great President. The total sum of his character, characteristics and abilities amount to greatness. Other men might achieve that status by reason of a different—and more flamboyant—combination of characteristics and abilities. But let there be no misunderstanding about this—Harry Truman's great accomplishments in the Presidency did not come about by accident or because he was led around by one or more geniuses behind the scenes. I would be the first to concede that he had able assistance, but the Truman Presidency is mainly a reflection of the kind of man *he* was and is.

What I wish to talk about here today is the kind of man he was during those years 1945 through 1952—what it was about him that enabled him to accomplish so much so well. Many of President Truman's "greatest" characteristics were of the kind not highly visible, and he was too modest to try to make them visible. I thought I knew them and appreciated them by the time he left the White House—after I had had an unexcelled opportunity to study him day after day for six years. But my appreciation has been much enhanced during the past six years as I have undertaken to serve as a Federal executive or administrator. Some of the lessons I learned from him are amazingly helpful.

I have heretofore had some doubts about the propriety of my discussing in public what I learned about President Truman as a member of his staff. But about a year ago I told him I had almost come to the conclusion that I should try to write a book about him to do my bit toward keeping the record straight—if he had no objection and if I ever had the time. He said on the spot that he had no objection, but I have not yet found the time. I consider his permission to write a book broad enough to encompass anything I will say here. This is just another of the penalties he yet has to pay for having been President.

So much has been written about the Presidency by White House staff alumni lately that it might not be amiss for me to review the Truman Presidency in the perspective of what has come after as well as what went before. Fortunately, we have Mr. Truman's own excellent accounts of his Administration as well as his remarkable lectures about the nature of the Presidential office. These are truly national treasures, and we can never hope to equal them. However, there were a few things that went on that President Truman might not have known about and many things that others might forget. It is unfortunate for anyone to have to depend on a non-historian such as I to fill in some of these gaps. Nevertheless, I have something of an urge in that direction.

In preparing for this talk, I have been helped greatly by a book published in 1952. This book is *Mr. President* by William Hillman. It was authorized by President Truman and quotes liberally and literally from his personal diaries, private papers, and personal interviews. As an authentic and contemporaneous exposition of the views of an American President concerning that office and his experience there, this book probably has no equal. It is largely real, unexpurgated Harry Truman—with very little denaturing. For those who want to know what kind of a man President Truman really is, I recommend this book as a source where this is revealed in his own words.

Incidentally, you will find in that book some statements that might surprise some people including this: "I rarely write angry letters." And that is a direct quote.

I propose to be quite objective here. There is a school of thought to the effect that objectivity requires giving equal time to both sides and arriving at no conclusion. I do not so hold. If a matter is very one-sided—with the pluses far outweighing the minuses—the objective thing to do is to say so.

Mr. Truman set out to do the best job he could. I suspect that his ambition was to be a good President rather than a great President. I believe his experience demonstrates that if one does a good enough job of being a good President, he becomes in fact a great President. I suspect it is also true that one who strives too hard and too consciously for greatness might end up not even being a good President.

Mr. Truman's approach to the Presidency involved many elements that one might usefully bring to any job. By his very example, he was a great teacher. Many of the lessons he taught are transferable not only to other occupants of the Presidency, but to the whole spectrum of human affairs.

SIMPLIFICATION

I wish to speak first of President Truman's gift for simplification. Not only could he simplify complex matters, he could also keep simple matters simple. Both are important, I mention this gift for simplification first not because it is necessarily of first importance, but because of its pertinence to my purpose here. I wish to deal as clearly as I can—and, therefore, as simply as I can—with some rather complex matters, as well as with some other most important matters so simple they are frequently overlooked in discussing the awesome office of the Presidency. Unfortunately, my talent for simplification is not nearly so great as President Truman's.

Some thirty years ago—just after the repeal of prohibition—a witness for the California wine industry was appearing before the Senate Finance Committee in an effort to get the law amended to liberalize the provisions relating to the labeling of wine. He complained about the restrictive interpretation of the then existing law by the Federal Alcohol Administration, saying "they have reduced the amplitude of the purview thereof to an inconsequential latitude". Well, if President Truman had been undertaking to make the same point, he would not have said it that way, although everyone would have understood what he meant.

He has said that his idea of what a speech should be is "A direct statement of the facts without trimmings and without oratory."

To express one's self in language that is simple and also precise requires first of all precision in the thought one wishes to convey. This is excellent mental discipline. If one practices it hard enough over the years, it can get to be a way of life. I believe this is the way it is with President Truman. I do not know the extent to which this is a natural talent or an acquired skill. But I do not believe he feels he has mastered an idea until he can express it in simple terms. And I must say that on more than one occasion when we were wrestling with an idea together, I didn't understand it either until he put it in simple terms.

When speaking of the American Presidency, it may be asking too much to say "keep it simple", but serious efforts in that direction are likely to be highly productive of good results.

DILIGENCE

I will not dwell at length upon how hard Mr. Truman worked at his job as President. This is not an unusual trait among American Presidents. I will simply record that for seven and three-quarter years he spent virtually every waking moment working at being President.

It is hard to convey to others the intensity of the continuous effort required. The most nearly comparable effort which occurs to me that is widely shared is "cramming" for—and taking—examinations. If one thinks of stretching those few days of intensive study into a continuous period of almost eight years he begins to get the idea. Fortunately, the human mind and body are sufficiently adaptable to sustain this kind of continuous effort if one has the will to make it.

ORDERLINESS

Mr. Truman was an orderly President. He was not a fanatic about this kind of thing, but he was neat in his dress, neat in his personal habits—and he had a regular daily schedule which he followed closely unless there was some particular reason for departing from it. And when he did depart from it, it was usually to accommodate his schedule to meet the needs of other persons—not vice versa.

You may think it is relatively unimportant for the President to follow a regular schedule. If so, you are wrong. The President must accomplish an enormous amount of work. He must have people to help him with it. They must have schedules, too. They must have an opportunity to do their part of the work. They need to be able to plan schedules of their own and to keep them. You'd be surprised at how much difference it makes in Washington for the President to have lunch regularly at the normal luncheon hour.

President Truman understood very well the importance of regulating his own schedule so as to fit the needs of his staff for timely guidance and directions. For example, the times for holding "speech conferences" with the staff were fixed more often at my suggestion than at his. If his schedule was so tight they could not be fitted in during the day, he would come back to the Cabinet Room in the evening—and he would come cheerfully. It's a unique experience to be telling the President of the United States he has to come back to the office to work after dinner—and, of course, I never put it just that way.

GENTLENESS

Speaking of staff, when I think of President Truman I often think of an advertisement that was current some years ago—"Tough but Oh so gentle". In many ways, President Truman really was as tough as a boot, but with his personal staff he was extremely gentle. In fact, he was more lenient at times then he should have been, and that got him into trouble more than once. On the other hand, the staff returned his kindness with an extraordinary amount of hard work, voluntary overtime, and wholehearted, single-minded devotion.

The ways in which he showed consideration for his staff were countless. Mrs. Truman joined him in this. I'm sure that on her part this was a natural manifestation of the nobility and generosity of her nature. I'm sure, too, that this was the real motivating factor for him. But I also suspect he was quite conscious of the dividends this brought him in terms of extra efforts from his staff.

There are different kinds of inspirational leadership. This particular kind might be striven for by almost any one in a position of leadership, even though his natural talents are far less than those of Mr. Truman. I commend it to the thoughtful consideration of executives everywhere as a possible means of getting more work, better work, and happier work from their organizations. But remember that one prerequisite for its success is that the man at the top has to work harder than any one else.

DEDICATION

Mr. Truman, from start to finish, regarded the office of President of the United States with enormous respect. He regarded his tenure there as a trust of the highest order. One does not think of him as being sanctimonious. He was not. At the same time, he was completely incapable of doing anything as President that he thought was wrong. The problems of the Presidency are so complicated and unprecedented that—for all of Mr. Truman's wisdom and talent for simplification—it was frequently difficult to tell what action was right and what was wrong in a particular situation; but what he thought was right was what he did.

He used to say to me, "Murph, I can't do that. It wouldn't be right." He didn't say, "I won't"; he said, "I can't." That was all the reason he gave and all the reason he needed. If I pressed him about some of these things, as I did on occasion, he would get more formal and call me "Murphy".

COURAGE

Much has been said about President Truman's courage. I do not know how much credit he is entitled to on this score. I've frequently heard that the highest form of courage is to be brave even when you are afraid. So far as I was able to tell, President Truman was never afraid of anything. So that leaves me with the philosophical question of how courageous a man can be if fear is absent from his make-up.

LEARNING

President Truman never stopped studying; he never stopped learning. As long as he was in the White House, he made a conscious and deliberate effort to learn how to be a better President. He was almost 61 years old when he came to the Presidency, almost 69 when he left it. But few men at any age have have such an intensive, productive and successful learning experience.

He learned by choice, not just as a byproduct of experience. Although he was by far the wisest and most knowledgeable man among the group that worked with and for him, he always kept trying to learn something from the rest of us. He made it extremely easy for his staff to tell him what they really thought—whether it was yes, no, or maybe. Harry Truman was not surrounded by yes men. We all knew who was boss, and we accepted his decisions and followed his orders. But we were encouraged to be both honest and candid in expressing our views.

I have heard, with some amusement, discussions of an alleged battle between liberals and conservatives for President Truman's mind. I would note first that he had a mind of his own and made it up for himself. And on most of the issues that usually distinguish liberals from conservatives in our political idiom, he was a liberal before he came to the White House and all the time he was there. His liberal views were based on much practical knowledge from earlier experiences and from his study of history, and he held them with deep conviction.

He was not distinctively a professing liberal. Indeed, he seemed to have some distaste for persons who flaunted their liberalism. But on the issues, there was never really any doubt in my mind about where he stood and was going to continue to stand. He always had within his official family a few conservatives whose views on social and economic issues differed sharply from his own. I asked him why he did this. His answer was essentially the same as these words of his in *Mr. President:*

"I like to have people understand each other, and that is why I have every shade of public opinion in my Cabinet.

"I have got a cross section of the thought and economics of the whole population of the United States in the Cabinet from left to right. And this makes for valuable discussions, and the only way you can get ideas. And I let everybody have his say before I come to a conclusion and decide on a final course of action."

I've even heard it said that President Truman was not aware of the battle for his mind that was going on around him. I think it would be closer to the truth to say he was drawing up the battle plans for both sides.

President Truman does not take the "liberal" point of view on every economic question. For example, he has an unshakable belief in the virtues of a balanced budget. He carried this belief with him when he left the White House. In 1963, President Kennedy recommended a tax cut when he did not expect it to result in a balanced budget. You may recall that President Truman, being in New York City at the time, was asked about this by a newspaperman on his morning walk—and replied that he did not think taxes should be cut until the budget was balanced. Understandably, this bothered President Kennedy, and he sent me to talk to President Truman about it. I did this. Finally, President Truman said that, although he would be extremely sorry to cause any trouble for President Kennedy, he could not change what he had said because that was what he believed; but, he said, he would try to keep quiet on the subject thereafter. I reported this to President Kennedy, and so far as I know, that ended the matter.

ORGANIZING THE PRESIDENCY

I spoke earlier about President Truman's orderliness. This was manifest also in his continuing and substantial moves to improve the organization of the Presidential office—the institutional aids to the Presidency. The need for this was brought home to him very sharply by the suddenness of his succession to the Presidency and the lack of preparation for the transition. I believe that he had seen President Roosevelt privately only three times, and very briefly, since his inauguration as Vice President, and that no provision had been made to keep him informed of matters in the Executive Branch. This was far less troublesome in the domestic field than in defense and foreign affairs because Mr. Truman's experience in the Senate gave him an intimate knowledge of domestic issues and problems.

In defense and foreign affairs, the new President felt his lack of current information very keenly. He did several things about this. First, he resolved to try to see that those who might succeed to the Presidency thereafter would be fully and currently briefed on defense and foreign affairs. He arranged such briefings for the man in line to succeed him in the event of death or disability, and in the campaigns of 1948 and 1952 arranged such briefings for the Republican candidates. This was a personal idea of Mr. Truman's. Next, when he first came to the White House, he set about studying day and night until he caught up on the information that was available. And soon he set about improving the machinery for gathering and evaluating information.

He puts it this way in *Mr. President:*

"One of the basic things I did was to set up a Central Intelligence Agency. Admirals Leahy and Souers, and the State, Defense, Treasury and Commerce Departments all helped me to set it up.

"Strange as it may seem, the President up to that time was not completely informed as to what was taking place in the world. Messages that came to the different departments of the executive branch often were not relayed to him because some official did not think it was necessary to inform the President. The President did not see many useful cables and telegrams that came from different American representatives abroad.

"I decided to put an end to this state of affairs.

"The Central Intelligence Agency now coordinates all the information that is available to the State Department, the Department of Defense, and the individual offices of the Army, Navy and Air Force, the Department of Commerce, and the Treasury. In this way I am able to get a concentrated survey of everything that takes place. If I need any elaboration I ask for it. I get a report from the Central Intelligence Agency every morning. In cases of emergency I got special reports. I get special reports on the situation in Korea throughout the day. I get a special report every day from the Secretary of State covering the entire diplomatic field. And once a week the director of the Central Intelligence Agency comes to see me and makes a personal report."

Next we should note the creation of the National Security Council as a major Presidential staff agency to provide continuing analysis and policy advice on defense-foreign policy-security matters. This became an extremely valuable aid to the President.

As I look back to consider who was President Truman's principal White House staff man in respect of defense and foreign policy, I conclude that he himself was that man. It also occurs to me somewhat ruefully that perhaps that is why his Presidency is so much more highly regarded in respect of foreign policy than in some other respects.

Intelligence reports were brought in each morning by the staff of the National Security Council and the President's Naval Aide, who spent about 30 minutes going over them with the President. Once each week, the Director of the CIA joined these meetings for a more extensive review. No other staff members were present.

The President met periodically with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Usually, no one else attended these meetings.

He met frequently with the Secretaries of State and Defense, together and separately. It was usually in these meetings that policy questions in the fields of defense and foreign policy were raised and settled. These Cabinet officers usually got "the word" first hand from the President himself.

No part of the civilian White House staff had a major and continuing responsibility for staff work in the defense-foreign policy fields such as apparently exists today. The National Security Council and its staff perhaps performed much of this function. Otherwise, White House staff was generally assigned to work on matters in these fields on an ad hoc basis. For example, one of my early assignments in 1947 was to work with General Lauris Norstad and Admiral Forrest Sherman in preparing the "Unification" bill which created the Department of Defense, the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board. Later that same year, I was assigned to work on drawing up the program of interim aid for Europe which preceded the Marshall Plan.

The special Counsel to the President received more assignments in the foreign policy and security fields than other White House staff because of his regular responsibility for the staff work on Presidential speeches and Messages to Congress. The President makes speeches and sends Messages on most of his major policies and actions. It follows that those who work on the speeches and Messages get a crack at almost everything. Frequently, the work went on at two levels—President to Cabinet Members, White House staff to departmental staff. This system worked pretty well, but sometimes with amusing side effects.

I remember once we had labored long on an important Message to Congress, through many drafts and many conferences, and finally met for the final "freezing session" with the President and Cabinet Members. General Marshall, who must have been Secretary of State at the time, and who had not participated in the earlier drafting sessions at the White House, pulled a document from his pocket and from time to time during the discussion would ask about including in the Message some language he would read from this document. After several of these interventions, Clark Clifford, who was then Special Counsel, said, "General, may I ask, what is that document from which you are reading?" General Marshall replied, with some emphasis, "It's a copy of the draft I sent to you as my recommendation as to what the Message should say." I'm afraid he thought his views had not been given "due process."

When I became Special Counsel, I got into the defense-foreign policy problems more deeply than before—largely by the speech-Message route. In fact, my initiation in 1950 was quite vigorous, with NSC 68 and Korea. This was a strenuous period that involved a basic redirection of our defense posture. A number of Messages were sent to Congress reporting on the situation in Korea and asking for additional legislation and appropriations. Toward the end of the year, the President was sending a Special Message requesting large new appropriations for defense. The need was urgent as well as large. At the staff level, we were struggling mightily. Our efforts reflected the decisions we had from above, but there were some critical gaps in these decisions. One was the amount of money to be requested. We could not get an estimate from the Department of Defense, and time was running out.

I was thoroughly persuaded by then that whatever we asked for would not be enough. So I filled in the blank space in the draft with the highest number I had heard anyone mention and sent it to General Marshall for clearance. His response was to send a message back to the President that he would like to know who was Secretary of Defense—Was it he or someone on the White House staff? But I got my number!

In the domestic field, President Truman delegated or assigned more responsibilities to members of his White House staff on a continuing basis. It is true that a line cannot be drawn to separate the assignments of all his staff members between domestic and foreign affairs. The Press Secretary, for example, obviously dealt with both. But I do tend to think of the organization of the staff predominantly in terms of domestic affairs.

President Truman held a staff meeting each morning at a quite civilized hour—9:30 as I recall. It lasted 30 minutes and was attended by some 10 or 12 staff members. The President had a "desk file" on his desk with one of the slots in it marked with the name of each of us. He would look through this and hand to each of us the papers from our respective slots. Then each man in a regular pecking order was given a turn to speak. This was mostly a quick noticing of current problems, arranging for later appointments, and the like. It moved quite rapidly with matters requiring lengthy discussion reserved for later. It kept all of us generally informed of the flow of current matters at the White House. There was always time for some humor in these meetings. And notwithstanding the fact we all felt somewhat as if we were living in the eye of a hurricane, these staff meetings were usually relaxed. In fact, as I look back, I think they may have been the most relaxed periods that most of us enjoyed during the day.

The Truman staff operated as staff rather than line officers. Cabinet Members and agency heads had direct access to the President as a matter of right and were not subject to orders of White House staff. The President insisted on dealing personally with the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers and other Executive Office unit heads, although his personal dealings were supplemented by much joint work at the staff level.

I believe that President Truman had his staff organized just about right in terms of having the right balance between definite, continuing responsibilities and flexibility to meet special problems, in terms of enough institutionalization but not too much, in terms of distributing responsibility among staff members so as to permit them to operate effectively but not tempt them unduly to try to build their own empires, and in terms of having the number of staff reporting directly to him being both manageable and diverse. Incidentally, President Truman was quite an ego deflator in a gentle way, and a couple of his staff were even more effective at this in a way that was not gentle at all.

During the Truman Administration there were also major changes in the parts of the President's staff that are in the Executive Office, but not in the White House Office itself. Notably, these included the establishment of the Council of Economic Advisers in 1946 and the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board in 1947. The latter was superseded later by the Office of Defense Mobilization to meet the exigencies of the Korean War.

In total, I believe that President Truman did so much to strengthen the institutional aids to the Presidential office it can properly be regarded as a "quiet revolution" of major proportions. Most of the reforms he instituted there appear to have endured. There have been subsequent changes, of course. I am not prepared to say whether all these changes are improvements or not. I believe that some of them are.

ORGANIZING BRAINS

Much has been said—and rightly so—about President Truman's great decisions. Nothing can account for the correctness of so many momentous decisions except his own ultimate wisdom and judgment. Nevertheless, he did have a technique for mobilizing brains, as well as facts, to help him reach decisions, and to help him plan for the future, which is worthy of more attention than it has received. I can do little more here than list some examples, but I hope this can be the subject of more extensive study.

1. How many of us would remember, for example, that before President Truman decided to drop the atomic bomb, he appointed a very distinguished civilian committee to study and advise him with respect to the moral and political issues involved as well as the military issues?

2. The critical decision in favor of civilian control of nuclear energy was reached with the advice of a distinguished committee that studied the question in great depth.

3. The ultimate commitment to the Marshall Plan was preceded by studies of three special committees as well as very extensive study within Government Departments and Agencies.

4. The decision to resist aggression in Korea was reached over the course of two days and night of most intensive discussions with the top civilian and military leaders of the Government—drawing upon all the knowledge, skills and judgment they possessed.

5. The order to relieve General MacArthur of his command was issued only after the President had discussed the matter for days with the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of Staff and had received their unanimous advice that the action was necessary.

Another group of examples of President Truman's techniques for organizing brains is represented by the commissions he appointed to study and make recommendations with respect to important national problems, and policies to deal with them in the future. These commissions included—

1. National Comission on Higher Education. (7/13/46. Chairman George F. Zook.)
2. Advisory Commission on Universal Training. (12/19/46)
3. President's Committee on Civil Rights. (January 1947)
4. President's Committee of Equality of Treatment and Opportunity in the Armed Forces. (July 26, 1948)
5. Commission on Migratory Labor. (6/3/50)
6. Advisory Committee on Management. (Report 12/18/52)
7. The President's Scientific Research Board. (10/17/46)
8. International Development Advisory Board. (11/24/50—Chairman Nelson Rockefeller)
9. President's Communications Policy Board. (2/17/50)
10. The President's Airport Commission. (2/20/52)
11. President's Commission on Immigration and Naturalization. (9/4/52—Chairman Philip B. Perlman)
12. President's Materials Policy Commission. (1/19/51—Chairman William S. Paley)
13. Water Resources Policy Commission. (1/ /50)
14. President's Commission on Health Needs of the Nation. (12/29/51—Chairman Dr. Paul B. Magnuson)

Although this list is not complete, it is impressive. I have long felt that the range of President Truman's studies and policy statements covered every topic of significance to the American Government—at least once. This feeling was strengthened when I ran across the Report of his Airport Commission—having in mind that I am at the moment a co-chairman of a Presidential task force and on the same subject. All of us could profit from a review of the reports of the study committees and commissions he appointed. His mobilization of this kind of talent for this purpose is clearly the work of a man who had his eyes on the future as well as the present.

THE ORDERLY TURNOVER

President Truman persisted in doing the right thing all the way to the end of his term. This included the "orderly turnover".

The day after the 1952 election, I received instructions from him from the train on which he was returning from Independence, where he had gone to vote, to begin to prepare for an orderly turnover of the Government to the Republicans. I must say that this was one time I was not very happy about his instructions. But I went to work on it nevertheless. He was right about it, of course.

A few days later, however, I did receive another set of instructions from him which gave us a more appealing assignment. This was to gather varied information with respect to statements by sundry persons in the recent campaign. The final instruction in that memorandum was to "Analyze Trumanism".

I have not been and probably never will be able to comply fully with that last mentioned directive. However, I hope that these remarks here today may be regarded as partial compliance.

SHOULD THERE BE A DECLARATION OF WAR IN VIETNAM?

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the range of objections to the depth of American involvement in the Vietnam war is taxing the limitations of freedom of speech. It is also taxing the patience of the vast majority of loyal and concerned Americans who deeply resent some of the untruthful, contemptible and even cowardly criticisms.

This is not to say that there is no room for constructive questioning of the extent of American involvement or of tactics sanctioned by the Johnson administration in Vietnam itself, but when socalled pacifists appear on university campuses to misrepresent, distort, and propagandize the Vietcong position, it is going too far.

At the University of New Hampshire recently such a situation took place in the appearance of one Barbara Deming who, as reported in the local press, told an assembled group that the North Vietnamese leader, Ho Chi Minh, had told her personally that North Vietnam has only two alternatives, to fight on or be slaves, and that "the Vietcong cause is a legitimate one."

Miss Deming asked her audience to refuse to pay income or telephone taxes, to support those who refuse to serve in the Army and to boycott war industries to show opposition to the war in Vietnam. Also, she physically demonstrated a so-called antipersonnel bomb, allegedly one of those directed at the civilian population by the American aggressors.

If this country were at war, such action would be treason. Should the mere fact that there has been no declaration of war make this much difference? I doubt it, for Vietnam, regrettably, has now exceeded the size and proportion of the Korean war.

Many constituents have asked me why this country has not declared war in Vietnam and why the Congress does not act to declare war and does not act to invoke time honored legal protection against sabotage, espionage, and subversion. In this connection I requested, and obtained, from the Department of State their answer to that question. This answer, in the form of a policy statement, for the information of those who are interested and concerned, is as follows:

THE QUESTION OF A FORMAL DECLARATION OF WAR IN VIETNAM

The question has been raised whether it would be desirable for the President to seek a formal declaration of war against North Viet-Nam. This question should be considered with respect to both international and domestic consideration.

INTERNATIONAL CONSIDERATION

From the international standpoint it seems undesirable to request a declaration of war for the following reasons:

1. The policy of the United States in Viet-Nam is to assist the Government of the Republic of Viet-Nam, at the latter's request, in thwarting an armed aggression from North Viet-Nam and to achieve a workable settlement of the dispute among the principal parties involved. This policy is pursued with limited aims, seeking to end the aggression against South Viet-Nam without threatening the destruction of North Viet-Nam, allowing a miscalculation by the enemy as to our intentions, or unnecessarily enlarging the scope of the conflict. The United States believes that the struggle must be won primarily in South Viet-Nam and is in that context a defensive military effort.

2. To declare war would add a new psychological element to the international situation, since in this century declaration of war have come to imply dedication to the total destruction of the enemy. It would increase the danger of misunderstanding of our true objectives in the conflict by the various Communist states, and increase the chances of their expanded involvement in it. Such a declaration would question the continued validity of the President's statements concerning his desire for a peaceful settlement allowing the various nations of the area, including North Viet-Nam, to live together in economic cooperation, and his reiteration that we do not threaten the existence of North Viet-Nam.

3. On balance, a declaration of war—which would be the first since the signing of the United Nations Charter—would significantly reduce the flexibility of the United States to seek a solution among extremely complex factors and reduce the chances that our adversary will take a reasoned approach to a solution, when US policy from the beginning has attempted to avoid closing off any possible avenue of resolution and to make the North Vietnamese more rather than less rational in the situation.

4. There is nothing in modern international law which requires a state to declare war before engaging in hostilities against another state; nor would a formal declaration of war impose any obligations on an enemy by which we would not otherwise be bound.

5. Absence of a formal declaration of war is not a factor which makes an international use of force unlawful. The only relevant legal question is whether the use of force is justified. Examples of hostilities begun without prior declaration of war abound in recent history. The fighting in Korea from 1950 to 1953, that in Indochina from 1947 to 1954, that in and around Suez Canal in 1956, and that in West New Guinea between the Dutch and Indonesians in the Spring and Summer of 1962 all took place without benefit of declarations of war. We are not aware that the absence of declarations of war in these cases has been alleged to constitute a violation of international law.

6. The legal rules of internatinal law concerning the conduct of armed conflicts apply to all armed conflicts without regard to the presence or absence of declarations of war. All that is required is armed conflict between two or more international entities. The 1949 Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims were specifically made applicable to any "armed conflict of an international character" between two or more of the parties. The rules of war embodied in the Hague Conventions formulated in the early years of this century are considered, in general, to be part of customary international law binding on all states, and their applicability is unrelated to declaration of war.

DOMESTIC CONSIDERATIONS

From the point of view of United States law it would be undesirable for the President to seek a declaration of war for the following reasons:

1. A declaration of war is not necessary either to authorize the actions that have been taken by the United States in Viet-Nam or to provide an expression of Congressional intent on the Vietnamese situation. The President has power under Article II, Section 2, of the Constitution as Commander-in-Chief to deploy United States military forces to Viet-Nam for the purpose of assisting South Viet-Nam to defend itself from armed aggression by North Viet-Nam. Since the Constitution was adopted, there have been at least 125 instances in which the President, without Congressional authority and in the absence of a declaration of war, has ordered the armed forces to take actions or to maintain positions abroad. Some of these historical instances have involved the use of United States forces in combat. Congressional intent

> is expressed by the Joint Resolution of Congress of August 7, 1964, passed by a combined vote of 504–2, explicitly approving all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, in the defense of freedom in Southeast Asia. A much fuller presentation of the views of the Executive Branch on the question of the President's Constitutional authority was published in February 1951, as a Joint Committee Print of the Senate Committees on Foreign Relations and Armed Services.
>
> 2. A declaration of war does not seem necessary in order to provide emergency authority to the Executive Branch. Many laws become operative in time of national emergency or in time of war. Most of these are operative today by virtue of the state of emergency proclaimed by President Truman in December 1950. These laws give the Executive Branch increased power to deal with the problems in Viet-Nam as well as other areas of the world. For example, they include special authority with respect to the movement of aliens in and out of the United States, the armed forces, reserves and the National Guard, procurement of material for the services, transactions in foreign exchange, government contracts, security and the protection of defense information, and defense transportation. A few emergency laws would not come into effect unless there were a declaration of national emergency or of war subsequent to the 1950 declaration of national emergency. However, there are only a few laws which can become operative only in time of war, and they have not been found necessary for the conduct of hostilities in Viet-Nam.

REPUBLICAN VIETNAM POLICY STATEMENT

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked, utterly amazed, and saddened to learn of a Republican staff policy statement pulling the rug from under General Westmoreland and our gallant men in Vietnam.

General Westmoreland appeared throughout the Nation urging unity and a determined resolve here at home to support our men in their struggle against Communist aggression, subversion, and terror.

The evil "political genius" behind the Republican policy statement blandly admitted it was a political blueprint for Republican candidates in 1968. This is cheap politics of the rankest order. It is politics at the expense of young lives in South Vietnam. It is reprehensible and indefensible. This policy statement supports the position of Dr. Martin Luther King and gives aid and comfort to the flag burners and the draft-card burners. It is welcome news in Hanoi, Peking, and Moscow. In a matter of hours it had top billing on Radio Hanoi and in Castro Cuba and throughout the Communist world. It will definitely encourage the Communists to fight longer and harder, thus killing and injuring more American boys.

I commend the distinguished Republican minority leader of the other body, Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, with whom I served in this House, for repudiating this policy of divide and conquer. I commend my distinguished friend, Senator JOHN TOWER, for repudiating this disastrous, ill-timed, and sinister recommendation.

Secretary Stimson and Secretary Knox—great Republicans—served in the Cabinet of President Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II and thus presented a united front to the world. That great Republican statesman, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, from Michigan, abandoned his isolationist views and supported our men on the battlefields of Europe in the air, on the seas, and on the islands of the Pacific. This united support in Washington enabled our men to move from victory to victory until the machines of fascism, nazism, and Japanese imperialism were crushed and destroyed.

As an American and, yes, as a Jeffersonian South Carolina Democrat, I supported the policy of Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower in southeast Asia. I supported John Foster Dulles' brinkmanship policy in Quemoy, Matsu, and in Vietnam.

We are in South Vietnam. We are actively engaged in heavy fighting, particularly in the north. The question is no longer debatable. There is "no substitute for victory." We must win conclusively in Vietnam. To win we need the united support of the North, the South, the East, and the West, of every nationality, creed, and political party.

The President is our Commander in Chief. He is guiding the ship of state. This is no time for political demagoguery. I urge my colleagues and my fellow Americans, regardless of party, not to throw sand in the gas tank and scuttle the whole ship of state. Let us unite for victory.

HEARINGS ON ECONOMIC EDUCATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Economic Committee has done pioneering work in many fields. I think one of the most interesting to me has been the recent set of hearings on economic education held by the Subcommittee on Economic Progress, of which I am honored to be chairman. I call these hearings to the attention of the Congress because an understanding of basic economic principles is vital to our public welfare. The complex relationships of our economy demand at least a rudimentary knowledge of economics if our people are to make sensible choices both as voters and as private citizens.

The hearings were undertaken pursuant to Senate Resolution 316 of the 89th Congress, second session, submitted by the Senator from Louisiana, Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, on October 19, 1966, which was considered and agreed to. It states:

> *Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the Joint Economic Committee . . . as a part of its continuing responsibility for study of matters relating to the Economic Report should (1) conduct a detailed study of the adequacy of practices in economic education followed at all school levels and in adult training; and (2) make findings and recommendations on the adequacy and objectivity of any curriculum relating to economic practices, leadership, and forces, and on the necessity and feasibility of large-scale Federal and private aid aimed at improving the skills of teachers and school administrators in the use of new technology for the dissemination of economic understanding at all levels, including adult education.

The objectives of the hearings were fourfold: First, to consider the reasons for the need for economic education; second, to determine the extent of economic education; third, to review public and private programs which promote economic education; and fourth, to determine whether the Federal Government was making an adequate effort in this field.

In assessing the reasons for the need for economic education, we were fortunate to have the testimony of two of the most knowledgeable Members of Congress in economic matters—Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, sponsor of the resolution and chairman of the Senate Finance Committee; and Representative WILBUR D. MILLS, the distinguished chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee. Each of these men stressed the complexity of the issues involved in the legislation their committees have considered in recent years, and the increasing importance of economic education for wise policy formulation. As Senator LONG stated:

> Virtually all the Government's operations affect the economy in some way. As Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I find that it is difficult to trace all the economic effects of proposals for taxes and expenditures. And if it is difficult even for those of us who work with these matters from day to day, how much more difficult is it then for those of our citizens who strive to make informed decisions on matters of economic policy?

I would like to emphasize this point from my own experience with the Banking Committee. The problems we consider are so complex, that even after 20 years on the committee I and my colleagues find that it is often difficult to fully weigh all the implications of policy proposals. Just think how confusing economic issues must be to the voter who has had no training on economics.

Yet, as Representative MILLS stressed in his testimony, the success of our policies will depend upon the voters. As he stated:

> Voters as well as legislators must understand the relation between the Government's fiscal policy and the functioning of the economy if they are to form reasoned judgments concerning policy proposals, and vote in accordance with their own best interests.

Obviously, Members of Congress must receive the support of voters to pursue the appropriate economic policies.

And the need for economic education is equally great for the citizen in the proper management of his private affairs. As a consumer and as a businessman, the individual must have a knowledge of basic economic principles if he is to participate successfully in our complex economy, and if he is to realize the effect that his decisions have upon others.

During our second day of hearings we received excellent testimony from distinguished representatives of business, labor, and agriculture. Each of these men stressed the importance of economic education in private decisionmaking as well as in public policy decisions. Our witnesses included Mr. Marvin Bower, managing director, McKinsey & Co.; Mr. Nathaniel Goldfinger, director of research, AFL–CIO; and Mr. W. E. Hamilton, director of research, American Farm Bureau Federation. I would like to quote briefly from their statements.

Mr. Marvin Bower:

> As an international management consultant to both business and government in this country and in Europe—and as a student of management—I have an unusual opportunity to observe and analyze how people make economic decisions. As a result, I have developed a deep conviction about the importance of economic understanding to every citizen, businessman, farmer, labor leader, government official, lawmaker—to everybody. . . .
>
> The Business community bears a particular responsibility for fostering economic education. A business organization benefits greatly from economic understanding and suffers quickly and severely from laws and economic and social forces that impair productivity, reduce competition, and dull the profit motive.

Mr. Nathaniel Goldfinger:

> Organized labor and collective bargaining need their "fair day" in the court of elementary and secondary school education. So do the realities of the economic world around us. And the students of elementary and secondary schools need such education, too—for a more adequate preparation for their own lives as adults in a world of vast and swift change.

Mr. W. E. Hamilton:

> Agriculture probably has suffered more than any other industry from an imperfect understanding of fundamental economic facts. If farmers and the general public had had a better understanding of economics, I am confident that we would have avoided farm programs which were destined to price our products out of important markets, misallocate resources, stimulate the production of competitive products, and pile up unwanted surpluses.

The importance of economic education for the individual in his every day decisions was also emphasized by Dr. Hugh G. Pyle, assistant director, Adult Education Association of the U.S.A. In his testimony, he stated:

> It has not been many years since economic life in America was a relatively simple existence. The typical adult who had mastered his 3 R's and who was blessed with a normal supply of common sense and physical strength, could expect to work out his economic problems with little help from the outside. But this simple life and pioneer isolation no longer characterizes one's economic existence. Economic problems, both personal and political, crowd upon all of us—problems that are bewildering and complex. . . .
>
> Despite the activities carried on by many agencies and the mass of publications having to do with economic education, economic illiteracy continues to be widespread. A large percentage of small businesses fail because they violate sound economic principles; individuals and families fail to budget wisely; unprofitable investments are made, and our citizens generally have limited insight into the many economic problems they face daily.

Thus, Dr. Pyle brings us to the crux of the problem. All of our witnesses unanimously agreed that there were compelling reasons for the need for widespread economic education today. Yet, the evidence shows that we are falling seriously behind in meeting this need. Congressman MILLS outlined the problem as follows:

> If an adequate background in economics is to be provided our voting citizens, it must be provided in the high schools. Only a minority of the country's high school graduates go on to college and only a fraction of those who do graduate from college ever take a course in economics.
>
> This is where the problem lies, for instruction in economics is concentrated at the college level and therefore fails to reach a large majority of the population, and in order for them to have an understanding of the problems they must do this study on their own.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Professors Bach and Saunders have concluded that 80 or 90 percent of high school graduates today have taken not one course in economics. While more high schools, particularly those in the large school systems, now offer a separate course in economics, very few require that students take the course.

Not only does the instruction of economics reach far too few students, but the quality of the instruction is very often inadequate. Congressman MILLS' statistics on the economics preparation of high school teachers are quite startling:

> Only 4 percent of the high school economics teachers and principles of democracy teachers majored in economics in college. Ten percent of them actually took no economics courses in college and an additional 32 percent took only one or two courses.

Several other witnesses underscored these facts.

Leon M. Shur, director, Center for Economic Education, University of Wisconsin, gave us some examples from the results of the test of economic understanding, which was prepared by the Joint Council on Economic Education. The following question was asked of a nationwide group of high school seniors who had not taken a separate course in economics:

> Inflation is most likely to benefit (a) savings bank depositors; (b) debtors; (c) life insurance policyholders; (d) persons living on fixed pensions?

The answer, of course, is (b) debtors. But 55 percent of the students missed the question. Another example which really hit home for me was the response of social studies teachers to a test question. This question concerned the power of commercial banks to create demand deposits. Sixty percent of the teachers did not believe that this power should be regulated. This is shocking, for in effect these teachers said we should have no monetary policy or control over the use of the Government's credit including the volume and distribution of money.

Other witnesses gave examples of the inadequacy of textbooks. Mr. Goldfinger, for example, cited a study which showed that high school textbooks "often invite, encourage, and even demand an anti-labor position from the reader." The study found that strikes are usually portrayed as exceedingly violent and accomplishing nothing.

The role of unions as political activists and instigators of socioeconomic legislation was adequately described by only two of the 18 history textbooks studied, and by only one-third of the government and problems books. Adequate definitions of such words as "injunction," "arbitration," and "closed shop," were seldom given. Clearly, we must be concerned not only with the numbers receiving economic education, but with the objectivity of that education as well, and it appears that we are falling seriously short on both counts.

In his excellent testimony, Dr. Duesenberry, member of the Council of Economic Advisers, emphasized the seriousness of the situation in quite a startling statement. He said:

> College instructors traditionally have preferred beginning students who received no economics instruction in high school because there was less need to uproot misconceptions and misinformation.

His testimony also pointed out the importance of economic education for those responsible for the news accounts in our mass media. For it is through these accounts that most people obtain their economic knowledge. This was one example he used to illustrate the need for economic education in varying degrees of intensity and the need for more people with economics training at each level. This includes professional economists as well.

Dr. Duesenberry emphasized a point I well know from my own experience as chairman of the Joint Economic Committee and the House Banking Committee—it is difficult to hire professional economists even when you have enough money. There are just not enough economists to meet the demand for their services by the educational community, the Government, and private business. So all of this testimony indicates that more and better economic education is needed and at all levels of expertise.

This is not to say that nothing is being done. We received impressive testimony about the efforts of various private groups and the programs being introduced into various school systems. Most impressive is the work being carried on by the Joint Council on Economic Education. Their fine work was mentioned by many witnesses, and we were most fortunate to hear from the council's president, Dr. M. L. Frankel. At present the council is the only one of its kind in the world. It is an independent, nonprofit organization which was incorporated in 1949 to encourage and improve education in our Nation's schools. It is widely supported by leaders of business, organized labor, farm groups, as well as economists, educators, foundations, and other groups. It has a network of 45 regional, State, and local councils in 31 States. Dr. Frankel gave us extensive information about the activities of the council, especially its recent 5-year program, the development economic education program—DEEP.

Representative Mills told us about the success of the program of the Arkansas Council on Economic Education, which is affiliated with the joint council. In 1966, Arkansas teachers won 11 of 52 national awards. I certainly hope that all of you will read Representative Mills' testimony about the Arkansas program of which he is rightly very proud. I believe the printed record will be available for distribution shortly.

We were also fortunate to hear from several distinguished educators about the programs undertaken by their schools. We heard from Mr. Lyle Stewart, assistant superintendent of public schools, Seattle, Wash.; Mrs. Vincent Patrick, coordinator of economic education, Tulsa public schools, Tulsa, Okla.; and Mr. Leon M. Shur, director, Center for Economic Education, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.

Dr. Lawrence Senesh, professor of economic education, Purdue University, presented a very interesting statement about the possibilities of teaching economics beginning in the first grade. During the last 8 years, he has been creating a curriculum which would incorporate economic concepts in the instruction of all grades with increasing depth and complexity. Certainly there is much room for work in this field, and Dr. Senesh is making a greatly needed contribution.

The Federal Government has several programs which support and encourage economic education, and these efforts are being expanded.

We received testimony from Dr. John T. Wilson, Deputy Director, National Science Foundation; and Dr. Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Dr. Wilson described the support which the Foundation gives to economics in basic research, in education, in international activities, in the provision of computers and other facility support, and in the assessment of activities in economics. Dr. Howe explained the programs of the Office of Education in the area of economic education. These include programs under the National Defense Education Act which provide educational materials to school systems and teacher training institutes in economics. The Office supports a graduate fellowship program for economics students, and in the area of vocational education does a great deal with consumer education. It also encourages high schools to improve programs in consumer education. And support is given through research grants for the development of curriculum materials in economics. All of these programs are greatly needed.

Mr. Speaker, despite these fine efforts by both public and private groups, it is clear that much needs to be done if we are to have an adequate program of economic education in this country. Many of our witnesses proposed additional Federal support for economic education. The subcommittee hopes that it will be able to hold additional hearings to further consider these and other proposals and to make recommendations to the Congress.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize again the importance of economic education, and to urge all of you to read the testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Economic Progress, which should be available for distribution shortly. I insert the hearing schedule in the Record at this point:

Members of the Subcommittee on Economic Progress of the Joint Economic Committee

REPRESENTATIVES

Wright Patman (D. Tex.), Chairman.
Martha W. Griffiths (D. Mich.).
William S. Moorhead (D. Penn.).
Thomas B. Curtis (R. Missouri).
W. E. Brock 3d (R. Tenn.).

SENATORS

William Proxmire (D. Wisc.).
J. W. Fulbright (D. Ark.).
Herman E. Talmadge (D. Georgia).
Len B. Jordan (R. Idaho).
Charles H. Percy (R. Ill.).

Schedule of Hearings—Economic Education in the United States, April 14, 17, and 21

THE NATIONAL NEED FOR ECONOMIC EDUCATION

Friday, April 14, 10 a.m., Room AE–1, the Capitol (Atomic Energy Hearing Room).

Senator Russell B. Long, United States Senate.

Representative Wilbur D. Mills, United States House of Representatives.

Chairman Gardner Ackley, Council of Economic Advisers.

THE COMMUNITY VIEWS THE IMPORTANCE OF ECONOMIC EDUCATION

Monday, April 17, 10:00 a.m., Room AE–1, the Capitol.

Business: Marvin Bower, Managing Director, McKinsey & Co., Inc., New York.

Labor: Nathaniel Goldfinger, Director of Research, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations.

Agriculture: W. E. Hamilton, Director of Research, American Farm Bureau Federation.

Academic: Lawrence Senesh, Professor of Economics, Purdue University.

ECONOMIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Friday, April 21, 10:00 a.m., Room AE–1, the Capitol.

National Programs: M. L. Frankel, President, Joint Council on Economic Education.

State Programs: Leon M. Shur, Director, Wisconsin Council on Economic Education.

School Systems: Norman Hamilton, Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction, Portland, Oregon, Public Schools.

Classroom Instruction: Mrs. Vincent Patrick, Coordinator of Economic Education, Tulsa, Oklahoma, Public Schools.

Adult Education: Eugene I. Johnson, Executive Director, Adult Education Association of the U.S.A.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS IN ECONOMIC EDUCATION

Friday, April 21, 2:00 p.m., Room AE–1, the Capitol.

Harold Howe II, U.S. Commissioner of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

John T. Wilson, Deputy Director, National Science Foundation.

SVETLANA STALIN

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are many unanswered questions over the defection of Svetlana Stalin and it is apparent that in order to minimize the irritation felt by Soviet dictators the State Department is doing everything to downgrade the significance of her defection. I insert into the Record at this point as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the April 15 issue of the Ukrainian Bulletin, a responsible publication vitally interested in developments behind the Iron Curtain:

Svetlana Stalin: A Symbol of East-West "Detente"

The defection to the West of Svetlana Stalin, the only daughter of the once powerful Soviet dictator, Joseph Stalin, and the ensuing development of her frantic search for political asylum in the "freedom-loving" West serves to symbolize some important and vital truths.

An obvious one is: conditions must still be bad indeed in the Soviet Union when the daughter of the once feared and omnipotent Stalin cannot find the "Soviet paradise" comfortable enough to live in.

And a less obvious but more important one: in our refusing her asylum here, the question is raised as to what depths of abasement and unprincipled compromise can we descend in quest of relaxation of tension and peaceful coexistence with the Russian and Eastern European Communist regimes?

THE SLOW "MELLOWING" PROCESS

The escape of Svetlana Stalin from the Soviet prison of nations points up a number of important lessons to be learned by our policymakers, our mass-media and our psychological warfare experts. For the lady defector is not just "anybody" from the USSR who has braved the prospect of an uncertain and perhaps hazardous life in the West.

Miss Stalin was somebody in the Soviet Union; her name alone sufficed. Although never politically involved, as reports indicate, nonetheless she was a daughter of Stalin, who lives on in many Russian hearts. Even if she were harassed by vengeful Commissars, her life, from all indications, was not in danger. Even Khrushchev, who could not but have made scores of enemies in his double-dealing life, is evidently unmolested. Miss Stalin undoubtedly led a quiet life with two teen-age children in Moscow, working as a translator in a publishing house. In fact, her children were completely bewildered when they learned of their mother's defection in India, so sedentary was her existence.

And yet she defected.

In our opinion she had had enough of the upside-down character of Soviet life, its hyprocrisy, the unease which pervades every man's actions, even his thoughts.

One lesson herefrom is that the "mellowing process" in the USSR has not mellowed anything discernibly. Optimistic reports that have been flooding the West of "great changes" taking place behind the Iron Curtain are to be consigned to limbo. Such reports emanate from some of our diplomatic emissaries. More often they stem from our traditionally "innocent" tourists abroad who, after spending a few days shopping, return with knowledgeable tales of what they have seen and done—in the company of Intourist intelligence agents and operatives.

Of course, alleviation of some of the more oppressive and inhumane features of Communist rule in the USSR and the satellite countries, especially some reduction of police terror and in forced deportations of non-Russian patriots to Siberia, is a matter of record. Recent nationalist overtones in public utterances made by some Soviet leaders indicate that, if not the "socialist democracy" it pretends to be, the regime now allows people to speak up once in a while.

Yet two important incidents concerning U.S. citizens should not be either forgotten or dismissed: the arrest and murder of Newcomb Mott and the kidnapping of Vladimir Komarek-Kazan from a Soviet commercial plane. Here are Soviet political "reflexes" in typical action, giving the lie to any "evolution to freedom" behind the Iron Curtain.

If one expects to find any real change as regards political rights, freedom of thought, freedom of movement, the right to work, freedom of religion and forced labor, he is in for a shocking surprise. The mailed first merely has been gloved.

One need only recall that in 1965–66 over 70 writers, poets, literary critics and other members of the Ukrainian intelligentsia were arrested, tried and sentenced in Ukraine for daring to show nonconformity to the party rule and for their resistance to the cultural Russification of Ukraine. In Poland young professors and intellectuals are being tried for their opposition to Communist regimentation. The same melancholy process goes on in Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria. Freedom of movement remains rigidly restricted, especially in the Baltic States and Ukraine. In the satellite states travel documents may be denied applicants if the state believes the trip "would not be in harmony with state interests."

As far as "freedom of religion" is concerned, the Soviet government as well as the Communist regimes in the satellite countries are doing everything they can to discourage worship, to the point of punishing people for religious practices. There are too many examples of this gross violation of human rights to be cited here.

Soviet deportations of recalcitrant non-Russian nationals have been reduced but not stopped. These deportations are an infallible instrument of Soviet policy whereby it reduces anti-Russian opposition in the non-Russian countries such as Ukraine, Byelorussia, the Baltic States and the like, and serves at the same time to increase the Russian ethnic element in the same countries, thereby strengthening Russian Communist rule over them.

All these policies are in direct violation of the U.N. Charter and the U.N. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, signed in 1948 by the USSR and other Communist states of Eastern Europe.

WHAT OF OUR BOAST OF FREEDOM?

Currently the American press, TV and radio media are righteously attacking the CIA for its financing of a number of American youth organizations in their anti-Communist work. But the same media persist in ignoring the plight of the captive nations, thus revealing both moral and political short-sightedness. What distresses them is that the "American image" has been "distorted" by the operations of the CIA, which did not ask for this particular job in the first place.

To our mind, what did distort our image as a beacon of freedom was refusal by our officials to admit Miss Stalin, or Mrs. Alliluyeva, for fear of "upsetting" present Soviet-American relations.

This was confirmed by State Department officials:

"According to officials, a final decision not to admit her to the United States has not yet been made by the Administration. For the indefinite future, however, the Administration, in the interests of promoting good United States-Soviet relations, would prefer that she not come to the United States . . ." (Cf. *The New York Times*, March 15, 1967).

We can imagine what would happen if the situation were reversed, if, say, a Miss Truman, a Miss Eisenhower, or a Miss Kennedy would defect to any Communist country! The Soviet Government does not hesitate to make much ado over even insignificant defectors from the West, for it knows that propaganda-wise defection is a powerful psychological weapon against "capitalism."

We talk loudly about our dedication to freedom, but we fail to act out our dedication. We can possibly claim acting like humanitarians—for when the Hungarian freedom fighters, who believed in our talk, finally straggled over the frontiers of their besieged country, did we not promptly feed and clothe them?

One of these days, perhaps not far off in the future, we may find to our consternation that our ideal of freedom, unexercised and more and more unappreciated, shall have ceased to exist at all.

Mr. Speaker, it would be in the national interest for the House Foreign Affairs Committee to conduct a practical review of this entire case so that we could ascertain the fundamental policy and purpose of the State Department on major defections of this nature.

FOLLOWING THE PARTY LINE

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, anyone who has been following Communist publications here in the United States is aware that a current tactic of the CPUSA is to merge the anti-Vietnam movement with the civil rights issue. For instance, the People's World, a Communist newspaper, on April 15 stated:

> The most influential spokesmen of the nation's ghettos now oppose the war, and perceive the need for vigorously fusion of the civil rights and anti-war movements.

Various Negro leaders are well aware that merging the two issues is a Communist tactic, would be detrimental to the advancement of civil rights, and have accordingly opposed this proposal. One glaring exception is the case of Dr. Martin Luther King who, unfortunately, has fallen for this Communist tactic completely. Although he denied any attempt to combine the two issues, he was reported by the press on April 23 as calling for a "Vietnam summer" in which he "expected to use a trained field staff of about 200 workers from the civil rights and peace movements."

I wonder how many of the Negro soldiers now in Vietnam and doing such a fine job would go along with Dr. King's statement that the Vietcong is "the only party in real touch with the peasants." I wonder how closely Dr. King has studied the public record of atrocities committed against these peasants by the same Vietcong. It will be interesting to hear what Dr. King's answers will be when Negro soldiers with firsthand experiences in Vietnam return with the true facts of Vietcong brutalities.

For several years Rev. Daniel Lyons, S.J., was in charge of a Negro mission and is certainly familiar with, and solicitious toward the problems of the American Negro. I would venture to say that, judging from his May 7 column in Our Sunday Visitor, a Catholic publication which is the largest national Catholic weekly, he is just about fed up with Dr. King's support for the Vietcong. Father Lyons, as I have pointed out before, has been to Vietnam twice at the request of the Defense Department and has coauthored a book, "Vietnam Crisis," which deals extensively with the Vietnam problem. I include his column of May 7, 1967, in the RECORD at this point:

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(By Father Daniel Lyons, S.J.)

On my many visits to Vietnam I often wondered why Dr. King was so indifferent to the fate of the 15 million people there. He has repeatedly complained about our defense of the Vietnamese people because it "costs a lot of money," and he wants the money to go into the poverty program here at home. With these thoughts in mind I went to see this famous Christian leader when he spoke at the Riverside Church on April 14, in New York City. I was never more shocked in my life.

Dr. King preached the straight Communist line. In elaborating on "the madness of Vietnam," Dr. King praised Ho Chi Minh as the only true leader of the Vietnamese people. He condemned the United States as "the greatest purveyor of violence in the world today." He called Ho Chi Minh an independent democratic leader, and condemned the late President Diem as "one of the most vicious modern dictators." "We may have killed a million, mostly children," he said. I wondered when he dug up the strange statistics. He obviously crossed the line between responsible dissent and irresponsible divisiveness. Everyone would like to see the war ended, but Dr. King's five-point proposal simply amounts to surrender. Of course we can give up, but that would solve nothing. It would merely lead to more and bigger wars, as did our peace treaty over Laos in 1962, when we trusted Ho Chi Minh and his promises.

Dr. King praised the Viet Cong as "the only party in real touch with the peasants." He charged that "none of the things we claim to be fighting for are really involved . . . We have no honorable intentions in Vietnam . . . Our minimal expectation is to occupy it as an American colony . . . We are on the side of the wealthy . . . Our war is against the people of Vietnam . . . We must all protest . . . Only Marxism has the revolutionary spirit . . . If we are to get on the right side of the world revolution, we as a nation must undergo a radical revolution of values."

Dr. King condemned our defense of South Vietnam as a "tragic attempt at re-colonization." He urges that strong protests should be made about the governments of Guatemala and Peru, Thailand and Cambodia, Mozambique and South Africa. He urged that committees should be formed to cooperate with revolutionaries in those six countries. Anyone familiar with Communist designs knows that he could not have picked countries that the Communists are more anxious to take over.

The following week the noted SNCC, the "non-student, violent coordinating committee," brought Stokely Carmichael to Birmingham, Alabama, where he told the students: "To hell with the laws of the United States." Meanwhile, CORE, the Congress of Racial Equality, ran half-page ads saying: "Vietnam is a tough problem, but De Gaulle faced a far tougher problem in Algeria. But he had the guts to face the problem. He lost Algeria." It really takes courage to surrender!

For several years, as a seminarian, I was in charge of a Negro mission. I am as anxious as anyone to see the Negro progress. But I cannot understand how Catholic people, and especially priests and nuns can continue to back such groups as SNCC and CORE, or get behind such persons as Martin Luther King. They are disloyal to their country and traitors to their people. Surely the Negroes in America deserve better leadership than this!

MORE AMMUNITION FOR MINK IMPORT CONTROL

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, having introduced legislation to protect American mink farmers from the price-depressing deluge of mink imports, I was disturbed to note another article which indicates the extent to which our producers are being shortchanged by mink import promotions.

If there is no objection, I hereby insert this pertinent and timely article from the current issue of Northeastern Mink Farmer in the Record at this point:

Give Us Help, Not Opposition

From time to time we read in our trade papers and in the public press of the help which foreign governments give to their mink producers both in the field of production and in the promotion of their export sales.

We are aware of the fact that every country apparently wants to build up its exports and cut down on imports. And so, in their own self interest, the mink producing countries periodically send their royal princes and princesses, dukes and duchesses to America to preside at fashion functions, teas, and give awards for pushing their products. And why not? One expects a government to promote the interests of its people.

When Canada Mink Breeders decided to expand their export trade, they held receptions for members of the fur trade and the fashion press in leading European cities and in New York. The support which they received from their government would fill American mink farmers with envy. Not only did their government permit the use of the Canadian coat of arms on the engraved invitations, but the gatherings in many instances were held in the Canadian consulate or embassy. Where this was not possible, members of the consular staff often acted as hosts. Such help and cooperation must have warmed the hearts of every Canadian rancher and everyone connected with the Canadian fur trade.

Now we wonder how our government's help in the promotion of American mink—acknowledged to be the world's finest—compares? What about *our* ambassadors, commercial attachés, consuls general, and so on? Do they do as much for us, the American taxpayer-mink producer?

Item. In a show for a famous charity in London, representatives of a number of embassies turned out, *but no one from the American Embassy.*

Item. In Paris there was a big American mink show in the Hotel Crillon. Although invited, nobody came from the American Embassy *which is situated next door.*

Item. In another country the U.S. authorities, when advised of the forthcoming plans for a prestige fur show six months later, warned that they were too busy and did not attend such functions and that no official notice could be taken of the event. However, the spokesman did say, ". . . but one of us might come in a private capacity—but it's completely unofficial you know."

These things have hurt. They have also caused us to question just *why* these people were there if not to protect and promote the interests of Americans in that area.

Then on February 6, 1967 came the biggest shocker of all. We were stunned to read in Fur Age Weekly the unbelievable headline: "American Ambassador Entertains U.S. Buyers at Saga Mink Sales." The story was of a reception given by Mrs. Elkus White, our Ambassador to Denmark, to buyers attending the sales of our most formidable competitors. The report stated: "This was an unprecedented gesture by an American Ambassador and was in honor of the large number of American fur merchants who travel regularly to attend the Saga auctions in Scandinavia. The guest list at the Embassy also included members of the International Diplomatic Corps as well as fur buyers from Canada, all of the European countries and even from as far off as Australia who were in Copenhagen to attend the Danish and Finnish mink sales."

Sadly we cry, "With friends like this we don't need enemies."

It is hard to believe that our government's representatives would go so far to thwart the interests of U.S. ranchers and voters, especially in view of the President's desire to stop the dollar drain. We cannot object to American buyers traveling abroad to purchase cheaper foreign mink despite exhortations from Washington to buy U.S. products, which are of better quality and in good supply. But we should fight tooth and nail this destructive action by an embassy of our country.

Year after year we have watched our foreign competitors expand their mink production at a fantastic rate only to dump the bulk of their production in the U.S.A. Since 1950 U.S. ranched mink production increased four fold, but in 1966 *imports* of Scandinavian mink pelts into this country were more than 10½ times the entire *production* of Scandinavian mink in 1950 and represented 77% of all imports.

Nor were our export figures compensating for this deluge of imports. While our embassy people were encouraging our competitors and bluntly refusing to attend our own promotions abroad, we exported to all countries one fourth as many pelts as Scandinavia alone shipped into our home market *free of duty* and free of restrictions of any kind. It is safe to say that whatever has been done to improve the export of American mink and develop markets abroad has been accomplished entirely on our own without the slightest interest or support from the one area which we should expect to show both—our embassy, consular and commercial people who, if the Copenhagen Embassy is any criterion, are too busy helping our competition.

Cruelly burdened with spiralling taxes, prohibitive labor costs, constantly rising costs of production, American mink ranchers, struggling for their economic lives, have been forced out of business by the hundreds by this market-breaking flood of imports.

We've heard Washington's pleas to citizens to stop the dollar drain, build up exports, buy U.S. products, etc., and we are heartily in favor of all this. We believe these things to be in the best interest of all our people.

We know that when we go abroad we can bring back only one bottle of Scotch duty free instead of the five formerly allowed us. We are quite content to bear with the $100 exemption on foreign purchases instead of the $500 allowance of just a few years ago. If it's to help and protect our native industries and help stabilize the balance of payments, we're all for it. But while we're supporting our government and paying the bills, we don't expect our State Department or any branch of it to sabotage our industry.

RESOLUTION URGING THAT CONGRESS REPEAL THE 7-PERCENT EXCISE TAX ON AUTOMOBILES

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I have just received from the secretary of the senate of the State of Michigan a copy of Senate Resolution 69, adopted unanimously on April 20, 1967, urging that Congress repeal 7-percent excise tax on automobiles.

As one who has fought for the repeal of this tax for many years and who reintroduced legislation for this purpose on the opening day of the 90th Congress I am very much gratified to learn of this expression of full support. The resolution urges and implores Congress "to take immediate action to repeal the excise tax on automobiles thus erasing this equitable burden and giving a lift to the bellwether of the U.S. economy." The case for repeal could not be more succinctly put.

In 1965 the President signed into law legislation that would redress this tax inequity, calling it "an unfair burden on many businesses and workers who produce the commodities singled out for excise taxation." However, just a few months later the President asked for a 2-year extension of these taxes. They are now scheduled for reduction during fiscal 1968. Of course, there is no guarantee that the President will not ask for a further extension. Mr. Speaker, the time is long overdue for this administration to get its fiscal house in order; to exercise some real restraint on Federal spending; to abandon its disruptive accelerate-brake, accelerate-brake approach to the economy; and to keep its promises about tax reform.

Under unanimous consent I include the resolution at this point in the Record:

Michigan Senate Resolution 69

A resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the automobile excise tax

Whereas the automobile industry in its primary and related activities accounts for thirty percent of our nation's economic activity; and

Whereas the automobile industry bears an inequitable burden in the payment of a seven percent excise tax; and

Whereas the automobile industry has suffered declines in sales at unexpected rate this year; now therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the United States Congress is urged and implored to take immediate action to repeal the excise tax on automobiles thus erasing this inequitable burden and giving a lift to the bellwether of the United States economy; and be it further

Resolved by the Senate, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the president of the United States Senate, the speaker of the United States House of Representatives and to each member of the Michigan delegation to Congress.

Adopted by the Senate, April 20, 1967.

Beryl I. Kenyon,
Secretary of the Senate.

DESECRATION OF THE FLAG

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, recent demonstrations against American foreign policy in Southeast Asia have taken a shameful turn. Misguided as I believe these protestors to be, there is no question that they have the constitutional right to speak out against our policy and to demonstrate for a change, even though I think these demonstrations are a gross disservice to our fighting men, and may well cause our enemies to miscalculate our resolute decision for victory in Vietnam. Finding their protests unheeded, however, the anti-Vietnam war demonstrators have disgracefully turned to physically attacking and destroying revered symbols of their own country.

It is strange indeed to see on the same day, in the same newspapers, pictures of American young men facing danger and death in Vietnam, and pictures of other American young men burning their Nation's flag in the safety of an American park. Certainly the Bill of Rights was never intended to protect those who would contemptuously set fire to the American flag.

What the desecrators refuse to realize is that by their acts they are undermining the very system that assures them the freedom to dissent. The flag, since the beginning of this Nation, has been fought for as the cherished symbol to preserve our unique way of life and to save for even these demonstrators, the right of free speech. The flag is the property of all Americans—dead, living, and yet to be born. Hundreds of thousands have died on the battlefield for it and do so today. To allow this rabble to trample on it is to condone an obscene insult to these brave Americans. In prohibiting this desecration we are not destroying free speech, for those who are so compelled remain free to protest, we are simply preventing the deliberate destruction of a sacred symbol that belongs to the entire people.

One of the greatest strengths of this Nation is the right of dissent. This right was established by our Founding Fathers and must remain inviolate. However, the right of dissent from particular policies or with particular individuals never was intended to sanction the desecration of the American flag, which is the symbol of our national heritage and unites all Americans in their allegiance "To the Republic for which it stands."

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that every State in the Union prohibits desecration of the flag by statute so that we are not creating anything new. The flag, however, is a national symbol and surely should have national protection. I hope that the Congress will swiftly act on this bill and punish those who insult the honor and dignity of the United States.

The bill I have referred to is as follows:

H.R. 9684

A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 3 of title 4, United States Code, is amended by designating the first sentence thereof as subsection (a) and the second sentence thereof as subsection (c), and by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

"(b) Whoever publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, defies, tramples upon or casts contempt, either by word or act, upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States shall be punished by imprisonment of not more than one year and a fine of not more than $1,000."

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking out "herein" and inserting in lieu thereof "in this section".

BETTER EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS, GREATER ACCESS TO THE WORLD'S INFORMATION SOURCES FOR AMERICANS—THE BEIRUT AND FLORENCE AGREEMENTS: WHAT THEY DO AND HOW THEY WORK

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article by Tariff Commissioner Dan H. Fenn, Jr., in the April 1967 edition of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's magazine American Education, clearly describes two 1966 legislative accomplishments in the educational and cultural field. These accomplishments were implementation of the Beirut and Florence agreements which were put into effect on January 12 this year. Commissioner Fenn's article, imaginatively titled "Treasures Without Tariffs," explains what these agreements as implemented by law and regulations will mean to Americans.

There has been some concern, which is recognized in Commissioner Fenn's article, that the regulations regarding the duty-free importation of scientific instruments are so complicated that American universities and other eligible institutions will not use the act—Public Law 89–651. This concern can only be evaluated in the light of experience, but already there is indication that the new provisions of law are being used and not hindered by regulations. Since February many institutions have filed application under the new law. Most recently the following diverse organizations have filed:

U.S. Department of Agriculture, one combined gas chromatograph—mass spectrometer unit with certain parts from Sweden, and others from domestic manufacturers; Youngstown University, three-phase electrical generalized machine set from England; University of California, one electron microscope, Hitachi model HU–125 from Japan; Oregon State University, Perkin-Elmer electron microscope, Hitachi model HU–11B–3, from Japan; University of Pennsylvania, one broad-range, multigap magnetic spectrograph from England; Harvard University, one electron microscope, Norelco model EM–200, from Holland.

As a sponsor of the Florence and Beirut implementing bills in the House I am continuingly interested in their implementation and successful use, and will watch them with great interest.

The article referred to above follows:

Treasures Without Tariffs

(By Dan H. Fenn, Jr.)

Nearly a decade ago, an enterprising Massachusetts businessman was featured on the Nation's TV screens surrounded by unique Russian-made Rube Goldberg machines which he was selling to schools and colleges for laboratory purposes. At about the same time, a Bay State physics professor was painfully acquiring an education in the mysteries of Washington as he tried to arrange duty-free status for specialized scientific equipment to be imported for educational institutions.

These two men—Paul Grindle, president of the Ealing Corporation, and Sanborn C. Brown, professor of physics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology—must have had a particularly satisfying January 12 this year, because that day the President's Executive order implementing the Beirut Agreement providing for free entry of "visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific and cultural character" went into effect. Shortly thereafter—on February 1—a proclamation by the President covering materials as described in the so-called Florence Agreement became operative at United States ports and customs offices.

Presumably, Grindle and Brown have a clear idea of just what they can bring into the country under the terms of these agreements, and just how they can go about it. Since one is a college classmate of mine, and the other a former colleague on the Lexington, Mass., School Committee, I take some personal pride in their intimate association with this particular educational breakthrough, as I do in the considerable technical contribution made by the staff of the U.S. Tariff Commission. But most of us are not familiar with the details of these documents and the legislation that underlies them. Perhaps this article will assist school people in utilizing these new aids to education.

Behind the congressional enactment of the two laws last fall which authorized the Presidential directives were nearly two decades of discussion, controversy, technical drafting, interdepartmental meetings, and jurisdictional arguments. The idea of duty-free exchange of educational materials was first introduced (by the United States delegation) in 1948 at the third General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in Beirut. A text was approved covering a range of audiovisual aids, and the agreement went into effect in August 1954 when ten countries (the U.S. was not one of them) began formal participation. The companion document, also proposed originally at Beirut, underwent intensive legal revision before being approved in 1950 at the UNESCO General Conference in Florence, Italy. This agreement became effective in May 1952.

Although the United States, as the largest exporter of such materials, was a leader in proposing and negotiating the two international agreements, our implementation of them had to wait until the fall of 1966. Both were approved by the Senate six years earlier, but the formal "instruments of ratification" were withheld for a variety of reasons.

For one thing, the terms of the agreements were so vague that there was considerable doubt as to what, precisely, should be admitted duty free. Congressional and other groups wanted to be able to gauge the impact on domestic manufacturers and assure that there would be safeguards. Definition of scientific instruments and the conditions under which they would be admitted proved particularly difficult; for example, is a shovel to be used for archaeological excavation a scientific instrument within the meaning of the Florence Agreement?

But two bills were finally hammered into shape by various Government agencies—the Department of State, the United States Information Agency, the Bureau of Customs, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Standards, and the U.S. Tariff Commission—as well as interested Congressmen and private groups, after innumerable meetings and conferences and drafts of proposed legislation.

Another retarding factor to implementation of the agreements was the feeling in some U.S. Government quarters that both agreements should move along together. Florence, however, was being held up by some questions surrounding the Universal Copyright Convention, also affecting in part the importation of books. The situation was resolved in 1957, and the way was clear for work on the Florence proposal.

BEIRUT AGREEMENT

Article I of the Beirut Agreement stipulates three conditions under which visual and auditory materials shall be deemed to be of an educational, scientific, or cultural character: (1) Their primary purpose to effect is to instruct or inform or their content is such as to maintain, increase, or diffuse knowledge and augment international understanding and goodwill. (2) The materials are representative, authentic, and accurate. (3) The technical quality is such that it does not interfere with the use made of the material.

Congress made the definition more specific, establishing a new item (870.30) in the tariff schedules for the free entry of: "developed photographic film, including motion-picture film on which pictures or sound and pictures have been recorded; photographic slides; transparencies; sound recordings; recorded video tape; models; charts; maps; globes; and posters; all of the foregoing which are determined to be visual or auditory materials. . . ."

In individual or organization, profit-making or nonprofit, that wishes to take advantage of the exemption from duties which the Beirut Agreement provides must first see to it that the exporter has received a statement from his own government certifying that the product comes under the terms of the agreement. Then the exporter must have a positive determination from the United States Information Agency that the item is, indeed, material of an educational, scientific, or cultural character within the meaning of the agreement.

USIA has, in fact, been certifying American goods for export to Beirut Agreement countries for some years. They have refused to approve materials whose primary purpose is merely to amuse or entertain; when the intent of the material is to stimulate the use of a patented process or product, advertise a particular organization or individual, or raise funds; when the material is religious, economic or political propaganda; when it lends itself to misinterpretation or misrepresentation of the U.S. or other countries, their people or institutions; and where the material has not already been produced at the time of application.

Presumably, USIA will rule against the importation of foreign materials which fall into these categories.

Under the terms of the Beirut Agreement, governments may establish regulations to make sure that the goods are exhibited or used only for nonprofit purposes. Anyone bringing in audiovisual supplies or equipment, therefore, should be aware of both the need for USIA approval and the hazards of misuse.

FLORENCE AGREEMENT

The Florence Agreement is designed to stimulate the free exchange of ideas and knowledge between nations, primarily by removing restrictions on the movement of books, publications, and educational, scientific, and cultural materials. It provides that there shall be no charge (other than those which apply also to domestic merchandise) in connection with the importation of such materials into the contracting states, and the signatories are to grant necessary licenses and foreign exchange and to avoid other restrictions and impediments. The rights of the individual nations are to be respected on such matters as national security, public morals, outstanding international obligations, copyrights, and trademarks or patents.

What do these general objectives mean when they are translated into the specific needs of American educational institutions? The coverage is very broad indeed. A series of annexes to the agreement lists the items entitled to free entry.

Annex A—books, publications and documents—will probably have little effect on educational institutions because many of the articles set forth were already entitled to free entry, or at least to exemption from duty when imported by an educational institution. For example, newspapers, periodicals relating to current literature, most travel literature, all manuscripts, books and music in print over 20 years, books in languages other than English, and drawings and plans printed over 20 years ago were exempt from duty. The newly enacted law removes existing duties on such of the books, pamphlets, periodicals, music, maps, atlases, charts, and certain other printed matter as are not already duty-free, except that duties are retained on "printed catalogs relating chiefly to offers for the sale of United States products"; this latter is not provided for by the Florence Agreement.

In addition, although not specifically set forth in Florence, the implementing legislation provides for printed matter "suitable for use in the production of such books as would be free of duty" to be exempt from assessment of duties. If the books are free, the reasoning is that the parts should be free.

Annex B—paintings, statuary, collectors' pieces, and antiques—contains items that were, for the most part, already on the free list or admited without duty when imported by educational institutions. Additionally, tariffs have been eliminated on antiques of lesser age, copies of paintings and drawings, and specimens for public and private collections not for resale.

Under the Florence Agreement implementing legislation, all antiques dating back 100 years before entry will now be free of duty. Up to now, only objects made before 1830 were so entered. No one can tell how great the additional volume of imports of antiques will be, but most knowledgeable people anticipate that it will be substantial. Undoubtedly many more articles of historical and cultural value will now be imported. In many instances handmade copies of paintings or sketches have great artistic merit and importations thereof may be encouraged. Even though the previous duty was only 8 percent ad valorem, it will certainly obviate the stigma attached to paintings being labeled as "copies" on importation and enable them to be judged more on merit.

The new provision, item 870.27 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, providing for the free entry of "specimens of archeology, mineralogy, or natural history (including specimens of botany or zoology other than live zoological specimens)" is a new concept in our law, particularly as to private collections. In view of the conditions that the specimens be "for exhibition or other educational or scientific use, and not for sale or other commercial use," it is anticipated that such collections will be used for broadening knowledge generally in the United States.

Annex C—visual and auditory materials of an educational, scientific or cultural character—deals mostly with items that were in greater part free of duty under the tariff schedules, as importations for public, educational, or scientific institutions or institutions for the encouragement of the fine arts; as newsreels; or as public documents issued wholly at the instance and expense of a foreign government or international organization. Certain amendments of the law, however, liberalize the tariff provisions somewhat by specifying exposed and developed motion picture and other films, recorded video tapes, and sound recordings to be eligible for free entry, and by providing that the "instance and expense" need be only "essentially" rather than "wholly" that of the foreign government or international organization as before.

So far as eligible domestic institutions are concerned, the organization no longer has to be established, for instance, solely for educational purposes. Now it is sufficient that the institution be "nonprofit" and established for educational or certain other purposes.

Such articles as "plans, globes, and recorded video tapes" were added to the specified items which the designated types of institutions may import free of duty. Such items as recorded video tapes were not provided for specifically in Florence but were made duty free because they certainly would have been included in the agreement had they been articles of commerce when the Florence provisions were formulated.

Annex D—scientific instruments or apparatus—has no itemized list. The requirements are only that the articles be intended exclusively for educational purposes or pure scientific research, that the articles be consigned to and used under public or private scientific or educational institutions approved by the importing country, and that articles of "equivalent scientific value" are not being manufactured in the country of importation.

This item is by far the most important—and troublesome—part of the Florence Agreement for the United States. It was Annex D which concerned my friends Grindle and Brown and occupied a substantial amount of time and effort in Government offices. The portion of the law implementing this provision reads in part:

"Articles entered for the use of any nonprofit institution, whether public or private, established for educational or scientific purposes. Instruments and apparatus, if no such instrument or apparatus of equivalent scientific value for the purposes for which the instrument or apparatus is intended to be used is being manufactured in the United States. . . . Repair components for instruments or apparatus. . . ."

The law further specifies that articles must be exclusively for the use of the institution involved, and not for distribution, sale, or other commercial use within five years after being entered. The "instruments and apparatus" are only those of the type provided within the specified provisions of the law and do not include the shovel referred to previously. The law does not include "materials or supplies" nor "ordinary equipment for use in building construction or maintenance or for use in supporting activities of the institution such as its administrative offices or its eating or religious facilities."

Annex D is particularly important because of the amount of money at stake. Many of the other articles for which exemption from duty is provided as a result of the Florence Agreement carry relatively low duties anyway. In the case of scientific instruments, however, many of the rates are in the 20, 30, and 40 percent ad valorem bracket—with many of these instruments being valued at hundreds or even thousands of dollars. Thus, the implementation of the Florence Agreement will lower the cost of these instruments to eligible importers by appreciable amounts. Although no one can tell just how much will be imported in the future under the terms of the agreement, total imports of such instruments and apparatus amounted to over $165 million in 1964 and over $210 million in 1965. There are more than 40,000 types of instruments used in the fields of laboratory research, metallurgy, engineering, automation, industrial process control, education, medicine, and chemistry that fall under these provisions. Domestic production is estimated at $4 billion in each of the years 1964 and 1965 according to industry sources.

Thus, there is a great deal at stake here for both domestic manufacturers and school people who want to bring in these articles. It is no wonder that these provisions presented the most difficult problems and required special procedures.

If a nonprofit institution wants to import items under this category without duty it must submit an application to the Secretary of the Treasury who, in turn, will submit copies to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and to the Secretary of Commerce. The Commerce Department will then publish notice of the pending application, requesting views and evidence, after which it will make a ruling as to whether or not (for the purpose for which it is to be used) the instrument or apparatus involved is of equivalent scientific value to domestically produced instruments. If "equivalent" instruments or apparatus are being manufactured in the U.S., or it can be shown that a U.S. manufacturer is able and willing to produce it promptly, the articles cannot be entered free of duty. Provision is also made in the law for priority review of the decision of the Secretary of Commerce by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.

Annex E—articles for the blind—lists books, publications and documents of all kinds in raised characters for the blind; and other articles specially designed for the educational, scientific, or cultural advancement of the blind, imported directly by institutions or organizations concerned with the welfare of the blind and approved by the country of importation. These articles were not set forth in the implementing legislation, as existing provisions of the law adequately implement this part of the Florence Agreement.

How much difference will the implementation of Florence and Beirut make to United States educational institutions? At this stage, it is impossible to say. Our experience with them so far has been so brief as to be meaningless. There are those who claim that classrooms will be far richer and more varied as a result; there are others, like Paul Grindle, who say that the restrictions on importing scientific apparatus overwhelm the intended users and counteract the value of the agreements.

But one fact is clear: the increased awareness of foreign sources of educational materials which all the discussion and debate has engendered should, in itself, stimulate the alert teacher and administrator to look abroad and the opportunity for free importation may prove to be an added incentive.

LEGISLATION NEEDED TO PROHIBIT DESECRATION OF THE FLAG

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill to prohibit desecration of the flag of the United States. In the second session of the 89th Congress I introduced similar legislation, and recent events in our country have convinced me that we should give early consideration to this type of bill.

It is a violation of the law to burn a draft card. It is strange indeed to see on the same day in the same newspapers, pictures of American young men facing danger and death in Vietnam and pictures of other American young men burning their Nation's flag in an American park. It seems to me that the burning of our flag by Americans is as much a crime against our Nation and our people as the burning of draft cards.

This legislation is not intended to take away the right of dissent. One of the great strengths of America is the right of dissent. However, the right of dissent from particular policies or with particular individuals never was intended to sanction the desecration of the American flag which is the symbol of our national heritage.

I was personally pleased with the action of the House Republican policy committee in its endorsement of legislative action to prohibit the deliberate and defiant desecration of the American flag.

RESOLUTION FOR TAX LEGISLATION

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SCHADEBERG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, in support of my suggested personal income tax bill, H.R. 8073, I have received signed petitions by members of the International Association of Machinists, Kenosha Lodge No. 34, and totaling 1,716 signatures.

An attached letter, presented here, from John Jansen, chairman of the group's legislation committee, reflects the attitude of the members of this union. I appeal to my colleagues to consider the feelings of these people and others who have urged an increase in the personal income tax exemption to an eventual $1,000 per dependent, by 1969.

The IAMAW Lodge 34 resolution, which follows, reflects the attitude of a disturbed union membership and points out that personal exemptions have not been changed, or updated, for 20 years despite the fact that the cost of living has risen nearly 50 percent since 1947.

The material referred to follows:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, KENOSHA LODGE NO. 34,
Kenosha, Wis., April 4, 1967.

HON. HENRY C. SCHADEBERG,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN SCHADEBERG: Enclosed is a resolution with 1716 number of signatures asking your support for fairer tax legislation.

We of Local Lodge 34 of the I.A.M.A.W. feel it is time our Federal income tax laws were updated by raising the personal exemption for each dependent to $1000, and by closing the loop-holes, in our laws, which have shifted the burden of taxes to the middle and lower income brackets.

We are asking your help in passing H.R. 4266 and other bills designed to make our tax laws fairer for people in the middle and lower income brackets.

We are also sending the same petition to the two fine Senators from our state; Gaylord Nelson and William Proxmire.

Thank you.

Yours very truly,

JOHN JANSEN,
Chairman, Legislation Committee.

IAMAW LODGE 34: RESOLUTION ON TAX EXEMPTION AND TAX LOOPHOLES, FEDERAL INCOME TAX LAW

Whereas the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers have long advocated and fought for fair taxes for all citizens; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States set the personal exemption at $600 for each member of the family over 20 years ago; and

Whereas the cost of living has risen nearly 50% since 1947, thus the $600 exemption set in 1947 is outrageously outmoded and unfair based on current living expenses; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has passed many amendments to the tax laws which permit special privileges to the upper classes and wealthy, affording them tax loopholes; and

Whereas by such loopholes the burden of taxes has steadily shifted from the high to the middle and lower income family in this country; therefore, be it

Resolved, That IAMAW Lodge 34 go on record as being in favor of updating the tax laws by increasing the personal exemption for each member of the family from $600 to $1,000, and closing up the tax loopholes for the wealthy; and be it further

Resolved, That our legislative representatives in Congress be urged to support such needed legislation, and all members of our IAMAW Lodge 34 be urged to send letters to their representatives in Congress asking them to join in an all out effort to pass such needed legislation.

EDWARD MCDONOUGH,
Recording Secretary.

A PROPOSAL BY THE RIPON SOCIETY FOR THE ADOPTION OF A NEGATIVE INCOME TAX

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WHALEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week I inserted in the RECORD the text of a speech I delivered on the subject of "The Negative Income Tax" before a group in Columbus, Ohio, in April of this year.

Today, I would like to amplify on this concept by furnishing the view of the Ripon Society as expressed in the Ripon Forum, a research paper published on April 10, 1967.

The imaginative thought and effort that went into the development of this paper deserve our attention. For the further information of my colleagues, I am submitting for the RECORD the full text of the paper:

THE NEGATIVE INCOME TAX: A REPUBLICAN PROPOSAL TO HELP THE POOR

Poverty means insecurity and dependence. The insecurity of never knowing where the next dollar will come from discourages poor people from seeking new opportunities. The dependence on welfare administrators saps them of the initiative to make their own decisions. The Republican Party believes that the poor man ceases being poor only when he is willing and able to make his own way in the economy, when he takes control of his life. To conquer poverty we must break down the barriers to free participation in the eco*nomic life of our Nation. This means provid*ing an adequate education for everyone; it means eliminating discrimination in hiring and housing; it means above all reducing the insecurity and dependence of the poor.

We must find a way to supplement and stabilize low incomes without interfering with the natural freedom and incentives of *the market. This can be done if the Republi*can Party stands by its traditional economic realism and fights for an attack on dependence and insecurity. Ripon urges it to commit itself to a Negative Income Tax and to make this commitment the cornerstone of an effective alternative to the mismanaged, mis*cellaneous and ineffectual War on Poverty* that has been put forth by the Johnson Administration.

The Ripon Society proposes that the United States increase incentives and opportunities for economic advancement through the adoption of a Negative Income Tax system.

I. WHAT IS NEGATIVE INCOME TAX?

A simple formula (so much per adult, so much per child) determines a "standard" income for every family. The family receives a fixed percentage, called the tax rate, of the difference between its earned income and the standard. These income transfers come in *payments, called the Negative Income Tax, which decreases gradually as income in*creases. All families with incomes below the standard—not just those that are unemployed—receive Negative Income Tax payments.

For example, suppose the standard income for a family of four is $5,500, and the tax *rate is 50%. If the family earns nothing, it* gets $2,750 (50% of $5,500). If it earns $1,000, it gets $2,250 from the Negative Income Tax, and has a total income of $3,250, $500 more than before. The Negative Income Tax encourages families to move up the income scale until they can begin to pay positive taxes. In 1966 both the national Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress and the Advisory Commission on Public Welfare endorsed similar proposals, as did the National Crime Commission in February, 1967. Yet President Johnson has delayed even a research report on the proposal until 1969.

The Negative Income Tax is not a new concept; already almost 60 countries have a similar program known as the family allowance. The Negative Income Tax has gained the support of many of the nation's most respected economists, both Republican and Democratic. Henry Wallich, a member of President Eisenhower's Council of Economic Advisors, supports the idea. One of its first proponents was University of Chicago economist Milton Friedman, Barry Goldwater's chief economic advisor during the 1964 presidential campaign, who proposed in 1962 the replacement of many welfare-state programs by the Negative Income Tax. Yale economist James Tobin, a recent member of the Council of Economic Advisors, has written extensively advocating the idea. Harvard's Daniel Moynihan and Dr. Martin Luther King have suggested variations of the plan.

The Negative Income Tax emphasizes individual incentives to find and create jobs, and the natural efficiency of free markets in eliminating poverty. The Negative Income Tax embodies Republican concern for human dignity, civil rights, and individual free economic enterprise. After careful study, the Ripon Society concludes that the Negative Income Tax is the fairest and most efficient way to accelerate the natural processes through which the American economy eliminates poverty.

The United States can institute a Negative Income Tax system providing significant improvement in both incentive and living standards at a cost of ten to twelve billion dollars a year. This represents the natural in*crease in tax revenues from two years' growth* of our economy. This program, which will be given in detail later in this paper, can be introduced gradually over five years, the cost rising about $2 billion each year, with no increase in positive tax rates.

II. ADVANTAGES OVER PRESENT PROGRAMS

Present welfare systems, because of their effects on incentives, freedom, equality and the efficiency of the economy perpetuate poverty. The Negative Income Tax will change the economic environment of the poor in ways that encourage poor people to help themselves. It will create incentives to find work; it will end the debilitating dependence *on bureaucratic administrators of present* programs; and it will eliminate the use of poverty money for political ends. Most importantly, it will reach many of our poorest citizens who are not being helped by the inefficient and inadequate programs now in existence. In all these ways the Negative Income Tax *is superior to present welfare* and poverty programs.

1. Incentives

Current welfare programs actually discourage recipients from seeking employment. A recipient of welfare at the present time cannot increase his total income by increas*ing his earned income. If a member of a* family receiving $3,000 a year in welfare earns $1,000 the next year, welfare payments drop by exactly $1,000, leaving total income unchanged. For these people the welfare system breaks the link between extra effort and extra income. They have no financial incentive to find or train for a job.

A recent account of the problems of a family on welfare illustrates this. Mrs. Pressley lives in Harlem with six children.

"That's one reason why I went to work," Mrs. Pressley explained, "so I could have a little more money for my family. It's not much more, though, and it doesn't go very far when you add up the carfare and cleaning bills as such."

Before she went to work in July as a part time neighborhood aide for the Urban League's Open City program that promotes housing desegregation, Mrs. Pressley had received $184 twice a month from the Welfare Department. The Department now deducts her weekly salary ($30) from the welfare allowance but adds employment expenses (carfare, lunch, clothes, cleaning bills, etc.) so that her combined income now comes to $203 twice a month . . .

Mrs. Pressley said that in the past, when she tried to work while on welfare, things did not go smoothly.

"Once, I was working, and I told the investigator not to call the employer and that I would show him my pay receipt as proof. He called my boss to check and I was fired the same day—many people don't want clients working for them."

Mrs. Pressley has the will to work, but it is clear that she is not benefiting from it financially (when she discovers this, she may stop working). It is also clear that the whole atmosphere of welfare administration discourages employment. Under the Negative Income Tax, everyone, no matter how small his earned income, can keep something extra if he earns something extra. Families are encouraged to move up the income scale and out of poverty.

2. Freedom

The Negative Income Tax will also work a radical and constructive revolution in the attitudes of the poor towards their own life.

The philosophy of paternalism pervading our welfare system does little to develop the confidence of the poor in their own ability to direct their lives. The recipient of public assistance suffers a far greater degree of public control over his everyday affairs than the rest of us: he is deprived of important economic and political freedom.

Often, the welfare recipient feels that he is forced to accept the advice of his caseworker. Professor William A. Klein notes that "welfare departments have very broad discretion in awarding aid and in varying the amount to meet special needs; . . . to many recipients the caseworker may be the embodiment of power and authority; and . . . caseworkers *are likely to be convinced that the services* offered are ones that are badly needed. In addition, the welfare recipient's failure to accept services might induce the caseworker to invoke, or threaten to invoke, certain statutory provisions that the recipient would probably find highly objectionable."

*This policing of a welfare client's life ex*tends to practices that are not worthy of our nation. Various detective measures to uncover possible welfare fraud have seriously infringed upon the privacy of welfare recipients. Midnight raids by caseworkers hoping to find female recipients in bed with boy*friends or husbands are not uncommon. The constitutionality of such practices is* open to serious doubt, but few welfare recipients are able to mount a legal challenge against these degrading practices.

In fact, the social worker meddles in every aspect of a recipient's life, even to the ex*tent of selecting items in a recipient's budget.*

One caseworker complains:

"Give us some independence in dealing with the client. . . . We come out of college wanting to help people, but we are policemen. We must check how much money they spend. We have to make sure they pay the rent and don't waste any money on cigarettes or a tube of lipstick.

"Every time a welfare client goes to the bathroom we have to make out a form. We can't be their friends. We represent the oppression of the unfeeling state."

A welfare recipient cannot by his own action control either his income or the way that it is spent and becomes accustomed to letting other people make decisions and take initiative. No wonder so many poor people stop caring and develop attitudes of futility and despair. Under a Negative Income Tax everyone will have the freedom to decide his own priorities and desires in spending his income. The experience of buying freely in a money economy is an important factor in developing the self-reliance and confidence that many poor people lack. The Republican Party has long recognized the role the free market can play in enriching people's lives and efficiently satisfying their needs. Must the poor—just because they are poor—be excluded from this part of American life?

3. Equality

The present system puts the heaviest financial burden on those depressed and underdeveloped areas of the country which are least able to afford them. The result is inequitable difference in state programs and standards. For example, even programs financed largely by federal funds such as Aid to the Families of Dependent Children (AFDC) are applied in quite contrasting manners by various state authorities. This variance in standards is an incentive for economically senseless migration to take advantage of more generous programs. Residency requirements instituted to prevent this "welfare shopping" are equally senseless barriers to mobility of the labor force and serve to keep aid away from newly arrived immigrants just when they need it most.

While certain of the wealthier states of the North still possess substantial poverty pockets in their urban ghettos, the greatest concentration of poverty in America is found in the South, the Border States, and the Great Plains States.

Economic progress in such regions of our nation is virtually impossible today because the inhabitants lack the purchasing power to support an economic expansion. Past poverty and associated low skill levels combine to discourage new industry from locating in these areas. While Negative Income Tax payments will do little immediately to raise skill levels in a poverty area, they will generate considerable purchasing power. In such areas as Harlan County, Kentucky, the added income which will flow from a Negative Income Tax will provide a basis for business vitality and create additional jobs. Sales and service jobs as well as jobs in light manufacturing will open up once a local market exists to support them.

4. Welfare politics

In the northern ghetto where welfare has become a way of life, entrenched political machines perpetuate their existence with the implied threat of withholding the essential welfare check. Such political intimidation is a disturbing feature of present public assistance programs. This has happened frequently in Chicago where the Cook County organization of Democratic Mayor Richard Daley holds sway.

The threat of welfare withdrawal was a significant factor in two widely publicized campaigns in 1966 in the overwhelmingly Negro First Congressional District in South Side Chicago. The New Breed Committee, a bipartisan group of young South Side Negro reformers, mounted a serious attempt to defeat veteran Congressman William Dawson, long regarded as the Daley organization's major spokesman in the Negro community. Fred Hubbard, a social worker backed by the New Breed Committee, unsuccessfully challenged Dawson in the Democratic primary. After Hubbard's defeat, David Reed, a New Breed Committee member who had received the Republican Congressional nomination, mounted a campaign with the all-out support of the young insurgents who had backed Hubbard in the Democratic primary.

Several Reed campaign strategists and organizers whom we have interviewed stressed the political potency of the threat of welfare withdrawal. Welfare recipients were exceedingly reluctant to serve as poll-watchers or otherwise publicly identify themselves with anti-organization candidates for fear that they would lose their welfare. The mere fact that a welfare recipient feels vulnerable to the withdrawal of his benefits often suffices to keep him politically passive.

Abuses and intimidation are not practiced solely in the ghetto; in many areas of the South, Negroes have been denied benefits for which they are clearly eligible. Often unaware of their rights and lacking access to legal assistance, the unsuccessful applicant can do little to resist this discrimination. The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund has documented some of the glaring injustices:

"In Grady County, Georgia, three Negro mothers, all with young children and no means of support, reported that the Welfare Department had refused in early July of 1966 even to consider their applications for Aid to the Families of Dependent Children. All were told that 'seasonal employment was available in the fields until October and that no applications would be accepted until the fall.'

"Another mother who had been receiving assistance since the preceding October had her benefits terminated in May. She was told that 'full-time seasonal work' was available. Further, her 12-year-old twins 'should work in the fields until October' when benefits might again be granted.

"In Grady County, only Negro women and their children are required to work in the fields during the growing season and denied benefits from May to October. Field work is not considered 'suitable' for white women and children receiving benefits under Aid to Families of Dependent Children."

Southern poverty, however, is by no means confined to negroes. Since the Civil War, severe poverty has characterized the large mass of the southern population, Negro and white, and has aggravated racial animosities. Uneducated poor whites have regarded the freed Negro as a threat to their already meager economic circumstances. Yet in every state except Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina there are more white than Negro families (in absolute numbers, not percentages) with annual income under $2,000.

The Negative Income Tax, nationally and impartially administered, will not be a tool in the hands of machine politicians or white supremacists. It will meet the needs of poor people of all races, in every part of our country.

5. Efficiency

The United States has committed itself to spend substantial sums to raise the living standards of the poor. Agricultural price maintenance, public housing, and the War on Poverty represent only a few of the major programs in this area. We can either establish government bureaucracies to spend this money, or give it directly to the poor, letting each family allocate its share to shelter, clothing, food, or education according to its own needs and wants. The Ripon Society believes, in the Republican tradition, that individuals can usually make more efficient economic decisions than any government agency. If a family renovates its home, it will try to get the best work for the lowest price simply as a matter of self-interest. A government agency building a housing project cannot achieve the same standards of personal inspection except at enormous cost.

Our present welfare system is itself riddled with paper work and consumes great amounts of valuable time in making decisions that would be automatic under a Negative Income Tax. Instead of counseling the poor, welfare workers have to police their conduct and scrutinize their assets.

Testified a woman case-worker from Harlem: "The woman asked me for three sheets. I had to visit the home and inspect the bed, determine how many used the bed. Were they really torn? If I gave out sheets six months ago, why were they needed today? Go over the records and make sure the sheets didn't exceed the family clothing limit. Wouldn't two sheets be enough? Before I got the sheets I had dealt with the unit supervisor, the case supervisor, and the senior case supervisor."

The Negative Income Tax is a self-liquidating program. As the number of low-income families decrease, the payments automatically diminish, and there is no bureaucracy to look for new excuses to keep up the appropriations. The time of case workers and supervisors represents a valuable social resource which is presently being wasted in policing and paperwork. Freed from the responsibilities of handing out money, social workers could provide counseling services much needed by all parts of the society.

6. Adequacy

Even if the present welfare system were to correct its deficiencies on the above points, one overriding fault would remain: present programs do not make payments to many of our poorest citizens. The payments we do make are often so inadequate that they create only despair among the recipients. As the Report of the Advisory Council on Public Welfare noted:

"Only a fifth of the poor (7.5 million out of 34.1 million) are now being helped by federally-aided State public assistance programs. Furthermore, they are receiving payment far below the nationally determined poverty figure of $3,000 for a family of four, or $1,500 for an adult living alone.

"The national median payment, including vendor payments, for medical care, for an Old Age Assistance recipient was $77.55 a month, or $930.60 a year; for a needy child, $35.45 a month, or $425.40 a year; or for a family of four, $141.80 or $1,701.60 a year.

"The national average provides little more than half the amount admittedly required by a family for subsistence; in some low-income states, it is less than a quarter of that amount. The low public assistance payments contribute to the perpetuation of poverty and deprivation that extends into future generations.

"Most public assistance recipients are too old, blind, chronically ill, or severely disabled, or are mothers of small children, or are children too young to add substantially to their assistance payments even if this were allowed without deduction by state standards."

Even a small rise in income from bare subsistence improves the morale of the poor, releases enormous energies toward self-improvement and increases the chances that their children will break out of the poverty cycle. Under the Negative Income Tax every penny spent will go to the poor directly. We expect that this modest increase in standards of living together with the incentives described above will lead to much greater participation of the poor in the economic life of the country.

A large number of people not presently receiving public assistance payments will obtain benefits under the Negative Income Tax plan. Yet, only the most obtuse Social Darwinian could argue that hunger and privation do much to make the indigent a more productive part of society. When people sink into the despair of our poverty pockets, whipped by the lash of hunger, living in rat-infested tenements or tarpaper shanties, and seeing their children without shoes, the erosion of their morale does far more to sap their incentive to work than would the receipt of governmental assistance. Any program to encourage individual initiative must recognize that a certain minimal level of security is necessary for anyone to become a productive part of society—to acquire the skills or take the chances which enable him to become an economic and social asset. Present programs are inadequate in combatting poverty because they fail to provide security to all those who need it. The Negative Income Tax has the great merit of providing the element of stability that is essential if the poor are to participate in the economic life of the country.

III. ANSWERS FOR THE CRITICS

1. "Won't a man working full-time for $3,500 a year resent someone else who is getting $2,000 for doing nothing?"

Since the Negative Income Tax applies to everyone whose income falls below the standard, the $3,500 man will himself be getting some payment. If the hypothetical worker with the $3,500 really covets the status of his neighbor, he has the option of quitting his job; but he must accept a lower income, and consequently a lower standard of living. The incidence of resentment will actually be reduced by a Negative Income Tax. Today, because of administrative, regional, and racial inequalities, identical families receive unequal benefits.

2. "Won't many people just stop working?"

The question is suggested by the operation of present welfare programs, which provide no incentive to work. People work for the things they can buy with extra income.

As we have seen, the Negative Income Tax reinforces this positive incentive to work by enabling people to receive the fruits of their labor. We must realistically note that the choice for the poor is not always between honest work and starvation—crime offers an opportunity for an adequate income. The Negative Income Tax will provide many of these people with the margin they need to resist the temptation of a life of crime.

Certainly, a few people will choose not to work even at the very low standards of living provided by the Negative Income Tax ($750 a year for a single person according to the plan suggested below). But many citizens in fact can use this opportunity in ways that will benefit themselves and society: artists, writers and students would be given a chance to have their time to themselves if they were willing to accept very low incomes. In any case, we can always influence the number of people who will choose leisure by altering the tax rate.

3. "If we pay some people for not working at all, two very different ways of life will grow up in America, leading to class conflict."

This is a better description of the present situation than of the Negative Income Tax. The poor family in America has no hope of controlling its future. If it is on welfare, its income and expenditures are completely controlled by government administrators. If it is scratching out a living from day to day, it lives in great uncertainty and insecurity which discourages any plans for the future or for a better life for its children. The result is a growing separation of the affluent middle class from the poor not only in income, but especially in attitudes toward life. The poor cannot hope for the security and regularity of life which the middle classes cherish. Furthermore, the step from no income to adequate income becomes larger all the time, and this barrier is heightened by minimum wage laws and the disincentive features of welfare means tests. The child who grows up without adequate food, clothing, shelter, or books is already handicapped in his attempt to become a productive member of society.

The Negative Income Tax will alleviate the insecurity of the poor and allow people to plan ahead. It provides a smooth transition from not working to working, from poverty to affluence. The Ripon Society believes that, by extending these features of the middle class environment to the lives of the poor the Negative Income Tax will knit the society closer.

Those who have experienced middle class ways of life and rejected them are most likely to be the "drop outs" under this plan. For these people, the problem is not to provide incentives by threatening them with starvation, since they are often well able to earn good incomes, but to interest them again in the society.

4. "We already have too many enormous Federal programs interfering in the economy. We need more freedom from Federal control, not an extension of it."

The Negative Income Tax will shift decisions from the Federal government to individuals. By freeing local resources now devoted to economically burdensome welfare programs, the Negative Income Tax will enable the cities and states to devote their energies to education, the improvement of the environment, and the curtailment of crime, all predominantly local responsibilities which are being poorly met at the moment.

The use of objective criteria that is central to the Negative Income Tax system should insure against an accretion of power in the hands of federal bureaucrats. In fact, local initiative in devising structural approaches to reduce the incidence of poverty may be strengthened by the adoption of a Negative Income Tax system. Under the grant-in-aid approach which dominates much of the public assistance area today, state and local governments often have little room for policy initiative. Instead they find themselves forced to tailor their welfare policies to maximize the matching federal grants.

The Negative Income Tax system would not pressure state and local governments to follow any single path in providing for the welfare of their citizens. Assured that their citizens would have at least a subsistence level income, these governments would have more room for initiative and experiment in providing services which encourage their indigent citizens to become more constructive members of society.

The criticism of over-centralization is actually more valid for proposed alternatives to the Negative Income Tax. For instance, the suggestion that the government become the employer of last resort would shift control of enormous resources into the public sector increasing even further the sphere of federal decision making in the economy.

5. "Won't the money be spent on liquor, drugs and fancy clothes?"

Most of it will go into housing improvements, into schoolbooks and home study space, into privacy and food and shoes. This is the way most people of all incomes spend their money. As with the earned incomes of the middle class, some of this money will be used for drugs and liquor and will reduce pressures on addicts and alcoholics to support their habits through crime. If making several hundred drug addicts more comfortable is the price of giving shoes to millions of schoolchildren, why not pay it?

6. "Isn't it 'wrong' to pay people for not working?"

The deepest-felt objection to the adoption of a Negative Income Tax plan or any proposal for insuring a minimum floor under all family income is essentially an emotional one. The idea of "paying someone for doing nothing" runs against the Puritan Ethic. In fact, the notion of "the undeserving poor" leads many Americans to associate poverty with shiftlessness, laziness, and other character debilities. A somewhat more sophisticated version of this attitude recognizes that poor children are not to be blamed for their plight but regards their parents as undeserving of sympathy. Consequently many will advocate large expenditures to educate the children of the poor but will oppose suggestions that these families be given some form of income supplement.

This view ignores the fact that poverty in America is to a large extent an inherited malady. The poor adults of today, more often than not, were the children of the poor of a generation ago. Growing up in an environment which discouraged personal advancement, most of our poor either left school early or merely went through the motions while attending school. Lacking necessary job skills, they have become accustomed to failure. Their despair in finding satisfactory employment has been compounded by the frustration born of economic deprivation.

The effects of this despair upon the family life of our poor have been devastating. Daniel Moynihan has documented the critical deterioration of the Negro family in his controversial report, The Negro Family: The Case for National Action. The family instability among the urban Negro poor has seriously complicated our task of providing adequate education and citizenship training in the ghetto. Still the major socializing institution in our society, the family, is the source of most of a child's values. The child who grows up in a broken home in an urban ghetto today is likely to receive little more than a sense of helplessness from his family situation. Though living in a poverty-stricken environment, he is exposed to the blandishments of advertisements urging him to consume. The poor youth in the city, lacking the means to share in the affluent life to which he is exposed, may turn sullen and silent or burst out in antisocial displays of anger and violence.

Society must accept the responsibility of assisting those whose major reason for not finding a job is the accident of their birth and upbringing.

IV. A WORKABLE PLAN

The advantages of the Negative Income Tax are best demonstrated in the context of a concrete plan. The one presented below does not purport to meet all administrative, technical or legal problems, but it does provide a framework for implementing the concept.

1. Cost

For purposes of discussion we use the following table for computing the standard income allowance:

Table 1

For each adult	$1,500
For the first child	1,500
For the second child	1,000
For the third child	600
For the fourth child	400
For other children	0
Limit for any family	6,000

These levels represent a reasonable upper limit to the standard income allowance. A family of four, two adults and two children, has a standard income of $5,500.

Our plan includes a "tax rate" of 50%. This means that the family of four would receive $2,750 if it had no outside income. A single adult would receive $750. The incentive to supplement these minimums will be substantial, since a 50% tax rate means a family keeps half of anything it earns. Table 2 indicates the relationship between earnings and total income for a family of four.

Table 2

Earned income	Deficit from "standard"	Negative income tax	Total income
0	$5,500	$2,750	$2,750
$500	5,000	2,500	3,000
$1,000	4,500	2,250	3,250
$1,500	4,000	2,000	3,500
$2,000	3,500	1,750	3,750
$2,500	3,000	1,500	4,000
$3,000	2,500	1,250	4,250
$3,500	2,000	1,000	4,500
$4,000	1,500	750	4,750
$4,500	1,000	500	5,000
$5,000	500	250	5,250
$5,500	0	0	5,500

NOTE.—Total income for a family of 4 with 2 children; "standard income" equals $5,500.

The difference for a family between its present income and the standard is called the "deficit" for that family. In 1965 the sum of these deficits for American families was

$20 billion. This figure includes welfare payments as income. Without welfare the deficit is $25 billion. In addition the Federal Government collected somewhat less than $1 billion in income taxes from families who will be eligible for Negative Income Tax under our plan.

From these figures it is easy to calculate the cost of any proposed tax rate. For example, if welfare payments continue at present levels and a 50% tax rate is in effect, the total cost to the Treasury will be $11 billion ($10 billion representing 50% of the total deficit plus $1 billion representing the loss of tax revenues). Of this $10 billion in direct payments about 80% will go to families with children. If welfare payments are not included as income but are counted as part payment of the Negative Income Tax, the total cost will be $13.5 billion (half of $25 billion plus $1 billion in lost revenue). We expect, of course, that much federally sponsored welfare assistance will be phased out as the Negative Income Tax comes into operation.

2. Legal details

A. Definition of Income

Certain receipts not counted as income for tax purposes must be included as income in claiming a Negative Tax payment. Scholarships, gifts, transfers between members of a family, alimony, interest on tax-free securities and realized capital gains are the most important items in this category.

Welfare payments which can be continued at the beginning of the Negative Income Tax should not be counted as income for Negative Income Tax purposes, but as partial payment of Negative Income taxes, if they are financed by the Federal government. State welfare payments should not be counted as income, or as partial payment, to avoid discouraging states from providing welfare for special hardship cases. Programs designed by the Federal government to help specifically emotionally and physically disabled persons should also be supplemental to the Negative Income Tax.

B. Deductions

Deductions from income must be severely limited for negative tax recipients. Deductions of business expenses and in fact all employment-related expenses will increase incentives to employment. In the absence of comprehensive medical insurance coverage some allowance is necessary for unusually large medical expenses. (If tuition to college were granted as a deduction, the Negative Income Tax could provide an automatic scholarship for everyone who has the will and ability to go to college. This, of course, would raise the cost substantially.)

C. Positive Tax Liability

Those eligible for Negative Income Tax payments will not be liable for ordinary income taxes. Under the present exemption and deduction system this will result in a fall in after-tax income if a family's income rises above the standard in some cases. This effect may not be too serious, but a simple way to eliminate it is to increase exemptions and standard deductions in the regular income tax to conform to the standards of the Negative Income Tax and raise lower bracket rates slightly to keep total lower-bracket tax payments constant. This method eliminates the disincentive to move above the standard income and does not change the tax burden on families just above the standard.

D. Eligibility

The basic principle of the Negative Income Tax is its universal applicability. Since our Social Security system is designed to maintain adequate income for older citizens, we recommend that persons over 65 be eligible for Negative Income Tax payments only if they are not adequately covered by Social Security. The same reasoning applies to recipients of veterans' pensions and similar governmental transfers.

Otherwise, every American who is either over 18 or the head of a family should be eligible for Negative Income Tax. There will be no incentives for rich families to live apart as a way of increasing total family income since intra-family transfers will be counted as income. It may be desirable to allow families that wish to keep their children dependent to offer to substitute their support for Negative Income Tax until the child reaches 21.

The Negative Income Tax is not intended to supplement the incomes of wealthy people who have substantial assets but low incomes. Eligibility should be denied to families or individuals who own more than, for example, $3,000 in liquid assets, or $10,000 in total assets not counting owner-occupied homes. These limits may also be tied to the standard income formulas. They will prevent the worst cases of abuse of the Negative Income Tax.

F. Size of Income

Certain businessmen with substantial borrowing power sometimes have negative incomes in certain years. To prevent open-ended claims on the Treasury, the minimum reportable income for Negative Income Tax purposes should be zero. The small size of the payments even at zero income will discourage most people from manipulating the timing of their incomes to take advantage of the Negative Tax.

G. Installment Debt

Installment debt payments cannot be allowed to eat up the negative tax. Legal limits may be set to the percentage of total income a Negative Tax recipient may be forced to pay as interest or principal on debt. This will provide a kind of semi-bankruptcy protection for the recipient.

3. Administration

One of the fundamental simplicities of the Negative Income Tax is the ease with which the program can be administered without establishing an additional welfare bureaucracy. An individual or family which expects its income to fall below the standard in a future period will file for Negative Income Tax payments from the Internal Revenue Service. These payments will be made monthly. At the end of each year, Negative Tax recipients will file returns showing their actual income in the year. Any discrepancy between the actual Negative Tax payments and what a family was entitled to can be made up by a lump sum refund or tax payment or, if the payment is large, by a tax payment spread over several months.

To minimize the variation in tax payments employed, Negative Tax recipients should have tax withheld at the source like other employees. Withholding, together with assistance in filling out forms and modern data-processing, will simplify the administrative problems in adjusting tax payments to income.

4. Fraud

Relatively well-off people who by some legal device can meet the letter of the requirements may abuse the Negative Tax. The incentive for this is small because the payments are small. The chances of its happening can be reduced by making the definition of "income" for Negative Tax purposes as broad as possible.

Another difficulty will be misreporting of income by poor people to avoid the 50 percent marginal reduction in Negative Tax payments for each dollar they earn. The most effective deterrent against this will be the actual requirement of filing a return, since it takes considerable ingenuity to fake a consistent series of fraudulent tax returns. In exchange for the Negative Tax privilege, people may also be required to provide information on returns, such as reports of purchases of durable goods, which will facilitate detection of fraud by computers. The most important point is that the Negative Income Tax criteria are simple and equitable, while present welfare regulations involve a byzantine code of behavior. The combination of deterrence and respect for a good law will help to reduce fraud to a low level.

5. Gradual enactment

The Negative Income Tax represents a substantial though not revolutionary change in our economic environment. For this reason it is desirable to watch the effects of it develop slowly and to gain experience in the problems it raises one by one. The Negative Income Tax should be introduced gradually by starting with a low tax rate, say 10%, and raising it year by year to the target of 50%. The first year this will cost about $3 billion (10% of $20 billion plus $1 billion in lost revenues) which itself is a modest but important contribution to the welfare of the poor. If, as the tax rate rises, significant bad effects become apparent, the program can be halted or reversed smoothly.

The Ripon Society notes that the Negative Income Tax with a 10% tax rate can be instituted immediately with provision for an automatic rise of 10% in the tax rate each succeeding year. If the end of the war in Vietnam provides an opportunity, we can raise the rate by more than 10% in that year. This is a powerful anti-recession weapon, especially since Negative Income Tax payments go to those whose propensity to consume is very high.

Each year until the fifth after the adoption of the program, it will cost about $2 billion more. The natural growth of tax revenues is about $5 billion a year, so that the Negative Income Tax can be initiated easily without any increase in positive tax rates. This is true even if the war in Vietnam continues.

V. THE POLITICAL CHALLENGE

We cannot tolerate the low incomes of the poor. Misery affronts our consciences. Ugliness afflicts neighborhoods drained of money and packed with people. Insecurity and discrimination drive their victims to a guerrilla action against the majority who have made it or have it made.

"Massive frontal attacks" on peripheral issues like schooling for four-year-olds do not raise incomes or make anyone more secure. The government's job corps programs, substitutes for on-the-job training, have helped a very few at enormous cost and have not changed the economic environment of the mass.

Direct transfer programs like welfare raise incomes but destroy incentives and erode self-reliance. The poor pay for the security of subsistence incomes by giving up their right to buy what they want or to earn more by their personal effort. Welfare threatens to become a cheap form of institutionalization for people with a problem; like many institutions, it tends to strengthen the problem rather than the person.

If we want to see an improvement in housing and a reduction in crime, we must put more money into poor neighborhoods and regions. If we want to see that money spent efficiently to help people, we can do no better than to let them spend it themselves.

Eighteen years ago Senator Robert Taft said:

"I believe that the American people feel that with the high production of which we are now capable, there is enough left over to prevent extreme hardship, subsistence, education, medical care and housing, to give to all a minimum standard of decent living, and to all children a fair opportunity to get a start in life."

The Ripon Society believes that the adoption of the Negative Income Tax will prove the most viable means of implementing this concept; it will be a great Republican initiative comparable to the Homestead Act and the Thirteenth, Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments. No other program to fight poverty can also strengthen free markets and reduce Federal intervention in the economy.

In five years our economy will be producing a thousand billion dollars worth of goods each year. We propose to give one percent to those who so far have been left out. The richest nation in history should do no less.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

The Ad Hoc Committee on The Triple Revolution, "The Triple Revolution." Reprint of the Committee's statement which was carried in the April 6, 1964 issue of Advertising Age Magazine.

The Advisory Council on Public Welfare, "Having the Power, We Have the Duty," Report to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, June 29, 1966.

Elman, Richard, "The Poorhouse State—The American Way of Life on Public Assistance," New York, Pantheon Books, 1966.

Friedman, Milton, "Capitalism and Freedom," Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Klein, William A., "Some Basic Problems of Negative Income Taxation," Wisconsin Law Review, no. 3. Summer 1966.

Moynihan, Daniel, "The Negro Family: A Case for National Action," Department of Labor publication, Washington, 1965.

NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc. "Poverty, Privacy and Prejudice" (pamphlet), New York, 1966.

The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, "Technology and the American Economy," vol. 1, February 1966.

The National Commission on Technology, Automation and Economic Progress, "The Employment Impact of Technological Change," Appendix Volume II, "Technology and the American Economy."

Nicol, Helen O., "Guaranteed Income Maintenance: A Discussion of Negative Income Tax Plans." Welfare in Review, April, 1966.

Reich, Charles A. "Individual Rights and Social Welfare: The Emerging Social Issues," The Yale Law Journal, vol. 74, No. 7, June 1966.

Schorr, Alvin R. "Against a Negative Income Tax," The Public Interest, No. 5, Fall 1966.

Sugrue, Frank, "Welfare, Snarled in City Red Tape," New York World Journal Tribune, January 8, 1967.

Theobald, Robert, "Free Men and Free Markets, Proposed: A Guaranteed Income," Garden City, N.Y., Anchor Books, 1965.

Theobald, Robert, editor. "The Guaranteed Income: Next Step in Economic Evolution?" Garden City, N.Y., Doubleday & Co., Inc., 1966.

Tobin, James, "A Rejoinder" (to Alvin L. Schorr's "Against a Negative Income Tax) in The Public Interest, No. 5, Fall 1966.

Tobin, James. "The Case for an Income Guarantee," The Public Interest, No. 4, Summer 1966.

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MORTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, Vic Johnston I numbered among my closest friends. His counsel, his wisdom, his warm companionship were always mine for the asking. I miss him a great deal.

There are those among us whose lives are dedicated to American political life, yet who, in the public place, are little known for their efforts, their sacrifices, and their accomplishments. Vic was such a man. His efforts were directed to bring better men to government. It could be said he was politically partisan but overriding any party considerations was his desire to bring better men into government.

He worked quietly but effectively. He was honest beyond measure. This country would be better governed were there more men like Vic Johnston. It is difficult for me in this hour to be objective in my appraisal and my evaluation of him, for truly to me his passing has been a personal loss.

BROWARD COUNTY EDITORS RECEIVE FREEDOMS FOUNDATION AWARDS

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BURKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am fortunate to have in my congressional district in Florida several outstanding newspapers staffed by writers who have for years exhibited articles which have improved our way of life in south Florida and in the Nation.

Writers on several papers in my area have earned numerous awards on both the State and National level, in addition to local civic awards and, in some cases, the coveted Pulitzer Prize.

Probably the greatest recognition a writer can receive in regard to service for his country is the famed Freedoms Foundation National Awards from Valley Forge, Pa. These awards are made annually to citizens who have contributed to the better understanding of the American way of life.

I am happy to say three writers from Florida's 10th District captured National Freedoms Foundation awards this year. They are Mr. Jack W. Gore, editor, the Fort Lauderdale News; Mr. Harvey A. Call, assistant editor, the Fort Lauderdale News; and Mr. William A. Mullen, editor, the Pompano Beach Sun-Sentinel.

I would like my colleagues in the House to have the opportunity to read these award-winning editorials, and am pleased to insert them in today's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

WHAT DOES A NATION PROFIT GAINING WHOLE WORLD WHILE LOSING ITS SOUL?

(NOTE.—Mr. Gore was voted Freedoms Foundation coveted George Washington Medal of Honor for an editorial published in the Fort Lauderdale News on September 14, 1968. It was his ninth honor from the national organization.)

(By Jack W. Gore)

It is a rather disturbing paradox that as Americans continue to spend huge sums of money to explore the relatively new world of space, their own world here at home continues to decay into increasing ugliness in many respects.

These contrasting stories vie with each other for attention in the headlines almost every day. The exploits of our astronauts in chalking up new space records and experiences are printed side by side with stories detailing new outbreaks of racial trouble across our land and new outcroppings of crime and violence on a regular and almost frightening basis.

Under the circumstances, the sober-thinking citizen must ask himself what lasting good we are achieved in conquering the mysteries of space all the while our own land is being consumed by the spreading fires of hatred and violence touched off by our inability to get along with one another.

It is a terrible thing to witness grown men and women venting their anger and their emotions on small children as happened in Grenada, Miss., just this week. It is an equally terrible thing to witness enraged teenagers in northern cities and states roaming the streets, defying the forces of law and order and displaying their contempt for others by destroying property, hurling insults at one and all, and using rocks and Molotov cocktails to express feelings for which they seemingly have no other outlet.

Where are we heading as a people and as a nation when we continue to permit such disgraceful events to take place on an almost daily basis? Have we become so soft in the head and so demoralized in mind and in spirit that the great majority of us seem compelled to wrap ourselves in our own tight blanket of isolation in the vain hope that in this fashion we can remain uninvolved and unaffected by these affairs?

All that stands between our nation and uncontrolled rioting and violence these days seems to be a thin line of police agencies who are caught in the middle of a fratricidal struggle between Americans that appears to be growing more violent each day.

We are demanding much of these police agencies. Almost too much, in fact, for the support we are giving them in return. We expect, if not demand, that they provide us protection from the lawless elements of our population. Yet our courts cripple their effectiveness with legal doctrines that make it virtually impossible for them to arrest and convict lawbreakers, and they are accused of brutality on all sides even when they are doing nothing more than attempting to protect themselves from angry mobs of bottle and rock hurlers.

We pay these men far too little for the risks they are required to take to protect the rest of us. Seemingly, there is never enough money in our budgets for law enforcement needs, but there always seem to be plenty to hand out for other far less worthwhile purposes.

Our nation can afford to spend billions of dollars figuring out ways and means to get to a lifeless moon yet it apparently lacks the resources necessary for maintaining a proper respect for law and order across the face of our land.

We send hundreds of thousands of our young men across the sea to search out and kill a violence-prone enemy in Vietnam, yet the same political leaders who rise up and defend the necessity for this action remain strangely silent about the urgent need for taking equally strong action to search out and destroy the violence-prone elements who are running amok in our own land and threatening the welfare and safety of our own people.

We can brag all we want to about the great strides we are making in space, and truly these are great strides and truly these are great Americans who are engaged in risking their lives to bring them about. But again we ask: What are we gaining from the exploration of space if in the process of finding new ways to explore as yet unknown worlds we are standing idly by while our own land rushes blindly to its destruction through the fires of racial hatred and violence?

Is it not about time we have one of those socalled "agonizing reappraisals" of what's happening in our own country while we are so preoccupied with what is taking place elsewhere? Is it not about time that we put first things first and begin to restore some respect for law and order in our own nation before we spend ourselves into bankruptcy trying to inflict it upon other peoples who may or may not appreciate our efforts?

There is a quotation in the Bible that well reflects the predicament that America finds itself in today. It says: "For what is a man profited, if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul?" Simply substitute the word "nation" for "man" in this quotation and thereby lies the gist of the fate that is in store for our country if we continue to ignore the terrible decline of law and order in our own country we have been witnessing of late.

If Flag Is To Have Meaning, Be Accorded Respect, National Purpose Is Vital

(Note.—Mr. Call also received the George Washington Honor Medal honoring his editorial of June 13, 1966, in the Fort Lauderdale News. It was his fifth medal in 6 years.)

(By Harvey A. Call)

A piece of cloth with colored designs on it makes a flag—any flag.

The cloth invariably has only slight value, and the design is not always the best that might be chosen.

But flags generally mean a great deal to the people of the countries they represent.

Because of this, most flags are widely respected, even revered by proud people.

In a passive way, most Americans are proud of The Stars and Stripes. Possibly underneath it all, they are as proud as the people of other nations more demonstrative of their feelings.

Rare, indeed, is the citizen who does not become angered when our flag is ripped down by foreign agitators and trampled upon or burned as a sign of their contempt.

It is these incidents which have become too frequent around the world. Flag burning, destruction of American libraries, destruction of property at American embassies and consulates and similar demonstrations are ample reasons for every citizen to be concerned.

More distressing by far are flag burnings or desecration incidents here at home. They are not numerous, but a few anti-Vietnam demonstrations, draft card burnings and the like have included shows of contempt for the flag.

Rep. Richard L. Roudebush, R-Ind., introduced H. R. 13942 which would make it a federal offense to desecrate The Stars and Stripes.

But laws alone will not bring the desired results. There must be an understanding of the fundamentals represented by our flag.

As a nation, where do we stand? And for what do we stand?

These are points that citizens will have to decide anew if we are to have a purpose, and just now there are grave doubts as to what our purposes or objectives may be.

That is true, in particular, with respect to the Vietnam war. America has never been more bewildered by a situation than this fumbling, bungling affair.

But, in the long run, the people will have to decide the issues and the objectives. If the leadership is not to be provided by our top officials, then the citizens will have to make their wishes known.

And this is an appropriate time to do that.

Flag Day will be celebrated tomorrow. That will be an occasion not so much to honor the cloth of slight value but rather to honor the nation for which it stands. It will be an occasion to honor the men who are making tremendous sacrifices in Vietnam while we content ourselves with a situation that drifts aimlessly along.

As one of our readers put it, this is a time for people to think.

Do we want The Stars and Stripes to continue as the banner representing a great republic proud of its heritage and confident of its future?

It is an old saw, but what are we passing along to future generations?

We are custodians of the present charged with preserving our heritage, our freedoms, our opportunities, and our advantages.

Are we fulfilling our responsibilities to those who will follow us tomorrow?

Are we even fulfilling our responsibilities to those with us today—particularly those bearing our arms in the jungles of South Vietnam?

Flag Day is a good time to think about all of this. Many organizations are trying to do their part to the best of their abilities.

The inclination is to shrug off problems with the idea that one man or woman cannot do anything about them anyway.

Perhaps one man or one woman may be a voice crying in the wilderness. But start accumulating one man here, one man there and build up a citizenry determined to accomplish an objective, and you will have a force that is effective.

There is a need for citizenship interest and dedication today as never before. If the people show this, their country and the flag representing it will rise in prestige throughout the world.

Opportunity Is at Hand To Heed Mr. Lincoln in His Dedication to Nation

(Note.—Mr. Mullen was voted the Freedoms Foundation's Honor Certificate Award for an editorial that appeared in the Pompano Beach Sun-Sentinel on June 13, 1966. He was an honor medal winner in 1964 as well.)

(By William A. Mullen)

For decades afterward, the Civil War, or as it also is called, the War Between the States, left the American people divided and in conflict over whether Abraham Lincoln was a truly great president.

Even today there may remain some doubt whether that gaunt and lonely man in the White House had performed the lawful and proper discharge of his duties in holding this nation together by the exercise of his presidential prerogatives.

All the details not withstanding, it must be agreed that Mr. Lincoln did as he must; and that was preserving the United States as an entity. Had he failed, we might today be an amalgamation of enclaves or, worse still, an outpost in this hemisphere of a European power.

This we do not know.

But we do know that in its dearly priced unity, the United States did grow and prosper and it did become the champion of freedom the world over.

This accomplishment was the priceless reward for the bloodshed, for the agony of American fighting American and for the searing scars that remained long afterward.

However dear the cost, it has been justified and made the more acceptable through the amelioration of time and the mitigation of national achievement.

If the outcome of that schism and the eventual recovery were enduring and impervious to the vicissitudes of life in an infinitely free nation, then all Americans could look back and agree that all was not in vain.

But that is not so. And now more than a century later, we need another Lincoln, a forlorn and tormented man who in his inner anguish mourns the course of events that arise again to threaten this nation, and who will dedicate his mortal existence to preserving the United States as a unified body politic.

For indeed we are a nation divided once more, not as clearly deliniated as North vs. South, slavery vs. anti-slavery, Blue against the Gray.

We have been beset by an ideological separation that knows no geographic lines, no economic strata, no blood ties.

Worse still, there are agitators in our midst preying upon that conflict of opinion and upon our prevailing lack of cohesive determination.

Their goal is to divide and conquer and to eradicate all that was salvaged and built upon in the Lincoln manner.

To these foes, our political differences are of no consequence, for out of our system of domestic conflict and compromise we emerge more resolute, more experienced and more tolerant of that which must prevail.

This is our history. We are a nation born of revolution and tempered by ferment.

We are not, however, a nation that can long survive a fragmentation of purpose; not in these times of subversion and programmed nihilism.

All of this is brought to the fore by our involvement in the fight against international communism, concentrated in the war in Vietnam and complicated by the opposite sides of those who see our commitment there as intractable and by those who would yield to aggression.

Each day the clamor worsens and each day the unity of our nation faces the threat of insidious deterioration.

Each day, however, we are given new opportunity for our salvation.

Such opportunity is immediately at hand in heeding the lesson of Lincoln and his dedication to preserving a nation nearly torn in two and almost denied its ordained greatness.

We may be of different faiths. We may follow separate political paths. We may cry out against the conduct of our internal affairs. We may deplore and resist incursions into our individual privacy and rights.

But none of us is privileged to quarrel among ourselves when the enemy is at the gate, as Communist aggression is today.

We must instead dedicate ourselves to passing on to future generations that which was preserved for us by that gaunt and melancholy man from Illinois.

HOUSE POLICY COMMITTEE URGES LEGISLATION TO PROHIBIT THE DESECRATION OF THE FLAG

Mr. BIESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Rhodes] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the House Republican policy committee urges the prompt enactment of legislation that would prohibit the deliberate and defiant desecration of the American flag.

It is strange indeed to see on the same day in the same newspapers, pictures of American young men facing danger and death in Vietnam and pictures of other American young men burning their Nation's flag in the safety of an American park. Certainly, the Bill of Rights never was intended to protect those who would contemptuously set fire to the American flag.

One of the greatest strengths of this Nation is the right of dissent. This right was established by our Founding Fathers and must remain inviolate. However, the right of dissent from particular policies or with particular individuals never was intended to sanction the desecration of the American flag which is the symbol of our national heritage and unites all Americans in their allegiance "to the Republic for which it stands."

PROGRAM FOR THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK AND FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order that I might ask the distinguished majority leader if the gentleman would announce the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma; yes.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority whip, we have furnished the legislative program for this week. It will be my intention to ask that we go over until Monday upon the announcement of the program for next week, which is as follows:

Monday is District day, but there are no District bills for consideration.

Tuesday there is for consideration H.R. 9240, authorizing defense procurement and research and development, under an open rule, with 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order.

Wednesday there is for consideration S. 1216, authorizing assistance to certain homeowners in areas affected by base closure actions, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Thursday there is for consideration House Joint Resolution 263, establishment of rice acreage allotments, under an open rule with 1 hour of debate, and waiving points of order.

Mr. Speaker, this announcement, of course, is made subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any further program may be announced later.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hagan). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WHY WAIVE POINTS OF ORDER ON H.R. 9240 AND HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 263?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have requested this time in order to ask the distinguished majority leader if the gentleman can inform the House as to why we are considering H.R. 9240 on Tuesday next and House Joint Resolution 263 on Thursday next under rules waiving all points of order?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman asks why we are considering them under the rule, waiving points or order? I would say to the gentleman that those are matters within the jurisdiction of the House, and the Committee on Rules and the legislative committees handling the bills. We put these bills down on the days requested by the chairman of the legislative committees.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for responding. I am not questioning the appropriateness. I am fully aware that we can find out when we discuss the rules, but I just wondered if in advance the distinguished majority leader could tell us why in these two instances—which are most unusual instances, by the way—we apparently have a rule waiving points of order.

Mr. ALBERT. I must say to the gentleman that I do not know what the provisions of the bills are that caused the committees to request such a rule.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

PROPOSAL FOR U.S. HELP ON SOVIET-FIAT AUTO FACTORY SHOULD BE REJECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, citizens across the Nation are genuinely concerned about the proposal for the United States to help equip and finance the Soviet-Fiat automobile factory.

Of all the unpromising, unlikely places in the world for the United States to provide technological and financial assistance, the most improbable should be the Soviet Union. And of all the industries in the Soviet Union, among the last candidates for assistance should be their machine tool and related industries, for this is the heart of the Soviet industrial defense strength.

Nevertheless, the administration last October announced that the United States is prepared to finance through the Export-Import Bank the export of a large amount of modern, precision American machine tools which would be used to equip an automotive factory the Fiat Co. of Italy has contracted to construct in the Soviet Union. Upward of $50 million of U.S.-built machine tools may be involved.

It seems inconceivable that it could be seriously proposed that the United States at this time should assist in any way in building up the automotive industry in the Soviet Union.

The products of existing Soviet automotive factories can be found in trouble spots throughout the world and notably in the war zone of southeast Asia. Trucks and other automotive products are among the significant war goods supplied to Hanoi by the Soviets and the Eastern Europeans. Such vehicles help to convey and transport Communist forces, ammunition, weapons, and other war goods in Southeast Asia.

To our soldiers these vehicles are enemy equipment. In 2 years, according to testimony presented in the Defense Appropriations hearings, we have destroyed or damaged over 9,000 trucks in North Vietnam.[1] Thousands more remain. The threat posed by Soviet- and Eastern European-built vehicles and other equipment must be measured in terms of American lives lost as well as the millions upon millions of dollars expended.

While there had been earlier press reports about the deal, the official announcement of the role proposed for America in building the Soviet automotive factory came on October 7, 1966. The President on that date made a sudden trip to New York where, in a major policy address, he announced that "the Export-Import Bank is prepared to finance American exports for the Soviet-Italian Fiat auto plant."[2]

The proposal that export licenses should be granted to authorize the shipment of American machine tools for the Soviet-Fiat plant and that the Export-Import Bank should finance the export of this equipment to the Soviet Union in my view was unsound last fall and it is unsound today. As I stated to the House of Representatives on October 17, 1966, the President received incredibly poor advice in making that proposal.

In the intervening time, an effort has been mounted to put across the idea to the Congress and to the public that the proposed Fiat deal is in the best interest of the United States.

This effort has been characterized by an assortment of claims, statements, conjectures, inferences, and so forth, many of which it appears have been deliberately designed to becloud the true issues involved. The basic purpose of the effort is clear however: The intent is to smooth the way for the Fiat deal to go through without going into any more detail than absolutely necessary.

---

[1] Hearings on Supplemental Defense Appropriations for 1967, page 90. General Earl G. Wheeler, Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff, testimony on February 21, 1967.

[2] Made before the National Conference of Editorial Writers at New York, N.Y. The *Washington Post* of October 8, 1966 said that President Johnson so suddenly accepted the invitation to make the "major policy speech" that "the impromptu arrangements nearly produced a comedy of errors . . . the first word that Mr. Johnson was even considering attending came at 2:30 p.m. [October 6] . . ."

Shortly after the President's October 7, 1966, announcement, the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe held a special hearing to discuss with representatives of the executive departments, U.S. policy on East-West relations as reflected in the President's speech. Among other things, the subcommittee at that hearing on October 18 attempted to learn details of the Soviet-Fiat arrangements, as to why the United States should finance any part of it, who made recommendations to the President on such policies, and so forth. But their attempts appeared to be in vain as witnesses from the Departments of State and Commerce apparently did not satisfactorily answer the questions posed. The chairman, the distinguished Congresswoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] said at the time:

> If you take all of the reasons that you gave, gentlemen, they still don't add up to a satisfactory answer to our questions.[3]

Last December four members of the Subcommittee on International Trade of the House Committee on Banking and Currency traveled to Italy and several Eastern European countries. In Italy on December 7, 1966, the subcommittee members conferred with various individuals who are dealing with the Soviets in the proposed Fiat automotive transaction. On December 17, they conferred in the Soviet Union with the Soviet Communist officials who expect to be the beneficiaries of the proposed transaction.

A subcommittee print issued by the Subcommittee on International Trade on March 1, 1967, contains the subcommittee report on the proposed Soviet-Fiat auto plant. The apparent purpose of the report is to assemble various materials and quotes in support of the administration's proposal.

The report tells us, for example, that the following remark was made by Secretary of State Rusk last October:

> It is the judgment of the Defense Department, shared by General Wheeler of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, that a loan that would induce the Soviet Union to devote greater resources to the production of consumer goods at the expense of applying these resources to military purposes is in our national interest.[4]

The report indicates that this statement by Secretary Rusk is included to make it "clear to Members of Congress that the Department of Defense is on record as favoring the loan by the Eximbank for Fiat."

In view of the claim attributed to Secretary Rusk, I made inquiry of General Wheeler on March 3, 1967, asking the general to furnish me with any information now available to him which gives evidence that the Export-Import Bank loan would induce the Soviet Union to devote greater resources to the production of consumer goods at the expense of applying these resources to military purposes.

Just as suspected, General Wheeler's reply of March 24, 1967, did not furnish information which to me gives any such evidence. General Wheeler did state his belief as follows:

> I do not believe that the Soviets would divert resources from a military program which they regard as vital to any program to benefit the Soviet consumer.[5]

Meanwhile, the platitude-filled statements continue to be bandied around by administration spokesmen such as this statement made March 2, 1967, by Anthony M. Solomon, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs:

> . . . [construction of the Soviet Fiat factory] in itself represents a sizable allocation of resources for peaceful uses, but more will follow to provide the roads, service stations, repair facilities, and the like to keep the cars running. . . . This growing attention to consumer needs is a heartening development in the Communist countries, one that we welcome and should support through trade.[6]

Those thoughts echo similar comments offered by Acting Secretary of Commerce Trowbridge, who on November 2, 1966, as Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Domestic and International Business, said:

> The President's decision to provide for Export-Import bank financing of American machine tools and other products for the Fiat automobile plant in the U.S.S.R. is a good example of how we will offer our cooperation on projects designed to improve the well-being of their people. We support their allocation of resources to expand consumer-oriented industries.[7]

The International Trade Subcommittee report contains additional enlightening information about the campaign underway to gain acceptance for the Fiat deal. It recites, for example, that last October, administration spokesmen sought to convince individual Members of the House, unidentified in the report, that "the Fiat deal would support the increased emphasis which the U.S.S.R. is putting on using its resources to produce consumer goods."[8]

Such wishful thinking actually runs counter to findings contained in a Central Intelligence Agency report which the subcommittee itself included in its March 1 report.

Claims that if the Soviet-Fiat factory is built it will cause the Soviets to invest extensively in tertiary automotive investments—which means such items as roads, service stations, repair facilities and the like—are refuted by the CIA report which states:

> The USSR will almost certainly have no desire and little need to duplicate in the foreseeable future the heavy tertiary investments that have been fostered by the automobile in Western Europe and the United States.[9]

The CIA report points out that the Soviet program is to produce cars for the Communist leaders, not the people. It states:

> Essentially, the new Soviet program is designed to produce automobiles for the bureaucratic and managerial elite, not for the average citizen.[10]

Furthermore, it is the CIA evaluation that the announced Soviet plans to increase automotive production will not divert resources from their defense or space programs:

> . . . announced plans are not so grandiose as to require a significant alteration in traditional Soviet economic priorities, *and would leave military and space program unimpaired.* [Emphasis added.][11]

There is little doubt that if the Soviets were required to design and build machine tools and equipment which closely approximate those they seek from abroad in the Fiat deal then they would probably have to use engineers, technicians and capital goods which otherwise could be employed in programs related to Soviet military and space endeavors. I asked the Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, Gen. John F. Carroll, about this and by letter of April 25, 1967, he responded:

> It is true that, if engineering and production resources were allocated to the design and fabrication of such machine tools and equipment, the resources would have to be taken from other programs, either military or civilian. In the past the Soviet Union has given priority to military programs over civil programs, and it is believed that—barring a major change in Soviet policy—this practice will continue.[12]

Note that General Carroll confirms that the Soviets would have to divert resources from their other programs if they were required to undertake the automotive project with their own resources.

In other words, to whatever extent the United States or any other nation provides capital goods to the Soviets, the Soviet leadership would be permitted to continue its traditional practice of allocating their own resources to military programs.

Neither General Carroll nor any other responsible official of a U.S. intelligence agency has ever, to my knowledge, claimed that there is evidence of a major change in Soviet policy. In other words, Soviet priorities in the Soviet industrial empire continue to go to military programs.

In spite of this we have witnessed a band of administration spokesmen, apparently ignoring evaluations of the intelligence agencies, touring the country and giving the impression to the American public, to trade, and business groups, and to communications media that the Soviet-Fiat deal will mean less Soviet tanks and more emphasis on consumer needs.

---

[3] Hearings before the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, October 18, 1966, page 66, Recent Developments in East-West Relations.

[4] A Report for the Subcommittee or International Trade, Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, March 1, 1967, The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant and Communist Economic Reforms, page 41.

[5] Letter, March 24, 1967, General Earl G. Wheeler to Rep. Glenard P. Lipscomb.

[6] Address March 2, 1967 by Anthony M. Solomon, Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs, made before the Chicago Automobile Trade Show luncheon, Chicago, Illinois.

[7] Address November 2, 1966 by Alexander B. Trowbridge, then Assistant Secretary for Domestic and International Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, prepared for delivery at the International Trade Session, National Foreign Trade Convention, New York City.

[8] The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant, page 42.

[9] *Ibid*, page 26.

[10] *Ibid*, page 11.

[11] *Ibid*.

[12] Letter, April 25, 1967, Lt. General Joseph F. Carroll to Rep. Glenard P. Lipscomb.

SHIPMENT OF MACHINE TOOLS SHOULD BE DENIED

I would like at this time to cite some reasons why in my opinion the Export-Import Bank credits and the machine tools should be denied the Soviets.

DETENTE NONEXISTENT

One rationale advanced by administration spokesmen for shipping and financing American machine tools to the Soviets is their claim in seeing in the present situation a détente. But that is a claim with little basis in fact. The highest ranking member of this Nation's Armed Forces, General Wheeler, told all Americans last February 26:

> . . . if history is any teacher, I see no particular reason to view the present situation as a détente. . . . It is a question of prudence in protecting the security interests of this country.[13]

BASIC SOVIET PLANS REMAIN UNCHANGED

The leaders of the organization which controls the Soviet industrial empire traditionally have planned for the production of a relatively small number of passenger automobiles. That is still true today of the current Soviet leaders.

The current Soviet Communist Party leaders approved of the plans of the State Planning Commission (GOSPLAN) which calls for the production of an estimated 230,000 passenger automobiles in 1967. The Central Intelligence Agency estimates that over 12 percent of those will be a Jeep-type vehicle, the GAZ 69.[14]

The CIA also estimates that 23 percent of all Soviet passenger automobiles produced in 1967, a total of 54,000, will be exported. Furthermore, according to the CIA estimates, that figure will increase to 250,000 automobiles exported by the U.S.S.R. by 1974.[15] Significantly, 1974 is the year when the proposed Fiat plant is scheduled to be in full production.

The ordinary Soviet citizens are today deprived of an automobile not because of any action which they, or you, or I have taken. They are denied an automobile because Soviet leaders have decreed that they not be permitted one.

Everyone who gives serious thought to the workings of the Soviet Union understands full well that the Soviet industrial empire could right now, today, increase its output of commercial-type vehicles.

But even if American financial assistance were granted and machine tools were exported to build the Soviet-Fiat plant, the CIA evaluation states:

> It seems certain that, within the next decade at least, the Soviet leadership not only has no plans to mass produce automobiles in imitation of the West, but would strenously resist internal pressure to do so. Although the USSR may some day join the circle of nations that provide automobiles for the average citizen, that day is not now in sight.[16]

In other words, the Communist leaders' plans for automobiles are basically to use them for rewarding the Soviet Communist Party elite and for exports and related purposes, not for the average citizen. The Communists' plans are designed to make the Communist Party more efficient in its communications and travel needs and better equipped to achieve its political goals.

IMPORTANCE OF MACHINE TOOLS TO DEFENSE INDUSTRIES

The following are some of the machine tools desired by the Soviets for use in the Fiat-constructed plant in the U.S.S.R.: Numerically controlled machines for diesinking; multispindle lathes; gear cutting machines; stamping presses; machines for mechanical operations, such as transfer lines; boring, grinding, broaching machines; high-production machines for ring bevel gear production; boring and honing machines; numerically controlled profile checking equipment; automatic lathes; high production machine tools for splined shaft production, hub production and transmission sliding sleeve production; transfer lines for the machining of differential gear carrier and gear housing; transfer lines for pistons.

A study prepared for the Joint Economic Committee which was published in the committee's report, "New Directions in the Soviet Economy, Part II-A," in July 1966 states that:

> . . . the Soviet industrial defense establishment has grown at the rate more than twice that of the Soviet economy; that by 1963 it was in absolute terms about as large or larger than that of the United States. . . .[17]

If 4 years ago the Soviet industrial defense establishment was as large or larger than their own, then how big is it today? And what kind of advice has been provided which results in decisions that could help the Soviet industrial defense establishment grow even more?

The Soviets know what they want when they ask for machine tools but I have the distinct impression that there are many others who are not completely aware of the importance of machine tools to the economy and military strength of a nation.

A machine tool is the only machine which is capable of reproducing itself. It is a power-driven machine which is used to shape or form metal by cutting, by impact, by pressure, by electrical techniques, or by a combination of those procedures.

The Machine and Tool Blue Book for January 1967 declares:

> Every item used, worn, or eaten by the military is directly or indirectly an end result of machine tools.[18]

That same reference tells us that more than half of the total U.S. machine tool shipments in 1965 went to defense and defense-related industries.[19]

The Blue Book states that the U.S. Departments of Defense and Commerce have "just reviewed current and critical military programs requiring stepped-up production of machine tools, and the types of machines that are so vital to this military procurement." It contains a listing of the specific machine tools which are critical and vital to the U.S. military for the procurement of such things as ordnance, helicopters, missiles, and jet engines. Here is part of that list:

> *Ordnance:* The machine tools needed [for ordnance production] are automatic chucking machines, automatic screw machines, numerically-controlled automatic milling machines, special heavy-duty vertical multi-spindle drilling machines with special fixtures, large hydraulic presses, and transfer machines or transfer-type machines.
>
> *Helicopters*: The critical items here are transmission gears and air foil blades.
>
> The machine tools needed are bevel gear generating machines, smaller size horizontal boring machines, numerically-controlled jig boring machines, and routing-type milling equipment.
>
> *Missiles*: The machine tools needed for missile production are "elephant-type" vertical and horizontal boring and milling machines, and vertical turret lathes with or without numerical controls.
>
> *Jet Engines*: This program is calling for the earliest possible delivery of additional machine tools.
>
> Machine tools are also being required in increasing numbers by many industries which indirectly support the defense establishment. It is estimated that over fifty percent of present machine tool output is flowing to defense and defense supporting industries.[20]

One could not say that all of the machine tool items and equipment which the Soviets are seeking from the United States, or which are manufactured in Europe by subsidiaries or licensees of American manufacturers, are in all cases identical to those which are today so critical and vital to our own defense needs. But there seems to be a remarkable similarity.

This is not the first time over recent years that the U.S.S.R. has attempted to obtain advanced automotive building equipment from the United States or that the question of the military and economic significance of such equipment has been brought into sharp focus.

Early in 1961 export licenses that had originally been granted authorizing the shipment of machine tools to the U.S.S.R. for the production of cars and trucks were canceled following an expression of opinion by the Department of Defense that the receipt of the equipment would contribute to the Soviet military and economic warfare potential.

The machine tools involved then were a transfer-type machine to make V-8 cylinder blocks and a transfer-type machine to machine V-8 motor heads. The authorization also covered six 8-spindle gear hobbing machines. Their total value was $6.1 million.

In that case Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Haydn Williams, said that the technology contained in those transfer machines produced in the United States was the most advanced in the world and that:

> The products of these transfer type machine tools are clearly of military value.[21]

---

[13] "Meet the Press," NBC television and radio program of February 26, 1967 with General Earle G. Wheeler as guest.

[14] The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant, page 13.

[15] *Ibid*, page 19.

[16] *Ibid*, page 11.

[17] "Comparative Progress in Technology, Productivity, and Economic Efficiency: USSR versus U.S.A.," page 233.

[18] *Machine and Tool Blue Book*, January 1967, page 122.

[19] *Ibid*, page 130.

[20] *Ibid*, pages 131, 132.

[21] Letter, February 23, 1961, Haydn Williams, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs) to Rep. Glenard P. Lipscomb.

The Department of Defense position was that the products of the $6.1 million in automotive building equipment would clearly be of military value. Why should there now be any difference as to the military significance of automotive building equipment? In view of present Soviet policy, including its heavy commitment toward aiding Communist aggression in Vietnam, our policy should be more stringent, and not softer.

IMPORTANCE OF COMMERCIAL-TYPE VEHICLES FOR MILITARY PURPOSES

Even assuming that only passenger or commercial-type vehicles were to be produced by the Soviets in the Fiat-constructed plant, would these vehicles contribute to the military establishment of the Soviet Union?

Perhaps the practices of our own Department of Defense can best give us the answer to that question. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics informed me on March 24, 1967, in response to my inquiry that the U.S. Department of Defense proposes to purchase 32,353 passenger cars, station wagons, and other commercial-type vehicles in the fiscal year which begins July 1, 1967.

In a letter to me dated March 24, the Department states that:

> All of the vehicles shown are procured for the purpose of providing transportation of supplies, equipment or personnel which contribute to the national security of the United States.[22]

Obviously, vehicles of all kinds are of great importance to the support and operations of military forces. Secretary of Defense McNamara showed his recognition of this fact on February 21, 1967. Regarding the case of enemy military forces denied the use of wheeled vehicles in South Vietnam the Secretary of Defense said:

> This is a tremendous limitation upon their warmaking capabilities.[23]

ADMINISTRATION OF THE EXPORT CONTROL ACT

The Export Control Act declares that it is the policy of the United States "to exercise the necessary vigilance over exports from the standpoint of their significance to the national security of the United States." The act is completely clear, too, in emphasizing that both the military and economic significance of exports must be considered in finding that the "unrestricted export of materials without regard to their potential military and economic significance may adversely affect the United States."

Who would deny that elementary prudence dictates that the intelligence agencies of the Department of Defense must be consulted before determination is made that a commodity has no "potential military and economic significance?"

On January 17, 1967, I made public four letters which unequivocally state that the Defense Intelligence Agency and the intelligence organizations of the Army, Navy, and the Air Force had not been consulted when hundreds of items were removed from the export control list.[24]

Yet the International Trade Subcommittee report expresses confidence in the procedures used by the Department of Commerce and assures us "that Commerce would weigh a variety of factors before taking action on machine tools that can be used for strategic purposes." [25] And to attest to this display of confidence, the report, of all things, quotes from an October 20, 1966, Department of Commerce letter wherein the Director of the Office of Export Control enumerates some of the agencies of this Government which participate in the formulation of export control policies. I call to your attention the fact that in the Department of Commerce letter, as quoted in the subcommittee report,[26] there is no specific reference to "intelligence community" or "intelligence agencies."

INCOMPLETE INFORMATION AVAILABLE

It appears that only a partial insight is being permitted as to what machine tools in total the Soviets actually hope to acquire from the United States. A detailed list of the machine tools including "both the types of tools desired and the U.S. companies most likely to be in a position to supply them" was not included in the International Trade Subcommittee report but was purposely excluded "for business reasons" because "publication might upset normal commercial relationships." [27]

To study the matter thoroughly, of course, would require a detailed and complete list of the machine tools which the Soviets desire to get from us. In such matters the national security and welfare of the United States must be paramount to all other considerations. It is not conceivable to me how anyone could give greater weight and importance to business and commercial considerations rather than to the national security and welfare of the United States.

Also it is difficult to see how anyone at this date could consider our involvement in helping to equip a Soviet automotive factory as a "normal commercial relationship."

SUMMARY

America should not at this time assist in any way in the building of the automotive industry of the Soviet Union. History teaches that the present situation cannot be viewed as a détente.

There are those who have voiced platitudes and claims in attempts to smooth the way for the Fiat deal to go through. But wishful thinking must not be substituted for reasoned and reasonable caution.

The Soviet Communist Party leadership continues to control and to command all facets of the Soviet industrial empire. The Soviet leaders exercise their control over Soviet industry by granting their approval to plans worked out by GOSPLAN. The announced current and future plans of GOSPLAN do not significantly differ from traditional plans which heavily favor military programs at the expense of consumer programs.

Soviet military programs are geared to the output of the Soviet industrial defense establishment and machine tools are the heart of any industrial defense establishment. The Soviet industrial defense establishment is huge; it is possibly as large or larger than that of the United States. But the Soviet industrial defense establishment does not have the quantity of quality machine tools as does that of the United States.

Soviet planners hope to import machine tools which incorporate advanced technology. Soviet planners say they intend to increase automobile production by receiving outside financial assistance and by importing machine tools of advanced design. If the Soviet planners' hopes are realized in this respect, then their military and space programs will remain unimpaired. In any event official U.S. intelligence evaluations are that the Soviet leaders do not plan to provide automobiles for the average Soviet citizen.

Soviet planners intend to increase the production of passenger cars in order to reward and provide incentives to the Communist Party elite. They also intend to increase the number of cars produced for export. Moreover, passenger cars and other commercial-type vehicles are important for military purposes; they do contribute to the national security.

The Export Control Act is very explicit on the point that both the economic and military significance of materials must be weighed in determining whether they may be exported.

It is difficult if not impossible to view the Soviet-Fiat deal as a normal commercial transaction, and complete information on the deal has not yet been disclosed by the Soviets.

The International Trade Subcommittee report tells us "that U.S. machine tool technology may play a larger role in the proposed auto plant than had been forecast earlier." [28] It explains this by saying that in addition to the direct purchases from the United States the Soviets want to lay hold of machine tools which are manufactured in Europe under license arrangements with American firms. Little by little the full measure of Soviet deceit in this grandiose scheme unfolds. We are told that a letter from the Italian middlemen was received on February 1, 1967, which contains this information:

> The final cost of said machine tools and equipment items is contingent upon the decisions of the Soviet agencies handling the actual purchase orders.[29]

That one sentence alone should give all of us cause to question what this Fiat deal is all about. The American people know full well what the final cost of machine tools is in the hands of the Communists. And over 9,000 Americans have thus far paid that final price in Southeast Asia.

---

[22] Letter, March 24, 1967, Major General Allen T. Stanwix-Hay, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Materiel) to Rep. Glenard P. Lipscomb.

[23] Hearings on Supplemental Defense Appropriations for 1967, page 90. Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara, testimony on February 21, 1967.

[24] *Congressional Record*, January 17, 1967, page 687.

[25] The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant, page 2.

[26] *Ibid.*

[27] *Ibid*, page 5.

[28] *Ibid*, page 3.

[29] *Ibid.*

ATTEMPT TO KILL EFFECTIVENESS OF THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply troubled by what appears to be an attempt quietly to kill the effectiveness of the food stamp program by an amendment which would force many States to drop out of the program which has meant so much to their needy citizens.

I refer to the amendment added by the House Committee on Agriculture to H.R. 1318, providing that beginning in fiscal 1968, States must pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons given to food stamp participants.

That would saddle the States with $40 million a year in extra costs, besides the cost of administering the program. My own State of New York would have to pay $4.4 million more—making a total of $6 million a year if you include the costs of administration.

Of the Nation's 15 largest cities, only two have not participated in the food stamp program up to now—my own city of New York, and Boston. Now, New York City has asked to be included, and it is considered likely that the Department of Agriculture will approve the request for the year starting June 30, if funds are provided.

Let me cite the effect of the amendment on New York City, as typical of how it would cripple the program in many large urban centers. For one thing, 70 percent of the people on welfare in the State of New York live in New York City. This is one aspect of the city's traditional position as the gateway to the East, and the Nation's greatest melting pot.

Just as New York City, in the last half of the 19th Century and the beginning of the 20th, received its steady stream of immigrants from other lands, so is the city now the focal point of a new kind of influx—the migration of large numbers of American citizens from other parts of the Nation.

The migrants of today live in our city while they become reestablished and reoriented, like the immigrants of the past. There is one difference: in those days, there were still western lands to homestead, railroads to build, factories to construct and man. Today, demands for technological skills and understanding of language are greater. It often takes newcomers longer to become completely reoriented.

The Federal Government recognized its responsibility to the immigrant masses in the earlier day, by offering homestead land and other inducements to move the newcomers out into other parts of the country. Today, the Federal Government has a similar responsibility to the migrant arrivals before they can fend for themselves.

The food stamp plan, with Federal Government shouldering its full share, is an important part of the process of reorientation for the 200,000 citizens of lowest income who can be expected to benefit from it in New York City.

Food stamp bonuses averaging about $66 a year for each of these participants in New York City would bring from $10 million to $15 million in additional purchasing power into merchants' tills. The merchants' increased income taxes would provide a significant return to the Federal Government.

At the same time, we would assure our newcomers of more and better food. We would help reduce the specter of malnutrition for the many children who will one day be a closer and more effective part of our city and its government than their parents can hope to be.

The food stamp program adds about 50 percent to the amount of food available to families which depend upon public assistance. Its greatest effectiveness is not only the fact that it feeds the hungry, but also because it is not a simple dole.

Participants contribute toward the purchasing process, and thus retain their human dignity. They use a combination of their own money and stamp bonuses, to get more food, and better food.

As the junior Senator from New York ROBERT F. KENNEDY pointed out so well in recent testimony, there are many States in which many of the poorest people even now do not have the benefit of the food stamp program. There will be many more if the amendment is allowed to stand.

This week, members of the Senate employment, manpower, and poverty subcommittee—Democrats and Republicans appealed to the President to invoke emergency powers to combat hunger and malnutrition in Mississippi, and elsewhere.

I am sorry to see that the administration refused this request. However, it would make little sense to take emergency measures to fight hunger on the one hand, while taking a calculated step on the other hand to defeat the battle against malnutrition.

The heavier burden of cost posed by H.R. 1318 in its present form could make it well nigh impossible for the program ever to start in New York City, and difficult for it to continue in the rest of the State and the rest of the Nation.

Let us not allow any shortsighted motives to ruin the value of this great program. The immediate benefits of a few Federal dollars saved can never make up for the long-term damage that could be inflicted upon future generations of Americans.

At present, H.R. 1318 is before the House Rules Committee, and we can expect to have it reported to the floor soon. There is still time for the Congress to rectify the mistake which has been made.

Mr. Speaker, I trust my concern will be shared by enough Members of the Congress in both Houses to permit continuation of the food stamp program which must be given a chance to provide even greater benefits in the next 3 years.

TARIFF ACTION HURTS DOMESTIC GLASS INDUSTRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last January the administration eliminated the escape clause tariff on sheet glass over the vigorous protests of a number of us in Congress. Today, 200 glassworkers are unemployed in Henryetta, Okla., in large part as a result of this tariff decision.

Those of us who are familiar with the sheet glass industry warned the administration that the lifting of the escape clause tariff could lead to possible disaster in the domestic industry. I am deeply concerned that this disastrous result has come so swiftly and so dramatically in my district in Oklahoma. It is no consolation to know you were right, when 200 good people, skilled workers, are now unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, the administration decision to lift the escape clause tariff in January 1967 was based on a Tariff Commission report submitted in June of 1965. This report just simply did not, and does not, reflect the conditions in the industry today. The report does not reflect last year's heavy cutback in new house construction. It does not reflect the reduced productivity of the automobile manufacturers. These are the two major markets for sheet glass.

The sheet glass industry is a small and specialized industry. The total employment in the United States when the industry is at peak production is less than 40,000. The market is severely limited because, unless it is broken, glass does not wear out. Thus, new home construction and automobile manufacture are the principal markets.

Mr. Speaker, the escape clause tariff was put into effect by President Kennedy in March 1962, in order to stabilize a small but vital industry which was seriously threatened by imports. The effect of the tariff was stabilization. The domestic sheet glass industry experienced a modest growth during the period the tariff was in effect, and the rate of import of foreign sheet glass grew at about the same rate. The domestic industry was healthy, and a consistent, large share of the market was going to the foreign industry.

I found it difficult to believe in January that the administration could, in view of this situation, truly justify the lifting of the escape clause tariff, which was the stabilizing factor in the market. I found it difficult to understand what reasoning could determine that it was in the best interests of the Nation to pull the rug from under the domestic industry and open the door to an even heavier volume of foreign sheet glass produced under conditions which make it impossible for the domestic industry to be competitive.

Somewhere, though, and somehow, someone found the reasoning which led to this decision. It was faulty reasoning, and it led to a bad decision. In Henryetta, Okla., the decision was worse than bad, and in the homes of the 200 men who were laid off it is disaster. These men have been frankly told that the number two tank furnace at the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. plant, where they have worked, will be shut down for at least a year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is time for Congress to review the provisions and the administration of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, which gives the President the power to impose these tariffs and take them away. I protested vigorously in January when the sheet glass tariff was lifted. I knew then that these results were very likely to follow.

I was not alone in this protest. I joined many of you here, and representatives of the labor unions and the industry to present sound arguments which should have been convincing, but they were not. The tariff was removed.

I believe Congress established the escape clause tariff as a means of protecting domestic industry where it is impossible for the domestic industry to compete in an international market. I believe Congress intended this escape clause to provide protection and job security for people such as these skilled, specialized glassworkers in Oklahoma. I believe Congress intended the escape clause to be used to make sure that we have adequate domestic industry and an adequate skilled labor pool as insurance against a time when imported products might not be available.

Whatever the reasoning which led to the removal of the escape clause on sheet glass, the results are not what Congress intended. I have pointed out that the sheet-glass industry is a small, specialized industry with a limited market. That does not mean it is dispensable. But without tariff protection, it cannot survive in any healthy fashion. It will be tragic if the Nation pays this price for a faulty decision based on out-of-date documentation.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION AND NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION SHOULD BE INVESTIGATED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, since April 10, the House Science and Astronautics Committee has been investigating the Apollo disaster which claimed the lives of three courageous Americans. During the hearings it became apparent that the issues raised by the disaster were far broader than the technical question of what specifically caused the fire. It also became apparent that the Apollo Review Board, which was essentially an inhouse investigation by NASA, did not address itself to the broader questions.

From the testimony and subsequent developments it is clear that the entire management capability and supervisory competence of NASA is in question. It is well known that NASA tried to avoid this issue by deliberately suppressing a report written by Maj. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips and sent to North American Aviation, the principal Apollo contractor, on December 19, 1965. Anyone who reads the report will immediately realize that NASA knew of many of the deficiencies in performance by North American Aviation months before the January 27, 1967, disaster. When the Phillips report is read in conjunction with the Apollo Review Board findings, it becomes crystal clear that NASA did not properly supervise its contractor.

On April 26, I issued a statement and made a speech on the floor of the House which outlined in detail the responsibility of NASA and North American Aviation in this matter. Then on April 29 after NASA had full opportunity to make the Phillips report available to Congress and had indicated to my office that it would not do so, I issued another statement and released the Phillips report. I will include my April 29 statement and the Phillips report at the end of my remarks.

The serious questions raised during the hearings and by the Phillips report have not been answered. Further and immediate action must be taken. The public is entitled to know whether its money is being spent with care. The public has a right to ask if we are developing a program of the highest quality. The public is entitled to ask assurances that everything humanly possible be done to protect the safety of future astronauts.

We know that the evidence produced so far indicates that NASA is not competently administering one of the largest Federal programs. We also know that NASA has been extremely reluctant to be candid about its operations. There is every reason to believe that NASA will not examine itself sufficiently to form the basis for the changes that are needed to insure that there are no further catastrophes.

Therefore, I recommend that the President appoint a high level commission to fully investigate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to determine whether that agency has the competence to carry out the space program and to recommend changes in the agency to insure that our space program is efficiently and safely administered.

The commission should not be made up of individuals from NASA or from any of its contractors. It should be composed of the most eminent Americans that can be found to serve and should include highly qualified scientists and engineers.

I propose that one of the Nation's most distinguished scientists, Dr. Jerome Weisner, be appointed as chairman of the commission. Dr. Wiesner's experience as the Director of the Office of Science and Technology and as Chairman of President Kennedy's Science Advisory Committee will be invaluable. His knowledge of the operations of Government coupled with his indisputable scientific ability make him the ideal person to chair the commission. At present Dr. Weisner is provost of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

The American people must have complete confidence in the administration of the space program. We cannot expect them to give it unqualified support until these questions are answered.

In order to insure confidence the Commission should thoroughly evaluate NASA and make recommendations regarding the future conduct of our space efforts.

The quest for space is exciting and challenging. It has stirred the bold spirits of men everywhere. We owe it to those who have responded to the challenge to insure their safety. We owe it to the taxpayers to insure the wise use of their dollars. We owe it to America to use our intelligence and abilities to strive for perfection. Now is the time for stocktaking. Out of the Apollo tragedy should come a determination to forestall another disaster and to seek answers to the broad policy questions through an objective, thorough inquiry by a distinguished citizens' commission. Then Congress can assess our priorities and make the basic policy decisions for the future of the space program.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the statement I issued on April 29, 1967, when I made available the Phillips report:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM F. RYAN, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1967

NASA's continued suppression of the Phillips Report is a challenge to the principle of freedom of information in a democratic society. It is also a challenge to the Congressional investigative process. The relevance of this report to the Congressional hearings on the Apollo disaster is obvious. Not only is it pertinent to the management competence of North American Aviation, but also the supervisory competence of NASA, both of which are in question. The record of the Congressional Hearings will be incomplete without the report and without a thorough examination of NASA officials regarding its contents and a similar examination of representatives of North American Aviation including its President, Mr. J. L. Atwood, who testified under oath on April 11, 1967, "General Phillips has not given us a copy of any report."

Having considered the importance of the Phillips Report to the Congressional investigation and my responsibility to the American people as an elected representative, and having given NASA an ample opportunity to release the document (it has been three days since NASA was advised I had seen it, and NASA has indicated to my office that they will not release it), I have decided to make available photocopies of the covering letter and NASA Review Team Report which anonymously came to me.

I am concerned that this information be used to stimulate an evaluation of the Nation's space program. The public must be assured that future space efforts are properly managed, that the public investment of billions of dollars is wisely husbanded, and that American lives are safeguarded.

We now know about the mismanagement, slipshod workmanship and lack of quality control involved in the Apollo program. No matter which wire or what phenomenon may have caused the actual fire on January 27, under such conditions accidents and disasters are bound to happen sooner or later and those responsible for the conditions must accept responsibility for the problems which ensue. I think the editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of Wednesday, April 26, put it very well in saying ". . . In the case of the Apollo ship, poor design and ground-testing procedures were at fault . . . the real challenge in space flight is the challenge to competence and individual craftsmanship at every stage of the project. Workmanship and operating procedures also have to exceed in quality anything men have attempted before." I think the implication of this is clear and is worth repeating. More important than being first on the moon is being first in quality anywhere.

Today I wish to stress another aspect of the problem that I do not think has been fully realized. I refer to the extreme spiraling of costs and fiscal mismanagement in the space program. Apparently, part of NASA's reticence in this episode is a concern that the public, if made aware of the gross waste and mismanagement of the taxpayers' money, might demand a more careful accounting. This is especially important now since the Congress of the United States is considering the NASA budget for 1968 and has shown some reluctance to accept at face value the often vague and at other times obscure and over-technical explanations accompanying NASA's budget requests.

Let me set forth some of the comments made about costs in the Phillips Report. And at the same time let me suggest that one of the reasons why various Congressmen felt that the Apollo Review Board amounted to NASA investigating itself is precisely because the Apollo Review Board made no mention of the need to reshape overall management policies nor did it point to the severe problem of excessive cost.

The Phillips Report says:

"The S-II cost picture . . . has been essentially a series of cost escalations with a bow wave of peak costs advancing steadily throughout the program life. Each annual projection has shown either the current or succeeding year to be the peak. NAA's estimate of the total 10 stage program has more than tripled. These increases have occurred despite the fact that there have been reductions in hardware.

"Late, incomplete, and incorrect engineering releases have caused significant hardware delivery schedule slippages as well as unnecessary program costs.

"Corporate interest in, and attention to, S&ID performance against the customer's stated requirements on these programs is considered passive . . . the main area of corporate level interest appears to be in S&ID's financial outlook and in their cost estimating and proposal efforts.

"The final (cost) estimate does not represent, either in tasks to be done or in resources required, the legitimate program requirements as judged by the program manager, but represents total work and dollars required to support a level of effort within S&ID

"The present proliferation of the functions invites noncontributing 'make-work' use of manpower and dollars as well as impediments to program progress.

"Frankly stated—we firmly believe that S&ID is overmanned and that the S–II and CSM programs can be done, and done better, with fewer people.

"Schedule requirements have been revised a number of times, and seven articles, originally required for delivery by the end of 1965, have been eliminated. . . . NAA is forecasting that the total cost of the reduced spacecraft program will be greater than the cost of the previous planned program.

"There is little confidence that NAA will meet its schedule and performance commitments within the funds available for this portion of the Apollo program."

There is no need to convince anyone of the seriousness of these comments. Certainly they speak for themselves. But one of the illusions that NASA has fostered is that these problems are unique to their relations with North American Aviation. But other evidence suggests a pattern.

On April 5, 1967, Congressman Joseph E. Karth, Chairman of the Subcommittee on Space Science and Applications, was interviewed during a program called "NBC Inquiry: Crossroads in Space" on NBC/TV. In the course of this interview he said: ". . . (On the subject of Surveyor) . . . Originally, NASA estimated the cost of this program through completion—that is for seventeen flights—to be upwards of fifty million dollars. It has now been pared down to seven flights and we expect that it will cost somewheres in the neighborhood of $650 million . . . The Centaur is another program where I think the same thing is true with Surveyor . . . the overall technological requirements of the program were seriously underestimated to begin with . . . the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory is one that I think has probably been the least successful of all the unmanned spaceflight programs. We find . . . that for all practical purposes the Orbiting Astronomical Observatory must be in fact completely redesigned. That spacecraft never had an opportunity, never had a chance of working . . . I would guess that the redesign work that's necessary to make the Astronomical Observatory workable, one in which we can have some degree of confidence of accomplishing its mission, will cost us (in addition to the more than $54 million already spent) somewheres in the neighborhood of from 75 to 100 million additional dollars . . . I don't think that the Congress really has supervised NASA as closely as it should or could . . . my major criticism is that NASA generally has not done enough preliminary design and basic research work, as it relates to the respective programs, before they begin cutting hardware and getting into the development field. Because, when you start cutting hardware which, indeed, in the first instance is very, very expensive, and then you reach a point where you find you've made a mistake and you have to go back, and then do your homework and then recut new hardware, this raises havoc with time schedules and it raises havoc with cost—original cost estimates."

Again I think the import of this commentary is self-evident. The problem goes beyond the situation described in General Phillips Report to the entire spectrum of NASA's activities. The Phillips Report only clarifies the extent to which NASA is well aware of this situation. At issue for us, therefore, are the decision-making processes within NASA and the question of accountability on the part of NASA to the public which pays for NASA's operations and pays, one might add, a spectacular bill.

I would like to call your attention to an immediate issue which also goes to the heart of NASA's decision-making processes. It is the question of how to proceed from here on. A good example of the seriousness of this question is the proposed development of the NERVA II nuclear engine, for which the Congress is now being asked to authorize funds. $200 million is being requested for NERVA during FY 68 for combined NASA and AEC relevant programs which are to be directed and coordinated by one NASA official.

Up to this point NASA has been involved in developing the technology that would make it possible to build this engine and in studies of its estimated efficiency and possible use. The decision has now been taken, within NASA, to proceed with the development of the hardware—to build the engine itself—at a conservatively estimated cost of $2 billion between now and 1975 when it is expected to be ready for flight testing. I will not go into the details here about the internal arguments at NASA as to whether this is a wise decision, or discuss the divisions within the scientific community over future space efforts. But the principal purpose or mission requirement that has been devised for this nuclear engine is a manned landing on Mars by 1985.

Are we confronted with another deadline?

Unlike the moon deadline, which had become an expressed national goal, and which must bear part of the responsibility for the corner-cutting leading to the Apollo disaster, the manned Mars mission is not an expressed national goal. The public has not been asked to approve of such a decision. It is not yet clear that we have the resources or skills to accomplish it. The scientific community is not certain that we will learn any more from such a mission than from an unmanned mission at a fraction of the cost. Moreover, the public has not been informed that those who intend to perform this feat are going to present a bill now conservatively estimated at upwards of 150 to 200 billion dollars in a relatively few years. In the light of past experience with the accuracy of original estimates, it would not be fantastic to suppose that the real cost would be 500 to 600 billion dollars instead, which (accepting the proposed 1985 landing year) could possibly mean the incredible average expense of approximately 30 billion dollars a year for this portion of NASA's effort alone.

No one has presented this picture to the American people and asked them if they are willing to support such a fantastic effort. And no one has asked the American people if they have confidence in those officials who are now managing our space program to carry out these decisions with the ultimate responsibility of safety, success and high quality, and at the least possible cost. If this issue is not faced now, when NASA's intention later becomes clear, there will already have been so much money sunk into this project that the only way the public will have a choice of saying yes or no will be if they are willing to consider the possibility of taking billions of dollars already spent and throw them down the drain.

The public has not been asked if they wish to proceed so quickly, or in a manned mission where instruments might do just as well. They have not been asked if their sense of priorities about all the other issues facing this nation allows for this effort at the possible expense of other matters of importance. These decisions are being made for them by the same agency whose competence in the management of the Apollo program is in question. As Newsweek said in its May 1st commentary on the Apollo program: ". . . the ability of the government-industry partnership to manage a $23 billion program must still be demonstrated."

The Phillips Report is only a means to an end. As I said in my statement on April 26, "The Phillips Report does not discuss these future plans. But it does give the American people some basis for evaluating the performance of those who will be shaping these plans at vast public expense."

Attached is the full text of the document which came into my possession entitled "NASA Review Team Report" with a covering letter to Mr. J. L. Atwood signed by Major General Samuel C. Phillips on December 19, 1965.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the Record the Phillips report, a document entitled "NASA Review Team Report," together with a covering letter dated December 19, 1965, from Maj. Gen. Samuel C. Phillips to Mr. J. L. Atwood, president of North American Aviation, Inc.:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., December 16, 1965.
Mr. J. L. ATWOOD,
President, North American Aviation, Inc., El Segundo, Calif.

DEAR LEE: I believe that I and the team that worked with me were able to examine the Apollo Spacecraft and S–II stage programs at your Space and Information Systems Division in sufficient detail during our recent visits to formulate a reasonably accurate assessment of the current situation concerning these two programs.

I am definitely not satisfied with the progress and outlook of either program and am convinced that the right actions now can result in substantial improvement of position in both programs in the relatively near future.

Inclosed are ten copies of the notes which we compiled on the basis of our visits. They include details not discussed in our briefing and are provided for your consideration and use.

The conclusions expressed in our briefing and notes are critical. Even with due consideration of hopeful signs, I could not find a substantive basis for confidence in future performance. I believe that a task group drawn from NAA at large could rather quickly verify the substance of our conclusions, and might be useful to you in setting the course for improvements.

The gravity of the situation compels me to ask that you let me know, by the end of January if possible, the actions you propose to take. If I can assist in any way, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Samuel C. Phillips,
Major General, USAF,
Apollo Program Director.

NASA REVIEW TEAM REPORT

I. INTRODUCTION

This is the report of the NASA's Management Review of North American Aviation Corporation management of the Saturn II Stage (S–II) and Command and Service Module (CSM) programs. The Review was conducted as a result of the continual failure of NAA to achieve the progress required to support the objective of the Apollo Program.

The scope of the review included an examination of the Corporate organization and its relationship to and influence on the activities of S&ID, the operating Division charged with the execution of the S–II and CSM programs. The Review also included examination of NAA off-site program activities at KSC and MTF.

The members of the Review Team were specifically chosen for their experience with S&ID and this intimate knowledge of the S–II and CSM programs. The Review findings, therefore, are a culmination of the judgments of responsible government personnel directly involved with these programs. The team report represents an assessment of the contractor's performance and existing conditions affecting current and future progress, and recommends actions believed necessary to achieve an early return to the position supporting Apollo program objectives.

The Review was conducted from November 22 through December 6 and was organized into a Basic Team, responsible for over-all assessment of the contractor's activities and the relationships among his organizational elements and functions; and subteams who assessed the contractor's activities in the following areas:

Program Planning and Control (including Logistics).

Contracting, Pricing, Subcontracting, Purchasing.

Engineering.

Manufacturing.

Reliability and Quality Assurance.

Review Team membership is shown in Appendix 7.

Team findings and recommendations were presented to NAA Corporate and S&ID management on December 19.

II. NAA'S PERFORMANCE TO DATE—ABILITY TO MEET COMMITMENTS

At the start of the CSM and S–II Programs, key milestones were agreed upon, performance requirements established and cost plans developed. These were essentially commitments made by NAA to NASA. As the program progressed NASA has been forced to accept slippages in key milestone accomplishments, degradation in hardware performance, and increasing costs.

A. S–II

1. Schedules: As reflected in Appendix VI key performance milestones in testing, as well as end item hardware deliveries, have slipped continuously in spite of deletions of both hardware and test content. The fact that the delivery of the common bulkhead test article was rescheduled 5 times, for a total slippage of more than a year, the All System firing rescheduled 5 times for a total slippage of more than a year, and S–II–1 and S–II–2 flight stage deliveries rescheduled several times for a total slippage of more than a year, are indicative of NAA's inability to stay within planned schedules. Although the total Apollo program was reoriented during this time, the S–II flight stages have remained behind schedules even after this reorientation.

2. Costs: The S–II cost picture, as indicated in Appendix VI has been essentially a series of cost escalations with a bow wave of peak costs advancing steadily throughout the program life. Each annual projection has shown either the current or succeeding year to be the peak. NAA's estimate of the total 10 stage program has more than tripled. These increases have occurred despite the fact that there have been reductions in hardware.

3. Technical Performance: The S–II stage is still plagued with technical difficulties as illustrated in Appendix VI. Welding difficulties, insulation bonding, continued redesign as a result of component failures during qualification are indicative of insufficiently aggressive pursuit of technical resolutions during the earlier phases of the program.

B. CSM

1. Schedules: A history of slippages in meeting key CSM milestones is contained in Appendix VI. The propulsion spacecraft, the systems integration spacecraft, and the spacecraft for the first development flight have each slipped more than six months. In addition, the first manned and the key environmental ground spacecraft have each slipped more than a year. These slippages have occurred in spite of the fact that schedule requirements have been revised a number of times, and seven articles, originally required for delivery by the end of 1965, have been eliminated. Activation of two major checkout stations was completed more than a year late in one case and more than six months late in the other. The start of major testing in the ground test program has slipped from three to nine months in less than two years.

2. Costs: Analysis of spacecraft forecasted costs as reflected in Appendix VI reveals NAA has not been able to forecast costs with any reasonable degree of accuracy. The peak of the program cost has slipped 18 months in two years. In addition, NAA is forecasting that the total cost of the reduced spacecraft program will be greater than the cost of the previous planned program.

3. Technical Performance: Inadequate procedures and controls in bonding and welding, as well as inadequate master tooling, have delayed fabrication or airframes. In addition, there are still major development problems to be resolved. SPS engine life, RCS performance, stress corrosion, and failure of oxidizer tanks has resulted in degradation of the Block I spacecraft as well as forced postponement of the resolution of the Block II spacecraft configuration.

III. NASA ASSESSMENT—PROBABILITY OF NAA MEETING FUTURE COMMITMENTS

A. S–II

Today, after 4½ years and a little more than a year before first flight, there are still significant technical problems and unknowns affecting the stage. Manufacture is at least 5 months behind schedule. NAA's continued inability to meet internal objectives, as evidenced 5 changes in the manufacturing plan in the last 3 months, clearly indicates that extraordinary effort will be required if the contractor is to hold the current position, let alone better it. The MTF activation program is being seriously affected by the insulation repairs and other work required on the All Systems stage. The contractor's most recent schedule reveals further slippage in completion of insulation repair. Further, integration of manual GSE has recently slipped 3 weeks as a result of configuration discrepancies discovered during engineering checkout of the systems. Failures in timely and complete engineering support, poor workmanship, and other conditions have also contributed to the current S–II situation. Factors which have caused these problems still exist. The two recent funding requirements exercises, with their widely different results, coupled with NAA's demonstrated history of unreliable forecasting, as shown in Appendix VI, leave little basis for confidence in the contractor's ability to accomplish the required work within the funds estimated. The team did not find significant indications of actions underway to build confidence that future progress will be better than past performance.

B. CSM

With the first unmanned flight spacecraft finally delivered to KSC, there are still significant problems remaining for both Block I and Block II CSM's. Technical problems with electrical power capacity service propulsion, structural integrity, weight growth, etc. have yet to be resolved. Test stand activation and undersupport of GSE still retard schedule progress. Delayed and compromised ground and qualification test programs give us serious concern that fully qualified flight vehicles will not be available to support the lunar landing program. NAA's inability to meet spacecraft contract use deliveries has caused rescheduling of the total Apollo program. Appendix VI indicates the contractor's schedule trends which cause NASA to have little confidence that the S&ID will meet its future spacecraft commitments. While our management review indicated that some progress is being made to improve the CSM outlook, there is little confidence that NAA will meet its schedule and performance commitments within the funds available for this portion of the Apollo program.

IV. SUMMARY FINDINGS

Presented below is a summary of the team's views on those program conditions and fundamental management deficiencies that are impeding program progress and that require resolution by NAA to ensure that the CSM and S–II Programs regain the required program position. The detail findings and recommendations of the individual sub-team reviews are Appendix to this report.

A. NAA performance on both programs is characterized by continued failure to meet committed schedule dates with required technical performance and within costs. There is no evidence of current improvement in NAA's management of these programs of the magnitude required to give confidence that NAA performance will improve at the rate required to meet established Apollo program objectives.

B. Corporate interest in, and attention to, S&ID performance against the customer's stated requirements on these programs is considered passive. With the exception of the recent General Office survey of selected functional areas of S&ID, the main area of Corporate level interest appears to be in S&ID's financial outlook and in their cost estimating and proposal efforts. While we consider it appropriate that the responsibility and authority for execution of NASA programs be vested in the operating Division, this does not relieve the Corporation of its responsibility, and accountability to NASA for results. We do not suggest that another level of program management be established in the Corporate staff, but we do recommend that the Corporate Office sincerely concern itself with how well S&ID is performing to customer requirements and ensure that responsible and effective actions are taken to meet commitments.

C. Organization and Manning: We consider the program organization structure and assignment of competent people within the organization a prerogative of the manager and his team that have been given the program job to do. However, in view of what we consider to be an extremely critical situation at S&ID, one expected result of the NASA review might be the direction of certain reorganizations and reassignments considered appropriate, by NASA, to improve the situation. While we do have some suggestions for NAA consideration on this subject, they are to be accepted as such and not considered directive in nature. We emphasize that we clearly expect NAA/S&ID to take responsible and thoroughly considered actions on the organization and assignment of people required to accomplish the S–II and CSM Programs. We expect full consideration, in this judgment by NAA, of both near and long term benefits of changes that are made.

Frankly stated—we firmly believe that S&ID is overmanned and that the S–II and CSM Programs can be done, and done better, with fewer people. This is not to suggest that an arbitrary percentage reduction should be applied to each element of S&ID, but we do suggest the need for adjustments, based on a reassessment and clear definition of organizational responsibilities and task assignments.

It is our view that the total Engineering, Manufacturing, Quality, and Program Control functions are too diversely spread and in too many layers throughout the S&ID organization to contribute, in an integrated and effective manner, to the hard core requirements of the programs. The present proliferation of the functions invites noncontributing, "make-work" use of manpower and dollars as well as impediments to program progress.

We question the true strength and authority of each Program Manager and his real ability to be fully accountable for results when he directly controls less than 50% of the manpower effort that goes into his program. This suggests the need for an objective reappraisal of the people and functions assigned to Central versus Program organizations. This should be done with full recognition that the Central organization's primary reason for existence is to support the requirements of the Program Managers. Concurrently, the Program Manager should undertake a thorough and objective "audit" of all current and planned tasks, as well as evaluate the people assigned to these tasks, in order to bring the total effort down to that which truly contributes to the program.

It is our opinion that the assignment of the Florida Facility to the Test and Quality Assurance organization creates an anomaly since the Florida activities clearly relate to direct program responsibilities. We recognize that the existence of both CSM and S–II activities at KSC may require the establishment of a single unit for administrative purposes. However, it is our view that the management of this unit is an executive function, rather than one connected with a functional responsibility. We suggest NAA consider a "mirror image" organizational relationship between S&ID and the Florida operation, with the top man at Florida reporting to the S&ID President and the two program organizations reporting to the S&ID Program Managers.

D. Program Planning and Control: Effective planning and control from a program standpoint does not exist. Each organization defines its own job, its own schedules, and its own budget, all of which may not be compatible or developed in a manner required to achieve program objectives. The Program Managers do not define, monitor, or control the interfaces between the various organizations supporting their program.

Organization—S&ID's planning and control functions are fragmented; responsibility and authority are not clearly defined.

Work Task Management—General Orders, task authorizations, product plans, etc., are broad and almost meaningless from a standpoint of defining end products. Detailed definitions of work tasks are available at the "doing level"; however, these "work plans" are not reviewed, approved, or controlled by the Program Managers.

Schedules—Each organization supporting the programs develops its own detailed schedules; they are not effectively integrated within an organization, nor are they necessarily compatible with program master schedule requirements.

Budgeting System—Without control over work scope and schedules, the budget control system cannot be effective. In general, it is an allocation system assigning program resources by organizations.

Management Reports—There is no effective reporting system to management that evaluates performance against plans. Plans are changed to reflect performance. Trends and performance indices reporting is almost nonexistent.

E. Logistics: The CSM and S–II Site Activations and Logistic organizations are adequately staffed to carry out the Logistics support. The problems in the Logistics area are in arriving at a mutual agreement, between NAA and NASA, clearly defining the tasks required to support the programs. The areas requiring actions are as follows:

1. Logistics Plan
2. Maintenance Manuals
3. Maintenance Analysis
4. NAA/KSC Relationship
5. Common and Bulk Item Requisitioning at KSC
6. Review of Spare Parts, Tooling, and Test Equipment Status

F. Engineering: The most pronounced deficiencies observed in S&ID Engineering are:

1. Fragmentation of the Engineering function throughout the S&ID organization, with the result that it is difficult to identify and place accountability for program-required Engineering outputs.

2. Inadequate systems engineering job is being done from interpretation of NASA stated technical requirements through design release.

3. Adequate visibility on intermediate progress on planned engineering releases is lacking. Late, incomplete, and incorrect engineering releases have caused significant hardware delivery schedule slippages as well as unnecessary program costs.

4. The principles and procedures for configuration management, as agreed to between NAA and NASA, are not being adhered to by the engineering organizations.

G. Cost Estimating: The "grass roots" estimating technique used at S&ID is a logical step in the process of arriving at program cost estimates and developing operating budgets. However, there are several aspects of the total process that are of concern to NASA:

1. The first relates to the inadequate directing, planning, scheduling, and controlling of program work tasks throughout S&ID. While the grass roots estimates may, in fact, represent valid estimates (subject to scrubbing of "cushion") of individual tasks by working level people, we believe that the present deficiencies in Planning and Control permit, and may encourage, the inclusion in these estimates of work tasks and level of efforts that are truly not required for the program.

2. The second concern is that the final consolidation of grass roots estimates, developed up through the S&ID organization in parallel through both Central functional and Program organizations, does not receive the required management judgments, at successive levels for (a) the real program need for the tasks included in the estimate, or (b) adequate scrubbing and validation of the man-hours and dollars estimates.

3. The third concern, which results from 1 and 2 above, is that the final estimate does not represent, either in tasks to be done or in resources required, the legitimate program requirements as judged by the Program Manager, but represents total work and dollars required to support a level of effort within S&ID.

Several recommendations are made in the appended reports for correcting deficiencies in the estimating process. The basic issue, however, is that an S&ID Management position must be clearly stated and disciplines established to ensure that the end product of the estimating process be only those resources required to do necessary program tasks. In addition, the Program Manager must be in an authoritative position that allows him to accept, reject, and negotiate these resource requirements.

H. *Manufacturing Work Force Efficiency:* There are several indications of less than effective utilization of the manufacturing labor force. Poor workmanship is evidenced by the continual high rates of rejection and MRB actions which result in rework that would not be necessary if the workmanship had been good. This raises a question as to the effectiveness of the PRIDE program which was designed to motivate personnel toward excellence of performance as a result of a feeling of *personal* responsibility for the end product. As brought out elsewhere in this report, the ability of Manufacturing to plan and execute its tasks has been severely limited due to continual changing engineering information and the lack of visibility as to the expected availability of the engineering information. Recognizing that overtime shifts are necessary at this time, it is our view that strong and knowledgeable supervision of these overtime shifts is necessary, and that a practical system of measuring work accomplished versus work planned must be implemented and used to gauge and to improve the effectiveness of the labor force. The condition of hardware shipped from the factory, with thousands of hours of work to complete, is unsatisfactory to NASA. S&ID must complete all hardware at the factory and further implement, without delay, an accurate system to certify configuration of delivered hardware, properly related to the DD 250.

I. Quality: NAA quality is not up to NASA required standards. This is evidenced by the large number of "correction" E.O.'s and manufacturing discrepancies. This deficiency is further compounded by the large number of discrepancies that escape NAA inspectors but are detected by NASA inspectors. NAA must take immediate and effective action to improve the quality of workmanship and to tighten their own inspection. Performance goals for demonstrating high quality must be established, and trend data must be maintained and given serious attention by Management to correct this unsatisfactory condition.

J. Following are additional observations and findings that have resulted from discussions during the Review. Most of them are covered in more detail in the appended sub-team reports. They are considered significant to the objective of improving NAA management of our programs and are therefore highlighted in this section of the report:

1. S&ID must assume more responsibility and initiative for carrying out these programs, and not expect step-by-step direction from NASA.

2. S&ID must establish work package management techniques that effectively define,

integrate, and control program tasks, schedules, and resource requirements.

3. S&ID must give concurrent attention to both present and downstream tasks to halt the alarming trend of crisis operation and neglect of future tasks because of concentration on today's problems.

4. A quick response capability must be developed to work critical "program pacing" problems by a short-cut route, with follow-up to ensure meeting normal system requirements.

5. S&ID must maintain a current list of open issues and unresolved problems, with clear responsibility assigned for resolving these and insuring proper attention by Program and Division Management.

6. Effort needs to be applied to simplify management systems and end products. There must be greater emphasis on making today's procedures work to solve today's problems, and less on future, more sophisticated systems. The implementation and adherence to prescribed systems should be audited.

7. NAA must define standards of performance for maintaining contracts current and then establish internal disciplines to meet these standards. Present undefinitized subcontracts and outstanding change orders on the S–II prime contract must be definitized without delay.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The NASA Team views on existing deficiencies in the contractor's management of the S–II, and CSM Programs are highlighted in this section of the report and are treated in more detail in the appended sub-team reports. The findings are expressed frankly and result from the team's work in attempting to relate the end results we see in program conditions to fundamental causes for these conditions.

In most instances, recommendations for improvement accompany the findings. In some cases, problems are expressed for which the team has no specific recommendations, other than the need for attention and resolution by NAA.

It is not NASA's intent to dictate solutions to the deficiencies noted in this report. The solution to NAA's internal problems is both a prerogative and a responsibility of NAA Management, within the parameters of NASA's requirements as stated in the contracts. NASA does, however, fully expect objective, responsible, and timely action by NAA to correct the conditions described in this report.

It is recommended that the CSM incentive contract conversion proceed as now planned.

Incentivization of the S–II Program should be delayed until NASA is assured that the S–II Program is under control and a responsible proposal is received from the contractor.

Decision on a follow-on incentive contract for the CSM, beyond the present contract period, will be based on contractor performance.

It is recommended that NAA respond to NASA, by the end of January 1966, on the actions taken and planned to be taken to correct the conditions described in this report. At that time, NAA is also to certify the tasks, schedules, and resource requirements for the S–II and CSM Programs.

It is further recommended that the same NASA Review Team re-visit NAA during March 1966 to review NAA performance in the critical areas described in this report.

THE LATE JAMES A. ALBERTSON, PRESIDENT, WISCONSIN STATE UNIVERSITY, STEVENS POINT

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has brought tragedy and loss to thousands of American families from coast to coast. Most of these have been personal tragedies in the sense that the fine young men who have given their lives fighting their country's cause in Vietnam were just beginning their careers and had not yet made an impact in what would have been their chosen field or profession or vocation.

For hundreds of these boys, we will never know what contribution they might have made to their communities and their nation had their lives not been cut short by the cruel and indifferent consequences of war.

One of the very tragic byproducts of the war in Vietnam, however, was not caused by enemy bullets or mortars or antiaircraft fire. It was an accident, tragic accident that could have happened here in the United States or anywhere—an accident in which a plane crash into the side of a mountain during a storm claimed the lives of eight distinguished educators.

One of those educators, the leader of the group, was a close friend of mine. More than that, he was a leader in education in Wisconsin, the President of Wisconsin State University at Stevens Point.

Like most of our war casualties in Vietnam, Jim Albertson was a young man—not a youth in his twenties with the wonders of the world beckoning him to a promising and challenging career—but a young man of 41 who had already served 5 years as President of WSU, Stevens Point.

His feet were planted firmly on the ground; he knew what he was and what he was about and he brought dynamic leadership and vision to a youthful but maturing university system in our State.

It has been said of Jim Albertson and the members of his team in Vietnam that they were men of great courage who gave their lives for a cause in which they believed deeply.

Of this, there can be no question.

These men with Jim Albertson as their leader were frontline soldiers in the long-range war of ideas. Their weapons were books instead of bullets. Their objective was to help develop universities in which young people of Southeast Asia could seek truth to guide them in deciding their own destiny.

Jim Albertson died performing his duties and discharging his obligations as he saw them. History will have nothing to say about the individual who was Jim Albertson because his short tenure in the role of shaping our educational system was too brief for its impact to be felt on a broad scale.

But those of us who knew Jim Albertson and who had the opportunity and privilege of working with him know that his contributions to Wisconsin in 5 short years were immense. More than that, We know that had he not been cut short in his promising career, he would have made further substantial contributions to education, not only in our State and throughout the Midwest but in our Nation as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, the loss of Jim Albertson is an incalculable loss. Our country is in sore need of men of his caliber and vision. He will long be remembered by those of us who knew him and worked with him in the short time he was among us as a leader in education in our community and State.

My fondest memory of Jim goes back to 1965 when together we planned "Education Day in Central Wisconsin."

The principal focus of "Education Day" was the youth leadership workshop for the high school students of my district. We invited two upperclassmen from each of the 64 high schools in the Seventh District to an all-day conference. Francis Keppel, the then Commissioner of Education, keynoted the day's activities and four panels were set up on the vital issues of the day.

It was a memorable experience for those students who attended and Jim Albertson's leadership and participation in the day's activities will, I know, always be remembered by those future leaders of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the tributes that were paid to Jim Albertson in the newspapers of our State, during the memorial services that were held for him, and in the Wisconsin State University paper, the Pointer, give a small indication of the measure of the man and the tremendous impact he made on the community of Stevens Point and central Wisconsin in his 5 years of service.

Under unanimous consent, I ask that these materials and certain other statements and remarks be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, there is little one can say when such a tragic loss occurs. My very deepest condolences go out to Jim's wife, Janice, and his five children who must bear the heaviest burden in what is a very deep loss to the hundreds of friends Jim Albertson had throughout the country.

The materials, referred to above, follow:

[From the Stevens Point Daily Journal, Mar. 24, 1967]

AIR CRASH KILLS STATE EDUCATORS

The president of Stevens Point university, two other Wisconsin educators and a former assistant director of the state college system were among nine persons killed Thursday in a plane crash in Vietnam.

All were members of a state department team of educators who had been in Vietnam since January studying problems of college and high school education.

The victims:

James H. Albertson, 41, president of Stevens Point State university.

A. Donald Beattie, 45, dean of the school of business and economics at Whitewater State university.

Melvin L. Wall, 54, head of the department of plant and earth sciences at River Falls State university.

Harry Bangsberg, 38, president of Bemidji (Minn.) State college, and a former assistant director of state colleges in Wisconsin.

Vincent F. Conroy, 44, lecturer and director of field studies in Harvard university's center for research and development on educational differences.

Arthur D. Pickett, 51, director of the honors program at the University of Illinois Chicago campus.

Howard J. Johnshoy, 48, dean of academic affairs at Gustavus Adolphus college, St. Peter, Minn.

Robert La Follette, 72, state department official working with the team, no close relative of the Wisconsin La Follettes.

Also killed was the unidentified pilot.

The small twin engine plane in which they were flying crashed into the side of a mountain south of Da Nang during a rainstorm.

The plane was operated by Air America, a charter firm employed by the United States mission in Vietnam and Laos. There was no indication that the plane had been downed by hostile fire. The weather was described as "very bad."

LANDED NEAR DA NANG

* * * * *

A marine patrol went in by helicopter to bring out the bodies.

The seven man team of educators was working under a $98,000 contract between the agency for international development and Stevens Point State to conduct a survey of higher education in Vietnam.

The group was to recommend methods of improving the Vietnamese educational system.

The team had been in Vietnam since the first week in January and was due to leave Apr. 1.

APPOINTED IN 1962

Albertson was named president of Stevens Point in July, 1962, and was inaugurated in April, 1963, as the youngest president in the nine school state university system.

He came to Stevens Point from Ball State Teachers college, Muncie, Ind., where he was assistant to the president and executive assistant to the president from 1957 to 1962. He and his wife had five children.

Beattie was the specialist in the field of business education for the team. He had been at Whitewater since 1962. Previously, he had been at St. Cloud (Minn.) State college.

He also had been supervisor of business education for the Minnesota department of education for six years. He had been vice-president of the National Business Teachers association. He and his wife were the parents of four children.

Wall joined the River Falls faculty in 1940 and was named head of the department after a reorganization of the college of agriculture in 1965. He had been a soil conservationist in Vernon county and a high school agriculture teacher at Roberts before moving to River Falls. He was the father of three children.

Bangsberg was named president of Bemidji State college in 1964. He was executive secretary of the Higher Education Co-ordinating Council of St. Louis at the time. He had been on the state college board of regents from 1959 to 1963.

TAUGHT AT EAU CLAIRE

Bangsberg, a La Crosse native, attended La Crosse State college and taught at Eau Claire State college from 1956 to 1959. His father, Roy L. Bangsberg, is retired editor of the La Crosse Tribune.

Bangsberg was the father of five children. He was to meet his wife, Trudy, in London after the Vietnam study for a European vacation before returning to Minnesota.

La Follette received his master's degree from the University of Wisconsin in 1917.

[From the Stevens Point Daily Journal, Mar. 25, 1967]

DR. JAMES H. ALBERTSON—A SPECIAL INDIVIDUAL

The untimely death in Vietnam of Dr. James H. Albertson is a tragedy of shocking magnitude. His contributions in the circles in which he moved in his brief span of years already were so tremendous that it staggers the imagination to contemplate how much more he would have added in the future were he not so suddenly taken from us.

Dr. Albertson was undeniably an outstanding man of rare special qualities. Time alone can assuage the grief that will be borne by the family to which he was so devoted and dedicated. Theirs is the greatest loss, for it was with them and for them that he lived his life.

Beyond this is the immeasurable loss also to Wisconsin State University. There is an unmistakable Albertson label on much that has taken place there in recent years, not only in physical facilities, but in standards of academic excellence. This is where he achieved his finest contributions to the cause of education. The pity is that it ends so soon.

He will be sorely missed as a community good friend and neighbor. As university president, he worked tirelessly to bring about harmony and understanding between campus and community. He shouldered the immense problems of campus expansion that could not be delayed or postponed, directing campus authorities in the earnest endeavor to make the impact of the expansion cause the least possible inconvenience to the area and its taxpayers.

The death of Dr. Albertson will affect the Wisconsin State University system. In councils at this level, he had demonstrated the qualities of leadership that had been apparent to the group that had selected him in the first place, when he took office as the youngest president in the state university system.

Dr. Albertson's destiny as a national leader in education was apparent in the assignment in Vietnam which led to the tragic accident that ended his life. His being there on a mission to aid in educational improvement for a less-favored people is indicative of his concern for the implementation of education as one of the keys to world peace, order and progress.

He was an example of a unique combination of fine qualities rarely found in a single individual. Vigorous, imaginative, inventive, bold, resourceful, articulate, he was a model of personal integrity and individual high quality. The excellence of his intellect invariably brought logic and reason to discussions in which he was a participant. Dedicated to the best that could be achieved through education, he was an intellectual leader in contriving means by which education could be put to more widespread use in serving all of society.

Sympathetic in his appreciation of the problems of others, he had the ability to understand them and when necessary, to bear with dignity his own disappointments when conditions prevented him from attaining worthy goals.

Stevens Pointers have long speculated on how long we would be able to keep Dr. Albertson here. His obvious destiny was for higher position with greater responsibility to better utilize his great talents for the cause of education. We expected one day to lose him, but certainly not in this harsh, tragic manner.

When our tears fall away, let us direct our thoughts to the great good fortune that is ours because Dr. Albertson was one of us, even for such a brief span of less than five years. He enriched our lives, and he influenced conditions that will mean benefits to the community and the university for many decades to come.

[From the Stevens Point Daily Journal, Mar. 24, 1967]

ALBERTSON KILLED IN VIETNAM AIR CRASH

A plane crash on a rainy Asian mountainside Thursday afternoon took the life of James H. Albertson, 41, president of Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point.

Killed with him in South Vietnam were six other educators on a study mission, a U.S. Agency for International Development official and the pilot.

Two of them, Dr. Melvin Wall of River Falls and Dr. A. Donald Beattie of Whitewater, were from Wisconsin, and a third one, President Harry Bangsberg of Bemidji (Minn.) State College, was a former Wisconsin resident.

They apparently died instantly when their small twin-engined plane hit the mountain north of Da Nang.

President Albertson left here Jan. 2 to head a team studying higher education in Vietnam for the Agency for International Development, and he was to have come home next month.

The Associated Press said the plane had left Saigon and was bound for Hue, 360 miles to the north and the site of one of the universities the group was studying.

The pilot landed at Da Nang, about 80 miles from Hue, when the weather became bad. It cleared temporarily and the flight resumed, but rain clouds reportedly closed in again before the crash.

The plane was operated by Air America, a charter firm employed by the U. S. mission in Vietnam and Laos.

A Marine patrol reportedly flew in by helicopter to bring the bodies out.

Word of the tragedy was received by university officials here about 3 a.m. today, and they notified the Albertson family and relatives of the other victims.

A memorial service for President Albertson has been tentatively scheduled for Tuesday afternoon or Wednesday morning at St. Paul's Methodist Church here. Interment will take place in Tacoma, Wash., following cremation.

A memorial fund has been established in President Albertson's name, and the family has requested that flowers be omitted.

The Boston Funeral Home is in charge of local arrangements.

President Albertson came to Stevens Point in July 1962 to succeed William C. Hansen, who retired and is now a state senator.

He was 36 then, and the youngest president in the State University system.

Before coming here, he was executive assistant to the president of Ball State College in Muncie, Ind.

President Albertson, who lived at 617 Linwood Ave., Park Ridge, was married and the father of five children.

Born Sept. 3, 1925, in Brush, Colo., he was a son of Dr. and Mrs. Cyrus E. Albertson. His father, a Methodist minister, died about a year ago, and his mother lives in Seattle, Wash.

President Albertson graduated from high school in Colorado Springs, Colo., and then served in the Coast Guard from August 1943 to June 1946, spending two years in the Pacific.

On Aug. 26, 1946, he was married in Colorado Springs to the former Janice S. Gray.

He received his bachelor's and master's degrees from Colorado State College at Greeley, and his doctorate from Stanford University in California.

In 1949–50 he was a high school teacher in Seattle, and from 1952–55 he taught at Colorado State.

He went to Ball State in 1957, after receiving his doctorate.

His children are Stephen M., 18, Cynthia L., 16, Charles P., 13, Phillip N., 12, and Richard A., 9

President Albertson was a member of St. Paul's Methodist Church, was active in the Area Chamber of Commerce and was a director of Citizens National Bank.

Victims of the crash, besides President Albertson, were:

Dr. Wall, professor of agriculture at River Falls State University.

Dr. Howard Johnshoy, dean of academic affairs at Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.

Dr. Beattie, dean of the School of Business and Economics at Whitewater State University.

Dr. Bangsberg, president of Bemidji State and former assistant to the director of the Wisconsin state university system.

Dr. Vincent F. Conroy, a lecturer and director of field studies in Harvard's Center for Research and Development on Educational Differences.

Dr. Arthur D. Pickett, director of honor programs, University of Illinois, Chicago.

Robert La Follette, an Agency for International Development official stationed at Saigon. La Follette was a Harvard graduate and former professor of history at the University of Maryland. He reportedly was not related to the famous Wisconsin political family.

The pilot was not identified.

Dr. Beattie, a University of Minnesota graduate, had been at Whitewater since 1962.

* * * * *

WSU Grew Rapidly Under Albertson

Wisconsin State University had just over 2,000 students when James H. Albertson became president in 1962.

It was obviously entering a period of expansion, but the rate was only dimly forseen. During President Albertson's five years here, the univeristy was to grow more than in its first 68 years.

In 1962, the state predicted a 1970 enrollment of 4,500 at WSU. This projection has had to be revised several times. Last fall, the student population passed 5,000, and by next fall it is expected to exceed 6,000.

The campus grew accordingly—the Science Building, the new classroom building, residence halls and residence centers on the north campus, and the addition to the University Center were all completed during his presidency, though some were begun under his predecessor, William C. Hansen.

Academic offerings grew, and the name of the state college system was changed to state university in recognition of its broader role here and in other cities.

With growth came inevitable problems.

During the 1950s and early '60s, the university had to expand where land was available, and this resulted in a divided campus, split by a belt of residenial property.

President Albertson sought to join the two segments. This brought opposition, because it meant buying homes and closing streets, but he felt it was a price WSU had to pay for a unified campus.

It was a message which was sometimes difficult to get across to the community.

As early as October 1962 President Albertson had talked openly of his hopes for closing parts of Stanley and Franklin Streets as part of a lang-range campus plan—currently a controversial topic.

Last year, he fought a losing battle to prevent the development of a shopping center in an area where he felt it would disrupt the campus.

But on the whole, he was unusually successful in guiding the university's expansion. With a gift of diplomacy, he eased most of the growing pangs accompanying the exploding student population, which is expected to climb to 10,000 by 1975.

President Albertson's influence extended beyond the campus and the state.

Last November he was named to the board of directors of the Association of State Colleges and Universities, and he was a leader in other educational organizations and served on many other special projects.

Sorrow Voiced at Albertson's Death

Shock and sorrow were expressed today by leaders in education and other fields on hearing of the death of President James H. Albertson of Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point.

Statements included—

Gov. Warren Knowles: "Wisconsin has sustained a tragic loss with the death of President James Albertson. Not only was he an outstanding administrator-educator, but a dedicated public servant. All of the citizens of the state have sustained a great loss, and I am sure join with me in extending sympathy to the family, faculty and students."

Gordon Haferbecker, acting president of WSU-Stevens Point:

"This is a great shock to all of us. We were all looking forward to President Albertson's return to the campus in April. His boundless energy, idealism and warm personality affected everyone with whom he came in contact. We at the university, both students and staff, know that a truly great educator has been lost. We have also lost a dear friend."

Mrs. Mary Williams, Stevens Point, a member of the Board of Regents:

"President Albertson brought to the president's office here his dedication to the importance of education. His capacity for hard work, his idealism, his persuasive and enthusiastic personality were tested during the changes and crises in this growing institution. His commitment to the development of a better world through educated men and women is an inspiration to all of us."

Eugene McPhee, Madison, director of state universities:

"President Albertson and the members of his team were men of great courage who gave their lives for a cause in which they believed deeply. They were front-line soldiers in the long-range war of ideas. Their weapons were books instead of bullets. Their objective was to help develop universities in which young people of Southeast Asia could seek truth to guide them in deciding their own destiny. The regents, fellow faculty and staff members and students of the state universities are shocked by this tragedy and extend deep sympathy to the families of President Albertson, Dean Beattie and Professor Wall of our system, and to the family of President Bangsberg, who served for many years with us."

Rep. Melvin R. Laird, R-Marshfield:

"The tragic loss of Jim Albertson in Vietnam last night was a shock to all of us who knew and revered him as a friend and who admired his outstanding work in higher education in central Wisconsin. The building job that Jim Albertson was doing for higher education will be sorely missed throughout our state. His active participation in community affairs resulted in much closer ties between the community and the university. Words are always inadequate to describe the deep feelings of loss and sorrow at the passing of a close and dear friend. Though young in years, Jim's contribution to education and his untiring zeal in his work will live on after him as an inspiration to those who follow. My deepest sympathy goes out to Jim's wife, Janice, to his children and to all his friends and neighbors in Stevens Point and throughout the country."

"Couldn't Say No," Said Albertson of Mission

When James H. Albertson was asked a year ago to head a mission in South Vietnam, he gave it lengthy consideration before agreeing.

"In the final analysis, I couldn't say no," he commented.

The purpose of the mission was to study higher education in war-ravaged Vietnam, to help the country prepare for a peaceful future.

He left Stevens Point Jan. 2 and was to have returned next month.

His death, and those of the other members of his team, does not necessarily nullify their efforts.

They had already filed a preliminary report on their recommendations for Vietnam's public universities, and this could prove a basis for changes in the nation's system of higher education.

President Albertson returned briefly to Stevens Point in early February to organize a team which will study secondary education in Vietnam.

During an interview then, he said his higher education team was trying to "operate under Ambassador Lodge's motto—doing not what we think is good for American education, but what is good for Vietnamese education."

He declared it would be "a great tragedy if we won the military war in Vietnam and pulled out at this time. We have a moral commitment to remain and help the country in other areas, as education."

He left here Feb. 11 and was to have returned home again April 20, a week later than the other members of the team.

During his absence, Gordon Haferbecker, vice president for academic affairs, has been acting president.

Eugene McPhee of Madison, director of state universities, said today Haferbecker will continue in this role until a permanent successor is named.

Selection of a new president, the ninth in WSU's history, will be made by the Board of Regents of the State University system, but the timing is uncertain.

The board will meet in April, probably on the 14th. Normal procedure is for a committee to conduct a nationwide search, screen applicants and then recommend a selection to the full board.

There is presently in existence a special board committee seeking a replacement for President Walker Wyman of Whitewater, who recently resigned. President Wyman had been appointed in 1962 almost simultaneously with President Albertson.

Whether the Whitewater committee will be expanded to include Stevens Point, or whether a new committee will be formed, will probably not be determined until the board meets.

President Albertson was regarded as a "comer" in the field of education, and was known to have had offers from other, larger universities.

With the late Regent John Thomson, he led a fight to establish a community college system in Wisconsin—a system of two-year institutions offering both academic and technical training.

They felt community colleges were needed in an increasingly complicated society to raise the status of technical training and serve more young people. The first such community college, or "dual track institution," may be established soon at Rhinelander.

In cooperation with Rep. Melvin R. Laird, R-Marshfield, President Albertson helped lay the groundwork for bringing a federal water pollution laboratory to Stevens Point.

The lab, to be started next year at the northeast corner of Maria Drive and Reserve Street, will serve the upper Mississippi valley.

More recently, he and John Joanis, president of Sentry Insurance, cooperated in purchasing 156 acres near the university as a future industrial site. The property, purchased by Sentry, is to be used by scientifically oriented industries which can draw on the talents of university and pollution laboratory personnel.

[From the Stevens Point Daily Journal, Mar. 25, 1967]

Dr. James H. Albertson—A Special Individual

The untimely death in Vietnam of Dr. James H. Albertson is a tragedy of shocking magnitude. His contributions in the circles in which he moved in his brief span of years already were so tremendous that it staggers the imagination to contemplate how much more he would have added in the future were he not so suddenly taken from us.

Dr. Albertson was undeniably an outstanding man of rare special qualities. Time alone can assuage the grief that will be borne by the family to which he was so devoted and dedicated. Theirs is the greatest loss, for it was with them and for them that he lived his life.

Beyond this is the immeasurable loss also to Wisconsin State University. There is an unmistakable Albertson label on much that has taken place there in recent years, not only in physical facilities, but in standards of academic excellence. This is where he achieved his finest contributions to the cause of education. The pity is that it ends so soon.

He will be sorely missed as a community good friend and neighbor. As university president, he worked tirelessly to bring about harmony and understanding between campus and community. He shouldered the immense problems of campus expansion that could not be delayed or postponed, directing campus authorities in the earnest endeavor to make the impact of the expansion cause the least possible inconvenience to the area and its taxpayers.

The death of Dr. Albertson will affect the Wisconsin State University system. In councils at this level, he had demonstrated the qualities of leadership that had been apparent to the group that had selected him in the first place, when he took office as the youngest president in the state university system.

Dr. Albertson's destiny as a national leader in education was apparent in the assignment in Vietnam which led to the tragic accident that ended his life. His being there on a mission to aid in educational improvement for a less-favored people is indicative of his concern for the implementation of education as one of the keys to world peace, order and progress.

He was an example of a unique combination of fine qualities rarely found in a single individual. Vigorous, imaginative, inventive, bold, resourceful, articulate, he was a model of personal integrity and individual high quality. The excellence of his intellect invariably brought logic and reason to discussions in which he was a participant. Dedicated to the best that could be achieved through education, he was an intellectual leader in contriving means by which education could be put to more widespread use in serving all of society.

Sympathetic in his appreciation of the problems of others, he had the ability to understand them and when necessary, to bear with dignity his own disappointments when conditions prevented him from attaining worthy goals.

Stevens Pointers have long speculated on how long we would be able to keep Dr. Albertson here. His obvious destiny was for higher position with greater responsibility to better utilize his great talents for the cause of education. We expected one day to lose him, but certainly not in this harsh tragic manner.

When our tears fall away, let us direct our thoughts to the great good fortune that is ours because Dr. Albertson was one of us, even for such a brief span of less than five years. He enriched our lives, and he influenced conditions that will mean benefits to the community and the university for many decades to come.

[From the Wisconsin Rapids Daily Tribune, Mar. 25, 1967]

Loss of Dr. Albertson and His Team Will Be Deeply Felt

The loss to the Midwest, and to the nation as a whole, in the tragic deaths of eight educators in a Vietnam plane crash defies measure.

These were young men—comers in the field of higher education—as their selection for this State Department team would indicate.

Dr. James Albertson headed the team. He had been president of Stevens Point State University, which took giant strides under his administration. At the age of 41, which is young for the position of leadership he held, his professional horizon appeared unlimited.

The others, including three with Wisconsin associations, were also just approaching the peaks of their careers.

What they might have accomplished will never be known. Whether the bulk of their findings concerning educational improvements in Vietnam died with them has not yet been determined.

We share with his family and friends in Stevens Point the grief over Dr. Albertson's untimely death, for he was a strong supporter of some of the aspirations which this community has had in the field of higher education.

The breadth of his vision carried beyond the provincial view that a two-year college in Wisconsin Rapids might pose some vague threat to the state university.

Rather, he was an advocate of the community college concept, and stood ready to assist with professional staffing from his own departments for those liberal arts courses which might have been offered here.

Other, and younger, men are also losing their lives daily in Vietnam. We continue to hope that these sacrifices will bring to that battered nation the goals which we espouse—freedom, and a better way of life.

[From the Stevens Point Journal, Mar. 25, 1967]

Dr. Albertson Merited Respect

Stevens Point.—Occasionally we come in contact with a person we develop a deep respect for. Sometimes this respect is merited by the individual's position, sometimes by his deeds and accomplishments in life. Sometimes this respect arises simply because of the type of person he is. Rarely, all too rarely, we are privileged to know a man who obviously warrants the respect of all who knew him for all of these reasons. Dr. James Albertson was such a man.

In situations like this, the tendency is to dwell on the extent of the loss. America is much poorer, for it is men like Dr. Albertson who shape our future. The state education system has a void which will be filled, but never completely. Our State University, which blossomed under his touch, will continue to produce fine young men and women for our society, but they will all be lacking the fine moulding of character that just knowing him would have caused. His family's loss, of course, is beyond relating.

But there are gains, too. A man like James Albertson does not live in this world without enriching it. I am sure his efforts in Vietnam, though interrupted, will result in the possibility of a brighter future for his fellowman. This possibility will, ultimately, be the thing which will win the war for America and the Vietnamese people.

And the state education system? The people guiding it cannot have helped but learn from this educator, for he had ability and vision perhaps even beyond many on the Board of Regents.

WSU has had its foundation for the future constructed by this man, and this alone cannot but be to the benefit of all who will use its facilities.

Don't let me forget the city of Stevens Point and its people. Our benefits, culturally and economically, have been, are and will be considerable due to his and the university's influence. Strangely though, there are many people in our city still unable to appreciate this.

As it should be, his family is the richest in what he has gained in life. They have been left in themselves some of his love of fellowmen, excellence of character, and conviction of purpose.

James Albertson was a man among men.

Sincerely,

Robert Winn.

President Albertson and the University

(By Gordon Haferbecker, acting president, campus memorial service for President James H. Albertson, Mar. 30, 1967)

Five years ago, in July of 1962, James H. Albertson became the eighth president of Wisconsin State College, Stevens Point. He assumed his duties at a time when the faculty, the student body, the physical plant, and the curriculum were in the midst of a dramatic expansion. Ten years earlier the college had become a multi-purpose institution, offering liberal arts degrees in addition to teacher education. The cooperative graduate program with the University of Wisconsin was in its third summer; college enrollment was 2,000.

He said, "I accept the presidency of this college in deep humility and with an awareness of the traditions of service and dedication that have been important in its history. I pledge to do my utmost to fulfill the responsibilities you have placed in my hands."

Dr. Albertson same to his new task with zest, enthusiasm, and a vision of what this college might become. Fate gave him only four and a half years to translate his dreams into reality. The time was short but it was long enough to leave a permanent imprint upon every aspect of the life of this university.

At the beginning of his administration, he invited the faculty to develop a new constitution which would give the student body and faculty a broader role in policy making. This challenge was accepted and during that first year the task was accomplished.

The university administrative structure was reorganized and expanded in preparation for the coming growth of student body and faculty. Every university administrator was challenged to examine his role and function and to establish goals and a program of action. Weekly breakfast meetings of administrators provided for communication and for advice and counsel. The President urged each of us to resolve our problems and issues in terms of principle, not of expediency; in terms of what is best in the long run for the student and for the university.

President Albertson recognized that a strong faculty was the University's greatest asset and that it would be difficult to build and hold such a faculty in a time of increased demand for professionally trained staff. He challenged the department chairmen and deans to reexamine recruitment methods and to find new ways of locating good personnel. He personally interviewed most of the prospective faculty members. He looked for qualities of scholarship, enthusiasm, and concern for students.

Under the President's leadership we developed an extensive program of orientation for new staff members, to acquaint them with the university past and present, with the community, and with the student body. We attempted to better define what was expected of a faculty member in teaching, in service, and in professional growth. An improvement of instruction committee was established to consider ways and means of improving the quality of teaching within the university.

The service role of the university was expanded to include the offering of non-credit courses and courses for paper industry personnel. Together with Congressman Laird, President Albertson brought about the establishment of a federal water resources laboratory on our campus. With President Jonas of Sentry Insurance plans were made to acquire land near the campus as an industrial site for scientifically oriented industries.

Dr. Albertson projected an international role for the University. He brought Dr. Borlasa of Philippine Normal University to the campus last year as an administrative interne. This year we have a library interne from Central America and an exchange professor from Scotland. He hoped to work out student and faculty exchange programs with the Philippines and with Latin America. He encouraged the faculty to establish a yearly study seminar on international affairs. This project is in its second year. In his inaugural address, the President said, "In my judgment it is imperative that all of our students know something about the people of the non western world—Latin America, Africa, the Near and Far East, and command an understanding of their culture and their history." The faculty has established a major in Latin American studies and a minor in Russian and East Central European Studies.

His greatest effort in the international area was the one to which he gave his life, assisting the people of Viet Nam in improving their whole educational program. Fortunately the work of the higher education team was nearly complete and a preliminary report had been prepared. The work will be completed and will be of great value to Viet Nam's educational future.

Dr. Albertson met regularly with student leaders to discuss their aims and desires. He strove to utilize the residence halls and university centers for a maximum contribution to student growth and development. He was always willing to talk to students, to listen to their problems and questions.

He urged he faculty to develop a statement of purpose and long range goals for the University. It is significant that these goals, now stated in our catalog, are given as characteristics of the individual student, the learner, as he becomes an educated person.

In his inaugural address, Mr. Albertson said "The primary function of this college is to teach students. The student was the reason for establishing an educational institution in Stevens Point and is the reason for continuing to support an educational program here. The question of what to teach and what to learn is the basic problem facing this college."

To mention just a few other dreams that were fulfilled during his 4½ years, we have seen the establishment of a Wisconsin State University Foundation, the inauguration of a College of Fine Arts, a new definition of the role of the University Laboratory School, active participation in federal educational and research projects, new concepts of campus planning, and the establishment of a learning resources center.

President Albertson left us with many challenges which will require our attention and efforts for years to come. In his inaugural address in 1963 he asked the faculty to examine the curriculum to see if it adequately met the needs of our students. He said, "Is what is going on now in the college classrooms the best use of the hour in terms of the needs and goals of the students, the purpose of the course, and the objectives of the institution and the society it serves? . . . The cold hard facts about the world in which we live today and the challenges and opportunities facing present and future generations of students, require that they receive an intensified and broadened liberal learning. One built upon the past, that accurately reflects the realities of the present, and equips the learner to meet the uncertainties of the future." The faculty has accepted this challenge but the task is not yet completed.

I am sure that the University will want to continue to expand its role in international affairs both in our curricular program and in our service to other countries.

The faculty is preparing a revised constitution, as he suggested, recognizing that a University which now has 5,000 students and will have 10,000 students in another decade, needs a different faculty organizational structure than a college with 2,000 students.

The President challenged us all in this conclusion to his Inaugural address: "as we move to reappraise what is going on in the classroom in terms of the needs and goals of our students, the purpose of the course, and the objectives of the college and the society it serves, may we remember the words of Abraham Lincoln in his message to Congress, December 1, 1862:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate for the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so we must think and act anew, we must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country." To this President Albertson added, "and then we shall serve our state."

The world, the nation, Wisconsin, and Stevens Point have lost a great educational leader. Students, faculty, and staff have lost a warm personal friend who was concerned for their welfare. His family has lost a husband and father who cherished every moment that he could spend with them.

James H. Albertson's work is done. May God give to each of us some of his vision of what can be, some of his dedication to principle, and some of his love for his fellow man.

Memorial Services Set for Dr. James Albertson

Memorial services have been set for Dr. James H. Albertson who was killed in Viet Nam Thursday, March 23. First services will be at St. Paul's Methodist Church in Stevens Point on Tuesday, March 28 at 2 p.m. and will be conducted by Dr. Ted Schwartz with the assistance of two of Dr. Albertson's brothers.

A campus memorial service will be held at 10 a.m. Thursday, March 30 at the WSU Fieldhouse. Dr. William Stielstra is in charge of this service which will be conducted by campus ministers along with Dr. Gordon Haferbecker, Acting President.

Official information from H. Ladenheim who was on the AID Viet Nam desk in Washington, indicates that recovery operations are still not complete but that there definitely were no survivors to the crash. Both Air Force and Marine teams were involved in the recovery operations and the Ambassador's plane is being used between Da Nang and Saigon.

It has been established that the accident was weather induced, the airplane was Air American plane which was a U.S. registered airplane and therefore is under F.A.A. control. The F.A.A. has an investigative team assembled and their safety director is on the scene. Deputy Ambassador Curran also visited the scene by helicopter shortly after the accident.

The survey work that this Agency for International Development team was doing in Viet Nam was not in the possession of the team members on the fatal flight and excellent preliminary draft of the survey work has already been mailed to all the agencies who were to receive it. The work will be carried on by AID personnel and others they select.

In addition to Mrs. Albertson and five children, Dr. Albertson was survived by six brothers and sisters: C. Gene Anderson, a Methodist minister who is district superintendent of the Methodist Church Oregon Conference from Portland, Oregon; Audrey McKnight, a faculty member from Olympic Junior College, Bremerton, Washington; Robert G. Albertson, Director of Humanities at the University of Puget Sound at Tacoma, Washington; Mrs. Ruth Hicks of Kennewick, Washington; Mrs. Barbara Johnson of Matawan, New Jersey and D. Richard Albertson, Director of Training Programs for the Washington Educational Association, Seattle, Washington.

Memorial services for Dr. Melvin Wall, professor of Plant and Earth Science at River Falls, a member of Dr. Albertson's team, will be held at 2:30 p.m. today at the First Methodist Church in River Falls. Robert Lewis, representing the WSU–Stevens Point Foundation, Inc. and Gilbert Faust, chairman of the faculty and their wives will represent WSU–Stevens Point in that service. A memorial service will be held Wednesday, March 29 at 10 a.m. in St. Peters, Minn. for Howard Johnshoy of Gustavus Adolphus University and one the same day at 1:30 p.m. on the campus of the Bemidji College for Dr. Harry Bangsberg, president of Bemidji, both members of Dr. Albertson's team.

Dr. Albertson's family has requested that no flowers be given but memorial gifts will be accepted by the WSU–Stevens Point Foundation, Inc. and by St. Paul's Methodist Church. Both will be used for educational purposes.

University Memorial Service for President James H. Albertson

Prelude: John M. Thomas, Organist.

Invocation: the Reverend Harris T. Hall.

Anthem—"The Eyes of All Wait Upon Thee," J. Berger, The University Choir.

President Albertson and the University: Gordon Haferbecker, Acting President.

A Student Reflections: Warren Kostroski, Student Body President.

Selected Readings: Earl Smith.

Memorial Silence.

A Prayer for the University: Monsignor James P. Finucan.

Benediction—"Benedictus and Hosanna," Dietrich: The University Choir.

Postlude.

Wisconsin State University—Stevens Point, 10:00 a.m., March 30, 1967, Fieldhouse.

Memorial Services for President Albertson Conducted at St. Paul's Methodist Church, Stevens Point, March 28, 1967

(By Rev. Schwartz)

We are gathered here in the sight of God and in His house to honor a man of vision. What constitutes a man of vision? In the first place, a man of true vision is one who is true to himself.

Dag Hammarskjold once penned these words, and unless I indicate otherwise in this address of tribute, they will be from his book, *Markings*—"Don't be afraid of yourself," he wrote. "Live your individuality to the full but for the good of others. Don't copy others in order to buy fellowship or make convention your law instead of living the righteousness. To become free and responsible—for this alone was man created. And he who fails to take this way which could have been his shall be lost eternally. A man of vision is not only alive to himself, but to his world as well. To say 'yes' to life is at one and the same time to say 'yes' to oneself. 'Yes,' even to that element in which is most unwilling to let itself be transformed from a temptation into a strength."

The ancient Goethe said that life is what you're alive to. It is not only life, but bread. To be alive only to appetite, pleasure, pride, money-making, and not to goodness and kindness, purity and love, history, poetry, music, flowers, stars, God and eternal hope, is to be all but dead.

The art of living rightly is like all arts; it must be learned and practiced with incessant care.

A man of vision is true to himself and alive to his world. And, therefore, he is free to give himself to a great vision, one which you can fix your heart upon as well as your eyes and your efforts and make your life count. Bishop Ensley once said the way to make your life count is to have a great idea and then marry it and settle down and raise a family.

Hammarskjold said "Never look down to test the ground before you take the next step. Only he who keeps his eye fixed on the far horizon will find his right road. Life only demands from you the strength that you do possess. Only one feat is possible, not to have run away. This is one of the things that divides and separates those few from the most of people, and that is the fact that some people have great visions and can give their lives to them. And it literally sticks out all over them in everything they do, and are, and say. But those of us who are satisfied with dreaming small—we run away when the going gets rough. And we never use our full strength."

Now, how does a man of vision affect others. Well, in the first place, he gives other people fits—especially those who do not share his vision. People with great vision are those who make life literally uncomfortable for those of us who are smaller than we ought to be—or could be. People simply do not understand very well a devotion to such a vast vision and, therefore, the man of vision is controversial; He is misunderstood and he is maligned at times. Anyone who has literally devoted his life to a vision—a big vision—drags the rest of us along, kind of in the wake.

Thomas Carlyle said "A man lives by believing something, not by debating or arguing about many things." Oh, what would happen to Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point if every doorway had this across the top of it!

One of the reasons that men of vision give the rest of us a difficult time is the fact that a person who has really devoted his life to vision is under an obligation to sacrifice his lesser dreams—the littleness of life; and if they are in a place of responsibility, involving lots of people, then if this vision is to be kept alive, then the lesser dreams and the littlenesses of the people who work with him whether they be above him on the packing order or below him makes no difference. Their littlenesses and their small dreams must be sacrificed, too. But without it, the vision would die. And if you've given your life to that vision, then so would the spirit of the man.

Paul Torneau, the Swiss psychiatrist, said that life is like a great staircase. The strong can cope with the high steps. Throw out a challenge to them and they can summon up the strength required for a veritable rock fact. The weak, on the contrary, tend to get discouraged if faced with an obstacle that is too high—I know how that is. And to doubt their own capacity to tackle it, one must hew out little steps for them to climb one at a time. They take fresh courage when eventually they have been able to climb as high as the others. Jim Albertson could help hew out the little steps for other people, but he couldn't do it for all. There just wasn't enough time.

The people who play it safe are not those who give their lives to visions. Those who prefer to go through life with mincing, small hesitating steps, they don't like it when somebody comes by who is a man of vision. They always want to go faster than we want to go. And there are those who always try and step up on the coat tails so they can ride along without doing anything about it.

The man of vision, you see, sees the panorama and the horizon while the rest of us see only a few feet ahead. And they also leave the overtones of life which most of us do not hear because we're just not tuned in to this bigger vision.

Again I quote from Hammarskjold, "The more faithfully you listen to the voice within you, the better you will hear what is sounding outside, and only he who listens can speak." Is this the starting point of your two dreams? To be allowed the clarity of mind, to mirror life and impurity of heart to mold it. Well, this is how the man of vision affects others. If you want to live an easy life, if you want to take the mincing, safe steps through life, then don't ever marry vision. Don't ever give your life to a great panorama. Because you can't let go.

A man of vision is remembered when he dies, not for what he's done, even though he may have done a great deal. Great men of vision are not known for what they knew. Ralph Waldo Emerson talked about such men. He said the comfort of meeting men of genius is that they talk sincerely. They feel themselves to be so rich that they are above the meanness of pretending knowledge which they do not have. And they frankly tell you what puzzles them. Men of vision are not known as wise men; they are known as seers. They're not known for what they do, they're not known for what they know. They're not even known for what happened to them. We remember Adlai Stevenson not because he fell dead on the streets of London. And that fact will soon be forgotten. What happens to you in the long run is immaterial. It's whether you follow your vision, regardless of the risks.

Not too long before he met his untimely death, Hammarskjold wrote this in his *Markings:* "To be free, to be able to stand up and leave everything behind, without looking back, to say 'yes', he who has placed himself in God's hands, stands free vis-a-vis men." He's entirely at ease with them because he has granted them the right to judge. Hammarskjold defined maturity among other things as a new lack of self consciousness, the kind you can only attain when you become entirely indifferent to yourself to an absolute ascent to your fate. Men of vision are not remembered for what they've done, or for what they know, or for what happened to them, but for what they are to us, when they are near and what their vision means to us, when they are gone.

William James once said, "Lives based on having and acquiring are less free. And lives based either on doing or on being." In Keats' *Iperian*, there are these lines: "For to bear all naked truths and to envision all circumstances all calm, that is the top of sovereignty." Men of vision are the top of sovereignty. Whether we like them or not we look to them. And when we lose them, the loss is profound. For these are the princes of the spirit. They are willing to risk everything, even life itself, for the larger vision which most of us only get a glimpse of.

Jim Albertson was such a man.

VITA: JAMES H. ALBERTSON

1. PERSONAL

Name: James Herbert Albertson.

Home address: 617 Linwood Ave., Park Ridge, Stevens Point, Wisconsin 54481.

Home Telephone: 715 (Area Code) 344-5763.

Birth Date & Place: 3 September 1925, Brush, Colorado.

Nationality: American (Norwegian-German-French ancestry).

Marital Status: Married to Janice S. (Gray) Albertson, 5 children: 4 boys, 1 girl.

Religion: Methodist.

Avocations: Reading, canoeing, sailing, theatre, music.

Travel: United States, Canada, Asia.

2. EDUCATION

High School: Colorado Springs High School, Colorado Springs, Colorado—Graduated June 1943.

College

Undergraduate: Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado, History Major—Degree granted June 1949.

Master's Degree: Colorado State College, Greeley, Colorado Administration Major—Degree granted June 1952.

Doctorate Degree: Stanford University, Stanford, Cal., Higher Education Major—Degree granted June 1957.

Dissertation Title: Influence of National Professional Organizations on Programs of Professional Education.

3. EXPERIENCE

Business: Retail ice cream, Clothing Salesman, Radio Announcer, Radio Technician, U.S. Post Office—All as a student during vacation periods or after school hours.

Service: U.S. Coast Guard (Reserve), served as an Electronics Technician August 1943–June 1946 in World War II; Overseas (Pacific) 2 years.

Education: Class Room Teacher, Seattle Public Schools—1949–50; Teacher-Administrator, Colorado State College—1950–57; Executive Assistant to the President, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana—1957–1962; President, Wisconsin State University, Stevens Point—1962 to present. (5200 students, 550 faculty and staff).

4. BIOGRAPHICAL LISTINGS

Who's Who in America, Who's Who in American Education.

5. PROFESSIONAL AND PERSONAL AFFILIATIONS

Consultant-Examiner, North Central Association.

Director, Association State Colleges & Universities.

Director, National Commission Accreditation for Teacher Education.

Director, Sentry Foundation.

Director, Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point Foundation, Inc.

Director, Citizens National Bank, Stevens Point, Wis.

Director, Lay Advisory Board, St. Michael's Hospital, Stevens Point.

President, Goerke Bequest Corporation.

Commission Member, Board of Education East Wisconsin Conference of Methodist Church.

6. MEMBERSHIPS

Professional and Honorary Memberships include: Phi Delta Kappa, Sigma Phi Epsilon, Phi Epsilon Phi, Blue Key, Association for Higher Education, Wisconsin Education Association, Colorado Schoolmasters Club, Stevens Point Rotary Club.

7. REFERENCES

Dr. W. H. Cowley, David Jacks Professor of Higher Education, Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Dr. John R. Emens, President, Ball State University, Muncie, Indiana.

Dr. Fred H. Harrington, President, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin.

[From the New Pointer, Mar. 30, 1967]

UNIVERSITY MOURNS JAMES H. ALBERTSON

Wisconsin State University has gone into mourning for its late president, Dr. James H. Albertson, as students, faculty, staff and administrators attend memorial services this week.

Classroom halls stood silent, administrative offices were closed as services were held in the University Fieldhouse on Thursday morning.

After an organ prelude, played by John Thomas, WSU Music department, Rev. Harris T. Hall called the congregation into prayer. The University Choir sang the anthem, "The Eyes of All Wait Upon Thee."

Acting president of the University, Gordon Haferbecker, read parts of James H. Albertson's inaugural address in which appears his dedication to the students. "The primary function of this college is to teach students," and to the faculty which he felt were needed to build a strong university. He had only four and one-half years to make his dreams come true.

Haferbecker stated that "The world, the nation, Wisconsin, and Stevens Point have lost a great educational leader" and asked "May God give to each what can be, some of his dedication to principle, and some of his love for his fellow man."

Warren Kostroski, Student Senate president, expressed his own personal reflections which he summarized in three words—respect, admiration, affection. He described him as a man to be respected, not just because of his high position, but because of his poise, confidence, educational training, sincerity, and great personal warmth.

Earl Smith, WSU speech and Drama major, read selections of poetry. They included Psalm 139—"The Searcher of Hearts is Thy Maker;" part of "Markings" by Dag Hammarskjold—

> "Tomorrow we shall meet,
> Death and I—
> And he shall thrust his sword
> Into one who is awake.";

"Lincoln, Man of the People" by Edwin Markham—

> ". . . As when a lordly cedar green with boughs
> Goes down with a great shout upon the hills
> And leaves a lonesome place against the sky . . .";

and a poem written by President Albertson's father, a Methodist minister—". . . let me follow the trail."

The readings were followed by a memorial silence and then a prayer for the university was led by Monsignor James P. Finucan, St. Joseph's Church.

The University Choir closed out the service with "Benedictus and Hosanna."

In addition to President and Mrs. Albertson's families, U.S. Congressman Laird, and State Senator Hansen.

Rites were held at St. Paul's Methodist Church on Tuesday afternoon. There Rev. Theodore Schwartz, pastor of the church, described Dr. Albertson as a man of vision to the congregation which crowded the church.

Throughout his speech, he used quotes from the late Dag Hammarskjold, United Nations Secretary General, who also met his death in a plane crash.

Two of the President's brothers, Robert, of Tacoma, Wash., and Gene, of Portland, Ore., participated in the afternoon service. They are both Methodist ministers.

Robert Albertson read from the scriptures and led prayers; Gene Albertson told of James Albertson's dreams.

"Jim, our brother, your friend, was one who sought in his life to make Christ real," he said.

He described his brother as a man with a special love for the sea. Albertson had spent his youthful years on the shores of Puget Sound in the state of Washington.

It was on the other side of the ocean he so loved that he met his death. In dying, Gene said, he and his associates gave evidence that there are people in the United States striving for reconstruction and peace. Surely their efforts will lead to consequences that are unending.

Also taking part in the service was John M. Thomas, WSU music department, who played especially selected music on the organ.

In addition to the members of the President and Mrs. Albertson's families, members of the university community, and townspeople, the services were attended by educators from Ashland, Eau Claire, La Crosse, Madison, Menomonie, Oshkosh, Platteville, River Falls, Superior, and Whitewater.

The Albertson family has requested that no flowers be sent. Instead, gifts may be sent to the James H. Albertson Memorial Fund, in care of WSU-Stevens Point Foundation, Inc. or to St. Paul's Methodist Church, Stevens Point. Both funds will be used for educational purposes.

ONE WHO WAS "WIDE AWAKE"

(The following is a talk given by Rev. Theodore Schwartz, Pastor of St. Paul's Methodist church, at the Tuesday afternoon memorial services held for President James H. Albertson.)

We are gathered here in the sight of God and in His house to honor a man of vision. What constitutes a man of vision? In the first place, a man of true vision is one who is true to himself.

Dag Hammarskjold once penned these words, and unless I indicate otherwise in this address of tribute, they will be from his book, Markings—"Don't be afraid of yourself," he wrote. "Live your individuality to the full but for the good of others. Don't copy others in order to buy fellowship or make convention your law instead of living the righteousness. To become free and responsible—for this alone was man created. And he who fails to take this way which could have been his shall be lost eternally. A man of vision is not only alive to himself, but to his world as well. To say 'yes' to life is at one and the same time to say 'yes' to oneself. 'Yes,' even to that element in which is most unwilling to let itself be transformed from a temptation into a strength."

The ancient Goethe said that life is what you're alive to. It is not only life, but bread. To be alive only to appetite, pleasure, pride, money-making, and not to goodness and kindness, purity and love, history, poetry, music, flowers, stars, God and eternal hope, is to be all but dead.

The art of living rightly is like all arts; it must be learned and practiced with incessant care.

A man of vision is true to himself and alive to his world. And, therefore, he is free to give himself to a great vision, one which you can fix your heart upon as well as your eyes and your efforts and make your life count. Bishop Ensley once said the way to make your life count is to have a great idea and then marry it and settle down and raise a family.

Hammarskjold said "Never look down to test the ground before you take the next step. Only he who keeps his eye fixed on the far horizon will find his right road. Life only demands from you the strength that you do possess. Only one feat is possible, not to have run away. This is one of the things that divides and separates those few from the most of people, and that is the fact that some people have great visions and can give their lives to them. And it literally sticks out all over them in everything they do, and are, and say. But those of us who are satisfied with dreaming small—we run away when the going gets rough. And we never use our full strength."

Now, how does a man of vision affect others. Well, in the first place, he gives other people fits—especially those who do not share his vision. People with great vision are those who make life literally uncomfortable for those of us who are smaller than we ought to be—or could be. People simply do not understand very well a devotion to such a vast vision and, therefore, the man of vision is controversial; He is misunderstood and he is maligned at times. Anyone who has literally devoted his life to a vision—a big vision—drags the rest of us along, kind of in the wake.

Thomas Carlyle said "A man lives by believing something, not by debating or arguing about many things." Oh, what would happen to Wisconsin State University-Stevens Point if every doorway had this across the top of it!

One of the reasons that men of vision give the rest of us a difficult time is the fact that a person who has really devoted his life to vision is under an obligation to sacrifice his lesser dreams—the littleness of life; and if they are in a place of responsibility, involving lots of people, then if this vision is to be kept alive, then the lesser dreams and the littlenesses of the people who work with him whether they be above him on the pecking order or below him makes no difference. Their littleness and their small dreams must be sacrificed, too. But without it, the vision would die. And if you've given your life to that vision, then so would the spirit of the man.

Paul Torneau, the Swiss psychiatrist, said that life is like a great staircase. The strong can cope with the high steps. Throw out a challenge to them and they can summon up the strength required for a veritable rock fact. The weak, on the contrary, tend to get discouraged if faced with an obstacle that is too high—I know how that is. And to doubt their own capacity to tackle it, one must hew out little steps for them to climb one at a time. They take fresh courage when eventually they have been able to climb as high as the others. Jim Albertson could help hew out the little steps for other people, but he couldn't do it for all. There just wasn't enough time.

The people who play it safe are not those who give their lives to visions. Those who prefer to go through life with mincing, small hesitating steps, they don't like it when somebody comes by who is a man of vision. They always want to go faster than we want to go. And there are those who always try and step up on the coat tails so they can ride along without doing anything about it.

The man of vision, you see, sees the panorama and the horizon while the rest of us see only a few feet ahead. And they else leave the overtones of life which most of us do not hear because we're just not tuned in to this bigger vision.

Again I quote from Hammarskjold, "The more faithfully you listen to the voice within you, the better you will hear what is sounding outside, and only he who listens can speak." Is this the starting point of your two dreams? To be allowed the clarity of mind, to mirror life and impurity of heart to mold it. Well, this is how the man of vision affects others. If you want to live an easy life, if you want to take the mincing, safe steps through life, then don't ever marry vision. Don't ever give your life to a great panorama. Because you can't let go.

A man of vision is remembered when he dies, not for what he's done, even though he may have done a great deal. Great men of vision are not known for what they knew. Ralph Waldo Emerson talked about such men. He said the comfort of meeting men of genius is that they talk sincerely. They feel themselves to be so rich that they are above the meanness of pretending knowledge which they do not have. And they frankly tell you what puzzles them. Men of vision are not known as wise men; they are known as seers. They're not known for what they do, they're not known for what they know. They're not even known for what happened to them. We remember Adlai Stevenson not because he fell dead on the streets of London. And that fact will soon be forgotten. What happens to you in the long run is immaterial. It's whether you follow your vision, regardless of the risks.

Not too long before he met his untimely death, Hammarskjold wrote this in his Markings: "To be free, to be able to stand up and leave everything behind, without looking back, to say 'yes,' he who has placed himself in God's hands, stands free vis-a-vis men." He's entirely at ease with them because he has granted them the right to judge. Hammarskjold defined maturity among other things as a new lack of self consciousness, the kind you can only attain when you become entirely indifferent to yourself to an absolute accent to your fate. Men of vision are not remembered for what they've done, or for what they know, or for what happened to them. But for what they are to us, when they are near and what their vision means to us, when they are gone.

William James once said, "Lives based on having and acquiring are less free. And lives based either on doing or on being." In Keats' Iperian, there are these lines: "For to bear all naked truths and to envision all circumstances all calm, that is the top of sovereignty." Men of vision are the top of sovereignty. Whether we like them or not we look to them. And when we lose them, the loss is profound. For these are the princes of the spirit. They are willing to risk everything, even life itself, for the larger vision which most of us only get a glimpse of.

Jim Albertson was such a man.

REMARKS OF PAUL A. YAMBERT, DEAN OF APPLIED ARTS AND SCIENCE

A good friend will not return, and yet his dreams will remain with us. In fact, to the extent we are able to perceive his vision, we shall be able to watch his dreams become reality.

In his inaugural address, President Albertson reconsidered Spencer's question, "What knowledge is of most worth?" His responses to this query clearly indicated his breadth of knowledge, his ability to organize and articulate complex ideas, and his sense of commitment to higher education; but they also outlined a path for us to follow.

At this sad time when we turn to consider what memorial is of most worth, the thought keeps recurring that the University itself may become a living and perpetual memorial. If only we can catch his vision, implement his plans, and emulate his commitment to those things which are truly of most worth.

HE WAS A "COMER" IN EDUCATION

President Albertson was regarded as a "comer" in the education field. He had received offers from larger universities. He was a leader in the fight to establish a community college system in Wisconsin. This is a system of two-year institutions offering both academic and technical training.

Dr. Albertson helped lay groundwork for a federal water pollution laboratory soon to be constructed here at WSU–SP.

When he became president in 1962, James H. Albertson was 37 years old. This University's enrollment was just over 2000. During his years as president, the University grew more than it had during the previous 68.

In 1962, the state's long-range prediction for this school was a 1970 enrollment of 4500. The student population passed the 5000 mark last fall and is expected to exceed 6000 by next fall.

Campus growth kept pace with the expanding student body. The Science and Classroom buildings, residence halls, residence centers, and the University center were all completed during Dr. Albertson's term as president.

The rapid expansion of the University was not without its problems. The campus was separated by a belt of residential property. President Albertson's efforts to join the two segments were met with local opposition because it meant buying homes and closing city streets.

Dr. Albertson felt that this was a price which had to be paid for a unified campus. Convincing the community of this was sometimes difficult. President Albertson had talked of closing parts of Franklin and Stanley Streets, as early as 1962. This is still a controversial topic today.

He fought to prevent development of a shopping center in an area which he felt would disrupt campus expansion.

Dr. Albertson had a gift of diplomacy which he used effectively in guiding the University's expansion, and to ease the problems of growth.

Last November, Dr. Albertson was named to the board of directors of the Association of State Colleges and Universities. He was a leader in other educational organizations and was deeply involved on many other special projects.

On campus, Dr. Albertson was a "doer," an organizer, and a leader. He urged a broader policy making role for the faculty and the student body. He strengthened the faculty in preparation for the growth of the school.

Dr. Albertson felt that "the question of what to teach and what to learn is the basic problem facing this college." With this in mind, he made certain that problems were resolved in terms of what is best in the long run for the student and the University. He was constantly involved with ways and means of improving the quality of teaching within the University.

In his inaugural address, Dr. Albertson said "In my judgment it is imperative that all of our students know something about the people of the nonwestern world; Latin America, Africa, the Near and Far East, and command an understanding of their culture and their history." WSU–SP has since established a major in Latin American Studies and a minor in Russian, and East European studies.

Dr. Albertson's efforts in international education carried him to South Vietnam where he was heading a study of higher education. The work of the team was nearly completed when a tragic plane crash claimed their lives.

"I COULDN'T SAY NO"

A year ago, President James H. Albertson, was asked by the U.S. Agency for International Development (AID) to head an educational study mission to South Vietnam.

The purpose of the mission was to study education at the university level in the war-torn country and to help prepare it for a peaceful future.

He agreed, with some apprehension, to go. "In the final analysis, I couldn't say no!" When asked if he had any fears about making the trip, Albertson replied, "There's always danger, and there is a war on."

He left Stevens Point January 2. The hundred day mission was to have ended in April.

It was on Good Friday that the University received the news of his tragic death, along with his seven man team and their pilot when their plane crashed into a mountain during a turbulent rain storm north of Da Nang, South Vietnam.

Victims of the crash, besides President Albertson, were:

Dr. Wall, professor of agriculture at River Falls State University.

Dr. Howard Johnshoy, dean of academic affairs at Gustavus Adolphus College, St. Peter, Minn.

Dr. Beattie, dean of the School of Business and economics at Whitewater State University.

Dr. Bangsberg, president of Bemidji State and former assistant to the director of the Wisconsin state university system.

Dr. Vincent F. Conroy, a lecturer and director of field studies in Harvard's Center for Research and Development on Educational Differences.

Dr. Arthur D. Pickett, director of honor programs, University of Illinois, Chicago.

The tragic accident did not, however, nullify the efforts of the AID team. Their preliminary report was filed including their recommendations for the Vietnamese universities which could prove as a basis for changes in the nation's higher education system.

The report approximately 200 pages in length with 10 pages of bibliography was drawn from notes of the educators. Two AID officials in Washington and one other representative will go to Vietnam to do a final wrap-up of the team's work with the rectors of the Vietnamese universities.

Copies of this report will be sent to WSU.

President Albertson had returned briefly to Stevens Point in early February to discuss the sending of a second team to Vietnam to study their secondary school system. The first team had been hailed by Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge as one of the most successful regarding the cooperation of the United States and the South Vietnamese.

REMARKS OF JOSEPH LIGHTFOOT, STATE HISTORIAN, UNITED COUNCIL OF WISCONSIN STUDENT GOVERNMENTS

I did not know this fallen man as intimately as others in the University, but have had more opportunities than most students to meet with him. In his office, at a banquet, or in his home, one always received his consistent and sincere, warm, personal greeting.

Dr. James H. Albertson was concerned for the best for all and not the profit of a few. A battle today and another battle tomorrow, concerned about tomorrow yet conquering today—this was his method. The small pettinesses were instantly dismissed for a greater something that he seemed to be reaching out for, yet had not grasped.

On one occasion before this first trip to South Vietnam, I requested a letter of welcome for 85 United Council state conference delegates meeting on the Stevens Point campus. His answer to my simple request left me in awe. "Let us put this letter on the new letterhead and personally type each copy to show these people that we truly enjoy their meeting on our campus." I asked for a post script on the letter about his trip to Vietnam because of the university's pride in his leading the survey team. He gave me that grand Albertson smile and "Thank you very much, Joe." In discussing a signature, I reminded him that time was short as his upcoming trip was very soon and he said, "Let me sign these. Let me do this for you." I left with words of appreciation expressed, but more with an even deeper appreciation of Dr. Albertson as a person.

He was a sincere and genuine human being, one did not have to look for something to be impressed with or something in which to invest esteem because of his university presidency. Dr. Albertson accepted people for what they were, never rebuilding, never remolding—just accepting. Conversation was on the level of the people he was speaking with, not on his level alone. Rich and poor had his time, neither was given any more nor any less than the other.

The loss has been great and personal to family, friends, students and administrators, as well as to the state and to the nation. It is extremely regrettable that this devastating tragedy occurred in the midst of peace activities of the United States in South Vietnam.

Gone is that constant and warm, friendly hand. Gone is the physical loving and lovable man. Gone is another person who honestly and truly put others before his own personal desires. That which remains *has* and *will* benefit the many. Accrediting him for his works does not matter, Dr. James H. Albertson was a gift beyond joy, a gift that needs no recognition.

For those who knew and loved him and for those who brushed his sleeves, all can be thankful to his Creator and worship God for being associated with one, whom Dag Hammarskjold would have called, "wide awake." Deo gratias.

A POINT WELL TAKEN—SOME SOMBER REFLECTIONS

(By Bill McMillen)

(NOTE.—This is not a eulogy and should not be mistaken for one. I, unfortunately, never met President Albertson and cannot speak in the personal terms a eulogy requires. The thoughts below are only my opinions, first on the attitude I felt and now feel toward his trip to Vietnam and second on one of the effects his death will have.)

We had a standing remark when we watched Walter Cronkite at 5:30 in the basement of Hyer. "Just wait," we said, "there will be a report about President Albertson and his team one of these nights, sandwiched right in between Roger Mudd and Eric Severeid."

The report came Good Friday night.

It was not what we expected.

But tragic events seldom are expected. However, they are becoming more and more frequent in the tragic war in Vietnam.

Why was President Albertson in Vietnam? We and others eyed the trip cynically. Perhaps, because, he was another symbol, albeit a peaceful symbol, of America in a country where our entire presence is a justly debatable question.

We viewed the trip and cynically asked why he did not stay home and tend the store. But our question was unfair, our judgment too quick. There were a number of reasons President Albertson and his team were in Vietnam. Some of these reasons were political, some financial, but most importantly they were there performing a service only they, as professional educators could perform. And in performing this service they had the satisfaction they were fulfilling a necessary need.

The President and his team were educators and they were in Vietnam doing a job no minor government official could do. Unfortunately our cynical outlooks clouded the fact that these men were the only people who could do this all important part of the pacification of Vietnam. Even more unfortunately our cynical outlook clouded the fact President Albertson undertook the trip not only out of dedication to his school and his country, but also out of dedication to his profession—education.

Students are at once the greatest cynics and greatest hero-worshippers in the world. Perhaps the two of these necessarily go hand in hand.

President Albertson will become a hero. And it is right that he does.

At forty-one he had accomplished many things and gained a high position.

He gathered a young administration around him and set ambitious goals for the university, both in the educational advancement and in the physical plant.

He was an outstanding representative for the university in the political, business, and social worlds outside.

He died performing a service for our country.

All of these are valid reasons for him becoming a hero. These are the right reasons.

But the ironic reason President Albertson will become a hero, especially to us students, is that he was one of those high and important persons who could be viewed cynically and yet was above the cynicism. We respect him for this.

Now with our cynicism gone we find we deeply respect him. We respect him for the right reasons listed above. Thus we will make him a hero. It will be the right thing to do.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE TO CONGRESS ON THE PENDING RAILWAY STRIKE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, we all listened with a great deal of interest today to the message which our President sent to the Congress relative to the pending railway strike. The recommendations that he offered to us were not easily reached. The public, Congress, and, I am sure, both management and labor are equally concerned about the final solution. In my opinion, the recommendations which the President made to us are fair and reasonable, and I think that they are in the public interest.

I believe that we should look at the alternatives. First, there is the alternative that each dispute from now on would be sent to the Congress. Every time there is an individual dispute, it will be referred to Congress. We would always be expected to settle each strike on an ad hoc, individual, piecemeal basis.

Second, we could do nothing. The President could do nothing, or the Congress could do nothing, and that would be catastrophic and unthinkable.

Third, the President could have recommended the process of seizure. In my opinion, that would be harsh and an improper approach, because it would throw Government into the direct solution of every dispute, wages and operations.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, a better solution for the overall picture would be for this Congress to set up some kind of permanent machinery for the solution of emergency strikes in the transportation industry.

It is for this reason that I have authored and introduced in the House H.R. 5638, which would amend the Railway Labor Act by extending the time for negotiations and offering to the President or to the Congress or to a special board certain courses of procedures, or an arsenal of weapons which any one of three or four different agencies or individuals could use at any given time.

The avowed purpose is to keep the parties bargaining as long as practicable and possible and wisely. But at some point after the entire processes have been exhausted, a definite solution for a limited period of time up to 2 years—which is the recommendation in the President's message today—would be made that would be binding for that period of time.

If we are going to protect collective bargaining, if we are going to keep it as the basically good, strong instrument that it has been over the years, we have reached a point in our Government where we must amend our present processes. In the history of our country, for some 80 years, we have had only two basic measures in this field, the Railway Labor Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. In this period of time the processes have worked reasonably well. In my opinion, however, we have reached a point where we have to find a better solution, a better extension of time in which the parties will bargain in good faith and give collective bargaining an added chance to work.

In this particular case, however, with reference to the President's recommendation, I believe his recommendations are fair and reasonable, and the Congress should enact them, or something similar to them, in a reasonable and good time.

Every Member of this House knows the President has worked diligently toward a solution to this problem over the past 8 months.

He has used wise counsel and tact. He has helped the contending railroads and unions move closer together. They are separated now only by matters of dollars and cents, and we must now help the President and the country bridge that small remaining gap and bring about an honorable, fair settlement to this wage dispute.

Railroads are critical to the Nation. We live in a difficult period; a period in which our national economic security could be damaged severely by a rail shutdown.

Yet, the President chose not to take over the railroads or force the parties into agreement. Rather, he has sought to extend the free collective-bargaining process by another 90 days, with protection for workers against lockout, with guarantee to employers of no strikes.

This is not compulsory arbitration in the sense that some claim. No specific terms are being laid down to either side. They are being asked to use the next months to complete an agreement which they are within a decimal point of attaining.

A yes vote on the joint resolution introduced will help collective bargaining. It will permit the contending parties to come to an agreement at any time during the 90 days. It will help the union. It will help management. It will help the country.

In my opinion, the President has steered a fair and a flexible course in this impending national crisis.

I urge my colleagues to support the joint resolution which will permit the full and free play of collective bargaining to work toward a nationally acceptable resolution of this dispute.

But I also conclude that this Congress must get about the business of finding a permanent solution to these emergency strike problems. We have ducked the issue as long as we can. I think the public has a right now to expect us to meet our responsibility.

AMENDING THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS ACT WITH RESPECT TO STRIKES AT SITES OF CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a refined version of my proposal to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects. The original Thompson bill, H.R. 100, has been revised somewhat as a result of hearings. In the light of those hearings my bill, H.R. 7750, is being revised also. I am introducing the refined version today, and will include a copy of the bill at the conclusion of my remarks.

It is my intention to offer my bill either in the form of individual amendments to H.R. 100 or as a complete substitute. Many Members of Congress, including myself, favor the basic objectives of H.R. 100 to equalize the rights of construction unions to picket with the rights of industrial unions to picket. Unfortunately, it is now absolutely clear that H.R. 100, even as revised in committee, would do a great deal more than its stated objective.

The Goodell bill would essentially equalize the rights of construction unions with the rights of industrial unions to picket. It would, however, clearly prohibit situs picketing where an object of the picketing—

First. Is to remove nonunion employees from the site.

Second. Is to remove employees belonging to independent unions from the site.

Third. Is to promote a product boycott.

Fourth. Is to remove employees who are members of an industrial union from the site.

Fifth. Involves a dispute between construction union employees and an industrial or retail concern.

Sixth. Involves other prime contractors on the site who have bid separately for the contract under requirements of State law.

Seventh. Involves a jurisdictional or other type of dispute in which procedures or arrangements are available for settlement.

Eighth. Involves a U.S. missile or defense installation.

In addition, the Goodell bill would outlaw product disputes on a construction site, thus reversing the recent Supreme Court decision making product disputes lawful.

The Goodell bill would, in effect, restrict situs picketing to circumstances where employees had a legitimate economic dispute with their immediate employer—usually the subcontractor. Under no circumstances could the plumbers, for example, pull down a construction site because they were unhappy with a subcontractor other than the plumbing subcontractor who employs them.

It is my understanding that the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], intends to seek a rule for consideration of H.R. 100 by the House at an early date. I think it is extremely important that the Membership understand the full ramifications of H.R.100. All the situations enumerated above that would be prohibited by my bill would, in a variety of situations, be permitted under H.R. 100. My bill adopts the basic language of H.R. 100 but specifically restricts the use of situs picketing.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 9669

A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows after the semicolon at the end of clause (D):

"(E) forcing or requiring any person to enter into, maintain, or comply with any agreement, express or implied, which shall, directly or indirectly, require such person to cease or refrain at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work, from handling, installing, transporting, using or permitting use of any products or any particular product produced by any other employer, producer, processor, or manufacturer, regardless of whether or not such product or products have previously been handled, installed, transported, used or produced at any such site or sites:

Provided, That nothing contained in this subsection (b) shall be construed to make unlawful a refusal by any person to enter upon the premises of any employer (other than his own employer), if the employees of such employer are engaged in a strike ratified or approved by a representative of such employees whom such employer is required to recognize under this Act: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this paragraph (4) only, nothing contained in such paragraph shall be construed to prohibit publicity, other than picketing, for the purpose of truthfully advising the public, including consumers and members of a labor organization, that a product or products are produced by an employer with whom the labor organization has a primary dispute and are distributed by another employer, as long as such publicity does not have an effect of inducing any individual employed by any person other than the primary employer in the course of his employment to refuse to pick up, deliver, or transport any goods, or not to perform any services, at the establishment of the employer engaged in such distribution:

"*Provided further,* That nothing contained in clause (B) of this paragraph (4) shall be construed to prohibit any strike or refusal to perform services or any inducement of any individual employed by any person to strike or refuse to perform services at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure, or other work and directed solely at any of several employers who are primarily engaged in the construction industry and are jointly engaged as joint venturers or in the relationship of contractors and subcontractors in such construction, alteration, painting, or repair at such site, and there is a labor dispute, not unlawful under this Act or in violation of an existing collective-bargaining contract, relating to the wages, hours, or other working conditions of employees employed at such site by any of such employers and the issues in the dispute do not involve an employer who is not primarily engaged in the construction industry. In determining whether several employers who are in the construction industry are jointly engaged as joint venturers at any site, ownership or control of such site by a single person shall not be controlling. Where a public or governmental body or agency which owns or controls such site, directly awards a contract to an employer in conformity with the requirements of applicable law, such body, or agency and employer are not joint venturers or subcontractors in relationship with each other or with any other employer at the site. For the purposes of this proviso only, and notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, (i) "employers who are in the construction industry" shall mean only those employers whose principal activity is in such industry; (ii) labor disputes unlawful under this Act or in violation of an existing collective-bargaining agreements shall include, but not be limited to—

"(a) any attempt by a labor organization to require an employer to recognize or bargain with or to require the employees of any employer to accept or select as their collective bargaining representative, any labor organization;

"(b) any attempt by a labor organization to cause employees to refuse to perform services because of the employment of employees of another employer on the site;

"(c) picketing, threatening to picket, or causing to be picketed, any employer where an object thereof is the removal or exclusion from the site of any employee on the ground of race, creed, color or national origin;

"(d) any dispute which is a breach of any existing collective-bargaining agreement between any employer and the labor organization representing his employees at the construction site or for which a remedy is available under procedures set forth in such agreement or in any other applicable agreement, arrangement or procedure;

"(e) any attempt by a labor organization to require any employer to cease or refrain from handling, installing, transporting, using, or permitting use of, at the site of the construction, alteration, painting, or repair of a building, structure or other work, any products or any particular product produced by any other employer, producer, processor, or manufacturer, regardless of whether or not such product or products have previously been handled, installed, used or produced at any such site. Any attempt by picketing or inducement of employees not to perform services where an object is to enforce a provision of a collective-bargaining agreement requiring an employer to cease or refrain from such handling, installing, transporting, using, or permitting use of such products or particular product shall constitute an unlawful labor dispute within the meaning of this proviso;

"(f) any picketing at a construction site at which are located the premises of any employer not primarily engaged in the construction industry, which is carried on at any time without truthfully and effectively advising the public, by picket signs and other adequate and appropriate means, that no labor dispute exists with such employer and that the picketing is not directed against him;

"(g) any dispute which requires a labor organization, as provided in this subsection, to give a prior written notice of intent to strike or to refuse to perform services of not less than ten days:

Provided, That in the case of any such site which is located at any military facility or installation of the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or which is located at a facility or installation of any other department or agency of the Government if a major purpose of such facility or installation is, or will be, the development, production, testing, firing, or launching of munitions, weapons, missiles, or space vehicles, or any other activity necessary to the national defense, prior written notice of intent to strike or to refuse to perform services, of not less than ten days shall be given by the labor organization involved to the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, to any State or territorial agency established to mediate and conciliate disputes within the State or territory where such site is located, to the several employers who are jointly engaged at such site, to the Army, Navy, or Air Force, or other department or agency of the Government concerned with the particular facility or installation, and to any national or international labor organization of which the labor organization involved is an affiliate. The notice requirements of the preceding proviso are in addition to, and not in lieu of, the notice requirements prescribed by section 8 (d) of the Act."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall take effect ninety days after the enactment of this Act.

THE QUIE EDUCATION AMENDMENT

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, in the current debate involving the Quie amendment to the administration's education bill, some points require emphasis. They can be stated quite simply, and I hope all individuals concerned with this issue will take the time to read the following:

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL ISSUE

The Quie amendment was specifically designed to avoid the church-state issue. It adopts exactly the same procedure as in present law, requiring public school officials to make equitable provision for private school students. Although the Quie amendment did not contemplate commingling of Federal and State funds, some private school officials raised this specter and said commingling would cut out private school students in 33 States that have strict church-state constitutional provisions. To reassure all concerned, Mr. Quie added a specific provision clarifying that there could be no commingling under his amendment. Other clarifications were added to the Quie amendment to meet all the initial reservations raised by private school officials. In addition, from the very beginning the Quie amendment has provided that the Commissioner could bypass any State that failed to make adequate provision for private school students. Under such circumstances the Commissioner could, in effect, proceed as under present law.

In truth, the private school officials are now divided over the Quie amendment. They agree that the bill itself makes sincere and ample provision for private school students, even expanding present provisions of the law. Some private school officials, however, now say in effect: "The only way you can guarantee adequate participation of private school students is to have authority centralized in an all-powerful Commissioner of Education in Washington. We cannot trust State school officials to include private school students." That is the real issue posed by those private school officials who still oppose the Quie amendment. No matter what provisions are added, as long as the Quie amendment gives greater flexibility and control of education at the State and local level, these particular private school officials will oppose it. Fortunately, many people concerned about fair treatment for private school students disagree vehemently with such opponents of the Quie amendment.

2. NO PUBLIC HEARING

The original Quie proposal, embodying a number of provisions beyond the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was introduced March 20, and was before the committee when hearings were held. Virtually every witness was questioned carefully as to the Quie proposal. The administration bill was refined in the light of committee hearings; so was the Quie amendment. It can be fairly said that most of the educational experts testifying agreed with the basic approach of the Quie amendment.

3. LESS MONEY TO SOME STATES

The Quie amendment changes the allocation formula. In its original form it would have reduced money to New York, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. Education spokesmen contended a large number of States would receive less money under the Quie formula, including most Southern States. Mr. Quie denied this. In order to resolve any question in this regard, Mr. Quie added a specific provision that under no circumstances shall any State receive less money than it received under the previous allocation.

In sum, the Quie amendment represents a giant stride in the direction of giving State and local officials more discretion and control over education. It guarantees that private school students will be taken care of exactly as they are under present law. The real opposition to the Quie amendment is from those who favor continued centralized control of Federal education funds. That will be the choice before the House of Representatives when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is debated.

POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. GALLAGHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791, a document which has served as a firm base stone in the historical pyramid built to human freedom and liberty.

It is ironic that a nation capable of promulgating this historic document stands today dominated by a political system and hierarchy of values counterpoint to the concept of the 1791 Constitution. It is sad and unfortunate that the events after 1791 destroyed again and again the freedom of the Polish people.

But it is significant and heartening that each time the Polish nation has risen again from the ashes of oppression to attempt to establish a lasting democracy capable of enduring the onslaughts of those opposed to human dignity and individual liberty.

Mr. Speaker, the future freedom of Poland and its return to democratic principles of government rests with the Polish people. It is obvious that force of arms cannot prevail. But I have been greatly encouraged by recent favorable economic trends in Poland which have brought with them a corresponding availability of some limited freedom, at least significant when viewed in the overall context of the Poland of a few years ago. Perhaps freedom and liberty will come again to Poland through its potential for a strong economy which will never reach full and efficient productivity under the system of government that now exists.

I am proud to join with the 10 million Americans of Polish ancestry in commemorating the Polish Constitution of 1791 and in reaffirming our belief that all peoples of every nation have the right to representative government and personal liberty.

Thank you.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LVIII

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, at the present time, approximately 41 percent of the Army personnel in Vietnam are inductees. That is about 99,000 soldiers. There is no sign that this policy of using the draftee in Vietnam will be reversed, more probably it will be accentuated.

The existence of the draft has given the administration a free hand in obtaining and deploying military manpower wherever and whenever it sees fit and it is becoming abundantly clear that this administration is using the draft as a vehicle to pursue what it believes to be the defensive military responsibilities of the free world to an unprecedented extent.

We are told, however, that we have interests in every part of the world and it is this administration's position that the protection of these interests is essential to the defense of the free world. President Johnson, by his intervention in the Dominican Republic and Vietnam, appears to have committed the United States to a policy, which perhaps was first enunciated by Theodore Roosevelt, when, in a message to Congress on December 6, 1904, he declared:

> Chronic wrongdoing, or an impotence which results in a general loosening of ties of civilized society, may . . . ultimately require intervention by some civilized nation . . . to the exercise of an *international police power*.

The original purpose of the 1940 draft law was to provide this Nation with the necessary manpower at a time when the threat to our national security was real and imminent. It was not intended that the draft should be used to support a policy of military intervention in a foreign land when insurrection breaks out and, accordingly, panics our policymakers. A history of American intervention in the 20th century may show that revolutions were prevented, but it will also show that little or nothing was accomplished toward providing a substitute for revolutions in the form of free and fair elections. Our policymakers would do better to recall the words of James Madison, written in 1787:

> If there be a principle that ought not to be questioned within the United States, it is that every nation has a right to abolish an old government and establish a new one. This principle is not only recorded in every public archive, written in every American heart, and sealed with the blood of a host of American martyrs, but it is the only lawful tenure by which the United States hold their existence as a nation.

The administration has no justification for casting the United States as a world policeman and using the draft in a supporting role. The United Nations, alone, should be charged with the responsibility of securing the peace throughout the world. For those who urge the administration to pursue such a policing policy as a way of protecting our vital interests, I call to their attention a passage written by historian Herbert Butterfield:

> The hardest strokes of Heaven fall in history upon those who imagine that they can control things in a sovereign manner, as though they were kings of the earth, playing Providence not only for themselves but for the far future, reaching out into the future with the wrong kind of farsightedness.

THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION AMENDMENTS OF 1967

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill entitled the "Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1967," to make important changes in the law which governs our Nation's public rehabilitation programs. My bill is identical with H.R. 8981, introduced on April 20, 1967, by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins]. This administration bill offers the Congress another opportunity to improve the lives of our disabled youth, men, and women.

For 47 years this country has had a Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation which provides a wide range of services to help disabled people become active again, prepare themselves for useful employment and become self-sufficient wage earners.

During most of those years it has been my privilege, from a position of responsibility in the Congress of the United States, to observe this program and the wonderful results it has accomplished.

I believe my colleagues should know that this year the program will pass the 2 million mark in the number of disabled people restored to useful places in life since the program began.

Today these disabled people are working in every part of the country, in practically every type of occupation that is found in today's labor force.

Perhaps more important, the rehabilitation program has proven that the American dream of opportunity and fulfillment can be made real for large numbers of people who face very serious problems.

I have followed the work of the rehabilitation program in my own State of Florida with great interest and pride. Recently Mr. Claud Andrews, one of the longtime leaders and pioneers in vocational rehabilitation, retired after a distinguished career. Our program in Florida is now under the direction of Mr. Craig Mills, a dynamic person with experience and imagination, and I know the work will reach new heights of achievement under his administration.

Last year the Florida vocational rehabilitation program restored 3,900 disabled people in our State—youths, older people, the middle aged. They came from all parts of the State, from all kinds of backgrounds and today they are working in about every occupation we have in the State. Hundreds of them were maintained on public assistance before; today they are working and paying taxes.

Florida ranks ninth among all the States in the number of people rehabilitated in relation to population. I am proud of that record and I believe we can improve it still further.

The bill I have introduced would extend through fiscal years 1969 and 1970 the appropriation authorization for the Federal funds required for this Federal-State program. In 1965 the Congress passed a major bill to broaden and improve this program. Included in the law was financing arrangement which specified the amounts of the annual appropriation authorizations. In the present year, $400 million is allotted among the States, subject to the availability of State matching funds. The bill I have introduced would authorize $500 million for 1969 and $600 million for 1970.

It is important that the Congress act on this proposal during this first session, in order that State governments may have a basis for their own program and financial planning. In 25 States, including my own State of Florida, the legislatures will not be in session next year. Thus it is vitally important that the States know this year the level of Federal financing they may expect in fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

The bill also includes two proposals which were set forth in Presidential messages to Congress earlier this year.

One of these is the President's proposal to establish a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults, as stated in his message on health and education. At present, the Federal Government is doing virtually nothing to aid these victims of one of nature's cruelest combination of handicaps. The Vocational Rehabilitation Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has supported some research in this field and the Office of Education not along ago began supporting three experimental programs to train teachers of the deaf-blind. However, as these agencies have agreed, these are token efforts in the face of this catastrophic condition which affects an estimated 5,000 of our people.

The bill would authorize the establishment of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults, where complete, comprehensive services would be available, along with research, the training of professional workers and a variety of other activities necessary to overcome the massive communication barriers, and prepare these young people and adults to live in a sighted, hearing, world. The bill also calls for planning for additional centers, so that this kind of institution and service program may become available within a reasonable distance in all geographical sections of the country.

I am informed that plans are underway at present looking to the establishment of similar centers for deaf-blind children.

The President also proposed, in his message on poverty, to establish a special system of grants for providing vocational rehabilitation services to disabled migrant workers and their families. I know the Members of this body are aware of the particularly tragic circumstances under which many of our citizens live today when they make their livelihood as migrant workers, following the seasons and the crops. However, you may not have considered how serious a problem they face when the worker or a member of his family sustains a serious disability on top of his other problems.

Under this bill, the Federal Government would pay 90 percent of the cost of providing vocational rehabilitation services for disabled migratory agricultural workers. The grants would be available to State vocational rehabilitation agencies on a project basis, and the Federal funds would not be available for any other purpose.

Another provision of the bill would extend through fiscal year 1968 the present authority for planning of comprehensive rehabilitation services and programs in each State. The 1965 amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act authorized a 2-year planning program in rehabilitation in each State. The objective was and is to help each State assess its needs completely, review present programs and facilities, and develop a plan in which, by 1975, all disabled people can receive the services they need.

However, by the time the 1965 amendments were signed into law and placed in effect, most of the first year of authorization had already passed. Nearly all States are now in the midst of this statewide planning program. This provision of the bill would permit States to complete their plans.

The final amendment proposed in this bill would amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to provide that, effective July 1, 1969, all States conducting vocational rehabilitation programs under an approved State plan would be required to furnish services to otherwise eligible disabled people, regardless of their ability to meet a residence test. This provision, so much in keeping with today's mobile population in the United States, will permit State agencies to serve disabled people much more promptly, without the requirement that they remain disabled and idle until a year's residence, or other residence requirement, has been established.

The bill I have introduced will greatly strengthen the present national effort in service, research, professional training, construction and the other activities that make up today's public rehabilitation program. It will give the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Commissioner of Vocational Rehabilitation the tools they need to move several steps forward in improving the Nation's work for disabled people. I trust and believe that the Congress will act on these proposals promptly and favorably, for I know from long experience how deeply dedicated the Members of this body are to the Nation's disabled. Our record on this score makes me particularly happy to be a Representative in the U.S. Congress.

FEDERAL AID TO ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION COMES OF AGE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ottinger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, one of the greatest milestones in recent educational history is now 2 years old—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

For almost a quarter of a century leaders throughout this country, and Members of this Legislature, have worked for the day when a national consensus on Federal aid to education would become a reality. That consensus is here. Let us not destroy it with amendments that seem to change hourly. The first fruits of our labor are already being tasted by schoolchildren the length and breadth of this great land. The act has proven its worth over and over again. Its results are visible in thousands of local school districts. Its programs are supported by educators, administrators, and citizens wherever it has been in effect.

It is a testament to the fact that President Johnson chose to make education one of the principal concerns of his administration.

Since this is the first comprehensive Federal aid to education program, and since the proposed legislation authorizes more than $3 billion to strengthen elementary and secondary schools, it is appropriate that the Congress carry out a review of the intent and the results of the program.

Last year, after a detailed review, the Committee on Education and Labor recommended major changes in the program. Those changes were put into effect by the Congress. The happy result was that the funds authorized for appropriation under the original act were increased by more than a billion dollars.

Present achievements have already demonstrated that this additional investment in the minds and talents of American children has already paid off in substantial benefits.

The expansion of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education has already provided a strong stimulus for the improvement of the quality of education offered to all American children. It has served to assure us that all our schoolchildren will ultimately enjoy greater access to equal opportunity in education. But we must move forward if we are to succeed.

This year, with the benefit of more experience in the program, the Committee on Education and Labor again conducted a review. It had the chance to raise new questions. It had the chance to talk to people across the country who are working in and with programs Congress authorized.

The committee found that while much progress has been made throughout the Nation, there are many areas in which critical needs still must be met.

These findings are reflected in the bill which will come before us. That bill provides that the elementary and secondary aid programs be continued through fiscal year 1969. The National Teacher Corps would be revised. New programs would be initiated to assist States in educational planning for improved opportunities for handicapped children. And the effective date of two major amendments made last year which would increase the cost of the program, would be delayed until appropriations are available.

Were we overoptimistic in our expectations of the accomplishments of Federal aid to education 2 years ago? The answer is "No."

The heart of the act—aid to schools for the education of the disadvantaged—has touched the lives of 8.3 million American schoolchildren. Those children are now enjoying the use of new books, new teachers, and new educational materials which would never have been theirs to enjoy.

They have now benefited from federally aided remedial reading courses, increased studies in mathematics, new services, special food services, psychological aid and attention, modern supplies and educational equipment.

This act has opened the doorway into modern American learning to millions of youthful minds.

And the people and the schools have supported our program. School systems across the country are more than eager to participate in the program. More than 17,000 school systems have already received title I funds. Those funds have stimulated imaginative thinking, creative planning and new approaches for the educationally deprived.

Teachers whose schools have benefited from Federal funds have reported that the new atmosphere of educational experimentation, and demonstrable feeling of success in working with deprived children, has changed their own attitudes toward the problems of slum schools and deprived areas. Teachers from a Chicago project expressed amazement at the improvement shown by disadvantaged students after special services were made available to them.

Testimony offered before the Committee on Education and Labor indicated that the program of textbook and library resources aid under title II, and the supplemental services centers provided for under title III, have been equally as successful as title I.

The committee recommended that these three programs be continued without substantive change through fiscal year 1969.

Two significant programs have been added to the act. Title V was amended to help States establish comprehensive educational planning programs. This has been one of the areas in education needing assistance for many years. I am proud to say that my own State of New York has one of the most dynamic State departments of education in the country, and will put its share of these funds to the best possible use.

Title VI of the act will also be amended to make funds available for regional resource centers to test and evaluate the educational abilities of handicapped children. This is a program no decent person could oppose.

From my reading of the bill reported out of committee, I can say without hesitation that it is a well-balanced measure which retains that sense of human compassion which the Congress intended when it passed the original act just 2 short years ago.

I think I speak for the people not just of New York, but for the people of the Nation when I say that no more important bill will come to a vote this session than the Elementary and Secondary Education Bill of 1967, and I urge every Member to give it his support.

However, I find very disturbing the administration's timorous requests for appropriations to implement this legislation. There is no doubt that the fiscal pressures of the war in Vietnam quite properly demand a general belt-tightening in the Federal budget.

However, the administration's choice of priorities in seeking appropriations from Congress is open to question and criticism. We are being asked to spend billions on public works projects and special-interest subsidies, many of which could be deferred, phased out gradually or eliminated altogether. The administration intends to come to Congress for $200 million for just one phase in the development of a supersonic commercial aircraft. This is budget fat that can and should be trimmed.

But if we believe that our young people are the most precious resource of this Nation, and if we believe that the education programs enacted in the 89th Congress are necessary for the full development of that resource, we must provide the funds that are necessary to implement them effectively. I sincerely hope that the administration will match the fervor with which it has been rallying support for the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 with courage sufficient to obtain the necessary appropriations.

QUIE HALTS PROGRESS FOR MIGRANTS

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your urgent attention to the deleterious effect the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would have on existing educational programs for thousands of migratory children throughout the country—youngsters who have long been "nobody's" children who have not been able to achieve in regular school programs because of cultural deprivation, constant moving about from place to place and, in many instances, lack of knowledge of the English language.

The impetus of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has given these children new worlds of opportunity. Within the last year, under State and Federal leaderships, we have witnessed new breakthroughs in interstate cooperation to make sure that these students can be adequately served wherever their parents go. Through jointly funded projects, encouraged and implemented by the U.S. Office of Education and Office of Economic Opportunity, States and school districts have expanded their services for these youngsters, exchanged school records, and conducted joint workshops so that teachers from one area can exchange ideas with and learn from their colleagues in other States and school systems.

I doubt seriously whether these programs will continue actively to be effective without the catalytic of the Federal Government in these regional programs.

The migrant communities cannot help but regard the Quie amendment as a complete betrayal of all this administration has proposed.

Within the past year there has been a new spirit in such migrant communities, a feeling that somebody at last cares about them and is willing to help them do something about their complex and staggering problems.

The Quie amendment expresses only indifference to their plight. If it is passed, Mr. Speaker, it will not only eradicate all that has been done so far—rendering wasteful the expenditure of numerous millions of dollars thus far—but also will deal a blow to the hopes and dreams of thousands of American families from which they are likely never to recover.

WE SHOULD NOT DEPRIVE OUR CHILDREN

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Wolff] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, there are those who have decided to make an issue of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and for that reason millions of schoolchildren throughout the country who received supplementary education for the past 2 years, which they badly needed, will lose that training. The so-called Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, H.R. 8983, would replace four titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with a program of "block grants" made to State departments of education, starting in fiscal year 1969. The State departments, in turn, would decide which educational programs and which school districts would receive the money.

The target of the Quie amendment is the great educational achievement of combining Federal and local resources to improve education. It is hard to believe the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] would wish to destroy programs for the most bitterly deprived children of our Nation—programs which have demonstrated a significant impact upon our elementary and secondary educational system. But it is the educationally disadvantaged who would be turned out of class by his proposal.

If the Quie amendment succeeds, New York alone will lose $122 million in Federal funds. That is, New York would lose that much under one version of his amendment. In fact, Mr. Quie's position changes from day to day. In the face of tabular evidence that his bill substantially decreases the amount of Federal assistance for elementary and secondary education going to 25 States, he has again changed his proposal. This makes the fourth "firm, unswerving Quie substitute" introduced into this session of Congress. It is obvious that his proposal was not well thought out. We cannot tell how many more changes will be forthcoming, as other flaws in his proposal are brought to his attention.

Mr. Quie states that his new section 702(c) will "dispel fears" that any State will lose money it would have received under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. He seeks to set a floor below which no State's allotment could go. But what floor does he set? The amount the State will actually receive for the fiscal year 1968. Mr. Speaker, this does not dispel my fears. The Quie amendment, or at least the current version of it, would not have replaced four titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act until fiscal year 1969.

What Mr. Quie has done is set a floor of fiscal year 1968 appropriations for each State's allotment for fiscal year 1969. In view of the fact that the total appropriation request for the act for fiscal year 1968 is only $1.6 billion—as compared with a total authorization of $3.28 billion for fiscal year 1969—the knowledge that each State's allotment is "protected" at the lower figure fails to reassure me. Mr. Quie is again comparing authorizations under his current, revised proposal with what he thinks might be appropriated under the act for fiscal year 1969. He again goes through this process of complicated fiscal calisthenics and decides that it would be "an unlikely event" that the full authorization for the act would be requested for fiscal year 1969. I am not convinced that he can predict the size of an appropriations request nearly a year before it is presented to the Congress. I would prefer to stick with the figures that are on the books, and these would indicate that there is much to lose and nothing to gain from the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Last year 8.3 million educationally disadvantaged children, 6 percent of them enrolled in nonpublic schools, benefited from educational programs tailored to their special needs under title I of the act. Title II made books and instructional materials available to 49 million pupils and 1.9 million teachers in public and nonpublic schools. Title III supplementary educational centers and services touched the lives of more than 10 million persons—schoolchildren and teachers, preschoolers and parents, and other adults.

The Quie amendment would alter the basic philosophy of Federal aid to education. Title I was passed because the Congress realized that education of disadvantaged children was costly, and that many school districts could not afford to provide the educational services that would allow the children of the poor to catch up with suburban children. Since poverty and lack of education go hand in hand, we felt that the problem was of a national nature and demanded a national solution. Therefore we authorized Federal funds to go to those districts with high concentrations of children from low-income families—pinpointing the uses to which these funds could be put in order to assure maximum educational benefits for disadvantaged children. Under the Quie amendment, only half of the funds would go to deprived children.

The Quie amendment will set up a power struggle within each State for Federal education funds. It will cause a bitter conflict among urban districts with slum neighborhoods, suburban districts which are rapidly growing, and rural areas which are isolated and economically depressed. Schools which might have problems being met by current Federal programs, but which do not have a high enough rating in any of these categories would be left out in the cold.

For these reasons, I oppose the Quie amendment. I can only characterize it as a cold and heartless attack on our system of education. The wealthiest nation in the world should have an education system far better than that which presently exists. The Quie amendment would cause us to take a step backward.

I insert in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks a comparison of authorization under the committee bill—H.R. 7819:

Comparison of authorizations under committee bill (H.R. 7819) and Quie substitute[1]

[Losses compared to the committee bill]

Fiscal year 1968	[2]
Fiscal year 1969:	*Millions*
Alabama	−$32
Arkansas	−27
Florida	−6
Georgia	−30
Kentucky	−25
Louisiana	−19
Mississippi	−48
Missouri	−9
North Carolina	−50
Oklahoma	−7
South Carolina	−33
Tennessee	−29
Texas	−25
Virginia	−13
West Virginia	−12
District of Columbia	−6
Total, 16 Southern and border States	−371
Alaska	−1.35
California	−26.70
Delaware	−.51
Illinois	−8.20
Iowa	−.60
New Jersey	−.71
New York	−121.90
North Dakota	−1.31
South Dakota	−2.39

[1] Overall, the Quie substitute slashes the authorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act by $281 million, to a total of $3 billion. As noted above, substantially more than this overall cut—or $371 million—is attributed to reductions in the entitlements of 16 Southern and border States.

[2] No change.

STEREOTYPING OF A PEOPLE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Brown] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in most cases, I will be found on the side of the American news media and their good and objective analyses and presentation of newsworthy events. Seldom have I taken any major news source to task for its reporting. But I feel duty-bound to report to my colleagues on the base article entitled "Pocho's Progress" which appeared in the April 28, 1967, issue of Time magazine.

I am the representative voice and, I hope, the friend of the largest concentration of Spanish-speaking citizens in California, but I hope that I may speak, in this special case, for all of the Spanish-speaking people in this country, when I say that I have never been a witness to such a pasteup, stereotyping piece of journalism as that conjured up in the mind of the author of "Pocho's Progress."

The great bulk of correspondence pouring in to the various offices of the Representatives of the Southwest from their Spanish-speaking citizens reflects the justifiable indignation of a proud and progressive people.

Who would be so blatantly naive, Mr. Speaker, as to stereotype over 4,000,000 people? And, this is, in effect, what the author accomplished. True, there are cultural, social, and language similarities within this ethnic group, but even the experts using scientific methods are confronted with vastly perplexing problems when conducting studies of the Spanish-speaking people. I, too, am awed by the ability of an evidently novice journalist who can run a spot check of a community as large and diverse as that of East Los Angeles and report such a distorted picture to his millions of readers.

And, I reiterate, the implication—intended or not—is that this analysis reflects the "plight" of a great number of the Spanish-speaking citizens of the great Southwest.

I, for one, emphatically deny and resent such an arrogant charge. Anyone who has even a cursory knowledge of the culture, conditions, hopes, and aspirations of the Spanish-speaking people must take issue with this article of Time magazine. This diverse people—the second largest minority in the United States—is spread from one end of the social, political, economic, and cultural spectrum to the other. In a large sense, they defy categorization; and, most certainly, they defy stereotyping of the sort presented to us in Time magazine of April 28.

I wish it to be a matter of public record, Mr. Speaker, that I am greatly incensed by the article in question, as were many of my colleagues here in the Chamber. I would like, however, to close my remarks on a more positive theme. I sincerely hope that Time magazine continues its study and interest in the Spanish-speaking populace; and may I suggest that, after this initial study, they have no place to go but up.

ALCOHOLISM

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, May 3, 1967, I cosponsored with our good friend and colleague, Congressman Theodore R. Kupferman, of New York, and 19 other Members of this body, a bipartisan bill, H.R. 9643, to deal with the problem of alcoholism, which according to medical experts is the fourth most serious medical problem in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the 21 Members of this House who joined together represent a broad cross section of opinion in this Congress. Our ranks include conservative Democrats and liberal Democrats, conservative Republicans and liberal Republicans, and others who are to be found somewhere in the middle. Whether it is in the gentleman from New York's [Mr. Kupferman] Manhattan district, my own Hudson County, N.J., which is just across the Hudson River from Manhattan, or in the great heartlands of America where several of our sponsors hail from, or from the Golden State of California, represented by Messrs. Reinecke and Bell, or along the Rio Grande where the name of our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez], is a household word, Americans are alarmed about the problem of alcoholism. Further, Mr. Speaker, it is up to us in the Congress to do something about this problem, which is clearly national in scope.

Mr. Speaker, recent court decisions have indicated a growing awareness that this problem is a medical one and what is needed is a crash program to combat its effects upon the 5 million Americans who are classified as alcoholics.

This bill will set up a Bureau of Alcoholism Care and Control within the Office of the Surgeon General to coordinate and direct Federal alcoholism programs.

Mr. Speaker, the ranks of the alcoholics are swelled every year by the addition of 250,000 persons.

Mr. Speaker, a serious problem is growing infinitely worse. I call upon all Members of the House to join with us in combating this problem.

LEGISLATION TO INSURE THAT THE AMERICAN FLAG BE TREATED WITH HONOR AND RESPECT

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Resnick] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, from the time of its birth in 1776, our country has had, as an emblem of its sovereignty, a flag—the Stars and Stripes. But the American flag is more than an emblem—it serves as a reminder to peoples the world over of those ideals of freedom and liberty for which the United States of America has always stood. It is a source of pride and honor to all Americans. Or at least this is what I thought—until recently.

During the past months, however, we have all seen pictures in the newspapers of so-called Americans burning, trampling, desecrating our flag—in "protest." Indeed, this seems to be the latest trend in bush-league anarchy. But this time I believe these young punks have gone too far.

They may have whatever political views they choose—they may speak, they may organize, they may conduct demonstration—but burning the American flag, universal symbol of freedom and liberty, is an action that I, for one, cannot let go unchallenged.

I was shocked to find that there is no law prohibiting desecration, defacement, or mutilation of the American flag, with the sole exception of the District of Columbia.

Therefore, I have today introduced a bill which would make this a Federal crime, punishable by fines and jail sentences.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sad day when we have to introduce legislation to insure that the American flag be treated with honor and respect. But, I am afraid that events of the past few months have given me no other choice.

POLISH CONSTITUTION OF 1791: ITS LASTING IMPORT

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, May 3, marked the 176th anniversary of the Polish Constitution of 1791; an anniversary which the citizens of Poland will not be permitted to celebrate, a Constitution which exists only in the hearts of the Polish people.

The adoption of the Constitution of 1791 by the Polish people was a revolutionary act in itself. The democratic principles embodied in this historical document were designed to revolutionize both the government and the social structure of Poland. By its provisions, Poland was transformed into an hereditary limited monarchy with a parliamentary system. Towns were given administrative and judicial autonomy. Class distinctions were abolished. Peasants were brought under the protection of the law; the plight of the serfs was ameliorated with a view to the eventual abolishment of serfdom. Religious tolerance was instituted. The Constitution of 1791 in its totality was revolutionary in an age of absolute monarchs. To the extent that it sought more extensive sovereignty of the people and to the extent that it expressed respect for individual freedom, the Polish Constitution of 1791 stands alongside other eloquent documents, such as our own Constitution which preceded it by 2 years, which so shaped modern history.

However, the Polish Constitution of 1791 was considered too revolutionary and too threatening by its long-covetous neighbors. A valiant force of barely 46,000 Poles withstood the onslaught of dissidents reinforced with Russian forces for 3 months. Their courageous defense was nullified and the democratic principles contained in the 1791 Constitution were rescinded by the King who was fearful of Russian victory. His attempt to mollify Poland's belligerent neighbors resulted in the partition of 1793 by which Poland was reduced to one-third its original size by Russia and Prussia. Later, Poland was completely divided by its neighbors and lost its independence.

The Polish people seized upon the opportunity afforded them by the First World War to again become a proud nation independent of foreign control. The constitution adopted by the Polish people in 1921 was hailed as one of the most democratic in Europe—a testament of the inextinguishable commitment of the Polish people to those principles of freedom embodied in their earlier constitution of 1791.

That fulfillment of freedom has again been denied the Polish people, whose tragic fate it was to fall under Russian-imposed Communist domination following World War II. The ideals, the promise, the hope, which were embodied in the Polish Constitution of 1791 are indelibly imprinted in the memories of the Polish people. May the day hasten when the legacy of that commitment to freedom expressed in 1791 be properly inherited by today's Polish generations. May the year hasten when the Polish people can again joyously celebrate the anniversary of their Constitution Day.

SBA SET-ASIDE PROGRAM

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government provides the citizens of this country with many kinds of assistance through its various programs. Some of these programs are highly publicized, others receive very little publicity, but are just as important.

Today, I would like to call to my colleagues' attention one of these very important, but seldom publicized, Federal programs. This is the Small Business Administration's set-aside program.

This program has helped provide small businesses with their fair share of Government contracts. In many cases, SBA's assistance has led to a small firm's success, enabling the firm to contribute to our strong economy, which President Johnson has aptly termed "a bulwark of freedom."

When the set-aside program was first established SBA officials, working with Government procurement agencies, determined whether a contract was to be set aside for exclusive bidding by small firms. A little over a year ago SBA changed the program leaving set-aside responsibility with purchasing officials of the major military and civilian buying offices.

In recent testimony before the U.S. Senate Select Committee on Small Business, SBA Administrator Bernard L. Boutin said the Agency has tentatively decided on a new way of handling the program.

This new approach is based on recommendations of a steering committee which included representatives of the Department of Defense, General Services Administration, Atomic Energy Commission, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and SBA.

Basically, the committee's recommendations, which were reached after a thorough study of the problem, seek to combine the best features of the several set-aside programs previously employed.

SBA representatives at the important Government procurement centers would again exercise the set-aside function on procurements.

These representatives would also—

Exercise the right of appeal to the Secretarial level in other agencies in appropriate cases;

Make periodic surveillance reviews of procurement activities;

Recommend breakouts from Government contracts of items that could be supplied by small firms;

Locate additional small business suppliers;

Recommend modifications of unduly restrictive specifications.

An improved and unified reporting system will be adopted to provide SBA with an accurate and current picture of what is being accomplished under the set-aside program.

With Mr. Boutin at the helm of SBA, I am confident that the set-aside program will provide important assistance to small business.

The past success of the program is exemplified by the story of a small business in my State, Canadian Pacific Corp., which manufactures wooden pallets.

In 1966 the firm learned that the Defense Supply Agency in Richmond, Va., needed hardwood pallets to be delivered to an Army terminal in Honolulu where Canadian Pacific is located.

Unfortunately, the type of wood used by Canadian Pacific in manufacturing its product was not included on the military specification list. The firm asked SBA assistance in gaining approval of this type of wood. After much diligence by SBA officials, the wood was approved.

Later, Canadian Pacific was asked to bid on a DSA contract. They won this contract and hope to win many more.

In this instance SBA's assistance benefited both small business and the Government. The small business, of course, benefited from receiving the Government contract. The Government has benefited by having found a good source of supply of hardwood pallets in the Pacific, where there is a great need among various military organizations. In the past, satisfying these needs had been difficult and expensive.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

> The performance of our men in Vietnam—backed by the American people—has created a feeling of confidence and unity among the independent nations of Asia and the Pacific.

Without SBA's assistance, Canadian Pacific would not have been able to provide its product to the military and aid the American effort in Southeast Asia.

I commend the SBA for its progressive outlook and continuing effort to improve its programs.

TO ASSIST STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN THE SALE OF REVENUE BONDS

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a chart.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 5136 of the Revised Statutes to provide that State and local revenue bond issues will be entitled to the same competitive advantages of the money market that are now accorded to all Federal bond issues and to all general obligation bond issues of State and local governments.

Earlier in this session, this House passed a bill to provide for the temporary increase in the public debt limit to $336 billion. There have been many hearings and debates concerning the Federal debt with which we are all familiar. However, very little attention has been given to the rising State and local debt and to the financial markets necessary to meet the ever-growing borrowing requirements of our States and local communities. The current Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisors pointed out the tremendous growth in State and local expenditures. The annual report stated:

> Since World War II, state and local expenditures have been growing far more rapidly than Federal outlays. To finance their budgets, these governments have increased tax rates and assessments frequently; yet state and local debt has increased sevenfold. Over the same period, Federal rates have generally kept pace with expenditure in peacetime, despite reductions in tax rates; and the net Federal debt has risen only one-fifth, falling sharply with relation to G.N.P.

The changing relationship of Federal debt and State and local debt to the gross national product presents a striking analysis.

The following chart demonstrates this dramatic change in the debt structure since 1940:

[In billions of dollars]

	Gross national product	Net Federal debt	Gross Federal debt	Net State and local debt
1940	99.7	44.8	50.9	16.5
1950	284.8	218.7	256.7	20.7
1960	503.7	241.0	290.4	60.0
1966 [1]	740.0	274.6	329.8	101.1

[1] Estimated.

Source: Annual Report of the Council of Economic Advisers, 1967.

It is very clear from these figures that as a percent of the gross national product, Federal debt is steadily declining, whereas State and local debt is steadily increasing.

Mr. Speaker, the manner of financing the capital needs of State and local governments as well as those of the Federal Government depend upon financial markets and mechanisms that are all too frequently misunderstood. Historically, public bond issues have been sold to underwriters consisting of both investment banking houses and commercial banks. Both of these financial institutions join with one another in syndicates which form the basis of competitive bidding for such issues.

When Congress passed the famous Glass-Steagall Act of 1933, specific provisions were made to insure that commercial banks would continue to act as underwriters and dealers of Federal obligations and of general obligations of State and local governments. Since that date, that act has been amended many times by the Congress in order to provide that the commercial banking industry could underwrite and deal in bond issues essential to Federal policies and programs such as those of the TVA, the Export-Import Bank, the World Bank, and the Inter-American Development Bank, thereby allowing the entire facilities of the investment-banking market to be available.

In 1933, nearly all bond issues of State and local governments were of the type that were and are known as general obligation bonds. However, a new form of State and local bond issue, known as the revenue bond has been developed over the past three decades. New issues of revenue bonds have grown from $200 million in 1946 to over $4 billion in 1966. In 1966 the total new issues of State and local governments set a record figure of slightly over $11 billion of which nearly 37 percent were revenue bonds.

There is every reason to believe that the use of revenue bond financing by State and local governments will continue to increase. The services that our citizens expect from their local governments, particularly in the urban and suburban communities, are certainly justified and should be provided at the lowest possible cost.

However, the original act of 1933 has been interpreted to penalize the issuers of revenue bonds by preventing commercial bank underwriters from competing in this market, thereby denying our State and local issuers the full competitive effect of access to the entire financial market. As a result, the over $4 billion in revenue bonds issued by State and local governments in 1966 were denied the benefits of competition in the financial marketplace. Furthermore, the fact that the nearly $50 billion of outstanding revenue bonds had to depend upon a limited secondary market, further prejudiced the issuers in obtaining the lowest possible borrowing costs.

Mr. Speaker, during hearings held on similar legislative measures, local bond issuers testified that many millions of dollars in borrowing costs would be saved if revenue bond issues could have the benefit of the full competitive forces of the capital market. I am hopeful that hearings on the subject will focus on this point so that the Congress can make a sound judgment on the structure of this important segment of the capital market.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND SECRETARY GARDNER STRONGLY SUPPORT THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (H.R. 7819)

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner have both spoken out strongly in support of extending the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reported favorably to this House by the Education and Labor Committee.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act is the first major legislation passed to bring aid to our overburdened schools. Its passage in 1965 is a benchmark in educational history.

Further extension of the act—which is wholeheartedly supported by the Nation's educators—has been jeopardized by the introduction of a series of misnamed, misunderstood substitute measures. Although labeled as providing "block grants to the States," these proposed substitutes are actually a hodgepodge of categories, restrictions, and onerous administrative conditions. These substitutes, as the President said, "are raising the same roadblocks which halted Federal aid to education for 20 long years."

Mr. Speaker, in his excellent statement, Secretary Gardner—formerly head of the Carnegie Foundation—pinpoints a further difficulty:

> In place of the carefully considered, broad categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—categories which the Congress deems to be in the national interest—the Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs. In the guise of conferring greater freedom on American education, it would scatter Federal financial assistance in such a manner that the American taxpayer would likely receive little for his money.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the statements of the President and of Secretary Gardner and insert them in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT BY JOHN W. GARDNER, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

The substitute that Representative Albert Quie has proposed for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 could, if enacted, undermine and destroy much that the Congress and the Administration have jointly achieved in recent educational legislation.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which is now bringing new skills and opportunities to eight million disadvantaged children and new hope and potentialities to every school district in the Nation, would be wiped out.

The proposal by Mr. Quie which threatens to produce this disastrous result has never been considered in Committee, has never been made the subject of hearings, and has been hastily revised three or four times within the past three weeks.

In place of the carefully considered, broad categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—categories which the Congress deems to be in the national interest—the Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs. In the guise of conferring greater freedom on American education, it would scatter Federal financial assistance in such a manner that the American taxpayer would likely receive little for his money.

It would take away Federal assistance from States which most need the aid because of their low economic capabilities and high concentration of educationally deprived children. The Southern and border States would lose $371 million, while the great cities of New York, California and Illinois would also suffer substantial cuts in Federal assistance.

Carefully defined and selected targets for educational improvement, now specified as beneficiaries of the ESEA, would suffer. Programs for the children of migrant workers, for foster children, for children in institutions for the handicapped, neglected or delinquent, children in the Bureau of Indian Affairs Schools, and children in the Territories of the United States would all suffer.

The Quie substitute cannot guarantee that Federal aid will be concentrated in places and in amounts necessary to do the job, rather than merely be dissipated in wide areas and for a wide variety of second-priority activities. It cannot guarantee, for example, that the cities, so sorely in need of Federal assistance, will receive their fair share of aid.

And it is a very unsure instrument for dealing with the gravest problem facing our nation today—the adequate education of children of the slums and rural depressed areas.

Even more serious is the fact that the Quie substitute poses a grave threat to the consensus that was put together with such difficulty in 1965 when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act came into being. For years all forward-looking Americans had known that the Federal Government must eventually provide large-scale support for education—but for years, literally decades, the accomplishment was frustrated by dissension over several key issues, chief among them the Church-State question.

The Quie substitute strikes at the very heart of that consensus, and we are already hearing the return of the old dissension and divisiveness. If it bursts out in full fury, we shall have neither the present Act nor the Quie substitute. We'll find ourselves right back where we were two years ago.

Some proponents of the Quie substitute say it offers flexibility and freedom of decision to the States in place of the narrow categories of the Elementary and Secondary

Education Act. This is misleading in the extreme. The categories of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act are anything but narrow. They are very broad and flexible. Its major titles contain the broadest and most permissive authorizations in American legislative history to strengthen the State departments of education, to stimulate educational expansion and innovation, to acquire the latest and best instructional materials, and, especially, to focus on the problems of educationally disadvantaged children, wherever they may be found, but particularly in our great urban complexes and sparsely populated rural counties.

No one in the Executive Branch or in the Congress has spoken or worked more consistently than I for helping the States to achieve greater flexibility and initiative in administering Federal programs. In the Partnership for Health legislation which we proposed and the Congress passed last year we combined 15 narrow categorical aid programs. In our Education Professions Development bill this year we would replace numerous fragmented training authorities with one comprehensive and flexible training program.

At the same time, I believe that Federal dollars should in broad terms be directed to targets selected by the elected representatives of the people in the Congress of the United States. They speak for the States and they judge the needs of the States against a background of national priorities.

While we must do everything within our power to strengthen the States—and no Administration has done more than this one to build strength in the State departments of education—I believe that as long as Federal resources in the field of education are limited, they should be used primarily for the elimination of those educational problems which the Congress identifies as the greatest obstacle to the growth and development of our Nation.

Statement of the President on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Proposed Quie Substitute*

Not many people realize how swiftly times have changed in federal support for education. Four years ago, the Federal Government was spending $4.2 billion for education and training programs. My budget for the coming year calls for $12.4 billion—almost three times as much.

Four years ago the Office of Education was spending only $700 million to support education. In the coming year it will spend $4.2 billion—six times as much . . .

It looks easy now, but we spent 20 years in the Congress battling for this breakthrough.

There were big road blocks in the way: the poor states were feuding with the rich states; public schools versus private and church schools; the city schools versus the rural schools; the integrated schools versus the segregated schools.

During those 20 years, many Members of Congress despaired of ever passing federal aid to education. But finally, we worked out a program which avoided the road blocks and settled the feuds. At long last we put the laws on the books and the money in the schools.

Now some so-called "friends of education" want to go back to where we started. They claim they know a better way to spend the money. They propose to discard the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—to scrap it before it is two years old—and to substitute a different kind of legislation.

No one can tell for sure how they plan to change the law. Each day they trot out a new version. But already they have accomplished a great deal.

They have stirred up the suspicions of the poor states toward the wealthy states. They are reviving ancient and bitter feuds between church and public school leaders.

They have aroused fears of the big city school superintendents.

They are raising the same road blocks which halted federal aid to education for 20 long years.

I hope Members of Congress will stop, look, and listen before they march down this blind alley.

It is a time of testing for American education.

The gains we have made so far are only the beginning. We must build on them. But we must not lose all we have gained by this reckless effort to rewrite our laws for partisan political advantage.

TRAGEDY IN GREECE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Pickle] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, it is now almost 2 weeks since democratic rule came to an end in Greece. In the days immediately following the military takeover, there were many who were shocked but who said little for fear of making matters worse. Censorship was almost total and one did not want to endanger more lives by suggesting immediate reaction to what appeared to be most ominous events. One hoped that quiet pressure by the NATO governments, or that the power of the palace would bring an end to what must surely be a farce. How could it be possible, we thought, that a group of colonels can fire generals loyal to the King? How can a junta be taken seriously which has arrested not only all leftwing and centrists leaders, but which also dragged out in the middle of the night, after kicking his door in, the former Premier and leader of the conservatives, Canellopoulos?

Our newspapers were strangely silent for several days. Indeed, the tragedy of what has happened is only beginning to be understood. Bernard Nossiter was able to get information past the censors which they did not recognize as damaging since he was quoting from official junta pronouncements. But, sensitive ears here knew the meaning of exhortations to farmers to believe that their elected leaders, now under arrest, had been traitors. Since Mr. Nossiter has returned to the free world he has given us one of the clearest analyses of the background leading up to the chilling events beginning on the night of April 21. Senator Fulbright inserted his recent dispatch from Paris in yesterday's Congressional Record at page 11452, and I commend it to you.

I am concerned most deeply for all Americans of Greek descent who have family and friends in Greece. I have many friends who are personally acquainted with Andreas Papandreou and Margaret, his American wife. Some of them worked with Andreas when he taught at the University of California and others campaigned with him when he and Margaret worked for the election of Adlai Stevenson in 1952. It seems to be quite clear that the coup was designed to eliminate Andreas as the natural political heir of his father, the leader of the liberal Central Union Party. Most observers of political developments in Greece over the last months predicted that George Papandreou's party would have won a clear majority if the promised elections had been held. It is also likely that the radical or Communist Party would not have won more than 10 percent. Yet, the junta claims that a Communist takeover was imminent.

Those of us who believe that the strongest antidote to communism is progressive liberalism and that repression in the name of the monarchy will enlarge the ranks of the Communists fear a polarization which will rapidly diminish the chance for a return to parliamentary government. To the extent that our Government, either by overt actions, or by failure to make sufficiently clear our abiding support for free and open elections, we share some of the blame.

I do not know what leverage we have on the military junta which has seized power. I do know that they seized power with planes and tanks and guns that the United States has been providing over the years. I have conveyed my views to the State Department and urged that our Government make it quite clear that we favor prompt restoration of constitutional guarantees and the release of political prisoners.

I have been assured by our Ambassador in Athens and by our Department of State that every effort is being made to assure the humane treatment of those who are in custody. It is, of course, most appalling to think of those who are ill and aged and who have been dragged away as threats to their country, men who have served in Parliament and who have been held in the highest regard by their professional colleagues around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I insert a recent article by Clayton Fritchey to be included in the Record at this point, as well as a further perceptive review by Mr. Nossiter, and a letter to the editor of the New York Times:

An Old, Sorry Story in Greece

(By Clayton Fritchey)

The Greek military coup may have come as a surprise (of sorts) to King Constantine, but if it also came as a complete surprise to the U.S. government (which is hard to believe) there is something radically wrong with our intelligence system.

First of all, many informed foreign correspondents and diplomats have been warning for months that the military (with the approval, passive or otherwise, of the throne) was prepared to seize the government if democratic forces won the May 28 election, or even if they appeared on the verge of winning.

These predictions recently became more widespread as young King Constantine, the pliant son of strong-willed, German-born Queen Fredericka, made one politically inept decision after another to head off the resurgence of former Premier George Papandreou, leader of the liberal Center Union party, whom he forced out of office in 1965.

At first glance, it appears that, as with the king, the United States may not have known just when or how the army intended to strike, but, as is now obvious, the planning was elaborate and must have been worked out with many people over a considerable period of time, for the coup was synchronized all over the country. Hundreds must have been in on the plot.

---

*Statement delivered at Crossland Vocational Center, April 27, 1967.

The CIA could have bought a copy of the New York Times a couple of weeks ago and discovered that "rumors abound" that the right wing, "along with the army and court figures," would persuade the king to "sanction a dictatorship." Or, before that, the CIA could have bought another copy which reported that the throne may become convinced that the only way to "prevent a Center Union victory" is to "establish a dictatorship."

In the immediate case, however, the responsibility rests even more on our military than on the CIA, because for 20 years the Greek army has almost been a branch of the U.S. armed forces. Ever since the Truman Doctrine was proclaimed in 1947, and U.S. military men moved in to direct the war against the Communists in 1949, there has been the most intimate association between Greek and American officers.

Even though the Communist threat was overcome long ago, American military aid has continued at the rate of $60 million or more a year. The guns, tanks, and planes that were used to overthrow the constitutional government last week were supplied by the U.S.

It is hard to believe, therefore, that our military advisers in Greece (and therefore our government) did not have some intimation of what was afoot, or at least what appeared to many others as a clear and imminent danger.

Since the United States has convincingly demonstrated that it has no inhibitions about intruding into the affairs of other countries, (be it Cuba, or Vietnam, or the Dominican Republic), we may rule out the possibility of the Administration being too shy to exert its influence in Greece.

There was nothing to prevent the United States from quietly and tactfully, but firmly, letting the Greek militarists know in advance that the United States strongly opposed overthrowing the constitutional government, and that we would not support, either morally, economically, or militarily, an army dictatorship.

Of course, this would have been out of character, for the United States has never concealed its distaste for Papandreou and his followings, just as it has never concealed its rapport with the crown and the army. So once more we have gambled U.S. prestige on leaders who have no popular place in their own country.

Washington is currently holding its breath, for Greece is the southern anchor of our NATO defense system. But what happens if the generals are overthrown by a counter democratic revolt? Above all, what happens if the now-emboldened generals trigger a war with Turkey, also a member of NATO, over the future of Cyprus? Vietnam would then seem a matter of secondary importance.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 30, 1967]

Greek Officers' Power Plots Revealed

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Paris, April 29.—A plan called "Prometheus" that was stolen from its designers, a secret group of younger Army officers, a tank battalion that moved into Athens from the village where Pluto is said to have seized Persephone—these were the ingredients of the plot that overthrow the Greek Government nine days ago.

As pieced together from Greek sources close to the junta and from Western military men in intimate touch with the Greek Army, this is what happened:

Several years ago, a group of ambitious majors and captains formed a secret group called EENA. The initials stand for the Union of Young Greek Officers. Among its leading figures were George Papadopoulos, Stylianos Pattakos and Nikolaos Makarezos—all now ministers in the new regime.

EENA was modeled in part after still another hidden Army organization, IDEA. IDEA had become the creature of the senior officers, the generals. They had sworn a private oath of allegiance to the throne and dreamed of establishing a dictatorship with the support of the King and Greece's conservative business group.

SAW KING AS LUXURY

The restless young field and company grade officers in EENA took a different tack. They, too, longed for dictatorial order. But in their eyes, the old establishment, King included, was an unnecessary luxury.

In time, EENA recruited some able captains and lieutenants. Finally it enlisted one critical senior commander, Lt. Gen. George Zoitakis. Until the coup, he commanded the strategic Army Corps of the North and he is now Under Secretary of Defense.

Ironically, IDEA provided the coup plan that EENA was to adopt. The senior generals had drawn up a contingency operation with the code name of "Prometheus." It is said to have been approved by both King Constantine and the former Conservative Premier Panayotis Canellopoulos. "Prometheus" was designed for a bloodless takeover of Athens and Salonika in the event of a Communist coup or an electoral victory by the Papandreous, which they thought might, under some circumstances be a threat to public order. Andreas Papandreou had been implicated in the Aspida Affair, in which left-wing officers were plotting to overthrow the King.

EENA's colonels—Pattakos had just received his first General's star—knew all about "Prometheus" because they occupied key posts, near the generals. Just as Prometheus stole fire from the gods, the EENA clique resolved to steal the operation.

They waited until April 20 when all senior Army commanders were in Athens for their monthly meeting. In such a circumstance, orders could be sent to the field to unleash "Prometheus" in the senior commanders' names.

On the night of the 20th, Makarezos was in charge of Army communications and he apparently sent the coded signal to set "Prometheus" in motion. To secure Athens, a tank battalion rolled in from Eleusis where Pluto is supposed to have leaped from a cave and carried off Persephone.

Soldiers and tanks sealed off the center of Athens, seized the principal ministries and cut all communications including the King's. Small detachments were dispatched to arrest the political figures marked for public disappearance on the "Prometheus" list plus some figures added by EENA.

SALONIKA ENCIRCLED

The same thing happened in Salonika, except that the ring was established all around the city.

The plotters discovered that the Army chief-of-staff, Lt. Gen. Gregory Spandadakis, was willing to go along with the premature use of "Prometheus." The next day he was named Defense Minister.

Constantine knew nothing. His principal personal advisers had also been arrested. Spandadakis was detailed to tell the confused and angry King what had happened.

Friday at noon, the dismayed Constantine went to the Pentagon, the misnamed four-sided Greek military headquarters to meet the junta. He was accompanied by Spandadakis and an escort of officers.

The King told the plotters, "I was always faithful to the Army. I kept my oath to the Army. How could you do such a thing to me?"

Four hours later, he emerged, shaken but defeated. He had succeeded only in securing the release of his aides and in persuading the junta to name a civilian Premier. But his nominees were turned down until he proposed an intimate of the EENA clique, Constantine Kolias.

Although the Army had been tricked, no units resisted. Five senior generals and the head of the Navy were retired. The rest of the military accepted the coup whose only flaw, in their eyes, was that it had been launched by the wrong men.

Andreas Papandreou

Ithaca, N.Y.,
April 28, 1967.

To the Editor:

Your April 22 editorial titled "Greek Tragedy" leaves a good deal to be desired. It reflects a bias that has manifested itself consistently on your editorial page, descending at times to unbecoming *ad hominem* charges, quite at variance with what one expects of a serious newspaper.

The undersigned are former colleagues of Andreas Papandreou at Berkeley and Harvard. We do not pretend to know the ins and outs of recent Greek politics although some of us have spent considerable periods of time there.

But we do know that Andreas Papandreou served this country in the United States Navy during World War II; that he is a talented economist who taught at four major American universities; and that during the many years of our association with him he manifested a consistent devotion to democracy and rejected totalitarian forms of government.

Andreas Papandreou was the organizer of a research institute in Greece which was responsible for the first serious analysis of the economic and social problems of that country. As for your statement that he "bid openly for far-left support," whatever one may think of the wisdom of such a policy, we wonder whether that would make him any more a demagogue than it does those members of the French Center who entered into an electoral alliance with the French Communist party during the recent electoral campaign.

CONSTITUTIONAL ACTION

The fact remains that neither Andreas Papandreou nor his father has ever advocated a course of action inconsistent with the Greek Constitution and with normal democratic processes.

We note with pleasure the statement in your editorial of April 28 calling upon the Greek Government "to call off their apparent plan to try Andreas Papandreou for treason." You comment: "A fair trial is impossible in the present climate."

We hope you will join with us in stating unequivocally that Greece cannot be regarded as a nation with which the United States should maintain close political and military relations until the Papandreous and the other arrested political leaders are released; until King Constantine reappoints a government based upon a parliamentary majority; and until elections are scheduled to permit the Greek people to express their political preferences by the only means legitimate to a democracy—the ballot box.

Kenneth J. Arrow.
Walter Galeson.
Harvey Leibenstein.
Roy Radner.
Henry Rosovsky.

The above are Professors of Economics at the University of California, Berkeley; Cornell, Harvard and Stanford.

GREECE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the military coup in Greece is a crime against democracy and the people who invented democracy.

As the New York Times observed editorially:

> No convincing case can be made for a dictatorship.

The hollow excuses of the junta to the contrary, there was no clear and present danger of a Communist takeover. There was no justifiable reason for this reckless destruction of parliamentary government and constitutional safeguard.

The implications of the coup are grave. Merely to list them is to sketch the enormity of the tragedy for Greece—and the United States. Let us cite: First, the great damage done to the parliamentary system, with the public will thwarted, the press censored, the "justice" summary, willful, and arbitrary; second, the crippling of the economy, including loss of confidence by foreign investors and tourists; third, the further delay of a Cyprus settlement; fourth, an extremely dangerous political polarization of the country, playing into the hands of the small but specially organized Communist apparatus; fifth, the further unfortunate identification of the United States with the Greek Army, for the Greek public has habitually linked the American presence with the military.

We are already, I am afraid, being identified with the coup.

OPPOSITION TO QUIE SUBSTITUTE

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] in proposing his amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is incredible. He now contradicts everything he said only 2 short years ago, when the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor.

In 1965, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] offered an amendment to focus every single title of ESEA on the economically and educationally deprived. In 1967, he wants to earmark as little as 50 percent of the funds for such children. The committee bill would earmark over 80 percent for this purpose.

In 1965, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] raised the specter of Federal control if Federal funds were used to purchase text books. In 1967—2 short years later—he wants to earmark 7 percent of the funds in his amendment for such purchases.

In 1965, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] implied that private schools would lose their "independence and integrity" if title II of ESEA went into effect. In fact, he wrote and I quote:

> It is easy to foresee, for example, the situation wherein virtually all textual materials used by private school children will be those approved by public school agencies.

In 1967, the gentleman from Minnesota's [Mr. Quie] proposal creates exactly what he was so fearful of 2 short years ago. Section 706(b) of his amendment limits the purchase of any materials, books, equipment, and so on to "those which have been approved by an appropriate State or local education authority for use in a public"—I repeat, "public elementary or secondary schools of that State."

Finally, in 1965, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] claimed that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was not really aid for the disadvantaged but that its "true purpose" was "to authorize general aid to education." Then he condemned what he claimed was the universal scope of the bill.

Now—in 1967—he says ESEA is "too restrictive and categorical" and claims that his bill is general aid, more universal in scope than the ESEA.

I ask you, Mr. Speaker, what kind of action is this when a Member of this House can rise with a straight face to propose a measure which 2 short years ago was the antithesis of everything he said he believed in?

IMPORTED MAIDS SOMETIMES SAY "AU REVOIR" TOO SOON

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier in this session of Congress I introduced legislation (H.R. 7293) to provide for the regulation of employment agents who arrange for employment in the United States of aliens seeking to enter the United States to perform domestic services and to change the status of such aliens from that of immigrants to that of nonimmigrants for the protection of U.S. housewives and employers. The response which my bill has received is gratifying and I am slowly compiling a file of individual cases illustrating the abuse of our immigration laws which my bill is aimed at curbing.

Montgomery County has been particularly hard hit by alien domestics who take advantage of our immigration law to gain entrance into the United States under the pretense of serving as live-in maids. I insert the following article, by Martha Robinson, which appeared in the Montgomery County Sentinel in the Record to further illustrate the problems H.R. 7293 is designed to remedy:

[From the Montgomery County (Md.) Sentinel, Apr. 20, 1967]

Imported Maids Sometimes Say "Au Revoir" Too Soon

(By Martha Robinson)

Importing domestic help from overseas is often risky, but it's one way to get a live-in maid.

More and more area housewives are flocking to the nearest international employment service for domestics. Officials estimate 50 to 100 from England, Europe, Latin America and dozens of other foreign countries arrive in the Washington metropolitan area each month. A sizeable number of these fill positions in Bethesda and Chevy Chase. It is relatively easy for $15,000-a-year families to qualify for imported maids and houseboys.

To further underscore the local demand for overseas domestics, the three largest area international employment agencies operate in Montgomery County. Since World Abilities Search Inc. got its start seven years ago, Quality Overseas and Milford Overseas, Inc., have launched similar services. World and Quality are both located in Bethesda; Milford has Silver Spring offices.

UP TO $350

An agency placement fee costs the employer from about $140 to $350. In most cases he must also advance transportation and travel expenses which range from $275 to $600. The employer gets a one-year contract with the overseas domestic. But, as in any investment, there's an element of risk.

The risk in importing maids is now a matter of concern to Connecticut Rep. John Monagan (D-Conn.) a Montgomery County resident.

Monagan claims too many agencies are charging "fat fees from both the alien and the prospective employer," that American housewives are frequently bilked out of large sums of money because of such agencies' "glowing and optimistic representations" of overseas domestics. He questions the agencies' selection process, supervision and acceptance for responsibility of contractual obligations.

LEAVE EARLY

The nature of the problem as sized up by Monagan is provided in these cases brought to the attention of his Capitol Hill office:

A Bethesda housewife wrote that her maid, presumably single and trained to be a domestic, actually came to find a home and job for a husband and four children. She did not fulfill her year's contract.

A West Virginia family hired a German girl based on agency representations she could speak English and cook. Upon arrival, they discovered she could do neither.

A Rockville couple hired an English girl who stayed a month and left to take an $85-a-week office job. The family is in the hole about $500 for the transportation advance and other costs.

Monagan's office indicates some aliens, once they obtain the required government clearance, simply never show up as domestics. They go directly to higher paying and "cushy jobs" for which they could not have obtained a visa.

The Congressman has introduced legislation which would require all international employment agencies to register with the Labor Department. His bill provides that aliens not become permanent residents immediately but be given a certificate of admission which may be converted to permanent residence after one year, if the alien has "reasonably complied" with the terms of admission in the meantime. A Monagan aide explains that none of the agencies now fall under federal control although they may be required to observe state-imposed regulations.

On the other side of the coin, abuse of

aliens also may be a problem. One domestic wrote Monagan that her employer required about 80 hours work a week despite a contract to the contrary.

SUCCESS

Local agencies claim mostly "success" stories. They report that the demand for their services is great, and that the vast majority of cases work out. If separations are necessary, the agencies say they attempt to locate second employers. They cite instances of satisfied customers who may have employed more than one foreign domestic, and other situations where the aliens themselves have completed a year's contract, eventually married and then imported their own domestics from overseas. They say some maids are required by their home governments to successfully complete a special training course before coming to the U.S.

A live-in imported maid's salary runs from about $40 to $50 a week. The contract may stipulate periodic raises. From her salary, deductions are usually made to cover the cost of advanced travel money and insurance, if any.

Potential overseas maid employers usually follow this course of action: They visit an agency, review resumes, and decide on a girl, a houseboy or even a couple, depending on their need. The employer pays the agency fee. He writes to the prospective employee offering the job and outlining expected duties. If the alien accepts, a contract is written, and efforts are begun immediately to obtain state and federal admission clearance through the employment bureaus, Department of Labor, and Department of Immigration. These officials carefully screen applications for overseas domestics to ascertain whether or not the jobs could be filled by unemployed Americans. Last year, 3000 applicants were rejected on these grounds while 24,000 domestics gained entrance to the U.S.

FIRST THOUGHTS ON NATO PULLBACK

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's announcement of our contemplated withdrawal of 35,000 troops from West Germany must give pause to all who believe in the necessity of NATO and feel that the security of Western Europe must be a prime element in the global defense of the free world.

To call this movement a "redeployment" obscures its real significance. It is a reduction and a withdrawal and it serves no purpose to conceal its importance. Furthermore, coming as it does on the heels of our withdrawal of 18,000 troops from France its effect is traumatic.

Probably the most important aspect of American contribution to NATO from the beginning has been the actual physical presence on the European continent of U.S. troops in a forward defense position. This clear commitment of our soldiers has provided a psychological component to the defense of Europe that has had an overwhelming significance. Surely, this is not the time to reduce the weight of this European deterrent to aggression.

What is the justification for this withdrawal of our troops? Obviously, it cannot be a change in Communist military capacity. The Russians still have some 20 divisions stationed in East Germany, four in Hungary and two in Poland. Not only have the forces of the Warsaw Pact not been reduced but General Lemnitzer has pointed out that they are today stronger than they ever have been since the organization of NATO. That Communist interest in this area has lessened is clearly incredible when one views the developing Russian naval presence in the Mediterranean and their growing involvement in the affairs of countries such as Algeria on the border of this sea.

Some may argue that Communist intentions have changed and that there has been a thaw in East-West relations that justifies a change in our policy. In response to this, I would agree that some elements in Communist countries have indicated a desire for a rapprochement with the West and that there is a growing interest in individual and economic freedom on the part of the mass of people of these countries which in the long run may make itself felt. Surely, however, this is a tenuous basis for justifying a security decision and it is far from indicating that the ruling elements cannot reverse any tendency to liberalization and change policies quickly and without notice. Further the activities of the Communists in North Vietnam, in Yemen, or in Greece do not indicate any lessening in their push for domination and influence.

Apparently the principal justification offered for the withdrawal of our troops is financial. It is argued that this move will save $100 million a year. Perhaps this is true, although a move of troops from one place to another would not seem to reduce cost but merely to reallocate them. Even if the reduction is granted, however, we read in the newspapers on practically the same day an announcement that $150 million will be allocated for the construction of a supersonic air transport plane. Clearly, this matter of spending is a matter of judgment and of the allocation of priorities but it would seem certain that this expenditure might be delayed pending the resolution of our critical defense situation. Without the opportunity for detailed investigation, it is not possible quickly to suggest areas where spending might be further curtailed, but the space program, the public works program, the program of Federal construction, and the farm program suggest themselves as fruitful fields for examination.

The foreign exchange aspect of the problem has been made vastly more acute by the war in Vietnam, but we are talking of a saving of $100 million against expenditures of many times this amount in Southeast Asia. There is incongruity too in the fact that while cutting back on our security forces for ostensible balance-of-payments reasons, some executive agencies are actively and vigorously advocating and implementing a policy of reducing our limitations on trade with Eastern Europe and in lowering the barriers to imports which are produced in low-cost labor areas of the world, both of which will further affect our balance of payments.

However, the balance-of-payments argument really does not have relevance. The question involved is the security of the United States and if this security is in issue, then action to promote our safety should be taken forthrightly and we should be prepared to pay the cost—as we are paying it in Vietnam.

Perhaps the most serious defect in this action is the absence of any reciprocal action on the part of any Communist country. Nowhere do we hear that troops have been removed on the other side of the curtain nor that restrictive policies have been relaxed. In fact, recent experiences of U.S. tourists indicate the contrary and, in addition, yesterday's newspaper stated that the U.S.S.R. has "forced" a suspension of current disarmament talks in Geneva. If we are to make a substantial reduction of our troop strength in Europe, at least we can make it conditional upon comparable moves by the opposition.

The official announcement indicates that no movement under the suggested procedure will take place prior to January 1968. It is certainly to be hoped that this whole matter will be thoroughly reviewed before that time and that this decision of withdrawal will be reconsidered.

AMERICANIZATION DAY

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD a very eloquent speech given last Sunday by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] as part of Americanization Day ceremonies held in Jersey City. As is typical, Mr. DANIELS in his speech leaves no doubt where he stands, and I think his words ought to be given serious consideration by every Member of this House.

Mr. DANIEL's speech follows:

AMERICANIZATION DAY SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN DANIELS, APRIL 30, 1967

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, Reverend Clergy, officers and members of the Clinton E. Fisk Post, friends. It is a great privilege and high honor to be here today with you as we observe the 36th annual Americanization Day. This community owes a great debt to all of those members of the Fisk Post who, down through the years, have worked to make this the great day for Jersey City that it is, and always will be.

It is unfortunate—in a sense—that we have to have an Americanization Day. Surely, each of us should have in our hearts a love of country which is only second to love of God. Yet, when you read the newspapers you can readily see that there are many in this God favored Nation who do not share the pride in the United States which motivates most of us.

Just last week, I saw a full page photograph in the New York Daily News featuring a group of young Americans burning an American flag in Central Park.

What has America done to earn the enmity of these young people who have taken so much from this country and given so little? Why is that inevitably those who participate in flag desecrations and draft card burnings are inevitably the children of parents wealthy enough to provide them with the best draft exempt education that money can buy?

One cannot help but ask if there is not some intellectual and moral cancer in American society which is eating away at the fiber of this nation.

I wish I could give you easy and quick answers to the motivation of those who are so quick to condemn their own Nation and so slow to criticize our enemies and the enemies of freedom at home and abroad.

I am afraid I am a product of an older America, an America where we were taught as children by our parents in many cases, ironically, by parents themselves immigrants on these shores that love of country was one of the eternal virtues.

It is for this reason that my blood boils when I see pictures in the press of these outrages. Just last week, when I saw the picture in the New York Daily News, I immediately contacted Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee and urged him to enact a law with teeth in it to put the flag burners where they belong—behind bars.

As you all know, last year Congress enacted a measure providing for a sentence of up to five years and a fine of up to $10,000 or both for draft card burning. I might tell you that I am disappointed that action has not yet been taken by the Justice Department in those cases where this law is so obviously being broken.

The question of dissent in our society is a subtle one and as a student of the law and of our Constitution I am not in favor of stifling honest disagreement, but when this dissent spills over into the area where it provides aid and comfort for those who are at this very moment in time killing our fighting sons, then it seems that dissent has moved perilously close to actual treason.

Make no mistake about it, the concept that American will cannot be sustained, has provided the Vietcong with a psychological lift and has sustained their military effort.

General William Westmoreland, Commander of the United States Forces in Vietnam, said only this week in New York, that "Anti-Vietnam demonstrations undercut the efforts of our troops and encourage the enemy to think that he can win politically that which he cannot win militarily."

General Westmoreland went on to say, "Thus discouraged by repeated military defeat but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This will inevitably cost lives—American, Vietnamese and those of our other brave allies."

There is no question in my mind that those who attack the morality of our effort in southeast Asia are willingly or unwillingly giving aid and comfort to our enemies.

The tragedy of all of this is that while this dissent goes on at home our young Americans are acquitting themselves in a manner worthy of the traditions of this Nation. Just the other day, I inserted into the Congressional Record a few citations of young marines who had been awarded the Navy Cross, the second highest honor which can be given to a marine.

I told my colleagues in the House of Representatives, and I repeat here today, that in Vietnam today, as on Iwo Jima 22 years ago, uncommon valor is still a common virtue.

These young men—and in some cases, very young men—are proving themselves worthy of those who fought in earlier wars. They are no less worthy of our esteem than those of you who defeated the Kaiser's finest troops fifty years ago or those of you who made a mockery of Hitler's thousand year Reich (Rike) or those gallant fighting men who fought their way from Chosin to Hungnam during the bitter Korean winter of 1950.

In conclusion, there is a time to protest but there is a time to stand with this Nation in its time of need and that time is now.

Our American fighting men are fulfilling their obligation in a way that can only be described as magnificent. The question then for us to answer—12,000 miles removed from the horror of war—is not whether our fighting men are worthy of our esteem. The question is rather are we so safe and so secure, worthy of theirs.

On this Americanization Day, I urge every man, woman, and child in this city, in this State, and throughout the length and breadth of this Nation to stand as one and to let the enemies of freedom know that this Nation shall never falter or weaken.

Thank you.

MEETING HEAD ON

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which I supported in 1965, and will support this year, has come under intense attack.

The debate on the bill has been more partisan than philosophical, and I consider that most unfortunate. There is no question that if the Quie substitute were passed, it would fan the fires of controversy over the church-state issue, which the 89th Congress had successfully quieted. It would destroy the fine programs of Federal assistance we have built up during these last years.

The Baltimore Sun, in a fine editorial on April 30, gave additional reasons for opposing the Quie substitute. The editorial follows:

MEETING HEAD ON

The President does well to meet the block-gift proposal for Federal aid to education head-on. He says it would jeopardize the whole development over the past 20 years of payments for local educational purposes from sources not contemplated in the original Constitution. The method devised was to make grants for narrowly specified objectives with Federal control of expenditure always firmly provided. What opponents now ask is Federal grants more or less in lump sum, with actual spending decisions left to state and local authorities.

Elementary school students of the national history recognize the heresy involved in proposals that the Federal Government supply the funds for others to spend. It is taxation without representation. Federal taxpayers are to write their checks to the collector of internal revenue. Congress is then to direct some part of each of those checks for non-Federal officials to disburse at their discretion. Having supplied the money, Federal taxpayers are to be unrepresented in its expenditure.

The perhaps not always realized motivation of these proposals in education and other fields generally is to evade confrontation with the basic constitutional issue involved: that Federal control of spending in state programs will impair state sovereignty. But to defend one constitutional truism by neglecting another is not the way to proceed. And the rule that the government which puts up the money must say how to spend it is constitutional bedrock. If, as can well be argued, the states need greater revenues to conduct programs now dependent on Federal subventions, the answer is, not Federal giveaways, but Federal relinquishment to the states of new sources for state revenues.

ESCALATION WILL NOT BRING PEACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have the greatest respect and admiration for General Westmoreland and the address which he made in this Chamber last Friday. The general is an outstanding soldier and leader of men. He made his case to the Congress and to the people of this country ably.

I also want to say that I have nothing but the greatest respect and admiration for the men who are serving under the general in Vietnam. I have had the privilege of making several inspection trips to South Vietnam and southeast Asia in the last several years. I have been consistently and tremendously impressed by the attitude, the competence, and the dedication of our country's officers and men. They operate under the most difficult of circumstances and they do their assigned jobs superbly.

Dissent, particularly at a time of national testing, is not easy. It would be easier, and probably safer, to say nothing. But constructive disagreement, as opposed to unreasoning protest, is still the backbone of our democracy. As the Bible reminds us, in the book of Ecclesiastics, there is a time to keep silent and a time to speak.

Mr. Speaker, after long thought I do not believe that our present policy of steady military escalation in Vietnam will lead us to our stated and desired objectives. The recent policy of bombing airfields and targets in heavily populated areas of North Vietnam is, in my judgment, inconsistent with our efforts to achieve an early, honorable, and peaceful settlement of this awful conflict.

I believe that the bombing of targets in heavily populated areas, such as the recent attacks within the port city of Haiphong, should be avoided. The destruction of homes and cities can only intensify the will of the North Vietnamese to fight on, as numerous correspondents have already reported. It can only harden the will of those under attack to resist, as the British so clearly demonstrated throughout the bombing of London in World War II.

I believe that the bombing of North Vietnamese airfields is a major tactical blunder with the most serious and far-reaching consequences. It could easily lead to North Vietnamese use of Communist Chinese airfields to "hot pursuit" into Chinese airspace, to attacks on these airfields and to direct military confrontation with China. Already there are reports of U.S. attacks and air losses across the Chinese border. Instead of moving to end the war we are acting to widen and broaden it and to make it far more dangerous.

The next step along the ladder of escalation could be the mining of the port of Haiphong. Along with purposeful bombing of the civilian centers of North Vietnam, it is about the only previously restricted target that has not been put on the approved list. But this step—which has been urged by some members of the military and the Congress—could lead tragically and quickly into an even greater and more direct involvement of the Soviet Union. The holocaust of world war III might then not be far away.

Mr. Speaker, we have been bombing, and escalating our bombing, of North Vietnam for 2 years now. Our objectives when we started were, first, to interdict the movement of supplies and support from the north to the south; and second, to put pressure on the north to induce negotiations.

Neither of these objectives has been achieved, nor is there any sign that either will be by these means. We have, undoubtedly, made the infiltration of troops and material to the south more difficult and costly, but we certainly have not stopped it or even significantly reduced it. Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara has confirmed this on several occasions. As for bombing the north into an attitude where they will accept negotiations, it seems pretty clear that the Hanoi regime today is even more defiant and intransigent than before.

As opposed to a policy of steady military escalation, I would recommend, as I have before, that we again halt our bombing of the north in an effort to remove a barrier which the other side states is keeping it from the conference table. A halt in our bombing, rather than escalation, would, in my judgment, best serve the cause of peace.

Robert Kleiman pointed out, in a recent editorial in the New York Times, which I placed in the RECORD earlier this week, that:

> Washington is suspicious that North Vietnam is far more interested in halting the bombing than in genuinely negotiating and would drag out any talks to gain a military advantage.

There are, unquestionably, certain risks inherent in a bombing halt of sufficient duration to be meaningful. But the risks involved if we do not give negotiations every chance, and if we do not seriously consider what went wrong with previous peacemaking attempts, are far greater.

As Mr. Kleiman has suggested, and I urge all Members to read his comments beginning on page A2163 of the daily RECORD of May 2:

> The United States could suspend the bombing but make it clear, after talks open, that negotiations could not continue very long if either side substantially increased its force levels in South Vietnam or the flow of supplies to its troops or allies.

It is vitally important, I believe, to return to the American position of December 1965, when we were apparently prepared to continue a bombing pause in return for negotiations. It is true that Hanoi failed to respond to this offer at that time, but Secretary McNamara, testifying before the House Appropriations Subcommittees on Defense and Military Construction in March of this year, said there had been indications that North Vietnam would be willing to talk if the bombing were stopped.

The anniversary of Buddha's birth on May 23, with the proposed 1- or 2-day truce and bombing pause, presents this country with an opportunity to return to its position of December 1965. It offers an opportunity to induce the negotiations we have repeatedly called for. It offers what may be the last chance to attain a peaceful settlement. If this initiative is not taken, I think we are committing ourselves to new escalation, to stalemate at a higher and more dangerous level, and to the threat of a much larger and longer war.

But more than a pause in the bombing is needed. I recommend that we plainly state our willingness to negotiate directly with all parties to this conflict, including the Vietcong. There is no reason why they, as direct participants in the conflict, should not be direct participants in any conference.

I recommend that we encourage, in every way we can, early countrywide elections of a broadly based national government; that we encourage this government to initiate direct contacts, looking to a settlement, with the other side; and that we make clear our acceptance of any role that the Vietcong may win in negotiations or free elections.

I recommend that we continue to work for the involvement of the United Nations, or, if this is not possible, some other appropriate international presence to mediate negotiations, to supervise a cease-fire and to insure that elections are free and fair.

Mr. Speaker, I seriously doubt whether a military solution, short of a disastrously wider war, is possible in Vietnam. I doubt whether either Russia or Communist China would stand by while we steadily and relentlessly increased the intensity of our attacks and the destruction of North Vietnam. The direct intervention of one, or both, under these circumstances is surely invited. The result would be, as the San Francisco Chronicle noted in an editorial on April 28, the weakening not strengthening, of the security of our country.

There is a war to be won in Vietnam, but it is in the south. It is, for now, partly military but even more it is a war on the root causes of discontent; it is war on the political, social, and economic injustices that have made unrest, disorder, and open warfare possible. It is this war, not the bombing, that needs to be escalated. I urge that we accelerate these tasks and that we do so without delay.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington (at the request of Mr. ALBERT) from May 8 through May 15, on account of official business.

Mr. FRASER (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), from today through May 8, on account of official business (Anglo-American Parliamentary Conference).

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. EDMONDSON, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. LAIRD, for 60 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. RANDALL, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GOODELL, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. COHELAN (at the request of Mr. PICKLE), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. DENT (at the request of Mr. PICKLE), for 1 hour, on May 9; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. HOSMER.

Mr. PELLY to revise and extend remarks to be made by him in Committee of the Whole today on H.R. 158 and to include a table.

Mr. PHILBIN and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida to include tables in his remarks made in Committee of the Whole.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BIESTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PICKLE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. KEE.

Mr. GONZALEZ.

Mr. NICHOLS.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 8, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

725. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of reclassification of lands within the boundary of the Highland-Hanover Irrigation District on the Hanover Bluff unit of the Missouri River Basin project in Wyoming, pursuant to the provisions of 53 Stat. 1187, 43 U.S.C. 483; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

726. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a proposed concession contract authorizing the Yosemite Park and Curry Co. to operate the Government-owned El Portal Motor Inn and provide related facilities and services for the public in the El Portal administrative site of Yosemite National Park, Calif., pursuant to the provisions of 70 Stat. 543; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

727. A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report, "National Atmospheric Sciences Program—Fiscal Year 1968"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

728. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases, together with the names of aliens involved, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(d)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PERKINS: Committee on Education and Labor. H.R. 100. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects; with amendment (Rept. No. 227). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rules XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4374. A bill to remove a cloud on the title of certain real property in the State of Oregon owned by John Johnson (Rept. No. 228). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BARING: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 4983. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain lands to Raymond Educational Foundation, an Arizona corporation; with amendment (Rept. No. 229). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6602. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in certain lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of such land (Rept. No. 230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EDMONDSON: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 6716. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to sell reserved phosphate interests of the United States in lands located in the State of Florida to the record owners of the surface thereof (Rept. No. 231). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 9658. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9659. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRINKLEY:

H.R. 9660. A bill to provide incentives for the establishment of new or expanded job-producing industrial and commercial establishments in areas having high proportions of persons with low incomes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9661. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of advertising revenues derived by a tax-exempt organization from its publication of a trade journal or other periodical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COHELAN:

H.R. 9662. A bill to amend section 117 of the Housing Act of 1949 to provide that grants thereunder for local code enforcement programs may be in amounts up to three-fourths of program costs in the case of programs in redevelopment areas (rather than only up to two-thirds of such costs as in other cases); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 9663. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the income tax treatment of business development corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9664. A bill to provide for a comprehensive program for the care and control of alcoholism; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9665. A bill to amend the Communication Act of 1934, as amended, to give the Federal Communications Commission authority to prescribe regulations for the manufacture, import, sale, shipment, or use of devices which cause harmful interference to radio reception; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9666. A bill relating to the construction, modification, alteration, repair, painting, or decoration of buildings leased for public purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9667. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 9668. A bill to provide a statute of limitations with respect to the deportation of aliens from the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 9669. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strikes at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9670. A bill to establish a minimum rate of retired pay for members of the Armed Forces who are disabled by injuries received in combat; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 9671. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9672. A bill to amend the joint resolution designating June 14 of each year as Flag Day (37 U.S.C. 157) to provide appropriate recognition of the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag and its author, Francis Bellamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9673. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide that accumulated sick leave be credited to the retirement fund or that the individual be reimbursed; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9674. A bill to reclassify positions and increase salaries in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 9675. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1924; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H.R. 9676. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATHIAS of California:

H.R. 9677. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported olives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 9678. A bill to amend section 2312 of title 18, United States Code, to permit a person enforcing that section to stop a motor vehicle to inspect the serial number of its body and motor if he has reason to suspect that the motor vehicle has been stolen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9679. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to authorize the issuance of a search warrant to search for and seize any property that may constitute evidence of the offense in connection with which the warrant is issued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9680. A bill to amend section 3731 of title 18, United States Code, to permit an appeal by the United States in certain instances from an order made before trial granting a motion for return of seized property and to suppress evidence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9681. A bill to amend section 3109 of title 18, United States Code, to permit an officer to execute certain search warrants without giving notice to his authority or purpose; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9682. A bill to amend section 22(g) of the Federal Reserve Act relating to loans to executive officers by member banks of the Federal Reserve System, and to amend the Federal Credit Union Act to modify the loan provisions relating to directors, members of the supervisory committee, and members of the credit committee of Federal credit unions; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9683. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to extend and expand the authorization of grants to States for rehabilitation services, to authorize assistance in establishment and operation of a National Center for Deaf-Blind Youths and Adults, and to provide assistance for migrants; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9684. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 9685. A bill to amend section 3 of title

4, United States Code, relating to improper use of the flag of the United States, to expand the application of, and to increase the penalties provided in, that section; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 9686. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9687. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBERTS:

H.R. 9688. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to provide for the appointment of one additional district judge for the eastern district of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 9689. A bill to assist cities and States by amending section 5136 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, with respect to the authority of national banks to underwrite and deal in securities issued by State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9690. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the States to preserve, protect, develop, restore, and make accessible estuarine areas of the Nation which are valuable for sport and commercial fishing, wildlife, conservation, recreation, and scenic beauty, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SAYLOR (for himself, Mr. Byrne of Pennsylvania, Mr. Cleveland, Mr. Dulski, Mr. McDade, Mr. Mathias of Maryland, Mr. Morton, Mr. Nix, Mr. Ottinger, Mr. Reid of New York, Mr. Schweiker, Mr. Bob Wilson, Mr. Wright, and Mr. Wyatt):

H.R. 9691. A bill to provide for the admission into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 9692. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of California:

H.R. 9693. A bill to exclude from income certain reimbursed moving expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTT:

H.R. 9694. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit payment to the recipient of medical assistance, for physician services furnished under the program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WATSON:

H.R. 9695. A bill to amend title 28 of the United States Code, "Judiciary and Judicial Procedure," and incorporate therein provisions relating to the U.S. Labor Court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9696. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9697. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PRICE of Texas:

H.R. 9698. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.J. Res. 558. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as National School Safety Patrol Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.J. Res. 559. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H. Con. Res. 339. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that in the interest of peace in Vietnam the Government of the United States should only consider further expansions of trade, educational and cultural exchanges, and other related agreements with the Soviet Union and its East European satellites when there is demonstrable evidence that their actions and policies with regard to Vietnam have been redirected toward peace and an honorable settlement and when there is demonstrable evidence that they have abandoned their policy of support for so-called wars of national liberation; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H. Res. 464. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional Capitol Police for duty under the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

181. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to amending the United States Constitution permitting Bible reading and prayers in our public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

182. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to increasing the amounts of minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

183. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to increasing allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

184. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to providing a tax credit for college tuition payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

185. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to changing the designation of Old Age Assistance to Senior Citizens Assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

186. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to providing for hearings for air routes between Minnesota and Europe; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9699. A bill for the relief of Ilias Sidiroglou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 9700. A bill for the relief of Petroula Kapranos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 9701. A bill for the relief of Giovanni Li Vorsi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9702. A bill for the relief of Catherine Cipolla; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9703. A bill for the relief of Francesco Graziano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9704. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Leone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9705. A bill for the relief of Santo Modica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9706. A bill for the relief of Maria Heincz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9707. A bill for the relief of Dr. Hilario Anido; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 9708. A bill for the relief of Burrowes Manufacturing Corp.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 9709. A bill for the relief of Rear Adm. William D. Wright, U.S. Navy (retired); to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SANDMAN:

H.R. 9710. A bill for the relief of Mario Errera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

* * *

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 4, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by Hon. Robert C. Byrd, a Senator from the State of West Virginia.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, who committest to us the swift and solemn trust of life, so teach us to number our days that we may apply cur hearts unto wisdom.

In this moment, dedicated to the unseen and the eternal, make vivid our abiding faith, we beseech Thee, in those deep and holy foundations which our fathers laid, lest in this desperate and dangerous day we attempt to build on sand instead of rock.

We pause at this wayside altar, not just to bow our spirits in a passing gesture of devotion and then go on our busy way with lives empty of Thee: rather, we come to ask Thy presence and Thy guidance as this day we face the strain of toil, the weight of burdens, and the call of duty.

Keep love's banners floating o'er us as we march forward in the ranks of those who do justly and walk humbly with their God.

May we see clearly the depth and scope of the historic drama of the centuries in which we are called to play our part, and may that vision help to turn its blood and sweat and tears into final glory for all mankind.

We ask it in Thine ever blessed name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. Senate,
President pro tempore,
Washington, D.C., May 4, 1967.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate I appoint Hon. Robert C. Byrd, a Senator from the State of West Virginia, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

Carl Hayden,
President pro tempore.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the

Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 3, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 195, and the measures following on the calendar, in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

RENEWAL AND EXTENSION OF INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) consent to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 15, after line 22, to insert two new sections, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall make a report to Congress not later than December 31, 1970, as to whether or not the activities of the States under the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas have been consistent with the purpose as set out in article V of such compact.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

So as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the consent of Congress is hereby given to an extension and renewal of a period of four years from September 1, 1967, to September 1, 1971, of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas, which was signed in the city of Dallas, Texas, the 16th day of February, 1935, by the representatives of Oklahoma, Texas, California, and New Mexico, and at the same time and place was signed by the representatives, as a recommendation for approval to the Governors and Legislatures of the States of Arkansas, Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, and Michigan, and which prior to August 27, 1935, was presented to and approved by the Legislatures and Governors of the States of New Mexico, Kansas, Oklahoma, Illinois, Colorado, and Texas, and which so approved by the six States last above-named was deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and thereafter was consented to by the Congress in Public Resolution Numbered 64, Seventy-fourth Congress, approved August 27, 1935, for a period of two years, and thereafter was extended by the representatives of the compacting States and consented to by the Congress for successive periods, without interruption, the last extension being for the period from September 1, 1963, to September 1, 1967, consented to by Congress by Public Law Numbered 88–115, Eighty-eighth Congress, approved September 6, 1963. The agreement to extend and renew said compact for a period of four years from September 1, 1967, to September 1, 1971, duly executed by representatives of the States of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming, has been deposited in the Department of State of the United States, and reads as follows:

"AN AGREEMENT TO EXTEND THE INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

"Whereas, on the 16th day of February, 1935, in the City of Dallas, Texas, there was executed 'An Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas' which was thereafter formally ratified and approved by the States of Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, Illinois, Colorado, and Kansas, the original of which is now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a true copy of which follows:

" 'AN INTERSTATE COMPACT TO CONSERVE OIL AND GAS

" 'ARTICLE I

" 'This agreement may become effective within any compacting state at any time as prescribed by that state, and shall become effective within those states ratifying it whenever any three of the States of Texas, Oklaoma, California, Kansas, and New Mexico have ratified and Congress has given its consent. Any oil-producing state may become a party hereto as hereinafter provided.

" 'ARTICLE II

" 'The purpose of this compact is to conserve oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause.

" 'ARTICLE III

" 'Each state bound hereby agrees that within a reasonable time it will enact laws, or if the laws have been enacted, then it agrees to continue the same in force, to accomplish within reasonable limits the prevention of:

" '(a) The operation of any oil well with an inefficient gas-oil ratio.

" '(b) The drowning with water of any stratum capable of producing oil or gas, or both oil and gas, in paying quantities.

" '(c) The avoidable escape into the open air or the wasteful burning of gas from a natural gas well.

" '(d) The creation of unnecessary fire hazards.

" '(e) The drilling, equipping, locating, spacing or operating of a well or wells so as to bring about physical waste of oil or gas or loss in the ultimate recovery thereof.

" '(f) The inefficient, excessive or improper use of the reservior energy in producing any well.

" 'The enumeration of the foregoing subjects shall not limit the scope of the authority of any state.

" 'ARTICLE IV

" 'Each state bound hereby agrees that it will, within a reasonable time, enact statutes, or if such statutes have been enacted then that it will continue the same in force, providing in effect that oil produced in violation of its valid oil and/or gas conservation statutes or any valid rule, order or regulation promulgated thereunder, shall be denied access to Commerce; and providing for stringent penalties for the waste of either oil or gas.

" 'ARTICLE V

" 'It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the states joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations.

" 'ARTICLE VI

" 'Each State joining herein shall appoint one representative to a commission hereby constituted and designated as "The Interstate Oil Compact Commission", the duty of which said commission shall be to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection.

" 'The Commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several states within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said states, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas. Said Commission shall organize and adopt suitable rules and regulations for the conduct of its business.

" 'No action shall be taken by the Commission except: (1) by the affirmative votes of the majority of the whole number of the compacting States represented at any meeting, and (2) by a concurring vote of a majority in interest of the compacting States at said meeting, such interest to be determined as follows: such vote of each State shall be in the decimal proportion fixed by the ratio of its daily average production during the preceding calendar half-year to the daily average production of the compacting States during said period.

" 'ARTICLE VII

" 'No State by joining herein shall become financially obligated to any other State, nor shall the breach of the terms hereof by any State subject such State to financial responsibility to the other States joining herein.

" 'ARTICLE VIII

" 'This compact shall expire September 1, 1937. But any State joining herein may, upon sixty (60) days notice, withdraw herefrom.

" 'The representatives of the signatory States have signed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States, and a duly certified copy shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory states.

" 'This compact shall become effective when ratified and approved as provided in Article I. Any oil-producing State may become a party hereto by affixing its signature to a counterpart to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.'

"Whereas, the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas has heretofore been duly renewed and extended with the consent of the Congress to September 1, 1967; and

"Whereas, it is desired to renew and extend the said Interstate Compact to Conserve Oil and Gas for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1967, to September 1, 1971:

"Now, therefore, this writing witnesseth:

"It is hereby agreed that the Compact entitled 'An Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas' executed in the City of Dallas, Texas, on the 16th day of February, 1935, and now on deposit with the Department of State of the United States, a correct copy of which appears above, be, and the same hereby is, extended for a period of four (4) years from September 1, 1967, its present date of expiration, to September 1, 1971. This agreement shall become effective when executed, ratified, and approved as provided in Article I of the original Compact.

"The signatory States have executed this agreement in a single original which shall be deposited in the archives of the Department of State of the United States and a duly certified copy thereof shall be forwarded to the Governor of each of the signatory States. Any oil-producing state may become a party hereto by executing a counterpart of this agreement to be similarly deposited, certified, and ratified.

"Executed by the several undersigned states, at their several state capitols, through their proper officials on the dates as shown, as duly authorized by statutes and resolutions, subject to the limitations and qualifications of the acts of the respective State Legislatures.

"The State of Alabama
"By George C. Wallace, Governor
"Dated: Aug. 11, 1966
"Attest: Mrs. Agnes Baggett, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Alaska
"By William A. Egan, Governor
"Dated: July 13, 1966
"Attest: Hugh J. Wade, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Arizona
"By Samuel P. Goddard, Governor
"Dated: March 8, 1966
"Attest: Wesley Bolin, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Arkansas
"By Orval E. Faubus, Governor
"Dated: May 3, 1966
"Attest: Kelly Bryant, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Colorado
"By John A. Love, Governor
"Dated: January 13, 1966
"Attest: Byron A. Anderson, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Florida
"By Haydon Burns, Governor
"Dated: June 28, 1963
"Attest: Tom Adams, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Illinois
"By Otto Kerner, Governor
"Dated: January 24, 1966
"Attest: Paul Powell, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Indiana
"By Roger D. Branigin, Governor
"Dated: May 31, 1966
"Attest: John D. Bottorff, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Kansas
"By Wm. H. Avery, Governor
"Dated: December 1, 1965
"Attest: Paul R. Shanahan, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Kentucky
"By Edward T. Breathitt, Governor
"Dated: 6–6–66
"Attest: Thelma L. Stovall, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Louisiana
"By John J. McKeithen, Governor
"Dated: November 2, 1965
"Attest: Wade O. Martin, Jr., Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Maryland
"By J. Millard Tawes, Governor
"Dated: October 10, 1966
"Attest: Lloyd L. Simpkins, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Michigan
"By George Romney, Governor
"Dated: 5/19/66
"Attest: James M. Hare, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Mississippi
"By Paul B. Johnson, Governor
"Dated: April 27, 1966
"Attest: Heber Ladner, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Montana
"By Tim Babcock, Governor
"Dated: Feb. 14, 1966
"Attest: Frank Murray, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Nebraska
"By Frank B. Morrison, Governor
"Dated: Jan. 31, 1966
"Attest: Frank Marsh, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Nevada
"By Grant Sawyer, Governor
"Dated: June 17, 1966
"Attest: John Koontz, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of New Mexico
"By Jack M. Campbell, Governor
"Dated: 11–8–65
"Attest: Alberta Miller, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of New York
"By Nelson A. Rockefeller, Governor
"Dated: Nov. 28, 1966
"Attest: John P. Lomenzo, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of North Dakota
"By William L. Guy, Governor
"Dated: Dec. 19, 1966
"Attest: Ben Meier, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Ohio
"By James A. Rhodes, Governor
"Dated: July 25, 1966
"Attest: Ted W. Brown, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Oklahoma
"By Henry Bellmon, Governor
"Dated: November 15, 1965
"Attest: James M. Bullard, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania
"By William W. Scranton, Governor
"Dated: Sept. 16, 1966
"Attest W. Stuart Helm, Secretary of the Commonwealth
(SEAL)

"The State of South Dakota
"By Nils A. Boe, Governor
"Dated: Sept. 26, 1966
"Attest: Alma Larson, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Tennessee
"By Frank G. Clement, Governor
"Dated: 4–18–66
"Attest: Joe C. Carr, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Texas
"By John Connally, Governor
"Dated: October 11, 1965
"Attest: Crawford C. Martin, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Utah
"By Calvin L. Rampton, Governor
"Dated: 4/11/66
"Attest: Clyde L. Miller, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of West Virginia
"By Hulett C. Smith, Governor
"Dated: July 14, 1966
"Attest: Robert D. Bailey, Secretary of State
(SEAL)

"The State of Wyoming
"By Clifford P. Hansen, Governor
"Dated: Jan. 18, 1966
"Attest: Thyra Thomson, Secretary of State"
(SEAL)

Sec. 2. The Attorney General of the United States shall make a report to Congress not later than December 31, 1970, as to whether or not the activities of the States under the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas have been consistent with the purpose as set out in article V of such compact.

Sec. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of the first section of this joint resolution is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 202), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

Senate Joint Resolution 35 gives the consent of Congress to an extension and renewal for a period of 4 years, from September 1, 1967, to September 1, 1971, of the Interstate Compact To Conserve Oil and Gas, originally signed in Dallas, Tex., on February 16, 1935. Twenty-nine States, which account for the overwhelming proportion of oil production within the United States, now are members of the compact, the purpose of which, in its own terms, is the conservation of oil and gas by the prevention of physical waste thereof from any cause (art. II of the compact).

Formation of the compact grew out of chaotic and wasteful conditions in domestic oil and gas production in the early 1930's. Petroleum was literally being pumped onto the surface of the ground, and with prices of 10 to 25 cents a barrel, often was allowed to sit there and waste away. Gas was being flared; that is, burned at the wellhead. Six of the States immediately concerned agreed on the necessity for joint action, and in 1935 the 74th Congress approved the compact. Since that time successive Congresses have on nine occasions approved extensions for periods of 2 or 4 years, after having looked into and found that the activities of the States under the compact were achieving success in fulfilling the avowed mission of preventing waste through local State action.

STUDY BY ATTORNEY GENERAL

During consideration in the 84th Congress of Senate Joint Resolution 38, in July 1955, the seventh renewal of the compact, a provision was added which required annual reports by the Attorney General of the United States on whether the activities of the States under the compact were consistent with article V of the compact. Article V provides:

"It is not the purpose of this compact to authorize the States joining herein to limit the production of oil or gas for the purpose of stabilizing or fixing the price thereof, or create or perpetuate monopoly, or to promote regimentation, but is limited to the purpose of conserving oil and gas and preventing the avoidable waste thereof within reasonable limitations."

The committee amendment to section 2 retains the requirement for oversight by the Attorney General, but, at his request, relieves him of the burden of submitting annual reports. Rather, the Attorney General is to make a report not later than December 31, 1970, prior to the time for the next renewal of the compact. The statutory reports of the Attorney General have consistently given the compact States a clean bill of health with respect to observance of article V, quoted above. The Department of Justice unequivocally approves the present extension of the compact.

THE COMPACT

The text of the provisions of the compact, and its legal history, are set forth in full in Senate Joint Resolution 35.

Member States agree to enact and enforce State legislation to prevent waste of oil and gas, and article VI provides for each member State to appoint one representative to a commission, designated the Interstate Oil Compact Commission, the duty of which shall be—

"to make inquiry and ascertain from time to time such methods, practices, circumstances, and conditions as may be disclosed for bringing about conservation and the prevention of physical waste of oil and gas, and at such intervals as said commission deems beneficial it shall report its findings and recommendations to the several States for adoption or rejection."

The commission has no power of compulsion. Its sole and only purpose is to assist the States, industry, and public in general in promoting the conservation program, the compact providing, by its terms, that—

"The commission shall have power to recommend the coordination of the exercise of the police powers of the several States within their several jurisdictions to promote the maximum ultimate recovery from the petroleum reserves of said States, and to recommend measures for the maximum ultimate recovery of oil and gas."

Thus, the sole authority for carrying out the conservation program rests with the member States.

Any State may withdraw on 60 days' notice, but no State has ever exercised this privilege. Rather, membership has steadily increased from the original six sponsoring States to a total of 29 active States (i.e., States in which oil or gas is now produced) and four associate members (i.e., States in which there are excellent prospects that oil or gas will be produced).

MEMBERSHIP IN THE COMPACT

The membership of the Interstate Oil Compact Commission now consists of the 29 principal oil-producing States: Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Mississippi, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

In addition to these States, Georgia, Oregon, Idaho, and Washington are associate members. An associate member is a State not now having oil and gas production, but having prospects for such production.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The amendments adopted by the committee add the requirement for oversight and report by the Attorney General, and the reservation of the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal the provisions of the first section. Both of these sections are in the existing law governing the compact (77 Stat. 145, 151).

As stated above, however, the Attorney General, pursuant to his request, will not be required to submit reports every year. Instead, he will submit one by the end of the year prior to the time for the next renewal of the compact.

CONCLUSION

The committee concurs unanimously with the findings and conclusion of the Department of the Interior that—

"The commission provides a forum for free discussion of oil and gas conservation practices and related problems and the study of State conservation laws, regulations, and administrative procedures. Through the many technical and specialized committees organized through the initiative of the compact commission, considerable information of value to the conservation of oil and gas has been developed. The Commission also provides a medium for informing the public of the necessity for oil and gas conservation and the methods by which this conservation can be achieved."

The committee believes that extending the compact as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 35 would be very much in the national interest.

REINSTATEMENT OF OIL AND GAS LEASE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 443) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122) which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "(30 U.S.C. 188 (c))" and insert "(30 U.S.C. 188(c)): *Provided*, That it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the failure to pay timely was either justifiable or not due to lack of reasonable diligence."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall receive, consider, and act upon any petition of Mountain Fuel Supply Company, a Utah corporation, filed within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, for reinstatement of United States oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122), and may reinstate such lease in accordance with the provisions of section 31(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 188(c)): *Provided*, That it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the failure to pay timely was either justifiable or not due to lack of reasonable diligence.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 203), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

The purpose of S. 102, which was introduced by Senator McGee of Wyoming for himself and his colleague, Senator Hansen, is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to do equity to a Federal oil and gas lessee whose lease in Wyoming was canceled as a result of his own honesty in dealing with the Government.

The undisputed facts are as follows: The Mountain Fuel Supply Co., a Utah corporation qualified to transact business in Wyoming, in September 1963, filed an offer for an oil and gas lease on some 1,920 acres in Uinta County, Wyo. The offer was rejected in part and accepted in part, and in November 1963, a lease designated Wyoming 0280122 was issued. The lands covered were described and the acreage set forth as 320 acres. Of the rental of $960 tendered at the time of the filing of the offer, $160 was retained as the first year's rental and the remainder refunded. In November, Mountain Fuel Supply paid the second year's rent of $160 in accordance with the terms of the lease.

In May of 1965 an officer of the company on his own initiative wrote the Bureau of Land Management office in Cheyenne pointing out that the area actually described in the lease totaled 480 acres, rather than the 320 acres the lease itself recited.

The land office conceded that the error had been on its part, not the lessee's, but ruled that under the law the lease was canceled automatically when advance payment for entire, actual acreage was not made on the anniversary date. As stated, there is no authority in the law for the Secretary to overlook the inadvertent nonpayment nor to reinstate. Hence S. 443 is necessary in this particular case.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee adopted the amendment proposed by the Bureau of the Budget in its favorable report on S. 443. This added provision would make explicit the implicit requirement that the Secretary must be satisfied that the failure to make timely payment was either justifiable or not the result of lack of reasonable diligence.

MISSOURI RIVER BASIN

The bill (S. 1601) to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Act of July 19, 1966 (80 Stat. 322), is hereby amended by changing "$60,000,000" to "$69,000,000".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 204), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of S. 1601 is to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing the going work on the Missouri River Basin project by the Department of the Interior. The measure will increase the authorization of $60 million authorized in the act of July 19, 1966, by $9 million, the amount determined by the Department of the Interior to be necessary to continue work on the Tiber Dam of the Lower Marias unit to alleviate a dangerous weakening of the spillway in the dam. It will also provide authorization for the continuation of work on the Fort Thompson-Grand Island 345-kilovolt transmission line and transmission facilities on the transmission division.

The statement below of the Department of the Interior sets out the status of the financing and expenditures of the Missouri River Basin project, including those units for which funds have been requested for the next fiscal year.

The Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee in executive session unanimously recommended approval of S. 1601.

REINSTATEMENT OF AN OIL AND GAS LEASE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 102) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090) which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the word "amended", to strike out "(30 U.S.C. 188 (c))." and insert "(30 U.S.C. 188(c)): *Provided*, That it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the failure to pay timely was either justifiable or not due to lack of reasonable diligence."; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall receive, consider, and act upon any petition of Paul T. Walton, Thomas F. Kearns, and Jerome B. Guinand filed within one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act, for reinstatement of United States oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090), and may reinstate such lease in accordance with the provisions of section 31(c) of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended (30 U.S.C. 188(c)): *Provided*, That it is shown to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the failure to pay timely was either justifiable or not due to lack of reasonable diligence.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 205), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

S. 102, which is sponsored by Senator Frank Moss of Utah, is needed in order that equity may be done to a lessee of a Federal oil and gas lease on lands in Wyoming whose own act of honesty and good faith resulted in the cancellation of the lease. The bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to receive, consider, and act upon a petition for reinstatement of the lease.

Under existing law, the Secretary has no authority to take such action, absent enabling legislation.

The facts are not in dispute and are as follows:

In May 1964, Paul T. Walton, Thomas F. Kearns, and Jerome B. Guinand were successful offerors for a lease on a tract designated as parcel 750 in Wyoming and in August of 1964 were awarded the lease (Wyoming 0310090).

The instrument set forth a legal description of the lands and showed "total area, 2,040 acres; retained rental, $1,020."

A courtesy notice dated May 7, 1965, for the second year showed again the annual rental due on 2,040 acres as $1,020. Payment of the second year's rental in the amount of $1,020 was received on July 29, 1965.

By a letter dated January 5, 1966, Mr. Paul T. Walton, one of the lessees, brought to the attention of the Wyoming Land Office that, based on the land description, the acreage appeared to be greater than the amount set forth in the lease, and that additional rental might be due for the first and second lease years. A review of the situation revealed (1) that the land office initially had made a mistake in showing the area as 2,040 acres on the simultaneous list, (2) that the land office continued the error in showing 2,040 acres on the issued lease, (3) that, in fact, the lands in the lease contained 2,190.36 acres, and (4) that the advanced rental for the first year and second year was short in the amount of $75.50 for each year.

The Secretary has no discretionary authority to overlook the failure to pay the full rental, regardless of the cause, nor to reinstate the lease. Thus the lease was canceled. S. 102 would provide authority for reinstatement in the instant case.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

S. 102 as introduced was identical to S. 2918 of the 89th Congress, which also was sponsored by Senator Moss. The committee amended that bill to conform with the pattern set in the act of October 15, 1962 (76 Stat. 943) which authorizes the Secretary to receive evidence as to the equities and take appropriate action, rather than directing outright reinstatement. This language is the usual form for such legislation.

S. 2918 passed the Senate in the 89th Congress, but was not acted upon in the House.

In its favorable report of S. 102 of this Congress, the Bureau of the Budget recommended that the bill be amended to make explicit one of the criteria that the Secretary must apply in reaching a determination as to reinstatement. That is, the petitioner must show to the satisfaction of the Secretary that the failure to make timely payment was either justifiable or not the result of reasonable diligence. The committee adopted the Bureau's recommendation.

REAPPOINTMENT OF JEROME C. HUNSAKER

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 58) to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by the expiration of the term of Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Boston, Massachusetts, on March 29, 1967, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of six years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 206), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Joint Resolution 58 would provide that the vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by the expiration of the term of Jerome C. Hunsaker, of Boston, Mass., on March 29, 1967, be filled by the reappointment of the present incumbent for the statutory term of 6 years.

The Board of Regents, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 42, is composed of the Vice President, the Chief Justice of the United States, three Members of the Senate, three Members of the House of Representatives, and six other persons other than Members of Congress. The six citizen regents, two of whom shall be residents of the District of Columbia and four of whom shall be inhabitants of some State (but no two of the same State), are appointed by joint resolution of Congress and serve 6-year terms.

CORREGIDOR-BATAAN MEMORIAL COMMISSION

The bill (H.R. 3399) to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 207), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

The simple purpose of this bill is to extend the expiration date of the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission from May 6, 1967 to November 6, 1968. No additional authorization is contained in this measure. There are unappropriated funds of $20,500 remaining from previous authorizations which will be sufficient to meet expenses for the remaining life of the Commission.

BACKGROUND AND COMMITTEE ACTION

The Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission was established by Congress in 1953 for the purpose of developing a suitable memorial for the Philippine and American soldiers who lost their lives at Corregidor. Over the years the basic act has been amended for various reasons, among others to provide that the memorial commemorate all Philippine and American citizens who lost their lives anywhere in the Pacific area during World War II. The last amendments adopted by Congress to the basic act were in 1953 (Public Law 240, 88th Congress). At that time $1,500,000 was authorized to be appropriated for the memorial and termination of the Commission was set at May 6, 1967, or completion of its work, whichever occurred first. Due to delays in letting the contracts (construction is now underway) it is estimated, that work will be completed in 12 months. The extension of the expiration date of the Commission was requested by it and endorsed by the Department of State so that the Commission could continue to supervise construction until the memorial is completed.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

SETTLEMENT OF RAILROAD DISPUTE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 118)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

To the Congress of the United States:

INTRODUCTION

On Monday, at my request, the Congress acted to protect the country for 47 days against the intolerable injury of a nationwide railroad strike.

This additional period affords the parties to the current dispute another opportunity to settle it by agreement.

The time has come, however, to insure that the public action we guard the public interest against a continuing failure of private responsibility in this case.

We cannot leave ourselves vulnerable, as a people, to the dangers of:

A disruption in the flow of arms and material to the 500,000 valiant men in Southeast Asia who are making sacrifices greater than any of us are called upon to make;

Food shortages and health hazards in our cities;

The paralysis of our economy;

A rising tide of unemployment, as factory doors close for lack of raw material.

I reviewed this situation in detail in my message to the Congress on April 10. Only a summary is necessary here.

The dispute is between virtually all of the major railroads and six shop-craft unions representing 137,000 railroad employees who inspect, maintain, and repair locomotives and other rolling stock. Without the continuing service of these workers, the Nation's railroads cannot operate.

The disagreement in this case is mainly about wages.

There have been 8 months of collective bargaining and mediation in the current round of railroad contracts.

During these months, the process of collective bargaining has produced settlements between the railroads and 11 other unions, representing over 70 percent of the Nation's railroad workers.

THE SEARCH FOR SETTLEMENT

There have been diligent and extended efforts to achieve settlement of the shopcraft dispute. This record is important, and I urge you to consider it carefully:

During the summer and fall of 1966, private collective bargaining between the parties proceeded, first at the local level and then at the national level, as the parties pursued their search for settlement.

From October 1966 through early January 1967, the National Mediation Board worked with the parties. The issues were refined, the differences narrowed.

On January 6, 1967, the National Mediation Board advised the parties that its mediation efforts had been unsuccessful and offered arbitration. The railroads accepted but the unions declined.

On January 19, 1967, the National Mediation Board advised me that the services of an Emergency Board were necessary in this case.

On January 28, 1967, under the Railway Labor Act, I appointed such a Board, chaired by David Ginsburg, a distinguished Washington attorney; John W. McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire, and Frank J. Dugan, professor of law at Georgetown University.

The Emergency Board conducted an exhaustive inquiry into the facts of the case. It compiled a record of over 1,000 pages. On March 10, 1967, it made a series of recommendations on the basis of that record.

These recommendations provided a new center point around which further negotiations could revolve. They were accepted by the railroads but not by the unions.

The full cycle under the Railway Labor Act ran out. A strike was called by the unions for 12:01 a.m. Thursday, April 13.

I proposed to the Congress on April 10 an extension of the period of statutory restraint under the Railway Labor Act for 20 additional days. The Congress promptly enacted that proposal.

THE FAHY PANEL

As soon as the Congress extended the no-strike period for 20 days, I asked three distinguished Americans with long experience in the field of labor management relations to serve on a Special Mediation Panel. They were Charles Fahy, recently retired judge of the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, as Chairman; Dr. John T. Dunlop, professor of economics at Harvard; and Dr. George W. Taylor, professor of industry at the University of Pennsylvania.

For 10 days the Special Panel worked patiently and with great skill, seeking to close the gap which separated the parties by encouraging a voluntary resolution of the dispute through collective bargaining.

Then, drawing upon the parties' own proposals, the work of the Emergency Board, and their own experience of 10 days of intensive mediation, the Special Mediation Panel developed a proposal. In their judgment, this proposal represented the conclusions the parties themselves could very well have reached if the give-and-take of collective bargaining had resulted in agreement. As the Panel stated to the parties in its report to me:

> We ask the parties to agree now to our suggested basis for settlement of this dispute. The matter is one of dollars and cents alone, and the real differences between the parties in our judgment are not great. We cannot say our proposals contain precisely the correct figures; but we can say our terms are reasonable and not unjust. There is no way in which perfect precision about a matter of this kind can be reached. To carry the dispute further, in light of the consequences of doing so, would not be justifiable, especially after so much consideration has been given to the matter.

Despite this plea, both parties declined to accept this basis for settlement.

On April 24, after hearing testimony from the Panel and the parties to this dispute, the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare called upon the parties "to seriously reconsider as the basis for settlement the recommendations of the Special Mediation Panel."

This summons went unheeded.

Monday, the Congress acted again, at my request, by extending the no-strike period for an additional 47 days, until 12:01 a.m. on June 19, 1967.

TO BRIDGE THE GAP

This is a record of a free society going to the very limit to permit private responsibility to play its part.

It is a record of risking everything except national catastrophe on free collective bargaining.

It is also a record of collective bargaining almost doing its job—narrowly failing—but coming close enough to offer clear guidance for the completion of the task.

The remaining dispute is principally about narrow differences regarding the amount of the general increase, about the amount—but not the principle—of an "inequity adjustment" covering journeymen and mechanics, and about the length of the contract period.

What is called for now is a procedure to complete collective bargaining, not to replace it—to bridge the remaining gap this bargaining has not closed.

Nothing here warrants resort to a compulsory arbitration procedure which would disregard all that collective bargaining has accomplished and substitute the unfettered discretionary decision of others.

The situation does not warrant seizure by the Government of the railroad properties. President Kennedy well defined the difficulties of such a course of action when confronted with a similar situation in July 1963. He rejected seizure of the railroads "as creating complex legal and financial problems for the Government, and as merely postponing the day of reckoning." Seizure of these properties would also be offensive to the equities involved in the present situation.

The solution here is one which:

Assures the Nation the continued availability of railroad transport.

Gives full effect to the record of collective bargaining in this case and builds on the negotiations which have taken place.

Looks toward the ultimate resolution of this dispute by agreement.

Provides only the means to bridge the remaining gap between the parties.

This solution is supplied by the recommendations of the Special Mediation Panel and the advice I have received from leaders of the Congress and my top advisers in the executive branch.

THE PROPOSAL

I propose a joint resolution authorizing the establishment, for a 90-day no-strike, no-lockout period, of a five-member Special Board to be appointed by the President. All will be "public members." But I intend to appoint one member with a management background and one member with a labor background.

The functions of the Board will be these:

For the first 30 days after enactment of the joint resolution, the Board would engage in intensive mediation with the parties to encourage and stimulate a final resolution of the issues in dispute.

Beginning on the 31st day, if no agreement has been reached, the Board would be authorized to hold hearings to determine whether the Special Mediation Panel proposals of April 21, designed to implement the collective bargaining contemplated by the Emergency Board recommendations meet the following criteria: are in the public interest, are a fair and equitable extension of the collective bargaining in this case, protect the collective bargaining process, and fulfill the purposes of the Railway Labor Act.

By the 60th day, if there is still no agreement, the Board would file, with the Congress and the President, its determination concerning the Special Mediation Panel proposals, and whether any modification of these proposals is necessary to insure that they meet these criteria.

If by the 91st day there is still no agreement, the Special Mediation Panel proposals, with any modifications which the Board finds necessary to insure conformity with these criteria, would take effect. They would continue in effect until the parties reach agreement or until such time, not to exceed 2 years from January 1, 1967, as the Board determines to be proper.

For the period after that, and until final agreement is reached or the time specified by the Board expires, the Board's determination would have the same effect—including the preclusion of resort to strike or lockout—as though it was arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act.

A final agreement reached by the parties at any time would supersede the Board's determinations and would apply retroactively, if the parties so agree.

CONCLUSION

I urge the Congress to act on this proposal.

At the same time, I urge these railroads and unions to finish this job themselves. The only completely successful conclusion of this case will come not from an act of necessity by the Congress but from an act of responsibility by the parties.

It is within their power to close the gap in this case by heeding the call of their country to reason together. Their taking the last few steps to settlement will show the world the industrial statesmanship which is the pride of America.

All Americans believe in the right of management to healthy profits. All Americans believe in the right of workers to a just and bountiful wage.

All of us realize our progress in labor relations in this country. We recognize—and take pride in—the significant strides we have made in improving the condition of the working man, while at the same time improving the profits of the employer.

We have met many of the problems of poverty, of substandard working conditions, of depression and business failure. But each step forward has brought us new problems—problems of prosperity, of technological progress, of sharing the affluence that is our blessing.

All Americans recognize that there is a management interest and a labor interest. But there comes a time when the interest of management and the interest of labor must be the public interest—a time when people must be fed, when soldiers must be supplied, when water must be kept potable, and when factories must not be allowed to close down for lack of materials.

I believe the action I propose to be in the public interest and in the interest of management and labor. It represents the slightest possible intrusion upon the process of collective bargaining. Indeed, in the long run I believe it will preserve the collective bargaining process in the railroad industry.

This proposed joint resolution will not solve all the difficulties prosperity brings to labor relations. But we must take this action now, as we continue and renew our search for a just and general solution to emergency strike or lockout problems in our country.

I urge the Congress to act promptly on this joint resolution.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1967.*

REPORTS OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE AND SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION ON CASH AWARDS TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit the reports of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Transportation on cash awards made during fiscal year 1966 to members of the Armed Forces for suggestions, inventions, and scientific achievements.

This Government continually strives to increase the efficiency and economy of its operations. The cash awards incentive program is a vital part of that effort. By rewarding ideas and accomplishments which help to lower costs and improve effectiveness, we improve the operations of Government and encourage the search for new solutions and better methods of operation.

Incentive awards have been available to civilian employees of the Government for many years. In 1965, the Congress extended these benefits to our men and women in uniform.

The reports I am transmitting today clearly confirm the value of the contributions which members of our Armed Forces are making toward the goals of economy and efficiency:

More than 141,000 suggestions were submitted during fiscal year 1966.

Some 25,700 of these suggestions were adopted and cash awards totaling about $378,000 were made.

The saving to the Government and the American taxpayer resulting from these ideas, in the first year of the program, was more than $33 million.

Many intangible benefits not directly measurable in dollars, such as improved safety in operations, have resulted from the suggestions.

Many individual ideas produced sizable benefits. An Air Force sergeant, for example, eliminated the need for a large procurement of new gyroscopes by suggesting an inexpensive modification of gyroscopes already on hand. This saved $275,400. In the Coast Guard an enlisted man proposed a modification of helicopter test equipment, making it unnecessary to purchase new test equipment which would have cost an estimated $72,000.

Equally important, however, is the fact that the $33 million saving to American taxpayers resulted from the efforts of many thousands of individual service men and women. In this fact lies the real importance of this program. For, if we are to have true economy and efficiency, it must be the business, not just of a few, but of all the men and women serving in government.

These reports provide further evidence of the great service being rendered to the American people by the members of our Armed Forces. They man our defenses with unsurpassed skill and courage. They also, as these reports document, bring new economy and efficiency to the operations of their government.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 4, 1967.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION TO PAY CLAIMS AND JUDGMENTS RENDERED AGAINST THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 25)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed supplemental appropriation to pay claims and judgments rendered against the United States, in the amount of $10,365,589 which, with accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

MEMORIAL

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a memorial of the Union County Board of Chosen Freeholders, of Elizabeth, N.J., remonstrating against any tolls on that portion of the Garden State Parkway that runs through Union County; to the Committee on Public Works.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF GEORGIA

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I bring to the attention of the Senate a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Georgia entitled, "A resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to call a Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, relating to Federal grants." I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

RESOLUTION 96

A resolution petitioning the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and for other purposes

Whereas, the relationship that exists between the Federal Government and the government of the states is a matter of vital concern; and

Whereas, the states play an indispensable role in our Federal system of government;

Whereas, unless the trend toward restrictive categoric federal grants is reversed, these grants will so entwine themselves that a state's freedom of movement will be significantly inhibited; and

Whereas, there is a need and a justification for broader unfettered grants that will give states and localities more freedom of choice, more opportunity to express their own initiative which reflects their particular needs and preferences, all within the overall direction of national purpose: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this Legislature respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to propose the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

"Beginning with the first full fiscal year after ratification of this amendment by the requisite number of states, there shall be remitted to all of the states of these United States, an amount determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equal to not less than 5% of the aggregate total of individual and corporate income taxes paid to the United States during the preceding calendar year.

"Such funds shall be remitted to the States without restriction and this remission of funds shall be in addition to any other federal grant programs which may be enacted by the Congress.

"Each state shall share in such remission in proportion as the population of such State bears to the total population of all of the States, according to the last preceding Federal census." Be it further

Resolved, That when the above amendment to the Constitution of the United States is ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States, it shall become a part of the Constitution of the United States. Be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to transmit a certified copy of this resolution to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each member of the Georgia Congressional Delegation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 1432. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 209).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 223. A bill to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 213).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

S. 645. A bill to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture (Rept. No. 214); and

S. 1136. A bill to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 215).

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 1190. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses (Rept. No. 211).

By Mr. BURDICK, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 477. A bill for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepoon (Rept. No. 210).

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, with amendments:

S. 1320. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for acquisition of career status by certain Government employees serving temporary appointments (Rept. No. 212).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 449. A bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 216).

POPULAR ELECTION OF GOVERNOR OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 217)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I file S. 450, a bill to provide for the popular election of the Governor of the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes, together with a report thereon, and ask unanimous consent for permission to include individual views of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from West Virginia.

LEAD-ZINC INDUSTRY STABILIZATION—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 218)

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], I file a report from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on S. 289, a bill relating to lead and zinc. I ask that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance for further consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MONRONEY, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Three hundred and nineteen postmaster nominations.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of 104 general and flag officers in the Army, Army Reserve, Navy, and Marine Corps Reserve. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations;

Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list, in the grade of general;

Lt. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving;

Rear Adm. Nels C. Johnson, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Rear Adm. Harold G. Bowen, Jr., U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving;

Robert B. Bell, Marine Corps Reserve, for permanent appointment to the grade of major general;

Douglas J. Peacher, and Charles T. Hagan, Jr., Marine Corps Reserve officers, for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general;

Lt. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, to be placed on the retired list;

Lt. Gen. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of general while so serving;

William C. Abhau, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Navy;

Maj. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Brig. Gen. Robert Bruce Shira, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Regular Army of the United States; and as major general in the Army of the United States;

Maj. Gen. Byron Ludwig Steger, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Philip Wallace Mallory, U.S. Army, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, in the grade of major general;

Col. Kenneth Dew Orr, U.S. Army, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, in the grade of brigadier general;

Vice Adm. Joseph M. Lyle, Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, and Rear Adm. John McN. Taylor, U.S. Navy, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral;

Brig. Gen. Lowell Joseph Bradford, and sundry other U.S. Army Reserve officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army;

Col. Charles Howard Bradey, and sundry other Army National Guard of the United States officers, for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army; and

Col. Joseph Mark Ambrose, and sundry other Army National Guard of the United States officers, for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 971 appointments in the Army in the grade of lieutenant colonel and below; 11,092 appointments and promotions in the Navy in the grade of captain and below; and 456 appointments in the Marine Corps. Since these names have already appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Blair P. Conway, and sundry other Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps officers, for appointment in the Marine Corps;

Timothy J. Anderson, and sundry other U.S. Naval Academy graduates, for appointment in the Marine Corps; Jack G. Airlie, Jr., and sundry other midshipmen (Naval Academy), for permanent assignment in the Navy;

Jack M. Pollin, for appointment as professor of mathematics, U.S. Military Academy;

James C. Lane, Jr., and sundry other persons, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Robert L. Baker, and sundry other officers, for promotion in the Navy.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HANSEN (for himself, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Moss, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Scott, Mr. Javits, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Brooke, Mr. Percy, Mr. Dominick, and Mr. McGovern):

S. 1684. A bill to provide for the establishment of an Office of Natural Science Research in the National Park Service; to establish a system of fellowships for support of research in the natural sciences; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hansen when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CASE:

S. 1685. A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1686. A bill to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1687. A bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to require a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the acquisition of a controlling interest, through the ownership of securities or in any other manner, of any person engaged in the transportation of natural gas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1688. A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TALMADGE:

S. 1689. A bill for the relief of Hiram Dunn; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GRUENING:

S. 1690. A bill for the relief of Juan Andres Lliteras and his wife, Engracia Heydrich Bellido Andres Lliteras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DODD:

S. 1691. A bill for the general revision of the patent laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dodd when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MONRONEY:

S. 1692. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to limit the liability of trip insurance sold within the confines of an airport; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1693. A bill to provide that bills and statements of account prepared by electronic data processing equipment be classified as first-class mail; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Monroney when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1694. A bill for the relief of John S. Attinello;

S. 1695. A bill for the relief of Wie Han Kwee and his wife, Relly Bernice Kwee; and

S. 1696. A bill for the relief of Dr. Rosario G. Guerzon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (by request):

S. 1697. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Jelica Jakovijevic (nee Sisic); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Louisiana:

S. 1698. A bill entitled the "Presidential Election Campaign Assistance Act of 1967"; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Long of Louisiana when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, and Mr. Dirksen):

S.J. Res. 81. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Morse when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE NATURAL SCIENCE RESEARCH ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in 1963, Interior Secretary Udall wrote a popular book about the conservation revolution entitled "The Quiet Crisis". This book, and the thinking it represents, has helped to bring great popular support to an expanding program for the preservation of our country's natural heritage. New national parks, monuments, recreation areas, memorials, and seashores, as well as a wilderness system, have been recently created by Congress. In addition, Congress is now considering the advisability of a wild rivers system, of scenic rivers, and of national scenic trails.

Also in 1963, an advisory committee of the National Academy of Sciences submitted a report to Secretary Udall on Research in the National Park Service. The committee's report pointed to another crisis—one within the National Park System itself. The committee found that less than 1 percent of the Park Service's total appropriations were being spent for research in the natural sciences. This compared to an average 10 percent spent by similar Federal agencies. Further, the advisory committee made 20 specific recommendations for improving research as a means to aid the National Park Service in fulfilling its mandate "to preserve and conserve the national parks with due consideration for the enjoyment of their owners, the people of the United States, of the esthetic, spiritual, inspirational, educational, and scientific values which are inherent in natural wonders and nature's creatures."

Unfortunately, many of the recommendations of the advisory committee have not been implemented despite its pointed urging for "prompt action." The Committee advised:

> (U)nless drastic steps are immediately taken there is a good possibility that within this generation several, if not all, the national parks will be degraded to a state totally different from that for which they were preserved and in which they were to be enjoyed.

I ask, Mr. President, that the text—exclusive of the Appendices—of the report by the Advisory Committee to the National Park Service on Research of the National Academy Sciences, Natural Research Council, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the recent emergency slaughter of elk in Yellowstone National Park, the extreme threats facing the aquatic and bird life of Everglades National Park, and human waste pollution of Mammoth Cave are but a few of the dramatic crises facing the managers of our national parks system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wyoming may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

I am sure that other pressing management problems as well could be pointed to in other areas administered by the National Park Service. Public reaction to these problems is a matter of great concern to the Congress and the Department of the Interior. I ask, Mr. President, that the article by Philip M. Smith entitled "Some Problems and Opportunities at Mammoth Cave National Park" which appeared in the February 1967 issue of National Parks magazine be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, within the past few months, the Park Service has made certain organizational adjustments in the face of its pressing needs. But I believe more is needed. Even today research appropriations remain below 1 percent. Consequently, I have drafted a bill which, if enacted, would be known as the "National Park Service Natural Science Research Act." Great help in this effort has come from those who assisted in the National Academy's Advisory Committee studies and from leaders in conservation and in the natural sciences.

It is anticipated that the National Park Service Natural Science Research Act will require about $5 million annually when the program reaches full maturity, however exact authorization figures await the advice of the Department of the Interior.

I am hopeful that Congress will act on this bill. I wish to acknowledge the support of the many Senators who have joined with me on this proposed measure. I am grateful for their support and will make every effort to properly guide this measure along its legislative course.

I ask, Mr. President, that the résumé and full text of the National Park Service Natural Science Research Act, as proposed by myself and Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. HRUSKA, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PERCY, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the text of the bill and résumé will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1684) to provide for the establishment of an Office of Natural Science Research in the National Park Service; to establish a system of fellowships for support of research in the natural sciences; and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HANSEN, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill, the report, article, and résumé were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1684

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) this Act may be known as the "National Park Service Natural Science Research Act".

(b) The Congress finds and declares that the natural science wonders and resources of this country are of great national value, and, owing to the increasing dangers to, and encroachment upon, these resources resultant from the increasing urbanization and industrialization of the country, the Congress declares the national policy that special care and effort should be taken to obtain the necessary information through research required to preserve our natural resources. The Secretary of the Interior shall take such steps as he deems necessary, including entering into contractual agreements, to promote this policy on the lands of the National Park System, and adjoining lands.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized, in furtherance of the national policy declared in the first section of this Act, to establish a National Park Natural Science Research Fellowship Program to assist outstanding graduate students in carrying out their research activities.

(b) The fellowship program established by this Act shall be limited to students satisfactorily pursuing research or course of study in the field of natural science at accredited college and university graduate schools in the United States, or pursuing post-doctoral studies at such institutions; the Director of the National Park Service, or his desgnee, shall certify that each fellow is pursuing a course of study or research within the scope of this Act. The number of fellows and the annual stipend for each fellow shall be determined by the Secretary, but the total annual funds available for fellowship purposes shall not exceed —— per centum of the total funds appropriated annually by the Congress to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to establish in the National Park Service an office to be known as the "Office of Natural Science Research" to be headed by a Commissioner who shall be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the provisions of Title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and who shall be compensated in an amount determined by the Secretary of the Interior without regard to the provisions of Chapter 51 and subchapter III of Chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The Commissioner shall report to the Director of the National Park Service.

(b) The Secretary may appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as he determines necessary for the discharge of the responsibilities of the Office of Natural Science Research under this Act. Such appointments shall be made and such compensation shall be fixed in accordance with the provisions of Title 5 of the United States Code governing appointments in the competitive service, and the provisions of Chapter 51 and subchapter III of Chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Pay Schedule pay rates; except that the Secretary may employ such technical and professional personnel and fix their compensation, without regard to such provisions of Title 5, as he may determine necessary for the discharge of the aforementioned responsibilities.

SEC. 4. It shall be the responsibility of the Commissioner to advise the Secretary in all matters relating to the natural sciences within any lands comprising the National Park System and miscellaneous areas. As directed by the Secretary, the Commissioner shall supervise the conduct of research in natural science within the National Park System and miscellaneous areas for the purpose of fulfilling the mission of the National Park Service as defined in section 1 of the Act of August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535).

SEC. 5. In carrying out his duties and functions under this Act, the Commissioner shall, as directed by the Secretary—

(1) ascertain the objectives and purposes of each area within the National Park System and miscellaneous areas;

(2) inventory and map the natural history resources of each such area within the National Park System and miscellaneous areas;

(3) plan and administer a mission-oriented research program within each area of the National Park System and miscellaneous areas, and shall determine the assignments of staff personnel engaged in such research activities and shall require such personnel to report to him;

(4) design and conduct research to anticipate and prevent problems in operational management as well as to meet any such existing problems, including impact of visitor use and construction of facilities and roadways;

(5) conduct research on aquatic life in order to assist in determining general policies on the maintenance of natural conditions for their scientific, educational, and cultural values;

(6) conduct research with respect to significant changes in land use, in other natural resource use, or in economic activities in areas adjacent to areas within the National Park System and miscellaneous areas likely to affect such areas;

(7) establish and maintain, in conjunction with local educational or research institutions, research laboratories or centers for areas within the National Park System and miscellaneous areas when justified, in the opinion of the Secretary, by the nature of any such area and the importance of the research;

(8) evaluate, publish, and disseminate information, materials, and other data relating to research conducted by the Office of Natural Science Research in accordance with this Act;

(9) foster cooperative planning and research with other Federal, State, and local agencies which administer public lands devoted to conservation and recreation;

(10) encourage colleges, universities, private research institutions, and qualified independent investigators to use parks, monuments, and seashores within the National Park System in teaching and research;

(11) be responsible for matters relating to population control and management of any animal or plant within any area within the National Park System or miscellaneous areas classified as an endangered species, and to be responsible for matters relating to population control and management of large ungulate, rodent and predatory animals within such System and areas;

(12) be responsible for the proper maintenance of all eco-systems, within the National Park System and miscellaneous areas, as ascertained by the proper application of the life and earth sciences; and

(13) engage in such other duties and functions as the Secretary of the Interior may direct.

SEC. 6. (a) Within one year following the date of enactment of this Act and every three years thereafter, the Secretary shall direct the Commissioner of the Office of Natural Science Research to supervise the taking of a census of the number of large ungulate and predatory animals within the National Park System and miscellaneous areas, such census to be conducted in cooperation with official representatives designated by the Governor of any State within which any such lands of the National Park System or miscellaneous areas are located and on which there are animals involved in such census.

(b) Within sixty days following the completion of any such census, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress the results thereof. Such reports shall contain the views and recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the Office of Natural Science Research.

SEC. 7. On January of each year, the Secretary shall report to the Congress with respect to the actions of the Office of Natural Science Research during the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which such report is filed in connection with the carrying out of the duties of the Commissioner relating to population control and management of any animal classified as an endangered species or over which the Commissioner exercises direct population control, and the projected plans relating to population control and management in connection with such animals during the calendar year in which such report is filed. Such report shall contain the views and recommendations of the Commissioner.

SEC. 8. (a) In directing the Commissioner to carry out his duties under this Act, the Secretary shall not resort to the direct destruction of such animals until every practicable means available for the live-trapping and transplanting of such animals has been exhausted.

(b) Before resorting to the direct destruction of such animals the Secretary shall report such proposed action to the Congress and to the Governor of each affected State.

(c) The Secretary or his delegated representative is authorized to enter into written contracts with any representative of a State designated by the Governor thereof for the purpose of supplying such State with excess animals live-trapped by the National Park Service.

SEC. 9. Whenever, in accordance with this Act, it is determined that any external or internal condition endangers or threatens to destroy any area or part thereof within the National Park System or miscellaneous areas in terms of the purposes for which such area was established the Commissioner shall so advise the Secretary of the Interior who shall report the matter to the Congress, together with his recommendations.

SEC. 10. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall appoint a Scientific Advisory Committee for the National Park Service from interested citizens outside the Government service who are recognized as experts in relevant fields of the arts and sciences. The members of such Committee so appointed shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary. Such members shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 for each day in which they are engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Committee, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties. The Secretary shall designate one of the members as Chairman, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Secretary.

(b) It shall be the duty of the Committee appointed pursuant to subsection (a) of this section to advise and consult with the Secretary, the Director of the National Park Service, or the Commissioner with respect to such matters as may be referred to it pertaining to scientific research in the park system.

(c) The Chairman of the Committee established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section may also procure, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the executive departments by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $50 per diem for individuals.

(d) The Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of each affected State, is authorized to appoint a similar Scientific Advisory Committee for each national park within the national park system as the Secretary determines advisable, and to assign to any such Committee so appointed such advisory functions as the Secretary deems appropriate for the purposes of this Act. Members of any such Committee so established shall receive compensation at the rate of $100 per diem while engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in such Committee, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 11. In carrying out his duties, the Director of the National Park Service shall consult with the Commissioner of the Office of Natural Science Research with respect to management operations involving preservation, restoration, development, protection, interpretation, and the public use of areas within the national park system, and miscellaneous areas.

SEC. 12. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "National Park System" and "miscellaneous areas" shall have the same meaning as that prescribed in section 2 of the Act of August 8, 1953 (67 Stat. 496);

(2) "research management" shall include the identification and definition of a given problem or situation and research or fact-finding based on observation and experimentation, but such term shall not include administration, interpretation, or operational management;

(3) "natural science" shall include the life and earth sciences;

(4) "Secretary" shall mean the Secretary of the Interior; and

(5) "State" shall include, in addition to the several States of the Union, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

SEC. 13. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, the sum of $———; for fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, the sum of $———; for fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, the sum of $———; for fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of $———; and for fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, and for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $———.

A REPORT BY THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ON RESEARCH OF THE NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES-NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES,
August 1, 1963.

The Honorable STEWART L. UDALL,
The Secretary of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY UDALL: Your letter of April 25, 1962 asked the advice and assistance of the National Academy of Sciences in the planning and organizing of an expanded program of natural history research by the National Park Service. I am pleased to transmit herewith the report of the committee that was appointed by the Academy to respond to that request. Supplemental material is being gathered together in an appendix which will be forwarded to you as soon as it is completed.

We have felt a special responsibility in undertaking this task. The challenge of preserving both the beauty and the substance of a significant portion of our environmental heritage, in the interests of this and future generations, is one that calls for the best that those with appropriate knowledge and competence can give. Our committee, under the chairmanship of William J. Robbins, has devoted sustained and careful thought to the several aspects of the problem.

Dr. Robbins assures me that the committee members will be glad to discuss with you any parts of their report if you would find that helpful.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK SEITZ,
President.

A Committee of the National Academy of Sciences, appointed at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, was instructed to report on the natural history research needs and opportunities in the National Park Service, in particular on those of the national parks. The Committee included Edward A. Ackerman, Marston Bates, Stanley A. Cain, F. Fraser Darling, John M. Fogg, Jr., Tom Gill, Joseph M. Gillson, E. Raymond Hall, Carl L. Hubbs, William J. Robbins, Chairman, C.J.C. Durham, Executive Secretary.

ABSTRACT

The report submitted to the Secretary describes how the Committee conducted its study and surveys the development of the national parks idea, which originated in the United States and has reached its fullest expression there. It calls attention to the responsibilities and obligations which stem from the worldwide recognition and appreciation of the leadership of the United States in this area.

It discusses some of the historical aspects of the establishment of national parks, the first of which was Yellowstone National Park in 1872, and highlights the characteristics of some of the 31 parks now in existence. The report asserts that the national parks of the United States are among the most valuable heritages of this country; that in setting these lands aside the people and the government of the United States demonstrated particular wisdom; and that the role of national parks in the lives of our citizens is dramatically enlarging.

The objectives or purposes of the National Park Service are discussed in the light of the origin of the national parks and the various Acts of Congress which deal with them. The conclusion is reached that the Service should strive first to preserve and conserve the national parks with due consideration for the enjoyment by their owners, the people of the United States, of the aesthetic, spiritual, inspirational, educational, and scientific values which are inherent in natural wonders and nature's creatures. The Service should be concerned with the preservation of nature in the national parks, the maintenance of natural conditions, and the avoidance of artificiality, with such provisions for the accommodation of visitors as will neither destroy nor deteriorate the natural features, which should be preserved for the enjoyment of future visitors who may come to the parks.

Each park should be regarded as a system of interrelated plants, animals, and habitat (an ecosystem) in which evolutionary processes will occur under such control and guidance as seems necessary to preserve its unique features. Naturalness, the avoidance of artificiality, should be the rule.

Each park should be dealt with individually, and the National Park Service in consultation with appropriate advisers should define their objectives and purposes for each park. These will vary from park to park and in general should be those for which the park was originally established. with special consideration for the specific natural phenomena (biological, geological, archeological) which instigated its establishment.

The report points out that the National Park Service has the responsibility of administering the national parks in accordance with the purposes for which they are or may be set aside by specific Acts of Congress and emphasizes that knowledge about the parks and their problems is needed to discharge this responsibility. Such knowledge comes from research, especially research in natural history.

An examination of natural history research in the National Park Service shows that it has been only incipient, consisting of many reports, numerous recommendations, vacillations in policy, and little action.

Research by the National Park Service has lacked continuity, coordination, and depth. It has been marked by expediency rather than by long-term considerations. It has in general lacked direction, has been fragmented between divisions and branches, has been applied piecemeal, has suffered because of a failure to recognize the distinctions between research and administrative decision-making, and has failed to insure the implementation of the results of research in operational management.

In fact, the Committee is not convinced that the policies of the National Park Service have been such that the potential contribution of research and a research staff to the solution of the problems of the national parks is recognized and appreciated. Reports and recommendations on this subject will remain futile unless and until the National Park Service itself becomes research-minded and is prepared to support research and to apply its findings.

It is inconceivable that property so unique and valuable as the national parks, used by such a large number of people, and regarded internationally as one of the finest examples of our national spirit should not be provided adequately with competent research scientists in natural history as elementary insurance for the preservation and best use of the parks.

It is pointed out, however, that the results of research can neither be predicted or prejudged. The results may not always be pleasant. They may indicate that a facility should not have been built, that a road should have been routed another way, that visitors into a particular region should not be encouraged in large numbers and without control. It may even indicate that a particular park has deteriorated so far that it can never be returned to its former state. It is the very integrity of these conclusions, however, that make it essential that they be brought to bear upon the management problems of the national parks.

The report presents the pressing need for research in the national parks by citing specific examples in which degradation or deterioration has occurred because research on which proper management operations should have been based was not carried out in time; because the results of research known to operational management were not implemented; or because the research staff was not consulted before action was taken. In still other situations problems are recognized for the solution of which research is needed, but where none has been undertaken or planned or, if planned, has not been financed.

Attention is called to the meager dollar support given to research and development in the natural sciences in the national parks. In the National Park Service as a whole less than one per cent of the appropriation in 1960, 1961, and 1962 was devoted to research and development while the proportion for comparable government agencies was in the neighborhood of 10 per cent. In fact, unless drastic steps are immediately taken there is a good possibility that within this generation several, if not all, the national parks will be degraded to a state totally different from that for which they were preserved and in which they were to be enjoyed.

Particular attention is called to the precarious condition of the Everglades National Park and the big trees in California.

As a result of the study made by the Committee a series of twenty recommendations are made.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The objectives or purposes of each national park should be defined.

2. The natural history resources of each park should be inventoried and mapped.

3. A distinction should be made between administration, operational management, and research management.

4. A permanent, independent, and identifiable research unit should be established within the National Park Service to conduct and supervise research in natural history in the national parks and to serve as consultant on natural history problems for the entire National Park System.

5. The research unit in natural history in the National Park Service should be organized as a line arrangement, with an "Assistant Director for Research in the Natural Sciences" reporting to the Director of the National Park Service.

6. Most of the research by the National Park Service should be mission-oriented.

7. The National Park Service should itself plan and administer its own mission-oriented research program directed toward the preservation, restoration, and interpretation of the national parks.

8. Research should be designed to anticipate and prevent problems in operational management as well as to meet those which have already developed.

9. A research program should be prepared for each park.

10. Consultation with the research unit in natural history of the National Park Service should precede all decisions on management operations, involving preservation, restoration, development, protection and interpretation and the public use of a park.

11. Research on aquatic life, on and above the land, should be pursued to assist in determining general policies or the maintenance of natural conditions for their scientific, educational and cultural values.

12. Research should include specific attention to significant changes in land use, in other natural resource use, or in economic activities on areas adjacent to national parks likely to affect the parks.

13. Research laboratories or centers should be established for a national park when justified by the nature of the park and the importance of the research.

14. The results of research undertaken by the National Park Service should be publishable and should be published.

15. Additional substantial financial support should be furnished the National Park Service for research in the national parks.

16. Cooperative planning as a result of research should be fostered with other agencies which administer public and private lands devoted to conservation and to recreation.

17. Universities, private research institutions, and qualified independent investigators should be encouraged to use the national parks in teaching and research.

18. Consideration should be given to including in the budget of the National Park Service an item for aid to advanced students who wish to conduct research in the national parks.

19. A Scientific Advisory Committee for the National Park Service should be established, and Scientific Advisory Committees for individual parks are desirable.

20. Action in implementing the recommendations of the present Committee's report should be taken promptly.

INTRODUCTION

At the request of the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the National Academy of Sciences appointed an Advisory Committee to the National Park Service on Research and instructed it to submit to the Secretary of the Interior a report on the natural history research needs and opportunities in the National Park System.

The agreement between the National Park Service and the National Academy of Sciences, dated June 29, 1962, states that advice and assistance on a research program are needed because the national parks are complex natural systems which, for their care, management, development, use, protection and interpretation, require a broad ecological understanding and continuous flow of knowledge about the characteristics of the national parks and monuments, the nature of normal and man-imposed forces at work within them and of the relation of man to these natural environments and because they constitute a scientific resource of increasing value to scientists in this country and abroad.

The Committee was specifically instructed to:

"A. Conduct a study of national park research accomplishments, needs, resources, values, and opportunities in the natural sciences and in such related fields as may be deemed appropriate by the Academy; and

"B. To submit to the Secretary of the Interior a report which shall:

"1. Describe in reasonable detail the methods used in performance of the study described in 'A' above; and

"2. Set forth in reasonable detail any relevant and material data gathered or disclosed as part of said study, or in connection with it; and

"3. Set forth the Academy's findings and recommendations for a research program designed to provide the data required for effective management, development, protection, and interpretation of the national parks; and to encourage the greater use of the national parks by scientists for basic research."

In making its study and recommendations the Committee has devoted its attention mainly to those 31 areas specifically designated as national parks, though the Committee recognizes that some areas otherwise labeled (especially a number of the national monuments) should be included with the national parks because of their area and/or character.[1]

The Committee has given most consideration to the role of natural history in the national parks. At the same time, it has not forgotten that important factors affecting the proper maintenance of the natural features of the national parks include visitor use, access by road, land use in surrounding areas and the location and architecture of man-made facilities; and that archeology and human history as well as natural history are related to the overall consideration of the Committee's directive. The Committee has not endeavored to propose research programs for solving the problems of any specific park, though it calls attention to some existing problems in particular parks.[2]

In its study the Committee has recognized numerous problems which deserve investigation because of their importance for the national parks. Not all of them were believed to be pertinent to the major directives of this Committee and not all could be considered adequately in the time at its disposal. Some are mentioned and briefly discussed below; others are considered at more length later.

For example, what are the objectives or purposes of the national parks? There is some confusion and uncertainty, even within the National Park Service itself, about the proper purposes and objectives for which the national parks should be administered. Yet it is obvious that a definition of objectives is of prime importance, and the Committee considered this question at some length.

What is the effect of the rapidly increasing number of visitors on the national parks? The magnitude of this problem impressed the Committee when figures on attendance were examined. In 1933 nearly 3,500,000 visits were made to the areas administered by the National Park Service. By 1962, this number had increased to 88,500,000; and it is estimated that in 1972 the total number of visits will have reached the fantastic figure of 126,000,000. A considerable proportion of visitors go to the national parks.

In 1962, for example, 32,000,000 visits were made to the national parks, which include 0.6 per cent of the total area of the United States. It is estimated that in 1972 there will be nearly 41,000,000 visits to the national parks.

Figures for individual parks are equally impressive. In 1951 about 500,000 visits were made to Grand Teton National Park; in 1962 the number was nearly 1,800,000, and the estimate for 1972 is 2,600,000. Graphs of numbers of visitors annually to a number of national parks during the past 20 or 30 years are presented.[3] They reveal that with the exception of Crater Lake and Carlsbad Caverns attendance has been rapidly increasing for those parks which had 500,000 visitors or more in 1962. These are, in general, the larger parks and readily accessible to centers of population. With one exception (the Virgin Islands National Park) attendance for those with fewer than 500,000 visitors in 1962, has reached a constant level or has decreased. This emphasizes that parks must be considered individually, generalizations are not necessarily correct, except for the aggregate.

---

[1] Reference to national parks hereafter will apply to those 31 areas; reference to the National Park System will include the 31 national parks and other areas administered by the National Park Service.

[2] See Appendix.

[3] See Appendix.

It is obvious that the large numbers concentrated in the summer months in many of the national parks present a group of serious problems which range from simple logistics to human relations and the impact of people on the plants, animals and habitat of the park itself. Why do visitors come to the national parks? What proportion simply pass through the park without planning a stopover? How many leave the roads and penetrate the wilderness areas? How far should provision for camp, cabin, or lodge accommodations meet the demands for such facilities? Should the number of visitors to a park be limited? What is the effect of a park on visitors and what is their effect on a park? Since the results of a special investigation under the aegis of the Conservation Foundation on the effects of people on the parks will be reported separately to the Secretary, this Committee did not pursue the visitor problem extensively.

What is the proper place of the national parks in the totality of Federal land management? How are proper uses of the national parks coordinated with those of other public lands? What harm or benefit results from management practices or the lack thereof on lands adjacent to the national parks and vice versa? To what extent do the national parks suffer from uses which do not conform to the legally expressed purposes? What are the attitudes of local and state authorities toward a national park? Is its national and international importance fully appreciated locally; is its economic contribution correctly judged; is it considered to be something in which to take pride or an area to be exploited without regard to effects on the park? What are the interrelations in research between natural history and archeology, history, landscape design and architecture in the National Park Service? How is research of the United States Geological Survey, Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, the Forest Service and the National Park Service correlated?

These questions and many others came before the Committee and were discussed; on many the Committee is not prepared to express a judgment; on others recommendations will be found at the end of this report.

HOW THE COMMITTEE CONDUCTED ITS STUDY

The Committee held five meetings.

The first was held in Washington, D.C., December 7–8, 1962, where it was addressed by Park Service officials, including Director Conrad Wirth, Assistant Director Jackson Price, and Howard Eckles, Assistant to the Secretary's Science Advisor.

The second meeting, combined with a field trip, was held in Everglades National Park, January 10–12, 1963.

On the evening of January 10, the Committee was briefed on research problems of the Everglades, and on the following day it made an extensive tour of the park, including an airplane inspection as well as on-the-ground visits to some of the park's more critical spots, such as water diversion projects, deteriorating bird refuges, experimental controlled-fire burns, various areas which show vegetation changes and effects of fire, hurricanes, and flooding.

The third meeting was held in Washington, D.C., March 8–9, 1963, where the Committee discussed organization and staffing of the Park Service Research unit.

The fourth meeting was held in Grand Teton and Yellowstone National Parks, June 14, 15, and 16. An executive session of the Committee was held at Jackson Lake Lodge, Sunday, June 16. During the preceding two days, the Committee made a tour of approximately 200 miles in the two parks. At various inspection points in the Yellowstone Park, the Committee was briefed on such topics as the fisheries studies in Yellowstone Lake, grizzly bear ecology and elk migration studies, the biology of the Northern Yellowstone elk herd, northern winter range studies, biology of Madison River and headwater streams and hydrothermal problems.

In Grand Teton National Park the Committee discussed with officials such problems as the impact of visitors on the Park (visits increased from 144,000 in 1946 to 1,800,000 in 1962); the ski and snowplane, and other mass recreational areas; the geology of the Teton Range; forest pest control; the national elk refuge, and the Jackson Hole Biological Research Station which has about 20 researchers in alpine ecological problems, range-type studies and other problems. The Committee was briefed also on places for proposed location of roads and facilities in accordance with preservation of park features. The fifth and concluding meeting was held in Washington, July 19, when the Committee considered a final report.

During the course of its investigation the Committee, individually and collectively, consulted with upwards of 100 persons with special competence in its field of inquiry, including Park Service officials and employees, representatives of other Federal agencies, scientists with State and local institutions and agencies, and private investigators. The resources of the National Academy of Sciences—National Research Council were made available to the Committee, as well as those of the National Science Foundation. The Committee consulted books, papers, reports and memoranda on the parks. Individual members visited many parks, other than the three mentioned, and one member visited all of them.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARKS

As background for its study the Committee was concerned with learning something of the development of national parks in the United States.

In his history of the United States, Henry Adams pointed out that in 1800, the Nation as it then existed held 5,300,000 persons. Nearly one-fifth of the people were Negro slaves; the true political population consisted of four and one-half million free whites, or fewer than one million able-bodied males. The land was still untamed; forest covered every portion, except here and there a strip of cultivated soil; the minerals lay "undisturbed in their rocky beds; and more than two-thirds of the people clung to the seaboard, within 50 miles of tidewater, where alone the wants of civilized life could be supplied. The center of population rested within 18 miles of Baltimore and the interior of the country was little more civilized than when La Salle and Hennepin found their way to the Mississippi more than a century before."

Adams added that with the exception that half a million people had crossed the Alleghenies and were struggling with difficulties of their own "in an isolation like that of the Jutes or Angles in the Fifth Century," America had changed little in more than half a century. The old landmarks stood nearly where they had before. The same bad roads and difficult rivers, connecting the same small villages "stretched into the same forests as when the armies of Braddock and Amherst pierced the northern and western wilderness; nature was rather man's master than his servant, and the five million Americans struggling with the untamed continent seemed hardly more competent than the beavers and buffalo which for countless generations made bridges and roads of their own."

How do we find our country today? We have a population of more than 180,000,000. We have and are building an almost incomprehensible network of highways, turnpikes and speedways. We can cross the wide continent in less time than it took to send a letter from Baltimore to Washington in 1800.

Domestically, we are faced with the challenge of growth. Our postwar industrial expansion, although not as great as some would like, is changing the face of the land and the habits of millions. In the early days Americans, with few exceptions, were too interested in the exploitation of a continent to be concerned about conservation of natural resources. Thomas Jefferson practiced contour farming on his Virginia plantation, Patrick Henry is reported to have said that "he is the best patriot who fills the most gullies," and Washington himself stated that the proper management of land was the thing least understood in Virginia. But general interest in conservation is of fairly recent origin.

It is somehow fitting that one of the earliest of the prophetic voices raised on behalf of the creation of national parks was that of an artist. In 1833, George Catlin, the great painter of Indians and the West, published in the *Daily Commercial Advertiser* the hope that the western regions "might in the future (by some great protecting policy of government) be preserved in their pristine beauty and wildness, in a magnificent park, where the world could see for ages to come" the primitive environment and its native inhabitants.

The next important voice raised in behalf of Catlin's park conservation plan, Huth, in *Nature and the American*,[4] reports, was that of Emerson, who in 1844, in a speech entitled "The Young American," stated that the "interminable forests should become graceful parks for use and delight." And in 1847, a similar idea was suggested by the painter Thomas Cole, who felt that it was necessary to save and perpetuate the disappearing wilderness.

National parks, as we know them today, first came into being when the Congress by the Act of March 1, 1872, created Yellowstone National Park. That park was "dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." Establishment of Yellowstone National Park pointed the way to a new type of land use which has served to guide this country and other nations of the world.

During the first three-quarters of the nineteenth century, the geysers and hot springs of the Yellowstone region had been seen by a few trappers and hunters. Their stories of the wonders of that wilderness area filtered to the outside world. At first disbelieved, their persistence finally led to the explorations of the Washburn-Langford-Doane Expedition in 1870. The members of that party confirmed the rumors of the outstanding natural features of the Yellowstone region.

Cornelius Hedges, a member of the Washburn-Langford-Doane Expedition, propagated the new idea regarding the disposition of public lands. He proposed that the Yellowstone area should not be privately exploited, but should be preserved as a national park for the benefit of all of the people for all time.

No other national parks were created until 1890, when the Yosemite, Sequoia, and General Grant National Parks in California were established, followed in 1899 by Mount Rainier National Park in Washington. Others have been created since 1900, bringing the present total to 31. The latest is Petrified Forest National Park, established December 9, 1962.

The most important legislation affecting national parks, and perhaps the most far-reaching in its effects since the approval of the Act establishing Yellowstone National Park, is the Act of June 8, 1906. That Act gave the President of the United States authority "to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest that are situated upon the lands owned or controlled by the Government of the United States to be national monuments."

---

[4] University of California Press.

The national parks and national monuments that came into being between 1900 and 1915 were administered by three different departments. There was no unified or systematic federal plan or policy for the protection, administration, and development of the areas whose characteristics and uses were closely related.

In 1915, Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane, realizing the important and distinctive type of conservation represented by these areas and the advantages of unifying the parks and monuments into an integrated system, appointed Stephen T. Mather as his assistant to devote his energies entirely to park matters. Under Secretary Lane's guidance, Mr. Mather and his assistant, Horace M. Albright, drafted the bill which became the Act of August 25, 1916, establishing the National Park Service as a bureau of the Department of the Interior.

In connection with the Federal Government's reorganization in 1933, many additional areas were transferred to the National Park System. Section 2 of Executive Order 6166 of June 10, 1933, issued pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1933 (47 Stat. 1517), relating to reorganization of the Executive Department, transferred the monuments, military parks and allied areas, and the National Capital Parks, administered by other Federal agencies, to the National Park Service on August 10, 1933. Executive Order 6228 of July 28, 1933, clarified Executive Order of June 10, 1933, in that it limited the national cemeteries transferred from the War Department to National Park Service jurisdiction to those contiguous to, or connected with, national military parks and monuments.

It cannot be emphasized too strongly or too often that the massive growth of population throughout the world—in the United States from 4 million in 1700 to more than 200 million predicted by the close of the century—is a direct threat to survival unless we learn the lesson of conservation and wise use of our natural resources, and the term "wise use" includes conservation of spiritual and intellectual values as well as material ones. National parks and the national park idea, which originated in the United States, are powerful influences contributing to this wise use of natural resources.

RESOURCES OF THE NATIONAL PARKS

The National Park System includes 187 units comprising 22,967,763.55 acres of which 22,560,437.64 acres are federally owned. Of the 187 units, 31 are known as national parks and cover 13,561,082.46 acres of which all but 228,165.78 acres are federally owned.[5] The 31 national parks are located in 24 of the 50 States and in the Virgin Islands.

The national parks, together with some of the national monuments, comprise a bewildering array of notable examples of scenic beauty, desert solitudes, unique geology, archeology and paleontology, and an unequaled range of plant and animal life. There are rugged coastal areas (Acadia, Maine; Olympic, Washington); spectacular mountain and desert scenery (Big Bend, Texas); colorful and unique caverns with magnificent and curious formations (Carlsbad Caverns, New Mexico; Mammoth Cave, Kentucky; Wind Cave, South Dakota); a lake of deepest blue in the heart of an inactive volcano (Crater Lake, Oregon); the largest remaining subtropical wilderness in the United States (Everglades, Florida); superb mountain scenery with glaciers and lakes (Glacier, Montana; Mount McKinley, Alaska; Mount Rainier, Washington); spectacular river canyons (Grand Canyon, Arizona; Kings Canyon, California); active and inactive volcanoes (Lassen Volcano, California; Hawaii Volcanoes, Hawaii); cliff dwellings of ancient man (Mesa Verde, Colorado); geysers and hot springs (Yellowstone, Wyoming, Montana and Idaho; Hot Springs, Arkansas); island and mountain wilderness areas (Isle Royale, Michigan; Olympic, Washington); the Grand Tetons in Wyoming; Great Smoky Mountains of North Carolina and Tennessee; Blue Ridge Mountains in Virginia; groves of giant sequoias (California); the mountains and waterfalls of Yosemite; tropical plant and animal life (Virgin Islands). Some features of each park represent the best and perhaps only examples of their kind in the United States. In some instances, these features are unique or nearly unique in the world: the geysers of the Yellowstone National Park, the giant sequoias, the redwoods, the temperate rain forest of the Olympic Peninsula, the Grand Canyon.

Even a casual examination of the natural resources of the National Park System of the United States inspires admiration for those who conceived the idea, pride in the possession of such natural treasures, and sympathy for those who have the responsibility for their management.

It emphasizes also that in the preservation of these natural resources, the United States has an obligation to the world community. At the First World Conference on National Parks held in Seattle, Washington, 1962, the leadership of the United States in the field of park preservation was universally recognized. The Secretary of the Interior pledged the efforts of this country to continue this leadership by maintaining the quality of our parks and by sharing our experience with other interested countries. That we may be worthy of our reputation, that the people of the United States may continue to enjoy their national parks and that we may wisely advise other countries upon request, this Committee has given its attention and consideration to the role of research in natural history in the national parks and has made its recommendations.

It is our conclusion that the national parks of the United States represent one of the most valuable heritages of this country; that in setting aside these lands the people and government of the United States have demonstrated particular wisdom; and that the role of national parks in the lives of our citizens is dramatically enlarging. The Committee is likewise convinced that unless drastic steps are immediately taken there is a strong possibility that within this generation we will see reduction of several if not all of our parks to a state totally different from that for which they were preserved and for which they were to be enjoyed.

PURPOSES OF THE NATIONAL PARKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Before an activity can be administered or managed, before its problems can be defined, investigated or solved, one must be completely clear about the objectives and one must have a fairly good idea of what, in a given set of circumstances, the changes in those circumstances are likely to be in order that they may be anticipated. Unless the purposes and objectives of the national parks are determined and clearly and generally understood, the management of the plants, the animals, the habitat in which they live and of man in his impact upon them is likely to be ineffective, and may even be harmful and destructive.

What are the objectives or purposes of the national parks? Who has the responsibility for seeing to it that the objectives are attained?

Purposes originally understood for each park are contained in the legislative act establishing it. The National Park Service has the responsibility for administering the national parks, and receives its overall authority from the Act of Congress, approved August 25, 1916, by which the National Park Service was established in the Department of Interior. The latter Act states:

"The Service thus established [the National Park Service] shall *promote and regulate the use* of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments and reservations hereinafter specified by such means and measures as conform to the fundamental purpose of the said parks, monuments, and reservations, *which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.*"[6]

By the legislation referred to above the National Park Service is confronted with the responsibility of administering, in accordance with the provisions of the various acts, areas which vary widely in size, in states of preservation, in geology, biology, and climate and in actual or potential impact of man and his activities within and without the park.

In some instances, by specific legislation, administrative orders or agreements, uses are authorized which may be considered as not conforming to the purpose of the National Park System as defined in the Act of 1916.[7]

There are differences of public opinion on the major purposes of the national parks. One extreme wishes the national parks to be developed as neon-lighted vacation resorts; another wishes them left as nearly primeval as possible. Should a major aim of the national parks be the attraction of more and more visitors, by adding more paved roads, more resort buildings, larger and more numerous trailer camps, greater mass recreational facilities,[8] golf courses, ski lifts, motorboat marinas, tennis courts, and amusement concessions?

The unique character of the national parks, the existence and extensive development of other areas specifically designed and administered for mass recreation and the injunction that the national parks are to be "conserved unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" dictate that the preeminent objectives and purposes of the national parks are and should be their preservation and conservation with due consideration for the enjoyment by their owners, the people of the United States, of the aesthetic, spiritual, inspirational, educational, and scientific values which are inherent in natural wonders and nature's creatures. The Committee believes that the purpose of the national parks should be the preservation of nature, the maintenance of natural conditions, the avoidance of artificiality, with such provisions for the accommodation of visitors as will neither destroy nor deteriorate the natural features which should be preserved for the enjoyment of future visitors who may come to the parks.

---

[5] The National Park Service is eliminating private inholdings as rapidly as appropriations permit because their usage does not conform to the purpose for which the parks were established.

[6] The underlining is that of the Committee.

[7] Such nonconforming uses include: Borax mining in Death Valley; prospecting and mining in McKinley Park; hunting in McKinley Park in connection with prospecting; copper mining in Organ Pipe Cactus; grazing rights in various parks; TV relay stations in Shenandodah National Park and Death Valley; use of part of White Sands, New Mexico, National Monument as an Air Force impact area for missile testing.

[8] The Committee means by mass recreational facilities those which are primarily for amusement or which require elaborate construction or extensive and/or artificial modification of the natural features of a park.

Differences of opinion exist on the place of management in the administration of the national parks. On the one hand it is said that management or artificial control of the native biological resources of a park is contrary to the concept of preservation and conservation; that the plants and animals in a national park should be left undisturbed to multiply, survive or disappear as natural forces might dictate. On the other hand, it is said that no national park is large enough or adequately isolated to be, in fact, a self-regulatory ecological unit, but is subject to direct and indirect modification by activities (visitors, for example) within the park, and by the effect of changes in the area surrounding a park. According to this point of view, limitation of herds of elk, supervision of visitors to a park, control of water levels, proper location of roads and other facilities, controlled burning, even the decision to leave untouched some areas in a park, are necessary functions of management if a park is to survive in anything like the condition which meets the purpose for which it was established. This Committee believes that management[9] of national parks is unavoidable.

The statement in *Management of National Parks and Equivalent Areas* formulated by a committee of the First World Conference on National Parks that was convened in Seattle in July 1962, serves to illustrate the concept:

"Management is defined as any activity directed toward achieving or maintaining a given condition in plant and/or animal populations and/or habitats in accordance with the conservation plan for the area. A prior definition of the purposes and objectives of each park is assumed. Management may involve active manipulation of the plant and animal communities, or protection from modification or external influences."

It is not enough, however, to urge that the purposes of the national parks should be the preservation of nature, the maintenance of natural conditions. Any Administrator honestly attempting to satisfy this recommendation is immediately faced with the questions—What state of nature? What natural conditions? The biological nature, the condition of a national park when first established, with rare exceptions, has not persisted; factors within and without the limits of a park have modified it, sometimes profoundly. Should the management of a national park endeavor to restore a park to its primitive condition, maintain it as now, or aim for some state in between?

In a report on Wildlife Management in the National Parks, prepared by a committee appointed by the Secretary, it is recommended that the goal of park management in the United States should be to maintain, or where necessary, restore the biotic associations as nearly as possible to the condition that prevailed when the area was first visited by white man. This wildlife management report recognizes that the implications of this "seemingly simple aspiration are stupendous," and that most, if not all, national parks as they now exist have a complex biological history ranging from indiscriminate exploitation by logging, burning, livestock grazing, and hunting, through artificial protection from fires, insect pests, predators, and changes in normal fluctuation of water levels. Exotic vertebrates, insects and plants, as well as plant diseases and pests have been inadvertently introduced; and some endemic species of living things are even now extinct. The activities of people within and in the vicinity of a national park have profoundly modified some of them.

The present Committee views with sympathy the ideal of making a national park "a vignette of primitive America," so eloquently presented in the wildlife report mentioned, and appreciates as keenly as the authors of the report the difficulties in even approaching such an ideal. In some instances because of the paucity of historical records it would be impossible to determine what the condition of a particular park was when white man first saw it. Changes, some irreversible, and current activities, in some instances impossible to control, in areas surrounding a park, as well as the impact of increasing numbers of visitors suggest that the ideal though admirable, may not be fully attainable; yet it is desirable to move in that direction.

The Committee recognizes that national parks are not pictures on the wall; they are not museum exhibits in glass cases; they are dynamic biological complexes with self-generating changes. To attempt to maintain them in any fixed condition, past, present, or future, would not only be futile but contrary to nature. Each park should be regarded as a system of interrelated plants, animals and habitat (an ecosystem) in which evolutionary processes will occur under such human control and guidance as seems necessary to preserve its unique features. Naturalness, the avoidance of artificiality, should be the rule.

This Committee suggests that each park be dealt with individually and that the National Park Service, in consultation with appropriate advisors, define the objectives and purposes for each park. These will vary from park to park and, in general, should be those for which the park was originally established, giving special consideration to the specific natural phenomena (biological, geological, archeological) which instigated its establishment.

In some instances the original particular objective of a national park is specific, and comparatively simple to define, though it may be difficult to accomplish. For example, the preservation of the organ pipe cactus, of ancient cliff dwellings, of a limited but unique group of living organisms, of colorful and spectacular erosion forms. For other parks the objectives are numerous and complex. They involve not only several special natural phenomena but the totality of the habitat and its biology, the ecosystem. McKinley, as a great mountain, cannot be separated from the tundra which surrounds it. The giant sequoia is unique, but it would lose part of its value if divorced from the natural setting in which it exists.

Objectives, insofar as possible, should be clear and definite, not diffuse; e.g., the best possible spectacle of wildlife in a natural setting, the restoration of a natural meadow, the introduction of bighorn sheep into an area from which they have disappeared, the protection (restoration) of the water table, control of surplus destructive elk, deer, or other hoofed animals. In setting up such specific objectives, it must be recognized, however, that each is a part of a whole and cannot be considered as an isolated phenomenon.

Some parks, because of their size, their remoteness, or isolation, contain areas which approach primitive conditions. Every effort should be made to preserve these areas, not only because they may be "vignettes of primitive America," but because of their scientific value as outdoor natural laboratories in which the working of natural laws can be observed to greater advantage than anywhere else and because each such area is a refuge or plant and animal species—a nature's biological bank in which a biological reserve can exist and from which species may spread to adjacent areas. It should be recognized, however, that with time these areas, too, change.

Such natural undisturbed areas could be preserved for research and park interpretation by developing and applying the concept of zoning[10] which would also dictate the type of use permitted in each zone. Parks and/or areas within a park might be zoned as follows:

1. Natural undisturbed areas. These are undisturbed ecological areas into which a visitor would be conducted or permitted by special permission. They would serve as examples and standards of natural conditions characteristic of the particular area as well as refuges for wild plants and animals.
2. Naturalistic areas. These are regions which are wild (natural in appearance but affected to some degree by use or by outside influences. They would be maintained to give, so far as possible, "a reasonable illusion of primitive America."
3. Public use areas.
4. Park Service facility areas.

NATURAL HISTORY RESEARCH IN THE NATIONAL PARKS

The National Park Service bears the responsibility of administering the national parks of the United States for the purpose for which they are or may be set aside by specific Acts of Congress. The Service is also charged with the responsibility of preserving these lands for the use and enjoyment of the public and for interpreting meaningfully the natural features. Finally, it must administer these lands as part of a complex public land system. National parks are units of the public domain and have a definable role within the totality of federal lands.

Carrying out these responsibilities requires knowledge about the parks and their problems and this can only come from research. Too frequently operational management acts even when the necessary information for action is fragmentary, or is lacking. Scientific research furnishes the knowledge and understanding of the complex natural elements of the national parks and their interaction with one another on which effective management can be based.

What is the past and present status of research in natural history in the national parks? Its status has been and is one of many reports, numerous recommendations, vacillations in policy and little action, insofar as actual financial support is concerned.

In 1929, the Secretary of the Interior appointed a Committee on Educational Problems in the National Parks to devise an educational or interpretive program for park visitors. Confronted with vast gaps in the scientific knowledge essential for this activity, the Committee recommended a research program to gather scientific information for the musuem, education, and wildlife administrative programs.

Research as an activity of the National Park Service was made official with the creation, July 1, 1930, of a Branch of Research and Education to coordinate the new educational program.

Also in 1930, a comprehensive ecological management survey of the fauna of the national parks was launched and privately financed by the late George M. Wright. Beginning in 1931, this survey was gradually integrated into and financed by the Branch of Research and Education as an official National Park Service function. In the first publication resulting from this research program, *Fauna Series No. 1* (1932) of the National Park Service, the wildlife research and management policies of the Service were officially formulated. *Fauna No. 1* analyzed the major ecological situations prevailing in each park in the early thirties and recommended numerous management solutions as well as more research. It analyzed the Yellowstone elk situation, which had been a cause for concern since 1911, warned of further range destruction, urged elk control and further research.

---

[9] Management as applied to the national parks in the United States is understood to be primarily for the purpose of or to lead in the direction of preservation or restoration of natural conditions.

[10] The term "zoning" as applied here to existing national parks in the United States refers to areas rather than belts.

In 1935, a second publication on wildlife research and management, *Fauna No. 2*, was produced. By that time, seven current biological research projects were described and the practice was established of designating and protecting as "research reserves" unique, unusually fragile scientific areas within the parks.

Between 1932 and 1940, 28 research reserves were listed in *Ecology* as established in 10 national parks and other areas under the National Park Service. There were approximately 25 biologists in the National Park Service at that time, mostly in field positions, financed from Civilian Conservation Corps funds. About half of the time of this staff of field biologists was spent in ecological reviews of proposed development projects; the other half was divided between wildlife management and research, which at that time were considered for practical purposes to be indistinguishable components of the total program. *Fauna No. 4, Ecology of the Coyote in the Yellowstone*, by Adolph Murie (1940), exemplifies the best of the biological research carried out by the Service during this period. In this publication, Murie repeated the warnings of severe range destruction by elk in the Yellowstone and indicated that a two-thirds reduction was necessary.

Moral support to research was given during this period by the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Building and Monuments, which has consistently urged greater support for research in natural history.

In November, 1939, in accordance with a reorganization program of the Department, the National Park Service biologists were transferred to the Fish and Wildlife Service, now called the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, but their stations and duties unchanged. The word "research" was dropped from the Branch of Research and Education of the National Park Service. With the outbreak of World War II, nearly all of these biology positions lapsed, owing to the abolition of the CCC from which funds for most of the positions had been derived. A comparable staff and program in geology, established during the 30's, was eliminated preceding World War II and has not been restored.

Fauna Series No. 5, The Wolves of Mount McKinley, by Adolph Murie (1944) marked the last of the Fauna Series for the next 17 years.

The resident Park Naturalist contributed much, particularly in the earlier years, to the knowledge of the parks through observation, collections and inventories of park resources, and through some basic research. The geological research of Edwin McKee at Grand Canyon is a most notable example, but the observations of Arthur Stupka at Great Smoky Mountains, Frank Brockman at Mount Rainier, and the early work of Milton Skinner at Yellowstone, also illustrate the research opportunities and accomplishments of that period.

World War II reduced the naturalist staffs to a minimum. After the war the National Park Service reestablished eight biologist positions under the Division of Interpretation, which was the lineal descendant of the old Branch of Research and Education. The number of biologists was not restored to prewar strength despite the increasing pressures on park resources; a situation experienced by no other professional groups within the National Park Service except the geologists.

On February 10, 1945, the National Park Service issued a statement on *Research in the National Park System, and its Relation to Private Research and the Work of Research Foundations*. Its recommendations covered natural history as well as history and archaeology and advocated a research program to provide a constant flow of knowledge on the interrelations of life forms (ecology) essential for interpretation and management and an adequate staff of biologists. A list of 77 needed biological research programs was included, with priorities. The years passed—but little happened.

During the period 1948–1957, research biologist Walter Kittams was stationed in Yellowstone to study the chronically serious elk situation and recommend corrective measures. He produced voluminous illustrated reports showing the spread of ecological destruction and urging an adequate elk-reduction program.

In 1953, the National Park Conference advocated research as a basic tool for interpretation and management. This led to inclusion in the Administrative Manual of a policy statement in support of research.

In 1956, the first (and last) meeting of National Park Service biologists since 1939 was held in Washington. A list of suggestions for strengthening and implementing the Service's biological program was submitted by the conferees, but was not implemented.

In 1957, a position of aquatic biologist was reestablished to handle research, interpretation, and management of fisheries and related aquatic resources. A previous fishery position had existed between 1934 and 1940.

In 1957, members of the first Everglades National Park Research Conference met to consider the urgent need for a research program to provide answers as soon as possible to various threats to the park's ecological existence. Special funds from the Service's Water Resources Branch were allocated annually for several years (until the first regular research funds finally were secured) for a study by the University of Miami of the park's freshwater needs—which study was recognized as being by far the most acute and immediate need. However, even with special funds derived from other sources, financing of this study never approached the $20,000 annually which the University has shown would be the minimum required for ecological field research covering the subject. A research project on the ecologically essential role of fire in the park received no research financing.

In 1958, the first research funds became available for natural history (ecology and geology). The total allocated in the National Park Service for this purpose was $28,000, in subsequent years reduced to $26,880 by a four per cent administrative overhead reduction. The annual amount allotted for natural history research has remained at this low level to the present. However, miscellaneous year-end moneys, and, at the local level, occasional contributions from park budgets, and donations, may have equalled or exceeded the formal allotments. The pump-priming effect of even so small a research budget as $28,000 (supplemented by year-end and other miscellaneous small funds, as mentioned) stimulated research institutions and scientific collaborators to produce for the Service, by 1962, several dozen manuscript reports on critical ecological problems. The majority of these reports have indicated the most immediately needed corrective management measures.

On February 10, 1958, the National Park Service reorganized the Divisions of Interpretation (Natural History) and Ranger Activities "to strengthen both the research and protection phases of biological resource conservation." This reorganization made a "clear-cut division of responsibilities between interpretation and conservation functions in the field areas with respect to biological research and management." It transferred one of the eight Service biologists to the Division of Ranger Activities, with responsibilities for all operational functions, and gave the Division of Interpretation (Natural History) the responsibility "for developing and carrying out a program of research on biological resources." In that year also, biologist Coleman Newman completed his four-year research on the ecology of *The Roosevelt Elk of Olympic National Park*.

In 1961, the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments recommended an expanded research program, stating that history and archaeology have proved the value of research, but that research in natural history has remained inadequate. The National Park Service revived the long-dormant Fauna Series with No. 6, *The Bighorn of Death Valley* by Welles and Welles, summarizing an ecological research project that had been partially financed out of the Service's annual allotment.

In January 1962, the National Park Service issued a prospectus on a proposed *Comprehensive Natural History Research Program*.

In 1963, the Secretary's Committee on Wildlife Management in the National Parks issued a report on Wildlife Management in the National Parks which included recommendations on the control of elk herd in Yellowstone National Park. This report dealt with a problem of concern since 1911 on which recommendations were made in *Fauna Series No. 1* (1932) published by the National Park Service, again in *Fauna Series No. 4* (1940), and again in a series of reports during the period 1948–1957.

The Department of Interior is well aware of the unsatisfactory status of natural history research in our national parks. Secretary Udall in a letter of April 25, 1962, addressed to Dr. D. W. Bronk, then President of the National Academy of Sciences, said:

"The National Park Service has long recognized that broad ecological knowledge is indispensable to the integrity and general welfare of the national parks. During recent decades, however, research undertaken by the Service has of necessity, consisted largely of projects stimulated by crises in park management, planning, protection, and interpretation. Some more broadly based and fundamental studies in the national parks have been made by scientists from universities, other federal agencies, and research organizations such as the Carnegie and Smithsonian Institutions, but no coordinated or long range plan of investigations has been developed. As a result, the needs of some areas have been fairly adequately met; in others, the accomplishments bear a haphazard relationship to actual needs; while for the remainder, comprising far too many areas, little has been done." The Committee agrees with Secretary Udall.

Research by the National Park Service has lacked continuity, coordination, and depth. It has been marked by expediency rather than by long-term considerations. It has in general lacked direction, has been fragmented between divisions and branches, has been applied piecemeal and his suffered because of a failure to recognize the distinctions between research and administrative decision-making, and has failed to insure the implementation of the results of research in operational management. Too few funds have been requested; too few appropriated. In fact, the Committee is not convinced that the policies of the National Park Service have been such that the potential contribution of research and a research staff to the solution of the problems of the national parks is recognized and appreciated. Reports and recommendations on this subject will remain futile unless and until the National Park Service itself becomes research-minded and is prepared to support research and to apply its findings.

These harsh comments are not to be interpreted as a criticism of much of the personnel of the Park Service. The Committee has been most favorably impressed by the quality of the men, their dedication to their profession and the morale which exists in the Service. There are simply too few research people and these few are inadequately supported. The Committee was shocked to learn that for the year 1962 the research staff (including the Chief Naturalist and field men in natural history) was limited to 10 people,[11] and that the Service budget for natural history research was $28,000—about the cost of one campground comfort station.

The Committee recognizes also that a limited amount of excellent research in natural history has been carried on by the Park Service and that much has been accomplished by independent investigators with the encouragement and cooperation of the Park Service. In fact, the accomplishment of research in natural history in the national parks should be a matter of pride to the Service in view of the limited funds and personnel available for that purpose. A list of publications and reports (far too many of these have not been published) is appended to this report.[12]

It is inconceivable to this Committee that property so unique and valuable as the national parks, used by such a large number of people and regarded internationally as one of the finest examples of our national spirit, should not be provided with sufficient competent research scientists in natural history as elementary insurance for the preservation and best use of parks. The national parks idea originated in the United States, and, in spite of all deficiencies, the parks are far beyond anything similar elsewhere in the world. The need for sound knowledge on which to make decisions was expressed to the Committee in strong terms by several of those responsible for the operational management of some of the more important parks. Such knowledge results from research. An examination of research in natural history accomplished by the National Park Service, projects now under way and the conditions in various national parks forcefully demonstrate the need for an expanded research staff adequately supported and emphasizes the urgency of immediate action.

One of the first needs is a complete inventory of each of the national parks including information on such items as topography, geology, climate, water regime, soil, flora and fauna, land use and archeology, with distribution maps where appropriate. Insofar as historical records permit, the inventory should include past as well as present conditions. An inventory furnishes a base from which changes in biology and habitat can be judged and by which management practices can be planned.[13] It supplies also a major part of the information by which a park and its significance can be presented (interpreted) to the public.

The Committee found that a great deal of inventory information has been accumulated for some parks and that much of it is effectively presented in attractive form for the pleasure and instruction of the public. There are, however, obvious deficiencies, the correction of which demands research. Most significant is a lack of detailed information on geology, aerial photography, adequate maps of topography, soil types and the distribution of plants and animals.

The place of natural history research in the national parks is demonstrated by the clear and present danger to some parks because research on which proper management operations should have been based was not carried out in time; because the results of research known to operational management were not implemented; or because the research staff was not consulted before action was taken. In still other situations problems are recognized for the solution of which research is needed but none has been undertaken or planned, or if planned, has not been financed.

"The condition of the Everglades National Park in its entirety is perhaps the most precarious. This park is the third largest in the National Park System and is the largest semi-tropical wilderness in the United States, a vast primitive area of prairie, swamp, and bay with unusual birds, fish, animals and plants in extraordinary and intimate ecological relationships. Its existence depends upon water, not only the annual quantity but the seasonal distribution which determines alternate periods of flooding and of drought. The development of canals and the diversion north of the park of water for agricultural and domestic uses has interfered so seriously with the normal supply of water that the future of the Everglades as a park is threatened and adjacent areas seriously affected. Insufficient fresh water in the Everglades influences the salinity of Florida Bay with potential deleterious effects on fisheries in the Bay and on its role as a main nursery ground for the Tortugas pink shrimp. A canal into Coot Bay has destroyed that area as a bird feeding center and additional canals contemplated for the convenience of motor boats will have further harmful effects on the ecology of the area. The importance of water for this park is clearly recognized and is a matter of serious concern to the management. However, much more information is needed on the ecology of the Everglades, on the effects of seasonal variations in the water supply and on the best and most intelligent way to provide water. Far too little research on these and related problems is under way. The adverse effect of the canal into Coot Bay should be corrected and further development of canals undertaken, if at all, only after thorough investigation. The Committee considers the future of the Everglades National Park a problem of pressing national concern.

"The dangerous condition of the giant sequoias of the Mariposa grove in Yosemite National Park is another situation which disturbed the Committee. These trees, some of them 2,000 years or more in age and the largest living things on earth, are unique; they occur in limited areas in California and nowhere else in the world. However, roots of older trees have been damaged by artificially induced high water tables, by roadways, motor traffic and visitor paths close to the trees. Because of the loss of a substantial portion of the root system some trees have fallen and others leaned so badly that it was necessary to fell them. Vandalism by visitors who have removed bark, injured the cambium or otherwise harmed the trees is also a factor. Of greatest importance is that young sequoias are choked out by competing plants and natural reproduction is not occurring. The Committee is pleased to note that research is under way looking toward the preservation of these extraordinary trees. It is hoped that the investigation is not too late and that suitable management practices can be introduced to save the groves.

"Other situations which demonstrate the need for research and/or adequate research staff in natural history in the National Park Service were noted by members of the Committee in their visits to the national parks or were called to their attention. Some of these were the following:

"Recommendations have been made in the past to curtail development of public accommodations in the Great Basin of Big Bend National Park. The Great Basin of the Chisos mountains is a remarkable physiographic feature of great beauty, now being defaced and the habitat of rare animals thus degraded. The ecology of such an animal area should have been investigated before development in order at least that knowledge of its characteristics could have been preserved, if the basin itself cannot be.

"In Yellowstone National Park problems of maintenance and the necessity of relocating some roads because of unstable roadbeds near hydrothermal features, as well as interference with these features, could have been reduced or eliminated had a prior geological study of underground features been made. For example, a road between Bonita Pool, Daisy Geyser and a parking area caused compaction of the center cap of Bonita and contributed to the dormancy of the Daisy Geyser. Plans are now in preparation to relocate the road. The importance of prior research is illustrated by experience at Beryl Spring. Investigations by a hydrothermal geologist employed during the construction of a bridge and new road prevented destruction as well as expensive construction.

"In the mid-1930's, crested wheat grass, not indigenous to the area, was sown on some previously cultivated lands to furnish forage for grazing animals. Most of this grass disappeared during a series of unfavorable growing seasons between 1944 and 1953, but some native grasses survived. This experience emphasizes the need for investigation of the ecology of vegetation as a basis for operational management. A study of the development of vegetation in limited areas protected from overgrazing by fencing would reveal plants best adapted to the region and furnish the information needed for intelligent management.

"Slippage brought on by construction operations greatly delayed the construction of Sections 15A6 and 15A7 of the Foothills Parkway in the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Adequate geological investigations would have shown that the tilting of rock strata with layers of clay between the rocks would allow slippage and preventive steps could have been taken. Construction along 8G–1 and 8G–2 on the Foothills Parkway (U.S. 73 to Butterfly Gap) caused a flow of freshets of sand into the stream and silting of waters on adjacent lands. This resulted in claims against the United States Government. Geological research before construction would probably have detected the weak condition of the sandstone and suggested measures to prevent the silting.

"A water system project in Mount McKinley National Park, for which a swatch of vegetation fifty feet or more in width was clear-cut and bench-graded around the hillside for upwards of a mile, proved to be useless and is known locally as the '$90,000 icicle.' This scar on the virgin wilderness and failure to accomplish the purpose could have been avoided if an investigation had been made prior to full-scale action.

"Road construction in areas of permafrost in Mount McKinley National Park have resulted in serious and continued problems in road maintenance. Had research guidance been obtained from scientists experienced with permafrost in different locations, the magnitude and type of construction would have been suggested for critical areas, and the problems now existing would not have developed or would have been much reduced. Road construction on tundra slopes has produced bleeding scars which will heal slowly even with man's help. The extreme gullying and 'raveling out' of slopes resulting from cuts and fills have dismayed some who made the plans. Botanists and geologists have long known the disastrous erosion which follows disturbance of the delicate equilibrium of soil and plants of tundra slopes. Research on a small-scale pilot project should have preceded the road construction to determine how to hold physical and aesthetic damage to a minimum.

---

[11] Total number NPS employees *5359;* in Washington *386;* in regional offices *1126;* in National Parks *1638;* in other Field areas *2209.*

[12] See Appendix 5.

[13] The Committee has been impressed by the management plans developed by the Nature Conservancy of Britain. Of the eighty-five National Nature Reserves in Britain, more than half are now under approved management plans, each of which is a document of from twenty to one hundred pages prepared according to a standard *pro forma* pattern. The Committee recognizes that plans devised for the nature reserves in Britain are not applicable *in toto* to the national parks of the United States but believes that they contain suggestions of value, and has submitted to the Secretary of the Interior with this report examples of the management plans prepared by the Nature Conservancy of Britain.

"Big Meadow Swamp was a unique park feature in Shenandoah National Park containing many plant species of unusual distribution and interest. The flora of this area has been under study for nearly 25 years. In 1962, the Park Service decided to extend the neighboring camp grounds into the swamp area with the result that the water level has been reduced by drainage, the flora has been seriously damaged in the construction and use of the camp site, and the ecology has been permanently altered."

In each of these examples, and there are others, operational management decisions were made by the National Park Service without benefit of adequate information such as comes from research, and the parks suffered serious damage.

A review of the areas included within the National Park System has also brought to light current need for specific research:

The causes of limited reproduction of the saguaro cactus in Saguaro National Monument are imperfectly known. Since the older cacti in the monument, when it was acquired in 1933, are dying out, some means to insure reproduction are essential to the continuance of this park for the purpose for which it was established.

Organ pipe and sinita cacti are not reproducing in Organ Pipe Cactus National Monument. The effects of a herd of approximately 800 cattle on the desert plant life are imperfectly known.

Numbers of surface streams and permanent springs in Big Bend National Park are not as large as they once were. The causes of this reduced water supply and its effects upon the animal life are not known. The reasons for the disappearance of bear from this park are not known.

The failure of Ponderosa Pine, Douglas Fir and Arizona Cypress to reproduce in this park has not been investigated. Modification of park features due to influences outside of the park require study to assess their effects upon the park and to provide guidance in restoration and further protection.

The only water supply in Carlsbad Caverns National Park is from Rattlesnake Spring—an out-holding on which the park has some first rights to part of the flow. The present total flow from the spring is reported to be far less than when the park was first established, and a nearby stream which once ran year round is now dry most of the time. Causes for the reduced flow from Rattlesnake Spring are suspected but not confirmed. The deer population in this park may be too large. The mountain mahogany is overbrowsed to the point that it may not be able to reproduce. The deer population has not been investigated.

A dam on the Green River downstream from Mammoth Cave National Park prevents the water level in the cave from falling as far as it once did. The effects on the biology of the cave, on cave formations and on the solution rates are not known.

The finest wild flower display in Acadia National Park is that of Rhodora (*Rhododendron Canadense*) in Great Meadow, near Sieur de Merits Spring, in late May or early June. Since 1956, this display has been modest as compared to earlier years. The cause for this deterioration may be associated with changes in the water table caused by dams built by beavers. Adequate research on the ecological relations between the activities of the beaver and the mass display of Rhodora flowers is needed.

In calling attention to these specific examples for which research in natural history should have been done before action was taken, and in emphasizing the great need for research on existing problems, the Committee is fully aware of the excellent but limited researches that the Park Service has been able to accomplish. The demonstration that it is necessary to maintain a ratio of at least 70 per cent grass cover to 30 per cent bare soil if the elk ranges of the Grand Tetons and Yellowstone are protected from destructive soil erosion, and that areas damaged by over grazing have a ratio of 30 per cent grass to 70 per cent bare soil, is one fundamental finding for the proper management of elk herds in these parks.

The discovery by Welles and Welles that it is not disease, predators or competition with wild burros that threatens the desert bighorn sheep in the southwest but competition with man for ancestral watering places, offers a solution for the preservation of that species.

The discovery of the differences in the causes for large-scale invasion of mountain meadows above 7,500 feet by lodgepole pine in the national parks of the High Sierra, and for the excessive invasion by forest on the floor of Yosemite Valley at 4,000 feet should suggest reasonable methods of management for preserving these meadows.

Other examples of research accomplished could be cited but the Committee considers that the amount is too little, the problems solved are too few and the need is too great for the status of research in natural history in the national parks to remain in its present anemic condition.

ORGANIZATION OF A RESEARCH PROGRAM

It is of the utmost importance that a research program in the natural sciences be inaugurated in the National Park Service and integrated smoothly into the continuing functions and activities of the Service in such a way as to insure that the results of such a program will be utilized in the decision-making process of operational management. A research program will provide the parameters and guidelines for operation. Its role in the National Park Service should not be simply an advisory function. It should be a line responsibility in the National Park Service organization.

The research organization within the National Park Service should be distinct from administration and the operational management organization. Management criteria for a research program are not identical with those for operational functions; they differ at headquarters as well as in the field. Research contract review and negotiation are not the same as with construction contracts. Research field personnel cannot fulfill their assignments effectively under the same personnel management policies as are most satisfactory for maintenance personnel.

In the final analysis the success of a research program in the National Park Service will depend upon the capabilities of the individuals who have the responsibility for planning, managing and executing this activity. In order to bring the necessary scientific knowledge and judgment to bear upon the research problems confronting the Park Service, and in order that the research program may achieve rapport with the scientific community at large, the scientific personnel must be of the highest professional quality.

As a line responsibility in the administration of the National Park Service, the research program in natural science will involve a heavy administrative burden. Not only will the development, review, and management of a research program require considerable imaginative and administrative efforts but, in order to focus research conclusions upon general park management problems, considerable time and effort will be required on administrative procedures and coordination.

Following the principle that scientific personnel directly involved in research responsibilities should not be distracted with administrative and operational matters, it is suggested that the research program be established under an Assistant Director for Research in the Natural Sciences who will be responsible for the administration of the research programs and for other activities directly related to the research program functions. It is further recommended that a Chief Scientist be appointed to direct the natural history research activities and the natural history research staff. The Chief Scientist would report immediately to the Assistant Director.

The Assistant Director to whom the responsibility for the research program is assigned, should be a scientist, thoroughly conversant with the general concepts of the problems to be encountered. He should have experience in working with other scientists and with research programs, and be knowledgeable in administrative techniques involved in reviewing, developing, and managing scientific programs. He must, particularly, recognize and be sympathetic with the importance of freedom of action which scientific investigation requires.

The Committee recommends that a nucleus of highly competent scientists be assembled in the headquarters of the National Park Service primarily to develop a research program in natural history, and to determine the exact extent and nature of the research problems confronting the parks with an assessment of priorities to be pursued. This nucleus should comprise at least 10 individuals including the present staff. Increases in staff, together with field personnel, should be based on the conclusions of this central group, and be determined by it.

Since the research problems of the National Park Service will involve complex biological and physical situations, emphasis should be placed on selecting scientists for the directing staff who have broad competence in their fields rather than merely specialists in particular areas or problems. Specialists, where necessary, may be sought when the problems of the parks are further defined.

Since the research program will directly relate to operational management policies of the national parks, the research program in natural history in the National Park Service should be mission-oriented; that is, it should be concerned with the problems involved in the preservation of the natural features of a park, their restoration, where necessary and possible; and the development of sound information for the interpretation of the parks to the interested public. The scientific investigators must, however, be free to pursue experiments which are in their judgment the most promising within the defined areas of the mission.

The National Park Service should not attempt to include on its natural history staff competence for every type of problem requiring mission-oriented research. Problems, specialized in nature, the solution for which may be anticipated within a limited period of time (one to five years), lend themselves to contractual arrangements for the needed research.

The permanent research staff in natural history of the National Park Service should be set up with the following criteria in mind:

It should include personnel of high scientific and administrative ability qualified to plan and direct a natural history inventory of the national parks; to assess the nature of the research problems encountered in each park and assign priority to the study and solution of these problems; to deveolp and direct a Service capability to conduct research on problems of long-term duration, common to multiple areas and involving interdisciplinary study; to review, approve, and coordinate proposed research in national parks by independent investigators; and to negotiate and manage research contracts for mission-oriented projects of specific problems of finite duration in which the best competence available is outside the Service.

It should be clearly realized by the Department of the Interior and by the Park Service that the results of research cannot be predicted nor prejudged. The results may not always be pleasant. They may indicate that a facility should not have been built, that a road should have been routed another way, that visitors into a particular region should not be encouraged in large numbers and without control. It may even indicate that a particular park has deteriorated so far that it can never be returned to its former state. It is the very integrity of these conclusions, however, that this Committee feels must be brought to bear upon the management problems of our national parks.

An important element of research activity is the line of communication between those directing and managing the program in Washington and those executing the research. During the course of the Committee's investigations, two occasions were discovered in which research reports submitted by field naturalists were either held in the regional office and not forwarded to Washington or were misdirected upon arrival in the Washington office. Examples were noted of research activities conducted by independent researchers in national parks about which the Washington Office was uninformed. Regional offices have negotiated research contracts without authorization by or previous knowledge of the Washington Office. In some instances, duplication of research efforts resulted or low-priority projects were supported. In order to prevent such occurrences communication between research personnel should be direct from field to the Office of the Chief Scientist. Regional offices serve as useful supporting services to field research activities, but the direction of the professional scientific research program should center on the Office of the Chief Scientist.

The National Park Service should immediately seek authority to hire the Chief Scientist and his top scientific staff at the highest possible salary levels (GS15). The Service should also seek authority to hire research personnel under excepted positions where necessary. This authority would greatly reduce the problem of securing adequate research staff and would permit utilization of personnel for relatively short periods of time (one to three years) from universities and other non-governmental organizations.

Policies of rotation of field research personnel should be developed in such a way as to allow the individual sufficient time in a location to accomplish effective research and yet not be excluded from appropriate professional opportunities and advancement. These policies should take into account also the importance that must be placed upon continuing familiarity with developments in the fields of science. Field research personnel should have the important benefit of association and regular contact with those planning and administering the program in Washington and should be encouraged also to participate in scientific gatherings and meetings within their respective disciplines and to exchange their results within the scientific community. Finally, research personnel should be encouraged to improve their capabilities by further study, and should be permitted to take advantage of government assignments or scholarships for such purposes.

Research in natural history conducted by the National Park Service should be of such quality that the results are worthy of publication and provision should be made for prompt publication either in established journals or publications sponsored by the National Park Service. It is in the public interest that the results of research be published. The policy of publication will be an element in attracting to the research staff qualified scientists who will find through this means one method of participating in the scientific community; and the research publications will play an important part in developing the interpretation program of the Service. It should be understood, however, that not all research results will be of a publishable nature, particularly studies conducted on specific operational problems through which a problem is solved but little new knowledge is gained.

Facilities to support research may be required in connection with some of the national parks. Although much field work can be conducted satisfactorily without a nearby laboratory some research projects are made more productive by or actually require a readily accessible field laboratory with supporting living accommodations for the research personnel.

The Committee suggests that in the establishment of a research facility the following criteria are pertinent:

It should be established and controlled by the National Park Service; it should not duplicate facilities conveniently available to independent investigators or the National Park Service personnel elsewhere; it should be located in park areas already zoned for facilities and not in a natural area; it should be as simple and inconspicuous as its purposes permit. Wherever possible, consideration should be given to the desirability of constructing research centers outside the limits of a park. Some of these might be supported, administered and used jointly with other agencies or organizations.

Interpretation of the National Parks is closely associated with the research program in natural history as well as with the operational management. Through its interpretation program the National Park Service presents the natural features of the parks in their historic setting. To do this adequately requires the information developed by the research program and requires also methods and facilities for presenting the data to the public and a staff qualified to serve as interpreters of the information and its significance. During the summer months members of the interpretive staff are fully occupied in that activity; at other times of the year they could assume other duties which might well include, for those individuals interested and qualified, assignment to research duties or participation in field research. The Committee believes that interpretive personnel should be organized separately from the research personnel in natural history but well integrated with it. Although depending on the natural history research staff for information within its competency, the interpretive staff should be well grounded in science and skilled in modern techniques and media of dissemination of information to the public.

Greater use of the parks will involve deeper penetration into the areas adjacent to facilities and access roads. The Committee notes that today only about five percent of park users penetrate farther than one-half a mile from the facilities and access routes. Heavier use of the national parks indicates a larger and deeper penetration and, if this occurs without impairing the parks, it will have to be done, in large part though not exclusively, on a guided basis. Such guiding should be included with interpretive activities. Therefore, the size of the interpretive staff in some of the parks areas will have to be greatly increased.

The Committee believes that the overall role and importance of research in natural history in the proper preservation, restoration and interpretation of the national parks is a subject which could profitably receive continued attention by the Advisory Board of National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments.[14] The Committee believes also that a Scientific Advisory Committee should be established to advise the Assistant Director of Research in the Natural Sciences and the Chief Scientist on such overall policy matters in natural history as may require attention.

In addition, ad hoc scientific advisory committees for individual parks are useful. Such committees would consist of individuals familiar with the particular region and with special competence in the area in which the particular research problems might fall.

Financial support is a limiting factor in determining the extent of any program. The Committee has considered the problem of how much money could justifiably be devoted to supporting research in the national parks. To determine the cost of meeting the research needs of each park and arriving in this way at a sum total was not considered by the Committee to be feasible at this time. An examination, however, of the annual appropriations for comparable bureaus disclosed the following:

The dollars devoted to research and development and scientific information in the Department of the Interior as a whole ranged from 10 to 12 percent of the total appropriation in the years 1960, 1961 and 1962, for the Department of Agriculture about 3 percent and for the Department of Commerce from 9.8 to 24 percent (Table I). The figures for comparable Services or Bureaus within these Departments show the National Park Service was next to the lowest, with less than one percent of its annual appropriations devoted to research and development. In fact, the percentage for the National Park Service is substantially behind the percentage (2.8%) of the gross national product devoted to research and development and behind that (1.8%) of net sales in private industry. An overall consideration of the figures in Table I suggests that 10% of the annual appropriation should be a reasonable basis for estimating the cost of research and development. This would have meant for the year 1962 an allotment for research and development in the National Park Service of approximately $10,000,000 instead of the $930,000 actually available.

---

[14] The Advisory Board of National Parks Historic Sites, Buildings and Monuments was established under the Historic Sites Act in 1935 (Section 3). Briefly the Act states that an Advisory Board will be established to advise and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior on matters concerning National Parks and the preservation, conservation, and restoration of Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments. The Advisory Board consists of 11 persons representing competence in the fields of history, archeology, architecture and human geography. The term of appointment is at the pleasure of the Secretary of the Interior and by administrative decision has been set so that several positions rotate each year. As of June 1963, the Board was composed of the following individuals:

Harold P. Fabin, Chairman, (Former Director of Utah State Parks)

Stanley A. Cain, Vice Chairman, (Chairman, Department of Conservation, University of Michigan)

E. B. Dansen, Jr., Secretary, (Director, Museum of Northern Arizona)

Mrs. N. S. Dryfoos, (Wife of the late Publisher of New York Times)

Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, (President, National Geographic Society)

Dr. John A. Krout, (Director of History, Arizona State University)

Mr. Sigurd F. Olson, (Author)

Mr. Earl H. Reed, (Architect) The American Institute of Architects

Dr. R. G. Sproul, (President Emeritus, University of California)

Dr. W. E. Stegner, (Director of Creative Writing Institute, Stanford University)

Dr. R. L. Stearns, (Citizens Committee on Modern Courts, Inc.)

The budget of the 31 national parks in 1962 was $42,754,866. Applying the 10 percent yardstick the amount of money available for research and development in the 31 national parks alone should have been not less than $4,275,000.

TABLE I.—*From Federal Organization for Scientific Activities 1962, NSF 62-37*

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

	1960	1961	1962
Department of the Interior:			
Total appropriation	$750,000	$837,000	$888,000
R. & D. scientific information	$75,000	$89,000	$106,000
Percent	10	10.5	12
Fish and Wildlife Service:			
Total appropriation	$65,000	$73,000	$83,000
R. & D. scientific information	$21,000	$26,000	$32,000
Percent	32	35	39
Bureau of Mines:			
Total appropriation	$29,000	$46,000	$48,000
R. & D. scientific information	$25,000	$30,000	$30,000
Percent	86	65	62.5
U.S. Geological Survey:			
Total appropriation	$42,000	$46,000	$50,000
R. & D. scientific information	$23,000	$26,000	$29,000
Percent	55	56	58
Bureau of Land Management:			
Total appropriation	$85,000	$94,000	$100,000
R. & D. scientific information	$88	$94	$94
Percent	0.1	0.1	0.1
National Park Service:			
Total appropriation	$86,000	$94,000	$105,000
R. & D. scientific information	$726	$878	$930
Percent	0.85	0.93	0.89
Bureau of Reclamation:			
Total appropriation	$260,000	$286,000	$290,000
R. & D. scientific information	$1,500	$1,900	$6,400
Percent	0.58	0.67	2.2
Department of Agriculture:			
Total appropriation	$5,684,000	$5,361,000	$5,509,000
R. & D. scientific information	$133,000	$178,000	$168,000
Percent	2.3	3.3	3.1
Forest Service:			
Total appropriation	$210,000	$324,000	$230,000
R. & D. scientific information	$16,000	$20,000	$25,000
Percent	7.6	6.2	11
Department of Commerce:			
Total appropriation	$571,000	$549,000	$612,000
R. & D. scientific information	$56,000	$80,000	$146,000
Percent	9.8	14.7	24
National Bureau of Standards:			
Total appropriation	$19,300	$445,000	$77,000
R. & D. scientific information	$17,000	$34,000	$50,000
Percent	89	75	65
Coast and Geodetic Survey:			
Total appropriation	$14,000	$23,000	$26,000
R. & D. scientific information	$100	$410	$932
Percent	0.71	1.78	3.6
Weather Bureau:			
Total appropriation	$51,000	$60,000	$70,000
R. & D. scientific information	$5,000	$7,000	$10,000
Percent	9.8	11.6	14.5

It is essential in future research appropriations and allocations within the National Park Service, which includes archeology, history, interpretation, landscape design and architecture, that natural history research be given support commensurate with the extent of the land in the national parks, the use of these lands, the preservation of national parks in the overall system and the key position of natural history in the preservation, restoration and interpretation of the parks.

The money spent on research and development by the National Park Service in 1962 amounted to one cent per visitor, or 0.6 cent per acre.

USE OF THE NATIONAL PARKS BY SCIENTISTS FOR BASIC RESEARCH

Although the word "research" does not appear in the National Park Service Act of 1916, when new parks were created their use by scientists was soon advocated. In 1902, an invitation to so use them was specifically included in the Act establishing Crater Lake National Park.

Outside institutions, recognizing the value of these areas for research, accepted the Service's invitation. In 1914, the University of California began in Yosemite the first of its series of scientific monographs and shorter publications on the ecology of western national parks and monuments.

In 1917, the annual report of the Director of the National Park Service stated:

"It is our hope to encourage the general use of all parks as fields for scientific study."

The list of publications and reports appended to this report demonstrates the research which has resulted from this encouragement.

The mission of the National Park Service is to preserve and conserve the national parks for the proper enjoyment of them by their owners, the people of the United States, and by future generations. Research carried on by the National Park Service should be governed primarily by this mission.

National Parks are, however, more than areas of importance for the aesthetic, spiritual, inspirational and educational values inherent in their physiographic and biological features. They are irreplaceable natural laboratories in which scientific studies can be carried out which would not be possible in even the most elaborate and conventional man-made laboratory. In the national parks it is possible to study the structure, interrelations and behavior of biological communities, discover how they are adapted to their environment and compare them with the artificial communities elsewhere created by the clearings, drainage, and contamination, and by the introduction of exotic animals and plants by man. They offer the opportunity to pursue long-term ecological studies difficult if not impossible to conduct elsewhere. Such studies by university scientists and independent investigators should be systematically encouraged by the National Park Service. For example, Isle Royale National Park is an area with a nearly undisturbed balance of plants and animals including moose, wolves, and beaver; it is an unrivaled laboratory in which to learn the role played by each species in an ecological system and by comparison with other areas to learn the effect of man on the land and the living things which inhabit it.

The National Parks contain unique or nearly unique plants and animals which may be of great scientific importance.

The thermophilic algae and other organisms in hot springs offer challenging questions of a fundamental character. What accounts for their ability to survive at temperatures considerably above those which are lethal for most organisms? The blind fish and other organisms in Mammoth Cave and other blind organisms in Carlsbad Caverns raise another series of questions which are basic to the problem of evolution and the loss of organs through disuse. Can natural selection account for the origin of these creatures or are principles at work with which we are ill acquainted?

The genus *Tripsacum* has become important in maize (*Zea Mays*) breeding, and the discovery that *T. floridanum* hybridizes readily with maize and produces highly fertile hybrids has aroused a great deal of interest in *Tripsacum* as a source of breeding material. The University of Illinois has three men devoting virtually all their time to research on hydrids of maize and *Tripsacum*, much of it on hybrids between maize and *T. floridaum*. *T. floridanum* occurs in the Everglades National Park; and Dr. Paul Mangelsdorf, "dean" of students of the genetics of maize, has this to say:

"*T. floridanum* is confined to southern Florida and its natural habitats are constantly being encroached upon by the construction of residential areas, highways, and airports. I first collected this species besides a shell road just south of Homestead. When I looked for it there again last Stepember the road had been paved and the *Tripsacum* had disappeared. It is still to be found in empty lots in Homestead and indeed as far north as Coral Gables but these empty lots will eventually be built on and the *Tripsacum* will be destroyed. All of these facts point to the importance of maintaining the Everglades National Park, if for no other reason than to preserve this grass which is related to maize, and which is an endemic to the southern part of Florida. I suspect that the Everglades National Park has other endemics which are of botanical interest but probably none is so closely related to America's principal food plant, corn."

Glaciers in the Cascade Mountains are advancing in contrast to the steady retreat of those almost everywhere else in the world, including glaciers in Olympic National Park. A comparative study of the glaciers of the Cascade Mountains and those of nearby Olympic National Park might contribute to our understanding of the mechanics of glaciation and the Pleistocene era.

The Grand Canyon of the Colorado still serves as a classic laboratory for the study of geologic history of the formation of this continent. The Grand Tetons and Jackson Hole form one of the finest examples in the world of blockfault mountain building, exposing a very fine geologic sequence from Precambrian to Mesozoic. Glacier National Park presents an equally fine example of overthrust faulting.

The temperate rain forest of Olympic Park, the subtropical Everglades, the desert flora of Big Bend National Park provide nearly unique situations for ecological studies.

For those interested in the vulcanology of the Pacific Basin, Lassen Volcanic Park and

Hawaii Volcanoes contain some of the most active volcanic regions in the northern western hemisphere.

Climatological investigations involving the geysers of Yellowstone National Park are being conducted by the Atmospheric Service Research Center of the State University of New York; ecological and geological studies are being conducted at Mammoth Cave; and glaciological studies in McKinley National Park.

The narrow, deep, well-watered gorge of McKittrick Canyon, a part of Carlsbad Caverns National Park in the Guadalupe Mountains, offers a striking contrast to the desert conditions of the surrounding terrain. In this narrow canyon, scientists have found an association of plants and animals which represent a relic from the Pleistocene era. More than 20 species of insects new to science have been discovered; four of them belong to new genera and it is likely that more new species, both plant and animal, exist there. An abundance of small and uncommon reptiles has been discovered. McKittrick Canyon offers to the biologist an opportunity to study an unusual example of evolution, and the ecological relations of organisms carried over from ancient times.

The isolated, high-altitude valley of Paradise Park in Rocky Mountain National Park has been virtually unmolested ecologically since the last glacial epoch. Many situations like McKittrick Canyon and the valley of Paradise Park exist in the national parks and offer the biologist an opportunity to study the interrelations of plants, animals and their habitat unmodified and undisturbed by man. They are rapidly disappearing elsewhere. This is not the place to list all the opportunities for research in the national parks. They are numerous and fundamental and range widely in the physical and biological sciences.

The Committee urges that the Park Service encourage research activities by independent investigators in these and other fields in the national parks. There are opportunities available that will increase general scientific knowledge and provide insight into basic scientific questions. The Committee does not believe that the Park Service itself should engage extensively in such research activities, however. There are sufficient research problems directly related to park management questions to absorb most of the efforts which can appropriately be directly supported by the Park Service. The Committee feels that independent research conducted in the national parks should be carried out with the full knowledge and permission of the Service and that cooperation between Park Service research personnel and independent research personnel should be encouraged. Independent researchers should realize that the Park Service, with its responsibilities to preserve the parks and to make them available to the public, must exercise its responsibility to insure that no research activity is harmful to the parks nor interferes with the preservation of natural conditions and public enjoyment. On the other hand, the Park Service must honor the basic freedom of the independent investigator to pursue his objectives, within the limits of these responsibilities, without interference.

Furthermore, the Park Service should avoid interference with independent research which has been authorized within the parks. Recently, in Mammoth Cave National Park, a beetle study plot in the cave was severely damaged when workmen, improving the visitor access in another area of the cave, dumped rubble and boulders down a shaft directly above the study plot. Similarly, in Shenandoah National Park a mammal study plot, without warning, was bulldozed into a new campsite area.

The Park Service should make every effort to support and accommodate independent research effort, and should recognize that basic research of this kind will enhance the importance of the national parks and will contribute to the interpretational functions of the Service and to our national scientific effort.

Closely related to the use of the national parks for basic research is their use for teaching and for research by advanced students. The Committee believes that there is considerable opportunity for advanced students to engage in research problems in the national parks. The National Park Service has engaged in a program part of which was directed towards this purpose: the Student Conservation Program. These efforts have demonstrated that such advanced student training can be beneficial to the park and to the individual. The concept of cost-sharing by the Park Service and interested private capital in the Student Conservation Program might offer an arrangement which would well serve the Park Service needs in research staff at the field assistant level and might reduce the necessity of maintaining the number of individuals required throughout the entire year on the permanent staff of the Park Service.

RECOMMENDATIONS

This Committee has stated that in its opinion the National Park Service must manage to some degree the lands which fall within the National Park System. The Committee has stated further that the management of any enterprise cannot be effective unless the objectives of the enterprise are clearly defined and well understood, and plans are devised to accomplish the objectives.

Plans must be based on information of the resources (inventory) of the activity, on its problems, and on its relation with other similar activities; and they must be implemented by adequate and competent personnel, properly organized, motivated, and supported financially.

Research is an essential part of the program outlined above and its use a necessity in each of the steps. These elementary principles apply to the national parks as well as to a business or any other organized activity.

The Committee has based its recommendations on these considerations, as well as on its acquaintance with the parks and their problems and begs leave to submit the following:

1. The objectives or purposes of each national park should be defined.

Comment: Each national park was established because of the potential esthetic, educational, scientific and cultural values of its natural history and/or its human history. The features of a park which make the values possible of attainment should be carefully defined to serve as the basis for operational management. They should be preserved and restored, where necessary, and provisions made for their proper enjoyment and use by the people. The objectives should exclude the use of the national parks for amusement or such mass recreation as requires elaborate facilities or extensive and/or artificial modification of the natural features of a park. The Committee endorses, in this respect, the conclusion of the report: "Wildlife Management in the National Parks." Zoning of a national park into, for example, natural undisturbed areas, naturalistic areas, public use areas and Park Service facility areas is suggested.

2. Inventory and mapping of the natural history resources of each park should be made.

Comment: Such an inventory should cover the past as well as the present, and include information on topography, geology, climate, water regime, soil types, flora and fauna and natural communities. Mapping, including aerial maps, should cover species distributions, natural communities, land use, archeology and such other mappable features as may be of importance in the park.

An inventory serves as a basis for judging changes, good or bad, in the condition of a park, supplies the information necessary for interpreting the area to the public, and is essential for proper operational management, as well as for further research.

3. A distinction should be made between administration, operational management, and research management.

Comment: Research is essential to solve problems of operational management whether the latter concerns preservation, restoration, interpretation or the use of the parks by the public. Administration, the management of research and the management of operations require somewhat different though well recognized administrative procedures. In most situations, the following steps are involved:

1) Identification and definition of the problems or situation;

2) Research, or fact finding, based on observation and/or experimentation;

3) Administrative action which involves decision on a course of action, grounded on the findings and recommendations of research and such other considerations as may be involved; and

4) Operational management, which means the implementation of the decisions by the appropriate operational division.

4. A permanent, independent, and identifiable research unit should be established within the National Park Service to conduct and supervise research in natural history in the national parks, and to serve as consultant on natural history problems for the entire National Park System.

Comment: In order to maintain objectivity, the principal research organization should be independent of operational management. It should provide knowledge which would allow predictions of the consequences of alternate lines of action or inaction. Close liaison should be maintained between the research unit and the administrative and operating divisions in order that the results of research may be adequately applied. All branches of the service should participate fully in identifying problems and in preparing programs and budgets for research. The research staff should have complete freedom in the execution of an approved research program, in evaluating the results, in reporting the findings and in making recommendations based on the findings. There should be free communication on research ideas and research accomplishment from anywhere in the National Park Service to and from the top research staff. Provision should be made to enable the research staff to maintain close association with other scientists.

5. The research unit in natural history in the National Park Service should be organized as a line arrangement with an "Assistant Director for Research in the Natural Sciences" reporting to the Director of the National Park Service.

Comment: A nucleus of highly competent scientists headed by a Chief Scientist should be assembled in the headquarters of the National Park Service. This nucleus should comprise at least 10 individuals—including the present staff. The scientific group in Washington should be supported by an appropriate staff of natural history specialists available for field assignments and other research. The committee emphasizes that quality is more important than numbers and that a selective and flexible approach to research problems is likely to be most profitable in the long term. Field research personnel should report directly to the Washington staff, and should be administered by personnel management policies compatible with their responsibilities.

6. Most of the research by the National Park Service should be mission-oriented.

Comment: The National Park Service should direct its in-service research mainly toward the problems involved in the preservation and/or restoration of the national parks for the esthetic, educational and scientific values and toward the adequate interpretation of these values. The solution of some of the problems may extend beyond the conventional bounds of natural history and involve, at least temporarily, contributions by, for example, economists, social scientists, and engineers. The problem should be emphasized and assistance for its solution sought wherever competence may be found. When appropriate, mission-oriented research should be carried out on a contract basis with universities or private research organizations.

7. The National Park Service should itself plan and administer its own mission-oriented research program directed toward the preservation, restoration, and interpretation of the national parks.

Comment: The mission of the Service in the preservation of the total environment is a unique responsibility. The research program necessary to support this objective is of a scope and character different from that of any other institution or land management agency. The Service must therefore accept the responsibility for the planning, administration and conduct of its own research program. While it may, and is encouraged to utilize the specialized services of other agencies and institutions, it cannot abrogate its responsibilities for the direction and execution of its own mission-oriented research program.

8. Research should be designed to anticipate and prevent problems in operational management as well as to meet those which have already developed.

Comment: A limited staff which has inadequate support can deal only with immediate "brush fire" problems; that is to say, it can deal only with situations which have already become critical and perhaps irreparable. A research staff adequate in competence and numbers can conduct research from long-term considerations, detect problems before they become critical and offer alternate choices of action for their solution.

9. A research program should be prepared for each park.

Comment: A basic goal of management should be to perpetuate and where necessary restore the values which justified the parks' creation and maintenance. A program of research studies needed to provide management with the information required to reach this goal should be established and implemented with the requisite funds and personnel.

10. Consultation with the research unit in natural history of the National Park Service should precede all decisions on management operations involving preservation, restoration, development, protection and interpretation, and the public use of a park.

Comment: The Committee discovered or had its attention called to numerous instances in which consultation with qualified scientists would have prevented or modified a development or operation which had harmful effects on a park or required expensive changes to prevent or correct such effects. Operational management is sensible of this need, as judged by frequent unsolicited comments to the Committee, but is handicapped by limited research staff available for consultation or by failures in communication.

11. Research on aquatic life, as well as on that existing on and above the land, should be pursued to assist in determining general policies for the maintenance of natural conditions for their scientific, educational, and cultural values.

Comment: The Committee recognizes that serious management problems for the preservation and restoration of aquatic life in the parks exist and that research is needed to arrive at rational decisions on these problems. They arise in part from the use of rotenone or other poisons as a fish management tool, the effects on aquatic life of motorboat traffic, sport fishing, the introduction of exotic forms and their effects on native aquatic life. The so-called "barren" lakes and streams are devoid of game fish but are of considerable scientific interest because of that fact. Each of these raise questions which can be properly settled only through the results of research.

12. Research should include specific attention to significant changes in land use, in other natural resource use, or in other economic activities on areas adjacent to national parks, and likely to affect the parks.

Comment: The problems of operating a park to meet objectives given the National Park Service by legislation are closely related to events in areas surrounding each of the parks. Effective, economical administration of each park could be materially aided by timely research of a modest extent on resource use in such surrounding areas. This research could be carried on jointly with the other agencies directly concerned.

13. Research laboratories or centers should be established for a national park when justified by the nature of the park and the importance of the research.

Comment: Such research laboratories or centers should not only serve the staff of the National Park Service but also scientists from universities and independent research organizations. Control of such centers should remain with the National Park Service. The location of such centers, and access to them, should be such as will not destroy other values of a park nor interfere with the proper use and enjoyment of a park by the public. Consideration should be given to establishing research centers, whenever possible, outside the limits of a park in some instances supported, administered and used jointly with other agencies or organizations.

14. The results of research undertaken by the National Park Service should be publishable and should be published.

Comment: Research in natural history carried out by the National Park Service should be of such quality that the results are worthy of publication and should be published. Although the research conducted by the National Park Service should be directed primarily toward park problems, it is in the public interest that the results be made available through publication, either in established journals or in a series sponsored by the National Park Service. It is recognized that on occasion research may be undertaken the results of which are not of general interest and do not require publication. Such investigations should be exceptions and not the rule.

15. Additional substantial financial support should be furnished the National Park Service for research in the national parks.

Comment: The Committee could not in the time available and from the data at hand, estimate the total cost of research, based upon the needs of each park. The Committee noted, however, that on the average, approximately 10 per cent of the annual budget was devoted in 1962 to research and development by those government agencies comparable to the National Park Service. The Committee considers this to be a reasonable basis for establishing a research budget and recommends that research in the National Park Service be supported at a level consistent with that of comparable agencies.

The Committee strongly urges that in future research appropriations and allotments within the National Park Service natural history research be given support commensurate with the key position of natural history in the preservation, restoration and interpretation of the parks. The number, variety and extent of the national parks, their unique character and international significance, as well as the complexity of their problems suggest that the allotment of money to research be of the order recommended above.

16. Cooperative planning as a result of research should be fostered with other agencies which administer public and private lands devoted to conservation and to recreation.

Comment: Various agencies in the federal government, the states, municipalities, universities, and other private or public organizations administer lands devoted to conservation and to recreation of one type or another. The National Park Service should be fully cognizant of the resources, objectives, and activities of these areas, and cooperate fully with those responsible for their administration, especially as related to natural history research.

17. Universities, private research institutions, and qualified independent investigators should be encouraged to use the national parks in teaching and research.

Comment: The national parks are a national and international scientific resource. In some respects, their natural history is unique or nearly so. They are outdoor laboratories of great scientific value and should be made available to independent investigators when the research work does not threaten deterioration of the park or interfere with its appropriate use by the public and when it can be effectively facilitated by the staff of the National Park Service.

18. Consideration should be given to including in the budget of the National Park Service an item for aid to advanced students who wish to conduct research in the national parks.

Comment: A program of this character should be considered in part a training program and a practical source of future personnel. Support for field work by advanced students is frequently inadequate, especially in natural history. It is recognized that the supervision of students places responsibilities on park personnel, and that provision for adequate supervision should be a part of any plan of the nature recommended. An expansion of those aspects of the Student Conservation Program concerned with the support of advanced students as Assistant Ranger Naturalists should be considered.

19. A Scientific Advisory Committee for the National Park Service should be established, and Scientific Advisory Committees for individual parks are desirable.

Comment: Such Advisory Committees should be working committees concerned with park problems. It should be clearly understood, however, that advisory committees are advisory, not decisionmaking bodies. The practice of engaging the assistance of *ad hoc* committees for special park problems should be continued.

20. Action in implementing the recommendations of this Committee's report should be taken promptly.

Comment: Time is an essential factor in dealing with forces that threaten the existence of certain indigenous animal and plant species and threaten or otherwise degrade park values, in some instances beyond the possibility of restoration. Among these factors are excessive human use, overgrazing, the invasion of park areas by aggressive exotic flora and fauna any interference with water supply. Studies are urgently needed to provide the basis for prompt action.

ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO THE NATIONAL PARK SERVICE ON RESEARCH

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES—NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL

Chairman: Dr. William J. Robbins, Associate Director for International Science Activities, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.

Executive secretary: Mr. C. J. S. Durham, Division of Biology and Agriculture, National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Edward A. Ackerman, executive officer, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Marston Bates, Department of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Dr. Stanley A. Cain, chairman, Department of Conservation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Dr. F. Fraser Darling, vice president, Conservation Foundation, New York, N.Y.

Dr. John M. Fogg, Jr., director, Morris Arboretum, Philadelphia, Pa.

Dr. Tom Gill, International Society of Tropical Foresters, Washington, D.C.

Dr. Joseph L. Gillson (retired), formerly with the Department of Geology and Geophysics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Mass.

Dr. E. Raymond Hall, director, Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.

Dr. Carl L. Hubbs, professor of biology, Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, Calif.

[From the National Parks Magazine, February 1967]

SOME PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES AT MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK

(By Philip M. Smith)

(NOTE.—A scientist examines one of our great cave preservations and concludes that its geologic and geographic unity can only be maintained through cooperative regional planning.)

Two recent articles in this Magazine discussed caves and cave conservation. One described the animal life at Mammoth Cave; the other cited good and bad general cave conservation practices. Neither article emphasized the relationships between man's use of the land immediately above and also inside the caves, and neither mentioned crucial conservation problems within Mammoth Cave National Park in Kentucky. The National Park Service itself has only lately begun to grasp the vital relationships between surface usage and the caves at Mammoth Cave, and the consequences of some previous management decisions. Many problems at Mammoth Cave relate to past park management and involve future management opportunities. The size and scope of the park, relations with nearby communities, water supply, pollution of the cave system with human wastes, incompatible Job Corps use, interpretation of the cave to the visitors, protection, and development of a national park research center are among them.

These problems are not exclusive to Mammoth Cave, but they make this one park a microcosm of management dilemmas facing the Park Service today. Some of the problems cannot be resolved, but those that can should furnish insight for other areas of the park system.

HISTORY OF CAVE MANAGEMENT

Some management problems at Mammoth Cave were born with the park. As with other eastern parks, land at Mammoth Cave was privately owned for nearly 150 years before the park was established. Agriculturally poor except for the bottom lands along the Green and Nolin Rivers, the land nonetheless supported about 500 families at the time the park was formed. For 100 years farm income had been supplemented by a vigorous and competitive "show cave" industry featuring cave tours of every description. Some 30 caves were open for public viewing in the years following World War I. Information about finances and the areal extent of each cave was closely guarded because of the competition. Explorers looked for caves to commercialize or to strip of cave onyx for sale to tourists. Prior to the development of the park, Mammoth Cave itself had been exhibited by a succession of owners for 100 years. Before the park was formed in 1941, two ends of Mammoth Cave were separately owned, and the confused visitor heard persuasive claims from roadside hawkers about the wonders in the rival portions of the cave.

Mammoth Cave was acclaimed as a unique geographic feature in Europe and to a lesser extent in the United States in the 19th century. Its inclusion in the National Park System was first proposed by Stephen T. Mather in 1918. Momentum for a park was slow to develop, partly because advocates of the park stressed tour entertainment rather than natural values. Although authorized in 1926, it was not until the mid-1930's that the park became a reality. Considerable acreage was purchased by the Mammoth Cave National Park Association and the Kentucky National Park Commission in the late 1930's, and the park was dedicated formally in 1942. Two privately owned caves inside the original boundaries of the park, Floyd Collins' Crystal and Great Onyx Caves, were purchased in 1960, adding approximately 600 acres to the park. Today we know more about the park, its interesting surface features and vast system of caves, than anyone knew when the proposals for the park were first advanced. A long history of tourism and enhancement of future drawing power predominated early planning. Now we know that the park contains two of the three longest cave systems in the world. Mammoth Cave has a surveyed length of 24 miles. The Flint Ridge Cave System contains at least 60 miles, of which 58 have been surveyed. The only other cave known in this size range is Hölloch in the Muota Valley, Switzerland. When government studies of a possible park began, the Flint Ridge Cave System was unknown except as isolated passages of five separate caves. Of these, four caves were significant—Floyd Collins' Crystal Cave, Great Onyx Cave, Salts Cave, and Colossal Cave. Crystal and Great Onyx were exhibited to the public. Salts and Colossal were unsuccessful as tourist caves, but the archeological importance of Salts Cave was well known.

In the 1940's and 1950's the management of Crystal Cave encouraged research and exploration. Before the cave was added to the park it was known to be the nucleus of a huge network of passages extending throughout the length and breadth of Flint Ridge. Exploration, cartography, and initiation of a considerable speleological research program in the Flint Ridge Cave System, as the interconnected cave is called, has all occurred during the last twenty years. Exploration and survey of the cave lead to a realization of the interrelationship of surface and the subterranean hydrologic and geologic processes. Today we can demonstrate that the formation of caves in Kentucky depends on water entering underground solution channels from three sources: the backflooding of the lowest level of the cave during seasonal fluctuations of the Green River; near-base level flow of water throughout the cave from the sinkhole area to the south of the park; and the water draining from the rocks overlying the caves. Rainfall in the park enters caves by way of vertical solutional channels or shafts at the edges of the ridges. An impervious shale underlying the ridges prevents water from reaching the caves except at valley walls. The first two of these water sources develop the long horizontal galleries in the cave system. The water from above the caves, on the other hand, form a spectacular silo-like voids called vertical shafts.

Underground water or its absence is also the key to the ecosystem. The most specialized subterranean ainmals, the fish and crayfish, are near the water table. Bats inhabit the cave passages protected from flooding. Beetles and other arthropods are found throughout depending on species need for food and a moist or dry environment.

BACKGROUND OF MANAGEMENT PROBLEMS

Some current management dilemmas at Mammoth Cave Park began when the park was established, prior to availability of the new knowledge of the caves. Other management decision, however, are of quite recent origin, made against a full background of knowledge about the extraordinary wilderness values of recently discovered cave areas. Thirty years ago ignorance of the great extent of the wilderness cave systems and the relation of the geologic and hydrologic processes within and outside the park was understandable. Failure to apply the new information to the solution of current problems is another matter.

From the beginning in acquisition of private holdings have come two problems that are still with the Park Service and Central Kentucky 30 years later. As with many other parks, the legislative authorization for the park was written so as to permit a minimum acceptable tract. Much land intended for inclusion in the park was omitted. As visitor pressure has grown and demand for expanded park facilities has increased, absence of this land is indeed unfortunate. Bylew Hollow is one area of particular value because of its scenic sandstone cliffs, minarets, and overhanging shelter caves. Now Bylew Hollow will be subject to increasing private, unplanned development because of accessibility from the newly completed Nolin Reservoir adjacent to the park. A more important omission at the time the park was formed was a portion of the Chester Escarpment (formerly Dripping Springs Escarpment) and the Sinkhole Plain. These areas south of the present park boundary are geologically part of the cave story, just as Jackson Hole is a logical part of the Grand Teton Park story. A national natural park should include examples of geologically-related landscape. Purchase today would be prohibitive because of soaring land values, but Mammoth Cave Park is incomplete geologically and scenically. Lands representative of missing features are being covered by sprawl. Management decisions now and in the future should recognize and resolve as well as possible the inadequacies of the original planning.

A second problem rooted in the park's origins is a community relations crisis. Displacement of families living on land incorporated in the park, coupled with competition by the Park Service and its concessionaire with privately owned tourist facilities of the region, did little to convince local communities that the park was beneficial to the central Kentucky region. Passage of time has not improved the situation. Development of new and expanded visitor facilities inside the park keeps alive a mistrust of Federal officials. Developments within the park have emphasized commercial rather than natural aspects. When the new Mammoth Cave Hotel—a structure of uninspired design—was constructed in 1965, it was allegedly to replace a 50-year-old wooden structure that was at least representative of local architectural style. The old building continues in use, virtually doubling the capacity for overnight guests in the park. This proliferation has been permitted even though it is a half-hour drive to numerous accommodations outside the park. The same kind of growth occurred at a new campground. Again the Mission 66 development program assumed the appearance of expansion rather than replacement of outmoded facilities. Local and Federal officials have disagreed strongly on the location of new highways and access roads.

The Service has recently undertaken to improve its image locally, but mistrust on both sides lingers. Where the tourist industry has long been an important source of private income, the Service's competitive interest in motels, restaurants, and other accommodations of the tourist business simply forms no basis for a mutually beneficial relationship. Local feelings concede that natural features are best managed by the Service, but visitor facilities, they feel, are a responsibility of the community.

The Great Onyx Job Corps Conservation Center in the park, completed in 1964, has intensified bad feeling and has probably postponed mutual understanding. The predominantly urban group of trainees is not accepted in communities where rural traditions and standards prevail. The question is raised, locally, about what else might be established in the national park because the land is available.

Within the park the single most important management failure has been in planning for water supply. Like many parks, Mammoth Cave has a water shortage. There is no water table as such in cavernous limestone. The water flows through joints and fractures in the limestone, in the process enlarging the cavities by dissolving the rock. The solid limestone contains no usable water—it is all in the joints and fractures, or in the streams of the enlarged cave passages. Well drilling to the water table may or may not yield water; if a joint is not tapped, yield is minimal. Water consumption by visitors and the Job Corps camp is greater than the regular flow from the park's present supply. Annual flooding and attendant problems of water treatment have steered Park Service planners away from the Green River, a plentiful if not pure source of water. They have instead exploited the relatively pure but meager flow from a perched water table in the sandstone caprock overlying the cave-bearing limestones. The water from this sandstone overburden normally goes into the cave systems below by way of vertical shafts and open joints. These springs met water demands over a 150-year period for the farming families living in the park area, and engineering planners assumed that this same supply would be adequate for the park. The initial park water system utilized the three springs on Flint Ridge. As water demand grows, this spring proves inadequate. Attempts at drilling deep wells have not been successful. The expedient solution has been adopted. The system has been expanded to include more and more of the half-dozen or so springs discharging from the sandstone rocks capping the Flint Ridge Cave System. A catchment basin system and pipelines, with attendant pumping facilities, roads, and overhead power lines, now taps every major spring around the perimeter of the Flint Ridge. Now the Flint Ridge water network is at its maximum expansion, the terrain slashed and scarred by the engineering works. When the need for water is greatest—in August when the tourist population is the greatest—flow from these springs is lowest. Although reports by the Geological Survey and the Cave Research Foundation had recommended the use of the Green River as a water supply, the management continues to hope that the present system will suffice. The only way to increase capacity is to enlarge the reservoir holding tanks to tide the park over during minimum flow years or to tap springs on other ridges. If the rate of visitor population continues to increase, water crisis is a yearly threat. Meanwhile, insensitive management decisions have led to a proliferation of engineering projects that scar the park and remove life-water from the largest wilderness cave system in the world.

SOME OTHER WATER MATTERS

Other water problems face Mammoth Cave. A Corps of Engineers proposal for a dam downstream on the Green River hopefully is now dormant. The impounded water from such a dam would flood the lower levels of the cave system, interrupting the natural cycle in the dynamic, living part of the cave. As with all uncompleted Corps of Engineers projects, the proposal must be watched at all times. A second water problem has plagued the Green River—oil and salt brine pollution from an oil field upstream. This pollution was unchecked in the early 1960's as wildcatting led to a rapid expansion of the Kentucky oil industry. The light-weight oils were floated off the oil-brine mixture as an inexpensive separation process and allowed to flow directly into the Green River. Enforcement of pollution regulations subsequently passed by the State of Kentucky has been rigid. Inspectors stopped the flow of the oil sludge and the river has since cleaned itself. Though the Park Service was actively pressing for the correction of this pollution, the vigorous action by State officials was in response to local community demands for usable river water for human and industrial purposes.

With this up-river pollution problem solved, a new one from within the park has entered the picture. The Great Onyx Job Corps Conservation Camp is served by a sewage settlement basin inadequate to handle sewage outflow from the camp. Though the settlement basin is an accepted engineering technique, its application to a wooded karst area of relatively high rainfall is poor engineering practice. The basin's effectiveness requires a relatively high degree of evaporation, and a runoff into a more normal water table. In a karst area the expected filtration does not take place. Today sludge cakes, raw sewage, and undissolved solids from the holding basin enter the Flint Ridge Cave System. At the local level, at least, the Park Service is aware of this pollution problem and is anxious to correct it.

Few can argue with the goal of the Job Corps, but one can be disturbed by the large-scale developments that accompany location of a Job Corps camp in a national park. In the 1930's men from a Civilian Conservation Corps Camp at Mammoth Cave provided the basic construction of surface and cave trails that have served until now. The Job Corps camp may have a similar benefit. Unlike the CCC camp, however, there is nothing primitive about the Job Corps camp at Mammoth Cave, which has such conveniences as automatic washers and dryers. Though living units were pre-assembled for rapid construction, permanent installations include a water system sized to support a modern community of 350 persons year-around, a 40 x 196-foot steel-framed shop building on a concrete pad, a similar building serving as a gymnasium, and a network of roads hacked through the park forests where Job Corps trainees learn to drive and operate heavy equipment. Front-loader trainees have virtually stripped off some Pennsylvanian-age gravel beds of unusual geological interest. The gravel has gone to support the road building and the building of the Job Corps camp itself.

Considering the vast developments necessary to support the Job Corps in a small park such as Mammoth Cave, the Center's location over the Flint Ridge Cave System, the bulldozer approach to scenic treasures, the pollution problem and the additional demand for water in the park, one must conclude that the Job Corps is incompatible with Mammoth Cave Park.

The management crisis in interpretation is upcoming, and may swamp Mammoth Cave in the 1970's. The number of visitors has tripled in the last ten years. Unlike Carlsbad Caverns, where the huge crowds are accommodated on a long tour around the perimeter of the spacious Big Room, tours in Mammoth Cave are confined to the examination of a series of long, relatively narrow passages. It is not easy to accommodate the throngs now arriving during peak days. The charming and leisurely exhibition of the cave to small groups by lantern is a thing of the past. The cave's silence and remoteness are gone. Present methods of dealing with the cave visitor cannot be multiplied greatly—"more of the same" will not do. An experimental self-guided tour into the Historic Entrance of Mammoth Cave to the Rotunda and to nearby features was conducted during the 1966 summer, and was highly successful. Longer tours into more remote areas, however, would be much more difficult to arrange. While more visitors can be accommodated through more rapid trips, greater use of trail-side signs, or even such devices as mechanical conveyors or taped lecture systems, the esthetic quality of the exerience will be totally lost. Already some cave trips resemble hurrying through a lighted hallway, an experience hardly different from dashing through the subway station beneath Times Square.

THE PARK IN ITS REGIONAL CONTEXT

The human history associated with the park is rich and colorful, and much of it is well presented; but the presentation stops after 1900. This is inexcusable, as the arrival of the automobile changed the whole visitor pattern at Mammoth Cave and many interesting events make up recent history. Roadside turnouts along the entry roads into the park have scenic views, but there are no interpretive exhibits to describe the geology and its relation to the cave trip the visitor will soon take.

The interpretive program requires a naturalist staff trained in cave geology and the related features of the park. The transient management of a constantly rotating naturalist force is a learning experience for Service personnel, but not for the public. The future interpretive challenges are extremely difficult and complex, and the naturalist management must be cognizant of the problems. Perhaps the only way to find optimum solutions is a new career policy which would permit specialization in individual types of parks.

A similar degree of specialization might increase the effectiveness of the protective staff. There are some 30 cave entrances in the park, and protection of the entrances is a requirement. The protection has been poor, even at times nonexistent. Since the park was established some formerly commercial caves with superb formations, such as Colossal Cave, have been stripped of formation. Patrol and protection of such features as caves are full-time jobs for one or two men who must be on the job long enough to become familiar with the area.

On the positive side, the interpretation program at Mammoth Cave has many excellent features. Evening lectures are better than average, presenting a complex geological story with reasonable accuracy and in an intelligible fashion. The concessionaire has avoided flamboyant tourist mementos to a large degree and has featured excellent handicrafts brought from the Appalachian area east of the park.

An extensive research program has been in progress at Mammoth Cave for a decade. With the exception of two studies, research has been initiated by those having an interest in the research without Service financial assistance. Since 1960, as before, the research personnel have been housed in modest facilities near Crystal Cave. Much of this work has been basic research; that is, no immediate management problem necessitated the investigation. Even though it is not specifically directed to do so, the research is contributing to and being applied by those in charge of the interpretative program. The engineering staffs have apparently overlooked any new findings. Following the remarks by former Director Conrad Wirth, that an expanded research program would be planned for Mammoth Cave and that a research center would be included in the plans, two extensive studies of a possible research center were completed and forwarded to the Park Service. Both recommended some limited laboratory facilities in Flint Ridge Cave System and one report called for a laboratory and housing complex on the surface. A decision has not been made to expand the present limited facilities and no Park Service funding has been available to investigators desiring to study in the park.

Eventually, research center plans may go forward. When they do, the Park Service will have to decide whether to support a national research center or a national park center. However, delays in any action by the Park Service have caused some cave scientists to develop alternate plans for simulated cave environments in their own campus facilities. Some successful studies in cave biology are now being conducted in these laboratories. By the time the management decision is finally made by the Park Service, the research center question may have reached a solution.

A DISCUSSION OF SOLUTIONS

Are there solutions to problems such as those outlined? There are, but they are not all immediate. Existing facilities and programs cannot be overturned or abandoned. The problem is to plan effectively now for the eventual longer-term solution to the problems, to deal realistically with matters such as water supply; seeking ultimate resolutions, not just getting beyond current crises. The key to most of the management decisions at Mammoth Cave is regional planning, encompassing the whole of the central Kentucky cave region, not just the park itself. The karst and cave features of central Kentucky are the unifying features of the region. The central Kentucky Karst represents an area of about 2000 square miles, while the park itself encompasses 70. Additional facilities for visitors must be in the areas surrounding the park and not in the limited space within the park. Drinking water for the future park visitor depends on sources external to the park. Either a pumping station must be built in the park on the Green River, where water that comes from outside the park would be tapped, or the Park Service must plan to join a water district and pipe in its water. Lack of adequate land inside the park probably cannot now be relieved by purchases of more land. The geologic and geographic unity can only be maintained through cooperative Federal, State, and local planning for the region.

A regional planning commission could preserve the integrity of the area by zoning to insure wise locations of new industries, visitor facilities, and city expansion. The Service should help rally viable local planning. The interpretative program requires a deeper view as to what the visitor to the cave should experience and remember. The visitor should be encouraged to stay in the area, not necessarily inside the park. Longer, more meaningful visits can be encouraged by cooperation, not competition between government and area residents.

There are, of course, many problems involved in effective regional planning. In rural Kentucky, zoning laws are minimal and there is a tendency to ignore potential crises. Residents consider Service personnel outsiders. Indeed, they are; for they live in an enclave inside the park. I believe that responsible local citizens can and would rise to the opportunity of regional planning. At least one major community project has been successful of late. A broad-based area fund-raising campaign with matching Federal contributions has made possible a 30-bed hospital. With the highway locations now set, a new period of planning for orderly development could begin. To take its place in a regional planning commission, the Service must give a new attention to its priorities, placing preservation of the cavern wilderness resources higher than what to do with next week's tourists. For the present, however, the Job Corps camp is the most difficult problem.

With the problems enumerated, it is evident that Mammoth Cave is a park where management has been less than adequate. One wonders how many other units of the park system face the same fate. It is clear that the focusing of citizen attention on the landmark conservation crises allows the Service to manage many areas without any review at all except at the appropriation hearing. Unfortunately, the water systems and sewage lagoons and the greatness of the parks do not get an airing at such reviews. Here is the greatest lesson in the Mammoth Cave microcosm—the management everywhere needs much more review than it is getting, and the inadequacies of the Service's transient management must be countered by an expanded interest among the citizens whose natural heritage is being abused. The Wilderness Act of 1964 provides the first clear opportunity for a citizen review of all the park areas and their management. There may not soon be another. Park management as well as park wilderness should be reviewed.

Résumé of Proposed National Park Service Natural Science Research Act

A. Congress declares a "national policy" that special care and effort should be taken to obtain the necessary information through research required to preserve our natural resources. (Sec. 1. (b).)

B. Authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to:

(1) enter into contractual agreements to promote the above policy. (Sec. 1. (b).)

(2) establish a National Park Service Natural Science Research Fellowship Program. (Sec. 2. (a).)

C. Directs the Secretary to establish an Office of Natural Science Research to be headed by a Commissioner. (Sec. 3.)

D. Defines the duties of the Commissioner of Natural Science Research. (Sec. 4 and 5.)

E. Directs the taking of periodic animal censuses. (Sec. 6.)

F. Directs the filing of reports with the Congress and affected States. (Sec. 7.)

G. Prohibits the direct destruction of animals until every practicable means available for the live-trapping and transplanting of such animals has been exhausted. (Sec. 8.)

H. Requires a special report to Congress of any threatened destruction of any area within the National Park System. (Sec. 9.)

I. Provides for the appointment of a Scientific Advisory Committee for the National Park Service. (Sec. 10.)

J. Provides for the appointment of similar Scientific Advisory Committees for individual Parks in cooperation with the Governors of affected States. (Sec. 10. (d).)

K. Sets forth definitions of terms used in the Act. (Sec. 12.)

L. Authorization for appropriations. (Sec. 13.)

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 13A OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to help arrest the decline of America's passenger railroads.

My bill would amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, known also as the Transportation Act of 1958, which provides procedures for handling proposed inter and intrastate passenger train and ferry discontinuances. The bill I propose would tighten these procedures to give more effective protection to the public against the unwarranted reduction of essential passenger services.

My bill is an alternative to S. 1175 which was introduced recently by Senator MAGNUSON, chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission. While in general I support S. 1175, I do not believe it goes far enough to overcome the inequities to the train-riding public caused by the 1958 Transportation Act.

S. 1175 is deficient in three important respects.

First, S. 1175 does not deal with a serious defect in section 13a(1), the section of the act which provides the procedures to be followed in interstate discontinuances.

Under this section it is possible for the Commission to permit a passenger train or ferry to be dropped without the agency even making an investigation or holding a hearing. Operating under the authority of 13a(1), the Commission has, between 1958 and last year, allowed 61 trains to be discontinued without any investigation whatever to determine whether the public convenience and necessity permitted the curtailments.

Perhaps the most famous ferry discontinuance dealt with under 13a(1) involved the Weehawken, N.J., ferries, which the ICC permitted to go out of business, again without investigation. As the public learned in that case, not only can a passenger service be dropped at will, but the public has no chance whatever for a review in the courts.

My bill would correct this defect by requiring the carriers to obtain affirmative authority from the ICC, or from appropriate State agencies where they exist, whenever they seek to eliminate interstate service. Under the 1958 Transportation Act, affirmative approval by the Commission already is required for the discontinuance of intrastate trains if a carrier, after failing to secure relief at the State level, requests the Commission's assistance.

My bill, in substance, would make the same requirement applicable in interstate cases the railroads ask the ICC to adjudicate.

Such a provision also would take care of situations where carriers operating in several States are free to drop the portion of their service that runs through a particular State without obtaining any official approval of either the State or the ICC.

The ICC is powerless to intervene in such situations since it takes jurisdiction over an interstate discontinuance, as it does over an intrastate case, only after a railroad applies directly to it for relief. It is safe to assume, I think, that a carrier will not seek help from the Commission when it has a virtually free hand at the State level to do as it pleases.

Second, both S. 1175 and my bill specifically require the railroads to justify passenger train curtailments rather than forcing the public to shoulder the burden of proof. But as has been shown in recent House hearings on a bill identical to S. 1175, its language is conflicting on this point. The conflict arises in the provision of the bill allowing the Commission to deny a discontinuance upon findings that the public convenience and necessity "do not permit" it, and that the continuation of a train or ferry will not unduly burden interstate or foreign commerce.

However, there is no requirement in S. 1175 that the carrier must assist the Commission in arriving at these findings. Indeed, it is hard to imagine a carrier volunteering facts and figures that might undermine its own case. In the circumstances, the public would be left with the burden of proof. Yet this is a responsibility the public has found difficult to discharge when the railroad is in possession of all the facts about its operations and is parsimonious in making those facts available for others to use.

In contrast to S. 1175, my bill, in addition to a specific provision placing the burden of proof on the railroad, permits the Commission to find for the carrier if it believes the carrier has made its case. This is a built-in incentive for the railroad to make every effort, and spare no statistic, to justify its request for a particular discontinuance. Given such an atmosphere of prompt and complete disclosure by the railroads, I believe the public interest will benefit greatly.

Third, S. 1175 does not provide the ICC with discretionary authority to impose employee protective provisions as is routinely accorded workers who lose their jobs because of train abandonments. My bill would make the employee protective provisions used in abandonments applicable to discontinuances as well.

There are two other provisions of my bill that I would like to point out.

One allows unlimited time for the Commission to consider interstate discontinuances, as is the practice in abandonments. Train curtailments may very well amount to abandonments when all service except freight is lopped off. Although under the law, technically, this is not an abandonment, it is hard to see the difference from the viewpoint of the passenger who is dependent on a particular train, or on an entire train service, for his essential transportation.

Train and ferry discontinuance cases deserve at least as much time for consideration as abandonments presently receive.

The other provision amends section 13a(2) to lengthen to from 4 to 7 months the time State regulatory bodies have for consideration of intrastate train or ferry discontinuances. The present time limit is unreasonable from the standpoint of the public interest, particularly since the public must rely on the railroads for the facts and figures upon which to build its case.

In the Erie Lackawanna Railroad's recent effort to drop all intrastate passenger trains in New Jersey, the information essential to development of the public's case was made available spasmodically, some of it only a few weeks before public hearings on the carrier's application ended. This situation is hardly conducive to preparation of a case that will adequately present the public interest.

The bill I am introducing today is by no means a cureall for the problems of the ailing American passenger railroad. Rather, it is designed to prevent the patient from dying before the right cure can be found.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1685) to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1685

A bill to amend section 13a of the Interstate Commerce Act and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13a of Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 13a) is amended to read as follows:

"13a(1). A carrier or carriers subject to this part, desiring to discontinue or change in whole or in part, the operation or service of any train or ferry operating between a point in one State or a foreign country and a point in any other State or in the District of Columbia, shall file with the Commission an application for authority to effect such discontinuance or change, and upon such filing shall mail to the Governor of each State in which such train or ferry is operated, and post in every station, depot, or other facility served thereby a notice of such filing. The carrier or carriers filing said application shall have the burden of establishing that the public convenience and necessity permit the proposed discontinuance or change, and that the continued operation or service without discontinuance or change will unduly burden interstate and foreign commerce. Within forty days following the filing of such application the Commission shall determine whether to hold a public hearing on the application. Should the Commission determine not to hold a public hearing, it shall issue an order to that effect. Should the Commission determine to hold a public hearing, it shall set the date for said hearing beginning within ninety days of the date of the filing of the application. If, after hearing, or at the time the Commission issues its order dispensing with hearing, the Commission finds that the public convenience and necessity permits the proposed discontinuance or change and that the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change would constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operation of such carrier or carriers or upon interstate commerce, it shall issue an order authorizing such discontinuance or change, subject to such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require. On and after the effective date of such order, and not before, the carrier or carriers may, without securing authority other than contained in said order, comply with the terms and conditions contained therein and proceed with the discontinuance or change. The provisions of this paragraph shall not supersede the laws of any State or the orders or regulations of any administrative or regulatory body of any State applicable to such discontinuance or change unless an application as provided in this paragraph is filed with the Commission.

"13a(2). Where the discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, by a carrier or carriers subject to this part, of the operation or service of any train or ferry operated wholly within the boundaries of a single State is prohibited by the constitution or statutes of any State or where the State authority having jurisdiction thereof shall have denied an application or petition duly filed with it by said carrier or carriers for authority to discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation or service of any such train or ferry or shall not have acted finally on such an application or petition within seven months from the presentation thereof, such carrier or carriers may petition the Commission for authority to effect such discontinuance or change. The Commission may grant such authority, in whole or in part, subject to such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require, only after full hearing and upon findings by it that (a) the present or future public convenience and necessity permit of such discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation or service of such train or ferry, and (b) the continued operation or service of such train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operations of such carrier or carriers or upon interstate commerce. When any petition shall be filed with the Commission under the provisions of this paragraph the Commission shall notify the Governor of the State in which such train or ferry is operated at least thirty days in advance of the hearing provided for in this paragraph, and such hearing shall be held by the Commission in the State in which such train or ferry is operated; and the Commission is authorized to avail itself of the cooperation, services, records and facilities of the authorities in such State in the performance of its functions under this paragraph.

"13a(3). Any State, administrative or regulatory agency of a State, or person, adversely affected or aggrieved by an order of the Commission entered pursuant to paragraphs (1) or (2) of this section, may bring suit to obtain judicial review thereof under the provisions of sections 1336, 1398, 2284 and 2321 through 2325 of the Judicial Code, 28 U.S.C. §§ 1336, 1398, 2284 and 2321–2325."

EXPANSION OF GRAND CANYON NATIONAL PARK

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to place all of the Grand Canyon of the Colorado in a national park. Representative JOHN SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, has introduced a similar bill in the House.

Beginning at Lees Ferry, the canyon extends 280 miles downstream to the Grand Wash Cliffs. There is no interruption of the canyon's continuity, no mile of it that can be described without superlatives, no justification for exposing any part of it to commercial exploitation. From end to end, the whole of Grand Canyon is an irreplaceable scenic, scientific, and recreational resource.

Most people who think they know Grand Canyon intimately might be surprised to learn that less than one-third of it is included within the existing Grand Canyon National Park—and less than half of it is contained within the park and the adjacent national monument. Outside the arbitrarily drawn boundaries of the park and monument are more than 50 miles of the canyon's upper end, in the Marble Gorge area, and nearly 100 miles of Lower Granite Gorge, at the lower end of the canyon.

Even within the existing park and monument, natural values that they were established to protect would be destroyed by hydroelectric dam and reservoir projects proposed for the canyon. Until all of Grand Canyon is reliably protected, all of it will remain in jeopardy. The time has come to give the entire canyon protection within the boundaries of an enlarged Grand Canyon National Park. This is the object of my bill.

Under pending proposals, the Colorado River would be dammed at points north—Marble Gorge—and south—Bridge Canyon—of the Grand Canyon National Park and National Monument. The length of the Colorado's course through the monument and 13 miles along the national park boundary would be flooded behind the proposed Bridge Canyon or, as it is now called, Hualapai

Dam. The Marble Gorge Dam would create a lake 300 feet deep and would inundate 40 miles of the upper Grand Canyon, as well as the undammed remnant of Glen Canyon.

Despite what many believe, the damage caused by the dams would not be localized. The 280-mile-long canyon is a physical entity, the creation of a free-flowing river. With the installation of two dams, or even one, this natural process of canyon-making would be seriously impaired, perhaps even halted. As some conservationists have put it, a living laboratory of stream erosion would be turned into a static museum piece.

Initially, some advocates of the Central Arizona project, whose purpose is to transport water from the Colorado River to the arid Phoenix-Tucson area, said the Marble Canyon and Bridge Canyon Dams were absolutely essential to the CAP. But the proposed dams never had any physical, engineering relationship to this project.

Many people assumed, and many still do, that water would be diverted into the CAP aqueduct from a reservoir behind one of the proposed Grand Canyon dams. Not so; water would not be diverted to central Arizona from Grand Canyon, but from existing Lake Havasu behind existing Parker Dam, hundreds of miles downstream on the Lower Colorado.

Nor would power generated at the proposed dams be used to pump water into central Arizona. Too expensive for that, it would be sold commercially as "peaking power" at periods of peak demand; less expensive power would be purchased from other sources to operate CAP's pumps.

Advocates of the dams in Grand Canyon claimed that revenue from the sale of electricity was needed to help pay the costs of CAP. But it was demonstrated conclusively—and finally admitted by the Bureau of Reclamation—that CAP could be built and operated without financial assistance from dams in Grand Canyon.

Ultimately, as other arguments withered under analysis, the real reason for advocating dams in Grand Canyon emerged. It was hoped that dams built with multimillion-dollar Federal subsidies would produce revenue for a development fund to be used to pay for transporting water from the Columbia River to the Colorado River basin. In other words, the dams would be simply a moneyraising gimmick.

I make no judgment at this time about a Columbia River water diversion project. Should future study show this to be sound as well as desirable, we should have it. But if and when that time comes, let us pay for it in taxes rather than by selling the Grand Canyon. In no circumstances should we consider selling this birthright of all Americans for a mess of pottage. There is no justification for sacrificing one of nature's noblest works to finance a wholly unrelated project.

Congress has recognized that water supply is a national, not merely a State, problem. As evidence of this, the Senate last year and this year passed a bill creating a National Water Commission to make a long-range study of the Nation's water problems. I was glad to both cosponsor and vote for this measure in 1966 and again this year.

We can meet the problem of water supply without despoiling the Grand Canyon or any of our other natural resources.

The administration, which never approved authorization of Bridge Canyon Dam, has withdrawn its approval of Marble Canyon Dam at this time. However, the threat to Grand Canyon remains. Bills now before Congress would authorize one or both dams. Moreover, the Federal Power Commission is considering applications for non-Federal dams at both sites. The way to extinguish this threat is to enlarge Grand Canyon National Park, removing from FPC jurisdiction the Colorado's entire course through the masterpiece it created.

The Grand Canyon is a unique treasure belonging to all the people of all the States. It belongs, in real sense, to all the people of the world. Quite probably the most famous natural attraction on our planet, it also is the most revealing geological display on earth. The highest and best use of the canyon would be to keep it as it is, undammed, undemeaned, and undiminished.

This would, in fact, be keeping faith with President Theodore Roosevelt who, during a visit to the Grand Canyon on May 6, 1903, said:

> Leave it as it is. You cannot improve on it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1686) to enlarge the boundaries of Grand Canyon National Park in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Case, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1686

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Grand Canyon National Park shall hereinafter comprise the area generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Grand Canyon National Park," numbered LNPSW–1006–GC and dated May 1967. The drawing shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

Sec. 2. Inclusion of any portion of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area that contains tribal lands or allotted lands of the Hualapai Indians shall become effective only on approval of the Hualapai Tribal Council: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to compensate the Hualapai Tribal Council annually for the value of any activity they agree to curtail to meet the standards of national park administration.

Sec. 3. Subject to the approval of the Hualapai Tribal Council and subject to the conditions, consistent with national park purposes, that they shall agree to, the parts of the Hualapai Indian Reservation depicted on the drawing referred to in the first section not now a part of the Lake Mead National Recreation Area shall be administered as a part of the Grand Canyon National Park: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to compensate the Hualapai Tribal Council annually for the value of any activity they agree to curtail to meet the standards of national park administration.

Sec. 4. Subject to the approval of the Navajo Tribal Council and subject to the conditions, consistent with national park purposes, that they shall agree to, the parts of the Navajo Indian Reservation depicted on the drawing referred to in the first section shall be administered as part of Grand Canyon National Park: *Provided,* That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to compensate the Navajo Tribal Council annually for the value of any activity they agree to curtail to meet the standards of national park administration.

Sec. 5. Subject to valid existing rights in such lands, all lands herein added to Grand Canyon National Park shall be subject to all the laws and regulations applicable to that park.

Sec. 6. Section 227 of title 16 of the United States Code is hereby repealed.

Sec. 7. The provisions of the Federal Power Act shall not apply to any portion of Grand Canyon National Park as hereby enlarged, and all existing withdrawals of the Federal Power Commission within the enlarged park are hereby vacated, and all withdrawals of the Bureau of Reclamation within the enlarged park, other than those related to Hoover Dam and Glen Canyon Dam, are hereby vacated.

REQUIREMENT OF CERTIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF CONTROLLING STOCK INTEREST IN A NATURAL GAS COMPANY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, at the request of the Federal Power Commission, a bill to require a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the acquisition of the controlling stock interest in a natural gas company, and to provide that the grant of a certificate authorizing the acquisition or either a controlling stock interest of a natural gas pipeline shall relieve the transaction from liability under the antitrust laws.

The reasons why this legislation is sought by the Commission are explained in detail in the 1966 Annual Report of the FPC and in the letter of transmittal. I ask unanimous consent that both of these items and the bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, extract from the 1966 Federal Power Commission annual report, and the letter of transmittal will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1687) to amend the Natural Gas Act to require a certificate of public convenience and necessity for the acquisition of a controlling interest, through the ownership of securities or in any other manner, of any person engaged in the transportation of natural gas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1687

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, as amended (56 Stat. 83; 15 U.S.C. 717f) is amended in the following respects:

(1) So much of the material in subsection (c), as precedes the proviso in the first paragraph is amended to read as follows:

"(c) No natural gas company or person which will be a natural gas company upon completion of any proposed construction, extension, acquisition or other transaction, shall engage in the transportation or sale of natural gas subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, or undertake the construction or extension of any facilities therefor, or acquire, lease, purchase, or operate such facilities or extensions thereof, and no person shall, in any manner, acquire control of or the power to manage, directly or indirectly, any person engaged in the transportation of natural gas subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, unless there is in force with respect to such person or natural gas company a certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission authorizing such acts, transactions, or operations. The Commission may, by rule or order, exclude from the requirements of this subsection, acquisitions of control by persons who do not engage in or control anyone engaged in the production, transportation, or sale of any fuel or source of energy."

(2) The second paragraph of subsection (c) is amended by changing "subsection (e)" to read "subsections (e) and (i)".

(3) Subsection (e) is amended by deleting the "and" which follows the words "Commission thereunder," and inserting in lieu of the words "convenience and necessity;" the following:

"convenience and necessity, and, where applicable, that the adverse effect which the proposed transaction will or may have upon competition is insubstantial or is clearly outweighed by other public interest considerations;"

(b) Section 7 of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(i) If the transaction for which application is made pursuant to the requirements of subsection (c) of this section involves the acquisition, lease, or purchase of the facilities of, or the acquisition of control of or the power to manage, directly or indirectly, any person engaged in the transportation of natural gas subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, the Commission shall notify the Attorney General of the United States and the Governors of the States in which a natural gas company participating in the transaction operates or does business, in addition to the parties specified in subsection (c) of this section. In such cases the Commission may issue a certificate of public convenience and necessity only if it finds that the adverse effect, if any, of the proposed transaction upon competition is insubstantial or is clearly outweighed by other public interest considerations. If the transaction so authorized by such certificate brings under common control or management natural gas transportation facilities or activities (subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission) of two or more natural gas companies, the transaction shall not constitute a violation of the provisions of the antitrust laws, as defined by section 1 of the Clayton Act, 38 stat. 730, 15 U.S.C. 12, and amendments and acts supplementary thereto, because of such common control or management. The Commission may define the terms "control" and "power to manage" as used in this subsection and in subsection (c) of this section by rule or order, to include, inter alia, the acquisition of securities, the use of common directors, officers, or stockholders, a holding or investment company or companies, a voting trust or trusts, but in no event shall the ownership of less than 10% of the voting securities of a natural gas company be deemed in itself to constitute control.

(c) Subsection (a) of section 20 of such Act is amended by deleting the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"The Commission may transmit such evidence as may be available concerning such acts or practices or concerning apparent violations of the Federal antitrust laws not exempted by section 7(i) of this Act to the Attorney General, who, in his discretion, may institute criminal proceedings."

The extract from the Federal Power Commission Annual Report, and letter presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

From 1966 Federal Power Commission Annual Report

Section 7(c) now provides that Commission approval must be secured for the acquisition by any person of the assets of a natural gas pipeline company. In *California v. Federal Power Commission,* 369 U.S. 482 (1962), the Supreme Court declared that the Commission's authority does not extend to approval of acquisitions of controlling stock interests in natural gas pipeline companies, that, unlike other Federal regulatory agencies possessing power to approve acquisitions, the Commission's approval of an acquisition of assets does not exempt the transaction from subsequent prosecution under the antitrust laws, and that the Commission cannot even make its statutory determination as to whether a proposed acquisition of pipeline facilities would be required by present or future public convenience and necessity as long as an antitrust action directed against the acquisition is pending in the courts. The Commission believes that where an industry is subject to such detailed regulation as it now exercises with respect to the operations of interstate pipelines, it is essential that the Commission also have authority to pass upon stock acquisitions affecting control of the pipeline. It also believes that, with respect to all acquisitions, stock or asset, the Commission should have the responsibility for determining the extent to which competition would or would not serve the public interest, and that the Commission's approval of any such transaction should immunize that transaction from prosecution under the antitrust laws.

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1967.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I transmit herewith twenty copies of a draft bill to amend sections 7 and 20 of the Natural Gas Act. The proposed amendment would require one who acquires control of an interstate natural gas pipeline company first to obtain a certificate of public convenience and necessity. It would also provide that such a transaction, if approved by the Commission, as well as a merger of facilities (which now does require Commission approval), would not constitute a violation of any provision of the antitrust laws, insofar as it involved a combination of pipeline transportation facilities and activities of two or more natural gas companies over which the Commission exercises jurisdiction.

The draft bill would correct an anomalous deficiency in the present law. The Natural Gas Act now requires that the acquisition of the assets of natural gas companies be reviewed by the Commission, but one natural gas company may gain control of another through stock acquisitions without any public review. The public interest implications, such as diminution of competition, of acquiring control through stock purchases are at least as great as those of outright purchase of pipeline facilities, yet the possibility of thus obtaining control of pipeline facilities without obtaining a certificate of public convenience or necessity remains open. The proposed bill would effectively prevent this method of evading the basic regulatory scheme.

The bill would also enable the Commission to review proposals by organizations which are not natural gas companies, including competitors of the natural gas industry, to take over control of an interstate pipeline company. There is a public interest in review of such transactions to consider their impact upon the preservation of competition and the ability of pipeline company management to function effectively.

The bill would bring the Natural Gas Act into line with the Congressional enactments for other regulated industries such as those under the ICC, the CAB and the FCC, which provide that transfer of assets or control of a regulated company, if determined to be in the public interest by the regulatory commmission, would not constitute a violation of the antitrust laws. Under the Natural Gas Act, construed in *California* v. *Federal Power Commission,* 369 U.S. 482, the FPC cannot even carry out its statutory responsibility to decide whether or not a proposed acquisition is in the public interest as long as an antitrust action is pending.

The provisions in the present draft bill have been drawn in full awareness both of the applicability of antitrust concepts to the Commission's public interest determination and of the necessity for ensuring that any immunization granted by the Commission be limited to matters over which the Commission exercises full regulatory control. First, the bill contains an express requirement that the Commission consider any adverse effects of an acquisition upon competition and approve the proposed transaction only if such effect is insubstantial or is clearly outweighed by other public interest considerations. Second, the draft bill provides that only so much of an approved transaction as combines jurisdictional natural gas pipeline facilities of two or more natural gas companies would not constitute a violation of the antitrust laws. The bill would not support a claim of immunity from antitrust actions challenging those aspects of a merger or acquisition which are outside FPC regulation and control, or even those under FPC jurisdiction but dealing with natural gas production, or those activities which the affiliated companies carry on subsequent to the approved transaction. Also, it would remain possible for a District Court to entertain the challenge of the Attorney General or a private party to the lawfulness of combining nonpipeline operations conducted by two diversified pipeline companies. It would thus assure the public that activities not under a comprehensive regulatory scheme would be judged by antitrust standards.

The bill contains express provision for participation by the Attorney General of the United States and the Governors of the affected states in Commission hearings on proposed acquisitions.

The Commission believes that the draft bill would permit improved regulation of the natural gas industry, benefiting both the gas consumer and the public at large while adequately protecting the national interest in competition.

Commissioner Ross concurs, except insofar as the bill grants the Commission authority to provide immunity from the antitrust laws. He also favors amending the bill to provide for review by the Commission of acquisition of non-utility facilities or control of a non-utility company by natural gas pipeline companies subject to the Commission's jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

Lee C. White,
Chairman.

A BILL TO AMEND THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK ACT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill "to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes."

The proposed bill has been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which Members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the RECORD at this point, together with the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury to the Vice President, dated April 28, 1967, in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1688) to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1688

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283–283k) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 15. (a) The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized to vote in favor of the resolution entitled 'Increase of $1,200,000,000 in Resources of Fund for Special Operations' proposed by the Governors at their annual meeting in April 1967 and now pending before the Board of Governors of the Bank. Upon the adoption of such resolution, the United States Governor is authorized to agree, on behalf of the United States, to pay to the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank, the sum of $900,000,000, in accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions of such resolution. The United States Governor is also authorized to vote in favor of the amendment to Annex C of the agreement, now pending before the Board of Governors of the Bank, to modify the procedure employed in the election of Executive Directors.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, for the United States share in the increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank, the sum of $900,000,000."

The letter presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT is as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 28, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill, "To amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes."

At the annual meeting of the Governors of the Inter-American Development Bank in April 1967, the Governors unanimously agreed to recommend to their governments that appropriate steps be taken to permit the adoption of two Resolutions, by December 31, 1967. The first Resolution would provide for an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations by the equivalent of $1.2 billion. Of this total, $900 million would be contributed by the United States, and the equivalent of $300 million by the Latin American members of the Bank. The increase would be paid in three equal and consecutive annual installments beginning December 31, 1967. The U.S. contribution would, of course, be subject to appropriate balance of payments safeguards.

Under a schedule of contributions completed in December 1966, the United States contributed $750 million and the Latin Americans contributed the equivalent of $150 million, for a total of $900 million. The contribution now proposed, therefore, represents a substantial increase by Latin American countries over their last contributions—both absolutely and in relation to the U.S. share—reflecting the determination of all members of the Bank to maximize self-help efforts.

The second Resolution contemplates an amendment to Annex C of the Bank's Articles of Agreement to permit a modification of the provisions which presently govern the election of executive directors. Under the Articles of Agreement the United States appoints its executive director. The remaining six executive directors are elected by the Latin American members without participation by the United States. When the procedures for the election of the Latin American directors were originally drafted in 1959, it was expected that Cuba would become a member of the Bank. When subsequent developments rendered Cuba ineligible for membership in the Bank, the balanced Latin representation which the election procedures were designed to assure, was disturbed. The proposed Resolution would rectify this situation to the satisfaction of the Latin American members, and would in no way affect United States representation or voting power in the Bank. Because the proposed Resolution involves an amendment to part of the Bank's Articles of Agreement, however, Congressional authorization is required in order that the U.S. Governor may vote for the Resolution.

The Inter-American Development Bank was established at the end of 1959 and began operations in the Fall of 1960. As the "Bank of the Alliance," it is providing a major stimulus to economic and social development in this hemisphere, through both its ordinary capital operations and its soft loan resources. By the end of 1966, the Bank had made 386 loan commitments, from both these categories, amounting to the equivalent of $1,905.3 million, and early this year total IDB lending passed the $2 billion mark. It is now estimated that the funds presently committed to the Fund for Special Operations will allow the Bank to continue lending operations at an adequate rate only through the first few months of calendar year 1968. Early replenishment of these resources is therefore required if the Bank is to continue to play its leadership role in the financing of economic and social projects, particularly in the areas of agriculture, education and health, and to intensify its efforts in initiating multinational projects. The contribution of the Latin American members of the Bank will double their last contribution to the Fund for Special Operations, reaffirming their faith in the Bank's ability to lead in promoting the development of Latin America, and evidencing their determination to meet fully the self-help requisites embodied in the Alliance.

The draft bill would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Bank to vote in favor of these two Resolutions. It would also authorize the U.S. Governor, on behalf of the United States, to agree to pay to the Fund for Special Operations over a three-year period, the sum of $900 million as the U.S. share of the increase, and authorize the appropriation of this sum. I urge the Congress to act favorably on this legislation so that the United States may continue to cooperate with our Alliance partners in the social and economic development of the hemisphere. Subject to approval of the proposed legislation, an appropriation of the first installment of $300 million will be requested for FY 1968.

The total amount requested for the next three-year period is $150 million more than for the previous three years. The increased amount will be devoted to carrying forward multinational projects designed to link the Latin American countries. At the recent meeting of the American Presidents in Punta del Este, it was decided to give priority to the mobilization of financial and technical resources for such projects. The increased responds to this decision.

A special report of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies related to the two Resolutions currently before the Board of Governors is being submitted to you and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

It would be appreciated if you would lay this proposed bill before the Senate. An identical bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the enactment of the proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY H. FOWLER.

S. 1688

A bill to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Inter-American Development Bank Act (22 U.S.C. 283–283k) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 15(a) The United States Governor of the Bank is hereby authorized to vote in favor of the resolution entitled 'Increase of $1,200,000,000 in Resources of Fund for Special Operations' proposed by the Governors at their annual meeting in April 1967 and now pending before the Board of Governors of the Bank. Upon the adoption of such resolution, the United States Governor is authorized to agree, on behalf of the United States, to pay to the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank, the sum of $900,000,000, in accordance with and subject to the terms and conditions of such resolution. The United States Governor is also authorized to vote in favor of the amendment to Annex C of the agreement, now pending before the Board of Governors of the Bank, to modify the procedure employed in the election of Executive Directors.

"(b) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation, for the United States share in the increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Bank, the sum of $900,000,000."

GENERAL REVISION OF THE PATENT LAWS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the patent law of the United States, title 35 of the United States Code and ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed as part of my remarks.

The basic approach and the essential features of this proposal have been endorsed by both the Connecticut Patent Law Association and the American Bar Association's Patents, Trademarks, and Copyright Section.

The bill is designed to update the Patent Act of 1952. In preparing this bill careful attention was given to all the recommendations contained in the Presidential Commission's report on the patent system. In addition, careful attention was given to the practical desires and interests of the individual inventor, the small corporate inventor, large corporations and the interests of the general public. As such, the bill that I propose changes the present patent system but with a view towards maintaining the strength of our present patent laws and adding where necessary, provisions to meet today's needs.

The patent system in this country has evolved over the years from decisions of the Federal courts and proceedings in the Patent Office involving the Government, the public, and the individual inventor.

Generally it has worked well. In fact, much credit must go to this country's patent system for the technological and scientific superiority of the United States. The Soviet Union has obviously realized this as evidenced by its new domestic and foreign policies concerning patents and licensing which in large part are based on this country's practices.

Last year alone the patent system was directly responsible for income from abroad in excess of $600 million. Considering the fact that the Patent Office's budget last year was $35 million, it is obvious that we are getting a substantial return on our investment. When one adds to this the investment of capital and employment of labor as a result of new inventions and the fact that close to 60 percent of the patents granted in this country are "worked" during the effective life of the patents, there is no doubt that the patent system is directly responsible for a large amount of revenue flowing into the U.S. economy.

I feel that it is imperative that we retain our system basically in its present form because it has so many highly desirable features.

It makes patent protection available on a practical basis to all segments of our economy both private and public, large and small.

It promotes early disclosure of the detailed technology encompassed within a small patent application.

There are no requirements for working the patent or paying maintenance fees to keep the patent in effect after it has been granted.

There are no long, drawn out, costly procedures during or after the grant of a patent whereby the intended patentee can be discouraged by opposition, public use, and cancellation proceedings.

Another significant asset of our patent system is the 1-year grace period. This allows the inventor to work the "bugs" out of his invention and to seek capital for commercializing it without feeling that a disclosure to third parties could be used to his detriment. In addition, it also gives inventors with trivial inventions time to decide whether the effort to secure a patent is worthwhile.

However, even though our system of patent application has been quite successful, some revisions are necessary if it is to keep pace with this country's expanding and complicated technology.

Crucial to its future and to any revisions in our patent procedures is the fact that the Patent Office budget should be increased to a minimum of $50 million. In the past its funds have not been sufficient to cope with the increased business nor with the more complex and sophisticated nature of the inventions the Patent Office is called upon to examine.

Competent patent examiners have been difficult to recruit due to the low pay and the necessity of having highly skilled examiners. People of this type are often lured away by high paying jobs in industries that require the sophisticated skills these men possess.

Perhaps the most significant revision I propose in my bill is a change in measuring the life of the patent so that it is measured from the date of filing of the application.

This is in line with the procedures of most industrial nations of the world. This change will help to cut down on the long pendency of applications as a result of delays occasioned by repeated filing of the same inventions by the same inventor and by dilatory tactics by parties involved in interference proceedings in the Patent Office. In conjunction with this change, the life of a patent would be extended from 17 to 20 years.

A proper safeguard to measuring the term of the patent from its filing date it provided for in section 154(c) of this bill, so as to extend the time of any patent when its grant is delayed by reason of Government secrecy orders.

In addition, while interference constitutes only 1 percent of the applications filed, my proposed section 135(e) should go a long way toward resolving interference in the Patent Office by limiting the parties' date of proofs.

It also encourages inventors to file early, not to engage in repeated filing, and would cut down appreciably on the work of the Patent Office in this area of its operations.

Section 111, 115, and 152 are designed to harmonize our patent system with those of other countries by allowing the inventor or his assignee to file his applications. This is done with proper safeguards and credits to the individual inventor or inventors, whichever the case may be.

I have followed the suggestions of the Presidential Commission by putting into this bill an infringement provision which is in harmony with other patent systems of the world. This is contained in section 271(e) and concerns the importation of infringing goods made by the process patented in this country.

And section 184 allows for the grant of a retroactive license after the grant of a patent for purposes of foreign filing. This revision should correct a problem which has long plagued the Patent Office as well as the courts and inventors.

In conclusion, the objective of this bill is to solve the current and immediate problems of our patent system. And equally important, the proposed bill would keep this system in its historic context, that of making patent protection available to the whole population on a practical, everyday level.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1691) for the general revision of the Patent Laws, title 35 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Dodd is as follows:

COMPARISON OF THE DODD BILL WITH THE CURRENT PATENT LAWS

1. Sections 12, 13 and 14 have been eliminated from the current Act and the following Section included as Section 12:

"SEC. 12. RESEARCH AND STUDIES.—The Commissioner shall conduct a program of research and development to improve and expedite the handling, classification, storage and retrieval of patents and other scientific and technical information."

2. Sections 25 and 26 have been cancelled from the current Act and the following Section 25 and Section 26 substituted in their place:

"SEC. 25. OATH AND DECLARATION IN LIEU OF OATH.—

"(a) An oath to be filed in the Patent Office may be made before any person within the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States authorized to administer oaths, or before any officer authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country in which the applicant may be, whose authority shall be proved by certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, and such oath shall be valid if it complies with the laws of the state or country where made.

"(b) The Commissioner may by rule prescribe that any document to be filed in the Patent Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be under oath may be subscribed to by a written declaration in such form as the Commissioner may prescribe, such declaration to be in lieu of the oath otherwise required.

"(c) Whenever such written declaration is used, the document must warn the declarant that willful false statements and the like are subject to punishment including fine or imprisonment, or both.

"SEC. 26. EFFECT OF DEFECTIVE EXECUTION.—Any document to be filed in the Patent Office and which is required by any law, rule, or other regulation to be executed in a specific manner may be provisionally accepted by the Commissioner despite a defective execution, provided a properly executed document is submitted within such time as may be prescribed."

3. Section 100 has added thereto the following language:

"(d) The term 'applicant' means any person who has filed an application for patent as provided in this title."

4. Section 111 is deleted from the current Act and new Section 111 substituted as follows:

"Sec. 111. Application for Patent.—

"(a) An application for patent may be filed by the inventor, the owner of the invention sought to be patented, or a person who otherwise shows sufficient proprietary interest in the invention sought to be patented. The application shall be made in writing to the Commissioner, shall be signed by the applicant and include the name of each person believed to have made an inventive contribution, and shall be accompanied by the prescribed fee. An application filed by a person not the inventor shall include, at the time of filing, a statement of the facts supporting the allegation of ownership of the invention.

"(b) A complete application for patent shall include:

"(1) a specification as prescribed by Section 112 of this title;

"(2) a drawing as prescribed by Section 113 of this title; and

"(3) if filed by the inventor, an oath prescribed by Section 115(a) of this title."

5. Sections 115 and 116 have been deleted from the current Act and the following sections substituted:

"Sec. 115. Oath of Applicant.—

"(a) The applicant for a patent, if he is the inventor, shall make oath that he believes himself to be the original and first inventor of the subject matter sought to be patented and shall state of what country he is a citizen.

"(b) The applicant for a patent, if he is not the inventor, shall prior to the grant of a patent:

"(1) file an oath by the inventor containing the averment prescribed in subsection (a) of this section and

"(2) record in the Patent Office an assignment, if ownership resulted from an assignment, or proof of ownership, in other cases.

"(c) The applicant who has filed an application for patent pursuant to Section 117 of this title may make the oath required by subsection (b) of this section, so varied in form that it can be made by him.

"Sec. 116. Joint Inventors.—

"(a) When two or more persons have made inventive contributions to subject matter claimed in an application, they shall apply for a patent jointly and each sign the application and make the required oath, or, if the application is filed by some other person having the right to do so, they shall be named as the inventors.

"(b) In an application for patent for a joint invention, it shall not be necessary for each person named as joint inventor to be a joint inventor of the invention asserted in each claim.

"(c) If a joint inventor refuses to join in an application for patent or cannot be found or reached after diligent effort, the application may be made by the other inventor on behalf of himself and the omitted inventor. The Commissioner, on proof of the pertinent facts and after such notice to the omitted inventor as he prescribes, may publish the application and grant a patent to the inventor making the application, subject to the same rights which the omitted inventor would have had if he had been joined. The omitted inventor may subsequently join in the application."

6. Section 118 has been deleted from the current Act and the following substituted in its place:

"Sec. 118. Action When No Oath or Assignment Can Be Obtained.—Whenever an application is filed by someone not the inventor and the inventor refuses to execute the oath required by Section 115(b)(1) of this title or an assignment, or cannot be found or reached after diligent effort, the Commissioner may, on proof of the pertinent facts and a showing by the applicant that such action is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties, and on compliance with such regulations as he prescribes, grant a patent in the name of the inventor."

7. The second paragraph of Section 119 has been deleted from the current Act and the following paragraph substituted in its place.

"(b) No application for patent shall be entitled to this right of priority unless the claim thereof and a certified copy of the original foreign application, specification and drawings upon which it is based are filed in the Patent Office within six months of the application filing date. Such certification shall be made by the Patent Office of the foreign country in which filed and show the date of the application and the filing of the specification and other papers. The Commissioner may require a translation of the papers filed if not in the English language and such other information as he deems necessary."

8. Section 121 has been deleted from the current Act and the following section substituted in its place:

"Sec. 121. Divisional Application.—

"(a) If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one complete application, the Commissioner may require the application to be restricted to one of them. The Commissioner may by rule dispense with signing and execution in the case of an application directed solely to subject matter described and claimed in the original application.

"(b) If the other invention is made the subject of a divisional application which complies with the requirements of Section 120 of this title, it shall be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the original application. A patent issuing on an application with respect to which a requirement for restriction under this section has been made, or on an application filed as a result of such a requirement, shall not be used as a reference either in the Patent Office or in the courts against a divisional application or against the original application or any patent issued on either of them, if the divisional application is filed before the issuance of the patent on the other application.

"(c) The validity of a patent may not be questioned for failure of the Commissioner to require the application to be restricted under subsection (a) of this section, nor may the validity of either of two or more patents resulting from and in accordance with a requirement under said subsection (a) be questioned solely because of the existence of several patents, if the subsequent application is filed in accordance with the provisions of Section 120 of this chapter."

9. Section 135 has added thereto the following paragraph:

"(e) In making determinations of priority under this section and other sections of the Statute, a party shall be able to show any and all acts of conception and reduction to practice but shall only be entitled to rely upon dates of such acts no earlier than two years prior to the date of filing the first filed parent application for patent in the United States Patent Office."

10. Section 141 has been cancelled from the Act and the following section substituted in its place:

"Sec. 141. Appeal to Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.—An applicant dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Appeals may appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. A party to an interference dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Patent interferences on the question of priority may appeal to the United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals."

11. Sections 145 and 146 have been cancelled from the current Act.

12. Section 152 has been deleted from the current Act and the following substituted in its place:

"Sec. 152. Issue of Patent to Assignee.—Patents may be granted to the assignee of the inventor of record in the Patent Office, upon the application made by the inventor or assignee as otherwise provided by this title."

13. Section 154 has been deleted and the following substituted in its place:

"Sec. 154. Contents and Term of Patent.—

"(a) Every patent shall contain a grant to the applicant, his heirs or assigns, of the right, during the term of the patent to exclude others from making, using, or selling the invention throughout the United States, referring to the specification for the particulars thereof. A copy of the specification and drawings shall be annexed to the patent and be a part thereof.

"(b) The term of a patent shall expire twenty years from the date of filing the application in the United States or, if the benefit of the filing date in the United States of a prior application is claimed, from the earliest such prior date claimed. In determining the term of the patent, the date of filing any application in a foreign country which may be claimed by the applicant shall not be taken into consideration.

"(c) The term of a patent whose issuance has been delayed by reason of the application having been ordered kept secret under Section 181 of this title shall be extended for a period equal to the delay in issuance of the patent after the notice of allowability referred to in Section 183 of this title."

14. The following paragraph was added to Section 184:

"(c) A retroactive license may be granted at any time notwithstanding the fact that a corresponding United States application has matured into a patent. Such retroactive license shall have the same force and effect as if granted during the pendency of said application."

15. The third paragraph of Section 251 has been changed to read as follows:

"(c) The provisions of this title relating to applications for patent shall be applicable to applications for reissue of a patent."

16. Section 256 was deleted and the following substituted in its place:

"Sec. 256. Correction of Named Inventor.—Omission of an inventor's name or inclusion of the name of a person not an inventor, without deceptive intent shall not affect validity of a patent, and the patent and patent application may be corrected at any time by the Commissioner in accordance with regulations established by him or upon order of a Federal court before which the matter is called in question. Upon such correction the Commissioner shall issue a certificate accordingly."

17. The following was added to Section 271:

"(e) Whoever, without authority of the patentee, imports into the United States, for purposes of trade or use in trade or industry, a product made in another country by a process patented in the United States shall be liable as an infringer."

AMENDMENT OF TITLE XI OF THE FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, TO PROHIBIT THE SALE OF AIR TRIP INSURANCE AT AIRPORTS, EITHER BY VENDING MACHINE OR OVER THE COUNTER, IN EXCESS OF $100,000

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduce by request, and for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, to prohibit the sale of air trip insurance at airports, either by vending machine or over the counter, in excess of $100,000.

The bill would apply only to airport sales of trip insurance and would not prohibit the sale of general travel insurance by agents or insurance companies directly.

The purpose of the bill is to remove what the commercial airline pilots of this country believe is the primary incentive for aircraft sabotage, financial motivation. These pilots, represented by the Air Lines Pilots Association, claim that there have been 19 incidents of known or suspected sabotage of aircraft since 1933. Of these, six have occurred in the United States with a resulting loss of 210 lives.

The problem of aircraft sabotage has been one of the main concerns of commercial pilots in this country and for a number of years they have sought relief in the Congress through bills to reduce or eliminate air trip insurance.

The bill I introduced today is similar to one I sponsored in the 89th Congress, although the liability limits are higher. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the Record following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1692) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 in order to limit the liability of trip insurance sold within the confines of an airport, introduced by Mr. Monroney was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1692

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title XI of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"INSURANCE LIMITATION

"Sec. 1112. (a) In any case in which—

"(1) one or more contracts of insurance are purchased within the confines of an airport to cover the loss of life or the personal injury of an individual while a passenger in air transportation on a one-way or round trip or during a limited period of time approximately covering the duration of a trip;

"(2) such contract or contracts provide for a total payment, in the event of liability in excess of $100,000, such part of the total liability so provided for as is in excess of $100,000 shall be null and void.

"(b) In any such case involving more than one such contract each such contract shall bear such portion of the $100,000 liability remaining, after nullification of the total in excess thereof pursuant to subsection (a), as the amount of payment provided in such contract bears to the total amount of payment provided in all such contracts.

"(c)(1) Any person selling insurance to which the provisions of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) apply shall (A) provide adequate public notice of the provisions of this section in connection with such sales, and (B) insert as a provision in each contract of such insurance the fact that such contract was sold within the confines of an airport.

"(2) The Administrator shall establish such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this subsection."

Sec. 2. The amendment made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to contracts entered into after the date of enactment of this Act.

PROVISION THAT BILLS AND STATEMENTS OF ACCOUNT PREPARED BY ELECTRONIC DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BE CLASSIFIED AS FIRST-CLASS MAIL

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I introduced by request, and for appropriate reference, legislation to provide that bills and statements of account prepared by electronic data processing equipment be classified as first-class mail.

The need for this legislation arose recently when the Office of the General Counsel of the Post Office Department made a determination that computer-produced material could not properly be classified as "typewriting." Under present law, bills and statements of account can go at the lower third-class rate if produced by any photographic or mechanical process other than typewriting and if 20 or more identical copies are mailed at one time. Prior to the General Counsel's ruling the Post Office Department had held that computer-produced material was similar to material produced by automatic typewriters and therefore must be sent at first-class rates. The Post Office Department estimates that if the law remains unchanged it will cost the Department at least $20 million in revenues annually.

This bill would simply classify all computer-produced billings as first-class mail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1693) to provide that bills and statements of account prepared by electronic data processing equipment be classified as first-class mail; introduced by Mr. Monroney, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 187

Mr. MANSFIELD proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 188

Mr. GORE (for himself and Mr. Williams of Delaware) proposed an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, to the amendment No. 187, proposed by the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], which was ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 189

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill H.R. 6950, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at the next printing of S. 876, my bill relating to Federal support of education of Indian students in sectarian institutions of higher education, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1681) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 1591) to amend the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF NOMINATION BY THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I desire to announce that today the Senate received the following nomination:

Andrew V. Corry, of Montana, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Maldive Islands.

In accordance with the committee rule, this pending nomination may not be considered prior to the expiration of 6 days of its receipt in the Senate.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1290—NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1967

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Securities of the Committee on Banking and Currency will begin hearings on Tuesday, June 27, 1967, on S. 1290, a bill to provide for a national program of flood insurance, and any other bills on the same subject matter pending at that time before the subcommittee. The hearings will commence at 10 a.m. in room 5302, New Senate Office Building, and will continue on June 28 and 29.

Persons desiring to testify or to submit written statements in connection with this bill should notify Mr. Paul M. Penick, assistant counsel, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-3921.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 9481) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPUBLICAN STAFF REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of today, entitled "Vietnam Reminders for Republicans."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> ### Vietnam: Reminders for Republicans
>
> The "white paper" just put out by the staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee makes important contributions to the discussion of Vietnam: It helps set the record straight, it asks the right questions, and it defines the possible shape of the political issue for next year.
>
> To start with the history of the war, the Johnson Administration has sought to foster the impression that the heavy U.S. military involvement represents an extension of policies pursued by the Eisenhower Administration. Not so, says the GOP study, and quite correctly.
>
> Although the U.S. had a small military advisory mission in Vietnam, President Eisenhower specifically refused to intervene to try to save the French garrison at Dienbienphu in 1954. Thereafter, he "stuck to his basic position that if there was a solution in South Vietnam, it was political and not military, insofar as the U.S. was concerned."
>
> It was President Kennedy who significantly increased the military commitment—a "qualitative shift," the document calls it. And it was of course President Johnson who, two years ago, began putting in thousands of American combat troops—a "quantitative change." Republicans, the staff study adds, have traditionally believed the U.S. should not get involved in a land war on the Asian continent.
>
> Thus reminding GOP Presidential prospects that they have an historical basis for disassociating themselves from Mr. Johnson's military policy if they choose, the white paper proceeds to imply that the present Administration is not very clear about its objectives in Southeast Asia.
>
> The basic questions, it contends, are: What precisely is our national interest in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos? To what further lengths are we prepared to go in support of this interest?
>
> It seems plain enough that the Administration has been unable to answer these questions satisfactorily. One proffered answer is that the ultimate U.S. interest is to thwart a Red Chinese design for aggression, but the argument is a bit tortuous.
>
> Although it unquestionably has designs for aggression, the Peking regime is not in fact fighting in Vietnam, and the U.S. interest in battling the Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars seems somewhat remote and tangential. To put it another way, if primary U.S. interests had been weighed in a hard-headed and realistic fashion, it is doubtful that the decision to fight this land war would have been made.
>
> The Republican polemic does not answer these questions either. But again, as with the historical disassociation, it makes potential ammunition against the Democrats for any GOP politico inclined to use it.
>
> Republican Senators are divided on the report, but at least some appear inclined to agree with it. Whether the Republican contenders, and the eventual Republican-standard-bearer, will in fact decide to oppose "Mr. Johnson's war" remains to be seen; if they do, it is difficult to speculate on the political merit of that strategy. While some polls show the majority of Americans backing the war, there is not only a great deal of noisy dissent but also a great deal of less vocal dissatisfaction.
>
> In any case, here too the GOP study makes a valuable point. The party should not be constrained from opposition, or vigorous questioning, out of any misplaced devotion to bipartisanship in foreign affairs—certainly not so long as this remains a war undeclared by Congress.
>
> Obviously criticism can get so extreme that it may hurt the war effort, but intelligent questioning and proposing of alternative courses are essential to a free society's well-being. The trouble with bipartisanism is that it may cement the nation into a wrong policy.
>
> Or as the study asks, "Does bipartisanship mean that Democratic mistakes are Republican responsibilities?" If the big involvement in Vietnam was indeed a mistake, then responsible political opposition might possibly help the nation avoid repeating it.

Mr. COOPER. The editorial discusses the report made by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee on the war in Vietnam. I do not offer this editorial for the Record in any attempt to stir up partisanship with respect to the war in Vietnam. However, I believe that the so-called white paper which has been reported by the Senate Republican policy committee asks some very important questions for the consideration not only of Republicans but also of all Members of the Congress and the people of the United States.

I quote from the first paragraph of the editorial:

> The "white paper" just put out by the staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee makes important contributions to the discussion of Vietnam: It helps set the record straight, it asks the right questions, and it defines the possible shape of the political issue for next year.

I now read the next to the last paragraph:

> Obviously criticism can get so extreme that it may hurt the war effort, but intelligent questioning and proposing of alternative courses are essential to a free society's well-being. The trouble with bipartisanism is that it may cement the nation into a wrong policy.

When the proposal was made that the staff make this study, the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] chairman of the Republican policy committee said that he would request the staff to do so and stated——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hollings in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. COOPER. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER (continuing). That the study would be made without any preconceived position, bias or prejudice, that the staff would be requested to conduct its own research and find the facts as they appeared to the members of the staff. I believe the staff has done this and that its report is an honest appraisal. In searching for the truth, the committee could not ask a staff to do anything except to seek the facts and to draw its conclusion from those facts.

I am not interested in seeking in the report a partisan political position. It does not help in solving the chief issue at stake.

Its importance is larger than evaluating and analyzing what has happened in the past, although that is important to provide help in dealing with the situation today and in learning lessons for the future. Its chief importance is that it proposes to Members of the Senate, Members of the House, and the people, that they continue to search for alternatives to a continuation of the war—a war in which the United States will be bogged down for a long time, and a war which can lead to the unhappy possibility that at some time our country and North Vietnam will come to that last confrontation where Vietnam will be tempted to ask China to intervene, and China will intervene.

It is the continuing search for alternatives that I believe gives hope. We have talked a lot about negotiations in the past, and it appears at times that negotiations are impossible. But I would voice the belief that this position is not correct, that it is not true, and that our Government should continue to seek new avenues toward negotiation, and that at the least we should not put ourselves in a position where the possibility of negotiation is foreclosed.

In 1962, 1963, 1964, 1965, and 1966 I spoke on Vietnam. My theme always has been the pursuit of negotiations, to determine if there was any possibility of a peaceful solution to this war. Speaking in the Senate in March 1965, I urged the President to make a statement that our country would negotiate without any preconditions—unconditionally.

A month later he did make that speech at Johns Hopkins. Early in 1966 I urged that the bombing pause be continued to test the possibility of negotiations, and early this year I made the same statement. Some time later, perhaps next week, I intend to speak again on this subject and again voice my hope that our country will not place itself in such a position in Vietnam that the possibilities of negotiations will be lessened or perhaps denied.

Today I wish to say that I believe the chief importance of this report which has been made by the staff of the Republican policy committee is that it states in essence and by implication that we should not accept as final, all that was done in the past, that we should keep our minds open, voice our opinions, and continue to seek a solution or settlement of the war other than on the field of arms.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ANTIBALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM—WITHDRAWAL OF U.S. TROOPS FROM EUROPE

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I have read in the press stories relative to what would seem to be a difference of opinion relative to the building of an antiballistic missile system, and also on the question of U.S. troop withdrawals from Europe.

It would be my hope that the letter which Ambassador Thompson handed to Premier Kosygin in Moscow in January of this year when he assumed his duties once again as Ambassador to the Soviet Union, which called for consultations on the part of both countries to consider ways and means to prevent both countries from building antiballistic missile systems, would be given a chance to be considered because if we start on an ABM race it is my understanding that it will cost this country anywhere from $30 billion to $40 billion. I assume it would cost the Soviet Union somewhat the same amount of money, and even then, neither country would be assured of the protection which the antiballistic missile system supposedly would give.

Of course, if there is no way to arrive at a mutually satisfactory agreement, I would assume that we would have no choice except to start digging in and making a system of our own. But it appears that if we embark on an arms race in this particular area we are laying the groundwork for future trouble which will not be beneficial to either country, or the world for that matter; and it could well end up as a waste of money, because at the end of it there would still be a standoff.

I would hope that we would give the most serious consideration, and that the Soviet Union would, too, to some sort of mutual agreement which would forestall the beginning of an arms race in this field, which could go into tens of billions of dollars, and allow both countries, if such an agreement were reached, to spend some of this money for the welfare of their own peoples, for the betterment of their own societies, and for a modicum of assistance, at least, to some of the underdeveloped and undeveloped countries of the world.

This is a most serious situation and I commend the administration for trying to work it out with the Soviet Union. I would hope that the Soviet Union would look at it in the same light as the civilian authorities in this country do.

Mr. President, the second matter refers to the question of U.S. troop withdrawals from Europe.

It is my understanding that there was considerable opposition to this suggestion, and from the military point of view that opposition was perhaps well founded; but I would like to commend the administration on this matter, and to point out that on the basis of announcements already made there will be a total reduction in Europe of 115,000 U.S. military personnel, military dependents, as well as civilian employees when the tripartite agreement recently announced goes into effect.

Broken down, that would include the withdrawal from France of 18,000 troops—of course, they are no longer there—and from Germany there would be 35,000 troop withdrawals to begin, I believe, the first of next year; or a total amounting to 53,000 U.S. troops withdrawn.

On the matter of dependents, 21,000 have already been withdrawn from France, and 25,000 I assume will be withdrawn from Germany beginning the first of next year; or a total of 46,000 military dependents will have left or will leave Europe.

In the matter of civilian employees, the withdrawal from France brought about a reduction of 11,000 in that category, and the announced reductions from the Federal Republic of West Germany will bring about a reduction of 5,000 in civilian employees in that country. That would be a total of 16,000 civilian employees who would be removed from the rolls in France and Germany.

The grand total of 53,000 troops withdrawn or to be withdrawn, 46,000 military dependents withdrawn or to be withdrawn, and 16,000 civilian employees removed or to be removed would amount to 115,000. This, I think, is an encouraging first step. I commend the administration for what it has done, and I believe we are facing up to the realities of the Europe of today and not the Europe of 15 years ago.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to executive business, for the purpose of considering Executive G, 88–1; Executive A, 90–1; and Executive G, 90th Congress. These are Executive Calendar Nos. 16, 17, and 18.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of Executive G, 88th Congress, first session; A and G, 90th Congress, first session.

CONVENTIONS CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS AND DOCUMENTS; AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 109 OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS; AND CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, 1961

Mr. **MANSFIELD.** Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have all three conventions reported.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection the clerk will report the three conventions.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in the Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider Executive G, 88th Congress, first session; and Executives A and G, 90th Congress, first session; Executive G, 88–1, concerns the international exchange of publications and documents; Executive A, 90–1, is an amendment to article 109 of the United Nations Charter; and Executive G, 90th Congress, is the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, which were read the second time, as follows:

[Executive G, 88th Cong., first sess.]

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EXCHANGE OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS AND GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS BETWEEN STATES, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AT ITS TENTH SESSION, PARIS, 3 DECEMBER 1958

The General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, meeting in Paris from 4 November to 5 December 1958, at its tenth session,

Convinced that development of the international exchange of publications is essential to the free exchange of ideas and knowledge among the peoples of the world,

Considering the importance accorded to the international exchange of publications by the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Being aware of the provisions for the exchange of official publications and government documents for the International Exchange of Official Documents, Scientific and Literary Publications and in the Convention for the Immediate Exchange of Official Journals, Public Parliamentary Annals and Documents, concluded in Brussels on 15 March 1886 and in various regional agreements for the exchange of publications.

Recognizing the need for a new international convention concerning the exchange of official publications and government documents between States,

Having before it proposals concerning the exchange of official publications and government documents between States constituting item 15.4.1 on the agenda of the session,

Having decided, at its ninth session, that these proposals should be made the subject of international regulation by way of an international convention,

Adopts, this third day of December 1958, the present Convention.

ARTICLE 1

Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents

The Contracting States express their willingness to exchange their official publications and government documents, on a reciprocal basis, in accordance with the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 2

Definition of Official Publications and Government Documents

1. For the purpose of the present Convention, the following are considered official publications and government documents when they are executed by the order and at the expense of any national governmental authority: parliamentary documents, reports and journals and other legislative papers; administrative publications and reports from central, federal and regional governmental bodies; national bibliographies, State handbooks, bodies of law, decisions of the Courts of Justice; and other publications as may be agreed.

2. However, in the application of the present Convention, the Contracting States shall be free to determine the official publications and government documents which shall constitute exchange material.

3. The present Convention does not apply to confidential documents, circulars and other items which have not been made public.

ARTICLE 3

Bilateral Agreements

The Contracting States, whenever they deem it appropriate, shall enter into bilateral agreements for the purpose of implementing the present Convention and regulating matters of common concern arising out of its application.

ARTICLE 4

National Exchange Authorities

1. In each Contracting State, the national exchange service or, where no such service exists, the central authority or authorities designated for the purpose, shall carry out the functions of exchange.

2. The exchange authorities shall be responsible within each Contracting State for the implementation of the present Convention and of bilateral agreements as referred to in Article 3, wherever appropriate. Each Contracting State shall give its national exchange service or the central exchange authorities the powers required to obtain the material to be exchanged and sufficient financial means to carry out the functions of exchange.

ARTICLE 5

List and Number of Publications for Exchange

The list and number of official publications and government documents for exchange shall be agreed between the exchange authorities of the Contracting States. This list and the number of official publications set forth in the Convention for exchange may be modified by arrangements between such authorities.

ARTICLE 6

Method of Transmission

Transmissions may be made directly to exchange authorities or to recipients named by them. The method of listing consignments may be agreed between exchange authorities.

ARTICLE 7

Transport Charges

Unless otherwise agreed, the exchange authority which undertakes the transmission shall bear the cost thereof as far as destination, but for transport by sea, the cost of packing and carriage shall be paid only as far as the customs office of the port of arrival.

ARTICLE 8

Rates and Conditions of Transport

The Contracting States shall take all the necessary measures to ensure that the exchange authorities benefit from the most favourable existing rates and transport conditions, whatever the means of transport chosen: post, road, rail, inland or sea transport, airmail or air cargo.

ARTICLE 9

Customs and Other Facilities

Each Contracting State shall grant is exchange authorities exemption from customs duties for both imported and exported material under the provisions of the present Convention or under any agreement in implementation thereof and shall accord them the most favourable treatment as regards customs and other facilities.

ARTICLE 10

International Co-ordination of Exchange

To assist the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in the performance of the functions concerning the international co-ordination of exchange assigned to it by its Constitution, the Contracting States shall send to the Organization annual reports on the working of the present Convention and copies of bilateral agreements entered into in accordance with Article 3.

ARTICLE 11

Information and Studies

The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shall publish information received from the Contracting States in conformity with Article 10 and shall prepare and publish studies on the working of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 12

Assistance of Unesco

1. The Contracting States may call upon the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for technical assistance in connexion with any problem arising out of the application of the present Convention. The Organization shall accord such assistance within the limits fixed by its programme and its resources, in particular, for the creation and organization of national exchange services.

2. The Organization is authorized to make, on its own initiative, proposals on these matters to the Contracting States.

ARTICLE 13

Relation to Previous Agreements

The present Convention shall not affect obligations previously entered into by the Contracting States by virtue of international agreements. It shall not be construed as requiring a duplication of exchanges conducted under existing agreements.

ARTICLE 14

Languages

The present Convention is drawn up in English, French, Russian and Spanish, the four texts being equally authoritative.

ARTICLE 15

Ratification and Acceptance

1. The present Convention shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by States members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.

2. The instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

ARTICLE 16

Accession

1. The present Convention shall be open for accession by all States not members of the Organization invited to do so by the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

ARTICLE 17

Entry into Force

The present Convention shall enter into force twelve months after the date of the deposit of the third instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, but only with respect to those States which have deposited their respective instruments on or before that date. It shall enter into force for each other State which deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, twelve months after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession.

ARTICLE 18

Territorial Extension of the Convention

Any Contracting State may, at the time of ratification, acceptance or accession, or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization that the present Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for whose international relations it is responsible. The said notification shall take effect twelve months after the date of its receipt.

ARTICLE 19

Denunciation

1. Each Contracting State may denounce the present Convention on its own behalf or on behalf of any territory for whose international relations it is responsible.

2. The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

3. The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation.

ARTICLE 20

Notifications

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization shall inform the States members of the Organization, States not members of the Organization referred to in Article 16, as well as the United Nations, of the deposit of all the instruments of ratification, acceptance and accession provided for in Articles 15 and 16 and of the notifications and denunciations provided for respectively in Articles 18 and 19.

ARTICLE 21

Revision of the Convention

1. The present Convention may be revised by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, any such revision, however, binding only those States which shall become parties to the revising convention.

2. Should the General Conference adopt a new convention revising the present Convention in whole or in part, and unless the new convention otherwise provides, the present Convention shall cease to be open to ratification, acceptance or accession as from the date when the new revising convention enters into force.

ARTICLE 22

Registration

In accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the present Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Done at Paris, this fifth day of December 1958, in two authentic copies bearing the signatures of the President of the tenth session of the General Conference and of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which shall be deposited in the Archives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and certified true copies of which shall be delivered to all the States referred to in Articles 15 and 16 as well as to the United Nations.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization during its tenth session which was held in Paris and declared closed the fifth day of December 1958.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this fifth day of December 1958.

The President of the General Conference
JEAN BERTHOIN,
The Director General
LUTHER H. EVANS,

Certified copy, Paris, 8 January 1959.

H. SABA,
Legal Adviser
of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION—PROCÈS-VERBAL RELATING TO THE CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EXCHANGE OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS AND GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS BETWEEN STATES, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AT ITS TENTH SESSION, PARIS, 3 DECEMBER 1958

We, the undersigned, Jean Berthoin, President of the tenth session of the General Conference, and Vittorino Veronese, Director-

General, having studied the English text of the Convention concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States, certified as authentic on 5 December 1958, together with the certified true copies thereof, drawn up in conformity with the said Convention, have noted misprints or inversions in the said text, as well as in the certified true copies, in the following clauses:

Preamble, fourth paragraph.
Article 5, second sentence.
Article 16, second paragraph.

Having noted that the Report of the Programme Commission of the tenth session of the General Conference (document 10 C/Resolutions, p. 109) includes the following paragraph:

"148. *Draft conventions on the international exchange of official publications and non-official publications.* The Programme Commission received a report from its Working Party on Draft International Conventions and Recommendations in which the Working Party recorded its unanimous decision to propose that the Programme Commission transmit the two draft conventions contained in Annexes I and II of document 10 C/12 for adoption by the General Conference. The Programme Commission *approved* this proposal. In doing so, the Commission referred to the Legal Committee a question which had been raised by the delegate of the United Kingdom concerning the precise procedural steps to be prescribed following the adoption of these conventions by the General Conference. The Commission received a report on this subject from the Legal Committee (document 10 C/PRG/4) and *approved* the proposal contained therein that Article 14 of the draft convention concerning the international exchange of publications and Article 15 of the draft convention concerning the exchange of official publications be amended by the insertion, in their paragraphs 1 and 2, after the word 'ratification', of the words 'or acceptance' and that consequential amendments be made to the other relevant articles of the two draft conventions."

Having noted that the Records of the tenth session of the General Conference (document 10 C/Proceedings, p. 262) contain the following passage:

"INTERNATIONAL CONVENTIONS CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS

"1.3 We pass on to item 15.4.1—Adoption of Draft Convention concerning the International Exchange of Publications, and the Draft Convention concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States. The texts of these Conventions appear in document 10 C/12, amended by paragraph 148 of the Report of the Programme Commission (document 10 C/72), adopted yesterday. Does any delegate wish to speak on this matter? If not, I should like to take a vote on the two Draft Conventions separately. According to Article IV..B.4 of the Constitution, a two-thirds majority is required to adopt these Conventions. I shall first put to the vote the Draft Convention concerning the International Exchange of Publications, Annex I of document 10 C/12, as amended by paragraph 148 of document 10 C/72.

"(The vote was taken by a show of hands.)

"1.4 The first Draft Convention is adopted by 43 votes in favour, none against, and 5 abstentions.

"1.5 I shall now put to the vote the Draft Convention concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States, Annex II of document 10 C/12, as amended by paragraph 148 of document 10 C/72.

"(The vote was taken by a show of hands.)

"1.6 The second Draft Convention is adopted by 50 votes in favour, none against, and 4 abstentions."

Having noted that, in the English text of the Draft Convention concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents between States, which appears in Annex II of document 10 C/12, page 7, the above-mentioned clauses read as follows, without any misprint or inversion:

Preamble, fourth paragraph "Being aware of the provisions for the exchange of official publications set forth in the Convention for the International Exchange of Official Documents, Scientific and Literary Publications and in the Convention for the Immediate Exchange of Official Journals, Public Parliamentary Annals and Documents, concluded in Brussels on 15 March 1886 and in various regional agreements for the exchange of publications."

Article 5, second sentence "* * * This list and the number of official publications and government documents for exchange may be modified by arrangements between such authorities."

Article 16, second paragraph "2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization."

Have therefore deemed it appropriate to bring the foregoing findings to the notice of the States mentioned in Articles 15 and 16 of the said Convention, in order that the necessary corrections may be made.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have signed the present procés-verbal, in two copies, at the Headquarters of the Organization, in Paris, this eighteenth day of October 1960.

The President of the General Conference
JEAN BERTHOIN,
The Director-General
VITTORINO VERONESE,
Certified copy, Paris, 4 March 1963.
HANNA SABA,
Legal Adviser,
of the United Nations Educational,
Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION—CONVENTION CONCERNING THE INTERNATIONAL EXCHANGE OF PUBLICATIONS, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AT ITS TENTH SESSION, PARIS, 3 DECEMBER 1958

The General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, meeting in Paris from 4 November to 5 December 1958, at its tenth session,

Convinced that development of the international exchange of publications is essential to the free exchange of ideas and knowledge among the peoples of the world,

Considering the importance accorded to the international exchange of publications by the Constitution of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization,

Recognizing the need for a new international convention concerning the exchange of publications,

Having before it proposals concerning the international exchange of publications constituting item 15.4.1 on the agenda of the session,

Having decided, at its ninth session, that these proposals should be made the subject of international regulation by way of an international convention,

Adopts, this third day of December 1958, the present Convention.

ARTICLE 1

Exchange of Publications

The Contracting States undertake to encourage and facilitate the exchange of publications between both governmental bodies and non-governmental institutions of an educational, scientific and technical, or cultural nature, which are non-profit-making in character, in accordance with the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 2

Scope of the Exchange of Publications

1. For the purpose of the present Convention, the following publications may be considered appropriate articles to be exchanged, for use but not for resale, between the bodies and institutions referred to in Article 1 of the present Convention:

(a) publications of an educational, legal, scientific and technical, cultural and informational nature, such as books, newspapers and periodicals, maps and plans, prints, photographs, microcopies, musical works, Braille publications and other graphic material;

(b) publications covered by the Convention concerning the exchange of official publications and government documents between States, adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the third day of December 1958.

2. The present Convention in no way affects exchanges carried out under the convention concerning the exchange of official publications and government documents between States, adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization on the third day of December 1958.

3. The present Convention does not apply to confidential documents, circulars and other items which have not been made public.

ARTICLE 3

Exchange Services

1. The Contracting States may entrust the national exchange service or, where no such national exchange service exists, the central exchange authority or authorities with the following functions in connexion with the development and co-ordination of the exchange of publications among bodies and institutions referred to in Article 1 of the present Convention:

(a) facilitating the international exchange of publications, in particular by transmitting, when appropriate, the material to be exchanged;

(b) supplying advice and information on exchange possibilities for bodies and institutions at home and abroad;

(c) encouraging, when appropriate, the exchange of duplicate material.

2. However, when it is deemed undesirable to centralize in the national exchange service or in central authorities the development and co-ordination of exchanges among bodies and institutions referred to in Article 1 of the present Convention, any or all of the functions enumerated in paragraph 1 of the present article may be entrusted to other authority or authorities.

ARTICLE 4

Method of Transmission

The transmission may be made either directly between the bodies and institutions concerned, or through the national exchange service or exchange authorities.

ARTICLE 5

Transport Charges

When transmissions are made directly between exchange partners, the Contracting State shall not be required to bear the cost thereof. If the transmission is made through the exchange authority or authorities, the Contracting States shall bear the cost of the transmission as far as destination, but, for transport by sea, the cost of packing and carriage shall be paid only as far as the customs office of the port of arrival.

ARTICLE 6

Rates and Conditions of Transport

The Contracting States shall take all the necessary measures to ensure that the exchange authorities benefit from the most favourable existing rates and transport conditions, whatever the means of transport chosen: post, road, rail, inland or sea transport, airmail or air cargo.

ARTICLE 7

Customs and Other Facilities

Each Contracting State shall grant its exchange authorities exemption from customs duties for both imported and exported material under the provisions of the present Convention or under any agreement in implementation thereof and shall accord them the most favourable treatment as regards customs and other facilities.

ARTICLE 8

International Coordination of Exchange

To assist the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization in the performance of the functions assigned to it by its Constitution concerning the international co-ordination of exchange, the Contracting States shall send to the Organizations annual reports on the working of the present Convention and copies of bilateral agreements entered into in accordance with Article 12.

ARTICLE 9

Information and Studies

The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization shall publish information received from the Contracting States in application of Article 8 and shall prepare and publish studies on the working of the present Convention.

ARTICLE 10

Assistance of Unesco

1. The Contracting States may call upon the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization for technical assistance in connexion with any problem arising out of the application of the present Convention. The Organization shall accord such assistance within the limits fixed by its programme and its resources, in particular, for the creation and organization of national exchange services.

2. The Organization is authorized to make, on its own initiative, proposals on this matter to the Contracting States.

ARTICLE 11

Relation to Previous Agreements

The present Convention shall not affect obligations previously entered into by the Contracting States by virtue of international agreements.

ARTICLE 12

Bilateral Agreements

Whenever necessary or desirable, the Contracting States shall enter into bilateral agreements for the purpose of supplementing the present Convention and regulating matters of common concern arising out of its application.

ARTICLE 13

Languages

The present Convention is drawn up in English, French, Russian and Spanish, the four texts being equally authorative.

ARTICLE 14

Ratification and Acceptance

1. The present Convention shall be subject to ratification or acceptance by States members of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, in accordance with their respective constitutional procedures.

2. The instruments of ratification or acceptance shall be deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

ARTICLE 15

Accession

1. The present Convention shall be open for accession by all States not members of the Organization invited to do so by the Executive Board of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

2. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

ARTICLE 16

Entry into Force

The present Convention shall enter into force twelve months after the date of the deposit of the third instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, but only with respect to those States which have deposited their respective instruments on or before that date. It shall enter into force for each other State which deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, twelve months after the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession.

ARTICLE 17

Territorial Extension of the Convention

Any Contracting State may, at the time of ratification, acceptance or accession, or at any time thereafter, declare by notification addressed to the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization that the present Convention shall extend to all or any of the territories for whose international relations it is responsible. The said notifications shall take effect twelve months after the date of its receipt.

ARTICLE 18

Denunciations

1. Each Contracting State may denounce the present Convention on its own behalf or on behalf of any territory for whose international relations it is responsible.

2. The denunciation shall be notified by an instrument in writing, deposited with the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

3. The denunciation shall take effect twelve months after the receipt of the instrument of denunciation.

ARTICLE 19

Notifications

The Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organizations shall inform the States members of the Organization, States not members of the Organization referred to in Article 15, as well as the United Nations, of the deposit of all the instruments of ratification, acceptance and accession provided for in Articles 14 and 15 and of the notifications and denunciations provided for respectively in Articles 17 and 18.

ARTICLE 20

Revision of the Convention

1. The present Convention may be revised by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, any such revision, however, binding only those States which shall become parties to the revising convention.

2. Should the General Conference adopt a new convention revising the present Convention in whole or in part, and unless the new convention otherwise provides, the present Convention shall cease to be open to ratification, acceptance or accession as from the date when the new revising convention enters into force.

ARTICLE 21

Registration

In accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, the present Convention shall be registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations at the request of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Done at Paris, this fifth day of December 1958, in two authentic copies bearing the signatures of the President of the tenth session of the General Conference and of the Director-General of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, which shall be deposited in the Archives of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and certified true copies of which shall be delivered to all the States referred to in Articles 14 and 15 as well as to the United Nations.

The foregoing is the authentic text of the Convention duly adopted by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization during its tenth session, which was held in Paris and declared closed the fifth day of December 1958.

IN FAITH WHEREOF we have appended our signatures this fifth day of December 1958.

The President of the General Conference
JEAN BERTHOIN,
The Director-General
LUTHER H. EVANS,

Certified copy, Paris, 8. I. 1959.

H. SABA,
Legal Adviser of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

[Executive A, 90th Cong., First Sess.]

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY

[on the report of the Sixth Committee (A/6180)]

2101 (XX). AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 109 OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The General Assembly,

Considering that the Charter of the United Nations has been amended to provide that the membership of the Security Council, as provided in Article 23, should be increased from eleven to fifteen and that decisions of the Security Council should be taken, as provided in Article 27, by an affirmative vote of nine members instead of seven,

Considering that these amendments make it necessary also to amend Article 109 of the Charter,

1. Decides to adopt, in accordance with Article 108 of the Charter of the United Nations, the following amendment to the Charter and to submit it for ratification by the States Members of the United Nations:

In Article 109, paragraph 1, the word "seven" in the first sentence shall be replaced by the word "nine";

2. Calls upon all Member States to ratify the above amendment, in accordance with their respective constitutional processes, at the earliest possible date.

1404th plenary meeting,
20 December 1965.

[Executive G, 90th Cong., 1st Sess.]

SINGLE CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, 1961

(United Nations, 1961)

PREAMBLE

The Parties,

Concerned with the health and welfare of mankind,

Recognizing that the medical use of narcotic drugs continues to be indispensable for the relief of pain and suffering and that adequate provision must be made to ensure the availability of narcotic drugs for such purposes,

Recognizing that addiction to narcotic drugs constitutes a serious evil for the individual and is fraught with social and economic danger to mankind,

Conscious of their duty to prevent and combat this evil,

Considering that effective measures against abuse of narcotic drugs require co-ordinated and universal action, *Understanding* that such universal action calls for international co-operation guided by the same principles and aimed at common objectives,

Acknowledging the competence of the United Nations in the field of narcotics control and desirous that the international organs concerned should be within the framework of that Organization,

Desiring to conclude a generally acceptable international convention replacing existing treaties on narcotic drugs, limiting such drugs to medical and scientific use, and providing for continuous international co-operation and control for the achievement of such aims and objectives,

Hereby agree as follows:

ARTICLE 1

Definitions

1. Except where otherwise expressly indicated or where the context otherwise requires, the following definitions shall apply throughout the Convention:

(*a*) "Board" means the International Narcotics Control Board.

(*b*) "Cannabis" means the flowering or fruiting tops of the cannabis plant (excluding the seeds and leaves when not accompanied by the tops) from which the resin has not been extracted, by whatever name they may be designated.

(*c*) "Cannabis plant" means any plant of the genus cannabis.

(*d*) "Cannabis resin" means the separated resin, whether crude or purified, obtained from the cannabis plant.

(*e*) "Coca bush" means the plant of any species of the genus erythroxylon.

(*f*) "Cocoa leaf" means the leaf of the coca bush except a leaf from which all ecgonine, cocaine and any other ecgonine alkaloids have been removed.

(*g*) "Commission" means the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Council.

(*h*) "Council" means the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

(*i*) "Cultivation" means the cultivation of the opium poppy, coca bush or cannabis plant.

(*j*) "Drug" means any of the substances in Schedules I and II, whether natural or synthetic.

(*k*) "General Assembly" means the General Assembly of the United Nations.

(*l*) "Illicit traffic" means cultivation or trafficking in drugs contrary to the provisions of this Convention.

(*m*) "Import" and "export" mean in their respective connotations the physical transfer of drugs from one State to another State, or from one territory to another territory of the same State.

(*n*) "Manufacture" means all processes, other than production, by which drugs may be obtained and includes refining as well as the transformation of drugs into other drugs.

(*o*) "Medical opium" means opium which has undergone the processes necessary to adapt it for medicinal use.

(*p*) "Opium" means the coagulated juice of the opium poppy.

(*q*) "Opium poppy" means the plant of the species *Papaver somniferum L.*

(*r*) "Poppy straw" means all parts (except the seeds) of the opium poppy, after mowing.

(*s*) "Preparation" means a mixture, solid or liquid, containing a drug.

(*t*) "Production" means the separation of opium, coca leaves, cannabis and cannabis resin from the plants from which they are obtained.

(*u*) "Schedule I", "Schedule II", "Schedule III" and "Schedule IV" mean the correspondingly numbered list of drugs or preparations annexed to this Convention, as amended from time to time in accordance with article 3.

(*v*) "Secretary-General" means the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

(*w*) "Special stocks" means the amounts of drugs held in a country or territory by the government of such country or territory for special Government purposes and to meet exceptional circumstances; and the expression "special purposes" shall be construed accordingly.

(*x*) "Stocks" means the amounts of drugs held in a country or territory and intended for:

(i) Consumption in the country or territory for medical and scientific purposes,

(ii) Utilization in the country or territory for the manufacture of drugs and other substances, or

(iii) Export;

but does not include the amounts of drugs held in the country or territory

(iv) By retail pharmacists or other authorized retail distributors and by institutions or qualified persons in the duly authorized exercise of therapeutic or scientific functions, or

(v) As "special stocks".

(*y*) "Territory" means any part of a State which is treated as a separate entity for the application of the system of import certificates and export authorizations provided for in article 31. This definition shall not apply to the term "territory" as used in articles 42 and 46.

2. For the purposes of this Convention a drug shall be regarded as "consumed" when it has been supplied to any person or enterprise for retail distribution, medical use or scientific research; and "consumption" shall be construed accordingly.

ARTICLE 2

Substances under control

1. Except as to measures of control which are limited to specified drugs, the drugs in Schedule I are subject to all measures of control applicable to drugs under this Convention and in particular to those prescribed in articles 4(*c*), 19, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34 and 37.

2. The drugs in Schedule II are subject to the same measures of control as drugs in Schedule I with the exception of the measures prescribed in article 30, paragraphs 2 and 5, in respect of the retail trade.

3. Preparations other than those in Schedule III are subject to the same measures of control as the drugs which they contain, but estimates (article 19) and statistics (article 20) distinct from those dealing with these drugs shall not be required in the case of such preparations, and article 29, paragraph 2(*c*) and article 30, paragraph 1(*b*)(ii) need not apply.

4. Preparations in Schedule III are subject to the same measures of control as preparations containing drugs in Schedule II except that article 31, paragraphs 1(*b*) and 4 to 15 need not apply, and that for the purpose of estimates (article 19) and statistics (article 20) the information required shall be restricted to the quantities of drugs used in the manufacture of such preparations.

5. The drugs in Schedule IV shall also be included in Schedule I and subject to all measures of control applicable to drugs in the latter schedule, and in addition thereto:

(*a*) A Party shall adopt any special measures of control which in its opinion are necessary having regard to the particularly dangerous properties of a drug so included; and

(*b*) A Party shall, if in its opinion the prevailing conditions in its country render it the most appropriate means of protecting the public health and welfare, prohibit the production, manufacture, export and import of, trade in, possession or use of any such drug except for amounts which may be necessary for medical and scientific research only, including clinical trials therewith to be conducted under or subject to the direct supervision and control of the Party.

6. In addition to the measures of control applicable to all drugs in Schedule I, opium is subject to the provisions of articles 23 and 24, the coca leaf to those of articles 26 and 27 and cannabis to those of article 28.

7. The opium poppy, the coca bush, the cannabis plant, poppy straw and cannabis leaves are subject to the control measures prescribed in articles 22 to 24; 22, 26 and 27; 22 and 28; 25; and 28, respectively.

8. The Parties shall use their best endeavours to apply to substances which do not fall under this Convention, but which may be used in the illicit manufacture of drugs, such measures of supervision as may be practicable.

9. Parties are not required to apply the provisions of this Convention to drugs which are commonly used in industry for other than medical or scientific purposes, provided that:

(*a*) They ensure by appropriate methods of denaturing or by other means that the drugs so used are not liable to be abused or have ill effects (article 3, paragraph 3) and that the harmful substances cannot in practice be recovered; and

(*b*) They include in the statistical information (article 20) furnished by them the amount of each drug so used.

ARTICLE 3

Changes in the scope of control

1. Where a Party or the World Health Organization has information which in its opinion may require an amendment to any of the Schedules, it shall notify the Secretary-General and furnish him with the information in support of the notification.

2. The Secretary-General shall transmit such notification, and any information which he considers relevant, to the Parties, to the Commission, and, where the notification is made by a Party, to the World Health Organization.

3. Where a notification relates to a substance not already in Schedule I or in Schedule II,

(i) The Parties shall examine in the light of the available information the possibility of the provisional application to the substance of all measures of control applicable to drugs in Schedule I;

(ii) Pending its decision as provided in sub-paragraph (iii) of this paragraph, the Commission may decide that the Parties apply provisionally to that substance all measures of control applicable to drugs in Schedule I. The Parties shall apply such measures provisionally to the substance in question;

(iii) If the World Health Organization finds that the substance is liable to similar abuse and productive of similar ill effects as the drugs in Schedule I or Schedule II or is convertible into a drug, it shall communicate that finding to the Commission which may, in accordance with the recommendation of the World Health Organization, decide that the substance shall be added to Schedule I or Schedule II.

4. If the World Health Organization finds that a preparation because of the substances which it contains is not liable to abuse and cannot produce ill effects (paragraph 3) and that the drug therein is not readily recoverable, the Commission may, in accordance with the recommendation of the World Health Organization, add that preparation to Schedule III.

5. If the World Health Organization finds that a drug in Schedule I is particularly liable to abuse and to produce ill effects (paragraph 3) and that such liability is not offset by substantial therapeutic advantages not possessed by substances other than drugs in Schedule IV, the Commission may, in accordance with the recommendation of the World Health Organization, place that drug in Schedule IV.

6. Where a notification relates to a drug already in Schedule I or Schedule II or to a preparation in Schedule III, the Commission, apart from the measure provided for in paragraph 5, may in accordance with the recom-

mendation of the World Health Organization, amend any of the Schedule by:

(*a*) Transferring a drug from Schedule I to Schedule II or from Schedule II to Schedule I; or

(*b*) Deleting a drug or a preparation as the case may be, from a Schedule.

7. Any decision of the Commission taken pursuant to this article shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to all States Members of the United Nations, to non-member States Parties to this Convention, to the World Health Organization and to the Board. Such decision shall become effective with respect to each Party on the date of its receipt of such communication, and the Parties shall thereupon take such action as may be required under this Convention.

8. (*a*) The decisions of the Commission amending any of the schedules shall be subject to review by the Council upon the request of any Party filed within ninety days from receipt of notification of the decision. The request for review shall be sent to the Secretary-General together with all relevant information upon which the request for review is based;

(*b*) The Secretary-General shall transmit copies of the request for review and relevant information to the Commission, the World Health Organization and to all the Parties inviting them to submit comments within ninety days. All comments received shall be submitted to the Council for consideration;

(*c*) The Council may confirm, alter or reverse the decision of the Commission, and the decision of the Council shall be final. Notification of the Council's decision shall be transmitted to all States Members of the United Nations, to non-member States Parties to this Convention, to the Commission, to the World Health Organization, and to the Board.

(*d*) During pendency of the review the original decision of the Commission shall remain in effect.

9. Decisions of the Commission taken in accordance with this article shall not be subject to the review procedure provided for in article 7.

ARTICLE 4

General obligations

1. The Parties shall take such legislative and administrative measures as may be necessary:

(*a*) To give effect to and carry out the provisions of this Convention within their own territories;

(*b*) To co-operate with other States in the execution of the provisions of this Convention; and

(*c*) Subject to the provisions of this Convention, to limit exclusively to medical and scientific purposes the production, manufacture, export, import, distribution of, trade in, use and possession of drugs.

ARTICLE 5

The international control organs

The Parties, recognizing the competence of the United Nations with respect to the international control of drugs, agree to entrust to the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council, and to the International Narcotics Control Board, the functions respectively assigned to them under this Convention.

ARTICLE 6

Expenses of the international control organs

The expenses of the Commission and the Board will be borne by the United Nations in such manner as shall be decided by the General Assembly. The Parties which are not members of the United Nations shall contribute to these expenses such amounts as the General Assembly finds equitable and assess from time to time after consultation with the Governments of these Parties.

ARTICLE 7

Review of decisions and recommendations of the Commission

Except for decisions under article 3, each decision or recommendation adopted by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of this Convention shall be subject to approval or modification by the Council or the General Assembly in the same way as other decisions or recommendations of the Commission.

ARTICLE 8

Functions of the Commission

The Commission is authorized to consider all matters pertaining to the aims of this Convention and in particular:

(*a*) To amend the Schedules in accordance with article 3;

(*b*) To call the attention of the Board to any matters which may be relevant to the functions of the Board;

(*c*) To make recommendations for the implementation of the aims and provisions of this Convention, including programmes of scientific research and the exchange of information of a scientific or technical nature; and

(*d*) To draw the attention of non-parties to decisions and recommendations which it adopts under this convention, with a view to their considering taking action in accordance therewith.

ARTICLE 9

Composition of the Board

1. The Board shall consist of eleven members to be elected by the Council as follows:

(*a*) Three members with medical, pharmacological or pharmaceutical experience from a list of at least five persons nominated by the World Health Organization; and

(*b*) Eight members from a list of persons nominated by the Members of the United Nations and by Parties which are not Members of the United Nations.

2. Members of the Board shall be persons who, by their competence, impartiality and disinterestedness, will command general confidence. During their term of office they shall not hold any position or engage in any activity which would be liable to impair their impartiality in the exercise of their functions. The Council shall, in consultation with the Board, make all arrangements necessary to ensure the full technical independence of the Board in carrying out its functions.

3. The Council, with due regard to the principle of equitable geographic representation, shall give consideration to the importance of including on the Board, in equitable proportion, persons possessing a knowledge of the drug situation in the producing, manufacturing, and consuming countries, and connected with such countries.

ARTICLE 10

Terms of office and remuneration of members of the Board

1. The members of the Board shall serve for a period of three years, and shall be eligible for re-election.

2. The term of office of each member of the Board shall end on the eve of the first meeting of the Board which his successor shall be entitled to attend.

3. A member of the Board who has failed to attend three consecutive sessions shall be deemed to have resigned.

4. The Council, on the recommendation of the Board, may dismiss a member of the Board who has ceased to fulfill the conditions required for membership by paragraph 2 of article 9. Such recommendation shall be made by an affirmative vote of eight members of the Board.

5. Where a vacancy occurs on the Board during the term of office of a member, the Council shall fill such vacancy as soon as possible and in accordance with the applicable provisions of article 9, by electing another member for the remainder of the term.

6. The members of the Board shall receive an adequate remuneration as determined by the General Assembly.

ARTICLE 11

Rules of procedure of the Board

1. The Board shall elect its own President and such other officers as it may consider necessary and shall adopt its rules of procedure.

2. The Board shall meet as often as, in its opinion, may be necessary for the proper discharge of its functions, but shall hold at least two sessions in each calendar year.

3. The quorum necessary at meetings of the Board shall consist of seven members.

ARTICLE 12

Administration of the estimate system

1. The Board shall fix the date or dates by which, and the manner in which, the estimates as provided in article 19 shall be furnished and shall prescribe the forms therefor.

2. The Board shall, in respect of countries and territories to which this Convention does not apply, request the Governments concerned to furnish estimates in accordance with the provisions of this Convention.

3. If any State fails to furnish estimates in respect of any of its territories by the date specified, the Board shall, as far as possible, establish the estimates. The Board in establishing such estimates shall, to the extent practicable, do so in co-operation with the Government concerned.

4. The Board shall examine the estimates, including supplementary estimates, and, except as regards requirements for special purposes, may require such information as it considers necessary in respect of any country or territory on behalf of which an estimate has been furnished, in order to complete the estimate or to explain any statement contained therein.

5. The Board shall as expeditiously as possible confirm the estimates, including supplementary estimates, or, with the consent of the Government concerned, may amend such estimates.

6. In addition to the reports mentioned in article 15, the Board shall, at such times as it shall determine but at least annually, issue such information on the estimates as in its opinion will facilitate the carrying out of this Convention.

ARTICLE 13

Administration of the statistical returns system

1. The Board shall determine the manner and form in which statistical returns shall be furnished as provided in article 20 and shall prescribe the forms therefor.

2. The Board shall examine the returns with a view to determining whether a Party or any other State has complied with the provisions of this Convention.

3. The Board may require such further information as it considers necessary to complete or explain the information contained in such statistical returns.

4. It shall not be within the competence of the Board to question or express an opinion on statistical information respecting drugs required for special purposes.

ARTICLE 14

Measures by the Board to ensure the execution of provisions of the Convention

1. (*a*) If, on the basis of its examination of information submitted by Governments to the Board under the provisions of this Convention, or of information communicated by United Nations organs and bearing on questions arising under those provisions, the Board has reason to believe that the aims of this Convention are being seriously endangered by reason of the failure of any country or territory to carry out the provisions of this Convention, the Board shall

have the right to ask for explanations from the Government of the country or territory in question. Subject to the right of the Board to call the attention of the Parties, the Council and the Commission to the matter referred to in sub-paragraph (*c*) below, it shall treat as confidential a request for information or an explanation by a Government under this sub-paragraph.

(*b*) After taking action under sub-paragraph (*a*) above, the Board, if satisfied that it is necessary to do so, may call upon the Government concerned to adopt such remedial measures as shall seem under the circumstances to be necessary for the execution of the provisions of this Convention.

(*c*) If the Board finds that the Government concerned has failed to give satisfactory explanations when called upon to do so under sub-paragraph (*a*) above, or has failed to adopt any remedial measures which it has been called upon to take under sub-paragraph (*b*) above, it may call the attention of the Parties, the Council and the Commission to the matter.

2. The Board, when calling the attention of the Parties, the Council and the Commission to a matter in accordance with paragraph 1(*c*) above, may, if it is satisfied that such a course is necessary, recommend to Parties that they stop the import of drugs, the export of drugs, or both, from or to the country or territory concerned, either for a designated period or until the Board shall be satisfied as to the situation in that country or territory. The State concerned may bring the matter before the Council.

3. The Board shall have the right to publish a report on any matter dealt with under the provisions of this article, and communicate it to the Council, which shall forward it to all Parties. If the Board publishes in this report a decision taken under this article or any information relating thereto, it shall also publish therein the views of the Government concerned if the latter so requests.

4. If in any case a decision of the Board which is published under this article is not unanimous, the views of the minority shall be stated.

5. Any State shall be invited to be represented at a meeting of the Board at which a question directly interesting it is considered under this article.

6. Decisions of the Board under this article shall be taken by a two-thirds majority of the whole number of the Board.

ARTICLE 15

Reports of the Board

1. The Board shall prepare an annual report on its work and such additional reports as it considers necessary containing also an analysis of the estimates and statistical information at its disposal, and, in appropriate cases, an account of the explanations, if any, given by or required of Governments, together with any observations and recommendations which the Board desires to make. These reports shall be submitted to the Council through the Commission, which may make such comments as it sees fit.

2. The reports shall be communicated to the Parties and subsequently published by the Secretary-General. The Parties shall permit their unrestricted distribution.

ARTICLE 16

Secretariat

The secretariat services of the Commission and the Board shall be furnished by the Secretary-General.

ARTICLE 17

Special administration

The Parties shall maintain a special administration for the purpose of applying the provisions of this Convention.

ARTICLE 18

Information to be furnished by Parties to the Secretary-General

1. The Parties shall furnish to the Secretary-General such information as the Commission may request as being necessary for the performance of its functions, and in particular:

(*a*) An annual report on the working of the Convention within each of their territories;

(*b*) The text of all laws and regulations from time to time promulgated in order to give effect to this Convention;

(*c*) Such particulars as the Commission shall determine concerning cases of illicit traffic, including particulars of each case of illicit traffic discovered which may be of importance, because of the light thrown on the source from which drugs are obtained for the illicit traffic, or because of quantities involved or the method employed by illicit traffickers; and

(*d*) The names and addresses of the governmental authorities empowered to issue export and import authorizations or certificates.

2. Parties shall furnish the information referred to in the preceding paragraph in such manner and by such dates and use such forms as the Commission may request.

ARTICLE 19

Estimates of drug requirements

1. The Parties shall furnish to the Board each year for each of their territories, in the manner and form prescribed by the Board, estimates on forms supplied by it in respect of the following matters:

(*a*) Quantities of drugs to be consumed for medical and scientific purposes;

(*b*) Quantities of drugs to be utilized for the manufacture of other drugs, of preparations in Schedule III, and of substances not covered by this Convention;

(*c*) Stocks of drugs to be held as at 31 December of the year to which the estimates relate; and

(*d*) Quantities of drugs necessary for addition to special stocks.

2. Subject to the deductions referred to in paragraph 3 of article 21, the total of the estimates for each territory and each drug shall consist of the sum of the amounts specified under sub-paragraphs (*a*), (*b*) and (*d*) of paragraph 1 of this article, with the addition of any amount required to bring the actual stocks on hand at 31 December of the preceding year to the level estimated as provided in subparagraph (*c*) of paragraph 1.

3. Any State may during the year furnish supplementary estimates with an explanation of the circumstances necessitating such estimates.

4. The Parties shall inform the Board of the method used for determining quantities shown in the estimates and of any changes in the said method.

5. Subject to the deductions referred to in paragraph 3 of article 21, the estimates shall not be exceeded.

ARTICLE 20

Statistical returns to be furnished to the Board

1. The Parties shall furnish to the Board for each of their territories, in the manner and form prescribed by the Board, statistical returns on forms supplied by it in respect of the following matters:

(*a*) Production or manufacture of drugs;

(*b*) Utilization of drugs for the manufacture of other drugs, of preparations in Schedule III and of substances not covered by this Convention, and utilization of poppy straw for the manufacture of drugs;

(*c*) Consumption of drugs;

(*d*) Imports and exports of drugs and poppy straw;

(*e*) Seizures of drugs and disposal thereof; and

(*f*) Stocks of drugs as at 31 December of the year to which the returns relate.

2. (*a*) The statistical returns in respect of the matters referred to in paragraph 1, except sub-paragraph (*d*), shall be prepared annually and shall be furnished to the Board not later than 30 June following the year to which they relate.

(*b*) The statistical returns in respect to the matters referred to in sub-paragraph (*d*) of paragraph 1 shall be prepared quarterly and shall be furnished to the Board within one month after the end of the quarter to which they relate.

3. In addition to the matters referred to in paragraph 1 of this article the Parties may as far as possible also furnish to the Board for each of their territories information in respect of areas (in hectares) cultivated for the production of opium.

4. The Parties are not required to furnish statistical returns respecting special stocks, but shall furnish separately returns respecting drugs imported into or procured within the country or territory for special purposes, as well as quantities of drugs withdrawn from special stocks to meet the requirements of the civilian population.

ARTICLE 21

Limitation of manufacture and importation

1. The total of the quantities of each drug manufactured and imported by any country or territory in any one year shall not exceed the sum of the following:

(*a*) The quantity consumed, within the limit of the relevant estimate, for medical and scientific purposes;

(*b*) The quantity used, within the limit of the relevant estimate, for the manufacture of other drugs, of preparations in Schedule III, and of substances not covered by this Convention;

(*c*) The quantity exported;

(*d*) The quantity added to the stock for the purpose of bringing that stock up to the level specified in the relevant estimate; and

(*e*) The quantity acquired within the limit of the relevant estimate for special purposes.

2. From the sum of the quantities specified in paragraph 1 there shall be deducted any quantity that has been seized and released for licit use, as well as any quantity taken from special stocks for the requirements of the civilian population.

3. If the Board finds that the quantity manufactured and imported in any one year exceeds the sum of the quantities specified in paragraph 1, less any deductions required under paragraph 2 of this article, any excess so established and remaining at the end of the year shall, in the following year, be deducted from the quantity to be manufactured or imported and from the total of the estimates as defined in paragraph 2 of article 19.

4. (*a*) If it appears from the statistical returns on imports or exports (article 20) that the quantity exported to any country or territory exceeds the total of the estimates for that country or territory, as defined in paragraph 2 of article 19, with the addition of the amounts shown to have been exported, and after deduction of any excess as established in paragraph 3 of this article, the Board may notify this fact to States which, in the opinion of the Board, should be so informed;

(*b*) On receipt of such a notification, Parties shall not during the year in question authorize any further exports of the drug concerned to that country or territory, except:

(i) In the event of a supplementary estimate being furnished for that country or territory in respect both of any quantity overimported and of the additional quantity required, or

(ii) In exceptional cases where the export, in the opinion of the government of the exporting country, is essential for the treatment of the sick.

ARTICLE 22

Special provision applicable to cultivation

Whenever the prevailing conditions in the country or a territory of a Party render the prohibition of the cultivation of the opium poppy, the coca bush or the cannabis plant the most suitable measure, in its opinion, for protecting the public health and welfare and preventing the diversion of drugs into the illicit traffic, the Party concerned shall prohibit cultivation.

ARTICLE 23

National opium agencies

1. A Party that permits the cultivation of the opium poppy for the production of opium shall establish, if it has not already done so, and maintain, one or more government agencies (hereafter in this article referred to as the Agency) to carry out the functions required under this article.

2. Each such Party shall apply the following provisions to the cultivation of the opium poppy for the production of opium and to opium:

(*a*) The Agency shall designate the areas in which, and the plots of land on which, cultivation of the opium poppy for the purpose of producing opium shall be permitted.

(*b*) Only cultivators licensed by the Agency shall be authorized to engage in such cultivation.

(*c*) Each license shall specify the extent of the land on which the cultivation is permitted.

(*d*) All cultivators of the opium poppy shall be required to deliver their total crops of opium to the Agency. The Agency shall purchase and take physical possession of such crops as soon as possible, but not later than four months after the end of the harvest.

(*e*) The Agency shall, in respect of opium, have the exclusive right of importing, exporting, wholesale trading and maintaining stocks other than those held by manufacturers of opium alkaloids, medicinal opium or opium preparations. Parties need not extend this exclusive right to medicinal opium and opium preparations.

3. The governmental functions referred to in paragraph 2 shall be discharged by a single government agency if the constitution of the Party concerned permits it.

ARTICLE 24

Limitation on production of opium for international trade

1. (*a*) If any Party intends to initiate the production of opium or to increase existing production, it shall take account of the prevailing world need for opium in accordance with the estimates thereof published by the Board so that the production of opium by such Party does not result in over-production of opium in the world.

(*b*) A Party shall not permit the production of opium or increase the existing production thereof if in its opinion such production or increased production in its territory may result in illicit traffic in opium.

2. (*a*) Subject to paragraph 1, where a Party which as of 1 January 1961 was not producing opium for export desires to export opium which it produces, in amounts not exceeding five tons annually, it shall notify the Board, furnishing with such notification information regarding:

(i) The controls in force as required by this Convention respecting the opium to be produced and exported; and

(ii) The name of the country or countries to which it expects to export such opium; and the Board may either approve such notification or may recommend to the Party that it not engage in the production of opium for export.

(*b*) Where a Party other than a Party referred to in paragraph 3 desires to produce opium for export in amounts exceeding five tons annually, it shall notify the Council, furnishing with such notification relevant information including:

(i) The estimated amounts to be produced for export;

(ii) The controls existing or proposed respecting the opium to be produced;

(iii) The name of the country or countries to which it expects to export such opium; and the Council shall either approve the notification or may recommend to the Party that it not engage in the production of opium for export.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of subparagraphs (*a*) and (*b*) of paragraph 2, a Party that during ten years immediately prior to 1 January 1961 exported opium which such country produced may continue to export opium which it produces.

4. (*a*) A Party shall not import opium from any country or territory except opium produced in the territory of:

(i) A Party referred to in paragraph 3;

(ii) A Party that has notified the Board as provided in subparagraph (*a*) of paragraph 2; or

(iii) A Party that has received the approval of the Council as provided in subparagraph (*b*) of paragraph 2.

(b) Notwithstanding sub-paragraph (*a*) of this paragraph, a Party may import opium produced by any country which produced and exported opium during the ten years prior to 1 January 1961 if such country has established and maintains a national control organ or agency for the purposes set out in article 23 and has in force an effective means of ensuring that the opium it produces is not diverted into the illicit traffic.

5. The provisions of this article do not prevent a Party:

(*a*) From producing opium sufficient for its own requirements; or

(*b*) From exporting opium seized in the illicit traffic, to another Party in accordance with the requirements of this Convention.

ARTICLE 25

Control of poppy straw

1. A Party that permits the cultivation of the opium poppy for purposes other than the production of opium shall take all measures necessary to ensure:

(*a*) That opium is not produced from such opium poppies; and

(*b*) That the manufacture of drugs from poppy straw is adequately controlled.

2. The Parties shall apply to poppy straw the system of import certificates and export authorizations as provided in article 31, paragraphs 4 to 15.

3. The Parties shall furnish statistical information on the import and export of poppy straw as required for drugs under article 20, paragraphs 1(*d*) and 2(*b*).

ARTICLE 26

The coca bush and coca leaves

1. If a Party permits the cultivation of the coca bush, it shall apply thereto and to coca leaves the system of controls as provided in article 23 respecting the control of the opium poppy, but as regards paragraph 2(*d*) of that article, the requirements imposed on the Agency therein referred to shall be only to take physical possession of the crops as soon as possible after the end of the harvest.

2. The Parties shall so far as possible enforce the uprooting of all coca bushes which grow wild. They shall destroy the coca bushes if illegally cultivated.

ARTICLE 27

Additional provisions relating to coca leaves

1. The Parties may permit the use of coca leaves for the preparation of a flavouring agent, which shall not contain any alkaloids, and, to the extent necessary for such use, may permit the production, import, export, trade in and possession of such leaves.

2. The Parties shall furnish separately estimates (article 19) and statistical information (article 20) in respect of coca leaves for preparation of the flavouring agent, except to the extent that the same coca leaves are used for the extraction of alkaloids and the flavouring agent and so explained in the estimates and statistical information.

ARTICLE 28

Control of cannabis

1. If a Party permits the cultivation of the cannabis plant for the production of cannabis or cannabis resin, it shall apply thereto the system of controls as provided in article 23 respecting the control of the opium poppy.

2. This Convention shall not apply to the cultivation of the cannabis plant exclusively for industrial purposes (fibre and seed) or horticultural purposes.

3. The Parties shall adopt such measures as may be necessary to prevent the misuse of, and illicit traffic in, the leaves of the cannabis plant.

ARTICLE 29

Manufacture

1. The Parties shall require that the manufacture of drugs be under licence except which such manufacture is carried out by a State enterprise or State enterprises.

2. The Parties shall:

(*a*) Control all persons and enterprises carrying on or engaged in the manufacture of drugs;

(*b*) Control under licence the establishments and premises in which such manufacture may take place; and

(*c*) Require that licensed manufacturers of drugs obtain periodical permits specifying the kinds and amounts of drugs which they shall be entitled to manufacture. A periodical permit, however, need not be required for preparations.

3. The Parties shall prevent the accumulation, in the possession of drug manufacturers, of quantities of drugs and poppy straw in excess of those required for the normal conduct of business, having regard to the prevailing market conditions.

ARTICLE 30

Trade and distribution

1. (*a*) The Parties shall require that the trade in and distribution of drugs be under licence except where such trade or distribution is carried out by a State enterprise or State enterprises.

(*b*) The Parties shall:

(i) Control all persons and enterprises carrying on or engaged in the trade in or distribution of drugs;

(ii) Control under license the establishments and premises in which such trade or distribution may take place. The requirement of licensing need not apply to preparations.

(*c*) The provisions of sub-paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) relating to licensing need not apply to persons duly authorized to perform and while performing therapeutic or scientific functions.

2. The Parties shall also:

(*a*) Prevent the accumulation in the possession of traders, distributors, State enterprises or duly authorized persons referred to above, of quantities of drugs and poppy straw in excess of those required for the normal conduct of business, having regard to the prevailing market conditions; and

(*b*)(i) Require medical prescriptions for the supply or dispensation of drugs to individuals. This requirement need not apply to such drugs as individuals may lawfully obtain, use, dispense or administer in connexion with their duly authorized therapeutic functions; and

(ii) If the Parties deem these measures necessary or desirable, require that prescriptions for drugs in Schedule I should be written on official forms to be issued in the form of counterfoil books by the competent governmental authorities or by authorized professional associations.

3. It is desirable that Parties require that

written or printed offers of drugs, advertisements of every kind or descriptive literature relating to drugs and used for commercial purposes, interior wrappings of packages containing drugs, and labels under which drugs are offered for sale indicate the international nonproprietary name communicated by the World Health Organization.

4. If a Party considers such measure necessary or desirable, it shall require that the inner package containing a drug or wrapping thereof shall bear a clearly visible double red band. The exterior wrapping of the package in which such drug is contained shall not bear a double red band.

5. A Party shall require that the label under which a drug is offered for sale show the exact drug content by weight or percentage. This requirement of label information need not apply to a drug dispensed to an individual on medical prescription.

6. The provisions of paragraphs 2 and 5 need not apply to the retail trade in or retail distribution of drugs in Schedule II.

ARTICLE 31

Special provisions relating to international trade

1. The Parties shall not knowingly permit the export of drugs to any country or territory except:

(*a*) In accordance with the laws and regulations of that country or territory; and

(*b*) Within the limits of the total of the estimates for that country or territory, as defined in paragraph 2 of article 19, with the addition of the amounts intended to be re-exported.

2. The Parties shall exercise in free ports and zones the same supervision and control as in other parts of their territories, provided, however, that they may apply more drastic measures.

3. The Parties shall:

(*a*) Control under licence the import and export of drugs except where such import or export is carried out by a State enterprise or enterprises;

(*b*) Control all persons and enterprises carrying on or engaged in such import or export.

4. (*a*) Every Party permitting the import or export of drugs shall require a separate import or export authorization to be obtained for each such import or export whether it consists of one or more drugs.

(*b*) Such authorization shall state the name of the drug, the international nonproprietary name if any, the quantity to be imported or exported, and the name and address of the importer and exporter, and shall specify the period within which the importation or exportation must be effected.

(*c*) The export authorization shall also state the number and date of the import certificate (paragraph 5) and the authority by whom it has been issued.

(*d*) The import authorization may allow an importation in more than one consignment.

5. Before issuing an export authorization the Parties shall require an import certificate, issued by the competent authorities of the importing country or territory and certifying that the importation of the drug or drugs referred to therein, is approved and such certificate shall be produced by the person or establishment applying for the export authorization. The Parties shall follow as closely as may be practicable the form of import certificate approved by the Commission.

6. A copy of the export authorization shall accompany each consignment, and the Government issuing the export authorization shall send a copy to the Government of the importing country or territory.

7. (*a*) The Government of the importing country or territory, when the importation has been effected or when the period fixed for the importation has expired, shall return the export authorization, with an endorsement to that effect, to the Government of the exporting country or territory.

(*b*) The endorsement shall specify the amount actually imported.

(*c*) If a lesser quantity than that specified in the export authorization is actually exported, the quantity actually exported shall be stated by the competent authorities on the export authorization and on any official copy thereof.

8. Exports of consignments to a post office box, or to a bank to the account of a party other than the party named in the export authorization, shall be prohibited.

9. Exports of consignments to a bonded warehouse are prohibited unless the government of the importing country certifies on the import certificate, produced by the person or establishment applying for the export authorization, that it has approved the importation for the purpose of being placed in a bonded warehouse. In such case the export authorization shall specify that the consignment is exported for such purpose. Each withdrawal from the bonded warehouse shall require a permit from the authorities having jurisdiction over the warehouse and, in the case of a foreign destination shall be treated as if it were a new export within the meaning of this Convention.

10. Consignments of drugs entering or leaving the territory of a Party not accompanied by an export authorization shall be detained by the competent authorities.

11. A Party shall not permit any drugs consigned to another country to pass through its territory, whether or not the consignment is removed from the conveyance in which it is carried, unless a copy of the export authorization for such consignment is produced to the competent authorities of such Party.

12. The competent authorities of any country or territory through which a consignment of drugs is permitted to pass shall take all due measures to prevent the diversion of the consignment to a destination other than that named in the accompanying copy of the export authorization unless the Government of that country or territory through which the consignment is passing authorizes the diversion. The Government of the country or territory of transit shall treat any requested diversion as if the diversion were an export from the country or territory of transit to the country or territory of new destination. If the diversion is authorized, the provision of paragraph 7(*a*) and (*b*) shall also apply between the country or territory of transit and the country or territory which originally exported the consignment.

13. No consignment of drugs while in transit, or whilst being stored in a bonded warehouse, may be subjected to any process which would change the nature of the drugs in question. The packaging may not be altered without the permission of the competent authorities.

14. The provisions of paragraphs 11 to 13 relating to the passage of drugs through the territory of a Party do not apply where the consignment in question is transported by aircraft which does not land in the country or territory of transit. If the aircraft lands in any such country or territory, those provisions shall be applied so far as circumstances require.

15. The provisions of this article are without prejudice to the provisions of any international agreements which limit the control which may be exercised by any of the Parties over drugs in transit.

16. Nothing in this article other than paragraphs 1(*a*) and 2 need apply in the case of preparations in Schedule III.

ARTICLE 32

Special provisions concerning the carriage of drugs in first-aid kits of ships or aircraft engaged in international traffic

1. The international carriage by ships or aircraft of such limited amounts of drugs as may be needed during their journey or voyage for first-aid purposes or emergency cases shall not be considered to be import, export or passage through a country within the meaning of this Convention.

2. Appropriate safeguards shall be taken by the country of registry to prevent the improper use of the drugs referred to in paragraph 1 or their diversion for illicit purposes. The Commission, in consultation with the appropriate international organizations, shall recommend such safeguards.

3. Drugs carried by ships or aircraft in accordance with paragraph 1 shall be subject to the laws, regulations, permits and licenses of the country of registry, without prejudice to any rights of the competent local authorities to carry out checks, inspections and other control measures on board ships or aircraft. The administration of such drugs in the case of emergency shall not be considered a violation of the requirements of article 30, paragraph 2(*b*).

ARTICLE 33

Possession of drugs

The Parties shall not permit the possession of drugs except under legal authority.

ARTICLE 34

Measures of supervision and inspection

The Parties shall require:

(*a*) That all persons who obtain licenses as provided in accordance with this Convention, or who have managerial or supervisory positions in a State enterprise established in accordance with this Convention, shall have adequate qualifications for the effective and faithful execution of the provisions of such laws and regulations as are enacted in pursuance thereof; and

(*b*) That governmental authorities, manufacturers, traders, scientists, scientific institutions and hospitals keep such records as will show the quantities of each drug manufactured and of each individual acquisition and disposal of drugs. Such records shall respectively be preserved for a period of not less than two years. Where counterfoil books (article 30, paragraph 2(*b*)) of official prescriptions are used, such books including the counterfoils shall also be kept for a period of not less than two years.

ARTICLE 35

Action against the illicit traffic

Having due regard to their constitutional, legal and administrative systems, the Parties shall:

(*a*) Make arrangements at the national level for co-ordination of preventive and repressive action against the illicit traffic; to this end they may usefully designate an appropriate agency responsible for such co-ordination;

(*b*) Assist each other in the campaign against the illicit traffic in narcotic drugs;

(*c*) Co-operate closely with each other and with the competent international organizations of which they are members with a view to maintaining a co-ordinated campaign against the illicit traffic;

(*d*) Ensure that international co-operation between the appropriate agencies be conducted in an expeditious manner; and

(*e*) Ensure that where legal papers are transmitted internationally for the purposes of a prosecution, the transmittal be effected in an expeditious manner to the bodies designated by the Parties; this requirement shall be without prejudice to the right of a Party to require that legal papers be sent to it through the diplomatic channel.

ARTICLE 36

Penal provisions

1. Subject to its constitutional limitations, each Party shall adopt such measures as will ensure that cultivation, production, manufacture, extraction, preparation, possession, offering, offering for sale, distribution, purchase, sale, delivery on any terms whatsoever, brokerage, dispatch, dispatch in transit,

transport, importation and exportation of drugs contrary to the provisions of this Convention, and any other action which in the opinion of such Party may be contrary to the provisions of this Convention, shall be punishable offences when committed intentionally, and that serious offences shall be liable to adequate punishment particularly by imprisonment or other penalties of deprivation of liberty.

2. Subject to the constitutional limitations of a Party, its legal system and domestic law,

(*a*) (i) Each of the offences enumerated in paragraph 1, if committed in different countries, shall be considered as a distinct offence;

(ii) International participation in, conspiracy to commit and attempts to commit, any of such offences, and preparatory acts and financial operations in connexion with the offences referred to in this article, shall be punishable offences as provided in paragraph 1;

(iii) Foreign convictions for such offences shall be taken into account for the purpose of establishing recidivism; and

(iv) Serious offences heretofore referred to committed either by nationals or by foreigners shall be prosecuted by the Party in whose territory the offence was committed, or by the Party in whose territory the offender is found if extradition is not acceptable in conformity with the law of the Party to which application is made, and if such offender has not already been prosecuted and judgment given.

(*b*) It is desirable that the offences referred to in paragraph 1 and paragraph 2(*a*)(ii) be included as extradition crimes in any extradition treaty which has been or may hereafter be concluded between any of the Parties, and, as between any of the Parties which do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty or on reciprocity, be recognized as extradition crimes; provided that extradition shall be granted in conformity with the law of the Party to which application is made, and that the Party shall have the right to refuse to effect the arrest or grant the extradition in cases where the competent authorities consider that the offence is not sufficiently serious.

3. The provisions of this article shall be subject to the provisions of the criminal law of the Party concerned on questions of jurisdiction.

4. Nothing contained in this article shall affect the principle that the offences to which it refers shall be defined, prosecuted and punished in conformity with the domestic law of a Party.

ARTICLE 37

Seizure and confiscation

Any drugs, substances and equipment used in or intended for the commission of any of the offenses, referred to in article 36, shall be liable to seizure and confiscation.

ARTICLE 38

Treatment of drug addicts

1. The Parties shall give special attention to the provision of facilities for the medical treatment, care and rehabilitation of drug addicts.

2. If a Party has a serious problem of drug addiction and its economic resources permit, it is desirable that it establish adequate facilities for the effective treatment of drug addicts.

ARTICLE 39

Application of stricter national control measures than those required by this Convention

Notwithstanding anything contained in this Convention, a Party shall not be, or be deemed to be, precluded from adopting measures of control more strict or severe than those provided by this Convention and in particular from requiring that preparations in Schedule III or drugs in Schedule II be subject to all or such of the measures of control applicable to drugs in Schedule I as in its opinion is necessary or desirable for the protection of the public health or welfare.

ARTICLE 40

Languages of the Convention and procedure for signature, ratification and accession

1. This Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be open for signature until 1 August 1961 on behalf of any Member of the United Nations, of any non-member State which is a Party to the Statute of the International Court of Justice or member of a specialized agency of the United Nations, and also of any other State which the Council may invite to become a Party.

2. This Convention is subject to ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General.

3. This Convention shall be open after 1 August 1961 for accession by the States referred to in paragraph 1. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General.

ARTICLE 41

Entry into force

1. This Convention shall come into force on the thirtieth day following the date on which the fortieth instrument of ratification or accession is deposited in accordance with article 40.

2. In respect of any other State depositing an instrument of ratification or accession after the date of deposit of the said fortieth instrument, this Convention shall come into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit by that State of its instrument of ratification or accession.

ARTICLE 42

Territorial application

This Convention shall apply to all non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which any Party is responsible, except where the previous consent of such a territory is required by the Constitution of the Party or of the territory concerned, or required by custom. In such case the Party shall endeavour to secure the needed consent of the territory within the shortest period possible, and when that consent is obtained the Party shall notify the Secretary-General. This Convention shall apply to the territory or territories named in such notification from the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General. In those cases where the previous consent of the non-metropolitan territory is not required, the Party concerned shall, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, declare the non-metropolitan territory or territories to which this Convention applies.

ARTICLE 43

Territories for the purposes of articles 19, 20, 21 and 31

1. Any Party may notify the Secretary-General that, for the purposes of articles 19, 20, 21 and 31, one of its territories is divided into two or more territories, or that two or more of its territories are consolidated into a single territory.

2. Two or more Parties may notify the Secretary-General that, as the result of the establishment of a customs union between them, those Parties constitute a single territory for the purposes of articles 19, 20, 21 and 31.

3. Any notification under paragraph 1 or 2 above shall take effect on 1 January of the year following the year in which the notification was made.

ARTICLE 44

Termination of previous international treaties

1. The provisions of this Convention, upon its coming into force, shall, as between Parties hereto, terminate and replace the provisions of the following treaties:

(*a*) International Opium Convention, signed at The Hague on 23 January 1912;

(*b*) Agreement concerning the Manufacture of, Internal Trade in and Use of Prepared Opium, signed at Geneva on 11 February 1925;

(*c*) International Opium Convention, signed at Geneva on 19 February 1925;

(*d*) Convention for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, signed at Geneva on 13 July 1931;

(*e*) Agreement for the Control of Opium Smoking in the Far East, signed at Bangkok on 27 November 1931;

(*f*) Protocol signed at Lake Success on 11 December 1946, amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925 and 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936, except as it affects the last-named Convention;

(*g*) The Conventions and Agreements referred to in sub-paragraphs (*a*) to (*e*) as amended by the Protocol of 1946 referred to in sub-paragraph (*f*);

(*h*) Protocol signed at Paris on 19 November 1948 Bringing under International Control Drugs outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success on 11 December 1946;

(*i*) Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and Use of Opium, signed at New York on 23 June 1953, should that Protocol have come into force.

2. Upon the coming into force of this Convention, article of the Convention for the Suppression of the Illicit Traffic in Dangerous Drugs, signed at Geneva on 26 June 1936, shall, between the Parties thereto which are also Parties to this Convention, be terminated, and shall be replaced by paragraph 2(*b*) or article 36 of this Convention; provided that such a Party may by notification to the Secretary-General continue in force the said article 9.

ARTICLE 45

Transitional provisions

1. The functions of the Board provided for in article 9 shall, as from the date of the coming into force of this Convention (article 41, paragraph 1), be provisionally carried out by the Permanent Central Board constituted under chapter VI of the Convention referred to in article 44(*c*) as amended, and by the Supervisory Body constituted under chapter II of the Convention referred to in article 44(*d*) as amended, as such functions may respectively require.

2. The Council shall fix the date on which the new Board referred to in article 9 shall enter upon its duties. As from that date that Board shall, with respect to the States Parties to the treaties enumerated in article 44 which are not Parties to this Convention, undertake the functions of the Permanent Central Board and of the Supervisory Body referred to in paragraph 1.

ARTICLE 46

Denunciation

1. After the expiry of two years from the date of the coming into force of this Convention (article 41, paragraph 1) any Party may, on its own behalf or on behalf of a territory for which it has international responsibility, and which has withdrawn its consent given in accordance with article 42, denounce this Convention by an instrument in writing deposited with the Secretary-General.

2. The denunciation, if received by the Secretary-General on or before the first day of July in any year, shall take effect on the

first day of January in the succeeding year, and, if received after the first day of July, shall take effect as if it had been received on or before the first day of July in the succeeding year.

3. This Convention shall be terminated if, as a result of denunciations made in accordance with paragraph 1, the conditions for its coming into force as laid down in article 41, paragraph 1, cease to exist.

ARTICLE 47

Amendments

1. Any Party may propose an amendment to this Convention. The text of any such amendment and the reasons therefor shall be communicated to the Secretary-General who shall communicate them to the Parties and to the Council. The Council may decide either:

(*a*) That a conference shall be called in accordance with Article 62, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations to consider the proposed amendment; or

(*b*) That the Parties shall be asked whether they accept the proposed amendment and also asked to submit to the Council any comments on the proposal.

2. If a proposed amendment circulated under paragraph 1(*b*) of this article has not been rejected by any Party within eighteen months after it has been circulated, it shall thereupon enter into force. If however a proposed amendment is rejected by any Party, the Council may decide, in the light of comments received from Parties, whether a conference shall be called to consider such amendment.

ARTICLE 48

Disputes

1. If there should arise between two or more Parties a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention, the said Parties shall consult together with a view to the settlement of the dispute by negotiation, investigation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, recourse to regional bodies, judicial process or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. Any such dispute which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed shall be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision.

ARTICLE 49

Transitional reservations

1. A Party may at the time of signature, ratification or accession reserve the right to permit temporarily in any one of its territories:

(*a*) The quasi-medical use of opium;

(*b*) Opium smoking;

(*c*) Coca leaf chewing;

(*d*) The use of cannabis, cannabis resin, extracts and tinctures of cannabis for non-medical purposes; and

(*e*) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to under (*a*) to (*d*) for the purposes mentioned therein.

2. The reservations under paragraph 1 shall be subject to the following restrictions:

(*a*) The activities mentioned in paragraph 1 may be authorized only to the extent that they were traditional in the territories in respect of which the reservation is made, and were there permitted on 1 January 1961.

(*b*) No export of the drugs referred to in paragraph 1 for the purposes mentioned therein may be permitted to a non-party or to a territory to which this Convention does not apply under article 42.

(*c*) Only such persons may be permitted to smoke opium as were registered by the competent authorities to this effect on 1 January 1964.

(*d*) The quasi-medical use of opium must be abolished within 15 years from the coming into force of this Convention as provided in paragraph 1 of article 41.

(*e*) Coca leaf chewing must be abolished within twenty-five years from the coming into force of this Convention as provided in paragraph 1 of article 41.

(*f*) The use of cannabis for other than medical and scientific purposes must be discontinued as soon as possible but in any case within twenty-five years from the coming into force of this Convention as provided in paragraph 1 of article 41.

(*g*) The production and manufacture of and trade in the drugs referred to in paragraph 1 for any of the uses mentioned therein must be reduced and finally abolished simultaneously with the reduction and abolition of such uses.

3. A Party making a reservation under paragraph 1 shall:

(*a*) Include in the annual report to be furnished to the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 18, paragraph 1(*a*), an account of the progress made in the preceding year towards the abolition of the use, production, manufacture or trade referred to under paragraph 1; and

(*b*) Furnish to the Board separate estimates (article 19) and statistical returns (article 20) in respect of the reserved activities in the manner and form prescribed by the Board.

4. (*a*) If a Party which makes a reservation under paragraph 1 fails to furnish:

(i) The report referred to in paragraph 3(a) within six months after the end of the year to which the information relates:

(ii) The estimates referred to in paragraph 3(*b*) within three months after the date fixed for that purpose by the Board in accordance with article 12, paragraph 1;

(iii) The statistics referred to in paragraph 3(*b*) within three months after the date on which they are due in accordance with article 20, paragraph 2,

the Board or the Secretary-General, as the case may be, shall send to the Party concerned a notification of the delay, and shall request such information within a period of three months after the receipt of that notification.

(*b*) If the Party fails to comply within this period with the request of the Board or the Secretary-General, the reservation in question made under paragraph 1 shall cease to be effective.

5. A State which has made reservations may at any time by notification in writing withdraw all or part of its reservations.

ARTICLE 50

Other reservations

1. No reservations other than those made in accordance with article 49 or with the following paragraphs shall be permitted.

2. Any State may at the time of signature, ratification or accession make reservations in respect of the following provisions of this Convention; article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3; article 13, paragraph 2; article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2; article 31, paragraph 1(*b*), and article 48.

3. A State which desires to become a Party but wishes to be authorized to make reservations other than those made in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article or with article 49 may inform the Secretary-General of such intention. Unless by the end of twelve months after the date of the Secretary-General's communication of the reservation concerned, this reservation has been objected to by one third of the States that have ratified or acceded to this Convention before the end of that period, it shall be deemed to be permitted, it being understood however that States which have objected to the reservation need not assume towards the reserving State any legal obligation under this Convention which is affected by the reservation.

4. A State which has made reservations may at any time by notification in writing withdraw all or part of its reservations.

ARTICLE 51

Notifications

The Secretary-General shall notify to all the States referred to in paragraph 1 of article 40:

(*a*) Signatures, ratifications and accessions in accordance with article 40;

(*b*) The date upon which this Convention enters into force in accordance with article 41;

(*c*) Denunciations in accordance with article 46; and

(*d*) Declarations and notifications under articles 42, 43, 47, 49 and 50.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, the undersigned, duly authorized, have signed this Convention on behalf of their respective Governments:

DONE at New York, this thirtieth day of March one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one, in a single copy, which shall be deposited in the archives of the United Nations, and of which certified true copies shall be transmitted to all the Members of the United Nations and to the other States referred to in article 40, paragraph 1.

For Afghanistan:
ABDUL H. TABIBI
For Albania:
——— ———
For Argentina:[1]
M. AMADEO
31 de julio de 1961
For Australia:
H. S. WARREN
For Austria:
——— ———
For Belgium:
WALTER LORIDAN
28 juillet 1961
For Bolivia:
——— ———
For Brasil:
ALUYSIO GUEDES REGIS BITTENCOURT
Ad referendum
For Bulgaria:[2]
A. GEORGIEV
31 July 1961
For Burma:[3]
TIN MAUNG

---

[1] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"Reservation to article 48, paragraph 2: The Argentine Republic does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

"Reservation to article 49: The Argentine Republic reserves the rights conferred by paragraph 1 (*c*) 'Coca leaf chewing' and paragraph 1 (*c*) 'Trade in the drug referred to under (*c*) for the purposes mentioned therein.' "

[2] With reservations concerning article 12, points 2 and 3; article 13, point 2; article 14, points 1 and 2; article 31, sub-point 1 (*b*); and article 48, point 2.

Text of reservations:

"(1) The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria accepts the provision of paragraph 2 of article 48 with the reservation that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, the agreement of all parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

"(2) As regards countries which have been deprived of the opportunity of becoming parties, on the basis of the provisions of article 40 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, to the Convention, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider as obligatory upon herself points 2 and 3 of article 12, point 2 of article 13, points 1 and 2 of article 14 and sub-point 1 (*b*) of article 31."

[3] I declare that my signature to this Single Convention is subject to the understanding that the Shan State is being allowed to have reservation of the right:

(1) to allow addicts in the Shan State to smoke opium for a transitory period of 20 years with effect from the date of coming into force of this Single Convention;

(2) to produce and manufacture opium for the above purpose;

(3) to furnish list of opium consumers in the Shan State after the Shan State Gov-

For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic: [4]
F. Gryaznov
31 July 1961
For Cambodia:
Nong Kimny
Sous réserve de la ratification par le Parlement cambodgien.
For Cameroun:
——— ———
For Canada:
R. E. Curran
For the Central African Republic:
——— ———
For Ceylon:
——— ———
For Chad:
J. Charlot
Sous réserve de ratification
For Chile:
D. Schweitzer
Sujeto a ratificación
For China:
Wei Hsioh-Ren
For Colombia:
——— ———
For the Congo (Brazzaville):
E. Dadet
For the Congo (Leopoldville):
Gervais P. Bahizi
28/4/1961
For Costa Rica:
G. Ortiz Martín
For Cuba:
——— ———.
For Cyprus:
——— ———.
For Czechoslovakia: [5]
Dr. Zdeněk Černík
31 July 1961
For Dahomey:
Louis Ignacio-Pinto
For Denmark:
A. Hesselund Jensen
For the Dominican Republic:
——— ———.
For Ecuador:
——— ———.
For El Salvador:
M. Rafael Urquía
For Ethiopia:
——— ———.
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
Frank
31st July 1961
For the Federation of Malaya:
——— ———.

For Finland:
Henrik Blomstedt
For France:
——— ———.
For Gabon:
——— ———.
For Ghana:
Alex Sackey
Ad referendum
For Greece:
——— ———
For Guatemala:
Antonio Arís
July 26, 1961
For Guinea:
——— ———
For Haiti:
Ernest Jean-Louis
3 avril 1961
For the Holy See:
James H. Griffiths
Subject to ratification
For Honduras:
——— ———
For Hungary: [6]
Lörinc Tamás
31 July 1961
For Iceland:
——— ———
For India: [7]
B. N. Banerji
For Indonesia: [8]
S. Wirjopranoto
28 July 1961

For Iran:
Dr. Azarakhsh
Sous réserve de ratification ultérieure
For Iraq:
Adnan Pachachi
Subject to ratification
For Ireland:
——— ———
For Israel:
——— ———
For Italy:
G. Ortona
April 4, 1961
Subject to ratification
For the Ivory Coast:
——— ———
For Japan:
Bunshichi Hoshi
July 26, 1961
For Jordan:
J. Joury
Subject to ratification
For Kuwait:
——— ———
For Laos:
——— ———
For Lebanon:
Georges Hakim
Subject to ratification
For Liberia:
Archibald Johnson, M.D.
Subject to ratification
For Libya:
——— ———
For Liechtenstein:
Olivier Exchaquet
14 juillet 1961
For Luxembourg:
M. Steinmetz
28 juillet 1961
For Madagascar:
Andriamaharo
For Mali:
——— ———
For Mauritania:
——— ———
For Mexico:
J. Castañeda
July 24, 1961
For Monaco:
——— ———
For Morocco:
——— ———
For Nepal:
——— ———
For the Netherlands: [9]
J. Polderman
31 juillet 1961
For New Zealand:
D. P. Kennedy
R. W. Sharp
For Nicaragua:
Luis Manuel Debayle
For the Niger:
——— ———
For Nigeria:
Alhaji Muhammad
For Norway:
Sivert A. Nielsen
Subject to ratification
For Pakistan:
M. Aslam
For Panama:
César A. Quintero
For Paraguay:
Miguel Solano López

---

ernment has completed the taking of such list on the 31st December, 1963

[4] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"With reservation to article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*)."

Text of the reservation:

"The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention."

[5] Signature with the reservation to the following articles: article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*).

Text of the reservation:

"The Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic is not bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, concerning those States, which have been deprived of the possibility to become Parties of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, according to the procedure embodied in the article 40 of the aforesaid Convention."

[6] With reservations concerning: article 12, points 2 and 3; article 13, point 2 article 14, points and article 31, sub-point 1 (*b*); and article 48, point 2.

Text of the reservations:

"1. The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic accepts the provision of paragraph 2 of article 48 with the reservation that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, the agreement of all parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

"2. As regards countries which have been deprived of the possibility of becoming parties, on the basis of the provisions of article 40 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, to the Convention, the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic does not consider as obligatory upon herself points 2 and 3 of article 12, point 2 of article 13, points 1 and 2 of article 14 and sub-point 1 (*b*) of article 31."

[7] Subject to ratification and to the reservations provided for in Art. 49, paragraph 1 (*a*), (*b*), (*d*) and (*e*). The Government of India will, in accordance with the second subalinea of Article 42, endeavour to secure, within the shortest time possible, the consent of Sikkim to the application of the Convention to that territory.

[8] Subject to ratification and to reservation to article 48, para. 2 and to a declaration of intention to make reservations to articles 40 and 42 in accordance with the attached statement.

Text of the statement:

"1. With respect to article 40, paragraph 1, the Indonesian Government does not agree to the present formulation which does not permit any State which wishes to become a Party to this Convention to do so.

"2. With respect to article 42, the Indonesian Government does not agree to the present formulation which may prevent the application of this Convention to non-metropolitan territories.

"3. With respect to article 48, paragraph 2, the Indonesian Government does not consider itself bound by the provisions of this paragraph which provide for a mandatory reference to the International Court of Justice of any dispute which cannot be resolved according to the terms of paragraph 1. The Indonesian Government takes the position that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case."

[9] *Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*

"In view of the equality from the point of view of public law between the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the term 'non-metropolitan' mentioned in article 42 of this Convention no longer has its original meaning so far as Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles are concerned, and will consequently be deemed to mean 'non-European'."

For Peru:[10]
M. F. Maúrtua
For the Philippines:
F. A. Delgado
For Poland:[11]
B. Lewandowski
31.VII.1961
For Portugal:
Luís Soares de Oliveira
Ad referendum
For the Republic of Korea:
Moon D. C.
For the Republic of Viet-Nam:
——— ———
For Romania:
——— ———
For San Marino:
——— ———
For Saudi Arabia:
——— ———
For Senegal:
——— ———
For Somalia:
——— ———
For Spain:
Jaime de Piniés
27 julio 1961
For the Sudan:
——— ———
For Sweden:
Agda Rössel
April 3, 1961
For Switzerland:
Michael von Schneck
20 avril 1961
For Thailand:
S. Anuman-Rajadhon
24th July 1961
For Togo:
——— ———
For Tunisia:
Ayari
For Turkey:
——— ———
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic:[12]
L. Kizia
31 July 1961
For the Union of South Africa:
——— ———
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics:[13]
Platon Morozov
31 July 1961
For the United Arab Republic:
Dr. Amin Ismail
Subject to ratification
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Patrick Dean
For the United States of America:
——— ———
For the Upper Volta:
——— ———
For Uruguay:
——— ———
For Venezuela:
Rafael Darío Berti
Ad referendum
For Yemen:
——— ———
For Yugoslavia:
Dragan Nikolic

SCHEDULES

LIST OF DRUGS INCLUDED IN SCHEDULE I

Acetylmethadol (3-acetoxy-6-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenylheptane),

Allylprodine (3-allyl-1-methyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine),

Alphacetylmethadol (alpha-3-acetoxy-6-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenyheptane),

Alphameprodine (alpha-3-ethyl-1-methyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine),

Alphamethadol (alpha-6-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenyl-3-heptanol),

Alphaprodine (alpha-1,3-dimethyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine),

Anileridine (1-*para*-aminophenethyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester),

Benzethidine (1-(2-benzyloxyethyl)-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester),

Benzylmorphine (3-benzylmorphine),

Betacetylmethadol (beta-3-acetoxy-6-dimethylamino-4,4-diphenylheptane),

Betameprodine (beta-3-ethyl-1-methyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine),

Betamethadol (beta-6-dimethylamino-4,4-diphenyl-3-heptanol),

Betaprodine (beta-1,3-dimethyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine),

Cannabis and cannabis resin and extracts and tinctures of cannabis,

Clonitazene (2-*para*-chlorbenzyl-1-diethylaminoethyl-5-nitrobenzimidazole),

Coca Leaf.

Cocaine (methyl ester of benzoylecgonine),

Concentrate of poppy straw (the material arising when poppy straw has entered into a process for the concentration of its alkaloids, when such material is made available in trade),

Desomorphine (dihydrodeoxymorphine),

Dextiomoramide ((+)-4-[2-methyl-4-oxo-3, 3-diphenyl-4-(1-pyrrolidinyl) butyl] morpholine),

Diampromide (N-[2-methylphenethylamino) propyl] propionanilide),

Diethylthiambutene (3-diethylamin-1,1-di-(2′-thienyl)-1-butene),

Dihydromorphine,

Dimenoxadol (2-dimethylaminoethyl-1-ethoxy-1,1-diphenylacetate),

Dimepheptanol (6-dimethylamino-4,4-diphenyl-3-heptanol),

Dimethylthiambutene (3-dimethylamino-1, 1-di(2′ thienyl)-1-butene),

Dioxaphetyl butyrate (ethyl 4-morpholino-2,2-diphenylbutyrate),

Diphenoxylate 1-(3-cyano-3,3-diphenylpropyl)-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester),

Dipidanone (4,4-diphenyl-6-piperidine-3-heptanone),

Ecgonine, its esters and derivatives which are convertible to ecgonine and cocaine,

Ethylmethylthiambutene (3-ethylmethylamino-1,1-di-(2′thienyl)-1-butene),

Etonitazene (1-diethylaminoethyl-2-*para*-ethoxybenzyl-5-nitro-benzimidazole),

Etoxeridine (1-[2-(2-hydroxyethoxy) ethyl] 4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester),

Furethidine (1-(2-tetrahydrofurfuryloxyethyl)-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester),

Heroin (diacetylmorphine),

Hydrocodone (dihydrocodeinone),

Hydromorphinol (14-hydroxydihydromorphine),

Hydromorphone (dihydromorphinone),

Hydroxypethidine (4-*meta*-hydroxyphenyl-1-methylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester),

Isomethadone (6-dimethylamino-5-methyl-4,4-diphenyl-3-hexanone),

Ketobemidone (4-*meta*-hydroxyphenyl-1-methyl-4-propionylpiperidine),

Levomethorphan* ((−)-3-methoxy-N-methylmorphinan),

Levomoramide ((−)-4-[2-methyl-4-oxo-3. 3-diphenyl-4-(1-pyrrolidinyl) butyl] morpholine),

Levophenacylmorphan ((−)-3-hydroxy-N-phenacylmorphinan),

Levorphanol* ((−)-3-hydroxy-N-methylmorphinan),

Metazocine (2′-hydroxy-2,5,9-trimethyl-6, 7-benzomorphan),

Methadone (6-dimethylamino-4,4-diphenyl-3-heptanone),

Methyldesorphine 6-methyl-delta 6-deoxymorphine),

Methyldihydromorphine (6-methyldihydromorphine),

1 - Methyl - 4 - phenylpiperidine - 4 - carboxylic acid,

Metopon (5-methyldihydromorphinone)

Morpheridine (1-(2-morpholinoethyl)-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester),

Morphine,

Morphine Methobromide and other pentavalent nitrogen morphine derivatives,

Morphine-N-oxide,

Myrophine (myristylbenzylmorphine)

Nicomorphine (3, 6-dinicotinylmorphine)

Norlevorphanol ((—)-3-hydroxymorphinan)

Normethadone (6-dimethylamino-4,4-diphenyl-3-hexanone)

Normorphine (demethylmorphine)

Opium,

Oxygodone (14-hydroxydihydrocodeinome)

Oxymorphone (14-hydroxydihydromorphinone)

Pethidine (1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester)

Phenadoxone (6-morpholino-4, 4-diphenyl-3-heptanone)

Phenampromide (N-(1-methyl-2-piperidinoethyl) propionanilide)

---

[10] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"*Ad referendum* with reservation regarding article 49, paragraphs 2(b) and 4(b)."

[11] With the reservations to article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3; article 13, paragraph 2; article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2; article 31, paragraph 1(*b*)—as explained in the attached note.

Text of the reservations:

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic does not consider itself obligated to the provision of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1(*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and concerning States deprived of the opportunity to participate in the above Convention.

"In the opinion of the Government of the Polish People's Republic it is inadmissible to impose obligations contained in the mentioned provisions, upon States, which in result of other provisions of the same Convention may be deprived of the opportunity to adhere to it."

[12] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

With reservation to article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*).

Text of the reservation:

"The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention."

[13] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"With reservation to article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2, and article 31, paragraph 1 (*b*)."

Text of the reservation:

"The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 12, paragraphs 2 and 3, article 13, paragraph 2, article 14, paragraphs 1 and 2 and article 31, paragraph 1(*b*) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs as applied to States not entitled to become Parties to the Single Convention on the basis of the procedure provided for in article 40 of that Convention."

*Dextromethorphan ((+)-3-methoxy-N-methylmorphinan) and dextrorphan ((+)-3-Hydroxy-N-methylmorphinan) are specifically excluded from this schedule.

Phenazocine (2′-hydroxy-5, 9-dimethyl-2-phenethyl-6,7-benzomorphan)

Phenomorphan (3-hydroxy-N-phenethylmorphinan)

Phenoperidine (1-(3-hydroxy-3-phenylpropyl)-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester)

Piminodine (4-phenyl-1-(3-phenylaminopropyl) piperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester)

Proheptazine (1,3-dimethyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxyazacycloheptane,

Properidine (1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid isopropyl ester),

Racemethorphan ((±)-3-methoxy-N-methylmorphinan),

Racemoramide ((±)-4-[2-methyl-4-oxo-3,3-diphenyl-4-(1-pyrrolidinyl) butyl] morpholine),

Racemorphan ((±)-3-hydroxy-N-methylmorphinan),

Thebacon (acetyldihydrocodeinone),

Thebaine,

Trimeperidine (1,2,5-trimethyl-4-phenyl-4-propionoxypiperidine); and

The isomers, unless specifically excepted, of the drugs in this Schedule whenever the existence of such isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation;

The esters and ethers, unless appearing in another Schedule, of the drugs in this Schedule whenever the existence of such esters or ethers is possible;

The salts of the drugs listed in this Schedule, including the salts of esters, ethers and isomers as provided above whenever the existence of such salts is possible.

LIST OF DRUGS INCLUDED IN SCHEDULE II

Acetyldihydrocodeine,

Codeine (3-methylmorphine),

Dextropropoxyphene ((+)-4-dimethylamino-3-methyl-1, 2-diphenyl-2-propionoxybutane),

Dihydrocodeine,

Ethylmorphine (3-ethylmorphine),

Norcodeine (N-demethylcodeine),

Pholcodine (morpholinylethylmorphine); and

The isomers, unless specifically excepted, of the drugs in this Schedule whenever the existence of such isomers is possible within the specific chemical designation;

The salts of the drugs listed in this Schedule, including the salts of the isomers as provided above whenever the existence of such salts is possible.

LIST OF PREPARATION INCLUDED IN SCHEDULE III

1. Preparations of: Acetyldihydrocodeine, Codeine, Dextropropoxyphene, Dihydrocodeine, Ethylmorphine, Norcodeine, and Pholcodine
when

(*a*) Compounded with one or more other ingredients in such a way that the preparation has no, or a negligible, risk of abuse, and in such a way that the drug cannot be recovered by readily applicable means or in a yield which would constitute a risk to public health; and

(*b*) Containing not more than 100 milligrammes of the drug per dosage unit and with a concentration of not more than 2.5 per cent in undivided preparations.

2. Preparations of cocaine containing not more than 0.1 per cent of cocaine calculated as cocaine base and preparations of opium or morphine containing not more than 0.2 per cent of morphine calculated as anhydrous morphine base and compounded with one or more other ingredients in such a way that the preparation has no, or a negligible, risk of abuse, and in such a way that the drug cannot be recovered by readily applicable means or in a yield which would constitute a risk to public health.

3. Solid dose preparations of diphenoxylate containing not more than 2.5 milligrammes of diphenoxylate calculated as base and not less than 25 microgrammes of atropine suphate per dosage unit.

4. *Pulvis ipecauanhae etopii compositus*

10 per cent opium in powder

10 per cent ipecacuanha root, in powder well mixed with

80 per cent of any other powdered ingredient containing no drug.

5. Preparations conforming to any of the formulae listed in this Schedule and mixtures of such preparation with any material which contains no drug.

LIST OF DRUGS INCLUDED IN SCHEDULE IV

Cannabis and cannabis resin,

Desomorphine (dihydrodeoxymorphine),

Heroin (diacetylmorphine),

Ketobemidone (4-*meta*-hydroxyphenyl-1-methyl-4-propionylpipeidine); and

The salts of the drugs listed in this Schedule whenever the formation of such salts is possible.

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE AT GENEVA

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary of State of the United States of America and has the honour to communicate the following amendments to Schedule III of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, which were adopted by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council at its twenty-first session, 5–21 December 1966, following upon recommendations made by the World Health Organization:

LIST OF PREPARATIONS INCLUDED IN SCHEDULE III

1. Section 1 (a) and (b) are deleted and replaced by the following: "When compounded with one or more other ingredients and containing not more than 100 milligram of the drug per dosage unit and with a concentration of not more than 2.5 per cent in undivided preparations."

2. In section 2 delete the words "in such a way that the preparation has no, or a negligible risk of abuse, and", so that the paragraph reads as follows: "Preparations of cocaine containing not more than 0.1 per cent of cocaine calculated as cocaine base and preparations of opium or morphine containing not more than 0.2 per cent of morphine calculated as anhydrous morphine base and compounded with one or more other ingredients in such a way that the drug cannot be recovered by readily applicable means or in a yield which would constitute a risk to public health."

3. In section 3 delete the words "Solid dose".

The Secretary-General has the honour to invite attention to Article 3, paragraph 7 of the 1961 Convention whereby the above decisions would become effective with respect to each Party on the date of its receipt of such communication, and the Parties would thereupon take such action as might be required under the Convention.

P.I.

20 January 1967.

EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1. The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary of State and with reference to the Secretary-General's circular note, reference C.N.212.1964.TREATIES–17 of 20 November 1964, advising that the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, will come into force on 13 December 1964, has the honour to communicate the attached amendments to the Schedules of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. These amendments were adopted by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council at its nineteenth session (see Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Thirty-seventh Session, document E/3893, paragraphs 157 and 158), pursuant to recommendations by the World Health Organization.

2. It was understood that in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 7, of the 1961 Convention, this decision should be communicated as soon as the Convention comes into force by the Secretary-General to all States Members of the United Nations, to Non-Member States Parties to this Convention, to the World Health Organization and to the Permanent Central Opium Board and Drug Supervisory Body, and that the decision would become effective with respect to each Party on the date of its receipt of such communication. The Parties would thereupon take such action as might be required under the Convention.

D.A.C.

11 December 1964.

SCHEDULE I

The following items should be added:

Fentanyl [1-phenethyl-4-N-propionylanilinopiperidine];

Methadone-intermediate [4-cyano-2-dimethylamino-4, 4-diphenylbutane];

Moramide-intermediate [2-methyl-3-morpholino - 1,1 - diphenylpropane - carboxylic acid];

Noracymethadol [(±)-alpha-3-acetoxy-6-methylamino-4, 4-diphenylheptane];

Norpipanone [4,4-diphenyl-6-piperidine-3-hexanone];

Pethidine-intermediate-A [4-cyano-1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine];

Pethidine-intermediate-B [4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid ethyl ester];

Pethidine-intermediate-C [1-methyl-4-phenylpiperidine-4-carboxylic acid];

SCHEDULE II

Nicocodine (6-nicotinylcodeine) should be added.

Dextropropoxyphene [(+)-4-dimethylamino-3-methyl-1,2 - diphenyl-2-propionoxybutane] should be deleted.

SCHEDULE III

Of the substances listed in section (1), dextropropoxyphene should be deleted.

EUROPEAN OFFICE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary of State and has the honour to communicate, in accordance with article 3, paragraph 7, of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, an amendment to Schedule I of this Convention, namely, the addition to that Schedule of the following substance:

1-(3-cyano-3, 3-diphenylpropyl)-4-(1-piperidino) piperidine-4-carboxylic acid amide (the proposed international non-proprietary name of which is piritramide) and its salts.

This amendment was adopted by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Economic and Social Council at its twentieth session (document E/4140, paragraph 54).

The attention of Governments is drawn to article 3, paragraph 7, of the Convention under which such decision of the Commission shall become effective with respect to each Party on the date of its receipt of such communication, and the Parties shall thereupon take such action as may be required under this Convention.

S.P.S.

2 February 1966.

UNITED NATIONS OFFICE AT GENEVA

The Secretary-General of the United Nations presents his compliments to the Secretary of State of the United States of America and with reference to his note dated 17 June 1966 (NAR/CL.5/1966) has the honour to state that the Commission on Narcotic Drugs has decided that the substances M.183 (the proposed international non-proprietary name of which is acetorphine) and M.99 (the proposed international non-proprietary name of which is etorphine) should be added to Schedule I of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, and that the substance M.285 (the proposed international nonproprietary name of which is cyprenorphine) should not be placed on any of the Schedules of the 1961 Convention.

The decision of the Commission was taken pursuant to the recommendations of the World Health Organization under Article 3 of the 1961 Convention and in accordance with the procedure adopted by the Commission at its twentieth session (Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fortieth session, Supplement No. 2; document E/4140, Resolution 1 (XX)).

The attention of governments is drawn to Article 3, paragraph 7, of the 1961 Convention by which such decision "shall become effective with respect to each Party on the date of its receipt of such communication, and the Parties shall thereupon take such action as may be required under this Convention".

19 October 1966.

FINAL ACT, UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE FOR THE ADOPTION OF A SINGLE CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS—UNITED NATIONS, 1961

1. The Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, by resolution 689 J (XXVI) of 28 July 1958, decided to convene in accordance with Article 62, paragraph 4, of the Charter of the United Nations, and with the provisions of General Assembly resolution 366 (IV) of 3 December 1949, a plenipotentiary conference for the adoption of a single convention on narcotic drugs to replace by a single instrument the existing multilateral treaties in the field, to reduce the number of international treaty organs exclusively concerned with control of narcotic drugs, and to make provision for the control of the production of raw materials of narcotic drugs.

2. The United Nations Conference for the Adoption of a Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs met at United Nations Headquarters from 24 January to 25 March 1961.

3. The following seventy-three States were represented by representatives at the Conference:

Afghanistan
Albania
Argentina
Australia
Bolivia
Brazil
Bulgaria
Burma
Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic
Cambodia
Canada
Chad
Chile
China
Congo (Léopoldville)
Costa Rica
Czechoslovakia
Dahomey
Denmark
Dominican Republic
El Salvador
Finland
France
Germany, Federal Republic of
Ghana
Greece
Guatemala
Haiti
Holy See
Hungary
India
Indonesia
Iran
Iraq
Israel
Italy
Japan
Jordan
Korea, Republic of
Lebanon
Liberia
Madagascar
Mexico
Monaco
Morocco
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Nigeria
Norway
Pakistan
Panama
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Senegal
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Thailand
Tunisia
Turkey
Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United Arab Republic
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
United States of America
Uruguay
Venezuela
Yugoslavia

4. The following State was represented by an observer at the Conference:

Ceylon

5. The following specialized agencies were represented at the Conference:

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations;
International Civil Aviation Organization;
International Labour Organisation;
World Health Organization.

6. The following international bodies were represented at the Conference:

Permanent Central Opium Board;
Drug Supervisory Body.

7. The following non-governmental organizations were also represented at the Conference;

International Conference of Catholic Charities;
International Criminal Police Organization;
International Federation of Women Lawyers.

8. General Safwat, Director of the Permanent Anti-Narcotics Bureau of the League of Arab States, at the invitation of the Conference, also attended in a personal capacity.

9. In accordance with the resolution of the Economic and Social Council referred to in paragraph 1 and with the rules of procedure adopted by the Conference, the observers and the representatives of the above-mentioned organizations and bodies participated in the work of the Conference without the right to vote.

10. The Conference elected Mr. Carl Schurmann (Netherlands) as President, and as Vice-Presidents the representatives of the following States:

Afghanistan
Brazil
Dahomey
France
Hungary
India
Iran
Japan
Mexico
Pakistan
Peru
Switzerland
Thailand
Turkey
United Arab Republic
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
United States of America

11. The Executive Secretary of the Conference was Mr. G. E. Yates, and the Deputy Executive Secretary was Mr. Adolf Lande.

12. The Conference had before it, in accordance with the resolution of the Economic and Social Council, the third draft of a single convention on narcotic drugs prepared by the Commission on Narcotic Drugs of the Council and a compilation of the comments thereon; it also had before it other documentation prepared by the Secretariat.

13. The Conference set up the following committees:

GENERAL COMMITTEE

Chairman: The President of the Conference

Ad Hoc *Committee on articles 2 and 3 of the Third Draft* (Scope of the Convention and Method of Bringing Additional Substances under Control)

Chairman: Mr. A. Tabibi (Afghanistan)

Ad Hoc *Committee on articles 25, 30 and 40–43* (National Control in General)

Chairman: Mr. B. Banerji (India)

Ad Hoc *Committee on articles 31–34* (National Control of Opium Poppy and Poppy Straw)

Chairman: Mr. L. Ignacio-Pinto (Dahomey)

Vice-Chairman: Mr. J. Koch (Denmark)

Ad Hoc *Committee on articles 35–38* (National Control of Coca Leaf)

Chairman: Mr. K. Chikaraishi (Japan)

Ad Hoc *Committee on article 39* (National Control of Cannabis)

Chairman: Mr. B. Grinberg (Bulgaria)

Ad Hoc *Committee on articles 26, 27–29, 20–21, 4* (Information to be furnished by Governments; the system of estimates and statistics; obligations of Governments in general)

Chairman: Mr. E. Rodriguez Fabregat (Uruguay)

Vice-Chairman: Mr. J. Bertschinger (Switzerland)

Ad Hoc *Committee on article 22* (Measures exercisable by the Board in case of noncompliance)

Chairman: Mr. A. Gurinovich (Byelorussian SSR)

Ad Hoc *Committee on articles 5–11, 13–19, 23* (Constitution, Functions and Secretariat of International Organs)

Chairman: Mr. H. Blomstedt (Finland)

Ad Hoc *Committee on articles 44–46* (Direct Measures against the Illicit Traffic)

Chairman: Mr. A. Bittencourt (Brazil)

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

Chairman: Mr. A. Johnson (Australia)

Vice-Chairman: Mr. A. Ismael (United Arab Republic)

DRAFTING COMMITTEE

Chairman: Mr. R. Curran (Canada)

Vice-Chairman: Mr. D. Nikolic (Yugoslavia)

CREDENTIALS COMMITTEE

Chairman: Mr. G. Ortiz (Costa Rica)

14. As the result of its deliberations, as recorded in the summary records of the Plenary and the summary records and reports of the committees, the Conference adopted[1] and opened for signature the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. In addition the Conference adopted the five resolutions annexed to this Final Act.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the representatives have signed this Final Act.

DONE at New York, this thirtieth day of March one thousand nine hundred and sixty-one, in a single copy in the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish languages, each text being equally authentic. The original texts shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

---

[1] The Conference took note that the Convention was approved without prejudice to decisions or declarations in any relevant General Assembly resolutions.

For Afghanistan:
Abdul H. Tabibi
For Albania: [3]
R. Malile
For Argentina:
C. Ortiz
For Australia:
H. S. Warren
For Bolivia:
——— ———
For Brazil:
Aluysio Guedes Regis Bittencourt
For Bulgaria: [3]
Y. Tchobanov
For Burma:
Tin Maung
For the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic: [4]
K. Shadursky
For Cambodia:
Nong Kimny
For Canada:
R. E. Curran
For Chad:
J. Charlot
For Chile:
D. Schweitzer
For China:
Wei Hsioh-ren
For the Congo (Léopoldville):
——— ———
For Costa Rica:
G. Ortiz Martin
For Czechoslovakia:[5]
Dr. Zdeněk Cerník
For Dahomey:
Louis Ignacio-Pinto
For Denmark:
A. Hesselund Jensen
For the Dominican Republic:
——— ———
For El Salvador:
M. Rafael Urquía
For the Federal Republic of Germany:
G. Brunner
For Finland:
Henrik Blomstedt
For France:
P. Millet
A. Mabileau
For Ghana:
Alex Sackey
For Greece:
P. Economou-Gouras
For Guatemala:
——— ———
For Haiti:
——— ———
For the Holy See:
James H. Griffiths
For Hungary: [6]
Mod Péter
For India:
B. N. Banerji
For Indonesia:
S. Wirjopranoto
Subject to ratification and reservations to articles 40, 42 and 48.
For Iran:
Dr. Azarakhsh
For Iraq:
Adnan Pachachi
For Israel:
——— ———
For Italy:
——— ———
For Japan:
Koto Matsudaira
For Jordan:
J. Joury
For Lebanon:
Georges Hakim
For Liberia:
Archibald Johnson, M.D.
For Madagascar:
Andriamaharo
For Mexico:
——— ———
For Monaco:
Marcel A. Palmaro
For Morocco:
——— ———
For the Netherlands:
C. Schurmann
For New Zealand:
D. P. Kennedy
R. W. Sharp
For Nicaragua:
Luis Manuel Debayle
For Nigeria:
Alahaji Muhammad
For Norway:
Sivert A. Nielsen
For Pakistan:
M. Aslam
For Panama:
César A. Quintero
For Paraguay:
Miguel Solano López
For Peru:
M. F. Maúrtua
For the Philippines:
F. A. Delgado
For Poland:[7]
B. Lewandowski
For Portugal:[8]
Luís Soares de Oliveria
For the Republic of Korea:
Moon D. C.
For Romania:
——— ———
For Senegal:
O. S. Diop
For Spain:
Jaime de Piniés
For Sweden:
——— ———
For Switzerland:
Michael V. R. von Schenck
For Thailand:
Sirivat Viseshsiri
Prasit Punnapayak
For Tunisia:
Ayari
For Turkey:
——— ———
For the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic: [9]
Oleg Bogomolets
For the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics: [10]
Konstantin Rodionov
For the United Arab Republic:
Dr. Amin Ismail
For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:
Patrick Dean
For the United States of America:
Carl De Baggio
For Uruguay:
——— ———
For Venezuela:
Rafael Darío Berti G.
For Yugoslavia:
Dragan Nikolic
The President of the Conference:
C. Schurmann
The Executive Secretary of the Conference:
G. E. Yates
The Deputy Executive Secretary of the Conference:
Adolf Lande

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE FOR THE ADOPTION OF A SINGLE CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS—(UNITED NATIONS, 1961)

RESOLUTION I

Technical assistance on narcotic drugs

The Conference,

Welcoming the establishment by General Assembly resolution 1395 (XIV) of special arrangements for technical assistance in the field of narcotics control,

---

[3] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"In signing this Act, the Albanian delegation declares that it does not recognize the validity of the credentials presented by the so-called representative of China and the representative of the Congo (Léopoldville). The only legal Government of China is the Central Government of the People's Republic of China."

[3] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"With a reservation as to paragraph 3 in respect of the validity of the representation of China and the Republic of the Congo (Léopoldville). On behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria, it is expressly stated that only the Government of the Peoples Republic of China is competent to act in the name of China in international affairs and that the Republic of the Congo can be validly represented only by the Government invested by Parliament and at present headed by Mr. Antoine Gizenga."

[4] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"Signature of this Act by the representative of the Byelorussian SSR may not be interpreted as implying agreement with the statement in paragraph 3 of the Act that China was represented at the Conference, since no representatives appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China took part in it. This declaration also applies to the representation of the Republic of the Congo at the Conference, inasmuch as the credentials of the Congolese delegation were not issued by the Government headed by Antoine Gizenga."

[5] The signing of the Final Act on our part does not represent a recognition of the so-called "credentials" issued by the Chiang Kai-shek authorities on Taiwan nor that of the "credentials" of the Congolese delegation (Léopoldville). The only legitimate Government of China entitled to issue credentials is the Central Government of the People's Republic of China in Peking. The only legitimate Government of the Republic of the Congo is its Central Government in Stanleyville.

[6] The signing of this Act does not imply the recognition by the Hungarian Government of the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek and the Congo (Léopoldville) present at this Conference.

[7] The above signature does not in any way imply a recognition of credentials of those persons who signed the present Final Act for China and the Republic of the Congo (Léopoldville).

[8] On the understanding that footnote to paragraph 14 is juridically irrelevant and, in no case, will prejudice reservations made by Member States to the Resolutions or other decisions of the General Assembly.

[9] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"Signature of this Act by the representative of the Ukrainian SSR may not be interpreted as implying agreement with the statement in paragraph 3 of the Act that China was represented at the Conference, since no representatives appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China took part in it. This declaration also applies to the representation of the Republic of the Congo at the Conference, inasmuch as the credentials of the Congolese delegation were not issued by the Government headed by Antoine Gizenga."

[10] [*Translation by the Secretariat of the United Nations:*]

"Signature of this Act by the representative of the USSR may not be interpreted as implying agreement with the statement in paragraph 3 of the Act that China was represented at the Conference, since no representatives appointed by the Government of the People's Republic of China took part in it. This declaration also applies to the representation of the Republic of the Congo at the Conference, inasmuch as the credentials of the Congolese delegation were not issued by the Government headed by Antoine Gizenga."

Noting that the United Nations and the specialized agencies concerned have already provided a limited amount of assistance under the Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and in their regular programmes,

Welcoming also the co-operation of the International Criminal Police Organization in the execution of technical assistance projects,

Expresses the hope that adequate resources will be made available to provide assistance in the fight against the illicit traffic, to those countries which desire and request it, particularly in the form of expert advisers and of training, including training courses for national officials.

RESOLUTION II

Treatment of drug addicts

The Conference,

Recalling the provisions of article 38 of the Convention concerning the treatment and rehabiliation of drug addicts,

1. *Declares* that one of the most effective methods of treatment for addiction is treatment in a hospital institution having a drug-free atmosphere;

2. *Urges* Parties having a serious drug addiction problem, and the economic means to do so, to provide such facilities.

RESOLUTION III

Illicit traffickers

The Conference,

1. *Calls attention* to the importance of the technical records on international traffickers kept at present by the International Criminal Police Organization;

2. *Recommends* that these records be completed as far as possible by all parties and be widely used for the circulation of description of the traffickers by that Organization.

RESOLUTION IV

Membership on the Commission on Narcotic Drugs

The Conference,

Invites the Economic and Social Council to examine at its thirty-second session the question of an increase in the membership of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs, in the light of the terms of this Convention and of the views expressed on this question at this Conference.

RESOLUTION V

International control machinery

The Conference,

Considering the importance of facilitating the transitional arrangements provided for in article 45 of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961,

Invites the Economic and Social Council to study the possibility of taking measures which would ensure the rapid and smooth carrying out of the simplification of the international control machinery.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, Executive G, 88th Congress, first session, contains conventions concerning the international exchange of publications and documents adopted by UNESCO which had been transmitted to the Senate on May 9, 1963. They are: First, a convention concerning the exchange of official publications and government documents between States, referred to as the Official Convention; and second, a convention concerning the international exchange of publications, referred to as the General Convention.

The Official Convention provides for the exchange on a reciprocal basis, of official publications and government documents, which are executed by the order and at the expense of the national governmental authority such as parliamentary documents, reports, journals and other legislative papers; administrative publications and reports from central, federal and regional governmental bodies; national bibliographies, state handbooks, bodies of law, decisions of the courts of justice; and other publications as may be agreed upon. While each contracting party is free to determine the items which shall constitute exchange material, confidential items are specifically excluded. The function of exchanging is to be carried out in each participating country by a national exchange service, or where such does not exist, the central authority or authorities designated for that purpose. Transport charges are to be met by the sending country to the point of destination or, if by sea, to the port of entry. The material is to be admitted customs-free. Other provisions concern international coordination of exchange, information and studies, assistance of UNESCO, relations to previous agreements, languages, ratification and acceptance, accession, entry into force, territorial extension, denunciation, notifications, revision, and registration.

In the General Convention the parties undertake to encourage and facilitate the exchange of publications between both governmental bodies and nongovernmental institutions of an educational, scientific, and technical or cultural nature, which are nonprofitmaking in character. The following publications are considered appropriate for exchange—but not for resale: publications of an educational, legal, scientific and technical, cultural and informational nature, such as books, newspapers and periodicals, maps and plans, prints, photographs, miscroscopes, musical works, braille publications and other graphic material and the publications covered by the Official Convention.

With few and minor exceptions, the provisions of the General Convention follow those of the Official Convention.

These are the third and fourth UNESCO conventions considered by the committee. The first two—the Beirut agreement concerning the circulation of audiovisual materials of an educational, scientific, and cultural character and the Florence agreement on the importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials—were approved by the Senate in 1960 but not ratified until last year, when the implementing legislation was enacted. In the letter transmitting the present conventions to the President, the Acting Secretary of State—George W. Ball—in 1963 wrote that—

> The Florence Agreement implementing legislation then pending "would also serve for the purpose of implementing the General Convention in such a way as to enable this Government to take all administrative steps necessary to carry out its obligations under the convention with respect to those items not presently on the duty-free list.

He added further:

> Exchange operations are now functioning satisfactorily in the United States within our existing framework, and the conventions are not intended to change them. The major justification for the conventions for this country is the expectation that they will bring about an improvement of exchange conditions in other countries, from which the United States will benefit. . . . In their general implications, the conventions will also promote the international information program of the United States.

Both conventions entered into force in 1961.

The Committee on Foreign Relations has received no comments, pro or con, on these conventions since they were received in 1963.

Mr. President, Executive A, 90–1, Executive Calendar No. 17, is an amendment to article 109 of the United Nations Charter adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 20, 1965, and transmitted to the Senate on January 23, 1967.

This amendment corrects an oversight. The U.N. Charter amendments approved by the committee and the Senate in 1965 increased the membership of the Security Council set forth in article 23 from 11 to 15, and at the same time from 7 to 9 the number of affirmative votes required for Council decisions set forth in article 27. Inadvertently a conforming change in Security Council voting requirements was not made in article 109, paragraph 1, which reads as follows—changes proposed shown by brackets and italic:

Article 109

> 1. A general Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any [seven] *nine* members of the Security Council . . .

There have been no objections to this treaty.

Mr. President, the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotics—Executive G, 90th Congress, first session—is the result of over 50 years of effort and progress in the field of international narcotics control. Its provisions are designed primarily to insure that the production and use of narcotic drugs are restricted to medical and scientific purposes.

Pursuant to the convention's provisions, parties must license all manufacture, trade or distribution of drugs; control the persons or enterprises engaged in these activities; license the establishments or premises where these activities take place; require that manufacturers obtain periodical permits specifying the kinds and amounts of drugs authorized to be manufactured; and prevent excessive accumulations of drugs in the hands of manufacturers, traders, and distributors.

In addition, the convention provides that parties must not knowingly permit the export of drugs to a country except in accordance with the laws and regulations of that country. Moreover, all parties must license the import and export of drugs, and control the persons and the enterprises engaged in these activities. In this connection, the parties to the convention shall not permit the possession of drugs except under legal authority.

Mr. President, this convention is supported by the Departments of State, and Treasury, and by Mr. H. J. Anslinger, the former Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics.

I should add that no witness testified against the convention and the committee has received no indication of opposition to it at this time from any source in this country. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will give its advice and consent to accession to the convention.

Mr. President, these conventions were reported without objection by the Committee on Foreign Relations and I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the reports which accompanied them may be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The excerpts from the reports are as follows:

Conventions on the International Exchange of Publications and Documents

PURPOSE

Executive G contains two closely related treaties: (1) a Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents Between States referred to as the *Official* Convention; and (2) a Convention Concerning the International Exchange of Publications, referred to as the *General* Convention. Many of the articles in the conventions are alike or very similar.

The *Official* Convention provides for the exchange on a reciprocal basis, of official publications and Government documents, which are executed by the order and at the expense of the *national* governmental authority (italic supplied) such as parliamentary documents, reports, journals, and other legislative papers; administrative publications and reports from Central, Federal, and regional governmental bodies; national bibliographies, State handbooks, bodies of law, decisions of the courts of justice; and other publications as may be agreed upon. While each contracting party is free to determine the items which shall constitute exchange material, confidential items are specifically excluded. The function of exchanging documents is to be carried out in each participating country by a national exchange service, or where such does not exist, the central authority or authorities designated for that purpose. For the United States, the Library of Congress has been carrying and will continue to carry out this function. Transport charges are to be met by the sending country to the point of destination or, if by sea, to the port of entry. The material is to be admitted customs free.

Other provisions of the treaty concern international coordination of exchange, information and studies, assistance of the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), relations to previous agreements, languages, ratification and acceptance, accession, entry into force, territorial extension, denunciation, notifications, revision, and registration.

In the *General* Convention the parties undertake to encourage and facilitate the exchange of publications between both governmental bodies and nongovernmental institutions of an educational, scientific and technical or cultural nature, which are *non-profit-making* in character. The following publications are considered appropriate for exchange (but not for resale): publications of an educational, legal, scientific and technical, cultural, and informational nature, such as books, newspapers and periodicals, maps and plans, prints, photographs, microcopies, musical works, braille publications and other graphic material, and the publications covered by the *Official* convention.

With few and minor exceptions, the provisions of the *General* Convention follow those of the *Official* Convention.

BACKGROUND

These are the third and fourth UNESCO conventions considered by the committee. The first two—the Beirut agreement concerning the circulation of audiovisual materials of an educational, scientific, and cultural character and the Florence agreement on the importation of educational, scientific, and cultural materials—were approved by the Senate in 1960 but not ratified by the President until last year, after the implementing legislation was enacted. In the letter transmitting the present conventions to the President, the Acting Secretary of State (George W. Ball) wrote that the Florence agreement implementing legislation then pending "would also serve for the purpose of implementing the *General* Convention in such a way as to enable this Government to take all administrative steps necessary to carry out its obligations under the convention with respect to those items not presently on the duty-free list." He added further:

"Exchange operations are now functioning satisfactorily in the United States within our existing framework, and the convention are not intended to change them. The major justification for the conventions for this country is the expectation that they will bring about an improvement of exchange conditions in other countries from which the United States will benefit. * * * In their general implications, the conventions will also promote the international information program of the United States."

Both conventions entered into force in 1961. Twenty-three nations, including the U.S.S.R. and some of its satellites, are parties to them.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND COMMENTS

Although these conventions were adopted by the UNESCO in 1958, they were not submitted to the Senate until 1963, when the executive branch reached agreement on the nature of the legislation proposed for implementing the Florence convention. As already noted, this implementing legislation was enacted in 1966.

On April 27, 1967, the Committee on Foreign Relations held a hearing on Executive G at which Charles Frankel, Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs, and L. Quincy Mumford, Librarian of Congress, testified in favor of the treaties. Their prepared statements are appended to this report.

On May 2 in executive session the committee ordered the conventions reported to the Senate for favorable action.

No additional implementing legislation will be required. The provisions of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Materials Importation Act of 1966 (Public Law 89–651) are considered adequate to cover any materials referred to in these conventions.

As already noted, these conventions do not obligate the United States to do anything that it is not now doing. They do not compel the United States per se to send or accept any publications. They are entirely permissive—in the Official Convention, contracting states express their willingness to exchange publications; in the General Convention, they undertake to encourage and facilitate the exchange of publications. Certainly, these are objectives to which the United States can subscribe.

It is the recommendation of the Committee on Foreign Relations that the Senate advise and consent to ratification of conventions contained in Executive G, 88th Congress, first session.

Amendment to Article 109 of the United Nations Charter

PROVISIONS

This amendment corrects an oversight. The U.N. Charter amendments approved by the committee and the Senate in 1965 increased the membership of the Security Council from 11 to 15, and at the same time increased from seven to nine the number of affirmative votes required for Council decisions. Inadvertently the United Nations failed to include in its amendments a conforming change in Security Council voting requirements in article 109, paragraph 1, which reads as follows (changes proposed shown by brackets and italic):

"Article 109

"1. A general Conference of the Members of the United Nations for the purpose of reviewing the present Charter may be held at a date and a place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any [seven] *nine* members of the Security Council. * * * "

COMMITTEE ACTION AND COMMENTS

This amendment was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 20, 1965, and transmitted to the Senate on January 23, 1967. The committee had a public hearing on this item, among others, on April 27 at which Philip B. Heymann, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs testified. His statement is appended to the report. On May 2, 1967, in executive session, the committee, without objection, ordered the amendment reported favorably to the Senate.

The committee recommends that the Senate give its advice and consent to the ratification of this amendment to the United Nations Charter.

Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961

BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE

The Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs (1961) was formulated at a United Nations Conference held in New York from January 24 through March 25, 1961. It is designed to terminate and replace the provisions of eight existing multilateral treaties, to simplify international narcotic control machinery, and to provide additional measures for the international control of narcotic drugs.

During the period the convention was open for signature (Mar. 30 to Aug. 1, 1961), it was signed by 64 countries, *not* including the United States. As of this date, 34 of those countries have deposited their instruments of ratification and 20 other countries have acceded to it. The main reason the convention was not signed for the United States in 1961 was because the convention permits any country to produce and export up to 5 tons of opium and it was feared that this would result in increased illicit drug traffic. In addition, it was felt that the provisions permitting reservations would have a crippling effect on international narcotics control measures. According to the Department of State, however, neither of these concerns has materialized and now it is believed that the "national and international interest in drug control will be significantly advanced" by U.S. accession to the single convention.

PROVISIONS OF CONVENTION

The Single Convention of 1961 contains detailed provisions relating to the control of narcotic drugs ranging from their production, sale, and distribution to recommendations involving the medical treatment, care, and rehabilitation of drug addicts. For example it lists four schedules of narcotic drugs classified according to the degree of their addicting liability; it requires the establishment of a national agency to supervise and control the cultivation of the coca bush and the cannabis plant; and it provides for the carriage of drugs in first-aid kits aboard ships and aircraft engaged in international traffic.

In addition, the convention limits the production, manufacture, sale, and distribution of narcotic drugs to medical and scientific needs. All parties to the convention are required to furnish annually to the International Control Board estimates of their requirements for narcotic drugs and statistical returns showing the production or manufacture of drugs, and the stocks on hand as of the end of each year. Parties are also required to exercise control over persons engaged in the trade or distribution of narcotic drugs and to license manufacturers and distributors of such drugs.

Under the terms of article 41, the single convention will enter into force for the United States 30 days after its instrument of accession is deposited.

A comprehensive explanation and analysis of the convention is contained in a statement submitted by the Treasury Department which has been incorporated in the appendix to this report.

COMMITTEE ACTION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Committee on Foreign Relations held a public hearing on the pending convention on April 27, 1967, at which time testimony in support of it was received from Mr. Walter M. Kotschnig, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs, Mr. James Pomeroy Hendrick, Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury (for enforcement), and Mr. H. J. Anslinger, former Commissioner of the Bureau of Narcotics. Their statements are reprinted in the appendix for the information of the Senate and the public. No witness testified against the convention and the committee has received no indication of opposition to it at this time from any source in this country.

The convention was considered in executive session on May 2, 1967, and it was ordered reported favorably with the recommendation that the Senate give its advice and consent to accession thereto.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and this has been agreed to by all parties concerned, so far as I am aware—that the vote on these conventions occur at 12 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that there be a yea-and-nay vote on each convention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

Unanimous-Consent Agreement

Ordered, That at 12:10 p.m. on Friday, May 5, 1967, the Senate proceed to vote, by three separate votes, on the treaties, numbered 16 through 18, Executive G (88th Cong., first sess.), Executive A (90th Cong., first sess.), Executive G (90th Cong., first sess.).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the treaties will be considered as having passed through all of their various parliamentary stages up to and including the presentation of the resolutions of ratification, which the clerk will read.

The resolution of ratification of Executive G, 88th Congress, first session, was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Convention Concerning the Exchange of Official Publications and Government Documents Between States and the Convention Concerning the International Exchange of Publications, adopted December 3, 1958.

The resolution of ratification of Executive A, 90th Congress, first session, was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the amendment to article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 20, 1965.

The resolution of ratification of Executive G, 90th Congress, first session, was read, as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the accession to the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, open for signature at New York, March 3, 1961, to October 1, 1961.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNITED STATES FAILS TO RESPOND TO CRISIS IN GREECE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, in his recent testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, Prof. Henry Steele Commager made a point about American attitudes that I believe is worth recalling as we try to understand the reaction of the U.S. Government to the military takeover in Greece. Professor Commager suggested that—

> Nations that are self-righteous and powerful are almost irresistibly prone to creating or accepting a double standard of conduct. Britain was guilty of this during much of the nineteenth century, and it is not perhaps surprising that the United States—or the American people—indulge in it today.

Professor Commager went on to say:

> It is perhaps in the realm of foreign relations, where we instinctively take for granted (as do other nations) the justice of our foreign policies, that we exhibit most markedly traces of a double standard.

Mr. President, the U.S. Government's silence on the overthrow of Greece's constitutional government is a conspicuous example of our tendency to indulge in a double standard in our reactions to sudden changes in government in other countries.

This tendency toward a national double standard in responding to political violence has its roots in our preoccupation with what has come to be called the Communist menace or Communist aggression. In our efforts to do battle with international communism we have all too often allowed ourselves to drift into the position of becoming the champions of the status quo.

When a government is brought down by force, the United States usually sits on its hands when a coup is staged by forces of the right, but when the overthrow is carried out by the left we condemn the action, and occasionally commit our power to reverse it. The reason for this difference in our reaction is clear enough. Rightist or conservative forces usually represent the status quo, so we tend to be more tolerant of their political activities, even when a constitutional government is the victim.

Since 1960, for example, the United States has given at least tacit approval, and in most cases quick recognition, to seven new regimes resulting from right wing, military coups in El Salvador, Korea, Burma, Guatemala, Ecuador, Ghana and Indonesia. During the same period, we supported only one left wing coup and that was in Yemen.

In the present case, if the constitutional government of Greece had not been overthrown by this junta of Greek colonies, it is generally accepted that the election scheduled for late May would have brought the leftwing party of George Papandreou back into power. At the very worst, a government controlled by Papandreou might have withdrawn Greece from NATO and put the country into a position of neutrality between East and West. The United States would, of course, be most dismayed if a leftist government did take Greece out of NATO. But I submit that if a duly elected government were to make such a decision, then it should take place. Moreover, I believe our national interests are usually better served by having more neutral nations with governments reasonably reflecting their people, than by allies with governments which do not reflect their people and which have to be artificially shored up with American money, and more important, American men.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished junior Senator from Rhode Island be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PELL. I thank the Senator.

I cannot help but recall almost 20 years ago when the tables were turned and the Communists in Czechoslovakia were in a similar situation. An election was scheduled to occur, at which time it was inevitable that the Communists, having failed in their various programs, would fare badly in the election. As the American vice consul in Slovakia at the time, I predicted that because the Communists would do badly in the election, they would take extra-legal methods of avoiding an election. This is exactly what happened. The Communists, in order to avoid failure in a fair election, simply set it aside by their putsch and then arranged for a rigged election.

In the present situation in Greece, I should also like to point out that this coup was made by the Greek military using almost entirely American-made weapons and materials. So far there has been no statement of protest by our Government for this misuse of equipment intended to help the Greeks protect themselves from invasion by Bulgaria or any other external threats. Moreover, our Government has had nothing to say about the suspension of the democratic process in Greece and the wholesale jailing of the political opposition. Rather, we are told we should not comment, as any comment by the United States might bring on a civil war. I would only trust that, while American weapons have been used in the coup, no branch of our Government was involved in it. I would also expect that

Greece will receive no more military aid from the United States until civil and political liberties have been fully restored.

I should also hope that our President will let Greece and the rest of the world know that we deplore this attack on democratic ideals and institutions, particularly in view of our longstanding friendship, and affection. Yes, love for Greece and her wonderful, creative, freedom loving people. I urge the President to make this clear even if his disapproval should increase the risk of internal strife in Greece. The President must know what is at stake here. Shall we apply the lesson of our own revolutionary history, or shall we cling to a double standard in our attitudes toward changes in government in other countries? If the threat of violence in Greece keeps us from being true to our own history, our Government will do well to remember Thomas Jefferson's thoughts on the price men must sometimes pay for liberty. It was Jefferson who described the French revolution as "one of the agonizing spasms of infuriated man, seeking through blood and slaughter his long-lost liberties."

Mr. President, I do not want to be misunderstood here. I am not recommending civil strife in Greece. No man in this Chamber deplores violence more than I do, whether in Vietnam or in Greece. But if we believe that our objective in Vietnam is the preservation of the rights of the Vietnamese people to choose their own form of government, how can we be indifferent to the destruction of that same right in Greece? Liberties have been lost in Greece. We, as a Nation, must censure those responsible. I trust our Government will meet this responsibility.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to proceed for 6 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am about to speak of something which I know is on the minds of many Senators, upon which I find I cannot speak, under conditions presently prevailing in this body, other than during the morning hour, for reasons which are obvious to all of us.

So at this time, during the morning hour, I should like to say something which is mighty important to the Senate and the Nation.

Mr. President, the newspapers today described yesterday's session of the Senate as "another day of inconclusive maneuvering and debate." I suppose today we shall have more of the same. This body has been stymied for 4 weeks on the matter of the campaign financing law. The Senate has voted three times in 3 weeks to repeal that law, and we are, today, still at an impasse. In my 11 years in the Senate, I can recall no time when public confidence in the Senate has been as low, and, I must add, with considerable cause. The impression we have given to the Nation in the past few weeks is that chaos reigns here, and that the present leadership in this body has produced it.

I should think the patience of Senators would be worn beyond reasonableness, and that it is high time that we as Members of this body should speak out, as I as one Senator am doing today, and as I hope others will, and demand more responsibility on the part of our leadership, and certainly on the part of the majority leadership, to lead us to some decisive action phase with respect to this matter.

It is time to stop playing games and to start working as the highest deliberative body in the United States.

This is the fifth month of the session. According to the Congressional Quarterly box score on major legislation, there has been final action on only two measures: The Consular Treaty and the Vietnam supplemental appropriations. We have also passed in the Senate the Legislative Reorganization Act after 7 weeks of debate only to see it apparently buried in the other body.

By way of comparison, at this time in the 89th Congress the Senate had passed seven major pieces of legislation.

The 88th Congress, in May of 1963—that Congress then being widely assailed as one of the most lethargic in history—had passed four major pieces of legislation according to the Congressional Quarterly box score.

I believe that we must get off the dime and begin to legislate.

The first question we must ask ourselves concerns how many times this body must vote on any issue before disposing of it.

We have voted three times already that there should be no campaign financing law, and apparently we must vote again on the matter.

I understand that there is even consideration in the Chamber of giving in on the issue, notwithstanding the view of the majority of the Senate.

If we tolerate the same kind of shenanigans on every piece of controversial legislation, the Senate and the country would be at a standstill.

The situation in the Senate is intolerable, and the Members of the Senate know it.

It is on the verge of becoming a national scandal. The public deserves a better performance by the Senate, and I hope very much that we will all do something about it.

I am not criticizing anybody, because every Senator has a right to fight with his greatest devotion for what he believes in and to use all the rules and make every effort to win his point. However, the rest of us have a duty also.

This is what I propose to do for myself, and I suggest that perhaps other Members would want to do the same.

We should accept no more amendments to the bill—good, bad, or indifferent.

We must file a cloture motion. With all respect to the participating debaters, the Senate must declare itself as to whether it will stop this charade. The only way in which to do that is by a cloture motion.

It would require a two-thirds vote to invoke cloture, but only 16 Senators are required to file a cloture motion. I am ready to sign such a motion, if the leaders are not ready to put such a motion forth, I will try to do so. I do not want to do it. Naturally the leadership should do it. However, it is high time that the Senate should express itself.

What I say is not in the remotest sense in derogation of any Senator. Every Senator has the right to the courage of his convictions, and he should fight for his convictions with every weapon at his command.

We must decide how long we will let this matter continue. I think the time has come to bring it to a stop now.

I speak in the interest of the standing and the reputation of the Senate before the people of the United States, in which I and every other Senator has a historic stake.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I do not say that I agree completely with the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York. I do think that the time is long past due when we should stop fiddling and proceed to dispose of the pending bill.

Yesterday I added my name as one of those willing to sign a cloture motion. I will vote for such a motion. I think we should take the only chance we have to dispose of this matter. The sooner we file a cloture motion, the sooner we will dispose of the pending legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

REPUBLICAN STAFF REPORT ON VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, there has been much discussion on the floor of the Senate about the Republican Party's staff report on Vietnam.

It is very pleasing to me to note that today the Wall Street Journal has written a ringing editorial approving the fact that the report represents helpful support for our effort in Vietnam rather than any divisive or destructive influence upon our effort. The people are thus informed. It is the duty of the minority party to inform the people. We will be better, will fight better, and will have more chance of success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "Vietnam: Reminders for Republicans," published in the Wall Street Journal of today, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: REMINDERS FOR REPUBLICANS

The "white paper" just put out by the staff of the Senate Republican Policy Committee makes important contributions to the discussion of Vietnam: It helps set the record straight, it asks the right questions, and it defines the possible shape of the political issue for next year.

To start with the history of the war, the Johnson Administration has sought to foster the impression that the heavy U.S. military involvement represents an extension of policies pursued by the Eisenhower Administration. Not so, says the GOP study, and quite correctly.

Although the U.S. had a small military advisory mission in Vietnam, President Eisenhower specifically refused to intervene to try to save the French garrison at Dienbienphu in 1954. Thereafter, he "stuck to his basic position that if there was a solution in South Vietnam, it was political and not military, insofar as the U.S. was concerned."

It was President Kennedy who significantly increased the military commitment—a "qualitative shift," the document calls it. And it was of course President Johnson who, two years ago, began putting in thousands of American combat troops—a "quantitative change." Republicans, the staff study adds, have traditionally believed the U.S. should not get involved in a land war on the Asian continent.

Thus reminding GOP Presidential prospects that they have an historical basis for disassociating themselves from Mr. Johnson's military policy if they choose, the white paper proceeds to imply that the present Administration is not very clear about its objectives in Southeast Asia.

The basic questions, it contends, are: What precisely is our national interest in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam and Laos? To what further lengths are we prepared to go in support of this interest?

It seems plain enough that the Administration has been unable to answer these questions satisfactorily. One proffered answer is that the ultimate U.S. interest is to thwart a Red Chinese design for aggression, but the argument is a bit tortuous.

Although it unquestionably has designs for aggression, the Peking regime is not in fact fighting in Vietnam, and the U.S. interest in battling the Vietcong and North Vietnamese regulars seems somewhat remote and tangential. To put it another way, if primary U.S. interests had been weighed in a hard-headed and realistic fashion, it is doubtful that the decision to fight this land war would have been made.

The Republican polemic does not answer these questions either. But again, as with the historical disassociation, it makes potential ammunition against the Democrats for any GOP politico inclined to use it.

Republican Senators are divided on the report, but at least some appear inclined to agree with it. Whether the Republican contenders, and the eventual Republican-standard-bearer, will in fact decide to oppose "Mr. Johnson's war" remains to be seen; if they do, it is difficult to speculate on the political merit of that strategy. While some polls show the majority of Americans backing the war, there is not only a great deal of noisy dissent but also a great deal of less vocal dissatisfaction.

In any case, here too the GOP study makes a valuable point. The party should not be constrained from opposition, or vigorous questioning, out of any misplaced devotion to bipartisanship in foreign affairs—certainly not so long as this remains a war undeclared by Congress.

Obviously criticism can get so extreme that it may hurt the war effort, but intelligent questioning and proposing of alternative courses are essential to a free society's well-being. The trouble with bipartisanism is that it may cement the nation into a wrong policy.

Or as the study asks, "Does bipartisanship mean that Democratic mistakes are Republican responsibilities?" If the big involvement in Vietnam was indeed a mistake, then responsible political opposition might possibly help the nation avoid repeating it.

THE HONORED DEAD AND DOMESTIC DEBATE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, with his unerring instinct for the truth and his innate good taste, Walter Lippmann has clarified for all to see the inherent impropriety of using for political purposes the solemn ceremony honoring a war hero, who has given his life for his country.

I ask unanimous consent to insert Mr. Lippmann's column "The Honored Dead" as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HONORED DEAD

(By Walter Lippmann)

Is it really a good idea to use the ceremony of giving the Medal of Honor to the widow of a soldier killed in battle as the platform for dealing with the President's critics? The President's remarks on Tuesday while conferring the Medal posthumously on Marine Sergeant Connor intended to stamp upon the public mind the notion that but for the dissenters, Sergeant Connor would not have died.

The President should realize that this is playing it rough, that to degrade debate to this level is certainly to provoke the retort that Sergeant Connor did not die because Senator Fulbright and Senator Aiken and the Council of Churches and some editors and some columnists and some students were against the President's conduct of the war. Sergeant Connor died in a military operation conducted under the orders of President Johnson. The obvious rebuttal to the President's use of the heroes is that if Mr. Johnson had remained true to the policy on which he was elected, if he had followed the advice of his critics to negotiate and not to escalate, Sergeant Connor would be alive today.

Let us not drag the honored dead into the domestic debate. Let the dead rest with honor and in peace.

The President has told us that he believes in the right of dissent and equally in the right to answer the dissent. Has any sane person ever argued that the President had no right to answer his critics?

What the critics want above all are candid answers to the troublesome questions. What is argued by some and is felt by many more is that instead of answering his critics, the President is evading the issues by stirring up a cloud of patriotic emotion. The exploitation of the dead heroes is a flagrant example of this. The exploitation of General Westmoreland, who as a representative of the troops cannot be attacked, is another example. The President himself does not even pretend to argue the Administration case. He merely asserts it in large, hot, question-begging generalities.

If the undeniable right to answer dissent is to be exercised usefully and with dignity, the answer must be addressed to the best-informed and most responsible critics. It is of course a temptation to ignore Senator Fulbright and Senator McGovern and Senator Aiken and the staff report of the Republican Policy Committee, and to focus attention upon the fringe, upon the draft card burners and the flag burners and the beatniks and their posters. General Westmoreland said on his return to Saigon that he used the word "unpatriotic" to apply to those who burned the flag. The General should learn not to play with matches around a powder keg.

Nor does it affect the real issue of the debate that Senator Dirksen comes out of the hospital to pledge Republican support to the Commander-in-Chief . . . For everyone knows that Senator Dirksen will do everything in his power to prevent Mr. Johnson from being re-elected. It is most probable that this is all that Ho Chi Minh hopes for from the mounting dissent in this country.

Indeed, whatever the Republicans may be saying now, the President is now on a course which will cause the Republican Party to present itself as an alternative to another Johnson Administration. It is reasonably certain that the President has enlarged the war and has enlarged his war aims to a point where he can no longer hold the confidence either of the hawks or the doves. The President has reached a point as Senator Aiken has just said, when "the present Administration cannot achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam."

It is a grievous predicament for the country and also for the Democratic Party. But that is where the President has brought us. And because this is a country where there are free elections, it is hard to imagine that the Republican candidate will take a me-too stand, that he will insist that he is more Johnsonian than Mr. Johnson himself; to imagine that the Republican candidate will not take advantage of the present fact that he is the alternative to Mr. Johnson.

THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET REQUEST FOR THE HUMANITIES SHOULD BE RESTORED

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the 89th Congress in approving the establishment and funding of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities indicated clearly its concern about the imbalance between our efforts to aid the sciences and the humanities and the arts. As the principal sponsor of the bill to provide for the establishment of the National Humanities Foundation last Congress, I expressed on several occasions my concern with the depressed state of the humanities.

On January 7, 1965, in introducing S. 111, I said:

> We in the United States are not materialists, although it is difficult to explain $50 billion for defense and the fact that 10.6 million students in the United States do not have access to a central library of any kind. . . . Serious defects in the teaching of the humanities are reported including overworked teachers, inadequate staffing of existing facilities, outmoded textbooks or none at all, lack of coordination between students and faculty at the elementary, secondary and college level, major defects in our classical libraries in nearly every area, and language instruction geared more toward the 17th century than to the 20th century.

The humanities, I observed, encompass the branches of learning concerned with human thought and relations. No one, I believe, wishes to dehumanize society. Yet, if we underfund the humanities and the arts, we do just that.

We have approved Public Law 89–209 and the arts and humanities will be strengthened if we fund them properly.

Within a short time the Senate will have the opportunity to fund the National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities as requested by the President. Full funding as requested in the President's budget is approximately $16 million. Regrettably, the amount was cut by the House to approximately $11 million.

This represents not only a cut in the President's request, but a reduction from the funds available for the current year for the endowment for the humanities, which in its first year prudently delayed spending until it was fully prepared to do so wisely and, therefore, carried over a considerable part of its initial appropriation.

In its first full year, the Humanities

Endowment has solid accomplishments. It has established a program of fellowships for scholars and has now about doubled the opportunities previously available to them. It has supported research in history, in literature, and in philosophy, particularly that part of history which makes the past of our country relevant to the present. It has supported a program of editing the great American writers of the 19th century—a program which has already produced 20 fine volumes. It has set up ingenious programs to improve education in our schools and colleges, and for the public outside of school or college, supports museums, historical societies, and improved television programing.

Despite the very small amount of money available, these programs reached individuals and institutions in 46 of our 50 States. One of the fellows is engaged in a study of Alaskan history. One of the educational programs will bring together people from all over the country in order to improve the teaching of Alaskan history.

Let us not now quench our spirit while we develop our material strength. This program must not be crippled now but supported as never before. I hope the Senate will restore the appropriation to the full amount requested by the President—a modest amount indeed in comparison with the vast funds we are spending for other purposes.

TRIBUTE TO THE BISHOP OF SAVANNAH

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this week Bishop Thomas J. McDonough, of the Savannah, Ga. diocese, is prepared to leave for his new post as Archbishop of Louisville.

Throughout the 88-county diocese in the southern part of Georgia, Bishop McDonough has been honored at farewell receptions in a fashion that indicates the love and friendship in which he was held by all Georgians.

His 10 years in the Diocese of Savannah have been marked with great progress for his church. He has compiled an outstanding record as a builder, with 100 church projects completed during his tenure, including the $400,000 renovation of Savannah's Cathedral of St. John the Baptist and the building of his beautiful chancery on the edge of historic Colonial Cemetery in downtown Savannah.

But in reality his greatest accomplishment has been in the field of developing vocations for the priesthood of the church in Georgia. When he came to Georgia in 1957 after serving as Auxiliary Bishop of Florida, the Savannah diocese had 64 priests, of whom 20 were diocesan priests and the other members of religious orders. Today the diocese has 77 priests of whom 34 are diocesan priests. Those figures only tell part of the developing story of how this hardworking prelate is gaining more workers for the Georgia corner of the Master's vineyard.

Ten priests are to be ordained in June for the Diocese of Savannah, while thirteen more priests will receive holy orders in 1968—thus giving the diocese more diocesan priests in 2 years than its total when Archbishop McDonough arrived on the scene.

Georgia Catholics are not large in number, representing only a little more than 1 percent of the population of my State. But in fervor to the church and its institutions, in loyal service to community, State, and Nation, and in patriotism, they are unmatched.

I am pleased to count so many Catholics as warm, personal friends. It is a pleasure to join them in wishing Godspeed to Archbishop McDonough, and at the same time to extend a hand of welcome to the new bishop of the Diocese of Savannah and to echo the words of the outgoing bishop, that he will find no more loyal or devoted members of the church anywhere than in south Georgia.

A NAIL IN THE COFFIN OF FREEDOM

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, frequently the pages of the Congressional Record are occupied by editorials which Members of Congress find significant—usually from the big city press. Today I wish to invite attention to an editorial from a small paper, a weekly whose editor and publisher is Wade Mann.

In the April 27 issue of the Scott County Journal, which is published at Scottsburg, Ind., Mr. Mann has written an editorial concerning the recent visit of General Westmoreland. It is written with conviction, with force, and with a style which enables it to stand favorable comparison with the editorial expression of any large newspaper.

One could hardly put the situation more bluntly than does this editorial when it calls the effort to silence doubts or criticism of the war another nail in the coffin of American freedoms; or when it concludes that we may prove in Vietnam that we are "still the land of the brave" but at the dangerous cost of perhaps also proving that we are "less and less the home of the free."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

More War, Less Liberty

When General Westmoreland, at the Associated Press dinner in New York this week, says that those who protest U.S. policy in Vietnam are aiding the enemy, he is speaking as the spokesman for President Johnson. None else.

So we are being told by President Johnson, in effect, to keep silent if we have doubts or criticism about the war. And another nail is being pounded into the coffin of American freedoms.

Johnson through Westmoreland, is telling American parents who see their boys being killed in the swamps of Vietnam that they dare not question why it is that OUR boys must be killed while the South Vietnamese army is given a secondary role in the defense of its own country.

He is telling American parents that they dare not question why it is that while their boys must have legs blown off by Viet Cong land mines, the sons of no other major power in the world are involved in the fighting. The manpower of Red China and Russia is not being bled on the field of battle, only that of North Vietnam.

He is telling American parents who see their sons missing in action in the jungles of Vietnam that they must not question our participation in this daily-enlarging major war which Congress has never declared and which could plunge all civilization into a nuclear disaster.

To question, we are told by Johnson's spokesman, Gen. Westmoreland, is almost treason.

How far we have come down the road to dictatorship. The ugly winds of suppression, of censorship, of thought and speech control are stirring in the land.

We have brutalized a small Asian country and now we would brutalize our freedom. We would sacrifice our liberty to oppose Communism in Asia.

We may prove in Vietnam that we are still the land of the brave at the heavy cost of proving that, in this country, we are less and less the home of the free.

REAL PARTNERS IN THE ALLIANCE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at a time when much of our foreign policy planning is directed toward our neighbors in our southern hemisphere, it is appropriate that we turn our attention to one of the most interesting programs we have instituted to weld goodwill in Latin America. I refer to the Partners of the Alliance program.

I can speak positively only of Idaho's role in the Partners of the Alliance, but I shall offer for the Record additional information that shows the scope of the work being done in other States.

Idaho is the Partner in the Alliance with the Republic of Ecuador. We are proud of the real person-to-person results of our partnership in that country, but we are equally proud of the fact that two Idahoans hold key positions in the national and international councils of the partners program.

One is Dr. Boyd Martin, of the University of Idaho, who has worked with the Alliance since its inception and who now sits as a member of the Inter-American Coordinating Committee and as a member of the National Association of the Partners of the Alliance.

The other is Robert V. Hansberger, president of the Boise-Cascade Corp. and a member of the National Business Advisory Committee of the Partners of the Alliance.

Idaho is a sparsely populated State, yet our people have real concern for our southern neighbors. Last year, more than $13,000 in equipment and supplies was voluntarily contributed from Idaho, most of it for the city of Pelileo in Ecuador. More than $3,000 has gone into the simple little hospital in that city presided over by Dr. Jorge Garcia, who is also mayor of Pelileo. I recall when Dr. Garcia came to Idaho and told us of his hospital, which had only a small gasoline generator for electricity. He performed surgery by the light of a goose-necked desk lamp. There was neither running water nor electricity.

The story of Pelileo spread throughout our State, and Idahoans have been responding.

Recently, Mr. James H. Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance, spoke at the University of Idaho. He honored

Dr. Martin for his service but he also presented a most comprehensive picture of the overall work of the Partners of the Alliance throughout South America.

I ask unanimous consent that both Mr. Boren's remarks and a brief summary of current financial accountings of the partnership as it relates to Mr. Boren's address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF JAMES H. BOREN, DIRECTOR, PARTNERS OF THE ALLIANCE PROGRAMS, THE ALLIANCE FOR PROGRESS, AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AT THE UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, MOSCOW, IDAHO, UNDER THE SPONSORSHIP OF BLUE KEY AND MORTAR BOARD, APRIL 4, 1967

The people of our nation do not want the United States to be identified in Latin America as the gendarmes of the status quo. This is reflected not in the words but in the actions of literally thousands of our citizens who are working in a direct alliance with the people of many regions of Latin America through the Partners of the Alliance.

In the early days of the Alliance for Progress many of us who were working in the government-to-government element of the program often were asked by highly skilled and highly motivated individuals, "What can I do? Is there a constructive way in which I can give 30 to 60 days of my time and energy to the Alliance?" We had no ready or meaningful answer. We could have asked such people to write letters to their congressmen to seek support of our appropriations but this would have been neither a proper nor effective response. People wanted to be involved directly . . . and people wanted to be identified with the forces of constructive change.

For many people the challenge of the Peace Corps was an answer to their interest, but for the many others who for various reasons were unable to volunteer for the Peace Corps another means of participation was needed.

While the great resources of citizen interest in terms of genuine involvement went untapped, those of us working in the government related part of the Alliance were seeing day after day examples of local self-help and local initiative to which we and our Latin American colleagues were unable to respond. With the official program focusing on the building of infrastructure and institutions, no financial or human resources were available for response to local self-help.

The existence of great citizen interest in the United States and the recognized need to assist in the completion of local self-help projects were sufficient factors to suggest such a program as the Partners of the Alliance. Another element was required, however, and that was the element of mutuality or partnership.

The people of Latin America, just as the people of the United States, do not want charity; they will strongly resent and properly reject any program which is put forward in a patronizing way. The people of the other American Republics do indeed have much to contribute to the United States in the fields of education, medicine, and the fine arts. It is this element of sharing—of being participants instead of recipients—that serves as the mortar to bind together the people of the hemisphere in a developing program of partnership.

In the current issue of *Foreign Affairs* (April 1967), the President of Chile, Eduardo Frei Montalva, discusses some problems and major criticisms of the Alliance for Progress. One point is of particular interest as it relates to the Partners program. President Frei wrote:

"This is one of the most serious criticisms made of the Alliance: that the people have not been able to participate in it. Could it have been otherwise? The people are grateful for the assistance received, but they have no sense of belonging to the scheme. The Latin American institutions which collaborate with the Alliance do not include trade unions, student federations, peasant leagues, cooperatives, etc., yet it is vital that such organizations should take part in an enterprise which is essentially popular and whose success depends fundamentally on its capacity to satisfy the demands made by the community. From a political point of view this is one of the weakest aspects of the Alliance; its task is to carry through a revolution which will bring about economic and social development, and for this it is absolutely necessary that the people as a whole be committed to it. The loyal participation of the community in this effort to build an egalitarian society is the only way in which the objective can be achieved. This is why the Alliance must incorporate all sectors of society in its work of transformation."

Today the citizens of 31 states in the United States are working directly with the people of 31 areas of Latin America through the mechanism of Partners of the Alliance committees. Partners committees are organized in the two areas to be joined in the partnership. Representation on the committees includes business, professional, labor, student, and other groups who wish to participate.

The organized committees, with a small amount of transportation assistance from A.I.D., exchange "program development teams" whose members visit possible project sites and become acquainted with the problems, people, and opportunities of their respective partner areas. The two committees then develop specific projects for implementation. Let me illustrate the type and range of activities which have been undertaken.

The United Steelworkers of Pennsylvania, following a team visit of one of their representatives, provided $5,000 for the materials which enabled union families in Loboto, Bahia (Brazil) to move and rebuild their homes—and open the first road through Loboto.

The Texas Electric Cooperatives as participants in the Peru-Texas Partners program provided 15 generators for community centers and rural training schools.

The Santa Cruz, Bolivia Partners provided two teachers of Spanish for a period of three months to assist in the language program of the Little Rock, Arkansas school system.

Approximately $4 million in hospital equipment, surgical instruments, and medical supplies have been provided to small hospitals and medical posts through Partners groups in California, Connecticut, Colorado, Indiana, Ohio, New Jersey, Indiana, Texas, Florida, and others.

A collection of Peruvian photographic art and valuable collections of historical artifacts were made available to the Texas Partners.

From the Idaho Partners, sewing machines for orphans' schools from Idaho; tents for use by tree-planting volunteers in Ecuador; funds for completion of small irrigation system, and numerous local self-help projects.

Approximately 200 students have been involved in Partner-arranged university scholarships.

4-H Club youth from Bolivia participated in a two-month program in Utah. While in Utah the young Bolivians worked directly and by tape recorder in the language program.

Large collections of Latin American paintings have toured four states and other collections will soon be shown in the U.S. partner states.

A collection of mineral specimens were sent from the Minas Gerais Partners to the schools in their partner state of Colorado.

Technical assistance on a no-contract cost basis has been provided in the fields of educational television, seaport operations, food processing, public administration, agricultural extension, medicine, and nutrition.

High school students of Connecticut, Wyoming, Texas, Maryland, Virginia, and Idaho have provided funds for the roofing, doors, and windows of many village-constructed adobe schools.

Investment conferences are bringing businessmen of the Americas together to explore specific joint ventures which will result in financial return but which will also create employment and contribute to the development process. (Example: funds for a development bank, funds for construction of resort hotel, rock crushing plant, livestock projects, etc.)

Professor of Portuguese from Parana, Brazil to Ohio to assist in language program.

Professional assistance and equipment for rehabilitation center.

Thermaform machines to enable an institute for the blind to produce educational materials in Braille.

Pumps for village wells; outboard motors for transportation cooperative in the jungle, etc.

The hard value of materials, equipment, and funds (excluding all investments) made available to the Latin American partners by the United States Partners of the Alliance groups is approximately $5 million. Inasmuch as the Partners program was launched only three years ago, many of the partnerships are relatively new and the overall results curve is now ascending rapidly. More important than the price tag which can be placed on the material assistance, however, are the intangibles which are involved when people work across national borders on projects which are jointly developed and jointly implemented.

President Frei of Chile stated that if economic and social development is to be achieved, "it is absolutely necessary that the people as a whole be committed to it." With involvement comes commitment. It is the task—and the opportunity—of the Partners of the Alliance to bring about broad involvement in the Alliance. Any group or any individual who is interested in the Alliance for Progress or who is concerned about the future of the hemisphere can translate that interest into meaningful action through the Partners of the Alliance.

The role of The Partners office in A.I.D. has been that of the catalyst. We respond to local interest and bring the partner areas together through organized committees. We then withdraw from the scene and the two private sector committees deal with each other directly. We are still available but on a "by request" basis. The Partners office of A.I.D. is now in the process of withdrawing even more and the recently-formed National Association of the Partners of the Alliance is gradually assuming the major "by request" servicing functions in the United States.

Mr. Edward Marcus, Executive Vice President of Neiman-Marcus, serves as the president of the national association, and the outstanding leadership which he is providing will assure the success of the organization. Serving with Mr. Marcus is another outstanding man, Dr. Boyd Martin of Idaho. Dr. Martin has participated in the two Inter-American Conference of the Partners of the Alliance. His contribution to the success of the two conferences was recognized by the 250 delegates from 16 nations, and he was elected to the ten-member Inter-American Coordinating Committee. The delegates from the 31 states of the United States also gave recognition to his active role in the partners program when they elected him to the ten-member Executive Board of the national association. In closing my remarks, I should like to do so with special recognition of the great assistance and leadership which Idaho has contributed to the Partners program in the person of Dr. Martin.

In behalf of the Agency for International Development and the United States Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, it is my pleasure to present to Dr. Boyd Martin this certificate of appreciation "in recognition of leadership and significant contribution toward the attainment of the goals of the Alliance for Progress." Idaho has reason to be proud of its role in the Alliance for Progress not merely in terms of completed self-help projects, but more importantly in terms of its contribution of people. Mrs. Martin has shared in the activities of her husband; John Chapman, Gayle Allen, Alice Deiter, and others of the Boise area have given effective leadership as has Col. John McFarland of North Idaho Junior College, Arlene Curtis of Orofino, and Col. Cook of Coeur d'Alene. The encouragement given to the Partners program by the Governor and the members of the congressional delegation has been most helpful. The hard but helpful questions of Senator Jordan and the insistence by Senator Church that the Partners of the Alliance deal with practical problems at the grassroots level have contributed to the proper direction of the program.

I have spoken of the Partners of the Alliance with a sense of satisfaction because the program has demonstrated by tangible results that the private citizens of the hemisphere *can* and *will* contribute to economic and social development.

I also have spoken of the Partners with a sense of concern because the program has grown by pressure of citizen interest to the point that we of the Partners staff in A.I.D., and the new National Association of the Partners find it difficult to keep pace with the technical and coordination requests from the state committees.

And, finally, I have spoken of the Partners with a sense of frankness and some frustration because we have found the means of converting into a constructive force for development the greatest of all resources—the creative talents and energies of people. But we are required to say "no" to offers of many man-months of free but needed professional and technical assistance because of the lack of transportation funds.

The organizational and funding problems are only temporary barriers, however, and will be overcome because both the tangible and intangible values of the program will require a solution. The existence of the problems is itself testimony to the success of the Partners in constructively involving people in the Alliance for Progress.

It has been a pleasure being with you, and in departing I wish to express the hope that you will accept the Partners of the Alliance in Idaho as the instrument through which you can dedicate your talents and energies to a constructive cause.

Results of the Partners of the Alliance

As of April 18, 1967, the total transportation costs of the Partners program from its formal initiation in March of 1964, amounted to *$409,000*. (This funding has been for the transportation of program development teams, technical assistance volunteers, and a small amount of shipping costs for commodities. The figure does not include the travel of the Partners/AID staff.)

As of April 18, 1967, the material and other assistance made available to the Latin American Partners amounted to *$7,313,000*. This figure includes such contributions as hospital equipment and medical supplies, funds for completion of self-help projects, scholarships, generators, hand tools for vocational schools, no-contract-cost technical assistance, laboratory equipment, etc. The figure does *not* include very large amounts of self-financed travel by U.S. program participants, nor does it include contributions such as room and board for students, state committees' publications, large amounts of radio and TV time given to the program, packing and shipping costs, and many other contributions for which a donation figure could be computed. In short, the $7,313,000 value is a "hard value" assignment.

Much more important than the price tag of the "hardware" or tangible contributions of the Partners of the Alliance, however, are the many intangibles which come from people working with people. Involvement, commitment, and working relationships at the grassroots level . . . these are the major values of the program.

In the general field of business and industry, five of the partnerships have been involved in investment conferences through which the business and commercial leaders of the Partners areas have explored specific investment opportunities. Although all five conferences have been held within the past six months, investments have been made and other investment surveys are in process. Most U.S. participants are newcomers to Latin American investment.

Finally, the Partners program is giving meaning to Title IX through developing and strengthening grassroots level democratic institutions and it is serving to attract more and more Latin American citizens to constructive effort in the development of their respective countries.

UNITED STATES HONORS ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH CONSTITUTION

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I am proud to call to the attention of my colleagues the 176th anniversary of the Polish Third of May Constitution Day.

It was on May 3 in 1791—just 2 years after the adoption of the U.S. Constitution—that Poland succeeded in reforming her public life. It was a bloodless reform and its anniversary this week reminds all of us of Poland's destiny in the history of mankind.

This holiday is being observed throughout America during the month of May in honor of Poland and to pay tribute to Poland's role as one of the pioneers of democracy in Europe.

The philosophy of government discernible in the Third of May Polish Constitution leads one to believe that the American people and the Polish people had each drawn inspiration for their respective constitutions from the same source.

The Polish Third of May Constitution declares, for example:

> All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people, its end and object being the preservation and integrity of the state, the civil liberty and the good order of society, on an equal scale and on a lasting foundation.

Unfortunately, history would be cruel to our Polish brothers. Their great assertion of democracy did not forestall the tragic partition by Russia, Prussia, and Austria in 1795.

Since that time, the Polish people have sought to exercise their love for freedom and democracy but have been prevented from doing so by many unfortunate circumstances, including the presence of the Soviet Union at this time.

We in this country, blessed as we are with freedom and independence, should take special note of the Polish people and their long struggle to assert their own national identity.

In turn, Americans of Polish origin are joining this month with persons of Polish descent all over the world in commemorating this important hallmark in history.

It is an anniversary that deepens the faith and heightens the courage of every Pole and every American of Polish origin.

It is appropriate that this commemoration of the Third of May Constitution of 1791 should coincide with the observance of three other significant events in Polish history.

We observe this week the 150th anniversary of the death of Thaddeus Kosciuszko, the great Polish patriot who also was one of America's Revolutionary War generals, an aide to George Washington, and a friend of Thomas Jefferson.

The 50th anniversary of the death of Henryk Sienkiewicz, the brilliant Polish novelist, author of "Quo Vadis," is also observed this week.

And this year is the centennial of the birth of Mme. Marie Sklodowska-Curie, whose discovery of radium is considered to be one of the most miportant scientific discoveries of all time.

There is no satisfactory way to describe or measure the tremendous importance of the contributions these three Poles made to mankind. Nor can we adequately assess the profound pride Poles feel for their May 3 Constitution.

But we can on this occasion salute the great Polish nation and pray for the ultimate triumph of justice—a free Poland, a Poland able once more to assert its own will, its own destiny.

PUBLIC POLICY TOWARD MERGERS IN FOOD RETAILING

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in June 1966 the National Commission on Food Marketing completed its extensive study of the food industries. One of the chief conclusions of the Commission's final report was that "the principal danger of impairment of competition appears to be merger and acquisition by dominant firms." The report continued:

> An urgent need, as we see it, is positive action by the regulatory agencies to make clear and effective the policy of Congress as declared in the Clayton Act, and we favor development of guidelines by the Department of Justice and the Federal Trade Commission to make the policy specific in those food fields to which its application is most significant.

In view of the obvious importance of this problem, I was gratified to learn that the Federal Trade Commission recently spelled out guidelines concerning its future merger enforcement policy in the field of food retailing. I therefore wish to insert in the Record a statement which interprets these guidelines and develops the background which made them necessary for this industry. This address was made by Dr. Willard F. Mueller, Chief Economist of the Federal Trade Commission, one of the country's leading authorities in the field of food distribution.

It is refreshing to read Dr. Mueller's

forthright statement on the constructive role which public policy can play in maintaining a competitive economy. Too many persons take our competitive system for granted and are unwilling to face up to the tough policy decisions which must be made to preserve it. Dr. Mueller puts the issues well when he says:

> Although many Americans speak glibly about the competitive process and the free enterprise system as things to be cherished and maintained at nearly any price, most are silent about what they would do to preserve them. But wishing, alone, will not make it so. Competition is not a flower that will flourish untended in every garden. There are no "natural" forces built into our economic system which guarantee that competition will be preserved if business firms are left entirely alone to set their own rules, or, worse still, to change them at will. Recognition of this fact has been the cornerstone of public policy toward competition since 1890. The ultimate purpose of our antitrust laws is to establish rules of law that will guarantee the maintenance of the competitive process.

I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC POLICY TOWARD MERGERS IN FOOD RETAILING

(An address by Dr. Willard F. Mueller, Director, Bureau of Economics, Federal Trade Commission, before the Conference on Competition in Food Marketing, sponsored by the Agricultural Policy Institute, North Carolina State University, Raleigh, N.C., January 24, 1967)

Abraham Lincoln preambled an address to Wisconsin farmers in 1859 with the observation, " I presume I am not expected to employ the time assigned me in the mere flattery of farmers as a class. My opinion of them is that, in proportion to numbers, they are neither better nor worse than other people."

I suspect this observation could be applied with equal force to food retailers in 1966. Certainly, my task today is neither to flatter nor criticize food retailers as individuals or as a class. Although their numbers have shrunken enormously over the past two decades, those remaining are little different than their counterparts in other American industries.

My assigned task today is to discuss the kinds of public policy required to maintain competition in food retailing. Although many Americans speak glibly about the competitive process and the free enterprise system as things to be cherished and maintained at nearly any price, most are silent about what they would do to preserve them. But wishing, alone, will not make it so. Competition is not a flower that will flourish untended in every garden. There are no "natural" forces built into our economic system which guarantee that competition will be preserved if business firms are left entirely alone to set their own rules, or, worse still, to change them at will. Recognition of this fact has been the cornerstone of public policy toward competition since 1890. The ultimate purpose of our antitrust laws is to establish rules of law that will guarantee the maintenance of the competitive process.

Today I shall discuss only one area of antitrust policy, that relating to mergers, and the application of this policy to food retailing. First a word about the nature and purpose of the so-called antimerger law.

THE CELLER-KEFAUVER ACT

The relevant framework for interpreting the legality of mergers is Section 7 of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Celler-Kefauver Act of 1950. Very briefly, this Act is aimed at only those mergers which *may* substantially lessen competition or *tend* to create a monopoly. Note well the words "may" and "tend," because the Act is designed to strike at monopoly in its incipiency, not at full blown monopoly. I fear that some persons interpreting recent merger policy have failed to appreciate the fundamental distinction between the Celler-Kefauver Act and the Sherman Act. They appear to have the mis-impression that the merger act does not come into play until competition has actually and demonstrably been injured to the extent that a merger has conferred substantial market power on an acquiring firm. It is imperative to keep in mind that the basic objective of Section 7 is to strike at *incipient* monopoly, and that this is the public policy objective guiding the inqury into the competitive impact of mergers.

The legislative history of the Celler-Kefauver Act and the decisions of the Supreme Court made it clear that the competitive impact of a merger must be analyzed within its industrial context, especially its effect on market structure. It is therefore instructive to review briefly the structural developments occurring in food retailing in recent years.

RECENT STRUCTURAL CHANGES IN FOOD RETAILING

The two decades since the conclusion of World War II have witnessed a number of basic changes in the structure of food retailing. First, consider what has occurred in the number of retail grocery stores serving the American consumer. Prior to World War II, the number of food and grocery stores increased as the population expanded. However, in the postwar years, this trend has been reversed. Not only has the per capita growth in food retail outlets been brought to a halt, but also the actual number of outlets has declined precipitously.

Number of grocery store companies, 1948 and 1963

Number of stores per company	1948	1963	Change, 1948–63
1	347, 063	215, 129	−131, 934
2	514	2, 238	+1, 728
3	1, 689	465	−1, 224
4 to 10	495	525	+30
11 or more	218	258	+40
Total	349, 979	218, 615	−131, 364

During the years 1948–1963, there was a net disappearance of more than one-third in the number of grocery stores in the United States—a decline from 378,000 in 1948 to 245,000 in 1963. A parallel decline occurred in the number of grocery store *companies*, from 350,000 to 219,000.

If we examine this mortality rate in the grocery store population in the postwar years, we find a further striking development. The great inroads into the number of retail outlets have occurred in the single store operators. Indeed, the decline in the number of single store retailers was even greater than the total for all grocery store companies combined. Specifically, the drop in the total number of grocery store companies between 1948 and 1963 totaled 131,364; the decline in the single store companies amounted to 131,934, or 570 more than the total.

There may have been some upward migration. In other words, some single store operators may have become chains—for we note that there was an increase of over 1,700 in the number of grocery store companies with two stores. However, there was also a decline in the number of three-store companies, more than 1,200. Finally, the chains with four to ten stores increased by 30, while those with eleven or more rose by 40 during the period.

When we examine these changes in the local market setting, we find that most of the net increase in chains with four or more stores involved companies operating in only one metropolitan area. Hence this represented a net increase of less than one chain per standard metropolitan area. On the other hand, the average number of single-store retailers per standard metropolitan area declined by over 500.

Although the postwar decline in the number of stores reflected a replacement of small stores by supermarkets, this alone does not explain the great shift from single to multiunit grocery store companies, nor is it the principal cause of the sharp increase in concentration in both local and national markets. Whereas the so-called "supermarket" revolution dictated a diminution in the number of stores, this alone would have dictated only a small increase in concentration. Increased market concentration occurred as sales became increasingly concentrated among relatively few firms operating a number of stores. Whereas economies of scale at the store level do not require multiunit operation, a number of other factors appear to favor the multiunit operator. Among these advantages are the following:

(1) greater ease with which large concerns are able to obtain financing and access to shopping centers;

(2) the real and pecuniary advantages of large-scale buying;

(3) the advantage of large-scale newspaper advertising;

(4) the greater ease with which large retailers may integrate vertically into food manufacturing;

(5) certain advantages which large concerns have over smaller ones in the use of trading stamps and other forms of nonprice competition;

(6) the ability of large multimarket retailers to sustain substantial losses in individual markets over protracted periods of time, which enables them to withstand competitive adversities which would destroy lesser concerns.

Whereas some of these advantages involve social economies of large-scale operations, others appear to be largely private advantages flowing from superior market power. But regardless of their source, the net result is to place continuing competitive pressure on smaller retailers which threatens to either erase their presence as viable competitors or to compel them to become larger in order to share in these advantages. Small firms often have responded to these developments by affiliating themselves with cooperatively owned or sponsoring wholesalers.

This is not to imply that all of these developments, in and of themselves, are necessarily undesirable. On the contrary, many are made inevitable by technological and market forces. Recent structural developments are important and relevant, however, in interpreting the probable competitive consequences of further merger-induced structural change.

There is no longer any doubt but that market concentration in food retailing has reached record levels in many metropolitan areas. By 1963 the 4 largest retailers typically held 45 percent of grocery store sales in large metropolitan areas and 54 percent in smaller ones. Moreover, between 1954 and 1963 there was a steady upward trend in local market concentration.

These comparisons represent minimum estimates of concentration among competing retailers in local metropolitan areas. Today the keenest competition occurs among supermarkets. Yet, in many markets the 8 largest supermarket operators alone control practically all supermarket sales.

Whereas local metropolitan areas are appropriate for measuring concentration in the sale of grocery products, the level of buyer concentration must be measured in broader geographic areas depending upon the products purchased.

Growing concentration at the national level has resulted from both the increasing share of business done by large retail chain organizations and the increasing affiliation of independent retailers with voluntary and cooperative buying groups. Between 1948 and 1963, the 40 largest corporate chains expanded by nearly one-half their share of food stores sales. During the period the 30 largest cooperative and voluntary wholesalers doubled their share of food store sales.

In recent years the share of food store business done by the very largest chains has remained virtually unchanged (Table 1). To say this, however, is to reveal very little about what has been going on in the industry. In the first place, what happens to A & P, the largest corporate chain, swamps the showing of the leading grocery chains—and the fact of the matter is that A & P has failed to grow as rapidly as total food store sales since 1958. However, if we examine the underlying concentration data more carefully, we find that the three largest chains just below A & P in the aggregate have expanded their share of the national food store sales from 8.1 percent to 9.7 percent. These three chains combined did not achieve A & P's status until 1963. In the aggregate they overtook A & P as A & P's national share dropped from 9.9 percent of the national sales in 1958, to 8.7 percent in 1963. Indeed, except for A & P, every major segment among the 20 largest chains expanded in market share, and this in turn was largely the result of mergers. Moreover, there was an increase in concentration on a national scale in terms of the top 20 chains from 23.1 percent in 1948 to 30.3 percent in 1958, and to 31.3 percent in 1963, notwithstanding A & P's decline in market share.

TABLE 1.—*Top 20 chains' share of total food store sales*

[In percent]

	1948	1954	1958	1963
A. & P	9.1	9.9	9.9	8.7
2d to 4th	8.1	8.4	9.4	9.7
5th to 8th	3.1	4.0	5.1	6.1
9th to 20th	2.7	4.0	5.9	6.8
Top 20	23.1	26.3	30.3	31.3

Source: Federal Trade Commission.

Another interesting development in the food store sector is that the largest chains have expanded rapidly in other areas of food distribution. Whereas between 1958 and 1964 their food store sales grew by 25 percent, their other food sales grew by over 200 percent (Table 2). Especially important in this category were their sales in supermarkets located within discount houses, sales to independent retailers with which they had become affiliated, sales (largely from chain-owned manufacturing plants) to other food wholesalers and retailers, and nonstore food sales. The 20 leading chains also expanded rapidly their nonfood retail store business—from $4 million in 1958 to $413 million in 1963. This represented primarily nonfood store business of the discount operations of food chains.

These developments indicate that the largest chains continued to expand rapidly during 1958–1964, although they changed somewhat the path of their expansion.

These figures represent minimum estimates of the level of concentration at the national level. Many chains, including some large ones, are members of buying groups, and other chains purchase some of their products from retailer-owned cooperative groups. In addition, many retailer-owned cooperative groups are linked, for buying purposes, through central organizations.

TABLE 2.—*Total sales of 20 largest food retailers of 1958 and 1964*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Number of companies	1958	Number of companies	1964	Percent increase, 1958–64
Food store sales	20	$14,910	20	$18,556	25
Other food sales		300		995	232
Supermarkets in discount houses	1	1	10	202	(¹)
Wholesale sales to affiliated stores	1	34	6	141	315
Sales to other food wholesalers and retailers	8	265	12	652	146
Nonstore food sales	4	104	3	95	−9
Nonfood retail stores ²	2	4	12	413	(¹)
Other domestic sales	11	64	11	88	38
Foreign sales	3	460	3	628	37
Total sales	20	15,842	20	20,791	31
Retail sales of affiliated independents ³	1	56	6	283	405

¹ Over 1,000 percent.

² Primarily discount houses and drugstores.

³ These are the retail sales of independent retailers affiliated with these chains.

Source: Federal Trade Commission.

Although it is impossible to measure precisely the level of buyer concentration in food distribution, it is clear that it has risen appreciably in recent years. While there were still 218,615 retail grocery store companies in 1963, fewer than 100 corporate chains or buying groups purchased most grocery store products purchased in essentially national markets. Buyer concentration is very high even for some products sold in essentially national markets. For example, the 10 largest chains bought 61 percent of all frozen fruits and vegetables sold under distributor labels in 1959. Moreover, the level of buyer concentration is even greater than this for grocery products purchased in local or regional markets. For products like fluid milk the top 4 companies or buying groups in a market may buy 70 percent or more of the fluid milk sold through food stores.

These developments and the economic factors underlying them led the National Commission on Food Marketing to conclude:

"In the future, concentration in retail selling and buying seems destined to increase. Rapid growth of local firms and increasing concentration in local markets can be expected to affect national concentration. Most important, the active use of merger by large firms as a means of growth presages increased concentration. The continuing growth of wholesalers and buying organizations shows no tendency to stop and, when considered in conjunction with the growth of retailers, can only result in increased concentration of purchases.

The Federal Trade Commission's experience with enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act during the postwar years demonstrators that large buyers frequently are the recipients of discriminatory prices. Each of the 9 largest corporate chains were cited as recipients of unlawful discriminatory preferences from suppliers in a total of 34 instances in 16 separate FTC cases in which cease and desist orders were entered over the period 1954–1965. This experience indicates that large buyers already have substantial buying power. The National Commission of Food Marketing likewise concluded on this point:

"Enforcement of the Robinson-Patman Act eliminated the most blatant forms of price discrimination in the purchase of grocery products. Increasing buyer concentration, however, breeds a continuing tendency for price discrimination. Significant and continued examples of price discrimination occur, especially where the coverage of the Robinson-Patman Act is inadequate—primarily with regard to perishable products and intrastate transactions."

Among its specific conclusions the National Commission on Food Marketing stated as follows on the point of increasing buyer concentration:

"Concentration of purchasing power by food retailers is especially significant. The increasing market orientation of the food industry and changes in the organization of buying have transferred market power from processors and manufacturers to retailers. Prospective developments in the industry are likely to further enhance their position. Increasing concentration of purchases restricts the alternatives open to suppliers, stimulates compensating concentration on their part, and weakens the effectiveness of competition as a self-regulating device throughout the industry.

"Concentration of much of the food industry is not yet high enough to impair seriously the effectiveness of competition, and we do not suggest divestiture of current holdings even where concentration is highest unless future conduct demonstrates the need for it. Nor do we believe that internal growth should be restrained if achieved fairly. *The principal danger of impairment of competition appears to be merger and acquisition by dominant firms.*"

This finding of the Food Commission has important implications for public policy. It identifies mergers as the single most important factor threatening the maintenance of competition in food retailing. What are the facts on which they based this finding?

MERGERS AS A SOURCE OF INCREASED CONCENTRATION

Mergers have been a major source of increased concentration in the retail distribution of food and grocery products both on a national and a local level. Two time periods of merger stand out, the 1920's and the post-1948 period. The merger movement in food retailing in the 1920's brought about a fundamental restructuring of food retailing in a single decade. That movement: "(1) greatly expanded the size and scope of operations of several leading chains; (2) increased the extent of market concentration on a national scale; (3) initiated widespread 'market-extension' merger activity; and (4) entrenched industry leaders who have, in most cases, remained dominent to the present time."

The merger movement among retail grocery organizations was sharply accelerated in the mid-1950's. Beginning in 1955 acquisitions increased to between $400 and $500 million a year. Over the entire period 1948-1965, companies with combined retail sales of $5 billion were acquired. Most of these acquisitions (82 percent measured by sales) were made by the nation's 20 largest chains.

Measured by sales size of acquired units, nine chains with sales of $500 million or more in 1963 made about 44 percent of all recorded acquisitions (measured by sales of acquired retailers); nearly 80 percent of all acquisitions were by acquiring units with annual sales exceeding $100 million. On the other hand, less than 20 percent were acquired by 102 retailers with annual sales under $100 million.

Even if only the direct effect—that is, the mergers' immediate contribution to the acquiring companies' sales—of these mergers on growth is considered, it is clear that these firms' extensive merger activity was the main cause of their extremely high growth rates. Using this conservative measure, between 1948 and 1963 the acquisitions of the 10 top acquiring chains increased their sales by 107 percent, whereas their internal growth added 178 percent to their sales.

The contribution which mergers made to the growth of leading acquiring retailers between 1948 and 1963 is illustrated by Fig. 5. [Figure 5 not printed in RECORD.]

Over the period, total food store sales grew by 84 percent and grocery store sales by 112 percent. The 10 most active acquiring chains (each of which made acquisitions exceeding $130 million) grew by 285 percent. The 30 most active acquiring chains grew by 337 percent. On the other hand, "all other" chains of 11 or more stores grew by 119 percent.

Mergers of large grocery chain organizations clearly have had a major impact on national concentration. An FTC Staff Study shows that practically all of the increase between 1948 and 1963 in the top 20 chains' share of food store sales was the result either directly or indirectly or acquisitions. The report estimates that had these chains made no acquisitions their share of the U.S. grocery store sales would have increased by less than 1 percentage point during the 1948–1963 period. The report concludes that: ". . . absent the merger movement of the 1950's and early 1960's in grocery retailing, the lower echelon of top chains would have gained less, the national market share of the 4 largest chains would have declined, and there would have been no significant increase in the market share held by the 20 largest grocery food chains of 1963."

Over the period 1949–1964 a declining portion of total mergers were between companies operating within the same counties. These comparisons also reveal that over the entire period 1949–1964 most mergers, measured by sales of acquired units, were partially or wholly of the "market extension" variety; that is, they were outside the marketing area of the acquiring retailer. Of course, all mergers were horizontal in the purchase of grocery products, and therefore contributed to increasing concentration in the purchase of grocery products.

Let us turn next to a consideration of how various kinds of mergers may affect competition.

COMPETITIVE SIGNIFICANCE OF MERGERS

Mergers may affect competition in various ways. The most obvious effects are those flowing from the merger of direct competitors in the same retail market. The precise competitive impact of such mergers depends on the relative size and financial success of the merging firms, the structure of the market, and the probable future structure of the industry. As explained earlier, there are powerful forces working toward concentration quite apart from mergers. This places special significance on any merger among the largest competing companies in a market.

Consider the merger in 1960 between Von's Grocery Co. and Shopping Bag Stores in Los Angeles. At first blush this merger might not seem to pose a serious threat to competition. Market concentration in Los Angeles had not reached high levels prior to the merger and the two merging companies had combined sales of only about 9 percent of the market.

But consider these additional facts. Concentration in this market had been on the increase for over a decade. Between 1948 and 1958 the share of grocery store sales held by the top 20 chains rose from 43.8 percent to 56.9 percent. Much of the remainder of the market was held by small retailers experiencing a high attrition rate. The number of single-store grocery retailers fell from 5,365 in 1950 to 3,818 in 1961, a decline of 150 per year. Nor has this high mortality rate fallen since 1961. By 1966 the number of single-store operators had fallen by another 889 companies. In addition, numerous mergers involving small chains had occurred since 1950.

It is against these facts that we must evaluate the probable competitive effects of the Von's-Shopping Bag merger. In 1958 Von's had sales of $94 million and Shopping Bag had sales of $90.5 million. Both were viable competitors, ranking third and sixth, respectively, in the Los Angeles market. The merger made it the second largest chain in the market.

As explained above, concentration in this market was increasing quite apart from this merger. The economics of the industry made inevitable the demise of thousands of smaller companies and, irrespective of this particular merger, concentration seemed destined to increase. In a word, the future of competition in this market was already in doubt.

This then raises the question of how the merger act should be applied in this setting. Remember, this act is concerned with arresting monopoly in its *incipiency*, not with stopping only those mergers which result in actual monopoly. Quite clearly the Los Angeles market was not yet sufficiently concentrated to warrant an inference of monopoly. But suppose two of the largest and most successful factors in the market were permitted to merge? Would it not also be equally appropriate to permit the other companies in the top echelon to merge? The problem facing enforcement agencies and the courts is to decide just where the line should be drawn.

After evaluating this merger within its industrial context, the Supreme Court concluded that the Von's-Shopping Bag merger fell within the incipiency range as defined by the Celler-Kefauver Act. Many persons may disagree with the rule of law enunciated in this case. Some economists are very critical of the decision because they argue that economic science is not exact enough to tell us the precise point at which a merger crosses the borderline of incipient monopoly. I agree. But it is not a very persuasive argument that no line should be drawn or that it be drawn only at the point where a consensus of economists agree it should be drawn. I fear our competitive system would become irreversibly concentrated while economists continued to debate the issue. It is my own view that when the Von's-Shopping Bag merger is viewed against its market context, the Supreme Court's ruling is acceptable economics as well as a good rule of law. Moreover, industrial history argues persuasively that to err on the side of a too strict antimerger policy is preferable to the reverse.

This is not to say that the Supreme Court's decision in Von's raises questions concerning the legality of all horizontal mergers. On the contrary, both prior to and since the Von's merger, many small horizontal mergers in the Los Angeles market have gone unchallenged by the antitrust authorities because they do not fall within the rule enunciated in Von's.

The Von's decision, of course, covers only horizontal mergers in the sales of grocery products. As explained above, most mergers in food retailing do not involve companies operating within the same metropolitan area. How may so-called *market extension* mergers affect competition? Elsewhere I have explained the general criteria which the Commission has applied in evaluating such mergers ("Merger Policy Toward Mergers in the Dairy Industry," statement made before the 21st Annual Midwestern Milk Marketing Conference, Kellog Center, Michigan State University, April 27, 1966.) It is important to note, however, that market extension mergers in food retailing not only may affect competition in the sale of grocery products, but in their purchase as well. All such mergers contribute to increased concentration in the purchase of grocery products which grocery manufacturers sell in essentially national markets. It is axiomatic that if large buyers already have substantial market power, as discussed above, further merger-achieved accretions in such power may pose serious questions under the Celler-Kefauver Act. On the other hand, some market extension mergers may have only a miniscule effect on concentration.

This then raises the question of where the line should be drawn between legal and illegal market extension mergers. The National Commission on Food Marketing has concluded as follows on this point:

"It is our conclusion that acquisitions or mergers by the largest firms in any concentrated branch of the food industry, which result in a significant increase in their market shares or the geographic extension of their markets, probably will result in a substantial lessening of competition in violation of the Clayton Act. In this connection, we believe accumulations of buying power have a significant effect on the competitive process and that food firms should not be permitted to form buying groups representing a greater sales volume than a single firm would be permitted to gain by merger or acquisition."

FTC ENFORCEMENT POLICY

The Federal Trade Commission recently spelled out the criteria which it used in identifying mergers in the food distribution industries which pose a threat to competition. (Federal Trade Commission, *Enforcement Policy with Respect to Mergers in the Food Distribution Industries*, January 3, 1967.) The Commission enunciated this policy following some years of continued surveillance over the merger movement in food retailing and after it had challenged acquisitions made by five of the country's largest food retailers: Kroger, National Tea, Winn-Dixie, Grand Union and Consolidated Foods. Litigation has been terminated in all but one of these cases—that involving the Kroger Company.

The Commission explained that "in view of [its] extensive legal activity in the area of food retailing and the probability that market forces will continue to create an environment conducive to mergers in the industry, it is appropriate that the Commission spell out as clearly as possible those mergers which the Commission's experience and knowledge suggest are most likely to have anticompetitive consequences. This is not to imply that the Commission has sufficient knowledge or foresight to draw with precision the legal boundaries around every pospective merger in food retailing. Conditions inevitably change with time and circumstances. On the other hand, businessmen contemplating mergers have a right to know whether particular mergers are likely to be challenged by the Commission and, perhaps, be forcibly undone after years of expensive litigation."

The Commission then set forth the "criteria" which it used to identify mergers which warrant immediate Commission action. It explained that in the future it would focus particular attention on mergers of companies with sales in excess of $100 million. It added, however, that mergers by companies with sales of $500 million or more are particularly significant. Companies of this size, alone, have accounted for about one-half of all retail mergers (measured by sales) which occurred since 1948. It explained further that, "The record in the one litigated case before the Commission illustrated that the large multimarket character of firms of this size may give them substantial advantages over smaller firms, and that some of these advantages are entirely unrelated to economic efficiency."

The Commission concluded that whereas continued mergers by companies with sales in excess of $500 million "may contribute to further concentration of buying power, in addition to any adverse effect that they may have at the retail selling level, it is unlikely that the prohibition of mergers by such companies would have an adverse effect on efficiency." It added, "insofar as economies of scale require fairly large-scale operations, the goal of promoting economic efficiency might be better achieved by channelling mergers away from the largest firms to those whose efficiency would be enhanced by further growth."

The Commission stated therefore that future mergers by food retailers or wholesalers with combined annual food store sales in excess of $500 million "raise sufficient question regarding their legal status to warrant attention and consideration by the Commission under the statutes administered by it."

With respect to market extension mergers by smaller retailers the Commission added, "In the Commission's experience, however, it appears that market extension mergers involving companies with combined annual sales of less than $500 million generally do not pose a serious threat to competition except when they involve some competitive overlap." The Commission indicated, however, that it would investigate all but very small mergers by such companies.

In order to implement its program "expeditiously and uniformly," the Commission stated that it must know of prospective acquisitions in advance of their consummation. Therefore, "Every food retailer and wholesaler with annual sales in excess of $100 million will be required to notify the Commission at least 60 days prior to the consummation of any merger, acquisition or consolidation involving any food retailer or wholesaler."

What are the implications of this statement of enforcement policy? Most important, it spells out those mergers which, in the Commission's view, pose the most serious threat to competition and those which do not. It identifies particularly mergers (of all types) made by the country's largest food chains and wholesalers. This covers roughly the 10 largest corporate food chains and two or three large grocery wholesalers.

I suspect it comes as no surprise to these concerns that the Commission takes a special interest in their mergers. In fact, since the Commission's *National Tea* decision in March 1966, there has been practically no merger activity by these concerns.

On the other hand, the Commission's statement does much to clarify the legal status of market extension mergers among retailers with combined sales of less than $500 million. To date, the Commission has not challenged any market extension mergers by companies with sales below $500 million. The Commission's statement indicates that it does not believe such mergers pose a serious threat to competition. Of course, horizontal mergers between important direct competitors in particular cities, even if they involve companies with sales below $500 million, will continue to be judged by the standards laid down by the Supreme Court in its *Von's* decision. This should not be interpreted to mean the Commission intends to concern itself with very small mergers. It recognized that "there may well be some situations where mergers between small concerns may stimulate and enhance competition even though their immediate effect is to increase market concentration."

In conclusion, then, it would seem that current and future enforcement policy toward mergers is designed to channel merger activity away from the very largest food retailers and wholesalers. Not only will this policy contribute to the maintenance of competition in the food retailing industry, particularly in the purchase of grocery products sold in national markets, but its net impact should also be to promote economic efficiency by channeling mergers toward those companies which do not yet enjoy all the economies of large scale procurement and distribution.

MORE ON OUR VIETNAM FOLLY

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, interesting comments on the mounting debate concerning our involvement in Vietnam may be found in the column written by Walter Lippmann entitled "The Honored Dead," published in the May 4 issue of the Washington Post; the leading editorial entitled "More Troops, Less Hope," published in the May 4 issue of the New York Times; and two articles likewise from that paper's editorial page, one by Tom Wicker, entitled "Let's Finish It Up," and the other by Russell Baker, entitled "Obstacles to a Department of Dissent." They all make valuable contributions to public enlightenment. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, May 4, 1967]

The Honored Dead

(By Walter Lippmann)

Is it really a good idea to use the ceremony of giving the Medal of Honor to the widow of a soldier killed in battle as the platform for dealing with the President's critics? The President's remarks on Tuesday while conferring the Medal posthumously on Marine Sergeant Connor intended to stamp upon the public mind the notion that but for the dissenters, Sergeant Connor would not have died.

The President should realize that this is playing it rough, that to degrade debate to this level is certainly to provoke the retort that Sergeant Connor did not die because Senator Fulbright and Senator Aiken and the Council of Churches and some editors and some columnists and some students were against the President's conduct of the war. Sergeant Connor died in a military operation conducted under the orders of President Johnson. The obvious rebuttal to the President's use of the heroes is that if Mr. Johnson had remained true to the policy on which he was elected, if he had followed the advice of his critics to negotiate and not to escalate, Sergeant Connor would be alive today.

Let us not drag the honored dead into the domestic debate. Let the dead rest with honor and in peace.

The President has told us that he believes in the right of dissent and equally in the right to answer the dissent. Has any sane person ever argued that the President had no right to answer his critics?

What the critics want above all are candid answers to the troublesome questions. What is argued by some and is felt by many more is that instead of answering his critics, the President is evading the issues by stirring up a cloud of patriotic emotion. The exploitation of the dead heroes is a flagrant example of this. The exploitation of General Westmoreland, who as a representative of the troops cannot be attacked, is another example. The President himself does not even pretend to argue the Administration case. He merely asserts it in large, hot, question-begging generalities.

If the undeniable right to answer dissent is to be exercised usefully and with dignity, the answer must be addressed to the best-informed and most responsible critics. It is of course a temptation to ignore Senator Fulbright and Senator McGovern and Senator Aiken and the staff report of the Republican Policy Committee, and on focus attention upon the fringe, upon the draft card burners and the flag burners and the beatniks and their posters. General Westmoreland said on his return to Saigon that he used the word "unpatriotic" to apply to those who burned the flag. The General should learn not to play with matches around a powder keg.

Nor does it affect the real issue of the debate that Senator Dirksen comes out of the hospital to pledge Republican support to the Commander-in-Chief . . . For everyone knows that Senator Dirksen will do everything in his power to prevent Mr. Johnson from being re-elected. It is most probable that this is all that Ho Chi Minh hopes for from the mounting dissent in this country.

Indeed, whatever the Republicans may be saying now, the President is now on a course which will cause the Republican Party to present itself as an alternative to another Johnson Administration. It is reasonably certain that the President has enlarged the war and has enlarged his war aims to a point where he can no longer hold the confidence either of the hawks or the doves. The President has reached a point as Senator Aiken has just said, when "the present Administration cannot achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam."

It is a grievous predicament for the country and also for the Democratic Party. But that is where the President has brought us. And because this is a country where there are free elections, it is hard to imagine that the Republican candidate will take a me-too stand, that he will insist that he is more Johnsonian than Mr. Johnson himself; to imagine that the Republican candidate will not take advantage of the present fact that he is the alternative to Mr. Johnson.

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1967]

More Troops, Less Hope

President Johnson is now facing another of the fateful decisions he has had to make on the Vietnamese war. Within the next few weeks he will have to determine whether a huge quantitative increase in the American expeditionary force to Vietnam is necessary to win the all-out military victory that is now apparently the Administration's goal. The alternative method is to continue to wage the "war of attrition" by the relatively slow and gradual method of escalation pursued during the last two years.

Although he said yesterday that he is making no recommendation "at this time," a decision is being forced upon the President by the inability of American forces in Vietnam at their present level of strength either to induce Hanoi to negotiate or to defeat the Vietcong and North Vietnamese troops. This has led to a public airing of what has long been an open secret—the Pentagon and General Westmoreland have argued that between 550,000 and 600,000 American troops would be needed to achieve military victory.

On his visit to the United States General Westmoreland put the problem clearly in his speeches. During the period from March 1965, when serious escalation of the war began, "over-all enemy strength has nearly doubled." The bombing of the North has not served to reduce infiltration or to weaken Hanoi's will to fight. It should be noted in passing that it takes a considerable stretch of credulity to find a relationship between the fighting qualities of the Vietnamese and expressions of dissent in the United States over the Administration's policies on Vietnam. The enemy is evidently not sitting back and waiting for the United States to quit.

The domestic and international politics that have been acting to restrain President Johnson make the need for a decision as awkward as it could possibly be. If the American forces are to be raised to 550,000 or more—and this is a strong probability—the process would be concluded in the summer of 1968. This is when the Democratic and Republican parties will be holding their nominating conventions for the Presidential elections in November.

The effort of escalation would weaken American ability to meet a hostile threat elsewhere unless there is at least partial mobilization. The extra financial and economic drain would be enormous. All this is without counting the greatly enhanced danger of a "wider war." Politically, psychologically and emotionally a much greater commitment in Vietnam would mean that there could be no turning back short of a result that might be accounted a victory.

The ideological factors—which were never so simple and clear as President Johnson and Secretary Rusk make them out to be—are even now taking second place. The military factors will become paramount if President Johnson makes the fateful decision to throw onto the scales of the Vietnam war the overpowering strength that the United States can muster.

Yet diplomacy has not played its last card. No one can say with assurance that it is too late for a negotiated peace. If President Johnson's hesitation in going ahead means that he is also weighing the possibility of testing Hanoi's sincerity in entering into peace talks provided the bombing of North Vietnam were stopped unconditionally, there is still hope for an end to the war without death and destruction on a vastly increased scale. A new and great escalation would have the classic effect of crossing the Rubicon. The die would be cast.

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1967]

In the Nation: "Let's Finish It Up"

(By Tom Wicker)

Philadelphia, May 3.—A bright-eyed youngster wearing the school sweater of the Episcopal Academy raised his hand for recognition this morning, then put a classroom visitor squarely on the spot with this question:

"Sir, are we winning or losing in Vietnam?"

The youthful questioner, like most Americans, wanted a straight answer. Pick a man at random today—your next cab driver, or someone sitting beside you at the drug store counter—and ask him what he thinks about the Vietnamese war. The chances are good that he will reply:

WHY DON'T WE

"I don't see why we don't get in there and finish it up."

And he may add: "Everybody knows we're strong enough to do it in a month or two."

This is a shorthand expression of the conventional American wisdom that wars are to be won, power is to be used, let's don't horse around, if it's worth fighting it's worth winning. But it overlooks the baffling complexities of a war where power has its limits, where power often cannot even be brought to bear; of a search for an elusive peace the shape of which no one can define; of an uncertain national interest the Administration cannot make indisputably clear; of an ambiguous moral and political position that has produced the most profound and dangerous divisions within American society.

WE WILL PREVAIL

What is winning and what is losing? Even General Westmoreland could only tell us that in the end we will "prevail."

The American role in the current effort to devise a world-wide treaty banning the proliferation of nuclear weapons is another example of the world's pervasive complexity.

What is good about this effort is, first, that such a treaty probably would have some restraining effect on those nations that might develop the financial and scientific ability, plus some military or political reason, to build nuclear weapons. Notably these nations are India, Japan, West Germany, Italy and perhaps the United Arab Republic.

Second, since the treaty would have to rest upon the agreement of the two nuclear giants, the United States and the Soviet Union, it would represent some development of confidence, each in the other, a step toward more harmonious relations, perhaps even a gesture in the direction of their mutual disarmament.

On the other hand, the treaty classifies France and Britain as nuclear powers, when in fact they are at best only marginally so, and thus it builds a formal division into a Europe which, in other ways, is seeking a greater unity. It could destroy or at least weaken Euratom, one manifestation of European unity. It breeds suspicion and resentment of discriminatory treatment, particularly in Germany, where these can be least afforded. It takes no weapons from anyone who has them. It evokes fears of a Soviet-American "deal" to manage the world. It asks India, for instance, to forgo nuclear armaments even though its giant neighbor, China, has them—and at a time when both sponsors of the treaty label China as aggressive and dangerous.

The latter point could even cause trouble in the United States, where nonproliferation is a popular cause. Before acceding to the treaty, India is certain to demand a kind of security guarantee from one or both of the nuclear giants that the Senate is now weary of supporting. A treaty agreed to only at the price of a strong American guarantee of Indian security against China would have hard going in the Senate, where many members are convinced that the nation already is "overextended" in its commitments.

MAN'S FOOLISH WAYS

So even an idea as worthy as restricting the spread of nuclear weapons turns out in this world of men to be full of human troubles. "Old now is earth, and none may count her days," the Academy boys sang in their clear voices, at morning chapel service, "yet thou, her child, whose head is crowned with flame/still wilt not hear thine inner God proclaim/'Turn back, oh man, foreswear thy foolish ways.' "

It will probably take a little longer for that day to come than to put an end to the war in Vietnam. But only then, as the hymn proclaimed, "Earth shall be fair, and all her folk be one." In the meantime, it will not be easy to get in there and finish up anything.

[From the New York Times, May 4, 1967]

Observer: Obstacles to a Department of Dissent

(By Russell Baker)

Washington, May 3.—Why has the Johnson Administration been so tardy in pointing out that dissent about the Vietnamese war has been helping the enemy? The President should have warned dissenters about this two years ago when he first went into Vietnam in a big way.

Now, suddenly, many persons who have been blithely dissenting away for the past two years are advised that they have been helping the enemy all along. The danger here is that one of these days Senator Joseph R. McSenator of Wisconsin will have these dissenters before his committee demanding to know why they committed two years of treason by helping the enemy during the early days of the Vietnamese war.

M'SENATORISM IS OUT

The President, who is as eager as the next man to avoid a repetition of McSenatorism, has asked his staff for ideas that might help prevent a recurrence. The most interesting reply so far is a proposal that he establish a Department of Dissent. ("It should be housed in a one-sided building to be called 'the Unagon,' " the proposal paper suggests.)

The Dissent Department's job would be to issue Federal dissent permits designed to prevent today's act of responsible criticism from becoming tomorrow's unpatriotic deed. Let us assume, for example, that the President has just committed another hundred thousand men to the Vietnamese war and John Doe thinks this is a grave mistake.

Under present procedures it might prove very risky to say so. Two years hence, the criticism might be interpreted as proof that Doe has given help to the enemy by frustrating formation of a solid war front at home. With a Dissent Department operating properly, however, such dangers could be eliminated.

The person who wanted to criticize the latest escalation would simply apply for a dissent permit.

If granted, it would state explicitly that "the dissent of John Doe in the matter of the landing of the first hundred thousand U.S. Army troops in Vietnam has been certified nontreasonous by the United States Government for a period of sixty days following the date stamped hereon, and such dissent as shall be committed within that time shall not be interpreted by future administrations, future generations or future McSenators as just cause for ruining the holder of this Federal permit."

Surely this is no more protection than the Government owes a citizenry from which it expects eternal vigilance. By limiting authorized dissent to a sixty-day term, the Government allows the citizen to speak out while the public issue is warm, yet retains the right to re-decide what dissent is and is not treasonous after a two-month testing period.

Sensible though this proposal seems on the surface, there are equally sensible objections to it. Some Cabinet officials argue, for example, that certifying today's dissent as nontreasonous today might seriously weaken the Government's ability to fight the Vietnamese war five years from now.

"After all," as one Cabinet officer puts it privately, "if we don't have the dissenters to blame for prolonging the war, the voters are going to start blaming us, and we can't very well go on fighting the war if we're de-elected five years from now."

The Republicans also dislike the idea of a Dissent Department. This is because they fear that to get dissent permits for the 1968 campaign, they would have to let President Johnson compose their platform and campaign rhetoric.

President Johnson also dislikes, quite naturally, the idea of going down in history as the President who required Americans to get a license to criticize the Government. The President, it can be reliably reported, would much prefer Americans to perceive, without Federal assistance, that there is nothing in the present Government that needs criticism.

NEW SPECIES NEEDED

The greatest obstacle to formation of a Dissent Department, however, is the difficulty in developing the new personnel required to make it work efficiently. Studies show conclusively that such an agency, under the present genus of Federal civil servants, might take up to ten years to approve and issue a dissent permit applied for this weekend.

This is because at present no civil servant can be found willing to put his head on the block by depriving tomorrow's politicians of the right to declare today's opinions unpatriotic tomorrow. This means that, until a new strain of civil servant can be developed, all dissent applications would have to be forwarded for processing at the White House.

And that, of course, would leave us exactly where we are right now.

LAWRENCE WELK'S ORCHESTRA TO SALUTE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY ON MAY 6

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, earlier this year, on March 2, I noted that the Commonwealth of Kentucky celebrates this year its 175th anniversary. Many programs have been established to commemorate Kentucky's entry into the Union as the 15th State. On the evening of May 6, the orchestra of Lawrence Welk will salute the Commonwealth of Kentucky. I am sure that it will be an interesting program.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I want to make a statement on personal privilege which is of interest to the members of the Ethics Committee. I would like to ask that the members of that committee be alerted that I intend to make the statement so that, hopefully, they will be present.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smathers in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

DUE RECOGNITION FOR POP WARNER JUNIOR LEAGUE FOOTBALL

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, yesterday I was pleased to join my distinguished colleague the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] in support of a Federal charter in recognition of the service to American youth rendered by Pop Warner Junior League football. Taking their inspiration from the deep interest in football which was the full lifetime preoccupation of Glenn Scobie "Pop" Warner, the football leagues which bear his name now boast 600,000 participants in every State in the Union.

Pop Warner is a legend in American football. He is a particular legend in the State of California, where he was the head football coach at Stanford University from 1924 to 1932. He produced three Rose Bowl teams, as well as a number of football immortals, including the great Ernie Nevers, who is still remembered as an alltime all-America fullback. I believe that it is fair to say that at Stanford, the famous Warner system came into full maturity. It was Pop Warner who introduced the single and double wing formations and such other innovations as the unbalanced line and the screen pass that are now everyday features of American football.

In the days that Pop Warner was at Stanford, his chief rival was another great American coach, Howard Jones, at the University of Southern California. In those days, I was an undergraduate at USC, and remember full well the titanic contests between Jones' famous "thundering herds" and the celebrated Warner teams. Unquestionably, Pop Warner and Howard Jones were preeminent, and their rivalry brought Pacific coast football to the fore. In those days, as now, it was the dream of every football coach to meet and try to overcome the Pacific Coast League in the annual football classic at the Rose Bowl, whose continuing reputation originated with the great football players and coaches of the 1920's. Recently, Pop Warner was voted "Coach of All the Years."

It is altogether proper that we honor him through the continuing activities of the football leagues which bear his name. In the House of Representatives, I am pleased to note that my colleagues, Representatives Don H. Clausen and Ed Roybal, of California, have submitted similar bills. I believe that all States in the Nation, including my own, will want to join in this act of tribute.

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY—EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, late last week the American Assembly, an affiliate of Columbia University dedicated to the discussion and refinement of major national policies, issued a report, "The United States and Eastern Europe," which I strongly recommend for the consideration of the Senate.

The report is important because it lends the prestige of the American Assembly in support of policies which are under attack in this country today by many organizations and individuals who find it difficult to understand how the United States can advocate building bridges to Eastern Europe while we are fighting Communists in Vietnam. But these policies are not inconsistent—we fight where necessary and propose to use our resources to improve relations with Eastern Europe via every possible channel, when possible, and as long as possible. The report upholds this position.

Of particular importance are the assembly's proposals with respect to East-West trade. He recommends that:

First. Congress should eliminate all legislative and procedural controls over trade in nonstrategic items with Eastern Europe more restrictive than those of our allies, so that trade relations may become normal.

Second. American trade with Eastern Europe in nonstrategic items should remain primarily the responsibility of American businessmen. Credit should follow the customary commercial patterns of trade, with Government guarantees when appropriate.

Third. The Congress should provide the President with the authority to extend nondiscriminatory treatment to imports from any Eastern European state when he determines such a step is in the national interest.

Fourth. With our Western European allies, we should encourage the active participation of the Eastern European states in the United Nations as well as in international institutions, such as OECD, GATT, and the aid consortia of the World Bank.

These proposals make a great deal of sense and I urge my colleagues to give these proposals as well as the report their closest consideration.

I ask unanimous consent that the report of the 31st American Assembly, April 27–30, 1967, including the list of the participants, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent that the sober and well-reasoned address of Averell Harriman on the background and justification for current U.S. policies toward Eastern Europe be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the report and the address were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

THE UNITED STATES AND EASTERN EUROPE

(Report of the 31st American Assembly, April 27–30, 1967)

PREFACE

The United States and Eastern Europe was the subject of the Thirty-first American Assembly, which met at Arden House, on the Harriman (N.Y.) campus of Columbia University, April 27–30, 1967. Persons prominent in business, education, government, communications, labor, agriculture and the clerical, legal and military professions—numbering 71 in all—discussed in depth, in small groups, the important social, political, and economic issues between the United States and the "iron curtain" countries of Eastern Europe: Poland, East Germany, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania. At the end of their discussions the participants met in plenary session to review, and approve, the report which follows on these pages.

A background volume for the discussions was prepared under the editorial supervision of Professor Robert F. Byrnes of Indiana University, with chapters and authors as follows:

1. *The Land and Peoples in History*—Stephen D. Kertesz, University of Notre Dame
2. *Internal Politics and Political Change in Eastern Europe*—Alvin Z. Rubenstein, University of Pennsylvania
3. *Economic Modernization*—Nicolas Spulber, Indiana University
4. *Social Forces and Cultural Changes*—R. V. Burks, Wayne State University
5. *Eastern Europe in the Communist World*—Kurt L. London, The George Washington University
6. *Europe, East and West*—John C. Campbell, Council on Foreign Relations
7. *American Opportunities and Dilemmas*—Robert F. Byrnes

Regional Assemblies on this subject, making use of the above named chapters and of American Assembly conference techniques, will meet across the nation with the cooperation of other educational institutions; and if it seems feasible an Eastern European-American Assembly will be held somewhere in Europe.

The report which follows reflects the collective view of the participants in their private, not their official, capacities. The American Assembly itself, a non-partisan educational organization, takes no position on matters it presents for public discussion; and The Ford Foundation, which generously provided support for the Thirty-first American Assembly program, similarly takes no official position on the opinions contained herein.

Clifford C. Nelson,
President, the American Assembly.

FINAL REPORT OF THE THIRTY-FIRST AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

(At the close of their discussions the participants in the Thirty-first American Assembly on *The United States and Eastern Europe* reviewed as a group the following statement. The statement represents general agreement; however no one was asked to sign it, and it should not be assumed that every participant necessarily subscribes to every recommendation.)

INTRODUCTION

Eastern Europe continues to be highly important to the United States. This region, long identified with the main currents of Western history, has contributed as well to our own national development. The changes in Eastern Europe over the past decade afford opportunities to the United States, in concert with Western Europe, to devise policies which promote the aspirations of the East European peoples, and contribute to international order. The policies now required must have the wisdom, understanding, and support of the American people.

Clearly the future of the countries of Eastern Europe should be determined by the peoples of those countries themselves. United States policy toward Eastern Europe must also take into account the character and tone of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and between the Soviet Union and Communist China. This policy will also be affected by developments in other parts of the world, such as Southeast Asia, and by other issues which require American attention and resources. *There is no inconsistency of purpose in working for improved relations with Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union at the same time as we oppose communist aggression in Viet Nam and other parts of the world. Both policies are instruments designed to promote peace and freedom.*

The core of American policy must remain the maintenance of national security, political vitality, and a readiness to use our resources with skill and resolution for the establishment of world order. We must remember that the progress of some of the states of Eastern Europe toward national independence has been influenced by American strength and policy, the existence of institutions such as NATO and the European Common Market, and the firm Western position in West Berlin.

The diversities among Eastern European countries, both in their domestic and international affairs, suggest that there is no single or simple policy for us or for them.

While continuing to pursue our active interest and role in Eastern Europe, *the United States must recognize the fact that the peoples of Western Europe are closer in culture and in space than we to the peoples of Eastern Europe and will play a leading role in relations with that area.*

The revival of national feeling, progress at varied levels and varied rates of speed toward greater autonomy and liberalization, the magnetic attraction of a revitalized West, and the pressures created by economic growth and resultant technological needs—all provide the United States and Western Europe the opportunity to assist the peoples of Eastern Europe toward a freer and more productive life. We should develop the means to pursue this opportunity *in closer consultation with Western Europe,* both within and outside NATO, than is the case at present.

The experience of Yugoslavia in the past two decades has illustrated both the possible political and economic evolution on the part of an Eastern European communist state and the mutual advantages flowing from normal and cooperative relations between such a state and those of the Western World. American attitudes and policies which have contributed to such trends continue to be relevant to developments in Eastern Europe.

In formulating long range objectives, we should take into account the *forces contributing to change in the countries of Eastern Europe:*

a. the move of these peoples toward national independence and responsive self-government, and their desire for the benefits of modernization, with the future character and form of each people's political and social system expressing its own individuality;

b. their desire to restore the traditional friendships between Eastern Europe and Western Europe so that the peoples of Europe as a whole may play a more important and constructive role in world affairs.

American policy should be so formulated and administered as to assist the spread of these changes in the communist world.

We seek evolution, not revolution. Therefore, the manner and style in which we execute our policies and seek these great goals are almost as important as the policies themselves.

In pursuing these objectives during the period of uncertainty, any policy, even a policy of doing nothing, is fraught with dangers. *The proposals which follow are made with the undestanding that no one can anticipate the future confidently and that accidents and the efforts of others may thwart our best designs.* Frustrations might arise from the nature of the communist regimes, complexities of the German issue, the powerful Soviet position in Eastern Germany, and the reluctance of the Soviet Union and the regimes of Eastern Europe to permit fundamental change.

While it may be argued that some of these proposals could have the effect of solidifying communist rule, rather than encouraging forces which will relax and modify the system, the evidence of the last ten years supports the latter judgment. Finally, our policies, indeed any policies one could propose for this area, assume that the American people will have the good sense and patience to support the East Europeans in a process which will inevitably last a long time.

PROPOSALS

1. The United States should maintain and strengthen its relationships with the peoples of Eastern Europe, build common interests with them, and encourage them to resume a responsible role in world affairs. National independence for these countries is a prerequisite to policies of interdependence which are fundamental to the solution of international problems.

2. Our relationships with the Soviet Union should be taken fully into account in shaping our policy toward Eastern Europe. While searching for a stable European settlement, we should at the same time strive to reduce tensions in Europe so as to decrease the dangers of war. We should seek to prevent a new race for anti-ballistic missile defenses, press for a nonproliferation treaty, and seek other means of arms control. Under existing conditions, such far-reaching approaches as neutralization of Germany or the establishment of atom-free zones in Europe, would not contribute to a satisfactory European settlement.

3. Germany and German reunification remain central to our policy for Europe.

a. We should increase our level of interest and concern with Germany and with Europe. We should ensure that West Germany remains confident of the continued support of the United States and its allies for the unification of Germany.

b. Our policy suggestions do not include East Germany, the situation of which is different from that of the Eastern European states. There seems to be no immediate prospect for a plebiscite within Eastern Germany regarding reunification of Germany, but the desire for national unity persists.

c. We should, with the Federal Republic be prepared to accept the Oder-Neisse line as the boundary between Poland and a reunited Germany when the communist powers are prepared to withdraw from the Elbe.

d. We welcome Western Germany economic and diplomatic agreements with the countries of Eastern Europe.

4. The United States welcomes the reestablishment of closer relations between Eastern and Western Europe and the expansion of West European cultural and technological contacts. The changing situation in Eastern Europe affords new opportunities for mutually beneficial economic relations, especially trade.

a. *Congress should eliminate all legislative and procedural controls over trade in non-strategic items with Eastern Europe more restrictive than those of our allies, so that trade relations may become normal.*

b. *American trade with Eastern Europe in non-strategic items should remain primarily the responsibility of American businessmen. Credit should follow the customary commercial patterns of trade, with government guarantees when appropriate.*

c. *The Congress should provide the President with the authority to extend non-discriminatory treatment to imports from any Eastern European state when he determines such a step is in the national interest.*

5. With our Western European allies, *we should encourage the active participation of the Eastern European states in the United Nations as well as in international institutions, such as OECD, GATT, and the aid consortia of the World Bank.*

6. The vitality of Western culture has a powerful attraction for the peoples of Eastern Europe. Individual Americans, foundations, universities, learned societies, religious groups, trade unions, community organizations such as World Affairs Councils, and the government alike should all contribute in their own way to increasing the reciprocal flow of ideas, people, publications, and artistic works.

We propose:

a. The expansion of exchange programs, particularly with opportunities for a richer intellectual development for East European leaders from the most important fields of activity and study.

b. New emphasis upon arrangements for continuing cooperative work of groups here and in Eastern Europe on common problems, such as air pollution and medical research.

c. The sharing of knowledge in areas central to modern life, such as business management, public administration, and non-strategic technology, to help speed the transformations already underway in those countries.

d. Expansion and improvement of English language instruction and of systematic study and knowledge of the United States in universities, and of libraries on the United States.

e. Continuation and enlargement of our efforts to provide accurate news and cultural programs via Western radio and television stations, and an increased flow of Western publications into Eastern Europe.

7. The historic cultures of these peoples have enriched American life. In spite of the impressive achievements of the last two decades, knowledge and understanding of Eastern Europe in the United States remain inadequate. Universities should continue and the private foundations should expand their investment in research, instruction, and publication concerning Eastern Europe. Programs of the International Education Act should include attention to these goals.

PARTICIPANTS—THE 31ST AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

George V. Allen, Director, Foreign Service Institute, Department of State.

Frank Altschul, Vice President, Council on Foreign Relations, New York.

Nils Anderson, Jr., President, Devevoise-Anderson Co., New York.

Paul B. Anderson, Consultant on Eastern Europe to The Executive Council of the Episcopal Church and N.C.C., New York.

F. K. Arthur, Jr., Publisher, Monterey *Peninsula Herald,* California.

R. W. Askanase, Chairman, Dunhill International, Inc., Houston.

Emile Benoit, Professor of International Business, Columbia University.

Meyer Bernstein, International Affairs Director, United Steelworkers of America, Washington, D.C.

Thomas C. Bostic, President, Cascade Broadcasting Co., Yakima, Washington.

Lawrence Broadwell, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

R. V. Burks, Professor of History, Wayne State University.

Robert F. Byrnes, Director, International Affairs Center, Indiana University.

† John C. Campbell, Council on Foreign Relations, New York.

*Jeffery Cohelan, Representative from California, Congress of the United States.

Guy Coriden, Deputy Director, Office of European Programs, Bureau of Educational & Cultural Affairs, Department of State

Alexander Dallin, Adlai E. Stevenson Professor of International Relations, Columbia University.

Richard T. Davies, Assistant Director (Soviet Union and Eastern Europe) U.S. Information Agency.

Vera Micheles Dean, Professor of International Development, New York University.

Rev. William H. Dickinson, Highland Park Methodist Church, Dallas.

Dudley P. Digges, *The Sun*, Baltimore.

† Walter Dowling, Director General, The Atlantic Institute, Paris.

John B. Fisher, Consultant to Congress, Washington, D.C.

Julius Fleischmann, Chairman, Fleischmann Foundation, Cincinnati.

Walter Friedenberg, Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Washington, D.C.

A. R. Gale, President, International Business Development Co., Cleveland.

Richard N. Gardner, Henry L. Moses Professor of Law and International Organization, Columbia University.

George Garvy, Economic Adviser, Federal Reserve Bank, New York.

Stanley T. Gordon, International Affairs Program, The Ford Foundation, New York.

†† James Gould, Foreign Area Fellowship Program, New York.

David L. Guyer, Vice President, Institute of International Education, New York.

* W. Averell Harriman, United States Ambassador at Large.

Milan Herzog, Vice President, Encyclopaedia Britannica, Educational Corporation, Chicago.

Paul M. Herzog, President, Salzburg Seminar in American Studies, Austria.

†† George W. Hoffman, Professor of Geography, University of Texas.

Norman O. Houston, Chairman, Golden State Mutual Life Insurance Co., Los Angeles.

James Kagen, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

Stephen D. Kertesz, Professor of Government, Notre Dame University.

William R. Kintner, Deputy Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute, Philadelphia.

Allan B. Kline, Western Springs, Illinois.

Josef Korbel, Dean, Graduate School of International Studies, University of Denver.

Tom Lilley, Director, Export-Import Bank of Washington.

G. A. Lincoln, Colonel, USA, Chairman, Department of Social Sciences, United States Military Academy, West Point.

Raymond E. Lisle, Director, Eastern European Affairs, Department of State.

K. L. London, Director, Institute for Sino-Soviet Studies, The George Washington University.

Richard B. Lynch, Rear Admiral USN, Chief, European Division, Plans and Policy, Joint Staff, Department of Defense.

Edwin A. Malloy, President, Fred F. French Investing Co., New York.

Philip Mosley, Professor of International Relations, Columbia University.

Zygmunt Nagorski, Foreign Policy Association, New York.

I. A. Oehler, President, The American Welding & Manufacturing Co., Warren, Ohio.

Christopher H. Phillips, President, U.S. Council, International Chamber of Commerce, New York.

Frederick A. Praeger, Publisher, New York.

John Richardson, Jr., President, Free Europe, Inc., New York.

Scovel Richardson, Judge, United States Customs Court, New York.

James Q. Riordan, President, Mobil Oil Corporation International, New York.

Hugh J. Rosellini, Judge, Supreme Court, State of Washington, Olympia.

Alvin Rubinstein, Professor of Political Science, University of Pennsylvania.

Howland H. Sargeant, President, Radio Liberty Committee, New York.

††Albert J. Schmidt, Chairman, Department of History, University of Bridgeport.

Harry Schwartz, Editorial Board, The New York Times.

*Marshall D. Shulman, Professor of International Politics, Fletcher School of Law & Diplomacy, Tufts University.

Sister Mary Grace, C.S.C., President, St. Mary's College.

J. E. Slater, Program Officer in Charge of International Relations, The Ford Foundation.

Philip Sporn, Chairman, Systems Development Committee, American Electric Power Co., New York.

Irving Stone, Author, Beverly Hills.

Shepard Stone, Advisor on International Activities, The Ford Foundation.

Theodore C. Streibert, Executive Secretary, Citizens Committee for Higher Education in New Jersey, Princeton.

Theodore L. Thau, Executive Secretary, Committee on Export Policy, U.S. Department of Commerce.

†Kenneth W. Thompson, Vice President, The Rockefeller Foundation, New York.

Edward Vernoff, Harriman Scholar, Columbia University.

A. G. Ward, Admiral, USN, United States Representative, Military Committee, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Washington, D.C.

Watson W. Wise, W. W. Wise Drilling Co., Tyler, Texas.

ABOUT THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY

The American Assembly was established by Dwight D. Eisenhower at Columbia University in 1950. It holds nonpartisan meetings and publishes authoritative books to illuminate issues of United States policy.

An affiliate of Columbia, with offices in the Graduate School of Business, the Assembly is a national educational institution incorporated under the State of New York.

The Assembly seeks to provide information, stimulate discussion, and evoke independent conclusions in matters of vital public interest.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY SESSIONS

At least two national programs are initiated each year. Authorities are retained to write background papers presenting essential data and defining the main issues in each subject.

About 60 men and women representing a broad range of experience, competence, and American leadership meet for several days to discuss the Assembly topic and consider alternatives for national policy.

All Assemblies follow the same procedure. The background papers are sent to participants in advance of the Assembly. The Assembly meets in small groups for four or five lengthy periods. All groups use the same agenda. At the close of these informal sessions participants adopt in plenary session a final report of findings and recommendations.

Regional, state, and local Assemblies are held following the national session at Arden House. Assemblies have also been held in England, Switzerland, Malaysia, Canada, the Caribbean, South America, and the Philippines. Nearly ninety institutions have co-sponsored one or more Assemblies.

AMERICAN ASSEMBLY BOOKS

The background papers for each Assembly program are published in cloth and paperbound editions for use by individuals, libraries, businesses, public agencies, non-governmental organizations, educational institutions, discussion and service groups. In this way the deliberations of Assembly sessions are continued and extended.

ARDEN HOUSE

Home of The American Assembly and scene of the national sessions is Arden House, which was given to Columbia University in 1950 by W. Averell Harriman. E. Roland Harriman joined his brother in contributing toward adaptation of the property for conference purposes. The buildings and surrounding land, known as the Harriman Campus of Columbia University, are 50 miles north of New York City.

Arden House is a distinguished conference center. It is self-supporting and operates throughout the year for use by organizations with educational objectives. The American Assembly is a tenant of this Columbia University facility only during Assembly sessions.

THE AMERICAN ASSEMBLY—COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Trustees:
Dwight D. Eisenhower, Honorary Chairman, Pennsylvania.
Arthur G. Altschul, New York.
George W. Ball, District of Columbia.
William Benton, Connecticut.
Courtney C. Brown, ex officio, New York.
William P. Bundy, District of Columbia.
Josephine Young Case, New York.
John Cowles, Minnesota.
George S. Craft, Georgia.
Douglas Dillon, New Jersey.
Marriner S. Eccles, Utah.
Thomas K. Finletter, New York.
Arthur S. Flemming, Oregon.
Katharine Graham, District of Columbia.
Alfred M. Gruenther, Nebraska.
W. Averell Harriman, New York.
J. Erik Jonsson, Texas.
Grayson Kirk, ex officio, New York.
Allan B. Kline, Illinois.
Sol M. Linowitz, New York.
Don G. Mitchell, New Jersey.
Clifford C. Nelson, ex officio, New Jersey.
Officers:
Clifford C. Nelson, President.
James H. Berry, Secretary.
Olive B. Haycox, Treasurer.
Mary M. McLeod, Assistant to the President.
Chairman Emeritus: Henry M. Wriston, New York.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE W. AVERELL HARRIMAN, AMBASSADOR AT LARGE, AT THE THIRTY-FIRST AMERICAN ASSEMBLY, ARDEN HOUSE, NEW YORK, SATURDAY, APRIL 29, 1967

THE UNITED STATES AND EASTERN EUROPE IN PERSPECTIVE

United States relations today with Eastern Europe are still being shaped by past events, attitudes and policies. The states of central Eastern Europe came into being as a result of the Versailles Conference. They were established in deference to a political principle, national self-determination, with little consideration of economic realities. As a result, these nations suffered serious economic difficulties. The greatest tragedy was Vienna—a head left without a body—with unmanageable unemployment. The leaders of the new countries made gallant efforts, with some success particularly in Czechoslovakia and Poland, to overcome the dislocations and construct viable economies. Another significant development of the early twenties was the network of treaties encouraged by France known as the Cordon Sanitaire, intended to create a buffer against the inroads of Bolshevism.

An abrupt change in attitude occurred

---

† Discussion leader.
* Delivered address.
†† Rapporteur

on the day the Nazis invaded Russia in June 1941 when Churchill accepted the Soviet Union as an ally. The early discussions between the Soviet Union and the British and ourselves related largely to immediate considerations of the war—military strategy and supply matters to help the Soviet Union withstand the Nazi onslaught.

From October 1943, the time of the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers, the political problems of the post-war Europe were increasingly discussed, with particular concentration of the future of Eastern Europe. By that time it was already apparent that the Red Army would occupy these countries as it forced the invading Nazi armies back to Germany. In this conference, however, Mr. Hull was primarily interested in reaching agreement with the Soviets on the over-all declaration of principles, expressed in the Moscow Declaration. This he felt would form a basis for detailed decisions at a later time. Mr. Eden's approach was the more direct one of attempting to reach understandings on specific issues. At that meeting, he proposed a confederation of Eastern European States, a plan that had been tentatively approved by Sikorski and Benes. He hoped this federation would create political as well as economic strength in Central Europe, and could overcome the weakness which the dismemberment of the Habsburg empire had created.

But Molotov would have none of it. He piously cloaked his rejection with what he called the need to await the "result of a free, peaceful and well-considered expression of the will of the people." The Soviets made it plain that they would not permit the reconstruction of any new Cordon Sanitaire, and they showed little respect for what they called "the emigre governments" in London. We got the impression that the Soviets wanted a fragmented post-war Europe consisting of small weak states throughout—easily dominated by the Soviet Union.

A month later at Tehran, Churchill sought Stalin's agreement specifically regarding an independent Poland. Stalin responded by demanding a revision of the Riga Treaty boundary, which the Soviets had always considered unjust. He referred to the prior British proposal of the Curzon line as being a more correct ethnic division. He offered compensation to Poland at the expense of Germany.

From then on, Poland became the primary political topic of discussion between the British and ourselves and the Russians. Hitler's invasion of Poland had brought Britain into the war, and Poland was a country with which many Americans were especially concerned. Under instructions from President Roosevelt, I talked about Poland with Stalin more frequently than any other subject.

I recall, one time in the late winter of 1944, opening a discussion with Stalin by saying that President Roosevelt had asked me to talk to him about the future of Poland. Stalin replied, "The Poles, the Poles—can't you think of anything else to talk about but the Poles?" He asserted that Poland had always created difficulties for Russia and that it was the invasion corridor through which Western European armies had attacked Russia. Since Poland was so important to Russia's security, he could not see why we did not leave the future of Poland to the Soviet Union. Stalin insisted that they must have a "friendly neighbor."

I explained to Stalin that American public opinion would not support a U.S. Administration that failed to protect the right of these peoples to determine their own future. Stalin's reply amazed me. He said that he had his own public opinion to think about—that the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians wanted to be reunited with their brothers in the areas that had been unfairly taken from them. As Stalin was blunt, I could be also. I suggested that Stalin was in a position to take care of public opinion in the Soviet Union. His reply was revealing. He maintained that he had to pay constant attention to public opinion since, he explained, "We have had three revolutions in a generation." In other words, Stalin regarded suppression of counter-revolution as his primary concern in dealing with Russian public opinion.

The talks continued. In October 1944 Churchill brought the London Polish leaders with him to Moscow, hoping thereby to reach an understanding. Finally, at Yalta in February 1945, an agreement was reached, not only for Poland, but for all of the states of Eastern Europe. Through the Declaration for Liberated Europe, as well as the Agreement on Poland, the Soviet Union undertook to work with the British and American Governments to assure the holding of free and unfettered elections, with all democratic, non-Fascist parties having a full right to participate. The unhappy fact is that Stalin failed to keep his Yalta Agreements.

It is hard to understand why Stalin should have made agreements at Yalta, and then broken them so soon thereafter. One explanation, which I am inclined to believe, is that he had expected that the Red Army would be welcomed as the liberator from the Nazi tyranny, and that, in the first blush of this enthusiasm, a Communist-dominated government could be elected. Perhaps this explains why at Yalta he had proposed elections within one month of liberation.

Beirut, the leader of the Lublin Poles, was in Moscow when Stalin returned from that conference, and he must have learned from him that in Poland a free election could not be trusted, that the Red Army was being regarded as a new invading force. The historic fear and distrust of Russia was still paramount in people's minds. This proved true in other countries as well. Later, in the summer of 1945, for some reason free elections were permitted in Hungary which exposed the fact that the Communist Party there had little popular support. It could only command 17 percent of the vote.

The fate of Eastern Europe in the immediate post-war period was sealed by the presence of the Red Army. The effort of Churchill and Roosevelt at Yalta to come to an agreement with Stalin failed, but that effort in itself had the value of exposing Stalin's perfidy and aggressive intentions to the world.

It is important to recall that the U.S. did not accept for several years the inevitability of conflict with the Soviet Union. It is well to keep in mind that even as late as June 1947 General Marshall in his famous Harvard speech offered assistance to *all* of Europe—including the Soviet Union. However, Molotov walked out of the conference convened in Paris to consider the offer, and the Soviets compelled Poland and Czechoslovakia to reverse their preliminary decision to participate. The Iron Curtain, which Churchill had described, came down to divide Europe—with a bang that all could hear—and the cold war was intensified.

American opinion had been slow to accept the split. It was hard for Americans to understand that the Soviet leaders after all the tragic losses of the war would not want to cooperate in rebuilding a peaceful world. It is significant to recall that after Churchill's Fulton speech, his hotel in New York was picketed and he was met with student demonstrations at Columbia where he was given an honorary degree. Many of these people were not extremists. They hated war. A Foreign Service officer with whom I have worked closely in recent years confessed to me that he had taken part as a student in the demonstration at Columbia in the belief that Churchill was fanning war emotions.

In the intervening twenty years, certain events have tended to exacerbate our conflict with the Soviet bloc: the Berlin blockade, the North Korean attack, the Cuban missile crisis and the Soviet's continuing support for so-called "National Liberation movements" in South America and elsewhere.

But other events have tended to ameliorate the tensions. Stalin's hopes for a monolithic structure of international communism have been shattered. The accord between Moscow and Peking, though never complete, has been ruptured, seemingly beyond repair. Tito's break with Stalin has encouraged the other Eastern European countries to force a loosening of Moscow's domination. *It is well for us to remember that although we had nothing to do with Tito's break with Stalin, there is no doubt that our military and economic help made it possible for him to maintain his independence.* Another favorable trend has been the changes within the Communist countries themselves which have somewhat eased the most rigid controls, making easier contacts with the West.

When in 1955 Khrushchev welcomed Tito back into the fold, Tito insisted on retaining complete independence—political, military, economic and ideological. Tito has continued the development of his relations with the West to the point where 65 percent of his foreign trade is with the Free World and only 35 percent is with the Soviets and the Eastern European bloc.

Trade between Western and Eastern Europe has steadily increased in non-strategic items. Throughout the period we and our allies have maintained what is known as a COCOM list, controlling shipments of products that are considered of strategic value.

In addition, cultural exchanges and mutual tourism have substantially increased. The larger numbers, of course, go from the West to the East. Not only Yugoslavia's Dalmatian Coast, but Bulgarian and Romanian Black Sea beaches are attracting large numbers of Western European vacationists. However, Hungary, for example, permitted 244,000 of their citizens to visit non-Communist countries in 1965.

Each of the Eastern European countries has in its own way undertaken to reduce the rigidities of Communist economic control. The economic difficulties faced by Communist countries have compelled them to experiment with ways to decentralize management and increase incentives.

Controls were never as complete in the Eastern European countries as in the Soviet Union. The most striking example is agriculture. In Poland, for instance, 87 percent of the land remains in the hands of the peasants.

In the new experiments, Yugoslavia has shown the way in breaking down central direction of the economy. Step by step individual enterprises, controlled, in theory at least, by the workers, have been forced to compete with one another. Bank credits have replaced government provided funds. Each enterprise must earn its right to exist by producing a profit. Also the need to expand exports has compelled these enterprises to meet foreign competition as well. *This has led Yugoslavia to join GATT in August 1966* and to welcome private foreign investment in their industry. It is still too early to judge how this will work.

Although the Communist Party in Yugoslavia still controls the ideology and policy of the Government, it is planning to give up its detailed direction of government operations. Politically, the Assemblies of the local Republic as well as the Federal Assembly in Belgrade are assuming greater responsibility. In Slovenia last December a cabinet submitted its resignation when it lost an Assembly vote on a health insurance bill. But the Communist Party still dominates political expression as is evidenced by Mihajlov's recent conviction.

The other countries of Eastern Europe are undoubtedly watching with fascination events in Yugoslavia. There can be no doubt that Yugoslavia's example will be followed if it is successful, even though at a more cautious pace. *Unfortunately, our ability to help Yugoslavia at this critical period has been checked by the adoption by Congress of the ill-considered Findley and Belcher Amendments.* The greater success Yugoslavia has with its experiments in the freeing of its economy, the greater influence its example will have on the other countries of Eastern Europe.

The increasing complexities of the Soviet economy are also compelling Moscow to experiment with new methods of decentralization and incentives. Their economists are studying the methods of the U.S. and Western Europe, in an attempt to understand the reason for the extraordinary post-war Western economic success which has belied so dramatically the predictions of Stalin's economists of the early economic collapse of the West. In Moscow one no longer hears such predictions.

In fact, I was interested in the attitude of one of the senior Soviet economists in a conversation I had with him the last time I was in Moscow. He complained that too many of the Americans he met were specialists on the *Soviet* economy. He wanted to talk instead to "the specialists on the *American* economy."

In no sense am I suggesting that the Communist one-party system is breaking down. Irreversible changes, however, are taking place, and this includes to a small degree, at least, freedom of expression. Control of individual thought and expression seems to be the last stronghold to which the Communists are clinging even though the demand for more freedom is growing in strength. Some criticism is permitted and the strict insistence on socialist realism in art has been relaxed. However, those who have the courage to overstep the bounds of "propriety" in their attack on the current regimes or Communist doctrine are severely punished.

The American attitude, particularly in Congress, toward Eastern Europe has adjusted itself haltingly to the changes that have taken place. President Johnson has appealed to the country to undertake building bridges to the East, and in his October 7 speech to the National Conference of Editorial Writers he brought into focus the interrelationship of our European policies.

In referring to the unnatural partition of Europe, he warned that Europe must be made whole again if peace is to be secure. He stated:

"Our purpose is not to overturn other governments, but to help the people of Europe to achieve:

"A continent in which the peoples of Eastern and Western Europe work shoulder to shoulder together for the common good;

"A continent in which alliances do not confront each other in bitter hostility, but instead provide a framework in which West and East can act together in order to assure the security of all."

"In a restored Europe, Germany can and will be united."

The distance the U.S. has lagged behind Western Europe in bridge building to the East is clearly shown by the trade figures. Whereas the trade between Western and Eastern Europe, exclusive of the Soviet Union, was over 5 billion dollars in 1965, the U.S. trade was less than 200 million.

Under these circumstances, it doesn't make any sense for us to continue to restrict trade in non-strategic goods as we have been doing. This self denial is achieving no useful purpose. We are simply losing business to Western European competitors and creating a lot of unnecessary ill will.

Over the years, Congress has placed restriction on restriction. Crippling amendments have been added to essential legislation which Presidents could not afford to veto. Even today there is danger that ultraconservative Congressmen may attempt to further damage our national interests by offering amendments to such legislation as the Export-Import Bank Charter renewal, handicapping its usefulness in expanding trade. The effect of legislation has been compounded by rigid bureaucratic interpretations. President Johnson has reversed some of these bureaucratic interpretations. He has reduced export controls with respect to hundreds of non-strategic items and he has authorized the Export-Import Bank to guarantee commercial credits to selected countries.

Incidentally, the President has most wisely authorized the Export-Import Bank to help finance the purchase by Fiat of 50 million dollars of machinery for incorporation into their project in the Soviet Union. This project will undoubtedly increase the pressures by the people on the Government for more automobiles, with all the diversion of resources that that will entail. Every family I have met throughout the Soviet Union longs for an automobile and the release that that will give them.

The President has also taken other steps within his authority, but legislation is essential before we can begin to encourage a reasonable flow of trade.

The proposed *"East-West Trade Relations"* bill, if approved by Congress, would authorize the President to extend most favored nation tariff treatment to individual Communist countries when he determines this to be in the national interest. *This authority would be exercised through a commercial agreement with a particular country for a period of not more than three years.* Aside from the export of strategic items which would, of course, remain prohibited, *the trade itself would depend on the decisions of individual private firms. The President would have the power to suspend or terminate such commercial agreements if he determined that the other party was not living up to its obligations, or if he determined that suspension or termination were in the national interest.* Communist China, North Korea, North Viet-Nam, Cuba and the Soviet Zone of Germany are specifically excluded by the provisions of this bill.

The people of Eastern Europe want to expand contacts with the West. In fact, they feel that they have more in common with the West than with Russia. They particularly long for better relations with us. The individual family ties with the U.S. are still close. But more than that, to Eastern Europeans, the U.S. exemplifies a better life. They seek not only technical knowledge and products, but also personal contacts and the opportunity to visit the U.S.

Hopes of improved relations with the U.S. have been encouraged by the decreasing threat of hostilities in Europe. This has, of course, also influenced the people of Western Europe, and has led to a demand for the re-thinking of NATO's role.

The receding fear of war has given impetus to the desire of Western Europe for less dependence on the United States, and a sense of greater independence. I do not see why we should be overly concerned by the natural development, but we must take into account this change in psychology and appreciate its sensitivities.

There are certain principles, however, that we must clearly continue to support in Western Europe. Since the Marshall Plan, encouragement of the integration of Western Europe has been one of our foremost policies. Our concern for the reunification of Germany must remain our firm policy as an essential means to achieve eventual European stability. The basic security interests of the North Atlantic Community must be safeguarded, but detailed arrangements must be modernized to meet changing conditions.

Except for France, the other 14 members of NATO have agreed to maintain integrated forces, but we are also exploring together ways in which NATO can enlarge its activities, including the field of East-West relations. The President has given encouragement to the development of common policies in this area.

Obviously, trade agreements and other detailed matters will be dealt with through bilateral understandings. However, all except France agree that the NATO nations must stand together to prevent the Soviet Union from succeeding in fragmenting Western Europe again, and to concert policies in East-West relations.

Although nationalism among the nations of Eastern Europe has led to their demand for greater independence from Moscow, there is reason for our recognizing that cooperation among the countries of Eastern Europe can contribute to the health of the entire continent. The President clearly recognized this when he pointed out that the alliances provide a framework in which West and East can act together in order to advance common interests and assure the security of all.

The hope that the peoples of Western and Eastern Europe can work together for the common good can only be realized if both accept the existence of each other's political systems and avoid interference in each other's internal affairs. Yet progress depends in no small degree on the development of more open societies in the East. These changes can only come from within, but they can be encouraged by our readiness to cooperate.

Increased Eastern European participation in various international economic organizations should be encouraged. Yugoslavia already is a member of the World Bank, the IMF, the International Development Association, and GATT. The UN Economic Commission for Europe can be made more effective in furthering East-West relations. We should attempt to get Eastern Europe as well as the Soviet Union to cooperate in the immense and pressing task of assisting the developing nations, perhaps through association with the OECD and its subcommittee, the DAC.

At best, progress can be made only on a step-by-step basis.

We must realize that the outward thrust of international communism is not dead. With all of the Soviets' protestations of peaceful coexistence, the Soviets still support "national liberation movements" and claim that so-called "wars of national liberation" are just. They call upon Eastern European Communist parties to do the same.

I have had an opportunity to discuss this question bluntly with Soviet leaders, and although they are pragmatic in considering methods of achieving production, they still hold rigidly to the concept that communism will eventually sweep the world.

Although I doubt that they are prepared to take the risks their predecessors did, and they certainly do not wish to face nuclear war, they will take advantage of any opening in any part of the world to expand the influence of communism.

There is no secret about this activity. The Communist press reports the actions taken at the international conferences held in Havana that blatantly call for "intensification of all forms of the struggle, including the armed struggle of the peoples of the three continents (of Asia, Africa and Latin America)". Eight Latin American countries, including such democratic countries as Venezuela and Peru, have been specifically named as targets for "organized revolution and violence". They even call for "resolute aid . . . for the struggle for the independence of Puerto Rico"! A *Pravda* editorial has supported these actions, stating: "The Soviet people . . . regard it . . . as their sacred duty to give support to the peoples fighting for their independence" and referred to the terrorists as "the Latin American patriots."

It is hard for a Westerner to understand how the Communists can maintain that we are the imperialist aggressor when, for example, we help the freely-elected Government of Venezuela in its efforts to stamp out the terrorist movement that is responsible for acts of sabotage and murder. They consider that we are attempting to block the inevitable trend of history. They contend that the small group of terrorists is, in fact, speaking for the people. One must understand that they still think in terms of the handful of Bolsheviks who arrived in Petrograd in April 1917 and within six months took over control of the country and have been "speaking for the people" of Russia ever since.

Nothing we say or do today will change that conviction. Developments within the Soviet Union, and particularly Eastern Europe, have tempered the ardor of the international revolutionary spirit and have made the Soviets more conservative in undertaking risky actions. This trend will probably continue, and I feel they will be less and less ready to invest in foreign adventures as time goes on.

Improved relations between East and West can speed that day. This is the answer to those who ask why we should improve relations with the Communist countries while they are giving assistance to North Viet-Nam in its aggression against the South. Whether we like it or not, the Governments of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe consider North Viet-Nam as an allied Communist country, and believe it is their duty to support it when it is engaged in a conflict.

Certainly, the Vietnamese war is making it more difficult to come to agreements with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. But such agreements as we have been able to reach tend to relieve tensions and to encourage the Soviet Union and others to use their influence to end the conflict. I am satisfied the Soviet and the Eastern European Governments would like to see the Viet-Nam war ended. They believe it contributes primarily to Peking's interests, and they do not want a confrontation with us. They want stability in Europe. The Soviets want to make progress in the control of nuclear weapons and want to be able to reduce military expenditures. Their resources are already strained, and they would like to devote more of their resources to improving the living conditions which their people are demanding.

But we must expect them to continue to give assistance to a sister Communist country, North Viet-Nam, which they consider an overriding obligation.

With our differences in ideology, we must expect continuing frictions in one place or another. We cannot today expect an ultimate settlement. But we can expect the gradual breaking down of barriers, improvement of relations, more areas of common agreement.

If we are wise enough to pursue the opportunities as they unfold, we will certainly hasten the day when we can hope for a viable settlement in Europe—"a continent", as the President has suggested, "in which the peoples of Eastern and Western Europe . . . work shoulder to shoulder together for their common good".

PROPOSED ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION ACCELERATOR FACILITY IN WESTON, ILL.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the Catholic Interracial Council of the Twin Cities, composed of public-spirited citizens and individuals deeply committed to the cause of human rights, has unanimously passed the following resolution, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD at this point so that it might be brought to the attention of the Congress.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> *Whereas,* the Catholic Interracial Council of the Twin Cities is deeply concerned about the continuing inequities in housing, employment and education available to American citizens of minority groups, and
>
> *Whereas,* it is national policy that Federal monies shall not be used in a manner which derogates the right of persons in the United States to enjoy and participate in the benefits which flow from the expenditure of such funds without regard to race, creed, or color, and
>
> *Whereas,* the Congress and the Administration at the present time have before them for consideration the location and funding of a proposed Atomic Energy Commission accelerator facility in Weston, Illinois, and
>
> *Whereas,* a grave doubt exists whether the metropolitan area of Chicago in which the Weston site is located and the State of Illinois have an effective affirmative action program for equality of housing, employment and education consistent with national policies,
>
> *Therefore, Be It Resolved,* that this Board strongly urges the Congress and the Administration to withhold decision as to the location and funding of the aforesaid accelerator installation until a factfinding committee of the Congress holds public hearings in the Chicago metropolitan area to determine whether the State of Illinois and the metropolitan area of Chicago have in fact or will adopt an effective affirmative action program, including a strong State Fair Housing Law, to implement national policy, and
>
> *Be It Further Resolved,* that if such a program is not offered within a reasonable time an alternate location be designated which would comply with national policy.

PULITZER PRIZE HIGHLIGHTS SENATE FAILURE TO RATIFY GENOCIDE CONVENTION—LXVI

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I rise again today to urge Senate ratification of the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the recent awarding of the Pulitzer Prize for reporting on international affairs to R. John Hughes of the Christian Science Monitor.

Mr. Hughes earned this coveted professional recognition for his outstanding coverage of the volatile situation in Indonesia.

Regardless of how one views contemporary developments in that troubled nation, the mind must shudder at the wholesale slaughter of Chinese there.

In the majority of murders, the only charge against those executed was the fact that they were Chinese. This was sufficient. The civilized world must react to such senseless violence with shock and horror.

Whenever the "crime" an individual is guilty of is merely membership in a national, religious, or ethnic group, the elements of genocide are present.

While different names are used at different times in different places—pogrom, a "final solution," or a holy purging—the stark facts remain the same: genocide.

International community reacted to the holocaust in Germany under the Third Reich by adopting the Genocide Convention.

The prime objective of the Genocide Convention was the prevention of the indiscriminate and inhuman killing of persons because they happen to be of this rather than that extraction, because they happen to go to this church rather than that temple, or because their skin is a little bit lighter or a little bit darker than the prevailing pigment.

Genocide is not the exclusive practice of any country or any continent. The seeds of genocide are present everywhere where one group advocates its own natural superiority or another's natural inferiority.

The Genocide Convention represents a sincere effort not to punish the past, but to preserve the future.

Seventy nations are on record by ratifying the Convention on Genocide. The United States is not one of those 70 nations.

The Senate can provide a signal service to the United States and to posterity by ratifying the Convention on Genocide.

SENATOR HANSEN: A VOICE FOR WYOMING AND THE WEST

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, many splendid comments have appeared in print with respect to the performance and potential of the newly elected Republican Senators. They have been hailed and correctly so, as an infusion of new thinking, ideas, and concepts into the Republican Party which will benefit not only the GOP, but the Senate and people of the United States, as well.

One of our newly elected colleagues, my good friend from the neighboring State of Wyoming, was the subject of a feature article that appeared April 16, 1967, in the Billings, Mont., Gazette.

The Gazette's Washington correspondent, Kenneth Scheibel, described Senator HANSEN's attitudes on his exposure to Senate responsibilities and challenges and ended on a note with which I thoroughly agree. Wrote Mr. Scheibel:

> It looks like Senator Clifford Hansen is going to be effective—not only for Wyoming, but as a voice for the West.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wyoming has left no doubt that he will indeed be effective.

He has represented well the interests of the Western States in developing a body of fact and programs that may ultimately lead to a major oil shale industry in my State of Colorado, in Utah, and in Wyoming.

The junior Senator from Wyoming has joined in hearings on oil shale development which are being held by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee and which are still going on. In this hearing, and in his other responsibilities as a U.S. Senator, CLIFF HANSEN has left no doubt that, as the Billings Gazette put it, he will be a "voice for the West."

I ask, Mr. President, that the article to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANSEN FINDS THINGS DIFFERENT IN WASHINGTON

(By Kenneth Scheibel)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—Things may seem a little different once a man gets to Washington.

Take it from Wyoming Sen. Clifford P. Hansen, former Republican governor.

Hansen told of his impressions as U.S. Senator after three months on the job in Washington.

Taking a break from his crowded schedule, Hansen also observed with a grin, "Tim Babcock would have liked it here in Washington, he would have liked it fine."

Hansen makes no bones about the fact that the West—and especially Wyoming—come first in his affections when it gets down to senatorial loyalties. But he also is tied up in some projects which Wyoming shares with Montana.

BETTER PRICES

The Wyoming senator is seeking improved prices and incomes for farmers and ranchers. He is after more money for research on oil shale development.

He wants Wyoming to get a full share of Colorado River water. He is trying to expand tourism in the West. He is pressing for year-round travel in Yellowstone Park.

The friendly freshman senator is leaving no stones unturned in his quests for Wyoming—whether during duty hours or on the social circuit.

The former governor was asked to give his strongest impression after three months in Washington.

"I think it is the dedication and commitment of the members of the Senate to their jobs," he said without hesitation. He went on, "It's easy to criticize when you are far removed from the operation. But when you get here, I think you begin to see that the members of Congress are responding to their consciences and convictions or are reflecting honestly the overwhelming sentiment of their constituency."

SENATORS PRETTY DEDICATED

Hansen remarked, "These senators are pretty dedicated."

He admitted he did not always hold a generous view of U.S. Senators during his days as Wyoming's governor.

"The public is not aware of all the forces that compel people to do things, and it is easy for Wyoming to criticize other areas of the country," he said with remarkable candor.

Hansen's more tolerant view of goings-on in Washington has not prevented him from protesting on some major issues, however.

Hansen voted against changing Senate rules to make it easier, among other things, to end Senate debate and break filibusters. He feels that small states, like Wyoming, must preserve unlimited debate to safeguard their own precious right to be heard.

The Senate rules were not changed.

Hansen also voted against the consular treaty with Russia. He did so on the grounds that it aided the Communist cause.

American boys are, at present, he pointed out, locked in a life-and-death struggle with Communism in Vietnam.

FLOODED WITH MAIL

Like all senators, Hansen is flooded with mail. Currently Vietnam is a big issue. On the domestic front, the Dodd firearms control bill sparks the most letters. Hansen opposes tighter curbs on firearms, a position he shares with Montana Sens. Mike Mansfield and Lee Metcalf and Reps. James Battin and Arnold Olsen.

Hansen succeeded former Sen. Milward Simpson. He hired several members of Simpson's staff, including Doug Baldwin, Simpson's highly efficient press secretary. Every member of Hansen's staff is from Wyoming. Not all U.S. Senators follow this procedure in Washington when they recruit aides.

Hansen, an easy-going man who chooses his words carefully, apparently has made the adjustment to the Senate role. Obviously, he will add to the decorum and senatorial friendliness of the Upper Chamber of Congress.

He and Mrs. Hansen have visited the White House socially on invitation of President and Mrs. Johnson.

'HE'S GOT PROBLEMS'

"He's got problems," Hansen said of the President, whom he does not hesitate to criticize.

"I think he has tried too hard at times to get a consensus. He has sacrificed some leadership."

Hansen thinks that the Johnson stand today is long overdue and should have been adopted a year ago.

The Wyoming senator probably will become one of the more popular members of the U.S. Senate.

Unlike some of the newly-elected lawmakers, Hansen does not look down his nose at senatorial social functions. He realizes they are a good vehicle for getting to know his Democratic and Republican colleagues better.

"If you are going to be effective, you have to gain rapport with your colleagues," he said.

It looks like Senator Clifford Hansen is going to be effective—not only for Wyoming, but as a voice for the West.

AN URGENT APPEAL FROM THE CLERGY TO THE CONSCIENCE OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CONCERNING THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, more than any other war in the history of the United States, the unjust, illegal, immoral and undeclared war in which it is engaged in Vietnam is stirring the conscience of the people of the United States.

Several weeks ago, 32 distinguished clergymen of all faiths released an appeal which I consider to be a most persuasive document. Entitled "We Plead for the Vietnamese," this statement is based on a previous one published by clergymen a year ago and which now has been signed by more than 10,000 leaders of almost every world faith from more than 40 countries.

The statement, drafted by members of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, calls upon our Government to stop, immediately and unilaterally, the air attacks on both North and South Vietnam; to express a clear intention to withdraw all U.S. military forces from Vietnam, consistent with the 1954 Geneva agreements; and to state unequivocally U.S. readiness to negotiate an end to the war on the basis of the 1954 agreements, with the National Liberation Front as one of the principals in the negotiations.

Alfred Hassler, executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, on returning from a recent 2-week visit to Saigon, released a sensitive and penetrating report of his impressions of the city; the medical needs in Vietnam and possible channels of distribution; and discussions he had with top officials of the Unified Buddhist Church, members of the Catholic peace movement, and students and professors from several of the five universities in South Vietnam.

Painting a vivid picture of the disruptive American impact on Vietnamese life and culture in Saigon, Hassler is most illuminating when he recalls conversations with moderate, well-informed South Vietnamese whose single theme is that U.S. support of the unpopular oppressive Ky regime is strengthening communism throughout the country and forcing many of them into an uncomfortable alliance with the National Liberation Front.

Two examples of this disaffection with American involvement in Vietnam are in the form of letters: one released on March 20 signed by representative South Vietnamese university students and professors expressing their appreciation to American students who have protested our policies in Vietnam, and the other dated February 18 and signed by two influential Buddhist monks who write:

> The more the war goes on, the stronger communism becomes, the more Americans become colonialists, and our people are destroyed.

In addition to the unrest being experienced in the American religious community over the moral implications of U.S. involvement in Vietnam, many of our young men who are facing active military service are also questioning a war that is repugnant to them.

Since the present selective service law does not permit draftees to choose whether or not they will fight in Vietnam, I have introduced a bill, S. 1414, which would prohibit draftees from being sent to Southeast Asia without their consent.

There is a distinct difference between the men in the regular armed services and the draftees. When a man enlists in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, he does so voluntarily.

Whatever may be his views on our undeclared war in Southeast Asia, he has voluntarily committed himself to go there if and when the military authorities of the branch of the service which he has joined order him to do so. The draftee also agrees to obey orders after he is inducted, but his agreeing to do so is not on a voluntary basis. He has no choice. The crux of the reluctance of so many men to serve in Vietnam is their knowledge that they are being sent to fight in a war which the Congress did not declare.

There are at present some 250,000 trained troops stationed in Europe, other hundreds of thousands are stationed in Japan, Korea, in the Philippines, and in the 50 States. They form a part of the essential body of our Armed Forces that went into the military service voluntarily. They have been trained for active service. It is appropriate that such of these volunteer troops as are needed be sent to Vietnam and replaced, if necessary, by such draftees as prefer service other than in Southeast Asia.

It is my hope that my amendment will get full consideration and debate when the extension of the draft law proposal comes up in the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the clergymen's statement, the Hassler report, and the two letters from South

Vietnamese students and Buddhist monks be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An Appeal From Men of All Faiths:

"We Plead for the Vietnamese"

Just over a year ago, 10,000 members of the world religious community, many of us among the American segment, joined in signing a statement entitled, "They Are Our Brothers Whom We Kill."

Our primary concern was the Vietnamese war, a tragedy which has only worsened during the passage of months, claiming ever greater numbers of innocent lives, searing not only the flesh of the Vietnamese but making a wasteland of an ancient culture.

As men rooted in a religious ethos, we have been further burdened by a realization, so fundamental to our faiths, that despite all justifications for killing, those who die are our brothers. More indeed than our brothers—the victims are ourselves and our children. For as surely as other ways than war are not found for solving human problems, the future for ourselves and our posterity is destroyed.

We are not here concerned with questioning the sincerity of the adversaries in this war. Perhaps the only element which has united the parties to this dispute is the passionate certitude of absolute justification. An atmosphere of holy war prevails across each frontier.

As for ourselves, we have chosen to stand not with the partisans but with the victims: the villagers who can neither defend themselves nor even hide, from falling bombs, napalm and indiscriminate strafing, who live in a nation dominated by military power which may at any moment shatter—and has already shattered in so many instances—the lives of their children, their loved ones or themselves.

It is on behalf of those caught in the crossfire—and those yet to be—that we have again found it necessary to call for American military withdrawal from the war.

In the interests of brevity, we concentrate on two areas: the character of the various governments the United States has supported in Vietnam, and the conduct of the war itself.

The biblical admonition that "figs will not grow from thistles" has been tested in the fires of history frequently, yet perhaps at no time has an ill-advised beginning been followed with such relentless disregard for principle and consequence as in Vietnam.

Little more than a dozen years ago the U.S. was the principal military ally of France in its colonial war for retention of the Indochinese Peninsula, most especially Vietnam, in contrast with our policy proclaimed and pursued almost everywhere else in the world. for the liquidation of colonialism. Into that effort, to perpetuate French control, our nation poured billions of dollars.

Since the conclusion of that costly war over the conference tables at Geneva in 1954, our government has militarily allied itself with what was to be a "temporary zone," South Vietnam. As if the Vietnamese had no memory whatsoever, we have assured them we now stand for their independence and freedom.

If the regimes our government so actively supported in South Vietnam had in fact stood for the freedom and advancement of the people, no doubt our present statement would never have been written. It is unlikely the present war would ever have begun. Certainly the massive uprising which has so taxed our nation's human and material resources would never have assumed its present proportions.

Yet as all the world knows, few concepts have been so alien to the leaders of the various Saigon regimes as respect for the fundamental rights of man.

Guarantee of the basic social rights of man is binding upon governments, both in times of war and of peace. Among these rights must be included the right of citizens to express political opinions, the right of fair trial, the right of free assembly and association. Such rights are granted, not by society, but by God; no human authority can be permitted to abrogate them.

We recall the moving but unheeded encyclical letter of Pope John XXIII, *Pacem in Terris*, in which it is stated: "If any government does not acknowledge the rights of man or violates them, it not only fails in its duty, but its orders actually lack juridical force."

For thirteen years the succeeding governments of South Vietnam have flagrantly violated all such rights. The press has been controlled with an iron fist. Nonviolent efforts to express dissent or to suggest alternatives to current policies have been ruthlessly suppressed. Many of the leading figures of South Vietnam are in prison, hiding or in exile.

Typical of Saigon policy was the recent "election" so applauded by the United States administration, in which both Communists and neutralists were forbidden to run, in which the war and its end were not discussed, in which the populace was threatened with the withholding of rice rations for failure to vote.

Equally typical has been the failure of each Saigon administration to implement a significant land-reform campaign. It has been pointed out that for a small fraction of the total investment the United States has made in the Indochina and Vietnamese wars, every parcel of land could have been purchased and equitably distributed.

Our government's commitment to such regimes, justified only on the basis of anti-Communism, has rendered meaningless that basic conviction which gave birth to our nation: the primary function of government is to serve the legitimate needs and aspirations of the population. Those governments which fail to fulfill that responsibility cannot be considered worthy of continued survival or the sacrifice of human life in their defense.

Our dissent is not limited, however, by our antipathy to the various South Vietnamese governments which have inherited the mantle of American acceptability. They lack popular support and have been maintained in office only with massive injection of American arms and funds.

Even had these regimes been worthy of continuity and human sacrifice, the horrors their survival is said to require could not be permitted.

The number of civilian casualties to Vietcong is estimated to range from five to ten civilians for each enemy soldier. Whole villages are incinerated with impersonal military efficiency from the air and ground. The words of a wounded French missionary priest who witnessed the destruction of all the villages he served haunt us still:

"I have seen my faithful burned up with napalm . . . I have seen the bodies of women and children blown to bits. I have seen my villages razed. My God, it's not possible."

Observers have found the hospitals filled far beyond capacity with war-wounded mothers, children and the aged. Children burned head to foot with napalm have been treated only with vaseline. Newspapers have been found to serve as covers for injured infants.

The South Vietnamese Ministry of Health now reports 2,000 children are being placed in orphanages each month; already there are 80,000 whose families have "officially" perished.

As the peasants flee from the bombers on the one hand and Vietcong mobilizations on the other, the number of refugees approaches 1,500,000.

At the same time, the national health profile has steadily deteriorated. Dysentery, typhoid fever and tuberculosis have become endemic. More than 46 per cent of the Vietnamese die within the first 15 years of life.

According to *The London Times*, there were 2,002 cases of bubonic plague during the first seven months of 1966, spread by sick and starving rats in search of food at a time when 104,000 acres of producing land has been chemically sterilized and countless tons of rice made inedible.

During the course of such mounting horrors, various military leaders and scientists have used the war as a "laboratory" for the development of new and more effective weapons: more adhesive napalm, which clings like flaming glue to the flesh of its unfortunate victims, "razor" bombs, gases, bomb-clusters and defoliants.

In the North we can assume on the basis of recent reports that the situation is little better. Msgr. George Huessler, for example, a Roman Catholic Welfare representative in North Vietnam to prepare for humanitarian aid from West Germany, reports 70 health facilities have been all or partially destroyed by bombing raids.

In the course of continuing this nightmare, more than 8,000 Americans have given their lives. Many more have been gravely wounded.

How many of them could have described, however briefly, the regime for whose perpetuation they gave their final sacrifice?

How many have been spiritually wounded as accomplices, hardened, perhaps for the rest of their lives, to human suffering and immunized against the finer human qualities of sympathy and compassion?

In the year that has passed since we last spoke, the weight of evidence against this war has reached mountainous proportions.

We therefore call again upon our countrymen and government:

To stop the air attacks on both North and South Vietnam, at once, unilaterally, not simply as a political move in the direction of negotiations, but because those attacks are an affront to human decency and unworthy of a great people;

To express a clear intention to withdraw all U.S. military forces from Vietnam, consistent with the 1954 Geneva Agreements, to take effect immediately on conclusion of satisfactory arrangements to assure the Vietnamese people a free choice of government;

To state unequivocally U.S. readiness to negotiate an end to the war on the basis of the 1954 Agreements, with the National Liberation Front as one of the principals in the negotiations.

We appeal to all concerned parties to pledge themselves to more representative and responsible government in South Vietnam.

We ask our fellow Americans to begin the work of repentance and healing in Vietnam. We have paid for the maiming. We cannot excuse ourselves from the consequences.

We ask more fundamentally for a national examination of conscience. We Americans boast of a religious heritage; many speak with scorn of the "Godless." Yet no act of brutality initiated by American or allied forces, seems to be a violation of the ethical values Americans profess; at the same time, enemy atrocities of far lesser magnitude are decried with vigor.

Every life on this planet is in some sense subject to the decisions made by the world's wealthiest, most powerful people.

In fact, as never before in man's history, Americans are now confronted with the fundamental choice: life, or death.

It is late, but not too late, to choose life.

Colin W. Bell, Exec. Secy., Amer. Friends Serv. Comm.; Rev. Daniel Berrigan, S.J. Assoc. Editor, *Jesuit Missions;* Rev. Philip Berrigan, S.S.J., Curate, St. Peter Claver Church, Baltimore, Md.; Dr. Harold A. Bosley, Pastor, Christ Church (Methodist), NYC; Bishop Matthew W.

Clair, Jr., Retired Methodist Bishop, St. Louis, Mo.; Rt. Rev. William Crittenden, Episcopal Bishop of Erie, Pa.; Dr. Edwin T. Dahlberg, Past President, National Council of Churches; Rt. Rev. William Davidson, Episcopal Bishop of Western Kansas; Rev. Edward Duff, S. J., Assoc. Prof., Holy Cross College, Worcester, Mass.; Rabbi Maurice N. Eisendrath, Pres., Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Rt. Rev. Msgr. Paul H. Furfey, Co-Dir., Bureau of Social Research, Cath. Univ.; Rabbi Everett Gendler, Rabbi, The Jewish Center of Princeton, N.J.; Bishop A. Raymond Grant, Bishop—Methodist Church; Dr. Abraham J. Heschel, Prof., Jewish Theo. Seminary of America; Rabbi Isidor B. Hoffman, Religious Counselor, Columbia University; Rev. Robert W. Hovda, Editor, The Liturgical Conference.

Rt. Rev. W. A. Lawrence, Retired Episcopal Bishop of Western, Mass.; Rev. James M. Lawson, Jr., Pastor, Centenary Meth. Church, Memphis, Tenn.; Mr. John Leo, Assoc., Editor, *Commonweal;* Rev. Robert W. Moon, Minister, St. Mark's Meth. Church, Sacramento, Cal.; Rev. John L. McKenzie, S.J., Prof., Univ. of Notre Dame; Rev. Richard McSorley, S.J., Prof., Georgetown Univ., Washington, D. C.; Dr. John Oliver Nelson, Director, Kirkridge Retreat Center; Rev. Richard Neuhaus, Editor, *Una Sancta;* Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Reese, Director, Catholic Social Services; Rev. Peter Riga, Prof., St. Mary's College, St. Mary's, Cal.; Rev. W. Harold Row, Exec. Sec., Brethren Service Commission; Sister Mary Corita, I.H.M., Graphic artist; Rev. Annalee Stewart, Legislative & Branch Liaison, WILPF, Wash., D. C.; Dr. John M. Swomley, Jr., Prof., St. Paul School of Theology, Kansas City; Rabbi Jacob Weinstein, Rabbi, K.A.M. Temple; Mr. Herman Will, Jr., Assoc. Genl. Secy, Board of Christian Social; Concerns, Methodist Church.

Visit to Saigon

(By Alfred Hassler, executive secretary of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, the International Committee of Conscience on Vietnam)

My visit consisted of two week-long stays in Saigon, separated by four days in Hong Kong, an arrangement that made it unnecessary to apply for a visa. The first week coincided with the Vietnamese New Year (Tet) and the truce arranged for that period. During this time I stayed one night at the Hotel Caravelle and the rest of the week at the Hotel Majestic, both heavily patronized by Americans and widely reputed to be under the close surveillance of the CIA, including "bugged" rooms, etc. During the second week I had a room in a rooming house operated by a Buddhist family in another section of the city, somewhat less convenient but considerably more secure.

Because I came armed with warm letters of introduction from Thich Nhat Hanh, I was accepted fully into circles of people in Saigon who, by their own admission, have not felt able to talk frankly and honestly with any American—or indeed any Westerner—for the past two years. I cannot say of personal knowledge whether their suspicions about the near-total penetration by the CIA of all Western groups in Vietnam, official and unofficial, are warranted, but I must assume that on these matters they, and some of the representatives of such Western groups who tend to confirm their suspicions, are better informed than I.

This is one of the first impressions one gets in Saigon today: the aura of suspicion that permeates the society, and the almost total lack of communication between any of the Americans there and those segments of Vietnamese society that are seriously critical both of the war and of the present South Vietnamese government. Since this is a very large proportion of the population, the consequence is a steadily deepening chasm between the South Vietnamese and the Americans who are ostensibly there to assist them.

In Saigon proper the curfew runs from midnight to 4 a.m., but on the edges of the city the householders are required to stay indoors after dark. The authorities "cannot tell them from the Viet Cong" is the explanation, and of course it is true, since many of them are the Viet Cong or its sympathizers. The sudden terroristic attack must be prevented, since there is almost no hope of catching the perpetrator once it has occurred; no one will have seen him, or would be able to identify him if they had!

The result of all this is an atmosphere more reminiscent of a police state than a democracy, even a democracy at war. Whether or not the CIA is actually as ubiquitous as people believe it to be, the fact is that the Vietnamese see CIA agents everywhere, and all relationships are distorted and fouled by suspicion.

I spent all of my time in Saigon and Cholon, the Chinese section of the city. I had hoped to get out at least to some of the villages in which the School of Youth for Social Service volunteers work, but my hosts considered it to be too dangerous for me to do so and flatly refused to take me. I neither sought nor had interviews with any officials of either the South Vietnamese or the American governments, or with members of the press. I did visit some of the voluntary agencies whose headquarters are in Saigon, including the Vietnamese Christian Service operated jointly by the Mennonites, Church World Service and Lutheran World Service; the American Friends Service Committee, the International Committee of the Red Cross, etc. Most of my time, however, was spent with Vietnamese individuals and groups to whom Nhat Hanh's letters had given me access. These included some of the top officials of the Unified Buddhist Church, members of the Catholic peace movement; and students and professors from several of the five universities of South Vietnam.

The most important single observation to make, I think, was the extent to which I found Thich Nhat Hanh's analysis of the situation confirmed: namely, that there is the potential for a substantial middle grouping of well-informed and sophisticated people who are committed to peace but who also wish to have a stance from which to deal on even terms with the National Liberation Front and the North Vietnamese.

The second half of this observation, however, is more depressing: it is that this middle group is being badly eroded by a despair of moderating the American position and by a growing conviction that the United States does not in fact want either peace or negotiations. Buddhist leaders, students and intellectuals, and Catholics alike grow increasingly cynical about U.S. objectives, and the word "colonialist" is common in their discussions. And the attribution of colonialist, or neo-colonialist, goals to America simply serves to underline and confirm these claims of the National Liberation Front. This is the source of their great despair: that in the name of fighting communism, the United States is strengthening communism throughout the country.

One senses this also in the indications of real hostility toward Americans in the people of Saigon. This is difficult to generalize about, but it is impossible to evade. It is not as evident in the middle of the city, which has become something of an American ghetto, where a great many of the people work in service occupations and profit from the money that the Americans bring in. As one moves into other sections of the city, however, where most Americans do not venture, the hostility in the faces of ordinary people is frequently open and undisguised. In one section of the city not very far from the center, where I was wandering around through some of the back streets of the crowded slums of Saigon, I found myself followed by a crowd of children, some of whom began throwing stones and pieces of garbage at me. This was not the mischievousness that one finds in children anywhere, but an anger that was revealed in their expressions. Similarly, a group of passers-by and workers just outside the entrance to the School of Youth for Social Service who gathered to look at me when I left that place by car, were grim and unsmiling in a way that made entirely credible the reluctance of my hosts to have any Westerners visit them. They said that I was the first Westerner whom they had invited to come out to the School, with the exception of one American who is of Japanese descent and "looks Vietnamese." The ordinary people, they said, cannot distinguish between "good Americans" and "bad Americans," and the impression given is that many of them would paraphrase the old frontier assertion and say that "the only good American is a dead American."

At the same time it is difficult to escape the impression of the dependency that has developed in Saigon, and presumably in other cities of South Vietnam, on the United States. There are reportedly three million people in Saigon, a city intended for 500,000, and a great many of the surplus population are refugees who are dependent largely on government subsidies. In addition to these, there is a general smell of money in the air that was not there a year and a half ago. The streets are full of new Japanese and Italian motorcycles and scooters, and there are evidences in the dress and general appearance of people that many Saigonese are prospering in spite of the inflation that has become so severe. The trouble is that the prosperity is entirely parasitical: while I was there the Saigon Post carried an article about the economy of South Vietnam, pointing out that it is capable of growing enough food to feed a hundred million people and in fact must depend on the U.S. to bring in large quantities of the rice on which its own population of fourteen million now lives.

The city is dominated by the American military presence. Literally scores of buildings, including many hotels, have been taken over as military billets, each of them surrounded by heavy wire mesh going up to the third floor windows, along with sandbag or concrete guard posts and guards on duty with automatic rifles 24 hours a day. American and "joint" patrols cruise the streets constantly and in large numbers, and the main streets and truck routes are crowded by army trucks carrying supplies and men to the outlying bases, or returning for new loads. (This steady stream of trucks continued, incidentally, through the truce during TET, an interesting sidelight on the official American indignation at the fact that the North Vietnamese had used the truce period in order to supply their own troops and people.)

One gets the feeling of an occupying army rather than that of allies defending a helpless country, and this is a feeling borne out in casual conversations with GIs there who react in varying fashions of bewilderment, contempt or arrogance to the impression they get of being excluded from the society around them. The bars and bar girls are all that they have been reported to be, but they still constitute a minute fraction of the Saigon population. Most of the rest of the Saigonese seem in a curious way to be living a life totally apart from the American presence, and to be attempting to ignore that presence in every way that they possibly can.

The polarization grows, and the chances of a "third way" diminish steadily. The continued war becomes less and less bearable, and in the absence of any believable evidence that the United States really wants to end it, more and more Vietnamese go over to the Front. While I was in Saigon the two English language newspapers (there were three, but the third was closed for criticizing the government) were full of dispatches by American correspondents telling of the dreadful beating being taken by the Viet Cong. Yet when I asked the Vietnamese whether the VC was stronger or weaker than a year ago, they invariably replied that it was stronger. One of the most attractive young student leaders, under no illusion about the Communist leadership and tactics of the Front, shrugged when I asked him.

"Soon we shall all be with the Front," he said. "Where else can we go?"

Thich Tri Quang gave much the same warning. The famous monk, who has been called the most astute political mind in Vietnam, was the person Nhat Hank most wanted me to see. It was a hard assignment. My intermediary came back with a glum report; the Venerable sent greetings and wished for success in my work, but he had vowed not to talk to an American again while the war continued. Further efforts brought the same response; it was not until I slid a note under his door suggesting that I might sit outside and enter on a "greve de faim" that he let me in, his lively sense of humor perhaps touched by the thought that I should threaten to turn his own weapon against him.

Some of his friends in the West had suggested to him that he and others address a message to the American people explaining their point of view. He rejected the idea forcefully: it was inconceivable to him that the American people could be in any doubt the terrible things their country was doing to his—"you are doing far worse things than the French ever did"—and if they did not approve of these things, let them stop the war. Why should they need a message from him?

"You are a democracy in the United States," he said, "not like here. The people must approve of the colonial policies of their government, or they would have ended them."

He would not accept an account of the obsessive anti-communism in the United States, or the fear of China, as an explanation. How could the most powerful country on earth be so ruled by fear?

"Besides," he said, "surely you must know that you are driving us into the arms of communism! In 1945 there were two important Communists in South Vietnam; today there are thousands."

The feeling of being driven against their will into an alliance with the Communists is widespread. A monk widely known for his deep pacifist convictions said to me hopelessly, "We have no doubt any longer that your country is openly colonialist. There is nothing left for us Vietnamese but for all the people to unite in opposing you."

All the people will not unite, probably, as he acknowledged when I pressed him. The Buddhists themselves are split: the proud accomplishment of having produced a Unified Buddhist Church has been dissipated. Instead of one Vien Hoa Dao (Institute for the Execution of the Dharma), there are two, with competing claims to legitimacy. I asked whether the split reflected ideological differences, a more intense anti-communism on one side than the other.

"No," he said bitterly, "just money. Not anti-communism. Money. American dollars have proved able to buy almost anybody in our country, I am afraid."

No visitor in a short period can tell whether the bitterness is wholly warranted, so far as the Vietnamese people are concerned. Clearly many of them have been "bought," from the girls who wait for visitors in the bars along Tu Do Street to the politicans who make it possible for the Viet Cong to buy supplies right in Saigon. Yet I had a curious feeling that in spite of their dependency, even in Saigon the Vietnamese retain an independence and an aloofness from the occupation forces. There are far more pretty Vietnamese girls on the backs of the motorbikes driven by Vietnamese boys, or walking hand in hand with them down the streets, or trundling two or three pretty youngsters along, than there are in all the bars and brothels. My principal aid during my stay there was an attractive young Buddhist girl. As she drove me back to my hotel after a fairly trying day, I asked her if she would stay and have dinner with me. There was a pause and she looked embarrassed. Finally she said gently:

"You will have dinner at my house one night, instead. In Saigon only the bad girls are seen with foreigners."

This is another aspect of the tragedy: the bewildered faces of young Americans who are accustomed to being liked and who have been told they are in this far-off country to protect its people, and who must live behind barriers and guards in the midst of the deep hostility of those they are "protecting." Jeep patrols are everywhere, some manned by Americans, some by South Vietnamese, and some "joint", but all constantly on the alert. Yet while I was there the VC made a mortar attack on General Westmoreland's headquarters from the roof of a bakery in the center of the city, which they then proceeded to blow up before they made their escape. The key word, of course, is "escape": even in Saigon itself the people do not betray the VC.

MEDICAL AID

Part of the reason for my trip was to learn as much as I could of the medical needs in Vietnam and possible channels of distribution, in connection with the Fellowship's current campaign to raise funds for such purposes.

In the Saigon-controlled areas of South Vietnam, the situation is confusing and revolting. Very dependable authorities told me that, with a few exotic exceptions, there is three times as much medicine and medical equipment in South Vietnam as would be needed if every Vietnamese were under treatment. Yet doctors even in Saigon hospitals are so short of needed supplies that they must appeal to voluntary agencies in Europe to help them, and the situation is reportedly even worse in provincial hospitals.

Behind this deplorable situation appears to be a combination of inefficiency, corruption, and politics, plus the difficulty of meeting the medical needs of the sick and wounded in villages that can be visited safely only in daylight hours. Very large segments of the medical supplies brought to Saigon simply disappear from ships, docks and warehouses, stolen and delivered directly to the Viet Cong by its supporters or pilfered for later appearance in the black market in Saigon where the Viet Cong buy many of their supplies. (This whole situation lends an ironic aspect to the refusal by the State and Treasury Departments to give the Fellowship a license to send medical and humanitarian aid to the Liberation Red Cross. The official reasons given for the refusal are that we would not be able to supervise distribution of such aid or to guarantee that it would not be used for wounded combatants rather than the civilians for whom it is intended. The irony lies in the fact that the United States Government is unwillingly supplying to the Viet Cong far larger quantites than we could hope to raise, without, it need hardly be noted, any hope of supervision.)

There is nothing ironic, but only revolting, to the fact that the Ky government permits medicine to be used as a political tool. I was able to confirm to my own satisfaction, again from a neutral, highly qualified observer, the authenticity of reports that medicines and supplies are being withheld from hospitals in the Hue and Da Nang areas, where Buddhist strength is greatest, in reprisal for the uprisings last spring that almost unseated Mr. Ky. (In a conference with representatives of the State and Treasury Departments on March 16, I was rebuked for reporting this by the State Department man, who observed that this was a "very serious charge" and that it was wholly untrue. In view of this it was interesting to read in the March 25 issue of *Saturday Review* a report by David McLanahan, a staff intern at the Da Nang Civilian Surgical Hospital, who wrote that, "The U.S. and Saigon government policies are to isolate the city of Hue and everything in it as punishment and a lesson for the future. The United States does not support the medical school or hospital; Saigon harasses them . . . Saigon taxed a load of microscopes donated by West Germany (to the Hue medical school)." And a little later, "The Vietnamese chief of the Medical Hospital in Da Nang had difficulty getting supplies from Saigon because he was thought to be too sympathetic to the Buddhists."

Another demonstration of this attitude was the response of Saigon to the proposal of an International Red Cross representative that his organization be allowed to bring in white-painted helicopters to deliver medical aid to the Montagnard villagers. General Ky's government not only turned down the proposal but expelled the man who made it, requiring him to leave the country on the next plane.

ADDENDA I—LETTER FROM VIETNAMESE STUDENTS

The following letter was addressed by representative students and professors from the five South Vietnamese universities to American students who have protested American policies in Vietnam. Signed by 70 of the best-known leaders in these universities, it was released to, and ignored by, the American press on March 20.

"DEAR FELLOW STUDENTS: We are students and professors from all the universities of South Vietnam (Saigon, Hue, Dalat, Can tho and Van Hanh), who write to thank you for you action in trying to stop this terrible war in our country. We cannot act officially, as you did, because the universities here are not permitted by the Government to express themselves freely. We have made petitions and appeals, but we cannot let our names be made public, because we would be arrested and imprisoned. That is the kind of society we live in here today.

"Nevertheless, we write to thank you for your actions and to plead with you to continue. We ask you to consider these facts:

"1. In South Vietnam cities the American power has become so great in support of the Ky government that no one can speak against the war without risking his life or his liberty.

"2. If it were not so, millions would speak out. The people of South Vietnam desperately want the war to end, but they are losing hope. They are not Communists, but if the war does not soon end, they will join the National Liberation Front because they see no other way out.

"3. Americans should not believe that they are protecting the South Vietnamese against communism. Most of us believe that the United States only wants to control our country in order to prepare for war with China.

"4. The present government of South Vietnam is not our government and is not representing our people. It was imposed on us by the United States, and is controlled by military men who fought for the French against the Vietnamese before 1954. If we were free to vote freely, that government would not last one day. We want a government of our own, not controlled by either side, so that we may be able to settle the problems of Vietnam by ourselves on the basis of national brotherhood: to negotiate peace with the National Liberation Front and North Vietnam, and negotiate the withdrawal of American troops with the United States.

"5. Do not believe that the danger of a Communist takeover justifies continuation of the war. We believe we are strong enough to form an independent government. The decision, however, should be ours, not yours, when it is our lives and our country that are being destroyed.

"6. We endorse the proposals outlined in the book written by our friend Thich Nhat Hanh, *Vietnam: Lotus In A Sea Of Fire*, and ask your help in realizing them.

"Finally, we send you the best wishes of ours and also of the Vietnamese people.

"Done in Saigon, the 20th of February, 1967

"Signed by:
"Cao Ngoc phuong
"giang vien,
"Dai Hoc Khoa Hor,
"Vien Dai Hoc Saigon,
"Vien Dai Hoc Hue,
"Pham hiu Tai
"sinh vien chinh tri,
"Vien Dai Hoc Dalat, for seventy students and professors."

ADDENDA II—A STATEMENT BY THE VENERABLE THICH TRI QUANG AND THE VENERABLE THICH QUANG DO

It is because of the religious conscience in us that we cannot accept the war which is going on in our country, that we cannot accept the presence of foreign troops and of troops whose actions are influenced by foreign governments, for this massacre of our people and of each other.

The more the war goes on, the stronger communism becomes, the more Americans become colonialists, and our people are destroyed.

We pray that the religious conscience will guide humanity to stop a war that has reached its utmost in atrocity.

Done in Saigon, February 16, 1967.

THICH TRI QUANG,
THICH QUANG DO.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a report on S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill, the Department of Labor strongly supported the bill and recommended its passage by the Congress. The Department indicated such legislation would be in accord with the President's program.

The Department believes this legislation would benefit the users of credit, many of whom are wage earners, and would encourage them to use credit more wisely and more efficiently. The Department also believes the bill would eliminate unfair competition by certain lenders and, therefore, protect the vast majority of ethical businessmen.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., March 8, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for our comments on S. 5, a bill "To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credits."

The proposed legislation would benefit the users of credit, most of whom are wage earners, in a number of important ways. Testimony regarding the loss of wages through garnishment and the numbers of personal bankruptcies resulting from over-extended buying in which excess credit charges were involved presents ample evidence of the part which such charges play in creating serious financial problems for many American families. This Department is greatly concerned with this whole problem of garnishment.

It would undoubtedly be helpful to the consumer buying on credit to be shown a purchase agreement clearly itemized as called for in the bill. This would call the attention of consumers to the significance of credit in their total expenses, thereby encouraging them to seek advantageous interest rates and stimulating competition among lenders and those extending retail credit.

Sellers would find it much more difficult to hide excessive charges which buyers now pay. This bill would assist in eliminating unfair competition by certain lenders based upon the inability of borrowers presently to determine what the real costs are.

The Department of Labor has long supported the principle of disclosure of financing charges, terms and conditions of credit purchases, and the annual percentage rate of the finance charge, as proposed in this legislation.

The Department strongly supports this bill, which the President has recommended to the Congress in his Consumer Message.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

THE GENERAL COUNSEL
OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, D.C., Apr. 12, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Reference is made to your request for the views of this Department on S. 5, "To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

The proposed legislation would require any person engaged in the business of extending credit to furnish potential borrowers or credit plan purchasers with a clear written statement of essential credit information, including not only the total amount of the finance charge, but also the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate. A creditor agreeing to extend credit pursuant to a revolving or open-end credit plan would be required to furnish a statement setting forth the finance charge in terms of the percentage rate per period, as well as the periodic rate of finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate.

In his message to the Congress on February 16, 1967, on consumer protection, the President said:

"I recommend the Truth-in-Lending Act of 1967 to assure that, when the consumer shops for credit, he will be presented with a price tag that will tell him the percentage rate per year that is being charged on his borrowing.

"We can make an important advance by incorporating the wisdom of past discussions on how the costs of credit can best be expressed. As a result of these discussions, I recommend legislation to assure:

"Full and accurate information to the borrower, and

"Simple and routine calculations for the lender.

"This legislation is urgently needed to:

"Close an important gap in consumer information.

"Protect legitimate lenders against competitors who misrepresent credit costs.

"The Truth-in-Lending Act of 1967 would strengthen the efficiency of our credit markets, without restraining them. It would allow the cost of credit to be freely determined by informed borrowers and responsible lenders. It would permit the volume of consumer credit to be fully responsive to the growing needs, ability to pay and aspirations of the American consumer."

The Treasury Department fully endorses the principle that the total cost of obtaining consumer credit should be clearly disclosed to a potential user, both in terms of dollars and annual rate, to enable the consumer to make a meaningful comparison of the cost of credit available from various sources. We are confident that such disclosure will substantially promote the selective use of credit by which the consumer can obtain the most benefit from his financial resources.

Testimony presented to your Committee over the past several years on various truth in lending bills amply supports the conclusion that most consumers enter the credit market without the basic information necessary to compare credit costs intelligently. Although some States require disclosure of consumer credit information, the fundamental need for an adequate basis for comparison has not generally been met. Federal action in this area is, therefore, imperative.

The case for truth in lending, we believe, is clear and unassailable on the basis of four points, the significance of which with respect to both the well-being of the general consuming public and health of our economy is far-reaching:

First, credit plays a role of vast and growing importance in our national economy. In addition to the rising volume of mortgage credit, consumer credit is used to finance a large proportion of automobile purchases and consumer purchases of other durable goods. Credit for these purposes is available from several sources. It is a matter of substantial public interest that consumers be furnished the information necessary to pick the credit source most suited to individual needs. The informed use of credit will also help to assure a better allocation of resources and will, in this way, contribute to both economic stability and growth.

Second, the variety of ways in which finance charges are stated, even where no deception is intended, makes it extremely difficult for the consumer to be certain what he is paying for credit. One lender, for example, may state a percentage rate of finance charge in terms of the annual or monthly rate on a declining balance. Another may state the rate of finance charge as a percentage of the original balance, even though the loan or installment purchase account is repaid in regular installments. Still other lenders quote no rate of charge, but only the amount of the downpayment and the installment payments. Often, the number of installments is not stated. Moreover, the borrower may be charged various fees which are not itemized and which are not included in the stated rate of finance charge. There may be other undisclosed charges, such as the required purchase of credit insurance, which serves primarily to protect the lender, thus adding to the cost of credit.

Third, the purpose of the bill is simply to assure the advance disclosure of the dollar amounts and percentage rates which the potential credit user would have to pay for the use of credit. Although the consumer credit industry provides a variety of credit plans which are designed to meet the different needs of different consumers, it is difficult to see how the average consumer can make a cogent comparison of credit costs and thereby make an intelligent choice as to alternative sources of credit. Without a meaningful basis for comparison, we must question whether there is effective competition in the credit field.

It should be emphasized that the proposed legislation is intended only as a supplement to State law. It would neither limit, nor otherwise control the rate or amount of finance charges. The contractual or other rights and obligations of both lenders and borrowers, vendors and purchasers, would not be impaired by the enactment of the truth in lending bill. These are matters left to regulation by the States and to the interplay of competitive forces in the market place.

Fourth, it is the traditional and proper responsibility of the Federal Government to take steps to assure the effective operation of our competitive market system. Examples of legislation to preserve free and fair competition are plentiful, beginning with legislation to protect consumers from mail fraud, from the excesses of monopoly, from false advertising, and from confusing methods of labeling and packaging. The truth in lending proposal, therefore, follows a long line of essential and effective measures to assist the American consumer in the wise use of his economic resources.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this report to your Committee and that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,

Fred B. Smith,
General Counsel.

THE ITALIAN FESTIVAL IN RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, to reflect the entire cultural tradition of Italy, the Italian way of life, past and present, the citizens of Rhode Island are currently sponsoring an Italian Festival. Under the chairmanship of Michael A. Gammino, Jr., president of the Columbus National Bank, the festival is attempting to bring to my State, and indeed to the entire southeastern New England area, the arts, culture, crafts, and industry of Italy on a scope never before attempted in the United States. Cooperating in this vast project are many of Rhode Island's most prominent civic and community leaders, together with government officials of Italy and the United States.

The official opening of the Italian Festival will take place the weekend of May 6 and 7, with Ambassador Sergio Fenoaltea of Italy in attendance. Opening events will include a parade in Providence, convocations at Our Lady of Providence Seminary and at Bryant College a performance of the Italian play "The Rope," a reception given by the Governor at the Statehouse, a ball sponsored by the International Institute, Mass celebrated by Cardinal Colombo, of Milan, a Premiere at Brown University, and a daylong Italian Food Festival. Special events already held or scheduled for the coming weeks run the gamut from exhibitions of Italian art to wine tasting meetings, from Italian-American horse races to showing of Italian fashions, and from concerts to clambakes.

Continuing events include displays of Italian arts and crafts, of Italian violins, of models of daVinci inventions, Italian books, maps, and manuscripts, of armor, automobiles, and art. There are also wine tasting and cheese tasting events conducted by the Italian trade commission, in-store promotions of Italian foods, luncheons and dinners supervised by Chef Fini, of Modena, Italy, and boccie playoffs in various cities and towns. A highlight of the festival will be the symbolic union as "sister cities," of Newport, on Aquidneck Island, R.I., to Ischia, in the Bay of Naples, Italy. Both islands are similar in size and population. It is hoped that student exchange programs and other cultural exchanges will grow out of this link.

The thousands of Rhode Islanders of Italian descent are proud of their heritage. Indeed all Rhode Island is proud of the contributions these citizens have made and are making to our State as well as our Nation. While this festival serves to point up those differences which make the Italian heritage so unique, at the same time it underscores the unity that makes our American tradition so rich. I salute all those many men and women who have worked so diligently and cooperatively to make Rhode Island's Italian Festival a success.

First, the officers and directors of the parent organization of Holiday Festival, Inc., a nonprofit citizens group dedicated to the enrichment of the arts in Rhode Island are Mrs. John C. A. Watkins, president; vice presidents Richard C. Dreyfuss, Dr. Louis Pichierri, and Carl Henry; treasurer, Ormston C. Aldred; secretary, Leighton D. Authier, and, as directors, are Renzo Raiss, Russell Fox, Robert Ruggles, Henry C. Hart, Jr., Thomas Policastro, William Edwards, T. Dawson Brown, George Wein, the Very Reverend William P. Hass, O.P., and Pierre Kleykamp.

Honorary chairman of the Italian Festival is my senior colleague, Senator John O. Pastore. In the sports division Bernard V. Buonanno, Jr., is chairman, Bradford R. Boss and Anthony Petronella, group chairmen; Joseph F. Prete, bocce chairman; Cliff Stevenson, soccer chairman; Thomas Hazlehurst, boat race chairman; Arthur Palmer, Jr., tennis chairman; Joseph Mullaney, basketball chairman; and Edward Perry, gold chairman.

Serving under Robert C. Laurelli, chairman of the community division, are Mrs. May Lauder, food exhibit chairman; John C. Rao, Jr., parade cochairman with Maj. Gen. Leonard Holland, chairman of the professional division; Louis DeAngelis and A. A. Savastan, doctors; Lester J. Millman, architects; Miss Corinne Grande, lawyers; Dr. Vincent Oddo, Jr., dentists; Msgr. Anthony DeAngelis, churches; Christopher DelSesto, Jr., Cranston; Leo P. Thompson, Community-Cranston; Louis Mascia, Providence; James P. Duffy, palio; and Richard C. Dreyfuss, gondola.

Chairman of sports, industrial, and community publicity is Alan Andrews, and heading visual performing and social publicity is Joseph Fogarty. Under the Very Reverend William P. Haas, chairman of the education division, are Howard Curtis, Mrs. Gertrude Meth Hochberg, Daniel Robbins, and F. Kurt Cylke. Serving with Aaron Roitman, chairman of the retail stores division, are Ormston C. Aldred, Leonard E. Johnson, Jeremia L. H. Cannon, and Mrs. Pat Long. Jake Kaplan is chairman of the auto show; George Sage, chairman of transportation; Maurice Bissonnette, chairman of hospitality and accommodations; Henry C. Hart, Jr., chairman of the social division; Ugo Gasbarro, head of wine tasting; Edward McCaughey, chairman of florists; Robert Wood, chairman of bankers; and Dr. John X. R. Basile, Connecticut chairman.

Those aiding Mrs. John C. A. Watkins, chairman of the performing arts division, are Leighton D. Authier, Carl Henry, Louis Pichierri, Myles Marsden, Muriel Stevens, C. Alexander Peloquin, Julian Rifkin, Mrs. Lydia Pettine, Mrs. Charles J. Jones, and David Grey.

In addition to the Italian Ambassador, other Italian officials participating include Dr. Ugo Morabito, Commercial Minister of the Italian Embassy, Dr. Giorgio Carega, Consul General of Italy, in Boston, Dr. Liugi Mian, Italian Trade Commissioner, Professor Giuseppe Cardillo, of the Instituto Italiano di Cultura, Dr. Renato Guierrieri, Travel Commissioner, and Dr. Guido Leopizz, Italian Vice Consul of Rhode Island.

Every one of these officials is owed a considerable debt of gratitude for the effort and time each is contributing to this truly excellent cause, the Rhode Island Italian Festival.

THE CREDIT CARD REVOLUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, we are rapidly heading toward the credit card society. Many people believe that within a few years our entire banking system will be conducted on the basis of credit cards rather than checks. Even more important, many forms of consumer credit are converting to revolving credit plans. Many department stores have their own revolving credit plans whereby the consumer is extended a specified line of credit which can be obtained through the use of a credit card. In addition, the banks have moved into the revolving credit business. Many banks are now providing credit cards, sometimes on an unsolicited basis, to consumers. These credit cards are commonly used to finance small retail purchases at a monthly service charge of 1½ percent.

One of the most controversial issues in the truth-in-lending bill is the section dealing with revolving credit. Many of the retail merchants have urged that the requirement to disclose the annual rate on revolving credit be eliminated. Although this form of credit is only about 3½ percent of the total consumer credit, it is a rapidly growing form of credit. There is no doubt that credit cards and revolving credit would grow even faster should this segment of the credit industry be exempted from truth in lending. I, therefore, feel it is vitally important to retain the revolving credit provisions of S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the article dealing with bank credit cards and check credit plans published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOURTH DISTRICT DEVELOPMENTS IN BANK CREDIT CARD AND CHECK-CREDIT PLANS

The rapid spread of credit card and check-credit plans among banks in all parts of the country represents a major innovation in consumer credit—one with implications not only for banking, consumer spending, and savings, but also for the basic payments mechanism of the United States economy. It has been suggested, for example, that credit cards may be the first step toward a checkless society. The Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland recently conducted a survey to determine the extent and nature of credit card and check-credit plans of member banks in the Fourth District. This article is a summary and brief analysis of the District survey.

BACKGROUND

The District survey comes at a time when commercial banks in general are expressing great interest in credit cards and check credit. There have been a number of articles and inquiries in banking magazines, and the American Bankers Association is conducting a study of credit cards. The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System is also conducting a comprehensive study of bank credit card and check-credit plans, as announced on March 1.

It is estimated that about 1,000 banks have credit cards or check-credit plans today, a tenfold increase in one year. Most of the growth, however, has been confined to credit cards, rather than check-credit plans, and to banks in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, and Wisconsin. The spread of multiple and interchangeable cards in those states has been an important factor in increasing participation in the plans.

The history of bank credit cards and check-credit plans is not long, dating only to the early 1950's. (Credit cards issued by retail organizations and service companies existed many years prior to that time.) The first bank credit card was introduced by the Franklin National Bank in New York in 1951–52. In 1952–53 banks in Michigan, California, and Florida followed suit, but the number of additional banks was small. By the end of 1954, only about 50 banks had plans in operation. In fact, many of the banks that were early entrants into the field discontinued their programs within a few years, perhaps due to overly optimistic projections of volume and profitability that did not materialize.

TABLE I.—*Number of credit card and check-credit plans, 4th district member banks, March 1967*

Type of plan	1956-57	1958-59	1960-61	1962-63	1964-65	1966-67	Total
Check credit	1	11	1	1	2	7	23
Special checking account only	1	8	1	1	2	2	15
Overdraft on regular checking account	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Combination of both accounts	0	2	0	0	0	1	3
Franchised plans	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Credit cards	0	1	0	1	2	2	6
Franchised plans	0	0	0	0	0	2	2

NOTE.—Items may not add to totals because not all banks answered all survey questions.

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Credit cards preceded check-credit plans by a few years, but the two programs seem to have been developed independently in the early 1950's. The first major growth period for both types of credit plans began in 1958, when Chase Manhattan Bank—the nation's second largest commercial bank—introduced its own credit card. In 1959 the Bank of America (the largest bank) began its credit card program in California. These moves stimulated an increase in the number of banks offering credit cards *and* check-credit plans. Both the Bank of America and Chase Manhattan had difficulties with their programs, and in January 1962 Chase sold its credit card business. Evidently, this experience discouraged many smaller banks, and the "troubles at Chase" are still cited by banks that do not offer credit card services. The Bank of America was able to overcome the problems inherent in the use of cards and this seems to have attracted renewed bank interest.

FOURTH DISTRICT EXPERIENCE

The responses to this Bank's survey indicate that in the Fourth District check-credit plans are more numerous and have a longer history than credit card plans. Thus, developments in the District have been somewhat in contrast to the pattern in the nation as a whole. The first check-credit plan in the District was started in 1956, by a bank in Lexington, and the second in 1958, by a bank in Pittsburgh. (See Table I.) In 1959 ten banks in the District introduced check-credit plans. It is significant that four of the ten are located in the Pittsburgh area, and four other banking offices are situated in or near Youngstown, Ohio, a city close to the Pennsylvania border.

The District's first credit card program began in 1959, organized by the bank with the first check-credit plan. The early wave of bank credit cards that occurred in the middle, eastern, and southern parts of the United States in the 1950's seems to have passed by the Fourth District; legal constraints discussed later in the article may have been a factor.

The second period of growth in credit plans in the District began in 1965 when the two largest banks in Pittsburgh introduced their own credit cards, accompanied by wide publicity. (Both banks had offered check-credit plans for several years.) These moves may have led to increased interest on the part of other banks, for in the next 15 months, nine more banks entered the credit plan field. In 1966–67, an additional motivating factor was involved—a number of credit card and check plans had become national in coverage through systems of local franchises. These franchises included American Express cards, Bank Americard, Carte Blanche, and Bancardchek, among others. As shown in Table I, five District banks received franchises in 1966–67, accounting for over half of the total plans put into operation in the District in that period. Moreover, this Bank's survey revealed that at least one additional bank has signed a franchise contract to take effect later this year, and several other banks have been approached by franchise organizations.

The development of franchises and card systems that are nationally interchangeable may lead to a sharp increase in bank participation in the near term. The survey disclosed that almost 50 banks in the Fourth District are considering offering credit cards or check-credit plans within a year or two, with some conducting market research on the services.

TYPES OF CREDIT CARD PLANS[1]

Most consumers are accustomed to various credit cards, particularly those for large department stores and gasoline companies. Bank credit cards are similar, as they provide a means of charging retail purchases for later payment. A bank card has some special advantages for the consumer, retailer, and bank. The consumer has less need to use cash, since bank cards usually are acceptable in a large number and different types of stores, with most of the credit purchases centralized in one billing. The retailer no longer has to finance his accounts receivable, because he receives immediate credit for all credit card charge slips turned into the bank. The bank has the opportunity of increasing its customers.

In general, credit cards issued by banks in the Fourth District can be used to charge a wide variety of goods and services at stores that have adopted the banks' programs. The only frequent exception is the purchase of food for home consumption. The handbook of member merchants honoring the credit card of the largest Fourth District bank reveals that one could charge such diverse items as foot care, airline tickets, wallpaper, drafting lessons, and wigs. However, most credit card charges involve purchases of clothing and household products. Bank credit cards also can be used to obtain cash advances on the line of credit that each card represents; advances (or "instant small loans") can be obtained at any banking office that honors the card held by the would-be borrower.

None of the six District banks with credit card programs limits issuance to depositors. Applications for cards are judged individually, just as if the consumer were applying for an instalment loan. In an attempt to limit credit risks, one bank issues cards only to individuals with annual incomes of $10,000 or more. (This type of screening within the District contrasts to the "shotgun" issuance of some bank cards, as described recently in the financial press.) There is a ceiling on the total amount of indebtedness permitted on each card; the ceiling varies widely among the District banks, ranging from $100 to $5,000. In addition, three of the credit card plans have a ceiling or "floor limit" on the dollar value of each separate purchase. All six banks have similar but larger ceilings on individual cash advances, but in practice the average dollar amount of advances has been substantially below the ceilings.

Four of the District banks schedule their cards to expire automatically within a year of issuance. This gives the banks an opportunity to discontinue credit privileges that have been abused, as well as to eliminate inactive cards. Survey responses suggest that no more than half of the cards issued are active; the average proportion is about one third.

Cardholders usually are given a "grace" period for repayments before a service charge is applied to unpaid balances. The "grace" period frequently mentioned in the survey was 25 days. After the "grace" period expires, a charge of 1-1½ percent a month is applied to any unpaid balances. All banks set a minimum repayment that is acceptable, varying from a flat $10 to 5-10 percent of the outstanding balance. Of the three District banks that reported the information, average length of maturity of outstanding credits ranged from 6½ to 12 months.

Four of the six banks charge a retailer entrance fee for participation in the credit card plan, and some levy a service charge on sales slip volume. The majority of the banks do not offer volume discounts to their retailers. Almost every credit card plan makes use of special equipment to imprint the card information onto sales slips, and four District banks rent imprinting machines to retail outlets honoring their cards. In the early days of bank credit cards, merchant fees and payments were expected to be the major source of income to banks issuing cards. This is not necessarily the case now and interest charges on cardholders' credit balances are providing a larger share of the income.

---

[1] For a description of the types of plans in operation in New England, see "Bank Credit Card and Related Plans" by Robert W. Pullen in *New England Business Review*, Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, December 1966.

The distribution of income by source is related directly to the size of each bank's card program. Credit card plans in the Fourth District show a wide size range, from about a quarter of a million cardholders to less than one hundred. These numbers, in turn, reflect both the size of the banks involved, their market area, and the length of time that the programs have been in operation. The bank with less than one hundred cards only began issuing them early this year.

There is a distinct impression within the banking community that credit cards are not feasible for small banks in small communities; that is, that volume is essential for successful operation. The survey by the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland does not completely confirm this impression. A Fourth District bank with less than $5 million in demand deposits and $10 million in total assets has had its own credit card plan for almost five years. (The other banks issuing cards range in size, as measured by demand deposits, from about $50 million to over $1½ billion.) It is true that a credit card plan could prove to be very expensive for smaller banks, which may explain why several banks reported in the survey that they were still searching for a plan appropriate for their size.

With so few District banks operating credit card programs, it is interesting to note why some banks are not issuing cards. One reason mentioned frequently was that the respondent bank and its market area were too small. Quite often, this meant that staff and equipment limitations prevented an expansion in bank services. Another reason cited by a large bank was that it is in the process of changing its computer system and cannot undertake additional accounting burdens until after the transition period. Several banks felt that there was no demand or "need" for credit cards in their communities. The lack of demand could also mean that there was no competitive pressure to offer a credit card program.

Some concern was expressed by respondents about the costs and profitability of bank credit cards, partly in relation to legal limits on interest charges. Generally, the initial costs of adopting a credit card plan are large if advance promotion has to be spread over a wide geographical area and if special equipment must be purchased, either for the participating merchants or for the bank itself. As a result, the period prior to "breaking even" may be long. These generalizations should not be accepted as established fact until further study of cost factors is undertaken, as the Federal Reserve System hopes to do. In other parts of the country, credit card programs have had problems in enrolling retailers and arranging fees, but these difficulties were mentioned by only a few Fourth District banks.

A small but articulate group of banks has not issued credit cards simply because they do not approve of them. They label this type of consumer credit as difficult to control, too risky, and not in the best interests of commercial banking or consumers' financial well-being. It should be remembered that many smaller banks are more in the nature of savings banks than multi-purpose financial institutions. These smaller banks are concerned about their function as advisers to their customers about sound financial practices. As one banker responded in the survey, "It is our opinion that people look to banks for leadership in financial matters." The use of credit cards will have to become much more widespread and the advantages thoroughly documented before all banks come to accept this relatively new development.

Finally, in the State of Ohio, there appear to be legal obstacles to credit card programs for state-chartered banks. Bank usury laws and a question as to whether the offering of credit cards constitutes ordinary lending activity have caused the Ohio Division of Banks to consider such services illegal. Ohio, as well as a few other states, requires all banks to set up hypothecated time deposits for each consumer instalment loan. Repayments on each loan must be treated as credits to the corresponding time deposit. When the amount of the deposit equals the amount of the loan, the loan is repaid, and both the loan and the deposit are erased through accounting entries. Hypothecated deposits were established by an Ohio banking statute so that banks would not break the state's usury laws in making instalment loans. Under the Ohio procedure, interest charges always are based on the principal amount of the loan; otherwise, loan repayments would become equal to a growing proportion of the principal, and the effective rate of interest might well exceed the state's maximum of eight percent.

The Ohio legislation is not binding on national banks operating in the state. The Comptroller of the Currency has ruled that national banks may charge interest rates as high as any of their competitors, including small loan companies, and further, that hypothecation is not necessary. The Comptroller's office has taken the position that credit extended through bank card (and check credit) plans constitutes ordinary bank lending activity.[3]

A ruling on these matters by the Attorney General of Ohio is pending, and the proposed new banking code for Ohio (now being considered by the state legislature) would legalize both credit cards and check-credit plans.

As a result, the banks in Ohio that offer credit cards (and check-credit plans) are all national banks. This is not the case in the Fourth District areas of Pennsylvania and West Virginia. The legal constraints in Ohio may have played an important part in holding down the growth of all types of credit plans relative to other sections of the country.

TYPES OF CHECK-CREDIT PLANS

As mentioned earlier, check-credit plans were introduced in the Fourth District before bank credit cards and have been adopted by a much larger number of banks. Several explanations for the growth of check-credit plans are possible. Check-credit plans apparently are less costly to operate than credit card programs. The risk factor can be lowered because of the opportunity to be more selective in extending credit facilities. Less bookkeeping may be involved, resulting in less dependence on sophisticated data processing equipment. Perhaps, most importantly, check-credit plans often can be tailored to certain types of customers, both within the bank and its community.

As a result of this last characteristic, the 23 check-credit plans in operation in the District in March 1967 represented a number of variations of instalment credit connected to a bank checking account and (as opposed to credit cards) not affiliated with retail outlets. The most common variation in the District (see Table I) establishes a revolving line of credit for a customer after a suitable credit investigation. The line of credit is extended through a special checking account, set up separately from the customer's regular account and drawn on only by special checks. By writing one of the special checks, the customer activates his line of credit. Interest is charged on the unpaid balance of this loan, and according to some plans, the borrower/depositor also must pay either the bank's usual deposit service charge or a flat fee per check. Interest charges on District plans generally range from ¼–2 percent per month on the unpaid balance. Infrequently, an annual "membership" fee is required; more often, the cost of a life insurance policy is passed on to the account holder.

A second variation, which is more prevalent at banks outside the Fourth District, represents a line of credit in the form of an overdraft allowed on a regular checking account. No special account is established, although the customer may be issued special checks used only for overdrafts. (This means that the depositor must know the balance in his account in order to determine when to use the special checks in contrast to his regular checks.) Very often, the special checks are pre-denominated and are guaranteed by the issuing bank. This has led them to be called "travelers' checks" and this version of check credit, a "travelers' check plan." Only a few District banks offer plans using the "travelers' checks," and most plans represent a franchise of the national Bancardchek system. In the Bancardchek system, accounts can be overdrawn by writing either regular checks or the special "travelers' checks." In other overdraft plans, there are no special checks, and in some plans, special but nonguaranteed checks are issued to depositors. Obviously, there is a great deal of flexibility in designing check-credit plans. A bank may even limit the availability of these plans to certain customers or to specific branch offices, as is the case with one District bank.

The third variation reported by banks in the Fourth District is characterized by a revolving line of credit attached to a regular checking account. Essentially, in this plan a special loan account becomes associated with a checking account, with the line of credit activated by writing special checks.

The size of check-credit programs, measured by the number of accounts, is much smaller than the size of credit card plans, according to the District survey. Check-credit accounts range from less than 20 at banks just starting this service to over 20,000. The average number of accounts for all 23 banks is about 1,800; and when the two largest plans are excluded, the average drops to approximately 500. Credit ceilings are higher on check-credit accounts, ranging in the Fourth District from $500 (on the franchised plans) to about $10,000. In several cases, the ceiling is determined by the account owner's creditworthiness or by his monthly income.

Banks responding to the survey also were asked to explain why they have not introduced check-credit plans. Many of the comments were identical to those listed for credit cards, with some differences in emphasis. There seemed to be relatively less concern about start-up costs and the length of time prior to the break-even periods, and more concern about the risk of loss and the banks' comparative lack of control over the credit extended. Apparently, many bankers were not willing to give their borrowers the amount of credit discretion implicit in both credit card and check plans. The most frequently mentioned reason for not offering check credit was that there was no demand for this service by the bank's customers or within its market area.

The survey disclosed that legal constraints against bank credit card plans in Ohio also exist for check credit. As one large Ohio bank responded in the survey, the "hypothecation requirement for state-chartered banks . . . virtually rules out the offering of this service."

EVALUATION OF PLANS

The Fourth District member banks with credit card or check-credit plans were asked to evaluate the results of their plans. While the responses were by nature subjective and qualitative, they still provide some interesting insights. Four of the six banks with credit card programs stated that they were quite satisfied with the operation; one bank felt it did not have enough experience as yet to pass judgment, and the sixth did not respond. Some of the comments indicated that the programs were profitable and had been successful in generating new deposit accounts for both merchants and individuals; these contacts in turn enabled the banks to introduce other bank services to the new customers.

---

[3] At least one state has challenged the Comptroller's position. See "Oregon Attorney General Says Interest on 2 Bank Credit Cards Is Usurious," *American Banker*, March 14, 1967, p. 1.

The survey also revealed that two District banks had had credit card programs and discontinued them. One small bank had tried to install a card operation in 1959, but "could not acquire sufficient volume to warrant" the service. Another larger bank discontinued its plan "because of cost factors and an unusually high percentage of delinquencies." Obviously, the course of credit cards is not always smooth for the issuing bank.

The individual banks' evaluations of check-credit plans may be more significant because of the large number of banks involved. Twenty of the 23 banks with a program provided an evaluation, and 17 reported that they were satisfied with their plans. A large part of the satisfaction reflected the fact that their check-credit accounts were limited to good credit risks. The pre-selection of check-credit customers has resulted either in minimal losses or a profit for many of the banks. Automation of data processing also has contributed to the success of the plans. Opportunities to generate new business were also mentioned and several banks plan to promote their check-credit programs more strongly in the future.

In contrast, three of the banks with check-credit programs stated they were *not* satisfied with the results of their plans and another bank discontinued its program because of its unfavorable experience. At one bank, "the volume is so small, it does not warrant handling this type of loan." A second bank decided that many borrowers are incapable of managing an open line of credit.

In view of these fairly typical evaluations, both pro and con, it is perhaps surprising that all types of credit plans have become popular in commercial banking recently. One possible answer reoccurred in the Fourth District survey; namely—banks believe the existence of these plans gives them a competitive edge to sell financial services. Several respondents mentioned that no other banks in their areas offered credit plans, thus enabling them to attract customers who might not otherwise be available. In some cases, this achievement was considered to be important enough to offset a low rate of profitability. The influence of competition was also apparent in the location of the bank and the spread of credit cards and check credit in the area. If a large city bank introduced one of these services, other banks in the city and in the surrounding market area seemed to respond with plans of their own.

It would be interesting and useful to weigh quantitatively the factors that determine whether or not a bank will provide credit cards and check credit, as well as to determine the balance between profitability and competition. That these are unanswered relationships emphasizes the need that exists for further study in the rapidly developing field.

BUGGING IN BRITANNIA

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, recently a witness at our hearings on the Right of Privacy Act of 1967—S. 928—testified that we should look to the situation in Great Britain as a model for controlling electronic eavesdropping. While the situation may have been controlled in the 1950's, it is our understanding that the 1960's have brought the same electronic eavesdropping problems to Great Britain as are currently found in the United States.

A recent issue of the Spectator, a British publication, comments on the present situation. Apparently, if any official investigator wants to tap a telephone, permission must be obtained from the Home Secretary before doing so. But if this same investigator merely wants to eavesdrop by using a hidden bug, he needs no permission whatsoever.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article published in a 1967 issue of the Spectator.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPECTATOR'S NOTEBOOK

(By J. W. M. Thompson)

If a policeman or some other more shadowy official investigator chooses to tap by telephone, he has to obtain the permission of the Home Secretary before doing so. This, at least, is an accepted principle. But if some bright boy at the BBC decides he would like to eavesdrop, by means of a hidden microphone, on any private conversation I may be having, does he have to seek permission at the same high level? Not at all, according to Sir Hugh Greene's astonishing pronouncement on the subject. He doesn't even need the approval of the director-general of the BBC, but merely the permission (according to Sir Hugh) of someone "very near the top in the BBC immediately below myself." Dutifully impressed as I am by this glimpse of the Corporation's vertiginous heights, I am not at all impressed by what Sir Hugh evidently intended to be a form of reassurance to the public. Tapping telephones, after all, is supposed to be carried out only for purposes of law enforcement or in the interests of national security (even if it so happens that everyone seems to believe there is a dirtier side to the business nowadays). But bugging private conversations for the BBC has an altogether different status: it is simply a form of news-gathering or even entertainment, and the use of vague phrases like "in the public interest" cannot make it other than a poisonous technique in either category. The only healthy course is for the BBC to forswear it for ever, sacrificing the hypothetical gain in some just-imaginable future case for the positive benefit of giving a check now to this growing and hateful business of electronic prying. MPs make plenty of fatuous complaints about radio and television: here is an occasion for really worthwhile pressure.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the complexity of problems facing Congress increases each year, and almost all of the issues have direct or indirect economic consequences. The economic implications are often the most difficult for Members to assess. The Employment Act of 1946, in establishing the Joint Economic Committee, gave it the responsibility—

> (1) to make a continuing study of matters relating to the Economic Report; (2) to study means of coordinating programs in order to further the policy of this Act; and (3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress . . . to file a report . . . containing its findings and recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and House of Representatives as it deems advisable.

I know all Members of Congress are familiar with the committee's annual report, but many Members of Congress may not be aware of the many detailed studies, hearings, and reports of the committee. Many of the committee's efforts have produced pioneering studies in various fields of economics. Not only are the recent documents of the committee and its subcommittees relevant to current problems, but also, many of the past studies are equally pertinent.

With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the list of available committee publications be printed in the RECORD. The publications which can be obtained in limited quantities from the Joint Economic Committee are indicated by a dagger; those which are available in quantity at the Government Printing Office are followed by a catalog number and price. I hope that each Member will take advantage of the fine work of the committee. While the committee's supply is very limited in most cases, we endeavor to service the needs of Congressmen first, so your request will be gladly entertained.

There being no objection, the list of publications was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[74] †*1955 Report on Economic Statistics.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, January 5, 1956. 22 p. (S. Rept. 1309.)

[76] †*Automation and Technological Change.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, January 5, 1956, 14 p. (S. Rept. 1308.)

[79] †*A Program for the Low-Income Population at Substandard Levels of Living.* Report of the Subcommittee on Low-Income Families, January 5, 1956. 14 p. (S. Rept. 1311.)

[84] †*Federal Tax Policy for Economic Growth and Stability.* Report of the Subcommittee on Tax Policy, January 5, 1956. 16 p. (S. Rept. 1310.)

[91] †*Conflicting Official Views on Monetary Policy: April 1956.* Hearing before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, June 12, 1956, 62 p.

[98] †*Fiscal Implications of the Economic Outlook and Budget Developments.* Report of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, June 26, 1957. 5 p. (H. Rept. 647.)

[104] *Federal Expenditure Policy for Economic Growth and Stability.* Papers submitted by panelists appearing before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, November 5, 1957. 1203 p. Y4.EC7:EX7/4. $3.25.

[106] †*Federal Expenditure Policies for Economic Growth and Stability.* Report of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, January 23, 1958. 15 p.

[137] Nos. 2 and 3. *Steel and the Postwar Inflation,* by Otto Eckstein and Gary Fromm; *An Analysis of the Inflation in Machinery Prices,* by Thomas A. Wilson. November 6, 1959. 81 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 2, 3. 25 cents.

[138] Nos. 4 and 5. *Analysis of the Rising Costs of Public Education,* by Werner Z. Hirsch; *Trends in the Supply and Demand of Medical Care,* by Markley Roberts. November 10, 1959. 85 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 4, 5. 30 cents.

[139] No. 6. *The Extent and Nature of Frictional Unemployment,* by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. November 19, 1959. 69 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 6. 25 cents.

[140] Nos. 7, 8, and 9. *The Incidence of*

Inflation: Or Who Gets Hurt, by Seymour E. Harris; *Protection Against Inflation,* by H. S. Houthakker; *The Share of Wages and Salaries in Manufacturing Incomes, 1947–56,* by Alfred H. Conrad. November 26, 1959. 153 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 7–9. 45 cents.

[141] Nos. 10 and 11. *Potential Public Policies To Deal With Inflation Caused by Market Power,* by Emmette S. Redford; *A Brief Interpretive Survey of Wage-Price Problems in Europe,* by Mark W. Leiserson. December 11, 1959. 86 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/Nos. 10 and 11. 25 cents.

[143] Nos. 14 and 15. *Liquidity and Financial Institutions in the Postwar Period,* by John Gurley; *Profits, Profit Markups, and Productivity: An Examination of Corporate Behavior Since 1947,* by Edwin Kuh. January 25, 1959. 111 p. 35 cents.

[145] No. 17. *Prices and Costs in Manufacturing Industries,* by Charles L. Schultze and Joseph L. Tryon. January 25, 1960. 56 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 17. 20 cents.

[147] No. 19. *Debt Management in the United States,* by Warren L. Smith. January 28, 1960. 154 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 19. 40 cents.

[148] No. 20. *The Potential Economic Growth of the United States,* by James W. Knowles. January 30, 1960. 56 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 20. 20 cents. See [67].

[149] No. 21. *Postwar Movement of Prices and Wages in Manufacturing Industries,* by Harold M. Levinson. January 30, 1960. 139 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 21. 40 cents. (Includes supplementary technical material to the staff report [134].)

[150] No. 22. *An Evaluation of Antitrust Policy: Its Relation to Economic Growth, Full Employment, and Prices,* by Theodore J. Kreps. January 30, 1960. 49 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 22. 20 cents.

[151] No. 23. *The Structure of Unemployment in Areas of Substantial Labor Surplus,* by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. January 30, 1960. 34 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/4/No. 23. 15 cents.

[174] †*Economic Programs for Labor Surplus Areas in Selected Countries of Western Europe.* Staff study, December 27, 1960. 15 p. Y4.EC7:L11. 25 cents.

[175] *A Study of the Dealer Market for Federal Government Securities.* Staff study, December 30, 1960. 144 p. Y4.EC7:SE2. 40 cents.

[180] †*Government Price Statistics.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, July 21, 1961. 13 p. Y4.EC7:P93/9. 10 cents.

[184] †*Review of Annual Report of the Federal Reserve System for the Year 1960.* Hearings, June 1 and 2, 1961. 174 p.

[187] †*93 Lots of Bids Involving Identical Bids Reported to the Department of Justice by the Federal Procurement Agencies in the Years 1955–60.* Staff study, August 30, 1961. 139 p.

[188] †*Higher Unemployment Rates, 1957–60: Structural Transformation or Inadequate Demand.* Staff study for the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, November 20, 1961. 79 p. Y4.EC7:UN2/3. 25 cents.

[190] *Employment and Unemployment.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, December 18, 19, and 20, 1961. 399 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/2/961. $1.00.

[191] †*Employment and Unemployment.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, February 2, 1962. 21 p.

STUDY PAPERS PREPARED FOR THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

[192] †*A New Look at Foreign Economic Policy: In Light of the Cold War and the Extension of the Common Market in Europe,* by Christian A. Herter and William L. Clayton. October 23, 1961. 10 p. Y4.EC7:F76/2. 15 cents.

[196] †*Japan in United States Foreign Economic Policy,* by Warren S. Hunsberger. November 1961. 27 p. Y4.EC7:J27:20, 25 cents.

[197] *Trade Adjustment in Theory and Practice,* by Otto R. Reischer. November 21, 1961. 98 p. Y4.EC7:T67/2. 30 cents.

[198] †*The European Economic Community and the United States,* by Robert R. Bowie and Theodore Geiger. November 27, 1961. 60 p. Y4.EC7:EU7/3. 15 cents.

[199] †*Food and People,* by Ralph McCabe and Louis H. Bean. November 1961. 74 p. Y4.EC7:F73. 25 cents.

[200] †*United States Commercial Policy: A Program from the 1960's,* by Peter B. Kenen. November 30, 1961. 37 p. Y4.EC7:C73. 15 cents.

[201] †*Trade Restraints in the Western Community: With Tariff Comparisons and Selected Statistical Tables Pertinent to Foreign Economic Policy.* Staff study. December 1, 1961. 59 p.

[203] †*Foreign Economic Policy for the 1960's.* Report of the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, January 17, 1962. 50 p. Y4.EC7:F76/3. 20 cents.

[204] †*The Political Stakes in East-West Trade.* A report on a fact-finding trip to the U.S.S.R and Eastern Europe, submitted to *the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic* Policy by Jacob K. Javits. February 2, 1962. 19p.

[209] †*The Role of Inventory Changes During Expansion and Contraction.* Task force report to the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, Automation, and Energy Resources July 3, 1962. 11 p.

[210] †*Inventory Fluctuations, Price Level Changes, and Economic Growth.* Task force report to the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, Automation, and Energy Resources, July 6, 1962. 15 p.

[211] †*Inventory Fluctuations and Economic Stabilization.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Stabilization, Automation, and Energy Resources, July 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13, 1962. 263 p. Y4.EC7:IN8/9. 65 cents.

VARIABILITY OF PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN PLANT AND EQUIPMENT

[218] †Part I. *Investment and Its Financing.* Report by the Department of Commerce, January 19, 1962. 68 p. Y4.EC7: IN8/6/Pt. 1. 25 cents.

[219] †Part II. *Some Elements Shaping Investment Decisions.* Papers, January 29, 1962. 55 p. Y4.EC7:IN8/6/Pt. 2. 20 cents.

[221] †*Measures of Productive Capacity.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, July 24, 1962. 20 p.

[223] *A Federal Statistics Program for the 1960's.* A study prepared for the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics by the Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, October 15, 1962. 69 p. Y4.EC7:St. 2. 25 cents.

[226] †*U.S. Payments Policies Consistent with Domestic Objectives of Maximum Employment and Growth.* Report of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments, December 26, 1962. 11 p. Y4.EC7: P. 29/2. 10 cents.

[228] *Dimensions of Soviet Economic Power.* Hearings (together with study papers), December 10 and 11, 1962. 929 p. Y4.EC7:SO8/5. $2.75.

JANUARY 1963 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

[231] †*Part 2. Statements of Economic Interest Groups,* March 1963. 177 p.

[232] †*Joint Economic Report on the 1963 Economic Report of the President.* March 14, 1963. 114 p. (S. Rept. 78.)

[233] †*Economic Policies and Programs in Middle America.* Report to the Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationships, by Martha W. Griffiths. January 22, 1963. 31 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/13. 15 Cents.

[236] †*Impact of Military Supply and Service Activities on the Economy.* Report of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement, July 18, 1963. 68 p.

[237] *Steel Prices, Unit Costs, Profits, and Foreign Competition.* Hearings, April 23, 24, 25, 26, 29, and May 2, 1963. 762 p. Y4.EC7/ST3/3. $2.50.

[239] †*The Federal Budget as an Economic Document.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economics, August 14, 1963. 28 p. (S. Rept. 396.) See [212].

[240] †*Measuring Employment and Unemployment.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, June 6 and 7, 1963. 129 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/2/963. 35 cents.

DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Hearings

[241] †Part 1. June 20 and 21, 1963. 192 p. See [270].

[242] †part 2. October 9 and 10, 1963. 137 p.

[243] †Part 3. November 19 and 20, 1963. 266 p.

[261] †Part 4. March 25 and 26, 1964. 181 p.

[269] †Part 5. Appendix. September 1964. 497 p.

THE UNITED STATES BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Hearings

[244] †Part 1. *Current Problems and Policies.* July 8 and 9, 1963. 218 p. Y4.EC7:P29/4/Pt. 1. 55 cents.

[245] Part 2. *Outlook for the United States Balance of Payments.* July 29 and 30, 1963. 117 p. Y4.EC7:P29/4/Pt. 2. 35 cents.

[246] Part 3. *The International Monetary System: Functioning and Possible Reform.* November 12, 13, 14, and 15, 1963. 290 p. Y4.EC7:P29/4/PT3. 75 cents.

[247] *The United States Balance of Payments.—Perspectives and Policies.* Staff materials and other submissions, November 12, 1963. 164 p. Y4.EC7:P29/6. 45 cents.

[248] *The United States Balance of Payments: Statements by Economists, Bankers, and Others on The Brookings Institution Study. "The United States Balance of Payments in 1968."* November 12, 1963. 587 p. Y4.EC7:P29/5. $1.75.

[259] †*The United States Balance of Payments.* Report, March 19, 1964. 30 p. (S. Rept. 965.)

[249] †*Probable Effects of the Proposed Quality Stabilization Act on Prices, Incomes, Employment, and Production.* A Summary analysis prepared by the Council of Economic Advisers, October 29, 1963. 4 p.

ECONOMIC POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Studies

[250] †*Paper No. 1. Comparative Features of Central Banks in Selected Foreign Countries.* October 15, 1963. 36 p. Y4.EC7: EC7/14/Paper. 15 cents.

[251] †*Paper No. 2. Governmental Policies to Deal with Prices in Key Industries in Selected Foreign Countries.* October 31, 1963. 16 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/14/Paper 2. 15 cents.

[252] *Paper No. 3. A Description and Analysis of Certain European Capital Markets.* January 20, 1964. 280 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/14/Paper 3. 70 cents.

[262] †*Paper No. 4. Private Trade Barriers and the Atlantic Community.* April 1964. 42 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/14/Paper 4. 20 cents.

[263] *Paper No. 5. Unemployment Programs in Sweden.* April 22, 1964. 51 p. Y4.EC7: EC7/14/Paper 5. 20 cents.

[267] †*Paper No. 6. Subsidies to Shipping by Eleven Countries.* July 16, 1964. 27 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/14/Paper 6. 15 cents.

[258] *Private Investment in Latin America.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationship, January 14, 15, and 16, 1964. 492 p. Y4.EC7:L34. $1.50

[266] †*Private Investment in Latin America.* Report of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationships, May 25, 1964. 27 p. Y4.EC7:L34/21. 15 cents.

JANUARY 1964 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

[254] †Part 1. Hearings, January 23, 27, 28, and 29, 1964. 253 p.

[255] †Part 2. *Invited Comments.* February 1964. 168 p. Y4. 50 cents.

[256] *Joint Economic Report on the 1964*

Economic Report of the President, March 2, 1964. 74 p. (S. Rept. 931.)

[257] †*Annual Economic Indicators for the U.S.S.R.* Compendium of statistical materials and interpretative articles. February 25, 1964. 218 p.

[260] †*Background Material on Economic Aspects of Military Procurement and Supply—1964.* Staff study of the Subcommittee on Defense Procurement, April 1964. 177 p.

[265] †*Economic Impact of Federal Supply and Service Activities.* Report of Subcommittee on Defense Procurement, September 3, 1964. 29 p.

[272] *Invention and the Patent System.* Study prepared by S. C. Gilfillan, December 21, 1964. 247 p. Y4.EC7:IN8/10. 60 cents.

[274] *1964 Supplement to Economic Indicators: Historical and Descriptive Background.* Prepared by the staff and the Office of Statistical Standards, Bureau of the Budget, December 1964. 130 p. Y4.EC7/964/SUPP. 65 cents.

[270] †Report. *Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates and the Balance of Payments.* January 6, 1965. 45 p. (S. Rept. 1.) See [24]. 89/1S.Rept. 1.15 cents.

JANUARY 1965 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

[276] †Part 1. Hearings, February 19, 22, and 23, 1965. 169 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/2/965/Pt. 1. 45 cents.

[277] †Part 2. Hearings, February 24, 1965. 33 p. Y4.EC7: EC7/2/965/Pt. 2. 15 cents.

[278] †Part 3. Hearings, February 25, 26, and 27, 1965. 199 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/2/965/Pt. 3. 50 cents.

[279] †Part 4. Invited Comments, February 1965. 93 p. Y4.EC7: EC7/2/965/Pt. 4. 30 cents.

[280] †*Joint Economic Report on the 1965 Economic Report of the President,* March 31, 1965. 114 p. (H. Rept. 175.)

[281] *Subsidy and Subsidy-Effect Programs of the U.S. Government.* Study prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, March 1965. 86 p. Y4. EC7:SU1/965, 40 cents. Revision of [173].

[282] *Current Economic Indicators For The U.S.S.R.* Compendium of statistical data and interpretative comments, June 23, 1965. 220 p. Y4.EC7:UN3/965. 55 cents.

[284] *Economic Impact of Federal Procurement.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation, April 27, 28, and 29, 1965. 407 p. Y4.EC7: P94/10. $1.25.

[285] †*Economic Impact of Federal Procurement.* Report of the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation, July 19, 1965. 13 p. Y4.EC7:P94/11. 10 cents.

[286] †*Measuring The Nation's Wealth.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, June 1, 2, and 3, 1965. 93 p. Y4.EC7:W37/2. 30 cents. See [271].

[287] †*Measuring the Nation's Material Wealth.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, August 27, 1965. 5p. Y4. EC7:W37/3. 5 cents.

THE BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS STATISTICS

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics

[298] †Part 1. May 11, 1965. 79 p. Y4.EC7: P29/7/Pt. 1. 35 cents.

[290] †Part 2. June 8, 1965. 155 p. Y4.EC7: P29/7/Pt. 2. 45 cents.

[291]†Part 3. June 9, 1965. 55 p. Y4.EC7: P29/7/Pt. 3. 20 cents.

[292] †*The Balance of Payments Statistics of The United States.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, July 27, 1965. 5 p. Y4.EC7/P29/8. 10 cents.

DISCRIMINATORY OCEAN FREIGHT RATES AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation

[293] †Part 1. April 7 and 8, 1965. 350 p. Y4.EC7:F88/965/Pt. 1. $1.00.

[294] †Part 2. May 27, 1965. 91 p. Y4.EC7: F88/965/Pt. 2. 30 cents.

[295] †Part 3. June 30, 1965. 66 p. Y4.EC7: F88/965/Pt. 3. 25 cents.

[328] *Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates and the Balance of Payments,* Part 4. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement Regulation, May 6 and 19, 1966. 149 p. Y4.EC7:F88/965/Pt. 4. 45 cents.

[329] †*Discriminatory Ocean Freight Rates and the Balance of Payments.* Report of the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation. August 3, 1966. 25 p. Y4.EC7: F88/2. 15 cents.

[275] *Fiscal Policy Issues of the Coming Decade: Statements by Individual Economists and Representatives of Interested Organizations.* Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, February 15, 1965. 196 p. Y4.EC7: 52/2. 50 cents.

[296] †*Fiscal Policy Issues of the Coming Decade.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, July 20, 21, and 22, 1965. 105 p. Y4.EC7:F52/. 35 cents.

GUIDELINES FOR INTERNATIONAL MONETARY REFORM

Hearings before the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments

[297] Part 1. Hearings, July 27, 28, and 29, 1965. 191 p. Y4.EC7: M74/12/Pt. 1. 50 cents.

[298] Part 2. Supplement. 410 p. Y4.EC7: M74/12/Pt. 2. $1.25.

[299] †*Guidelines for Improving the International Monetary System.* Report of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. August 30, 1965. 22 p. Y4.EC7: M74/13. 15 cents.

ECONOMIC POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Studies

[300] Paper No. 7. European Social Security Systems.* September 17, 1965. 129 p. Y4.E7C:E7C/14 paper 7. 40 cents.

[304] § Paper No. 8. Programs for Relocating Workers Used by Governments of Selected Countries. January 26, 1966. 76 p. Y4. EC7:EC7/14 paper 8. 25 cents.

[332] † *Economic Policies and Practices,* Paper No. 9, Foreign Banking in the United States. July 5 1966. 35 p. Y4.EC7:L–C7/14/Paper 9. 15 cents.

[301] *Latin American Development and Western Hemisphere Trade.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationships, September 8, 9, and 10, 1965. 293 p. Y4.EC7:L34/3. 75 cents.

[302] † *The Impact of Government-Generated Cargo on the U.S.-Flag Foreign Trade Fleet for Calendar Year 1964.* Study presented to Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation by the Maritime Administration, November 24, 1965. 13 p.

[303] † *Off Dead Center: Some Proposals to Strengthen Free World Economic Cooperation.* Report by Henry S. Reuss and Robert F. Ellsworth. December 20, 1965. 20 p. Y4. EC7:F87/2. 15 cents.

[305] † *The Federal Reserve Portfolio: Statements by Individual Economists.* Materials submitted to the Subcommittee on Economic Progress, January 28, 1966. 176 p. Y4.EC7:F31/3. 45 cents.

RECENT FEDERAL RESERVE ACTION AND ECONOMIC POLICY COORDINATION

Hearings

[366] †Part 1. December 13 and 14, 1965. 306 p. $1.00.

[307] † Part 2. December 15 and 16, 1965. 284 p. 70 cents.

[308] *Improved Statistics for Economic Growth:* Comments by Government Agencies on Views submitted to the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. March 10, 1966. 84 p. Y4.EC7:ST2/2. 25 cents.

JANUARY 1966 ECONOMIC REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT

[309] † Part 1, Hearings, February 1 and 2, 1966. 169 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/2/966/Pt. 1. 50 cents.

[310] † Part 2, Hearings, February 3, 4 and 8, 1966. 216 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/2/966/Pt. 2. 55 cents.

[311] † Part 3, Hearings, February 9 and 10, 1966. 170 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/2/966/Pt. 3. 45 cents.

[312] † Part 4, Hearings, Invited Comments. 164 p. Y4.EC7:EC7/2/966/Pt. 4. 45 cents.

[313] *Joint Economic Report on the 1966 Economic Report of the President,* March 17, 1966. (H. Rept. 1334). 86 p. 89/2. H. Rept. 1334. 25 cents.

[314] †*Latin American Development and Hemisphere Trade.* Report of the Subcommittee on Inter-American Economic Relationships. March 24, 1966. 17 p. Y4.EC7: L34/4. 15 cents.

[315] †*Twentieth Anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946, An Economic Symposium. Hearings,* February 23, 1966. 150 p. Y4.EC7:EM7/10. 45 cents.

[338] †*Twentieth Anniversary of the Employment Act of 1946:* An Economic Symposium, Supplement. Invited comments on Directions for the Future. 192 p. Y4.EC: E7/10/Supp. 50 cents.

[316] †*Background Material on Economic Impact of Federal Procurement—1966:* Materials prepared for the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation. March 18, 1966. 134 p. Y4.EC7:P94/9/966. 35 cents.

[317] †*Economic Impact of Federal Procurement—1966.* Hearings, January 24, March 23 and 24, 1966. 422 p. Y4.EC7: P94/10/966. $1.25.

[318] †*Economic Impact of Federal Procurement—1966.* Report of the Subcommittee on Federal Procurement and Regulation. May 27, 1966. 22 p. Y4.EC7:P94/11/996. 15 cents.

[319] †*Tax Changes for Shortrun Stabilization.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy, March 16, 17, 18, 22, and 30, 1966. 313 p. Y4.EC7:T19/6. 75 cents.

[320]†*Tax Changes for Shortrun Stabilization.* Report of the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy. May 24, 1966. 23 p. Y4.EC7: T19/7. 15 cents.

[321] †*Inflation and the Price Indexes.* Monograph submitted to the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics by the National Industrial Conference Board. June 8, 1966. 129 p. Y4.EC7:IN3. 35 cents.

[322] *Government Price Statistics.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, May 24, 25 and 26, 1966. 266 p. Y4.EC7:P93/8/966. 70 cents.

[323] †*Government Price Statistics.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. July 12, 1966. 19 p. Y4EC7: P93/9/966. 15 cents.

[324] †*Job Vacancy Statistics.* Hearings before the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics, May 17 and 18, 1966. 215 p. Y4.EC7:J57. 60 cents.

[325] †*Job Vacancy Statistics.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Statistics. June 8, 1966. 6 p. Y4.EC7:5 57/2. 10 cents.

PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Hearings before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy

[326] †Part 1, April 26, 27 and May 2, 1966. 262 p. Y4.EC7:P38/2/Pt. 1. 70 cents.

[327] †Part 2, May 3, 9, 11, 16, and 20, 1966. 262 p. Y4.EC7:P38/2/Pt. 2. 70 cents.

[330] *Technology in Education.* Hearings of the Subcommittee on Economic Progress, June 6, 10, and 13, 1966. 273 p. Y4.EC7:ED8. 65 cents.

[331] †*Automation and Technology in Education.* Report of the Subcommittee on Economic Progress. August 9, 1966. 11 p. Y4.EC7: ED8/2. 10 cents.

---

* A comparative analysis of program in England, Sweden, and the Common Market countries, together with a description of the U.S. System.

NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE SOVIET ECONOMY

Studies prepared for the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy, June 27, 1966

[333] †Part I. Economic Policy. 98 p. Y4.EC7:508/7/Pt. 1. 30 cents.

[334] Part IIA. Economic Performance. 239 p. Y4.EC7:508/Pt. 2A. $1.00.

(1) Aggregate National Product.
(2) Industry.

[335] Part IIB. Economic Performance. 254 p. Y4.EC7:508/Pt. 2B. 60 cents.

(3) Agriculture.
(4) Consumption.
(5) Transportation.

[336] Part III. The Human Resources. 280 p. Y4.EC7:508/Pt. 4. 65 cents.

[337] †Part IV. The World Outside. (Also includes a selected bibliography of Recent Soviet Monographs and the Appendixes.) 222 p. Y4.EC7:50P/Pt. 4. 55 cents.

[339] †New Approach to United States International Economic Policy. Hearing before the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments, September 9, 1964. 44 p. Y4.EC7:IN 8/12. 20 cents.

[340] †*Twenty Years After: An Appeal for the Renewal of International Economic Cooperation on a Grand Scale.* Report of the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. September 16, 1966. 4 p. Y4.EC7:IN8/11. 10 cents.

[341] †*Old Age Income Assurance: An Outline of Issues and Alternatives.* Staff document prepared for the Subcommitee on Fiscal Policy. November 4, 1966. 39 p. Y4.EC7:OL1. 15 cents.

STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC FACILITY NEEDS AND FINANCING

Staff study prepared for the Subcommittee on Economic Progress

[342] Volume 1, *Public Facility Needs.* December 14, 1966: 693 p. Y4.EC7:F11/V.1. $2.00.

[343] Volume 2, *Public Facility Financing.* December 21, 1966. 453 p. Y4.EC7:F11/V.2. $1.25.

[344] †*Contingency Planning for U.S. International Monetary Policy.* Statements by private economists submitted to the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments. December 30, 1966. 160 p. Y4.EC7:-M74/14. 45 cents.

[345] †*U.S. Economic Growth to 1975: Potentials and Problems.* Staff study prepared for the Subcommittee on Economic Progress. December 12, 1966. 63 p. Y4.EC7:-EC7/16. 25 cents.

FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES

A compilation of Replies from Departments and Agencies of the U.S. Government to a Questionnaire formulated by the Subcommittee on Economic Progress. December 19, 1966

[346] Volume 1. 458 p. Y4.EC7:H88/V. 1. $1.25.

[347] Volume 2. 492 p. Y4.EC7:H88/V. 2. $1.25.

[348] Volume 3. 358 p. Y4.EC7:H88/V. 3. $1.

[---] †*Employment Act of 1946, as Amended with Related Laws, and Rules of the Joint Economic Committee.* (This also contains a chronological listing of members who have served on the committee since its inception, executive directors from 1947–66, and a bibliography: The Employment Act of 1946 and Its Administration.) 23 p.

[---] *Economic Indicators.* A monthly publication of the Congress under Public Law 120, 81st Congress, 1st session. Issued monthly. Y4.EC7: 25 cents a copy, $2.50 a year.

CUTLER-HAMMER'S CONTRIBUTION TO UNDERSTANDING WORLD TRADE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few days ago a remarkable Milwaukee firm, the Cutler-Hammer Co., held a symposium entitled "Global Understanding Through World Trade."

Some of the Nation's outstanding experts on world trade were brought to Milwaukee by Cutler-Hammer for a fascinating and enlightening discussion of the impact of world trade on the life and the pocketbook of all of us.

Most important, the relationship of international trade to peace was discussed by qualified experts who know what they are talking about.

In commenting on this meeting, the Milwaukee Journal published an editorial that is as succinct and impressive an analysis of the import of world trade as I have read in a brief statement.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the May 1 issue of the Milwaukee Journal be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD TRADE AND YOU

Cutler-Hammer, Inc., earned commendation for itself and Milwaukee Saturday with its 75th anniversary symposium—"Global Understanding Through World Trade."

The coffee you drink, the bananas you eat, the paper on which this print appears—each comes to us from a foreign country and each forms part of the vast, essential fabric of world trade. When a Milwaukee housewife buys a carton of cocoa or a can of pepper she puts money in the pocket of, say, a struggling farmer in Ghana or a peasant in India. When a Brazilian buys a tractor made in West Allis he helps protect the weekly paycheck of a local factory worker.

This is how world trade aids global understanding. It opens channels of communication and commerce among peoples, helps form strong bonds of mutual benefit. While these links do not guarantee perfect harmony in the affairs of men, they do create an air of interdependency that encourages leaders to substitute reason for rancor, understanding for cold mistrust.

In the last 20 years, world trade has grown more than threefold. Last year global exports exceeded $200 billion for the first time. The United States alone bought some $26 billion worth of goods from other countries in 1966; we sold almost $30 billion of our products overseas. More than a million Americans owe their jobs to the transportation, distribution or processing of imported goods.

The impact of all this has been staggering. As George W. Ball, former undersecretary of state, pointed out Saturday, the world has shrunk enormously in the postwar period, thanks to new technology, better communications, more trade. In an age of increasing economic interdependency, the nation-state tends to lose relevance. Societies can advance materially only by joining in larger economic units or, at least, by pursuing a kind of close co-operation previously unknown. These imperatives clash with age old jealousies and suspicions; they impose great strains on archaic political institutions. The imperatives remain, nonetheless.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty of all, as the Argentine economist, Dr. Raul Prebisch, put it, is to employ the channels of world trade more wisely for the benefit of two-thirds of the globe's population that lives in poverty and deprivation. Rich nations trade more with each other, to their mutual advantage. But they trade less with poorer nations, to the latter's disadvantage. This growing imbalance urgently needs correction. The way to do it, however, is not, as western Europe has been doing, by taking one underdeveloped region—Africa—under its wing. This creates vertical spheres of influence which could easily produce a dangerous kind of economic colonialism. The only real answer lies through greater efforts of richer nations to provide better markets for poorer nations on a multilateral basis.

This was a key message at Saturday's meeting. The real worth of the symposium, however, was in helping transfer the problems and potentials of world trade from the "realm of rhetoric to the realm of reality." Only when men truly grasp the reality of their world can they ever hope to make it a better world—for all men.

LLOYD KIRKHAM GARRISON, A MAN OF MANY POSTS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, anyone who has known Lloyd Kirkham Garrison knows the full truth of the New York Times profile of him published this morning.

It was a pleasure for me to read the article because, as the Times points out, the Garrison contribution has been large throughout history, whether one discusses his great grandfather, the Boston abolitionist leader, or his grandfather, Wendell Phillips Garrison, the literary editor of The Nation.

As Lloyd Garrison steps down as president of the New York City Board of Education, it can be said that he has upheld the tradition of public service well.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAN OF MANY POSTS: LLOYD KIRKHAM GARRISON

"I've never planned my life," Lloyd K. Garrison once said in an interview. I've taken things as they've come along. For me life has been a series of accidents."

The accidents, as the tall, rangy, bald president of the Board of Education called them, add up to a list of major posts that many would consider enough to fill two lives.

He has been a lawyer, the dean of a law school, an investigator, the first chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, a labor arbitrator, a civil rights leader, a politician and a member of the Board of Education.

He announced yesterday he was stepping down as president of the board—a post he has held since 1965—but he would remain a member.

Despite the diversity of his activities, a common thread runs through all of them: a passion for the useful life dedicated to the betterment of mankind.

"I LIKE TO BE OF USE"

It is a passion that is expressed by a rather shy and reticent man with piercing dark eyes, a broad smile and a self-effacing manner.

"I like to be of use," he explained to an interviewer, "but I don't consciously go out to serve."

The diversity of his activities is matched by the diversity of his talents. Friends have called him a reformer with a sense of humor, a scholar who has managed to penetrate the jungle of New York politics, and a liberal humanitarian who has dealt successfully with the tough realities of urban and national life.

Lloyd Kirkham Garrison was born in New York City Nov. 19, 1897, the son of Lloyd McKim Garrison and Alice Kirkham Garrison. His heritage reached deep into the social and intellectual history of this country. His father was a lawyer; his grandfather, Wendell Phillips Garrison, was the literary editor of The Nation; and his great-grandfather, William Lloyd Garrison was the Boston abolitionist leader of pre-Civil War days.

Mr. Garrison was educated at St. Paul's School and Harvard, where he took a bachelor's degree in 1919 and a law degree in 1922. He interrupted his college studies in 1917 to spend a year and a half in the Navy, starting as a seaman and ending up as a chief petty officer.

CONDUCTED INVESTIGATIONS

After receiving his law degree, Mr. Garrison joined the Wall Street law firm of Root, Clark, Buckner & Howland. He remained with that firm until 1926, when he left to become a member of the firm of Parker & Garrison.

In 1928 and 1929, as associate counsel of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, he investigated ambulance-chasing and bankruptcy fraud. His work gained such prominence that in 1930 President Hoover named him a special assistant United States Attorney General to conduct another bankruptcy inquiry.

ACTIVE IN POLITICS

Mr. Garrison was appointed dean of the University of Wisconsin Law School in 1932, but he continued to play an active role in the field of labor relations throughout the ensuing period. In 1934, he left Wisconsin for seven months to organize the newly created National Labor Relations Board, and during the next several years served repeatedly as a mediator, arbitrator and Federal Labor Board member.

During World War II, he again left Wisconsin to serve on the National War Labor Board, first as general counsel and executive director, later as vice chairman, and finally as its last chairman.

Mr. Garrison resigned from the University of Wisconsin in 1945 and became a member of the New York law firm of Paul, Weiss, Wharton & Garrison.

In the period around 1950, Mr. Garrison helped to organize the Reform Democratic movement in New York. A member of the Lexington Democratic Club, he participated in the drafting of the constitution for the Reform Committee for Democratic Voters. He believes fervently in citizen participation in politics.

"If we're going to live successfully under a party system," he said, "I think every citizen ought to belong to a party and be as active as he can, however humble his role may be."

Mr. Garrison has been a leader of the National Urban League since 1924 and was president of the civil rights group from 1947 to 1952. He also has been vice chairman of the American Civil Liberties Union since 1937.

ON BOARD SINCE 1961

He was appointed to membership on the Board of Education in 1961 and has been its president since 1965. He has described his tenure on the board as one of his less enjoyable experiences.

"I can't say it's satisfying in the sense one feels that one is accomplishing something," he told an interviewer in 1963.

Mr. Garrison married the former Ellen Jay, a descendant of John Jay, the first Chief Justice of the United States, in 1921. They have two daughters, Mrs. Clarinda Brochart of Liege, Belgium, and Mrs. Ellen Kean of New York, and a son, Lloyd McKim Garrison, a foreign correspondent for The New York Times stationed in Lagos, Nigeria.

EVEN A BUSY SPARE TIME

Mr. and Mrs. Garrison live at 133 East 64th Street and have a country home in Brewster, N.Y., where he spends his spare time birdwatching, keeping up the grounds and reading philosophy, Greek literature and books on politics.

In an interview several years ago, Mr. Garrison was asked whether he had any unfulfilled hopes or dreams. The question puzzled him, for he was unable to think of any. Finally, after pondering for a few moments, he said:

"I guess I must be a basically happy guy. It took me a long time to think of it. There is something I'd like to do. I'd like to go to Greece before I die. I've been to most other parts of Europe, but I'd like to see Greece and the cradle of our civilization."

Mr. Garrison has been to Greece three times since then.

THE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE'S ILL-ADVISED REPORT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this week in a statement, Dwight D. Eisenhower declared:

> America doesn't have to apologize for her part in the war—she can be proud of it. I hope America will wake up to the fact that our soldiers are dying for something we believe in.

This week, in a report issued by the Republican Senate policy committee, the question was raised:

> Does the Republican Party serve America best by saying that politics stops at the water's edge?

The difference between General Eisenhower's statement and the policy committee report is the difference between a responsible, statesmanlike approach to bipartisan foreign policy—which is the traditional Republican approach to foreign policy—and an attempt to wreck national unity at a time of crisis.

I hope and believe that my Republican colleagues will strongly oppose the sentiments embodied in this partisan report.

I hope and believe they will reject an attempt to wreck our bipartisan foreign policy.

I hope and believe they will remind the authors of this document that the overwhelming majority of Republican Senators have supported President Johnson's conduct of the war in Vietnam.

The United States does not stand alone in the struggle against Communist aggression in Vietnam. More than 53,000 troops from other nations are fighting at our side—several thousand more than the number which fought with us in Korea.

The United States does not act without the support of the majority of its people—Democrats and Republicans alike. There can be no place for partisan politics in a matter involving the lives of our brave, young fighting men.

UNITED KINGDOM APPLICATION TO EUROPEAN ECONOMIC COMMUNITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the decision announced yesterday by Prime Minister Wilson to apply for membership in the European Economic Community is a momentous decision for Britain. As the Prime Minister so rightly said, this decision could well determine Britain's as well as Europe's future.

It is clear that it is now up to France whether or not Britain will be accepted for membership in the EEC. The five other members of the EEC are reportedly in favor of British membership. Whether President de Gaulle can be convinced that Britain honestly wants to play a constructive part in the future of Europe, adding to it its not inconsiderable economic, political, and military strength, remains in doubt.

There are those—and I count myself among them—who believe that Prime Minister Wilson's speech yesterday indicating that Britain will not ask for any amendment to the EEC Charter; the attitude of the five others in the EEC toward Britain; and the changed political situation in France are factors that could very well convince President de Gaulle to a last concern in Britain's entry.

As I stated this January and before that in November 1965, should Britain's application on the above basis be rejected, Britain's friends must prepare an alternative which would enable Britain to strengthen its economy and to enable her to continue to play a major role in world affairs.

We must do everything possible to encourage and assist the United Kingdom in the endeavor that it is now undertaking. I hope that the Six and the United Kingdom recognize their obvious common interest in this matter and begin the process of making a Western European community, including the United Kingdom, a reality. Should Britain fail in this effort, however, we must give careful consideration to the alternative I propose.

I ask unanimous consent that a New York Times editorial and two articles from today's New York Times on this subject be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1967]

Britain Turns to Europe

Britain's decision to seek entry into the Common Market is more a political than an economic move. Since World War II an empire has been lost and London has been looking, unsuccessfully, for a new role in the world. That role, it now is clear, can only be found by becoming one of the major states cooperating to build a new United States of Europe.

This was a hard decision for the only important European country that was neither defeated nor occupied during the war. London emerged not only as a victor but as one of the world's Big Three, joining Russia and the United States at Yalta and Potsdam in shaping the future of Europe and the globe.

But the effort to maintain great power status through reliance on the Commonwealth and a special relationship with the United States drained a Britain irreparably weakened in the war and complicated its efforts to regain financial and economic health.

That game had long since been played out when Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan in 1961 hesitantly opened negotiations with the six-nation Common Market without unequivocably applying for membership. Much of his party and the bulk of the Labor opposition resisted the move. This division led to a cautious approach and much quibbling about details. The prolonged Brussels negotiations that followed alienated Britain's friends on the Continent and contributed as much to the failure of that effort as General de Gaulle's final veto.

The general remains an antagonist, but the crucial difference now is that Britain is united. The support of large majorities in both major parties and in the country as a whole enables Mr. Wilson to conduct the new negotiations with imagination, flair—and the willingness to take risks without which great fortune is never won.

Britain's Prime Minister has rejected the advice of those who urged him to sign the

Treaty of Rome and negotiate out Britain's problems after entry. However, he is not asking any changes in the treaty and he has whittled down the list of issues to be settled in advance to a minimum; agricultural finance, New Zealand butter and West Indian sugar are the main points. More difficult economic questions probably will be raised by France and the other Common Market countries, especially on the future of sterling as a reserve currency.

But, in the end, what will determine the outcome is not the matter of economics and finance but the high politics of Britain's role in Europe, and Europe's role in the world. For although France may bring up many economic issues, particularly in the monetary field, General de Gaulle's final decision will be influenced by political factors at home and abroad. With his domestic political situation already uneasy, the attitude of France's five Common Market partners may become the decisive element.

The five are concerned about Mr. Wilson's onetime opposition to the political union of Europe and his tendency to regard the Common Market as solely an economic enterprise. They are even more concerned about the likelihood that Britain's entry will also bring in Denmark, Ireland and Norway. But these doubts about whether an effective political union can be achieved in a Europe of Ten are likely to be resolved in Britain's favor if Mr. Wilson gives convincing evidence that Britain shares Europe's political goals.

On this score, the Prime Minister made a good start yesterday in supporting political union while steering a careful course between the federalists and the Gaullists. It is here and in the way Britain conducts its foreign and defense policies in the coming months that the outcome will be shaped.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1967]

London Decides To Request Prompt Entry Into Market

(By Anthony Lewis)

London, May 2.—The British Government made its decision today to apply for membership in the European Common Market. It will seek a prompt decision.

Prime Minister Wilson gave the news to the House of Commons. It had been expected for so long that there was relatively little excitement in the atmosphere. There was, rather, a solemnity reflected in Mr. Wilson's peroration:

"This is a historic decision which could well determine the future of Britain, of Europe and indeed of the world for decades to come."

From the world viewpoint the Prime Minister's words may seem exaggerated. But for Britain under Labor party rule, a decision to seek entry into the Common Market, or European Economic Community, marks a fundamental change of national course.

ROLE INITIALLY REJECTED

A decade ago, when her Continental neighbors were forming the market, Britain declined to take part. Both Labor and Conservative parties then thought she should continue to rely mainly on her Atlantic and world connections.

In 1961, a Conservative Government sought to enter the community, but Labor's leadership remained opposed. France vetoed that attempt in 1963.

President de Gaulle remains the great obstacle to British membership. It is assumed that he would like to block the applications without an open veto, but British officials are not certain how far he will carry his opposition.

There was no official comment in Paris today.

[French authorities indicated that President de Gaulle remained opposed to Britain's entry, at least on the terms she was likely to seek.]

The Wilson announcement was greeted favorably in the capitals of the five other markets at the same time. Even Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

Denmark, a partner of Britain in the European Free Trade Association, or Outer Seven, said she would try to join the market at the same time. Even Sweden, formerly reluctant about a market connection, said she would seek associate membership.

Thus the British move could pave the way for a realignment of Western Europe. It would eliminate the Free Trade Association, a loose association without a central executive, and would greatly increase the size and power of the more closely knit Common Market.

Summarizing arguments for entry Mr. Wilson first mentioned economics—"the creation of a single market of approaching 300 million people, with all the scope and incentive which this will provide for British industry, and the enormous possibilities which an integrated strategy for technology on a continental scale can create."

"But whatever the economic arguments," he continued, "the Government's purpose derives above all from our recognition that Europe is now faced with the opportunity of a great move forward in political units and that we can—and indeed must—play our full part in it."

Answering a question from a left-wing Member of Parliament, the Prime Minister added: "We believe our foreign policy could become more effective and our influence much greater if we were within a Europe which was growing stronger and more united."

The Free Trade Association's main feature is tariff-free movement of industrial goods among its members. The Common Market aims at tariff-free movement of industrial and farm products among the members, with a single set of tariffs to the rest of the world. It is moving toward a uniform farm-price system and has a central executive body, the commission.

Mr. Wilson was intentionally obscure about a central question—what special terms he will seek to cushion the short-run impact of membership on Britain's economy.

But he clearly implied that he did not expect significant exceptions to be carved out for Britain in the rules. Among his major points were these:

Britain will not ask for any amendment to the Common Market's charter, the Treaty of Rome, except the mechanical ones needed to refer to an enlarged membership.

Britain recognizes that she "must come to terms with" the community's agricultural policy, Mr. Wilson said. This was a guarded concession but a significant one, since the market's high food prices have been seen as a critical problem.

Britain hopes that negotiations for entry will deal with only a few large issues. Mr. Wilson said "many lesser issues can be best dealt with after entry"—in short, will not be raised as conditions by Britain.

QUICK OUTCOME SOUGHT

The schedule planned by Mr. Wilson and his colleagues reflects urgency. Informed sources emphasized that the Government wanted short negotiations—"some months," one source said.

The Common Market's Council of Ministers was officially notified of Britain's intentions in the afternoon, shortly before Mr. Wilson started speaking in the House. The Governments of all Common Market, Outer Seven and Commonwealth countries were also notified.

Next week Parliament is to debate the issue for three days and then vote on whether to approve the Government's decision. The vote is expected to be overwhelmingly favorable.

Then the Foreign Office here will send a formal letter of application to the present chairman of the Common Market's council, Renaat Van Elslande of Belgium. It will be brief and unconditional, saying in effect: We apply and hope for early negotiations.

CABINET BROUGHT IN LINE

Then it will be up to the Common Market to set the timetable. There is no chance of beginning formal negotiations but British officials hope to have exploratory talks by June or July.

Before making the move toward Europe, the Prime Minister, skillfully smothered opposition within his Cabinet.

Perhaps a half-dozen of the 21 Cabinet members have been rated strong opponents. Some, like Douglas Jay, President of the Board of Trade, have advertised their views. But not one now intends to resign.

What remains in the way of notable opposition is a bloc of Labor party back benchers, most though not all in the left wing of the party. Their position was dramatized today by Emanuel Shinwell, a doughty 83-year-old former minister, who told Mr. Wilson:

"May I assure the Prime Minister that I will give him the most relentless and ruthless opposition. We'd better be frank about that. He will need all the support he can get from the Opposition."

TORY BACKING LIKELY

Some Labor members may therefore abstain or even vote against the Government. But most Conservatives will be on Mr. Wilson's side. Their leader, Edward Heath, hailed the decision as did the Liberal party leader, Jeremy Thorpe, who could not resist speaking of Mr. Wilson's "conversion."

The issue of food prices demonstrates how sharply Mr. Wilson has changed his position on British membership.

A little over a year ago, during the general election campaign, he excoriated the Conservatives for wanting to switch to the community's system of farm-price supports.

In Britain, food prices are low, imports are usually free of tariffs, and domestic farmers are paid subsidies. In the Common Market food prices are kept high to protect farmers. High tariffs, or levies, are applied to food imports.

[From the New York Times, May 3, 1967]

France Indicates Opposition to Bid—De Gaulle Reported Still Opposed to Market Entry

(By Richard E. Mooney)

Paris, May 2.—The best available indications today were that President de Gaulle remained opposed to Britain's entry into the European Common Market.

It was officially announced tonight that General de Gaulle had received a message from Prime Minister Wilson informing him of the statement that would be made this afternoon. The General replied immediately, but there was no disclosure of what he had said.

The French Government issued no official statement of reaction to Britain's announcement of her application for admission. The official attitude has been that it is not possible to take a stand, pro or con, until London makes its terms known, which it has not done yet.

But French authorities indicate that, at bottom, Britain is not wanted on the terms for which she is likely to ask. In its latest form, the French argument—strikingly similar to General de Gaulle's 1963—declaration vetoing British membership—is that "The British are not ready."

President de Gaulle's brother-in-law, Jacques Vendroux, newly elected chairman of the National Assembly's foreign affairs committee, commented today: "There is no doubt that we wish to welcome Britain into the Common Market, but the question is how far will London go to modify certain clauses of the Treaty of Rome—the Common Market's basic charter.

He said France would be "understanding"

if Britain wanted only changes "of a secondary nature," but not if Britain wanted to convert the integrated Common Market into a loose free-trading zone.

General de Gaulle is likely to discuss the issue in his talk to the press two weeks from today, but even this may leave people guessing. His veto statement to the press in January, 1963, was not immediately clear even to his own negotiators.

What he will, or can, do this time is unknown. Some authorities speculate that he will veto the new British bid, as he did the last one four years and four months ago. Others contend that politically he cannot. Some think he will try to stifle the new bid by stalling through long negotiations.

And some believe that, in the end, he will not have his way.

General de Gaulle's distaste for British membership has been known from the outset of Britain's renewed interest. To judge by the remarks of ranking French officials, Prime Minister Wilson's efforts to appease the general's opposition have changed nothing.

French officials assert that Mr. Wilson and his Government today are no more prepared to make a genuine commitment to Europe than Harold Macmillan and his Conservative Government were when they applied in 1961.

This means, from the French point of view, that London still clings too much to its special relationship with Washington, and still is unwilling to accept in full the rule and rules of the 10-year-old European Community.

As interpreted from a non-French point of view, this means that General de Gaulle prefers a Community in which his very great power is not challenged by another major country, and particularly by a major country that could be a Trojan horse for United States influence.

The French position today, according to responsible officials, is that if the British want to be members they must stop talking about the accommodations that must be made for them to join—modification of the Community's common farm policy, for instance, and special privileges for imports from New Zealand and other Commonwealth countries.

Reaction Generally Favorable

Brussels, May 2.—Except for silence from the French, the reaction was generally favorable in the capital of the Common Market today to Prime Minister Wilson's new bid for membership.

But most persons commenting saw a long period of negotiation ahead. Dr. Joseph M. A. H. Luns, the Netherlands Foreign Minister, said that it could take three years and that he would not entirely exclude a veto from President de Gaulle.

Communications signed by Foreign Secretary George Brown were received this morning in the foreign ministries of the six member states—France, West Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg—formally telling them of Britain's intentions.

The big question now is whether, after the British lodge their application, the Council of the Common Market will agree to open negotiations in the near future. This will depend on the attitude of France, which might contend that the time was not yet right.

From the statements by other member countries today, however, the French would probably meet strong opposition if they adopted this view.

The Belgian Foreign Minister, Pierre Harmel, said that British membership would be "one of the most important political and economic steps in the construction of Europe in recent years," and that it was "in conformity with the original ambitions of the Treaty [of Rome] signatories."

Dr. Luns and Foreign Minister Willy Brandt of West Germany also made statements welcoming the British move.

DISCLOSURE OF INCOME AND ASSETS BY SENATOR FRANK CHURCH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, public respect for Congress is vital if the Republic is to endure. We who are Members must do our utmost to preserve the prestige of Congress. If the public trust is lost, if the confidence of the people in Congress vanishes, a death sentence will fall upon representative government itself. Our days will be numbered. Our remaining authority will quickly wither away.

During this century, under both political parties, the powers of the Presidency have grown incessantly. This flow of power toward the executive branch has dangerously distorted the "checks and balances" so carefully written into the Constitution by the Founding Fathers. Even so, it is still Congress which remains the principal bulwark against the eventual emergence of one-man government in the United States.

This is why I feel so deeply the need for Congress to put its house in order. I cannot discount, for example, the extent of the injury Congress has sustained in recent months, in the eyes of the people. The misbehavior of Adam Clayton Powell leaves its stain on the House of Representatives even after Powell himself is denied his seat. The censure of Senator Thomas J. Dodd, as recommended by the select Senate committee which investigated this unfortunate case, will not remove the new doubts created in the public mind concerning the financial dealings of other Senators.

Perhaps there is no way for Congress to protect itself against the fallout damage of such individual cases as these. But we could help to restore popular confidence by adopting a code of ethical standards, including a uniform rule, applicable to all Members, requiring the full disclosure of personal assets.

When a person is nominated to a high Government post, say, a Cabinet office, it is customary for the Senate committee passing judgment on confirmation to require from the nominee a full disclosure of his personal holdings. The purpose, of course, is to determine whether a conflict of interest may exist between the private pocketbook of the nominee and the public responsibilities he is to assume. When we ask, as a safeguard, for such a disclosure from others, we in Congress should be willing to impose a like requirement upon ourselves.

During my first term in office, when I was a freshman Senator, I noted the number of such disclosure bills which were being introduced, and kept waiting for one to be enacted. They just gathered dust. As the months turned to years, and one session of Congress followed upon another without any action being taken, I finally concluded that to wait for the adoption of a disclosure rule, uniformly applicable to all Members, might well mean waiting indefinitely.

So I decided to make a voluntary disclosure of my own, which appeared in the Congressional Record on May 18, 1964. I sent reprints to everyone on my mailing list in Idaho. Nearly 3 years having passed since then, and my financial circumstances having changed somewhat in the interval, I think the time has come to make another accounting to the people of my State.

In doing so, Mr. President, I fully realize that there are many Members of Congress—men of unquestionable integrity—who have strong personal feelings against making public their private holdings. They argue, with much force, that they are as much entitled to own business property, stocks, and bonds, and to invest in commercial ventures, as any other citizen, and that, therefore, their private holdings ought not to be treated as a public affair.

However, I believe that this argument misses the point. Naturally, Members of Congress need not refrain from making investments, as other citizens freely do, so long as no conflict of interest is involved. But since Members of Congress regularly vote on legislation which affects every segment of the economy, there is legitimate reason for making the private holdings of Representatives and Senators a matter of public record. Each Member of Congress, in my judgment, should make a periodic disclosure of his property, his investments, and the sources and amount of his annual income. Then the voters, or anyone else with doubts to resolve, could compare the Member's voting record in office with his financial portfolio, and determine for himself whether the Member has voted his private pocketbook interest or the general public interest, in the discharge of his duties.

Moreover, if periodic disclosures were to reveal an accumulation of wealth without satisfactory explanation, or income which is out of line with listed sources, the voter would be alerted to possible misconduct in office bearing further investigation.

This is a commonsense test. And I have no doubt that the good judgment of the people can be relied upon. I am advised by the Library of Congress that since I made my original declaration 3 years ago, 11 Senators and 25 Representatives have made voluntary disclosures of their personal assets. Some Members of Congress who are rich men have voluntarily listed all of their holdings; certainly those of modest means should be no less willing.

The following statement, Mr. President, brings up to date my earlier disclosure, published in the Congressional Record on May 18, 1964. Now, as then, I hold no interest in any private business; I own no stocks or bonds; I am not a member of any law firm, and have not engaged, directly or indirectly, in the practice of law since my election to the Senate over 10 years ago.

My principal source of income is my salary, amounting to $30,000 a year. Like other Senators, I have to dig deeply into my salary in order to meet the out-of-pocket expense of office for which there is no Government allowance or reimbursement. For this reason, I have had to supplement my salary with earnings from lecture fees and magazine articles. This supplementary income has averaged about $5,000 a year, since 1964.

The combination of salary and supplementary earnings has enabled me to close the gap, in recent years, between income and outgo. My combined savings at the time I entered the Senate, in January 1957, totaled $15,569.23. They had been drawn down to $6,833.17 at the time I made my earlier disclosure. Since then, I have been able to add to them sufficiently to purchase a $10,000 savings certificate, currently bearing 5-percent interest at the First Federal Savings & Loan in Boise, Idaho. This interest constitutes the third, and last, source of my present income.

During my tenure in the Senate, I have also acquired an equity in a brick-and-frame, split-level dwelling house, located in Bethesda, Md., against which there was originally a $30,000 mortgage. As of May 1, 1967, my payments had reduced the principal still owing to $19,142.98. I own, free and clear, the furnishings in the house, together with two automobiles, a Mustang and a Chevrolet. I carry the usual insurance coverage, including medical insurance for my family, and I make a monthly contribution to build my entitlement in the Senate's retirement fund.

Mr. President, it is somewhat chastening to have to acknowledge so modest an estate in this Chamber, which has often been referred to as a "rich man's club." But at least it can be said that I need not worry about conflicts of interest. Besides, I know my situation is typical of that faced by other Members of Congress who must rely mainly on their salaries.

In fact, my family obligations have been lightened in a very helpful way. My late father-in-law, Judge Chase A. Clark, who had enough experience of his own in politics to know its cost, set up separate college accounts for my two sons, Forrest and Chase, his only grandchildren. These accounts, on deposit with the First Federal Savings & Loan in Boise, Idaho, should be sufficient to cover the costs of a college education for both boys.

Finally, my wife, Bethine, has certain property holdings which I think I should list. She is the owner of the family residence at 109 West Idaho Street in Boise, Idaho, and she holds an undivided half interest in the Robinson Bar Guest Ranch near Clayton, Idaho. Upon her father's death, she was the beneficiary of some of the life insurance he carried. She invested the lump-sum insurance proceeds in a $10,000 savings certificate with the Provident Savings & Loan in Boise, Idaho, and deposited the balance, $3,840, in a savings account at the Bank of Idaho. Both the certificate and the account are jointly held, in her name and mine.

One other matter needs attention. Many people may wonder why a Senator's salary is not more than ample. I often wonder, myself. Yet, I find it necessary to supplement my salary, by writing and speaking, just to make ends meet. I say this without complaint, for I am not only opposed to any new increase in salary for Members of Congress, but I have always voted against past increases. The problem does not derive from inadequate pay but from the heavy out-of-pocket costs each Senator must bear.

This problem would be partly alleviated if Senators had expense accounts like businessmen have, or, for that matter, like traveling employees of the Government have. Most people assume that a congressional office involves no special expense, or that the costs are fully covered by Government allowances. Neither assumption is true.

The fact is that only some expenses are covered in full, some in part, and some not at all. For example, I find my allowance for airmail stamps, telegrams, and long-distance telephone calls, entirely sufficient. On the other hand, I know of no Senator, from a large or a small State, whose annual stationery allowance is adequate to meet his need. He must make up the difference from his own pocket.

The situation relative to trips home has improved in recent years. A Senator is now entitled to six round-trip fares annually from Washington to his own State. This will not cover his necessary travel expense, but it is much better than the two trips we used to get. When home, meeting with the people from county to county, a Senator has no expense account to draw on. He pays for his own food, lodging, and travel.

A Senator also wants to be host to constituents from his home State who are visiting Washington. It is pleasantly surprising how many Idahoans come to the Capital each year. When they arrive at my office, they are entitled to be hospitably received. If no more than a plain lunch in the Senate Dining Room is offered, where the prices are very reasonable, my total bill usually runs between $150.00 and $200.00 a month. Unlike businessmen, Senators have no entertainment account. This is another out-of-pocket expense.

Then there are those costs of office which it would be improper, in any case, for the Government to pay. These are peculiar to the nature of the job, and they must be drawn from the Senator's own salary—the statewide newspaper subscriptions, film clips, news photographs, radio tapes—all of which are necessary if effective two-way communication with the State is to be maintained. For most Senators, these costs prove the heaviest drain of all.

This being the squeeze, it is somewhat exasperating to read the extravagant newspaper descriptions of the "fringe benefits" of Congressmen, their cutrate haircuts, or their swimming pool and gymnasium facilities. I want the people of Idaho to know that I use the Senate pool whenever I can find the time. It is the only exercise I get, once or twice a week. The rest is sedentary work—at my desk, in committee, or on the Senate floor—for 10 to 12 hours a day, and longer when unavoidable evening engagements extend the working day until midnight. The weekends I try to spend with my family.

I have discussed the cost of holding office in Congress, not to complain about it, but simply to explain why it is that any Senator who must depend on his salary will do well to break even. There is no hardship or injustice in this; no one should expect to pile up money serving in Congress. It would be wrong if it were otherwise.

But occasionally a Member does "otherwise," and accounts of his misconduct are carried as front-page news from coast to coast. In the eyes of the people, Congress itself is discredited, as the suspicion spreads that such misbehavior is somehow typical. I was dismayed to read, on February 5, 1967, the results of a Gallup poll showing that of the total number of persons surveyed on the question: "Do you think the misuse of Government funds by Congressmen is fairly common or not?" 60 percent of those polled said they felt it was fairly common; 21 percent said "No" and 19 percent had no opinion.

Mr. President, the shocking results of this poll demand our urgent attention. We must delay no longer in adopting a code of ethics, establishing standards for upright conduct which the people have a right to expect from us. We should now adopt a mandatory rule requiring every Senator and Representative, whatever his income may be, to disclose it, together with all of his business interests and property holdings. These disclosures should be made periodically, with affidavit forms provided for the purpose, and with a designated depository where the reports would be available for public review.

The disclosure requirements we impose on others we should willingly assume ourselves. It is time for Congress to end this double standard. The sooner we do, the better.

U.S. TRADE POLICY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, on April 1 of this year, the very able and distinguished minority leader of the Senate [Mr. DIRKSEN] made the featured address at the 18th annual meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc.

The ATMI is a prestigious group of American textile manufacturers from all over the country. Although the textile industry may not be as large in the State of Illinois as other industry groups, and textile manufacturing is certainly not as prevalent there as it is in my home State of South Carolina, the importance of this industry to the Nation as a whole is well recognized by our distinguished leader on this side of the aisle. His address was outstanding, containing valuable observations on the history of trade problems gleened over years of involvement on the congressional level, and interspersed with the characteristic good humor for which Senator DIRKSEN is so well known.

The theme of Senator DIRKSEN's remarks; namely, that the trade policy of the United States jeopardizes the welfare of domestic industries because of its nonreciprocal nature, is certainly well taken. In no single industry is this better known or more apparent than it is in the textile industry. Our domestic textile industry is suffering tremendously from the burden of low-wage imports, rushing in virtually unrestrained from many foreign countries.

The textile industry has never shied away from competition, and the technical know-how and expertise which exists in the textile industry of the United States is second to none. Yet, there is such a thing as fair and unfair competition. The competition from the imports originating in countries where the laborers are paid what in this country would be an unconscionably low, starvation wage makes this the most unfair sort of competition. Foreign governments compound the problem by giving direct and indirect subsidies to their own textile industry, sometimes in devious ways.

Senator Dirksen has issued a challenge to the executive branch of the Government, which administers our foreign trade laws, to require reciprocity in trade dealings with foreign countries. I know that the overwhelming majority of the Members on this side of the aisle subscribe to that proposition. If our country is to remain economically strong and financially stable, we must seize the initiative, and either require the administration to protect the interests of American business in trade negotiations or reassert our congressional authority in this field.

Senator Dirksen's remarks will be of interest to everyone in the country, and particularly to his colleagues in the Congress. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the text of Senator Dirksen's speech before the 18th annual meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

Proceedings, 18th Annual Meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., April 1, 1967, Hollywood Beach Hotel, Hollywood Beach, Fla.

SATURDAY MORNING SESSION, APRIL 1, 1967

Mr. Everett M. Dirksen. President Erwin and distinguished officers and directors of the Institute and members and guests, I am delighted to see you.

I should feel at home here. They had an election in Florida Tuesday (laughter and applause), but I should feel at home for other reasons, as well.

When Justice Tom Clark was still Attorney General of the United States, he called me up one day and said, "Everett, I want your daughter to be the Cotton Bowl Princess when we have this grand affair." Well, I said, "Tom, are you trying to kid me?"

"No," he said, "I am not. I am very serious about it." Well, I said, "I don't fit in. We are not a cotton State."

He said, "Oh, yes, you are. I looked it up in the statistics and I discovered that your State produces 250 bales a year." (Laughter) "You have a compress, two gins in the lower-most part of the County on the Ohio River, and you have an oil mill down there. And that makes you a cotton State." (Laughter)

So, I salute you as one who is in the textile orbit, so to speak, and it ought to make me feel at home. (Laughter)

Perhaps I feel like the Methodist Bishop who was robbed on the streets of Detroit in broad daylight. And when the robber had taken everything of value, he noticed the color of the cloth and with some dismay he said, "Why, you are a preacher." He said, "So I am."

"And in what church do you preach?" "I preach in the Methodist church with great solemnity."

And he just passed a pistol from one hand to the other and boomed out his hand and said, "Shake, old man. That is the church I belong to." (Laughter)

Now, at the very outset, since there is no time limit, I will have to watch you wiggle a little to see whether I talked too long. I have learned long ago that the mind will contain only what the seat will endure. (Laughter)

So, I will watch very, very closely. But I must disabuse you at the outset that I come as an expert, because I am not.

There was a general interest in this country in matters relating to tariffs and protection. I am not so sure that that remains today—at least I have seen no great evidence of it among the generality of people.

I can illustrate by a very simple story. Years ago a tramp or a hobo wandered into a farm yard out in South Dakota and asked whether he could have something to eat. The farmer happened to have come in from the field, and he said, "Such as it is, we will take care of you."

He fed the horses and they went into the house. It was anything but an elaborate place. They sat down to the table. And pretty soon this strange tramp began to make great fun and sport of the home and he even criticized the farmer-wife's clothes.

The result was that the farmer landed in court, and the Judge began to question him a little bit because the tramp was rather badly abused. The farmer had struck him with a heavy piece of cord wood.

The Judge said, "How did you come to do that?" He said, "Well, when he criticized my wife, I didn't care. When he talked about our modest home, I didn't care. When he made some real criticism of the food, it didn't bother me. But, Judge, when he said something about the tariff, that is when I hit him." (Laughter.)

When we speak of tariff and protection, we are speaking, generally, of jobs in the country. And when you look at the rate of growth, the population growth, the influx of people from all over the world, there must be jobs and there must be something that will sustain life if they are to maintain the living standards that are obtained in this country today.

Now, I am not going to make you a speech this morning. This is just going to be a visit, and there will be a little chronology of it.

I go back to 1934 when I was in the House of Representatives. At that time, we enacted the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. It was sponsored in the main by Cordell Hull, a distinguished Secretary of State who had served in the House and also in the Senate of the United States.

It was with some misgiving that I voted for that, wondering, of course, whether or not we were going to forfeit all the protective devices that the country needed so that our industry could properly flourish and carry on.

But that was my first experience in a discussion of tariff matters and of free trade. I soon discovered that my own constituents, who were in business and in industry, were not going to have adequate protection against imports, so I appeared before the Committee on Reciprocity Information.

Well, it was a rather strange business because this Committee had within its power, because we had delegated that power, the authority to select commodities and then bargain with other countries in the world.

And when we made our protest, I discovered later that it was a rather cavalier performance, to say the least, because I learned they listened respectfully enough and afterward looked upon us with some disdain. And I call that a rather cavalier performance.

Now, there came successive extensions of the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, sometimes for a year, sometimes for two years, sometimes for three years.

We went along to finally enact to so-called International Wheat Agreement. I discovered from the farm groups in the wheat belt that it serves very little purpose today. But there again it was a question of whacking up the world market and giving everybody a shake.

I don't mind when we do that. But I want to be sure that it is on something of a reciprocal basis.

I sat in on all the deliberations and discussions when we enacted the International Coffee Agreement. I was not a bit happy with the protective devices that we included in it, and the State Department and others in the administration really bore down on members of the Senate with respect to that agreement.

We were not satisfied with a kind of format and formula that had been worked out with respect to quotas and prices, because if we needed more coffee in this country, we didn't want them to take advantage and then close the quota and let these prices go up beyond that which the housewife felt that she justifiably ought to pay.

And that is precisely what happened, and pretty soon coffee began to move into the dollar and dollar twenty cent a pound bracket because here was a medium of control which had been set up by the International Agreement.

In due time, we got around to GATT, G-A-T-T, the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs which was negotiated in Rome. It all seems so remote to our people. I can go back home and ask the first 100 people whether they know what GATT is, and probably not over one out of the hundred will have the slightest notion—that is rather singular.

But here is an undertaking that is going to have a tremendous impact upon this country before we get through, and it is not remote at all.

We get the idea that sometimes these things are remote, like the young man who went to write an examination to become a mail carrier. And one of the questions was, "How far is the sun from the earth?" He hadn't the slightest idea. And, finally, after some deliberation, he wrote down, "Far enough so it won't interfere with me in the duty of carrying mail." (Laughter)

Well, it was a good answer. Most of our people think that is so remote and so far away that it can have no impact whatsoever upon their livelihood and upon what they do in the business interest and the industrial interest that they pursue. Well, it is a reality today.

And in all this time, we came along with the Foreign Air Program. Guess what the Foreign Aid Program has cost this country. I am speaking with some authority, because last year I managed to chop 250 million out of that program on the floor of the Senate. (Applause.)

I can say to you that my friend, the President, didn't like it. (Laughter)

We have expended on the Foreign Aid Program in the last twenty-two years 140 thousand million of your money. That is "billion" to you—140 billion dollars.

We have done pretty well by all the countries on the face of the earth that needed any aid or assistance, whatsoever.

And we shouldn't be so shy and so timid and so reluctant about asking a few favors and a little protection for ourselves in our present and our future welfare. (Applause.)

We have now set up a series of Development Banks—one for Asia, the Inter-American Bank for Latin America, and then we have a General International Development Bank. And who do you think is the largest subscriber to the capital stock of these Banks? It is the United States of America.

And when we get others to put a little capital into the Banks, they are ready then to loan money. And your country doesn't get any of the money, because it has been designed to help countries that are regarded as in need or under-developed—but it is a great scheme.

And, of course, the latest one now is the one in Asia where we are going to help develop the Mekong River and make that country blossom as the rose.

I have been out there several times, and this is going to be worth going miles to see. (Laughter)

Now, in this period, in order to help people everywhere, we put on the statute books Public Law No. 480. It was designed to help dispose of our surpluses—corn and wheat and cotton and peanuts and soybean and anything else that is in the granary of this country. It has become quite a large operation.

And so, when we want to help a country particularly, we will say, "Yes, we will make available to you a billion tons of wheat and we will take your currency in return. Now, of course, we will give you back half of your currency so you can spend it on projects in your country."

We will take half. And with that half, maybe, "There are some defense highways we would like to improve because we think they are conducive to the security of our country. And then maybe we can build an Embassy out of this currency of yours or anything else that you let us do."

I thought a great gimmick would be to let every tourist who went from here abroad buy that currency out of the Federal treasury with dollars and leave the dollars at home.

And what do you think the Secretary of the Treasury said? "Why, they will not tolerate it. They do not want our tourists to buy their currencies here. They want them to bring the dollars over there and buy the currency there and leave the dollars."

And those dollars become a charge upon your country and, very tragically, affect the balance of trade that bothers us to no end in the nation's Capitol today.

And, so, that was just another device that we used to help the worker.

And then came the Trade Expansion Act. Your officers and directors and your members are quite familiar with it.

I remember the long hearings we held. I was on the Committee at the time. And we tried to write a Congressional intent into it, notwithstanding the fact that the Act had been slightly mangled at the request of the Administration by removing the so-called "peril point clause" and, likewise, the "escape clause."

It is an amazing thing to express Congressional intent in a statute and then have it so widely ignored, ofttimes by the Executive Branch of Government.

One of the great statesmen who came to Washington from this area—and I use the word "great" advisedly—was Senator Walter George of Georgia. We were great friends.

Long ago he was Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee and later that Chairmanship went into the hands of another distinguished statesman, Harry Byrd of Virginia. It was Senator Byrd who demanded that I come on the Committee. As a matter of fact, I didn't want to do so, but I listened to his entreaty and finally did.

One day while Senator George and I were walking back to the Senate Office Building, he turned to me and said, "Dirksen, the greatest problem in this country today is to get the Washington bureaucracy to carry out the intent of Congress," and he was everlastingly right.

So, we write these things in the statutes and then you discover that they are not carried out after all or they are perverted or they are twisted or they are ignored so that the intent becomes nothing more than a fiction.

Now, to this list, besides the Trade Expansion Act, there is a new gimmick—it is in the works now—and they say that it is the International Grains Act. And what do you think they are going to do? They are going to determine who are the agricultural consuming countries and who are the producing countries. And then they are going to slice up and divide the markets of the world.

And if they succeed, they are going to say to our country, "You can export so much wheat to this country and so much to that country and no more, because that is going to be your quota."

You see, that is the way agriculture goes down the drain.

Is it any wonder that Charles Shuman, President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, has stated publicly and privately that the GATT negotiators ought to come back home and forsake their labors? Because it appears something is going to happen to the American farmer, he is already caught in the vise of the Common Market and all we have to do is sell him down the river under this GATT proposal.

And then watch the American farmer squawk at what has been done to him by his Government and those who always give America second place, who want to do good abroad and fairly denude us of the high standards that we have set through the enterprise and the genius of America.

Now, these are the things that have happened over a period of time. Now, there has been an unfoldment, of course, here and we have to look at that a little bit.

I go back to 1917 when I was a soldier on the Western Front. You see, that is three and a half wars ago. (Laughter)

We have, first, World War I then we had World War II; then we had World War II½ in Korea; and now we have got War III½ or III out in Viet Nam. A lot of things have happened since then.

The tremendous expansion of the industrial and agricultural branch of the United States of America—what a tribute and what a testimonial to the enterprise system of this country and to the genius of the American people.

It is an even greater testimonial to the fact that here we have the moral climate of freedom where the talent can be summoned up in any individual who has a spark of energy, and there is no limit to the horizon that he can attain because opportunity is here.

That is the prize thing that has been vouchsafed to us by God Almighty. If it ever fails or falters, then, of course, you can probably begin to write an epitaph for free America.

Now, in this scheme, we have gotten to the point where we could develop surpluses, oh, without limit and how we cudgeled our heads and our thoughts and sought devices to deal with surplus commodities, the result of the beneficence of the soil and the genius of the American producer. We had to do something even in time of war.

We could sustain the other nations that were allied with us because we simply compounded the slogan, "Food will win the War," and how right it was. No soldier is worthy of his sword if he isn't adequately fed and his energy sustained to do a hard and difficult job.

But after our experiences in war and, particularly, World War II, how strange that the victors became the losers and the losers became the winners.

Do I make myself clear?

Well, George C. Marshall, Secretary of State, went up to Harvard and made a speech twenty-two years ago, and there was only one paragraph in that speech which became the predicate for the Foreign Aid Program. He took the position that unless we rehabilitated and sustained the War-decimated countries of Europe, the chances are that Europe would go bankrupt, it would fail and it might fairly conceivably be overwhelmed by this brutal ideology that we refer to as Communism.

And, so, we pitched in and we tapped the American pocketbook and we sent out people everywhere to make sure that this disastrous blow would not fall. And in the doing, we undertook to rehabilitate, including their industry, so that today we can lift our eyes like Ishmael did in the wilderness and we can see new plants and new machinery and new equipment in the other competing countries of the world, much of it done with the aid of the American people.

I don't mind so long as our people are not forgotten in the scheme of things.

We used to find comfort in the fact that our quality was so overriding that other countries simply couldn't match us.

My friends, I am not sure. It is now two years ago that I went over to McCormick Auditorium on the front of Lake Michigan in Chicago to see the International Machinery Institute Show. You never saw better products.

And when I said to some of our people who belong to the Allied Machinery Institute that, "Maybe these things had flaws," people who were knowledgeable in that field said, "Don't you kid yourself. They are turning out a quality product today and they are real competition."

I have a friend who is in the business of running four or five hosiery mills, knitting particularly hose for children. I saw him on the street in Chicago a couple of years ago. I said, "Henry, what gives here?" He said, "Well, I am on my way to Japan."

I said, "What are you going to do over there?" He said, "I am going to buy myself a couple of mills." He was thinking of the labor disparity. And so, he thought they would help him some.

Well, when I saw him next, I said, "Did you buy those mills?" He said, "Indeed not." I said, "Now what?" He said, "I am going over to Belgium and to Holland and to Germany and to France and maybe I can pick up a mill over there."

When I saw him last, he hadn't bought a mill. But he continues to run his mills against some real hard competition.

And, so, let nobody think that they are not producing quality goods among the countries abroad.

The American market, of course, is the great lure in this world today. That is why every country on earth wants to get into it. And with the disparity in labor cost and other items, it gives you cause for concern.

Now, these things that have unfolded elsewhere in the world, including all that we put on the statute books have developed some real problems and some practices abroad, and we just as well survey them realistically as not.

Well, I mentioned the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and how cavalier it all seems and how little weight our protests and our limitations had with those who were running that operation.

I think now again of agriculture. One-fifth of all the products of agriculture in this country must be exported in order to have a prosperous agriculture.

Now, between the Common Market and GATT, I am not sure what is going to happen to the American farmer. But I am glad to see that on one front the Administration has backed up a little.

Along with my opposite number, Congressman Ford of Michigan, who is the Republican leader in the House of Representatives, we went on all of the TV networks to state our case, and we complained of the fact, as your distinguished Executive Vice President here said, the great rise in dairy products in this country from roughly 900 million four years ago to an estimated four billion pounds in 1967.

What are they doing in Wisconsin? And, probably, the fever will catch on in Minnesota. Farmers are having to ride milk trucks with shotguns to keep their neighbors away. That is their way of protesting the colossal drop in what they have gotten for their products.

And so, the Secretary of Agriculture, as I heard him the night before last on television, said that something ought to be done about the imports that are coming into this country and have a real impact upon the price of dairy products and have, consequently, lowered the price that the farmer receives.

We had a steel breakfast in Washington. About 300 members of the House and Senate attended. I never expected to live to see the day when the United States Steel Corporation, the largest producer of steel anywhere in the world, should through its President come before that breakfast meeting and make a plea for some protection because of the importation of steel. You could have struck me down with a feather when one morning the Vice President of U.S. Steel and the Vice-President of the Steelworkers Union walked in my Capitol office arm in arm and jointly joined in that plea.

The growth of steel capacity in other countries of the world promises even more pressure on our market.

Now, of course, you are concerned with what is going to happen over at GATT. You see, in 1962, the twenty-three nations got together and they set this in motion, the machinery for establishing textile trade levels and negotiating bilateral trade agreements.

Well, if I understand correctly, American textiles are almost barred in the markets of fifty countries in the world and, on the basis of duties and non-tariff barriers and taxes, may come close to being barred in the markets of still another twenty countries.

That is, indeed, an unhappy picture, so far as the future is concerned.

And these barriers, these non-tariff barriers, are really something because they have a genius all their own that they can use in adding to the regular tariff barriers to keep our products out.

Now, I mentioned the labor cost and the great disparity between this country and others which is largely responsible for the large volume of imports of textiles of all kinds.

Man-made fabrics have jumped by 350 percent since 1962. Woolen fabrics have jumped by 250 percent. And cotton fabrics by 200 percent.

All of that is finally going to have to be equated in terms of jobs, because if that is the way it is now, what will it be like in terms of square yards, whether it is a man-made fabric or whether it is wool or whether it is cotton, as the years begin to unfold?

And what a rather strange and perverse thing we do. Here we pass a particular statute to rehabilitate the Appalachian area—probably about eleven States. And in those States, twenty-six percent of the manufacturing jobs were in the textile apparel or man-made fiber industries.

So, what happens? When imports are heavy, what happens to the jobs up there? Now, you would think we would go to the source, we would go to the root cause. But do we? We put upon the books a Poverty Program and we hand it to Sargent Shriver. We give him several billions of dollars and say, "Now, go into Appalachia and any other place in the country and you cure poverty and see whether you cannot create some jobs for the people."

That is when the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing, a strange thing to say the least.

Now, what has actually happened? What are some of the root reasons?

Well, frankly, my friends, one is the nature of the statistics that come out of Government. I have done a good deal of work on it. I know there are some members of the Department of Commerce in this audience this morning, and I am glad they are here.

It is several years ago that I started a one-man crusade to give to industry and to the public honest figures where values are equated so that everybody will have a fair chance.

When imports come in, they don't come in on an F.O.B., free-on-board, basis. They come in on a C.I.F. basis, which is quite a different thing, credit, insurance and freight. And, of course, you can add a few more things.

But no less an Agency of the United States Tariff Commission said that if you want to get a real, solid trade figure, you are going to have to multiply those trade figures, so far as imports are concerned, by 110 percent in order to get a figure that is comparable to our exports.

And what are the figures today? I can give them to you. These were published on the 25th of January, 1967. Now, I can't afford to give you a bogus figure. So, I got this from the Department of Commerce. (Laughter.) Here is their export figure.

Our exports, in round figures, are $28.9 billion. Our imports, $25.5 billion. Draw the line and do your own arithmetic.

So, our trade balance, according to this, is 3.4 billion. Pretty good. Nobody will quarrel, particularly. It could be a little larger.

But is it realistic? Can you rely on it? The answer is, "No," and I want to make it emphatic. (Laughter.)

First, suppose we deduct all the non-commercial things that we export, that are financed not privately by your industry and others but by the Government of the United States out of the Federal treasury. What does it amount to? This is their figure, 2.9 billion.

So, now, what happens to this rather fancy trade balance? Well, it has suddenly skidded to only 456 million. That is a half a billion instead of about three and a half billion.

Now, suppose we take the Tariff Commission's suggestion and analyze that figure. They said you will have to add ten percent. So, let us add 2.1 billion in order to put import figures in line.

And then where are you? We have not a trade balance but a trade deficit of 2.1 billion dollars. That is a different story; isn't it?

I have been fighting with the Secretary of Commerce for quite some time, but I will assure you right here and now that we are going to get those figures and make sure they are published on an equated basis so that they make sense or, otherwise, my name isn't Dirksen. I can assure you of that. (Applause.)

The Trade Expansion Act will expire on the 30th of June. And I am happy to know that the distinguished Chairman, Senator Russell Long of Louisiana has already given assurances that we are going to have some hearings in depth and find out where we are.

And when that comes, I do want to take a look at that peril point clause that we have always carried in foreign trade and tariff proposals.

You see, one of the things that happened was that in connection with GATT in May of 1963, I believe before we even complied with what we wrote in the Trade Expansion Act, we gave assurances to the negotiators in Geneva that we would go along with a linear fifty percent cut across the board, and then they use the phrase that I take right out of context and quote to you, "with bare exceptions," and believe me they are bare exceptions. (Laughter.)

So, I am going to have to look at that.

But why was that assurance given almost a year before they complied with the intent of the law and had the Tariff Commission first make an investigation and make—a report to the President of the United States?

Well, that is a question that I want to answer. And I suppose our new Ambassador, Mr. Roth, who has been in my office a number of times, will be brought back from Geneva to answer some of these questions. He is our chief negotiator.

He has been making the rounds. And he wanted to see me just before I came away from Washington. Unfortunately, my time was pretty well preempted and there was no opportunity to see him the last time.

However, by these fast planes, it will be no great difficulty to get Mr. Roth to come back from Geneva. (Laughter.)

So, these are the things that are happening—ignoring the intent of the law as we wrote it; and then cutting corners, even as the Tariff Commission did on Section 332 which calls for investigations; and then the non-tariff barriers that somehow they regard with too little emphasis; and then the valuations and the efforts to get around our anti-dumping statutes; and the failure to impose duties.

These are the problems with which your industry is wrestling today, and in the Congress we make some point of it.

Now, all of this is happening because we have lost track of a word, and that word is "reciprocity."

I am not so blind to the realities of this world as to feel that we could exist exclusively in an isolated way and not pay attention to the other countries on earth. There must be trade in the very nature of things.

But we ask only one thing, and that is that it be absolutely, unqualifiedly reciprocal in nature, and that it be so equated that it will be fair to all and especially fair to the people and to the industries of the United States of America.

So, the Congress, I think, has failed. It has a responsibility here, too. We tried to put that peril point back when the Trade Expansion Act was before us and we failed. We tried to put the escape clause back, and we failed.

And then, of course, there is another thing. I think the time has come to ride herd on the United States Tariff Commission. They probably won't like to hear me say it. But if I think it right when I say it, why don't I say it? (Applause and laughter.)

Years ago, and I don't know how I ever contrived it, but I got a man from one of the towns in my old congressional district on the Tariff Commission. I won't even tell you his name.

After about a year and a half he quit. He came up to me and poured out his heart to me and to tell me what was happening. I am not even going to burden you with that story. But it was enough.

And after I heard it and after I heard a little more from still other members, then I decided then that perhaps we are going to have to ride herd on that Agency on which we have to depend so much.

So, that is one of the things that has to be done now.

Now, I have got an answer here to some of these problems. First, an investigation in depth. It must be done. And we must call everybody who can throw some light on it and put the solid truth out there where all of the people and all of the industries of this country and very notably the textile industry can see. Then you would know what the principles are with which you have to wrestle, and know the lines within which you have to work.

Secondly, I think we might very well consider—and I give this to you only tentatively, the possibility of excluding textiles from the Kennedy Round. They have been at it now for a long time over in Geneva.

But suppose they cut you fifty percent, linearily across the board? It is going to have a tremendous impact. You measure it. You know better than I do what it will be like.

You have asked for an extension of the International Cotton Agreement. Well, you know, we have bartered away enough advantages in the cotton domain to the people abroad. But if there is some advantage in keeping this on a fair and equitable basis to our own textile industry then, of course, I could support it.

We have contrived now to install another approach and we do it through the House of Representatives rather than the Senate because tariff measures and all tax measures usually originate in the House of Representatives.

So, we are working now to set up a Committee on Export Control. We have no such Committee in the House or the Senate. It is one of those jobs that needs a refined and diligent approach, if you are going to do a good job.

And I think that such a Committee would serve a very useful purpose for all of American industry and, certainly, for the textile industry.

And now, apropos the U.S. Tariff Commission, I rather fancy, because of the size and the importance of the job that they do, that perhaps that Tariff Commission ought to be expanded.

Why not start with five members, one from the north, one east, one south, one west and one mid-west? And then why not add another five members, one labor, one industry, one agriculture, one business and one consumer? And then why not some advisory members without a vote and put on another five—that is fifteen.

When you stop to consider the importance of the reports that the Commission makes to the President of the United States and to the Congress, it could well stand additional members, all of whom should diligently do their homework in order to make sure that American industry in this competitive world is going to be fairly treated.

Now, then, America has come of age. But, more importantly, the world has come of age, too. And that makes quite a difference.

As I mentioned before, once we thought we were competition-proof. Let us not be too sure, and especially when they are producing with our money, our loans and so often with our machinery. We have helped to rehabilitate them and probably sharpened the competition for ourselves.

This is the lush market, the one lush market on the face of the earth. And do we give our people an equitable chance to operate here fairly against the competition that comes from all over the world?

I should mention one other thing. It seems strange that when the industry and their salesmen of other countries go abroad and try to move into those markets, they do not get the hostility of their governments, rather, they get the aid of their governments, sometimes in the form of subsidies.

I am afraid at times our Government hasn't been quite so generous or so charitable. I can cite one case, and that is the so-called banana problem—maybe you are familiar with it.

Here was a boy aged six who came from Poland long ago and in due course landed in New Orleans and got a job as a train dispatcher. There he saw an opportunity to pick up bananas at shipside, load them into a car and then send a dispatch to every way station on the railroad going up, and then people would come out and buy their bananas. That is how United Fruit was established, the biggest banana organization anywhere in the world.

Now, all you have to do is go to Honduras and Guatemala and see the job that they have done for the people. The commissaries, the schools, the work that they provide, the wages that they pay. Why, those people there were honored to work for United Fruit. And they got every possible benefit that the corporation could provide.

And then one fine day there came a complaint, and what happened? It wasn't that the complaint came from down there. It was that a competitive complaint came from up here and our own Department of Justice had to indict the United Fruit Company, notwithstanding all the good that they have done.

I went to the Secretary of State and I complained as bitterly as I could. I don't own a share of stock in United Fruit, and I only know two or three people in that organization. But I know when something is wrong and when something is right.

You don't find foreign governments indicting their producers, their suppliers, their salesmen and their businessmen. No. They stand in their corner and help them whenever they can.

I think our Government could be just a little more charitable than it has been so far as business and industry in this country is concerned in connection with their ventures abroad.

I will be through in a minute.

You see, it was my pleasure to serve on a very distinguished Sub-Committee of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate. It was known as the Sub-Committee on Monopoly and Anti-Trust. The Chairman of that Committee was a distinguished Tennessean. His name was Estes Kefauver of late and lamented memory. I had a great affection for him. My affection was as wide and as deep as was my disagreement with him. (Laughter.)

Four years we probed the drug industry of this country. And then not satisfied began to probe the operations of the American drug companies in Venezuela and other countries.

And, so, we had to probe them and make it more difficult, and put all the data, all the statistical evidence and all the evidence before the Department of Justice.

I do not know what will be the ultimate result. I am reasonably confident that it will be exactly nothing. They didn't want to go down there to begin with. They were invited to come and in some quarters they were urged to go.

Well, let us show a little of that charity and think of America, because, if we don't, who shall say in what future day and, God forbid, if it ever comes to pass, but who shall say when America, as we knew it, will suddenly take on a new form and be something quite different from what we inherited.

I do not want to see that day come. You see, I have got something to work for and live for so long as I am around these days. I have got a couple of grandchildren. They live over there in Tennessee when they are not up in Washington. Their father has got the smell of politics in his nostrils. (Laughter.)

It is rather something to have a father-in-law and a son-in-law as in-law makers in the United States Senate. (Laughter.) But that is what is happening.

But I think of them and, on other occasions, I used to go down there and do a little gardening, my only delight, my only recreation, and they would follow me around, one granddaughter and one grandson. We would sit down on the grass and, after some time, then came the question—and, of course, I used to lecture them a little, too. I talked to them as if I were Earl Warren on the Supreme Court (laughter). They didn't understand a word I said (laughter).

But under my breath I used to say to them, "Sonny, your great-grandpappy came from the old country. Your grandpappy was born here. They have had an opportunity in this country and I don't want to see it fail. I do not want to see it impaired. And I want to make what contribution I can so that you and Sissy will have as good a country, as free a country, a country as filled with opportunity, a country as free as possible from undue Government regulation and Government insistence."

And, so, I have taken some interest in your problems in the textile business, inasmuch as my State is a cotton-producing State. (Laughter)

But it goes a little further than that. In my own city, Pekin, Illinois, which is named after Pekin, China, because it is on the same parallel of latitude, we have one of the largest corn products refining company mills anywhere in the country. In Illinois we have another mill almost equally as large. At Decatur, Illinois, we have the Staley Starch Works. And, once upon a time, I worked in the corn products refining company in my home town—that is when I got out of high school. No bank or railroad offered me the presidency after I graduated. (Laughter) So, I went to work in the starch mill.

I tried to find out all about it. And then I discovered how much starch was freighted out of my town to North Carolina and to South Carolina and to other States in the union to be used in the textile industry.

So, there are lots of suppliers who have an interest in the well-being of your industry, as well as the Minority Leader of the United States Senate.

So, that interest must be pursued because it is genuine and it is worthwhile. And it will determine, finally, if we do it fairly and on a reciprocal basis, whether we will have the kind of country we ought to have or whether we do not.

So, let me close with this thought: During World War II, the English began to send children from England to Canada, largely because of the V-1's and the V-2's. I remember being in London when we were bombed by these hideous weapons, and what a ghastly business it was. And, so, they sought to send them to safe haven in Canada.

They had a shipload that started out and, tragically, that ship with all the children was torpedoed in the North Atlantic just off the Irish coast.

Before it left, some person with great vision and great perception had supplied every one of those children with a little booklet. That booklet contained the quotations from the great people produced in England over a period of years.

And after the torpedo struck and those children were floundering in the icy water in the Atlantic, their troubled cries could be heard shouting the title of this book, for it was very simple, "There Will Always be an England."

I want to be able to say, "There Always Will be an America."

But let us go a little further. Let us say in America that it is fair always to its people, to its industries, to its labor, to its business, to its farmers and asks nothing more than just, fair, reciprocal treatment from the rest of the world with whom we must deal.

You have been very patient. I hope I didn't belabor you too long.

Thank you so much.

(Applause.)

AID PROGRAMS AND THE U.S. BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the international accounts of the United States have given cause for concern over at least the past 8 years. Our problem has been how to increase our foreign receipts or diminish our foreign expenditures, or both. Moreover, that problem has had to be tackled in such a way that we did not sacrifice too many of the purposes for which we undertake international dealings. In the main, we have succeeded very well.

Today, I wish to draw attention to a notable example of achieving our purposes without damage to our stability. That is in the matter of U.S. foreign aid. I make this report all the more willingly because in the past I have been critical of many of the operations of the Agency.

The actuality is that our AID programs have created a diminishing burden on our balance of payments. Mr. Gaud, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, has presented an analysis of the effect. The net impact of the AID programs and the balance of payments was estimated at $934 million in fiscal year 1961. The estimate for fiscal year 1968 is only $107 million.

This achievement is remarkable. People who are constantly talking about "squandering our dollars overseas" should stop and take notice. The result has been brought about by a careful supervision of the actual expenditures. In fiscal year 1968, no less than 97 percent of the commodity expenditures are being made in the United States, and the U.S. share of the total expenditures is expected to be 87 percent. It is difficult to see how offshore procurement can be much further limited since AID's contributions to U.N. agencies and other international organizations are included in the total and our control over these latter expenditures is naturally less strict.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Administrator of AID, Mr. William S. Gaud, on the balance-of-payments effects of his Agency's expenditures, and our accompanying correspondence, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the correspondence were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AID AND THE BALANCE OF PAYMENT

During the Marshall Plan and most of the 1950's, aid appropriations were generally spent wherever prices were lowest. For the first few years after the war, the United States was the only major source for most of the goods needed by aid recipients. Consequently, most aid dollars were spent in this country even though they were not tied to U.S. procurement.

This situation changed as the revived European economies became increasingly effective competitors for U.S. aid purchases. By 1959 only 40% of our aid dollars were being spent on U.S. goods and services.

Beginning in 1959, in order to improve the U.S. balance of payments, we began to limit our policy of world-wide procurement. Today, funds are spent primarily in the United States for goods and services procured in this country. The only elements in the A.I.D. program not specifically tied to U.S. goods and services are salaries and payments to A.I.D. overseas personnel and contractors (only part of which is spent abroad), limited offshore procurement for A.I.D. administrative purposes, and A.I.D.'s contributions to UN agencies and other international organizations (part of which is used in any case for the purchase of goods and services in this country).

In FY 1968, the U.S. share of total A.I.D. expenditures is expected to reach 87%, with 97% of commodity expenditures being made in the United States. The net impact of the A.I.D. program on the balance of payments in FY 1968 is estimated at $107 million, as compared to $934 million in FY 1961.

This change has been brought about by the aggressive steps which A.I.D. has taken in recent years to minimize the balance-of-payments costs of its programs. These steps fall into three general categories—(a) expansion of A.I.D.'s tied procurement regulations; (b) measures to improve U.S. export additionally, both in the context of A.I.D. programs and generallly; and (c) use of local currencies.

TIGHTENING OF TIED PROCUREMENT REGULATIONS

Loan financing

To assure that A.I.D. funds are used for the purchase of goods and services in the United States, A.I.D. has progressively tied *all* loans to U.S. procurement. Exceptions are possible only if waivers are approved by inter-agency committees and signed by the A.I.D. Administrator. There are no current exceptions.

Grant financing

Virtually all grant procurement is also tied to U.S. goods and services—procurement is limited to the United States and eight Asian and African less-developed countries. These commodities are paid for in local currencies. But arrangements are made to purchase in the United States a dollar-equivalent amount of U.S. goods under Special Letters of Credit. These arrangements are used almost exclusively for security-related foreign procurement for Vietnam and are estimated at about $75 million in FY 1967.

Local cost financing

In some instances, A.I.D. pays part of the local costs of A.I.D.-financed projects. In countries where the United States does not already have available local currency in excess of U.S. requirements, dollars must be used to obtain the local currency to cover any project costs which A.I.D. may finance. Since 1963, A.I.D. has moved progressively to tie these dollars to U.S. procurement by using Special Letters of Credit good only in payment of goods and services originating in the United States.

There are only three elements of the A.I.D. program, then, which still have a significant impact on our balance of payments:

1. *Salaries and other payments to A.I.D. overseas direct-hire personnel and contractors.* A.I.D. direct-hire personnel and contractors working overseas have to spend money for living expenses and other local costs. Their salaries and payments cannot, of course, be tied to U.S. procurement, but only part of these funds is spent abroad. The estimate for the FY 1968 program is about $125 million. Little can be done to reduce this amount materially, although A.I.D. is continuing efforts to increase the use of local currencies where they are available.

2. *Minimum foreign procurement for A.I.D. administrative expenses.* A very small amount of A.I.D. funds ($10 million of FY 1968 funds) is used to make local purchases of items necessary for administration of the program which cannot be imported from the United States. Here again, available local currencies are used whenever possible.

3. *A.I.D.'s contribution to UN agencies and other international organizations.* Although A.I.D. is exploring ways in which a portion of these contributions may be formally tied to U.S. procurement, little can be done about contributions to international organizations under the existing practices and procedures of these organizations. Even without formal tying, however, the true balance-of-payments impact of the contributions is reduced by the expenditures of those organizations for U.S. goods and services, even though under Department of Commerce ground rules the contributions are charged in full against the balance of payments. In practice, over two-thirds, about $100 million annually, of these contributions are spent in the U.S.

The classic case is that of the Indus Basin Development Fund. The United States contributes 44% of the foreign exchange needed by the IBRD to finance the construction of the Indus Basin projects. The entire amount of the U.S. contribution is counted as a drain on the balance of payments, even though 54% of the foreign exchange costs of contracts under the Indus Funds have been let to U.S. firms for construction or consultant activities.

A.I.D.'s expenditures as measured by the "accounting" method

One way to measure the impact of A.I.D.'s expenditures on the balance of payments—the way used by the Department of Commerce in preparing its balance-of-payments figures and which might be called the "accounting" approach—is to look at the direct result of A.I.D. spending. To what extent are aid dollars spent directly in this country, and to what extent are they spent abroad or paid to an international organization? To what extent are offshore expenditures offset by repayments to the United States of principal and interest on prior-year loans?

In FY 1963 A.I.D.'s offshore expenditures totaled $799 million. In that year the Agency made a commitment as part of the U.S. balance-of-payments program to reduce its offshore expenditures to not more than $500 million by FY 1965. That goal was reached. In FY 1965 they were $411 million. Despite the greatly expanded Vietnam program, offshore expenditures were held to $503 million in FY 1966 and, as a result of A.I.D.'s further tightening of tied procurement regulations, expenditures are estimated at only $378 million in FY 1967 and $319 million in FY 1968.

These offshore figures are on a *gross* basis. They do not take into account the fact that each year the United States receives payments on loans made by A.I.D. and its predecessors. Such payments totaled $173 million in FY 1965 and $183 million in FY 1966, and are estimated at $203 million and $212 million, respectively, in FY 1967 and FY 1968. Offsetting these payments against the *gross* figures of $411 million, $503 million, $378 million and $319 million for FY 1965 through FY 1968 leaves corresponding *net* figures for those years of $238 million, $320 million, $175 million and $107 million.

In percentage terms, total A.I.D. expenditures for goods and services in the United States rose from 41% in FY 1961 to about 77% in FY 1966. For the current fiscal year, this percentage will rise to about 84% and for FY 1968 is expected to reach 87%. These percentages would, of course, be higher if the total A.I.D. contributions to international organizations (currently about 7% of total A.I.D. outlays) were offset by those organizations' expenditures in the United States, rather than being treated, as they are, as offshore expenditures.

Calculated on the basis of expenditures which will result from current commitments, rather than on the basis of current expenditures (made in part as a result of prior-year commitments), and including that portion of contributions to international organizations which will buy goods and services in the United States, total A.I.D. funds recorded as spent in the United States have risen to over 90%, a level which cannot be increased significantly.

The dramatic rise in the proportion of recorded A.I.D. expenditures in the United States is even more apparent when expenditures for commodities alone are examined. A.I.D. expenditures for commodities purchased domestically rose from 44% in FY 1961 to about 90% in FY 1966. A.I.D. commodity expenditures currently being made in the United States are now above 90% and are expected to rise to about 97% in FY 1968 as tightened A.I.D. procurement measures take effect and remaining expenditures from prior-year commitments are liquidated.

This improvement in aid-tying has not, of course, been achieved without cost. Individual commodities financed by A.I.D. and, therefore, produced in the United States, may cost an aid recipient as much as 50% more—including higher transportation costs—than if they were bought elsewhere at world market prices. A.I.D. has estimated that the value of the average aid dollar to the recipient is decreased by at least 15%-20% as result of tying.

ENSURING ADDITIONALITY OF U.S. EXPORTS

The true economic effect on the balance of payments of the A.I.D. program (or of any other program involving overseas expenditures) cannot be determined as simply as the "accounting" method suggests. There are indirect effects not revealed by the direct accounts.

Many dollars contributed under the A.I.D. program to UN agencies, for example, come back through regular commercial channels for purchases of U.S. goods. Also, dollars which go out and enter the economy of a less-developed country may later be used by that country to buy needed goods in the U.S. market. Or they may go through trade channels to a third country which will use them to purchase goods here.

These are examples of the so-called "feedback" or "re-flow" which comes from overseas spending. They demonstrate that the "accounting" method overstates the effect of aid outflows on the U.S. balance of payments because the outflows are to a considerable extent soon reflected in increased U.S. export sales.

But there is another indirect effect in the opposite direction. When an aid recipient buys U.S. goods financed by A.I.D. under a tying arrangement, it may be buying goods that it would otherwise have brought with dollars it already owns. The latter dollars—free foreign exchange—can then be used for other purchases either in the United States or elsewhere. When purchases are made elsewhere, the U.S. balance of payments may be adversely affected, although (because of the re-spending effect) not necessarily by the full amount of third country purchases.

This is the so-called "substitution"—effect meaning that A.I.D.—financed purchases are sometimes substituted for purchases that would otherwise have been made with "free dollars." To the extent that this takes place, the "accounting" method understates the adverse effect of the A.I.D. program on the balance of payments.

Simply tying procurement to U.S. sources may not, therefore, be fully effective in reducing the impact of the A.I.D. program on the balance of payments. Having already gone about as far as possible in tying procurement to U.S. goods and services, A.I.D. has undertaken a wide variety of measures to ensure that A.I.D.-financed exports will be additional to, rather than a substitute for, exports that would have occurred without A.I.D. financing. A.I.D. has include U.S. export promotion as an important factor in selecting capital projects and commodities for A.I.D. financing and has stressed in other ways the urgent necessity of minimizing the impact of A.I.D. programs on the U.S. balance of payments. Moreover, U.S. Embassy commercial staffs in the more important aid-recipient countries have been or are being strengthened.

Project and commodity selection criteria

A.I.D. is paying increasingly close attention to balance-of-payments considerations in selecting projects and commodities which it will or will not finance:

A.I.D. is placing greater emphasis on projects and products which will ensure not only immediate U.S. exports but also "follow on" orders for such items as spare parts or specialized intermediate materials.

A.I.D. also has limitations on financing projects which will compete with U.S. exports.

Another device A.I.D. uses is to refuse to finance items, such as spare parts or goods in which the United States is strongly competitive, which a recipient will buy from the United States in any event since they are available at reasonable cost only in this country.

Still another method, in use for example in Pakistan and India, is to limit the list of goods eligible for A.I.D. financing to those in which the United States does not have a price advantage.

Other measures to increase additionality

It has also been possible in a number of cases for host governments to make A.I.D.-financed loans less costly or otherwise more attractive to importers through surcharge reductions or elimination; waiver of prior import deposits; or favorable terms for bank credit. Other more established A.I.D. procedures include general ineligibility of commodities of which the United States is a net importer (e.g. POL) for A.I.D. dollar financing and tightened provisions covering the application of 50/50 shipping regulations, commodity import component value rules, and rules concerning contractor services.

In addition, A.I.D. Missions are taking a number of steps to make sure that information about U.S. exports is made available, for example:

Officials responsible for public and private procurement are being brought to the United States to meet U.S. suppliers;

An Afro-American Purchasing Center has been set up in New York and special arrangements made with the National Institute of Governmental Purchasing to improve knowledge and availability of U.S. supplies; and

The availability of unused Special Letter of Credit dollars in certain African countries is being publicized in *International Commerce*.

General measures to increase U.S. exports

Finally, in addition to these and other measures taken by A.I.D. to reduce the impact of its own program on the balance of payments, discussions have been held with aid recipients about the difficulties of maintaining current assistance levels in the face of the U.S. payments deficit and about ways, in light of the deficit, in which U.S. commercial exports, not financed through the A.I.D. program, may be increased. In several instances A.I.D. has obtained agreement from aid recipients on measures, such as liberalization of exchange or trade restrictions, designed to increase their imports from the United States.

Not only can this approach serve to offset any adverse effect that the A.I.D. program in a particular country may have on the U.S. balance of payments, but it can in some cases result in a positive balance of payments effect flowing from the existence of the A.I.D. program in that country.

Research

A.I.D. is also continuing research into the indirect effects of the program on the balance of payments—the effects which the "accounting" method does not measure. With the results of this research not yet available, it remains difficult to estimate the size of the feedback, substitution and other effects of aid spending. Only indirect evidence is available. With respect to the question of how much substitution occurs, for example, an analysis of U.S. trade figures does not indicate that a drop-off in commercial trade occurs when there is an increase in aid. On the contrary, there is evidence that commercial trade with less-developed countries is increasing even where aid may in some cases be increasing.

The less-developed countries do not, as a rule, increase their foreign exchange reserves, although some of the developed countries do. Nevertheless, looking at the world as one large trading community with an infinite number of rounds of respending or feedbacks, there can be little doubt that the great majority of the dollars spent abroad under the A.I.D. program ultimately come back to the United States.

Clearly, more work needs to be done on this score. Meanwhile, it seems fair to conclude that the indirect economic effects of the A.I.D. program on the balance of payments roughly cancel out. Even allowing for some variation from time to time, the true effect of the program on the balance of payments would probably not differ very much from the figures shown by the "accounting" estimates referred to earlier.

USE OF LOCAL CURRENCIES

Increasing stress has been laid on using local currencies derived from the sale of commodity imports—including P.L. 480 imports—in place of dollars. In all countries where a supply of local currencies is available, these are used for any U.S.-financed local costs of dollar-assisted projects, local salaries, housing allowances and the like. In the so-called excess currency countries—where U.S. holdings of local currency greatly exceed U.S. needs—local currency is used instead of dollars not only for local procurement, pay and allowances, but also for such items as international air travel of American technicians and foreign participants, meeting international commitments to the Palestine Refugee Program and the Indus Basin Development Fund, and the support of American-sponsored schools and hospitals abroad.

CONCLUSION

The measures taken by A.I.D. over the past several years have reduced the balance-of-payments impact of the A.I.D. program, as measured by the "accounting" method, to a virtually irreducible minimum. The gross impact in FY 1967 is estimated at $319 million and the net impact of $107 million.

About 97% of the commodities currently being purchased are procured in the United States and more than 90% of the expenditures resulting from the total proposed FY 1968 program will be made in the United States. The remaining untied expenditures are not currently susceptible to being tied, although A.I.D. is exploring the possibility of tying part of the contributions to international organizations to U.S. procurement.

A.I.D. is taking a series of measures designed to ensure export additionally and to increase U.S. exports to aid-recipient countries. In addition, A.I.D. is studying the indirect effects of the program on the balance of payments. It is fair to assume, pending the results of these studies, that the "accounting" yardstick is a reasonably accurate indicator of the net effect of the program on the balance of payments.

Department of State,
Agency for International Development,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1967.

Hon. William Proxmire,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Proxmire: As a Member of the Cabinet Committee on the U.S. Balance of Payments as well as in my capacity as Administrator of A.I.D., I have been greatly concerned with the necessity to improve the U.S. balance of payments situation.

The enclosed statement on the relationship between A.I.D. activities and the U.S. balance of payments has been prepared in response to numerous requests from Members of Congress to make available in unclassified form information which we prepare for the Congressional committees responsible for our legislation.

The A.I.D. program now transfers U.S. goods and services, not U.S. dollars, to less-developed countries. With three exceptions, A.I.D. funds are spent only in the United States. Salaries and payments to A.I.D. personnel and contractors (only part of which is spent abroad), limited offshore procurement for administrative purposes, and A.I.D.'s contributions to international organizations (part of which is spent in this country) are the only elements of the program not tied to domestic expenditure.

The estimated net impact of the A.I.D. program on the balance of payments in fiscal year 1968 has been reduced to $107 million as compared to an estimated $934 million in fiscal year 1961.

A.I.D. has also taken a number of actions to promote U.S. exports and to ensure that A.I.D.-financed commodities are additional to normal commercial exports from the United States.

These improvements have been brought about by cautious supervision of the expenditure of our appropriations, and I assure you continuing efforts will be made in this direction.

Should you need additional copies of the enclosed statement, or if I may be of other assistance, please let me know.

Sincerely,

William S. Gaud.

April 19, 1967.

Mr. William S. Gaud,
Office of the Administrator, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Gaud: This is to acknowledge and thank you for your letter of April 14 regarding the effect of AID programs on the balance of payments.

As Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, quite naturally I am very much concerned with the balance of payments. It is very useful to have the benefit of your up-to-date analysis. I hope that you will continue to keep us apprised of developments such as this.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE, *Chairman.*

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on January 17, I introduced S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act. This bill would provide funds to schools for planning and setting up bilingual education programs. It would also provide funds for the training of bilingual teachers and for research into problems of bilingual education.

There is great interest in my part of the country in bilingual education. The rest of the country, too, is beginning to become aware of the issues faced by people in the Southwest in the education of Spanish-speaking children. Today's Christian Science Monitor carries a story on movements which are underway in Texas to implement bilingual educational programs. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Bilingual Schools in Texas?" from the Christian Science Monitor of May 4 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILINGUAL SCHOOLS IN TEXAS?

SAN ANTONIO, TEX.—Bilingual instruction in Texas public schools may be a way to help Mexican-American children hold their own in the classrooms.

Texas now has laws that require public-school instruction in English only.

But the Texas Conference for the Mexican-American has heard an official of the United States Office of Education declare that while there might have been good reasons for such laws at one time, such reasons "are not valid today." The official was Dr. Nolan Estes, Associate United States Commissioner of Education.

Dr. Estes said, however, that bilingualism is not the only way to solve problems arising out of economic, social, and educational deprivation for millions of Mexican-Americans. He suggested that communities which have a heavy concentration of Mexican-Americans take advantage of educational aids offered in new federal programs.

Mexican-Americans make up the state's largest minority group. They have gotten little attention in the drive for full equality and civil rights.

Texas statute books were swept clear many years ago of discriminatory laws, but local customs still work against their full assimilation. Discrimination against them is still strong in public education. As a result, drop-out rates are very high among Mexican-American school children.

Dr. J. W. Edgar, Texas Commissioner of Education, said the state already is looking into remedial plans such as the use of bilingualism in the classroom. Among some of the changes under study is a proposed change in state school-accreditation standards to encourage bilingual instruction in the early grades.

"A few schools in Texas are already exploring the use of bilingual classrooms," Dr. Edgar said.

Also coming under scrutiny by the conference was the problem of education for migrant children. Mexican-Americans make up most of the migrants who range up the plains during the agricultural season. Many Mexican-American families go as far north as Nebraska and even into the Dakotas, looking for farm work as stoop laborers.

Dr. Estes announced that the federal government has approved a grant of $716,000 to the Texas Education Agency to bolster programs of aid for migrant children.

SENATOR HANSEN DISCUSSES THE AWARENESS OF OUR TIMES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the interaction of the public, the press, and the politician, as well as the electronic marvel of television, came under study recently by the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN].

In remarks entitled "Awareness of Our Times," Senator HANSEN told the Rocky Mountain Collegiate Press Association meeting at Laramie:

> Those who make the news and those who report it have a mutual responsibility which neither is exercising to the fullest.

And he said of the television industry:

> Television, in bringing history into our living rooms, has an absolute responsibility to be essentially honest and factual . . . the presentation of total fantasy wrapped in the toga of truth ought not to be condoned by the public or the television industry.

Senator HANSEN asserted also that the people of America have a responsibility to keep themselves informed—to be the truly informed electorate essential to our constitutional system. And he pointed out that the press could perhaps prevent war if it could explain the subtleties and complexities of economic and ideological conflict which provide the spawning ground for war.

He reaches the conclusion that—

> Over the long haul of history, a press restrained only by its own conscience and responsibility shall be the oracle from which the people can learn the truth—if the people will seek the truth.

I ask, Mr. President, that Senator HANSEN's speech be inserted in full in the RECORD along with my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AWARENESS OF OUR TIMES

(Remarks of CLIFFORD HANSEN at meeting of the Rocky Mountain Collegiate Press Association, Laramie, Wyo., Apr. 28, 1967)

Thank you. Ladies and gentlemen of today's and tomorrow's press, fellow students and fellow newspaper readers.

I feel that I'm among friends, although friends in a competitive sense.

The politician and the press have always been amiable antagonists engaged in a sort of reciprocal shell game; the press to find out what's really behind the press release, a thousand copies of which just reached the Press Gallery;

And the politician, to convince the press that the ringing version of a dull event transmitted on the neatly stenciled release is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

Thus far, I think the press has had the better of the engagement.

I appreciate having been assigned the topic, "Awareness of our Times." It is a fitting topic for a press association. It is most appropriate in the context of our political crises, which, for the most part, center on international affairs.

The awareness of our times or the lack of it, with respect to Vietnam, is a good part of our problem in Southeast Asia.

I'd like to discuss with you for a few minutes, the relationship of the press to the people and to the government; the walls and short circuits which complicate this relationship, and the extent to which the awareness of our times is thus affected.

I'd like to suggest that those who make the news and those who report it have a mutual responsibility, which neither is exercising to the fullest.

THE BASEBALL DIAMOND

For just a moment, visualize in your minds a baseball diamond. On home base is an event that is worthy of attention by the press. On first base is the press.

Continuing around the loop, we find the public on second base and the politician on third.

We are pre-supposing that the event is a political one and essentially a domestic issue. It will generate interest which can be translated to the politician to cause a corresponding event amending our original act.

If we extend this analogy to foreign affairs, we find that in most instances, there is a short circuit between first and third bases which cuts out the public.

PRESS ON FIRST

The Press, sitting on first base, has a dual responsibility. First, the event must be picked up. Next, it must be related in a manner that will, in turn, be picked up by the public on second base. The press has to catch the ball and pass it to second. This is not always easy.

A great share of the problem confronting the press in catching and transmitting the event is in the sheer magnitude of activity, particularly political activity, and the magnitude of the press, itself.

Today, government is involved in more activities than at any time in our nation's history. The first cabinet had five members. Today, we have 12.

We have Washington involved in every phase of state, county and municipal activity which doesn't even include its massive involvement in international and strictly federal affairs.

We have cooperative and competitive ventures of the legislative, executive and judicial branches weaving an intricate web which the press must penetrate.

And so the press first has to make itself aware of a happening in government. This pre-supposes a degree of government cooperation consonant with the Constitutional allusions to an informed electorate, and the First Amendment.

To do your jobs properly, you sometimes have to go beyond the official government utterance and I think you must be concerned, as is another great newspaperman of our times, Scotty Reston, with what he calls "the old problem of the people's right to be informed and the government's obligation to govern effectively which sometimes means governing secretly."

What this means, in essence, is that where there over-riding national interest or survival is concerned, secrecy is justified and the responsibility of the press is to not publish.

If the former press officer of the Pentagon, Arthur Sylvester, had phrased his famous "right to lie" statement in the context of the national defense, many in Washington would have agreed with him. But what he said was that "government" has the "right to lie to save itself." He defended not the nation, but the government. He sought to defend by prevarication the political interest, rather than the national interest.

Government today has many responsibilities which it ought not to have. But its greatest responsibility is to exercise truth and frankness of utterance. This alone can bridge what many call the "credibility gap," and greatly increase the "awareness of our times."

As the American Society of Newspaper Editors, meeting in Washington last week asserted, "President Johnson continues to hurt his image and his credibility by consistently trying to make the news sound or seem better than it is."

Except in matters of the gravest national importance, the people and the press of this country cannot accept the assertion of the President's press officer that general secrecy of action is necessary to give the President the widest possible range of alternatives. What about the alternatives open to the people, if they don't agree with the President's action?

If the public, the press and the Congress cannot engage in discussion before proposals become history, then we are served neither by the free press nor the informed electorate, which are deemed essential to our self-government.

THE PUBLIC ON SECOND

Relaying the ball, in this case the event, from the press to the public is a joint endeavor.

The press must pitch the ball straight, true and hard; not too high, and not too low. And the public must catch what is transmitted to it. If only it were that easy.

The press of our nation has made a valiant effort to keep up with the massive multiplying of news and events.

We are today a nation boasting 10,000 newspapers, 8,000 magazines, 7,000 radio and television stations.

We publish millions of books a year. Indeed, we have 190,000 titles available today through 1,600 American publishers.

Our electronic media broadcasts thousands of hours of news a year and our wire services commit to the ticker some seven million words a day.

When you consider that the individual's capacity to absorb all of this has increased little since the days of Aristotle, you realize that this staggering quantity of material requires a much greater intake-effort on the part of the public. Is it any wonder, then, that the President of McCall Corporation, Arthur R. Murphy, Jr., spoke recently of a serious "understanding gap?"

Americans, according to Mr. Murphy, are "ill informed and confused about major news and events." He commented also that we have allowed ourselves to become a "picture and caption" society worshiping at the alter of graphics and brevity."

The staggering volume of fact and fancy, interest and boredom, fiction and ought-to-be-fiction, and opinion—good and bad—has left its mark on all of us.

We sometimes echo the lament of Life Magazine's Shawna Alexander, who complained in frustration, "Books, books, books . . . they pile up on the chairs, stand in stacks on bureaus and shelves and tables and chairs . . . heap my bed table, overflow to the floor and flood out into the hall again. . . ."

Never have the people of the United States had a greater responsibility to study in depth the problems that confront America. But we find an apathy born of the electronic miracle of television which allows us to learn while we scoop up spaghetti; to say good night to Chet and David as we polish off the plum pudding.

We have also a leisure-oriented society that objects to pausing at great length to read detailed accounts of what might seem to be abstract events of little consequence. Besides that, some of us are just plain lazy.

This, in my judgment, places an additional burden on newspapers to present the highly perishable commodities of their profession in an attractive, tasty package that invites consumption beyond and above what might be gleaned from radio or television.

WHO'S ON THIRD?

Assume that the player on second, the citizen who needs to be informed, has received, digested and acted upon the news. We now have the problem of getting the ball from second base to our Senator or Representative on third.

The same glut of information that discourages the reader cascades into Capitol Hill. Several members of my staff and I recently completed a speed-reading course. In theory, at least, we can all read in excess of 11 or 12 hundred words a minute. But even that has not been sufficient to enable us to absorb the deluge of material which inundates the office every two or three hours, carried on the backs of tireless mailmen.

Of course, mail—first-class mail from constitutents—gets priority treatment; sometimes all the treatment available.

Despite the fact that much of the mail reflects an imprecise understanding—particularly in foreign affairs—the mail does have a substantial effect on a Senator's attitudes. My awareness of the times has been increased by several thousand letters to object to legislation prohibiting the use or ownership of firearms. Although my views in this matter have already been determined, these letters have reinforced those views, and this is as it should be.

THIRD TO HOME

It is in the run from third base back to home that our last great obstacle presents itself. In our analogy, we're assuming that the news generated at home, picked up by the press, and relayed to the people and the politician, necessitates an affirmative action by the man on third.

The first awareness of our times that sweeps over a newly-elected Republican Senator is the extent to which the party emblem is a liability in a chamber controlled two-to-one by Democrats. Let me illustrate.

During his campaign for the Senate, Charles Percy of Illinois perceived a need for some sort of home ownership legislation which would recognize the traditional respect one has for property that he owns.

And so with the support of every Republican member of the Senate, such legislation was introduced last week.

Now, politics notwithstanding, nothing that has the support of 36 Senators is going to be irresponsible; I don't care whether those 36 are Democrat or Republican. It may not be perfect, but it is substantially sound in concept or it wouldn't merit such sponsorship.

And yet, because of, and not despite, the unqualified Republican support of this measure, the secretary of Housing and Urban Development, Robert Weaver, issued a nine-page statement calling the financing plan a "wholly inadequate subsidy, etc., etc."

Here was an effort by the minority of the Senate to make public awareness run full circle by changing an untenable situation at the legislative level. Reaction to it was nothing less than a political slap in the face of a well intended effort that had the support of Senators from Everett Dirksen to Yours Truly.

SHORT CIRCUITS

In my opening remarks, I spoke of the short circuits which our hypothetical news and information diamond contains. Principal among these shorts are the ones between first base and third, the press and the Congress; and between home plate and second, the event and the people. Let's look briefly at these two short circuits.

Nothing in Washington is so ubiquitous as the little men who gallop about Capitol Hill and the agencies stamping "top secret" on everything that falls in their path. The Secretary of Defense has been accused of letting security become a substitute for decision. If you can't decide what to do with something, mark it "top secret" and no one will see it to know of the indecision.

Domestic affairs are seldom surrounded by this top secret aura. It is in affairs of state and the military that the public awareness is stymied by security requirements.

Now I'm not attempting in these comments to deny the total necessity for secrecy. I'm suggesting that it is a vital factor in our military and international activities, but that it has been carried to preposterous lengths by some in the Defense and State Departments.

Because the press is able to establish a rapport, which goes beyond secrecy restrictions, certain reporters can get information which is not available to the public. This doesn't mean they can print it, but they can obtain it; at cocktail parties; sometimes in confidential, deep-background briefings; and sometimes simply in corridor conversation. This information will often be quietly transmitted to a Senator, who, in turn, might attempt to carry the ball back to home plate and effect a change.

But in this exchange, the public is not involved. Nor is the public involved in the general evolvement of foreign policy which is so dependent on classified information.

The awareness of our times is ill-served by such public information as I found when I was researching a recent speech on the use of battleships in Vietnam.

I'd like to read to you a very brief exchange which appears in a transcript of a Senate hearing on military appropriations.

Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman Richard Russell is questioning the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Secretary of Defense:

"Chairman RUSSELL. (Deleted) have any estimates been made as to what it would cost to put one of our four battleships back into operation?

"General WHEELER. (after a brief discussion) I believe that ($11 million) was the figure, Mr. Chairman.

"Chairman RUSSELL. (deleted).

"Secretary McNAMARA. (deleted) perhaps you would like to query the Chief of Naval Operations more extensively on this matter.

"Chairman RUSSELL. (deleted).

"Secretary McNAMARA. (deleted).

"General WHEELER. (deleted).

On the heels of this enlightening exchange, there appeared, also in parentheses, a footnote explanation that following General Wheeler, the colloquy was deleted.

Our other short circuit is between the President and the Public.

Once upon a time a Presidential press conference was a tool of the press to keep the President in line and make him account for his actions. Today, the President completely controls the press conference. There are several reasons for this. The most obvious, of course, is that from the studio in the White House the President can directly invade the living rooms of millions of American families with the press acting only as the most irrelevant intermediary.

The press can throw a few questions during these conferences and the President is able to respond at great length and get his points across directly to the people.

The greater the crisis at home and abroad, the greater the power of the President in calling a press conference, using free network television time.

It was also discovered several presidents ago, that by allowing reporters all of 20 or 30 minutes preparation for a press conference, the issue-experts of the newspapers, wire services and networks would not have time to get to the White House to partake of the fun and games.

Those normally assigned to the White House beat are general newsmen. They are well-rounded practitioners of liberal arts in journalism. They are competent men, but seldom able to ask a question which someone as nimble as the President can't field.

TELEVISION

Thirty years ago, the term "press" applied only to a gentleman's trousers and a nation's newspapers. Today the press is also an electronic phenomena—the costliest, most elaborate and highly technological means yet developed for conveying events and impressions.

I'd like to talk to you for a moment about television. People in politics are acutely aware of it. The ability to use it can make or break a candidate.

The press has been making news for hundreds of years. But television is unique in that it makes events. It concentrates more on action and photographs than deliberation and dialogue. In many instances, the latter may be of greater importance to the total understanding of a story.

A newspaper reporter could walk quietly through Central Park taking notes and observing, and return to his newspaper to write a story. Television crews setting up in that same locale would generate demonstrations or exhibitions sufficient of themselves to make "news."

Television also accentuates, in the coldest and most candid fashion, the physical imperfections of its subjects—often at the expense of less photogenic but more important attributes.

There's a story about the Galloping Swede, Hugo Aronson, the craggy-faced former Governor of Montana. During a campaign, Hugo was accused of being a "two-faced Swede." In response, the Galloping Swede galloped to the TV studio, bought a few minutes of what was in that era less expensive time, and replied: "I've been accused of being a two-faced Swede. Do you think if I had two faces, I would have brought this one to the studio?"

It has been suggested that Lincoln, with his high, reedy voice and a face that appealed most to a mother, could not have survived the cutting, uncomplimentary examination of television, had this marvelous medium existed a hundred years ago.

But that is conjecture. Other things about television, we do know. Potentially, it is the greatest educational tool ever devised and there is reason to despair that it should be used more to sell soap and new cars than democracy and new ideas.

Without television, there would have been no Civil Rights Act of 1965. Newspapers could never have brought into American homes at dinner time the brutality of Alabama officers, the viciousness of Georgia police dogs, or the pathos of negroes herded into police cars to the accompaniment of jeering, cursing racists.

Marshall McLuhan, who expounds the premise that the medium is the message, asserts that radio and television are reshaping patterns of social interdependence and every aspect of our personal lives.

Sam Levinson, author of "Everything But Money" says the same thing a little more graphically:

"We are back in the dark ages; the lights are out and the television set is on. There are shadows eating peanuts and drinking beer. The answer to 'good evening' is 'Sshhhhh!' At 11:00 the lights are turned on, everybody says 'hello,' and goes home."

On a more serious level, the often-quoted Pilkington report prepared at the behest of the British Parliament, says in part, "Television is and will be a factor in influencing the values and moral standards of our society. Television does not and cannot merely reflect the moral standards of society. It must affect them either by changing or reinforcing them."

I've yet to find a responsible personality in the television field who suggests that the evening newscasts, which are almost national institutions, were intended to be the sole source of information for the American people.

Responsible broadcast journalists such as Huntley and Brinkley, and Walter Cronkite regard their product as complementary to, rather than competitive with, newspapers.

But because TV does at first blush, seem to give an adequate overview of the main events, it has become the major source of news for Americans.

It is estimated today that 65 per cent of us get our news from television. This would be fine if we would supplement this superficial treatment of complex events by reading some in-depth commentary. But studies indicate that such is not our response.

Whatever its drawbacks might be, television remains the most potential-pregnant educational device in the world. Some of the finest hours available to Americans have been those in which such programs as "China: Roots of Madness" and the "Saga of Western Man" series have appeared on the television screen.

But apart from the documentaries, television fails to recognize that life is not made up of dramatic incidents. Life and the evolution of history are matters of slowly developing and often uninteresting events strung together over the days, months or years. It is tragic in this context that dramatic incidents, violence and physical action are the stuff of which good television news is made.

The British critic, Henry Fairlie, puts it this way: "Television, by its emphasis on movement and activity, by its appetite for incident, has become by far the most potent instrument in creating this over-excited atmosphere, this barely-recognizable world. The medium, to this very important extent, has become the message; and the message is perpetual stimulation, perpetual agitation, perpetual change. The world it creates is a world which is never still."

In comparing radio, television and newspaper news, it is necessary to realize that the newspaper can expand or contract its page content to accommodate more news and fewer ads or vice versa. In television, time periods are fixed and it is the individual news items which must be expanded or contracted to fit a pre-determined space. It is seldom in this danger-fraught world that little of consequence occurs.

I've half expected some nights that Walter Cronkite would announce: "There's been action in the world tonight, ladies and gentlemen; buckle your seatbelts and put on the coffee pot; I'll be with you till the cock crows."

Or, imagine hearing Chet in New York say to David in Washington, "Pardner, not a darn thing happened today. Let's go home."

But of course, in television. the time is the page and the page numbers are fixed. There is an exception, however, which helps explain the terrible expense to which television must go for news. This is the preemptive coverage.

Newspapers can cover a news story the magnitude of Senate hearings on Vietnam with the financial commitment of only the reporter's time. But as Fred Friendly points out in his splendidly readable book, "Due to Circumstances Beyond Our Control," coverage of part of one day's hearings in 1966 cost the Columbia Broadcasting System $175,000. Had an entire entertainment schedule for the day been pre-empted, CBS would have lost between $900,000 and $1.1 million.

Perhaps we can sympathize with the networks for broadcasting pictures that might not really seem important when we consider that it costs $3,000 an hour to send Vietnam photos from the west coast to New York. There's no comparable cost factor in the newspaper business.

If television has an educational potential, a visual, graphic news covering capacity denied newspapers; and educational excellence, it also has a responsibility generated by its acceptance and believability.

We can turn on our television sets and see a soldier die in Vietnam; see the bodies of Vietnamese children mangled; see villages burned, bridges destroyed and the enemy bombed. This is news; it is truly what has occurred.

But on the same channel, we can watch in a manner virtually as believable, the heroic efforts of Sergeant Saunders as he machine guns the people who are today among our strongest European allies.

And if we're lucky, we can watch a chapter that somehow never made the history books as Daniel Boone charges across a field, dives into a river and captures Benedict Arnold.

Both are dramatizations of history; one, the combat episodes of Sergeant Saunders in "Combat" could be essentially accurate. But the other is absolutely false. It's doubtful that Daniel Boone ever heard of Benedict Arnold, but this fact is not known to the thousands of school-age youngsters who watched their hero tackle the traitor and throw him to the ground in a great flurry of fists.

To these children, to whom the characters are historically credible, the event is assumed to have a commensurate credibility.

And so I submit to you that television, in bringing history into our living rooms, has an absolute responsibility to be essentially honest and factual.

If television wishes to fictionalize, there is abundant opportunity in the myriad of fertile, fictionalized minds running around Hollywood. But the presentation of total fantasy wrapped in the toga of truth ought not to be condoned by the public or the television industry.

WHERE ARE THE TWO LOST WARS?

And that brings us back to Sergeant Saunders. There is much truth in the episodes portrayed in that interesting series. But there have been two wars involving hundreds of thousands of Americans since Sergeant Saunders chased Nazis through the Black Forest. Why in the world hasn't television awakened to Korea and Vietnam? Is it because of the ideology?

We were engaged in a clean, clear-cut good-versus-bad crusade during World War II. The good guys—the allies, against the bad guys—the axis. "And we won a clear-cut victory.

Certainly there are more subtleties in Korea and Vietnam, but are these subtleties so difficult that they cannot be overcome by the excellent writers and producers of Hollywood and the television industry?

Korea was the first military confrontation between the United States and International Communism. The war lasted three years, and killed 35,000 Americans. It produced many memorable acts of courage and daring already recorded in literature.

Vietnam, although far from over, is already our Nation's longest war. It is predicted that by midyear, we will have lost 11,000 dead; and 75,000 wounded, in a war that will probably have claimed nearly 500,000 military and civilian casualties on both sides.

But more than the statistics is the fact that Vietnam is the kind of war we're likely to be fighting again in the years ahead. The awareness of our times would be substantially heightened and greatly strengthened if the story of America's involvement in Vietnam were to be credibly fictionalized and presented on television.

James Flinchum, the editor of the Wyoming State Tribune, quoted movie makers in Hollywood as saying: "There is no clear-cut division between the good guys and the bad guys."

Who says there isn't? If those who produce our motion pictures and help substantially to mold opinion in America can see no clear cut difference between the good guys and the bad guys in Vietnam, then they ought to be ashamed of themselves.

Or perhaps they ought to go through a verterans' hospital and talk to some of the men who have been there. Our veterans can tell Hollywood in an instant how to tell the difference. Or the industry could ask Senator Brooke, who went to Vietnam a dove, and returned convinced that our course is vital and just.

WINNER BY GUESSTIMATION

Let me inflict on you one more comment on television; this with respect to the network's electronic vote analysis system, which picks the winner by key precinct votes.

As the old saying goes, everybody loves a winner. I cannot bring myself to believe that the rapid-fire election night "guesstimations" of winners projected by the networks have not influenced votes in states where the polls were still open.

I agree with the Christian Science Monitor that "the possibility that the mass media can influence the outcome of elections by early victory predictions remains a threat to the democratic election process."

Either the Congress must pass laws establishing uniform closing times for polls from the eastern seaboard to Hawaii, or the networks must be prohibited from guessing and broadcasting the so-called winners, particularly in presidential elections.

SUMMATION

You are part of the only craft specifically protected by the Constitution. There are many rights that go with the protective covenant of the First Amendment. There are also many responsibilities. Let me as an occasional figure in the news, leave you with these few thoughts:

When you become editors and publishers, or when you join the electronic media, work to establish more professional teaching programs within your organizations;

Work to cultivate a better-educated, broader-based corps of experts who can be thrown into any situation and grasp it quickly, write it well, and report it accurately.

Be not afraid to turn occasionally to the specialists outside of journalism for their views and writings on the complexities of today;

Attempt to so construct a newspaper that it gives prominence to responsible opinion on the front page and explains the quiet which precedes the storm;

Find the language and photo artistry that will enable television to better balance its presentation of the causes, the effects, the violence and the commonplace of events as they are;

Don't be hesitant to question those of us in politics for the hard truth behind the casual press release. Remember that a press release, by its nature, is completely subjective, whereas, your job is objectivity.

Remember that the profession of journalism distinguishes itself in the coverage of war. But if in peacetime you could produce the same quality copy, warning that economic and ideological conflicts are creating the spawning ground for more and perhaps bigger conflicts, you might prevent war.

Sometimes the truth hides in subtlety; in tales of economic intrigue or in unhurried conversations between heads of state. Getting to this quiet, often elusive truth, explaining its complexity and committing it to the printed page or the television screen, is a measure of excellence in journalism.

Despite the obstacles imposed by government, the proliferation of events, publications and people, the truth, as Walter Lippmann phrases it, "will emerge from free reporting and free discussion."

Over the long haul of history, a press restrained only by its own conscience and responsibility shall be the oracle from which the people can learn the truth—if the people will seek the truth.

Thank you.

POLAND'S CONSTITUTION DAY

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, it is appropriate that freedom-loving men around the world pause to reflect on the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791. It followed the American Constitution by only 2 years and its purpose was the same. "All power in civil society should be derived from the will of the people," said Poland's Constitution writers. Partition and tyranny at the hands of Germany and Russia followed in 1791, but the document stands today as a courageous and enlightened step toward democracy. It speaks for the spirit of freedom which has been the inner strength of the Polish people, wherever they have lived.

In the world today, the struggle for freedom continues along many borders and among conflicting ideologies. As long as man inhabits the earth, the longing for self-determination will persist, and with it the prospect of ultimate success.

With history on the side of free men, we have cause to believe that one day the principles of Poland's May 3 Constitution will benefit the courageous people of that nation and many others around the world.

CAPITOL PRESERVATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, over the weekend I received a letter from Rodger A. Bull, a junior at Springfield Senior High School in West Springfield, Mass., reminding me of a most prescient observation made many years ago by Rufus Choate:

> We have built no national temples but the Capitol. We consult no common oracle but the Constitution.

Rodger goes on to say that in his estimation "the Capitol should be preserved for generations to come so that America in the future will not forget its heritage."

This young man voices the aspirations of the great majority of the American people. I ask unanimous consent that his letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WEST SPRINGFIELD, MASS.,
April 26, 1967.

Hon. RALPH S. YARBOROUGH,
U.S. Senator from Texas,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am a Junior in High School and enrolled at West Springfield Senior High School, West Springfield.

Today while reading the Congressional Record of Thursday April 20, 1967 I came across your article on page 5576 concerning the "preservation of the U.S. Capitol." Recently, while visiting Washington, I had the opportunity to tour the Capitol Building and found it to be most enlightening and beautiful. I feel as you do that such a building should be preserved for the people of the United States as a memorial. In the great words of Rufus Choate a past Congressman, "We have built no national temples but the Capitol. We consult no common oracle but the Constitution." The Capitol should be preserved for generations to come so that America in the future will not forget its heritage. Thank you.

Respectfully,
RODGER A. BULL.

MOTORCYCLE SAFETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on several occasions over the last few months I have pointed to the need for special concern over the problems of motorcyle safety. Highway safety, with the passage of last year's legislation with which so many of us were concerned, requires concerted effort at every level, from the individual citizen to the vehicle manufacturer to the Federal Government. Within that broad scope, motorcycles comprise a special problem due to the nature of their design and their different handling characteristics from automobiles.

Recently I received a very long and largely critical letter commenting on an article dealing with motorcycle safety which I was originally asked to prepare for Trial magazine, and which was reprinted in Cycle World. The author of the letter is Jack McCormack of Pasadena, Calif., who accounts for 300,000 miles of travel personally by motorcycle, who has been national sales manager for the largest U.S. distributor of a Japanese motorcycle, and who has been recognized for his contribution to safety in motorcycling. Although he takes issue with me on a number of things, I believe his comments are worth noting and that we are both concerned for improving motorcycle safety.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that Mr. McCormack's letter and my reply may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PASADENA, CALIF.,
April 14, 1967.

Hon. VANCE HARTKE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I have just finished reading your article concerning motorcycle safety, published in the October-November issue of "Trial Magazine" and re-printed in the April issue of "Cycle World Magazine". My reactions to your statements are mixed—on the one hand it is encouraging to see interest concerning motorcycle safety beginning to appear at so high a level while on the other hand I am appalled that a man charged with the responsibilities of a United States Senator, a man who certainly must be aware of the weight his words will hold for those who are exposed to them, would publish such a slanted and biased article. While you have obviously taken some time to accumulate certain facts, you have not either obtained all the salient facts available, or have not chosen to be objective, for reasons known only to yourself.

I am inclined to think the first alternative is most likely the case for certain comments made throughout your dissertation indicated a lack of knowledge on the subject and lack of experienced counsel on the motorcycle itself.

In fairness, it can truly be said that you are not alone in this regard. Almost without exception the comments and actions I have observed being expounded by our civil servants at various levels of Government take the same subjective emotional tack.

The environment that seems to nourish this attitude is, in my opinion, related to two particular facets of the motorcycle sport and industry. The first and probably least important (in that it has been rather effectively controlled at least so far as general public opinion is concerned) is the so called 1% crumbs, idiots, degenerates, small time crooks, and general dead beats, i.e. Hells Angels, Satans Slaves, etc. that are attracted to motorcycles because of their mobility, masculine image, low cost of operation and most of all the relative ease by which they can be stolen and reassembled into untraceable vehicles.

Area number two is noise. While the majority of motorcycles are left unmodified and are as quiet as modern engineering can produce, there is a very large number of riders, especially in the younger age brackets that do modify their cycles exhaust systems and unfortunately are allowed to get away with it.

Here the industry from factory to distributor to dealer to rider has no one but itself to blame. An organized program of rider education on this subject and encouraged law enforcement cooperation would have cured this problem long ago.

But such is not the case, and thus we have, in my opinion, created an environment in which the general public and in turn legislators at all levels react with emotion and a certain vindictiveness to any opportunity of restricting motorcycle operations.

I have strayed a bit from your comments, Senator, but I felt some preliminary discourse necessary.

You quote from the medical profession quite often in the article. It should be noted that this group has gone on record frequently in a very negative manner about motorcycles. One doctor going so far as to call it a "national epidemic." While it is perhaps somewhat understandable that these men would react to the sights that they necessarily become exposed to, I have often wondered why we do not get similar reactions toward other motor vehicles. Could it be that our learned medical practitioners understand the nature, need and positions of the automobile but react to the aforementioned negatives concerning motorcycles in such a manner as to wish their total removal from public use?

You also quote from "Trial Magazine" which pointed out the extreme danger envolved in the use of motorcycles by "careless, inexperienced, incompetent drivers." I submit that a careless, inexperienced, incompetent driver would be a menace in or on any motor vehicle—but if one must choose, I would certainly prefer such a driver propelled by a 300 to 800 pound vehicle of some 5 to 60 horsepower than behind the wheel of a 300 or 400 horsepower two ton partially guided missile.

Dr. James C. Drye, Professor of Surgery at the University of Louisville School of Medicine, is quoted by you as saying the motorcycle is one of "the most lethal weapons on our highways and streets. Sensible regulations must put an end to the mayhem, death and economic waste resulting from motorcycle accidents." Certainly no one argues that sensible regulations are necessary for all forms of motor vehicular traffic. It is the definition of sensible that appears to be in controversy.

I find it hard to relate the doctor's most lethal weapon comment, and the economic waste when one considers the increasing automobile accident rates and the economic waste involved there. The point here is not one of trying to compare the safety or lack of it between these two types for obviously this is difficult. The single mistake of one automobile driver can account for a lot more lives and property damage than can the single mistake of the motorcyclist. The point is that current statements and the controversy in general appears to be out of proportion to the problem, when it is related to our disgraceful national traffic problems in general.

You state, Senator, that in "1964 1,100 people in the United States were killed in motorcycle, motor scooter and motor bike accidents. This was an increase of almost 25% over 1963. For 1965 it is estimated that another increase of 25% caused the number of deaths to soar to over 1,500."

These increases are discouraging and deplorable but they tell a much different story than you have expounded when compared to the number of increased motorcycles sales and new riders actually on our highways. There were 69.5% more motorcycles sold in 1964 than in 1963, and there were 47.7% more first time riders than in 1963.

In 1965 there were 78.9% more motocycles sold than in 1964 plus there were 51.2% more first time riders than in 1964. You state further that in the four year period, 1961–1964, cycle fatalities in the United States increased 83%. It is interesting to note that during the same period motorcycle sales increased 365% and first time riders increased 428.5%.

While no one argues that even one death or injury is one too many, experience tells us that additional exposure is going to cause increased accident rates, often in multiples of the rates at lower exposure levels. However, as can be seen from the above comparisons the motorcycle exposure levels have thankfully far outstripped the accident rate gains.

This is even more remarkable when an analysis of the prime motorcycle market is reviewed. This exercise points up the fact that the prime market for these vehicles is to males between the ages of 15–34. This group obviously includes the infamous 16–25 age bracket that insurance companies consider the most accident prone driver.

In 1960 there was one motorcycle sold for every 52,664 males in the 15–34 age group. In 1961 the ratio was one for every 40,868; in 1963 one for every 15,548; in 1964 one for every 9,496 and in 1965 one for every 5,471. As can be seen a very substantial prime market penetration.

Admittedly this is not the total United States motorcycle market but it is certainly the prime portion of it. Thus these figures are significant in that they indicate to what degree the motorcycle is involved with so called high risk operators.

Yet despite this, in the last two years that complete figures are available, being 1964 and 1965, and being significant years to the motorcycle industry because they represent years when considerable numbers of motorcycles were on the road, the number of fatalities in relation to registrations has reduced not increased as might have been expected. In 1964 there were 1,100 fatalities compared to 939,165, registered two-wheeled vehicles or .012%. In 1965 there were 1,500 fatalities compared to 1,364,372 registered two-wheeled vehicles or .011%.

I do not point all this out to make excuses for the industry or the motorcycle itself or in any way indicate anyone should be satisfied with the current picture. It is only to emphasize that the problem is not one of undue or unexpected proportions but one that is in reality commensurate to the increased use.

However, even this picture can be improved substantially, with the cooperation of knowledgeable people within the industry along with both State and Federal authorities who are willing to approach the problems objectively and with constructive attitudes toward the really worthwhile goals of reduced injury and death for operators and passengers of all vehicles.

At this point I must take issue with your statement that "a major factor in motorcycle accidents is the vehicle itself. The motorcycle is basically an unstable vehicle often difficult to handle at slow speeds."

This statement can only indicate a lack of experience with the modern motorcycle, a lack of knowledge of the laws of physics or both.

In actuality at any speed above 2 or 3 miles per hour the vehicle become quite stable and unlike its four-wheeled cousins, becomes more stable as speed increases, this is due to the gyroscopic action created by the two wheels in line. This plus the fact that a motorcycle does not tend to develope lift as does a car at speed adds to the stability.

The limiting factor of this stability is the motorcycles need for traction. Should traction be lost (between tire and surface) then rider skill and experience becomes even more critical in retaining control.

It is the acquired ability of trained and/or experienced riders to be aware of changing surface conditions that in large separates them from the untrained or inexperienced cyclist as traction is probably the single most limiting factor in the operation for a motorcycle.

All motor vehicles have certain abilities and limitations. It is the understanding and mastery of these various positive and negative factors that establishes the skill of the operator and thus the major reason that driver and/or rider training is the major area of concern.

This is doubly true with the motorcycle. Where its real safety lies is in its ability to *avoid* contact. For certainly if contact is made, its is the motorcycle rider who comes out second best.

This is where the need for driver training is so apparent. The properly trained rider with even limited experience can, because of the motorcycle's very nature, avoid contact in situations that would be almost certain to result in a collision between four-wheeled vehicles under similar circumstances.

Consider that the motorcycle rider has 100% visibility, not limited by roof or side posts, has no right front or rear fender to judge distances from, has simultaneous brake and throttle control enabling him to enter potentially dangerous situations with ultimate control. He is in an environment that is conducive to full concentration, i.e. no radio, closed windows, air conditioning, etc., that belies reality of actual speed as in an auto. Concentration as you know is the true key to proper defensive driving. All this combined with the motorcycles maneuverability, stopping power and instant acceleration give him one of the most potentially safe vehicles on the road. There are two immediately obvious limitations to this potential. One of course is road conditions which might limit the traction factor, mentioned earlier. The other is the rider, who must adjust to any limiting factor and who must be familiar and reasonably skilled in the operation of his vehicle.

A motorcycle rider learns from experience, instruction or both to be aware at all times of the surface on which he is traveling and to compensate, by reducing speed, increasing distance between vehicles, etc. when he is on a surface that could impede his normal maneuverability and/or stopping distances.

Contrary to the implications in your article a motorcycle does not suddenly just fall because of inconsistant or slippery surface conditions, or even when striking a reasonably large obstacle in or on the road. The inherent stability and modern day suspension systems more than compensate for such hazards unless the vehicle is put through either ill-considered or needless maneuvers by the untrained, inexperienced operator.

Thus we get back to what is, in my opinion the real need in this program of driving safety, the proper education of the motorcycle operator as well as some indoctrination to the automobile driver who must learn to co-exist with the motorcycle. In order to do this he too should be at least reasonably aware of its abilities and limitations. Some seem to feel they paid $3,000 more for the road as well as their vehicles or that motorcycles are capable of jumping over their suddenly turning autos. Captain Carl Hamm of the Milwaukee Police Department's traffic safety program was quoted by the "Milwaukee Journal" as saying "Believe it or not, in most auto-motorcycle accidents, the motorist is at fault."

It should be fairly obvious that we are not going to be able to design the motorcycle into a tank, we have so far not succeeded into doing this with automobiles even though some seem to approach that size. It seems reasonable to assume then that if we are to reduce the injury and fatality rate that it should be through the medium of the operator. As an example we cooperated with David Momathin Air Force Base in the installation of a cycle rider training program. At last report they had significantly reduced the motorcycle accident rate and had experienced no fatalities since the program was initiated in 1965.

I might take this opportunity to point out that the industry, has, since the late 50's been endeavoring to get two-wheeled instruction included in the high school driver education classes. However, at this writing have yet to meet with any significant success. Thus the current safety record that is under discussion has been achieved, in the face of this now mushrooming use of motorcycles, by industry efforts through their dealer organizations.

Do the various states rely on the automobile dealer to handle driver training? Of course not. It is far too complex a subject and most often the salesman or dealer is not qualified as an instructor. Why then is the motorcycle industry left to carry this burden and that responsibility?

The industry has requested and freely solicited help in exercising the responsibilities that are inherent in dispensing a registerable motor vehicle to the public.

Until recently these attempts have fallen on deaf ears. Now that numbers are greater we are faced with what amounts to the emotional screaming and yelling that accompanies panic rather than constructive, objective help and guidance in working out programs both educational and legislative that will accomplish what we all desire, safe vehicular travel.

Senator, if you really want to help and are as concerned as your comments indicate, then I say, Number One—Help us get two-wheeled instruction into driver education curriculum. This can accomplish the initial needed understanding of two-wheeled vehicles to both potential two-wheeled owners and to the future four-wheeled driver who will share the highways with them.

I believe, Senator, you will find both industry and rider support in many of the steps you are proposing.

Certainly in the area of special licensing for two-wheeled vehicles. The industry is on record supporting this and the need for development of uniform testing procedures for use in all states as a necessary and desired portion of obtaining such a qualified operator's permit.

The record is also clear as to the industry stand on compulsory periodic inspections for all motor vehicles including motorcycles. It is a needed and desirable program.

While on the subject of equipment let me point out that to my knowledge every one of the major manufacturers produces equipment that is above reproach when evaluated against current technology. These units are designed and manufactured to standards of technical, handling and braking specifications that are in a great many respects superior to current day automobiles. There are, however, some two-wheeled motorcycles of the "backyard" variety—mostly in the "mini-bike" class that should be either upgraded or removed from sale.

I am confident you would find the industry ready, willing, and certainly able to help in the formation of adequate safety standards for all two-wheeled vehicles.

There is also no doubt in the minds of industry or experienced riders that helmets and reasonable eye protection should be worn.

There is, however, some concern in the area of compulsory helmets as this would seem an infringement on the individual's constitutional rights, as it pertains to no one's protection but his own. In respect to eye protection there is no question as a failure here could offer a potential threat to others.

Please consider that according to the National Safety Council the per cent of fatalities occurring in automobiles from cranial area injuries is about the same as that in motorcycles—around 70%.

In the automobile the safety belt is now compulsory to help reduce this exposure. Yet no one has yet figured how to enforce a law that would make fastening it compulsory.

As you know the safety helmet for the motorcycle rider is designed to accomplish what the safety belt does for the auto driver—keeps his head from substantial or even fatal injury. The belt through restraint of movement. The helmet through packaging.

Perhaps, in view of the similar fatality percentage for both drivers and riders, it would make sense to propose that all motor vehicle operators use helmets as this would be an enforceable program. (Constitutionally might still be a problem.)

Your comments concerning passengers are not valid where the vehicle is properly equipped for this purpose, i.e. footrest, seat, hand grips. The industry would, I believe, support legislation requiring this equipment before allowing two up riding. (Some States have it now.)

All in all, Senator, while I disagree with some of the opinions and premises that seem to have led you to your conclusions, I feel these conclusions, with the exceptions I have indicated, are valid and constructive.

My concern is that they be implemented in as uniform manner as possible throughout the 50 States and that persons at all levels charged with the responsibilities and authorities concerning our vehicular and traffic programs, be objective and constructive in their efforts to forward the cause of safety.

When these things are accomplished, Senator, I'll wager we motorcyclists can and will show you the best safety record obtainable.

Yours very truly,

JACK McCORMACK.

P.S.—Perhaps, Senator, you are wondering what my qualifications are for speaking in this manner concerning the motorcycle sport and industry. I have taken the liberty of listing the most applicable areas of my experience:

Rider for past 20 years with better than 300,000 miles driven on a motorcycle.

District Manager for Triumph and Ariel Motorcycles 1956–1959.

National Sales Manager for American Honda 1961–1963 (largest United States distributor of motorcycles).

Vice President and General Manager, U. S. Suzuki Motor Corporation 1963–1966 (third largest United States distributor of motorcycles).

Past member of the Executive Committee in the American Motorcycle, Scooter and Allied Trades Association.

Past Director and Trustee of the American Motorcycle Association.

Member of the Motorcycle Safety Council.

Past member of the Los Angeles County Committee on motor sports vehicles.

Commended by Board of Supervisors, County of Los Angeles, for "Leadership in safety and road courtesy among drivers of two-wheeled vehicles in the State and the Nation."

U.S. SENATE,
May 4, 1967.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: I value your criticism of my article on motorcycle safety so highly that I would like to see it published. As a starter, I shall move to have your letter printed in the Congressional Record.

While many points you make may appear to rebut my position, a careful analysis of your criticism convinces me that we are really on the same side—that of safety.

Please be assured that I make no pretense of expertise in motorcycling per se. I am primarily occupied with the Senate Commerce Committee, the Finance Committee, the Steering Committee, several subcommittees and seven children! But I am interested in ending the death toll on our streets and highways. Any way we can accomplish that objective transcends any pride in authorship that I may have. You have some good ideas in this direction and I think they deserve a hearing.

Sincerely,

VANCE HARTKE, *U.S. Senator*.

OUR HUNGRY PLANET AND ITS DWINDLING RESOURCES

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, on March 7 this year, the plenary address at the meeting of the National American Wholesale Grocers Association in New York City was given by Prof. Georg Borgstrom, a member of the faculty at Michigan State University.

Professor Borgstrom is the author of "The Hungry Planet: The Modern World at the Edge of Famine," published by the MacMillan Co. in 1965. This book should be a part of the library of each person concerned about the worldwide population explosion. I have found "The Hungry Planet" to be a continuing, valuable reference source.

Georg Borgstrom has not stopped in his quest to awaken people. His address before the National American Wholesale Grocers Association contains pertinent suggestions to use our knowledge in new ways to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources—as President Johnson has pledged.

Borgstrom's remarks will not particularly please all readers, but they should provoke thought and debate, and, hopefully, new approaches to the population problem. Perhaps, as he says, our grandchildren will be less likely to remain in the position of experiencing the thrill of an orange, a banana stock, or even coffeebeans, because they are "far too valuable to the producing country as animal feed to move out—leave—these countries."

He concluded his March 7 address, as follows:

> 1. The World is now irrevocably *One*—this was for decades a cliché—but it has finally become an inescapable reality—
>
> 2. We cannot expect to remain seated on the First Row and see the immense Tragedy unfold on the World Scene—the drama of two billion people, already short of almost everything: food, water, forest resources for housing and packaging—rapidly mounting to four billion—
>
> They are not only an untapped potential market—but certainly will not remain our providers in terms of food and fibers. The sight of us, whether we are North Americans or Europeans, as buyers and almost beggars on the world's pauperized food markets is not only repulsive but reflects (mirrors) lack of imagination on our part—our sterotyped thinking and non-creative approach to these matters may well stifle our economy.
>
> I further interpret the writing on the wall to mean—a call to arms for us—this is the third point (3)—not in stockpiling more bombs but in organizing the greatest and most challenging War ever to be waged by Man—The Grand War of Human Survival

We may well ask ourselves, "What can we do for the World?" instead of continuing the current short-sighted game ensuing from the persistent petty query—"What can the World do for us?" In switching focus we might well discover that we can do great things.

But with this end in mind, we certainly are well advised to put an end to our large-scale gambling and start to be more concerned with our own survival. We seem seriously to believe that our civilization is the first in the long line of at least civilizations to attain immortality. Without a supreme effort to regain control of our destiny we might very well vanish into oblivion.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his remarks be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Plenary Address Given to National American Wholesale Grocers Association, by Prof. Geo. Borgstrom, MSU, Tuesday, March 7

Despite extraordinary efforts, almost unique in world history, mankind has failed to provide satisfactorily for more than one-third of the human race. 2,300 million belong today in the deficit category, short of food, water, and several additional prerequisites for an acceptable human existence. This is particularly ominous, as this comes after twenty years of exceptional countermeasures. The success of our efforts is mirrored in the fact that the globe never experienced a year when more food was produced than in 1965. At the same time it can be stated that there never was in human history a year when more hundred million people were hungry and starving. The growth of the population was seriously outpacing the increase in food production and at a rate accelerating by each year. This is termed the Hunger Gap, one of the most ominous features of our days. We are presently adding three Canadas each year or, if you so prefer an additional US each third year.

We like to attribute this discrepancy of the Hunger Gap to our superior technology, to our legendary thriftiness and to our exceptional creativity. Others put emphasis on the technical backwardness of this other world, its notorious listlessness and faltering ingenuity. Sometimes this stagnation is described as a "failure of this other world to share in our advances."

But let me in brief retrospect remind you of the fact that Western Man not only stood for the greatest migration in history going out to all corners of the globe. He also had the good fortune to strike a richer booty than most any group of men in history. I am refering to those Europeans which reached into this continent and took possession of the North American prairies, in effect the richest farmlands of the globe. Western Man went further and grabbed the Argentina pampas, the llanos as well as the Brazilian storehouse. Western Man also took S. Africa and its grassland and later penetrated the African high plateau. We took the huge Australian continent with its valuable satellite New Zealand. Western Man further took up power positions, largely for trade purpose, in key parts of Asia. The Second World War and its aftermath marked the end of this era; when close to two billion people gained national independence.

In the great lottery of history we consequently not only have been most favored part and in this way the well fed world has kept hunger away from its tables basically through our far greater resources in terms of forests, soils and water than ever became the lot of that hungry world in which recorded history goes back for at least 50 centuries and where poverty and parsimony have ruled relentlessly for at least a century. To this world which we glibly have labelled as "underdeveloped" a number of advanced civilizations belong.

The conclusion to be drawn from all this is that we are entering a new era in world economy and international politics, although we might for some time yet continue to linger on in outmoded, anachronistic patterns. Consequently we cannot extrapolate from present trends into the future and expect these projections to become true. Let me explore with you some of the harsh facts of this new reality.

If we Americans are going to survive as a nation or on the whole the western world as a civilization, we will be forced to recognize the needs of this hungry world. We cannot live comfortably not profitably in surplus and abundance, a kind of affluent oasis, surrounded by slums which sooner or later will be encroaching upon our enclaves. Using our resources to create and strengthen these immense slumbering markets is therefore a prime goal. This other world does not need our costly weapons, nor our glittering gadgets. They need protein—this will presumably become the gold standard for a new economic world economy. Long range protein treaties will in all likelihood take the place of defense alliance. Present large relief deliveries of grain will be supplanted by still more massive dispatching of new grain protein concentrates, of oilseeds, converted into readily digestible items into the realm of gilded products. This will further tax the ingenuity of our own livestock producers.

Few Americans realize the tremendous degree to which US currently is contributing to India's grain balance—each fifth wheat acre is presently earmarked for this purpose. And yet, we are not alone. Many other countries are also making their contributions for India's survival. Nonetheless these massive deliveries hardly provide more grain than what is needed in the recipient importing coastal cities. The same is true about Australia's and Canada's multimillion ton deliveries to China.

Despite these deliveries from the granaries of the well-fed, the hungry world is by and large, earmarking large portions of their scanty soil resources as well as toiling hard to provide and deliver food and feed to the rich world. This is both an anomaly and an absurdity. The two tiny Central American countries of Nicaragua and El Salvador contribute one fourth of the world market in invaluable cottonseed. Sudan of Africa stands for 2/3 and Nigeria 1/6. Main recipients of this cottonseed are W. Europe and Japan. Together they take 95%. The protein hungry of the world get a pittance. The truth is that all the four countries mentioned are sellers which themselves desperately need this protein.

We frequently flag with the hungry of the world but facts speak another language. I could relate to you innumerable quaint conditions in this respect. The 4.5 million of Denmark carry the world record as protein importers primarily for feed—close to 250 lbs. per person and year. Holland has in recent years imported more non-fat milk solids to raise veal than what the entire hungry world has received. This tiny country furthermore brings in in the form of fish meal 25 lbs. per person of fish protein—another world record. This is 15 times more than the direct intake of fish and 40% more than the intake of milk per person of this dairy country. Yet the absurd notion has been swirling around that this net-importing country could constitute a model to the hungry world. The lion's share of the international food market still moves between the well-to-do, non-needy countries. Less than 3% of our soybeans currently end up in the bellies of the hungry. We have hardly started to mobilize this invaluable resource in the Great Battle for Human Survival. The US has in recent years topped UK as a buyer of meat on the world market and furthermore regularly receives meat deliveries from Mexico, Costa Rica, and other countries in this general area which are critically short both of meat and protein.

It is worth noting that on the aggregate two-thirds of the world's agricultural production is consumed or utilized by one third of the world's people. The same enormous discrepancy applies to the oceans. There never was in human history a period in world fisheries showing greater advances than those that have taken place in the postwar period yet a persistently growing proportion of the world's catches move into meal and oil factories, rendering feed to broilers, egg layers and hogs of the well-fed Western World as well as raw materials to the margarine industry of the West. No less than one third of the world's catch of perfectly good food fish and a consistently growing percentage of the world catch at large is channeled into the troughs of the well-fed and rich. One day, and not a very distant one, the hungry world will demand their just share of these protein resources—in particular as most of it is taken from the coasts of critical protein deficiency areas.

The US is currently importing more than half of all the fish it is consuming as human food and yet we are scanning to the limit both the Pacific and the Atlantic to fill our needs for tuna fish, presently 2 lbs. of tuna meat per year and person. A number of countries, in the first line Japan but also Taiwan, S. Korea and Okinawa provide raw material to US canneries in California and in the Samoa Islands. Japanese, Spanish, French and other trawlers aid in the US hunt for tuna in the Atlantic to keep the giant canneries of Puerto Rico and recently also in New England going. In a world desperately short of protein, the US is top-ranking in purchasing fish and shellfish protein, acquiring no less than half of the food fish moving into world trade.

We have done little to tap the riches of Alaska. The huge Soviet and Japanese fleets on the Alaskan horizon bear witness to our failure to enter these enormous markets. These two nations are now being joined by S. Korea. Behind Japan's hundred million, however, looms China's mighty 750 million.

More than 50 countries around the globe are part of the great shrimp airlift to US, supplemented with Mexican tributes, more than 9/10 of their catch. More than 40 of these countries belong in the category of malnourished countries, some even desperately hungry. The clamor of the hungry millions will, however, be heeded. Excessive, short range profits will leave place for long range but more modest gains, as these resources step by step are mobilized to fill the insatiable markets of their own needy. These shrimping operations, furthermore, involve large-scale wasting. In most instances 5 to 7 tons of fish are caught for each ton of shrimp. These are currently thrown overboard as it does not pay equally well to fill the refrigerated shrimpers with lowly fish.

A significant feature of the postwar world is the influx into US of foods and food products from the entire world, providing the US market with almost a new dimension and placing products from distant corners of the globe within reach of many Americans. Walking through a modern supermarket is like a guided world tour—sardines from SW Africa, pineapples from Taiwan, fishballs from Norway, pickled herring from Sweden, mandarines (tangerines) from Japan, hams from Poland, kangaroo soup from Australia, etc. This exuberant abundance has given most Americans a distorted picture of the world. It is a long-standing Western notion, shared by Western Europe, that particularly the tropics were a rich cornucopia from which welled forth a seemingly endless stream of "goodies" such as bananas, coffee, cacao, sugar, tropical fruits, oilseeds and oilseed cakes. Yet, the world scene is showing deep convulsions heralding completely new patterns both to world economy and world trade. The hungry world desperately needs the lands which are rendering these riches in order to feed themselves. We have so far exhibited little awareness of what is happening, yet the unmistakable signs are there—all the elements of a new world order. An American historian once remarked that the Western World has queer liking for "fighting history rather than adjusting to it."

The conventional rational for this trade has been the collecting of foreign currency to the benefit of economic progress. This has turned out largely to be a fallacy. The foreign currencies only erratically become available for national use. Taxation efficiency is among other things wholly inadequate in most of these countries. World market prices largely fixed by us have dropped persistently and drastically cut net gains. A 5% drop in prices of world commodities almost mullifies all capital contributions through foreign aid. This phenomenon may also be formulated in this way: declining incomes due to increasingly less favorable terms of trade for raw materials versus industrial products.

This brings us to a few more wide-ranging phenomena which already are showing their impact on the wholesale trading of the world. The concept of raw material countries as against industrialized countries—largely a remnant of 19th century thinking—is gradually becoming an anachronism also in the food field. One major driving force is obviously the global availability—universality of technical knowledge. This is no longer the exclusive domain of the Western World or any individual country as advanced it yet may be. Our grandchildren are therefore less likely to remain in the position of experiencing the thrill of an orange, a banana stock or even coffeebeans. The coffee grinds, the banana stock and the banana peel are far too valuable to the producing country as animal feed to move out (leave) these countries. Future economists as well as historians will establish with amazement that in 1965 70% of the world's registered fleet of refrigerated ships was busy with no other task than to carry bananas from the tropics to North America and Western Europe. Add to this that more than half of the carried weight is stock and peel ending up in our garbage cans. Despite first-rate installations both in delivery and receiving ports and a big fleet of refrigerated trucks and railway cars, the losses of bananas are estimated to exceed one tenth. The elements of a new order is, however, emerging with profound repercussions. Several plants, manufacturing less perishable banana flakes, banana flour and other items are already providing the world market with this new array of products, thereby partly avoiding this exceptionally wasteful economy and making in more than one way a contribution to the Freedom from Hunger of the banana-producing countries. The same applies to the budding plants in Brazil and in other tropical coffee-growing countries for the manufacture of soluble coffee and coffee concentrates.

URBANIZATION

Another feature in our immediate future is the accelerated urbanization in the wake of the population explosion. I will not enter into the consequences of our American congestion, supposedly creating 15 megalopoli within a few decades. This will have a revolutionizing effect on food marketing, both wholesale and in retail. This latter may even be doomed, when bulk deliveries to central kitchens become the tune of the day. Milk could conceivably in the form of concentrates be delivered through a tubing system similar to that for water but not to individual homes but to such collective feeding centers. Do we realize that the latest decades on the average already have meant that close to one third of *all* food is bypassing retailing and home consumption.

The urbanization of the hungry world is, however, a far more sinister and complex phenomenon. The superpressure on the countryside is there reaching the explosion point. Farms have been cut up into "miniplots" and count at the best a few acres for the feeding of a family. Shanty-towns, garbage dumps and gravel pits are the domiciles of millions. This is the picture in most Latin-American and Tropical African cities as well as in Asia. In several instances this influx has already reached unmanageable proportions. Calcutta claims more than one million simply sleeping in the streets.

Fancy projects of monstrous buildings, 40 miles at the base, 2 miles high, to house 30–40 million are of little avail, if food and water is lacking. Our lack of foresight and queer priorities have resulted in a quarter million dollars going into a single astronaut meal, while there is hardly a trace of any programming, planning, designing or researching, going into ways of feeding these giant cities in our immediate future of 20–30 even 50 million people This is the great challenge of our days but it is now so late in the game, that in order to meet the catastrophe this will require a huge crash program, at least the size of our space efforts.

YOUR CHALLENGE

The great challenge facing the human race is by no means the futility of the moon. Despite the fables of our childhood, I assure you, the moon is no cheese. I appeal to you as the grand merchantmen of food to join the progressive and creative forces of mankind to find usable solutions to our Great Wholesale Grocering to the World. Perhaps clearer than any other group you would be in position to realize the fundamental truth that the *true* state of a country or a nation is reflected (mirrored) in the state of common daily life—the conditions of man—those men that constitute the people as they are encountered in the streets; in the stores; in the factory plants, and on the farms. The aggregate condition of these people measure the general prosperity—not the wealth of a few, whether they happen to be countries or individuals. A world where a proportionately greater number are getting hungrier, poorer and more destitute while a dwindling minority are becoming richer and richer invites global disaster. Complacency is in this context a crime, despair on the other hand a vice. What the world now needs is courageous activity in the pursuit of human happiness.

It would certainly reflect sadly on our civilization if we were to conquer universe but irrevocably lose the earth. I also appeal to you to make yourself acquainted with the true magnitude of the immense needs we are facing. You owe this not only to your profession, to our nation but also to the world. *I assure you, the future will not be what we now are made to believe*—a computerized bliss with maximum leisure and limitless abundance. We will on the contrary be facing hard work for Human Survival and need to mobilize all our talent and knowledge to regain control of our human destiny—otherwise the world will slowly and irretrievably move down towards a Least Common Denominator when Freedom and Civilization is squeezed out.

Both lands and oceans have become small, when placed in relation to the oversized human race—this is paradoxically also true with regard to outer space and universe. Putting a brake to population growth and producing more food need to be exercised to the hilt, but equally important and maybe at the moment even more essential to our future is to give maximum attention to the Third Dimension of Food—that of processing, packaging and distribution. In doing so, we will see many changes and experience great upheavals. The World Food Issue has its most potent ramifications in your area—bulk food distribution.

In the novel, "The Leopard," describing the collapse of the old Italian feudal society, the author, Lampedusa, allows his mouthpiece to make the thought-provoking comment: "If you do not want to change anything—everything will change." Ladies and gentlemen, the writing is on the wall of our festive banquet. Like Belsazzar of old Babylon it is up to us to interpret and translate the meaning of the handwriting on our wall. My reading of this writing is based on thirty years' study of these matters in all continents and in painstaking research in my two professional disciplines of Food Science and Economic Geography and it goes like this:

1. The World is now irrevocably *One*—this was for decades a cliché—but it finally became an inescapable reality—

2. We cannot expect to remain seated on the First Row and see the immense Tragedy unfold on the World Scene—the drama of two billion people, already short of almost everything: food, water, forest resources for housing and packaging—rapidly mounting to four billion—

They are not only an untapped potential market—but certainly will not remain our providers in terms of food and fibers. The sight of us, whether we are North Americans or Europeans, as buyers and almost beggars on the world's pauperized food markets is not only repulsive but reflects (mirrors) lack of imagination on our part—our stereotyped thinking and non-creative approach to these matters may well stifle our economy.

I further interpret the writing on the wall to mean—a call to arms for us—this is the third point (3)—not in stockpiling more bombs but in organizing the greatest and most challenging War ever to be waged by Man—The Grand War of Human Survival. We may well ask ourselves, "What can we do for the World?" instead of continuing the current short-sighted game ensuing from the persistent petty query—"What can the World do for us?" In switching focus we might well discover that we can do great things.

But with this end in mind, we certainly are well advised to put an end to our large-scale gambling and start to be more concerned with our own survival. We seem seriously to believe that our civilization is the first in the long line of at least civilizations to attain immortality. Without a supreme effort to regain control of our destiny we might very well vanish into oblivion.

CONSOLIDATION AND REENACTMENT OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Committee on Commerce has begun the project of consolidating and reenacting the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. In the last Congress, the committee undertook a compilation and revision of the maritime statutes. That bill received wide support and was subsequently passed by the Senate, however, the House of Representatives failed to act before adjournment. On January 24, 1967, I reintroduced the bill (S. 620).

The Interstate Commerce Act, like the shipping laws of the United States, is in need of consolidation and reenactment. Since the original passage of the act to regulate commerce in 1887, it is estimated that there have been no fewer than 80 amendments and amendatory acts. The present Interstate Commerce Act consists of a part I, dating from 1887; a part II, dating from 1935; a part III, dating from 1940; a part IV, dating from

1942; and, a dormant part V and certain related and supplementary acts.

An example of the confusion resulting from adding 80-odd amendments to a law over an 80-year period can be found in the provisions relating to the Interstate Commerce Commission itself. Section 11 of the present Interstate Commerce Act provides that the Commission shall be composed of five Commissioners each serving 6-year terms. Section 18 provides that each Commissioner shall receive an annual salary of $7,500. Section 24 of the act provides that the Commission is enlarged to 11 Commissioners, each with a term of 7 years, and each of whom shall receive an annual compensation of $12,000.

With the recent transfer of certain statutory duties from the Interstate Commerce Commission to the Department of Transportation, further difficulty in utilizing the present law can be anticipated. This is an opportune time to begin the task of consolidating the similar provisions now scattered throughout the four parts of the Interstate Commerce Act. Not only will such a consolidation and reenactment aid those who must utilize the interstate commerce law, but also such a project could focus attention on matters which at a later time might be the subject of substantive changes.

The project will involve bringing together similar provisions from all parts, and rewording of the law after all amendments are incorporated, and repealed and obsolete sections eliminated. I want to emphasize that this consolidation and reenactment will proceed under a directive not to make substantive changes in the law.

The Interstate Commerce Commission has agreed to assume the primary responsibility for this project. As a first step, the Commission has advised the committee that they will prepare a draft consolidating the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act. This draft will be circulated to interested organizations of practitioners such as the Association of Interstate Commerce Commission Practitioneers, the Motor Carrier Lawyers Association, the Federal Bar Association Transportation and Commission Practitioners, the Motor American Bar Association, and also to other interested groups. After interested parties have had ample time to inspect the draft and submit comments on necessary changes, a bill will be introduced incorporating the draft. Opportunity will be given for study and comments on the bill before any hearings are scheduled.

With the cooperation of all concerned, I am hopeful that this project of consolidation and reenactment of the interstate commerce law can be completed in time for action in this Congress.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, as I had previously suggested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMEMORATIVE AIRMAIL POSTAL CARD TO BE ISSUED IN TRIBUTE TO THE BOY SCOUT WORLD JAMBOREE

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that this morning Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien has announced that he plans today to issue a 6-cent commemorative airmail postal card on August 4, 1967, with ceremonies at Farragut State Park, Idaho, in tribute to the Boy Scout World Jamboree, which is being staged in the United States for the first time.

Mr. President, I personally appreciate this action on the part of the Postmaster General in issuing this postal card. It recognizes an organization, the Boy Scout movement, which was founded in England in 1908 by Sir Robert Baden-Powell, and spread to the United States almost immediately through the efforts of William D. Boyce, a Chicago publisher.

At the gathering in Farragut State Park, Idaho, there will be 20,000 Boy Scouts from nearly 100 nations encamped for the 12th World Jamboree. Each previous host country has issued a postal tribute to this organization that has more than 10 million members, about half of which are in the United States.

I deeply respect the Boy Scout movement of this Nation and the world. On February 24 I submitted a bill to the Senate, providing for the issuance of this special postage stamp honoring this 12th World Jamboree of Boy Scouts.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of that bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1070

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue a special postage stamp in honor of the Twelfth World Jamboree of Boy Scouts hosted by the Boy Scouts of America in August 1967.

SEC. 2. Such postage stamp shall be issued in such denomination and design, and for such period, as the Postmaster General may determine.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, may I have as much time as I need to make my statement?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. How much time would the Senator require?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I would require approximately 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I must reserve my right to object because I want to make a personal statement that will only take 2 minutes, if the Senator will permit me to proceed. I will clear my decks after that and the Senator can have as long as he wishes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator.

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA—THE DODD CASE

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I had hoped that members of the Ethics Committee—Select Committee on Standards and Conduct—would be present when I make this statement that I am about to make, but I must go to another meeting and fulfill another commitment. Therefore, I will make the statement for the RECORD and they can read it. If they think that an apology is in order, I would certainly be glad to subscribe to their wishes.

When I first read the report in the press that the Ethics Committee had recommended that TOM DODD be censured, not having read the report, I made the statement that I was going to vote against censuring TOM DODD, and speak against it. The press account of the statement was somewhat out of context which did not entirely cover what I had in mind. What I said was that it seemed to me that the man was being subjected to censure for the violation of a rule that did not exist, and he was not accused of violating a rule of the Senate, or a law on an ex post facto basis.

It seemed to me that if any man had come before that committee, such as the Senator from Louisiana, and it was said that I had been accused of wrongdoing by these Washington columnists, if I laid my life before these men, if I said that I thought I had done nothing wrong, but if they thought that I had done so, please tell me what I should do to make amends for it. If I had then been subject to investigation for every public and private act I had committed in recent history, with special agents hired and trecherous employees who had stolen my papers were brought before the committee and asked questions and charges were made that I had done something wrong which did not violate any rule or any law, that I doubted that the average Senator would have made out any better than TOM DODD, even including in the generality of the statement those superior high caliber type Senators who were chosen to serve on the Ethics Committee itself.

It seems to me that practically anybody would be subject to being seriously embarrassed if he were investigated in such depths searching for mere improprieties. I know that I would. I am sure that if I were worked over as he was, for some mistakes I made in my life, for which I am genuinely repentant, and for which I think the good Lord has forgiven me, I am sure I would be embarrassed.

If this man should be censured because he picked up the wrong fork at dinner or accepted an invitation to make a speech and did not show up, or cashed a check which was issued in error, then a great number of men would be in danger of serious criticism, even worse than the nature of that which has been directed against TOM DODD.

As one who felt TOM DODD committed no crime and did no wrong justifying the censure of the Senate, when I said, "Half of the Senate" I meant the average Senator. Even some of the finest Members of the Senate, if put through the type investigation that Tom Dodd went through, could be seriously embarrassed and scathed.

If anyone finds that I have offended his honor when I referred to one-half of the Senate or one-half of the committee, if he will stand in place and say he feels he has been offended, I will offer him an apology right here at this minute, either now or in the future. I did not mean to offend these fine men who are on the committee. I helped recruit some of those fine men on that committee, and they are six of the finest men that have ever served in this body. It is a very distasteful task for them to serve on this committee. They do not want to charge their friends and neighbors or to sit in judgment on them. We pleaded with them to serve on the committee because it is not a pleasant task.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, they did it against their better judgment. If I had any complaint with the Ethics Committee, it is that their standards are too high. I do not know if I could measure up to them. I think we should be practical with regard to this matter.

Mr. President, the inspiration I find to carry on can be found in the Bible. This is the Bible presented to the Official Reporters of Debates. It is inscribed "Huey P. Long, U.S. Senator," and it is dated 1934. That was my father. This is the Bible that our reporters use to check quotations to determine whether what a Senator says is correct. My father could afford to let the reporters have the Bible. He could almost recite the entire Bible by heart.

The Bible says:

> Two men went up into the temple to pray; the one a Pharisee, and the other a Republican.

[Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hasten to correct myself. That did not say "Republican"; but "publican." A publican is more like a Democrat, in my opinion.

The quotation goes on to state:

> The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank Thee, that I am not as other men are, extortioners, unjust, adulterers, or even as this Publican.

He is saying to the Lord he is not a publican. He did not say "Republican."

> I fast twice in a week. I give tithes of all that I possess.
>
> And the Publican, standing afar off, would not lift up so much as his eyes unto Heaven, but smote upon his breast, saying, God be merciful to me a sinner.
>
> I tell you, this man went down to his house justified rather than the other: for everyone that exalteth himself shall be abased; and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted.

Mr. President, that is about the only thing that keeps this Senator going.

On one occasion I discussed a matter of right and wrong and matters of that sort with a member of the Ethics Committee. I said that although I pray for forgiveness frequently, about the only real hope I can see of entering the pearly gates and making sure I do not fall from heaven is this story by the Master about the publican and the Pharisee. This Senator knows that in his life he has made mistakes about which he is sorry and he repented and he hopes he has been forgiven.

Mr. President, it is my feeling that when we judge ourselves and our fellow Members we must judge ourselves as human beings and mortals because if we are to be judged otherwise, if we look upon ourselves as a group of Saints, then some of us must surely fall from Heaven. If we are to be judged by the standards suggested for one who tries to do right but sometimes fails to do as well as he hoped to do, or fails in what he would like to do, the decision might be otherwise.

If I made a mistake and did wrong by saying what I said, which led to a very unfortunate quotation, and perhaps reflected on a man of the highest moral standards and one of the finest men I have ever known in my life, and whom I asked to serve on that committee, as well as these other fine Senators, I am here to offer an apology.

It was an unfortunate misunderstanding. That is how most mischief occurs. What I said would have been correct if the entire quotation had been carried. But what was intended to be the meaning was lost somewhere between the lips and the scratch pad, or perhaps at the rewrite desk downtown.

We have fine Senators on the committee. Whether I agree with their recommendation or not, I would be the first to offer a resolution, if need be, to thank every one of them who serve on the committee and thereby serve the Senate. I know that theirs was a task for which I would not have liked to volunteer.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, another Senator desired to speak during the morning hour, but he has left the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hollings in the chair). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana withhold his request for a moment?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business is pending at the moment.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will resume the consideration of the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware and Mr. LONG of Louisiana addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Proxmire].

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE and Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the pending amendment is an amendment which, as I was saying yesterday, is strictly germane to the pending bill. To the best of my knowledge, it is the one amendment that was offered on the floor which is related exclusively and entirely to investment credit. It is fully relevant. It was accepted by the Senate before.

Under those circumstances, it is clear to me that the only objection to this amendment is that it would be a precedent which would leave the bill open to a lot of other amendments that might be offered to this bill. That argument just does not stand up, because there is no other amendment to this bill which has been offered that is germane to the investment credit.

This amendment was taken off the bill only because it was recommitted and ordered to be reported back stripped of amendments. But it was the only germane amendment which was adopted. So I want to make it very clear to Senators that adoption of this amendment would not in any way develop a precedent for introducing other amendments.

Mr. President, we could save a lot of time today if we could accept the amendment, put it back in the bill, and got the bill underway.

I hope Senators appreciate the fact that I am in extreme difficulty with respect to this matter. I am extremely anxious to have the investment credit bill passed. I think the investment credit should be restored promptly. I think it is a disservice to industry and to the workers of America to have a situation in which this particular provision of the tax law is in considerable question.

I think the likelihood of business making investment in plant and equipment is jeopardized by the fact that this bill has not been passed, and some businessmen may think it may never be passed.

Under the circumstances, I am extremely anxious to move ahead, and I feel that no Senator wants to delay the bill. I certainly would not want to delay it. It is only my desire to have fair treatment for the biggest employer in the

State of Wisconsin, who is also an employer in other States.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PROXMIRE. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I have been in discussion with Senators. I am sure the Senator knows it has been said that no amendments will be accepted to this bill. But Senators, having added one amendment to the bill, want to vote down other amendments no matter how meritorious or germane they may be.

If this is what Senators are proposing to do—and I would ask the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] to hear this—I want to remind them that I made a statement some time ago, when there was a misunderstanding between the majority leader and myself. I said publicly that I was not going to filibuster the bill. I know how to filibuster bills. I have not said, however, that I did not reserve the right to offer amendments relevant to the Presidential Campaign Fund Act. But, I said, if I did offer such an amendment I would propose that we debate it long enough for Senators to know what they are voting on, and then vote it up or down, one way or the other.

I would hope that Senators would understand my position—thereby doing justice to the Senator from Wisconsin—that there will be no filibuster, but that we should legislate in such a way that we do not put ourselves in a position of voting contrary to our consciences rollcall after rollcall. Then, we would not have to explain to our people why we did not do the right thing when we had the opportunity to do so, such as on the amendment the Senator from Wisconsin is offering.

If anyone is worried about the Senator from Louisiana conducting a filibuster on this bill, he can forget it. I promised I would not conduct a filibuster. I put it in the newspapers; I wrote out a statement for them. I said it on the floor.

It is one thing to conduct a filibuster—and I have done it, and my hide is tough enough to filibuster when circumstances require it—but I said I am not going to do it. It is another thing to legislate judiciously, calmly, logically, and to consider amendments which other Senators have in mind.

I am not prepared to enter into a unanimous consent request to vote on the bill itself or to limit debate on amendments. We will consider and discuss the amendments, at reasonable length, and when there has been reasonable discussion and reasonable explanation in the press and reasonable understanding by Senators as to what they are voting on, there need be no reason why we cannot vote on the amendments, as far as I am concerned.

I myself have tried many times to move expeditiously on some legislation, and have gone to the Republican leader with a request to have a unanimous-consent agreement to vote. He has said, "Not now. Let us talk for a while. Maybe a week from now. I think it should be debated."

That is how I feel about amendments to this bill. This is a major bill. It is my belief it is a bill the President wants to sign. I do not want to contrive a parliamentary situation where we may have so many amendments to the bill that the President might feel compelled not to sign because it contains amendments that have not been adequately considered. But, as far as filibustering the bill or preventing the bill from coming to a final vote is concerned, let me say that will not happen.

This bill has been before us for almost a month, but we do not have any other pressing legislation before us. If the railroad strike bill comes before us, we can lay this bill aside and return to it after we consider the strike bill. This is a big bill. It involves billions of dollars. It involves presidential elections.

So there need be no fear of a filibuster. There will not be one as far as I am concerned. But we should hammer out a bill logically. We are debating an important issue, perhaps one that is as big as the Senate will pass this year.

I have seen other bills before the Senate that took an equally long time. When I first came here, if we had for example, a Taft-Hartley bill before us, a big bill—and this is a big bill, perhaps the most important revenue bill that will pass this year—perhaps a month of debate would be par for the course before we would come to a final decision.

Some Senators have chosen this particular bill as the one to which they want to offer a number of amendments, and extraneous amendments. I was against that, but if that is what they want to do, I think we ought to accord other Senators the privilege to offer other amendments.

I pledge to the Senate that I will do the best I can to persuade the House conferees to take all amendments except one, and I will name a majority of Senate conferees to take that one, if it remains in the bill.

I want the Senate to know, and anyone interested in this matter to know, that there is no filibuster going on and there will not be one. We are just legislating as the Senate ordinarily legislates. I would hope we could proceed with that in mind. There have been times when I had delayed matters to get my supporters in town. There have been times when others have done likewise. There should be no objection to that.

If I had been in their position, I would have been doing the same thing under the same circumstances, and I would say that we should vote on all Senators' amendments on their merits. As far as I am concerned, as soon as Senators are willing to agree that the amendment is a good amendment, is meritorious, and deserves the approval of the Senate, I would hope we can just accept it and go on to legislate on the next one.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the Finance Committee, the assistant majority leader, and the manager of the bill, who has been very helpful in connection with my amendment.

Mr. President, I am about to withdraw this amendment, and I wish to take about a minute and a half to explain why.

At the beginning of the debate on the investment credit, this amendment was accepted. It has been approved by the managers of the bill; it has been approved by the Treasury, which says it should be on the bill; it was approved by the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], who was managing the bill, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], and by the ranking Republican member of the committee, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. In fact, the Senator from Delaware said just yesterday:

> As a member of the committee I say this to the Senator from Wisconsin: In the event his amendment does fail as a result of the parliamentary situation in which we find ourselves at this time, I would be glad to give it sympathetic consideration at a later date when the committee will be working on another tax proposal. . . .
>
> It is an amendment that is germane to the subject, and it should not be characterized as a loading amendment. It is not of that character.

The next ranking Republican member [Mr. CARLSON] said this:

> I make the Senator this definite commitment, as a member of the Committee on Finance: At the first opportunity in the committee, this amendment will be offered, or it will be offered on the floor and I shall support it.

Mr. President, I think with this kind of commitment for my amendment, I would be foolish to press the amendment to a vote now. I think it should pass, but it might not. It would endanger the amendment; it would endanger the opportunity for a very important industry in my State to receive this kind of equitable treatment. I am assured, and I am confident that these Senators are men of their word, that they will act in the near future to support the amendment, and see that it becomes law.

Under those circumstances, Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Senator from Delaware is recognized, under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, for 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me for the purpose of making a statement and offering an amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I certainly will yield to the majority leader at any time he wishes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished senior Senator from Delaware, who has always been most courteous and gracious, and who has waited a long time for this unanimous-consent request to come to fruition. I wish to express to him my deep personal appreciation for the courtesy he has shown toward me.

Mr. President, provided that I may do so without losing my right to the floor, I suggest the absence of a quorum. It will be a live quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator does not wish the time for the quorum call to be counted against the time of the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 101 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Muskie
Nelson
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Republic is in a troubled time in foreign policy, especially with respect to Vietnam. The Republic is headed into a troubled time at home, with a long summer looming. Yet, when the Senate attempts to respond to the best economic judgment available in the Nation and apply the much-needed stimulus of an investment credit to the Nation's economy it is unable to do so. Six weeks later, we are still bushwhacking in the procedural thickets; 6 weeks later, there is no real or apparent progress.

The time has come when the matter now before us must be settled. In the judgment of the Senator from Montana it is not going to be settled, however, on a basis which anyone can regard as a total victory for his particular predilection. We have all been here long enough to know that when an issue is fused in the Senate with the kind of heat that has been engendered and when the margin of vote for either point of view is as minimal as it is—there are no total victories. There is the option of passing over the matter. There is the option of continuing the kind of futile antics which we have witnessed for weeks—the option of marching up the hill and down again. That is the choice; that, or a reasonable compromise. It is about time for all concerned to face up to these Senate realities.

In an effort to help the Senate face up to them, the Senator from Montana asks the Senate and, particularly, those who have argued vigorously for their respective viewpoints to consider the compromise which is about to be offered. It is offered in the hope that it will break the impasse confronting us. It is offered as a reasonable solution to the difficulty.

I do not delude myself or the Senate, however, as to its prospects. The compromise which will be offered will not go anywhere without the cooperation, the understanding and the tolerance of the Members of the Senate.

The issue of campaign financing is, as everyone knows by this time, the key to solution although we are, presumably, on an investment credit tax bill. The campaign financing issue has been voted upon four times already; the investment tax credit restoration has not been voted on at all.

The Senate will recall that my motion to recommit the bill with instructions carried on April 25, 1967, by a vote of 64 to 22. By that action, the Senate swept the bill of many extraneous matters—and there were at that point so many as to win for the bill the appellation of "Christmas Tree."

The recommittal left in the measure only the investment tax credit and the question of campaign financing. I had thought the action at that time would be conclusive and would bring about final disposition. I was wrong. We are now on the verge of beginning again the process of possibly adding extraneous matters. Spring has already come to Washington, but we are about to light up the Christmas tree all over again.

I cannot believe that the Senate desires to repeat this demeaning indulgence. Nevertheless, that is the point at which we find ourselves in this most unhappy state of affairs. We are no nearer a visible prospect of a final vote, today, than we were 6 weeks ago.

At this point, I think the Senate should be aware of the availability of these principal procedural alternatives:

First. We could take no action to break the impasse. In that event, we are likely to be in for a repeat performance of the Christmas Tree Act.

Second. We could send the entire bill to the calendar once again. The leadership could move to proceed to some other item of business on the calendar and the investment credit bill would go back to the calendar. It would remain there unless motioned up at a future date. This procedure, in the judgment of the Senator from Montana, would merely evade the question; it would not settle it.

Third. We could table the entire bill. A tabling motion of the entire bill would kill the investment credit bill as well as the Senate action on the Long Act, which is now in the bill. In other words, it would cancel out the expiration date of July 31 on the campaign fund law.

Fourth. We could invoke cloture. This possibility has been mentioned to me by various Senators. Not only do I have, as do most Members, a personal dislike for cloture, but also, I do not believe that it can be a substitute for the personal restraint and reasonableness and mutual accommodation which alone assures the highest contribution of each Senator and of the Senate as a whole to the Nation under the Constitution of the United States. I would prefer, therefore, on that basis, to hold the alternative of cloture in abeyance, and even beyond.

Having enumerated these procedural options, I would suggest to the Senate that in the judgment of the Senator from Montana, they are all undesirable in this situation—at least for the present. It would be my view that we are left, therefore, with only one desirable alternative at this time. The Senator from Montana suggests to the Senate that it should reject a reaccumulation of nongermane amendments and at the same time it should seek a compromise which will bridge the gap in present positions on campaign financing and lead to a broadly acceptable Senate position. I believe we can build this bridge by an amendment which retains the principle of public financing of elections on the statute books but prohibits the disbursement of any funds under the present Campaign Act until Congress acts again to provide safeguards and election reforms.

This proposal, in my judgment, is a reasonable answer to the situation which confronts the Senate. It does not throw into the waste heap, the legislative achievement of the principle of public financing which is represented by the Long Act. But it holds that principle inoperative, as urged by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], unless and until a measure is forthcoming which adjusts the Long Act to include the kind of careful safeguards which the Senate, if I am correct, also desires as a precondition to its operation. Under this compromise proposal, no campaign funds would be disbursed until and unless an honest elections campaign measure were forthcoming and became the law of the land.

Last week the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] asked that I not offer this modification after the Senate refused to table his motion to strike the July 31 date; I complied with his request. Last week it was made clear that I was bound, at that time, by my word to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] not to alter the language of my motion to recommit so that it might express the compromise which I have just described. I did not feel free therefore to offer the compromise at that time.

At this point, however, I request, in the interest of the orderly procedure and in the interest of its reputation that the Senate proceed, without delay, to a vote upon the amendment which I will offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read the amendment, as follows:

On page 4 strike section 5 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 5. (a) Funds which become available under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be appropriated

> and disbursed only after the adoption by law of guidelines governing their distribution.
>
> "(b) Guidelines adopted in accordance with this section shall state expressly that they are intended to comply with this section."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may interpret the second section, the purpose of the second section of the amendment is to identify clearly and unmistakenly the "guidelines" which must be adopted by Congress to enable the disbursement and the act of appropriation of any moneys out of the campaign fund. While the adoption of the guidelines would be a precondition to the act of appropriation and to the actual disbursement by the Treasury, any such enabling legislation must state by its own terms the intent of Congress to satisfy this requirement.

This requirement is intended to remove any doubt or ambiguity from what would constitute a guideline.

Under the mandate the Senate gave to the Committee on Finance over a week ago, the full range of ideas and proposals in the area of election financing and reform is before the committee. The term "guidelines" therefore could be interpreted in various ways in various quarters. However, to insure no misunderstanding, and to make the intention of Congress crystal clear, the satisfaction of this prohibition of funds shall explicitly state, as a part of the proposed law, the intention of Congress to satisfy this precondition.

If this amendment is adopted by the Senate and ultimately becomes a part of the law, the Long Act will remain on the books but will not be operative as a source of campaign funds until Congress speaks twice again on this question—once with the guidelines, once with the act of appropriations.

If Congress does not act again—this Congress—no funds will be disbursed to finance the next presidential election. The checkoff feature will still be in effect, but no funds will be disbursed under it.

The checkoff feature will simply permit a bookkeeping entry at the Treasury establishing a ceiling on any future authorization from Congress; it will act also as the ceiling on any future act of appropriation by Congress.

Any fears that an apparently innocuous provision inserted as a part of an unrelated bill might satisfy the guideline precondition of section 5(a) should be negated by the provisions of section 5(b).

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I share fully the concern—I might even say the agony—of the majority leader in all these weeks in seeking, somehow, to unsnarl the difficulty that has virtually stalemated the Senate. I hope it can be done. I have hoped so before now. When on Tuesday we had a vote in which 98 Members of the Senate were on record, and a fair majority, at least, of the Senate asserted its will, I thought that that perhaps, was sufficient to resolve the problem and dispose of it once and for all. Had the Senator who was absent at the time been present and voting, the result would have been 46 to 53. The result might have been changed, however, by the vote of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], but he announced a pair. But when out of 98 votes, of a possible 100 votes, in this body, a majority of six asserted its will, I think the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] ought to accept that as the will of the Senate, instead of making what I think was some rather boastful and, on occasion, quite unwarranted remarks as to what he proposed to do with investment credit unless the Senate bowed to his will.

That certainly was not language that is becoming the dignity of the Senate and could best have been left unuttered. But it has been uttered, and it is presently in the RECORD, and the problem is still here.

The question now is what to do. If there is an assault upon the propriety of the repealer that is in the investment credit bill, I can only remind the Senate of how the presidential financing campaign measure finally found its way upon the statute books, because it happened last year. It failed in the Committee on Finance. I am a member of that committee. I voted against it in committee, and ultimately it was appended to another tax measure on the floor of the Senate, so that it would be in order and would not be returned by the House with a remonstrance because of what they regard as the constitutional function of the House. So if that action was improper then, it could be said it is improper now. But nobody contested the propriety of that action in the 89th Congress.

The matter was debated on the floor of the Senate and was finally approved by the Senate. There was a good, hard fuss in conference. The provision remained after the conference impressed its will upon the final bill, and that is the way the Presidential Campaign Financing Act got upon the statute books.

I affirmed my opposition to it then, and I reaffirm my opposition to it now. If that was a proper exercise of parliamentary power in this body, then the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was not only within his rights by the action that he took or the procedure that he followed but was perfectly proper in offering the repealer which is presently the horn of the dilemma.

I had hoped that we could stand by the vote of Tuesday and then proceed beyond there, but evidently we cannot. If perchance the action taken here should be favorable to the proposal of the distinguished majority leader, it will only mean that we will go right back to the benchmark where we started more than 6 weeks ago. Let us make no mistake about it. If Senators want to walk through the valley of the shadow of that again, it will be all right. But I prefer not to do so. I do not care to retrace those steps again. I am quite anxious because of the interest of the business fraternity of this country, to see something done about investment credit.

I want to say now—and I observe that the majority whip is in the Chamber—that I think it ill becomes him as a Member of this body to make a threat that unless the Senate bows to his will there will be no Investment Credit Act. I think there will be another answer. I cannot imagine that this body is so impotent, I cannot imagine that this body is so remiss in its larger duty, that it will let the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] tell it what it is going to do and what it is not going to do, because there will be another answer to that.

Let any measure that has so much as the odor of a tax measure about it come before the Senate, and let us see what will happen, because we will be ready. We will gird up our loins and demonstrate to the country that the Senate, in an hour of emergency, is not an immobile body.

That is why I say this occurrence ill becomes the Senator from Louisiana. I have great affection for him. I like him. I like to serve on his committee. He is an excellent chairman. But a time comes when a false pride has got to submit to the will of this body. That is precisely where we stand today.

That is precisely where we stand today. I trust that we will not take favorable action on this proposal merely to make this inoperative, because this canker will still be on the statute books.

The thing to do is to erase it. The thing to do is to make a fresh start. We can do it in this session, or we can do it in another session.

I have no time for this proposal for presidential financing. If we are going to finance a campaign, let us walk that whole furrow and include other Federal officers as well.

What do we say about Representatives and Senators who will be running on their ticket in a presidential year?

Let them go to the public and undertake to get some money, and what will be the answer?

Why, we make a little pen scratch in a small block on the income tax form. The press reports that there are literally million of dollars available. We will go to those who have in their charge the funds which have been taken out of the taxes and get Senate financing or House financing there. That is finally going to be the answer.

We do not run a senatorial or a House campaign on a shoestring. I have been through three senatorial campaigns, and eight House campaigns—so I know what they cost.

So there we are—left out in the cold.

If we are going to do something, let us do something worthwhile and encompass the whole election reform business while we are at it. Then, for the first time, we can see that we are on good ground.

Let no one be frightened by any boast that there will be no investment tax credit bill.

Mr. President, there will be. There has got to be. Take note of the falling rate in motorcar manufacturing right now, and a good many other indicators which are before us. All I can say is, this is something we must do for the economy of the country.

So, Mr. President, let us vote down the proposal, difficult as it is for me ever to go against the majority leader. I know the good faith, I know the bigness of heart he always brings to these problems. We sit down and consider them in the best of spirits and with the maximum of good will at all times. I wish I could see eye to eye with him today, even as I have seen eye to eye with him so many times since he has occupied that chair, which he graces with great distinction, in my book—and since, in a modest way, I have been permitted to exercise the responsibilities that go with this chair.

I do not like to have to vote against the proposal, but I trust that the Senate will not adopt it, that it will "mow 'em down," as Charlie McCarthy used to say, mow down every amendment that comes along and then, at long last, we shall proceed to the business in hand and give ear to the will of the Senate as expressed only a few days ago by what I thought was a reasonably substantial vote.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is with reluctance that I must oppose the amendment offered by the distinguished majority leader.

Let me take one moment briefly to state what the amendment would do and what it would not do, as I have been able to determine after having read it with some haste.

I cannot find that it would effectively resolve the issue. It would leave the tax checkoff provisions in the law. It would leave effective provisions of the law under which tax forms would be printed giving to each taxpayer discretion to dispose of $1 of his tax liability to a purpose of his own choosing. The special presidential campaign fund would remain in the Treasury, with direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer to the fund such amounts as the taxpayers in aggregate designated, there to accumulate until Congress takes some action.

What action? What action which would differ from that required in the law today?

The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 already provides for these same steps, and the exercise of this choice by the taxpayer, the establishment of a presidential campaign fund in the Treasury, and direction to the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer such funds, as he collects them, to the special fund; and then it provides that Congress may appropriate those funds for the purpose of distribution to the treasuries of the two parties whose nominees received 15 million votes in the previous presidential election.

Accordingly, I ask: How would this amendment change the law?

It would change it in this regard: It states that disbursements under the act shall not be made until Congress provides the guidelines.

Mr. President, what are the guidelines?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the proposed amendment offered by the able and distinguished majority leader provide, in substance, that the Gore Act is to remain the law of the land?

Mr. GORE. The Senator means the Long Act.

Mr. ERVIN. I mean the Long Act. Has not the Senate voted three times since the 3d day of April this year to eradicate the Long Act from the statute books?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. This amendment, then, would have the effect of preserving the Long Act. All it would do would provide that the money will not be disbursed under the Long Act until Congress comes up with some guidelines to enforce the Long Act; is that not correct?

Mr. GORE. I do not think the amendment goes quite as far as the Senator has just now stated. It provides that Congress must adopt guidelines—it is quite indefinite as to what Congress must do, or what it should do. Indeed, Congress could proceed to appropriate the money by the same act under this amendment as would be the case if we did nothing to the Long Act.

Thus, in my opinion, this amendment is not a compromise. There is nothing in the nature of a compromise in the proposal. It would permit the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] to work his will and undo the will of the Senate as thrice expressed.

The law would still direct the Secretary of the Treasury to transfer tax funds to a special fund in the Treasury, the presidential campaign fund, there to accumulate as it would without this amendment. These steps are not affected by the proposed amendment.

Mr. President, I should like to recall for the Senate that not only did the Senator from Tennessee commit himself to abide by the will of the Senate expressed in a vote last Tuesday; the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], who has been associated with me in the attempt to repeal what we regard as a dangerous and unsound act, made a similar commitment.

In order that each Senator would have an opportunity to vote, a time was set, with ample notice to enable each Senator to arrive; and only the illness of one of our colleagues prevented the presence of 100 Senators. Unfortunately, one Member was ill, but he was given a pair, with a stated position. Thus, 100 Senators expressed their will, 98 by votes, one by an announcement of his position, one by giving a pair to the ill colleague. Thus, 100 Members of the Senate, at the appointed time, expressed their will. As has been said, the vote was 52 to 46.

I have offered no amendment since then. Had the vote gone the other way, I would have offered none. Only one amendment is pending now.

We heard a commitment earlier today that no filibuster would be conducted. What have we had? I have pleaded for votes repeatedly for 5 weeks. It has not been by my action that this bill has not been disposed of. The Senate has expressed its will, as I have said, three times.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I should like to get the Senator's opinion as to whether or not it is a fact that the setting of the vote for Tuesday, May 2, at a time not later than 3 o'clock, was specifically intended to eliminate the jockeying that was going on, under which at one time one side had all of its Members, or most of them, present, and at another time the other side had all or most of its supporters present; and thus to get a true expression of what the Senate thought of this issue.

It was said, "We will discuss the subject until Tuesday afternoon, May 2, not later than 3 o'clock." And it was for that reason that 99 Members were present. And is it not a fact that the general, open purpose was that the issue would be brought to an end?

Mr. GORE. It was my understanding that this agreement was entered into in order to facilitate exercise by the Senate of its majority will with the fullest possible participation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In other words, so both sides would have the opportunity of telling their supporters, "You must be present on Tuesday when the vote will be taken. If you are present, we will have a full expression of judgment." The consequence was that 99 Senators were here.

Now, my question is, Was that or was it not a complete and full declaration of the will of the Senate as to what it wants done with this subsidy bill for the election of Presidents?

Mr. GORE. I think it was, and the issue was simple, sharp, and clear—repeal of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966. The issue was as clear cut as possible. The amendment, now proposed by the majority leader in all good will and in the good-faith exercise of his responsibility, would nevertheless, however well motivated, abort the will of the Senate and substitute, instead, the will of the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if that was not the third time that the able and distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana had gone to bat.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. And he struck out. Now he wants to go to bat a fourth time?

Mr. GORE. And not accept the rule that three strikes are out.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is it not also true that on an occasion prior to Tuesday's vote, when the Senator from Louisiana was defeated by a vote of 46 to 42, and he suggested that he lost because of absentees, that Senators who were absent declared their position in the Congressional Record; and had they all been present, the vote would have been 51 to 49 and he would still have lost if all Senators had been in their seats?

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. At no time has the Senator from Louisiana been able to demonstrate that a majority of the Senate is in favor of his position. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. At no time; and, in my opinion, at no time has a majority of the U.S. Senate wished the Long Act to remain the law of the land. I do not believe a majority of the United States today wishes that act to be the law of the land.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Would not the only explanation for the Senate's reversing its position, after making it plain three times, be a complete capitulation to the Senator from Louisiana. And if we did so would not the Senate adopt a principle that one Senator, by these tactics, can achieve his will against the majority of the U.S. Senate?

Mr. GORE. I regret that that appears to be the situation.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator yield again?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I feel obliged to express my commendation to the Senator from Montana. The views I have expressed about the measure are no reflection upon his honest effort to do a good job as the majority leader of the Senate.

My compassion goes to the Senator from Montana. He has labored and agonized for practically 5 weeks in trying to get this measure through. When he proposed a vote no later than 3 o'clock on Tuesday, May 2, he thought he was going to get the matter concluded; and it would have been concluded were it not, as I said yesterday, for the insistence of the Senator from Louisiana that his will be done, and that the will of the U.S. Senate be cast aside.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I join him in his expression of esteem and good will for the distinguished majority leader of this body. I fully join in that respect.

But respect for Senator MANSFIELD does not induce me willingly to capitulate to the will of another single Member of this body. The pending amendment is subject to amendment. Unquestionably, someone may wish to offer an amendment. It is even subject to a substitute amendment.

Mr. President, who stands in the way of the passage of this bill? Not the senior Senator from Tennessee. I have no amendment pending. There is but one amendment pending. Should this amendment be withdrawn, and the will to filibuster be withdrawn, then we can vote this afternoon and pass the bill.

But that is not the only issue. The important issue is whether the U.S. Senate shall capitulate in the name of compromise. I am unwilling to see that occur.

I should like to review the history of this law.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, before the Senator starts on that, will he yield briefly?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I have great difficulty in understanding what the purpose of this amendment is, if it is not to save the face of the Senator from Louisiana, who, I understand, intends to support it. Does the Senator from Tennessee see any other advantage to be gained from the pending amendment?

Mr. GORE. I would not call it an advantage. It would abort the will of the Senate, as expressed three times.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I find it very difficult indeed to vote against my majority leader on a matter in which he is keenly interested; but unless somebody can explain to me what this proposal would do except to get the Senator from Louisiana off the hook, I would find great difficulty in voting for it, because I have no interest in that objective whatever.

Mr. GORE. I have no unkind feeling toward the junior Senator from Louisiana. I would be willing to go to any reasonable length to get him off the hook, so to speak. But I do not want to put my country on the hook in order to take anyone off the hook.

This is an unwise, unsound, and dangerous law, and we are asked here to perpetuate it, after the Senate has voted three times to repeal it.

I am confident the Senate will vote again to repeal it; and that opportunity shall be afforded the Senate. It is entitled to it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It would occur to me that a far more orderly way of disposing of this matter, in view of the procedures of which the Senator from Louisiana, acting quite within his rights, has availed himself, would be to file a motion for cloture, which I for one would be glad to sign.

Mr. GORE. I know that a cloture motion has been suggested. In fact, I have been advised that a number of signatures are already attached to one.

I have never signed a cloture motion. I would want to give careful consideration to all the alternatives before doing so. But that is a parliamentary weapon which the Senate can use to work its will, and if the choice is between cloture to facilitate the will of the Senate and a capitulation to abort the will of the Senate, I will choose the former.

This, I repeat, is not a complicated parliamentary situation. There is but one amendment pending. The bill is a clean bill, by direction of the Senate. The Senate, by a vote of 52 to 46, defeated the only amendment that has come to a vote since the bill was last reported by direction of the Senate. I hope the Senate will defeat the pending amendment.

I should like at this time to review the history of this legislation briefly. As the senior Senator from Illinois has pointed out, the 1966 act was offered as an extraneous amendment to another bill in the closing days of the session last October. The senior Senator from Tennessee undertook with vigor, for a period of 2 days, to dissuade the Senate from its passage. It would have been within my physical capacity, as it was clearly within the capacity of a group of Senators who felt strongly that the bill should not become law, to have kept the Senate in session a week or perhaps 2 weeks, when it was very difficult to obtain a quorum.

We did not do that. With reluctance and regret, we yielded to the vote of the Senate, although I believe there was but two Senators more than a quorum available, barely a quorum with which to pass the bill. Many Senators returned by plane to the Senate only minutes or hours before the vote.

I announced then that at the first opportunity in the new session of Congress, I would give the full Senate an opportunity to decide upon repeal of the measure which we, in haste, without hearing and without adequate consideration, had passed.

Upon the convening of Congress in January, I announced that at the first opportunity I would seek repeal of this act, and I introduced a bill for that purpose. So, there was no surprise move on my part. And it is only by an amendment to a revenue measure that has originated in the other body that the Senate can pass a lawful act to repeal this law.

Thereafter, at a meeting of the Senate Finance Committee on the investment credit tax bill, I offered the bill I had introduced to repeal the Long Act as an amendment thereto.

The junior Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, was absent that day. Out of respect for him, I was persuaded, and yielded to the persuasion, to withhold the amendment, and not press for a vote on it in committee.

The acting chairman of the committee was the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] who explained that for reasons beyond his control—at least, for reasons that I am sure were sufficient—the chairman of the committee could not be present. The acting chairman asked me not to press for a vote.

The acting chairman of the committee expressed the view at that time in the committee that if I were to ask for a vote on my amendment, in his opinion a majority of the committee would vote to adopt it. I did not press, as I have said, for a vote.

When the bill reached the floor of the Senate, I offered my amendment, but upon being advised that the junior Senator from Louisiana would not return to Washington until the next day, I withheld asking for a vote until he could be present, and advised his office that I would do so.

I was ready for a vote the next day. I have been ready to vote on this issue every day since then. The only occasion upon which I asked for delay was a delay requested out of courtesy and consideration for the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Senator speaks about delay and, I assume, the cause of the delay.

I read what was said yesterday by the junior Senator from Louisiana:

> Mr. President, it does not make any difference how long it takes. If it takes from now until Christmas, or from now until New Year's Day, we ought to do what we are paid to do: give the people some good legislation for their money.

The Senate has spoken three times and declared that this legislation is not good legislation. Yet, yesterday, May 2, the junior Senator from Louisiana made the statement that we will stay here, in effect, until he can achieve his objective, until Christmas or until New Year's Day, so as to comply with his judgment and repudiate the judgment of the majority of the Senate expressed three times by affirmative vote.

When we speak of the cause of the delay, we are told that we will be here until the snow begins to fall, and I assume that is why the majority leader is trying in some way to bring this matter to an end, and the only avenue presently open seems to be to yield supinely and abjectly to the command of the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I must say in all candor that I have great sympathy and the deepest of affection for the distinguished senior Senator from Montana, our majority leader.

His is a grave responsibility, but so is mine.

What responsibility does the senior Senator from Montana have that the junior Senator from Louisiana does not have? What responsibility does one Senator have that another Senator does not have?

When we are dealing for the first time in the history of our Republic with the provision of public money for the election of a President of the United States, we are dealing with an issue so vital that it goes to the very heart of our system of self-government.

I am, as I have said, persuaded that we must seriously consider the provision of public funds for election to Federal office. But the President of the United States is not the only Federal officer.

I think that election reform must take into consideration the cost of campaigns, as I have said repeatedly, and there must be public participation therein. However, along with it there must be safeguards to protect the ballot box from the undue influence of money, special favor-seeking money.

I wish to be candid enough to say that I consider the influence of money the gravest threat to freedom and self-government in the United States.

Next week, the party of the people will have a fundraising dinner at $250 per plate. What man of toil will be there? Who will buy the plates at $250 each? I do not know who will buy them by the plate. Not many. Who will buy the tables of plates? We know, and we are ashamed of it. The lobbyists and the special interests seeking favors from Congress and the Government will buy those plates and those tables. And the Republican Party always seems to go us one better. Their dinner is $500 a plate.

The party machinery of both parties has become like kept women of special interests.

And what does the Long act propose? Merely to pour more money into the slush fund, without doing anything whatever to correct the evils which every Member of this body, Republican or Democrat, knows are eating at the heart of our system of self-government today.

Oh, it is said that if you provide money from the Treasury in ample amounts for the election of a President, there will be more slush funds from the private sources for congressional campaigns. Can we call that a virtue? Is that an improvement?

Mr. President, I started out to give some brief history of the 1966 act. I should like to complete the history by referring to the votes by which three times the Senate has expressed its will on this issue.

The first vote on repeal was 48 to 42—90 Senators. There are not many rollcall votes in the course of a year in which 90 Senators vote. Most of the rollcalls, I seem to remember, are in the 80's. But in this case 90 Senators voted. Still others made their views known; some by pairs. I am advised by an aide that even on that vote there were three sets of pairs. So in this instance 96 Senators expressed their will, their judgment, their decision.

The next vote came only after another Christmas tree had been erected on the floor of the Senate, as a tactic, as a parliamentary tactic, to so belabor and so beladen the bill as to cause further action. Well, the Senate took further action. By a vote of 64 to 22, the bill was recommitted, with instructions to the committee to report back forthwith the bill that is now before the Senate, containing but two provisions: one, the restoration of investment credit; two, the repeal of the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966.

The junior Senator from Louisiana, the chairman of the committee, acted in accordance with that instruction, and forthwith, as directed, reported the bill to the Senate; and then forthwith moved to seek to undo what the Senate had just directed.

I was ready to vote soon after he offered the motion. But a time was set which would give all Senators an opportunity to be here. Wires were sent out by the party leadership of both parties, advising of the vote, requesting the presence of Senators; and all but one ill Member of this body were here. One hundred Senators expressed their will—98 by rollcall vote and two by pair. The distinguished junior Senator from Alaska, with his usual compassion and kindness, gave a pair to the ill and absent Member.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Would that several of our friends on the Republican side of the aisle and those who did not agree would have been as considerate, with the five absentees I had the first time this matter came to a vote. The way I count them, I would have won on that occasion. I salute the Senator from Alaska for his kindness and consideration. I regret that it has not been accorded to us in the same fashion.

Mr. GORE. There is no question that on the first vote, 96 Senators took a position—90 by rollcall vote, six by pairs. But the question of absentees cannot now be advanced as having been a factor in determining the will of the Senate. A time was set which would eliminate the question of absentees, and that question was eliminated. Let me repeat and emphasize that 100 Senators reported their decision last Tuesday.

The bill stands before the Senate unamended as a result of that vote. All we need do now is either vote the pending amendment down and pass the bill or, if the distinguished majority leader would but withdraw it, we could vote in 5 minutes, unless someone wished to prevent or delay that vote.

Mr. President, having agreed to accept the will of the Senate, whatever that will might turn out to be, I have accepted it; but I did not agree to participate in its undoing. I am now going to defend that expressed will of the Senate. I believe in majority will. I never believed in minority will in this body or in this country.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When the Senator refers to the will of the Senate, and the instructions of the Senate, he should realize that I voted for the motion. I delivered more votes on that occasion than at any time during the debate because that was a motion where the majority leader put his leadership on the line with respect to the understanding that was reached. He made a motion he did not want to make because the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware inferred, if he did not do this, he would be breaking his word—which he gave when a misunderstanding existed. The majority leader put his leadership on the line; he made the motion and voted against it. Even though nothing could have hurt my position more, I voted for it, and I must have delivered 15 votes on that occasion.

Having done that, we would now like to express our true will as to what we really think about the matter where the majority leader makes a motion which I understand, and the Senator from Tennessee understands, and which does justice and fairness, and perhaps expresses the real will of the Senate, and an understanding of what he is doing, the Senator is doing, and what I am doing.

Mr. GORE. I have accorded to the junior Senator from Louisiana throughout this contest the respect to which I know he is entitled, and which I freely accord.

I cannot let stand unchallenged, however, the statement which the able Senator has just made that I in any way inferred that the majority leader had, was about to, or would break his word.

The Record will show that I said to the Senate and to the senior Senator from Montana that he had lived up to his commitment, which was to offer the motion which he offered. This was the end of the commitment and I made that plain.

I did suggest that no notice was given that after the gentlemen's agreement had been complied with, the motion would be altered. This is the record. There was no inference that the Senator from Montana had broken his word or would.

The word of Mike Mansfield is the word of a gentleman. It is as good as his bond, as good as his life.

I stated as meticulously, as carefully and as fully as I could possibly remember every single step that was taken, and then specifically said that the Senator from Montana had fulfilled his commitment. If there is any question about it, I will get the RECORD and read it.

I did say that I was not advised of the possibility—I do not remember the exact words I used—but it was that I was not advised of any possibility of modifying, withdrawing, or altering the motion. That was not discussed. And I suggested to the distinguished majority leader that he think about it overnight, contemplate the relation I had given of events, and what others participating in the conference might recall, and then come to his own decision.

Now, the remarks I was making when the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana asked me to yield were not in reference to the vote of 64 to 22. I was referring to the vote of last Tuesday, a vote which came at the time of the Senator's own choosing. I had agreed to vote the previous week. I had agreed to let the vote come on Monday. The distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana preferred Tuesday. I said Tuesday is agreeable with me.

The RECORD will show that I said so long as Senators have sufficient notice to reach the Capitol from their constituencies, or wherever they might be—I am not sure I suggested 24 hours, but I had that in mind—such time to vote would be agreeable to me. In any event, not only was the day agreed upon at the will of the junior Senator from Louisiana but the hour for the vote and the length of debate were likewise agreed upon. The Senator from Louisiana even specified that there be a live quorum before the vote. I agreed to that.

There has been no dilatory action on my part. I have tried to facilitate the work of the Senate and I have said I would accept the will of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I wish to say to the Senator, first, that I endorse everything he said about the integrity and the word of the majority leader. I go further and say that, as far as I am concerned, the word of the senior Senator from Tennessee is as good as gold with me. I have never seen him break his word in my life.

Where we get into difficulty occasionally is where there is a misunderstanding. Somebody thought the man said one thing, when the man said something a little different than that. That is where I got into difficulty myself with the majority leader. But I was willing to take it on the chin in voting for the motion. I pointed out that I intended to support the leadership in those circumstances, and I did.

I am not delaying the Senate. As far as I am concerned, we can vote on the majority leader's motion this afternoon or at some other time. I am not interested in delaying the bill. I am willing to legislate however the Senate wishes to legislate—this amendment or any other amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator has made a strong and explicit statement. If he would be so explicit as to say that he will agree to a vote on this bill this afternoon upon withdrawal of the pending amendment, I think that the majority leader might be persuaded to withdraw it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Unfortunately, the Senator made a suggestion that I will not agree to.

The majority leader came to me, and he said, "Here is what I am going to propose." He said, "Will you agree to it?" I said, "Yes." He said, "I will see if the other side will agree to it." I said, "Don't bother. You won't find anything that I agree to, to which they will agree. We have been trying to agree around here for a month, and we come to certain fundamental differences. If you tell them that I agreed to it, I know they won't agree to it. But even if they did not know that I agreed to it, they would not agree to it. I know their thinking. If they agree to it, I will find something about it to which I cannot agree. It cannot be any other way. It has been going on like this for a month. You had better decide what you want to do, but tell us what you have in mind; then go ahead and do it. If I vote with you, they will not. If they vote with you, I will not."

Previously the majority leader made a motion that you wanted to make. He did not want to make it, but he did make it. You did not let him make the motion he wanted to make. As a result, he made a motion that he did not want to make. Now he is making a motion that he wanted to make, the one he would have made if you had let him.

Now you do not want to agree to that. I can understand why you would not do that. Sooner or later, we will have voted enough times until one side or the other will have decided that this matter has been disposed of. But if this motion carries, the Senator understands—and so do I—that this matter is over and settled. The bill is passed, and that is it.

If the motion does not carry, we will still be legislating, and we will do the best we can. That is how it always is. People try to work together the best they can. Good people offer their services to try to get folks together. Unfortunately, we get to the point where we cannot agree. I am convinced that we will pass the bill. I am the Senator in charge of the bill, and I have never been as convinced in my life as I am now that we will pass the bill. It might require a little more conversation to go one route rather than the other route, but this bill will pass, whether we go the Gore route or the Mansfield route.

I should like to say to my good friend from Tennessee, who differs from me at this moment but whom I admire and respect as one of the great men of the Senate, that this matter has taken so long because, when we have voted, there have been absentees on one side at one time and absentees on the other side at the next time.

As Senator in charge of the bill, I suggest that there is a way in which we can get on with our business: That is for us to agree as a matter of honor with one another that I will give you a pair for every absentee you have, from now until we are through with the bill, if you will give me a pair for every absentee I have. Then, it will not make any difference whether we vote today tomorrow, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, or Tuesday because every Senator will be on record. In that way the Senate can decide what it wants to do about this matter.

I do not find fault with my opponents for bringing the matter to a vote when it is to their advantage. We did the same thing to them when we knew the next vote was going to come. That time the vote came when our "troops" were in town and they were hurting because of absentees. I have suggested that we do what the old Senate used to do, when my father was a Member of the Senate, and every Senator would have a pair, and if the Vice President knew he had to break a tie vote, one man could withdraw his pair, so we could have a decision of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator has made a very interesting suggestion. Maybe we are about to arrive at a method for having the Senate work its will. I would not want to ask unanimous consent without consulting the majority and minority leaders, but if the able Senator from Louisiana, chairman of the committee, is really willing to let the Senate work its will, I would be willing to ask unanimous consent that debate upon the pending amendment, all amendments to the bill, all amendments to any amendment, all amendments whatsoever, in any respect, or any motion, be limited to 30 minutes. Then we can reach a decision before the week is out.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. We are always talking about two different things. What I proposed was so simple. It did not have any complications. I said, "Why can't we stop this business of having to vote five times on the same issue, because every time we vote there is a different combination of Senators present, and agree to pair every Senator?"

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator really mean he is ready to let the Senate work its will?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have been, all the time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon all amendments to the bill, all amendments to any amendment that can be offered or will be offered to the bill, be limited to 30 minutes each.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object. That is not what I said. I did not say that at all.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not yield just now.

There is an amendment pending that proposes to make inoperative a certain provision—I am not sure it does—of the Long law. I may offer an amendment to make inoperative the tax checkoff provision of that law. I do not want the tax form to be cluttered up with this proposed box. If the law is going to be inoperative in one respect, it should be inoperative in other respects. But I am willing to offer such an amendment and have it voted on after 30 minutes of debate. However, the Senator objects.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I do not yield just now. I will in a moment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill, the pending amendment, all amendments to the bill, all amendments to the pending amendment, or to any amendment that is later offered be limited to 3 hours each, 2½ hours to be under the control of the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on all amendments or any amendment, including the pending amendment, and the bill be limited to 6 hours on each, 5½ hours on each to be under the control of the junior Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, it is my judgment that a unanimous-consent request ought to come from this desk which says "Mr. Mansfield," or that desk which says, "Mr. Dirksen." If one has no right to stand at this desk or that desk, he has no right to be making unanimous-consent requests.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator wants the request agreed to, he ought to discuss it with the Senator who holds this seat or his nominee, or the Senator who holds that desk [Mr. Dirksen], or his nominee. Otherwise the Senator is just making conversation when he stands up and asks unanimous consent on a controversial matter. If the Senator wants to talk unanimous-consent agreements, he or his nominee should talk to the majority leader or his nominee or to the minority leader or his nominee.

Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield to the acting minority leader [Mr. Williams of Delaware].

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the absence of the minority leader, and as his representative, I ask unanimous consent that debate on all amendments to any amendment or on amendments and on the bill be limited to 6 hours each, 5½ hours to be controlled by the Senator from Louisiana——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask that the Senate proceed to vote——

Mr. GORE. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. GORE. No, I do not; not just now.

The able Senator has suggested that he wants the Senate to work its will. I am trying to find out when.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Not just now. I am trying to find out when the Senator wants the Senate to work its will. I have been trying to facilitate the work of the Senate for weeks. I am willing to limit the debate. I will take 5 minutes and the Senator can have 5 hours.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The reason the Senate is not acting is that the Senator from Tennessee is talking. I am willing to vote now. Just sit down and we will vote now.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the amendment before the Senate is subject to amendment. It would make only certain parts of the Long Act inoperative. We have tried for years to simplify the tax form on which the American taxpayer makes his return, and now it is proposed to clutter it up with this proposed box to be checked. In some way the amendment proposes that the law will be inoperative unless Congress does something. It is uncertain what Congress is expected to do about a guideline. I do not know what kind of guidelines are contemplated. I suppose a guideline is what the law provides it shall be, and that is not clear. I am sure the Senator from Montana is sincere in wanting this law to be inoperative at least to the extent that he has proposed. But if it is going to be inoperative in one respect, it ought to be inoperative in other respects.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. Not just now. I will in a moment.

So I would not want to foreclose myself the right to offer an amendment, but I am willing to limit the time I talk on it or any other amendment. I am willing to agree to have a final vote on the bill with a limitation of debate.

Mr. President, being unable to get an agreement that we vote after any sort of limitation of time—I see the senior Senator from Delaware on his feet, who has remarks to make, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he makes that suggestion?

Mr. GORE. I withhold that suggestion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it the position of the Senator from Tennessee that the argument has been made that by the adoption of the Mansfield amendment this law will become inoperative and therefore a dead letter?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And it is further the position of the Senator from Tennessee that it would allow the checkoff, justifying the Treasurer to put aside $1 that has been marked according to the taxpayer's showing——

Mr. GORE. Not allowed; the law directs him.

Mr. LAUSCHE. To that extent, the law is operative, and the Senator takes the position that in one instance they declare it shall be inoperative and in the next instance they want it to be operative?

Mr. GORE. That is right.

Mr. LAUSCHE. And the Senator is one of the opinion that if it is to be inoperative, it should go all the way, not only in part; is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. If there is no intention of using this money for campaign purposes, if there is no intention of pouring this money into the political pot, why clutter up the tax form? Why take this inadvisable and perhaps unconstitutional step of letting the individual taxpayer decide what will be done with a portion of the tax money he pays. Why accumulate the fund in the Treasury? Why leave the fund there? What is the purpose of having it inoperative in part only? If it is to be inoperative, then let us have it inoperative.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I concur with the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I wish to see if I understand the Senator correctly.

The Senator from Tennessee, in response to an interrogatory propounded to him by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, has declared that this amendment makes the Long Act a dead letter.

I further understand that the Senator from Tennessee takes the position that dead things, including dead laws and dead letters, ought to be buried?

Mr. GORE [laughing]. Interred.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 102 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams], which I send to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed by the Senator from Montana, insert the following:

"Sec. 5. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be inoperative after September 15, 1967, unless Congress shall by law otherwise direct."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to reread the amendment in order that the Senate may clearly understand what is before it.

> In lieu of the language proposed by the Senator from Montana, insert the following: "The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be inoperative after September 15, 1967, unless Congress shall by law otherwise direct."

Mr. President, if we are to have a part of this law inoperative, surely all of it should be inoperative.

Why accumulate the funds? Why clutter up the tax form of every taxpayer unless it is intended that the money is later to be used?

I am sure that the majority leader is sincere and has in good faith, offered the amendment to render the law inoperative.

What is the difference between repeal and being "inoperative?"

If the Long Act is inoperative it would remain dormant on the books, subject to activation by Congress.

Is there one Senator here who wants this act to become operative unless this session of Congress amends it?

Is there one?

Every Member of this body knows that the 1966 act is an inadequate, an imperfect, and a defective law.

I do not expect everyone to agree with me that it is also a dangerous law, but I believe all would agree that when we provide public funds for the election of a President of the United States, we are dealing with a major issue, an issue that goes to the very vitals of our system of self-government.

Mr. President, the substitute amendment which I have offered would give Congress until September 15 to enact guidelines and to provide safeguards for this huge amount of money.

Is there one Senator here who wants it to become operative if we have done nothing by September 15?

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does this amendment differ from what the Senator previously proposed, that is to repeal the Campaign Fund Act on July 31. Is it not substantially the same? The only thing the Senator is doing is extending the time of repeal from July 31 to September 15. Do I correctly understand that is all he is doing?

Mr. GORE. What the Senator from Tennessee is doing?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. GORE. No. I respectfully suggest that it is not quite the same. The bill before the Senate repeals the Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966 as of July 31, 1967.

Mr. ELLENDER. Right.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Montana has offered an amendment to strike this repeal provision and insert a provision that disbursement of funds under the act shall be withheld until Congress has provided some guidelines. But his amendment would leave other parts of the act operative. It would still leave the special fund in operation. We would still have on the tax forms the checkoff box by which each taxpayer would be given the privilege of appropriating a certain portion of the payment he has made to the Treasury for this particular purpose. The law would still direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay the funds thus designated by the taxpayer into the presidential campaign fund.

Now I have offered a substitute therefor, which states that the entire act shall be inoperative as of September 15, 1967, unless Congress has by law directed otherwise.

Mr. ELLENDER. If Congress fails to act, then the law is repealed on September 15, is that correct?

Mr. GORE. It would not be repealed, it would be inoperative. But, let me suggest to the Senator that what he says, if it is true of my amendment, would be equally true, insofar as it goes, of the Mansfield amendment. What I am saying is that if we are going to make this law inoperative in part, then it should be inoperative in whole. I would prefer outright repeal, of course.

Mr. ELLENDER. I know that.

Mr. GORE. I think I have made that plain.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator has been making that very plain for the past 5 weeks.

Mr. GORE. Yes, sir.

However, I have been willing for the Senate—as the Senator knows—to work its will.

Mr. ELLENDER. Oh yes.

Mr. GORE. I have offered numerous suggestions to expedite voting. I have asked unanimous consent this afternoon that debate upon each amendment be limited to 30 minutes. I am willing to accept that limitation now on all amendments. I have also offered to limit debate on each amendment to 6 hours and give the junior colleague of the Senator from Louisiana 5½ hours to speak on each amendment, or I will agree to reserve for my side 5 minutes only on each amendment.

This Senator, I readily admit, is against the law and has been against the law——

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes, there is no doubt about that. The thing I do not like, and have not liked from the beginning, is using the present investment credit bill as a vehicle to repeal the compaign fund law. Why did not the Senator come in with a bill to repeal the campaign fund law instead of attaching it to this tax bill which gives relief to business through restoration of the investment credit and accelerated depreciation?

Mr. GORE. If the able Senator will just give it a second thought, I am sure he will know why. It is because it is a revenue measure, and such a proposal can be offered only to a revenue measure that has originated in the House.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the way the original Long Act originated.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I suppose the Senator has noticed that I have voted for few amendments, in the hope that we would pass this tax bill.

Mr. GORE. I agree. Is the Senator suggesting that he may vote against the Mansfield amendment, too?

Mr. ELLENDER. No, I am not suggesting that at all; but it seems to me the effect of the amendment the Senator is now offering is to repeal the Long Act.

Mr. GORE. Well, the amendment and the substitute amendment use the identical language—"inoperative."

Mr. ELLENDER. No, as I heard it read, may I say to my good friend from Tennessee——

Mr. GORE. Let me make a correction. The actual word "inoperative" is not in the amendment of the Senator from Montana, but he used the word in describing the effect of his amendment; and that is the effect of his amendment.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I heard the reading of the Senator's amendment, the Long Act would be repealed on September 15 if Congress did not act.

Mr. GORE. I want to say, in all candor, to the senior Senator from Louisiana that I desire the law to be ineffective and inoperative unless Congress by September 15 shall have acted otherwise.

Mr. ELLENDER. And that means repealed.

Mr. GORE. It means ineffective.

Mr. ELLENDER. It means ineffective; it means the repeal of the law.

Mr. GORE. Unless Congress shall have by law otherwise directed.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. GORE. There is some difference between "repeal" and "inoperative."

Mr. ELLENDER. Will the Senator tell us what the difference is?

Mr. GORE. Yes, I shall be glad to. There would still be on the statute books an act bearing the name of the junior Senator from Louisiana. It would be inoperative unless Congress, prior to September 15, 1967, or thereafter, shall by law bring it into effect. That is the distinction from "repeal." Do I make myself plain?

Mr. ELLENDER. Would Congress have to act again?

Mr. GORE. Congress, by law, would have to direct that it become effective.

Mr. ELLENDER. It would be the same as passing a new act. Congress would have to go through all the regular procedures to legislate on the subject and secure the President's signature.

Mr. GORE. Well, it would be a new act of Congress, but it would not mean that every word must be rewritten.

There is no purpose on my part to mislead in any way. The amendment means that unless Congress took action by law, this law would not go into effect. It would remain in the statutes. The Congress could bring it into effect by law.

Mr. ELLENDER. By reenacting it.

Mr. GORE. By law.

Mr. ELLENDER. I said by reenacting the law. As I said, I do not see any distinction between "repeal" and the language the Senator is using in his amendment.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I have done my best to point out the difference.

But, Mr. President, why should this law be operative in part? Can anyone answer that?

Mr. ELLENDER. Under the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from Montana, Congress would have time to put guidelines into effect. The law will remain effective, and will remain on the statute books. If this amendment of the Senator from Tennessee is enacted, it will mean that the entire Long Act will be repealed, and Congress will have to act anew on such a bill. Such is not the case with Senator MANSFIELD'S amendment. That, to me, is the distinction. May I say, Mr. President, that is a very real difference.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest that I have made this point as explicit as it is within my power to do.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment originally offered by the Senator from Montana provides that no moneys shall be appropriated under the act. The Senator from Tennessee seeks to go a bit further and to say that no moneys shall be appropriated——

Mr. GORE. Or collected.

Mr. LAUSCHE. No moneys shall be collected, no forms shall be printed, under which the taxpayer could check off a dollar, and that no moneys shall be distributed.

Mr. GORE. That is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In substance the amendments are identical, except that the Senator from Tennessee says that beyond the prohibition of appropriating, the printing of forms, the collecting of the dollar, and the distribution of the dollar or otherwise shall be prohibited. I think in substance they are identical; in degree, they differ.

Mr. GORE. Except that my amendment includes the entire act, and the amendment of the Senator from Montana affects it only in part.

Mr. President, I think the distinguished coauthor of the amendment desires to speak. I would hope he would join me in seeking a limitation of debate not only on the pending amendment, but on all other amendments to the bill.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I will say just a few words first; then we can have a vote, as far as I concerned. I request the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been requested.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The clerk will resume the call of the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, up until now, I have been voting on each vote with the chairman of the Committee on Finance on the question of financing presidential campaigns, with the understanding that unless something is done by Congress before the end of this session, the law should be repealed.

I think the amendment that has now been offered, which sets the date of September 15, 1967, which is a reasonable date in anticipation of the printing of the income tax forms for 1968, is fully consistent with the position I have been taking. Therefore, I commend the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] for having worked out this very proper compromise.

I certainly hope that the Senate will adopt the proposal and that we may have an end to the prolonged discussion on subjects that have been both relevant and irrelevant. The time has come to let the business community and the financial community of the country know what Congress proposes to do about investment credit.

If we had not had the semi- or quasi-retroactive feature in the House bill, I think many of them would be in desperate circumstances now. We have been saved somewhat by virtue of the action of the House of Representatives; but I think the time has come to put aside the question of financing presidential campaigns with this amendment, and to proceed immediately with the adoption of the bill to repeal the suspension of the investment credit.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MORSE. Will the Senator withhold that request for just a moment, for a query?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from West Virginia withhold his request?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S FAIR AND JUST PROPOSAL FOR AD HOC EMERGENCY LEGISLATION DEALING WITH RAILROAD DISPUTE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have the honor to introduce, in behalf of the President of the United States, for myself, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], a joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees.

I send the joint resolution to the desk, out of order, and ask that it be appropriately referred and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 81) to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees, introduced by Mr. MORSE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. RES. 81

Whereas the labor dispute between the carriers represented by the National Railway Labor Conference and certain of their employees represented by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers; Sheet Metal Workers' International Association; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers functioning through the Railway Employees' Department, AFL–CIO, labor organizations, threatens essential transportation services of the Nation; and

Whereas Emergency Board No. 169 (created by Executive Order 11324, January 28, 1967, 32 F.R. 1075) has made its report; and

Whereas under procedures for resolving such dispute provided for in the Railway Labor Act as extended and implemented by Public Law 90–10 of April 12, 1967, as amended, the parties have not succeeded completely in resolving all of their differences through the processes of free collective bargaining; and

Whereas related disputes have been settled by private collective bargaining between the carriers and other organizations representing approximately three-quarters of their employees, so that the present dispute represents a barrier to the completion of this round of bargaining in this industry; and

Whereas a Special Mediation Panel appointed by the President upon enactment of Public Law 90–10 proposed settlement terms to assist the parties in implementation of the collective bargaining envisaged in the recommendations of Emergency Board No. 169; and

Whereas it is desirable to provide procedures for the orderly culmination of this collective bargaining process; and

Whereas the national interest, including the national health and defense, requires that transportation services essential to interstate commerce be maintained; and

Whereas the Congress finds that an emergency measure is essential to security and continuity of transportation services by such carriers; Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby established a Special Board for the purpose of assisting the parties in the completion of their collective bargaining and the resolution of the remaining issues in dispute. The Special Board shall consist of five members to be named by the President. The National Mediation Board is authorized and directed: (1) to compensate the members of the Board at a rate not in excess of $100 for each day together with necessary travel and subsistence expenses, and (2) to provide such services and facilities as may be necessary and appropriate in carrying out the purposes of this resolution. For the purpose of any hearing conducted by the Special Board, it shall have the authority conferred by the provisions of sections 9 and 10 (relating to the attendance and examination of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents) of the Federal Trade Commission Act of September 26, 1914, as amended (15 U.S.C. 49, 50).

SEC. 2. The Special Board shall attempt by mediation to bring about a resolution of this dispute and thereby to complete the collective bargaining process.

SEC. 3. If agreement has not been reached within thirty days after the enactment of this Resolution, the Special Board shall hold hearings on the proposal made by the Special Mediation Panel, in its report to the President of April 22, 1967, in implementation of the collective bargaining contemplated in the recommendation of Emergency Board No. 169, to determine whether the proposal (1) is in the public interest, (2) is a fair and equitable extension of the collective bargaining in this case, (3) protects the collective bargaining process, and (4) fulfills the purposes of the Railway Labor Act. At such hearings the parties shall be accorded a full opportunity to present their positions concerning the proposal of the Special Mediation Panel.

SEC. 4. The Special Board shall make its determination by vote of the majority of the members on or before the sixtieth day after the enactment of this Resolution, and shall incorporate the proposal of the Special Mediation Panel with such modifications, if any, as the Board finds to be necessary to (1) be in the public interest, (2) achieve a fair and equitable extension of the collective bargaining in this case, (3) protect the collective bargaining process and (4) fulfill the purpose of the Railway Labor Act. The determination shall be promptly transmitted by the Board to the President and to the Congress.

SEC. 5. If agreement has not been reached by the parties upon the expiration of the period specified in section 6, the determination of the Special Board shall take effect and shall continue in effect until the parties reach agreement or, if agreement is not reached, until such time, not to exceed two years from January 1, 1967, as the Board shall determine to be appropriate. The Board's determination shall have the same effect (including the preclusion of resort to either strike or lockout) as though arrived at by agreement of the parties under the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 151 et seq.)

SEC. 6. The provisions of the final paragraph of Sec. 10 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 160), as heretofore extended by law, shall be hereby extended until 12:01 AM of the ninety-first day after enactment of this Resolution with respect to the dispute referred to in Executive Order 11324, January 28, 1967.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. There are several Senators who would like to vote on the pending matter this afternoon. I wonder if the Senator from Oregon would yield if we are able to obtain unanimous consent to vote within 10 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator from Delaware has my complete cooperation. I was only trying to utilize the intervening time while I understood a conference was occurring off the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, we may be getting pretty close to action here. The distinguished assistant majority leader offered earlier, on the pending amendment, before the substitute was offered, to give a pair for anyone on our side who was absent, if we would do likewise. Several Senators from both sides are absent. If the junior Senator from Louisiana is ready to do that, perhaps we can have a vote right away. I do not wish to press the matter unduly.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask to have the attention of the Senator from Delaware, because I know that he would be the last Senator on this floor who would think of putting any other Senator in an embarrassing position.

I think the Senator should know the parliamentary situation under which I received permission to offer this resolution. I received such permission from the acting majority leader, who yielded to me only for the purpose of presenting the resolution and reading my brief statement. He did not yield to me for the purpose of agreeing to have a vote on the pending legislation.

Therefore, I request the Senator from Delaware to release me from any commitment. I state further, Mr. President, that I shall not yield to any other Senator while I make my brief statement in support of the President's resolution, which I have just introduced, in connection with the railroad case.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, under the circumstances I withdraw my request.

A PROPOSAL FOR EXTENDED COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AND MEDIATION TO FINALITY

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am delighted to recommend to my colleagues a proposal by the President of the United States that will avert a nationwide railroad strike.

President Johnson's proposal is a wise and statesmanlike solution to insure the security and welfare of the American people. It is fair. It is just. It is new and it is unique. It will do the job, and, at the same time, it will insure the collective bargaining rights of both labor and management if they want to exercise those rights in good faith.

Mr. President, I have followed this dispute very closely for eight long months. I have been consulted by the President on numerous occasions as to the course of action the Government should take. I have studiously avoided taking sides because I know that collective bargaining, in the final analysis, is always the best solution.

But, at the same time, I have made it clear to the administration that both seizure and compulsory arbitration should be avoided in the interest of preserving economic freedom of choice and action for all of American labor and management. My advice has been based on the truism of American constitutionalism that under our system of self-government rights of any individual or group must be exercised in relation to and in respect of the relative rights of others. In the field of industrial disputes as in the areas of other human relations in our society, most rights under our constitutional system are relative especially in respect to the superior interests of the public welfare. We should never forget that our social, economic, and political order rooted in our system of constitutional self-government has as its primary objective the promotion of the general welfare of all of our people.

The decisions of our courts throughout our history are legion in proclaiming that as a matter of law the public interest and general welfare of all of the people must prevail when there is a conflict between public rights and subordinate private rights.

Yesterday afternoon, the President held an informal press conference in which he discussed the very tentative provisions of a proposal for ad hoc emergency legislation on the pending nationwide railroad dispute. That plan was perfected and finalized at a conference at the White House this morning which I attended.

Last night, the press asked me for my views on President Johnson's comments on possible legislation for settling the railroad dispute which he made at an informal press conference yesterday afternoon. I issued the following statement:

> It is my understanding that President Johnson made very clear in Washington today that he and his advisors are still at work drafting proposed legislation for the President to send to the Congress. In his news conference the President made clear that he is still weighing the advice and suggestions for ad hoc emergency legislation dealing with the railroad case which he has been receiving from various members of Congress, Labor Relations authorities, and highly qualified advisors within his administration. The statements which the press has related to me concerning what the President is reported to have said at an informal press conference at the White House this afternoon make good, common sense to me.
>
> It appears that he made clear that neither compulsory arbitration or seizure of the railroads are the most appropriate or desirable procedures to be followed by the government in carrying out its clear responsibility to prevent a stoppage of railroad operations in this time of national crisis. It may be that the final legislative solution will have more aspects of compulsion than some may prefer, but I'm satisfied that we can count on President Johnson to recommend legislation that will result in a minimum of restriction on voluntarism. In this hour of national crisis, the superior public interest and national security must be protected, but every effort should be made to avoid any unnecessary restriction on voluntarism through free collective bargaining in settling labor disputes.
>
> It seems to me that under the President's tentative suggestions as carried in the press tonight, railroad labor and railroad management would have the widest possible latitude and opportunity to make free collective bargaining work.
>
> If either or both sides to the dispute are unwilling, in good faith negotiations with the President's proposed special board of public members, to compromise their economic demands, through mediation, to that degree necessary to place the welfare of the nation in time of war above their selfish economic interests, then the national government serving all Americans has no choice but to apply emergency dispute procedures of the nature the President is suggesting. Any other course would mean government by lock-out and picket line rather than government by law doing justice to all our people, including railroad labor and railroad management. The welfare and security of the Republic calls for the passage of such legislation as the President in broad outlines has suggested.

In the final draft of the President's proposal for ad hoc emergency legislation which he called for this morning and is now recommending to the Congress for its consideration in meeting on the legislative front the threat of a nationwide stoppage of railroad transportation in time of war, I am pleased to see the President has carefully avoided these two extremes.

This proposal does not seize the railroads.

This proposal does not ignore the negotiations which have already taken place.

This proposal is not compulsory arbitration.

He did not sacrifice the basic rights of either side of this dispute—despite enormous public pressure to find a speedy solution.

The American people are well aware of what a nationwide railroad strike would mean to their welfare and security. They are also well aware of the painstaking efforts taken by the President and the Congress to do everything possible to avert a disastrous and paralyzing strike.

Today's proposal by the President builds upon these previous efforts. Specifically, the President is requesting a new procedure to extend collective bargaining, not to supplant it.

He is proposing a joint congressional resolution authorizing the establishment of a five-member special board to operate during a 90-day, no-strike, no lockout period.

The heart of the proposal pulsates these guarantees of fair dealing to the parties and to the public through the arteries of just channels:

First, the protection of the public interest;

Second, the protection of the collective bargaining process;

Third, the protection of the purposes of the Railway Labor Act;

Fourth, the assurance of a fair, equitable extension of true collective bargaining in this case if the parties wish to protect that precious right of economic freedom; and,

The providing of a final judgment of the Board filling the narrow gap now separating the parties if at the end of 90 days they have been unable to resolve their differences through extended good faith collective bargaining and mediation.

During the first 30 days in the life of this Board, there would be intensive mediation efforts with both sides in the dispute in an effort to find a satisfactory solution.

If no agreement is reached, beginning on the 31st day, the Board would be authorized to hold hearings to study the equity of the President's Special Mediation Panel proposals of April 21.

That Panel, I might add, was the very best that could have been appointed. It was neither antiunion nor antimanagement. It sought neither to muscle aside outstanding issues nor to ignore the rights and interests of either side.

The Chairman of the Board, Judge Charles Fahy, has had a brilliant career of serving our Government in many capacities since 1933. From 1949 to 1967, he was U.S. circuit judge, U.S. Court of Appeals, District of Columbia.

The two other members of the President's Special Board are Dr. George W. Taylor and Dr. John T. Dunlop.

Dr. Taylor is professor of industry, Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. He has been one of the Nation's leading arbitrators of labor disputes for over 25 years. I had the honor of serving under his leadership on the War Labor Board during World War II. Dr. Taylor was Vice Chairman of the Board. His expert knowledge in the field of industrial relations and unimpeachable impartiality are proclaimed by both labor and management throughout the Nation.

Dr. John T. Dunlop is a professor at Harvard University and also is one of the leading labor arbitrators in the country. He was Vice Chairman of the Boston Regional War Labor Board during World War II and was of great assistance to the National War Labor Board in helping resolve some of the most critical industrial disputes during the war.

These three members of President Johnson's Special Panel performed dedicated and distinguished public service to our President in seeking to lead the six railroad craft unions and carriers to a mediated settlement of the pending railroad dispute. The record shows that the Board was successful in narrowing the gap of differences between the parties, and they submitted a report to the President and to the country which will be turned to as a document of authoritative reference by students and scholars working in the field of industrial relations for years to come.

This Special Presidential Panel recommended a general wage increase of 6 percent, effective January 1, 1967, for 18 months.

Now, under the President's proposal, if there is still no agreement reached by the 60th day following passage of the resolution, the Board would file its determination with the Congress and the President, stating whether any modification of the Special Mediation Panel proposals is deemed necessary.

If on the 91st day, there is still no agreement, the Special Mediation Panel proposals, or any modifications which the Board has found necessary, would take effect. They would continue in effect until both sides reach their own agreement through the process of collective bargaining. The Board's recommendations would continue in effect until agreement is reached, or for a period not to exceed 2 years from January 1, 1967.

Let me emphasize: A final agreement reached by both sides will, at any time, supersede the Board's recommendations and would apply retroactively.

I trust that a majority of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will agree that President Johnson has recommended a reasonable and equitable formula for helping the parties reach a settlement in this dispute. While this proposal effectively eliminates the possibility of a walkout, it does not impede the effectiveness of collective bargaining.

This proposal is fair to both labor and management. It is fair to the American people. It is in the public interest.

I am proud to present this joint resolution for the consideration of my Senate colleagues. It deserves and it is essential that it receive prompt Senate committee hearings and early Senate action if the Nation is to avert a disastrous and unnecessary stoppage of operations in the railroad industry in time of war.

The general counsel of the Subcommittee on Labor has just informed me that the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, has scheduled a meeting of the committee at 11 o'clock tomorrow. The purpose of the meeting is for us to discuss and reach agreements and understanding in regard to the procedures to be followed in carrying this resolution, and any amendments to it or any substitute resolutions, through the subcommittee, for hearings leading to the final recommendations of the subcommittee to the full committee.

Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the acting majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. I understand that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] wishes me to yield at this time, only for the purpose of supporting the resolution in general and offering supporting material for the RECORD. If I have the permission of the acting majority leader to so yield, I should like to yield for that purpose.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I have no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the cooperation of the acting majority leader and of my very able colleague on the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the Senator from Oregon, who is so knowledgeable on the subject matter about which he speaks this afternoon.

The President's proposal for the resolution of the current railroad labor-management dispute represents a diligent effort to meet the traditions of free collective bargaining, the uninterrupted continuation of essential transportation service, and the fulfillment of the public interest.

The proposed resolution provides an extension of the negotiations without strike period under the Railway Labor Act for an additional 90 days, during which time the parties will attempt to resolve their differences through collective bargaining. During this period, they will be assisted by a special five-member panel appointed by the President.

For the first 30 days, the special board will engage in intensive mediation. If these efforts do not prove successful by the end of 30 days, the special board will hold a hearing to review the positions of the parties. At that time, the special board will review the proposals of the special mediation panel which submitted a report to the President on April 22, 1967. The special board will then determine whether the parties should abide by the proposal of the special mediation panel, subject to any modifications which the special board deems appropriate.

The determination of the special board will become effective before the 60th day after the enactment of the measure proposed today by the President in his message to Congress. For the remaining 30 days, the parties will bargain on the basis of the determination of the special board. If they have failed to reach agreement by the end of 90 days, the determination of the special board will become effective until such time as the parties mutually agree to a change.

As the President said in his message to Congress, this proposal is designed to bridge the remaining gap that the long history of bargaining on this dispute has not closed. The President emphasized—and I underscore the fact—that nothing in this labor-management episode warrants resort to a compulsory arbitration procedure which would disregard all that collective bargaining has accomplished. The dispute, with the threat of a nationwide railroad strike as a factor to be considered, has had widespread attention. It has attracted numerous suggestions on how it should be resolved. The extremes advocated have been either seizure of the railroads or outright compulsory arbitration. The President has chosen to reject both. But in doing so, he has not overlooked the true test which any statute of this character is required to meet; namely, that it fully comports with the public interest. I believe that what he has proposed will have perhaps the best opportunity for acceptance and understanding—not only by the parties at issue but also by the American public.

I have pointed out heretofore why a stoppage of railway service cannot be tolerated. In West Virginia, such a breakdown of a vital segment of transportation, under the economic conditions and within the economic framework of commerce and industry in our State, would result in chaos. Both seizure of properties and transportation systems by the Government and compulsory arbitration under law are, in my judgment, offensive methods of very last resort. The plan recommended by the President in his message today seems worthy and supportable under the terms of the history of this dispute and the perseverance and patience which have been manifested in the important and purposeful efforts to keep the parties in negotiations through the always-preferable collective bargaining system. I believe that, under the 90-day plan provided in the newly proposed resolution, collective bargaining can be reinstituted and stimulated in the shopcraft-rail management negotiations, even with the new element in the form of a special board appointed by the President to be induced.

The dispute which continues to persist must not drag on interminably. The new element and the new procedures recommended to Congress by the President are worthy of consideration and, in my judgment, offer appropriate mechanisms as means to bring settlement out of disputation. I do not believe any other suggested solution will be more understood or more acceptable to all parties at interest, including the American public.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the acting majority leader yield to me for the limited purpose of referring to the resolution?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Michigan for that purpose.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to say that in general I believe the President's proposal is a reasonable proposal, a reasonable course of action for Congress to adopt. There might be differences as to whether or not the time should be 90 days or 60 days or some other length of time. I believe that differences will develop as to the meaning of the proposal, whether it amounts to compulsory arbitration or whether it does not.

It is interesting that the distinguished and learned Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has referred to this proposal as mediation to finality. I have no quarrel with those terms. I do not understand the difference between mediation to finality and compulsory arbitration, but I will concede that there are different degrees of compulsion in various proposals that might be made.

I should like to ask the Senator from Oregon if he can clarify the meaning of the proposal. Do I correctly understand that the 90 days would commence after the expiration of the 46 days which Congress recently authorized and which would commence this week?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Oregon for the purpose of answering the inquiry propounded by the Senator from Michigan.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. The 90 days will start running after the passage of our resolution. If we pass the resolution in 20 days, the 90 days will start running the following day, which will be the 21st day. Whenever we pass this resolution, the 90 days will start to run.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am glad to have that clarification.

Mr. MORSE. While I am responding to the Senator from Michigan, may I say that I shall discuss later, at greater length, the point the Senator has raised in regard to compulsory arbitration.

What we have done in this resolution is really to follow the procedure that was followed on the War Labor Board in many, many cases during World War II, in which we gave the parties an opportunity to settle their dispute by way of collective bargaining and mediation. Then we would say, "If you two sides can't settle this dispute now that we are in the midst of this war, we will have to settle it in the public interest for you."

There are differences between the War Labor Board procedures and the procedures set forth in this resolution, but the similarities are greater than the differences.

The result was that during World War II our procedure of extended collective bargaining and mediation settled most labor disputes without the need for the last step of finality by way of a War Labor Board decision on the merits of the substantive issues that caused the dispute in the first place.

I will be very much surprised if these parties do not settle this dispute long before the expiration of the 90 days, because the gap of financial difference between them is very small, anyway.

But, as I explained to the President and his advisers in our various discussions, we cannot escape the fact that we are at war, a very serious war. That war raises for evaluation and comparison the right of self-help on the part of the carriers and the brotherhoods by way of lockout or strike as against the right of the people of this country, from the standpoint of their public interest, to have uninterrupted operation of the railroads for the duration of the war. It is on that basis that I advocate this resolution.

Further, may I say that in arbitration you do not have mediation. Arbitration is a straight judicial process. When you walk into an arbitration room, you walk into a courtroom, and the case is decided on the basis of the evidence before the board of arbitration, as before a court, with the proponent of each issue having the burden of proof on it and the responsibility of sustaining his burden of proof on that issue. But the procedure involved in this resolution is not arbitration in that sense. This resolution may I say, provides basically for a procedure calling for extended collective bargaining and mediation ending up if necessary with a ruling of finality on the part of the Government ordering a continuation of operation of the railroads on a basis of a reasonable application and adaptation of what would seem to be a fair and equitable compromise of the position taken by the parties in collective bargaining and mediation.

In fairness to the Senator from Michigan as well as to myself, I desire the RECORD to show that using this type of technique in World War II is somewhat different procedurally from using it now under this resolution. I say that because in World War II there was a no-strike, no-lockout agreement on the part of American labor and management, although in a strict sense it was not binding upon individual companies or upon individual unions. But they accepted it because their national leaders, both union leaders and national representatives of management, entered into that understanding with the President of the United States.

I would be the first to point out that we do not have that kind of agreement now and I wish we did and I think we should. But I also wish to say to those who want to raise that technicality that we do have a war now and we had a war then. The reason for the use of this type of procedure in World War II was to protect the paramount public interest because of the necessity for a successful prosecution of that war. The same public interest is paramount today.

You will not find a jury box of 12 Americans anywhere in this country that would not render a unanimous verdict in opposition to a stoppage of the operation of the railroads because they know our national security would be imperiled. They know that the war interests that face the Republic are so serious that the public interests cannot possibly justify a shutting down of railroad transportation in this country.

The last point I wish to make, as I have said previously on the floor of the Senate and as I have said over and over again in the White House Conferences, is that there is no doubt about a mutuality of responsibility between the parties in this case. The brotherhoods and the carriers both have to share responsibility for the fact that they have not settled this dispute by collective bargaining. It is not for me to pass judgment, other than to say that of the many cases in this country during World War II which were settled in extended collective bargaining and mediation were settled because there was a recognition upon the part of the parties that they had a patriotic duty to reach a collective bargaining or mediation settlement. I am sad that this case has not been settled to date by the parties themselves.

After all, that is water over the dam and under the bridge. Our job now is to provide the parties—as I say in the title of my speech, and I hope the Senate will give heed to the title of the speech—with what is really a proposal for extended collective bargaining and mediation leading to finality. The time has come in this case, in my judgment, at which Congress, representing the American people, must make perfectly clear to both sides of this dispute, if they do not want to reach finality by collective bargaining and mediation, finality will be reached for them by Congress carrying out its trust and duty to place the public interest above the selfish economic interest of the two sides to this dispute.

I hope that the Senator will pardon the length of my reply, but I thought in fairness to both of us and to the President I should make it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I appreciate the statement of the Senator. I commend the Senator from Oregon for supporting this course of action regardless of the label or name that he or the President may wish to put at the top of it.

I think that the Senator is right that in a time of war, particularly, this Nation cannot tolerate a nationwide railroad strike; and the course outlined here seems to be a reasonable course and one of the few courses that is really open to the Congress and the President.

In order that we can further clarify what the proposal involves, I appreciate the explanation that the 90 days goes into effect at any time that the resolution is adopted, without reference to the 46 days already provided. Then, as I understand it, after the 90 days commence, the President would appoint another panel, which would be the third board or panel that has been appointed during the period of this particular dispute. Am I correct?

Mr. MORSE. The President will appoint the panel forthwith after passage of the resolution. It will be the last panel. It will take the parties through the procedures of the resolution providing for extended collective bargaining and mediation leading to finality.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Then, they will mediate with the parties for 30 days to try to get them to settle.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If at the end of 30 days they have not been able to get them together, the new panel would hold hearings and allow both sides to appear and present their cases, and hear others who might have something to report; and at the end of 60 days the panel would make recommendations and proposals for a settlement, as I understand it.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Then, if at the end of 90 days, the parties have not agreed, on the 91st day the proposed settlement arrived at by the panel will take effect as though the parties agreed.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct; for not more than 2 years.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It would continue in effect for 2 years from January 1, 1967.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

THE KENNEDY ROUND AND AGRICULTURE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, with the Kennedy round of trade negotiations now approaching what is bound to be the showdown stage, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues, the firm pledge which the administration has given to American agriculture from the outset of the negotiations. From the start of the Kennedy round the administration has assured U.S. agriculture that it would not conclude a trade agreement that failed to provide improved conditions of access for U.S. agricultural exports into foreign markets.

That assurance has been stated—repeatedly stated, I should say—by the President himself, by Governor Herter, and by Ambassador William Roth and Michael Blumenthal. These gentlemen have cited in their public statements the importance of agricultural exports to the American economy and the U.S. balance of payments. They have recognized and acknowledged that American agriculture did not share fully in the trade liberalization that was obtained in the Dillon round of 1960–61. When the guidelines for the current negotiations were written, it was undoubtedly on the basis of U.S. insistence that they provide for "acceptable conditions of access to world markets for agricultural products."

Although the United States in 1964 tabled offers to reduce its industrial tariffs separately from offers on agricultural products, and thereby separated the industrial and agricultural phases of the negotiations, the administration has nonetheless made clear that any ultimate agreement must include trade liberalization for agriculture as well as for industry. The President, Governor Herter, and others in the administration have pledged repeatedly that the United States would insist on obtaining improved conditions of access for U.S. agricultural exports. Ambassador Roth, as recently as his Senate confirmation hearing in March, has repeated and renewed that assurance.

Mr. President, there is nothing in the Kennedy round negotiations to date that would indicate that the European Economic Community will come through with meaningful offers on agricultural trade that would justify the conclusion of a trade agreement based on the administration's promise.

American agricultural producers are much concerned, as they have been throughout these negotiations, that the United States should not conclude a trade agreement with the EEC that fails to fulfill the administration's promise of improved access. The United States must work out improved conditions of access for agricultural exports to foreign markets. A trade agreement with the European Economic Community that fails to live up to the administration's assurance to American agriculture would not meet the goal of the Trade Expansion Act or the needs of the United States. Reductions in U.S. industrial tariffs should not be made merely by a mathematical balancing of concessions, as doing so will amount to giving away our trading stock without achieving for American agriculture the goals which the administration has promised it would attempt to achieve.

Mr. President, I have compiled quotations from speeches and statements which contain the administration's pledge to American agriculture of which I speak. That pledge has been repeated over and over again during the past several years. These statements indicate clearly and consistently the importance which the administration has attributed to the agricultural negotiations. I ask unanimous consent that this compilation may be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the compilation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ADMINISTRATION PROMISES IT WILL NOT CONCLUDE A TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE EEC THAT DOES NOT PROVIDE IMPROVED CONDITIONS OF ACCESS FOR U.S. AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS TO FOREIGN MARKETS

Christian A. Herter, at the International Luncheon of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D.C., April 29, 1963: "We believe that it is vital that agricultural as well as industrial products should be covered by the next round of negotiations. In the last, the so-called Dillon Round, it was not possible to bargain with the EEC on several of their major agricultural imports from the United States because the Community had not yet agreed upon their own internal and external trade agreements for these products. Wheat, feed grains, dairy products, poultry, and beef were all in this category. We put off discussion of those products at the last negotiating session, but we will not be able to do so again. Our sales of farm products to Western Europe constitute one of the largest elements in our export trade, and before we engage in far-ranging tariff reductions on industrial products, we feel that we must have indications that the Common Market is not adopting a restrictive trade policy on agriculture. To the United States, the bargain that we strike on agricultural goods will be one of the most important elements in the entire negotiating round."

Christian A. Herter in a letter to a Senator, July 26, 1963: "We have made it very clear that any negotiations undertaken pursuant to the Act must include agricultural trade as well as industrial products, and that no agreement can be concluded unless agricultural trade is included in a comprehensive manner. This is a matter of simple justice to our farmers. It also involves a vital national interest. Our agricultural exports in the Common Market in 1962 amounted to $1.2 million, compared with $200 million in imports; they accounted for almost all our trade surplus with the Common Market, out of which our defense commitments there are financed in large part."

W. Michael Blumenthal, before the San Francisco World Trade Association, San Francisco, California, August 28, 1963: "From the beginning, we have made it clear that the negotiations we seek cannot be confined to industrial goods."

Christian A. Herter, at the White House Conference on Export Expansion, Washington, D.C., September 17, 1963: "From the beginning, we have made it clear that the coming trade negotiations *cannot* be limited to industrial goods. The level of the U.S. exports depends to an important degree on our overseas markets for farm products. In the Common Market alone, our agricultural market amounted to almost $1.2 billion last year. Agriculture has always raised thorny problems in international trading relationships. It is a long-standing problem, and the time is overdue for coming to grips with it."

Christian A. Herter, at the 97th annual session of the National Grange, Portland, Oregon, November 15, 1963: "To put it in simple language, the Kennedy Round must deliver the goods for our farms as well as our factories, or we will not sign on the dotted line."

Christian A. Herter, before the Economic Club of Detroit, March 30, 1964: "The proposed EEC agricultural negotiating plan is neither acceptable nor workable as a general negotiating formula."

Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal, on American Day at the Luxembourg International Fair, June, 1964: "We have emphasized at Geneva from the outset . . . that farm products *must* be included in the negotiations, for it is impossible to negotiate any longer on industrial products alone."

The Eighth Annual Report of the President on the Trade Agreements Program, H. Doc. 366, 88th Congress, 2nd Session, p. 10: "The United States from the beginning made it clear that it could not enter into negotiations that did not have as one of the objectives a reduction in barriers to agricultural trade, in accordance with the May 1963 directive of the GATT Ministers."

President Lyndon B. Johnson, in a letter to the National Grange convention, November 16, 1964: "As part of the effort to improve the incomes of farmers, we shall seek particularly to continue to strengthen markets abroad for U.S. food and fiber—markets which were at record levels the past fiscal year.

"Of particular interest currently is the effort to lower barriers to our historic agriculture markets in Europe through the Kennedy Round negotiations. As you know, the United States had tabled its industrial offers in Geneva today. We regret very much that we were unable to agree on rules for agricultural negotiations and therefore to table agricultural offers at the same time. However, I want to assure the American farm community and this body that represents it so well that this action does not, in any way, lessen our determination to obtain a fair and reasonable bargain for American agriculture in this negotiation. There can be no successful negotiation that does not include American agriculture as well as American industry."

Christian A. Herter in a letter November 16, 1964: "Let me emphasize, however, that this decision to go ahead with our industrial exceptions list in no way represents a weakening of our resolve that the trade negotiations must include agriculture. Our position continues to be that any final bargain in the Kennedy Round, to be fair and reciprocal, must include reductions in agricultural trade barriers."

President Johnson to National Foreign Trade Convention, New York City, November 18, 1964: "We are working, in the Kennedy Round, to achieve an agreement, solidly based upon reciprocity, which will expand our present markets and open up new ones. That applies to our agricultural as well as our industrial exports—for the United States will enter into no ultimate agreement unless progress is registered in trade liberalization for the products of our farms as well as our factories."

Ambassador William Roth at the meeting of the Roster of Technical Specialists, Washington, D.C., December 16, 1964: "The U.S. position is clear. Presidents Kennedy and Johnson have indicated unequivocally that the Kennedy Round is intended to provide for the liberalization of international trade in agricultural commodities."

Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal, to the Dusseldorf Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Dusseldorf, Germany, July 15, 1965: "Trade liberalization in agriculture and industry must go hand in hand."

Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal to National Council of American Importers, New York City, September 16, 1965: "Countries such as Australia, Canada, Denmark, and New Zealand, with vital interests in agricultural products, would find little meaning in trade negotiations which do not consider agricultural and industrial products together. As regards the United States, about one-quarter of both our total exports and our total imports are farm products, and we have also made it clear time and again that a successful Kennedy Round must include a significant widening of export markets for farm products."

The Ninth Annual Report of the President of the United States on the Trade Agreements Program, October 13, 1965: "The United States made it clear that the decision to proceed on November 16 [with the tabling of industrial offers] without agreement on the handling of agricultural products did not reflect any change in its basic position that an ultimate Kennedy Round agreement must include liberalization of agricultural trade."

Ambassador William M. Roth, before the United States-Japan Trade Council Conference, New York City, February 1, 1966: "From the outset, the United States insisted—an insistence repeatedly emphasized—that meaningful liberalization of agricultural trade must be an integral part of the negotiations."

Ambassador William M. Roth, before the American Management Association, Inc., New York City, February 14, 1966: "The interdependence of agricultural and industrial products require that they be treated together in any international trade negotiations."

Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal, at a round table sponsored by the Institute for International Relations, Rome, Italy, March 12, 1966: "Most of the trading nations of the world must benefit from the Kennedy Round, and agricultural exports are too important for too many nations to permit a separation of the industrial and agricultural sides of the negotiations."

Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal, at a meeting of the Carl Schurz Association, Bad Gotesburg, Germany, March 16, 1966: "The United States, as a major exporter of low-cost agricultural products, has made from the start, and continues to make progress in the agricultural sector a necessary element in the over-all balance of the Kennedy Round negotiations."

Ambassador W. Michael Blumenthal, at the annual meeting of the American Chamber of Commerce, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, September 28, 1966: "How does the United States approach these negotiations in agriculture? We can only look at each offer from the viewpoint of our exporter back home—or with the same yardstick some of you, as exporters undoubtedly use. How much duty and levies were paid before the Kennedy Round when exporting to the Community or some other export market? How much less will have to be paid after the Kennedy Round?"

Ambassador William M. Roth, in prepared statement before the Subcommittee on Foreign Economic Policy of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, February 15, 1967: "The United States continues its adamant insistence on the inclusion in the Kennedy Round agreement of provisions for the improvement of the conditions of agricultural trade."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have just read the comments—carried on the ticker a few moments ago—made by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], relative to extension of the Selective Service Act. These comments state the general conclusions of the Armed Services Committee after the extensive hearings it held on S. 1432, which would extend the Selective Service Act.

I understand, at the present time, that the committee staff is in the process of preparing the committee report on this extension of the act.

There are a few brief comments I should like to make at this particular time.

First, I think that the general conclusion we should reach, from the comments of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is that we should extend the Selective Service Act. By recommending that we extend the Selective Service Act, he has, I think, accepted a number of the recommendations made by the distinguished Commission, chaired by Mr. Burke Marshall. It is my belief that these would, in large part, provide a more equitable distribution of the burdens and the responsibilities of military service.

Perhaps the most controversial aspect of any proposed changes in the draft relates to the method of selection. The President has proposed what he calls a FAIR system—a fair and impartial random selection system.

The Armed Services Committee has stated its feeling that adoption of a random selection system might not eliminate all the inequities. It also expressed some concern that adoption of a random selection system might have some effect on officer procurement. Nonetheless, the committee recognized the widespread, highly respectable opinion that random selection would result in a fairer selection process, and for that reason has suggested a trial of a random selection system.

Mr. President, I think that the Armed Services Committee has acted extremely responsibly by taking this approach. Many statements have been made about a random selection system. Many cartoons have been drawn, and many speeches made. It has been the subject of a great deal of demagoguery. I feel that the conclusions the Armed Services Committee has reached, which coincide roughly with those of the Burke Marshall Commission report, are very much along the lines of the conclusions I hold; that is, a recognition of the fact that there are many hundreds of thousands of young men in this country who have the physical and mental ability to serve in the Armed Forces of our country, that we really need only a small percentage of them, that we should devise a system which will be equitable in the selection of those young men, that the fairest way to provide that system is by the random selection system, and that by such a system we will be incorporating wise and judicious public policy considerations. We can develop a system which will be equitable in distributing the responsibility of serving in the Armed Forces of our country, and a system which will be predictable so that a 19-year-old will know when he is going to serve in the Armed Forces. That system, in my mind, is a random selection system.

This system will be fully flexible, so that in a Vietnam situation it will be easily expandable, or in a non-Vietnam situation it will be contractable.

Mr. President, the Armed Services Committee has stated that if we are going to continue student deferments, we should give comparable consideration to those young people in on-the-job training programs, or apprenticeship training programs. They should be given the same considerations as students who are presently deferred. This is a very important conclusion, Mr. President, and it is one which the hearings I chaired in the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty dwelt upon in detail.

There are a number of other aspects of the committee report which I think are extremely important. I commend the report to Members of the Senate because I feel that it is extremely useful and constructive, and will be most helpful to all Senators in arriving at their own determination on this problem.

Mr. President, this morning I had the privilege of appearing before the House Committee on Armed Services to discuss draft reform. I ask unanimous consent that the testimony I gave this morning be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY BEFORE THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, MAY 4, 1967

Mr. Chairman, distinguished members of the Committee:

I want to express my appreciation to you for giving me the opportunity to appear before you this morning to present you with a summary report of the hearings I recently chaired in the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

I remember well my appearance before this Committee almost a year ago, on June 29, 1966, when you held hearings on your review of the administration and operation of the Selective Service System. In opening those hearings, you said, Mr. Chairman, that "the current debate on the draft law is helpful in clarifying the air on the uncertainties and inequities in the administration of the draft law." I certainly seconded that comment, Mr. Chairman, when you made it last year. And I would add that your very farsighted resolve to hold the hearings was prophetic. I believe that, to a large degree, your hearings last year precipitated the national debate which has been carried on for the past year, and which has highlighted the many faults in our present system. This debate was capped by the reports and recommendations of two major study groups, the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, appointed by President Johnson and chaired by Mr. Burke Marshall; and the Civilian Advisory Panel on Selective Service, appointed by the distinguished Chairman of this Committee and chaired by General Mark Clark. In addition, we have before us the President's special message on Selective Service, sent to the Congress March 6, as well as the recommendations of many, many private individuals and groups.

I don't think that ever before in history has the Congress had so much advice on how the laws under which we induct our young men into military service should be shaped. And it was in this connection, after discussing the matter of draft reform with the distinguished Chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee, Senator Richard Russell, that we decided the Employment, Manpower and Poverty Subcommittee would be an appropriate forum for hearings on the nonmilitary implications of the structure and policies of our military conscription system.

We held these hearings over a period of seven days during the weeks of March 20 and April 3, and we heard the testimony of nineteen witnesses. If we learned one thing from those hearings, Mr. Chairman, we learned that the draft we have today disrupts the lives of our young men at a crucial time in their lives, a time when they are trying to make the educational, career and family decisions which will mark the course of the rest of their lives. This disruption in their lives would be justified if there were no way of providing the manpower for our national defense needs other than our present draft system, for no one would disagree that the needs of national defense must be the overriding concern in the design of any draft system. But even our military leaders argue that the present system falls short, although doing so on different reasoning than that advanced by manpower, education and other experts.

In our hearings, we sought the answers to, among others, the following questions:

Are the job and skill training programs of the Defense Department consciously and closely correlated, where possible, with civilian job skills? Would increasing the compatibility between civilian and military job training raise serious problems of re-enlistment? Even if it would, do the countervailing benefits outweigh the problems?

What procedures have been established for helping those young men rejected by the services, for medical or physical deficiencies, play a part in society? What lessons have we learned from these procedures? Are there other referrals or rehabilitation procedures and programs which could be built upon the screening process of the Selective Service System?

Have deferments for education caused any distortions in the rationale for attendance at school? Have increased draft calls placed greater pressures on graduate schools and fellowship programs? Would an interruption for military service coming between college and graduate school have an adverse or a beneficial effect upon the educations of our young men and the institutions which must train them? Would such an interruption during college have adverse or beneficial effects?

What are the best methods of assuring an adequate supply of health professionals to the military without disrupting the needs of our communities?

How can we make the greatest use of volunteers in the military? Would increasing the opportunities for women to serve in the armed forces, and continuing to reclassify non-combat jobs as civilian instead of military, have this effect? Would a national service alternative to military service seriously upset the flow of volunteers into the armed forces and thus have the effect of raising draft calls?

Would reliance upon the youngest eligible men as those first susceptible to draft calls divert manpower from fields of study relevant to the national security?

What are the fairest ways of dealing with those young men who have fled the country rather than face their draft boards?

What is the most equitable method to choose those few who must be drafted from among the many who are eligible and have similar qualifications?

Does the operation of the Selective Service System ensure that the national commitment to racial equality is being met?

In answering these questions, our witnesses of course covered different aspects of different problems. In summarizing their testimony for presentation to you today, Mr. Chairman, I have broken the general question of draft reform down into a number of specific issues, such as draft age, deferments, method of selection, and so forth. I think this facilitates discussion of the very troubling and often emotional issue of draft reform.

DRAFT AGE

Within the wide range of recommendations for reforming our present system, there are, as far as I was able to discover, surprisingly broad areas of agreement among the proponents of various systems. There is, for example, unanimous agreement that we should reverse the present order of call and draft the youngest eligible men first. There appeared to be three general reasons for this unanimous conclusion.

First, it would increase the effectiveness of our armed forces—a matter which I know is of intense interest to the members of this Committee. Mr. Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, quoted to us from a recent statement by General Earle Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in which he made the point that younger recruits make better soldiers than older ones. "The younger ones are eager, they are sturdy and they learn quickly," General Wheeler said, while older men "are not as eager and not as willing to understand the military service." This statement is the most recent of many similar statements made in the past by such distinguished military leaders as General Omar Bradley and Admiral Forrest P. Sherman. I would like to add that no single witness who appeared before our Subcommittee differed with this judgement of our military leaders.

Second, reversing the order of call and starting with the youngest first, with the 19-year-olds, would eliminate the uncertainty as to *when* the induction call comes which presently clouds the lives of our draft-age young men. In the past four years, the average age of inductees has gone as high as 23 year and 7 months. It is now, because of the increased draft calls due to Vietnam, down to about 20 years. This variability in induction age has caused our young men serious problems in planning their careers, educations and family lives. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz testified, for example, that between registration at 18½ and the actual time of induction, large numbers of young men face serious problems "because of many employers' reluctance or even refusal to hire them." And a Department of Defense study showed that, in 1964, 48 per cent of employers placed restrictions on hiring draft-eligible college graduates. It goes without saying that the private lives of our young men, in directions other than employment, are also disrupted by this uncertainty.

Third, drafting the youngest first would largely eliminate the hundreds of thousands of deferments which are presently a major objection to the existing system of drafting the oldest first. I will, in a few moments, discuss this matter of deferments specifically, but at this point it is sufficient to point out that 27 per cent of all 24-year-old registrants have either an occupational or dependency deferment, while only two-tenths of one percent of 19-year-olds have an occupational deferment, and less than 5 per cent have a dependency deferment. It is apparent, then, that drafting the youngest first would eliminate a serious strain on our present system, where we have over 3.75 million otherwise draft eligible men with dependency or occupational deferments.

The testimony, in short, gives further weight to the recommendation of the Marshall Commission, the Clark Panel, and the President's Message that the youngest should be drafted first.

METHOD OF SELECTION

A subject of acute disagreement has been whether the present system of selection for induction, a sequence based upon a chronological listing of birth dates, should be dropped in favor of a system based upon a sequence determined by chance.

When I appeared before this Committee last year, I said that I "strongly support giving serious consideration to the introduction of the lottery method of selection." Mr. Chairman, that serious consideration has been given, and, predictably, it has given rise to conflicting viewpoints which are well-known to members of this Committee.

Of those who testified on this subject before the hearings I chaired, all favored dropping the present selection system and instead adopting some form of random selection or lottery system. I regret that General Clark, who I know is firmly opposed to random selection, declined to testify before our Subcommittee, because we had hoped to have him explain the reasons for his opposition.

The testimony favoring random selection was based on various rationales, ranging from the inherent equality of a system based on chance, to frustration at being unable to devise any other system for selecting the few to serve from among the many eligible, to a concern for the mechanics of selecting from within a given age class by a sequence based upon a chronological list of dates of birth.

General Lewis B. Hershey, Director since 1941, of the Selective Service System, told us: "I think random choice may satisfy better than what we have been doing, the choosing of those who will not have to serve."

Assistant Secretary Thomas Morris made a very strong case for the FAIR system proposed by the President. Even if we continue undergraduate—and I emphasize undergraduate—deferments, he said, "about 1,300,000 19-year-old men will be qualified and available for service each year. Our estimated military requirements for new men might amount to about 680,000 per year in a typical post-Vietnam year, or slightly over one-half of the total qualified age group. We can expect to obtain about 570,000 of these men from voluntary enlistment and officer programs. Our estimated requirements for inductees would, therefore, total about 110,000 per year." These 110,000 draftees would be drawn from a pool of men who were eligible but did not volunteer, which would number about 730,000. *Thus we would have to draft only one man out of the seven available.*

Mr. Morris, after detailing the possible types of selection systems, concluded that "the method that would most approach equity would be to establish a Fair and Impartial Random (FAIR) system of selection to determine the order of call for all equally eligible men." He added that he saw no difficulty in a rapid effectuation of a random selection system, seconding the judgment of General Hershey.

Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz favored random selection because it would be "as fair to the sons of economically and politically weaker parents as to the sons of parents with more immediate influence." This argument—that a random selection would operate with absolute fairness—is subject to little argument.

I would like to point out that the members of our Subcommittee asked repeated and close questions about random selection, but that in every case the witness concluded that random selection was the best possible system.

When I presented the findings of our hearings to the Senate Committee on Armed Services, I presented, in addition to the views of our witnesses, an example of one way in which random selection might work. After I had presented this, and after the Chairman and I had discussed it in detail, he said, and I quote, that "I have no objection to a random system for all men after they have been placed on the same scale." I have had prepared, Mr. Chairman, a short memorandum which outlines the proposal Senator Russell and I discussed, and which I have attached to my statement. I might request that it be included in the record of your hearings.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, that the State Directors of the Selective Service System have been in Washington this week giving their views to the Director; and that one panel, studying procedures to implement a random selection system, has developed two different systems, both of which meet the requirements of the military and both of which accord with the State Directors views of the Selective Service System.

DEFERMENTS

Our Subcommittee devoted close attention to the question of deferments, an issue of overriding concern in planning for the needs of national defense. It is in this troubled area that our Subcommittee, with its background in manpower and employment policies, made its most important findings.

Concerning deferments based on manpower needs, for example, Secretary Wirtz presented most interesting testimony. He told us that "There is no justification under present circumstances, and especially in view of the prospective shift to a 19-year-old group induction priority, for 'occupational deferments . . .' There is nothing in the civilian manpower needs of the economy which warrants any consideration in determining who shall assume the military service obligation." I and the other Subcommittee members questioned Secretary Wirtz closely about the production of engineers, mathematicians, scientists, and physicists, to perform national defense work. He stated unequivocally that "the supply of those absolutely invaluable talents will not be interfered with in a significant way by the induction of the 19-year-old group." Part of the Secretary's reasoning was based on a statistic I have already cited: that only two-tenths of one percent of 19-year-olds have an occupational deferment. The complete elimination of this deferment can hardly be said, then, to work a disruption in our supply of highly trained scientific specialists.

Secretary Wirtz did, however, warn that there are "skill shortages today in some key occupations." But the Secretary went on to argue that, in terms of drafting 19-year-olds first, "these are all situations in which there is somebody who can be trained for them." Consequently, these skill shortages should have no effect or impact upon who gets drafted and who does not. Those not drafted—six out of seven eligible—are plainly sufficient to meet these shortages.

We must not forget that our armed forces possess a capability for highly-advanced technology, and that many servicemen receive training in the military directly related to these skill shortages—such as in advanced welding, missile control, radio communications, and electronic circuitry. Our Subcommittee found Secretary Wirtz very persuasive on these points, since his knowledge of the manpower needs of our country and how they are being met is perhaps unequalled.

Another problem area, when we consider deferments, is education.

We found a near agreement that graduate school deferments should be eliminated, with the exception of deferments for doctors and dentists. Doctors and dentists are subject, under our present system, to an entirely separate concription system. I believe we should continue this separate treatment, and that they should be permitted to finish their educations and then be subject to their own draft. This would ensure that our Armed Forces have a continued and adequate supply of trained health professionals. It would, further, not subject doctors and dentists to a double draft eligibility. And because there is a separate draft for these health professionals, they would not be using graduate school deferments as an escape from military service.

With this exception of a postponement from draft eligibility for doctors and dentists, no support at all was indicated in our hearings for continuing the graduate school deferments.

Undergraduate deferments, however, presented us with marked differences of opinion.

Mr. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for Program Coordination, told us that he did not favor deferments for either undergraduate or graduate students. Yet he qualified this statement by pointing out that once graduate deferments are eliminated, "college deferment is no longer tantamount to evasion from service." Further, he drew upon Department of Defense and Department of Health, Education, and Welfare studies which found "no evidence that breaking the (educational) career at mid-point would discourage continuation; so from a long-term point of views, ending college deferments would not necessarily have important implications one way or the other for the trained manpower which our educational system produces." It is apparent, in fact, that many young men actually prefer military service before college because, on their discharge, they are eligible for the broad benefits of the Cold War GI Bill. Finally, Mr. Gorham said that there were no convincing policy reasons for permitting college deferments. Such deferments had to be based upon public sentiment.

Mr. Burke Marshall expanded very ably upon both the majority and minority views of this Commission, on college deferments, and I see no need to elaborate upon his presentation, which is summarized in the Commission's Report.

Mr. Harold Howe, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, said that "from the point of view of HEW and the Administration, we want to keep this matter (of college deferments) open . . . With that reservation, and with the feeling that we have a lot to learn from the results of these hearings and other evidence that will be brought to the matter, I would personally feel that undergraduate deferments are no longer justified." We discussed this matter at great length with Commissioner Howe, who has had long experience in matters of education, and I am now well satisfied that from the point of view of educational needs, no valid reasons exist for requiring the continuance of college deferments.

A panel of student newspaper editors appeared before us, and they were divided over whether we should continue the college deferment. Their testimony, I am certain, reflected the division of opinion on our campuses. It is appropriate at this point to call attention to the president of the student body at the University of Oregon, Mr. Henry Drummond. Last month, he voluntarily gave up his 2–S deferment, subjecting himself to the draft. He left college, he says, because he believed college deferments to be unfair in times of war such as that in Vietnam. Mr. Drummond has, incidentally already received his notice of induction. This voluntary surrender of a 2–S deferment is not, I am sure, a typical reaction. But it does highlight the very strong feelings our young men have about the draft and the equities of college deferments.

This strong feeling is greatly strengthened during conflicts such as Vietnam, when thousands of young men are killed in combat but no war or national emergency has been declared. I have visited many college campuses in recent months, and the hostility to fighting in an undeclared war is, among some students, overt. I do not believe this overt hostility is a matter of lack of courage or of lack of faith in our government, as some have suggested. I think, rather, the ease with which those who have college deferments can avoid the burdens of service in Vietnam have caused what Yale University President Kingman Brewster called "a cynical avoidance of service, a corruption of the aims of education and a tarnishing of the national spirit."

This cynicism gives me great concern. And it does, in my mind, give a certain credence to one particular argument against continuing college deferments in times of a shooting war.

This is the so-called "timing argument." To illustrate, a young man today with the money and brains to attend college could choose to enter college instead of exposing himself to the draft. He would be taking the chance that four years from now our commitment in Vietnam, or anywhere else, would not be of the nature it is today. But a young man without the brains or money, or both, could not get this 2–S college deferment. These young men without the 2–S deferment are exposed to the draft, and perhaps are inducted and go to Vietnam. This is, in the minds of many people, an overt discrimination against the poor.

The point is this: If a man now has the choice of whether or not to go to college, then he can be certain of avoiding service in the military—and perhaps in Vietnam—for the next four years. In this, he has an unfair advantage over the young man who does not have that choice.

An idea discussed by both members of the Subcommittee and the witnesses was some way to permit four-year college deferments in peacetime, when induction calls are low, but to discontinue them during periods of hostility, such as Vietnam, when calls are high and there is a material risk of death in combat. This concern was evident in General Clark's testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee when he asked that some way be found to share the risks of the Vietnam war more equally, as for example, between reservists and inductees. The risks should also be shared between students and non-students.

No one was able to suggest an appropriate triggering device for determining, for the purposes of the draft, when a peacetime situation becomes a wartime situation. For example, there is hardly any question that Vietnam is a wartime situation. Yet we in the Congress have neither declared war nor has the President declared a national emergency. There should be some mechanism whereby, assuming we permit four-year college deferments in peacetime, these deferments would be discontinued when we become engaged in a shooting war in which thousands of our young men are being killed and tens of thousands wounded. It is difficult to justify permitting one boy the luxury of choosing to avoid the risks of the Vietnam war by going to college, while sending another off to do battle with the Viet Cong.

I am certain that the members of this Committee have thought about this problem of developing a suitable triggering device, and it is my hope that one can be developed.

To sum up, on the matter of college deferments: The great weight of testimony favored eliminating them entirely for those selected for induction at age 19, unless some triggering mechanism were developed which would prevent the inequity of a young man being able to elect his way out of a shooting war.

Secretary Wirtz first raised this issue, and we subsequently discussed it with all of the rest of our witnesses because of its importance. It is appropriate at this juncture to quote from Secretary Wirtz's testimony, because he was quite specific and eloquent. The Secretary said, "If there is to be continued deferment of college students, on the grounds that a general education is important enough to warrant it, the question will be pressed more and more strongly of why and whether there should be any different treatment of young men who are in occupational training programs.

"My own answer is that there cannot justifiably be any such distinction made. It would be hard to prove, and it hasn't been proved so far, that there is a larger value—either to the public or to the individual involved—in letting Bob finish college than in letting Jim complete his apprenticeship as a carpenter or letting John work his way up the unskilled steps toward a skilled job as a punch press operator.

"In fact, the last two may be more likely to get thrown off stride by a two year interruption than the college student would be.

"Without arguing either for or against 'student deferments' I urge that the answer must be the same for the boys who are getting their training in college and for those who are getting it in a school of harder knocks.

"This point has been increasingly recognized in the case of young men who are in private apprenticeship programs. But that . . . still leaves out those who are in different kinds of employment where the 'training' is on unskilled or low-skilled jobs that offer advance to the next higher work classification, and then the next, and so forth."

Mr. Chairman, I believe that Secretary Wirtz has given us a very important insight into a serious fault in our present draft system. We now permit high school students, college students and graduate students to have draft deferments. But only in a very, very limited fashion do we permit students in occupational training to have deferments. We have based college deferments on the security and welfare of the nation, yet we have not recognized that the young man learning the skills he must have to become a productive participant in our economic system is also vital to our security and welfare, and just as deserving of deferment.

Secretary Wirtz also pointed out that "of the current 250,000 registrants classified by the local boards as 2–A (occupational deferment), half are neither in essential activities as certified by the Secretary of Commerce nor in critical occupations as certified by the Secretary of Labor." The Secretary gave us examples of those occupations listed as critical, and glass blowers and structural linguists, among others, appeared on the list. He also gave us some idea of the applications he has received for new occupational deferments, which included pretzel bakers and pipe organ makers. The applications had been turned down, the Secretary told us.

There is not, at the present time, any information about the occupations of activities of the 125,000 registrants now deferred whose jobs are not either on the Labor Department's critical occupations list or on the Commerce Department's essential activities list. Secretary Wirtz indicated that only the Selective Service could develop this information.

We hear, on another day, from a panel of three young men in apprenticeship training. One was drafted out of his apprenticeship training, after one year, and spent two years in the Army as a missile technician stationed in Germany. He is now back completing his apprenticeship—as a carpenter. His experience illustrates the unfairness of a system which could defer a 20-year-old student of 14th century baroque music, but draft a 20-year-old student of carpentry. Both young men are students, and both are acquiring the knowledge and the skills they will need to assure their futures as wage earners.

There is, in addition to the problem of those in occupational training, a problem regarding the eligibility of part-time students. Since our hearings began, I have received considerable mail outlining specific instances of unfairness to part-time students. One letter came from a part-time engineering student who was working both to support himself and to pay his tuition. When he reached his senior year, after six years of part-time schooling, he received his induction notice. After basic military training, he was sent to Vietnam from where he wrote the letter. He described the case of students who, because they were lacking credits, had also spent six years in college, but were not drafted because they were full-time students. Something is wrong with a system which drafts a young man working his way through college carrying only a part-time course load, but defers the young man who can afford to be a full-time student while carrying less than a full-time course load.

Gross unfairness now plagues our policies governing apprentices, vocational trainees and part-time students. In Secretary Wirtz's words, "There is a very real danger here of denying democracy's basic ideals by putting boys in double jeopardy because they are poor."

REJECTEES

The final area of particular concern to our Subcommittee involves those rejected by the Armed Services as unfit for military duty.

In 1963, President Kennedy established a task force on Manpower Conservation, which made its report on January 1, 1964. The Report was titled *One-Third Of A Nation*, because one third of all men who turn 19 every year are found unfit for military service. The letter transmitting the report to President Kennedy said: "This level of failure stands as a symbol of the unfinished business of the nation, and unavoidable fact of the present. There could be no more urgent task than to ensure that in our time it becomes a thing of the past."

Mr. Chairman, the testimony to our Subcommittee indicates that the situation is only slightly better over three years later. In fiscal year 1966, for example, nearly three quarters of a million men were rejected—half for educational deficiencies, the other half for health reasons. We received considerable information on the income and racial breakdowns of the rejectees, but I will not go into it in detail. I think, though, that one example and a generalization indicates the nature of the problem. Seventy-six and one half percent of all Negro registrants in one state are rejected as unqualified for military duty. The Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Sargent Shriver, told us that the profile of rejectees is very close to that of a person classified as poverty-stricken.

I will not dwell extensively on this aspect of our hearings, because the programs of economic opportunity designed to raise the one-third of a nation out of their hopelessness are largely the concerns of other committees. There is however, one particular area of joint concern and this has to do with the rehabilitation of rejectees.

One way of increasing the extent of voluntarism in our Armed Forces is to focus some of our attention on those who volunteer but are rejected. It has been estimated that from one third to one half of the young men presently rejected each year, or from 230,000 to 350,000, were volunteers for military duty. Their rejection has at least two effects. The first is that we must draft other men to fill the places they would have occupied in the military if qualified and accepted. The second is, in the words of a witness who has worked extensively with rejectees, that since "the Army is the last chance for many of them, if they are rejected from the Army, they have nothing left, and this leads to difficulty. They roam the streets. They get in a group, something develops, and the next thing you know they are in the courts. On the other hand, those who have served, maybe in Vietnam, are very proud of their service. Many want to go back and serve in Vietnam for their nation."

All of our witnesses who spoke to this point emphasized the great importance of training and treating those rejectees who have deficiencies easily correctable. Secretary Wirtz went so far as to recommend compulsory rehabilitation, on analogy to compulsory education. Sargent Shriver recommended screening all young men—and women—at age 16 to identify their educational and health deficiencies, as a guide to offering assistance. Commissioner Howe recommended an expansion of the referral service, which presently exists, for some of the rejectees. Mr. Morris recommended that Project 100,000 be expanded. This is the program under which the Department of Defense gives military training to 40,000 young men who missed qualifying by a very small margin. It is, I think, important to note that these men are not being given the intensive, special training envisioned by the STEP Program, which was not funded, but are taking regular basic training courses along with those not in Project 100,000. The preliminary results have been highly satisfactory, according to Mr. Morris, particularly from the standpoint of the military, because of the high military motivation of this group.

I noticed with interest the recent recommendation of the Republican members of the House Education and Labor Committee that "Military Career Centers" be established in the Department of Defense. These centers would provide educational and medical rehabilitation for volunteers who fall short of meeting the requirements for military service.

This area of the medical and educational rehabilitation of rejectees is one of intense interest in the military establishment, in the Administration, in the Congress, and in universities. I am certain it will be given close attention by the Congress, both in the Armed Services and in other Committees, and I think the net result will be a better military establishment, a higher degree of public satisfaction with the draft, and a marked improvement in the lives of those young men exposed to the advantages of military service.

VOLUNTEER ARMY

We had much discussion of the volunteer army concept. Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, a leading advocate of the volunteer army, was our primary witness on this subject. Despite the many attractions a volunteer army offers, which Professor Friedman discussed very ably, there remain, for me, a number of troublesome, unresolved problems.

The first is cost. The Department of Defense has estimated the additional cost of maintaining a volunteer army at from $4 to $17 million a year. This is quite a range, and the members of our Subcommittee did not feel competent to make any judgments as to the validity of these costs. It was Professor Friedman's view that these figures were not correct, and that a volunteer army might be less costly, from an economist's point of view, and might even result in a net cost saving to the military.

The second is one to which General Clark spoke eloquently before the Senate Armed Services Committee. This involves what he called the "serious moral and psychological" problems of a volunteer army . . . General Clark pointed out that direct citizen participation in the military provides a "bridge of participation and identification" between military and civilian, and that an erosion of this bridge by reliance upon an army of professionals would have serious and unforseeable consequences.

My conclusion, from our testimony, is that we should attempt to increase the opportunities for volunteers to serve in the military, but that at this time we should not adopt a strictly volunteer army without considerably more serious study of the problems surrounding it. One which is particularly salient is based upon a poll of students which showed that while 61% of the students favored a volunteer army, 58% would *not* volunteer. And I wonder how much we would have to pay someone to serve in a rice paddy in Vietnam?

I note, in this regard, the great interest a number of members of the House of Representatives have shown in having the desirability of a volunteer army made the subject of a special study. This would, it seems to me, be one way of resolving the unanswered questions surrounding the volunteer army.

National service was also an area of much discussion. The Executive Director of the National Service Secretariat, Mr. Donald J. Eberly, commented upon the various proposals for development of national service alternatives to military service. It was clear, from his testimony and from that of our other witnesses, as in the volunteer army matter, much thought must be devoted to the ramifications of national service before it is adopted. For example, I am troubled by whether we can possibly equate nonmilitary service with military service in such a situation as Vietnam, even with the various point systems which have been proposed.

CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS

All the members of our Subcommittee were concerned about the delicate problem of conscientious objectors.

I think we can all agree with the Report of General Clark's Panel that "This country has a tradition of respecting the conscience of the individual." It is my belief that the Supreme Court, in the 1965 case of U.S. v. Seeger, interpreted the language of section 6(j) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act in that tradition. I do not believe that a man must be a member of an orthodox religion in order to be deemed to have a conscientiously-held objection to all war, and I believe that the local boards are the best place for the validity of this belief to be tested. If, as the Clark Panel points out, inordinate delays result from appeals to the Justice Department from the local or state board decisions, then there may be room for adoption of something akin to the recommendation B.6.b of the Clark Panel's Report.

I also endorse the majority view of the Marshall Commission that "legal recognition of selective pacificism could be disruptive to the morale and effectiveness of the Armed Forces." It is my judgment that conscientious objection must be based upon a validly held objection to war in all forms, and that it is a matter of individual conscience which has a long tradition in the religious and philosophical history of this country.

CONCLUSION

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment briefly upon S. Con. Res. 12, which I introduced into the Senate on February 23, and which was referred to the Senate Armed Services Committee. I would, Mr. Chairman ask you to include the text of the bill in the record of the hearings at the conclusion of my remarks.

This resolution would declare it the sense of Congress that the President should effect certain changes in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. These changes, in brief, are:

(a) to establish national criteria for the classification of persons registered under the Act, and to require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States;

(b) to require that the order of induction of persons under the Act be determined on the basis of random selection, and that the method of such random selection be the same throughout the United States;

(c) to eliminate all deferments authorized by regulation except deferments for extreme hardship cases and deferments for students pursuing undergraduate work in colleges and universities, with the provision that such student deferments should not last longer than four academic years;

(d) to require that youngest registrants be inducted first; and

(e) to continue to revise the physical and mental standards for military service so that persons who do not meet the physical and mental standards necessary for combat service may be inducted and, with remedial training and treatment, be made fit to perform noncombat or limited service, or, in appropriate circumstances, combat duty.

My reasoning for submitting a Concurrent Resolution, instead of a bill, is my belief that the President, as Commander-in-Chief, should have a high degree of flexibility in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. That Act, as General Clark pointed out, has an inherent flexibility which is readily adaptable to our changing demands for military manpower, and it has consistently provided the "manpower essential to the security of the nation." I do not think we should restrict the President's authority to operate the Selective Service System, particularly at this time when the President is moving to institute many of the reforms urged by witnesses to our Subcommittee and to your Committee.

But the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as it now stands, does not give the President any policy guidance in the five crucial areas of draft reform listed in S. Con. Res. 12. And that is the reason for S. Con. Res. 12: to give the President an explicit statement of Congressional policy in how he should operate the Selective Service System. The actual operating details would be left to Executive Order and administrative regulation. In this way, the President would have the guidance of the Congress in how he is to administer the Act, but the actual details of the administration would be left to him.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Universal Military Training and Service Act should be extended before the induction authority which is its operative section expires this June. But I think we in the Congress have a responsibility to indicate to the President our feelings on what general form the badly-needed reforms in our draft system should take. The calls for reform are persistent, they are wide-spread, and they are specific. And they are persistent, widespread, and specific because they are needed.

I am very honored to have been able to present to this distinguished Committee a summary report on the hearings on the employment, manpower, poverty, and educational implications of the draft which it was my privilege to chair. The information we have developed is provocative, and I am certain that it will prove highly useful in this Committee's deliberations.

Draft reform is, Mr. Chairman, a most difficult issue. It fully deserves the intensive consideration being given it by your Committee and by the Congress. Our overriding concern must be provision for the continued strong defense of this country. But we must at the same time be fair to our young men, as they are the source of strength in our future. It is in this context that I will be happy to answer your questions.

Random Selection of Inductees: One Proposal

A. Under this proposal:

1. Local draft boards would continue to examine and classify their registrants;

2. Induction calls would continue to be based upon monthly quotas; and

3. 19-year-olds would be drafted first.

B. For the purposes of this proposal, the following Department of Defense figures are used:

1. 1,900,000 men turn 19 each year;

2. 600,000 will be disqualified on mental, physical or moral grounds or will receive hardship or other legal exemptions;

3. Leaving 1,300,000 19-year-olds qualified and eligible for induction;

4. 680,000 men will be needed every year;

5. 570,000 men will volunteer (enlisted and volunteer);

6. Leaving 730,000 non-volunteers from whom the 110,000 draftees must be chosen. This is one out of seven.

C. Procedures for the Director of the Selective Service System:

1. Every month, arrange the days of the month in a random sequence, either by drawing or by computer; and

2. Assign monthly quotas to states or local boards based upon monthly calls received from the Department of Defense.

D. Procedures for local boards:

1. Examine and classify local registrants, producing, in each monthly period, 7 draft availables for every 1 who will be inducted;

2. Select that 1 for induction by birth date, based upon the sequence of days of the month established by the Director of the Selective Service System;

3. The 6 not selected for induction would be free from the draft, subject to the below-listed exemption;

4. In the following month, the same procedures would be applied to those registrants born in that month, and so on; and

5. In any given month, if the induction calls exceeded the draft availables, then those in the preceding month would be called, based upon the sequence established for that preceding month.

E. Miscellaneous:

1. This proposal expouses a continuous cycle of 19-year-olds to the draft. In the words of General Clark, it is a conveyor belt.

2. The letters of the alphabet, corresponding to the last names of registrant could be scrambled each month to establish a sequence of induction for those born on the same day.

3. The proposal is administratively simple, as it is based upon an impartially-ordered sequence of birth dates and utilizes existing and familiar examination and classification procedures and practices.

4. Its impartiality is above question.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT, MANPOWER AND POVERTY HEARINGS ON MANPOWER AND POVERTY IMPLICATIONS OF THE SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM

MONDAY, MARCH 20, 9:30 A.M.

Lt. General Lewis B. Hershey, Director, Selective Service System.

Hon. Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower).

TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 10 A.M.

Hon. W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor.

Mr. Donald J. Eberly, National Service Secretariat, Executive Director.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 10 A.M.

Hon. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary for Program Coordination, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Mr. Burke Marshall, General Counsel, IBM, Chairman, National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

THURSDAY, MARCH 23, 10 A.M.

Hon. Sargent Shriver, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.

TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 10 A.M.

College papers panel

Don Morrison, Editor-in-Chief, Daily Pennsylvanian.

Chuck Sable, Editorial Writer, Harvard Crimson.

Tom Myles, Staff Writer, Howard Hilltop.

Carolyn Carter, Editor-in-Chief, Howard Hilltop.

Panel of young men rejected as unfit for military duty

Morris Bunch, Washington, D.C.

Freddie Finch, Washington, D.C.

William M. Stokes, Washington, D.C.

Panel accompanied by: Mr. Vernon E. Hawkins.

Panel of young men in job training programs eligible for draft

Ronald Corder, Washington, D.C.

Wesley Livingston, Cedar Heights, Maryland.

Stephen Soraka, Avondale, Maryland.

THURSDAY, APRIL 6, 10 A.M.

Mr. Arlo Tatum, Executive Secretary of the Central Committee for Conscientious Objectors.

Professor Milton Friedman, Department of Economics, University of Chicago.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The rollcall was concluded, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 103 Leg.]

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Gore
Griffin
Gruening
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11 A.M. MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SCOTT ON MONDAY MORNING

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the morning prayer on Monday morning next, the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be recognized up to 12 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TIME TO VOTE ON CONVENTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that beginning at 12:10 p.m. on Monday next the three votes be taken on the three conventions which were discussed in the Senate earlier today and that, if that request is granted, the prior order for a vote on those three conventions on tomorrow be vacated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, is as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That at 12:10 p.m. on Monday, May 8, 1967, the Senate proceed to vote, by three separate votes, on the treaties, numbered 16 through 18, Executive G (88th Cong., first sess.), Executive A (90th Cong., first sess.), Executive G (90th Cong., first sess.).

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a unanimous-consent request and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous-consent request will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, that, effective at 2 p.m., on Tuesday, May 9, 1967, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, debate on any amendment, including the pending amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the manager of the bill, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG]: *Provided*, that in the event the manager of the bill, the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, that on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to one hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the chairman of the committee, the manager of the bill and the minority leader: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and I do not plan to object, does the proposed unanimous-consent request contain a provision as to the time allowed on amendments?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There will be 1 hour on each amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There will be 1 hour, the time to be equally divided?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I understand that any of the amendments which have heretofore been considered would be in order, as would other amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. There is no germaneness provision in the request.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. But other amendments must be germane.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No. May I say it would be my hope that after the Gore and the Mansfield proposals are disposed of, the Members of the Senate would not be too indisposed towards motions to table.

This is just a proposal which may or may not come to pass, but I thought I would make a statement to that effect.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Reserving the right to object, I wish to congratulate the majority leader on the achievement of an agreement which will in due course give the majority of the Senate an opportunity to work its will, whether the decision is in agreement with my views or not. I have been ready to vote for weeks and days. I am ready to vote now. I will be ready to vote next Tuesday.

I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The unanimous-consent agreement, subsequently reduced to writing, reads as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered, That, effective at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, May 9, 1967, during the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, debate on any amendment, including the pending amendments, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and manager of the bill: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader or some Senator designated by him.

Ordered further, That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] and the minority leader: *Provided*, That the said Senators, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for those undeserved words. But I must say, in all candor, that it was a voluntary suggestion on the part of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], the manager of the bill, the chairman of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I, too, wish to congratulate the majority leader for his fine leadership in this matter.

We are not going to have a session tomorrow. We could have a session tomorrow, if we had some other measure that required immediate action. The Senate has spent a long time on this bill. It is not an unusually long time by the standards that existed when I first came to the Senate.

In my early days in the Senate, when we had before us a bill such as the Taft-Hartley bill, a major issue, the debate could last a long time; or, if we had a bill like the tidelands bill, talk could go on for a long time and we could come to a conclusion without a cloture petition being filed.

These hard-fought issues eventually come to settlement. We will settle this one, as I said we will settle it, and I am happy that we have entered into this unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, this is the kind of magnanimity that we have always expected of the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, and he always rises to the occasion. Even though he sometimes gets the Senate snarled, he always comes to the fore and saves the situation. I told him today that he reminded me in a way of his very distinguished father, whom I knew very well.

His father and I used to go abroad in the country, on the platform together, to address encampments and conventions and that sort of thing, and we became well acquainted and we became good friends.

Back in those early days, I was on a committee in the House that took testimony all over the country, and we dealt mainly with bondholder's protective reorganizations. There was a man in Chicago who had been the president of three banks. All the banks failed in the crash, but not until he had settled a million-dollar trust fund on each of his children and his wife. And so, being without gainful employment, he came down to Washington and he came to see me. I talked to the chairman of the committee, and we found him a job.

At that time, the distinguished late Senator from Louisiana was on the Banking and Currency Committee. Our friend from Chicago said to me:

> I would like to meet Senator Huey Long of Louisiana.

I said:

> John, I'll arrange it for you.

So, on a given morning at 9 o'clock, my friend from Chicago went to the Mayflower Hotel and pushed the buzzer. The door opened, and there was the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He said:

> Come in. I'll be with you directly.

While the Senator was managing his toilet, my friend looked around and noticed there were five or six Bibles, all of them open—large Bibles and small. So when the distinguished Senator essayed from the bathroom, my friend said:

> Mr. Long, what do you do with all these Bibles?

The Senator said:

> Why, I want you to know that that's the Book of law. I wouldn't think of undertaking anything unless I first found the citation and found the justification in the Book. You know, Mr. C, it just seems to me that mankind often doesn't want to be saved. They hedge about as much as to say that they're ready for perdition; they just don't want to be saved. They always crucify their saviors. They crucified the Man of Galilee. They burned John Huss at the stake. They burned Sardanapalus. And there are many others whose bones dot the pages of history who were crucified. No, often I believe they don't want to be saved. But, damn 'em, I'm going to save 'em whether they like it or not.

So, our friend, the Senator from Louisiana, was bound to save the day, and he did, and we thank him.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the consent agreement—and I certainly agree to it—the suggestion was made that there may be a motion to table amendments that would affect the revenue-producing provisions of the bill. But it was my understanding and it is my hope that there will not be a motion to table amendments affecting the Corrupt Practices Act, if such amendments are offered. We should get a vote on those amendments on their merits. My understanding is that the suggestion of possible motions to table referred to amendments that might be characterized as "loading" amendments.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Illinois mentioned my father's six Bibles. Here is the Bible used to check Senators' quotations since 1934. It says:

> Presented to the Official Reporters of Debates by Senator Huey P. Long, 1934.

Signed "Huey P. Long, U.S. Senator."

My father had another story that the Senator from Illinois may not recall. It was along the same line.

Mr. DIRKSEN. When the Senator reads from that Bible, he should not read "the Republicans and the Pharisees." [Laughter.]

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shall try to avoid making that mistake. That "Republican" sounded more like a Democrat to me.

Mr. President, my father used to tell a story about an uncle of his in Winnfield, La., who had a bad reputation with some people. His wife decided she might find it necessary to divorce him unless he joined the church, and so he did.

Folks around Winnfield were practically all Baptists. They pushed him under the water and planned to bring him back up and cleanse him. But as they pushed him under, the ace of spades came out of his vest pocket. They pushed him under again, and out came the king. Then out came the queen, the jack, and the 10 of spades.

His wife just could not stand it any longer. She shouted:

> Stop it! Stop it! It's all over! He's lost, he's lost!

At that point, his 16-year-old son, who was standing beside the wife, said:

> Hold on just a minute, Maw. Paw ain't lost. If Paw can't win with that hand, ain't nobody ever going to win.

I would say, Mr. President, that the hand I had was so good that if I could not win with that one, I would never win. But I am willing to take my chances, whether I hold that hand or a different one, and on Tuesday we will see who has the vote.

ORDER FOR YEA-AND-NAY VOTE ON THREE CONVENTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, as in executive session, that it be in order to request the yeas and nays on the three treaties to be voted on on Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, for some time I have been working on the kind of bill which I believe the Committee on Finance should consider when it follows the instructions of the Senate to conduct hearings on the subject of the Presidential Campaign Fund Election Act and reports back to the Senate.

I have been very much impressed by the cogent and logical statements of the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] that there is a better way to do what we were seeking to do than the so-called Long Act. I agree that there might be a better way.

Mr. President, I have been exploring various thoughts with the staff and others to see how we might improve on our handiwork, as we have agreed we should.

I am sending to the desk at the close of business today a bill which I believe incorporates the best suggestions made by Senators on the floor during the course of this vigorous debate. I hope that advisers to the President and the White House, Dr. Neustadt and those who are with the President, would look at it and consider it along with other recommendations they make to the President. I hope Senators will study it and see if it has some constructive thought to it.

I have carefully studied the debates over the last 4 weeks, analyzing all the objections both real and fancied, which were voiced against the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act as it presently stands. I suspect that two or three of the Senators who voted against the act did so because of a belief—a belief I did not share—that in some strange way the $1 tax checkoff violated the appropriations process required by the Constitution. I suspect another Senator might have been swayed because the act did not provide for the costs of waging primary campaigns. Personally, this Senator felt that it would be proper and appropriate, after we had gained experience with the new law, to study the peculiar problems of primary elections and extend the benefits of the act to the preferential primaries. Perhaps I am wrong; perhaps it would be better to do the whole job at once.

It is true that one valid criticism of the new act is that it only covered the general election. It is equally true that the vested interests can buy primary elections. We have seen it happen in some States. And we have all heard the story of the wealthy father who warned his politician son, "Don't win by a landslide, we can't afford it."

I know that was said in jest, but there is enough to it to make an audience roar on the theory that there is something to it.

The one thing that impressed me most in the last 4 weeks is that "commitments for contributions" are just as evil in primary campaigns as they are in general elections. The gamble is greater for the private interests but if they pick the right candidate, they truly become part of the "inner circle" and their influence will be reflected in major decisions for the next 4 or 8 years. An infusion of clean money, and money that requires no commitment, into primary campaigns can do much to correct this sort of pressure on a President.

We also heard much discussion of the merits of letting a person contribute to "the candidate of his choice." This is a principle which I find highly desirable. Indeed, my original thoughts along this line were reflected in the bill I introduced last year prior to the hearings of the Finance Committee into political campaign financing. Later when we voted in executive session the committee deleted the "candidate-of-his-choice" concept in order to be fairer to the minority Republican Party. Elections since 1928 have demonstrated that that party rarely presents a candidate who is the choice of the people.

But if the "candidate of his choice" is a principle the Senate finds persuasive, this Senator is happy to subscribe to it.

Comments were also made during the debates that present law was deficient because it permitted only taxpayers to participate in the financing of an honest election. "What about the millions of retired people who do not pay tax because of the retirement income credit?" "Why shouldn't they be allowed to help clean up elections?" "What about the millions of people who are too poor to pay tax—shouldn't they be allowed to help finance an honest election?" Certainly they should not be denied that right. There is no reason why they should, in my opinion.

Mr. President, I have listened to all the arguments and I have studied the record. My study convinces me that a majority of the Senate wants to provide for a presidential election free of the suspicion of improper influence which accompanies reliance on large private contributors to pay the tremendous costs of today's political campaigns. They want to provide for the kind of campaign where any candidate who has the ability can run for President, knowing his chance is not prejudiced because he has no great personal wealth. A majority of the Senate wants to separate commitments from contributions.

Knowing this and believing this, I have worked out an amendment based on the discussions in this body over the last 2 weeks. It draws on the comments of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE]. It reflects the "candidate-of-his-choice" concept urged by the Senator from Delaware and the Senator from New York. The Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF] contributed much to the preparation of this amendment, as did the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Maryland. The Senator from Wisconsin also added thoughts that are reflected in my proposal.

It covers primaries. It covers minor parties. It is not limited to taxpayers. Rather, it allows anyone to make a $1 contribution to the candidate of his choice for the greatest elective office in America—the office of the President of the United States.

Here, in essence, is how this amendment works. Each presidential election year every U.S. citizen would be furnished with a $1 presidential election campaign certificate. These certificates would be distinctive in appearance. I visualize them as resembling currency or perhaps a savings bond certificate. They might bear the portrait of Theodore Roosevelt, who fathered the idea of mass support for political campaigns. To make them nonpartisan in appearance. The certificate would have a blank on its face in which the individual could write the name of the candidate he wants to receive the $1 amount represented by the certificate. The certificate would be good in a primary election or in a general election.

It would not be honored, however, unless a primary candidate received 10 percent of the votes cast for all candidates in his party's primary election. In a general election, the candidate would have to receive at least 2 million votes to validate the certificates assigned to him. To assure strict compliance with the new rules, candidates would have to give bond that they would restore amounts improperly paid to them. Expenses will be reimbursed under this act only if they are incurred on behalf of a presidential candidate by an individual or organization which is specifically authorized by the candidate himself to assist him in carrying on the primary or general presidential campaign.

Providing financial assistance of this sort for primary campaigns reflects the contributions made in the debate by the Senator from New York. Allowing the individual to designate which candidate will receive his $1 certificates mirrors the "party of his choice" principle urged by the Senator from Delaware and reflected in the bill introduced on April 3 by the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF].

Validating certificates assigned to candidates receiving as few as 10 percent of the primary votes cast or as few as 2 million general election votes embodies the concepts recommended by the Senator from Wisconsin when he offered a third party amendment last week.

I must say I would prefer to have included in my amendment provisions to limit campaign expenditures to the amounts received under the certificate assignments. Unfortunately, the "party of his choice" principle makes this sort of limitation impossible. The equal distribution of funds provided by last year's act was more equitable to both the major parties and readily lent itself to a limitation on private contributions. The "party of his choice" principle, on the other hand, could result in all the assignments going to the candidate of a single party.

The certificates provided under this amendment would identify the presidential election year for which they are issued. For each campaign year 1968, 1972, 1976, and so forth only one certificate will be available. It would be sent to individuals early in 1968 and in subsequent presidential election years. As a matter of fact, the Internal Revenue Service, which would handle the distribution of these certificates, could include them with each package of tax returns it mails out at the end of the preceding year. The limited funds available to the parties by reason of the single $1 certificate every 4 years reflects the contributions made to the debate last week by the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS].

The certificates would bear the tax account numbers of the individuals involved. The endorsed certificates, assigned to specified candidates, must be returned to the Internal Revenue Service in the presidential year for which they are issued. Certificates returned in any other year would not be honored. After verifying the tax account numbers—in order to help control counterfeiting and trafficking in these certificates—they would be turned over to bonded certified public accountants who have been retained by the Comptroller General to tabulate the certificates assigned to various candidates. The accountants would report the totals to the Comptroller General. After he has verified their totals, the Comptroller General will instruct the accountants to have the cancelled certificates returned to the individuals who submitted them. These cancelled certificates could become campaign souvenirs if the people want to keep them for that reason.

They could become collector's items. Those would become souvenirs which anyone would pay a premium to own.

In some homes, I suppose they would become accustomed to framing them and putting them on the walls to show that grandfather had sent in his certificate, or that grandma had sent in her certificate, that Uncle Joe had sent in one, and Aunt Sarah had sent in another. There they would all be, on the walls, to show how the family had proudly voted for Presidents without having to show who they voted against. In other words, they would make all friends and no enemies.

Setting up certified public accountants to do the counting of the certificates as they come in represents the contributions of the distinguished minority leader. The Internal Revenue Service, under this amendment, is nothing more than a clearinghouse for these certificates, although, as I have pointed out, their electronic data processing equipment can be used to verify and match up the tax account numbers on the incoming certificates in each election year.

Bills from the primary and general election campaigns would be submitted to the Comptroller General by the candidates. If they are for proper expenses, which I shall describe in a moment, and if the candidates in the primary election receive the necessary number of votes to make them eligible for reimbursement, the Comptroller General would certify the amounts payable to the Secretary of the Treasury, who would issue the checks.

In a general election, payments could be made currently to candidates of a party whose candidate for President in the prior election received at least 15 million votes. These candidates, however, would have to give bond for repayment of amounts advanced to them in the event that they should not receive at least 2 million votes in the current election. Other candidates would be reimbursed only after the election is over and their eligibility has been established.

The items for which reimbursement would be permitted include: Television, radio, and motion picture production and time; newspaper and periodical advertising; printing, postage, and distribution of campaign literature; telephone, telegraph, and data processing; and travel and transportation. Other items would have to be paid out of private contributions.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] made great contributions to this part of the proposal—that is, in the proposed bill.

An innovation in this bill requires the Secretary of Defense to make aircraft available to the presidential and vice-presidential candidates of the major political parties. The cost of operating these aircraft while they are being used by the presidential and vice-presidential candidates of the major parties would be charged to the candidates.

In other words, if we had Air Force 1 sitting around or Air Force 2, why should we have President Johnson flying around in a chartered plane which may not be adequate, when he has these two good planes available to him? Why have them sitting around when the man who might be the next President—if President Johnson loses—needs an airplane to fly around the countryside. Why not provide him with these airplanes and let him pay for them with the certificates?

Let me say that I am not suggesting that either party should have a prior claim on Air Force 1 or Air Force 2. Just make good airplanes like these available to both sides to fly around the country and make their campaigns.

Under my amendment, no candidate would be eligible for reimbursement unless he received the level of votes in the primary or general election I have already described. Certificates designated for other candidates would become useless since that candidate could not use them nor could they be transferred to other candidates.

On the other hand, a primary candidate who received the necessary number of qualifying votes in the primary election in State A would be eligible for reimbursement of the expenses specified in the amendment. If the funds designated for him under the certificates exceed his reimbursable expenses, the excess could be carried over and used in the primary campaign in State B, if he receives 10 percent of the votes cast in the State B primary.

Alternatively, this excess, in the case of both presidential and vice-presidential nominees, could be carried over and used in the general election.

Except for this, these certificates would be non-negotiable and stiff penalties are provided for counterfeiting, falsifying, or for trafficking in these certificates. Penalties are also provied for willful misuse of the funds received under this act, including the use of these funds for personal purposes or kickbacks. A clarifying amendment assures that payments under this act are exempted from the $3 million limitation on expenditures by political committees.

The Comptroller General is directed by the amendment to conduct a thorough audit of the campaign expenses of each candidate and to require repayment of money used other than for proper campaign purposes. This will give us information we have never had before on the actual operations of a political campaign for the Presidency. For the first time, we will know where all the money is spent and for what purposes. The amendment further directs the Comptroller General to report this information and other information regarding presidential elections to Congress, where it will be printed as a Senate document and made a matter of public record. This disclosure of the operations of a political campaign for the presidency involves a reform in the law which has long been sought by many but never achieved by any. It can be achieved only when the parties are assured that money will be available to them in sufficient amounts to enable a candidate to make an honest campaign for this high office without having to go hat in hand from one wealthy contributor to another seeking the funds to make his race and making whatever commitments are needed to assure he gets the money.

The changes in the law which will be made by this proposal would become effective on August 1, 1967. Most persons will receive their first certificates early in 1968 for use with respect to the 1968 presidential election campaigns. To be valid they would have to be returned to the Internal Revenue Service in the 1968 presidential campaign year.

The amendment technically adds a new title to the bill before us. The new title would be called "The Presidential

Election Campaign Assistance Act of 1967." As a practical matter, the proposal is a composite of thoughts expressed by a great many able Senators who are experts in the operation of political parties. It contains the best thoughts of a lot of people—those who have contributed to this debate.

For this reason, it deserves the best thoughts of the Senate, and I urge that it be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1698) entitled the "Presidential Election Campaign Assistance Act of 1967," introduced by Mr. Long of Louisiana, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Now, Mr. President, I have no particular pride of authorship in this proposal. It is merely the kind of thing on which men of good will, working together, try to join in submitting their best thoughts.

I would hope very much that Senators would submit their own thoughts. Some of the thoughts of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] are incorporated in this proposal. I would hope that Senators would analyze and study the proposals and determine what would be required to make of them a bill in which we could all join in good conscience and support. That is the kind of action that should be taken by this body.

It is unfortunate, when we seek to provide for cleaner elections and to eliminate improper influence, that we find party lines votes, with Republicans voting to a man against a position, and the Democrats voting 76 percent for the position.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. I am glad to know that the able Senator from Louisiana is looking beyond the pending bill. The Committee on Finance has a firm, solemn mandate from the Senate to report an election reform bill. I hope the able Senator from Louisiana will schedule hearings on such a bill as soon as possible. I might suggest for his consideration that perhaps hearings could begin a week from next Tuesday, although I really do not mean to be suggesting any specific date. I merely hope that hearings will begin as quickly as possible.

I had an interesting visit with the distinguished Attorney General, Ramsey Clark. I would suggest that he be invited to appear.

It is my hope that after we have finally reached a conclusion on this measure, as we are sure to do early next week, we can return to the committee and consider the necessities of political campaigning under the conditions of today, and also consider the dangers to our system of self-government arising from dependence upon private contributions, much of which comes from self-seeking sources.

I thank the Senator for looking ahead. I hope that the committee can start public hearings and commence the consideration of such a measure as soon as possible.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it has grieved me that during the long and arduous debate I have been constantly at odds with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore]. In my judgment, the political philosophy of the Senator from Tennessee is very similar to that of the Senator from Louisiana. The Senator from Tennessee himself has stated as much to me on occasion. In terms of our general philosophy of government, our thinking is about the same.

I sometimes think that the Senator from Tennessee perhaps looks with disdain upon the Senator from Louisiana for supporting proposals to provide equitable treatment for the oil and gas industry, which provides the major payroll in my State. But I will excuse him for that. I will pardon him for whatever shortcoming may exist in the Senator's mind, because I am sure he realizes that I have a responsibility to represent that industry, since it provides 40 percent of the employment in Louisiana.

But even so, while the Senator from Tennessee perhaps feels that, from time to time, the Senator from Louisiana is doing something mischievous in seeking to provide equitable tax treatment for oystershell diggers in Louisiana, or for the shrimp fishermen, nevertheless the Senator knows that, in general, we share the philosophy that government should be for the benefit of everybody, and that if the little fellow at the bottom is doing all right, the fellow at the top must be doing very well indeed.

Matters of monopoly and interest rates are of great concern to little folks who live in areas where oystershells are dug, and who do not know what is happening. Those are subjects on which a speech by the Senator from Tennessee would read like a speech of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The senior Senator from Tennessee is in a generous mood now that we have finally come to an arrangement to arrive at a majority decision and acceptance thereof. If I may make a fraternal suggestion to the Senator from Louisiana, I have noticed that for some days he has had an extra pair of shoes under his desk here. They seem to be fit for running. Now that we are going to have this vote, if the Senator will just be willing for me to take them along, I will have them shined for him.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, the pair I am wearing is worse than the pair the Senator from Tennessee is taking. They are a little dusty. I have been keeping them around here during this fight when both of us have been trying to keep our "troops" in town to vote. I thought that if someone came to me, making a pitiful plea for a pair, for example the Senator from Tennessee coming and saying that Senator Murphy, who had a forebear by the name of Long, was sick unto death and under the care of a doctor, "won't you give your cousin George a pair?" I could say, "Yes, here it is right here." [Laughter.]

Mr. GORE. I kept my eyes on those shoes because I did not want them to be voted against me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I conclude with this thought. I would hope the Senator from Tennessee would look at what we have here. He is an able lawyer. He undoubtedly will have some suggestions to make if he thinks he can vote for the bill. I have been in a compromising mood so far as the basic law is concerned. On occasion a Senator has said to me, "If you will take my amendment, I will vote for it." I would say, "Well, the amendment is good, but it does not go far enough." He would say, "Well, either you take the amendment or lose my vote. So I would say, "Well, it is better than I thought. I will take it."

The Senator from Tennessee realizes that a floor manager of a bill does that.

I would urge the Senator from Tennessee to put his brilliant and talented mind to work on this matter and see if he finds merit in it. Perhaps he can suggest how it can be modified and changed.

We have had a staff of 12 persons working on this for several days. There are suggestions here to the Long proposal as now drafted. If the Senator eventually decides he can vote for this measure, I would be honored to have him as a cosponsor of it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator.

LAWYERS FOR THE LAWMAKERS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Lawyers for the Lawmakers," written by Erwin G. Krasnow and Stephen Kurzman. Lawyers in private practice should derive satisfaction from the revelation therein of the significant contribution of their fellow practitioners in the shaping of the legislation enacted by the Congress.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Lawyers for the Lawmakers

(By Erwin G. Krasnow and Stephen Kurzman)

To most lawyers, the phrase "Government lawyer" probably connotes an attorney in the executive branch or, at least, in that "fourth branch" composed of independent regulatory agencies such as the Federal Trade Commission or the National Labor Relations Board. It may also suggest service with the judicial branch, usually as a law clerk to a judge. Much less known is the role of the lawyer on Capitol Hill, perhaps because relatively few practitioners have as much personal contact with the Congress as an institution as they do with the other branches.

Despite this relative obscurity, lawyers serving the Congress play a leading role in shaping the body of law with which practitioners are concerned. In influence, if not in sheer number, lawyers dominate the Congress and its related institutions. That domination grows as the work of the Congress increases in size and complexity and demands additional legal skills.

The twenty-six Senators and sixty-five Representatives who met as the First Congress in 1789 had only a handful of staff members to assist them with their legislative activities, which consisted of the enactment of only 118 bills involving a total budget for the entire federal establishment of less than $4.5 million. The 89th Congress, consisting of 100 Senators and 435 Representatives (more than half of whom are lawyers), will handle well over 10,000 bills during each of its two annual sessions and will plow through an annual budget submitted by the President of more than $100 billion. In contrast to the First Congress, which had few committees and conducted no investigations, the modern Congress regards legislative oversight and investigation as an important part of day-to-day committee work. Unlike their eighteenth century predecessors, today's federal legislators have a full-time, year-round occupation whose scope and breadth require the help of approximately 2,500 nonclerical staff aides, including approximately 500 graduates of law schools.

Generally speaking, Representatives and Senators can call upon four kinds of lawyers for aid in carrying out their legislative duties—personal aides in their own Congressional offices, the staff members of the various committees and subcommittees, the draftsmen in the Legislative Counsel's office, and the attorneys in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Each of these four categories of legislative lawyers differs in regard to the breadth and variety of the subject matter it is expected to cover.

THE PERSONAL STAFF AIDE

The personal assistants of members of Congress generally have the widest range of subject matter responsibility, although this varies with the scope of the member's interests and the size of his personal staff. Senators, because of their larger constituencies, have bigger salary allowances and office space for staff than Representatives. While virtually every Senator has at least one lawyer on his staff and some as many as four, the number is not nearly as great in the House and some Representatives have no lawyers on their staffs.

A member expects his staff man to draft answers to reams of constituent mail, shepherd constituents through the maze of the executive branch on individual problems and literally shepherd constituents through the Capitol's corridors. A staff man who is a lawyer often, but not always, is designated "legislative assistant". In addition to all the functions he shares with other personal staff members, he is usually responsible for analyzing legislation going through the member's committees and being considered on the floor, briefing and counseling the member on what is involved, both as a matter of law and as a matter of policy, and recommending a position for the member to take. He is also expected to prepare bills and amendments for the member himself to introduce, help buttonhole cosponsors for the proposals and lobby for action on them.

In all these functions he cannot, of course, be expected to be an expert on the subject matter. In fact, he often is really no more than an informed "brain-picker", calling upon the *expertise* of the Library of Congress, the committee staffs, the Legislative Counsel of the Senate or House, the executive departments and agencies, bar and trade associations, colleges and universities, and lobbyists.

A personal staff assistant is so closely identified with the member for whom he works that he is often expected to act as his employer's alter ego. Occasionally he is called on to stand in for the member at speaking engagements or to testify on his behalf before committees. In executive, or closed "mark-up", sessions of his member's own committees, if proxy votes are authorized, a staff assistant may be expected to advise the chairman or ranking minority member as to how his principal would wish to be recorded as voting. Sometimes, when an important vote is close, an assistant who is without specific instructions may suddenly find himself the object of considerable attention from members of the committee!

The price exacted for this close association and identification with his employer-member is usually a fairly high degree of anonymity for the assistant outside the confines of the Congressional staff milieu. His role is basically that of house counsel: to give sound advice in his employer's best interest and, once his employer's position has been taken, to defend it to the best of his ability, whatever his own views may be.

COMMITTEE COUNSEL

Somewhat more specialized subjects are assigned to lawyers on committee and subcommittee staffs. They are generally held to a higher standard of personal *expertise* than are personal staff assistants, at least as to the subjects within the jurisdiction of their committees or subcommittees. However, this is only relatively true as contrasted, say, with the greater degree of specialization common today among lawyers in the executive branch and in private practice.

The number of committees, as bewilderingly profuse as it may seem at first glance, is quite small in relation to the vast range of issues and subjects that come before Congress. This universe of topics is divided among the sixteen Senate and twenty House standing committees that handle legislation and some fifteen or more special, select and joint committees, which are solely investigatory bodies. These committees in turn often spawn subcommittees, some of which are independently staffed.

The Library of Congress analyzed the make-up of Senate committee staffs in some detail in a 1963 report, "Senate Committee Staffing", Senate Document No. 16, 88th Congress, First Session. The library found that there were some 256 professional staff employees of Senate committees and subcommittees. It concluded that while the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 requires professional and clerical employees of the committees to be appointed on a vote of the majority of the committee, in practice staff appointments are generally made instead by committee chairman and, in the case of minority staff, by the chairman after consultation with or on the recommendations of the ranking minority members. It also found that there are three types of committee staffs: (1) nonpartisan, without distinction as to political affiliation in hiring or in service; (2) partisan-sponsored staffs who work together as a team, serving members of both parties in varying degrees; and (3) staffs divided between majority and minority not only as to sponsorship but as to working relationships as well. Four of the Senate's sixteen standing committees were found to fall into the first category; the bulk of the remaining ones were considered to be in the second grouping. Much the same pattern could be found in House committee staffing.

This means that in most instances a committee staffer owes his primary allegiance to his sponsor: either the chairman or the ranking minority member. However, unlike a personal staff assistant, the committee staff aide also has a responsibility to the other members of the committee or subcommittee, particularly those of his sponsor's party. He is expected to furnish factual information about matters relating to committee business to any member who requests it, including those not on his committee. Of course, more extensive work and advice are expected by the committee members, and particularly by the sponsoring member, whose mail relating to committee business will usually be answered by the committee staff. Consequently, in contrast to personal staff, the committee aide is generally responsible for a narrower range of subjects but is expected to have knowledge in greater depth and to be responsible, in varying degrees, to a number of members rather than exclusively to one.

There are also functional differences from personal staff work. Committee counsel prepare for hearings by creating a witness list, developing lines of questioning and assembling relevant source materials. During the course of hearings, counsel may brief members who are able to attend only sporadically. After the hearings, they prepare for an executive session, analyze the hearing record and suggest amendments for the members to offer.

When the committee reports a bill to the floor, they write the committee report or individual, supplemental or minority views. When a committee bill is taken up on the floor, they prepare statements and brief members, particularly members who are not on the committee and not as familiar with the legislation as the committee members. Finally, if the House and Senate versions of a bill differ, the Senate-House conference committee irons out the differences, and the two committee staffs must be prepared to give advice and counsel. In addition to legislative work, a committee staff aide usually maintains a close relationship with the executive departments and independent agencies as to which his committee has oversight jurisdiction.

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL

The most traditionally craftsman-like work on the Hill is performed by the attorneys in the Office of Legislative Counsel. Each of the two houses has its own office offering bill-drafting services to its members and committees. These services are available at any stage of the legislative process, from preparing a bill for a member to drop in the hopper and drafting an amendment to be offered on the floor, to ironing out technical difficulties arising in a House-Senate conference committee. Often they simply check over drafting done first by members themselves or by lawyers on personal or committee staffs.

Attorneys in the Office of Legislative Counsel emphasize that their role is limited to the technical one of shaping legislative language to achieve the policy goals given to them, not defining those goals. However, as every lawyer knows, the choice of words and the choice of policy are inextricably intertwined. Thus, it is often legislative counsel's function to point out to the member whose bill he is drafting the choices of policy involved in various alternative wordings. Like a private practitioner drafting a will, legislative counsel must elicit from his "client", who is often a member's personal staff aide or committee counsel, as many facts as possible about the policy goals sought. In jest it is sometimes said that all a member has to do is call up the legislative counsel's office and say, "I've got a lot of farmers in my district. Draw me up a farm bill." A member would never make such a request and, even if one did so, legislative counsel could not honor it.

Drafting language that will conform to the style and content of the huge mass of existing legislation is a complex and specialized skill. One cannot successfully draft an amendment to the parity provisions of the agricultural laws, for example, without a considerable familiarity with the entire scheme of our farm legislation and how that legislation has been interpreted, both administratively and in the courts. Accordingly, the Office of Legislative Counsel tends to break down its organization along subject-matter lines, so that its attorneys generally work in the same few fields and with the same committees. But, since there are fewer than two dozen attorneys in each office, the scope of each attorney is formidably broad.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE

The Legislative Reference Service is the arm of the Library of Congress devoted to furnishing factual information to members and committees of Congress. The American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service in turn supplies information about the state of existing law and is composed largely of lawyers. Its staff performs research and prepares memoranda in all fields of federal and state statutory and decisional law. The service employs on a nonpartisan basis some 120 lawyers, whose specialization depends in part upon seniority.

Like the attorneys in the Office of Legislative Council, lawyers in the Legislative Reference Service perform a purely technical function and are not expected to assist in the formulation of policy, although, as in the case of drafting, the product of research also may shape policy. However, the service is charged by law with preparing reports without *partisan bias in the selection or presentation* of the materials incorporated in them. Although objective reports written by the service are frequently published by committees or inserted by members in the *Congressional Record*, memoranda that develop only one side of a case cannot be attributed to the service.

Like the service performed by the legislative counsel, the demands on the Legislative Reference Service appear staggering to a newcomer on Capitol Hill. Literally, any question of fact submitted to the service by a member or committee of Congress or their staffs will be given an answer. It may take some time to get it, depending on the complexity of the question, but it will come! For example, a member may ask only for the name of the Secretary of Agriculture in 1932 or he may request a detailed, scholarly analysis of the history of agricultural parity price legislation.

As these brief descriptions indicate, lawyers in a variety of roles are highly important to the effective functioning of today's Congress. They provide the analytical skills and common law perspective developed by legal education and increasingly in demand in fields of endeavor previously thought to be independent of the practice of law. In an age of rapidly accelerating specialization in the legal as well as other professions, lawyers on Capitol Hill are among the last of the generalists. Perhaps more often than their brothers practicing privately, they have the gratification of grappling with issues of national and international importance and of influencing their resolution.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY AT 11 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 8, 1967, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4, 1967:

Diplomatic and Foreign Service

Andrew V. Corry, of Montana, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Ceylon, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Maldive Islands.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be Postmasters.

ARIZONA

Paul W. Strain, Sun City, Ariz., office established July 2, 1962.

ARKANSAS

Virgil L. Brooks, Jacksonville, Ark., in place of B. F. Thompson, retired.

Vaughan C. Jackson, Newport, Ark., in place of J. F. Ball, retired.

CALIFORNIA

James M. Hurley, Campbell, Calif., in place of E. H. Litynsky, resigned.

Cecilia M. Custard, Isleton, Calif., in place of B. L. Dunn, retired.

Patricia A. Herrington, Pollock Pines, Calif., in place of Ted Ballew, retired.

John C. Sanchez, Santa Clara, Calif., in place of W. C. Miller, retired.

Porfirio Q. Lopez, San Ysidro, Calif., in place of E. J. Cordeau, Jr., retired.

GEORGIA

Alto Hanner, Jr., Buena Vista, Ga., in place of A. S. Boyett, Jr., deceased.

ILLINOIS

Alice B. Duax, Ashkum, Ill., in place of L. E. King, transferred.

Norma M. Muggler, McConnell, Ill., in place of J. M. Hulbert, retired.

Virgil J. Gebhart, Troy, Ill., in place of Myrtle Schmitt, retired.

INDIANA

Emma B. Wiley, Vevay, Ind., in place of L. A. Byram, retired.

KANSAS

Thelma M. O'Brien, Abbyville, Kans., in place of J. W. McGuire, retired.

John M. James, Arma, Kans., in place of G. S. Frere, retired.

John D. Cawby, Fontana, Kans., in place of J. O. Allman, retired.

Roscoe D. Godsey, Gaylord, Kans, in place of B. E. Carter, retired.

Donald C. Zimmerman, Oberlin, Kans., in place of G. M. Miesner, retired.

KENTUCKY

Thomas M. Brizendine, Franklin, Ky., in place of H. S. Bogan, retired.

LOUISIANA

Floyd C. Cloutier, Morgan City, La., in place of T. N. Sofford, retired.

MASSACHUSETTS

Robert P. Foley, Leicester, Mass., in place of G. F. Lennerton, resigned.

Willard P. Wright, Shrewsbury, Mass., in place of E. C. Moroney, retired.

MICHIGAN

Edward T. Steinmetz, Crystal Falls, Mich., in place of J. E. Burling, retired.

Beatrice G. Vatter, Decker, Mich., in place of E. M. Baldwin, retired.

MINNESOTA

Marian E. Tollefson, Beltrami, Minn., in place of P. B. Boyer, deceased.

Lawrence L. Kent, Clontarf, Minn., in place of R. H. Perrizo, retired.

Robert J. Farley, Mound, Minn., in place of H. A. Smith, retired.

Stephen J. Dasovich, Nashwauk, Minn., in place of E. S. Thomas, transferred.

MISSISSIPPI

Hugh W. Godbold, Magnolia, Miss., in place of C. G. Raborn, retired.

Gary C. Terrell, Pass Christian, Miss., in place of J. W. Terrell, retired.

Bart W. LaHatte, Redwood, Miss., in place of G. M. Gaunt, retired.

MISSOURI

Treacil B. Myers, Ash Grove, Mo., in place of G. T. Johnson, retired.

Marvin L. Staley, Garden City, Mo., in place of R. C. Smith, retired.

J. Ross Reger, Harris, Mo., in place of B. D. Blagg, retired.

Myrtle M. Sapp, Hartsburg, Mo., in place of R. N. Glascock, retired.

Edgar A. Slusher, Jr., Lexington, Mo., in place of H. T. Seaton, retired.

Ethelbert T. Chaney, Wheatland, Mo., in place of H. W. Hunt, deceased.

MONTANA

Drury G. Phebus, Baker, Mont., in place of K. O. Lentz, retired.

NEVADA

Maurice E. Lewis, Reno, Nev., in place of E. J. Arch, transferred.

NEW JERSEY

Mildred A. Roche, Gibbstown, N.J., in place of S. N. Roche, retired.

Franklin H. Obenhaus, Haddon Heights, N.J., in place of W. C. Eberhardt, retired.

Lois L. Kern, Readington, N.J., in place of J. G. Scannicchio, resigned.

NEW YORK

John A. Braymer, Delhi, N.Y., in place of J. H. Griffin, retired.

Daniel C. Bohl, Guilderland, N.Y., in place of T. B. Ward, retired.

Irene A. Welch, Neversink, N.Y., in place of K. H. Rolfs, resigned.

Herbert J. Dowd, New Hartford, N.Y., in place of B. F. Green, retired.

John R. Strachan, New York, N.Y., in place of R. K. Christenberry, retired.

NORTH CAROLINA

F. Delores Burrus, Hatteras, N.C., in place of R. A. Job, retired.

NORTH DAKOTA

Reuben H. Zeller, Carson, N. Dak., in place of V. H. Lane, retired.

OHIO

Richard H. Thibaut, La Rue, Ohio, in place of R. W. Hoagland, retired.

OREGON

Archie L. Lane, Powers, Oreg., in place of A. L. Burch, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

Katherine A. Hart, Genesee, Pa., in place of E. L. Emerson, transferred.

Myrtle R. McGuirk, Glen Mills, Pa., in place of M. I. Ahearn, retired.

Henry A. Golavich, Harwick, Pa., in place of John Stipanovich, retired.

John J. Miller, Huntingdon Valley, Pa., in place of M. F. Doering, retired.

Harry A. Shibley, New Milford, Pa., in place of R. F. Oliver, deceased.

PUERTO RICO

Ramon Mulero, Carolina, P.R., in place of J. G. de Iturrondo, retired.

SOUTH CAROLINA

William P. Hogan, Pacolet, S.C., in place of A. B. Stephen, retired.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Julia V. Buck, Egan, S. Dak., in place of I. M. Bowen, retired.

Allan L. Anderson, Mansfield, S. Dak., in place of D. A. Wiltfang, transferred.

TENNESSEE

Lester K. Neese, Paris, Tenn., in place of W. T. Vaughn, transferred.

VERMONT

James M. Hastings, Ludlow, Vt., in place of F. E. Rock, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Margie H. Alexander, Port Republic, Va., in place of A. G. Pearl, deceased.

WASHINGTON

U. Scott Hull, Brewster, Wash., in place of C. V. Elliott, retired.

Harvey D. Thompson, Yelm, Wash., in place of L. O. Cochrane, retired.

WEST VIRGINIA

Robert F. Heavner, French Creek, W. Va., in place of O. B. Phillips, retired.

Harold K. Carpenter, Harrisville, W. Va., in place of G. A. Fowler, retired.

Denzil Price, Sinks Grove, W. Va., in place of L. W. Michael, removed.

WISCONSIN

William J. Gendrich, Honey Creek, Wis., in place of J. E. Gendrich, retired.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Senior Citizen Month

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BILL NICHOLS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, the month of May has been proclaimed Senior Citizen Month in my State of Alabama. As one who does not yet consider himself in the golden age group, but who, after only 4 months of serving in the Congress, is beginning to feel like a senior citizen. I wish to share my feelings with all the senior citizens of this Nation. Therefore, I insert my weekly newspaper column on Senior Citizen Month in the RECORD:

SENIOR CITIZEN MONTH

I want to join with Governor Lurleen Wallace in paying tribute to the Senior Citizens of our great state this month. Governor Wallace has proclaimed May as Senior Citizens Month. She has also set aside this Saturday as Golden Age Sabbath and this Sunday as Golden Age Sunday.

Too often we tend to forget that, although they may have passed their most productive years, our Senior Citizens are still a very important part of our society. Many times we tend to minimize their needs, although in many instances their needs are greater now than ever.

While the cost of living continues to rise at a greater rate than ever before, most of our Senior Citizens are attempting to live on the same income they had several years ago. I want to see some increase in the Social Security benefits, and I will work towards that here in the Congress.

But, I would also like to see our people continue to serve our communities through their later years. This might be done by encouraging them to do part time work for our public agencies that are sometimes badly understaffed. This encouragement could be given by increasing the amount of income a person can have and still draw Social Security benefits.

Many of our Senior Citizens are voluntarily helping their communities through their own organizations. Many of our towns have clubs for retired persons, and Alabama has a state organization of Senior Citizens clubs which is very active. These groups participate in civic activities, and are a big asset to their areas.

We can all participate in Senior Citizens month to make it more meaningful. First, I hope all churches and synagogues will honor our Golden Agers this weekend. They are the ones who have built our places of worship into what they are, and have been responsible for our religious leadership in the past.

Secondly, I hope that our Senior Citizens will rededicate themselves to service to the community during this month. Join a Senior Citizens or Golden Age Club near you. If there isn't one, get your friends to start one. Mr. Phil Cox, Alabama Commission on the Aged, Montgomery, Alabama, can help you.

Thirdly, this month should be a time for those of us with friends and relatives in the Golden Age group to show our appreciation to them for the help they have given us. A letter, a visit, or some special favor means so much to someone who is no longer as active as they would like to be.

The Kee Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is Loyalty Day.

The report follows:

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars are engaged in a commendable campaign to have the first day of May designated as Loyalty Day with patriotic exercises to mark the occasion. Each year, thanks to the V.F.W., a growing number of communities are observing Loyalty Day with parades and other appropriate ceremonies.

May Day is an ideal time for the citizens of the United States to renew their faith in the worth of democratic institutions. For many years, this day was set aside in Europe as a special day to honor working men and women. This is similar to our own Labor Day. Then, the Communists, under the direction of Moscow, took over the European May Day for their own purposes.

That action was one of the great ironies of history because no government has ever enslaved as many defenseless workers as the Soviet regime in Moscow. Once again this year, the streets of Moscow will resound on May first to the rumble of tanks and missiles as the Soviet government tries to impress the world with its warlike might. There will be many sections to the parade. But no marching division of free workers because there are no free workers in the Soviet Empire.

I believe the Veterans of Foreign Wars are right in proposing that we should recapture May Day and employ it as a symbol of patriotic devotion to our country. The V.F.W. suggests that the motto for Loyalty Day should be "down with Communism and up with Americanism."

This slogan is timely because this year again young Americans are fighting against Communistic tyranny on the battlefields of Asia.

This far-off war has caused a bitter division among our people here at home. But let me assure you there is no division among young Americans who are fighting this war in Vietnam.

Almost every issue of the Congressional Record contains a letter from a young soldier in Vietnam telling exactly why this war is just one more chapter in the old struggle of freedom against despotism. The daily press is likewise printing many of these letters. The soldiers in Vietnam declare that they are fighting for freedom and democracy and they are glad for the chance to do it. Their attitude is an inspiration for our entire country.

It is hard to put in words just what freedom means. But a recent news item described what happens in a land where there is no freedom.

A careful survey of Radio Free Europe disclosed that there are nearly a quarter of a million World War II prisoners who are still being held captive in Soviet Russia. They are in fact slave laborers. I would like to remind some of our young listeners that these men have been enslaved since before they were born.

Why don't the young people of Russia speak up and demand that their government free these unfortunate men? Because these young people of Russia do not know that they exist. There are no free newspapers in Russia—every one is censored by the government. There are no free public halls where young people can meet to express their views—no free churches and no free schools. The government controls all.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars deserve our heartfelt gratitude for marking May 1 as Loyalty Day.

National Homeownership Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN, JR.
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, recently I joined with many of my colleagues in sponsoring a bill that could have the effect of regenerating many depressed and depressing American neighborhoods. I refer to the proposed National Homeownership Foundation, and the great impact its implementation may have on restoring a fading facet of the great American dream.

I am convinced that making homeownership available to all Americans is the best possible means of changing rundown residential neighborhoods into healthy communities. A man who owns his home will surely have pride in it, and that pride will rub off onto his community.

Creation of the foundation will enable local groups such as church, civic, professional, and labor organizations to offer a home of his own to the man whose circumstances now force him to rent. At the same time, this plan will upgrade a portion of substandard housing that is common in our towns and cities. The idea of a local, nonprofit organization acquiring such property, arranging for the complete refurbishing of it, and then making it available to families with low incomes at attractive interest rates makes sense. Downpayments and monthly mortgage installments would be placed within the reach of the many Americans who earn no more than a minimum wage.

It is important to note that this plan is as applicable to small towns as it is to large, metropolitan areas, because social agencies—like church, civic, and labor groups—already exist who can administer the plan.

In the broad sense, the National Homeownership Foundation may finally accomplish what many Federal programs in the housing and urban field have set out to do but failed.

It does not ask for great sums of Federal money, but just enough seed money to take advantage of available private dollar resources. It has been suggested that, by providing a credit-differential fund of $10 million in Federal moneys, $2 billion of private money would be stimulated for use under the proposal. The Government, then, would have an investment of just one-half of 1 percent in the total potential financing of the program.

View From Mount Vernon Again in Jeopardy—Congressman Machen Urges Senate To Restore Piscataway Park Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, all our plans, efforts, and hopes for a model pilot program in cooperative preservation of open spaces and natural beauty across from Mount Vernon at Piscataway Park have been dealt a severe blow by the House Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department. This subcommittee, in reporting out a $1.3 billion Interior Department spending program for fiscal year 1968, deleted the administration's request for $2.7 million to complete parkland acquisition at Piscataway Park. Since that adverse action, we have been strongly urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the $2.7 million before we lose the park completely.

This park has been authorized twice, by the 87th Congress and again by the 89th Congress. Its primary purpose is to preserve the natural beauty across from Mount Vernon in much the same scenic state as when George Washington admired it. To achieve this, the Congress called for a park of about 1,100 acres, 50 percent purchased by the National Park Service and 50 percent donated by nonprofit foundations. It would have an adjacent scenic reservation of 2,600 acres, all protected by donations of scenic easements from private landowners.

Thus far, as I pointed out in a statement on the House floor April 26, private landowners have been extremely cooperative, as have the nonprofit foundations. A total of 151 acres have been donated by the Accokeek Foundation, 85 acres are committed for donation by the Alice L. L. Ferguson Foundation, along with 220 acres more by the Accokeek Foundation. In the scenic reservation area, 168 private landowners have donated scenic easements protecting 1,196 acres. All of this is voluntary. But in order to complete the pilot program we must have the Government purchase its share of 521 acres and we desperately need the $2.7 million to do it.

Piscataway Park is the only one to my knowledge where the Government, in effect, will get a dollar back for a dollar invested. The private landowners and foundations will more than match the Federal share. Their total donations of land and scenic easements are valued at $11 million. The total Federal share is $4.1 million. This pilot park project is a bargain in every sense of the word.

As a Congressman and a taxpayer I would not be as incensed at the appropriation committee deletion of the $2.7 million for the park if the committee had made drastic cuts in all appropriations for economy's sake. But the whole bill is actually $32 million more than last year's Interior Department appropriation and it is false economy to throw away a park project where so much is being donated by so many.

We have a deadline to meet in saving the view from Mount Vernon at Piscataway Park. The 151-acre tract from the Accokeek Foundation was donated on August 8, 1962. It has a 5-year reversion clause to the effect that if the Federal Government does not do its share in parkland acquisition the donation will revert in 5 years, or on August 8, 1967. The scenic easements will also revert. If citizens want to assist me and everyone else who is dedicated to making a success out of this open-spaces project which has so much potential, I would suggest that you join me in urging the Senate Appropriations Committee to restore the $2.7 million for Piscataway Park. If you have time, a short note or letter to the Senate Appropriations Committee, Room 1235, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., would be deeply appreciated.

SST Balance-of-Payments Impact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. aircraft industry has had a favorable impact on the U.S. balance of payments, and it is estimated the SST will have a similar impact. Analyses show that travel, overall, has had a negative effect, notwithstanding the positive increment due to aircraft sales. However, had the U.S. industry, and especially the Boeing Co., not produced jet transports, foreign industries would have. Overall traffic volume would have been nearly the same in either case, and the United States would have lost the benefits of aircraft sales abroad. The same thing could happen in the case of the SST.

The estimated balance-of-payments figures associated with aircraft and air travel in the 1970–90 time period swing favorably to the U.S. SST—a figure of $54 billion. If only the low estimate of 650 U.S. SST sales were achieved, the favorable impact would still be $30 billion.

Even more important is the fact that the SST will assist the United States in its policy of continuing to expand international trade to the benefit of all countries.

Mr. Speaker, the low market estimate of 315 SST's by 1980 and 650 by 1990, with a more likely market of 475 by 1980 and 1,100 by 1990, shows that the U.S. SST program should be attractive to all participants. Each of the investors—the Government, the manufacturers, and the airlines—should receive an adequate share of the program returns which will be paid, ultimately, by travelers using the SST. All segments of the country will share in the other benefits—increased employment, expanded levels of international trade, and improved technology in the United States.

El Cinco de Mayo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, May 5, marks an important and much celebrated day in the history of Mexico. This day is not celebrated only in Mexico, but by people of Mexican descent throughout the Western Hemisphere.

"El Cinco de Mayo," as this day is now popularly known, can be regarded as an epic in Mexican history. On May 5, 1862, the Mexican troops gained fame and glory by defeating the French armies, much to the astonishment of the whole world.

In recounting this history briefly, not only is the determination and courage of this great people to be admired, especially against such obstacles, but it can be observed now as it has been before, that the desire for freedom and justice which has been suppressed for a period of time, will eventually erupt in a volcanic burst to overcome any attempts of subjugation.

The French, believing that the Mexican people were under oppression, set out to liberate the entire country, much to the satisfaction of Mexican dissenters. French troops landed at Vera Cruz, and without much difficulty, marched on to overtake the capital at Mexico City.

The first meaningful sign of defiance greeted the French troops at Puebla, May 5, 1862, where a small ill-equipped band of guerrillas, with a furious and passionate battle cry, fought at the Cerro de Guadalupe and succeeded in driving back the remains of what had been an overly confident French army. The lid of the pot, simmering with patriotic love and a burning desire for justice, had been flung off to expose a proud and brave people.

The French, under Napoleon III, in a mighty effort, not to lose face, sent over 30,000 more troops, plus an additional number of cannon, and finally managed to overcome the hard-pressed Mexican forces. The government forces under Benito Juarez was eventually driven out of the country and a monarchy ruled under Emperor Maximillian was established. Even though Mexico was now under a monarchy, the Mexican people in many sections of the country refused to give up. Guerrilla warfare and other harassment continued much to the dismay of the French. In 1867, the perseverance of this great people paid off, and the French were driven out of the country, with their emperor dying before a firing squad.

Mr. Speaker, one cannot help but be proud of the legacy of patriotism, strong determination, relentless courage, and national dignity of this people which was brought to this country. The rich culture of this country can be found predominantly in the Southwest, where we are proud to join enthusiastically in the celebration of "El Cinco de Mayo."

Award to Fintan Guilfoyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I recently was very much pleased to learn that my valued friend, Mr. Fintan J. Guilfoyle, outstanding community, civic, and political leader, was recently selected for and awarded the Winchendon, Mass., Community Service Award for 1967 in that great American community in my district.

The presentation was made at a very large banquet attended by about a thousand people. The award was approved by the unanimous vote of 16 trustees of the Wendell Clark Memorial and could best be summarized in the eloquent words of Mr. Philip J. Sullivan, executive director of that great charitable and civic organization, when he said, referring to Mr. Guilfoyle:

> Your life-time devotion to the Town of Winchendon is most inspirational, and certainly note-worthy.
>
> We hope that all fine youth will grow as you have; with courage and Christian spirit. You are, above all, a credit to us and a leader of men.
>
> May your life be filled with blessings and your reward, by the Lord, be more so.
>
> It has been our privilege and pleasure to have you with us at the banquet and bestow upon you the most deserving Award.

I have known Mr. Guilfoyle and have been privileged to enjoy the inspiring friendship of Fintan Guilfoyle for many years.

He is a most unusual man. Of humble beginnings, by virtue of his ability, courage, dedication, undaunted spirit, and hard work, he has risen step by step to the pinnacle of high esteem, respect and affection in his community.

He has been chosen for high public office. He has worked for every good cause. He has stood for high principles and ideals. He has given of himself without stint or limit.

He has held out his hand of assistance and compassion to those in need. He has been militantly loyal to everything that he believes in and to his community and his friends.

He has followed a course of unswerving devotion to the public good and the cause of the people and has stood for God and country with faith, humility, and resolution.

He has been a citizen of the first order, a gentleman of the first rank, a public servant of unexcelled distinction, and a friend of unfailing loyalty.

To his family and friends, he has given his love; to his community, his heartfelt service; to his country, his unmeasured devotion.

While I cannot possibly encompass all the fine qualities of this great American with these few words, I am proud to avail myself of this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to bring to the attention of the House and country the high award which my dear friend, Mr. Guilfoyle, has received from his fellow townspeople as an expression of their respect, admiration, and gratitude for what he has meant to them and accomplished for them in their historic community.

I heartily congratulate my cherished friend, Fintan Guilfoyle, his beloved family and dear ones upon this great honor, and wish for them many more happy, successful years together. May the good Lord always bring them His choicest blessings and in the words of the Irish prayer—"hold them always in the hollow of His hand."

AEC Continues To Fumble and Stumble Over 200 Bev. Accelerator Siting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 4, 1967

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, the big new 200-billion-electron-volt accelerator, a scientific tool which the Nation needs rather badly, thus far has had a lurid history. Or, at least, the record of the AEC, which is in charge of the project, has been lurid, or dismal, or inept, or bungling regarding it, according to who is choosing the adjectives to describe it. Rather than forthrightly picking a site for the accelerator in accordance with scientific judgment and in execution of its responsibility, the AEC made a sweepstakes out of the siting. More than 100 localities in the United States vied to get it. The list was trimmed down to five finalists and finally Weston, Ill., turned up the winner. During the sweepstakes, Congress and the AEC were deluged with local delegations setting forth their claims. Also during the process the AEC allowed the extraneous matter of civil rights to loom large in site selection criteria. In addition, it laid heavy emphasis on the matter of power costs. Now both these subjects are still plaguing the AEC because, it seems, people think the Commission paid little attention to its own criteria in making the final selection. I am setting forth below examples of these continuous goings on in the form of a letter from Representative ERLENBORN, two letters from Representative Moss, and a release which I have prepared for May 5. Enclosures to some of the letters have been deleted:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1967.

Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

DEAR CRAIG: The Chairman and some members of the Atomic Energy Commission have recently suggested that absence of an open occupancy law in Illinois may jeopardize the appropriation for the 200 BEV accelerator at Weston.

I cannot believe that this point of view enjoys any wide currency, either in the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy or in Congress. To those who believe that this appropriation should be conditioned on an open occupancy law in Illinois, I call attention to H.R. 8363, which passed the House of Representatives April 17. This bill authorized the following amounts:

Alabama-Coosa River Basin	$34,000,000
Arkansas River Basin	170,000,000
Brazos River Basin	9,000,000
Central & Southern Florida Project	14,000,000
Columbia River Basin	153,000,000
Missouri River Basin	20,000,000
Ohio River Basin	38,000,000
Ouachita River Basin	8,000,000
San Joaquin River Basin	2,000,000
South Platte River Basin	2,000,000
Upper Mississippi River Basin	4,000,000
West Branch, Susquehanna River Basin	9,000,000
White River Basin	2,000,000
Total	465,000,000

This bill proposes that about $93,000,000 will be spent in states which have open housing laws, and about $372,000,000 will be spent in states which do not have open occupancy laws. If Congress is to deny the 200 BEV accelerator to Illinois, may it properly spend $372,000,000 of federal money in other states which do not have open occupancy laws?

I submit that the real furor over the location of this device for scientific research will be found not on Capitol Hill, not in Congress, but in the newspapers and in an apparent effort by Governor Kerner of Illinois to bend the Illinois General Assembly to his will. By some persuasion which I do not know, he seems to have enlisted the members of the Atomic Energy Commission to this enterprise.

My own stand on open occupancy is well known. I voted for the Civil Rights Act last year with its provision in regard to housing.

I want no misunderstanding on this next point: I want the Illinois General Assembly to pass or to reject an open housing statute according to the best wisdom and judgment of its members. I do not believe their decision should be swayed by the presence or absence of a 300 million dollar bribe from the U.S. Government, and I do not believe the United States Government should offer a 300 million dollar bribe, or even a one dollar bribe.

It must be clear to any fair-minded person that this whole question of an open housing law is a contrived and specious argument. Nobody has ever claimed that there is more housing discrimination or more racial discrimination in Illinois than in the other five states which were under consideration.

Let me cite the last two paragraphs of an official resolution adopted last June by the Board of Directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

"Whereas, we recognize that racial discrimination exists in each of the six communities now under consideration, we also believe that the degree of difference, if any, between such discrimination in one as opposed to another, is not great enough to justify the NAACP in taking sides in the matter.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved that the NAACP expresses no preference with respect to the question of selection for the site of the atom smasher planned by the Atomic Energy Commission."

Chairman Seaborg has told members of the Illinois General Assembly that the atom smasher may still be moved because of discrimination from Weston to one of the other sites. I challenge him, as I have challenged before:

Where?

Where will this accelerator be moved in the United States, or in the world, where there is no racial discrimination?

I say that Illinois *could* pass an open occupancy statute, but that would not end discrimination in housing in Illinois, any more than similar statutes have ended discrimination in New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, or Colorado, or California.

Presently, 19 states have open occupancy statutes; 31 states have none. If I am to take Chairman Seaborg at his word, then I am to assume that the Atomic Energy Commission will spend no more money in any of the 31 states without an open occupancy statute. Furthermore, those members of Congress who subscribe to this point of view are saying that the United States Government regrets having built Cape Kennedy in Florida, the Redstone Arsenal in Alabama, the Strategic Air Command Headquarters in Nebraska, the Tennessee Valley Authority Dams in Tennessee, Alabama, and Kentucky, the Internal Revenue Computer Center in West Virginia, the AEC facility at Alamagordo, the Pentagon in Virginia, and that it will never again let a TFX contract to a company in Texas.

I believe that the AEC should stick to its role as a distinguished body of scientists, and should leave the political infighting over whether Illinois does or does not pass an open occupancy law to the governor and the General Assembly of Illinois. I believe the present furor has more likely postponed, rather than hastened passage of the law.

Moreover, I believe the Commission has incorrectly reported the sentiment on Capitol Hill. Most of the Members of Congress who have voiced a reluctance on the matter of the appropriation appear to be members of what might be called the Sore Losers Club. In saying that, I hasten to embrace members from the other five states who have proved that their sense of propriety is stronger than their instinct of acquisitiveness for their states.

Yours very truly,
JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 25, 1967.
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CRAIG: I feel that the Atomic Energy Commission was less than candid with the communities which were considered for the location of the 200 BEV accelerator with regard to the issue of civil rights.

Chairman Seaborg led the State of California to believe that the issue of residential segregation patterns in Sacramento was "important." On July 22, 1966, in a letter to Gene A. Blanc, Coordinator, Office of Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection, State of California, Chairman Seaborg said the Commission "was in the process of reviewing the information of civil rights submitted earlier by Governor Brown, but I feel that you may wish to develop further the question of discrimination in the housing field, especially as a result of this recent letter." (The letter he refers to was one sent to the AEC by Sacramento civil rights leaders.)

As a direct result of Chairman Seaborg's letter, 20 members of the Sacramento Citizens Civil Rights Committee attended five meetings, spending about two and one-half hours per meeting; final meeting to adopt final reports lasted over four hours. A staff of three persons assembling and writing material invested over 600 hours. Special attention was given to apartment housing and some 160 extra secretarial hours were used for this phase of the study. The Sacramento City-County Chamber of Commerce Civic Affairs Manager conducted the technical aspect of the study of education, employment, and housing of minorities, spending evenings as well as daytime office hours on the project and hundreds of hours of time were expended by him.

Two department managers of the Chamber, the director of the Human Relations Committee and five to six secretaries spent untold time on the project. On occasion, I am told, the entire Chamber staff worked on the project. Over 4,000 letters were mailed, over 10 cases of paper, envelopes, postpaid return envelopes, and other materials were used—postage being an expensive factor.

Press reports of recent days would indicate that all of this effort in Sacramento was futile. Even more disturbing is the fact that the Illinois site is only 35 miles from one of the nation's most segregated large metropolitan areas—Chicago.

For your files, I am enclosing a copy of a recent clipping from the *Chicago Tribune* on the racial issue.

Your comments will be appreciated.

Sincerely,
JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., May 1, 1967.
Hon. CRAIG HOSMER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CRAIG: Recently, I requested in a letter to Senator Senator John O. Pastore that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy review the Atomic Energy Commission's evaluations of the Weston, Illinois site selected for the location of the 200 Bev Accelerator. In addition to the housing discrimination issue, I feel that California Sierra Foothills site was unfairly considered in regard to power costs.

The AEC, in a letter addressed to me under date of March 29, 1967, confirms that the Commission used 7.82 mills per kwh as the cost of energy to the Sierra Foothills site for the National accelerator laboratory when comparing it with other sites that had been proposed. I am enclosing an exchange of correspondence which also confirms that the AEC did not endeavor to evaluate separately Pacific Gas and Electric Company's proposal for interruptible power or the assurances conveyed by the Sacramento Municipal Utility District in its letter to Mr. Gene A. Blanc, Coordinator, Atomic Energy Development and Radiation Protection of the State of California of June 6, 1966.

The Commission's March 29 letter states: "If the Sierra Foothills site had been selected for the 200 Bev facility, AEC would have included in its negotiations with PG&E the subject of providing for interruptible as well as firm power."

I find the above logic most difficult to understand. It is obviously known by the AEC that were they to locate at the Sierra Foothills site they would not pay 7.82 mills per kwh for energy any more than they are paying this for energy at the Stanford Linear Accelerator. Instead, they would choose the 70 megawatts firm power which SMUD has agreed to release from the Bureau of Reclamation, purchasing the balance from PG&E on their so-called interruptible schedule, just as do other prime industrials who purchase from PG&E, and the cost of energy would be near *5 mills* instead of near 8 mills per kwh.

As a ranking member of the Joint Committee, it is important that you have this information.

Sincerely,
JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

TWO HUNDRED BEV. GEOLOGY ISSUE RESOLVING

Rep. Craig Hosmer (R-Calif.), the ranking House Minority member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, said core drilling at the proposed Weston, Illinois, site of the 200 Billion Electron Volt atom smasher "has not yet turned up geological conditions which would bar construction of the scientific installation."

A total of 67 core holes are to be drilled. Forty-five have been completed, one is in progress and 21 holes remain to be drilled.

Hosmer said his interpretation of the data so far accumulated is that the glacial soils overlaying limestone bedrock at Weston "are not soft enough to make construction impossible, but not firm enough to make it easy."

Bedrock occurs at a depth of 60 to 90 feet below the ground surface, with a relatively well defined surface sloping generally 10 feet per mile to the south.

"Unless the remaining holes turn up soft spots which would boost foundations costs unreasonably, Weston seems to be 'home free' on the geology issue," Hosmer said.

The National Academy of Science Foundation Panel which established geological requirements for the 200 BEV "sweepstakes" stated "the surficial materials may contain pervious zones and pockets leading to occasional construction problems in excavation. . . . which will not require extraordinary or unusual construction procedures. . . ."

Weston was chosen from a group of "finalist" sites in Wisconsin, Michigan, Colorado, New York, California and Illinois.

Rep. Hosmer stated that Weston's current troubles on the civil rights issue "probably will be resolved in a week or so." He charged "they should never have arisen" and said they are "characteristic of the inept handling of the 200 BEV siting problem by AEC from the beginning."

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 8, 1967

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m., and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Very Reverend Ian White-Thomson, dean of Canterbury Cathedral, England, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.

Let us pray for the President of the United States, for the Members of this Senate, and for all in civil authority.

O God, by whose power alone men are enabled to live together as brethren: look upon the broken body of humanity, and grant that wherever men meet in council for the ordering of the world, Thy Holy Spirit may bring them into unity. Let Thy forgiveness make us ready to forgive and to be reconciled to those from whom we are estranged; through Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Let us pray for peace, especially in Vietnam.

O Holy Spirit, through whom alone men are turned from the ways of evil to the paths of goodness, and by whose help alone our prayers can bear the pattern of God's love: we pray Thee so to move in the hearts and minds of men that the nations, being converted to the will of the one Father, may be able to build a world wherein righteousness and peace shall dwell.

Let us pray for all in need.

Almighty God, Father of all mankind, we bring before Thee the need and despair of those whose lives are broken by the enmities and indifference of men. Prosper all who are working to provide homes for the homeless and food for the hungry. Give wisdom and understanding to all who are called to govern peoples other than their own, that they may be just and merciful in all their dealings; and hasten the day when hatred and enmity may be done away in a common obedience to Thy holy will; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Let us pray for peace between labor and management.

O God, who hast ordained that men should live and work together as brethren: remove, we humbly beseech Thee, from those who are now at variance, all spirit of strife and all occasion of bitterness; that, seeking only what is just and equal, they may ever continue in brotherly union and concord, to their own well-being, and the prosperity of the realm; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Four things a man must learn to do
If he would make his record true:
To think without confusion clearly,
To love his fellow men sincerely,
To act from honest motives purely,
To trust in God and heaven securely.

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. Amen.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered on Thursday, May 4, 1967, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott].

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. SCOTT. I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Montana, with the understanding that the time will not be taken from my time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1967, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States, submitting a nomination, was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar, under rule VIII, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business after the conclusion of the votes on the conventions, be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with postmasters.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting the nomination of Eugene M. Becker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for postmaster.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS, NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Navy and Marine Corps.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—PRIVILEGE OF FLOOR

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my assistant, Joan Kurilla, may be present with me on the floor during my address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bayh in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Symington], with the understanding that the time shall not be taken from my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for his courtesy.

POPULATION CENTERS AS AGAINST MEANINGFUL MILITARY TARGETS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the lead story in the May 8 "Periscope" column of Newsweek magazine asserts:

> This will enrage a great many people, but some top Air Force officials now argue that the final stage of the escalating air war over North Vietnam should be a World War II type of punitive bombing of population centers as well as industrial sites.

Starting with the Air Force Chief of Staff, Gen. J. P. McConnell, and the Air Force Vice Chief, Gen. Bruce Holloway, we have made thorough inquiry; and I am glad to report to the Senate that no "top Air Force officials" recommend any population center bombing, or believe in it. Neither does any member of the Air Force Secretariat.

"Enrage" is a strong word, but this distortion of the aims and capacity of Air Force and naval airpower does distress those who believe that, if the United States is to continue this war on any basis, the Government should use its qualitative advantages, in the air and on the sea, instead of continuing to slug it out on the ground, month by month, one for one, foot by foot, hill by hill. In the last few days, hundreds of the finest of our youth were killed, and hundreds more wounded, in the capture and holding of three hills in the northwest area of South Vietnam.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff should not make policy. But their opinions as to how we should conduct the tactical day-to-day operating details on the battlefront should not be so consistently disregarded.

It is mathematical that the more the Air Force and the Navy attack the more meaningful military targets in North Vietnam, the less will be the number of guns available against American youth in South Vietnam.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent that a thoughtful and interesting article by Hanson Baldwin in the New York Times of May 5, "Raids On Mig Bases," be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Raids on MIG Bases—Attacks on Two of the Six in North Vietnam Found To Have Little Effect So Far

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

United States attacks on two of the six principal fields used by the North Vietnamese Air Force have had relatively little effect on the air war so far.

Officers agree that the bombings, though perhaps of political and psychological importance, were bound to have limited military effectiveness because of restrictions that governed them. Air officers say that the attacks, which began April 25, violated some basic principles of air warfare.

Normally, the enemy's airfields are the first target in any war in which air power is involved. Neutralization of the enemy's air power is regarded as essential to gain and maintain air superiority with a minimum of losses.

But the United States has been bombing North Vietnam for more than two years, and the principal jet bases for North Vietnam's MIG fighters were not bombed at all until 10 days ago.

DELAY ALLOWED BUILD-UP

The delay permitted gradual development of a North Vietnamese air force that virtually did not exist three years ago. North Vietnamese pilots trained in the Soviet Union have received advanced "on-the-job training" in North Vietnam.

New planes have been provided by the Russians, and the North Vietnamese air order of battle includes 100 to 120 fighters. A score of these are believed to be MIG–21's, some of them of the late MIG–21D model, equipped with the Soviet A–2 heat-seeking missile.

Reports in aviation circles indicate that even later aircraft are being provided. All of the most modern MIG's are based at Phucyen, a field that has not been bombed. The rest of the growing North Vietnamese Air Force—chiefly MIG–15's and MIG–17's, with a few MIG–19's—is based at Hoalac and Kep, the only two bases so far bombed, and at Gialam, Catba and Kienan.

A second principle of air war was violated the officers say, when the attacks were restricted to only two of the six known bases. The two were regarded as the least important of the six; indeed, when Kep was originally bombed, its runway was being lengthened, and no MIG's were stationed there.

To insure optimum destruction of an enemy's air force, heavy simultaneous attacks upon all his known air bases are regarded by military men as essential.

The targets would be the planes themselves, refueling and rearming facilities, control towers, hangar and maintenance shops and the runways, which should be cratered with heavy bombs.

Heavy earthwork and concrete and steel protecting walls around aircraft parking areas have been built at the North Vietnamese fields; to insure destruction, each parked plane would have to be hit with separate bombs or rockets, or with heavy-caliber ammunition. If the facilities at one or both of the bombed airfields were destroyed, the surviving aircraft could be based on the four fields that have so far been exempted from attack. In time, other fields, now perhaps under construction, could serve similarly.

Presumably the two fields that were attacked were selected by Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara and the White House because of their distance from Hanoi and from relatively heavily populated areas.

Hoalac is 20 miles west of Hanoi; Kep is 38 miles northeast of the city, Gialam, on the other hand, is in the city's outskirts, in the midst of a built-up area. Phucyen, 16 miles away—perhaps the most important of the six fields is also near some built-up areas. Catba is miles east of Hanoi.

The North Vietnamese planes are few in number but they play a key role in an intricate and tightly integrated air-defense system that is probably—for the area covered—the most modern and the densest in the world.

North Vietnam is defended by early-warning and ground-control-intercept radar in profusion, plus about 200 sites for surface-to-air missiles—some 25 battalions with six launchers each. There are 5,000 to 7,000 antiaircraft guns of 37-mm., 57-mm., 85-mm., and 100-mm., the heavier ones radar-controlled, plus many lighter weapons.

The MIG–21's, which Senator Stuart Symington says can "outmaneuver, outclimb, outaccelerate and even outrun our own fighters at higher altitudes," have nevertheless had little success in their air-to-air combat with United States planes. But their importance is disproportionate to their numbers.

They have forced many United States aircraft to low levels within range of North Vietnamese antiaircraft, pilots say. Frequently many United States fighter-bombers must jettison their bombs to prepare for air combat.

IF MIG'S WERE IN CHINA

If the bombing of the North Vietnamese airfields were intensive and inclusive enough, the MIG's could be forced to take stanctuary on Chinese bases.

The MIG is a short-range aircraft, designed primarily as a bomber interceptor. Retirement to more distant Chinese fields—perhaps 100 to 300 miles from Hanoi—would considerably handicap it, greatly reducing the ability of the North Vietnamese Air Force to intervene effectively in air battles around Hanoi or Haiphong.

As Gen. William C. Westmoreland said on April 24 in his New York speech, "Their reaction time would be increased," and in air battles time is of the essence.

Greater freedom of action and more effectiveness for United States aircraft should be, as these officers see the situation, the strategic objective of the airfield bombings but because the bombings have been piecemeal and delayed, and because Hanoi, forewarned, has used the time well, they say this result cannot now be achieved without much greater United States effort and more casualties than would have been required a year or two ago.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender], with the understanding that the time he consumes shall not be taken from my time.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE VOTE BY WHICH H.R. 3399 WAS PASSED

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H.R. 3399) to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission was passed on Thursday, May 4, 1967.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The motion will be entered and placed on the calendar.

MOTION FOR HOUSE TO RETURN TO THE SENATE THE PAPERS ON H.R. 3399

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I move that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the papers on H.R. 3399, to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240, to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The motion will be stated.

The **Assistant Legislative Clerk.** The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Ellender] moves that the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate the papers on H.R. 3399, to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240, to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Louisiana.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott]. In keeping with his always-complete cooperation and courtesy to Senators he agreed to yield to me long enough to insert two items in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

PROGRAM TO REFORM WASHINGTON COURTS PROPOSED BY BAR GROUP

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as the chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia which deals with problems of law enforcement in the District of Columbia and problems that arise in connection with our courts, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article in the Washington Post of this morning entitled "Bar Group Proposes Progam To Reform Washington Courts," and a digest of the major points on the report be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article and digest were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bar Group Proposes Program To Reform Washington Courts—Committee Cites Delays, Lack of Personnel

(By Leonard Downie, Jr.)

A committee of leading Washington lawyers, backed by the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, has drawn up a blueprint for "immediate progress" in reforming the city's crowded, slow-moving courts.

After a year's study, the committee focused on these major problems:

Confusion, waste of manpower and lack of legal safeguards in the Juvenile Court.

Shortages of judges, probation officers, defense attorneys, clerical help, space and money in the Court of General Sessions and its parent D.C. Court of Appeals.

The lack of strong administrative leadership and resulting "far-too-long" delays in the U.S. District Court.

The need throughout the city's system for much more information on how the courts do business and what they need to do it more efficiently.

The committee's 45 recommendations called on the judges themselves to take immediate steps to manage their work better, to ride herd on stalling lawyers and to report regularly on their progress.

MORE LEGAL AID URGED

Many more judges and other court personnel, expanded legal aid for the poor and for juveniles, and a professional efficiency study of the courts also were recommended.

The committee's nine members—Chairman Gerhard A. Gesell, George E. C. Hayes, Mrs. June L. Green, John Pickering, John H. Pratt, James Francis Reilly, Daniel A. Rezneck, Samuel Spencer and Edward Bennett Williams—were named last April by the District's Judicial Council.

The Council, made up of the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, already has endorsed all of the committee's proposals.

This means that recommendations which the courts can carry out on their own—nearly half of the 45—come virtually as directives from the Judicial Council, which can enforce many of them by rule, if necessary.

SOME EARLY ACTION SEEN

The Judicial Council committee already has discussed them with officials of the courts, and action on some is expected "within a week to 10 days," one spokesman said.

Starting with the Juvenile Court, the committee said it could not recommend adding more judges to it (although it urged that the current vacancy on the three-judge court be filled), because the court is not now "making effective use of all available judicial time."

The committee called for an internal overhaul of the Juvenile Court's case handling procedures and "for greater coordination and communication between judges." This was a clear reference to the public feud between Chief Judge Morris Miller and Judge Orm Ketcham, which has limited the amount of cases assigned to Ketcham daily.

Every child brought before the court should be represented by a lawyer, the committee said it recommended that the court cooperate with the city's bar and legal aid groups to provide attorneys for children whose families cannot afford them.

The lawyers also should have access to the Court's so-called "social file" on each child, the committee urged. The Juvenile Court is now considering a rule making the files available and setting up a limited legal-aid plan.

The committee wants Court officials and police to reexamine their policy of placing children in the overcrowded D. C. Receiving Home to await court hearings. Both groups have consistently resisted this proposal, which was first suggested by the D.C. Crime Commission in its report four months ago.

EARLY REVIEW SOUGHT

A Juvenile Court judge should review the reason for holding a child in the Receiving Home within a day of the child's arrival there, the committee said. The delay before that review is now five to seven days.

The committee said it would also urge the District Commissioners to stop both the Court and the Welfare Department from mixing delinquents with neglected and homeless children in the Receiving Home and other juvenile institutions.

For the Court of General Sessions, the committee recommended adding five more judges, to a total of 26.

Although the Crime Commission had said that more judges were not needed, a committee spokesman said its members felt that the new General Sessions chief judge, Harold H. Greene, had made several reforms in the Court but was still facing long backlogs and delays.

Until a new courthouse can be built to improve the court's "inadequate facilities," the committee suggested that more room be made in General Sessions by taking the D.C. Court of Appeals out of its "civil building."

COURT MOVES OUTLINED

The Appellate Court could be put in the building across E Street nw. that now houses the U.S. Court of Military Appeals, the committee said. The Military Court, which meets only three times each month, could in turn be put into "some place like the new Court of Claims," a committee spokesman suggested.

The primary problem in the U.S. District Court, the committee concluded, was that the chief judge did not have the power of administrative help to regulate the work of the other judges and to improve case handling procedures.

At the committee's urging, the Judicial Council is now considering adoption of a rule that would greatly expand the chief judge's powers and responsibilities. Right now, he is only an "equal," a committee spokesman said, explaining that the other judges seldom are bound by his direction.

The committee urged District Court judges to "be less lenient" in granting lawyers' requests to continue cases. It wants all civil suits called up for hearing three times a year in attempts to settle them before trial whenever possible. Civil suits now may lie fallow for years without any judicial action.

MANAGEMENT STUDY

A management study of the entire city court system, as recommended by the committee, is now in the final stages of planning by the Judicial Council and the staff of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee chaired by Sen. Joseph D. Tydings (D-Md.).

Announcement of private foundation and Government grants covering the estimated $400,000 cost of the study is expected within a few weeks. The study is expected to begin next fall.

The Judicial Council committee underlined the need for more probation officers and other court personnel for each of the trial courts. The Juvenile Court probation officers should be based in the neighborhoods where the children they supervise live, the committee added.

It also wants enough personnel in each court to operate the Criminal Justice Act program, which pays lawyers to defend indigents, and 10 more Legal Aid Agency public defenders for the Court of General Sessions, where 4,000 criminal defendants show up without lawyers each year.

The total cost of implementing all 45 recommendations would be about $4 million, a committee spokesman estimated. More than half of that would be spent in General Sessions, he said, and the bulk of the rest for the Juvenile Court.

The committee will continue its study of the courts and will issue more recommendations later, the spokesman said this first group of suggestions will be discussed at the District's Judicial Conference of judges and lawyers later this month.

REPORT'S MAJOR POINTS

Here are the major recommendations of the Judicial Council committee for improving Washington's courts:

COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS

It should have five more judges, 10 more public defenders and 23 more probation officers.

Judges' salaries should be raised from $23,500 to $27,500 to conform with other big cities.

Witness fees should be raised from 75 cents to $4 a day, plus travel expenses.

Court for some criminal, traffic, small claims and landlord cases should be held at night.

A new courthouse should be built.

U.S. DISTRICT COURT

The Chief Judge should have and use strong powers to regulate the other judges and to control the court's workload.

Judges should not grant so many lawyers' requests to have cases continued.

More effort should be made to settle civil suits before trial.

JUVENILE COURT

Every child brought before the court should have a lawyer.

Homeless and neglected children should not be sent to the same institutions as delinquents.

Delinquents locked up in the D.C. Receiving Home to await hearings should be brought into court sooner.

The judges should cooperate better in managing their work.

Paternity, child support and other adult cases should be transferred to the Domestic Relations Branch of the Court of General Sessions.

D.C. COURT OF APPEALS

It should have six judges instead of three.

It should be moved out of the overcrowded General Sessions Court and into the building across the street now used by the U.S. Court of Military Appeals.

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

It should have more staff to reduce clerical delays.

Its procedures should be made clearer to lawyers.

THE SYSTEM

A planned $400,000 efficiency study of all the city's courts by a management expert should be made as soon as possible.

Each court should have a trained administrator with enough power and staff to streamline procedures.

Each court should report publicly every three months on the size of its caseload, length of delays and what it is doing to deal with them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a very penetrating and, I think, unanswerable editorial in the Washington Post of this morning entitled, "Deficiencies in the Courts" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFICIENCIES IN THE COURTS

The price of justice for this community has been outlined with admirable clarity by the Judicial Council's Committee on the Administration of Justice. Nine eminent lawyers under the chairmanship of Gerhard A. Gesell have listed the needs of the five courts serving the District. The total is rather formidable. Yet it is difficult to see how any one of more than 40 recommendations can be ignored without detracting from the quality of justice here.

The unfortunate truth is that most of the local courts are overwhelmed with their burden of adjudicating cases. The volume of work in the D.C. Court of Appeals, for example, has grown to a point where it needs six judges. It has only three. The United States

District Court is critically short of administrative staff, and the Chief Judge lacks the authority to manage the court in an efficient manner. It is said that 150 cases in that court are awaiting sentence because of the shortage of probationary officers to make presentence surveys. High on the list of requirements for its court are expansion of the administrative staff and a detailed management survey to help it clear up its self-defeating backlog of stale cases.

For the Court of General Sessions the experts prescribe five additional judges, increased salaries, a night court, an improved library, 10 more legal-aid attorneys, 23 more probation officers, more law clerks, higher witness fees, a management study and enlargement of its jurisdiction. For all the local courts the Committee recommends regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public—reports that would focus attention upon their performance and their problems. In addition, of course, there is urgent need for a new court building. Many of the recommendations can be put into effect by the courts themselves or by the Judicial Council, but other improvements must await action by Congress and the appropriation of about $4 million for new and increased salaries and the proposed management surveys.

The Juvenile Court presents a special problem that could not be fully explored by this programmaking Committee. But the report alludes to the feud within the court by calling for "greater coordination and communication between the judges" and for more efficient use of available judicial time. Among 13 pointed recommendations for the Juvenile Court are these: No child should be detained beyond "the next court day" without a hearing; neglected or dependent children should not be mingled wtih delinquents; counsel should be appointed in every case where a child appears without a lawyer; the Corporation Counsel should play a larger role in juvenile cases; probationary and psychiatric services available to the court should be greatly improved. No community that is concerned with a mounting volume of youthful crime can afford to ignore such critical deficiencies in its juvenile court as may be seen between the lines of this brief report.

Fortunately, all the recommendations of the Committee have the endorsement of the Judicial Council. Presumably this means that the Council will issue directives putting the reforms into effect wherever possible. But the hearty cooperation of Congress, individual judges and the public will also be needed if these grave shortcomings in our judicial system are to be overcome.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not rise to criticize the courts. I believe the courts in the District of Columbia do a remarkable job in view of the inadequate support that they receive from the Congress. However, for years, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia I have been pleading on the floor of the Senate for more adequate support of our courts and a larger number of courts because we are faced with a most serious problem involving the administration of justice in the District of Columbia, in all areas of jurisprudence, and not only in the area of criminal jurisprudence.

Mr. President, I close by highly commending the District Bar Commission for the recommendations they have made, and the Washington Post for carrying out a great educational responsibility in publishing the two items to which I have referred.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

ADDRESS BY FORMER GOV. ALF M. LANDON, AT THE WICHITA CONFERENCE ON CHINA, WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas and an outstanding student of our international problems, spoke on Saturday, May 6, at the Wichita conference on China, Wichita State University, under the auspices of the League of Women Voters of Wichita and the American Friends Service Committee.

Governor Landon spoke frankly and forthrightly on "Our Confused Foreign Policy."

In his speech Governor Landon stressed the need for a thorough reappraisal of our commitments and our ability to effectuate them.

He stated:

> What the country needs is for the President to create an actual council of state, which should include at least the majority and minority leaders of the Congress and the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to operate within the full meaning of the term.
>
> And I do not mean for a mere briefing. I mean a fully informed council of state which will consider not only Vietnam, but all other perilous options calling for immediate consideration and decision in Asia, Africa and the Western Hemisphere.
>
> That council of state means an assessment of our entire foreign policy, recognizing that Vietnam does not exist apart from that.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR CONFUSED FOREIGN POLICY

(By Alf M. Landon)

Tonight I discuss the hard facts of war and peace problems and policies in the light of the world we actually live in and in the light of the dangerous developments of the past month. The war in South Vietnam has once more entered a new phase—brought on by the bombing of power plants in the city limits of Hanoi and MIG airfields in North Vietnam.

At this stage in our affairs, we find the United States of America fighting the fourth largest war in our history far from our shores.

We find ourselves cast in the role of the imperialist aggressor in the eyes of much of the world.

Saddest of all, we find self-doubt—widespread confusion except a noisy few—not over fighting the war in South Vietnam to a successful conclusion, but over the administration's double-talk concerning what the war is all about—President Johnson's lack of constitutional authority—and why the President escalated the Vietnam war from the little handful of Kennedy advisors to the major war it is today.

I do not mean that Americans are not going to have to finish the job in Vietnam that President Johnson started. I do mean that we need more realistic information on what that job entails.

Never in our history—except perhaps the bloody mass riots in New York City in 1863 and 1864, in protest against the draft and the Civil War—have we known anything like the disgraceful and shameful burning of the American flag and draft cards that took place in our great and beloved country on Saturday, April 15th.

The right of lawful dissent is a precious one, and must be guarded zealously and be protected in every phase of American public life.

The attempt by some to rationalize tramping on the flag—draft card burning and vilifying a president of the United States—cannot be classified with the sacred right of dissent.

Their irrational emotional display only serves to discredit and disrupt objective discussion and consideration of the facts and solution of the world's present perilous position.

Equally unrealistic and emotional is the committee of one million against the recognition of China and its admission to the United Nations, or those who are for limiting all trade with Communist countries—or for a total military or "peace at any price" solution of our Vietnam-Asian issues.

Laying those extremists aside, there exists a broad field of legitimate protests of the President's leadership that cannot be classed as "unpatriotic."

For the first time in our history, in an effort to silence his critics, a president has brought home a field commander of a major war and put him into the political arena.

The basic mistake President Johnson has made was to underestimate what Americans had to do to win in South Vietnam. That contributed as much to giving Hanoi a lift as any demonstrations anywhere.

This is the most centrally controlled war by a president that America has ever fought—not only on selecting the North Vietnam targets, but also on the type and load of bombs to be carried by the bombers.

General Westmoreland has more people dictating to him the conduct of the war than any general in command on the field of action in our history.

Since Mr. Johnson is selecting both the political and military targets with respect to the conduct of the Vietnam war, Americans have the right to fix the responsibility on him for the conduct of that war and for failure to achieve peace. So far, the President has failed to act on General Westmoreland's latest request for more troops.

The unpopularity of the Vietnamese war is born of frustration and confusion arising from national administration statements that conflict with what we do in South Vietnam—both militarily and politically—and the failure of our national administration to relate it clearly to our overall foreign policies. Vietnam has always been a part and parcel of the world's international relations which include many other unsolved key problems.

Vietnam is more than merely of American concern. The fact can not longer be concealed that it is an Asian war—not an isolated South Vietnamese war. It is not a war of conquest. And President Johnson says it is not a war for a military base in Asia.

Yet the war has turned South Vietnam into an enormous military base—one of the greatest installations in the world. The question of who is going to occupy it when the American military personnel leave is one of more than pressing concern to every government in the world. It is obvious that the South Vietnamese have neither the technological knowledge, training, economy, natural resources nor population to fit that tremendous job.

Yet President Johnson disposed of that momentous question off-hand when he offered—as soon as a peace agreement with Hanoi is reached—to withdraw five hundred thousand American military personnel within six months—a completely unrealistic solution—as well as another presidential unilateral decision.

President Johnson's off-again, on-again, gone-again strategy in Vietnam shattered confidence in military and political minds all over the world in his leadership, and has precluded support from those who believe in an open society based on democratic processes as compared with Communistic rule by a closed society.

The failure of President Johnson to match what he says with what he does in Vietnam is not a partisan observation. That failure has been consistently questioned by Democrat members of the Congress. In fact, President Johnson's own party leaders in our country have been outspoken and critical—for different reasons—of the way he has dragged his feet, either in missing opportunities to settle the Vietnam war satisfactorily to America and our allies, or in his tactical military decisions.

The questions raised concerning the President's Vietnam military and political policies are clearly bipartisan. Clearly they question more than our masive military intervention in that little jungle-dominated country with a sizeable stone-age population. Clearly President Johnson at times has attempted to characterize that little country in the kind of unrealistic emotional terms that all wars must be wrapped in, in order to make them popular.

Vietnam is a concrete example of chain reactions that exist in all fields of life's affairs. Beginning in 1948, I urged that we could no more ignore China than Pike's Peak, and urged diplomatic recognition, with admission of China to the United Nations. Had we recognized in that normal way the existence of China—instead of thinking we could wish it away—the question now can be raised with validity whether either the Korean War or the Vietnamese war would have ever occurred.

Although Mao is a ruthless would-be conquerer—following in the footsteps of others like Napoleon and Stalin the Terrible—it must be noted that he ran the Russians out of Manchuria—thus preventing their domination of China.

Also, China was practically invited into Korea by Secretary of State Dean Acheson when he publicly stated that Korea was beyond the periphery of American interests.

Vietnam became a major scene of action because our last three presidents stumbled into an expanding war there through their political policies affecting other more crucial areas in world affairs and through the Soviets' and Mao's attempt to establish new colonial empires in Africa and Asia.

Vietnam was not selected by either side as the site for the critical decisions it now occupies—any more than Gettysburg was planned as a crucial battlefield by Generals Lee and Meade in our Civil War. The Vietnam War—that started as a mere jungle skirmish—with American forces presented to the American people as merely "advisors"—is growing bigger month by month.

Although Vietnam is the fourth largest war in our history, it is somewhat of a prologue to coming momentous events that require reappraisal and re-evaluation of the executive's political policies by the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

American preoccupation with the Vietnam war hinders the realization that all the Communist world is solidly behind Hanoi.

In October, 1964, when Chou and Mao proposed to Washington, Moscow, London and Paris 2 days after China's first successful nuclear bomb—a conference of those five nuclear powers for the purpose of discussion preliminary to a conference of all the world governments to eliminate nuclear weapons—our national administration dismissed China's bomb as obsolete and its proposal as mere propaganda.

I immediately urged acceptance of their proposal for the purpose of discussion. If it was only propaganda, that was the way to expose it. United Nations Secretary General U Thant the next morning endorsed my response. Russia and France accepted China's proposal. Prime Minister Wilson reversed his previous public and private record in joining with President Johnson in rejecting this proposal.

That could well have proved to have been one of the decisive decisions in all the world's history.

That conference would, of course, have had to include a settlement of the Vietnam war. At that time, we had not bombed the north, as President Johnson pledged he would not do.

The administration talks about a NATO and a Europe that do not exist. President Johnson has talked about a South Vietnam that never existed and a United Nations that never existed.

A World War Two peace treaty has never been signed. We have had—and have now—six divisions stationed in Europe. The Korean War settlement was polished to look like peace. We still have a 50,000 military force there and half the country is still Communist.

We even talk about a Cuba which does not exist. Russia has a military beachhead there 90 miles from our shores. We ignore that like an ostrich with its head in the sand—as we have China. Yet we are fighting a big war in the other half of the world while looking over our shoulder, concerned whether China will do this if we do that.

Yet we wonder at the huge anti-administration demonstrations here at home and anti-Americanism all over the world.

I do not doubt for one minute that—as Secretary of State Rusk said—the "Communist apparatus" has been very active in U.S. demonstrations and elsewhere all over the world. However, quoting Ambassador Goldberg, "Well, I'm sure the secretary did not mean to equate dissent with disloyalty."

Therefore, let us think about our foreign policies in an interdependent world that does exist—a world in which local elections in England, in Germany, in India, in Japan make front page headlines here as do American local elections—a world in which the people are more interested in saving their own respective hides than being reformed en masse in our image. As I said—on this point—some 25 years ago—all the world does not like ice cream sodas.

Imperialistic Communism is defeating itself by the failure of the Lenin-Marx theories wherever they have been tried and by its ruthless brutality.

We must consider momentous events that are occurring in Asia. There is an evident swing there among heretofore unquestioned neutralist countries against Communist domination. Indonesia has resumed its place in the United Nations and is gradually re-establishing better relations with America.

Another significant turn in Premier Ky's reversal of his truculent, belligerent position following the Honolulu meeting in February, 1965—at Manila in October, 1966—and at Guam a few months later.

In February, 1967, the Premier proposed that Hanoi and Saigon discuss peace themselves on terms including the Viet Cong in the Hanoi delegation—amnesty for them and their inclusion in any South Vietnamese government if elected in a free election. Hanoi has not replied.

Of course, the stumbling block is the well known fact that Communists are very allergic to free elections.

Recently Singapore's Prime Minister publicly stated, "We may well prefer a permanent American military presence. What is happening in Vietnam cannot be repeated."

Cambodia is going through the same conflict that bothered Indonesia for a while in its revolt for independence and freedom from China. The Cambodian government is trying to reconcile its resistance to encroaching Communism with American containment policies in Asia without, at the same time, asking for direct military aid.

These reversals of Communism in Asia probably contributed to the modification last March of the Sino-Russian split to the point at least of speeding up railroad transportation across China of Russian military equipment and supplies for North Vietnam.

This new development, in turn, has stiffened Hanoi's position on negotiations for a settlement in Vietnam.

The biggest question confronting all foreign offices at this very moment is how much further will the healing of that Sino-Soviet split go. Therefore, this swing away from Chinese influence in Asian neutral countries is most timely.

We must know in order to wisely consider these developments what pledges President Johnson made at the Manila Conference—or what might well be construed as pledges by any Asiatic nations that would involve the United States of America in another war like Vietnam.

Why has not President Johnson submitted to the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—the most unique and powerful legislative Committee of all the world governments—the text of what he said at the Manila Conference in October, 1966? Every other government in the world has that complete manuscript by this time. Why is it still a secret from the U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations—where, under proper constitutional procedure, it belongs?

I believe it is the responsibility of this distinguished Committee to re-examine our overall foreign relations. It is timely for the Congress to temper our evangelistic foreign policy with reality.

Mr. Johnson's failure to comply with our constitutional requirements for a declaration of war by the Congress is another case in point of the complete ignoring of our democratic processes by our impulsive President—by his plunging ahead naively—assuming that because we are the richest country in the world, we can do anything we want under the sun. Meanwhile, his fiscal policies are arousing increasing doubts in the monetary markets of the world.

While all this is occurring in Asia, hot spots continue to develop in Africa—particularly with reference to Rhodesia and South Africa. The great strategic importance of Aden as an air and naval base which England is going to leave is not to be overlooked if Nasser occupies it. Along with the majority of the United Nations, at England's request we voted sanctions on Rhodesia that are not working and are of doubtful constitutionality.

That brings us to glimmers of hope for discovery of terrestrial peace instead of a smoldering nuclear war, and for continuation of the Soviet adjustment of Marx-Lenin theories by spreading capitalistic principles in Russia and other Communist countries in varying degrees. Rising nationalism—the disintegration of the European Cold War by growing East-West tradewinds, the advent of the Sino-Russian split, a shrinking Communist position in Asia and Africa—these are momentous developments. It's been a long time since we have heard that old Soviet chant of "decadent capitalism." They are even boasting now of their economic gains resulting from individual profit incentives.

That adjustment started in Europe a year or so ago with the Soviet abandoning its theretofore truculent and belligerent policies for a better workable understanding with West Europe.

President Johnson last summer then responded by giving notice of reversing the impractical policies of his predecessors that were based on the unification of West Germany and of ignoring the existence of China. "Building bridges" with Russia and China, he called it.

Then came another curious go-and-stop in the President's policies. He made no attempt to push the American-Russian consular treaty through the Congress—until last

February, when he was informed if he really wanted it, he would have to get behind it—which he finally did.

Also, he has not lifted a finger to get approval of his recommendation to the Congress for legislation freeing trade from its present restrictions between America and the Communist countries—except for a special bill of limited extent.

Yet the trade legislation, in particular, is a very important step in better relations with the Soviet and all Communist governments.

I have long believed that trade was the greatest influence for international understanding and the greatest deterrent to war in this modern world of ours. The market place is where the theories of Lenin and Marx failed. Therefore, the market place is where Communist imperialism is the weakest. Trade—not force—is the key to the counter revolution that is slowly taking place—not suppressing by force what was created by force—but by economically reducing a complex Communist structure to discredit.

The repeal of our present restrictions on Communist trade is certainly the place for America to make a realistic start on "building bridges with Russia." Throughout all history, the market place has been where Homo Sapiens got acquainted.

Retention of these trade restrictions means only waving fists on our part at the Communists. The Communist nations can get—and are getting—whatever they want and need from our NATO allies—who are doing much business with them—while we are doing little.

The trade and cultural agreement with Poland, which was recently concluded for submission to the Congress, makes sense in equating American interests with that country.

In August, 1966, President Johnson offered a different, sound and constructive policy with China. Then again came the curious contradictions that have so often characterized the President's policies and statements. At the same time he was talking of "building bridges," he continued to oppose China's admission to the United Nations.

President Johnson must push vigorously his corollary legislation, pending in Congress for almost two years, for open trade with Communist countries.

Also, we must withdraw our opposition to the admission of China to the United Nations and we must grant diplomatic recognition of China—if and when there is a stable central government once clearly established in that country.

The need is to re-think—with our allies and associates of the non-Communist world—aspirations and goals for living a happy life. By that I mean a good life—based on tangible pragmatic arrangements. Many old concepts must be revised by the Soviets—by Chinese—by Americans and by other great and proud peoples.

Vietnam has become the stage—the location—for what can be the modern world's greatest tragedy—or Vietnam can become a great construction of a remote jungle country primitive society. Vietnam can become the start of the brightest epoch in the history of mankind—or the darkest.

Last March occurred an ominous development—the Sino-Soviet modification of their bitter split to the point at least of speeding up railroad transportation across China of Russian military equipment and supplies for North Vietnam.

Brezhnev exultingly boasted about it and what that meant in the way of "direct and active political, economic and military help" from Russia. Therefore, its meaning must be read in that light.

The biggest—the most momentous question confronting all foreign offices at this very moment is how much further will the healing of that split go. If it leads to uniting once again the Communist nations and parties in every country with that Asian giant—and uniting China itself once again—it would be the biggest news since China's first nuclear bomb.

The position of the United States in Vietnam changed almost over-night in the middle of April. The biggest jump in escalating the Vietnam war occurred with the bombing of North Vietnamese air fields and targets closer to Hanoi and Haiphong Harbor. Is that President Johnson's reply to the Sino-Russian escalation of the Vietnam war?

Three weeks ago administration officials broke that bad news indirectly to Americans and the world when our southeast Asian allies, meeting in Washington, were told that prospects for peace in Vietnam were extremely poor and forecast a long war. The principal reason given was the Sino-Soviet agreement providing quick and dependable delivery of Soviet military supplies over Chinese railroads to North Vietnam.

Two weeks later, the State Department informed a committee of the Congress that there is no danger for the United States in the Sino-Russian deal. The State Department said the same after the first Chinese nuclear bomb.

This crucial decision is not the sole responsibility of President Johnson based on information available only to him. He should make a complete report of all the information he possesses to a council of state of the executive and legislative leaders who should be given the opportunity to share that responsibility with him.

World War One was stumbled into—just as America stumbled into Vietnam. There was no reason for a small country down in the Balkans to precipitate a catastrophe like World War One except it became a test of strength between great powers.

By the same token, Vietnam has similarities to the precipitation of World War One.

When Austria sent the ultimatum to Serbia in 1914, it was thinking only of a small war. When President Kennedy sent in the first eight or ten thousand "advisors," he was thinking of a small war—a Vietnamese war.

It is no longer a Vietnamese war. It is no longer a small war. It is more than an American big war—our fourth largest. It is constantly growing bigger. This small war has become a major war. Now, in view of the Sino-Russian agreement on transportation, it can become even greater.

Just as the Balkan War of 1914 escalated into first a European war—then a World War—when one nation after another entered—so this small Vietnam war has escalated on the battle front to a big war and is threatening to escalate still bigger by more nations being drawn into it.

A concrete illustration that the Vietnamese war may be reaching that point of climax is the new Sino-Russian treaty of last March. This treaty may mean two things. One—a forerunner of the renewal of Sino-Russian cordial solidarity; that is—provided the Chinese central Government does not break up into segments of war lords, as may well occur. And two—whether President Johnson's immediate widening of the field of targets for American bombers in North Vietnam was in response to the Sino-Russian agreement or whether it is his counter to Hanoi's increased bombing, as Secretary of Defense McNamara says, and whether the Sino-Russian support stimulated Hanoi—whatever it is—the biggest jump in escalating the war in Vietnam occurred in the middle of April.

That certainly precipitates the question whether more escalation of the American war in Vietnam is threatening to reach a point of no return from actual collision with Russia or China—or both.

That is the question that must be decided without any further delay. It would be best if it were not done unilaterally—from the White House.

What the country needs is for the President to create an actual council of state, which should include at least the majority and minority leaders of the Congress and the chairman and the ranking Republican member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, to operate within the full meaning of the term.

And I do not mean for a mere briefing. I mean a fully informed council of state which will consider not only Vietnam, but all other perilous options calling for immediate consideration and decision in Asia, Africa and the Western Hemisphere.

That council of state means an assessment of our entire foreign policy, recognizing that Vietnam does not exist apart from that.

This is what the statesmen of Europe on the eve of World War One did not realize—that Austria's attack on Serbia was tied up with the entire foreign policy of all the European nations.

Let us not continue to make that mistake with reference to Vietnam. Let us not stumble into another world war by ignoring the fact that Vietnam is a major part and parcel of the foreign policies of other great powers.

We have got all sorts of perilous pieces—like Rhodesia, the Red Sea, NATO, our Southeast Asian allies, Europe—to mention the most obvious—which resemble a jigsaw puzzle which this council of state needs to fit together for a foreign policy that is not improvised over-night to fit each recurring crisis.

What I am asking for is a complete reappraisal of international relations of the countries of the world—not by the executive alone, but also by the legislative, represented by the proper leaders of both parties in responsible positions.

That of necessity includes a review of missed opportunities for "building bridges" for peace by the last three presidents.

The United States and other powers have really paid only lip service to the United Nations. The United Nations was oversold to begin with and has been oversold since by politicians and idealists alike.

All the great powers have acted unilaterally outside the United Nations when it came to their own interests—just as was the case with the League of Nations. When they had a hot potato they could not handle—or did not want to handle—they dumped it into the United Nations and then proceeded to sweep it under the carpet, as was done with the Congo and Cuba and is now being done with Rhodesia.

Oh, sure, at England's request sanctions were levied against Rhodesia—over the protest of the small African countries who said such sanctions represented a mere gesture because they would not work.

We are concentrating on the best way to wage war or to survive war—not to prevent war.

The United Nations is the only agency we have to work out the guidelines for a world without war. We are not concentrating on making the U.N. work as was intended when it was organized. So far, its original purpose after 20 years is far short of the hopeful anticipation of the role it could and should fulfill in adjusting international relations and settling disputes without war.

The United Nations as it exists today is not an organization that can block war—except for a few special cases. It is a forum for discussion and to that extent of value.

We have witnessed a number of so-called summit talks since World War Two. Why not a summit conference of all the major powers for a thorough over-hauling of the United Nations in the light of experience—in the light of the necessity of preventing a future nuclear war?

Concentrating on this goal—under the

> pressure of the proliferation of nuclear weapons—and realizing the impracticability of eliminating nationalism in any world organization—the United Nations can be at least a more effective organization in dealing with the long range problems of stability in the world on which peace is always built.
>
> That, of course, calls for more cooperative policies by the major powers and in stronger support of the United Nations. That is the lesson they must learn if the United Nations is to be a more effective barrier to a nuclear war.
>
> All these eminent and momentous questions—starting with Vietnam—are a part and parcel of the same package. Man is standing at his last crossroad. Either he works out the way to peace and survival—or he stumbles into the bottomless pit of nuclear war.
>
> And time is running out for all mankind—for all major and minor powers.

Mr. CARLSON. I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. I am always glad to see in the RECORD any statement made by the distinguished former Governor of Kansas, Alfred M. Landon, a man of great sagacity, whose consideration of public issues continues to be a matter of general interest. His sagacity, his reflective mind, his contributions to the American scene are always noteworthy.

I am very proud to claim former Governor Landon as a good personal friend.

INVESTIGATION OF SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the social security law will have served the people of the United States for 32 years this August 14. We must all be grateful for the farsightedness of Congress which, when Americans were suffering the deepest of economic depressions, enacted a social insurance that is so vital today.

In 1935 when the Social Security Act became a working reality, the visage of America was different from that of today. We were in the depths of a devastating depression. People had little and expected less. The social security law was originated under those condition as a minimum protection against destitution in old age.

As the Nation grew, standards changed, and prices increased with the rising economic level. Minimum protection and services of the social security law broadened as the system came to grips with other social ills.

Mandated increases in the years following the Second World War more than doubled old-age pensions. Couples who retired in 1940 and received social security payments of $36.40 a month were getting $120.60 a month by 1959. Today, they would receive $140 each month.

If we consider the pension dollar in 1939 as having a purchasing power of 100 cents, that dollar's purchasing power dropped to 46.9 cents by 1960, more than offsetting a social security benefit increase of 7½ percent in 1958. By 1965, the purchasing power of the dollar was 44 cents, and social security benefits increased by 7 percent. Today, the pension dollar will buy only 42.2 cents of the goods and services that it would have purchased in 1939.

Because of this, the Republican coordinating committee, of which I am a member, proposed an increase of another 8 percent in social security benefit payments. The committee urged also that an automatic cost-of-living increase provision be written into the social security law. This coincides also with a recent AFL–CIO recommendation for a provision in the social security law against such erosion of benefits.

To further help retired people maintain a decent standard of living, I introduced this year a bill which would permit those who receive social security benefits to earn up to $3,000 annually without loss of pension funds. At the present time, beneficiaries lose pension money when they have earned over $1,500 a year.

SOCIAL ILLS

In its 32 years of existence, the social security law grew and attempted to deal with many of the problems of our society.

The old-age pension of that original law became an old age, survivors, and disability insurance program in 1956. The law established the basis for related State and Federal programs which today serve the needs of the blind, the unemployed, dependent children and their mothers, orphaned children and crippled children.

This left still another area for our concern with the less fortunate. We recognized that the aged and the indigent, those who are in the greatest need of doctors and hospitalization, are the least able to afford proper medical care. Congress provided health insurance benefits for the aged through the Social Security Amendments of 1965. The program is known as medicare.

But with these developments which changed social security to meet more fully the needs of our people, there occurred other changes which began to erode the benefits. Almost unnoticed, social security has become a bureaucratic operation of unwieldy systems which no longer are able to cope with today's increased workload.

TODAY'S PROBLEMS

All of us recognize that social security pensions and other benefits are hardly enough to meet the needs of this complex society. Yet we have overlooked a basic malfunction in the administration of this program which cancels for many the very benefits it was devised to provide.

The problem today is that more and more people have to wait longer and longer periods of time before they receive their social security checks.

My office is inundated with pleas from Pennsylvanians who have made repeated, unsuccessful entreaties to local and regional social security offices concerning long-delayed payments. The Social Security Administration in Washington has prepared a written statement in response to inquiries about abnormal delays. This indicates that such cases are not confined to my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, but have developed into a national problem.

The problem is a very real one to those who depend entirely on that social security check that may fail to arrive.

Social security is the major source of income for about one-half of the beneficiaries over 65. For nearly one-fifth of the aged couples and more than one-third nonmarried beneficiaries, social security is their sole source of income. Imagine how even 1 month's delay in a social security check affects the lives of these people.

A widow with three small children in Pittsburgh filed a claim for a social security pension on May 27, 1966, shortly after her husband's death. Having received no money, 10 months later, the woman asked my office in Pittsburgh for help on March 10, 1967. After checking with the local social security office, my staff called directly to the Philadelphia payment center where her claim had been filed. On March 13, the widow received a check, but said that the amount was less than she was entitled to receive.

On April 4, one of my assistants wrote to the regional director in Philadelphia. Nearly 3 weeks later, on April 21, my Pittsburgh office received a letter of acknowledgment. It is now almost a year since the original claim was filed.

I receive an average of 30 such pleas each week.

THREE CAUSES OF DELAY

Three factors, all of which could be remedied, seem to cause such delays: First, an antiquated system of operation; second, an inefficient system of locating critical case files; and third, an overload of work caused by the new medicare program.

One Social Security Administration employee in Pennsylvania tells my office that the following situation exists today:

> The local office is handicapped by its own system of operation. Because of the system, it can take up to six weeks to receive word on cases which are identified as critical. Claim delays up to two months are not unusual.
>
> When a local Social Security office receives a complaint from a beneficiary, the office files a form with its regional office, which is Philadelphia in the case of Pennsylvania. I understand that it is a Social Security Administration rule that the local office must wait 15 days before taking further action.
>
> If further action by the local office is necessary and if the complaint is one of particular hardship, the complaint enters "critical case procedure." The local office may mail a list of critical cases to the regional office only once a week.
>
> The local office must then wait another 10 days before taking further action. At that point, the critical case could be in any one of six regional offices: New York, Philadelphia, Birmingham, Chicago, Kansas City, or San Francisco. When this happens the local office loses direct control over the case.
>
> The local office which filed the original complaint may not make further inquiry to the regional office handling the critical case, but must direct all questions through its own regional office.
>
> What regional office handles an individual case is determined by the beneficiary's original entry into the Social Security program. If a retired Pennsylvania steelworker began paying Social Security for the first time on a job in California, everything involving his pension, including payment, would be handled from the San Francisco office.

A second major cause of delay is the Social Security Administration's "freeze list" system of locating files which are in process of review.

Account numbers from the critical case lists sent to the regional office weekly are mimeographed and circulated to the dozen work stations where case reviewers have hundreds of cases out of file. Arrival of the freeze list on the reviewer's desk demands that all regular work must stop. The reviewer is to search through the files on his desk to locate any of the wanted files. These, of course, are the critical cases.

My office is told, however, that as a reviewer is promoted in rank and in salary scale, he must meet and maintain a certain daily caseload. If stopping to look for missing files on critical cases will keep a reviewer from meeting his daily quota of cases reviewed, he just might not stop to look for the files.

A Social Security Administration employee told my office that some account numbers are carried from one weekly freeze list to another.

A third major cause of delays is the growing backlog of delayed medicare payments and other administrative problems involved with this new program. They create a work overload in social security offices which further delays progress on social security claims.

Enacted by Congress in 1965, the hospital insurance amendments went into partial effect on July 1, 1966. While the medicare program, as it is popularly known, is administered directly under the social security law, much of the actual operation is handled by reputable health or life insurance companies, or other such agencies. Under the present system, the beneficiary is billed directly for doctor or hospital fees and is then reimbursed under the medicare program through the agency. This has proved to be unsatisfactory to many people.

A resident of Tunkhannock, Pa., wrote to me that the agency had paid no attention to a request for a refund on a receipted bill of $135.

A Philadelphian complained that a claim filed for 3 months with the agency is still unpaid.

A Norristown resident wrote to me—

> Three months ago I sent in a surgeon's bill for $400 and an anesthetist's bill for $80. All necessary forms were included. They sent a check for $24 and that is all I have received on the $480 claim. I wrote to Medicare December 31st, after waiting three months for reimbursement, asking for an explanation. I received a card advising they would check it. This was three weeks ago.

Therefore, with the administrative problems of the new medicare program, the human factor in locating critical case files, and an inefficient system of operation worsened by confining rules, the isolated delay has become daily routine.

TWO STEPS TO CORRECTION

Regardless of the reasons, the fact remains that some people are not getting their money on time.

I recommend two steps toward remedying the situation:

First. There should be a Senate investigation of the social security system through the appropriate committee to establish beyond doubt the causes of payment delays and to seek methods to correct the situation.

The committee should also reexamine medicare reimbursement and consider one recommendation that physicians handle medicare claims as they do other medical insurance. All medical costs covered by medicare would then be paid directly to the physician or the hospital, not to the patient. This would be of further service to many people who find it difficult to pay medical bills in the first place. Direct reimbursement also would reduce much of the paperwork which is contributing to the overburden of work in social security offices.

Second. The Social Security Administration should establish in each State, "complaint centers" which would examine the claims, to handle them expeditiously. Each center should have a separate fund from which all reasonable claims would be paid immediately.

The beneficiary would then get prompt compensation. The beneficiary would report to the center in person each month for his payment until his claim is properly processed and automatic payment can begin. With the exception of obviously doubtful claims, there would be no reason to withhold money from a beneficiary.

The beneficiary would understand that all necessary adjustments will be made in subsequent payments so that the individual who receives too little or too much during the waiting period could enter the new program with a corrected balance of payment.

SUMMARY

The Social Security Act of 1935 became law so that people, by saving money during their most productive years, could provide for themselves a basis of financial security in their later years. The system is a good one. But until now, most changes have been to increase payments and to broaden coverage. I have supported all such beneficial changes. I am now recommending changes so that people who are entitled to social security benefits get them promptly.

It is the function of government to serve its people. The people involved in this problem of delayed social security payments are for the most part those who are in the greatest need of our help. They are justly entitled to full support from the Congress in this effort to give them the prompt help they need and deserve.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I would like to concur with my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania in his assumption that the citizens of his State are not the only ones who suffer from the painfully slow and exasperatingly inaccurate service of the Social Security Administration. My office has also received vast numbers of requests for assistance in untangling the snarled web of paperwork surrounding payment of social security benefits as well as medicare and disability claims.

My staff and I have found that when we assist in these cases, nearly all are satisfactorily settled in favor of the individual. These cases were not settled earlier due only to bureaucratic redtape and lack of communication between the claimant and a department of the Government established to serve them.

When I see the number of Illinois citizens who communicate their problems with social security to me, I know that this must represent a fraction of the iceberg. For every individual that requests my assistance, there must be a hundred struggling with local and regional social security officials, helplessly delayed in receiving benefits upon which they may depend for subsistence itself.

One Chicagoan wrote to me:

> My husband died August 1st, 1966, and I applied on August 9th, for Social Security benefits for myself and my five sons. To this day I have not received any benefits.

My office contacted Social Security officials and this case was finally resolved. The family received social security benefits that had been delayed for over 8 months.

Certainly, some system can be devised whereby this mother could have promptly received the benefits needed to support five young children.

Another Illinois citizen wrote to me:

> My problem is that after a year of countless forms, of being examined at the expense of the United States Government, and of correspondence which in volume is almost equal to the Churchill memoirs, Social Security is now sending letters to my wife to see how she is responding to treatment for arthritis when in fact I am the person who has filed the claims. . . . I am trying to follow Social Security procedures, in fact I have no choice. However, they seem unable to follow the relatively unsophisticated procedures as outlined by the Congress in investigating my claim. What would you suggest I do?

A couple sent me this plea:

> Since we are both in the late 70 years of age, it makes it doubly difficult. We have registered our complaint with our Social Security board by going in twice, writing letters, and phone calls, all to no avail. Instead of benefits, they send bills. All our bills have always been paid long before they are due.

Most of these requests for assistance come from the elderly, who have little or no recourse for support but social security benefits and are dependent on the regular receipt of these checks to maintain an adequate standard of living. Other requests come from families who are struggling against insurmountable odds with the loss of their breadwinner. Social security was instituted to assist just such individuals, but in an overwhelming number of cases, it cannot and does not help when it is most needed.

When it becomes necessary for an individual to contact his Senator or Congressman for assistance in obtaining funds that he himself paid into the social security program during his earning years, close scrutiny should be given to the administration of the program.

I would like to second the recommendation of the Senator from Pennsylvania that a Senatorial investigation of the social security system take place to discover the causes of delayed and inaccurate payments so that a viable solution to this problem can be found.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express my thanks to my distinguished colleague the able Senator from Illinois, whose statements indicate that the problem is as much a problem in Illinois as it is in my State, and as I am sure it is throughout the whole Nation. The efforts of citizens to find out why the Government does not do what it has agreed to do for the citizens imposes a heavy and unjust burden on Government agencies and on the legislators when they are expected to, and should, act as mediators in the attempt to solve the numerous problems raised.

The amount of havoc which can be wrought by inefficient Government employees unwilling or unable to grasp the significance of a social security beneficiary's problems, his frustration, and even his agony upon failing to receive that to which he has contributed and which is rightfully his to receive at times approaches the appalling.

For the busy caseworker we should certainly have sympathy, but for the beneficiary, for whom the whole system was established, we should have efficiency and prompt, just, and expeditious operation and administration of the laws.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that by taking this time today, with the assistance of the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], we may have helped to bring to a head some better realization of the nature of the problem involved. The citizen's contact with Government, when unsuccessful, when frustrated, when unduly annoyed, when absolutely unfair in some cases, is what leaves the average American citizen with such an experience to condemn his Government, to attack all agencies and officials of Government, as politicians, as incompetents, or as generally engaged in some sort of conspiracy to befoul the clear streams which should connect the creeks and rivers of his discontent with the broad ocean of the Government's solution—and which is anticipated—of these problems, which aid in the citizen's respect for his Government and in his desire to cooperate fully with it, which is certainly a desirable end in itself.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may have printed at this portion of the RECORD an item from the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin of May 2, 1967 which discusses certain views of my colleague in the other body, Representative SCHWEIKER.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, May 2, 1967]

MORE LIBERAL SOCIAL SECURITY CERTAIN, SCHWEIKER PREDICTS

(By David M. Cleary)

WASHINGTON, May 1.—A more liberal Social Security law, authorizing higher monthly payments to retired and disabled workers and simplifying the cumbersome paperwork of Medicare, is certain to be passed by the 90th Congress, now in session.

But old folks may not get the increases of 15 percent across the board—with a minimum pension at age 65 of $70 per month—recommended by President Johnson in January. Lawmakers may be unwilling to saddle people now working with the price tag $4 billion per year.

These are the views of Rep. Richard S. Schweiker (R-Pa) who has carefully watched the last several weeks of hearings by the House Ways and Means Committee, studying a 164-page list of proposed changes to the Social Security law.

"The Administration's program," said Schweiker in an interview, "calls for raising the Social Security tax to ten percent on incomes up to $10,800 in 1974.

COOL TO BIG INCREASE

"A man earning $900 per month would be taxed $540 per year, with his employer paying an additional $540," he said. "The self-employed man with the same income would pay a Social Security tax of $756 per year, and I doubt that Congress will be willing to impose such a heavy tax."

The Montgomery County Republican, serving his fourth term in Congress, said he sees little opposition among his colleagues to certain changes in the law proposed by the Administration. He expects an amended law to be enacted by the end of this year to provide for:

Inclusion in Medicare of people under 65, now receiving monthly Social Security payments because of disability.

Monthly pensions to disabled widows, who under present law get nothing until age 60, unless they are caring for at least one child under age 18.

INCREASE IN EARNING SUMS

Inclusion of the services of podiatrists under Medicare for medically-necessary services, although not for such routine matters as the trimming of corns, calluses, and toenails.

An increase in the amounts Social Security recipients are allowed to earn each month without forfeiting Social Security benefits.

An across-the-board increase in monthly payments to the elderly and disabled, though not as large as President Johnson has recommended.

"Of equal importance to many constituents who have written to me," said Schweiker, "the bill under study would make several changes in Medicare bookkeeping, designed to reduce the paperwork load on hospitals, doctors and patients alike. I support those changes, and I'm sure they have the support of the majority of Congressmen."

PROPOSED MEDICARE CHANGES

Among the proposed Medicare changes:

All services rendered by hospitals to inpatients (those admitted for bed care) would be under Medicare Part A, while all those for outpatients (people visiting clinics) would be under Part B, thus eliminating a "splitting billing" for many patients which maddeningly ties up hospital accounts.

Creation of a new "Part C" which would pay 80 percent of the reasonable charges of radiologists and pathologists in hospitals, eliminating another "splitting billing" situation that has both riled patients and caused much unnecessary clerical work.

Elimination of the requirement that a physician certify the need for every general hospital admission, since doctors argue they don't send patients into hospitals except when necessary. However, doctors would still be required to certify need for admission to mental and tuberculosis hospitals, and certify the need for longer-than-usual hospital stays.

Federal hospitals, operated by the military services and Veterans Administration, would be able to treat Medicare-eligible patients, getting paid from the Medicare fund.

THE PRICE TAGS

"These amendments would make a significant contribution to smoother administration of Medicare," said Schweiker. "I testified in support of them before the Ways and Means Committee on March 7, and I believe the majority of the House feels as I do."

The biggest objection to the Administration's entire package of Social Security amendments, as Schweiker sees it is the cost of raising monthly benefits to the elderly and the disabled. The price tags, as submitted to the Congress, look like this:

15 percent general increase with $70 monthly minimum	$4,001,000,000
Special minimum of $100 after 25 years	8,000,000
Raising earning limit from $1,500 to $1,680 per year	140,000,000
Benefits to disabled widows	140,000,000
Increase to $50 of monthly payment to persons over 72	225,000,000
Benefits for children	11,000,000
Benefits for parents of retired or disabled workers	15,000,000
Total	4,471,000,000

EIGHT PERCENT, MAYBE, 15 PERCENT, NO

"Obviously," Schweiker said, "the single measure of raising benefits to everyone now getting them, and eligible for them in the future, is the most expensive item, representing more than $4 billion of the $4.471 billion total. This is the part most likely to run into opposition."

Schweiker said House Republicans favor a general increase of about eight percent, rather than the 15 percent proposed by the Administration, and some conservative Democrats have similar feelings.

"I personally support substantial increases because of the tremendous increases in the cost of living," he said, "and on that point, I differ with some Republicans. But I doubt that the 15 percent increases will be authorized."

Schweiker also said he'd like to see Social Security recipients allowed to earn considerably more than the $1,680 per year proposed by the Administration before being required to forfeit part of their Social Security income.

PENALIZED FOR ACTIVITY

"Many people are hale and hearty, and ready to start new careers at age 65," he said. "I think it is detrimental to the general welfare to penalize people who do that, and we lose the mature judgment of many good men by discouraging their continued activity in industry merely because af advancing age."

But he said the bill, once it leaves the Ways and Means Committee, will go to Rules Committee, from which it may reach the House floor under a "no amendment" rule. In such a case, the House can vote to accept or reject the entire package, but cannot vote on the provisions separately.

That situation can be changed, he said, by a bit of parliamentary footwork called "a motion to recommit, with instructions."

If such a motion is adopted, so that individual parts of the bill would be subject to House vote, Schweiker predicted that the earnings limits for Social Security recipients will be raised well above the suggested $1,680 per year.

PREDICTS COMPROMISE

"There's a lot of feeling in that direction among the members," he said.

But as things stand now, Schweiker and other Congressmen who are not members of the Ways and Means Committee can only wait. Some three more weeks of Committee deliberations are scheduled, so the bill can't reach the House floor until some time in June.

If passed by both House and Senate in its present form, the bill calls for some Social Security amendments to become effective next January.

"But the bill can't hope to pass without change," said Schweiker. "The final law will be a compromise between the Administration and the Congress."

SPEECH BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY BEFORE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a speech delivered by Gov. George Romney to the National Federation of Republican Women on May 5, 1967.

In passing, I express the hope that there were those who listened, and I express the judgment that this speech was a very good one, that it was constructive and helpful, that it was not confined to narrow ideological ideas, and conveyed and sought to convey the responsible views of a responsive citizen in meeting current issues, both foreign and domestic.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY GOV. GEORGE ROMNEY OF MICHIGAN TO THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN, MAY 5, 1967

In the past few months, I've traveled from Alaska to Atlanta . . . from New Mexico to New England . . . and everywhere, the message is clear:

The most significant political fact in America today is the new vitality and attitude of the Republican Party.

These days it's exciting and it's fun to be a Republican.

And in Michigan . . . as in many other states . . . it's not as lonely to be a Republican these days.

When I first took office as Governor in 1963, even my Lieutenant Governor was a Democrat.

In those days, only 23 percent of Michigan voters identified themselves as Republicans, while 27 percent thought of themselves as independents and fully 50 percent identified themselves as Democrats.

Through positive problem solving programs, through a new Constitution, through genuine public interest government, through fiscal integrity, through hard political work by thousands of people, particularly women, things have changed in Michigan.

In the 1966 election, 52 percent of the voters cast straight Republican votes. And that's Republican progress!

Today in Michigan, we have Republican leadership in both houses of the Legislature.

We have a 12–7 Republican margin in our Congressional Delegation, including five outstanding young Congressmen who replaced Democrats last year.

We have erased Democratic majorities in the State Supreme court for the first time in a dozen years.

We finally retired "Soapy" Williams.

We elected a Republican United States Senator from Michigan for the first time in 14 years—the dynamic Bob Griffin.

We're making gains everywhere.

More than half the people of this country now live under problem solving Republican Governors.

We Republicans elected 47 more Members to the House of Representatives last year, and five more Senators.

In state legislatures across the country, we elected 540 more Republican Members.

And the victories of 1966 are only the beginning.

The exciting truth is that a new Republican Party, with a new look, is preparing to lead our Nation into a new generation of progress.

The Republican Party today is in an unequalled position to help the people of this Nation find a better way. And we're ready to win!

The National Republican Coordinating Council has provided invaluable groundwork for the 1968 national campaigns.

The effective work of the Republican minorities in Congress is providing sound, positive Republican programs in the House under the capable leadership of Rep. Jerry Ford and in the Senate under the incomparable Sen. Everett Dirksen.

The National Committee is playing a key role in these vital make ready months under the practical effective leadership of our Chairman, Ray Bliss.

The women of our party are unequalled in their enthusiasm, their spirit, their devotion and their effectiveness. You are showing the party has a heart.

And the young people of this country, with America's future in their hands, are looking to the Republican Party for leadership as never before in recent memory. And they're ready to help us, too.

Yes, we can win in 1968 not only the White House but the House of Representatives as well.

When the people spoke in 1966, this is what they said:

"We the people . . . we are individuals. Treat us as individuals.

"Don't try to lump us into faceless special interest categories. We refuse to be neatly packed and labeled into economic, religious, racial or ethnic blocs to be used by political brokers.

"We will not be deceived by promises of group favoritism and special privilege. We're not for sale.

"Give us a government that serves us, not one that makes us dependent and stifles us—a government we can control, not one that manages our lives."

That's what the people said.

The political epoch of the New Deal and its offspring is over.

Our position party is still living in the glories of the thirties. Its leaders are still trying to apply the theories of the thirties as the solutions of the sixties.

And they just don't work. The "Great Society" methods have been too shallow and superficial. The truth is the "Great Society" is really the "Great Facade."

The people are concerned and dissatisfied. They want a change. Most of them know there is a better way than LBJ.

When I spoke to you last, I voiced some of my deepest convictions.

I believed then, and I believe now, that the gravest threats to the future of America are not from without, but from within.

The gravest threats to the future of America are the decline in religious conviction, decline in moral character, decline in responsible citizenship based on an understanding of the principles on which this nation was built, and the deterioration of family life.

I believed then, and I believe now, that we don't have to worry in the future about having enough government in America. We're going to have plenty of government. But grave deficiencies are already developing in personal responsibility, family responsibility and private institutional responsibility.

I believe then, and I believe now, that human and social problems can't be solved just with government and money. It takes responsible citizens who care . . . and care enough to get involved.

I believed then, and I believe now, that politically only the Republican Party can do the job which must be done if America is to realize its purpose and destiny.

In my opinion, the Republican Party is the last political hope in this country for the type of government which you and I want for ourselves and for our children.

Our opportunity to realize this hope exists because the people don't want what LBJ is giving them and because there is a better way.

The people don't want a government that runs their lives. We know there's a better way—a government that serves and puts the people first.

The people don't want a government that ignores the basic cause of vast economic power struggles based on class warfare. There's a better way—government that encourages labor management teamwork to put an end to strikes and lockouts that paralyze entire communities and create national emergencies.

The people don't want a government that coddles and makes them dependent on welfare.

There's a better way—leadership that believes in and knows how to lick poverty with jobs, not just handouts.

The people don't want a government that bends to cronies and special interest bosses. There's a better way than LBJ—government that shapes its policies and enforces the law without fear or favor.

The people don't want a government that conceals big spending with phony budgeting. There's a better way—an administration that believes in and practices truth in budgeting.

The people don't want continuous deficits or a government that spends us into inflation and then blames others. There's a better way than LBJ—an administration that believes in and practices fiscal integrity.

The people don't want a government that ignores the danger of excessive concentrations of public or private power. There's a better way—government that keeps public and private power divided so the people can rule.

The people don't want a government that weakens private competitive enterprise and red tape and regulations. There's a better way—government that fosters and strengthens competition, and puts the people as customers back in the driver's seat.

The people don't want a government that undermines their independent action and voluntary cooperative institutions. There's a better way—to recognize that "The most powerful force on earth is the spontaneous cooperation of a free people."

The people don't want a government that takes more and more responsibility away from elected state and local representatives and gives it to a few appointed federal officials. There's a better way than LBJ—an administration that believes in and will work to really strengthen state and local self government.

Because the present administration is out of touch with the people and the principles that are the roots of America's greatness, it lacks the capacity to solve America's problems at home. It is treating the symptoms with aspirin, but it can't effect a cure.

The shallowness of the administration's approach is shown by the way it talks about the issues.

It talks about a war on this and a war on that—a war on crime, a war on poverty, a war on pollution. It's even conducting a war on fiscal integrity—unfortunately that's the only one it's winning.

Sure, we're against crime and poverty and pollution, but isn't it time we started talking about what we're for?

Isn't it time we got down to fundamentals—back to basic principles—and started applying them positively and constructively?

Plenty of things are wrong in this great land of ours, but plenty of things are right, too.

And the better way to correct the things that are wrong is to hold fast to the things that are right and strengthen the forces that have lifted America to unparalleled heights of freedom and well being.

There's a better way than LBJ abroad, too.

The people don't want a government that stumbles into international commitments that grow like topsy. There's a better way—a foreign policy based on a consistent, realistic long range concept of America's world role.

The people don't want a government that squanders American prestige, raising false fears and hopes by acting as a global policeman and global financier. There's a better way—a government that establishes sound priorities and then commits its resources and prestige with respect for the interests and responsibilities of its allies.

The people don't want a government that doles out foreign aid money simply for the asking, while world poverty and instability continue to increase. There's a better way—government whose foreign economic development programs encourage greater private investment, partnership and self help.

The people don't want a government that misleads America with manipulated, inflated and distorted reports on the conflict in Southeast Asia. There's a better way—government that forthrightly tells us what's really going on.

We don't want a government looked to by other nations just because of our economic and military might. There's a better way—government that wins the world's respect for our ideals, realism, knowledge and institutions rather than for our arsenals and pocketbooks.

Do you agree there's a better way than LBJ?

Yes, and our job as Republicans is to show the people of this nation how to achieve that better way.

Yes, and if we do, we can win in 1968.

We can win as Republicans united in these basic beliefs about the people and their government.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the individual, and what he can accomplish.

The Republican Party has greater faith in what the people will do voluntarily for themselves and for others, if encouraged to do it.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the vitality and potential of state and local governments to help the people solve their problems close to home.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the matchless power of private initiative, free competitive enterprise, and free collective bargaining.

The Republican Party has greater faith in limited government and in government by law.

The Republican Party has greater faith in the necessity of meeting the needs of the people through fiscal integrity.

The Republican Party places its faith in candidates who when elected will serve as public officials and not as partisan officials or special interest tools.

The Republican Party has greater faith in telling the people the facts about our international involvements.

The Republican Party has greater faith in a foreign policy which is consistent with long range definition of our national purpose.

The Republican Party has greater faith in applying our proven principles to achieve progress and peace at home and abroad. A better way. The Republican Way.

I'm convinced that a majority of the American people share these basic beliefs.

If we will unite in taking them to the country, we will win in 1968.

And we must win in 1968. For the Republican Party is political hope for our future as a nation.

THE SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

I regret that I was not able to be present to hear the Senator's address on a very important and vital subject. I know he understands the problems concerned with the schedules of the day.

It seemed to me as I read his statement last night—he was courteous enough to provide me with a copy over the weekend—that once again we have an example of a situation and condition where the present administration seems to think that problems may be solved when slogans are coined, or merely by the passage of a bill.

I recall, as will the Senator from Pennsylvania, that in the 89th Congress much was said and there was much to-do about the great volume of legislation. Great emphasis was placed upon quantity, without very much being said about the quality of the legislation that was passed.

But the essence of solving the Government's problems is not merely the action which takes place in this Chamber and that on the other side of the Capitol, but in the implementation.

I am impressed by two things about the Senator's speech: first, it is not merely a blanket criticism of a condition, but is well-documented by the work of his office and letters that he has received; and, second, I think it most important that on the first page of his draft he compares the amounts received by social security beneficiaries with the increased cost of living; for these are the real, hard facts of the whole matter.

I endorse the steps for correction that he has set forth on page 4 of his statement; and I ask the Senator to permit me, in connection with his statement, to urge once again the passage of a bill introduced by me, which the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania was so gracious as to endorse, to provide a new Hoover Commission to look into all of the executive agencies, bureaus, and organizational pyramids that exist in Government today. For as I note on page 4, the administration of social security is not confined within that agency itself, but, especially since the advent of medicare, is spread out all through the Government. I am sure that the Senator joins with me in that plea.

I congratulate the Senator on a most worthwhile statement. I concur with his proposed increases in the amounts that those on social security may earn. Such a change is long overdue. Many of us have sought it heretofore. If I am not a cosponsor on this measure, I have been on such measures before, and I ask the Senator that my name be so included at this time.

Mr. SCOTT. I shall be very happy to do so, and I thank the distinguished Senator from Kansas for his very thoughtful, kind, and generous consideration of the suggestions I have made. I do underscore the purport of his bill in regard to the establishment of a commission to examine into all these matters, and hope for its success. I am most grateful that the Senator has taken the time to study the statements I made, and, as I have said, I thank him for his support here.

I conclude, Mr. President, by recounting an incident which occurred in my life a great many years ago, when I was a beginning debater in high school. I add, incidentally, that I lost my first 13 debates, before I discovered the value of rebuttal. I was somewhat more successful thereafter.

But being unaware of the devastating nature of rebuttals, I was engaged in a rather juvenile effort, in one of those debates, on the subject of which of two historical characters was the greater. I made my statement in behalf of my historical character, and stated, in opposition to the other character, that I thought he had bitten off more than he could chew.

I was completely destroyed as a debater that day, in that little country high school, by a farm boy who commented, in defending the other historical personage, who had died at an early age, "I reckon if he had lived long enough, he would have chawed his bites."

I think that has been the trouble with the legislation passed by the 89th Congress: We bit off more than we could chew, and we are now in the process of imploring our own Government to "chaw" its bites, to overcome the indigestion of administrative difficulties which has led to the frustration of the lonely citizen, and particularly the elder citizen, who wonders how it is possible, if he cannot even fight city hall, for him to fight the U.S. Capitol.

I hope I have made some suggestions and stirred up some interest in the problem, so that an old man or an old woman—or let us be more tactful, being in politics, and say an elderly senior citizen, be he lady or gentleman—may hope hereafter to receive better and more expeditious treatment from the Government—which, after all, belongs to him. One day not long ago, an elderly couple walking through the corridors of the Capitol very timidly approached one of the guards and asked, "Is it all right for us to walk through here?"

The guard looked at them for a moment, smiled, and said, "Why not? It's yours, isn't it?"

I thank the Presiding Officer.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business extending no later than 10 minutes after 12 today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that statements during the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

GOVERNMENT EXPANDS USE OF CONSULTANTS

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, during the past several years the various agencies of the Government have greatly expanded their use of consultants, and questions have arisen as to whether or not this is resulting in a backhanded method of padding the payrolls.

It is recognized that in certain instances the use of consultants or experts can be justified, but it was intended that this category of employment be confined to specialized use.

In an effort to determine to what extent this practice has expanded and to what extent it is being abused, I filed an inquiry on March 9 with Mr. John W. Macy, Jr., Chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Under date of March 23, 1967, I received a preliminary report, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD along with my March 9 inquiry. In this report Mr. Macy has promised to furnish a more detailed breakdown including the amount of compensation received, days worked, and so forth. When this additional information is received, it, too, will be placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 9, 1967.

MR. JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman, Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MACY: Will you please furnish me with an itemized breakdown of the number of consultants that have been hired by each of the respective agencies during the first half of fiscal 1967 (July 1, 1966, through December 31, 1966). With this report please include the following:

1. The name of the agency, the number of employees, and the per diem payments.

a. In addition to the per diem payments do these consultants receive expense allowances to cover travel, hotels, etc.?

2. Does service as a consultant count as additional time in computing civil service retirement benefits?

a. If so, is the time counted on the basis of the work period or over the period of time in which the man is carried on the rolls as a consultant?

This report may be broken down by agencies or Departments, whichever is more convenient.

Yours sincerely,
JOHN J. WILLIAMS.

U.S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1967.

Hon. JOHN J. WILLIAMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR WILLIAMS: You asked in your letter of March 9, 1967 that I furnish you with certain information concerning the use of consultants in the government service.

We will have to get information directly from the agencies to answer in detail your first question, relative to the number and pay of consultants, by agency. I can give you some general information, however, which may be helpful while are are collecting the data to answer more specifically.

Although there is some technical distinction between experts and consultants (the primary one being that experts actually do the work while consultants serve as advisers), they are generally hired under the same authorities and once employed, the same rules apply to both groups. Relatively few appointments are made to the expert category. Most agencies lump both groups together statistically. Therefore, we are not attempting to distinguish between the two in the information we furnish you.

We found through a telephone survey during February of this year that agencies in the Washington area, where nearly all the experts and consultants are employed, have 8,924 on the rolls. Attached is a listing of these by agency. There are, on the average, about 75 additional consultants on the rolls employed under individual authorities granted to agencies which do not have blanket agreements. Thus the total number of experts and consultants on the rolls in February was approximately 9,000.

Only a portion of this number would actually have worked during the month. Common agency practice is to make appointments for one year and then use the consultants as needed. Often a consultant will work only three or four days during the course of the year.

Rates of pay and allowances for expenses vary widely. These are determined by the individual agencies, within statutory limitations. Many consultants work without compensation and are only placed on the rolls so that they may be reimbursed for travel expenses. About one-third of the consultants with the Bureau of Standards, for example, serve without compensation.

Your second question is whether service as a consultant counts as additional time in computing civil service retirement benefits. In general the service of a consultant who is paid on a time basis is creditable Federal service for retirement purposes. Credit is thus allowed for consultant service paid for on a per diem basis or on a "while-actually-employed" basis; in the latter instance credit is allowed only for the days actually worked.

Service on a fee basis is not creditable. Likewise, service without compensation or with nominal compensation ($1 a year) is not creditable unless the consultant performs full-time or substantially full-time Federal service.

In addition to the listing of the numbers of experts and consultants employed by the individual agencies, I am enclosing a pamphlet which may be useful to you, "Employment and Compensation of Experts and Consultants."

We will conduct a survey among the agencies and furnish you more precise information on the number of consultants employed, the compensation received, the expense allowances, and the man days worked, as soon as we receive and compile it.

Sincerely yours,
JOHN W. MACY, JR.,
Chairman.

Number of experts and consultants employed by agency

	Number
Department of Commerce:	
Bureau of Standards	62
Bureau of Domestic and International Business	21
Environmental Science Services Administration	26
Maritime Administration	1
Patent Office	0
Bureau of the Census	18
Office of the Secretary	77
Department of the Interior	90
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:	
Office of Education	1,804
Social Security Administration	106
Food and Drug Administration	128
Vocational Rehabilitation Administration	161
Administration on Aging	65
Welfare Administration	68
St. Elizabeths Hospital	0
Office of the Secretary	143
Defense Communication Agency	9
Defense Intelligence Agency	20
Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	5
Export-Import Bank	1
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	3
Federal Trade Commission	5
National Capital Planning Commission	4
Post Office Department	10
Smithsonian	5
U.S. Information Agency	20
Federal Aviation Agency	62
Office of Emergency Planning	60
Department of the Treasury	90
Department of Transportation	58
Department of Labor	179
National Foundation on Arts and Humanities	136
National Science Foundation	41
Peace Corps	223
Department of Housing and Urban Development	109
General Services Administration	15
National Advisory Commission on Selective Service	4
Commission on Civil Rights	19
Commission on Marine, Science, Engineering, and Resources	6
Federal Radiation Council	3
National Advisory Commission on Food and Fiber	13
President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice	22
Special Representative on Trade Negotiations	5
Water Resources Council	1
National Capital Transportation Agency	0
National Security Agency	48
Department of Agriculture	55
Defense Atomic Support Agency	47
Department of Justice	5
General Accounting Office	19
Administrative Office, U.S. Courts	6
Civil Service Commission	16
Bureau of the Budget	98
Department of State	332
Office of Economic Opportunity	152
HEW, Public Health Service	2, 197
Department of the Navy	100
Department of the Air Force	187
Department of the Army	435
Office of the Secretary of Defense	302
National Aeronautics and Space Agency	400
Veterans' Administration	225
Agency for International Development	400
Total	8, 924

THE NEW LEFT: SEDITION AND RIOTS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I read with a great deal of alarm a statement by the national secretary of the Students for a Democratic Society, which appeared Sunday in the New York Times.

Gregory Calvert, a former history teacher, was quoted by Reporter Paul Hofmann as declaring:

> We are actively organizing sedition.

Calvert also was quoted as saying that:

We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment.

Mr. President, I do not know whether this group has been investigated by the proper authorities. I would hope that it is.

I do not believe that we should permit any organization to preach its doctrines of sedition. I do not believe we should condone a group which admits, as was done in this article, that "some of our members undoubtedly will help" in ghetto riots this summer. Riots violate the law and trespass on the rights of law-abiding citizens.

If nothing has been done to curtail this group, something should be done forthwith. The press could help in this respect by relegating the so-called "news" of such irresponsible statements by people like Mr. Calvert to the back page.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The New Left Turns to Mood of Violence in Place of Protest" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW LEFT TURNS TO MOOD OF VIOLENCE IN PLACE OF PROTEST

(By Paul Hofmann)

"We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," said the national secretary of the left-wing Students for a Democratic Society, Gregory Calvert, one day recently.

"We are actively organizing sedition," he said.

Mr. Calvert, a 29-year-old former history teacher, spoke pleasantly about revolution in his dingy office on Chicago's Skid Row. The threat of violence in his words characterizes the current radicalization of the New Left.

A maze of factions with a penchant for verbosity and a hankering for action, the New Left wants emphatically to be distinct from the old left—the socialist and Communist movements whose history goes back over generations.

EBULLIENCE AND FRUSTRATION

Just how distinct it has become was made clear during a three-week series of interviews with some 75 New Left activists and sympathizers from coast to coast. Most of them were younger than 30, and some sounded much more truculent than members of the Moscow-oriented Communist party, U.S.A.

The trend toward radicalism and direct action constitutes perhaps the major attitude in the New Left today. Other findings in this assessment of the New Left's mood are as follows:

An ebullience over the impact of opposition to the war in Vietnam, which emotionally involves some members of the middle class and leads them to New Left positions also on domestic issues.

A frustration resulting from the lack of New Left political power and the failures of "peace" candidates in national and local elections.

A virulent factionalism similar to the doctrinaire old left feuds, a factionalism that is being exploited by extremists.

A spreading tendency to link up with leftist and "anti-imperialist" movements in Latin America, Europe and emerging nations.

The growth of a broadening "hippie" segment, mainly on the East and West Coasts, occasionally joining the New Left in demonstrations but also worrying it because drug users and beatniks tend to withdraw from society instead of attempting to reform or revolutionize it.

The drifting apart of young whites and Negroes, close allies in the civil rights battles in the South a few years ago, as black power extremism spreads in Northern ghettos.

CHE LIVES IN OUR HEARTS

If there is one dominant hero of the New Left mood, perhaps he is Ernesto Che Guevara.

Mr. Calvert, the beardless, ruddy-faced national secretary of Students for a Democratic Society, said:

"Che's message is applicable to urban America as far as the psychology of guerrilla action goes. . . . Che sure lives in our hearts."

Che Guevara, the Argentine-born revolutionary who was an associate of Premier Fidel Castro of Cuba, disappeared more than two years ago and is rumored to be leading insurgents somewhere in the Andean vastnesses.

A long way from the South American sierras, a surprising number of young left-wing intellectuals were found to revere the Argentinian adventurer. Rebellious students who spoke with equal disdain about "Establishment liberals" and "Communist squares" professed the cult of the "pure" man of revolutionary action.

Posters of Che Guevara and of Malcolm X, the black nationalist slain here two years ago, are advertised for sale "at special bulk rates" in a San Francisco monthly, The Movement. The radical publication disaffiliated recently from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the militant, Southern-oriented movement that used to be one of the pillars of the New Left but has lately veered toward black power goals and away from Students for a Democratic Society.

I'M NO PACIFIST

Che Guevara's bearded likeness was encountered on the walls of the littered offices of radical newspapers and left-wing groups. His name cropped up in talks in college cafeterias whenever the New Left's current infatuation with direct action was mentioned.

"I recognize that violence may be necessary, I'm no pacifist," said a vibrant young woman who has done much work for the New Left, Leni Zeiger. "I'm a white, middle-class girl, but I understand why Negroes, Puerto Ricans or Okies riot. I feel the same frustrations in myself, the same urge to violence."

Nevertheless, Miss Zeiger said during an interview at that citadel of the New Left, the University of California campus at Berkeley, "there are a lot of dilemmas about violence. . . ."

At the age of 21, Miss Zeiger considers herself "old New Left," because she believes more in community work and, possibly, political action than in urban guerrillas. She has been active in left-oriented projects in black and poor-white ghettos in Chicago and Cleveland and, while working for her B.A., is now on the staff of The Movement, doing research among poor Southerners and "hillbillies" in California.

Of the continual left-wing rifts, Miss Zeiger said:

"The trouble is that the politically minded people aren't very radical, and the radicals aren't very political."

Violence was a topic, too, in a talk with a University of Michigan economics teacher at Ann Arbor, Michael F. Zweig. He is a former president of the S.D.S. chapter there.

CALLS VIOLENCE NECESSARY

"I think violence is necessary, and it frightens me," Mr. Zweig said. The 24-year-old graduate school teaching fellow, whose face is framed by a luxuriant blond beard remarked:

"There isn't a great feeling of personal liberation in burning down a Cleveland store."

After another wave of urban riots like those of recent summers, Mr. Zweig suggested, local governments might decide to collaborate with left-inspired neighborhood groups, and poor people might even obtain guaranteed annual minimum earnings, a kind of negative income tax.

"If that's all we get," the teacher said "violence doesn't become so desirable."

He added: "I am very pessimistic about the prospects of change, even of meaningful reforms in this country. The quality of life [in America], that's what I am so pessimistic about."

Profound dissatisfaction with living in the contemporary United States was voiced by many other New Left backers. They saw the nation as oppressively dominated by an Establishment of political-corporate power structures that were hampering social and civic rights progress at home and tampering with the destinies of people abroad.

"Nicaragua and a lot of other countries should get together to resist the United States," said Gary Rothberger, a sociology student who succeeded Mr. Zweig as president of the Ann Arbor chapter of S.D.S.

Insurgency in Nicaragua and in other Latin-American countries is stirring news to the left wing on United States campuses. A California student, not yet 20, who looked like a younger Che Guevara, said he had spent last summer with Guatemalan guerrillas.

NEW LEFT MANIFESTO

Ann Arbor is important on the New Left map because Students for a Democratic Society was born there some six years ago. The movement's first national convention in Port Huron, Mich., in June, 1962, produced a basic New Left manifesto.

This rejected "paranoiac anti-Communism" while blaming the Soviet Union for suppressing opposition. It strongly attacked American capitalism, denounced the "hypocrisy of American ideals" and advocated a vaguely defined "participatory democracy."

Several S.D.S. members asked for practical examples of "participatory democracy" in action, pointed to the Yugoslav system of workers' councils' running nationalized business enterprises.

Amendments to the "Port Huron Statement" have made the S.D.S. program completely agnostic on Communism, opening the door to membership of Communists.

Since then, Students for a Democratic Society has gone through various phases. It aided the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in the South, it went into the Northern ghettos to organize their inhabitants, and lately it has swung back onto the campuses.

Some of the ghetto efforts are still alive. Among them are the Newark Community Union Project—directed by Tom Hayden, a cofounder of S.D.S. and main author of the Port Huron manifesto—and Chicago's Jobs or Income Now (J.O.I.N.).

In the short but lively history of S.D.S., 1967 is the year of the "prairie guys," the national leaders who were elected at a convention in a Methodist camp at Clear Lake, Iowa, last September. Nick Egleson, president, Carl Davidson, vice president, Mr. Calvert and their friends are leading S.D.S., in Mr. Davidson's words, "from protest to resistance."

ACTION ABOVE IDEOLOGY

Mr. Calvert described himself as a "post-Communist revolutionary," putting action above ideology. Dee Jacobsen, assistant national secretary and headquarters manager, said the North Vietnamese whom S.D.S. representatives had got in touch with "cannot understand why we don't take any direct action."

The three-room, $125-a-month national headquarters of Students for a Democratic Society is at 1608 West Madison Street, Chicago's Skid Row. It is close to the area of last summer's Negro rioting.

Despite the squalid setting, the headquarters looks more efficient than it did at its former location near the University of Chicago campus on the city's South Side.

Last year there was picturesque clutter; now there is drab orderliness. There are boxes for outgoing and incoming mail, staffers who answer telephones and an ancient safe with a combination lock.

"We are getting ready for the revolution," Mr. Jacobsen joked with a thin smile when a visitor remarked on the new look.

Mr. Jacobsen said he had abandoned psychiatric hospital work to become a full-time S.D.S. organizer because he felt "my life was getting unbearable."

Mr. Calvert and Mr. Jacobsen said S.D.S. had some 200 chapters, with 6,000 dues-paying members and at least 25,000 other supporters who participated in chapter activities.

These activities, the S.D.S. leaders said, are centered on assisting young men to evade military duty by "insubordination, legal and illegal emigration to Canada, going underground in America—everything."

Students for a Democratic Society is organizing "draft resistance unions" and has a "national draft resistance coordinator," Jeff Segal.

CHANGE OF PLAN

The resistance-fomenting new leadership has only contempt for electoral campaigns by "peace" candidates and is cool toward mere protest demonstrations. The leadership first decided not to participate in the Spring Mobilization antiwar demonstrations of last April 15, deeming them a futile exercise, but was overruled at a meeting of the movement's national council in Cambridge, Mass., early in April.

The national leaders still did not seem to think much of the mobilization, and they have hinted at possibly even sterner action than resistance to the draft.

"Some of our members undoubtedly will help" in ghetto riots this summer, Mr. Jacobsen said.

A former S.D.S. organizer, who asked that he not be named, ridiculed the present leadership's talk of urban guerrillas.

"Greg Calvert has read something about leftist terrorist commandos in Caracas," he said, "and he and his friends think they are Venezuelans. They are becoming a sect. Romantic and out of touch with reality."

He said infiltrators from the pro-Peking Progressive Labor party had gained control of at least one S.D.S. chapter in Chicago. He did not name it.

Other New Left moderates suggested that the verbal militancy in S.D.S. headquarters might mask an inferiority complex vis-a-vis Negro racists who had already made up their minds that violence was necessary to attain black power.

"Some of the black nationalists are stacking Molotov cocktails and studying how they can hold a few city blocks in an uprising, how to keep off the fire brigade and the police so that the National Guard must be called out," a white Ohio student said. "And they're right. We ought to help them where we can, but we oughtn't be hung up with leading or liberating the Negroes."

IN PRAISE OF BLACK POWER

Mr. Calvert conceded that S.D.S. had few Negro members. He said:

"Black power is absolutely necessary. When we have organized the white radicals we can link up with the Negro radicals."

This seemed to imply a lack of such a link at present.

In the view of Jack Newfield, assistant editor of The Village Voice, the Greenwich Village newspaper, and a former S.D.S. member, the radicalization of New Left movements results from a feeling of hopelessness.

"The situation is getting more oppressive," he said. "Look at Alabama, look at Georgia, look at the war in Vietnam."

At the Internal Security Division of the Department of Justice, an official said "it is obvious that these [New Left] groups are becoming more and more vociferous and threatening" in protesting against the war in Vietnam and calling for sedition. However, he said he was unable to comment on how serious a threat to law and order these groups were.

He said that "we are following closely the activities of some of these groups," keeping in mind that the First Amendment to the Constitution protects freedom of speech. He said violations of the Universal Military Training and Service Act and the Sedition Act were being investigated but declined to indicate whether prosecutions were on the increase.

Talks with police officers and community leaders in various cities found most in agreement that only a small hard core of leftist activists is determined to defy the law—maybe not more than a few hundred across the nation. The number of young New Left militants who advocate violence is growing, it was found, but whether their increasingly radical talk will be translated into unlawful action is controversial.

A potential threat to public order from New Left radicals was seen in areas where racial disorders this summer are feared including Cleveland, Chicago and, possibly New York.

Numerically, the New Left remains weak. The figure of 200,000 adherents nationwide that is often mentioned by sympathizers seems exaggerated.

STAUGHTON LYND'S VIEW

In the New Left itself, the campus talk about direct action is only rarely frightening. It does not frighten Staughton Lynd, who at the age of 38 is often called an "elder statesman" of the New Left.

The guerrilla concept is "not descriptive" of the new radical trend, he said in an interview. He appeared to distinguish between active violence and civil disobedience, which he himself practiced at the end of 1965 when he defied the United States Government and visited Hanoi with Mr. Hayden, the S.D.S. cofounder, and Dr. Herbert Aptheker, the leading theoretician of the Communist Party, U.S.A.

Mr. Lynd, an associate professor of history at Yale University, who has been influenced by Quaker pacifism and Marxist doctrine, said he expected to receive a leave of absence from Yale and move to Chicago to teach at an S.D.S.-backed school for community organizers. Graduates of the school may lead draft resisters or defend the interests of the poor in housing and welfare, he said.

Mr. Lynd stressed that a "solid base of local organization" was more important to the New Left than going "too quickly" into national politics.

"I believe in local political candidates" of the New Left, he said.

A more sanguine assessment of the New Left's political possibilities was given by Paul Booth, who was S.D.S. national secretary before Mr. Calvert. Mr. Booth said in Chicago that the defeats of New Left and "peace" candidates in last year's primaries and Congressional elections "have given our people a better sense of how much work is to be done" to win political power.

THIRD-PARTY IDEA

Mr. Booth said the idea of setting up a third party on an antiwar and New Left platform deserved consideration.

He expressed hope that "maybe in three months" a vast alliance would rally behind the Rev. Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the civil rights leader and Nobel Peace Prize winner, and Dr. Benjamin Spock, the pediatrician and antiwar leader, as candidates for President and Vice President. Dr. King has said he does not intend to run.

Mr. Booth, a 23-year-old Swarthmore College graduate, is a board member of the National Conference for New Politics. ("Those left liberals!" Mr. Calvert sneered when the group was mentioned to him.)

The conference was established last year to help New Left and antiwar forces win political influence. Cochairmen are Julian Bond of the Georgia Legislature and Simon Casidy, a California Democrat. Dr. Spock was among the founders.

Another backer of Dr. King is Robert Scheer, the 31-year-old managing editor of Ramparts magazine. During a visit to New York he predicted broad popular support for the clergyman.

"I cannot think of any Negro minister attacking him," Mr. Scheer said. "Stokely Carmichael [chairman of the S.N.C.C.] embraced him publicly. The extremists will have to go along."

Mr. Scheer knows how to sound pretty extremist himself. In the Spring Mobilization rally in San Francisco he called President Johnson a "murderer" who was aiming at a "final solution" in Vietnam. The term "final solution" was used in official Nazi documents to describe the destruction of Jews ordered by Hitler.

The executive director of the Conference for New Politics, William F. Pepper, said in an interview at the group's New York headquarters, at 250 West 57th Street, that "we aren't a bunch of liberal do-gooders, we are revolutionary." ("Liberal" is a dirty word in New Left.)

He said the conference aimed at affiliating with the hundreds of antiwar committees and left-oriented "single-issue and multi-issue" groups that had sprung up throughout the country.

Mr. Pepper said he once was a campaign coordinator for Senator Robert F. Kennedy in Westchester County but that in his present activity he was not "fronting for Senator Kennedy."

A MEETING WITH KENNEDY

Senator Kennedy has shown interest in the New Left and some time ago had a long talk with Mr. Lynd and Mr. Hayden at his home here. The meeting was arranged by Mr. Newfield, who is working on a biography of the Senator.

It was an aide of Dr. King, the Rev. James Bevel, who served as national director of the Spring Mobilization. The protest idea was originally conceived by pacifists around the Rev. A. J. Muste, who died last Feb. 11.

While Dr. King jolted the civil rights movement by saying that it was vitally connected with the campaign against the war in Vietnam, leftists became prominent in the mobilization campaign. Some moderates withdrew.

The antiwar rally on April 15 in San Francisco's 62,000-seat Kezar Stadium, which was almost filled, was directed by a 21-year-old Trotskyite, Kipp Dawson. Outside the stadium, members of a Los Angeles-based pro-Peking group, wearing homemade uniforms with red-star insignia, sold copies of the "little red book" anthology of Chairman Mao Tse-tung's thoughts. The Maoists had denounced the April 15 demonstrations as a "revisionist Trotskyite betrayal," but did not pass up its possibilities for propaganda.

The W. E. B. DuBois Clubs, widely regarded as an unofficial youth arm of the Communist Party, U. S. A., played a subdued role in the antiwar drive or were missing altogether. Leftists of various shades wondered why.

An attempt to obtain an explanation at the Chicago national headquarters of the clubs was unsuccessful. The two-room office in the Great Lakes Building, 180 North Wacker Drive, was closed, and the telephone was disconnected.

A THEORY ABOUT THE CLUBS

Some DuBois Clubs have ceased their advertising of activities in local student publications. A Negro undergraduate had his own theory of why the clubs, which are named after a dead Negro Marxist scholar, seem dormant:

"The Communist Party desperately wants to look liberal and respectable. These DuBois cats, square as they are, are too swingin' for the party bureaucrats."

A former DuBois leader, Michael Myerson, is director of a newly formed Tri-Continental Information Center here that, according to an announcement last week, "has established contacts with anti-imperialist organizations and movements throughout the world." Among the sponsors are Communist party members such as Dr. Aptheker, S.D.S. backers and Dr. Spock.

Mr. Myerson, a 26-year-old University of California graduate, said the members of the center were offering their services and support as individuals and not as representatives of any organizations. The group has an office at 1133 Broadway and a two-man staff. It said it would issue a monthly bulletin and a series of pamphlets and would send fact-finding missions "to areas suffering from United States domination."

Students for a Democratic Society, too, is branching out internationally. A new Radical Education Project calls for creation of a network of "scholars, journalists, leftist youth leaders, government officials, guerrilla leaders, etc.," to gather international intelligence on insurgent movements and foreign policy developments.

The Young Socialist Alliance, an appendage of the Trotskyite Socialist Workers party, thoroughly committed its small but disciplined membership to the Spring Mobilization demonstration.

The Trotskyites' advocacy of all-embracing, "nonexclusive" antiwar alliances is met with deep distrust by many New Left adherents.

"LIARS," A STUDENT SAYS

"The Trotskyites are liars and just want to take over the entire left," a Harvard University student said.

A visitor to the Spring Mobilization headquarters in San Francisco, a few days after the April 15 demonstrations, found the organizing committee's director there, the petite Miss Dawson, counting money contributions and arranging for the payment of bills.

It quickly developed during an interview that Miss Dawson's revolutionary idol is Che Guevara.

"The Cuban revolution is the most exciting thing that has happened in our time," said the Young Socialist Alliance activist, who was not yet born when Leon Trotsky was murdered in Mexico in 1940.

Trotsky, one of the chief organizers of the Russian October Revolution of 1917, advocated world revolution and establishment of uncompromising "pure" Communism. He was forced into exile by Stalin. Followers of Trotsky's doctrine of "permanent revolution" are influential in some Latin-American countries.

While the heirs of the old left thus identify with Che Guevara, his book "Guerrilla Warfare"—and not Mao's little red book—is becoming part of the young radicals' field kit.

Still on their required reading list is Albert Camus, the Algerian-born French author and moralist who groped for secular saintliness without God and would not cross the "tragic dividing line" from nonviolence to violence. But Camus seems to be losing ground on campuses to Major Guevara and to Frantz Fanon, the late psychiatrist from Martinique who glorified the Algerian war and wrote, in "The Wretched of the Earth," a passionate manifesto for global revolution.

"I'm just reading Fanon," remarked Miss Zeiger on the Berkeley campus. "I think I prefer Camus."

But then, she is old New Left.

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, the Washington, D.C., Post last Saturday published a statement by Howard University President James M. Nabrit, Jr.

In one portion of the statement, President Nabrit superbly set out the role of the university, and the student in today's troubled academic community. He said:

> Each right of an individual places a reciprocal responsibility upon others: the responsibility to permit the individual to exercise that right. The student, as a member of the academic community, has both rights and responsibilities. Within that community, the student's most essential right is the right to learn. The University has a responsibility to provide for the student that environment and those protections and opportunities which best promote the learning process in all its aspects. Hence, the University will not tolerate any action which interferes with the right of students to learn, including freedom of discussion of both sides of a controversial issue.
>
> The student, in turn, has responsibilities to his fellow members of the University community, the most important of which is to refrain from interference with those rights that promote essential purposes and processes of this community.

Mr. President, I particularly applaud the emphasis this statement gives to the responsibility side of the ledger. Rights mean little if responsibilities are not fulfilled. Freedom of discussion on our campuses means little if it is one sided or if the search for truth is perverted by attempts to mislead.

S. 35—INCOME TAX OF SINGLE PERSONS

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, on the opening day of this Congress I introduced S. 35, the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to extend the head of household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers and individuals who have attained age 35 and who have never been married or who have been separated or divorced for 3 years or more, who maintain their own households.

The measure is designed to reduce a tax inequity which discriminates against single persons and is similar to bills which I introduced in the 87th, 88th, and 89th Congresses. I am pleased to have joining me as sponsors of S. 35, Senators Carlson, Cooper, Gruening, Hart, McGee, Mondale, Moss, Prouty, Randolph, Smith, Scott, and Young of North Dakota; and I am hopeful that a majority of the Senate will support this change when we bring it before the Senate for action.

The discrimination against single persons which this bill seeks to reduce has been in the Internal Revenue Code since 1948. In that year, Congress extended income-splitting to married couples for the Federal income tax. The purpose was to adjust the Federal code to provisions in several State tax laws, but the result has been a tax inequity against single persons. The action taken by Congress in 1948, of course, did not change the rate of tax as between single and married persons, but it did change the rate of progression to the higher rates as income increases.

Under the tax-splitting provision, the income of a married couple is treated as though it were equal portions of income from two individuals. This advantage is granted regardless of the amount the spouse earns or even whether the spouse earns any income at all. It also applies whether the married couple have dependent children—although one of the arguments made for income splitting was that married couples had the costs and responsibilities of rearing children.

The tax advantage is small at the lowest levels, but it increases rapidly. The point of the highest percentage of tax advantage to a married couple is about the $24,000 level. Under 1966 rates, the tax paid by a single person on a $24,000 taxable income is $8,030. On the same taxable income a married couple filing a joint return would pay a tax of only $5,660. The difference is $2,370, or nearly 30 percent in favor of a married couple filing a joint return.

The inequity of the provision was modified in 1951, when we approved the category of head of household for some single persons who maintain a household for certain dependents or who maintain a separate household for parents. The head of household tax status gives them about half of the tax advantage that married couples receive if they file a joint return.

There is not much prospect for a comprehensive revision of the code at this time, but we should make limited adjustments to reduce the most serious inequities. It is my view that one important step which should be taken is to reduce the discrimination against widows and widowers and against single persons—at least those single persons who have attained age 35 and who are maintaining a household of their own.

The discrimination is particularly severe against single women age 35 or over. At this age they generally are required to maintain their own household because of their occupation, their place in society, or simply for the sake of decency and convenience in living. Often at this age they are expected to—and do—make special contributions for the support of relatives and for social and civic welfare. They have the responsibilities and expenses of maintaining a household, and the tax law should take account of their status.

A recent column by Sylvia Porter deals with the discrimination against single persons in the tax law, and I ask unanimous consent that her article, which appeared in the Washington Star, April 30, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

U.S. Tax Unfair to Unwed

(By Sylvia Porter)

Sally is a single woman living alone in a New York City apartment and supporting herself by her earnings as a secretary. A fortnight ago Sally mailed her 1966 income tax return and paid an income tax which unfairly discriminates against her because of her marital status.

Joe is a bachelor also living alone in a midtown apartment, who supports himself and an aged aunt in a different household by his earnings as a junior executive. Joe has just mailed his 1966 tax return and paid a tax which unjustly penalizes him not only because he is single but also because his dependent is not his mother but the aunt who reared him after his mother's death—and therefore, he does not qualify for "head of household" status.

Our current federal income laws are biased against the single individual, both in application of tax rates and in personal exemptions.

CALLED INDEFENSIBLE

The discrimination is indefensible. It adds a harsh financial blow to the emotional one the single status imposes, particularly on the never-married middle-aged woman.

If you are a married couple and have just filed a joint return for 1966, you have paid an income tax which is equivalent to what you would have paid if each of you had reported separately and paid tax on half your total income at single person rates. You have, in effect, "split your income" to achieve a substantial tax advantage.

If you are single and you have reported the same total income as this married couple, you have paid your income tax at the much higher rate applied to the full total. You have no advantage comparable to income splitting.

If you are married with no children and living in a three-room apartment, you are entitled to two personal exemptions of $600 each to help you reduce the taxes you owe on your income.

MANY COSTS ARE SAME

If you are single and living in an identical apartment on another floor of the same building, you are entitled to only one personal exemption of $600. Many of your overhead costs are the same and your living expenses are much more than half those of the childless married couple, but the personal exemption rules in our tax laws do not recognize this reality.

If you are unmarried but support close relatives, you may be able to get head of household status and preferred tax treatment.

If you too are unmarried but support people not closely related, you cannot get this status or preferred tax treatment.

In a major study of our income tax structure last fall, Joseph A. Pechman, director of economic studies for the Brookings Institution, zeroed in on the discrimination against single taxpayers, but his findings received meager attention.

As I know Sally and Joe, so you know (or are) their counterparts, for there are millions like them the nation over.

The inequities have crept into our tax structure by miscalculation and historical accident. The personal exemptions were set to protect very low income people and to help families with large numbers of children. Little thought was given to the single middle-income man or woman. Income splitting was adopted in 1948 to give to the rest of the country the tax advantages of the states which at the end of World War II had community property laws and which treated income as if divided equally between husband and wife.

But in Pechman's words: "The needs of a household do not increase in proportion to the number of people in the household. . . . Present exemptions do not cover the rock-bottom economy standard for single persons and married couples with no children but are more than adequate for families of six or more."

As for income splitting, Pechman says, "The practical effect is to produce large differences in the tax burdens of single persons and married couples, differences which depend on the rate of gradation and not on the level of rates. Such differences are difficult to rationalize on any grounds. Moreover, it is difficult to justify treating single persons with families more harshly than married persons in similar circumstances."

Vietnam or no, tax reform again will become a major target in 1968. This, therefore, is the time for you, America's millions of single taxpayers, to start putting pressure on Congress for elimination of the discrimination against you—via increases in your personal exemptions, liberalization of head of household provisions or other devices.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota. I believe that this matter is one of the real injustices of our tax structure at the present time, and I am happy that he has introduced the bill. This problem should have and must have consideration by this session of Congress, in order to treat fairly many of the people involved.

Mr. McCARTHY. I thank the Senator.

TRIBUTE TO 1ST SGT. SAM K. SOLOMON

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in a war which has tested the fighting qualities of the American serviceman and found him both capable and courageous, no higher accolade can be accorded the combat soldier than the deep and lasting respect of his own comrade in arms. Such a mark of special recognition has come to a Hawaii soldier whose heroism in Vietnam has become legendary among men of the 25th Infantry Division.

Last November 3, 1st Sgt. Sam K. Solomon, of Kohala, Island of Hawaii, gave his life while rescuing wounded men in his company. His self-sacrifice under enemy fire was so conspicuous, his helmet has become a symbol of the man and his deed. The story of Sergeant Solomon and his helmet is related poignantly in an article written by Associated Press correspondent Al Chang.

In tribute to the memory of a gallant Hawaii solider, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "No GI Can Fill This Helmet," published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of May 3, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 3, 1967]

MEMORIAL TO ISLE SOLDIER—NO GI CAN FILL THIS HELMET

(By Al Chang)

CU CHI, VIETNAM.—In the corner of the orderly room of "Charley" company, 1st battalion, 27th Wolfhounds, there is a shiny helmet liner emblazoned with the stripes of a first sergeant, the Wolfhound crest and the taro leaf patch of the 25th Infantry Division.

Newcomers are warned forcefully not to touch it.

Then when they are filled in on the history and traditions of the Wolfhounds, they are told what the helmet liner means.

It belonged to Sam K. Solomon, a tall tough soldier from Kohala, Hawaii. He left it in the orderly room last November when he went into the field with "Charley" company at the start of Operation Attleboro.

On November 3 the outfit was in heavy action, and Solomon moved out alone eight times into the dense bush to bring back wounded men. Then, halting for a breather, the big first sergeant was shot and killed by a sniper.

"He was one of my finest soldiers," said Major General Fred C. Weyland, who was commanding general of the 25th at that time. "He didn't have to come to Vietnam because he was the lone survivor in his family, but he volunteered to be with his men. His death was a most tragic loss to our country."

After Solomon died, the men of his unit made sure the helmet liner stayed where he left it as a memorial to the man they consider "the first soldier of the Wolfhounds." It is shined carefully every day.

"I had been in the company only four months when he was killed," said Sergeant George R. Tabor of Chicago, Illinois, the company clerk. "During that time I got to know him well. When he was killed, I was really hit hard. It was like losing a father. He was the type that if you were in danger and hit, he would come out after you and he did.

"That helmet in the corner of this orderly room is for him, and, like everyone else, I'll see to it that it will remain there and we'll all keep it shining."

When Solomon was killed, Charles J. Buckley of Bryan, Texas, took over as "C" company's top kick. He shares the feeling for the almost legendary Solomon.

"When I came into this company and heard about his feats and saw his helmet lined in one corner of my orderly room, I got a great feeling of respect for this man," Buckley said.

"Nobody is going to be allowed to touch that helmet," he went on. "It's a living memorial to a fine and great soldier. It's a reminder of the courageous acts of our first sergeant. When I leave, I'll pass the word along to my replacement.

"Since I took his place, a couple of people tried to manhandle the helmet, not knowing what it meant. They nearly got shot."

Solomon had a reputation for being a tough sergeant when new men joined his unit, but he made soldiers out of them and they came to respect and love him. His service now has become legendary and the shiny helmet liner serves as a constant reminder of the man and his deeds.

"We had 12 people left in the company who knew Solomon when he was first sergeant," said First Lieutenant Thomas L. Coldren of Hughes, Arkansas, company executive officer. "When new men arrive they are told of the traditions of the Wolfhounds and the helmet is shown to them.

"It has become a symbol. No one can fill that helmet."

PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON URBAN GROWTH

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, representatives of the United States and a number of Pacific Basin nations convened this week in Honolulu for the first Pacific Conference on Urban Growth.

In his welcoming remarks, Gov. John A. Burns, of Hawaii, noted that many of the most imaginative programs relating to urban growth are in Asia rather than in the West.

Governor Burns painted a grim picture of what we can expect if we do not "nurture and promote that essential human dignity which each man must have."

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Governor's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY GOV. JOHN A. BURNS, PACIFIC CONFERENCE ON URBAN GROWTH, KENNEDY THEATRE, EAST-WEST CENTER, MAY 1, 1967

It is my pleasure, on behalf of the people of the State of Hawaii, to extend to all of our distinguished guests our very warmest Aloha. This conference, which has brought delegates from throughout the Pacific-Asian world to Hawaii, once again demonstrates that Hawaii is playing its destined role as the meeting place of East and West. As the 50th State of our Union, situated almost halfway between the great land masses of North and South America and that of Asia, we are delighted to serve as the bridge over which those of different cultures can walk the path to mutual understanding, to peace, and to co-operative efforts to solve the many problems which confront us.

We are pleased, as host for this conference, to represent all of the states of the United States and their deep and common concern with the problems of urban growth. The topics we will be discussing at this conference have relevance not only for Hawaii and the nations you represent but for most of our sister states; and our conclusions will be of interest to all urbanized societies. Increasingly in this country we are developing the concept of "creative federalism" in which the federal government, the states, and the cities co-operate in meeting the vast and complicated problems of urban growth and in which they in turn call on private industry and the voluntary associations for assistance and aid. "Creative federalism" then is a kind of partnership approach which invites and fosters innovative ideas, diverse involvement, and multiple sources of criticism of present approaches and proposals. It is based on the belief that only through the combined and best efforts of all of us will we even achieve partial solution of our major urban problems. This "creative federalism" makes many of us important participants in urban development including state governors, members of our state legislatures, and heads of state departments, as well as federal and city officials, labor, business, church and professional leaders, and private citizens. We at the federal, state, and city levels in the United States are still struggling to work out the substance and form of "creative federalism." We do know, however, that it involves all of us intimately in the problems of urban growth.

There can be no conscientious citizen today who is not deeply troubled by the plight of our cities both in your nations and in mine. The world is rapidly becoming urbanized. While there may be those who would lament it, the forces of science, technology, and related phenomena are such that increasing urbanization seems inevitable. And while there are exceptions, generally speaking the world has not adjusted well to this growing urbanization. We have permitted slums and hovels to develop. We have hardly begun to cope with our mounting transportation problems. And sometimes when we have moved to replace inadequate and unattractive housing, we have ended up creating modern slums conducive neither to family living nor community spirit. The time has come for all of the nations of the world to be particularly honest, one with the other; to face up squarely to the inadequacies of both our conceptual thinking about the problems of the city and to our inability to implement much of our new thinking; to make a massive but intelligent attack on the problems which are with us now; to project ourselves far enough into the future so that we do not develop instruments of urban growth that merely offer temporary solutions to present problems and actually increase our difficulties ten, twenty, or fifty years hence.

One of the most propitious elements of this conference is that our Asian friends and neighbors are joining with us in this consideration. For if one looks with care, he finds that many of the most imaginative programs relating to urban growth are in Asia rather than in the West. Who could have been in Singapore without admiring what has been done there in the building of new housing? And in a number of your nations you have dealt intelligently with the always difficult political problem of squatters. Tokyo with its electric railway has given all the world pause and caused us to take a second look at our sometimes unimaginative attempts to solve the mass transit problem. And representing a state which did not have sufficient foresight to provide adequate land for its state university, I cannot but envy the planning that has apparently been done at the University of Malaysia in Kuala Lumpur. For all of these and many other accomplishments, your nations are to be commended. And we are fortunate that you have come to this conference to give us the benefit of your experience and planning.

It is extremely easy to become discouraged and disturbed about mankind's plight. One can think of, and in many cases see, so many evidences of where we have placed profit ahead of human beings, where we have worshipped function and disregarded style, where we have been opportunistic rather than brotherly. Examples of these processes exist all over the world. No nation and no part of any nation is free from them—the depressing industrial complexes in parts of England; the grimness and poverty of squatter villages in some Asian cities; or the unhappy slum ghettos of America.

When one views all of this it appears that man is, indeed, a sorry creature and there seems little hope for him to plan his salvation.

But somehow I sense a quickened concern for the problems of the human spirit throughout the world, a deeper recognition that man lives not by bread alone. But all that we produce, all the affluence which we can attain, will taste as ashes if they do not nurture and promote that essential human dignity which each man must have. It is possible that a new age is upon us. All of us, from time to time, are irritated with the sometimes seemingly irrational activities of the young. And indeed some of these activities are exactly that: contributing nothing to the human enterprise and even, in fact, tending to destroy such good as has been achieved. But if one looks with care and casts aside his predispositions toward judging everything in terms of himself, one sees at least a core of young people who are crying out to us—in all honesty and with all sincerity in the best way they know how—that affluence is not enough. They are asking the questions beyond affluence, the questions which we in our anxiety to achieve our economic ends did not permit to be of concern to us. Affluence for what? Economic security for what? What is the end of man? How does our new technology meet the fundamental needs of human nature? These are good questions, too long left unattended; and difficult as they are to resolve we must face them,

And in relation to the subject of this conference, one can draw fresh hope from the fact that in some places major problems of urbanization have been met with resolve and intelligence. The Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, of 1936 almost always had over it a low-lying bank of smog created by the great industrial complex that had located there and been permitted to exist without any regard for the human beings who were operating it. So bad did the condition in the area become that in nearby Donora one bitter weekend many people were killed. But the community leaders, both public and private, of the city of Pittsburgh finally saw what they were doing to themselves and all their fellow citizens, and we had what has come to be called The Pittsburgh Renaissance.

Smoke and pollution of the air have not been eliminated, but they have been effectively controlled. The dilapidated run-down unhappy area known as The Point, which is where the Ohio and Monongahela Rivers meet, is now a beautiful park-like development with magnificent buildings on it. These civil leaders in Pittsburgh have changed that city from one where corporations used to have great difficulty in getting talented executives to serve to a city where the living conditions are—if not perfect—quite good, indeed. And one could repeat this example a number of times and throughout the world on all the continents. This seems to me to be the evidence that all is not lost. Man, under the proper circumstances, does have the ability to cure urban blight. He can articulate alternatives and provide options which offer some hope of enlarging human freedom and contributing to the development of responsible men. He can expand the range of viable and real choices in terms of the style of life people choose to lead. He can attend to the functional aspects of our economy but do it in such a way that the human spirit can soar and we can live the kinds of lives that free men are entitled to live.

Man can establish institutions that are concerned with the problems of urban growth, both theoretically and practically. Thus our universities through research and education may provide us with real assistance in helping us to understand the problems we face today and those that will be upon us tomorrow, and then assist us to solve these problems. In Hawaii, for example, we have a unique institution—the East-West Center—devoted to promoting mutual understanding. Among the concerns of its constituent institutes have been the processes and effects of the urbanization which we are considering at this conference. Furthermore, at this time, the University of Hawaii is considering the establishment of an educational program in public policy planning which should enhance the opportunities for those of us of Asia, the Pacific, and America to examine together the planning processes and the policy problems that are common to our nations, regions, and cities and to prepare ourselves to deal with them. In addition to educational institutions, we in America rely heavily on a wide variety of voluntary associations including citizen groups, churches, unions, business and industry groups, and professional associations to participate in solving the pressing urban problems that confront our people. The vitality of 'creative federalism,' which I spoke of earlier, is dependent upon the willingness of the individual to participate in the urban process as a member of these institutions and as a private citizen. Thus, the initiative of the individual is the cornerstone on which our society rests its hopes of progress; this is the same individual whose human spirit ought to soar and who ought to live the kind of life free men are entitled to live.

The problems of urban growth, which bring us together here today for mutual consideration over the next 12 days, are the problems of all humanity.

They are, by and large, problems common to all societies.

From country to country, from state to state, from city to city, from village to village, there are the full range of differences in the modes and standards of living of people.

Fundamentally, however, urban growth creates problems common to all peoples—whether in Honolulu or Hong Kong, Chicago or Cairo, Taipei or Tokyo, Singapore or Stockholm.

Wherever and whenever man congregates to live together in an organized society, problems arise in housing, in providing public services in water and power, in transportation and in other requirements of communal living.

If urban problems give us any comfort at all, it is in the proof they give us that no society is more equal than any other in this area—we are all afflicted with common growing pains.

Urban growth offers a challenge, therefore, to all of us.

The road to the development of the present Constitution of the United States of America was difficult, troubled, and rocky. It started with a revolution and then proceeded through a number of ineffective attempts to devise a new government for our states including the Articles of Confederation which functioned so badly that it began to appear that the revolution had been fought in vain. Finally there came the Constitutional Convention of 1787, but even then there was no end of disagreement. Many compromises were necessary before the venture could be brought to a successful conclusion. Finally, the Constitution was signed by all the members present, but three. While the last members were signing it Benjamin Franklin, looking toward the President's chair, at the back of which a rising sun happened to be painted, observed to a few members near him, that painters had found it difficult to distinguish in their art a rising from a setting sun. "I have," said he, "often in the course of the Session, and the vicissitudes of my hopes and fears as to its issue, looked at that behind the President without being able to tell whether it was rising or setting: But now at length I have the happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting sun."

Today, I, too, believe I see a rising—not a setting—sun.

Mahalo!

RETIREMENT OF CARROLL KENWORTHY FROM UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I understand that Carroll Kenworthy will retire Tuesday after 37 years of reporting the Washington scene for the foreign clients of United Press International. For the past 26 years, he has been head of the foreign department at UPI's Washington bureau.

Kenworthy's reputation with his colleagues has been earned by his equanimity in a crisis and his reliability on all occasions. Perhaps the greatest newsbeat of his career came a week before Pearl Harbor, when he wrote a story—later cited by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson at the joint congressional committee investigating the lack of preparedness at Pearl Harbor—saying it was felt that "talks between Secretary Hull and the special Japanese Envoy, Saburo Kurusu, are near collapse" and "it is believed Japan may strike."

Kenworthy is the son of a Quaker minister, and he has remained active in the Quaker Society of Friends. He received a bachelor's degree from Earlham College, Indiana, in 1925, and later served as trustee for that college from 1954 to 1963. After receiving his master's degree from Columbia in 1927, he acquired newspaper experience on the Hartford Courant, the Tokyo, Japan, Advertiser, and the Wall Street Journal before joining what was then the United Press as diplomatic reporter in Washington in 1930.

His accuracy and dependability will be missed on the Washington news scene, and I join his colleagues in wishing him many happy years of retirement.

THE GREAT ATTRIBUTES OF KANSAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, we in Kansas are proud of our position as "Midway-U.S.A." and one of the businessmen in the State who is continually calling attention to the great attributes of Kansas is Fred Kimball, senior vice president and director of Kansas Gas & Electric Co. in Wichita.

The enthusiasm with which Fred Kimball sells his company and his State is captured in full measure by an article written by Dick Dilsaver, Wichita Beacon editor. Mr. President, I ask consent that the article, published in the Wichita Beacon of May 4, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

K.G. & E.'s Fred Kimball Claims Job "Is Anything Dealing With People"

(By Dick Dilsaver)

If you're a salesman, you need a prospect before you can make a sale.

Fred Kimball found a sure way to locate prospects in 1929 when, at the brash age of 20, he started selling appliances for Kansas Electric Power Co. at Leavenworth, Kan.

He offered a new-fangled product, the electric refrigerator. To find who needed one, he simply followed this iceman.

When he'd come to a house where a sign in the window said ICE—that's how the housewife who needed her icebox filled signalled the ice man to stop—Kimball knew he had a genuine prospect. He set a sales record his first month on the job.

Fred Kimball has been selling successfully ever since. Today as a senior vice president and director of Kansas Gas and Electric Co., he's selling electricity and promoting the sale of the many products that use it. But he works just as hard at selling Wichita and Kansas.

Kimball learned about hard work at an age when most fellows are finding out more about girls, mumblety-peg and how to throw a curve ball.

He did his share of the chores while being raised as the fifth of six children on a corn-country farm near the Missouri River in northeast Nebraska.

By the time he was 13 he was jerking sodas and clerking in drug stores 50 hours a week—up to 90 hours in summer—to aid his widowed mother. Even a move to sunny Albuquerque hadn't saved his father from tuberculosis.

A year at the University of New Mexico preceded the job at Leavenworth which started his career in utilities that now has spanned 38 years. He had hopes of flying lessons at Kansas City and part-time study at the University of Kansas in Lawrence, but "there always seemed to be work to do."

He moved up the pole in Kansas Electric Power (it's Kansas Power and Light now) with transfers to Parsons and Lawrence, then switched in 1939 to Missouri Public Service Co. at Warrensburg, Mo. World War II was served in Washington as an administrator and analyst for the Office of War Utilities Division, War Production Board.

Some men who liked to fish as avidly as Kimball does wouldn't have budged from his post-war spot, promotion manager for Portland, Oreg., Gas and Coke Co. He'd found a glacier-fed stream on Mount Hood he could reach in 90 minutes after lunch, catch a basketfull of rainbow trout and be home by dark.

The man who induced Kimball to leave that was Gordon Evans, now KG&E board chairman and president, who many a Wichita businessman will agree has a persuasive way about him.

The two men had worked together in Missouri before the war. Evans, then executive vice-president of KG&E, hired Kimball to come here as general sales manager.

"It's the happiest move I ever made," says Kimball. That includes fishing. "We have great fishing. I soon learned that landing a Kansas big-mouth black bass on a spinning rod is more fun than catching trout in Oregon." Mostly he fishes Wichita area farm ponds, using "anything and everything" for lures, but favoring Mepps spinners. His top bass catch scaled 5½ pounds.

Kimball's first assignment here was to expand the KG&E sales program with emphasis on development of industry. In 1956 he was named vice president, with personnel administration and public information added to his realm. He was elected to the board of directors a year ago and this February was named senior vice president. He describes his job as "anything in the company that deals with people."

The electric business isn't the same as when he came here. Christmas Eve once was the day of the year when use of electricity reached its peak. Then came air conditioning. Huge power plans were built to meet the increased need, which now peaks in summer, usually the third weekday of a hot spell.

That expansion also brought problems. The entire generating capacity was needed only a few days a year. The rest of the time it stood idle, yet it represented great investment and fixed costs—such as taxes, interest, depreciation—which continued year around.

The industry pondered the problem and came up with this answer: make it feasible and economical to heat complete homes and businesses through electricity, thus using more electricity in winter.

"There's been an astounding change in just four or five years," says Kimball. "Of 1,450 living units—homes and apartments—on which construction started in the KG&E service area last year, 615 or 42.4 percent used electricity as the only source of energy."

He practices what he preaches. The home he built at 550 N. Armour in Woodlawn Village a few years back is so all-electric that the driveway is wired to melt ice and snow. Even the dog house is all-electric.

A person trying to get a head start on Kimball would stumble in the dark.

He's up sometimes at 4:45 a.m. and always by 5:30. Mrs. Kimball is, too. She sets out orange juice and coffee while he gets the paper.

"Nothing would upset me more than if the paper boy were late," he says. "I'm an inveterate newspaper fan and read every Beacon and every Eagle from front to back. Even when I'm away on business, the family saves every copy and I read them when I return."

Kimball reaches his seventh-floor office at First and Market before 8 and starts by distributing a healthy stack of work and assignments he completed at home the night before.

A high proportion of his time is devoted to community development.

"Kansas, particularly southeast Kansas and Wichita, have been very good to me," he says. "I feel I should do anything I can to return any of these benefits to the area."

What he considers "anything" is just about everything. Here's just a partial list of the positions he's held:

President, Wichita Area Chamber of Commerce; president, United Fund; founder and president, Kansas Sales Executive Club; board chairman, Wichita Area Development Inc.; vice-president and director, Metropolitan YMCA; national council and Quivira council, Boy Scouts of America; vice-president and director, Sedgwick County Mental Health Assn.; founder, South Central Kansas Economic Development Council; a trustee, member of executive committee and chairman of development committee, Wesley Medical Center; vice president and trustee, Midwest Medical Research Foundation.

Where does he find time for such service? "When things need doing in the community, you simply take whatever time it needs," he said.

Now, he's president-elect of Rotary Club, where he's completed a cycle of sorts. In other communities he was a member of Lions and Kiwanis. Other affiliations are Wichita Club and Wichita Country Club. The Kimballs are members of East Heights Methodist Church.

Among his fondest honors he counts the 1961 Man of the Year award presented by Public Relations Society of Wichita for his work on "Focal Point U.S.A.," a KG&E promotion depicting the attributes of this area. In 1964, he was named Salesman of the Year by the Sales and Marketing Executives Club, again for boosting Kansas and Wichita.

"Kansans need to be proud of our area's advantages," he says.

Like climate—"We are blessed here by four true seasons without monotonous long-time extremes like some of the so-called glamour spots."

And location—"Kansas is becoming the population center and the best place in America to produce goods for all of America."

And recreation—"We have splendid facilities for all the most popular participation sports like bowling, golf, fishing, hunting, swimming, picnicking and boating, and sports spectators in Kansas see some of the finest college teams in the nation."

The next project Kimball wants to see moving faster and further is the Mid-Arkansas Valley Development Assn. (MAVDA). He's a member of the MAVDA executive committee pushing for a comprehensive study of the Arkansas River and tributaries from Tulsa to the Colorado headwaters.

"This study is long overdue," Kimball says, "A complete one never has been made even though the Arkansas is the fifth longest river in the United States. We must learn and consider the best ways to conserve this river's resources and develop navigation, municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, irrigation and recreation. We need also to evaluate the aesthetic contributions which can be made to our city and state."

Recently Kimball has been making a not-always-successful effort to cut down on night meetings so he can spend more time with his family. It includes his wife, the former Anita Bazer Lantz; daughter Sandra, 17; and twin sons Larry and Leigh, 13.

But one activity defies cutting—Wichita State University sporting events. He's vice president of Century Club which boosts the Shockers, and a director of WSU Physical Education Corp., which governs the school's sports operations. He's always at WSU games, shouting "Go, Shockers!"

Just as in other settings he's always cheering "Go, Wichitans!" and "Go, Kansans!"—not from the sidelines but from the thick of the action.

NATIONAL SCHOOL SAFETY PATROL WEEK

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, this week will mark a time of great pride for the 900,000 safety patrol volunteers who promote school safety in all 50 States.

Safety patrol members from throughout the United States will assemble in Washington, D.C., to commemorate more than 40 years of continued high civic service, to march in a spectacular parade—and to honor those young persons who have distinguished themselves in the cause of school traffic safety.

To provide national recognition to this annual event, I have introduced legislation to establish on a permanent basis that the second week in May every year be designated "National School Safety Patrol Week."

This designation from the Federal Government would be a token of the gratitude Americans—particularly those of us who are parents—feel for the safety patrol teams. They can be justly proud of their work.

I am equally proud to announce that among the 22,000 youngsters who will gather this week in Washington for the safety patrol tribute will be 215 boys and girls from my State of Connecticut—and that five Connecticut youths will be singled out for honors in the 1967 National School Traffic Safety Poster Contest.

A $500 savings bond is the prize one Connecticut boy—12-year-old Alexander Baker, of Branford—will be awarded in an honors program in the Federal Aviation Agency building here.

Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, will make the presentation.

Young Mr. Baker, who lives at 149 Linden Avenue, in Branford, entered his poster in the "Cross Only at Corners" category. He competed against some 17,000 youngsters from 2,200 schools across the Nation.

The other Connecticut finalists—all of whom entered the "Wear White After Dark" category—are:

Thomas Ardise, of 96 Colonial Road, Stamford. First place, elementary school division.

Michael Roth, of 1 Marshall Place, Branford. Second place, elementary school division.

Joseph Verrilli, of 62 Fourth Street, Bridgeport. Second place, primary school division.

Christopher McAuliffe, of 31 Parkwood Drive, Windsor. Honorable mention, primary school division.

I congratulate these fine youngsters for their posters and the awards they will receive. They have represented their State well.

At these same award ceremonies Thursday, Secretary Boyd will also present the American Automobile Association's Gold Lifesaver Medals to nine safety patrol members who actually saved a life in a traffic incident.

Then, the nine Lifesaver Medal winners will ride at the head of the 31st annual National School Safety Patrol Parade Saturday.

The parade—highlighted by 80 marching bands, 50 floats and hundreds of majorettes—is expected to last six hours and is one of the most colorful yearly processions in the Nation's Capital.

Secretary Boyd will be the grand marshal and the U.S. Army Band will lead the way. The parade will march down historic Constitution Avenue starting at 9 a.m. In the reviewing stand will be Members of Congress, Cabinet officers and diplomats.

The parade will be an impressive sight—a fitting tribute to the dedication and sense of high purpose the school traffic safety patrol program represents.

WITH THE GREATEST RESPECT—PLEASE, UNCLE SAM

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, a Cheyenne, Wyo., citizen, Mr. Jack Mabee, who is president of the Chief Oil Corp., and Chief Enterprises, has placed a paid advertisement in a recent edition of one of the newspapers in his city—the Wyoming Eagle.

Mr. Mabee's advertisement commanded the largest portion of a full page and took the form of a plea to Uncle Sam from a "citizen, taxpayer, and businessman, insofar as Government and taxes permit," to rationalize the dilemma many taxpayers find themselves in today.

Mr. President, I cannot help thinking that the majority of American citizens perhaps find themselves in the same "pickle" as Mr. Mabee—that of attempting to "make both ends meet" at a time when the cost of living is at an alltime high and still rising, and the frustration and difficulty of rationalizing the actions of the Great Society is almost overwhelming.

I can certainly understand this gentleman's consternation, and I believe he makes some worthwhile points in his advertisement.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Mabee's statement of April 26, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH THE GREATEST RESPECT—PLEASE, UNCLE SAM

"Hey, Uncle, how much does it cost to rear a child? You allow us taxpaying parents only $600 a year to clothe, feed, house and train a youngster. In your Federal Job Corps you spend $7,000 a year! Now which is the correct figure? Either we're allowing you too much or you're not allowing us enough.

"You allow tax-paying parents $600 deduction for the care and feeding at each child. Yet, under the Cuban refugee program you assume minimum upkeep requires $1,200 a year—and if the Cuban boy or girl is attending school an extra $1,000 a year.

"How come you short change the home folks, Uncle? In the austere environs of a federal prison, you have discovered that it costs—to maintain one person, with no frills, no luxuries and no borrowing Dad's car—$2,300 per year. By what rule of thumb do you estimate that Mom and Dad can do it for one-fourth of that amount?

"Under Social Security, you will pay $158 a month to maintain the elderly. What makes you think we can maintain our young'uns on $50 a month? And, Uncle, your Vista program (Volunteers in Service to America) spent $3.1 million last year to train only 202 trainees. That indicates that the cost of maintaining and training one youth for one year is more than $15,000. Then how come we taxpayers get an exemption of $600 to maintain and train one youth for a year?

"Or let's see how much you spent upkeeping one youngster in military uniform. House $55.00 a month. Food, $30.27 a month. Clothing upkeep, $4.20 a month. That comes to $1,074.04 a year. How in the world do you expect parents to provide all these things, plus clothes, recreation, books, medicine—for $600 a year? With your figures, Uncle, you admit it can't be done.

"Is it possible, Uncle Sam, that you expect us parents to manage more efficiently than you do, because we usually do? With all our expenses, we American individuals have more than enough in savings to offset our debts. You don't.

"With all our prosperity, you, Uncle, are still spending per year $2.9 billion more for relief than during the depths of depression. So it just may be that you are uncommonly extravagant.

"Regardless of how we try to rationalize and explain you and excuse you, it is still

a hurtful affront when you allow us working, dues-paying home folks only $600 a year to rear a legitimate child—while you, under ADC, will pay more than $800 a year to upkeep an illegitimate one."

This advertisement is paid for, personally, by the undersigned, who is a Citizen, Taxpayer and a Businessman, insofar as Government and taxes permit.

(Signed) JACK MABEE,
President, Chief Oil Corp., and Chief Enterprises.

HARRY S. TRUMAN—A VERY GREAT PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, today marks the 83d birthday of President Harry S. Truman, one of the greatest Americans of all time. It has been given to few men in history to serve his Nation and mankind as has Harry Truman throughout a lifetime of public service. He was a great U.S. Senator, a great citizen, and a great President of the United States.

Not only is he loved by his countrymen, but he is greatly honored and respected by freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Mr. President, he has helped many of us who are Members of this body. He is not only a great citizen, but also a great partisan when he needs to be a partisan.

I may say very definitely that I would not have been elected Senator from my State of Ohio in 1958 except for the fact that former President Harry S. Truman came to Cleveland for the sole purpose of urging my election over the incumbent, Senator John W. Bricker. Former President Truman made speeches and televised statements urging my election in Cleveland and at huge rallies in Akron and Columbus. Up to that time, no one, but no one, predicted anything other than my defeat.

The sad truth, from my personal standpoint, is that the national leaders of my party had "not given me a prayer." Sad to relate, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and the treasurer of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee had manifested a very dim view of even the possibility of my election.

Former President Truman's courageous whistlestop campaign for election in 1948 will always be remembered in the annals of the politics of our country. Well, he made the same sort of "give 'em hell" speeches for me in Ohio, and immediately following them and his denunciation of the political record of my opponent, my campaign was off the ground. The rest is Ohio history. In 1963 President Truman came to Ohio and addressed a banquet held in my behalf and urged my reelection to the Senate. It will always be a matter of great pride on my part that this great man manifested his confidence in me and gave me encouragement in two difficult campaigns where I was regarded as the underdog, to really understate the situation.

Mr. President, I do not need to take time here to recite the many accomplishments of this great man's administration and of his life's work. I fervently hope that all of us and the Nation will have the benefit of his wisdom and counsel for many, many more years.

The facts are that nobody grows old by living a specific number of years. People grow old by deserting their ideas and losing their enthusiasm. Men and women are as old as their doubts. They are as young as their hopes, their zest for life, and their self-confidence. Given that criterion, Harry S. Truman is one of the youngest men I know.

I am happy to salute one of the first citizens of our land on his birthday anniversary. I wish him and Mrs. Truman a long life of happiness.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session, to consider treaties on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair state the unanimous-consent agreement in connection with the vote on the treaties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the agreement previously entered into by the Senate, the Senate will proceed at 12:10 p.m. today, by three separate votes, to vote on treaties numbered 16 through 18 on the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

In accordance with the previous unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now proceed to vote, by three separate votes, on treaties Nos. 16 through 18 on the Executive Calendar.

The roll will first be called on Calendar No. 16, Executive G, 88th Congress, first session, the subject of which is a convention concerning the international exchange of publications and documents.

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE EXCHANGE OF OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS AND GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS BETWEEN STATES, ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONFERENCE AT ITS 10TH SESSION, PARIS, DECEMBER 3, 1958

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 83, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 104 Ex.]

YEAS—83

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—17

Case
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Ellender
Gruening
Hollings
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Montoya
Mundt
Pell
Smathers
Tydings

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

AMENDMENT TO ARTICLE 109 OF THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** In accordance with the unanimous-consent agreement previously entered, the Senate will now proceed to vote on Executive Calendar No. 17, the subject of which is the amendment to article 109 of the Charter of the United Nations.

On this question, the years and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 105 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Case
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Gruening
Hollings
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Montoya
Mundt
Pell
Smathers
Tydings

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Two-thirds of Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

CONVENTION ON NARCOTIC DRUGS, 1961

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. SPONG in the chair). The Senate will now proceed to vote on Executive Calendar No. 18, the Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS] the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Alaska, [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HOLLINGS], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. **KUCHEL.** I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 84, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 106 Ex.]

YEAS—84

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Cooper
Dirksen
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Morse
Morton
Moss
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—16

Case
Clark
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Gruening
Hollings
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Montoya
Mundt
Pell
Smathers
Tydings

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A LARGE PROTOTYPE DESALTING PLANT

Mr. **JACKSON.** Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 270, a bill to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 270) to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to participate in the development of technology for a large-scale desalting plant by providing financial, technical, or other assistance to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California for the design, development, construction, and operation of a water treatment and desalting plant to be constructed as a part of a dual-purpose electrical power generation and desalting project in the Southern California area.

SEC. 2. Before providing any assistance as authorized by this Act, the Secretary shall first determine that the value of the anticipated technical knowledge and experience in desalting to be derived from his participation in the construction and operation of this facility will be not less than the amount of such assistance.

SEC. 3. In order to provide the assistance authorized by this Act, the Secretary may, without regard to the provisions of Revised Statutes 3648, enter into a contract with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California containing such terms and conditions as he deems appropriate and covering such periods of time as he may consider necessary but under which the liability of the United States shall be contingent upon appropriations being available therefor. No such contract, however, shall be executed by the Secretary until 45 calendar days after it has been transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which 45 days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment for more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die. The contract shall provide that any financial assistance by the United States under this Act toward the construction of the Bolsa Island or the facilities thereon shall be contingent upon the parties concerned obtaining, prior to the start of construction of the Bolsa Island, a construction permit from the United States Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of the nuclear reactors on the said island. The contract shall also provide that the United States, its officers and employees shall have a permanent right to access to said island and the desalting project located thereon for all official purposes.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall report to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives on or before March 1 of each year on his operations under this Act and on the results obtained by the United States from participation in the desalting and electrical power generation project pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 5. To carry out the purposes of this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $57,200,000, which shall remain available until expended.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I intend to move that the Senate concur in the amendments added by the House, but before doing so, I want to explain their effect on the bill as previously passed by the Senate.

Senate bill 270 authorizes the Department of the Interior, in association with the Atomic Energy Commission, to join in a cooperative arrangement with the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, a public corporation engaged in the wholesale supply of water to many municipalities and other public corporations, the Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, and two investor-owned electric utilities serving the southern California market area.

The bill would authorize the Department of the Interior to contribute to both the capital investment costs and the operation and maintenance costs of the desalting facility. The Department's total contribution of $57.2 million plus the $15 million which the Atomic Energy Commission is already authorized to provide will represent only about one-sixth of the total capital costs involved in the dual-purpose project. The capital costs that will be borne by the metropolitan water district and the public and private electric utilities in relation to this project will be approximately $380 million. The Department of the Interior's participation in this project will enable it to purchase needed technology, produced under practical, demonstrational conditions, which will greatly advance the Nation's saline water conversion program.

I believe the amendments added by the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs should cause no significant difficulties as I interpret their intent and could inure to the benefit of all the project participants.

The most significant new language adopted by the House reads as follows:

> No such contract, however, shall be executed by the Secretary until 45 calendar days after it has been transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, which 45 days shall not include days on which either the Senate or the House of Representatives is not in session because of an adjournment for more than three days to a day certain or an adjournment sine die. The contract shall provide that any financial assistance by the United States under this Act toward the construction of the Bolsa Island or the facilities thereon shall be contingent upon the parties concerned obtaining, prior to the start of construction of the Bolsa Island, a construction permit from the United States Atomic Energy Commission for the construction of the nuclear reactors on the said island. The contract shall also provide that the United States, its officers and employees shall have a permanent right to access to said island and the desalting project located thereon for all official purposes.

This will allow our committee to carefully examine the proposed contract between the Government and the metropolitan water district which, under the bill, must be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I also agree with the judgment of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that the Secretary of the Interior should report to the Congress annually on his operations under this act and on the results of the Government's participation in this project.

Another feature added by the House committee is the requirement that the contract with the metropolitan water district provide that any financial assistance by the United States under this act toward the construction of the island site or the project facilities on the site shall be contingent upon the parties concerned obtaining an AEC construction permit for the construction of the nuclear reactors before the beginning of construction of the island site. It is clear to me that it is not intended to apply to those project activities which necessarily must precede the actual physical construction of the island—including those related to detailed design, site investigations, and other advance activities, including the placing of orders for long lead items in order to get on manufacturers schedules. Obviously, these pre-construction efforts must proceed without delay, in advance of the start of actual construction of the island, if the project is to be undertaken and accomplished in a manner satisfying the needs of all the participants.

The reference to the AEC construction permit is also clear. As is generally known the regulatory side of the Atomic Energy Commission maintains careful licensing and regulatory control of the construction and operation of nuclear facilities from the standpoint of nuclear health and safety, and AEC's initial construction permit, if issued, is but the first of its licensing measures. When AEC issues its initial construction permit the condition represented by this provision will have been fully met.

As the preparatory efforts progress, the parties to this project may start on certain necessary advance features of the island, short of actual physical construction, before AEC formally issues its initial construction permit for the nuclear facilities. This type of activity is not intended to be precluded prior to the actual issuance of the permit. On the other hand, if the AEC permit is not issued for the Bolsa Island site, or any other suitable site, and consequently the project is terminated, this provision would preclude Interior's financial participation in the cost of the actual construction of the island itself as distinguished from the preconstruction activities. Thus, all the participants in this cooperative arrangement are made fully aware of this legislative and contractual aspect of the financial assistance to be provided by the Department of the Interior under this act, as distinguished from the AEC which is presently authorized to provide its assistance to this project. AEC's assistance as authorized by the Congress does pertain to certain safety features of this island siting as well as to the coupling of the water facilities with the power generation plants. Interior's assistance will, without duplication of AEC's assistance, apply to the capital costs of all the facilities related to water production, including the systems required for the supply of energy for the desalting operation and the site for the water facilities, but not including the capital costs for conveying the product to the metropolitan distribution system.

I congratulate Chairman ASPINALL and the other members of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs who have, in my judgment, strengthened this bill. I also extend my congratulations to the senior Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the sponsor of S. 270, for his zeal, guidance, and dedication to this worthwhile project.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield.

Mr. KUCHEL. I express my gratitude for the generous comments of my friend from Washington, the chairman of the committee which sat in judgment on this legislation. All I can say is that I thank him very much.

In addition, Mr. President, I quite agree that the purpose of the House amendment has been correctly spelled out by the distinguished Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON]. I thank the Senator for most carefully spelling out the purpose of the language we will approve today, as I think it is important in going forward with the construction of this facility to have a clear understanding of the meaning of the enabling legislation. This giant facility will be built on a manmade island of some 43 acres, lying seaward of the coastline of my home county of Orange in the State of California. It will carry on, with the aid of nuclear energy, an actual test, Mr. President, of whether the salt water of the sea can be used to produce, economically, 150 million gallons of fresh water each day, for distribution by the public agencies of southern California.

I thank my able friend for his interest, his enthusiasm, and his leadership in what has now been accomplished. I also thank the other Senators who have joined me in sponsoring this bill: the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], my colleague from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. HANSEN], and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

The combination nuclear electric power and sea water conversion plant is to be owned and operated by these local, private, and public agencies. The Federal Government, in turn, will gain valuable technological experience in the field of sea water conversion. This unique partnership of private and governmental agencies will make it unnecessary for the Department of the Interior to seek funds for all-Federal construction of such a massive prototype plant.

In a study report submitted in December 1965, the Bechtel Corp., of San Francisco, stated that the project was technically feasible and could produce fresh water at a cost of 21.9 cents per 1,000 gallons at plantsite, and 27 cents per 1,000 gallons delivered to the metropolitan water district system. The present minimum cost of fresh water from existing desalination plants is about $1 per 1,000 gallons.

There is no substitute for having a large prototype plant operating if we hope to measure the cost savings to be achieved by large-scale operations. Although the plant is not expected to produce any dramatic technological breakthroughs, a demonstration that water can be taken from the sea and converted to fresh water at a low cost will have a great impact on future water resource development.

Upon completion, the plant will provide southern California with 150 million gallons of fresh water each day. This is over 100 times the 1.4 million gallons per day capacity of the former San Diego-Point Loma experimental plant which was moved to the Guantanamo Naval Base in Cuba late in 1964. The proposed plant would have more than twice the combined capacity of all the salt water conversion plants in existence today.

In addition, the nuclear reactors and turbine generators will generate approximately 1,800 megawatts of electricity—enough to supply the domestic needs of 2 million people. Even mighty Hoover Dam produces less power than will the proposed plant. The plant will be built on a 43-acre manmade island about one-half mile off the Bolsa Chica State Beach in Orange County. A two-lane causeway will carry water and power transmission lines to the mainland. The water will then be pumped 25 miles to the Diemer filtration plant where it will be blended with other water in the existing distribution system.

Those of us who have studied California's water resources for many years do not expect desalination to solve all of our State's water problems. It will however, help to ease our critical water shortages.

Reliable estimates foresee a doubling of California's population within a mere 25 years. This, coupled with the fact that per capita water consumption is ever increasing, makes it imperative that we test every promising approach to assure a reliable water supply for future generations.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I express my appreciation to the able senior Senator from California. The Senator is the ranking minority members on the committee, and the interpretation that has been stated here by the Senator is a unanimous one. I think it should make very clear to the departments concerned; namely, the Department of the Interior and the Atomic Energy Commission, the clear intent of the Senate in accepting the amendment offered in the House of Representatives, and now being concurred in here. With that understanding, I urge that the Senate concur in that amendment.

I do wish to say, as the able Senator from California has pointed out, this is indeed a historic event. I think it is just the beginning of a program that can not only do much to relieve the growing water problem in our own country, but I sincerely feel that, this being a very large plant, it will be one through which not only our Government but other governments around the world can obtain, I am sure, much valuable information which will help make possible the promotion of tremendous programs in the area of desalinization.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House of Representatives to S. 270.

The motion was agreed to.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, morning business is now in order under a 3-minute limitation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY THE CANADIAN SENATE AND EXPRESSING THEIR APPRECIATION OF THE SAME

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Senate of Canada expressing its appreciation and gratitude to the Senate of the United States adopted on March 14, 1967, which was ordered to lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

CERTAIN ADDITIONAL FACILITIES PROJECTS FOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting, pursuant to law, the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects to be undertaken for the Air National Guard (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

NATIONAL ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE PROGRAM, FISCAL YEAR 1968

A letter from the Director, Office of Science and Technology. Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., transmitting, for the information of the Senate, a report "National Atmospheric Science Program—Fiscal Year 1968," with an accompanying report; to the Committee on Commerce.

SPECIAL REPORT ON U.S. PARTICIPATION IN A PROPOSED INCREASE OF THE FUND FOR SPECIAL OPERATIONS OF THE INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Policies, signed by the Secretary of State, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, the Acting Secretary of Commerce, and the President and Chairman of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Advisory Council, to the President and the Congress (with an accompanying report); to the Committeeman on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the savings available through the use of formal advertising in contracting for automotive tires and tubes, General Service Administration, report dated April 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings in costs of transporting food donated for distribution abroad, Agency for International Development, dated April 7, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED CONCESSION CONTRACT, YOSEMITE PARK AND CURRY CO.

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed concession contract which will authorize the Yosemite Park and Curry Co. to operate the Government-owned El Portal Motor Inn and provide related facilities and services for the public in the El Portal Administrative Site of Yosemite National Park, Calif. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON RECLASSIFICATION UNDER RECLAMATION PROJECT ACT OF 1939

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the reclassification of certain land in the Hanover Bluff Unit of the Missouri River Basin Project, in Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

ORDERS ENTERED IN CASES OF CERTAIN ALIENS WHO HAVE BEEN FOUND ADMISSIBLE

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, enclosing copies of the orders entered in the cases of certain aliens who have been found to be admissible to the United States (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Adjustment of Status of an Alien

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the adjustment of status of Koesmartono Prawotoadikoessoemo (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Office of Emergency Planning, Report on Forest and Grass Fires

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, dated May 5, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Joint Memorial 8

"A joint memorial to the President of the United States, the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled

"We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Idaho, hereby request that:

"Whereas, the milk prices paid to the farmers for raw milk have declined substantially while milk production costs have elevated sharply with the price to the consumer being increased; and

"Whereas, the farmers' selling price for cattle has declined 10% in the last few months, the selling price for lambs has declined 33% in the last year, the selling price for hogs declined 31% in the last few months, and the selling price of poultry has decreased 6.4% while the price of meat to the consumer has increased 29% in a matter of months; and

"Whereas, the farmers' selling price for wheat has declined 14.4%, for wool 42% in one year, and for eggs 21.5%, as the cost of living and the cost of production of the farmer have increased sharply; and

"Whereas, two-thirds of the world's population are not receiving adequate foodstuffs and the farmers of the United States are being encouraged to increase production, while farm prices now at 75% of parity have dropped two points during the past month and are five points lower than the last year.

"Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the Thirty-ninth Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, that we most respectfully urge the President of the United States, the Congress, and the Secretary of Agriculture to undertake to determine the problems and explain to the citizens of the United States the reasons for the great disparity between the prices paid to the farmer and the prices paid by the consumer for agricultural products.

"Be it further resolved, that the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of Congress, to the Senators and Representatives representing this state in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Governor of the State of Idaho."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; to the Committee on Commerce:

"Resolution 4

"Resolution memorializing the President, Congress and the Civil Aeronautics Board to provide for hearings for air routes between Minnesota and Europe

"Whereas, it has long been recognized that adequate air transport is essential to the economic progress and full development of the potential of this State; and

"Whereas, there is a strong and growing community of interest between Minnesota and the friendly nations of Europe which will continue to expand because of the long existing business and cultural ties between the citizens of Minnesota and our friends in Europe; and

"Whereas, there is no direct air service between any point in Minnesota and any point in Europe which results in substantial inconvenience to the traveling public and the expenditure of additional time and money in making intermediate connections at other cities in the United States; and

"Whereas, air transport has developed to the point where it is economically and operationally feasible to provide direct air service between airports in Minnesota and airports in Europe; and

"Whereas, in 1965 there were 24,768 travelers between the State of Minnesota and points across the Atlantic and an estimated 800 round the world travelers, who would all be benefited and convenienced by direct air service between Minnesota and Europe; and

"Whereas, air cargo is increasing at a greater rate than air passengers, manufacturing firms headquartered in Minnesota have plants throughout Europe and require direct air cargo service as a necessity for economic growth, and direct air cargo service is essential for public convenience of Minnesota and Europe; and

"Whereas, there is now a proceeding before the Civil Aeronautics Board to improve the air service between the Twin Cities of Minneapolis-St. Paul and points in the Orient but no such proceeding has been scheduled or is being heard with respect to any point in Minnesota and Europe; now, therefore,

"Be it resolved that it is the sense of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that the Civil Aeronautics Board should schedule and conduct hearings looking toward the establishment of direct air service between points in Minnesota and points in Europe, and, if necessary, that the United States Department of State should negotiate for the establishment of such service.

"Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota be instructed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, the President of the United States Senate, the Minnesota Senators and Representatives in Congress, and the several members of the Civil Aeronautics Board.

"James B. Goetz,
"President of the Senate.

"L. L. Duxbury,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Passed the Senate this 21st day of April in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

"H. Y. Torrey,
"Secretary of the Senate.

"Passed the House of Representatives this 24th day of April in the year of Our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven.

"Edward A. Burdick,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved May 1, 1967.

"Harold LeVander,
"Governor of the State of Minnesota.

"Filed May 1, 1967.

"Joseph L. Donovan,
"Secretary of the State of Minnesota."

Four resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Finance:

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Changing the Designation of Old-Age Assistance to Senior Citizens Assistance

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to enact legislation changing the designation of Old Age Assistance to Senior Citizens Assistance; and be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State Secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

"Norman L. Pidgeon,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:
"[seal]

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Providing a Tax Credit for College Tuition Payments

"Whereas, The cost of a college education has increased markedly in recent years; and

"Whereas, The burden of paying for such education is becoming increasingly difficult to bear; therefore be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation providing a tax credit for college tuition payments; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, April 11, 1967.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"Senate, adopted in concurrence, April 13, 1967.

"Norman L. Pidgeon,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:
"[seal]

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Increasing the Amounts of Minimum Monthly Payments Under the Social Security Act

"Whereas, The cost of the necessities of life in this country has risen to an all time high; and

"Whereas, A substantial portion of the people of this nation depend to a large extent if not entirely upon the monthly payments received by them under the Social Security Act; and

"Whereas, The current minimum monthly payments under said program have now become grossly inadequate for their needs; and

"Whereas, An increase of such minimum payments to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple would tend to relieve such conditions; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation increasing the minimum monthly payments under the Social Security Act to one hundred and fifty dollars per month per person and two

hundred and fifty dollars per month per married couple; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

"Norman L. Pidgeon,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:
"[seal]

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT LEGISLATION INCREASING ALLOWABLE EARNINGS OF PERSONS RECEIVING SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS FROM $1,500 TO $2,500

"*Whereas,* Under present regulations, those persons receiving social security benefits are not permitted to earn more than fifteen hundred dollars in any one year without a decrease in payments received by them; and

"*Whereas,* Many of the persons receiving such payments are almost totally dependent upon them for their living expenses; and

"*Whereas,* The cost of living has increased substantially so that the benefits referred to are now totally inadequate; and

"*Whereas,* An increase of allowable annual earnings from fifteen hundred dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars will enable such persons to retain their self respect; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States enact legislation increasing allowable earnings of persons receiving social security benefits from fifteen hundred dollars to two thousand five hundred dollars; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the presiding officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, April 13, 1967.

"Norman L. Pidgeon,
"Clerk.

"House of Representatives, adopted in concurrence, April 18, 1967.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"A true copy. Attest:
"[seal]

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO SUPPORT AND ADOPT AN AMENDMENT TO THE U.S. CONSTITUTION PERMITTING BIBLE READING AND PRAYERS IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS

"*Whereas,* These United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts were founded and established in and under a belief in Almighty God; and

"*Whereas,* This principle and belief is explicity set forth in the Declaration of Independence adopted by the thirteen original states in Congress at Philadelphia, and in the preamble to the Constitution of Massachusetts; and

"*Whereas,* This same principle and belief is recognized by the United States Government in the 'Flag Code', in the 'Pledge of Allegiance to Our Flag', and in the official coinage of the United States Government by having inscribed thereon the words 'In God We Trust'; and

"*Whereas,* This same principle and belief is inherently a part of our American way of life and is the basic belief of the great majority of adult American citizens and their children and grandchildren; and

"*Whereas,* A great majority of our adult American citizens are products of our public school systems and their children and grandchildren are enrolled in the public school systems of these United States; and

"*Whereas,* The majority of the private and parochial school systems likewise hold a firm belief in the principle of 'A Nation under Almighty God'; and

"*Whereas,* It is a basic belief of the people of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and of these United States that reading of the Bible which is 'God's Holy Book' and prayer are a basic part of the belief that this State and Nation is a State and Nation under God and that such Bible reading and prayer should be a part of the curriculum of our public school systems; and

"*Whereas,* Under the recent United States Supreme Court decision reading of the Bible and recitation of the Lord's Prayer is now unlawful in our public schools; and

"*Whereas,* Such Supreme Court decision denies the very great majority of Americans of their fundamental constitutional right to express in our public schools their belief in Almighty God, the reading of the Bible and prayer. and forbids the public school systems of these United States from expressing and teaching that ours is a State and Nation under God; and

"*Whereas,* The said Supreme Court decision has made it possible for a very small minority to suppress the will, desires and wishes of the great majority of the peoples of these United States; therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Massachusetts House of Representatives memorialize the Congress of the United States to support and adopt an amendment to the United States Constitution permitting Bible reading and prayers in our public schools; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the Secretary of the Commonwealth of the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to the members thereof from this Commonwealth.

"House of Representatives, adopted, April 18, 1967.

"William C. Maiers,
"Clerk.

"[seal]
"A true copy. Attest:

"Keith H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A letter in the nature of a petition, signed by the president, International Association of Fire Chiefs, enclosed by a pamphlet, entitled "The Wingspread Conference Report," prepared by that association, in New York, N.Y., relating to the isolation of some of the major problems facing the fire service of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Anniston, Ala., praying that a commemorative stamp to note and commemorate the 150th anniversary of the Alabama Territory; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AUTHORITY FOR THE SENATE TO RESPOND TO OFFICIAL INVITATIONS RECEIVED FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS OR PARLIAMENTARY BODIES AND ASSOCIATIONS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported the following original resolution (S. Res. 115); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 115

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint as members of official Senate delegations such Members of the Senate as may be necessary to respond to invitations received officially from foreign governments or parliamentary bodies and associations (including the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association) during the Ninetieth Congress, and designate the chairmen of said delegations.

Sec. 2. (a) The expenses of the delegations, including staff members designated by the chairmen to assist said delegations, shall not exceed $25,000 for each such delegation, and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairmen of said delegations.

(b) The expenses of each delegation shall include such special expenses as the chairman may deem appropriate to carry out this resolution, including reimbursements to agencies for compensation of employees detailed to each delegation and expenses incurred in connection with providing appropriate hospitality to foreign delegates.

(c) Each member or employee of each delegation shall receive subsistence expenses in an amount not to exceed the maximum per diem rate set forth in section 502(b) of the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended by Public Law 88–633, approved October 7, 1964.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. Monroney):

S. 1699. A bill to permit negotiation of a modification to a contract for sale of certain real property by the United States to the city of Lawton, Okla.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1700. A bill to amend the Adult Education Act of 1966 in order to revise the allotment formula under the provisions of such Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1701. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1702. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the District of Hawaii to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of Mrs. Agnes J. Wong against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORITY FOR THE SENATE TO RESPOND TO OFFICIAL INVITATIONS RECEIVED FROM FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS OR PARLIAMENTARY BODIES AND ASSOCIATIONS

Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 115) to authorize the Senate to respond to official invitations received from foreign governments or parliamentary bodies and associations, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. FULBRIGHT, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DESIGNATION OF THE SENATE OFFICE BUILDING AS THE TRUMAN OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. BIBLE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 116) to name the Senate Office Building as the Truman Office Building, which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, for himself and other Senators, which appears under a separate heading.)

MODIFICATION OF CONTRACT FOR SALE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO CITY OF LAWTON, OKLA.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I introduce for myself and my senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], a bill to permit negotiation of a modification of a contract for sale of certain real property by the United States to the city of Lawton, Okla. The bill I introduce today is intended to correct a situation which has existed for some 40 years and has become a burden on the city of Lawton.

Under the provisions of an indenture signed by the Secretary of the Interior on June 11, 1926, 270 acres of Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache reserve lands were conveyed to the city of Lawton in consideration of the payment of $2,800 and a promise to furnish, without cost to the Government, a sufficient supply of water for domestic use at the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital.

Since the signing of this indenture, the facilities of the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital have expanded considerably, which has required the city of Lawton to construct an 8-inch water main to the facilities of the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital. Also, the daily requirements of the Fort Sill Indian School have now reached approximately 45,000 to 50,000 gallons, which constitutes a sizable expense to the city of Lawton and which would appear to be somewhat beyond the intentions of the indenture agreed to in 1926.

The bill I introduce today would allow the Secretary of the Interior and the city of Lawton to negotiate an agreement under which the U.S. Government would pay for such water that is used at the Fort Sill Indian School and the Kiowa Indian Hospital.

I feel that this bill will be fair and just to both parties concerned. It will permit a renegotiation of the contract based upon changed conditions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1699) to permit negotiation of a modification to a contract for sale of certain real property by the United States to the city of Lawton, Okla.

AMENDMENT OF THE ADULT EDUCATION ACT OF 1966

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Adult Education Act of 1966, which is found in title III of the Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1966.

Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to correct a legislative oversight that could cause irreparable harm to adult basic education programs in the smaller States in fuller participation in achieving part B, of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the Adult Basic Education Act contained an important provision permitting the less populated States fuller participation in achieving the overall objectives of the program. That allotment provision was contained in section 215(a) of title II–B. This was the forerunner to our present Adult Education Act. The particular excerpt to which I refer reads as follows:

> The amount allotted to any State under the preceding sentence for any fiscal year which is less than $50,000 shall be increased to that amount, the total thereby required being derived by proportionately reducing the amount allotted to each of the remaining States under the preceding sentence, but with such adjustment as may be necessary to prevent the allotment of any such remaining States from being thereby reduced to less than $50,000.

This statement was a vital part of the legislation which formerly governed the adult basic education program. But it was inadvertently omitted from title III of the Elementary and Secondary Amendments of 1966, which now is the governing legislation for the present adult basic education program.

The allotment provision in the present act sets out a formula for the distribution of funds, but does not allow for a minimum base. This greatly reduces program involvement in 10 States. A pertinent section of that formula reads as follows:

> From the remainder of such sums he shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of adults who have completed not more than five grades of school (or have not achieved an equivalent level of education) in such State bears to the number of such adults in all States.

Mr. President, without a minimum availability feature in the present act, States such as Alaska, Delaware, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Utah, Vermont, and Wyoming will participate in the adult basic education program at a greatly reduced level. Yet their educational opportunities problems are just as serious as those in larger States.

This means in essence that those participants presently attending adult basic education classes may never be able to complete their program. This means that a very serious limit will be placed on the number of new participants that can enter the program. This means that new materials and innovative methods may never be tried. And this means that severe reduction in program funds will seriously reduce all of the positive aspects the program has fostered thus far.

I am not asking that the language previously included in title II–B of the Economic Opportunity Act be reinstated in title III of the Elementary and Secondary Amendments. I am proposing to go beyond the minimum availability clause previously stated, and rewrite an amendment to reflect a minimum amount of $100,000 to all States. This will insure that present adult basic education programs in the less populated States will continue to show program growth and development.

The $100,000 minimum would also enable other States such as Maine, Nebraska, and North Dakota, to participate to a fuller extent since they fall between $50,000 and $100,000 in receiving adult basic education program funds.

The adult basic education program has been exceedingly popular with the people. Since Congress enacted the law only a short 3 years ago, more than one-half million undereducated adults have learned to read and write. Many thousands are now leading productive lives as a result of this adult educational opportunity and our country is richer in human resources. The passage of the proposed amendment will strengthen this important program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received, and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1700) to amend the Adult Education Act of 1966 in order to revise the allotment formula under the provisions of such act, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

TO HOLD IN TRUST FOR INDIANS OF THE BATTLE MOUNTAIN COLONY OF CERTAIN LANDS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes. I ask unanimous consent a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting the proposal, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD, together with the bill.

The bill (S. 1701) to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1701

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That all of the right, title, and interest of the United States in the following described public domain land located in the State of Nevada are hereby declared to be held by the United States in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony:

T. 32 N., R. 44 E., Mount Diablo base and meridian, sec. 13, W½SE¼NW¼NE¼, containing 5 acres, plus a right-of-way for access purposes across the west 33 feet of the NE¼NW¼NE¼ of said sec. 13.

T. 32 N., R. 45 E., Mount Diablo base and meridian, sec. 18 N½NW¼SW¼NE¼SW¼, containing 1¼ acres, plus a right-of-way for access purposes across the west 33 feet of the S½NW¼SW¼NE¼SW¼, SW¼SW¼NE¼SW¼, and SE¼SW¼ of said sec. 18.

The letter presented by Br. BIBLE is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1697.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of a proposed bill "To declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes."

We recommend that the proposed bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and we recommend that it be enacted.

The bill provides that two tracts of public domain, plus an access right-of-way, will be held in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony. One tract contains approximately 5 acres and the other 1¼ acres. The right-of-way is 33 feet wide across approximately 2,805 feet of adjacent public domain, to provide access to each tract.

This group of Indians has been using the two tracts for cemetery purposes. There are about 130 graves in one tract and some 16 graves in the other. The estimated fair market value of the two cemetery sites and right-of-way areas is $400.

The Colony, which had a population of 77 in 1962, has beneficial interest in 680 acres of land. The cemetery sites are about one-half mile from the Colony lands. Our understanding is that the public domain land surrounding the cemetery sites is vacant.

A similar bill was passed by the Senate in the 88th Congress (S. 1885).

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposed legislation from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Sincerely yours,
HARRY R. ANDERSON,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

DESIGNATION OF THE OLD SENATE OFFICE BUILDING AS THE TRUMAN OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

S. RES. 116

Resolved, That the Senate Office Building constructed under authority of the Act of April 28, 1904 (33 Stat. 452, 481), is hereby designated, and shall be known, as the "Truman Office Building".

SEC. 2. Any law, rule, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which reference is made to the building to which the first section of this Act applies shall be held to refer to such building under and by the name of the "Truman Office Building".

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit this resolution today because it is the birthday of a great American, a former President of the United States, and a former Member of this body, Harry S. Truman. The Senators from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. LONG] and my colleague from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] join with me in this resolution, the effect of which would be that if any of the Senate Office Buildings are to be named, in the fashion that the House Office Buildings are named—the Cannon Building, the Longworth Building, and the Rayburn Building—it would be eminently proper to designate what is now known as the Old Senate Office Building in honor of that very distinguished American, Harry S. Truman. I know of no one in American history whose name would be more appropriate to go on a building in which he served and worked, and in which the offices of so many of his friends still remain.

Mr. President, I ask that the resolution be received and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 116) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, coming as I do from the neighboring State of Kansas, near Independence, Mo., the home of our distinguished ex-President and former Senator, Harry S. Truman, I commend the distinguished Senator from Washington and others for introducing this resolution, which, of course, will be referred to the Committee on Rules for further action. I concur that if the Senate Office Buildings are to be named in honor of former Senators, no more appropriate choice could be made.

Harry S. Truman came to the Senate with the 74th Congress, in the same year I first came to the House of Representatives. For many years, we both belonged to what was called the 74th Congress Club. We served many pleasant years together, and I extend to him today my congratulations and best wishes on his birthday.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to file a report on H.R. 6133, a bill to expand the saline water program, following the conclusion of business today until 5 o'clock p.m.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE HIGHER EDUCATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, it was not possible for me to be on the Senate floor several days ago when the distinguished junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] offered his statement introducing legislation (S. 1502) to provide assistance to students pursuing programs of higher education in the field of law enforcement. Because of my support of this legislative approach, I have requested that I be permitted to join as a cosponsor on this bill.

As a former county district attorney in my State, attorney general of Nevada for many years and as president of the National Association of Attorneys General before coming to the Senate, I have always had a deep interest in the matter of crime prevention and crime detection. This legislation, patterned after the National Defense Education Act of 1958, is an approach that I believe deserves great attention.

With the advent of the atomic and sputnik eras, the need for improved education was given the greatest single impetus in many long years in this country. Today we are teaching our young men and women in our colleges and universities technical methods to push America's scientific frontiers farther into space. Certainly, I believe that those demonstrated capabilities can also be utilized to protect American men, women, and children from criminal acts and to develop more modern methods of crime detection and crime prevention. Probably we have been at fault in recent years in not fully recognizing the fact that our law-enforcement officers must keep pace with a changing world.

Career development for police officers is important, and better and more permanent training programs could be developed under this legislation.

If we properly spend our dollars pushing the frontiers of space farther out into the universe, then I believe we can also spend dollars properly in educating our law-enforcement officers to provide safe streets, safe homes and safe businesses, both in the day and in the night.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of my bill, S. 1626, which would prohibit the desecration or improper use of our country's flag, the name of my colleague, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 778, to provide for the establishment of the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore in the State of Wisconsin, and for other purposes, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE] be added as a cosponsor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] be added as a cosponsor of S. 382, to amend Public Law 874, 81st Congress, with respect to the amount to be deducted from payments pursuant to such law on account of certain Federal contributions.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 158) to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 158) to amend section 209 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, so as to require future authorization of funds for certain programs of the Maritime Administration, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

HEARINGS ON THE FEDERAL JUDICIAL CENTER—S. 915, AND S. 475—HOLDING COURT IN DISTRICT OF NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce hearings for the consideration of S. 915, a bill that would provide for the establishment of a Federal judicial center; and S. 475, a bill to provide an additional place for holding court in the district of North Dakota.

The hearings will be held on May 10, 1967, at 9:30 a.m., and May 11, 1967, at 10 a.m. in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, room 6226, New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

HEARINGS ON FEDERAL JURY SELECTION BILLS—S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, AND S. 1319

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President as chairman of the Judiciary Committee's Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, I wish to announce another set of hearings for the consideration of S. 383, S. 384, S. 385, S. 386, S. 387, S. 989, and S. 1319. These bills would provide improved judicial machinery for the selection of Federal juries.

The hearings will be held at 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 16, and 10 a.m. on Tuesday, May 23, and Wednesday, May 24, 1967, in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, 6226 New Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, room 6306, New Senate Office Building.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 428, THE BILINGUAL AMERICAN EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, one of the great uncharted areas in American education is the problem of bilingual education, the problem of educating children who learn as their first language—that is to say the language spoken to them by their parents, the language spoken in the home—a language other than English. This situation is encountered especially in the Southwest and Northeast, where millions of children have to try to educate themselves solely in English, whereas the language they learn first and with which they are most familiar, and in some cases solely familiar, is Spanish. This special situation creates special problems which must be dealt with if these children are to receive equal educational opportunity.

Therefore, on January 17 I introduced S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act cosponsored by Senators JAVITS, KENNEDY of New York, KUCHEL, MONTOYA, TOWER, and WILLIAMS of New Jersey. The bill would provide funds to schools to improve the education of bilingual children, funds for training teachers of bilingual children, and for research.

The chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has created a Special Subcommittee on Bilingual Education to handle this bill. The members of the special subcommittee are Senators MORSE, RANDOLPH, WILLIAMS of New Jersey, KENNEDY of New York, JAVITS, MURPHY, and FANNIN. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] is most grateful to have been named chairman of this special subcommittee.

Hearings will be held on S. 428 and on the problem of the education of the Spanish-speaking and of other bilingual minorities in general, on May 18 and 19 in room 4232, New Senate Office Building. Hearings will also be held, on dates to be announced later, in Texas, California, and New York. Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record are asked to contact Allan Mandel on extension 5922 or at 460 Old Senate Office Building.

BETTY FURNESS—THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE AMERICAN CONSUMER

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday, Betty Furness was sworn in by President Johnson as his new Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs.

This is a particularly important appointment, and I am confident Miss Furness will do her job well. She has national stature and will be highly visible as a representative of the American consumer at the highest levels of government.

Miss Furness is gracious and intelligent. She is no stranger to Government. As a private citizen she contributed to the programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity, Headstart, and VISTA. In the last few years she has come to know the problems of the American consumer well. She has traveled across the country speaking—and listening to—housewives and community groups. She is known to almost every American. And she has her heart and soul in the job before her.

President Johnson has raised the Committee on Consumer Affairs to the highest level. Thus, Miss Furness will have the authority and backing to make certain that the views of the consumer are heard and protected.

The swearing in of Miss Furness marks a continuing interest of the President in consumer protection. Some months ago he sent to the Congress an extensive message dealing with new ways and means of insuring that the consumer in America is protected by his Government. That message is now being translated into legislation. I am confident that Miss Furness will continue to strengthen the President's commitment in this area, and I ask unanimous consent to insert his swearing-in remarks into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT DELIVERED AT THE SWEARING-IN CEREMONY OF MISS FURNESS TO BE SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO THE PRESIDENT ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

The PRESIDENT. Miss Furness, Members of the Cabinet, Members of the Congress, distinguished ladies and gentlemen: Often I find it very useful at a swearing-in exercise to have a little biographical information.

Somehow I don't believe that will be necessary today.

Betty Furness has, however, never held Federal office before. But she is known to millions of people in this country.

Now she is about to embark on a public career. She is about to become the advocate of the American consumer in the highest councils of her government.

She will speak for the housewife in the marketplace, who must provide her family with good food at reasonable prices for the mother who must protect her children from unsafe products; for the father who must buy for his family on credit, and who should be told what that credit is costing him.

We have made great strides in the safeguarding of the rights of consumers during the past three years.

Consumer was a word that was hardly known in our American language three years ago. Today it is on everyone's tongue.

It is something everyone is interested in. It is something that we have concentrated on in trying to make everyone in America aware of.

We have made great strides, I think, in safeguarding the rights of the consumer during the past three year. I want to acknowledge and express appreciation not only to the American people for their support but to the American Congress for their foresight and their willingness to endure criticism, even editorial comments at time, in the passing of measures.

We have put on the statute books—the Truth in Packaging Act, to require that products carry clearly and carry honestly information about their contents; the Child Protection Act.

Normally we talk about these things on their 50th anniversary or their 100th anniversary, as we did about the Commissioner of Education the other day.

But I think this morning Miss Furness would like to have me recount just some of the duties she will have—to keep our children safe from the hazardous toys.

We have put on the statute books—the Traffic and Highway Safety Acts, to help us reduce the shameful toll of lives that have been lost on our highways.

We have put on the statute books—greater insurance protection for the savings on deposits made by our citizens.

There is still much more to be done and Betty Furness has agreed to help us do it.

We still have to secure a law that will give the installment buyer a clear statement, honest statement, of the interest charges that he will pay.

We still have to guard those who invest in tracts of underdeveloped land against sharp and dishonest practices.

We still have to safeguard the public by insuring that natural gas pipelines are just as safe as we are capable of making them.

We still have to strengthen our protection of the public's interest in private pension and welfare plans, and in mutual funds.

We still have to protect consumers from hazardous fabrics, and to reshape our laws that deal with dangerous household products.

These efforts may not seem so dramatic as many great foreign and domestic programs that we have had. But they are, I think, absolutely vital to the health and safety and to the security of the American family.

Betty Furness has been traveling throughout this country. She has been learning what is most on the minds of the homemakers and the individual consumers. She has been talking to both the consumers and the producers.

I think since her announcement she has been visiting some grocery stores and buying some clothing.

She knows that a healthy relationship of the mutual trust and respect is critical in everything that we do. In doing these things she is going to be wearing three Easter bonnets, three different hats: she will be Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs to the President; she will be Chairman of the President's Committee on Consumer Interests; she will be Executive Secretary of the Consumer Advisory Council.

To help her wear those hats as effectively as possible I have had the lawyers draft an Executive Order that we think will greatly strengthen the Committee on Consumer Interests, including on it for the first time the principal officers of the Cabinet of the President of the United States, and the principal agency heads of this government.

This will give the Committee increased authority in carrying out the consumer program.

It will strengthen the voice of the consumer in the council of government.

Betty, I know we are not giving you much time to catch your breath. Before the week is out you are going to have a real baptism. You will be testifying before a Senate Subcommittee.

I never wake up in the morning but what I am not thankful to George Washington for setting a precedent and making it very clear that Presidents would not have to do the same thing.

So we are glad to welcome you aboard. We appreciate the fact that you were willing to respond to your President's call.

We drafted you for this place. We know we didn't make a mistake.

We are looking forward to working with you. I predict that some day we will meet in this room on an anniversary date and point with pride to the leadership that you have provided.

WHY AUTOMOBILE DEALERS DO NOT WANT CASH

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, on April 20 the New York Times carried an article describing why many car dealers discourage cash sales. The article indicated many automobile dealers make more money on the financing of the car than they do on the car itself. Much of this has been made possible because consumers generally do not know the rate of finance charge which the dealer assesses. For example, a recent study asked a sample of 800 families to estimate what the rate of interest was on their personal debts. The average estimate was 8 percent, whereas the actual rate was nearly three times higher or 23 percent.

The truth-in-lending bill I have introduced would correct this situation. It would provide consumers with immediate knowledge of the true dollar cost of credit and the annual rate being charged.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the New York Times article in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PERSONAL FINANCE—DISCOVERING WHY NEW-CAR SALESMEN ARE FRIGHTENED BY THE SIGHT OF CASH

(By H. J. Maidenberg)

Next to a person wearing a bell and shouting "Unclean!" the most frightening sight to some auto salesmen seems to be a customer who does not want a multitude of optional equipment—and worst of all—wants to pay cash.

At least that is the impression more and more people have received recently after visiting new-car salesmen. One such prospective customer recalled that the sight of his warm checkbook brought a cold stare from the salesman waiting on him the other day in a Manhattan showroom.

"And I thought sales of new cars were in a slump," the customer added. "You would think I was passing bum checks or something."

The reaction of both the puzzled customer and the stony salesman are quite understandable to experienced new-car dealers, however. One major dealer in New Jersey, who had been disturbed over this state of affairs for years, offered to explain the situation.

According to the outspoken dealer, most new-car salesmen do not receive any bonus or commission by merely selling the auto at the "tissue price." Their bonuses are based on the sales of optional equipment, the placing of insurance and the "fees" from finance companies. Without these potential commissions, a salesman receives only his weekly salary.

The tissue price is the suggested list price for a new car that is delivered, stripped, from the factory. (The dealer pays the freight.) In one example given by the New Jersey dealer, the tissue price on a currently popular auto was given as $2,845 plus freight. The dealer's discount brought his cost down to $2,559. And if his sales quota is fulfilled, another $53 could be expected from the manufacturer at the end of the model year.

"With insurance, freight and repairs—you should see how some of the cars reach us—we are lucky to get a $200 profit per unit before overhead, wages and other expenses," he declared.

The salesman, on the other hand, tries to work upward from the tissue price—in this case, $2,845. "In our shop, my salesmen get 30 per cent on anything they get over the tissue price," the friendly dealer said.

This means, the dealer went on, that if a customer orders undercoating at $21 extra, the salesman can earn 30 per cent of the difference between that figure and the actual cost of the job. The cost is $7, so the salesman earns 30 per cent of $14, or $4.20. The same applies to any other extras or optional equipment ordered in that showroom by the customer.

REAL COST OF A LOAN

Of course, the potential profit on a trade-in often makes the cash customer as welcome as the one who plans to finance his car.

If the buyer asks the salesman to place his auto insurance, the commission on that usually is the standard 20 per cent brokers' fees as well. If the buyer agrees to finance his purchase through the dealer at the common nonbank stated rate of 6 per cent, he will find that his real cost of the money is not $60 per $1,000 a year, but double that.

The real interest works out to roughly 12 per cent because the borrower does not have full use of all the money for a year, only for the first month. The fees paid by the finance company (and many banks) to salesmen may come to $30 a year for each $1,000 of credit. Thus a $3,000 financing contract for three years may mean $270 to the salesman.

It seems that auto buyers who pay cash are less likely to be enticed into buying optional equipment. No matter how much hard cash a person has, salesmen have found his sales resistance much greater than a customer buying on the "never-never."

THOSE GUILT FEELINGS

Besides, many people buying on credit appear to have feelings of guilt and order extra items in an effort to placate the salesman, who they think looks down on customers financing their purchases. Whatever the psychological reasons involved, the cash customer has his guilt feelings too, but in his case the manifestations usually take the form of buying only the bare needs.

Some auto buyers have been trapped into believing that they will get a better deal by allowing the salesman to finance the car. Their thinking is that, once the car is delivered, they will pay off the whole loan and recoup all but one month's interest cost.

Most of these people receive rude shocks when they discover that the interest on installment loans discounted in advance is not spread evenly over the life of the loan but is concentrated in the first few months, when the borrower has the use of most of the money.

HOW REBATE IS FIGURED

Therefore, a borrower taking out a loan for, say, a year does not get back eleven-twelfths of his interest if he repays the money after one month. For example, if an auto buyer borrows $2,000 for one year at the current bank rate here of 5.25 per cent, he has $105 deducted in advance of his first payment.

If he decides to repay the loan when his first payment is due, he would not get back eleven-twelfths of the interest ($96.25) but only $89.25. After the loan is two months old, the rebate would be $74.50 instead of the strict pro rata figure of $87.50. By the time the loan is half paid (six payments) the bank will have earned 73 per cent of the interest on the loan.

Interest on the loan should not be confused with the "service charges" that some finance companies add in order to cross limits set by state laws. The rebates on prepayments of loans are spelled out by law in New York and most other states and usually appear on the back of the loan contract which should be read before signing even if the borrower must use a magnifying glass.

Another popular misconception centers on the cost of a new car, particularly if it it advertised at an unusually low price. This is known as "freezing a customer." By this old ploy a new-car shopper is offered a price at which the dealer would not deliver the car to his mother. It is meant to send the buyer on a futile shopping tour and bring him back convinced that he has really hit upon an extraordinary bargain.

MILWAUKEE SENTINEL CONDEMNS SST AS BOONDOGGLE

Mr. **PROXMIRE.** Mr. President, the administration's proposal to spend $198 million this year for constructing a supersonic transport prototype is wasteful, as I have already said and intend to document in coming weeks.

Recently the Milwaukee Sentinel expressed its disapproval of this waste. In a hard-hitting editorial the Sentinel said that the money would be far better spent if it were poured into the ground—specifically into sewers and sewage treatment systems.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent sensemaking editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SST BOONDOGGLE

Even if conditions on earth were ideal, serious questions would remain as to whether it would be advisable to take billions of dollars away from millions of taxpayers to fling a few thousand travelers around the skies at supersonic speed.

But, of course, ground conditions fall considerably short of being ideal. Nevertheless, President Johnson is asking congress for $198 million to finance the government's share of the cost of construction of two prototypes of an American supersonic transport plane. This would be on top of $200 million appropriated for the SST program last year but not yet spent.

Total development costs of the plane, which is to cruise at more than 1,800 miles an hour and to carry more than 300 passengers, is estimated at $1.14 billion. The way these things go, that figure may be doubled.

With all the problems besetting our society—notably in the area of environmental pollution—it borders on madness to be spending precious resources to cut a few hours of travel time for a few people while leaving all people to spend lost hours in thickening traffic jams on the ground.

The money being committed to the SST would be far better spent if it were poured into the ground, specifically into sewers and sewage treatment systems. This, to be sure, is far less glamorous than putting it into a project that would enable some big executive or high public official to leave after lunch and arrive before breakfast the same day. But it would be far more practical, and it would be to the benefit of everybody.

Let the British and French or the Soviet Union be the first to develop the SST, if they want to be. The United States taxpayers can take advantage of their research and development, instead of footing the bill for R and D for other nations to copy free, as generally has been the case.

Meantime, America can regard the SST program for what it is—a superboondoggle.

PADDING THE PUBLIC PAYROLL

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on September 25, 1966, President Johnson ordered the Budget Bureau to freeze Federal employment at the July 1966 level.

Today I call attention to the manner in which the administration has ignored this freeze order, and instead of holding employment at the July level it has actually continued adding new employees at the rate of 4,500 per week.

Since the freeze order of September 25, 1966, the administration has actually added an additional 108,910 civilian employees to the public payroll. Those additions are as follows:

October 1966	24, 488
November	36, 728
December	7, 588
January 1967	5, 721
February	16, 377
March	18, 008
Total	108, 910

When the September 25 freeze order was issued Director Charles L. Schultze, Bureau of the Budget, estimated the cost of each extra employee at $7,000 per year. That means that the 108,910 extra employees added to the public payroll—in contradiction of the spirit of the freeze order—will cost the taxpayers over $700 million annually.

Furthermore, these increases cannot be attributed to the Vietnam war. A large percentage of the increase is in civilian agencies and represents an expansion of the Great Society programs.

A breakdown of the 18,008 increase for March shows that over one-half or 10,537 of these were in civilian agencies. A partial breakdown of those added in civilian agencies follows:

Post Office Department	3, 618
Agriculture Department	2, 328
Interior Department	1, 388
Veterans' Administration	674
Department of HEW	633
Treasury Department	510

It is apparent that the September 25, 1966, order freezing civilian employment at the July 1966 level was the same type of Great Society political propaganda as was the grandstand announcement of economy in December 1965. At that time the President promised to cut back Federal employment by at least 25,000.

Following that much-publicized promise in December 1965 the administration promptly forgot it, and between December 1965 and July 1, 1966, instead of cutting back 25,000 in Federal employment it increased the payroll by over 190,000.

When both of these broken promises are added together it means that the administration has increased Federal civilian employees by 334,711 in the 17-month period since this "phony" economy drive was launched. Nor can it be claimed that this increase was all attributable to the Vietnam war.

A breakdown of these 334,711 extra employees is as follows:

Civilian employees added, Department of Defense	208, 022
Civilian employees in domestic agencies	126, 689

These extra 334,000 employees, which both the President and his Budget Director have said were not needed, are costing the taxpayers over $2 billion per year.

How can the administration argue that the acceleration of the Vietnam war made necessary these extra employees? The Vietnam war was in progress in both December 1965 when the first promise was made and last September when the last freeze order was issued.

Furthermore, even the Vietnam war could not explain the 126,689 extra employees that have been added to the payroll as the result of the expansion of the Great Society programs under various civilian agencies.

These 126,689 unnecessary employees added to the civilian payroll will cost over $800 million annually.

Based upon these statistics it is evident that the administration's promise of economy is worthless. There remains but one way to force this administration to carry out its promise to economize, and that is to cut appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two reports giving a breakdown of these statistics as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Federal civilian employment in executive branch showing employment in agencies other than Department of Defense and total, by months, November 1965 to March 1967

Date	Civilian agencies (other than Department of Defense	Department of Defense (civilian employment)	Total
November 1965	1, 488, 043	1, 059, 880	2, 547, 923
December	1, 493, 214	1, 057, 528	2, 550, 742
January 1966	[1] 1, 492, 513	1, 063, 059	2, 555, 572
February	1, 508, 459	1, 072, 059	2, 580, 518
March	1, 522, 516	1, 088, 264	2, 610, 780
April	1, 543, 393	1, 100, 760	2, 644, 153
May	1, 554, 198	1, 110, 962	2, 665, 160
June	1, 599, 856	1, 138, 191	2, 738, 047
July	1, 622, 199	1, 165, 898	2, 788, 097
August	[1] 1, 618, 104	1, 187, 415	2, 805, 519
September	[1] 1, 589, 227	[1] 1, 184, 497	[1] 2, 773, 724
October	1, 597, 998	1, 200. 214	2, 798, 212
November	1, 612, 849	1, 222, 091	2, 834, 940
December	[1] 1, 612, 705	1, 229, 823	2, 842, 528
January 1967	[1] 1, 601, 815	1, 246, 434	2, 848, 249
February	1, 604, 195	1, 260, 431	2, 864, 626
March	1, 614, 732	1, 267, 902	2, 882, 634
Change, November 1965 to March 1967	+126, 689	+208, 022	+334, 711

[1] Denotes decrease as compared with previous month. Decreases generally represent reduction in employment of seasonal and youth opportunity summer temporary employment.

Source: Monthly reports of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

STATEMENT BY HON. GEORGE H. MAHON, DEMOCRAT, OF TEXAS, CHAIRMAN, JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, IN RE MONTHLY REPORT ON FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND PAY FOR MARCH 1967

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment 'n the month fo March totaling 2,882,634. This was a net increase of 18,008 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of February.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1967, which began July 1, 1966, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1966	2, 788, 097	50, 050	
August	2, 805, 519	17, 422	
September	2, 773, 724		31, 795
October	2, 798, 212	24, 488	
November	2, 834, 940	36, 728	
December	2, 842, 528	7, 588	
January 1967	2, 848, 249	5, 721	
February	2, 864, 626	16, 377	
March	2, 882, 634	18, 008	

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of March was 1,614,732, an increase of 10,537 as compared with the February total of 1,604,195. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in March was 1,267,902, an increase of 7,471 as compared with 1,260,431 in February.

Civilian agencies reporting the larger increases were Post Office Department with 3,618, Agriculture Department with 2,328, Interior Department with 1,388, Veterans Administration with 674, HEW Department with 633, and Treasury Department with 510. The increases in Agriculture, Interior and Treasury were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the larger increases in civilian employment were reported by the Navy with 5,035, Army with 1,874 and Defense Supply Agency with 648. The Air Force reported a decrease of 229.

Total employment inside the United States in March was 2,647,357, an increase of 15,917 as compared with February. Total employment outside the United States in March was 235,277, an increase of 2,091 as compared with February. Industrial employment by federal agencies in March was 607,721, an increase of 2,307 as compared with February.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,882,634 civilian employees certified to the Committee by federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 126,799 foreign nationals working for U. S. agencies overseas during March who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in February was 128,666.

PUBLIC TELEVISION—A BENEFIT TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, all of us who have been Members of Congress in the last several years are proud of what we have been able to do in the basically important field of education. We now have before us the opportunity to take another historic step for the enlightenment and edification of the American people.

I refer to S. 1160, the Public Television Act of 1967, which would establish an independent commission, charged with the responsibility of bringing to the public television and radio programs free of commercial influence and completely responsive to the needs of local communities.

One of the witnesses who appeared before the Communications Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee, is a former Member of the House of Representatives from Wisconsin, Andrew J. Biemiller. Mr. Biemiller, now director of the Department of Legislation of the AFL–CIO, testified in support of the bill and further urged that one of the members of the governing body be from the labor movement, which he pointed out is "the largest single group of listeners and viewers in the Nation." As an aid in considering S. 1160, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Biemiller's testimony be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the testimony was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Andrew J. Biemiller

Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am director of the Department of Legislation of the AFL–CIO, and I am appearing on behalf of that organization to express our unqualified support for S. 1160, the Public Television Act of 1967.

In our view, this is basically an education bill. As such it is a worthy companion—and an essential supplement—to the splendid series of educational measures enacted by the Congress during the last several years.

These earlier measures, as you know, broadened and strengthened the nation's school system from pre-kindergarten to post-graduate levels. While there is still more remaining to be done—in this field, there will always be more—the statutes now on the books have gone a long way toward the fulfillment of the ultimate goal, truly equal educational opportunity for all, regardless of race, creed, national origin or economic status.

The AFL–CIO was and is among the most vigorous supporters of these measures. Education has been a primary concern of the labor movement since the first unions were formed, some 175 years ago. It is in the same spirit that we support the bill before you.

Let me say at this point that we are pleased that S. 1160 also covers radio. The AFL–CIO itself makes extensive use of radio, and we know that while it is overshadowed in the public mind by the glamour of television, it remains an extremely important medium—and one which is in even greater need of educational influences. So while for the sake of brevity I will refer to television, the same remarks apply to radio as well.

We are aware, of course, that instructional television is an important function within the whole field of educational television. We are sure it is a useful tool, and we are fully in favor of its wider availability to educators who want to use it. But our chief interest is in the broader aspect—a non-commercial television establishment, wholly free to concentrate on public interest rather than private profit.

In saying this, we are in no way attacking the concept of private profit in commercial television. I personally agree with those who complain that too often, television programming is aimed at the lowest common denominator in terms of taste and intellectual content. On the other hand, I am not at all sure I would be happy with the kind of programming which some of these critics seem to have in mind. I don't know if we could trust them to give proper attention to the Redskins or the Green Bay Packers—even without those phony time-outs.

The fact is that tastes differ, in television and everywhere else. However, broadcasting is in a category by itself compared to other enterprises.

The air—television air or radio air—belongs to all the people of the United States. The broadcasters are not owners of the medium in which they operate. They are licensees, who are pledged to devote a reasonable amount of their broadcasting day to programs that serve the public interest.

We believe this is a proper requirement, which is all too often ignored and which should be more vigorously enforced. However, even if this were done, there would be a need for another approach, represented by S. 1160.

Viewers and listeners ought to have a choice—a wider choice than they have now, and a wider choice than commercial television can reasonably be expected to offer.

A moment ago I mentioned the Redskins and the Packers. What about those who prefer serious music or serious drama? Two Sundays ago, I believe it was, the Senators were playing the White Sox on Channel 9; Philadelphia and San Francisco were fighting it out in the basketball playoff on Channel 7, and the Baltimore soccer team was making its debut on Channel 2. The other choices were a detective story and a couple of old movies.

There are millions of citizens who prefer sports and situation comedy to loftier programs. The commercial networks—and the advertisers—can't be blamed too harshly for giving them what they want. But there should also be available, in every community, television and radio programs that are selling nothing but their own content; programs that can experiment, that can innovate, without fear that one bad guess will cause an angry sponsor to put them off the air.

This, we are convinced, will come about through the passage of S. 1160.

Other countries have tried other methods. In some, the government exercises complete control over broadcasting. In others, commercial television is permitted, but government television serves as the viewers' alternative.

There is no need to dwell on the first of these, since Americans quite rightly would not tolerate it. The second isn't much better, for it offers a choice only between Big Business and Big Brother. No matter how scrupulous a government operation tried to be—or in fact was—it couldn't escape the label.

Therefore we warmly welcome the approach embodied in the bill you are now considering—an independent corporation, established and supported in part by the federal government but free of government control. We do recommend very strongly that one member of the governing body be named from the labor movement—the largest single group of viewers and listeners in the nation. This independent corporation would be charged only—if I may paraphrase the bill—with the duty of making available to all Americans the kind of programs that will enrich as well as amuse, edify as well as entertain.

This, we believe, could well be the most effective stride ever taken toward adult education—toward a better-informed citizenry, and even toward the improvement of public taste.

Mr. Chairman, we in the AFL–CIO are keenly conscious of the great impact of television and its immense potential for good or evil. To those who see only evil in it now, we say that a far greater evil would have been its perversion to the service of the state. Yet to realize its potential for good, viewers must have a better and freer choice. This is what S. 1160 offers, and we hope you will give it your prompt approval.

THE 83D BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, today is the 83d birthday anniversary of my State's favorite son, Harry S. Truman. With every passing year, we witness new evidence of his wisdom while President and our great love and admiration for him grow even greater.

Our Nation has had the good fortune of having great Presidents to lead it through times of trial. Probably at no time in our history have the challenges facing us been greater than during the years immediately following World War II. Forceful and wise leadership was necessary to save the free world not only from the devastation of the war but from the menace of Communist imperialism. President Truman provided that leadership. The peace was won and the free world was saved from the slavery of communism.

Western Europe, Greece and Turkey, Japan, Korea, and the Philippines are only a few reminders of his wisdom and courage. If the world ever achieves lasting peace, and I am quite hopeful that it will some day, it will be because Harry Truman started us up the right road, and because his example, as well as his advice and counsel, has helped keep us on that road.

A better and freer America and a better and freer world were his goals. He strove long and hard for them as President, and he continues to strive for them.

It is a pleasure today to say "Happy birthday, Mr. President, and I wish you many more."

WISCONSIN SPEAKS ON THE APOSTLE ISLANDS NATIONAL LAKESHORE PROPOSAL

Mr. **NELSON.** Mr. President, tomorrow, May 9, the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Senate Interior Committee will hold the first set of hearings on my Apostle Islands National Lakeshore bill, S. 778. Field hearings on the bill will be held in Ashland, Wis., on June 1 and 2.

The proposed national lakeshore would be a 57,511-acre park made up of three units. One unit would be 21 of the 22 Apostle Islands which form an archipelago off the Bayfield Peninsula in northern Wisconsin, the second unit would be a narrow strip of land about 30 miles long along the edge of the Bayfield Peninsula, and the third would be a 10,000-acre wild rice marsh known as the Kakagon-Bad River Sloughs. The wide variety of recreational opportunities that will be available to visitors to this park is unequaled anywhere in the Midwest.

The effects of the park will be twofold. First, it will offer to the people of the Midwest, as well as to the people of the Nation, quality recreation. Secondly, the proposed park will provide a tremendous economic boost to northern Wisconsin.

This proposal is the result of a great deal of work by a large number of people, including a task force from the Department of the Interior and Wisconsin citizens. I personally have been involved in this project since I was Governor of Wisconsin.

The late President Kennedy visited the area in 1963 and said:

> Lake Superior, the Apostle Islands and the Bad River area are all unique . . . we must act to preserve these assets.

President Johnson, in his message to the Congress on "Protecting our National Heritage," in January of this year, named the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore bill as one of four priority national park projects.

The bill has won the enthusiastic backing of business, labor, local government, farm organizations, conservation groups, civic clubs, regional organizations, and most of the State's daily newspapers. The great opportunity which this bill offers Wisconsin is shown dramatically by the support it has attracted. Following is a list of organizations which have supported this bill:

Hunting and Fishing Club of Globe-Union, Inc.

The Portage County chapter of the Izaak Walton League.

The Faculty Fishing Club, Wisconsin State University, La Crosse, Wis.

Business & Professional Women's Club of Madison, Wis.

Vernon Electric Cooperative.

Eau Claire Archers.

Chippewa Falls Chamber of Commerce.

Chippewa Valley Field Archery League.

Hillcrest Garden Club of West Allis, Wis.

Polk County Sportsmen's Club.

Lions Club of Mellen, Wis.

The Fond du Lac chapter of the Izaak Walton League.

Wisconsin Indian Head Country, Inc.

Oakdale Cooperative Electrical Association.

West Bend Garden Club.

So Bay Co Sportsmen's Club.

Jump River Electric Cooperative, Inc.

Wisconsin Association of Rural Electric Cooperative Office Managers.

Barron County Farmer's Union.

Bayfield County National Farmer's Organization.

Save the Dunes Council.

Ozaukee County Fish and Game Association.

Wisconsin State division of the Izaak Walton League.

Minnesota State division of the Izaak Walton League.

Bayfield County Board.

Wisconsin Electric Cooperative.

Iron River Lions Club.

Managers Association of Rural Electric Cooperatives of Wisconsin.

St. Croix County Electric Cooperative.

Lincoln County Sports Club.

Rice Lake Area Chamber of Commerce.

Watertown chapter of the Izaak Walton League.

Fairchild Rod and Gun Club of Fairchild, Wis.

Northland College.

Wisconsin chapter of the National Campers and Hikers Association, Inc.

South Shore Lions Club of Port Wing, Wis.

Wauwatosa Chamber of Commerce.

Duluth-Superior Area Milk Producers Association.

Iron County Board of Supervisors.

Burnett County Audubon Society.

Finnish-American Festival, Inc., of Hurley, Wis.

Daniel Boone Conservation League of Milwaukee.

Milwaukee Organic Gardening Club.

Milwaukee Nature Club.

McKinley TNT Family Campers.

Outlook Club of Beloit, Wis.

Duluth Superior Labor Council.

Lake Superior District Power Co.

Ashland Chamber of Commerce.

From this impressive list it is apparent that support for this project is coming from a wide variety of people with a wide variety of interests. My office has been deluged with many, many hundreds of letters from individual citizens who have expressed their support. The Senate Interior Committee and the offices of other members of the Wisconsin congressional delegation have received a great quantity of mail from interested citizens.

Editorial support from the following newspapers has been given to the proposal:

Ashland Daily Press.

Wisconsin State Journal.

The Milwaukee Sentinel.

Eau Claire Daily Telegram.

The Milwaukee Journal.

Portage Daily Register.

Appleton Post-Crescent.

Chippewa Herald Telegram.

Superior Evening Telegram.

Mellen Weekly Record.

The Green Bay Press Gazette.

Waukesha Freeman.

The Sheboygan Press.

Kenosha News.

Racine Journal-Times.

Fond du Lac Commonwealth Reporter.

Wausau Record Herald.

Medford Star News.

Bayfield County Press.

All of these newspapers have given the project tremendous support. I would like to include all the articles that have been written in these fine newspapers, but I realize that this is not practical. Therefore, I have selected four editorials which I will insert in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

I am not aware of any widespread opposition to the proposed lakeshore, although I do understand that some local sportsmen mistakenly fear that passage of the bill would close the area to hunting and fishing and that some property owners in the area are concerned about how land would be acquired. The Apostle Islands bill will make no changes in hunting and fishing rights except to increase the area open for these purposes once private property is acquired.

The bill also provides that owners of homes and cottages within the boundaries of the project, which is now largely undeveloped, would have the option of selling for full current market value, retaining life tenancy, or retaining a 25-year right of use to their property.

This impressive record of support for the Apostle Islands project will be presented to the Senate Interior Committee on Tuesday, May 9. Then Wisconsin citizens will have a chance to express their feelings on the project at a public hearing in Ashland on June 1 and 2. This is a period of great satisfaction for the many dedicated citizens who have worked for many years to achieve an Apostle Islands park.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that certain editorials and expressions of support for this legislation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Kenosha (Wis.) News, Apr. 11, 1967]

APOSTLE ISLANDS PROJECT VITAL

People of this country are becoming increasingly aware of the need for more recreation areas.

With more and more human beings around, the expansion of recreation facilities is viewed as part of our growing pains.

However, it's not a simple matter.

Many areas, including Wisconsin, are vying for national parks or recreation projects and the competition is extremely intense.

Today we narrow the focus down to the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore project, a longtime effort to preserve spectacular islands, marshes and forests which is now approaching the critical stage.

The Apostle Islands region of Lake Superior is a magic wilderness familiar to many Kenoshans. It includes 21 offshore islands, undeveloped mainland bird and wildlife areas near Bayfield. More than a third of the 57,500 acres, which lie 400 miles north of Kenosha, already is in public ownership.

President Johnson and the Federal Bureau of the Budget have given support to the

Apostle Islands project which is sponsored by Senator Gaylord Nelson. The bill, along with other competing projects, will come before the Senate Interior Committee in May.

The Apostle Islands park proposal is important to you, to Wisconsin, and also to the nation. Its chances for approval hinge to a considerable degree upon the cumulative efforts of Wisconsin residents.

You can help by writing personal letters of support for Bill S. 778, the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore bill, to your congressman, and also to the Senate Interior Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[From the Racine (Wis.) Journal-Times, Apr. 11, 1967]

Opportunity That Mustn't Be Lost

In 1931, Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Jr. introduced a bill in the United States Senate to make the Apostle Islands and the adjoining shoreline of Lake Superior a national park. LaFollette's project was passed over that year in favor of Isle Royale, but the plan to preserve the wild, unspoiled islands at the northernmost tip of Wisconsin stayed alive.

After 36 years—indeed, 300 years after Father Claude Allouez, a Jesuit missionary, was the first white man to see these beautiful islands—the plan for their preservation is still alive. But this year it has come to a crisis; if Congress does not act favorably, the chance to preserve the islands in their natural state may be lost to private developers, who have already taken over the largest of the islands, Madeline.

The Apostle Islands project also has its greatest opportunity this year. Sen. Gaylord Nelson has introduced the bill to create the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore; President Johnson and the Interior Department have endorsed it, and Johnson has put it among four top priorities. Nelson persuaded Interior Secretary Udall to view it in 1962, and the late President Kennedy saw the islands and endorsed the park project a few weeks before his death in 1962.

The Nelson bill would establish a 57,500 acre National Lakeshore, which would include 21 wild off-shore islands with their unique rock formations, 30 miles of mainland shoreline and a 10,000 acre wild rice marsh that forms a natural habitat for bird and wildlife.

Just for scenery, the Apostle Islands are unique. The centuries of wind and water working on the rocks of Lake Superior have left unusual formations and these high evergreen-forested islands look like they have been pushed out of the surrounding waters. The area is virtually undeveloped and unspoiled.

It will remain that way only if Congress agrees to take it over for public use.

Senator Nelson is urging an outpouring of public support addressed to the Senate Interior Committee and individual members of the House of Representatives, where the bill faces its stiffest test.

The opportunity here is to create in the Middle West one of America's most beautiful national recreational areas. The opportunity cannot be lost.

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Sentinel, Apr. 4, 1967]

Backing Needed

Sen. Nelson (D-Wis.) says that the decisive stage has been reached for realization of a dream held by conservationists for many years—the establishment of the Apostle islands national lakeshore. The difference between success or failure now may rest on the degree to which the private citizens of America are determined that this chance not be lost.

Bill S-778 would preserve for posterity a magnificent stretch of shoreline along Lake Superior, 21 islands still wild and undeveloped, and a 10,000 acre wildlife area. Chances for passage appear to be reasonably good, as the president has given priority to the proposal, and it has been cleared by the budget bureau for action by the senate interior committee. That committee will hold hearings soon, and the expression of public sentiment may determine the fate of the bill in the senate.

Nelson suggests that the Apostle islands bill will clear the senate, but will face a tough test in the house, and he urges, accordingly, that all of us tell our congressmen that we want the bill passed.

The advice is good, and it certainly is timely. It is far too seldom today that we still have left the opportunity to preserve such a large and wonderful part of our natural heritage. The opportunity must be seized; if it is lost now, it may be gone forever.

The proposed Apostles park would also be a large boost for Wisconsin's economy. As Nelson says, it would provide northern Wisconsin with a tastefully developed national park service facility, which could well provide the nucleus for the recreational development of an area too long neglected. It could be one of the nation's truly great tourist attractions.

The time is at hand for all-out support of this project.

[From the Green Bay (Wis.) Press-Gazette, Apr. 23, 1967]

Preserve the Apostle Islands Lakeshore

Almost 40 years ago, President Calvin Coolidge spent a summer in the Apostle Islands area in northwestern Wisconsin. Impressed by its beauty, he asked the United States Park Service to prepare a study on the merits of designating the area as a national park. Several years later the late Sen. Robert M. LaFollette Sr. of Wisconsin introduced a bill to put the area in the national park system. Congress took no action. In 1963, President Kennedy toured the area and said, "This must be preserved." Now, both President Johnson and the Department of the Interior have expressed support for the project.

Chances of preserving the 57,500-acre site in Ashland and Bayfield Counties have never been better than now. The Senate Interior Committee has scheduled two hearings on Bill S. 778 by Sen. Gaylord Nelson of Wisconsin to designate the area as the Apostle Islands National Lakeshore. The first hearing will be held in Washington May 9. The second, and perhaps more important, will be conducted by Sen. Nelson in Ashland June 1 and 2. Sen. Nelson points out that the Ashland hearing "will give citizens from all walks of life an opportunity to . . . express their opinions on the bill. From these hearings, the Senate Interior Committee hopes to learn how badly Wisconsin wants this project and whether improvements can be made in the bill . . ."

The bill deserves broad public support, especially from Wisconsin residents, and also from the neighboring states of Minnesota and Michigan. Such support will help to convince the Interior Committee to recommend passage of the bill in the face of stiff competition from other areas for similar projects.

More than a third of the 57,500 acres in the proposed park are owned by federal, state and county governments. The land is valued at $2.9 million. This cost could be reduced if public owners approve grants or transfers of ownership. The $2.9 million even without such grants, however, is still a bargain. It compares with over $5 million paid for the Sylvania tract in Upper Michigan for about one-third the number of acres.

More than cost is involved. With increasing pressures on park and recreation facilities through population mobility, the Apostle Islands area provides shore and off-shore tracts which can be developed to provide excellent facilities for tourists and wildlife lovers. Forests, sandy beaches, wild rice marshes ideal for wildlife, fishing, and a variety of other attractions in combination make the area ideal for park purposes. But immediate action by Congress is necessary if it is to be preserved against speculative development and its consequent loss for future use by citizens.

A blunt fact is that there are few areas left in their natural state in the nation to preserve. The Lake Superior shore is one place where this opportunity exists, which the Congress recognized last year with the act for preserving the Pictured Rocks shore in Upper Michigan.

Apostles Lakeshore critics claim that it would cause tax losses through removal of some privately-held land from the tax rolls. The loss in taxes is estimated at $6,000 to $9,000 annually. Such losses, however, would be more than offset by revenues estimated at $7 million annually in tourist trade. Even if the revenue estimate is on the high side, it almost certainly would be many times higher than the estimated tax losses, once the area is developed for easy access and interior improvements are made to attract tourists.

Another criticism has been that nationalization of the area would cause hardship to those living on parts of the two Indian reservations within the proposed site. Indian councils, however, would determine, under the proposed bill, whether they wish to move off by selling, leasing or trading their land. Owners of homes or cottages within the area likewise could sell at fair market value, receive 25-year leases, or retain life tenancy. Both approaches are reasonable. Development of the park could, in fact, aid the Indians by providing more opportunity for jobs in various aspects of tourist business than are now available in any industrial or commerical enterprise.

Further delays in approval of the area as a national park could be fatal. Wisconsin should support the project through every means available at hearings in both Washington and Ashland.

PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO GOVERN OIL SHALE LEASING

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, on May 7, Secretary of the Interior Udall made public a draft of regulations proposed by the Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, to govern leasing procedures for Federal oil shale lands. At that time interested persons were invited to submit their comments in writing to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C., within 30 days of the date of publication in the Federal Register of that notice.

I am writing today to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to request that public hearings be scheduled to examine in depth the implications of these proposed leasing regulations. I believe that these hearings would be most beneficial if they could be scheduled as soon after the 30-day comment period as possible. I am hopeful that all interested persons will give these proposed regulations their close scrutiny and will be prepared to present their views to the Senate Interior Committee when hearings are held.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the full text of the proposed regulations recently released by the Department of the Interior be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the proposed

regulations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, WASHINGTON

[43 CFR, Part 3170]

OIL SHALE

Basis and Purpose. Notice is hereby given that the Department of the Interior proposes to amend the regulations regarding the leasing of oil shale lands, found at Part 3170 of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, by revoking those regulations and substituting the proposed regulations set forth below.

Interested persons are invited to submit their comments in writing to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, within thirty days of the date of publication in the *Federal Register* of this notice. Persons wishing to present their views orally are requested to communicate with the Director, Bureau of Land Management.

Part 3170 is amended to read as follows:

Part 3170—oil shale

Subpart 3170—Oil Shale: General

3170.0–1 *Purpose.*
3170.0–3 *Authority.*
3170.0–5 *Definition of term "Oil Shale".*
3170.1 *Designation of Available Lands.*

Subpart 3171—Applications for Leases

3171.1 *Qualifications of Applicants.*
3171.2 *Form and Contents of Applications.*
3171.3 *Considerations to be used in Evaluating Applications.*
3171.4 *Time for Filing.*

Subpart 3172—Miscellaneous Provisions

3172.1 *Form of Lease.*
3172.2 *Term of Lease.*
3172.3 *Acreage Designations and Limitations.*
3172.4 *Rentals.*
3172.5 *Royalties.*
3172.6 *Termination of Lease.*
3172.7 *Lease Bond.*
3172.9 *Other Provisions.*
3172.10 *Antitrust Consultation.*

Subpart 3170—Oil Shale: General

§ 3170.0–1 *Purpose.*

These regulations govern the availability for leasing of a limited acreage of oil shale lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The objectives are to:

Foster improved technology for the mining and recovery of shale oil and other mineral components of oil shale;

Encourage competition in development and use of oil shale and related mineral resources and develop a basis for subsequent competitive leasing of Federal oil shale lands;

Encourage participation by companies not favorably situated with respect to access to reserves of the minerals present in oil shale;

Prevent speculation and windfall profits;

Provide reasonable revenues to the Federal and State Governments;

under mining operation and production practices that are consistent with good conservation management of overall resources in the region.

§ 3170.0–3 *Authority.*

There regulations are issued pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 445), as amended (30 U.S.C. 181–287).

§ 3170.0–5 *Definition of Term "Oil Shale."*

As used herein, the term "oil shale" means sedimentary rock containing organic matter which yields substantial amounts of oil or gaseous products by destructive distillation. The term includes all the minerals which are components of the rock, but does not include:

(a) deposits of minerals which may be interbedded in the sedimentary rock series and which the Secretary determines can be mined (i) without removal of significant amounts of organic matter and (ii) without significant damage to oil shale beds; and

(b) deposits subject to lease as oil and gas, asphaltic minerals, or coal.

§ 3170.1 *Designation of Available Lands.*

The Secretary will from time to time publish notices in the *Federal Register* designating areas of oil shale bearing lands and deposits for the conduct of particular types of mining, extraction, or processing activities which will be made available for leases for research and development and for subsequent commercial operations in accordance with these regulations. Areas will be selected with a view to encouraging research on a variety of mining and processing methods under a variety of conditions of mineral depths, composition, thicknesses and qualities, and taking into consideration sound principles of conservation and environmental protection. A total of no more than 30,000 acres of oil shale bearing lands will be designated hereunder. Oil shale bearing lands, the surface of which is under the administrative jurisdiction of a Federal agency other than the Department of the Interior, will not be designated hereunder.

Subpart 3171—Applications for Leases

§ 3171.1 *Quaifications of Applicants.*

(a) Leases may be issued to:

(1) Citizens of the United States;

(2) Associations of such citizens;

(3) Corporations organized under the laws of the United States, or any State or Territory thereof;

(4) Municipalities.

(b) The term "associations" includes partnerships, syndicates, groups, pools, joint ventures and other unincorporated organizations.

§ 3171.2 *Form and Contents of Applications.*

(a) No form of application is prescribed.

(b) Applications should be in writing and filed in triplicate in the Office of the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Interior Building, Washington, D.C. 20240, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3001.0–6 of this chapter.

(c) The application should provide:

(1) The complete name(s) and address(es) of the applicant(s).

(2) The qualifications of applicant(s) to hold a lease under the Act.

(3) A description of the land for which a lease is desired.

(4) A detailed statement of any direct or indirect interest which the applicant then has in any lease issued or applications pending hereunder, including ownership interests in any holder of a lease issued hereunder.

(5) If the applicant is a corporation, the name and address of each stockholder of record holding more than 10 percent of the corporation's stock.

(6) If the applicant is an association, the name and address of each member who has an interest of more than 10 percent in the association.

(7) A statement of the applicant's interests in non-federally owned oil shale lands and the reasons why the applicant needs federally leased land for the proposed research and development. The statement should include a description of the location and acreage of such lands, and the best available information on the depth, quantity, composition, quality and thickness of mineral deposits present in such land.

(8) A detailed statement of the applicant's financial capability to conduct the proposed research and development.

(9) A detailed statement of the applicant's technical capability to conduct the proposed research and development.

(10) A description of the applicant's plan of research and development during the research term, specifying:

[1] The goals of the research plan;

[2] The nature, location and cost of plants and equipment to be utilized;

[3] The number of key persons to be employed and their qualifications;

[4] The schedule of expenditures;

[5] The mining and processing techniques to be studied;

[6] The possible adverse effects on the environment and the measures to be taken to avoid or minimize such effects;

[7] The acreage required for the research;

[8] The depth, quantity, composition, quality and thickness of shale deposits required for the research;

[9] The quantity of water required and the expected source;

[10] The measures to be taken to prevent waste of the mineral resources of the leased land.

(11) A description of the reserves the applicant then owns or controls of oil and other minerals of the kind believed to be present in the lands applied for.

(12) With respect to the commercial operation sought to be developed if the research plan is successful:

[1] The general nature of the commercial operation, the commodity(ies) or product(s) expected to be produced, and the approximate service life and capacity of the plant to be constructed.

[2] The expected annual unit and dollar value of production of each mineral product to be produced. If the proposed commercial operation does not include extraction of component mineral products from the oil shale, a description of the prospective market.

[3] The expected capital and annual operating costs.

[4] The quantity of water required and the expected source.

[5] The expected hazards to the environment and the measures proposed to avoid or minimize them.

[6] The quantity of land and the depth, quantity, composition, quality and thickness of mineral deposits required.

§ 3171.3 *Considerations to be used in Evaluating Applications.*

After consultation with appropriate Federal, state and local agencies, evaluation of the research and development proposals will be made on the basis of the following considerations:

(a) Selection of proposals showing greatest promise of:

(1) Ascertaining the commercial feasibility of a variety of mining and processing methods, under a variety of conditions;

(2) Enhancing opportunities for maximizing multiple mineral recovery;

(3) Enhancing the competitive opportunities of smaller companies;

(4) Limiting any potential hazards to the environment;

(5) Limiting any potential hazards to human safety.

(b) The financial and technical capabilities of the applicant to conduct the proposed research and development, and the projected commercial operation.

(c) The pace at which the research and development is proposed to be conducted.

(d) The applicant's need for leased lands to conduct the proposed research and development, and the projected commercial operation.

(e) The effects on competition of the proposed research and development and the projected commercial operation.

(f) The applicant's need for reserves of the minerals proposed to be produced under his proposal.

§ 3171.4 *Time for Filing.*

No application will be accepted if filed later than five years from the date of publication of these regulations in the *Federal Register*. [The exact date will be inserted when the final regulations are published.]

Subpart 3172—Miscellaneous Provisions

§ 3172.1 *Form of Lease.*

No form of lease is prescribed.

§ 3172.2 *Term of Lease.*

(a) Research Term.

The research term of any lease issued under these regulations shall be designated by the Secretary, but in no event may exceed 10 years.

(b) Commercial Production Term.

The Secretary will extend the term of such lease upon completion of the research term to permit commercial production for so long as mineral products are produced from oil shale in paying quantities from deposits on the land, if he has determined that:

(1) The lessee conducted research activity during the research term substantially in accordance with the plan submitted in his application, or any modification thereof which was approved by the Secretary.

(2) The lessee has, in the course of the research term, developed a mining and processing method, which:

[1] Is commercially feasible;

[2] Provides for optimum recovery of minerals to be produced;

[3] Can comply with requirements determined by the Secretary to be necessary to prevent or minimize pollution of air and water, scenic or esthetic damage to surface resources, to fish and wildlife, and hazards to human safety.

(3) The lessee has complied with all the terms of the lease.

§ 3172.3 *Acreage Designations and Limitations.*

(a) No lease issued hereunder may exceed 5,120 acres.

(b) Upon the issuance of any lease hereunder the Secretary shall designate the part of the leased lands upon which the lessee will be permitted to conduct operations during the research term.

(c) At the time for the grant of any extension of the term of lease as provided in section 3172.2(b), the Secretary will determine the quantity of mineral deposits needed for commercial production, allowing reasonable reserves. The term will be extended only with respect to the area which contains the quantity of mineral deposits so determined.

(d) No person, association or corporation (including a municipality) may take, hold, own or control an interest in more than the total maximum acreage of land included in any lease hereunder, except insofar as natural persons are permitted to hold greater interests under 30 U.S.C. sec. 184(e), by virtue of their 10 percent or lesser interests in corporations or associations holding leases hereunder.

§ 3172.4 *Rentals.*

Leases shall provide for the payment, in advance, of an annual rental of 50 cents for each acre or fraction thereof.

§ 3172.5 *Royalties.*

(a) Leases shall provide for the payment of royalties on production during their commercial production terms.

(b) The royalty rate on production shall be 3 percent on the gross value, at the point of shipment to market, of the mineral products from the oil shale, except as provided in subsections (c) and (d) of this section. Such royalties shall be due and payable monthly on the last day of the calendar month next following the calendar month in which produced.

(c) If the total annual royalty payment on production as computed in accordance with subsection (b) of this section is less than the payment would be if computed in accordance with subsection (d), then the lessee shall pay, by March 1 of the succeeding year, an additional amount equal to the difference between the royalty paid and the royalty as computed in accordance with subsection (d).

(d) The annual net income royalty rate shall be a percentage of net income from the production of mineral products from oil shale to the point of shipment to market.

The net annual income royalty rate is:

Ten (10) percent of that part of the net income which is no more than ten percent of investment.

Thirty (30) percent of that part of the net income which exceeds ten percent and is no more than twenty percent of investment.

Fifty (50) percent of that part of the net income which is more than twenty percent of investment.

As used in this section, "net income" means taxable income, computed without allowance for royalty and depletion. "Investment" means the original cost less depreciation of capital assets used in the aforesaid production and processing of oil shale. The term "investment" does not include oil shale obtained pursuant to a lease issued hereunder.

(e) Lease royalties shall be subject to readjustment at 20-year periods succeeding the issuance of the lease. Lessees will be notified of the proposed readjustment of royalties or notified that no readjustment is to be made. Unless the lessee shall file either a notice of objection and offer to negotiate the proposed readjustment of royalties, or file a relinquishment of the lease within 30 days after receipt of the notice, he will be deemed to have agreed to such readjusted royalties.

(f) The Secretary will, prior to any readjustment under subsection (e) of this section which would reduce the rate of royalty on any lease, publish a notice of intention to make such reduction in the Federal Register, inviting written comments by interested persons, to be filed within 60 days of the issuance of the notice. The Secretary will not readjust such royalties prior to the expiration of such 60-day period.

(g) Leases shall provide for the payment of royalties during their research terms, on minerals and mineral products sold by the lessee. The royalty rates shall be the same as those applicable during the commercial term.

§ 3172.6 *Termination of Lease.*

Each lease issued hereunder shall terminate at the end of its research term unless, prior thereto, the Secretary has authorized the commencement of the commercial production term.

§ 3172.7 *Lease Bond.*

A bond of not less than $100,000, conditioned on performance of the obligations imposed by the lease, the Act, and these regulations will be required prior to the issuance of an oil shale lease. The right is reserved at any time before or after the issuance of the lease to require an increase of the amount of the bond in any case where the Secretary deems it proper to do so.

§ 3172.9 *Other Provisions.*

(a) Protection of the Environment and Human Safety.

The lease will contain such provisions as the Secretary deems necessary to prevent or minimize pollution of air and water, scenic or esthetic damage, damage to surface resources, and to fish and wildlife and hazards to human safety.

(b) Prevention of Damage to Other Mineral Resources.

The lease will contain such provisions as the Secretary determines necessary to protect other mineral resources which may be involved.

(c) Diligence in Pursuit of Plan of Research.

The lease will require that the lessee pursue diligently both the plan of research upon which his lease was issued and operations during the commercial production phase.

(d) Disclosure of Information Developed During the Research Term.

(1) The lease will contain provisions requiring the lessee:

[1] To submit annual progress reports during the research period, in sufficient detail to disclose fully all work accomplished and results achieved.

[2] To submit, within 120 days after completion of all work under the research plan, a final report summarizing the state of the art and covering conclusions and recommendations derived therefrom. The report shall include a complete and detailed disclosure of all materials, processes, and equipment involved, including all the technical and financial data needed to enable any qualified person to carry out the work performed under the lease. Where appropriate, the recommendations shall include proposals for further improvements which would advance the future state of the art based on knowledge acquired in the performance of the work under the lease.

[3] To make such other reports and supply such information regarding the progress of the research as the Secretary may specify from time to time.

[4] To permit access, by persons designated by the Secretary, to the leased premises, all facilities thereon, all other facilities in which any part of the research is conducted, and all books and records which directly relate to the plan of research being conducted.

(2) The lease will provide that no report required under the lease may be copyrighted and the lessee, without additional compensation, therein grants to the Secretary the full right to publish, reproduce and use, and to have others do so, for any purpose without limitations, the reports and any information obtained by the Secretary hereunder. The Secretary will promptly publish the reports received and make the other information he has obtained available to the public.

(3) The lease will require that the lessee agree not to publish, or to make available to others besides representatives of the Secretary, the results of the research work under the lease or any information concerning the same, without prior approval in writing from the Secretary.

(e) Patents.

The lease will contain provisions that the United States will acquire title to all inventions made in the course of or under the research term of the lease, and requiring the lessee to issue licenses at reasonable royalty rates, with respect to such patents as he may own, which are necessary to permit others to practice inventions made in the course of or under the research term of the lease, except that the lease may contain provisions granting greater patent rights to the lessee, in such cases where a proper showing of exceptional circumstances is made, in accordance with the Statement of Government Patent Policy issued by President Kennedy on October 10, 1963, 28 F.R. 10943.

(f) Assignments and Relinquishments.

The lease will contain provisions governing assignments and relinquishments.

(g) Cancellation of Leases.

Upon failure of a lessee to comply with the provisions of the Mineral Leasing Act, or of the regulations issued thereunder, or of the lease, and continuation of such default for 30 days after service of written notice thereof by the Secretary, the Secretary may institute judicial proceedings for the cancellation of the lease as provided in section 31 of the Act. Failure to give notice with respect to any particular cause of forfeiture shall not be deemed a waiver and shall not prevent the cancellation and forfeiture of the lease for any other cause of forfeiture, or for the same cause occurring at another time.

(h) Additional Provisions.

The lease will contain such additional provisions as the Secretary deems appropriate.

§ 3172.10 *Antitrust Consultation.*

Prior to the issuance of a lease, the Secretary will forward a copy to the Attorney General, requesting his advice as to whether the issuance of the lease would be consistent with the objectives of the Federal antitrust laws.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, WASHINGTON

[43 CFR, Subpart 2244]

EXCHANGES

Basis and Purpose. Notice is hereby given that the Department of the Interior proposes to amend the regulations regarding exchanges of privately owned lands under the Taylor Grazing Act, found at Subpart 2244 of Title 43 of the Code of Federal Regulations, by adding the proposal regulations set forth below.

Interested persons are invited to submit their comments in writing to the Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C. 20240, within thirty days of the date of publication in the *Federal Register* of this notice. Persons wishing to present their views orally are requested to communicate with the Director, Bureau of Land Management.

A new section 2244.1–7 is added, as follows:

§ 2244.1–7 Exchanges of Oil Shale Lands

(a) Policy. Exchanges of public lands containing oil shale deposits may be consummated pursuant to Section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act, 48 Stat. 1272 (1934), as amended, 43 U.S.C. 315g (1964), where such action will promote economic recovery of shale oil and associated minerals and is otherwise in the public interest. Except as otherwise provided in this subsection (2244.1–7) such exchanges will be made pursuant to section 2244.1.

(b) Criteria. Exchanges of public lands containing oil shale deposits may be effected under the regulations in section 2244.1 only where each of the following requirements are met:

(1) The offered land is oil shale land having similar geologic and physical characteristics and of a value equal to or exceeding the value of the selected public land.

(2) The exchange will result in the consolidation of the offeror's lands so that they are susceptible of being managed as an economic unit for the recovery of shale oil and other mineral products.

(3) Consummation of the exchange will not result in impairment of proper utilization and management by the United States of its lands, including the land it is to receive in the exchange.

(4) The applicant enters into a written agreement with the authorized officer that he will manage and utilize the selected lands and all neighboring oil shale lands owned or controlled by him at any time in such a manner that (a) there is compliance with all applicable Federal and State statutes and regulations relating to control of environmental pollution, and (b) there is adherence to a coordinated plan of sound conservation practices in the management and use of such lands, including the avoidance of waste.

(c) Application. Application must be made in accordance with section 2244.1–2. Upon the filing of an application, and prior to the making or issuing of any classification decision, the authorized officer shall direct publication of a notice of application in a designated newspaper of general circulation in the county or countries in which both the offered and selected lands are situated. The notice, which shall be published once a week for three consecutive weeks, shall set forth the legal descriptions of the offered and selected lands, together with such other data as the authorized officer may deem pertinent, and shall provide for a 60-day period from date of the notice during which other private exchange applications may be filed for the selected lands pursuant to section 8 of the Taylor Grazing Act. Where more than one application has been filed for the selected lands the authorized officer shall take the following additional elements into consideration in determining which, if any, of the exchange offers will best benefit the public interest:

(1) the relative values of the offered lands;

(2) the location of the offered lands in relation to the public lands; and

(3) the willingness of any of the applicants to enter into a written agreement with the Secretary specifying a time schedule and rate of investment reasonable in the circumstances and a plan of mineral operations that will permit optimum recovery of shale oil and other mineral resources from the selected tract and all neighboring oil shale lands owned or controlled by the applicant.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE SUPPORTS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, in a report on the truth in lending bill, the Department of Commerce recommended its passage with a few minor amendments. The Department believes that the full disclosure of finance charges makes for more effective price competition, and would thereby be beneficial to the American economy and its growth. Unlike several witnesses who testified that the bill would have an adverse impact upon the economy, the Department of Commerce believes exactly the opposite will take place. It is encouraging to know that the Department, with its vast knowledge of the American economy, is able to refute the prophets of gloom who have charged the bill would retard consumer credit sales.

The Department also estimated such a measure would be in accord with the President's program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Commerce Department report be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL COUNSEL OF THE
DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman,
Committee on Banking and Currency,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is in further reply to your request for the views of this Department with respect to S. 5, a bill

"To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

The purposes of the bill are to promote economic stabilization, to inform consumers adequately and to strengthen competition among institutions extending credit by assuring full disclosure of the cost of credit. The bill would require a creditor to furnish the borrower with a written statement of the terms of the transaction. The statement must include such information as the total amount to be financed, the charges made, and the time and amount of payments.

The "finance charge" must be stated in dollars and cents, and also as an annual percentage rate, computed typically by multiplying the monthly percentage rate by the number of months per year. With respect to revolving or open-end credit plans, a creditor would have to furnish to the borrower prior to agreeing to extend credit under the plan, a written statement setting forth balance, dates, and percentage rates of the finance charge per period and per annum. In addition, the creditor must make periodic reports to the borrower of such information as the amounts of outstanding balances; the finance charge for the period in dollars and cents; and the annual percentage rate used to compute the finance charge for such period. If information disclosed becomes inaccurate because of prepayment, late payment, or other adjustment in the credit agreement consented to by the parties, this inaccuracy would not constitute a violation of the disclosure requirements of the bill.

S. 5 would authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to prescribe rules and regulations necessary to carry out the provisions of the bill. Such rules shall describe the methods which may be used to determine the annual percentage rate, prescribe reasonable tolerances of accuracy, and regulate the prominence (of type) with which the information is to be disclosed to the debtor. The Board may provide for classifications and differentiations and for adjustments and exceptions necessary to effectuate the purposes of the Act, prevent circumvention or evasion, or facilitate enforcement of the bill or the rules and regulations. The Board shall establish an advisory committee with fair representation of the interests of sellers of merchandise on credit, lenders, and the public.

The bill would not apply to extensions of credit to business firms or governmental agencies, nor to transactions in securities or commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

S. 5 provides both civil and criminal penalties for violations of the bill. Any creditor who fails to disclose information to any person in violation of the provisions of the bill or regulations issued under the bill shall be liable to such person in the amount of $100, or an amount twice the finance charge, whichever is greater. Liability on any credit transaction, however, shall not exceed $2,000. No recovery could be made if the percentage disclosed is in fact greater than the percentage required to be disclosed under S. 5. Any person who gives false or inaccurate information or fails to disclose information required to be disclosed under the bill or any regulation issued under the bill is also subject to a fine of not more than $5,000, imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

This Department supports the enactment of S. 5, but urges its amendment in certain respects.

This legislation should benefit consumers, stimulate efficiency in distribution, encourage competition in the credit market, and put the credit grantor and the consumer on a more equal bargaining basis. Disclosure to the purchaser of the annual rate for consumer credit charges, as required by the bill, would provide a common denominator by which a consumer may know what he is paying for credit, and how it compares with credit terms of other merchants or lenders. The annual percentage rate for credit can give the consumer a good basis for comparison purposes. Full disclosure of finance charges makes more effective price competition for credit and would thereby be beneficial to the American economy and its growth.

Today consumer credit (not including long term credit such as real estate mortgages) totals about $95 billion. The total level of consumer debt, including long term credit on real estate mortgages, was about $301 billion at the end of 1965. The increase to this figure, from $117 billion in 1955 and $197 billion in 1960, seems clearly to have been a major factor in the growth of our economy. During the same period, installment credit rose from about $29 billion in 1955 to $43 billion in 1960, and to $69 billion in 1965. In view of the size of this type of debt and its potential impact on the economy, it is obviously desirable to have maximum disclosure of information about credit terms.

A few amendments to the bill, however, are highly desirable.

1. This Department recommends changing the name of the bill from "Truth-in-Lending" to the more accurate and appropriate name of "Full-Disclosure-in-Lending Act", to avoid any implication of widespread, deliberate untruth in consumer lending today. While there undoubtedly exist instances of such deception, which tend to pull down the ethical practice of other businessmen to a lower competitive level than they would choose of their own accord, these are the exceptions. Full disclosure will help the consumer to make a more efficient free choice in the market place. Full disclosure will, in practice, free the majority of the businessmen from unfair competition from those making less than full credit disclosures.

2. We urge that section 4(b) of the bill, relating to revolving or open-end credit, be revised to insert the word "approximate" before the words "annual percentage rate" where they appear on page 5, line 20, and page 6, line 13, of the bill.

In a speech before Congress on February 16, 1967, Senator Proxmire, who introduced S. 5, stated his intention to require the statement of finance charges as an "approximate" annual percentage rate. This should be expressly stated in the bill.

3. We recommend that it be made clear that section 5 of the bill, which directs the issuance of rules and regulations by the Federal Reserve Board, is intended to give the Board broad discretionary powers to assure sufficient disclosure of credit terms to carry out the objectives of the bill without seriously restricting the availability of legitimate sources of credit. The Board needs to have considerable latitude in its determinations to make its regulations of maximum usefulness to credit users while minimizing the cost of compliance to extenders of credit and to the consumer who will ultimately bear such costs. Such flexibility in the Board's regulations is most desirable because of the special problems encountered in different types of credit transactions and the many variations in the past practices of different suppliers of credit.

4. We recommend the inclusion of a specific provision in section 6 of the bill indicating that the provisions of this law for disclosure of finance charges are not intended to affect State usury statutes dealing primarily with interest rates (as compared to finance charges covering servicing). Such a provision would make it clear that this legislation is not intended to affect the "time-price doctrine," held in almost all of the States, that finance charges in vendor credit transactions are not equivalent to the term "interest" within he meaning of usury statutes.

5. Finally, we believe that the development and use of standardized charts and tables could greatly lessen the burden upon businessmen. We recommend that the bill specifically authorize their use in satisfaction of the disclosure requirement.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of our report to the Congress and further that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

BURT W. ROPER,
Acting General Counsel.

PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S BIRTHDAY RECALLS SENATE FAILURE TO RATIFY GENOCIDE CONVENTION—LXVII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, one of the world's leading citizens celebrates *his birthday today. Our 33d President,* Harry Truman, is 83 today.

This truly remarkable man who, with matchless courage and magnificent wisdom, guided our people through some of the most perilous days in the history of our Republic, will celebrate the day quietly with his beloved Bess.

I salute Harry Truman for many battles well fought and for a life well lived. I admire Harry Truman for his invaluable service in behalf of the American people and his unflagging dedication to the great cause of world peace and human dignity.

It was Harry Truman who, at the conclusion of the San Francisco Conference in 1945, spoke these prophetic words:

> Unless we can attain these objective (human rights) for all men and women everywhere . . . we cannot have permanent peace and security.

True to his word, President Truman strongly supported the United Nations, and in 1949 submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate for its advice and consent.

President Truman straightforwardly and emphatically urged the Senate to ratify the Convention on Genocide.

Now, 18 years and three Presidents later, the Senate has still failed to act. Senate ratification, if anything, is even more urgent in 1967 than it was in 1949.

Mr. President, I can think of no more fitting tribute to a great President, nor no more meaningful act by the Senate of the United States on May 8, 1967, than the resolve of this Senate that it will speedily ratify the Convention on Genocide.

DAMAGE TO U.S. TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nation's textile industry, certainly one of the most vital in our economic makeup, is being knocked to its knees by a flood of foreign imports, which are dealing severe blows across the whole spectrum of the industry—from fiber producers to apparel manufacturers. In recognition of this problem, efforts are underway in Congress to reverse this trend before a recession hits the textile industry. Members of Congress from textile-oriented States and others, such as Republican Minority Leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, are also gravely concerned and are urging the administration to negotiate and administer trade agreements with the best interests of this country foremost in their consideration.

Mrs. Dolly Darr, staff writer of the Spartanburg, S.C., Herald, has written three penetrating articles on this subject, which appeared in the April 25, 26, and 27 issues of the Herald. Mrs. Darr and the Spartanburg Herald have rendered an important service in publishing these well-researched and incisive articles. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Apr. 25, 1967]

TEXTILE IMPORTS INCREASE FASTER THAN U.S. TURNOUT

(By Dolly Darr)

Webster defines imports as merchandise brought into a country from abroad; then adds in parentheses: usually in plural.

From the U.S. textile industry's point of view, this parenthetical addition is the understatement of the decade.

Not merely are textile imports into this country "usually in plural," they totaled close to three billion square yards last year—a 50 per cent increase over the previous year.

And there, in a large, tough nutshell, is the meaty problem facing U.S. textile men today.

Part of the problem lies in the fact that the imports story itself is so complicated.

Everybody, including the textile industry, agrees foreign trade is necessary to achieve our country's foreign policy goals. But textile imports are growing much faster than our own industry. While U.S. production is up one-third in the past five years, textile imports have tripled.

The international Long Term Arrangement (LTA) reached by 23 countries in 1962 (it expires Sept. 30, this year) covers only cotton textiles and provides for reasonable annual increases in exports to the U.S. Despite this, cotton textile imports have doubled in five years, from an initial high base. Fabrics of man-made fibers, which are completely uncontrolled, have more than tripled in four years, and increased approximately 41 per cent in 1966 over the previous year. Wool fabric imports now are six times greater than they were 10 years ago, and double those of 1964.

There are two frequently heard reactions to these figures: (1) let our textile industry compensate for imports by increasing its own exports; and (2) we shall modernize and increase our own efficiency in order to compete more effectively.

But about 50 nations virtually prohibit importing American textiles and another 20 have tariffs and taxes so high as to effectively shut off these markets.

While the U.S. textile industry continually invests large sums of money and manpower in research and development, as well as in new buildings, machinery, expansions, and modernizations, it still cannot compete with foreign imports in price because of production costs—particularly labor. The average wage of textile workers' pay in this country is $2 per hour, as compared with 53 cents an hour in Italy, 37 cents in Spain, 36 cents in Japan, 25 cents in Hong Kong, 18 cents in Brazil, and 14 cents in India, in 1965.

Many other factors contribute to the full textile imports story. But the chief concern of U.S. textile men is the rapid rate of growth of imports.

The chart above shows the rate of import growth over the last five year period. It also shows that Japan and Hong Kong remain responsible for nearly half our total textile imports, but other countries also have made significant gains in import totals.

The U.S. textile industry doesn't even hope to get these import totals reduced—only to curtail their growth rate.

Imports presently are making a decided impact on our textile and related industries. This impact is showing up in employment figures, profit statements, industry investment decisions, and in many other ways.

Specific ways in which the imports are affecting the textile industry throughout the nation—and in Spartanburg, in particular—will be shown in articles in this series on Wednesday and Thursday.

U.S. textile imports, by major country, for the year ending December 1966

[In millions of square yards]

Country	Cotton		Wool		Man made		Total		Percent of total U.S. textile imports	
	1962	1966	1962	1966	1962	1966	1962	1966	1962	1966
Japan	351.2	412.0	34.7	58.3	110.7	445.0	406.6	915.3	33	33
Hong Kong	209.4	353.4	8.8	20.1	5.8	39.3	284.0	412.8	19	15
Mexico	9.2	152.7	------	.2	(1)	.8	------	153.7	------	5
Portugal	101.5	112.8	.9	.2	(1)	1.8	------	114.8	------	4
Taiwan	84.8	61.6	------	2.0	6.9	32.9	91.7	96.5	6	3
Brazil	68.6	95.6	------	.5	(1)	------	------	96.1	------	3
Canada	1.6	16.7	.4	2.3	(1)	63.4	------	82.4	------	3
India	35.5	81.4	.1	.1	(1)	.2	------	81.7	------	3
Italy	19.9	19.0	41.6	26.1	51.2	29.0	112.7	74.1	7	3
West Germany	15.0	32.1	2.8	2.8	(1)	36.8	------	71.7	------	3
United Kingdom	11.6	14.5	24.3	21.4	(1)	17.8	------	53.7	------	2
All others	------	471.0	------	43.6	------	130.5	------	645.1	------	23
Grand total	1,164.7	1,822.8	141.0	175.3	213.4	797.5	1,519.1	2,795.6	------	100

[1] Country data unavailable.

IMPORTS AND THEIR EFFECT, PART II—THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY IS CRYING, AND IT SHOWS FIGURES TO BACK UP ITS TEARS

(By Dolly Darr)

The U.S. textile industry is characterized by some as a cry baby.

"Textile people cry too much and too often—over the cotton price law, investment tax allowances, government subsidies—and now imports."

This is the attitude of some people, including some government officials, concerning the industry's most recent pleas for controls over textile imports.

So the industry's most powerful organization, American Textile Manufacturers Institute (ATMI), has decided it's time to put on a new public face.

At the ATMI annual meeting in Florida last month, the people who represent the industry—traditionally one of the most publicity-shy—voted to underwrite an advertising program. This will be an important first for the organization.

The program is designed to build a new image with the American public. First it's necessary, some of the industry's top leaders believe, to inform the general public, and especially Washington, of what is happening in the U.S. now as a direct result of the spiraling imports, and of potential dangers.

That many people are unsympathetic is understandable. Looking on the surface one sees a giant industry with more than four million people directly employed in textile-apparel-fiber-producing. There have been reports that production is up one-third since the early '60's, and there are frequent announcements of new buildings, expansions, modernizations, and breakthroughs in technology.

It would appear that the industry isn't hurting all that much.

However, what doesn't show on the surface is that industry profits are slipping in spite of increased investments and even increased sales. ATMI statistics show that for the second quater of 1966, net earnings in textiles were 3.9 cents on each dollar of sales. This doesn't compare very favorably with the 5.9 cents earned on an average by all other U.S. industries.

In 1967, according to one senior analyst, every major textile producer will show a decline in profits, possibly as much as 10 to 20 per cent.

As a result of a market flooded with imports and a declining interest in paying the higher price for domestic goods, U.S. producers are cutting back production and inventories. In answer to the lessening demand, many of the nation's textile plants have reduced operations from a six-day to a five-day week, with some dropping to three and four days periodically.

John Q. Public also doesn't know that unfilled orders have fallen to the lowest point in history for many mills, that increasingly often responsible customers are deferring orders (if not canceling them), and that quiet curtailment is rampant throughout the industry.

Most informed American do realize that employment cut-backs are being made in the textile industry, that that imports are being named as the major cause. But few know the extent of current and coming layoffs. And still fewer stop to think that this unemployment is centered in Appalachia and other "poverty" areas, where the country can least afford it.

Imports of foreign textiles are replacing 200,000-250,000 jobs held by Americans who work directly in textiles—plus another 100,000-150,000 indirectly in those industries which supply materials and services to textiles, according to knowledgeable spokesmen for the U.S. textile industry.

Dr. R. Buford Brandis, director of the International Trade Division of ATMI, earlier this month addressed a subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor which is studying the effect of imports on American industry and employment. He said, "The impact of imports . . . has been shattering. Currently, imports are taking more than 10 per cent of the American market. This industry provides 13 per cent of all manufacturing jobs in the entire U.S. economy. Textile jobs are heavily concentrated in Appalachia and other 'pockets of poverty'. Hence their relative social-economic importance is even larger than the 13 per cent overall figure would signify."

He said ATMI, representing 85 per cent of the domestic textile industry, endorses two bills being considered by the subcommittee under the chairmanship of Rep. John H. Dent of Pennsylvania. The bills would empower the President to take necessary action to provide relief for industries where imports are curtailing employment or earning power.

"Unless reasonable controls are placed on import volume," Dr. Brandis says, "there will continue to be a shifting of critically needed jobs and job opportunities out of Appalachia and other underdeveloped portions of our country to foreign nations, some of which are highly industrialized."

"A healthy, dynamic, expanding textile industry in the U.S. is essential to our economic well-being and our national defense. We are willing in our country's international political interest to share the growth—but only the growth—of our markets with our friends abroad."

The import problem is having a significant effect in Spartanburg and nearby counties, as will be shown in the final part of this series tomorrow.

LAST PART OF A SERIES—TEXTILE IMPORTS: PLANT CUTBACKS REVEAL THE STORY

(By Dolly Darr)

The textile import problem begins at home. In Spartanburg County, second largest textile-producing county in the state, employment of mill workers fell 200 in March, according to information released last week by the local state employment office.

The county's total employment in textile mill products was 21,400 last month, compared with 21,600 in January and February. This reflects a steady decline from November's high of 21,800.

The average textile workweek declined one full hour earlier this year compared with the previous year, with some types of operations much harder hit than others.

Growing inventories of finished goods and order deferments have caused many mills in the county to cut back production schedules, covering up some looms or switching them to other types of production.

Several textile plants have revealed cuts in capital expenditures of up to one-third from last year's levels.

Several other local mill groups predict workweek schedules will be cut from six to five days by mid-summer; some departments may get as low as three or four days. Current periodic and temporary layoffs may become permanent.

Several textile companies with mills in Spartanburg County have announced significant decreases in profits for the first quarter of this year.

All of these things are attributable, directly and indirectly, to foreign textile imports, local manufacturers believe.

Last year's surge in imports continues to disturb the industry. The Commerce Department reports that cotton textile imports for instance, totaled 160 million square yards in January, up 20 per cent from December.

Here's how some of the local mills are being affected:

—Spartan Mills group: Walter Montgomery, president, reports, "Our unfilled orders have gone down faster than I've ever known them . . . orders are being deferred . . . responsible customers don't cancel, but they do ask for deferments . . . this is happening now."

—Arkwright Mills group: Barry Hayes, vice president: "Imports are hurting us more and more . . . Cotton gray goods are showing the largest increase in imports recently . . . If something is not solved our production schedule could be cut from six days to five . . . I see a possibility of this happening if no action is taken by June . . . Canton flannel, product of our new plant, is a low import problem . . . but our other two plants, coarse sheeting, denims, etc., could be hurt after June."

—Deering Milliken mills: the record speaks: 600 white-collar employes discharged companywide, recently; a shifting of operations away from fine goods into more industrials; further diversification (DM is now engaged in an attempt to buy more than 50 per cent of common shares of Albany Felt Co., manufacturer of dryer felt for paper machines); DM's Farnsworth Mill in Lisbon Center, Maine, and Cowan Mill of Lewiston, Maine, will be sold at auction May 24. Farnsworth Mill was closed two years ago but left in operable condition in the hope that steps would be taken to curtail the amount of wool fabric imports, according to a company spokesman.

—M. Lowenstein & Sons (of which Lyman Printing and Finishing Co., largest employer in Spartanburg county, is a division): Earnings declined 11.4 per cent, sales by 10.7 per cent for the first quarter that ended April 1, this year.

—Dan River Mills, Inc. (owner of Clifton Mfg. Co. here): Net sales for the quarter ending April 1 are estimated at $65½ million, a decline from approximately $73½ million in the first period a year ago. Robert S. Small, president, said in a report to stockholders at the annual meeting this month that part of the reason for the decline was unrestricted textile imports.

Mills in nearby counties also have been affected:

—J. P. Stevens & Co., Inc., (which has operations in this county): laid off an undetermined number of workers at its Maples No. 2 plant at Piedmont "because of lack of demand for its products."

—Rutherford County textile plants have slowed down production in recent months.

—Gaston County, N.C.: some textile mills have been running three and four-day weeks since last February.

—North Carolina textile employment: decreased 3,200 in February from the previous month to 256,600. Employment there, too, has been dropping since last November.

Spartanburg's Frederick Dent, president of Mayfair Mills at Arcadia, and president-elect of ATMI, sums up the industry-wide problem: "Textile imports in 1966 totaled 2.8 billion square yards, a level 300 per cent greater than in 1961. During the past six months cotton textile imports continued upwards of 12 per cent greater than a year earlier. Manmade fiber textile imports in January and February, this year, were 50 per cent greater than in 1961. The escalation of textile imports has weakened the U.S. Textile market.

"With over four million people directly employed in the textile-apparel-fiber producing complex and many more in related industries and service, it is hard to believe that the federal government will fail to take action to see that our jobs are not exported to areas where wage rates are 36 cents per hour down to the 18 cents level."

MARSHALL McNEIL WRITES OF BILL TO COMPENSATE INNOCENT VICTIMS OF CRIME

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mr. Marshall McNeil, of Scripps-Howard, has recently written an excellent article summarizing the rationale for compensation to victims of crime. I am much pleased by the article's favorable mention of my bill, S. 646, which would establish a program for providing compensation to injured victims of crimes occurring in the District of Columbia, and other areas of Federal jurisdiction.

Mr. McNeil rightly stresses the opinion of the President's Crime Commission, which in its recent report stated that—

> The general principle of victim compensation especially to persons who suffer injury in volent crime, is sound and that the experiments now being conducted with different types of compensation programs are valuable.

I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "Crime: What of the Victim?" published in the Washington Daily News of May 4, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILL SEEKS COMPENSATION—CRIME: WHAT OF THE VICTIM?

(By Marshall McNeil)

Pity the poor victim of a mugging. He could be you.

If a suspect is caught, the fellow is instantly enveloped in new protections fabricated out of the Constitution by the Supreme Court.

The police must treat him with care. They cannot question him unless his lawyer is present. If he hasn't got a lawyer, they'll get him one. He needn't say a word. But if he confesses, chances are his admissions cannot be used against him.

He is guaranteed a fair trial in which his attorney employs all his skills to cast reasonable doubt on the tale of violence told by the victim.

If the defendant is convicted, a reasonable effort most often is made to treat him humanely and to see that he is adequately housed, clothed and fed while he pays his "debt to society." With the help of experts hired with tax funds, an attempt is made to "rehabilitate" him so that he may rejoin this society cured of whatever ailed him.

But his victim? That's another story.

Once he might have carried a gun to protect himself from violence in the streets. He can do that no more. Instead, he is assured of protection by "society," which uses his tax money to create a police force to shield him from the mugger.

HAS ALMOST NO RECOURSE

When this protection for which he has paid and which he has been taught to expect fails, the victim has almost no recourse.

He loses his money. Perhaps he is seriously injured in the assault. Maybe he loses an eye. He has doctor bills to pay. His employment, and his wages, may be interrupted. He could even be incapacited to the point where he cannot resume his work.

What of the victim then?

In 48 states and the District of Columbia, the answer is "nothing" . . . except, of course, he can seek damages under civil law. But what are the chances of his assailant having money with which to pay?

That's the reason Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D. Tex.), in company with nine of his colleagues, has just re-introduced his Criminal Injuries Compensation Bill.

FEDERAL VIOLENT CRIMES COMMISSION

It sets up a Federal Violent Crimes Compensation Commission which would decide whether, and how much, compensation should be paid out of general tax funds—the same funds that support the police force—to the victims of crime or their heirs. It covers 18 offenses generally grouped under the headings of homicide, assault, and sexual offenses.

It covers only areas where the federal government exercises general police power, such as the District of Columbia, ships at sea, national parks, military reservations.

It is not intended to compensate completely for all losses suffered by victims of violence. No more than $25,000 could be paid in any one case.

But even so, Sen. Yarborough is convinced that to the extent now possible it would settle in part the debt he believes society owes when there is a failure by its organized protective force to shield a citizen from violence.

Sen. Yarborough is trying to get hearings on his bill and in this he has the backing of the President's national Crime Commission.

HEARINGS PROVIDE NATIONAL FORUM

"The commission believes," its final report said, "that such hearings would provide a national forum for a much-needed debate over the philosophy, assumptions and potential advantages and disadvantages of such a program, and the relative merits and design of a program on the Federal level in particular.

And there are disadvantages. There is opposition to this idea of state compensation to victims of crime. Some call it "socialism." Others fear it will produce phony crimes just to allow "victims" to dip their hands into the public treasury.

But California has passed a law for compensation of victims of crimes. So has New York. There are similar laws in New Zealand and Britain.

Sen. Yarborough holds with the opinion of the President's Crime Commission that "the general principle of victim compensation, especially to persons who suffer injury in violent crime, is sound."

He hopes his bill, when enacted, will be a model for the states.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR MORSE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a leading editorial was printed in the Baltimore Sun of today entitled "MORSE Should Know."

The editorial indicates that—

> People who follow labor developments will be impressed by Senator Wayne L. Morse's support of the President's proposals for settling the rail labor dispute.

If for no other reason than the fact that the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon has participated, in a significant capacity, in many disputes over more decades than he or I care to remember, there is no question about the Senator's ability, integrity, and understanding of this most complex and complicated problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MORSE SHOULD KNOW

People who follow labor developments will be impressed by Senator Wayne L. Morse's support of the President's proposals for settling the rail labor dispute. Morse knows as much as any man alive about the way the National Railway Labor Act declined from almost invariable success in settling rail labor disputes to almost invariable failure. Morse was the chairman 26 years ago of the special emergency board set up to handle a nationwide strike threat on the eve of Pearl Harbor. When his board brought in its expert, quasi-judicial fact-finding recommendations, the Administration failed to support them.

Instead direct negotiations were reopened with the unions involved and the union spokesman himself testified in open hearings that the White House had encouraged him to demand more. Recalling the episode in debate on the Senate floor some years later, Morse assured his colleagues that trade unions would never be content with the proposals of disinterested boards if they felt better deals were available by direct intervention of the White House.

What has grown up in the country is simply a feeling among energetic union leaders that the due process held out in strike-settling legislation is insufficiently productive from the labor point of view. If the direct coercion of strike or strike threats promises to yield more, no union leader eager to maintain face and following will forgo the challenge to the White House.

But in the latest rejection by rail workers of not one but two official board reports, Mr. Johnson seems to be saying simply that White House intervention this time is unlikely to outbid expert and unbiased proposals already filed. Senator Morse approves and his approval, as we say, is important. After all, rehabilitation of fact-finding on the rails might bolster it in general industry under Taft-Hartley and could conceivably pace a gradual return in American employment relations (industrial and otherwise) to the idea that law and order pay best. Surely vindication of present laws would be better than new legislative plunges toward compulsion.

THE NECESSITY OF BEING A DISSENTER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, this week's Outlook section of the Washington Post carried an essay by former White House aide, Richard N. Goodwin, on "The Necessity of Being a Dissenter." I commend him for his restatement of a principle that bears constant repetition, if we are to stay free:

> It is the blessing of our system that we not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms.

I ask unanimous consent to have Mr. Goodwin's article printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Necessity of Being a Dissenter

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Nothing is more depressing about today's Washington than the mounting reluctance of the official community, and some of the press, to treat dissent on its merits, to view it as a reflection of conscience and conviction and to examine it not for motive but for its intellectual force, relevance and truth.

Does Sen. Fulbright challenge our foreign policy? Immediately the mutterings begin that he is a "bad" Foreign Relations Committee chairman, doesn't control his committee (although when the committee defeated the President's Latin American resolution it was his fault) or, even worse, is lazy. And so it goes. Sen. Wayne Morse is a "wild man." Intellectuals are cowardly or alienated or don't like Texans. (Except for those in Government who, presumably, are brave, committed and in love with Texas.)

Of course, if you are a Republican, everything is changed. You have a reason for dissent: to defeat Democrats. That is something Washington can understand. Those whose opposition can be traced to institutional self-interest are accepted. Men who speak out of passion or belief are scorned and their motives searched. For the ultimate, incomprehensive offense is that anyone should endanger his public career simply out of conviction.

Merely to admit this possibility would challenge and endanger the tranquil consciences of the hundreds who are busy every day enforcing a policy they do not believe in.

THE RISE OF DEMAGOGY

I speak here especially about the critics who have been involved in public life. I do not believe they criticize President Johnson because of his "style" or because he is from Texas. I myself like Texas very much; countryside, ranches, barbecues, long and marvelous anecdotes and the immense stamina and vitality which the President recreates. Like many others now in dissent, I was always treated with much sympathy, generosity and warmth.

But that is not the issue. The issue is that many sincere and moderate men believe we are engaged in a steadily more hazardous war and a war which greater skill and wisdom could have brought to an honorable settlement consistent with America's self-interest.

The attitude toward this dissent has allowed the rise of dangerous and undemocratic demagogy. It takes many forms. Dissenters, we are sometimes told, are cowardly and timid. Yet it does not take excessive courage to send men off to war. Were all those who conducted wars valiant and those who opposed them cowards?

It is a view with horrendous and unacceptable implications. It may even at times take more courage to oppose the massive political power which conducts conflict. What bravery is there in saying "The President is right"? After all, none of us—on either side of the debate—are going to be shot or burned or bombed.

THE CHARGE IS MURDER

Another form of assault charges the advocates of moderation with responsibility for the loss of American life. Dissent is not only unpatriotic, it is murder. How cruel a lie this is. The fact is that not a single American has died because of a bombing halt we did not begin or a moderate course we have not pursued. And thousands of persons are dead from what we have in fact done.

If we are willing to concede the sincerity of those who are actually killing human beings, we are forced to concede the humane and peaceful motives of those who offer an alternative view. Certainly it requires as much vision and humanity to preserve the living as to justify the dead. To pursue the debate at any other level is a deliberate effort to arouse irrational and irrelevant passions unworthy of this Nation and its leaders.

The most shameful demagogy of all is to accuse those who dissent of unpatriotically prolonging the war by increasing the confidence of the enemy. How curious it is to claim that those who wish a decent and honorable peace are continuing the conflict while those who have plunged us into war take upon themselves the mantle of peace.

This war has seriously eroded the world leadership, international position and moral power of the United States. By ending it honorably we can restore some of the strength for which millions have died and millions have worked for generations and which now is being carelessly and wantonly cast on the unnecessary fires of Vietnam.

ACCOMPLICE TO HORROR

Hanoi may draw what conclusions it likes. That is irrelevant. Our concern is with the United States and with opposing the acts of those who are damaging our country. That is the only course of true and courageous patriotism.

Vietnam is not just another political issue. Every day fellow human beings are being crippled and scarred and killed. Those who support our present policies believe this devastation and carnage is necessary to higher aims. Others disagree.

For anyone who dissents in his heart, not to dissent with whatever weapons he has—words or speeches, petitions or demonstrations—is to find in the secret depths of his own mind the silent accomplice to horror.

It is the blessing of our system that we not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms. That, after all, is what even the most militant tell us the Vietnamese war is all about.

THE VICTORY OF CINCO DE MAYO

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, this Nation is justly proud of the rich heritage bestowed on this land by the many Americans of Mexican descent. They have given to America not only a strong spirit of national consciousness, but an indomitable sense of courage and independence.

In my own State of California, we are particularly proud of our over 1½ million Mexican American citizens. They represent, in a very real sense, the devotion and love for country which a small band of gallant Mexicans displayed in 1862 when they defeated a large foreign army on the fifth of May.

Each year on this day, the Republic of Mexico and Spanish-speaking citizens of Mexican descent celebrate this historic victory of Cinco de Mayo. This battle symbolizes the overwhelming power of the human spirit over all military odds.

In the 1860's, Mexico was a struggling young nation fighting to retain its independence. European nations, particularly France under Napoleon III, cast greedy glances on this new and vibrant country.

In 1862, 6,000 French soldiers set out from Veracruz to Mexico City to the victory they were sure would be theirs. But their confidence was unwarranted, for on May 5, they encountered a small, courageous band of Mexican patriots at Puebla, a strategic city halfway between Veracruz and Mexico City. The French Army was thrown back and the victory at Puebla became a national legend. The valor of these patriots in the face of superior odds and their heroism led to the creation of Cinco de Mayo as a national holiday for Mexico.

The fifth of May commemorates a day upon which courage and love for country triumphed over the threat of a foreign power. The strength, valor, and patriotism of those men has served as an inspiration to the entire world for over 100 years. It is these same inspiring qualities which Spanish-speaking people of Mexican descent have given to California and America.

In honor of those fine citizens and in memory of the brave men who fought so valiantly at Puebla, I take great pleasure in extending greetings and warmest best wishes to the Republic of Mexico and to all Mexican Americans on this, the 105th anniversary of Cinco de Mayo.

ANDREAS PAPANDREOU AND THE SITUATION IN GREECE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, all Americans have a stake in the welfare of the Greek people and nation, but many Minnesotans have a special concern for recent events there.

In the hearts of the university community especially, Andreas Papandreou is a Minnesotan. During his 8 years on the faculty there, he made a deep impression not only on his colleagues in the department of economics but also on his students and his many friends in the community and in the State.

In recent days I have received many inquiries and requests to help insure the rights of the Papandreou family in particular and political prisoners in general, as well as many expressions of concern over the unfortunate fall of the constitutional Government in Greece.

Mr. President, I have been greatly heartened by the news reports and personal responses that I have received concerning our Government's involvement in this matter. I am informed that our Ambassador, Mr. Talbot, has continually been involved in obtaining assurances of proper treatment of political prisoners. Furthermore, I understand that our Government has very clearly expressed the concern of Americans for a return to constitutional government at the earliest possible time.

And of course, Minnesotans, and many other Americans, are especially concerned for Andreas Papandreou. We know him as a man who is genuinely interested in social reform. I have been told that the strong feeling in this country for Andreas Papandreou has also been made clear to the military junta.

I was pleased, Mr. President, to note the newspaper story this morning that President Johnson has assured academic leaders in this country that he is willing to intercede personally on behalf of Andreas Papandreou to make certain that he will not be summarily executed. Last week the New York Times raised the question whether the present atmosphere in Greece provides any possibility of fair treatment of any of those who are being held prisoner. Given that atmosphere, it seems to me that our Government could press with good conscience for the release of elected political leaders who are being detained in Greece.

It is extremely important for this Government to bring every appropriate diplomatic pressure to bear to insure the return of constitutional rights to the Greek people. We must, of course, give the Government an opportunity to demonstrate that its real concern is for the Greek people and not for its own power. But we must be prepared as well to demonstrate that we look with extreme disfavor on this tragic but hopefully temporary setback for democratic institutions in Greece.

Mr. President, I join with my constituents of Greek heritage, with my constituents who admire and love Andreas Papandreou, and with supporters of free institutions everywhere in lamenting the military takeover in Greece and in urging the Government of the United States to continue its efforts to protect political freedom in that country and assist in the restoration of constitutional government.

We must not relax our efforts until the verbalizations of the military government have been translated into acceptable specific actions. Until that happens, we must refrain above all, from any actions on our part which would enable the Greek junta to claim that it has support from the American Government.

STEEL IMPORTS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania adopted, on April 19, 1967, a resolution on the effects of foreign imports on the steel industry. The health of the Nation's steel industry is of vital concern to the economy and to the national security. The resolution memorializes the U.S. Congress to take steps to provide the domestic steel industry with temporary relief from the increasing inflow of foreign steel imports. I agree with the resolution and wish to bring it to the attention of all Senators.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution of the Pennsylvania Senate be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas, imports of foreign steel have increased from more than one million tons in 1957 to eleven million tons in 1966; and

Whereas, In 1966 these imports accounted for eleven per cent of the total domestic steel market; and

Whereas, The current world excess steel producing capacity of approximately seventy-five million tons and projected facility additions for Western Europe and Japan indicate that imports will account for an increasingly greater share of the domestic steel market in the years to come; and

Whereas, The current high level of importation is largely due to the many actions of foreign governments to encourage their steel industries to export, coupled with the significantly lower employment costs in those countries; and

Whereas, If present trends continue, the loss of volume caused by the rapidly increasing imports will pose a serious threat to the profitability of the steel industry; and

Whereas, A healthy domestic steel industry is vital to our National security, is instrumental in maintaining a high level of employment in Pennsylvania and other steel producing states, and is a significant factor in stemming the drain on the United States balance of payments; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorializes the United States Congress to take all necessary steps to provide the domestic steel industry with temporary relief from the increasing inflow of foreign steel imports until equitable and fair competition is established; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the two United States Senators from Pennsylvania and to each member of the House of Representatives from the Commonwealth.

A TREASURY VIEW OF BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS STRATEGY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the balance-of-payments problem is one which is of continuing concern to the United States, particularly when viewed in conjunction with the discussions taking place concerning international monetary reform.

The Honorable Winthrop Knowlton, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, discussed the balance-of-payments question on May 2 before the World Affairs Council at a meeting in Boston. Because his statement is that of an administration officer intimately concerned with the subject, I believe his exposition is worthy of note. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROBLEM: A LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

(Remarks by Hon. Winthrop Knowlton, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for International Affairs, at the luncheon meeting of the World Affairs Council, Sheraton-Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass., May 2, 1967)

I. INTRODUCTION

I want to discuss with you today a problem that is *statistical; sexless; senseless,* in the eyes of some; and *remote* in the minds of most. In other words, the United States balance of payments.

Despite these distasteful characteristics, the subject has recently been embraced with considerable conversational fervor; the light shed upon it appears to vary in inverse proportion to the conversational heat.

You are all no doubt familiar with the problem in a general way—and many of you are familiar with its intricies. For every year but one of the last seventeen, the United States has paid out more dollars to foreigners than it has taken in. Some of these dollars have moved into the hands of foreign monetary authorities who can convert them into gold if they so desire. In 1956 the amount of liquid dollars held by foreign countries totaled $14.6 billion, and our gold stock totaled $22.1 billion. By the end of 1966 foreign liquid dollar holdings had grown to $27.9 billion ($13.7 billion in official hands), and our gold stock had dropped to $13.2 billion.

As the problem persists, individual sectors of our society tend increasingly to blame other sectors for the deficit. The prescription of some (outside the Administration) is to have us bring back our troops from Western Europe or drastically to reduce our foreign economic assistance programs. Some (not in the financial business) would reduce or eliminate various types of private capital outflows. Others (presumably not members of the jet-set) select the American tourist, conveniently pictured as sipping champagne and ogling bare-bosomed girls in a Paris night club, as the villain. And still others (usually those doing poorly in trade) would have us erect trade barriers. Each group views its *own* contribution to the deficit as morally sacrosanct and economically viable in the long run—even if costing us a few dollars in the short run.

As if this chorus were not sufficiently diverting for the policy makers, there is a simultaneous dialogue in progress over whether the steady increase in U.S. liquid liabilities and the steady decline in reserve assets is really a problem at all. Here our advice ranges from that of distinguished professors who view the process as one of normal banking intermediation and exhort us "not to do something but just stand there" to the disciplinary exhortations of foreign central bankers, who pursue cure of the deficit with the religious zeal of Captain Ahab in pursuit of the White Whale.

We are confronted, on the one hand, by those who would have us break the link to gold (the only question being whether to do it now, with $13 billion left, or to let it all drain out first) and, on the other, by those who would apply a good dose of old-fashioned economic discipline, stagnate the economy, and, presto, bring ourselves into equilibrium. Somewhere in between are advocates of a "dollar bloc."

None of these groups—in my view—lives in the real world as it exists today, or as we want it to exist in the future.

II. BASIC ASSUMPTIONS

Today, I want to discuss United States balance of payments problem—and our strategy—in what I hope is a more frontal and pragmatic way. Time does not permit me to discuss the closely-related problem of international liquidity and the negotiations in progress for the reform of the international monetary system.

With respect to the United States balance of payments per se, I will assume that:

It *is* a problem.

The problem *must* be solved.

It can *only* be solved through effective, long-range measures.

It *need* not be solved by restrictive measures and *can*, as a practical matter, be solved largely by a combination of increasing our private balance of payments receipts and exercising restraints over our Government outlays.

It requires an organized approach in which the talents and resources of the Government and private industry are more effectively coordinated.

And, finally, it *cannot* be solved without positive action by other countries.

III. THE SHORT-TERM STRATEGY

I will comment on the short-run picture only in passing by saying that shorter term measures include:

The Interest Equalization Tax, which we are attempting to extend and strengthen;

The Voluntary Federal Reserve Program to restrain capital outflows from banks and other financial institutions;

The Voluntary Commerce Program designed to moderate direct investment outflows.

Like the shots of cortisone pumped into Sandy Koufax's left elbow, these measures have enabled us to produce a respectable balance of payments performance during a difficult—and presumably temporary—period in which Vietnam costs have had an important adverse impact. They have enabled us to reduce our liquidity deficit in the last two years to $1.4 billion, on average, compared to $2.8 billion, on average, in the preceding five years; they helped reduce our official settlement deficit to $0.5 billion, on average, in the last two years, compared to $2.2 billion, on average, in the preceding five years.

IV. THE LONG-RANGE STRATEGY

A. Goal

The United States' long-range balance of payments objective—stated most simply—is to reach and sustain the degree of equilibrium necessary to preserve confidence in the stability of the dollar as a *transactions* and *reserve* currency. (I use the word *preserve* advisedly. Confidence in the dollar exists today. The fact that 94 percent of our gold losses to foreign central banks in the last three years are attributable to purchase by *one* central bank suggests these drains relate to factors other than lack of confidence in our currency.)

B. Structure

We must achieve this objective in the right way. I suggest that the most rational and desirable profile for balance of payments equilibrium would be one in which:

The United States would meet its fair share of international commitments on behalf of *mutual security* in the Free World and *economic development* in the poorer nations of the Free World.

The United States would export private capital. We have the most efficient capital market in the world; to deprive a world that needs capital of access to this economic resource would, over the long run, constitute an act of economic perversity.

To cover these Government outflows and private capital outflows, the United States would increase *its balance of payments receipts* from a variety of sources, of which the most important are *exports of goods and services,* including travel; *direct investment income,* including royalties; and *foreign portfolio investment.*

C. Implementation

Let me now suggest specific ways in which we can *increase the receipts* and *limit the payments* in question. As you will see, achievement of the desired balance of payments profile will require new actions, better planning, and a greater sense of urgency on the part of many people. It also requires, in my opinion, far greater self-confidence in ultimate success than many analysts in Governments, in business, and in the academic community have lately professed.

1. Increasing Our Trade Surplus

The time has come for us to improve our trade surplus by launching a powerful long-range export drive. Price and cost stability are essential ingredients of success in this endeavor. After out-performing our major competitors with respect to costs and prices in the period 1960–65, we did no better than hold our own in 1966. If we are to increase our market share in the future, as we must, we must again out-perform our major competitors in this important respect.

With respect to *export promotion,* the Commerce Department has already greatly intensified its efforts.

U.S. Trade Missions, begun in 1954 largely as good will tours, have been entirely recast as vehicles for hard-selling of American products, services, and investments abroad.

Attendance at Commercial Trade Fairs has climbed from 1.6 million persons in fiscal 1963 to an estimated 5 million in fiscal 1967 to date. The number of U.S. firms participating in these fairs has jumped from 147 in 1963 to 522 thus far in 1967 and may well exceed 1,000 by the end of the year.

Commerce is now storing in computers vast new quantities of information on the international trading interests of 23,000 U.S. corporations. Of these, 10,000 are not now exporting but have indicated an interest in doing so. Commerce helps these novice exporters by suggesting a variety of established channels for distributing their products overseas.

The recent report of the National Export Expansion Council (the so-called Kimberly Report) struck just the right note, in my view, when it stated:

"An export expansion program, projected for ten years, should be planned to analyze the total potential for American exports, market-by-market, based upon three kinds of growth: (1) a normal growth based on an expanding world economy; (2) a penetration growth based on taking business away from foreign countries which are competitors; and (3) the introduction of new products and services which are presently unavailable in world markets.

"There should be an expansion of electronic data processing involving market information, trade opportunities, identification of prospective exporters, and the compilation of export data to permit tabulation of results."

With respect to *export financing,* we have made progress in the last year in streamlining the operations of the Export-Import Bank. It has simplified its procedures. It has a new rediscount facility. New loan authorizations by the Bank are up 70 percent to an annual rate of $3.7 billion in fiscal year 1967. Additional measures to improve the quality and quantity of support the United States can give exporters in the field of finance are under active consideration by the Administration and the Congress.

In the *tax* field, we have in the last year streamlined regulations relating to exports. The Government has under continuing review the relationship between tax systems here and abroad; if differences exist or should materialize that would put our exporters at an unfair disadvantage, we intend to take appropriate measures to correct the situation.

The United States is extraordinarily competitive at the two extremes of the export spectrum—agriculture and advanced technology. The world food outlook is such that we can be optimistic about the demand for our agricultural production and our ability to supply greater quantities of food to help meet it. In advanced technology, our computer industry—to cite one example—has in the last fifteen years reduced the cost of making 100,000 calculations from $1.38 to 3½ cents—the kind of price reduction that does not show up in official statistics measuring national competitiveness. The nature of modern technology is such, furthermore, that it quickly "attaches itself" to other, more "humdrum" manufactured products (the machine tool is now often "computer-controller") so that our technological lead—if maintained—should manifest itself across a growing range of export products.

Thus, given an economic policy in which cost and price stability are emphasized, given adequate support by the Government in the fields of *promotion, finance,* and *taxation,* and given adequate interest by exporters themselves, we ought to increase our trade surplus substantially in coming years. *We should certainly have that as a major national policy objective.*

A United States trade surplus $3-$4 billion higher than the $3.7 billion of 1936 is not going to create havoc domestically in an economy with a gross national product of $760 billion or in an expanding international trading world in which the exports of all countries currently exceed $200 billion. We have had a trade surplus of this magnitude before, in 1964. A return to such a level—or new high ground—is essential to a healthy solution of our payments problems.

2. Increasing Our Travel Receipts

As one Washington economist likes to point out, a travel gap is really no different than a banana gap, or a steel gap, or a widget gap. The kinds of institutions and measures necessary to stabilize or narrow the travel gap—$1.8 billion in 1966—are, in fact, similar to those necessary to increase our merchandise trade surplus.

Last year, the U.S. Travel Service operated with a minuscule $3 million budget—a budget that compares with $10 million for Canada, $10 million for Spain, $7 million for Mexico, $5 million for France, and $5 million for Greece.

Imagine what could be accomplished with a major budgetary effort on the part of the U.S. Government—more funds not only for the U.S. Travel Service, but also for improved customs and reception centers, translation services, better park facilities, and so on. One can let one's imagination run wild in terms of a variety of actions—governmental and non-governmental—that would increase foreign travel to the United States. For example:

Why can't we have an attractive, comprehensive guide book for the United States, translated into a variety of foreign languages?

Why can't we give foreigners "standby" status on domestic airlines similar to that given to students and military personnel?

Why can't we fill thousands of empty university dormitory beds at vacation periods, provide revenues to the universities in question, and low cost lodgings to foreign student travelers?

Why can't we develop a system of certified guides using U.S. students with a high level of foreign language proficiency and familiarity with U.S. history and points of interest?

Why can't our airlines fight harder at international air conferences for differential air rates encouraging traffic to the United States?

Why can't we have a permanent World's Fair of Science and Technology—a scientific Disneyland, located somewhere in the United States—that would attract tourists and promote U.S. exports as well?

We need more interest, more action, and more imagination by both the Government and the private travel business. I am hopeful that the new travel task force about to be appointed by the President will make recommendations for institutional arrangements and for increased budgetary support of such an effort.

3. Increasing Our Direct Investment Income

There is much debate about the effect of direct investment on our trade balance. Some Analysts contend that the construction of manufacturing plants abroad preserves markets and promotes American exports. Others allege that the transfer of production from the United States to the foreign country results in a loss of U.S. exports.

One does not have to resolve this debate to reach the conclusion that *at the very least* direct investment must be sufficiently profitable to permit corporations to send home a steadily increasing stream of dividend and royalty income. *The surplus of income over direct investment outflow must grow.* Recent performance on this score has been disappointing.

Since the beginning of 1960, U.S.-controlled corporations have invested $42 billion (net of depreciation) in new plant and equipment and working capital outside the United States. The annual amount of such investments—financed from earnings retained from abroad, other foreign funds, and funds from the United States—rose from $3.7 billion at the beginning of the decade to nearly $10 billion in 1966. According to our estimates, this $42 billion investment has produced an incremental return in the form of earnings and royalties of only about 7 percent. (I include retained as well as repatriated earnings in this calculation.)

Since only about 37 percent of the financing for this investment came from the United States, the performance in balance of payments terms has been better but still inadequate. The annual excess of dividend and royalty income over direct investment outflows doubled, from $1 billion to $2 billion, in the period 1960–62. It has since remained on a $2-billion plateau.

These poor results can be attributed, in part, to a number of special factors—hopefully largely non-recurring.

It would be difficult for corporate managements to increase *domestic* investments across a broad range of industries as rapidly as these expenditures have been climbing abroad in recent years without making mistakes. The business of making investments abroad is inherently more difficult than making them here—there are the added difficulties of language, distance, finding personnel. Mistakes have undoubtedly been made, and it seems reasonable to assume that recent rates of increase cannot be sustained on sound business grounds.

There has undoubtedly been an element of "fashion" in recent overseas spending. A study last fall by a New York investment banking firm of 40 U.S. corporations accounting for 70 percent of U.S. direct investment in Western Europe indicated that almost half gave the desire "to be a worldwide enterprise" as the most important reason for making the investments in question; only 10 percent gave the desire to "earn a higher rate of return or profit margin" as the most significant motivation.

Even the best conceived investments of the last two years may not yet be providing maximum potential rates of return because of start-up costs.

Growth rates in certain important countries have slowed; favorable results have thus been delayed.

The cost of financing abroad is higher than here. In response to the voluntary programs administered by the Department of Commerce, firms have been financing a larger percentage of their investment with funds obtained outside the United States—67 percent in 1966 as against 54 percent in 1960. The higher cost of foreign financing should have only a minor impact over the long run—but it has its most telling impact in the early stages of operation.

Past investment ought to become more profitable as mistakes are corrected, and operating rates improve. Future investment decisions by business should be more selective and prudent. If these favorable trends can be coupled with a moderate further reduction of direct investment outflows from the United States as European capital markets adjust to higher levels of overseas borrowing by U.S. corporations, the excess of our dividend and royalty receipts annually over direct investment outflows—could and should increase by $2–$3 billion by the end of the decade.

Our present program and our long-range strategy are based on this premise.

4. Increasing Foreign Portfolio Investment in the United States

Just as the United States travel industry must regard the sale of U.S. travel facilities to foreigners as an *export*, so the financial community should look upon U.S. securities as exports.

In exercising its fiduciary responsibilities, the investment community cannot, of course, put itself in the position of never recommending sales of domestic securities by foreigners. However, a number of the factors that make the United States a natural exporter of capital (its efficient money and capital markets make it cheap and convenient for foreigners to raise funds here) also make it a natural importer of *certain types of foreign capital over the long run*. The breadth of trading in our securities, the quantity and quality of information available on corporations, the speed with which information is transmitted to stockholders, the variety of investment instruments that are available (a new kind of mutual fund has recently been invented) make the United States a place where every long-term investor should put a portion of his savings. If he does, then outflows of other needed types of capital from the United States will be offset, in part, by these inflows, and we will have a more rational, if not perfectly balanced, two-way flow of funds.

The Fowler Task Force Report of 1965 addressed itself to this problem. Passage of the Foreign Investors Tax Act, designed to end tax discrimination against foreign investors, represents the latest and most important effort of the Government to implement the recommendations of that group.

The financial community is already hard at work selling securities to foreigners. It can probably do more.

Is there any way in which the industry can organize itself, on a cooperative basis, to provide foreign investors with more up-to-date, consistent information on changes in securities regulations? to translate brokerage material into foreign languages and to encourage more corporations to translate reports into foreign languages?

Can foreign investment decision-makers be brought here more often and in larger numbers to visit companies uniquely American in managerial approach and in technological and merchandising skill? If such visitors were interested in obtaining first-hand exposure to United States economic policy-makers—whose views are not irrelevant in investment decision-making—top government officials would be at their disposal.

Looking to the more distant future, should our stock and commodity exchanges view themselves in more global terms, open for longer hours, providing material in all major languages, and beaming quotations via communications satellites to the major financial centers of the world?

There may be considerable scope also for investment in a variety of medium- and long-term U.S. instruments by those stewards of central bank assets who are more concerned with the creative utilization of their nation's reserves than with the preservation of sterile and outmoded traditions. As the Bible tells us, the steward who buried his master's talent in the sand was dismissed; those who wisely invested the talents entrusted to them earned their master's trust and praise.

5. Limiting Government Foreign Exchange Expenditures

We in the Government must not delude ourselves or others that the balance of payments deficit will disappear automatically when the Vietnam fighting stops and our foreign exchange costs in Southeast Asia drop. They *will* drop—and hopefully quite substantially—but like the month of June, they may "bust out all over" again, in other forms, unless we exercise self-discipline and insist that other nations do their fair share—in the military and economic assistance field—in meeting joint responsibilities.

We have already made quite an effort to hold down the foreign exchange costs of our military and economic assistance programs.

We have tied our *bilateral* aid so that virtually all of our aid money returns to us in the form of *exports*. Our job now is to make sure that the exports we receive from aid-tying do not simply substitute for exports we would have received anyway. A Treasury-Commerce-State-AID team will begin visits later this month to a number of major aid-recipient countries to see how performance can be improved.

We must intensify our technical assistance efforts, training personnel in less developed nations in the skills needed to sell and service U.S. products in their home countries. The United States Government should consider bringing more technicians from developing countries to the U.S. for training, not only in order to obtain exports while our aid programs are in progress but also after they have phased out.

In the field of *multilateral* economic assistance, the emergent Asian Development Bank with 20 percent of the capital provided by the United States, and the rest by Japan, Canada, Western Europe and other regional donors represents the kind of burden-sharing necessary if the industrial nations are, together, to promote economic progress in the less-developed world in the decades ahead.

With respect to other multilateral institutions, an increased U.S. contribution to the World Bank's soft loan window (International Development Association) will be contingent upon satisfactory balance of payments safeguards. The Executive Directors of the Inter-American Development Bank are looking at ways in which the balance of payments burden of their operations can be more equitably distributed.

In the *military* field, the Defense Department has already taken a broad range of steps—in the handling of procurement, construction, and personnel—to minimize the balance of payments costs of its activities. It has accelerated the sale of military equipment. Trilateral discussions between Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States, the results of which are to be announced today, have included consideration of the problem of equitable financing of required troop levels.

The determination of a nation's "fair share" of economic and military assistance is not a simple matter. As Secretary Fowler recently stated, this issue can no longer be resolved solely by relating the size of a given country's contribution to the size of its gross national product. The form in which a donor provides aid, the terms of its aid, and its international liquidity position must be taken into account.

With U.S. negotiators approaching these critical matters in this spirit, I am confident we will cut the foreign exchange costs of our various overseas commitments from present levels when the fighting in Vietnam stops.

V. SUMMARY

What I have been suggesting today is that a marginal change in world trading patterns, spearheaded by a well organized, long-range U.S. export drive, can increase our trade surplus by $3–$4 billion; that more profitable overseas, direct investment and a continuation of our present strategy, which calls for financing more of that investment from overseas sources, will lead to a $2–$3 billion gain in our direct investment accounts; that a more vigorous effort in the travel field will enable us, at worst, to prevent further deterioration in the travel deficit; that better organized efforts to sell U.S. securities by the U.S. securities industry will lead to a secular uptrend in foreign portfolio inflows compared to the flat trend of recent years; and that governmental discipline and hard-headed negotiations on burden-sharing will enable us to reduce official foreign-exchange expenditures.

Together, these changes—which do not alter the character of the United States' role in the international world—could bring a dramatic *over-all* change in our balance of payments results.

It would be naive to expect all of these things to happen quickly, or easily, or all of them to fall into place together in a given year.

As we move toward equilibrium by reducing our deficits, other countries with payments imbalances in the form of surpluses must also move into equilibrium. The program that I have outlined above for the United States calls for adjustment in the trade surpluses of these countries, improvement in their capital markets, and the export of more capital from them on more generous terms to the less-developed world.

Many countries have been seduced by the belief that time alone would yield a solution to their deficit. Milton Gilbert of the Bank for International Settlements has put it as follows:

> "In case after case in the post-war period we have seen deficit countries procrastinate and play around with half measures while the situation deteriorated, while reserves were drawn down, and while liquid resources were borrowed from abroad—not because the need for policy action was not clear but because political difficulties stood in the way of firm action. And then, as the means of financing the deficit became scarce and a crisis developed, such obstacles were brushed aside; the policy actions previously claimed to be impossible and unworkable suddenly became possible and did work."

In the last resort, other deficit nations have invariably turned to a variety of restrictive devices to solve this problem: among them, controls on capital flows, on tourism, on trade; deflationary measures that have slowed demand for imports, increased exports, and at the same time thrown hundreds of thousands of individuals out of work. Surely these are not appropriate measures for the United States. Surely the United States has the time to solve this problem through the application of sound long-range measures.

Today, I have tried to list the kinds of *positive, expansionary* measures that I believe will solve our problem. Taken alone, certain of the measures I have described will have a trivial impact. *But the cumulative impact of all these measures could be great*—resulting in better business for the American businessman, greater long-range flexibility for the United States Government in international affairs; and a larger—not a smaller—economic pie for the world.

THE NECESSITY OF BEING A DISSENTER

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, former White House Assistant Richard N. Goodwin is the author of a highly perceptive article which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday under the title, "The Necessity of Being a Dissenter."

That view is one which I, among others, have felt keenly in the present state of affairs with relation to Vietnam. Mr. Goodwin has described a position which is shared by many, when he says that "many sincere and moderate men believe we are engaged in a steadily more hazardous war and a war which greater skill and wisdom could have brought to an honorable settlement consistent with America's self-interest."

Yet there has been attack upon dissenters, attack which charges those who dissent with "unpatriotically prolonging the war by increasing the confidence of the enemy."

> How curious it is—

Says Mr. Goodwin—

> to claim that those who wish a decent and honorable peace are continuing the conflict while those who have plunged us into war take upon themselves the mantle of peace.

It is, indeed, as Mr. Goodwin says, the blessing of our system that—

> We not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms. That, after all, is what even the most militant tell us the Vietnamese war is all about.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Goodwin's article may appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NECESSITY OF BEING A DISSENTER

(By Richard N. Goodwin)

Nothing is more depressing about today's Washington than the mounting reluctance of the official community, and some of the press, to treat dissent on its merits, to view it as a reflection of conscience and conviction and to examine it not for motive but for its intellectual force, relevance and truth.

Does Sen. Fulbright challenge our foreign policy? Immediately the mutterings begin that he is a "bad" Foreign Relations Committee chairman, doesn't control his committee (although when the committee defeated the President's Latin American resolution it was his fault) or, even worse, is lazy. And so it goes. Sen. Wayne Morse is a "wild man." Intellectuals are cowardly or alienated or don't like Texans. (Except for those in Government who, presumably, are brave, committed and in love with Texas.)

Of course, if you are a Republican, everything is changed. You have a reason for dissent: to defeat Democrats. That is something Washington can understand. Those whose opposition can be traced to institutional self-interest are accepted. Men who speak out of passion or belief are scorned and their motives searched. For the ultimate, incomprehensible offense is that anyone should endanger his public career simply out of conviction.

Merely to admit this possibility would challenge and endanger the tranquil consciences of the hundreds who are busy every day enforcing a policy they do not believe in.

THE RISE OF DEMAGOGY

I speak here especially about the critics who have been involved in public life. I do not believe they criticize President Johnson because of his "style" or because he is from Texas. I myself like Texas very much; countryside, ranches, barbecues, long and marvelous anecdotes and the immense stamina and vitality which the President recreates. Like many others now in dissent, I was always treated with much sympathy, generosity and warmth.

But that is not the issue. The issue is that many sincere and moderate men believe we are engaged in a steadily more hazardous war and a war which greater skill and wisdom could have brought to an honorable settlement consistent with America's self-interest.

The attitude toward this dissent has allowed the rise of dangerous and undemocratic demagogy. It takes many forms. Dissenters, we are sometimes told, are cowardly and timid. Yet it does not take excessive courage to send men off to war. Were all those who conducted wars valiant and those who opposed them cowards?

It is a view with horrendous and unacceptable implications. It may even at times take more courage to oppose the massive political power which conducts conflict. What bravery is there in saying "The President is right"? After all, none of us—on either side of the debate—are going to be shot or burned or bombed.

THE CHARGE IS MURDER

Another form of assault charges the advocates of moderation with responsibility for the loss of American life. Dissent is not only unpatriotic, it is murder. How cruel a lie this is. The fact is that not a single American has died because of a bombing halt we did not begin or a moderate course we have not pursued. And thousands of persons are dead from what we have in fact done.

If we are willing to concede the sincerity of those who are actually killing human beings, we are forced to concede the humane and peaceful motives of those who offer an alternative view. Certainly it requires as much vision and humanity to preserve the living as to justify the dead. To pursue the debate at any other level is a deliberate effort to arouse irrational and irrelevant passions unworthy of this Nation and its leaders.

The most shameful demagogy of all is to accuse those who dissent of unpatriotically prolonging the war by increasing the confidence of the enemy. How curious it is to claim that those who wish a decent and honorable peace are continuing the conflict while those who have plunged us into war take upon themselves the mantle of peace.

This war has seriously eroded the world leadership, international position and moral power of the United States. By ending it honorably we can restore some of the strength for which millions have died and millions have worked for generations and which now is being carelessly and wantonly cast on the unnecessary fires of Vietnam.

ACCOMPLICE TO HORROR

Hanoi may draw what conclusions it likes. That is irrelevant. Our concern is with the United States and with opposing the acts of those who are damaging our country. That is the only course of true and courageous patriotism.

Vietnam is not just another political issue. Every day fellow human beings are being crippled and scarred and killed. Those who support our present policies believe this devastation and carnage is necessary to higher aims. Others disagree.

For anyone who dissents in his heart, not to dissent with whatever weapons he has—words or speeches, petitions or demonstrations—is to find in the secret depths of his own mind the silent accomplice to horror.

It is the blessing of our system that we not only permit, but urge, each man to follow the inner call of his conscience to the most spacious limits of our legal and constitutional freedoms. That, after all, is what even the most militant tell us that Vietnamese war is all about.

PROPOSED COURT REFORMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Committee on the Administration of Justice of the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia, after more than a year of study, has issued initial recommendations to improve the processing of business and the quality of justice in the courts of the District. The total of 45 recommendations, involving each of the courts, presents a range of suggestions that would modify in important respects the personnel, facilities, and practices of the judicial institutions of this community.

These recommendations deserve our most dedicated attention, and I stand ready to cooperate with the judicial council to insure that appropriate action is taken. Although many of the recommendations can be implemented by the courts themselves, it is clear that in some instances legislation by Congress will be necessary. I can promise my best efforts to see to it that Congress does not neglect that task.

One of the committee's most important recommendations is their request for a comprehensive management study, especially of the District Court and the court of general sessions. Some of the recommendations of the committee would be furthered by a court study, especially those relating to statistical reporting by each of the courts, reevaluating pretrial and settlement procedures, improving the handling of requests for continuances, and modernizing court facilities. I have been cooperating with the judicial council during the past months in a search for funds for such a study. My staff and I have turned to private foundations for the approximately $400,000 required for a proper management survey. It is my hope that Federal funds will also be available to assist in this effort. There are initial signs that we will be successful in raising the money, but it would be premature to make that promise now. I hope to present a clearer picture of the results of our effort within 6 weeks.

Many of the committee's recommendations, however, need not await a management study. The salaries of the judges of the District of Columbia court of appeals and of the court of general sessions should be increased, as recommended, to a level commensurate with the heavy responsibilities those judges bear. There is a need, as well, for additional supporting personnel in all of the courts. At present, for example, judges and professional staff, such as social psychologists and probation officers, consume their time involved in tasks that could be performed by supporting personnel. Providing more people able to relieve that burden would, in the long run, achieve an economy of operations through a better allocation of manpower resources.

Certainly the probation staff of the juvenile court needs to be increased. And the legal aid agency that has been serving the needs of the poor is drastically undermanned. More legal aid agency lawyers would be needed, for example, to implement the recommendation that each child appearing in juvenile court have benefit of counsel. Under present conditions, the lawyers and staff of the legal aid agency have not been able to handle adequately the load in the court of general sessions alone.

I want to call attention, Mr. President, to the efforts of the District of Columbia Bar Association in providing legal services through its criminal trial panel program. I join the Committee on Administration of Justice in endorsing this excellent program, and in congratulating the members of the bar for their unselfish efforts to provide adequate legal aid to residents of the community whose needs might otherwise go unheeded.

The committee recommendations also indicate that the juvenile court is not "making effective use of all available time," and that "greater coordination and communication between the judges" is necessary. It is well known to the bench and bar of the District of Columbia that the judges of that court, through personal disagreement concerning the processing of cases, do not function together in the best interest of the administration of justice. We must fill the current vacancy on that court, and perhaps that will alleviate existing strains, but it is necessary as well that the judges of the juvenile court take immediate steps to resolve their disagreements so that the interests of the public will be properly served.

The initial recommendations of the committee will be helpful in informing the public that the courts of the District of Columbia have been working with drastically inadequate resources. Public support for reform should then encourage Congress to respond to existing needs. Legislation and funds are urgently needed, Mr. President, to permit the courts to function at the level of excellence to which they aspire. The people expect and deserve no less. And I pledge my effort as a U.S. Senator, and more particularly, as a member of both the Judiciary and District of Columbia Committees to help the courts meet the expectations of this community.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Committee on Administration of Justice be printed in the Record at the close of these remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Initial Recommendations of the Committee on the Administration of Justice of the Judicial Council of the District of Columbia Circuit, May 1967

ORIGIN AND PURPOSE

The Judicial Council of the District of Columbia Circuit is composed of the active members of the Court of Appeals. By statute the Council is charged with responsibility for making all necessary orders for the effective and expeditious administration of the business of the courts within the circuit. The Council has been particularly concerned with the growing civil and criminal case backlog and attendant delays in the administration of justice, the lack of adequate supporting services for the courts, and the urgent need to develop more effective procedures for the day-to-day administration of court business.

On March 15, 1966, the Council unanimously appointed a Committee on the Administration of Justice consisting of the undersigned nine lawyers selected from the private bar of the circuit.

The Committee was directed to make recommendations concerning the organization, composition and jurisdiction of the District of Columbia courts and related institutions, either existing or to be established, the transfer or retention of certain judicial functions by those courts, the methods of appointment and tenure of judges of certain courts, and such other matters as may be pertinent to the effective administration of justice in the District of Columbia.

The Committee is not an investigating committee which is called upon to present detailed findings and conclusions. Rather, its role has been to draw upon the knowledge of the judges, court personnel the bar, experience in other jurisdictions and various prior studies and in the light of the practical experience of its members make concrete recommendations for improving the administration of justice in the Nation's Capital. Its function and focus were not to study why conditions now exist but to suggest concrete and practical ways to improve those conditions. In preparing this report the Committee and Subcommittee members have conferred at length with judges of the various courts, and particularly with the Chief Judges of the trial courts in the District.

A generous grant from the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation has supported one full-time and one part-time staff and provided a small office and secretarial assistance. Much of the work of the Committee has been carried out by able subcommittees,[1] which the Council authorized the Committee to appoint.

It is clear from the Committee's work to date that there is no single or simple solution for the problems confronting the administration of justice in the District of Columbia courts. It is apparent that cases take far too long to process, that the courts do not have sufficient administrative assistance and supporting services to deal effectively with the increasing volume and complexity of their caseload, that physical facilities are in many cases wholly inadequate, that there is a pressing need to develop improved systems for controlling the calendaring and processing of cases through the courts, and that there is a vital need for accurate statistics against which the progress or lack thereof can be measured by the courts themselves and the community.

The Committee decided to issue its initial recommendations at this time because there is opportunity for immediate progress with the support of the courts, the bar, the Congress, and the community at large. Certain of the recommendations can be implemented by the courts on their own initiative. Others will require budgetary appropriations or implementing legislation. Progress can and will be made if a wide community interest and support in these areas is maintained, if the courts' docket performance can be periodically measured, and if new solutions continue to be sought where results are discouraging.

This initial series of recommendations has the unanimous approval of the Committee and in outline form presents a program for immediate action. The Judicial Council has endorsed each of the proposals and authorized their public release. The Committee, in line with the suggestion contained in President Johnson's Goal for the Nation's Capital message of February 27, 1967, is forwarding the recommendations to the Attorney General and the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. It is continuing its work, and will forward further recommendations to the Council in due course.

Gerhard A. Gesell, Chairman; George E. C. Hayes, Vice-Chairman; Sarel M. Kandell, Executive Director; Mrs. June L. Green, John Pickering, John H. Pratt, James Francis Reilly, Daniel A. Rezneck, Samuel Spencer, Edward Bennett Williams.

INITIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

The Committee recommends as follows with respect to each of the following courts:

I. Juvenile court

1. The Juvenile Court should submit regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public showing statistics as to the number of juvenile cases and the number of adult cases pending before the court. The report

---

[1] The chairman and members of the subcommittees are listed at the end of this report.

should show in some detail the number and type of cases awaiting initial hearing, trial and disposition hearing, together with information as to the time which has elapsed in each category since petitioning. This report should be accompanied by whatever comments and explanations the Chief Judge wishes to make for the information of the bar and the public as to measures being taken by the court to improve the situation, steps to be taken by the bar to work toward elimination of backlog, and other matters relating to the efficient administration of the court.

2. The Committee does not recommend any additional judges for the court although the existing vacancy should, of course, be promptly filled. The procedures of the court for calendaring and processing cases need revision and call for greater coordination and communication between the judges. On the basis of the information available, the Committee does not feel that the court at present is making effective use of all available judicial time.

3. No child should be detained beyond the next court day without being brought before the court for either an initial hearing or a detention hearing.

4. Counsel should be appointed in every case where a child appears without an attorney. Such appointment should be made after Intake has interviewed and petitioned the child, but before he is brought before the court. A system of complete legal representation modeled after the New York law guardian system should be instituted. A first step in providing adequate representation in the court should be an invitation by the court to the bar and appropriate legal aid agencies in the community to institute such a program. The lawyer representing a child should be given access to the social records in connection with the disposition hearing.

5. The Corporation Counsel should take a greater role representing the community's interest in Juvenile Court proceedings. They should advise Intake on any legal questions relating to petitions or the sufficiency of the evidence. In any event, they should be brought into the case immediately upon denial of involvement by a child and have responsibility for preparation and handling of the case from that time. Legislation should be enacted amending D.C. Code, Section 11-1583(a)(1) to strike "upon request" so it will read:

"The Corporation Counsel of the District of Columbia or any of his assistants shall: (1) Assist the Juvenile Court in hearings arising under Section 11-1551."

6. Neglected and dependent children should not be placed in the same facility as those charged or adjudicated as delinquents. Separate facilities should be provided.

7. The criteria used by the Youth Aid Division and the Intake Division of the court for detention should be studied and reinterpreted to bring their divergent application of criteria into alignment with each other.

8. More effective community services should be developed and both Youth Aid Division and Intake urged to make greater use of these services by referring greater numbers of children to them on a voluntary basis, rather than petitioning them to court.

9. The duties of the social work staff should be reallocated so that non-professional workers perform the clerical and collection functions, thereby releasing the social workers for professional tasks.

10. The Probation Department should be decentralized and some evening hours instituted to enable the officers to spend more time in the neighborhoods and to meet with working parents and with children who are normally in school during the daytime. This may well involve appointing additional probation officers but the number cannot now be determined since other administrative changes are first required. Whatever staff additions would be necessary to reduce the case load of probation workers to 50 cases, as recommended by the U.S. Children's Bureau and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, should be made.

11. The social records should be reorganized and brought up to date. Additional clerical staff necessary to accomplish this should be provided to work with the archivist who has been loaned to the Juvenile Court for this purpose.

12. An operating manual to guide the staff of the court on general policies and procedures should be prepared and kept up to date and abbreviated materials of the same kind should be available for guidance of parents and attorneys.

13. Although efforts have been initiated to improve the psychiatric facilities and services available to Juvenile Court, particularly in the area of diagnosis, there is an urgent need for additional adolescent in-patient and out-patient treatment and facilities.

II. Court of General Sessions

1. The court should submit regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public showing the caseload, backlog, and other statistics. This report should contain some detail as to the number of civil and criminal cases docketed, number of cases ready for trial, number of cases tried, settled, and disposed of in each branch of the court, together with the number of cases in each category pending by age since filing. The report should be accompanied by whatever comments and explanations the Chief Judge wishes to make for the information of the bar and the public as to measures being taken by the court to improve the situation, steps to be taken by the bar to work toward elimination of backlog, and other matters relating to the efficient administration of the court.

2. The Court of General Sessions should be increased by five more judges, making a total of 26. The present backlog of criminal jury cases is over 1,300 and about 500 additional jury demands are filed every month.

There is presently a civil backlog of 3,500 cases. The time from joinder of issue to disposition of a civil jury case in the Court of General Sessions is now 21 months. In 1963 it was four months. The civil backlog increased by over 100 cases within the last month, as the court attempted to diminish its criminal backlog. The court, at this stage particularly, needs the appointment of skilled lawyers with substantial civil litigation background.

From these figures it would appear that unless the Court of General Sessions is increased to 25 judges it will be impossible even to remain abreast of the current caseload, let alone make any inroads on the backlog or begin to provide for any gradual transfer of some jurisdiction from the District Court. This proposal will require an amendment to D.C. Code, Section 11-902(a).

3. The salaries of the judges of the court should be increased. The judges receive $23,500 per year and the Chief Judge receives $24,000. Salaries in general trial courts in other jurisdictions with large municipal centers range between $25,000-$37,000, with a median range around $27,000 to $28,000. It is suggested that the salary should be $27,500 for the associate judges and $28,000 for the Chief Judge. The legislation should assure greater tenure for judges of proven competence after serving a probationary period.

4. A night court should be instituted, providing the court is enlarged to 26 judges. It should be given sufficient jurisdiction to utilize fully one judge's time. As well as handling presentments, sentencing, preliminary hearings, and other criminal matters, it should have authority to conduct criminal non-jury trials and to handle Traffic Court, Small Claims and Landlord and Tenant matters, with leeway to set special hours for operating those sections. It would appear that this can be accomplished by court rule.

5. A new courthouse is needed to house the Court of General Sessions, Juvenile Court, District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and supporting services. These courts—and in particular the Court of General Sessions, which is presently occupying four buildings—have been operating under severe difficulties due to inadequate physical facilities. There is a request in the D.C. Budget for $100,000 for a preliminary study for a new courthouse and the Committee supports this request. Pending the construction of the new courthouse the Committee recommends that the Court of Military Appeals be transferred to another location and that the facilities now occupied by that court be used by the D.C. Court of Appeals, thus providing additional court space for the Court of General Sessions in its own Civil building.

6. Improved library facilities should be provided. There is a highly inadequate library in the Civil Building. The judges in the other two buildings are without any research facilities whatsoever. The Committee recommends that the D.C. Commissioners request a supplemental appropriation in the current Budget for this purpose.

7. The Committee supports the immediate Budget request of $115,700 for ten additional Legal Aid Agency attorneys and eight supporting positions so that the Agency would be in a position to handle up to 40% of the indigent cases in the Court of General Sessions. Last year the Legal Aid Agency handled 502 cases in the Court of General Sessions. With the additional staff it should be in a position to handle approximately 2,000.

8. The Committee supports the appointment of a coordinator and staff to implement the Criminal Justice Act. The D.C. Budget requests an appropriation of $24,300 for a staff of three persons for this purpose. More than 200 attorneys have thus far registered for appointment under the Act. Of the approximately 8,000 defendants per year to be interviewed, over 4,000 qualify under the Act and some form of coherent administration is necessary to interview the defendants, make recommendations as to indigency, and verify and process vouchers. The budget request should be supported. In view of the need to evaluate fully the performance of the Criminal Justice Act panel of lawyers and the need to bring in new defense attorneys and orient them to court procedures in addition to the routine work of making recommendations and processing vouchers, favorable consideration should be given to Judge Greene's request for a supplemental appropriation to increase the coordinator's staff.

9. The Committee endorses the creation of the Criminal Trial Panel program of the District of Columbia Bar Association.

10. The Chief Judge should assign the judge sitting on pretrial matters to sit as a settlement judge in civil cases. At the present time four months elapse from joinder of issue to pretrial and 17 months from pretrial to trial. Possibly pretrial should be rescheduled for one month before trial.

11. The probation staff should be enlarged by 23 positions and its pay scale increased. The Probation Department is presently staffed by 13 officers, each of whom supervises over 100 cases per month, as well as preparing an average of 18 presentence reports and conducting intake screening on additional cases. This results in a workload for each officer which is about three times the nationally recommended average. The highest grade of pay is GS-11. Since the District Court pays GS-12, once probation officers become experienced and would be of most use to the department, they switch to the District Court staff. A supplemental appropriation to the current Budget will be required for the staff increase.

12. Law clerks should be provided equal to the number of judges and assigned by the Chief Judge. A supplemental appropriation to the current D.C. Budget should be requested for this purpose.

13. The witness fee in the Court of General Sessions should be raised to the same

level as the District Court. It is presently only 75 cents with no travel allowance. This increase would be in accordance with Section 905(a) of the proposed D.C. Crime Reduction Act of 1967, amending 15 D.C. Code, Section 714(a), presently before Congress.

14. Adult non-support and paternity cases should be transferred from the jurisdiction of Juvenile Court to the Domestic Relations Branch of the Court of General Sessions. This would require substantive legislation amending D.C. Code, Sections 11–1555, 11–1556 and 11–1141. Support cases should no longer have a criminal character but should be handled solely as civil actions.

15. A management study of the entire operation of the court should be conducted. We urge that funds be made available for a study, possibly concentrating on calendaring and scheduling problems, procedures and personnel required to develop adequate statistical data, ways to relieve judges of administrative duties, and supporting service needs.

III. D.C. Court of Appeals

1. The Court should publish quarterly statistics as to the state of its docket and indicate procedures which it believes will expedite disposition of appeals.

2. The number of judges should be increased from three to six and appropriate legislation should be enacted to enable the expanded Court of Appeals to sit in panels of three. The provisions should be analogous to 28 U.S.C. § 46(b) and 28 U.S.C. § 175, which authorize the U.S. Court of Appeals and the Court of Claims, respectively, to sit in panels. A bill (H.R. 8582), which would implement this recommendation, is presently before the House Committee on the District of Columbia. When the D.C. Court of Appeals was formed in 1942 it handled appeals from the ten-judge Court of General Sessions. Its caseload in fiscal year 1943–1944 was 104 cases. As of fiscal year 1965–1966, the caseload was 392 cases and it is presently handling appeals from the 21-judge Court of General Sessions. With an increased number of Criminal Justice Act appointments of counsel, more cases being reported by court reporters, a greater number of defendants out on bail under the Bail Reform Act provisions, and the possibility of increased requirements for counsel in Juvenile Court, it is likely that there will be an even greater increase in the number of appeals within the coming year. A further increase can be predicted if the Court of General Sessions is increased to 26 judges and its jurisdiction expanded. When the legislation is up for amendment, provision should be made to permit retired judges greater participation in the work of the court following retirement.

3. The salaries of the judges should be raised. At present the Chief Judge receives $25,000 and the associate judges receive $24,500. Salaries of judges in comparable intermediate appellate courts range between $27,000–$41,000, with the median range around $33,000. An increase to $29,000 for the Chief Judge and $28,500 for the associate judges is recommended. This would require legislation amending D.C. Code, Section 11–702(d).

IV. U.S. district court

1. The District Court should submit regular quarterly reports to the bar and the public in standard form showing by categories of the criminal and civil dockets, separately, number of cases docketed, number of cases pretried, number of cases ready for trial, number of cases settled, number of cases tried and disposed of, together with a breakdown of the number of cases in each category pending by age since filing. This report should be accompanied by whatever comments and explanations the Chief Judge wishes to make for the information of the bar and the public as to measures being taken by the court to improve the situation, steps to be taken by the bar to work toward elimination of backlog, and other matters relating to the efficient administration of the court.

2. The Chief Judge should devote the preponderance of his time to the administration of the court's affairs. The extent of his authority is presently unclear and should be clarified by resolution of the Judicial Council. Specifically, the Chief Judge should have authority comparable to that granted by statute to the Chief Judge of the Court of General Sessions [3] and it should be made clear, among other things, that the Chief Judge can assign particular judges to particular parts of the calendar, assign a particular case to a particular judge with directions to conduct the trial, and obtain such reports and other data from individual judges about their work as may be required in his task as administrator. The Chief Judge should review the monthly forms now prepared for submission to the Administrative Office and should undertake to improve the detail and specification of these reports. The Chief Judge should take direct, immediate responsibility for expediting and improving the docket and his authority should run to both active and retired members of the court.

3. The court does not have sufficient funds for the effective administration of its affairs. The Chief Judge requires an enlarged administrative staff. Provision for an Administrator to handle problems under the Criminal Justice Act is essential. In addition, there is an inadequate staff of probation officers. The Clerk's Office and the Assignment Office are seriously undermanned and in no position presently to provide the statistical data and assistance which are necessary for effective administration of the court. Higher grade levels in certain job categories appear to be required. The budget of the court should be given separate and special consideration by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts since its docket is quite unlike that of any other District Court.

4. It is believed that the docket backlog can be substantially reduced if one or more members of the court sit as settlement judges. As far as civil cases are concerned, Rule 11(h) could be modified to provide for a call of the civil calendar three times per year at which settlement discussions will be had. A rule applicable to the civil jury calendar might be drawn along the following lines:

"There will be a call of all civil jury cases on the general calendar during the months of October, February and June in each year, or such other time as the Court may direct. At such time, discussions of settlement will be had and counsel for the respective parties will be expected to cooperate with the Court in attempting to bring about a prompt disposition of those cases."

The calendar call would be conducted by the settlement judge.

With respect to the criminal docket, it is suggested that the Chief Judge or his designee review all pending criminal cases for disposition purposes with counsel for the Government and the defendants at least twice a year.

5. The operations of pretrial require a major continuing study by the court and the Committee. Pretrial procedures must be made more effective. The rules should be more strongly supported at the trial level by the court.

6. The court is, on occasion, too permissive in handling requests for continuances made by the prosecution or members of the private bar. There should be less leniency in this regard.

7. Consideration should be given in complicated protracted civil cases to the assignment of such cases to a single judge on an individual calendar basis for purposes of pretrial motions, trial and disposition. As experience develops with a limited individual calendar for this type of case, consideration should be given to some expansion of this method of assignment for other civil cases.

8. A detailed management survey of the District Court is required to assist the Chief Judge by 1) pointing up where different procedures in the processing of cases will result in greater expedition and prompter disposition, and 2) disclosing manpower shortages, the correction of which could result in more efficient administration. The survey should also develop the types of statistical information required by the Chief Judge for effective administration of the docket and should recommend appropriate procedures and personnel necessary for the prompt accumulation and development of such statistics.

V. U.S. court of appeals

1. The court should publish quarterly statistics as to the state of its docket and indicate procedures which it believes will expedite disposition of appeals.

2. An undue amount of court time is presently required to deal with petitions for rehearing. This is largely the fault of the bar. The court should undertake to make a clearer statement of the factors which it considers requisite to the granting of a rehearing either by the original panel or en banc.

3. The court should clarify the conditions under which appeals will be heard during the summer months inasmuch as there is considerable confusion among the bar on this point and there is apparently time under the existing summer schedule for hearing additional cases.

5. Additional funds are needed to provide with an additional law clerk and related secretarial assistance.

5. Additional funds are needed to provide personnel for the administration of the court's affairs and the effective operations of the Council.

VI. Judicial Conference

Representatives of the Court of General Sessions, the D.C. Court of Appeals and the Juvenile Court should be made members of a Judicial Conference concerned with problems of the D.C. legislative courts.

---

[3] D.C. Code:

"§ 11–903. The chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall administer generally and superintendent the business of the court. He shall give his attention to the discharge of the duties especially pertaining to his office and to the performance of such additional judicial work as he is able to perform.

"§ 11–904. (a) The chief judge of the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions shall, from time to time and for such periods as he determines designate the judges to preside in and attend the divisions and several branches and sessions of the court. He may:

"(1) . . . determine the number and fix the time of the various sessions of the court; and

"(2) arrange the business of the court, and divide it and assign it among the judges.

"Each associate judge shall attend and serve at the division, branch, or sessions of the court to which he is assigned.

"§ 11–907. (b) Each associate judge shall submit to the chief judge a monthly written report, in a form prescribed by the chief judge, of the duties performed by him, specifying:

"(1) the number of days attendance in court of the judge during the month covered;

"(2) the branch courts upon which he attended;

"(3) the number of hours per day of his attendance; and

"(4) such other data as the chief judge requires."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON JUVENILE COURT

ALEXANDER B. HAWES,
Chairman.
JOSEPH P. MCCORMICK.
KENNETH W. PARKINSON.
KATHERINE M. STALEY.
PATRICIA WALD.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON D.C. COURT OF GENERAL SESSIONS AND D.C. COURT OF APPEALS

THOMAS A. FLANNERY,
Chairman.
BARBARA BABCOCK.
SYLVIA BACON.
JUDAH BEST.
ADDISON BOWMAN.
ALBERT BURKA.
JOYCE CAPPS.
WILLIAM J. DONNELLY.
DAVID EPSTEIN.
WILLIAM GREENHALGH.
HONORABLE TIM MURPHY,
THEODORE R. NEWMAN.
JACOB A. STEIN.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON U.S. DISTRICT COURT AND U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

STEPHEN AILES,
Chairman.
EDMUND D. CAMPBELL.
PAUL R. CONNOLLY.
JAMES V. DOLAN.
RICHARD W. GALIHER.
BELFORD V. LAWSON, Jr.
RICHARD MILLMAN.
DANIEL O'DONOGHUE.
THOMAS M. O'MALLEY.
JOSEPH SITNICK.

FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM NOT GOOD SHORT-RANGE CONTRACYCLICAL TOOL BUT IT STRENGTHENS ECONOMY, RANDOLPH-JANEWAY INTERVIEW SHOWS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, there are numerous ways in which the partnership program involved in Federal-aid to the States for highway purposes can affect the national economy and various industrial and commercial segments of the economy. In an interview recently with one of our country's leading consulting economists and newspaper columnists, Eliot Janeway, this subject was explored by us in an effort to evaluate the road program's value as a fiscal tool.

Mr. Janeway expressed the judgment that the Federal highway program, being a form of public works spending outside the budget, because it is financed from the highway trust fund, will expand. He said that—

> The size of the highway program, and the country's need for it, add up to one good reason why the public sector of the economy is so big and is slated to grow so steadily.

And here he added—

> War or no war.

At the outset of our interview, Mr. Janeway remarked:

> It appears that (highway) trust fund monies have been used to serve a contracyclical purpose—first against the threat of inflation in 1966 and now against the threat of recession in 1967.

He asked me:

> How effective will the release of highway funds (by order of the President) be in averting recession.

I said that, in general, a highway program is not a good short-term contracyclical tool. We learned that in the 1930's—and again during the 1958 recession. And, by the time the program took hold in 1960, we were fighting inflation again. Inasmuch as the highway program was in forward thrust when the slowdown was ordered late last year, and because it is really a continuous program, the release of the funds which had been ordered held back should be effective in swinging the tide away from recessionary tendencies. This is made more probable because, for the most part, highway plans and projects already are available for immediate implementation.

In response to an inquiry by Mr. Janeway as to what timelag exists between funding for highway construction and stimulus for heavy industry activity, I offered the estimate that the overall lapse in time between the start of a new program and the peak of its impact would seem to be approximately 2 years. Because it no longer is a matter of placing men at work with picks and shovels to construct roads, the concept of highway investment as an antidepression workmaker has been overplayed. The very real technological advances in highway construction require highly skilled workers. This is a fact which emphasizes still another reason for taking the stop-go out of the funding of the highway program. Skilled persons simply will not remain in industries which blow hot and cold with every change in the Washington weather.

With reference to the question of the impact on homebuilding and on car sales by highway construction, I expressed the view to Mr. Janeway that the impact of the rate of highway construction on homebuilding and commercial and industrial development is substantial. But whether or not highway building has an affirmative influence on car sales is difficult to say. I suggested, however, that the present lag in the rate of automobile sales may possibly have some relationship to the fact that highway construction in some categories is lagging behind forecasted highway needs.

Mr. Janeway brought up in our interview the question of the possible impact of highway expenditure cutbacks or slowdowns on accident insurance costs—a very important element of the economy and the cost of living. My response was that I do not doubt that newer highways are safer, but there seems to be no way definitely to show the correlation of highway construction funding cutbacks with accident insurance costs.

But, as I also pointed out, we have embarked on two major safety programs, one dealing with equipment and vehicle safety and the other with highway traffic safety. Sound administration of these two programs probably will do more to hold down insurance costs than will any other.

Mr. President, I am grateful to Mr. Janeway for having afforded me the opportunity to discuss vital questions with him in an area of my prime responsibility in my capacities as chairman of the Committee on Public Works and chairman of its Subcommittee on Roads. I request unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the "Point of View" column by Eliot Janeway, consulting economist for the Chicago Tribune Press Service, as it appeared in that newspaper on April 27, 1967, under the headline, "U.S. Road Program's Value as Fiscal Tool."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Apr. 27, 1967]

U.S. ROAD PROGRAM'S VALUE AS FISCAL TOOL

(By Eliot Janeway)

NEW YORK, April 26.—When recession is thought to be a danger, public works programs are relied on as a standard remedy. When inflation is feared as the big problem, people argue about cutting back on the nonwar part of the budget. But the federal highway program is a form of government public works spending outside the budget. Its size, and the country's need for it, add up to one good reason why the public sector of the economy is so big and slated to grow so steadily—war or no war.

For an X-ray of the federal highway trust funds at work in the economy, this column interviewed Sen. Jennings Randolph [D., W. Va.], chairman of the public works committee.

JANEWAY. It appears that trust fund monies have been used to serve a contra-cyclical purpose—first against the threat of inflation in 1966 and now against the threat of recession in 1967. As a practical matter, how effective will the release of highway funds be in averting recession?

RANDOLPH. In general, a highway program is not a good short-term contra-cyclical tool. I think we learned that in the 1930's—and again during the 1958 recession: By the time it took hold in 1960, we were fighting inflation again. Since this program already is under way and continuous, however, with plans and projects ready for immediate implementation, the release of this money now should be particularly effective in swinging the tide against recession. It will certainly be a boost to business psychology.

JANEWAY. Just what is the federal highway program and where do the trust fund monies come from?

RANDOLPH. Highway trust fund monies come from special taxes paid by highway users—such as the 4-cent a gallon gasoline tax, taxes on tires and tread rubber, and on new truck equipment and parts. The federal-aid highway program is a partnership between the states and the federal government, for which 4.4 billion dollars of federal funds have been authorized for fiscal 1968. In general, the matching ratios are 90 per cent federal to 10 per cent state for the interstate highway system, and 50-50 for primary and secondary systems and their urban extensions. The total annual expenditure for construction and maintenance of our nation's highways is approximately 15 billion dollars.

JANEWAY. Does the rate of highway construction have a great impact on car sales and home building?

RANDOLPH. The impact of highway construction on home building and commercial and industrial development is very great. Whether highway building has an influence on car sales, or whether it is the other way around, is difficult to say. Certainly highway construction is lagging behind forecasted highway needs.

WOULD PRESSURE ECOMONY

JANEWAY. Would you favor Export-Import bank financing to get American industry the business Russia wants to place here to further her own highway needs?

RANDOLPH. At the present time, with the multiple demands being made on our own industrial capacity because of Viet Nam, and our own accelerated highway program, I feel that incentives to foster a foreign market would put undue pressure on our own industry's ability to deliver what we need for our own program.

Janeway. When we hold back on highway expenditures, do accident insurance costs go up?

Randolph. There's no doubt that newer highways, because of improved technology, are safer; but there is no way of showing the correlation you suggest. We have recently embarked on two major safety programs, one dealing with vehicle and equipment safety and the other with highway safety. Execution of these two programs will probably do more to hold down insurance costs than anything else.

TIME LAG IS 2 YEARS

Janeway. What is the time lag between appropriations for highway construction and stimulus for heavy industry activity.

Randolph. The over-all time lag between the start of a new program and the peak of its impact appears to be about two years. But the concept of highway investment as an anti-depression work-maker has certainly been overplayed. It is no longer a matter of putting men to work with a pick and shovel and coming up with a road. The great technological advances in highway construction require highly skilled workers—a fact that emphasizes still another reason for taking the stop-go out of the highway program. Nowadays, skilled people simply won't stay in industries which blow hot and cold with every change in the Washington weather.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. Metcalf). The hour of 1 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will report.

The Assistant Legislative Clerk. Calendar 80 (H.R. 6950) a bill to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock tomorrow noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 8, 1967:

Assistant Secretary of the Army

Eugene M. Becker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice W. Brewster Kopp.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 8, 1967:

Postmasters

ALABAMA

William A. Garrett, Fort Payne.
James M. Ford, Gadsden.
Clarence N. Bryant, Jr., Hollywood.
Donald E. Driskell, Loxley.
Rudolph Harrison, Marion.
James R. Morrow, Mulga.
Charles W. Thomas, Tuskegee Institute.

ARKANSAS

Berty A. Williams, Beech Grove.
Ellie L. Chaney, Coy.
Dean P. Duboise, Hackett.
James C. Holt, Jr., McRae.

CALIFORNIA

Josephine D. Dahlstrom, Ballico.
Veda M. Davis, Campo.
George R. Saunders, Carlsbad.
Patricia A. Shields, Del Mar.
Ben R. Taylor, Durham.
Clayton W. Fountain, El Granada.
Lloyd G. Wood, Idyllwild.
Wesley G. Barnes, Loomis.
Gerald McGinnis, Lynwood.
Richard S. Long, Needles.
Carl H. Winnefeld, Nipton.
Stella L. Davis, Walnut.

COLORADO

Ida J. Kettle, Austin.
Walter B. Lovelace, Boulder.
Vernamae C. George, Breckenridge.
Emil G. Johnson, Durango.
Carl B. Larned, Golden.
Paul F. Dearmin, Idaho Springs.
Burdette S. Stone, Rifle.
Beryl E. Lambert, Yuma.

DELAWARE

Bernard P. Lynch, Frankford.
G. Edgar Williams, Middletown.

FLORIDA

Audrey B. Golden, Alva.
J. Willard Marcom, Brandon.
Joseph M. Webb, Fort George Island.
William O. Neal, Mango.
Clifford C. Betts, Okeechobee.
Bruce W. Lloyd, Oklawaha.
Walter G. Edwards, Sneads.
Thomas A. Williams, South Bay.
John L. McLee, West Palm Beach.

GEORGIA

T. Hartley Hobbs, Dublin.
Runette B. Cronic, Hull.
William W. Ware, Ringgold.
George H. Gunby, Tennille.
Dessie P. Jeanes, Union City.

HAWAII

Hon Chung Chee, Honolulu.

IDAHO

Lenorah G. Shaeffer, Nezperce.
Lorin F. Widdison, Rexburg.
Cameron H. Edgar, Troy.
John A. Albertini, Wallace.

INDIANA

Eugene J. Gabriel, Fort Wayne.

IOWA

Donald E. Klumpp, Albert City.
Ward Foster, Jr., Altoona.
Ralph N. Wilson, Anthon.
Thomas K. Hardy, Bloomfield.
John C. Halvorson, Clermont.
John E. Tomb, Eldora.
Donald E. Roseland, Gilman.
Frank P. Simon, Lake View.
Opal A. Bonynge, Lester.
Wyatt W. Vance, Milton.
Naomi A. Galbraith, Newell.
Leland J. Hart, Oskaloosa.
Dorothy M. Petersen, Pierson.
William C. Miller, Pilot Mound.
Rupert R. Thorpe, Salix.
Lowell D. Morehead, Westfield.
Rodger L. Johnston, West Liberty.

KANSAS

Marion W. Mooberry, Cheney.
Frank Lill, Emporia.
Ernest H. Barton, Geuda Springs.
Victor A. Wasinger, Hays.
James H. Kusel, Kensington.
Ronald Sidebottom, Kinsley.
Virgil W. Green, Mount Hope.

KENTUCKY

Carol W. Graves, Adolphus.
Alta D. Morrison, Big Clifty.
William S. Jenkins, Central City.
Lark K. Box, Cynthiana.
Edwin T. Elliott, Harrodsburg.
Barbara B. Brand, Jeffersonville.
Thomas R. Abell, Leitchfield.
Joseph R. Cox, Livermore.
Edward K. White, Perryville,
Jack Stumbo, Prestonsburg.
G. Evelene Myers, Salt Lick.
Nina M. Williams, West Van Lear.

LOUISIANA

Robert N. Williamson, Dubach.
Marie D. Johnson, Hackberry.
Quincy J. Lemoine, Moreauville.

MAINE

Dwight L. Simonds, Friendship.
John L. Ross, Gorham
Hayden E. Fairbanks, Phillips.
Leonie M. Lagasse, St. Agatha.

MARYLAND

George E. Rosensteel, Emmitsburg.
Daniel C. Robertson, Gaithersburg.
Nada L. Joines, Highland.
Hubert L. Harden, Olney.
Melvin B. Grimes, Owings Mills.
W. Sherman Mellott, Williamsport.

MINNESOTA

George H. Judish, Browns Valley.
Dwaine D. Babb, Cambridge.
Daniel C. Schnyders, Edgerton.
Edwin L. Wegleitner, Forest Lake.
Alvin O. Rosenthal, LeRoy.
Kermit W. Thorsland, Milan.
Robert F. Doyle, Owatonna.
Carlton G. Hess, Pipestone.
Morris A. Johnson, Renville.
Ragnvald N. Aaker, St. Hilaire.
John L. Bystrom, Sauk Rapids.
Wayne M. Viesselman, Trimont.
Vernon R. Heggen, Wheaton.

MISSISSIPPI

William L. Laughter, Batesville.
Thomas B. Woodruff, Burnsville.
M. Deaton McAuley, Byhalia.
Mildred M. Blair, Caledonia.
Eugene R. Stamper, Chunky.
James S. Thornton, Clarksdale.
Louel B. Fisher, Como
Charles E. Monroe, Dennis.
John B. Waller, Enid.
George E. Reid, Enterprise.
Delois W. Lowery, Georgetown.
Edward S. Thompson, Grenada.
Francis L. Townsend, Lena.
Lettie H. Johnson, Louise.
E. Lamar Reynolds, Lumberton.
Julian P. White, McComb.
William G. Collins, New Albany.
Roy L. Webb, Newhebron.
Jesse H. Carter, Philadelphia.
William A. Moser, Richton.
William A. McLaurin, Sr., Sandersville.
Clyde S. Faust, Sledge.
Annie L. Greene, Sumner.

MISSOURI

James R. Burge, Craig.
John J. Strode, Grandview.
William A. Reader, Oak Grove.
Ellis M. Huston, Windsor.

MONTANA

Edward C. Clark, Ennis.
Katherine L. Heikkila, Roberts.

NEBRASKA

Glen W. Hayes, Hershey.
Cecil G. Hutt, Lexington.
Carl F. Eman, Oxford.

NEVADA

Betty F. Keep, Jackpot.
Theobald G. Travers, North Las Vegas.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Norman T. Fecteau, Exeter.
Ralph J. Lavallee, Goffstown.
Russell P. Merrill, Jr., Hampton Falls.
Victor J. Dean, New London.

NEW JERSEY

Alfred W. Conrads, Andover.
George P. Ross, Belmar.
Lee M. Evans, Newport.
Belford L. Cox, Port Elizabeth.
Frank J. Antine, Secaucus.
Dolores Sweetman, Townsends Inlet.
Walter A. Forrest, Westwood.

NEW YORK

Helen E. McKniff, Amenia.
Samuel N. Sackett, Apalachin.
Frank J. Viola, Bronx.
Robert G. Havens, Center Moriches.
James J. McTamaney, Cornwall.
Kathryn S. Rose, Elka Park.
Franklin G. Bassakalis, Ghent.
Emory J. Branning, Hancock.
John E. Foley, Harrisville.
Helen B. Santay, Henrietta.
Thomas P. O'Toole, Hensonville.
Regina V. Myers, Kill Buck.
Patrick J. Reilly, Larchmont.
Joel C. Stein, Locust Valley.
Merwin W. Jester, Meridale.
James L. Bloomfield, Meridian.
Lloyd R. Milliman, Palmyra.
Joseph R. Fallon, Pittsford.
Anthony F. Biscone, Ravena.
Anthony F. Gadzinski, Riverhead.
Dyas W. Carden, Scarsdale.
Katherine I. Bristol, Schuylerville.
Ida M. Marlatt, Shokan.
Huldah J. Murphy, Silver Lake.
Edgar H. Jay, South Dayton.
Ernest C. Warga, South Salem.
Felix Masterson, Valhalla.
Betty J. Kelver, Wales Center.
Forrest M. Lanfair, Warrensburg.
Walter F. Brady, Watertown.

NORTH CAROLINA

Crayteen A. Brown, Cedar Falls.
Ralph C. Jones, Crumpler.
Roscoe D. Franklin, Glade Valley.
Robert E. Sharpe, Greensboro.
Gilbert L. Ferguson, Kernersville.
Charles C. Brown, Sr., Kittrell.
Jeannine W. Winstead, Leasburg.
Paul D. Johnson, Jr., Siler City.
Norris C. Long, Southport.

NORTH DAKOTA

John P. Wheelihan, Ellendale.
Delores E. Moore, Emerado.
Roger O. Lunde, Mohall.
George J. Lemieux, Rolla.

OHIO

Joan C. Dickerson, Alpha.
Joseph L. Clark, Amlin.
Darrell E. Fawley, Chillicothe.
Forest A. Baird, Chippewa Lake.
Edward J. Hinde III, Huron.
Paul L. Rider, Lancaster.
Don M. Davis, Minerva.
Russell J. Krueger, Oberlin.
Keith L. Rutledge, Rockford.
Donna V. Miller, Somerdale.
Charles E. Franz, Sr., Stony Ridge.
Charles F. Smith, Utica.

OKLAHOMA

Harvey R. Bettis, Atoka.
Thomas L. Detherage, Fairland.
Jetta J. Wiseman, Gate.
Laura E. Vaughan, Kiowa.
John I. Washecheck, Sr., Piedmont.
Harry J. Frasco, Savanna.
Frank C. Coon, Stilwell.
Denver L. Turner, Wister.

OREGON

Harry M. Stevenson, Canyonville.
Jean C. McDougall, Deadwood.
Patricia M. Hescock, Fort Klamath.
Claude B. Allen, Gold Hill.
Norman J. Fischer, Mount Hood.
Mildred V. De Mastus, Unity.

PENNSYLVANIA

Martha D. Ridgway, Allenport.
Mario J. Gabrielli, Avella.
James F. Beck, Center Valley.
Raymond C. Hall, Coal Center.
John M. Dranzo, Cokeburg.
Genaro G. Landi, Cresco.
Elzer N. Coates, Jr., High Spire.
Sheldon E. Kleintob, Huntington Mills.
Victor E. Blank, Kinzers.
Rayburn R. Krause, Laurys Station.
John H. Shaffer, Millersburg.
James W. Mengel, Mount Pleasant Mills.
Anson L. Bigham, Normalville.
Harold C. Lorah, Oley.
Floyd F. Plasterer, Shippensburg.
Myra B. Pifer, Tarrs.

PUERTO RICO

Luz Piazza, Adjuntas.

SOUTH CAROLINA

David L. Benson, Fairforest.
Frederick W. Dantzler, Holly Hill.
Eugene Craven, Joanna.
Marise B. DeVore, Kinards.
Douglas W. McMillan, Mullins.
Donald A. Yongue, Orangeburg.
Duncan L. Crawley, Jr., Ruby.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Merlon M. Kotila, Frederick.
Raymond F. Cerney, Geddes.
Dale N. Rezac, Highmore.
Delmar J. Nelson, Rosholt.

TENNESSEE

Roe H. Price, Erie.

TEXAS

Mary L. Montandon, Aiken.
Louise E. Baker, Barnhart.
Herbert M. Cole, Beaumont.
Lee R. Moreland, Canyon.
Ruby E. Seat, Cayuga.
Webster T. Graves, Coleman.
Jack Q. Durham, Cotulla.
Armando E. Gonzalez, Edcouch.
Jack D. Watson, Fort Worth.
W. Kenneth Suddeth, Hubbard.
Jack King, Junction.
Donovon A. Boyett, Moran.
Laura M. Maney, Natalia.
Mark A. Phillips, Jr., Port Lavaca.
Ross Hodges, Ranger.
Lloyd E. Million, Jr., Stamford.
William R. Brooks, Sterling City.
Willa M. Chandler, Tuleta.
Charles E. Baum, Whitesboro.

UTAH

Ned B. Mitchell, Altamont.
Velda J. Jensen, Castle Dale.
Carlene N. Reed, Manila.
Laurella D. Holley, Tropic.

VIRGINIA

Harold H. Copenhaver, Atkins.
Herbert D. Jones, Coeburn.
Doris H. Noel, Daleville.
George A. Johnson, Fort Blackmore.
Leon R. Waters, Luray.
Cecil W. Wood, Meadows of Dan.
Lester L. Hall, Montpelier.
Daniel R. Lynn, Randolph.
Mary E. Moshenek, Ringgold.
Katherleene D. Rountree, Whaleyville.

WASHINGTON

Gloria P. Wharton, Carlsborg.
Billy M. Moyer, Dayton.
George I. Simmons, Kennewick.
Helen M. Scott, Langley.
Louis L. Valentine, Mount Vernon.
John W. Hull, Port Orchard.
Leona M. Wing, Tracyton.

WEST VIRGINIA

Glenn W. Thompson, Barboursville.
Glenn L. Crane, Capon Bridge.
Stephen J. Moore, Leon.
James L. Scarberry, Ona.
Carl W. Lang, Philippi.
Earl F. Wellman, Prichard.
Johanna M. Guadino, Triadelphia.

WISCONSIN

John W. Wied, Amherst.
William P. Brennan, Barneveld.
Richard B. Dougherty, Ellsworth.
John R. Thompson, Elroy.
William E. Leonhard, Greenleaf.
Oswald R. Curtis, Hazel Green.
John F. Mooney, Janesville.
Walter J. Wessely, Kewaunee.
Howard L. Newman, Markesan.
Robert A. Otzelberger, Menomonee Falls.
Emil W. Plain, Oconto Falls.
Norman L. Myhra, Stevens Point.
Gerald J. Lonzo, Suring.
Frederick A. Mohrmann, Viola.

IN THE ARMY

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Lowell Joseph Bradford, O357923.

Brig. Gen. Carl Leslie Buck, O410902.

Brig. Gen. Carl Jens Dueser, O300655.

Brig. Gen. Rowland Falconer Kirks, O337691.

Brig. Gen. William Hartwell Prentice, O385130.

Brig. Gen. Laddie L. Stahl, O448301.

To be brigadier generals

Col. John Warmington Atwood, O945150, Signal Corps.

Col. William Harvey Birbari, O329788, Infantry.

Col. Rafael Gabriel Duffley, Jr., O429229, Medical Corps.

Col. Stephen Scott Ferebee, Jr., O462398, Infantry.

Col. Lester Wallace Grawunder, O385632, Infantry.

Col. Joe Grady Hanover, Jr., O389553, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Kermit Read Hansen, O379451, Infantry.

Col. James Gilliam Hughes, O339576, Medical Corps.

Col. Robert Loren Johnson, O367048, Artillery.

Col. John Joseph King, O425917, Infantry.

Col. Milton Alfred Pilcher, O363806, Civil Affairs.

Col. William Early Reynolds, O363770, Artillery.

Col. Thomas Jackson Thorne, O384897, Artillery.

Col. William Albert Tidwell, Jr., O377627, Army Intelligence and Security.

Col. John Estes Whiting, O378212, Civil Affairs.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier generals

Col. Charles Howard Brady, O405716, Artillery.

Col. Frank J. Dalley, O397520, Artillery.

Col. Don L. Doane, O668708, Artillery.

Col. Roy Wesley Hogan, O331107, Armor.

Col. Nicholas Peter Kafkalas, O1287540, Infantry.

Col. Boleslaw Henry Pokigo, O365481, Artillery.

Col. Gaylord Edward Shepard, O360405, Artillery.

Col. Clarence Binder Shimer, O366079, Infantry.

Col. D. A. Thompson, O430664, Armor.

The Army National Guard of the United States officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Clarence Schnipke, O359322, Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier generals

Col. Joseph Mark Ambrose, O460406, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Thomas Bonner, O403521, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. William LaFayette Ward, Jr., O348287, Artillery.

Col. LaVern Erick Weber, O963734, Infantry.

Col. Charles Vawter Wheeler, O529878, Artillery.

Col. Erbon Wilbur Wise, O1280066, Adjutant General's Corps.

Lt. Gen. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, O21739, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), for appointment as senior U.S. Army member of the Military Staff Committee of the United Nations, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 711.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list, in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be generals

Gen. Andrew Pick O'Meara, O18062, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. James Hilliard Polk, O19028, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. James Lowell Richardson, Jr., O18232, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Thomas Weldon Dunn, O18157, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Louis Watson Truman, O18755, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. August Schomburg, O18422, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Harvey Herman Fischer, O18832, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. William Frew Train, O18415, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Richard Davis Meyer, O18963, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Lt. Gen. Ralph Edward Haines, Jr., Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), in the grade of general.

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

Maj. Gen. Frank Joseph Sackton, O30553, U.S. Army, in the grade of lieutenant general.

Brig. Gen. Robert Bruce Shira, O21052, Dental Corps, U.S. Army, for appointment as Assistant Surgeon General, U.S. Army, as major general, Dental Corps, Regular Army of the United States, and as major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3040, 3442 and 3447.

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, to the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3307:

To be major generals, Medical Corps

Maj. Gen. Byron Ludwig Steger, O19661, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Robert Estes Blount, O19612, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joe Morris Blumberg, O29332, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Conn Lewis Milburn, Jr., O20405, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Thomas McGibony, O20406, Army of the United States (brigadier general, Medical Corps, U.S. Army).

The following-named Medical Corps officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major general, Medical Corps

Brig. Gen. Philip Wallace Mallory, O20916, U.S. Army.

To be brigadier general, Medical Corps

Col. Kenneth Dew Orr, O31042, U.S. Army.

In the Navy

Rear Adm. Nels C. Johnson, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Harold G. Bowen, Jr., U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

William C. Abhau
Walter V. Combs, Jr.
Earl R. Crawford
Walter F. Schlech, Jr.
Thomas S. King, Jr.
Ed R. King
John J. Lynch
David B. Bell
Donald M. White
Roger W. Mehle
Frederick H. Schneider, Jr.
Ralph W. Cousins
Donald "G" Baer
Richard G. Colbert
Walter L. Curtis, Jr.
John E. Dacey
Woodrow W. McCrory
Philip A. Beshany
Robert W. McNitt
Raymond F. Du Bois
Ralph Weymouth
Evan P. Aurand
Vincent P. de Poix
Thomas J. Walker III
Eugene P. Wilkinson
Frederic A. Bardshar
Lawrence R. Geis
C. Edwin Bell, Jr.
Frank C. Jones
Paul A. Holmberg
Donald M. Showers
Harry C. Mason
Jamie Adair

Medical Corps

Frank T. Norris
John S. Cowan
Harry S. Etter

Supply Corps

Kenneth R. Wheeler
George E. Moore II

Civil Engineer Corps

Robert R. Wooding

The following-named officers, when retired, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

Vice Adm. Joseph M. Lyle, Supply Corps, U.S. Navy.

Vice Adm. Fitzhugh Lee, U.S. Navy.

Rear Adm. John McN. Taylor, U.S. Navy.

In the Marine Corps

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of major general:

Robert B. Bell

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps Reserve for permanent appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Douglas J. Peacher
Charles T. Hagan, Jr.

In the Army

The nominations beginning Jack M. Pollin, to be professor of mathematics, U.S. Military Academy, and ending Jack A. Ziemke, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 17, 1967.

In the Navy

The nominations beginning Jack G. Airlie, Jr., to be ensign, and ending Patrick J. Hephner, to be lieutenant (junior grade), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 21, 1967.

In the Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Blair P. Conway, to be second lieutenant, and ending Robert D. Rogers, to be first lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 21, 1967.

In the Navy and Marine Corps

The nominations beginning Robert L. Baker, to be captain in the Navy, and ending Alan C. DeCrane, to be second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on April 3, 1967.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

A faithful man shall abound with blessings.—Proverbs 28: 20.

Eternal Father of our spirits, we rejoice in the glory of a new day and in the beginning of another week. During this time when the foundations of the world seem to be shaken and the bite of bitterness would blight the best of men, we would use this hallowed moment of prayer to be assured of Thy presence and to tap the spiritual resources we need as we face the pressing duties of these hours.

May we feel Thy spirit leading us as we make our decisions, may we possess Thy power which holds us steady amid the constant pressures of daily life, and may our trust in Thee deliver us from those tensions which would tear us to pieces, and from those worries which would wear us out. All through this day may we think our best, do our best, and be our best, and thus be worthy of our calling to this high office.

Hasten the day when justice and love shall rule the hearts of men and reign in the lives of all people. In the spirit of Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 4, 1967, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090).

S. 443. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122).

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The message also announced that the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H.R. 3399) entitled "An act to amend section 2 of Public Law 88–240 to extend the termination date for the Corregidor-Bataan Memorial Commission."

COMMENDATION OF STATEMENT MADE BY CYRUS VANCE, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, the Congress and the public can well applaud the statement made by the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, to the 90th annual convention of the Diocese of West Virginia at Martinsburg, W. Va., on May 6. He spoke with forceful logic which again spelled out the reasons for America's commitments in South Vietnam. He contrasted the clear and unmistakable difference between the efforts of the United States to help the South Vietnamese to establish a sound and stable government with the brutality and wanton terrorism used as deliberate tools by the Communists in an effort to enforce their will.

There are a number of passages which are of particular significance in his well-prepared statement. For instance, he declared:

> Knowing these things—knowing the true face of the war, on both sides—I find it difficult to understand the convoluted logic which leads some to condemn this nation for "immorality" and to defend terrorism as a heroic struggle for "independence."

In reply to the argument that the United States has no vital interest in Southeast Asia, Secretary Vance said:

> The national interest of the United States is international . . . our role of leadership is inescapable.
>
> This does not mean that we must become the policeman of the world.

He said:

> It does mean that we must stand behind the commitments we have made if we hope to preserve peace rather than permit raw and naked power to govern.

In his conclusion, Mr. Vance declared:

> I would say to the young divinity students then: I share your abhorrence of war, but the sacrifice of principle and the loss of freedom are worse than the loss of life. Both principle and freedom are at stake in Vietnam, and so I believe that we are engaged in a just battle.
>
> I believe, too, that the national interest of a great nation is involved wherever principle, freedom and the peace and stability of the world are imperiled. Thus, for these very reasons, I think we should be in Vietnam and we should stay there until the aggression ends.

RETIREMENT OF CARROLL KENWORTHY

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that on Tuesday, Carroll Kenworthy will retire after 26 years as head of the foreign department at United Press International.

After early experience on the Hartford, Conn., Courant; the Tokyo, Japan, Advertiser, and the Wall Street Journal, Kenworthy began his UPI career while the organization was still the United Press, in 1930.

For a decade he covered the diplomatic beat, the foreign committees of Congress and other international news centers, and wrote about such great continuing stories of that era as the great depression, the Philippines independence campaign, the Roosevelt New Deal, the rise of Hitler, and the mounting war tensions in Europe and Asia.

Soon after being named head of the foreign department in August 1941, he scored a remarkable triumph with a story exactly 1 week before Pearl Harbor, which said talks between Secretary Hull and the special Japanese envoy, Saburo Kurusu, "are near collapse" and "it is believed Japan may strike."

His story was cited by Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson at the joint congressional committee which after World War II investigated the lack of preparedness at Pearl Harbor.

His newspaper colleagues and many great and near-great news sources in Washington will miss his cool judgment and reliability. I wish him well on his retirement.

ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the cause of academic freedom and higher education was seriously set back last week when former Governor of Alabama, George C. Wallace, was forced to leave a speaking platform at Dartmouth College as the result of mob action.

Both the president and dean of Dartmouth have condemned this attempt to silence Governor Wallace, which was led, according to press reports, by a faculty member from another nearby New England college.

However, apologies aside, the fact remains that the raucous and undemocratic mob action of members of an audience at Dartmouth stands in direct contrast to the reception given speakers by the faculty and students at the University of Alabama.

For example, I think it is generally understood that the junior Senator from New York is not likely to win any Gallup or Harris poll popularity contests in Alabama or Mississippi. Yet, not many months ago Senator KENNEDY came to the campuses at Tuscaloosa and Oxford, the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi, and he was received and his views were given a hearing by the faculty and students at those institutions, regardless of any differences in opinion which may have existed between speakers and audiences.

Again, in contrast to the outrageous conduct at Stanford University and Harvard University toward, respectively, the Vice President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense, I had occasion recently to accompany the Secretary of State to the University of Alabama campus, where he delivered an address on foreign policy. Mr. Rusk was cordially and respectfully received by the faculty and students at Tuscaloosa, as befits a Cabinet member of the U.S. Government who is a guest at an institution of higher learning in this country.

We are forced to conclude, then, that the "tolerance" level of Stanford, Harvard, and Dartmouth, as well as some other institutions thought to be enlightened leaders of American academia, may not be so high after all. And we are also forced to conclude that there must be a vital element missing in the standards being set and taught at these institutions.

As a Member of Congress and as a citizen, I am, therefore, greatly disturbed over the serious implications of this trend to political disorder and intolerance in many of our country's major educational institutions. Obviously, the "right to dissent" as it is understood by some students on these campuses means the right to dissent so loudly as to deny any other point of view being heard. This, then, is not academic freedom, but a form of academic license that infringes upon the freedom of others.

We can all regret the need for the president and dean of a major American university to apologize for the unruly conduct of a student audience, as occurred last week at Dartmouth. But I must also admit to a considerable degree of pride that, in my own State of Alabama, the principles of patriotism, respect for our system, our Government, and our fundamental freedoms remain the solid foundation to our institutions of learning.

Mr. Speaker, although it is a rare occasion when I find myself in agreement with a general editorial statement of the Washington Post, that newspaper on May 5, 1967, expressed the growing concern of the country regarding the campus trend of which I speak.

This editorial follows:

STORM TROOPERS

When college children behave like children, as they sometimes will—engorging goldfish, infesting telephone booths, raiding panties from women's dormitories—one can laugh or sigh according to one's disposition and tolerance. But when they behave like Hitler Youth members—chanting slogans, stifling speech and wreaking violence—they betray their status as students. It would be folly to make light of such behavior or to treat it as a prank or even to condone it as an expression of adolescence. It hacks at the roots of freedom. It amounts to a very sick symptom of the unhappy polarization taking place in the American community.

The latest case in point, at Dartmouth College on Wednesday, involved a former Governor of Alabama, George Wallace, who had been invited to the campus by the college newspaper. He was heckled and physically threatened when he spoke; and after he had completed his speech, his car was surrounded, damaged and nearly overturned by a mob of fledgling storm troopers. The incident was, of course, money in the political bank for George Wallace who behaved with infinitely more dignity, intelligence, and wit than his assailants.

Dartmouth apologized, of course—as Howard and Harvard have recently had to apologize for similar unseemly happenings. But one wonders what they teach at these institutions. They had better begin teaching something about the real meaning of free speech and the democratic process and the rule of reason. Pretty soon, the way things seem to be going, they'll be burning books on college campuses, instead of reading them—because they don't like the authors.

FALSE NEWS PHOTOGRAPHS

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a falsely captioned news photograph alleging American atrocities in Vietnam.

The photo to which I refer has been used by the magazine, the Minority of One, for the cover of its May issue. On the board of sponsors are Bertrand Russell, Linus Pauling, Prof. Pitirim A. Sorokin, and Brig. Gen. Hugh B. Hester, U.S. Army, retired.

The picture shows an American soldier at the controls of a U.S. Army tank looking backward at the body of a man being dragged by a rope. The photo caption states that "In U.S.-'Aided' South Vietnam: 'Dusty Death' Is Administered to Guerrilla Suspects Caught by U.S. Military Personnel." The accompanying photo, from World War II, shows Nazis dragging live Polish partisans behind jeeps.

Upon inquiring at the Departments of State and Defense, I learned that the Vietcong shown in the photo was already dead, and that his body was pulled away with a rope to guard against the Communist practice of booby trapping bodies left on the battlefield, in order to blow up U.S. soldiers sent to bury them. Since the Buddhist religion requires prompt burial, a body left at the scene of battle is immediately suspect as a trap. In other instances, bodies are pulled away with a rope when they are badly decomposed.

I have asked the Post Office and Justice Departments to investigate the possibility that this false photo is an act of treason. But the main purpose of these remarks is to call attention to the tactics being used by some of those who obviously hold little love for their own country. At a time when America's young men are dying in Vietnam in defense of freedom, such lies betray their sacrifice and mock the free speech for which they fight.

GOVERNMENT JOBS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the May 4, 1967, issue of the Christian Science Monitor carried the following Associated Press dispatch:

The State Department has ordered a 2 percent cut in its employment ceilings here and around the world. The order abolishes an estimated 273 jobs and apparently is aimed both at economy and at curbing what critics contend is overstaffing in the big foreign-affairs agency.

This announcement reminds me that I gave the House an opportunity on April 26, 1967, to reduce the approximately 80,000 jobs in the Department of Interior and related agencies by 2 percent. This opportunity was given in an amendment I proposed that day to the bill making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968. The amendment was rejected in the Committee of the Whole.

My amendment was based upon the fact, as disclosed on page 18 of part I of the hearing record, that at December 31, 1966, there were 4,820 job vacancies in the Department. Some of the vacancies came about as a result of a circular issued by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget last September directing that employment levels be rolled back to the level of July 1, 1966, but some of it came about because of the inability of the Department to fill all jobs money had been appropriated for.

If the Department of Interior could operate throughout 1966 with 4,820 fewer jobs than were appropriated for last year, I cannot see why, in view of the critical budget situation that we face and the substantial deficit contemplated next year, the Department could not get along without increasing employment by 1,662 jobs.

My amendment would have done for the Department of Interior exactly what the State Department has now announced it is going to do on its own responsibility, as reported by the Associated Press. This is a clear example of how Congress has lost control of the purse strings—by appropriating money for more jobs than the executive departments need. Perhaps we will now begin to scrutinize more closely the agencies' requests for higher and higher levels of employment.

The State Department comes in for a great deal of criticism from time to time but in this instance it is setting Congress a good example. I hope we will take it to heart and stop giving departments more money than they actually need.

SUPPORT LEGISLATION PROHIBITING FLAG DESECRATION

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection?

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I support measures now before the Judiciary Committee that would stiffen the penalties imposed on anyone found guilty of flag desecration. The States now have their own laws, and the penalties vary from a fine of a few dollars to $100, but my concern is that the States would be helpless to act when a violator crosses State lines. This legislation would allow the Justice Department to enter the case and prosecute. The founders of our Nation, when they wrote our freedoms into the Constitution, certainly did not intend for any of those freedoms to permit mutilation of the Nation's emblem. Mr. Speaker, I join the efforts of my colleagues who represent the beliefs of outraged Americans that contemptuous flag burning and mutilation have to cease.

CRIME AND POPULATION GROWTH

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, the standard rebuttal of those who say crime is no crisis in America is that "we have more crime because we have more people." That rebuttal simply will not stand analysis.

The FBI crime report covering the

1960 to 1965 period shows that the incidence of major crimes increased by 46 percent; in the same period, the Nation's population increased by only 8 percent. Crime grew nearly six times greater than population.

Neither is it accurate to say that population concentration in cities is the cause of urban crime growth. Dr. Clement S. Mihanovich, professor of sociology at St. Louis University, recently published total crime statistics for 18 major cities compared to population changes reflected in official Census Bureau figures. For the 10-year period, seven of those cities had population increases ranging from 10 percent to 71.42 percent while crime increases ranged from 47.29 percent to 186.80 percent. In only one of these seven cities, Dallas, was the rate of crime increase less than the rate of population increase.

The other 11 cities showed, not an increase, but a decrease in population ranging from 0.28 percent to 13 percent. Yet, all 11 cities had a total crime increase ranging between 11.64 percent and 168.44 percent.

The inescapable conclusion is that there is little correlation and probably only a negligible causal relation between demographic factors and our modern crime epidemic.

ERIC SEVAREID AND HIS COMMENTARY ON THE NEWS

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, over the weekend a news story reported that CBS news commentator, Eric Sevareid, has had discussions with leading Democrat officials from the State of North Dakota, regarding his possible candidacy on that party's ticket for U.S. Senator, against incumbent Republican Senator Milton Young.

With all the attention that has been given recently to the question of congressional ethics, I think this news story raises a question of journalistic ethics, which cannot be ignored by CBS.

To put this situation in proper perspective it must be recognized that Eric Sevareid's major responsibility with CBS is not to report the news, but to interpret and comment upon it.

This open admission by Sevareid that his sympathies lie with the Democrat Party would seem to raise questions about his own objectivity in political commentary on national and international issues. In my mind this has long been evident. The same obviously applied to former CBC commentator, Howard K. Smith, now with ABC.

The situation becomes even more critical because of the fact that the great television networks are not affected by the equal time provisions of the law, as they apply to local stations. The networks do not recognize any equal time requirements. It is doubtful that CBS would ever consider giving a Republican Party spokesman the opportunity to have 5 minutes of each evening on CBS news to reply to Sevareid, when his subject matter involves issues of political significance.

Assume, for example, that Sevareid is commenting upon a national issue in which the Republican Senator from North Dakota takes a different stance than Sevareid. Would such commentary from a supposedly nonpartisan or journalistically objective source, not enhance Sevareid's potential as a political candidate? And would it not have at least a subtle impact on constituents of all Republicans officeholders, whose views and positions almost by definition also differ from Sevareid's?

I realize that an effort might be made to draw a parallel in this instance to Gov. Ronald Reagan who is presumed to have drawn some advantage from his public exposure as a performer on television. But Reagan was not a political analyst on a network television program and it would indeed be stretching a point to make any valid comparison. Indeed, he was only helping market "progress" as the most important product of you know who.

I submit, there is a very real question of ethics involved in this situation which CBS cannot afford to ignore.

If CBS does not see fit to replace Sevareid, it might at the very least consider adding a disclaimer each evening to the effect that the views of this possible Democrat candidate for public office does not necessarily represent the views of CBS news—or do they?

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR—PERMISSION TO SIT TOMORROW, TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967, DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit tomorrow, Tuesday, during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE CANADIAN SENATE, THE HONORABLE SYDNEY J. SMITH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I include with my remarks a letter from the President of the Canadian Senate, the Honorable Sydney J. Smith. He requests that I advise the House of the appreciation and gratitude of the Canadian Senate for the expressions of this House's congratulations to Canada contained in House Resolution 280, agreed to on March 20, 1967.

The letter follows:

Speaker of the Senate,
Ottawa, Canada, April 28, 1967.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker: I have been requested by my colleagues in the Canadian Senate to convey to you on their behalf, and to all Members of the United States House of Representatives, our appreciation and gratitude for the Concurrent Resolution introduced on March 14th last and adopted shortly thereafter. This thoughtful gesture of extending congratulations on the occasion of our Centennial of Confederation was received with gratitude and affection by all my colleagues, as indeed were the generous remarks made by the sponsors of the Resolution.

I have been honoured to place the Resolution, together with the remarks of its sponsors, on the official record of the Canadian Senate on April 19th, last, and I am sure that this is a most fitting prelude to the Tenth Meeting of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, which we will be pleased to welcome to Canada in two weeks' time.

I am, my dear Mr. Speaker,
Yours sincerely,
Sydney J. Smith.

THE TEACHER CORPS AS AN EXPRESSION OF AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL IDEALISM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, today there is hardly a school district, a school, or a community in America that is not looking for new tools for educational innovation.

What does innovation mean today? It means new schoolrooms. It means new ideas about who gets what in our schools. It means new machines and new equipment. But most of all it means new teachers, additional teachers, teachers imbued with the spirit of serving those who have been too little served by our public school system in the United States.

Under the forceful leadership of President Johnson the Congress established a national teacher corps to meet the educational needs of the rural and urban poor. The funds allocated for the program were limited compared with other expenditures. The number of teachers recruited was small. Yet the impact of the program has been great in every school district affected.

It is the intention of the administration to continue and strengthen the Teacher Corps. Under the committee's bill, the Commissioner of Education will be able to continue to arrange with the local school board—at their request—to send Teacher Corps teams to local schools. This completely preserves the local character and local control of the Corps.

In addition, committee amendments to the act provide that the poorest States will receive the largest number of Teacher Corps members, if the supply of corpsmen exceed demand from other States. This provision links the Teacher Corps teams intimately to title I of the act which is geared to the number of low-income school children in a district.

The purpose of the Teacher Corps is to supply increased numbers of qualified educational personnel to needy children whose learning has suffered from educational and economic deprivation.

The Teacher Corps is probably one of the most idealistic yet practical education experiments which this country has undertaken in 25 years. It will test our resolve. It will test the ability of our youth. It will benefit our children—the leaders of tomorrow.

I urge my colleagues to join me in assuring all our children the grand opportunity furnished to them through the Teacher Corps. Let us all support the approved committee version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967.

BENEFITS OF MODEL CITIES PROGRAM ALREADY SEEN IN TULSA, OKLA.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we are daily reading about the benefits already flowing from the model cities program. On March 30, the Tulsa Tribune published an editorial, entitled "A Side Benefit," which described the efforts of Tulsa in preparing their application for a model city.

This editorial noted:

> Regardless of the outcome of this application, however, the efforts of the many Tulsans involved will not have been wasted . . . For the committee debates should strengthen the entire city.

Mr. Speaker, Congress has long been searching for ways to stimulate our cities and our State governments to take an active role in planning for the future of their communities. The activities to date clearly shows that the model cities program is doing just that. It is motivating our mayors, our citizens, our business and civic leaders to take an active part in seeking new solutions to their problems.

I suggest that the model cities program has already proven successful in its initial stages. Tulsa, Okla., is but one example of successes across the country. With sufficient funding I believe the program will be even more successful.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues this informative and interesting editorial by inserting it in the Record:

A SIDE-BENEFIT

Tulsa now has a network of citizens' committees at work on the problems associated with poverty and blight in this community.

One group of committees, appointed by the mayor, is exploring Tulsa's chances of participating in the Model Cities program, which is a major national-local effort to revitalize poor neighborhoods.

The plans are for the future, but one side-benefit is already in view. Preparing these applications takes a lot of time and community-wide effort. Simply getting people and agencies together to work on these problems is "strengthening the abilities of cities to cope with their own problems."

That observation comes from the Massachusetts consulting firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., which has been active in developing Model Cities programs across the nation. It is true here, too. The firm reports:

"For the first time in a number of cities, the problem of planning a program application has brought together city agencies that have never met before in the same room. It is evident, too, that new groups of citizens and private firms are being brought into the development effort."

Tulsa has six such committees with dozens of members and they have been working toward a deadline which falls tomorrow. The discussions are truly community-wide, and that is good.

The Model Cities act, passed by Congress in 1966, emphasizes local initiative and responsibility. It calls for not just urban renewal, but expansion of job opportunities, less dependency on welfare payments, better educational opportunities and concerted attacks on disease, delinquency and crime.

The consulting firm urges cities to be "idealistic in purpose, yet pragmatic in approach." It recommends that cities set up specific and obtainable objectives, and that they protect themselves by building flexibility into their programs.

In this way, they "can avoid the situation where the validity of a single project or assumption could determine the success or failure of the entire program."

This is sound advice. To date, Congress has appropriated only enough money for a limited number of cities to undertake the initial planning phase. Competition for funds is bound to be keen.

Regardless of the outcome of this application, however, the efforts of the many Tulsans involved will not have been wasted if the plans are, as Arthur D. Little Inc. says, pragmatic and flexible. For the committee debates should strengthen the entire city.

PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES RELATING TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF SUBVERSIVES IN THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEVILL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my position on House Joint Resolution 544, which I introduced last week, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States in the matter of employing subversives in the public schools.

The need for the proposed amendment arises from a majority opinion handed down by the U.S. Supreme Court this January, in the case of Keyishian against University of New York. The opinion to which I refer denies to a State government the right of refusing employment in the public schools to a schoolteacher on the grounds that he or she is advocating the violent overthrow of government in the United States or is knowingly a member of an organization advocating such doctrine. House Joint Resolution 544 is designed to overrule the decision of the Court in the case of Keyishian against University of New York.

In seeking to protect the individual American in his right to the free expression of political opinion, the Supreme Court has simply gone too far. It has declared, in the name of the Federal Constitution, that the State cannot refuse employment to a person openly advocating the destruction of the State. And that does not make sense. Surely, the authors of the Federal Constitution did not intend to include in the document the seeds of the destruction of the several State governments and of the Federal Government itself. Surely they did not intend to tie the hands of persons sworn to the protection of our constitutional principles, State and Federal alike. To have so intended would have set us on a course of national suicide, from the very beginning.

House Joint Resolution 544 empowers a State, following full judicial review, to disqualify from teaching in the public schools any person found guilty of willfully advocating the forceful overthrow of any Government in the United States, or of printing, publishing, editing, or selling any book or paper advocating such doctrine, or of willfully and deliberately becoming a member of an organization advocating such doctrine.

It must be admitted that in every case wherein a vaguely worded or ambiguous law is passed, concerning the political beliefs of public officials, there is always a chance that the law will be misused; that demogog may seize upon it, simply to embarrass their political opponents.

No such possibility exists here, however. The law is clearly stated. There is nothing ambiguous about it. The only persons it can touch are those who advocate, in one way or another, the overthrow of a Government in the United States, by violent means.

And if nothing is done to reverse the position of the Supreme Court in this regard, what then? My opinion is the same as that of the four justices of the Supreme Court who voted against the majority opinion in the case of Keyishian against University of New York. From their point of view, the doors of American education have been opened to communism—to the enemies of the Republic—who are free, therefore, to spread their propaganda, in the guise of schoolteachers. And even if discovered, they cannot be removed from their positions.

I heartily concur with the dissenting justices of the Supreme Court, and I urge the favorable consideration of House Joint Resolution 544, as a means of preventing the continuation of this fantastic state of affairs.

FEDERAL AID TO SCHOOLS

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection

to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the controversy that has arisen with respect to the proposal offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] which would provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools in the form of block grants, has prompted many concerned residents of Michigan's Sixth Congressional District to write to me. Because I wish to respond to these inquiries as rapidly and as fully as possible, I insert in the RECORD materials which I believe should clarify this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that there has been much misunderstanding regarding the intentions and the expected consequences of this effort to insure both the most effective use of aid funds and the future freedom and independence of our schools. No one having a long-range interest in the education of our youth should pass judgment on this new approach without carefully studying the following statements by members of the House Education and Labor Committee:

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES E. GOODELL, OF NEW YORK

In the current debate involving the Quie amendment to the administration's education bill, some points require emphasis. They can be stated quite simply, and I hope all individuals concerned with this issue will take the time to read the following:

1. THE PRIVATE SCHOOL ISSUE

The Quie amendment was specifically designed to avoid the church-state issue. It adopts exactly the same procedure as in present law, requiring public school officials to make equitable provision for private school students. Although the Quie amendment did not contemplate commingling of Federal and State funds, some private school officials raised this specter and said commingling would cut out private school students in 33 States that have strict church-state constitutional provisions. To reassure all concerned, Mr. Quie added a specific provision clarifying that there could be no commingling under his amendment. Other clarifications were added to the Quie amendment to meet all the initial reservations raised by private school officials. In addition, from the very beginning the Quie amendment has provided that the Commissioner could bypass any State that failed to make adequate provision for private school students. Under such circumstances the Commissioner could, in effect, proceed as under present law.

In truth, the private school officials are now divided over the Quie amendment. They agree that the bill itself makes sincere and ample provision for private school students, even expanding present provisions of the law. Some private school officials, however, now say in effect: "The only way you can guarantee adequate participation of private school students is to have authority centralized in an all-powerful Commissioner of Education in Washington. We cannot trust State school officials to include private school students." That is the real issue posed by those private school officials who still oppose the Quie amendment. No matter what provisions are added, as long as the Quie amendment gives greater flexibility and control of education at the State and local level, these particular private school officials will oppose it. Fortunately, many people concerned about fair treatment for private school students disagree vehemently with such opponents of the Quie amendment.

2. NO PUBLIC HEARING

The original Quie proposal, embodying a number of provisions beyond the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, was introduced March 20, and was before the committee when hearings were held. Virtually every witness was questioned carefully as to the Quie proposal. The administration bill was refined in the light of committee hearings; so was the Quie amendment. It can be fairly said that most of the educational experts testifying agree with the basic approach of the Quie amendment.

3. LESS MONEY TO SOME STATES

The Quie amendment changes the allocation formula. In its original form it would have reduced money to New York, the District of Columbia, and Alaska. Education spokesmen contended a large number of States would receive less money under the Quie formula, including most Southern States. Mr. Quie denied this. In order to resolve any question in this regard, Mr. Quie added a specific provision that under no circumstances shall any State receive less money than it received under the previous allocation.

In sum, the Quie amendment represents a giant stride in the direction of giving State and local officials more discretion and control over education. It guarantees that private school students will be taken care of exactly as they are under present law. The real opposition to the Quie amendment is from those who favor continued centralized control of Federal education funds. That will be the choice before the House of Representatives when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is debated.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE ALBERT H. QUIE, OF MINNESOTA

A number of misconceptions have been circulated about my amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), known as the Quie Amendment. It is extremely unfortunate that the Church-State issue has been introduced into the debate over the merits of my amendment and the amendments proposed by the Administration, H.R. 7819.

The Quie Amendment to ESEA is designed solely to return Federal aid to public and private school pupils in the form of "block grants" to the states, rather than through categorical grants. This method of getting aid to pupils would, in my view, be much more efficient and beneficial to students.

The rumor has been circulated that the Quie Amendment would take benefits away from private (parochial) school pupils. This is not true. The Amendment would continue every form of assistance now available for private (parochial) school pupils and teachers. In fact, it would even extend some of those benefits.

When I prepared the amendment, I deliberately wrote in sections to make certain that private school pupils would continue to receive the same benefits they enjoy under the present Act.

Programs in the local schools funded through the block grant must include arrangements for private school pupils to participate. In fact, no State plan could be approved unless it met requirements designed to safeguard pupils in private schools, because the funds must be used for the benefit of students both in public and private schools to the extent consistent with the number of children attending each. This is exactly the same as provided in ESEA. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 704. (a) (3) provides that, to the extent consistent with the number of children attending private elementary and secondary schools in school attendance areas selected for programs under Section 703, provision will be made on an equitable basis for including special educational services and arrangements (such as, but not limited to, dual enrollment, educational radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment and other special educational arrangements) in which such children can participate;"

Federal funds for textbooks and library materials (a minimum of $120 million under the Quie Amendment) must include an equitable distribution on a loan basis for private school pupils and teachers. Moreover, my amendment expands to the present Act by including laboratory and other instructional equipment among these materials. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 704. (a) (4) provides that arrangements (whether through the State educational agency or some other State agency or commission) for the distribution of library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, and audiovisual equipment and materials for the use of teachers and pupils shall include provisions for the loan of such resources, textbooks, equipment and materials on an equitable basis for the use of teachers and pupils in non-public schools;"

My amendment includes still another safeguard for private schools, the so called "bypass" mechanism. If a State cannot legally provide for the loan of textbooks, instructional equipment and materials for private school pupils and teachers, the U.S. Commissioner of Education would arrange for such loans directly to them on an equitable basis from the funds allotted to these States, thus avoiding any State constitutional limitation. This is exactly the arrangement under which the ESEA and the National Defense Education Act (NDEA) presently operate. The precise language is as follows:

"SEC. 705. (b) In any State which has a State plan approved under Section 704(b) in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide library resources, textbooks, laboratory and other instructional equipment, audiovisual equipment and materials, or other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for such testing and for the provision on an equitable basis of such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials and equipment for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year out of the State's allotment."

In addition, since the Quie Amendment will specifically prohibit the commingling of Federal with State funds, no State is restricted by its legal requirement on State funds in carrying out arrangements for the participation of private school pupils.

In conclusion, let me emphasize again, the Quie Amendment will not take benefits away from pupils who attend private (parochial) schools.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES JOHN N. ERLENBORN, OF ILLINOIS, AND WILLIAM J. SCHERLE, OF IOWA

Let us say, first of all, that we are Roman Catholics, and that both of us are products of parochial schools. We believe that erroneous information and even more erroneous interpretation has been circulated about this amendment.

It is not an anti-Catholic amendment, but it is anti-Federal bureaucracy. It intends to give school children better educational opportunities; and it intends to afford school administrators—both public and parochial—a better chance of bringing those opportunities to the children in their care.

MINK RANCHERS NEED EMERGENCY FHA FINANCING

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have called on the Department of Agriculture and the Farmers Home Administration to use their authority in providing emergency financing to U.S. mink ranchers who find themselves caught in a financial vise between current high operating costs and deflated prices on current pelt stocks caused by free-flowing cheap imports.

In a letter to the Department and FHA, I noted that our Nation's mink farmers are in desperate need of financial credit to sustain them through this period of low prices for their pelts, caused by increased mink imports, and high overhead costs as the kitting—birth of young mink—season gets underway.

Mr. Speaker, emergency help is needed right now, while we work on the long-range problem of restoring the American mink industry to a profitable level through legislation such as mine to limit the increasing glut of mink pelts into the country. The U.S. mink industry, after spending millions of dollars to promote mink throughout the Nation and the world, now find cheap foreign imports have increased to the point that the imports account for 42 percent of domestic consumption. The result was an average auction price drop of about $4.50 per skin. In Minnesota, for instance, the mink industry estimates that over 50 percent of the current crop remains to be sold. Unless the price rises, the ranchers face economic disaster at the very moment when they are experiencing their yearly peak in feeding expenses as the young mink are born.

Production credit associations have been able to lend assistance in a few cases and local banks have helped some. But the greatest need is for priority treatment by the Farmers Home Administration in its loan program. With American mink buyers stepping up purchases of mink from foreign sources, the U.S. auction companies are no longer in a position to provide the primary credit to domestic producers, as has been the practice in past years.

That is why FHA should exert every effort to help mink farmers get through this crucial period of low prices, high imports, dried-up credit sources, and high carryover rate of last year's stocks.

FLAG DESECRATION SHOULD BE MADE A FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful that the House Judiciary subcommittee now holding hearings on legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal crime will approve the strong provisions of my bill, H.R. 3925, at the earliest possible time.

Unquestionably there is widespread public resentment against recent flag-burning and flag-marring incidents. The burning of our national flag at so-called peace demonstrations last month in New York should be reason enough for Federal legislation to prohibit such shameful and despicable incidents. Also in April, a college instructor in Indiana burned an American flag in class on a dare, while denying there was anything unpatriotic about the incident.

Accordingly, we must deter and punish any further efforts to deliberately damage the flag, which is the symbol of our freedom and proud heritage. At a time when American soldiers are engaged in a war halfway around the world, Congress should not hesitate to insure proper respect and protection for our national flag at home.

Under my bill, those who mutilate or desecrate the flag would be punished by imprisonment up to 5 years or a fine up to $10,000, or both. This penalty is the same as that prescribed for draft card burners by a 1965 amendment of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

As further need for this legislation, I recall several flag-marring incidents which received nationwide publicity last year: An Illinois schoolteacher trampled on the flag in front of his class; demonstrators in Georgia pulled down the flag from courthouse grounds and proceeded to tear it, trample and spit on it; a speaker on a college campus in Indiana spit on the flag, then ripped it into pieces, threw it on the floor and stomped on it; and a New York theater sponsored the burning of the flag on stage.

It is my earnest hope that the subcommittee and full Judiciary Committee will see fit to approve this legislation to make desecration of the flag a Federal crime.

RENT CERTIFICATE PROGRAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, in 1965 I sponsored the rent certification program which was included in the Housing Bill of 1965. The administration now refers to this as the section 23 program. This enables the Housing Assistance Administration to make use of privately owned, privately operated properties, paying full taxes, for low income people who are eligible for public housing. The program—when I last checked—was in use in all parts of the country, in 27 States and 94 cities. The HAA had a total of 21,512 units applied for, about 13,000 units under contract and approximately 10,000 people under roof.

I believe this is an excellent record on the part of the Housing Assistance Administration and its Housing Management Division. I hope that the successful operations to date continue.

It has come to my attention, however, that certain restrictive conditions are being added by the HUD secretariat, to the contracts made by the individual housing authorities. This was not the intention of the Congress.

To be specific, in Washington, D.C., the secretariat allows no rent certificate "section 23" units to be utilized except when they have been rehabilitated. The justification for the secretariat's action is that there is a low vacancy rate in Washington and to do otherwise might drive rents upward.

This may or may not be so. There were, however, no such intentions in the Congress at the time at the time of the Housing Act of 1965's enactment. Such conditions could not be added by any interpretation I can conceive. I regard the nature of such conditions as a contravention of the intent of Congress. It breaks faith with the people who so badly need decent, safe, sanitary housing. If such housing is available and does not need rehabilitation they should have its use.

Had the secretariat consulted Congress as to these restrictive conditions which it intended to add to contractual relationships, things might have been different. In this particular case, however, I find that once against the administration is trying to remake the rent housing program, which is working, so it will serve as a handmaiden to the rent supplement program which is not working. Consequently, I have today introduced legislation which will prevent the secretariat of HUD from misinterpreting the intent of Congress by adding restrictive conditions.

VICTOR A. JOHNSTON

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Cramer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join my colleagues today in paying our respects to the late Victor A. Johnston, director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee and formerly executive director of the Republican Party of Wisconsin.

Vic, who recently made his home during part of the year in the State of Florida, was highly respected as an adviser to senatorial Republican officeholders and aspirants. His impact both on the Republican Party and on the national political scene was substantial during his 18-year career as director of the Republican senatorial campaign committee.

Victor A. Johnston was one of the unsung heroes of the two-party system. He went about his tasks out of the public limelight. We can be sure, however, that his memory will shine brightly in the hearts of those who had the privilege of working with him. Vic will be missed both as an individual and as a party adviser in the years ahead.

THE PLIGHT OF AMERICAN AGRICULTURE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Zwach] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from a farmer in Lincoln County, Minn., commenting on the difficulties that his family has faced because of the critical agricultural situation. It certainly sums up the plight of our rural areas, and points to growing insistence by the people that something must be done—and done now.

Mr. Speaker, in order to share this letter with my colleagues in the House, I place it in the Record at this point:

> I am a farmer living in Lincoln County, married and have three boys, ages 21, 17, and 13. Don't ask me why I'm in agriculture because my wife and I have had it up to our necks. We milk 25 cows, raise hogs, cattle, and chickens. At the present time, I'm sure we aren't breaking even on milking cows and today our milk check showed another 3 cents *drop* in price. Hogs used to be mortgage lifters but now you have to be pretty sharp to break even. Eggs are 19–20 cents per dozen, have been for six weeks or more, so the laying hens go to the soup factory next week. Holstein bulls are a good price which shows people are eating baloney and hamburger instead of steak.
>
> What's to become of Lincoln County and all counties you represent under conditions like this? What kind of an administration do we have in Washington? Why doesn't someone give some consideration to the family farmers, who are raising some of the finest children in the world, and produces the food which is so vital to everyone's existence? LBJ worries more about foreign aid, putting a man on the moon, his poverty program and scores of other unnecessary things than what's really his chief concern—agriculture. Last night we heard a Catholic priest from Elkton, South Dakota speak on the farm problem at Tyler. He had attended the meeting in Ames, Iowa, where our Honorable Secretary Orville Freeman met with farmers and had made the remark that, "I can't see anything wrong out here, everything looks good and there's no problem in Agriculture"! Tell me, if you can, Mr. Zwach, is he really that stupid or doesn't he want to see for fear he'll lose his Federal pay check?
>
> I'm speaking for 95 percent of the people in Lincoln County when I say LBJ better pull his head out of the sand along with his aids, because all over farmers are getting a raw deal. We can't hang on much longer and you better believe this.
>
> Government spending the way they do, can't go on. This Viet Nam war is needless. Money, men, and munition plants are the ones gaining, at the cost of human life. If you or I had pulled the crooked deals of Adam Clayton Powell, Bobby Baker and scores of others have done, would we be around? You know the answer.
>
> Do all you can to push the bill for postal driveway delivery to all farms. We have been driving over a mile for our mail for over 50 years and yet the school bus picks up our boys at the driveway every day. Mail service is terrible and gets worse all the time in spite of hikes in postal rates.
>
> Consumers of milk scream their heads off by having to pay 23 to 25 cents per quart for milk, but say nothing when they pay 80 cents per quart for beer.
>
> The N.F.O.—Farm Bureau—Farmers Union and the Grange should all get together and form one good, solid farm organization and demand a price for their farm products. Without it we have nothing and will get nothing.

DOCUMENTATION OF CITIZENSHIP FOR CHILDREN BORN ABROAD

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today joined my colleague the gentlemar from Maryland [Mr. Machen] in introducing a bill to reform the method of documentation of U.S. citizenship for children born overseas to American parents.

Under this bill, Department of State certification of American citizenship would be adequate proof of this citizenship. This would do away with the hardships and burdens on thousands of American families who return home to face an administrative burden trying to prove their children are actually American citizens.

This situation occurs because there is no law requiring the acceptance of this State Department certification of birth as evidence of U.S. citizenship. The bill I am joining my colleague [Mr. Machen] in proposing, would simply require the U.S. Attorney General to issue a certificate of citizenship to those persons who hold the State Department certification of birth, and thus simplify an otherwise complicated process.

I am personally well aware of the problems involved in the present process. When I was called back into the service during the Korean conflict, my daughter was born in Germany. And today, with our increasing involvements and commitments in the free world, there are more American citizens facing similar situations overseas.

This bill would be a simple answer to these problems and I urge my colleagues to take quick action to adopt it.

LOWER PRICES AND HIGHER COSTS—THE MAJOR PROBLEM FACING AGRICULTURE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I have here a letter from Mr. H. L. Selvig, a farmer who lives at Plaza, N. Dak. He sums up, in a few words, the major problem facing agriculture—lower prices and higher costs. Mr. Selvig writes:

> In looking over our farm records this morning we find in 1947 on a ½ sec. of land, our wheat sold for $2.60 and flax $5.85 per bushel. And taxes were $67.08. In 1966, or 20 years later, we got $1.40 for our wheat and $2.80 for the flax and taxes $286.68. And we have rec'd. notice that our taxes will be a lot more in 1967.
>
> With Freeman fixing grain prices we better sell this land.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, PRESIDENT TRUMAN

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Randall] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, it is both a great honor and a matter of personal pride to stand here in the well of the House again today, as I have done on this occasion since 1959, to pay tribute to so great and distinguished an American, and to claim proudly as a constituent, former President Harry S. Truman. On this day as he celebrates his 83d birthday, I wish to extend to him, on behalf of millions of his fellow Americans, and on behalf of his fellow Missourians and fellow townsmen, the fondest wishes for continued health and happiness.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to our majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the distinguished Member of this body who has the honor to represent former President Truman and the Fourth District of Missouri in this House.

Great Presidents are usually measured in terms of their contribution to their day and generation. Once in a while a man comes along who serves not only his generation but many generations.

In my mind, Harry Truman is one of those men. He cut the pattern for American foreign policy not only for his own administration but for many administrations to succeed him. President Truman's accomplishments and foresight loom larger with every passing year; both by the judgments of his day and of future generations he certainly will be listed among the most distinguished of our Presidents.

I commend the gentleman on calling the attention of the House to the fact that this is the birthday of this eminent American and I join him in wishing happy birthday to President Truman. Mrs. Albert and I hope that he will have many more birthdays and that they will all be happy.

Mr. RANDALL. I am very grateful for the contribution of our majority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan, the minority leader of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, although former President Truman was a President of these United States as a

Democrat, and although on occasions he has been somewhat critical and harsh of those of us on this side of the aisle, I think all of us regardless of political affiliation, wish him many more years of health and happiness on this, his 83d birthday.

Mr. RANDALL. I appreciate very much the kind remarks of the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri, yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join Members on both sides of the aisle who are wishing the former occupant of the important chair of the Presidency of the United States, my own fellow Missourian, Hon. Harry S. Truman, many happy returns.

It has been my privilege since serving in the executive branch during World War II under his administration to have been designated by him on occasion, although poles apart politically perhaps, as the acting White House physician when he journeyed into the Ozarks or when the White House physician or his present doctor, Dr. Graham, was not available. I have always honored this.

We have had him in our town to dedicate armories and other institutions named Truman, and after his cousin, Gen. Ralph Truman and others who have been great men in the history of our country.

Indeed, former President Truman did bring history into the concept of evaluating matters and the future trend of this Nation's problems.

We hope he has many happy returns and that the arthritis which plagues him on his 83d birthday may disappear before his 84th birthday rolls around.

Many happy returns, President Truman.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I had occasion to become involved in a conversation with Sir Robert Menzies, who at that time was Prime Minister of Australia. He spoke in glowing terms of his friend, Harry Truman. He said that there were three things that stood out in his mind about Harry Truman. One was his personal integrity and another was the fact that he was loyal to his friends, and the last was his great capacity for making a decision when the decisionmaking was very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I share those sentiments and I, too, want to join my colleagues in wishing our former President a happy birthday and many more of them.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank our colleague, the gentleman from Indiana, very much for bringing us this appraisal of Mr. Truman from the former Prime Minister of Australia.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me, and I take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate and commend the gentleman from Missouri for calling to the attention of the House this fine day, the 83d birthday of former President Truman. I certainly join my friend in the well in extending to President Truman best wishes on this day, with every wish for his health and happiness in the years to come.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and appreciate the fact that he took this time today to give some of us an opportunity to express our great admiration and our best wishes to the great former President on his birthday. I served the complete number of years that Harry Truman was Vice President and President, and one of the things that sticks in my mind in regard to this great man from Missouri is the fact that he had the capacity to make decisions, rough, hard, difficult decisions, in times of need.

I go back to the time when he had to carry on the work of the United Nations which had been started by his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

I go back to the time when he made the decision to use the atomic weapon in Japan.

I go back to the time when he made the decision to find out if it was feasible to make the hydrogen weapon. I have often wondered what would have happened had he not made that tremendously important decision at the time he made it, because on the unanimous recommendation of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy we told him that we thought this thing had to be explored to find out if you could unite and fuse the light elements of hydrogen to cause this tremendous explosion a thousand times greater than the fission of the atom in the atomic weapon.

At that time he made the right decision on the recommendations that we and others had proposed. It was a decision fraught with the greatest possibilities for humanity and the world. We did not know at that time that the Soviets were working on a hydrogen weapon; but we had every reason to believe that this was being done. Nineteen months after we successfully exploded the hydrogen device, the Soviets exploded a hydrogen device.

Now, think for a moment; if at that time in the world's history the Soviets had had sole possession of the hydrogen bomb, could they or would they have issued ultimatums to the other nations of the world? Would they have said, "Get out of Europe or we will let you have one of these weapons at a strategic place"? What would our position have been? What would have been the positions of the nations of Europe at that time? If that kind of ultimatum had been given to them, would they have borne the responsibility of an impact of a weapon of this kind in case the Soviets decided to use it?

We were not in that position. We were not in that position due to the fact that Harry Truman made the decision to spend, if necessary, a billion dollars to find out if you could have a hydrogen weapon.

We began to have it in inventory in a usable fashion at the time the Soviets proved that they could also fuse the light elements of hydrogen. World history, there is no doubt in my mind, was affected because we were in a position of strength due to the decisiveness of Harry S. Truman. We were in a position where we could not be intimidated or threatened as we would have been had another course been taken; that is, if we had appointed a commission to study the problem, for instance, for a couple of years.

So this man made many other decisions, but these are three of the great decisions that I want to call to the attention of Members today and to add my tremendous respect and admiration for a man who served his country and served it well. I thank you very much.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank the gentleman. Those remarks are most welcome because they come from one who is knowledgeable and speaks with authority as a member and former chairman of the Joint Atomic Energy Committee.

As we are given only one opportunity on this earth to develop our skills and to make some contribution to the betterment of mankind, the manner in which we develop our talents determines our place in history. And as time mellows our historic perspective, the greatness of our forebears is revealed. Each generation is faced with challenges which force it to seek out men of leadership, determination, resourcefulness, and courage, thrusting upon them the responsibilities for decisions which literally mold the course of history and charging them with the responsibility of maintaining the peace and security of humanity.

The Truman years were years of challenge, years in which the security and peace of the world were threatened, and thus thrust upon the shoulders of this great man were burdens and decisions almost unequaled and certainly unparalleled throughout our history. I would never want to be one who took a part in trying to distort any event in history, but I am sure I am correct in saying I believe history will support the claim that President Truman will go down in the records as one of the truly great American Presidents of our time.

His courage was outstanding in those critical hours of decision which seem to run the whole gamut of his administration. His confrontation with Stalin at Potsdam, his acceptance of the responsibility for the use of the atomic bomb, his unhesitating response to the challenge against the United States in Korea, the fortitude which caused him to carry through the 1948 election campaign to an electoral triumph that had been widely regarded as an impossibility—these attest to his courage, bravery, fortitude, and, yes, his greatness.

To courage, he added a gift for seeing issues clearly and for stating them in plain and sometimes blunt terms; but ones which were clearly understood by his countrymen. Many Americans esteem this gift of his—a rare one in political life; in and of itself a special form of courage.

Now, to merely reiterate the accomplishments of the Truman years would be a dry recitation of facts of which I am sure the Members are all aware. But to try to perceive them in the perspective of the time in which they were necessitated would reveal some of the impact and significance of Mr. Truman's mark upon history.

On March 12 of this year, we took time to observe the 20th anniversary of the Truman doctrine, the cornerstone of American postwar diplomacy.

It was on March 12, 1947, that Mr. Truman went before a joint session of the Congress to announce a policy that was to prove to be a milestone in U.S. history. Under the terms of that policy, American military and political power were extended throughout the world.

President Truman's immediate purpose on that March 12 day in 1947 was to request $400 million in economic and military aid with which to rescue Greece and Turkey. Greece was on the edge of political and economic collapse, in grave peril from the Communist guerrilla movement. Turkey, along with Greece, was about to lose her military and economic support from Great Britain.

One of the first great decisions of that administration which became the cornerstone of American postwar policy, is today called the Truman doctrine. Under the direction of this policy, the United States has assumed the burden and, yes, the responsibility of world leadership as the mightiest nation on earth. The core of the Truman doctrine, as it has been known, is that the United States declared her willingness and determination to support free peoples resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

It operated under the premise that totalitarian regimes imposed upon free peoples by direct or indirect aggression undermine the foundations of international peace and hence the security of the United States.

But the responsibility of world leadership did not stop with the creation of the Truman doctrine. Three months later the Marshall plan was instituted—one of the most humanitarian ventures ever undertaken by one nation for the benefit of its fellow states. It led to the economic recovery of the states of Europe and the development of bonds of friendship.

The Truman doctrine led, in a series of related steps, to the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and to the entire policy of containment of communism by a network of military alliances stretching from the United States to Europe and across Asia.

Recently—very recently, in fact—there was a meeting of what is called the Council of Europe. The Council held a session a week or so ago to observe the 20th anniversary of the Marshall plan, which at the depths of the post-war depression helped to rebuild the devastated economies of France, England, Belgium, the Netherlands, and other allies.

Significantly, at the time of that meeting, there was not a single Frenchman, not one single member of the Gaullist government, who got up to say a word in memory of the Marshall plan. But there was an old gentleman, the 90-year-old dean of the French National Assembly, Marius Moutet, who could not stand it any longer, and who jumped to his feet to say:

> Maybe the Gaullists don't want to mention the Marshall plan, but I am going to mention it. France owes a great debt of gratitude to the United States and we will never forget it. If the French Government wants to remain silent, I will not.

Deputy Moutet went on to say:

> My voice will speak out for the people of France. We will always remember the Marshall plan.

The Truman years witnessed many challenges to America's determination to maintain peace.

The impact of the Truman doctrine upon the events abroad was immediate and powerful. Turkey and Iran were fortified against Soviet pressures. The previous attitude toward the power of the Communists in Western Europe was so altered that the Communists were dropped from the Governments of France and Italy within about 2 months.

American policies and actions growing out of the Truman doctrine have been successful in maintaining international order, in helping nations to preserve their independence, in promoting economic and social progress, and in keeping the peace.

The United States came a long way from the isolation and noninvolvement policies of our Founding Fathers by the end of the Second World War, but not until the leadership of the Truman administration did she fully and permanently assume the responsibility for this new leadership.

In the years of the Truman Presidency, mankind took tremendous steps toward the unsure future—steps unparalleled almost throughout the entire previous course of history.

I will mention two, which we believe to be of great significance:

First, we must remember that here we are dealing with the transition period, the transition from the pre-atomic era into the age of nuclear energy, into an age of advanced technology and science. The advancement into the nuclear age, or atomic age, challenged and tested man's ability to maintain peace and with that peace the responsibility for the future of humanity.

The atomic era challenged mankind, and especially its leaders, with the choice of using nuclear energy, on the one hand, for the benefit of mankind, or, on the other hand, for the destruction of mankind and civilization. Never before in the history of the civilized world had any one nation possessed the ability to destroy in an instant that which had been built up over the thousands of years of history or with the same power of the atom to build and expand the horizons of human achievement.

Realizing only through peace could mankind ever hope to achieve the peaceful utilization of the atom rather than the destructive force and power that it had, he fostered and encouraged the plans for the creation of a permanent organization in which the nations of the world could peacefully meet. I refer to the United Nations.

Much to the credit of President Truman, the United Nations found its home here in the United States. A President forced, because of the exigencies of the time, to be a President of war, found a way also to be a President who thought in terms of the future peace and security of the world. The establishment of a lasting international organization dedicated to the cause of peace in a time of turmoil was the second great transition in the thinking of the world which occurred under the Presidency of Harry S. Truman. The Truman years saw the materialization of the United Nations, an organization dedicated to peace, at about the same time man became possessed of the capability to destroy his neighbor as well as himself.

I think we might take a moment to turn to recall some of his triumphs in terms of the domestic programs proposed and accomplished by Mr. Truman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RANDALL. I am pleased to yield to our beloved Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. It is well that we pause on an occasion like this to pay our respects to one who has occupied the most responsible position in the world, the office of the President of the United States, whether one has passed into the great beyond or is living, as is our dear friend Harry Truman today.

I join with my friend from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] and others in congratulating former President Harry S. Truman on his birthday anniversary. I know it is with the sincere hope and prayers of all of us that God in His infinite wisdom will bestow upon him countless future similar anniversaries. I know I express the sentiments of all of my colleagues when I also convey to Mrs. Truman our kindest regards, because we all know the very important part that Mrs. Truman has played in the life of Harry S. Truman.

Harry S. Truman, the 33d President of our country, is already recognized as one of the outstanding Chief Executives in our entire Nation's history. It was my pleasure and it is my pleasure to have known him very closely, to have been very closely acquainted with him, and to have carried out as leader of the House the programs that he recommended to the Congress of the United States both in the field of foreign affairs and in the field of domestic affairs. We all remember the dramatic recommendations in the confrontation with international communism that Harry Truman made. We all remember the difficulty in connection with some of them, in having them pass through the two branches of the Congress and be enacted into law.

We remember the courage of Harry Truman in West Berlin, Greece, Korea, and elsewhere. We remember the decisiveness with which he approached any question with which he was confronted.

Mr. Speaker, Harry Truman was a man

who consulted with others and obtained their advice. But the whole world knew that when a decision was made that should have been made on the presidential level, Harry Truman made that decision.

Mr. Speaker, his years of experience developed within him extraordinary abilities and outstanding courage, a very important element in all walks of life, particularly in public life and more particularly when one is the chief executive of our Nation.

And, over and above all, he must possess the quality of courage. Even those who did not like him while he was in public life, admit that Harry Truman was abundantly possessed of that necessary quality, the quality of courage. I attended many of the meetings—all of the meetings with the leaders that took place, as I have with other Presidents, without regard to party—concerning the national interests of our country. I introduced the lend-lease bill in this body, a bill known as 1776, a very important piece of legislation, highly emotional.

The bill, as we look back, was a bill that strengthened the peoples of the free nations of the world against the attempts of international communism to subvert both from within and without, or as the result of a combination of both.

I remember the criticism directed against Harry Truman when he ordered the atomic bomb to be dropped in Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, when that criticism was directed against Harry Truman, my mind went back to an occasion when I was with former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, prior to his death, at a time when we were taking back the Philippines from the Japs and at a time when General MacArthur was mopping up. I was with Franklin D. Roosevelt on one occasion, and he told me that he had before him at that moment three different plans of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for the next action to be taken by our country. Two of them were in different parts of continental China and one was right direct to the heartland of Japan. I never have forgotten—and I never shall forget and I can mention it now although I could not mention it at the time—Franklin D. Roosevelt told me that if the estimates of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—if he made the decision that the next invasion, or next move, would be the heartland of Japan, that invasion inevitably would result in 1 million American casualties.

As I left there I knew Franklin D. Roosevelt would make that decision if it was necessary. But then he passed into the great beyond, and it was necessary for Harry Truman to make that decision.

There is another moral question involved. What about his concern for 1 million American casualties that the Joints Chiefs of Staff in their recommendations, or in their report, or in their plan, whatever you want to call it, said would be involved when they made their report to the President, Franklin D. Roosevelt? The decision he would have to make involved the possibility of 1 million American casualties.

In World War II that meant approximately 200,000 dead and 800,000 wounded in varying degrees. So there was a moral question of dropping the bomb on the poor people of Hiroshima. But there was also the moral question of 1 million American casualties.

I have often addressed the question to myself: "What would I have done under the circumstances if I had been President of the United States?" and with all humbleness I am frank to state I would have made the same decision Harry Truman made.

So I saw Harry Truman in action, as a man whose intuition was remarkable, as a man who could look into the future, and with those intuitive instincts of his unerringly to see history in the making. Such intuition is a remarkable possession for any person. Very few of the male sex have it, although it is more or less abundantly possessed by those of the female sex, but Harry Truman had a powerful sense of intuition, and he certainly exercised it in the national interest of our country. So I repeat that his contributions are history.

He not only helped make history, but he made history at times where action was simultaneous with the decision he made.

It is well that we pause to pay tribute to a great man, a humble man, one who if he were here would remonstrate at our praising him as we are, and thinking of him as we are. He is all the greater because of his humbleness. He is a man whose place in history will grow more and more when the historians of tomorrow—two generations from now—are able to objectively appraise without the emotionalism of a living generation, the motives and the purposes of individuals who participated in the making of history and in the one man who, under our form of government, in the final analysis makes the decision—the President of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, we all wish Harry Truman—not as Democrats or Republicans, but as Americans—every happiness on this day, and hope God will permit him to be with us for countless years to come.

Mr. RANDALL. I am sure I am right when I say, when Mr. Truman reads the remarks which have just been made on this observance of his 83d birthday, he will be pleased. I know his gracious lady will also be pleased with these remarks because they come from one who was on the scene. Both will know the observations just made were not hearsay but were made by one who was majority leader of this House during those years, and by one who was in the very center of the action of which he spoke about and a part of the very important events which transpired in the days described in the remarks of one who for so many years was the majority leader of the House and now is our distinguished Speaker.

Lest we forget to recall some of the important domestic accomplishments under Mr. Truman, I want to mention just one. Another great triumph of the Truman years and the postwar period was the Employment Act of 1946 whose goals were maximum employment, production, and purchasing power.

On the 10th anniversary of that act, former President Truman wrote—

> There is almost no other piece of domestic legislation enacted while I was president to which I would attach greater importance or greater significance.

This legislation proclaimed a new responsibility of government: namely, the promotion of conditions for employment opportunities for the able, willing, and those seeking to work.

The act was not only a milestone in the development of modern democratic government, but it has also had a deep and, I believe, a wholesome influence on the private economy.

Businessmen, labor leaders, and consumers can now plan their activities with more confidence that the Government will take action if a major downswing or deflationary pressure should develop as well as action to control inflationary pressures.

The act required the President to transmit to Congress, within 60 days from the beginning of each regular session, a detailed economic report that included recommendations for legislation that the President deemed necessary or desirable for stimulating or regulating the economy.

The Employment Act set up a three-man Council of Economic Advisers in the Executive Office of the President. The council's duties were to assist and advise the President in the preparation of the Economic Report, to study economic developments and trends, to appraise the policies of the Federal Government in the light of the policy objectives of the act, and to recommend to the President policies which would attain the purposes of the act.

On the legislative side, provision was made for a joint congressional committee charged with the function of making a continuing study of the American economy. This joint committee was required by the act to file a report each year with the House and the Senate containing its findings and recommendations concerning each of the main recommendations made by the President in his economic report.

In establishing these administrative and legislative requirements, Congress gave institutional expression to the acceptance by Government of a new responsibility for the economic well-being of the Nation. The act was signed by President Truman on February 20, 1946, as landmark legislation to maintain a stable American economy.

The Truman years were also marked by any number of other crises that required decisions that could be made by no other person than the one on whose office desk there was a plaque with these words:

> The buck stops here.

It took uncommon steadfastness and presence of mind to commit our Nation to choices between paths which were dimly visible and with unforeseen consequences, and with results unpredictable.

As an elder statesman he now has the opportunity to look upon his life in public service, to assess his mark upon history and to look at the world which he helped to create, and to look upon the problems and the challenges that are resting upon the shoulders of those who have followed him.

For many their impact in history is mainly one of having made the world no worse for their existence. But for President Truman, his was a contribution that led actively and positively to forward the thrust of America's role in world leadership.

Perhaps it is worth a certain sadness today that Mr. Truman now views a world still in turmoil and sees that the peace he so agonizingly sought during his term in office is still the distant goal of man.

But the tragedy and the sacrifices of war and the seeming continued existence of that hatred, mistrust, and lack of understanding all seem to be a part of the human condition.

Therefore, no individual can be measured necessarily by his success in overcoming these evils but rather by his determination, dedication, and commitment to the ever-continuing battle to meet these challenges.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HUNGATE. I want to thank the very able gentleman from Independence, Congressman RANDALL, who so well represents the district in which our former President Truman now lives.

I would like to join him in his remarks to pay tribute on his birthday to our great President, Harry S. Truman, a man who was more concerned with the welfare of the American people than with any image that he might have for the moment—a man who spoke a language that all Americans could understand and a language that required no bureaucratic translation.

I want to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL] again in wishing Mr. Truman many more years of health and happiness and to thank him for the service that he has rendered to our country.

Mr. RANDALL. I thank my colleague, and friend, the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am compelled to rise to say now, as one who did not always agree with Mr. Truman when he was President of the United States, that today, looking back in retrospect, I see his light becoming brighter with each passing day. More and more the image of a great President becomes apparent. We could use many more people of the courage of Harry Truman; many more people of his decisiveness and understanding. It is my privilege to wish him well on this particular day, and I am particularly happy to do so in respect to the fact that I can look back over the years with our disagreements and now look upon him as a great individual, a great President.

Mr. RANDALL. We are all grateful for the contribution of our friend from Louisiana. On the occasion of this 83d birthday I think we can say that if only one thing seems more clearly certain than another about Mr. Truman, it is, that as President, he never shrank from a necessary decision. Discussing the Truman years at a Freedom Dinner recently, his Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, praised his Chief Executive's foreign policy and his powers of decision, when he said:

> When the Truman Government found its footing in foreign affairs, its policies showed a sweep, a breadth of conception and a boldness of action which were new in his country's history. We had seen it in the early domestic policy of the New Deal and in our vast military effort in World War II, but never before in foreign policy.
>
> The 1947 assumption of responsibility in the Eastern Mediterranean, the 1948 grandeur of the Marshall Plan, the response to the blockade of Berlin and the NATO defense of Europe in 1949, the intervention in Korea in 1950—all these constituted expanded action in a truly heroic mold. All of them were dangerous—all of them required a rare capacity to decide and act. All of them were, we know now, rightly decided and vigorously carried through.

It has been said many times that the rarest gift that God can give a man is the ability to have a capacity for decision, and this, President Truman had in abundance and to a unique degree. The anguish of decision was and still is the duty of every President. If there is a lesson to be learned by any office-holder, it is to copy President Truman's example to be as perceptive and then, most of all, decisive.

Presidents come and go. Each leaves his mark on the course of history. Each contributes in his own distinctive manner toward the contribution of his Nation in the improvement of humanity. A nation can honor its heroes by laying wreaths at the graves or by building memorials to their deeds. But to the Presidents who are still alive it can give only gratitude. To be honored and acclaimed by one's fellow citizens and to be referred to in the Nation's history books is a mark of distinction. But to be held in the hearts of one's countrymen is the greatest tribute that a nation can offer to a man, especially to one of its former Presidents.

Therefore, I say it is from the hearts of your fellow Americans comes the greeting, "Happy birthday, President Truman."

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, a onetime Missouri farm boy who proved he was big enough to handle the biggest job in the world is 83 years old today and still busily at work setting the record straight. Not as active as he used to be, he nevertheless keeps sharp watch on the events of the day and expresses his views with customary vigor. One of his characteristic opinions is that people should not make a "fuss" over his birthdays, but I think every American who remembers this man's courageous work as President of the United States wants to pay him honor on this day.

We have been blessedly fortunate as a people and as a country to have had Presidents who, in nearly all instances, rose to their responsibilities. Mr. Truman will go down in history as one of our best Presidents, I am sure. To him, and to the gentlewoman, a lady to her fingertips, who has shared his life—Mrs. Bess Truman—and to their wonderful family, every Member of the House would want to send greetings today.

We truly hope that Mr. Truman and his successor in office, President Dwight D. Eisenhower, now at Walter Reed Hospital, enjoy many, many more years of useful life in the service of a country to which both men have devoted their entire lives. Happy birthday, Mr. Truman. Get well quick, Mr. Eisenhower.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the whole Nation joins in celebration of the birthday of former President Truman, the outstanding leader of our people in times as perilous and trying as any in our country's history. I was privileged to be a freshman Congressman during his administration. My primary hobby is the study of history. I assert, without doubt, that the great stature of this man will grow in the perspective of history. None of our leaders have had more difficult decisions to make; and he made them excellently. My constituents join me in sending our best wishes to him and to his devoted and able wife on this great occasion. We wish them many happy and glorious returns of the day.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in paying tribute to a great American, Harry Truman, on his 83d birthday.

I knew Harry Truman when he was Grand Master of Masons in Missouri in the 1930's. He came to Kirksville, Mo., when I was teaching in the high school there. Several of our mutual friends arranged for me to meet there with him. It was at that time I discovered he had an interest in American history and loved to talk about American history.

After that I observed Harry in public life, first as a U.S. Senator—following his noted work on the special committee investigating war contracts and other matters publicly involved with legislation and public policy; later, of course, with all Americans I observed him as Vice President of the United States.

I remember very well the date of President Roosevelt's death and his taking of-fice. I noted his humility and recall his humility and sincere expression of hope to serve well, be a worthy successor, and make a contribution to the American system. Establishment of a better life and a better understanding of Americans worldwide was his constant goal. I shared his concern along with other Americans for a peaceful world and one where the basic freedoms could be extended and serve fellow men.

Mr. Speaker, I never voted for Harry and I disagreed often with many of his policies—both on domestic fronts and foreign fronts—but I do agree with the vast majority of Americans that Harry Truman did his best to serve his country. He had a greatness about him as well as a concern for better Government. He supported the Intergovernmental Organization Committee designed to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government. When this proposition passed and became law, he named a former President, Herbert Hoover, to the Commission as chairman. It then became known as the Hoover Commission.

On one occasion when I met and visited with him—and I remember the date, January 9, 1959—he told me what he had said to Mr. Hoover. It was "I want to take the political stench out of the Hoover name." It is well known that he and President Hoover were great personal friends. I remember so well the last time he was in West Branch, Iowa. It was on the occasion of the dedication of the library. Herbert Hoover was there. So was Harry Truman. A number of speeches were made honoring Herbert Hoover that day—on his birthday. Among the best, if not the best, was made by Harry Truman. I thought history was made that day, Mr. Speaker, when these two great men got together to renew old friendships, to make all of us see our purpose as Americans, each through their public utterances. Together they made another contribution to the history and heritage of our country. This, also, lent greatness to the American character. It showed the world that men could be antagonists, but when that was over they could be and many would be and all should be friends. It was a fine example of sportsmanship and good will. It was my pleasure that day to visit with both of these great men.

Since that time I have been in personal contact with both President Hoover and President Truman and have had the benefit of assurance from both that there is a great respect that each had for the other. Also, when I saw Mr. Truman he seemed to want to talk about American history and I enjoyed talking to him. After I had a part in organizing the United States Capitol Historical Society, I received many letters of accommodation and good wishes. The very first letter I received was from President Kennedy and very soon after that I received a nice letter of accommodation and good wishes from Harry Truman. Each, in his own way, had a part in encouraging what was a feeble effort at one stage to contribute to a better understanding of American history and later a substantial contribution was made possible because we had men like Harry Truman. He was a great supporter of the historical society and saw to it that "We, the People" was sold in his library at Independence. I saw him next at Mr. Rayburn's funeral in Texas. Again, we had a nice visit. Again, he voiced his interest in history. He said:

> Good luck to you in your promotion of American history.

I think this is an exact quote of his:

> Every American ought to know more about American history, for when he does, he will understand what America stands for and the result will be better citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, the last time I saw Harry was in his library at Independence a year ago last March. Again we had a nice visit. This time, with his great interest, the reaction people were finally evidencing to his work for peace in the world. My colleagues have already spoken of all of them. Again I want to say while there may be mistakes in administration, there were no mistakes in his heart. He desired to do good and to be known for what he said rather than what he had as material possession. There is much we can learn from the example of his life and I commend it to every American and join my colleagues in giving his salute and paying this respect to him today.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks upon the occasion of this birthday tribute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RESPONSIBILITY OF NEWS MEDIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I hesitated to address you today on this subject, but after an examination of my own thinking, my own conscience, I can do no less.

It may not be understandable to some, but I am sure it is understandable to many that I have—and I have had throughout my life—a fetish for accuracy. Strange as it may seem, in my many years that I spent in the newspaper world—some 23—as an editor, and previously as a reporter, before coming to the Halls of Congress, I insisted upon accuracy in newspapers and among those under me discharging their responsibilities in the freedom of the first amendment of the Constitution of the United States—which I hold so dear to myself because of my profession and because of my background.

I stand with those who believe with Voltaire:

> I disapprove of what you say, but I will defend to the death your right to say it.

The freedom for each American guaranteed by the Constitution for free expression is something sacred to all of us. Perhaps even more sacred than that one amendment, the first of the Bill of Rights to the Constitution, is the Constitution of the United States. I believe it was Gladstone who said:

> I have always regarded that Constitution as the most remarkable work known to me in modern times to have been produced by the human intellect at a single stroke (so to speak), in its application to political affairs.

It is because of my dedication to that Constitution, because of my belief in the first amendment of the Constitution, that I am compelled to rise today, not in anger, but in sadness, to direct the attention of the Members to the manner in which this freedom of the press and the usage of the first amendment can be prostituted for purposes which I cannot understand.

As I indicated, I do not rise in anger, nor do I rise in a critical manner in an effort to take away from those who want to express an opinion other than mine, their right to do so, but I must insist, I must demand, that the news media of this country—whether it be the newspapers, the radio, or television—confine themselves to the facts in reporting the news. At the moment, I direct attention to a cartoon which appeared May 7 in the Washington Post, by one of America's great and acknowledged cartoonists, Mr. Herblock. Perhaps it is because I recognize his ability and his worth and the tributes which have been paid and the honors given him that I am all the more saddened that this man of great stature has wandered down the path of misrepresentation, inaccuracy, and obviously misleading statements in order to put over a point of view.

I do not disagree with him and his views. He is well qualified and certainly able to express them. I do recognize the force that he has at his command for molding public opinion—not the reporter, not the editorialist, not the news commentator, but that most effective of all media—a picture. It was the Chinese who said that one picture is worth a thousand words. So it becomes more necessary to understand that the cartoonist has within his grasp multiple powers over the voice and the pen.

Of course, the cartoon cannot be printed in the RECORD, so I shall attempt to accurately describe exactly what it says, and then discuss it. I shall not comment upon its inaccuracies until I have described it.

The cartoon is in the usual cartoon form, signed by "Herblock" in the left-hand corner, and over the top is this, in quotes: "We'll Teach You Patriotism and Respect for the Law."

Depicted in the right-hand side of the cartoon are three individuals.

One individual is holding in his hand and burning the U.S. Constitution. Tagged as his identification is "L. MENDEL RIVERS."

The next individual is holding a sign entitled " 'Let's Forget the First Amendment'—House Armed Services Committee members." This individual is identified as "E. Hébert, Jr."

The next individual has no name attached to him, but is holding a sign which reads "Hell with the U.S. courts," and over his left shoulder is the Confederate flag.

In the upper left-hand corner are two apparent youngsters, I presume—they look like youngsters. One is holding up a sign which says, "To hell with the draft." The other supposedly is holding up a draft card, or a paper, which says "Draft Act," and is in the act of burning it.

This is the cartoon, described accurately. Now I shall comment on its accuracy and discuss with the Members what might be the intent of the cartoonist. I shall not attempt to probe his intent. I merely read what the cartoonist apparently intends.

Let us begin with the designation of "E. Hebert, Jr.," which obviously refers to me. Well, this is minor, and it is not important, but it is just an example of the fallacies and inaccuracies. My name is not "E. Hébert, Jr." I have never been called "Junior" in my life. My father's name was Felix Joseph Hébert. My name is FELIX EDWARD HÉBERT, but not "Junior."

Until last Saturday in the report of the New York Times I have never seen myself referred to as "Junior."

Of course, this is inconsequential, but whoever is "E. Hébert, Jr." might take objection to it; I do not know. But at least this is the starting inaccuracy.

Holding up the sign, " 'Let's forget the first amendment'—House Armed Services Committee members," causes me to say that not a single member of the House Armed Services Committee—the entire 40 of them—with one exception, has said "Let's forget the first amendment," and that exception was me. I said it; not the other Members of the House. Yet they are all being held up to ridicule, including myself, as saying, "Let's forget the first amendment."

How did I say it, after discussing my feeling for the first amendment? I hold here in my hand the transcript of the hearing of last Friday before the House Armed Services Committee.

I direct your attention to page 897 at line 24 which is quoting me in reply to a statement by Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, following a lengthy colloquy and dialog as to why the Department of Justice was not enforcing the law by bringing to the bar of justice the Carmichaels and the Kings and the other individuals of that ilk who are going about the country today making statements which, if they are not treasonable, then I do not know what treason is. They are urging individuals to break the law, urging our people to defy the law, talking at mob demonstrations, telling our boys, "Do not enlist," "Do not be drafted," praising Ho Chi Minh as a great savior of the world, spewing forth the Communist line better than it is spewed from Hanoi or Peking. The American public is asking the $64 question and the $164 question, "Why are not these people prosecuted?" Now keep in mind. In discussing this let me make it crystal clear that I do not want to equate in any way dissent and disloyalty. I recognize and defend the right to dissent, but I condemn and damn disloyalty and the challenge to the fighting men of this country and to their patriotism. There is a strong and clear line of demarcation between dissent and disloyalty. This is to what I address myself here, that is, not to dissent but to disloyalty.

Now, be this as it may, the law is clear on this subject. I shall put into the RECORD the entire colloquy in which it says in no uncertain terms that any individual whosoever in time of war shall frustrate or attempt to incite to mutiny or urge disloyalty or urge nonconformity to the law shall be prosecuted—by whom? By the Justice Department. Every time this questioning turned to that subject and the law, the cloak of immunity of the first amendment was raised—the umbrella of the first amendment. I shall discuss this more in detail tomorrow as far as the Department of Justice is concerned, but I am emphasizing it here in order that you might understand and realize just how this expression was used. It was in this context that the Department of Justice would say, "Well, we cannot prosecute and we will not prosecute them and we do not intend to prosecute them because they come under the umbrella of the first amendment." Now, this is not the function of the Justice Department. The function of the Justice Department is to prosecute and defend the law. It is not the function of the Justice Department to engage in judicial decisions and make decisions before the law is tested. It may very well come under the first amendment, and, knowing the Supreme Court as well as I do, it undoubtedly will come under the first amendment, if I am to judge the future by the past, because the murderers, the rapists, and the Communists run wild because of Supreme Court decisions today. However, I am not engaging in that dispute now and I am not talking about that discussion now. I am talking about what the law says and what is written in the law.

And, Mr. Speaker, strangely enough, the Assistant Attorney General testified and said he had never heard of the statute. But, anyway, he insisted that no matter what it would be, it would come under the coverage of the first amendment.

And, Mr. Speaker, it is in that context and in that direction that I made the statement, "Let us forget the first amendment."

So, Mr. Block, or Herblock, whatever his name may be, lifts out of context "Let's forget the first amendment," and attributes it to every member of the House Armed Services Committee, which is not true and not accurate and indicates that we subscribe to forgetting the first amendment and its full protection of the freedom of speech. That is what its effect has and that is undoubtedly what it was intended to be, while nothing could be further from the truth—nothing could be further from the truth.

There is in the testimony—I have it right here—the first sentence, and here is another page of the discussion and nothing was said about that—of course not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me show you just how far some people go. I detest hate, racism, and bigotry. I come from Louisiana, the Deep South, and I am proud of that fact. I believe that every man has the opportunity, and the equal opportunity, regardless of race, color, or creed, to have that equal opportunity. I believe in privileges for none, whether they be white, black, green, pink, or yellow. I am not a racist. I am not a bigot. I am not intolerant. I recognize your right to disagree with me. I only ask your respect.

At no time during these hearings was anything mentioned about the North or the South, at no time.

At no time was the word "Confederacy" used. At no time was the race question raised and particularly so, because the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS] and I, coming from that section of the country, would be immediately suspect. So it was not raised. We were not talking about these violators as Negroes or Chinamen or Indians. I do not know what they want on the campuses of this country. True, many white people disgrace the campuses of our country, in my book, and thereby do a disgrace to this country. I do not care about their color or race. The race issue has no place in this.

Mr. Speaker, the cartoon portrayed a third man with a Confederate flag on his shoulder. What does he mean by that? Whether he means to raise it or not, he immediately arouses the race issue; he immediately wants to indicate that the race issue is involved in this consideration. It is not.

What does he mean when he says, "To hell with the courts." No one said that. It was not even uttered.

Perhaps, I would like to say it, but I do not say it, because I respect the courts which have a valid and a legal place in our constitutional form of government, and I will follow any court-ordered decision validly given in the future. However, it is confusing, upon occasion to follow some of the Court's orders. I have decried certain decisions of the Supreme Court. I shudder to think where this country is going, based upon some of the decisions which the Court has rendered, and not in civil rights questions alone.

Mr. Speaker, if I were any one of those nine men I might not be able to sleep at night, based upon some of the decisions which the Court has rendered.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I have a right to criticize this sacrosanct body, or I do not. But, I hope that I am protected by the first amendment; I hope so in the eyes of some people.

Then the other quote: "We will teach you patriotism and respect for the law."

Nobody said that during the hearings. Here are the hearings. You cannot find that quotation in the hearings, but yet it is attributed to the members of the Committee on Armed Services.

I would add the Committee on Armed Services needs no defense from me, but I must defend them with the record.

Then up here, the draft card with two young kids. What do you think youngsters in their formative years—their impressionable years—think when they see a cartoon like this placed before their view? Here is a great newspaper with a large circulation. Here is an outstanding cartoonist, a man of great scope and ability, telling in effect these youngsters: "Do not pay any attention to them. Burn your draft card. To hell with the draft. These are old fuzz-doodles, old racists, old bigots, old, stupid individuals, they do not know what they are talking about. Pay no attention to them."

That is what I object to. I object to the inaccuracy. If the gentleman could have drawn his cartoon and quoted correctly and accurately, he would hear no voice of mine raised against it. I would defend his right to draw it. I will defend the right of every individual to disagree with this country, and the President of the United States, in the conduct of the war, but for my part I stand with the President.

Mr. Speaker, I am not ashamed to be addressed as a "hawk." I want to be a hawk because I want to win, and I want to get those boys back here. But if some people want to be doves, and fly around and flutter their little eyes, then that is their business, or anybody else's business, and they have a right to do it. They have the right to dissent. They have the right to criticism. They have a right to criticize the manner in which this war is being carried on. But they do not have—nobody has the right to arouse to riot and to mutiny, whether this country is at war or not at war. I deny the right of anybody to use the Constitution of the United States to destroy the Constitution of the United States. Under the Constitution we are all supposed to be guaranteed the right of liberty and the pursuit of happiness. But this type of thing as enunciated in this cartoon, and as enunciated by the Department of Justice on the witness stand, that if I want to use LSD or smoke marihuana, and they deny me that, then they have taken my happiness away. That is what it means.

It means this: that there is no law on the books of the Federal Government or of a State that does not violate the first amendment if you want to stretch it that far, ad infinitum, and ad ridiculum, if Latin could be put in that context.

Mr. Speaker, that is all I want to bring to your attention. I do not care if Mr. Herblock wants to embrace Mao Tse Tung, Ho Chi Minh, or anybody else, or if he wants to take his stand at the side of the Carmichaels and the Kings and the other individuals who are trying to bring disruption to this country—I cannot stop him. He well can do it. That is his right. But, Mr. Speaker, by the same token, I reserve the right and privilege to put my arms around General Westmoreland. I prefer to embrace those kids who are giving everything they can give, and not delay one day their return from Vietnam. General Westmoreland has told us, and I share that opinion, that every day these people contribute to the extension of this war—a war that has claimed 10,000 lives and 50,000 casualties. I want these kids back home as quickly as we can get them home.

Now, Mr. Herblock wants to embrace those who wish to give aid and comfort to the enemy by getting in the headlines of the newspapers in Peking, Moscow, and Hanoi, that this country is divided. As General Westmoreland stated, they are depending on the Achilles heel for their victory.

If Mr. Herblock wants to side with the Communists, that is his business. His business.

But in siding with them, if he so desires, let him at least be a little accurate in his presentation—particularly because of the great force and effect that a cartoon has.

I know the futility of engaging in a contest with a newspaper. I know that. I sat on that throne a long time and I knew the futility of those who would write letters in. I had the upper hand when I was on the paper. I had more ink and more paper than any character could have who could write and send letters in.

I always had the last word. I recognize this. I recognize the unevenness of the contest and of the debate. I recognize the difference in exposure and the audience. But I do recognize and do retain for myself my own conscience and my own belief and what I believe America is and what we should do in America.

Oh, I am old fashioned. I am rather naive. I would rather stand on the gallows with Nathan Hale and say, "I regret that I have but one life to give for my country," than to stand up on a platform rabble rousing and in denunciation of my Government and telling fellow Americans not to defend that Constitution that guarantees them the right and guarantees me the right to say the things they want to say and that I want to say.

This is my observation today.

Tomorrow during the discussion of the procurement bill to furnish these fighting men with arms, I shall have more to say on the Department of Justice, which I suggest to you is most derelict in its duty. It could easily find reasons to go into other fields which do not concern them but it can find many reasons not to prosecute. Not one single newspaper in this country, not one radio station or one television station carried the affirmative statement that the Department of Justice refused and is refusing and will continue to refuse to prosecute these individuals who have committed what I think are crimes against the law.

To my mind, that would be a good lead—but no, the lead was that members of the House Committee on Armed Services said, "Forget the first amendment."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am ended. I am finished—but I would ask for accuracy and truth in reporting.

Do not take my word—what I have said and uttered here today. Do not accept that as the truth and the fact. Do not accept my conclusions and my observations. These are my opinions. These are my own expressions. I would instead ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to place in the RECORD the entire dialog unexpurgated, unedited, and unchanged—but a raw, accurate report by the reporter of the House Armed Services Committee on last Friday—the colloquy between Mr. Vinson and myself—with nothing changed—and to put this in the RECORD at this point.

Read the record—not the conclusions or the evaluations—but read the raw record and tell me how an individual can come up with this type of misleading, inaccurate, inflammatory cartoon such as Mr. Herblock has presented to his viewers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCFALL). The Chair will inquire of the gentleman from Louisiana if the material that he desires to put in the RECORD was in a public hearing?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it was in a public hearing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

The CHAIRMAN. Now, Mr. Hébert.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Vinson, I have several questions I desire to explore here.

In the very opening, may I say I want to make a very distinct distinction between the right to speak and the acts of disloyalty or treason or sedition. I will stand in the forefront to defend any man a right to dissent, but in this right to dissent I am afraid we are going into an area of what is certainly treason and sedition as being exhibited on public platforms throughout this country today and on the university campuses of our nation.

I understand that an opinion was asked of a previous Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, as to why some of these individuals who are uttering treasonable and disloyal statements, not statements of dissent or opinion, but treasonable statements and seditious statements, that they could not be prosecuted because we are not in a declared war.

Do you subscribe to that opinion? This is hearsay of Mr. Katzenbach's opinion. Now I am asking you now, is this a reason why certain acts now committed which would be treasonable or seditious if we were in a declared war are not being prosecuted—the individuals who are guilty?

Mr. VINSON. First, Mr. Congressman, I am not aware of the precise opinion that you refer to. We received considerable mail from the House and from the Senate last year in regard to such utterances, but I don't recall any response that drew the line between a declared war and an undeclared war.

However, the case that was previously referred to where the Chief Justice enunciated the clear and present danger test was, I believe, a case under the sedition laws and not under Selective Service. So we are back to the degree and proximity proposition.

Mr. HÉBERT. Well, of course, now, you have indicated by your reply, Mr. Vinson, that these letters in multiple numbers are coming from Members of Congress of the House and the Senate. You will agree with me, I am sure, that these letters reflect the thinking of the American people or else you wouldn't get such letters in such quantity. I think we can be in agreement on that?

Mr. VINSON. Oh, I think so, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. HÉBERT. After all, who is the Constitution of the United States except the American people and what they want? They adopted the Constitution.

Mr. VINSON. The problem with that is that a great deal of the Constitution is to protect minorities and dissenters, and not——

Mr. HÉBERT. We have been made aware of that in the last several years, of the interpretation of that.

What I am trying to get at is this—I may ask your opinion, and may I say I appreciate your position as a lawyer, because undoubtedly you have demonstrated very adequately that you are a good lawyer because you could undoubtedly carry a client far and beyond two years if you were called upon to do so, which in the law is right, that is even under the Constitution.

Now, these utterances—and I am sure you are familiar with them since the general public is well acquainted with them—of individuals standing before crowds arousing those crowds to treasonable heights, to mutiny against the Government, to defiance of the laws, and supposing we were at war on a formal declaration would these utterances and these actions be indictable?

Mr. VINSON. I don't think the existence or nonexistence of a war has any legal relevancy. It obviously might have some psychological relevancy.

Mr. HÉBERT. Wait, never mind, let's don't wander into the field of psychology and all this sort of thing. Let's get down to the facts. I am a country boy like my chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me read this, then I will give it back to you. Under Title 18, Section 2388 of the Code, among other things, these are the words of that section, quote:

"Whoever, when the United States is at war, wilfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or wilfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment in service of the United States to the injury of the service or to the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined $10,000", and so forth, "20 years."

Then I am finished.

Could we make this applicable to the Selective Service and Training Act? This says "enlistment." The Selective Service and Training Act says "procurement." Why isn't this applicable now?

Mr. Vinson. I would not like to answer that off the top of my head, Mr. Chairman. You definitely and distinctly have First Amendment problems.

Mr. Hébert. This is existing law, Mr. Vinson. This is existing law. This thing as Mr. Rivers has pointed out and read and was the section I had in mind when I asked these questions, what does it say, the exact language?

The Chairman. "When the United States is at war".

Mr. Hébert. "At war."

The Chairman. I think that is the only thing that might proscribe your capacity to enforce the intendment of this statute.

Mr. Bates. There is an amendment to include the present emergency in a later section.

Mr. Hébert. That is what I am trying to get at. Of course now the refuge there is when the United States is at war. Technically, and when there is no desire to prosecute these individuals, technically the lawyer and the law can stand behind that technicality, and I am damned sick and tired of technicalities when we have treason in this country and sedition.

What I am trying to find out is this: If that is the prohibition, because it says "at war," and the technicality is we are not at war, wouldn't it suffice to say "are engaged in armed conflict"? Three little words. Or "in armed conflict"? Wouldn't that bring these individuals to the bar of justice?

Mr. Vinson. Well, my previous statement was keyed to the First Amendment.

Mr. Hébert. The First Amendment, as Justice Holmes said.

Mr. Vinson. The First Amendment I stated really wasn't relevant, as to the First Amendment, whether you are in war or not in war. I was not referring to this statute.

Mr. Hébert. Let's forget the First Amendment. I know that will be the refuge of the Supreme Court, I recognize that. But at least the effort can be made and the demonstration given to the American people certainly that the Department of Justice, and most assuredly the Congress, is determined to eliminate this rat-infested area in this country. But if we are going to stand idly by and merely say we can't do it and all of a sudden go back to the First Amendment, as Justice Holmes so well said you can't cry fire in a theater, free speech ends there.

This begging the question of the First Amendment continuously rather upsets me a little bit, and upsets not only me but millions of American people. They want to know a very simple answer, why can the Carmichaels and why can the Kings, and other individuals of that ilk stand before the American people and institute riot, incite defiance of the law, while the Justice Department stands idly by and the Congress takes no action to strengthen that law?

Now, all we can do is strengthen the law. We can't enforce it. That is not our jurisdiction or our problem. But we can give you the weapons to use.

Now the law says this. It is clear and distinct, "at war." If there is a technicality there, why can't we say "or engaged in armed conflict"? And may I ask you, Mr. Vinson, under that law couldn't you prosecute these individuals?

Mr. Vinson. I am unfamiliar with this particular statute, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. Hébert. What is that?

Mr. Vinson. I am unfamiliar with this particular statute. This statute is administered by the Internal Security Division of the Department. However, as the statute was read to me, it related only to those in service.

Mr. Hébert. No, sir. Read it again. The very opening sentence is very clear. I can even understand it and I am not a lawyer.

Mr. Bates. You have to read both sections there I think really to get an understanding.

Mr. Hébert. Read them.

The Chairman. Of course in the prosecution, the prosecution comes under you, I don't care what division enforces it.

Mr. Hébert. You are speaking for the Department of Justice today.

The Chairman. Unless it has been changed since I was down there, you are the prosecutor.

Mr. Vinson. Not under the Internal Security statute.

Mr. Slatinshek. Title 18, Section 2388, reads as follows: "Activities affecting armed forces during war: (a) Whoever when the United States is at war wilfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military-naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies, or whoever when the United States is at war wilfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty in the military or naval forces of the United States, or wilfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 20 years, or both."

And the statute continues, and there is a succeeding section in the statute, Section 2391 of Title 18, which provides a temporary extension of Section 2388 and therefore makes it effective during the current period, despite the fact we are not at war. It simply provides—this portion of Title 18, this section, will be effective during periods of emergency, such as the one we are now in, which was declared December 16, 1950, and has not been terminated.

So the question of war is not really particularly pertinent now. The question is whether or not this statute would apply under the particular situation and whether this statute, when it speaks of recruiting and enlistment service, would cover anyone who interferes with the Selective Service procurement function.

Mr. Hébert. That is what I am trying to develop, Mr. Slatinshek. Would my suggestion of adding "armed conflict" strengthen the first section which you read.

However, can you tell us, Mr. Vinson, why there has been no prosecution under the existing law, which certainly is clear enough? We are in an emergency, declared by President Truman. The emergency has never been revoked in the Korean War. We are acting in many areas under the aegis of that so-called emergency. Why hasn't anybody been prosecuted to date?

I admit this, that the Justice Department can't make the decisions that overrule the Supreme Court decisions, which I know that is what they would be, but anyway you can't hit a ball unless you take the bat off your shoulder and find out if it is going to be fair or foul.

Why hasn't the Justice Department proceeded to find out? And remember this too, sir, that twelve men will sit in that jury box and make this decision—twelve men will make the decision after the evidence, and they will decide what the facts are, and of course the Supreme Court will upset it, I know that, but anyway at least it can be shown to the American people that the Justice Department wants to prosecute.

The Chairman. I think we are more concerned with the rights of these people than we are with the existence of this republic.

I don't want to—you don't form the policy.

Mr. Bennett. Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Mr. Hébert, have you finished?

I have promised Mr. King, then we will come to you, Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Hébert. I want an answer to the question, Mr. Vinson. You represent the Department of Justice here today.

Mr. Vinson. That is correct, sir.

Mr. Hébert. You are speaking for them and you are head of the Criminal Division. If this isn't criminal, I don't know what criminal is.

Mr. Vinson. Well, that is——

Mr. Hébert. Why hasn't this been done?

Mr. Vinson. It is a criminal statute.

Mr. Hébert. It is a criminal statute. Are we going to get caught in a place of who handles what division?

Mr. Vinson. No, sir, I can assure you no one has been prosecuted under this statute because the Department felt no one has violated the statute.

Mr. Hébert. No one violated the simple and clear language that has just been read to you? These individuals, and there have been hundreds of others besides that, unidentified people, because trouble hasn't been taken to identify the people on these campuses?

Why, a simple man like myself can understand that language, or maybe I wasted years in the business I was in before I came here, understanding words.

I can't understand it, and if you tell me that the Department of Justice can't understand, there is a case for prosecution and presentation, let's test the law. Let's find out whether it is valid or not, whether it is inadequate or not. And if it is inadequate, we want to pass something.

I intend to offer a bill in this committee to strengthen that first section by putting the words in "or armed conflict". What good are the words going to do if the Congress passes the law and the Department of Justice fails to prosecute under the explicit direction of the law and explicit intention of the Congress. And we I think are backed by the American public today. We are not backed by the Department of Justice.

Mr. Vinson. Mr. Congressman, that goes back to preceding colloquy with the chairman, when I stated that any law that deals with utterances must be read in light of the First Amendment. The First Amendment is not absolute; as you point out, the fire in the theater. But there is a line which must be drawn and which has been drawn.

Mr. Hébert. Here, Mr. Vinson, the Department of Justice is performing a judicial function. It is not the Department of Justice's function or authority to make judicial decisions. That is up to the courts.

Of course, the courts go beyond that and legislate—I recognize all these facets—but it is the primary duty of the Department of Justice to prosecute when a prima facie case is made, and certainly I don't think anybody with an average intelligence, except maybe below the average of me, or like me, can't understand and read clearly and distinctly what that statute says. And that is, it is the duty and responsibility of the Department of Justice to prosecute and let the courts make the determination. This is just merely a lawyer's opinion, that is all it is.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

MILWAUKEE JOURNAL WINS PULITZER PRIZE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEIGER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, last week, one of the great newspapers of America, the Milwaukee Journal, received its fourth Pulitzer Prize.

All Wisconsin citizens are proud of the accomplishments of this newspaper and it is significant that the Pulitzer Prize was awarded to the Journal for its outstanding efforts on behalf of stiffening the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin.

For the information of my colleagues, I include as part of my remarks a series of newspaper articles describing the work done by the Journal and its excellent staff on the subject of water resources and its subsequent receipt of the Pulitzer Prize:

JOURNAL IS AWARDED PULITZER FOR FOURTH TIME

The Milwaukee Journal Monday was awarded a Pulitzer prize for meritorious public service.

The Journal won its prize for "its successful campaign to stiffen the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin."

The Pulitzer award committee described the Journal effort as a "notable advance in the national effort for the conservation of natural resources." The award was announced in New York city.

The Journal shared the prize in the public service category with the Louisville Courier-Journal, which was cited for a successful campaign to control the Kentucky strip mine industry.

It was the fourth time The Milwaukee Journal or members of its staff had won Pulitzer prizes, considered the top award in American journalism.

The first, in 1919, was, like this year's, given to the newspaper for meritorious public service. The other two Journal Pulitzer prizes were for individual achievement. Cartoonist Ross Lewis received a prize in 1935, and Journal reporter Austin C. Wehrwein won in 1953 for international reporting.

The Pulitzer prizes were endowed by Joseph Pulitzer, publisher of the World, New York city, in a bequest to Columbia university. They are awarded annually by the trustees of the university.

A gold medal is given for meritorious public service. Other Pulitzer awards in journalism are $1,000.

The Journal's entry this year was a portfolio centered around a series on water pollution published a year ago in three issues of the Sunday Picture Journal. Also submitted were editorials demanding antipollution action, news stories describing subsequent passage of the state's pollution control program by the legislature and letters to The Journal praising its campaign.

The Picture Journal issues of Apr. 17, Apr. 24 and May 1 last year were devoted entirely to the theme "Pollution: The Spreading Menace."

Journal editor Richard H. Leonard said, "The Milwaukee Journal is deeply gratified by this recognition of its efforts to fight one of the great menaces of our times—the pollution of our lakes and rivers. The Journal has long regarded conservation of our natural resources as one of its most important objectives. We will continue the fight."

The sections were a team effort involving a dozen photographers, writers, artists and editors on The Journal's staff.

The project was planned and supervised by picture editor George J. Lockwood, editor of The Picture Journal. Most of the photos were made by Journal photographer George P. Koshollek, Jr. One of the most dramatic, however, was an aerial color picture by staff photographer Clarence P. Schmidt.

Richard C. Kienitz, The Journal's natural resources writer, did the basic reporting. Journal writer Robert W. Wells assisted Lockwood in editing the text.

Olesen wrote editorials

Editorial writer Don Olesen wrote the editorials.

Other writers contributed to the prize winning sections. Reporter Paul G. Hayes, who specializes in planning, wrote "A Tale of 5 Rivers." Outdoor writer Tom Guyant did an essay, "Wild as the Wolf," on the unspoiled Wolf river.

Photographer Allan Scott produced an eight page color portfolio on the upper Wolf river.

Staff artist Gregg Klees prepared full color maps and Pulitzer cartoonist Lewis turned out a full color cartoon dramatizing the need for action on pollution. Its caption: "Only you, Paul Bunyan, are big enough to do this cleanup job."

Artist Al Berg worked with Lockwood on the page layouts.

Action was demanded

As the series ended, an Olesen editorial demanded state action to provide "more facilities, more enforcement, some new laws, a better co-ordinated antipollution effort, public awareness and indignation—and more dollars."

The editorial agreed with a Green Bay critic of state antipollution efforts that there was slender comfort in knowing that "while other states might be up to their necks in pollution, we're only up to our knees."

The congratulatory letters submitted included letters from Gov. Knowles and Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

The Picture Journal series already had been honored in several other nationwide competitions.

Kienitz, Koshollek and Lockwood last month shared second place awards of $500 each in the Edward J. Meeman conservation contest for their work on the sections.

The Meeman awards, named for the late conservation editor of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, were given by the Scripps-Howard Foundation.

Schmidt's aerial photo, showing wastes pouring into the Fox river waterway at Neenah-Menasha, was ranked second in the National Press Photographers' association competition this year.

Pictures won award

Koshollek's pollution pictures placed first in the Inland Daily Press association competition last fall.

The 27 pages in the three issues were the largest concentration of color photos on a single subject The Journal had ever published.

It is relatively rare, but not unprecedented, for the Pulitzer judges to cite two newspapers in the public service category. It has done so three other times in the half century of Pulitzers.

The Journal's first public service medal, in 1919, was only the second year that this distinction had been awarded.

Americanism cited

That Pulitzer resolution cited The Journal for its "strong and courageous campaign for Americanism in a constituency where foreign elements made such a policy hazardous from a business point of view."

The Journal was one of the first newspapers during World War I to recognize the "uncivilized methods employed by the German government in its war against civilians."

The Pulitzer committee hailed The Journal's exposure of German ruled alliances in this country, its opposition to Wisconsin congressmen who resisted war efforts and its editorials attacking elements that put Germany above America.

Cartoonist honored

Lewis' Pulitzer in 1935 was for the best American newspaper cartoon of the year "in some commendable cause of public importance."

The cartoon, picturing a huge figure of violence looming over strikers and standing next to an industrial plant, bore the caption: "Sure I'll Work for Both Sides."

Lewis, who still is drawing Journal cartoons, is widely regarded as one of the nation's best political cartoonists.

In 1953, Wehrwein won the international reporting award for a series of 25 articles entitled "Canada's New Century." The story told of Canada's economic boom and its relationship to the United States.

The Journal sent Wehrwein thousands of miles, traveling coast to coast, to get the facts.

Wehrwein then was a writer on The Journal's business news staff. He subsequently became a New York Times reporter and now is on the editorial board of the Minneapolis Star and Tribune.

VETERAN NEWSMEN RESPONSIBLE FOR AWARD WINNING CAMPAIGN

The four men primarily responsible for the stories, photographs and editorials that won a Pulitzer prize Monday all are veteran members of The Journal staff.

George J. Lockwood, picture editor, edited the series in The Picture Journal, George P. Koshollek, jr., Journal staff photographer, took most of the pictures. The reporting was done by Richard C. Kienitz, The Journal's natural resources reporter. Don Olesen, editorial writer, wrote the editorials on water pollution.

Journal man since 1956

Lockwood, 35, was born in Albany, N.Y. He is a graduate of Syracuse university, and received a master of arts degree from the University of Minnesota in 1957. He served in the navy 1953–'55.

Lockwood has been with The Journal since 1956. He was a police reporter and later moved to general assignment, then to the picture desk. He was named editor of The Picture Journal in 1962. In 1966, he was promoted to picture editor.

Koshollek, 41, grew up in Stevens Point. During World War II, he served with the navy on Guam. He returned home to attend Stevens Point State college, and joined The Journal staff in 1949. His assignments for the Journal have been varied, including a trip to Castro's Cuba. He also photographed President Kennedy's funeral. He has won dozens of major photo prizes.

Wisconsin native

Kienitz, 48, is a native of Neenah. He has been with The Journal since 1953. Before that he was news editor of the Dubuque Telegraph-Herald. Kienitz was a member of The Journal's state news desk before becoming natural resources writer. Kienitz studied at the University of Wisconsin, and served with the air force in Italy during World War II.

Olesen, 45, was born in Madison. He is a graduate of Swarthmore (Pa.) college. In

World War II, he served with the army in the China-Burma-India theater.

He began his journalistic career reporting for the Washington (D.C.) Daily News. He later worked as a reporter for the Washington Post. He also was a staff member of the Lakeland Boating magazine before joining The Journal staff in 1957. Olesen wrote boating and skiing news before he became an editorial writer.

PULITZER STARTED IN MUDDY TRIPS

This is how a Pulitzer prize winner is born.

The Milwaukee Journal's series on water pollution, which won American journalism's top award Monday, had its beginnings in August, 1965.

Richard H. Leonard, then managing editor and now editor, and Arville Schaleben, an associate editor, were discussing the fall plans for news and picture projects with other editors.

The conversation went into such things as "a series on education . . . The Journal's Drive Alive campaign . . . and something on water pollution."

George J. Lockwood, editor of The Picture Journal, volunteered that the pollution story would best be told with color photography in The Picture Journal. As he puts it, "In about 10 seconds I had the toughest assignment of my career."

Many gave leads

Lockwood, now also picture editor of The Journal, began to research the story in Milwaukee, Waukesha and Madison. Game wardens, regional planning officials, public health inspectors and others concerned provided all sorts of leads, such as:

Chicken entrails turn the Root river blood red in summer; South Milwaukee pours its sewage—about 65% untreated—into Lake Michigan, and a knitting mill in the Appleton area dyes effluent a rainbow of colors in a huge settling pond.

By mid-October, Lockwood had enough information to provide a shooting schedule for a photographer.

Photographer George P. Koshollek, jr., many times a prize winner, was assigned to the job for three weeks. Before he was through, Koshollek would cover 3,000 miles of the state in waders and hunting boots, in boats and planes.

Writer joins him

Richard C. Kienitz, conservation writer who is based in Madison, was assigned to join forces with Koshollek.

They found pollution everywhere, in every county, in creeks, lakes and rivers.

After Koshollek's trip, Leonard and Schaleben spent an afternoon examining the color pictures. The editors insisted on complete documentation of each picture and also insisted that the paper mills—the biggest single polluters in the state—be allowed to show their side of the campaign to clean up the waterways.

Kienitz, Koshollek and Lockwood spent two days in the Fox River valley in talks and tours with officers of the state's paper industry.

Goes to Madison

Lockwood took all the pictures to Madison, where he and Kienitz met with Theodore Wisniewski, director of the state committee on water pollution, who detailed the polluting elements shown in the pictures.

By this time, it was 1966. The word was out that the legislature would meet in May for a special session to develop antipollution laws. Timing for publication of the series became critical.

Apr. 17 was selected for the opening installment. The third and final story would appear May 1, a day before the special session was convened.

Results approved

Half a dozen other Journal staffers contributed to the team effort. They included photographer Clarence P. Schmidt, writers Tom Guyant, Paul G. Hayes and Robert W. Wells, artist Gregg Klees and cartoonist Ross A. Lewis, himself a Pulitzer winner.

Lockwood took four weeks to complete the editing and layouts. The other editors approved the result with minor changes.

Lockwood and Al Berg, a Journal artist, went to Chicago to the Cuneo Press, where The Picture Journal is printed. They looked over the engraver's shoulders as he prepared plates. Color can be spoiled if photographs do not have expert reproduction.

On Apr. 17, Wisconsin citizens picked up The Picture Journal and "Pollution: The Spreading Menace" hit them between the eyes. This was the first of three Picture Journals devoted to pollution.

The Journal's editorial columns took up the cause. For Journal editorial writers, who have been defenders of natural resources for decades, this was no new crusade.

The editorials, written by conservation specialist Don Olesen of the editorial writing staff, demanded state action.

Reactions pour in

Reaction was swift. Of the pollution series, Gov. Knowles wrote: "In spite of the hard work done by pollution committees, meeting for the last eight months, it is most difficult to present the problem adequately to the public without your help."

Stewart L. Udall, United States secretary of the interior, said the series was "one of the most effective and constructive pieces on water pollution I have ever seen."

At the bottom of his letter he wrote: "Keep slugging."

The series reached many desks. The federal department of agriculture wanted to reproduce the color photo. So did Audubon magazine.

On June 10, the state legislature wrote the end of the series. It passed and sent to the governor for his signature a bill that Udall has since called "the finest piece of legislation yet enacted in the national fight to preserve clean water."

SERIES ON FOUL WATER ACCLAIMED BY MANY

The Milwaukee Journal's 1966 campaign against water pollution, honored Monday with a Pulitzer prize, won acclaim from high officials and ordinary citizens soon after it was printed.

Praise came from Gov. Knowles, congressmen and cabinet members.

The Journal's efforts were credited with a major role in getting passage of Wisconsin's 300 million dollar pollution control law.

Patrick Lucey, then lieutenant governor, said The Journal's photography "portrayed the pollution problem as no amount of words could have done."

Gov. Knowles, applauding "the efforts of The Milwaukee Journal and its staff for its accomplishment," said the paper was to be congratulated for bringing the pollution story to the attention of the state.

"Most effective"

Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall wrote that The Picture Journal series was "one of the most effective and constructive pieces on water pollution that I have seen."

"The pictures are superlative and the text shows both the in depth research and the deft word handling of a truly excellent reporter," the secretary wrote.

Udall later praised the new Wisconsin control bill.

Sen. Gaylord Nelson (D-Wis.), introducing a "clean waters act of 1966" in congress, made a senate speech recommending that his fellow senators read The Journal's series. It would, he said, shock every citizen and every public official into action.

"Finest combination"

H. W. Poston, regional program director in Chicago for the federal water pollution control administration, called the project the "finest combination pictorial and narrative job of water pollution reporting I have ever seen." He said he had distributed copies to key people in the field.

William A. Riaski, Glenview, Ill., executive director of the Izaak Walton League of America, wrote: "Your paper has a long history of being in the forefront in publicizing the urgent conservation issues. The present series on 'The Spreading Menace' will add another star to your crown."

Some demur

Reader Frank Cetin, 5246 N. 44th st., wrote that he had "never heard or read anything on the subject that impressed me as much."

W. J. MacNeill, secretary of the Green Lake (Wis.) Lake Property Owners association, reported that his board of directors had voted unanimously to express appreciation to The Journal "for this public spirited and powerful assist to the fighters for 'clean water.' "

Not all the reaction was laudatory. In South Milwaukee, Mayor Chester Grobschmidt objected strenuously because some pictures in the series showed South Milwaukee's cataract of municipal sewage—65% untreated—pouring into Lake Michigan.

Village Trustee James Ackley of Pewaukee complained about a picture of the debris clogged Pewaukee river. "We have done our level best to keep pollution down," he said.

But in the Madison suburb of Shorewood Hills, the village board officially commended The Journal's series and trustee Victor Johnson said it should be "required reading."

THE PULITZER AWARD

It is significant that the two newspapers that share the Pulitzer prize award for meritorious public service were honored for achievements in a common cause—the mounting struggle to restore and protect the nation's natural resources.

The Milwaukee Journal was cited for "its successful campaign to stiffen the laws against water pollution in Wisconsin" and the Louisville Courier-Journal for its fruitful efforts to control the ravages of strip mining in Kentucky.

Both efforts simply are different phases of the new national wave of conservation awareness which concerns itself with the natural world around us—air, water, land—and the worsening of much of it. It is the crisis of man's marvelous and sometimes mindless technology and its impact on natural resources. It is the problem caused by perhaps 70% of our population crowded into 1% of our total land area.

The Journal's campaign undoubtedly was a significant factor in passage of Wisconsin's landmark 1966 water quality law, designed to provide some of the money, manpower and enforcement teeth needed to begin cleaning up our waterways. The Courier-Journal's long struggle against unchecked surface or strip mining of coal resulted in a tough new law to control the practice in Kentucky. Both campaigns have had an impact in other states.

Wisconsin, however, may have a tough new law to curb pollution, yet the Milwaukee river is murky and sometimes foul as it flows through the state's largest city. Many of our inland lakes are sickened in season with a carpet of green algae. Even portions of our inland oceans, the Great Lakes, are blighted.

Both efforts, in Wisconsin and in Kentucky, are beginnings only. Now must come the essential, the tedious and never ending business of translating law into effective action. It will require patience, determination

and, most of all, the wisdom to use with intelligence and restraint the technology which is our triumph.

LEGISLATION LONG OVERDUE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of us saw the photos of the burning of the American flag in Central Park in New York on April 15 which were carried by many newspapers across the Nation. This was the latest and most spectacular of a number of cases in which the flag was mutilated and held up to derision.

I am also sure that most of those who read about the New York case boiled with indignation that those so-called Americans responsible for the burning were not apprehended, expeditiously tried, and socked with a stiff fine and jail sentence. The truth of the matter is, of course, that there is no Federal statute to cover this abuse, and some of the local and State statutes are mere wrist slaps as penalties go.

I can well imagine the exasperation of organizations like the veteran groups, many of whose members saw American soldiers die in defense of causes exemplified by the flag. One need only remember the scene of the four marines on Mount Suribachi straining to erect the American flag while the battle raged around them.

There is no excuse why legislation now before Congress cannot be evaluated, amended if necessary, and enacted into law promptly. Hearings are now in progress on the House side, and it is hoped that resulting legislation will be presented to the full body as soon as possible.

Legislation was first introduced in the House to correct abuses of the flag by Congressman RICHARD ROUDEBUSH during the 89th Congress. Similar legislation, which I also introduced last year, was again submitted this year by Congressman ROUDEBUSH and other interested Members, reflecting the concern of many citizens for corrective action. The Veterans of Foreign Wars, for instance, adopted a resolution last year calling for a Federal statute to cover flag abuses. Indicative of the feeling that many citizens have experienced on this issue is the VFW press release of May 8, 1967, which I insert in the RECORD at this point:

VFW BACKS FLAG DESECRATION LEGISLATION BEFORE HOUSE PANEL

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 8.—The Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, Joseph A. Scerra, Gardner, Mass., today told a Subcommittee of the House of Representatives that "it is the position of the VFW that the Congress must make desecration of the Flag a crime. Present laws concerning disrespect for the Flag are inadequate to meet the times."

Testifying before the House Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee, headed by Rep. Byron Rogers (Colo.), Scerra said in part: "Our organization has long been intensely concerned over the public defilement and desecration of our National Flag. During the past several years the Veterans of Foreign Wars has been the leader in bringing this development to the attention of the Congress. Unfortunately, these incidents which have been accelerating of late have received nationwide and international publicity."

The Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief told the House panel that the VFW lends its "support to a bill presented by Rep. Richard L. Roudebush (Ind.), a former VFW Commander-in-Chief, and to similar bills which propose to make it a crime to desecrate our Flag. Roudebush's bill is H.R. 1207."

"The Veterans of Foreign Wars at its 67th National Convention in New York City last August adopted a resolution which resolves that 'we strongly support legislation providing punishment of one year in prison and a $1,000 fine for any person who publicly and willfully destroys, mutilates or desecrates the American Flag.'

"It is incredible to the VFW that legislation of this kind should be necessary," Scerra said. "It is becoming almost commonplace throughout this great Nation to read that certain fringe elements of our society have in some way or other publicly desecrated our Flag. It is believed that because this is our National Flag, a national law should be enacted by the Congress so that there will be uniformity both in the administration of the law and the attachment of penalties for conviction of crimes under the act."

"What is most regrettable," the VFW leader said, "is that defilement of our Flag has been interpreted by other nations and particularly by North Vietnam as a substantial resentment of the American people to the Vietnam war effort in that country. The Flag of the United States is a Federal banner and a Federal concern. Let us guard that concern. We believe that the Congress should act expeditiously to establish penalties as provided in the legislation pending before this committee in order that debasement of the Flag of the United States in the areas of contempt and sedition can no longer be accomplished with impunity."

"VIETNAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS"—AN ADDRESS BY HAROLD E. STASSEN

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday night, April 20, the Honorable Harold E. Stassen addressed the Honors Convocation of the University of Maryland. Drawing on his experience at the founding of the United Nations in San Francisco in 1945 and during the Eisenhower administration, Governor Stassen proposed a course toward peace in Vietnam which emphasizes a comprehensive expansion and strengthening of the United Nations. So that his proposals may be widely read and discussed, I would like to include his speech in the RECORD at this point:

VIETNAM AND THE UNITED NATIONS

(Address of Harold E. Stassen to the Honors Convocation at the University of Maryland, Apr. 20, 1967)

Honors Awards Winners, Students, Faculty and friends of the University of Maryland:

As we meet in this Honors Award Convocation, our country is deadlocked in a bitter bloody unending war in Vietnam. The other side in that war is supported by the Communist Governments of Mainland China and of the Soviet Union. General William Westmoreland, the Commanding General of the United States and Allied Forces in Vietnam, stated a week ago that in the way in which he was engaged in fighting it, there was no end in sight to that War.

Nothing will have a more profound effect upon the future lives of the young men and young women who are awarded honors at the University of Maryland tonight than the future course of that Vietnam War and its worldwide implications.

Therefore, in addition to directly joining in the acclaim to each and every student who on this night is honored for special attainment at this great University, it seems to me that I would honor you most if I spoke out earnestly and emphatically of the path of peace in Vietnam and in the world.

In doing so, I speak with respect for those who have different views. I speak with recognition of the sincerity of those who have divergent opinions.

I do not speak as either a dove or a hawk. I do not speak in a partisan sense, as I am mindful thoroughly that the divergence of views cuts across party lines.

Nor do I consider that in speaking I am exercising merely the right of dissent. I consider that I am exercising the right of a free people to endeavor to change the course of their government when they are convinced that it is mistaken!

And I am convinced that the present course of our government in Vietnam is tragically mistaken and must be changed!

In speaking in positive and definite terms about an issue as far-reaching as that in which we are engaged this evening, I know full well the danger of appearing to be arbitrary or seeming to be categorical. Let me simply say with humility that I do not wish to be any of these. I do continue to listen to and read of all other views on Vietnam. I do continue to be willing to meet and discuss or debate the views on Vietnam of any one with different views, whether they be in the Administration or out of it; in my political party or in the other political party.

The correction of this tragic mistake, the turning toward what I feel certain is the path of peace, is so important that the task cannot be approached in superficial terms or with personal preferences.

Permit me also to preface my remarks with a brief reference to the experience of which I speak. In my student days at the University of Minnesota, in my junior year, as I participated in a Convocation such as you are engaged in tonight, I decided that the top priority in my life would be to make a contribution to peace with justice for humanity.

This decision led to many steps through the years, some understood and some not understood.

Out of my continuing study and my experiences, I am certain that the path of peace in Vietnam is marked by three major inseparable parallel courses of action.

First of all, the United States must take an open, creative initiative to modernize and strengthen the United Nations through a rewriting of the Charter, a rewriting which would declare all peoples eligible for membership, whatsoever may be their current form of government and thereby encompass within the eligibility both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, both Nationalist China on Formosa and the Republic of China on the Mainland, both the Federal Republic of Germany in the West and the Communist Government of East Germany, both North Korea and South Korea.

Your first reaction may be that they are too complex. May I emphasize that there are no simple answers to the whole inter-related matters of the emergence of peoples from Colonialism, at a time when there is a worldwide competition between the systems of modern Russia and Chinese Communism and modern American peoples' capitalism, and in an age of nuclear weapons on both sides that would make a world war a holocaust for all humanity.

Let us take up these three inseparable parallel courses of action of the path of peace in Vietnam in detail.

Let us do so in the form of some of the questions and answers which have arisen in the process of my current advocacy of this path of peace to the Administration and to Senators and Congressmen. I have been asked these questions and have given these responses.

1. Why do you state that you do not believe there can be an American War solution in Vietnam?

Because extensive American War action is self-defeating in that it creates new guerillas and new opposition among the young men of the nation faster than it can possibly lead to the killing of guerrillas and the killing of young soldiers of the opposition.

Vietnam is a territory of approximately the size of the State of New Jersey with 24,000,000 people living within it. Approximately one-half of these are North and approximately one-half are South. This division of the country was established by the French as they ended in 1954 their postwar nine-year endeavor to reassert Colonial administration. The feeling against Colonialism, and the feeling that centers on the color differences, are so deep, and the feeling against bombing on the part of all people is so intense, that our American direct military action in the past two years has built up greater opposition rather than lessened it.

In that modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, a new sound financial base must be established; a new Central Council or Regional Council with weighted voting must be added; improved methods for peaceful solutions need to be brought forward, such as a World Court of Equity, a Board of Arbitration and a Panel of Mediators. The beginnings of a small elite United Nations Police Force must be organized.

Parallel to the initiation of this first course of action, implemented immediately, there must be a change in the United States policies in Vietnam with new orders to quiet down the War; to stop hunter-killer drives through the jungles and over the mountains, to stop the bombing except in direct defense against attack or the imminent threat of attack; to maintain a very powerful military presence in Vietnam, but to do so deliberately with the minimum of casualties for Americans and for the Vietnamese.

The third of the courses of action likewise to be started contemporaneously is an extensive program with highest priority to advance the educational, economic, social and political well-being of the peoples of Vietnam and particularly of the youth of Vietnam, and generally of the less fortunate peoples of the world. The major resources and the great productive potential of our country which will be released by the quieting down of the War in Vietnam would be utilized for these purposes.

I realize full well that these three inseparable parallel courses of action may well at first sound unrealistic to you. Let me assure you that I believe they are realistic and practical and essential.

Our American men in the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines have carried on an outstanding courageous performance of duty. They are heroes, and they deserve to be so regarded. They are endeavoring valiantly to carry out the orders to bomb and to seek out and kill the opposing forces.

Furthermore, I recognize the sincerity of purpose of President Johnson and his Administration in changing from the patient advisory, educational and supply role which the United States had from 1954 to 1965, over into direct extensive American military combat. But I point out the difference of results. In ten years under Presidents Kennedy and Eisenhower from 1954 to 1964 only one hundred Americans were killed in the entire ten-year period. Vietnamese casualties were also relatively limited. The young men were gradually getting educated and prepared for goverment, a process which the French under Colonialism had not permitted.

When President Johnson changed the orders and moved into direct American military combat and extensive bombing that unfortunate weekend in February 1965, the result was to accelerate the guerilla movement. The further result was to solidify the people of North Vietnam in the supply of their armed forces. Now after more than 8,000 American deaths and many times this number of American casualties and many, many times this number of Vietnamese casualties, South and North, the opposing military forces in South Vietnam are more numerous today than they were in February 1965. More young Vietnamese reach military age each month than the highest claims of enemy killed! This is one indication of the futility of the present course of action.

American military forces have a very important role to play in standing in a defensive posture in South Vietnam to safeguard against any military takeover and to safeguard against any Chinese intervention in Vietnam. But American military might cannot force negotiations. The long resistance to Colonialism, the feeling of color, the cultural background, all combine in a result that every time President Johnson says to the North Vietnamese "you come to the negotiating table or I will bomb you more intensively," he makes it more difficult, if not impossible, for them to come to the negotiating table. In my judgment they will die before they knuckle under to these actions and threats. The American military forces cannot obtain a decisive military victory. The extensive jungles cannot be permanently occupied. The Cambodia haven for the opposition cannot be obliterated. The Communist support cannot be threatened away. The other side can escalate with more missiles and longer range missiles and more guerillas for each escalation of the United States. Even if the United States took the extreme action of completely devastating North Vietnam, a vacuum would be created which in the long term future the Chinese Communists would fill. Certainly this is not a solution of Vietnam!

Our priority aim should be changed! Our priority aim should be to *win the people of Vietnam,* rather than to *win the war in Vietnam!*

2. What is the basis for your feeling that if both Vietnams were to be proposed for membership in the United Nations at this period of history as a part of the modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, and if the United States unilaterally quieted down the War, this could lead to a solution?

My conviction on this is based on my lifelong experiences and studies. As you may know, on behalf of President Eisenhower, I was in charge of the mutual security and foreign operations programs in all countries. Before that, during World War II, as Assistant Chief of Staff for Administration for Admiral William Halsey, I had the responsibility for bringing together all of the various Intelligence Information from the American Ccmmands, including General MacArthur's and from Lord Mountbatten's British Command. It was my duty to see to it that this Intelligence Information in turn reached the Commanders who needed to know within Admiral Halsey's combined fighting forces. At the end of World War II, in the Drafting of the United Nations Charter under appointment by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, I was in direct charge of drafting and negotiating the provisions for trusteeship which related to dependent peoples and mandated territories and Colonial changes. Long before that, in college days, one of my specialties was the study of the Far East. I know something of the peoples, the jungles, the rice paddies, and most of the leaders.

I am convinced that the opportunity to have full status within the United Nations for the peoples of both North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and their governments; the parallel quieting down of the War by unconditional decision of the United States; the opportunity for the young men to turn to education and to the development of their country in an economic sense; repeated amnesty offers to the opposing forces; genuine social, economic, and political reforms; will together cause the guerilla forces and the war actions to wither away. This will be the effect whether the leaders of the guerillas and the officials of the government of North Vietnam agree or not. These actions will also cause new leaders to arise who fit these new circumstances, even as President Magsaysay rose in the Philippines during similar policies which we instituted in the Philippines during Presdent Eisenhower's Adminstration.

So long as we continue currently the concept of the 1954 French Agreement that one or the other of the Vietnam governments will take over a United Vietnam, we rivet into the situation an unending bitter bloody struggle.

3. Do you believe in peace at any price?

Certainly not! The United States must continue to be prepared to fight a modern war with all of its devastation, if it becomes necessary to defend freedom, or to defend our national security, or to defend against aggressive war. I served in World War II in active and extensive combat with Admiral Halsey in a number of the major battles and campaigns of the Pacific. My philosophy has not changed. But I do believe that we should be prepared to pay a very large price of patience for peace. We should be prepared to pay a substantial price of economic and educational assistance for peace. We should be prepared to pay an extraordinary price of diplomatic endeavor, of pioneering, of leadership efforts in the United Nations, and of thoughtfulness for the differences of cultures, aspirations, and circumstances of other peoples, all for peace!

We should exercise exceptional moral restraint upon the use of American combat forces in direct military action.

We should recognize the change of the nuclear age in that it is no longer sane to try to solve an international problem by the means of direct combat force. We must continue to be very powerful and very alert but recognize the profound change that since the ultimate use of military force is a nuclear holocaust of mutual devastation, there should be an extraordinary moral restraint upon the first use of military force.

4. Do you consider Communism to be a threat?

Definitely. We must ever be very alert to the threat of Communism, particularly through the dictatorships of states under Communism. Very powerful military force on our part must not only be prepared for the ultimate tragedy which a Third World War would mean, but we must also be so powerful and alert as to discourage any miscalculation on the part of any Communist dictatorship. Thus our military position should minimize the danger that any opposing force would ever think it could get by with an attack upon the United States.

But the actual change from Communism toward freedom, I am convinced, will not come about through war action. It can only come about through the inherent internal pressure for more freedom on the part of the peoples within the Communist States. I have long held and expressed this view. I suggest that there is increasing evidence in support of it within all of the Eastern European States and within Russia itself.

A sharp confrontation with the Communist dictatorship States leads to the tragedy of war, war with mutual devastation. But patient and powerful defensive resistance, designed to provide the time for the internal evolution of the peoples' desire for freedom; programs aimed at improving the conditions of such peoples' evolution toward freedom; and actual progress in the United States in the true wellbeing of all of our citizens without discrimination; these three combined constitute the foundation for a successful American world policy for the decades ahead.

Time for such peoples' evolution is particularly important now in the instance of China, which relatively is in the early stage of Communist dictatorship. Even now the internal ferment in China, which I had predicted, is becoming evident. Out of this ferment, I am convinced will arise, gradually and powerfully, a reassertion of the individual Chinese desire for freedom, and a persistent demand for the rights of the Chinese family. This process will be facilitated if we open up the windows of communication with China, and if we avoid, skillfully and without appeasement, the sharp aggressive confrontation which would trigger a world war.

I was in the center of the studies and discussions in President Eisenhower's Administration which gave rise to the President's "opening up" proposals at the Summit Meeting in 1955. This "opening up" has been followed through ever since with the extensive reciprocal visits of delegations and exchanges of exhibitions in the years since then. I believe all objective students are now quite well agreed that this "opening up" has been a part of the process by which the evolution toward the individual freedom of the Russian people, and toward a better prospect for peace, has occurred. The strong defensive position of NATO and of the United States; the favorable development of the Marshall Plan and of the European Common Market; the successful Austrian negotiation for sovereignty and independence; the Berlin Food Program for East Germans; and many other steps; were and are a part of the process. But the "opening up" was and is a crucial and indispensable element in the favorable result. May I emphasize that it is a favorable result for the people of Russia as well as for the people of the United States. It is also a favorable result for the people of the other nations of the world. One of the basic facts of the modern space-atomic age is the high degree of true mutual interests of all peoples of all nations.

5. Why do you now advocate universal eligibility for membership in the United Nations?

The developments in the space atomic age seem to me to make it so clear that this is now truly one world. Its problems cannot be resolved without recognizing it as one world. The most intense dangers and difficulties today are those which were left outside of the United Nations; that is to say the divided Germany, the Vietnam situation, and Mainland China.

At the time the original Charter was drafted, it was basically a matter of the nations that had been working together and standing together in World War II forming an organization to continue their quest for peace. As time moved on, former enemy states such as Italy and Japan were taken into membership. But in the most crucial area of the divided states emerging from World War II to wit: Germany, China, Vietnam, and Korea, all these were left outside of the United Nations. I believe that any objective study, any thorough fresh review of the situation and of the best prospects for moving into the next decade without war, will conclude that all of these problems areas should be within the framework of the United Nations. Therefore, all of the peoples should be included within the universal eligibility for membership, whatever may be their current form of government.

6. Explain what you mean by amending the United Nations Charter without a veto; could not, for example, the Nationalist Government of China on Taiwan veto any change in the Charter?

Neither the Nationalist Government of China nor any other one government can arbitrarily veto any amendment in the Charter if that amendment is brought about through the Charter amending convention process as provided in Article 109.

First of all the amending convention can be called without a veto. This requires any seven votes of the Security Council and two-thirds of the Assembly.

Once such a convention is called and convened, it has complete authority in and of itself to amend any portion of the Charter. It can amend Article 109 and Article 23. Such a convention can decide, for example, that for the contemporary period of history both Chinas should be eligible for membership, and neither one should have a permanent seat in the Security Council, and neither one should have the right of vetoing amendments or of any other kind of veto.

In other words, each state in the world in such a convention would have the sanction of its own true position in the world and would not have any arbitrary or legalistic absolute power.

It is quite evident that it would not make much sense to go forward with a revised United Nations Charter unless both the United States and the U.S.S.R. would become members and ratify the revised Charter. But even these great powers would not be entirely immune from the thorough consideration of the views of others. Under extreme circumstances, the rest of the world could move forward without any one major power. The aim, of course, would be, as I have emphasized, to follow the concept that this is one world in the space age and that all peoples should be eligible for membership whatsoever may be their contemporary form of government, and whether or not we approve of that form of government.

The aim would be to establish the improved structure of the organization of the United Nations so that there was a better prospect for the working out of peaceful change, the evolution of increasing freedom, progress in true well being of all peoples, and the growth of improved methods of settling differences between nations without war.

I emphasize that at the time the original United Nations Charter was drafted in 1945, Senator Arthur Vandenberg, Senator Tom Connally, and I and others foresaw this need of updating the Charter and specifically provided this means of the amending convention which had not been included in the original Dumbarton Oaks draft. We specifically did not want to permanently freeze the organization. We did not want to stagnate the United Nations for all time with the permanent members that were then emerging from World War II.

7. What other changes would you want to see brought about within the United Nations Charter in such an amending convention, to, as you put it, "modernize and strengthen the organization"?

A. A new method of financing;
B. A new Council of Regional Secretaries;
C. A World Court of Equity;
D. A United Nations Board of Arbitration;
E. A United Nations Panel of Mediators;
F. A United Nations Police Force.

8. What do you mean by a Council of Regional Secretaries?

This would be a new Council which would function between the large Assembly, with its one-vote one-State, and the Security Council, with its veto votes. It would function with weighted voting and its members would be elected through weighted voting within the respective Regions of the World. It would have a number of approximately 11. These Regional Secretaries would meet regularly with the Secretary General. They should be empowered to make recommendations on any matter within the scope of the Charter.

The town hall effect of the Assembly has value and would be continued. But the Assembly cannot be the sole functioning body for the future. Likewise, the Security Council, perhaps with a reduced number of permanent seats, would still function and still have a restraint upon the actual major combat military moves of the United Nations.

But a Council of Regional Secretaries could be an important part of the gradually developing effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and in furthering progress in a comprehensive sense for all humanity.

9. Why do you propose a World Court of Equity, when there already is a World Court?

The present World Court has many limitations in its origin, its emphasis, and in the United States' reservations to it. The greatest need is for the approach to world problems that is comparable to what we know as "equity", and comparable to the original development of the English Equity Courts. It is a procedure that can take into account the totality of facts. It can lead to an amendment of agreements, as well as their interpretation; to a recommended modification of boundaries; as well as the study of old shifting boundaries; to the comprehensive inter-related conditions and requirements for reality and fairness and justice, as well as one specific treaty or documentary interpretation. Equity provides a key to lifting away from past outmoded conditions or injustices without chaos.

With a limited power of enforcement, and a basic procedure of referring its decisions, if necessary, to the United Nations itself, I believe the United States Senate could be convinced to approve membership in such a new World Court of Equity without reservation. Other members of the United Nations would likewise ratify without reservation. This World Court of Equity would then be available as one of the alternative means of reaching peaceful answers to difficult problems in the world such as Kashmir, between India and Pakistan; the Jordan River, between Israel and the Arabian States; and other similar intense problems. It would also be available to lead into the very important new areas of the equities and orderliness of the use of outer space, and the equities and orderliness of the use of the resources under the sea.

10. What type of amended financial support for the United Nations do you suggest?

The best method of strengthening the financial arrangements within the United Nations would be to provide for a small United Nations charge or fee upon all international movements of goods, materials and machinery. A one-percent charge would provide quite an adequate financial base. This provision could be included within the revisions of the Charter, arising out of a Charter-amending session. Since there is a direct relationship between the stability of international relations and the large volume flow of export and import, there is a certain amount of logic in placing the cost of the maintenance of the United Nations upon this flow of goods, materials and machinery. It is a bit like charging a gas tax for the funds to maintain the highways upon which the automobiles may then operate in increasing numbers and with greater facility.

There is a small but significant precedent for this kind of approach to the financing of the United Nations. In the Suez Canal crisis ten years ago, when the Canal was closed through the sunken ships, the United Nations borrowed the money and issued the contracts to salvage companies to clear out the Canal. Then a United Nations surcharge of five percent was placed upon all ships going through the Canal, and this surcharge was used to pay off the United Nations debt. Complete payment was concluded within a few years time.

Some automatic regular source of revenue paid in by all peoples is an essential part of the modernizing and strengthening of the United Nations, and I have not heard of any better proposal than the foregoing.

11. What about your recommendation for a United Nations Police Force?

If strong financing is arranged, a small standing United Nations Police Force in United Nations uniforms, ready to move in promptly in situations of border disputes or instability, could help nip trouble in the bud before it becomes a major matter. Such a United Nations Police Force can fit in with the moving of these differences toward the United Nations Board of Arbitration and the World Court of Equity, rather than toward an intense struggle between military forces in War.

It would be best to recruit the members of this elite Police Force from among the nationals of the smaller states, and limit the percentage of men in the force from any one member state. Through various provisions of this kind, it could be made a truly United Nations Force to psychologically as well as physically advance the potential for peace.

12. What would be the nature of a United Nations Board of Arbitration?

There could be many variations. But the probable makeup would be three individuals from three different member states, none of which had any major direct interest in the contending states in any particular dispute.

Such a United Nations Board of Arbitration would be an additional and important alternative for settling differences without War.

13. How would the United Nations Panel of Mediators function?

This would be another alternative method available for the solution of differences between nations without resort to military force. Through a standing Panel of such mediators there could be more rapid action in moving one of them into a difficult problem, and a more sustained long term attention until solutions are reached.

There would be many parallels to the diverse methods and successful functioning of mediators in labor-management disputes in the United States.

14. Do you agree that you cannot trust the Communist dictators?

Yes, I agree. But I also emphasize that we should always keep in mind both the people and the government in a Communist dictatorship or any other dictatorship state. The people within a dictatorship are members of the same human race as the people in a free and democratic state. They have in large measure the same aspirations and the same human nature. They will develop internal pressures for more individual freedom, for more dignity, and for more economic and educational progress. This pressure from the people has been the basic, modifying force against dictatorships from the earliest beginnings of history. It is very evident that it operates now within the Communist dicatorships. The United States should ever think through its policies in terms of advancing the future wellbeing of all humanity on this earth under God. Within that context it can and will also advance the wellbeing of the people of the United States. But a narrow nationalism, or offensive military moves, or oppressive economic actions, against an entire people caught currently under a Communist dictatorship are, and will continue to be, shortsighted and in error.

15. What do you consider to be the greatest policy problem for the United States?

The tendency to polarize our viewpoint or think only in the two extremes. The most desirable course is usually in between these extremes. Thus in Vietnam, the greatest emphasis has been upon either greater United States military action and escalation, or withdrawal. Both of these in my view are a grave mistake. The maintenance of a presence in Vietnam, but the quieting down of the War, and the bringing forward of the diplomatic alternatives and of the economic, educational and cultural advances is the course that should be followed. I sometimes refer to it as "The Fourth Alternative." It is the path of peace in Vietnam.

These in-between solutions have in the past proved to be right in instance after instance. But to reach such solutions we must resist either one of the polarized extremes with all of their seeming attraction of simplicity, and the emotional advocacy of their sincere partisans. These in-between solutions need to be arrived at with the best available information, plus a sensitivity to the basic moral principles which should guide our nation.

May I close with a call to action. If upon reflection you become convinced that the creative path of peace which I advocate is right; if you conclude that you prefer it over either of the extremes of continued or escalated American war action on the one hand, or withdrawal on the other hand, then I suggest you take one or more of the following steps:

1. Write to the President.

2. Write to your Senators and Congressmen, or better yet, get together a delegation to go to Washington to call on them.

3. Propose resolutions in organizations of which you are a member.

Above all, do not underestimate the impact which you and the members of your generation can have upon the policy of our nation and of the world.

May I express the hope that all of you will decide that during your lifetimes, whatever may be your occupation, you will give some of your time and your energy and your intelligence to this cause of peace.

May I further express the hope that some one or more of the honor students of this night at the University of Maryland will decide to give top priority throughout his or her lifetime to this cause of peace, peace with justice for all humanity on this earth under God.

CONGRESSMAN McCLURE TO COSPONSOR WIDNALL-PERCY HOMEOWNERSHIP PLAN

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. McClure] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, individual homeownership is a goal sought by most Americans, but one that has eluded a sizable segment of the populace.

The role of Government in this matter has always been under dispute. The late Senator Robert A. Taft, author of one of the first Federal housing bills, justified it this way:

> The object of a housing policy should be to see that there is a housing plan which provides decent shelter and decent housing for all those [American] families . . . It is claimed that private enterprise without any aid from the government can solve the problem. I think that's contradicted by the facts and figures.

Today, however, prosperity is very nearly universal, and one would think that all the Government need do would be to establish an economy in which all who so desire could work and flourish.

But today's economy is "managed." And the housing proposals of the Federal planners range from Government-owned projects that will be tomorrow's slums to the rent supplement program.

Congressman Widnall and Senator Percy have devised an alternative program in which the Federal Government works in partnership with private enterprise and slum residents themselves. Financing of the program comes from the sale of bonds guaranteed for a fee by the Government. Local nonprofit housing associations would be supported in their efforts to rehabilitate or construct housing for sale to families unable to obtain ordinary financing. The Government would pay the difference between the market rate of interest and a lower rate charged to the homebuyer. When a homeowner increases his income to a higher level, he will make repayments into a revolving fund to help other low-income buyers. Prospective buyers are able to reduce the cost of their home by contributing their own labor to its construction.

From a humanitarian standpoint, I regret there is a need for a housing program. From a philosophical standpoint, I regret that we turn once again, hat in hand, to the Federal Treasury. But from a realistic standpoint, I know that the choice narrows down to a rehash of welfare-state failures or the hope of a permanent cure that lies in the Widnall-Percy plan. For this reason, I have decided to cosponsor the Republican proposal.

Recently, a newspaper columnist wrote that this measure was being offered in an attempt to deter the presidential hopes of our former Vice President, and to boost similar ambitions on the part of the bill's chief sponsor. Had I felt the motivation for the bill was anything but a humanitarian one, I would not be endorsing it today, and I would vehemently object to anyone construing my cosponsorship as either a repudiation or an endorsement of any potential candidate.

MUTUAL FUND PROPOSALS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **MOSS**. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday the New York Times editorialized on the currently pending SEC mutual fund industry proposals. One comment from the Times deserves particular attention:

> Congressional hearings ought to make clear that mutual funds are not on trial.

How very true that is.

I commend to my colleagues the editorial which follows:

Mutual Fund Responsibility

> After failing to win agreement in direct negotiations with the mutual fund industry, the Securities and Exchange Commission has reluctantly taken its case to Congress. It is asking for approval of reforms designed to give a fairer deal to mutual fund investors.
>
> The industry's refusal to strike a compromise with the S.E.C. is based in part on its belief that there is no real need for reform. It points to its extraordinary growth over the past twenty years as proof that investors are being well served. And it takes the position that the S.E.C.'s proposals to reduce sales charges and management fees and to abolish the "front-end load"—the practice of deducting up to half of initial payments on long-term installment agreements—will cripple the industry and hurt investors.
>
> It is true that the S.E.C. has not established an ironclad economic case for some of its reforms. Yet investors are subject to excessive sales charges; they do not benefit from economies of scale or from price or performance competition, and the industry's high commissions are conducive to high-pressure sales practices. In asking for new safeguards the S.E.C. is not seeking to put efficient mutual funds out of business. Indeed, its recommendations are designed to see to it that mutual funds continue to operate at a profit.
>
> Clearly the future of mutual funds is not at stake. The S.E.C. has in fact testified to their value as a medium for diversifying risk for small investors. But the mutual fund industry has not undertaken to reform itself, nor has it shown the responsibility and maturity that should accompany control over nearly $40 billion in shareholder assets.
>
> The industry hopes that its size and its influence in Congress will serve to maintain the *status quo*. But the needs of the nation's investors and potential investors in mutual funds must also be taken into account. They should not be compelled to pay excessive sales charges or exorbitant management fees. And people who have no reason to buy mutual funds should not be pressured into signing up for them by fast-talking salesmen earning fat commissions.
>
> Congressional hearings ought to make clear that mutual funds are not on trial. But their practices are. It is up to Congress to see that the industry takes a more responsible attitude in dealing with the public.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LIX

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KASTENMEIER**. Mr. Speaker, two former standard bearers of the two great political parties have advocated the elimination of the draft. In 1956, the Democratic candidate, the late Adlai E. Stevenson, spoke out against conscription. Although severely criticized by his opponents, Stevenson said:

> I don't see how we can ever get anywhere against the rigid, negative position that we cannot even discuss the matter or even look forward to the time when we can do away with compulsory military service.

In 1964, the Republican Party nominee for President, Senator Barry Goldwater pledged that if elected:

> I would do everything in my power to end the draft system altogether in favor of a fully professional military force.

Mr. Speaker, although supporters of abolition of compulsory military service may represent different political parties and opposing philosophies, they are, however, united in their concern for the freedom of the individual in a democratic society. Conscription is an alien institution in American life, and because it is compulsory, it is in direct conflict with our notion of liberty and it should be abolished.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. **THOMPSON** of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, we have heard over the last 10 days a number of statements from both sides of the aisle about the possible effect the Republican substitute to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act would have on the participation of children from parochial schools. Most of the statements were very general in nature. As a lawyer, I have grave reservations about Mr. QUIE's substitute bill and would like to outline my specific concerns.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

First, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been a success. It has involved children attending parochial schools in many ways: dual enrollment, special evening and weekend classes, and special public school services in parochial schools to name a few. This progress did not come about by chance. The law was carefully designed to meet the church-state problems. We realized that for many years Federal aid to education was thwarted by this issue and a solution was painstakingly devised. Funds are provided to public schools with the specific proviso that public school programs should be extended to all children whether they are in school or are dropouts, or whether they attend public schools or parochial schools.

We thus laid down several guidelines to assure participation of children in parochial schools while at the same time set up restrictions to prevent any unconstitutional practices.

Basically, the law provides:

First. State administration must be consistent with State law.

Second. Funds must not enrich or directly benefit any private schools.

Third. Title and control of all material must remain with the public authority.

Fourth. Materials used by children in private schools must be in use or approved for use in the public schools.

Fifth. Grants are to be made to the local school district. The flexibility built into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was to permit all States to participate even though State laws governing its operation vary greatly over the United States.

STATE CONSTITUTIONS

As we all know, State constitutions and laws vary greatly and in many respects impose stricter limitations in the area of church-state relations than does the U.S. Constitution. Many State constitutions prohibit any aid "direct or indirect" to church-related institutions. All State constitutions go into greater detail than the U.S. Constitution to spell out the line of separation between church and state. The difference is best illustrated by various rulings on providing public transportation for children attending private schools. The U.S. Supreme Court in *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), held that such transportation did not violate the first amendment. Since that decision, the highest courts in four States have ruled that public transportation of parochial school children violated their State constitution.

In spite of these greater State constitutional restrictions, the administration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has continued virtually unaffected. Time and again, State attorneys general have ruled that the State constitution does not apply to Federal programs, the entire cost of which is paid for with Federal moneys kept separate from State and local funds.

Two examples of these rulings are as follows:

First. In Nevada where dual enrollment has been ruled to be unconstitutional, the attorney general said that although Nevada law forbids the use of State, county, or municipal funds to benefit any sectarian society, the State may accept and use funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 "providing the moneys are designated as Federal moneys and kept in separate funds."

Second. In New York the attorney general ruled that the constitutional provision which forbids direct or indirect aid forbids dual enrollment even where the program is entirely paid out of Federal funds. He added, however, that no violation would occur "if the entire cost of the program in this State—including administration thereof—is paid out of Federal grants without the use of any State or local property or credit or public money at any stage of the program."

PROBLEMS UNDER H.R. 8983

While I cannot be completely sure States will be unable to participate fully in the Republican substitute, I am not convinced some of the statutory gloss added to the bill, such as anticommingling provisions, resolves all the issues. The basic concept behind a block grant is contrary to the legal philosophy seen in these State rulings. A block grant is designed to provide general aid to States to operate State, not Federal, programs. Even if this block grant proposal does not reach this end result, it does involve the State to a much greater degree.

There are basic differences between the administrative mechanisms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and those contained in H.R. 8983. Under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act a school district prepares a proposal based on its allocation of funds provided for in the law. All funds are distributed by the Federal Government and are identifiable as Federal funds. Under the proposed substitute a State department of education has almost total discretion concerning reallocation of funds within a State and would be charged with the responsibility for general administration. Such a program obviously requires substantial State participation. Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is administratively similar to H.R. 8983 but the State law problem was recognized and a provision was made in the law to bypass these State restrictions. The substitute bill has retained this bypass, but only as it relates to provisions for books and equipment.

Other portions of H.R. 8983 raise similar State law problems. For just one example, section 703(1) authorizes grants for programs and projects designed to meet the needs of educationally deprived children, yet there appears no statement that these grants must be limited to local school districts. In fact, a contrary implication exists in section 704(a)(6) which gives a local education agency or other applicant denied assistance a right of a hearing before the State educational agency. Does a reading of these sections together mean that a parochial school can request constructional assistance? If this be true, then severe State law questions exist.

In closing, while it may be true, as has been said by many, that there are no church-state impediments in H.R. 8983, I have not been convinced that all these problems have been carefully reviewed and solved. With so much at stake—a multibillion-dollar program that is working well—I cannot support a bill that seemingly has internal inconsistencies and has not been considered and refined by our committee process.

For my colleagues, I am introducing into the Record those State constitutional provisions which relate to the church-state issue:

State Constitutional Provisions Relating to Separation of Church and State

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

Article I

Sec. 3. That no religion shall be established by law; that no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect, society, denomination or mode of worship; that no one shall be compelled by law to attend any place of worship; nor to pay any tithes, taxes or other rates for building or repairing any place of worship, or for maintaining any minister or ministry; that no religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this State; and that the civil rights privileges and capacities of any citizen shall not be in any manner affected by his religious principles.

Article IV

Sec. 263. No money raised for the support of public schools shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian or denominational school.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

Article I

Sec. 4. No law shall be made respectig an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Article VII

Sec. 1. The legislature shall by general law establish and maintain a system of public schools open to all children of the State, and may provide for other public educational institutions. Schools and institutions so established shall be free from sectarian control. No money shall be paid from public funds for the direct benefit of any religious or other private educational institution.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

Article II

Sec. 7. The mode of administering an oath, or affirmation, shall be such as shall be most consistent with and binding upon the conscience of the person to whom such oath, or affirmation, may be administered.

Sec. 12. The liberty of conscience secured by the provisions of this Constitution shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise, or instruction, or to the support of any religious establishment. No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned touching his religious belief in any court of justice to affect the weight of his testimony.

Article IX

Sec. 10. No tax shall be laid or appropriation of public money made in aid of any church, or private or sectarian school, or any public service corporation.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS

Article II

Sec. 24. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; no man can, of right, be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship; or to maintain any ministry against his consent. No human authority can, in any case or manner whatsoever, control or interfere with the right of conscience; and no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment, denomination or mode of worship above any other.

Sec. 25. Religion, morality and knowledge being essential to good government, the General Assembly shall enact suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceful enjoyment of its own mode of public workship.

Sec. 26. No religious test shall ever be required of any person as a qualification to vote or hold office, nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious belief; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be guaranteed in this State; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness or juror on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this State.

Article IV

Sec. 30. Neither the Legislature, nor any county, city and county, township, school district, or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation, or pay from any public fund whatever, or grant anything to or in aid of any religious sect, church, creed, or sectarian purpose, or help to support or sustain any school, college, university, hospital, or other institution controlled by any religious creed, church, or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of personal property or real estate ever be made by the State, or any city, city and county, town, or other municipal corporation for any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever; provided, that nothing in this section shall prevent the Legislature granting aid pursuant to Section 22 of this article.

Article IX

Sec. 8. No public money shall ever be appropriated for the support of any sectarian or denominational school, or any school not under the exclusive control of the officers of the public schools; nor shall any sectarian or denominational doctrine be taught, or instruction thereon be permitted, directly or indirectly, in any of the common schools of the State.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Article II

Sec. 4. Religious freedom.—That the free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege or capacity, on account of his opinions concerning religion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship, religious sect or denomination against his consent. Nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article IX

Sec. 7. Aid to private schools, churches, etc., forbidden.—Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian society, or for any sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property, ever be made by the state, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any sectarian purpose.

Sec. 8. Religious test and race discrimination forbidden—Sectarian tenets.—No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as a teacher or student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT

Article I

Sec. 3. The exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be free to all persons in this state; provided, that the right hereby declared and established, shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state.

Sec. 4. No preference shall be given by law to any Christian sect or mode of worship.

Article VII

Sec. 1. It being the duty of all men to worship the Supreme Being, the Great Creator and Preserver of the Universe, and their right to render that worship, in the mode most consistent with the dictates of their consciences; no person shall by law be compelled to join or support, nor be classed with, or associated to, any congregation, church, or religious association. But every person now belonging to such congregation, church or religious association shall remain a member thereof until he shall have separated himself therefrom, in the manner hereinafter provided. And each and every society or denomination of Christians in this state, shall have and enjoy the same and equal powers, rights and privileges; and shall have power and authority to support and maintain the ministers or teachers of their respective denominations, and to build and repair houses for public worship, by a tax on the members of any such society only, to be laid by a major vote of the legal voters assembled at any society meeting, warned and held according to law, or in any other manner.

Sec. 2. If any person shall choose to separate himself from the society or denomination of Christians to which he may belong, and shall leave a written notice thereof with the clerk of such society, he shall thereupon be no longer liable for any future expenses which may be incurred by said society.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF DELAWARE

Article I

Sec. 1. Although it is the duty of all men frequently to assemble together for the public worship of Almighty God; and piety and morality, on which the prosperity of communities depends are hereby promoted; yet no man shall or ought to be compelled to attend any religious worship, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of worship, or to the maintenance of any ministry, against his own free will and consent; and no power shall or ought to be vested in or assumed by any magistrate that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control the rights of conscience, in the free exercise of religious worship, nor a preference given by law to any religious societies, denominations, or modes of worship.

Sec. 2. No religious test shall be required as a qualification to any office, or public trust, under this State.

Article X

Sec. 3. No portion of any fund existing, or which may hereafter be appropriated, or raised by tax, for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to, or used by, or in aid of any sectarian, church or denominational school; provided, that all real or personal property used for school purposes, where the tuition is free, shall be exempt from taxation and assessment for public purposes.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF FLORIDA

Declaration of Rights

Sec. 5. Religious freedom; liberty of conscience, etc.—The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship shall forever be allowed in this State, and no person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of consicence (sic) hereby secured shall not be so constrewed (sic) as to justify licentiousness or practices subversive of, or inconsistent with, the peace or moral safety of the State or society.

Sec. 6. Religious preferences; public aid, etc.—No preference shall be given by law to any church, sect or mode of worship and no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury directly or indirectly in aid of any church, sect or religious denomination or in aid of any sectarian institution.

Article XII

Sec. 13. Restriction on use of county or district school funds.—No law shall be enacted authorizing the diversion or the lending of any County or District School Funds, or the appropriation of any part of the permanent or available school Fund to any other than school purposes; nor shall the same, or any part thereof, be appropriated to or used the support of any sectarian school.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Article I

Section I

Paragraph XII. Freedom of conscience. All men have the natural and inalienable right to worship God, each according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no human authority should, in any case, control or interfere with such right of conscience.

Paragraph XIII. Religious opinions; liberty of conscience. No inhabitant of this State shall be molested in person or property, or prohibited from holding any public office or trust, on account of his religious opinions; but the right of liberty of conscience shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the State.

Paragraph XIV. Appropriations to churches, sects, etc., forbidden. No money shall ever be taken from the public Treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect, or denomination of religionists, or of any sectarian institution.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF HAWAII

Article I

Sec. 3. No law shall be enacted respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press, or the right of the people peacably to assemble and to petition the government for a redress of grievances.

Article IX

Sec. 1. The State shall provide for the establishment, support and control of a statewide system of public schools free from sectarian control, a state university, public libraries and such other educational institutions as may be deemed desirable, including physical facilities therefor. There shall be no segregation in public educational institutions because of race, religion or ancestry; nor shall public funds be appropriated for the support or benefit of any sectarian or private educational institution.

IDAHO STATE CONSTITUTION

Article I

Sec. 4. Guaranty of religious liberty.—The exercise and enjoyment of religious faith and worship shall forever be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege, or capacity on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, or excuse acts of licentiousness or justify polygamous or other pernicious practices, inconsistent with morality or the peace or safety of the state; nor to permit any person, organization, or association to directly or indirectly aid or abet, counsel or advise any person to commit the crime of bigamy or polygamy, or any other crime. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship, religious sect or denomination, or pay tithes against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship. Bigamy and polygamy are forever prohibited in the state, and the legislature shall provide by law for the punishment of such crimes.

Article IX

Sec. 5. Sectarian appropriations prohibited.—Neither the legislature nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian or religious society, or for any sectarian or religious purpose, or to help support or sustain any school academy, seminary, college, university or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church, sectarian or religious denomination whatsoever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money or other personal property ever be made by the state, or any such public corporation, to any church or for any sectarian or religious purpose.

Sec. 6. Religious test and teaching in school prohibited.—No religious test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as teacher or student; and no teacher or student of any such institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatever. No sectarian or religious tenets or doctrines shall ever be taught in the public schools, nor shall any distinction or classification of pupils be made on account of race or color. No books, papers, tracts or documents of a political, sectarian or denominational character shall be used or introduced in any schools established under the provisions of this article, nor shall any teacher or any district receive any of the public school moneys in which the schools have not been taught in accordance with the provisions of this article.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

Article II

Sec. 3. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever be guaranteed; and no person shall be denied any civil or political right, privilege or capacity, on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, or justfy practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State. No person shall be required to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent, nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of [religion].

Article VIII

Sec. 3. Neither the General Assembly nor any county, city, town, township, school district, or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any church or sectarian purpose, or to help support or sustain any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary or scientific institution, controlled by any church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation of land, money, or other personal property ever be made by the State, or any such public corporation, to any church, or for any sectarian purpose.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF INDIANA

Article I

Ses. 2. Right to worship.—All men shall be secured in the natural right to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences.

Sec. 3. Freedom of thought.—No law shall, in any case whatever, control the free exercise and enjoyment of religious opinions, or interfere with the rights of conscience.

Sec. 4. No preference to any creed.—No preference shall be given, by law, to any creed, religious society, or mode of worship; and no man shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support, any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent.

Sec. 5. No religious test for office.—No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of trust or profit.

Sec. 6. No money for religious institutions.—No money shall be drawn from the treasury, for the benefit of any religious or theological institution.

Sec. 7. Competency of witness.—No person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness, in consequence of his opinions on matters of religion.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF IOWA

Article I

Sec. 3. The General Assembly shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing places of worship or the maintenance of any minister, or ministry.

Sec. 4. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office, or public trust, and no person shall be deprived of any of his rights, privileges, or capacities, or disqualified from the performance of any of his public or private duties, or rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity, in conesquence of his opinions on the subject of religion; and any part of any judicial proceedings shall have the right to use as a witness, or take the testimony of, any other person not disqualified on account of interest, who may be cognizant of any fact material to the case; and parties to suits may be witnesses, as provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF KANSAS

Bill of Rights

Sec. 7. Religious liberty. The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any person be compelled to attend or support any form of worship; nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, nor any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. No religious test or property qualification shall be required for any office of public trust, nor for any vote at any election, nor shall any person be incompetent to testify on account of religious belief.

Article 6

Sec. 8. Nonsectarianism. No religious sect or sects shall ever control any part of the common-school or university fund of the state.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY

Bill of Rights

That the great and essential principles of liberty and free government may be recognized and established, we declare that:

Sec. 1. Rights of life, liberty, worship, pursuit of safety and happiness, free speech, acquiring and protecting property, peaceable assembly, redress of grievances, bearing arms.

* * * * *

Second: The right of worshipping Almighty God according to the dictates of their consciences.

* * * * *

Sec. 5. Right of religious freedom. No preference shall ever be given by law to any religious sect, society or denomination; nor to any particular creed, mode of worship or system of ecclesiastical polity; nor shall any person be compelled to attend any place of worship, to contribute to the erection or maintenance of any such place, or to the salary or support of any minister of religion; nor shall any man be compelled to send his child to any school to which he may be conscientiously opposed; and the civil rights, privileges or capacities of no person shall be taken away, or in anywise diminished or enlarged, on account of his belief or disbelief of any religious tenet, dogma or teaching. No human authority shall, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience.

Sec. 189. School money not to be used for church, sectarian or denominational school. No portion of any fund or tax now existing, or that may hereafter be raised or levied for educational purposes, shall be appropriated to, or used by, or in aid of, any church, sectarian or denominational school.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Article I

Sec. 4. Every person has the natural right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No law shall be passed respecting an establishment of religion, nor prohibiting the free exercise thereof; nor shall any preference ever be given to, nor any discrimination made against, any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship.

Article IV

Sec. 8. No money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister or teacher thereof, as such, and no preference shall ever be given to, nor any discrimination made against, any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship. No appropriation from the State treasury shall be made for private, charitable or benevolent purposes to any person or community; provided, this shall not apply to the State Asylums for the Insane, and the State Schools for the Deaf and Dumb, and the Blind, and the Charity Hospitals, and public charitable institutions conducted under State authority.

Article XII

Sec. 13. No appropriation of public funds shall be made to any private or sectarian school. The Legislature may enact appropriate legislation to permit institutions of higher learning which receive all or part of their support from the State of Louisiana to engage in interstate and intrastate education agreements with other state governments, agencies of other state governments, institutions of higher learning of other state governments and private institutions of higher learning within or outside state boundaries.

Article XIV

Sec. 15(A)(L). Appointments and promotions, examinations; discrimination. Permanent appointments and promotions in the Classified Civil Service of the State and of cities having a population exceeding two hundred fifty thousand, according to the last preceding decennial census of the United States for which the final report of population returns have been printed, published and distributed by the Director of Census, shall be made only after certification by the appropriate Civil Service Departments pursuant to a general system based upon merit, efficiency, and fitness, under which certificates shall be based on examinations which, so far as practical, shall be competitive, and all employees in the Classified Service shall be competitive, and all employees in the Classified Service shall be employed from those eligible under such certification. No person in the "State" or "City Classified Service," having gained civil service status shall be discriminated against or subjected to any disciplinary action except for cause, and no person in the State or City Classified Service shall be discriminated against or subjected to any disciplinary action for political or religious reasons, and all such persons shall have the right to appeal from such actions.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MAINE AND AMENDMENTS

Article I

Sec. 3. All men have a natural and unalienable right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences, and no one shall be hurt, molested or restrained in his person, liberty or estate for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience, nor for his religious professions or sentiments, provided he does not disturb the public peace, nor obstruct others in their religious worship;—and all persons demeaning themselves peaceably, as good members of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the laws, and no subordination or preference of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law, nor shall any religious test be required as a qualification for any office or trust, under this state; and all religious societies in this state, whether incorporate or unincorporate, shall at all times have the exclusive right of electing their public teachers, and contracting with them for their support and maintenance.

THE CONSTITUTION OF MARYLAND DECLARATION OF RIGHTS

Art. 36. That as it is the duty of every man to worship God in such manner as he thinks most acceptable to Him, all persons are equally entitled to protection in their religious liberty; wherefore, no person ought by any law to be molested in his person or estate, on account of his religious persuasion, or profession, or for his religious practice, unless, under the color of religion, he shall disturb the good order, peace or safety of the State, or shall infringe the laws of morality, or injure others in their natural, civil or religious rights; nor ought any person to be compelled to frequent, or maintain, or contribute, unless on contract, to maintain, any place of worship, or any ministry; nor shall any person, otherwise competent, be deemed incompetent as a witness, or juror, on account of his religious belief; provided, he believes in the existence of God, and that under His dispensation such person will be held morally accountable for his acts, and be rewarded or punished therefor either in this world or in the world to come.

Art. 37. That no religious test ought ever to be required as a qualification for any office of profit or trust in this State, other than a declaration of belief in the existence of God; nor shall the Legislature prescribe any other oath of office than the oath prescribed by this Constitution.

Art. 38. That every gift, sale or devise of land to any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or to any Religious Sect, Order or Denomination, or to, or for the support, use or benefit of, or in trust for, any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any Religious Sect, Order or Denomination; and every gift or sale of goods, or chattels to go in succession, or to take place after the death of the Seller or Donor, to or for such support, use or benefit of any Minister, Public Teacher, or Preacher of the Gospel, as such, or any Religious Sect, Order or Denomination, without the prior or subsequent sanction of the Legislature, shall be void; except always, any sale, gift, lease or devise of any quantity of land, not exceeding five acres, for a church, meeting-house, or other house of worship, or parsonage, or for a burying ground, which shall be improved, enjoyed or used only for such purpose; or such sale, gift, lease or devise shall be void. Provided, however, that except insofar as the General Assembly shall hereafter by law otherwise enact, the consent of the Legislature shall not be required to any gift, grant, deed or conveyance executed after the 2nd day of November 1948, or to any devise or bequest contained in the will of any person dying after said 2nd day of November 1948, for any of the purposes hereinabove in this Article mentioned.

Art. VIII, sec. 3. School Fund

The School Fund of the State shall be kept inviolate and appropriated only to the purposes of education.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Declaration of rights

Art. II. It is the right as well as the Duty of all men in society, publickly, (sic) and at stated seasons to worship the Supreme Being, the great Creator and the preserver of the Universe. And no Subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, Liberty, or Estate, for worshipping GOD in the manner and season most agreeable to the Dictates of his own conscience, or for his religious profession or sentiments; provided he doth not Disturb the public peace, or obstruct others in their religious Worship.—

Art. III. (As amended by Art. XI of the Articles of Amendments) [As the happiness of a people, and the good order and preservation of civil government, essentially depend upon piety, religion and morality; and as these cannot be generally diffused through a Community, but by the institution of the public Worship of God, and of public instructions in piety, religion and morality: Therefore, to promote their happiness and to secure the good order and preservation of their government, the people of this Commonwealth have a right to invest their legislature with power to authorize and require, and the Legislature shall, from time to time, authorize and require, the several Towns, Parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, to make suitable provision, at their own Expence (sic), for the institution of the Public worship of GOD, and for the support and maintenance of public protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality, in all cases where such provision shall not be made Voluntarily—And the people of this Commonwealth have also a right to, and do, invest their legislature with authority to enjoin upon all the Subjects an attendance upon the instructions of the public teachers aforesaid, at stated times and seasons, if there be any on whose instructions they can Conscientiously and conveniently attend—provided notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, precincts, and other bodies politic, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their public Teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance.—And all monies, paid by the Subject to the Support of public worship, and of the public teachers aforesaid, shall, if he require it, be uniformly applied to the support of the public teacher or teachers of his own religious sect or denomination, provided there be any on whose instructions he attends; otherwise it may be paid towards the support of the teacher or teachers of the parish or precinct in which the said monies are raised—And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves peaceably, and as good Subjects of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the Law: And no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law.]

Articles of amendment

Art. XI. "Instead of the Third Article of the Bill of Rights, the following Modification and Amendment thereof is substituted.

As the public workship of GOD and instructions in piety, religion and morality, promote the happiness and prosperity of a people and the security of a Republican Government;—Therefore, the several religious societies of this Commonwealth, whether corporate or unincorporate, at any meeting legally warned and holden for that purpose, shall ever have the right to elect their pastors or religious teachers, to contract with them for their support, to raise money for erecting and repairing houses for public worship, for the maintenance of religious instruction, and for the payment of necessary expenses: And all persons belonging to any religious society shall be taken and held to be members, until they shall file with the Clerk of such Society, a written notice, declaring the dissolution of their membership, and thenceforth shall not be liable for any grant or contract, which may be thereafter made, or entered into by such society:—And all religious sects and denominations demeaning themselves peaceably and as good citizens of the Commonwealth, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another shall ever be established by law."

Art. XLVI. (In place of Article XVIII of the Articles of Amendment of the constitution ratified and adopted May 23, 1855, the following article of amendment, submitted by the constitutional convention was ratified and adopted November 6, 1917.) Article XVIII. Section 1. No law shall be passed prohibiting the free exercise of religion.

Sec. 2. All moneys raised by taxation in the towns and cities for the support of public schools, and all moneys which may be appropriated by the commonwealth for the support of common schools shall be applied to, and expended in, no other schools than those which are conducted according to law, under the order and superintendence of the authorities of the town or city in which the money is expended; and no grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized by the commonwealth or any political division thereof for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any school or institution of learning, whether under public control or otherwise, wherein any denominational doctrine is inculcated, or any other school, or any college, infirmary, hospital, institution, or educational, charitable or religious undertaking which is not publicly owned and under the exclusive control, order and superintendence of public officers or public agents authorized by the commonwealth or federal authority or both, except that appropriations may be made for the maintenance and support of the Soldier's Home in Massachusetts and for free public libraries in any city or town, and to carry out legal obligations, if any, already entered into; and no such grant, appropriation or use of public money or property or loan of public credit shall be made or authorized for the purpose of founding, maintaining or aiding any church, religious denomination or society.

Sec. 3. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to prevent the commonwealth, or any political division thereof, from paying to privately controlled hospitals, infirmaries, or institutions for the deaf, dumb or blind not more than the ordinary and reasonable compensation for care or support actually rendered or furnished by such hospitals, infirmaries or institutions to such persons as may be in whole or in part unable to support or care for themselves.

Sec. 4. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive any inmate of a publicly controlled reformatory, penal or charitable institution of the opportunity of religious exercises therein of his own faith; but no inmate of such institution shall be compelled to attend religious services or receive religious instruction against his will, or, if a minor, without the consent of his parent or guardian.

Sec. 5. This amendment will not take effect until the October first next succeeding its ratification and adoption by the people.

Article XLVIII

Sec. 2. Excluded Matters.—No measure that relates to religion, religious practices or religious institutions; or to the appointment, qualification, tenure, removal, recall or compensation of judges; or to the reversal of a judicial decision; or to the powers, creation or abolition of courts; or the operation of which is restricted to a particular town, city or other political division or to particular districts or localities of the commonwealth; or that makes a specific appropriation of money from the treasury of the commonwealth, shall be proposed by an initiative petition; but if a law approved by the people is not repealed, the general court shall raise by taxation or otherwise and shall appropriate such money as may be necessary to carry such law into effect.

Neither the eighteenth amendment of the constitution, as approved and ratified to take effect on the first day of October in the year nineteen hundred and eighteen, nor this provision for its protection, shall be the subject of an initiative amendment.

No proposition inconsistent with any one of the following rights of the individual, as at present declared in the declaration of rights, shall be the subject of an initiative or referendum petition: The right to receive compensation for private property appropriated to public use; the right of access to and protection in courts of justice; the right of trial by jury; protection from unreasonable search, unreasonable bail and the law martial; freedom of the press; freedom of speech; freedom of elections; and the right of peaceable assembly.

No part of the constitution specifically excluding any matter from the operation of the popular initiative and referendum shall be the subject of an initiative petition; nor shall this section be the subject of such a petition.

The limitations on the legislative power of the general court in the constitution shall extend to the legislative power of the people as exercised hereunder.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MICHIGAN

Article I

SEC. 2. No person shall be denied the equal protection of the laws; nor shall any person be denied the enjoyment of his civil or political rights or be discriminated against in the exercise thereof because of religion, race, color or national origin. The legislature shall implement this section by appropriate legislation.

SEC. 4. Every person shall be at liberty to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, or, against his consent, to contribute to the erection or support of any place of religious worship, or to pay tithes, taxes or other rates for the support of any minister of the gospel or teacher of religion. No money shall be appropriated or drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious sect or society, theological or religious seminary; nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purpose. The civil and political rights, privileges and capacities of no person shall be diminished or enlarged on account of his religious belief.

Article IX

SEC. 11. There shall be established a state school aid fund which shall be used exclusively for aid to school districts, higher education and school employees' retirement systems, as provided by law. One-half of all taxes imposed on retailers on taxable sales at retail tangible personal property, and other tax revenues provided by law, shall be dedicated to this fund. Payments from this fund shall be made in full on a scheduled basis, as provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MINNESOTA

Article I

Sec. 16. The enumeration of rights in this constitution shall not be construed to deny or impair others retained by and inherent in the people. The right of every man to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed, nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any religious or ecclesiastical ministry, against his consent; nor shall any control of or interference with the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the State, nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of any religious societies, or religious or theological seminaries.

Sec. 17. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the State. No religious test or amount of property shall ever be required as a qualification of any voter at any election in this State; nor shall any person be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequency of his opinion upon the subject of religion.

Article VIII

Sec. 3. The legislature shall make such provisions, by taxation or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of public schools in each township in the State.

But in no case shall the moneys derived as aforesaid, or any portion thereof, or any public moneys or property, be appropriated or used for the support of schools, wherein the distinctive doctrines, creeds or tenets of any particular Christian or other religious sect are promulgated or taught.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Article 3

Sec. 18. No religious tests as a qualification for office shall be required; and no preference shall be given by law to any religious sect or mode of worship; but the free enjoyment of all religious sentiments and the different modes of worship shall be held sacred. The rights hereby secured shall not be construed to justify acts of licentiousness injurious to morals or dangerous to the peace and safety of the state, or to exclude the Holy Bible from use in any public school of this state.

Article 8

Sec. 208. No religious or other sect or sects shall ever control any part of the school or other educational funds of this state; nor shall any funds be appropriated toward the support of any sectarian school, or to any school that at the time of receiving such appropriations is not conducted as a free school.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Article I

Sec. 5. Religious freedom—liberty of conscience and belief—limitations.—That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worshop Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences; that no human authority can control or interfere with the rights of conscience; that no person shall, on account of his religious persuasion or belief, be rendered ineligible to any public office of trust or profit in this state, be disqualified from testifying or serving as a juror, or be molested in his person or estate; but this section shall not be construed to excuse acts of licentiousness, nor to justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace or safety of the state, or with the rights of others.

Sec. 6. Practice and support of religion not compulsory—contracts therefor enforcible.—That no person can be compelled to erect, support or attend any place or system of worship, or to maintain or support any priest, minister, preacher or teacher of any sect, church, creed or denomination of religion; but if any person shall voluntarily make a contract for any such object, he shall be held to the performance of the same.

Sec. 7. Public aid for religious purposes—preference and discriminations on religious grounds.—That no money shall ever be taken from the public treasury, directly or indirectly, in aid of any church, sect or denomination of religion, or in aid of any priest, preacher, minister or teacher thereof, as such; and that no preference shall be given to nor any discrimination made against any church, sect or creed of religion, or any form of religious faith or worship.

Article IX

Sec. 8. Prohibition of public aid for religious purposes and institutions.—Neither the general assembly, nor any county, city, town, township, school district or other municipal corporation, shall ever make an appropriation or pay from any public fund whatever, anything in aid of any religious creed, church or sectarian purpose, or to help to support or sustain any private or public school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other institution of learning controlled by any religious creed, church or sectarian denomination whatever; nor shall any grant or donation or personal property or real estate ever be made by the state, or any county, city, town, or other municipal corporation, for any religious creed, church, or sectarian purpose whatever.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF MONTANA

Article III

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination, shall forever hereafter be guaranteed, and no person shall be denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his opinions concerning religion, but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be construed to dispense with oaths or affirmations, excuse acts of licentiousness, by bigamous or polygamous marriage, or otherwise, or justify practices inconsistent with the good order, peace, or safety of the state, or opposed to the civil authority thereof, or of the United States. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any ministry, religious sect, or denomination, against his consent; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article V

Sec. 35. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denomination or sectarian institution or association.

Article XI

Sec. 8. Neither the legislative assembly, nor any county, city, town, or school district, or other public corporations, shall ever make directly or indirectly any appropriation, or pay from any public fund or moneys whatever, or make any grant of lands or other property in aid of any chuch, or for any sectarian purpose, or to aid in the support of any school, academy, seminary, college, university, or other literary, scientific institution, controlled in whole or in part by any church, sect or denomination whatever.

Sec. 9. No religious or partisan test or qualification shall ever be required of any person as a condition of admission into any public educational institution of the state, either as teacher or student; nor shall attendance be required at any religious service whatever, nor shall any sectarian tenets be taught in any public educational institution of the state; nor shall any person be debarred admission to any of the collegiate departments of the university on account of sex.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA

Article I

Sec. 4. All persons have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship against his consent, and no preference shall be given by law to any religious society, nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for office, nor shall any person be incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious beliefs; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths and affirmations. Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the Legislature to pass suitable laws to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction.

Article VII

Sec. 11. No sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution supported in whole or in part by the public funds set apart for educational purposes, nor shall the state accept any grant, conveyance, or bequest of money, lands or other property to be used for sectarian purposes. Neither the State Legislature nor any county, city or other public corporation, shall ever make any appropriation from any public fund, or grant any public land in aid of any sectarian or denominational school or college, or any educational institution which is not exclusively owned and controlled by the state or a governmental subdivision thereof. No religious test or qualification shall be required of teacher or student, for admission to or continuance in any public school or educational institution supported in whole or in part by public taxation.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinions on matters of his religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article XI

Sec. 2. The legislature shall provide for a uniform system of common schools, by which a school shall be established and maintained in each school district at least six months in every year, and any school district at least six months in every year, and any school district which shall allow instruction of a sectarian character therein may be deprived of its proportion of the interest of the public school fund during such neglect or infraction, and the legislature may pass such laws as will tend to secure a general attendance of the children in each school district upon said public schools.

Sec. 9. No sectarian instruction shall be imparted or tolerated in any school or university that may be established under the constitution.

Sec. 10. No public funds of any kind or

character whatever, state, county, or municipal, shall be used for sectarian purposes.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Part first

Art. 5th. Every individual has a natural and unalienable right to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and reason; and no subject shall be hurt, molested, or restrained, in his person, liberty, or estate, for worshipping God in the manner and season most agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; or for his religious profession, sentiments, or persuasion; provided he doth not disturb the public peace or disturb others in their religous worship.

Art. 6th. As morality and piety, rightly grounded on evangelical principles, will give the best and greatest security to government, and will lay, in the hearts of men, the strongest obligation to due subjection; and as the knowledge of these is most likely to be propagated through a society, by the institution of the public worship of the Deity, and of public instruction in morality and religion; therefore, to promote these important purposes, the people of this state have a right to empower, and do hereby fully empower, the legislature, to authorize, from time to time, the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies, within this state, to make adequate provision, at their own expense, for the support and maintenance of public Protestant teachers of piety, religion and morality:

Provided notwithstanding, that the several towns, parishes, bodies corporate, or religious societies, shall, at all times, have the exclusive right of electing their own public teachers, and of contracting with them for their support and maintenance. And no person, of any one particular religious sect or denomination, shall ever be compelled to pay towards the support of the teacher or teachers of another persuasion, sect, or denomination.

And every denomination of Christians, demeaning themselves quietly, and as good subjects of the state, shall be equally under the protection of the law; and no subordination of any one sect or denomination to another, shall ever be established by law.

Art. 6th. And nothing herein shall be understood to affect any former contracts made for the support of the ministry; but all such contracts shall remain, and be in the same states as if this constitution had not been made.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW JERSEY

Article I

Sec. 3. No person shall be deprived of the inestimable privilege of worshiping Almighty God in a manner agreeable to the dictates of his own conscience; nor under any pretence whatever be compelled to attend any place of worship contrary to his faith and judgment; nor shall any person be obliged to pay tithes, taxes, or other rates for building or repairing any church or churches, place or places of worship, or for the maintenance of any minister or ministry, contrary to what he believes to be right or has deliberately and voluntarily engaged to perform.

Sec. 4. There shall be no establishment of one religious sect in preference to another; no religious or racial test shall be required as a qualification for any office or public trust.

Sec. 5. No person shall be denied the enjoyment of any civil or military right, nor be discriminated against in the exercise of any civil or military right, nor be segregated in the militia or in the public schools, because of religious principles, race, color, ancestry or national origin.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

Article II

Sec. 11. Every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and no person shall ever be molested or denied any civil or political right or privilege on account of his religious opinion or mode of religious worship. No person shall be required to attend any place of worship or support any religious sect or denomination; nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious denomination or mode of worship.

Article IV

Sec. 31. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, educational or other benevolent purposes to any person, corporation, association, institution or community, not under the absolute control of the state, but the legislature may, in its discretion, make appropriations for the charitable institutions and hospitals, for the maintenance of which annual appropriations were made by legislative assembly of nineteen hundred and nine.

Article XII

Sec. 3. The schools, colleges, universities and other educational institutions provided for by this Constitution shall forever remain under the exclusive control of the State, and no part of the proceeds arising from the sale or disposal of any lands granted to the State by Congress, or any other funds appropriated, levied or collected for educational purposes, shall be used for the support of any sectarian, denominational or private school, college or university.

Sec. 9. No religious test shall ever be required as a condition of admission into the public schools or any educational institution of this State, either as a teacher or student and no teacher or students of such school or institution shall ever be required to attend or participate in any religious service whatsoever.

NEW YORK STATE CONSTITUTION

Article I

Sec. 3. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall forever be allowed in this state to all mankind; and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness on account of his opinions on matters of religious belief; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article XI

Sec. 4. Neither the state nor any subdivision thereof shall use its property or credit or any public money, or authorize or permit either to be used; directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance, other than for examination or inspection, of any school or institution of learning wholly or in part under the control or direction of any religious denomination, or in which any denominational tenet or doctrine is taught, but the legislature may provide for the transportation of children to and from any school or institution of learning.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA

Article I

Sec. 4. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship, without discrimination or preference, shall be forever guaranteed in this state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to be a witness or juror on account of his opinion on matters of religious beliefs; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of this state.

Article VIII

Sec. 147. A high degree of intelligence, patriotism, integrity, and morality on the part of every voter in a government by the people being necessary in order to insure the continuance of that government and the prosperity and happiness of the people, the legislative assembly shall make provision for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all children of the State of North Dakota and free from sectarian control. This legislative requirement shall be irrevocable without the consent of the United States and the people of North Dakota.

Sec. 152. All colleges, universities, and other educational institutions, for the support of which lands have been granted to this state, or which are supported by a public tax, shall remain under the absolute and exclusive control of the state. No money raised for the support of the public schools of the state shall be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school.

Article XVI

Sec. 203. First. Perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF OHIO

Article I

Sec. 7. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience. No person shall be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or maintain any form of worship, against his consent; and no preference shall be given, by law, to any religious society; nor shall any interference with the rights of conscience be permitted. No religious test shall be required, as a qualification for office, nor shall any person be incompetent to be a witness on account of his religious belief; but nothing herein shall be construed to dispense with oaths and affirmations. Religion, morality, and knowledge, however, being essential to good government, it shall be the duty of the General Assembly to pass suitable laws, to protect every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship, and to encourage schools and the means of instruction.

Article VI

Sec. 2. The General Assembly shall make such provisions, by taxation, or otherwise, as, with the income arising from the school trust fund, will secure a thorough and efficient system of common schools through and efficient system of common schools throughout the State; but, no religious or other sect, or sects, shall ever have any exclusive right to, or control of, any part of the school funds in this State.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

Article I

Sec. 2. Religious liberty—Polygamous or plural marriages.—Perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of the State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; and no religious test shall be required for the exercise of civil or political rights. Polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.

Sec. 5. Public schools—Separate schools.—Provisions shall be made for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools which shall be open to all the children of the State and free from sectarian control; and said schools shall always be conducted in English; provided, that nothing herein shall preclude the teaching of other languages in said public schools * * * etc. further, that this shall not be construed to prevent the establishment and maintenance of separate schools for white and colored children.

Article II

Sec. 5. Public money or property—Use for sectarian purposes.—No public money or property shall ever be appropriated, applied, donated, or used directly or indirectly, for the use, benefit, or support of any sect, church, denomination, or system of religion, or for the use, benefit, or support of any priest, preacher, minister, or other religious teacher or dignitary, or sectarian institution as such.

OREGON

CONSTITUTION OF OREGON

Article I

Sec. 2. Freedom of worship. All men shall be secure in the Natural right, to worship Almighty God according to dictates of their own consciences.—

Sec. 3. Freedom of religious opinion. No law shall in any case whatever control the free exercise, and enjoyment of religeous (sic) opinions, or interfere with the rights of conscience.—

Sec. 4. No religious qualification for office. No religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of trust or profit.

Sec. 5. No money to be appropriated for religion. No money shall be drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any religious (sic), or theological institution, nor shall any money be appropriated for the payment of any religeous (sic) services in either house of the Legislative Assembly.—

Sec. 6. No religious test for witnesses or jurors. No person shall be rendered incompetent as a witness, or juror in consequence of his opinions on matters of religeon (sic); nor be questioned in any Court of Justice touching his religeous (sic) belief to affect the weight of his testimony.—

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA

Article I

Sec. 3. All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent; no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship.

Sec. 4. No person who acknowledges the being of a God and a future state of rewards and punishments shall, on account of his religious sentiments, be disqualified to hold any office or place of trust or profit under this Commonwealth.

Article III

Sec. 17. No appropriation shall be made to any charitable or educational institution not under the absolute control of the Commonwealth, other than normal schools established by law for the professional training of teachers for the public schools of the State except by a vote of two-thirds of all the members elected to each House.

Sec. 18. No appropriations shall be made for charitable, educational or benevolent purposes to any person or community nor to any denominational and sectarian institution, corporation, or association: Provided, that appropriations may be made for pensions or gratuities for military service and *to blind persons twenty-one years of age and* upwards, and for assistance to mothers having dependent children and to aged persons without adequate means of support, and in the form of scholarship grants or loans for higher educational purposes shall be given to persons enrolled in a theological seminary or school of theology.

CONSTITUTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO

Article II, Bill of Rights

Sec. 3. No law shall be made respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof. There shall be complete separation of church and state.

Sec. 5. * * * There shall be a system of free and wholly nonsectarian public education * * *. No public property or public funds shall be used for the support of schools or educational institutions other than those of the state. Nothing contained in this provision shall prevent the state from furnishing to any child noneducational services established by law for the protection or welfare of children.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND AND PROVIDENCE PLANTATIONS

Article I

Sec. 3. Freedom of religion.—Whereas Almighty God hath created the mind free; and all attempts to influence it by temporal punishments or burdens, or by civil incapacitations, tend to beget habits of hypocrisy and meanness; and whereas a principal object of our venerable ancestors, in their migration to this country and their settlement of this state, was, as they expressed it, to hold forth a lively experiment, that a flourishing civil state may stand and be best maintained with full liberty in religious concernments; we, therefore, declare that no man shall be compelled to frequent or to support any religious worship, place, or ministry whatever, except in fulfillment of his own voluntary contract; nor enforced, restrained, molested, or burdened in his body or goods; nor disqualified from holding any office; nor otherwise suffer on account of his religious belief; and that every man shall be free to worship God according to the dictates of his own conscience, and to profess and by argument to maintain his opinion in matters of religion; and that same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect his civil capacity.

CONSTITUTION OF STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Article I

Sec. 4. Religious worship—freedom of speech—petition.—The General Assembly shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, or abridging the freedom of speech or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government or any department thereof for a redress of grievances.

Article XI

Sec. 9. Property or credit of State shall not benefit sectarian institutions.—The property or credit of the State of South Carolina, or of any county, city, town, township, school district, or other subdivision of the said State, or any public money, from whatever source derived, shall not, by gift, donation, loan, contract, appropriation, or otherwise, be used, directly or indirectly, in aid or maintenance of any college, school, hospital, orphan house, or other institution, society or organization, of whatever kind, which is wholly or in part under the direction or control of any church or of any religious or sectarian denomination, society or organization.

Article XVII

Sec. 4. Supreme Being.—No person who denies the existence of a Supreme Being shall hold any office under this Constitution (Note: Cf. Torcaso v. Watkins, (1961) 367 U.S. 488)

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Article VI

Sec. 3. The right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience shall never be infringed. No person shall be denied any civil or political rights privilege or position on account of his religious opinions; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse licentiousness, the invasion of the rights of others, or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the state.

No person shall be compelled to attend or support any ministry or place of worship against his consent nor shall any preference be given by law to any religious establishment or mode of worship. No money or property of the state shall be given or appropriated for the benefit of any sectarian or religious society or institution.

Article VIII

Sec. 16. No appropriation of lands, money or other property or credits to aid any sectarian school shall ever be made by the state, or any county or municipality within the state, nor shall the state or any county or municipality within the state accept any grant, conveyance, gift or bequest of lands, money or other property to be used for sectarian purposes, and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed in any school or institution aided or supported by the state.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF TENNESSEE

Article I

Sec. 3. Right of worship free.—That all men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own conscience; that no man can of right be compelled to attend, erect, or support any place of worship, or to maintain any minister against his consent; that no human authority can, in any case whatever, control or interfere with the rights of conscience; and that no preference shall ever be given, by law, to any religious establishment or mode of worship.

Sec. 4. No religious or political test.—That no political or religious test, other than an oath to support the Constitution of the United States and of this State, shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under this state.

Article IX

Sec. 1. Ineligibility of ministers and priests to seats in legislature—Whereas Ministers of the Gospel are by their profession, dedicated to God and the care of souls, and ought not to be diverted from the great duties of their functions; therefore, no Minister of the Gospel, or priest of any denomination whatever, shall be eligible to a seat in either House of the Legislature.

Sec. 2. No atheist or disbeliever shall hold a civil office.—No person who denies the being of God, or a future state of rewards and punishments, shall hold any office in the civil department of this State.

(Note: Cf. Torcaso v Watkins, (1961) 367 U.S. 488)

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF TEXAS

Article I

Sec. 4. There Shall Be No Religious Test for Office.—No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office, or public trust, in this State; nor shall anyone be excluded from holding office on account of his religious sentiments, provided he acknowledge the existence of a Supreme Being.

Sec. 5. How Oaths Shall Be Administered.—*No person shall be disqualified to* give evidence in any of the Courts of this State on account of his religious opinions, or for the want of any religious belief, but all oaths or affirmations shall be administered in the mode most binding upon the conscience, and shall be taken subject to the pains and *penalties of perjury.*

Sec. 6. Freedom in Religious Worship Guaranteed.—All men have a natural and indefeasible right to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of their own consciences. No man shall be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry against his consent. *No human authority ought,* in any case whatever, to control or interfere with the rights of conscience in matters of religion, and no preference shall ever be given by law to any religious society or mode of worship. But it shall be the duty of the Legislature to *pass such laws as may be necessary to pro*tect equally every religious denomination in the peaceable enjoyment of its own mode of public worship.

Sec. 7. No Appropriation for Sectarian Purposes.—No money shall be appropriated, or drawn from the Treasury for the benefit of any sect, or religious society, theological or religious seminary, nor shall property belonging to the State be appropriated for any such purposes.

Article VII

Sec. 5. Permanent School Fund; Interest; Alienation; Sectarian Schools.—The principal of all bonds and other funds, and the principal arising from the sale of the lands herein before set apart to said school fund, shall be the permanent school fund, and all the interest derivable therefore and the taxes herein authorized and levied shall be the available school fund. The available school fund shall be applied annually to the support of the public free schools. And no law shall ever be enacted appropriating any part of the permanent or available school fund to any other purpose whatever; nor shall the same or any part thereof ever be appropriated to or used for the support of any sectarian school; and the available school fund herein provided shall be distributed to the several counties according to their scholastic population and applied in such manner as may be provided by law.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF UTAH

Article I

Sec. 4. The rights of conscience shall never be infringed. The State shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; no religious test shall be required as a qualification for any office of public trust for any vote at any election; nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror on account of religious belief or the absence thereof. There shall be no union of Church and State, nor shall any church dominate the State or interfere with its functions. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or for the support of any ecclesiastical establishment. No property qualification shall be required of any person to vote, or hold office, except as provided in this Constitution.

Article III

Ordinance

First:—Perfect toleration of religious sentiment is guaranteed. No inhabitant of this State shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship; but polygamous or plural marriages are forever prohibited.

Fourth:—The Legislature shall make laws for the establishment and maintenance of a system of public schools, which shall be open to all the children of the State and be free from sectarian control.

Article X

Sec. 1. The Legislature shall provide for the establishment and maintenance of a uniform system of public schools, which shall be open to all children of the State, and be free from sectarian control.

Sec. 12. Neither religious nor partisan tests or qualification shall be required of any person as a condition of admission, as teacher or student, into any public educational institution of the State.

Sec. 13. Neither the Legislature nor any county, city, town, school district or other public corporation, shall make any appropriation to aid in the support of any school, seminary, academy, college, university or other institution, controlled in whole, or in part, by any church, sect or denomination whatever.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF VERMONT

Chapter I

Art. 3rd. That all men have a natural and unalienable right, to worship Almighty God, according to the dictates of their own consciences and understandings, as in their opinion shall be regulated by the word of God: and that no man ought to, or of right can be compelled to attend any religious worship, or erect or support any place of worship, or maintain any minister, contrary to the dictates of his conscience, nor can any man be justly deprived or abridged of any civil right as a citizen, on account of his religious sentiments, or peculia(r) mode of religious worship; and that no authority can, or ought to be vested in, or assumed by, any power whatever, that shall in any case interfere with, or in any manner control the rights of conscience, in the free exercise of religious worship. Nevertheless, every sect or denomination of christians ought to observe the sabbath or Lord's day, and keep up some sort of religious worship, which to them shall seem most agreeable to the revealed will of God.

Chapter II

Sec. 64. Laws for the encouragement of virtue and prevention of vice and immorality, ought to be constantly kept in force, and duly executed; and a competent number of schools ought to be maintained in each town unless the general assembly permits other provisions for the convenient instruction of youth. All religious societies, or bodies of men that may be united or incorporated for the advancement of religion and learning, or for other pious and charitable purposes, shall be encouraged and protected in the enjoyment of the privileges, immunities, and estates, which they in justice ought to enjoy, under such regulations as the General Assembly of this State shall direct.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF VIRGINIA

Article I

Sec. 16. Religious freedom.—That religion or the duty which we owe to our Creator, and the manner of discharging it, can be directed only by reason and conviction, not by force or violence; and, therefore, all men are equally entitled to the free exercise of religion, according to the dictates of conscience; and that it is the mutual duty of all to practice Christian forebearance, love and charity toward each other.

Article IV

Sec. 58. Prohibitions on General Assembly as to suspension of writ of habeas corpus, and enactment of laws referring to religion and other laws.— * * * No man shall be compelled to frequent or support any religious worship, place, or ministry, whatsoever, nor shall be enforced, restrained, molested, or burthened in his body or goods, nor shall otherwise suffer on account of his religious opinions or belief; but all men shall be free to profess and by argument to maintain their opinions in matters of religion, and the same shall in no wise diminish, enlarge, or affect, their civil capacities. And the General Assembly *shall not prescribe any religious test* whatever, or confer any peculiar privileges or advantages on any sect or denomination, or pass any law requirinig or authorizing any religious society, or the people of any district within this State; to levy on themselves, or others, any tax for the erection or repair of any house of public worship, or for the support of any church or ministry; but it shall be left free to every person to select his religious instructor, and to make for his support such private contract as he shall please.

Article IX

Sec. 141. *State appropriations prohibited to schools or institutions of learning not owned or exclusively controlled by the State or some subdivision thereof; exceptions to rule.*—No appropriation of public funds shall be made to any school or institution of learning not owned or exclusively controlled by the State *or some political subdivision thereof*; provided, first, that the General Assembly may, and the governing bodies of the several counties, cities, and town may, subject to such limitations as may be imposed by the General Assembly, appropriate funds for educational purposes which may be expended in furtherance of elementary, secondary, collegiate or graduate education of Virginia students in public and nonsectarian private schools and institutions of learning, in addition to those owned or exclusively controlled by the State or any such county, city or town; second, that the General Assembly may appropriate funds to an agency, or to a school or institution of learning owned or controlled by an agency, created and established by two or more States under a joint agreement to which this State is a party for the purpose of providing educational facilities for the citizens of the several States joining in such agreement; third, that counties, cities, towns and districts may make appropriations to nonsectarian schools of manual, industrial or technical training and also to any school or institution of learning owned or exclusively controlled by such county, city, town or school district.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WASHINGTON

Article I

Sec. 11. Religious Freedom—Absolute freedom of conscience in all matters of religious sentiment, belief and worship, shall be guaranteed to every individual, and no one shall be molested or disturbed in person or property on account of religion; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state. No public money or property shall be appropriated for or applied to any religious worship, exercise or instruction, or the support of any religious establishment: Provided, however, That this article shall not be so construed as to forbid the employment by the state of a chaplain for such of the state custodial, correctional and mental institutions as in the discretion of the legislature may seem justified. No religious qualification shall be required for any public office or employment, nor shall any person be incompetent as a witness or juror, in consequence of his opinion on matters of religion, nor be questioned in any court of justice touching his religious belief to affect the weight of his testimony.

Article XXVI

First. That perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured and that no inhabitant of this state shall ever be molested in person or property on account of his or her mode of religious worship.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Article III

Sec. 15. No man shall be compelled to frequent *or support any religious worship, place* or ministry whatsoever; nor shall any man be enforced, restrained, molested or burthened, in his body or goods or otherwise suffer, on account of his religious opinions or belief, but all men shall be free to profess, and, by argument, to maintain their opinions in matters of religion; and the same shall, in no wise, affect, diminish or enlarge their civil capacities; and the legislature shall not prescribe any religious test whatever, or confer any peculiar privileges or advantages on any sect or denomination, or pass any law requiring or authorizing any religious society, or the people of any district within this State, *to levy on themselves*, or others, any tax for the erection or repair of any house for public worship, or for the support of any church or ministry, but it shall be left free for every person to select his religious instructor, and to make for his support *such private contract* as he shall please.

THE CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

Article I

Sec. 18. The right of every man to worship Almighty God according to the dictates of his own conscience shall never be infringed; nor shall any man be compelled to attend, erect or support any place of worship, or to maintain any ministry, against his consent; nor shall any control of, or interference with, the rights of conscience be permitted, or any preference be given by law to any religious establishments or modes of worship; nor shall any money be drawn from the treasury for the benefit of religious societies or religious or theological seminaries.

Sec. 19. No religious tests shall ever be required as a qualification for any office of public trust under the state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to give evidence in any court of law or equity in consequence of his opinions on the subject of religion.

Article X

Sec. 3. The legislature shall provide by law for the establishment of district schools which shall be as nearly uniform as practicable; and such schools shall be free and without charge for tuition to all children between the ages of four and twenty years; and no sectarian instruction shall be allowed therein.

CONSTITUTION OF THE STATE OF WYOMING

Article I

Sec. 18. Religious liberty. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall be forever guaranteed in this state, and no person shall be rendered incompetent to hold any office of trust or profit, or to serve as a witness or juror, because of his opinion on any matter of religious belief whatever; but the liberty of conscience hereby secured shall not be so construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or justify practices inconsistent with the peace or safety of the state.

Sec. 19. Appropriations for religion prohibited. No money of the state shall ever be given or appropriated to any sectarian or religious society or institution.

Article III

Sec. 36. Prohibited appropriations. No appropriation shall be made for charitable, industrial, educational or benevolent purposes to any person, corporation or community not under the absolute control of the state, nor to any denomination or sectarian institution or association.

Article VII

Sec. 12. Sectarianism prohibited. No sectarian instruction, qualifications or tests shall be imparted, exacted, applied or in any manner tolerated in the schools of any grade or character controlled by the state, nor shall attendance be required at any religious service therein, nor shall any sectarian tenets or doctrines be taught or favored in any public school or institution that may be established under this constitution.

VETERANS' VIEWS ON VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION MEDICAL CARE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in January 1966 and again in January of this year I directed that a survey be made of veterans discharged from general hospitals operated by the Department of Medicine and Surgery of the Veterans' Administration. The purpose of this survey was to obtain a further insight into the quality of medical care provided in VA hospitals and from the point of view of the veteran who received such care. The committee is gratified to learn, through these two surveys, that almost 98 percent of the veterans indicated that in general they received good hospital care. The questionnaire was received by 21,462 veterans and 7,425 of those responded when the survey was ended on March 13. Each of the general hospitals was instructed to distribute the questionnaire to the first 200 patients discharged during the period and to have the patient complete the questionnaire and mail it after leaving the hospital. The complete survey is printed as House Committee Print 64. A summary of the survey is shown by the tables which follow:

Summary of 1967 survey, overall and by each VA general hospital

[Asterisk (*) denotes favorable response]

Question	Total responses	Number of respondents		Percent yes or no	
		Yes	No	Yes	No
1. (a) Have you ever been a patient in a VA hospital before?	6,966	5,171	1,795	74.2	25.8
(b) If "Yes," in this hospital?	4,990	4,108	882	82.3	17.7
2. Did the admitting doctor interview you in a friendly and understanding manner?	7,206	*6,959	247	*96.6	3.4
3. About your room—					
(a) Was it attractive?	6,929	*6,614	315	*95.5	4.5
(b) Was it clean when you arrived?	7,211	*7,088	123	*98.3	1.7
(c) Was it ventilated?	7,152	*6,689	463	*93.5	6.5
(d) Was it well lighted?	7,194	*7,081	113	*98.4	1.6
(e) Was your bed comfortable?	7,204	*6,998	206	*97.1	2.9
4. About your comfort—					
(a) Were you annoyed by noises?	6,800	922	*5,878	13.6	*86.4
If "Yes," was this due to—					
(1) Visitors?		273			
(2) Roommate?		544			
(3) Equipment?		401			
(4) Hospital personnel?		472			
(5) Radio or TV sets?		459			
(b) Were you annoyed by so-called hospital odors?	7,226	286	*6,940	4.0	*96.0
(c) Were you awakened too early in the morning?	7,176	840	*6,336	11.7	*88.3
(d) Were Were hospital routines arranged so you could generally get sufficient rest?	7,198	*6,557	641	*91.1	8.9
(e) Were there other patients in your room?	6,995	6,288	707	89.9	10.1
(1) If "Yes," did they disturb you?	6,288	453	*5,835	7.2	*92.8
5. About your visitors—					
(a) Were you satisfied with visiting hours?	7,222	*7,088	134	*98.1	1.9
(b) Did your visitors receive courteous treatment from hospital personnel?	7,144	*6,960	154	*97.8	2.2
6. Were hospital rules and schedules adequately explained to you	7,260	*6,860	400	*94.5	5.5
7. Were tests and treatments explained to you so that you understood what was happening?	7,218	*6,541	677	*90.6	9.4
8. Before being discharged, were you instructed how to care for yourself at home?	7,241	*6,538	703	*90.3	9.7
9. Do you feel the nurses were—					
(a) Skilled in giving you personal care?	7,235	*7,133	102	*98.6	1.4
(b) Interested in you as a person?	6,847	*6,477	370	*94.5	5.4
(c) Prompt in doing things for you?	6,935	*6,626	309	*95.5	4.5
10. Did you have as much nursing care as needed?	7,234	*7,019	215	*97.0	3.0
11. Did the following give you friendly efficient service—					
(a) Doctors?	7,231	*6,974	257	*96.4	3.6
(b) Dentists?	6,123	*5,794	329	*94.6	5.4
(c) Technicians who drew blood?	7,135	*7,063	72	*99.0	1.0
(d) Technicians who took X-rays?	7,112	*7,020	92	*98.7	1.3
(e) Nursing attendants?	7,115	*6,938	177	*97.5	2.5
12. Housekeeping:					
(a) Was room cleaned daily?	7,285	*7,043	242	*96.7	3.3
(b) Were cleaning persons considerate of you?	7,214	*7,085	129	*98.2	1.8
(c) Was a good cleaning job done?	7,180	*6,849	331	*95.5	4.6
13. In regard to food and considering whether or not you were on special diet—					
(a) Were the servings adequate?	7,219	*6,964	255	*96.5	3.5
(b) Was the hot portion of the meal served hot?	7,102	*6,428	674	*90.5	9.5
(c) Were the meals attractively served?	7,193	*6,943	250	*96.5	3.5
(d) Did you like the coffee?	6,747	*5,939	808	*88.0	12.0
14. In general, do you feel you had good hospital care?	7,172	*7,007	165	*97.7	2.3
15. Did you receive surgery?	7,207	3,091	4,116	42.9	57.1

Veterans' views on medical care in VA hospitals

Total answers to all questions:	
Number of favorable answers	222,495
Number of unfavorable answers	11,473
Percent favorable answers	95.1
Physician care questions 2, 7, 8, 11(*a*):	
Number of favorable answers	27,012
Number of unfavorable answers	1,884
Percent favorable answers	93.5
Nursing care questions 9(*a*) to 9(*c*), 10:	
Number of favorable answers	27,255
Number of unfavorable answers	996
Percent favorable answers	96.5
Dietetic service questions 13(*a*) to 13(*d*):	
Number of favorable answers	26,274
Number of unfavorable answers	1,987
Percent favorable answers	93.0
Housekeeping questions 3(*a*) to 3(*e*), 12(*a*) to 12(*c*), 4(*b*):	
Number of favorable answers	62,387
Number of unfavorable answers	2,208
Percent favorable answers	96.6
General hospital management questions 4(*a*), 4(*c*), 4(*d*), 4(*e*)(1), 5(*a*), (5*b*), 6, and 14:	
Number of favorable answers	52,752
Number of unfavorable answers	3,728
Percent favorable answers	93.4

Percent of favorable responses to VA hospital care received by combinat.on groups, comparison between 1966 and 1967 surveys

General hospitals	All questions		Physician care		Nursing care		Dietetics		Housekeeping		Hospital management		General attitude	
	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966
Total	95.1	95.0	93.5	92.9	96.5	96.3	93.0	93.4	96.6	96.5	93.4	93.5	97.7	97.6
Albany, N.Y	91.5	94.3	87.5	89.4	91.8	96.8	86.9	89.9	94.5	96.2	89.1	94.2	93.8	98.2
Albuquerque, N. Mex	95.2	95.8	94.6	93.5	98.2	98.5	93.0	94.2	96.9	97.4	92.2	94.1	98.8	98.5
Alexandria, La	97.5	96.6	98.8	94.4	98.4	97.3	92.3	91.7	99.1	99.4	96.3	96.0	100.0	100.0
Altoona, Pa	94.7	92.6	94.9	90.4	96.0	96.2	93.5	84.6	95.7	94.3	92.4	92.6	97.7	91.2
Amarillo, Tex	93.8	92.9	89.8	89.7	95.7	91.4	92.7	89.7	96.2	95.5	90.1	90.9	92.9	93.3
Ann Arbor, Mich	94.8	94.4	96.1	94.9	96.9	95.2	93.5	92.3	95.0	94.7	91.4	92.8	96.8	100.0
Atlanta, Ga	96.9	96.7	97.6	97.6	98.4	97.6	97.2	96.7	97.2	95.9	93.9	95.4	98.4	100.0
Augusta, Ga	93.4	97.5	89.6	97.7	97.3	96.6	96.6	95.3	94.7	99.0	89.3	96.0	89.7	100.0
Baltimore, Md	95.6	(1)	93.8	(1)	98.9	(1)	92.0	(1)	97.7	(1)	94.1	(1)	97.7	(1)
Batavia, N.Y	96.8	95.1	100.0	93.2	99.2	97.4	88.7	90.4	97.9	97.4	97.1	92.6	100.0	100.0
Bath, N.Y	96.9	95.0	97.3	95.7	100.0	97.1	91.5	90.8	97.2	95.8	96.1	93.4	100.0	100.0
Bay Pines, Fla	94.4	92.4	93.9	87.0	94.8	94.7	94.4	93.1	94.5	93.6	92.8	90.1	97.3	100.0
Beckley, W.Va	96.2	96.7	90.9	89.3	96.6	98.5	97.7	100.0	96.9	98.8	96.5	96.6	95.5	91.9
Big Spring, Tex	95.5	91.4	85.3	79.7	94.5	91.0	95.7	95.1	99.0	95.1	96.3	89.1	95.2	84.8
Biloxi, Miss	93.1	96.7	91.3	95.9	90.7	97.1	88.5	95.9	96.8	99.2	90.4	93.9	97.4	97.7
Birmingham, Ala	95.0	94.3	95.9	94.7	94.4	94.7	95.7	92.6	96.7	94.0	91.2	93.0	97.9	96.0
Boise, Idaho	97.2	98.0	95.9	97.6	98.7	99.4	95.8	96.9	99.0	99.2	94.6	96.2	100.0	98.8
Bonham, Tex	98.7	99.2	99.3	99.4	100.0	100.0	97.2	98.7	99.7	99.7	96.7	98.3	100.0	100.0
Boston, Mass	95.0	96.0	97.2	96.0	97.1	95.3	89.4	94.6	94.9	98.4	94.3	93.1	98.3	100.0
Bronx, N.Y	90.8	93.0	88.1	94.3	95.1	95.8	85.0	85.5	91.1	95.3	90.5	91.7	96.3	98.3
Brooklyn, N.Y	94.1	93.1	93.4	88.4	96.1	94.9	85.3	87.6	97.3	97.0	92.3	91.4	100.0	97.2
Buffalo, N.Y	93.1	92.3	88.5	89.7	92.3	93.5	92.1	90.8	94.9	93.2	92.3	90.3	96.2	96.1
Butler, Pa	94.7	97.0	91.0	96.3	95.4	97.8	95.5	93.2	96.4	98.4	92.7	96.0	100.0	97.1
Castle Point, N.Y	95.3	97.9	96.8	96.7	97.6	99.2	91.9	96.8	97.5	99.6	91.5	95.6	100.0	100.0
Charleston, SC	97.3	(2)	96.0	(2)	98.7	(2)	94.3	(2)	99.0	(2)	96.1	(2)	100.0	(2)
Cheyenne, Wyo	96.8	97.9	91.0	94.4	99.5	99.5	93.7	97.8	99.3	99.8	95.6	96.1	100.0	100.0
Chicago, Ill. (West Side)	94.0	95.2	92.2	92.9	95.9	96.6	90.5	93.4	94.1	98.9	93.9	90.7	98.4	96.5
Chicago, Ill. (research)	94.3	96.9	94.2	96.4	94.8	98.8	91.2	95.3	94.5	98.2	93.8	95.1	98.1	100.0
Cincinnati, Ohio	96.4	93.4	97.0	88.9	94.7	93.8	94.2	91.0	98.4	96.6	93.3	91.2	100.0	95.3
Clarksburg, W. Va	97.3	94.2	96.8	93.9	98.9	93.3	96.3	93.4	98.9	96.7	94.5	91.9	100.0	93.3
Cleveland, Ohio	93.8	95.8	92.6	95.5	90.8	97.7	89.9	94.1	95.7	98.0	93.7	93.4	97.1	97.8
Columbia, S.C	94.4	94.3	88.5	91.7	95.3	94.4	96.3	95.3	95.7	96.3	92.8	91.6	98.0	93.3
Coral Gables, Fla	(3)	91.8	(3)	89.5	(3)	92.1	(3)	93.3	(3)	92.3	(3)	89.0	(3)	97.5
Dallas, Tex	95.0	94.6	94.5	92.6	96.8	96.3	94.0	96.7	95.8	93.6	93.3	93.9	96.9	97.8
Dayton, Ohio	93.7	88.7	91.5	85.0	95.5	87.5	91.1	90.5	97.5	89.3	89.1	87.5	94.3	94.4
Dearborn, Mich	78.7	91.4	81.2	88.2	78.8	92.7	80.5	91.1	72.0	91.5	79.6	89.9	82.9	92.2
Denver, Colo	93.4	94.0	93.8	92.2	93.8	94.0	89.9	94.4	95.8	94.6	92.1	94.2	94.0	97.6
Des Moines, Iowa	96.1	97.6	93.1	96.0	98.6	98.1	96.1	97.4	98.8	98.9	92.8	96.4	98.6	100.0
Dublin, Ga	96.8	97.7	94.3	94.8	99.0	99.0	95.9	97.1	98.7	99.8	95.7	96.5	98.8	100.0
Durham, N.C	95.0	94.9	96.7	91.0	95.9	96.6	91.6	92.5	97.1	98.1	91.5	93.1	98.6	95.6
East Orange, N.J	93.9	94.7	91.3	93.6	95.7	96.3	85.2	90.8	96.4	97.4	93.0	92.1	93.5	98.1
Erie, Pa	97.7	96.1	98.3	94.3	100.0	97.5	98.2	94.9	98.4	97.3	94.1	94.1	100.0	97.9
Fargo, N. Dak	97.0	96.9	93.0	94.1	98.5	97.3	97.4	97.9	98.6	98.4	95.4	95.4	100.0	100.0
Fayetteville, Ark	97.2	96.4	93.0	94.1	97.8	96.8	98.6	94.4	98.7	98.5	96.2	95.2	97.9	97.5
Fayetteville, N.C	96.4	95.9	91.7	95.2	99.1	98.0	96.3	93.5	97.9	97.9	94.8	93.9	96.7	98.7
Fort Harrison, Mont	96.2	94.7	92.6	91.3	97.1	95.0	92.4	90.8	98.2	97.7	95.3	93.0	97.7	98.2
Fort Howard, Md	96.9	96.6	95.8	94.5	99.1	99.2	95.7	95.9	97.3	97.5	95.7	96.0	93.3	100.0
Fort Wayne, Ind	96.4	97.1	96.4	95.7	96.3	98.9	93.0	98.9	97.7	99.0	95.7	93.5	98.6	100.0
Fresno, Calif	96.8	96.4	98.5	96.1	99.2	97.9	94.4	95.1	97.2	97.9	94.7	94.8	100.0	98.8
Grand Island, Nebr	97.6	97.5	98.8	94.7	97.5	99.3	96.6	96.4	98.0	98.8	96.7	96.5	100.0	98.6
Grand Junction, Colo	94.6	96.3	93.9	94.4	96.5	96.2	91.2	95.7	94.9	97.7	93.4	95.5	97.8	96.3
Hines, Ill	87.6	89.4	85.9	87.0	87.2	87.9	85.8	87.4	89.1	91.3	85.9	89.0	87.1	90.4
Hot Springs, S. Dak	98.8	97.2	97.5	96.5	100.0	98.2	97.4	94.7	99.4	100.0	98.1	94.2	100.0	100.0
Houston, Tex	9.03	94.6	83.9	92.0	89.8	94.1	89.1	91.8	95.4	97.8	87.5	92.9	91.0	94.7
Huntington, W. Va	93.4	92.8	86.9	91.8	96.1	95.1	92.1	92.5	96.8	95.9	90.9	86.9	93.5	87.5
Indianapolis, Ind	95.9	92.1	94.7	86.4	97.9	94.7	93.6	92.5	97.1	94.6	94.2	89.8	98.4	98.0
Iowa City, Iowa	95.8	96.6	92.7	96.5	97.2	98.7	94.6	95.5	98.2	97.2	93.3	95.5	98.7	100.0
Iron Mountain, Mich	96.3	96.7	95.6	95.5	97.4	98.2	94.4	96.7	96.9	97.8	94.8	95.1	98.6	100.0
Jackson, Miss	95.4	96.3	93.1	94.7	98.4	97.3	92.0	93.3	97.8	98.8	93.7	94.7	100.0	96.5
Kansas City, Mo	92.0	94.5	88.5	92.6	89.9	94.9	92.8	91.2	94.1	96.1	90.7	93.7	93.7	98.6
Kecoughtan, Va	96.8	94.6	96.7	92.9	98.2	95.2	97.2	93.9	96.5	94.1	95.7	94.0	97.8	97.7
Kerrville, Tex	96.3	94.8	93.9	93.2	96.6	97.8	95.4	94.1	98.5	94.6	94.2	94.6	97.6	98.6
Lake City, Fla	95.6	97.6	94.9	95.3	96.5	99.0	91.7	96.1	98.0	98.6	93.8	97.1	97.3	100.0
Lincoln, Nebr	97.0	96.2	95.8	92.9	98.9	99.3	95.1	98.3	97.9	96.4	95.5	93.9	100.0	100.0
Little Rock, Ark	96.2	96.5	93.8	93.6	98.8	98.9	95.3	96.0	97.7	98.1	93.6	94.8	96.9	100.0
Livermore, Calif	96.1	94.6	95.7	95.2	100.0	96.9	92.3	89.1	96.1	95.6	94.6	94.1	98.5	98.8
Long Beach, Calif	92.6	92.6	91.8	89.7	94.0	95.9	88.4	89.5	92.2	92.8	92.6	92.7	98.1	98.0
Los Angeles, Calif	92.6	81.2	92.1	85.2	93.8	90.8	86.4	71.6	95.6	84.0	90.3	78.3	100.0	92.3
Louisville, Ky	95.7	96.4	93.8	96.4	96.2	97.1	96.3	95.4	97.7	98.4	92.8	94.2	98.7	96.7
Madison, Wis	96.2	96.5	94.8	96.3	97.5	97.4	93.8	95.3	97.7	97.4	95.3	94.9	98.9	99.0
Manchester, N.H	96.8	96.8	97.3	99.2	98.6	96.8	93.6	93.6	92.2	97.9	94.7	95.2	100.0	98.4
Marion, Ill	97.1	95.1	95.9	91.1	98.9	99.9	97.3	93.1	97.5	95.2	96.0	94.6	98.5	95.8
Marlin, Tex	97.3	97.2	95.8	92.8	96.5	98.8	97.7	98.0	99.1	98.9	95.1	95.3	98.5	98.9
Martinez, Calif	96.3	94.9	94.1	96.2	97.8	96.2	91.9	88.0	97.7	97.0	96.7	93.1	99.0	98.6
Martinsburg, W.Va	95.9	97.0	92.8	92.1	100.0	98.8	96.6	97.2	98.1	99.3	92.8	95.8	98.1	100.0
Memphis, Tenn	97.0	96.4	97.3	93.3	98.4	98.0	95.6	97.9	96.9	97.1	95.8	94.8	100.0	98.4
Miles, Mont	97.9	98.2	99.4	98.8	100.0	100.0	95.9	97.7	98.0	97.4	96.0	98.8	100.0	100.0
Minneapolis, Minn	95.0	95.3	91.6	94.3	99.1	95.9	95.9	96.5	96.9	97.6	91.5	91.0	97.5	98.7
Montgomery, Ala	96.1	96.6	94.0	96.7	95.8	97.2	95.0	95.0	98.6	98.2	94.0	94.3	97.4	100.0
Mountain Home, Tenn	94.4	95.7	89.5	91.1	95.2	95.5	96.9	97.6	97.1	98.5	92.9	92.7	94.9	96.2
Muskogee, Okla	92.9	93.8	81.7	86.5	94.8	96.3	88.1	88.3	97.1	95.6	92.7	96.1	94.4	94.7
Nashville, Tenn	96.7	95.3	96.2	92.3	98.2	95.4	94.3	95.1	97.1	96.6	95.6	94.4	98.6	98.6
Newington, Conn	93.4	93.4	98.3	94.8	96.5	95.3	86.2	89.9	94.0	95.0	89.7	90.4	100.0	97.4
New Orleans, La	93.2	92.6	92.8	88.0	93.2	95.0	88.6	90.9	95.2	93.6	91.2	91.1	93.2	97.8
New York, N.Y	(3)	87.2	(3)	85.6	(3)	89.9	(3)	83.1	(3)	87.7	(3)	86.2	(3)	93.0
Oklahoma City, Okla	94.1	95.2	93.1	92.6	94.2	97.3	92.3	92.5	95.8	96.7	91.9	93.7	96.3	97.3
Omaha, Nebr	95.6	95.9	94.1	92.0	96.6	97.0	95.8	95.2	97.3	98.3	93.0	93.4	97.2	97.4
Oteen, N.C	95.3	95.4	96.0	93.0	97.6	98.3	93.8	93.5	95.8	97.0	93.6	93.9	98.6	99.0
Palo Alto, Calif	92.4	94.0	90.1	94.8	96.1	97.5	89.7	91.4	93.9	95.0	90.9	90.6	97.6	98.6
Philadelphia, Pa	97.0	96.0	96.7	94.2	98.5	93.8	93.4	96.5	97.5	98.1	96.8	94.9	100.0	100.0
Phoenix, Ariz	91.8	85.8	89.5	87.4	92.8	91.3	85.3	73.8	94.0	85.3	90.6	85.2	97.8	90.7
Pittsburgh, Pa	93.9	94.3	92.5	90.5	93.2	92.3	87.3	93.5	96.1	95.1	93.4	94.9	96.3	94.9
Poplar Bluff, Mo	95.7	95.6	89.9	86.3	97.5	96.4	96.2	97.6	96.9	98.6	95.3	95.3	97.3	94.9
Portland, Oreg	95.6	94.3	93.0	91.5	95.7	96.9	91.9	91.2	97.3	96.3	95.1	92.5	100.0	98.2
Providence, R.I	95.3	94.2	92.5	91.8	98.0	93.8	90.6	91.1	97.2	95.9	94.3	94.0	98.7	97.5
Reno, Nev	95.8	97.7	96.3	92.0	98.8	100.0	95.0	95.6	97.5	99.4	91.5	97.8	100.0	100.0
Richmond, Va	94.1	93.7	93.6	96.2	93.9	91.7	89.2	89.5	97.3	94.1	91.9	93.2	95.3	97.4
Saginaw, Mich	96.8	96.8	94.6	92.0	97.8	97.9	97.3	99.0	98.6	98.4	94.8	95.4	97.9	98.0
Salt Lake City, Utah	93.0	95.9	90.4	92.2	96.4	97.4	88.7	93.4	94.1	97.5	92.0	95.4	96.9	99.1

See footnotes at end of table.

Percent of favorable responses to VA hospital care received by combination groups, comparison between 1966 and 1967 surveys—Continued

General hospitals	All questions		Physician care		Nursing care		Dietetics		Housekeeping		Hospital management		General attitude	
	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966	1967	1966
San Fernando, Calif	95.9	94.2	94.3	91.7	97.8	97.3	95.3	90.4	98.0	97.5	92.8	90.9	100.0	97.7
San Francisco, Calif	89.1	94.0	88.0	96.2	90.2	96.6	89.6	92.3	87.5	93.6	88.5	91.8	97.4	96.6
San Juan, P.R	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Seattle, Wash	95.8	93.6	96.4	90.2	96.4	92.8	90.2	87.7	98.4	97.3	94.4	92.6	100.0	97.5
Shreveport, La	95.9	93.1	93.5	87.4	97.6	93.3	96.4	94.7	96.3	96.0	94.1	91.2	97.6	97.1
Sioux Falls, S. Dak	96.2	96.8	90.5	94.0	98.0	99.1	97.7	96.1	97.3	98.6	95.8	94.5	98.7	100.0
Spokane, Wash	95.3	95.3	97.2	90.5	95.7	97.8	95.3	93.4	96.3	96.8	92.2	94.4	97.1	96.7
St. Louis, Mo	93.3	91.6	89.9	89.5	94.3	91.5	93.1	90.9	94.5	93.5	91.7	89.8	96.3	98.7
Syracuse, N.Y	94.2	93.3	93.3	92.7	96.6	95.8	91.4	89.8	96.4	93.0	92.3	93.8	97.3	97.8
Temple, Tex	93.2	96.7	94.1	93.9	96.3	97.2	88.9	94.8	93.0	98.9	92.0	96.1	96.3	98.4
Tucson, Ariz	95.1	95.7	96.2	95.8	94.5	97.3	94.2	90.7	94.7	96.6	94.3	94.7	98.4	100.0
Vancouver, Wash	95.8	95.3	96.5	93.8	99.7	97.5	93.2	95.5	96.5	94.6	92.7	94.4	99.0	100.0
Wadsworth, Kans	95.7	97.2	92.2	97.0	97.9	100.0	94.2	96.2	98.1	97.3	93.5	95.1	95.7	100.0
Walla Walla, Wash	96.9	95.5	91.1	87.7	98.2	97.9	98.2	95.1	99.2	97.2	94.3	96.2	92.3	97.2
Washington, D.C	96.6	92.2	96.9	92.2	97.6	92.4	92.3	93.2	98.9	92.7	94.5	90.1	100.0	93.4
West Haven, Conn	93.8	93.4	94.7	93.7	95.1	92.5	89.8	89.4	96.5	96.7	89.7	90.9	100.0	97.9
West Roxbury, Mass	93.9	92.5	96.8	94.4	96.6	94.6	84.4	90.2	96.1	93.0	91.6	89.6	97.7	93.7
Whipple, Ariz	97.1	95.0	95.3	91.5	96.3	97.0	98.4	96.5	98.1	95.4	95.7	93.5	97.9	98.2
White River Junction, Vt	96.5	96.7	97.0	95.5	97.5	99.4	95.8	94.0	96.2	97.7	95.1	95.9	100.0	98.8
Wichita, Kans	92.7	94.2	91.4	95.6	94.5	95.5	88.9	89.7	93.9	95.6	90.7	93.4	100.0	98.9
Wilkes-Barre, Pa	96.6	95.8	96.1	94.2	96.7	96.3	95.9	94.1	97.0	97.1	95.5	95.2	98.5	97.5
Wilmington, Del	95.4	96.7	93.0	95.2	96.8	96.7	93.0	95.0	97.4	97.3	94.1	96.7	98.6	98.4
Wood, Wis	95.9	92.4	96.2	87.1	97.7	94.1	90.3	91.5	98.0	94.5	94.1	89.9	100.0	96.2

[1] Did not report. A tuberculosis hospital in January 1966.

[2] Not open in January 1966.

[3] Number of veterans responding are too few for a valid percent.

OUR CURRENT TAX POLICIES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. KING] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to my colleagues in the Congress the remarks made by Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Tax Institute of New England, concerning current developments in tax policy. The text of the remarks are as follows:

CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS IN TAX POLICY

(Remarks by Hon. Stanley S. Surrey, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, before the Federal Tax Institute of New England, John Hancock Hall, Boston, Mass., April 29, 1967)

The topic of Current Developments in Tax Policy is best approached by placing present tax policies in the broader perspective of recent history and future prospects. In this way we can see how our current tax policies fit into a longer range program and a way of thinking about the uses of tax policy. For it is the attitude regarding the uses of tax policy that marks the main theme of tax policy in the present and preceding Administrations.

The main economic goal of these two Administrations has been the high level utilization of our real resources within a framework of reasonable price stability—that is, to achieve a growth in real Gross National Product that matches our potential, with unemployment pushed to as low a level as we can through appropriate fiscal and monetary policies, supplemented by special training and related programs. Also, it has been an important aim to maintain an appropriate balance of payments position, so that accomplishment of our domestic objectives will not be hindered by international financial concerns.

The consistent theme of tax policy through seven years has been to use tax policy in an affirmative manner to achieve this economic goal. It will be the consistent theme in the years ahead. The manner in which tax policy is so used—the substantive programs which reflect this use—has changed and necessarily will constantly change, as the economic conditions in which the goal is being pursued themselves change. For the goal is never won forever—there is no permanent trophy to be carried home for success in one year or three years. Instead, the coming of each New Year relentlessly challenges us to seek continued advancement toward our goal. We are involved in a perpetual obstacle race, with new obstacles constantly being introduced and old obstacles rearranged to appear different. Insights once obtained must constantly be re-examined and new insights sought if we are successfully to negotiate each new set of obstacles.

In the first years of this decade the main obstacles to be overcome were a growth rate lagging far behind our potential, a discouraging pattern of recessions followed by recoveries that quickly faltered into new recessions, and a consequent high unemployment rate. Tax policy in this setting was aimed at spurring investment, thereby generating a higher productive capacity and more jobs. The substantive tax program involved the adoption of an investment credit to correct a tax structure imbalance that appeared to hamper our obtaining the needed investment level. This credit was supplemented by administrative measures removing restrictive factors in the application of tax depreciation rules.

These 1962 measures were then followed by the massive tax reduction of the 1964 Act, designed to produce a strong consumer demand and the markets needed to encourage our producers to push their investment plans. The reduction in tax rates also acted to improve incentives to invest by strengthening the rate of return and cash flows.

This 1964 tax reduction was the first to recognize the power of our tax structure to generate such a strong revenue intake in periods of rising economic activity that the intake soon exerted a drag on that very activity and made continuous forward progress impossible. The 1964 tax reduction also freed us from the shackles of a rigid budget balance posture and enabled fiscal policy to provide a response that would reflect economic conditions rather than mathematically suit a figure resulting from the additions of many disparate items of expenditure and receipt in our budget. The need to strengthen consumer demand was again reflected in 1965 in the Excise Tax Act of that year, in which that need became the opportunity for a major reform of a crazy-quilt excise tax structure.

These programs met with success—a strong business expansion, rising incomes and profits, a falling unemployment rate, a GNP capable of sustaining broad social programs. But then in the latter part of 1965 the obstacles changed—the demands of the Vietnam conflict showed us once again that no economic forecasting is safe against the intrusion of external events we cannot control. A high pace of Government military expenditures demanded that a policy of fiscal stimulus be switched to a program of fiscal restraint, but without clear signs to chart the size or timing of that restraint.

Tax policy was therefore shifted from stimulus to restraint, which called for increasing revenue collections to dampen an inflationary potential. This need became the opportunity to achieve desirable improvements in our current collection procedures. The substantive programs of the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966 reflected this dual target—graduated withholding, a speed-up in the transition to current payment by corporations, and current payment of the self-employment Social Security tax. This was accompanied by administrative programs in both 1966 and this year speeding up the deposit of withheld taxes and excise taxes. And there is still room for further improvement, as reflected in the President's current recommendations regarding the corporate estimated tax.

As the year 1966 progressed, with a high level of economic activity insured through strong private investment, strong consumer demand and rising Governmental military expenditures, fiscal policy had to cope with emerging price instability and serious imbalances in the business expansion. Moreover, the tasks of fiscal policy were conjoined by the difficulties being experienced in charting the proper course for monetary policy. These obstacles culminated in September, 1966, in a threatening financial situation, as interest rates rose alarmingly, the money supply contracted, and business investment still proceeded at an unsustainable level.

Suspension of the investment credit was the tax policy response chosen, and another step in tax flexibility was taken. But it was taken with an awareness that the particular step was not without the problems of the two transitions in the step involved—the transition from allowance of the credit to suspension and the transition from suspension to restoration. This step was therefore accompanied by a frank recognition that only the usual events of last September—a serious financial situation, an unsustainable business investment boom, and wartime expenditures—would call for this particular response of tax flexibility. It was accompanied by strong expenditure tightening.

The immediate goals sought were obtained—the financial tension subsided, the investment pace began to be more manageable, and monetary policy could begin to ease and adjust the imbalances, as in housing, that had accompanied its tightening.

We thus come to the year 1967 and a new set of obstacles, even more challenging. The imbalances of 1966 are giving way to an economic advance that will show a more even front, as business investment moderates its prior pace and housing starts to catch up. This moderation in business investment signaled the end of the need for the suspension of the investment credit, perhaps a bit earlier than had been foreseen. The President accordingly recommended restoration of the credit, with this step thus completing the application of tax flexibility initiated last September. The differing views on the terms of the restoration underscore the belief expressed last year that only that combination of unique circumstances would call for this form of tax flexibility.

The economic radars that scanned the horizon in January forecast for the immediate months a pause in the economy, as the components of the advancing economic front regrouped and balanced their relationships. An important factor in this pause has been the downward adjustment in inventory accumulation. Other factors are the moderation in the growth in plant and equipment investment and the low level of housing activity which reflected the past period of tight money. Those radars that scanned further ahead forecast that the economic front would later gather momentum from a variety of sources—increased Social Security expenditures, the pace of Government expenditures, resumed strength in housing, the end of the inventory adjustment, and a pick-up in consumer spending. In the absence of tax action, the Federal budget would move more strongly into deficit and fiscal policy would become highly stimulative. Instability in the form of inflationary pressures would again threaten. It would be desirable to meet that obstacle through tax policy rather than through a resumption of monetary tightening lest we become locked into a level of high interest rates.

This forecast in January thus called for over-all tax restraint, in contrast to the specialized restraint in the business sector that was needed last September. The hearings and discussions of last year on the techniques of tax flexibility, notably before the Fiscal Policy Subcommittee of the Joint Economic Committee—hearings that had been urged by the Administration—indicated that the most appropriate application of tax flexibility for this purpose was a surcharge of individual and corporate income tax liabilities. The President in January recommended this course. For Budget and revenue estimating purposes a precise starting date was needed and July 1 was chosen. But tax flexibility and rational economic policy obviously do not always demand rigid adherence to dates based on prior economic forecasts. The task is to match policy as closely as possible to current forecasts as these forecasts sharpen and change—not to rigidly match action to a previously set timetable that was itself only a forecast based on earlier and therefore less reliable data.

The economic radars still indicate that in the months ahead the predicted momentum will gather. While the radars are still not equipped to pinpoint the exact month of change, this summer is still the governing forecast. The important point, however, is to recognize that as forecasts sharpen and more clearly foretell the change, we should not be misled by looking backwards or even around us at the figures that reflect the pause we are now moving through. Instead, we must concentrate on what is forecast for the period ahead. We must be willing to act on what that forecast implies, not because it is infallible but because it is far better than the unfounded assumption that the present condition will continue simply because it is the present. We can be willing to act on the forecast because the tax change that is being recommended—a temporary income tax surcharge—is an adjustment that after its adoption can be readily removed earlier than the targeted date for its termination if the economic radars then begin to forecast different and unexpected signals.

We must remember that the aim is not always to see that forecasts are borne out. Rather, it is to so alter economic conditions that forecasts of undesirable instability ahead, either of an inflationary nature or a downward trend, will not turn out that way and that the forecasted instability will instead be replaced by a more desirable economic situation. The surcharge thus rests on a forecast of too exuberant an economy in the latter part of the year and an intention to prevent that forecast from becoming actuality. The recommendation of the surcharge was a frank statement of Government opinion and policy—what it expects will happen without policy action and how it plans to solve the problem. If the problem starts to shape up differently, then of course a different solution will be called for—but as of now that is not what our current knowledge tells us.

The use of tax policy is thus at present an exercise in tax flexibility—as we attempt to keep our high level economy as close to optimum operating conditions as we can in the face of inevitable instabilities flowing from the Vietnam hostilities. Necessarily tax flexibility means tax change, to keep the economy on a proper course. Rigidity in tax policy is an impossible course—the Policy that brought success in one year can bring great difficulties the next year. We must seek tax adjustments responsive to predicated economic conditions, and attempt to structure them so that the change is accompanied by the least strain on taxpayers and tax administration in applying and accommodating to those changes. Change is necessary because rigidity is disaster, but change should not itself cause needless instabilities.

When Vietnam hostilities end, a new set of conditions will appear and the use of tax policy will in turn have a different content. A most likely use is that of tax reduction, as the revenue structure will presumably have to adapt to lower military expenditures. The nature of the adaptation—how much reduction, in what mix of temporary and permanent change, in what mix of rate change and structural alteration—necessarily must await the events that condition the tax response.

Let me turn now to another goal and another use of tax policy. Whatever the ever-changing character of the economic role of tax policy, we are always involved in the raising of revenues to pay for Government expenditures as well as to fulfill the revenue raising targets that the economic role sets. Tax policy is charged with the task of raising those revenues with fairness, with the least interference in the efficient utilization of our resources, and with the lowest possible level of difficulty in compliance and administration. It is this use of tax policy with which tax reform is concerned.

The achievement of this goal of tax policy is one of constant efforts at improvement—past decisions turn out to have been misguided or no longer sensible under changed circumstances; a new pattern of economic and social conditions forces tax thinking into new areas; new compliance techniques make certain steps feasible for the first time; perennially intractable problems may yield to new solutions; a better understanding is gained of the effects of taxation in a particular area. The needs for improvement are endless and the response must be continuous over many areas. This use of tax policy in this decade has proceeded steadily, through a variety of measures aimed at improving the tax structure—the Revenue Acts of 1962 and 1964, the Excise Act of 1965, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1966, the Foreign Investors Tax Act of 1966, the Federal Tax Lien Act of 1966. Along with these major legislative measures have been many major administrative measures in Regulations and rulings—consolidated returns, the international tax area, unrelated business income, for example—and many minor legislative measures.

But the effort must remain continuous. We are all aware of the many possible areas of inquiry. We will have different sets of priorities and different approaches and different emphases—but we are all seeking change in our tax structure rather than embalmment. The Treasury has often mentioned some of its current concerns—industrial revenue bonds, multiple corporations, private pension plans and foundations, to name a few. It has called attention to the fact that the estate and gift taxes represent the only part of our Federal tax structure that has remained unexamined by the Congress over a long period. The recent parallel studies by the Brookings Institution on the economic side and the American Law Institute on the legal side clearly indicate that there are promising paths to improvement of these taxes.

An area of reform now before the Congress concerns the President's recommendations for revision of the income tax treatment of the elderly. The existing income tax benefits extended to the elderly cost about $2.3 billion annually in tax revenues. The Administration's proposals for revision of these tax rules would not alter this revenue cost. The proposals aim only to redirect this relief, in a uniform manner, to benefit those elderly most in need of it and at the same time to simplify the structure of the tax rules applicable to the elderly. But these proposals appear to be surrounded by a fog of confusion and misrepresentation.

Some critics portray in detail the suggested elimination of the present $600 added exemption and the retirement income credit. But they do not mention the substitution under the proposals of a simple blanket special exemption of $2,300 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple where both are over age 65. Other critics state that Social Security benefits will be subject to tax, and add that this is unfair because the beneficiaries will have made payment of Social Security taxes before retirement. But they do not mention that the costs of those taxes will be taken into account through the blanket exemption, which in no event would be reduced below one-third of the benefits included in income. Nor do the critics point out that about two-thirds of the elderly now subject to income tax will receive a tax reduction under the proposals—almost all married couples below $11,600 and single persons below $5,800.

There are about 20 million persons over the age of 65. Of these, about 4 million now pay income tax or join in the filing of a return on which income tax is paid. The President's proposals will not change the tax-free status of the almost 16 million elderly who now pay no tax. Of the remaining group of elderly, about 2.8 million will have tax reductions. Thus, for the great majority of the elderly—over 18.5 million persons, more than 94 percent of the total—the recommendations will not change their position of being free of income tax burdens, or they will result in a tax reduction.

The tax liabilities for the remaining group of elderly will be increased and thereby brought more in line with the tax liabilities of those taxpayers under age 65 with similar amounts of income. This also has been criticized. But in criticizing the increases that are involved for the wealthier elderly, the critics do not indicate why a person with $20,000 or $50,000, or $100,000 of income, even though elderly, needs the special tax benefits that Congress granted because of the special financial problems associated with age. The financial problems of most of the elderly come down essentially—as do all financial problems—to a lack of income. But—where the income levels are in these higher ranges—there is no justification to apply a lower tax on a $20,000 or $50,000 income when received by a person over age 65 than when received by a person under that age. To keep the matter in perspective, an income of $20,000 a year is over twice the average family income in the United States. In addition, many of the needs that a younger family faces have already been met by the family over 65—the house and furniture are paid for, and the like.

Editorials and similar comment critical of the taxation of Social Security benefits may well have given those now receiving those benefits the impression that their well-being is threatened. But the real facts are completely the other way around. Under the proposed changes annual tax reductions of approximately $220 million dollars would go to the taxpaying elderly below $10,000, and the overwhelming number of Social Security recipients are below that level.

Nor do the real facts end here. The proposed special exemption ($2,300 for a single person and $4,000 for a married couple) take fully into account the present levels of Social Security benefits. But this does not mean that future Social Security benefit increases will automatically be taxed to all recipients. The regular income tax exemptions and deductions, which are allowable in addition to the special exemption, will together with the special exemption shelter from income tax payment future Social Security benefit increases for all who have only this source of funds and, indeed, for most other recipients.

For example, the maximum Social Security benefit payable to a married couple under present law is about $2,500 per year. This would rise to about $2,700 under the President's Social Security proposals. But this is not even half the amount of income necessary before any income tax would be due under the proposed changes, since the couple would not owe tax until their income exceeded $5,800 a year. In other words, for a married couple living only on Social Security benefits, the maximum benefit level would have to more than double before the income tax would become a factor. If they are now receiving average Social Security benefits (about $1,500 per year), their benefits would have to more than triple before they would owe any tax. Viewed in another way, it is only the addition of non-Social Security income tax that could cause a tax to occur and here the leeway is also significant. Even if Social Security benefits were to reach $3,000, there would still be a $2,800 leeway to absorb pension or other income before the recipients became taxpayers.

In sum, for the overwhelming number of Social Security recipients, the proposal will have no effect on their Social Security benefits or will actually result in a tax reduction. This will also be true well into the future. There are 14 million Social Security recipients. About 12.6 million are now free of income tax, and would remain so. Only about 1.4 million are taxpayers now. Half of these would receive tax reductions under the proposal. The rest—700,000 out of 14 million recipients—would have increases, but to do so they must have an income of over about $6,000 if single and about $12,000 if married. And for many these increases would be offset by the increases proposed in Social Security benefits.

It is therefore a pretty safe assumption—keeping in mind the kinds of people who are prone to be concerned about anything touching their Social Security benefits—that the letters any newspaper, any organization, or any Congressmen may be receiving from Social Security recipients who have become concerned by what they read or hear about these proposals can be answered simply and clearly: "If you are not paying an income tax today, you will still continue to be free of tax—if you are paying a tax, you will receive a tax reduction."

To continue with our discussion of general tax reform, the President in his Economic Report has stated that he will submit a tax reform message later this year. He has delineated several useful principles to apply at this time to tax reform proposals—they should be considered apart from significant rate changes or temporary tax increases or decreases, such as the six percent surcharge, and they should not occasion a significant net gain or loss in revenue. While the various components would thus involve revenue-raising or revenue-losing measures, over-all they would balance out with no significant net change.

We may, of course, as respects this use of tax policy, look ahead even beyond this reform message to notice that many significant policy areas will be under study, in Government and in private research. We must learn more about the relationship of the income tax system to those persons who lie outside that system, and this involves the interrelationships between our Social Security system, our welfare system and the proposals for negative income taxes and income guarantees. The President has stated he will appoint a Commission to study much of this ground. We must also make sure that the benefits of economic growth spread to all and that all may share in them, or the affluence we seek for our people will become social injustice. We must strive to protect against any unfairnesses that may result from the necessary uses of tax flexibility, the necessary adjustments in monetary policy, and the necessary reliance on macroeconomic measures. We must not allow our tax system and its uses for economic policy to be regarded as involving only sterile counters remote from the human beings whose lives they affect. The measures to accomplish all of this will not, of course, lie entirely within the tax system. But those who work with tax policy must aid in joining tax policy with other economic and social measures to achieve these desired objectives.

I have been considering the uses of tax policy. These uses, as you can see, are many and varied, and perhaps to some may even appear too ambitious or wide-ranging in what is sought to be accomplished. But let me hasten to assure you that they are indeed modest alongside the claims that some have made for the use of tax policy.

There are those who urge tax policy as the solution for almost all of our social ills and problems. If you object to polluted air or polluted water, then a tax incentive will clean it right up. If a college education appears too costly to a family, then a tax credit will open the college doors. If our business firms are not training enough workers, then a tax incentive will set them to improving worker skills. If private enterprise and city officials will not eradicate our slums, then a tax incentive will remove this urban blight. If businesses won't locate in depressed areas, then a tax incentive will show them the way. If electric companies will not place their transmission lines underground, then a tax incentive will turn the soil. If urban transportation is too slow and too antiquated, then a tax incentive will make it fast and attractive. Indeed, all you need to learn what is wrong with America is to read the tax bills in Congress—wherever you see a tax proposal, that is where the action is.

Now, as Assistant Secretary for Tax Policy, I am not at all sure why I should object to these suggestions that the tax system can cure all our problems. For clearly I could well become an economic czar were Congress to agree to this course. I, and my small staff, could control all our new social programs and the other Departments, such as Labor, HEW and HUD, would have so little to do they could be merged into one small Department and thereby simplify Government. All this almost seems to be how the world would look to a Treasury Department official on an LSD trip.

But I do not use LSD and I have the cautious feeling our social problems can not be so simple that a tax device—indeed the same tax device—will solve all of them. I suspect that there are better ways to clean our rivers and skies, to eradicate our urban ills, to give a college education to all who are qualified. Those ways will require loan guarantees, credit programs, direct subsidies and other Federal expenditure programs, and our facing up squarely to the costs involved.

A major appeal of the tax device is that it hides the budgetary cost and, of course, this appeal is strong from the standpoint of the private interests affected. But this should not deter us from the rational calculations and analyses which must be made to weigh the benefits of alternative expenditure programs. The sheer weight of the various demands being placed upon Government makes it urgent we obtain the utmost efficiency in the use of public funds, and that we fully recognize the amount of funds allocated to each demand. That efficiency and recognition cannot be obtained by hiding the costs in the intricacies of our tax system. Nor could that tax system survive the cumulative weakening of its strength and its fairness that would be involved in this massive use of tax incentives.

We must therefore be alert to the non-uses as well as the uses of tax policy. Nor is this sentry duty assigned solely to Government officials. Those who work daily with the tax system—those lawyers and accountants and scholars who know the strengths and the weaknesses of that system—must also stand their watch. For it is you who counsel daily with a far wider audience of businesses and individuals than the words of Washington can reach. Those businesses and individuals have a vital stake in how our tax system is shaped. Yours, then, is a vital role in explaining the issues surrounding tax policy, in clarifying the choices. No one can ask for blanket agreement and conformity on the choices to be made. But we can hope for an understanding of the concerns that must be weighed in reaching those choices. And it is to this task that your talents can bring accomplishment.

A YEAR TOWARD TOMORROW—VISTA

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, VISTA, as we know, stands for "Volunteers in Service to America." It is the volunteer corps within the Office of Economic Opportunity which serves our less fortunate Americans in their struggle against the misery of poverty.

I recently had the opportunity, together with other Members of the Congress and administration, to attend a showing of a VISTA recruitment film here in Washington. The film is called "A Year Toward Tomorrow"; it is not an ordinary film and will not soon be forgotten by those who see it. A well-deserved tribute was paid to this film by the Academy of Motion Picture Arts and Sciences. At their 39th annual academy awards ceremony they presented the coveted "Oscar" to Mr. Edmund A. Levy who directed the film for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Mr. Paul Newman, the actor, narrated this outstanding 28-minute production, generously donating his service to OEO for that purpose.

Mr. Speaker, "A Year Toward Tomorrow" tells realistically and in down-to-earth fashion a story of the struggle, heartbreak, and success that VISTA volunteers experience in their work with the Nation's poor.

One of the VISTA volunteers shown in the film is Eric Metzner, a Navy veteran, who joined VISTA for a year of work in Atlanta, Ga. Working with low-income families in a tenement section of the city, Eric met with frustration and failure as he began his effort to improve the living conditions in the community in which he now lived and worked. By earning the confidence and trust of his neighbors, however, Eric soon was able to assist with the organization of a tenant's association which, with his guidance, embarked upon a successful campaign of improving the surroundings of the neighborhood.

This VISTA film also describes the work that volunteers are doing on Indian reservations and the difficulties they have overcome in gaining acceptance among these first Americans. Two courageous young girls, from comfortable backgrounds, exchanged a life of relative ease for the difficult and demanding tasks of serving as VISTA volunteers among the Indian population. They met with initial failure and frustration, but with perseverance were able eventually to establish a kindergarten class for the children of the reservation and to bring to the Indian women new skills in cooking, sewing, and health care.

"A Year Toward Tomorrow" provides us a glimpse into the dedicated and compassionate work that VISTA volunteers are providing in the Nation's struggle against poverty. One of the fundamental reasons VISTA is successful in its part of the OEO campaign is well illustrated by this film: We are shown volunteers who serve while living and working among the poor. They become part of the community, accepting its challenges, understanding its needs, and participating fully in its efforts to secure community progress and self-respect.

Mr. Speaker, over 6,500 men and women of all ages and backgrounds have served and are serving in the VISTA program. In the OEO campaign for a fuller life for America's poor, "A Year Toward Tomorrow" traces the good work of three of these volunteers, but it illustrates the idealistic and common sense approach that is typical of all VISTA workers. This film is a masterful and moving documentary of the vital spirit of voluntary service that is an important part of our history. VISTA, as one of the important ways in which American volunteer service is being expressed today, deserves our congratulations and continued full support. Its work, as the film so well describes, is effective and inspiring.

WHOSE CREDIBILITY GAP?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished superintendent of the Pittsburgh schools, Dr. S. P. Marland, has recently telegraphed me the reasons for his strong opposition to the Quie amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Dr. Marland's telegram quite accurately points out that the Quie substitute will not provide general aid, but rather a general shell which will simply serve to conceal the aid it takes away from those who need it most. I think Dr. Marland's telegram shows that the Quie proposal does not provide general assistance for the problems of the schools, but merely offers a general anesthetic which will temporarily take our minds off the problem.

Under unanimous consent I place Dr. Marland's telegram at this point in my remarks:

> PITTSBURGH, PA.,
> *April 28, 1967.*
>
> Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND,
> *Rayburn House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> The proposed changes in the distribution of Federal funds for elementary and secondary education would critically damage big city Federal programs in education. Barely started over the past 18 months, categorical programs aimed squarely at the children of poverty have brought a beginning of hope to the poor and the minorities heavily populating the cities. The suggested partial removal of categorical restraints, and reversion of control and procedure to State authorities would defeat any chance of inner-city recovery, or of significant help for rural poverty. State systems of fund distribution historically and quite universally discriminate against cities. Notwithstanding the desirability of long term goals or general aid, the present level of funding even at full authorization, is insufficient to meet the essential costs of categorical compensatory education as per title I. Any effort toward general aid should be in addition to, repeat—in addition to, the present categorical support, not instead of. When Federal funds are available at some future date in quantities sufficient to justify noncategorical distribution, over and above present categorical needs, we would strongly encourage such aid.
>
> Urge you to give strong support to present ESEA program, funding title I at full authorization and spurn blandishments that speak seductively of general aid that indeed is not general aid, but a thin layering of token monies to be so widely diffused as to have little significance in American education. State formulaes for distribution vary so widely as to give no assurance that funds would be used where needed, or for innovation in increased services. Absorption of Federal funds by States to meet present mandated State support programs has occurred in the past and could recur. General aid and present level of funding would simply result in higher expenditures for the status quo.
>
> DR. S. P. MARLAND, Jr.,
> *Superintendent, Pittsburgh Public Schools.*

Our Republican friends have been asserting, with increasing shrillness lately, Mr. Speaker, that the President, the Office of Education, the Democratic members of the Education and Labor Committee, and the private school administrators have all been "misrepresenting," or, more charitably "misunderstanding" the Quie amendment. I hope they do not strain our credulity further by asserting that professional public educators, like Dr. Marland, whose interests are solely in the development of the best formula for Federal assistance in the pressing problem of education, "do not understand" what their own needs are.

While we are on the subject, Mr. Speaker, I was intrigued by a joint statement recently issued on the Quie substitutes by the gentleman from Minnesota and his leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD FORD]. The burden of this statement was to the effect that the supporters of the committee's bill are all twisting the facts. As an "example" of this, the statement contained the following remarkable paragraph:

> The President has falsely asserted that Republicans "trot out a new version" of their school aid substitute every day. The truth is we have made slight additions to calm the fears of private school leaders—groundless fears stirred up by the Administration through a scare campaign based on false statements.

Translating this into plain talk, our friends seem to have said that "we have not changed our bill, and when we did, it was only to meet the objections of private school leaders—but the objections were not based on facts, anyway, so we changed it anyway, but we did not have to, but." Now, whose credibility were you talking about, gentlemen?

FATAL IGNORANCE OF HO CHI MINH

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Pittsburgh Press recently ran an editorial entitled "Fatal Ignorance of Ho Chi Minh," which, I believe, deserves to be spread upon the record. The Press editorial, citing a speech by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], makes the point that Ho Chi Minh is on dangerous ground if he assumes that the existence of dissent in this country, and argument over the course of the war, means that the American people are on the verge of upsetting their country's course.

This country has always been hospitable to the free mind. We have always leaned over backward, as well we should, to let everyone have his say about whatever great endeavor the Nation was engaged in at the time. This has been a healthy exercise in the development of our Nation's greatest strength. I hope and trust, Mr. Speaker, that we continue our faith in the positive value of letting people say things most of us do not agree with.

But our national penchant for free speech has constantly confused and misled rulers of countries where they do not enjoy this right. Hitler never believed the American people could unite against him because all he could see was the loud argument between the "hawks" and "doves" of 1939 and 1940. Even after he had declared war on the United States, he made the fatal mistake of assuming that because we lacked the artificial "unity" of a dictatorship that we should not, therefore, fight with the unforced unity Americans showed from Kasserine Pass to the Elbe. If Ho Chi Minh is making this same mistake, he is due for the same surprise.

As the Press editorial states, "Americans don't like this war." Americans have never liked any war—a fact for which we should thank God daily. But free men, who have and need no one to tell them what to say or think or write, can win wars in spite of internal criticism, while followers of rigid ideologies, who remain deeply dedicated so long as their world remains in accord with their theories, find themselves confused and disheartened whenever the discontent of their own people finally finds expression. Freedom is the natural condition of man. Those who repress freedom, those who themselves feel a need to stamp out its manifestations, can never understand that a free country like ours can withstand all kinds of internal dissent without weakening in its resolve.

For the sake of the peace which we all seek, for the sake of the Vietnamese people, north and south, against whom Americans bear no grudge, someone should have a long talk with Ho Chi Minh and explain this to him. What may sound to Ho Chi Minh like a nation cracking under the tensions of war, is merely the customary sound of a noisy, independent, and free people, whose freedom is the measure of their strength. In the words of the editorial:

> Ho Chi Minh ignores this fact to his own peril.

The editorial follows:

Fatal Ignorance of Ho Chi Minh

> In his letter to President Johnson, North Vietnamese President Ho Chi Minh displayed his ignorance of the temper of this country.
>
> He wrote that his country's "cause" evoked sympathy and support from "broad sections of the American people."
>
> The facts are otherwise.
>
> Americans don't like this war. They gripe at the draft and the taxes. They weep for the dead and the wounded. They sorrow for the Vietnamese who are casualties of the conflict. They abhor the destruction of homes and fields and forests. They yearn for peace.
>
> But, being in the war, the vast majority of Americans are ready, willing and able to continue until there is victory or an honorable peace assuring the protection of the freedoms of South Vietnam, and putting an end to one more aggression.
>
> There is, of course, opposition to the President's policies. Some very loud-mouthed opposition.
>
> But what Ho and those like him ignore is that in total this opposition is small and in Congress relatively impotent.
>
> "There is no question whatsoever that they (the enemy) misinterpret the weight of the opposition to the Government's policy," Defense Secretary Robert McNamara lately told a House committee. Ho's letter makes that apparent.
>
> Rep. George Mahon, Texas Democrat, was speaking the real view of Americans when, before that same House committee, he said:
>
> "In my opinion, the American people generally feel more is involved than the independence of the people of South Vietnam. They feel they are engaged in a war and are making these sacrifices in money and blood in order to build the kind of world that will make the people of the U.S. more secure in their pursuit of freedom and happiness."
>
> Ho Chi Minh ignores this fact to his own peril.

PRIORITY OF FUNDS FOR THE EDUCATION OF LOW-INCOME CHILDREN

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, the need for rapidly improving the education of children at the lower end of the economic scale is so great that our first concern should be to allocate our resources so we can be certain that they are used in areas where there are large concentrations of such children. If we really believe this, then it certainly follows that the main test of a distribution formula should be the extent to which it meets this need.

So far, the only formula we have seen that makes a serious attempt to meet the test of putting money where the low-income children are is the one provided in title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Probably one of its most unique and useful characteristics is that it distributes the funds according to the relative concentration of such children—whether it be a northern city or a southern rural area.

Although useful for many purposes, distribution formulas based mainly on per capita income, as is the Quie substitute, cannot meet this test for the simple reason that they are based on averages and, consequently, do not take into account the fact that areas with the same per capita income can vary greatly in the concentration of low-income children. In this instance, the old axiom that many things can be hidden in averages certainly becomes an all-important point in assessing the utility of the Quie per capita income distribution scheme.

My conviction that the present title I formula is the best available for improving the education of our most disadvantaged children is not lessened by my awareness that we still have problems in this area. We know that it would be better to have more current census data and that we may need to make some adjustments in our distribution system. We are trying to solve such problems as soon as possible. However, I completely reject the notion that we should solve these problems by destroying the most effective tool we have ever had for channeling funds directly to areas where concentrations of disadvantaged children reside.

EXEMPTIONS FROM COMBAT ASSIGNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 9636, which I believe urgently meets the demands of compassion and human suffering, while recognizing the needs of our military forces in the field of combat. So often in my service as a Member of this august body, I have received letters requesting assistance in securing exemption for sons and fathers who are in combat zones in Vietnam, where already one son has been killed in action. While I view all war as tragic for the families whose loved ones are killed or maimed, even more tragic is the suffering of those who, having already lost a loved one, are yet being asked to sacrifice the life of another. This I believe is far more than the exigencies of the moment require in the interest of our national security. I have therefore proposed H.R. 9636 which will remove from the soldier himself the need to make a request for an exemption when a father, brother, or sister has already been killed in action or died in the line of duty while serving in the Armed Forces in a combat zone. After such a loss of an immediate family member, the surviving brothers, sisters, or father will be as a matter of regular course transferred out of the combat zone. The present rules and policy of the Defense Department already require that such a family member be relieved of combat duty for a period of 6 months. Thus his release is already part of the procedure recognized as proper by the Defense Department. No disruption of regular procedure would be required by my bill; however, the release would be permanent rather than temporary.

My bill, H.R. 9636, would also prevent the simultaneous assignment of more than one member of a family to a combat zone, except if the other member volunteers for such service. The current rules of the Department of Defense provide for such an exemption which applies only upon an affirmative request. My bill would remove the requirement of a formal request and in order for the second member to be assigned to a combat zone, he must volunteer.

I urge my colleagues in this House to consider H.R. 9636 carefully, and I hope after careful study and consideration that many of you will join me in urging its swift enactment into law.

VETERANS DISABILITY COMPENSATION BENEFITS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to advise the House of a bill, H.R. 9637, which I have introduced regarding the payment of veterans disability compensation benefits. It has come to my attention that in a number of instances veterans who have sustained service-connected injuries which are today compensable were under previous laws not eligible. The change in the law making a previously denied claim now compensable is not often brought to the immediate attention of the veteran. Where these changes in the law have been made, the Congress has placed the burden upon the veteran to make a timely reclaim. His compensation rights, however, do not vest until the date of the reapplication. Thus if he waited 5 years before refiling, he has through no fault of his own lost 5 years of compensation benefits. While I am thoroughly aware of the rule of law which says that ignorance of the law is never an excuse, I earnestly believe that in this instance the burden of loss upon the veteran is far too great. H.R. 9637 does not seek to benefit the veteran who has never sought his rights to compensation. It seeks only to help those who have acted in good faith upon their belief that their claims were compensable, but who were turned down, not because the disability was not service connected, but solely because the statute did not render authority to pay for other reasons. If this statutory requirement is later amended or modified, and a heretofore denied claim is now compensable for the sole reason that the law has been changed, then I feel that the veteran ought to be allowed to come in at any time thereafter and his claim ought to be payable to him beginning from the date of the change in the law. This is all that my bill, H.R. 9637, does.

I urge my colleagues to study this bill carefully, and in doing so I know that you will have to agree with me. Justice and equity require such legislation, given these special circumstances.

SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS IN DAY CARE CENTERS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers. My bill would provide funds for supplementing educational programs for preschool children who spend the day in child care centers, many of which now furnish primarily only custodial care. The enhancement, expansion, and enrichment of educational programs in these child centers is urgently needed to supplement what we have started in other Federal programs such as Headstart. Most of these preschool children being cared for in day care centers do not qualify for Federal programs currently in operation because their parents' income is greater than criteria established for these programs.

The Congress has recognized the needs of preschool youngsters; it endorsed the concept of early childhood education when it allowed funds for this purpose under the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. More and more we are being shown that the learning process begins earlier than at age 6, and that greater benefits for these preschool children must be provided.

We took cognizance of the younger child when we authorized funds for Operation Headstart under the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965. We are presently seeking expansion of these opportunities for some 3 million children in the preschool years whose family incomes are under $3,000. But we need to further extend this excellent effort to thousands of other children who need enrichment. These additional services can be readily provided them because they are already in attendance at these centers.

President Johnson recognized the importance of early childhood education when he called for increased day care services including training for new careers in child care and the establishment of parent-child centers in his message of February 8 to Congress on children and youth. A child's future is shaped by his early experiences and we must not overlook these young children already in centers. Provision must be made for more than physicial care; the 3- or 4-year-old needs and thirsts for expertly directed primary educational experiences to motivate and inspire his young mind.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that there is a tremendous need for funds so that these child care centers can upgrade, supplement, and increase the educational impact of their day care programs. At present there are day care facilities for about 310,000 pre-school-age children. In 1965, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, there were an estimated 7,334 licensed day care centers in the United States. According to March 1965 statistics released by the U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bureau, there were nearly 26 million working mothers in the United States. Two million of these mothers had children under 3 years of age; 1.7 million had children between 3 and 5. These children number 2 million under age 3; 2.5 million between 3 and 5 years of age. The number of working mothers has increased more than sixfold since 1940 and is expected to continue to rise. There were then 1.5 million mothers working and this has more than doubled since 1950, when 4.6 million mothers were working. These mothers represented almost two-fifths of all working women in March 1965, compared to a tenth in 1940 and a fourth in 1950.

The employment of mothers will also continue to rise. With respect to mothers of preschool children, for example, the Department of Labor has projected an increase of about 55 percent between 1960 and 1970 in the number of mothers 20 to 44 years of age who will work.

The fact that these statistics clearly show that the vast majority of children of preschool age cannot be reached immediately by this bill makes even more urgent the need for Congress, recognizing the importance of early education, to provide funds to supplement the educational services of existing centers now caring for 300,000 of these children, a figure which is expected to increase as more working mothers enter our labor force. Financial support by the Federal Government for these child centers will serve to encourage the States to wage an aggressive program to assure the children of working parents greater opportunity for the stimulus to learning these centers can provide. These child day care centers can be developed into centers of learning which will begin to provide important educational experiences for these children and which will have a vital influence upon their development.

My bill which is titled "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act" would authorize for fiscal year 1968 and each succeeding fiscal year, $300,000,000 to make grants available to the States. States participating in the program will designate a State agency broadly representative of these public and private child care centers and submit to the Commissioner of Education a State plan for participation. Priorities shall be given to centers with children in greatest need of such programs and which best demonstrate that they can achieve the objectives of this act, while still leaving maximum flexibility for the development of State plans and standards. These centers and groups to qualify must first be approved by State licensing agencies for safety and sanitary conditions and the projects they submit to the Commissioner must be approved by the designated State agency created under this act.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and to urge its enactment in the present session of Congress for the thousands of youngsters this bill will help.

The full text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 9720

A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Preschool Centers Supplementary Education Act."

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. The Congress recognizes the value of early childhood educational programs. Millions of pre-school-age children whose parents work have no opportunity for this kind of experience. Congress believes that these preschool education programs should be extended to the Nation's child care centers by providing supplementary education services.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Sec. 3. There is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each succeeding fiscal year, the sum of $300,000,000 to make grants under this Act.

ALLOCATIONS TO STATES

Sec. 4. From the sums appropriated for a fiscal year to make grants under this Act, each State shall be allocated an amount which bears the same ratio to the amount appropriated as the number of working mothers, in such State bears to the number of such mothers in all the States, as determined by the Secretary of Labor.

STATE COMMISSIONS AND PLANS

Sec. 5 Any State which wishes to participate in the grant program under this Act shall designate or establish for that purpose a State agency which is broadly representative of the public and private nonprofit day care and other child education groups, and submit to the Commissioner through such agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State commission") a State plan for such participation. The Commissioner shall approve any such plan which—

(1) provides that it will be administered by the State commission,

(2) sets forth, consistently with basic criteria prescribed by regulation pursuant to section 6, objective standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants and the amounts thereof,

(3) provides for approving and recommending to the Commissioner the day care centers which shall receive grants, and the amounts thereof, solely on the basis of such criteria, standards, and methods,

(4) provides for affording to every applicant for a grant an opportunity for a hearing before the State commission as to its action under paragraph (3) with respect to such applicant, and

(5) provides for the making of such reports, in such form, and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his functions under this Act.

BASIC CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING PRIORITIES

Sec. 6. As soon as practicable after the enactment of this Act, the Commissioner shall by regulation prescribe basic criteria to which provisions of State plans setting forth standards and methods for determining which day care centers shall receive grants, and the amount thereof, shall be subject. Such basic criteria shall be such as will (1) give a preference to day care centers where the Federal grant will provide the greatest educational and cultural enrichment to children most in need thereof, and (2) best tend to achieve the objectives of this Act while leaving opportunity for flexibility in the development of State plan standards and methods which will best accommodate the varied needs of the several States.

APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

Sec. 7. (a) Child day care centers which wish to obtain grants under this Act shall submit applications therefor at such times, in such manner, and containing such information as the Commissioner shall prescribe.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application for a grant under this Act if—

(1) the grant will be used only to provide supplementary educational services and education equipment for day care centers;

(2) the State or the political subdivision in which the day care center is located enforces standards for the operation of day care centers which give assurances satisfactory to the Commissioner that such centers will be operated in a manner which will not be unsafe, unsanitary, or otherwise detrimental to the children there, and the applicant meets such standards;

(3) the project has been approved and recommended by the appropriate State commission; and

(4) the State commission has certified to the Commissioner, in accordance with the State plan, that sufficient funds are available in the State's allotment to make the grant.

AMOUNT OF GRANT—PAYMENT

Sec. 8. Upon his approval of any application for a grant under this Act, the Commissioner shall reserve from the appropriate allotment the amount of such grant. The Commissioner shall pay such reserved amount in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, and with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

ADMINISTRATION OF STATE PLANS

Sec. 9. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this Act, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State commission submitting the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State commission administering a State plan approved under this Act, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with provisions of section 5, or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision, the Commissioner shall notify such State commission that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this Act until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

JUDICIAL REVIEW

Sec. 10. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 5 or with his final action under section 9(b), such State may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located. The summons and notice of appeal may be served at any place in the United States. The Commissioner shall forthwith certify and file in the court the transcript of the proceedings and the record on which he based his action.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the transcript and record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified finding of fact shall likewise be consluive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 11. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "supplementary educational services an education equipment" means services (and related equipment) which provide educational and cultural enrichment of the day care center's program, such as the services of art and music teachers, psychologists and other child development specialists, as well as the use of books and audio-visual material and equipment.

(2) The term "child day care center" means a public or private nonprofit agency, organization, or institution which provides, at one or more centralized locations, for the care, guidance, and supervision of children during the day if (A) the daily period of care, guidance, and supervision is at least eight hours for a majority of the children involved, and (B) a majority of the children involved are aged 3 to 5, inclusive.

(3) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

(4) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

FEDERAL CONTROL NOT AUTHORIZED

Sec. 12. No department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States shall, under authority of this Act, exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirements or conditions with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any educational institution.

COLLEGE DORMITORY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concern about the critical college housing situation which I believe requires the review and attention of the Congress lest our efforts to expand higher education opportunities will be a promise to young America which cannot be fulfilled, because of the lack of living accommodations on our college campuses.

In 1950, under the able leadership of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Congress authorized a Government program of direct loans at a 3-percent interest rate, with an annual authorization of $300 million for college dormitory construction. This assistance has enabled our Nation's institutions of higher learning to mount a program of dormitory construction since 1950 totaling $2.875 billion.

However, today, accelerated college enrollments over the past decade have expanded the need far beyond what can be loaned under present authority. The backlog of requests for college housing loans became so formidable, in fact, that the administration had to declare a moratorium on applications back in January of 1966, with $760 million worth of unfulfilled requests on hand. If the moratorium had not been declared and applications were still accepted, the backlog today might well be in excess of $2 billion.

While the Federal loan program has contributed to the financing of some 600,000 housing units since 1950, a survey report prepared for the American Council on Education last year projected a need for an additional 1.5 billion accommodations over the next decade, which with a conservative estimate of $5,000 per unit, will call for minimum expenditures of $10 billion in the decade ahead, for new college housing.

I am certain that many Members of Congress have had this problem brought to their attention during recent months, and it has become obvious that the present program, unless greatly expanded, will not suffice to provide more than a fraction of the accommodations as college admissions mount year after year.

This problem has reached staggering proportions in Hawaii. The University of Hawaii now has an enrollment of just under 15,000 students with only 1,200 dormitory accommodations available, 600 of which are assigned to East-West Center students, leaving only 600 rooms for the regular college enrollment. With an anticipated enrollment of 25,000 in the very near future, we are faced with a problem of great magnitude. Some 2,100 students applied for the 684 spaces currently available in the 1966–67 school year, and even with present plans for the immediate construction of an additional 1,140 rooms, by 1968 less than 10 percent of the university's student enrollment will have campus housing.

Many students live in Honolulu and can commute, but public transit is a problem on Oahu as in most other communities, and more importantly students miss out on a very significant facet of a well-rounded education if they are forced to leave the campus environment every day because there is no dormitory to house them. Too many of these young people have had to move into substandard off-campus housing, and the consequent dislocation of their lives cannot be doubted to have adverse effects on their academic progress. As in other institutions, we are faced with overcrowding of present facilities, and the practice of squeezing three or more students into quarters designed for two cannot be considered adequate to their needs.

In addition, we are in the early stages of an ambitious program of developing a community college system, and if these are to accommodate other than students in the immediate environs of the school, some housing will have to be planned. A new 4-year institution, Hawaii Loa College, expects to open its doors to its first freshman class this fall, and has had an application for Federal housing funds pending for more than a year now. And a recent study done by a New York consulting firm on future educational needs in Hawaii calls for yet another 4-year State college that would be capable of handling 5,000 undergraduates by 1975.

I have had this problem under consultation for some time now, and have met with officials of the University of Hawaii and mainland colleges, Department of Housing and Urban Development experts, and representatives of major educational associations in an attempt to work out a solution. The result was the introduction of my college housing bill, H.R. 8647, on April 17, 1967, which I ask my colleagues who share with me in this concern to cosponsor.

H.R. 8647 is designed to supplement the existing loan program and provide the needed housing at a cost within the reach of students and their families without imposing a serious burden on the Federal budget. It would be done through private financing, with the Government providing only that margin of assistance necessary to give colleges the benefit of the same 3-percent financing available under the existing loan program.

The approach in my bill is very simple:

The university would finance the housing by selling serial bonds to private investors at the market rate of interest.

Under a contract previously entered into, HUD would make an annual payment of the difference between the actual debt service and the debt service at a 3-percent interest rate. Before HUD could enter into any such contract it would have to obtain approval from the Appropriations Committee. The 3-percent direct loan authorization in existing law would remain available to be used in cases where the private market required an inordinately high interest rate, with discretion left to the Secretary to determine the dividing line.

Under H.R. 8647, $10 million would be made available to institutions for this interest subsidy for each of the next 2 fiscal years. The impact on the Federal budget in any year under the supplemental interest payment approach would be very small. For example, assuming an average private market interest rate of 5½ percent for public and private universities together, an annual supplement of less than $10 million would achieve the effect of 3-percent interest for $300 million of college housing financing.

I am pleased to note that the initial reaction of educators has been favorable to the principle embodied in my bill. The National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, termed my bill a constructive approach to the problem. I am also in receipt of a copy of the letter forwarded to the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee on housing by the Association of State Colleges and Universities, an organization comprised of 213 institutions of higher learning and seven statewide systems of State colleges in 41 States and Guam. In this letter the chairman of the association's legislative committee, President Earle T. Hawkins of Towson State College in Maryland, asks that "the Federal Government assist higher education in generating a capital funding source of at least $1 billion each year for the next 10 years for single and married student housing at an interest cost of not more than 3 percent and for debt terms of not more than 50 years." The letter, which was written on the same day that I introduced my bill, also called for an interest subsidy plan at a cost of no more than 3 percent to the institution, or an alternative program of capital grants that would have the effect of reducing the interest cost on construction of housing to at least a 3-percent level for the term of the debt.

I am further advised that the Investment Bankers Association of America has also gone on record in favor of programing Federal subsidies to higher education. The association points out that the Federal interest rate of 3 percent is more attractive than current private market rates, and thereby has created an artificial condition which hampers rather than encourages decisive solutions to the growing problem of providing sufficient college housing. This same association suggests direct Federal subsidies by three possible approaches, one of which is a direct reflection of the provisions of my bill, to wit, a variable interest grant to absorb interest costs over a prescribed rate. The Investment Bankers conclude that "maximum construction of new college academic buildings and dormitories depends upon utilizing the private market to its full potential, and then supplementing it when necessary with a Federal Government loan program."

This is precisely the approach I concluded would be the most feasible in the drafting of H.R. 8647.

I am pleased also to have the endorsement of my own University of Hawaii, which like other educational institutions is most concerned over the effect on its budget of a proposed Federal interest rate higher than the present 3 percent. The vice president for business affairs at the university, Mr. Richard Takasaki, terms my bill a "most practical approach for assisting students with this pressing problem." Mr. Takasaki endorses the use of private market financing with the Federal Government subsidizing interest costs in excess of 3 percent, and expressed to me the concern of the university over the President's proposal to increase the interest rate from 3 percent to somewhere in the neighborhood of 3⅝ percent.

I am encouraged by the initial reaction to believe that we do have with this legislation a feasible and workable plan whose early inception at such a minimal cost to the Government can do so much to relieve the present worsening situation in construction of new college housing accommodations. I sincerely hope that this Congress will see fit to give its careful consideration to H.R.8647 as a positive approach that will draw the approval of educators and the business community in unison, while meeting an overlooked need in making a well-rounded education available to the hundreds of thousands of students who will be swelling college enrollments in the years ahead.

EDUCATION PROFESSIONS DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my support for H.R. 6232, the Higher Education Amendments of 1967, presently the subject of hearings in the Special Subcommittee on Education and most particularly to express my interest in title V of the bill relating to the education professions development.

In this 90th Congress, I have again sponsored a bill, H.R. 3372, which will establish a national sabbatical leave program for elementary and secondary teachers. In the 89th Congress the identical bill (H.R. 10622) was reported out of our Committee on Education and

Labor, but did not reach the House floor for consideration.

I am pleased to see that H.R. 6232 is addressing itself to the questions of improving the quality of American education by providing programs of enrichment for our elementary and secondary teachers, which is the principal concern of my bill H.R. 3372.

While it is well known that our country faces a serious shortage of teachers, and that this bill seeks to respond to this question, I feel that it is equally important that we strengthen it by specifically recognizing the special needs of teachers who are already teaching and who have not had an opportunity to leave work for an extended year's study in their field of teaching or to develop further skills in another field in which they may have found new interests.

I heartily endorse section 532(b)(1) of H.R. 6232 which specifically refers to various subject matters such as history, civics, reading, international affairs, and the arts and humanities, in addition to education-type courses, as those which might be included in programs that institutions could provide for teachers who are presently in the specific teaching field. Paragraph (2) refers to guidance, remedial speech and reading, child development, and educational media as other areas of study for the teacher. Reference is also made in other paragraphs to special programs for teachers of preschool children, of disadvantaged children, of handicapped children, as well as programs for administrators and other school personnel.

H.R. 6232 authorizes the Commissioner to include in the terms of the grant or contract with the institution of higher education, State or local educational agency, or other agencies, payments to persons participating in these training programs of such stipends, including allowances for subsistence and other expenses for such persons and their dependents, as he may determine to be consistent with prevailing practices under other comparable Federal programs. This provision is absolutely necessary for the teacher to participate in these programs.

A recent study by the National Education Association showed that in urban districts selected for study only 19.4 percent offered their teachers sabbatical leaves with at least partial pay for professional study. The study also showed that the smaller the school district and the more limited its financial resources, the less likely it was that any provision for such a leave was available. The study also pointed out that only 4,229 teachers were on such leaves, averaging less than one teacher from the 4,697 school districts included in the study.

The complexity of our society and the rapid expansion of new knowledge and ideas are self-evident. Equally apparent is the fact that we are not helping our teachers keep up with the current explosion of concepts and ideas, if the vast majority are left to their own resources to maintain professional competence and expertise. We are penalizing our children if we do not provide our teachers with ample opportunities to return to institutions of higher learning without undue sacrifice to their families' well-being.

Summer institutes, inservice training programs, and other short-term programs, seminars, workshops and conferences are worthwhile but in my opinion cannot take the place of offering the teacher concentrated full-time academic study in his particular field of study or in a new area which is urgently needed in his school system. For this reason, I have asked the subcommittee to amend the language on page 61 of H.R. 6232 to make specific the authority that section 532 grants to teachers already in the system may be for yearlong academic programs at institutions of higher education.

While fully supporting the provisions of the bill which provide refresher courses, as well as the degree-program fellowships which are designed to attract qualified people into the teaching profession, I am most fearful that H.R. 6232 as drafted will not make possible the intensive study many of our nondegree teachers need to upgrade their qualifications. Nor will it allow such longer periods of study to experienced teachers. It cannot be assumed that these teachers are able to maintain professional competence only through attending evening institutes or summer courses.

Also in my bill H.R. 3372, I have made specific provision for yearlong study grants to teachers who are currently teaching but who do not have a baccalaureate degree. Current figures are not available; however, a 1955 report of the NEA showed that 34 percent of all elementary school teachers lacked a bachelor's degree and in 1960 a further study revealed that 25 percent of the elementary teachers had less than 4 years of undergraduate teacher preparation. In recognition of this problem I have urged the Education Subcommittee to write specific language in H.R. 6232 to provide special programs which will accelerate the completion of the basic academic studies necessary to bring these teachers' professional requirements up to standard. Such a move is as necessary as attracting new students into teaching careers.

No matter how vigorously we work to achieve equal educational opportunity for our children, each class is only as good as its teacher. The Federal Government needs to make a firm commitment to our teachers by providing them with greater ease and access to the available knowledge and education in our universities. Finally I urge the provision of adequate funds for implementing these programs; this would be the surest guarantee of the highest quality education for our elementary and secondary school children.

Mr. Speaker, the following is a list of organizations and individuals who have written in support of my bill H.R. 3372, and also a list of the Members of Congress to date who have cosponsored my bill H.R. 3372:

ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 3372

ORGANIZATIONS

American Federation of Teachers.
California Teachers Association.
Everett Federation of Teachers (Massachusetts).
Hawaii Education Association.
Hawaii State Board of Education.
Illinois Federation of Teachers.
International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers.
International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America.
Kauai Education Association (Hawaii).
Labor's Non-Partisan League.
Lanai Education Association (Hawaii).
Maine Teachers Association.
Minnesota Federation of Teachers.
National Education Association of the United States.
Nebraska State Education Association.
New Jersey Education Association.
North Dakota Education Association.
Ohio Education Association, Association of Classroom Teachers.
Oregon Education Association.
Overseas Education Association, Inc.
Rhode Island Federation of Teachers.
Texas State Teachers Association.
United Automobile Workers of America.
Washington Education Association.
Wisconsin Education Association.

INDIVIDUALS

Mr. Mark Cockrill, Maunaolu College, Maui, Hawaii.
Mr. Eugene C. Edgerly, Heidelberg American School.
Mr. Don B. Goodloe, The Washington Teachers' Union.
Mr. Don Kenyon, Covina High School, California.

U.S. REPRESENTATIVES

Hon. John H. Dent, identical bill introduced.
Hon. John G. Dow, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Ed Edmondson, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Don Edwards, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Donald M. Fraser.
Hon. Julia Butler Hansen.
Hon. Henry Helstoski, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Elmer Holland, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Hervey Machen, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Spark Matsunaga, identical bill introduced.
Hon. George P. Miller.
Hon. Robert N. C. Nix, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Joseph Resnick, identical bill introduced.
Hon. James Scheuer, identical bill introduced.
Hon. Lionel Van Deerlin.
Hon. E. S. Johnny Walker, identical bill introduced.

I urge the Members of this body to join me in seeking the inclusion of this program in the higher education amendments now under consideration.

OIL SHALE AND MINERAL RULES AND REGULATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Burton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall announced a proposed set of rules and regulations by which he hopes to administer the development of oil shale and other minerals on federally owned land in the Western United States.

I rise at this time, Mr. Speaker, to urge the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw his proposed regulations until Congress has had further opportunity to study them more thoroughly.

It is estimated that the volume of oil in shale lands runs to 2,000 billion barrels—five times the world's known reserves in the United States. The oil is estimated to be worth $5,000 billion at current market prices, which comes to about $25,000 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

Since we are dealing here with the last great known reserve of oil and other natural resources still in the public domain, I believe we must be very careful to see that it is developed in such a manner as to assure the best use of the resources and the maximum possible return from them for public use.

Considering the primitive condition of the technology regarding the recovery of oil from shale, and particularly considering that 30 percent of the oil shale land already is in private ownership, I can see no need to rush.

It would be a tragic thing if this complicated situation were mishandled in such a way as to permit monopolization of this great untapped natural resource belonging to all the people of this Nation.

AMERICANIZATION DAY IN JERSEY CITY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great days in my native Jersey City, is the annual Americanization Day celebration which is sponsored by the Clinton E. Fisk Post, 132, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

This year I was invited to be the principal speaker at the 36th annual celebration which the Jersey Journal, a very outstanding newspaper and a reliable indicator of the public pulse in our community, described as the "greatest ever."

To observe this event, some very distinguished representatives of the Armed Forces honored our city with appropriate remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of all Members of this honorable body to the remarks made at the Americanization Day ceremonies which were held at Pershing Field, Jersey City, on Sunday, April 30, 1967, and I would like to express my eternal gratitude to the officers and members of this great veterans' group for their continuing support of this event and to the city fathers of the city of Jersey City who labored with the members of the Fisk Post to make this once again a great day for Jersey City.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include at this point in the Record the remarks made by Maj. Gen. John G. Cassidy, commanding general of the 78th Division, USAR, the grand marshal for the 36th annual Americanization Day parade, Brig. Gen. Edward B. Thorpe, New Jersey National Guard, and Capt. C. J. Schulz, USNR. The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF MAJ. GEN. JOHN G. CASSIDY, COMMANDING GENERAL, NEW JERSEY 78TH DIVISION (TRAINING), U.S. ARMY RESERVE, GRAND MARSHAL FOR THE 36TH ANNUAL JERSEY CITY AMERICANIZATION DAY PARADE, APRIL 30, 1967

"Our Country. In her intercourse with foreign nations may she always be right. But our Country, right or wrong."

I have been bestowed a great honor in being Grand Marshal for this 36th annual Jersey City Americanization Day Parade. It is one of the proudest moments of life.

As our Country is faced with so many problems in the world and in protecting innocent, defenseless peoples from Communist aggression, displays of loyalty and Americanism as witnessed here today most assuredly prove to the minority who dissent with the policies of President Johnson and our Country that our Country is right and that our President is right.

There can be no other way—But the American way and President Johnson's policies must be carried out if peace is to reign throughout the world. The war in Vietnam is a war all of us would rather not be involved with—But we are.

We are involved for good reason. We are in Vietnam to stop Communist aggression before it reaches the shores of the United States. We must hold the line somewhere.

Today we have an excellent opportunity for all of us to register emphatic support of President Johnson in the Vietnam war and complete contempt for those who would hamper the war effort and prolong the bloodshed.

The turnout of tremendous magnitude today will be an expression of utter condemnation of those with subnormal minds who would resort to such despicable acts as burning the American Flag and destroying their draft cards, and heaping abuse on official Washington. These same characters, a discredit to any nation, would be among the first, when involved in trying circumstances who would wrap around themselves the Constitution and "Old Glory" and cry for protection of their rights as citizens. Unmindful, however, are these lawbreakers, peaceniks, Vietniks to the precept that citizenship carries responsibility.

Today we will have an opportunity to imbue and rekindle in ourselves and our children—the so-called old fashioned way of patriotism, a burning devotion to the principles and ideals upon which our Country was founded.

It comes at a time when these very basics of American democracy are menaced by misguided groups who would desecrate the Flag and utter traitorous phrases against our President and a valiant, generous country's institutions.

Our prayer today is to keep the flag flying high, we can't wave it too much. Our hope is to find a way to reach the blackened hearts of the "niks" of all varieties without resorting to force and try to make them realize that in no country can they enjoy the privileges made available to them here. In no country outside the United States would their reprehensible acts be tolerated.

Organizations such as the V.F.W. and American Legion, encourage individual participations in programs such as will be conducted today and add a personal protest against the alien "isms" that are responsible for the present unrest and are threatening world peace. We must rededicate ourselves to the ideals of our forefathers conceived 191 years ago. Thank you.

REMARKS OF BRIG. GEN. EDWARD B. THORPE, NEW JERSEY ARMY NATIONAL GUARD AT THE THIRTY-SIXTH AMERICANIZATION DAY CELEBRATION, JERSEY CITY, N.J., APRIL 30, 1967

I wish to congratulate the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the citizens of Jersey City and Hudson County.

This annual program is most outstanding. I don't believe it is equaled anywhere in the U.S.A. In fact, it should be duplicated in every hamlet and city in the country.

I have come to the conclusion that there are too many people in this country who have forgotten the meaning of loyalty. Several events have taken place recently that prompt me to make this statement.

First, the disclosure by "Ramparts Magazine" that our Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) was assisting clean-cut students to attend international student conferences. The purpose of this assistance was to send these clean-cut Americans abroad to improve our posture . . . to let the world know that the majority of our students were not long-haired Lotharios. They were not sent to these conferences as agents of the CIA.

Then a couple of weeks ago we saw these bathless-bearded, Communists and fellow travelers burn draft cards and the United States flag. In my opinion, each and every one of the participants in the march and the speakers are treading on seditious ground.

I was raised and taught to respect, love and understand that the U.S.A. is the greatest country ever founded. Stephen Decatur said "My country, may she always be in the right: but our country, right or wrong." I say "Our President, right or wrong, is always right when dealing with foreign powers in the time of war.

I compare the position of President Johnson with that of General Washington. He was surrounded by the enemy in red coats and the Tories in civilian dress. He always had to be on his guard: During the Campaign of 1777 one night he had to give the order, "Place only Americans on guard tonight." At Brandywine, Germantown, Chester and in and around Philadelphia the loyalists, the Tories and their fellow travelers were so numerous he couldn't rely on the Intelligence passed on to him because of the loyalists and the fellow travelers who were masquerading as patriots. He had his problems with the Congress, too. They delayed authorizing him 150 lbs that he urgently required for maintaining his Intelligence system.

Today, our President has a war on his hands—the Communists and their fellow travelers have organized a spy and sabotage system that is giving comfort to the enemy.

The bathless, bearded ones and a few misguided clergy are attempting to undermine every decent and patriotic principle thousands of men have died for. We can't permit these unpatriotic individuals to sabotage our President, our country, and comfort the enemy.

To the young folk, and there are many of you present, I want you to remember the rights and privileges you enjoy haven't been acquired on a silver platter. They have been earned by sweat and blood. This freedom is only temporary and it has to be earned and protected from generation to generation.

In Vietnam, we are not fighting an unorganized group of starved peasants, using bows, arrows and slingshots that these flag and draft card burners would like you to believe. The Vietcong are using weapons equal to those used by our ground forces, and they have the advantage of using guerrilla warfare tactics in the jungle. In the cities they are using modern explosives to sabotage public and private property and kill innocent citizens. They also have in their possession the most sophisticated weapons of our time. These weapons are supplied by the Soviet bloc nations, including Soviet Russia and Red China.

Our pilots state that the flak around the V.C. industrial and railroad installations is greater than anything they encountered during World War II. They are also using 140mm missiles against our airports and troops. This weapon is produced in the Soviet Union and shipped to N. Vietnam.

I quote part of an article that appeared in the Chicago Tribune. This is a statement of Nicolai Lenin. Quote: "On basis of my observations gathered during my years of exile: The cultured class of the capitalist countries of Western Europe and America and the idealistic bourgeoisie should be regarded as deafmutes and treated accordingly. They will grant us credits which will fill the coffers of the Communist organizations in their countries while they enlarge and improve our armament industry by supplying all kinds of wares, which we shall need for future and successful attacks against our suppliers."

If Kosygin and his perverted constituents were sincere about peace and easing tensions, they could tear down the Berlin Wall and allow free passage between East and West Berlin. This would be a practical effort towards peace.

Don't forget, Khrushchev stated "he would bury us" and this is their ultimate objective.

I have faith and trust in our President Johnson; I have faith in the loyal Americans. After listening to Congressman Daniels, I am assured that our representatives in Congress have had about enough of this minor minority group of fellow travelers and their bearded patsies. I am further assured that the Congress will support our President and our men in uniform during the present crisis.

Thank you for your attention and wholesome acceptance of these remarks.

REMARKS FOR AMERICANIZATION DAY CEREMONY BY CAPT. C. J. SCHULZ, USNR

It is gratifying to see such a large and enthusiastic turnout for a patriotic event such as this. The Navy has always enjoyed the wonderful support given it by the people of Jersey City and it is pleased with the support it continues to receive during the present world crisis.

There are currently about 150,000 Navy men and Marines in and off Vietnam engaged in military operations ranging from the flying of sophisticated supersonic aircraft to sailing and searching wooden hulled junks—their design as ancient as Asia itself.

The ships, aircraft and men are conducting the most intensive air and combat operations in naval history. Many carrier pilots have flown more than 200 combat missions in this war, twice as many as most pilots flew in World War II. Navy-Marine Corps amphibious assaults from the sea, by helicoptor and landing craft along with combined United States and South Vietnamese counter insurgency operations are preventing men and material from reaching the Viet Cong by sea.

The problem of keeping 50 combat ships operating and 500 aircraft flying is considerable. The Navy directed military sea transportation service is engaged in a massive sea-lift operation carrying men and supplies to Vietnam—over 98% of all supplies going to Vietnam are carried by ships over the longest supply route of any war in history. Primitive harbors have had to be made into efficient modern ports.

The Navy in Vietnam is not just men fighting enemy forces, it is also Navy men and Marines building homes for orphans and helping children. It is doctors treating civilians and teaching medical students. It is Seabees teaching new methods and new tools. Navy men are helping the South Vietnamese help themselves toward a better life.

These men are working 16- to 18-hour days without complaint. General Westmoreland said just a few days ago that certain so-called peace demonstrations in the U.S. are undoubtedly the cause of loss of life among the valiant men of all services in southeast Asia. We in the Navy like to think that a patriotic demonstration such as this, may in the long run shorten this war and save lives of our fighting men.

On behalf of all Navy men and especially of the thousands of present and former Navy men from Jersey City, I want to convey our appreciation for your support. The freedom that the world seeks has a tremendous cost. It is pleasing to us to know that the people of Jersey City know that freedom is not free.

JUDICIAL CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Speaker, during October 1966, there was created a permanent Judicial Conference of the Americas composed of the Chief Justices of the Western Hemisphere nations and at the same time there was adopted a Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas. The Judicial Conference is a nonprofit international organization with permanent headquarters in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Its creation grew out from a combined regional meeting of the American Bar Association and the biennial conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in San Juan, P.R., May 22–29, 1966. More than 800 lawyers and judges from 19 nations, including 500 from the United States, attended the meeting.

The purpose of the Judicial Conference of the Americas is to strengthen the independence of the judiciary, sponsor forums, conduct research, provide consultations on problems related to the administration of justice, improve judicial procedures, and stimulate the adoption and implementation of standards that dignify the judicial function.

The Judicial Conference aims to provide the means of informational exchange between the member countries to enhance the judicial function and to establish judicial schools and sponsor the exchange of magistrates and jurists in furtherance of the principles sanctioned in the Declaration of San Juan.

The Declaration of San Juan calls upon all governments in this hemisphere to recognize the independence of the judiciary as essential to "the very existence of any society that respects the rule of law."

The recent trip of President Lyndon B. Johnson to Punta del Este, which gave additional impetus to the efforts to integrate South America economically, makes this an opportune time to call the attention of our colleagues to the "Charter of San Juan." Because for economic integration to be a success, it will also be necessary for the South American countries to unify their judicial rules. The "Charter of San Juan" is a significant step in this direction.

The meeting of the American Bar Association and the holding of the biennial conference of the Inter-American Bar Association in San Juan last May, the establishment of the permanent Judicial Conference of the Americas, and the adoption of the "Charter of San Juan" is further evidence of Puerto Rico's role as an essential link between North and South America. This link which has heretofore proved valuable for economic and political communication now takes on a new meaning with the judicial function.

The "Charter of San Juan" follows:

We, the undersigned, assembled in plenary session of the Second Judicial Conference of the Americas in the city of San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico, hereby adopt the following Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas.

First: A nonprofit association named Judicial Conference of the Americas, Incorporated, is hereby created with a permanent nature and for an indefinite time, pursuant to legislation of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and which in its international relations shall be known as Judicial Conference of the Americas.

Second: Its headquarters shall be in the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, with the main office temporarily located at 19 Betances Street, Hato Rey, San Juan; and Mr. Luis Negrón Fernández is hereby designated, for purposes of its registration, provisional representative or agent in charge thereof, who shall later be substituted as the Board of Directors may determine through resolution of the Conference itself.

Third: The Conference shall meet in San Juan, Puerto Rico, every two years, and shall hold sessions with the absolute majority of its members, but it may meet in any other country and at such other time as the Conference itself may decide by two-thirds of the votes of the members present.

Fourth: It shall promote, execute and carry out the following objectives or purposes:

1. To sponsor forums, studies, research and consultations among the members of the judiciary of the countries of the Continent on problems related to the Administration of Justice, so as to strengthen its independence as an indispensable requirement for the prevalence of the Rule of Law; to improve and simplify all administrative and judicial procedures; and to stimulate the adoption and application of standards that dignify the judicial function.

2. To provide means of information to bring within the reach of the members of the judiciary of the Continent, texts, jurisprudence, studies, and research in the fields of law, judicial administration and court operation, and advise them of the achievements and measures adopted in different countries, within their respective systems, aimed at enhancing the judicial function.

3. To develop an educational program through the establishment of Judicial Schools and sponsor the exchange of magistrates and jurists of the different countries, with a view to the coalescence of the principles sanctioned in the *Declaration of San Juan*, which is attached herewith as part of this Constitutive Charter.

Fifth: The members of the Judicial Conference of the Americas shall be: (1) the chief justices of the Supreme Courts of Justice of the countries which were represented in the First Judicial Conference of the Americas, held in San Juan, Puerto Rico, from the twenty-fourth to the twenty-sixth of May, nineteen hundred and sixty-five, and in this second conference; (2) the signers of the Declaration of San Juan and of this document, as long as they form part of their respective courts.

The chief justices of the Supreme Courts of Justice of other countries in America may be members of the Judicial Conference of the Americas when the Conference so decides in a plenary session, by two-thirds of the votes of the members present. The Chief Justices of the Supreme Courts who are members of the Conference may delegate their representation to another magistrate of their own court.

Sixth: The signers of the Declaration of San Juan and of this Constitutive Charter who cease to be members of their respective courts shall continue belonging to this association on an Adviser-Member capacity.

Seventh: This corporation shall not have the power to issue capital stock.

Eight: The names and addresses of the incorporators are:

Hon. Pacificio Ledezma, Sucre, Bolivia.

Hon. Osvaldo Illanes Benitez, Santiago, Chile.

Hon. Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Bogotá, Colombia.

Hon. Evelio Ramirez Chavarri, San José, Costa Rica.

Hon. José Vicente Vilanova, San Salvador, El Salvador.

Hon. Fabio Murillo Díaz, Tegucigalpa, Honduras.

Hon. Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Managua, Nicaragua.

Hon. Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Panama City, Panamá.

Hon. Luis Martinez Miltos Asunción, Paraguay.

Hon. Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Lima, Jeru.

Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Hon. Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic.

Hon. Hamlet Reyes, Montevideo, Uruguay.

Hon. José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Caracas, Venezuela.

Ninth: The Judicial Conference of the Americans shall have a Board of Directors composed of a president, a vice-president, a secretary, and a treasurer, which Board, for its first term of office, is elected unanimously as follows:

Hon. Luis Negrón Fernández, President.

Hon. Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Vice President.

Hon. José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Secretary.

Hon. Manuel A. Diaz Escala, Treasurer.

The Board shall adopt its resolutions by a majority of its members.

The Board shall have, furthermore, an assistant secretary and an assistant treasurer, having been unanimously elected as such the Hon. José Vicente Vilanova, assistant secretary, and Hon. Evelio Ramírez, assistant treasurer, who shall act as substitutes for the secretary and treasurer whenever these can not attend a meeting.

The members of the Board of Directors shall hold office for a term of two years and until their succesors are elected and qualify.

Given in San Juan Bautista de Puerto Rico, this twenty-eighth day of October, nineteen hundred and sixty-six.

Pacifico Ledezma, Dean of the Supreme Court of Justice of Bolivia.

Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Chile.

Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Colombia.

Evelio Ramírez, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Costa Rica.

José Vicente Vilanova, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of El Salvador.

Fabio Murillo Díaz, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Honduras.

Salvador Mayorga Orosco, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Nicaragua.

Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Panama.

Luis Martínez Miltos, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of Paraguay.

Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Dean of the Supreme Court of Justice of Peru.

Luis Negrón Fernández, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Puerto Rico.

Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Justice of the Dominican Republic.

Hamlet Reyes, Minister of the Supreme Court of Justice of Uruguay.

José G. Sarmiento Núñez, Magistrate of the Supreme Court of Justice of Venezuela.

JURAT

We, the Justices Pacífico Ledezma, Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Evelio Ramírez, José Vicente Vilanova, Fabio Murillo Díaz, Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Manuel A. Díaz Escala, Luis Martínez Miltos, Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Luis Negrón Fernández, Manuel R. Ruiz Tejada, Hamlet Reyes and José G. Sarmiento Núñez, being duly sworn, hereby depose: that we are of full age, married, except the one named above in third order, all lawyers, and residents, respectively, of Sucre, Bolivia; Santiago, Chile; Bogotá, Colombia; San José, Costa Rica; San Salvador, El Salvador; Tegucigalpa, Honduras; Managua, Nicaragua; Panama City, Panamá; Asunción, Paraguay; Lima, Perú; San Juan, Puerto Rico; Santo Domingo, Dominican Republic; Montevideo, Uruguay, and Caracas, Venezuela, being the subscribing incorporators of the preceding Constitutive Charter of the Judicial Conference of the Americas, ratifying our agreement with the same and acknowledging the truth of the facts herein stated, all of which are of our own and personal knowledge.

AFFIDAVIT NUMBER 8729

Subscribed and sworn to before me by Justices Pacifio Ledezma, Osvaldo Illanes Benítez, Samuel Barrientos Restrepo, Evelio Ramírez, José Vicente Vilanova, Fabio Murillo Díaz, Salvador Mayorga Orozco, Manuel A. Diaz Escala, Luis Martínez Miltos, Alfredo Maguiña Suero, Luis Negrón Fernández, Manuel R. Riuz Tejada, Hamlet Reyes and José G. Sarmiento Núñez, of the personal circumstances above stated, all of whom I personally know, this twenty-eighth day of October, nineteen hundred and sixty-six, in San Juan de Puerto Rico. I attest.

FELIX OCHOTECO,
Notary.

POLISH CLUB OF WASHINGTON, D.C., PRESENTS POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY PROGRAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the Polish Club of Washington, D.C., Group 848 of the Polish National Alliance, presented a program commemorating the signing of the Polish Constitution in 1791 at the Franciscan Monastery in Washington, D.C. I wish to hereby submit excerpts of remarks made in my address commemorating this great event inaugurating this great milestone in Poland's long fight for freedom and self-government. The program was under the chairmanship of Tadeusz Drweski, president of the Polish Club of Washington.

SPEECH OF CONGRESSMAN MADDEN

Mr. Chairman, I am, indeed, glad to participate in the ceremonies today commemorating the historic Constitution of the Polish nation which was signed in 1791 and inaugurated the beginning of what was then thought to be liberty, freedom and self-government for the people of Poland. The world did not know at that time that Poland would, in a short time, again be enslaved by powerful neighbor nations. During the intervening years up to the present day, the people of Poland have consistently fought for freedom and self-government. Over the generations the desire for liberty and freedom has never diminished in the minds and the hearts of Polish people whether they are living in the mother country or in other lands throughout the world.

Older people in the audience vividly remember the days after World War I when Woodrow Wilson was making his fight for the League of Nations. At that time Poland, for the first time in generations, was again given a free government and national identity. To my mind one of the darkest periods of world history was the unfortunate opposition and successful fight made by opponents of Wilson's League of Nations in the United States Senate during the early 1920's. When our nation refused to join other nations of the world in this great effort to insure world peace, many suspected then the League of Nations would fail. Had the Number One nation, the United States, participated, there is no doubt in my mind that the League of Nations would have succeeded to outlaw future international wars.

We must remember that in those days the international communist conspiracy had not been organized and the communist threat was merely in the minds of a few world insurrectionists and fanatics. Had we joined the League of Nations, Hitler, Mussolini and and Japanese war lords could not have constructed the gigantic war machines over the years during the late 20's and 1930's. This great opportunity for future world peace was destroyed by reason of party politics in the election of 1920. The Congress elected in that year rejected participation in an organization to protect the future peace of the world.

Poland again received independence and self-government after World War I and in the twenty years of the Polish Republic great progress in government organization was accomplished. No nation in the history of the world succeeded in such a short time in establishing national educational, industrial, financial programs, transportation, highways, and all the modern improvements and progress which many older nations had not established. The aggression of the Soviets and Hitler destroyed again the hopes of a free Polish nation in World War II.

The history of Poland is the history of a heroic people, a people who peacefully welded together into a nation singularly united in language and customs, an area stretching from the Baltic Sea in the north, across the verdant plains, to the Black Sea in the south.

The first Poles arrived in America at Jamestown in 1608. Polish generals were heroes of our own Revolution. Almost 900,000 Polish-Americans served in our Armed Forces in World War II.

And so it has gone, down through the centuries—in Poland or in the new homelands to which they went seeking refuge and freedom, the Polish people have never lost that indomitable spirit that has enabled them to give so much to human achievement.

The Polish Constitution, 176 years old May 3, 1967, is not merely a document in history's archives. It is a vital symbol of assurance that one day Poland will again stand in full freedom and independence. Here in this nation where we so fully reap the blessings of freedom, we must ever be prepared to support freedom.

It is in fitting discharge of that sacred responsibility that we dedicate this celebration of Polish Constitution Day to the abiding faith of the Polish people in the ultimate freedom of man.

THE VIETNAM WEEK DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, the House Committee on Un-American Activities issued a 55-page report on the "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week"—April 8 to 15, 1967. The timeliness of this report is indisputable in that it informed the Members of Congress and the American people, a full 2 weeks in advance, of the now notorious April 15 demonstrations in New York and San Francisco.

The committee, which I have the honor to chair, had been monitoring the development of these demonstrations for several months, and the report, carefully compiled and thoroughly documented, proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that Communists were the prime movers behind them.

Today, as a followup to that report, I would like to bring to the attention of the House certain significant facts about the Vietnam Week demonstrations.

The first thing I would like to point out is that both Radio Hanoi and Radio Moscow publicized the April 15 demonstrations for days before they took place. In addition, organizers of Vietnam Week sent a telegram to the Communist Premier of North Vietnam, telling him of their plans to organize a "massive drive of the American people" in opposition to the U.S. Government's effort to halt his aggression against South Vietnam.

Pham Van Dong, the Communist Premier of North Vietnam, in his reply to the telegram, thanked the organizers of Vietnam Week for the "valuable support" they were giving to his country.

No one in this House, I am sure, and no one in this country will be surprised by this.

The Committee on Un-American Activities stated in its report that the global Communist propaganda apparatus would capitalize in every way possible on Vietnam Week and the April 15 demonstrations. It further stated that they would give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere, particularly in Vietnam, and that among non-Communists throughout the world, it would tend to create the false impression that a truly large segment of the American people oppose the war in Vietnam.

Communist Premier Pham Van Dong's telegram is partial evidence of the accuracy of this prediction. Its accuracy has also been corroborated by Radio Moscow, Radio Peking, Radio Hanoi, and the official propaganda agencies of other Communist capitals.

They filled the air waves with accounts, most of them highly exaggerated, of the April 15 demonstrations. Here are just a few examples:

Radio Hanoi:

> The stirring demonstrations on 15 April showed the high indignation of broad masses of the American people at the wide differences between the words and deeds of Johnson . . .

Padding the attendance figures by a few hundred thousand, Hanoi continued:

> 500,000 Americans of all walks of life held high portraits of Ho Chi Minh and flags of the NFLSV . . .

It is important to note that these broadcasts were in English and can be easily picked up by our troops in Vietnam.

Hanoi went on:

> Like a thunderbolt, the demonstrations once again exposed the unjust, barbarous, and inhuman character of the U.S. war of aggression in Vietnam, smashing the peace-negotiation fraud and all other intrigues of the Johnson clique against the American people and other peoples of the world . . .

Moscow Radio claimed it was "impossible to estimate precisely" the number of those who took part in the "historic" New York demonstration, but that "perhaps as many as a half a million" marched "for an end to the dirty war in Vietnam."

It is interesting to note that demonstrations against the U.S. role in Vietnam were also staged in other major cities of the world on the same day. They were, however, pitifully small. Police in Mexico City quickly broke up a small demonstration of a dozen antiwar agitators about a block from the U.S. Embassy. Only about 100 demonstrators turned out in Paris, carrying a statue of Thomas Paine and banners demanding U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam. In Amsterdam, only 700 agitators could be induced to demonstrate. Demonstrators in London lunged at Prime Minister Harold Wilson and denounced him as a puppet of the United States. Eight of them were jailed. Thirty London marchers tramped around the U.S. Embassy and shouted "Hands off Vietnam." Five thousand gathered in Vancouver, British Columbia, to hear the United States berated. In Tokyo, about 500 members of the Japanese "Peace for Vietnam Committee" marched through the Ginza area carrying signs demanding that the war be brought to an end.

Communist propagandists grossly exaggerated the number of persons who took part in all these demonstrations. Hanoi Radio reported, for example, that April 15 would go down in history as a day "of seething struggle of millions of people in the world against Johnson's war in Vietnam."

If your arithmetic is the same as mine, however, total worldwide participation in the April 15th anti-Vietnam war demonstrations was only about 200,000 people. This fact alone should give us all cause to do some thinking.

Is world opinion really against American policy in Vietnam as much as the Communists—and some of our ultraliberal brethren—would have us believe? Apparently not. In fact, if the April 15 demonstrations are any criteria at all, just the opposite would appear to be true; namely, that the overwhelming majority of peoples throughout the world somehow see the situation in Vietnam as it truly exists.

Now, in contrast to the Communist propaganda claims, what are the facts about the April 15 demonstrations in this country?

We might as well face the truth that the Communists succeeded in one of their aims—that of staging the largest demonstrations that have ever been held in this country against the war in Vietnam.

The other side of the coin, however, is that they failed miserably in another respect. Their original plan and hope was to turn out 1,000,000 demonstrators—500,000 in New York City and the same number in San Francisco.

THE NEW YORK DEMONSTRATION

The Communist Party has claimed that more than a half million people took part in the New York demonstration. The Spring Mobilization Committee, the technical sponsor of the affair, has claimed that 300,000 to 400,000 persons paraded in New York and that there were 125,000 people in the United Nations Plaza rally which climaxed the march.

Dr. Martin Luther King, the featured speaker at the rally, has claimed that he spoke to 100,000 to 125,000 persons who were crowded into the U.N. Plaza and that 300,000 to 400,000 people turned out for the New York demonstration.

But the truth about the attendance at the New York demonstration is a far cry from these figures.

Mathematical computations made by the New York City Police Department, prove that it was a physical impossibility for more than 29,000 people to have been in the U.N. Plaza at the time of the rally. Official police estimates indicate that only 100,000 to 125,000 took part in the New York march.

Considering the fact that the New York metropolitan area alone has a population of almost 11,000,000, and the fact that demonstrators were imported for the New York rally from major population areas as far west as Minneapolis, the turnout was exceedingly small.

Communists of all varieties were prominent in the demonstration, although they by no means comprised a majority of the participants.

A contingent of the Moscow-controlled Communist Party, USA, marched openly behind a large red and white banner with the name of the party emblazoned on it. It was led by party boss Gus Hall, and included many top officials of Moscow's fifth column in the United States. The party has since gloated over the fact that it was able to demonstrate openly for the first time since 1949.

New York District Chairman Gil Green led the delegation in singing the traditional Communist revolutionary song, the "Internationale."

Hours before the parade started, the Communist Party had set up a table at the assembly point in Central Park for the purpose of distributing literature, including 20,000 copies of its official newspaper, The Worker. This issue of The

Worker, published just before the New York rally, gave complete information on assembly points for the march and the order of the march—so that every party member would know just where to go.

The Communist Party has issued a statement proclaiming "a sense of pride and joy" in the demonstrations and claiming that, through them:

> A great deal has been gained. . . . The opposition to the war . . . is more vocal than ever.

Gus Hall has boasted that the New York and San Francisco demonstrations were mass actions that had "few precedents in the history of the world progressive movement," and that they comprised "a qualitative leap" in the U.S. peace movement.

The Communist Party's youth group, the W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America, also marched openly in the demonstration. Its units carried signs with slogans spelling out the party line. One read "Youth Unite—Resist the Draft."

The Socialist Workers Party—SWP—the Trotskyist Communist organization, also had a literature table set up at the parade assembly point in Central Park. The SWP claims that it had a "full gamut of radical literature" available for the demonstration and distributed most of it free; also, that it sold over 5,000 copies of its newspaper, the Militant, and about 1,200 copies of Young Socialist, the magazine of its youth section, the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA.

SWP contingents in the parade included delegations from Chicago, Cleveland, New York, Detroit, Boston, Philadelphia, and Minneapolis. Young Socialist Alliance contingents represented YSA chapters in Chicago, New York, Atlanta, Washington, D.C., Boston, and Minneapolis, and also various colleges and universities including Antioch College, University of Wisconsin, Queens College, Columbia University, and the University of Pennsylvania.

Other Communist groups which participated in the demonstration in New York were the Spartacist League—a Trotskyist offshoot—Youth Against War and Fascism, and the ultrarevolutionary Progressive Labor Party.

A group called the Ad Hoc Committee for a Revolutionary Contingent also took an active interest in the demonstration by stating that its members would be "marching in support of national liberation movements throughout the world." A leaflet distributed by the group openly called for the support of a Communist "victory" in Vietnam. Listed among those who endorsed this new organization were M. S. Arnoni, Maxwell Geismar, John Gerassi, Allen Krebs, Conrad Lynn, Russell Stetler, Paul Sweezy, Walter D. Teague III, the Spartacist League—New York District—Students for a Democratic Society—Free School of New York Chapter—and the U.S. Committee To Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam.

The U.S. Committee To Aid the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam built a 30-foot cardboard tower in Central Park on which its members attached flags of the Communist Vietcong. Vietcong flags were displayed throughout the parade and demonstration.

The Black United Action Front which had distributed flyers promoting the April 15 march in New York, also took part in it. This flyer referred to President Johnson and Secretary of Defense McNamara as "murderers."

"Wake up black people," the flyer urged and asked in reference to Watts and Vietnam, "What the hell are we doing there?" The Black United Action Front, formerly known as BAND—Blacks Against Negative Dying—is composed of elements of the Progressive Labor Party, the Socialist Workers Party, and black nationalist groups.

An interesting sidelight occurred on the day before the New York demonstration. Michael Laski, embittered Communist revolutionary and national secretary of the Communist Party, U.S.A.—Marxist-Leninist—stated in a press interview that the "revisionist Communist Party in connection with the Socialist Workers Party control and dominate this particular protest."

Laski's militant organization is ideologically opposed to the Communist Party, USA and the Socialist Workers Party because it feels that the CPUSA and the SWP are not true Marxist revolutionary organizations.

The Spring Mobilization Committee distributed a list of official slogans for use in making signs for the parade and rally. The Communist Party expressed pleasure that "more militant" slogans were not banned, as they had been in some past demonstrations.

Some of the approved slogans: "Stop the Bombing," "End the Draft—Let Young Men Live," "Children Are Not Born To Burn," "No Vietnamese Ever Called Me Nigger," "Free the Fort Hood Three," "Cease Fire Now—Negotiate With the NLF."

Many groups and individuals, ignoring the approval slogans, marched with placards bearing far more militant and extremist declarations, including "L.B.J.: The Penalty for Murder is Death," "L.B.J.: Go to Hell," "Pale Face President Speaks With Forked Tongue," "Hell No, We Won't Go," "Hey, L.B.J., How Many Kids Did You Kill Today?" Other slogans used were too obscene to repeat.

As has been widely reported in the press and commented on at length here on the floor of the House, an American flag was burned in Central Park by some of the demonstrators. Draft cards were also burned. Swastikas were placed over a reproduction of the American flag.

Speakers at the U.N. Plaza rally in New York City were:

Fritz Weaver, actor, who served as master of ceremonies.

Dr. Benjamin Spock, cochairman, National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.

Rt. Rev. Msgr. Charles Owen Rice, pastor, Holy Rosary Parish, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Mad Bear Anderson, American Indian.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., president, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Floyd McKissick, national director, Congress of Racial Equality.

Stokely Carmichael, chairman, Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

Nick Egleson, president, Students for a Democratic Society.

Dave Dellinger, editor, Liberation magazine.

William F. Pepper, executive director, National Conference for New Politics.

Prof. Howard Zinn, professor of government, Boston University.

Cleveland Robinson, secretary-treasurer, Retail, Wholesale, and Department Store Workers Union, District 65, AFL–CIO; president, Negro American Labor Council.

Mrs. Dagmar Wilson, founder, Women Strike for Peace.

Rabbi Michael Robinson, New York City, chairman of the Jewish Peace Fellowship.

Linus Pauling.

Rev. James Bevel, national director, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Entertainment was provided by Pete Seeger, an identified member of the Communist Party, and also by folksingers Tom Paxton, Phil Ochs, Peter Paul and Mary, and the Freedom Singers.

A former official of the progressive Labor Party, Phillip Abbott Luce, witnessed the April 15 demonstration in New York and has written a detailed description of the event which he states was openly controlled by the Communists. Luce said in part:

> The marchers themselves were an odd lot. Communists, ultra-leftists, left liberals, sincere pacifists and hippies dominated the street. With that many people it was naturally impossible to note all the Communists, but I did see such people as Levi Laub, Jeff Gordon and Rick Rhoads from Progressive Labor. Laub was pushing a baby carriage full of copies of "Challenge," the P.L. newspaper . . . The protestors met in Central Park's Sheep Meadow before they were led down the parade route by the Communist Judas goats. Most of the demonstrators looked like characters out of the "Three Penny Opera" . . .

THE SAN FRANCISCO DEMONSTRATION

The "mobilization" of the Vietnam war protesters in San Francisco was an even greater failure than the New York demonstration, from the viewpoint of the number and the kind of people who took part in it. As previously indicated, the aim of the organizers was a turnout of 500,000 people. They were to pour into the San Francisco area from all States west of the Mississippi River.

Actually, only about 23,000 persons took part in the San Francisco march and only about 60,000 assembled in the city's Kezar Stadium for what was ballyhooed in advance to be a mammoth turnout of American citizens protesting against their Government. The marchers represented less than one-twentieth of those expected to attend the demonstration and, though they came from States all over the West, represented less than one five-hundredths of the population of Metropolitan San Francisco.

It is significant, too, that to get the above number of demonstrators, they had to rely heavily on the west coast beatnik element and the tambourine and bongo drum-playing "hippies" from San

Francisco's Haight-Ashbury district, the home of the so-called love generation.

Steve Murdock, columnist for the Communist Party's west coast newspaper, the People's World, had to confess after the demonstration that—

> The people connected with the mobilization who threw around loose and enormous figures about the number of participants did their cause no service.

The slogans on the placards carried by the San Francisco marchers and those who took part in the rally made it clear that this was not an assembly of genuine, conscientious pacifists inspired by love of their fellow man. One sign read: "Where is Oswald now that we need him?" Another in an obvious reference to the vicious and disgraceful play, "MacBird," read: "Who killed Kennedy?"

Still another promoted the same theme as a placard in the New York demonstration which I have mentioned. A black Nazi swastika was superimposed on a cardboard replica of the American flag. The theme that the United States is a Nazi-like country has long been promoted by the Communist Party.

Stokely Carmichael, the radical leader of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, sent a telegram which was read to the gathering at the Kezar Stadium. In it, he accused the United States of genocide in Vietnam.

Miss Kipp Dawson, Trotskyist director of the West Coast Spring Mobilization Committee, referred in her speech to "one section of American youth who aren't with us in the stadium today."

> They are—

She added—

> the American youth who have been drafted to fight in Vietnam.

She then told her audience—

> But because they are not with us today, we cannot assume—and indeed we must not assume—that they are against us.

She claimed that the men "who have to fight this war in Vietnam are getting sick of it."

I doubt that even her listeners believed these words. Just a few days ago, here in this House, General Westmoreland, who is certainly far more deserving of belief, informed the Congress and the Nation that the "gallant American fighting men in Vietnam understand the conflict and their complex roles as fighters and builders." Further, he added, "They believe in what they are doing."

Statistics recently released on the number of defectors from the Vietcong suggest, I would say, that if anyone fighting the war in Vietnam is getting sick of it, it is the Communist Vietcong, rather than our own troops. Eleven thousand Vietcong defected in 1965, 20,000 in 1966, and in the first 3 months of 1967 alone, nearly 11,000 more.

Miss Dawson, making use of a shopworn Communist slogan, referred to the U.S. effort in Vietnam as a "dirty war."

I agree with her. It is a dirty war, but not in the way she implied.

The Communist Vietcong, in a veritable reign of terror, have, as General Westmoreland pointed out, killed or kidnapped 53,000 teachers, clergymen, civil servants, and elected officials in South Vietnam during the last decade. They have, in addition, inflicted unspeakable atrocities on thousands upon thousands of the South Vietnamese people, including women and children.

Yes; it is a dirty war in Vietnam, but we can be proud of the fact that the dirt is not on our hands or those of our fighting men. The dirt, the filth, and the blood are on the hands of the Communists there—and it rubs off on the hands of all those in this country who demonstrate to aid those Communists.

Speakers who addressed the Kezar Stadium rally included:

Edward Keating, publisher of Ramparts magazine, rally chairman and west coast chairman, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Julian Bond, Georgia legislator.

Robert Vaughn, TV actor.

Paul Schrade, western regional director, United Automobile Workers, AFL–CIO.

Robert Scheer, managing editor, Ramparts magazine.

Mrs. Martin Luther King, Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

Rabbi Abraham Feinberg of Toronto, who recently made a trip to North Vietnam.

Eldridge Cleaver, Bay Area chairman, organization of Afro-American Unity.

Kipp Dawson, west coast executive director, Spring Mobilization Committee.

Elijah Turner, "peace" candidate for city council in Oakland, Calif.

David Harris, recent student body president, Stanford University.

Gerald Hill, president, California Democratic Council.

Mrs. Grace Nora Newman, sister of Dennis Mora—one of "Fort Hood Three" GI's who refused to fight in Vietnam—also a recent traveler to North Vietnam.

Charles Duarte, president, Local 6, International Longshoremens' and Warehousemens' Union.

John Burton, California State assemblyman.

Willie Brown, California State assemblyman.

Rev. Robert McAfee Brown, theologian, Stanford University.

Folksingers Judy Collins and Melvina Reynolds, an identified Communist Party member, provided entertainment.

STUDENT VIETNAM WEEK ACTIVITIES

When I revealed last January 28 that the Communists, through Vietnam Week, were instituting a crash program to sabotage U.S. policy in Vietnam and were going to rely heavily on American students for assistance, I expressed the conviction that, despite the Communists' efforts, the overwhelming majority of students in this country would demonstrate the good sense and loyalty they have consistently demonstrated in the past and would refuse to be taken in by the cynical manipulators of the Vietnam Week operation.

I am glad to say that I was correct in my judgment. It was originally hoped that one of the features of Vietnam Week would be a nationwide student strike against the war in Vietnam. That project had to be scuttled. It was then hoped by the Communists that they would at least be able to call student strikes on a half dozen or so key university campuses.

Actually, throughout all of Vietnam Week, there was not a student strike at a single college or university. Moreover, the whole student-campus aspect of Vietnam Week was an even greater flop than the New York and San Francisco demonstrations. Few of the student and campus activities originally conceived actually took place and of those that did, student support for them was negligible.

In conclusion, I would make the following observations about Vietnam Week.

Basically, it was a failure because it fell far short of the number of persons the Communist organizers had hoped to induce to demonstrate against our Government.

At the same time, it was a disturbing indication of the number of Communists, pro-Communists, and fellow travelers in this country and the extent to which they can induce significant numbers of Americans to do their will. There is reason for pause when Communist elements, whose operations have been revealed in advance, can still mobilize about 185,000 Americans for a demonstration that is designed to discredit this country and weaken one of the most important elements of its foreign policy.

The Communist effort, in Vietnam Week, to make the Vietnam war a racial issue was a failure. Despite the efforts of the Communists behind the operation, and the leadership and support of Martin Luther King and Mrs. King, Stokely Carmichael, Floyd McKissick, James Bevel, and others, Negro attendance—as was generally noted by the press—was proportionately very, very small; even negligible. Moreover, it was primarily composed of Black Nationalist and leftist elements who, today as always, represent a tiny minority of Negroes in this country.

It is my belief that the obvious lack of general Negro support for the Vietnam Week demonstrations raises serious questions about the alleged "leadership" of some of the persons I have named.

I am also convinced that the overall result of the Vietnam Week demonstrations has been a pro-American "backlash." The American people have never been impressed—they never will be—by Communists, fellow travelers, and a motley collection of unkempt hippies and beatniks, cowardly draft-card burners, treasonous flag burners, and the ilk that will unite with them.

The citizens of this country, regardless of race or nationality, have been revolted and disgusted by what took place during the Vietnam Week demonstrations, and by the misfits of our society who comprised the majority taking part in them.

The American people and peoples of the world have not been fooled. Secretary of State Dean Rusk himself has made a statement which, in conjunction with the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, has served to enlighten the American people about who is primarily responsible for these demonstrations. In response to a question about them, Mr. Rusk stated on the April 16 "Meet the Press" TV program:

> I have no doubt at all that the Communist apparatus is very busy indeed in these operations all over the world and in our own country, but I do not mean to say by that that all those who have objections to the war in Vietnam are Communists. But the worldwide Communist movement is working very hard on this.

General Westmoreland has referred bluntly to the "unpatriotic acts here at home" which are paid for with American lives in Vietnam. In his address to the Congress, his views corresponded with the finding of the Committee on Un-American Activities that these demonstrations give aid and comfort to Communists everywhere, particularly in Vietnam. He stated:

> But I am mindful that the military war in South Vietnam is, from the enemy's point of view, only part of a protracted and carefully coordinated attack, waged in the international arena. Regrettably, I see signs of enemy success in that world arena which he cannot match on the battlefield. He does not understand that American democracy is founded on debate, and he sees every protest as evidence of crumbling morale and diminishing resolve. Thus, discouraged by repeated military defeats but encouraged by what he believes to be popular opposition to our effort in Vietnam, he is determined to continue his aggression from the north. This, inevitably, will cost lives—American, Vietnamese, and those of our brave allies.

A BILL TO PERMIT OUR COUNTRY TO DEAL MORE INTELLIGENTLY WITH THE WORLDWIDE GROWTH OF POPULATION

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of years ago I suggested that if Mark Twain had the privileges of this floor it is probable he would say: "Population is something everybody does something about but nobody talks about." Today the population explosion is much more freely discussed and, hopefully, Congress will provide the leadership to increase our knowledge and concern with the consequences of overly rapid population growth.

Under our most recent rules, it is now possible for Members to join in cosponsorship of resolutions and bills. I am pleased that a number of my colleagues join with me in cosponsoring legislation to deal with the world population explosion. We thus join in the May 3 action taken by Senator Gruening and 13 of his senatorial colleagues who introduced S. 1676, commonly referred to as the "population bill." I commend to you the detailed statement of introductory remarks, the background material provided by the Bureau of the Budget, the bill itself and the long list of distinguished experts who have testified at the various hearings on this topic. All of this information is a part of Senator Gruening's statements in the Congressional Record of May 3.

On April 1, 1965, I had the privilege of being the initial sponsor of similar legislation in the House. Today, I am pleased that 10 of my colleagues have joined with me in cosponsorship.

BACKGROUND FACTS

It took the earth millions of years to acquire, by the time of Christ, a population of one-fourth billion. It took until 1830 for the world's population to reach 1 billion. But in only 100 years we passed the 2 billion mark. In less than 35 years the population reached 3 billion. And, incredibly, the fourth billion will be here in but 15 more years.

If present rates are unchecked, it will take only a 35-year span to add the next billion to our present 3 billion. And it will take less than 35 years after that for the 6 billion to double to 12 billion. An increase of 1 billion—due by 1980—is equal to the total present population of all of North and South America plus all 55 nations in Europe.

Each year the United States adds more than 3 million to its population, enough to fill six brandnew cities the size of Arizona's largest city, Phoenix. Providing the additional schools, streets, sewers, post offices, and all the other facilities needed by modern society is a heavy and expensive burden.

By the year 2000 the United States will increase its population from 198 million to 340 million. Of these, 100 million will be children who need schools, playgrounds, library facilities, and so forth. And 30 million will be "senior citizens" with medical care and other problems which become acute as years advance.

Population growth, like compound interest, is self-accelerating; that is, the more people there are the greater the population growth, even though the rate of growth remains the same. When you are talking about billions of people the results of doubling are staggering.

Men and women everywhere are awakening to the possibilities of a decent life and are insisting on improvements in their standard of living. Yet the population explosion threatens to wipe out most of the benefits of economic growth—and our foreign aid program—in the underdeveloped parts of the world. For example, a key democratic nation in Asia, attempting to rise by its bootstraps several years ago, successfully completed a 5-year program by increasing its economic output 12 percent. During this same period the population of this Nation increased 15 percent and the net living standards are now worse than before.

WHY A POPULATION EXPLOSION NOW?

What caused population growth to reach such startling rates in this era? The answer is found in two words: medical science. Humans are not suddenly more fertile; our reproduction potential has not changed. In any given year the increase or decrease in population is simply the number of births minus the number of deaths.

In North America and Western Europe birth and death rates have declined more or less proportionately. But medical science has upset this pattern in the underdeveloped parts of the world. It has caused a precipitous decline in the death rates while birth rates have remained constant. The result is galloping population growth.

Never before in history has it been possible to introduce an extensive program of death control so quickly in any given area of the world. Armed with miracle drugs, insecticides, and extensive knowledge of sanitation and nutrition, scientists almost overnight can drastically curtail the rate of dying. Just since World War II, for example, death rates have been reduced more than one-third in such places as India and Malaya. In Ceylon the spraying of DDT reduced the death rate by 40 percent within a single year.

Birth rates are higher in the underdeveloped areas of Latin America, Asia, and Africa—where two-thirds of all the world's people live. Where birth rates are high, there are high proportions of youth. As infant mortality has declined, family burdens have increased. And the children, when they become adults and parents, face the same prospect of endless toil just to acquire the barest of essentials.

POPULATION A NONPARTISAN ISSUE

While the wonders of medical science have brought on this problem, doctors are also concerned with its solution. We are now within sight of having, if indeed we do not already have, safe, reliable drugs and other medical means to make it possible for mankind, if it will, to regulate its growth. However, this is a matter for decision by individual citizens, community leaders, and people acting through their governments all over the world. Fortunately, the population problem is not a partisan political issue in this country.

Shortly before his death, President Kennedy said:

> We should know more and do more about the whole reproductive cycle, and this information should be available to the world.

Former President Eisenhower commented several years ago that—

> The time has come when we must take into account the effect of the population explosion on our mutual assistance system. Unless we do, it may smother the economic progress of many nations.

After his Asian tour of several years ago, Richard Nixon said he had observed poverty "worse than I have ever dreamed existed" and recommended that the United States give assistance to nations requesting help on population matters.

President Johnson, in his January 10, 1967, state of the Union address said:

> Next to the pursuit of peace, the really great challenge to the human family is the race between food supply and population increase. That race tonight is being lost. The time for rhetoric has clearly passed. The time for concerted action is here, and we must get on with the job.

This topic is, without doubt, one of those rare subjects upon which a great many leaders with widely differing political views wholeheartedly agree.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION

Central to any consideration of the population problem is the religious question, and particularly the position of the Roman Catholic Church on birth control. It should be noted, however, that the church does not condemn birth control, but is concerned with the methods of control.

A national survey of several years ago found that at least 30 percent of Catholic couples use birth control methods condemned by the church. And a heavy majority of those polled hoped that their church would change its attitude toward birth control. It should be remembered that of the 11 countries of the world with the lowest birth rates five are predominantly Catholic: Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, and Luxembourg.

Pope Paul VI, in his encyclical "Populorum Progresso," released on March 28 of this year, indicated that government has the right to concern itself with birth control and that, officially, the government has a legitimate interest in the field. In this action, the head of the Catholic Church has taken a most important step forward in helping meet the population problems of the world. This legislation is in the spirit of Pope Paul's recognition of government responsibility and is a genuine step in the evaluation of moral and scientific aspects of control.

IT IS TIME TO ACT

When 6 or 8 billion people are shoved into the already overcrowded cities and slums of this planet, breathing polluted air and fighting for an insufficient supply of land, water, and other natural resources, then wars, revolutions and global strife are inevitable. And even if through science we manage to provide enough basic essentials for everyone we would likely do so only by sacrificing improvement of society's institutions for the sake of providing bare minimums. I believe wholeheartedly that the problems of overpopulation on this planet can be solved. But the time to begin was yesterday.

Mr. Speaker, although there is wide agreement that something should be done about the worldwide population explosion, few have objective data or complete information on which to base decisions. This legislation will provide the mechanisms within the executive branch to obtain information, share ideas, and determine appropriate actions. Basically, this legislation seeks to establish channels of communication and areas of responsibility for demographic studies and action.

One of the bill's most important features is the provision for a White House Conference on Population to be held in January of 1968. Basic to the success of a White House conference are the results and suggestions stemming from State-level conferences prior to the national meeting. The legislation provides for grants to States to assist in planning and conducting State conferences on population prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations to the White House conference.

For the reasons cited, Mr. Speaker, I now join with my distinguished colleagues in introducing this legislation designed to permit our country to deal more intelligently with the worldwide growth of population.

AUTHORIZATION OF NAVAL NUCLEAR-POWERED WARSHIPS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the House is scheduled to consider the fiscal year 1968 Defense authorization bill tomorrow. I want to update my past reports to the Congress on the nuclear navy and I would like to again this year bring some facts concerning the authorization of nuclear propelled naval warships in the bill to the attention of my colleagues.

In my capacity as a member of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy I have delved deeply into the factors involved in the value of nuclear propulsion for warships. As you all know, the Joint Committee has studied and analyzed the question of nuclear propulsion for submarines and surface warships for many years. This intensive review was required before the committee could recommend to Congress the research and development effort necessary to build a nuclear Navy "second to none."

Throughout the years our reviews indicated the research and development work was justified and throughout the years the Congress agreed with the Joint Committee's recommendations and annually authorized funds for this purpose. Time has proven the value of our actions. The United States is preeminent in the technology of nuclear propulsion for warships. The utilization of nuclear propulsion in all of our new submarines has given this country an unequaled defense force. Unfortunately thus far we have not taken the same advantage of our position of technological leadership by utilizing nuclear propulsion in our new surface warships. The bill we are to consider tomorrow takes some important steps in respect to nuclear propulsion for surface warships. I would like to review some of the facts concerning this item so that they will be fresh in our minds when we consider the Defense authorization bill tomorrow.

The Defense authorization bill for fiscal year 1968 includes three nuclear attack submarines, and authorization for procurement of long leadtime items for one nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier requested by the Department of Defense. It also substitutes two nuclear-powered frigates in place of two nonnuclear-powered destroyers requested by the Department of Defense. Further, the authorization bill includes funds for performing the contract definition of a new class major fleet escort called the DXG; the Armed Services Committee report contains language which prohibits using any of these funds for the design of any major fleet escorts not powered with a naval nuclear propulsion plant—a step which I also endorse.

The aircraft carrier continues to be one of our prime naval attack weapons. It provides a movable platform from which to launch airplanes wherever they may be needed. It is a floating airbase complete with maintenance and repair facilities. It has proved to be a vital asset in support of our military activities in Vietnam. The tremendous problems and expense of building up land airbases in Vietnam continue to demonstrate the great advantages of the aircraft carrier concept.

However, to fully exploit the full potential of the carrier task group, everything possible must be done to minimize the logistic support required to sustain the ships in a combat environment. Elimination of the requirement for a continuous supply of propulsion fuel makes nuclear-powered ships valuable. This became abundantly clear to the members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy when we studied this problem in 1963 and prepared our report on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels. See the December 1963 Joint Committee report entitled "Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels."

The Department of Defense has finally come to realize this, in the case of aircraft carriers—after Congress repeatedly pointed it out. They still have not recognized this important truth in the case of ships built to escort nuclear carriers.

We must be able to operate attack carrier task forces anywhere on short notice. Nuclear propulsion in our naval striking forces will greatly enhance our capability to operate our carrier task forces throughout the oceans of the world—without the entangling logistic support problems created by conventional fuel requirements and free from the constant changes in the worldwide political climate.

Our one nuclear-powered aircraft carrier, U.S.S. *Enterprise*, which is now deployed for the second time to Vietnam, has set record after record since she joined the fleet 5 years ago. She has proven so effective in battle in Vietnam that the Secretary of Defense requested a new nuclear-powered attack carrier in last year's bill and has told Congress that he intends to ask for one more next year and another in a future year.

At least four major fleet escort ships—destroyers or frigates—are assigned to each aircraft carrier. These escorts are designed to operate either on independent missions against enemy targets or as part of a coordinated protective screen to destroy enemy aircraft, missiles, submarines, and surface ships that attack the force.

The two nuclear frigates which Congress has added to this bill will have the same general types of antiair and antisubmarine weapons systems as would the two nonnuclear destroyers proposed by the Department of Defense, but the nuclear frigates will be larger and will have considerably more military capability. Specifically, each nuclear frigate—in addition to being nuclear powered—compared to the destroyers—will have twice the number of missile launchers and missile magazines; will have a helicopter landing area and facilities and accommodations for a screen commander which the destroyer would not have; will have more complete naval tactical data system facilities; and will have provisions for twice the number of torpedo launchers.

All of these factors are covered in detail in the hearings and report of the House Armed Services Committee.

A nuclear propulsion plant similar to the two-reactor plant now in the nuclear frigates *Bainbridge* and *Truxtun* is suitable for installation in either a new destroyer or a new frigate.

The shipbuilding program proposed by the Department of Defense called for building conventionally powered escorts to accompany the new nuclear carriers. The House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have studied in depth the questions of nuclear power for escorts for the nuclear carriers; both committees have concluded that to build new conventionally powered escorts to accompany nuclear carriers would be a serious mistake. Further, both committees have concluded that each nuclear carrier should have a complete complement of nuclear powered escorts.

The House Armed Services Committee has the duty of making recommendations to the House of Representatives on defense matters. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is charged, by law, with the responsibility for making continuing studies of problems relating to the development, use and control of atomic energy and making recommendations to both the Senate and House of Representatives.

Section 202 of the Atomic Energy Act provides that the Department of Defense "shall keep the Joint Committee fully and currently informed with respect to all matters within the Department of Defense relating to the development, utilization, or application of atomic energy."

In carrying out these responsibilities, the House Armed Service's Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy have reviewed this matter continuously, thoroughly and, I believe, with great deliberation. Both committees requested the complete record of correspondence between the Navy and the Department of Defense on the question of building nuclear frigates. They also requested copies of all studies comparing nuclear and conventional surface warships conducted by the Navy and the Department of Defense.

These committees have carefully reviewed the documentation furnished by the Navy and the Department of Defense. They also received extensive testimony on the issues involved. Very shortly the Joint Committee's hearings earlier this year on nuclear propulsion will be published. These studies, reports, and testimony clearly show that the increased military effectiveness of nuclear powered warships—both aircraft carriers and escort ships—far outweighs the small increase in lifetime cost necessary to provide these ships with nuclear propulsion plants.

The facts behind the action recommended by the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy to proceed now on a nuclear powered surface escort warship building program can be assessed by review of the following reports:

Report of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on Nuclear Propulsion for Naval Surface Vessels, December 1963.

Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels, October 30, 31, and November 13, 1963.

Hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on naval nuclear propulsion program, January 26, 1966.

House Armed Services Committee Report No. 1536, dated May 16, 1966, to accompany S. 2950, authorizing Defense procurement and research and development and military pay.

House Armed Services Committee hearings on military posture and H.R. 13456, Report No. 64.

House Appropriations Committee hearings on Department of Defense appropriation for 1967, part 6, pages 67–147.

House Armed Services Committee Report No. 221, dated May 2, 1967, to accompany H.R. 9240, authorizing Defense procurement and research and development.

House Armed Services Committee hearing on military posture and H.R. 9240, Report No. 8.

In addition, the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is currently preparing for public release a report and record of executive hearings held this year on the naval nuclear propulsion program.

The case for nuclear-powered escort ships was summarized last year by the Chief of Naval Operations in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy dated April 14, 1966. With the exception of some deletions for security reasons, Admiral McDonald's memorandum is published in its entirety on pages 8034 through 8063 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing report—No. 64—on military posture. Admiral McDonald's memorandum provides a detailed basis for the position that the increased military effectiveness of nuclear propulsion in carrier escorts fully justifies the small increase in lifetime cost of the ships and for concluding that construction of nuclear powered escort ships is in the best interest of this Nation.

The case for nuclear-powered escorts for our nuclear carriers and the importance of insuring that the new class of major fleet escorts called DXG is provided nuclear propulsion was summarized this year by Vice Adm. H. G. Rickover in a memorandum to the Secretary of the Navy dated February 3, 1967. With the exception of some deletions for security reasons, Admiral Rickover's memorandum is published in its entirety on pages 1804 through 1848 of the House Armed Services Committee hearing report—No. 8—on military posture.

Admiral Rickover's memorandum makes it clear that each nuclear escort substituted for a conventional escort significantly improves the military effectiveness of the overall nuclear carrier task group. His report shows that the incremental gain in military effectiveness is larger as each nuclear escort is substituted, with the largest increment being added when the all-nuclear task group is achieved.

The Chief of Naval Operations has succinctly summarized the situation with the statement:

> Nuclear power makes possible the greatest advance in propulsion since we went from sail to steam.

Congress has all the information necessary to make an assessment of whether a nuclear escort construction program is in the best interests of the United States.

As I have just pointed out, the issue of nuclear propulsion for surface warships has already been studied in great depth. The studies of this subject furnished Congress by the Department of Defense and the Navy when piled on top of each other make a stack several feet high. Most of the effort in these studies has been devoted to analyzing costs, rather than determining military effectiveness.

The time has come for us to stop these futile cost comparisons between nuclear and conventional surface warships. Let us get on with fulfilling our country's urgent need for nuclear propulsion in the surface fleet.

The danger of continuing to make extensive cost studies is that they divert attention from the real issues that nuclear propulsion has the fundamental advantage of permitting our warships to go anywhere in the world, to deliver their combat load and return—all without logistic support. Oil-fired warships must be refueled every few days. This requires a vulnerable, worldwide distribution system of tankers and storage facilities to provide fuel oil for conventional ships. Admiral McDonald's memorandum which I referred to earlier cites many examples from the history of modern war where major military defeats were brought about by the inability of military forces to maintain an adequate supply of propulsion fuel to the forces in combat. The U.S. decision to bomb the fuel oil storage facilities in North Vietnam has again emphasized to the whole world the importance and yet the extreme vulnerability of petroleum supplies in modern war.

I cannot understand the logic which admits the vulnerability of the enemy's fuel oil supplies but will not admit that our own fuel oil supplies are also vulnerable. Admiral McDonald's memorandum points out that—

> The vulnerability of our overseas logistic supply lines is greater today than at any time in the past and is continuing to increase for the following reasons:
>
> a. The increased threat of submarine attack because of the improvements in conventional submarines and the advent of nuclear powered submarines.
>
> b. The increased threat of air attack because of the increased range of aircraft and missiles and their improved means of detection.
>
> c. The amount of fuel which must be transported has increased because of the higher fuel consumption rate of post-World War II military units.
>
> d. Each tanker lost has a greater impact because of the substitution of a smaller fleet of larger tankers for the large fleet of small tankers used in World War II.
>
> As the number of nuclear submarines and air-striking capabilities of our potential

> enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support when our supply lines to our combat forces are under attack gets worse. One principal reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce the logistic support required for our fighting forces.

Vietnam operations have shown that two-thirds of the fuel used by a conventional carrier task group—a carrier plus its escorts—is used just to keep the ships running. One-third is used for carrier propulsion, one-third is used for escort propulsion, and the other one-third is used for aircraft fuel. So, if the need for fuel for the escorts and the carrier itself can be eliminated by utilizing nuclear propulsion, only one-third the amount of fuel is needed. This simplifies the logistic problem tremendously.

In supporting this position the Chief of Naval Operations has stated:

> The compelling reason for the Navy's strong recommendation for nuclear power in surface warships is based on the increased survivability and tactical flexibility which derive from freedom of dependence on propulsion fuel oil logistic support.
>
> The dependence of U.S. air power on the fuel distribution system in the western Pacific is well known. The vulnerability of the system to attack, particularly the overland and terminal fuel distribution required for land-based air operations, is a matter of concern. While the Navy's underway replenishment groups are considered to be less vulnerable, they can also be brought under attack. Current utilization of *Enterprise* and *Bainbridge* is reducing our dependence on fuel oil and thus strengthening our total tactical air posture in Southeast Asia. The introduction of CVAN–68 and other nuclear powered warships could be of critical importance to the efficient projection of air power during the early 1970's. (See House Armed Services Committee Report 1536, p. 40, dated May 16, 1966.)

The scope and magnitude of the logistic effort to provide propulsion fuel for the fleet is often not fully appreciated. For example, the total amount of petroleum products the Navy alone is using each month in Southeast Asia today is as great as the maximum monthly rate the Japanese were able to import into their home islands in World War II, and nearly as great as the average monthly requirements for the U.S. carrier strike forces during the peak of naval operations in the Pacific during World War II.

Admiral McDonald has pointed out to Congress that one torpedo, fired by an unidentified submarine in Southeast Asia, could "radically change the entire concept of our operations" on both land and sea. See hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, January 26, 1966, page 62. As reported in the newspapers, Red China has about 30 submarines, and the Soviets now have over 400 submarines—of which about 45 are nuclear, which have unlimited attack range—and they are building more. Why would they build attack submarines unless they wanted the capability to sink our ships and cut off our supply routes? Do you realize that U.S. submarine forces with only 250 submarines nearly strangled the Japanese fuel oil pipeline during World War II.

It is vital that our Navy have the capability to detect, identify, and sink enemy submarines in time of hostility. In this connection it should be noted that only nuclear-powered escort ships can give unlimited chase to any nuclear-powered submarine without having to abandon the chase to refuel.

Each time a nuclear-powered warship is substituted for a conventionally powered warship in a carrier task force, the overall capabilities of the whole task force are improved. When a nuclear carrier is substituted for a conventional carrier, the range of a carrier task group with four conventional escorts is about doubled. When two of the escorts accompanying the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is almost doubled again. When all of the escorts with the nuclear carrier are nuclear, the range of the carrier task group is essentially unlimited.

The nuclear aircraft carrier must, of course, be replenished with aviation fuel and ammunition. However, it must be remembered that when the escort ships are conventionally powered the nuclear carrier itself must carry the oil to supply them. When the carrier is able to have its own tanks devoted solely to aviation fuel, it can launch many more aircraft strikes than when much of its fuel tank space is devoted to carrying fuel oil for conventional escorts. When the new nuclear carrier has all-nuclear escorts, she will have almost twice the aviation fuel capability of the most modern conventional carrier.

The most recent Navy studies show that when the estimated lifetime construction and operating costs of a nuclear frigate or destroyer are compared to the comparable costs of a conventional ship with the same military features, the nuclear ship is less than 25 percent more expensive than its conventional counterpart. See House Armed Services Committee hearings on military posture, report No. 8, page 1845.

Since nuclear propulsion in the escort ships improves the military effectiveness of the task group as a whole, the increased cost of the task group as a whole is the cost which should be considered in determining the "cost effectiveness." Each escort for a nuclear carrier that is changed to nuclear propulsion adds about 1 percent to the overall lifetime cost of the nuclear carrier task group. Thus, making all four escorts nuclear would increase the lifetime cost of the entire group by only 4 percent. Surely the tremendous increase in effectiveness of the task group fully justifies this small increase in cost.

If the two conventional aircraft carriers and the nine conventional frigates authorized since 1960 had been provided with nuclear propulsion, the United States would now have in being or under construction three nuclear-powered carrier task groups instead of only one. These nuclear-powered task groups would have given the United States a much stronger Navy with which to face the uncertain and perilous future that lies ahead. Even with the nuclear frigate which was included by Congress in the fiscal year 1967 shipbuilding program, it will not be until our Nation's first nuclear powered aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise,* has been at sea for 10 years that this country will have its first all-nuclear carrier task group.

Our surface Navy is aging rapidly and is even now faced with widespread block obsolescence. Of the cruisers, destroyers, and frigates in the active fleet today, 81 percent are over 20 years old.

In the late 1950's and early 1960's there was a vigorous warship construction program. This was also the time that nuclear propelled surface warships were introduced in the fleet. However, since that time there has been a long hiatus in surface warship construction—nuclear and conventional. The only surface warship escort of destroyers size or larger in the approved shipbuilding programs of the last 5 years—fiscal years 1963–67—nuclear or conventional, is the nuclear frigate provided by Congress last year. It is clear that this hiatus cannot last much longer without the capability of the U.S. Navy sinking far below the needs of our national security.

In 1963, Secretary McNamara testified to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that "we will be building literally tens" of major surface warships, destroyer leaders and large destroyers, "during the remainder of this decade." See hearings before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy on nuclear propulsion for naval surface vessels, October 30, 31, and November 13, 1963, page 187. However, two conventional destroyers proposed by the Department of Defense again this year are the only major fleet escorts they have proposed in the last 6 years.

The U.S. Navy needs more surface warships and needs them with the unique capabilities provided by nuclear propulsion. Recognizing this, Congress has supported a major scientific and engineering effort to achieve this capability. We have been successful. Today, the U.S. Navy is preeminent in the field of nuclear propulsion. We must take advantage of this lead by building more ships which have the tremendous advantages nuclear propulsion can give them.

The cost effectiveness studies of nuclear versus conventional warships assume that we will have adequate advance overseas bases from which to operate our conventional ships. They assume we will have no trouble maintaining our logistic supply lines at sea and that fuel oil will be available whenever and wherever needed. They assume that our forces will not be subject to attack. They assume that we will not need sustained high speed endurance in our warships. They assume all these things, but the studies cannot insure that the assumptions will be correct. Once these assumptions are made, the possibility of situations arising where these assumptions are not valid is removed from consideration. Yet it is in just such situations where nuclear propulsion in our warships could mean the difference between victory and defeat.

During the 20- to 30-year lifetime of any warship, there will be many changes in the world situation. Since World War II, our three major enemies have become our friends and two of our previous major allies have become our antagonists. Bases in foreign countries upon which we must presently depend for storage of fuel oil for our oil-fired warships may not be available when needed in future conflicts due to changes in the international situation. Further, as the number of foreign nuclear submarines increases and as the air strike capabilities of our potential enemies increase, the difficulty of providing logistic support will increase. The basic reason for developing nuclear power for surface warships is to reduce this logistic support—support which will be most difficult, if not impossible, to provide in wartime.

It is in the heat of battle that the superior mobility, flexibility, and reliability of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled military advantage, an advantage which could be crucial to deciding the outcome.

The argument used by the Secretary of Defense against building nuclear powered escorts is the same argument used a decade ago by those in positions of authority who did not want to go to nuclear power in submarines because it cost more; by those in authority a half-century ago who did not want to convert from coal to oil for naval ships; and by those a century ago who did not want to shift from sail to steam. The argument against obtaining improved capability in warship propulsion because of its higher cost is just as fallacious today as it was a hundred years ago, 50 years ago, and 10 years ago.

The only argument the Defense Department makes against nuclear power for naval surface ships is that they are "too expensive." The argument can be made that all new weapons are "too expensive" when their costs are compared with the obsolete weapons they replace. Apparently when the Department of Defense decides it wants something, expense is never the criterion. When Congress wants it, it becomes "too expensive."

Aside from his vague statement about expense, no other reasoned or technical judgment has ever been given by the Department of Defense to justify its stand. Those who do recommend nuclear powered ships gave reasoned arguments—arguments which have never been specifically rebutted.

The impression given to the public is that the Defense Department has reached its conclusions based on scientific analysis. The Department of Defense has not given our committee this scientific analysis. We must therefore conclude that it will not stand the test of objective scrutiny.

I am puzzled and distressed by the reluctance of the Defense Department to accept nuclear propulsion in the new escorts being built to accompany the nuclear carriers.

Based on detailed study and appraisal of the military effectiveness and the cost of nuclear-powered and conventional warships and careful consideration and study of past and present experience of naval forces in combat, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

> The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st Century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security. (See House of Representatives Report No. 1536, Authorizing Defense Procurement and Research and Development, and Military Pay, May 16, 1966, p. 25.)

The United States is committed to a nuclear aircraft carrier building program. The issue before Congress is very simple: Shall we have all-nuclear carrier task forces?

The new Defense authorization bill answers that question with an unequivocal "go ahead."

Congress must take this step. The language in this bill that "the contracts for the construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest," makes it clear that it is the will of the people of this country voiced through their elected representatives in Congress that the two new nuclear frigates be constructed as a continuation of the nuclear escort building program started by Congress last year.

The determination of overall force levels and the precise number of new escort ships needed in the next several years will no doubt be the subject of continuing study by the Department of Defense. However, with the obvious problem of the obsolescence of the United States Navy staring us in the face and the exemplary performance of the nuclear carrier *Enterprise* and her nuclear escort ships *Bainbridge* and *Long Beach*—all now performing outstanding combat service off Vietnam—it is clear that construction of the two nuclear frigates contained in this bill is a minimum requirement and should proceed forthwith and not be delayed while more studies are made.

Your approval of the provisions of the Defense authorization bill to authorize three nuclear-powered attack submarines, to authorize long-lead-time items for a nuclear-powered attack carrier, and to authorize two nuclear-powered frigates—and your endorsement of the recommendation of the House Armed Services Committee and the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy that all future major fleet escorts be nuclear powered—will go far toward determining the strength and flexibility of U.S. seapower for decades to come. Future generations of Americans will recognize that it was this Congress—the 90th Congress—that had the foresight, wisdom, and courage to take this initiative to strengthen the defense of our Nation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Messrs. Kluczynski, Howard, Zion, and McDonald of Michigan (at the request of Mr. Fallon), for an indefinite period, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Selden, for 60 minutes, on May 18.

Mr. Hébert, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. Holifield (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Roush.

Mr. Rarick.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kleppe) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Martin.

Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Albert) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dingell.

Mrs. Green of Oregon.

Mr. Roybal in two instances.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

Bills and joint resolutions of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 102. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0310090); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 443. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to consider a petition for reinstatement of an oil and gas lease (Wyoming 0280122); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1601. An act to increase the appropriation authorization for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S.J. Res. 35. Joint resolution consenting to an extension and renewal of the interstate compact to conserve oil and gas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S.J. Res. 58. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Jerome C. Hunsaker as Citizen Regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 9, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

729. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain additional facilities projects to be undertaken for the Air National Guard, pursuant to the provisions of 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1), and

to the authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

730. A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting a report on the first year's work of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 88–352; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

731. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of review of audit and inspection programs conducted by U.S. agencies in Vietnam during 1966, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

732. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of claimant's contributory negligence, to clarify the procedure for appeal from certain claims determinations, and to limit the amount of attorney fees thereunder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

733. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in certain cases found admissible to the United States, pursuant to the provisions of section 212(a) (28) (I) (ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

734. A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a report on forest and grass fires, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–769; to the Committee on Public Works.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 9711. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9712. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for the establishment of a National Eye Institute in the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9713. A bill to amend section 341 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to require the Attorney General to furnish a certificate of citizenship to a person holding certification of birth issued by the Secretary of State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 9714. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 9715. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple in their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's of father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 9716. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H.R. 9717. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9718. A bill to amend the Bankruptcy Act and the civil service retirement law with respect to the tenure and retirement benefits of referees in bankruptcy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemption of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemption for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 9720. A bill to provide Federal assistance to improve the educational services in public and private nonprofit child day care centers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9721. A bill to require that a portion of Government parking facilities at national monuments and memorials and Government buildings be reserved for use by visitors confined to wheelchairs; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9722. A bill to restrict imports of dairy products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9723. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment when a complaint is filed by an employer or labor organization; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RHODES of Arizona:

H.R. 9724. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 9725. A bill to revise the quota control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (for himself, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Johnson of California, and Mr. Mathias of California):

H.R. 9726. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported olives; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California (by request):

H.R. 9727. A bill to amend section 2(3), section 8c(2), and section 8c(6)(I) of the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 9728. A bill relating to taxation by States of the incomes of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 9729. A bill to amend section 23 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 to make it clear that the program of low-rent housing in private accommodations may not be restricted by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to specified types of housing on the basis of vacancy rates in a community; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9730. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9731. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which a taxpayer may become eligible for the existing exclusion from gross income of gain from the sale or exchange of his residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 9732. A bill to prohibit mutilation and desecration of the national flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYDLER:

H.R. 9733. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL (by request):

H.R. 9734. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southeastern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9735. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Southwestern Power Administration; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9736. A bill to establish a revolving fund for the Bonneville Power Administration; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 9737. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 9738. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide scholarships to selected persons for education in medicine, dentistry, and other health professions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 9739. A bill to liberalize the provisions of the retired servicemen's family protection plan under chapter 73 of title 10 of the United States Code; to the Committee on Armed services.

By Mr. BRAY:

H.R. 9740. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that an individual may deduct amounts paid for his higher education, or for the education of any of his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9741. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 9742. A bill to designate certain real property of the Unied States in the District of Columbia under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service as the Eleanor Roosevelt Square; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9743. A bill to provide Federal financial assistance to public agencies and institutions and to hospitals and other private nonprofit organizations to enable them to carry on comprehensive family planning programs; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9744. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 9745. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide for control of interstate traffic in firearms; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9746. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 9747. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 9748. A bill for the relief of the city of El Dorado, Kans.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 9749. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL (for himself, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. FISHER, Mr. HOLIFIELD, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PEPPER, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 9750. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MARTIN:

H. Con. Res. 340. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress with respect to an investigation and study to determine the potential of railroad passenger and mail transportation in the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KLEPPE:

H. Res. 465. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LUKENS:

H. Res. 466. Resolution to provide that an estimated cost figure be applied at the time a bill is introduced; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 467. Resolution authorizing the printing of extra copies of part 2 of the hearings relating to "Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States," 89th Congress, first session; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 9751. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Inez Augusta Wright; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 9752. A bill for the relief of Douglas E. Kennedy and Alvin V. Burt, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9753. A bill for the relief of Aida Calacas Valenciano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9754. A bill for the relief of Maria Sole; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9755. A bill for the relief of Natale Cangialosi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9756. A bill for the relief of Maria Antonietta Storino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 9757. A bill for the relief of John W. Watson, a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 9758. A bill for the relief of Claudio Amauri Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9759. A bill for the relief of John Lee Adams and the estates of his wife, Altheia J. Adams, and his sons, David John Adams and Mark Edward Adams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 9760. A bill for the relief of Kamal Husein; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

73. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to the distribution of U.S. Federal aid to education funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

74. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Charlotte Snell and others, of El Toro, Calif., relative to the giving of aid in any form, directly or indirectly, to our Communist enemies; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

75. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Wyman C. Lowe, Atlanta, Ga., relative to the general election of November 8, 1966, in the Fifth Congressional District of Georgia; to the Committee on House Administration.

76. Also, petition of Board of Chosen Freeholders of the County of Union, N.J., relative to its opposition to any tolls on that portion of the Garden State Parkway that runs through Union County; to the Committee on Public Works.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Mothers Crusade for Victory Over Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, over the past weekend, I witnessed a new invasion here in Washington, D.C.—a first, and perhaps just the start—mothers crusade for victory over communism.

Hundreds of nicely dressed and well-mannered mothers carrying American flags visited their National Capital protesting peaceably for victory over atheist communism.

These ladies were from almost every State in the United States and represented many national origins. Some mothers from captive nations under communism wore the native dress of their homeland. Many had sons in Vietnam—some were gold star mothers who have lost sons in battle.

One of the national shrines they visited was Arlington National Cemetery where the Honor Guard permitted a special prayer for those lost and the living.

Their question was: If we are fighting communism in South Vietnam, why not stop trading with Communist countries—why not fight communism here at home?

A wonderful group of sincere, concerned Americans lobbying in the true, God-given right of every mother for victory over tyranny, deceit, and oppression—victory over communism.

Railroad Passenger Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a concurrent resolution calling for an investigation and study by the Department of Transportation into the passenger railroad service of the Nation. The resolution calls for the ICC to declare a moratorium on the discontinuance of railroad passenger service as well as the Post Office Department to declare a moratorium on the cancellation of railroad postal contracts.

This resolution was introduced in the Senate by Senator ALLOTT, of Colorado, and I sincerely hope the House will see fit to take early action on the measure.

Passenger train cars and passenger rail miles have declined almost 50 percent in the last 15 years, and many of our smaller communities are being abandoned by the railroads. Recently in Nebraska, the Burlington Railroad requested discontinuance of two passenger trains in one community alone. I think the time has come to make a thorough investigation into the reasons for the discontinuance of such railroad service as well as the reason for the Post Office Department to cancel many of these rail contracts. I am hopeful that such a study will reveal the true ills of the matter and allow us to take appropriate action to remedy the critical condition of our national railroad passenger service.

Geographical Distribution of Research and Development Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. EDWARD ROUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I am introducing an amendment to H.R. 9240, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

As a member of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics I have seen that committee and NASA gradually embrace the idea of geographical distribution, that is, the principle that Federal funds for research and development should be spread around the country as much as possible. It is recognized that the projects concerned must be given first priority, but this can often be done without detriment to the project and to the great advantage of a region, an educational institution, by solicitation of other than the 20 or so best known educational institutions for receipt of Government funds.

Two-thirds of the funds colleges and universities use come from the Government and some 13 percent of the administrative Federal budget is directed to research and development. We cannot, then, fail to recognize the importance of where these funds go. If those who have continue to get, we cannot hope to develop other significant centers of science and technology throughout the Nation. Yet this we must do, if we would increase the number of our scientists and provide some kind of equality of educational opportunity to all American citizens.

Moreover, the Federal research dollar affects regional economies, the growth and diversification of industry, the availability of trained manpower, the quality and quantity of educational facilities, even the overall scientific and technological progress of our Nation.

The amendment I am proposing will read:

> It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible, and that the Department of Defense should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible.

I believe such an amendment would endorse the principle of geographical distribution and urge its application, providing a healthy competitive stimulus to smaller universities, colleges, and industries, which might now expect to receive Federal funds regardless of their locale.

Small Business Loans Beneficial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has spoken and acted many times on behalf of small business in the Nation. The legislation relating to small business associations passed by the Congress over the years has improved and strengthened the national economy and has had a salutary effect on the economic life of many communities.

Since the Small Business Administration was established in 1953, through March 16, 1967, it has approved loans to more than 900 small Oregon firms for a total of $48.3 million.

SBA approved loans by congressional districts for the years 1953 through 1962 show that my district ranked 30th among all congressional districts with $5,854,450 in loans to small businessmen. SBA-approved loans by congressional districts are not available through December 31, 1966, but the Small Business Administration gave me figures by States and for my district. Oregon ranked 22d in the Nation on December 31, 1966. My district through December 31, 1966, has had 187 business loans amounting to $9,709,219; 54 disaster loans amounting to $1,037,805; 6 loans to businesses displaced by Federal construction projects in the amount of $871,000; and one local development company loan of $297,500 These total 248 loans amounting to $11,915,524. This, in contemporary times, does not sound like a great quantity of money. However, it is not always the volume of dollars that is important. Oftentimes a little seed money will result in a good harvest.

A dramatic and encouraging part of this program in my district is the superlative record of Portland businessmen in meeting their obligations of repayment. Only one-eighth of 1 percent of the $11,915,524 was chalked up to bad debts. This record reflects the industriousness and integrity of Portland businessmen.

Impressive as these statistics are, the story can be told best by the impact it has had on people.

The story of Mr. Donald W. Byers, a successful businessman in Portland, portrays the human side of the Small Business Administration program. In 1946 Mr. Byers was discharged from the U.S. Navy. As chief photographer's mate, with $2,000 of hard-earned savings and a determination to own and operate his own film processing laboratory, in partnership with G. T. Orengderiff, Byers opened his business in April of 1947.

The firm expanded and in July 1947, Byers bought his partner's interest and began expanding his business to handle an increasing volume of business.

Husband and wife, working side by side, not only expanded volume but began to diversify their photographic business. In order to provide service to take advantage of new developments in film processing, Mr. and Mrs. Byers decided to build a new laboratory to meet the new specialized requirements. In 1955 they moved into the new modern laboratory.

In 1956 they formed Byers Color Laboratory, Inc. In the following months technicians were trained, specialized equipment was installed, and service was immeasurably improved. By 1958, the firm was a success, its sales having jumped six times in 10 years. However, growth and success bring problems to any business, and Byers Color Laboratory was no exception. Their expansion had cost a considerable amount of money, and the firm was saddled with a substantial short-term debt. Forty thousand dollars was needed to retire the debt in an orderly manner.

Small Business Administration came to the rescue. In 1958 a 7-year $40,000 Small Business Administration loan enabled the firm to retire its debt and continue to improve its service.

In 1964 a $48,000 addition was built to provide room for the company's rapidly expanding business.

Byers and his wife, still a young couple, are the owners of a vigorous and successful business. They provide employment, pay taxes, and add to the economic strength of Portland and the Nation.

This story dramatizes that cooperation between the National Government and local small businessmen can pay handsome dividends in local communities, States, and the Nation.

Success on the Campus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, most college students in the news these days are the minority who are the malcontents and the protestors.

The great majority of college students everywhere are constructive-minded, well-adjusted, serious, thoughtful students who have a balanced perspective of themselves, their colleges, their Nation, and their world.

This was proven once again at Auburn University, in Alabama, when recently a Red Cross blood drive produced 4,812 pints of blood in 2 days.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to say that the chairman of the blood drive project is a fine young man from Mobile in the First District of Alabama. He is a credit to this Nation and is a shining example of what is good and wholesome and right on our college campuses. I think we ought to give more headlines to the Larry Menefees of this Nation and quit playing up the wild antics of a few troublemakers.

As further information on the remarkable effort, the university's report follows:

> Patiently they stood in a line that wound 100 yards from the processing center in one building to the bustling Red Cross blood center next door.
>
> One by one, as an aide raised a hand to signal an empty station, the students moved forward, arms bared, and carrying empty containers they would fill with life-giving blood.

That was the scene at Auburn University from the time the doors opened Wednesday, April 5, at 9:30 a.m., until weary workers, surveying the long line already processed for donations, closed the intake center at 4:30 p.m. the following afternoon.

There had been no records to break but their own, those set last year when Auburn University students racked up 3,507 pints of blood in 2 days to prove themselves the champion donors worldwide.

Shortly after noon Wednesday a new world record was set and by midafternoon the students had passed their own goal of 4,000 pints. Still they came, standing often more than an hour in the steaming, crowded receiving area to drive the total to a final 4,812 pints.

The success of the Auburn "bleed-in" came as no surprise to officials of the American Red Cross who are familiar with the annual demonstration beginning in 1952 in support of the Korean war and the Salk polio research program. Since that time, Auburn students have contributed 20,170 pints of blood.

Student leaders of this year's drive based their appeal on the Vietnam conflict. Actually, the plasma is designated for use at American military installations throughout the world.

A committee of 17 students laid the groundwork for this year's drive. Throughout the 2-day period, however, some 275 students—members of honor organizations campuswide—assisted at the center.

As bone-tired workers and donors returned to classes Friday, a wire was flashed to Gen. W. C. Westmoreland, U.S. Army, Vietnam, by the commandant of the School of Military Science at Auburn telling the commanding officer—"Auburn has done it again—War Eagle."

The American Promise: Equality of Opportunity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, there is a grim human paradox in America today. It mars our national journey to a better social order.

More than 6 years of the mightiest economic upsurge of all time has carried the Nation far. For most citizens, it means better jobs at better wages than ever before.

In 1966 alone for example:

The overall jobless rate plunged below 4 percent, hitting a 13-year low.

Seventy-four million Americans were working, 2 million more than the beginning of the year.

After-taxes income of American families rose 3.5 percent, even after allowances for price increases.

But, behind this bright and heartening picture is quite another picture—a picture that shows a large body of Americans who are denied the opportunity to share in our vast abundance.

These are the victims of problems beyond their control—ethnic prejudice, language difficulty, inadequate education, advancing age, outmoded skills. They are prosperity's disadvantaged.

As President Johnson said in his 1967 Manpower Report to the Congress:

> These Americans need hope, not handouts. They want—and deserve—work and training, not welfare.

Mr. Speaker, we have a long way to go to achieve this goal, but let us make no mistake that a great deal of progress has been made toward insuring that all Americans, regardless of their background, may enjoy brighter and more productive lives.

In the Los Angeles area that I represent, a major beginning has been made to provide Americans of Mexican descent with the opportunity to prepare for the future—to get fresh starts in life.

Mexican-Americans of all ages are benefiting from Department of Labor programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

These Americans, by preparing for useful work careers, are setting their sights on bigger and more equitable shares of our national abundance.

Briefly, I want to recount some of the progress that is being made in the Los Angeles area under these strategic efforts for citizens of Mexican descent, many of whom have English-language difficulties.

First, under the Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job training program, 400 Mexican-Americans are training in a number of fields in an 18-month program sponsored by the Mexican-American Opportunity Foundation.

In this program, operating with $224,308 in Federal funds, trainees are being groomed for jobs as metal and honeycomb integral tank sealers, machineshop helpers, structural and production assemblers, wire pressers, and laminaters.

A skill center operated by the Los Angeles School District with Manpower Development and Training Act money was opened in East Los Angeles last June. About 64 percent of the population in this area is Spanish speaking.

With a Federal appropriation of $8,041,247, the institutional program is designed to train 1,410 disadvantaged adults and 830 disadvantaged youth. Four hundred enrollees are currently being trained for such jobs as aircraft sub-assembler, auto body repairman, clerk-typist, electrical-mechanical assemblers, licensed vocational nurse, truck mechanic, laundry appliance repairman, fork-lift mechanic, food-service worker, and motorcycle repairman.

I understand that the placement record for graduates of this institutional program has been excellent. In fact, 100 percent of the graduates trained as nurses aides and licensed vocational nurses have been placed. That is a pretty heartening record any way you look at it.

More than 1,500 Mexican-American youths are enrolled in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in the Los Angeles area. They are performing useful jobs for the city and county of Los Angeles and the Federal Government. This important antipoverty program enables them to continue their education or to gain valuable experience to launch work careers.

The words of the trainees themselves best illustrate the great benefits they are reaping from these programs. Seguire M., an on-the-job trainee in his late twenties said:

> My work on Northrop's S-5 Freedom Fighter gives me personal satisfaction and the future looks real good.

And Joe M., a 22-year-old machineshop trainee, said:

> I'm glad to be learning a skilled trade and hope to work as a machinist for many years.

There is no question in my mind that these and other vital training programs are proving extremely valuable not only to the trainees themselves but to the entire Nation. Every day these national programs are spelling an end to the public dependency that hinders so many of our citizens. These programs are quite accurately turning tax-eaters into taxpayers.

I urge Congress to give its wholehearted support to the President's requests for sufficient appropriations to help eliminate disadvantage in America. It is a challenge we must meet. To ignore it would be perilous to the entire Nation.

As we act to translate the American promise of equality of opportunity into an everyday reality, we should keep in mind the words of President Johnson:

> We will never lose sight of our goal—to guarantee every man an opportunity to unlock his own potential; to earn the satisfaction of standing on his own two feet.
>
> Our goal, in short, is to offer every citizen one of the greatest blessings: a sure sense of his own usefulness.

The FCC and the Communications Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, last May, Subcommittee No. 6 of the Small Business Committee held some hearings on the importance to small businessmen of adequate land mobile radio communication. In the course of these hearings, the truth of the statement of Chairman EVINS, our very able and distinguished chairman of the full committee, became very clear, indeed. He had said at the time he created the new subcommittee to study the activities of regulatory and enforcement agencies relating to small business:

> Perhaps no other facet of our Government has more impact on the small business community than the regulatory agencies.

Time after time in the course of our hearings with respect to the Federal Communications Commission we heard how small businessmen used land mobile radio to better serve both themselves and their customers. We heard how a fuel oil dealer is able to respond more rapidly to the needs of his cash customers who are generally old folk or live in trailer communities because he could use his two-way radio to divert his truck to serve them quickly after receiving their call, instead of waiting until the truck made its next day's trip. We heard how this ability to serve his customers better meant more dollars and more success for him.

We heard how an electrical contractor uses two-way radio in pulling cables from the basement to the 10th story of a building, thus saving the time and cost of communicating by messengers running up and down the stairs. Incidentally, the building he was talking about was a building to shelter our senior citizens as a part of our Federal program to assist them.

We heard how night patrolmen can

move more safely on their security rounds if they can call for assistance by their two-way radio. We heard how hundreds of people in an air-conditioned building in Atlanta which had nonopening windows were saved the misery of being in almost a furnace when the air-conditioning plant broke down because the service contractor was able to quickly get a message to one of his radio equipped service trucks to go immediately to the building and fix the trouble.

We heard how a livery car service on the south side of Chicago, where the cabs of the major taxi companies were scarce, is able to provide transportation for the thousands of people in that area because of the speed and flexibility in dispatching which they have as a result of land mobile radio.

We heard how a tractor repair service in the hills of North Carolina increased its business 15 percent during a 2-year period largely due to its trucks being two-way radio equipped. We heard how a packing company in Des Moines, Iowa, which processes about 275,000 cattle per year, uses two-way radio to make sure that it would have a steady flow of cattle into its plant. We heard how a food vending machine company in western Massachusetts uses two-way radio to provide prompt service to the machines it operates.

In short, we heard how land mobile radio affects the life of almost every person in this country in one way or another.

Since these hearings, we have also become aware of the tremendous importance of land mobile radio to the police departments of this country in preventing crime and apprehending those who commit crime. The Crime Commission, established by President Johnson, has itself urged the need for more frequency channels for crime prevention. We have heard also how land mobile radio has cut the costs of city water departments, sewer departments and other phases of State and Government activity.

We learned, too, that almost all of these uses for land mobile radio have developed in the past 10 or 15 years as equipment which was adequate and practical for such uses has become available. We also learned that public benefit from the use of land mobile radio is being hampered because these uses are all compressed into an amount of radio frequency spectrum which was allocated by the FCC 20 years ago, before these uses were thought of. Indeed, the FCC in its annual report for 1966, which was issued not long ago, said, and I quote:

> With the possible exception of a few unavailing voices, no one then envisioned the birth of so many diverse services and the astonishing growth pattern of the entire group.

Because of the importance of this problem to the people of this country, I was very gratified to see the public notice of the Commission which it issued recently, stating that the Commission is undertaking an intensified study of the feasibility of meeting the needs of the land mobile services within spectrum space now allocated to the upper and lower ends of the bands now assigned to UHF television, with an objective of providing essentially needed spectrum space for the explosive growth of land mobile use with a minimum impact on our nationwide television service. The Commission also stated that it would examine the more efficient use of the frequencies now assigned to the land mobile services, sharing of various types and combinations of these possibilities. It noted that it invited and encouraged studies by land mobile radio groups and requested that they be expedited and the results promptly submitted to the Commission.

For this action I commend the Commission. It has shown, by this public notice, its determination to attack this problem and solve it, fully aware that it is a difficult problem but one which must be solved in the public interest.

I know, too, from the information I have received in the few weeks since this public notice was issued, that all of the people who are affected by this shortage of frequency spectrum in the land mobile services are grateful that the Commission has indicated its determination to attain its objective which, in the Commission's words, "is to provide essentially needed spectrum space for the explosive growth of land mobile use with a minimum impact on our nationwide television service."

While I am very much encouraged by the notice which the Commission has issued, the mere fact that such a notice has been issued does not mean that I will not be interested in knowing how the FCC is coming along with its efforts. I rather suspect that there will be many who will be watching to see that solid progress is made by the Commission in reaching its objective.

We are all well aware that there are many matters competing for the attention of the busy Commission, and we are aware that for too long this matter has been put aside until, now, the matter has reached a crisis stage. The Commission described this crisis stage in its 1966 annual report when it said that:

> The condition is not unlike that of a main highway on a summer weekend, so overcrowded with vehicles that traffic has come to a standstill. Getting it moving again in orderly fashion becomes a problem of gigantic proportions.

In the interest of the people of this country, I shall follow closely the steps the Commission takes to find an adequate solution to this problem.

H.R. 8000—The Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 8, 1967

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, because of the fast-growing evidence of widespread national support for a program of bilingual education to offer America's millions of non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school children a better chance to realize their full educational aspirations, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of my bill, H.R. 8000, the Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act:

H.R. 8000

A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress hereby finds that one of the most acute educational problems in the United States is that which involves the more than two million bilingual and bicultural children of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background; that little headway has been made in finding adequate and constructive solutions to this unique and perplexing educational situation; and that the urgent need is for comprehensive and cooperative action now on the local, State, and Federal levels to develop forward-looking approaches to meet the serious learning difficulties faced by this substantial segment of the Nation's school-age population.

BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

SEC. 2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended by redesignating title VII as title VIII, by redesignating sections 701 through 706 and references thereto as sections 801 through 806, respectively, and by adding after title VI the following new title:

"TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 701. This title may be cited as the 'Bilingual Educational Opportunity Act'.

"DECLARATION OF POLICY

"SEC. 702. In recognition of the special educational needs of the large numbers of students in the United States to whom English is a second language, Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance to local educational agencies to develop and carry out new and imaginative elementary and secondary school programs designed to meet these special educational needs.

"AUTHORIZATION AND ALLOTMENTS

"SEC. 703. (a) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $15,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970, and the succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) From the sums appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) for each fiscal year the Commissioner shall allot an amount to each State based upon the number of non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school students in such State and the per capita income in such State in such manner as he determines will best carry out the purposes of this title. For the purposes of this title 'non-English-speaking elementary and secondary school students' means elementary and secondary school students born in, or one or both of whose parents were born in, a non-English-speaking area such as Mexico, Puerto Rico, Cuba, or French Canada, and in States for which such information is available, other students with Spanish surnames, and where the Commissioner establishes additional objective criteria which he deems appropriate for carrying out the purposes of this title, other students determined on the basis of such additional criteria.

"(c) A State's allotment for a fiscal year pursuant to subsection (b) shall be available, prior to such date in such year as is established by the Commissioner, for grants to local educational agencies in such State pursuant to this title. Allotments not reserved prior to such date may be reallotted to other States and made available for grants pursuant to this title prior to the end of such fiscal year in such manner as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 704. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 705, for—

"(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs designed to meet the special educational needs of students who speak English as a second language, including—

"(1) special bilingual and bicultural educational research and demonstration projects; and

"(2) pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans and programs so developed; and

"(b) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including minor remodeling of classroom or other space used for such programs and acquisition of necessary equipment, designed to meet the special educational needs of students who speak English as a second language through activities such as—

"(1) intensive preschool, Headstart-type programs specifically designed to orient and prepare non-English-speaking children for smoother transition to and more rapid advancement in the elementary education environment;

"(2) the utilization of the ability to speak a language other than English as a bridge to the learning of English;

"(3) regular, ongoing comprehensive bilingual educational programs;

"(4) the teaching of English as the first or primary language;

"(5) the teaching of the language spoken in the home as a second language;

"(6) programs designed to impart to non-English-speaking students a knowledge of and pride in their ancestral culture and language;

"(7) programs to attract and retain as teachers promising individuals of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background;

"(8) efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home; and

"(9) other activities which meet the purposes of this title.

"APPLICATIONS FOR GRANTS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL

"SEC. 705. (a) A grant under this title may be made to a local educational agency or agencies upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such applications shall—

"(1) provide that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

"(2) set forth a program for carrying out the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of section 704 and provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

"(3) set forth a program of such size, scope, and design as will make a substantial step toward achieving the purposes of this title;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 704, and in no case supplant such funds;

"(5) provide for such fiscal control and fund-accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

"(6) provide for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds provided under this title have been effective in improving the educational opportunities of persons in the area served, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioners only if—

"(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

"(2) the program set forth in the application is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within each State, which criteria shall be developed by him on the basis of a consideration of (A) the geographic distribution of non-English-speaking students within the State, (B) the relative need of persons in different geographic areas within the State for the kinds of services and activities described in paragraph (b) of section 704, and their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and (C) the relative ability of particular local educational agencies within the State to provide those services and activities;

"(3) in the case of an application for assistance for a program for carrying out the purposes described in paragraph (b) of section 704, the Commissioner determines (A) that the program will utilize the best available talents and resources and will substantially increase the educational opportunities in the area to be served by the applicant, and (B) that, to the extent consistent with the number of children enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served whose educational needs are of the type which this program is intended to meet, provision has been made for participation of such children; and

"(4) the State educational agency has been notified of the application and been given the opportunity to offer recommendations.

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"(d) The Commissioner shall encourage local educational agencies to utilize in programs assisted pursuant to this title the assistance of persons with expertise in the educational problems of the non-English-speaking. He shall also encourage local educational agencies to make optimum use in such programs of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'cultural and educational resources' includes State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, nonprofit private schools, public and nonprofit private agencies such as libraries, museums, musical and artistic organizations, educational radio and television, and other cultural and educational resources.

"PAYMENTS

"SEC. 706. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 703 the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this title an amount equal to the sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

"(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE

"SEC. 707. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Increasing Educational Opportunity for Bilingual Children, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary. At least four of the members of the Advisory Committee shall be educators experienced in dealing with the educational problems of children who speak English as a second language. In addition, at least four of the members of the Advisory Committee shall be of non-English-speaking ethnic or nationality background.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner (1) on the action to be taken with regard to each application for a grant under this title, and (2) in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including traveltime; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 708. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all minor remodeling projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar minor remodeling in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c)."

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

SEC. 3. (a) Section 601(a) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by inserting after the second sentence a new sentence as follows: "Any such grant or contract may include a curriculum designed for the special training of teachers of bilingual children."

(b) Section 603 of such Act is amended by striking out "$18,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$19,000,000".

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XI OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1958

SEC. 4. (a) Section 1101 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 is amended by striking out "and each of the two succeeding fiscal years" and inserting in lieu thereof "and the succeeding fiscal year, and $51,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968".

(b) Such section is further amended by striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (3), by striking out the period at the end of clause (4) and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the word "or", and by inserting after such clause a new clause as follows:

"(5) who are engaged in or preparing to engage in special educational programs for bilingual students."

AMENDMENTS TO COOPERATIVE RESEARCH ACT

SEC. 5. subsections (a) and (b) of section 2 of the Cooperative Research Act are each amended by inserting "and title VII" after "section 503(a)(4)".

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Why art thou cast down, O my soul? Hope thou in God.—Psalm 42: 5.

Our Father in heaven and on earth, who dost love all the children of men, teach us to trust Thee and to live in good will with all our people.

Forgive those moments when we find it difficult to believe in Thee, discouraging to trust one another, and disheartening to have faith in ourselves. We are weighed down by the problems we face as a nation and by the burdens we carry day by day. So often we want to change conditions and circumstances without any thought of changing ourselves or of letting Thy spirit change us.

So we pause in Thy presence, praying that Thou wilt change us, restoring our faith in Thee, retrieving our belief in one another, and renewing our respect for ourselves.

Thus, may we live this day keeping our lives and the life of our Nation in Thy strong hands. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 270. An act to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE THIS AFTERNOON AND DURING THE BALANCE OF THE WEEK

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works may have permission to sit during general debate today and during the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Elections of the Committee on House Administration may sit while the House is in session during general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Blatnik
Bow
Burleson
Collier
Conyers
Cowger
Culver
Davis, Ga.
Diggs
Eckhardt
Evins, Tenn.
Feighan
Giaimo
Goodell
Hansen, Wash.
Howard
Kluczynski
Landrum
McDonald, Mich.
Miller, Calif.
Morse, Mass.
Pool
Rees
Resnick
St. Onge
Saylor
Scherle
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Utt
Watts
Willis
Winn
Younger
Zion

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SIOUX INDIAN CROWNED MRS. SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, not since 1964 when a South Dakota Indian boy, Billy Mills, gained the respect and admiration of the American people by winning an Olympic Gold Medal has the proud State of South Dakota and the Sioux Indian people had so much to be proud of.

Mrs. Ramona Zephier, a fullblooded Sioux Indian from Flandreau, was crowned Mrs. South Dakota last week and is presently competing for the title of Mrs. America in San Diego, Calif.

Our State's new homemaker was born and raised on South Dakota's Pine Ridge Indian Reservation and is a graduate in home economics from my alma mater, South Dakota State University. Mrs. Zephier represents not only South Dakota but also is a tribute to the Indian people of America.

She views the title as an opportunity to "destroy some of the stereotypes of how the American Indian works and lives."

She says her goal is twofold: to show people that all Indians are not bad and to show the Indian people that whatever they want to do, they can.

For the past 10 years Mrs. South Dakota's husband, Andy, has been athletic director of the Indian school in Flandreau.

Mrs. Zephier is a versatile substitute teacher in the same school where her husband works and is the loving mother of three children.

AUTHORIZING DEFENSE PROCUREMENT AND RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 463 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 463

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9240) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 9240, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 666), and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 9240 as passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the ranking minority member of our committee, the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as the reading of the resolution discloses, this is an open rule, providing 3 hours of debate, making in order the consideration of the bill H.R. 9240 as reported out of the Armed Services Committee, authorizing the expenditure of more than $21 billion for procurement, research, and development in connection with carrying on the undeclared war in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, twenty-one and a half billion dollars, in round figures, is a lot of money but yet there is a real question as to whether this authorization is sufficient for the needs of the armed services for the next fiscal year. I doubt there will be a dozen votes against this bill. Frankly, I do not believe there should be any votes against this bill, because regardless of whether we ought to be in Vietnam or not, that is now an academic question, we are there. Our boys are dying every day in ever-increasing numbers. Our planes are being shot down over there. Our materiel for the waging of war is being destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wonder whether the people of this country are fully aware of the real situation in which we find ourselves in this shooting war that is being waged in Vietnam today. We find that too many of our people are proceeding along their normal courses, with business as usual, making money, and not particularly concerned about how this will eventually affect them, their families, and their country.

As a matter of fact, not only the status and the prestige of our country are involved, but the very existence of our country is involved. This is no brush war. This is a real shooting war. I wish we would give more consideration to the severity and to the tragedy of the situation in which we are involved.

I said a moment ago I thought it was more or less academic whether we should or should not be there. The fact remains, I repeat, we are there.

In the humble judgment of this humble person, either we have to go in there to win this war with whatever it takes or we have to "tuck tail," as it were, and retreat.

I cannot, for the life of me, understand some of the things which are going on in this country while the boys are dying over there. I cannot understand why there seems to be a lack of the patriotic fervor which usually characterizes our people in the waging of a war.

We see our flag being burned not only in foreign countries but also in this land of the free and the home of the brave, if I may use a popular expression.

We see our public officials, including the Director of Selective Service System and other important members of the executive branch of this Government, being hooted and being picketed on many occasions, while at the same time we find certain citizens of this country going about raising the flag of discord; yes, some even blatantly and brazenly and openly appearing before the youth of this country in the various colleges of the land urging them to resist being drafted, to resist fighting for their country.

I do not profess to be a great constitutional lawyer. As a matter of fact, in the duties I have to perform around here I just have not had the time, really, to give to the study I should have liked to have given to it. But even so its is most difficult for me to understand why our great Justice Department and why those in authority do not take some overt action to stop some of this sabotaging of our war effort.

As the information about the action that I have just described gets back over to Vietnam, it must affect some of these boys that we send over there. How can you expect them to go on the firing line, to bleed and to die for the cause for which we have sent them over there, when at the same time they read and hear about these acts of sedition and sabotage and, yes, treason in my book that are going on in this country? It is just beyond my comprehension.

Why, we have had a dozen bills or more introduced to make it a Federal offense to desecrate the flag of this country. Those bills have been pending over here in the committee, yes, in the Committee on the Judiciary for months with no action being taken on them. When certain gentlemen, high-ranking members of that committee, were before our Committee on Rules, some of us raised the question as to why they were not doing something about that. About the only answer we got was that there were State laws on the subject. I might add parenthetically here it was certainly enlightening, to say the least, to find certain people who are constantly advocating the centralization of the Government here under the dome of this Capitol suddenly becoming States righters. I believe in States rights. But here is a field that it is appropriate for the Federal Government to operate in. As a result of that action I think maybe we are going to get some action out of that committee on this particular thing.

Now, I mentioned desecration of the flag as one thing. Maybe you do not think it is too important, but again I call your attention to the fact that our boys over there in Vietnam do not feel about that flag that they are bleeding and dying for in the same way as some of the people in this country feel who would openly and brazenly set fire to that flag.

I repeat that $21 billion plus is a lot of money, but I think I have a little reputation for being somewhat conservative around here in the spending of the taxpayers' money, and I say if this were $221 billion and it was needed to give our boys the support they need over there, I would gladly subscribe to it and support it.

Mr. Speaker, in that connection there is grave doubt in many areas and among many Members of the Congress that $21 billion is a sufficient amount of money to do the job.

Mr. Speaker, with the escalation of the war—and in my opinion it was appropriate that we should have the escalation—this figure in my judgment is going to be, and in the judgment of many who are more knowledgeable on the subject than I, insufficient for the fiscal year of 1968.

Mr. Speaker, we are spending over $60 million a day just to wage this war. As I say, I do not feel that this amount is going to prove to be adequate.

Already, Mr. Speaker, we have authorized, during the 90th Congress, over $33 billion for our cause. This includes this legislation. Of necessity, it is going to have to be increased as we go along. My point, simply, is this: that it takes a lot of money but it takes a lot more than money to win a war.

Mr. Speaker, I realize that there is a feeling in some circles that the answer to crime, the answer to poverty, the answer to all questions, is spend and spend and spend more money.

This is one area in which I do not mind spending the money. But, I repeat, it takes more than the expenditure of public funds to win this war. It requires a united front. I regret to say that, apparently, we do not have the united front today.

Mr. Speaker, have we arrived at the point in this glorious young republic when a man can get up and openly defy the Government, openly advocate sedition and openly advocate treason and get by with it? And, Mr. Speaker, it is not all confined to the "Kings" and the "Carmichaels."

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this bill is going to pass. I prophesy that before this Congress adjourns we will authorize and appropriate a minimum of $10 billion more with which to carry on this war for the next fiscal year.

Give, Mr. Speaker—and this is the earnest plea of my brief appearance here—give to our boys over there not only the financial support necessary, but give to them the moral support which should naturally flow from this great country, the kind of solid support which they so much need and crave and deserve at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include pertinent extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 463 provides for the consideration of H.R. 9240, which is the defense procurement and research authorization for 1968, with 3 hours of debate on an open rule, from the standpoint of amendments, but points of order are waived.

We had a request to waive the points of order from the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services due to title III, where certain funds therein for the use of the Army can be transferred for use in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand. The rule actually waives all points of order. We could have done it just for title III, but it makes no difference that we had it written in this way because there are no other points of order except title III, which must be waived.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the bill is to authorize procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles for the Armed Forces, and to authorize research and development programs for new weapons systems, for the fiscal year 1968.

The total of authorizations contained in the bill are $21,435,032,000, broken down into two main categories: $14,129,400,000 for procurement and $7,305,632,000 for research and development.

Title I provides the following authorizations for the various types of equipment covered:

Aircraft: for the Army, $768,700,000; for the Navy and Marine Corps, $2,420,400,000; for the Air Force, $5,582,000,000.

Missiles: for the Army, $769,200,000; for the Navy, $625,600,000; for the Marine Corps, $23,100,000; for the Air Force, $1,343,000,000.

Naval vessel: $1,824,000,000.

Tracked combat vehicles: for the Army, $424,700,000; for the Marine Corps, $5,100,000.

Title II provides the following authorization in the field of research and development of new weapons systems:

For the Army, $1,539,000,000;

For the Navy and Marine Corps, $1,864,118,000;

For the Air Force, $3,288,514,000;

For defense agencies, $464,000,000;

For the Department of Defense as a defense emergency fund for use for either research or procurement needs, $125,000,000.

The committee added $368,600,000 to the requests submitted by the Department of Defense—$25,000,000 was added to the request of Department of Defense for continued work on the replacement bomber for the B–52, now designated AMSA. This brings the authorization up to what the Air Force originally asked for but was denied by the Department of Defense. The committee has also required that the two Navy frigates authorized be nuclear powered, at an additional cost of $83,000,000, part of its continuing fight with the Department of Defense to build a modern nuclear-powered navy. Unless the President certifies otherwise, the two ships must be nuclear powered. In addition, the committee added $106,700,000 to the authorizations for Army aircraft, chiefly helicopters, and $188,700,000 for Navy and Marine Corps aircraft.

Title III provides that funds authorized for our Armed Forces can be used to support allies in Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand under such terms as the Secretary of Defense may decide.

Title IV changes the manner of appointment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Four-year terms are provided for, at the pleasure of the President, and an individual could not be reappointed except in time of war or national emergency as declared by the Congress. These provisions would become effective on January 1, 1969.

The committee points out in its report the importance of the Nike X system and supports the Department of Defense in its request for funds to begin the changeover from research and development to production during fiscal 1968. The report discusses the various possible levels of deployment, their cost, and their effectiveness. They support the Department of Defense in its belief that each succeedingly higher level of deployment could be a point of stopping or a step upward if necessary.

Congressmen Pike and Nedzi support the bill, but not the language of the report concerning the Nike X. They do not want anything done or said which could imperil the current negotiations between the United States and Russia about the antimissile systems.

Mr. Speaker, I support the bill; I urge the adoption of the rule and reserve the the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall].

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to the discussion of the resolution itself, House Resolution 463, and particularly, and as usual, to establish a legislative record and the reason for the waiver of all points of order.

It has been closely and clearly held by the gentlemen who preceded me in the well that these waivers of points of order which preempt the rights of an individual elected legislator could have applied only to title III, but there was no other point of order entertainable as to the remainder of the bill.

I did not want to interrupt the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Committee on Rules or the ranking minority member, concerning this question of points of order. I was actually so enthralled by their statements that I thought it would have been ill-timed and inappropriate to do so.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we have here waived points of order against all points, and I am advised it is against title III.

I would like to ask the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, if in fact, this is waived in order to authorize a transfer of military assistance funds as stated by reference under title III, or not from the jurisdiction of one committee to the other?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from Missouri yield to me?

Mr. HALL. I would be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. I would be glad to attempt to answer the gentleman's question, by saying it was the understanding of the committee that there were certain funds, as the gentleman has pointed out, that were authorized to be transferred—and for that reason the rule made provision for the waiving of points of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's answer. I would like to pursue it just a bit further.

Is it not true that this involved originally the military assistance fund for use in Vietnam only and that title III extends that usage to other areas in Southeast Asia?

Mr. COLMER. If the gentleman will yield again, and permit me to suggest that he direct his question to the very learned and very able chairman of the Committee on Armed Services who is possibly—not possibly but—I am sure he is, more knowledgeable about this question than I am.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to yield to my chairman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding me this time. But what I am after is the technique or the why of the waiver of points of order which is provided by the Committee on Rules in the consideration by the House of a bill like this which the gentleman himself has pointed out.

Did the request for waiver of points of order against title III or any other part of this bill come spontaneously from the Committee on Rules?

Or did it come from our parliamentarian?

Or did it come on request of the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. In response to the gentleman, I would have to say my recollection of the matter is that it came from the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services.

I might further add, which is not unusual procedure, the appropriate rule was prepared by the parliamentarian. I think perhaps that answers the gentleman's question.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. I simply want to point out to the Members of the House that as we go into this rule limiting our prerogatives, actually this is a worthwhile rule as far as the transfer and use of these military assistance funds and other contiguous areas are concerned. I support jurisdiction and surveillance over military assistance by the Committee on Armed Services, or indeed—I support supervision of economic assistance by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

On the other hand, I want to point out and to note in the Record that the authority last year in the bill which became Public Law 89–367 did not have a waiver of points of order for the same purpose, nor was the question ever projected.

I doubt if it would have been this time, and I would certainly hope that we do not, by precedent or by custom, waive points of order which would eliminate the prerogatives of the individuals insofar as items of this type are concerned.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SMITH of California. The gentleman has said that we did not waive points of order in relation to Public Law 89–367. Of course, we did not have the provision on that bill. It was unnecessary. It was leftover money in the previously passed bill. We are now waiving points of order so the money can be used if the Secretary of Defense wants to in Thailand and Laos.

Mr. HALL. Then if the gentleman——

Mr. SMITH of California. We were requested to waive points of order. The rule was drawn up. I explained—I thought in detail—when I presented the reasons why this would have to be done in that way. If the Secretary of Defense wants to use that money, he can use it. We are trying our best to cooperate with your committee. We did not do it out of any wishy-washy desire in the consideration of the bill in the Rules Committee.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's statement, but does he not agree with me that this also confers jurisdiction on the Committee on Armed Services from the Committee on Foreign Affairs relative to the use of Military Assistance funds, originally specifically only in the case of South Vietnam? Is it not enlarging that jurisdiction? Is that not the subject of the point of order?

Mr. SMITH of California. Yes; I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 13 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert], a very valuable member of the Committee on Armed Services, and ask unanimous consent that he may speak out of order.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. Albert). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DERELICTION OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, of course, I wholeheartedly support the rule and support my committee in its entirety in relation to the bill which will come before the House after the rule is adopted.

I pause to pay high compliment and tribute to the gentleman from Mississippi for the remarks which he made while explaining the rule. I concur wholeheartedly in his remarks. I concur wholeheartedly in his sentiments. It is for that purpose that I have asked for the time to talk at this moment.

Yesterday I stood in the well of the House to indicate how words can be taken out of context and used for other purposes than intended. I understand that since then the practice has spread beyond the cartoonists to whom I referred yesterday in other publications, which I shall examine and, of course, have something to say about them.

But today in this particular time and in this particular instance I want to get crystal clear before the House the answer to the question on the lips of millions of American people in this country today as to why these individuals who have been described so adequately by my distinguished colleague from Mississippi who roam about the country attempting to cause disunity, defying the law and urging others to defy the law, are not brought to the bar of justice. Again I emphasize I not only speak of the Carmichaels and the Kings, whose names are in the forefront of the news, but I talk about others, particularly on the university campuses of this country.

It was my understanding before I delved into this subject that the reason that this discussion was not brought before the responsible body, the Department of Justice, was that there was no law on the books which permitted prosecution because we are not in a declared war. I am amazed, and I am sure you will be amazed to learn that the Department of Justice does not intend to prosecute these people. It has no intention at all of bringing them to the bar of justice, regardless of what the law is, and has advised the Committee on Armed Services during the draft hearings that no law can be written to bring these people to the bar of justice.

Why? Because in the opinion of the Department of Justice, the laws which are now on the books must be looked at in connection with the application of the first amendment. As I have said and tried to describe yesterday—and did say in this discussion—nobody defends the first amendment more than I do, nobody subscribes to the first amendment more than I do, nobody understands the right of dissent more than I do. Let us not attempt to equate the right of dissent under the first amendment to disloyal acts against the law of the country as written on the statute books.

I defend the first amendment. Of course I do. But it is not that I love the first amendment less, but that I love my country more.

Let me read a part of the exchange of the colloquy in the Armed Services Committee—and I am sure the Members will be as shocked as I was when I heard this. This colloquy took place when Mr. Fred Vinson, Jr., representing and speaking for the Department of Justice, was on the witness stand. This took place on Friday, May 5, 1967, at pages 875 and 876. Mr. Slatinshek, the counsel of the committee, was reading and testifying at the request of the committee.

> Mr. Slatinshek. Section 12 of the Act relates to penalties for violation of the Draft Act, and I will read as follows:
>
> "Sec. 12. Penalties:
>
> "(a) Any member of the Selective Service System or any other person charged——"
>
> Mr. Blandford. Start over—"or who otherwise evades".
>
> Mr. Slatinshek. I have skipped a portion of the preceding paragraph, and I pick up——

Listen well to these words. One does not have to have a baccalaureate degree, or be a long-hair, or be a doctor of philosphy, or be an egghead, but just be an ordinary common variety of citizen, such as most of us are, to understand plain English and to understand what the law says, and it says this:

> or who otherwise evades or refuses registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title or of said rules, regulations or directions, or who in any manner shall knowingly fail or neglect or refuse to perform any duty required of him under or in execution of this title, or rules, regulations or directions made pursuant to this title, or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way by force or violence or otherwise with the administration of this title or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses shall upon conviction in any District Court of the United States of competent jurisdiction be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years—

The chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], interrupted and said, "That is enough."

Continuing, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] asked this question of the representative of the Department of Justice:

> Has anybody been charged under the provision of that Act for knowingly counselling, aiding, or abetting another to refuse registration for service in the Armed Forces? Do you know of anybody who has been prosecuted under that?

This is the amazing statement from the representative of the Department of Justice. I quote Mr. Vinson:

> Not within my experience, Mr. Chairman.

It is shocking—shocking—from the Department of Justice.

Let me pursue the matter further. Let me go beyond what is contained in section 12 of the Selective Service Act and read what is even more damning, by referring to the code. This is the United States Code, title 18, section 2388, under title: "Activities Affecting Armed Forces During War."

Listen well. Drink in these words to better understand the dilemma we are in and the frustration we experience:

> (a) Whoever, when the United States is at war, willfully makes or conveys false reports or false statements with intent to interfere with the operation or success of the military or naval forces of the United States or to promote the success of its enemies; or
>
> Whoever, when the United States is at war—

I parenthetically make this statement: God knows we are at war. There are more than 10,000 dead and more than 50,000 casualties. Nobody, not even the Department of Justice, disputes the fact that we are at war.

I continue to read from the code:

> willfully causes or attempts to cause insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or willfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States, to the injury of the service or the United States, or attempts to do so—
>
> Shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both.
>
> (b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).
>
> (c) Whoever harbors or conceals any person who he knows, or has reasonable grounds to believe or suspect, has committed, or is about to commit, an offense under this sections, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than ten years, or both.
>
> (d) This section shall apply within the admiralty and maritime jurisdiction of the United States, and on the high seas, as well as within the United States. (United States Code, title 10, section 2388.)

This act was adopted June 25, 1948.

I ask the Members of the House, could anything be more clear? What do the Members think was the response of the representative of the Department of Justice when this statute was read to him? "I am not familiar with the statute."

This is the official opinion and testimony of the Department which is charged with the prosecution of the laws of this country. This is from the Department of Justice.

In the colloquy, which appeared in the Record of May 8, on pages 11931–33, the entire colloquy is developed as to why these people have not been prosecuted, and the Department of Justice blandly tells us that it takes unto itself the jurisdiction of judicial decision.

I frankly and readily admit that this is a practice that has become all too common. We have the Supreme Court taking unto itself the jurisdiction of writing the laws instead of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HÉBERT. So it is little wonder that the Department of Justice takes unto itself the functions of the judiciary. It is not hard to understand. Is there some understanding between the Justice Department and the courts as to what is right and what is wrong in judging laws? Oh, I know—and I say it with authority—that some of our Federal judges today in certain sections of the country have an open line to the Justice Department to get guidance as to what the ruling should be. Can anyone deny that a Federal judge sitting on a bench is there through the sufferance of the Justice Department and the Justice Department will not OK his appointment unless they have reason to believe that they are in line with the Justice Department's thinking. Upon what meat doth this our Caesar feed?

They deny to us, the people of the United States, the prosecution of the law which they are charged with. It was in this context that I said let us forget the first amendment. I did not say "Forget the first amendment, period." It has been taken out of context that this is something I said in that way. Every time we brought up the question—and you can read it in the record—the first amendment was thrown in. If we are going to take this and carry it to its logical conclusion, there is not a law on the books, criminal or otherwise, which does not in some way, if you want to interpret it in that way, interfere with the first amendment. That is what I cannot understand. I think this is what should have been brought to bear on this. The Justice Department publicly, openly, blandly, says we are not going to prosecute because these individuals have not violated the law. I wonder if they remember when a train was stopped out in California, a military train. Yet nothing was done about it. What are we to expect from the Supreme Court?

It was interesting to note yesterday that one of the judges—I think maybe only one of two, but at least one—wanted to wipe out convictions of some demonstrators in New York, and he raised the first amendment. It was interesting to also note that his most recent wife was an attendant at the Carmichael-King demonstration in New York. What are we coming to in this country when our Justice Department tells us that they are not going to prosecute these people? I join my fellow colleague from Mississippi in saying, Yes; in my book these activities of some of these people are treason. This is disloyalty. This is beyond the right of dissent, which I defend. I surely think these people are doing a disservice to their country when they do dissent in the fashion they do.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. Yes. I yield.

Mr. NEDZI. I am not sure I quite understood the gentleman earlier when he was referring to the statute that had in its preface the words "in time of war." I believe that the gentleman said there is no question of it. Have we officially declared war?

Mr. HÉBERT. This is not an official——

Mr. NEDZI. Will the gentleman please clarify his earlier statement?

Mr. HÉBERT. I will be very happy to repeat what I said. Regardless of whether it is a war or we have a declared war or have any language in that statute to strengthen it, the Department of Justice said it would not prosecute because the first amendment supplants it. It was in that context, which I am glad the gentleman brought up—it was in that context that I said let us forget all of these things and forget the first amendment in considering this. Let us talk about why you have not enforced the law. I said it it is not your function and it is not your duty to determine what the courts are going to hold. It is your duty to prosecute that law. Also, if that law is prosecuted in the courts, remember that 12 members of a jury will decide on the facts and not the courts.

Mr. NEDZI. I agree with the gentleman, but I think the Record should be clear as far as the second statute that he referred to, which stated "in time of war." I do not believe anybody in the room states or adopts the philosophy that at the present time we are officially at war.

Mr. HÉBERT. No one has said that we are "officially at war," nor does it say "officially at war." It says "at war."

Mr. Speaker, do not the 10,000 dead Americans testify to the fact that we are at war, as well as the numerous thousands of American casualties testify that we are at war? If not, then I do not know what war is.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates].

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear from the hearings which we held in the committee that the question of whether we are at war or not, is academic, because there is an amendment to that law which states that the December 1950 emergency is still in effect and is pertinent to the particular case to which the gentleman from Louisiana refers. That law is in title 10 of the United States Code, section 2391.

Mr. HÉBERT. The gentleman from Massachusetts is correct.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The time of the gentleman from Louisiana has again expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I yield to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] yesterday, during my absence referred to the creator of an infamous cartoon, a cartoon depicting the Constitution and the participants therein.

Mr. Speaker, for want of a better word, I believe the gentleman referred to this cartoonist as a sickened man.

Mr. Speaker, I have a better word—that it is a low down, dirty trick that could only emanate and be consummated by the minds of people working for certain newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, no one has advocated the burning of the Constitution. I suspect that if anyone did recognize or would recognize the burning of the Constitution, this particular cartoonist would advocate it, because the newspaper which he represents has been burning it since I have been in Congress. There is very little left for anyone else to burn insofar as this periodical is concerned. Would the gentleman from Louisiana also remind the Members of the House as to whether or not our committee inquired of this representative of the Department of Justice whether or not any legislation could be written or whether or not any other statute was in existence—involving treason, sedition or whatever have you—that could be employed to bring these people to the bar of justice?

Mr. HÉBERT. I did inquire, as the chairman knows, with reference to this matter, and I was told, as our chairman was told and as our committee was told, that the answer was negative.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Louisiana will yield further, did not the representative of the Department of Justice state that he did not know of any way on earth whereby he could be indicted and prosecuted. They have made up their minds in the Department of Justice. They have already made the decision. They have already decided the case before the trial. They have decided the facts, and they have decided not to bring these people before the bar of justice.

Mr. Speaker, that is how simple it is.

Yet, when we inquire about this—those of us who come from south of the Mason-Dixon line—they accuse us of disrespect for the Constitution, and I guess this is to be expected.

But I want to say this to you: The American people are not going to let this go on—they want this treason stopped.

Mr. HÉBERT. I thank the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HÉBERT. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I might be able to shed a little light upon the problem as to whether the laws applicable to sending supplies and material aid to the Vietcong and North Vietnamese are effective or not, laws designed to curtail the type of activity against which the distinguished gentleman in the well speaks.

Last year I questioned the Assistant Attorney General of the United States, now the Attorney General of the United States, for perhaps an hour and a half in regard to such assistance by Vietcong sympathizers in this country and the line of questioning has been printed in the record of the House Committtee on Un-American Activities, and is available for the Members.

The situation is this: You have two laws on the books that could possibly curtail such activity. One is the Trading With the Enemy Act, and the other is the Export-Import Control Act. The Attorney General contends that these laws are efficient and are effective, but I believe the record very clearly shows that to date there has not been a single prosecution or a single indictment obtained under those laws. I would say to the gentleman that it would be a very stupid Vietcong sympathizer indeed who would send aid to the Vietcong and be prosecuted under the present laws of the United States. He should be able to do it and still avoid prosecution in view of the present ineffective laws on the statute books. The laws simply are not effective. We do not have effective laws to curtail this type of activity and for this reason the Senate last year should have passed the so-called Pool bill notwithstanding the opposition of the Department of Justice.

Mr. HÉBERT. In addition to that, the Department of Justice says we cannot write an effective law and shows no inclination not only to write it, but to assist us in writing it. And if we write it they have no intention of prosecuting under it.

Mr. ICHORD. I would tell the gentleman that any citizen in the United States under the present law can go out and solicit money, supplies, military ammunition, or anything else to send to the Vietcong, and he will not be committing a criminal offense under the present laws.

Mr. HÉBERT. It is a sad state of affairs when this Congress cannot write such legislation.

Mr. Speaker, these people may be Americans, or they may claim to be Americans, but as for me I would rather be a dog baying at the moon than to be such an American.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Wyman] and ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to speak out of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this brief time to protest an abuse of the right to dissent that is taking place in the Pentagon even as I speak.

Right now, today, bearded beatniks stationed at the entrances, inside the Pentagon, and at the ramps to the offices, are handing pamphlets out to everybody who enters, urging refusal to enlist, refusal to be drafted, refusal to go to Vietnam if you are in the service, refusal to pay income taxes, refusal to work in war industries, refusal to do any research for the Government, and encouraging acts of civil disobedience.

In all of this where is the Secretary of Defense? There is no constitutional right to undermine our Government in this way on Government property. Does the Secretary of Defense condone this action inside the very heart of the Defense Establishment while men are dying? It is worse than disgraceful. It is an abuse of the right of freedom of speech that not even the U.S. Supreme Court with its present majority would presently protect. It helps demoralize men who are fighting, and it helps the Communist cause. In time of war, declared or undeclared, such conduct on the part of American citizens is treasonable.

Yet this is not all. These pamphlets contain pictures of an American GI with a caption "Do you really want him setting fire to the homes of families, torturing prisoners, proudly counting the number of men he has killed? Do you want him playing with the children whose father or mother he may have shot that morning?"

This handout material specifically urges Americans to "follow one's conscience rather than the policies of one's government if the two conflict."

Mr. Speaker, this is the language of anarchy. Essentially the cumulative message from this material is subversive and pro-Communist. It is called "Nonviolent Direct Action for Peace," but the message seeks to destroy the fabric of law and order, and to harm the national defense effort. And whether it is a grape grown from the seeds of the grapes of wrath of licentious Supreme Court decisions or not, there is no requirement that subversion should be tolerated within our Military Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me for this purpose, and I say again that if the Secretary of Defense did not authorize and does not condone the presence of these beatniks and these activists in the Pentagon, why have they not been ejected long ago?

I think the Secretary should act to expel them from the Pentagon and its approaches. I think that when our men are dying for America—and some of them are friends of mine the sons of friends of ours, and not long from now it may be my own boy, I think it behooves us if the Secretary does not act—we should—to stop this sort of thing. This makes a mockery of freedom of speech. This is not mere license. This is outright subversion. It is harmful to the defense effort and damaging to the national security.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 9240) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 9240, with Mr. Rostenkowski in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I will not dwell on the remarks which my colleague, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Hébert] so eloquently made. In this Committee of the Whole today, I am trying to address myself to the contents of the bill.

But prior to that, if the Chairman will permit me, I would like to say this about the colloquy between the gentleman from Louisiana and me concerning the attitude of the Department of Justice with respect to these people who are making a mockery of their responsibility to their Nation in time of war and who not only are giving aid and comfort to the enemy but they are chopping the hearts out of the boys who are fighting in Vietnam.

Mr. Chairman, I charge that people who will disseminate unfair and untruthful information in cartoons or otherwise are engaged in a conscious effort to give aid and comfort to the enemy.

My mail, Mr. Chairman, has increased over 866 percent in the 2 years since I became chairman.

We are 14 days behind in answering mail, and I have employed at least a half-dozen new employees. I get reams and reams of mail from your fighting men asking us—What is happening to America?

When a witness from the Department of Justice tells my committee "There is nothing I can do and nothing I intend to do," I say to you—What on earth has happened to your country? What on earth has happened to your country?

God help us when the highest representative of law enforcement in this country sits down and makes a statement such as this—What on earth are we to do? At least they should try to do something.

These people should be indicted. These

people should be tried, and if convicted, let them do the appealing. This is all we ask. If the Supreme Court declares that these acts, written long before these days, are unconstitutional and in violation of the first amendment to the Constitution, let that burden be upon the Supreme Court of the United States. We have done our work.

Why does not the executive branch do its? No; they elect to take another course, the course of "Do nothing, fiddle and let Rome burn."

But, Mr. Chairman, so far as I am concerned, count me out of that kind of philosophy, that kind of cowardice, that kind of inaction, and that kind of "Help" to our fighting men wherever they may be. I will not be a party to it. If there are 50 million cartoons about me and 100 million of the continually low life, dirty articles written about me and my committee in a conscious effort to destroy not only my image but that of the great committee you have elected me to run for you, I will still feel the same.

As long as you keep me as your chairman, I am going to run that committee for you—I repeat, for you. That will be my position. Nothing can be said to hurt me; nothing can be done to hurt me. I am going to keep my faith with this House, so help me God.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 9240 is as important—and perhaps more important—than any authorization bill which will be presented on the floor of the House during this session of the Congress. I use the word "presented" rather than "defended" in referring to my submission of this bill for the consideration of the House, since I think you will agree that a bill of this kind—and at this time—needs no defense. The problems that face us in Vietnam and potential problems in other parts of the world constitute the best defense that the bill could have.

I would like to say that all of the departmental requests as they appeared in the program sent to the Congress have been approved by the committee with two exceptions, and I will note those exceptions at this time.

First, the Department of Defense requested two conventionally powered guided-missile destroyers; the committee has stricken those two DDG's and substituted instead two nuclear-powered guided-missile frigates. The two DDG's would cost $166.6 million while the two DLGN's—the nuclear-powered frigates—will cost $269.6 million.

I will deal with this matter again later in my statement.

The second difference is this: the Department of Defense requested five fast deployment logistic ships. The committee recommends two—which will make actually a total of four authorized FDL's since two were authorized and funded in fiscal year 1966. This, too, I will deal with again later in my statement.

This bill is, of course, the fiscal year 1968 authorization for appropriations for weapons procurement and research and development. It is essentially the same as many previous bills for which rules have been requested over the past several years. Some of them have been regular fiscal year programs—as this one is—and some of them have been supplemental authorizations. This bill and all of the others have merely represented more of the same kind of thing.

The bill as presented to the committee sought authorization in the amount of $21,066,432,000. To this request the committee added $368.6 million for a new recommended total of $21,435,032,000. Last year's law, incidentally, was $17.5 billion.

In addition to describing the whole bill I will deal with each of the additions made by the committee in sufficient detail to permit understanding of the committee's action.

PROCUREMENT

ARMY

First, I will briefly describe the Army program. It totals $1,962,600,000. The procurement items for the Army are aircraft, missiles, and tracked combat vehicles. Each aircraft, missile, and tracked combat vehicle is described in detail starting on page 12 of the report. The items to be procured are essentially the same as in the past with, of course, improvements or more advanced types of weapons as these have been developed and produced.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

The total Navy and Marine Corps program comes to $5,053,800,000. This covers aircraft and missiles for the Navy and Marine Corps, tracked combat vehicles for the Marines and, of course, naval vessels.

The two biggest areas in the Navy and Marine Corps program are aircraft at about $2.5 billion and naval vessels at almost $1.9 billion. Both fixed wing aircraft and helicopters are to be procured as well as usual types of missiles.

A description of each of these items, from aircraft to ships, is contained in the report starting on page 20.

AIR FORCE

The Air Force program, which is the largest of the three, totals $7,113,000,000 and represents the proposed procurement of their aircraft and missiles.

For a detailed description of these aircraft and missiles you can turn to page 27 of the report.

Let me again state that the items to be procured are essentially those that have been procured in the past for all three departments, with variances here and there which merely represent more advanced systems as they have come into being.

I would now like to deal with the additions made by the committee. You will recall that they totaled $368.6 million which represents about a 1.2-percent increase in the whole bill. In this connection I draw your attention to the table which appears on page 2 of the report.

All but $25 million of this amount were additions to the procurement portion of the bill. The $25 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft, I will refer to later on.

Here are the additions: First, we added EA-6A aircraft for the Marine Corps. These are needed to provide for attrition and to replace other obsolescent electronic warfare aircraft now in Vietnam.

For the Air Force we added C-130E aircraft for the very simple reason that these outstanding cargo aircraft are needed for command support, for attrition and to fill squadrons not now fully equipped. I might mention, incidentally, that the Department of the Air Force both in the last supplemental and for this bill asked the Secretary of Defense for 50 of these aircraft. The Air Force was turned down both times. We have added only 25 of the 50.

The next aircraft is the C-7A. This is a short takeoff and landing airplane for use close in to combat areas. It can move troops, weapons, equipment and supplies rapidly within the combat zone.

Next we added some C-X2 airplanes. The designation of C-X2 does not refer to a particular airplane but rather to a type. These aircraft would be used for aeromedical evacuation and are urgently needed. The planes to be procured could be Boeing 727's, 737's, Douglas DC-9's or other aircraft of this general configuration.

At the present time our aeromedical evacuation fleet consists of old C-131's and C-118 aircraft. I think we owe a little more speed and a little bit better transportation than is now being provided our sick and wounded.

The committee also added—and this is a very high priority item—a substantial amount of authority for funds for aircraft modifications. This money would provide, for example, improved electronic equipment for fighters to give better penetration capability, greater bombing accuracy, and to provide better offensive and defensive jamming.

I want to make it clear that every one of the additions made by the committee is something requested by a military department which was turned down by the Secretary of Defense. We did not, therefore, add anything to the bill that is really "new."

The last two items that I want to talk about do not represent additions. In fact, one of them represents a deletion; these two items are the nuclear powered guided missile frigates and the fast deployment logistic ships.

Each of these has a long story connected with it. But I will be quite brief in discussing them and touch only on the highlights.

With respect to the DLGN's, you, Mr. Chairman, and the House, are aware of the long and only moderately successful fight which the Armed Services Committee has been putting up over the years to get the Department of Defense started on a nuclear surface Navy. It is completely incomprehensible to us why we have met such resistance from the Secretary of Defense. The Navy is well aware of the tremendous advantages of the nuclear powered guided missile frigates. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Price], both members of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy as well as the Armed Services Committee, know of these advantages, and I can say with complete accuracy that there is not a single dissenting view on our committee with respect to the need for at least a start on a nuclear surface Navy.

You will note, Mr. Chairman, that the committee has inserted language in the bill stating that—

> The contracts for the construction of the two nuclear powered guided missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest.

We have taken the bull by the horns before and authorized a DLGN which finally the Secretary of Defense has agreed to build. In this bill we have authorized two more of them—substituting them, as I have mentioned previously—for the two conventionally powered guided-missile destroyers recommended by the Department.

Simply stated, we have no other course to follow. We must continue to authorize these ships and press the Secretary of Defense to build them. We are going to continue to do exactly this.

By the way, I should note that these DLGN's are dealt with in great detail starting on page 5 of the report. Every aspect of the advantages of nuclear power in surface ships and all other pertinent matters are set out in this portion of the report.

Now let me turn to the fast deployment logistic ships. As you know, these have been the subject of a great deal of public controversy. Much of it, I think, arose from a fear on the part of the private ship owners that they would be used at some time in the future to carry cargo on a point-to-point basis thereby taking business away from the private ship owners. In actuality, they will never be used in this fashion and we have the assurance of the Secretary of Defense that this is the case.

I think virtually all of the other objections to this kind of ship have also been removed as those interested in them have become better informed as to their true military function.

Essentially the idea is this: the FDL ship would be loaded with equipment—tanks, guns, and so forth—and would be at sea—or ready to go to sea—prepared to head for a trouble spot in the world such as Vietnam was at its inception. The giant C–5 aircraft which will be coming off the line in the near future would carry the troops to the trouble spot where they would marry up with the equipment on the FDL's and form a fighting force. It's that simple.

You should understand that two of these ships were authorized in fiscal year 1966 and the Department requested five more in this 1968 program. We are recommending two of the five for an actual authorized total of four: the two from 1966 and the two in this program.

We are directing that the whole subject of these ships, functionally and otherwise, be the subject of a report to the committee by the Department of Defense early next year.

I want to draw your attention to the fact that the whole idea of the FDL ship is dealt with in detail beginning on page 8 of the report. You will find it interesting reading.

Let me now turn to "Research and development."

This is the largest defense research and development budget ever presented to the Congress, $7.3 billion. It is $102 million more than Congress authorized last year, including the supplemental, and $187 million more than was appropriated.

The requests submitted by the military services were reduced within the executive branch approximately $900 million before the budget was submitted to Congress. The Armed Services Committee adjusted only one program by adding $25 million to the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA. You will recall that this is to be the follow-on bomber to the B–52. The Air Force is modifying the controversial TFX into an interim bomber. But the FB–111, which is the designation, will not have the unrefueled range and payload required by the Air Force. The JCS were unanimously in favor of the add-on for the AMSA in the fiscal year 1968 budget.

The Nike X antiballistic missile system is supported at the funding level requested by the Army and approved by the Department of Defense, so there is no disagreement on this program from a funding standpoint. The question is on when and where to deploy the system. Hopefully, this will be resolved upon conclusion of the negotiations presently going on with the Soviet Union. The committee strongly favors the initial deployment of the "austere" system which would provide an area defense for the entire United States against an attack from the Chinese Communists as well as an accidental firing from any other country against the United States. It would also offer protection to a number of our Minuteman ICBM missile sites. In addition, it would have the growth potential for whatever future degree of protection is desired by the Department of Defense and the Congress.

The amount included in this budget for research and development is almost $900 million less than that requested by the military services and is intended in the words of Defense witnesses to provide "only the funds necessary to support research and development efforts where the problems are pressing, the needs clear, the approach sound, and the talent available."

We made an amendment to the bill which in no way relates to procurement and research and development but rather to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The amendment which I will describe in a moment would become effective after January 1, 1969, and will change existing law by establishing a 4-year term of appointment for the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Chief of Naval Operations.

Such persons hereafter appointed as members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff would serve during the pleasure of the President and could not be reappointed except in time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress.

Under existing law only the Commandant of the Marine Corps, who has coequal status with the Joint Chiefs of Staff when Marine Corps matters are discussed, must be appointed for 4 years. The law with regard to the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and the Chief of Naval Operations permits appointment up to a term of 4 years. The history of the appointment and reappointments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff vary from a period of 4 years, 2 years, no term specified and, to as little as 1 year.

Under the provisions of this title a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff appointed after January 1, 1969, will know that he serves at the pleasure of the President and can be removed at any time before he completes his 4-year term. The normal tour of duty will be 4 years but each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff hereafter appointed will know that he can be removed by the President at any time and for any reason whatsoever. This proposed title in no way requires, forces, or compels the President to retain any officer as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The sole objective of the proposed title is to permit members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to advise the Congress, as well as the President and Secretary of Defense, freely in defense matters. The final decision in defense matters must always rest with the Commander in Chief. A fixed 4-year term of office established by law will not trespass in the slightest degree upon civilian control of our Armed Forces.

I wish to strongly emphasize that the provisions of this title will not in any way affect the status of the current members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff since the effective date will be January 1, 1969.

This title also does not affect the appointment or tenure of the office of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. His term of appointment continues to be for 2 years and reappointment in the same manner for one additional term. In time of war declared by the Congress there is no limit on the number of reappointments for the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

That is the bill. I do not feel I even need to urge your support of it because the legislation speaks for itself.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT. I have read the report of the committee and I note that it calls for a total expenditure of beyond $76 billion. Certainly I have every intention of supporting the committee, as I am sure practically every Member of the House has, but I do have some misgivings with regard to the expenditure of this huge sum of money. I wonder if the committee has done anything to assure that this vast expenditure of money will be spent to win the war in Vietnam. I wonder if the chairman would care to comment on that? We hear of such things as a "no win" policy in Vietnam. I hate to see this sum of money spent and the lives of our men sacrificed unless this country is making every effort to win this war.

Mr. RIVERS. Of course, I do not form the policy, but every speech I make I call for a win policy. I want to win this war. I want to bring these people to the peace table, if this is possible, and the only way we can do it is to make them hurt so they must come to the peace table.

I want to win this war, and every speech I make is to that effect.

I believe the total defense budget for fiscal year 1969 is some $76.5 billion. This is only $21 billion of that. That is for the hardware and research and development.

But indeed I do want to win this war, make no mistake about that.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the military authorization bill, H.R. 9240, which provides nearly 21 and a half billion dollars for missiles, aircraft, naval vessels, tracked vehicles, and research and development for the Department of Defense.

This amount contained in this bill is but a fraction of the $73 billion needed for the operations of the Department this year. From 1945 through this fiscal year, the Congress has voted over $1 trillion for the Department of Defense. One trillion dollars. This is a sum quite impossible to imagine. I am told 1 trillion miles is as far as 4 million trips to the moon. Our rate of spending has risen from $96 billion for the 5 years from 1946 on to $322 billion for our last 5 years.

In other words, over 3½ times since that first 5-year period following World War II.

Of course, it is true that our new weapons systems cost much more than did those of World War II. During World War II we spent $4 million for a submarine. Today a Polaris submarine costs about $150 million.

In World War II a destroyer cost $7 million. Today a destroyer costs $67 million.

During World War II an aircraft carrier cost $55 million. The nuclear carrier *Enterprise*, without its airplanes, cost half a billion dollars.

A bomber in World War II cost approximately $250,000. The latest version of our B–58, which we discontinued in 1962, costs $14 million.

We have been spending at the rate of 10 percent of our military budget for research and development. So we have spent over $100 billion since 1945 for research and development alone. One-third of this bill before us is for research and development.

In the postwar period there was a word that was used every day and was commonly understood. That word was "breakthrough." Now it is almost a stranger. We no longer hear about breakthroughs. Instead we hear about studies.

With the amounts of money we have been continuing to spend on our research and development—and this year, as I have indicated, it is over $7 billion—we would expect that we would be reaching as many breakthroughs now as we did in the past. Indeed we would even expect them to be more frequently because of the spending we are doing, but that is not so.

During the period of World War II and immediately thereafter we saw the successful development of radar and sonar, of the ballistic missile and the Polaris submarine, of nuclear weapons and transistors in miniature form. This same feeling of accomplishment has been missing lately.

It might be thought that during the earlier years there was an abundance of advanced ideas which no one had enough money fully to develop. So these were available for quick development as soon as we had the money and applied our talents. We hope this same situation prevails today, but unfortunately the entire psychology of our military development appears to lack the excitement, the determination, and the urgency which characterized our military developments in the earlier postwar periods.

A new thinking has come among us which should suggest that we take comfort in the status quo, that we have reached the highest peaks of military development necessary for our national defense. That is shown by the statement in the report of the Presidential Committee on the Economic Impact of Defense and Disarmament, which said:

> As the production of strategic weapons brings us close to our needed strength, the demands of defense on our scientific and technical resources are leveling out.

This feeling that we have reached the plateau of accomplishments is also reflected in the fact that our scientists are not as eager now as they were to participate in research in our defense efforts. A recent article in Science discussed this problem under the title "Military Research: A Decline in the Interest of Scientists?"

In recent years we have been put in the position where our choices have been limited. For instance, we are now phasing out the B–52 bombers for the less advantageous FB–111. The choices available are not the best that this country can procure or that industry can provide because of the postponement of decisions which the distinguished chairman of this committee has mentioned on many occasions.

In our earlier period of research we had a number of developments from which we could make the decision to move ahead. We do not now. We should be advancing now at great speed on the AMSA, but now it is necessary for us to have an interim airplane, an expensive one, with limited capabilities, called the FB–111.

While there is no one whose desire for peace is greater than mine, I sometimes feel that the moving force of someone in the decisionmaking process is to go toward equality of armaments with our potential enemies and to relax our efforts more than the security of our country really permits.

I could not take issue with some of these decisions if there were a solid inspection system under which we could with safety deescalate our development of greater military weapons systems. This is certainly an ideal worthy of our most meticulous and careful examination. Even more, such consideration is crucial in this dangerous world in which we live.

But I would also suggest that there is nothing more dangerous than idealism in a vacuum. Until sound agreements are reached, the peace we seek is but an illusion if we do not develop our military strength to see to it that we always have superior power. We must always have the technological superiority so that we are the ones to have the "ace in the hole." We were caught short on October 4, 1957, regardless of the reasons, and it must never happen again. What if Sputnik had been a new weapon system of corresponding significance? We must have the best defenses. We can maintain the peace—our freedoms and our way of life—only if the potential enemy knows we have the power of great destruction.

We had that advantage at the end of World War II. Our development of atomic power has given us such an amount of destruction in one B–52 that one million B–52's would be needed to match that if the load were TNT.

For our best military offense we must have a series of weapons systems carefully planned, proven, and developed. These would force our potential enemy to develop defenses against each such system.

We must be careful in the development of any jack-of-all-trades system that military degradation is not the result. Thus in producing a single fighter for the Air Force and the Navy, the Navy fighter had such setbacks that its ability to fly off a carrier deck and perform its missions has suffered greatly. While commonality is an attractive word, we should not permit it to result in a compromised weapon that cannot compete with an enemy who decided that a compromise was not good enough.

There are those who believe that our missile systems are sufficient to deter the aggressor from ever striking. I believe to the contrary. There is a centuries old adage "Never put all of your eggs in one basket." In the latter part of the 20th century, this should be a clarion call to us to avoid the trap that history teaches so graphically in that expression. While it is expensive for us to have alternative offensive systems, it is also expensive to the other side to develop defenses to cope with our systems. It is for this reason that I have so strongly supported the further development of the Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft—and that our committee has added $25 million to the President's budget for this program. This sum is to carry on the development of the engines and avionics for the plane.

The missiles and the bombers fall within the first category of our weapons systems called by the Pentagon our deterrent forces. The second great group of forces is supposed to be our damage limiting forces. Yet the best known damage limiting force that we have to date—our antiballistic missile system—is still not in production and is still only in the advanced study phase. Even the funds the Congress added last year for the preproduction activities have been deferred and have not been allowed to be spent. In the meantime, our potential enemies have started the installation of one, and perhaps even two, such systems.

One of the main items to which our committee has addressed itself over the past years has been the development of the nuclear navy. To us this seems logical and sensible, but the development is a long time in coming.

Although the aircraft carrier, the *Enterprise*, has been in operation now for a number of years, it was not until last year that the Department of Defense decided to build another nuclear-powered carrier—letting two other carriers be conventionally powered in the meantime. This year the Department added the funds needed for the long leadtime items for a third nuclear-powered carrier. Now we are trying to get the escorts for these nuclear carriers to be nuclear powered also so that we can have entire task forces independent of the propulsion fuel supply. It was only after we put mandatory language in last year's bill that the Defense Department allowed the Navy to have a third nuclear-powered guided missile frigate to add to the *Bainbridge* which has been in commission and operating in Southeast Asia, and the *Truxtun* which is just being commissioned. We have also the nuclear-powered cruiser the *Long Beach* as the only other nuclear-powered surface ship. The change is still too slow.

It took two-thirds of a century to convert our Navy from sails to steam. Coal was more expensive and its use posed many problems. As the sails were eliminated each coal-fired ship had to have a collier attend it when it had extended periods of operation at sea. So the operation today is much easier than it was in the days gone by. With the change to nuclear power, it will no longer be necessary to provide tankers alongside the carriers or its escorts for their propulsion fuel, thus cutting a great logistics train. Indeed, as the Chief of Naval Operations has told our committee:

> Nuclear power makes possible the greatest advance in propulsion since we went from sail to steam.

At the present each nuclear ship receives a supply of nuclear fuel when it is built that lets it operate for 10 years without refueling. The time is not too far away when the life of the initial loading of fuel will be the same as the life of the ship. The first core loading will provide enough energy to satisfy all requirements for the lifetime of the vessel.

Now is the time to have all major fleet escorts nuclear powered. This is the position of this committee, as it has been the position of all other committees which have considered the matter. It is inconceivable that in 1967 we should be building any ship which will still be available in the year 2000 and have a fuel system that was first introduced 100 years before. Yet that is what will be happening if we do not insist on having the major fleet escorts nuclear. Last year the Chief of Naval Operations expressed it this way:

> Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security.

Admiral Rickover has provided the committee with copies of letters he has received from the commanding officers of our nuclear surface ships in operation, and especially in operation in Southeast Asia. These show that our nuclear ships are capable of continued high speed operation on a moment's notice that is impossible with conventionally powered ships. They can be sent on special missions on a moment's notice without having to top off with black oil. They are far cleaner and do not require the manhours for maintenance that our fuel-burning ships do.

However, instead of making the judgment on the basis of experience, the Department of Defense is going through two more studies. Nuclear power has been so studied to death that there has been nothing but delay. Our committee has in the past year received studies of nuclear power over a foot thick. Strangely enough when I asked for the studies on which the Department asked for the construction of gas turbine-powered ships, they produced one seven-page study and one 1-inch study. Neither study considered nuclear power.

The main difficulty with the studies is that they are based on numerical calculations set up by the systems analysis people. Yet these studies do not take into consideration the vital elements of experience, such as the effect of finally cutting the propulsion fuel pipeline. It was most shocking to find that while the Chief of Naval Operations believes he could conduct a mission with less loss of American lives if he had an all nuclear task force, that decrease in the loss of lives is never included in any of the studies since it cannot be expressed as a number with which the systems analysis people are familiar.

As of this moment, there are two more studies being conducted—one the major fleet escort study, the other the DX/DXG study. It is the committee position that the time has long since passed when further money should be spent on studying major fleet escorts which are not nuclear powered, and it has taken that position in its report.

Again this year, as in years past, the committee has drawn attention to the fact that the fleet is becoming obsolescent at a much faster rate than it is being rebuilt. This year we point out that if the fleet were to remain at its expected strength with usable ships in 1973, the Navy would have to build new ships at the rate of over 140 ships a year for the next 3 years.

This year, as in the past, there is a considerable sum of money included in the budget for antisubmarine warfare operations.

As we have learned from Vietnam, the enemy likes to use guerrilla tactics. This will probably also be true in his use of submarines. The murky depths of the oceans can hide a submarine—especially a nuclear submarine that never needs to surface for air. The game can be very deadly. The fleet of submarines which is available against us is growing—and already has over 400, including over 50 with nuclear propulsion.

Our committee has been concerned about the progress being made in our antisubmarine warfare programs. It has been concerned enough to set up a special subcommittee for this. It appears that our fears in this regard have been well founded. In the past year, the Department of Defense has decided to cut back the construction of new nuclear attack submarines—the weapons which have been described as our primary antisubmarine weapons. It has also been announced that the number of hunter-killer groups, which have already been reduced from nine to eight, will be further reduced to six in the near future. In the meantime, the Department of Defense is running a number of studies to see whether the aircraft carrier for this group is needed—and to plan the type of plane which should go on the carrier if it is continued. Unfortunately, what has not been made clear so far is that there are very few if any carriers presently in use in our antisubmarine warfare groups from which the newly planned plane—the VSX—can fly.

The tendency in the Department of Defense is to replace carrier-based aircraft with land-based aircraft—and this at a time when our ability to have land bases around the world is becoming increasingly questionable.

Indeed an examination of the study on which the Department of Defense concluded to take some of these actions discloses that the study not only specifically disclaims being the base for making force levels decisions, but the study is so poorly put together that it is not a proper basis for any decision. The conditions on which the study was based are so contrary to fact and the deductions from those conditions so far from the present day world that the study is worse than no good—it is dangerously misleading. The "scenario" on which the study was based is in fact a "dream" which upon examination in the cold light of day makes the study more nearly a "nightmare."

NUCLEAR NAVY: THE POINT AT ISSUE

The point at issue is whether an aircraft carrier that is nuclear powered, and hence cut free from the logistics supply line for its own propulsion, should be accompanied by four or more escorts, any of which are tied to the logistics pipeline for their own fuel. Our committee believes, in line with the studies made by Admiral Rickover, that the real military effectiveness of such a task group is not fully realized until the last escort is freed from the fuel oil pipeline.

NUCLEAR ESCORTS

Last year in its report, this committee set forth the basic issue as:

> #### THE ISSUE
>
> The issue before Congress is very simple—do we start now to have all-nuclear task forces?
>
> *The attack carrier*
>
> The attack aircraft carrier is our prime naval attack weapon. It provides a movable platform from which to launch airplanes wherever they may be needed. With the British decision not to defend east of Suez,

the French decision to pull out of NATO and to have all foreign troops withdrawn from French soil, and with the increasing problems with rights of overflight, we must be able to operate attack carrier task forces anywhere.

Nuclear-powered attack carrier

The nuclear-powered attack aircraft carrier has proven so far more effective in battle that the Department of Defense has requested one new nuclear-powered carrier this year at a cost of $427.5 million and is planning for other new nuclear carriers. The nuclear carrier has a complement of about 6,000 officers and men. With its air wing of about 100 planes, its initial total capital cost is about $1 billion.

Escort ships

At least four escort ships are assigned to each aircraft carrier to protect it against any air or submarine attack. The initial capital cost of the four escort ships is about $500 million if they are nuclear powered and $300 million if they are conventionally powered; however, the cost of the nuclear-powered ships includes the first cores which provide power for at least 10 years and also extra armament. The cost of conventionally powered ships does not include the cost of fuel or fuel delivery. When all costs are considered the difference in building and operating a nuclear-powered task force over a conventionally powered task force with the same type ships is only about 6 percent over their entire lifetime.

Soviet submarines

As reported in the newspapers, the Soviets now have about 45 nuclear submarines which have unlimited attack range and are building more. Only nuclear-powered escort ships can give unlimited chase to any nuclear-powered submarine without having to abandon the chase for refueling.

Conventional power

Substituting conventionally powered escorts for nuclear-powered escorts does not in any way meet the problem of protecting the attack aircraft carrier against the unlimited attack range of a nuclear-powered submarine. Nor do they provide the continuous screen for the carrier.

It is foolhardy not to provide the best protection for the 6,000 man crew and the initial $1 billion unit capital investment in a nuclear-powered carrier by not spending the additional 4 percent to make the entire task force nuclear powered.

Black oil logistics

A nuclear-powered task force that is free of the black oil logistics train can travel anywhere around the world on a moment's notice without refueling and can arrive ready for immediate operations. This freedom from the logistics train for black oil can be followed by new methods of replenishing ammunition and food so that the task force is less and less dependent on any logistics train. This possibility can open up new tactics which are flexible to meet peculiarities of any individual situation. As the Chief of Naval Operations stated in his memorandum of April 14, 1966, to the Secretary of the Navy:

> "The endurance, tactical flexibility, and greater freedom from logistic support of nuclear warships will give the United States an unequaled naval striking force. Our new warships, which the Navy will be operating into the 21st century, should be provided with the most modern propulsion plants available. *To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security.*"

Nothing has happened to make this committee change its mind on this position. On the contrary, the committee is more convinced than ever that nuclear-powered aircraft carriers need to have nuclear-powered escorts in order to make the task group have the highest military effectiveness possible. To this end, the committee is recommending this year the additional funds needed for the completion of the nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate partially funded last year together with the funds necessary for the construction of another nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate. The Navy requested two DDG's—conventional guided-missile destroyers—and one DLGN—nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate. The Secretary of Defense eliminated the nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate, leaving only the two conventional guided-missile destroyers.

By this action, the committee is recommending an increase of only $83 million over the program of the Secretary of Defense while at the same time assuring that our nuclear-powered aircraft carriers are receiving the most militarily effective escorts it is possible to provide.

The figures are:

[In millions]

2 DLGN, at $134.8 million (follow ship cost, which includes $12 million per ship for initial nuclear fuel that will power at least 10 years of normal ship operation	$269.6
Less advanced procurement previously authorized (fiscal year 1967)	20.0
Subtotal	249.6
Less 2 DDG (lead ship cost $99.7 million, follow ship cost $66.9 million) included in fiscal year 1968 budget request	166.6
Additionally required in fiscal year 1968	83.0

The committee cannot fail to point out to the Congress that it was only after the Congress inserted strong language in the authorization bill last year that the Secretary of Defense proceeded with the one nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate. That language is:

> The contract for the construction of the nuclear powered guided missile frigate for which funds were authorized to be appropriated under Public Law 89–37, and for which funds are authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1967, shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that its construction is not in the national interest.

As a result of this position, the Congress in 1966 authorized and appropriated $130.5 million to complete the funding for the one nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate for which $20 million for the procurement of long leadtime items had been authorized and appropriated in 1965. The Congress also authorized and appropriated $20 million for the procurement of long leadtime items for an additional nuclear-powered guided-missile frigate.

Of these, the Department of Defense has allowed only the first of these two guided-missile frigates to be constructed.

Last year in its hearings, this committee published a paper by Rear Adm. Henry L. Miller, then commander, Carrier Division 3, on the advantages of nuclear power in a combat environment. This paper was extensively quoted in last year's report. This year, upon the urging of the committee, several letters were introduced from the commanding officers of nuclear-powered surface ships showing how the nuclear power greatly facilitated their operations. While there are deletions for security purposes in the letters, the balance is inserted in the RECORD for the clear proof of the advantages of nuclear power.

One letter was from the commanding officer of the *Enterprise:*

> Of particular interest at this time is the issue of nuclear propulsion in escort ships for the attack carrier strike forces. I think you would be interested in the experience of the *Enterprise* and her escorts, both nuclear and conventionally powered, during actual fleet operations. One incident in particular serves as a forceful example of the military advantages which are gained when the nuclear propelled carrier's escorts are also nuclear powered.
>
> At the completion of the recent deployment to the U.S. Seventh Fleet in the Western Pacific, the USS *Enterprise* was scheduled to return to her home port of Alameda, Calif., [deleted] in company with the nuclear powered frigate USS *Bainbridge*, and four oil burning destroyers. . . . The four conventionally powered ships were to utilize all of the *Enterprise's* [deleted] gallon capacity of NSFO. . . .

Now, do not forget, by having to carry black oil for escorts, she is required to carry less aviation fuel. That is, if she had all nuclear escorts, she would not have to carry the black oil and could use these tanks for more aircraft fuel.

Captain Holloway's letter goes on:

> In the first stage of planning, it was evident that even with a conservative SOA of [deleted] knots, using all available measures to conserve fuel, the oil burning destroyers would arrive in their home ports in the United States with less than [deleted] fuel remaining. This figure included no reserve for storm evasion, prosecution of unidentified contacts, search and rescue operations, or any of the myriad of other fuel consuming contingencies which could be expected on a Pacific crossing. This situation was reported . . ., and an oiler was requested to refuel the force in the vicinity of the Hawaiian Islands. However, no Navy oilers were available for this task at the time required.
>
> On this transit, the task group was considered to be vulnerable to overflights from USSR long range reconnaissance aircraft. To take advantage of the air search radars on the destroyers and attain the early warning considered necessary for the interception and identification of suspicious air contacts, it had been originally planned to station the destroyers in a widely dispersed AAW disposition with pickets deployed in the sectors from which the approach of USSR reconnaissance aircraft was most probable.
>
> The very tight fuel situation of the conventional destroyers and the additional travel required of these ships steaming from their disposition station to the *Enterprise* for refueling, made the employment of the optimum AAW disposition impossible. Instead, it was necessary to station the conventional ships in close to the carrier in an ASW type screen (despite the fact that the threat was from the air and not sub-surface) in order to attain the fuel economy necessary to accomplish the transit.
>
> As the events actually occurred, the *Enterprise* departed WESTPAC one week early on a sudden change of plans, leaving [deleted] [deleted] and accompanied only by the USS *Bainbridge*.
>
> To gain the greatest advantage of the early warning radar capability of a single ship, the

> *Bainbridge* was stationed [deleted] miles from the *Enterprise* on a [deleted] bearing, the general direction of [deleted] the most probable direction from which Russian reconnaissance aircraft could be expected to approach the force.
>
> Overflights occurred on the transit to CONUS. . . . Of significance here, the USSR aircraft approached the *Enterprise* from [deleted] [deleted]. Whether the track of the Russian aircraft which approached the carrier from [deleted] was deliberately evasive or the result of a search pattern is not known nor is it important. The significant fact is that a [deleted] was inadequate to provide early detection of the long range reconnaissance aircraft. In this particular case, it is believed that [deleted] pickets, properly disposed [deleted] [deleted] would have extended the radar coverage to detect this particular mission. Under other circumstances, in other geographic locations where the expected directions of approach may cover a 360 degree arc, a minimum of [deleted] pickets may be required.
>
> To keep the record clear, I must add however, [deleted] and missile armed F4 Phantom fighters were launched in time to intercept the Russian search aircraft well away from the force, and escort them continuously in the vicinity of the *Enterprise*.
>
> I think that the experience of the *Enterprise* points up several important facts:
>
> (1) Conventionally powered escorts demand a considerable quantity of fuel even when conducting an unopposed transit at economical speeds.
>
> (2) Oilers are not necessarily available when needed.
>
> (3) Conventional escorts low on fuel can actually constitute a detriment to the mobility and tactical freedom of a nuclear powered carrier.
>
> (4) [Deleted.]
>
> I feel that these events should hold a special interest for you because they represent real happenings in an actual situation, as opposed to parameters in a scenario based study.

One letter from the captain of the *Bainbridge* said:

> [Deleted] escorts (frigate or destroyer) are normally assigned to *Enterprise* to provide AAW and ASW protection, plane guard services, and electronics backup. During flight operations, *Enterprise* requires [deleted]. The screen commander's schedule calls for rotating the plane guard duties in order to release the [deleted] escort for individual ship exercises during the day. However, thus far, this rotation has not worked out in practice. *Enterprise* has been launching and recovering at speeds of [deleted] knots 80% of the time because of the very light winds encountered the past ten days. When high speeds are necessary for flight operations, she must also run down wind at [deleted] knots in order to remain in her assigned area. As a result, *Bainbridge* has been assigned primary night plane guard every night because we can remain on station during these high speed operations. The conventionally powered escort has not been so assigned because it would mean going to [deleted] boiler operation, with concomitant increased fuel consumption and watch requirements (engineering personnel go to watch and watch for [deleted] boiler operation). In order to be in proper position to assume night plane guard duties, we must also remain in the immediate vicinity of *Enterprise* during the day. For a conventionally powered escort to carry out the assignment properly when the winds are light, it would mean [deleted] boiler operation on a 24 hours basis. In addition to plane guard duties, *Bainbridge* was assigned the [deleted] guard for the task group during a [deleted] hour period when *Enterprise* [deleted] was down. This involved maintaining station [deleted] of *Enterprise* during a period when *Enterprise* was steaming at speeds of [deleted] knots conducting flight operations.
>
> During the seven day period *Gridley* operated with us she refueled [deleted] times from an AOE/AO. At no time did she go to boiler operation. [Deleted.]

Another letter from the captain of the *Bainbridge* said:

> We are scheduled to enter [deleted] this afternoon; that is, if Typhoon Sally [deleted] does not require us to divert. When word was received yesterday, [deleted] that a typhoon was in the area and heading West, the Task Group was slowed to [deleted] knots for 2 hours and *Enterprise* refueled to maximum capacity the [deleted] conventionally powered escorts who, along with *Bainbridge*, comprise the screen unit. There was no oiler with the task group or in the vicinity. During this two hour period, *Enterprise* was without the protective services of [deleted] ASW screen ships, because while [deleted]. *Bainbridge*, not requiring fuel to be ready for typhoon evasion measures, took station in the van and screened for submarines. However, effective sonar coverage in the direction of movement was reduced by [deleted] and on the spot ASW weapons availability was reduced at the very minimum by [deleted]. The [deleted] weapons availability assumes optimistically that the lifeguard escort could leave station astern, gain sonar contact, solve the fire control problem and launch a long range ASW weapon, e.g., ASROC—all within a matter of minutes. In addition to the degradation in sonar coverage and quick-reaction weapon availability, slowing the task group to [deleted] knots for two hours greatly increases the vulnerability of all ships to enemy submarine atttack. The prime defense against attack by nuclear powered submarines is high speed, but even in the case of a conventional submarine, a reduction in the speed of the task group widens the "limiting lines of submerged approach" and quickly changes an impossible or unfavorable submarine attack position into an entirely feasible or favorable one.
>
> [Deleted.]
>
> This is just one specific and actual example of the degradation in readiness posture which results from underway refueling. Unfortunately, because the fleet is dependent upon frequent refueling, this situation occurs at least every three days in a task group, and then at times not even of our choosing, and we must be ready to react quickly to any contingency which may arise. The fleet, of course, has lived with this situation so long that the reduction in readiness is accepted as inevitable. It is automatically a part of our planning, thinking, and decision-making. We have developed underway refueling to a fine art, with increased pumping rates, reduced alongside times, and more efficient deck rigs. But the fact remains that to perform the evolution, the task group must slow and ships must leave their screening stations to take station alongside, and in effect, the task group becomes a "sitting duck" for attack by enemy submarines. With nuclear powered surface ships, particularly escorts, we do not have to live with this problem forever.

There was still another letter from the captain of a nuclear attack submarine which had been assigned to attack an aircraft carrier during fleet exercise. The letter has been classified in its entirety, but its lesson is as Admiral Rickover stated in our hearings:

> Here is an excerpt from a letter dated 10 March 1967 I received from the Commanding Officer of a nuclear attack submarine. This letter brings out the reduced vulnerability to submarine attack of nuclear warships gained by eliminating the need to run at slow speeds to conserve fuel or to refuel.

RICKOVER MEMORANDUM

While the letters quoted above show that nuclear power in the real world has many advantages over conventional power, there have been two studies which also show these advantages. The first was by Admiral McDonald and was published in this committee's hearings of last year. The more recent one is of February 3, 1967, and was by Admiral Rickover. Its main features are:

> For sustained operations, a CVAN68 task group with *five gas turbine driven escorts will require between 1.2 and 4.2 times as much aircraft fuel (JP–5) for escort propulsion as is required for aircraft propulsion*, the ratio of escort to aircraft fuel depending on the tempo of air operations and on the distance to the replenishment area. The results of this study . . . show that each nuclear escort substituted for a conventional escort significantly improves the military effectiveness of the overall nuclear carrier task group. *The incremental gain in military effectiveness is larger as each nuclear escort is substituted, with the largest increment being added when the all-nuclear task group is achieved*. The CVAN68 with all nuclear escorts will have the capability to steam at high speed to any ocean area in the world and carry out more than [deleted] days of combat operations, delivering a sustained average of [deleted] short tons of aircraft ordnance per day—*an ordnance delivery rate [deleted] greater than that ever achieved by any aircraft carrier to date—all without mobile logistic support.*
>
> A nuclear carrier task group with five conventional escorts will require much more fuel for the escorts than is required for aircraft. An advantage of nuclear power in the escorts is the elimination of the requirement to deliver ships' fuel to the force which greatly simplifies logistic problems, reduces the number and frequency of task group replenishments, increases response range of the task group, improves effectiveness of the escort screen, and reduces vulnerability of the task group. This could also increase the overall percentage of time spent on the line, depending on how far and how frequently the force must retire for replenishment. As the Chief of Naval Operations stressed in his memorandum to you [Secretary of the Navy] of 14 April 1966 concerning nuclear power for surface warships, the improvements which nuclear propulsion provides in readiness, response, mobility, tactical flexibility, and survivability—all derived from being independent of propulsion fuel logistic support—are important in all circumstances and could be decisive in many situations.
>
> . . . the CVAN68 will be able to operate at much greater ranges from sources of replenishment and still require much less replenishment when she has nuclear escorts than when she has conventional escorts. For example, for the same percent time on the line with the same amount of ordnance dropped, the CVAN68 with a screen of all nuclear escorts, compared to the CVAN68 with a screen of five conventional escorts, depending on the tempo of air operations and the distance to the replenishment area:
>
> a. [Deleted.]
>
> b. [Deleted.]
>
> c. [Deleted.]
>
> "d. In addition to the reduction in the amount of fuel to be delivered and the reduction in the number and frequency of replenishments, these in turn will allow the all-nuclear task group, with one replenishment group, to conduct the same sustained operations [deleted] times as far from an advanced base.
>
> The number of AAW missile batteries, the number of sonars and ASW weapons systems, and the number of escorts needed to

> protect the great investment in a CVAN cannot properly or logically be traded off for nuclear propulsion. No matter how many tradeoffs we study of other ways to spend the money we need to pay for nuclear propulsion, we will always be faced with comparing unlike things; none of the tradeoffs accord freedom from logistic support for propulsion fuel which is provided by nuclear propulsion. The other tradeoffs provide additional defensive protection to the CVAN, but none of them increase the offensive capability of the CVAN as well—as does nuclear propulsion in the escorts. To compare a larger number of conventional escorts with a smaller number of nuclear escorts at equal cost is not to compare alternate ways of achieving the same capability; it is merely to compare two different capabilities that can be achieved with the same amount of money.
>
> I consider that nuclear propulsion should be judged on its own merits; for those ship types where the increased military effectiveness is worth the higher cost we should spend the dollars necessary to provide nuclear propulsion—we should not sacrifice some other needed military capability to provide these dollars. Since nuclear propulsion in the escorts for a CVAN improves the military effectiveness of the nuclear carrier task group as a whole, the increased cost of the task group as a whole is likewise the cost factor which should be considered. In this regard, the cost of providing nuclear propulsion in a nuclear carrier escort increases the carrier task group system overall cost only about one percent.
>
> I consider the information presented in this memorandum and enclosure (1) clearly establishes the superior cost-effectiveness of all nuclear escorts for nuclear carriers. If we are to continue to develop the Navy's nuclear propulsion capability, it is essential that we continue to build nuclear ships. Further, the only way we can hope to make any appreciable reduction in the cost of nuclear escorts is to build a significant number of them. Therefore, I strongly recommend that the Navy adopt the policy of providing all nuclear escorts for our nuclear aircraft carriers, and seek the approval of the Secretary of Defense, the President, and the Congress for this policy.
>
> The Navy needs [deleted] new nuclear powered guided missile escorts in addition to the *Long Beach, Bainbridge, Truxtun*, and the fiscal year 1967 DLGN (DLGN36), in order to provide a minimum of four nuclear escorts for the *Enterprise*, CAVN68, and the [deleted] nuclear carriers approved by the Secretary of Defense in the fiscal year [deleted] shipbuilding programs. [Deleted] more nuclear escorts will be needed for the [deleted]. Thus the Navy needs [deleted] new nuclear powered guided missile escorts in addition to the DLGN36 to accompany the nuclear carriers planned by the Navy through the fiscal year [deleted] program.
>
> Building [deleted] CVANs and [deleted] nuclear escorts through the fiscal year [deleted] program would provide a reasonable rate of introduction of nuclear propulsion into the surface striking forces. By the late 1970s the Navy would then have [deleted] of its carrier striking forces with nuclear propulsion. This would provide a solid base of experience from which to determine the future rate at which the Navy should adopt nuclear propulsion and the ultimate extent nuclear propulsion will prove feasible and desirable in the Navy.
>
> The nuclear surface warship building program I propose is within the capacity of the nuclear and shipbuilding industries and within the capability of the Navy to train the personel to man the ships. It will serve as a practical approach to bringing the advantages of nuclear propulsion to the Navy at a reasonable rate and will serve as a stimulus to the further advancement of the state of the art.

SECRETARY OF THE NAVY'S OBJECTIONS

When this report was submitted to the Secretary of the Navy, he wrote a two-page letter of March 1, objecting strongly to it.

The first objection was that—

> Admiral Rickover's paper makes use of "Time on the Line Before Retiring for Replenishment" as a primary index of merit. It seems to me that this index of merit would be meaningful only if the force could not be replenished, or if we do not plan to engage in sustained operations.

But this objection is not valid. By April 17, the Secretary of the Navy had given Admiral Rickover a letter to read before the committee in which the Secretary himself said:

> The addition of one or more nuclear powered escorts to a carrier task force (nuclear or non-nuclear) does increase its military capability. For example, it can increase the time interval between replenishments.

The Chief of Naval Operations answered the question:

> Is increased time on the line before having to retire for replenishment made possible by providing nuclear powered escorts for a nuclear powered carrier a meaningful indicator of increased military effectiveness?

By stating:

> Generally, yes. It is of course possible to postulate conditions where the increased potential might not have to be used.

There were other assumptions which the Secretary of the Navy tried to attack. Yet the Rickover memorandum had had its assumptions approved by the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations. Indeed, in response to a question, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

> The assumptions in the memorandum of 3 February 1967 are considered to be valid and I agree with them.

Indeed, in his forwarding memorandum of February 20, 1967, to the Secretary of the Navy, the Chief of Naval Operations stated:

> The memorandum concludes that all CVAN escorts should be nuclear powered, based on lifetime costs and military effectiveness. From the operational viewpoint, I would support this conclusion. * * * The basic memorandum adds emphasis to our need to expedite implementation of the Navy's previously recommended program of *at least* two nuclear powered escorts per CVAN.

Part of the reasoning of the Secretary of the Navy is based on the belief that there would be one DLGN to be substituted for two DDG's. In stating this, the Secretary of the Navy is not stating the facts correctly. Last year the Congress completed the authorization and appropriation for one DLGN and started the funds for a second, urging the Department of Defense to request yet another DLGN this year. In taking the action that it is doing this year, the committee is adding two DLGN's over the number requested by the Department of Defense by completing the funding for the second DLGN and providing a third DLGN. Thus, it is providing two DLGN's that the Navy does not yet have in place of the two DDG's that the Navy requested this year along with the one DLGN that it sought, but which the Secretary of Defense turned down.

POSITION OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

The position of the Secretary of Defense is set forth in his annual posture statement:

> Last year Congress added funds to our original budget request for construction of a nuclear-powered frigate. As you know, we did not recommend the inclusion of such a ship in our FY 1967 program. However, we have decided to proceed with construction this year, building it ahead of the time it will actually be needed to support the plan for one high speed nuclear-powered escort (three DLGN's and one CGN) for each of the four planned nuclear-powered carriers. (The fourth nuclear-powered carrier is scheduled not to be started for several years.)

This position is directly contrary to the position he took last year when he appeared before this committee. At that time he said:

> There is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't, I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for * * *. As I say, I believe we have. If we haven't, I'm quite prepared to change the programs.

This committee has asked for a long time to receive the systems analysis studies on which the Department of Defense decisions are based. The Secretary of Defense has developed a reputation for making his decisions on the basis of these studies. Yet to this day, not one of the famed Department of Defense systems analysis studies has been made available to this committee.

In response to the latest request from this committee, the Secretary of Defense wrote that—

> On March 1, I received a paper prepared by Admiral Rickover on the subject of nuclear powered escorts for nuclear aircraft carriers and I understand that the Navy will forward a copy of this memorandum to you.
>
> The Navy will also be forwarding to you a memorandum from the Secretary of the Navy to the Chief of Naval Operations commenting on Admiral Rickover's study. The Secretary points out that the figure of merit proposed by Admiral Rickover would be meaningful only under unrealistic assumptions. His letter also brings out the fact that Admiral Rickover's analysis rests on several very questionable assumptions. Further analysis is required.

MILITARY VIEWS

The best answer that I can make to the objections of the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy to the memorandum by Admiral Rickover is found in the questions put to the Chief of Naval Operations and his answers thereto:

QUESTION

1. Were the assumptions in the memorandum from Admiral Rickover to you of 3 February 1967 agreed upon by the Naval Ship Engineering Center of the Naval Ship Systems Command and representatives of the Strike Warfare Division and of the System Analysis Group of the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, or taken from assumptions used in earlier Navy studies?

ANSWER

1. The assumptions contained in pages 14–18 of enclosure (1) to the memorandum from Admiral Rickover to me of 3 February 1967 regarding Aircraft Ordnance and Aircraft Fuel Usage Rates were agreed upon by representatives of Naval Ship Systems Command, and the Strike Warfare Division and Systems Analysis Group of my office. Other assumptions such as on-the-line escort speed profile and fuel and ordnance reserves have been included in earlier Navy studies (NAVWAG 33 and my memo of 14 April 1966 on nuclear power for surface warships).

QUESTION

2. Are any of the assumptions in the memorandum of Admiral Rickover questionable in your opinion? If they are questionable, please set forth exactly how they are questionable, what you believe they should be, and the basis for your opinion. If you agree with his assumptions, would you please state so? Would you do the same for the Admiral's response to the SECNAV memorandum of March 1, 1967?

ANSWER

2. The assumptions in the memorandum of 3 February 1967 are considered to be valid and I agree with them. The comments contained in Admiral Rickover's 9 March response to the SECNAV memorandum of 1 March have been reviewed. I do not desire to constrain the groups studying Major Fleet Escort requirements or the DX/DXG Concept Formulation by judging at this time that all DXG or other Major Fleet Escorts of the future should be nuclear. I do feel, however, that good and sufficient operational reasons exist to program more nuclear-powered escorts than are presently programmed.

QUESTION

3. Is increased time on the line before having to retire for replenishment made possible by providing nuclear-powered escorts for a nuclear-powered carrier a meaningful indicator of increased military effectiveness?

ANSWER

3. Generally, yes. It is of course possible to postulate conditions where the increased potential might not have to be used.

QUESTION

4. Assuming replenishment can be carried out on the line, won't there still be an increased time between replenishments for a group with nuclear-powered escorts as compared to a group consisting only of conventionally-powered escorts or of gas turbine-powered escorts?

ANSWER

4. Generally, yes. Exceptional cases may occur.

QUESTION

5. Are there other aspects to the military effectiveness of nuclear power which should be considered in making this kind of decision? How are they reflected in the cost-effectiveness studies? How is our five year experience with nuclear surface forces, including the combat experience in Vietnam, considered in these studies? What is your personal evaluation of this experience?

ANSWER

5. The trade-off between replenishment ships and their escorts required for support of conventionally-powered forces as compared to nuclear-powered forces should be considered. The relative costs of such support forces should provide an added measure of comparison. Additionally, some of the advantages of nuclear power which were enumerated on pages 3 and 4 of my memorandum of 14 April 1966 and within enclosure (1) thereto have not been quantified, but are nonetheless substantial from the standpoint of military effectiveness. Our previous experiences with nuclear surface forces including current combat experience have not been explicitly considered in previous studies. My personal evaluation of this experience is that good and sufficient operational reasons exist to program more nuclear-powered escorts than are presently programmed.

QUESTION

6. Would you please tabulate and discuss each significant item that bears directly on the relative military effectiveness of nuclear escorts compared to non-nuclear escorts for nuclear aircraft carriers that will be covered in either the Major Fleet Escort Study or the DX/DXG Concept Formulation that is not discussed in Admiral Rickover's memorandum of 3 February 1967. Will the Major Fleet Escort Study or the DX/DXG Concept Formulation be completed in time to influence the type or number of major fleet escorts which will be built in the FY 1968 shipbuilding program now before this committee?

ANSWER

6. I expect the Major Fleet Escort Study and the DX/DXG Study to consider all significant items relating to the military effectiveness of major fleet escorts. I do not believe that information from these projects will be timely for consideration in connection with the FY 1968 shipbuilding program.

QUESTION

7. How has the cutting of the logistics train for propulsion fuel been reflected in the cost-effectiveness studies? Would the lack of this train play an important part in real naval operations? How, and to what extent?

ANSWER

7. NAVWAG 33 examines the effect of oiler losses under certain specified conditions. It was assumed in the computer model for this study that the underway replenishment group is not subject to air attack, that this group is under submarine attack only when the Strike Force (carrier group) is in transit to or from the replenishment area, and that the logistics pipeline is outside the model playing area. Since conventional carrier groups require a larger amount of replenishment support than nuclear carrier groups, increasing the threat to the replenishment group can only increase the differential losses of underway replenishment ships supporting conventional carrier groups compared to nuclear carrier groups. The study results thus indicate that reduced time on the line is caused by oiler losses, and that such reduction is less for CVAN than for CVA. This is obviously not a complete treatment of the problem. I have asked the Major Fleet Escort Study to examine this area in more detail. The lack of any required logistic support would seriously restrain naval operations. Inability to resupply such items as ship propulsion fuel, aircraft fuel, or ordnance could cause curtailment or cessation of operations, in proportion to the extent that such shortages prevailed.

QUESTION

8. As Chief of Naval Operations, if you had to conduct a war against a determined enemy, in which case would you expect to be able to attain our objectives with less loss of American lives:

a. Our nuclear carriers were escorted by one nuclear escort plus some non-nuclear escorts, or

b. Our nuclear carriers were provided with the same number of escorts but all with nuclear propulsion.

ANSWER

8. Generally, I would expect less loss of life with an all-nuclear group because of its reduced vulnerability and lesser dependence on re-supply operations.

QUESTION

9. In the cost effectiveness studies comparing nuclear and non-nuclear surface ships, what cost and what value is included for American lives? If no values have been included for this in the studies, doesn't this mean that zero cost and zero value have been assigned to American lives in the studies?

ANSWER

9. Cost or value associated with American lives is not included in such studies conducted by the Navy. This does not mean that zero cost and zero value are assigned to American lives in the studies. It is simply a recognition of the fact that in order to keep the cost effectiveness analysis within manageable limits, the cost factors assigned the various elements under study must be both supportable and of finite proportions; that attempting to assign an intrinsic value to a human life would introduce such a questionable and indeed controversial factor into the problem that the objectives of the studies would not be attainable.

QUESTION

10. Does the increase in military effectiveness of a nuclear carrier task group to be achieved by providing nuclear-powered escorts justify the expenditure of the money necessary to provide this capability?

ANSWER

10. In reply to this question, I prefer not to deal with either comparative costs or comparisons of cost-effectiveness between nuclear-powered and conventionally-powered escorts for nuclear carriers. As you are aware, we already have a great deal of information on this subject derived from both theoretical studies and practical experience. In reviewing this subject in the past, I have seen costing figures which vary to such a degree that I fear that (within the realm of reason) one can prove almost anything one wishes to prove provided the assumptions are not prescribed.

There is no doubt in my mind but what nuclear-powered escorts appreciably increase the military effectiveness of a carrier task group whether the carrier is nuclear-powered or not. I also believe that such does cost more, but exactly how much I am not prepared to say. Nuclear power makes possible the greatest advance in propulsion since we went from sail to steam. Since the Navy has a great deal to gain from this development I consider it essential for us to pursue the application of nuclear propulsion to surface vessels. I do not believe it necessary or desirable for us to try to nuclearize the Navy overnight, but we should pursue the use of nuclear propulsion in surface vessels at a moderate rate.

In doing this, I stated before the Congress last year that I thought that a carrier task group composed of one nuclear-powered carrier and four major escorts should have at least two of these major escorts equipped with nuclear power. In reaching this decision it was, of course my opinion that the military capabilities which would be thus enhanced would be sufficient to justify spending the dollars necessary to provide nuclear power in those two escorts. I still believe this and have so testified this year.

QUESTION

11. Isn't the only study to date, other than the studies of Admiral Rickover, which discusses the proper mix of escorts for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier NAVWAG 33? Isn't the only place in that study where the mix is considered in Appendix AA, page 12, where it is said:

"However, limitations on the endurance of the people involved, the ordnance capacity of the CVAN, and the aircraft maintenance cycle, may place a limit on the usable value of such endurance. It has not been possible to place a dollar value on the unique capability of one or two escorts to perform independently for long periods, even though the operational advantages of this capability are recognized. It is, nonetheless, possible that the incremental value of providing all escorts with this capability may be less than for the first one or two."

"ASW protection requires that some escorts operate in the vicinity of the carrier. These can be refueled as required, with a relatively small loss in screen integrity. Considering the much lower cost of a DDG, compared to a DLGN, the most cost-effective four-ship screen for a nuclear carrier may consist of a mix of nuclear and conventional ships. For an existing conventional carrier, the most cost-effective four-ship screen would be composed of ships having, as nearly as possible, the same endurance as the carrier."

ANSWER

11. In addition to Admiral Rickover's studies and NAVWAG 33, the CNO memorandum of 14 April 1966 and an Office of Program Appraisal (OPA) paper on Analysis of Escort Mixes for CVAN, May 1966, both discuss the mix of escorts for a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier. NAVWAG 33 does cover this point in Appendix AA, page 12, and also on pages 7, 15, 17, and 23 of that Appendix.

QUESTION

12. Isn't it true, as stated in our report of last year:

"While the study thereafter proceeds to examine various combinations of a conventionally-powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts, and a nuclear-powered carrier and various mixes of escorts, at no time thereafter does the study go into the nuclear-powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts. Appendix AA is only 25 pages in length."

"Apparently this is the 'elaborate study' as a result of which the Secretary of the Navy 'came to the conclusion that with each nuclear carrier we would like to have two nuclear DLGNs'."

ANSWER

12. It is true that the study (NAVWAG 33) does not pursue the subject of the nuclear-powered carrier and four nuclear-powered escorts, however, this mix is mentioned in several places.

QUESTION

13. What relative figure of effectiveness do your studies show for the two Tartar D systems in one DLGN compared to the single Tartar D system in one DDG including consideration of the increased missile storage and more complete naval tactical data system in the DLGN?

ANSWER

13. Our studies have developed only tentative figures of effectiveness. I would prefer to not specify these values until we have firmer results.

QUESTION

14. If the Congress should decide to provide nuclear-powered escorts in the Fiscal Year 1968 shipbuilding program should they be of the same design as the nuclear frigate (DLGN 36) provided by Congress in the Fiscal Year 1967 shipbuilding program?

ANSWER

14. Yes.

QUESTION

15. If Congress should decide to provide the additional funds in the Fiscal Year 1968 program necessary to change the two DDGs to two DLGNs, based on your experience and professional military judgment, do you consider the greater military capabilities of the DLGNs would be worth their higher cost?

ANSWER

15. Yes. However, it is still my recommendation that the Navy be authorized 1 DLGN and 2 DDGs for FY 68.

QUESTION

16. On pages 15–16 of the February 3 memorandum by Admiral Rickover to you, you are reported to have included as one of seven Primary Naval Objectives which appear to demand priority attention:

"Objective: *To develop and improve capabilities to conduct sustained naval operations, further, faster, and longer, with decreasing reliance on overseas bases.*

"Discussion: Although the United States employs a forward strategy and has made commitments to some forty-three (43) nations, it is clear from viewing current trends that we can expect ever-increasing denial of base and overflight rights overseas. The handwriting is clearly on the wall in NATO, the Middle East, and North Africa, and is beginning to appear in the Western Pacific, [deleted]. The time is soon coming in many areas of potential conflict when we will not be able to move our Army and Air Forces in through friendly ports and airfields as we did in Lebanon, Dominican Republic and Vietnam. Consequently, the Navy is going to be called upon repeatedly for missions in the counter-insurgency and contingency areas as well as those in larger type conflicts. We must be prepared in reasonable depth to respond to these challenges while operating solely from the sea."

One key action necessary to enable this potential objective to be met was set out by you as:

"Introduce nuclear power as rapidly as feasible, concentrating first on those ship types in which the return in effectiveness is greatest, i.e., strike forces, and those which combine naturally into tactical groups wherein uniform steaming characteristics are most important."

Do you still concur with these statements?

ANSWER

16. Yes.

QUESTION

17. How do you evaluate the following statements of Admiral Rickover in his study of February 3, 1967?

(The statements have been quoted above as the main points from the memorandum.)

ANSWER

17. As stated in my endorsement of 20 February to the Secretary of the Navy of Admiral Rickover's study of 3 February which contains these statements, I would support the conclusion that, from an operational viewpoint, all escorts for nuclear carriers should be nuclear powered. My previously stated position, based on an earlier analysis, that each nuclear carrier should have at least two nuclear powered escorts, is not necessarily at variance with concurrence in the efficiency and desirability of all nuclear escorts for nuclear carriers but did, and does, reflect an awareness of the added initial cost of nuclear power and of the finite limits of annual SCN appropriations.

ROLE OF CONGRESS

Last year I made an extensive study of the background out of which the congressional powers with respect to the Navy were included in our Constitution. Further search this year has added nothing more to what I had to say then. However, I believe it so important that I am restating it this year.

Despite the constitutional power of the Congress "to provide and maintain a Navy" the Department of Defense has refused to consider the positions which the Congress has set into law. In our opinion, this is a serious matter. As the Chief of Naval Operations has said with respect to nuclear propulsion:

> To do less is to degrade effectiveness with grave implications for national security.

After the deliberate failure of the Department of Defense in not following the program for the Navy as set forth in the statutes, the only answer is to provide that the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the construction of the two frigates as soon as practicable.

This is the real civilian control of the military as envisioned by our forefathers. This is the real exercise of the Congress and its constitutional power to provide and maintain a Navy.

Section 101 of S. 2950, as reported by the Committee on Armed Services in 1966, contained, in the section on naval vessels, the sentence:

> Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable.

In my opinion, this provision is constitutional. The Constitution starts out, article I, section I:

> All legislative Powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States.

Article II, section I, on the other hand, provides:

> The executive Power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America.

What do these words mean? Legislative? Executive? What did they mean when the Constitution was written? The Dictionary of American English, 1940, University of Chicago Press provides some help:

> Legislative: Of or pertaining to a legislature. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)
>
> Legislature:
>
> 1. The body of assembly of constituted representatives of a colony, state, or territory, vested with authority to make laws for the governance of the body politic. (Citing instances from 1729 on.)
>
> 2. The federal Congress. (Citing instances from 1787 on.) Executive department: The, or a, department of government concerned with the proper carrying out of the laws:
>
> 1. Of a State government. (Citing instances from 1776 on.)
>
> 2. Of the U.S. government. (Citing instances from 1787 on.)

Thus it is that by the very terms of the first sections of both article I and article II of the Constitution, it is the function of the Congress to enact the laws of the United States, and for the President to see that those laws are carried into effect. Lest there be any doubt of this, article II, section 3 provides "he shall take care that the laws be faithfully executed."

Under the Articles of Confederation of 1778, there was no executive to carry out the will of Congress—there was only a Congress. This was felt to be a very real drawback. Hence it was that when the Constitutional Convention met in 1787 to try to eliminate some of the shortcomings of the Articles of Confederation, the first proposal put before the Convention, that of Edmund Randolph, included the provision:

> 7. Resolved, that a National Executive be instituted; to be chosen by the National Legislature for a term of ——; to receive punctually, at stated times, a fixed compensation for the services rendered, in which no increase nor diminution shall be made, so as to affect the magistracy existing at the time of increase or diminution; and to be ineligible a second time; and that, besides a gen-

> eral authority to execute the national laws, it ought to enjoy the executive rights vested in Congress by the Confederation. ("The Papers of James Madison, and his Reports of Debates in the Federal Convention, 1840," p. 732.)

The next proposal came from Charles Pinckney, including an article VIII which would provide:

> The executive power of the United States shall be vested in a President of the United States of America, which shall be his style; and his title shall be His Excellency. He shall be elected for —— years; and shall be re-eligible.
>
> He shall from time to time give information to the Legislature, of the State of the Union, and recommend to their consideration the measures he may think necessary. He shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed. ("Madison Papers," p. 742)

Beyond the introduction and reference to the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style, there was little further that happened to the provisions that the President "shall take care that the laws of the United States be duly executed" during the Convention.

There were several powers given to the Congress with respect to military affairs:

> To declare War. . .
>
> To raise and support Armies. . .
>
> To provide and maintain a Navy. . .
>
> To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces. . .
>
> To provide for calling forth the Militia. . .
>
> To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia. . .
>
> To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever. . . and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings.

The extent to which the Congress was intended to have the control over the military is best shown by the special provision in the power to raise armies:

> But no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two years.

The Founding Fathers were so fearful of having a military imposed on the country that they even wanted to keep the moneys limited so that each Congress would be able to decide how the military would be run.

The reasons for this special provision were given in the debates:

> To the second clause Mr. Gerry objected, that it admitted of appropriations to an army for two years, instead of one; for which he could not conceive a reason; that it implied there was to be a standing army, which he inveighed against, as dangerous to liberty—as unnecessary even for so great an extent of country as this—and if necessary, some restriction on the number and duration ought to be provided. Nor was this a proper time for such an innovation. The people would not bear it.
>
> Mr. Sherman remarked, that the appropriations were permitted only, not required to be for two years. As the Legislature is to be biennially elected, it would be inconvenient to require appropriations to be for one year, as there might be no session within the time necessary to renew them. He should himself, he said, like a reasonable restriction on the number and continuance of an army in time of peace.
>
> The second clause was then agreed to, *nem. con.*" ("Madison Papers," p. 1495.)

In the Federalist, No. 24, there was discussion of the exact relation between the Executive and the Congress:

> A stranger to our politics, who was to read our newspapers at the present juncture, without having previously inspected the plan reported by the convention, would be naturally led to one of two conclusions: either that it contained a positive injunction, that standing armies should be kept up in time of peace; or that it vested in the Executive the whole power of levying troops, without subjecting his discretion, in any shape, to the control of the legislature.
>
> If he came afterwards to peruse the plan itself, he would be surprised to discover, that neither the one nor the other was the case; that the whole power of raising armies was lodged in the Legislature, not in the Executive; that this legislature was to be a popular body, consisting of the representatives of the people periodically elected; and that instead of the provision he had supposed in favor of standing armies, there was to be found, in respect to this object, an important qualification even of the legislative discretion, in that clause which forbids the appropriation of money for the support of an army for any longer period than two years—a precaution which, upon a nearer view of it will appear to be a great and real security against the keeping up of troops without evident necessity."

From this discussion, it is obvious that the Founding Fathers were most fearful of a standing army and that they wanted the controls over that Army to be in the Congress, not in the Executive.

It is claimed that the President has full power over the military from his position, given him by article II, section 2:

> The President shall be commander-in-chief of the army and navy of the United States.

This position was first suggested by Mr. Charles Pinckney as part of article VIII of his proposed draft. It was incorporated in all later drafts without discussion.

The relation between the powers of the Congress to raise and support armies and to provide and maintain a navy and the position of the President as Commander in Chief were clearly spelled out in the report of this committee on the Defense Reorganization Act of 1958:

RESPONSIBILITIES OF CONGRESS

> While the Constitution designates the President as Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, it places upon Congress the responsibilities to provide for the common defense, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a Navy, and to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. Analysis of these constitutional provisions in comparison with the powers of the British Crown, from which the Colonies wrested their independence, clarifies the origin of the responsibilities placed upon Congress by the Constitution. The King—like the President today—had the power of command over the armed forces of Britain, but he also had the power to raise and regulate armies and navies and to govern them.
>
> In contrast, under the Constitution, the President's powers over military affairs were not allowed to pass to him by implication, rising from his position as the Chief Executive. His military authority was specifically designated as command only. The responsibility to provide for the common defense, to create the forces necessary for such defense, and to make necessary rules for the government of the forces thus created was placed and remains with Congress.
>
> This separation of powers over the military affairs of the Nation was the product of conscious and careful design. It was completely consistent with a fundamental concept upon which our Government was, and is, established; that is, that freedom can thrive only when the basic powers of government are not vested in one man or a small group of men. A firm and distinct separation of power over our military forces was to be expected from men who had experienced the tyranny of a government in which all power over military affairs was vested in one man. Indeed, the abusive employment of military force was a major complaint lodged by the Declaration of Independence against the Crown.
>
> It is apparent that, under the Constitution, the power of Congress over the Military Establishment is, and was intended to be, complete, save for the power to command the forces they create.
>
> Congress has never considered this responsibility to consist merely in providing funds as requested by the executive branch to be used or withheld at its discretion. Under this view, Congress would be unable to discharge its constitutional responsibilities or to insure that the views of the American people, as expressed by their elected representatives, are observed by the executive branch of the Government.
>
> The committee recognizes military power as an instrument of national policy and the necessity for close cooperation between the executive and legislative branches in shaping that policy. If, however, Congress is to perform its constitutional responsibilities and give vitality to the fundamental doctrine of separation of powers, it must retain a meaningful measure of control over the combatant functions of the Armed Forces it creates. Otherwise, the flexibility or rigidity of our military policies will come to rest entirely upon the executive branch of the Government. The legislative branch would thus abdicate its historic responsibility over the design and capabilities of our major instruments of military policy and would renounce its responsibility to provide for the common defense. The Committee on Armed Services is confident, from the testimony of representatives of the executive branch, that this is neither contemplated nor desired by the present incumbents; but it is the responsibility of Congress to insure that the law does not permit such a result.
>
> The committee has made no provision to give the Secretary of Defense increased control over the funds appropriated to his Department. This area of the President's recommendations as set forth in his message of April 3, 1958, was not developed in specific terms by witnesses from the executive branch. It is also an area that will require meticulous examination by Congress.

The executive department has from time to time contended, as early as 1795, that appropriations for military purposes ought to be general or even lump-sum grants to be expended at discretion by the executive rather than specific appropriations. Congress has never accepted this view as being consistent with its responsibility to insure that money is not withdrawn from the Treasury except for a specific object, to an extent, and out of a fund which has been established by law. The relationship of this control over appropriations to the constitutional responsibilities of Congress relating to the Armed Forces, which are enumerated above, is too apparent to necessitate discussion—House Report No. 1765, 85th Congress, second session, May 22, 1958.

That this analysis is probably correct is shown by the study made by the Library of Congress, "The Powers of the President as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States"—House Document No. 443, 84th Congress, second session, June 14, 1956. Of the 117 instances of the use by the President of his powers as Commander in Chief cited therein, none relates to the composition of the fighting force and its equipment. Rather the instances are directed toward the tactical use of the forces and equipment available in specific instances.

That the President is bound by the legislation, in his capacity as Commander in Chief even in wartime, is shown by the message to Congress of September 2, 1942, in which President Roosevelt demanded repeal of a provision of the Emergency Price Control Act, which he felt to be a hindrance to the war effort, although he threatened to use his powers to achieve the same end if the Congress did not act.

The power of the Congress to provide a navy was first suggested by Charles Pinckney in his proposal:

> Article VI. The Legislature of the United States shall have the power . . . To build and equip fleets. ("Madison Papers," p. 739.)

In the debates this phrase was changed to—

> To provide and maintain a Navy ("Madison Papers," p. 1360) without discussion and without dissent, as a more convenient definition of the power.

After that, the phrase was accepted by the Committee on Detail and the Committee on Style.

While it was not until 1798 that the Congress found it desirable to establish a Department of the Navy—1 Stat. 553, ch. XXXV, April 30, 1798—the Congress in 1794 authorized the President "to provide, by purchase, or otherwise, equip and employ four ships to carry 44 guns each, and two ships to carry 36 guns each."

Not only does the 1794 law provide for the number of guns; it also provides:

> That there shall be employed on board each of the said ships of forty-four guns, one captain, four lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one chaplain, one surgeon, and two surgeon's mates; and in each of the ships of thirty-six guns, one captain, three lieutenants, one lieutenant of marines, one surgeon and one surgeon's mate, who shall be appointed and commissioned in like manner as other officers of the United States are. (1 Stat. 350, Chap. XII, March 27, 1794.)

The statute then goes on to provide for the number of warrant officers for each ship, and the number of men in the crews. The pay of all is set forth—"That the pay and subsistence of the respective commissioned and warrant officers be as follows."

Thus, while the Congress authorized the President to obtain the ships, it specified the armament, the manning, the pay for the officers and even the ration.

There was similar legislation in 1797:

> That the President of the United States be and he is hereby empowered, should he deem it expedient, to cause the frigates *United States, Constitution* and *Constellation*, to be manned and employed. (1 Stat. 523, Chap. VII, July 1, 1797)

However, the balance of the law sets forth what the strength in officers and enlisted shall be, what their pay shall be and what shall be the ration.

The provisions of the law of 1799 are even more direct:

> That under the orders of the President of the United States, and in addition to the naval armament already authorized by law, there shall be built within the United States six ships of war, of a size to carry, and which shall be armed with not less than seventy-four guns each. (1 Stat. 621, chap. XIII, February 25, 1799)

An examination of the membership of Congress in 1794, 1797, and 1799 shows that, along with the President and Vice President, there were eight Members of Congress in 1794 who attended the Constitutional Convention and five Members of Congress in 1797 and 1799 who attended the Constitutional Convention. Although the laws directed the size of the ships, their manning, pay and rations, there was no recorded discussion on the floor of either the House or the Senate that these requirements were an infringement of the President's prerogatives. On the contrary, the bills always passed on voice votes and were signed immediately by the President.

Again, in 1809, Thomas Jefferson signed into law a bill—

> That, in addition to the frigates now employed in actual service, there be fitted out, officered and manned, as soon as may be, the four following frigates, to wit: the *United States, Essex, John Adams*, and *President* (2 Stat. 514, chap. XI, January 31, 1809).

From the historical background, it is clear not only that the drafters of the Constitution intended the Congress to direct the President in the operation of the Navy, but that the Congress immediately after the adoption of the Constitution did direct the President as to the kinds of ships and armament he should have in the Navy. Indeed, Thomas Jefferson signed one such mandate into law.

There are several instances in recent periods where the Department of Defense has been directed by the Congress with respect to its operations.

In 1952, the Congress directed the Department of Defense to maintain the Marine Corps at a certain level. The precise language of the law—Public Law 416, 82d Congress, chapter 479, 2d session, 61 Stat. 502, June 28, 1952—includes:

> The United States Marine Corps, within the Department of the Navy, shall be so organized as to include not less than three combat divisions and three air wings.

On August 10, 1956, the Congress thoroughly reexamined title 10 of the United States Code, Armed Forces, and enacted the title into law. According to House Report No. 970, 84th Congress, 2d session, the real task of preparing the new codification was carried on by the Department of Defense.

Section 101 of title 10 is "Definitions" and contains:

> (28) "Shall" is used in an imperative sense.
>
> (29) "May" is used in a permissive sense. The words "no person may" mean that no person is required, authorized, or permitted to do the act prescribed.

While the first section after the "Definitions" is permissive—

> SEC. 121. REGULATIONS.—The President may prescribe regulations to carry out his functions, powers, and duties under this title—

The third section is mandatory:

> SEC. 124. COMBATANT COMMANDS.—Establishment; composition; functions; administration and support—
>
> (a) With the advice and assistance of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the President, through the Secretary of Defense, shall—
>
> (1) establish unified combatant commands or specified combatant commands to perform military missions; and
>
> (2) shall prescribe the force structure of those commands.
>
> (b) The military departments shall assign forces to combatant commands established under this section to perform the missions of those commands.

Attention should also be drawn to the mandatory language of the fourth section following the definitions:

> SEC. 125. Functions, powers, and duties; transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition—
>
> (a) Subject to section 401 of title 50, the Secretary of Defense shall take appropriate action (including the transfer, reassignment, consolidation, or abolition of any function, power or duty) to provide more effective, efficient and economical administration and operation, and to eliminate duplication, in the Department of Defense.

Note that the Secretary is directed to provide more effective efficient administration before he is directed to provide more economical administration.

It is exactly the lack of effectiveness and efficiency that has caused the Committee on Armed Services to recommend to the House that it direct the Secretary of Defense to proceed with the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

From that point on, the title on armed services is replete with mandates in the operation of the Department of Defense and of the military departments.

There are also other mandates in the United States Code directed to the Department of Defense. For example, the matter of pay is directed by the Congress. Thus in section 2211 of title 5, the pay of the Secretary of Defense, the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force and some of their subordinates are set forth. Title 37 of the United States Code is devoted to the pay and allowances of the uniformed services. Congress sets the pay levels mandatorily. That is why it is necessary to have title III to S. 2950 as reported by the committee, when the committee believes that pay actions in other parts of the Federal Government make it equitable to increase the pay of the members of our armed services.

The mandatory language we have been discussing was taken from another statute, passed by the Congress and approved by the President. In 1957, the Congress, on the proposal of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, directed the Atomic Energy Commission to undertake various studies and research leading to the construction of some new kind of reactors. Included in the reactors which the Congress wanted to have built, and which the Atomic Energy Commission was opposed to building, was a plutonium recycle experimental reactor. In order to be sure that this reactor was constructed the Congress wrote into the authorization act for fiscal year 1958 the following language of section 110(a):

> The Commission shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction under contract, as soon as practicable, of the prototype power reactor facility authorized by section 101 for project 58-e-15 (plutonium recycle experimental reactor) at an installation operated by or on behalf of the Commission and the electric energy generated shall be used by the Commission in connection with the operation of such installation. (Public Law 85-162, 71 Stat. 403, August 21, 1957.)

Similar mandatory language was included in sections 110 and 111 of the authorization act for fiscal year 1959—Public Law 85-590, 72 Stat. 490, August 4, 1958.

The mandatory language in our bill is necessary. Following the construction of the nuclear cruiser *Long Beach*, authorized in fiscal year 1957, and the nuclear frigate *Bainbridge*, authorized in fiscal year 1959, there have been no proposals from the Department of Defense to have any more nuclear escorts. In fiscal year 1962, the Congress changed one frigate, the *Truxtun*, to nuclear power and in 1963 it authorized another nuclear frigate which was later canceled by the Department of Defense.

In 1955, the Congress authorized $150.5 million for another nuclear frigate and appropriated $20 million toward it. Despite the appeals of the Department of the Navy, these funds have never been released by the Department of Defense.

In 1956, the Secretary of Defense testified before our committee:

> There is no sense having a carrier that is nuclear powered if you don't realize the full potential of the nuclear power in the carrier because you don't have a nuclear-powered escort fleet. I think we have such a fleet. If we don't, I want to have one, because I fully accept the point that we ought to balance off these advantages we paid so heavily for.

Despite this testimony, the Secretary of Defense had not released the $20 million appropriated in 1955.

Under the words and history of the Constitution, under the first statutes putting into practice the ideas of our Constitution, and under recent legislative practices drafted in part by and accepted by the executive branch, there is no doubt that the Congress has the power to prescribe the kind of ships that will be built for the Navy. In view of the history of Department of Defense defiance to the will of Congress, the power can well be exercised. The language—"Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Navy shall proceed with the design, engineering, and construction of the two nuclear-powered guided missile frigates as soon as practicable"—is constitutional. The Congress has the power to direct the construction of the two nuclear frigates.

It seems to me the time has long since passed when we should have nuclear power for our surface ships. Let us not take two-thirds of a century again, as we did 100 years ago, in making a necessary transition. Let us cut the chains that bind our fighting ships to a pipeline.

Let us cut the umbilical cord from the mother ship so that these nuclear ships can do the kind of a job that our country and the times demand.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the Congress has a great responsibility to the defense of this Nation and to the protection of the peoples throughout the world. The Secretary of Defense has assumed unto himself the complete authority as to what should be done or should not be done even though the Congress has enacted legislation and the President has signed such legislation into law. It is my further opinion that we have a grave responsibility under the Constitution—it is not only a responsibility but a duty—to provide and maintain a Navy to meet any and all emergencies and an Army and any other necessary components with which to deal with our national defense.

The only thing I can add, is that in "Trial by Impeachment," by Theodore W. Dwight, is the description of the impeachment of Michael De La Pole, Earl of Suffolk and Chancellor of England:

> The Earl of Suffolk was dismissed from his Chancellorship, and immediately afterwards was impeached by the Commons for High Crimes and Misdemeanors.

The third charge in the trial was:

> 3. That when Parliament granted a tax to be expended in a specific manner in guarding the sea "as it was ordered to have been" yet it was not so expended "whereas many mischiefs have already happened, and more are likely to enure for the realm, and all this by the default of the said Lord Chancellor.

If we do not shortly begin to get our advanced manned strategic aircraft, our antiballistic missile system and our nuclear Navy then the question before Congress will be:

> Can the appointed Secretary of Defense thwart the exercise of the constitutional powers of the Congress to raise and support Armies and to provide and maintain a Navy?

The Parliament had spoken. The law was clear, but the Chancellor failed to act, and to assume his responsibility under the mandate of that law.

So here in the U.S., Congress today speaks as it has spoken before. Whether or not the Secretary of Defense will act as we have asked him to act before, and as we command him to act in this bill, remains to be seen. But in any event let us here assume our responsibility as we see it. The committee bill and the report before us recognizes our obligations under the Constitution and the oath of office we took which bound us to exercise these duties as Representatives of the American people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and commend him for his statement.

I should like to say just this: that I have supported all these defense bills, and I intend to support this one, but my faith in the operations of the Department of Defense under the present Secretary of Defense is being shaken more almost every day, and these bills are becoming more and more difficult to accept. I would take the time to give only one or two reasons from my personal observations, one being Secretary McNamara's award of the contract for the TFX, now known as the F-111A and F-111B supersonic military planes. Without going into the financial ramifications of this contract, the military still does not have an acceptable plane. Certainly we do not have a dual-purpose plane, and apparently never will have a dual-purpose aircraft as the contract provided for originally, and on which hundreds of millions of dollars have already been expended.

In the second place Congress, in 1962, enacted a law, commonly known as the Truth-in-Negotiations Act, in an effort to do something about the scandals in the award of contracts in the Defense Department. The Comptroller General of the United States, as the members of the Committee on Armed Services well know, made a sampling of 186 prime and subcontracts issued by the Secretary of Defense and found that only 20 of these contracts conformed to the Truth-in-Negotiations Act.

How much of the money in this bill, I ask, will go out on negotiated contracts with the law being ignored by the Secretary of Defense?

The Comptroller General of the United States, Mr. Staats, castigated the Department of Defense for failing to observe the plain provisions of the law enacted in 1962 for the specific purpose of safeguarding the expenditure of public funds.

So I say to my friend from Massachusetts that in my opinion it is high time we got a better quality of performance from the Department of Defense. I say again, that some of us are being taxed to the utmost to support these bills only to find the laws have not been observed; that the proper administration is lacking.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his comments, and particularly for his reference to the TFX. I will say to the gentleman that several years ago when this plane was first proposed as a plane common both to the Air Force and to the Navy, that I had grave doubts about it. But the Secretary of Defense believed through the common use of this one plane flying for both purposes he could save a lot of money and would still have the effectiveness the services require. Obviously, as time has gone by, it is quite clear that what the Navy had expected in its version of this plane has not come to pass. They are still having considerable trouble with this plane.

As we all well recall, only a few days ago this plane did crash up in Long Island, and the pilot was killed.

I think the big difficulty is we are trying to have a compromise and talking of trades and I do not believe that in the dangerous world in which we live and in which we commit our men to battle that we can have a compromise airplane serving all purposes that can compete with an uncompromised airplane that an enemy might design.

I think we can do better than what we have done through the compromise in this particular case.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BATES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Going beyond the shocking financial aspects of the TFX contract, and the way in which the award was made, I want to come back to the pending bill which provides for longer periods of service for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Is that not correct?

Mr. BATES. That is correct. Not to the present ones, but this pertains to those under the next President of the United States.

Mr. GROSS. I understand—it would be in the future. This I take it was because of the sordid manipulation that went on when Gen. Curtis LeMay opposed the McNamara award of the TFX contract, as did Admiral Anderson, the admiral was virtually shanghaied out of the service and General LeMay was put on probation—in other words, a 1-year reappointment—which is virtually unheard of, as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

So I am pleased that this bill provides a longer tenure, more hoped for protection for those in the military who have the courage to speak out frankly and honestly.

General LeMay and Admiral Anderson were punished for their opposition to Secretary McNamara in his high-handed award of the TFX contract, and that punishment served as a lesson to other military commanders of the fate that could await them if they dealt honestly and frankly with Congress.

Mr. BATES. I want to thank the gentleman.

Our committee was unanimously in favor of the extended period of time for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The purpose is obvious. We want to have people come before us who will tell us exactly what is on their mind. I must say that it is getting more and more difficult to get the facts that we are looking for. The facts are not volunteered and we want ultimately to get answers and it would seem to me we should get such answers other than the prejudged determination of someone else when the witnesses come before us. It is our responsibility as indicated in the Constitution so far as I am concerned and I know so far as the Members of this Committee are concerned, we are determined to exercise our responsibilities under the Constitution and as we understand that responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has consumed 19 minutes.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, in connection with what the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts has said about the Joint Chiefs and our responsibility, I want to read the directive whereby members of the Department of Defense are permitted to testify before our committee.

The letter is as follows:

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., January 11, 1965.

Memorandum for the Secretaries of the Departments; the Director of Defense Research and Engineering; the Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff; the Assistant Secretaries of Defense; the General Counsel; the Assistants to the Secretary of Defense; the Directors, Defense Agencies.

Subject: Congressional appearances by Department of Defense witnesses.

I have been asked by prospective witnesses to provide guidance for the benefit of personnel of the Department who, in the course of congressional hearings, are required to give their personal opinions on matters concerning which a Department of Defense position has been established by the Secretary of Defense with the approval of the President. If pressed for his personal opinion, the witness should make clear:

1. that his personal views were expressed (if such be the fact) to appropriate authorities within the Defense Department before the departmental position was established;

2. where his views are not in accord with the departmental decision, that, nothwithstanding his personal views, he has accepted and will abide by the departmental position; and

3. the considerations or factors which support the decision; in other words, the pros and cons on the issue involved.

CYRUS VANCE.

As you see, Mr. Chairman, that is the directive. We never, never, never get any voluntary statement. A voluntary statement would be a strange thing indeed. When these people testify, we have to cross-examine them sometimes like an attorney cross-examines a defendant to get information.

We think that the 4-year provision for the future will improve the quality of the testimony in the long run.

I would like to put it this way. It will make for more of an unconscious independence, if you catch the point. That is what we are trying to do.

I do not know how to run an army in the field. What do I know about running a vessel on the high seas? What do I know about the strategic problems of a long-range bombing mission? What do I know about the tactical problems of a battlefield saturation mission?

Let the military do this. That is what they learn at the Academies. Why should they not tell us their problems—the shortage of pilots, the reasons for it, the breakdown of certain types of aircraft? Why should they not develop that information? Must we ask the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] to issue a directive to the Department of Defense agencies all over the world to find out what is breaking down in the Army, Navy, and Air Force? Cannot the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] come up with what is necessary in research and development?

We want people who are dedicated and motivated to give to their Congress what is needed to secure America. That is the reason behind it.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps has a 4-year term. Since this has been enacted, his testimony has been more independent than that of his colleagues. I want the RECORD to show that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to my fine friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Only about 3 weeks ago the Secretary of Defense appeared before a committee of which I am a member. I had the opportunity of asking him about the shortage of pilots, and he denied that there was a shortage. I am sure that had those in uniform who accompanied him felt free to testify, they would have provided a different story with respect to the shortage of military pilots that was then apparent and is now admitted. The shortage did not develop in a matter of weeks.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman.

I now yield to the gentleman from Florida as much time as he may consume.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this legislation and particularly I speak in behalf of the fast deployment logistic ship program as a necessary tool for our national defense. It will allow us to meet our commitments promptly and to save lives and to assure victory in cases where it might not otherwise be assured. It can help to prevent wars and to diminish the escalation of wars. We should get on with the program at the earliest possible moment.

Long ago, President Washington stated:

> The path to peace is through the preparation for war.

As times change, the needs of our country in being prepared also change.

For many years, our country has relied upon American-flag merchant marine vessels and the vessels of friendly countries to provide the necessary transportation of war materiel and personnel to places where wars must be fought or where strength must be shown to prevent war. We have found in the Vietnam war that these sources of shipping are not adequate for modern times. Our own maritime industry has shown a reluctance to make the ships available because of the world shipping losses which would occur to them and to our Nation. Our allies have not furnished the ships which we need.

Although our immediate needs have been met, the handwriting of warning is on the wall; and something must be done to prepare for a future that will give us overseas, prompt availability of the needed tools of war.

Two things have already been done. In the first place, we have already shipped and stored across the seas, in various localities, large quantities of military materiel to be available in general localities for ultimate shipping to specific spots where the need may arise.

Second, we have, in the last few years, greatly increased our combat airlift capacity. It is not, however, economically feasible to move by air the tremendous quantities of materiel needed in any large operation; for the cost of this procedure would be prohibitive; much greater than what the proposed new type of ship program would cost.

Therefore, there remains a need for speedy placement of the needed weapons in quantity, without the long leadtimes of advanced notice which would be required if merchant ships were to be used.

The Department of Defense has come up with the idea of the fast deployment logistic ship, a vessel specifically designed to carry all that would be needed in the way of weapons and to have these loaded ships placed around the world in a quickly movable manner. Of course, even with such vessels there would still be, in any great war, a need for calling upon the merchant marine for a reserve capacity.

It is planned to have perhaps 30 such fast deployment logistic ships. The cost of the construction of each is estimated to be about $30 million apiece for construction. The cost of maintaining each of them through their lifespan, including the cost of the crews, maintenance men, and communications personnel, would run another $30 or $40 million. Thus, the cost of the program is about $70 million a ship times 30 ships or $2.1 billion.

A giant step forward occurred when the President in his annual budget message to Congress asked for five of these ships, to begin the program. Two experimental ships were authorized and funded in fiscal year 1966, but the Department of Defense postponed the construction of these ships for consideration of the package concept in producing the FDLS, which was proposed by the President this year. The purpose of this postponement is to reduce the ultimate expense of each of the FDL ships and the whole package. This way we will take full advantage of the multiple procurement program for the ships. The House Armed Services Committee has approved four of the FDLS'; the two recommended by Congress in 1966 and two more this year. This recommendation includes cancellation costs if the whole program concept is not later approved.

The personnel aboard each ship would consist of Army personnel who would maintain the equipment; Navy personnel who would man the communications activities; and finally, civilian maritime personnel who would operate the ship itself.

Capt. Lloyd Sheldon, president of the International Organization of Masters, Mates & Pilots, said in an interview in the New York Times that the program should not be approved and that—

> Both the unions and private business will be knocked out of the military end of the shipping business if this program is approved.

Some others in organized labor have taken a similar view.

But when all of the facts and data are considered, organized labor may find that this program will be in no way detrimental to them, but actually of assistance. The reason for this is that, as I have already indicated, there will be certain permanently employed civilian maritime personnel in this program which would be added to the job opportunities for those now employed in maritime activities. The number of such new jobs would be somewhere between 1,000 and 2,000. When this becomes clear, I would think that the maritime unions would support the program.

There is some opposition from parts of the maritime industry and that opportunity can probably be best summarized by the statement of Congressman Leggett in his letter to the President dated January 9, 1967, in which he said:

> Far better it would be to build a fleet with a function, i.e., a true modern fast merchant fleet that would be available on priority call to the Department of Defense.

The weakness of this position is that no merchant fleet which is engaged in active maritime voyages can be readily available in the time frame that is needed and contemplated for these FDL ships, even if all of the difficulties of obtaining the ships for the military can be overcome in time of war.

Currently, the United States ranks only sixth among the world's active fleets—behind the United Kingdom, Liberia, Japan, Russia, and Norway.

At the present time, owners of the merchant fleet argue that they do not wish to furnish ships which have been financed with Federal assistance because to do so interferes with theirs, and the U.S. world trade.

So, what Congressman Leggett argues for is not likely to be a real solution to the problem confronting our country. Moreover, the presence of these FDL ships will, to an extent, allow the maritime industry to have a more solid and permanent base for their investments and operations on a continuous basis, regardless of whether war occurs or not.

The 30 FDL ships would be but about 2 percent of the number of ships in the total U.S. merchant marine.

The decline of merchant marine shipbuilding in the United States has been well publicized. Russia is outbuilding us by a ratio of 12 to 1 on numbers of ships and 8 to 1 by tonnage.

In addition, Soviet shipyards are operating at near capacity; about half of the capacity of this country is today idle. Some shipbuilders feel that the increasing Russian fleet will be her principal economic weapon against the West; the Soviets having the power to control ocean freight rates.

What they overlook is that these ships in key positions throughout the world can position materiel where needed at a cheaper cost in time and money than having to airlift thousands of tons of equipment by air in time of crisis. The merchant fleet could not be depended on to have the capability, to be loaded and assembled in the positions needed to deliver, a division-worth of Army equipment with complete unit integrity in less than a few months.

America suffers a serious disadvantage in shipbuilding: We now rank 14th among the 15 chief shipbuilding nations in the world.

Some shipbuilders now have positive thoughts on this project because they feel the new assembly line type production of ships, similar to the well-known Arendal yard in Sweden, which has developed a standardization in design will help mold modern yards. Some individual shipyards may be hurt by the new concept; but, overall good will be felt by the industry.

There have been questions of the need for a new shipyard to build these ships. The program could be undertaken in several shipyards now in existence, but the cost would be much, much higher and at a reduced level of standardization. There is no single shipyard presently capable of delivering all of these ships at the requisite rate.

Greater economies in shipbuilding from this program will result in overall benefits to the merchant marine as well as to the Navy. The FDLS program will represent only 6 percent of the total U.S. shipbuilding effort on an annual basis for the next 6 years. It is difficult to see how this could create a monopoly.

What of the small shipbuilder? There will continue to be many ship programs involving relatively small numbers of ships and others involving larger numbers of small ships.

In view of the realities of the present situation in shipbuilding in the United States, there are now a goodly number of shipbuilding companies who are giving approval to the FDLS program. This is not to say that all are in agreement but the trend is in the direction of approval.

I did not approach this program and its implications with any prejudgment; and I sought out the facts in a quest only for what is best for our country. After this study it appears clear to me that the program is needed and that the benefits from it will be experienced not only in the added defense strength of our country, but in the upgrading of our shipbuilding and maritime industries, which greatly need any assistance they can get.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Machen] as much time as he may require.

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support H.R. 9240, the military defense procurement, research, and development authorization bill for fiscal year 1968 in the amount of $21.4 billion.

The reason I am pleased is because I believe this legislation to be forward-looking and very responsive to the defense needs of our country for today—and tomorrow. Additionally, it is my feeling that Chairman Rivers is to be complimented for his leadership in formulating and shaping this bill to meet present and future requirements, as he sees them, and as our colleagues on the Armed Services Committees see them.

Mr. Chairman, it is not an easy task, and it usually is a thankless one, for the chairmen of the respective Armed Services Committees to lead their committee members, their hearings, and their reports through the enormous amount of material that comes from the Defense Department regarding the largest portion of the Federal budget each year. Decisions of monumental consequence must be made. They cannot be procrastinated, nor can they be held in abeyance.

For example, we discussed and made far-ranging decisions on the present and future of the anti-ballistic-missile system—a decision which is directly related to our foreign affairs and foreign policy in the cold war; we considered and made decisions on the future of the fast deployment logistics ships, decisions which directly affect the future of our shipbuilding industry, and we made numerous other decisions of vital national and international significance.

Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the decisions that the House Armed Services Committee has made on these issues. I feel that the committee has performed a public service in presenting the committee's position on these issues in a clear and concise fashion in the report on H.R. 9240.

Looking at our functions in general terms, I feel that the problems of making these decisions are compounded by two requirements: First, is to make certain that we meet our obligations in Southeast Asia and the day-to-day needs of our forces there. Second, is the necessity to maintain our military posture in the world by moving ahead at a reasonable speed in the development of the new weapons systems but without leaping ahead too far and too fast in a manner which wastes taxpayers' money and fails to keep up with technological developments as they occur. In this respect, I do believe that our first line of defense is deterrents through a strong military offensive capability. I believe that this bill, H.R. 9240, fully meets these requirements.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], who is the chairman of our very important Subcommittee on Research and Development, as much time as he may require.

Mr. PRICE of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, H.R. 9240, includes $7.3 billion for Defense research, development, test, and evaluation. The amount recommended, in terms of new obligational authority, is $212 million more than was appropriated last year and is $127 million more than the Congress authorized last year, including the supplemental authorization and appropriation bills considered earlier this year. The amount requested for research and development reflects a reduction of approximately $900 million by the Office of the Secretary of Defense from the amounts submitted in the budget requests of the military departments.

The Committee on Armed Services made only one change in the research and development programs submitted to the Congress. We added $25 million for the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA. This action by the committee was strongly recommended by the Chief of Staff and the Secretary of the Air Force, and all the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It has long been the position of the Committee on Armed Services that the Nation should have a balanced strategic force consisting of both manned and unmanned systems, missiles, and aircraft. From the standpoint of unmanned systems, the Nation is in a very strong position with our Minuteman and Titan missiles deployed and operational in the continental limits of the United States and our fleet ballistic missile system deployed, or ready for deployment, in the oceans of the world.

From the standpoint of manned systems, our posture will deteriorate in the 1970's unless we develop and produce a replacement for the aging fleet of B-52 bombers. Last year the Congress was told of the decision to convert the TFX, now known as the F-111, into a long-range strategic bomber, the FB-111. However, this weapon system will, in the opinion of the majority of the members of the House Committee on Armed Services, as well as many of our military leaders, be an interim system only; therefore, the need for an advanced manned strategic aircraft to replace the B-52's and fill the gap not covered by the FB-111.

The funds recommended by the committee for this program will enable the Air Force to initiate the contract definition phase of development during the early months of fiscal year 1968. Initiation of contract definition is not a commitment on the part of the Air Force to produce the aircraft in question. The purpose of contract definition is to determine the design and operational characteristics of the aircraft and to establish cost parameters for the development and production of the total weapon system. If the contract definition phase is successfully completed during the coming year, the budget request for fiscal year 1969 will undoubtedly include a substantial increase in research and development funds necessary for a major development effort on the AMSA.

In view of the limited time I have been allotted, I cannot describe the total research and development program of the Department of Defense. Therefore, I will touch only upon those major projects requiring the greatest dollar amounts.

For the Army, the largest program is the Nike X anti-ballistic-missile system which totals $443 million. Much has been said and written about this program over the past few years. You will recall that our research and development efforts on a ballistic missile defense system were first begun by the Department of Defense in 1955 with the project known as the Nike-Zeus. Since the beginning of that research effort, over $4 billion have been expended by the Department of Defense. While the Army has consistently recommended deployment of an antiballistic missile system, it has been only the last 2 years that the Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously recommended the deployment of Nike X.

The Secretary of Defense has stated that he will take no action now to deploy Nike X pending the outcome of the current negotiations with the Soviet Union designed to limit the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system. The Secretary stated to the committee that in the event these negotiations prove unsuccessful, it is proposed to reconsider the deployment decision. Funds have been included in the fiscal year 1968 budget to provide for such actions as may be required at that time. The funds contained in the budget before you are said to be adequate to initiate production if the decision is made to do so, so there is no argument as to the proper funding level for the coming fiscal year.

The question is when to deploy and what degree of deployment is desired. Many different levels of deployment have been studied and proposed ranging from a defense of our cities against attack by the Soviet Union at a cost of $20 billion or more to a level of deployment called austere, which would offer a high degree of protection for the whole Nation against a missile attack in the 1970's from the Red Chinese—at a cost to the United States of about $3½ billion. It is said that this austere deployment could be coupled with the defense of our missile forces into a "thin defense" for a total cost of about $4 billion. Since it will take months and years to produce and deploy the Nike X system, regardless of the level of deployment, it seems to me that we should begin the production now and make judgments at the proper times in the future as the necessary final level of deployment. The major effort should probably be toward the thin deployment and then—as the difficult production problems are overcome and the reaction of our potential enemies is studied—the necessary changes, if needed, can be introduced into the deployment plans.

In my opinion, we, as a nation, in the 1970's will need the protection that only the Nike X antiballistic missile system can provide. No one can guarantee when Red China will have an operational ICLM capability that will be a threat to the security of our country. Their development efforts can be accelerated without our knowledge, thereby giving them an earlier operational capability than presently predicted. On the other hand, I realize that development problems can be encountered which would delay that same date. Likewise, we could encounter similar delays in the production and deployment of the Nike X system. Rather than gamble on this unnecessary risk, I, as a Member of Congress, am willing to spend the funds now to provide some degree of protection against ballistic missiles at a safe date in the early 1970's.

Another missile system supported by the bill before you is the Sam D. While this missile system is intended to provide a more effective air and missile defense of the field Army, it will also provide a capability within the United States for defense against submarine-launched missiles. This advanced air defense system will replace the Hercules and Hawk batteries in the 1970's.

Two other Army development efforts that I will describe briefly are in the aircraft and related equipment area. In July 1965, General Westmoreland stated that an urgent requirement existed for an improved armed helicopter to escort troop-carrying helicopters without having to degrade the speed capability of the troop carrier. To fill this critical need in the shortest possible time, the Army initiated a program on the UH-1 series of aircraft as an interim measure pending the development of a more advanced aerial fire support system now known as the AH-56A. This interim armed helicopter, designated the Hueycobra, is being flight-tested at the present time and will be deployed to Vietnam in the very near future. The Hueycobra will replace the UH-1B/C as a primary armed helicopter in Vietnam. On an escort mission the Hueycobra will have an approximately 30-percent cruise speed advantage over the UH-1D troop carrier helicopter. It will be able to protect the flanks of the air mobile column as well as dash ahead to conduct reconnaissance and provide suppressive fire in the landing zone.

Although the Hueycobra is being sent to Vietnam as an improved armed helicopter, the Army considers it to be an interim measure since the aircraft reportedly will not meet all the requirements of a fully integrated three-dimensional gunship. For this requirement the Army is continuing development of an advanced aerial fire support system which I indicated was the AH–56A, and will be named the Cheyenne. The first prototype was rolled out on May 3 and will immediately begin a series of systems tests leading to the first flight test later this year. This helicopter is designed to fly at nearly twice the speed of combat helicopters now in Vietnam. The Army is very excited about the potential operational capability of this armed helicopter/aircraft.

The largest single research and development program in the Navy budget is the fleet ballistic missile system, which includes the Polaris and Poseidon missiles. This program totals almost 25 percent of the Navy research, development, test, and evaluation budget for fiscal year 1968, and represents an increase of over $80 million from last year. The Polaris system was initially deployed in November 1960. The fleet ballistic missile force has grown considerably in size and capability since that date. Forty ballistic missile submarines have been commissioned. The 41st, and last, SSBN in the approved program, the *Will Rogers*, will be ready for deployment in the late summer of this year.

Improvement in the fleet ballistic missile system has been as significant as the growth and size of the force. The 1,200-mile Polaris A–1 missile has been retired. All submarines on deployment now carry 1,500-mile Polaris A–2 or 2,500-mile A–3's. In December 1965, the Secretary of Defense directed that development of the Poseidon missile be pursued. This year the Congress is being asked to approve production for deployment. Poseidon will have even greater range and accuracy than Polaris. In order to take advantage of its greater operational capability, the Navy now plans to equip 31 of the nuclear missile submarines with the Poseidon. The remaining 10 boats of the authorized force will carry the A–3 missile.

Included in the Navy request are development funds for six models of fleet aircraft; the F–111B interceptor; the A–7A light attack aircraft; the EA–6B attack warfare aircraft; a new carrier-based antisubmarine aircraft, now referred to as VSX; an advanced carrier-based early warning and control aircraft E–2B; and preliminary work required for a new multimission fighter attack aircraft, FAX.

An air-to-surface tactical missile under development by the Navy which has the strong support of the committee is the Condor missile. Last year the committee increased the funds requested for the development of this system. However, Congress elected not to appropriate all the funds authorized. This missile will be the first weapon to allow attack aircraft to deliver a conventional warhead with high accuracy without exposing the launch aircraft to ground fire and missiles in the target area. I am sure that our pilots flying over North Vietnam would like to have this missile in their inventory today.

The manned orbiting laboratory—MOL—is the largest single program in the Air Force research and development budget request. This program consists of a Titan III space booster, a Gemini spacecraft, a laboratory vehicle, and supporting equipment. The booster planned to be used is designated the Titan III–M which differs from the Titan III–C by having an uprated core and seven-segment solid propellant motor in place of a five-segment motor. The spacecraft will be the Gemini B which was developed in the national space program, but modified for the MOL application. The laboratory vehicle is being designed specifically for the MOL program. The Air Force objectives in the program are threefold. First, to determine, in greater detail, the capabilities of man in space, particularly with defense application. Secondly, to develop equipment that will contribute to subsequent manned and unmanned space flight. And, lastly, to experiment with these equipments. The fiscal year 1968 budget for the MOL is $430 million which will be used to complete design work and continue fabrication of flight hardware.

The largest aircraft development program is the C–5A for which $305 million is included in the bill before us. This is the third year of full-scale development. The C–5A, with a maximum gross weight of well over 700,000 pounds, will be the world's largest airplane and represents a tremendous stride in the evolution of aircraft. It will be able to move 110 tons of cargo more than 3,000 nautical miles in 7 to 8 hours. Each of the four TF–39 fan jet engines will deliver 41,000 pounds of thrust, double that of today's commercial fan jet engines, while at the same time reducing specific fuel consumption by one-fourth. Delivery of the first production C–5A is scheduled for mid-1969.

As a member of the Military Airlift Subcommittee, I cannot help but have a feeling of pride in the development of this aircraft, as well as the C–141 which is now in our inventory and performing such a splendid job in support of our forces in Southeast Asia. Much of the credit for the great increase in our strategic aircraft capability over the past 6 years belongs to the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, our illustrious leader, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. As chairman of the Airlift Subcommittee in 1960 and again in 1963, he forcefully revealed the deficits then existing in our total airlift capability to meet wartime requirements. He fought for the modernization of the Military Air Transport Service by requesting the Congress to appropriate the funds for the C–135 and the C–130E. His subcommittee also strongly recommended the development of the C–141 and the C–5A. As a result of these actions, our strategic airlift capability by 1970 will have increased 1,000 percent in this decade.

While not in the research and development section, the bill before you includes $60 million for procurement of additional C–130E's. These are badly needed by the Tactical Air Command to replace those lost in Southeast Asia during fiscal years 1966 and 1967. Based on the hearings held by the Airlift Subcommittee in 1965 and 1966, I strongly believe that still additional aircraft are needed to provide tactical airlift capability to meet the requirements imposed upon the Tactical Air Command. It is my desire as chairman of the newly reestablished Military Airlift Subcommittee to again carefully review this area of airlift later in this session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have covered only a very few of the projects and programs supported by the $7.3 billion contained in this bill. While this is the largest dollar amount ever authorized for research and development by the Department of Defense, it does not necessarily reflect an increase in effort over previous years. The 3-percent dollar increase is said to be less than the normal annual cost-of-living increases which affect research and development efforts as well as production. In my opinion, the funds requested are austere. The amount included in this budget for research and development is almost $900 million less than that requested by the military services and is intended in the words of Defense witnesses to provide "only the funds necessary to support research and development efforts where the problems are pressing, the needs clear, the approach sound, and the talent available."

Mr. Chairman, I strongly urge the approval of the bill as reported from the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may require to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. ICHORD].

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, in support of that portion of H.R. 9240 dealing with research and development, I would like to direct my remarks to the subject of the Army research program on night vision devices.

In discussions of Vietnam one often hears the expression "The night belongs to the Vietcong." For several years now the Army has been actively pursuing a program entitled "Night Vision," which will change that ownership. The impact of this program on future warfare is enormous. No longer will the fall of darkness mark the stop or even slowdown of the tempo of operations. No longer will darkness offer our enemies either opportunity for counterattack or even rest from our own relentless pressure. The accomplishments and promise of the night vision program are such that this dramatic change will be a reality.

This is not a new program, it is one that the Army has been pursuing for a number of years. The Army's early recognition of the promise and wholehearted support of the program has pioneered the way in developing items of night vision equipment.

The Army has also prepared a program, taking advantage of these new developments to provide our forces in Vietnam with interrelated sets of night vision and radar equipment to further improve our night combat capabilities. The basic objective is to so equip our infantry and air mobile forces along with their supporting artillery and surveillance units so that they can extend their daylight successes into the night. The program is entitled "Sea Niteops." As this program is completed, the Vietcong, who resupply, move, and fight predominately at night will find themselves as exposed and vulnerable to our superior forces as though it were daylight.

Because the Army is leading the way in this new and expanding technology, its program has been growing rapidly over the past few years. The current budget provides for both the continued expansion of the night vision R. & D. program and the Vietnam-oriented Sea Niteops. The Army is to be commended for its aggressive leadership in this area.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE].

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee and Mr. BATES have given an excellent overall picture of this important bill. I would like to make some further remarks about specific elements of the program.

On the occasion of his appearance before the committee when he presented the proposed Navy 1968 aircraft procurement program, Vice Adm. Thomas Connolly addressed what I construed as the Navy's minimum need for the phase-in of more effective aircraft and for the replacement of projected combat and operational losses.

The overall figure he used at that time for all categories of naval aircraft was 695; these are included in the 1968 authorization we have before us.

It might be well to consider our national dependence on the sea-based striking force concept—the enormous dividends we have derived as a result of our wise but sometimes hesitant investment in the heart of the concept—the attack aircraft carrier with its embarked carrier air wing. Its record during the past 3 years in the Vietnamese war underscores both its military and political independence and causes me to recall a statement made by Winston Churchill toward the close of World War II. The great Englishman observed:

> If we didn't have aircraft carriers, we would have had to invent them.

The quote has significant application here and now.

Navy and Marine airmen introduced the first tactical night and all-weather attack capability into Southeast Asia. Tribute must be paid to the Navy/industry teams which conceived and brought to operational fruition the Grumman A-6A Intruder, E-2A Hawkeye, the McDonnell F-4 Phantom II and the North American RA-5C Vigilante. Superlatives are justified in the case of each.

The Intruder is the world's finest all-weather attack airplane.

The Hawkeye has advanced the state of the art of airborne air control on a quantum basis to the benefit of all of our services flying operational aircraft in Southeast Asia. While it does not appear in this authorization, it is worthy of such mention.

The Phantom is the standard of the fighter or interceptor world—the fastest and most effective aircraft of its type flying today as well as a uniquely effective attack bomber.

Our reconnaissance posture, with the advent of the Vigilante integrated operational intelligence system, leaves little to be desired.

The nature of the other airplanes appearing in the authorization bespeaks increased effectiveness for the Navy-Marine team. Ling-Temco-Vought's A-7A Corsair II is on the verge of operational deployment and will add longer legs, increased loiter time and larger ordnance load-carrying ability to the sea-based commander's power portfolio.

Marine aviation looks eagerly and rightfully to the North American OV-10A Bronco since its introduction will enhance an already proven and vital ability to support troop maneuver and consolidation.

In the same light, one of the most astonishing impacts of the so-called primitive war in Vietnam is to be noted in the helicopter buys proposed in the authorization. Combat use of massed helicopters was something few experts predicted, yet we have been shown dramatically that the versatility and mobility inherent in these machines have been the key tools in coping with Vietcong guerrilla tactics.

And now I would like to turn for a moment to an item in the Army procurement portion of the bill—an item which does not receive as much attention as I think it should.

As you are aware, the authorizing authority of the Congress with respect to weapons systems has grown since the first enactment of the so-called 412 law in 1959. The latest addition to that law requires specific authorization for tracked combat vehicles—and it is to these vehicles that I would like to direct my remarks at this time.

The authorization recommended by the committee for the support of the tracked combat vehicles for the Army is $424.7 million, representing about 7 percent of the Army's fiscal year 1968 PEMA budget.

Among the vehicles to be procured under the authorization are additional quantities of several with new combat capabilities. These include the armored reconnaissance/airborne assault vehicle, XM-551—General Sheridan—and the M-60A1E2 tank, both mounting as the principal armament the Shillelagh weapons system. With this combination gun and guided missile system, the XM-551 and the M-60A1E2 are equipped to disrupt troop concentrations, reduce strong points, and defeat any known enemy armor.

Improved capabilities are represented by the full-tracked cargo carrier, M-548. This vehicle, adapted from the M-113 armored personnel carrier, is designed to serve primarily as an ammunition supply vehicle for self-propelled artillery units, affording a degree of mobility equal to that of the new lightweight, self-propelled guns and howitzers that it will support. The M-548 will also serve as the carrier vehicle for the Army's Chaparral air defense system.

Included in the request are funds for additional quantities of the self-propelled air defense gun, XM-163—Vulcan. This weapon, with its multibarrel automatic 20-multimeter cannons, will provide antiaircraft fire against low-flying aircraft and can be used to deliver ground fire against personnel and lightly armored vehicles.

Funds are also programed for additional buys of other tracked combat vehicles to enable the Army to meet authorized acquisition objectives, equip new units, replace combat and other losses, and, to a limited extent, modernize its inventory.

Additional procurements are planned of the full-tracked, self-propelled 155-millimeter medium howitzer, M-109, which is deployed in Vietnam. This highly mobile fire support weapon is organic to the Army's mechanized and armored divisions and armored cavalry regiments. First procured in fiscal year 1962, production has been continuous since that time.

Also planned are additional buys of the self-propelled 81-millimeter mortar carrier, M-125A1, a lightweight, armored vehicle for transporting the 81-millimeter mortar and crew, and the full-tracked light armored recovery vehicle, M-578, which is used to recover armored vehicles and self-propelled artillery in the 15- to 30-ton class.

Also to be procured are additional quantities of the tranporter-launcher for the armored vehicle launched bridge, a vehicle designed to transport, launch, and retrieve a 60-foot scissoring-type aluminum bridge. Additional quantities are also being procured of the full-tracked combat engineer vehicle, M-728, which is used by combat engineers for demolition, obstacle clearance, and construction support; it is equipped with a 165-millimeter turret-mounted demolition gun, an A-frame with winch, and a bulldozer blade. Both the M-728 and the AVLB transporter-launcher use the basic M-60 medium tank chassis.

These vehicles do not have the glamor of jet aircraft or nuclear submarines but they are a very important part of our total offensive capability.

Vietnam is on our mind but we should be aware that the Soviet Union is still our greatest threat and that country together with its satellites possesses something in the order of 90,000 tanks.

Another phase that drew my particular attention during our consideration of this bill was the increasing use of the C-130 aircraft in Southeast Asia and the necessity for additional aircraft. The committee is proposing, therefore, that the Air Force program be increased by the procurement of 25 additional C-130E aircraft.

This aircraft is basically a medium-size, four-engine transport aircraft capable of air delivery of personnel or material by parachute or landing as required. Special features in this aircraft include an integral ramp and cargo door, crew and cargo compartment pressurization, ground and in-flight air conditioning, thermal de-icing system, single-point refueling, and an excellent automatic pilot system.

The committee has examined the impact of continued hostilities in Southeast Asia. The increased daily utilization and employment of the C-130 aircraft in the combat environment of SEA results in greater attrition than originally projected. Also, due to the versatility of the C–130 aircraft, aircraft have been diverted from assignment to the tactical airlift role to satisfy high national priority missions.

The possibility of replacing the diverted C–130 aircraft in their special mission roles with other aircraft and returning the C–130's to the airlift fleet was examined. It was found that it is not only economically impractical to replace the modified C–130 aircraft committed to special mission accomplishments with substitute aircraft, but that there is no other aircraft available in the inventory which can meet the requirements as effectively as the C–130 type aircraft.

In conclusion, this bill speaks for itself and I know that it will receive prompt approval by the House. It is the result of long and detailed hearings and represents a most important step forward in achieving the necessary capability which the Nation requires.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Clancy].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to give my full support to H.R. 9240 and urge its immediate passage. In my judgment, this is one of the most important bills to come before the Congress each year, if not the most important.

The bill authorizes appropriations totaling $21,435,032,000, the bulk of which is for the procurement of urgently needed aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and other military hardware to keep our defenses at the high levels needed at this critical time.

Of particular concern to me is the authorization of $377 million included in this bill for preproduction activities directed toward the deployment of an antiballistic-missile defense system. Unfortunately, the $167.9 million the Congress appropriated last year for the purchase of items leading to the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system was not obligated and spent by the Department of Defense. The Armed Services Committee has indicated its strong support for the immediate procurement of long leadtime items necessary for the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system. The funds authorized in this bill, added to the amount made available in fiscal year 1967, and related items would give the Department of Defense $734.9 million to move ahead with an antiballistic-missile deployment.

I am extremely hopeful that the Secretary of Defense will not delay any longer a decision to move forward in this area. This Nation cannot afford to procrastinate while the known enemy prepares. We cannot take a defense gamble that could result in annihilation of some of our cities and the loss of countless lives. As of now, we have absolutely no active defense against missiles. Our nearly 200 million people are left at the mercy of enemy nuclear weapons. Not only would the Nike X offer protection against actual nuclear attack, it would additionally serve as a safeguard against the threat of attack.

The expenditure of the funds made available in this bill for the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system does not necessitate an immediate decision on the type of defense to be ultimately deployed. The decision could be reached later as to whether we desire to deploy the thin defense or a more extensive version.

It is ironic that the administration, which has not hesitated to spend huge sums of taxpayers dollars on expensive social programs, pleads high cost as a reason for recommending against the missile defense system which could save millions of American lives. I believe the American people are willing to pay for a missile defense system.

For 6 years now the administration has rejected repeated recommendations that the United States move forward in the development and deployment of such a system. In recent years, the Joint Chiefs of Staff have unanimously urged that this be done. It is of crucial importance for the United States to go ahead immediately with an antiballistic-missile system, particularly in view of the confirmed step-up of Soviet activities in ABM deployment.

Secretary McNamara has not proven himself to be an expert in all military evaluation. Yet he continues to dispute this basic point of national security and defense which is urgently recommended as vital by men possessed of great military knowledge. It is my earnest hope that the Secretary will give greater heed to the combined judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and that he will follow more closely recommendations made by them on military matters. Experienced professional military judgments are most essential in aiding the Secretary to arrive at the crucial decisions he must make.

I would emphasize that we are not unmindful of the great responsibilities which rest on those who must make the decisions regarding our defense against a nuclear threat. In fact, the very gravity of the decisions makes it imperative that military advice representing many years of experience be heeded.

Not too many weeks ago there appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer an editorial headed "Is McNamara Making His First Mistake?" The editorial summed up a discussion of whether the United States should build a missile defense system this way:

> It was the early boast of Secretary McNamara that he hasn't made a mistake yet . . . Unless we soon acquire an effective antimissile system, heaven help the United States. Defense Secretary McNamara's first mistake could be a beaut.

To that, I say "Amen." We have added an additional $25 million to the authorization request for the advanced manned strategic aircraft program, and I strongly support this action. I have frequently expressed the opinion that it is imperative to expedite work on this program to develop a bomber follow-on to the B–52. The reluctance of the Secretary of Defense notwithstanding, I believe more than ever that it is a matter of great urgency to hasten the development of a new manned aircraft that can meet the optimum performance characteristics that the Air Force requires today.

The manned bomber deserves full partnership in our strategic arsenal because, among many assets, it forces the enemy to provide a very costly second type of defense, and it can attack mobile targets of uncertain location.

I might point out that I have from the very beginning disagreed with the DOD's decision to phase out the B–58, our only supersonic bomber. This decision is a perfect example of what we have cautioned against in the past, and that is unilateral decisionmaking by the Secretary of Defense without heeding the advice of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I join with my colleagues on the committee in strongly and emphatically urging that, in the interest of our national security, the Department of Defense pursue the development of a manned bomber with much more interest and speed than we have witnessed to date. This is essential if we are to preserve the offensive striking power of the United States.

The passage of this important legislation will help provide the needed equipment to continue unrelenting military pressure on the enemy in Vietnam. We need swift and decisive action to win this unfortunate war, with intensified bombing of enemy territory to end it in victory in the quickest time possible. We must increase our operations by air and sea in order to mount a new peak of sustained assault.

The military should be given greater freedom of action in selecting strategic targets for our bombing program. This program has proved its value and effectiveness. Among other things, it has restricted infiltration, and has aided in the reduction of enemy initiative in the south.

In my opinion, there is nothing that the Communists respect more than strength. We are the strongest Nation in the world militarily. The procurement authorized by this legislation will enable us to retain our strong military posture.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I am impelled to state for the Record that I am strongly opposed to one expenditure which would be authorized in H.R. 9240. I refer to the inclusion of two fast-deployment logistics ships which, as projected, would probably cost $50 million each.

Frankly, I do not often given the Senate credit for having exercised better judgment than the House. To me, however, this was certainly the case when the other body knocked out the entire program, including authorization for two other of these costly vessels which had been previously approved.

At least the House Committee on Armed Services has made it plain it was not endorsing the entire project of 30 of these ships at a cost of more than $1 billion. But, I am opposed to any or all of them.

We have a lot of compromises around Capitol Hill. This is one entailing the spending of money that should be going into the construction of privately owned and privately operated ships. Secretary of the Navy Nitze justifies this program because of its modernizing influence on private shipbuilders. He says the Navy can provide, by example, a useful contribution toward an effective maritime policy. He looks for the FDL program to show American shipbuilders how to cut costs and solve their difficulties.

In this connection there has been some talk of one city providing a tax-free site for the new yard to build these ships. That is the poorest way to save money I know. It would immediately force tax-free port districts all over the country to protect their private, taxpaying shipyards from this unfair competition. I certainly hope no such offer is accepted.

As for saving money, private enterprise does not have to look to the Navy or to Government yards for ideas on modernization. Give any private shipbuilder an order of sufficient ships to operate on a production-line basis, and he can save money too.

All I can say is that I hope the Senate stands firm and knocks the whole fast deployment logistics ship project out. If the House-Senate conferees compromise on a two-ship program or accept the four-ship program, there will be no saving. The answer will be great pressure next year on Congress to relent. It will be argued to justify the money spent on a new yard and for a limited number of ships, it is essential to expand the program.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary McNamara stubbornly keeps insisting, as he has throughout the years, that our merchant marine is adequate. Now he wants to provide his own cargo ships. When the Vietnam war is over, what will happen to these McNamara supply ships? I don't know, but I would feel better if they were privately owned and could help carry our American commercial cargoes and help with our balance of payments.

Secretary Robert McNamara wants to build ships like automobiles and airplanes on a production-line basis, but meanwhile, the administration cuts back on the number of ships to be built. Is there any sense to such inconsistency? I think it is absolutely ridiculous.

Americans know the techniques that are used by lower cost foreign shipyards. They know the techniques which the Secretary of the Navy supports for use in a 30-ship FDL program.

How much cheaper, Mr. Chairman, to have the Maritime Administration call for bids on a production-line basis for private shipyards and for private ship operators.

I favor keeping the Navy out of the merchant marine business. Let us maintain a fourth arm of defense for war or for peace that is a formidable fourth arm. This poorly considered FDL item should be stricken from the bill.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT].

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Chairman, the House Armed Services Committee in recent years has strongly supported the accelerated development of the advanced manned strategic aircraft—AMSA—as a follow-on bomber to replace the aging B-52G and B-52H fleet in the mid-1970's.

The Air Force continues to believe that AMSA is one of its most pressing needs if it is to maintain an effective strategic deterrent in the years ahead. The committee joins that service in the belief that further delay in the development of this aircraft is a calculated risk which we cannot afford to take. The concept formulation phase being essentially complete, the best timing for contract definition appears to us to be now.

Last year an additional $11.8 million was authorized and appropriated over and above the $11.0 million requested in the Department of Defense budget for the Air Force research, development, test, and evaluation appropriation to initiate contract definition during fiscal year 1967.

The Air Force budget submission to the Secretary of Defense presented a total program for fiscal year 1967 and fiscal year 1968 of $69.8 million with system contract definition to begin in July 1967 and to be completed in June 1968. This program required financing of $22.8 million in fiscal year 1967 and $47 million in fiscal year 1968.

The current Air Force proposal also contemplates a total 2-year, fiscal year 1967–68 program of $69.8 million. This consists of an approved fiscal year 1967 program of $18.8 million and a proposed fiscal year 1968 program of $51 million. It contemplates the initiation of system contract definition on July 1, 1967, with completion in June 1968. This would still permit a first wing operational capability in the mid-1970's. This program therefore requires an additional $25 million in authorization and appropriation for fiscal year 1968.

The OSD currently approved program for the 2-year period—fiscal year 1967–68—of $44.8 million, with no provision for funding system contract definition, would have the practical effect of delaying contract definition by 1 year and consequently delaying the initial operational capability by 1 year.

In presenting this bill, the committee reiterates its previous position and strongly recommends the addition of $25 million in fiscal year 1968 authorization to support earliest initiation of contract definition for this program.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 9240 and I urge its speedy passage by this House as reported by our committee.

Our distinguished chairman and other members of the committee have given a very lucid and persuasive description of the details of this bill.

The chairman has indicated, and others I am sure will state, that we held long and detailed hearings on this bill. We examined every element of it and there were literally hundreds of these elements. Much time was devoted to its consideration.

The bill is in a large measure a reflection of the requests made by the executive branch. Our disagreements with it were small in total amount. It is the committee additions which are a most significant improvement to the bill.

The committee added a net of $368.6 million to the bill. Of particular significance are the committee additions pertaining to aircraft.

The committee added a number of EA-6A aircraft to the bill on the basis of highly detailed and impressive testimony presented by the Marine Corps. Testimony indicated that the Marine Corps urgently requires additional EA-6A's to provide for attrition and to replace obsolete EF-10B electronic warfare aircraft in Vietnam. The EF-10B lacks the capabilities of the EA-6A, and the expiration of its service life will deplete the EW aircraft inventory below Marine Corps requirements commencing in fiscal year 1968. These additional EA-6A's will bridge the gap between the loss of the EF-10B's and the introduction of the EA-6B in fiscal year 1971.

Testimony indicated clearly that C-130E aircraft are required, first, to provide replacements for C-130's diverted from airlift to high national priority assignments; and second, in the airlift forces for command support, for attrition, and to fill squadrons not fully equipped.

The Air Force requested the procurement of C-7A aircraft as attrition replacements on the basis of anticipated losses in Vietnam and losses due to normal attrition. The Air Force request was disapproved by the Secretary of Defense but the committee feels that there is a clear need, based on testimony received, for these aircraft.

Regarding the CX-2, testimony revealed to the committee's satisfaction that there is a real requirement for these aircraft to modernize the fleet of aeromedical evacuation aircraft which now consists of C-131 and C-118 aircraft. The committee wishes to note that it believes that these aircraft should be procured from U.S. sources unless, as is wholly unexpected, foreign aircraft prove themselves to be superior.

On the subject of aircraft modification, here again the request of the Air Force for authority and funds for aircraft modifications was denied by the Secretary of Defense. The committee is in complete disagreement with the Secretary of Defense with respect to this deletion and feels that as a result of experience in Southeast Asia this authority should be available to the Department of the Air Force. The modifications will include improved electronic equipment for fighters to give better penetration capability, greater bombing accuracy and to provide better offensive and defensive jamming.

Turning now to a matter which was somewhat controversial, and which has been described as the fast deployment logistic ships, this Member was not in complete agreement with the concept of the FDL program. I believe such ships would be highly vulnerable unless given protection. At the very best, they should be kept in U.S. ports and capable of deployment at high speeds. Under such a program fewer ships would be needed. I am not in favor of a 30-ship program. There was a request for five this year, and our committee approved two. I hope it is very plain that we have not committed ourselves beyond the approval of these two FDL ships. There were many problems raised in connection with the FDL ships, such as their use in point-to-point shipping in competition with our merchant marine.

There was also an argument that these FDL's would be built by companies that were primarily aerospace companies who just very conveniently did go out and acquire a shipyard, and then just as a matter of further convenience became shipbuilders because they happened to get a shipbuilding contract. In our opinion this is wrong. These contracts should go to the old shipbuilding companies, and thus through the expenditure of these Federal funds such companies would be able to rehabilitate and modernize their shipyards in order that they might compete with the more modern foreign shipyards. We are looking toward the day when we might be able to spend more money on modernizing our merchant marine.

I do not have the exact figures, but the United States ranks way below some of the other countries in the world today in merchant ship construction. This is not good enough for a great country such as ours. In my opinion, the authorization of the two FDL's may give us a chance to test the FDL concept. Let us hope that old shipbuilding companies will submit proposals, other than the three aerospace companies who have submitted proposals, and that the old shipbuilding companies may find themselves qualified to build on the designs submitted by these aerospace companies. Surely some of the old companies can meet the price competition, and would be able to accomplish the desired modernization of our own U.S. shipyards.

Mr. Chairman, there are other things about this procurement bill which we would have preferred over that which was adopted. I refer to the argument about the so-called "thin" deployment of the antiballistic-missile system or the Nike X. We are talking about preventing a new arms race with the Soviets. It is my opinion that it is probable these negotiations may be fruitless. If that happens, we may have to embark upon not simply a "thin" deployment, but go to what has been described as "posture A" or "posture B," which is a heavy defense and which will protect most of our cities. The cost of a missile defense system may be several billion dollars, but it could reduce American fatalities from 120 million in an all-out exchange to as few as 30 million fatalities. There may be some advantages of beginning with a thin deployment, but it is my opinion that we should proceed toward meeting the defense needs of this Nation and fully protecting it against missile attack by any hostile nation. In other words, as to the proper level of Nike X deployment it is my belief it should be one that will protect not just a few of our cities but all of our cities. We should spend dollars to save lives, if by the expenditure of these dollars we can be afforded protection for the whole country.

I have no doubt that the House today will approve this authorization bill, perhaps unanimously. If they do, it will show they have a clear awareness of our defense problems. It will show they have a clear determination to protect our freedom.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for yielding to me. I should like to pose some questions.

The committee report states on page 10 that none of the $30 million authorized for contract definition of the DXG types of ships should be used for design of any major fleet escorts not powered with a naval nuclear propulsion plant. Is this statement, Mr. Chairman, sufficient to insure that the Defense Department cannot use any of these funds for the design of a nonnuclear major fleet escort?

Mr. RIVERS. The answer to that, Mr. Chairman, is just as the gentleman stated: They must have nuclear propulsion.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I thank the chairman. One further question. The bill before us provides two nuclear guided-missile frigates. I want to congratulate the chairman on that provision being in there. These are a substitute for the two non-nuclear-powered destroyers requested by the Department of Defense in this year's shipbuilding program. The question is, once this bill is passed, this substitution will have to be approved in conference. To what extent can we, the Members of the House, be assured that the House conferees will take a strong stand on this and will not accept any compromise? In other words, to what extent could we be assured that the language in the bill before us today will stand, requiring that not zero, not one, but two nuclear-powered frigates be contracted for as soon as possible? Can we be assured there will be a strong stand made on that?

Mr. RIVERS. Last year we came from conference with the provision that these ships shall be constructed unless the President certifies to the Congress fully it is not in the national interest. To answer the gentleman, we will insist on the language we inserted in the bill in conference last year and which is now the law of the land.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. I thank the distinguished chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee having responded to two questions which I have asked, and I understand the answers to these:

Yes, the Secretary of Defense must not use the $30 million DX/DXG funds for nonnuclear ships.

Yes, the Defense Department must build not zero, not one, but two, DLGN's as soon as practicable under this authorization. I appreciate, further, the chairman having clearly stated that he will insist on these provisions in conference with the other body.

Mr. Chairman, may I say to the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that you and your committee deserve great credit for the initiative that you are taking in clearly expressing the will of Congress that this Nation shall have a nuclear powered Navy. In my experience in this body, I have found a deep seated conviction supporting the construction of nuclear powered submarines and surface combatant ships. I have found the same conviction among the American people. It is true that at the present time they cost slightly more, but, according to the committee report, the Chief of Naval Operations has himself said that nuclear powered task forces would save lives because of the increased effectiveness of such forces and their greater independence from supply. This in itself is enough reason for me. This in itself is enough reason for the Congress. And this is enough reason for the American people.

Now, to get down to just one specific example.

On page 7 of the committee report there is reference to a letter from the captain of a nuclear attack submarine which had been assigned to attack a conventional aircraft carrier during fleet exercises. The report states:

> He made several successful attacks when the carrier had slowed down to conserve fuel.

I note on page 1780 of the record of hearings that the letter referred to has been deleted, since it apparently contained classified information. However, the record states that the classified letter brings out the reduced vulnerability to submarine attack of nuclear warships because such ships do not have to run at slow speeds to conserve fuel or to refuel.

I have had some experience in this matter myself. I fully concur with the committee pointing out the reduced vulnerability of nuclear powered surface warships to submarine attack because of their ability to steam continuously at high speed as one prime reason for insisting that all future major fleet escorts be nuclear powered. Any submarine commander will tell you that the capability to steam continuously at high speed—which can only be obtained through nuclear propulsion—is an important factor in reducing the vulnerability of surface ships. A conventional ship lumbering along at slow speed to refuel or to conserve fuel is a sitting duck.

There is no question that the Russians are building a large nuclear submarine fleet. Only nuclear powered warships will have the endurance to outrun or outchase their nuclear subs, not for just a few hours, but for weeks on end. We must see to it that any new major surface warships we build are given the added protection afforded through nuclear propulsion. It is wasteful—indeed it is dangerous—to do otherwise.

Thanks to Admiral Rickover, we have several years advantage in nuclear propulsion. Let us not fritter away this advantage.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, as we consider H.R. 9240, I wish to call attention to the fact that the bill includes an authorization of $377 million for continued development of the Nike X. Moreover, the Armed Services Committee in its report—House Report 221—states:

> The committee strongly believes that the thin deployment would be a useful step toward meeting the defense needs of the Nation in protecting against ballistic missile attack from any hostile nation.

I strongly support the minority views of my colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI], who point out:

> At the present time the United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in extremely complicated and sensitive negotiations seeking to limit in some meaningful and responsible manner a major new round in the continuing cycle of increased armaments and increased spending for armaments.

The minority views go on to indicate that the committee statement is not in keeping with the effort to negotiate as the committee "regardless of the outcome of these negotiations" endorses an antiballistic-missile system.

I believe that the minority report does us a service by objecting to the committee's purpose. Will the deployment of an antiballistic-missile system increase our security? In his testimony before the committee Secretary of Defense McNamara, in answer to a statement by Mr. Hardy who said:

> I get right concerned about the number of people that are going to be obliterated by that first attack, in the absence of any ABM system. And I would, too, if an ABM system would reduce the number that would be killed by their attack. But I don't see any way to deploy an ABM system with that result.

The Secretary of Defense also pointed out that the deployment of an ABM system would put a premium on the further development of offensive capability and stated:

> I don't believe the deployment of an ABM system in an attempt to protect our population against a Soviet attack would strengthen our deterrent in the slightest degree.

We are now at a critical stage. If the present negotiations with the Soviet Union fail and we then deploy an ABM, it may very well provoke a major arms race which will not only be enormously costly but will greatly increase tensions and lead to further instability. It should be understood clearly that a vote on this bill in no way binds the Congress to any ABM system and in no way should be construed to be in support of such a proposal.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Chairman, the committee's addition to H.R. 9240, the weapons procurement and research and development bill, of title IV which changes the present period of appointment of members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was objected to by the Department of Defense. The objections of the Department, which I consider to be worthy of real consideration, were not included as a matter of record during the consideration of the bill.

I therefore am setting out below the full text of the letter dated May 8, 1967, from Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus Vance indicating the views of the Department with respect to this new and, so far as the Department is concerned, unwanted language in the bill relating to the Joint Chief of Staff.

Mr. Chairman, I will ask that these remarks on the letter be set out at the conclusion of that portion of the debate relating to title IV. The remarks follow:

THE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

Hon. L. MENDEL RIVERS,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In the bill as reported by the Committee, a new Title IV has been added to H.R. 9240, 90th Congress, a bill "To authorize appropriations during the Fiscal Year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test and evaluation for the Armed Forces and for other purposes."

I am taking the liberty of writing this letter in order that you may have the views of the Department of Defense on this new subject matter. Sections 401 through 404 of Title IV would amend sections 3034(a), 5081(a), 8034(a) and 5201(a) of Title 10, U.S. Code, to provide that the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Naval Operations, Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and Commandant of the Marine Corps, respectively, shall each be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period or term of four years. They would serve during the pleasure of the President and would be eligible for reappointment only in time of war or of national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress. These amendments would change the present law which permits terms of not more than four years of office for the Chief of Staff of the Army, Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of Naval Operations. Additionally, they would restrict the President's power to reappoint these officers and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

In essence, therefore, Title IV of the bill is similar to the legislation proposed in 1963 by H.R. 6600, 88th Congress. In expressing its opposition to H.R. 6600, the Department of Defense stated its views that the President, in carrying out his constitutional responsibilities as Commander-in-Chief, should retain a reasonable degree of flexibility in his choice of those to serve as his principal military advisors. The Department also expressed its belief that the existing statutory provisions had proven satisfactory and that no basis appeared for a change in the terms of appointment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The Department believes that experience since 1963 with the operation of the Joint Chiefs of Staff system confirms the appropriateness of the present statutory pattern and establishes that no change is necessary. We do not believe that, in any instance, the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense or the Congress of the United States has been deprived of the free and independent judgment of the Joint Chiefs of Staff on military matters. We believe it would be unwarranted and unfair to the distinguished officers who have served in this capacity to convey through such amendment the unintended, but unavoidable, implication that they have in any way suppressed their genuine views or compromised their professional judgments in order to win reappointment.

As a practical matter, moreover, the proposed amendments do not appear likely to achieve the Committee's purpose of assuring a free flow of expert military advice. For such advice to be effective, each member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff must enjoy the full and complete confidence of the President. Where this relationship of confidence does not arise, the rigidity of a four year term would confront the President with the alternatives of losing a significant part of the military counsel which Congress intended that he have or of subjecting a distinguished military officer to the stigma of dismissal.

In summary, we believe that the experience of four Presidents over almost two decades has revealed no compelling reasons for the proposed change and has abundantly confirmed the wisdom of preserving the present system. Accordingly, the Department of Defense reaffirms the views expressed with respect to H.R. 6600, 88th Congress, and urges the deletion of Title IV of H.R. 9240.

Sincerely,

CYRUS VANCE.

Mr. KING of New York. Mr. Chairman, it has long been the established policy or position of the Congress that our military forces should have a balanced capability. To me, that balanced capability includes the unmanned missile systems and manned strategic, as well as tactical bombers.

While I am a junior member of the Committee on Armed Services—this is my first year to serve on that important committee—I was greatly impressed by the testimony presented by the Secretary and the Chief of Staff of the Air Force on the advanced manned strategic aircraft and the review of past history presented to the committee by our staff on the AMSA.

On the basis of the information presented to the committee, I am convinced that the FB–111, which some propose as a replacement for the B–52 bomber, will be merely an interim replacement and will not be able to reach some of the targets now within reach of the later model B–52's, G's and H's. This lack of capability to meet the total requirement for a manned bomber to supplement our missile capability clearly indicates the need for a more advanced system which the Air Force identifies as AMSA.

The reluctance on the part of the Secretary of Defense to approve the development of such an aircraft appears to be his lack of conviction for such a system and his skepticism of the design proposals submitted to date.

The question before the Congress is not how many AMSA's we authorize for construction or the adequacy of the operational capabilities sought by the Air Force. The funds requested in the fiscal year 1968 research and development budget of the Air Force would merely support the contract definition phase of the development program. It is estimated that this phase would require approximately 1 year. During that time, Air Force contractors will recommend the design and operational characteristics of the most optimum aircraft possible within a certain time frame. Also, during the contract definition phase cost information can be developed which will enable the Department of Defense and the Congress to know what the total cost of a programed force of advanced manned strategic bombers will be. The approval of funds for the contract definition phase is not a release for production and deployment of a system. It is a development stage at a lower cost that enables us to make wise decisions relative to later production and deployment.

In testimony before the Congress, representatives of the Department of the Air Force stated that:

> The Air Force continues to believe that an Advanced Manned Strategic Aircraft is one of its most pressing needs if it is to maintain an effective strategic deterrent in the years ahead. Our experience in Vietnam has also shown us that the AMSA would be of significant value in limited wars by virtue of its large internal payload of non-nuclear ordnance which is nearly double that of the B–52.

Mr. Chairman, as noted by the Congressman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE], this was the only item in the total defense research and development budget that was changed by the Committee on Armed Services. I believe the urgent requirement of the Air Force for this system well justifies the funds authorized in this bill reported by the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend our Committee on Armed Services, and particularly its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], for the recognition it has given in its report on the bill, H.R. 9240, of the current deplorable condition of the American merchant marine. I heartily endorse the committee's view that an approved program be submitted by the Department of Defense with respect to a strengthened American merchant marine.

However, I am constrained to express my regrets over the action of our Committee on Armed Services in providing authority for the construction of four fast-deployment logistics ships: the two which were authorized in fiscal year 1966 plus two for fiscal year 1968. The construction of these so-called FDL ships has been and continues to be a matter of deep concern to me. What bothers me most is the apparent lack of factual data concerning the construction program itself, its possible effects, and even the specific mission of this proposed new class of vessel.

As I stated only last month when appearing before our Committee on Armed Services, I have no objection to the construction of two prototype FDL ships. But to authorize the construction of more than two of these ships would serve no productive purpose whatsoever and are not actually required for combat military operations just seems to me to be a tremendously lavish and costly program. This is especially true at this time when our budget is being heavily taxed by extraordinary demands both at home and abroad, coupled with the fact that what appears to be the stated task of these FDL ships could perhaps be accomplished far more economically by a reasonable and adequate promotional program for the American Merchant Marine which could serve both the country's economy and its military requirements. Therefore, I am disappointed in this action recommending an authorization for appropriations to construct not two but four ships of this new and as yet unproven class of vessel.

Now, it is my understanding that to construct these four FDL ships will require an expenditure of $199.4 million in addition to the $67.6 million of unobligated funds authorized in fiscal year 1966 for a total of $267 million. Certainly, when we have not even received the final design for these FDL ships, such an expensive undertaking does seem to me to be both untimely and extravagant when it goes beyond an experimental program.

In March of this year, the Senate acted upon the military authorization bill and disapproved the construction of these FDL ships, including the $67.6 million of unobligated funds previously authorized in fiscal year 1966. The reason cited by the Senate Committee on Armed Services in its report was that:

> The committee is unconvinced that a program of such cost is justified.

Frankly, I am equally concerned about the lack of justification for the construction of the four FDL ships, especially when there appears to be no agreement on even the most basic issue of the cost of this construction program. Therefore, when this measure goes to conference, I hope the Senate's view on this matter will prevail to the extent that only two prototype FDL ships are authorized for construction.

Although our Committee on Armed Services in its report makes it crystal clear that in recommending the construction of the four FDL ships it does not commit itself to approval of a larger number of these vessels, I still entertain serious reservations over the open-ended cost aspect of this program. Perhaps this is owing to the fact that I have a vivid recollection of a similar proposal of the Secretary of Defense in the development of the TFX aircraft now renamed the F–111. As recently as last month in an issue of the New York Times Magazine, an article by Mr. Richard Witkin, entitled "Why the Flak Around the F–111," concluded with this observation:

> As for McNamara, despite all his brilliance he is emerging in the F–111 dispute as a merely human, fallible policy-maker who compounded what appears to have been an initial mistake—commonality—by tactlessness and a presumptuous flouting of sound managerial doctrine.

I have no desire to witness a second such costly miscalculation by authorizing the construction of any more than two prototype fast deployment logistics ships.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate on H.R. 9240, the Defense Authorization Act for fiscal 1968, with great interest—and with even greater concern and trepidation for what that debate portends.

Obviously many of the speakers have been deeply moved by their emotions in the consideration of this bill. Much of the time allocated to consideration of the rule and to the bill has been devoted to heated discussion of the limits of dissent in time of war, the excesses of those who are protesting the war, the burning and desecration of the flag, the picketing at the Pentagon, and similar matters only indirectly related to the bill before us.

The sentiment of most Members with regard to the programs authorized by the bill has probably been represented as well by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Mississippi, as by anyone else. He has made it clear that if the bill were for $221 billion, rather than $21 billion, he would still vote for it and urge its passage. Under these circumstances we may count the action of the Armed Services Committee in recommending only a third of a billion dollars more than requested by the President as the height of moderation. The gentleman from Mississippi and others did point out, of course, that we could expect to vote for as much as another $10 billion in addition to the $75 billion of new obligational authority contained in this bill and other existing legislation for use by the Pentagon in 1968. We may expect, in other words, to spend $85 billion or more on defense in fiscal 1968.

The language of the report on this bill also makes it clear that the committee is urging the Defense Department to move far more aggressively in the deployment of an anti-ballistic-missile system than it is now doing. It considers that the economy model "thin deployment" at the bargain price of only $4 billion would be only a "useful first step," leading to the more sophisticated systems at prices from $20 to $40 billion. In view of the committee's expression I welcome and commend the minority views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIKE] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] who alone on the committee seem to realize the enormous consequences of the proposed action, and counsel a degree of moderation.

When we, as Representatives of the people of these United States, are confronted by a bill authorizing $21 billion—and that bill only a portion of a program calling for $75 billion—and that program probably to be later expanded to $85 or $90 or $100 billion—and we are asked to give it rational consideration in 3 hours, in an atmosphere charged with the most intense emotion, we are asked the impossible. To make a few comparisons, the total moneys spent on defense next year may well exceed that of any year in the history of the United States. It may well exceed the total Federal administrative budget of any year prior to 1960. It may well exceed the total of all money spent by the U.S. Government from its founding until the administration of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And do the Members of this Congress seem to be concerned? Are they worried about the policies of this country which produce this astronomical demand for defense authorization? Do they feel better defended, more secure, than they felt last year, or 20 or 50 years ago? The answer to all of these questions is obviously "No."

I feel that perhaps my only contribution to this debate may be to ask the Members of this body to pause and consider what they are doing. We are emotional. Most of the speakers have said that we are at war. The words "treason" and "disloyalty" have been used to describe those who protest over our involvement in Vietnam. Considerable time has been taken by able and distinguished Members of this body to explain the real meaning of their statement that we should forget the first amendment to the Constitution.

All of this is, in my opinion, an exercise in self-deception. We all know that the Constitution clearly says that Congress shall declare war—and it has not. We all know that treason is a crime that only exists in time of war. We have all joined in this House in a conspiracy to pretend that the Constitution has not been violated as we fight the third largest war in our history without any action by Congress to declare war. We have abdicated the constitutional role of Congress in this crisis. We have turned over to the President the complete power to direct the awesome forces of the most powerful nation in the history of mankind. And we are understandably frustrated that all of the people of this country do not immediately fall into line, as we have the flag, as we cry treason, as we point with alarm to the pickets, the placards, the leaflets and the speeches that protest what we are doing. The protesters are becoming emotional too, for in most cases they, or their sons and loved ones, will be doing the fighting and dying in this war we in Congress have not declared, have not understood or justified to the American people.

I have no doubt but what a majority of Congress would be glad to resolve this problem by declaring war—as soon as the President directs them to. I have no doubt that many would clamor for a declaration of war before the President gave the word if we faced a major defeat in Vietnam or, for example, one of our major bases were wiped out by a missile attack. We would, of course, have to ask the President against whom we should make the declaration. If it occurred in the Camau Peninsula, where there are no North Vietnamese troops, would we declare war against the National Liberation Front—whom we do not recognize as a legitimate party to the conflict, worthy of equal rights at the negotiating table? Or would we declare war against North Vietnam, as the instigators of the deed? Or perhaps the President would tell us to declare war against Russia, which supplied the missiles and trained their crews. Or perhaps China, the real enemy, because it is their nefarious doctrine of "wars of national liberation" that we are really fighting, and the Russians are our friends—temporarily embarrassed into helping the enemy. I am sure that the President, ably advised by the Pentagon and the State Department, will have the solution to this thorny problem, and that we will accept his wisdom.

Should we not pause and consider where we are bound?

I have just observed on the news tickers a report that high military figures are now condemning the policy of gradual escalation practiced by the President as the path of moderation. It has obvious military defects. It telegraphs our punches. It allows vital installations to be moved and concealed. It permits the installation of massive defensive systems which vastly increase our casualty figures and our equipment losses. It only works if its assumptions are valid; namely, that the enemy will give up when he has been hurt a little. If the enemy will not give up—and we now begin to perceive that he might not—the better course is to wipe him out immediately, using whatever weapons are required, and save yourself the time and trouble of escalating gradually. This means that a successful choice of military strategy requires that we must understand the enemy—why he fights, how strong are his motivations, why he thinks he is right.

Apparently the Pentagon, the President and the Congress have never understood these things, just as we are rather vague as to how we got so deeply involved in this morass of a land war in Asia.

I must confess the deepest sympathy for the tragedy of the President—criticized by the military for not unleashing them against this poverty-stricken Asian nation—as we devote 3 hours to debating an authorization bill that commits this Nation to spending more for defense than the total gross national product of all of China and Southeast Asia combined. The President, in the name of moderation, has poured the vast resources of this country into an effort to rescue a hopeless situation, and is now criticized by his military advisers for taking the course most expensive in money, men, and casualties, and apparently less likely to succeed. It is indeed tragic.

The tragedy is more than the President's. This Nation has now become the captive of the military mind. We no longer have a diplomatic policy, only a military policy. Every other country is an enemy or a potential enemy. This does not exclude nations that may have been our allies a few years earlier. For the military mind, the only safe posture is to be prepared to meet all of those real or potential enemies with military might. No posture is completely safe if it considers only what a rational course would be for those enemies and potential enemies. We must consider also the condition that every enemy intended to accomplish our destruction and would use its present actual and future potential capacity to achieve that destruction.

This is the tragedy of the garrison state dominated by the military mind. All of this is done under the banner of national defense, of preserving freedom and democracy. It is unpatriotic and even treasonous to dissent from these demands of the military. After all, they exist only to protect us.

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the greatest parliamentary body in the world, the nightmare I am describing is not in the future. It is here today. It dominates the debate, or what passes for debate, on this bill, and it will dominate the voting. I doubt that even a handful of Members will care to resist the course we are taking.

I choose to resist. I ask you to stop and think what is happening to this great country.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Chairman, this bill authorizes $21.4 billion for procurement of military equipment, together with research, development, test, and evaluation. This bill paves the way for the appropriations committee to appropriate $75 billion for defense in fiscal 1968, an increase of $17 billion over fiscal 1967.

The bill as reported to the House contains three provisions which were not requested by the administration. The first is the "thin deployment" in the United States of the Nike X anti-ballistic-missile system. The President asked that such a decision be deferred until after the outcome of negotiations with the Soviet Union. I concur with the administration view.

Second, the bill establishes a 4-year term for the Joint Chiefs of Staff. While it is true that any member can be removed at the pleasure of the President under the new language, the net effect is to lessen the flexibility of the President in making his selections. The stated purpose of the amendment is to strengthen the position of the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff when they are in disagreement with the civilian authorities. I do not find that at the present time our Nation suffers from too little military influence in our decisionmaking.

The third new feature in the bill is military assistance to Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam. Traditionally these authorizations have come under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee. I have little reason to believe that the gradual erosion of the Foreign Affairs Committee's jurisdiction in these matters will lead to improved congressional supervision.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, this bill provides authorization to finance an expanded war in Vietnam, both north and south. I believe that the administration has erred in its handling of the Vietnam war, that it has steadily lost its options, and has failed at any time to comprehend the reality of this war. The United States is being drawn into a broader war every month. This commitment far exceeds our national interest, and it doing incalculable damage to our Nation both at home and abroad. I do not find it possible, therefore, to vote for a measure which finances ever-expanding military operations.

I believe in a strong military posture for the United States. Moreover, I would unhesitatingly vote for those resources needed to supply the troops presently committed to Vietnam. Under certain circumstances I would vote the resources needed to support additional troops in Vietnam. These circumstances do not now prevail, and this bill is not limited to support of present levels of military activity. Therefore, in order to express my opposition to our present course, I shall vote "no."

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I rise, not in opposition to H.R. 9240, but to express my support of this legislation with rather significant reservations. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has previously alluded to a matter which also concerns me and I should like to explore it further and a little more in detail.

My concern is about the procurement practices of the Department of Defense. I should like to ask the Armed Services Committee and its distinguished chairman to give consideration to my concern and to mount an investigation of the procurement practices of the Department of Defense so that the Congress can be fully cognizant of the inadequacies which exist in Defense Department procurement negotiations, contracts, and auditing.

The Armed Services Committee has

full authority to do this under House Resolution 124 which passed this body on February 20 of this year.

If this concern about shoddy procurement practices were mine alone, I would not presume on the time of my distinguished colleagues to go into the question here. But it is not my concern alone, nor only the concern of the gentleman from Iowa and myself.

Rather it has been the concern for the past several years of the General Accounting Office and the Congress itself, including the distinguished predecessor of the estimable present chairman of the Armed Services Committee. And it should be the concern of every taxpayer in this Nation.

It should be the concern of the taxpayer because the annual procurement of the Federal Government amounts to $46 billion—not just the $21 billion being discussed today—and $38 billion of that total amount is procured by the Defense Department. It is the taxpayer who pays this bill when he sends in his check with his 1040 return on April 15. None of us who pays income tax wants to pay any more than necessary. The Federal Government, when it purchases the equipment it needs to run a war or to operate this Nation, should also not want to pay any more than necessary.

To this end the General Accounting Office is established to see that the Government makes the best buys possible with the taxpayers' money. To this end the Defense Department 8 years ago promulgated regulations applicable to all its procurement activities. To this end the former chairman of the Armed Services Committee proposed legislation before the Congress which was passed unanimously. And to this end a distinguished Ohio newspaper, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, recently devoted a series of articles to publicize the fact that the Federal Government has not always been getting the best buys for its money because it has been failing to observe its own regulations and laws.

Plain Dealer Reporter Sanford Watzman, in his series of articles on the inadequacies of the Defense Department procurement system, reviewed the history of the truth-in-negotiating law which the Defense Department should be observing:

> Throughout the 1950s, GAO checked war contracts at random, repeatedly finding cases where some companies were inflating their cost estimates and then banking the extra money with their legitimate profits.
>
> By 1959 the Pentagon was persuaded to promulgate a new regulation. Henceforth, companies would be required to certify that their cost estimates were based on information that was current, complete and accurate.
>
> But GAO kept checking, and its findings were the same. In fact, the Pentagon was not enforcing its own regulation. In file after file examined by GAO there was no "truth" certificate.
>
> At this point, Rep. Carl Vinson, D–Ga. (retired), then head of the House Armed Services Committee, decided that there ought to be a law. He introduced the first Truth-in-Negotiating Act in 1960 with GAO backing.
>
> In essence, the Vinson bill merely sought to add the force of law to what already was demanded—theoretically—in the Defense Department regulation. The "truth" certificate should be required by statute, Vinson insisted. Then perhaps Defense might then give it more attention.
>
> But the Pentagon objected. It argued not only that legislation was unnecessary, but also that it would deprive procurement officials of the flexibility they needed to negotiate contracts. The Vinson Bill died in that session.
>
> In 1962, Vinson again introduced it. Two more years of GAO reporting had given him more ammunition. This time the bill passed, 362–0 in the House and on a voice vote in the Senate.

Unanimous congressional passage of Public Law 87–653—the truth-in-negotiating law—should have resulted promptly in every negotiated Federal procurement contract including in that contract a certificate that costs and prices on which the contract was based were "accurate, current, and complete."

It has been 4 years since the passage of that legislation—and many billions of dollars of Federal procurement contracts since—but the GAO reports that the requirements of the law still are not being met by the Defense Department in many instances.

And so, today, I should like to take this opportunity to draw to the attention of the Armed Services Committee, its distinguished chairman, and my colleagues in this Congress, the findings of two recent GAO reports which indicate that many procurement contracts negotiated by the Defense Department are being negotiated in direct violation of Public Law 87–653, thus permitting the possibility of gross profiteering on the expenditure of this $21 billion and other funds appropriated by this Congress for Federal procurement.

I include the letters of transmittal of the GAO report on the "Need for Improving Administration of the Cost or Pricing Data Requirements of Public Law 87–653 in the Award of Prime Contracts and Subcontracts" of January 1967, dated January 16, and the GAO report on its "Survey of Reviews by the Defense Contract Audit Agency of Contractors' Price Proposals Subject to Public Law 87–653" of February 1967, dated February 15.

I urge the Armed Services Committee to do all in its power to see that the findings of these reports result in improvement in procurement procedures in the Defense Department.

Mr. Chairman, the letters of transmittal of the two reports follow:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
January 16, 1967.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

The accompanying report summarizes our findings on the need for improving administration by the Department of Defense of the cost or pricing data requirements of Public Law 87–653 in the award of prime contracts and subcontracts. Our review was directed principally toward an examination into the extent that agency procurement officials were requiring prime contractors and subcontractors to submit cost or pricing data and a certificate prior to the award of negotiated contracts as required by Public Law 87–653 effective December 1, 1962.

During fiscal years 1957 through 1966, we submitted to the Congress 177 reports disclosing that Government costs on negotiated prime contracts and subcontracts were increased by about $130 million. The increased costs resulted primarily from the failure of contracting officials in negotiating contract prices to obtain accurate, current, or complete cost or pricing data upon which to establish fair and reasonable prices. As a result of certain of these reports, the Congress enacted Public Law 87–653 to provide safeguards for the Government generally where competition is lacking.

The findings summarized in the accompanying report were disclosed by the first phase of our review of 242 negotiated prime contracts and subcontracts awarded to 85 prime contractors and 89 subcontractors after October 1964. This examination was performed at 18 military procurement agencies and 31 prime contractor plants during the period April 1965 to June 1966.

The second phase of our review, which is currently in progress, includes an evaluation of the practices of the military services in negotiating the prices of 127 of the prime contracts we reviewed in the first phase. These contracts were selected for further detailed review because of our findings that procurement officials had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted and certified by the contractor in support of significant cost estimates included in the contract prices. In this second phase of our examination, we performed examinations at 79 prime contractor plants during 1965 and 1966. Our findings on this review will be the subject of further reporting to the Congress in the near future.

We found that 185 of the 242 procurements examined in the first phase were awarded under requirements of the law and the procurement regulations for submission of cost or pricing data and a certificate that the data submitted were accurate, complete, and current. However, in 165 of these awards, we found that agency officials and prime contractors had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted and certified by offerors in support of significant cost estimates.

As a result, it appears that the certificate is not wholly effective since it may be impracticable to establish whether the offeror had submitted inaccurate, incomplete, or noncurrent data in instances where he had not identified the data he had certified. Further, the Government's rights under the defective-pricing-data clause required by the law to be included in these contracts may be impaired since in such cases it may be impracticable for the contracting officer to establish that erroneous data were relied on in the negotiation if data were not submitted or made a matter of record by the offeror.

We also found that, in the remaining 57 of the 242 procurements examined, agency and contractor records of the negotiation indicated that cost or pricing data were not obtained apparently because the prices were based on adequate price competition or on established catalog or market prices of commercial items sold in substantial quantities to the general public.

Public Law 87–653 waives the requirement for obtaining certified cost or pricing data under such circumstances. However, the records of these awards did not contain an explanation by the contracting officials of why cost or pricing data were not required and the reasons for determining that the prices were based on adequate price competition or on catalog or market prices of commercial items. As a result, it could not be ascertained whether the bases for these determinations were consistent with criteria established in the Armed Services Procurement Regulation.

During our examination of subcontract awards, we found that prime contractors also had no record identifying the cost or pricing data submitted by subcontractors in support of significant cost estimates even though agency contracting officials were required, under negotiated prime contracts other than firm fixed-price type, to ascertain that such data were being obtained. Therefore, there also appears to be a need for thorough reviews by agency administrative contracting officials to ensure that prime contractors are obtaining adequate cost and pricing data, where appropriate, in the award of subcontracts.

During our review, we found that agency officials in awarding prime contracts were not requiring prime contractors to use a new Contract Pricing Proposal Form (DD Form 633) dated December 1, 1964. This form contains instructions to offerors which, if properly implemented, could, in our opinion, go a long way toward achieving compliance with the procurement regulations implementing the law. The Department of Defense has now taken steps to correct this matter. However, during our review of subcontracts, we found that prime contractors were not being required to use the new form in obtaining proposals from their subcontractors.

We proposed that the Department of Defense clarify its procurement regulations to provide that, where cost or pricing data are required in the award of prime contracts and subcontracts, agency officials and prime contractors be required to obtain from offerors written identification of the cost or pricing data, as defined in the regulations, in support of cost estimates along with certificates specifically covering the identified data and to retain such records in procurement files.

We proposed also that the prescribed certificate be revised to require the contractor to certify that a written identification of the cost or pricing data, as defined in the regulation, provided or otherwise made available to the contracting officer or his representative in support of the proposal, has been submitted and that such data are accurate, complete, and current as of the date agreed upon by the parties (which shall be as close to the date of agreement on the negotiated price as is practicable).

Further, we proposed that the Department of Defense take appropriate actions to emphasize and clarify certain existing requirements dealing primarily with the application of Public Law 87-653 to the award of subcontracts and to ensure that agency and contractor officials are complying with them.

The Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Procurement) advised us that a special group had been appointed under the guidance of his office to study all the material contained in our report. He assured us that the necessity of providing additional guidance on the subject of submittal and retention of data or identification in lieu of submittal will be considered. He indicated, however, that it was not possible to forecast the exact outcome of this study.

We have also completed a similar examination covering 138 contracts awarded by 15 offshore procurement agencies to prime contractors in Europe and the Far East. We have advised the Secretary of Defense of our findings which are essentially similar to those described above.

We also have submitted to the Department of Defense for comment similar findings stemming from our review at seven Army Corps of Engineer procurement offices in the United States and at six overseas locations of 195 contracts for construction work.

This report is being issued so that the Congress may be informed of the need for the Department of Defense to improve the effectiveness of its administration of the cost and pricing data provisions expressed by the Congress in the enactment of Public Law 87-653.

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget, and to the Secretary of Defense.

Elmer B. Staats,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Washington, D.C.,
February 15, 1967.

To the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

The accompanying report presents the results of a nationwide survey which we made in response to interest expressed by the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, in strengthening contract audit work in the Department of Defense.

Since July 1965 this audit work has been performed by the Defense Contract Audit Agency, a new agency formed at the direction of the Secretary of Defense by consolidating various contract audit staffs formerly assigned to the three military departments.

We directed our attention to the Agency's responsibility for making reviews of contract pricing proposals negotiated without the safeguards of competition. These reviews, which are made prior to negotiation with the contractor, constitute a substantial portion of the Agency's workload and are accorded the highest priority.

Our survey included work at Agency audit sites at 20 plants of private companies generally among the top 100 defense contractors in the United States.

The Agency is making significant progress. But our survey showed that, in order to operate more effectively with its workload of many thousands of contract pricing proposals totaling over $40 billion annually, improvements are needed in four areas, as summarized below.

1. Prices of most defense procurement contracts are based largely on estimated costs in proposals submitted by contractors as a basis for negotiation. Nationwide and individual reviews in recent years by military procurement and audit organizations—as well as current surveys by the Defense Contract Audit Agency—have disclosed a need for major contractors to improve and incorporate into a formal system their estimating methods and procedures. This would provide greater management control over the estimating processes used in preparing price proposals, and facilitate review and negotiation.

We brought this problem to the attention of top Defense officials in a preliminary report and in a special briefing. In January of this year, the Department released a Defense Procurement Circular, effective immediately, designed to attain a number of improvements, including:

Policy guidance to procurement officials and auditors.

Criteria for acceptable cost estimating systems.

Reasons why these systems benefit industry as well as Government.

Steps to be taken to correct present deficiencies.

This action by the Department is important and commendable. We are recommending in the report some steps to help carry out the new directive.

2. In a number of instances defense auditors did not review significant cost estimates in price proposals. This was due in part to a carryover of practices followed by former audit organizations when responsibilities for reviews of proposals were less than those currently specified in procurement regulations. The Department told us that actions are underway—or are planned—to correct this situation. We are recommending that the Secretary of Defense review these corrective efforts within the next year.

3. Defense auditors ordinarily were not receiving information from procurement officials on the usefulness of their audits in negotiations or on ways that their services could be more effective in future negotiations. The Department has acted on our proposal to provide this type of "feedback" to its auditors.

4. Defense auditors have experienced difficulties, when reviewing proposed contract prices, in obtaining what they considered to be sufficient access to contractors' records. The Department informed us that new guidelines had been issued to help resolve these access-to-records problems. If this action is supported by continuous assistance from procurement officials, at all levels, it should improve the situation.

In a prior report to the Congress (B-158193, February 1966), we recommended that the Defense Department establish a regularly scheduled program to administer the defective pricing provisions required in certain types of negotiated contracts by Public Law 87-653—"The Truth in Negotiation Act."

This law provides for price adjustments in favor of the Government when it is found that established prices have been increased significantly because of defective data used in negotiations. A program for these reviews was established by the Defense Contract Audit Agency during 1966. Reviews have been initiated, and we plan to examine the progress of the program this year.

Copies of this report are being sent to the Director, Bureau of the Budget; the Secretary of Defense; and the heads of other agencies which make significant use of the services of the Defense Contract Audit Agency.

Elmer B. Staats,
Comptroller General of the United States.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I want to state my general agreement with the minority views of our colleague from New York [Mr. Pike] and our colleague from Michigan [Mr. Nedzi] which are included in the committee's report.

As Members know, I strongly opposed the inclusion last year of $167 million for preproduction of the Nike X antiballistic-missile system. This money for preproduction had not been requested by the Secretary of Defense and its use had been resisted as unnecessary and dangerous by many leading scientists and engineers closely associated with the subject.

As before, I do not oppose the $440 million included in this bill and defense budget for continued research and development of the Nike X system. I have voted repeatedly for the research and development work in this field which totals now some $4 billion.

At this time in world history, though, as Mr. Pike and Mr. Nedzi have noted in their views:

> The United States and the Soviet Union are engaged in extremely complicated and sensitive negotiations seeking to limit in some meaningful and responsible manner a major new round in the continuing cycle of increased armaments and increased spending for armaments.

I think it is inappropriate for us, while these negotiations are going on, to proceed with the funds for construction and deployment of this system, as the committee has recommended. For let us be very clear, this "thin deployment," which would provide protection against an unsophisticated attack by the Red Chinese in the 1970's, is only a first step. The next step would be a defense against the more sophisticated Soviet missiles, and the ultimate cost of this program over a 10-year period, as estimated by Secretary McNamara, is in the order of $40 billion.

Other questions need to be raised as well. They are discussed by Secretary McNamara in the committee's hearings and I urge a careful reading of his points.

Fundamental is the question of whether the deployment of an ABM system at this time would improve our security. The Secretary has noted that the Soviet Union would be forced to react to a U.S. deployment by increasing its offensive nuclear force still further. The results, he suggests, are: one, the risk of a Soviet nuclear attack on the United States would not be further decreased; and two, the damage to the United States from a Soviet nuclear attack would not be reduced in any meaningful sense.

An ABM system would also require an extended fallout shelter program, but the political decision to proceed with such an extended system has not yet been made.

It may be, Mr. Chairman, that the present negotiations with the Soviet Union will not lead to a treaty banning the development of anti-ballistic-missile systems. It may be that both countries, at some point, may need to develop a shield against the Communist Chinese. The budget, as recommended, already included $375 million for production of the Nike X, should negotiations fail. I support the inclusion of these funds. I would also support a supplemental authorization and appropriation if such should become necessary.

But I believe that production and deployment at this time would be most unfortunate. There is a real question in the minds of many knowledgeable experts as to whether it would add to our security. It would certainly jeopardize the chance of successful negotiations that could be a meaningful step in turning down the arms race.

I would hope that this decision on actual production and deployment could be delayed until the need, or lack thereof, of such an expensive and potentially dangerous system could be more adequately determined.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, this is an extremely important bill. It comes at a crucial time when our Nation is engaged in conflict in Vietnam and American boys are offering their lives and giving their all for the security of the Nation and the cause of human freedom.

There can be and will be little, if any, opposition to this bill, because it provides authority for the sinews, the materiel, the aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, combat vehicles, and other equipment, as well as the research, development, test and evaluation, so vital and indispensable to the struggle for liberty, independence, and world peace that this Nation is presently carrying on against Communist aggressors.

The able distinguished chairman of the committee, our esteemed friend, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. Rivers], has summarized the bill with his usual clarity, knowledgeability, and persuasiveness. He has, to my mind, in his eloquent, forceful way, presented an irrefutable case for the bill, and so has my dear friend and esteemed, able, dedicated colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Bates].

There is little that can be added to stress the reasons that make the speedy enactment of this measure by the House definitely imperative.

This bill is very necessary now in the public interest and for the security of the country.

The cost of national defense is very high in terms of dollars, since this year we will spend something like $73 billion, a truly astronomical amount.

However lamentable it may be that the Nation must provide such huge outlays for military purposes, it is clear that not to do so could well have disastrous consequences to the Nation and the world. But we must insist on every measure of economy, efficiency, and accountability.

Let us hope and pray that through our strength, our firmness, our spirit of resolution, and our unyielding purpose to defend our country, preserve our heritage, support the cause of freedom, and do our utmost to speed the peace, we may soon be able to achieve peace in Vietnam, and elsewhere in the world.

I am in strong support of the bill and would like to touch briefly upon an improved operational measure in behalf of our military personnel.

The committee has evidenced great interest in the aeromedical evacuation job being done by the Air Force in Southeast Asia. While that service is performing praiseworthy service, our analysis indicates additional resources are required to transport the wounded from the overseas port of entry to hospitals throughout the United States.

The CX-2 aeromed aircraft is the medium-sized jet transport needed to modernize the domestic aeromedical fleet for this mode of transportation.

During our review of last year's budget, it was brought to the committee's attention that the older prop-driven C-118 and C-131 aircraft currently performing the domestic transport missions were resulting in transfer times within the United States of longer duration than it was taking to bring our casualties from overseas. To help this situation, the Congress added four CX-2 aircraft to the fiscal year 1967 program. The bid proposals are currently being completed and the procurement is planned for July of this year.

To continue the necessary modernization of the domestic fleet, the Air Force has requested four more CX-2 aircraft in the fiscal year 1968 program. However, a minimum of 12 aircraft are required to completely replace the C-118's and C-131's with modern jets. By the addition of four more aircraft to the fiscal year 1968 procurement, the total requirement will be realized a year sooner. Maximum benefits will be obtained at the earliest date while precluding a possible break between delivery of the first eight and the follow-on aircraft. Completing the buy with fiscal year 1968 funds would also eliminate an additional year's operation of a mixed fleet which is always more expensive and less efficient since both old and new equipment would have to be used in combination.

Mr. Chairman, I urge prompt, unanimous passage of the bill and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Sec. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, $768,700,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $2,527,100,000; for the Air Force, $5,770,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $769,200,000; for the Navy, $625,600,000; for the Marine Corps, $23,100,000; for the Air Force, $1,343,000,000.

Naval Vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,872,900,000, of which amount $249,600,000 is authorized only for the construction of two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates. The contracts for the construction of the two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest.

Tracked Combat Vehicles

For tracked combat vehicles: For the Army, $424,700,000; for the Marine Corps, $5,100,000.

TITLES II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Sec. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $1,539,000,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,864,118,000;

For the Air Force, $3,313,514,000, of which amount $51,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft:

For the Defense agencies, $464,000,000.

Sec. 202. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1968 for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto, $125,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Subsection (a) of section 401 of Public Law 89-367 approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes to support (1) Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam, (2) local forces in Laos and Thailand; and for related costs, during the fiscal year 1968, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine."

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. Section 3034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of four years, from the general officers of the Army. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 402. Section 5081(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Chief of Naval Operations, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, for a term of four years, from officers on the active list in the line of the Navy, eligible to command at sea and not below the grade of rear admiral. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 403. Section 8034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed for a period of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the general officers of the Air Force. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 404. Section 5201(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Commandant of the Marine Corps, appointed by the President, for a term of four years, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, from officers on the active list of the Marine Corps, not below the rank of colonel. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 405. The foregoing provisions of this amendment shall take effect as of January 1, 1969.

Mr. RIVERS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be printed in the RECORD and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STRATTON

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STRATTON: On page 3, line 1, delete the figure "$1,864,118,000;" and substitute in lieu thereof the figure "$1,910,118,000 of which sum $46,000,000 shall be used only for antisubmarine warfare programs:"

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in the nature of a perfecting amendment. It is being offered on behalf of the members of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services. This subcommittee was set up toward the end of the last Congress by our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina, because he was concerned, as we have been, with the increasing numbers of Soviet submarines and with the threat which they have represented. We have been concerned, too, with our attention focused so greatly on Vietnam, that this country not lose sight of the necessity for staying abreast of and, in fact, ahead of this Soviet submarine threat.

Members of our subcommittee were especially disturbed that the budget request submitted from the Department of Defense this year for research and development funds, particularly in the Navy, which had left out some $46 million of the sum originally requested by the Navy for research and development in the field of antisubmarine warfare, this $46 million was deleted by the Department of Defense when the budget was submitted to Congress. Our subcommittee was concerned because antisubmarine warfare is one of the top priority items in the Navy. In response to a request from the subcommittee, Admiral Martell, the Navy's top official with respect to antisubmarine warfare matters, replied to us that elimination of this $46 million would seriously impede our ability to continue research and development in a number of programs, some of which are classified, which are urgently needed to keep us ahead of the Soviets as we are at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, at this point I include the unclassified letter from Admiral Martell outlining the need for these funds.

The letter referred to follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF
NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.
Hon. SAMUEL S. STRATTON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare, Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your letter of 4 May 1967 as to my personal views as to the adequacy of the FY68 ASW RDT&E funds, I consider the present situation to be as follows:

I have repeatedly stressed that our present advantage in ASW derives from the superior technological effort of our Navy-Industry teams and that the improving ASW posture I have postulated for the early 1970's depends upon a continued high level R&D effort. Naturally, an adequate procurement program must follow but the R&D effort is indispensable in providing the edge between winning or losing encounters with enemy submarines.

The potential threat posed by the Soviet submarine force to our sea lines of communication is well documented. In view of the fact that the Soviet Union has continued to upgrade the capability of this force and indeed pursues those developments which provide great offensive capabilities, it is prudent that we also achieve the new capabilities which American technology can provide.

I share your concern for the need for additional R&D funds to accomplish this. This same feeling of concern has been expressed by others, including the Secretary of the Navy.

A strong ASW posture provides a strategic deterrent and damage limiting force of great importance. ASW forces will continue to be deterrent forces only as long as we maintain a capability for almost total destruction of any potential enemies' submarine force. The application of technology is the primary factor in assuring that we have viable forces to meet this goal.

As long as any potential enemy continues to upgrade his offensive submarine capability, the level of our ASW R&D effort must progress from year to year as each single new development contributes to building total capability. This is the only way to stay ahead in this deadly business. If there is merely a balance of capability, then there is strong temptation for an enemy to use the submarine as an offensive weapon at sea.

ASW forces can remain deterrent forces only if we have overwhelming ASW superiority. In my view, we urgently need additional funds in FY68 to apply to R&D efforts that will assure sufficient progress and this capability in the years to come. I state unequivocally that R&D is the primary area of the ASW budget which poses a threat to achieving this ASW posture.

In each of the last several years I have identified ASW R&D funding deficiencies in the neighborhood of $30–50M. In order to support the programs of highest ASW priority, and in the absence of adequate financial relief, I have sacrificed intensive effort on a number of other important ASW developments. I believe we must have a well-rounded body of ASW platforms, sensors and weapons, not a skeleton. I become most uncomfortable as I see these programs delayed another year because of inadequate funds. One project, for example, is the Extended Range ASROC weapon, capable of killing at ranges well beyond the present ASROC and beyond the submarine's attack range. Use of such a weapon could well provide the margin of victory in a Submarine-Escort encounter. I am simply unable to afford this development within the present funding envelope, even though its feasibility has been demonstrated and we are ready to proceed to engineering development.

While the ASW RDT&E Budget reflects some $50M less than originally requested, new problems have arisen and information has become available since preparation of the budget that reaffirms the necessity for the original request. I have just concluded an apportionment review which indicated conservatively an urgent requirement for $46M in FY68 above the amount budgeted. As I have indicated in Congressional hearings, the deficiency in ASW R&D has been passed on from year to year, and is with us still in FY68. It is difficult to describe precisely the effect of many of these deferrals and cancellations because they may not have a visible impact on our National Security for several years.

I see little, if any, possibility of obtaining funds for ASW from prior year monies or from the emergency or discretionary funds within the authority of the Secretary of Defense. Accordingly, I envisage that ASW deficiencies will continue to be accommodated by reprogramming within ASW unless additional funds are made available. In FY67 reprogramming within ASW amounted to over $60M.

It has been my experience that whenever prior year assets are generated outside of ASW they usually are reapplied to urgent requirements that exist there. In like manner, whenever ASW prior year assets become available I reprogram them to satisfy ASW urgent requirements. With respect to discretionary funds, I find that the pressure of world events during the last two years has resulted in the utilization of these funds primarily for important new starts, for quick reaction R&D items for Vietnam or for other programs of great national urgency. As a matter of record, no such funding has been made available for ASW R&D over the past two years. So in my view, I am still faced with a current deficiency of $46M in R&D funds.

I appreciate your concern and that of your Committee for our ASW readiness. I know you share with me the view that nothing less than complete technical supremacy in this field can meet the demand of National Security.

Sincerely,
CHARLES B. MARTELL,
Vice Admiral, U.S. Navy,
Director, ASW Programs.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, because of the very busy schedule of our full committee, it was not possible for our Subcommittee on Antisubmarine Warfare to conclude its examination of these matters until after the subcommittee headed by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PRICE] had concluded its own hearings.

However, Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Illinois has no objection to this amendment, which is being offered on behalf of all the members of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee, an amendment designed to fill in a very substantial gap in our research and development programs in this field.

Let me just make very clear, Mr. Chairman, that the funds added to the bill by any amendment, the $46 million, are in addition to those funds for antisubmarine warfare research and development already included in the bill. I want to make it clear that the language of the amendment is simply intended to insure that these additional funds not be reprogramed for any other purpose than ASW without the approval of the Armed Services Committee.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. STRATTON. I very gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton] that this recommendation, then, is not only supported by the subcommittee to which the gentleman from New York has referred, but is also supported by the Department of the Navy's top officer in this field?

Mr. STRATTON. That is right. Admiral Martell has the full responsibility. Of course, as the distinguished chairman of our full committee indicated a moment ago, the personal views of Navy officers cannot be given to Members of Congress except in response to a specific question. Our subcommittee had submitted that question to Admiral Martell and he has replied to it in the letter which I have just presented.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I commend the gentleman from New York and support the amendment.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment represents a very urgent need for defense development funds. I do hope it will be approved.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding and I wish to state to the Committee that I support the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I say this in view of the fact that the very distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whom I have appointed as head of the Antisubmarine Warfare Subcommittee, has cleared this matter with the chairman of the Research and Development Subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, this is an area in which there is reposed one of the most vital segments of our defense effort. If we have an Achilles heel, it is in the antisubmarine warfare defense program.

Mr. Chairman, I would much rather take the responsibility for accepting the amendment than that of rejecting it.

Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development is willing to go along with this amendment, and as the top admiral in this operation has recommended, the committee has no objection to accepting the gentleman's amendment; in fact, we are very happy to accept it.

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, and I appreciate his acceptance of our subcommittee's amendment.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. STRATTON. I am happy to yield to the ranking minority member of the subcommittee, the very able gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain].

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to associate myself with the remarks which have been made by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton], and say to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that this is a matter that has had our urgent attention, not just recently, but for many months. It is my opinion, Mr. Chairman, that this is something which is vitally needed for our national security.

As for myself, Mr. Chairman, I shall support the amendment which has been offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Stratton].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DOW

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. Dow: On page 2, Line 10, strike out "$1,872,900,000" and substitute "$1,605,900,000."

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would reduce the sum to be authorized for naval vessels from $1,872,900,000 to $1,605,900,000. The difference, $267,000,000, represents an authorization to construct four fast deployment logistic ships. This authorization should not be given. We gave an authorization for two of these ships in the 1966 fiscal year. My deduction would eliminate that authorization so that none of these FDL ships would be constructed.

Let me quote from a brochure issued by the Chief of Naval Material in October 1966. It explains these ships as follows:

> The FDL Ship Project is a Navy program . . . to provide at minimum cost a fleet of ships for the continuous seaborne basing of United States land combat equipment in any area of the world. FDL ships will have the capability to disembark promptly the heavy equipment and initial combat supplies for land forces, if necessary in an over-the-beach operation.
>
> These loaded ships, manned and operated by the Department of Defense, could be located at sea near potential trouble areas.

A later brochure of the Navy dated November 14, 1966, develops the intended use of the ships somewhat further. For example, it says:

> They may move in irregular patterns in ocean areas near expected trouble spots: or be sited on neighboring ports.

In addition to our present instant capability on the sea and in the air, these vessels would give us an instant capability overseas on the ground. They add an awesome new dimension to our military outreach.

It means, gentlemen, that we are rapidly backing to a de facto role as the world's sole policeman. We got into that role somewhat and altogether too much in Vietnam. Apparently the taste did not dismay us, for here we are eagerly seeking the complete role.

This thought was emphasized recently by Senator Russell in a committee hearing of the other body. Senator Russell had this to say:

> That suggests we are going to be drawn into war in new places.

He went on:

> If we build anything like this, we are just going to be handed more and more of this business of fighting everybody's wars everywhere.

The other body happily has eliminated the provision for these FDL ships.

The painful, tragic part of all this, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that the decision to build these ships has been generated by the Defense Establishment, and not by Congress. Frankly, I wonder whether even Defense decided it. More likely they just fell themselves into the lure of doing something because it can be done, and not because it should be done.

The Navy brochure of November 14, 1966, lists 23 questions about the FDL ship program that "have been raised by the press, by individuals, by industrial associations and by Congressmen regarding various aspects of the FDL ship program." I think it is a national disgrace, and a congressional failure that not one of those 23 questions were the central ones that should be asked. Not one of them was the monumental question: "Should the United States be a world policeman?" Note that none of them was a second great question: "Should the United States prepare itself to crush all rebellions of underprivileged men in all quarters of the globe?"

The world is peopled by 2 billion hungry, deprived people, who are just lately realizing that opportunity is brighter for those who try. Shall we who are secure behind two oceans and arsenals of nuclear weapons send vessels thousands of miles in order to prevent the colored races from trying, at least, to struggle for a better way of life. If we take this negative stance in every quarter of the globe, I am not so sure that even the two oceans and the nuclear arsenals will ultimately protect us from the wrath of those with whom we interfere. I am not so sure that numbers may not in the end overpower our machines. Quite often right, and even God, Himself, has been on the side of the bigger battalion.

Well, Mr. Chairman, to argue or settle these questions here is beside the point. The point itself is this: How can we as intelligent, perceptive, patriotic, and wise representatives of the American people allow the highest kinds of policy to be established for us by a juggernaut in the Pentagon? How can we allow technicians of the shiploading craft to guide the juggernaut and lay down the policies of our Nation and the destiny of the world?

Has Congress abdicated? Are there in these halls where vision has been a tradition none who can perceive the salient issues? Perceiving them, are there no longer any who can ponder these issues in quiet, debate them in public, and master them in the end.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment before it is too late.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. In general debate, it will be seen that I have set forth my views in opposition to the construction of these fast deployment logistic vessels. I think possibly for somewhat different reasons than the gentleman's reasons. But I want to say to the gentleman, I shall support his amendment.

Mr. DOW. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, to begin with we have done neither of the things to which the gentleman's remarks refer. We have rejected the notion that we build 30 fast deployment logistic ships. We have rejected the notion that they shall be tied up in foreign waters.

We have not accepted the notion that one shipyard will get 30 of these ships.

But we have insisted, Mr. Chairman, on the original position of building four prototypes. We are badly in need, and we are vitally in need, Mr. Chairman, of logistic support in this area. We need some kind of logistic ship. We put all kinds of guarantees in this bill to comply with the objections of the distinguished gentleman from Washington. We will not allow them to compete with existing ship companies and shipping lines. We will not let them be built if they are not necessary. They must come back and make a full report to the committee next year. The committee will then take a hard look at the entire proposal.

We have committed ourselves in the report. I do not think we should be the world's policemen.

We want to get some prototypes so that we can give our Army and Marines the supplemental logistic help that they need because we cannot give it to them with airplanes.

We know we need seaborne, logistic help and this is what the committee is endeavoring to do as we did 2 years ago without any objection.

I want to see what these ships look like. Then the committee will recommend to you what we will do with them. But to cut out the limited capacity recommended by the committee and the Congress needed for the prototypes of transportation facilities of men and materiel would not be wise.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PELLY. I certainly want to commend the Committee on Armed Services for the way they have very carefully looked at this whole matter of this proposal and this program. It was actually because I recognized that the committee had done this, and the protection that the chairman has indicated as to any future program, that I, myself, did not put in the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I would like to say this. One reason that the committee acted as we have acted is because of the fine information and the intelligent opposition that we received from members of your distinguished Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

We want to look at these things. We have committed ourselves to nothing. We want to see what they will look like because we need some kind of logistic ship, as the gentleman well knows. We do not plan to let them compete from point to point. We have rejected the notion of point-to-point use of these ships. These are purely and simply protypes.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BATES. I want to say, I agree fully with what the distinguished chairman of the committee has said. If the Department of the Navy merely asked for two of these ships, there never would have been any question about it. The fact of the matter is, as the chairman so well pointed out, there is a shortage of logistical ships in the Navy today. The merchant marine has not kept up to date. This year, with 14 ships and the number of tons being built, this is not good enough for the United States, and will not sustain our naval forces to move overseas when the time and circumstances require the men and equipment that we need. So this is a small step that we are taking today, and I believe the Committee should approve it now as they approved it 2 years ago.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I might say that the existing shipbuilding companies are embarking upon a program now of trying to provide some kind of ship that would carry out a response to this type of need. Perhaps private industry will come up with something that we can use. But for the time being, we must move in the direction of at least seeing where we are headed in this area in which there is such a great need for logistics.

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOW. Let me thank the chairman for his patient explanation. I merely wish to say that in this debate we have concerned ourselves too much with the numbers of the ships and the technical details, whereas the point I was trying to make was that we need to take stock of our whole policy in the world, and it seemed to me that this was a point to close the door and say, "Here is where we will take such steps."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROUSH

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROUSH: On page 3, after line 18, insert the following:

"SEC. 203. It is the Sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the Department of Defense should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible."

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to propose an amendment to H.R. 9240, a bill to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

It is the latter part of the bill to which I would direct attention, that portion dealing with "Research and development."

Although not a member of the esteemed chairman's Committee on Armed Services, my interest has been elicited by my past experience in the Armed Forces myself, by my concern for our country's defense, its scientific development, and most recently my attention to research and development programs in the House Committee on Science and Astronautics.

I should like to propose an amendment, an inclusion to the present bill, which would put the Congress on record as favoring the geographical distribution of Federal funds for research and development whenever feasible.

May I explain the value of such an amendment, Mr. Chairman, by a history of this matter as it has concerned the committee of which I am a member?

Federal obligations for research and development are estimated at $17.3 billion for 1968. New investment in development will decline, while funds for basic and applied research will increase significantly.

Expenditures for research and development comprise a substantial part of the Federal budget. In 1968, 13 percent of administrative budget expenditures will be for research and development. About two-thirds of the Nation's research and development effort is financed from Federal funds, and about 75 percent of the research conducted in universities comes from Federal funds. One of the chief recipients is national defense—which along with space and health objectives continues to comprise the major part of Federal research activities.

From time to time Members of Congress have expressed concern over the apparent imbalance of geographical distribution of Federal research and development funds. This concern is justified since the Federal research dollar affects regional economies, the availability of trained manpower, the quality and quantity of educational facilities for all ages of students, and the overall scientific and technological progress of our Nation.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, which established NASA, called for scientific and technical competence of the country for work in aeronautics and space. However, it was in 1965 that the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, in its report No. 273 on the fiscal year 1966 NASA Authorization Act—Public Law 89–53, June 28, 1965—stated that:

> SEC. 5. It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of federal research funds whenever feasible and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds on a geographical basis whenever feasible and use such other measures as may be practicable toward this end.

Similarly, the 1967 Authorization Act—Public Law 89–528, August 5, 1966—provided that:

> SEC. 5. It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

On September 14, 1965, President Johnson made a statement to the Cabinet and a memorandum for heads of departments and agencies on "Strengthening Academic Capabilities for Science," in which he noted that two-thirds of the total research expenditures in colleges and universities come from Federal funds and that:

> The manner in which such funds are spent clearly has a most important effect upon advanced education in this country and upon the future of our Nation's universities.

The President also urged insurance—

> that our programs for Federal support of research in colleges and universities contribute more to the long-run strengthening of the universities and colleges. . . .

President Johnson remarked at that time that one-half of the Federal expenditures for research went to some 20 major educational institutions, most of which were strong before the advent of Federal research funds.

Compatible with their primary interests in special projects, agencies were urged to "find excellence and build it up wherever it is found so that creative centers of excellence may grow in every part of the Nation."

Since that time NASA has undertaken to follow the President's directives—and more. The principle and the goal of geographical distribution appears in authorization legislation. And, as of April 6, this year, the NASA procurement regulation has expanded the following stipulation about contracts to include those indicated in b— "existing contracts." The present NASA procurement regulation reads:

> 1.302–52 New source of scientific and technical competence
>
> As a Government agency whose mission calls for substantial Federal expenditures and use of substantial national resources, NASA has a strong interest in assisting in the accomplishment of collateral national economic goals within the framework of applicable statutory and administrative authority in such manner as will not impair program effectiveness. Utilization and the accompanying development of the potential of all geographical regions in the space program will effectively contribute to achieving national goals. To advance the further development of competence and capacity of sources, it is NASA's policy to encourage the placing of subcontracts over wider geographic areas. To carry out these objectives, the fol- and development contracts of $500,000 and over to be performed within the United lowing clause shall be inserted in all research States:
>
> GEOGRAPHIC PARTICIPATION IN THE AEROSPACE PROGRAM
>
> (a) It is the policy of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to advance a broad participation by all geographic regions in filling the scientific, technical, research and development, and other needs of the aerospace program.
>
> (b) The Contractor agrees to use his best efforts to solicit subcontract sources on the broadest feasible geographic basis, consistent with efficient contract performance, and without impairment of program effectiveness or increase in program cost.
>
> (c) The Contractor further agrees to insert this clause in all subcontracts of $100,000 and over.
>
> b. EXISTING CONTRACTS. The "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause shall be included in existing research and development contracts of $500,000 and over at the time the contract is modified.

At this point I should like to include a letter from James E. Webb, the Administrator of NASA, which explains in detail this procurement regulation and NASA's attention to geographical distribution of contracts with industry as well as with academic institutions:

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1967.

Hon. J. EDWARD ROUSH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROUSH: This letter replies to your inquiry, made when I appeared on February 28, 1967, before the Committee on Science and Astronautics, concerning what NASA has done in the past year to promote geographic distribution of Federal research funds.

We have developed a NASA Procurement Regulation Directive (PRD 66–8), "Development of New Sources of Scientific and Technical Competence," which became effective on September 1, 1966 (see Enclosure No. 1). This Directive requires inclusion of a "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause in all NASA research and development contracts of $500,000 and over. Under this clause, the contractor agrees to use his best efforts to select his subcontractors on the broadest feasible geographic basis. Also, the contractor agrees to insert this clause in all subcontracts of $100,000 and over.

This Directive has been revised (see Enclosure No. 2), effective April 6, 1967, to require the "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause, in addition to benig used in new contracts, to be included in all existing NASA research and development contracts of $500,000 and over.

The revised directive contains background material emphasizing the importance which Congress and, in turn, NASA place upon achieving maximum geographic distribution of Federal research funds.

To better measure the effectiveness of the program, our major contractors will be asked to submit to NASA an annual report of the specific methods being used or to be used to further implement the "Geographic Participation in the Aerospace Program" clause.

We have actively pursued other aspects of our program. We are continuing to make available to concerns that have not participated in NASA research and development programs the benefits of new technology (discoveries, improvements, processes, innovations) developed by NASA contractors. It is believed that this dissemination of new technology will increase the likelihood that more and varied sources will be able to undertake NASA research and development contracts. To further strengthen our new technology disclosure program, we now require contractors to specifically describe their proposed plan for new technology identification and disclosure in their proposals. Also, these plans are now evaluated when NASA considers proposals for award of a contract.

To assure availability of new technology to all sources, NASA has established local centers to provide rapid access to this information. Such centers have been set up in Michigan, Indiana, Pennsylvania, Missouri, North Carolina, Maryland, New Mexico and Oklahoma. In addition, NASA has entered into an agreement with the Small Business Administration, under which SBA personnel are specifically assigned the responsibility of finding small business concerns that can take advantage of NASA's Technology Utilization Program.

Specifically directed to greater geographic distribution is a recent change in NASA's practice of limiting to the local business community contracts for "on call" type services requiring quick response. Such geographic limitations have been replaced by time limitations. As a result, any qualified firms, regardless of location, are eligible for such contracts as long as they can demonstrate ability to meet NASA's needs within prescribed time limitations. The use of a time limitation instead of a geographic one, while not a cure-all, will nonetheless tend to broaden the geographic market for such services.

I should like to take time now to commend the Department of Defense for its imaginative program closely following the President's suggestions. Project Themis endeavors to create new academic centers of excellence in science and technology. This program is in addition to the regular contract-grant arrangement with institutions of higher learning and is not a substitute for them. It is hoped that eventually some 100 new departmental centers will be created by this plan—centers of superior scientific and engineering competence at universities which were previously poorly supported financially. Funds for implementing this plan were included in the fiscal year 1967 budget request and approved by Congress.

The Defense program aims at two complementary objectives: first, wider geographical distribution of Defense research funds, favoring institutions and areas that do not now receive substantial support; and second, the development of new centers of excellence capable of improved assistance to the Department of Defense in the years ahead.

Mr. Chairman, while commending this notable project, I would recommend that more attention be directed to contracts with industry and the in-house research and development effort of the Defense Department as well. Most of all, today, I would recommend that the legislation we have before us, the formal authorization for defense funds, should explicitly and specifically endorse the principle of geographical distribution. I believe the sense of Congress, embodied in legislation, an assurance of continuance and advancement of the principle involved. Such projects as THEMIS will be encouraged and assisted by such a declaration of intent.

Accordingly my amendment would read:

> It is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds whenever feasible and that the Department of Defense should explore ways and means of distributing its research and development funds whenever feasible.

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, coming from the Midwest as I do, I very reluctantly rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana, because I believe that the gentleman does have a point. If we will look at the geographical distribution of the college research contracts in this Nation, we will see most of them are going to institutions along the east coast. But I rise in opposition because of the great concern about the wording of the amendment. I hesitate very much to have such an amendment adopted on the floor of this House without very close consideration.

Certainly we cannot place the defense of this Nation on a WPA basis. The defense of this Nation cannot be placed on geography alone.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that I share his interest in this amendment, but I believe the amendment should be voted down and the language watched very closely, because the first wording of the amendment says it is the sense of Congress that it is in the national interest that consideration be given to geographical distribution of Federal research funds.

I have just gone through the experience of having a research contract application in my district turned down by the Defense Department. This application was by one of the foremost institutions in its field. It was a very competitive contract. I thought my institution made a very good case.

But certainly I would not want—and I am sure the gentleman from Indiana would not want—the defense of this Nation to be placed on a geographical basis alone.

I would say to the gentleman from Indiana that a program is already being started at the instance of Congress in this field, and I refer to Project Themis. I would like to read to the committee, from the hearings, the testimony of Dr. Foster, in whom the committee has a great deal of confidence. This will accomplish the purpose of the gentleman from Indiana. The sum of $27 million has been allotted to Project Themis. Now I quote from the testimony:

> The recently implemented Project Themis—our University Center of Excellence Research Program—was designed to make a high level of coupling and relevance a natural attribute of the program. The goal of this program is to strengthen the scientific and engineering capabilities of selected academic institutions throughout the country, enabling a larger number to carry out high quality research on problems related to national defense.

We are making progress in this area. Because of the first part of the language and the danger of the language, I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana be voted down.

Mr. ROUSH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ICHORD. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROUSH. The gentleman will agree that Project Themis goes only to research and development being accomplished in universities and colleges of the Nation and has nothing whatsoever to do with that research and development which is taking place in industry. Is that not correct?

Mr. ICHORD. Certainly Project Themis deals only with research among the colleges and universities.

I sympathize with the gentleman's purpose. I would not want, and I am sure the gentleman would not want, the defense of this country to be placed on geographical basis alone whether it be university research or research and development by private business. Research and development is the very beginning of the great defense of this country. We must have the research contracts placed in those institutions and businesses who are equipped to do the job. I would not want a research and development grant awarded, if the organization was not qualified or able to do the job, just because of geography. Too much emphasis on geography could be seriously detrimental to our Nation's defense and that is why we must proceed very carefully.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUSH].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EDWARDS OF ALABAMA

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama: On Page 3, line 2, change the semicolon to a comma and add the following: "giving due regard in all such research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American merchant marine.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. If the gentleman will permit, I should like to make a brief statement.

Mr. RIVERS. I want to accept your amendment. It is the same amendment that was accepted last year.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say to the chairman of the Armed Services Committee as well as to the whole committee how much I appreciate the interest which the committee has shown in the progress of the merchant marine generally.

The committee report itself indicates the extent to which the committee has gone to see that this Nation does have a strong merchant marine.

As the chairman has said, this amendment was offered last year and was accepted by the Committee. I believe it has had a good effect. I hope it will be accepted again this year.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BYRNES OF WISCONSIN

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin: On page 2, immediately after line 16, insert the following:
>
> "Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no naval vessel may be constructed in any foreign shipyard with funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, unless specifically authorized by law."

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman if he will accept the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. I understand the amendment has to do with a new prototype ship. If this is the fact, I see no reason why we cannot accept it.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to prohibit, unless specifically authorized by Congress, the construction in a foreign shipyard of any naval vessel with funds authorized to be appropriated in this bill.

Since last year, we have, for the first time, been constructing naval vessels in foreign shipyards. Two contracts have been let to British yards; another large one is impending. These ships are being built in Great Britain—not because Congress so decided, not because the Navy decided—but because the Department of Defense used the promise of the ship contracts to complete an arms sale to Great Britain. Let me emphasize that point. We are building these ships in Great Britain—over what I understand is the opposition of the Navy—in order to make good on the promise of our arms sale negotiator that we would throw certain contracts into the deal for the purchase of the F-111 aircraft.

This, I submit, is the wrong way to decide a question of such significance to our national defense and our national security. Whether we build ships abroad or not ought not to be decided on the basis of whether it helps us make an arms sale or not; it ought to be decided on the basis of whether it helps or harms the national defense.

Whether naval vessels should be built abroad is a matter which ought not be decided except by the Congress. Congress alone has the solemn constitutional obligation not only "to provide for the common defense' but also, specifically, "to provide and maintain a Navy."

My contention, of course, is that the construction of naval vessels abroad will be extremely harmful to the national defense in the long run. We help the British shipyards only at the expense of harming the American yards. If it is to become the policy of this Nation to build abroad and to drive American yards out of business, the Congress had better start giving consideration to where it is going to obtain its naval vessels when the foreign countries either cannot or will not build them in a future emergency.

Let me discuss a specific case which

involves a specific authorization in the bill before us.

The funds for naval vessels authorized by this bill include $60.7 million for the construction of seven ocean minesweepers—MSO's. The Navy proposes to obtain these seven ships in a multiyear procurement. Combining the seven with the 4 MSO's authorized for fiscal year 1966 and the five authorized for fiscal year 1967, it will shortly advertise for the construction of the first 16 of this new minesweeper. The British will be invited to bid upon this multiyear contract, running well over $100 million.

Now, this vessel has never been built before. It is newly designed and the first 16 will be the first models, or prototypes. The new ship will contain highly sophisticated equipment, both for minesweeping and mine hunting. It will operate in support of amphibious forces. It is a combat vessel which can be highly crucial to the success of naval operations. The Congress ought to assure itself that it will be able to procure and maintain this vessel in the shortest possible time in the event of future emergencies.

Yet, the Defense Department, in order to make good its pledge during an arms sale negotiation with Great Britain, proposes to take the risk of making a foreign yard the sole immediate source of supply for this vessel. That will be the practical result of the award of the multiyear contract for all of the first 16 of these vessels to a foreign yard. The foreign yard will have innovated the construction of a complex, newly designed vessel; it will have the experience, and the know-how which result from pioneering the first attempt to construct a brandnew ship.

What happens then, if we need more of these vessels badly, at some point in the future? I need not remind this House that we are engaged in a conflict whose end can now not be foreseen.

Well, we can ask the British yard to build us more of them, that is for certain. But what if the British yard, or the British Government, does not choose to build them? What if the British Government has requisitioned the yard for its own purposes? What if the British yard cannot build the ship either for lack of manpower or material, or cannot deliver them because of the military situation?

This Congress of course, will have no control over the British. It cannot seize the yards. It cannot force the foreign yard to give priority to their construction. It cannot act upon an emergency basis to obtain the vessels, as we have done at home with similar ships in the past.

This Congress, with its constitutional responsibility to provide and maintain a Navy, will then be forced to turn to our domestic shipyards. We will then find, if there are any yards then left capable of building this particular wooden-hulled minesweeper, that the procurement of the first ship will be delayed for at least 2 years, because all of the experience and know-how resides, not in the United States, but in a foreign shipyard.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is folly to build naval vessels in foreign yards. I believe it is utter folly to build prototype naval vessels in foreign yards. I daresay you will not find many Navy men who privately will not agree. I believe the construction of these particular prototypes in Great Britain was opposed by the Naval Ships System Command.

If we are to take this grave risk of committing ourselves to a foreign yard for the future construction of combat Navy vessels, then I say it should not be as the result of pledge made by some arms sale negotiator in the Department of Defense. It ought to be a deliberate, eyes-open risk taken by the Congress in the light of a full study of all the facts involved.

My amendment would require congressional authorization before any naval vessel authorized by this bill could be constructed in a foreign yard. I urge its adoption.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my support for the pending 412 defense authorization for fiscal 1968. My expression is with some trepidation. My concern stems from several areas which I would like to review.

To begin with, we are authorizing one of the largest armament programs in history as part of a $76 billion defense budget next year. It has been estimated by ranking Members in the other body that even this budget must be augmented next year in excess of $5 billion. We have come a long way over the past year proving that the U.S. military machine is not a paper tiger. We have certainly proved, however, that it is an expensive tiger.

In a manner our total effort in Southeast Asia is schizophrenic. Our tactical operations appear to be programed almost for the indefinite future. Our high budget strategic operations on the other hand appear to anticipate the war's termination every year. Expressly the budget this year was conditioned on the war's ending next month. The large defense supplemental appropriation of $12.5 billion this year led many to believe that there was a credibility gap. I do not think there was a gap so much in our information as there was in our planning. The right hand many times does not know what the left hand is doing. It was this gap in our planning that allowed the United States to be cascaded over the past year into one of the most colossal of foreign encounters in our history. We started off calendar 1966 by approving a $4.8 billion authorization bill for South Vietnam that is ending up at nearly the $3 billion a month rate at the present time by a simple budget differentiation subtraction. The proof of the arithmetic is in the fact the Department of Defense has withheld approval of Department budget requests that would increase the 1968 defense budget by one-third.

The American people in a measure are being torn apart at the seams. Sixty-three percent support the President's foreign policy on the last poll—many because of convictions—many because it is the patriotic thing to do or because of the obvious benefits of a unified foreign policy right or wrong. I hope that same 63 percent will voice support to the administration next year.

Our overall policy is fraught with a number of problems. In our effort to buy off the war overseas quickly we are almost breaking the bank at home and it is arguable that our military efforts today have done little but stimulate an equal but opposite enemy force.

On the economic side we have programed this year a $9.7 billion deficit. The Pentagon in making its plans seems to care little that the deficit envisions raising the national debt not only the $2 billion last July and the $6 billion last February, but also $8 billion next month. Nor is it readily apparent how the bills get paid if we fail to raise taxes at least $4 billion next year and fail to allow for the sale of $5 billion more of our paper assets in the form of participation certificates. Nor is it now apparent how a further unplanned supplemental defense deficit would be funded. Washington economics was fraught with disaster last February when we absolutely had to have the votes on the floor of the Congress to pay our bills the following week.

Unfortunately I see little real blue sky on the horizon during 1968. The problem simply is not credibility gap but the fact that the Bureau of the Budget simply is not geared to provide oversight of the Department of Defense. What is needed is some agency actually able to exercise heavy restraint on Defense spending such that the size and nature of our foreign military operations could be controlled.

I mentioned that while our war financing was almost panic on an annual basis of the war's duration, tactical operations are to the contrary. If this was true a year ago I think that it is true in spades today. Actually at one time last year I saw a type of victory on the horizon—not so today, largely because of escalation.

I firmly believe we have escalated to no place. In the face of continuous recommendations from General Westmoreland that the war will go on indefinitely, I have failed to understand the theory of escalation. When we in the States have assumed that our force level at 150,000 or 250,000 was at the outer limit considering that a $750 billion economy was fighting a $1 billion economy without modern transportation, a Navy or airpower, we have always assumed that the large buildup had some kind of foreseeable victory in mind.

General Westmoreland has recently addressed the Congress and the country is now brought to realize that even with 450,000 men and an expenditure rate of $3 billion per month, that this is not enough.

I think that it is easy to move blindly ahead, every soldier or Congressman relying on the man ahead and ultimately on the Commander in Chief. When things go wrong or not as anticipated we blame the Russians, the Chinese, the Congress, the President, or the vocal minority. I think that it is time to lose a little of the Notre Dame football team spirit and take dead aim on where we have been and where we are going.

Our bombing is marginally effective. We are panicing to get a better night fighter and anti-SAM device. Our effort overall reminds me of a giant trying to swat a gnat on a sheet of balsam wood with a sledge hammer, becoming very nervous in the endeavor. The largest importer into North Vietnam last year was not the Soviet Union but the United States when we dropped better than 1 million tons of bombs. It is possible that as a Great Society we are trying to solve a war problem with technology of infrared and kindred devices giving at all times too little consideration to the people problem and human nature. If we intended to break the back of the north with our bombing we have been unsuccessful. The morale of the North Vietnamese is better today after having knocked 534 of our multimillion dollar machines from the sky than it was a year ago. I am sure that they are longing to get a shot at our 14 million TFX–F-111's—that are now rolling off the runway. Neither would I classify our B–52 program as a howling success. I know when I hunt duck that unless I pick a bird out of the flock my game bag will be empty. Likewise to bomb a jungle on course and distance is noisy but little else.

While we stated a year ago that we needed to beef up our troops because there were 10,000 North Vietnamese troops in the south and that we needed at least a 10-to-1 overkill ratio to handle guerrillas in the bush—today while the United States has raised its level by 150,000 the North Vietnamese raised its level to better than 100,000. While we were fighting 225,000 solid core enemy a year ago, we now admit their numbers to be 278,000 and we frankly admit also that there is no magic in these numbers.

The casualty levels also have been a modified success story. We have talked too often about 10-to-1 kill ratio in our favor.

In the 1964 elections we had lost 450 Americans. Today we have lost 9,445 American boys and 56,327 have collected Purple Hearts and will collect pensions. In addition, last year the South Vietnamese lost 13,154 and 29,597 were wounded. Other allied losses are 845 dead and 2,330 wounded—all as of last week. Total casualties on our side of 102,062 last year alone then must be measured against 84,430 Vietcong dead and 126,645 estimated wounded. Since Vietcong casualty figures must be discounted by unidentified civilian casualties counted in the overall numbers it is readily apparent that an enemy casualty ratio of 1 to 2 would be optimistic.

And how are we doing on the ground? When last year the I Corps and the Mekong were well in hand—this year they are both open-ended areas. Army troops which should have been programed to pacify the Mekong bread basket are now all tied up on the demilitarized zone.

In addition, we should take stock of attitudes outside of Vietnam. The Soviet Union to date with a gross national product half the size of the United States has engaged in the war only modestly. The 120 Soviet ships that called on Haiphong last year is but a few percent of the U.S. sailings to Saigon. The Soviet Union has expended in North Vietnam to date in 15 years about the dollar amount that the United States expends in the south in 15 days. The Soviet Union is now considering a more ambitious program and it is no wonder since the United States indiscriminately calls every enemy peasant casualty a "bloody Communist."

The Soviets of recent date are holding support rallies for North Vietnamese. But for the accident of the Sino-Soviet cleavage the United States might have had the "fat in the fire" already. With Soviet opinion hardening I see nothing but a foreboding future for United States-Asian policy.

And how about opinion at home. Admittedly draft conscientious deferments are running 4 to 1 of previous encounters. Dr. King and Black Muslim Clay cannot now be considered as isolated objectors. The college community with serious reservations in the past will have calamitous reservations in the coming year. The Republican policy position recently disclosed statement in a measure indicates the possibilities for some men's logic. As more butter and bread are cut out of domestic programs in the coming year, more Americans will be introspectively quizzical of our policy.

What does this dissent mean? It means that the opinion is entitled to respect. In local school bond elections the rule of thumb is that bonds cannot be issued to levy a tax on all unless two-thirds of the voters assent. We can't remove a man from Congress once seated under the Constitution unless two-thirds of the Members so vote. Yet we subject every young person not deferred to the draft while 63 percent of the people of the country only have subscribed in a poll to our foreign policy.

Legally the United States can pursue its present foreign policy course. Not to be concerned wiht the respectable minority, however, is foolhardy.

I would say then that the better part of valor at the present time would be for the administration to be deadly serious with itself as to where we have been and where we are going. It will profit us little as a nation if we exhaust ourselves economically on North Vietnam only to find that our curtailment and lack of attention to the rest of the world, including the Americas, has allowed a Communist foundation to be dug on our hemispheric mainland. While our policy in Vietnam at one time was a matter of choice, at the present time it is monumentally compulsive. We criticized last year the U.S. AID program in South Vietnam as a conglomeration of confusion. If the situation is any better today I am unaware in spite of a major AID effort at reorganization. The South Vietnamese revolutionary cadre system of 30,000 men has suffered high casualties over the last year and is now reputed to be ineffective. What this all really means is that the war on poverty for the world's deprived and underprivileged must be fought offensively through effective AID programs in a time of peace rather than defensively at a time of war. Because people are bound to wonder if the United States does not care for my political future at a time of peace, why do they care at a time of war with communism? I sincerely hope that one day we will realize that American wealth was given to us for a purpose. If we would help our neighbors but 25 percent of the magnitude of our military assistance, there might truly be a hope for peace in our time. The fact that AID and poverty programs are ineffective for reasons other than money is another story.

I would finally like to address a point in the pending bill called the FDL—fast deployment logistics program.

Over the past year and before I have concerned myself about the need for and manner of construction of the projected $2 billion fast deployment logistics shipbuilding program. I am concerned likewise with this Nation's critical need for a nuclear Navy and the needs of this Nation for a crash program to revitalize our rapidly depleting merchant marine fleet.

It is obvious that as a result of our Southeast Asia involvement our Nation has become critically aware of our Nation's current deficit in ability to commandeer on short notice a surface fleet capability to deliver logistic material support on underdeveloped shores. Having participated as a member of the Armed Services Committee on a south Asia inspection tour last year, however, I am satisfied that this deficit was overcome by our Department of the Army and Navy at Chu Lai and Cam Ranh Bay by alternative means. I am personally also satisfied that though we moved troops to the shore before supplies, the overall delay has not seriously affected our total overall effort.

The FDL program could overcome the referenced deficiency. You could speculate that perhaps the program could also assist in providing the United States with a continuing capability with the C5A aircraft that would allow us to retract troops from overseas positions and still allow us to involve ourselves very quickly in a police action of war overseas. I am satisfied that the United States needs more of a capability to get out of encounters easily rather than get in. The nuclear Navy which I support has a "defensive" world image. A patrolling FDL fleet, I am sure, would be considered as "offensive."

Secretary McNamara said last year in Montreal that during the past 8 years there were 150 encounters around the world, one-third of which were affected by communism—some intracountry and some between nations in all of which the United States could have involved itself.

The idea of maintaining a $2 billion fleet—an amount equal to the shipyard cost of our Polaris fleet, I think is preposterous.

I personally believe that the purpose of the FDL program and its manner of procurement have been confounded.

My reasons for opposing this program can be summarized as follows:

First. The timing is wrong. Our current year deficit of $9.7 billion should be limited in every way possible.

Second. The FDL program would be mutually exclusive to a nuclear Navy program which program I know carries paramount priority by the Navy Department. In the 1960's we have averaged $1½ billion annual Navy expenditure for new construction. The FDL program while perhaps only 6 percent of the total U.S. shipbuilding program would comprise nearly 25 percent of all Navy construction procurement for the next 6 years.

Third. The FDL program I believe to be the most cost ineffective to ever receive the stamp of approval of the Secretary of Defense. The ships constructed will not be operational because they will have no place to go. To tie up $2 billion of a merchant fleet we do not have dockside, loaded with progressively obsolete military equipment is not sound.

First, the Army and Marines would have to buy two of everything, one-half of which would be hermetically sealed for perhaps a 5-year period when it must be replaced without ever going in service—hopefully. If the ships were used once capriciously or ill timed, thereafter our fleet would be persona non grata all over the world.

The ships also would be manned 24 hours a day with military crews or civilians claiming overtime, hazard, and special-duty pay.

Far better it would be to build a fleet with a function; that is, a true, modern fast merchant fleet that would be available on priority call to the Department of Defense. It is my information that such a fleet could be constructed for private merchant marine operation in private shipyards and could be available on call to the Department of Defense. The Department would pay an annual rental for the preemptive rights which financial guarantee I am informed would be adequate for private financing and construction.

The proposed pending FDL submission could be used to develop the required merchant fleet with the full FDL capability. This type of program has real merit. The work would be spread to all private shipyards or to one on a competitive bid. The United States would not get into the merchant shipping business. The ships would be in full operation and operated under the regulations of the Military Sea Transportation Service or Navy Department maintaining perhaps a partial FDL capability at all times. Taxpayers' money would be involved at a minimum. The base could be laid for a new modern merchant fleet and the fleet operation would not be construed as a hostile act.

Fourth. It would seem that if we must pre-position logistics hardware, that we could do it much cheaper at the many American bases overseas. If the FDL have a quick off-loading capability, they must also have a quick on-loading capability of containerized material. There should be no need, therefore, to maintain idle a complete fleet of floating warehouses.

We are authorizing in the present bill but two of the five FDL's requested by the Department of Defense. Our committee has taken volumes of testimony in several days of hearing on this issue from military and private witnesses.

Though the committee is approving a total of four FDL ships, including two ships from the 1966 authorization, I would call attention to the following language in our report:

> The committee, therefore, in approving two of the five F.D.L.s requested in this year's budget does not commit itself to approval of the 30 ship program . . . before considering any further expansion of the F.D.L. program beyond that recommended in the proposed legislation. The committee will want to see an approved program submitted by DOD with respect to
>
> (a) Modernization of naval shipyards
>
> (b) A strengthened American Merchant Marine
>
> (c) A continued assurance that none of the ships previously authorized will be used in competition with the American Merchant Marine.
>
> * * * * *
>
> It is also possible that other shipbuilding companies who have not submitted proposals on the F.D.L. program may find themselves qualified to bid on the design of one of their aerospace companies. If the proposal permits such a possibility the DOD would be remiss in not taking advantage . . .

Finally I would like to offer my views looking toward resolution of the Vietnam issue.

How should the United State resolve our current international dilemma? First, we should recognize that we are escalating to nowhere. We should resist escalation at all costs unless we know the escalated result. We have played too much blind man's bluff on a major scale too long. We should unilaterally scale down our cost and size of operations in South Vietnam and keep the burden of the conflict on the Vietnamese themselves. We should recognize, I believe, that the alternative to being pushed into the Tonkin Gulf in 1965 is not wholesale, all-out war in 1967 especially when our commander in the battlefield has no predictions for victory whatsoever in the foreseeable future.

If actions were scaled down and if our war budget could reapproximate the $5 billion level, then we would be postured as a nation to wait out the hardheadedness of Ho Chi Minh. He sees us now restless in our Great Society and today his patience is better than ours.

In some encounters in the past perhaps we had not the option to reason why, only to do and suffer the consequences. Today we are involved in a new kind of undeclared war which is concerned not so much with a mad dictator's lust for power, but with a surge of people to better their plight. While we can destroy a dictator, you cannot destroy a whole people.

It is inevitable, therefore that the present conflict be concluded with some kind of an accommodation by the people on both sides of the encounter looking toward their mutual development. The United States has been, perhaps, too ready with the olive branch in the past and now grows weary of offering to negotiate. In time, I believe tensions will relax to the point when Ho Chi Minh will talk. It is to American interests that the balance of the world, free and Communist, not become too exercised or alarmed in the meantime.

The **CHAIRMAN**. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration, the bill (H.R. 9240) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 463, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The **SPEAKER**. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. **RIVERS**. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 401, nays 3, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—401

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, Ala.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bevill
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dent
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gallagher
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzales
Goodell
Goodling
Gray

Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harrison
Harsha
Harvey
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kirwan
Kleppe
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Kyros
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Lukens
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Meskill
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris, N. Mex.
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
Nix
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Randall
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
St Germain
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stanton
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Thomson, Wis.
Tiernan
Tuck
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watkins
Watson
Whalen
Whalley
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Miss.
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Winn
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Young
Zablocki
Zwach

NAYS—3

Brown, Calif.
Edwards, Calif.
Fraser

NOT VOTING—29

Anderson, Ill.
Ashbrook
Barrett
Bell
Bow
Collier
Conyers
Culver
Diggs
Evins, Tenn.
Giaimo
Gubser
Hansen, Wash.
Howard
Landrum
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Morse, Mass.
Murphy, N.Y.
St. Onge
Saylor
Smith, N.Y.
Utt
Watts
Willis
Wolff
Younger
Zion

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Utt.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Saylor.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Zion.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Murphy of New York with Mr. Morse of Massachusetts.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Culver with Mr. Gubser.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Younger.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. McEwen.

Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Ashbrook.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Anderson of Illinois.

Mr. Conyers with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Diggs with Mr. Collier.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Mills). Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 463, the Committee on Armed Services is discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 666) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. RIVERS

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rivers moves to strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 666, to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H.R. 9240, as passed, as follows:

TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

Sec. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

Aircraft

For aircraft: For the Army, $768,700,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $2,527,100,000; for the Air Force, $5,770,000,000.

Missiles

For missiles: For the Army, $769,200,000; for the Navy, $625,600,000; for the Marine Corps, $23,100,000; for the Air Force, $1,343,000,000.

Naval Vessels

For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,872,900,000, of which amount $249,600,000 is authorized only for the construction of two nuclear powered guided missile frigates. The contracts for the construction of the two nuclear powered guided-missile frigates shall be entered into as soon as practicable unless the President fully advises the Congress that their construction is not in the national interest.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no naval vessel may be constructed in any foreign shipyard with funds authorized to be appropriated by this Act, unless specifically authorized by law.

Tracked Combat Vehicles

For tracked combat vehicles: For the Army, $424,700,000; for the Marine Corps, $5,100,000.

TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATION

Sec. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during the fiscal year 1968 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

For the Army, $1,539,000,000;

For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,910,118,000, of which sum $46,000,000 shall be used only for anti-submarine warfare programs; giving due regard in all such research programs to benefits which may accrue therefrom to the American Merchant Marine;

For the Air Force, $3,313,514,000, of which amount $51,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

For the Defense agencies, $464,000,000.

Sec. 202. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Department of Defense during fiscal year 1968 for use as an emergency fund for research, development, test, and evaluation or procurement or production related thereto, $125,000,000.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Subsection (a) of section 401 of Public Law 89–367 approved March 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 37), is hereby amended to read as follows: "Funds authorized for appropriation for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States under this or any other Act are authorized to be made available for their stated purposes to support (1) Vietnamese and other free world forces in Vietnam; (2) local forces in Laos and Thailand; and for related costs, during the fiscal year 1968, on such terms and conditions as the Secretary of Defense may determine."

TITLE IV

Sec. 401. Section 3034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, for a period of four years, from the general officers of the Army. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

Sec. 402. Section 5081(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Chief of Naval Operations, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, for a term of four years, from officers on the active list in the line of the Navy, eligible to command at sea and not below the grade of rear admiral. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

Sec. 403. Section 8034(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"The Chief of Staff shall be appointed for a period of four years by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from the general officers of the Air Force. He serves during the pleasure of the President. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

Sec. 404. Section 5201(a) of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"There is a Commandant of the Marine Corps, appointed by the President, for a term of four years, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to serve at the pleasure of the President, from officers on the active list of the Marine Corps, not below the rank of colonel. In time of war or national emergency hereafter declared by the Congress he may be reappointed for a term of not more than four years."

SEC. 405. The foregoing provisions of this amendment shall take effect as of January 1, 1969.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 9240) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks and include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY—PERMISSION TO SIT

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during general debate on May 10.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

RAILROAD SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, a national railroad strike would be an intolerable setback to the economy of the Nation.

The President last week submitted a resolution to Congress which I believe constitutes the best, and perhaps only, recourse we can take to prevent a nationwide rail strike while at the same time protecting the public interest and preserving free collective bargaining.

We are now in our second extension of the Railway Labor Act and agreement between labor and management still appears distant. The irony of the situation is that, while the issues in this dispute are important, the differences that divide both parties are not that great.

I was hopeful that the recommendation of the Fahy Mediation Board would be acceptable. They were not.

But we cannot let this setback become an emotional stoppage to continuing the collective bargaining process. The stakes are too great. The joint resolution now before us would not let that happen. Rather, it establishes specific procedures for assisting the disputing parties in the completion of their collective bargaining and the resolution of remaining issues of difference.

The railroad system in this country is the largest carrier of intercity freight in the entire transportation system. In 1965 it moved approximately 700 billion ton-miles of freight, 43 percent of the total intercity movement. In 1965 railroads moved 4.3 billion ton-miles of Department of Defense freight traffic in the continental United States, 39.3 percent of the total.

In terms of passenger service, railroads have been declining steadily over the post-World War II period but still accounted for 17.5 billion intercity passenger miles in 1965, about 2 percent of total intercity movement and 18 percent of common carrier intercity travel. In certain cities, particularly New York, Philadelphia, and Chicago, railroads perform significant commuter service. In 1965 they carried 192.6 million commuters, or about 750,000 for each working day.

These figures help to point out the importance of keeping our railroads in service. But of equal importance is preserving America's tradition of free collective bargaining—a subject of which we can't attach figures—but which can be counted among the most important individual rights of our citizenry.

The President's proposals take both situations into account. Indeed, the very heart of this resolution is to allow every opportunity for labor-management agreement without detrimental governmental intervention.

The proposed five-man board would be established for 90 days with the express hope that a privately negotiated settlement could be reached during that time. More importantly, no action of this board will, at any time, preclude continued bargaining or private agreement.

The first 30 days of the Board's existence will be dedicated solely to continued efforts of collective bargaining. If agreement cannot be reached, the Board will deliberate upon the recommendations of the Fahy panel—a group of men, I might add, whose efforts toward settling this dispute will historically distinguish them among labor mediators.

The Board's determinations on the Fahy recommendations will, after 60 days, be submitted to the President and the Congress.

I consider this process the most equitable means of establishing terms for agreement that could be devised. It encompasses all of the goals we seek—to avert the strike while at all times preserving collective bargaining. If agreement terms are established at the end of 90 days, they will only be in effect until private agreements can be reached.

I urge both labor and management to continue their deliberations in earnest. And I applaud the President's proposal as the most deliberate means of allowing them to do so.

COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN THE COUNTIES OF WATAUGA, MITCHELL, AVERY, AND YANCEY, N.C.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article and an application by WAMY, Inc.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, it has been brought to my attention that WAMY Community Action, Inc., Boone, N.C., has filed a request for $179,000 with the Office of Economic Opportunity for a community action news demonstration project in the counties of Watauga, Mitchell, Avery, and Yancey.

I had not seen a copy of the application until today. It came to me by courtesy of Tri-County News, a newspaper published in Spruce Pine, N.C. This newspaper printed the full text of the application and also had a front page news story dealing with the project.

Mr. Speaker, it is little wonder that the North Carolina Press Association has vigorously protested this attempt by a community action organization to establish a general newspaper with taxpayers' money. I cannot conceive of the Office of Economic Opportunity approving such action. I cannot understand the community action organization ever conjuring up such a proposal. It is my hope that upon mature reflection, the directors of WAMY, Inc., will immediately withdraw their request for Federal funds for this project and that they will immediately forget the whole matter.

I am astounded at some of the language used by WAMY, Inc., in undertaking to support their request for this vast amount of Federal money. The gratuitous assault which this application makes upon ministers of the gospel and upon their followers in the counties of Watauga, Mitchell, Avery, and Yancey is shocking. Their further contention that the people of this area have a "long history of foraging" is contrary to my observation of the people of three of these counties whom I have been privileged to represent in the Congress at one time or another. From my visits to Watauga County over a period of years, I am sure that the allegations are equally incorrect as to that county.

The statement contained in the application that the communities are "fractured by generations-old feuds stemming from personal hurts and differences of religious belief" is an insult to every citizen of the four-county area in which WAMY, Inc., operates.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that I know the mountain people of the area involved in this application. I have worked and lived with them for years. I have been honored to serve them in the Congress. I can say, without hesitancy, that I know of no finer, more law abiding and patriotic citizens than the people who have been reflected upon by the language of this application by WAMY, Inc. It may be that some of them are not as financially affluent as they would like to be, but the same can be said of every area of the world. They are well-informed people who are imbued with ambition to improve their own status and are experiencing great progress in the development of a better economy for their area.

It may well be that the news media of the area fail to carry the message which will result in "pressure on the bodies responsible for financing" some of the programs that the originators of the application desire. This, however, does not warrant the Federal Government financing a propaganda organ for those who want to change the American system.

Mr. Speaker, this application by WAMY, Inc., should be rejected by the Office of Economic Opportunity if it is not promptly withdrawn by the organization.

I place the news article and the application by WAMY, Inc., in the RECORD for today:

WAMY SEEKS FEDERAL FUNDS FOR AREA NEWSPAPER

A government-supported weekly newspaper, operated in conjunction with a broadcasting project, has been proposed in Western North Carolina as one of the newest approaches in the poverty war, it was learned here today.

Putting Uncle Sam in the newspaper and radio business is the brainchild of the Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey County Community Action Agency, Inc. (W.A.M.Y.) at the urging of the Offices of Economic Opportunity. W.A.M.Y. has its headquarters in Boone, N.C.

Under its Demonstration Project Plan, a 16-page summary submitted to federal agencies for approval, W.A.M.Y. asks for $179,000 to finance the two ventures.

"This project," says the W.A.M.Y. report "is intended to help solve the problems of some 30,000 men, women and children who exist on family incomes of $3,000 per year. These people are scattered across 1100 square miles of mountainous, wooded country-side on tiny farms and in small, isolated settlements in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey.

"The central characteristic of the low income population as far as this project is concerned is their historic and continuing physical, social and psychological isolation not only from the world at large, but from each other . . . The low-income people have developed psychological characteristics consistent with their physical isolation . . ."

Citing other problems among the people of the area, the report says they are relatively ignorant of the outside world, and even of persons and events only a few miles from their homes; they find it difficult to cope with other people and are distrustful of strangers; and they are lacking in their capacity for group feeling and group endeavor.

"Their only significant tradition of group participation, passive at that," W.A.M.Y. states, "is in their church congregations, but these congregations are many and small, many led by lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism. . . ."

The Community Action agency says it has "spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible."

W.A.M.Y. complains that the agency services now available to the people are underused. This situation exists, the report states, despite "a great deal of manpower devoted to these efforts:

"1) Informing the poor individual of the availability of services, exhorting him to use these services, and facilitating his use of them through the provision of transportation.

"2) Exhorting the agencies to expand their useful services and extend them to the poor.

"3) Organizing the poor to the point where they realize a consensus of their needs and will work in concert to have the agencies fulfill them."

It is as a cure to this indifference to federal programs that W.A.M.Y. proposes to organize its own weekly newspaper and broadcasting project.

A considerable portion of the newspaper content and broadcast material will be testimonials from those who have benefited from the poverty programs.

According to the W.A.M.Y. report, this will create among the poor a greater awareness that their problems are shared by others, give them a feeling of familiarity with other people and places, and strengthen their feeling of self-significance and importance.

In addition, the report states, the project will establish the belief among the poor "that efforts at self-improvement by individuals and communities are commendable, and that such efforts can actually be successful. This objective will be achieved through recognition and praise, in print and on the air, of individuals and communities that have been successful."

There would also be a listing of opportunities available through the Community Action agency "and testimonials of low income persons who have benefited from them."

The proposed weekly newspaper would be produced by a staff of 23 full and part-time employees, headed by an editor at a salary of $10,000 a year. It would be mailed free to approximately 8,000 residents of the four-county area.

Modern newspaper type-setting equipment, designed for the cold-type method of production, would be purchased and the newspaper would be prepared up to the printing stage in a 3,000-square-foot leased plant. The actual printing would be done on a contract basis, at an estimated $250 a week, on the press of a weekly plant in Avery County.

Spruce Pine—The W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors April 25 approved a request for funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington to finance an experimental communications project for low-income residents of the four W.A.M.Y. counties.

The project would provide a weekly newspaper for about 8,000 families in the four counties and also feature up to an hour a day in radio programming over local stations. It is designed to test whether it is cheaper to use mass communications or staff workers to inform low-income residents of opportunities and services available, and of the responsibilities of citizens.

The W.A.M.Y. Board approved the request after a long debate over the cost of the project and its effect on the local image of W.A.M.Y.

The Board also agreed to ask the North Carolina Fund for additional money over the next few months to make improvements in the W.A.M.Y. programs. Included in these requests will be money to help finance a community center at the old Toe River School in Avery County, and a large expansion of the Incentive Grants Program which helps finance community projects.

W.A.M.Y. staff members told the Board the communications project was an experiment, and that the Office of Economic Opportunity had asked W.A.M.Y. to submit the project.

"If we had our choice, we would spend the money on job training," W.A.M.Y. Director Ernest Eppley told the Board. "But we have no choice in the matter. If we don't want the communications project, some other area will get it."

Several agency heads on the Board, including Dr. Mary Michael of the Watauga County Health Department and Dorothy Thomas of the Tri-County Regional Library, said the work of their agencies was hampered by poor communications with many people in the four counties.

DEMONSTRATION PROJECT PLAN AND SUPPORTING DATA FOR A COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT IN WATAUGA, AVERY, MITCHELL, AND YANCEY COUNTIES, N.C.

A. PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

This project is intended to help solve the problems of some 30,000 men, women and children who exist on family incomes of $3,000 per year. These people are scattered across 1,100 square miles of mountainous, wooded countryside on tiny farms and in small, isolated settlements, in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey in western North Carolina. Almost without exception these people are the direct descendants of pioneers of the early 1800's with a long history of subsistence farming and foraging, untouched by prosperity down to the present day.

(See "Background Paper on Operation of W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc.," in Part II, Supporting Data, for more details on the history and characteristics of the low-income population.)

The central characteristic of the low-income population as far as this project is concerned is their historic and continuing physical, social and psychological isolation not only from the world at large, but from each other. From the earliest days of settlement, the families and small clusters of families whose descendants make up the local poor have remained established in isolated homes or tiny settlements. Lack of good roads and lack of money to buy vehicles and telephones have maintained the physical factor in isolation.

The low-income people have developed psychological characteristics consistent with their physical isolation. They are relatively ignorant of the outside world, and even of persons and events only a few miles from their homes. They find it extremely difficult to cope with other people and are generally reserved and distrustful of strangers. Their capacities for group feeling and group endeavor have not been developed. Their history shows few examples of cooperative endeavor. Their only significant tradition of group participation, passive at that, is in their church congregations, but these congregations are many and small, many led by lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism. Their "Communities" are in many cases not communities at all, but merely clusters of interrelated families, fractured by generations-old feuds stemming from personal hurts and differences of religious belief, maintained in physical proximity only by the formidable obstacles of establishing livelihoods elsewhere.

The physical and psychological situation of these people makes it difficult to achieve two major objectives of the war on poverty: (1) achievement of effective community organization, and (2) improvement of social services.

The applicant CAA has spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible.

The CAA has also expended a great deal of effort attempting to increase the services received and available to the poor from the CAA and non-CAA agencies. It has attempted this through three general approaches: 1) Informing the poor individual of the availability of services, exhorting him to use these services, and facilitating his use of them through the provision of transportation, 2) exhorting the agencies to expand their useful services and extend them to the poor, and 3) organizing the poor to the point where they realize a consensus of their needs and will work in concert to have the agencies fulfill them. Despite a great deal of manpower devoted to these efforts, the agency services available are underused, and local agencies remain underfinanced through lack of pressure on the bodies responsible for financing them.

A list of specific problems to be addressed in this Project are implied in the specific hypotheses set out in the following section.

B. IDENTIFICATION OF HYPOTHESES

It is hypothesized that a project such as the one herein proposed for financing shall demonstrate the effectiveness of such projects in achieving the objectives listed below, all of which are either intrinsically desirable or instrumental to the elimination of poverty.

1. Creating, among the poor, a greater awareness of the fact that their predicaments, problems, hopes and aspirations are shared by many other individuals and communities across the four-county area, and thus helping create the feeling of identity necessary to concerted effort for improvement. This awareness would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimonials of low-income people.

2. Creating, among the poor, a greater feeling of familiarity with people and places in the area beyond their immediate settlement, and thus helping develop attitudes conducive to cooperation across wide areas. This feeling of familiarity would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimony of low-income people.

3. Strengthening, among low-income individuals and communities, the feelings of self-significance and importance that will arm them for the task of coping with the systems and institutions that they should utilize for their advancement. The poor will be assisted to this end through the experiences of being interviewed, broadcast, and quoted in print.

4. Establishing the belief, among the poor, that efforts at self-improvement by individuals and communities are commendable, and that such efforts can actually be successful. This objective will be achieved through recognition and praise, in print and on the air, of individuals and communities that have been successful.

5. Improving the poor's awareness of, interest in, familiarity with and demand for the opportunities provided through the CAA and through other social agencies. These objectives will be achieved through announcements of services and opportunities, and through the printed and broadcast testimony of low-income persons who have benefited from these opportunities.

6. Causing the existing social agencies, including the CAA, to concern themselves with the quality of execution of their programs and to be attentive to the preferences of the poor in the administration of their programs. These results would seem to follow if the poor are allowed to speak their minds on the air and in print.

7. Increasing the understanding, on the part of the middle-class, of the nature and problems of the poor and the utility of services provided by social agencies, an understanding critical to developing the necessary local support for anti-poverty efforts. This will be achieved through the middle-class' exposure to the radio broadcasts and occasional reading of the weekly newspaper.

C. METHODS, PROGRAM TECHNIQUES, WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

1. Introduction

The aims of this Project will be carried out through two vehicles: 1) a four-county-wide weekly newspaper and 2) a radio program development and broadcasting system. The two vehicles will be directed and coordinated by a single Project Director, who will edit the newspaper and generally supervise the work of the Broadcast Development Staff. The Project Director will report to a Board of Directors composed of 8 low-income and 5 non-low-income persons who will set general and editorial policy for the newspaper and for radio broadcasts.

The weekly newspaper will be staffed, with the exception of the editor, with local low-income people, who will act as reporters and assistant editors. The paper will be directed at the low-income readership, and will be distributed by mail, free, to all families in the four counties whose incomes fall below the OEO poverty-level. The newspaper will be printed by a local commercial printer.

The radio system will have two (2) professional staffers (Broadcast Developers) in addition to the Project Director, and the remaining four (4) people on the staff will be drawn from the local low-income population. The radio system staff, to be equipped with mobile recording vans, will travel throughout the low-income community taping programs for broadcast over the commercial stations that serve the area. The staff will also accept announcements and programs of interest and service to low-income people from the local CAA and from other public agencies.

2. The weekly newspaper

The weekly newspaper will be the most conventional of the information techniques to be demonstrated, in that the techniques of writing and printing a paper of this type are well known, although little used by the commercial press. The first, and most essential feature of the newspaper will be saturation circulation among the poverty-level residents of the four county area. This will be achieved by mailing the paper to all poor residents at no charge. Extensive mailing lists are presently available from the Community Action Agency files, and the Community Action field workers will be mobilized to add to the list as rapidly as possible. The twenty community "stringers" will also contribute to the mailing list. In its initial months of operation the paper will also hand distribute copies to community centers, schools and country stores, and will solicit readers to subscribe for themselves and their friends through subscription blanks which will be printed as a regular feature of the paper. It is expected that the newspaper can build to mailed circulation among almost all of the approximately 8,000 poverty-level families of the area within three months after it starts publication.

Although the paper will be circulated free-of-charge to its subscribers, the addressed, mailing method of circulation will prevent the paper from taking on the characteristics of a throwaway sheet. The positive impact on the poor of receiving a publication each week addressed to them and directed toward them will be far greater than the negative impact of receiving a free publication.

The newspaper will be supervised by one professional journalist, who will also be director of the entire Community Action News project. The editor will continually provide in-service training and supervision for his newspaper staff of three full-time assistants and twenty community stringers, but the great majority of the writing and editing will be done by indigenous personnel. The editor will constantly strive to teach effective communication through the language of the poor.

The paper will constantly try to balance its dual functions of providing information about services and opportunities, and of printing the "news" of the smaller communities and the larger county and area community.

The Informational content will include facts on how to get services, "how-to" columns on home management, child care, home repairs, discussions of legal problems, "citizen's advice column" (answers to any questions submitted by readers), man-on-the-street interviews on specific questions, a column where readers can directly request services from agencies, information on voter registration and the organization of all local political parties, information about the various CAA programs and other information features as the need arises.

The news content of the paper will include coverage of activities in various communities as reported by the community stringers, news of local government, the news of the CAA, discussions of legislation that affects the poor, school news, births, deaths and marriages, hospital notes, schedules of all events that affect the poor, and articles of general interest that are solicited and purchased from the poor.

Feature articles will focus on extensive coverage of activities in one community that have informational and educational value for other communities. Features will also spotlight new services or new uses of existing services, and occasional issues of the papers will devote extensive space to in-depth coverage of one problem that affects large numbers of the poverty-level residents of the area.

Miscellaneous features of the paper will include the active solicitation of letters to the editor, free want-ads for low-income readers, and suggestions on how the CAA or the newspaper could serve the area better.

Editorials will be signed by the writer in most cases, and will reflect only his opinions. Unsigned editorials which reflect general opinions and policies of the paper will have prior approval of the executive committee of the Corporation's Board of Directors unless the Board delegates this authority to the editor.

The presentation of the paper's content will be almost as important as the content itself. The paper will be an eight-page tabloid and will feature a large body type—10 and 12 point—and will emphasize the actions, pictures and names of its readers. Each of the staff members will use a Polaroid camera, and will be encouraged to take pictures whether they are printed or not, as many pictures will be needed for the bulletin boards which are described later in this proposal.

Layout will play a vital role in attracting readers. The paper must look both professional, and different. Many stories will be told mainly with pictures and headline-size sentences. Modern advertising techniques will be applied to the paper's layout to make it highly readable and attention-worthy, and some items—such as announcements of meetings and new programs or services—will be presented in the form of simulated advertisements. This type of layout philosophy is so totally foreign to area printers, that it is essential to the paper's success that all make-up be done by the paper's staff and delivered to the printer as completed dummies, ready for the production of offset printing plates. The operation of typesetting equipment and the production of completed dummies at the paper itself will also provide valuable training for low-income personnel in journalistic skills that are in critically short supply in rural areas.

This combination of public information and local news, attractive and readable presentation, and saturation circulation among the poor in the area, will reinforce the organizational efforts of the poor in a way that the conventional press has never attempted to do in this area. A noted communications expert from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, speaking to a statewide meeting of CAA directors, commented that one of the greatest effects of mass media is to reinforce the attitudes and activities of those persons and groups whose efforts are reported in the media. The content of the weekly newspaper will seek not only to reinforce community activities by reporting their news, but also to further organization and improvement efforts by providing the informational tools needed for advancement.

Each community correspondent will, in addition to his other duties, be assigned two bulletin boards that will be erected by Neighborhood Youth Corps crews at centers of community activity. These bulletin boards will carry announcements of community activities and pictures of community residents involved in CAA programs or other community self-help projects. Mimeographed materials for the bulletin boards will be produced at the newspaper office on community action subjects of interest to several communities or pertaining to the entire four-county area. County coordinators of the CAA will use the bulletin boards and help the community correspondents in keeping up-to-date materials posted on the displays. The public information staff of the North Carolina Fund has agreed to assist in the production of printed materials for the bulletin boards and to assist in developing new methods of using the displays as communications vehicles.

As the poor begin to become involved in the newspaper, and begin to respond by writing letters, asking questions and voicing complaints, the paper will serve as an important information gathering vehicle for use of the CAA. A staff member of the Human Resources Planning project—funded under a demonstration grant—will serve on the paper's Board of Directors.

One of his delegated functions will be to coordinate the planning program with the paper, and to use the newspaper's information as an indicator of how well existing CAA programs are matching the needs of the poor.

At least one Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee will be assigned to the paper's staff to search its columns for possible referrals to the public agency personnel. The CAA's public information worker will also scan the paper for articles suitable for reprint in the county weeklies and in the daily press outside the area, so as to further reinforce the activities of the poor and to strengthen the communication links between the poor and the middle class. The CAA's OJT Coordinator will try to place members of the paper's staff in permanent jobs with the conventional media in the area, so as to open training opportunities on the paper to other low-income residents.

Preliminary training for newspaper personnel will be directed by the editor with the help of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina fund, which has offered its full cooperation in assisting with preliminary and in-service training. The most important training, however, will be conducted by the editor in his day-to-day supervision of the production of the paper, and in regularly scheduled in-service training sessions which he will supervise.

The editor is the logical person to supervise the entire project because of his wide contacts with the four-county area through his full and part-time newspaper staff of 23 persons. From his position he will be able to schedule and coordinate the radio units so that their work closely follows the patterns of events among the poverty-level residents of the area. Although the mobile units will attempt to cover every area of the four counties during each six weeks of their operation, it is essential to the success of the radio operation that the mobile units appear "where the action is."

3. Radio system

The radio portion of the project is more experimental in nature than the newspaper. Public information and participation projects over a long-term period using the radio medium as described in this proposal are an extreme rarity in conventional broadcasting. The techniques are used somewhat in educational FM broadcasting, but these stations reach mainly the middle and upper class audiences which own FM receivers.

The radio project will be centered in two mobile recording vans with equipment capable of producing almost any kind of radio program. Each of the vans will operate in two of the four counties and will be loosely assigned to the commercial station which broadcasts in those counties. Most of the programming produced, however, will be appropriate for broadcast on either station and will be used on both stations.

There is a possibility that a third commercial radio station will become operational in the southernmost county of the four county tier during the period of the demonstration grant, but programming for this station will consist mainly of duplication of programs produced for the two stations now in existence. This third station will add significantly to the primary coverage area of the radio programming, bringing the coverage area from 85 to approximately 95 per cent of the four county target area.

Each of the mobile units will travel to a different community each day, recording for broadcast at the community center in sight of the people, interviewing participants in work projects or CAA programs, plugging community activities, soliciting man-in-the-street interviews and questions for the citizens' advice bureau, recording the discussion and debate at community meetings, and generally allowing people to express themselves through talk or musical performances.

From each recording session in a community will come the program material for a day's broadcasting. Questions asked by the community people will be answered on five minute radio spots. The questioner will be told at the interview when the answer to his question will be broadcast. Longer interviews, discussions, and musical performances will be broadcast on two fifteen minute segments or one thirty minute program daily on each station.

Because of the geographical characteristics of the area, it is expected that each recording team will spend at least one night a week in the northeast and southwest ends of the four counties in order to cut down on time wasted in travel, and to insure that the entire four-county area is covered thoroughly and equally.

At each recording stop, the Friendly Home Visitor (non-professional CAA health caseworker) for that area will accompany the van to take referrals. One of the jobs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee apprentice assigned to the van will be to take duplicate referrals to assure the delivery of services.

Other five-minute spots and occasional longer programs will be recorded by the broadcast developers from information gathered from public agency personnel, including the CAA. Homemakers from the Agricultural Extension Service and group workers from the CAA will provide information for shows on the preparation of commodity foods, other recipes, sewing hints and child care. CAA horticulturalists working with the Agricultural Extension Service, a delegate agency, will provide farm information. The Citizen Education Specialists of the CAA, who is a lawyer, will provide information for a legal advice program, and for programs dealing with county government and voter information. The public information worker of the CAA will provide information about CAA programs on both the county and four-county level. Most of the service information spots for one week can be recorded and edited for broadcast in an intensive half-day's work, thereby allowing the broadcast developers and their assistants to spend most of their recording time in the field.

Two of the essential elements in producing successful radio programs will be the development of attractive program formats and the compilation of extensive information files that can be used to answer questions asked in the field and to make effective referrals. Some trial and error work is anticipated in the development of suitable formats. The two radio stations involved have offered to assist in developing formats and in measuring their success. The CAA personnel and the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund will assist in providing information on service delivery and citizen education. It is expected that about three months will be required to build up to the desired programing production level of an hour a day for each station.

Programing will be presented on a combination of public service and commercial air time. Radio station WATA in Boone has offered the use of five minutes of public service time daily. Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine has offered the use of fifteen minutes of public service air time daily. The owner of WTOE also indicated that attractive public service programs could be sold to commercial sponsors, thereby freeing budgeted money for the purchase of additional air time. Since the project will not be dependent on commercial sponsors for support, however, there is no possibility that commercial sponsors could influence program content. Commercial sponsorship could be an effective tool for involving part of the business community in the war on poverty, but the appropriateness of spending federal money for the development of programs which might be sponsored by commercial sponsors is a matter for decision by the funding agency. Other public service programs produced by public agencies are sponsored, and FCC regulations do not differentiate between public service time that is given free and that which is sold to sponsors.

The medium of radio by its very nature provides little opportunity for censureship, as previewing of recorded material is a costly and time-consuming job. All programs will be strictly non-partisan, as required by OEO regulations and federal statutes, and the radio station owners have agreed that only partisan programs or serious breaches of libel law and good taste will be considered grounds for cancellation of program contracts.

Preliminary training for broadcast personnel will be conducted by the public information staff of the North Carolina Fund with the assistance of instructors at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, using the facilities of both institutions. Most of the training of the non-professional assistants will be conducted by the broadcast developers on the job.

The recording vans will provide physical support for community organizations, as well as public recognition. Each of the vans will carry a portable public address system that can be used either from the van or from inside a building. Other physical support equipment will be used to compare the effectiveness of various communications methods. One of the vans will carry video tape equipment that will be used to record parts of community meetings for replay in other communities. The equipment will also be used for the production of short training tapes on subjects such as: how to run a meeting, how to plan a community budget, and other subjects of interest to community organizations.

The other van will carry movie projection equipment capable of projecting films through a screen suspended from the rear of the van in daylight, and that can be used in the normal manner in a darkened building. Several existing films on community organization and service delivery will be carried as part of the van's equipment, and its crew will use a 16mm movie camera for the production of short films about local communities and for the production of news film for area television stations.

4. Financial administration

A public accountant in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to manage the financial affairs of the corporation on a contract basis. The accountant will set up the books of the corporation according to existing guidelines of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He will train and supervise the clerical staff of the corporation in bookkeeping, make all financial reports, and close the books of the project preparatory to final audit.

5. Timetable

The Community Action News Project will begin operation within five weeks after confirmation of receipt of the Demonstration grant. The project will build up to full circulation and full broadcast time within three months after it begins operation. This timetable is illustrated in the table below.

Process—Time subsequent to confirmation of demonstration grant

[In weeks]

	1	2	3	4	5	6					17
Formation of board and incorporation of community action news	X	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Hiring and orientation of personnel	X	X	X	X	---	---	---	---	---	---	
Training of nonprofessional staff	X	X	X	X	X	---	---	---	---	---	
Process of building to full newspaper circulation and target radio broadcast level	---	---	---	---	---	X	X	X	X	X	X

D. ORGANIZATION

1. Governing body

An independent, private, non-profit corporation shall be formed to carry out the Community Action News Project.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall manage the establishment of the corporation. When the initial directors of the corporation have been selected and have assembled, elected officers, written Articles of Incorporation, written By-Laws, and received a corporate charter from the State of North Carolina, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. shall, with the concurrence of OEO, delegate the Project to this new Corporation.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action Inc., shall ensure that the composition of the governing body, and the by-laws of the corporation shall be consistent with the intent of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The governing body of the corporation shall be constituted as follows:

a. One representative of the local press to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors with the concurrence of the press.

b. A representative from one of the two local radio stations to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors, with the concurrence of the stations' owners.

c. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Community Action staff to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors.

d. A representative from Appalachian State Teachers College to be chosen by the College.

e. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors to be chosen by that Board.

f. Eight representatives of the poor, two from each county, to be selected by the Community Development Councils in each county.[1] Only persons with incomes below the poverty line shall be considered qualified representatives of the poor.

2. Operating organization

Subject to the corporate By-Laws and policies to be established by the Board of Directors, and subject to the Board's regular review, the authority for the operation of the project shall be delegated to the Project Director. The Project Director shall be responsible for carrying out the work program described under section "D" of this application. Individual staff positions and duties are described below.

a. Senior Personnel

(1) *Project Director*—The project director shall directly supervise the weekly newspaper and train low-income personnel in its production. He shall provide overall supervision and staff direction for the entire Community Action News project.

(2) *Broadcast Developers*—(2)—The broadcast developers shall develop suitable program formats, and shall assemble, write, edit, and record in the field, materials to fit the program format. They shall arrange recording and broadcast schedules under the supervision of the project director. They shall train their low-income assistants in the operation of recording equipment and in the techniques of radio production and broadcasting, and supervise their work in the field.

b. Junior Personnel—Broadcast

(1) *Technical Assistants*—(2)—These personnel shall directly assist the Broadcast Developers. They shall learn and use the skills necessary to operate recording and audio-visual equipment, and shall learn and use the techniques of radio production and announcing.

(2) *Apprentices*—(2)—The apprentices shall work as trainees with each Broadcast Developer and his assistant, and shall have the specific job of monitoring recording sessions and noting requests for services or information indicating the need for services, and referring this information to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

c. Junior Personnel—Newspaper

(1) *Assistant Editor*—The assistant editor shall learn and use the techniques of assembling and editing copy, planning layouts and writing headlines, and producing make-up dummies for offset printing.

(2) *Reporters*—(2)—The reporters shall learn and use the techniques of news writing and photography, including the various skills necessary for investigative and government reporting, human interest writing, and the production of comprehensive feature stories.

(3) *Clerical*—(2)—The clerical personnel shall learn and use the techniques and skills necessary for efficient secretarial work. One clerical person shall also be trained to operate Justowriter typesetting equipment and the other clerical person shall be trained in bookkeeping and proofreading.

(4) *Correspondents*—(20)—Twenty local low-income persons shall be trained to accurately judge and report the news of their local communities.

(5) *Apprentices*—One or more Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall be assigned to the newspaper to work as trainees with the full-time personnel. Apprentices shall have the specific job of scanning the news pages and noting requests for services or information which indicates the need for services, and referring this information on to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

E. RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR THE PROJECT

1. Expense items

a. Project Staff

The applicant has no particular individuals in mind for staffing the project at this time, but is confident that qualified personnel can be recruited for the professional and nonprofessional positions on the Project staff at the salaries indicated in the enclosed Budget.

b. Project Equipment and Supplies

The applicant believes that the equipment and supplies listed in the Budget can be obtained at the costs indicated without undue delay.

c. Contract services:

(1) Press: The publisher of the Avery Journal in Newland, North Carolina, has agreed to print the weekly newspaper.

(2) Radio:

(a) Radio station WATA in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 5 minutes daily as public service time.

(b) Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 15 minutes daily as public service time.

(c) The above two stations' signals reach practically all points in the 4-county area served by the CAA which will coordinate with the Project, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., (see Exhibits *B* and *C* in the supporting materials for an illustration of geographic coverage of these radio stations.)

Although no data on listening habits are available, a 1965 survey by the North Carolina Fund revealed that out of a random sample of roughly 8% of the low-income families in the four-county area, 80% owned radios.*

Financial Administration and Training

A public accountant in Boone, N.C., Mr. Jack Williams, has agreed to handle the bookkeeping and accounting affairs of the corporation and train project personnel in any bookkeeping necessary on a contract basis if requested. The agreement with Mr. Williams is, of course, subject to the approval of the Corporation upon its establishment.

2. Non-expense items

a. Technical Assistance

(1) The University of North Carolina: The Chairman of the Department of Radio, Television, and Motion Pictures of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, has offered the use of his department's radio facilities for the training of broadcast staff.

(2) The North Carolina Fund: The director of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund, Billy E. Barnes, has offered the full use of his staff and facilities for training of newspaper and broadcast personnel, (including on-the-job training). The Fund also offers the use of citizen education programs, which it continues to develop for use with low-income persons.

b. Supportive and Coordinating Services: W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. offers the full cooperation of its staff in the following ways:

(1) Field Staff: W.A.M.Y. and its delegate agencies field over 12 full-time contact workers in each county. These workers will assist the project in completing referrals, arranging programs, providing "feedback" on the impact of the project, and in compiling mailing lists for the weekly newspaper.

(2) Professional Staff: The professional staff will assist the project in preparing service information programs and columns.

(3) Planning Staff: The planning staff will assist in any evalution of the project, as well as provide information on resources available to individuals and communities from all sources.

(4) Public Information Staff: The public information staff will provide regular information on current W.A.M.Y. programs, as

---

[1] The County Community Development Councils are made up of representatives of most of the communities in each county.

**A Survey of Low-Income Families*, The North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina, (Data not yet published).

well as presentations prepared by its Citizen Education Specialist.

(5) Neighborhood Youth Corps: The W.A.M.Y. Neighborhood Youth Corps project will help select and will pay enrollees who will work as apprentices in the Broadcasting Project, and will provide these with supporting services in the form of general education and counseling.

F. PHYSICAL FACILITIES REQUIRED

Approximately 3,000 square feet of indoor floor space will be required for the Project's housing. This space would provide office space for newspaper personnel and the Broadcast Developers, and for a composition room, make-up room, project room and sound editing room. Some expense (as indicated in the Budget) will have to be taken to convert floor space into specialized work areas, but the labor of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall reduce the cost of renovations. No difficulty is anticipated in finding the necessary space.

G. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Evaluation arrangements for this project will be left to the discretion of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The staff of W.A.M.Y. Community Action shall be made available to assist in evaluation upon request.

H. RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE APPLICANT

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. has been operating anti-poverty programs since June of 1965. It is currently operating nine (9) year-round CAP components, a Neighborhood Youth Corps operation (in-school and out-of-school), an On-the-Job Training Project. It has recently begun operation of Human Resources Planning Project under a Demonstration Grant from OEO. (A copy of a Community Action Program Status Report, enclosed under Part II, Supporting Data, provides some detail on W.A.M.Y.'s CAP operations).

I. QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL

1. Senior personnel

a. Project Director-Editor: The editor shall have an AB degree in journalism or equivalent work experience, and shall have at least two years experience as editor of a weekly newspaper. He shall also have had experience in and understanding of radio broadcasting techniques.

b. Broadcast Developers: The two broadcast developers shall have BS degrees or equivalent work experience in radio production and electronics, and shall have at least two years experience in radio production and announcing, and extensive experience in field recording.

2. Junior personnel

Junior personnel shall have the talents necessary for training in their various jobs. They shall be hired by the project director from local applicants with incomes below the poverty level.

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967–APRIL 30, 1968—GRANT PERIOD

Funds requested from OEO

A. Personnel:	
1 Project director-editor ($834 per month)	$10,000
2 Broadcast developers ($708 per month)	17,000
1 Assistant Editor ($375 per month)	4,500
2 Reporters ($375 per month)	9,000
2 Technical assistants ($375 per month)	9,000
2 Clerical ($333 per month)	8,000
20 Correspondents (one-fourth time) ($65 per month)	15,600
8 percent benefits	4,600
Accounting (see attachment)	3,000
Subtotal	80,700

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967—APRIL 30 1968—GRANT PERIOD—Continued

Funds requested from OEO—Continued

B. Training (not applicable)	
C. Permanent equipment (see attachment)	$38,911
D. Consumable supplies (see attachment)	10,644
E. Travel (see attachment)	7,648
F. Miscellaneous expenses (see attachment)	41,167
Total	179,070

Item A

Public accountant to serve as financial officer of Community Action News on contract basis. Accountant will open and close books, pay for audit, train project personnel in bookkeeping and handle all financial transactions of corporation	3,000

Item C

26 Polaroid cameras (at $125)	3,250
1 Mimeograph (at $350)	350
1 Justowriter recorder (at $2,430)	2,430
1 Justowriter reproducer (at $3,245)	3,245
1 Justowriter headliner (at $825)	825
1 Ampex video tape recorder (at $3,000)	3,000
1 Bell & Howell 16-millimeter camera (at $350)	350
1 projection system (at $1,000)	1,000
2 RCA electronic lecterns (at $125)	250
2 mobile recording studios (see supplement) (at $8,969)	17,938
2 staff vehicles (at $1,900)	3,800
40 bulletin boards (at $30)	1,200
8 desks (at $77)	616
12 chairs (at $22)	264
3 filings cabinets (at $45)	135
1 adding machine (at $208)	208
2 tables (at $25)	50
Total	38,911

Item D

1,450 Polaroid film, at $2.10	3,020
150 flashbulb packs, at $1.50	300
2 electric typewriters (rental), at $180	360
4 upright typewriters (rental), at $90	384
2 portable typewriters (rental), at $60	120
8 office supplies, at $180	1,440
4 cases Justowriter tape, at $25	100
50 hour video tapes, at $60	3,000
40 rolls 16 millimeter film, at $15	600
400 rolls recording tape, at $1.85	740
Miscellaneous audio expendable supplies	600
Total	10,664

Item E

Two staff cars, 11,000 miles each at $0.08	1,760
Two vans, 75 miles per day, at $0.08	3,120
Out-of-area mileage, 3,600 miles, at $0.08	288
Per diem, out-of-area training, 8 persons, at $12 per day for 5 days	480
Per diem, 100 nights for 2 recording crews, at $10 per crew per night	2,000
Total	7,648

Item F

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967—APRIL 30 1968—GRANT PERIOD—Continued

Funds requested from OEO—Continued

Item F—Continued

Commercial air time, radio station WATA:	
1,500 5-minute spots, at $3	4,500
600 15-minute spots, at $8	4,800
Radio station WTOE:	
900 5-minute spots, at $3	2,700
600 15-minute spots, at $5	3,000
Printing, 8,000 copies per week, at $250	13,000
Postage, 8,000 copies per week, at $0.0125 per copy	$5,200
Article purchase, two articles per week, at $5 per article	520
Insurance, four vehicles	332
Insurance, recording equipment	315
Physical plant, rental of 3,000 square feet, at $0.05 per square foot	1,800
Renovation	500
Utilities, at $75 per month	900
Telephone (previous experience)	1,800
Soundproofing, two vans, at $300	600
Equipment installation, two vans, at $400	800
Equipment maintenance, two vans, at $200	400
Total	41,167

Item C. Supplement

2 Ford parcel delivery chassis P–350 with insulated, walk-in body, 6 cylinder, 300 cubic inch, 170 horsepower engine, at $3,800	7,600.00
2 Terado dual continental transistorized inverter, 600 watts, at $302.38	604.76
4 Ampex 602–4, full-track, 7.5 ips unmounted recorded, at $575	2,300.00
2 Crown SS801, full-track 7.5–15 ips, remote controlled master studio recorder, at $1,200	2,400.00
2 Sparta 815 mixing console with accessory amplifiers, at $650	1,300.00
2 Uher 4,000 report-L field tape recorder, at $440	880.00
2 RCA 77–DX studio microphone, at $251.50	503.00
2 Electro-Voice 666 field microphone, at $150	300.00
2 Rek-O-Kut B–12H 3-speed turntable, at $165	330.00
2 Rek-O-Kut S–320 tone arm for above, at $34.95	69.90
2 G.E. VR–II cartridge for above with replacement styli, at $24.95	49.90
Miscellaneous audio supplies and equipment	1,000.00
Furniture (chairs, table, lights, etc.)	600.00
Total	17,937.56

PROPOSED NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION IN NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE FINANCED BY OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks just made by my colleague from North Carolina [Mr. WHITENER]. I was surprised and shocked when I learned that it is being proposed that the Federal Government sponsor and finance a newspaper to be circulated in several counties in our State.

We have always maintained a separation of State and press in this country and in my judgment it would be unwise to abandon that policy. A Government-financed newspaper could be a dangerous tool for the dissemination of propaganda. A Government-controlled press would be intolerant in a free society and for an agency of Government to sponsor and finance a newspaper could be the first step in what might lead to control.

While I do not represent the area where this newspaper is supposed to circulate, and do not wish to inject myself into the community's affairs without invitation, I will add that I previously had the high honor of representing two of the counties and still feel very close to the people who reside there. But I am interested in this proposition because of a precedent that might be established if this project is implemented. I am, therefore, speaking out today for the purpose of concurring in the views expressed by my colleague and to express my own views as an interested citizen and a Member of Congress.

SPEECH BY DEPUTY SECRETARY OF DEFENSE CYRUS R. VANCE AT 90TH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a speech by the Honorable Cyrus Vance.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I submit for reprinting in the body of the Congressional Record an outstanding speech made by the Honorable Cyrus Vance, Deputy Secretary of Defense, to the 90th annual convention of the diocese of West Virginia at Martinsburg, W. Va., on May 6, 1967.

His statements deserve the plaudits of the entire country, and they bear careful reading:

Address by Deputy Secretary of Defense Cyrus R. Vance at the 90th Annual Convention of the Diocese of West Virginia, Trinity Church, Martinsburg, W. Va., May 6, 1967

I deeply appreciate your invitation to address this 90th Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of West Virginia. It gives me a chance, as you may know, to come home again to the land of my forebears. And it gives me a welcome opportunity to meet with the leaders of my church in this state—clergymen and laymen alike.

The Episcopal Church has always been concerned with the problems confronting men in the world in which they live. So, in your discussions here, I am certain that you have sought to relate your faith to the world that is, as well as the world that ought to be. In so doing, no issue comes more rapidly to the forefront of concern than this nation's involvement in Vietnam.

Quite recently, 1000 divinity students of many faiths wrote a letter to Secretary McNamara. It was a thoughtful and responsible communication in which these young men expressed both a moral and a policy dissent. "Large numbers of divinity students," they said, "cannot support the war in Vietnam because they believe this war is neither in the religious tradition of just wars nor in the national interest." They noted, too, that there are other Americans who are similarly troubled.

I appreciate both the depth and the sincerity of this concern. It deserves the most serious thought. Because the matters at stake are so profoundly important to us all, I will devote my time tonight to a consideration of the fundamental issues involved in Vietnam.

I intend to examine both allegations made by the divinity students—"that this war is neither in the religious tradition of just wars, nor in the national interest."

I do not agree with these conclusions. But, at the same time, I respect their convictions and I strongly defend their right to express them. Informed, disciplined, and responsible dissent is the very essence of our freedom.

In America today, one of the greatest barriers to understanding is the very nature of the dialogue which has developed over the issue of Vietnam. It is heated and intolerant. The lines, on both sides, are too sharply drawn.

We need, I think, to restore the national sense of balance, for there is little enlightenment in the dark words which pass back and forth over a gulf of misunderstanding today. We *can* agree to disagree. But, surely, we must all seek meaningful communication as a bridge to reasoned understanding and rational action.

Vietnam has been viewed too often in absolutes of black and white. The situation is not so starkly apparent as it is sometimes painted by the several sides in the debate. There are gray tones. The issues are complex and sometimes ambiguous. This is what makes it difficult to discuss or understand Vietnam. But we must recognize this beclouded aspect of the problem in trying to see through it clearly. Clear vision depends upon a dispassionate balancing of all the factors at play.

I have given much time to this balancing of the essential elements. Let me illustrate the complexities of such a process by brief mention of the troublesome grays on the Vietnam scene.

Certainly there is a shade of gray in the state of political affairs in South Vietnam. It is not ideal in terms of stability, freedom, or progress. But one must balance against this the progress made in recent years in the face of an armed struggle for survival. Local elections have been held, a Constituent Assembly has met, a new Constitution has been promulgated, local elections are in process, and national elections are to be held in September. Contrasted with the colonial regimes of yesterday, or the suffocating rule which North Vietnam would offer as an alternative, the hopeful progress of the Republic of Vietnam is clearly apparent.

Related to this is the fact that there are some South Vietnamese, recalling colonial days, who distrust the occidental and would like to see him leave. This is not, however, the view of even a substantial minority. The people see other Asians joined with us—Koreans, Thais and Filipinos. They see young Americans helping to build a new Vietnam even while others are dying on the battlefield. They note that, with Americans, the energy and resources flow *into* the country, not out. And they know from history that we are not an imperialistic nation.

The Vietnamese Armed Forces are another case in point. They are not yet as effective as they should be, and will become. Conceding this, however, they have come a long way since 1954 when there was no national army. They have fought long and hard. Often, they have fought well. The measure of their determination is their sacrifice—in equivalent population terms, they have lost more men in action than the total of American battle deaths since 1776.

Another example is the question of civilian casualties. Regretfully, we have caused some in both North and South Vietnam. But this has not been our intent. Rather, in defending South Vietnam, we have sought in every possible way, even at some risk of our own men, to avoid harming civilians. On the other hand, those who have inflicted this war on South Vietnam have set out to terrorize, maim and kill civilians as a deliberate tactic of conquest. The scales for judgment must be balanced accordingly.

And there is, without question, an element of native discontent in South Vietnam. This is rooted in the colonial past and the imperfect present, as well as in aspirations for the future. But, recognizing this, it is quite another thing to leap to the conclusion that this is just a civil war. It is not, and I shall discuss this more fully in a few moments.

When I have weighed all the facts—those which are disquieting as well as those which are reassuring—I find that the scale inclines sharply and without hesitation to the position which we have taken in Vietnam. Of course, there is room for concern, but not for real doubt that our course of action in Vietnam is right and necessary.

Turning back now to the statement of the divinity students, I find it difficult to understand what they believe to be a just war "in the religious tradition." Does this depend upon the particular religion of those who sit in judgment? Were the crusades a just war? Was the Saracen invasion of Europe a just war?

Is the use of military force ever moral?

The Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, Minister of the National Presbyterian Church of Washington, recently said this:

"Military force as such is neither morally right nor morally wrong. It is the uses to which it is put—the times, the places, the amount and the purposes—which determine the moral or immoral use of force. And in this stage of the development of mankind, failure to use military force in the proper time and place, and for the proper purpose, can be disastrous and highly immoral."

The world has been racked with wars in the names of religious causes throughout history, but there is a transcendent moral ethic—the right of mankind to determine its own destiny. Certainly this is at the heart of the Judeo-Christian ethic which teaches that man is created in the image of God, by which we mean that he is given free will to determine his own destiny.

Applying this standard to the conflict in Vietnam, is our cause just? I believe that the answer is an unequivocal yes, because our objective in Vietnam is to permit the South Vietnamese to determine their own destiny. However, fundamental to the answering of this question is a threshold question. Are we, as some charge, intervening in a civil insurrection 10,000 miles from our shore? Or are we assisting a small nation, at its request, to resist aggression from beyond its borders—an aggression mounted by those who would dictate that nation's future by force of arms, and would take from its people the right to shape their own future? It is to this threshold question I now turn.

There is, as I have said, some genuine discontent and an element of disaffection in South Vietnam. This is hardly surprising in view of the tortuous and complex history of the Vietnamese people, and the fact that they are beset by all the unfulfilled aspirations of an underdeveloped land in an affluent world. The fact that there is some dissatisfaction which the communists have exploited, does not prove, however, that the Vietnamese conflict is a spontaneous, indigenous southern movement.

It is true, too, that there is a long history of Vietnamese nationalist resistance to foreign domination. This began at the close of the 19th Century, even as the French completed their colonial conquest, and continued unabated throughout the first five decades of the 20th Century. Vietnamese nationalism took definitive form, during World War II, in the Viet Minh organization sponsored by the Chinese Nationalists to harass the Japanese in Indo-China. But this movement, while not communist-organized, was joined soon after its inception by the Vietnamese Communist Party which took control of the Viet Minh and subverted it to Communist Party ends. In so doing, they exploited the genuine nationalist sentiments to which the Viet Minh appealed and which gave the Viet Minh much of its strength.

The real political power base of the Vietnamese Communist Party was created in 1945 after Japan's precipitate surrender when the communists used the Viet Minh to seize power in Hanoi and proclaimed the existence of the (so-called) "Democratic Republic of Vietnam" under Ho Chi Minh.

In the days which followed, Ho prepared for and then fought the war with the French. A first tactic was to announce the "dissolution" of the Communist Party and the formation of a "popular front," the Lien Viet, purportedly to achieve both "independence and democracy." Though there were devoted non-communists in the ranks of this war, there was never any question as to communist leadership and control.

By 1951, having established a common frontier with Red China, the mask was dropped. The Communist Party—the Lao Dong—was reestablished in public, and new war objectives were given. Instead of aiming for "independence and democracy," it was announced in all-too-familiar language that "The anti-imperialist and the anti-feudal fights are of equal importance."

In North Vietnam, this signalled the beginning of a campaign to completely communize the country. Americans should study this campaign to understand our adversaries, and to comprehend what their victory would mean to South Vietnam. The record is one of incredible savagery, violence and repression. Among the victims were many non-communists who had served in the Viet Minh against the French, and even some lifelong members of the Communist Party. Their theory of operation was—"it is better to kill ten innocent people than to let one enemy escape."

In 1954, the war between the French and the Viet Minh was concluded by the Geneva Accords—a set of truce arrangements to which neither South Vietnam nor the United States were official parties. The seeds of conflict in which we are now engaged were sown in the months and years immediately following the termination of this earlier conflict.

In the aftermath of Geneva, the Communists took to North Vietnam the bulk of their forces located south of the 17th Parallel and many of their southern supporters. But, significantly, they left behind secret cadres to serve as future focal points for renewed military and political action, and several thousand weapons caches for future use.

During this period, the myth that Ho Chi Minh was universally loved and supported by the Vietnamese people was shattered. This fact is important, since that same myth is again in circulation and is sometimes reinforced by misquoting a remark President Eisenhower made at the time of Geneva. It is claimed, erroneously, that he said Ho Chi Minh would win the votes of 80 percent of the Vietnamese people in a free election. This is false. President Eisenhower actually said that in an election against Emperor Bao Dai, Ho Chi Minh would gain such a vote.

The fact that the Vietnamese people would have almost certainly repudiated a French puppet—and did so in South Vietnam's 1956 Referendum—does not mean that the bulk of them revered Ho Chi Minh or would favor his leadership. It is important to remember that some 900,000 northerners, given the chance by provisions of the Geneva Accords, chose to leave their homes and flee to the south to avoid living under Ho's communist rule. Many more were denied escape when the communists recognized how damaging this exodus was to their image and ambitions. This denial, incidentally, was a flagrant violation of the Geneva Accords.

In the first few years after Geneva, South Vietnam made strides toward stability and progress which were astonishing in light of the difficulties with which the South Vietnamese people and their new government had to cope. Despite the chaos of two decades of war, the legacy of colonial rule, the political inexperience, and endemic corruption, life in South Vietnam presented a contrast which was increasingly unflattering to that in North Vietnam. This was one of the main determinants of the communist decision to launch an insurgency which would stop South Vietnam's political evolution, recreate anarchy and chaos, and thus permit the establishment of communist power over the South Vietnamese people.

The Communist Party in Hanoi took several steps to implement this strategic decision. Cadres left behind in the south were ordered to renew political agitation and build up a political and terrorist structure. A ruthless campaign of terror was initiated, designed to undo the political progress that the government had made. Its particular targets were those local officials and workers, representatives of the Saigon government, whose dedicated activities were making some progress in improving the lot of the South Vietnamese peasantry. At the same time, the Party in Hanoi created a Reunification Department, placed it in command of a major general in the North Vietnamese Army, and gave him control over those ethnic southern supporters who had re-grouped to North Vietnam after 1954. This Department soon began dispatching these agents back to their native areas to reinforce the insurgent communist organization.

By 1959, the communists in North Vietnam were focusing publicly on their objective. " . . . We are building socialism in Vietnam" Ho Chi Minh said. "We are building it, however, only in half of the country, while in the other half we must still bring to a conclusion the democratic-bourgeois and anti-imperialist revolution." To these ends, Viet Cong agitation and terrorism were greatly accelerated, and infiltrators moved southward in ever greater numbers down the "Ho Chi Minh Trail." Six years ago, in 1961, the annual flow was already more than 10,000 men.

It is important to understand the identity and the mission of these infiltrators. Until 1964, they were almost exclusively ethnic southerners. It was they who built the political and military apparatus for the communists in the south, and it is they who usually still direct it at regional, provincial, and district levels. Although southern, they were devoted to communist objectives and subject to Party discipline. Without them, the communist movement could never have been developed into the force it is today. These men did not infiltrate spontaneously in response to legitimate southern grievances. Instead, they represented the cutting edge of a brilliantly conceived and ruthlessly executed campaign of politico-military aggression, developed by the Lao Dong Politburo in Hanoi, and completely controlled by Hanoi from its inception to the present day.

Thus, although it is true that many of those whom we fight in Vietnam are themselves South Vietnamese, and that substantial numbers of southerners support the enemy in some degree, it is not true, and never has been, that this is a simple civil conflict in which Hanoi took no role until after the United States had already intervened. From its inception, this insurgency has been run on Hanoi's orders to further Hanoi's political objectives. Viet Cong forces and the Viet Cong political organization are led by ruthless, hard-core communists who take orders from Hanoi. The ranks are filled, in the main, by very young men who have been conscripted at gun point, and who are kept in line by unrelenting discipline in the field and unmistakable threats against their families at home. It is these threats, in turn, backed up by military force and deliberate terrorism, which account for the support given to the enemy in Viet Cong-controlled areas.

The events of recent years are too familiar to need much recounting. Exploiting the problems and weaknesses of South Vietnam, the communists moved to take over the land through subversion, terror, and mounting armed aggression. Well before the United States deployed major forces to South Vietnam at the request of its government, the flow of men and supplies from north to south had reached floodtide. And today, nearly half the enemy divisions in the south come from the North Vietnamese Army, and the Viet Cong ranks themselves are increasingly filled with northerners.

It is clear to me, then, that the war in Vietnam is no simple civil conflict. Its roots are traceable in history. Its mainspring, tactics, and even its language are familiar to all who have studied communism. It is an attempt by North Vietnam to impose an unwanted rule on a sovereign nation, an attempt clearly nourished by massive support from Red China, the Soviet Union, and other communist nations throughout the world.

In a word, what we see in Vietnam is aggression. There may be no precise, literal analogy which can be drawn to past aggressions because the form of aggression has changed. Massive conventional attack has been largely replaced by political subversion, intimidation, terrorism, and guerrilla attack. But the essential analogy remains, the hallmark of aggression remains the same—an attempt to impose political change by force of arms and without the consent of the people.

Next, it is essential to understand that this is a war of limited objectives. The confusion over these objectives is at least partly to blame for the attitudes of those citizens who are troubled by our participation and who oppose our effort. To understand clearly what our objectives are, perhaps we need to repeat again what they are not.

We are not seeking to destroy or change the government of North Vietnam. We do not want permanent bases in South Vietnam.

We do not want one inch of new territory for America.

We are not even seeking to enlist South Vietnam as a permanent ally in that portion of the world.

Our objective *is* limited. It is limited because we want to halt conflict in one place without precipitating it in others. And, in Vietnam, it is limited to assuring that South Vietnam can shape its own destiny, choose its own political and economic institutions, and do so without military pressure from external powers.

But what is the objective of the enemy? It is to force his own political solution on the South Vietnamese. This is at least implicit in his statements; it is explicit in his ideology and in his actions.

I spoke earlier of the grays in this struggle. But there is an area of vast importance in which there are no shadings. It is clear and indisputable. It concerns the way in which the war is fought.

It is a fact that brutality and wanton terrorism are deliberate tools of the communists in Vietnam, as they always have been. It is no error when the most talented members of a village are threatened, beaten, abducted, or forced to serve the enemy. It is no mistake when a village chief is made to watch his family murdered, and then has his head cut off. It is deliberate when the enemy destroys schools and medical dispensaries. It is intentional when he attacks the hearts of cities. And the cumulative, innocent victims of these deliberate actions now number many thousands.

We, on our side, have made errors on occasion. We have injured innocent civilians in South Vietnam, and we have injured our own soldiers. But we have injured them by error, error inevitable in the course of conflict. And we have injured civilians in North Vietnam in bombing attacks. But they have been unintentional victims, hurt in attacks against military targets—attacks carried out with more restraint than any bombing attacks in history. Never has a nation had so much power as the United States today. But, most significantly, never has a nation so limited the power employed, or used it with such discrimination.

What we would like to do, for *all* Vietnamese, is best reflected in the countless kind acts of unsung soldiers, and civilians and the contributions to nation building, which now take place every day in South Vietnam.

Knowing these things—knowing the true face of the war, on both sides—I find it difficult to understand the convoluted logic which leads some to condemn this nation for "immorality" and to defend terrorism as a heroic struggle for "independence."

Still another issue in dispute concerns the efforts which have been made to achieve an honorable peace in Vietnam. Here, the contrast between our side and the other is sharply etched on the public record.

The communists, for their part, have said that discussions cannot even be begun without unilateral concessions by us. As they know, without reciprocal moves on their side, these concessions could exact a toll of blood from those who are defending South Vietnam. This is an unacceptable condition for achieving peace talks. Yet there are thoughtful Americans who believe we should accept it.

We cannot be that naive or take the chances implicit in such action. But we have, over the past several years, explored reasonable avenues to peace in Vietnam with more than half the nations on this earth. As Secretary Rusk has pointed out within the past week, the United States has agreed to some 28 separate peace proposals. These were not just American proposals, oriented to our own optimum interests. They were varied in content, with some having limited and some having broad objectives. They stemmed from many sources. They would have involved such agencies as the United Nations, the International Control Commission, the International Red Cross, a reconvened Geneva Conference, or an all-Asian Peace Conference. They would have called on the good offices of such individuals as the Secretary General of the United Nations or the Geneva Co-Chairmen. Nevertheless, the record is clear: The North Vietnamese rejected every proposal.

I cannot believe that there is any real doubt as to which side has taken the initiative for peace, and which has cast its lot with war.

I believe, then, that we are in a just war and are seeking to achieve an honorable peace.

But what of the second allegation of the divinity students, the allegation that this war is not in our national interest?

We live in a world which is at once filled with hope and despair, good chance and no chance, trust and mistrust, ease and hardship, security and peril, even peace and war at the same time. It is a world suddenly, and significantly, grown small. The hiding places are gone; each man's need is the concern of every man and each nation's problem is the burden of every nation. It is a complex world—interrelated, interdependent, in ferment, dynamic, and demanding much of those who must assume leadership.

In the small world today, the national interest of the United States is international. Our role of leadership is inescapable. We cannot fulfill a meaningful destiny as an affluent but passive witness to great principles in contest.

We have, as you know, not been passive.

For more than 20 years we have made a major contribution to the security and stability of Western Europe. As a consequence, that area has prospered economically, and both peace and freedom have been preserved.

Again, in Korea, we stood fast for the principle of self-determination. While that land war in Asia went on, domestic critics were both numerous and vocal. Some wanted out; some wanted total war; and few could find reason or value in what we did. Yet, today, South Korea is freer than it has ever been, politically responsible, economically resurgent, and able to play a leading role in Asian affairs.

In Southeast Asia, as a further extension of our leadership role and our support of self-determination, we committed ourselves through the SEATO Treaty. We also committed ourselves, through the voices of three Presidents; to defense against aggression in South Vietnam.

All these commitments to principle, and our similar interests in other world areas, are interrelated. A principle worth defending any place, is worth supporting in other places. A promise kept in one place, gives integrity to promises made in other places. Aggression halted in one place, discourages aggression in other places. And what happens anywhere is known everywhere in the modern world of swift transport and rapid communication.

Can anyone truly doubt, in this world, that the struggles in Southeast Asia have their impact upon the internal struggles of Africa, the pressures of Europe, and even the peoples of the Western Hemisphere?

Would the success of military aggression in Southeast Asia, then, be in our national interest? What undermines peace in Southeast Asia undermines peace throughout the world.

Is it in our national interest to allow one large nation or nations to project their power across international boundaries by force of arms?

Would not the loss of independence of the 200 million persons in the nations of Southeast Asia constitute a serious shift in the balance of power against the free world?

This does not mean that we must become the policeman of the world.

It does mean that we must stand behind the commitments we have made if we hope to preserve peace rather than permit raw and naked power to govern. We act in our national interest when we stand behind those commitments; we act against our national interest when we do not.

In the time available, I have sketched in the outlines of my views. There is need for us all to ponder these issues in greater length and depth, and always with balanced perspective. For we must answer to our own people, and to history, for the conclusions we reach, the decisions we make, and the actions we take.

No one votes lightly for war, especially in the face of ambiguities which are more troublesome than the simplicities of earlier days. And the first vote of every responsible American today is for peace. But there is no peace in the surrender of principle, or in turning away from aggression; there is no honor in vacating solemn commitments; there is no morality in tolerating brutality; and there is no security or stability in isolation.

I would say to the young divinity students then: I share your abhorrence of war, but the sacrifice of principle and the loss of freedom are worse than the loss of life. Both principle and freedom are at stake in Vietnam, and so I believe that we *are* engaged in a just battle. I believe, too, that the national interest of a great nation is involved wherever principle, freedom, and the peace and stability of the world are imperiled. Thus, for these very reasons, I think we should be in Vietnam, and we should stay there until the aggression ends.

BEEF IMPORT RESTRICTIONS

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will recall the strong support I gave to legislation in 1964 to strengthen restrictions against the importation of meat products. Although many of us agreed that legislation was as strong as we could hope to pass into law at that time, we expressed our determination to make an occasional review of how things were going in the delicate area of meat imports.

Despite the regulations which have been enacted, the trend in meat imports during the last 3 years has continued upward. We cannot allow imports from foreign countries to jeopardize the income of our farmers, and it is my belief that the time has come for a thorough review and for stricter limitations.

I am introducing legislation today which would further restrict meat imports. It would improve the existing law. Briefly, here are the changes which I recommend today.

Existing law allows for a 10-percent overrun before import quotas are legally applicable. I think considerable damage can be done before any action can be taken, and this legislation provides for elimination of the 10-percent overrun clause.

A second provision would remove from the Secretary of Agriculture the duty of estimating in advance the level of imports and determining whether it is likely they will exceed the quotas. This bill calls for quotas to be imposed by the law itself. It would eliminate the uncertainty of departmental predictions.

I also recommend changing the period on which our present quotas are based. Present quotas are based on imports during the 5-year period 1959–63. I do not think this is a representative period and my bill would base quotas on imports during the years from 1958 to 1962. The base would, therefore, be lowered from approximately 725 million pounds to approximately 585 million pounds.

Another change would call for quotas to be imposed quarterly instead of annually as under existing law. I am hopeful this adjustment will eliminate unduly heavy imports of meat products in any one season of the year.

I am also recommending that the administration be given the power to impose quotas on importation of meats not covered in the legislation if these imports should become a threat to domestic producers. This would be effective in situations in which the Congress may not be able to act swiftly enough.

Finally, this bill provides that meat purchases abroad by the Department of Defense for use of our troops abroad will be charged against import quotas for such meats.

Our meat producers are plagued by low income and I believe the industry, as a whole, is in serious trouble. Rural America must continue to be a primary consideration of our Government. Solutions to the rural-income problem must be found, and the longer we wait the more difficult it will be to achieve effective and equitable solutions. I hope my colleagues in the House will join in support of this legislation. Believe me, our farmers need it.

KNOCK ON THE DOOR OF A HOME IN CALUMET CITY

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Calumet City is in the district that I have the honor to represent. This is the story of a morning knock on the door of a home in Calumet City that the Chicago Tribune thought enough of to put on the first page of its edition of May 8, 1967, under a three-column headline. To William Granger, the writer, John P. Granger, the soldier, and the sister in Calumet City go my warmest greetings. The article follows:

A KNOCK AT THE DOOR—YOUNG BROTHER IS HOME FROM WAR

(By William Granger)

This is a story about Viet Nam. It is not about a victory or defeat, or death, or bombing. It is good news.

My brother came home from the war Saturday.

My sister called me at work: "I just wanted to let you know Johnnie came home this morning. He's sleeping now."

Other brothers and sons and husbands came home from the war this week-end as he did, safe and well, and their families knew what I felt that afternoon.

YEAR OF WATCHING LISTS

And I know some of what those families feel about whose kin are still there because during his year overseas, I read the death lists in the newspaper and listened to the radio for that day's battle and where it was and wrote letters with blind faith that they would be answered.

And I know some of what those families feel whose kin did not come back because of my own reckless dreams at night or a sudden thought during the day: What if he were dead now?

After he woke up Saturday night and after I left work, I called him. I didn't want to see him then because he has a fiance and he would want to see her.

We did not know what to talk about. I asked him how he was and he said fine and he asked me how I was.

He had not told anyone when he was coming home exactly. I think I understand why. We had our own calculations and calendars to mark and we expected him in a few weeks.

A KNOCK AT THE DOOR

He got off the plane Saturday morning and went to my sister's house in Calumet City and knocked on the door and went inside and had some coffee. He called my mother, who lives in Wisconsin, and she cried. Then he went to sleep.

While we talked, I mentioned I was working odd hours the last few weeks.

"Not as odd as mine," he said. Then he laughed.

He was not decorated in the war. He was drafted two years ago, just as I was getting out of the army. The army sent him to school and gave him leave and then sent him to the APO and then sent him to Viet Nam.

When he landed he wrote a funny letter about the boat trip over.

We sent him the papers and told him about the Big Snow and told him what we were doing. He wrote back and would say he was well and ask about us.

AN ORDINARY SOLDIER

He did not win a medal. He was an ordinary soldier.

His voice sounded different when I talked to him on the phone. But maybe it was the telephone.

We were going to get together this morning before I went to work to talk.

But he called my sister yesterday and said he was taking the train home to Wisconsin to see our mother.

He will never forget the war and in a different way, neither will I, because he was there.

But maybe today, at home, he will forget it.

NEW BILL TO AMEND VESSEL EXCHANGE PROGRAM

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I have long been a stanch supporter and advocate of a strong American merchant marine. However, like other Members of the House, I have an even greater allegiance to the principle that "John Q. Public," the taxpayer, is entitled to have his tax dollars protected and spent in the most efficient manner. For this reason, I am compelled to introduce today a bill designed to remedy what to me appears to be maladministration of a law and in contravention of the intent of Congress.

Two years ago our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries reported to the House a bill to extend and broaden the vessel exchange program of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. That legislation was favorably acted upon by this body and by the Senate becoming Public Law 89-254. It then was my understanding, and I believe that of many of my colleagues on our Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, that when we broadened the provisions of this program, it was to meet a specific problem concerning obsolete vessels in operation on the Great Lakes. The hearings before our committee on this earlier legislation support this view.

It now has come to my attention that this well-meaning piece of legislation has been so liberally construed as to totally disregard congressional intent. Ferryboats, which in many instances have been nonoperative over a period of time, have been held to be eligible for trade-in and have been used as a credit in computing the net cost of large oceangoing Government-owned cargo vessels received in exchange. These ferryboats have come to be known in the jargon of the maritime industry as "box tops"—a token needed to qualify for the transfer out from our reserve fleet of Government-owned vessels, since a direct sale is not permitted under the existing law.

Based on current information, I am constrained to view such questionable practices as nothing more than a ruse. It presents the appearance of gimmickry simply to circumvent the prohibition on the direct sale of Government vessels. Although I recognize the need for additional shipping capability as a result of the demands of Vietnam, and that this liberal interpretation of the vessel exchange program may serve to meet these needs, I would have hoped that the Maritime Administration would have taken a more direct and honest approach to the matter. If such a need exists, then why, I ask, has not the Maritime Administration requested an appropriate amendment to the law to allow direct sale of Government vessels? Either the law should be properly interpreted and administered, or it should be changed. There should be no subterfuge undercutting either the intent of the Congress or giving cause for anyone to question the possibility of the existence of a windfall to participants in this vessel exchange program.

I inquired into this matter by letter to the general counsel of the Maritime Administration. The answer which I received indirectly took the form of a 12-page letter which unfortunately was not satisfactory in my opinion and did not serve to assuage my well-intentioned concern over this matter.

Perhaps the greatest significance in the reply from the general counsel of the Maritime Administration was in but two of the many paragraphs of his somewhat lengthy letter. One of these paragraphs simply indicated that the lack of the new construction of American vessels had reduced the number of eligible vessels to be traded in under the vessel exchange program. This only points up the need for a reasonable and adequate program of new merchant vessel construction. The second paragraph of significance quoted portions of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which held that:

> The reference in the National Transportation Policy of the Interstate Commerce Act (40 U.S.C. 1) to the objective of preserving a transportation system "adequate to meet the needs of the commerce of the United States . . . and of the national defense" is not merely a *"hoped-for 'end'", but an operative policy* which must be followed in the administration of the act in a case involving the welfare of coastwise shipping of the United States. *Interstate Commerce Commission v. New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad Co.*, 372 U.S. 744, 761 (1963).

Well, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the General Counsel of the Maritime Administration the words of this Supreme Court decision in the administration of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. It, too, is not simply a "hoped-for end." Rather, when enacted it was designed to be an "operative policy" which over the years has been frustrated and maligned by a marked disregard for congressional intent—a disregard which is exemplified by this latest example in the administration of the vessel exchange program.

I, for one, have no desire to be a party to such a questionable transaction. Accordingly, I am introducing today legislation designed to bring this matter once more before our Committee on Merchant Marine. I sincerely hope that our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Maryland, will see fit to hold early hearings on my bill, so as to rectify what now appears to be a gross error in the interpretation of the intent of the Congress by an executive agency charged with the administration of the law.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would clarify that vessels traded in under section 510(i)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 must have been in operation for the 365-day period prior to the date of exchange, either as an ocean-going cargo vessel or as a cargo vessel in use exclusively on the Great Lakes. This was the intent of Congress, as I understood it, when the trade-in law was passed.

ADEQUATE CAPITOL

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I think it is time for the Members of Congress, and in particular, the Members of the most populous side of the Capitol, that is, the House, where we have 435 Members, the time has come to decide whether this Capitol Building is going to be a museum or whether it is going to be a functioning, living instrument of our Government. This Capitol Building has had to grow many times in the past to accommodate the growth of this great Nation—1803, the completion of the original building; 1817, the restoration of the burned building; 1859, the addition of the House and Senate wings; 1861, completion of new dome; 1961 completion of west front.

We have many functions that have to work to make the Congress work in the numerous offices for clerks, attendants, and for important committees—Ways and Means, Rules, and Appropriations. Of course, the work is growing for everybody because the country is growing at a more rapid rate than ever before in its history.

A particular fact is the terrible inadequacy of eating facilities. It is becoming increasingly embarrassing that a Congressman cannot lunch with his constituents in the Capitol Building. This is increasingly inconvenient and embarrassing because our work is more and more commanding with attendance on the House floor commencing at noon every weekday.

I think we owe it to our constituents when they travel far to visit their Congressman that there be dining facilities where they can lunch and visit their views upon their Congressman. I think that we, of course, should listen to the architects on the question of the appearance of the building. I think we should retain the outward appearance of the building as nearly as engineeringly possible, but the growth of the building, to meet the growth of the Nation and the growth of the needs of a functioning, living Congress has got to be the decision of the Congress. We know that we need more room here in this building. We cannot give in to sentimentalism and make this building a museum. Were this building to become a museum, the needs of the Congress would demand that we build a new building, and move to new quarters. I think the result of moving to new quarters would be to neglect the care of these quarters. I wonder if the architects would be listened to at all if the clamor was that the Congress remain in Philadelphia? How ridiculous it would be that we remain in the original quarters of the Continental Congress in Philadelphia.

Finally, we have no other place to meet. Here is the Hall of the House of Representatives to be accommodated.

AID PROGRAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, I wrote Mr. William S. Gaud, Director of the Agency for International Development and asked for answers to 13 questions. Because the answers to these questions may be of interest to many Members in studying the Foreign Economic Assistance Act that is now before the Foreign Affairs Committee, I would like to insert at the conclusion of my remarks the text of my questions and the answers which Mr. Gaud furnished. My questions concerned food production, population control, and the development of the private sector in the developing countries:

Question 1: How many mission directors of AID have had college or graduate training in agriculture?

Answer: Of the 38 Mission Directors on the rolls as of February 28, 1967, two had college or graduate degrees in Agriculture.

Question 2: How many of their staff members have had this specialized training in agriculture?

Answer: A study made in October, in connection with another subject, showed that at least 286 employees overseas had their highest degree in Agriculture.

Question 3: What percentage of the AID direct-hire staff within developing countries is devoted full time to agricultural problems? Please give breakdown between Washington staff and staff within developing countries.

Answer: The following table summarizes the situation as of February 28, 1967:

	Direct-hires	Agriculturists	Percentage
Overseas	4,525	535	11.8
United States	3,657	53	1.45
Total	8,182	588	----------

These figures exclude, of course, clerical and secretarial support, personnel from other U.S. departments and agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture, and the many contract personnel engaged in agricultural activities.

Question 4: What specific progress in the past six years can you report in the developing countries receiving our aid in regard to food output?

Answer: The index of total food production in the developing countries has risen from 110 in 1961 to 123 in 1966 (1957–1959=100).

Progress in some countries, of course, has been more marked than in others. In the last decade, for example, agricultural production has risen 32% in Korea. In Turkey, in just a one-year period (1965–1966), agricultural production increased 11%.

Likewise, progress within most countires is more marked in particular geographic regions or for particular crops. For example, a large program in cooperation with the Pakistan Government in East Pakistan has enabled many farmers almost to triple production within three years.

But the major fact of life relating to food production in the less developed countries is the offsetting effect of rising populations. Population increases in many developing countries is equal to or greater than food increases. This means that food production per capita has stood about still over the last six years in the developing countries. The index of per capita food production in the less developing countries was 102 in 1962, and in 1966 it was 101. In 1957–1959 it was 100.

The balance between food and mouths is therefore today the number one priority of AID programs.

Question 5: I understand that only a tiny percentage of the students from Latin American Universities who study in the United States specialize in agriculture. What have we been doing to reverse this trend.

Answer: A.I.D. financed international training programs in the United States expose participants from less developed countries to a variety of studies and practices. A significant number, however, concentrate their time in a study of agriculture.

From FY 1965 through the first half of FY 1967, 5,647 Latin American participants financed directly by A.I.D. arrived in the U.S.; 1,088 of these specialized in agriculture. Of the 117 Latin Americans who arrived in the first half of FY 1967, and undertook regular academic courses, 24 of these have concentrated on agricultural matters. In addition, 40 out of 238 contract arrivals in the first half of FY 1967 likewise have concentrated on agricultural matters, mainly at U.S. universities.

While these programs have proved productive, the trend within A.I.D. is to train Latin Americans in agriculture in their home countries, rather than in the U.S. In this way local or regional institutions are created which will first, outlast the life of U.S. assistance, and second, concentrate on the particular and peculiar obstacles to increased food production in their own area.

Question 6: I understand that in 1962 only 187 of the students of the 10,000 students in Central America attending universities there were studying agriculture. To me this shows that the field of agriculture is not receiving the attention or official encouragement it should locally. What have we done since 1962 to reverse this trend?

Answer: In the case of agricultural education in Central America there have been several institutional developments. Faculties of agronomy have been established at the National Universities in Nicaragua and El Salvador in the past few years. The Regional School of Veterinary Medicine at San Carlos University in Guatemala has been established and with A.I.D. assistance is gradually becoming a viable institution. Existing agricultural education facilities in Costa Rica and Honduras have received technical assistance from A.I.D.

Question 7: It is further my understanding that the percentage of students in Central American Universities studying agriculture has been dropping rather than increasing.

Answer: While we are unable to identify your figures, data available to us shows an absolute increase in numbers of students enrolled in agriculture with a negligible decrease in percentage from 1961 to 1964. It is anticipated that future statistics will reflect the impact of the actions noted above.

Question 8: Is the promotion of basic human liberties set forth in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights one of the objectives of our AID program? If so, what specifically has AID been doing or attempting to do in this regard?

Answer: The promotion of the specific basic human liberties set forth in the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights is not specifically mentioned in the legislation governing A.I.D. programs. The Declaration of 1948 was a statement of principles to serve as a guide for domestic policy.

Nonetheless, an ultimate objective of all A.I.D. programs is the evolution of economic, social and political conditions which are most conducive to the thriving of the specific human rights enumerated in the UN Declaration of Human Rights. Through a variety of A.I.D. tools and programs, we work with less developed countries to further economic, social and political progress and justice for the widest possible number of peoples.

To cite a few examples, A.I.D. is involved in strengthening and promoting democratic institutions vital to development and individual participation in the development process. Programs for community development, mass literacy, civil service reforms, labor leadership and the like have now been brought together for special coordination and promotion under Title IX of the Foreign Assistance Act of last year. A.I.D. programs to foster local initiative and private enterprise work, in the long run, to promote the objectives of the UN Declaration.

Question 9: Has AID imposed any firm requirements of birth control measures in any of the countries receiving our aid? Are any such requirements being negotiated at the present time? Do you have any future plans to impose any such firm requirements?

Answer: A.I.D. does not require that countries receiving assistance from the United States adopt measures for family planning or birth control. It has not had any such requirement in the past and President Johnson has clearly stated that the USA will not coerce any nation to practice family planning. As the President stated in his Foreign Aid Message to the Congress on February 1, 1966, "The United States cannot and should not force any country to adopt any particular approach to this [population problem]."

Assistance by A.I.D. for the population programs of developing countries is guided by the following principles:

1. Assistance is given only at request of each recipient country and is extended only as a supplement to the country's own self-help efforts in the population field.

2. Help is given only for programs and projects in which individual participation is wholly voluntary and in which each individual, who chooses to participate is free to select methods of family planning which are in keeping with his or her religious beliefs, culture and personal wishes.

3. A.I.D. does not advocate any specific population policy for another country, nor any particular method of family planning or birth control. The Agency's aim is to provide needed assistance upon request so that people may have the fundamental freedom of controlling their reproduction if they so desire.

Within this framework, A.I.D. may provide requested assistance for collection of needed population data in assisted countries, provide technical help in analysis of population problems, and supply technical and advisory assistance for population programs, training, and research. In addition, it may supply commodity assistance, as for vehicles and educational aids, and may give local currency assistance. Also, it cooperates with other assisting institutions, such as United Nations agencies, the Pan American Health Organization, and other organizations, in helping meet the full needs of countries engaged in self-help action in this field.

Question 10: To what extent has the AID program succeeded in strengthening marketing prices so that farmers in developing countries have an incentive to produce food? To what extent has the operation of the P.L. 480 program tended to depress market prices? I cite in particular India although other countries would be equally important.

Answer: As the question implies, the price level for farm produce is one of many key factors in the level of food production in the less developed countries. It is clear that the farmer will have no incentive to produce food for the market if sales do not result in adequate profits. There is a thorough awareness of this basic consideration among A.I.D. officials and technicians. Where farm prices are not adequate to provide necessary incentive, this is of great concern to A.I.D. planners.

One way to strengthen market prices is to help the farmer himself to influence these prices. A.I.D. programs in a number of countries have done just that:

In Bolivia, A.I.D. organized the Rice Marketing Committee which then offered rice producers a guaranteed minimum price. As a result, Bolivia is now self-sufficient in rice. She previously had to import one-third of her requirements.

An A.I.D. technical assistance project in Guatemala led to institution of a radio program in Indian dialect which broadcasts market news. This has put small farmers in a significantly improved bargaining position with commodity speculators.

A rice floor price in the Dominican Republic was instituted by the Agricultural Bank, through an A.I.D. loan. Rice production is expected to increase 15% as a result. Similar plans are moving ahead for bean and corn prices.

Throughout the less developed world A.I.D.-funded marketing and deficit cooperatives have enabled farmers to influence market prices by affecting the level of market supply. Similarly, and more specifically, an A.I.D. project in Nepal has resulted in the building of grain storage facilities which enable the farmer to store grains away until prices increase.

A second, and more direct way A.I.D. programs have strengthened market prices for the farmer is by actually arguing, persuading and showing government officials the importance of policies which create incentives for the farmer. This has been done in a number of countries either through daily contact with host government officials or through advisory groups or high-level U.S. consultants. In any list of countries where A.I.D. has been successful in influencing higher market price policies, Thailand, Taiwan, Korea, Pakistan and India would be included. A.I.D. program loan negotiations in India have likewise led to changes in Indian Government policies affecting prices for the farmer.

As to the effect of PL 480 shipments on market prices, this is difficult to answer, because the effect is not really measurable. To some extent, at least, it is probably true that past PL 480 shipments dampened the incentive of some less developed countries to increase their own food production. In a few countries—India is no doubt an example—large supplies of U.S. foods did tend to decrease farm prices. In most countries, however, shipments were too small in relation to total supply to influence prices to any degree.

Under the current PL 480 program, self-help efforts by recipient countries are being strongly emphasized, and PL 480 programs are being watched closely to avoid any disincentive effects. And A.I.D. itself is making greater efforts than ever before to get governments to help raise farm prices where an adequate profit incentive is required to increase farm production. It is significant that food prices have risen since last summer in both Pakistan and India, despite large PL 480 shipments.

Question 11: What achievements can AID cite in its effort to establish an entrepreneurial class in developing countries? What further measures are being undertaken in this regard?

Answer:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,

Hon. PAUL FINDLEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FINDLEY: Thank you for your letter of February 20, requesting specific information on our foreign aid programs as they relate to the development of an entrepreneurial class in the developing nations.

A.I.D.'s programs as a whole are oriented very strongly to the development of the local private sectors. We recognize that, without exception, the countries that have grown most rapidly have been those where public policy and public investments have spurred private initiative on the farm and in the factories.

As illustrated in the enclosed "Private Resources for International Development," a chapter from our Summary Presentation for Fiscal 1967, direct assistance to the private sectors is accomplished in many ways and through the administration of many programs:

A.I.D. program loans finance the import (from the United States) of a great variety of goods, raw materials, components and spare parts, making it possible for hundreds of small and medium-size, privately-owned enterprises in the less-developed countries to obtain the materials they need for new investment or current operations. And, by making such loans conditional on the adoption by the countries concerned of more liberal policies toward the private sector (elimination of rigid and inequitable import controls, for example) we have tried to further improve the climate for private development.

A.I.D. has also provided, both through loans and technical assistance, for the creation or expansion of local sources of capital for private ventures in the form of intermediate credit institutions—industrial, agricultural and housing development banks. In addition to direct loans, A.I.D. has secured the cooperation of local governments in earmarking portions of the local currencies generated by program loans for the establishment of further credit facilities through local Private Investment Funds. From 1958 to date, a total of $730.6 million has been lent to 100 institutions for relending to local private borrowers.

Through the assistance of experienced private U.S. organizations and their technical experts, A.I.D. has assisted in the development of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan institutions to make more investment capital available at the grass roots level. A.I.D. is now in relationship, through contracting organizations, with all major national, regional and local cooperatives in the United States. These organizations supplied some two-thirds of the 357 advisors and consultants working on A.I.D. cooperative projects in 54 countries. During 1966 A.I.D. assistance affected 30,000 cooperatives and credit institutions with 9.8 million members in 46 countries. Some 2,500 new cooperatives with 500,000 members were organized, most of them agricultural.

A.I.D.'s many programs of technical assistances, training, and research services to private investment institutions, productivity centers, trade associations, and business schools are designed to help local private industry improve its technology, help local investors locate sound investment opportunities and industry groups improve the quality of their output and the marketing of their products. As examples of the many ways in which technical assistance is used to assist private sector growth, recently authorized projects are designed to:

help Korean industrialists expand their exports through improved quality control;

set up a productivity and investment center in Paraguay;

develop small indigenous industries in Nigeria;

improve the capacity of the private sector in Chile to participate in national planning;

stimulate the formation of democratically oriented labor unions in Latin American countries and in Africa.

assist Brazil in drafting comprehensive capital markets legislation;

develop a modern graduate school of business administration in Peru.

As of September 30, 1966, A.I.D. had 1,489 technical service contracts with private groups with a total value of some $509 million to carry out projects in 73 countries. Within this group 127 American colleges and universities held 307 contracts valued at some $220 million for research, surveys, training and technical assistance.

A.I.D.'s international training program provides for the specialized training of foreign technicians and professionals in the United States or in third countries. Since the beginning of the Point IV program in 1949, 97,000 such participants have been brought to the United States for advanced education or training, and another 19,000 have been trained in third countries.

In recognition of the major role in development that can and should be played by American private enterprise, which has unequaled resources of managerial, technological and entrepreneurial skills to transmit to business partners in less-developed countries, A.I.D. administers a broad range of programs to encourage and assist private U.S. investment in productive enterprises in these countries. Our programs of information services, investment survey participation, investment insurance and guaranties, and local currency and dollar loans to private firms are described in the enclosed AIDS TO BUSINESS (OVERSEAS INVESTMENT), which is widely distributed in this country.

We are sure you will be interested to learn, for example, that while A.I.D. is obligated for $725,000 as its share of 80 completed investment surveys in which the investment decision was negative, 31 affirmative decisions have been made representing $70 million in planned investment. Thus for each dollar of appropriated funds, $90 in private investment has been generated. Outstanding coverage under the specific risk insurance program rose from $479 million in 1961 to $3.1 billion by the end of 1966. New investment covered under this program in 1966 totalled $250 million.

To strengthen private cooperation for development between American business and private enterprise in the less-developed countries, A.I.D. has strongly supported the establishment and growth of the International Executive Service Corps, a private, nonprofit organization directed and managed by American businessmen. The IESC provides experienced American volunteers to help private firms in the less-developed countries to improve their management, production, and marketing. During 1966 IESC received 367 requests from businesses, large and small, in 37 developing countries. The Service Corps has a roster of 2,150 experienced businessmen, recruited by unpaid representatives of business in 38 American cities.

To some degree most A.I.D. programs exert a forceful, if indirect, influence on the development of an entrepreneurial class. A.I.D.'s project loans for the development of needed infrastructure help create the power, transportation facilities, etc., that open the way for industrial development; our programs of health, education, and agricultural production assist in the growth of a healthier, better-educated populace and the creation of a more favorable climate for entrepreneurial growth.

As indicated, A.I.D.'s effort to improve and develop private sector growth cut across nearly all functional and organizational lines within the agency, making it extremely difficult to isolate and list those personnel concerned *solely* with entrepreneurial growth. However we are enclosing a list of certain AID/Washington offices primarily concerned with this area, together with the total number of positions and personnel funding.

As to an evaluation of the effectiveness of these programs, it is our feeling that much is being accomplished. Those countries which are developing most rapidly are those where government policies, investments of self-generated savings, and external assistance have combined to bring the creative forces of private initiative into full play . . . for example, Taiwan, Israel, Greece, and now Pakistan, Peru and Korea. Awareness of this truth underlies A.I.D.'s entire program, and further it has sharpened the Agency's appreciation of its role in encouraging and assisting the widest possible participation in development by other American groups—State and local governments, private business and non-profit organizations. An Office of Private Resources is being established in A.I.D. to coordinate the relations of the Agency wtih private groups and to strive for broader participation from them.

Much remains to be done. However in little more than a decade, new nations have moved from doctrinaire reliance on state enterprise to a pragmatic support of private initiative.

Evaluation of the effectiveness of such programs is a continuing process, stimulated particularly in the summer of 1965 by the thoughtful and substantive report and recommendations of the Advisory Committee on Private Enterprise in Foreign Aid (the Watson Committee.) Many of the Committee's recommendations (particularly those relating to our investment guaranty programs) have been put into effect; the others are being carefully studied. I am enclosing a copy of the Committee's report, and a report on the status of its recommendations as inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 18, 1966. A further and more comprehensive report on the work accomplished to date is now in preparation, and a copy will be sent to you just as soon as it is available.

In response to your last question, we would say there are no areas in which efforts to promote a private entrepreneurial class would be inadvisable or impractical; there may be a question of the degree to which such efforts can be successful at a given time. When a country government might have policies which hamper free development of private enterprise, or when current economic conditions such as rampant inflation, etc., might stifle development opportunities, it may be necessary to concentrate first on assisting in the correction of these specific detrimental conditions. The end result of such assistance, however, is intended to be the creation of a climate in which private enterprise can thrive and in which direct assistance to the private sector can bear fruit.

I hope this information is helpful, and that you will let us know whenever this office can be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. GIBBONS,
Director, Congressional Liaison.

AID/Washington office with particular responsibility for private sector development:

Office of Development Finance and Private Enterprise.

Bureau for Africa—Office of Capital Development and Finance.

Bureau for Africa—Office of Private Enterprise.

Bureau for Near East and South Asia—Office of Capital Development and Finance.

Bureau for Latin America—Office of Capital Development.

Bureau for Latin America—Private Sector Development Division.

Bureau for Far East—Office of Capital Development and Finance.

Office of International Training.

International Cooperative Development Service.

Current Positions: 474.

Salaries: $5,639,349.

Total A.I.D.: Current Positions: 3,795.

Salaries: $44,097,300.

Question 12: If as argued by the U.S. Department of Agriculture, famine conditions on a rather wide spread scale are effected by 1984, can the United States justify using any of its AID or P.L. 480 resources for projects that are not directly related to food production?

Answer: There are two main points that should be emphasized:

1. Projects *not* directly related to food production are many times necessary to break bottlenecks that stand in the way of *directly* increasing food production. Increased use of fertilizer, for example, requires, among other things, increased production of fertilizer. Increased production requires the building of fertilizer plants which in turn requires inputs from the steel industry, the chemical industry and even the education system. In addition, at all stages transportation facilities are required: farm-to-market roads to get the fertilizer in and the produce out, even perhaps port facilities to get raw materials to the fertilizer plants and to the suppliers. Also, marketing and credit facilities, plus adequate price incentives and perhaps additional education are necesary to induce the farmer to use the fertilizer and everyone else to want to supply it to him. A bottleneck anywhere along the line could slow down the use of fertilizer by the farmer. The main point is that the agricultural sector does not exist as an independent, autonomous unit; it is interrelated in a complex way with the rest of the economy. If many of the nonagricultural sectors do not grow in a more or less balanced way, the agricultural sector itself cannot grow.

2. There are two ways for a country to acquire more food: grow it itself or produce more of something else and trade it for food produced in other countries. The choice between the two should depend on resource endowments. A land-rich country should—all things being equal—specialize in the production of food and trade with a land-poor country whose comparative advantage may lie in an entirely different field. Chile, for example, has good supplies of phosphate and copper and relatively poor land, at least in comparison with its neighbor Argentina, for

example. While everything should be done to increase yields in Chile so long as it is efficient to do so, food output in both countries will be maximized by inducing Chile to concentrate on phosphate and copper production while Argentina concentrates on food production, perhaps utilizing Chilean phosphate and copper for this purpose. To do otherwise would be to waste resources just at a time when we cannot afford to do so.

Question 13: In negotiating AID projects, has our government made any attempt to negotiate the release of U.S. owned local currencies for purposes other than the ones specified in the P.L. 480 agreement under which the currency is acquired? Give details.

Answer: PL 480 local currency sales agreements specify three general purposes for which proceeds are to be used: (1) U.S. Uses—primarily payment of U.S. expenses in the country, (2) Loans to private enterprise, and (3) Loans or grants to the foreign government for economic development, for the common defense and for population control programs. In determining the distribution of currencies for these general purposes, first priority is given to the need for U.S. use currency and to the demand for private loan funds. The specific purposes for which amounts set aside for loans or grants to the foreign government will be used are not usually spelled out in detail in PL 480 sales agreements. For example, the agreements usually provide only that a percentage of sales proceeds will be made available for loans to promote multilateral trade and agricultural and other economic development. This provides sufficient latitude for US AID Missions to reach agreement with the foreign governments on the specific programs or projects for which loan funds will be used without the necessity of renegotiating the PL 480 agreement. In many instances, the problem is a shortage of local currency generated by PL 480 or otherwise available to foreign governments for economic development, the common defense, etc. rather than one of insisting that PL 480 currencies be used for purposes not included in the sales agreement.

SENATE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE WHITE PAPER ON VIETNAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week the Senate Republican policy committee released an in depth historical study of the U.S. involvement in Vietnam entitled "The War in Vietnam." Only 500 copies of this report were printed and they were quickly exhausted. Only brief excerpts of the report appeared in the press. This report has been critically reviewed, praised by some and condemned by others.

It is, I feel, a significant document that merits thorough examination. It deals with the background and future course of America's longest war—a conflict that is costing about $25 billion a year and has already taken over 9,000 American lives.

In order that each person may make his own individual judgment on the report, I believe it should have the widest possible circulation. Accordingly, I have asked that the full text be inserted in the Record, as follows:

The War in Vietnam

(Prepared by the staff of the Senate Republican policy committee, Bourke B. Hickenlooper, chairman, Fred B. Rhodes, Jr., staff director, April 1967)

INTRODUCTION

Dimensions of the war

As of April 1967, the war to contain Communist aggression in Vietnam has assumed for the United States these unusual dimensions:

It means a conflict that has escalated from a small force of 600 American technicians to over a half-million fighting men.

It means over 8,000 men killed.

It means over 50,000 wounded.

It means greatly increased American conscription at a time when the rest of the Western world has done away with its draft.

It means our longest war since the American Revolution—six years—a weary nightmare and yet the men who fight are fighting with extraordinary bravery and skill.

It means not knowing at any given moment precisely who the enemy is.

It means a war which is not simply fought over this tiny land of Vietnam; for this war, unlike all others in American history, is more and more justified as much on geopolitical grounds as on the defense of one small government.

It means our relative isolation as the world's policeman, for here we have no Grand Alliance as in World War II, no United Nations Combined Forces as in Korea. In addition to South Vietnamese troops, four Pacific nations have provided some fighting help—with our financial assistance.

It means fighting a people who claim this is a civil war, and who in turn are spurred on by two giant powers quarreling openly with each other.

It means that while we have committed 500,000 men to battle communism, neither the Soviet Union nor Red China—the great Communist powers—has found it necessary to commit troops.

It means the most frustrating sort of war, with no front lines, which breaks out here and there, even across national borders in Laos and Cambodia, neither of which is involved.

It means spending over $300,000 to kill each enemy soldier.

It means spending $24 billion a year, with another increase in taxes threatened, a further drain on an already inadequate gold supply, and an escalation of inflation.

It means enormous discretionary powers assumed by the President, with Congress asked to approve his actions after the fact.

It means the Nation which started the war—France—and lost it, now has become our most outspoken critic while profiting heavily from the war.

It means a war where, in the eyes of many Asiatics, we are fighting against indigenous Asiatic nationalism, much as France did in the past.

It means the first war in our history fought not only on the battlefield but brought into the American livingroom, every day, through the raw emotionalism of today's mass communications.

It means a war in which religious controversy between Catholic minority and Buddhist majority has come dangerously close to causing collapse of the successive governments of South Vietnam.

Here at home this confusion, this frustration, has raised challenges within Congress, within colleges and universities, within the press, within the military itself—and all to a degree not experienced in the United States since the Civil War. Conscientious objectors today outnumber their Korean counterparts 4 to 1.

PART I

Vietnam is a 2,000 year old country which, because of its exposed position, has been invaded by the Mongols, the Chinese, the Siamese, the French, the Japanese. One of the few things uniting the 30 million Vietnamese is a strong, common tradition of fighting outsiders.

The longest, most recent, most oppressive occupation—from the Vietnamese viewpoint—is still fresh in the minds of most Vietnamese. That occupation was by France; a white, western, capitalist, Christian power. America, no matter how pure its motives, cannot overcome the weight of history insofar as the Vietnamese look at it. In short, their memory of history is what we must learn to deal with, not our concept of it.

The crucial era

The most crucial moments in Vietnam's recent history came at the close of World War II, and are among the least remembered. The critical events of this era—the genesis of today's conflict—bear recounting in the strictest historical terms, complicated though they may be.

For nearly two decades prior to World War II Vietnamese, directed in large measure by Ho Chi Minh, an exiled Communist from Annam, had carried on an underground struggle for independence from France.

Ho Chi Minh became the principal rallying agent for underground factions when the Japanese conquered Indochina during World War II.

The World War II pattern of Axis conquest, that of setting up local, native puppet regimes (Quisling in Norway, Laval in France) was broken in Indochina. The Japanese found a tractable colonial bureaucracy running the country, that of the Vichy French; they took advantage of it, and for a time allowed the French to continue doing business at the same stand, but with new directors. Not all the French in Indochina were so ready to cooperate. Many were secretly allied with the Free French under De Gaulle.

Both the United States and Nationalist China openly recognized Ho as leader of the free Indochina movement during World War II. We supplied Ho's forces, the Vietminh, with arms and advisors.

Because of the Atlantic Charter and the outspoken United States stance in opposition to colonialism, the Vietminh and all Vietnamese had reason to expect U.S. support for their claim to independence following World War II. They had, after all, fought on our side—against both Japan and Vichy France.

Toward the end of the war, alarmed by the growing strength of the independence movement, Japan set up a puppet Vietnam government under the Emperor of Annam, Bao Dai.

Aftermath of Potsdam

The Potsdam Agreement provided that Chinese Nationalist troops were to disarm and intern Japanese forces north of the 16th parallel. British troops were to perform the same task in the south.

On September 2, 1945—following the Japanese collapse—Ho Chi Minh proclaimed from Hanoi the independence of all Vietnam. Bao Dai resigned, offered to serve the new government of independent Vietnam, and was appointed as an advisor.

British occupation forces, under Major General Douglas Gracey, put their own interpretation on the Potsdam Agreement and proceeded first to rearm, and then to use defeated Japanese troops to throw representatives of the newly proclaimed independent Vietnam government out of Saigon.

The consequences of this decision are with us today.

Thereafter, the British rearmed approximately 5,000 French troops interned in Saigon. On September 23, 1945, the British allowed the French *coup d'etat*, returning southern Vietnam to its colonial position under Paris rule.

British and Japanese troops supported the French in battle against Vietnamese units until enough French reinforcements—50,000 of them—arrived by December of 1945 to reestablish total French domination in the south.

Commenting on the use of Japanese soldiers to reestablish European colonialism, General Douglas A. MacArthur is reported to have said:

"If there is anything that makes my blood boil, it is to see our Allies in Indochina and Java deploying Japanese troops to reconquer the little people we promised to liberate. It is the most ignoble kind of betrayal."

An eight-year colonial war

Thereafter began an eight-year colonial war which did not then attract general attention in the United States. We were deeply involved elsewhere.

We were, in 1946, attempting unsuccessfully to establish a modus vivendi with the Soviet Union. The Cold War had begun.

In 1947, through the Marshall Plan, we were trying to rebuild a shattered Europe. This same year we had to move with arms and men to yet another Cold War frontier, the Greek and Anatolian Peninsulas.

In 1948, one more Iron Curtain rang down—this time over Czechoslovakia—necessitating the establishment of NATO to defend the rest of free Europe from Communist aggression. A few months later we were in the grim struggle to save West Berlin—and West Germany—by means of the Berlin airlift.

As for Asia, our attention was riveted on the war between Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists for control of mainland China. In terms of stakes in the Cold War, our commitments were elsewhere than Indochina. While we occasionally urged France to grant independence to these peoples—as we ourselves had already done for the Philippines—our prime concern was to secure French cooperation in forming NATO. Since France was absolutely vital to the success of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and was a permanent member of the U.N., we found it inappropriate to nudge France on the matter of colonialism in quite the same fashion as we did with the Netherlands in Java.

In 1949, the Communists had conquered mainland China, igniting a stormy debate within the United States. It was obvious that a nation of 3.7 million square miles, bursting with half a billion people, under aggressive Communist leadership, had to be contained. This containment of Chinese expansion was to become the key aspect of President Truman's Asia policy.

France argued that while Ho Chi Minh was admittedly the leader of Vietnamese nationalism, he was also a Communist. He was beginning to receive aid from Communist China. Therefore, the French were able to convince us that containment of China meant support of French colonialism in Vietnam.

Vietnam 1946: France recognizes Ho Chi Minh

Despite the "ignoble betrayal" referred to by General MacArthur, Ho Chi Minh found it convenient to negotiate with French representative Jean Sainteny. As a result of the agreement entered into, in March 1946, France recognized the Republic of Vietnam as a "Free State" within the French Union, under Ho Chi Minh, with its capital at Hanoi.

In return, Ho Chi Minh agreed to the stationing of French troops in the north with the understanding they would be withdrawn by 1951. The French agreed to permit a referendum as to whether all of Vietnam would become a unified, independent state within the French Union.

France abided by neither promise.

Troops were not withdrawn, nor were elections held. Instead, France took a step which was to insure 20 years of conflict—conflict which continues to this day.

On June 1, 1946, Admiral G. Thierry D'Argenlieu, the new French Viceroy in Indochina, established and recognized a puppet government in South Vietnam.

The Vietnamese desire for independence was frustrated a second time. Subsequent negotiations proved fruitless. So intense by now was the Vietnamese hatred for France that Ho Chi Minh, a Communist, was able to crystallize these emotions into a willingness by many Vietnamese—whether Communist or not—to fight against the French occupation forces for eight years, eventually to win.

Gradually, Ho Chi Minh's forces won control of most of Vietnam. French power shrunk to control of forts and the few large cities. To bolster their collapsing government in Vietnam, France appealed to the one-time Japanese puppet Bao Dai to again become head of state.

Negotiations were begun with Bao Dai in 1948, finally resulting in the "Elysee Agreements." As ratified by the French Parliament in January 1950, the Agreements—278 pages of tendentious legalisms—created three "autonomous" states, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. In these states, France retained control of foreign relations, armed forces, and, for all practical purposes, finances.

It was at this time, in January of 1950, that Ho Chi Minh sought and secured recognition from the Soviet Union and from Communist China.

On February 1, 1950, Secretary of State Acheson stated that the recognition by the U.S.S.R. and Communist China of Ho Chi Minh's government "should remove any illusions as to the 'Nationalist' nature of Ho Chi Minh's aims and reveals Ho in his true colors as the mortal enemy of native independence in Indo-China."

On February 7, both the United States and Britain recognized the Bao Dai Government.

In May of 1950, Mr. Acheson announced the U.S. would provide aid to restore "security" and "develop genuine nationalism" in Indochina.

With the outbreak of the Korean War in June 1950, President Truman announced the "acceleration" of aid to Indochina.

It was argued in 1950 the decision by President Truman to assist the French in Indochina was a logical extension of the Truman Doctrine which evolved in the Mediterranean in 1947. Under that doctrine the United States had sent aid to Greece and Turkey when threatened with Communist aggression.

There were some basic differences between the Greek-Turkish situation and that found in Vietnam in 1950.

Greece was an independent nation with clearly established and defined borders, and an internationally recognized government. It was being attacked by Greek Communists who were based—and financed—from abroad. There was no popular internal revolution in process, no fight by the Greek people for freedom from foreign domination. The Greek government requested help. First Britain, then the U.S. responded with money, arms, and advisors.

Turkey was also a long-established nation with a recognized government whose borders were threatened by the Soviet Union. The government requested help and we responded with money, arms, and training advisors.

Vietnam was an altogether different situation. For the first time, we were officially committing American arms, money, military advisors to a colonial war on the side of colonial power.

The decision by President Truman was made in a peculiarly turbulent political climate. The fall of China had so charged the political atmosphere in Washington that the French appeal for assistance met readily receptive ears. The overt attack by the Communists in Korea, combined with the Communist recognition of Ho Chi Minh earlier in the year, seemed to justify even more the position adopted by the Truman Administration.

In August of 1950, the first American military advisors arrived in Vietnam—35 of them.

From this point, all opponents of the Bao Dai government were labeled Communists by the French. The tragic, unintended result of this war, as President Eisenhower noted in his book, "Mandate for Change, The White House Years":

". . . had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 percent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader, rather than Chief of State, Bao Dai. . . ."

The Eisenhower inheritance

Aid received from Communist China beginning in 1950 had already enabled Ho Chi Minh's forces to capture one by one the entire French line of forts along the Chinese border. With the conclusion of the Korean War, Communist China was able to increase its aid to the Vietminh.

In 1953, President Eisenhower took office. He was forced to make basic decisions on Indochina almost at once. Most important was whether to continue assistance to the French, cut it back, or end it. President Eisenhower decided to continue and increase American aid, but to attempt to channel this aid around the French directly to Bao Dai and the Vietnamese people. He hoped to make Bao Dai more independent of France, more acceptable to the Vietnamese.

The French balked, insisting on keeping total control over all military and most economic aid. A relatively small program of direct aid to the Vietnamese continued, although it was resented by the French.

By 1954 our aid program had totaled over $1 billion. As the French military collapse accelerated, we were underwriting a high percentage of the cost of their war.

Troubled spring

In January and February of 1954 a four power conference met to discuss the status of Berlin. Unable to resolve that question the representatives turned to other matters and agreed that a conference at Geneva would be convened in May to effect "a political settlement of the Korean question" and to discuss "the problem of restoring peace in Indochina." While not originally intended as a conference to settle boundaries in Indochina, but rather as a discussion of a cease fire, Ho Chi Minh's artillery was already at work writing a different conclusion. The saga of Dien Bien Phu had begun.

With the French military catastrophe at hand, President Eisenhower had to decide whether or not to intervene directly. The question of American intervention in Vietnam was put to the President on March 20, 1954, by the French Chief of Staff, General Paul Ely. He stated that only by massive American intervention could France hope to prevent a defeat at Dien Bien Phu. Without such intervention, it was intimated, France would be obliged to negotiate a settlement with the Vietminh.

In short, the general French thesis—supported by many Americans—seemed to be that if we did not intervene we would be handing the whole of Southeast Asia to the Communists.

A sharp argument arose within the Eisenhower Administration. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Arthur Radford, proposed a major United States military intervention from the sea beginning with air strikes to support the French at Dien Bien Phu. General Matthew Ridgway opposed this.

Congressional leaders were consulted.

President Eisenhower gave serious consideration to such proposals. However, he also circulated our allies in Europe and elsewhere as to the advisability of and their willingness to join in such an intervention. He made clear that any intervention would have to be joint, not unilateral. Britain was the key, and refused, fearing it would scuttle the pending Geneva Conference and involve them in another endless colonial war.

Furthermore, France would not give satisfactory assurances, even at this late date, that it would grant independence to the peoples of Indochina.

In the end, President Eisenhower refused to permit a unilateral armed intervention to save a colonial regime.

He declared that he could not: ". . . conceive of a greater tragedy for America than to get heavily involved now in an all-out war in any of those regions (Indochina)."

The Eisenhower approach

Several facts are worth noting. President Eisenhower, the professional military man, permitted a full, free debate over our Vietnam policy among military chiefs. In effect, it was General Ridgway arguing against the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford.

He also listened to Members of Congress who objected to American intervention in Vietnam.

Even though we had expended enormous amounts of aid in support of the French in Vietnam, President Eisenhower was willing to cash in his chips in 1954, no matter how humiliating it might be to admit we had backed a loser, rather than throw good blood after bad money.

In other words, he realized the application of military power could not resolve a hopeless political situation in Vietnam.

President Eisenhower had listened to all the arguments and weighed them carefully. Regardless of which individual advanced what argument, the ultimate decision was the President's. It was not the arguments that preceded it, but the decision that counted.

The decision had the effect, as well, of cementing as an American position subscribed to by Republican and Democrat alike, at that time, that we should not become involved in another land war in Asia.

As a footnote to history, General Matthew B. Ridgway was to write in his memoirs:

"When the day comes for me to face my Maker and account for my actions, the thing I would be most humbly proud of was the fact that I fought against, and perhaps contributed to preventing, the carrying out of some harebrained tactical schemes which would have cost the lives of some thousands of men. To that list of tragic accidents that fortunately never happened I would add the Indochina intervention."

The Geneva Conference

The Geneva Conference was not arranged to preside over the partition of Vietnam nor the withdrawal of France. Events at Dien Bien Phu—which fell on May 7, the day before the Vietnam phase of the Conference opened—dictated otherwise. The Conference did partition Vietnam and registered ultimate French withdrawal.

Participating in the Indochina phase were the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union, and after prolonged haggling, Communist China. These powers finally agreed agreed that representatives of Cambodia and Laos take part along with a representative of Bao Dai and Ho Chi Minh.

The Conference was uniquely structured in that the five great powers were interested in an agreement on Indochina but were also interested in other problems and negotiations of equal delicacy. Indeed they may have considered the latter of greater importance than peace in Indochina.

The key was the European Defense Community. The U.S. and Britain were attempting to found EDC and felt they could not over-pressure France on the Indochina question. The Soviet Union was equally interested in blocking EDC and pressured Ho Chi Minh to make concessions to France which Ho did not feel were justified. Since the Vietminh controlled three-quarters of all Vietnam, Ho was confident he could quickly capture the rest. He also felt it was but a matter of time before Laos also fell to Communist rule. Communist China, at the time, was trying to present a more moderate image to the world and was willing to cooperate with the Soviet Union in forcing Ho Chi Minh to ease his demands.

During the Conference France underwent a domestic crisis because of military reverses in Indochina and elected a new Premier, and thus a new set of negotiators. Even so, France emerged from the Conference having salvaged at the negotiating table much of which she had lost on the battlefield.

Ho Chi Minh agreed to pull Vietminh forces out of South Vietnam, which they largely controlled, back above the 17th parallel.

The Conference agreed to withdrawal of "regular troops," but did not press the issue of guerrillas. There was to be only routine replacement of troops and armament. Reinforcement and introduction of new weapons were prohibited. The population was to be allowed to move freely from one zone to another. A special "regroupment area" was created in Laos for the Communist Pathet Lao, composed of the northern provinces bordering on China and North Vietnam.

On the subject of reunification of North and South Vietnam the Conference made it clear the 17th parallel was not to be a permanent dividing line. It called for nationwide elections within two years, by July 1956. This last provision was assented to orally by all parties except the U.S. and Bao Dai.

The International Control Commission was to supervise observance of all provisions including elections. The Commission was composed of India (chairman), Poland and Canada.

Neither the U.S. nor South Vietnam signed the agreements. The U.S., in a separate statement, declared it would refrain from disturbing the agreements. The Vietminh probably were persuaded to accept the agreement because they felt confident that in two years the elections would sweep them into power.

Principal gain of the Vietminh was international recognition of their control over what has since become known as North Vietnam.

France—the government and French citizens—emerged from Geneva with Vietnam no longer a drain on resources and manpower, but with their commercial interests intact in South Vietnam. They profited vastly from the American investment, both economic and military, all through this decade. They still profit today.

The new South Vietnam

With Vietnam divided—at least temporarily—as a result of the Geneva Conference, the Eisenhower Administration was faced with yet another critical decision: whether to give aid to the government of South Vietnam.

During the Geneva Conference, Bao Dai had persuaded Ngo Dinh Diem to become premier of his government. Diem was strongly nationalist, anti-French and anti-Communist. He was, however, an unknown quantity, both in his homeland and internationally, as to his ability to govern; many considered him a mere caretaker until the 1956 elections when, they were confident, Ho Chi Minh would come back to power.

The events of the next 18 months read like a history of the Byzantine court. There were American officials—civil and military—who supported Diem, and Americans who thought him inadequate. There were French officials who actively conspired against him; others actively cooperated. Bao Dai—"governing" from Paris or the Riviera—alternately backed his premier, charged him with usurping his power, demanded his resignation, or ordered Viet troops to fight in his defense. Diem's army commander negotiated with the French, or disaffected Vietnamese, to overthrow him.

Diem had no administrative corps upon which to draw, the French were leaving and Vietnamese who had served under the French were not welcome. Great areas of South Vietnam were governed by nearly autonomous religious sects with their own armies. The Saigon police were a Mafia-like group of gangsters—also with their own militia.

Compounding the confusion in Saigon, a million refugees from the north fled Ho Chi Minh's Communist dictatorship and settled in South Vietnam. Diem had to provide housing, employment and food for the refugees and attempt to relocate them.

Ho Chi Minh used the two years 1954–56 to consolidate his power in North Vietnam. No longer leading a band of guerrillas, he took the course all newly-constituted Communist regimes have taken. Those who opposed his rule were killed. At least 50,000, perhaps as many as 100,000 were slaughtered. A peasant uprising were put down brutally. Small landowners—many of them with only a tiny fraction of an acre—were treated as though they were absentee landlords: they were shot.

In short, the millions who fled south were fleeing a reign of terror.

Diem: The successful years

Diem hung on. For the first time there was a Vietnam independent of both France and the Communists. A group of officials within the Eisenhower Administration argued that this fact alone merited American support and aid. Additionally, they argued, such aid could now go directly to the Vietnamese people, in line with the original Eisenhower goal.

Thus, when Diem formerly requested assistance from the United States—economic aid immediately to help care for the refugees as well as long-term aid programs—President Eisenhower agreed to help in a letter dated October 23, 1954.

That letter, so often trotted out by succeeding Administrations to prove that whatever they did was simply in line with the Eisenhower "legacy" deserves to be quoted:

"I am accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador . . . to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid is supplied.

"The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam, endowed with a strong Government. Such a Government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalistic aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people."

There are several points worth noting with respect to this offer of aid.

The most important is that a primary condition was attached, and reiterated in several different ways, to wit, that the new Government had to make the proper effort to survive on its own in order to receive economic and military assistance. This principle of "self-help" on the part of the recipient country had long been advocated by Republicans.

The letter was primarily "political" in its prescriptions, emphasizing the establishment of a "strong," "viable" government, and the effecting of needed reforms in the country. The military program was intended to establish a climate of security to make the former possible.

A month previous, in September 1954, the SEATO agreement and the Manila Pact had been agreed to by the U.S. and other nations, specifically giving the states of Indochina a guarantee against aggression from the outside and subversion from within.

This, plus the promise of aid, had the immediate effect of giving the Diem Government a combination of psychological, economic and military support necessary for it to survive.

Diem, thereafter, moved first against the gangsters around Saigon, and after defeating and dispersing them, disarmed and suppressed the autonomous religious sects. By October 1955, he felt strong enough to propose a referendum between the absent Bao Dai and himself. It was clear that Diem would have won overwhelmingly in any event, but his brother felt it necessary to manipulate the election giving Diem about 98 percent of the vote. This was the first indication that Diem's concept of a "viable" government was one in which authority was centralized in the person of the President.

The 1956 nonelection

The Geneva Agreements called for a national plebescite in Vietnam by July 1956. That election was never held.

Diem knew that were the election to be held, it would be a popularity contest between himself and Ho Chi Minh; and he knew Ho would quite likely win. Ho was far better known as the leader in the fight against France. He had the aura of success about him. On a head-count basis there were simply more votes to be cast in the north than in South Vietnam. Further, Diem felt the International Control Commission could not supervise the election properly in the North and that Ho could as easily manipulate the polling there as Diem had in his own election in 1955. Finally, France, which had been commissioned at Geneva to help the ICC supervise the election in the south had pulled out completely, early in 1955, at Diem's insistence. The Geneva co-chairmen, Britain and Russia did not name a replacement for the French.

So, Diem decided against allowing the election.

He defended his action by saying neither his Government nor the United States had agreed at Geneva to the election and therefore were not bound by that agreement, and that France, which had agreed was gone. Technically, perhaps, he was correct. His decision foreshadowed a renewal of guerrilla activity a year later, in 1957, which became dangerously widespread and brutal in 1959–60.

Diem in decline

Diem, by 1957, had taken other actions which made the renewal of revolutionary guerrilla warfare both inevitable and successful.

He suppressed all political opposition in the south, and not just the Viet Cong, but those who attempted to criticize him through the regular channels of parliament and press. His administration drew to a large extent from the Catholic refugees from the north, causing the beginnings of friction with the largely Buddhist population of the south.

Throughout history Vietnam's thousands of villages were traditionally governed by village chiefs or headmen. These village leaders had their family roots deep in the local soil, many having lived in the same village for centuries. Diem chose to replace many of these village headmen with appointees of his own from Saigon, causing deep resentment among the villagers so governed.

This resentment made it easier for the Viet Cong to draw much of its early support from non-Communist South Vietnamese. Many of the revolutionists in the South were not necessarily Communist to begin with, but rather anti-Saigon or anti-Diem.

The Eisenhower Administration has been criticized for not pushing Diem harder on political "reforms." What is really meant is that Diem allowed the power structure he had so carefully put together in 1954–55 to disintegrate. To talk of superimposing western democratic institutions overnight on the Vietnamese culture is pointless. There exists no truly democratic nation from Burma to the gates of China in all of Southeast Asia.

A candid statement as to Diem's disintegrating regime, however, should not obscure one important point.

President Eisenhower stuck to his basic position that if there was a solution in South Vietnam, it was political and not military, insofar as the U.S. was concerned. That fundamental precept was not to be altered until 1961 when the new Administration of President John F. Kennedy took office.

Thus, the Republican position could be summarized:

(1) No American armies in Asia, no land war in Asia;

(2) No commitment to aid colonialism or to suppress nationalism in Asia;

(3) In any event, no unilateral military intervention; a resort to force only under some international sanction, in particular the U.N.;

(4) Any multilateral commitment to force should be in a specific area, for a specific, limited purpose in order to keep the conflict localized;

(5) Specifically in South Vietnam, the supplying of aid—money, supplies, arms—but not U.S. armies.

PART II—YEARS OF FAILURE

The Kennedy administration

In 1961 President Kennedy had most of the same options President Eisenhower had in 1953; he could continue economic and military aid with the same emphasis on a political solution; he could increase aid, cut it, or phase it out. The choice was his.

We tend to forget the political climate of the time. The tone of the new Administration was one of disdain for the performance of Eisenhower, particularly in the field of foreign affairs. There was a tendency in the Kennedy Administration to believe that everything could be fixed if the proper American was sent there to fix it.

On April 30, in Vietnam, a group of 18 South Vietnamese leaders who had fought against the French signed an open letter to Diem demanding economic, administrative and military reforms. By November 11, anti-Diem feeling was so intense a military coup by elite paratroop battalions was attempted against the Diem regime. It failed.

One month later, in December 1960, the National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam (NLF) was formed by militant South Vietnamese insurgents—mostly Communists. Their platform was a renewal of open, armed warfare against the Saigon government, following 3 years of terror and assassination.

In dealing with the NLF, successive Democratic Administrations have assumed since 1961 that the revival of the war in the South was undertaken solely at Hanoi's initiative. Secretary of State Dean Rusk says the war in the south "could end literally in 24 hours" if Hanoi so decided.

U.S. State Department assumptions that (1) South Vietnamese Communists are totally controlled by Hanoi, and (2) there is absolutely no difference between the ambitions of the two, are open to question.

It should be noted that the NLF has been southern oriented. Forty of their senior leaders were native South Vietnamese. The South Vietnamese Communists have, in the past, found Hanoi quite willing to enter into agreements at the expense of the South Vietnamese where Communist or not. Examples:

One, on March 6, 1946, Ho Chi Minh entered into an agreement with the French which provided for a "free state" embracing what is now North Vietnam, but leaving southern Vietnam under French control.

Two, a second agreement on September 14, 1946, further confirmed Paris rule over the South Vietnamese.

Three, the Geneva Agreements of July 1954, left the south under control of the Diem government for at least 2 more years—this when most of the south was already under Communist control.

Four, thereafter, neither Hanoi nor Peking, nor Moscow made strong representations against dropping elections in 1956, in effect confirming Diem's control and leaving the South Vietnamese Communists out in the cold.

All of which is a reminder to the South Vietnamese Communists that North Vietnam has separate interests, and has not in the past been the most reliable of allies.

On January 29, 1961, Hanoi Radio recognized the NLF, praised it and shortly thereafter infiltration from North Vietnam into the south was stepped up. Terrorism was on the rise; assassinations of South Vietnamese increased; attacks on Diem military forces rose in number and ferocity.

President Kennedy, concerned with this increased Communist activity, told a news conference on May 5, 1961, use of American forces in South Vietnam was under consideration.

Thereafter, American counter-insurgency forces were moved into South Vietnam; President Kennedy reverted to old fashioned gunboat diplomacy and sent an aircraft carrier to demonstrate off Haiphong; troops were sent into Thailand and then withdrawn to show our strength and readiness to move.

From the vantage point of 1967 these maneuvers seem to have the thrust and feint of shadow boxing, but they were military actions and made more fateful military actions which were to follow much easier.

The parade to Saigon

In 1961, too, began a parade of political, diplomatic and military figures from Washington to Saigon. May 11, six days after the President's press conference, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was dispatched to Southeast Asia. Warmed by a cordial, two-day session, Mr. Johnson likened President Diem to George Washington, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill.

In a joint statement at Saigon, May 13, Diem and Mr. Johnson said:

"The United States recognizes that the President of Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, who was recently reelected to office by an overwhelming majority of his countrymen despite bitter Communist opposition, is in the vanguard of those leaders who stand for freedom on the periphery of the Communist empire in Asia."

On returning from Southeast Asia, Vice President Johnson wrote a memorandum to President Kennedy dated May 23, 1961:

"The fundamental decision required of the United States—and time is of the greatest importance—is whether we are to attempt to meet the challenge of Communist expansion now in Southeast Asia by a major effort in support of the forces of freedom in the area or throw in the towel. This decision must be made in a full realization of the very heavy and continuing costs involved in terms of money, of effort, and of U.S. prestige. It must be made with the knowledge that at some point we may be faced with the further decision of whether we commit major U.S. forces to the area or cut our losses and withdraw should our efforts fail. We must remain master of this decision."

Close upon the Vice President's heels, Professor Eugene Staley of Stanford University visited Saigon for the Administration. He was commissioned to direct an all-embracing study which was to form the basis for a new program of American aid.

Staley strategic hamlets

Staley prescribed large increases in the Vietnamese army, the Civil Guard and village militia, together with an increased flow of arms and radio communications equipment. Most of this equipment which went to the villages was later acquired by the Viet Cong.

The Staley plan also called for creation of the Strategic Hamlet, whereby scattered villagers would be brought together in compounds better to protect them from marauding Viet Cong. It was based on the successful British tactic in Malaya.

There were, however, basic differences between the British situation in Malaya a decade earlier and that found in Vietnam in 1961.

First, with the cooperation of the Thailand government, the British were able to seal the border and therefore deny the Communists in Malaya any overland supply routes.

Second, the Communist foe were largely Chinese aliens, squatters, and therefore readily identifiable.

Third, the native Malayan people were willing to cooperate because of the hostility with which they regarded these Chinese aliens. At most in Malaya the hard-core Communist terrorists numbered no more than 8,000 and the total Chinese population something over 400,000.

Fourth, the French had already tried it during their war in Vietnam and failed.

In Vietnam there could be no sealing off of the Laotian border which was controlled by Communists. Infiltration and cross-border movement were easy for the guerrillas. In Vietnam, the Communist guerrillas were indigenous and could not be distinguished from non-Communist villagers. In Vietnam the villagers had lived on the same land for generations. They objected vehemently to being moved from their villages into what could too often be described as concentration camps. Finally, in Vietnam the guerrillas totaled between 15,000 and 20,000 armed men in 1961 and by 1962 this figure had grown to 30,000.

Yet, President Kennedy approved the program. On September 17, 1961, R. G. K. Thompson, former permanent Defense Secretary in Malaya, was brought to Vietnam to put the Staley plan into action.

The Taylor-Rostow mission

On October 11, 1961, President Kennedy announced he was sending his military advisor, General Maxwell Taylor, and Economist Walt W. Rostow, then the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs, to South Vietnam. Their mission, charged the President was to find out "whether Vietnamese nationalism had turned irrevocably against us or still might serve as a basis for the fight against Communism."

It is generally agreed that the Taylor report contained not simply recommendations to beef up and improve military operations, but made a strong case for sweeping political reforms in the Diem government, including increased freedom of speech, some form of decentralization, and the release from jail of bona fide nationalist leaders.

Unfortunately, General Taylor's report was severely denounced by the government-controlled Saigon press for what it termed an attempt to infringe on South Vietnamese sovereignty. On November 24, 1961, the newspaper *Thoi-Bao* ran an eight-column headline: "Republic of Vietnam No Guinea Pig For Capitalist Imperialism—Is It Not Time to Revise Vietnamese-American Collaboration?" The accompanying article, echoed by other Saigon newspapers, contained accusations of American "interference" with internal affairs of South Vietnam, aimed at "gaining profits under the exploitation policy of capitalist imperialism." The Diem government refused to be swayed by broad diplomatic hints that we might recall our Ambassador if reforms were not effected.

The result was a joint American-Vietnamese eleven-point declaration of January 1962, which was clearly a compromise in favor of Saigon. The political reforms urged by Taylor were watered down, but military and economic support were increased.

The qualitative shift

The war in Vietnam—and American involvement—had taken a qualitative shift. By the end of 1961, it became apparent that the Kennedy Administration had opted for military intervention.

Arthur Schlesinger admits that Mr. Kennedy's decision at the end of 1961 "was to place the main emphasis on the military effort."

The first American soldier was killed in open combat in 1961.

Perhaps the most succinct account of President Kennedy's decision to escalate the Vietnam conflict is that of his Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Robert Manning, who wrote in April 1967:

"One day late in 1961, President Kennedy discussed with his counselors a decision to increase the American 'presence' in South Viet Nam from a few hundred 'military advisers' to a military force of 15,000 men. Undersecretary of State George Ball opposed this, arguing that it would seriously alter the character of the war and might eventually suck more than 300,000 American men into action there. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara agreed that Ball's reservations were fair ones, but they were willing to risk the consequences. Kennedy decided that he was too.

"Hindsight marks that decision as a critical step in this country's creeping escalation toward international tragedy and a domestic crisis of politics and morality. Yet in the news reports of the day it was characterized only as a 'modest' increase in American advisory help to the beleaguered South Vietnamese government.

"What if news reporters had been told of the full discussion? They would have reported that the United States had decided to increase its commitment to 15,000 men, that this might lead to the involvement of as many as 300,000 soldiers—then unthinkable—and that the President's advisers disagreed about taking such a step. If the newsmen had told that story, how would the American public have reacted? Would the course of history have been changed?"

Note.—The historian searching for a motive in President Kennedy's decision to opt for a military solution in Vietnam finds two separate accounts. The first is that of James Reston, *New York Times* editor: "A few minutes after this meeting (with Khrushchev in Vienna in June 1961) President Kennedy told me that apparently Khrushchev had decided that 'anybody stupid enough to get involved in that situation (the Bay of Pigs) was immature, and anybody who didn't see it thru was timid and, therefore, could be bullied.'" Mr. Reston says, President Kennedy then put 12,000 American soldiers into Vietnam as an offset to Khrushchev's estimate of him, altho he was amply warned that he was creating an unlimited commitment and was violating all his pronouncements about not allowing the United States to get into an Asian land war. (*Washington Daily News*, June 2, 1966). The second account is found in "Facing the Brink" by Edward Weintal and Charles Bartlett. "Had he not suffered reverses in the Bay of Pigs and Laos," they write, "it may well be that President Kennedy would have thought twice before expanding the Viet Nam commitment early in 1962 from 700 to 11,000 advisers. Had he followed a long-range policy plan rather than an understandable concern for his image as a result of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, he might have reduced rather than increased the Viet Nam commitment."

The two principal historians of the Kennedy Administration, Theodore Sorensen and Schlesinger, both plead that past American policy gave Mr. Kennedy virtually no alternative. Schlesinger wrote that President Kennedy, "had no choice now but to work within the situation he had inherited," and Dulles' policy in South Vietnam had "left us in 1961 no alternative but to continue the effort of 1954." Sorensen agreed.

Accepting this thesis at face value—that an entire Democratic Administration was bereft of alternatives—pictures President Kennedy as a mere robot with no responsibility for whatever actions he took in Vietnam. Carried to its ultimate absurdity this thesis presents Lyndon Johnson as a captive of George Washington's policies, with no real justification for quadrennial Presidential elections.

United States again backs Diem

By February 7, 1962, the total of U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam had increased to 4,000. Three weeks later, two fighter planes piloted by members of the South Vietnam Air Force, bombed and strafed President Diem's Saigon palace. Diem's relations with American newsmen were deteriorating as correspondents for U.S. papers and networks were booted out of South Vietnam with increasing frequency. Yet the Kennedy Administration, by the beginning of March 1962, was attempting to rally public opinion behind Diem. *Time* described it this way on February 23, 1962:

"Whatever the difficulties, the U.S. is sticking with Diem. Speaking last week to Rotarians in Saigon, U.S. Ambassador Frederick Nolting Jr. urged critics of Diem to be boosters instead of naysayers. 'The divisions among patriotic, anti-Communist Vietnamese, which are no secret to anyone here,' said Nolting, 'are in my judgment a great barrier to your country's progress and a real danger to your country's survival.' Conceding that Diem was taking his own sweet time in instituting reforms, Nolting said that he agreed 'to a certain extent' with those Vietnamese who complain that 'the real benefits of a free society are not getting through to the people.' But he also praised Diem's 'dedicated and courageous leadership,' added that reforms 'could be accomplished relatively quickly if only more people were willing to work and sacrifice to accomplish them.'"

Washington soon after, according to *The New York Times*, instructed the American Mission in Saigon "to get along with President Ngo Dinh Diem's regime come hell or high water and forget about political reforms."

Lest the scale be tipped too far against Diem, it must be remembered the fabric of his regime was further weakened by acts of Communist terrorists. During 1962, an estimated 1,700 South Vietnamese civilians were assassinated by the Viet Cong, frequently with unimaginable barbarism, and 9,688 were kidnaped. Their targets were not just Diem's unpopular village administrators but schoolteachers, and those engaged in agriculture and social reform; literally irreplaceable citizens of South Vietnam.

Peking proposal

On March 1, 1962, Secretary Rusk commented on the request by Peking of February 24, 1962 that the co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference, and other countries concerned, consult regarding Vietnam.

Said Rusk, ". . . the United States is always prepared to talk about situations which represent a threat to the peace, but what must be talked about is the root of the trouble; in this case it is the Communist aggression against Vietnam in disregard of the Geneva Accords."

No talks were held.

The ICC report

On June 2, 1962, the Canadian and Indian members of the International Control Commission in Vietnam created by the 1954 Geneva Accords issued a report (which Poland refused to sign) charging North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and the United States with factual violations of the Geneva Accord.

Thereafter, the Commission issued no more reports until 1965.

U.S. Marines in Thailand

In 1961, The Three Princes War resumed in Laos. The U.S. had withdrawn its chips from the middle or "Neutral" Prince, and placed them on the "Rightist" Prince. His Royal Laotian Army suffered serious defections and reverses in 1962, and was driven by the Neutralist forces and Pathet Lao Communist forces across the Mekong River into Thailand. On May 15, 1962, at the request of Thailand, President Kennedy dispatched a force of 5,000 U.S. Marines into northern Thailand. On July 30, 1962, the Marines were withdrawn. Their effect on the outcome of the Geneva Conference on Lao was, at best, problematical.

The Conference convened in 1961, and finally achieved agreement in 1962. The agreement was billed by the Kennedy Administration as neutralizing all of Laos. Actually it left untouched the Pathet Lao control of the Laotian territory bordering on Vietnam, through which North Vietnamese have been infiltrating to South Vietnam and supplying the Viet Cong.

About this time, in 1962, comforting analyses of the Vietnam conflict by two of the most prominent U.S. State Department officials were offered for public consumption, one as to the inferiority of the enemy and the other as to the limited nature of our commitment.

Said Under Secretary of State George W. Ball:

"The guerrillas whom the Vietnamese Army is fighting are under distinct handicaps. In many cases they are poorly trained and equipped and not motivated by deep conviction. Rather, they are merely unsophisticated villagers or peasants who have been conscripted by terror or treachery. In such a case they are likely to have had only rudimentary training in weapons-handling and tactics. Their equipment may be makeshift, often just what they can capture or fabricate themselves.

"Only the leaders and the hard core have a strong ideological commitment. The rank and file are their puppets—those whom they have bought, coerced, or intimidated."

And Mr. Kennedy's roving ambassador Averell Harriman, in explaining why we could afford a military commitment in Vietnam but not Laos, said:

"In Vietnam, on the other hand," he said in 1962, "a decision to assist the Republic of Vietnam to defend itself against the sort of attack being waged in that country would not involve the deployment of U.S. combat forces and would not require the occupation of foreign territory by the United States or other Western forces."

Political developments in South Vietnam

On June 26, 1962, South Vietnam's National Assembly extended its own term of office by one year. And when on October 26, the Assembly extended Diem's emergency powers to rule by decree for another year, it was an act of near prophecy, for Diem was assassinated precisely one year and seven days thereafter.

In considering the politics of the Diem regime, it must be kept in mind that in Vietnam, as in most Asiatic countries, no tradition of formal representative government exists.

The Vietnam nationalist parties that formed during French rule were secret movements accustomed to operating clandestinely and often warring with each other. This tradition of secretiveness, of factionalism, of small, select groups composed of men who could be trusted implicitly, continues today.

Diem accomplished a miracle in putting together a stable government, and attracting support of many key factions of the elite in South Vietnam. If there is one point most observers agree on, it is that from 1958 onward Diem seemed to draw inward, losing touch with the coalition he had put together.

More and more, he appeared to rely on the advice of his immediate family and few others. Personal government, not new to Vietnam, was carried to an extreme.

Thus, when crack paratroop battalions surrounded his palace in 1960 and demanded reforms, their leaders were not thinking in terms of Western democracy; rather, they sought an end to deliberate use of the personal power of members of the Diem family to monitor the loyalty of civil and military officials, to control both the formulation and execution of policy, to determine who should be promoted in the civil and military bureaucracies, and to manipulate the military in such a way as to interfere with successful prosecution of the conflict with the Viet Cong.

While Communist pressure increased, Diem and his family devoted increasing attention to sumptuary legislation to improve Saigon morals. As an example of the state to which the National Assembly had been reduced, Madam Nhu—Diem's sister-in-law—was able to dictate legislation prohibiting men and women from dancing with each other. . . .

Meanwhile, Viet Cong victories multiplied. On January 2, 1963, a force of 200 Viet Cong attacked and defeated a demoralized force of 2,000 South Vietnam regulars in the Mekong Delta. Five helicopters were shot down, killing three Americans.

By spring, military action was overshadowed by a series of tragic political events; yet Kennedy Administration pronouncements remained highly optimistic.

In 1962 Defense Secretary McNamara had said, "Every quantitative measurement we have shows we're winning this war."

On March 8, 1963, Secretary Rusk said the struggle against the Viet Cong was "turning an important corner" and concluded Diem's forces "clearly have the initiative in most areas of the country."

The fall of Diem

Of the near-million North Vietnamese who fled southward in 1954–55, roughly 90 percent were Catholic. It was among these people that Diem found many of his most loyal administrators. South Vietnam, predominantly non-Christian, found these refugees doubly alien. They were from the north; they were adherents of a Western religion. Whatever favoritism was shown northern Catholics by the Diem regime—and there is some evidence of such favoritism—created frictions and jealousies on the part of the leaders of the Buddhist majority.

On May 8, 1963, in the city of Hue, government troops fired into a crowd protesting Diem's strictures against flying the Buddhist flag during a religious festival.

Demonstrations spread to Saigon. On June 11, a monk committed suicide by setting fire to himself, to be followed in the next six months by six other acts of self-immolation.

On August 21, Diem's Special Forces attacked Buddhist pagodas in Saigon, Hue, and other cities, arresting a number of Buddhists.

Diem's Buddhist Foreign Secretary, Vu Van Mau, resigned in protest. Mme. Nhu's father, the Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, also resigned along with most of his staff.

Students joined the Buddhist demonstrations. Diem closed the Universities in Saigon and Hue, and all secondary schools in Saigon. About 4,000 students were arrested.

Not all opposition to Diem, his brother Nhu, and his sister-in-law, Mme. Nhu, arose from Buddhist leaders. Discontent in key segments of South Vietnam's rickety power structure was being transformed into rebellion.

Still, on July 11, 1963, Ambassador Nolting returned to Saigon from Washington with assurances of continued U.S. support of the government of President Diem. He called for "unity of purpose" and warned against "internal dissension."

Newspaper accounts describing the deteriorating situation in Vietnam had long been labeled propaganda by Administration spokesmen. By the end of summer the Kennedy Administration could no longer maintain the credence of the American people that Diem was popular with his own people and was winning the war. On September 2, 1963, in a CBS interview President Kennedy admitted Diem's regime had "gotten out of touch with the people" and that he believed it could regain support only if there were "changes in policy and perhaps with personnel."

On September 21, Secretary McNamara and General Taylor once again flew to Saigon. While they were there elections were held for the National Assembly. All candidates were approved in advance by the Diem Government. Obviously, so far, no change in policy or personnel had taken place.

On October 2, 1963, the White House issued a summary of the McNamara-Taylor report on their findings. The summary makes interesting reading:

"Major U.S. assistance in support of this military effort is needed only until the insurgency has been suppressed or until the national security forces of the Government of South Vietnam are capable of suppressing it. Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. They reported that by the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

Added General Paul Harkins, Commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon, in the November 1, 1963 service newspaper *Stars and Stripes:*

"Victory in the sense it would apply to this kind of war is just months away and the reduction of American advisors can begin any time now."

As *Stars and Stripes* was being delivered to the newsstands that November 1, a military junta led by General Duong Van Minh, overthrew the Diem Government and seized control of Saigon. The next day, November 2, Diem and his brother Nhu were assassinated.

Despite all the clamor, rioting, and discontent among civilians, in the end it was the South Vietnamese military—the group over which the U.S. had the greatest degree of direct control—which was to overthrow and assassinate Diem.

Political chaos was immediate in South Vietnam.

Nonetheless, on November 15, a U.S. military spokesman carried on the McNamara-Taylor-Harkins line and promised 1,000 American military men would be withdrawn from Vietnam beginning on December 3.

On November 22, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated and a new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, took office.

Lyndon Johnson takes command

Once again a new American President had an opportunity to reassess the situation and the American position in Vietnam:

President Johnson could deal with an altogether new government in Saigon; he was not obliged to deal with the Diem family.

The NLF and Viet Cong controlled much of South Vietnam. By June of 1963, the NLF was able to levy taxes in 41 of South Vietnam's 44 provinces.

The NLF had already (reported by Radio Hanoi November 17, 1963) made a six-point peace statement, couched in violent accusatory language.

There were still fewer than 20,000 American troops committed to Vietnam.

According to *The New York Times*, UN Secretary General U Thant met with President Johnson shortly after President Kennedy's assassination and conveyed to him an offer from Ho Chi Minh proposing talks on a settlement.

He still had before him the DeGaulle offer of August 29, 1963, rejected by the Kennedy Administration, to help work for an independent but neutral South Vietnam.

In December 1963, Cambodian Chief of State Norodom Sihanouk again invited South Vietnam to join his country in a neutral confederation.

While President Johnson had options to choose from, President Kennedy did not leave him the same alternatives which President Eisenhower left in 1961. Actions of the Kennedy Administration had decidedly narrowed the field. The American commitment was greater; Americans were actually involved in combat; more and more, American military prestige was at stake.

In addition, President Johnson from all accounts was concerned with maintaining the appearance of continuity in both domestic and foreign policy.

In December 1963, President Johnson made his choice and announced it through his New Year's message to General Minh of South Vietnam. The message read in part:

"The United States will continue to furnish you and your people with the fullest measure of support in this bitter fight. We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and materials as needed to assist you in achieving victory.

"Our aims are, I know, identical with yours: to enable your government to protect its people from the acts of terror perpetrated by Communist insurgents from the north. As the forces of your government become increasingly capable of dealing with this aggression, American military personnel in South Vietnam can be progressively withdrawn.

"The United States Government shares the view of your government that 'neutralization' of South Vietnam is unacceptable. As long as the Communist regime in North Vietnam persists in its aggressive policy, neutralization of South Vietnam would only be another name for a Communist takeover. Peace will return to your country just as soon as the authorities in Hanoi cease and desist from their terrorist aggression.

"I know from my own experience in Vietnam how warmly the Vietnamese people respond to a direct human approach and how they have hungered for this in their leaders. So again I pledge the energetic support of my country to your government and your people."

Thus President Johnson publicly revealed his belief that American involvement in Vietnam required an open-end military commitment.

The President now set the goal as military victory.

At a time when President Johnson was making his decision for deeper American involvement in Vietnam, the opportunity existed to make that involvement worthwhile by insisting on a sound civilian government in Saigon capable of leading the people. Yet, he allowed the military junta to continue its total dominance of the civilian government. The generals neither knew how to govern, nor showed any real desire to learn. The Administration, meanwhile, shipped in more money, more guns, and more American troops.

In the 18 months that followed ten governments passed through Saigon in quick succession, each more disorganized than the last.

The Johnson Administration was to express high hopes for each of these ten regimes. General Khanh, for instance—who replaced General Minh in January 1964—was described by McNamara as "an able and energetic leader," who has "demonstrated his grasp of the basic elements—political, economic and psychological, as well as military—required to defeat the Viet Cong." Etc., etc.

Khanh bounced in and out of the premiership for a year after the McNamara speech, finally was packed off as roving Ambassador to the world.

Despite this political chaos, when McNamara testified before Congress on February 18, 1964, he still insisted the "bulk" of U.S. troops would be pulled out by the end of 1965.

By July 1964, when General William C. Westmoreland succeeded to the command of the U.S. military advisory mission, our advisory body had grown to about 23,000, but the South Vietnamese whom they came to advise were melting away. During the winter of 1964–65 the South Vietnamese Army had dwindled to slightly over 200,000 men. They had lost by desertion, or to the Communists, a good third of their strength.

Not only was South Vietnam suffering from massive desertions from its army, but shortly after Diem's death it was discovered Staley's Strategic Hamlet Program was a crushing failure. The U.S. Mission found thousands of supposedly "secure" hamlets were really controlled secretly by the Viet Cong, who often used them for supply and rest havens. The United States had contributed tens of millions of dollars worth of equipment, including cement, radios, weapons, fertilizer and livestock.

When the Minh junta came into power Premier Tho stated that only 20 percent of the 8,600 Strategic Hamlets the Diem government claimed to have built could in any way be regarded as usable.

The succeeding military governments and juntas did little to remedy this situation. The key to real security for the South Vietnamese peasant lay not so much in barbed wire but in the type of political leadership that would attract his loyalty and make the struggle against the Viet Cong seem worth the risk.

On March 26, 1964, Secretary McNamara admitted: "But the large indigenous support that the Viet Cong receives means that solutions must be as much political and economic as military. Indeed, there can be no such thing as a purely 'military' solution to the war in South Vietnam."

The presidential election

At this point in history conduct of the affairs of Vietnam was once again influenced by political events elsewhere—the United States was involved in a presidential election campaign.

Through the summer of 1964, the Vietnam situation—both political and military—was deteriorating. Day-to-day conduct of the war remained the responsibility of Kennedy appointees who stayed with the Johnson Administration. Rusk, McNamara, Bundy, Rostow, Taylor, were left to handle Vietnam while President Johnson electioneered.

The first indication of a theme that was to be struck repeatedly during the coming campaign was introduced during a television interview on March 15, 1964, when the President told the listening audience:

"I was reading a letter only today that General Eisenhower wrote the late President Diem 10 years ago, and it is a letter that I could have well written to President Khanh and sent out by Mr. McNamara."

One of the most trying aspects of living with Mr. Johnson's conduct of foreign affairs is precisely this gambit which might be termed Diplomatic Darwinism. By this is meant the President's insistence that whatever he may be doing is but part of a steady evolution from commitments made by earlier Presidents, particularly President Eisenhower.

Thus, he was to reiterate during the presidential campaign that his several decisions by which we became engaged in a full-scale shooting war in Vietnam were merely logical implementations of that far away and long ago 1954 Eisenhower letter agreeing to limited aid for South Vietnam—money, supplies and arms, but not combat troops.

Gulf of Tonkin resolution

A second justification, equalling the by-now tattered 1954 letter in usefulness, was the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of August 7, 1964. The series of events leading to the resolution began with a July 30 South Vietnamese naval raid on North Vietnamese island radar and naval installations. According to official accounts, the U.S. Seventh Fleet was not informed of the raid. On August 2, a U.S. destroyer on patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin near the islands was attacked by North Vietnamese PT boats. The PT boats were driven off with gunfire and an air attack. The U.S. formally protested to Hanoi.

On August 4, two U.S. destroyers reported a second attack by North Vietnamese PT boats. President Johnson ordered U.S. "air action" against "gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Vietnam."

On August 5, President Johnson requested Congress to enact a joint resolution "to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia."

Senator Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.) questioned the wisdom of such unilateral action on the part of the United States as provided for by this resolution. During consideration of the resolution he raised the same issue President Eisenhower had raised 10 years earlier when, in 1954, the French requested American assistance at Dien Bien Phu. In 1954, Mr. Eisenhower surveyed our allies as to their willingness to join in taking such a step. Asked Senator Javits of Senator Fulbright in 1964:

"What I wish to know from the Senator is, first: Have we consulted with our allies? Second, what are we to look to from our allies in the way of assistance, aid, comfort, partnership, and the future implementation of the resolution? It is one thing to stand alone; it is another thing to stand with seven other countries, three of them in the area, implementing a solemn commitment, which is just as binding on them as it is on us."

Scope of the resolution

The joint resolution was in three parts. The first expressed Congressional approval of the President's action to repel attacks on U.S. forces, and the third part extended the life of the resolution until the President should determine that peace had been restored or until terminated by concurrent resolution of Congress. These two sections were not challenged in the Senate debate.

Section 2 was the center of discussion. It reads:

"Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense for its freedom."

The potential effect of agreeing to this section was of concern to many Senators. During the Senate debate, Senator Daniel Brewster (D., Md.) asked:

"So my question is whether there is anything in the resolution which would authorize, or recommend, or approve the landing of large American armies in Vietnam or in China?"

Replied Senator J. William Fulbright (D., Ark.) floor manager of the resolution and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"There is nothing in the resolution, as I read it, that contemplates it. I agree with the Senator that that is the last thing we would want to do. However, the language of the resolution would not prevent it. It would authorize whatever the Commander in Chief feels is necessary. . . . Speaking for my own committee, everyone I have heard has said that the last thing we want to do is to become involved in a land war in Asia; that our power is sea and air. . . ."

The reply did not satisfy the Senate. Senator John Sherman Cooper (R., Ky.) went more directly to the heart of the issue. He engaged Senator Fulbright in a lengthy colloquy, part of which follows:

"Mr. Cooper. The second section of the resolution goes, as the Senator said, to steps the President might take concerning the parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the countries under the protocol—which are, of course, Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. The Senator will remember that the SEATO Treaty, in article IV, provides that in the event an armed attack is made upon a party to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or upon one of the protocol states such as South Vietnam, the parties to the treaty, one of whom is the United States, would then take such action as might be appropriate, after resorting to their constitutional processes. I assume that would mean, in the case of the United States, that Congress would be asked to grant the authority to act.

"Mr. Fulbright. I think that is correct.

"Mr. Cooper. *Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?*

"Mr. Fulbright. *That is the way I would interpret it.* . . .

"Mr. Cooper. *I ask these questions because it is well for the country and all of us to know what is being undertaken.* . . .

"Under section 2, are we now providing the President, if he determines it necessary, the authority to attack cities and ports in North Vietnam, not primarily to prevent an attack upon our forces but, as he might see fit, to prevent any further aggression against South Vietnam?

"Mr. Fulbright. One of the reasons for the procedure provided in this joint resolution, and also in the Formosa and Middle East instances is in response, let us say, to the new developments in the field of warfare.

"Under modern conditions of warfare . . . it is necessary to anticipate what may occur. Things move so rapidly that this is the way in which we must respond to the new developments. That is why this provision is necessary or important. Does the Senator agree with me that this is so?

"Mr. Cooper. Yes, warfare today is different. Time is of the essence. But the power provided the President in section 2 is great.

"Mr. Fulbright. *This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that.*

"Mr. Cooper. I understand, and believe that the President will use this vast power with judgment.

"Mr. Fulbright. He intends to do it, and he has done it. . . .

"I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

"Mr. Cooper. I know it is understood and agreed that in the defense of our own ships and forces any action we might take to repel attacks could lead to war, if the Vietnamese or the Chinese Communists continued to engage in attacks against our forces. I hope they will be deterred by the prompt action of the President.

"We accept this first duty of security and honor. But I would feel untrue to my own convictions if I did not say that a different situation obtains with respect to South Vietnam. I know that a progression of events for 10 years has carried us to this crisis. Ten years have passed and perhaps the events are inevitable now, no one can tell. But as long as there is hope and the possibility of avoiding with honor a war in southeast Asia—a conflagration which, I must say, could lead into war with Communist China, and perhaps to a third world war with consequences one can scarcely contemplate today—I hope the President will use his power wisely with respect to our commitments in South Vietnam, and that he will use all other honorable means which may be available, such as consultations in the United Nations, and even with the Geneva powers.

"We have confidence in the President and in his good judgment. But I believe we have the obligation of understanding fully that there is a distinction between defending our own forces, and taking offensive measures in South Vietnam which could lead progressively to a third world war."

(Emphasis added.)

Perhaps the most often repeated statement during debate on the resolution was that the United States should not get bogged down in a land war in Asia. There were equally as many assurances that this was not contemplated.

Yet it was made quite clear that Section 2 of the resolution did in fact authorize the President to send land armies into Vietnam and also to bomb North Vietnam.

Certainly, from their colloquy, both Senator Cooper and Senator Fulbright were firm in their own minds that the resolution did authorize whatever actions the President might see fit to take. If this is the correct interpretation, then it would appear the President is on firm ground when he states—as he has so often since stated—that later commitments of U.S. ground forces to combat as well as the bombings of North Vietnam were authorized by Congress.

Congress drew some assurance from its assumption in 1964 that such a contingency was remote and that the President, being a man of "good judgment," would not act rashly, would use his power cautiously, would always consult Congress as well as the U.N. and the Geneva powers.

The President was to give Congress ample ground for this belief during 1964. During the entire presidential election campaign he repeatedly assured the American people he was not in office to engage in such a massive land war or to take rash actions.

During the debate on the resolution, Senator Thruston B. Morton summarized the feelings of many Republicans in Congress when he said, "I believe Congress should speak loud and clear and make it plain to any would-be aggressor that we intend to stand here. If we make that clear we will avoid war, and not have to land vast armies on the shores of Asia." The President found the resolution spoke loudly enough and clearly enough so that he signed it on August 11.

But this was an election year. And the very next day, August 12, the President was to dull the sound and blur the clarity of the resolution—and his own intentions—with a campaign speech to the Bar Association in New York. He spoke sorrowfully of those who were "eager to enlarge the conflict" and then he added:

"They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover such action would offer no solution at all to the real problem of Vietnam."

This thesis, that American boys were not to be sent half-way around the world to do the job Asian boys should be doing, was repeated in an Akron, Ohio, speech October 21.

This was the President's campaign reassurance to the American people; it may also have contributed to the Communist miscalculation as to American intentions in Vietnam.

Election year—Bargain budgets

Reinforcing Congress' belief that the U.S. commitment in Vietnam would be limited, new obligational authority sought for defense had dropped from $48.1 billion in fiscal 1963, to $47.2 billion in fiscal 1964.

A further decline had been registered in fiscal 1965 when defense N. O. A. (requested in January 1964) amounted to only $46.8 billion. In short, the election year defense requests did not reflect the realities of fighting then going on.

By March 1964, newspaper accounts described Vietnamese reluctance to take U.S. military advice and described the difficulties we were facing in getting Vietnamese troops to fight. On April 25, the AP reported that in the first four and a half months of 1964, 324 American servicemen had become battle casualties.

Beginning in May, with American forces already in combat, reports of serious shortages were verified making necessary the use of dangerously obsolete equipment.

On May 15, Rep. Carl Vinson, then Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, announced he would call Secretary McNamara for a closed session in regard to a full-scale investigation of the use of obsolete military equipment in Vietnam.

The distressing series of events led Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen on May 27 to declare, "While the Johnson Administration falters in indecision, the United States is a party to another treadmill conflict . . ."

By July 1964 the war was costing the United States $1.5 million a day. Announced troop strength in Vietnam had climbed to 18,000.

The Administration found it necessary to request a $700 million defense supplemental appropriation specifically for the war in Vietnam, the first in a chain of afterthought supplementals to follow.

Yet total U.S. troop strength levels consistently failed to reflect the escalation of conflict in Vietnam. On June 30, 1962, total active duty military personnel numbered 2,807,819.

On June 30, 1963, troop strength was down to 2,699,677 and the next year, on June 30, 1964, down a third time to 2,687,409.

By June 30, 1965, after five years of steadily increasing U.S. commitment in Vietnam, total active duty U.S. military personnel had further declined to 2,655,389.

President Johnson's refusal to allow budget requests to follow, even remotely, the actual course of events in Vietnam was to plague the military up to the fiscal 1968 budget. For instance, in fiscal 1966 his initial defense spending request was only $46.8 billion, but once again, a supplemental appropriation of $13.1 billion was required later in the year.

Again, in fiscal 1967, although the main defense appropriation jumped approximately $11.2 billion, a supplemental appropriation of $12.2 billion was requested and received later in the year.

The effect on military procurement—particularly the so-called "long leadtime" items requiring commitment well in advance of actual delivery—was devastating from 1963 through 1966.

Korea—The forgotten lesson

To a frightening degree, these events paralleled the mistakes made over a decade earlier by another Democratic Administration in Korea. Said President Johnson in his January 1967 Budget Message to Congress:

"A year ago we were in the midst of a rapid buildup of our forces in Vietnam. Rather than submit a budget to the Congress based on highly uncertain estimates, I requested funds sufficient to finance the conflict through fiscal year 1967. At the present time the situation is different. While unforeseen events can upset the most careful estimate, we are in a much better position to determine our future requirements in Vietnam. As a consequence, my 1968 budget provides for those requirements on a continuing basis, including the possibility of an extension of combat beyond the end of the fiscal year."

Said the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee 14 years earlier, in May 1953:

"To touch specifically on the budgetary guidelines, it has been testified that the planners could not plan properly for the Korean War because one of the assumptions was that it would be over by the beginning of the fiscal year which was being planned. Budget requests were based on the amount of ammo used plus the replacement of reserve stocks with no thought that the War would continue for a longer period of time.

"In hindsight this is a most unrealistic policy or assumption. It may well have had an adverse effect on our military planners. We know that applied to the Korean ammunition program, an adverse effect occurred somewhere because no substantial quantity of ammunition was produced, and this was responsible for depleting our existing stocks. This is the result of partial mobilization."

Finally, in 1967, Mr. McNamara was to admit:

"Since we can now project our requirements for the conflict in Southeast Asia with far greater confidence than last year, we have changed our basic approach in preparing the FY 1967 Supplemental as well as the FY 1968 Budget. Sufficient funds are being requested in both the FY 1967 Supplemental and the FY 1968 Budget to protect the production leadtime. . . ."

In belated recognition of this fact, the initial Defense Budget request this year is fully $75 billion.

Peace proposals, 1964

After President Kennedy's assassination, repeated newspaper stories told of attempts by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to arrange for some sort of peace negotiations between Hanoi and Washington. Their authenticity was denied by the Johnson Administration.

Today we know that Mr. Thant, in September 1964, made a serious proposal to Hanoi and Washington that they secretly send representatives to Rangoon, Burma to discuss the Vietnam war. Hanoi accepted the proposal yet Washington turned it down.

According to the late Adlai Stevenson, the Johnson Administration refused to discuss peace in Vietnam with Hanoi because of the possible effect on the 1964 elections.

Secretary Thant agreed to wait. After President Johnson's overwhelming reelection, he again made the proposal. Hanoi again agreed but the Johnson Administration, through Secretary McNamara, once again refused.

When *The New York Times* on March 9, 1965 reported that U Thant had undertaken to arrange for such negotiations, Mr. Johnson's State Department denied that it had in fact rejected the Thant proposals.

Only after Eric Severeid published his articles in the November 30, 1965, *Look* concerning the late U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, including Stevenson's revelations about the Thant mission, did the State Department at long last admit the existence of the Thant proposal and that it had been rejected.

This episode, when added to the host of other incidents, utterances, misleading statements, half-truths, outright untruths, emphasizes the hallmark of the Johnson Administration in the conduct of the Vietnam war—a complete lack of candor.

The Americanization of the war

President John Kennedy once remarked the war in Vietnam could be won only so long as it was their war. If it were ever converted into a white man's war, we would lose as the French had lost a decade earlier. In the French period, Paris had some 5,000 to 7,000 administrators, plus the French colonials, in Vietnam. Their troop commitment reached 272,000.

Today, the United States has roughly 500,000 military men in Southeast Asia, plus about 30,000 American civilian administrators, with more of each to come, and with Americans doing most of the fighting.

How did this war become Americanized? As the record has shown, a qualitative shift in the American commitment in 1961—from arms, money, and advisors to armed combat troops—set the stage for increased United States involvement. It also set the stage for the next shift in our commitment, this time a quantitative change.

On February 7, 1965, eight Americans were killed, 62 wounded in a guerrilla attack by the Viet Cong. President Johnson promptly ordered the American Air Force into a retaliatory attack on targets in North Vietnam. Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin was in Hanoi at the time of the first bombing attack.

Correspondents on the scene have speculated Kosygin had gone to Hanoi on a mission to wean North Vietnam away from Peking. The Chinese Communists had not given Hanoi as much material support as promised. Kosygin was in Hanoi to promise Ho Chi Minh more supplies and equipment.

The bombing, when it came, gave the Soviet Union its "reason"—for public consumption, at least—for making such an offer. On February 9, Kosygin made his first public announcement of stepped-up Soviet support for the Hanoi regime.

Each of the first three raids, we carefully notified Moscow, were in retaliation for specific attacks against American military personnel in South Vietnam.

Bombing and troops—Up and up

During this period the military situation in South Vietnam was deteriorating badly. Vietnamese army units were being defeated daily; the Vietnamese army was losing a battalion a week; district capitals were falling weekly; village strongpoints were being overrun nightly.

Within this framework the President stepped up the bombing of North Vietnam, no longer as retaliatory raids but as an effort to break the supply route to the South which Ho was using to supply the Viet Cong. American military strength in South Vietnam began to climb dramatically; by mid-1965 we had 53,000 ground troops in Vietnam and by year's end over 200,000.

The escalation continued through 1966. Our bombings, formerly tactical—to interdict supply routes—were now strategic, as well, aimed at whatever steel mills, power plants, industrial complexes existed. By spring of 1967, the United States had committed 500,000 men to a land war in Asia and was spending, for that conflict alone, one-fifth of its entire national budget.

In casualties, there are over 9,000 Americans dead; 50,000 wounded.

We have lost over 1,200 airplanes and nearly 800 helicopters.

Yet at the beginning of April 1967, the United States and South Vietnamese were able to claim control over fewer villages and hamlets than in 1962.

Administration policy

In 1961 the State Department issued a white paper on Vietnam which emphasized the indigenous nature of the conflict. It said in part:

"The basic pattern of Viet Cong (Vietnamese Communist) activity is not new, of course. It operated, with minor variations, in China, and Mao Tse-tung's theories on the conduct of guerrilla warfare are known to every Viet Cong agent and cadre. *Most of the same methods were used in Malaya, in Greece, in the Philippines, in Cuba, and in Laos. If there is anything peculiar to the Vietnam situation, it is that the country is divided and one-half provides a safe sanctuary from which subversion in the other half is directed and supported with both personnel and material.*" (Emphasis added)

By 1965 the indigenous character of the Viet Cong was being played down in favor of the new theme; that is, aggression from the north. Said the 1965 State Department white paper on Vietnam, in part:

"The war in Vietnam is a new kind of war, a fact as yet poorly understood in most parts of the world. Much of the confusion that prevails in the thinking of many people, and even many governments, stems from this basic misunderstanding. For in Vietnam a totally new brand of aggression has been loosed against an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom.

"Vietnam is *not* another Greece, where indigenous guerrilla forces used friendly neighboring territory as a sanctuary. (Emphasis State's own)

"Vietnam is *not* another Malaya, where Communist guerrillas were, for the most part, physically distinguishable from the peaceful majority they sought to control.

"Vietnam is *not* another Phillippines, where Communist guerrillas were physically separated from the source of their moral and physical support."

Perhaps the State Department was correct in its new assessment of the nature of the war. Perhaps, too, the increased North Vietnamese involvement was to match increased U.S. commitment to battle.

Preconditions to negotiations

This second white paper was issued during a three-week lull between the first retaliatory air raids on North Vietnam in 1965 and the commencement of sustained bombing. During this lull, U Thant, recognizing the possibility of retaliation turning into open warfare, approached Hanoi and Washington with a renewed plea for negotiations.

The Johnson Administration at this point laid down what seemed to be two basic preconditions to peace negotiations:

(1) That Hanoi accept South Vietnam as a separate and independent State.

(2) That Hanoi agree to pull all forces out of the South.

Meanwhile, a separate appeal had come from the conference of 17 so-called nonaligned nations meeting at Belgrade asking Hanoi to negotiate. Both appeals—Thant's and the nonaligned nations'—were dismissed by Hanoi on grounds the United States had already *rejected* any negotiations on a "no-preconditions" basis.

Johnson position hardens

In retrospect, it is clear the Johnson Administration did not wish to negotiate during this period. The Saigon government controlled barely 20 percent of South Vietnam. Its generals made no bones of the fact they were losing to the Viet Cong. To come to the bargaining table in hopes of salvaging an independent South Vietnam would be asking the impossible. In 1954, at Geneva, Ho Chi Minh had agreed to relinquish the area of Vietnam south of the 17th parallel in return for nationwide elections in 1956, elections which failed to materialize. For the U.S. to hope for similar concessions in 1965 was unrealistic.

In commenting on the President's attitude toward negotiations at this time, Senator Albert Gore (D., Tenn.) said:

"We know that at one time President Johnson opposed negotiation. He was very much opposed to negotiation or a negotiated settlement at the time I suggested more than a year ago. . . . Fortunately at his speech at Johns Hopkins (in April 1965), he changed his strategy and came to what I think was a far more realistic defensible, feasible position."

President Johnson added to the confusion surrounding a negotiated settlement when, on March 25, 1965, he said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in Southeast Asia."

Did the President indeed wish to return to the essentials of the 1954 Geneva Agreement? To hold nationwide elections in Vietnam as provided for at Geneva? To withdraw all foreign troops as provided for at Geneva? To reunite North and South Vietnam as provided for at Geneva? Or was the U.S. position really the one stated by Dean Rusk February 25, 1965, i.e. that Hanoi must accept South Vietnam as a separate, independent state?

Again, contradiction within the welter of statements coming from the Johnson Administration confuses not only Americans, but allies, bystanders and enemy alike. If a policy of deliberate obfuscation was desired, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Johnson succeeded. Clearly, too many "official" statements have been made by too many different officials, shaped and adapted to the wants of too many different audiences.

On April 13, 1965, Hanoi also hardened its position, laying down four principal points:

"1. Recognition of the basic national rights of the Viet Nam people: peace, independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.

"2. Pending peaceful reunification of Viet Nam, while Viet Nam is still temporarily divided into two zones, the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Viet Nam must be strictly respected; the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, there must be no foreign military bases, troops and military personnel in their respective territory.

"3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Viet Cong), without any foreign interference.

"4. The peaceful reunification of Viet Nam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference."

Present political situation

The South Vietnamese Constituent Assembly in March 1967, adopted a new constitution for the Republic. It was promptly approved by the ruling junta of Marshal Ky. The constitution provides for free elections throughout South Vietnam and on the surface seems to provide some hope for stability and political progress.

However, with the Viet Cong controlling at least 50 percent of the territory, and 40 percent of the population—and even more when the sun is down—the significance of the elections seems problematical. Elections for President are scheduled September 1, 1967.

It is also problematic as to how freely a newly-elected government can operate. The military, to date, has provided the most cohesive force in Vietnam, at least from our viewpoint. It can be assumed they will let go of the reins of power reluctantly, constitution or no constitution. The problem, however, is not simply the military in Saigon, according to seasoned Southeast Asia reporter, Marvin L. Stone, in his article "Vietnam—A Hopeless War?", in *U.S. News and World Report* for Dec. 5, 1966:

"At the top, it is a Government of power blocs and factionalism, in the French tradition. Leaders in Saigon are preoccupied fighting to keep their grasp on power.

"At just about every level below the top it is a Government of local fiefs, run by entrenched military sycophants or petty underpaid civil-service officials."

This, says Stone, means that District or Province chiefs in the countryside buy their jobs and impose their own "unofficial" forms of taxation to make a profit. The peasant has no place to turn for relief. Adds Stone:

"Saigon's land-reform program, so vital to the aspirations of peasants, has never really been put in motion. In the secure areas, tenant farmers—that means 70 per cent of all farmers in the Delta—still are forced to pay up to 50 per cent and more of their rice crops to absentee landlords who have absolutely no obligation in return. A law on the books since 1955 sets the limit at 25 per cent.

"Americans here insist that no progress will be made so long as the men at the top in Saigon are members of mandarin families, or allied with families which have vested interests in land that they have no intention of relinquishing."

Peace feelers, 1965–66

The year 1965 marks the beginning of an enormous number of proposals from all over the globe for peaceful negotiations. They can be summarized as follows:

Reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference to effect a cease fire and eventual peace.

Direct negotiations between Washington and Hanoi.

A mediation effort through U Thant.

Resort to the U.N. General Assembly or Security Council as mediators.

Negotiations between Saigon and Hanoi.

Negotiations to achieve a neutral federation of Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam.

Negotiations between Saigon and the NLF-Viet Cong with Hanoi and Washington backstopping each side.

Negotiations between Saigon, Hanoi, and the NFL with a neutral nation acting as chairman.

Informal discussions between Hanoi and Washington in a neutral country to determine whether any grounds for formal negotiations exist.

It is physically impossible to compare the texts of each of the proposals and note all the differences, all the conditions, whether they are factual, semantic, or mere nuance. Nor can each such proposal be detailed. For these reasons, this study is confined to the last known U.S. position, contained in President Johnson's letter to Ho Chi Minh of February 1967, and in the exchange between U.N. Secretary General U Thant and Mr. Johnson.

Previous Administration utterances—at Johns Hopkins in 1965, the Hawaii Conference of December 1965, the Manila Conference of 1966 and the Guam Conference of 1967—while significant, must be considered in the context of domestic American politics, in the context of current world opinion, and in the context of the actual military situation in Vietnam at the particular time they were issued.

Thus the present position of Mr. Johnson and his advisors is the only truly useful benchmark in this spring of 1967. It is, as best as can be judged, contained in the texts of a letter from President Johnson to President Ho Chi Minh, dated *February 2*, 1967, and in the North Vietnamese leader's reply, dated February 15, 1967, and translated from the French in Washington:

President Johnson's letter

"Dear Mr. President: I am writing to you in the hope that the conflict in Vietnam can be brought to an end. That conflict has already taken a heavy toll—in lives lost, in wounds inflicted, in property destroyed and in simple human misery. If we fail to find a just and peaceful solution, history will judge us harshly.

"Therefore, I believe that we both have a heavy obligation to seek earnestly the path to peace. It is in response to that obligation that I am writing directly to you.

"We have tried over the past several years, in a variety of ways and through a number of channels, to convey to you and your colleagues our desire to achieve a peaceful settlement. For whatever reasons, these efforts have not achieved any results.

"It may be that our thoughts and yours, our attitudes and yours, have been distorted or misinterpreted as they passed through these various channels. Certainly that is always a danger in indirect communication.

"There is one good way to overcome this problem and to move forward in search for a peaceful settlement. That is for us to arrange for direct talks between trusted representatives in a secure setting and away from the glare of publicity. Such talks should not be used as a propaganda exercise, but should be a serious effort to find a workable and mutually acceptable solution.

"In the past two weeks, I have noted public statements by representatives of your Government suggesting that you would be prepared to enter into direct bilateral talks with representatives of the U.S. Government, provided that we ceased "unconditionally" and permanently our bombing operations against your country and all military actions against it. In the last day, serious and responsible parties have assured us indirectly that this is in fact your proposal.

"Let me frankly state that I see two great difficulties with this proposal. In view of your public position, such action on our part would inevitably produce worldwide speculation that discussions were under way and would impair the privacy and secrecy of those discussions. Secondly, there would inevitably be grave concern on our part whether your Government would make use of such action by us to improve its military position.

"With these problems in mind, I am prepared to move even further toward an ending of hostilities than your Government has proposed in either public statements or through private diplomatic channels. I am prepared to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of further augmentation of United States forces in South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has stopped. These acts of restraint on both sides would, I believe, make it possible for us to conduct serious and private discussions leading toward an early peace.

"I make this proposal to you now with a specific sense of urgency arising from the imminent new year holidays in Vietnam. If you are able to accept this proposal I see no reason why it could not take effect at the end of the new year, or Tet, holidays. The proposal I have made would be greatly strengthened if your military authorities and those of the Government of South Vietnam could promptly negotiate an extension of the Tet truce.

"As to the site of the bilateral discussions I propose, there are several possibilities. We could, for example, have our representatives meet in Moscow where contacts have already occurred. They could meet in some other country such as Burma. You may have other arrangements or sites in mind, and I would try to meet your suggestions.

"The important thing is to end a conflict that has brought burdens to both our peoples and above all to the people of South Vietnam. If you have any thoughts about the actions I propose, it would be most important that I receive them as soon as possible."

Ho Chi Minh's reply

"YOUR EXCELLENCY: On 10 February 1967, I received your message. This is my reply.

"Vietnam is thousands of miles way from the United States. The Vietnamese people has never done any harm to the United States. But contrary to the pledges made by its representative at the 1954 Geneva conference, the U.S. Government has ceaselessly intervened in Vietnam; it has unleashed and intensified the war of aggression in South Vietnam with a view to prolonging the partition of Vietnam and turning South Vietnam into a neocolony and a military base of the United States. For over two years now, the U.S. Government has with its air and naval forces carried the war to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, an independent and sovereign country.

"The U.S. Government has committed war crimes, crimes against peace and against mankind. In South Vietnam, half a million U.S. and satellite troops have resorted to the most inhuman weapons and the most barbarous methods of warfare, such as napalm, toxic chemical and gases, to massacre our compatriots, destroy crops and raze villages to the ground.

"In North Vietnam, thousands of U.S. aircraft have dropped hundreds of thousands of tons of bombs, destroying towns, villages, factories, roads, bridges, dikes, dams and even churches, pagodas, hospitals, schools. In your message, you apparently deplored the sufferings and destructions in Vietnam. May I ask you: Who has perpetrated these monstrous crimes? It is the U.S. and satellite troops. The U.S. Government is entirely responsible for the extremely serious situation in Vietnam.

"The U.S. war of aggression against the Vietnamese people constitutes a challenge to the countries of the Socialist camp, a threat to the national independence movement and a serious danger to peace in Asia and the world.

"The Vietnamese people deeply love independence, freedom and peace. But in the face of the U.S. aggression, they have risen up, united as one man. Fearless of sacrifices and hardships, they are determined to carry on their resistance until they have won genuine independence and freedom and true peace. Our just cause enjoys strong sympathy and support from the peoples of the whole world, including broad sections of the American people.

"The U.S. Government has unleashed the war of aggression in Vietnam. It must cease this aggression. That is the only way to the restoration of peace. The U.S. Government must stop definitively and unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. and satellite troops, and let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their own affairs. Such (is the basic) content of the four-point stand of the Government of the D.R.V., which embodies the essential principles and provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam. It is the basis of a correct political solution to the Vietnam problem.

"In your message, you suggested direct talks between the D.R.V. and the United States. If the U.S. Government really wants these talks, it must first of all stop unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the D.R.V. It is only after the unconditional cessation of the U.S. bombing raids and all other acts of war against the D.R.V. that the D.R.V. and the United States would enter into talks and discuss questions concerning the two sides.

"The Vietnamese people will never submit to force, they will never accept talks under the threat of bombs.

"Our cause is absolutely just. It is to be hoped that the U.S. Government will act in accordance with reason."

The second expression of position is contained in statements of U Thant in March 1967.

On March 28, U.N. Secretary General U Thant called a news conference and presented a new three-point peace formula that he had circulated secretly in mid-March. Mr. U Thant's formula was this:

First, a "general standstill truce . . . a halt to all military activities by all sides."

Second, preliminary talks between the United States and North Vietnam, attended either by Britain and the Soviet Union, as co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Vietnam, and/or Canada, India, and Poland, as the International Control Commission for Vietnam.

Third, reconvening the Geneva Conference with both the South Vietnamese Government and the Viet Cong as participants.

The day before, Hanoi radio had broadcast U Thant's proposals, pointedly rebuffing United Nation's "interference" in Vietnam. U Thant held out hope that Hanoi had not "categorically" turned him down, while U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk treated Hanoi's negative response as a fatal blow to the Thant initiative.

Yet, as Washington congratulated itself on its good fortune in finding itself squarely in agreement with the Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant had begun to slide back to his previous position that the U.S. must stop bombing North Vietnam as a necessary precondition to negotiations.

Meanwhile, Saigon was reported to be in agreement in principle with the U Thant three-point proposal, but displeased at being precluded from preliminary talks and "being treated like a puppet."

Thereafter, Washington qualified its acceptance of the same three-point proposal by saying "it is essential" to work out the details of the military cease-fire in advance.

And there the matter would seem to rest.

CONCLUSION

Obviously, there is a great amount of information to which only Mr. Johnson and his advisors have access. A review such as this must perforce rely on materials that have been made public by the Administration, or are obtainable from other public sources.

One other observation is necessary. Deep currents, Asian in origin, hold enormous sway over events in Vietnam yet cannot be adequately treated in a brief political history. A list of such currents is large, and would include the observation that Vietnam is basically Buddhist and Confucian, both ethical religious without a personal god. Thus, Asiatic communisms as espoused by Asiatics can masquerade as an ally in the older, more familiar struggle against Western theism, Western colonialism, and Western capitalism.

Such a list would necessarily include also the tragic involvement of Diem's brother Nhu with opium; the profound effect the writing of an obscure French Catholic philosopher, Emmanuel Mounier, was to have on Nhu and in turn on his lonely, celibate brother, Diem; the fact that Nhu and Diem translated Mounier's "personnalisme" ethic into a secret, authoritarian organization, the "Can Lao" (Personalist Labor Revolutionary Party), to control all aspects of government and society in South Vietnam, thereby tragically destroying the coalition they had put together in 1954–55; even the distaste of individual Vietnamese in thousands of daily contacts at levels high and low for open, frank, Western speech compared to their own fluid, often subtle, conversational forms. These accidents of culture, history, and geography, for better or for worse, carry equally as much weight in the Vietnamese conflict today as, say, the effective fire power of the 7th fleet on a given day.

In a larger sense much more can be cited to confound the best of minds in resolving the Vietnamese conflict. The West divides good and evil, and thinks that evil can be conquered. Yet in Asia, a man is generally capable of believing that something is simultaneously good and bad, right and wrong, black and white, in such a manner as to render most difficult real understanding by the Western mentality.

Just as difficult to comprehend are the "politics" of the Buddhists, or the meaning of their proposals for a peaceful, independent Vietnam; we dismiss them as visionary or unrealistic, yet they may be more acceptable and understandable to the South Vietnamese—after 27 years of warfare—than anything we propose in our Western political terminology.

In short, we Americans cannot simply go to Asia, wipe the slate clean, and say to them, "This is how it shall be." The Vietnamese have their own view of nationalism, quite different from ours, the Vietnamese Communists identify with it, and it renders our involvement immeasurably difficult.

FURTHER DECISIONS

Does the Republican Party serve America best by saying that politics stops at the water's edge? That we must rally behind the President? Does bipartisanship mean that Democratic mistakes are Republican responsibilities?

Republicans—for two decades—have believed the United States must not become involved in a land war on the Asian continent. We are so involved today.

Republicans have believed that no American military intervention should be unilateral. Our commitment today in Vietnam is primarily unilateral.

Republicans, 1954, made a limited commitment to the South Vietnam Government. Under the Democrats, our commitment has become open-ended.

Before making any further decisions to support or differ with the President, Republicans might agree to seek hard, realistic answers to two basic questions:

1. What precisely is our national interest in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos?

2. To what further lengths are we prepared to go in support of this interest?

APPENDIX I

Troop strength

	American [1]	Army of the Republic of Vietnam [1]	Vietcong [2]
1961	3,164	338,000	63,400
1962	9,866	467,000	79,000
1963	16,500	525,000	91,700
1964	23,000	559,500	103,000
1965	181,000	679,000	230,000
1966	389,000	671,000	280,000
1967	[3] 430,000	[3] 650,000	[3] 287,000

[1] Source: 1961–66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.

[2] South Vietnam Communists, strength in the south. Source: 1961–66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967. (Unable to obtain official estimates as to total number of regular North Vietnam troops in south.)

[3] As of Apr. 1, 1967.

APPENDIX II

Casualties

	Americans killed [1]	Army of the Republic of Vietnam killed [2]	Enemy killed [3]
1960		2,200	5,669
1961	42	4,000	12,133
1962		4,400	21,158
1963	78	5,700	20,575
1964	147	7,500	16,785
1965	1,369	11,000	35,436
1966	5,008	9,400	55,524
1967	[4] 2,434	[5] 2,954	[5] 25,773
Total	9,078	47,154	193,053

[1] In hostile action. Source: Department of Defense.

[2] Source: 1960–66: Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, compiled from news dispatches.

[3] Source: Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.

[4] As of Apr. 15, 1967.

[5] As of Apr. 1, 1967.

APPENDIX III

Casualties (wounded and noncombat dead)

	Americans dead	Americans wounded
1961	23	81
1962		
1963	36	411
1964	48	1,039
1965	359	6,114
1966	1,045	30,093
1967	[1] 398	[1] 16,350
Total	1,909	54,088

[1] As of Apr. 15, 1967.

Source: Department of Defense.

APPENDIX IV

	Enemy captured [1]	Enemy defections [2]
1961	6,200	
1962	5,500	
1963	4,000	
1964	4,200	11,000
1965	6,000	5,500
1966	10,000	20,000
1967	[3] 1,000	[4] 8,000
Total	36,826	44,500

[1] Source: 1961–66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.

[2] Source: Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee.

[3] January 1967 only.

[4] As of Apr. 1, 1967.

UNITED STATES SHOULD REAFFIRM NATO COMMITMENT TO GREECE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the House Republican Committee on Western Alliance urged President Johnson to reaffirm the U.S. NATO commitment to Greece. In a telegram, which I signed as chairman, the group said:

> The United States should promptly and unequivocally reaffirm its commitment under the North Atlantic Treaty to aid Greece and other NATO nations automatically in case of armed attack.
>
> The recent change in the government of Greece and the manner in which this came about may tempt the Soviet Union or other Communist-oriented countries to aggravate the tensions which inevitably accompany such a change, and we therefore respectfully urge that you publicly reaffirm our defense commitment.
>
> This development in Greece together with unrest and instability throughout the eastern Mediterranean constitutes a new peril to NATO and comes at a crucial time in its history. The alliance has not recovered from the shock and dislocations produced by the withdrawal of French forces from its integrated command and the exclusion of allied troops from France. Germany is concerned over the nuclear weapons treaty. Within a year members of NATO will be free to denounce the treaty.
>
> The reaffirmation of our defense commitment must of course be accompanied by a strong expression of hope for an early return to constitutional processes in Greece. While we deplore the interruption of constitutional government there we must leave no doubt about our determination to protect that country from attack.
>
> This initiative would help to repair damage done by a qualification of our NATO commitment to Turkey during the Cyprus crisis of 1964. In a letter to the Prime Minister of Turkey dated June 5, 1964, you stated, "I hope you will understand that your NATO allies have not had a chance to consider whether they have an obligation to protect Turkey against the Soviet Union if Turkey takes a step which results in Soviet intervention without the full consent and understanding of its NATO allies."
>
> Whether or not so intended this letter had the effect of qualifying our automatic commitment to Turkey. Evidence of this appears in the reply of the Turkish Prime Minister who wrote on June 13, 1964: "Our understanding is that the North Atlantic Treaty imposes upon all member states the obligation to come forthwith to the assistance of any member victim of aggression. The only point left to the discretion of the member states is the nature and the scale of this assistance.
>
> "If NATO members should start discussing the right and wrong of the situation of their fellow-member victim of a Soviet aggression—the very foundations of the alliance would be shaken".
>
> This qualification to which Turkey pointed has never been rescinded. With instability in the Mediterranean growing day by day, a new affirmation which will sweep away the earlier qualification is most urgent.
>
> Both of these episodes—the Turkish threat to invade Cyprus in 1964 to protect its former nationals, and the recent military takeover of the Greek government—reveal an organic weakness in the structure of NATO. As so clearly stated in the official NATO Handbook (1965 edition) "The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was not established to defend geographically homogeneous territory but was established primarily to defend a way of life."
>
> We hope that the committee recently created by the North Atlantic Council to make a thorough study of the Alliance will give this its careful attention before reporting to the Ministerial Session of the Council next December.

BEATNIKS IN THE PENTAGON, MR. PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, today we here in the House were shocked to learn of the fact that the peacenik marchers have nestled in the Pentagon. These people may have the right to a dissenting opinion, but Mr. Speaker, for us to allow them to use the Pentagon as a vehicle of distribution is unthinkable.

Apparently Secretary McNamara does not object, Mr. Speaker, or he would have had them thrown out as we did here in the Congress yesterday. Why should this country tolerate a Secretary of Defense who does not have the courage to take such action. Or is it, Mr. Speaker, that the White House has ordered hands off. The President is the Secretary's only boss and I strongly suggest that if Secretary McNamara will not touch these no-goodniks then it is only because he knows that his superior condones this type of activity.

INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF CONSULTING ENGINEERS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. REINECKE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, as both a Member of Congress and a consulting engineer I want to call to the attention of the House the fact that our Nation's Capital is, this week, privileged to host the first International Congress of Consulting Engineers ever held in this country.

Consulting engineers are distinguishable from other engineers by virtue of their independence—for each is an entrepreneur, a professional in private practice. Their efforts may range from personal advisory services to complete engineering design of such complex facilities as O'Hare International Airport, or the world's longest suspension bridge—the Verrazano-Narrows in New York. Consultants cover such specialized fields as radar, metallurgy, solar heating, noise control, or munitions. All represent a vital, technological resource to their respective governments for it is they who are called upon to design highways, water systems, defense installations, and other public works.

This week's International Consulting Congress brings to this country outstanding engineers from 20 nations, including the highly industrialized areas of Western Europe as well as some of the lesser developed countries of South America and Africa. All are members of the 52-year-old Federation Internationale des Ingenieurs-Conseils which is headquartered in Belgium. Hosting the world meeting is the Consulting Engineers Council/USA, which is the largest and most active of all the organizations which make up the international group.

The U.S. Department of Commerce has estimated that American consulting engineering firms earn approximately $300 million per year overseas. This amount is, however, a far cry from the consultants' overall contribution to the international balance of payments. As designers of projects they often specify construction which includes equipment, materials and services available only from U.S. firms. During the period 1959–63 American engineers worked on 672 overseas projects with a total construction value of $7.6 billion. Their magnificent role in designing military and defense installations in Vietnam constitutes one of the unsung sagas of that conflict.

Superlatives hold little awe for consulting engineers who are regularly being called upon to design the largest, fastest, longest, smallest or tallest. Chances are that the water we drink, the highways we traverse, even the conditioned air we breathe, is the product of consulting engineers.

In the light of this week's International Consulting Engineers Congress I ask that the Congress join me in welcoming the consulting engineering profession to our city and in extending best wishes to the delegates for an enjoyable and productive meeting.

TIME FOR LAWS TO PROTECT OUR FLAG

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to join with the increasing number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who are rising in defense of the American flag. I am introducing legislation that would make it a Federal crime to desecrate the flag of this Nation.

Although several States do already have such laws, there is no regulation or standard on the Federal level to protect the flag.

In recent weeks we have heard of an endless series of protests, demonstrations, and marches where our flag, as the symbol of the greatness and pride of this land, has been burned, trampled, torn, or otherwise mutilated. Most Americans are growing sick and tired of these irresponsible demonstrations. These flag burnings are nothing short of traitorous acts in the eyes of those loyal citizens who respect the flag as a tangible symbol of our heritage.

These actions are made all the more loathsome occurring as they do at the same time that thousands of our young men are risking and giving their lives to protect the precious rights for which the flag stands. Ironically, it stands, among others, for the right of dissent that protects its defilers.

The bill I am introducing provides that mutilation of the flag shall be made punishable by a fine of not more than $1,000 and imprisonment of not more than 1 year.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal has been lauded not only by public officials and citizens throughout the country, but also by patriotic organizations. I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join with me in urging passage of this legislation.

I am heartened to see that in answer to all these anti-American activities we have another kind of demonstration—the patriotic rally. One such rally was recently held in Merritt Island, Fla., where schoolchildren and veterans marched and sang their way through an inspiring "We Love America" rally. I commend the following accounts of the rally, taken from local newspapers, to the attention of my colleagues:

[From Today, Apr. 27, 1967]

MARCH OF THE PATRIOTS

A fired-up band of Brevard young people will give their answer this weekend to the anti-war marchers.

They will call it the "We Love America" march.

Their route will be from Cocoa to the sea, the same path trod two weeks earlier by a couple of dozen young people who remain unconvinced America fights a just and moral war in Vietnam.

Only the "We Love America" troupe knows how their signs will read. But it's a safe bet the placards will make more sense than the likes of "Draft Beer, Not Boys."

The young people leading the Saturday parade rightfully call themselves patriots.

They are positive their display will "demonstrate beyond all doubt" the patriotism of Brevard County students.

It is unlikely their protest against the protestors of two weeks ago will attract very much attention beyond the confines of Brevard.

There will be those who will yell, others who will think "cornball" because the young people declare themselves patriots. That's a very old-fashioned, unstylish word in the 60s. But it has kept America great for many years.

And we are sure the young patriots are aware that as true patriots their feeling must go far beyond a mere physical demonstration of their love for their native land.

When an American says he loves his country, he must mean more than loving the rocks and rills of New England, the broad Midwest prairies gleaming under the goodness of God, the wide plains, the great mountains, the sandy beaches of Florida sloping gently to the sea.

When an American speaks of love of country his meaning only begins with physical glories or physical demonstrations.

Love of and for America means love for an inner air, an inner light in which freedom, as we know it, lives. It means love for a way of life in which a man can breathe the air of self-respect.

"We Love America" are easy words to say. But this is a mighty assignment we give ourselves.

It is often easier to fight—sometimes even easier to die—for principles than it is to live up to them.

[From the Cocoa Tribune, Apr. 28, 1967]

WE LOVE AMERICA MARCH TOMORROW

(By Will Land)

Merritt Island residents can make it three groups of marchers taking part tomorrow in Central Brevard's "We Love America" activities.

Islanders today were invited to gather at the First National Bank parking lot and join the hikers from Cocoa who will leave the Cocoa library at 10 a.m.

Another group will leave at 11 a.m. from the Publix Market parking lot at the A1A and SR520 intersection in Cocoa Beach.

They will all meet at Kiwanis Island, a Merritt Island recreation complex, for a rally bginning at 12:30 p.m.

State Sen. Beth Johnson, county commissioner George King Jr., several teachers and a representative of Sheriff Leigh Wilson will speak at the rally.

The march and rally has attracted the support of various civic and fraternal organizations and business firms.

The county commissioners have declared tomorrow "We Love America" day in Brevard, and residents are being urged to fly flags and join the march.

Groups pledging to participate in the march include several drum and bugle corps, many local VFW and American Legion posts and their Ladies Auxiliaries, and numerous Boy Scout troops.

Cocoa Beach motel and business marquees are scheduled to display "We Love America" messages to commemorate the activities.

Leonard Hays, 20, a Brevard Junior College student, and Tracy-Lynn Weir, 17, a Cocoa High School student, are credited with organizing the march.

It is a reaction to a "Peace March" here two weeks ago to protest American involvement in Vietnam.

Miss Weir said she and Hays saw the demonstration, heard the arguments and were appalled that "everybody was anti-American."

[From the Brevard Sentinel, Apr. 30, 1967]

MARCHERS PROVE PATRIOTISM POPULAR IN BREVARD

MERRITT ISLAND.—In protest to recent anti-American demonstrations throughout the country, marchers from grade school and grizzled veterans of past wars marched and sang their way to a patriotic rally here Saturday.

The red, white and blue of the American flags the marchers carried snapped briskly in the wind as youngsters and their parents left Cocoa Beach and Cocoa to meet here at Kiwanis Island.

As marchers and card carrying members of the various veterans organizations arrived at Kiwanis Island, the rally took on the air of a Fourth of July celebration.

District Two County Commissioner George King Jr., his beard grown long for the Titusville centennial celebration, addressed the crowd dressed in the garment of Abraham Lincoln saying, "if this portrayal of Mr. Lincoln can be just a reminder then it has well served its purpose."

King added, "It bothers me that few men will get to their feet and publicly endorse the philosophy of the government. "I had begun to wonder what happened to the spirit of America," he said, adding that it was this spirit which evolves from the interrelationship of Christian morality and individual responsibility.

The spirit of America was also the concern of another speaker, Ralph Paz, president of the Mid-County Republican Club who added that all Americans should continue the esprit de corps that was alive when the country was young.

Brevard County's State Sen. Beth Johnson of Cocoa Beach was also on hand for the rally. She said, "I love America and I'm proud to be a part of her."

Other speakers included Dick Thompson, another Republican leader, Clinton Deval, social science teacher at Cocoa High School and Steve Valvanis, Brevard Junior College political science instructor.

Cocoa Beach marchers started out at Canaveral Plaza Shopping Plaza toward Kiwanis Island under the watchful eye of Cocoa Beach policemen who shepherded them along the highways and across the temporary bridge over the Banana River.

Many of the policemen, their duties discharged, stayed to hear and applaud the speakers.

> [From the Brevard Sentinel, Apr. 29, 1967]
>
> EVERYONE URGED TO JOIN PARADE
>
> (By Ralph Bates)
>
> COCOA.—"The March for America" in support of America and American foreign policy, has grown to where it will receive national coverage on this patriotic day.
>
> A Life magazine crew from Miami, an Air Force camera crew from Orlando Air Force Base, and other news media will be on hand to record the events of the day.
>
> The Cocoa Veterans of Foreign Wars, including the ladies auxiliary, are in full support of the march as are leading citizens, public officials, businesses, and civic and community organizations.
>
> County Comm. George King Jr. will be the principal speaker for the rally at Kiwanis Island. Other speakers will be State Sen. Beth Johnson; County Democratic Executive Committee Chairman, William Mullon; Republican County Executive Committee Chairman, Richard Thompson; Cocoa High School teacher, Cliff DeVoe, and Brevard Junior College Instructor Steve Valvanis. The Rev. Adrian Rogers, pastor of First Baptist Church Merritt Island will give the invocation.
>
> The board of county commissioners has proclaimed Saturday as "We Love America Day" for Brevard County, and citizens and organizations are urged to fly their American flags and march.
>
> The Cocoa group will form at 10 a.m. in the parking lot behind the Cocoa Public Library for the march to Merritt Island.
>
> They will proceed on Church Street to Delannoy Avenue and then east of Florida 520 to the island.
>
> The parking lot behind the First National Bank of Merritt Island has been designated as the meeting place for those people desiring to join with the Cocoa marchers as they arrive at that point.
>
> The Cocoa Beach marchers will form their group at the Publix market parking lot at 11 a.m. They will then proceed west on Florida 520 to the recreation center.
>
> People are reminded that the center has picnic tables and facilities and to bring their lunches for the afternoon's events.

THEY MUST WANT TO SEE US KILLED

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I never cease to be amazed at the contrast between the men who use freedom and the men who defend it. As an example, a letter to the editor, published May 6, 1967, in the Columbus, Ohio, Dispatch, states the significance to one American soldier in Vietnam of the actions of a group of Ohio professors who are seeking a "reasonable" settlement of the war.

On the one hand is the Columbus soldier, Sp4c. Edward I. Arthur. This soldier "has been all over South Vietnam." In contrast, the professors, in all probability, have merely been all over the front pages of newspapers from here to Hanoi.

Specialist Arthur answers the charge that the National Liberation Front is supported by a large number of the Vietnamese people by citing the terrorist tactics that force a villager to comply or pronounce his family's death sentence.

The man who is doing the fighting says that 90 percent of the South Vietnamese are against Communist rule and that—

> Only about 10 percent of the people go along with the Reds. These nuts are just like those we have at home in the same category—like the professors who signed the open letter.

In answer to the charge of fighting the Vietcong, that is, civil war forces, this soldier says:

> The people we are fighting are not Viet Cong for the most part, but NVAs from the North.

And to the charge that the United States should stop bombing the north, Specialist Arthur adeptly sums up the GI's feelings by saying: "They must want to see us killed."

Mr. Speaker, men like this soldier are fighting for freedom, they have accepted a responsibility to their Nation. In contrast, persons like these professors apparently have failed to accept the responsibility for finding out the facts about the war and their half-informed conclusions can be deadly.

I think we can all benefit from reading this letter. It represents the views of those who are sweating in the filthy danger of a Southeast Asian jungle for the freedom of the "folks back home," some of whom are attempting to verbally slit their throats.

For those who are seeking a reasonable settlement—and no sane man wants war—I would ask, reasonable to whom? To the South Vietnamese people and others throughout the world who seek freedom? To Sp4c. Edward I. Arthur, and more than 400,000 like him? I think the vast majority of Americans will stand with Specialist Arthur.

I place this letter in the RECORD at this point:

> COLUMBUS GI FIGHTING IN VIETNAM REPLIES TO PROFESSORS' OPEN LETTER
>
> To the EDITOR:
>
> I have just seen a copy of the April 6 Dispatch which contained the "Open Letter to President Johnson" signed by the "Committee of Ohio Professors for a Reasonable Settlement in Vietnam."
>
> This paid ad claims the people of South Vietnam would like for the U.S. to get out of their country. This is not true.
>
> These professors claim the National Liberation Front is supported by a large number of the Vietnamese people.
>
> Ha! If you were ordered by armed thugs to do as you were told or your wife and children would be killed and your home taken over, would you tell them to get out?
>
> I have been all over South Vietnam and I have found 90 percent of the people are for getting the Communists out of their country.
>
> Only about 10 percent of the people go along with the Reds. These nuts are just like those we have at home in the same category—like the professors who signed the open letter.
>
> I am in the field here in South Vietnam and have been for a long time. The people we are fighting are not Viet Cong for the most part, but NVAs from the north.
>
> They have come south to kill and take over the country. The people in the south are fighting to stop that, as they have a perfect right to.
>
> I hope the people back in the U.S. will not be taken in by the likes of these Ohio professors who signed the open letter to the President.
>
> It would be nice to be back home in Columbus and not get shot at, to eat regular meals, sleep well and watch television, but like the men in South Vietnam we are trying to help them save their country for freedom.
>
> These professors say to stop bombing the north. They must want to see us killed.
>
> Bombing escalation is needed to show the Communists they are not going to take over this land. If we stopped bombing, the NVAs would be swarming all over the south.
>
> I try, but I just can't understand people like these professors. As a free man and with God's help, I'll never stop fighting to keep the Communists from taking over.
>
> Spec. 4 EDWARD I. ARTHUR,
> *U.S. Army, South Vietnam.*

WE SHOULD PRESERVE FIRST AMENDMENT FREEDOMS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DENNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENNEY. Mr. Speaker, the first amendment is one of our hallowed freedoms guaranteed to us by the Bill of Rights.

The right of television and radio broadcasters as well as newspapers to comment on public issues must be preserved. Although it is a right, it is also a trust. Some abuse that trust, but it is my feeling that the vast majority do not. Certainly, the dangers in curbing the right of fair comment outweigh the small benefit to be derived in suppressing the irresponsible few. For that reason, I feel compelled to speak out against recent proposals that would unduly restrict, the rights of a broadcaster to editorialize on issues affecting the public interest.

With the current trend of fewer and fewer daily newspapers in our cities, the burden of commenting on issues affecting the public has become greater on the radio and television industry.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to read to my colleagues a resolution in support of broadcaster editorializing which has been recently approved by the board of directors of the Nebraska Broadcasters Association. The resolution is as follows:

> Whereas both the Congress and the Supreme Court have consistently recognized that broadcasting is a medium protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, and
>
> Whereas for the past seventeen years the Federal Communications Commission has upheld the right of a broadcaster to editorialize on issues of public controversy, and
>
> Whereas existing local, state and federal ordinances and laws are adequate to resolve the facts and issues which may arise when local broadcasters do editorialize.
>
> Now therefore be it resolved that the Nebraska Association of Broadcasters does vigorously oppose any legislation that would impose limits on the rights and responsibilities of a broadcaster to editorialize on any issue of public interest or concern.

IN DEFENSE OF THE FLAG

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Schadeberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is again beset with war and internal strife which threatens to tear asunder the very things upon which this great Nation is founded, a refreshing bit of Americana was wafted into my office today to remind me, and now you and my colleagues, that in each city and hamlet of America still lives that spirit which inspired early settlers to defend their country, and their flag, to the death, if you please.

However, this refreshing breath of freedom's faith comes not from some adult group but, instead, from the eighth-graders of Burlington Junior High School, Burlington, Wis. A letter above the 218 signatures commends me for my activity in the line of legislation which would make it a Federal offense to publicly destroy or maliciously deface the American flag. My bill, H.R. 9208, and other similar bills are pending before Congress at this time. With this petition of thanks from youngsters who still feel Old Glory means something, I again appeal to you gentlemen to take swift action to halt the defacing or destruction of our flag.

These 218 students have ended their letter—which follows—with a pledge to lend their wholehearted support to "your noble and 'truly American' effort." Let us pledge ourselves to passing legislation which will help this Nation retain some measure of that dignity which has been our heritage and for which our gallant young men are now fighting, and dying, in some far-off land.

The letter follows:

Burlington Junior High,
Burlington, Wis.

Hon. Henry C. Schadeberg,
Longworth Congressional Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Schadeberg: It was with a tremendous amount of satisfaction that we, the eighth grade Social Studies classes of Burlington Junior High School, Burlington, Wisconsin, learned of your fine efforts to introduce legislation that would make it a federal offense to publicly destroy or maliciously deface the American flag.

Can we justify sending thousands of fine American men to their death in defense of our flag while we allow it to be destroyed in our own country? When misguided individuals are allowed to deface or destroy our flag, a part of our democracy dies with it because our flag is a symbol of our democracy and will to be free.

To this end, we the undersigned students pledge to you our wholehearted support in your noble and "Truly American" efforts.

Respectfully yours,
Burlington Junior High, Eighth Grade
Social Studies Students.

CURTAILMENT OF AGRICULTURAL IMPORTS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Langen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, in further support of legislation to restrict harmful agricultural imports, which I have introduced in the House earlier in this session, I call to the attention of my colleagues a resolution recently passed by the 1967 Legislature of the State of Minnesota.

It is good to note that the legislature of my home State, where I had the privilege to serve for 8 years, recognizes the problem that American agriculture is facing and has seen fit to call this to the attention of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress in this manner. I commend them for their action.

I hereby insert this resolution at this point in the Record:

Resolution No. 5

A resolution memorializing the President, Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States to curtail agricultural imports

Whereas, agricultural prices have now declined to 74 percent of parity; and

Whereas, agricultural prices have declined in recent months at the alarming rate of seven percent; and

Whereas, the severe underpayment for agricultural production places in jeopardy all of rural America; and

Whereas, at this time the nation's dairy farmers are engaged in an all out effort dedicated to price improvement for dairy commodities; and

Whereas, capital inputs in today's economy are limited in agriculture and are not a complete substitute for the family farm and its family labor force; and

Whereas, present agricultural policies are crippling and destroying the efficiency of our food-making industry and stimulating the decay of rural communities; and

Whereas, this nation must have sufficient resources in agriculture—in people, machinery and other materials of production—to provide abundance for the American people and also to provide food and fibre for sharing with hungry people in other nations; and

Whereas, the present administration has failed to provide for equal justice in this essential area of the nation's economy; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota that it hereby petitions the President, Secretary of Agriculture and the Congress of the United States to curb price depressing importation of agricultural commodities and products; and

Be it further resolved that the federal government continue to resist price depressing agricultural imports until such time as agricultural prices to the American farmer are in balance and in keeping with the cost of production, and

Be it further resolved that the federal government immediately take all necessary steps to provide a return to the dairy producers in sufficient amount to assure a necessary and vital supply for the great needs of this country;

Be it further resolved that the Secretary of State of the State of Minnesota, be instructed to forward copies of this resolution to Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States, Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the United States House of Representatives; the Honorable Mike Mansfield, Majority Leader of the United States Senate; and the members of the Minnesota congressional delegation.

ADDRESS BY CAPT. FRANK M. MOCRE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Keith] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, as the delays and difficulties of our Vietnam sealift continue and as our obsolete reserve fleet and merchant vessels prove to be more and more inadequate, I think it is important to keep before the Congress and the people the extreme urgency of correcting this situation. For this reason, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an excellent address delivered recently in the famous shipbuilding city of Quincy, Mass.

The address was given by Capt. Frank M. Moore, a constituent of my district who has spent 40 years in the U.S. Navy Reserves and in the merchant marine. Captain Moore is well qualified by his long experience to speak about the vital role of our merchant marine and its tragic decline over the past 20 years. The text which I am including in the Record gives a very clear picture of the need for a modern merchant fleet to carry America's important foreign trade and to hold our own in the worldwide competition for mastery of the seas. I hope that these remarks will be read with the attention which this great problem merits.

The address follows:

Remarks Made to Quincy Kiwanis Club, April 17, 1967, by Capt. Frank M. Moore, of Marshfield, Mass.

It is difficult to draw a clear and concise picture of the importance of our merchant marine as related to the other segments of our economy. To the average shore-side worker, engrossed as he must be in the problems of his own industry, his family welfare and educational requirements, the merchant marine is something remote and vaguely related to the days of the Yankee clipper ships. Most people do, of course, realize that there is a huge volume of cargo which must be transported over great distances but the problem is so immense and remote that they feel individually they can do little about it and they just hope that "someone is minding the store."

To orient your thinking I propose to use a hypothetical situation which is admittedly an over-simplification. Let us suppose that the home delivery of all sales was essential to the survival of two such firms as Macy and Gimbels. Can anyone think that Macy would rely on Gimbels' trucking service in this essential matter? Yet, in our ocean transport we rely 92% on the ships of our competitors to deliver our manufactured goods to our customers and to supply us with our essential raw materials. There are 100 strategic raw materials which are not found in North America. We import 98% of our manganese; 86% of our nickel; 85% of our aluminum ore; 44% of our zinc; in fact, the U.S. economy consumes 50% of the non-agricultural world's raw materials. Relying 92% on foreign shipping is a somewhat hazardous position in which to place ourselves.

On the slippery world road which we are forced to travel today, our technological, industrial and agricultural production is the envy of every country in the world. Our so-called friends and allies are not averse to seeing us stumble a little and maybe bark our shin. Many other countries frankly hope we fall and break our neck. Under such conditions it is hardly realistic to rely on foreign shipping for 92% of our required ocean transportation.

Also involved in this matter is the deficit in our balance of payments from foreign trade. The billions of dollars we pay to foreign vessels as freight money, if paid to U.S. shipping, would go far toward eliminating this deficit.

Our Vietnam sea-lift has exposed the weakness of our merchant marine. Some years ago it was said the next war would be short and could be supplied primarily by air. However, 95% of our troops and supplies for Vietnam are transported by ships. In order to accomplish this we have had to withdraw ships from trade routes on which we did have a toe-hold. We have had to recondition, at abnormally high cost, all the old 20 to 25 year old ships we had in reserve since World War II. The maintenance and repair costs of these old and inefficient ships are much higher than normal and it seems probable that they will all reach the point of obsolescence at approximately the same time—and that time fairly soon.

Use of foreign shipping to alleviate our shipping problem proved unsatisfactory. Many countries prohibited their ships from participating in this trade. In other cases, ships were loaded and foreign crews refused to sail. The ships had to be unloaded.

It is ironic that the trade routes from which we had to withdraw ships are being pre-empted by foreign shipping. It is more ironic to see ships of these same countries delivering fertilizer plants, busses and machinery to Cuba and, in some instances, even delivering war materials to North Vietnam.

Japan and Korea profit greatly from our Vietnam problem, and also contribute to our balance of payment deficit, by manufacturing most of the uniforms and shoes needed by our troops. Not because we cannot manufacture uniforms and shoes, but because we do not have the ships to deliver them.

So it would seem that the problems of our Vietnam supply lines justify a close and hard look at our national maritime policy.

However, there is another aspect to this maritime problem and, over the long term, probably a more important area of concern. In the mid 1950s Russia declared a firm policy to extend their maritime influence to the oceans of the world. In recent years the USSR has shifted the major area of conflict from military, or quasi-military, to the arena of economics and industrial management. This increases the importance of the merchant marine and makes the ability to carry a substantial proportion of our ocean transport a more vital consideration. The present Soviet merchant fleet is 8½ M dwt.—approximately equal to our active merchant fleet. Russia plans to have 20M dwt. by 1980.

The USSR carries 75% of their foreign commerce under the Red flag—we carry 7.7% of our foreign trade in American ships.

In 1965 USA accepted delivery of 16 new merchant ships. The USSR accepted delivery of 129.

Our 1967 fiscal budget called for delivery of not more than 13 new merchant ships. The USSR had 464 new merchant ships on order. In other words, 24% of the production of the shipyards of the world is for account of the USSR. The shipyards of Japan, Great Britain, West Germany, etc., as well as those of the satellites such as Poland etc., are busy building ships for the Soviets. Meanwhile, our 1968 fiscal budget again calls for the same as 1967—delivery of not more than 13 new merchant ships.

The Soviet merchant fleet serves 600 ports, in 91 different countries to which the USSR maintains trade routes. And only 13 of these countries are communist. The USSR openly seeks to dominate the oceans of the world and hope to position themselves so that they can deny ocean services to any country which does not conform to Kremlin policy. A Congressional Sub-Committee, of which Congressman Hastings Keith of the Massachusetts 12th District was a member, recently made a trip to Russia. This Committee was told by Bakayev, USSF Minister of Merchant Marine, that their purpose was, "To gain control of the seas."

So the question arises, is something wrong with our maritime policy? Some of our present Administrators maintain we do not need any merchant marine at all. All we need is a fleet of Fast Deployment Logistic ships to fulfill the defense requirements of a merchant marine and ignore the commercial requirements entirely. In other words, we should rely 100% on foreign shipping for our raw materials and deliveries. To some others it seems we have no maritime policy at all.

Many persons who have made a serious study of this problem feel that the basic fault is that our present Maritime Administration is buried deep in the Department of Commerce—mired in bureaucratic red tape and obliged to submit plans and budget requirements through many devious channels.

The remedy proposed by this group is the establishment of an independent Maritime Administration able to submit their program and budget requirements direct to the Congress. The House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries endorses this plan and some 50 or more Congressmen have filed bills to create such an independent Maritime Administration.

Further recommendations of this group are that we:

1. Recognize the major role of our merchant marine in both peace and war.
2. Overcome public apathy.
3. Re-vitalize our shipyards and start building the merchant fleet, the fishing fleet, and the oceanographic vessels which modern competition requires.

In conclusion, it is interesting to look at the position of the shipbuilding countries of the world:

1. Japan; 2. Great Britain; 3. Sweden; 4. West Germany; 5. Italy; 6. Spain 7. Norway; 8. France; 9. Poland; 10. Netherlands; 11. United States; 12. Denmark; 13. Yugoslavia; 14 Brazil; 15. Finland; 16. Australia.

It seems odd to see United States of America in 11th place between Netherlands and Denmark.

Some people say Japan is number one because Japanese shipyard labor is paid one third of the USA pay scale. However, Japanese labor is paid two annual bonuses which, together, generally equal their annual wage. It is hard to believe that we with our technological and industrial capabilities cannot re-vitalize our shipyards and make them competitive. And if it should require some government equalization subsidy, would not this be good insurance to protect our supply of raw materials and delivery of sales?

What can you as an individual do? Write your Congressman and tell him your thoughts. Ask for his opinion. Your Congressman is encouraged in his work when he hears from his constituents once in a while. And the men who are working to save our merchant marine need all the encouragement they can get right now!

PARITY RATIO CREDIBILITY GAP REVEALED

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that we now have another credibility gap in the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Farmers have been discouraged because of the actions of their Government in doing many things that tend to hold down farm prices. They were not surprised, therefore, to read recently in the April 28 "Agricultural Prices" release of USDA that the parity ratio for April fell to 72 percent. This is the lowest rate since the summer of 1934.

Ever since the parity ratio was first used, it has been based on prices and not income.

In a deceiving effort to offset the impact on farmers that the relationship between the prices they receive and the prices they pay is as bad as it was in the depression years of 33 years ago, the USDA has now begun publishing an "adjusted parity ratio" every month.

The new "adjusted ratio" uses direct Government payments to farmers to increase the index prices received by farmers. This is obviously an effort to distort the sorry record of the Freeman administration.

A complicated formula has been developed by USDA to show that the "adjusted parity ratio" is now 77 percent—5 points above the regular parity ratio. However, this "adjusted ratio" is still 9 points below the comparable figure for April 1966.

To use direct Government payments to distort parity ratio is comparable to using figures on farmers' income from off-farm work and investments—higher now than in the 1910–14 base period—for the same purpose.

If USDA continues publishing an "adjusted ratio," farmers may conclude that the Department thinks the direct payment program has depressed farm prices.

Many of us in Congress who have been saying for years that a series of Department actions and policies has resulted in Government-wrecked market prices can well appreciate why USDA has again tried to fool the farmer.

It is my belief that farm people will resent this latest attempt to cover up their unfortunate position by those in USDA who are more interested in holding down farm prices than they are in letting the market system operate so farmers can get a better income.

I include in the Record the Agricultural Prices material to which I have referred at this point in my remarks:

Prices Received Index Down 4 Points—Parity Index Up 1 Point—Adjusted Parity Ratio 77

The Index of Prices Received by Farmers declined 4 points (1½ percent) during the month ended April 15 to 246 percent of its 1910–14 average, the Crop Reporting Board announced today. Contributing most to the decrease were lower prices for eggs, hogs, and wholesale milk. Partly offsetting were higher prices for lettuce and cattle. The index was 7 percent below April 1966.

The Index of Prices Paid for Commodities and Services, including Interest, Taxes, and

Farm Wage Rates rose 1 point (⅓ percent) during the month, as a result of an increase in the seasonally adjusted index of farm wage rates. At 341, the index was 8 points (2 percent) above a year earlier.

The preliminary Adjusted Parity Ratio, reflecting Government payments, which will be published monthly beginning with this issue, was 77, down 2 points from March.

The Parity Ratio declined 2 points to 72

Summary table

Index, 1910-14=100	Apr. 15, 1966	Mar. 15, 1967	Apr. 15, 1967	Record high	
				Index	Date
Prices received	265	250	246	313	February 1951.
Parity index [1]	333	340	341	341	April 1967.
Parity ratio	80	74	72	123	October 1946.
Adjusted parity ratio [2] (preliminary)	86	79	77	--------	

[1] Prices paid, interest, taxes, and farm wage rates based on data for indicated dates.

[2] The adjusted parity ratio, reflecting Government payments, averaged 86 for the year 1966, compared with 80 for the parity ratio. Preliminary adjusted parity ratios for the current year, supplied by the Economic Research Service, are based on estimated cash receipts from marketings and estimates of Government payments for the current calendar year. See p. 30 of this issue of Agricultural Prices for a description of the method of making current estimates of the adjusted parity ratio.

GIVE GOVERNOR REAGAN A CHANCE—HIS PLAUDITS ARE INCREASING

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, when Ronald Reagan was elected Governor of the largest State of the Union, he inherited some of the largest problems ever to burden a State.

His first efforts to keep faith with the voters, to follow through on his campaign commitments, to bring some order out of chaos, to rescue the State from insolvency, to develop a respect for law and order, and to cope with the growing problems of finance and student behavior at the State universities were lampooned, and ridiculed by the leftist and partisan news media, and by sulking defeated candidates and former administration officialdom.

Now that observers are able to evaluate Governor Reagan's efforts and accomplishments with more objectivity, the reaction is surprisingly more commendatory. Most citizens are applauding his ideas and efforts. Even the skeptics are saying, "Give him a chance; he obviously is trying with great effort to give California better government."

His official appointees have been superior in ability and in their dedication to California than any of their predecessors. His volunteers—a resource of extraordinary potential never before tapped by a Governor—have been making great contributions. The mail response from private citizens has far exceeded the mail of all previous Governors in quantity and percentage of approval.

Because California is a large State and because a great experiment in representative government is being conducted in California by Governor Reagan, I include two recent newspaper columns which pertain to Governor Reagan—one by Roscoe Drummond from the Washington Post of May 3, 1967, and one from the Sacramento Union of April 18, 1967.

I hope they are of interest to all Members.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 3, 1967]

IS REAGAN REAL?—GOVERNOR HAS LEARNED FROM BLUNDERS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

SACRAMENTO, CALIF.—Ronald Reagan, as Governor, looks better closeup than at a distance.

The facts just do not support the impression which many east of the Rockies seem to have, that Reagan is some kind of conservative kook who is out to dismantle the government of the most populous State in the Nation and keep California's young people from getting an education.

I do not conclude that Reagan will turn out to be a distinguished Governor—or, in the end, even an effective Governor; it is too soon to know. But I have become convinced that his first four months in office show:

That his efforts to economize do not make him a reactionary bogeyman.

That the substance of what he is trying to achieve—less expensive, more efficient government which, he avows, "will never put dollars ahead of people"—is entirely reasonable.

That Reagan is quite aware that he has made political and tactical blunders which have got him into hot water—and he is learning from them.

That it is simply uninformed to dismiss Reagan as an actor playing Governor and premature to guess how he is going to look a year from now.

Such facts as the following about the Reagan record seem little known outside of California and they deserve to be better understood:

Reagan's top-level appointments reflect no reactionary mold. He is putting together a team of able administrators, some outstanding. He has retained three of Gov. Pat Brown's best men, named a Democrat head of the Water Resources Board because he was the most qualified, put a dedicated conservationist in charge of natural resources, placed a farm expert with Washington experience in the Eisenhower Administration in charge of California agriculture, and appointed a Negro to run veterans' affairs.

Reagan began his administration by trimming the state budget by $127,000,000—more than half of what he hoped to save.

He has faced up to the necessity of some increase in sales and income taxes to cope with a deficit and to give some relief to excessively high property taxes.

He has shown that he is not afraid to tread on some toes, that he can make decisions and stand behind them, that he intends to redeem his campaign promises. He is proving in practice that the idea he is an empty-headed actor reading somebody else's script is bunk.

Reagan is being too hastily judged, not on the basis of what he is seeking to achieve but on the basis of a few tactical mistakes.

I am not saying that Reagan has landed securely on his feet. But the facts certainly do not justify suggesting that he has fallen on his face. He hasn't.

[From the Sacramento Union, Apr. 18, 1967]

MAKING A START—GOVERNOR MADE IMPACT IN FIRST HUNDRED DAYS

In his first major post-election speech at Coronado last November, Ronald Reagan, governor-elect, outlined what he considered among the most important tasks confronting his administration.

His administration, Reagan said, would go beyond correcting executive and other deficiencies and repealing certain laws as important as these functions must be for any governor.

"In our case (we) must change the entire attitude and approach of government. We cannot reverse a trend of years overnight, or even in one term. But we can make a start."

As columnists have noted, Gov. Reagan made an impact in his first 100 days in office. It has been an impact good for the state.

An analysis of state laws and other changes must of necessity wait until the Legislature adjourns. But there can be no denying that Gov. Reagan's appointments for the most part have been of top-notch executives who have rolled up their sleeves for the state at a fraction of the income their talents would command in private business. More than 150 businessmen additionally are contributing their time to analyze deficiencies in government.

Gov. Reagan has stopped the practice he called "magic bookkeeping" by the previous administration to give Californians the hard fiscal facts of life as brutal as they are, even as he had said he would do.

He has earnestly sought genuine economies in government without affecting vital services, trying to reach the 10 per cent cut in the general fund he promised during his campaign.

He also has proposed meaningful changes in administration and its habits that will make state government more responsive to the will of the people, also a campaign promise.

In short, the remarkable aspect of the first 100 days of the Reagan administration is that he has made a good start in changing the entire attitude of state government, even as he has sought the correction of deficiencies.

The impact this has had from the entrenched interests is not surprising, but even this is salutary. Without the impact, the governor could not have received the undivided attention of the vested interests to let them know he means business.

And in spite of the outcry in some quarters, the governor has turned the runaway trend of state government with grace, equanimity and logic—gaining national attention in the process, for if Gov. Reagan turns the tide of bureaucracy in California, other states will follow.

To persons who voted for the governor and now are seeing their wishes followed, or to his loyal opposition which will benefit in spite of itself, the first 100 Reagan days are encouraging.

With the hundreds more to come the job might get done.

IN DEFENSE OF THE FLAG

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. BROCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the other Members of this House who are supporting passage of legislation which would make it a Federal crime to desecrate the flag of our country. I offer this bill to demonstrate my support.

Mutilation of the flag is not—by any possible stretch of the imagination—a legitimate form of protest. It is, to my mind, disgraceful, unforgivable behavior that borders closely on treason.

The burning of our flag, such as has taken place on several occasions recently, is a direct assault upon all of the principles and values which we as Americans have come to cherish as a part of our national heritage. It is a direct insult to this Nation—to all of us who live under its flag—and especially to the memory of those who have given their lives in its defense.

It is a sad commentary upon the spirit of our times that such a law should be necessary, but necessary it is. If respect for our country and our flag must be enforced by the threat of fine and imprisonment, then I am prepared to impose such a threat. That respect is due. It must be forthcoming.

A BILL TO PROVIDE CAREER INCENTIVES FOR CERTAIN PROFESSIONALLY TRAINED OFFICERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GUDE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, to foster the very best of professional services for our members of the Armed Forces I would like to call attention to H.R. 794, sponsored by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEGGETT], a bill now pending before the House Armed Services Committee to amend titles 10 and 37, United States Code, to provide career incentives for certain professionally trained officers of the Armed Forces. In my district I am constantly aware of the need for the professionally trained officer. Bethesda Naval Hospital and nearby Walter Reed are but two of the facilities that require this highly trained personnel. It is imperative to attract and retain the professionally trained individual in the Armed Forces. The purpose of H.R. 794 is to authorize constructive service credit for payment purposes for officers of the Armed Forces whose original appointments are conditioned upon the possession of advanced degrees. No more than 3 years of such credit would be given in any case. The effect of the proposed legislation would be to equalize the constructive service credit given to veterinarians, lawyers, chaplains, and certain medical corps officers with that now given to doctors and dentists. The Department of Defense acknowledges the need to recognize the advanced degree education of officers whose special knowledge is of vital importance to defense missions.

An officer who obtains professional or graduate education beyond the normal 4-year undergraduate level usually enters military service from 1 to 3 years later than his college contemporary who obtains only the basic baccalaureate degree. Since he has less active service, he is entitled under present law to less pay than his college contemporary, even if they both have the same military grade. Thus, although the Armed Force of which he is a member both requires and receives the benefit of his professional or graduate training, he is, in effect, penalized for the time spent in obtaining additional education.

The proposed legislation would eliminate this penalty and thereby encourage a greater number of professionally trained officers to remain in the Armed Forces on a career basis, under certain limited circumstances, various officers who required professional training are today given constructive credit for initial appointment in a grade higher than their line contemporaries. This credit, however, with the exception of physicians and dentists, is limited. To correct this inequity, I am, therefore, joining my colleagues in requesting that this bill be reported favorably out of the House Armed Services Committee, and passed by the House of Representatives and on through the Senate. I do hope my honorable colleagues join me in this action.

VIETNAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. WATSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, for the majority of the American people who have been shielded from the untold barbarous and criminal acts inflicted by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong against innocent people, I am certain that recent newsphotos showing captured American fliers being paraded through the streets of Hanoi came as a profound shock.

While I applaud the swift and certain reaction by our State Department against this atrocity, it is clearly evident that a note of protest is not going to curtail this inhumane treatment so indicative of our enemy. I have said before, and I say again today the only way to deal with these people is to show them that we mean business. To these agents of deceit the Geneva Convention is only a means toward an end. To them, international commitments are only made to give an air of legitimacy to their aggression. Like their Chinese Communist compatriots in Korea 15 years ago, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong have no respect for the rights of prisoners under article 13 of the Geneva Prisoner of War Convention.

Our retribution must be harsh and should include a blueprint for the total destruction of all military and strategic installations in North Vietnam. It is all too obvious that these people are convinced we are a paper tiger. We have displayed courtesy—and, in reality, timidity—in our objective of limited bombing of the North. Certainly the inhumane treatment given these airmen should command our maximum support for our men in Vietnam and strengthen our determination to make the necessary military commitments to bring this war to a quick conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that any normal American would react with horror when he views the mistreatment of a fellow American by these Communist bandits. Such a feeling is intensified when we see one of the prisoners with a head wound and obviously suffering great physical pain. But, this scene and many others will be duplicated unless the go-ahead is given to our military leaders to prosecute this war as they see fit. We have been engulfed in the wraps of rhetoric too long. Too long has Vietnam been treated as a political war. The only way to bring the Communists to the negotiating table is through a position of strength. Notes of protest would not get the job done, but the destruction of every target of military importance in North Vietnam will.

MISLEADING ADVERTISING

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BROYHILL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, literally thousands of people in the Washington area have been victimized by the activities of a few businesses allowed to operate here under names such as "debt adjusters," "budget counselors," "budget planners," or "credit advisers."

The victims, often people with good credit ratings and reasonably good incomes, but facing unusual emergency financial situations, have responded to carefully worded and deliberately misleading advertisements, and have contracted to pay set amounts of money on a periodic basis to "adjusters" who, in turn, attempted to obtain from their creditors agreement to accept reduced payments paid through the adjusters.

Misleading advertising has convinced many victims that their debts were being paid in full by the adjusters and that they, in turn, were to pay the adjusters a commission plus the balance of the debts on a regular basis. However, the adjusters do not actually make lump sum payments to creditors, but simply notify creditors that they will pay specific amounts in behalf of their clients until the debts are satisfied. The adjusters' commissions, deducted from the debtors' payments, are often sizable, and many debtors have found themselves facing repossession of their automobiles and garnishment of their wages by creditors who refuse to deal with so-called debt adjusters.

As early as 1956 the State legislature in my own State of Virginia decided that the business of debt adjusting defied regulation and must be outlawed. I believe it has been now prohibited in some 20 other States as well.

In 1957, I introduced legislation which would have outlawed debt adjusting in the District of Columbia. However, a smoke screen, promoted by the adjusters themselves, was built up around the old argument of regulation as opposed to prohibition, and enough confusion was generated that the measure was amended and later died.

Since then, however, enough time has passed that we have been able to accumulate evidence which should convince anyone that the protection of the public desperately requires outlawing rather than regulating commercial debt adjusters here. The bill I am introducing today for this purpose will prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association.

I believe this legislation is long overdue, and I urge favorable consideration by my colleagues.

HON. MENDEL L. RIVERS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SMITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the Honorable MENDEL L. RIVERS, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee upon which I serve, for the good work that he performs on behalf of our Nation and for his work put forth, and his efforts in behalf of H.R. 9240 which is now before this body. It is most urgent that this bill be passed in order to supply the needs of our Armed Forces throughout the world but more particularly in South Vietnam. I encourage each of my colleagues to give it a vote of confidence.

I wish to join Chairman RIVERS and Mr. HÉBERT, my colleague on the Armed Services Committee, in their remarks regarding the beatniks and so-called peace marchers who are in this city even on this very day, and who have the uncommon lack of good judgment to take this means to abuse freedom of speech and to heap untold harm upon our boys who are fighting in Vietnam.

It is indeed regrettable that the Department of Justice has the authority, capability, and the reinforcement of law to prosecute these demonstrators and yet refuses to do so. It is incumbent upon this body to urge, in every way possible, that the Department of Justice move quickly to deal properly with the responsibility that lies before it and correct this prostitution of justice.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of controversy surrounding the Nike X program, and the installation of this kind of antiballistic missile system. However, a great deal of money has already been spent in research and development in this area and it is my strong belief that continued research and development is absolutely necessary in order that we may have a ready deployment of these missiles which would be a useful first step toward meeting the defense needs of our Nation, and protect our citizens against ballistic missile attack from any present or future hostile Nation.

The appropriations reported by our committee in the amount of $14,129,400,000 for procurement by all of our services of the necessary aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and track combat vehicles, of course, is absolutely necessary for the maintenance of our national defense posture worldwide and in our commitment to the people of South Vietnam.

I further urge this body to support the necessary and mandatory request of our services for further research, development, testing, and evaluation of our other defense systems in the amount of $7,305,632,000.

Mr. Speaker, in a day when we have witnessed the deplorable conduct of some American citizens both at home and abroad who have openly desecrated our flag, and have criticized our soldiers for their involvement in a war to which our Nation is committed, this body is bound to condemn them for their acts and rally to the support of our fighting services with all that is necessary.

I urge support of this measure.

REPORT ON THE SPRING MEETING OF THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, as leader of the U.S. group I wish at this time to report on the spring conference of the Interparliamentary Union which was held at Palma de Mallorca on the island of Mallorca from March 27 to April 2, 1967.

The spring conference is the meeting at which the agenda and resolutions are prepared for the plenary session which this year will be held in Moscow, September 7–15. The U.S. group was composed of the following:

Representative ALEXANDER PIRNIE, Republican of New York, president.

Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, vice president.

Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, vice president.

Representative E. ROSS ADAIR, Republican, of Indiana, vice president.

Representative EMILIO Q. DADDARIO, Democrat, of Connecticut, member of the Interparliamentary Union Executive Committee and Interparliamentary Union Council.

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan, member of the Interparliamentary Union Council.

Representative PAUL C. JONES, Democrat, of Missouri, treasurer.

Representative EDWARD J. DERWINSKI, Republican, of Illinois, secretary.

Representative W. R. POAGE, Democrat, of Texas.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN, Democrat, of Connecticut.

Representative ROBERT MCCLORY, Republican, of Illinois.

Representative CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington.

Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN, Democrat, of North Carolina.

Senator WALLACE F. BENNETT, Republican, of Utah.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California.

Senator HUGH SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas.

Honorable Katharine St. George, executive secretary and honorary member of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay a well-deserved tribute to the entire delegation for their fine cooperation and outstanding participation at the meeting. They were faithful to their assignments and worked untiringly throughout the sessions. Not only were they effective in the debate but also in the personal contacts which are a most important aspect of such a conference.

We met each morning in a group prior to the official sessions. This enabled us to keep in touch with the activities of the several committees and to review the problems presented. These preliminary discussions contributed valuable preparation for the final tests. In fact, this approach worked so satisfactorily that regular monthly meetings of the group will be held here in Washington to follow up the work undertaken at Palma. This will keep everyone currently informed on all activities of the Union as reported by the Secretariat in Geneva.

At the first morning session of the U.S. group in Palma we had a briefing by our Ambassador to Spain, Angier Biddle Duke. The Ambassador gave the delegates a good statement on political and economic conditions in Spain.

We then went to the first session of our conference, where we were greeted by the mayor of Palma, members of the Spanish Cabinet, and the head of the Spanish delegation, Conde de Mayalde. Our delegation was particularly happy to renew our friendships with many members of the Spanish delegation, especially with Senor Manuel de Aranegui, who has always been such a good friend of the United States.

At these spring meetings, we receive proposals from the various international groups and the committees as to the resolutions to be brought before the plenary sessions of the Interparliamentary Union Conference next fall. Our members on the five study commissions were as follows:

Political Questions, International Security and Disarmament.

Congressmen PIRNIE and DADDARIO; Senators SPARKMAN and BENNETT.

Economic and Social.

Congressmen POAGE and MAY; Senator JORDAN.

Parliamentary and Juridical.

Senators SCOTT and HART; Congressman ADAIR.

Non-Self-Governing Territories, and Ethnic Questions.

Congressman DERWINSKI, Senator KUCHEL, and Congressman JONES.

Cultural.

Senators ALLOTT and YARBOROUGH; Congressmen MCCLORY and MONAGAN.

During the conference, I was named a vice president of the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament.

As anticipated, the debate in the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament centered on Vietnam. The agenda item embraced measures for insuring, in particular at the parliamentary level, the implementation of the United Nations declaration on the inadmissability of intervention in the domestic affairs of states and the protection of their independence and sovereignty. The Soviet Union, supported by other members of the Communist bloc, attacked the United States for its actions in Vietnam and offered a resolution which made specific charges against us. Senator SPARKMAN and I restated our position in support of self-determination for all nations and our desire to terminate the Vietnam struggle under terms assuring stability in that area, and protection against all forms of aggression, including terrorism and subversion. Other speakers affirmed their faith in our intentions.

Finally the problem was referred to a drafting committee composed of representatives of the U.S.S.R., Belgium, the United Arab Republic, Japan, and the United States. As a member of the Committee, I was very pleased that the resolution as reported dealt objectively with the real dangers of all forms of aggression, devoid of propaganda and specific charges. We joined with 27 nations in approving the resolution and the Soviets could only command 10 votes in opposition. Thirteen nations abstained. The full text of the resolution is appended to this report, together with the remarks of Senator SPARKMAN and myself.

The Economic and Social Committee passed a resolution that was acceptable to our three delegates after some revision; but it was decided to hold over the resolution, which dealt with the present international monetary system and its possible reform, for further study. Quite frankly, the delegates did not appear to be sufficiently informed to deal with this very specialized subject in such a short time.

The Cultural Committee accepted the U.S. resolution on parliament's role in the elaboration and control of national scientific policy, and named its author, Congressman MCCLORY, as rapporteur for the Committee. Representative MCCLORY's remarks, and those of Senator ALLOTT, on this resolution and the work of this Committee are also part of this report.

In the same Cultural Committee, Senator ALLOTT proposed an excellent resolution on conservation, but it was decided to hold this matter over for further study. It was evident that the Senator's resolution was way ahead of anything that other delegations offered, as they specialized in only a few facets of the problem, whereas the Senator's report was much more inclusive:

> The *Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions*, on March 30 and 31, resumed discussion of *Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism and New Forms of Racial, Religious, Political and Economic Discrimination* which it had begun in Teheran. Two separate tendencies came to light in the course of the debate, certain speakers stressing the virtual disappearance of colonialism in the world and the serious difficulties experienced by the newly independent countries, while others pointed out that the number of peoples under colonial domination was still considerable and denounced, in particular, the instances of neo-colonialism which manifested itself increasingly on the economic plane. The draft resolution, drawn up by the nine-member drafting committee and largely based on a text put forward by the French Inter-Parliamentary Group, takes these factors into account and stresses the economic aspect of the problem. With minor amendments, the draft was adopted unanimously by the full Committee. A summary of our position before this Committee may be found in the remarks of Congressman Derwinski hereto appended. In concluding debate he summarized the comments of other countries and rebutted hostile charges.

Finally, the Council met and accepted those resolutions noted above, which had affirmative committee action. In addition, the Council approved two significant resolutions introduced directly into its proceedings. One was a Belgian resolution on Vietnam which the U.S. group successfully amended in part before its approval by the Council for report to the Moscow Conference. The United States abstained from voting on the second resolution which was a proposal of the Polish delegation. Amended in two instances by the delegation from India, this resolution pertained to the nonproliferation of atomic weapons, and will probably come up for further discussion and possible amendment at the Plenary Session next fall.

On the whole we came out ahead on the deliberations at the conference, but it is well to remember that we are still fighting a rearguard action; and that we are not getting very much help from certain countries we assume to be our friends. For this reason we must be diligent in keeping abreast of everything that transpires, and consider carefully all communications from the Secretariat in Geneva.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this House will bear in mind that the Interparliamentary Union is the only group of international parliamentarians in the world; and that if the modern world does not support such a group in one of the world's largest democracies, the parliamentary form of government may well disappear from the earth.

Before I finish, I would also like to thank the staff which accompanied us and extend our appreciation for its work and attention to detail. In addition to Mrs. St. George, our executive secretary, we had support from our administrative secretary, Mr. Darrell St. Claire, Chief Clerk of the U.S. Senate.

We were also helped by Dr. Charles Zinn, of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House, by Mr. William H. Gleysteen, of the Department of State, and by Miss Milrae Jensen, of the staff of the Committee on Foreign Relations in the Senate.

Our military escorts were Lt. Col. William Parker, USA; Lt. Col. Richard Guertin, USA; Lt. Col. Anthony DiLorenzo, USA (MC); Sgt. James J. Furey, USA; and Sgt. James Buchanan, USA.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include copies of the speeches made at Palma in the RECORD following my remarks, and that copies of the resolutions to be debated at the Moscow meeting in September also be included.

OPENING STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ALEXANDER PIRNIE BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL QUESTIONS, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY, AND DISARMAMENT, PALMA DE MALLORCA, MARCH 28, 1967

It is a great pleasure for the United States Delegation to meet once again as members of this international body—and, I should add, to be able to meet on this beautiful island. Each of our groups has major responsibilities within its own country to help assure conditions for constructive growth. Our task here should be to extend these national efforts into international relations. I hope we can use this meeting to increase our mutual understanding, because I am convinced there can be no sound basis for international peace and security without such understanding.

The need for our joint efforts should be apparent from a brief review of our progress and continuing problems. Helpful changes have taken place since the end of World War II and the bitterest days of the cold war. Mutual abhorrence of nuclear war now helps sustain an uneasy military balance among the major powers despite the tragedy of local wars. The confrontations of the 1950's have been altered as a result of national revivals in Europe and Asia, the virtual disappearance of former colonial systems, and the emergence of so many newly independent states.

The United States welcomes these changes. We seek the greater security which can come with growing maturity and confidence, even between nations with opposed ideologies. We have tried to adjust our policies to these new circumstances and to demonstrate appropriate flexibilities.

We have promoted a variety of contacts with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe;

We have joined in a limited test ban treaty;

We are in the process of achieving a new treaty for peaceful uses of outer space.

We are seeking an agreement which will help control the proliferation of nuclear weapons.

We must not, however, let the encouragement of these trends obscure the vast area of unsolved problems. Communist China's militant leadership still pushes an enormous portion of mankind toward extreme goals creating unrest and turmoil within the country, severely threatening international efforts to stabilize the security of southern and eastern Asia. An ugly war continues in Vietnam. Korea remains divided. Improved relations in Europe have not opened a way to early unification of Germany. Tensions and periodic violence remain chronic in the Near East. A new range of problems has developed in Africa. And finally the vast majority of countries in the world remain in great need of assistance.

I know that many of you share my delegation's anxiety about the war in Vietnam. Our basic purpose there is simply to ensure that the people of Vietnam have the opportunity to work out their own future free from external attack—whether that attack be open and direct or covert and indirect. We seek nothing more. We do not threaten the legitimate interests of any other country in the area. We are not bent on imposing our own will in Vietnam, or intervening in the affairs of the Vietnamese people. We do not desire permanent military bases in South Vietnam.

Our determination to meet our commitments and resist aggression in Vietnam stems from our past experience and the world conflagration which resulted from previous failure to meet aggression. Anyone familiar with the United States role in this century knows that our people and government fervently desire the maintenance of a world order based on peace, progress, justice, and stability. We have sought most vigorously a peaceful settlement which would protect and preserve the legitimate interests of the people of both North and South Vietnam. Our record in seeking an honorable solution speaks for itself. We have repeatedly offered to go anywhere, at any time, meet with anyone, if doing so would advance the cause of peace in Vietnam. We are prepared to discuss all reasonable proposals. We have said we will engage in discussions without preconditions or undertake reciprocal actions leading to a cessation of hostilities. To this end we have used all responsible channels known to us, but up to this time have found no constructive response from the other side.

We have made clear our preference to use our resources to assist efforts of Asians themselves in the field of economic and social development. We have invited the Soviet Union and North Vietnam to participate with us and others, once peace is restored, in this cooperative venture on behalf of all people.

Although the war has enormously complicated steps toward national construction in South Vietnam, much progress has been made. A new constitution has been drawn up. Local elections will be held within the next few weeks and national elections will be held within a few months. Equally important, the Government of South Vietnam has undertaken measures of national conciliation in hopes of a situation where no elements of South Vietnam will be excluded from *peaceful* participation in their nation's political life.

In conclusion, my delegation believes there are specific steps which this body can usefully undertake whether we are dealing with the question of war in Vietnam or with other cases where we must concern ourselves with protecting states from outside intervention:

First, we can alert all nations, through study and debate, to the danger of intervention and its many forms;

Second, the IPU may call on national parliaments to search for ways to strengthen the capacity of their own nations for individual or collective self defense against attempted intervention;

And, finally, the IPU may encourage individual parliamentarians to study the problem of intervention.

If words about intervention can be translated into action to ensure non-intervention, then ideologies should be able to compete peacefully on their merits without endangering world peace.

Statement by Senator John Sparkman Before the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament, Palma de Mallorca, March 28, 1967

I regret the attempt to make this debate serve propagandistic ends.

I also regret the invectives which have been used to heat this debate.

Above all, I regret that a few delegations have, in their presentations, chosen to ignore the dangers of the modern techniques of intervention. All of us here can, of course, agree to condemn open armed invasion. There have been a few cases of it in the last two decades—in Korea, Tibet, and Hungary, for example. Still open invasion has gone a little out of style. Most threats to the peace in the last few years have come from the equally vicious but slightly more subtle forms of intervention—such as terrorism, subversion, and support of the so-called "wars of national liberation."

The United Nations has long since condemned these forms of malicious intervention along with all the others. I leave it to my colleagues to judge the intentions of the Communist states in omitting subversion, infiltration, and terrorism from their statements and positions. Whatever the motives, I trust this organization, like the United Nations, will rectify the oversight.

My own conclusion, unfortunately, is that the Soviet Union and a few other states view debate on this topic not as an opportunity for serious work but as another chance to attack the United States for its support of the Government of South Vietnam. The Soviet Union always seems more prepared to talk about the Vietnamese situation than to *do* anything to end the war.

Although my delegation has already discussed the problem of Viet-Nam, concern for the truth and the integrity of the record requires me briefly to state the facts again. The action of the United States in Viet-Nam has been in response to aggression by North Viet-Nam against South Viet-Nam. The response of the United States to the requests of South Viet-Nam is an act of collective self-defense as perceived in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter. Further, the United States has offered time and again to enter into negotiations, without preconditions, for a settlement of the Viet-Nam conflict.

What is so disturbing about the repeated attacks made by the Soviet Union is the unspoken assumption that this body is so gullible that it can be made victim to the philosophy that if you repeat a story long enough, no matter how untrue, people will begin to believe it. And, at the same time, the U.S.S.R. has obstructed action in the United Nations Security Council—a body competent to do something besides talk about Viet-Nam. The nation that has wept the biggest tears in this debate is one of the nations that has prevented action by the United Nations. Nor has that member's ally, North Viet-Nam, been prepared to talk privately about peace.

The United States, for its part, has continually stressed its willingness to negotiate. And my country will continue to strive for peace. We are, however, a little tired of getting in reply the same sterile invective and the same refusal to engage in serious work. We are tired of hearing pious thoughts for peace and witnessing contradictory actions.

I appeal now to the Soviet Union, and to any other nations who may be able to influence the North Vietnamese regime, to use their influence to bring about negotiations for peace—unconditional negotiations based on the principles of the Geneva Agreements.

Let me turn to the task before us: the task of drafting a resolution which will guide parliamentarians of all nations in the task of defining and combating intervention. This task is no longer so straightforward as it might have been a few decades ago. The problem is that intervention of one state in the affairs of another no longer invariably takes the simple form it had in past times. More common than direct invasion have been attempts to overthrow free and independent governments in the developing countries through assistance to so-called "national liberation movements." Such assistance has taken the form of arms, money, and training. We saw it in Greece in the years after World War II. The Governments of Venezuela and Guatemala have fought this sort of intervention for years and are still doing so. In the case of Southeast Asia, the intervention has gone a step further. South Viet-Nam has long been subject to massive infiltration of enemy troops. Laos is the victim of the same aggression, and now it is beginning in Thailand. In these circumstances, it is important for this body to make clear that it condemns conquest, aggression, and intervention by any name. The action we are debating must be specific on this point.

Our task this year is given special urgency and importance because, last January, an organization was set up with the specific purpose of developing communist plans for intervention and making arrangements to carry them out. I refer to the Havana Tri-Continental Conference and the organization it established. The Tri-Continental Conference specifically attacked the United Nations and went on to make recommendations that are directly opposed to the UN Charter in every important particular. Every sort of intervention was justified and recommended to further "national liberation"—which is to say communist subjugation.

The Tri-Continental Conference and its permanent organizations have encouraged subversion and guerrilla warfare in a great many of the newly independent members of this organization. In Africa, some of the countries attacked have been Uganda, Congo (Kinshasa), Nigeria, Senegal, Upper Volta, Cameroon, Niger, Ivory Coast, Malagasy, Morocco, Libya, Tunisia, Rwanda, Botswana, and the present regime of Ghana. In Asia the Conference urged subversion in Japan, Malaysia, Singapore, Thailand, Laos, South Viet-Nam, Indonesia, and the Republic of China. In the Western Hemisphere, the list is too long to repeat, for it includes twenty-one independent states—Virtually the entire Hemisphere with the exception, of course, of Communist Cuba.

I would also note that the Havana Conference had high-level delegations of officials from every Communist country, but that with few exceptions its delegates from other countries were drawn from subversive groups or "liberation movements" engaged in open warfare with the governments of those independent countries. In my view, this body must make clear that it condemns such intervention by a few in the affairs of a great many.

I often wish that the nations guilty of fomenting such intervention would pay a little more attention to their own doctrine.

If the Communists really believe that every free people will of their own choice pick communism then I wish the salesmen for communism would throw away their guns. Let the people decide and decide freely. That is how to bring about peace. That is the way to insure that intervention, no matter what its form, will become a curiosity of history.

Remarks of Congressman Edward J. Derwinski Before the Committee on Non-Self-Governing Territories and Ethnic Questions, March 31, 1967, at Palma de Mallorca

The various resolutions before the Committee dealing with "neo-colonialism" require clarification since the term itself is subject to different definitions. We must first make clear that "neo-colonialism" is a term which the Communist nations use extensively in their propaganda which is directed at the economic philosophy and policies of Western nations who have freedom of economic activities not practiced behind the Iron Curtain.

The UAR, whose delegation seems determined to join in hurling criticism at Western nations, labeling them as imperialists, is itself a potential victim of "neo-colonialism" practices by the Soviet Union. The UAR must fully recognize that the economic potential of its recently-discovered oil resources would be frustrated if the sales it would look forward to generating would be victimized by Soviet oil-dumping policies.

Our colleague from the USSR surprised me in that his presentation didn't reflect any change in substance from those utterances we have heard at previous conferences. I am afraid that the USSR and the other self-styled peoples' democracies are demonstrating their use of old cliches rather than providing practical suggestions as to how to advance world economic progress which would include betterment of conditions in developing lands.

In response to the commentary of the Hungarian spokesman, criticizing that the U.S. receives cooperation from South Africa in the aggression which the Communists claim we are waging in Vietnam, I must point out to them that it is the Communist North which is attacking the non-Communist South Vietnamese. However, it is the height of irony for a Hungarian Parliamentarian to profess to be interested in the rights of individual citizens of Aden or South Africa when his own government deprives its people of religious freedom. If the Hungarian government wishes to demonstrate its legitimate respect for human rights, it should permit Cardinal Mindszenty to return to his pastoral duties.

I must address myself in a very personal way to our committee member from Poland, who like his Soviet counterpart, attacked the U.S. in the standard Communist propaganda fashion. As an American of Polish extraction, I am proud of the land of my forebears, but must recognize that the present government in Warsaw is certainly not following the great traditions of freedom that can be seen in the history of the Polish nation. I recognize that the presence of Soviet troops on Polish soil might force the Warsaw government to take certain positions and I am hopeful that at future conferences we will discuss this type of "neo-colonialism" as well as the continued Soviet control of the Baltic States, Armenia, The Ukraine, and other captive nations held in colonial-type bondage.

However, the main assignment of our committee should not be to indulge in criticism of other nations, but to produce a workable resolution. On behalf of the U.S. group which includes my colleagues, Senator Kuchel and Representative Jones, I suggest that the draft resolution submitted by the French be the basis for refinement by a special committee and that emphasis be placed on legitimate logical plans for economic cooperation. No nation or any people will benefit from propaganda harangues or emotional disregard for the facts of life of international economics.

[The final resolution of the committee cleared up most of the objections which our delegation had, but since reference was still made to "neo colonialist" policies we did not support the final draft. Senator Kuchel proposed amendments which cleared up some of the language so that the final draft was as reasonable as we could have expected.]

Remarks by Congressman Robert McClory Before the Cultural Committee at Palma de Mallorca, March 29, 1967

It is most significant that a discussion on the vital subject of national science policy should occur in the homeland of our distinguished chairman, Senor Manuel de Aranegui. For whatever else may be said of this conference, there can be no doubt about the vital role which the nations' parliaments must play in developing science policy for their respective nations. It is also obvious that the interchange of scientific knowledge and information between the nations of the world can be a most useful activity in behalf of greater international understanding and peace. Of course, it is essential that such knowledge and information should be applied for improving the economic and social condition of all of the peoples of the world.

The expressions "science" and "science policy" should be given the broadest interpretation possible to include science in all its branches, both basic and applied, and to include all of the various technological and other related disciplines which may be employed in our modern society.

The universal interest in this subject is apparent when we realize that a definitive and comprehensive science policy is a vital element in the programs of developing and developed countries alike. In addition to the universal application of the subject before the committee, our discussion of the role of parliament in the development of national science policy is intimately related to the important work of UNESCO (United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization) with which this committee has established close liaison.

In my own country, the United States Congress (parliament) has attached increasing importance to science policy in recent years. I might say, in passing, that in 1946 only approximately 1 percent of the national budget related to research and development on scientific and technological subjects. This figure has increased so that in 1965 an amount in excess of 15 percent of the national budget was allocated for scientific and technological purposes. On the basis of current national expenditures, this amounts to something more than $15-billion annually.

The emphasis has been not solely that of the national government itself. The 50 states and lesser units of government have also devoted increasing amounts of their annual budgets to scientific uses. What to many seems of equal or perhaps greater significance is the allocation by private industry of sizable amounts of capital and earnings for scientific and technological research and development. In general, this results in improvements in the industry's processes and products. Frequently these private expenditures also result in substantial public benefits.

The role of Congress has expanded as this public and private emphasis on science and technology has increased. For instance, the Congress has supported and encouraged coordination of scientific activities in the executive departments and agencies of the government. More significantly, the Congress has established a Committee on Science and Astronautics, in which is included a Subcommittee of Science Research and Development. This subcommittee is headed by my colleague, Congressman Emilio Daddario, member of the United States delegation, and also a member of the Executive Committee of the Inter-Parliamentary Union.

The principal aim of this subcommittee has been to provide improved scientific information for the Members of the United States House of Representatives. The essential character of this subcommittee is apparent when one considers that the Congress must make expensive and vital decisions with respect to those areas of scientific research and development which it elects to authorize and finance.

In addition to the scientific information available through those scientists attached to the executive branch of the government, as well as those in educational institutions and private industry, the Congress has provided an independent source of scientific information in the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

At the inaugural ceremonies of the new headquarters of the Inter-Parliamentary Union in Geneva in November 1965, Dr. Edward Wenk, Jr., presented a paper entitled, "Information required by Members of Parliament in a World increasingly Governed by Science." Dr. Wenk's presentation was reproduced in a special issue of the Inter-Parliamentary Bulletin (First Quarter 1966). In concluding his remarks, Dr. Wenk declared significantly:

"* * * in a representative government, Parliaments must be not only recipients of science-based information; Parliaments must also be the sources of information and interpretation—to illuminate the issues and alternatives before the nation so as to be sure that there is adequate exchange with their constituency for parliamentary action indeed to be the 'people's choice'." (p. 39)

What is, I believe, a unique practice inaugurated by Congressman Daddario's subcommittee is the convening of an annual symposium to which leaders in the various categories of science from various parts of the world are drawn together to exchange ideas and to share information with representatives of the Congress and their staffs. These scientific experts are drawn from government, institutions of higher learning and the private sector.

We were privileged during this most recent symposium, which was held in January of this year, to have as a participant our distinguished Secretary General, M. André de Blonay. In the course of his remarks, M. de Blonay appraised this particular work of the United States Congress in part as follows:

"My first comment is that the U.S. Congress is to my knowledge—and I know a great many parliaments in all parts of the world—the only assembly where a seminar of this type can take place providing for a free exchange of ideas and information between political leaders, on the one hand, and qualified representatives of the scientific community, both national and international, on the other.

"* * * the integration of science and politics (is) a prerequisite for any nation which wishes to develop and to implement an integrated national science policy corresponding to the needs of its people."

I suppose the main significance of this discussion of the United States science policy is that the role of Congress has grown dramatically in order to meet its responsibilities to the people whom the various Members of Congress represent. Also, it seems important to point out that in the American parliamentary system the minority party is given appropriate recognition. Decisions with regard to science policy, including authorizations and appropriations, reflect many of the views of the Members of the minority party in the Congress. I should add, also, that in searching out the best and most current scientific information and advice, Members of the Congress frequently hear from scientists who expound divergent points of view.

In endeavoring to abbreviate these remarks and point to the broad objectives of my nation's science policy as I believe it exists, and to provide a consensus or cross-section of the views of the 535 Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, I would like to suggest the following as our nation's main objectives:

1) Congress is anxious to obtain the maximum benefit from scientific and technological advances and to support those activities which are the most productive in benefiting the nation.

2) Congress favors the greatest possible coordination between various scientific research agencies and endeavors to prevent as much overlapping of activities as possible.

3) Congress undertakes to promote interest in science and technology and to encourage among the general public the benefits which flow from these developments.

4) Congress endeavors to encourage its citizens to engage in basic and applied scientific research and to utilize scientific and technological developments.

5) Congress also encourages a maximum of cooperation and interchange between the scientists from the private and public sectors, and advocates a maximum dissemination of scientific and technological informa-

tion. It is the feeling of the Congress that by promoting this sort of cooperation, we can gain greater international understanding and promote universal well-being—and peace.

As our distinguished Secretary General declared at the recent United States Congressional Symposium on Science:

"There was one * * * point on which our members meeting in Paris agreed and this was that the universal nature of science implies that every state, when formulating its science policy, must take into account the imperative requirements of international cooperation and solidarity.

"* * * Yes, science is universal. Its language ignores national barriers. Science in an interdependent world can only develop through the free flow of talent and ideas and scientists probably form the only true international community whose members share common values and have a common understanding of their objectives in the search for truth.

"The concept of world peace through world law, on which great hopes were placed in the past, has not made much progress. We now look to scientists, hoping that they will make their contribution to world peace in this great tradition of scientific humanism * * *."

I conclude by stating, that, in my opinion, the attainment of these objectives by parliamentarians from all countries could help move the people of the world rapidly toward a goal of friendly and cooperative understanding and universal peace.

May I add that the approval of a draft resolution for appropriate discussion or debate at the September meeting in Moscow would seem to be a most important step for this Committee.

Addendum to Remarks by Senator Gordon Allott Before the Culture Committee at Palma de Mallorca, March 27–April 2, 1967

At the Spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union meeting, which was held at Palma de Mallorca from March 27–April 2, I was assigned to the Cultural Committee, upon which Representative Robert McClory has served for a considerable length of time.

At a preliminary meeting of our Committee, held in the Capitol, we determined that he would handle the first area of discussion assigned to the Cultural Committee, which was basically the subject of the application of Science and Technology in our expending world and the dependence of developing countries.

Mr. McClory did a very fine job of presenting this area to the Cultural Committee and drew a draft resolution which was adopted with only minor modifications and presented to the Council.

The second portion of the Cultural Committee assignment was the world-wide problem of the conservation of nature and natural resources. The very title left the whole area to be covered quite undefined because as Mr. John Kenneth Rose of the Library of Congress pointed out in the paper prepared for the use of the Delegation, the term "conservation of nature" is not commonly used in the United States. We were not certain, therefore, whether the subject matter to be covered was the "preservation of nature" or the conservation and use of all natural resources of a country, including timber, ore, water, hydro-electric potential, soil and the many other uses deriving from the multiple purpose concept which has been enacted into law by the United States Congress.

At the meeting of the Cultural Committee, upon this particular item, Senator Yarborough was also present and did not speak only because of the pressure of time from other delegates.

It appeared that the assignment of the subject matter had not been given sufficient thought and definition. Some countries who made statements were not certain whether they should talk about "preservation of nature" or conservation of natural resources.

Statements were made by the delegates from Belgium, Israel and Germany, as well as Japan and the Netherlands, and demonstrated the confusion as to the area of discussion.

We had taken the precaution to draw a draft resolution, covering basically the two broad aspects of this problem as to the preservation of natural environments and the multi-purpose use of all the natural resources of the country.

I attach a copy of this resolution. It was filed with the Chairman of the Cultural Committee and action was diverted upon the basis that the Cultural Committee was to submit only one resolution to the Council and that the Science and Technology Resolution drawn by Mr. McClory was much more advanced in discussion. Action was diverted upon the Resource Resolution, but it was agreed it would be discussed at Moscow.

If I am in attendance in Moscow, I would suggest the submission of this Resolution as a source for discussion, but it is obvious that the Chairman of the Cultural Committee, or ourselves, will have to define the areas of discussion. Most persons who spoke were concerned with the preservation of natural environment and not with the conservation of multiple uses of all the natural resources of a country.

It would be my hope that Moscow would form a basis for defining some of these areas, where the great know-how of the United States could be of assistance to the developing countries in the great and broad area of the use of natural resources.

DRAFT RESOLUTION ON THE WORLD-WIDE PROBLEM OF THE CONSERVATION OF NATURE AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Considering conservation to include both the preservation of nature and the wise use of natural resources, emphasizing development and management of resources to obtain and assure the greatest good for the largest number of people for the longest period of time;

Observing the continuing growth of population in most of the lands of the earth, the rising expectations of such populations and the expanding demands made by such populations upon natural resources;

Realizing the dependence of all mankind upon soil and water for food and fiber, conservation, development, rehabilitation, and augmentation of these vital resources must be universally encouraged, utilizing the most advanced and proven techniques which in some instances may require the joint efforts of two or more nations;

Believing that it is necessary for every State to formulate and implement conservation policies in harmony with the natural resources available to it, whether they be proven or potential supplies, as well as with its own present and hoped-for national development;

Recognizing the common interest of all mankind in the preservation of endangered species, the setting aside of unspoiled samples of the natural environment, the establishment of parks and monuments of unique character or beauty, the making available of sites, reserves, trails, wild rivers, green belts, open spaces, and other natural areas for use, recreation and study;

Recognizing also the basic dependence of our complex civilization on the development and wise use of land and soil, water, air, minerals, energy, forests, and other vital resources from which man supplies his needs for food, clothing and shelter as well as the sinews of modern industry;

Concerned that easily available supplies of some resources are being exploited at a rate which cannot be maintained, and that the quality of the environment, especially of air and water, is being degraded by preventable pollution;

Recognizing furthermore the world-wide nature of some conservation problems, that international cooperation is necessarily involved if policies and programs are to be established and accomplished with respect to some resources and that mutual benefits are to be derived from international discussion of many aspects of most conservation problems;

Aware of efforts to promote natural resource surveys, encourage the formulation of conservation policy and the planning and activation of conservation projects by UNESCO, the United Nations Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology, and other international organizations;

Believing that it is the responsibility of Parliaments to help formulate and control national conservation policies and to ensure that advances thereunder are applied in the development of national economies:

1. *Notes with satisfaction* that Resolution 2173 (XXI) of the General Assembly, adopted on December 6, 1966, endorsed the continuing study by the Economic and Social Council of the means of implementing a five-year survey program for the development of non-agricultural resources, intended to strengthen the economic base and the economic independence of the developing countries.

2. *Urges* that such surveys be directed specifically to discovering and evaluating resources which now are or soon will be in short supply.

3. *Emphasizing* that such surveys are not an end in themselves but if oriented toward meeting an emerging need may provide an adequate base for feasible economic development.

4. *Notes, also with satisfaction* that UNESCO, in its General Conference, fourteenth session meeting in Paris in October–November 1966 adopted Resolution 2.23 which reaffirms that the Director-General is authorized to continue to take appropriate steps to stimulate research and training relating to the natural environment and resources of land areas and their conservation.

5. *Requests* that conservation of natural resources as encouraged by UNESCO and other international agencies will involve a broad rather than restricted definition of the field and its problems.

6. *Expresses hope* that the developed nations will continue to share their present knowledge and technologies with the developing nations for the benefit of all peoples, and continue the search for better ways and means and will cooperate in joint endeavors to develop, rehabilitate, and augment vital basic resources.

7. *Urges* all parliaments to ensure that national conservation policies, programs and activities are provided with the human, financial and material resources necessary for timely development and to establish the governmental bodies and institutions required for activating and coordinating national conservation policy, giving emphasis to education of the public as well as skilled technicians or research and development.

Resolution From the Committee on Political Questions, International Security, and Disarmament Adopted by the Interparliamentary Union Council for Consideration at the Moscow Meeting Concerning Measures for Ensuring, in Particular at the Parliamentary Level, the Implementation of the United Nations Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of Their Independence and Sovereignty

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Noting the great international significance of the Declaration adopted by the XXth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty,

Displaying serious concern over the fact that, despite the unanimous approval and adoption of the above-mentioned Declaration, some States continue armed intervention in the domestic affairs of other States in different parts of the world as well as carry on other forms of direct or indirect interference with the sovereign independence of other countries and nations, resulting in increased international tension and in threats to universal peace,

Expressing full support of the resolution adopted by the XXIst Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Status of the Implementation of the Declaration on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty,

Realizing the urgent need for adoption by Parliaments of concrete measures so as to achieve strict observance of the principles of the said Declaration,

Considers it its duty to call upon the Parliaments of all countries:

1. to facilitate, in all their foreign-policy activities, the strict implementation of the principles of the Declaration of the XXth Session of the United Nations General Assembly on the Inadmissibility of Intervention in the Domestic Affairs of States and the Protection of their Independence and Sovereignty, as well as the Resolution on the course of the implementation of this Declaration adopted by the XXIst Session of the United Nations General Assembly;

2. to strive for the immediate termination and continued avoidance of armed intervention or promotion or organization of subversion, terrorism or other indirect forms of intervention for the purpose of changing by violence the existing system in another State or interfering in civil strife in another State;

3. to oppose actively all actions directed towards interference in the domestic affairs of other States, particularly by open parliamentary discussions of such actions, by refusal to approve appropriations for carrying them out and by coming out against all other actions capable of hampering the unconditional application of the humane principles of non-intervention and national independence in the practice of international relations.

Resolution From the Economic and Social Committee Adopted by the Interparliamentary Union Council for Consideration at the Moscow Meeting Concerning Methods of Assisting Developing Countries in the Field of Foreign Trade by Fixing Equitable and Stable Prices for Their Exported Products as Well as for Goods Imported by Them From Industrialized Countries

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Convinced that unrelaxed efforts are essential for normalizing and further developing trade and economic contacts directed towards accelerating economic and social progress and promoting mutual understanding among nations,

Recognizing that the recommendations adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development for the normalization of international trade reflect the progressive conception of international economic relations,

Convinced that "Principles governing international trade relations and trade policies conductive to development", adopted by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, created the basis for normalizing international trade,

Considering that the deterioration in the terms of trade, that is to say the relation between the prices of exported and imported goods, seriously impedes the economic progress of developing countries.

Supporting the ardent efforts of the developing countries to put an end to economic backwardness as quickly as possible and to build up an independent national economy,

Taking into account the need for encouraging the expansion and diversification of all trends in international trade, particularly the ensuring of the proper solution of urgent problems pertaining to trade and development of the developing countries,

Recognizing the need for further efforts in order to continue the work begun by the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development and to implement its Principles and recommendations,

Appeals to the Governments of all countries:

1. to mobilize the constructive efforts of their States for the speedy implementation of the decisions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development;

2. to support in every way measures to make the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development an effective instrument for normalizing international trade and its growth on the basis of the principles of equality, respect for sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs of countries and mutual benefit;

3. to facilitate in every way the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, directed towards creating favourable conditions for increasing the export receipts of the developing countries.

Resolution From the Cultural Committee Adopted by the Interparliamentary Union Council for Consideration at the Moscow Meeting Concerning Parliament's Role in the Elaboration and Control of National Science Policy

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Considering science to include not only the basic study of natural laws but also the application of this knowledge to the needs of mankind through development and engineering and other technology,

Observing the continually increasing importance of science in the life of all peoples and its essential role in economic development,

Recognizing the necessity for every State to set its own goals, to formulate and implement a science policy in harmony with its own national development, and to help itself towards the achievement of its goals,

Recognizing also the universal nature of science, the imperative necessity for international co-operation in many fields of science, and the mutual benefits to be derived from international co-operation in all scientific fields,

Aware of efforts to promote national science policy planning by Unesco, the Advisory Committee of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on the Application of Science and Technology to Development, and other international organizations and of the advantages of strengthening the relationship between the Union and Unesco in this area as well as in the other fields of common interest,

Believing that it is the responsibility of Parliaments to help formulate and control national science policies and to ensure that scientific advances are applied in the development of national economies and social progress,

1. *Reaffirms* the resolution adopted by the 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference on the Application of Science and Technology to Economic Development, drawing particular attention to the invitation to developing countries to establish organs and institutions for studying means of harnessing the national scientific and technological potential for the purpose of economic development;

2. *Requests* that Unesco continue its role in co-operation with other international agencies to assist nations with science policy planning;

3. *Expresses the hope* that the developed nations will search for new ways to share the benefits of their scientific knowledge and capabilities with the developing nations for the maximum benefit of all the peoples of the world;

4. *Urges* all Parliaments to ensure that national scientific activities are provided with the human, financial and material resources necessary for their full development and to establish the governmental bodies and institutions required for the elaboration and co-ordinated implementation of national science policy, giving emphasis to education as well as to research and development;

5. *Recommends* that each Parliament take the initiative in defining the objectives of a national science policy which is responsive to its national needs and the guiding principles for achieving those objectives;

6. *Recommends* further that all parliamentarians be made aware of their new responsibilities in the sphere of science and technology;

7. *Invites* consideration by legislative assemblies of the following procedures to ensure that their new responsibilities in the field of science are fulfilled:

(a) The establishment of standing parliamentary committees specially constituted for the examination of questions relating to science policy with the aim of helping to co-ordinate scientific activities and preventing duplication of effort without adversely affecting basic scientific research;

(b) The provision to parliamentarians of access to all sources of information and the assistance necessary for debating questions regarding science policy with a full knowledge of the facts;

(c) The creation of opportunities for exchanging ideas with qualified representatives of the scientific community drawn from industry and education and other independent sources as well as government;

(d) The adoption of long-term and medium-range plans for scientific development, as well as functional budgets for scientific activities.

Decision Adopted by the Interparliamentary Union Council as an Appeal in Support of the Conclusion of a Treaty To Prevent the Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

Referring to point 3 of the resolution on "Methods of strengthening Regional Security in Conformity with the United Nations Charter", which was adopted unanimously by the 55th Inter-Parliamentary Conference in Teheran,

Recalling UN General Assembly Resolution 2028/XX, of November 19, 1965, Resolution 2149/XXI, of November 4, 1966, and Resolution 2153/XXI, of November 17, 1966, concerning the conclusion of a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons,

Considering that the absence of an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons incurs the risk of an increase in the number of States possessing nuclear weapons and in stocks of nuclear weapons, as well as their proliferation, and, consequently, is the source of an aggravation of international tension, constitutes a threat to world peace and increases the danger of a nuclear war,

Recalling the duty of Parliaments and Governments of all States to contribute towards the creation of favourable conditions for the conclusion of disarmament agreements,

Convinced that an international treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons would be a step forward in strengthening security and peace, and achieving general and particularly nuclear disarmament,

Urgently appeals **to all Parliaments and Governments:**

1. to use their influence and take the necessary measures to facilitate and accelerate the conclusion of a treaty to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons which would be acceptable to all States;

2. to refrain, until the conclusion of such a treaty, from any action liable to render its conclusion more difficult or which could lead to the proliferation of nuclear weapons throughout the world;

3. to use their influence towards achieving general and particularly nuclear disarmament.

Colonialism, Neo-Colonialism and New Forms of Racial, Religious, Political, and Economic Discrimination

DRAFT RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT PALMA BY THE COMMITTEE ON NON-SELF-GOVERNING TERRITORIES AND ETHNIC QUESTIONS, AND INCLUDED BY THE INTER-PARLIAMENTARY COUNCIL IN THE AGENDA OF THE MOSCOW CONFERENCE

Rapporteur: Mr. P. de Montesquiou (France)

The 56th Inter-Parliamentary Conference,

Recalling its attachment to the basic principles contained in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and guaranteed by Article 55 of the United Nations Charter and in the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in Resolution 1514 (XV),

Aware that respect of fundamental rights and freedoms is an integral element of the dignity of human beings, the violation of which, by acts of racial, national or religious intolerance, is liable seriously to compromise international security,

Deeply concerned that, despite the recent liberation of many peoples from colonialist rule, there remain a great number of human beings in certain parts of the world who are still under its yoke,

Deeply concerned, furthermore, at the maintenance and practice of racial discrimination in certain States which constitute a denial of the right of peoples to self-determination, in particular by the policy of apartheid,

Convinced that the efforts to promote human rights throughout the world are not sufficient to eliminate all forms of intolerance,

Noting that the gap between the industrialized and the developing nations is widening and that this constitutes one of the most urgent problems of the age which seriously hinders the establishment in the developing countries of effective freedoms based on the economic, social and cultural promotion of the individual,

1. *Condemns* violations of human rights and fundamental freedoms wherever they occur;

2. *Associates* itself with the work of the numerous international organizations preoccupied with these problems, particularly the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the Commission on Human Rights of the United Nations;

3. *Invites* delegates to take action in their respective Parliaments to ensure the adoption of legislative measures which would promote absolute respect for human rights and the elimination of all forms of discrimination based on race, sex and religion, as well as of all propaganda designed for this purpose;

4. *Urges* them to increase their efforts for the acceleration of the process of decolonization of the still dependent territories on all continents, in keeping with the United Nations resolutions;

5. *Appeals* to National Groups to exert their influence to urge their Governments to co-operate with the United Nations without delay by taking positive steps against violations of the territorial sovereignty of nations;

6. *Urgently requests* Governments:

(a) to seek a solution for alleviating the economic difficulties of developing nations resulting from the trade and economic conditions maintained by neo-colonialist policies;

(b) to support the work of the 1964 Geneva Conference on Trade and Development, especially regarding the state of world market prices for raw materials, the intensification of technical aid and investments of a productive character;

(c) to support the granting of aid through the intermediary of international organizations.

Decision Adopted by the Interparliamentary Union Council for the Dispatch of a Delegation From the Union to North and to South Vietnam

The Inter-Parliamentary Council,

1. *Invites* its President to request the Governments of North and South Vietnam, as well as the National Liberation Front, whether they would be prepared to receive a delegation from the Union;

2. *Decides,* on condition that the agreement of all the interested parties is obtained, to dispatch a delegation from the Inter-Parliamentary Union, composed of its Executive Committee, to North and to South Vietnam so that it may discuss with all interested parties the possibilities of rapprochement, reconciliation and peace, offer the facilities and good offices of the Inter-Parliamentary Union for these purposes and report to the Conference of the Inter-Parliamentary Union to be held in Moscow from September 7 to 15, 1967.

Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to express once more my well-deserved appreciation to those Members of this body who so effectively participated in this meeting.

I am sure that for all of us it was a great experience as we came in close contact with the parliamentarians of other nations and had an opportunity to review our thoughts with people who have become more than acquaintances and more than fellow parliamentarians, in becoming our personal friends.

I trust that the members of the delegation share with me the feeling that this was one of our most memorable experiences in conferences of this type.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to commend the gentleman from New York for his statement here today. I would call attention to his recommendation that the documents that will be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD not only reflect the work of the members of the Interparliamentary Union at the last meeting but contain some very worthwhile reading matter. I, too, want to take this opportunity to call the attention of the Members of this House to these documents. They are well worth the reading.

I feel it is extremely important, Mr. Speaker, to call special attention to the fine work that the gentleman from New York, who is addressing us from the well in this Chamber, has done as president of our American delegation this year and as acting leader the last couple of years at these international meetings.

He has done his work so well and has attracted so much attention and so much personal support from the delegations from other countries that he has been an honor and a credit to the United States. The gentleman has been a real tower of strength during the course of these hearings and as a result he has had the support of the American delegation to the fullest extent.

The work has been arduous. The activities have been important. The U.S. delegation has always had to watch very carefully the work it has done because, unfortunately, we are under attack for many reasons by many countries. The fact is, too, that we are looked to for leadership. We had the opportunity, such as on the committee which Mr. McCLORY represents, to draw attention to the importance of science and technology, and this rapidly expanding scientific and technology age in which we live, the way in which parliaments throughout the world must adjust and adapt themselves to scientific and technological developments.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will allow me to proceed further, there is a very important development which I believe took place during the course of these meetings, namely, a legitimate peace attempt made through a resolution submitted by the Belgium group. This is one of the documents which the gentleman from New York will put on record, but it deserves specific attention particularly because during a time the United States is being chastised, as it has been at those meetings, and particularly charged with not making the necessary efforts to bring about peace through proper negotiations in Vietnam, the Belgium group submitted a resolution which offered that opportunity through the dispatch to North Vietnam and South Vietnam of members of its executive committee to use the Interparliamentary Union, representing some 70 nations throughout this world, for the purpose of putting its weight behind the bringing of this problem to the negotiation table for a peaceful solution.

The U.S. delegation supported that resolution after making some correcting amendments, and the record will show that during the course of that debate in every single instance the entire Communist bloc voted against those efforts. We were particularly proud of the support that the U.S. group gave to the Belgium declaration. It is, I believe, important that, during the course of this, we showed that the Members of Congress had objectivity, flexibility, and knowledge of the problem, and that they were doing everything possible to draw attention to the fact that, as a Nation, the United States placed no barriers in the path of peace.

The debate upon the Belgium resolution was one of the most important ones which took place at that meeting, and we would hope that, since it was a resolution favorably acted upon, despite the opposition of the so-called Communist bloc, with steps being taken at the moment so that an invitation might be obtained in order for the executive committee to carry out these responsibilities, that these efforts might be successful.

Again I thank the gentleman from

New York for yielding me this time. I congratulate him further for the fine work he has done, and I congratulate, too, the entire delegation which, under his leadership, accomplished such important actions at the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union.

Mr. PIRNIE. I would like to say to the gentleman from Connecticut that I thank him very much for his kind remarks, but his comments have been made with characteristic modesty because, in fact, he was the one who handled in the Council this very difficult question with respect to the Belgium resolution, and, by the changes he was able to develop, he made it acceptable in form so that it could be an intelligent appeal in behalf of the parliaments of the world to the respective parties to accept, if they will, the good offices of the Interparliamentary Union, with its headquarters in Geneva, so that there might be a meeting to negotiate a peaceful settlement of the Vietnam situation.

There has now been brought before all the parliaments of the world our willingness and our eagerness to use to the fullest extent this method of arriving at a peaceful settlement. There remains no shred of justification for charging this Nation with aggressive intent.

I believe it was a powerful example of the type of leadership that can be given in this body and congratulate the gentleman from Connecticut for the way in which this situation was finally resolved. Steps are now being taken to implement that resolution. They have already sent in behalf of the Union a notification to the respective governments of the passage of the resolution and offer of these services has been intended. We now can only await the result.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana, an able member of the delegation.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join those other members of the group who attended the spring conference of the Interparliamentary Union who have spoken and who will hereafter speak.

First of all, it was appropriate, Mr. Speaker, to pay tribute to the leadership which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Pirnie], who is now in the well, accorded our delegation. Its importance cannot be overstressed. With the number of committees meeting, with the several people present as members of the delegation, it was of the utmost importance that our efforts be closely synchronized and tied together. Under the leadership of the gentleman from New York, this was certainly done.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, the meetings of the Interparliamentary Union are an illustration—I believe perhaps the best illustration—of a committee in which Members of both bodies of our Congress can meet and work jointly and closely together. Never was this more clearly demonstrated than in the meetings of this spring.

Previous speakers have indicated that the entire group were diligent in their efforts. I certainly subscribe to that statement. Members of both bodies of this Congress worked diligently and hard in furthering the American position.

In these days when members of the executive branches of the governments throughout the world meet very frequently—and I believe generally quite effectively—it becomes more and more important that members of legislative bodies also meet together and have an opportunity to exchange views and to arrive at conclusions particularly reflecting the standpoint of the legislative body. This, to me, is one of the important things which these meetings of the Interparliamentary Union afford us an opportunity to accomplish.

I am sure that in the years ahead, increasingly—again under such leadership as we have had from the gentleman from New York—these meetings will continue to be effective and increase in their fruitfulness as we strive to find solutions for problems of national and international importance.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana. His experience, not only as a member of former delegations, but as a ranking minority member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, has brought to this work a wealth of knowledge that has been very earnestly applied. I thank him for his most effective participation in our work.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, a veteran member of the delegation.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Connecticut and the gentleman from Indiana.

I am sure they express the feeling of all of the delegates to this most recent conference as to the fine leadership that our body had.

I should like to speak particularly to those who possibly are not well acquainted with the objectives of the Interparliamentary Union as such and particularly to those who might be critical of groups from the Congress meeting with members of legislative bodies from the other nations of the world.

Having been identified with and having participated in these conferences over the past 12 years, I believe I have been in a position to observe not only the improvement we have been able to make in the manner in which our participation has taken place but also the benefits which have come to this Nation as a result of the opportunity of members of the American group to meet with members of groups from some 50 or 60 nations each year and to observe their operations and to have a better understanding of their motivation and also to recognize any feeling they might have for the United States—which has not always been good, as we all realize.

I know as an individual and as a member of the Committee on Agriculture I have been able to return from these conferences with what I consider to be constructive suggestions about things we can do to improve the programs in which we have been engaged over the years.

I believe we have an opportunity to impress upon the representatives from these other nations the fact that here in the United States we do have a system of government—which others have tried to pattern themselves after—that we actually practice. We have been able to impress upon the representatives from other nations the importance of the Congress, as the legislative body of our Government.

I have seen this improvement. I believe this money not only is well spent but is returned to the people of America manifold from the benefits we are able to bring back from these conferences, both the one held in the spring for the planning and the main conference in the fall.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for his comments. I should like to say that the years he has served as a member of the delegation have afforded him a background against which to make these judgments. His faithfulness to the opportunity of making personal contacts and engaging in helpful conversations with members of other delegations has been particularly noted. I should like to commend him for the genuine friendships he has developed.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski], the secretary of our group.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join my colleague from New York in reporting to the House on the work of the U.S. delegation to the spring session of the Interparliamentary Union in Palma de Mallorca, Spain.

Necessary emphasis must be placed on the individual contacts that are developed with members of foreign parliaments at Interparliamentary Union meetings and the great potential that lies in the person-to-person relations which could develop with key officials in foreign lands. For example, a personal contact which I made at recent Interparliamentary Union meetings, the Honorable Luigi Turchi, Member of the Italian Parliament, was visiting in Washington last Wednesday and we renewed our association and discussed problems facing NATO in the light of the recent developments in Greece. Our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. Daddario], in addition to our chairman, maintains numerous contacts of this nature. The Interparliamentary Union meetings present us with a great opportunity and an even greater responsibility of puncturing Communist propaganda attacks against the United States, demonstrating to participants from all over the world the vitality and effectiveness of our legislative branch of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I especially wish to emphasize the excellent coordination which has developed within our congressional delegation to the Interparliamentary Union meetings between Members of the House and Senate. This coordination has been demonstrated to a practical advantage in our preparation for debate at the conferences. The allocation of subject matter equips us to meet the "curve balls" continually hurled by delegates from the Communist bloc nations.

The basic purpose of the Interparliamentary Union is to advance parliamentary or representative government. When we view the tendency to dictatorships or one-party governments in many lands, we know that it is essential that emphasis be placed on effective parliamentary governments representing the views of the people. Among the significant contributions our U.S. delegation makes at all of these meetings is the demonstration of the vitality of our legislative branch of Government, the spirit of our two-party structure, and the respect we maintain for the views of our respective political parties.

The United States, along with the British Commonwealth countries, sets an example in maintaining an effective parliamentary government, that if followed by emerging lands, would contribute to their stability and progress. In official discussions, as well as in unofficial conversations, we have an opportunity to explain the vitality of our free enterprise economic system, to discuss the foundations which have helped produce the greatness of our country, and give the assembled leaders from other nations an opportunity to understand the American way.

Mr. Speaker, I join the other members of our Interparliamentary Union Delegation in commending the gentleman from New York for his leadership.

I point out to the Members that even though we as Representatives of the U.S. Congress find that too many of our colleagues pay scant attention to this conference and our participation, most of the other nations find their participation to be one of their major undertakings. This is especially true with respect to the newly developing countries which are attempting to develop a thriving parliamentary government. To them an opportunity to participate in a world conference is something to which they attach significance.

So it is necessary for us to reemphasize to our colleagues what we feel is a valuable contribution we make on behalf of the citizens of the United States and the Congress of the United States, through this opportunity to explain, especially to delegates from the emerging countries, the vitality of our congressional structure, the freedom of our legislation branch of Government, and the bipartisanship with which we approach the major problems.

I especially wish to pay tribute to our colleague from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], who has been our spokesman this year in the executive committee and the Council and has done an excellent job not only in debate but in developing personal contacts that are needed to expand the influence of the United States and to protect us—and I use that word deliberately—from the propaganda that the Communist bloc continually develops.

Mr. PIRNIE. I thank the gentleman. He has made a very good point when he stresses the opportunity for explaining what is really meant by our parliamentary system. We find all classifications of parliament within this group. Those who are just starting to attain some responsibility in the legislative branch marvel at the scope of the activities which we enjoy and the way in which we initiate and develop legislation. Only through personal conversation have we been able to make this point clear.

It is interesting to note some of the delegations have seen fit to take advantage of our offer to come here and witness at close range the form of activity in which our committees engage and the procedures under which legislation is brought to the House.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the gentleman from New York on organizing and making this report to the House and to the Congress, because certainly everyone should know the value of this work that is being done by our delegation with the Interparliamentary Union. Much is to be gained from spreading it upon the RECORD.

I was interested to read recently in a rather well-known book called "Washington Wife," which is a diary of the wife of a Texas Congressman named Ellen Slayden, who was writing at times in the Wilson administration and previously of trips to the Interparliamentary Union at that time. It was interesting to me to realize specifically that we had been sending delegations to the Interparliamentary Union for this period of time.

As the gentleman from New York has said, there are over 50 members who attended the last meeting and over 80 nations are members of this Interparliamentary Union. Although there has been some change in the objectives of the organization and in the means by which they are worked out since the time when it was founded in the 1880's, I certainly agree with what the gentleman has said as to the usefulness of the delegations from different countries getting together not only because of the formal agenda but also because of the opportunities that we have to talk with delegations and with individual members from other countries about some of the deep problems that apparently separate us. In many instances we find there are approaches that might not have been discovered otherwise.

I should like to refer just briefly to the commendations that the gentleman from New York and the American delegation received for the work that was done at Teheran, which was an outstanding job of defending the position of the United States, which resulted in a change in sentiment, I think, on the part of some countries and which resulted in very strong expressions of support. Certainly the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO], in that meeting and also in the last meeting in Majorca performed yeoman service in presenting our point of view. And, clearly, in many instances it is a lack of knowledge and lack of information which causes differences between countries and which caused the differences which existed at this meeting.

Mr. Speaker, all of us had the opportunity to briefly explain some of the political phenomena in the United States and some of the reasons as to why we have reached the decisions at which we have arrived.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that we can modestly say, but with confidence, that this delegation has contributed to a greater understanding between the nations represented and has contributed towards some substantial steps for a peaceful solution of the world's problems.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that no one has been more sensitive to the opportunity for advancing this understanding between our great country and the other nations of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], drawing upon his day-to-day experiences in the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, exhibited a depth of knowledge and interest which was very, very valuable. Above all, I would like to commend the gentleman for his faithfulness in carrying out every assignment and for his display of genuine interest throughout the conference.

Mr. Speaker, these traits which were exhibited in such an exemplary manner on the part of the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN] were tremendously helpful in bring about the best possible results from this conference.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished gentleman from New York yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am very delighted to yield to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] for his very clear résumé of the proceedings of the spring meeting of the Interparliamentary Union Conference in Spain. May I also say that I know the entire delegation shares with me the feeling that Congressman PIRNIE once again distinguished himself and brought great credit to the United States for the way he handled his heavy and manifold responsibilities as chairman of our IPU delegation. Under his guidance all the delegates were given the chance to participate in daily planning meetings held each morning so that we could exchange notes and information on the progress of the work of the various committees to which we were assigned. This resulted in intelligent teamwork and the ability to hold knowledgeable discussions with delegates of the other countries on all facets of the important questions under discussion.

My specific assignment at Palma was to serve on the Economic and Social Committee. I served on this Committee with Representative W. R. POAGE and Senator B. EVERETT JORDAN. Here again, I would like to pay tribute to both Representative POAGE and Senator JORDAN for their contributions to the discussions of two very important international questions concerning international trade and the international monetary system. Congressman POAGE served as our representative on the drafting committee which finalized the wording of the resolution that will be debated at the fall meeting in Moscow. A great deal of credit goes to Congressman POAGE for successfully resisting any attempts to draft a resolution that would distort the question or include unfortunate implications. For your information the resolution that will be debated at Moscow concerns methods of assisting developing countries in the field of foreign trade by fixing equitable and stable prices for their exported products as well as for goods imported by them from industrialized countries.

I am sure all our colleagues are interested in the problem presented by this resolution—the fact that the economic growth and the development of developing countries is tied to and limited by their ability to acquire foreign exchange. Because of our heavy foreign aid commitments in many of these countries, we have a large stake in helping them to work toward more economic independence so as to lessen their dependence upon foreign aid. Unfortunately, many of the solutions proposed by the developing countries themselves are apt to be one sided and shortsighted. We sincerely hope that our delegation at the Moscow conference can successfully point out some truths that will inspire parliamentary delegates from member nations to recommend practical and effective remedies beyond the limits of manipulation of prices of commodities and other questions of foreign exchange earnings.

Along with other members of the delegation I urge all Members of this House to help us achieve the full potential of the goals of the IPU meetings by studying our chairman's report and offering us their advice and guidance on the crucial questions that will be debated next fall in Moscow.

I thank the gentleman from New York very much for performing the service of bringing this report to our colleagues in the House and the Senate and, again, I pay him tribute for his outstanding performance as chairman of the delegation.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Washington, and I am reminded of the great work that she did on behalf of our delegation at the conference in Ottawa when, under very trying conditions, she and Congressman JONES from Missouri so effectively represented this Nation during the brief absence of the remainder of the delegation obliged to return here to meet the problems of the House in session. The remarks that she has made about the opportunity which lies ahead in Moscow are appreciated. There is no one who worked more sincerely to achieve the objectives of the conference we had in Palma and to prepare for the Moscow meeting than my colleague from Washington, and I am very, very proud and happy to have her as a member of the delegation.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, international meetings in which Members of the Congress participate are more difficult and more challenging at the present time than at any period in our recent history. I am confident that all of my colleagues who have had occasion to take part in such gatherings are aware that the numerous international complications, particularly the war in Vietnam, make it more difficult than usual to resolve problems affecting our Nation in its relations with other nations.

At the same time, exchanges between Representatives of our U.S. Congress and Members of the parliaments of other countries are of greater significance today than they would be during a period of relative international tranquillity.

The recent Inter-Parliamentary Union Spring Conference in Spain proved these points.

The problem of meeting and explaining the war in Vietnam was one which required the greatest skill and diplomacy. I noted particularly that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], the chairman of the U.S. delegation, handled this subject expertly when he addressed the delegates from more than 50 nations in the New Congress Building at Palma de Mallorca. In reporting the U.S. position the gentleman was able to draw upon his knowledge as a member of the House Armed Services Committee as well as his past experiences at numerous earlier Inter-Parliamentary Union conferences. Another important discussion of our Nation's role in Vietnam and Southeast Asia was presented by the vice chairman of the U.S. delegation, the gentleman from Alabama, Senator JOHN SPARKMAN. There were numerous other public expressions delivered in the various committee sessions. I was privileged to take part in the business of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Committee along with the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN].

In addition to the formal meetings of the Union and the committee sessions, the individual exchanges which occurred outside of the meeting halls were perhaps of even greater importance in promoting the interests of our Nation with influential representatives of the other member countries. The contacts which members of the U.S. delegation have developed with parliamentarians from other nations have enabled us to advance our national interests to a degree which it is difficult to measure but which is invariably reflected in the final results of the Interparliamentary Union proceedings.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, the overwhelming election last fall at Tehran of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. DADDARIO] to the 10-member executive committee of the Interparliamentary Union. I observed also that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] was enthusiastically reelected as vice chairman of the Political Committee. In my own case, I am privileged to serve again as rapporteur of the Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Committee to report in Moscow on behalf of the entire committee on "Parliament's Role in the Elaboration and Control of National Scientific Policy."

These expressions of confidence in our U.S. delegation are in themselves evidences that our national position has received understanding and also support.

Our success is also evidenced in the language employed in various of the resolutions adopted by the Interparliamentary Union Council—including those which will be debated at the September meeting in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that all of the members of the U.S. delegation to the recent IPU Conference are proud of the results achieved. Indeed this should provide a source of pride for the Congress itself and for all of the people of our Nation.

I congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] for his leadership in this successful work. I congratulate also all of my other colleagues and the staff of the delegation who took part in this memorable and successful event.

Mr. PIRNIE. I would like to say to the gentleman from Illinois that probably no one has contributed more effectively to the work of the conference than has he. It is worthy to note, when we are speaking of recognition, that within his group he has been repeatedly named as the rapporteur, which is a position of honor given to one who is capable and knowledgeable so that the debates can properly be reported. He was also the author of a resolution which received generous approval and he has actively participated in all of our activities within the group and within the conference.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend him not only for his ability but for his faithfulness and his genuine, sustained interest.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIRNIE. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is worth noting that there are some changes taking place within the Interparliamentary Union which bode good for all of us—changes that have been made possible as in this last spring meeting. For that meeting to have taken place in Spain is an accomplishment. In past years Communist countries would not have voted so that it could happen. The Spanish Government would not have allowed Communist delegations to be in their country and would not have invited them.

The meeting in Moscow extends that flexibility which is developing and the opportunity to break down barriers that exist between the nations because here too there will be the need for the Russians to invite to Moscow members of countries with which they do not presently have diplomatic relations.

This was one of the points about which there was discussion. For example—would the South Koreans be invited and be allowed to attend. We have every assurance that they will be.

These developing events, it seems to me, are of extreme importance because they do show that given time nations can come to a better understanding and that the obstacles that have grown up between them can be diminished and that hazards can be overcome. It gives us cause to be optimistic despite the crisis in which we find ourselves at the moment. This is a good development and one which we hope will continue in the future.

Mr. PIRNIE. As further evidence of the trend to which you have referred, the projected conference in Moscow also includes an invitation to the leader of the U.S. group to participate in a forum for two evenings on television on the general subject of the relations between constituents and their Congressman, which is a story we are delighted to tell. It is so different from that which is experienced in many other countries.

Mr. DADDARIO. If the gentleman will yield further, I will predict that the gentleman from New York will be an instant hit on Russian television.

THE WOBBLY KENNEDY ROUND AND OUR ANGRY MERCHANTS

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, from such reports as are available from the press and other sources the Kennedy round of tariff negotiations in Geneva is still in trouble and in a state of uncertainty. It is nearly 5 years since the Trade Expansion Act was passed in 1962. In no other instance has so much time been consumed with such uncertain results.

The Kennedy round is the sixth in a series of international tariff negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. Never before has there been so much confusion, such divergence of attitudes among the contracting parties as in the present instance.

The reason may be that after five previous tariff-cutting sessions, beginning with the first GATT agreement in 1947, much greater caution has come to prevail and much greater concern is felt about further cuts. Many industries in many countries have about used up their margin of safety, if indeed they have not already become overexposed to import competition. It is natural that the leading trading countries should examine more closely what further reduction of trade barriers would mean. Let us not forget that the Kennedy round was and is an American proposal.

We placed ourselves in the role of petitioners from the outset. We were and are the proponents. This fact placed our trading partners in the position of disposers.

The meaning of this was not lost on the other members of GATT. They were in the position of the wooed, and therefore they could wait. That they were prepared to wait us out became clearer as the negotiations proceeded on their dismal round. At one time the negotiations came to a complete standstill for nearly a year because of French intransigence.

The European Economic Community, or Common Market, was the principal actor in the successive delays caused for the most part by failure to meet deadlines. The United States bowed in each instance, to such an extent that a deadline was no longer a deadline. It was no more than a meaningless date.

The latest deadline, put forward not long ago as the absolute deadline, was April 30. Now that date has gone the way of all the others. Yes, we have been the wooers and pursuers, and the EEC has been more than coy.

Now we are in the position of having spent all the deadlines and still being without an agreement. Clearly we have been outwaited and outmaneuvered. The other countries know how eager we are to achieve an agreement, if for no other reason than to avoid the ignominy, as our State Department sees it, of a failure. The EEC countries know that a failure would not be ignominious and unbearable, but also know that we would so regard it. Therefore they have the upper hand.

If any further evidence were needed to show how far our negotiators are willing to go in order to achieve an agreement under the Kennedy round we have it in the proposal now being made to reach an international agreement on grains. The extremity to which they have gone will become clear when we take a look at the latest proposal our negotiators have advanced; but first we must go back a little.

Members of this body who have kept abreast of the Kennedy round will recall that the American position from the beginning has been that the United States would not negotiate industrial tariffs unless other countries gave us satisfactory concessions on agricultural items. This was the position taken by the late Honorable Christian Herter when he was the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

The position was reasserted subsequently by Messrs W. Michael Blumenthal, Deputy Special Representative, and by William Roth, also a Deputy Special Representative, who has recently been appointed to fill the vacancy left by Mr. Herter's death.

Mr. Blumenthal, at a press conference in St. Louis, December 7, 1965, quoting the President, said:

> We are striving for fully reciprocal trade liberalization which will open new markets for both industrial and agricultural products.

On December 15, the same year, Mr. Irwin R. Hedges, Agricultural Trade Specialist, of the Herter office, speaking in Lincoln, Nebr., before the annual convention of the National Association of Wheat Growers, said:

> We have repeatedly emphasized that a successful negotiation must provide improved access to world markets for U.S. agricultural products, including wheat . . . I assure you we have no intention of negotiating any arrangement that is not in the interest of wheat farmers.

William R. Roth, speaking before the Japanese-American Trade Council in New York City, on February 1, 1966, reaffirmed the position. Said he:

> From the outset, the United States insisted—an insistence repeatedly emphasized—that meaningful liberalization of agricultural trade must be an integral part of the negotiations.

Later, on February 14, 1966, before the American Management Association, New York City, he repeated the same thesis. At that time Mr. Roth said:

> Nevertheless, the principle of the inclusion of agriculture is firmly established. It is not a question of swapping industrial for agricultural concessions: on all sides there is a growing realization that agriculture is a part of the total economy, not a separate, independent field of endeavor. The interdependence of agricultural and industrial products requires that they be treated together in any international trade negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, these quotations should be sufficient to establish the position of the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

More recently Mr. Roth, testifying before the Senate Finance Committee, after his appointment to the post he now occupies, reaffirmed the position on agricultural negotiations. The industrial tariffs would not be negotiated unless satisfactory concessions were received on agricultural items.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that when the EEC finally made its offer on agricultural products, it was a far cry from anything that could be regarded as acceptable.

The United States had indeed already compromised its position in the Ministerial Council Agreements of May 1963 and May 1964. Since the EEC countries were in the midst of very difficult negotiations of their own among themselves in an effort to establish a common agricultural policy and had many hurdles to surmount, we agreed to accept an agreement that we would not be squeezed out of their agricultural market. Instead of bargaining for an improved position in their market, which was the supposed purpose of the Kennedy round, we agreed to something called a guaranteed access. This is to say we were willing to be satisfied not with a gain, but with a promise that we could hold our own.

It developed, however, that the offer made by the EEC was not such a guarantee. Our exports would be at the mercy of the variable import fee that would deprive us of any competitive advantages in the EEC countries.

In this dilemma our negotiators looked about for a substitute. Having looked at the EEC offer, which is secret, and finding it pitifully inadequate, they groped for some other device that would save the Kennedy round.

In casting about, the negotiators hit on the international grain agreement. Someone seized upon the idea that if the other industrial countries would agree to contribute grain toward feeding of the hungry people of the world, thus relieving us of the totality of the burden, this action might take the place of the "guaranteed access" to their markets for our agricultural exports. If, for example, France should set aside a million tons of wheat for food-hungry people in India, such action might enable us to ship a million tons of wheat into France that we could not have done otherwise.

This is a long way around the barn, Mr. Speaker, and shows the desperation of our negotiators. It reflects a deplorable situation. I will say no more about it because other Members may wish to express themselves, except to say that our negotiators should have known that they had thrown the game long before it came to this desperate pass. When our delegates go into negotiations with eagerness to reach an agreement written all over their faces, it would have been a dull and stupid trader on the other side who would not have known that all he had to do was to stall and wait. At the very end those who had shown their eagerness so clearly, would find themselves in exactly the dilemma that now confronts the President's Special Representative.

The only sound and sensible thing to do now would be to stand by the initial conditions agreed to, which is guaranteed access, bad as that was, and let the chips fall where they may. We made a false start. Let us correct our stance now before it becomes the standard for all future time. If we wish above all to have a Kennedy round we will of course get it; but it will bear little relation to reciprocity.

If the EEC countries will not meet their commitments we should forget the Kennedy round. This would, in any case, be the best possible outcome for the many and growing number of our industries that already face withering import competition without further tariff reduction.

Mr. Speaker at this time, I want to put into the RECORD a few of the remarks and some of the testimony of Mr. Irving Glass, representing the Tanners Council of America.

I do this in my continuing efforts to awaken the Congress of the United States to the serious dangers involved in our present trade policies.

Unless we change our thinking this Nation will have a revolution headed by angry and disturbed Americans, both workers and employers.

STATEMENT OF MR. IRVING GLASS, ON BEHALF OF THE TANNERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA

Mr. GLASS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Glass, we are happy to have you with us.

Mr. GLASS. Well, I am grateful for the privilege of being able to talk to you and the members of the committee. I trust Congressman Bell's industry or California might elicit some facts that might be of particular interest to him in California and Japan.

I beg your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, for not giving you a prepared statement. I should like the privilege of submitting one to you within several days.

It is now in preparation.

I might add that the reason I do not have it with me is we have decided recently that we must begin eschewing all of the pro forma conventional arguments and discussions on the issues of foreign trade and tariffs.

We recognize the province of your committee, sir, and we believe that that, in a sense, emphasizes precisely what you indicated a few minutes ago. You are concerned with economic viability of this country; and so are we.

It is our opinion, sir, that the conventional discourse which we have had for generations in this country on high tariffs and low has become pretty meaningless.

It is an anachronism. The discussion in more recent years about such matters as escape clauses and anti-dumping procedure, remedies available to industry, are, from our point of view, utterly meaningless. We have been through them. It is our position, sir, that at this juncture in our economic history, what we need is a revolution in the thinking of the Congress, the thinking of the United States.

We must have a complete change in a philosophy which is outworn. We are now living at the tail end of an illusion which began sometime ago in the thirties.

I think the consequences of that illusion, its perpetuation by the administrative agencies, the pro forma doctrine which has been espoused again and again, emphasizing diplomatic or political considerations at the expense of industrial welfare, of business welfare, of jobs in the United States, is running out.

Time is running out on us. And what I should like to do with you gentlemen, if I may, is discuss with you our case history as an illustrative history of a development in the United States and in world trade today which has the most ominous kind of shadows.

The tanning industry is not a large industry. Our total employment is somewhere in the area of 30,000 production workers. We have plants in the northeast, in the midwest, in Pennsylvania, Virginia, West Virginia, Area, and on the west coast.

We have some 14 tanners on the west coast.

We suffer, not alone from the imports of leather competing with our production here, we suffer because every pair of shoes imported into the United States, every Japanese baseball glove coming into this country—and last year, 68 percent of the gloves and mits used in our national sport came from Japan.

We suffer when work glove imports increase as they have within the past 14 months by some two or three hundred percent from Japan and from Europe. But beyond that, beyond the loss of capital, the eventual liquidation of plant, the loss of jobs, the great many small communities where tanners are located, we are concerned, as an old traditional industry.

We are concerned with the fact that certain fundamental truths are being lost sight of, and we look to Congress, we look to your committee, to become the active germinal influence in generating and developing a force of thinking in this country which can face up to an issue in modern terms, and do something which can help make the American economy viable for the long run.

Let me give you some excerpts from the lengthier statement which you will have very shortly. Will you be good enough, sir, to pass them?

(The documents referred to follow:)

"TANNERS' COUNCIL OF AMERICA, INC.,
"New York, N.Y., January 9, 1967.

"DEAR CONGRESSMAN: At the suggestion of constituents in your state we take the liberty of enclosing the leading article from the Tanners' Council membership bulletin of December 30th.

"Our industry is confronted with an exceedingly dangerous problem in foreign trade. The consequences will seriously affect shoe manufacturers, retailers and the consuming public. Above all, the continued record export of cattle hides from the U.S. could easily lead to a critical situation in the procurement and production of boots and other leather products for our Armed Forces.

"Our industry has never asked for anything more than equity and reciprocity in foreign trade. We believe the time is long past due for a critical appraisal by Congress of the inequities in foreign trade which lead to loss of raw material and a simultaneous flood of imports of finished goods. The survival of the domestic industry is at stake. Even more important, the ability of our country to satisfy its own requirements in civilian and military leather products may be jeopardized.

"We hope that the constituents of your state can look to you for support. If we can furnish you with any additional information please call on us.

"Sincerely yours,
"IRVING R. GLASS,
"Executive Vice President."

[From the Council News, Tanners' Council of America, Dec. 30, 1966]

"FOREIGN TRADE: OMINOUS FACTS

"The last issue of this bulletin in recent years has ventured into the appraisal of prospects for the year ahead. Such appraisal is secondary this year end to the long range implications once again exposed, emphasized and underlined by the November foreign trade figures. The report for last month should not be read cursorily. It is startling and might well be ominous.

"In November, U.S. cattle hide exports reached 1,698,000. Granted valid question or qualification with respect to the cut hides included in this total, it remains the largest ever. The Council estimates that these shipments represented 58% of all the hides produced in November and a considerably larger percentage of the packer and and commercial slaughter. Was this extraordinary export volume merely the aftermath of export controls being suspended on November 7th? It would be reassuring to think so but far too much evidence suggests the alternative—a dangerous long-term trend.

"The trend has been under way for more than a decade. Seemingly moderate year to year changes have masked its impact. That is no longer the case; complacency has become impossible. Tanners, and their customers, are faced with the gravest issue of modern times for the leather, the shoe and the leather goods industries. It is two pronged—loss of raw material resources at home and abroad and a huge increase in the imports of finished products.

"On the raw material side a look at the facts from 1954 on brings the trend into focus. This period was not chosen to make a statistical point; it is the period in which the strangling chain of foreign trade events began. The links include a steady rise in the volume and proportion of U.S. hide and skin supply exported; a sharp decline in the availability and movement of foreign hides and skins to the U.S. On net balance this country has suffered a drastic loss in raw material resources.

"Here is a table that tells part of the story. It is doubled in spades by the foreign trade facts in calfskins and kips and compounded by a huge shrinkage in imports of goat and kidskins.

"Cattle hides

"[Thousands of hides]

	Total U.S. hide supply	Exports	Percent exports of slaughter
November 1966	22,900	1,698	58.6
11 months 1966	32,500	13,007	40.0
Total, 1965	34,550	13,309	38.5
Total, 1954	27,480	5,173	18.8

"What are the major forces taking U.S. hides and skins or foreclosing foreign supply from the tanners of this country? They may be familiar but must be spelled out to emphasize a basic inequity underlying each instance. Japan, for example, buying U.S. hides in mounting quantities, returning baseball gloves or radio cases to the U.S., has never opened its markets to U.S. leather. Japan has welched on promise after promise to grant reciprocity, and it has been permitted to do so. Eastern Europe is now the major factor in the world hide market. Buyers representing that area have the incredible advantages of a controlled economy with price secondary to economic and political purposes. Rupees accumulated from Soviet sales or purported aid grants to India are used to buy goatskins. Perhaps rupees from the same source are converted in some fashion to acquire hides in the U.S.! It is pointless to ask whether any of the hundreds of millions of rupees credited for U.S. wheat have ever been used for commercial purposes. In Western Europe the Common Market is an instrument for discrimination against the U.S.; leather tariffs are far higher than insignificant U.S. duties; direct and indirect subsidies promote exports. Even in the Western Hemisphere a dozen inequities can be cited ranging from the higher comparative tariffs of Canada to outright embargoes in Latin America.

"Hide export destinations

"[Thousands of hides]

	"Japan	Eastern Europe	Western Europe	Western Hemisphere	Total
November 1966	190	551	532	284	1,698
11 months, 1966	3,706	2,389	3,789	2,346	13,007
Total, 1965	2,777	1,821	5,070	1,968	13,309
Total, 1954	879	321	2,766	1,081	5,178

"Even less solace can be drawn from the other side of the coin. Imports of shoes, leather and leather products into the U.S. have reversed the historic position. Such imports now account for a very sizeable fraction of U.S. consumption and the rate of increase has accelerated. All too often, U.S. raw material returns to these shores as finished goods. In many other cases abridgement of free competitive trade through discriminatory restrictions or through subsidization is responsible for the import tide.

"In effect tanners and manufacturers are having their candles burnt at both ends. The consequences go beyond the direct and immediate interests of domestic industry. National welfare and security are involved. In the broadest sense the root causes of inequity in foreign trade must be dealt with by Government. The time has come when the entire industry, in every affected community, must lay the facts before the responsible agencies of Government so that the minimal charity of economic fair play can be aggressively demanded and gained for home industries. Congress convenes on January 10th; there is no time to lose.

"November details

"Raw material. A summary of November exports is shown below. It has previously been noted that the accuracy of shipments reported as 'cattle hides except whole' has been questioned and it is impossible to estimate the degree of inaccuracy in this category. Reported totals for cattle hides, calfskins and kips were all above a year ago for the eleven months.

"U.S. raw stock exports

"[Thousands of pieces]

	"November 1966	October 1966	November 1965	11 months' total	
				1966	1965
Cattle hides, whole	1,261	764	931	10,430	10,527
Cattle hides, except whole	437	344	105	2,577	1,505
Total	1,698	1,108	1,036	13,007	12,032
Calfskins	136	120	209	1,920	1,706
Kips	39	25	44	483	442
Sheep and lamb wool on	139	131	220	1,728	1,809
Sheep and lamb pickled	40	111	104	529	772

"The net balance of foreign trade through November was as follows:

"U.S. foreign trade in raw stock, 11 months' totals

"[Thousands of pieces]

	"Exports and reexports		Imports		Net balance	
	1966	1965	1966	1965	1966	1965
Cattle hides	13,022	12,042	189	263	−12,833	−11,779
Calfskins	1,928	1,730	220	422	−1,708	−1,308
Kips	483	442	391	583	−92	+141
Goat and kidskins	403	328	9,967	13,021	+9,564	+12,693
Sheep and lambskins	2,830	2,745	34,338	28,641	+31,508	+25,896
Cabrettas			1,205	1,475	+1,205	+1,475

"Leather. Exports in most categories moved up a little. Imports remained large. All of the detail on raw material and leather will be issued this week in the usual monthly foreign trade bulletin."

"IMPORTS OF LEATHER, SHOES AND OTHER LEATHER PRODUCTS

(By Tanners' Council of America, Inc.)

"Imports of leather, shoes and leather products have reached record proportions. This trade is one sided and non-reciprocal. The direct result is an unprecedented invasion of the U.S. market, an invasion which clearly threatens the future of American industry. The scope of the invasion and its danger are apparent from the following summary figures.

"Imports of shoes. The shoe imports recorded below include only leather types. In addition, millions of pairs of vinyl, canvas and non-leather types were brought in during 1966, enough to make the gross import total equal 16 percent of aggregate U.S. footwear production.

"Leather footwear (000 omitted)

"[In pairs]

	Imports	*Exports*
1952	1,216	4,825
1953	1,235	5,159
1954	1,049	4,750
1955	1,785	4,642
1956	2,996	4,532
1957	4,956	4,398
1958	16,099	4,225
1959	11,057	3,505
1960	12,980	3,244
1961	15,078	3,035
1962	21,106	2,867
1963	26,162	2,843
1964	27,557	2,836
1965	34,723	2,491
1966	46,036	2,737

"In 1966, there were also imported more than 46,000,000 pairs of vinyl shoes and 35,000,000 pairs of rubber-canvas types, making a grand total of 132,187,600 pairs.

"Foreign trade in leather. The traditional relation of leather exports and imports has been completely reversed. Last year imports far outweighed exports from the U.S. and accounted for a substantial proportion of domestic consumption."

Mr. GLASS. Those contrast imports and exports, and give you the picture in essence of what is developing, Gentlemen.

On one sheet, you will notice, is the cattle hide position, and on the next sheet, you will notice the comparative figures on imports of shoes.

All of that has taken place within a decade. It is not something that was a problem ten or twelve years or fifteen years ago. Certainly we had problems, tariff problems, in those days, but suddenly, we are faced with a situation which is completely new and unprecedented.

Let me give you the elements of that situation. We are exporting our raw material, as the largest cattle hide producing nation in the world. We are now moving into a position where we are becoming the hewers of wood and the drawers of water for the rest of the world.

We are shipping cattle hides, our raw material, to Japan, to Western Europe, to Eastern Europe, to Mexico, to Venezuela, to Colombia, to Peru, to be processed and made into finished leather to be fabricated in shoes, handbags, gloves and a hundred other items and returned to us.

Mr. BELL. Not to Argentina, though.

Mr. GLASS. Not to Argentina. Argentina is the second largest hide producing nation in the world.

Mr. DENT. We buy them from there?

Mr. GLASS. Not anymore. Very few. We in effect are becoming an agricultural underdeveloped nation, looking to the technological skills abroad.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. GLASS. The manufacturers of the goods which our retail stores must purvey to consumers. One of our members sent me the other day a column from the Sun Times, in which the columnist makes the point that consumers benefit by the import of these lower cost items, such as shoes from Italy and Spain.

That is part of the illusion. That is part of the tremendous error which has been foistered upon the thinking of this country, and which seems to be more than ever inherent in the thinking of some of the executive agencies of the government of the United States.

The error is fundamental. No economy can live in the long run by taking in one another's wash. If we all become teachers, doctors, lawyers, servicemen, who then will produce the goods?

Who then will function at the base of the economy, producing the productive wealth which is essential to its ultimate sustenance and its viability?

One industry or another may well be found, in the language of certain people in government, expendable. Dozens of industries are not, because ultimately, what happened to the watch business—and I have been fascinated over the years by the demonstration of fact in that industry—what happened to the watch business happens everywhere else, productive equipment is liquidated, capacity is lost, skills are lost, whole technological structure—and it is a complex technological structure which is necessary for the production of goods—begins to disappear.

How did we ever get into a situation in which we export raw material, and we import finished goods? I can answer the question, sir, Congressman Bell, which you asked a few minutes ago about shoe production on the west coast.

Shortly after World War II, we recognized in common with other industries, the validity of our government's program. Japan had to be aided. An aid program had to be extended. We had to put up with certain departures from fair trade practices, from the concept of reciprocity, because there was a dollar shortage in Japan, and Japan had to be put on its feet, and we surmised in our layman's fashion that obviously, Japan had to be kept economically healthy in order to become a bulwark against the spread of ideas from Red China, and so forth.

But that time is long since past. For more than 15 years, we have been asking the State Department to intervene on our behalf to get us a measure of reciprocity from Japan. Time and again Japanese manufacturers, of baseball gloves, for example, and of small leather goods, such as the cases in which their binoculars and their mini-radios come to us, I have been talking to Japanese manufacturers who want to buy leather in the United States.

The Japanese Government still maintains a virtual embargo through currency control, against the import of a single foot of leather from the United States.

Now witness then what happens: We can't compete in the Japanese market. The Japanese manufacturer who wants to buy leather from the west coast tanners, from Calnap, in Napa, California, from Menassie Block in Berkeley, from A. K. Saltz in Santa Cruz, can't buy a foot of leather.

He must go to his own protected tanners, which is in effect a cartel or a monopoly today in Japan. Behind that wall of protectionism, which has nothing to do with tariff, which is an absolute violation of all the GATT conventions, and all the concepts of reciprocity, the Japanese tanners can come forward, come to the west coast and buy hides and on the west coast.

Fully half of the hides now produced on the west coast are shipped to Japan. And the Japanese tanners can buy them transport them, transport hide substance, water and manure, 8,000 miles to Japan.

Why? Because their internal market is completely protected against the slightest midget smidgen of possible competition from the tanners on the west coast.

Utterly unfair, inequitable, yes. Nothing has ever been done on it. Within the past two months as a result of a renewed campaign of letter writing by our tanners and their suppliers, we have once again begun to receive the pro forma reply from members of the executive agencies, namely, "Something will be done shortly. We are asking Japan to let down the bars."

Well, we heard that five years ago.

Mr. **Bell**. Mr. Glass, may I interrupt your very interesting comments?

Mr. **Glass**. Certainly.

Mr. **Bell**. I wanted to ask you one little situation. That was just one word, why? Why is this? I mean, why can't we get our story across of this great inequitable situation as far as Japan is concerned?

It would seem to me with all the feelings that we are involved with with Japan that this inequitable thing would stand out like a sore thumb, according to what your story is.

I can't understand why we can't get that across. What is the stumbling block? What is the administration attitude or is it the administration or who is it that is blocking it?

Mr. **Glass**. Well, Sir, I will give you my opinion for whatever it is worth. I have reached the stage of life where I can speak with complete candor, because my conscience is absolutely clear.

In my opinion, what we have is a perpetuated philosophy, a series of egghead concepts which have become so ingrained in all the echelons of government that no one dares depart from them.

I think that when a bureaucracy continues to function, in a given pattern, it is always reluctant to see its tomorrows any different from its yesterdays.

I believe that political and diplomatic considerations, which may have had validity at one time, tend to persist in the operative levels or agencies of the government, and so concepts continue to remain.

There is no question that on grounds of reciprocity or equity of justice, we are absolutely right. Japan ought to let down the bars. But not one agency of government, not the last ambassador, Professor Reischauer, or any one else has yet succeeded in getting even a nod from the Japanese Government.

Mr. **Bell**. Well, this egghead thing, I see some point to it, all right, I am not arguing against it, except that it does not quite satisfy me. It seems to me that as in any crowd, there is always some bright boy that is going to come up and really insist on this thing and really make an issue of it, public relations wise, or however, if it is so equitable, it would seem to me that if somebody would make such an issue of this that these eggheads would fall on their egg heads.

I just can't quite see that.

Mr. **Glass**. What you have got at stake is the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, all of the efforts and energy which has gone into that.

Would you venture to jeopardize this at a—at this stage which is inimical to the Kennedy Round?

Mr. **Dent**. That is right.

Mr. **Glass**. And all of those things seem to have a bearing. Perhaps we are ignorant.

Perhaps there are military, diplomatic or economic considerations of which we know nothing, and obviously, we as layman have no access to the diplomatic pouch.

Perhaps it is absolutely important that we do things for Japan. Well then, for heaven's sake, why aren't we told? But I believe that the failure to discharge the obligations imposed upon the United States Government by the requirements of our own economy go further.

For example, Mr. Shannon mentioned the indirect subsidy given Italian shoe manufacturers. Some of the subsidies given to German producers, German tanners, German manufacturers. It is called a remission of internal turnover taxes. It amounts in West Germany to seven and a half percent. In France, it amounts to some seven and a half, and depending on the season of the year, towards the end of the year, it can be as much as 13 percent.

We raised that issue once with the U.S. Treasury, which governs the customs law, and interpretation of the customs law. We submitted that such a remission of internal turnover tax was subsidization within the meaning of our tariff act.

The Treasury ruled that it was not, that it was the internal province of a government, of a sovereign government, to control its taxes as it saw fit.

Well, the tanning industry of the United States, the shoe manufacturers of the United States, would love to do business for seven percent. I don't know anybody in our industry who makes seven percent on sales, and if we export whatever we export is subject to our income tax or whatever other, any excises that apply in the United States, no special dispensation for export, why that conclusion by the Treasury, and why that unremitting adherence to the doctrine that remission of tax is not a subsidy?

We can't account for it. We think it is wrong. We think it is contrary to the congressional intent as embodied in the Tariff statute of the United States.

I am not sure that I have answered your question, sir, because I am not sure that I can. I can't read the mind of the Executive Branch of Government. All I can report to you on is that in executing its functions, under the existing law, we have gradually built up a tremendous complex of inequity which now is beginning to show up in the destruction of the fundamental base of American industry. Let me give you——

Mr. **Bell**. The only thing, of course, that is just so amazing to me is that it is so obvious, that such an obvious situation like the one you spoke of, and all the ramifications of it, where even Japan herself could gain by making the change.

Mr. **Glass**. Certainly, Congressman Bell. I have argued to our government—

Mr. **Bell**. It is a difficult one for me to comprehend, how just as a matter of policy we could stick to something like that, if there is even consideration on the other side that that is not equitable, and that they would be better off to have it equitable.

Mr. **Glass**. I am leading a group of three tanners to Japan early in June. With the help of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, we are going to exhibit and show U.S. leather.

The objective of our effort is to demonstrate to the Japanese manufacturers that they have nothing to lose and everything to gain from getting access to more diversified, varied materials, such as U.S. leathers, that in turn they can develop their ultimate export trade, that they can raise their standard of living a notch thereby, and we believe that earnestly and sincerely.

Mr. **Bell**. You think you can get it accomplished by the back door, get Japan to do something?

Mr. **Dent**. The Department of Agriculture is sponsoring this fair, isn't it?

Mr. **Glass**. No, sir, they are paying the way for two men, the air transportation. The tanner's council is paying the way for the third man.

Mr. **Dent**. I was in Japan with our group. Mr. Bell, you would be interested. I was in Japan with our group when we had a show, a trade show in Tokyo, sponsored by our government, and they were showing supermarket equipment, you know, these little carts which you get in supermarkets and all that stuff, and I think that they did not realize what they were doing, but what they were doing was bringing their patterns over there for the Japanese to copy, because I predicted within the year we will be importing the carts from Japan, and we will be, because the Japanese told me that is what they were doing.

They were buying enough of it to take it home and tear it apart and design it, and make it themselves.

Mr. **Bell**. Yes, but Mr. Chairman, you can see the other point that he was making, where Japan themselves would be gaining by a change.

Mr. **Dent**. We understand that, but you see, that is not the point. The whole point all over the world is employment. When you get down to the bedrock, you will find that there is only one consideration in trade.

One consideration in trade is a job. A job for a worker. That is the whole consideration, and it is completely ignored in this country. The Japanese admit it. Then in testimony before this committee. Their whole purpose is jobs.

Mr. **Daniels**. Mr. Glass.

Mr. Glass. Certainly.

Mr. Daniels. If we did not ship our leather goods or hides to Japan, would Japan have other available markets available to it?

Mr. Glass. Yes. Japan could draw on other sources for raw material, but more important, sir, they would have to buy some leather in the United States. There would be a two way trade to their advantage and to ours, in the long run.

Two-way trade, with basic equities, does provide the element of competition which stimulates technology, which stimulates style, which opens markets and raises consumer standards of living.

I was very interested in Mr. Shannon's remarks about the hand sewn shoe in the United States. Three years ago with the help of the Department of Agriculture, we staged a show in Paris. We demonstrated American shoes, American leather.

It was a revelation to the Europeans. We even brought a shoemaker over from Nashua, New Hampshire, to sit on a podium, sewing hand sewn vamps by hand.

The Europeans could not get over it. United States, home of mass production machinery, standardization, actually does hand sewing. We have started something in Europe by that demonstration which has swept Europe today.

They are off on a hand sewn binge, and it has helped us. They are buying our raw material, and we hope, eventually, we can get them to let down the bars in Europe and buy our leather, because we believe we can service their manufacturing economy to even better effect than they can themselves.

Mr. Dent. What about the second part of Mr. Shannon's statement, where he said they are now shipping the hand-sewn shoes back to the United States they showed them how to make?

Mr. Glass. The answer, Congressman Dent, again is when they are protected by remission of taxes, or by restrictions of one kind or another, which, as you know, are extra-tariff considerations, beyond that, they have advantages which we can't match.

Mr. Dent. We have an extra tariff in the minimum-wage law in this country.

Mr. Glass. For which no manufacturer gets a remission.

Mr. Dent. That is right, it is a tariff against American made goods.

Mr. Daniels. Getting back to this tour that you propose to take in the fall with three tanners, in going to Japan, two of whom will be sponsored by the Department of Agriculture——

Mr. Glass. Right.

Mr. Daniels. What would be the objective of that trip?

Mr. Glass. To sell the Japanese manufacturing industry, shoes, handbags, gloves, small cases.

Mr. Daniels. Our finished products?

Mr. Glass. The desirability of persuading their Government to let down the bars, to override the objections of the tanners, let some U.S. leather in. We haven't gotten any help from our own Government. We are going to try to do it ourselves, now.

Mr. Daniels. Will the Japanese people be able to afford this merchandise at prices that would be necessary, which would necessarily have to be paid in order to give American industry a reasonable profit?

Mr. Glass. We could sell them leather for baseball gloves to be manufactured in Japan, at cheaper prices, far greater value, because our quality is greater.

It is from California, shipped from San Francisco, at better prices than the Japanese manufacturer of baseball gloves can buy in Japan. And that is in spite of the fact that their labor cost is roughly 20 percent of ours.

Mr. Dent. Yes, but they have a cartel which establishes a false selling price on the leather. But in competition they would raise that price immediately.

Mr. Glass. That is right.

Mr. Daniels. Who would benefit, sir? The Japanese consumers?

Mr. Dent. No, they don't have that many. Their real consumers are the American baseball industry. That is, the consumers for the Japanese baseball equipment. Sixty-eight or 69 percent of all the gloves used in the American baseball enterprise are imported from Japan.

Mr. Bell. Isn't baseball quite a sport in their country, also?

Mr. Dent. Yes.

Mr. Daniels. Why would the Japanese manufacturers sell 68 percent of baseball gloves used by our big leagues in the U.S.A., when you say our leather is superior to the Japanese leather?

Mr. Glass. In making a baseball glove the labor component is the principal factor. Some 60 percent of the cost of sewing, handling, and molding of the glove is labor.

Mr. Daniels. I wanted to get that on the record.

Mr. Glass. One of the factors in Japan is that the going rate today is roughly 43 or 44 cents. On the West Coast, in the San Francisco area, for example, the tanners last contract calls for $3.10 an hour, plus fringes.

Now, when you get to products where the labor component runs 40 or 50 percent, competition becomes almost insuperable when you are faced with 43-cent labor in Japan.

Isn't that what you are talking about when you say we have to have a revolution in our thinking? The philosophy of trade that we still operate under is outmoded. The events of the world have overtaken the Adam Smith theory, which is basically what we are doing, regardless of whether we try to polish it up with new language. This is very much so.

Mr. Dent. We are still operating on the theory of Adam Smith, that that nation which makes the product cheaper ought to be able to sell it to another nation, so that nation can enjoy the benefits of a product at a lower price, and that in turn should send its products to the country.

But what has happened is, in the centuries that have passed, the generations of recent generations have developed a production capability in every line of goods all over the world.

Mr. Glass. I would go one step further, perhaps. I concur in your reasoning. I think, as a matter of fact, all industry owes you and your committee, sir, a debt of thanks for your prescience in having recognized these trends and fundamental obligations of revamping our thinking as long ago as five or six years ago.

There is another element that enters into this picture. I need not dwell on all of these considerations. I don't have to tell you that our industry is technologically capable and that we haven't sat on our duffs and let progress go by.

We are as technologically capable, I am sure, far more so, in fact, than any industry in the world, any tanning industry in the world.

Leather is needed today, and we are doing quite a job in supplying the shoes and the leather equipage needed in Southeast Asia. You are familiar with all of that. You have heard those arguments dozens of times. But there is one other consideration that perhaps you may not be aware of, gentlemen.

We are faced, it seems to me, in this necessity for revamping our thinking with a factor that has never come to light before. But it has shown up in our industry to such a startling extent that I think you ought to be interested in it.

Fifteen years ago we were the largest kid-leather producing country in the world. We produced 40-odd million goat and kid skins annually, made leather.

Our business has shrunk now to about 10 million kid skins. Who is producing the kid leather? The Soviet Union.

We used to buy 85 percent of the goat and kid skins from India, and we furnished hard dollars to the Indian economy for shipping us the goat skins. We made these skins into shoes and bags, gloves, jackets, and so on.

India today is shipping almost 90 percent of her goat and kid skins to Eastern Europe. How did this change come about? It did not develop as a result of the operation of the market place. It didn't develop because Soviet or Polish or Rumanian buyers are more capable or their plants are more skilled than ours.

It developed by virtue of the fundamental difference between a free-enterprise economy and an economy which is planned and has, as its objective, political or economic considerations that have nothing to do with the market place.

The Russians gave aid, purported aid, to India. They built a steel mill in Behar, and elsewhere. They got rupee credits, x-hundred millions of rupee credits for that.

We have given aid, enormous aid, to India. We have got counterpart fund credits in rupees. Ours lie idle in India, or they are used to gild the Taj Mahal, or some similar purpose.

The Russians use their rupee credits, garnered from aid, for the purpose of goat skins. Ergo, they can afford to pay a price for goat skins simply impossible for any competitive, commercial U.S. tanner.

What has happened? As a result, the Indian hide skin and leather economy has been sucked into the orbit of the Eastern European system. We have been displaced.

I submit, gentlemen, that that process can happen in a variety of other economic areas, that it represents, to put it bluntly, economic warfare of a kind which we have not yet realized is going on.

Do you know who is one of the principal buyers of our cattlehides today? Eastern Europe.

Mr. Bell. Our what?

Mr. Glass. Cattlehides. Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, is buying a substantial proportion. In the first three months of this year almost 30 percent of our cattlehides were shipped to Eastern Europe. They were shipped to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, and Russia. And a great many of those cattlehides will eventually come back to us in the form of the work shoes and the dress shoes from Czechoslovakia about which Mr. Shannon commented previously.

That is a completely new factor in the organization of an economic system, a world foreign-trade system. How are we going to cope with it? Is it not likely that the next step will be titanium? Or titanium ore, or bauxite, or jute, or hemp? Or that the strength of a controlled economic system can be funneled deliberately into a given product area or to a given country, and that it can be utilized to such purpose and in such a way as to capture that economic entity and bring it within the orbit of Eastern Europe?

What I am leading up to fundamentally, gentlemen, is this. I beg your leave to suggest to you, as a committee which has heard testimony on this subject, that perhaps in your own thinking you must concur with the basic philosophy we offer you for revamping our national thinking.

The time has come when the United States, as an island in the world economy, an economy where, as you properly point out, Mr. Chairman, technology has been diffused to such a good extent that everybody today owns the means and the know-how. That as an island in such tn economy, the time has come when we must control the traffic on the bridge. That unless we do, we can be swamped.

We can't project these figures. Last year there were record imports of shoes. First quarter of this year, up 24 percent from the first quarter of last year.

Now, I think Mr. Shannon is much too conservative in his paper when he predicts a loss of some 59,000 jobs by 1970. As an economist, when I project the trend, I say that within two years the shoe industry of the United States—and that means our bread and butter, the tanner's sustenance—the shoe industry of the United States will have suffered irreparable losses. It can't take it. It can't take it because that kind of loss of market no longer means just the loss of economic growth. It means the loss of the basic substratum which we have held.

Mr. BELL. Could I ask a question right here?

Mr. GLASS. Certainly.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I assume that most of the leather and equipment goods that are going to our troups in Viet Nam are from California? I mean, not California, but I mean national industries.

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Is that correct?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. Therefore, as we increase activities in there, if we do, why this, to some degree, to that extent, helps our industry. Is that correct?

Mr. GLASS. Yes.

Mr. BELL. But it is minor, I assume.

Mr. GLASS. Whether it be major or minor, sir, our point of view is that it is fundamentally abnormal. We hope the day will come——

Mr. BELL. Oh, I agree. There is no argument there. I was just curious about that one point, whether we were doing that, or if we were taking Japanese equipment.

Mr. GLASS. At the moment, and last year, if it were not for military orders placed, the position of the shoe industry and of the leather industry in terms of domestic products and in terms of the ratio of imports to domestic products, would have been far more serious than it actually was.

We are for the legislation that you are sponsoring. You have our unqualified approval. God bless you for initiating that legislation.

But we also suggest to you that in your capacity as legislators, as representatives of American industry and of the American economy, that perhaps you ought to join with us in supporting measures to control imports, to let others share in our growth.

But let us make it an orderly process. Let us incorporate the concept of the Muskie bill, so that the growing process will be extended to others as well as to ourselves, and without their pre-empting our markets and destroying our industry.

That is, it seems to us, the only possible philosophy of a national foreign-trade policy which will allow domestic industry to survive in the long run.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Glass, that, I believe, is the aim of all right-thinking persons. Those of us who have to take a stand that appears to be drastic and oriented completely to a protectionist view do so because we know that all other arguments have failed.

Therefore, in order to bring into focus the problem, we have to take the extreme view. I would be the last to recommend that we close the borders of this country, or any country. But I also must be the first to admit that if we don't do something, the American industry complex has lost its will to fight.

I have right before me the answer that the American industry has given to the problem, and it is becoming more and more the answer. It is the kind of an answer that spells nothing but economic oblivion for this country.

And here is the answer of Stern and Stern. I would just like to read you two or three paragraphs of why this revolution in thinking is necessary.

It is to save the American economy and those who control the economy. Labor does not alone control the economy. The tools of labor control the pace of the economy. When the tools are gone, the whole economy is dead.

Mr. BELL. Will you yield, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. BELL. I don't think that I understand what you are saying when you speak of "extreme." I am not saying that we don't have to rouse this situation, but I think that the orderly approach, which he emphasized, I think, is of utmost importance, because there are certain areas of international situations where——

Mr. GLASS. If I may clarify my statement, I referred to the control of the commercial traffic between the United States and the rest of the world, the world continent as being desirable to be orderly.

But I do think that at this juncture, where a revolution in anything is needed, the more explosive it can be, sir, the more violent we can get, the more we can make men realize the enormous implications of what is happening, the more likely you are as legislators to prevent damage before it is too late.

Mr. DENT. We are in the position of a person who has been warned by his doctor that if he doesn't take care of that innocent little scratch, that it may become poisoned. He lets it go and lets it go. He cannot cure that greater damage done to himself in an orderly fashion. He has to cut the arm off to save the body. We have to cut the arm off today.

I am serious.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, isn't what you are saying, what we are really saying here, that in our drive to win the political Cold War, we are losing the political Cold War with an economic method?

Mr. DENT. We are losing the greatest war of all, because you can't survive in politics without the sustenance of politics which is economic.

Mr. GLASS. I can give you a clear-cut illustration, Congressman Dent, which will interest you.

Some five years ago we had a case before the Tariff Commission, an unescape-clause proceeding. This was prior to the 1962 Act. It was on calf leather, mounting imports of calf leather.

We pointed out then that if that trend continued, the calf leather industry of the United States would have to go down the drain.

Mr. DENT. That is right.

Mr. GLASS. The rejoinder at that time was that you have not proved injury. This is prospective and conjectural, in spite of the fact that the law clearly charged the Tariff Commission with potential injury and an appraisal and evaluation of potential injury.

Our forecast has been more than fulfilled. In Pennsylvania the Hulshman plant no longer exists. In Wyoming the Eisendor plant no longer exists. We are down now to five producers of calf leather in the United States, and we rely on imports now for more than 45 percent of our requirements.

Mr. DENT. This is the thing. But let us see what is happening in American industry. What is its thinking in this line? Unless it has a complete change in the philosophy, here is the pattern of the future, because it is already the pattern of the present.

This is from Stern and Stern, and I would like to read it, because I think it is important enough to be heard.

"Dear Congressman Dent:

"I know that there will be hearings on HR–478 and –479 which are aimed at cutting cheap imports which seriously affect American Workers and the industries employing them.

"I am greatly in favor of these Bills and can tell from sad experience that something should be done.

"Several years ago the American Silk Council had a case before the Tariff Commission in endeavoring to have the Tariff raised on light All Silk products. Stern & Stern was represented at the Tariff Meeting and I made a long deposition which was read at that time.

"The effects of the Government's inactivity to protect the small All Silk industry was that we closed our Easton, Pa., plant known as the Stewart Division—that there were about 170 people thrown out of work—some older ones permanently—the older machinery was scrapped—the newer sold to weaving mills in Mexico and the property has now been disposed of.

"This weaving mill had been in existence since 1902 under the Stewart Management and we took same over in 1931 and, unfortunately, had to liquidate in 1965.

"We fought the Japanese imports unsuccessfully for one year and almost all our silk needs, which are considerable, are now being imported from Japan and in this way making our balance of payments worse and taking work away from the American working man. . . ."

Now I read that because in hearings five years ago before this committee, the then-Congressman Scranton, later Governor of Pennsylvania, testified that they had numerous silk-textile mills in the Scranton area. They came into being after the World War II.

The people in Scranton, there are many skilled workers in the lace industries up there, are very fine needle work people and textile workers.

Because of imports we were down to four mills working part-time in 1962. I asked the Japanese trade council representative to appear. I asked questions about silk textiles, because Mr. Scranton at that time testified that we were buying 25 million dollars worth of raw silk a year for these mills. We were now importing 25 million dollars worth of finished textiles, so the money balance was exactly the same.

I asked the Japanese witness why they decided to sell the manufactured product rather than the raw product, which was a national product of export, when the dollar volume of business was identical, almost to the penny.

He said, "The dollar volume is only important insofar as making world credits available. But the most important item in our economy is the number of jobs. We are weaving the textiles out of our own silk to create the employment for our people."

So even the hardest-headed free trader and the hardest-headed protectionist, when they sit down at the table, must agree that the only thing being bartered today are the jobs of workmen. Nothing else is, because industry can survive.

Stern and Stern is not losing any money. They are still selling their silk textiles. But what they are selling is imported, and the jobs of the 170 people in industry are completely gone.

The danger that we face is the greatest upheaval in the world's history, because once the American consumer market dries up, and it will dry up at the rate of three consumers for every job loss in production——

I say this as a curbstone economist, and I defy anybody to prove me wrong, that when the American consumer market dries up, not alone will we go down the drain. The exporting nations who depend for their internal economy on their exports to the others will go down the drain. And the greatest of all world upheavals will take place in our lifetime.

You remember what I tell you. This is a prediction. I hope I never live to see it, because it is inevitable.

Mr. GLASS. I am sorry to say, sir, that in my opinion as an economist, we are far closer to the consummation of that prediction than has been realized in these United States. And one day, when the flow of dollars from the United States is interrupted, the lifeline of Europe and the lifeline of Japan will suffer very seriously. Their well-being depends on our well-being.

Mr. Dent. There is no question about it. We have testimony here where production is created in West Germany for the simple purpose of exporting to the United States. And they don't even have the labor of their own. They import their labor force from Italy. And they export the product to the United States.

This cannot exist in a free world. It cannot exist.

Mr. Glass. Sooner or later the cornucopia runs dry, and the goose is killed.

Mr. Dent. We cannot help it. It is just one of those instances in which we have lead the world into a freedom from colonialism, political colonialism, and we are leading the world into economic colonialism, which will have graver effects than any political colonialism ever had on the world.

I speak as a man who is distinctly disturbed, even not considering the condition of our own precarious financial structure in the United States, with feeding people, on one hand, for not being employed, because their jobs have been taken away from them. This is as unsound as it can be.

Mr. Bell. In other words, what you are saying is that we are doing so many things that are helping other nations build up their economies and our nation to become an outlet for them, or import area for them, that we are stifling our own industry to the point where even the consumers in our country will not be buying all these things.

Mr. Dent. That is right. The automobile industry is down in production, but no one is saying why. The reason is that the automobile industry for the production they are losing in the United States, is importing automobiles from Europe and selling them through their agencies.

The automobile industry, the corporate shareholder, doesn't lose. The consumer loses, because he doesn't have the money to buy, because every producer is a consumer. That is the only consumer you have.

You and I are parasites. We are parasites on the body politic and body economic of this country. We do not produce anything.

Mr. Bell. Lawyers, doctors, schoolteachers are all the same.

Mr. Dent. We are parasitic, and we can't become a nation of parasites.

Mr. Glass. I ran into a shoemaker—Congressman Dent, this will interest you—I was in Spain two weeks ago, for two days, and I ran into a shoe manufacturer, an American shoe manufacturer. He was there dickering for a plant. And I took him to task.

Mr. Dent. That is right. Listen to this, Al. This is very important.

Mr. Bell. I am listening.

Mr. Glass. I ran into this American shoe manufacturer. He had been vehement in protesting against imports and the injury they had been causing him.

He was in Spain dickering for the purchase of a plant to produce shoes there. Obviously, I took him to task. And he said, "What can I do? Competition forces me to do it. My chain-store customers are importing shoes. If I can't get in on the act, I will be forced out. Stop everyone from doing it, and I would be more than happy not to undertake this venture myself."

So you have a divisive element entering into business interest today which distorts and muddies the picture.

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS MUST BE PROTECTED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Quillen] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to make available to each Member of the Congress and to each reader of the Record the information that the U.S. Government, through the Office of Economic Opportunity, is contemplating starting a newspaper—the first step to a controlled press.

Freedom of the press is something that we must protect, and the shocking news that a demonstration project plan is now under consideration by the Office of Economic Opportunity for a community action news demonstration project in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties of North Carolina, which border my district, the First District of Tennessee, is indeed frightening.

It is proposed by WAMY Community Action, Inc., headquartered in Boone, N.C.

Mr. Speaker, freedom of the press is one of the most cherished rights of our people. There has been grave concern recently of a controlled press from the standpoint of the extent to which the Executive should and does control the output of facts. This development in our press organization has been extremely disturbing.

Now we are faced with a plan for the Government to back a newspaper, and this plan would destroy completely and fully our right to freedom of the press. This plan is more than potentially dangerous, it is insidious.

If this plan is not rejected immediately, I recommend that the Congress not lose 1 minute in stepping in to halt this misguided destroyer of our freedom.

I am calling on Sargent Shriver for a full report of this action and am asking him to never let this plan see the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Record the full demonstration project plan and supporting data, which outlines this insidious venture. I know this material will be of great interest to all my colleagues.

Demonstration Project Plan and Supporting Data for a Community Action News Demonstration Project in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, N.C.

A. PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

This project is intended to help solve the problems of some 30,000 men, women and children who exist on family incomes of $3,000 per year. These people are scattered across 1100 square miles of mountainous, wooded country-side on tiny farms and in small, isolated settlements, in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey in western North Carolina. Almost without exception these people are the direct descendants of pioneers of the early 1800's with a long history of subsistence farming and foraging, untouched by prosperity down to the present day.

(See "Background Paper on Operation of W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc.," in Part II, Supporting Data, for more details on the history and characteristics of the low-income population.)

The central characteristic of the low income population as far as this project is concerned is their historic and continuing physical, social and psychological isolation not only from the world at large, but from each other. From the earliest days of settlement, the families and small clusters of families whose descendants make up the local poor have remained established in isolated homes or tiny settlements. Lack of good roads and lack of money to buy vehicles and telephones have maintained the physical factor in isolation.

The low-income people have developed psychological characteristics consistent with their physical isolation. They are relatively ignorant of the outside world, and even of persons and events only a few miles from their homes. They find it extremely difficult to cope with other people and are generally reserved and distrustful of strangers. Their capacities for group feeling and group endeavor have not been developed. Their history shows few examples of cooperative endeavor. Their only significant tradition of group participation, passive at that, is in their church congregations, but these congregations are many and small, many led by lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism. Their "communities" are in many cases not communities at all, but merely clusters of interrelated families, fractured by generations-old feuds stemming from personal hurts and differences of religious belief, maintained in physical proximity only by the formidable obstacles of establishing livelihoods elsewhere.

The physical and psychological situation of these people makes it difficult to achieve two major objectives of the war on poverty: 1) achievement of effective community organization, and 2) improvement of social services.

The applicant CAA has spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible.

The CAA has also expended a great deal of effort attempting to increase the services received and available to the poor from the CAA and non-CAA agencies. It has attempted this through three general approaches:

(1) Informing the poor individual of the availability of services, exhorting him to use these services, and facilitating his use of them through the provision of transportation, (2) exhorting the agencies to expand their useful services and extend them to the poor, and (3) *organizing the poor to the point where they realize a consensus of their needs and will work in concert to have the agencies fulfill them*. Despite a great deal of manpower devoted to these efforts, the *agency services available are underused*, and local agencies remain underfinanced through lack of pressure on the bodies responsible for financing them.

A list of specific problems to be addressed in this Project are implied in the specific hypotheses set out in the following section.

B. IDENTIFICATION OF HYPOTHESES

It is hypothesized that a project such as the one herein proposed for financing shall demonstrate the effectiveness of such projects in achieving the objectives listed below, all of which are either intrinsically desirable or instrumental to the elimination of poverty.

1. Creating, among the poor, a greater awareness of the fact that their predicaments, problems, hopes and aspirations are shared by many other individuals and communities across the four-county area, and thus helping create the feeling of identity necessary to concerted effort for improvement. This awareness would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimonials of low-income people.

2. Creating, among the poor, a greater feeling of familiarity with people and places in the area beyond their immediate settlement, and thus helping develop attitudes conducive to cooperation across wide areas. This feeling of familiarity would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimony of low-income people.

3. Strengthening, among low-income individuals and communities, the feelings of self-significance and importance that will arm them for the task of coping with the systems and institutions that they should

utilize for their advancement. The poor will be assisted to this end through the experiences of being interviewed, broadcast, and quoted in print.

4. Establishing the belief, among the poor that efforts at self-improvement by individuals and communities are commendable, and that such efforts can actually be successful. This objective will be achieved through recognition and praise, in print and on the air, of individuals and communities that have been successful.

5. Improving the poor's awareness of, interest in, familiarity with and demand for the opportunities provided through the CAA and through other social agencies. These objectives will be achieved through announcements of services and opportunities, and through the printed and broadcast testimony of low-income persons who have benefitted through these opportunities.

6. Causing the existing social agencies, including the CAA, to concern themselves with the quality of execution of their programs and to be attentive to the preferences of the poor in the administration of their programs. These results would seem to follow if the poor are allowed to speak their minds on the air and in print.

7. Increasing the understanding, on the part of the middle-class, of the nature and problems of the poor and the utility of services provided by social agencies, an understanding critical to developing the necessary local support for anti-poverty efforts. This will be achieved through the middle-class's exposure to the radio broadcasts and occasional reading of the weekly newspaper.

C. METHODS, PROGRAM TECHNIQUES, WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

1. Introduction

The aims of this Project will be carried out through two vehicles: (1) *a four-county-wide weekly newspaper* and (2) a radio program development and broadcasting system. The two vehicles will be directed and coordinated by a single Project Director, who will edit the newspaper and generally supervise the work of the Broadcast Development Staff. The Project Director will report to a Board of Directors composed of 8 low-income and 5 non-low-income persons who will set general and editorial policy for the newspaper and for radio broadcasts.

The *weekly newspaper* will be staffed, with the exception of the editor, with local low-income people, who will act as reporters and assistant editors. The paper will be directed at the low-income readership, and will be distributed by mail, free, to all families in the four counties whose incomes fall below the OEO poverty-level. The newspaper will be printed by a local commercial printer.

The *radio system* will have two (2) professional staffers (Broadcast Developers) in addition to the Project Director, and the remaining four (4) people on the staff will be drawn from the local low-income population. The radio system staff, to be equipped with mobile recording vans, will travel throughout the low-income community taping programs for broadcast over the commercial stations that serve the area. The staff will also accept announcements and programs of interest and service to low-income people from the local CAA and from other public agencies.

2. The weekly newspaper

The weekly newspaper will be the most conventional of the information techniques to be demonstrated, in that the techniques of writing and printing a paper of this type are will known, although little used by the commercial press. The first, and most essential feature of the newspaper will be saturation circulation among the poverty-level residents of the four county area. This will be achieved by mailing the paper to all poor residents at no charge. Extensive mailing lists are presently available from the Community Action Agency files, and the Community Action field workers will be mobilized to add to the list as rapidly as possible. The twenty community "stringers" will also contribute to the mailing list. In its initial months of operation the paper will also hand distribute copies to community centers, schools and country stores, and will solicit readers to subscribe for themselves and their friends through subscription blanks which will be printed as a regular feature of the paper. It is expected that the newspaper can build to mailed circulation among almost all of the approximately 8,000 poverty-level families of the area within three months after it starts publication.

Although the paper will be circulated free-of-charge to its subscribers, the addressed, mailing method of circulation will prevent the paper from taking on the characteristics of a throwaway sheet. The positive impact on the poor of receiving a publication each week addressed to them and directed toward them will be far greater than the negative impact of receiving a free publication.

The newspaper will be supervised by one professional journalist, who will also be director of the entire Community Action News project. The editor will continually provide in-service training and supervision for his newspaper staff of three full-time assistants and twenty community stringers, but the great majority of the writing and editing will be done by indigenous personnel. The editor will constantly strive to teach effective communication through the language of the poor.

The paper will constantly try to balance its dual functions of providing information about services and opportunities, and of printing the "news" of the smaller communities and the larger county and area community.

The Informational content will include facts on how to get services, "how-to" columns on home management, child care, home repairs, discussions of legal problems, "citizen's advice column" (answers to any questions submitted by readers), man-on-the-street interviews on specific questions, a column where readers can directly request services from agencies, information on voter registration and the organization of all local political parties, information about the various CAA programs and other information features as the need arises.

The news content of the paper will include coverage of activities in various communities as reported by the community stringers, news of local government, the news of the CAA, discussions of legislation that affects the poor, school news, births, deaths and marriages, hospital notes, schedules of all events that affect the poor, and articles of general interest that are solicited and purchased from the poor.

Feature articles will focus on extensive coverage of activities in one community that have informational and educational value for other communities. Features will also spotlight new services or new uses of existing services, and occasional issues of the papers will devote extensive space to in-depth coverage of one problem that affects large numbers of the poverty-level residents of the area.

Miscellaneous features of the paper will include the active solicitation of letters to the editor, free want-ads for low-income readers, and suggestions on how the CAA or the newspaper could serve the area better.

Editorials will be signed by the writer in most cases, and will reflect only his opinions. Unsigned editorials which reflect general opinions and policies of the paper will have prior approval of the executive committee of the Corporation's Board of Directors, unless the Board delegates this authority to the editor.

The presentation of the paper's content will be almost as important as the content itself. The paper will be an eight-page tabloid and will feature a large body type—10 and 12 point—and will emphasize the actions, pictures and names of its readers. Each of the staff members will use a Polaroid camera, and will be encouraged to take pictures whether they are printed or not, as many pictures will be needed for the bulletin boards which are described later in this proposal.

Layout will play a vital role in attracting readers. The paper must look both professional, and different. Many stories will be told mainly with pictures and headline-size sentences. Modern advertising techniques will be applied to the paper's layout to make it highly readable and attention-worthy, and some items—such as announcements of meetings and new programs or services—will be presented in the form of simulated advertisements. This type of layout philosophy is so totally foreign to area printers, that it is essential to the paper's success that all makeup be done by the paper's staff and delivered to the printer as completed dummies, ready for the production of offset printing plates. The operation of typesetting equipment and the production of completed dummies at the paper itself will also provide valuable training for low-income personnel in journalistic skills that are in critically short supply in rural areas.

This combination of public information and local news, attractive and readable presentation, and saturation circulation among the poor in the area, will reinforce the organizational efforts of the poor in a way that the conventional press has never attempted to do in this area. A noted communications expert from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, speaking to a statewide meeting of CAA directors, commented that one of the greatest effects of mass media is to reinforce the attitudes and activities of those persons and groups whose efforts are reported in the media. The content of the weekly newspaper will seek not only to reinforce community activities by reporting their news, but also to further organization and improvement efforts by providing the informational tools needed for advancement.

Each community correspondent will, in addition to his other duties, be assigned two bulletin boards that will be erected by Neighborhood Youth Corps crews at centers of community activity. These bulletin boards will carry announcements of community activities and pictures of community residents involved in CAA programs or other community self-help projects. Mimeographed materials for the bulletin boards will be produced at the newspaper office on community action subjects of interest to several communities or pertaining to the entire four-county area. County coordinators of the CAA will use the bulletin boards and help the community correspondents in keeping up-to-date materials posted on the displays. The public information staff of the North Carolina Fund has agreed to assist in the production of printed materials for the bulletin boards and to assist in developing new methods of using the displays as communications vehicles.

As the poor begin to become involved in the newspaper, and begin to respond by writing letters, asking questions and voicing complaints, the paper will serve as an important information gathering vehicle for use of the CAA. A staff member of the Human Resources Planning project—funded under a demonstration grant—will serve on the paper's Board of Directors.

One of his delegated functions will be to coordinate the planning program with the paper, and to use the newspaper's information as an indicator of how well existing CAA programs are matching the needs of the poor.

At least one Neighborhood Youth enrollee will be assigned to the paper's staff to search its columns for possible referrals to the public agency personnel. The CAA's public information worker will also scan the paper for articles suitable for reprint in the county weeklies and in the daily press outside the area, so as to further reinforce the activities of the poor and to strengthen the communication links between the poor and the middle class. The CAA's OJT Coordinator will try to place members of the paper's staff in permanent jobs with the conventional media in the area, so as to open training opportunities on the paper to other low-income residents.

Preliminary training for newspaper personnel will be directed by the editor with the help of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina fund, which has offered its full cooperation in assisting with preliminary and in-service training. The most important training, however, will be conducted by the editor in his day-to-day supervision of the production of the paper, and in regularly scheduled in-service training sessions which he will supervise.

The editor is the logical person to supervise the entire project because of his wide contacts with the four-county area through his full and part-time newspaper staff of 23 persons. From his position he will be able to schedule and coordinate the radio units so that their work closely follows the patterns of events among the poverty-level residents of the area. Although the mobile units will attempt to cover every area of the four counties during each six weeks of their operation, it is essential to the success of the radio operation that the mobile units appear "where the action is."

3. *Radio system*

The radio portion of the project is more experimental in nature than the newspaper. Public information and participation projects over a long-term period using the radio medium as described in this proposal are an extreme rarity in conventional broadcasting. The techniques are used somewhat in educational FM broadcasting, but these stations reach mainly the middle and upper class audiences which own FM receivers.

The radio project will be centered in two mobile recording vans with equipment capable of producing almost any kind of radio program. Each of the vans will operate in two of the four counties and will be loosely assigned to the commercial station which broadcasts in those counties. Most of the programming produced, however, will be appropriate for broadcast on either station and will be used on both stations.

There is a possibility that a third commercial radio station will become operational in the southernmost county of the four county tier during the period of the demonstration grant, but programming for this station will consist mainly of duplication of programs produced for the two stations now in existence. This third station will add significantly to the primary coverage area of the radio programming, bringing the coverage area from 85 to approximately 95 per cent of the four county target area.

Each of the mobile units will travel to a different community each day, recording for broadcast at the community center in sight of the people, interviewing participants in work projects or CAA programs, plugging community activities, soliciting man-in-the-street interviews and questions for the citizens' advice bureau, recording the discussion and debate at community meetings, and generally allowing people to express themselves through talk or musical performances.

Form each recording session in a community will come the program material for a day's broadcasting. Questions asked by the community people will be answered on five minute radio spots. The questioner will be told at the interview when the answer to his question will be broadcast. Longer interviews, discussions, and musical performances will be broadcast on two fifteen minute segments or one thirty minute program daily on each station.

Because of the geographical characteristics of the area, it is expected that each recording team will spend at least one night a week in the northeast and southwest ends of the four counties in order to cut down on time wasted in travel, and to insure that the entire four-county area is covered thoroughly and equally.

At each recording stop, the Friendly Home Visitor (non-professional CAA health caseworker) for that area will accompany the van to take referrals. One of the jobs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee apprentice assigned to the van will be to take duplicate referrals to assure the delivery of services.

Other five-minute spots and occasional longer programs will be recorded by the broadcast developers from information gathered from public agency personnel, including the CAA. Homemakers from the Agricultural Extension Service and group workers from the CAA will provide information for shows on the preparation of commodity foods, other recipes, sewing hints and child care. CAA horticulturalists working with the Agricultural Extension Service, a delegate agency, will provide farm information. The Citizen Education Specialist of the CAA, who is a lawyer, will provide information for a legal advice program, and for programs dealing with county government and voter information. The public information worker of the CAA will provide information about CAA programs on both the county and four-county level. Most of the service information spots for one week can be recorded and edited for broadcast in an intensive half-day's work, thereby allowing the broadcast developers and their assistants to spend most of their recording time in the field.

Two of the essential elements in producing successful radio programs will be the development of attractive program formats and the compilation of extensive information files that can be used to answer questions asked in the field and to make effective referrals. Some trial and error work is anticipated in the development of suitable formats. The two radio stations involved have offered to assist in developing formats and in measuring their success. The CAA personnel and the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund will assist in providing information on service delivery and citizen education. It is expected that about three months will be required to build up to the desired programming production level of an hour a day for each station.

Programming will be presented on a combination of public service and commercial air time. Radio station WATA in Boone has offered the use of five minutes of public service time daily. Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine has offered the use of fifteen minutes of public service air time daily. The owner of WTOE also indicated that attractive public service programs could be sold to commercial sponsors, thereby freeing budgeted money for the purchase of additional air time. Since the project will not be dependent on commercial sponsors for support, however, there is no possibility that commercial sponsors could influence program content. Commercial sponsorship could be an effective tool for involving part of the business community in the war on poverty, but the appropriateness of spending federal money for the development of progams which might be sponsored by commercial sponsors is a matter for decision by the funding agency. Other public service programs produced by public agencies are sponsored, and FCC regulations do not differentiate between public service time that is given free and that which is sold to sponsors.

The medium of radio by its very nature provides little opportunity for censureship as previewing of recorded material is a costly and time-consuming job. All programs will be strictly non-partisan, as required by OEO regulations and federal statutes, and the radio station owners have agreed that only partisan programs or serious breaches of libel law and good taste will be considered grounds for cancellation of program contracts.

Preliminary training for broadcast personnel will be conducted by the public information staff of the North Carolina Fund with the assistance of instructors at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, using the facilities of both institutions. Most of the training of the non-professional assistants will be conducted by the broadcast developers on the job.

The recording vans will provide physical support for community organizations, as well as public recognition. Each of the vans will carry a portable public address system that can be used either from the van or from inside a building. Other physical support equipment will be used to compare the effectiveness of various communications methods. One of the vans will carry video tape equipment that will be used to record parts of community meetings for replay in other communities. The equipment will also be used for the production of short training tapes on subjects such as: how to run a meeting, how to plan a community budget, and other subjects of interest to community organizations.

The other van will carry movie projection equipment capable of projecting films through a screen suspended from the rear of the van in daylight, and that can be used in the normal manner in a darkened building. Several existing films on community organization and service delivery will be carried as part of the van's equipment, and its crew will use a 16mm movie camera for the production of short films about local communities and for the production of news film for area television stations.

4. *Financial administration*

A public accountant in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to manage the financial affairs of the corporation on a contract basis. The accountant will set up the books of the corporation according to existing guidelines of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He will train and supervise the clerical staff of the corporation in bookkeeping, make all financial reports, and close the books of the project preparatory to final audit.

5. *Timetable*

The Community Action News Project will begin operation within five weeks after confirmation of receipt of the Demonstration grant. The project will build up to full circulation and full broadcast time within three months after it begins operations. This time table is illustrated in the table below:

Process—Time subsequent to confirmation of demonstration grant

[In weeks]

	1	2	3	4	5	6					17
Formation of board and incorporation of community action news	X										
Hiring and orientation of personnel	X	X	X	X							
Training of nonprofessional staff	X	X	X	X	X						
Process of building to full newspaper circulation and target radio broadcast level						X	X	X	X	X	X

D. ORGANIZATION

1. Governing body

An independent, private, non-profit corporation shall be formed to carry out the Community Action News Project.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall manage the establishment of the corporation. When the initial directors of the corporation have been selected and have assembled, elected officers, written Articles of Incorporation, written By-Laws, and received a corporate charter from the State of North Carolina, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. shall, with the concurrence of OEO, delegate the Project to this new Corporation.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall ensure that the composition of the governing body, and the by-laws of the corporation shall be consistent with the intent of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The governing body of the corporation shall be constituted as follows:

a. One representative of the local press to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors with the concurrence of the press.

b. A representative from one of the two local radio stations to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors, with the concurrence of the station's owners.

c. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Community Action staff to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors.

d. A representative from Appalachian State Teachers College to be chosen by the College.

e. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors to be chosen by that Board.

f. Eight representatives of the poor, two from each county, to be selected by the Community Development Councils in each county.[1] Only persons with incomes below the poverty line shall be considered qualified representatives of the poor.

2. Operating organization

Subject to the corporate By-Laws and other policies to be established by the Board of Directors, and subject to the Board's regular review, the authority for the operation of the project shall be delegated to the Project Director. The Project Director shall be responsible for carrying out the work program described under section "D" of this application. Individual staff positions and duties are described below.

a. Senior Personnel

1. *Project Director*—The project director shall directly supervise the weekly newspaper and train low-income personnel in its production. He shall provide overall supervision and staff direction for the entire Community Action News project.

2. *Broadcast Developers*—(2)—The broadcast developers shall develop suitable program formats, and shall assemble, write, edit, and record in the field, materials to fit the program format. They shall arrange recording and broadcast schedules under the supervision of the project director. They shall train their low-income assistants in the operation of recording equipment and in the techniques of radio production and broadcasting, and supervise their work in the field.

b. Junior Personnel—Broadcast

1. *Technical Assistants*—(2)—These personnel shall directly assist the Broadcast Developers. They shall learn and use the skills necessary to operate recording and audio-visual equipment, and shall learn and use the techniques of radio production and announcing.

2. *Apprentices*—(2)—The apprentices shall work as trainees with each Broadcast Developer and his assistant, and shall have the specific job of monitoring recording sessions and noting requests for services or information indicating the need for services, and referring this information to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

c. Junior Personnel—Newspaper

1. *Assistant Editor*—The assistant editor shall learn and use the techniques of assembling and editing copy, planning, layouts and writing headlines, and producing make-up dummies for offset printing.

2. *Reporters*—(2)—The reporters shall learn and use the techniques of news writing and photography, including the various skills necessary for investigative and government reporting, human interest writing, and the production of comprehensive feature stories.

3. *Clerical*—(2)—The clerical personnel shall learn and use the techniques and skills necessary for efficient secretarial work. One clerical person shall also be trained to operate Justowriter typesetting equipment and the other clerical person shall be trained in bookkeeping and proofreading.

4. *Correspondents*—(20)—Twenty local low-income persons shall be trained to accurately judge and report the news of their local communities.

5. *Apprentices*—One or more Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall be assigned to the newspaper to work as trainees with the full-time personnel. Apprentices shall have the specific job of scanning the news pages and noting requests for services or information which indicate the need of services, and referring this information on to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

E. RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR THE PROJECT

1. Expense items

a. Project Staff: The applicant has no particular individuals in mind for staffing the project at this time, but is confident that qualified personnel can be recruited for the professional and non-professional positions on the Project staff at the salaries indicated in the enclosed Budget.

b. Project Equipment and Supplies: The applicant believes that the equipment and supplies listed in the Budget can be obtained at the costs indicated without undue delay.

c. Contract services:

1. Press: The publisher of the Avery Journal in Newland, North Carolina, has agreed to print the weekly newspaper.

2. Radio:

a. Radio station WATA in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 5 minutes daily as public service time.

b. Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 15 minutes daily as public service time.

c. The above two stations' signals reach practically all points in the 4-county area served by the CAA which will coordinate with the Project, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., (see Exhibits *B* and *C* in the supporting materials for an illustration of geographic coverage of these radio stations.)

Although no data on listening habits are available, a 1965 survey by the North Carolina Fund revealed that out of a random sample of roughly 8% of the low-income families in the four-county area, 80% owned radios.[2]

3. Financial Administration and Training: A public accountant in Boone, N.C. Mr. Jack Williams, has agreed to handle the bookkeeping and accounting affairs of the corporation and train project personnel in any bookkeeping necessary on a contract basis if requested. The agreement with Mr. Williams is, of course, subject to the approval of the Corporation upon its establishment.

2. Nonexpense items

a. Technical Assistance:

1. The University of North Carolina: The Chairman of the Department of Radio, Television, and Motion Pictures of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, has offered the use of his department's radio facilities for the training of broadcast staff.

2. The North Carolina Fund: The director of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund, Billy E. Barnes, has offered the full use of his staff and facilities for training of newspaper and broadcast personnel, (including on-the-job training). The Fund also offers the use of citizen education programs, which it continues to develop for use with low-income persons.

b. Supportive and Coordinating Services: W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. offers the full cooperation of its staff in the following ways:

1. Field Staff: W.A.M.Y. and its delegate agencies field over 12 full-time contact workers in each county. These workers will assist the project in completing referrals, arranging programs, providing "feedback" on the impact of the project, and in compiling mailing lists for the weekly newspaper.

2. Professional Staff: The professional staff will assist the project in preparing service information programs and columns.

3. Planning Staff: The planning staff will assist in any evaluation of the project, as well as provide information on resources available to individuals and communities from all sources.

4. Public Information Staff: The public information staff will provide regular information on current W.A.M.Y. programs, as well as presentations prepared by its Citizen Education Specialist.

5. Neighborhood Youth Corps: The W.A.M.Y. Neighborhood Youth Corps project will help select and will pay enrollees who will work as apprentices in the Broadcasting Project, and will provide these with supporting services in the form of general education and counseling.

F. PHYSICAL FACILITIES REQUIRED

Approximately 3,000 square feet of indoor floor space will be required for the Project's housing. This space would provide office space for newspaper personnel and the Broadcast Developers, and for a composition room, make-up room, project room and sound editing room. Some expense (as indicated in the Budget) will have to be taken to convert floor space into specialized work areas, but the labor of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall reduce the cost of renovations. No difficulty is anticipated in finding the necessary space.

G. EVALUATION PROCEDURES

Evaluation arrangements for this project will be left to the discretion of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The staff of W.A.M.Y. Community Action shall be made available to assist in evaluation upon request.

H. RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE APPLICANTS

W,A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. has been operating anti-poverty programs since June of 1965. It is currently operating nine (9) year-round CAP components, a Neighborhood Youth Corps operation (in-school and out-of-school), an On-the-Job Training Project. It has recently begun operation of Human Resources Planning Project under a Demonstration Grant from OEO. (A copy of a Community Action Program Status Report, enclosed under Part II, Supporting Data, provides some detail in W.A.M.Y.'s CAP operations).

I. QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL

1. Senior personnel

a. Project Director-Editor: The editor shall have an AB degree in journalism or equivalent work experience, and shall have at least two years experience as editor of a weekly newspaper. He shall also have had experience in and understanding of radio broadcasting techniques.

---

[1] The County Community Development Councils are made up of representatives of most of the communities in each county.

[2] *A Survey of Low-Income Families*, The North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina. (Data not yet published.)

b. Broadcast Developers: The two broadcast developers shall have BS degrees or equivalent work experience in radio production and electronics, and shall have at least two years experience in radio production and announcing, and extensive experience in field recording.

2. *Junior personnel*

Junior personnel shall have the talents necessary for training in their various jobs. They shall be hired by the project director from local applicants with incomes below the poverty level.

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967–APRIL 30, 1968, GRANT PERIOD

Item A

Public accountant to serve as financial officer of Community Action News on contract basis. Accountant will open and close books, pay for audit, train project personnel in bookkeeping and handle all financial transactions of corporation	$3,000

Item C

26 Polaroid cameras at $125	$3,250
1 mimeograph at $350	350
1 Justowriter recorder at $2,430	2,430
1 Justowriter reproducer at $3,245	3,245
1 Justowriter headliner at $825	825
1 Ampex video tape recorder at $3,000	3,000
1 Bell & Howell 16-mm. camera at $350	350
1 projection system at $1,000	1,000
2 RCA electronic lecterns at $125	250
2 mobile recording studios (see supplement) at $8,969	17,938
2 staff vehicles at $1,900	3,800
40 bulletin boards at $30	1,200
8 desks at $77	616
12 chairs at $22	264
3 filing cabinets at $45	135
1 adding machine at $208	208
2 tables at $25	50
Total	38,911

Item C supplement

2 Ford parcel delivery chassis P–350, with insulated, walk-in body, 6-cylinder, 300-cubic-inch, 170-horsepower engine at $3,800	$7,600.00
2 Terado dual continental transistorized invertor, 600 watts at $302.38	604.76
4 Ampex 602–4, full-track, 7.5 i.p.s. unmounted recorder, at $575.00	2,300.00
2 Crown SS801, full-track 7.5–15 i.p.s., remote-controlled master studio recorder at $1,200	2,400.00
2 Sparta 815 mixing console with accessory amplifiers at $650	1,300.00
2 Uher 4,000 report-L field tape recorder at $440.00	880.00
2 RCA 77–DX studio microphone at $251.50	503.00
2 Electro-Voice 666 field microphone at $150.00	300.00
2 Rek-O-Kut B–12H 3-speed turntable at $165.00	330.00
2 Rek-O-Kut S–320 tone arm for above at $34.95	69.90
2 GE VR–II cartridge for above with replacement styli at $24.95	49.90
Miscellaneous audio supplies and equipment	1,000.00
Furniture (chairs, table, lights, etc.)	600.00
Total	17,937.56

Item D

1450 Polaroid film at $2.10	$3,020
150 flashbulb packs at $1.50	300
2 electric typewriters (rental) at $180	360
4 upright typewriters (rental) at $90	384
2 portable typewriters (rental) at $60	120
8 office supplies at $180	1,440
4 cases Justowriter tape at $25	100
50 hour video tapes at $60	3,000
40 rolls 16-mm. film at $15	600
400 rolls recording tape at $1.85	740
Miscellaneous audio expendable supplies	600
Total	10,664

Item E

2 staff cars, 11,000 miles each at $.08	$1,760
2 vans, 75 miles per day at $.08	3,120
Out-of-area mileage, 3,600 miles at $.08	288
Per diem, out-of-area training, 8 persons at $12 per day for 5 days	480
Per diem, 100 nights for 2 recording crews at $10 per crew per night	2,000
Total	7,648

Item F

Commercial air time, radio station WATA:	
1,500 5-minute spots at $3	$4,500
600 15-minute spots at $8	4,800
Radio Station WTOE:	
900 5-minute spots at $3	2,700
600 15-minute spots at $5	3,000
Printing, 8,000 copies per week at $250	13,000
Postage, 8,000 copies per week at $.0125 per copy	5,200
Article purchase, 2 articles per week at $5 per article	520
Insurance, 4 vehicles	332
Insurance, recording equipment	315
Physical plant, rental of 3,000 sq. ft. at $.05 per sq. ft.	1,800
Renovation	500
Utilities at $75 per month	900
Telephone (previous experience)	1,800
Soundproofing, 2 vans at $300	600
Equipment installation, 2 vans at $400	800
Equipment maintenance, 2 vans at $200	400
Total	41,167

Funds requested from OEO

A. Personnel:	
1 Project director-editor ($834 per month)	$10,000
2 Broadcast developers ($708 per month)	17,000
1 Assistant editor ($375 per month)	4,500
2 Reporters ($375 per month)	9,000
2 Technical assistants ($375 per month)	9,000
2 Clerical ($333 per month)	8,000
20 Correspondents (one-fourth time) ($65 per month)	15,600
8 percent benefits	4,600
Accounting (see attachment)	3,000
Subtotal	80,700
B. Training (not applicable)	
C. Permanent equipment (see attachment)	38,911
D. Consumable supplies (see attachment)	10,644
E. Travel (see attachment)	7,648
F. Miscellaneous expenses (see attachment)	41,167
Total	179,070

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WAMPLER].

Mr. WAMPLER. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked recently to learn that plans are being made in the mountains of North Carolina to place the Government in the newspaper business. To me, this represents a clear infringement upon the traditional American concept of a free and unfettered press as well as a violation of the inherent right of the American citizen to weigh the news of the day without encountering the taint of government-imposed thoughts and beliefs.

In asking the Office of Economic Opportunity for a grant of $179,000 to finance this highly questionable project, the community action agency involved allegedly feels that the presence of a weekly "poverty paper" will promote group spirit. It is possible that group spirit could be achieved through the power of the press, but I submit that the inevitable and unfortunate end results of a government press far outweigh any benefits which might accrue.

Surely the fact that the Small Business Administration is prohibited from making loans to legitimate newspapers is a clear indication of congressional thinking on this subject. I cannot believe that the Office of Economic Opportunity—or, if necessary, the Congress of the United States—will permit such an obvious infringement on the American traditions of a free press.

Many others have indicated concern over this plan. It is easy to imagine the alarm of those small newspapers which find themselves threatened with government competition, but it is heartening to note that people in other areas have also expressed shock and alarm.

On May 7, 1967, the Bristol Herald Courier of Bristol, Va., carried an editorial pointing out the hidden dangers which would necessarily result from a government controlled press. I am pleased to be able to insert this editorial so that all Members may have an opportunity to study it.

The editorial follows:

AN INSIDIOUS PLAN

The "war on poverty" has taken some strange twists and turns, wasting millions of dollars in the process.

But nothing yet has been proposed which is quite as ridiculous, nor as potentially dangerous, as the project advanced by an agency of the Office of Economic Opportunity in the mountains of Western North Carolina.

This fuzzy-minded, frustrated agency is seeking $179,000 to publish a weekly newspaper, in conjunction with radio broadcasts. The purpose, as best we can determine, is to convince the proud, independent mountain people of that region that they are, indeed, poverty stricken and should surrender both their pride and their independence to the Great Society.

Obviously, the OEO agency has been unable to find enough takers for the wide variety of "benefits" which it has to offer. It seems the good people of the area lack the "group spirit" and need to be indoctrinated in the virtues of the herd.

The Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey County Community Action Agency, Inc. (WAMY) complains that it has spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that the individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible.

And, in a remarkable bit of self-ordained righteousness, the WAMY pins much of the blame for the absence of "group spirit" on "lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism . . . " Even if true, it still is an effrontery and constitutes an intolerable judgment of religious beliefs by government.

The government, of course, nor any agency of the government, has any business publishing a newspaper for any purpose, much less one designed to mold people into preconceived patterns of life and thought.

To do so is to take the first step toward evils which attach to controlled news media, as was the case in Nazi Germany and is the case today in Soviet Russia. That such a project could be proposed is bad enough; that it may receive a sympathetic ear in Washington, is even worse. There is no place in the U.S. for a "federal press," no matter how innocuous it may appear in infancy nor how much "good" its sponsors believe it will accomplish.

That there are people who decline to accept the beneficence of federal programs is, understandably, a challenge for the Great Society. How dare them!

We wonder, though, if anyone has considered the possibility that they simply want to be let alone. Does such an attitude demand a massive government effort to convince them they are poverty-stricken and down-trodden? Is the success of a government program more important than the desire of these people to maintain their own customs, traditions and way of life, however foreign they may be to others? We think not.

The WAMY proposal for a government financed and controlled newspaper is insidious. It ough to be rejected outright by the OEO—and if it isn't, then Congress ought to lay a heavy hand on the project before it gets off the ground. This is one Great Society proposal which cannot be countenanced under any guise.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LX

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, although the administration and the Defense Department are seeking ways to better integrate compulsory military service into the fabric of American life, the idea of maintaining an entirely voluntary Army has been gaining greater acceptance because of the increasing concern over the draft's encroachment upon, and constriction of, the personal freedom of America's young men. It is in this respect, that I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement signed by 77 prominent Americans urging the abolition of conscription.

LET US END CONSCRIPTION

The increased draft calls of the past two years have directed the public's attention to the need for change in the present selective service system and indeed have raised fundamental questions about the continuation of the draft itself.

Most concerned critics, ourselves included, cite many dissatisfactions with the draft as it now stands:

1. The draft is inequitable. As a method of selection the system tends to conscript the poor and the uneducated.

2. Because the draft is compulsory, it is undemocratic. No nation can justify conscription of its citizenry except under conditions of immediate threat to its survival. It is this feature of involuntary servitude that is in direct conflict with our libertarian traditions—and is a feature we abhor among other, less democratic nations.

3. The draft tends to give the Executive Branch access to an unlimited supply of manpower—without any checks and balances or review by Congress.

4. Presently Selective Service is administered unfairly and poorly. Draft board members often have little information on considered conscripts. In addition, local draft boards operate on different standards. There is no national uniform enforcement of standards for the draft. This situation has led to many abuses, particularly in the South where some draft boards have tended to draft disproportionate numbers of Negroes.

5. The draft has been used to suppress dissent. In Ann Arbor, Michigan, several young students lost their 2S deferments for sitting-in at the Ann Arbor draft board. The young men were protesting the war in Vietnam and the draft. When questioned, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service, approved of the reclassification.

6. The draft is inefficient, both economically and militarily. Many young men are drafted and sent through costly military training only to be employed in distinctly non-military tasks, e.g. cooks, clerks, dishwashers, etc. Furthermore, the draft is a military waste. Two years service is by no means sufficient for the making of a competent soldier in a highly technological age. Most conscripts leave after two years and the pay for the training of a fresh group of recruits before using the skills of the old one, is wasteful.

While we are in basic agreement with these criticisms and while we see a pressing need for change, we find ourselves deeply dismayed with two alternatives of Selective Service that are most frequently considered: A lottery and Universal National Service.

UNIVERSAL NATIONAL SERVICE

Widely suggested as an alternative to the draft is the Universal National Service proposal. Basically, Universal National Service suggests that all young men and women above a specified age be drafted and that non-military alternatives be permitted to conscripts within manpower requirements of the Department of Defense.

We cannot help but strongly object to this alternative. Universal National Service would seek to make the draft more democratic by extending conscription with all of its previously stated objectionable characteristics to all. We see true danger in conscripting an entire generation and setting it outside the framework of the democratic process for two years or more.

1. Universal National Service would not end the inequities of the present system of Selective Service, since selection for actual military duty would proceed very much on the same basis as at the present with its accompaniment of economic, class and educational differentiations. There is no question that the middle class and the college educated would seek and receive alternatives while the poor would continue to form the bulk of the fighting force.

2. While many proponents of the Universal National Service program see it as a means of solving many of America's most grave social problems, we can only feel that little will be accomplished if young people are impressed to perform humanitarian services. The success of such programs as the Peace Corps is due to the tremendous energy and commitment of volunteers. What is more, a democratic society must not use compulsion as a means of solving its social problems.

3. Compulsory National Service is open to the strong temptation of grave governmental misuse. The temptation to employ a vast network of manpower distributed around the world and throughout the nation for the partisan advance of narrowly conceived political goals could prove irresistible to any government.

4. Persons concerned about the increasing regimentation of modern society find the Universal National Service proposal most alarming. We can only feel that mass conscription of our youth would increase the trend towards a citizenry that increasingly accepts authoritarianism as a norm.

THE LOTTERY

Thoughtful critics of the inequities of the present system have also suggested that a lottery might remedy many of the inequities inherent in the draft. While a lottery, if properly administered, might be more equitable than the present system, depending upon how deferments from the lottery were established, a lottery would still maintain the present shortcomings and dangers of the draft.

1. The lottery is only another form of compulsory service.

2. Inequities of the present draft would not be ended because deferments would still be granted to those with special skills and those pursuing training deemed in the National interest.

FOR A VOLUNTEER ARMY

It is our conclusion that both Universal National Service and the lottery contain many of the defects of the present Selective Service System and that the only forthright and equitable solution is abolition of the draft. We see only one means of correcting Selective Service and that is to abolish the draft and replace it with a volunteer army.

There are two major arguments used by critics of a volunteer army. First, these critics contend that volunteer enlistment would create a mercenary army of professionals rather than a "citizens' army." This is misleading. Before the war in Vietnam draftees accounted for less than one-third of our armed forces. Two-thirds were professionals. Thus we do not have a "citizens' army." The argument is a false one. Critics of the volunteer army fear the possibility of the development of an army elite. It should be noted that a conscript army is not more democratic.

A second criticism of the volunteer system is that it is too expensive. Salaries of military personnel would have to be raised and various incentives offered if military service is to be made attractive to potential recruits. Varying estimates have been made of the expense necessary to create the proper incentives, and present studies on this matter have been hasty and inadequate. However, a recent Defense Department study indicated that a volunteer army of 2.2–2.7 million men could be sustained without any additional incentives whatever. It is also possible to reduce military costs greatly with the institution of a volunteer army. A volunteer army would eliminate the costly need to retrain recruits every two years. Millions could be saved by the transference of civilian jobs (such as clerical and service work) now filled by conscripts, to civil service. Again the expense of combat training and turnover would be eliminated.

Critics also claim that a volunteer army would not meet the military's manpower requirements in time of crisis no matter what incentives were offered. However, we cannot believe that the young people of this nation would not rally to the defense of their country in time of national emergency.

We recommend the following steps be

taken to facilitate the transition from Selective Service to a volunteer army.

1. The institution of wages comparable to civilian pay for all enlisted men.

2. An enlargement of job-training and educational opportunities available to volunteers.

3. The turning over to civil service of all non-military tasks now performed by draftees and enlisted men.

Conscription is quickly becoming a feature of national life. Its result can only be increased militarization of our society and acceptance of authoritarianism as the norm and military solutions as a way of life. A volunteer army is economically feasible. It is incumbent on us to lift the unfair burden of conscription from our youth. Of all the possible alternatives to the draft, a volunteer army must be given the most serious considerations. It is the only alternative that is consistent with our heritage and safeguards at home and the freedoms we seek to protect abroad.

JUDGE ABRAM OTTO KANNER

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, an old friend, a distinguished legislator, an eminent judge, recently passed away in Florida—Judge Abram Otto Kanner. I came to know him when he and I were members of the House of Representatives of the Florida Legislature in 1929. He served many years thereafter as representative and senator in our legislature.

A man of keen intellect, of judicial temperament, and a symbol of noble character, he was wisely selected for the Florida bench. After serving many years as circuit judge he was elevated to the district court of appeals, our intermediate appellate court in Florida, and there he served with great dedication and distinction until his recent retirement.

At his funeral on April 16 at Stuart, Fla., Judge Kanner's longtime home, a beautiful tribute was paid to him by Rabbi Mordecai M. Thurman, of Temple Beth El, Fort Pierce, Fla. This tribute is so deserved and so beautiful that I wanted to enroll it in the Record of the Congress of the United States, and to commend it and the character of the noble judge and dear friend, who is its subject, to my colleagues and to my country.

In Memory of Abram O. Kanner, November 2, 1893–April 13, 1967

(By Rabbi Mordecai M. Thurman, Temple Beth El, Fort Pierce, Fla.)

When Judge Abram Otto Kanner, distinguished public servant, legislator, and jurist was summoned to the Family above, death stilled a noble impulse. Our departed erected for himself an enduring memorial in the hearts of all those who were privileged to know him. His was the rare combination of keen intellect, inflexible integrity, untiring industry, and fine feeling. In the words of the psalmist, Judge Kanner "walked uprightly and spoke truth in his heart," keeping "his tongue from evil and his lips from speaking guile." We are in the presence of the mortal remains of a prince among men, an aristocrat who journeyed through life with clean hands and a pure heart.

This kindly, quiet, unassuming, gracious gentleman filled his surrounding sphere with a pervading good. His were the virtues and joys of the hearth. His wife was his home. His religious faith was to him joy and comfort, guide and strength. He brought to the Synagogue, which he loved, a genuine religiousness and a reverent appreciation of all that is good and noble and true.

His is the imperishable crown of a good name.

We are deeply grateful for the years of his life and service. Now that God's finger has touched him and he sleeps, we feel we have surrendered something vital and uncommon to the unconquerable years.

May you who are bereaved be imbued with the faith that death does not sever the bond of devotion which unites loving hearts. Death cannot kill that which never dies. Your loving togetherness is greater than the tomb. Thank God, therefore, for the life which in His love He gave you, and which in His wisdom He has taken away. It is our fervent prayer that God may temper your heartache and grant you inner peace and serenity.

HOPE ON

There was never a day so misty and grey
 That the blue was not somewhere above it;
There is never a mountain top ever so bleak
 That some little flower does not love it.

There was never a night so dreary and dark
 That the stars were not somewhere shining;
There is never a cloud so heavy and black
 That it has not a silver lining.

There is never a waiting time, weary and long,
 That will not some time have an ending;
The most beautiful part of the landscape is where
 The shadows and sunshine are blending.

Upon every life some shadows will fall,
 But heaven sends the sunshine of love;
Through the rifts in the clouds we may, if we will,
 See the beautiful blue above.

Then let us hope on, though the way be long,
 And the darkness be gathering fast;
For the turn in the road is a little way on,
 Where the home lights will greet us at last.

NORTHWEST TOWN PIONEER DAYS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, Hon. Richard J. Daley, the outstanding mayor of Chicago, Ill. has proclaimed the period from May 15 through May 20 as Northwest Town Pioneer Days.

This period has been set aside by the mayor in order that appropriate observances may be held of the 130th anniversary of the Near Northwest Side, one of the most interesting and exciting neighborhoods in Chicago.

The festivities which have been scheduled will focus attention on 130 years of progress made by this community, and will include a torchlight parade on May 26. All the religious, civic, business, and industrial groups will participate in the parade and in the other activities which have been scheduled.

The 130th anniversary program is being sponsored by the Chicago-Ashland Business Men's Association, an organization devoted to serving the community, and the Community Advertiser, a leading neighborhood newspaper which has served for years as a voice of the community under the capable and inspired guidance of its publisher, Mr. Arthur Schimmel.

Mr. Wayne Dunkel, manager of Goldblatt's Department Store, is serving as chairman, and Mr. Mort Miller, of Mort Miller, Inc., and president of the Chicago-Ashland Business Men's Association, is cochairman of the event. The committee members include Milton Kaplan, Don Esrig, Jot Friedland, John Lythke, Eduardo Pacheco, Irving Lamet, Al Dorenfest, Abraham Cohen, Leonard Wald, Isadore Finkelstein, Irwin W. Mendlesohn, Al Piet, Ralph Credio, Harold Pikeo, Mrs. Wanda Skalski, Joseph Zilka, Lou Kwasman, Mrs. Sophie Aron, Paul Grossman, Edward Howaniec, Meyer Hirst, Charles Dexter, Robert Mendez, Roy Garwood, Vanta Coda, Al Moss, James H. Newmark, Larry Bell, Max Cohen, Sam Weiss, and Edward Zable.

By their contributions and their efforts, I know that the hard-working and dedicated members of the committee, together with all of the members of the community who are participating in the Near Northwest Pioneer Days, will make this event a tremendous success. I commend all of them for their community spirit and their best efforts in the public interest.

I am particularly proud of the outstanding progress that the Near Northwest Side has made because it is located in the Seventh District of Illinois, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress.

I am, therefore, pleased to insert at this point in the Congressional Record the mayor's proclamation:

Proclamation

Whereas, the City of Chicago is this year observing the 130th Anniversary of its incorporation; and

Whereas, in this connection the people of the admirably progressive Near Northwest Side area are planning observances which will emphasize particularly the development of this section in consonance with the great growth of Chicago as a whole; and

Whereas, this local celebration of the city's anniversary of incorporation will be under the general direction of the Chicago-Ashland Businessmen's Association and the Community Advertiser:

Now, therefore, I, Richard J. Daley, Mayor of the City of Chicago, do hereby proclaim the period from May 15 through May 20, 1967 to be Northwest Town Pioneer Days and urge all citizens to take cognizance of the special events arranged for this time.

Dated this 2nd day of March, A.D., 1967.

Richard J. Daley,
Mayor.

TRIP TO AFRICA IS A NECESSITY

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Rosenthal] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I read with much interest the editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, entitled "This Trip Is Necessary." It deals with the forthcoming trip to Africa of Under Secretary of State Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, who will be accompanied by Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs J. Wayne Fredericks.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Africa of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have had the opportunity to work closely with Wayne Fredericks. I have found him to be one of our most knowledgeable and informed experts in the Bureau of African Affairs at the State Department, and I most certainly subscribe to the Times editorial that his achievements over the past several years have been considerable.

His contributions as a public servant have been outstanding, and I would hope that neither the President nor the Secretary of State would permit him to leave the Department—a possibility mentioned in the editorial. His services are too necessary to the country and to the public, and I look forward to a continued association with him as one of those gifted individuals with the foresight to know what our foreign policy should be, and the devotion and persistence to carry such policy through to fruition.

At this point in the Congressional Record, I would like to set forth the editorial from the New York Times of May 9, 1967.

This Trip Is Necessary

> The trip to eleven African countries on which Under Secretary of State Katzenbach starts tomorrow will be the first such swing through Africa by anyone from State's top layer. The trip is long overdue.
>
> Mr. Katzenbach's job will not be easy. He will try to persuade leaders of the new Africa that the United States is not disengaging from the continent, that Washington remains interested in their problems and opposed to perpetuation of white minority rule in southern Africa.
>
> He will be called on to explain how the United States, on one side, can take strong stands against the white rebel regime in Rhodesia and against South Africa's flouting of the United Nations in South West Africa and, on the other, can approve such a spectacular goodwill gesture toward Pretoria as the visit of the carrier Franklin D. Roosevelt to Capetown.
>
> The Under Secretary's trip to an area entirely avoided to date by the most traveled Secretary of State in our history is a tribute to the persistence of J. Wayne Fredericks, Deputy Assistant Secretary for African Affairs. In accompanying Mr. Katzenbach, Mr. Fredericks may be performing a last public service before returning to private life.
>
> In five years of hard work he has done much to persuade the State Department's seventh floor that Africa exists and will not go away—a considerable achievement.

EDITORIAL COMMENT ON THE ILLS OF OUR MAIL DELIVERY SYSTEM

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Charles H. Wilson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Postmaster O'Brien's proposal to convert the Post Office into a nonprofit Government corporation was the catalyst for a nationwide wave of editorial comment on the ills of our mail delivery system. Most of the editorials praised the Postmaster General for his forthright comments, and rightfully so. He has made a bold, thought-provoking recommendation that deserves, and is receiving, full consideration in both the legislative and executive branches of Government.

However, in their haste to blame someone for the manifold problems our postal service is heir to, some editorial writers have decided that the Congress is the principal, if not the sole, culprit. They have even implied that the Postmaster General has come to the same conclusion. These newspapers are incorrect on both points. The Congress is not responsible for the admittedly serious postal problems that now exist in our country. Nor did our very able and astute Postmaster General ever even suggest anything of the kind.

To the contrary, in the speech before the Magazine Publishers Association, in which he proposed a postal corporation, Mr. O'Brien said our postal problems are rooted in history. Here is what the Postmaster General said, and I quote:

> Permit me to say loud and clear that I am not focusing any criticism on Congress for the manner in which the Postal Service is organized. Our organization is the product of evolution, and I think any candid assessment of the record will show that whenever ready progress has been made during that revolutionary process, Congressional prodding has had much to do with it.

It is always more convenient if a handy villain can be found. But as Mr. O'Brien has pointed out, there is no villain in this piece—unless you can call a system that has failed to respond to the needs of the times a villain.

Let me emphasize that most of the editorials I have seen have been constructive and have reflected an awareness of the complexities involved in Mr. O'Brien's proposal.

But all the editorials, even those which insist that what ails the Post Office is Congress, and nothing more, contribute to the important national dialog now underway. With permission, I will insert in the Record excerpts from editorials on the postal service from California and other States throughout the Nation.

Los Angeles Times:

> Final judgments cannot be made until the details are spelled out. But it appears that O'Brien has come up with an imaginative and practical approach to averting the threatened breakdown in mail service.
>
> President Johnson should seriously consider endorsing the proposal and sending it on to Congress for action.

The Sun, San Bernardino, Calif.:

> The conclusion of the experts apparently is that Congress is going to have to give up some of its rigid control over the postal system. Pulling out tradition is even more difficult than pulling teeth, but congressmen have had their warning.
>
> Congress was not designed to be an administrative body, and that is what has ailed the Post Office for these many years.

Independent Star-News, Pasadena, Calif.:

> Congress currently has before it a $700 million mail rate increase and a $100 million crash mechanization program. Both are necessary, but will only momentarily shore up the department's sagging efficiency.
>
> The entire problem is in need of urgent study. O'Brien's proposal may be too drastic or not drastic enough. It even has been suggested that postal rates be done way with entirely and the post office be run completely as a public service. The obvious drawbacks to this solution put it in the realm of impossibility, but it may be more realistic than many other plans being given serious consideration.

News Tribune, Fullerton, Calif.:

> The postmaster general may not have the perfect answer to the problem, but at least he has provided a starting point for serious discussions of remedial action. Congress ought to pick up the ball.

The Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn.:

> The calamity of postal operations has been so dramatically exposed by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien that it should be obvious emergency treatment is vital.

The Tuscaloosa News, Tuscaloosa, Fla.:

> Postmaster General O'Brien's proposal for replacing the present department with a public service corporation deserves serious study and consideration. And above all, the plight of the nation's postal system demands public interest and understanding.
>
> We cannot continue to run a space age postal service with pony express policies and practices.

The Minneapolis Star, Minneapolis, Minn.:

> O'Brien has sprung a bold and exciting idea. The change would be titanic, and the proposal will be hashed over for a long time. Even if it doesn't succeed as presented, the idea should be the avenue to lesser reform.

Ogden Standard-Examiner, Ogden, Utah:

> This has promise of being the course long needed to get the U.S. Post Office Department out of the doldrums and on its way to handling mail faster, more efficiently and cheaper.
>
> Best of all, it could—and should—get the postal service out of politics.

News-Sun, Waukegan, Ill.:

> Some people may ask why the department isn't completely divorced from government and turned over to private enterprise. On the surface, this is a reasonable question. However, in order to run the system on an unswerving profit-and-loss basis, private enterprise would have to heavily increase mail rates to stay consistently in the black. The post office was never meant to operate strictly by the balance sheet, but to help promote the general welfare and to advance the economy. It does so in many ways—such as distributing books, periodicals and other publications at a subsidized rate. Small, but useful publishing companies could be driven out of business if they had to pay sky-high mail charges.

Press Citizen, Iowa City, Iowa:

> The alternative appears to be continued division of decision-making and veto powers

among the administration. Congress, postal unions and mail users' associations. This blocks efficient management, so we can expect to have continued rate increases in an effort to hold a deteriorating system together. Someday, however, things are likely to get so bad that the government corporation idea, or something like it, will come through public demand.

The Salt Lake Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah:

The O'Brien plan is too radical a departure from the present system to be endorsed—or rejected—out of hand. But the O'Brien plan should not be laid on the shelf, as has happened with so many other ideas for the improvement of government services. On the contrary, the plan could well be used as the starting point for a searching study of the Post Office. The department has been described as one of the nation's biggest "businesses." If so, it should be operated like one.

The Roanoke Times, Roanoke, Va.:

It's a spectacular plan. It might work, it might not. But unless Congress can come up with something better, it seems worth a try. In fact, almost anything might be preferable to a system that is still trying to recover from the near-fatal breakdown of mail distribution that occurred in the Midwest last year.

The Columbus Ledger, Columbus, Ga.:

As we said, the idea should not be shot down before there's time for a complete study. Mr. O'Brien's proposed solution might not be the right and appropriate one. But, at least, it should be given the benefit of study. For one way or another, something is going to have to give in the operation of the postal service. It is growing into an unmanageable monster.

Journal Herald, Dayton, Ohio:

Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's radical proposal to overhaul the U.S. mail system is welcome.

The Scranton Times, Scranton, Pa.:

The O'Brien proposal may not get very far. Congress is jealous of its power to fix postal rates. Moreover, many members of Congress contend that the Founding Fathers intended the Post Office Department to constitute a public service and not necessarily a self-supporting institution. But at least Mr. O'Brien has advanced an idea that is certain to stir up a lot of debate.

North Adams Transcript, North Adams, Mass.:

The most intriguing—and refreshing—idea to come from Washington in a long time was Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien's plan to abolish the present postal system and replace it with a non-profit government corporation.

Adirondack Daily Enterprise, Saranac Lake, N.Y.:

Two business communities benefit from the post office and, in our view, unnecessarily. One is the newspaper industry and the second is the industry that produces so-called "junk" mail and the businesses that use that form of advertising.

At every meeting of publishers, whether of newspapers or magazines, there is a valiant defense of the present low rates for publications, rates which cost the taxpayers many millions of dollars.

The original purpose of this low rate was the freedom of the press. But this was the only medium of communications, more than a century and a half before radio or television. We find it ridiculous to insist that the freedom of the press requires that the federal government should deliver either The Enterprise or Time and Life magazines at a cost to the U.S. taxpayer.

News-Register, Wheeling, W. Va.:

So it was good to hear the splendid proposal by Postmaster General Lawrence O'Brien a couple of weeks ago whereby he would abolish the Post Office Department as a part of the Cabinet, and turn it into a nonprofit corporation operated by a board of directors and managed by a professional executive appointed by the board. Certainly the idea offers something better than continual postal deficits, poor service and higher rates.

CREDIT UNION LEGISLATION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives today voted, with my full and complete support, to report the bill H.R. 9682, which would liberalize the rules under which officers, directors, and members of supervisory and credit committees of Federal credit unions may borrow from their own credit unions.

Many credit unions, particularly smaller ones, have found present law a handicap to obtaining and holding the services of qualified officials. I am glad that this needed legislation is starting to move in the Congress of the United States.

MISSILES

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I should like next to discuss the Army's fiscal year 1968 program for the procurement of missiles, and repair parts, for which authorization is also sought.

The total cost of this program is $769.2 million, or approximately 13 percent of the PEMA budget for fiscal year 1968. The program as presented will provide for the introduction of the Tow missile, and for the continued procurement of the Chaparral, Redeye, Lance, and Shillelagh missile systems, as well as for the enhancement of the capabilities of other existing systems.

Tow is a tube-launched, optically tracked, wire-guided missile designed for use by the infantryman to destroy enemy tanks, armored vehicles, and pillboxes. It is crew-portable and can be mounted on either a light vehicle, such as the Mule, Jeep, and armored personnel carrier, or fired from the ground. Its range, accuracy, and ease of operation greatly exceed those of the Entac missile and 106-mm. recoilless rifle which it replaces.

Chaparral is a ground-to-air adaptation of the Navy and Air Force air-to-air Sidewinder. The missile launcher is mounted on a full-tracked, self-propelled carrier, affording a high degree of mobility and maneuverability. The system, when operational, will provide low-altitude defense against enemy aircraft in forward combat areas.

Redeye is a man-transportable, shoulder-fired, guided missile developed for use by frontline combat units for close-in air defense. It is being procured for both the Army and the Marine Corps.

Lance is a lightweight, highly mobile, surface-to-surface missile system designed to provide nuclear as well as conventional firepower. Lance will replace Honest John, providing improved accuracy, range, and mobility. Lance may be launched from a modified full-tracked personnel carrier, which serves as both transporter and launcher, or from a lightweight towed launcher.

Shillelagh is a command guided missile which is fired from a gun tube that is also capable of firing conventional ammunition. It is a direct-fire, surface-to-surface missile for attack of moving or stationary targets. The Shillelagh system, with its 152-mm. gun launcher, will comprise the principal armament on the Army's new armored reconnaissance/airborne assault vehicle, XM551—General Sheridan—and the M60A1E1-M60A1E2 tank.

The program includes $269 million for the procurement and manufacture of long lead-time components for the Nike X anti-ballistic-missile defense system. This is the second year increment and, together with $153.5 million authorized in fiscal year 1967, constitutes the required amount to begin Nike X procurement should a decision be made to provide a ballistic missile defense for the United States.

Other missile program costs include the purchase of additional target missiles; production base support; procurement of additional towed Hawk tactical and maintenance float sets, and self-propelled training equipment items; the procurement of improved Pershing ground support equipment to better perform the Quick Reaction Alert role; and funds for the land combat support system—LCSS—and electronic, automatic, multipurpose assembly of test and repair equipment for use in maintaining the Shillelagh, Tow, and Lance missile systems in the field.

Missile parts, at a dollar value of $37.9 million, are programed for initial provisioning and replenishment.

EDWARD P. MORGAN SAYS "MISGUIDED REPUBLICAN SCHEME THREATENS SCHOOL AID"

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one

of the ablest commentators on public affairs in our country is Edward P. Morgan of the ABC radio network.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record a column excerpted from Mr. Morgan's broadcast. The column is entitled, "Misguided Republican Scheme Threatens Federal School Aid."

Misguided Republican Scheme Threatens Federal School Aid

(By Edward P. Morgan)

Two years ago, for the first time in the nation's history, Congress began to provide federal aid to grade schools and high schools.

It was a massive belated blood transfusion against the educational anemia that has afflicted especially America's poor like an endemic disease for generations. This was no miracle drug and there were some mistakes in its application. But its needle was aimed at the right target: the vicious circle of ignorance in which the nation's needy are trapped. To improve themselves they need jobs. But to get and hold jobs they need training. In the past educational opportunities open to them have been strikingly limited, shockingly inferior and for the most part they have not been able to afford the extra training necessary to develop more than manual labor skills demanded by an increasingly specialized and mechanized economy.

But this national help to the grass roots was a bright beginning to combat the blight. The bogeyman raised in the frightened, prejudiced minds of some of a big government brainwashing the population by dictating school curricula turned out to be a limp scarecrow.

Admittedly there has been some bureaucratic imperiousness and more red tape than necessary. Give an official the opportunity to circulate a form and he all too often is inclined to attach more importance to the form than the substance. This, of course, proves Parkinson's Law, that the more blanks there are to fill out, the emptier the efficiency.

The ingeniousness of the school aid legislation, however, lay in its ability to clear two bigger obstacles: the antagonisms of race and religion. It was a must, of course, that the federal law provide equality of educational benefits to Negro children. The constitutional separation of church and state foreclosed the possibility of earmarking tax dollars for parochial schools, as such. Some state constitutions forbid outright public aid to church-supported schools. No federal money now goes directly to private or parochial schools.

The compromise came through by-passing the category of the school, in effect, and considering the category of need of the principal objective of the whole exercise, the child. The result has been a new-found cooperation between government officials and public and private school officials at a local level to provide children who have never had them before such things as remedial reading, a guidance counselor or a hot breakfast.

But now this whole intricate apparatus is in danger of being swept away through a sinister combination of misguided Republican ingenuity and the vindictiveness of some diehard segregationists smarting under federal compulsion—13 years after the Supreme Court decision—to integrate public schools.

Without committee hearings, GOP Rep. Albert Quie (Minn.) has introduced—and changed it hastily several times—an amendment to the elementary and secondary education act which would substitute block grants to states for aid now going to local communities. On the surface this seems a reasonable projection of the "creative federalism" the Johnson Administration has talked so much about.

Beneath the surface, however, the Quie amendment is a booby-trap. Mobilizing support from conservatives by its philosophy of tax-sharing to counterbalance "too much federal control," its formula would allocate funds to states on the basis of the relative number of school-age children and the relative income per child in each state.

The ironic flaw in this arithmetic is that it would hurt both the poorest and the richest states. All the southern and border states—except Maryland—would get less money and these are states which already are among the lowest in per-pupil expenditure for education. But New York, California, Illinois, New Jersey and Texas would be injured too. With big populations they have some of the largest numbers of educationally-deprived children in school who need more financial help.

That's not all. Funds for that political orphan, the District of Columbia, would be cut almost in half. (Tests just released show that students in four out of five District schools are poor readers and below the national average.)

The Quie amendment also would jeopardize if not wipe out school aid to migrant workers' children, American Indians, and dependents of government workers overseas. It would further weaken the fledgling Teacher Corps as well as deprive handicapped and/or delinquent children whom federal school funds now help.

The Leadership Conference, an influential civil rights lobby, opposes the amendment, fearing that in a spite-the-face mood, the South will prefer to cut off the nose of present federal funds and accept less under the Quie formula in order to continue the blind fight for "states' rights."

A mixture of misunderstanding, prejudice and complacency could allow the Quie amendment to reverse the progress in primary and secondary education. In a recent speech, one of the nation's most valuable public servants, Health, Education and Welfare Sec. John Gardner, said:

"I understand the love of complacency. But down that path lies the decay and ruin of this great nation."

AFL-CIO CALLS FOR BIPARTISAN SUPPORT OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (H.R. 7819)

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the list of those concerned with the education of American children who have endorsed continuation of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is growing daily. The AFL-CIO Executive Council has now joined the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, the American Parents Committee, the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and a host of others in endorsing continuation of the present, successful program of Federal aid to elementary and secondary school children.

As the AFL-CIO statement points out, the Quie substitutes were "never considered by any congressional committee. It was introduced after the House Education and Labor Committee had held lengthy hearings on ESEA and had reported out H.R. 7819."

Mr. Speaker, the statement goes on to point out that the Quie substitutes have been amended substantially several times. The AFL-CIO says four times, but I have lost exact count at this point. This is no way to legislate in such an important area as the education of American children.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 7819 "includes no radical changes and creates no new areas of controversy. It strengthens the ESEA." These are the conclusions of the AFL-CIO Executive Council. I urge my colleagues to read the full statement.

Statement by the AFL-CIO Executive Council on Support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been hailed widely and correctly as historic legislation providing a breakthrough in the area of federal aid to education.

Today, this legislation is in serious jeopardy. The AFL-CIO Executive Council is determined that the great educational gains achieved by the 89th Congress shall not be destroyed.

Despite support for the continuation of ESEA from every major educational organization, the vast majority of state school superintendents, local school districts, and the non-public school organizations, the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives has chosen to make this vital legislation a partisan political issue.

Waving the banner of "federal control," this Republican leadership is seeking to wipe out ESEA and substitute a form of financial block grants to the states. In playing politics with the education of America's youth, the Republican leadership is guilty of a national disservice.

Over eight million educationally deprived children in virtually all of the country's 23,000 school districts already have received direct benefits under ESEA. This far-reaching law has established a national policy directed at meeting the special needs of the educationally poor.

As proposed by Rep. Albert Quie (R. Minn.), the Republican substitute would permit the states to ignore this national policy. It would, instead, permit the individual states to practice economic discrimination.

Block grants can only intensify the present financial conflicts between the large cities and respective state governments. Programs developed at the state level can provide no federal guarantee that funds will go where they are most needed—to help the children of the slums and the rural depressed areas.

The block grant approach also threatens to rekindle the flames of controversy over the state-church issue that frustrated enactment of federal aid to education for over 20 years. Private school organizations are deeply concerned that their students will no longer be able to participate in many federal programs if these programs are administered by state departments of education.

But there is much more that is wrong with the Quie substitute.

The substitute was never considered by any Congressional committee. It was introduced after the House Education and Labor Committee had held lengthy hearings on ESEA and had reported out H.R. 7819.

The allocation formula as now spelled-out in the Quie substitute provides half the states with less funds than they would receive under H.R. 7819. These are the states most in need: those with low per pupil expenditures and those with the largest number of youths living in property.

The original Quie proposal has now been amended four times in an effort to gain new political support. Rep. Quie has modified his block grant approach to provide that at least 50 percent of a state's grant be used for the educationally disadvantaged. Under H.R. 7819, however, 80 percent of the federal funds must be used for this purpose.

The Quie substitute also prohibits the use of such funds for general classroom construction and improved teacher salaries, while—at the same time—eliminating provisions for such successfully operating programs as the Teacher Corps, aid for the children of migrant workers, foster children, and many others.

The Quie substitute also has a detrimental effect on civil rights. The elimination of "federal control" will not make it easier to enforce desegregation guidelines. A cutback in funds to the cities will punish severely the economically poor children of minority groups.

The Quie substitute would reduce by $281 million fiscal 1969 authorizations provided in H.R. 7819. No such reduction is justified.

H.R. 7819, in direct contrast to the Quie substitute, continues the popular programs born in 1965 that have earned wide public and Congressional support. The bill includes no radical changes and creates no new areas of controversy. It strengthens ESEA, instead of destroying it as proposed by Quie.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council is convinced that the education of our youth is too important to be dragged into the partisan, political arena. We are confident that many Republican members of the House of Representatives share these views.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council, therefore, urges the members of both parties in the House to join together in rejecting the Quie substitute and giving bipartisan support to H.R. 7819—a continuation of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

BOSTON GLOBE URGES DEFEAT OF QUIE BILL

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive editorial comments I have seen about the proposed amendments of Representative ALBERT QUIE to do away with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 was published in the Boston Globe of May 1, 1967.

The Boston Globe, like the New York Times and the Washington Post, becomes one more significant voice in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 (H.R. 7819).

The editorial follows:

SCHOOL AID DIVERSIONS

The "Republican plan" for revamping the administration's elementary and secondary education program would carry more weight if its principal backers were not men who had voted up, down and across against practically every aid-to-education bill which has come up in the past decade.

The amendment which Rep. Albert Quie of Minnesota has offered on behalf of twelve G.O.P. colleagues is a serious one. It accepts the fact that Federal aid to education is here to stay. But by substituting block grant appropriations to the states for the present system of allocations by categories it would take most of the punch and effectiveness out of the Federal program.

HEW Secretary John W. Gardner summed the situation up when he said: "The Quie substitute would spread assistance over so wide an area that it would be no more than a thin film of Federal funds on top of a vast ocean of educational needs."

It would also eliminate important Federal safeguards. Southern Democrats are rallying behind the amendment in the belief that it would scratch Federal guidelines on discrimination. There is no doubt that it would sharply curtail Federal control over the kind of programs to be aided. It might reopen the old controversy over church-school aid.

Congress should forget these diversions and get back on the track.

A BILL FOR THE LONG-TERM CAPITAL INVESTMENT IN OUR COUNTRY'S PRIME ASSET: OUR YOUNG PEOPLE

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the country's greatest asset is its people and particularly its youth. And I for one sincerely believe that the best investment in our youth, as well as our country, is to encourage and provide for their education, particularly higher education. I refer here to education beyond the high school level, not just college, but also accredited business, trade, technical, and other vocational schools. The Federal Government is presently encouraging this in a number of ways; but, to date, we have failed to squarely face the high cost of acquiring this level of education. To meet this situation I am introducing a bill to allow a credit against income tax for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education.

The bill provides an income tax credit on the first $1,500 of tuition, fees, books, and supplies to anyone who pays these expenses for a student at an institution of higher education, including business and trade schools. The amount of the credit is 75 percent of the first $300, 50 percent of the next $200, and 25 percent of the next $1,000. The maximum credit allowable for any one student is $575. The tax credit is available to anyone who pays tuition expenses.

Anyone financing more than one student, a parent with two children in college or business school, for example, could get a credit of this amount for each child; it is available to other relatives; it is available to students who are working to put themselves through school and pay their own expenses; and it is available to those who would like to help deserving students.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the cost of education in general and particularly going to college, business, or trade school has risen and will continue to rise. The present programs which help those desiring to further their education are inadequate and insufficient to meet the needs of the majority of American families. As the costs of education continue to rise, the burden will continue to fall the hardest on the lower and middle income groups—who are struggling to pay bills, buy their homes, and educate their children. This bill is designed to provide direct help to those in the lower and middle income groups in the United States.

It is in the national interest that the Congress recognize this need for furthering the education of our people. Increasing one's education generally increases one's earning power—so this would be, in effect, a long-term, capital investment in our country's prime asset and future. Just as some tax relief is recognized for such items as large medical bills and property loss or damage, so must there be some relief for the high cost of education.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about the future of the food stamp program. Recent action taken by the House Agriculture Committee by amending H.R. 1318 to increase State participation in the cost of the program by 20 percent of the cost of bonus coupons will, in my opinion, place the program in great jeopardy. I fear that many States, including my own of New York, will be forced to discontinue the program. Those who need the program—persons in the lowest income brackets and those on public assistance—will suffer. The program has been an important one in combating poverty and in permitting these people adequate amounts of proper food.

Mr. Speaker, I also oppose the committee action to limit fund authorization through fiscal 1967. The bill, as introduced, had provided for open-end authorization. Without the need for new authorization by Congress each year, I think this provision should be restored to H.R. 1318.

The food stamp program, put into effect by Public Law 525 of the 88th Congress, authorized appropriations for 3 years through June 30 of this year. The program requires the participating family to use some of its own income to purchase food, and provides them with the opportunity to buy more and better food for less money. This is not a welfare program. There is no reason for any citizen of this country of great abundance and food surplus to go hungry or to lack a proper, nutritious diet.

Although the food stamp program is not yet in operation in New York City, it has been in operation in other sections of New York State. We have requested the program for New York City for fiscal 1968 and, hopefully, the Department of Agriculture will give approval if State funds are available to match

Federal funds. It is estimated that more than 200,000 will benefit if it goes into effect. However, at the projected level of the program for next year, the amendment to add the 20 percent assessment will cost my State $6 million for the food stamp program—an increase of $4.4 million.

Mr. Speaker, 41 States and the District of Columbia support the food stamp program. More than 2 million low-income, needy families throughout the country are being assisted. Many other States, just as my State of New York, have indicated that they desire to initiate the program. I want to go on record as strongly opposing H.R. 1318, as amended and reported by the House Committee on Agriculture. The States participating in the program and those wishing to participate should not be penalized by a burdensome 20-percent additional cost.

When H.R. 1318 comes to the House floor I will support an amendment to eliminate the 20-percent assessment, and I will also support an amendment to restore open-end authorization.

SUPPORT FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION AMENDMENTS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the AFL–CIO Executive Council has added its voice to the rising chorus of opponents of the Quie substitute for the 1967 amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

The statement adopted by the executive council is a good summary of the major arguments against the substitute, and I urge Members of Congress to take a few minutes to read it.

Like many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I have been committed for years to the proposition that there is a national interest in improving the quality and quantity of education available to the young people of America. And it is the responsibility of Congress to legislate in that national interest.

It took years of hard work and preparation by many Americans—in and out of Congress—to enact finally the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965. Although I do not believe the act is perfect, I am very proud to have been a member of the Education and Labor Committee when the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was put together and finally reported for action by the full House. I think each of us who served in the last Congress and who supported this landmark legislation can be proud of the programs it authorized. It represents a good foundation upon which to build.

Mr. Speaker, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been good for America. The Education and Labor Committee has reported a good bill to extend and expand this program, and I hope Members of the House will support the committee bill and oppose the Quie substitute.

For the information of readers of the Congressional Record, I insert the statement adopted by the AFL–CIO Executive Council in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments to be printed as part of my remarks at this point in the Record. The statement follows:

Statement by the AFL–CIO Executive Council on Support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1967

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 has been hailed widely and correctly as historic legislation providing a breakthrough in the area of federal aid to education.

Today, this legislation is in serious jeopardy. The AFL–CIO Executive Council is determined that the great educational gains achieved by the 89th Congress shall not be destroyed.

Despite support for the continuation of ESEA from every major educational organization, the vast majority of state school superintendents, local school districts, and the non-public school organizations, the Republican Policy Committee of the House of Representatives has chosen to make this vital legislation a partisan political issue.

Waving the banner of "federal control," this Republican leadership is seeking to wipe out ESEA and substitute a form of financial block grants to the states. In playing politics with the education of America's youth, the Republican leadership is guilty of a national disservice.

Over eight million educationally deprived children in virtually all of the country's 23,000 school districts already have received direct benefits under ESEA. This far-reaching law has established a national policy directed at meeting the special needs of the educationally poor.

As proposed by Rep. Albert Quie (R., Minn.), the Republican substitute would permit the states to ignore this national policy. It would, instead, permit the individual states to practice economic discrimination.

Block grants can only intensify the present financial conflicts between the large cities and respective state governments. Programs developed at the state level can provide no federal guarantee that funds will go where they are most needed—to help the children of the slums and the rural depressed areas.

The block grant approach also threatens to rekindle the flames of controversy over the state-church issue that frustrated enactment of federal aid to education for over 20 years. Private school organizations are deeply concerned that their students will no longer be able to participate in many federal programs if these programs are administered by state departments of education.

But there is much more that is wrong with the Quie substitute.

The substitute was never considered by any Congressional committee. It was introduced after the House Education and Labor Committee had held lengthly hearings on ESEA and had reported out H.R. 7819.

The allocation formula as now spelled-out in the Quie substitute provides half the states with less funds than they would receive under H.R. 7819. These are the states most in need: those with low per pupil expenditures and those with the largest number of youths living in poverty.

The original Quie proposal has now been amended four times in an effort to gain new political support. Rep. Quie has modified his block grant approach to provide that at least 50 percent of a state's grant be used for the educationally disadvantaged. Under H.R. 7819, however, 80 percent of the federal funds must be used for this purpose.

The Quie substitute also prohibits the use of such funds for general classroom construction and improved teacher salaries, while—at the same time—eliminating provisions for such successfully operating programs as the Teacher Corps, aid for the children of migrant workers, foster children, and many others.

The Quie substitute also has a detrimental effect on civil rights. The elimination of "federal control" will not make it easier to enforce desegregation guidelines. A cutback in funds to the cities will punish severely the economically poor children of minority groups.

The Quie substitute would reduce by $281 million fiscal 1969 authorizations provided in H.R. 7819. No such reduction is justified.

H.R. 7819, in direct contrast to the Quie substitute, continues the popular programs born in 1965 that have earned wide public and Congressional support. The bill includes no radical changes and creates no new areas of controversy. It strengthens ESEA, instead of destroying it as proposed by Quie.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council is convinced that the education of our youth is too important to be dragged into the partisan, political arena. We are confident that many Republican members of the House of Representatives share these views.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council, therefore, urges the members of both parties in the House to join together in rejecting the Quie substitute and giving bipartisan support to H.R. 7819—a continuation of the landmark Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

REMARKS OF SENATOR TALMADGE AT GEORGIA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONGRESSIONAL DINNER

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Stuckey] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, each year, the Georgia Chamber of Commerce has been honoring the staff members of our Congress with an annual dinner to show appreciation for the loyal diligence of these men and women who assist the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in serving their constituents.

And, each year, the members of the Georgia delegation and their staff look forward to the fine dinner which is held by our outstanding chamber of commerce.

At this year's annual dinner, we had the pleasure of hearing from our distinguished Senator, the Honorable Herman E. Talmadge, as he addressed the more than 500 people present.

I believe that Senator Talmadge's remarks concerning civil disobedience and free speech are particularly pertinent at this time; a time when crime is on the increase in our country. I would therefore, like to include Senator Talmadge's remarks at this dinner in the Congressional Record for the benefit of my colleagues in the Senate and House:

REMARKS OF U.S. SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE AT THE GEORGIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, MAY 1, 1967

We are again indebted to the Georgia State Chamber of Commerce for an evening of good food and excellent company. I know that I speak for all the Georgia Congressional Delegation in saying that this annual event is indeed a highlight of the year.

And our great appreciation is matched by that of our staffs. For it is their night, too. This is an opportunity for us to take off our hats to the men and women in our offices and thank them for a job well done. You may or may not be aware of the fact, that these are very hard-working and dedicated people.

It is to the credit of our state that there is not a harder-working or more devoted group of people on Capitol Hill than the staff members of the Georgia Congressional Delegation.

For us in the Senate and the House of Representatives to try to conduct our business without them would be like trying to function with one arm tied behind us—our right arms in most cases.

I am reminded of the apprentice plumber who spent most of his time on the job mumbling and grumbling about how hard the work was. Finally, one of the old-timers had enough.

"Look sonny," he told the boy, "you just don't know how easy things is nowadays. Back in the old days when I was starting out, the boss would let us put down the first two lengths of pipe . . . and then he would turn the water on . . . and we would have to stay ahead of it."

Well, that's pretty much the way it is a lot of the time in our offices. And somehow or other, our people manage to stay ahead of the flow of mail, telephone calls and constituent requests of all kinds.

Speaking of my constituents, I read in the paper the other day that I was out of touch with the people. Then I read the next day that I was back in touch again. All this may be, and I may have been out of touch with the people. But judging from the mail, visits, and personal telephone calls I get, the people haven't been out of touch with me.

You know, keeping in touch with the people is just one of many of the trials and tribulations of political life. It goes a little like this:

If you try to please the people, you're a demagogue. If you don't you're a poor public servant. If you aspire to higher office or re-election, you're ambitious and greedy. If you don't, you have no brains and no ability.

If you get written up in the press, you are a publicity hound and headline hunter. If you don't, you're a do-nothing politician. If you speak up and express your views, you are a loud-mouth and a show-off. If you don't, you don't know what is going on.

Nothing is very simple any more—not nearly so simple and straight to the point as this masterpiece on anatomy written by a sixth-grade boy. He wrote:

"Your head is kind of round and hard, and your brains are in it, and your hair is on it. Your face is the front of your head where you eat and make faces. Your neck is what keeps your head out of your collar. It's hard to keep clean.

"Your stomach is something that if you don't eat often enough, it hurts . . . and spinach don't help it none. Your spine is a long bone in your back that keeps you from folding up. Your back is always behind you no matter how quick you turn around.

"Your arms you got to have to reach the butter, and your fingers stick out of your hands so you can add up arithmetic. Your legs is what you got to have two of to get to get to first base. Your feet are what you run on, and your toes are what you always get stubbed.

"And that's all there is of you except what's inside, and I never saw it."

You don't run across pure simplicity like that much any more, especially not in Washington . . . where you hear a lot of people say that an elephant is a mouse built to Government specifications.

Did you know that the Ten Commandments contain 297 words, the Bill of Rights is set forth in 463 words, and the Gettysburg Address had 266 words.

Then there was a recent Federal Directive to regulate the price of cabbage that took 26,911 words.

I was struck by this story the other day. It seems that this drunk was sitting in a bar around here very busy scribbling down some figures on a piece of paper.

The bartender got curious and asked him what he was doing.

"Well, it's like this," replied the drunk, "My wife is on a diet and she told me she is losing four pounds a week."

"So what?" said the bartender.

"Well, if my figures are correct," the man explained, "I'll be rid of her completely in 23 months."

On a more serious note, I want to say a few things tonight about something that I know to be of great concern to you and people throughout the country.

And that is: What we have been witnessing in recent months in the name of so-called civil disobedience and free speech.

Warm weather is here again. The streets are beginning to fill up again. Campuses are hotbeds of disorder. Crime is on the increase.

Let me tell you my personal experiences and that of my office in this regard, in just the past four years.

My house has been burglarized.

The apartment of my Legislative Assistant has been burglarized, within the shadow of the Supreme Court building.

Several hundred dollars worth of goods were stolen from one of my secretary's apartment. One secretary had her purse snatched and was pushed down before the thief ran away.

One of my patronage employees was robbed and assaulted on the public street within a few blocks of the capitol dome.

And, one secretary had her automobile stolen last September and then broken into just last month. In the first instance, the teenage thief was slightly slapped on the wrist and sent merrily on his way.

Last month when her car was broken into and a tire stolen, the guilty party was turned scott free even though he was caught with the goods from her car and several others.

It seemed the police officers had not properly advised him of his so-called constitution rights in connection with the arrest.

And, to top it all off, after spending the better part of the day in court to watch the man turned loose, this secretary left the courtroom to find a $2 parking ticket on her car.

And unfortunately, all too often in the forefront of all this lawlessness and disorder are our young people. This indicates to me that something is bad wrong and something very serious is lacking.

It doesn't take a psychiatrist to tell us what many of our young people need today: A lot of love . . . attention and affection . . . and a haircut. Someone told me the other day that it's gotten hard to tell the males from the females, unless they're skinny-dipping.

Well, I want to say this. I am proud of what it see in Georgia. Last week, I had occasion to address the Georgia Association of Student Councils at Rock Eagle. Here were about 800 fine young boys and girls, all leaders in their schools and all at least "B" students, I didn't see a one among them who needed a haircut. I didn't see a one who needed a shave. I didn't see a one who looked like he wanted to get out in the street and carry some kind of silly sign, or mouth Communist propaganda about our involvement in Viet Nam, or start a revolt on his high school campus just to show that he was against authority, as so many young people are doing today.

I think these people were representative of Georgia youth, and I think this is why we haven't had this kind of trouble in Georgia.

I think most Georgia young people stand tall and walk straight, and they're too busy working and studying and trying to improve themselves and their state to get out in the street singing and chanting and marching off in all directions.

I am proud of what we have in Georgia, and I know you are, too.

By the same token, I am sickened by much of what we see in many of our large cities and schools across the country. I do not believe we ought to stifle dissent. I do not advocate infringing on anyone's right of free speech. But—

I do not believe that burning one's draft card . . . desecrating the American Flag . . . slandering the President of the United States . . . or spouting the Communist line falls within the realm of reasonable or sensible dissent As a matter of fact, it is a disgrace to the United States and an insult to our fighting men in Viet Nam.

I say that it ought to be halted. And every public leader from the President on down ought to see that it is halted by making it crystal clear to these beatniks, vietniks and —in some cases—just plain criminal elements, that law and order is going to prevail in this country, come what may.

—And that we are going to keep our commitments in Viet Nam and prosecute this war to a successful conclusion.

—And that the Communists are making a big mistake if they pay any attention at all to these bleeding hearts who would have us tuck our tail and run.

I was brought up to believe that the one who wants to throw in the towel and quit is the loser. And that's just what these people are—*Losers.*

POSTAL RATE INCREASE DISCUSSION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the proposed increase in postal rates has aroused considerable discussion. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Rates of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I have had quite a deluge of mail. But among those comments I have some highlights—one is from the Washington Post as follows:

POSTAL REFORM—PART I

Why should an affluent, technologically progressive country be concerned about the imminent breakdown of its postal service? Men who can land an intact vehicle on the surface of the moon are surely capable of transporting objects over a small area of the earth's surface. But the goal of postal efficiency remains elusive, a disquieting reminder of the widening gap between the potentialities of technology and the social organization required for their realization.

The Post Office now handles about 80 billion pieces of mail a year. In the last 20 years the volume has almost doubled, and at the present rate of growth it will double again in only 14 years. Yet much of the mail is still being sorted and transported much as it was a century ago. An army of 700,000 is required to move it, and one gloomy postal authority, taking note of the diminishing efficiency of operations, predicted that if present trends continue to the year 2000, every man, woman and ambulant child will be delivering mail.

But we need not become a nation of mail carriers. As a result of experiments conducted by the Post Office's Department of Research and Engineering since 1956, a great deal is known about how to increase efficiency. With optical scanners and a number of less sophisticated devices, the process of sorting and moving the mountains of paper can be mechanized. But the modernization of the system will require a large capital outlay, $5 billion according to the estimate of Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien. At the moment $100 million is being spent on a crash mechanization program. Whether or not the Post Office continues to be operated as a Federal agency, or is transferred to a nonprofit corporation as Mr. O'Brien proposes, there is no way of escaping from the need for a massive infusion of capital.

Unfortunately, the problem of postal efficiency involves much more than capital equipment. Efficiency is hampered by the political appointment of postmasters. And for years the postal workers' unions have hampered the growth of productivity by using their political influence to legislate restrictive work rules. Public Law 89301, passed by the 89th Congress, provides that workers with seniority are to be given preference in the assignment of Monday-through-Friday schedules "to the greatest extent possible." As a consequence of the inflexibility in scheduling for a 7-day-a-week operation, postal authorities claim that they are compelled to hire 45,000 additional workers.

It should, however, be noted that the obstructionist tactics of the postal unions stem from bitterness and frustration. The hours are inconvenient; the work is dull; and the pay, despite recent increases, is poor. Some 85 per cent of all postal employees are in the four lowest grades, and the highest income to which they can aspire after 21 years of service is only $7257. Limited opportunities for advancement breed resistance to the very technological changes that would create higher paying and more interesting jobs.

Mr. O'Brien is right in insisting that the managers of the postal system must have effective control over labor policies. But there must also be radical changes in the structure of postal rates, a subject that will be discussed in the concluding editorial.

Postal Reform—Part II

When governments persist in selling services at far below costs, they create what John Stuart Mill described as "intractable problems." Suppose that Congress were to establish a flat, $70 ceiling on domestic air flights in excess of 150 miles, irrespective of the distance traveled, but permitted increases in the rates for shorter flights. The nightmarish results are not difficult to envisage. Airlines would be deluged with business between such points as Honolulu and New York or Washington and Los Angeles. The excess demand would create a "shortage" of the larger jets, and the airlines would rightfully claim that the lack of profits made it impossible to purchase more equipment. And at the same time, short-distance flight fares would increase sharply with a probable deterioration in the quality of service.

Congress would not be so irrational as to impose such a ceiling on long-distance flights, but for more than 110 years it has committed similar errors in setting postal rates. By pricing some classes of postal services at far below cost, it creates excess demand which tax the capacity of the postal system. First-class air mail revenues exceeded the costs of delivery by 21 per cent in 1966. But the percentage of costs covered for second-class mail—magazines and newspapers—was a little more than 21 per cent, and for third-class mail—principally direct mail advertising—it was less than 63 per cent.

Why is the structure of postal rates so irrational? Prof. Jane Kennedy of Houston University, in a penetrating historical analysis, concludes that "postal rates are used to accomplish all sorts of social and political objectives extraneous to the delivery of mail." A desire to win favor with the press caused Congress to provide second-class subsidies in the Jacksonian era. (By withdrawing second-class mailing privileges, the Post Office can exercise dangerous powers of censorship.) In 1851, the Post Office discontinued its policy of abandoning unprofitable mail in order to assist rural communities through subsidized service. Third- and fourth-class mail rates were set with an eye to helping the mail-order industry.

In addition to the subsidies granted by virtue of class rates, there is a category of "publice service" subsidies, paid for out of general funds at a cost of about $600 million a year. In 1966, $110 million of the "public service" subsidies represented the cost of special, low rates for "nonprofit publications," periodicals such as the *National Geographic*, the *Journal of the American Medical Society* and *Nation's Business*, none of which pay income taxes on large advertising revenues.

Rather than perpetuate this peculiar patchwork of subsidies and the resulting misallocation of postal resources, Congress shoud wipe the slate clean. There need be only two classes of mail, air and surface, and if possible all rates should reflect both weight and distance. The practice of charging a flat rate for first-class mail, irrespective of the distance carried, began in the early 19th century when the Post Office feared that it would lose its letter-carrying monopoly. Its perpetuation should hinge only on whether it would be inconvenient to establish zone rates.

In summing up, three reforms are required for an efficient postal service: the modernization of physical facilities; the elimination of restrictive labor practices; and the rationalization of the postal rate structure. Whether or not the system continues to be run by the Government, Congress and only Congress has the power to institute these reforms. These and a host of other issues should be studied by the Commission on Postal Organization, a group of distinguished citizens recently convened by President Johnson.

Another expression of opinion is from the Magazine Publishers Association over the signature of John K. Herbert, president:

Demolishing the Myth That First-Class Mail Pays Its Way

If I tell you that when first class mail pays 103% of its way and it is still not paying its proper share of postal rate costs, you will think me nuts. But that's the way it is. The postal rate situation is a very complex one and since your point of view is a communicative one and since you want it to be accurate, will you continue reading?

Postmaster General O'Brien, who should know his business, testified before the House Appropriations Sub-committee on postal matters that first class mail should pay 140% of its cost.

The reason for this seemingly extraordinary statement is the basic postal rate law which requires that first class mail should recover not only its fully allocated cost, but the extra amount representing the fair value of the preferential handling it receives. Postmaster General O'Brien says this is 140%.

The proposed increase on first class mail of 1¢ makes its contribution 123% of its allocated cost and, therefore, according to the leading authority, it still will not be paying its way. To meet the Postmaster General's standard, first class should be raised to 2¢.

Whether this is good judgment is a question for Congress.

But this is my point: if the fair return of first class by law and by the Postmaster's testimony is 140%, then it would take a 7¢ first class stamp to bring this about. Under these conditions, second and third class mail at 28% and 60% are more than paying their share.

The foregoing is an attempt to clarify your thinking. You may conclude that it is propaganda, but we are simply making a recitation of the facts. As Casey Stengel would say, "You can look it up."

Essential Points About Postal Rates (H.R. 7977, 7978, and Identical Bills)

The Administration has proposed the largest postal rate increase in history—a bill to raise almost $825 million a year when fully effective. Most of the money, $536.5 million, would come from penny increases in first-class rates, raising postcards to 5 cents, letters to 6 cents, and airmail to 9 cents. The first-class letter rate increase would be 20 percent. Second-class mail would be increased 23 percent, bulk third class 32 percent, and fourth-class educational materials 21 percent. For the following reasons, the magazine industry believes the proposed increase on zone-rated publications is excessive.

ZIP Code Has Shifted Burden to Mailers.—Since January 1, 1967, magazines have been required to presort their mail by ZIP Code numbers. Well before the deadline, most magazines voluntarily complied with the ZIP requirement, at considerable expense. This expensive change has meant that publishers have assumed functions formerly carried out by postal employees.

One reason why second-class magazines are carried at a lower rate than first-class letters is shown below:

	Post office handlings required for—	
	A letter	A magazine
1. Collection from mailbox	X	
2. Transport to post office	X	
3. Stacking and postmarking.	X	
4. Primary separation	X	
5. Secondary sort	X	
6. Tie in bundles	X	
7. Put in mailbag	X	
8. Dispatch to train	X	
9. Transportation	X	Some.
10. Delivery to destination post office.	X	Do.
11. Primary sort	X	
12. Secondary sort	X	X.
13. Transport to post office station.	X	X.
14. Sort by carrier route	X	X.
15. Delivery by carrier	X	X.

Whereas the average letter is handled 15 times by the Post Office, the average magazine is handled only 6 times under ZIP Code requirements. This reduction of handlings will substantially lessen Post Office costs while increasing publishers costs.

The Post Office has estimated that its savings on second- and third-class mail because of ZIP Code will be $42 million. We believe this underestimates the potential savings. While Post Office costs have been reduced, publisher costs of ZIP compliance have been increased—an indirect but nonetheless expensive rate increase for magazines. Nor is this a one-time cost that has already been absorbed. There will be continuing annual costs of compliance with the new sorting and sacking requirements of ZIP Code. Many magazines estimate these additional costs to be in excess of the proposed increase for second-class postage. The Post Office Department is now engaged in a campaign to persuade the general public to use ZIP Code numbers on their mail. This program has been wholeheartedly supported in the public interest by the magazine industry. Magazine publishers have contributed 1,087,000,000 page impressions of advertising space in magazines to further the campaign of the Post Office Department to persuade the public to use ZIP Code on first-class mail.

Costs and Rates.—Congress has repeatedly determined that first-class mail shall recover not only its fully allocated cost but an extra amount representing the fair value of the preferential handling and extra services it receives. That is the law today, and the pending bill would not change it. The reason a 6-cent letter is being requested now is that first-class cost coverage has declined to 103 percent. Historically, this is far too low. It has been as high as 164 percent, and for the twenty year period ended in 1964 the average was 142 percent. Even if a 6-cent letter rate is enacted, the coverage would be only 123 percent. In testimony this year before the House Subcommittee on Postal Appropriations, Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien said first-class cost coverage should be 140 percent. To attain that figure would require a 7-cent letter rate, which would produce about $1 billion in added annual revenue from first-class mail alone—more than enough to put the Post Office in the black without any second- or third-class increases. The following chart shows the historical pattern: [Chart not printed in RECORD.]

First-class mail is the priority service and properly pays the highest rate. Second- and third-class mail are deferred services, with charges properly reflecting the type of service rendered. The following chart, based on official Post Office figures, illustrates the postwar trend, showing that second- and third-class mailers have been burdened with a disproportionate share of the increase in general postal costs. First-class *rate* increases have lagged far behind those on second and third class, while first-class *piece cost* increases have climbed well above second and third class.

The following table tells the story:

Cost per piece and rates (1951–66)

[Percent of rise]

First class:	
Costs	100
Rates	67
Second class:	
Costs	61
Rates	122
Third class:	
Costs	89
Rates	188

A few final words on costs. Magazine publishers do not accept the Cost Ascertainment System as accurately reflecting second-class costs. We dispute the claim that magazines do not pay a sufficient share of their cost, and we deplore the use of these Cost Ascertainment figures, which the Post Office states are not intended for rate-making purposes, to allege underpayment by publishers. We believe that Congress should develop its own cost figures, as promised by the Senate Post Office Committee in 1962, before second-class rates are increased.

Productivity and Mechanization—Postal productivity in mail sorting and handling operations has declined for each of the past two years and is expected to decline in the coming year. One reason is the lack of mechanization in the Post Office Department. While progress is being made, the Department is woefully behind private industry in modernizing its facilities. The Postmaster General has stated that he needs $1 billion per year for each of the next five years to modernize the postal system. Providing the proper tools for increasing the productivity of its employees is basic to sound postal management.

Postal workers should be paid a proper wage, but if they are not provided with the proper means of increasing productivity in handling the 80 billion pieces of mail now flooding the postal system, then the accelerating unit cost spiral will be even more damaging to postal finances. Wages have risen since 1961 by about 25 percent while overall productivity has risen only 4 percent. This relationship must be improved. Mechanization is only one of several means to achieve it, but it is most important.

Private industry has been able to keep rising costs in check by increasing the productivity of their workers through heavy investment in modern plant and equipment. The Post Office does not have the control over its own operations that a corporation exercises. Eighty percent of Post Office costs are for wages for over 700,000 employees—Congress sets the pay scales and determines how much the postal service can invest in labor-saving machinery.

The following table contrasts overall productivity and pay increases in the Post Office with the twenty-year record of private industry:

Productivity and pay increases, 1945–65

[In percent]

U.S. Post Office:	
Productivity	26
Pay	194
U.S. industry:	
Productivity	78
Pay	143

Public Services and Postal Policy—Congress wisely determined in 1958 and again in 1962 that the Post Office engages in many necessary functions unrelated to delivery of the mail, and that the cost of providing such services should be paid from general revenues. Included in this category were 10 to 20 percent of the cost of operating rural services and small post offices in villages, the loss on non-profit publications and publications for the blind. Magazine publishers endorse the philosophy of prior postal policy legislation but believe the existing law does not go far enough. Examples of public service costs not now included in public services are forest fire observation and the apprehension of criminals by the Postal Inspection Service. Magazine publishers believe that the earmarking of $594 million this year for public service costs is fully justified and that a careful study of all postal operating costs would enlarge the list of public services and increase the amount of the allocation. To do so would decrease the sum needed to be raised through rate increases.

Even with all its non-postal costs included in its budget, the Post Office Department occupies a unique role. It is the only Department which serves every American regardless of his location, station in life, or income. It is also the Department which comes closest to paying its way, recovering 80 percent of its costs. The Department of Commerce, by contrast, costs the taxpayers more money to operate than the Post Office and recovers only 2.7 percent of its expenses.

For the foregoing reasons, although magazine publishers spend millions of dollars on first-class mail, we do not oppose rate legislation this year and we support the proposed increase on first-class rates. However, the proposed increases in second-class rates on zone-rated publications are excessive.

And the final view is expressed in the New York Times by Robert B. Semple, Jr., as follows:

Battle Lines Form for House Hearing on Postal Rate Rise Plan

(By Robert B. Semple, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, May 6.—Conflict is expected to break out in Congress next week among the users of the Nation's mails. The battlefield will be provided by the Subcommittee on Rates of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The subcommittee will begin hearings Tuesday on President Johnson's proposal to raise postal rates, but already the lines have formed. First class mailers are saying they are tired of "subsidizing" second and third class users who get cheaper rates.

Second and third class mailers have countered with a variety of arguments, including the charge that first class receives better service and should pay more. And the second class users, including newspapers and magazines, and the third class users, mainly direct mail advertisers, are also squabbling with one another.

The President's proposal would raise $812-million more in revenue over the next three years and is designed to meet an estimated gap of $650-million a year between postal revenue and postal expenses, a gap that does not include further losses incurred by "public services" performed by the post office at the direction of Congress.

JOHNSON'S PLAN OUTLINED

Under the President's plan, the price of first class and air mail stamps would rise 1 cent, effective July 1, to 6 and 9 cents respectively, increases of 21 per cent on second class rates for newspapers and magazines delivered outside their counties of publication and 32 per cent in minimum postage for bulk rate third class matter are the other major elements of the rate package.

Little serious opposition is expected to the proposed increases in first class mail rates—in part because first class users are not organized to lobby their case effectively with Congress. The real battle, which may keep the hearings going for more than a month, and perhaps beyond the July 1 effective date of the proposed increases in first class mail—will involve second and third class users and their friends and critics in Congress.

The departments agree that recurrent post office deficits are unhealthy, express sympathy for the generation of Postmasters General who have had to operate at a loss—the post office last broke even in fiscal year 1945, accumulating since then a deficit of more than $12.5-billion—and insist they are willing to pay their "fair share" of the rates necessary to reduce those deficits.

But they do not want to pay what they believe is a disproportionate share of the costs of making up the deficit. They argue that already the ratios are out of line. For example, John K. Herbert, president of the Magazine Publishers Association, asserted recently:

"It is abundantly clear that a considerable portion of the historical share has been unreasonably shifted to the other classes of mail. As a result, the treatment of second and third class mail has, to say the least, verged on the punitive."

To understand these and similar arguments, it is necessary to examine the post office deficit, who contributes to it, and why.

In the fiscal year 1967, ending June 30, the department's net operating loss is estimated at $1.2-billion, up from $942-million in fiscal year 1966. This deficit, however, consists of two parts. One is the direct subsidy ordered by Congress as a "public service" under the Postal Policy Act of 1958 "to benefit the nation as a whole rather than any one mail user group."

These services, which account for $567-million of the deficit, include free and reduced-rate mail for non-profit publications, fraternal magazines such as The American Legion Magazine, and publications defined as "educational," such as The National Geographic; nonpostal services such as selling Savings Bonds; special services such as money orders, and a small part of the costs of operating third and fourth class post offices, rural routes and so-called "star" routes, which are intercity routes operated by private carriers.

PREFERENTIAL RATES

The rest of the deficit, defined as a "hidden subsidy" by some and defended as indispensable by its beneficiaries, derives from not charging certain kinds of mail enough to cover the cost of handling that mail—in other words, from preferential rates.

The size of this deficit—known as the "postal deficiency"—is $652-million.

The main recipient of preferred rates are second and third class users. By law, first class postage must cover full handling costs plus "an additional amount representing the preferential treatment it receives," including faster service.

First class now pays about 103 per cent of the costs of handling. Mr. Johnson's proposals would increase this to 123 per cent. Moreover, the increases on first class and air mail, which account for 55 per cent of all mail volume would yield about 68 per cent of the new revenues under the proposed legislation—$536.5-million.

No other class of mail produces a surplus. Although the Postal Policy Act of 1958 requires Congress to adjust postal rates periodically to balance revenues with costs after "public service" expenses have been written off, there are no specific guidelines, which means that the field is wide open for controversy and Congressional disputes.

Second class mail, for example, will lose about $416-million in fiscal year 1967. Of this, nearly half stems from public service costs—such as reduced rates for fraternal magazines—and about $236-million stems from "regular" second class mail, mainly mass circulation magazines such as Time and Newsweek, newspapers and business publications. Thus, second class contributes about one-third of the $652-million "postal deficiency."

The Administration contends that regular second class mail pays only 29.3 per cent of the costs of handling but proposes to raise the cost coverage to 36.2 percent. This would cost publishers an estimated $25-million in new mailing costs and, in the words of Mr. Herbert, "will be a great hardship for many fine magazines that are struggling to keep their heads above the rising tides of costs."

The proposed increase on second class regular mail would account for about 3 per cent of the $812 million that Mr. Johnson wants to raise over the next three years.

The total loss on third class mail, mostly direct mail advertising, is expected to be about $401-million,of which $100-million is attributed to public service costs—for example fund raising appeals and church meeting notices and $301-million to regular mailing.

Third class regular mailing thus causes a little less than half of the $652-million "postal deficiency."

Under the Administration's proposals, the cost coverage on advertising circulars (including those addressed simply to "occupant") would rise from 61.2 per cent to 80.2 per cent, costing mailers $154.1-million and accounting for about 20 per cent of what Mr. Johnson would like to raise.

Most of the controversy will probably center on the proposed increases for third class mail, which also includes a $34.9-million increase for single piece third class mail, mainly greeting cards, small parcels and catalogues.

FIFTY PERCENT RISE ASKED

A leading opponent of third class subsidies, Representative Ken Hechler, West Virginia Democrat, argues that "if billboards and newspaper advertisers pay their own way, why should these people expect the taxpayers to pick up their costs?"

He has introduced a bill that would raise the regular third class bulk rate 50 per cent instead of the 31 per cent proposed by the Administration.

The third class users counter with an economic argument. The president of the Associated Third Class Mail Users, Harry J. McGinnis, asserts that sales through direct mail advertising amount to $40-billion annually and account for 4 to 5 million jobs, thereby justifying the lower rates.

Proponents of second class subsidies argue that in addition to providing advertising space, newspapers and magazines also provide educational values that merit a continuing subsidy.

The two classes occasionally fight with each other. Newspapers and magazines regularly denounce third class advertising circulars as "junk mail" and an irritant to the "occupant" who receives them.

Mr. McGinnis says that newspapers and magazines are merely envious because they do not like "major department stores spending advertising dollars on direct mail catalogues and circulars."

I have no opinion to express on these publications until after all of the hearings are conducted, but I thought my colleagues would like to know what we are being subjected to.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON REAFFIRMS OUR COMMITMENT TO THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, in his remarks at the White House last night, President Johnson put an end to irresponsible speculation that the administration has abandoned its commitment to the war on poverty.

The President made it clear that his administration is determined to continue this vital program—and at full throttle. The Doubting Thomases will just have to find another issue.

Those of us who know President Johnson know that he does not make a commitment lightly. We have learned better. If there is any doubt left on this score, I would only say remember Atlantic City in 1964. There, at the Democratic National Convention, our President committed his administration to a broad range of programs and policies.

To date, he has kept more than 90 percent of these promises.

And he will keep his word on the commitment to the war on poverty.

I commend the President for his wise leadership in this battle. And I am convinced that the overwhelming majority of the American people are ready and willing to join with the administration in carrying forward the important work of the poverty program.

I urge my colleagues of the 90th Congress—on both sides of the aisle—to support the programs that, in the President's words, are offering needy Americans the chance to help themselves.

The promise of America is the opportunity it offers for Americans to realize their dreams and ambitions. We must insure that the boundaries of opportunity are extended to include all Americans who desire self-fulfillment.

This is the real meaning of the war on poverty. And this historic battle has only begun.

THE TEACHER CORPS: IT WORKS

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some talk recently about abolishing one of the finest programs approved by this Congress in years, the Teacher Corps.

I could deliver a lengthy speech defending this program on its own merits—but such a speech would be unnecessary. The best defense of the Teacher Corps is its end result. And that result is told many times over by young American boys and girls whose horizons have been broadened by this remarkable and imaginative program.

In the April issue of the AFL–CIO American Federationist, Richard A. Graham, the distinguished Director of the Teacher Corps, presents some case histories that I commend to all of my colleagues. I particularly commend them to those who would do away with the Teacher Corps in the name of efficiency.

I insert this article in the Record:

The Teacher Corps: It Works

(By Richard A. Graham)

Can a nation enjoying unprecedented economic prosperity ignore some 5 million children in poverty and force them to accept second-rate education and its grim consequences just because they are poor?

President Johnson has answered "no" by calling up new troops to join in the battle against poverty of the mind. They are the Teacher Corps, a group of 1,200 apprentices and veteran teachers now serving in 111 school districts across the country.

Now the President has asked Congress to expand the Corps to five times its present size by 1963 to provide what he called a "symbol of hope" for poor children across the country.

Established in November 1965 as part of the Higher Education Act, the Teacher Corps is designed to train prospective teachers in the special methods needed to successfully teach the poverty child. The Corps, however, was not able to get fully into operation until it received all its funds in October 1966.

Today, thanks to its work in 29 states, the Teacher Corps is proving it can make good on its promise.

In mid-March, Life magazine said of the Corps: "At these prices, it remains the best bargain in the federal education program."

The Corps has gone where it was wanted and needed into the understaffed, overpopulated schools of America's urban ghettos and rural slums. It has done the job it was asked to do—helping overworked classroom teachers while it trained new teachers for the toughest job in education—teaching students who had no incentive to learn; who would rather have three square meals a day than a diploma.

How has the Teacher Corps accomplished these ends in six short months?

It cannot be judged either in dollars and cents or statistics—only in terms of children.

A success story in Solidad, California; another in Conway, Arkansas, added to reports from Teacher Corps programs across the country, add up to this: it works.

One such story was reported recently by one of four participating colleges in New York City. A teacher-intern is working with a small group of 10-year-olds who had been written off as "social adjustment problems." They skipped class regularly and already had police records.

At the request of the principal, the corpsman set up a special program that takes these children from their regular classrooms for scheduled periods each week. It is paying off in two ways: the boys no longer dominate the class and overpower the teacher. And they are getting needed guidance and a teacher they can talk to man-to-man. The young corpsman didn't realize how well he had won these boys over until he got a call from one of the boys' older brothers—a high school dropout. The older boy just wanted to know if the corpsman had time to teach him and his pals how to read. The corpsman dug into his own pocket for rent on a storefront where he holds night classes for the dropouts.

The kids aren't the only ones who appreciate the corpsmen. Parents in Arkansas and an impoverished Appalachian area also have expressed their thanks to local corpsmen with daily gifts of precious home-grown fruits and vegetables.

Stories like these suggest that corpsmen have made the program work not only in the classrooms but in the school neighborhoods. Community acceptance is an important part of their work and training.

In Brooklyn, corpsmen have organized storefront centers which serve as social spots as well as training centers where women can learn typing and shorthand.

In Philadelphia, evening "arm chair" classes have been organized for illiterate adults. In Minneapolis, Minnesota, a community library was stocked by corpsmen who managed to get 1,000 paperback books donated by an understanding publisher. In southern Texas, corpsmen took mothers on their first tour of a big city supermarket.

There are other examples, but they all point up the fact that the teacher in the slums gets through to his students best if he is part of the scene—part of the child's daily life.

This way the corpsmen have learned how poverty limits a child's experiences and slows down the learning process. It is common in ghetto schools to find youngsters two years behind the average by the time they reach third grade, hopelessly behind by the time they should be ready for high school.

Although unequal educational opportunities are so often defined in terms of a racially imbalanced school, corpsmen have learned that it means much, much more.

In a slum school, 35 youngsters of varying background and abilities are often grouped together and expected to perform at the same speed and grade level. It just doesn't work but, in an overcrowded schoolroom manned by an over-burdened teacher, this is the only way the school can keep its doors open.

How does the corpsman help? On the one hand, by taking the child who learns slowly and giving him personal, patient attention. On the other, by working with gifted students, giving them the extra push and confidence which will get them through high school, perhaps into college.

In one junior high school in Washington, D.C., for example, a young corpsman is now giving daily literature lessons to four exceptional students who have been coasting along in their regular English class. The course is held during half of the children's lunch period and runs 30 minutes. Books must be read at home and the children must be prepared to discuss them, in depth. The questions posed by the corpsman are tough and provocative—they are making these children think as they have never had to think before. The group is currently reading The Taming of the Shrew and short stories by Salinger—heavy going even for the average college freshman.

"We've got to tax these kids," says one intern from Arkansas. "It doesn't matter if they are bright or below average—whatever their abilities, you have got to push them. You have to make them want to overreach. They enjoy it. Failure is a built-in commodity in the slums. It's expected, accepted. Success, however, is understood and means something very special to these kids. And they recognize it and love it."

How to give these children the extra push varies from Teacher Corps project to project. Since local school administrators determine how and where corpsmen can best be used, each corps member's assignment and academic preparation differs. Their work is specifically geared to the needs of the local schools they are serving. In fact, the local school administrators work closely with the corpsmen's training institutions to develop the two-year graduate work-study program.

In Chicago, public schools work with a group of colleges and universities to develop the Teacher Corps program. Corps activities here center on developing the urban child's language skills.

In Canada, Kentucky, the focus is different. This remote, rural area requires the corpsmen to introduce the children to life beyond the hills, to teach them about newspapers, telephones, escalators and restaurants, things almost taken for granted by the urban poverty child.

In Rio Grande City, Texas, teaching English as a second language is the corpsmen's priority. Here, 95 percent of the children are Spanish-speaking and start school not knowing a word of English.

Although the Teacher Corps has proved itself, its future may be uncertain. The Corps will require renewed congressional authorization and appropriations.

The Teacher Corps has support in the top areas of government. It has support at the bottom in the children the Corps is helping, the college faculties who are learning much about training teachers from the Corps and in the teachers who welcome the help.

It needs more support in the middle. It needs the support of all those who believe every boy and girl has a right to a good education, no matter how poor their homes.

GUNNAR MYRDAL SPEAKS TO ADA 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the 20th annual convention of the Americans for Democratic Action held in Washington in April 1967, we were honored with a visit from the distiguished Swedish economist, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal. Dr. Myrdal's remarks before the convention were too penetrating to not receive broader publications and so, under unanimous consent I include the following address by Gunnar Myrdal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Myrdal, since his monumental work on "The American Dilemma," has been renowned as a sort of international citizen—a critic of our society who nevertheless shares our deep commitment to the ideals and traditions of America. He sees a threat to the maintenance of these ideals in the tremendous impact at home and abroad of the war in Vietnam and the awesome role this Nation has assumed as the world's policeman, a role which is influenced by a rigid, fearful, and often neurotic view of nationalist and revolutionary movements.

We must pay particular heed to some dire predictions made by Dr. Myrdal. He asks that we think the unthinkable. He asks that we examine the ever-tightening stricture of population pressure and food production and the ever-widening income gap between rich nations and poor. We must face the ominous meaning of this for the underdeveloped nations and the whole world and be prepared to take the requisite steps to avoid full-scale chaos. Dr. Myrdal's excellent and unprovocative remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY GUNNAR MYRDAL, ADA 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

No personal recognition has pleased me more than my election to become an extraregular "American for Democratic Action." I have never been a non-partisan in American public affairs. I have been a New Dealer, a Fair Dealer, a New Frontiersman, and, of course, a private in the Unconditional War Against Poverty and for the ultimate attainment of the Great Society. And I have rather been on the side of the activists—as has the ADA—urging better planning of the reforms and speedier action.

In my own view, this has not interfered with my search for objective truth as an economist and social scientist. This is related to my conviction that research needs the stating of explicit value premises—already when establishing facts and factual relationships and not only when drawing political conclusions. "Things look different, depending upon where you stand."

This is, however, not an appropriate occasion to discuss the methodology of social study. But, on a personal note still, and simply to "define the situation" of my speaking at this banquet, I would like to mention that, in studying American problems and, indeed, problems in other parts of the world as well, my value premises have consistently been what I have called the "American Creed." By this I mean the glorious ideals of liberty, equality and justice, which this country inherited from European Enlightenment and has stubbornly adhered to ever since—in principle.

The ideals are far from realized. There have been periods of grim reaction, and there have at all times been individuals and whole communities trampling on these ideals—and other individuals and communities opportunistically yielding to the social and political forces around them rather than standing up in their defense. Nevertheless, as I read the history of this country, the trend in America has been towards a gradually fuller realization of these ideals. That is also the deeper justification for their use as relevant and significant value premises in social study.

Contrary to many of my academic colleagues, I always stress that ideals are important social facts when they have a hold on people's minds and become rooted in institutions: in America the Constitution and many others. It is a fact that your national heroes on whom spiritual immortality has been bestowed, have almost all been convinced liberals, struggling for these ideals. I do believe that the same will be true in the future.

I have permitted myself these introductory remarks, because this organization—which is not a party, nor part of a party, but a fellowship bent upon influencing the people, the parties, and the government—so definitely and actively stands in this long tradition of upholding and propagating the ideals I referred to as the American Creed. The ADA seeks to disturb complacency among the American people and politicians by persistently spelling out in concrete terms the radical changes of conditions and policies needed to realize these ideals. And it has not been unsuccessful as a long string of reforms, not least in recent years, testify. Some of these reforms are so radical that nobody would have believed them possible only a short time before they were enacted.

Back in Stockholm when I began to think about what I should say tonight, I read the *Program for Americans '66* and did so with increasing enthusiasm. It is clear and unambiguous; it is not evasive but faces squarely the burning problems of America and the world today. I believe I have never felt so much in agreement with any political program I have ever encountered anywhere in the world, including my native country, Sweden. These are the beacons I would follow—almost to the last detail—if I were an American Congressman or otherwise responsible for policy decisions in the United States.

The most sinister threat to all of our ideals, abroad and at home, is the Vietnam war. It has a horrifying impact on millions of people in a distant and very poor country who are starved, burned, maimed and killed, and who see their little property destroyed. And it has corroded the moral climate of this country. It threatens to frustrate all efforts of realizing the American ideals by reforms at home. There is no question that the civil rights battle, the rebuilding of the cities and the bulk of social legislation, have all come to a grinding halt.

This is stated here by a man who for decades has consistently been an optimist in regard to America. I have never, up until now, agreed with those who from time to time have prophesied that "it can happen here."

The Vietnam war is also causing a tightening moral and political isolation of this country in the world at large. It is the common people abroad who have become estranged from America, while some governments, officials and representatives of big-business almost everywhere may have their own good reasons for silently accepting or even for speaking with "understanding" of the policy of the United States government.

You might not be fully aware of this deeply tragic element in the foreign reaction to the United States' military activitiy in Vietnam and more broadly to the inclination of its present government to want to police the world on its own terms. In earlier times it was the farmers and workers in Europe who had on the whole, the friendliest feelings toward America. In their homes there were photographs of their near relatives who had emigrated, and there was a continuous exchange of letters. It was these people, along with most of the liberals and intellectuals who felt closest to America, while the traditional upper classes often felt cultural distance. It is now, however, the common people and even more conspicuously the entire youth—who increasingly view the United States as a nation which is careless, insensitive and irresponsible in the exercise of its might and power. This is, as I said, deeply tragic.

I will not touch further on the Vietnam issue on this occasion; in spite of its paramount importance for everything dear to us. I must stress, however, that playing with fire in Southeast Asia becomes the more charged with danger because of several other threatening international developments. I will, as I now move on to characterize these developments, hopefully assume that the Vietnam war will soon end—and end in such a way that its people will be left free to seek their own destiny without any colonial "containment" policy upheld by American military might. I hope for that, and we must begin to think of new perspectives.

Even under this optimistic assumption, our world does not present the picture of a sane, safe and wholesome home for humanity. The nuclear armament race continues unabated. The test ban is still only partial, leaving the atomic powers free to continue with underground tests. There is, as yet, no limitation to their production of still more forceful nuclear weapons and penetrating delivery systems. The nonproliferation issue, about which the newspapers are full, does not even touch these real disarmament problems.

While following the frustrated negotiations in Geneva from a distance, one impression retained is the following: in many countries, and particularly in the United States, those in the government who are sincerely interested in reaching a positive result are looking over their shoulders. They are quite free to express general, moving but noncommital declarations about the horrifying dangers involved in the present armament race and of their eagerness to put a stop to it. But when it comes to agreeing on even a small practical step in that direction, they are acutely aware that at home they meet nationalist suspicions that they are letting down the guards and selling out the security of the country. The powerful military-industrial complex—to use former President Eisenhower's expression—has a vested interest in fostering such suspicions. This is probably also true in the Soviet Union. They also have their generals and suspicious nationalists and their military-industrial complex.

Considering the way people are informed—or rather misinformed—an organized propaganda campaign by a determined nationalist group can foment a wave of popular emotion. Cowardice towards the China lobby played a disastrous role in the United States policy toward China from 1949 onwards, when manipulating more or less dependent governments to block China's taking its place in the United Nations, and of, course, in the initial setting up and use of the Diem regime in South Vietnam as a bastion in the cold war, and the later successive escalations of the United States involvement in that war.

In the nuclear disarmament issue, the understandable anxiety to avoid arousing nationalist complexes back home has, first, severely constricted the room for reasonable negotiations. Secondly, it has given the government and its negotiators an interest in managing its releases, press conferences, and briefings in certain ways. Thus, facts and compromise proposals that do not fit the tactical positions taken by the United States government under the restraints caused by consideration of the volatile home front, tend to be overlooked or blotted out. This is the behavior of your negotiators, and your newspaper people collaborate.

In the final analysis, progress in the field of nuclear disarmament, in so far as it depends on the United States position, must rest on popular education, on people becoming better informed and thereby "propaganda-safe" not least towards your own officials (an expression from pre-war time that has unfortunately fallen out of use). This, in turn, would allow the government to follow a more courageous and rational line. I am aware that ADA plays a role in this field also, and I earnestly hope its educational activities will be intensified.

The widespread preparation for biological and chemical warfare is less on people's minds—except that the use of the Vietnam war by the American military for large scale experimentation with non-conventional weapons has greatly contributed to the moral and political isolation of the United States that I spoke of.

The United States, which has an obvious and generally recognized interest in preventing proliferation of mass-destructive weaponry, should have had all reasons to refrain from these experiments, as they are breaking down inhibitions. These types of non-conventional weapons are cheap and do not require much large scale research. The risk is, indeed, that they might become the poor man's opportunity to commit genocide.

It is, of course, of paramount importance and urgency to reach intergovernmental agreements to outlaw biological and chemical warfare. The United States, as you know, has not even signed the Geneva Agreement of 1925. In this question I also see a field where one would wish the ADA to intensify activity.

There are other trends in the world at large that are pregnant with stupendous dangers. One major set of such trends are the developments among that great majority of mankind who lives in the underdeveloped countries. We are all aware that the income gap between them and us is increasing every year. The 1960's, which on the proposal of the late President Kennedy was named the "development decade," has seen instead a widespread failure to maintain even the slow progress of the 1950's.

The inflow of capital from the rich countries has tended to stagnate and as a percentage of their national output it has decreased by a quarter. At the same time, because more and more of it is tied to exports from the donor countries, the "quality" of aid has fallen. Also the political motives for directing the bilateral aid—which is by far the larger part of all "aid"—to particular countries, and the strings attached, are also apt to decrease its "quality."

At the same time a much smaller share of the capital flow is now in the form of credits instead of grants. Even if there has been a tendency, until recently, to keep interest rates low and amortization periods long, the net result has nevertheless been a rapid increase of the burden of debt-service to be paid out of the poor countries' meager export returns. The president of the World Bank and many others, who are competent to judge, have given us ringing warnings of the dire consequences of a failure to reverse these trends. But as yet there have been no signs of such a change.

Meanwhile, the population explosion in the poor countries is increasingly blighting their hopes for rapid advancement. It has been in actual fact by far the only really important economic and social change in the underdeveloped world.

Belatedly, the United States has in recent years been revising its position to a positive one in regard to the spread of birth control in the underdeveloped countries. And there are signs that both the Catholic Church and the communist countries are doing the same, thus releasing the World Health Organization and the other intergovernmental agencies from the political restraints that up until now have prevented them from assisting poor countries in family planning. More directly important is that we may now stand before a veritable technological breakthrough making new contraceptives available that can make a birth control campaign in underdeveloped countries truly effective.

But still there is need for decisive government action in the underdeveloped countries to embark upon a birth control campaign. There will be need for large cadres of doctors, nurses, and other para-medical personnel, and the rich countries can, at most, be helpful in training additional personnel, but cannot normally substitute for them. The new policy, even when it becomes accepted, raises huge administrative problems which are difficult to solve in countries that are what I call "soft states." It is an illusion to believe that in the underdeveloped world at large progress in spreading birth control among the masses will be a swift one.

As these nations, because of the high fertility level up until now, have very youthful populations—with around 45 per cent under 15 years of age, against around 25 per cent in the developed countries—there is an extraordinary momentum in their population increase. The future parents are already born or will soon be born. By the same token, the labor force will, under all circumstances, continue to grow rapidly until the end of the century. This raises very large problems for economic planning, particularly in agriculture. To this I will return.

These last observations are most definitely not arguments against these countries trying to press down their birth rates as much and as rapidly as possible. Quite the contrary: they make this imperative all the more urgent. But we should guard ourselves from the illusion that it is easy and that impressive results on a world scale will be quickly achieved.

We know that in recent years food production in Latin America, Africa and Asia has tended to lag behind population expansion, thereby aggravating the already widespread undernutrition and malnutrition in almost all underdeveloped countries. There would have been intensified mass hunger in very big countries like India and Pakistan and in many smaller countries, had it not been for the availability of large scale food imports from the United States, granted without foreign exchange compensation under P.L. 480 from the surpluses in this country. These surpluses have now virtually disappeared.

Production restrictions have been eased in the United States. If they are lifted still more, food production can be raised considerably. There are also other countries that could produce more. But even on the optimistic assumption that we shall be able to make more food available—and agree on a formula for sharing the financial burden among the rich countries—food aid can at most bridge over an emergency. The real answer, if disaster is to be averted, is to generate a marked and sustained increase in agricultural productivity in the under developed countries themselves.

This assumes the application of a new agricultural technology. For the most part, it cannot be borrowed from the rich countries with temperate climates. Very much more of programmed, practically directed, specialized, and localized research into food production in areas in the tropical and subtropical zones will be needed. To accomplish this, these countries have neither the financial, nor the personnel resources, but will need large scale assistance from the rich countries.

Moreover, while the dramatic rise in yields in the rich Western countries could happen, while the labor force in agriculture was rapidly decreasing, the new technology in underdeveloped countries must be increasingly labor intensive, to a degree most agricultural experts do not fully appreciate. The present labor force is largely underutilized—what is popularly known as underemployment—and for decades to come it will continue to grow almost as fast as the total population increases at present, that is between 2.5 and 3.5 per cent a year. The practical problem is to raise crop yields by a larger input and a higher efficiency of a labor force that is now underutilized and is rapidly increasing all the time. This new, extremely labor-intensive technology is yet to be developed, mostly by fresh research focused on the specific preconditions in regard to factor proportions and, as I said, on the different climates and soils.

Then comes the practical problem of how to substitute the new techniques for the primitive ones that are responsible for the low yields. This raises a host of problems—education and extension work, marketing, credits, and cooperation—but at the heart of them lies the terms on which the cultivator works the land. These terms, while different in different areas, are generally such that they do not give the toiler either practical possibilities or rational motivation for exerting himself to raise the yield.

This is the problem of land reform. In almost all underdeveloped countries vested interests have prevented effective land reform. The problem is a most complicated one and takes different forms in different countries. My point in this rapid survey over the world problems is merely that radical changes in the relation between man and land are necessary to raise agricultural yields which, in turn, is the only long run answer to world hunger.

The dimension of the problem is so overwhelmingly big, that food aid from America and the rich countries generally cannot do more than buy time for a vigorous and sustained food production drive in the underdeveloped countries. In the long run much can happen. At the end of the century we shall no doubt see entirely new techniques of producing food. It is the next fifteen to twenty years which worry me deeply.

I have been speaking in sweeping generalities. Unfortunately, they do, I believe, convey only too well the somber truth. I fear we are growing accustomed to living on happily and attending to the business of the day without giving much thought to the unthinkables ahead of us.

More specifically, in regard to the development problems of the underdeveloped countries, I feel that we have been living, and are still living, in a fool's paradise. We have formed opinions which are heavily biased in an optimistic direction. The careless application of Western economic theories and models that are not adequate to reality in underdeveloped countries, has contributed to this, by making it possible to disregard levels and modes of living, and attitudes and institutions—that is, the social facts which raise obstacles and inhibitions to development.

The widespread habit of referring to the underdeveloped countries as "developing countries" is, of course, unimportant by itself, but it indicates the direction of the biases in our whole view of these problems. The biases are opportunistic. For if we could disregard the awkward facts just referred to and if we could believe that the underdeveloped world was surely "developing," this would make things a lot easier for us all. As the biases are also apt to encourage and please the governing elites in the underdeveloped countries, we cannot expect them to correct our attitudes. They share them with us.

In time, our scientific approaches will be corrected. Facts kick, as I used to say. As the research work proceeds, we shall in ten or fifteen years' time evolve quite different theories and models. Generally, I believe this development of the scientific orientation will go towards a more institutional approach, discarding the Western models we have used, and laying stress on the factors I mentioned which are now usually disregarded in the economic analysis of underdeveloped countries: modes and levels of living, attitudes, and institutions.

President Johnson's recent message to Congress on the Alliance for Progress with the Latin American countries provides an extreme example of the working of the optimistic biases. The exalted rhetoric of the message is not only empty, but grossly misleading as to facts and factual relationships. The most disquieting trait of the message is, however, that the urgent need for land reform and reform of the structure of taxation, which the late President Kennedy had emphasized when inaugurating the Alliance for Progress, has now been dropped. We can be sure that this will please dominant interests in the Latin American countries as well as certain special interests in the United States.

I referred to the President's message because it highlights a common type of superficiality and bias in our view of the underdeveloped countries. The first condition for wisely directing our policies toward that huge majority of mankind that live in the underdeveloped countries is to have a correct appreciation of their realities.

We must squarely face what is happening to them: (1) the slackening rate of development in most of these countries; (2) the leveling off of the flow of financial resources from the rich to the poor countries; (3) in particular, the speedy rise of the debt service burden they have to meet; (4) the rapid rate of population increase, which, even on the most hopeful assumption regarding the spread of birth control, will continue to rise for some time ahead; (5) the sluggish improvement of agricultural productivity; and, hence, (6) the spectre of a world hunger crisis. These interrelated and speedily moving trends are, as I said, threatening. The dangers the world is facing are not placed as mere possibilities in a distant future, but are immediate and certain, if radical action is not taken by us in the rich countries and by those in the poor countries. The world will not be the same place ten or twenty years hence: either hell will have broken out, or we shall all have learned how to cooperate much more intensively and on a world scale.

Our "aid"—and to simplify matters I will include the whole net-inflow of capital and technical assistance to underdeveloped countries—has so far not been anywhere nearly large enough to make more than a dent in world poverty. In none of the rich countries have we made real sacrifices; in none has the aid been raised to the level of a really important item in our national budgets. Including in this connection the Soviet Union and its European allies, we are probably spending as much on war and war preparation as the total of national incomes in all underdeveloped countries put together (I then exclude China but take account of what the economists call opportunity costs, that is, the loss of income by the men who are drafted, and the national sacrifices inherent in employing so large a part of our scientific and engineering skills in unproductive activity). Most countries, including the United States, take protection—such as tying aid to exports—in order to make aid as cheap as possible, while lowering its value for the recipient countries.

A main reason for our niggardliness has, of course, been the opportunistic biases I have already mentioned. Future events will treat them roughly. The hunger crisis, when it aggravates, will be a real eye-opener to us all.

Another reason is that internal economic policies and external financial cooperation of rich countries themselves have been so weak and deficient as to have landed them all in the preposterous situation of having to nurse their balance of payments and take a restrictive view of all financial outflows, including those to the underdeveloped countries. The preservation of internal and external balance in the economic development of rich countries does not, in my opinion, constitute insoluble technical problems. This is an area where policies are dangerously lagging behind our available knowledge.

The same lack of competence, courage, and will to cooperate which brings rich countries into a position where they feel that they cannot afford larger outflows is also evidenced in their reluctance to provide the poor countries with greater market opportunities for their exports. In all of the rich countries there are special interests exerting pressures to prevent a more generous commercial policy towards the underdeveloped countries.

In this connection, I will restrict myself to the observation that the United States has not been among those rich countries who have shown much of a positive interest in meeting the demands of the underdeveloped countries. It has been less liberal than several other rich countries, both in the positions taken in UNCTAD and in its bilateral policies.

From what I have said, it is clear that reforming economic policies at home which are strongly in the interest of the rich countries themselves—attaining and preserving internal and external economic balance and resisting the pressure of special vested interest groups—would also make possible more generous policies towards the underdeveloped countries.

I would also like to stress that it is a world-wide interest that as much as possible of aid resources should be channeled through intergovernmental agencies, in particular those within the United Nations system. At present, multilateral aid forms only a small percentage of total aid. The explanation, of course, is that the big countries, and some small countries too, want to use aid in the political game. I feel sure that an internationalization of aid would greatly improve its effectiveness and also contribute to a more healthy international climate.

I believe that a gradual development in this direction will come naturally, if and when aid takes greater proportions. When the threatening hunger crisis makes it imperative that, to over-bridge an emergency, the rich countries come forward with bigger deliveries, and when much of these must come from the United States—which as a legacy from its agricultural policy since the 1930's has the possibility to increase its production very substantially by enlarging the sown areas—it is only natural that this country will feel that it should not pay for all of it. But other countries are not willing to pay to the U.S. Treasury for an American operation. They will demand that this aid be internationalized as a condition for their participation.

But much more important than anything the rich countries *can* do by way of aid and trade is what the underdeveloped countries *must* do themselves in order to make development possible. These countries need radical internal changes.

They need an effectively administered birth control campaign that reaches the poverty stricken masses. They need many more and much better schools, breaking the class monopoly over education and imparting skills and attitudes that are conducive to development and not, as often now, inimical to it. They need a vigorous movement for adult education of which in most poor countries there has been astonishingly little.

As I have already mentioned, most of them need land reform urgently. Generally, they need to tear down an entrenched social stratification that is preserving privileges for the few and withholding opportunities for the masses. They need to stamp out corruption which in most underdeveloped countries has been on the increase. They are all "soft states" and need very much more of internal discipline.

In many of these countries, for example India, it has for decades been almost a commonplace that a social and economic revolution is a necessary prelude to development. But of such revolution we have seen very little. To press for it and carry it out is a task for these people themselves.

But we can, at least, abstain from supporting reaction. Too often in a post-war era we have fallen into the tradition of colonial regimes of allying ourselves with the privileged classes, intent upon preserving social *status quo*. We have even pampered reactionary regimes using military assistance and bribes. And this—together with the careless use of poor countries as pawns in the Great Power rivalry—is what gives credibility to the accusation that what we are offering the poor countries is but a new form of colonialism and imperialism.

In the re-orientation of the rich countries' policies toward the underdeveloped world, the United States should play its role, and it must be a considerably altered role. I believe, however, that it would be healthy if we stopped talking so much about American world leadership. Real leadership will come to the United States to the extent it does the right things, shows restraint in its use of power and wins the confidence of common people in the world.

It is no news that the United States has overkill capacity to exterminate mankind. It can certainly put fear into the whole world. But this is the opposite of world leadership. In fact, the U.S. government has managed to approach a low point of world confidence and true world leadership. America has abandoned *isolationism* but it has gone to the opposite extreme. Intent on policing the world on its own terms, it has instead invoked *isolation*.

A quarter of a century ago, when I brooded over things to come, I saw the danger of the United States falling for the illusion that financial and military might can substitute for the moral power of winning the sincere approval of all decent people in the world, not the opportunistic acquiescence of some dependent governments and business interests.

A most unfortunate casualty of the adventurous foreign policy of the United States government is, as I said earlier, that the reforms of its own society are being stifled. Wars breed reaction in many ways, monopolize the interest of public opinion, distort the economy, and breed a feeling that the margins for costly internal reforms have been narrowed.

In a queer and not altogether logical way the climate of warfare at the same time stimulates exaggerated ideas about the richness of the country. As this point it is my duty to put in a reminder that the American mansion is a heavily mortgaged piece of real estate. It has to invest trillions of dollars within the near future to rebuild completely its cities and, equally important, to rehabilitate the human content of the slums. As we all must be aware, this is an urgent necessity. The situation is continually deteriorating. Not to embark upon these huge investments soon, entails dangers for the cohesion of the American society and the stability of democracy.

Plans have to be worked out. They will need to embrace fundamental changes not only in housing policy but in transport and the division of the country in fiscal and administrative units. The Social Security legislation has to be remade so as to progressively integrate the under-employed, low productivity groups now in the slums. The structure of taxation that is now regressive up to a rather high level has to be reformed. And within the framework of all these reforms, new clean healthy modern cities will have to rise, where people can live and be happy and productive. They will have ample parks and recreation grounds, good public schools and hospitals.

And to enjoy this new life the inhabitants will have to be themselves educated out of their present slum-mindedness. Under any conditions this will take at least a generation to accomplish.

I am convinced that in the end these investments will be productive. The slums and the tolerance of a less well organized society is a drag even on American economic progress. But the investments are long-term ones and will for a time require the utmost economy of effort and entail sacrifices for the majority of Americans who are now in comfortable circumstances. The programs undertaken as part of the Unconditional War Against Poverty are pointing in the right direction and may have their greatest importance by preparing the American people for the much bigger, better planned and better organized and administered investments in its future.

As I said, I am and I have always been an optimist about America. When the Vietnam war is ended—as I have optimistically assumed it will—the American people will have drawn certain lessons for the future course of United States foreign policy, I hope. And in regard to internal policies this proud nation that is so intensely and indeed exaggeratingly aware of its wealth, will not for long be satisfied to remain the one country among the rich nations that has the most horrible slums, the dirtiest subways, the highest rate of unemployment, and of functional illiteracy, crime, and a sociality, and does least for the children of the poor, who are so many.

I would only add that changing these unfortunate conditions will give America a new image in the world. It will greatly increase its possibility to exert true leadership in a world which is sick and tired of force and violence but receptive to advice coming from a nation sincerely devoted to improve itself.

The history of American civilization has a strong legacy of puritan religiosity. Though undoubtedly it has contributed to the unfortunate self-righteousness which alienates America from enlightened opinion abroad, a more important effect is to make America more prepared than any other nation I know for conversion—for fundamental changes of approach and attitude. It is this dynamic capacity I rely upon when in spite of all I have to say, I look forward to an America that at home and abroad stands for what is really good for herself and for the world.

THE 10TH OF MAY: INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR RUMANIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the national holiday of the Rumanian people. Three great events of its history are celebrated on this date.

The first event was in 1866, when Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern, a scion of the southern and Catholic branch of the Prussian royal family, was proclaimed in Bucharest, Prince of Rumania, and thus was founded the first Rumanian dynasty. This occasion was made possible by the unrelenting efforts of Rumanian patriots, and the diplomacy of Napoleon III, Emperor of the French Empire. The establishment of this dynasty also brought to an end the strife and rivalry, which had long prevailed in the internal situation in Rumania.

The second noteworthy event occurred 11 years later in 1877 during the turmoil of the Russo-Turkish war. Rumania proclaimed her independence by severing the old and outdated bonds that linked her with the Ottoman Empire. This independence had to be fought out on the battlefields south of the Danube, where the young Rumanian Army, as an ally of Russia, played a significant part in the defeat of the Turkish forces. The Berlin conference of 1878, confirmed Rumania's independence, a bright page in the country's dreary history, though marred unfortunately by the loss of Bessarabia, cynically wrenched by Russia from its ally who helped them obtain victory over the Turks.

Four years later came the last of the three events to make history. In 1881, Charles I was crowned by the will of his own people, the King of Rumania. A prosperous era of six decades followed. Its apex was attained when national unity in the historic boundaries was reached after World War I. This socially progressive country had now become a factor of peace and equilibrium in the southeast of Europe.

During all these years and up to the present time, Rumanians have cherished the 10th of May as their national holiday. The anniversary of happy and glorious events in their history, in which achievements of monarchy and people are interwoven. It remains the symbol of their permanency and perseverance, through woes and hardships, to reach the ultimate end of freedom and wellbeing.

As we commemorate the independence of Rumania, it might be well to reflect what independence means to us. We are guaranteed freedom of expression, freedom of the press, freedom of choice and place to work, and an equitable share in the fruits of our labor. We may openly profess our belief in God, and the dignity of the individual. We salute the achievements of the Rumanians and may they someday in their own country live to enjoy the fruits of freedom and independence.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KLEPPE (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), for May 11 through May 17, on account of official business.

Mr. WOLFF (at the request of Mr. GALIFIANAKIS), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) to revise and extend their remarks and to include tables and other pertinent extraneous matter:

Mr. QUILLEN, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. HALPERN, for 10 minutes, on May 10, 1967.

Mr. FEIGHAN (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO), for 10 minutes today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. ROUSH to revise and extend and include extraneous matter in his remarks made during consideration of H.R. 9240.

Mr. STRATTON to revise and extend his remarks made during consideration of H.R. 9240 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio to revise and extend his remarks made during considerations of H.R. 9240 and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MAILLIARD during debate on H.R. 9240 and to include pertinent extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. KLEPPE) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland.

Mr. ERLENBORN.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. FINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DADDARIO) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FISHER.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida.

Mr. BROOKS.

Mr. TENZER.

Mr. RARICK.

Mr. DOW.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. FRASER.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 270. An act to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

735. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations in the budget for the fiscal year 1968 for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 119); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

736. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting a letter requesting the appropriation of necessary funds to create a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the United States foreign service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

737. A letter from the Acting Director Civil Defense, transmitting the report of Federal contributions program equipment and facilities (reporting symbol OCD–CONG (Q)2), for the quarter ending March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of subsection 201(i) of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended; to the Committee on Armed Services.

738. A letter from the Chairman, United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting a letter recommending the combining of the functions of the Center for Educational Cooperation, which is to be established in the office of the Assistant Secretary of HEW for Education, the functions of the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs in the Department of State, and the genuine educational and cultural aspects of the United States Information Agency, such as its libraries and English language teaching programs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

No. 739. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of examination into the transfer of handtool and paint stocks from the Department of Defense to the General Services Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

740. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting a report on the backlog of pending applications and hearing cases, as of March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 82–554; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, House Report No. 232. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 2531. A bill to provide for the disposition of the unclaimed and unpaid share of the Loyal Creek Judgment Fund, and to provide for disposition of estates of interstate members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma or estates of members of the Creek Nation of Oklahoma dying without heirs; with amendment (Rept. No. 233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HALEY: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H.R. 7965. A bill to transfer title to tribal land on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARING (by request):

H.R. 9761. A bill to declare that the United States holds in trust for the Indians of the Battle Mountain Colony certain lands which are used for cemetery purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 9762. A bill to provide for the payment of debt service construction charges, and increased operation and maintenance charges when irrigable lands are taken for nonagricultural uses under Federal programs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9763. A bill relating to the income tax treatment of advertising revenues derived by a tax-exempt organization from its publication of a trade journal or other periodical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 9764. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 9765. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM:

H.R. 9766. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKINSON:

H.R. 9767. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.R. 9768. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9769. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 9770. A bill to incorporate the Armed Forces Retired Association; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9771. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon," approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9772. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9773. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce from 65 to 62 the age at which the additional exemption on account of age becomes allowable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FOLEY:

H.R. 9774. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 9775. A bill to provide Federal assistance to courts, correctional systems and community agencies to increase their capability to prevent, treat, and control juvenile delinquency; to assist research efforts in the prevention, treatment, and control of juvenile delinquency; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARDNER:

H.R. 9776. A bill to provide for the appointment of postmasters and rural carriers on a merit basis under the civil service system; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.R. 9777. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 9778. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same benefits for employees of public hospitals with respect to certain pensions and profit-sharing plans as those presently provided for employees of private nonprofit hospitals, other charitable organizations, and public and private schools; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 9779. A bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on irradiated fresh, chilled, or frozen fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KYL:

H.R. 9780. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a program for the preservation of additional historic properties throughout the Nation, and for other purposes" to require the preservation of Jackson Hill-Holt-Adams House and grounds in the Nation's Capital; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9781. A bill to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 9782. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 9783. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9784. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9785. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9786. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create an independent Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. MICHEL (for himself, and Mr. RAILSBACK):

H.R. 9787. A bill to amend the River and Harbor Act of 1958 to authorize the appropriation of $10,000,000 for the repair and modification of certain structures along the Illinois and Mississippi Canal in the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H.R. 9788. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9789. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the inclusion in the computation of accredited service of certain periods of service rendered States or instrumentalities of States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 9790. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 with respect to the types of vessels which may be traded in for certain war-built vessels owned by the United States; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PETTIS:

H.R. 9791. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9792. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 9793. A bill to amend section 12 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act (50 App. U.S.C. 462), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9794. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the Illinois Sesquicentennial to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 9795. A bill to authorize the transfer of a vessel to the Los Angeles Unified School District for nontransportation use in the training of merchant marine personnel; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H.R. 9796. A bill to authorize the extension of certain naval vessel loans now in existence, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9797. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to allow an additional income tax exemption for a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 9798. A bill to establish a National Institute of Criminal Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9799. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for expenses paid by him for the education of any of his dependents at an institution of higher learning; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9800. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi:

H.R. 9801. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 9802. A bill to incorporate Recovery, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9803. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend the head-of-household benefits to unremarried widows and widowers and single persons who have attained age 30 and maintain their own households; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRETT:

H.R. 9804. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 9805. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9806. A bill to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 9807. A bill to establish an emergency program of direct Federal assistance in the form of direct grants and loans to certain hospitals in critical need of new facilities in order to meet increasing demands for service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.R. 9808. A bill to authorize the Catholic War Veterans to erect a statue of St. Sebastian in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 9809. A bill to limit Federal financial assistance otherwise available for the construction or operation of nursing homes to nursing homes in States which have in effect programs which provide for the licensing of the operators of such homes and which meet certain requirements; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9810. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist in assuring the availability of both nursing home and alternative noninstitutional services for recipients of assistance thereunder, to encourage the use whenever professionally determined to be appropriate of noninstitutional services for such recipients, to establish basic standards of quality for nursing home and home health services provided to such recipients, and to provide for fair and equitable reimbursement for those providing health care services to such recipient; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 9811. A bill to amend title 38 to provide that service in the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps shall be considered active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9812. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the classification of the position of deputy U.S. marshal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. OLSEN (for himself, and Mr. ASPINALL):

H.R. 9813. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 9814. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grains programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9815. A bill to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WINN:

H.R. 9816. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of facilities to control water and air pollution by allowing a tax credit for expenditures incurred in constructing such facilities and by permitting the deduction, or amortization over a period of 1 to 5 years, on such expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9817. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9818. A bill to exempt from the antitrust laws certain combinations and arrangements necessary for the survival of failing newspapers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9819. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9820. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.J. Res. 560. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H.J. Res. 561. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.J. Res. 562 Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Con. Res. 341. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the adoption of minimum wage and overtime compensation standards in foreign countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H. Con. Res. 342. Concurrent resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H. Con. Res. 343. Concurrent resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H. Res. 468. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Res. 469. Resolution to amend rules X, XI, and XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

187. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, relative to informing residents of the county or counties where works of improvement are to be performed that construction contracts are being let; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

188. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, relative to the curtailment of agricultural imports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

189. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, relative to condemnation of the burning of the U.S. flag, or its desecration in any way; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

190. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to ratification of the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9821. A bill for the relief of Raul A. Du-Breuil; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 9822. A bill for the relief of Ladislas G. Kerenyi, Claire Kerenyi, and Ladislas G. Kerenyi, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia:

H.R. 9823. A bill for the relief of Michael Murphy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.R. 9824. A bill for the relief of Fayez S. Tushan, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 9825. A bill for the relief of Milanio Pastore; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 9826. A bill for the relief of Branka Mardessich and Sonia S. Silvani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9827. A bill for the relief of Ligaya L. Villazor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 9828. A bill for the relief of Cristina Rubio Gonzalez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 9829. A bill for the relief of American Petrofina Co., of Texas, a Delaware corporation, and James W. Harris; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9830. A bill for the relief of Chin Duck Sam also known as Yee Gim Ball; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9831. A bill for the relief of Robert Harry Urch; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9832. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis, Georgia, and Constantina Malliaras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. By Mr. UTT: Petition of Mrs. H. G. Littrell, 5815 Lindo Pasco, San Diego, Calif., and the Mother's Crusade of San Diego County, Calif., relative to protesting aid and trade with Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

78. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Charles Edward Smith, Represa, Calif., relative to a writ of habeas corpus; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

79. Also, petition of American Bakery & Confectionery Workers' International Union, AFL–CIO, Philadelphia, Pa., relative to the improvement and modernization of the Federal social security system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 9, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rabbi Jacob Weitzman, Congregation B'nai Jacob, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

Oveenu shbashomayim. Our Heavenly Father, may Thy divine presence rest upon us and upon all those who deliberate upon the affairs of our beloved country.

We beseech Thy guidance in our councils and decisions for the welfare of our Nation and its people.

We pray Thee, O Father of Peace, be Thou with our tireless President and Vice President and with all the leaders of our country as they walk the difficult path of statesmanship and diplomacy.

May we emerge from the agonizing struggle in which we are now engaged, united and strengthened by a common destiny.

Spread Thy mantle of peace over the four corners of the earth. Let every man, whatever his race, religion, or creed, recognize Thee as the father of us all, so that we may dwell in brotherhood and in tranquillity.

May we be blessed with the greatness of soul which will enable us to rise above the everyday and behold the vision of the eternal.

May your efforts bring about the cessation of hatred and intolerance. May the law of Thy truth unite all nations into a bond of brotherhood so that no nation war against its brother nor hurt or destroy its neighbor. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 8, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1039) to extend the authority of the Postmaster General to enter into leases of real property for periods not exceeding 30 years, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 270) to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 8, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of measures on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 201 and the succeeding measures in sequence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Byrd of West Virginia in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

WIDOW OF ALBERT M. PEPOON

The bill (S. 477) for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepoon was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 477

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in the administration of the Civil Service Retirement Act of May 29, 1930 (as in effect on August 31, 1956), Albert M. Pepoon shall be considered to have retired on August 31, 1956, pursuant to section 6 of such Act and to have elected at such time, pursuant to section 4(b) of such Act, to receive a reduced annuity and an annuity after death payable to his widow, Loretta C. Pepoon.

Sec. 2. No annuity shall be payable by reason of the enactment of this Act for any period prior to the first day of the month in which this Act is enacted.

Sec. 3. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, benefits payable by reason of the enactment of this Act shall be paid from the civil service retirement and disability fund.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 210), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This legislation would create a survivor annuity for the benefit of the widow of Mr. Albert M. Pepoon.

Albert M. Pepoon served as acting postmaster and postmaster at Bordulac, N. Dak., from July 10, 1945, until his resignation at age 72, August 31, 1956.

At the time of his retirement, Mr. Pepoon elected to receive a single life annuity without survivor protection. Under the provisions of the Civil Service Retirement Act in effect at the time of his retirement, election of a survivor annuity was not available to an employee who had fewer than 15 years' service unless his retirement was for disability.

Albert Pepoon died February 4, 1963. He had resigned as postmaster at Bordulac because of ill health. In its official report to the committee, the Civil Service Commission points out that there is doubt that Postmaster Pepoon was properly advised concerning disability retirement. He was suffering from tuberculosis at the time of his resignation. Had he retired on disability, he would have been able to elect a survivor annuity and to continue his group life insurance into retirement.

S. 477 would have the effect of electing a disability retirement and a survivor annuity in his behalf. His annuity will be recomputed as if such an election had been made, and any overpayment due the civil service retirement and disability fund will be made before a survivor annuity becomes payable to his widow.

COST

Enactment of this legislation would create a monthly annuity of $26 until the death or remarriage of the widow of Albert M. Pepoon. In addition, a group life insurance policy of $750 would be paid to her.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1190) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to provide for inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of their surviving spouses which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 8344(a) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the fourth sentence the following new sentence: "If an annuitant upon termination of employment is married to a spouse potentially entitled to annuity as surviving spouse by virtue of the annuitant's retirement, the supplemental benefit payable under the fourth sentence of this subsection shall be reduced by 10 percent and such spouse shall be paid an annuity equal to 55 percent of such supplemental benefit commencing and terminating at the same times as the survivor annuity payable by virtue of the annuitant's retirement, unless at the time of claiming such supplemental benefit the annuitant notifies the Commission in writing that he does not desire his spouse to receive such annuity."

(b) Section 8344(a) is further amended by striking out the following: "The employment of an annuitant under this subsection does not create an annuity for or affect the annuity of a survivor."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply only with respect to reemployed annuitants whose periods of reemployment expire on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 3. Section 8348(g) of title 5, United States Code, shall not apply with respect to benefits resulting from the enactment of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An Act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of surviving spouses."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 211), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

This bill is identical in substance to S. 699, introduced in the 89th Congress, which passed both Houses of Congress but failed of enactment. This legislation would permit a reemployed annuitant to designate that his surviving spouse shall receive a survivor annuity created out of any supplemental annuity to which he is entitled at the time of his final separation.

Under existing law, if a retired employee is reemployed under conditions which do not terminate his title to annuity, his salary in the reemployment position is reduced by the amount of his annuity, he is considered subject to the civil service retirement program during his reemployment, but he does not have deductions made from his salary during the period of reemployment.

If his period of reemployment lasts 1 year, he is entitled to a supplemental annuity based on the salary and service during the reemployment period. If he serves 5 years, he may, at his election, make a deposit to the retirement fund equal to the amount which would have been withheld during his reemployment, and may retire again with a new computation based on total service and under laws and regulations existing at the time of his new retirement.

Survivor annuities, created out of the employee's annuity and paid for in part by a small reduction in the employee's annuity, are equal to 55 percent of the employee's annuity. The supplemental annuity earned during a period of reemployment does not create any additional survivor annuity.

The committee believes it is fair to create a survivor annuity out of the supplemental annuity if appropriate reductions in the supplemental annuity are made to pay the cost. The committee recognizes the value of services rendered by many reemployed annuitants, some of whom return to Government service at the request of their agency.

In most instances, reemployed annuitants do not serve as long as 5 years and do not become eligible for a recomputation of annuity. Thus, their spouses future rights for a survivor annuity are not improved by any higher salary or additional service.

Section 1 of S. 1190 changes this by creating a survivor annuity out of any supplemental annuity earned by a reemployed annuitant who at the time of his original retirement designated his spouse as entitled to a survivor annuity. His own reemployment annuity will be reduced by 10 percent in order to pay for the survivor annuity. The figure of 10 percent is the same as the reduction for a survivor annuity made under present law for any annuity exceeding $3,600.

Section 2 provides that the amendments made by this bill will affect only the annuity rights of reemployed annuitants whose reemployment service terminates on or after the date of enactment of this legislation.

Section 3 provides that the costs resulting from this legislation shall be paid out of the civil service retirement and disability fund.

It is not possible to estimate accurately the cost of this bill. The very small number of reemployed annuitants in the Federal service indicates that the costs will be quite small in comparison to the total cost of the retirement program.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1320) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for acquisition of career status by certain Government employees serving temporary appointments which had been reported from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3304 the following new section:

"§ 3304a. Competitive service; career appointment after four years' temporary service

"(a) An individual serving in a position in the competitive service under an indefinite appointment or a temporary appointment pending establishment of a register (other than an individual serving under a term appointment, under an overseas limited appointment, in the postal field service, or in GS-16, -17, or -18) shall acquire competitive status and have his appointment converted to a career appointment without condition when—

"(1) he completes, without a break in service of more than 30 days, a total of at least 4 years of full-time service (or an equivalent of intermittent or part-time service) in such a position;

"(2) he passes a suitable noncompetitive examination for his position;

"(3) the appointing authority recommends that his appointment be converted to a career appointment and certifies to the Commission that his work performance is at least equivalent to that of others in similar levels who qualified through competitive processes; and

"(4) he meets Commission qualification requirements for the position and is otherwise eligible for a career appointment.

"(b) The employing agency shall terminate the temporary appointment of an individual serving in a position described in subsection (a) of this section not later than 90 days after he has completed the 4-year period unless prior thereto the individual shall have been recommended and qualified for career appointment in accordance with this section.

"(c) In computing years of service under subsection (a) of this section for an individual who leaves a position in the competitive service to enter the armed forces and is reemployed in such a position within 120 days after separation under honorable conditions, the period from the date he leaves his position to the date he is reemployed shall be included.

"(d) The Commission may prescribe regulations necessary for the administration of this section."

(b) The analysis of subchapter I of chapter 33 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new item immediately below item 3304:

"3304a. Competitive service; career appointment after 4 years' temporary service."

Sec. 2. (a) Chapter 43 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 3302 the following new section:

"§ 3303. Career appointment after 4 years' temporary service

"Subject to section 3302 of this title, the Postmaster General may appoint any person serving in a position in the competitive service in the postal field service to a career position in the postal field service (other than as a postmaster or rural carrier) if the person (1) in each of the 4 years next preceding his appointment has been paid for not less than 700 hours of satisfactory work under temporary or indefinite appointments in the postal field service; (2) the appointing authority recommends that his appointment be converted to a career appointment and certifies to the Civil Service Commission that his work performance is at least equivalent to that of others in similar levels who qualified through competitive processes; (3) passes a suitable noncompetitive examination for his position; and (4) meets Commission requirements for the position and is otherwise eligible for career appointment. In computing years of service for a person who leaves a position in the competitive service in the postal field service to enter the armed forces and is reemployed in such a position within 120 days after separation under honorable conditions, the period from the date he leaves his position to the date he is reemployed shall be included. The Civil Service Commission may prescribe regulations for the administration of this section."

(b) The analysis of chapter 43 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding the following new item immediately below item 3302.

"3303. Career appointment after 4 years' temporary service."

Sec. 3. The first sentence of section 1310 (a) of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952 (65 Stat. 757), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"The Civil Service Commission and the heads of the executive departments, agencies, and corporations shall make full use of their authority to require that initial appointments to positions in and outside the competitive service shall be made on other than a permanent basis in order to limit the number of permanent employees to that required for the efficiency of the Federal civil service: *Provided*, That any position vacated by a permanent employee called to military service or transferred to a national defense agency shall not be filled except on a temporary or indefinite basis."

Sec. 4. (a) This section and section 3 of this Act shall become effective on the date of enactment.

(b) The provisions of section 3304a(b) of title 5, United States Code, as added by this Act, shall become effective 240 days following the date of enactment. In the case of an individual who prior to such effective date shall have completed the 4-year period referred to in such section, the date of such completion shall be deemed to be such effective date.

(c) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, section 1 and 2 of this Act shall become effective 120 days following the date of enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 212), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE AND JUSTIFICATION

TAPER appointments

Under existing civil service regulations, appointing officers in Federal agencies can employ a person in a temporary capacity when a suitable civil service register of eligible candidates is not available. These employees continue on the job until an examination is held, a register established, and an appointment is made on a permanent basis. The temporary employee may qualify on the examination and be appointed, if within reach on the register, but he acquires no status simply because of his temporary service in the position.

TAPER appointments (so called because of the words "temporary authority pending establishment of a register") serve a useful function in filling personnel needs of executive agencies. Occasionally, a register may be used up because of unexpected increases in appointments. There is an unavoidable delay between the expiration of an old register and the establishment of a new register. TAPER and other temporary authority fill the gap.

In other cases, appointments and candidates are so few in number that it is neither economically or administratively convenient to follow normal examination procedures to fill vacancies. As a result, an employee may be appointed by TAPER procedures and continue in the job for a long period of time. A recent survey conducted by the Civil Service Commission indicated that there are about 19,000 TAPER employees in the executive branch, of whom nearly 8,000 have served more than 3 years.

The disadvantage to the employee of being in TAPER status is that he accrues no benefits from his continued service. He has no retention preference (regardless of military service), acquires no seniority, is not eligible for promotion, and is not covered by the civil service retirement program. He is eligible for life insurance, health insurance, and injury compensation benefits.

The committee believes that this is unfair to the employees. Evidence presented to the committee indicates that many would prefer to take their changes on a competitive examination and acquire career status if the opportunity to do so existed. It is not their fault that examination procedures have not been followed. In some cases, agencies have made continued efforts to arrange for examinations or to obtain other administrative relief, but their efforts have not been successful. The expense and administrative work involved in giving an examination and establishing a register outweigh the advantage to the Government of following competitive procedures.

From time to time, both Congress and the President have provided relief for TAPER employees. Public Laws 84-380, 84-386, and 85-847 provided conversion to career status for certain temporary employees in the classified and postal services. Nine Executive orders, dating back to 1941, have been issued to convert certain temporary employees to career status. None of these laws or Executive orders provided a permanent solution to the problem of long-term temporary employment.

POSTAL TEMPORARIES

Temporary employees in the postal field service differ from temporary employees in other agencies. Postal temporaries usually work at peak periods of the day and do not usually work a full workweek. They are appointed because persons ranking higher on a register of eligibles do not accept an offer for any position less attractive than career substitute.

Some postal temporaries work for years without achieving career status. Either no vacancies occur (as in the case in small post offices) or others consistently outrank them on the register. They continue to serve the post office but never qualify for career employment.

CONVERSION TO CAREER STATUS

S. 1320, as amended, will resolve the temporary status appointment problems of the classified and postal services by permitting agencies to convert temporary employees to career positions under specified conditions. These are:

(1) The employee must complete 4 years' service in a TAPER or indefinite appointment;

(2) He must qualify on a suitable noncompetitive civil service examination (assembled or unassembled);

(3) He must fulfill Commission standards of qualification for the position and be eligible under prevailing law; and

(4) He must be recommended by his appointing authority for a career position, and his appointing authority must certify to the Commission that his work performance is equal to that of others at a similar level of employment who attained their positions through competitive processes.

The committee has given thoughtful consideration to the conflicting interests of providing career status to long-term temporary employees and the protection of the competitive merit system. TAPER or indefinite appointments should never be used to avoid competitive processes. The authority created by this legislation must not be used to permit appointment of any person with a view to achieving career status after 4 years' service. It is the administrative responsibility of the executive branch and particularly of the Civil Service Commission to be certain that no "back door" is opened for entry into the competitive service. The committee has insured that TAPER employees shall be qualified, eligible, recommended, and certified as performing service equivalent to competitively appointed employees. It is the Commission's responsibility to insure that examination and appointment procedures are improved and refined so that long-term temporary service is quickly reduced to a minimum.

THE WHITTEN AMENDMENT

Section 3 of the bill, as amended by the committee, provides for the revision of the Whitten amendment (65 Stat. 757) to repeal the numerical limitation on permanent positions in the Federal civil service. Enacted during the Korean conflict as a means of preserving the positions for employees who resigned to enter military service, the amendment has since served as a guard against unwarranted appointment of employees to permanent positions.

Sixteen years have passed since its enactment. During that time, three departments and many agencies have been established to carry on the work of the executive branch and the various programs established by Congress. The population has increased by nearly 50 million. The permanent ceiling of 110 percent of the number employed as of September 1, 1950, is no longer realistic. Congress in 1965 removed the postal field service from the effect of the limitation, and the committee now recommends that it be removed altogether. Congress, through the appropriation process, is perfectly able to make sure that excessive numbers of persons are not hired.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Hearings were held before the Subcommittee on Civil Service on April 13, 1967. Testimony was presented by the Civil Service Commission and interested employees and employee groups. All testimony favored enactment.

COST

The only cost directly attributable to enactment of this legislation is the additional cost of agency contribution to the civil service retirement and disability fund over the present agency contribution to social security.

The committee estimates that the total number of TAPER, indefinite, postal temporary, and former TAPER employees now in career-conditional status who will receive benefit by enactment of this legislation is about 70,000. This figure includes those former TAPER employees who have qualified for competitive appointment and been appointed to career-conditional positions. If credit for their TAPER service is not added to their tenure as conditional employees, those now in TAPER status who qualify for career appointments will be senior to them. The committee believes that the former TAPER service should be added to these employees' career-conditional service to prevent this.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. **MANSFIELD**. Over, Mr. President.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be passed over.

DISPOSAL OF LONG-LINES COMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 223) to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with an amendment on page 3, line 21, after the word "of", to strike out "Agriculture" and insert "the Interior"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Alaska Communications Disposal Act".

TITLE I—DEFINITIONS

Sec. 101. In this Act—

(1) "Transfer" means the conveyance by the United States of any element of ownership, including but not restricted to any estate or interest in property, and franchise rights, by sale, exchange, lease, easement, or permit, for cash, credit, or other property, with or without warranty.

(2) "Long-lines communication facilities" means the transmission systems connecting points inside the State with each other and with points outside the State by radio or wire, and includes all kinds of property and rights-of-way necessary to accomplish this interconnection.

(3) "Agency concerned" means any department, agency, wholly owned corporation, or instrumentality of the United States.

TITLE II—TRANSFER OF UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT-OWNED LONG-LINES COMMUNICATION FACILITIES IN AND TO ALASKA

Sec. 201. (1) Subject to the provisions of section 202, and notwithstanding provisions of any other law, the Secretary of Defense or his designee, with the advice, assistance and, in the case of an agency not under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of Defense, the consent of the agency concerned, and after approval of the President, is authorized to and shall transfer for adequate consideration any or all long-lines communication facilities in or to Alaska under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government to any person qualifying under the provisions of section 202, and may take such action and exercise such powers as may be necessary or appropriate to effectuate the purposes of this Act.

(2) Transfers under this title shall be made in accordance with the procedures and methods required by sections 203(e), (1), (2), and (3) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484(e)), except that "the Secretary of Defense or his designee" shall be substituted for all references therein to "the Administrator".

(3) The requirements of section 207 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 488), shall apply to transfers under this title.

(4) The head of the agency concerned or his designee shall execute such documents for the transfer of title or other interest in property, except any mineral rights therein, and take such other action as the Secretary of Defense deems necessary or proper to transfer such property under the provisions of this title. A copy of any deed, lease, or other instrument executed by or on behalf of the head of the agency concerned purporting to transfer title or any other interest in public land shall be furnished to the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) No interest in public lands, withdrawn or otherwise appropriated, may be transferred under this title, without the prior consent of the Secretary of the Interior, or, with respect to lands within a national forest, of the Secretary of Agriculture.

(6) In connection with soliciting offers to purchase such long-lines facilities of the Alaska Communication System the Secretary of Defense or his designee shall:

(a) Provide any prospective purchaser who requests it data on (i) the facilities available for purchase, (ii) the amounts deemed to be the current fair and reasonable value of those facilities, and (iii) the initial rates which will be charged to the purchaser for capacity in facilities retained by the Government and available for commercial use;

(b) Provide, in the request for offers to purchase, that offerors must specify the rates they propose to charge for service and the improvements in service which they propose to initiate;

(3) Provide an opportunity for prospective purchasers to meet as a group with Department of Defense representatives to assure that the data and the public interest requirements described in (a) and (b), above, are fully understood; and

(d) Seek the advice and assistance of the Federal Communications Commission, the Federal Field Committee for Development Planning in Alaska, and the Governor of Alaska or his designees, to assure consideration of all public interest factors associated with the transfer.

Sec. 202. No transfer under this title may be made unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determines that—

(1) the United States does not need to

retain the property involved in the transfer for national defense purposes;

(2) the transfer is in the public interest;

(3) the person to whom the transfer is made is prepared and qualified to provide, without interruption, the communication service involved in the transfer; and

(4) the long-lines communication facilities will not directly or indirectly be owned, operated, or controlled by a person who would legally be disqualified by the Federal Communications Commission from holding a radio station license under any of the terms of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 203. The agreements by which a transfer is made under this title shall include a provision that—

(1) the person to whom the transfer is made shall, subject to the rules and regulations of and body or commission established by the State of Alaska to govern and regulate communication services to the public and of the Federal Communications Commission and all applicable statutes, treaties, and conventions, provide without interruption, the communication services involved in the transfer, except those services reserved by the United States in the transfer;

(2) the rates and charges for such services applicable at the time of transfer shall not be changed for a period of one year from the date of such transfer unless approved by a governmental body or commission having jurisdiction; and

(3) the sale will not be final unless and until the purchaser shall receive the requisite certificates of convenience and necessity to operate interstate and intrastate commercial communications in Alaska from the appropriate governmental regulatory bodies.

SEC. 204. Transfers under this title do not require the approval of the Federal Communications Commission except to the extent that the approval of the Federal Communications Commission may be necessary under section 202(4).

SEC. 205. Notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, the gross proceeds of each transfer shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 206. The Secretary of Defense or his designee shall report to the Congress and the President—

(1) In January of each year, the actions taken under this title during the preceding twelve months; and

(2) not later than ninety days after completion of each transfer under this title, a full account of that transfer.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. Except as provided in section 204, this Act does not modify in any manner the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

SEC. 302. There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Defense such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 213), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE AND BACKGROUND OF THE LEGISLATION

S. 223 would authorize the Secretary of Defense to sell or lease Government-owned, long-lines communications facilities in the State of Alaska to a private commercial carrier, or to allow the use of such facilities by permit, easement, or other form of transfer. The Secretary of Defense is to obtain the advice, assistance, and, in the case of agencies not under the jurisdiction of the Defense Department, the consent of the heads of agencies of the Government which operate long-lines communications facilities being transferred. No sale, lease, or other transfer could be made unless the Secretary of Defense or his designee determined that the rights to be transferred were not necessary for national defense purposes, and that the transfer is in the public interest. The carrier acquiring any such facilities would be required to provide, without interruption, the communications services involved in the transfer.

Since there are no commercial long-lines communication companies operating in Alaska, that State, alone among the 50 States of the Union, depends upon the Federal Government to provide the telecommunications network, facilities, and services that are required for business and other purposes by the general public. These services are now being provided by the Alaska Communication System (ACS), a Department of Defense (DOD) activity. The authority for Government operation of the ACS is an act of Congress of May 26, 1900, which specified that commercial business might be done over military telegraph cable lines in Alaska under such conditions as the Secretary of War might deem to be equitable and in the public interest. Effective July 1, 1962, the Secretary of Defense transferred responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the ACS from the Department of the Army to the Department of the Air Force.

In response to the ever-increasing requirements of the public for commercial communications services over a period of more than 60 years the ACS has grown to the point that today it provides all kinds of long-distance telephone and telegraph services for private individuals, commercial enterprises, State and Federal civilian agencies, as well as for the Department of Defense.

The uniqueness of the communication situation in Alaska, and the ever-increasing volume of commercial business, led DOD and the Federal Aviation Agency (FAA) in the late 1950's to consider the possibility of selling their Alaskan communications facilities to enable service to the public in Alaska to be provided by a private, regulated commercial carrier. The Department of Defense has indicated that the facilities initially offered for sale will be, generally, those now operated by the ACS. Other facilities, now used primarily for defense purposes would not be sold: however, capacity on these facilities would be leased to the ACS purchaser to allow continuation of public service throughout the entire State of Alaska. The DOD facilities involved are described in appendix A.

Since the ACS facilities are not, in the main, excess to the needs of the Department, such sale could be accomplished only with special congressional authorization. DOD, in anticipation of sale authority, has been reluctant to make even minor improvements and expansions in the system to meet the continually increasing requirements of the public. The growing gap between the capabilities of the system and the requirements of the public emphasizes the importance of a realistic new look at the communications situation in Alaska.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 645) to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture was announced as next in order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Over, Mr. President.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be passed over.

SURVEYS OF TIMBER AND OTHER FOREST RESOURCES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1136) to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the last sentence of section 9 of the Act of May 22, 1928, as amended (45 Stat. 699, 702; 16 U.S.C. 581h), is hereby amended by striking out "$2,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$5,000,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 215), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill, with the committee amendment, would increase the limit on annual appropriations to keep the timber survey current to $5 million from $2.5 million.

The Department of Agriculture, which requested complete removal of the appropriation limitation, has advised that (1) survey costs have risen over 6 percent annually since the $2.5 million limit was fixed in 1962; (2) there is an increasing need in most States for more intensive forest inventories; (3) by 1977 the total cost may amount to $5 million; and (4) Federal and State agencies, private forestry groups, landowners, and timber operators all need up-to-date facts provided by the survey for management decisions.

As introduced at the Department's request, the bill would have removed the ceiling completely. The amendment recommended by the committee substitutes a ceiling of $5 million, which should be adequate through 1977.

POPULAR ELECTION OF THE GOVERNOR OF GUAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 449) to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That section 6 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 386; 48 U.S.C. 1422), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. The executive power of Guam shall be vested in an executive officer whose official title shall be the 'Governor of Guam'. The Governor of Guam, together with the Lieutenant Governor, shall be elected by a majority of the votes cast by the people who are qualified to vote for the members of the

Legislature of Guam. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be chosen jointly, by the casting by each voter of a single vote applicable to both offices. If no candidates receive a majority of the votes cast in any election, on the fourteenth day thereafter a runoff election shall be held between the candidates for Governor and Lieutenant Governor receiving the highest and second highest number of votes cast. The first election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be held on November 3, 1970. Thereafter, beginning with the year 1974, the Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall be elected every four years at the general election. The Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall hold office for a term of four years and until their successors are elected and qualified.

"No person who has been elected Governor for two full successive terms shall be again eligible to hold that office until one full term has intervened. The term of the elected Governor and Lieutenant Governor shall commence on the first Monday of January following the date of election.

"No person shall be eligible for election to the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor unless he is able to read and write the English language, is and has been for five consecutive years immediately preceding the election a citizen of the United States and a bona fide resident of Guam and will be, at the time of taking office, at least thirty years of age. The Governor shall maintain his official residence in Guam during his incumbency.

"The Governor shall have general supervision and control of all the departments, bureaus, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the executive branch of the government of Guam. He may grant pardons and reprieves and remit fines and forfeitures for offenses against local laws. He may veto any legislation as provided in this Act. He shall appoint, and may remove, all officers and employees of the executive branch of the government of Guam, except as otherwise provided in this or any other Act of Congress, or under the laws of Guam, and shall commission all officers that he may be authorized to appoint. He shall be responsible for the faithful execution of the laws of Guam and the laws of the United States applicable in Guam. Whenever it becomes necessary, in case of disaster, invasion, insurrection, or rebellion, or imminent danger thereof, or to prevent or suppress lawless violence, he may summon the posse comitatus or call out the militia or request assistance of the senior military or naval commander of the Armed Forces of the United States in Guam, which may be given at the discretion of such military commander if not disruptive of, or inconsistent with, his Federal responsibilities. He may, in case of rebellion or invasion, or imminent danger thereof when the public safety requires it, proclaim the island, insofar as it is under the jurisdiction of the government of Guam, to be under martial law. The members of the legislature shall meet forthwith on their own initiative and may, by a two-thirds vote, revoke such proclamation.

"The Governor shall make to the Secretary of the Interior under section 3 of this Act an annual report of the transactions of the Government of Guam for transmission to the Congress and such other reports at such other times as may be required by the Congress or under applicable Federal law. He shall have the power to issue executive orders and regulations not in conflict with any applicable law. He may recommend bills to the legislature and give expression to his views on any matter before that body.

"There is hereby established the office of Lieutenant Governor of Guam. The Lieutenant Governor shall have such executive powers and perform such duties as may be assigned to him by the Governor or prescribed by this Act or under the laws of Guam."

Sec. 2. Section 7 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422a) is deleted and replaced by the following new provision, also designated section 7:

"Sec. 7. Any Governor of Guam may be removed from office by the people registered to vote in Guam if a majority of two-thirds of the persons registered to vote shall vote in favor of recall at a referendum election. A referendum election, for purposes of this section, shall be initiated by the legislature of Guam following: (1) a two-thirds vote of the members of such legislature in favor of a referendum; or (2) a petition for referendum to the legislature by 25 per centum of the people registered to vote in Guam."

Sec. 3. Section 8 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422b), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 8. (a) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor shall have the powers of the Governor.

"(b) In case of a permanent vacancy in the office of Governor, arising by reason of the death, resignation, removal by recall or permanent disability of the Governor, or the death, resignation, or permanent disability of a Governor-elect, or for any other reason, the Lieutenant Governor or Lieutenant Governor-elect shall become the Governor to hold office for the unexpired term and until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified at the next regular election for Governor.

"(c) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of the Lieutenant Governor, or during any period when the Lieutenant Governor is acting as Governor, the speaker of the Guam Legislature shall act as Lieutenant Governor.

"(d) In case of a permanent vacancy in the Office of Lieutenant Governor, arising by reason of the death, resignation, or permanent disability of the Lieutenant Governor, or because the Lieutenant Governor or Lieutenant Governor-elect has succeeded to the office of Governor, the Governor shall appoint a new Lieutenant Governor, with the advice and consent of the legislature, to hold office for the unexpired term and until his successor shall have been duly elected and qualified at the next regular election for Lieutenant Governor.

"(e) In case of the temporary disability or temporary absence of both the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor, the powers of the Governor shall be exercised. as Acting Governor, by such person as the laws of Guam may prescribe. In case of a permanent vacancy in the offices of both the Governor and Lieutenant Governor, the office of Governor shall be filled for the unexpired term in the manner prescribed by the laws of Guam.

"(f) No additional compensation shall be paid to any person acting as Governor or Lieutenant Governor who does not also assume the office of Governor or Lieutenant Governor under the provisions of this Act."

Sec. 4. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the second and third sentences of subsection (a) of section 9 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422c(a)) are deleted.

(b) The first sentence of subsection (b) of section 9 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422c(b)) is deleted.

Sec. 5. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 9 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 387; 48 U.S.C. 1422c) is amended by adding immediately after the end of section 9 the following new section 9–A:

"Sec. 9–A. (a) The Secretary of the Interior shall appoint in the Department of the Interior a government comptroller for Guam who shall be under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, shall not be a part of any executive department in the government of Guam, and whose salary and expenses of office shall be paid by the United States from funds otherwise to be covered into the treasury of Guam pursuant to section 30 of this Act.

"(b) The government comptroller shall audit and settle all accounts and claims pertaining to the revenues and receipts from whatever source of the government of Guam and of funds derived from bond issues; and he shall audit and settle, in accordance with law and administrative regulations, all expenditures of funds and property pertaining to the government of Guam including those pertaining to trust funds held by the government of Guam.

"(c) It shall be the duty of the government comptroller to bring to the attention of the Secretary of the Interior and the Governor of Guam all failures to collect amounts due the government, and expenditures of funds or uses of property which are irregular, unnecessary, or not pursuant to law. The audit activities of the government comptroller shall be directed so as to (1) improve the efficiency and economy of programs of the government of Guam, and (2) discharge the responsibility incumbent upon the Congress to insure that the substantial Federal revenues which are covered into the treasury of the government of Guam are properly accounted for and audited.

"(d) The decisions of the government comptroller shall be final except that appeal therefrom may, with the concurrence of the Governor, be taken by the party aggrieved or the head of the department concerned, within one year from the date of the decision, to the Secretary of the Interior, which appeal shall be in writing and shall specifically set forth the particular action of the government comptroller to which exception is taken, with the reasons and the authorities relied upon for reversing such decision.

"(e) If the Governor does not concur in the taking of an appeal to the Secretary, the party aggrieved may seek relief by suit in the District Court of Guam if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction. No later than thirty days following the date of the decision of the Secretary of the Interior, the party aggrieved or the Governor, on behalf of the head of the department concerned, may seek relief by suit in the District Court of Guam, if the claim is otherwise within its jurisdiction.

"(f) The government comptroller is authorized to communicate directly with any person having claims before him for settlement, or with any department officer or person having official relation with his office. He may summon witnesses and administer oaths.

"(g) As soon after the close of each fiscal year as the accounts of said fiscal year may be examined and adjusted, the government comptroller shall submit to the Governor of Guam and the Secretary of the Interior an annual report of the fiscal condition of the government, showing the receipts and disbursements of the various departments and agencies of the government. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit such report along with his comments and recommendations, to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"(h) The government comptroller shall make such other reports as may be required by the Governor of Guam, the Comptroller General of the United States, or the Secretary of the Interior.

"(i) The office and activities of the government comptroller of Guam shall be subject to review by the Comptroller General of the United States, and reports thereon shall be made by him to the Governor, the Secretary of the Interior, and to the Congress.

"(j) All departments, agencies, and establishments shall furnish to the government comptroller such information regarding the powers, duties, activities, organization, financial transactions, and methods of business of their respective offices as he may from time to time require of them; and the government comptroller, or any of his assistants or employees, when duly authorized by him, shall, for the purpose of securing such information, have access to and the right to examine any books, documents, papers, or records of any such department, agency, or establishment."

SEC. 6. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 18 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 388; 48 U.S.C. 1423h) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 18. Regular sessions of the legislature shall be held annually, commencing on the second Monday in January (unless the legislature shall by law fix a different date), and shall continue for such term as the legislature may provide. The Governor may call special sessions of the legislature at any time when in his opinion the public interest may require it. No legislation shall be considered at any special session other than that specified in the call therefor or in any special message by the Governor to the legislature while in such session. All sessions of the legislature shall be open to the public."

SEC. 7. Section 19 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 389; 48 U.S.C. 1423i) is amended by deleting its fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth sentences and by substituting therefor the following: "If, after such reconsideration, two-thirds of all the members of the legislature pass the bill, it shall be a law.".

SEC. 8. (a) Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, subsection (c) of section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d(c)) is repealed.

(b) Effective January 4, 1971, section 26 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 391; 48 U.S.C. 1421d), as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 26. The salaries and travel allowances of the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, the heads of the executive departments, other officers and employees of the government of Guam, and the members of the legislature, shall be paid by the government of Guam at rates prescribed by the laws of Guam."

SEC. 9. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, section 5 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 385; 48 U.S.C. 1421b), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (u):

"(u) The provisions of clause 1 of section 2 of article IV and section 1 of amendment XIV of the Constitution of the United States shall have the same force and effect within the unincorporated territory of Guam as in the United States or in any State of the United States."

SEC. 10. Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, chapter 15 of the General Military Law (70A Stat. 15, 16; 10 U.S.C. 331–334) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section 335:

"SEC. 335. For purposes of this chapter, 'State' includes the unincorporated territory of Guam."

SEC. 11. (a) Section 3 of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384; 48 U.S.C. 1421a), as amended, is further amended by deleting all after the words "Federal Government" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "in all matters not the program responsibility of another Federal department or agency, shall be under the general administrative supervision of the Secretary of the Interior."

(b) Section 28(c) of the Organic Act of Guam (64 Stat. 384, 392; 48 U.S.C. 1421f(c)), as amended, is amended by deleting the words "head of the department or agency designated by the President under section 3 of this Act"; and deleting from the proviso the words "head of such department or agency" and by substituting in each such instance the words "Secretary of the Interior".

SEC. 12. Those provisions necessary to authorize the holding of an election for Governor and Lieutenant Governor on November 3, 1970, shall be effective on January 1, 1970. All other provisions of this Act, unless otherwise expressly provided herein, shall be effective January 4, 1971.

SEC. 13. This Act may be cited as the "Guam Elective Governor Act".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 216), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The primary purpose of S. 449, introduced by Senators Jackson and Burdick, is to provide for the popular election of the Governor and Lieutenant Governor for the territory of Guam. Other purposes which the bill would accomplish are: (1) Create the office of Lieutenant Governor; (2) provide that the salaries and expenses of the office of the executive as well as the legislative branch be paid by the government of Guam; (3) specify the powers, duties, and responsibilities of the Governor; (4) provide a method of recall for removal of the Governor; (5) set out the line of succession in the event the Governor is disabled; (6) create the office of government comptroller and specify the powers, duties, responsibilities, and procedures of that office; (7) provide that the expenses and salaries of the office of the government comptroller shall be paid by the United States from funds to be covered into the treasury of Guam pursuant to section 30 of the Organic Act of Guam, thus resulting in a substantial savings to the Federal Government; (8) extend the privileges and immunities clauses, the due process clause, and the equal protection clause of the U.S. Constitution to the people of Guam; (10) make Guam subject to the general military law of the United States; and (11) make certain technical changes in the organic act.

On October 11, 1966, the Senate passed H.R. 11775, a bill similar to S. 449, providing an elective Governor of Guam. Due to the lateness of the session, it was not possible to take final action on that measure.

BACKGROUND AND NEED

S. 449, as amended, represents a significant forward step in the development of full local self-government in Guam and toward the fulfillment of the political aspirations of its people.

Following World War II and the transfer of administrative responsibility of the unincorporated territory of Guam from the Secretary of the Navy to the Secretary of the Interior the island has made remarkable economic, political, and social progress. The organic act of 1950 (64 Stat. 384, 48 U.S.C. ch. 8A) was the first important step toward the granting of local self-government taken by the Congress. It gave American citizenship to the Guamanians, created a 21-member unicameral legislature, provided for appointment of the Governor by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, directed that locally collected Federal income taxes be covered into the territorial treasury, and turned over to the government of Guam title to much real property located there which the United States owned.

During the consideration of the organic act, members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs advised the Guamanians that additional measures of self-government would be extended to them commensurate with their proven capacities and indications of mature judgment. In line with this, the Congress has enacted several items of significant legislation since 1950, each encouraging local responsibility: Public Law 84–876 made it possible for the government of Guam to collect taxes on post exchange gasoline sales; Public Law 86–316 permits civil suits to be filed against the Government of Guam; Public Law 88–183 gave the government of Guam concurrent jurisdiction with the United States over "parties found, acts performed, and offenses committed" on Federal property in Guam and authorized the transfer to the territorial government certain submerged areas bordering on the island; Public Law 88–170, in authorizing the appropriation of funds to assist Guam in recovering from heavy typhoon damage, provided for the concurrence of the legislature in requests for appropriations made by the Governor; Public Law 88–171 authorized the creation of an urban renewal authority on Guam; and Public Law 89–100 provides that the legislature may determine the salaries of its own members and that these shall be paid by the local rather than the Federal Government. Public Law 89–552 amended the Guam Organic Act to authorize the territorial legislature to provide by law for the election of some or all of its members by election districts.

The present bill is thus the latest in a long series of measures designed to grant the Guamanian people an ever-increasing share in the government of their island. A number of factors make it clear that the time is ripe for this additional step. The people of Guam have now had 17 years experience in electing their own legislature and have demonstrated their capacity for doing so in a responsible manner. The strong two-party political system that exists in Guam is evidence of their political maturity. Except in such emergency cases as the one caused by Typhoon Karen in November 1962, a large portion of the expenses of the government of Guam are borne locally and the expenditure of Guam's tax revenues are fully under local control. Since 1950, moreover, the governorship has become an office of almost exclusively territorial importance. The Governor no longer performs exclusive Federal functions, as he used to, but he does play an important role in local government since he performs all the usual functions of a Governor of one of our States, including those of recommending legislation and vetoing bills which, in his judgment, are improperly or unwisely passed by the legislature. It is the view of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, therefore, that his office should become one whose incumbent is in all respects responsible to the electorate of Guam.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar at this time.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS PROGRAM, EQUIPMENT AND FACILITIES

A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Civil Defense, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Federal contributions program, equipment and facilities, for the quarterly period ended March 31, 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of audit and inspection programs conducted by U.S. agencies in Vietnam during 1966, Department of State, Agency for International Development, Department of Defense, dated May

1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Amendment of Section 2733 of Title 10, United States Code

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 2733 of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the application of local law in determining the effect of claimant's contributory negligence, to clarify the procedure for appeal from certain claims determinations, and to limit the amount of attorney fees thereunder (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of Equal Employment Opportunity Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Commission, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1966 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **PRESIDING OFFICER**:

A joint resolution from the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 9

"Joint resolution relative to federal construction projects

"Whereas, To enable federal agencies to procure the most beneficial contract when letting contracts for construction on federal land, information concerning the proposed construction project should receive wide dissemination; and

Whereas, Many federal agencies do not disseminate such information to the county or counties where the construction is to take place; and

"Whereas, It would be most desirable for federal agencies when letting construction contracts, relating to works of improvement on federal land, to afford the appropriate persons within the county or counties where the construction is to take place to bid on the contracts; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly,* That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, the Congress of the United States, and all federal agencies who let construction contracts relating to improvements or federal land to take such action as may be necessary to inform the residents of the county or counties where the work or improvement is to be performed that construction contracts are being let; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Administrator of General Services, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Calendar S. 422

"Concurrent resolution condemning the burning and desecration of the American flag by irresponsible groups, some of whom mistakenly call themselves American citizens

"Whereas, the General Assembly views with deep concern the burning of the United States Flag and its wanton desecration by irresponsible groups in this country and in fact, the entire world; and

"Whereas, it is noted that this nefarious practice appears to be increasing; and

"Whereas, the General Assembly believes that an immediate effort should be made by the Federal Government to provide speedy and certain punishment for those convicted of burning or otherwise desecrating the Flag of the United States; and

"Whereas, the General Assembly believes that the government of the United States in Washington should do no less, as it is feared that continuation of an open disrespect and defiance of the symbol of our country will have an adverse affect upon the youth of the nation. Now, therefore,

"*Be it resolved* by the Senate, the House of Representatives concurring:

"That the General Assembly of the State of South Carolina places itself on record as condemning the burning of the United States Flag or its desecration in any way, and petitions the Federal Government to institute an active campaign looking to the curbing of such disrespect to our Flag.

"*Be it further resolved* that a copy of this Resolution be forwarded to the President of the Senate of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives in the Congress."

A letter in the nature of a petition from the North Suburban Organization for Fair Housing, Evanston, Ill., signed by Emory G. Davis, executive director, urging that the atomic accelerator be relocated to a State where a fair housing law has been enacted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Ingham County, Ill., Board of Supervisors, relating to the reduction of some Federal expenditures, but urges that said reduction should be confined to those capital programs with particular reference to the Urban Planning Assistance funds of the Department of Housing and Urban Development; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Santa Barbara, Calif., requesting the Congress to establish an oil drilling sanctuary offshore of the city of Santa Barbara and to establish a moratorium for one year on oil leasing in the Santa Barbara Channel; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

RESOLUTION OF RHODE ISLAND GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. Pastore], I present, for appropriate reference, a resolution of the Rhode Island General Assembly memorializing the Congress to provide greater State sanction control over the disbursement of Federal funds to combat air pollution.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Resolution S. 271

Resolution memorializing Congress to provide greater State sanction and disbursement of Federal funds for air pollution purposes

Whereas, The nation recently has become aware of the inherent dangers which air pollution produces; and

Whereas, In accordance with this hazardous situation the federal government has embarked on a progressive program; and

Whereas, Such federal funds should not be earmarked for specific uses by the states prior to appropriation; and

Whereas, The individual states are better equipped and more aware of the specific problems which may be encountered in their own states; and

Whereas, The aims of an air pollution program are indeed applaudable but should not be limited by over-definitive laws; now, therefore be it.

Resolved, That the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations through its general assembly now requests the Congress of the United States to give consideration to this resolution in limiting air pollution legislation whose ends can better be served by state disbursement; and be it further

Resolved, That the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said congress be and they are hereby earnestly requested to use concerted effort to assist the states in their plea for disbursal of federal funds for air pollution control; and the secretary of state is hereby authorized and directed to transmit duly certified copies of this resolution to the senators and representatives from Rhode Island in said Congress.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 588. A bill to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States (Rept. No. 220).

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of May 8, 1967,

Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, reported favorably, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute, on May 8, 1967, the bill (H.R. 6133) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes, and submitted a report (No. 219) thereon which was printed.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

PROTOCOL FOR THE FURTHER PROLONGATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT OF 1958—REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SECRECY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive K, 90th Congress, first session, the Protocol for the Further Prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, done at London, November 14, 1966, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the protocol, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign

Relations, and that the President's message be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The message from the President was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification, I transmit herewith the Protocol for the Further Prolongation of the International Sugar Agreement of 1958, done at London, November 14, 1966.

The protocol was open for signature at London from November 14 to December 30, 1966, inclusive, and was signed in behalf of the United States of America on December 22, 1966.

The purpose of the protocol is to extend the administrative organization created by the International Sugar Agreement of 1958 through December 31, 1968.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the protocol and give its advice and consent to its ratification.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Robert H. McBride, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and

R. Peter Straus, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services I report favorably the nominations of six officers of the Army for special assignments in the grade of lieutenant general. I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army); Maj. Gen. Harry Herndon Critz, U.S. Army; Maj. Gen. Frederick Carlton Weyand, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army); Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, U.S. Army; Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army); and Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army), to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant generals while so serving.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 549 appointments in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant and 37 appointments in the Regular Army in grades of first and second lieutenant. Since these names have already appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

William D. Abraham, and sundry other cadets, U.S. Air Force Academy, for appointment to the Regular Air Force;

William M. Gares, Jr., and Joe M. Sanders, Jr., for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States;

Robert D. Hunt, and William J. Nelson, Jr., midshipmen of the U.S. Naval Academy, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States; and

Michael S. Baldwin, and sundry other distinguished military and scholarship students of ROTC, for appointment in the regular Army of the United States.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. MONRONEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated April 20, 1967, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. Aiken):

S. 1703. A bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to exclude from such Act contracts with the Post Office Department, the principal purpose of which is the transportation, handling, or delivery of the mails; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Carlson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND (by request):

S. 1704. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 1491, to authorize the Court of Claims to implement its judgments for compensation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1705. A bill to authorize the U.S. District Court for the District of New Hampshire to hold court at Manchester; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1706. A bill to provide that certain highways extending from Laredo, Tex., to the point where United States Highway 81 crosses the border between North Dakota and Canada shall be known collectively as the "Pan American Highway"; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1707. A bill to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1708. A bill to provide for the sharing with the States of one-half of the revenues derived from Federal excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1709. A bill for the relief of Antonio Martin Ruiz del Castillo; and

S. 1710. A bill for the relief of Dr. Luis Cabrera; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Smathers when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1711. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MONDALE:

S. 1712. A bill for the relief of Vittorina Danieli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONDALE (for himself and Mr. Burdick):

S. 1713. A bill to amend title VII of the Housing Act of 1961 to authorize financial assistance for pilot projects to develop and demonstrate improved methods for preventing, removing, and controlling pollution in public lakes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1714. A bill for the relief of Harvey E. Ward; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1715. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Yarborough when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1716. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, and re-enacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, to provide for payment by handler assessments of part of the administrative costs of the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. PROXMIRE (for himself, Mr. Mansfield, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Percy, Mr. Talmadge, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Moss, Mr. Young of North Dakota, Mr. Miller, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McGee, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Bible, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Dominick):

S. 1717. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit certain property to be declared excess or exchanged with other Federal agencies whenever its remaining storage or shelf life is too short to justify its retention, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Proxmire when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1718. A bill for the relief of Laszlo Heincz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGEE:

S. 1719. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the same benefits for employees of public hospitals with respect to certain pensions and profit-sharing plans as those presently provided for employees of private nonprofit hospitals, other charitable organizations, and public and private schools; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1720. A bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1721. A bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act with respect to the payment of premiums in connection with the insurance of mortgages on certain properties owned by servicemen; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1722. A bill to amend the wheat acreage allotment provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 1723. A bill to amend section 175 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to include expenditures for the installation of tile drains as soil and water conservation expenditures which may be deducted under such section; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH):

S. 1724. A bill to prohibit trading in Irish potato futures on commodity exchanges; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KENNEDY of New York (for himself and Mr. JAVITS):

S. 1725. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KENNEDY of New York when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. BROOKE, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CLARK, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DODD, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. ERVIN, Mr. FANNIN, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. LAUSCHE, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER, Mr. MORSE, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MUNDT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. PEARSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. SYMINGTON, Mr. TALMADGE, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. YARBOROUGH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1726. A bill to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARTKE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ANDERSON (for himself and Mr. MONTOYA):

S. 1727. A bill to authorize the consolidation and use of funds arising from judgments in favor of the Apache Tribe of the Mescalero Reservation and of each of its constituent groups; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BREWSTER):

S. 1728. A bill for the relief of Young Kwon Chun and his wife, Dong Seung Chun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1729. A bill for the relief of Rogelio Alejandro Sumagit; and

S. 1730. A bill for the relief of Young Hai Lim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

S. 1731. A bill to amend title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. MORSE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CARLSON:

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of Mah Bing Shoung (Lee Nyin); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RESOLUTIONS

AUTHORITY TO PRINT AS A SENATE DOCUMENT A COMPILATION ENTITLED "HOW TO OBTAIN DEATH CERTIFICATES"

Mr. DIRKSEN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 117); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 117

Resolved, That the compilation entitled "How to Obtain Death Certificates", prepared by the American Law Division of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, shall be printed as a Senate document.

TO NAME THE NEW SENATE OFFICE BUILDING THE "STYLES BRIDGES BUILDING"

Mr. COTTON submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 118); which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 118

Resolved, That the Senate Office Building constructed under authority of the Act of June 25, 1948 (62 Stat. 1028), is hereby designated, and shall be known, as the "Styles Bridges Office Building."

SEC. 2. Any law, rule, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which reference is made to the building to which the first section of this Act applies shall be held to refer to such building under and by the name of the "Styles Bridges Office Building."

STAR ROUTE CARRIERS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the 89th Congress passed Public Law 89-286, known as the Service Contract Act of 1965. The 1965 act requires that employees of contractors of the U.S. Government be paid wages comparable to those set by the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Section 7 of the Service Contract Act specifically mentions seven exemptions from the act. The Secretary of Labor determined that these exemptions did not include star route carriers of the U.S. mails. There are about 12,000 star route carriers with whom the Post Office Department has contracts. These contracts were negotiated on a bid basis—mostly with small contractors who employ one or two drivers.

There are approximately 4,000 of these contracts which expire July 1, 1967. If these contracts are renegotiated on the basis that the star route carrier would necessarily have to pay his driver 3 to 4 dollars an hour, the small contractor would be out of business.

Mr. President, this determination by the Secretary of Labor caused much concern among postal officials, star route carriers, and I believe the public in general. Therefore, in the April 22, 1967, Federal Register, the Secretary of Labor announced:

> Insofar as such contracts are concerned (but not in other applications) such determinations are hereby withdrawn until further notice published in the Federal Register.

Mr. President, this announcement by the Secretary of Labor no doubt will relieve the situation for star route contracts up for immediate expiration, but is no guarantee that those contracts expiring in 1968 or 1969 would have the same consideration.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing a bill, for me and the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] which would exclude star route carriers from such acts of the Service Contract Act of 1965.

Mr. President, I suggest that Senators who wish to offer their names as cosponsors of the bill may do so later on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1703) to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to exclude from such act contracts with the Post Office Department, the principal purpose of which is the transportation, handling, or delivery of the mails, introduced by Mr. CARLSON (for himself and Mr. AIKEN), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

A WEST COAST ARM OF THE U.S. CUSTOMS COURT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, the growth of international trade through the ports of the west coast has been truly phenomenal. The Los Angeles-Long Beach area, in particular, has become a new and growing center of trade between the United States and the rest of the world.

Today, Los Angeles is second only to the city of New York in the amount of customs collections. During the past 21 years, customs duties collected in the Los Angeles district have increased almost 800 percent, from $18,734,000 in 1945 to $178,980,158 in 1966. This represents a rate of increase double that for the country as a whole.

The size of these collection figures clearly evidence the tremendous number of imports that daily enter the United States through the Los Angeles-Long Beach harbor. In 1935, there were approximately 7,000 formal dutiable entries; today, there are over 100,000 formal entries being made in Los Angeles at a rate of 500 entries per day, or one entry per minute.

With the increasing volume of importations, U.S. Customs Court litigation which arises on the west coast has also increased proportionately. The backlog of cases is most substantial in Los Angeles where the principal offices of the major law firms handling the bulk of west coast litigation before the Customs Court are located. In fact, the workload has increased so substantially that the Customs Court has been forced to schedule a third trial term to be held in Los Angeles, in addition to the two regular sessions held annually on the west coast.

This severe congestion of Customs Court cases, however is not only due to increased imports on the west coast, but to the antiquated procedures of the court itself. The office of the clerk and the records of the U.S. Customs Court are, by law, located only in New York City. The law requires that pleadings filed at the port of entry where the importations enter the United States must be forwarded to the clerk of the court in New York, where the official file relating to

each case is kept and prepared. This law further requires that all of the official files and documents of the court be retained in New York except for a very limited period prior to the actual circuit sessions.

These procedures are particularly distressing and inconvenient to hundreds of west coast litigants and their counsels. They do not have ready access to the official court papers and it is oftentimes necessary to travel the extensive distance back and forth to New York in order to properly prepare a case for trial and ultimate disposition. Because of this outdated procedure and the fantastic growth of imports, Customs Court litigation on the west coast is today experiencing unreasonable delays and undue hardships and congestion.

The operation of the U.S. Customs Court must be modernized if it is to meet effectively the demands raised by today's complex import problems. The first step in this direction must be the creation of a permanent arm of the court on the west coast—a clerk of the court permanently located in the city of Los Angeles. Such an office would greatly facilitate the work of the court and the disposition of pending litigation. The Chief Justice of the U.S. Customs Court—the Honorable Paul Rao—has publicly supported such an extension. Leading west coast customs attorneys and civic leaders have written to me requesting the establishment of such a permanent office for the court. One leading customs attorney in Los Angeles, Miss Marjorie M. Shostak, has gone so far as to suggest the location of such an office in a recent letter:

> Since the United States Customs Court has its own quarters in Los Angeles, consisting of a Courtroom, Judge's chambers, and secretary's office, in the new Federal Building at 300 North Los Angeles Street, the Office of the Clerk of the Court should be at the same location. I believe there is vacant space now available on the same floor of that building on the same corridor as the Courtroom, in which the Clerk's Office could be located.

I believe that the establishment of a permanent Customs Court clerk in Los Angeles will help alleviate the congestion that has been created by this increased amount of goods entering the western ports, and will provide a quicker and more just customs operation. Such an office would permit retention of all west coast files on the west coast where the counsels and litigants will be able to complete much of the preliminary work necessary to the prompt disposition of customs cases. Adequate space for such an extension is available in Los Angeles, and I intend to see a Customs Court office located there.

Mr. President, I am therefore introducing legislation which would amend section 251 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles. This proposal will help serve the needs of both the litigants and the court itself in responding to the challenge of increased trade on the west coast.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the Record. I further ask unanimous consent that sundry letters and articles supporting the need for such legislation be placed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and sundry letters and articles will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1707) to authorize the U.S. Customs Court to maintain an office at the city of Los Angeles, introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1707

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last paragraph of section 251 of title 28, United States Code, relating to offices of the United States Customs Court, is amended by adding the following new sentence: "The court shall also maintain an office, to which it shall assign a deputy clerk, at the City of Los Angeles."

The sundry letters and articles presented by Mr. Kuchel are as follows:

Law Offices Stein & Shostak,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 4, 1967.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: For some years, interest has developed on the West Coast in the possibility of having a permanent office of the Clerk of the United States Customs Court established in Los Angeles, to afford to West Coast litigants and their counsel more reasonable access to official court papers relating to their pending cases.

The office of the Clerk of the United States Customs Court is located in New York City and the records of the Court are kept there, in accordance with the law (28 U.S.C. Sec. 251). Pleadings filed at the port of entry where the importations enter the United States are now forwarded to the Clerk of the Court at New York, where the official file relating to each case is prepared. Thereafter, the files are normally retained at New York, except for a very limited period of about 30 days prior to circuit hearings, when these records are available for inspection at the port of entry. During this period, however, Customs Counsel are usually engaged in trial matters before the Court at Los Angeles or other West Coast ports and do not have an opportunity to examine them. This prevents litigants and counsel on the West Coast from having ready access to the official court papers, for preparation of the cases for trial and for ultimate disposition.

As the official court papers are not normally required at New York, after the case file has been prepared, until after the cases have been tried and submitted, the establishment of an office of the Clerk of the Court at Los Angeles, staffed with personnel familiar with the handling of the Court papers, would permit retention of West Coast files on the West Coast, where the parties to the suit and their counsel would have a more adequate opportunity to examine them and prepare the cases for trial. We believe the disposition of pending cases would be expedited by this procedure.

As you know, the growth of international trade through the Port of Los Angeles has been phenomenal. As pointed out by William R. Knoke, District Director of Customs at Los Angeles, last month, in an address to the Foreign Trade Association of Southern California, during the past 10 years Customs duties collected locally increased almost 800%, from $18,734,000 in 1945 to $165,739,000 in 1965, double the rate of increase for the country as a whole, during the same period. There has also been a tremendous increase in the number of dutiable entries made at the port of Los Angeles, from approximately 7,000 formal entries in 1935 to over 100,000 formal entries per year in 1966, with entries now being filed in the Los Angeles Customs District at the rate of 500 entries per day, or one entry per minute.

With the increasing volume of importations, U.S. Customs Court litigation which arises on the West Coast has also increased proportionately. The increased case load on the West Coast has been most substantial in Los Angeles, where the principal offices of the major law firms handling the bulk of West Coast litigation before the Customs Court, are located. In fact, the workload has increased so substantially that the United States Customs Court has scheduled a third trial term to be held at West Coast ports during 1967, in addition to the two regular sessions held annually on the West Coast in recent years.

It would greatly facilitate the work of the Court and the disposition of pending litigation if an office of the Clerk of the Court were established in Los Angeles, to handle the large volume of records which must now necessarily be transported back and forth from the Court's headquarters in New York City for each court session scheduled on the West Coast.

We understand that space is available in the New Federal Building at 300 North Los Angeles Street, adjacent to the United States Customs Courtroom, for such facilities to be established.

In view of the needs of West Coast litigants to have these documents more readily available, and the benefits to the Court as well as the litigants, we hope that you will lend your support to insuring that authorization for establishment of an office of the Clerk of the U.S. Customs Court in Los Angeles, during the next fiscal year, will be approved by Congress.

Sincerely,

Marjorie M. Shostak,
Chairman, Committee on Import Legislation and Customs Problems, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

Glad & Tuttle, Attorneys at Law,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 15, 1967.

Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: I wish to indicate my enthusiastic support to Miss Shostak's letter to you dated February 4, 1967, as Chairman, Committee on Import Legislation and Customs Problems, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, relative to budgeting for a permanent office of the Clerk of the United States Customs Court to be located at Los Angeles.

The need for such an office is apparent by the marked increase in the number of protests and appeals that have been filed on importations covering the ports west of the Mississippi, and particularly on the West Coast.

I would further recommend that in the event this Clerk's office is established at Los Angeles, that the court papers for all entries west of the Mississippi River be filed or kept at this Clerk's office.

Not only is the present set-up slow and time-consuming, but adds an additional burden on the local customs personnel who are under the District Director of Customs.

Such an office of the Clerk of the Court at Los Angeles would greatly facilitate the work of the Court as well as counsel for the various litigants. Therefore, I respectfully urge that you lend your support towards the establishment of an office of the Clerk of the United States Customs Court in Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

Edward N. Glad.

State of California, Southern
California World Trade Center
Authority,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 6, 1967.
Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: This agency has been aware for some time of the interest which has developed on the West Coast in the possibility of establishing a permanent office for a Clerk of the U.S. Customs Court. It is felt that the advantages to business people and for attorneys operating in the western United States, which would result from such a move, would far outweigh any effort and costs which might be incurred in accomplishing this.

Some time ago, the undersigned along with representatives of several of the foreign trade organizations had a brief discussion with a representative of General Services Administration in which it was acknowledged that consideration was being given to the provisions of space for this facility. In addition, we have been advised by the District Director of Customs at Los Angeles of the phenomenal growth in entries and customs duties noted in this area in the past 20 years. The rate of approximately 500 entries per day in the Los Angeles Customs District alone would to us indicate that the volume of activity in the Customs Court would warrant the maintenance of a permanent Clerk in Los Angeles.

It would be greatly appreciated by the members of this Authority who represent communities throughout Southern California if you would lend your support to the request for establishment of an office of the Clerk of the U.S. Customs Court in Los Angeles.

Sincerely,

R. D. Kleist,
Chairman.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 8, 1967]

Los Angeles Now in Second Place in Customs Collections

Los Angeles outdistanced Detroit and moved into second place in U.S. customs collections last year, the Bureau of Customs reported Tuesday.

Collections of $178,980,158 were rung up in the Los Angeles district, while Detroit slipped to third place with $171,953,866.

The Los Angeles area figure was up 15.3% from the 1965 total of $155,250,410. The Detroit figure was down 3.3% from $177,865,810.

New York's seaport, as usual, headed the list with a total of $801,723,219 for 1966, up 9.98% from $728,957,142 in the previous year.

New York's airport, took fourth place in both years. Its 1966 total was $157,202,611, up 21.4% from $129,520,330 in 1965.

Los Angeles' gain for the year was greater than the national average. Total 1966 collections for the United States were a record $2,604,890,760, up 14.6% from $2,272,472,949 in 1965.

[From the Commercial News, Jan. 2, 1967]

Customs transactions for week ending Dec. 23, 1966

	Los Angeles	Airport	Total
Collections			
Dec. 23, 1966	$2, 675, 251. 31	$294, 161. 10	$2, 969, 412. 41
Previous year	1, 579, 677. 91	143, 550. 01	1, 723, 227. 92
Export shipments:			
Current week	2, 229	2, 939	5, 168
Previous year	1, 834	2, 646	4, 480

Customs transactions for week ending Dec. 23, 1966—Continued

	Los Angeles	Airport	Total
Entries:			
Dutiable:			
Current week	$1, 877	$399	$2, 276
Previous year	1, 170	281	1, 451
Free:			
Current week	174	139	313
Previous year	102	113	215
Warehouse:			
Current week	96	0	96
Previous year	54	0	54
Warehouse withdrawals:			
Current week	304	12	316
Previous year	230	6	236

NOTES

Total entries, Los Angeles/Long Beach:	
Current week	2, 451
Previous year	1, 556
Total informal, Los Angeles/Long Beach:	
Current week	371
Previous year	485
Total entries, international airport:	
Current week	550
Previous year	400
Total informal entries:	
Current week	607
Previous year	450

FEDERAL-STATE TAX SHARING

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, for the last 2 years or so there has been considerable discussion regarding the merits and demerits of tax sharing. As evidence of the interest this discussion has engendered, a large number of bills have been introduced both in the House and in the Senate to provide various formulae under which the Federal Government would share part of its tax revenues with the State and local governments. Some of these measures share a portion of the individual income tax. Others share a portion of total Federal taxes.

Some of these bills attach conditions which States must adhere to in order to become eligible for a Federal payment. Others avoid restricting the State's right to use the money, leaving it solely to the good judgment of the State legislatures to determine how the additional revenue provided through tax sharing would be utilized.

In the matter of taxation we have been faced for years with the question of State tax structures overlapping the Federal tax structure and the Federal tax structure overlapping the State tax structures. Broadly speaking, the Federal Government has tended to rely most heavily on income taxes to provide its needed revenue. State governments, on the other hand, typically look to excise taxes and sales taxes for their principal revenue needs.

Against this background, I believe it would be more appropriate for the Federal Government, if it is going to seriously consider tax sharing, to carefully weigh the advantages and merit of sharing with the States a portion of the Federal revenue derived from our principal excise taxes. I refer specifically to the excise tax on alcoholic beverages and the excise tax on tobacco products. These Federal excise taxes together accounted for nearly $6 billion of Federal tax collections in fiscal year 1966.

It is my thought that sharing excise tax revenues for these sources will reflect the historic reliance State governments have placed on direct taxes for their revenues. It would also retain the current structure under which total Federal income tax collections are used for Federal Government needs.

This has a distinct advantage in my opinion. As we all know, the income tax has been held up as a great tool for stimulating or retarding the national economy. We should not do anything which will hamper our ability to adapt the Federal income tax to anticyclical needs when the time is on us to use it for such purposes. If revenues from the Federal income tax were shared with the States and we found it necessary to cut individual income taxes to spur a lagging economy, the share of revenue allocated to the States would be diminished under a tax-sharing scheme based on the income tax. States, seeing their revenue sources cut, would have to react by imposing additional taxes of their own in order to meet their expenditure programs. To the extent that they would raise taxes, it would offset the stimulating effect of the Federal tax cuts.

Conversely, if we were to increase Federal income taxes in a time of high prosperity with a view toward balancing the Federal budget, allocations to the States would go up. There would be less revenue available to apply against the Federal debt and we might very well find States cutting their own taxes because of the increased Federal payments they would be getting. Once again, the objective of the income tax change could be thwarted.

If we are to have tax sharing, and I believe there is much to commend this sort of a program, then I believe it should be based on an allocation which would retain the most flexibility from a tax policy and economic standpoint.

For that reason, I am today introducing a bill which provides that one-half of the revenue derived from the Federal sumptuary taxes on alcoholic beverages and tobacco products would be allocated to the States in proportion to the sales of these products in each of the States. Under my bill, there would be no conditions, no strings, no restrictions on the eligibility of a State to participate in sharing these revenues or in their use of their share of these Federal taxes.

I have talked with the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the distinguished junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long], and he advises me of his hope that the work program of the Committee on Finance for 1967 can include a hearing into the feasibility of tax sharing. I believe the advantages of tax sharing based on excise taxes can be demonstrated at this hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1708) to provide for the sharing with the States of one-half of the revenues derived from Federal excise taxes on alcohol and tobacco, introduced by Mr. Smathers, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS TO THE FEDERAL COAL MINE SAFETY ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act to provide improved safety for the 100,000 persons who work underground in the hazardous coal mining industry.

When Congress enacted the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act Amendments of 1965 (Public Law 89-376), it was provided that "the Secretary of the Interior shall conduct a special study to determine the sufficiency of the present safety requirements of the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act." As a result of this study, certain inadequacies in the present law were revealed and the Secretary of the Interior recommended that the act be amended to better protect mineworkers from injury and loss of life. The bill which I am introducing is a result of the Secretary's recommendations for amendments to strengthen the act.

Under the present law, the requirement for roof support in a mine omits one of the most important areas—that of the face of the mine. This is where most of the work is performed and where several men are usually working, making it a potential major disaster area in the event of a sudden roof collapse. Bureau of Mines injury statistics for 1965 indicate that 63.5 percent of the roof and rib fatalities occurred in this face area. During the period of the Secretary of Interior's study—from March 26, 1966, to January 31, 1967—there were inspections of 3,971 mines. Of these, 2,920 mines, or almost 75 percent, lacked proper roof support or were following a hazardous practice in some part of the mine. Under the bill which I am introducing, this source of potential disaster will be averted.

The law also makes no provision for ventilation at the face area, unless gas is present. A stipulated amount of ventilation is required at the last crosscut, but this may be as much as 200 feet from the actual working face of the mine. Because gas is generally released at the working face and should be diluted immediately, some device is necessary to convey the air from the last crosscut to the work site, if ignition or a possible explosion is to be avoided.

Ventilation problems are also presented in those mines where the air current is circulated from one section to another as a continuous current because gas released in one section is carried into the next section. During the study period, 212 sections of mines were found which were not separately ventilated. The proposed bill requires such separate ventilation in gassy mines in addition to requiring ventilation to the face of every working place.

The bill also requires that idle or abandoned sections of a mine be inspected before persons work in or enter into them. These sections are not ordinarily maintained as well as actively worked areas and they deteriorate rapidly causing potential hazards to workmen who might have to enter them.

Coal mining is at best a hazardous profession and those men who work underground are entitled to adequate protection provided by a safe place to work. Our Nation has experienced too many mining disasters to avoid taking the opportunities where we can to provide strengthened safety measures, such as those in this bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bill (S. 1715) to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act, introduced by Mr. Yarborough, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1715

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act (66 Stat. 692; 30 U.S.C. 471) is amended as follows:

(a) Subsection 209(c) is revised to read as follows:

"(c) Roof Support. (1) The roof and ribs of all active underground roadways, travelways, and working places in a mine shall be adequately supported to protect persons from falls of roof or ribs.

"(2) A roof-control plan suitable to the roof conditions and mining system of each mine shall be adopted and set out in printed form showing the type and spacing of supports approved by the Bureau of Mines.

"(3) All persons shall be prohibited from advancing beyond the last permanent support unless temporary support is provided."

(b) In subsection 209(d)(1), after the first sentence insert:

"In a gassy mine each mechanized mining section shall be ventilated with a separate split of intake air directed by overcasts or undercasts."

(c) In subsection 209(d)(1), after the present second sentence ending with the words "flammable or harmful gases" insert:

"Line brattice or other suitable device shall be installed from the last open crosscut to a point near the face to assure positive airflow to the face of every active working place."

(d) In subsection 209(d)(11), after the third sentence insert:

"Idle or abandoned workings shall be inspected for gas and other dangerous conditions by a certified foreman or fireboss immediately before other employees are permitted to enter or work in such places."

STOCKPILE DONATION IMPROVEMENT PROPOSAL

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, last year I introduced legislation to amend our Federal property donation laws so that stockpiled medical supplies could be disposed of before they had to be destroyed. I am very pleased again today to introduce an expanded, improved version of this legislation that corrects many of the weaknesses contained in last year's bill.

Under existing law Federal property can be given away only if it is declared to be surplus to Federal needs. If this is the case, the property may be donated to public or nonprofit private State and local organizations.

Some items have to be destroyed because they never become surplus to Federal needs. They simply lose their efficacy. This is the case with stockpiled medical supplies. Substantial amounts of these supplies, which are stored in more than 2,500 packaged disaster hospitals, have short shelf lives. They cannot be declared surplus because they are needed for use in case of emergency until this shelf life expires. Yet when they lose all of their value to the Federal Government they also are worthless for donation purposes.

For example, in 1966 the Public Health Service had to destroy $16 million worth of these supplies. In 1965 the dollar value of worthless goods was even greater—$19 million. Over a 2-year span, $35 million in precious medical supplies had to be destroyed because they could not, under the law, be donated before they lost their value. This is a national disgrace in a time of soaring medical expenses.

The bill I am introducing today for myself and Senators Mansfield, Metcalf, Fulbright, Jordan of Idaho, Percy, Talmadge, Moss, Young of North Dakota, Miller, Burdick, Long of Missouri, McGee, Kennedy of New York, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Tydings, Cannon, Bennett, Thurmond, Dominick, Mondale, Ribicoff, and Bible, will change this situation. It will permit the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to donate stockpiled medical supplies that have a short remaining shelf life. There are literally hundreds of State and local hospitals and other medical organizations that could benefit from such donations. It will also permit medical supplies stockpiled by the Federal Government overseas to be donated to certain organizations eligible to receive assistance under sections 214(b) and 607 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. This includes hospitals outside the United States that have been founded or sponsored by American citizens—hospitals that desperately need medical supplies.

I have made a number of improvements in this legislation as a result of suggestions made in a report to the chairman of the Senate Government Operations Committee by the General Accounting Office.

First, the general definition of excess property has been amended to include all items whose remaining shelf life is too short to justify continued retention by the Federal Government. This means that the Government will be able to dispose of other materials, such as paint, which have short shelf lives before the shelf life expires and they have to be destroyed.

Second, my revised bill would permit more ready transfer of stockpiled medical supplies by allowing the Public Health Service to exchange unlike medical items with other Government agencies without having to repurchase the same items or place an appropriate amount in the miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury. The bill would also allow a transfer of medical supplies between agencies with the proceeds to be used for the purchase of other medical supplies needed by the transferring agency. This provision should facilitate Federal use of medical supplies before shelf life expires.

Third, if my proposal is enacted, foreign excess property could be returned to this country for exchange or donation as excess or surplus property. Under present law this foreign property must be disposed of overseas, often at great loss to the U.S. Government.

Mr. President, this bill will give the Federal officials working with stockpiled goods the authority they badly need to make our surplus exchange and disposal programs more effective and efficient. It will result in the maximum use of valuable and, in many cases, lifegiving supplies purchased with tax dollars. But, above all, it will make federally stockpiled medical supplies more readily available at a time when medical costs are soaring—the very supplies which are now being destroyed because of a loophole in the Federal law.

I ask unanimous consent that the Comptroller General's report on last year's bill as well as the text of this year's bill be included at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Comptroller General's report and the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1717) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to permit certain property to be declared excess or exchanged with other Federal agencies whenever its remaining storage or shelf life is too short to justify its retention, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Proxmire (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1717

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That paragraph (e) of section 3 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 472), is amended by inserting (1) immediately after Federal agency and by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "or (2) the remaining storage or shelf life of which is determined by the head of such agency to be of too short duration to justify continued retention of such property for possible use by such agency."

Sec. 2. (a) Section 203 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(p) (1) Whenever the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (referred to hereinafter in this subsection as the 'Secretary') determines that the remaining storage or shelf life of any medical materials or supplies stored for national emergency purposes pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act, as amended (50 U.S.C. 98 a–h), or the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2251–2297), is of too short a duration to justify their continued retention for national emergency purposes and that their transfer or disposal would be in the interest of the United States, such materials or supplies shall be considered for the purposes of section 202 of this Act to be excess property. Upon agreement between the Secretary and the head of any other Federal agency, such excess medical materials or supplies may be transferred at their fair value or exchanged for other medical materials or supplies having a comparable fair value and the proceeds from any transfers may be credited to the current applicable appropriation or fund and be available only for the purchase of such medical materials or supplies. If such materials or supplies are not transferred to, or exchanged with, any other Federal agency pursuant to section 202 of this Act or an agreement as provided in the preceding sentence, they shall be made available for disposal pursuant to this section as surplus property. Whenever practicable, the Secretary shall make such determination at such time as to insure that such medical materials or supplies can be disposed of in compliance with this subsection in sufficient time to permit their use before their shelf life expires and they are rendered unfit for human use.

"(2) Whenever the storage of shelf life of any medical materials or supplies stored for national emergency purposes, pursuant to the Acts referred to in paragraph (1) of this subsection, has been extended as the result of retesting, the Secretary may make as to such materials or supplies the determination described in paragraph (1) within thirty days after the date on which the storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies has been extended.

"(3) The Secretary shall inform the recipients of medical materials or supplies made available for donation pursuant to this subsection of the estimated remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies, and whether the original estimated storage life thereof has been extended as the result of retesting.

"(4) The United States shall not be responsible for the safety, freshness, or effectiveness of any medical materials or supplies donated pursuant to this subsection, and the Secretary shall inform all recipients of such materials or supplies of that fact."

(b) Section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 512), is amended by—

(1) Inserting, immediately after the section number "Sec. 402.", the subsection designation "(a)";

(2) Inserting after the words, "Foreign excess property" in the first sentence thereof the words "not disposed of under subsections (b) and (c) of this section";

(3) Striking out in the first sentence thereof the clause designations "(a)" and "(b)", and inserting in lieu thereof the clause designations "(1)" and "(2)", respectively; and

(4) Adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe pursuant to this subsection, any executive agency having in any foreign country any medical materials or supplies not disposed of under subsection (c) of this section, which, if situated within the United States would be available for donation pursuant to section 203(p) of this Act, may donate such materials or supplies without cost (except for costs of care and handling), for use in any foreign country, to non-profit medical or health organizations, including those qualified to receive assistance under sections 214(b) and 607 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended (22 U.S.C. 2174(b) and 2357)."

(c) Under such regulations as the Administrator shall prescribe pursuant to this subsection, any foreign excess property may be returned to the United States for handling as excess or surplus property under the provisions of sections 202 and 203 of this Act whenever the head of the executive agency concerned determines that it is in the interest of the United States to do so.

The Comptroller General's report, presented by Mr. Proxmire, is as follows:

Comptroller General of the
United States,
Washington, D.C., July 13, 1966.

Hon. John L. McClellan,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, U.S. Senate

Dear Mr. Chairman: By letter of May 23, 1966, you requested our views on S. 3328, 89th Congress, entitled "A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the disposal of certain medical materials and supplies whenever the remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies is too short to justify their retention, and for other purposes."

We are in favor of the general objectives of the bill, but we have the following comments which we believe should be brought to the attention of the Committee for its consideration.

Section (a) of the bill would add a new subsection 203(p)(1) to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (40 U.S.C. 484) which would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make determinations as to whether the remaining storage or shelf life of any medical materials or supplies stored for national emergency purposes is of *too short* a duration to justify their continued retention. The Secretary also would be required by this section to make such determinations *at such times* as to insure that such medical materials or supplies can be *disposed of before their shelf life expires* and they are rendered *unfit for human use.* Further, the Secretary pursuant to this section would be required to notify the recipients of the medical materials or supplies available for donation, of the estimated remaining storage or shelf life of such materials or supplies, and whether the estimated storage life thereof has been extended as a result of retesting.

In order to accomplish what we believe is or should be the primary purpose of the legislation—*use first in the Federal establishment if possible*—the language relating to excess medical materials and supplies, in our opinion, should be clarified to assure that the determinations of excess are not required to be based on imminent spoilage of the materials.

In our opinion, the proposed legislation should more clearly permit or endorse utilization of the Federal establishment's peacetime consumption to rotate items stockpiled for national emergencies. We believe that the Secretary should be permitted to make single determinations, on an individual item basis, that deterioration and disposal losses would be reduced by (1) transfer of the oldest quantities to other Federal agencies for use in their current peacetime programs and (2) replacement of the stockpiles with fresh stock.

Associated with the deterioration problem are the legal requirements of the Economy Act of June 30, 1932 (31 U.S.C. 686) which have hindered Public Health Service rotation programs with other Government agencies. In this connection, in our report on actions being taken to achieve greater utilization of limited-life and long-supply items in the civic defense medical stockpile, February 17, 1966, B–133038, we discussed a decision of the Comptroller General (41 Comp. Gen. 671) dated April 12, 1962, which pointed out that a plan proposed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which would have allowed the Public Health Service to exchange unlike medical items with other Government agencies without having to repurchase the same items or to place an appropriate amount in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury was not in accordance with section 601 of the Economy Act. The Comptroller General recognized the general merit of the proposal and recommended that the matter be presented to the Congress for the purpose of obtaining specific authorizing legislation. We believe that enactment of such authorizing legislation would enable increased rotation of Public Health Service civil defense medical stocks subject to deterioration with other Government agencies and, therefore, decrease the potential losses from disposing of such medical stocks. This proposed legislation, however, would not authorize the plan proposed by the Secretary and considered in our decision of April 12, 1962.

The secondary purpose of the legislation, in our opinion, should be to effect donation to public institutions or other authorized recipients before the material becomes unfit for use. Where the current requirement of other Federal agencies is too low to permit effective rotation of stock-piled medical materials, the Secretary should in these instances make periodic determinations that the remaining storage or shelf life of the oldest quantities is too short to justify continued retention for national emergency purposes. Based on imminent spoilage, these quantities should be declared surplus property at such time as to insure disposal before the material is unfit for use.

However, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should in our opinion, be given a certain amount of flexibility in complying with the requirements of the bill as it relates to medical stocks subject to deterioration in its Packaged Disaster Hospitals required to be disposed of as surplus property.

The Public Health Service had 2,680 Packaged Disaster Hospitals as of February 1966, of which 2,266 were in storage sites throughout the country, 107 were on loan to the States for demonstration and training purposes, and 307 were in medical depots. Each of the assembled Packaged Disaster Hospitals contained from 288 to 295 separate items of supplies and equipment packed in 354 to 372 cases. Of these items about 20 were dated items and were packed in about six cases. The dated items had expiration dates ranging from 18 months to 10 years from the date of manufacture.

It may not be practicable in all instances to dispose of an individual item in an individual Packaged Disaster Hospital. For example, of the 20 dated items in each Packaged Disaster Hospital, the item with the lowest total dollar value was penicillin—200 units valued at $14. If withdrawal of the penicillin from a Packaged Disaster Hospital in an isolated location was not done in connection with a replacement or inspection program, the cost associated with such withdrawal might make the disposal economically impracticable.

At the present time, the Public Health Service is not replacing any of the deteriorated items in the Packaged Disaster Hospitals because of a Bureau of the Budget freeze on the funds appropriated for this purpose. Of the total value of items in the civil defense medical stockpile subject to deterioration, about $10 million was estimated by the Public Health Service to be applicable to antibiotics which when procured had a stated shelf life of five years. It is the policy of the Public Health Service to retain "outdated" antibiotics in the civil defense medical depots as long as periodic tests by the Food and Drug Administration indicate no significant loss of potency or evidence of deterioration. A PHS official has informed us that usually the shelf life of the antibiotics after testing by the Food and Drug Administration has been extended and in some cases for as much as 10 years past their original shelf life.

We have been further informed by a PHS official that about $5 million worth of the antibiotics have shelf lives that have not expired and about $5 million worth of antibiotics have original shelf lives which have expired of which about $4 million has been tested and the shelf life extended and about $1 million is due for testing.

Therefore, disposal of antibiotics to recipients prior to or after expiration of their original shelf life could result in disposal of items which could still have a remaining relatively long useful life. Also, if funds were not made available for replacement of the antibiotics disposed of, the Packaged Disaster Hospitals would not have the necessary antibiotics for use in the event of a national emergency. Accordingly, we believe that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should have a certain amount of latitude in determination of the policies and procedures for disposal of certain medical stocks subject to deterioration.

H.R. 15210, the companion bill to S. 3328, expands the general definition of excess property (40 U.S.C. 472(e)), to include any property under the control of any Federal agency when the remaining storage or shelf life is determined by the head of such agency to be of too short duration to justify continued retention of such property for possible use by such agency. S. 3328 does not amend the general definition. It authorizes, however, use of the expanded definition of excess property to items in the medical stockpile.

Our report of April 2, 1965, B-150417, on supply management of paint and other short-shelf life items points out that other items also deteriorated during storage and became unsafe or worthless before transfer to other Federal agencies or donation to public institutions. Therefore, we believe that the wording of the proposed subsection 203(p)(1) to be added to the above-cited act by both bills should be expanded to cover all short-shelf life items stockpiled for national emergency purposes, subject, however, to the foregoing comments on utilization of stockpiled medical materials in the peacetime programs of other Federal agencies.

The above comments pertain to minimizing losses from deterioration of short-shelf life items which are stockpiled for national emergencies. In our report of April 2, 1965, we identified shelf life losses resulting from management deficiencies including unnecessary procurement and accumulation of long supplies of deteriorative material stored for peacetime requirements.

To minimize deterioration losses for these assets as well as for stockpiled assets, we believe that S. 3328 should be conformed to H.R. 15210 in that the general definition of excess property (40 U.S.C. 472(e)), should be amended to permit excess declarations even though the property is required and still useful for meeting the agencies' needs.

The proposed subsection 402(b) would provide for the donation of medical materials or supplies to "medical or health organizations which are qualified to receive such materials or supplies under section 203(p) of this Act." It is not clear to us what criteria are to be applied in the qualification of such organizations.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

AMENDMENT OF NATURAL GAS ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate referral, a bill to amend the Natural Gas Act to assign the Federal Power Commission broadened responsibility to gather information concerning the natural gas industry and to publish compilations of such information. The need for such legislation is explained at length in the letter of transmittal and I ask unanimous consent that this letter be made a part of the record at the close of these remarks.

An important comment on this legislative proposal is found in the examiner's decision in the Federal Power Commission case of Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp.—docket No. CP65-181, phase II. In briefest summary, that case involved the continuing efforts of Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corp. and Consolidated Edison to obtain additional quantities of natural gas for use under Con Edison's boilers in New York City. One of the important issues was the reduction of air pollution by using natural gas.

In the course of reaching his decision, the Examiner said:

> As the Examiner will point out, the greatest Commission need today—a need of which the Commission has been keenly aware—is a National Gas Survey of natural gas reserves in relation to the Nation's future needs. The survey advocated by the Commission must have the voluntary and complete cooperation of all segments of the industry, particularly the producing segment, and would be similar to FPC's recently completed National Power Survey which has proved to be so beneficial to the Commission and the power industry it regulates.

An agency's decisions can be no better than its factual information. It is remarkable to me that a Federal agency like this does not have this continuing authority to gather a full basis of fact on which to base its regulatory decisions. That other groups are gathering some of this information only points out the urgency of the need. A Federal agency should not have to, as a matter of course, look beyond its own resources for basic information, particularly when regulation is its purpose.

Another important aspect of this information gathering authority could be its contribution to safety. The Committee on Commerce is in the process of hearings on S. 1166, a bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to prescribe safety regulations for the transportation of natural gas by pipelines. In a letter to me dated April 18, 1967, FPC Chairman Lee White said, in commenting on the costs of applying safety technology to interstate pipelines:

> Nor has any survey been made of the degree to which pipe in the ground owned by the various pipeline companies conforms to any particular standards.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The cost of upgrading existing pipelines to a level of safety realistically obtainable through present technology . . . may be greater than any possible costs for new construction . . . . We are unable to estimate what such a program would cost, absent a detailed survey of the actual condition of the pipelines. . . .

Some significant items of information simply are not available. It is relevant to recall that when the American Gas Association testified on S. 1166 last month, the witness said:

> As part of its continuing interest in public safety, the American Gas Association, about six months ago, employed the firm of Arthur D. Little, Inc., in Cambridge, Massachusetts, to make a study of the fatalities and injuries associated with natural gas for the ten-year period 1957-1966. This study has not been completed, but a preliminary report . . . has been received.

This bill would make it possible for the Commission to keep current on important matters such as this.

The administration has requested funds for a gas survey, but this would only be a one-shot operation. The Commission needs the authority such as this bill provides, for continuous gathering of comprehensive data.

Congress should seriously consider this legislation. In these days when we discuss legislative reorganization, much talk revolves around the ready availability of information. This information-gathering authority would help the FPC in the formulation of its legislative recommendations; and more important, it would help the Members of Congress in their own consideration of natural gas matters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter of transmittal will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1720) to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
Washington, April 10, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee are twenty copies of a draft bill to amend section 14 of the Natural Gas Act to assign the Federal Power Commission broadened responsibility to gather information concerning the natural gas industry and to publish compilations of such information for the benefit of the Congress, consumers, responsible government agencies, investors, and the industry. The amendment would be comparable to existing provisions of the Federal Power Act.

The natural gas industry supplies approximately one-third of the nation's total energy requirements. The continued prosperity of this vital industry will depend on progress in the industry itself, conscientious public regulation, and an informed public.

At present the Commission may secure reports from natural gas companies subject to its jurisdiction and may also investigate to determine whether any person has violated the Natural Gas Act (or is about to violate the Act) or to obtain information to serve as a basis for legislative recommendations to the Congress. Although about two-thirds of the natural gas used in this country enters interstate commerce, and consequently comes under FPC jurisdiction for a time, the ultimate distribution of the gas is generally by companies not subject to FPC jurisdiction.

Congress has concluded, in section 1(a) of the Natural Gas Act, "the business of transporting and selling natural gas for ultimate distribution to the public is affected with a public interest" and has provided for Federal regulation of interstate transportation and sales for resale, to complement and support state regulation of the ultimate sales to consumers. In view of the Federal regulatory commitment to assure just and reasonable rates to the distribution companies, we believe that Congress and the public are entitled to comprehensive information concerning the ultimate distribution of gas.

Determinations entrusted to the Commission significantly affect gas supply and requirements. We believe that increased access to comprehensive data would permit us more readily to evaluate the implications of matters coming before us for decision and would, thereby, serve the interests of both the regulated industry and the public.

The bill would not expand the regulatory responsibility of the Commission. It is intended solely to enhance the Commission's ability to gather and publish information. Although some gas industry statistics are now collected by a variety of private and Government agencies for limited purposes and in most cases, on a voluntary basis, no Government body is responsible for securing and publishing statistics on all phases of the gas industry, from producing well to burner tip. The bill would direct the Commission to use all available data sources in the Federal Government, the States and the natural gas industry before the Commission seeks information from individual companies but the bill would improve upon the information now available to satisfy public needs. For example, the bill would strengthen the public's right to authoritative and impartial information in areas such as:

(1) Data on the retail price of gas in all parts of the country, comparable to data in the Commission's publication of "Typical Electric Bills" for cities over 2,500 population. Apart from summary data for two dozen larger metropolitan areas, no agency publishes data comparable to "Typical Electric Bills". Such information would help the consumer spotlight out-of-line prices and stimulate companies to improve performance.

(2) Annual summaries of financial and operating information of individual gas companies comparable to data on interstate gas pipeline and electric companies the Commission now publishes. This would be of particular aid to the investing public. No agency now publishes such summaries.

With better data the Commission would also be able to exercise its regulatory powers more efficiently. As one example, the Commission may need a study of the retail market beyond its regulatory jurisdiction to make a decision on whether to approve a proposed jurisdictional pipeline project. It now requires natural gas pipeline transmission companies to submit evidence on their proposed markets with certificate applications. The Commission must, in turn, evaluate such evidence and initiate studies in each particular case. This *ad hoc* procedure may delay completion of the case.

Industry associations are undertaking substantial improvements in their data systems, but further information would be useful to our Commission, to State commissions, to defense agencies for use in planning for emergencies, and to Congress to keep informed on the state of the natural gas industry. Thus, at present, no authoritative source collects and publishes gas reserves for each of the major gas fields and reservoirs. At least two States (California and Mississippi) publish such details but most producing States do not. Some associations and private parties publish certain conglomerate data, undifferentiated, however, as to field or reservoir and without full disclosure of the source or accuracy of the basic information. The bill would direct the Commission to secure data on gas reserves on a field or reservoir, rather than company basis, in order to protect certain confidential industry information.

The natural gas industry, as a part of a private market economy, would itself operate more efficiently with more accurate and more comprehensive data. The bill would provide a means whereby information now in the possession of individual members of the natural gas industry but inaccessible to the public would be gathered by a single agency and made generally available.

We envision no difficulty in compliance by, or undue hardship upon, those who would be expected to report. The bill minimizes any reporting burden on individual companies by directing the use of all available government and industry information sources.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposal would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely,

LEE C. WHITE,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 203 OF NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act with respect to the payment of premiums in connection with the insurance of mortgages on certain properties owned by servicemen.

Mr. President, the recent tight money situation has brought a serious, and I am sure unintended, hardship to members of the military service. When a serviceman buys a house, he normally buys the house under section 222 of the National Housing Act, which provides that the military may pay any mortgage insurance premium when the buyer is a person in the military service to whom a certificate of eligibility has been issued. But during a tight money situation, it becomes very difficult for a serviceman to get a section 222 inservice loan from a bank. And, like many others, servicemen purchase a house by assuming the mortgage of the seller, rather than getting a new mortgage of their own.

Here is the trouble. When a serviceman assumes another mortgage which has been insured under a different section of the National Housing Act, the mortgage insurance cannot be converted to section 222 under present law. Thus, under the current law, a serviceman assuming an existing mortgage must pay the FHA mortgage insurance himself rather than receive the benefits Congress intended him to have.

My bill simply removes a technical obstacle which keeps our servicemen from getting the benefits Congress intended. Certainly Congress intended to give the benefit of mortgage insurance to all servicemen purchasing homes, whether they take out a new mortgage or assume an existing mortgage. It is the only fair way. A serviceman should not have to pay this additional penalty when a tight money situation arises.

The difficulties the members of our Armed Forces face in finding adequate housing for their families are well known. We must certainly give them all the support we can. The cost involved is negligible, but the benefit to our individual soldier seeking housing is great. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1721) to amend section 203 of the National Housing Act with respect to the payment of premiums in connection with the insurance of mortgages on certain properties owned by servicemen, introduced by Mr. RIBICOFF, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and

Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1721

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subsection (c) of section 203 of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "(c)" preceding the text of such subsection and inserting in lieu thereof "(c)(1)";

(2) by striking out "Such" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "Except as otherwise hereinafter provided, such"; and

(3) by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph as follows:

"(2) Premiums fixed by the Secretary under this subsection with respect to, or payable during, the period of ownership by a serviceman of a property (A) covered by a mortgage insured under section 222, or (B) covered by a mortgage, insured under this section or section 221(d)(2), the indebtedness under which has been assumed by such serviceman subsequent to the execution thereof, shall not be payable by the mortgagee but shall be paid not less frequently than once each year, upon request of the Secretary to the Secretary of Defense or the Secretary of the Treasury, as the case may be, from the respective appropriations available for pay and allowances of servicemen. The benefits herein provided shall not be available in the case of any serviceman who is the owner of a property described in clause (B), unless such serviceman either occupies such property or certifies that his failure to do so is the result of his military or (in the case of the United States Coast Guard) other assignment. The Secretary of Defense (or his designee) or the Secretary of the Treasury (or his designee), as the case may be, shall notify the Secretary in writing whenever the ownership (as defined by the Secretary) of a property described in clause (A) or (B) by a serviceman receiving the benefits of this paragraph has terminated. As used in this section, the term 'serviceman' shall have the same meaning as is assigned to such term in section 222(a)."

(b) Section 222 of such Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the second sentence of subsection (a) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "As used in this section, a 'serviceman' means a person to whom the Secretary of Defense (or his designee) or the Secretary of the Treasury (or his designee), as the case may be, has, for the purposes of this section or section 203(c)(2), issued a certificate indicating that such person is serving on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States or in the United States Coast Guard and has served on active duty for more than two years, but such a certificate shall not be issued to any person ordered to active duty for training purposes only."; and

(2) by striking out the second and third sentences of subsection (c).

AMENDMENT OF WHEAT ACREAGE ALLOTMENT PROVISIONS OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, on behalf of myself and my colleague [Mr. Jackson], a bill to amend the wheat acreage allotment provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

This bill is designed to provide relief for farmers who because of adverse weather conditions, plant disease, or loss of markets are threatened with economic disaster. The assistance provided by this proposal would be available to those farmers who had formerly grown wheat, but changed to another primary crop which has subsequently become unprofitable for one of the foregoing reasons. Growers who live in areas where wheat is the only alternative income-producing crop suitable for production would qualify.

As the law is now written, growers who had previously grown wheat cannot be granted a meaningful wheat allotment without resultant loss of allotment to other farmers. The purpose of this bill is to broaden the national allotment reserve so that when emergencies do arise, the Department of Agriculture will have the power to significantly increase allotments for old wheat farms in the affected area without at the same time reducing the wheat allotments of other growers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1722) to amend the wheat acreage allotment provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CIVIL RIGHTS PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, during the last session, I introduced on behalf of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] and myself, a bill entitled the "Civil Rights Procedure Act." The bill was designed to revise Federal court procedures in two areas: First, it would liberalize the right of removal of State prosecutions; and second, it would broaden the right to a Federal injunction against certain civil rights-related State court proceedings. Today, on behalf of Senator Javits and myself, I again introduce this bill. That it is badly needed and will produce important legal changes was made only too clear last June when the U.S. Supreme Court decided two new cases involving the right of removal under present Federal law.

The bill itself was drafted after careful study by a distinguished special committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York under the able and conscientious chairmanship of the Honorable Francis E. Rivers. The members of the committee had the expert help, in both the study and the actual drafting, of the former staff director of the U.S. Civil Rights Commission. The bill constitutes a responsible and thoughtful proposal which deals with a limited but nevertheless very significant subject. In short the bill's importance is not as a comprehensive piece of civil rights legislation, but rather as a careful effort to deal with one problem which must be covered if we are to move forward toward insuring equal rights under law to all our citizens.

That problem involves the relationship between the State and Federal courts in civil rights cases. More specifically that problem stems from the inadequacy of current Federal law concerning the removal of civil rights cases to Federal courts and the possibility of obtaining Federal injunctions against unconstitutional State prosecutions.

The bar association committee's report extensively documents the basic inadequacies of existing law.

Mr. President, rather than repeat the entire contents of the report, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks. For the next few moments, I would like only to review the basic findings of the committee and supplement them by reference to last year's Supreme Court rulings concerning the right of removal.

After briefly tracing the necessity for Federal jurisdiction to vindicate certain Federal rights, the bar association report notes that a series of Supreme Court decisions in the late 19th and early 20th centuries sharply circumscribed the significance of 28 U.S.C. 1443—the basic removal statute. The effect of these decisions was to limit the categories of State prosecutions of private persons removable to Federal court to those occurring under a local statute or ordinance unconstitutional on its face. The inevitable result was that defendants in clearly unconstitutional State prosecutions were forced to wend their way through the State courts up to the U.S. Supreme Court, and sometimes further yet—to the Federal district court on petition for habeas corpus. This path to exoneration was slow and costly. The bar association report cites the Shuttleworth case and the Jackson freedom riders litigation where the road to dismissal of charges was traversed successfully but only at great cost in time and money. And there were, of course, hundreds and hundreds of cases where the defendants lacked either the financial resources or the legal skills or perhaps just the inclination to travel the whole way.

In 1964, the Congress took a roundabout step to remedy the removal problem. It provided in the Civil Rights Act of that year that the remand orders issued by district courts in removal cases should now be appealable. Jurisdiction was thereby granted to the Supreme Court to determine the correctness of its half-century-old restrictive interpretations of 28 U.S.C. 1443.

Within 2 years, the Court was faced with the cases of Georgia against Rachel and City of Greenwood against Peacock—cases involving various individuals who, while attempting to integrate public facilities in the one case and protest against continued segregation in the other, had been arrested by local officials. The defendants had sought removal in an effort to have these prosecutions quashed without the inordinate expenditure of time and funds needed to fight their cases through the State court systems. Reaffirming its past decisions on the question of removal, the Court ruled that only a person who is denied or cannot enforce in the State courts a right under any law providing for specific civil rights stated in terms of racial equality can seek to shift jurisdiction from a State to a Federal court. Even then, the individual has to demonstrate that by reason of a State law or by the very act of prosecution those rights would be violated if the defendant were brought to trial in a State court. Although agreeing that removal might be justifiable in Rachel, the Court noted that its interpretation of section 1443 made it applicable only "in rare situations." To a five-man majority it was now up to Congress to act if the removal situation were to be altered. "Congress" wrote Justice Potter Stewart on behalf of the Court, "is constitutionally fully free to establish the conditions under which civil or criminal proceedings involving Federal issues may be removed from one court to another."

The bill which I introduce today represents a scholarly and carefully thought through effort to meet the problem which the Supreme Court has informed us is ours to solve. First, it broadens the right to remove cases for immediate Federal consideration by those being prosecuted at the State level. It affords protection for those exercising or attempting to exercise rights secured against the denial of equal protection. It also insures that those prosecuted for exercising their rights to speak or write freely or peaceably assemble in furtherance of the right to equal protection will be entitled to a Federal forum. It does this by adding new subsections to 28 U.S.C. 1443 rather than by changing any existing language. Second, it alters the law on injunctions to make it complementary to the new provisions on removal. Under the bar association's proposal, injunctions can be issued by a Federal court when a State prosecution is infringing upon the same civil rights which will support a claim for removal. The petitioner also must demonstrate that in its prosecution, the State is attempting to enforce an unconstitutional law or to discourage the exercise of civil rights or to base its case on an issue already determined by a court of law in favor of the petitioner or his contention in a substantially related proceeding. Third, the bill provides that where such an injunction is otherwise appropriate, the Federal courts shall not apply that part of the abstention doctrine which relates to the exhaustion of State remedies. As the bar association report notes, this provision is needed to guarantee that an expanded power to issue injunctions will, in fact, lead to "expeditious" equitable relief in the Federal courts.

Senator Javits and I introduce this legislation today because we believe it is needed to alter and clarify the law involving removal and injunctions in civil rights-related cases. The bar association bill offers us an excellent approach to a very taxing problem. I think that the members of the bar association committee, and particularly Judge Rivers, deserve our congratulations and our thanks for the outstanding job they have done and the great contribution they have made.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with the report of the committee of the Bar Association of the City of New York be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and report of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1725) to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Kennedy of New York (for himself and Mr. Javits), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1725

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Civil Rights Procedure Act".

FINDINGS AND PURPOSE

Sec. 2. (a) The Congress has over the last century adopted legislation declaring, protecting, and granting various civil rights to citizens. It is the sense of Congress that some citizens seeking to avail themselves of these declared rights have been subjected to lengthy and expensive criminal prosecutions instituted to deter them from attempting to obtain their civil rights. It is further the sense of Congress that the proper means to correct this unlawful activity is to vest appropriate jurisdiction in the district courts of the United States.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this legislation to promote the general welfare by preventing reprisals against those who seek to end discrimination on account of race, color, religion, or national origin prohibited by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

REMOVAL OF CAUSES

Sec. 3. (a) Section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of subsection (2) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(3) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured, or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin; or

"(4) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subsection (3) of this section."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 1447 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(d) An order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed is not reviewable on appeal or otherwise, except that an order remaining a case to the State court from which it was removed pursuant to section 1443 of this title shall be appealable as a final decision under section 1291 and an order denying remand of a case removed pursuant to section 1443 shall be appealable as an injunction of proceedings in the State court under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1292."

INJUNCTION OF STATE PROCEEDINGS

Sec. 4. Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by inserting "(a)" at the beginning of the section and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Such redress shall include the grant of an injunction to stay a proceeding in a State court where such proceeding was instituted for—

"(1) any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured, or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured, or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion, or national origin; or

"(2) any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subparagraph (1) of this subsection;

and where—

"(i) An issue determinative of the proceeding in favor of the party seeking the injunction has been decided in favor of his contention in a final decision in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation;

"(ii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation, or other authority for the proceeding has been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding;

"(iii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation, or other authority for the proceeding is, on its face, an unconstitutional abridgment of the rights to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble; or

"(iv) The proceeding was instituted for the purpose of discouraging the parties or others from exercising rights of freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble.

"(c) In an action seeking an injunction under subsection (b) the court shall not deny or defer relief on the ground that a defense or remedy in the State courts is available."

The report of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York is as follows:

[From the Association of the Bar of the City of New York]

Special Committee on Civil Rights Under Law

Hon. Francis E. Rivers, *Chairman.*

G. Wallace Bates, Aaron Benenson, Robert L. Carter, John R. Fernbach, Lloyd K. Garrison,* Murray A. Gordon, Jack Greenberg, Daniel Gutman, Robert H. Janover.

J. Robert Lunney, Barbara Scott Preiskel, J. Lee Rankin, Hon. Scovel Richardson, Hon. Samuel I. Rosenman,* Alan U. Schwartz, Whitney North Seymour, Asa D. Sokolow, Robert W. Sweet.

Martin F. Richman, *Secretary;* Seymour Klein, *Executive Committee Liaison;* Berl I. Bernhard, *Staff Director;* Ronald B. Natalie, *Associate Staff Director.*

Proposal for a Federal Civil Rights Procedure Act—Summary of Report and Recommendations With Proposed Bill, March 1966

INTRODUCTION

In the spring and summer of 1963, members of this Association, as citizens and more particularly as lawyers, were greatly disturbed by news reports out of the South. These reports told of repeated instances in many communities in which the efforts of Negroes to exercise civil rights claimed, and in many cases well-established, under the Constitution and Federal laws were being frustrated by the use against them of the processes of local and State law enforcement. These processes included arrest, physical coercion by the police, denial of or onerous conditions on bail, rejection of Federal claims at trial and on appeal, and delays or harassment at various stages of the proceedings.[1] That the local and State law enforcement processes were being misused in many instances was confirmed by the decisions of the Federal courts when these or related cases finally reached a hearing in a Federal court.

---

*Judge Rosenman resigned in 1964, upon becoming President of the Association, and Mr. Garrison resigned in 1965, upon becoming President of the Board of Education of the City of New York.

It was also apparent from such decisions that the ability of these defendants to have their Federal claims passed upon by a Federal court promptly and decisively was severely restricted by the out-of-date wording of the applicable Federal remedial statutes, some of which have come down unchanged from Reconstruction legislation, and in particular by the narrowing interpretations that had been given these statutes by the Supreme Court in the last decades of the nineteenth century in civil rights and other cases. Subsequent developments in the recognition and expansion of the substantive civil rights of Negroes by the Court and the Congress, particularly in the period since the *School Segregation Cases* of 1954, had not been accompanied by equivalent rethinking of Federal remedial law. The problem became acute in the last several years, as Southern Negroes, aided by civil rights workers from all sections, have stepped up the pace of demands for realization of their substantive civil rights in all communities by public attempts to exercise those rights and by demonstrations and similar activities in public places to protest the denial thereof.

Accordingly, the then President of the Association, Herbert Brownell, appointed this Special Committee on Civil Rights Under Law, charged with the primary duty of conducting a study of the relevant Federal remedial statutes available to protect civil rights and with recommending revisions found necessary or advisable for their modernization.[2] The work of the Committee was informed by an extensive legal and factual research study made under contract by a professional staff, financed by foundation grants.[3] The detailed study (to be referred to herein as "the Staff Study") is presently undergoing editorial revision with a view to publication in book form.

In view of the fact that the problem with which this study is concerned has continued to be severe, despite the further expansion given to the scope of substantive civil rights by the Congress in the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965, the Executive Committee of the Association has authorized the release of the present Recommendations and Summary of Report at this time, in order that the Congress and the public may be informed of the recommendations of the Committee, including the changes in Federal legislation it proposes.

I. THE NATURE OF THE PROBLEM

Many Americans have been arrested, jailed, tried, and convicted by local authorities only because they have tried to exercise rights granted by the Constitution and laws of the United States. In recent years the offenses charged have not generally been based upon statutes or ordinances avowedly commanding racial segregation, but upon apparently neutral enactments, such as those prohibiting disorderly conduct, resisting arrest, obstructing sidewalks, breach of the peace, and similar alleged offenses.

Ultimately, however, the facts proved in these cases have generally boiled down, as the Staff Study shows, to activity protected against State interference by the Fourteenth Amendment, together with the First Amendment and Federal civil rights statutes. And ultimately many of the defendants have been vindicated on the basis of Federal law, but usually not until a hearing was secured in a Federal court. Under the existing restrictions upon the applicability of Federal remedial statutes, it may require two to three years for a State criminal case to reach a Federal hearing, either in the Supreme Court on direct review of the State conviction or in a District Court on petition for habeas corpus. Meanwhile, persons who ultimately will be vindicated are incarcerated or subjected to harsh bail restrictions, and they and others similarly situated are discouraged from asserting their legitimate substantive civil rights demands.

Constitutional history teaches that Federal rights require the backing of Federal remedies to assure their vindication in States hostile to such Federal rights. It may be hoped that in the generality of cases the State courts will recognize their concurrent responsibility for enforcement of such rights and thus make unnecessary widespread use of the Federal court remedies. However, it is clear, upon a review of the reported cases in which Federal substantive civil rights have been claimed as defenses against State criminal prosecutions for activity asserting such rights, that local and State authorities in some areas have taken unfair advantage of the delays and other difficulties of invoking the ultimate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court to review such State criminal prosecutions. Hence, it became apparent to the Committee early in its deliberations that remedies in the Federal courts at the local level had to be strengthened to assure justice, speed and finality in the vindication of Federal defenses in criminal prosecutions for civil rights activity.

The focus of the Staff Study was upon the three classic means of Federal intervention to protect Constitutional and other Federal rights against State attack, each long recognized in Federal statutes: habeas corpus, injunction of State criminal proceedings and removal of State criminal proceedings to a Federal District Court. With respect to each remedy, as will be discussed below, various restrictions of statutory construction or judicial doctrine were found to limit its full effectiveness as a means of assuring the desirable justice, speed and finality in achieving the protection of substantive civil rights. The problem is essentially one of modernizing the law governing Federal remedies so as to make them effective to prevent the exercise of Federally granted substantive civil rights within a State from being unlawfully frustrated by means of State action in the form of criminal prosecution. These statutory remedies, and the revisions proposed by this Committee, do not relate to purely individual invasion of individual rights, but only to wrongful State action.

The Committee concluded that precedents in the case law make statutory change unnecessary with respect to habeas corpus, that statutory expansion of Federal removal jurisdiction is imperative and is the most salutary approach to the problem presented, and that a narrowly limited statutory expansion of Federal injunctive jurisdiction is also essential for complete relief.

II. THE SCOPE OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS

After reviewing the text, the legislative history, and the judicial interpretations of the relevant statutes, the Committee determined that it was advisable to make fresh definitions of the conditions under which Federal courts should intervene in the State criminal process in this type of case. Tinkering with the imprecise nineteenth-century wording of the Reconstruction legislation, which stands encumbered with the gloss of judicial interpretations dating from an era when the courts were not in sympathy with expansive recognition of civil rights, was recognized as unsatisfactory in principle.

Moreover, the meaning of these old enactments is the subject of pending litigation in numerous civil rights cases. The Committee believed that the Congress would not want to prejudice the positions of the parties therein by changing the existing statutory wording. Thus, where the Committee recommends statutory revision, the changes take the form of adding independently-defined conditions for relief to the provisions now on the statute books. (The Committee's recommended changes, in the form of a bill entitled "Federal Civil Rights Procedure Act," are set out in Appendix A. The most relevant provisions of the existing statutes, with the recommended changes added in italics, are set out in Appendix B.)

The Committee was concerned that its recommendations should not represent punitive or sectional legislation—but rather should be equally applicable in all sections of the Nation as and when cases of the defined types may arise in the continuing quest of minority groups for equal rights. For this reason, the Committee rejected the approach of enlarging upon the "local prejudice" jurisdictional test of some of the Reconstruction legislation, and instead sought to define objective classes of lawful activity for which Federal jurisdiction could be invoked as a protection against unwarranted State criminal prosecutions. For the same reason, the recommended statutory provisions speak, as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 similarly does, in terms of denial of equal protection, not against Negroes alone, but "on account of race, color, religion or national origin."

The Committee was, of course, aware of the current controversy existing with respect to Federal court intervention in State criminal proceedings in contexts other than civil rights cases. Because the civil rights cases present a distinct and urgent claim for Federal remedies to protect the Federal rights actively being asserted in the conduct for which these defendants are prosecuted, we deemed it unnecessary and inappropriate to become involved in the quite different problem of the relation of Federal and State judicial proceedings in the context of alleged deprivations of due process (or denial of equal protection or of First Amendment rights on any basis other than civil rights activity). The Committee's recommended legislation therefore is limited in terms to cases within the scope of civil rights activity as commonly understood—the assertion and advocacy of equal civil rights for minority groups.[4]

---

[1] See "Law Enforcement—A Report on Equal Protection in the South," United States Commission on Civil Rights, pp. 62–83, (1965).

[2] Mr. Brownell's successor as President of the Association, Hon. Samuel I. Rosenman, was an original member of the Committee, but resigned upon becoming President. He has continued in that position to give interested and strong support to the work of the Committee, as has Paul B. DeWitt, Executive Secretary of the Association.

[3] The Staff Director was Berl I. Bernhard, Esq., formerly Staff Director of the United States Commission on Civil Rights, who during the period of this study held similar positions with the Lawyers Committee for Civil Rights Under Law and the White House Conference "To Fulfill These Rights." Ronald B. Natalie, Esq., a former member of the staff of the Commission, served as Associate Staff Director. The present Recommendations and Summary of Report was prepared by the Committee, based upon the manuscript of the Staff Study.

The work of the Committee has been financed to date principally by grants from the Ford, Field and Taconic Foundations. A supplementary grant from the New World Foundation covered the expenses of the conference with a group of Federal and State judges and prosecutors referred to in note 4, *infra*.

III. THE EXISTING REMEDIES AND SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STRENGTHENING THEM

A. Definition of civil rights activity

Even with the avowed intention of limiting its recommendations to the civil rights context, the Committee found varying views as to the best way to define the protected civil rights activity in a remedial statute. Recognizing the one problem with the existing legislation was its use of imprecise terms such as "equal civil rights," the Committee determined to couch its recommendations in objective terms by describing activities prosecution for which merited and needed Federal protection because such activities were the vital manifestations of the substantive civil rights declared by Federal law.

One view was that the definition should reach all Constitutionally protected activities by speaking in terms of the Equal Protection Clause and the First Amendment. This view was deemed too broad, in that it might permit unintended use of the legislation by State defendants in contexts other than civil rights cases as properly defined.

On the other hand, it was suggested that the protected activities might be described by reference solely to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the most compendious catalogue of substantive civil rights in modern legislation. Although reference to the Act by way of example seemed desirable, limiting the coverage of remedial provisions to its subject matter was deemed too narrow, in that the remedial statute might thus become obsolete soon after enactment. This could occur as the minority rights movement shifts emphasis to new areas of concern not mentioned in the 1964 Act, but which may come to be held within the Constitutional or Federal statutory protection against racial and similar discrimination.

The Committee concluded, therefore, that the scope of civil rights activity to be protected should encompass State prosecutions for "any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin."

However, civil rights activity is commonly conducted not merely by bare attempts to exercise individual rights, but by demonstrations and similar public manifestations of protest at the denial of civil rights, and by advocacy for their enforcement and enlargement. These "First Amendment" activities will typically include civil rights workers and other persons in addition to those whose individual rights are sought to be furthered by the activity. Hence the Committee's definitional provision goes on to include State prosecutions for "any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right described in [the preceding quotation]."

As explained more fully below, the proposed legislation would make all State prosecutions for activity within either branch of this definition removable to a Federal District Court. The more severe remedy of injunction of State proceedings would also be available in cases meeting the same test, but only if one of the additional stringent requirements explained below is met. The proposed definition would not affect Federal habeas corpus jurisdiction, as no statutory change is proposed there.

B. Habeas corpus

The Committee believes that statutory amelioration of restrictive decisions regarding the availability of habeas corpus is unnecessary because there are now persuasive precedents in the case law which recognize that the general requirement of exhaustion of State remedies before resort to Federal habeas corpus is not applicable in circumstances found in the typical civil rights case. Moreover, adoption of the enlargement of removal jurisdiction we recommend would make resort to habeas corpus in this type of case largely unnecessary in the future.

It is fortunate that these conclusions are possible. Many members of the Committee were reluctant to propose departures from the historic generalities of the rules governing the Great Writ for any particular class of cases, even in light of the urgent current problem with respect to civil rights cases. The Committee was aware that general legislative expansion of the remedy of habeas corpus might arouse great State resentment, as evidenced by the reaction to the broad scope given recently to this remedy in the general criminal law context by Federal judicial decisions.[5] In habeas corpus actions, the Federal court discharges a person held by the State and, although the writ is not necessarily a bar in law to a re-prosecution, it may well be one in fact depending on the grounds for its issuance.

The nub of the matter is that the remedy of habeas corpus has been used rarely in civil rights cases[6] because there has been uncertainty as to the requirement of prior exhaustion of State remedies in such cases.[7] Briefly, the exhaustion doctrine provides that the writ of habeas corpus may not be granted unless the petitioner has first exhausted his State remedies. Although the original habeas corpus statute[8] in no way conditioned habeas corpus upon such prior exhaustion, some subsequent judicial decisions read the exhaustion doctrine into the law as an exception to the general availability of the writ. First and most notable of these was the case of *Ex parte Royall*, 117 U.S. 241 (1886), which devised the exhaustion doctrine in a case involving a petition for anticipatory (pre-trial) habeas corpus in a Contracts Clause dispute.

However, many anticipatory habeas corpus decisions subsequent to *Royall*, while recognizing the exhaustion doctrine, have held it inapplicable to cases involving incarceration of persons attempting to exercise specific Federal rights.[9] It is the view of the Committee that, under existing case law and without any additional legislation, Federal courts can and should grant anticipatory habeas corpus in civil rights cases without requiring exhaustion of State remedies.[10]

There seems also to be confusion in the cases as to the scope and effect of the exhaustion doctrine upon post-conviction habeas corpus, now governed by 28 U.S.C. § 2254, which explicitly requires that State remedies must, in most cases, be exhausted before habeas corpus may be obtained after judgment in a State court. The Reviser's Note (1948) to this provision states that "this new section is declaratory of existing law as affirmed by the Supreme Court." However, Section 2254 itself provides that the exhaustion doctrine is inapplicable if there exist "circumstances rendering such [State] process ineffective to protect the rights of the prisoner."[11]

We suggest that present civil rights experience in the South, as well as recent Federal civil rights legislation, indicates clearly that such circumstances do exist and should be judicially recognized. Therefore the Committee feels that Federal District Courts now have the authority, without further legislation, to hold that the exhaustion requirement of Section 2254 is inapplicable after, as well as before, judgment in civil rights cases where the denial of governing Federal rights is patent.[12]

C. Removal

Federal removal jurisdiction dates from the founding of the United States. Thus, the very first Judiciary Act passed by Congress authorized removal of specified classes of cases to the Federal courts.[13] Congress from time to time thereafter has enlarged Federal removal jurisdiction to meet new situations which seemed to require special consideration.

---

[4] In order to test out the tentatively formulated recommendations against possible attack on the ground they could be abused by defendants in State criminal cases having nothing to do with civil rights and in order to seek out informed views on the central problem of Federal remedial protection for civil rights defendants, the Committee invited a distinguished group of judges and prosecutors, Federal and State, from Southern as well as Northern jurisdictions, to express their views.

Following an afternoon and evening conference with this group of experts in the practical administration of such remedies, the Committee sharpened its recommendations. The responsibility for the final recommendations lies entirely with the Committee, of course, but it wishes here to record its appreciation for the candid, thoughtful and constructive views expressed at the conference by the following persons who responded to its invitation:

Hon. Harold Tyler, Jr., United States District Judge for the Southern District of New York;

Hon. Francis L. Valente, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division, First Department (now deceased);

Hon. Barefoot Sanders, Assistant Deputy Attorney General of the United States; former United States Attorney for the Northern District of Texas;

Hon. Terrell Glenn, United States Attorney for the Eastern District of South Carolina; and

Hon. Richard Uviller, Chief of the Appeals Bureau, New York County District Attorney's Office.

[5] The judicial expansion of the scope of habeas corpus is best illustrated in *Fay* v. *Noia*, 372 U.S. 391 (1963).

[6] The notable exception has been *In re Shuttlesworth*, 369 U.S. 35 (1962). The history of this case prior and subsequent to the cited decision of the Supreme Court is discussed at length in the Staff Study, and a summary is set forth at pp. 22–24 herein.

[7] See, e.g., *Hillegas* v. *Sams*, 349 F. 2d 859 (5th Cir. 1965).

[8] Act of February 5, 1867, Ch. 28, § 1, 14 Stat. 385–86.

[9] See, e.g., *Cunningham* v. *Neagle*, 135 U.S. 1 (1890); *Ohio* v. *Thomas*, 173 U.S. 276 (1899); *In re Loney*, 134 U.S. 372 (1890); *In re Sam Kee*, 31 Fed. 680 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1887); and *In re Lee Sing*, 43 Fed. 359 (C.C.N.D. Cal. 1890).

[10] Particularly with respect to rights claimed under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the cases arising under the Commerce Clause, analyzed in the Staff Study, are precedent that in prosecutions interfering with an important Federal interest, a petition may be granted before trial. See generally, Amsterdam, *Criminal Prosecutions Affecting Federally Guaranteed Civil Rights: Federal Removal and Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction to Abort State Court Trial*, 113 U. Pa. L. Rev. 793, 882–908 (1965).

[11] Section 2254 is set forth in Appendix B hereto.

[12] If application for bail pending exhaustion in the State courts is denied, the Federal habeas court may deem exhaustion completed. *In re Shuttlesworth*, 369 U.S. 35 (1962). See also *Johnston* v. *Marsh*, 227 F. 2d 528 (3d Cir. 1955); *United States* v. *Hamilton*, 3 U.S. (3 Dall.) 17 (1795). Even appeal is not required where prisoners are held for petty offenses and numerous prosecutions are likely to be pressed in the State courts—typical civil rights situations. *Ex parte Kieffer*, 40 Fed. 399 (C.C.D. Kan. 1889); *Collins* v. *Frisbie*, 189 F. 2d 464 (6th Cir. 1951), *aff'd*, 342 U.S. 519 (1952).

In 1886, Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act, which was designed to give the freedmen the full and equal benefit of laws for the security of person and property.[14] The Act contained procedural provisions which appeared to authorize the removal to a Federal court of all civil and criminal cases affecting persons who were denied or could not enforce in the State courts the rights granted by the Act.

These provisions, as subsequently extended and codified, now appear in 28 U.S.C. § 1443. The section authorizes removal of criminal prosecutions

"(1) Against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction thereof;

(2) For any act under color of authority derived from any law providing for equal rights, or for refusing to do any act on the ground that it would be inconsistent with such law."

While this statutory grant of removal jurisdiction appears broad on its face, the Staff Study clearly demonstrates that the Supreme Court, in a series of decisions which culminated in 1906, construed the grant so narrowly as to render it virtually nugatory to effect removal of cases arising in the current civil rights struggle.[15] These landmark cases, and the many lower court decisions which followed them, apparently restricted the right to removal under subdivision (1) of what is now Section 1443 to those limited situations where a State constitutional or statutory provision was unconstitutional on its face.[16]

Thus, these precedents served in recent reported cases to deny a right to remove where a State statute or ordinance, possibly valid on its face, was unconstitutionally applied because of purposeful and discriminatory application against Negroes and civil rights workers. These decisions also inhibited removal where arrests were made pursuant to law laid down by the highest court of the State, rather than by State statute. Even the wrongful actions of State court judges were apparently not deemed grounds for removal under the statute as thus construed.[17]

These restrictive precedents were established in a totally different Constitutional and legal atmosphere when, for example, a State's provision of "separate but equal" facilities for Negroes was deemed an acceptable Constitutional practice.[18] And they were decided long prior to the time that Congress manifested its recent clear intent to enact into law specific statutory guarantees of substantive civil rights.[19] However, whatever the background or explanation, the Committee has concluded that Section 1443, as interpreted by these controlling decisions rendered some 60 or more years ago, does not speak adequately to the serious problem of the administration of justice now existing in many areas of the country. This appears clear from the fact that, until recently, a remand to the State court was ordered in virtually every reported civil rights removal case, and the right to remove to a Federal court was thus effectively and definitively frustrated.

A dramatic, but not atypical, example is found in *Baines* v. *City of Danville*, 337 F. 2d 579 (4th Cir. 1964), where a group of civil rights demonstrators were unsuccessful in removing their arrest cases to the Federal court under Section 1443. The submission made by the Department of Justice to the District Court showed that the State court judge had actually been in the streets attempting to disperse the demonstrators, carried a gun to court, had otherwise displayed prejudice against the defendants, and had tried to intimidate the defendants and other Negro citizens from any further exercise of their Constitutional rights. Nonetheless, Section 1443, as interpreted, was found not to justify a removal of this case to a Federal court.

In another landmark case described in detail in the Staff Study (see pp. 22–24, *infra*), a Negro minister prominent in the civil rights struggle was convicted of disturbing the peace on absolutely no evidence, but was required to spend more than five years in a massive legal battle to vindicate his rights. In the course of this struggle, he had to appear no less than 16 separate times in Federal and State courts. A right to remove this case at an early stage would clearly have effectively served the interests of justice.

In still another series of cases, the Jackson (Miss.) Freedom Riders were compelled to spend four years in the courts at great legal expense in order to overturn their convictions. This long struggle was necessary despite the fact that the Supreme Court had previously declared the statute underlying the arrests to be unconstitutional.[20] Here again a liberal removal statute would have achieved justice, speed and finality.

There have been few opportunities in recent years to urge the Supreme Court to reverse the aforementioned long course of restrictive judicial interpretation and application of the thrust of Section 1443. Until the Civil Rights Act of 1964, for many years orders of Federal courts remanding civil rights cases to the State courts were not appealable. As a result of the new appeal provisions of the 1964 Act,[21] there is a glimmer of evidence that some lower courts are seeking to find some way to make Section 1443 fill its original purpose.[22] The Committee has concluded, however, that these piecemeal efforts to erode the line of ancient Supreme Court precedents, followed by lower court rulings for some 60 years, will be time-consuming, expensive, and may ultimately fail on the basis of application of the doctrine of *stare decisis*. In our judgment, continued delay in this area will only foster disrespect for law and order as an effective method to achieve equal civil rights for all.

With many removal cases pending in the courts, the Committee feels, as noted earlier, that it would be inappropriate to attempt modification of the original language of subdivisions (1) and (2) of Section 1443 at this time. Accordingly, the Committee proposes the addition of new subdivisions to Section 1443, providing that the defendants may remove to the Federal court any state criminal prosecution:

"(3) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin; or

"(4) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subsection (3) of this section."

Some members of the Committee initially felt that in the light of the extension in the definition of removable cases being recommended, the procedure for removal might be restricted in two respects. They suggested that removal should no longer be automatic upon filing appropriate papers, but should require an order of the District Court upon an evidentiary showing. They also believed that remand orders should not be appealable as of right, as the 1964 Act provided, but that a certificate of probable cause from a District or Circuit Judge should be required (along the lines of the procedure for appeals *in forma pauperis*).

---

[13] Act of September 24, 1789, Ch. 20, § 12, 1 Stat. 79–80.

[14] Act of April 9, 1866, Ch. 31, § 3, 14 Stat. 27.

[15] See, e.g., *Virginia* v. *Rives*, 100 U.S. 313 (1880); *Neal* v. *Delaware*, 103 U.S. 370 (1881); *Kentucky* v. *Powers*, 201 U.S. 1 (1906).

[16] The Committee's research leads it to the conclusion that these opinions limiting the thrust of the original civil rights removal statute, which were not in fact based upon the legislative history of the Civil Rights Act of 1866, may be inconsistent with the available historical record. These cases were decided long before legislative history had become accepted as an important tool in the interpretation of statutes. See Cox, *Judge Learned Hand and the Interpretation of Statutes*, 60 Harv. L. Rev. 370 (1947).

[17] Subdivision (2) of Section 1443 has rarely been construed by the courts. Accordingly, while the door may still be open to a more liberalized construction of this part of the statute, the Committee thinks it possible that the thrust of the subdivision will be restricted to situations where Federal officers, or perhaps private citizens, were actually discharging a Federal *duty*, as distinguished from exercising a Federal *right*, at the time of their arrests. See discussion in *New York* v. *Galamison*, 342 F. 2d 255 (2d Cir. 1965), *cert. denied*, 380 U.S. 977.

[18] Compare *Plessy* v. *Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), with *Brown* v. *Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).

[19] See, e.g., Civil Rights Act of 1964, 78 Stat. 241, 42 U.S.C. §§ 2000a–2000h-b; Voting Rights Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 437.

[20] *Bailey* v. *Patterson*, 369 U.S. 31 (1962).

[21] The Committee's recommendations include technical changes in the 1964 provision, to clarify the basis for appeal of remand orders (see *New York* v. *Galamison*, *supra* n. 17), and to make denials to remand also appealable in civil rights cases, in the interests of fairness to the State and greater consistency of standards through appellate review. See proposed amendments to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(d), in Appendix A and B.

[22] See, e.g., *Rachel* v. *Georgia*, 342 F. 2d 336 (5th Cir. 1965), *cert. granted*, 15 L.Ed.2d 58 (indicating that removal may be effected when a State statute, valid on its face, is unequally applied in violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964); *Peacock* v. *City of Greenwood*, 347 F. 2d 679 (5th Cir. 1965), *cert. granted*, 15 L.Ed. 2d 464 (1966) (indicating that removal may be effected where it is proved that the accused was deprived of his equal civil rights by virtue of an arrest made for reasons of racial discrimination); *Cox* v. *Louisiana*, 348 F. 2d 750 (5th Cir. 1965) (indicating that removal was justified where the State court prosecution was deliberately designed to frustrate the protective mandate of the Supreme Court); *McMeans* v. *Mayor's Court*, 247 F. Supp. 606 (M.D. Ala. 1965) (indicating that removal was justified where the police made harrassment arrests of civil rights workers engaged in peaceful and lawful picketing; a local parade ordinance and State statute relating to reckless driving were held unconstitutional as applied to these defendants). For argumentation supporting a more liberal interpretation of the present civil rights removal statute, see Amsterdam, *Criminal Prosecution Affecting Federally Guaranteed Civil Rights: Federal Removal and Habeas Corpus Jurisdiction to Abort State Court Trials*, 113 U. of Pa. L. Rev. 793, 851–82 (1965).

However in *Commonwealth of Virginia* v. *Wallace*, No. 9462, and *Baines* v. *City of Danville*, No. 9080, both decided January 21, 1966 by the Fourth Circuit, the court refused to order removal on two grounds—first, that First and Fourteenth Amendment rights generally are not within the protection of the present removal statute, and second, that the inability to enforce one's right in the State court must be shown with certainty. In both cases, the court held that the *Rives—Powers* line of cases (*supra* n. 15) are still good law and noted that when Congress made remands appealable, it did not seek to change the scope of the removal statute.

The Committee concluded, however, that the present removal procedure should not be restricted in either respect. Basically, the Committee believes that the burden of going forward in these cases should be on the State prosecutor, particularly in light of the severe shortage of lawyers to handle civil rights cases in many areas. The establishment of the conditions warranting removal can be made upon the prosecutor's motion to remand as well as upon an original petition for removal, and the nature of the showing to be made can best be developed by case law in the course of application of the new jurisdictional standard recommended. As to appeal, the Committee favors expansion, rather than contraction, of the right to appeal in these cases in order to achieve greater consistency of standards (see note 21). Moreover, even though the right to appeal a remand order is not limited, a stay of further proceedings in the State court continues to be discretionary.

In reaching its conclusion, the Committee was not unmindful of the caveat expressed by some members that automatic removal might cause calendar problems by enlarging substantially the caseload of the Federal courts. But a consideration of these possibilities in the light of the goals involved shows such objections to be untenable for many reasons: (1) under the present wording of the removal statute, Section 1443 (1) and (2), many removal cases have been filed in recent years; (2) with the proposed liberalized removal provision, there will be less resort to petitions for habeas corpus or for equitable relief; and (3) in any event, deprived persons should not be denied the enjoyment of Federally granted rights to equal protection of the laws because of inconvenience to judges or to other litigants.[23]

The Committee's recommended enlargement of Federal removal jurisdiction is, we believe, consistent with the original purposes of the century-old Section 1443, as applied to the problems of 1966. It will truly make removal in genuine civil rights cases available to those who desperately need the prompt protection of the Federal courts, and will not adversely affect the existing rights of the States to try non-civil rights cases in State courts.

D. Injunctive relief

Of all the remedies considered by the Committee, that of Federal injunction of a State prosecution is the most drastic. Removal contemplates a trial in the Federal court of the State criminal charge removed. But Federal equitable relief would enjoin and thereby terminate the trial itself.

The pressures for such summary disposition are great, particularly where the prosecutions are in conflict with plain or adjudicated Constitutional principles and motivated by hostility to guaranteed civil rights. In such cases the delays in obtaining justice have become notorious. The NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, at the request of the Committee, compiled a statistical analysis of all the State criminal prosecutions in its files arising from civil rights activities. That analysis indicated that the average time required to complete action within the State court system, from the date of arrest through the final disposition of the case by the highest court of appeals, was 20 months. It required an additional 9½ months to obtain certiorari and a decision by the Supreme Court.[24] Months and years therefore elapse before basic rights can be vindicated. During this span, many defendants have been incarcerated or released on bond at great and continuing cost as in the Freedom Rider cases in Jackson, Mississippi.[25] Federal injunction of such prosecutions, ultimately determined to be unconstitutional, would foreclose the harassing effect and purpose of these prosecutions.

At the same time the Committee was cognizant that the remedy of enjoining a State criminal prosecution, and thus imposing an absolute bar to that prosecution, involves considerations impinging upon serious aspects of our Federal system. This problem of the accommodation of overlapping Federal and State judicial jurisdiction occasioned by our dual system of government has presented a perplexing problem from the beginning of our national history.[26] One of the earliest amendments to the Judiciary Act of 1789 was that contained in Section 5 of the Act of March 2, 1793, 1 Stat. 335, which limited the jurisdiction of the Federal courts by providing:

"nor shall a writ of injunction be granted to stay the proceeding in any court of a state . . ."

In addition to this statutory limitation upon the Federal injunctive power in the case of a pending State proceeding, the Federal courts, as a matter of comity, have frequently abstained from enjoining or interfering with prospective or anticipated State prosecutions or proceedings.[27] There is, therefore, a formidable tradition in the Federal system dictating extreme caution in the use of the Federal injunctive power *vis-a-vis* threatened or actual State proceedings or prosecutions.

Yet, despite this tradition of caution, the courts and Congress have from time to time found it necessary and desirable to extend Federal jurisdiction in this area. Thus, following the Civil War, numerous exceptions were engrafted by judicial decision upon the original injunctive prohibition.[28] The cases have indicated that certain acts passed since the enactment of the foregoing Act of 1793 operated as implied legislative amendments to the blanket prohibition where those subsequent statutes expressly vested Federal courts with exclusive equity jurisdiction.[29] This doctrine is incorporated in the present legislative prohibition against Federal injunction of State proceedings, which appears in 28 U.S.C. § 2283, as follows:

"A court of the United States may not grant an injunction to stay proceedings in a State Court except as expressly authorized by Act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments."

The question arises whether the equitable remedies specified by Federal statutes for the protection of civil rights have "expressly authorized" an exception to the anti-injunction statute. It was provided in 1871, and now incorporated in 42 U.S.C. § 1983, that:

"Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States, or other person within the jurisdiction thereof, to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceedings for redress." [30]

It has been held by the Court of Appeals in the Third Circuit [31] that 42 U.S.C. § 1983 supplied the statutory basis for an exception to the prohibition against Federal injunction of State proceedings; however, there are decisions in the Fourth,[32] Sixth,[33] and Seventh [34] Circuits to the contrary. Recently the Fifth Circuit held that the injunctive remedy provided by the Civil Rights Act of 1964 constituted an express statutory exception to the anti-injunction statute.[35]

In our view, the present state of the law does not adequately define or settle the appropriate occasions for the exercise of Federal equity power where a State proceeding or prosecution is brought in those areas of civil rights which the Committee deems entitled to Federal remedial protection. In undertaking to define the appropriate area for Federal equitable intervention in such cases, the Committee would propose to balance the right of the State to enforce its criminal laws and the right of the accused to prompt adjudication of his Federal Constitutional claims by extending the right to an injunction in certain narrow but highly significant areas in civil rights cases subject to removal on the grounds discussed at pp. 8–9, *supra*.

---

[23] See further discussion in the article by Amsterdam in the University of Pennsylvania Law Review, *supra* n. 22, at pages 832–35.

[24] It should be noted that these figures embrace several States, in some of which unusual delays in civil rights cases have been nominal or non-existent. Moreover, these figures reflect only those cases which have been fully completed, and prosecution in large numbers on account of demonstration activity is a relatively recent phenomenon. There are over 1,100 current unclosed cases in the Fund files, and the average age of these cases, even counting those just begun, is 30.3 months.

[25] See Lusky, *Racial Discrimination and the Federal Law: A Problem in Nullification*, 63 Col. L. Rev. 1163, 1179–1182 (1963).

[26] See *Toucey* v. *New York Life Ins. Co.* 314 U.S. 118, 129–141 (1941); Warren, *Federal and State Court Interference*, 43 Harv. L. Rev. 345 (1930); Taylor & Willis, *The Power of Federal Courts to Enjoin Proceedings in State Courts*, 42 Yale L. J. 1169 (1933); Durfee & Sloss, *Federal Injunction Against Proceedings in State Courts: Life History of a Statute*, 30 Mich. L. Rev. 1145 (1932); Note, *Federal Power to Enjoin State Court Proceedings*, 74 Harv. L. Rev. 726 (1961).

[27] *Douglas* v. *City of Jeannete*, 319 U.S. 157, 163 (1943); see also *Wells* v. *Hand*, 238 F. Supp. 779 (M.D. Ga., 1965), *aff'd*, 382 U.S. 39 (1965).

[28] See *Wells Fargo & Co.* v. *Taylor*, 254 U.S. 175, 183 (1920); *Toucey* v. *New York Life Ins. Co., supra* n. 26, at 134–139.

[29] *French* v. *Hay*, 89 U.S. (22 Wall.) 238, 250, 253 (1875) (two cases); *Toucey* v. *New York Life Ins. Co., supra* n. 26, at 132–134; *Bowles* v. *Willingham*, 321 U.S. 503 (1944); *Porter* v. *Dicken*, 328 U.S. 252 (1946).

[30] Act of April 20, 1871, Ch. 22, § 1, 17 Stat. 13; R.S. § 1979; 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

[31] *Cooper* v. *Hutchinson*, 184 F. 2d 119 (3d Cir. 1950). On motions for temporary injunctions in *Tuchman* v. *Welch*, 42 Fed. 548 (C.C.D. Kan. 1890), and *M. Schandler Bottling Company* v. *Welch*, 42 Fed. 561 (C.C.D. Kan. 1890), it was held that the predecessor to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 provided the necessary statutory authorization for federal equity jurisdiction notwithstanding the prohibition contained in the predecessor to 28 U.S.C. § 2283, but on subsequent demurrers the temporary injunctions were dissolved and the bills dismissed for want of equity in *Hemsley* v. *Myers*, 45 Fed. 283 (C.C.D. Kan. 1891).

[32] *Baines* v. *City of Danville*, 337 F. 2d 579 (4th Cir. 1964), *cert. denied*, 381 U.S. 939 (1965).

[33] *Sexton* v. *Barry*, 233 F. 2d 220 (6th Cir. 1956), *cert. denied*, 352 U.S. 870.

[34] *Goss* v. *Illinois*, 312 F. 2d 257 (7th Cir. 1963).

[35] *Dilworth* v. *Riner*, 343 F. 2d 226 (5th Cir. 1965).

There are four types of circumstances, any one of which, in the view of the Committee, should be a sufficient condition precedent in such cases for the exercise of the injunctive power to stay the criminal proceeding:

1. "An issue determinative of the proceeding in favor of the party seeking the injunction has been decided in favor of his contention in a final decision in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation."

The need for an extension of the remedy of equitable relief in this type of use is illustrated by the litigation arising out of the cases of the Jackson Freedom Riders, which commenced on May 24, 1961 when they entered the "wrong" waiting room at the bus terminal, ignored the request of police to leave it, and were arrested on charges of breach of the peace and conspiracy to breach the peace.[36] The facts in relation to each of some 300 defendants were substantially the same. There was no genuine dispute over these facts, and there was no claim that any of the Riders had been disorderly in any way. Fifteen white Protestant ministers, on the basis of testimony not materially different from that available in the other 300 cases, were given a directed acquittal at a trial *de novo* in the Hinds County Court.

In November, 1963, all of the other cases had been tried in the Municipal Court and then tried *de novo* before juries in the County Court; a number had been decided and affirmed by the Circuit Court and some of them had been briefed in the Mississippi Supreme Court.

When the fifteen white Protestant ministers were found not guilty, it meant that, as regards the other civil rights defendants, a final decision had been made in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation which constituted a holding that these facts could not amount to a violation of the State's criminal law. Under such circumstances, the Federal court should have had the power to stay State criminal proceedings against tha other Jackson Freedom Riders. Removal would not be the most appropriate remedy here since its allows the prosecution to continue, and in these cases the prosecutions should have been terminated.

2. "The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding has been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding."

Again, in the case of the Freedom Riders litigation, the Federal District Court, acting on instructions from the Supreme Court (*Bailey v. Patterson*, 369 U.S. 31, 34), had held the segregation statute underlying the prosecution to be unconstitutional (see p. 13, *supra*). If Freedom Riders who were tried subsequent to this 1962 Federal court decision were being prosecuted under this same statute, it would be a prosecution under a statute which had been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding. Such a factual situation would certainly justify a Federal court's having the power to enjoin and further steps being taken to prosecute the criminal proceeding.

3. "The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding is, on its face, an unconstitutional abridgement of the rights to freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the people to peaceably assemble"; or

4. "The proceeding was instituted for the purpose of discouraging the parties or others from exercising rights of freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the people to peaceably assemble."

The Committee further recommends that in the civil rights cases made subject to removal, the remedy of equitable relief also be made available where either of the above two criteria recently laid down by the Supreme Court in *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister*[37] are met. The Court there authorized Federal injunctive relief against a threatened prosecution by the State of Louisiana of officials of the Southern Conference Educational Fund for violation of statutes "justifiably attacked on their face as abridging free expression, or as applied for the purpose of discouraging protected activities."[38] Statutory codification of *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister* will serve to stabilize the rule of that case and to provide Federal district Courts with re-enforced guide-lines. Accordingly the Committee has proposed the two additional bases for Federal equitable relief quoted above.

In addition to urging the statutory creation of the aforementioned four categories of cases where the exercise of Federal injunctive power is appropriate, the Committee further recommends the abolition of the judicially created abstention doctrine. The Staff Study shows that this doctrine has been frequently invoked to bar or delay the granting of prompt and effective Federal relief. Unlike the anti-injunction statute itself, the abstention doctrine was a judicial creation which has, in the past, served to lead Federal courts to defer to State courts in the adjudication of Federal rights. Abstention permits the Federal court to postpone the exercise of its jurisdiction and thus to delay the resolution of serious Constiutional problems in civil rights cases.[39]

In order to assure that the grounds recommended for Federal equitable relief are not eroded by requirements of exhaustion of State remedies such as developed as part of the abstention doctrine, the proposed bill provides that, where a Federal injunction is appropriate on the grounds mentioned, the relief is not to be denied or deferred by reason of the availability of any defense or remedy in the State court. Since the purpose of expanded Federal equitable relief in the limited circumstances described by the Committee is to provide expeditious Federal disposition of a pending State proceeding, it would be inappropriate to require exhaustion of remedies in that same State proceeding. This branch of the Committee's recommendation is in accord with the prevailing authorities.[40]

Finally, it should be noted that the proposed instances for the remedy of Federal equitable intervention will be resorted to only infrequently if the Committee's removal proposal is adopted. Every case in which we would authorize the grant of equitable relief would also be subject to removal under the proposed removal statute. However, if in addition to the grounds for removal there is also present one of the explicit conditions warranting *prompt* equitable relief discussed above, the State proceeding should be enjoined finally.[41]

IV. EFFECT OF PROPOSED REVISIONS ON AN ACTUAL CASE

On October 20, 1958, the Reverend Fred Shuttlesworth, a Negro civil rights leader, walked to a Birmingham, Alabama, bus stop with a group of Negroes. When the bus arrived, all but Shuttlesworth boarded it and took seats in the front section. There was a city ordinance, only six days old, which authorized the bus system to make its own seating regulations and provided that failure to comply with the regulations was a breach of the peace. The bus company immediately adopted regulations requiring segregated seating, and the Negroes acted to test this new maneuver which had the purpose of avoiding desegregation. The driver of the bus ordered the Negroes to move to the rear of the bus, which they refused to do. All of them, including Shuttlesworth, who was still on the sidewalk, were arrested on charges of breach of the peace, conspiracy to break the peace and disorderly conduct. On October 23, Shuttlesworth and the other Negroes were convicted of disorderly conduct in the Recorder's Court and varying sentences were given, including one of 82 days in jail at hard labor for Shuttlesworth.

That this criminal prosecution of Shuttlesworth was obviously to thwart and frustrate the exercise by him and others of civil rights was shown more than five years later in a decision of the Federal District Court. On December 12, 1963, that court released Shuttlesworth in a habeas corpus proceeding, stating:

> "The court finds no evidence whatever in the record to support the conviction of petitioners, and, under the compulsion of the authority of the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Thompson* v. *The City of Louisville, supra*, has no alternative except to conclude that the convictions are void and without force and effect, since as the court there said 'just as conviction upon a charge not made would be sheer denial of due process' so is it a violation of due process to convict and punish a man without evidence of his guilt." *Shuttlesworth* v. *Moore*, 9 Race Rel. L. Rep. 107 (N.D. Ala. 1963).

Under the ancient removed precedents discussed earlier this criminal prosecution could probably not have been removed initially to the Federal court since the ordinance under which Shuttlesworth was convicted was not discriminatory on its face. However, under the Civil Rights Procedure Act recommended by the Committee herewith, removal would have been authorized since the prosecution was on account of acts coming within the definition of the proposed subdivisions (3) and (4) of Section 1443. Promptly after removal, the defendant might have had the case dismissed because his acts were pursuant to vested civil rights. Instead of waiting five years to effect protection of his civil rights, Shuttlesworth might have secured such protection within a matter of months. It is this speed which the proposed removal revision would bring to Federal process for vindicating the substantive rights granted by the Constitution and Federal statutes.

On July 20, 1960, after Shuttlesworth's conviction had been affirmed by the County Court of Alabama and he had appealed to the intermediate State appellate court, the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit held that the ordinance under which he was convicted was unconstitutional.[42] Under the proposed Civil Rights Procedure Act,

---

[36] The following are some of the citations of these various decisions: *Bailey* v. *Patterson*, 199 F. Supp. 595, 612–13 (S.D. Miss. 1961), *vacated and rev'd*, 369 U.S. 31 (1962); 206 F. Supp. 67 (S.D. Miss. 1962), *rev'd in part*, 323 F. 2d 201 (5th Cir. 1963), *cert. denied sub nom. City of Jackson* v. *Bailey*, 376 U.S. 910 (1964).

[37] 380 U.S. 479 (1965); see also *Cameron* v. *Johnson*, 244 F. Supp. 846, *vacated and remanded*, 381 U.S. 741 (1965).

[38] *Dombrowski* v. *Pfister, supra* n. 37 at 380 U.S. 489–90.

[39] See discussion in Lusky, *Racial Discrimination and the Federal Law: A Problem in Nullification*, 63 Col. L. Rev. 1163–1177 (1963).

[40] See *Lane* v. *Wilson*, 307 U.S. 268 (1939); *Mills* v. *Board of Education*, 30 F. Supp. 245 (D. Md. 1939); *Thompson* v. *Gibbes*, 60 F. Supp. 872 (E.D. S.C. 1945); *Stapleton* v. *Mitchell*, 60 F. Supp. 31 (D. Kan. 1945), *appeal dismissed sub nom. Mitchell* v. *McElroy*, 326 U.S. 690; see also *Hague* v. *CIO*, 307 U.S. 496 (1939).

[41] A possible correlation between the two remedies may arise in a Freedom Rider situation, where arrests are made and trials held over a period of weeks. It is conceivable that the first group arrested might remove and obtain a final adjudication of the unconstitutionality of the statute under which the arrests were made. If the State continued to press the prosecutions, an injunction would be available.

[42] *Boman* v. *Birmingham Transit Company*, 280 F. 2d 531, 535 (5th Cir. 1960).

Shuttlesworth could then have secured an order from the Federal court enjoining any further State criminal proceedings. However, under the present state of the law, because of the anti-injunction statute and decisions thereunder, Shuttlesworth could not stay further States court proceedings and continued to be involved in protracted proceedings in the State courts until December 12, 1963, when the District Court finally granted habeas corpus.

A summary of the Shuttlesworth litigation, since his arrest for disorderly conduct on October 20, 1958, shows the following: He made numerous court appearances, divided as follows: 5 in the State court to review his conviction directly; 3 in the Federal court to obtain an injunction; 3 in the State court seeking collateral review and bail; 1 in the Federal court to obtain bail; and 4 in the Federal court to secure release on habeas corpus. In addition to the five years involved with this court litigation, he served 34 days in jail, had to pay money for bail and had to be afforded legal services of a value of many thousands of dollars. This gross miscarriage of justice would have been prevented if the Committee's recommendations for statutory amendments had then been in force.

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, the Special Committee on Civil Rights Under Law is of the opinion that the Congress should consider and enact improvements in the Federal remedial statutes applicable to civil rights cases along the lines discussed herein. The Committee's draft of a Federal Civil Rights Procedure Act, annexed in bill form as Appendix A, is believed to represent a carefully limited extension of Federal jurisdiction to protect the vital Federal interest at stake in State prosecutions for civil rights activity, without unduly hampering the States in the discharge of their legitimate responsibility for enforcement of the criminal law.

APPENDIX A

[Proposed bill, 89th Cong., second sess.]

S. ——

[H.R. ——]

In the Senate of the United States

[In the House of Representatives]

———, 1966

Mr. ——— introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on ———

A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the district courts of the United States over certain classes of removed cases and to provide injunctive relief in certain cases, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Civil Rights Procedure Act."

SEC. 2. Findings and purpose.

(a) The Congress has over the last century adopted legislation declaring, protecting, and granting various civil right to citizens. It is the sense of Congress that some citizens seeking to avail themselves of these declared rights have been subjected to lengthy and expensive criminal prosecutions instituted to deter them from attempting to obtain their civil rights. It is further the sense of Congress that the proper means to correct this unlawful activity is to vest appropriate jurisdiction in the district courts of the United States.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress and the purpose of this legislation to promote the general welfare by preventing reprisals against those who seek to end discrimination on account of race, color, religion or national origin prohibited by the Constitution or laws of the United States.

SEC. 3. Removal of causes.

(a) Section 1443 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended by substituting a semi-colon for the period at the end of subsection (2) and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(3) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin; or

"(4) For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subsection (3) of this section."

(b) Subsection (d) of section 1447 of title 28 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"(d) An order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed is not reviewable on appeal or otherwise, except that an order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed pursuant to section 1443 of this title shall be appealable as a final decision under section 1291 and an order denying remand of a case removed pursuant to section 1443 shall be appealable as an injunction of proceedings in the State court under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1292."

SEC. 4. Injunction of State proceedings.

Section 1979 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1983) is amended by inserting "(a)" at the beginning of the section and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) Such redress shall include the grant of an injunction to stay a proceeding in a State court where such proceeding was instituted for:

(1) Any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin; or

(2) Any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subparagraph (1) of this subsection;

and where:

(i) An issue determinative of the proceeding in favor of the party seeking the injunction has been decided in favor of his contention in a final decision in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation;

(ii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding has been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding;

(iii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding is, on its face, an unconstitutional abridgement of the rights to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble; or

(iv) The proceeding was instituted for the purpose of discouraging the parties or others from exercising rights of freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble.

"(c) In an action seeking an injunction under subsection (b) the court shall not deny or defer relief on the ground that a defense or remedy in the State courts is available."

APPENDIX B

PRESENT TEXT OF RELEVANT STATUTES WITH PROPOSED REVISIONS INCLUDED

(Matter added is italicized, and matter to be omitted is bracketed.)

TITLE 28, U.S. CODE

§ 1443. Civil Rights cases

Any of the following civil actions or criminal prosecutions, commenced in a State court may be removed by the defendant to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place wherein it is pending:

(1) Against any person who is denied or cannot enforce in the courts of such State a right under any law providing for the equal civil rights of citizens of the United States, or of all persons within the jurisdiction thereof;

(2) For any act under color of authority derived from any law providing for equal rights, or for refusing to do any act on the ground that it would be inconsistent with such law[.];

(3) *For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin; or*

(4) *For any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subsection (3) of this section.*

§ 1447. Procedure after removal generally

(a) In any case removed from a State court, the district court may issue all necessary orders and process to bring before it all proper parties whether served by process issued by the State or otherwise.

(b) It may require the petitioner to file with its clerk copies of all records and proceedings in such State court or may cause the same to be brought before it by writ of certiorari issued to such State court.

(c) If at any time before final judgment it appears that the case was removed improvidently and without jurisdiction, the district court shall remand the case, and may order the payment of just costs. A certified copy of the order of remand shall be mailed by its clerk to the clerk of the State court. The State court may thereupon proceed with such case.

(d) An order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed is not reviewable on appeal or otherwise, except that an order remanding a case to the State court from which it was removed pursuant to section 1443 of this title shall be [reviewable by appeal or otherwise] *appealable as a final decision under section 1291 and an order denying remand of a case removed pursuant to section 1443 shall be appealable as an injunction of proceedings in the State court under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 1292.*

§ 2241. Power to grant writ

(a) Writs of habeas corpus may be granted by the Supreme Court, any justice thereof, the district courts and any circuit judge within their respective jurisdictions. The order of a circuit judge shall be entered in the records of the district court of the district wherein the restraint complained of is had.

* * * * *

(c) The writ of habeas corpus shall not extend to a prisoner unless—

* * * * *

(3) He is in custody in violation of the Constitution or laws or treaties of the United States;

* * * * *

§ 2254. State custody; remedies in State Courts

An application for a writ of habeas corpus in behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted unless it appears that the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, or that there is either an absence of available State corrective process or the existence of circumstances rendering such process ineffective to protect the rights of the prisoner.

An applicant shall not be deemed to have exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State, within the meaning of this section, if he has the right under the law of the State to raise, by any available procedure, the question presented.

§ 2283. Stay of State court proceedings

A court of the United States may not grant an injunction to stay proceedings in a State court except as expressly authorized by Act of Congress, or where necessary in aid of its jurisdiction, or to protect or effectuate its judgments.

TITLE 42, U.S. CODE

§ 1983. Civil action for deprivation of rights.

(a) Every person who, under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom, or usage, of any State or Territory, subjects, or causes to be subjected, any citizen of the United States or other person within the jurisdiction thereof to the deprivation of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured by the Constitution and laws, shall be liable to the party injured in an action at law, suit in equity, or other proper proceeding for redress.

(b) Such redress shall include the grant of an injunction to stay a proceeding in a State court where such proceeding was instituted for:

(*1*) *Any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right granted, secured or protected by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or of any other right granted, secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States against the denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, color, religion or national origin; or*

(2) *Any exercise, or attempted exercise, of any right to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States, when committed in furtherance of any right of the nature described in subparagraph (1) of this subsection;*

and where:

(i) An issue determinative of the proceeding in favor of the party seeking the injunction has been decided in favor of his contention in a final decision in another proceeding arising out of a like factual situation;

(ii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding has been declared unconstitutional in a final decision in another proceeding;

(iii) The statute, ordinance, administrative regulation or other authority for the proceeding is, on its face, an unconstitutional abridgement of the rights to freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble; or

(iv) The proceeding was instituted for the purpose of discouraging the parties or others from exercising rights of freedom of speech or of the press or of the people to peaceably assemble.

(c) In an action seeking an injunction under subsection (b) the court shall not deny or defer relief on the ground that a defense or remedy in the State courts is available.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am pleased once again this year to join with my colleague Senator Kennedy in introducing this bill to provide for the removal of certain cases from State to Federal courts. This bill is the result of a comprehensive study by a committee of the Association of the Bar of the City of New York headed by the distinguished judge, Francis Rivers. Other members of the committee were Lloyd K. Garrison, president of the Board of Education of the City of New York; J. Lee Rankin, former Solicitor General of the United States; Whitney North Seymour, former president of the American Bar Association; the Honorable Samuel I. Rosenman, former Federal judge and now president of the association; Robert Sweet, now deputy mayor of the city of New York; Jack Greenberg, head of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund; and G. Wallace Bates, Aaron Benenson, Robert L. Carter, John R. Fernbach, Murray Gordon, Daniel Gutman, Robert H. Janover, J. Robert Lunney, Barbara Scott Preiskel, Hon. Scovel Richardson, Alan U. Schwartz, and Asa D. Sokolow, all distinguished members of the New York bar.

Briefly, this bill would allow removal of certain cases from State to Federal court where it is alleged that State prosecutions had been instituted to curb the exercise of rights guaranteed by the Civil Rights Act of 1964, or by the Constitution. This is a limited approach and would not authorize wholesale removal simply on the accusation that racial bias was a factor in the prosecution, but it would allow a fair hearing in a Federal court where such a hearing might not be available in State courts.

Last year, the Supreme Court, in two cases from the fifth circuit, greatly restricted the removal power, and held that the 1866 statute allowed removal only in cases where the State statute in question was patently unconstitutional. Justice Stewart, writing for the majority however, specifically stated that a broadening of the removal power would be within the purview of Congress.

I hope our bill will receive the early attention of the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, in connection with their consideration of jury reform legislation which both Senator Kennedy and I have cosponsored.

AMENDMENT OF THE ANTIDUMPING LAW

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott], and Senators Bayh, Bennett, Bible, Boggs, Brewster, Brooke, Burdick, Byrd of West Virginia, Carlson, Clark, Curtis, Dirksen, Dodd, Dominick, Ervin, Fannin, Hansen, Hickenlooper, Inouye, Kuchel, Lausche, McCarthy, Metcalf, Miller, Morse, Moss, Mundt, Murphy, Pearson, Prouty, Randolph, Ribicoff, Sparkman, Symington, Talmadge, Thurmond, Tower, Yarborough, and Young of Ohio, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Anti-Dumping Act of 1921.

I feel the introduction of this bill to be particularly important at this time. Negotiations are presently being conducted—or have already been concluded—in Geneva on an international antidumping code. This satellite agreement to the Kennedy talks would necessarily encompass substantive changes in provisions of the 1921 act. While I have been assured time and time again there are no substantive changes envisioned in the agreement and that there will be no need for implementing legislation or senatorial consent to an international instrument, I find this difficult to comprehend. How does one substantively modify a statute without legislation?

Mr. President, much as I respect the judgment of the Office of the Special Representative for Trade, I submit that the decision on whether an agreement needs legislation to effect it, or approval to make it legal, remains in the Congress and not within the executive. I value the administration's advice and give it due consideration, but when administration advice takes the form of deciding what areas of trade agreements are not our concern, I feel I must stand up and voice unequivocal disagreement. Is the executive branch now to supersede the function of the policymaking committees of the Congress and allow access only to those areas it deems fit? Must we wait to see here legislation by the executive branch that will weaken rather than strengthen the provisions of the 1921 act? I say no, and I feel that the over 40 Senators who have joined me as cosponsors feel the same way.

To me this broader issue is what is at stake here today, as well as the merits of the bill I am now proposing. This bill will provide clarification in this area of our international trade policy, provide guidelines for investigation procedures, and define just what constitutes injury.

But I believe, in light of what has been reported in the press and from what I have been told by administration spokesmen, that more is at stake here than providing ourselves and our trading partners with a responsible curb to unfair trade practices. What is at stake here is the right of the U.S. Congress to determine where and when it shall legislate. What is at stake here is the right of the U.S. Congress to speak with its composite wisdom in areas that are constitutionally and traditionally its domain. What is at stake here is the beginning of a movement within the Congress to reassert its rights, prerogatives, and, indeed, its beholden duty to itself and the people it represents. What is at stake here is a refusal by the Congress to again and again be presented with international agreements the rejection of which would place the Executive in an embarrassing position. What is at stake here is the Congress firm declaration to see eroded no further the separation of powers that has served this country and, indeed, the world so well.

I ask you, Mr. President, have we been delinquent in providing discretionary powers to the President to negotiate in Geneva? Have we been delinquent in providing food to starving peoples all over the globe? Have we failed to respond to the needs of developing nations that depend so heavily on banks and funds we generously support? Is there any shame to be confessed by the Congress when 25 years after V–E Day we look at the achievements of the Marshall plan? Where, Mr. President, have we failed to respond to a genuine need that was presented to the Congress? I maintain, Mr. President, that recent history shows the Congress of the United States can and does respond in a timely and fulsome manner when the need is clearly demonstrated. The purpose of this bill is, therefore, twofold, Mr. President. First, it provides the Congress the opportunity to put the Executive on notice that the pendulum of power has swung too far in one direction and will begin to move back where the Founding Fathers intended it to be. Second, the bill itself provides clear ground rules for antidumping investigations and administrative proceedings.

Mr. President, a fair and effective antidumping act is urgently needed, and it is needed now before there is further harm done to domestic industry by the dumping of imports into our home markets. Vice President HUMPHREY, then our distinguished colleague, used these words in introducing the 1963 antidumping bill:

> The amendment I introduce today does not alter the philosophy of purpose of the Antidumping Act in any way. Its only purpose is to make the act more effective in achieving its original purpose and to help insure that international trade will be conducted in a fair and equitable fashion.

The word here that goes to the heart of the matter, Mr. President, is "fair." That is all this bill seeks to insure American industry and agriculture. It has been the declared policy of this country to seek often free but fair trade. The 14 points of President Woodrow Wilson included "removal so far as possible of all economic barriers to the establishment of quality of trade conditions among nations." From that time, despite the intervention of World War II, there has been an ever increasing degree of international commerce, which this past year totaled over $200 billion. This has been made possible by the spirit behind President Wilson's vision of a lasting world peace underwritten, so to speak, by free international trade under an international rule of law. There have sprung from this original vision, Mr. President, many institutions whose aim is to encourage free but fair trade in the world. Today we have the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and more recently the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. All of these have been made possible by the belief of the United States in the soundness of the motivating spirit made possible by and resulting from the Bretton Woods Conference.

Mr. President, I have purposely outlined very briefly here progress made in the last half century in liberalizing international trade. I feel the United States, by being in the forefront of this movement, has demonstrated beyond any doubt it is not protectionist. We wish trade to become increasingly free. Surely, the powers granted to the President under the Trade Expansion Act demonstrate the belief of the Congress in free but fair trade. But as one studies the evolution of these ideas and the institutions that have arisen as a result of them, one word comes through ever and ever more clearly; and that word is "fair."

This then, Mr. President, is what we are trying to achieve through the bill now being offered for the consideration of the Senate. We are trying to take that important step in insuring that fair and equitable trade under an eventual international rule of law will indeed become a reality. This act is to make clear that we desire to increase our commerce but will not permit violations of equity standards we demand of our own industries in domestic trade. Surely, a look at the health of the American free enterprise system, operating under rules that encourage rather than discourage competition, will demonstrate the wisdom of the approach and philosophy embodied in this bill.

The primary purpose of the bill will be to provide the Treasury and the Federal Tariff Commission with a clearer definition of what constitutes injury to domestic industry. Far too often the Commission has considered it appropriate to find injury only to afford some dying domestic industry a measure of equity against foreign dumping. Far too many times there has been real and serious injury to American industry and labor by unfair practices of producers from abroad without appropriate action being taken by the Commission. The bill thus elaborates the standards by which injury is to be recognized under the Antidumping Act. These standards, I feel, are in harmony with the spirit that gave rise to antitrust and other unfair trade laws as they have been developed by the Congress, administered by Government agencies, and adjudicated by the courts.

Under the provisions of this bill, injury to domestic industry would exist if dumped imports capture 5 percent of total domestic sales, or are a contributing cause of: first, a price decline affecting 50 percent of domestic sales; second, a 5 percent decline of labor; or third, any anticompetitive effects. This clarification should make clear to the importer just what would constitute injury and would lessen the chance of his embarking on a venture that would prove expensive to both him and domestic industry.

A second provision of the bill would curtail the number of opportunities now available to circumvent the act by offering exclusive dealing arrangements or allowances for differences in quantity discounts or circumstances of sale on sales to the United States, as compared with the foreigner's home market sales. This would be limited to differences in costs involved which were actually taken into account by the seller in setting his price.

A third provision of the bill would ease the harsh language of the present law and permit the Treasury to determine dumping on the basis of information other than material volunteered by the supplier. Refusal to supply information would not be the grounds for conclusive determination of dumping, thus immediately sending the matter to the Tariff Commission for injury determination.

A fourth provision of the bill would require firm assurances from a supplier that his ceasing to dump is not just a ploy to halt the investigations and that he will not immediately resume dumping of the same or another product.

A fifth provision of the bill would, in effect, ratify some of the concessions now given to the importing community by the Treasury. I am referring particularly to the revisions which would require more detailed complaints, more specific notices of investigations, elimination in large part of the retroactive application of dumping duties and the recognition by by Treasury of a warranty by foreign exporters to reimburse U.S. importers for dumping duties on certain shipments.

Mr. President, these provisions of the bill would, I am sure, obviate present confusion and eliminate a great deal of needless frustration. The bill is moderate and constructive. Its thrust, I say again, is not toward protection but toward fairness and equity. This bill would go a long way toward answering the complaints of both domestic and foreign interests against the present law and the way it is being administered. Therefore, I feel that continued and increased bipartisan support should be enlisted to make the U.S. Antidumping Act a model of efficiency, speed, certainty and above all, fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1726) to amend the Antidumping Act, 1921, introduced by Mr. HARTKE (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

INCREASED NUMBER OF JUDGES IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing three additional judges for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, five additional judges for the District of Columbia court of general sessions, and two additional judges for the District of Columbia juvenile court.

As a member of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, I have made a very careful study of the judicial manpower requirements of these courts and have become convinced that the number of judges proposed in my bill is minimal. I am convinced that the 10 additional judges proposed for these three courts can be utilized very fully and efficiently in processing the business and improving the quality of justice in the Nation's Capital in this city's war against crime.

As recently as yesterday, a panel of very distinguished District of Columbia lawyers, supported by the judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals, released a study and recommendations concerning the courts. Among these recommendations of this distinguished group was the call for five additional judges for the court of general sessions and three additional judges for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals.

I regret that this panel of distinguished District of Columbia lawyers and judges of the U.S. Court of Appeals did not recommend any additional judicial manpower for the District of Columbia juvenile court. The case backlog for the juvenile court is a very serious one and should be remedied as expeditiously as possible. The study which I just mentioned urges that every child brought before the juvenile court should have a lawyer and that any delinquent housed in the District of Columbia Receiving Home, awaiting a hearing, should be brought before the court sooner than under the present practice. I do not understand why in view of these recommendations, which I believe are very valid ones, the study group did not recommend additional judicial manpower for the juvenile court. In my judgment, additional judicial manpower for the juvenile court is imperative. Not only should two new judicial positions be authorized, but the White House should act without delay in filling the vacancy which occurred in that court in November of last year.

A study undertaken by the Office of Criminal Justice of the U.S. Department of Justice, released in October 1966, entitled "Criminal Justice in a Metropolitan Court," states that—

> Of all the problems facing the court, the problem of an unmanageable volume of cases is the most immediate.

As Senators will recall, Congress authorized five additional judges for the court of general sessions last year. The additional judicial manpower authorized last year for the court of general sessions has been helpful, though it does not meet the present or future requirements of that court. Again, I urge the President of the United States to nominate without any further delay two judges for the court of general sessions in order that existing vacancies in that court will be filled.

My very wonderful friend, the chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, Mr. BIBLE, introduced in the Senate on May 3, 1967, a bill to authorize three additional judges for the District of Columbia Court of Appeals. Senator BIBLE has very effectively documented the case for these additional judges. I am in wholehearted support of the proposal made by the Senator from Nevada.

The case backlog in the three courts which I have just mentioned continues to grow. One of the reasons for this backlog is that more and more defendants are requesting trials, and this is as it should be, but we must face up to the fact that this is the situation and provide the courts with the necessary number of judges to handle the workload. The litigants and the public are entitled to no less.

As Senators know, judges cannot do all of the work on behalf of the court. There are many problems in the District of Columbia crying out for a solution. Among these problems are the types of programs established to treat and rehabilitate juvenile delinquents and adult criminals. Much more needs to be done in the juvenile field in order that, when the judges of that court in their wisdom impose sanctions against a juvenile, the necessary educational, social, and rehabilitative programs may be put to work so that the possibility of the juvenile returning to a life of crime or asocial behavior may be sharply diminished. There simply must be additional money appropriated in order that the facilities and training programs may be greatly improved.

The staffs of these three courts must also be greatly increased. More probation officers are urgently needed, and I shall do what I can to see that we at least recognize the problem and then begin to appropriate the amount of money which is necessary to achieve these requirements.

We must seek to establish in the District of Columbia a first-class court system. The bill I introduce today will help achieve that objective.

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk for appropriate reference and ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Oregon.

The bill (S. 1731) to amend title 11 of the District of Columbia Code to increase the number of associate judges on the District of Columbia court of general sessions, the District of Columbia Court of Appeals, and the juvenile court of the District of Columbia introduced by Mr. MORSE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1731

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 11-902(a) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "twenty" and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty-five".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 11-702(a) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "five".

(b) Section 11-703(c) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "four".

SEC. 3. Section 11-1502(a) of the District of Columbia Code is amended by striking out "two" and inserting in lieu thereof "four".

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 190

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE] and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH] be added to the list of cosponsors of my bill, S. 877, to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1282) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], I also ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY], be added as cosponsors of the bill (S. 1283) to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1691, a bill to revise the Patent Laws of the United States, the name of the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF] be included as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator TYDINGS be added as a cosponsor of S. 1591, an amendment to the Oil Pollution Act of 1924, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I ask unanimous consent that the name of Senator CLARK be added as a cosponsor of S. 1485, the Intergovernmental Manpower Act of 1967, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], I ask unanimous consent that the names of Senators INOUYE, MOSS, and PELL be added as cosponsors of S. 1582, the Federal Fine Arts and Architecture Act, at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of my bill, S. 1684, the National Park Service Natural Science Research Act, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] be added as a cosponsor. Senator KUCHEL indicated to me his desire to be added as a cosponsor of this proposed legislation. I am extremely grateful for the support of the ranking minority member of the Senate Interior Committee and I regret that his name was inadvertently omitted from the first printing of this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added as a cosponsor to S. 727, to exclude certain State employees from the application of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] be added as a cosponsor of S. 925, to direct the Secretary of the Treasury to establish a reserve of at least 165 million ounces of silver for national defense purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. Hansen] be added as a cosponsor of the bill (S. 884) to authorize the appropriation of the receipts of the Colorado River development fund for the purpose of making allowances to the Hoover Dam powerplant for deficiencies in firm energy generation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I wish to announce additional hearings on resolutions pending before this subcommittee which pertain to electoral college reform. The hearings are scheduled to begin at 10 a.m. on May 16, 17, and 18. They will be conducted in room G 304 of the New Senate Office Building.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, May 9, 1967, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 270) to provide for the participation of the Department of the Interior in the construction and operation of a large prototype desalting plant, and for other purposes.

POSSIBLE GROUND INVASION OF NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an able reporter, Richard Dudman, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, wrote an article in that paper last Sunday to the effect that the United States was considering a ground invasion of North Vietnam.

If he is correct with respect to this consideration, for several reasons I want, now, to register my opposition to any such military development.

The United States already has some 450,000 troops in South Vietnam, not counting tens of thousands of additional military in the 7th Fleet and various air units; and because of the problems our brave and dedicated military are already having in that country, this additional move would generate the need for tens of thousands, if not ultimately hundreds of thousands, of additional American troops.

It is no secret that we already have serious problems and heavy casualties in South Vietnam, and I know of no reason to believe that those problems would be any less in North Vietnam. In addition, we would become further bogged down in the one war all our military experts of this century have warned against—a major ground war on the mainland of Asia.

Finally, it is my considered judgment—and, what is more important, the considered judgment of our leading experts in the Far East—that such an invasion on our part would probably result in Red Chinese combat ground troops moving into North Vietnam to oppose the forces of the United States.

The results of such an action on our part, therefore, are incalculable. They would include heavy additional loss in both lives and treasure, along with inevitable deterioration in our relations with Soviet Russia.

It is a fact that the United States is defending and/or financing most of the countries of the free world. Let me ask, which of these countries, in Europe, or the Middle East, or for that matter the Far East, would support the United States in any such new development?

Our chances for success in this war depend upon the nature and degree of the utilization of our technological advantages as contained in our airpower and seapower.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I referred, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Invasion of North Debated—Four Communist Divisions Threaten Near the Demilitarized Zone—Policymakers Recall MacArthur's Success With Inchon Landing

(By Richard Dudman)

Washington, May 6.—The idea of a United States invasion of North Vietnam is attracting increasing attention as a logical step in the expanding war.

A respected military observer, who happens to favor extrication instead of escalation, says: "From a purely military point of view, if I had another 300,000 men I would invade as soon as possible. The best time would probably be next December, when the rice paddies will be dry and the tanks could run over them."

A high ranking State Department official, asked about the prospects of invasion, said: "If we do, it will be only in the southern part of North Vietnam."

President Lyndon B. Johnson spurred such talk last March by the peculiar wording of his demand for reciprocal action by Hanoi in return for a halt in the U.S. bombing. He said, "we have said that we would be glad to stop our invasion of North Vietnam if they would stop their invasion of South Vietnam."

The State Department called special attention last week to the presence of North Vietnamese troops just north of the seventeenth parallel, the boundary between North and South. In carefully chosen words, reporters were told that at least four divisons were "massed" there, that the "most immediate problem" was the possibility of a conventional attack across the six-mile wide demilitarized zone at the border, and that the United States "may have to undertake more aggressive patrolling."

Reporters were told also that the United States still believed that the war must be won in the South but that, at the same time, it must not allow a "safe haven" in the North.

New talk of invasion grows partly out of an unannounced but evident change in American strategy. In the absence of a negotiated settlement, the Johnson Administration appears to have decided that it must destroy Hanoi's capacity to wage war.

Secretary of State Dean Rusk warned this week that the North Vietnamese forces just north of the border might attack the U.S. Marines just south of the border if there were a new halt in the bombing.

Hanoi's buildup at the demilitarized zone is not new. It began about a year ago. The change since the first of the year has been some shift in positions and stepped up patrolling.

The Pentagon appraisal is that the northern forces now could march across in force in a conventional raid, that their losses would be heavy and that they would be driven back.

"They would be playing our game," said an officer who has studied the matter. "I don't see what they could achieve by it."

Without taking that risk, however, the northern divisions pose a continuing threat that has tied down a big part of the U.S. Marine force that has been conducting painstaking pacification efforts in spreading areas of I Corps, comprising the five northernmost provinces of South Vietnam. Two battalions have been shifted this month from the southern part of the corps area up to the border. Army units had to be brought in to take their places in Quang Ngai and Quang Tin.

A logical military response by the United States would be to encircle this enemy force by landing perhaps three divisions on the coast of North Vietnam somewhere between the border and Hanoi. The result would be a typical nutcracker or hammer-and-anvil operation, in which the enemy units would be caught between the landing force behind them and a frontal attack across the border.

Military men visualize a brilliantly successful operation in which the enemy force would be cut off from its supplies, hit from both sides, and subjected to heavy bombardment from air, sea and ground.

Such a move would follow the pattern of General Douglas MacArthur's landing at Inchon, just southwest of Seoul in 1950, part of his drive northward after his forces had been forced into the tiny Pusan beachhead at the southern tip of Korea.

An account of the Inchon landing was given by Rutherford Poats, now assistant administrator for the Far East in the Agency for International Development and then a United Press correspondent, in his book "Decision in Korea."

Poats described the Inchon landing as a bold stroke that "turned near defeat into brilliant victory."

"It offered a chance to exploit fully for the first time the allies' absolute control of the sea and air and thus end the costly matching of man for man with the Communists on the ground," he wrote. "In exchange for great risks, it offered quick and complete victory."

Two reinforced divisions made the landing. Casualties were light. The move was hailed as a great success. It led to MacArthur's drive northward, past the thirty-eighth parallel, and on to the Yalu river, the border with China. That further move led, in turn, to China's entry into the Korean War.

The question of Chinese or Soviet intervention is a major one in all such possible escalations of the war, whether ground invasion of the North, bombing the immediate Hanoi area or bombing or blockading the harbor at Haiphong.

Policymakers have been showing increased confidence lately, however, that intervention is not likely. A commonly heard remark is, "if you had told me a year ago that we could do what we are doing now and China would not come in, I'd have said you were crazy." Some officials have been saying this for a year.

A new tone is evident on the Soviet side. A Soviet diplomat said this week in Washington that his country would respond to a U.S. invasion of North Vietnam with new and better military assistance to Hanoi.

Another Soviet diplomat, asked if his country was still having difficulty transporting military supplies across China to Vietnam, replied: "If necessary, we can move our supplies by other routes—directly into Saigon or Da Nang."

The remark was a scarcely veiled threat to use missiles to attack the South Vietnamese capital or the headquarters of the U.S. Marine forces in I Corps.

Another objection, held even by some Americans who fully support the bombing of North Vietnam, is that an invasion would mean additional massive involvement in ground warfare in Asia.

Some military observers question the effectiveness of U.S. combat forces in dealing decisively with the Viet Cong insurgency in the South. They believe that U.S. troops would find the going even tougher in the North, surrounded by a totally hostile population.

Some see a "limited" invasion, moreover, as a first step that would be expanded into an American effort to subjugate and occupy all of North Vietnam. They believe that would mean multiplying by at least two the present formidable problem of pacifying the South.

Serious talk of a U.S. invasion of the North would have been out of the question a few months ago. Even now, some find the idea inconceivable.

When Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara was asked at a recent briefing about the possibility, he was able to laugh off the question without answering it.

But it is in the nature of escalation that strategic horizons expand as the stakes rise.

McNamara gave persuasive arguments why it would be unwise to drop bombs at Hanoi and Haiphong and why it would be unwise to bomb North Vietnam's MIG airfields. Later—within days in the case of the MIG bases—the target list was enlarged to include what he had ruled out.

As one anxious observer of the war puts it, "this week's madness is next week's policy."

Mr. GORE. Does the Senator have the article in hand?

Mr. SYMINGTON. I do.

Mr. GORE. I read the article and found it disturbing. I should like to read one paragraph:

> A high ranking State Department official, asked about the prospects of invasion, said: "If we do, it will be only in the southern part of North Vietnam."

I hope this is not prophetic. I hope this does not turn out to be typical of, first, advisers; then, inch by inch, a full-fledged war.

I thank the Senator for calling this matter to the attention of the Senate. I concur in the remarks he has made.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the able senior Senator from Tennessee.

RESOLUTIONS APPROVED BY THE FARMERS COOPERATIVE COMMISSION CO. AT ITS 52D ANNUAL MEETING IN WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., at its 52d annual meeting in Wichita, Kans., April 10 and 11, approved resolutions and expressed its views on several items affecting agricultural income.

Approximately 1,000 people were in attendance at the meeting, representing 128 member cooperatives in Kansas, Colorado, and Oklahoma.

The Farmers Cooperative Commission Co., with its assets of over $15 million, is one of the strongest cooperative regional grain marketing agencies in the United States.

As these resolutions are of national interest, I ask unanmious consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURDICK in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolutions ordered to be printed in the RECORD are as follows:

RESOLUTION 1—FARM PROGRAMS

The marketing of wheat and feed grains has become a complex combination of domestic and export transactions. Grain producers are becoming more affected by International trade agreements, Government aid programs and barters.

Even with these complexities, farmers have accomplished much with their general farm, commodity and cooperative organizations. A Government farm program is an additional means available at present to gain the desired end in many commodities, especially wheat and feed grains.

We urge the continuance of price supports and a loan program. We further recommend the continuance of the present domestic wheat certificate program. We also recommend the use of export wheat certificates or a similar device to improve farmers income.

We favor the continuance of the P. L. 480 Food for Peace program and the expansion of section 32 purchases, expansion of the food stamp program and reduction of imports where they affect prices and income to producers.

RESOLUTION 2—FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS AND THE AGRICULTURE BUDGET

The cost of the current government Foreign Aid programs are now charged to the agricultural budget. These shipments do much to aid our foreign policy efforts. We recommend that the cost of the foreign aid programs be charged to the State Department or a similar interested department and not to USDA. We recommend that a concerted effort be made to help the general public recognize that a major portion of the money spent by USDA benefits all people, not just the farmer.

RESOLUTION 3—NATIONAL GRAIN RESERVE

We strongly urge that a so-called strategic or minimum wheat reserve be established during this session of Congress. This reserve to be set aside solely as a means of protection against crop failure or in cases of extreme national emergency. Such a reserve should be sufficient to meet these extreme conditions.

We strongly urge that these reserves should be completely isolated from the market and at no time should they be used in influencing the market. Further, the cost of carrying such reserve should be borne by the Department of Defense, State, or a like or proper department.

RESOLUTION 4—TRANSPORTATION

The very large investments by farmers in facilities which are rail connected and which were built in good faith in the expectation of the continuance of transit can be destroyed in short order by the elimination of transit privileges.

We vigorously oppose any changes in the present regulations pertaining to transit. We further oppose multiple car freight rates, non-transit rates, or rates based on mileage. We oppose multiple car rates unless multiple car rates can be construed to be two or more cars as can be used by rural stations.

We further recommend that flour rates be lowered to allow the flour mills of Kansas to compete with mills in other sections of the United States.

RESOLUTION 5—GRAIN GRADING STANDARDS

The present Federal Grain Grading Standards are unnecessarily strict, severe, and unduly expensive. We are convinced that the present grading standards have not resulted in any significant increase in exports or domestic sales of wheat. Since the wheat producer is the one who pays the discounts that are created by these stricter standards, we recommend that a re-examination of the Federal Grain Grading Standards be made for the purpose of making necessary changes, taking into account the financial effect on wheat producers.

RESOLUTION 7—RESEARCH AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT

The directors and management of the Farmers Cooperative Commission Company are supporting market research and development that promises economic improvement to the membership and the area it serves.

We encourage continued research and the employment of qualified personnel to find additional grain products for sale in the domestic and foreign markets. We recommend that an adequate promotional budget be maintained to support these products.

We commend the directors, the management, and the employees of the Farmers Cooperative Commission Company for their diligence in developing new products and markets for Kansas wheat.

RESOLUTION 8—CONSOLIDATION AND COMPETITION

Many cooperatives are still duplicating services to members of a general area. There are many cooperatives in the area served by the Farmers Cooperative Commission Company that could better serve the membership by being merged into a more efficient business. In most areas services could be expanded, improved and even established.

It is desirable that managers and directors study the possibilities of mergers both on the local and regional levels.

We encourage the Farmers Cooperative Commission Company to continue working on the possibility of a merger of regional cooperative grain marketing associations, keeping in mind the best interests of the general membership of Farmers Cooperative Commission Company.

Every cooperative should review its grain pricing structure and grain handling procedure with the aim of increasing grain margins to a level consistent with good business management and the lasting welfare of its members.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak for not more than 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY AND THE CONFLICT IN VIETNAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, last week the Republican policy committee released a report entitled "The War in Vietnam." This thought-provoking and heavily documented study brought to light a number of differences in the handling of the problem in Southeast Asia by Republican and Democratic administrations. It pointed out that in the Eisenhower administration, our policy in Vietnam was to treat the situation largely as a political matter. Times have changed. The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], has pointed out that the report does not suggest that we modify Republican support of our present national effort in Southeast Asia.

Today's problems are, in many respects, far different from those of a decade ago. It would be tragically wrong, in my opinion, for members of our party to assume that by playing upon simple contrasts between past and present policy, that the party in power can be left alone with the problem of the war. Acting on such an assumption would be both irresponsible and uninformed.

The Republican Party has, since the time of Arthur Vandenberg, stood firmly for a policy of collective security and constructive bipartisanship in foreign policy wherever the national interest required it. Politics cannot always stop at the water's edge. There must be dissent and discussion. But whenever the Nation has been committed, whether we agree or disagree with it, there arises a common responsibility for all of us.

Whether we like it or not, the United States is committed today in Vietnam. The issue before us now is not the origin of our involvement in the conflict, but bringing it to a conclusion, honorably, and, hopefully, peacefully. The role of our party is to seek that end, not for the sake of potential political gain but for the sake of the course of freedom for human beings.

The role of the Republican Party must be a forthright one—criticizing where blame is due, providing alternative avenues for solution, and encouraging, advising, and warning the administration regarding our national policies, as we conceive them.

The Republican Party has a major role to play. There are a number of critical actions, which, in service to the American people, it must continue to take.

First. Support the military effort in Vietnam and give all necessary support and assistance to the men in the field. The Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, Gen. Harold K. Johnson, defined our objective as "restoring the integrity and security of Vietnam and its people; so this means no attempt to overthrow the North Vietnamese Government, no wish to be involved in China, but that whatever is required in South Vietnam would be done." The accepted view of the conflict is still that it is a limited one.

Second. Encourage initiatives toward ending the war by honorable negotiations. Particular attention must be given to Asian initiatives such as the proposed All-Asia Peace Conference and negotiation between the Republic of South Vietnam and opposing forces willing to accept constitutional government. If there is one aspect of the Eisenhower policy that needs reiteration by our party, it is the continued emphasis on the political aspects of the conflict.

Third. Oppose expansion of the war to global dimensions. The risks of Soviet or Communist Chinese involvement are all too apparent. The larger Communist powers must be on notice of the determination of the Government and people of the United States to bring an end to our effort by negotiation, if possible, but by military force, if necessary.

Fourth. Clarify the issues and the aims of the American people. Free debate is essential to the democratic process. So is constructive criticism. The people must speak out when the administration fails to treat events with candor.

In a recent speech before the junior chamber of commerce of the city of Los Angeles, I called upon the President to take positive action to overcome the doubts that plague our Nation. I then said:

> The people, through their President and their Congress, must sharpen the public dialogue in order to fix our goals, to put an end to the corruption of initiative which stems from misunderstanding, and to reassure our gallant men in the field that their sacrifice is not in vain.
>
> I believe the cause of a just peace would be advanced if the Administration were to send a clear statement of its goals for the future peace, security and independence of Southeast Asia to the Congress for debate and action. It would help to bring our people together, and to strengthen the faith of all Americans in freedom. I think it would help our position before the world.

In the national dialog the Republican Party has a special role to play as the "loyal opposition." It must help guard against a tendency, all too common in our involvement in Vietnam, of taking at face value optimistic estimates of what we can hope to achieve. The situation in Vietnam is highly complex. It represents a wholly unique tragedy in all our country's history. Oversimplification or attempts to conceal important facts can only increase the tempo of criticism and the divisions among us.

Fifth. Expose excessive expenditures and wasteful use of Government funds. The growing costs of the Vietnam conflict have put the budget in deficit, caused a rise in taxes, encouraged inflation, and forced the curtailment of many important domestic programs. The administration's handling of national monetary and fiscal problems must not be left unchallenged. The economic effects of the war, now and in the future, are of grave and continuing concern to all Americans.

Sixth. Help to achieve unity for a divided people. The Republican membership in the Congress has given the administration unstinting cooperation to our effort in Southeast Asia. Unity can be achieved when the Nation's obligation is made clear. This can be demonstrated by free debate and a frank exchange of views. If the administration plays fair, it can continue to count on that support.

The Republican Party must not engage in specious political flummery merely to gain political advantage. Our party must not:

First. Disavow our support of allies in Asia who are faced with the clear and present danger of Communist aggression.

Second. Give aid and comfort to the enemy by attempting to speak with two voices in order to take advantage of divisions in our country between "hawks" and "doves." I doubt that either of these terms expresses a philosophy in keeping with the best interests of the United States.

The truth is that the United States believes in peace, is devoted to peace, and works for peace. It is equally true that our idealism is not going to deter us from aiding a free friend who has been made the victim of terror and aggression.

Third. Abandon our clear and longstanding support of a system of collective security against Communist expansion in Asia, in any effort to gain possession of the White House in 1968.

The goal of the American people in Vietnam is to find a solution that is acceptable to the people of Vietnam themselves. Honest men may differ on the scope of action required. But we must keep faith with our undertaking to join in the defense of independent nations in Southeast Asia. It is a matter of keeping faith with the idea, born of long suffering and many tragic failures, that no people should be obliged to accept imposition of rule by subversion and fear, by diplomatic intervention, or by force of arms. Ours must be essentially a role of assistance in Vietnam—to help the Vietnamese stand up for themselves. The political situation in the south has, from time to time, been far from clear. But simply because some of the population has been forced to accept communism, it does not follow that the majority want that system forced upon them. Their conduct shows it. They have shown their determination to resist. We are there to help.

The great majority of the American people support our national effort in Southeast Asia. The Republican Party seeks to speak for the American people.

OIL IMPORTS: A CALL FOR BETTER REGULATIONS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, on Thursday, April 20, 1967, I testified before the Oil Import Administrator of the Department of the Interior regarding a situation which I think cries out for solution.

As you well know, Mr. President, the country is now divided into five geographical areas for the purposes of administering the oil import program. The importation of finished products from Puerto Rico to the east coast, districts I through IV, is strictly regulated, but a gaping loophole exposes the west coast, district V, to the possible influx of unlimited volumes of gasoline to that area from Puerto Rico. Furthermore, pending applications for special treatment import quotas from the Virgin Islands, Guam, and Puerto Rico threaten to throw the oil import program into disarray and severely to impair the west coast independent refining industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the statement I made before the Administrator, plus a copy of some correspondence with the Department of the Interior on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Lausche in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of U.S. Senator Thomas H. Kuchel Before the Oil Import Administrator, Department of the Interior, Thursday, April 20, 1967

Mr. Hoehn, I am honored to be here today to testify. As United States Senator from California, I certainly approve of the basic purpose of the oil import control program. We must maintain a healthy domestic petroleum industry as a pillar both of our national security and our economy.

I have, however, been deeply concerned by the unregulated flow of refined products from Puerto Rico into District V. This traffic, which began last year, is now of the order of 10,000 barrels a day.

Last May I wrote Secretary Udall requesting that the importation of refined products from Puerto Rico into District V be subject to regulations similar to those which benefit Districts I through IV. Although the volume of gasoline shipped into Districts I through IV is strictly limited by regulation, as you know, there is no formal limitation whatsoever on the volume of such products which can move into District V.

Secretary Udall said last year:

"Along this line we have been assured by Commonwealth Oil & Refining of the company's interest to hold the amount being sent to California to 10,000 b/d. This guarantee should go a long way to reassure the West Coast refiners that the situation is not going to get out of hand. As the time approaches for the new allocation period beginning January 1, 1967, it is our present intention to seek authority to place definite limits on these shipments, along the lines suggested by the West Coast refiners and by you in the last paragraph of your letter to Assistant Secretary Moore dated June 22."

As you know, when January 1, 1967, came, no such change was made in Presidential Proclamation 3279.

I ask consent that my correspondence with the Department be included in the record at this point.

I wish to address myself briefly to the various arguments which have been presented to me over the months during which I have been concerned with this issue. In his letter of June 20, 1966, Assistant Secretary Moore explained to me that there was no need for regulation of the volume of Puerto Rican refined products moving into District V, since "District V is an oil deficit area and there is no significant amount of available domestic production in District V that does not have a market."

Although I respect the judgment of the Department that District V is, and will continue to be, an oil deficit area, I am told by authorities outside the Department that the gap between domestic supply and total demand in District V is diminishing. When the domestic supply begins to catch up with the total demand in District V, any Puerto Rican gasoline brought into the District will present an extreme hardship to some spheres of the California industry. I would prefer to see any gasoline shortage in District V met by increasing the crude oil imports for the benefit of the entire domestic industry, rather than by importation of Puerto Rican gasoline for the benefit of the few companies having special privileges in Puerto Rico.

I have also been told that the District V demand for motor gasoline is nearly 700,000 barrels a day. I quote, again, from Secretary Moore's letter of June 20, 1966:

"Currently the gasoline shipments into District V from Puerto Rico are estimated to be approximately 10,000 b/d. This must be considered against an approximate total demand for motor gasoline in District V of 673,000 b/d which was supplied from the following sources:

	Barrels per day
District V Refiners	605,000
Tanker shipments from Gulf coast	16,000
Pipeline from other districts	57,000
Licensed and overland imports	3,000
Total	681,000
Less shipments and exports	8,000
Total	673,000"

In my view it is unfair to compare the volume of Puerto Rican imports with the total demand in District V. Rather, one should compare the Puerto Rican imports with the output capacity of that segment of the market most likely to be displaced by such imports—the small independent refiner. As of 1966, the seven small refiners in District V produced only about 18,500 barrels per day, or only about 3 per cent of the total of gasoline in District V. If these refiners do not have their own distribution facilities, their refinery output can easily be displaced by the cheap Puerto Rican by-product gasoline.

It may be of economic benefit to Puerto Rico or, for that matter, the Virgin Islands or Guam, to have refineries or petro-chemical plants built on their soil. I would be the first to applaud such measures to assist the economic well-being of these areas. However, the Administrator has, I believe, a serious duty to weigh carefully the adverse impact on any segment of the domestic industry of the importation of gasoline from these areas. A healthy and viable domestic industry means an industry not only of giants which can withstand the influx of cheap foreign gasoline, but, also, those smaller companies whose future might well be endangered by flooding their market with such products.

I have been told by the Department that it will control the flow of refined products into District V informally by administrative action. On November 11, 1966, Secretary Udall wrote to me:

"In the circumstances, it will be necessary for the Department to provide indirect controls on movements of products from Puerto Rico to the West Coast. We intend to achieve this objective by restrictions on importation of crude and unfinished oils into Puerto Rico, which will have the effect of restricting the capability of refiners on that island to ship products to District V. Lately, Assistant Secretary Moore repeated, saying: . . . we will include estimates for shipments of products from Puerto Rico to the West Coast in the development of total allocations available to Puerto Rican importers. We are confident that this procedure will provide an absolute limit on Puerto Rican movements to California."

Now, however, the Federal Register reveals a 5% increase in Puerto Rican crude oil imports for the year ending March 31, 1968, plus a special quota to Phillips. I do not understand this increase in view of the Secretary's previous assurance that crude oil imports into Puerto Rico would be restricted so that the flow of refined products to the West Coast would be controlled.

If we have a problem which demands a regulation under Presidential Proclamation 3279 to control the flow into Districts I through IV, then regulation, rather than administrative discretion, is appropriate for District V. One of the criticisms often aimed at the administration of the oil import program is that it extends valuable special privileges to individual companies. I am not prepared to comment on these charges. Frankly, I am not close enough to the operation of your program to know whether this is true. I do see, however, the danger of abuse of power in the broad discretion with which you have been entrusted.

As I understand it, the Department has an informal agreement with Commonwealth Oil Refining Co. that it will move no more than 10,000 barrels per day into District V. I insist that regulations, on the books, for all the world to see, are a more sound way to administer a program than are informal oral agreements.

Over the last few months, Commonwealth has shipped more than 10,000 barrels a day into District V. Phillips Petroleum will be on line in Puerto Rico soon and, although the company says it has no intention to ship its gasoline into District V, there is no law or regulation to stop or control such shipment. Union Carbide wishes to build a new petrochemical facility in Puerto Rico. The company says it does not intend to produce gasoline, but if it should subsequently decide to do so, there is no regulation to prevent it from selling an unlimited amount of cheap Puerto Rican gasoline in District V.

I have touched only on the Puerto Rican situation. I understand that interests in the Virgin Islands and Guam wish to build refineries and ship finished products into the United States and, specifically, into District V. These shipments, of course, can be made only if you grant a quota. I urge you to recognize the great power which has been placed at your disposal and to use it with wisdom, taking into account not only the speculative economic benefit to the territory, and the great financial boon to the company seeking a quota, but, also, the possible blight on the domestic industry in District V. I strenuously oppose the use of the oil import program by individual companies, under the guise of helping the local economy, to obtain special treatment and great financial windfalls in the form of quotas for the importation of gasoline from the Virgin Islands and Guam.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., January 20, 1967.
Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: As you know, I have had a thorough discussion with Mr. Lewis E. Reid of your office with respect to shipments of petroleum products from Puerto Rico to District V. As I explained to Mr. Reid, it was impossible for us to obtain revision to Presidential Proclamation 3279 which would have had the effect of placing absolute limitations on Puerto Rican shipments to the West Coast in time to be effective for the allocation year beginning January 1, 1967. As an alternative, we have adopted a procedure consistent with the existing proclamation which will achieve the objective that you have sought.

As outlined to Mr. Reid, we will include estimates for shipments of product from Puerto Rico to the West Coast in the development of total allocations available to Puerto Rican importers. We are confident that this procedure will provide an absolute limit on Puerto Rican movements to California.

We have appreciated the opportunity to work with you and your staff on this matter.

Sincerely yours,
J. Cordell Moore,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., November 11, 1966.
Hon. Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: This is in response to your letter of October 7 concerning shipments of finished products from Puerto Rico to District V. Direct control through regulation of shipments from Puerto Rico to District V would require an amendment to Presidential Proclamation 3279. At the present time it does not appear that the Proclamation will be amended prior to commencement of the 1967 allocation period.

In the circumstances, it will be necessary for the Department to provide indirect controls on movements of products from Puerto Rico to the West Coast. We intend to achieve this objective by restrictions on importation of crude and unfinished oils into Puerto Rico, which will have the effect of restricting the capability of refiners on that island to ship products to District V.

While there have been no recent discussions with Phillips, earlier ones indicated an intention on the part of Phillips to ship to Districts I–IV.

You may be assured this matter has received our very careful attention. We believe that the procedure we intend to follow will be effective in holding shipments to District V from Puerto Rico to the current levels.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

October 7, 1966.

Hon. **Stewart L. Udall,**
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: As we move toward the end of the year, I wish to call to your attention our earlier correspondence regarding the regulation of oil imports from Puerto Rico into District V. I understand, from discussions which have taken place between Assistant Secretary Moore and my staff, that you still intend to abolish the discrimination against District V which exists in present regulations, and to impose a quota on the volume of refined products flowing from Puerto Rico into District V. I am advised that your tentative intention is to set the figure at 10,000 barrels per day. I respectfully request that you furnish me a draft of the regulation which you propose to establish before it becomes effective.

Many independent producers in California are concerned that when the Phillips Petroleum Company petrochemical plant in Puerto Rico begins production, all, or a large portion, of its output of refined products will move into District V. Could you advise me if you have had any discussions with Phillips Petroleum on this topic and, if so, whether you have reached any agreement with the firm about the areas in which the output of its petrochemical plant will be marketed.

I feel it is difficult to justify the importation by Commonwealth Oil Refining Co., Inc. of 10,000 barrels a day into District V and, that being the case, I believe it imperative that no other company be given an allocation for importation of Puerto Rican gasoline into District V.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Senate,
Committee on Interior
and Insular Affairs,
July 13, 1966.

Hon. **Stewart L. Udall,**
Secretary, Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Stewart: Thank you for your June 30, 1966, letter regarding importation of gasoline from Puerto Rico into District V.

From your letter, and from conversations between my staff and Assistant Secretary Moore, I understand that Commonwealth Oil & Refining has agreed to limit its importation of gasoline into District V from Puerto Rico to 10,000 barrels a day, and that this represents the total amount of Puerto Rican gasoline from all sources which will be allowed to move into District V.

As Senator from California, the state most directly affected by the lack of any regulation on these imports, I am deeply concerned by the movement of any Puerto Rican gasoline whatsoever into District V. There can be no legal or moral justification for a regulation limiting the volume of refined products moving into the United States from Puerto Rico but excluding the western states from its protection.

I appreciate your decision to seek the amendment of oil import regulations effective January 1, 1967, so that District V will enjoy the same regulatory protection as Districts I through IV, which, in my view, should have been the case from the beginning.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Department
of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., June 30, 1966.

Hon. **Thomas H. Kuchel,**
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: With further reference to our letter of June 20 concerning imports into District V of gasoline from Puerto Rico, I feel I would like to provide you with some additional information.

As you probably know, the level of licensed imports into District V is based upon the difference between supply and demand. Oil imported overland from Canada is considered part of domestic supply. Oil brought around from the East Coast and Puerto Rico is also considered on the supply side of the equation. Thus, as far as domestic producers are concerned, any oil imported from Puerto Rico would have a tendency to reduce the supply-demand gap and thus to reduce licensed imports. This provision virtually assures 100 percent operation for California crude producers.

The domestic refiners, particularly the small independents, have in the past objected somewhat to the reduction in the amount of licensed imports since this obviously affects their individual quotas. I cannot at this moment fully appraise the current situation on the West Coast although we have been attempting to obtain information from all interested parties. The latest report indicates that gasoline inventories are somewhat on the short side so gasoline receipts from Puerto Rico probably do not present a very serious problem. I believe the refiners on the West Coast are more concerned with the threat that these imports imply for the future rather than the amount currently being imported.

Along this line we have been assured by Commonwealth Oil & Refining of the company's interest to hold the amount being sent to California to 10,000 b/d. This guarantee should go a long way to reassure the West Coast refiners that the situation is not going to get out of hand. As the time approaches for the new allocation period beginning January 1, 1967, it is our present intention to seek authority to place definite limits on these shipments, along the lines suggested by the West Coast refiners and by you in the last paragraph of your letter to Assistant Secretary Moore dated June 22.

In the meantime, we will continue to watch the situation very carefully and of course would be pleased to talk to you or to any of the petroleum groups who might wish to discuss this matter with us.

Sincerely yours,

Stewart L. Udall,
Secretary of the Interior.

U.S. Senate, Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs,
June 22, 1966.

Hon. **J. Cordell Moore,**
Assistant Secretary,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Moore: Thank you for your letter of June 20, 1966, regarding the lack of oil import regulations on refined products moving from Puerto Rico into District V. While I appreciate your reply, I respectfully urge that your response does not address itself to the basic problem raised by my inquiry.

There presently exists a discriminatory variation in the import regulations for District V when compared with the regulations for Districts I–IV. Refined products are permitted to flow from Puerto Rico into District V without regulation, while strict regulations exist on the movement of gasoline from Puerto Rico into Districts I–IV. Although the present demand for gasoline in District V is 673,000 barrels per day, I am told that the total production of independent domestic refiners in District V is only 18,500 barrels per day, and that the 10,000 barrels per day of gasoline now moving into District V from Puerto Rico is marketed below the price of comparable domestic products.

The availability of excess Puerto Rican products in the District V market places domestic refiners, who use domestic labor and raw materials, at an unfair competitive disadvantage. Furthermore, since independent refiners do not have an assured market for their production, this influx of a significant supply of cheap Puerto Rican gasoline may make it more difficult for independent refiners to sell their gasoline.

I see no reason to favor the few refiners authorized to move Puerto Rican products into District V market at the sole expense of the domestic refiners in District V. I respectfully request that you consider amending the applicable regulations to proscribe this unfair discriminatory situation.

With kindest regards.

Sincerely yours,

Thomas H. Kuchel,
U.S. Senator.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., June 20, 1966.

Hon. **Thomas H. Kuchel,**
U.S. Senate
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Kuchel: We appreciate the opportunity to comment upon the views of Mr. H. S. Rothschild expressed in your letter of May 24.

Currently the gasoline shipments into District V from Puerto Rico are estimated to be approximately 10,000 B/D. This must be considered against an approximate total demand for motor gasoline in District V of 673,000 B/D which was supplied from the following sources:

	Barrels per day
District V refiners	605,000
Tanker Shipments from Gulf Coast	16,000
Pipeline from other Districts	57,000
Licensed and overland imports	3,000
Total	681,000
Less Shipments and Exports	8,000
Total	673,000

Effective January 1, 1966 Oil Import Regulations were amended to provide that allocations made to a person in Puerto Rico who shipped petroleum products (excluding residual) into Districts I–IV (East of the Rocky Mountains) would be reduced by the amount by which such shipments exceed shipments made by or attributable to such person during the calendar year 1965. Shipments of gasoline from Puerto Rico to District I (East Coast) in April were approximately 30,000 B/D out of total shipments of light products of 42,000 B/D. Demand for gasoline in District I is approximately one million B/D.

Also, District V is an oil deficit area and there is no significant amount of available domestic production in District V that does not have a market.

We are concerned with the stability of the gasoline market in District V and you may be assured that we will continue to watch it closely.

Sincerely yours,

J. CORDELL MOORE,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

MAY 24, 1966.

Hon. STEWART L. UDALL,
Secretary of the Interior,
Department of the Interior,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Mr. H. S. Rothschild, President of Powerine Oil Company, Santa Fe Springs, California, has written to me to express his concern as an independent refiner that there is no restriction on imports of foreign source gasoline into District V (the west coast, Alaska and Hawaii) from Puerto Rico.

I am told that refined product shipments into Districts I–IV (east of the Rocky Mountains) from Puerto Rico are in effect limited to those of a base period, with substantial penalties being imposed when the limits are exceeded. There is, however, no such control over shipments into District V where products may be shipped in unlimited volume without penalty.

If this is so, I believe Mr. Rothschild has good reason for concern. It is hard to see how refiners processing domestic crude in District V can be expected to compete effectively with the few importers in a position to use products manufactured from low-cost foreign crude in Puerto Rico. Is there some reason why refiners in District V should be exposed to this sort of competition while those in Districts I–IV are protected against it?

I understand that the purpose of the Oil Import Control Program is to encourage domestic exploration and production by limiting imports. Under that program there exist strict limits on the importation of foreign crude into District V. Under such circumstances, unlimited imports from any source would be in direct conflict with the basic objective of the program. I do not understand how an exception for gasoline moving into District V from Puerto Rico can be justified.

May I respectfully request that you clarify the situation for me. It would be particularly helpful if you could tell me what controls you plan to impose on movements from Puerto Rico into District V.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely yours

THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senator.

REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures has compiled a report showing that between January 1 and April 21 of this year, 24 new Federal advisory and study groups and special Commissions have been formed.

Some of these groups and commissions were created by law, and others by Executive order and administrative action. The membership of each ranges from five to 29 individuals.

I ask unanimous consent that this report as compiled under date of April 27, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORMATION OF 24 NEW FEDERAL ADVISORY GROUPS AND STUDY GROUPS, AND SPECIAL COMMISSIONS—ACTIONS ANNOUNCED BETWEEN JANUARY 1 AND APRIL 21

Weekly issues of the White House publication *Presidential Documents* between January 1 and April 21, 1967, have recorded formation or contemplation of 24 new federal advisory or study groups and special commissions.

These groups and commissions were created by law, executive order, or other administrative action. They do not include the new Department of Transportation, or any other new executive agency, where action was not recorded during the period in the publication *Presidential Documents.*

The groups and commissions fall generally into three categories: (1) *advisory* committees, commissions, councils and boards, (2) *study* committees and commissions, and (3) *special* commissions and councils.

Announcements in the *Presidential Documents* related primarily to appointment of membership ranging from five to 29 to the respective commissions, committees, boards, councils, etc. Memberships include appointees from the public, the professions, industry, labor, and in most instances memberships included federal representation.

Some of the new bodies involve out-right staffing and use of appropriated funds. In some cases provision was made for "cooperation" of interested or affected federal agencies (presumably for staffing and support). In some instances payment of per diem and travel expenses was specifically provided for non-federal members.

The list of these new study and advisory groups, and special commissions, as compiled from *Presidential Documents*, between January 1 and April 21, 1967, follows:

Name	Date and page reference	Authority	Membership and purpose	Staffing
National Motor Vehicle Safety Advisory Council.	Jan. 6, No. 1, p. 11	White House release	17 members from State and local government and public, to "work with Secretary of Commerce (Transportation) on new auto safety standards." This is an advisory group with no time limitation.	None indicated.
Commission on Political Activity of Government Employees.	Jan. 9, No. 2, p. 24	White House release and Public Law 89-617, Oct. 3, 1966.	12 members: 4 each by President, Vice President, and Speaker, to "study the effects of the Hatch Act." This study group is to report by October 1967.	Staffed in February; March employment, 12. 1967 appropriation, $75,000, until spent.
Commission on Marine Science, Engineering, and Resources.	do	White House release and Public Law 89-454, June 17, 1966.	15 members from governments, industry, research, etc., and 4 advisory members from Congress, to advise the National Council on Marine Resources (established September 1966) and to prepare report to Council for the President, "to develop, encourage, and maintain a comprehensive long-range program in marine science." To report in 18 months.	Staffed in March with 9 employees. 1967 appropriation for the Commission and the Council, $1,100,000; 1968 request $1,300,000.
Commission on Codes, Zoning, Taxation, and Development Standards.	Jan. 12, No. 2, p. 45	White House release	15 members from Government, education, research, etc., "to make thorough study of our cities," advise HUD, and seek ways to increase supply of low cost housing.	None indicated. To "work with HUD" in studies.
American Revolution Bicentennial Commission.	Jan. 18, No. 3, p. 61	White House release and Public Law 89-491, July 4, 1966.	17 members from the public and 8 from Congress, "to plan, encourage, develop, and coordinate the commemoration" of the bicentennial.	None indicated. Would expect staffing in future.
National Advisory Committee on Adult Basic Education.	Jan. 23, No. 4, p. 74	White House release and Public Law 89-750.	7 members from public, to "advise the Commissioner of Education in preparation of general regulations and policy guidelines for adult education." No indication of time limitation.	None indicated. To work with HEW in policy development.
National Advisory Commission on Libraries.	Jan. 31, No. 5, p. 148	White House release and Executive Order 11301, Sept. 5, 1966.	20 members from the public, education, etc., to study and recommend with respect to our library resources to the President's Library Committee, within 1 year.	HEW to provide administrative services; per diem and travel authorized for members; Federal agencies directed to assist.
Study Commission for Providing Facilities for Visitors to the Nation's Capital.	Feb. 2, No. 5, p. 162	White House release and Public Law 89-790, Nov. 7, 1966.	21 members from public and Federal agencies, "to investigate sites and plans for visitor facilities and services." To report by Sept. 15, 1967.	None indicated. 1967 appropriation $60,000.
Advisory Commission on Parcel Distribution Services.	do	White House release and Public Law 89-593, Sept. 20, 1966.	5 members, 4 from public and 1 Federal, to "make a full and complete study of small parcel distribution services.". To report by Jan. 1, 1968.	None indicated.
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.	Mar. 1, No. 9, p. 351	White House release	10 members from public and 7 Federal officials with the Director of the Park Service to serve as Executive Director. No time limit.	None indicated. $100 per diem provided for non-Federal members.
Commission To Study the Federal Budget (reported as President's Commission on Budget Concepts).	Mar. 3, No. 9, p. 360	do	15 members from public and Government, "to make a thorough study of the Federal budget and the manner in which it is presented to Congress and the public." To report by September 1967; if not ready, submit progress report; President's aim to incorporate recommendations in 1969 budget.	Staffed in March with 1 employee reported. It is understood White House and agency funds are to be used.

Name	Date and page reference	Authority	Membership and purpose	Staffing
National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity.	**Mar. 4, No. 10, p. 375**	**White House release, authorized by Congress last November.**	**21 members from public, to "review the operation of all programs and make recommendations concerning improvement of existing programs, elimination of duplication, and coordination, etc." No time limit. To report annually.**	**To be staffed in April. Assume use of White House and agency funds.**
President's Council on Youth Opportunity.	Mar. 5, No. 10, p. 379	White House release and Executive Order 11330.	11 Federal officials (with provision for more), to be responsible for, and to strengthen, evaluate, and encourage youth opportunity programs—summer and other. No limit.	To be staffed in April. Provides for Executive Director and staffing; expenses to be paid from White House and agency funds.
Citizens Advisory Board on Youth Opportunity.	do	do	15 members from the public to "advise the Council and the President on youth opportunity programs."	None indicated; per diem and travel authorized for members.
Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission.	Mar. 6, No. 10, p. 398	White House release and Water Resources Act.	15 members (plus) from interstate compact and Federal Government. Formation of commissions by request of compact States under provisions of Water Resources Act.	None indicated. Staffing possible.
National Commission on Reform of Federal Criminal Laws.	Mar. 16 No. 11, p. 480	White House release, created by Congress last November.	12 members, 3 from public, 6 from Congress, 3 from judiciary, "to review Federal criminal law." To report to Congress by November 1969.	None indicated.
National Highway Safety Advisory Committee.	Mar. 16, No. 11, p. 481	White House release, and Public Law 89-564, Sept. 9, 1966.	29 members, with Secretary of Transportation as Chairman, to advise secretary in re activities and functions of Department of Defense on highway safety. No time limitations.	Do.
Advisory Committee on Top Federal Salaries.	Mar. 22, No. 12, p. 526	White House release	8 members from public, to review top Federal salaries. To recommend and report by June 1, 1967.	Do.
Kansas-Oklahoma Arkansas River Commission.	Mar. 27, No. 13, p. 548	White House release, and Public Law 89-789, Nov. 7, 1966.	Members from compact States and Federal representative. Formation by request of compact States under Public Law 89-789. To study and advise in re water resources in area.	Do.
Commission on Postal Organization.	Apr. 8, No. 15, p. 618	White House release, and Executive Order 11341.	10 members from public, to study, recommend and report on postal improvement and reorganization by April 1968.	"Cooperation" of Federal agencies and appointment of staff authorized; also Executive Director; per diem and travel for members.
Quetico-Superior Committee (reestablishment under new Executive order.	Apr. 10, No. 15, p. 620	White House release, and Executive Order 11342.	5 members: 3 from public and 1 each from Agriculture and Interior, to "promote the protection of the primitive quality" of the region. No limit.	None indicated.
Advisory Council on Cost Reduction (announced).	Mar. 17, No. 11, p. 487	White House release (Executive order to follow).	— members from public and governments, "to review our cost reduction programs and explore opportunities for increased savings."	Not known. Budget Director to be Chairman.
Great Lakes Basin Commission	Apr. 20, No. 16, p. 646	Executive Order 11345 and Water Resources Act.	18 members (plus), from the 8 States involved, 10 Federal members, plus compact members. Formed under Water Resources Act at request of States to study and advise on area.	Employees authorized.
Temporary Commission on Pennsylvania Avenue.	Apr. 20, No. 16, p. 647	Executive Order 11347 (amending Executive Order 11210).	16 members (plus), Federal officials specified, to study and plan Pennsylvania Ave. project.	None indicated.
District of Columbia groups:				
Federal City College, Board of Higher Education.	Feb. 13, No. 7, p. 241	White House release and District of Columbia Higher Education Act of 89th Cong., 2d sess.	9 members, appointed by District of Columbia Commissioners, to develop plans for the new Federal City College. No limit on time indicated.	Do.
Washington Technical Institute, Board of Vocational Education.	do	do	9 members, appointed by President, to develop plans for the technical institute authorized. No time limit indicated.	Do.

Source: Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents, Jan. 1–Apr. 21, 1967. Information re commissions, etc., extracted from White House releases and Executive orders reported. Staffing notes include information on employment reported to JCRNFE, and budgeted appropriations. Complete check and review of Public Law provisions not attempted as of this date.

AGENCIES ESTABLISHED AND TERMINATED FOR PERSONNEL REPORTING PURPOSES BETWEEN JULY 1966 AND MARCH 1967

Agencies terminated

Virgin Islands Corporation.

National Commission on Food Marketing.

President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia.

White House Conference on Civil Rights.

U.S.-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico.

Agencies established

Ozarks Regional Commission.

National Advisory Commission on Selective Service.

National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development.

Upper Great Lakes Regional Commission.

National Conference on the Problems of Mexican-American and Puerto Rican Communities.

Select Committee on Western Hemisphere Immigration.

Department of Transportation (interim staff).

New England Regional Commission.

National Advisory Commission on Rural Poverty.

Commission on Political Activity of Government Personnel.

President's Commission on Budget Concepts.

Commission on Marine Science, Engineering and Resources.

NOTE.—In April the Department of Transportation is formally reported, with the corresponding termination of the independent FAA, St. Lawrence Seaway Corporation and other organizational changes. In April the formation of *two new* groups is expected—National Advisory Council on Economic Opportunity and President's Council on Youth Opportunity.

Source: Agencies as shown on monthly personnel reports of the JCRNFE.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in the April 14, 1967, issue of the Wall Street Journal there was published an article entitled "Social Research Efforts Multiply, Draw Charges of Waste, Duplication." The theme of this article is that Congress should study the impact of these numerous and ofttimes overlapping commissions which are being formed on a wholesale basis.

I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S STUDY IT: SOCIAL RESEARCH EFFORTS MULTIPLY, DRAW CHARGES OF WASTE, DUPLICATION—LOS ANGELES' TRANSIT STUDIES PRODUCE LITTLE PROGRESS—EDUCATION PROJECTS GROW—WASHINGTON IS MAJOR SPONSOR

(By Mitchell Gordon)

"Judging from what is being studied, researched and fact-found all over the world, it is clear that as a civilization we no longer know how to do anything. We can meet no situation, pursue no purpose, without stopping work and studying. . . . We are persuaded that nothing can be done today as it once was done. So we repeatedly analyze the familiar and suspend action."

What the man's saying is that we're being studied to death.

And he's in a good position to judge. The speaker is Jacques Barzun, provost and dean of the faculties at Columbia University in New York City.

As his remarks from a recent speech indicate, Mr. Barzun is convinced that the nation has gone overboard on social research. Some other eminent scholars agree with him. It is easy to see why they are so concerned about the burgeoning U.S. "study industry."

The city of Los Angeles has spent more than $2 million for more than two dozen transit studies since 1945. Its transit system still is criticized as inadequate—and apparently its transit problems still require more study. Another public agency, the Southern California Rapid Transit District, is currently sponsoring a $3.9 million study of Los Angeles transit that, among other things, will study the previous studies. Not long ago, the State Water Pollution Control Board in California financed a $47,000 study that simply compiled a list of all the studies that could be found on the subject of water pollution.

DUPLICATE STUDIES

A Congressional subcommittee headed by Rep. Henry S. Reuss, a Wisconsin Democrat, has compiled a 2,400-page study of waste, duplication and inefficiencies in Government social research projects. The report, to be released Monday, says that duplication of research often occurs because work in such areas as environmental pollution, law enforcement, education and urban problems is widely scattered among Federal agencies and departments that don't know what the others are doing. Often Federal researchers aren't even aware of other studies under way within their own agencies, the subcommittee found.

No one knows precisely how big the study business has become. But most estimates put the current level of spending for social and other nonscience studies in the U.S. at well over $500 million a year. The Government, by far the biggest consumer of such studies, will spend over $325 million for nonscience research in fiscal 1967, up from less than $75 million as recently as fiscal 1960.

Federal studies are expected to increase in coming years. Louis R. Bright, an associate commissioner of the U.S. Office of Education, which spends more for social research than any other Government agency, says: "Our expenditures for this purpose could easily double or triple by 1970 if we get peace in Vietnam, and they'll probably be increasing dramatically over the longer run even if we don't." The Office of Education has budgeted $75 million for research in fiscal 1967, up from only $1 million in fiscal 1958, the first year it financed studies.

RESEARCH ORGANIZATIONS

Most social research studies are paid for by Federal, state or local government agencies or by private foundations. Usually they are produced by big universities or by independent, nonprofit research organizations such as Rand Corp. in Santa Monica, Calif., Stanford Research Institute in Palo Alto, Calif., or Brookings Institution in Washington.

A big question raised by critics of the study industry is whether the sponsor of a study gets his money's worth. "When Ford Motor Co. produces an Edsel, it finds out fast enough. But when the Ford Foundation (which sponsors many studies) does so, no one may ever know of it," says Kenneth E. Boulding, an economics professor at the University of Michigan and author of The Impact of the Social Sciences, a book that criticized certain study techniques.

Researchers insist it is inevitable that some social research projects will flop. "Oil men are happy with one gusher in six—and knowledge is no more predictable than petroleum," says one researcher.

LANDMARK STUDIES

There is no question that many studies have been well worthwhile. Gunnar Myrdal's study, The Negro Problem in American Democracy, financed by Carnegie Corp., was published in 1944 under the title An American Dilemma. The book played a major role in shaping the framework of Federal policies and public attitudes toward civil rights during the past decade. Former Harvard University president James B. Conant's 1958 study. The American High School Tragedy, has been credited with widely reshaping curriculums and standards in the nation's secondary schools.

One of the most influential studies of all was Abraham Flexner's 1910 study of medical education in the U.S. and Canada. It put a flock of fly-by-night medical schools out of business and helped create today's system of modern clinical training for doctors.

But many studies turn out to be dismal failures. Critics say that even some of the most highly regarded researchers are so out of touch with reality that the recommendations they make are wholly impractical. Critics also bemoan the fact that many studies are so dull and verbose that they end up gathering dust on an obscure office shelf. "A lot of people producing studies are motivated not so much by a desire to solve a social problem as to produce a dessertation that's respectable to their colleagues," says Henry S. Rowen, president of Rand Corp.

"About 90% of the Federally sponsored stuff is sheer waste," claims an administrator who is in charge of a costly study being financed by the Ford Foundation. He says that "too often studies are designed around preconceived notions" and as a result don't produce useful new ideas.

Ely M. Brandes, a senior economist at Stanford Research Institute, says studies in the field of mass transportation often are a waste of time and money. Both sponsors and researchers in this area "are too enchanted with painting pretty pictures and not concerned enough with grubby details to provide operational instructions for getting from here to there," he says.

A 1960 Rand Corp. study of urban transportation, financed by a $500,000 Ford Foundation grant, has drawn a lot of criticism. Charles J. Zwick, who directed the study, credits the minutely detailed, 427-page work with "contributing to the body of source documents and delivering a whole group of people for employment in Washington." (Many of the researchers involved in the study were hired by Federal agencies looking for specialists in transportation and urban problems. Mr. Zwick himself has been "delivered for employment" in Washington, as assistant director of the U.S. Bureau of the Budget.)

AN "INTERESTING BOOK"

The Ford Foundation's overseer on the Rand study say that "a very interesting book came out of it." But he concedes that he's read no more than 10 pages of the study. He says its authors "aren't the most lively writers in the world." (A sample conclusion from the study: "It is a virtual certainty that the spatial pattern of a city in a free-enterprise society is the collective result of a large number of separate business and household location decisions and transportation choices.")

The Department of Housing and Urban Development is distributing copies of the study, which bears the title The Urban Transportation Problem. But a top official of the new Federal agency admits he hasn't read the entire volume himself.

The Office of Education is trying to make findings of education studies more readily accessible. It has designated 13 U.S. organizations and universities to serve as repositories and disseminators of information on various educational specialties. The education office plans to spend close to $3 million this fiscal year to help establish three or four more of these "Educational Research Information Centers." The centers make printed or microfilmed documents from their files available at nominal cost to anyone who wants them.

SEVERAL CENTERS OPERATING

Among the centers already operating are clearinghouses for information on the disadvantaged student (Yeshiva University, New York), on exceptional children (the National Education Association, Washington, D.C.) and on foreign language study (the Modern Language Association of America, New York).

Carnegie Corp. during the past few years has been hiring authors and editors to make its studies more readable and to turn out popularized versions of its technical tomes. It recently gave the American Association of Junior Colleges a $5,000 grant to produce an illustrated, 46-page synopsis of a study on counseling, placement and other student personnel functions that ran 260 pages in its original form.

At least one social researcher believes that the key to success is to stay small. The six-year-old Vera Institute of Justice in New York operates on the premise that it can get more done "by resisting attempts to get too big, zeroing is on a soft spot in a given system, going into it in real depth and then following up with action programs to demonstrate and refine proposals," says Herbert Sturz, director.

Vera Institute operates on an annual budget of only $250,000 with a full-time staff of 12 persons, including secretaries. But it is widely considered to be one of the most efficient social research organizations in the country.

BAIL PROJECT

In 1961, Vera devised the "Manhattan Bail Project Honor System" and persuaded New York City courts to release without bail many prisoners awaiting trial. As a direct result of the project's success, Congress last year passed the Bail Reform Act, which requires Federal judges to extend to most Federal prisoners the privilege of being released until trial without putting up a financial bond. Vera soon will begin studying arrests and rehabilitation of alcoholics.

Researchers involved in the about-to-be-released Congressional subcommittee study of waste in the study industry expect their report to have more of an impact than did a previous Federal study of studies. In 1954, the Government's National Science Foundation commissioned University of North Carolina researchers to make a $50,000 study of social science study activities in New York, California and four other states.

By the time the study was delivered in 1960, however, officials who had launched the probe were no longer with the NSF. An official who saw the original version of the report says new NSF officials ordered researchers to tone down their criticisms and to remove from the report entirely their references to waste and duplication and their recommendations for coordinating state and Federal study projects more closely.

MONUMENTAL BUILDER'S MILESTONE

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, an extraordinary American who personifies resourcefulness and determination, and whose contributions to our Nation almost defy description, reaches his 85th milestone today. I wish to extend salutations to Henry J. Kaiser, an outstanding citizen of California and a prodigious influence for progress and good, on this significant occasion.

In a life of creativeness, Henry J. Kaiser has carved out what undeniably are several careers. With boundless energy and determination, with impatience for hidebound thinking and readiness to innovate, with compassion and understanding, he has created monuments in varied fields of activity. To catalog his accomplishments and beneficences would itself be a monumental task.

I ask to have appended to these remarks a news dispatch highlighting the eventful, productive span of Henry Kaiser's years.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OAKLAND, CALIF.—Henry J. Kaiser got his first job when he was 13 as a helper in a Utica, N.Y., drygoods store. Today—his 85th birthday—he's still working, running the $2.7 billion industrial complex he founded.

"I'd be lost if I couldn't have the fun of working every day," confides the man whose 190 plants in 33 states and 40 foreign countries employ 90,000 persons, have an annual payroll of $630 million.

When will he retire?

"Never," answers Kaiser who still rues the fact that when he entered his 80s he was forced to cut down on 16-hour daily work schedules.

What does he consider his great accomplishment?

"The Kaiser Foundation hospitals and health plan.

"I see the day when no one need die for lack of medical care, as my own mother died in my arms when I was 16 years old."

There are 18 Kaiser Foundation hospitals, more than 40 clinics in California, Oregon and Hawaii, and a health plan providing hospital service and care by 1,500 doctors.

By telephone from his office and home in the new community of Hawaii-Kai that he is building, Kaiser keeps in touch with his son, Edgar, president of Kaiser Industries, and with company managers around the globe.

To keep his health, he has dieted down from the 260 pounds he weighed during World War II when his shipyards were turning out a ship a day. Now he's at 180 pounds.

He scoffs at mention of the "good old days." He recalls that he had to walk four miles from Whitesboro, N.Y., to his first job in Utica.

"I never believed in looking back," Kaiser said.

"The projections to the year 2000, which have most impressed me, came up with these forecasts: The average family will be earning $14,750 a year. The national income will reach $2,000 billion—think of it, two trillion.

"We can realize an abundance-for-all, and that means not only in material things, but the best in education and cultural pursuits, better, more livable cities and homes, rewarding leisure, and achievements in the finest values of life."

Kaiser first planned a birthday dinner in Honolulu tonight, but last Wednesday decided to fly to Oakland, headquarters for his industrial empire.

He is expected to dine with his wife Alyce, his son Edgar, his son's family and some close associates.

Then back on the job again Wednesday.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, mankind, not only our Nation is tremendously in Henry Kaiser's debt. He has pioneered in dealing with grievous health problems. He supplied incentive and drive to strengthen the forces of freedom and develop resources for defense of liberty when a global conflagration broke out three decades ago. He pointed the way for new processes and techniques to bring economic progress at home and in faraway lands. He gave meaning to enlightened management-labor relations. He personified vision and perseverance, and above all he has been a symbol of selfless brotherhood.

It is a distinct privilege to be able to voice happy birthday wishes to this grand and venerable citizen and to express the hope he is blessed with many more years of health and vigor. We applaud one who radiates endless youth.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HILL BEFORE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, recently, Employ the Physically Handicapped Week was observed here in Washington. My colleague, Senator HILL, made a very fine, interesting, and informative speech at the volunteers luncheon during the observance of that week. It gave a good bit of the history of the movement for the physically handicapped. I think it would be good reading for every Senator and everybody else who reads the RECORD. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be included as a part of my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR LISTER HILL, THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED VOLUNTEERS LUNCHEON, WASHINGTON-HILTON HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 28, 1967

Luke, the Beloved Physician, tells us that one of life's sorrows is the impermanence of its joys. Certainly, the joy of this occasion and the honor that you have done me will ever live in my mind and in my heart. It will indeed be an inspiration to me and a challenge for the great tasks that lie ahead, and I shall ever be grateful to you.

At a volunteers luncheon in honor of "old timers", it is fitting that we look back over the last 20 years and see whence we have come together, because these years have had an impact on history and we owe it to the future to place their events on record.

It is also proper that we share our own bit of history with today's newcomers to encourage them to build on our own foundations. That's the way progress is made.

It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this, together, while thanking God for His past blessings upon our work and asking Him to energize our spirits that we may not weary in our work for others.

Twenty years ago—in 1947—a number of significant events were set in motion which profoundly affected world history. One of these was the Truman Doctrine which halted the spread of Communism in Turkey and Greece and established as national policy both economic and military aid to nations threatened by Communists. The following spring, Congress enacted the Marshall Plan which helped Europe to help itself and saved Europe from economic and political chaos following World War II.

In the halls of Congress during this time, a Joint Resolution was being considered which would establish an annual appropriation for the work of The President's Committee on National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week, which had come into being in the fall of 1947. Such was the preoccupation of the Congress at that time, as we focused our eyes on the necessity of saving the Free World, that this Joint Resolution wasn't passed until two years later.

The Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan both have passed into history, having done the job for which they were intended. But, the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, its name shortened twice in the intervening years since 1947, is still at work, still doing the job for which it was intended by its founders. I can assure you that the Congress of the United States and four Presidents are proud of your work and, so long as you remain true to your task, will continue to give you the tools with which to carry on.

Some of the architects of the President's Committee are with us today, Paul Strachan, among them. Others have gone to their eternal reward. Admiral Ross T. McIntire lies on a grassy hill across the Potomac at Arlington, a brief walk from the last resting place of our martyred President Kennedy. As the first Chairman of the President's Committee, Admiral McIntire established a tradition of volunteer service on which his two successors have built wisely and well. The second Chairman, General Melvin J. Maas, also sleeps on another Arlington Cemetery hill, close by the Marine Corps Headquarters which he loved and with a clear view of the Capitol where he served his country so well. Well do I remember Mel Maas on a visit that he made to my home city of Montgomery, Alabama. Made totally blind in his service in the Marines in World War II, denied the light of day, he cast the radiance of heaven all about us. As Members of Congress, Mel Maas and I were privileged to serve and work with our good friend, your distinguished toastmaster of today, Bob Ramspeck, when the world and we were somewhat younger. You all know of the energy and dedication of today's Chairman, Harold Russell, the valiant warrior fighting for our country in World War II, and today the valiant warrior fighting for the handicapped, the disadvantaged, the deprived.

Paul Strachan, together with Mildred Scott and Millard Rice, had made possible the 1945 Resolution establishing an annual week on employing the physically handicapped. I am delighted that Paul is with us today and to know that he will share with you the historical background of "NEPH" Week.

When General Graves B. Erskine decided that the Retraining and Reemployment Administration back in 1946 ought to do something about jobs for the handicapped, it was Millard Rice who suggested that Paul Strachan be invited to assist. The result was the Citizen's Cooperating Committee of RRA, the actual predecessor of today's President's Committee.

Paul Strachan worked with Admiral McIntire and Dr. Merle E. Frampton not only in establishing the President's Committee, but in obtaining the Congressional Joint Resolution in 1949 which provided for appropriations annually.

In proposing what came to be known as the Truman Doctrine, President Truman stated that it was the foreign policy of the United States, among other things, to create "conditions in which we and other nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion." He said that we must "support freed peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures." None of us would deny the intelligent self-interest which has made such a principle an accepted part of our national life.

President Truman didn't use the same or similar language in support of a President's Committee in that same year of 1947, but he might well have done so. Let's substitute a few words and see how the Truman Doctrine for Europe sounds when applied to the handicapped in America. What is our work all about if it is not the creation of conditions in which the handicapped will be able to work out a way of life free from the coercion of the denial of jobs which they could well do. What are we doing if we are not supporting handicapped people who are resisting the attempted subjugation by thoughtless and biased outside pressures. There are no "armed minorities" who prey on the handicapped. It might almost be better if there were, for they would be visible and we could find, fix and destroy them as General Maas would have urged in the vocabulary of the military. No, the coercion, subjugation and outside pressures are in the subconscious, lurking beneath the surface and dangerous not only to the handicapped, but to employers as well, since they deny faithful workers to employers crying for more hands to get on with tomorrow's work.

Just as the Truman Doctrine of 1947 and the Marshall Plan which shortly followed it brought promise and life indeed to untold millions, so also has National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week and the President's Committee and Governor's Committees and local committees which followed brought promise and life itself to countless millions of Americans.

It is so easy to think of the beginnings of the President's Committees as occurring "only yesterday". We have lost some of our noble leaders, but most of us are still here, serving the same cause of the handicapped that motivated us twenty years ago. There is a great sense of continuity and purpose that, I believe, carries us forward with enthusiasm and renewed vigor in this magnificent crusade.

May I say that my Father was a surgeon and one of the early pioneers in the field of helping the severely handicapped to lead lives of usefulness and dignity. I have seen firsthand the task involved and the challenge before us. I can tell you that it has been one of the richest joys of my life on Capitol Hill to respond favorably to the recommendations of the Chairman of the President's Committee.

During the brief twenty years that the President's Committee has been in existence, an entire revolution has taken place.

Life for the handicapped is not today the same as it was back in 1947—and let us hope we never return to those days. Think of what strides have been made for the handicapped in the last twenty years:

Vocational rehabilitation has been broadened and strengthened and refined—so that it not only serves many more people than ever before, but so that it also has become a dominant force in research into all aspects of rehabilitation. Twenty years ago, 48,000 handicapped persons were rehabilitated, this past year 154,000—a three-fold increase in two decades.

National attention at long last was turned toward the mentally retarded and mentally restored. Miracles of medicine and therapy brought them to the threshold of normal, productive life—and the President's Committee and Governors' and local Committees provided the essential ingredients of hope and opportunity. As a result, the mentally retarded and mentally restored have been finding jobs as never before; these decades, in a sense, belong in part to them.

I am happy to note that approximately 10,000 retarded persons were trained and placed in job situations in 1966 through the combined efforts of federal and state programs, and it is a source of deep satisfaction to all of us in the Congress that our own national government has pioneered in placing these once forgotten and neglected people in 40 different kinds of jobs where 90 percent have performed successfully.

In this same year, 14,000 mentally ill persons were rehabilitated and placed in productive jobs—double the 1961 figure, and four times the 1957 figure. Furthermore, for the first time in the history of the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, the number of mentally restored rehabilitated persons exceeded 10 percent of the total number of people rehabilitated in this country.

Since 1947, employment opportunities for the handicapped have greatly increased. Prejudice has lessened substantially for most of the handicapped, and I have no doubt that it will continue to do so.

It is good that you have set aside this lunch hour to share some of your proud history with today's volunteers. However, we should all keep in mind that any national movement such as employing the handicapped has some of the aspects of an iceberg in that you only see that part which stands out of the water. Four-fifths of the volunteers, like the four-fifths of the iceberg, remain hidden. But, what would an iceberg be minus the 80 percent of it which doesn't show, which gives it strength, which provides the broad base on which the peak can stand out as a beacon for the world to see?

So, in honoring the leaders, the founders, the men and women of courage and vision, we do this well aware that they could not have achieved, could not have progressed, could not have continued the fight without the support and selfless dedication of the 80 percent of the workers. This 80 percent includes the state and local committee leaders, the representatives of countless organizations who worked with and for the handicapped through their unions, their employer organizations, their veterans groups, their local, state and national associations, clubs, churches and medical groups. Those of us who have the responsibility of leadership may receive awards and trophies, but it is this 80 percent who have the actual satisfaction of seeing the handicapped we jointly serve, of consummating almost another resurrection in the person and the family of a severely handicapped man or woman gainfully employed because somebody dared to care enough to make this extra effort.

I would like to thank all the State Chairmen and Secretaries here today and all the other volunteers around the country, out of whose ranks will come the State Chairmen and Secretaries of tomorrow. No matter what the Chairmen and Vice Chairmen of the President's Committee plan, no matter what the Committee staff proposes in memo or manuscript, not very much is ever going to happen unless volunteers at the state and local level take these plans and these ideas and adapt and adopt them as best they know how within their own area, in close cooperation with the public and private agencies who have the direct responsibility of serving the handicapped. Saying this, I want to urge each of you to look around you and see if there aren't some people coming up who can do more than they have been allowed to do.

Also, when you get back home, look into things at your State Capitol and see if legislators are matching the available money for rehabilitation which the Congress appropriates, or if the handicapped in your state are being denied a chance simply because nobody has been able to tell the story that rehabilitation doesn't cost, it pays.

Again, when you get back to your cities, towns and counties, check around and see if there isn't a great deal more that could be done if someone were willing to lead the way. In a volunteer program such as jobs for the handicapped, the responsibility of the volunteer is constant and heavy.

I am proud to salute you, old timers and newcomers, dedicated vocational rehabilitation and employment service personnel and equally dedicated volunteers.

In enriching the life of the handicapped of our beloved country and of the world, you have learned that it is more blessed to give than to receive. For, in serving others, you have found yourselves and have made our Judeo-Christian ethic a vital part of your daily lives. In the confidence of knowledge, in the strength of integrity, in the tenderness of sympathy, in the fellowship of humility, and in the love of God, we shall continue to wage the battle for the handicapped.

U.S. CHAMBER OF COMMERCE ENDORSES REVENUE SHARING

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, last week the Chamber of Commerce of the United States officially endorsed the adoption of Federal revenue sharing as a means of revitalizing State and local governments.

The more than 1,000 businessman delegates to the chamber's 55th annual meeting here voted that their organization's policy should be to support revenue sharing with the States as an alternative to expansion of Federal grant-in-aid programs.

In addition, in a poll conducted at the meeting, a remarkable 84 percent of the 942 delegates and their guests who were questioned answered "Yes" to this question: "Should business consider Federal revenue sharing without Federal strings?"

These actions by the influential and highly respected chamber are gratifying events for those of us who believe that revenue sharing should be an important part of the new direction our Nation must travel in order to develop the governmental structure that can most effectively solve the problems of this new generation. A national public opinion survey shows that 70 percent of the American people favor such an approach. This strong public sentiment is reflected in the 74 revenue sharing bills that have been introduced in this session of Congress alone.

Although last week's statement was the chamber's first official policy statement on revenue sharing, I hasten to add that the chamber is no latecomer to the ranks of those concerned about strengthening State and local government. The chamber has long demonstrated an enlightening and constructive concern about the need for preserving the traditional Federal balance-of-partnership government in our Nation, a tradition which has been jeopardized by the burgeoning power of the Central Government. One excellent recent expression of that concern was a speech delivered by Mr. M. A. Wright, the retiring president of the national chamber, in Oklahoma City at the Oklahoma Community Achievement Award banquet on April 12.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the inclusion in the RECORD of, first, the text of the chamber's policy statement on revenue sharing; second, a copy of the "Poll on Community Problems," with results, taken at the chamber's annual meeting here; and third, a copy of retiring chamber president Wright's Oklahoma address entitled "State and Local Governments in a Changing Society."

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE POLICY DECLARATION: FINANCING LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT

Federal-State Relationships. Preservation of our system of constitutional government requires that Congress terminate Federal direction and control over those functions which are the rightful obligation of state and local governments.

Crucial to the ability of state and local governments to perform their rightful functions is the availability of adequate fiscal resources.

Federal grants-in-aid to state and local governments are becoming a major growing source of revenues to such governments. Proliferation and expansion of grants-in-aid have increased Federal direction and control over wide areas of traditionally state and local government functions.

Every effort should be made to consolidate the vast number of existing conditional Federal grants-in-aid programs.

Alternative approaches to grants-in-aid, such as block grants, credits of state and local taxes against Federal income tax, sharing of Federal revenue, and reductions of Federal income tax rates as a means of providing revenues to the state and local governments should be carefully developed and supported where necessary as substitutes for Federal grants-in-aid.

Any law providing these approaches, however, should contain certain conditions essential to making them effective and in keeping with the concept of state and local government responsibility. The conditions are (1) that these approaches provide incentives for state and local governments to provide adequate revenue structures consistent with their needs; (2) that these approaches contain provisions to assure that a reasonable percentage of Federally provided funds goes to local governments; (3) that the approaches encourage and help local and state governments to improve their ability to manage and administer public services; and (4) that the approaches encourage local and state governments to provide adequate levels of expenditure for needed public services.

POLL ON COMMUNITY PROBLEMS

(Tally card results as reported by Frank Blair of the NBC–TV "Today" show at the second general session, 55th annual meeting, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, May 2, 1967)

[Results in percent.]

MODERNIZING LOCAL GOVERNMENT

1. Is need for modernization greater today than 10 years ago?

Yes	90
No	10

2. Is your chamber making sufficient efforts?

Yes	51
No	49

3. Are you personally involved?

Yes	66
No.	34

SOCIOECONOMIC PROBLEMS

4. Are community problems more pressing today than 10 years ago?

Yes	88
No	12

5. Do businessmen understand these problems as well as economic development problems?

Yes	24
No	76

6. Should your chamber help solve these problems?

Yes	95
No	5

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

7. Has your chamber taken a significant part in creating new jobs in the past 5 years?

Yes	78
No	22

8. Does improving community education, welfare, cultural facilities help attract business and industry?

Yes	97
No	3

9. Is your community and chamber organized for total community development?

Yes	69
No	31

FINANCING GOVERNMENT

10. Are your local and State tax revenues adequate to finance present community needs?

Yes	36
No	64

11. If not, should business consider Federal revenue sharing without "Federal strings"?

Yes	84
No	16

12. Does the Federal Government have a role in equalizing opportunities between poorer and richer States?

Yes	42
No	58

LEADERSHIP

13. Should businessmen be involved in solving education, welfare, race relations, unemployment, crime, pollution, and slum problems?

Yes	99
No	1

14. Is your chamber the appropriate vehicle for business action in these areas?

Yes	94
No	6

15. Are you active in solving local problems affecting your business climate?

Yes	89
No	11

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS IN A CHANGING SOCIETY

(By M. A. Wright, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, before the Oklahoma Community Achievement Award banquet, Oklahoma City, Okla., Apr. 12, 1967)

Over the past several years, one of the fastest growing sectors in our economy has been the state and local governments. In just ten years these governmental bodies have increased their employment almost 60 percent. Over the same period their payrolls more than doubled, rising to $3.5 billion, and their total expenditures nearly doubled, increasing to about $80 billion. State and local expenditures have in fact grown about twice as fast as federal outlays and account for more than three-fourths of all government civilian expenditures.

State and local government operations have indeed become big business—and a growth industry of the first magnitude. As you meet here to recognize those communities in Oklahoma that have done a particularly outstanding job of serving the needs of their citizens, it would seem appropriate to take a closer look at some of the problems and challenges facing these communities and, more generally, some of the problems and challenges facing most of the nation's state and local governments. What are the forces and trends, for example, that have caused these units of government to undertake such an enormous expansion in their operations? Have these governmental bodies developed the appropriate organizational, institutional, and financial framework to perform their functions effectively? And finally, what role can and should the business community play in helping these governments do a better job in meeting their responsibilities?

One of the most obvious forces causing the recent surge in state and local government activities has been the rapid growth in population and the attending shift of this population to the metropolitan areas. Since the end of World War II the nation's total population has increased about one-third, receiving a particularly strong boost from the post-war baby boom. The population of the nation's metropolitan areas, however, grew at an even faster rate, rising one-and-a-half times as fast as the total population. As a result, fully 70 percent of all Americans are concentrated in urban areas today.

Another factor that has contributed to the growth in state and local government expenditures has been the nation's growing commitment to education. Not only have we had more people to educate but we have also attempted to give each person a better education. School and college enrollment for the present year is up almost 50 percent from just ten years ago. Well over three million of our young people will receive college and high school degrees this year, almost twice as many as ten years ago. In the nation as a whole 95 percent of today's students will complete the 8th grade, 70 percent will graduate from high school and almost one-fourth will graduate from college. All of these ratios are up substantially from just a few years ago.

A third force leading to new and expanded demands on our state and local governments has been the nation's ever-increasing industrialization and economic affluence. Since the early 1950s, for example, the country's total manufacturing capacity has doubled. Over the same 15 years, similar increases were registered by the nation's total output of goods and services and by the average income per person. As a result, family income in the United States today is almost half again as large as that of any other nation in the world and, of course, many times greater than the income of most countries.

This increased prosperity has afforded the American people endless opportunity for a comfortable and rewarding life. But it has also refined our tastes and increased our awareness and concern over the environment around us. With our new-found affluence we have in many instances become dissatisfied with the level and quality of public services and uncomfortable with some of the problems that an earlier date were ignored. We now, for example, place a much higher priority on maintaining spacious and beautiful parks and open areas in our local communities. The larger public libraries, new halls for the performing arts, and increased number of museums that were once thought of as luxuries are now considered essential for the joy and enrichment of our people. And poverty, though in absolute terms less serious today than at any time in our nation's history, has aroused our social conscience and caused us to become committed to the goal of its complete and final elimination. All of these new desires and changing attitudes have placed increased pressure on our state and local governments for more and better services.

The growth in state and local government operations, however, reflects much more than our goal as a nation to solve past problems and provide for previously latent desires. Though the nation's urbanization, industrialization and prosperity offer unlimited promise and opportunity to our society, they have also created their own set of problems—problems that most often call for the attention of our state and local governments. Air and water pollution, for example, has become one of the more widespread and unwelcome offshoots of our highly concentrated, affluent society.

In addition, the Nation's population shift from the downtown areas to the suburbs has caused many of our central cities to become blighted and rundown, and at the same time has reduced the tax base necessary for restoring and maintaining them. Further, as we have concentrated more people into smaller spaces, such problems as crime and juvenile delinquency, slum and ghetto housing, and social and civil unrest have become more acute. And finally, the rapidly increasing stock of automobiles—and the leisure time and income to enjoy them—has created traffic congestion problems that pose a challenge to the imagination and resources of our local officials. The increasing speed of our jet airliners and the gradually slowing pace of our city transfer systems have in fact established a new law of transportation—the longer the distance to be traveled, the shorter the time needed to cover it.

All of these forces, trends, and problems have combined to place the machinery of our state and local governments under tremendous pressure. Our efforts to improve the general quality of environment around us—and to enhance and maintain our social, moral, and economic values—have in almost every case called for the governments closest to the people to take on larger and larger responsibilities. And with the nation's economic growth and urbanization quickening—and the list of social and public needs growing—there seems little likelihood that these responsibilities will diminish in the near future. There is in fact reason to believe that the role assumed by these units in satisfying the nation's most urgent needs will continue to increase in scope and in magnitude.

Thus it is regrettable that at the time most factors are pointing toward expansion of state and local government responsibilities, other forces are at play that tend to diminish the effectiveness of these governments in performing their various activity. Many of our state and local governments, for instance, have not responded in full—or in some cases even in part—to the changing times and to the ever-growing demands being placed upon them. Even though many of their most pressing problems—air and water pollution, traffic control, urban transportation, police and fire protection, education—are area-wide or regional in nature, often there is no single government unit to handle these problems—or even coordination among the many smaller units that attempt to handle them. The average metropolitan area has 87 different units of government, and some cities such as Chicago and New York have well over 1,000. One recent study has shown that the nation's 200 metropolitan areas are now governed by more than 18,000 governmental units. In addition there are more than 3,000 counties, about 17,000 townships, and almost 50,000 special districts—including school districts, road districts, park districts, and fire fighting districts. Altogether there are more than 80,000 local governments in the United States doing a job that one source estimates could be done effectively by 16,000 units.

This fragmentation of our local governments has left few units large enough in population, area, or taxable resources to apply modern and efficient methods to their problems. A recent study by the Committee for Economic Development concludes that the minimum size for an effective unit of government is a population of about 50,000. Yet the average population of local jurisdictions is 2,500 and less than half the local units contain as many as 1,000 people. Moreover the inefficiencies of such small sizes are further complicated by a government structure which at times calls for as many as 11 overlapping layers of government to perform the same or similar functions. It is surely evident that such fragmentation and duplication of effort among the lower levels of government is not conducive to efficient operations.

Even more regrettable, the federal government's policies and programs often tend to encourage and intensify these disjointed efforts. Over the years, the federal government's response to the nation's many social needs has been what one senator has called the "Washington reflex"—the tendency "to discover a problem and then to throw money at it, hoping that it will somehow go away." This rather spontaneous—and all too often ill-planned and uncoordinated—reaction to these problems has prompted the establishment of some 399 separate federal aid appropriations to the state and local governments, almost a nine-fold increase over just five years ago. As would be expected, such a diversity of separate and in many cases disorganized efforts forces some cities to become involved with as many as 100 or more different federal programs in order to satisfy local needs. Such induced fragmentation by the federal government surely discourages consolidation and coordination at the local level and further compounds the already existing inefficiencies.

One final, and certainly not insignificant, factor contributing to the state and local government's reduced effectiveness is the generally widespread inability of these units to generate sufficient revenues. Over recent history, these levels of government have had to rely on sales and property taxes to meet their revenue needs. As both of these taxes generally have responded slower to overall economic growth than the needs and problems caused by this growth, most state and local authorities have faced the rather common dilemma of watching their spending outpace their income. The alternatives have been to increase taxes—which is politically distasteful—raise debt limits, or rely even more heavily on grants-in-aid from the federal government.

Although tax increases and the implementation of new taxes have certainly not been uncommon, this avenue has not been used frequently enough to close the revenue-expenditure gap. Thus, the state and local governments have been forced to float larger bond issues and to become more dependent on funds from Washington. As a result, state and local government debt has increased four-fold since 1950, reaching nearly $100 billion in 1965. Over the same period, total federal grants to state and local governments rose from about $2 billion to over $11 billion. For the coming year the Administration has requested that these funds be expanded to $17 billion, thus providing about one-fifth of all the revenues received by the state and local governments. As most of these funds are tied to specific projects, the flexibility and initiative of the local authorities in responding to their communities' needs is often restricted. In many cases, this further limits the state and local governments' effectiveness in solving their local problems.

The challenges and opportunities facing the nation's state and local governments are infinite. Our society's growing commitment to improve the quality of its environment and eliminate some of man's oldest problems has created a whole new set of needs that demand public attention. We, in effect, must see that poverty is eliminated, pollution controlled, crime reduced, our central cities revitalized, our slums removed and, in general, our overall environment improved. But we must see that all of these objectives are met in the most effective and efficient means possible—and without damaging the political and economic system that placed such ambitious goals within our reach.

If the most desirable solutions to these problems are to be developed, the nation's state and local governments—the governmental units that should be most responsive to the people—need to take much of the initiative. In a nation as diverse as ours, we cannot hope to formulate national policies which account for all the differences between regions and between states. We cannot hope to develop uniform programs that will solve all the nation's social problems with equal effectiveness regardless of local circumstances. We need instead to encourage local communities and states to respond to their own needs—to develop the flexible policies necessary for each unique problem. We need to develop the strong state and local governments required to counterbalance our strong federal government. Indeed, we need to develop the home-rule that will continue to make our federalism viable and effective.

If the state and local governments are to develop such strength—and become fully effective in meeting their many responsibilities—they must become more receptive to change and to modernization. They need to make efforts to streamline their operations and to coordinate and consolidate their programs. As more and more of the nation's social problems extend across present jurisdictional boundaries, the governmental units necessary to encompass and solve these problems must be formulated. The need in many cases will be for regional cooperation, regional planning and, in effect, regional governments. If we do not wish to see the federal government assume more and more of the responsibilities that traditionally—and logically—have belonged to our state and local governments, we must develop the organization and machinery at these lower levels that are necessary to do the job ahead.

Much of the burden for reforming state and local governments must rest with our elected and appointed public officials. These are the people who are most involved with the present problems and who in many cases best understand the limits and the advantages of the current system. But if these officials are to respond in full to the current situation—and consolidate those units of government that need consolidation and coordinate the efforts of those units that need coordination—responsible citizens in all our communities must become actively involved in the reform process. It is the duty of every citizen to encourage and to assist state and local officials as they develop more efficient and effective ways of doing their job.

The business community, however, is in a particularly unique position to fulfill its responsibility in this process. Because of its experience in administration and management—and organization and reorganization—the business community can—and should—be a primary force in bringing about the needed changes. It was with this goal in mind that the National Chamber recently established a program to develop a more generalized view of the modernization problem.

On a more specific basis, businessmen can help state and local authorities apply the same techniques to government operations that have long been used to improve the productivity of the private sector. They can point out operations and units that need to be consolidated for better over-all efficiency. Through the use of such scientific management techniques as operations research and systems analysis, businessmen can advise government officials on what are the most efficient methods to solve their problems. Businessmen can also help public officials apply these same scientific techniques to government decisions, encourage them to expand their cost-effectiveness studies and, in general, help them develop a more analytical approach to their budget and financial responsibilities. In brief, businessmen can act as management consultants to their state and local governments and perhaps initiate a management revolution in the public sector similar to the one that began several years ago.

With respect to these suggestions, it is interesting that only this past week Postmaster General O'Brien proposed that the Post Office Department be converted into a nonprofit government corporation so as to take advantage of more business-like management techniques in its operation.

The business community can also offer guidance and leadership to the state and local governments in their efforts to increase revenues. If these units of government are to retain their most desirable characteristics—responsiveness, flexibility, and diversity—they must remain as independent as is feasible of federal grants and the controls that accompany these funds. Where possible, taxes should be levied by those governments which spend the money. The local citizen should be able to see his tax money at work—and know exactly what public services and public programs he is paying for and how much they are costing.

But if incomes are to match outflows it is likely that more states and communities will need to evaluate their present tax systems—and perhaps make substantial revisions. More effective use of the property tax—through uniform assessments—and wider application of user taxes may prove necessary. It is even possible that after careful studies some of the current taxes will need to be supplemented by new sources of revenues.

In the way of a summary, let me briefly restate some of my observations on this all-important area of public activity. Because of the many social and economic changes currently at play in our society, the nation's state and local governments are being placed under intense pressure to satisfy a growing list of new and different public needs. Their ability to meet these obligations, however, has often been diminished because of outdated structural and institutional arrangements. Government fragmentation and duplication have in many cases reduced their ability to respond in an effective and efficient manner to the demands placed upon them. This necessitates that some of the smallest government units be consolidated, or if this is impractical, greater coordination of local efforts must be achieved.

Businessmen can help facilitate this process by analyzing present government operations, and—with the aid of scientific management techniques—offer suggestions on how more efficient approaches to various problems can be implemented. It is hoped that, after these changes have been made, substantial savings will be realized, thus perhaps reducing some of the financial pressure currently being placed on these units of government. But finally, if after the appropriate changes have been made state and local governments still find their revenues inadequate, business leaders can help public officials make further utilization of current tax sources and, if necessary, help develop new tax sources. Through all these efforts our state and local governments should be better prepared to assume their proper role in our changing society.

CANCER RESEARCH

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, the year 1967 marks the 30th anniversary of passage by the Congress of the National Cancer Institute Act. It seems especially fitting at this time, therefore, that we reexamine our situation with regard to cancer, and ask ourselves what we can do to stem the onslaught of malignant disease.

In the 30 years since the Federal Government began to support cancer research and control with an organized program, there has been a marked improvement in the cancer cure rate. In 1937, one out of four cancer patients, or 25 percent, survived 5 years or longer without evidence of disease. At present one out of three, or close to 35 percent, survives 5 years or more.

Unfortunately, this does not tell the whole story. In 1937 there were about 145,000 reported cancer deaths in the United States—a rate of some 112 per 100,000 population. It is estimated that in 1967 the number of deaths will total 305,000—a rate of 153 per 100,000. So we find ourselves faced with a grim paradox that produces on the one hand a rise in the cure rate while we find on the other hand that more people are dying of cancer than ever before. Moreover, because of population growth and the increasing proportion of older persons, cancer mortality will probably continue to rise. Thus, it is estimated that by 1975 there will be more than a million cancer cases under treatment and 325,000 deaths a year. Should the alarming increase in lung cancer continue, these estimates will prove to be low. The seriousness of this situation cannot be overemphasized.

Confronted with this critical state of affairs, can we find any reason for optimism? I believe so, provided we have the boldness and vision to give our unstinting support to programs of cancer research. For through research lies the only avenue to the solution of the cancer problem.

When Federal support of cancer programs began in 1937, the prevailing view was that much more would have to be learned about the basic nature of the cancer process before any practical solution to the problem could be sought. Indeed, during 30 years of all-out organized attack on malignant disease, scientists supported by both Federal and voluntary funds have spent a large share of their time and efforts in attempts to learn the nature of the cancer process. Today, it can be said that scientists have learned more about cancer in the past 30 years than in all the previous years of medical history. At the same time, increasing funds of knowledge have made it possible to tackle an increasing number of specific cancer problems. Therefore, our present understanding of cancer, although far from complete, enables our scientists to apply research knowledge in a vigorous and practical way along several fronts.

A striking example of this exploitation of accumulated knowledge can be found in the National Cancer Institute's special virus leukemia program. Scientists have known for some time that some forms of cancer can be caused in animals by certain viruses, and although it appears highly probable that a similar relation holds for man, a link between viruses and human cancer has not yet been established. However, it is the conviction of the Institute that there now exists sufficient scientific knowledge and technical capacity to plan and carry out an intensified, coordinated and integrated research effort in this area. The Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate shared this conviction to the extent that they recommended funds for the establishment of the special virus leukemia program. The program is proceeding satisfactorily in its quest for a viral cause of human leukemia and, if successful, could, through development of a vaccine, pave the way for immunity against the disease.

This is especially gratifying to me, inasmuch as I was helpful in having a special appropriation of $10 million for the National Cancer Institute added to the fiscal year 1965 appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to permit acceleration of the special cancer virus research program.

This action was taken in the hope of achieving a major breakthrough in the identification of the causal agent for at least one form of cancer: the highly fatal leukemia of childhood.

Now, not only in the prevention of leukemia, but in its treatment likewise are scientists beginning to move forward. Although this disease must still be regarded as a fatal affliction, drug treatment combined with supportive therapy is each year increasing the length of remissions, or disease-free periods, in patients. A few years ago a child with acute leukemia could expect to live no more than 2 or 3 months after diagnosis of his disease. Today we are measuring remission periods in years, and we know of at least 140 acute leukemia patients who have been kept alive for 5 years or longer.

This improvement has been brought about not only through the use of a half dozen fairly new drugs, but also through the discovery of more effective ways to administer these drugs. It was found, for example, that two or more of the compounds, used in combination, were far more effective than when administered singly. In addition, blood platelet transfusion techniques have been improved and germ-free situations maintained to help control the hemorrhage and infection that have claimed the lives of so many leukemia patients.

Another form of cancer that is giving ground to research is Hodgkin's disease. This affliction which affects the lymph glands and other infection-fighting tissues can now be considered curable in about 40 percent of those patients in whom the disease is discovered in an early stage and treated with large doses of X-ray. This is a vast improvement over the situation of just a few years ago when Hodgkin's disease was looked upon as universally fatal. Progress is also being made in the drug treatment of more advanced disease. Our research people are looking forward to the time when the cure rate will be considerably higher.

Perhaps it will have been noted in my brief remarks today on advances against cancer how the word "research" keeps running through the various thoughts expressed. I can assure you it is the key word. For here is the way we shall conquer cancer: through research and more research. The pace of scientific investigation in the field of malignant disease is beginning to accelerate to a degree undreamed of 30 years ago. No one expects miracles, naturally. The solution to the cancer problem will not come about in a blinding flash. But come it will—through the increasing momentum of biomedical research.

However, research cannot proceed without support—generous financial support. The Congress has been very liberal in appropriating funds for cancer research in the past, but as our knowledge of the disease expands, as our scientists begin to apply this knowledge to the practical task of eradicating cancer, much greater sums will be needed.

This body will shortly have the opportunity to cast its vote for that portion of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968, which provides funds for Federal support of cancer research. The amount programed for fiscal year 1968 for the National Cancer Institute is $183,356,000.

I would suggest that in considering this appropriation, or the appropriation of even more moneys than the amount requested, every Senator view his vote as a means of endorsing the efforts of dedicated scientists who are bringing us ever nearer to the day when cancer will have been eliminated as a threat to the Nation's health.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE CRISIS IN GREECE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, this morning's New York Times contained a timely and well-reasoned editorial entitled "Greece Takes a Good Turn."

The American people and the people of the world who honor and respect the contributions Greece has made to freedom and democratic institutions join in the hope and prayer that the return of constitutional government in Greece will not be long delayed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the editorial to which I have referred, entitled "Greece Takes a Good Turn," published in the New York Times of May 9, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Greece Takes a Good Turn

The new military junta in Greece has responded to what must have been a multitude of pressures from inside and outside the country. Yesterday it promised that a new Constitution would be submitted to a national referendum and, after that, general elections and a return to parliamentary government.

These developments will represent—always presuming the Government carries out its promise—a triumph that can be widely shared. King Constantine, who took the gamble of reluctantly playing along with the new Government; the Greek people, who stayed calm under what must have been a deep sense of frustration; and the upper ranks of the army, that held firm while a group of colonels seized power—all these elements have won out.

The United States and other interested governments also have proved that they did the right thing in sitting back and waiting for the Greeks to settle their own affairs. However, United States Ambassador Talbot was justified in expressing concern on behalf of Washington for all political prisoners.

It was clearly understood that Andreas Papandreou and his father, George, the former Premier, were included in this expression of anxiety. Andreas was an American citizen for some years and was well known in the United States as an economist and teacher. His academic friends here besieged the White House in his behalf.

For the moment there are merely assurances that all the political prisoners are being well treated—but there is no assurance about what is going to happen to them. It would cause worldwide revulsion if the Papandreous and other political prisoners were treated as if they really were traitors. Political opposition is "treachery" only in totalitarian regimes not in democracies.

Yesterday's announcement came at a moment when the Greek picture looked black. All lovers of freedom will hope there is no backsliding now. It will be good to welcome back to the ranks of democracy the nation that invented the word.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NUEVAS VISTAS CONFERENCE ENDORSES BILINGUAL EDUCATION ACT

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Spanish-surnamed population of the Southwest has long been handicapped by a language barrier which of itself defeated efforts to eliminate poverty by the most effective means; that is, education. The special nature of their problem requires special means of solution, and for that purpose I have introduced S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act.

On April 13 and 14, the Nuevas Vistas Conference, sponsored by the State of California Department of Education, adopted a resolution of support of S. 428, the Bilingual American Education Act, and H.R. 800, introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Roybal of California.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and the letter of transmittal to me from Eugene Gonzales, assistant superintendent of public instruction, Department of Education of the State of California, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution and letter were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

State of California,
Department of Education,
Los Angeles, Calif., May 3, 1967.

Senator Ralph Yarborough,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: The Nuevas Vistas Conference held on April 13 and 14 of this year was called to discuss those educational needs of the Spanish surnamed—with focus mainly on the Mexican-American.

At the conclusion of the two-day Conference sponsored by the State Department of Education the enclosed statement was voted upon and approved by persons who attended the last session. This was a total group action taken by the conferees as a supporting statement to encourage passage of S 428 and H.R. 8000.

With approximately half of all the Mexican-Americans in the Southwest in California, the State Department of Education is most anxious to insure adequate and proper educational services to the Spanish-speaking.

Sincerely,

Eugene Gonzales,
Assistant Superintendent of Public Instruction.

At the Nuevas Vistas Conference held on April 13–14, 1967 at Los Angeles, California, a motion was made by Manuel Ruiz, seconded by George Herrera, that the following resolution be adopted:

Whereas, it is the sense of this Assembly that the ability to communicate effectively is a requirement for a realistic and rapid transition into our body politic of a large number of students in the United States to whom English is a second language, and

Whereas, those handicapped because of language barriers, are in need for immediate and aggressive remedial action to help overcome this handicap so as to be able to better take advantage, participate and share fully in the rich abundance of twentieth century America; therefore

Be it resolved: That this Assembly endorses the passage and adoption of House of Representatives Bill 8000 introduced into the Assembly on Wednesday, April 5, 1967 by the Honorable Edward R. Roybal of California, entitled "The Bi-lingual Educational Opportunity Act, and Senate Bill 428 introduced into the Senate on January 12, 1967 by the Honorable Ralph Yarborough of the State of Texas, entitled an amendment to the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965," to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bi-lingual education programs and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON COMMENDS AMERICAN GROUPS' CONTINUING COMMITMENT TO THE WAR AGAINST POVERTY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. It was my privilege to be at the White House last evening when President Johnson addressed the National Conference of Women in the War on Poverty.

A very distinguished audience was present. In these days of international strife we too often lose sight of the importance of the war on poverty. The audience filled every square foot of space in the East Room of the White House. These ladies were giving their time to the problems of poverty in such numbers they stood to hear the President; there was no room for chairs.

The President made a commitment regarding the expansion and continuance of the war on poverty.

The remarks made by the President last night emphasized that:

> We are not backing off from our commitment to fight poverty.

The President went on to point out that:

> The dimensions of poverty are not new. What is new is the all-out American effort to break their grip on millions of our fellow citizens.

It is just such an effort that is being made by this group, the Women in the War on Poverty. They are much to be commended on their continuing dedication and their continuing accomplishments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the brief remarks of the President last night at the White House be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Text of Remarks of the President to the Participants in the Conference of Women in the War on Poverty, May 8, 1967

I know that you have heard a great many speakers today, so I will not detain you long.

I do want to share a few thoughts with you about the struggle we have been waging—with increasing intensity—against poverty in America.

Long before there was an official, Federal "war on poverty"—long before the New Deal and the Fair Deal—women's groups were fighting poverty in the neighborhoods and legislative halls. Many of the early victories in the struggle against poverty were won because women cared enough to work, and plan, and make their influence felt. The battles for compulsory education and against child labor are two that come most readily to mind.

Now you have organized behind a new program, using new methods and new resources. But this program—like all those that have gone before—will succeed only if you make the same commitment that women have made over the generations to teach, to heal, to awaken the conscience of the nation.

I would like to speak realistically this evening about the job that remains to be done—by all of us.

We have heard a great deal of contrary talk about poverty during the past few weeks.

Some people say we are spending too much, or wasting too much, on a losing battle to help poor Americans.

Others say that we are spending too little, that we have backed away from our commitment to this war, because of our commitment to the other war—in Vietnam.

Both views are earnestly held. But both, unfortunately, are wide of the mark.

To those who believe we are backing off, I say, no—we are not backing off. We are staying for the long pull.

Let the figures speak to you—not because they can tell the whole story, but because they represent a conscious and deliberate commitment of the American people over the past six years.

The figures show that in this fiscal year, the amount of Federal funds going to help the poor in America—through all our social programs—will reach $22 billion dollars.

If Congress passes the 1968 budget I have sent forward, that amount will rise to $25.6 billion.

That is two and one-half times as much as we spent back in 1960.

It is clear—to me at least—that we are not backing off from our commitment to fight poverty. Nor will we—so long as I have anything to say about it. We have just begun.

To those who believe we are spending too much, I want to address a special word:

You—and I—are against crime in the streets.

We are against violence and delinquency.

We are against the dulling effects of dependency on welfare, that continue from generation to generation.

We want our fellow men to be productive and responsible citizens—not drop-outs from our society.

I would like to suggest that we cannot logically oppose the effects of poverty, and efforts to relieve them. We cannot abhor the disease, and fight the cure—not if we want a healthy nation. And poverty is curable. I have seen it cured.

Thirty years ago, in Texas, when I was 27 years old, I served as the regional administrator for the National Youth Administration. That program, started by Franklin D. Roosevelt, was similar in many ways to the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps and Upward Bound.

It was a depression-version of the War on Poverty—and it was a success. In all, 33,000 young Texans became involved in the NYA program in the late 1930's. Some learned trades. Some were provided part-time jobs so they could stay in school. Some got full-time jobs.

You may not know it, but the first beautification expert in the Johnson family was me—not Lady Bird. The NYA youth in Texas built a hundred roadside parks that are still in existence today, and they worked on hundreds of other projects that helped their state and themselves.

Don't think the NYA and the other New Deal programs didn't have their critics—just as the War on Poverty does today. But for all the criticisms, most of the programs survived—and more importantly, they helped millions of Americans to survive, and ultimately to prosper.

Today, when I go through Texas, I meet the people who were helped by NYA thirty years ago. Most are in their late forties today. Most are responsible and productive citizens: doctors, businessmen, skilled craftsmen.

It will be hard for their children to understand what poverty is like. That is one of the information gaps of our time; many middle-class Americans cannot grasp the elementary facts of life for the poor:

Many of us may wake up in the morning to gentle music of a clock radio.

A poor person in America may wake up because there is no heat—or because a rat is running across his bed.

This is no exaggeration. In one poor neighborhood, 40% of the four-year-old children identified a picture of a teddy-bear as the only animal they knew—a rat.

Middle-class Americans may complain about how hard it is to arrange a house call from a doctor. But a poor person in America may go without a doctor altogether—because there are few doctors' offices in the slums. The poor in America do not know what the phrase "family doctor" means. They take their medicine—when they can— from the emergency room of a public hospital, and they do not see the same doctor twice.

One doctor summed up the relation between illness and poverty very clearly. He said "The poor get sicker. The sick get poorer."

Middle-class Americans may settle most of their legal problems with ease. When a poor person reports a violation of the housing code, he and his family may be evicted by the landlord. He cannot afford a lawyer to fight the eviction.

Poverty means all of these things—not one-by-one, but all at once. Each compounds the others.

Poverty wears different masks in different places. We think of it as a city disease, but almost half of American poverty is found in rural areas. We sometimes may think of it as a Negro affliction, but seven in ten poor people are white. Poverty afflicts the old man and the young child. Poverty is found on Indian reservations, in the hollows of West Virginia, in the migrant camps of Oregon, and here, in Washington, D.C.

These dimensions of poverty are not new. What is new is the all-out American effort to break their grip on millions of our fellow citizens.

I believe we are making progress. Not everywhere, not always, not totally. But the tide of progress is clear.

Let me share with you a letter from a mother in Peoria, Illinois: "You literally saved my boy's life. Before he entered the Job Corps, he used to say that the only way he could ever have anything was to steal it. He could have ended up in prison—or worse. Now he has a job at the Caterpillar Tractor Company and makes $2.96 an hour, and has a chance to advance as he becomes more experienced."

The only thing the government gave this young man—was the chance to help himself, and if that's a give-away program then I'm for it.

The Job Corps will not eliminate poverty—or the effects of poverty—in the United States. Neither will Neighborhood Youth Corps, nor a hundred re-training programs. Neither will the massive education programs that are now pumping over a billion dollars a year into education aid for disadvantaged children; nor will the medical centers, the legal centers, the VISTA program, or Head Start. Urban renewal alone will not eliminate poverty, nor will the new Model Cities program.

The Teacher Corps will not eliminate poverty, nor will an increase in Social Security.

I wish I could say that all these programs together—all 25 billion dollars worth—would eliminate poverty and its effects in America during this decade.

They won't.

For the war on poverty is not fought on any single, simple battlefield, and it will not be won in a generation. There are too many enemies: lack of jobs, bad housing, poor schools, lack of skills, discrimination,—and each aspect of poverty relates to, and intensifies, the others. That is the vicious circle we must break.

We have spent well over a hundred billion dollars in the past six years in that effort. Those dollars have not brought us total victory; but they have brought partial victory. They have helped many millions of Americans take their first steps toward full and meaningful participation in their society.

We can see that on the faces of young people from the Job Corps—many of them now wearing the uniform of their country. We can see it in the Head Start classroom—although we may not be able to measure its results for a generation. We can see it as fully 20% of the young people from households in poverty go on to college, and break forever their own bondage to the vicious circle. We see it in the hollows of Appalachia, where a job is again becoming a common occurrence, instead of a rarity.

Perhaps most importantly, we can see progress in the fact that bitterness is being rejected as the solution to poverty in the United States. The seeds of aspiration—of the will to succeed—have been planted in the slums and ghettos and hollows of America.

As they grow, there grows with them a new and restless spirit that seeks a constructive change and a voice in our society. That spirit will build a better America. Bitterness and strife and separatism will not and cannot build anything; they can only destroy. And that fact, I believe, is understood among all but a small minority today.

We may never live to see an America without poverty.

But we may see an America where a lifetime of poverty is not the inevitable fate of a child born into it: where there is a genuine opportunity for every child and young person to live in decency and security; where the means of liberation, and the understanding of how to use them, are available to all.

If we reach that America, it will be because we did not grow tired. It will be because we gave Americans a chance to help themselves.

That is in the finest and oldest American tradition: the very same tradition that established land grant colleges and public education; and the GI Bill of Rights; the same tradition that passed the Homestead Act; the same tradition that established the NYA about thirty years ago.

It is also the tradition out of which you come. You have given hope to so many—better lives to so many. May you never grow weary of the blessed work you do.

PROPOSAL TO NAME OLD SENATE OFFICE BUILDING FOR FORMER PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I was gratified and pleased yesterday to note the introduction by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] of a Senate resolution to name the Old Senate Office Building for former President Harry S. Truman.

Mr. President, as an occupant of the Old Senate Office Building, I very much favor the proposal of the Senator from Washington.

Everybody knows that whatever Harry Truman did was done first class, from his investigation of the frauds perpetrated in World War II to his fight for medicare, civil rights, and other important legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield?

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Even today in spirit and outlook Harry Truman would qualify for membership in the Young Democratic Club.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is correct. I commend the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for calling our attention to that.

Harry Truman remains young in spirit and outlook and understanding.

The fact that we have on the statute books civil rights and medicare legislation is due to Harry Truman's dedicated fight for such legislation. He paved the way for passage of these acts in subsequent administrations. He would not compromise. He fought for principle.

Harry Truman's stature increases year by year. With the passage of time, history reveals what kind of President he was.

It is fitting that our former President should be so honored on his 83d birthday.

I commend the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] for his thoughtfulness and timeliness of his resolution.

As the Senator from Washington pointed out, Harry Truman loved the Old Senate Office Building. Furthermore, as President, Harry S. Truman showed his concern for the historic structures of our Capital City by his renovation of the White House, the residence of our country's Chief Executives.

As one who served his country well during the troubled last days of World War II, and as one who himself enchanted, by beautifying and renovating, one of its most treasured buildings, the White House, former President Truman is truly deserving of this honor.

I congratulate Harry S. Truman on his 83d birthday and heartily endorse the resolution to give his name to the building which he loved.

I wrote former President Truman on last Saturday. I wired him yesterday. Our country was greatly honored to have a man of Harry Truman's dedication and ability serve as President.

I should like to see his name perpetuated on the face of the building in which I work.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT OF 1967

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 206, S. 645, which has now been cleared with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry [Mr. ELLENDER].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 645) to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 4, at the beginning of line 14, to strike out "(h)" and insert "(i)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Community Development District Act of 1967".

SEC. 2. It is the purpose of this Act (1) to provide the means for more equitable participation by rural residents in coordinated planning activities and decisions; (2) to increase efficiency in the use of resources; (3) to provide full representation of smaller governmental units in the planning activities and decisions which affect their residents, so that existing and future programs can be made more effective in providing in rural America equality of opportunity; (4) to improve the relationships between and the welfare of both urban and rural people; (5) to facilitate the cooperation among all Federal, State, and local agencies in establishing community development districts to better coordinate the planning of programs to improve rural life.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, may approve as a community development district (hereafter called "district") for the purpose of this Act any area that has been so designated by the State agency specified by the Governor or legislature of the State, or in absence of such designation any other area: *Provided,* That no district shall be approved under this section unless (1) local units of government participating in such district have requested the Secretary of Agriculture to approve the area as a community development district; (2) the State agency having supervisory responsibility under State law has received forty-five days' notice of the intention to approve such district, and has not disfavored such approval; (3) except in the case of a district designated by the State agency specified by the Governor or legislature of the State or in the case of a district in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the district does not include any area of any county unless the entire area of the county is included. Such district shall encompass as nearly as feasible the area which includes at least one service center and the surrounding territory within convenient commuting distance thereof, and any additional territory from which the residents beyond convenient commuting distance depend on such center as their central source of goods and services. "Convenient commuting distance" means the distance and direction within which residents carry on their day-to-day commercial, vocational, public service, social, and cultural pursuits.

SEC. 4. (a) In order to qualify for approval by the Secretary of Agriculture, a community development district board (hereafter called "board") shall have been organized in the district and empowered to establish and direct a community development district planning agency (hereafter called "planning agency"). Members of the board shall be elected by the governing bodies of the participating governments, and shall be responsible to the respective governing bodies by which they are elected. Representation on the board shall be so established that all citizens residing within the district can be represented on the board through action of a government in which jurisdiction they reside.

(b) "Participating" governments as used in this Act means those counties and municipalities which have authorized by official action of their governing bodies representation on the board and participation in the functions of the board. If such participating governments see fit to include in the charter or bylaws of the district provision for participation by additional public bodies, such additional public bodies shall be participating governments for all purposes of this Act after their governing bodies have by official action authorized representation on the board and participation in the function of the board.

SEC. 5. Section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, is amended by adding thereto the following:

(i) Notwithstanding any other provisions of this section, but within the total amount authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b), grants may be made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with the concurrence of the State within which the district is located to the planning agency of any community development district when such grants are approved by the Secretary of Agriculture under the Community Development District Act of 1967 for comprehensive planning as defined in this section, but including planning for all needs of the district in accordance with said Community Development District Act. Such grants shall be in the amounts certified by the Secretary of Agriculture, as follows:

"(1) not to exceed 75 per centum of the cost of salaries and expenses of the professional staff required for community development district program development planning, and for other planning of public services and other functions of the participating governments for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available; but in no event shall any grant under this paragraph be based on costs serving as a basis for any other Federal planning grant.

"(2) planning incentive grants in an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the amount of other Federal grants for planning purposes extended within the district.

"Grants provided under this subsection to the planning agency may be paid in whole or in part to participating governments or to States for the use of the State or the planning agency or both where this will facilitate the planning for the district.

"For purposes of this subsection comprehensive planning may also include the undertaking of coordinated planning for public services and for all other local governmental functions."

SEC. 6. The Administrator of any Federal assistance program having a requirement for planning as a condition of loan or grant assistance shall, before approval of such assistance, give consideration to the plans for the applicable district.

SEC. 7. The Secretary of Agriculture shall require, as a condition of extending planning assistance, that the Board agree to give consideration to all other plans prepared under other federally assisted programs affecting the district.

SEC. 8. Any agencies of the United States authorized to make grants, loans, or other assistance shall accord due and appropriate consideration to requests for assistance to carry out plans of districts. Upon request of a board, the Secretary of Agriculture may provide technical advice to applicants for such assistance in the development and implementation of plans provided for in this Act.

SEC. 9. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government such of his functions, powers, and duties under this Act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers, and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will, to the maximum extent permitted by other applicable laws, assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act.

SEC. 10. The planning staff employed by the district shall prepare or revise annually a detailed study for the district describing the Federal programs of aid or assistance in economic or social development that the district is eligible for, together with the criteria, standards, or other conditions that the district must meet to avail itself of such Federal programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 214), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION

This bill provides for grants to assist local areas in planning for facilities and services necessary to their future development. Similar assistance is now provided under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1964 for urban planning. The bill is identical (except as to date) to S. 2934, as passed by the Senate on April 25, 1966. That bill was requested by the President in his message of January 25, 1966, on rural poverty.

Under the bill, the Secretary of Agriculture, after consulting with the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, could approve community development districts initiated by local governments, if such approval is not disfavored by the State and if the district otherwise meets the requirements of the bill. Grants could then be made by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development with the concurrence of the Secretary of Agriculture and the State for—

(A) Up to 75 percent of the professional staff cost required for district development planning and for other planning of public services and functions for which Federal planning grants are not otherwise available; and

(B) Planning incentive grants in an amount up to 10 percent of the amount of other Federal planning grants made within the district.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, this bill is designed to provide rural areas and local communities with practical means of achieving some degree of equality with our large urban communities in the planning of future economic growth and development.

At the present time few, if any, of our rural areas have the resources to achieve a satisfactory level of development, even with the help of the many new Federal programs enacted by Congress during the last several years. Federal grants-in-aid are now available for comprehensive planning, as well as planning for a wide variety of specialized purposes. At the present time, this aid has not resulted in effective planning for rural areas, but has been very helpful in urban areas. Rural areas have suffered, mostly because of the small, poorly staffed, and financially weak local governments. In those cases where regional planning does exist, rural people are frequently underrepresented and sometimes not represented at all.

My bill, S. 645, is designed to overcome these deficiencies by providing grants to local communities and rural areas that desire to get together and form planning and development districts so that they might have a say in their own future.

The initiative and control of planning remains at the local level. Under no circumstances can the Federal Government impose a program on rural areas. The State must approve, not only the boundaries of the community development district, but also the grants that the Federal Government will make to the District Planning Commission. Under my bill, the Planning Board for the District must be elected by the local governing bodies and will be responsible to locally elected officials.

S. 645 aims at providing local areas with an opportunity for their own betterment. It also assures that complete control remains at the local level. This bill provides planning funds only and none for capital investments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS SUBJECT TO CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reconvened at 1 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INOUYE in the chair).

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE FAVORS TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture joins a long list of Federal agencies which enthusiastically support and endorse the truth-in-lending bill which I have introduced and which has completed hearings before the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. President, in a report to the Banking and Currency Committee, the Department of Agriculture strongly supported S. 5, the truth-in-lending bill. The Department believes that farmers as well as others will benefit from fuller knowledge of the real cost of credit. The Department believes the cost of credit may be made particularly evident if it is stated in the terms of an annual percentage rate as provided in S. 5.

The Department also conservatively estimated that the American farmers could save $60 million a year by shopping for better credit bargains, if they were more aware of cost.

The Department also estimated such a measure would be in accord with the President's program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the Department of Agriculture's report on S. 5 printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.
Hon. JOHN J. SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOHN: This is in reply to your letter of January 26, 1967, requesting a report on S. 5, a bill "To assist in the promotion of economic stabilization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit."

We have strongly endorsed the purposes of this bill in supporting earlier versions of the bill and continue to endorse the purposes as set forth in S. 5 now before your Committee. As we stated in supporting the earlier versions of the bill, we believe the proposed legislation can provide the kind of education and can arouse the kind of public interest that will combat ignorance and exploitation in the field of credit. Farmers, as well as others, will have a much fuller knowledge of the real costs of the credit they are using if these costs are stated in terms of the actual annual percentage rate as provided in S. 5.

We pointed out in my statement before your Committee in 1962 that if farmers, having been made aware of the real cost of credit, were to choose the best credit bargain available to them, and if by so doing they could save 2 percent on $3 billion worth of credit—a conservative estimate of the volume of farmer credit which would be affected—the saving would total $60 million annually. Due to the increased use of credit by farmers since 1962, the saving today would be substantially higher. This saving would be a complete addition to the net farm income and to the purchasing power of the American farmer.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely yours,
ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,
Secretary.

CREDIT UNIONS ENDORSE TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on April 20, Dr. Kenneth J. Marin, representing the Credit Union National Association, delivered a most impressive statement on behalf of the truth-in-lending bill. I have long been a strong supporter of the credit union movement in our country. Credit unions are now organized in 48 States and have nearly 18 million members. They have done an admirable job in bringing low-cost financing to the American consumer.

It is encouraging that the Credit Union National Association is supporting the truth-in-lending bill. Many financial institutions have testified the disclosure of the annual percentage rate would be difficult or unworkable. However, the credit unions, which by and large rely upon unpaid volunteer help, do not foresee any practical difficulties. On the contrary, the credit unions believe the disclosure of the annual percentage rate will provide valuable and useful information to the consumer. It will provide them with a meaningful yardstick to measure the cost of credit from many different sources.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the statement made by Mr. Marin printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record as follows:

STATMENT OF CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC., TO COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, U.S. SENATE, APRIL 20, 1967, BY KENNETH J. MARIN, EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, my name is Kenneth J. Marin. I am an ex officio member of the Executive Committee of CUNA International, Inc., and I am the immediate past President of CUNA. CUNA International, Inc., is a non-profit association of credit union leagues. In this country, there are 48 state credit union leagues which represent approximately 22,000 credit unions and which comprise approximately 18 million members.

I am appearing before you today to testify in support of S. 5, the Truth-in-Lending Act.

As you know, credit unions are non-profit mutual membership organizations chartered for the purpose of promoting thrift and providing provident and productive loans. They are chartered by either the Federal government or by one of the state governments, and they are supervised and examined by a state or Federal agency. They are exempt from Federal income taxes. Credit unions do not deal with the general public. They must have a common bond of membership and they can only deal with members. Each member of the credit union has one vote which he is free to exercise for the election of officers and for many other purposes. In order to become a member, an individual must pay a 25 cent admission fee and he must agree to subscribe to one 5 dollar share. The member is legally an investor and not a depositor. These facts are stated as a means of indicating the unique structure of a credit union as compared to other lenders.

We in the credit union movement like to believe that credit unions exist for one purpose—that purpose is to serve the members. Traditionally, we have fulfilled a substantial need for those who have been unable to obtain credit. We like to believe that we have been responsible for proving to other lenders that the "average man," whether he is a factory worker, an enlisted man in the military, a teacher, a civil servant, or a welfare recipient, has the capacity and the character to repay his loans if he is dealt with fairly and counseled wisely.

To this end, we like to think of ourselves as more than just a savings and lending institution. We believe that we are also an educational institution and a considerable amount of our time is devoted to educating our members. We justify this undertaking on the theory that our members save money not only by depositing a specific amount in the credit union each month, but, more important, by being knowledgeable buyers and by having adequate information with which to make decisions in the market place. This consumer orientation is reflected in many of the publications which are produced by CUNA International and by the various state credit union leagues. We publish a series of pamphlets known as Consumer Facts which attempt to give the facts to our members so that they will be able to get more for their money. These pamphlets cover everything from "How to Save On Meat Purchases" to the "Veteran's Benefits Available Under the Cold War GI Bill". Moreover, we punish a consumer's magazine known as *Everybody's Money* which has a circulation in excess of 1,500,000. This magazine is sent only to credit union members and its specific purpose is to provide them with facts so that they will be able to get more for their money. In addition, we carry on all kinds of educational programs for credit union volunteers and professionals. Among the more important of these programs is our family financial counseling course which, in many cases, is available to credit union members through a correspondence course.

We point all of this out so that you will understand our position on S. 5. We believe that S. 5 contains the provisions which are necessary for the consumer credit user to know the facts which will allow him to get more for his money. We have taken a favorable position on the Truth-in-Lending bill ever since it was first introduced by Senator Douglas, and we have wholeheartedly supported it. We continue to do so, even though we realize that the approximate annual interest rate disclosure may put us at a disadvantage since there are some lenders that have a lower rate than is available from many credit unions. We think this is good. If an individual can get a better rate elsewhere after comparing all the facts, we think he should go elsewhere. As a matter of fact, some surveys we have taken indicate that many members do just that. This has led some credit union people to believe that our educational endeavors may be just a little bit too good.

In expressing our support of this bill, we frankly admit that we do not know all of the problems that will be faced by other creditors and lenders in complying with the bill. However, we do know that credit unions will be able to comply without much difficulty. We have substantiated this in previous hearings and we continue to hold this view. We continue to hold this view even though within the past few years many credit unions have established open-end credit plans for members. We still maintain that even with these plans it will be possible for the credit unions to comply.

In supporting this bill we also admit that, generally speaking, most credit unions quote an interest rate on a monthly percentage basis. Historically, we believe that this practice originated with the recommendations of the Russell Sage Foundation. We have not changed to an annual rate because of the confusion which exists in the mind of the credit user concerning the cost of consumer credit. There have been occasions when credit unions have switched to an annual interest rate but had to go back to the monthly rate because it proved to be too difficult to explain to the members the difference between the annual rate charged by the credit union and the discount or add-on rate used by other lenders. Regardless of these experiences, we remain convinced that if all lenders and creditors are required to disclose the interest rate on a uniform basis, then the consumer will be in a position to make a knowledgeable comparison.

We want to make it quite clear that while we have adhered to a monthly rate, we have made no attempt to hide the annual percentage rate. Many of our publications clearly disclose the annual rate. In educating our members, we constantly use the annual rate since we have found from experience that it is the only adequate means of comparison. Moreover, since the Department of Defense has issued its directive (DOD Directive 1344.7) requiring on base lenders to disclose an approximate annual percentage rate, we have complied and we have no evidence that this compliance has adversely affected credit union service. We must admit, however, that in complying with the directive we deemed it necessary to include a statement to the effect that "a 12 percent annual rate means that you will pay approximately $6.50 per year per $100 balance owed." This proved necessary for reasons indicated previously.

Our concern with the lack of meaningful disclosure of interest costs in the consumer credit industry has become increased during the past six years. In reviewing past testimony of the Credit Union National Association on S. 1740, the then pending Truth-in-Lending bill, we note that we pointed out that economists were predicting that by 1970 the amount of installment credit outstanding would exceed $100 billion. This is only 1967, and it would not be surprising if installment credit exceeds that figure by the end of 1968. We point this out because we believe that the consumer credit industry is still in its infancy. We believe that an analysis ofthe present age distribution of the population of the United States indicates that consumer credit will be growing substantially in the next 25 years. According to a recent article in *Banking Magazine*, by 1980 there should be approximately 14,800,000 families in the 25 to 34 age group, an increase of 62 percent over 1965. In the same article, it is pointed out that between 1960 and 1963, 67 percent of the families in this age group had personal debt.

Because of the substantial growth expected in the consumer credit field, we think the time has come to provide the consumer credit user with the facts necessary to make an intelligent decision. We believe that it is time to destroy the 6 percent myth. The myth serves no useful purpose in our contemporary economy.

While speaking of the 25 to 34 age group, we would like to point out the fact that the people in this age group have an entirely new concept of debt. To these people, debt is actually becoming a form of thrift. When these people borrow, they must set aside a certain part of their income to pay for property they have already acquired. As you know, under the old concept, debt was considered to be somewhat immoral so consumers would try to save the money first and then use this money to purchase property. This changing concept of debt has been recognized by our own credit union managers and by other lenders. As a matter of fact, the president of the Mortgage Guaranty Insurance Corporation, Max H. Karl, articulated this changing concept in a recent report.

This is an important concept. If the contemporary consumer looks upon debt as a form of thrift, then it seems absolutely necessary that he have available the means to compare this new concept of thrift with the traditional concept of thrift. In both instances, the consumer is setting aside a portion of his income. When practicing thrift according to the traditional concept, he is quoted a simple annual rate. But when practicing thrift according to the contemporary concept he is quoted a discount, add-on or monthly rate. A meaningful comparison is obviously difficult.

In turning to the bill itself the credit union movement contends that it is essential to retain the approximate annual percentage rate disclosure requirement, to retain the coverage of revolving and open-end credit, and to retain the inclusion of all charges incident to the extension of credit.

We believe the approximate annual percentage rate disclosure requirement is essential since it is the only fair means of disclosing the cost in a meaningful way. The use of the cost of credit in dollars and cents does not tell the entire story since it is very difficult to make an adequate comparison only on the basis of dollars when the amounts of the downpayment or the length of the contract are varied. The use of a monthly percentage rate is substantially deceptive since it is misleading to the consumer. It is misleading because in almost every other instance the business world states the interest rate as an annual percentage rate. It is used by commercial lending institutions when dealing with business firms. It is used by all government agency lenders and borrowers, including those lending directly to the consumer. The recent widespread publicity given to the prime rate being charged by commercial banks is an excellent example of the prevalence of the annual interest rate in the commercial world. It is not unfair to assume that the average individual reading about a 5½ percent prime rate in the newspapers jumps to the conclusion that this is necessarily so since lending institutions do not charge in excess of 6 percent on loans.

In talking our stand on the annual percentage rate disclosure requirement, we realize that some confusion will result initially. We realize that adjustments in attitudes and practices will be necessary. However, as we previously indicated, we believe that the time has come to destroy the 6 percent myth and to put some facts back into the consumer lending business. Consumer credit has become too important to the economy to allow the perpetuation of such a meaningless fiction. We anticipate just as much confusion as do most other lenders, but we are prepared to handle it.

We also believe that it is essential to retain revolving and open-end credit within the coverage of the bill. Credit unions have recently established means of extending open-end credit plans to their members. We believe that we will be able to adhere to the approximate annual percentage rate disclosure requirement of the bill on these accounts. Possibly, since our system of computing interest rates is more simple than some other creditors, we fail to see the problems that other creditors will have. Yet, some of the testimony given earlier in the week increases our confidence that there are means by which other lenders can comply. We are also of the opinion that to exclude revolving credit would be to defeat the purpose of the bill since it would eliminate one of the possible areas where a consumer would be able to make an intelligent comparison. We strongly maintain that if the annual percentage rate disclosure requirement is to be maintained as a part of the bill, that it must be equally applicable to all creditors.

We are also of the opinion that it is essential to include all charges incident to the extension of credit. To do otherwise would be to destroy the yardstick of measurement. To allow a creditor to quote an interest rate and then add on extra fees would in effect increase the rate and effectively distort the disclosure. There are, of course, many situations in which it is difficult to determine whether a charge is incident to the extension of credit. However, we are of the opinion that such situations can be handled by the regulatory authority as they arise. The regulatory authority would be in a position to hold a public hearing and to receive briefs from interested parties. An adequate determination could then be made and the decision of the regulatory authority would be binding on all creditors. Federal credit unions have faced this problem without difficulty. Section 8 of the Federal Credit Union Act allows Federal credit unions to make loans "at rates of interest not exceeding 1 per centum per month on unpaid balances, inclusive of all charges incident to making the loan." Over the years there has been disagreement as to whether a particular charge was or was not incident to the making of the loan. After listening to arguments, the Bureau of Federal Credit Unions has made a decision and we have lived with it. Had we disagreed strongly, we could have appealed to the courts on the grounds that the decision was arbitrary and capricious.

Finally, we would like to make one final observation. It is our interpretation of the present provisions of S. 5 that the disclosure provisions apply only to threshold disclosure. In other words, the provisions of the bill must be applied at the time that the contract is entered into. This of course is in conformity with the purpose of the bill which is to provide the borrower with the essential knowledge necessary to make an intelligent decision at the time that he intends to borrow.

That concludes my statement Mr. Chairman, and I thank you and the members of the Committee for the opportunity to appear before you and I will try to answer any questions that you may have.

THE 22D ANNIVERSARY OF V-E DAY RECALLS THE SENATE'S FAILURE TO RATIFY HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS—LXVIII

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 22 years ago this past Sunday, on May 7, 1945, Nazi Germany surrendered unconditionally, thus ending World War II in Europe.

The Third Reich lasted just 988 years short of the millennium prophesied by its brutal masters.

Barbarism, unmatched in recorded history, left as its monument a Germany, in rubble, and a Europe, devastated.

Out of this abomination came civilized man's resolve that the world could not and would not accept the awesome sentence of another world war.

The United Nations was founded to establish and preserve world order and world peace through the recognition of individual human rights.

The United Nations Charter boldly proclaimed that organization's objectives, the promotion of peace through the establishment of universal standards of human dignity. Human rights were rightly regarded as innate to every human being, not some commodity to be alternately granted and grabbed by any despot.

The United Nations has sponsored human rights conventions toward achieving that recognition of human rights in international law.

The Genocide Convention, the first "magnum opus" of the United Nations, was adopted through American initiative in 1948. The Genocide Convention was submitted to the Senate by President Harry Truman in 1949.

The Genocide Convention was the subject of hearings before a subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee in early 1950.

Since then no report, no statement, no progress, no explanation.

When submitted to the Senate by President Truman, only five nations had ratified the Genocide Convention. Now a total of 70 nations have ratified this convention. But nowhere will the name of the United States be found on that list.

The Senate cannot blame the usual scapegoats—"bureaucratic bungling," "executive inaction," or simply "State."

The responsibility for ratification of the Convention on Genocide, as well as for the Conventions on Forced Labor, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery, resides squarely in this Chamber with each Senator.

The hour is late. But the Senate can still right a most grievous failure by ratifying the Genocide Convention along with the other three Human Rights Conventions now.

HARLOWTON: MONTANA'S OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Montana Chamber of Commerce has instituted a community betterment program, and this year they selected their first outstanding community. I am delighted with the selection of Harlowton, one of our fine communities in central Montana. Harlowton received top honors for cities in the 1,001 to 5,000 population bracket, in addition to being declared top performer in all divisions. This is a graphic example of what a small community can do in developing its general appearance, recreation facilities, and overall economic improvement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the Harlowton Times of May 4, 1967, printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Times is published by Hal Stearns, who, I am certain, had a great deal to do with this community project. Hal is an enthusiastic promoter of the Treasure State and has been most active in these areas. He recently addressed the National Lewis and Clark Commission meeting at Billings, Mont. It is an interesting discussion which, I think, the Senate will find of interest. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the speech be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

HARLOWTON WINS TOP HONORS AS MONTANA'S OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY

Sweepstakes honors in the form of a magnificent trophy and two road signs were awarded to Harlowton at the first annual Montana Chamber of Commerce Community Betterment program in Great Falls Friday night.

It was a great night for Harlowton as former Governor Hugo Aronson presented the grand prizes to Chairman Tony Poirier, who accepted them on behalf of the community. A delegation from Harlowton was present to accept the plaudits of large throng of folks from all over Montana.

Harlowton was declared as the recipient of top honors for cities in the 1,001 to 5,000 population bracket, and in addition was declared as top performer in all divisions.

F. M. Gannon, president of the Montana Chamber of Commerce, presided at the awards dinner.

Governor Aronson advised in his talk that if Montanans keep Montana Clean it will Stay Green.

He said Montana is a great state and we can do much ourselves to keep it that way if we are determined to do our part and not go seeking aid from others.

Don Ulrich, past president, reported for the judging team and said if a community is bent upon progress the door is open to prosperity.

Representing Harlowton at the dinner were Mr. and Mrs. A. A. Poirier, Mayor Warfield Munce, Zoyd Alexander, Wilfred Russell, Hal Stearns, Mr. and Mrs. Leon Palmer, Mr. and Mrs. Reubin Johnson, and from Great Falls, former residents Mr. and Mrs. John Moore.

The magnificent Harlowton scrapbook was on display, along with the fine efforts of other communities entered in the contest. Twenty two Montana towns competed this year.

Mr. Poirier extends special thanks to Dale Schmeling for his fine pictures. Chuck Nissen for the scrapbook cover. Oscar Biegel, chairman of priorities committee; Harlowton Times for publicity, and to Leon Palmer, who served as secretary, and to all others who assisted.

1966 Montana Chamber of Commerce Community Betterment Contest Award Winners:

Under 1000:

1. Hobson.
2. Absarokee.
3. Culbertson.

Honorable Mention, Big Sandy.

1001–5000

1. Harlowton.
2. Sidney.
3. Whitefish.

Honorable Mention, White Sulphur Springs.

5001–15000

1. Glendive.
2. Glasgow.
3. Miles City.

Honorable Mention. Lewistown; North Side Missoula.

Over 15000

1. Butte.
2. Great Falls.
3. Helena.

Sweepstake award: Harlowton.

First Place received 2 road signs.

Second—Trophy.

Third—Plaque.

Honorable Mention—Certificate.

22. Entries.

1001 to 5000 population: Harlowton (Also Sweepstakes Winner). Submitted by Harlowton Chamber of Commerce and signed by A. A. "Tony" Poirier, Chairman.

The narrative begins with a joint meeting of community development and beautification committee of the Harlowton Chamber of Commerce and the public and business affairs committee of the Harlowton Kiwanis Club. It is evident in the detailed scrapbook that these two organizations spearheaded a remarkable and many-faceted development program.

The scrapbook index lists 29 separate projects. A sequel to the original committee meeting was a citywide meeting, at which projects were discussed in the presence of representatives of virtually every public and private group in the community. Total attendance was 160. In this scrapbook newspaper co-operation was especially evident.

The partial index list, which is documented with color photographs and clippings, showing actual accomplishments:

1. Cleanup, paint-up, elimination of old buildings, old car bodies and junk. (250 truckloads hauled to dump—350 car bodies moved).
2. Cleanup of old junkyard at upper end of Main Street.
3. Improving city dump.
4. New postoffice building.
5. Additional medical facilities, with new clinic (old service station converted and enlarged).
6. Designation of Montana Flour Mills as second-class terminal.
7. Highway 12 and 191 construction.
8. New lights on Highway 12.
9. Bond issue passed; new paving in business district.
10. New rest home for Wheatland county. (old building torn down by volunteers).
11. Jawbone flood control project completed.
12. Improvements made to Chief Joseph Park and entrance.
13. Fairgrounds and rodeo grounds improvement.
14. American Lutheran Youth center built.
15. Dead man's basin recreation improvement.
16. Outdoor basketball and tennis courts built.
17. New playground equipment at swimming pool.
18. Improvements to Kiwanis Youth Center building and grounds.
19. New railing at football field.
20. Kids baseball grounds improvement.
21. Improvement to railroad shops and yards.
22. Airport improvements and upkeep.
23. Improvements to golf course and clubhouse.
24. Christmas decorations and Christmas party for kids.
25. Initiation of Community Development program, with assistance from Montana Chamber of Commerce.

EXHIBIT 2

SPEECH BY HAROLD G. STEARNS, HARLOWTON TIMES AND EASTERN MONTANA CLARION PUBLISHER, AT THE NATIONAL LEWIS AND CLARK COMMISSION MEETING, BILLINGS, JULY 9, 1966

I am addressing the most intelligent and well-versed and scholarly group of distinguished personages gathered in one place since Thomas Jefferson, who was author, philosopher, statesman, inventor, musician, college founder, architect,—dined alone. Also the most sunburned and dampened, because of the float trip down the Yellowstone River, following Captain Clark's route. However, we went him one better for we had no navigational problems at all. We followed the Northern Pacific railroad tracks and U.S. Highway 10 all the way from Livingston to Columbus and knew where we were all the way.

My fellow Americans we are re-living a glorious chapter of the American story. By re-living history we are helping prove history is truly a pontoon bridge—we work at our end and have come as far as we have over pontoons laid by others—many of whom we have never heard heralded.

No man, even the most polished and civilized, who has once savored the sweet liberty of the plains and mountains, ever went back to the settlements' monotony without regret and an everlasting determination to return—Stanley Vestal.

The hegira toward the setting sun has never ceased since the dauntless explorers returned.

To them, all of us owe a debt of unending gratitude—for the spacious skies, purple mountains and expanse of land from sea to shining sea, which comprises our homeland—the United States.

Two years, four months, 10 days—over 4,000 miles, of which nearly half that tremendous distance was in Montana's Big Sky Country. In the Treasure State are 286 camp sites, many of which we must seek out and properly designate.

Said Macauley "If a man takes not pride in the accomplishments of his ancestors, he will never be worthy to be remembered by his remote ancestors."

Truly we cannot live in the past or off its past glories. But we can profit from its study. If a man discerns no historical laws his chance of guiding, or still less being master of his fate, remains negligible.

The Two Captains, Meriwether Lewis and William Clark, opened the way to the American Destiny. Longfellow in "Hiawatha," wrote:

> "Journeyed westward, westward,
> Left the fleetest deer behind them
> Passed the mountains of the prairie
> Passed the land of Crows and Foxes
> Passed the dwellings of the Blackfeet
> Came unto the Rocky Mountains
> To the kingdom of the West Wind."

It is difficult indeed to interpret the significance of the Exploration. Especially, when Helen West of the Montana Commission, has written a virtual classic in the Summer issue of the Montana Magazine of History, which tells the Tale of Valor's meaning far better than this phrase-maker is able to utter.

Lewis' and Clark's trek is far more than being merely a tremendously great adventure story, replete with heroic deeds, accomplished in the face of incalculable adversity and odds. History is filled with accounts of treks—Moses, Xenophon, Xerxes, Hannibal, Caesar, Alexander, Stanley and Livingstone, Amundson, Peary, Shackleton, Sheppard, Grissom, Carpenter and Glenn.

But the Corps of Discovery is especially captivating and important.

It is Douglas MacArthur's "duty, honor, country." It is Montana's Pericles, Wilbur Fiske Sanders' "Men, do your duty" as he dauntlessly braved the desperadoes at Virginia City and ordered the trap be sprung for Ives, thus assuring the triumph of law and order in the new Montana Territory.

Lewis and Clark, more than any other men in history, even though unwittingly, created the greatest nation ever to exist on this globe. And unlike most expeditions it was not punitive and the end results were productive beyond comprehension.

Adams said the annexation of the Louisiana Territory was an event so portentous as to defy measurement.

Napoleon, as DeVoto wrote, in accomplishing the sale of his North American possessions, remarked:

"this accession of territory forever consolidates the power of the United States, and I have given England a maritime rival who will sooner or later humble her pride.

Again DeVoto: The unifier of Europe and remaker of the world of his time, who had also ended the dream of a North American France, was here looking down the long arc of time with great clarity in foreseeing the Americans would become the future masters of the world.

The Purchase gave the new country boundaries from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and we were thus able to consolidate a continent.

The Expedition was a writin' crew. In addition to the Journals, several members of the party put down their own versions, several of which broke into print before the writings of the Captains, who found getting publishers not as easy a task as is the case today. Not until 1904 when Thwaites completed his monumental research, were the Journals printed in their entirety. And new information keeps turning up. Sgt. Ordway's account wasn't found until 75 years later. And in 1953 Clark's Field Notes were discovered in a St. Paul attic and were published in 1964 by Ernest Osgood.

The Journals are more than mere diaries. The blotted and crowded pages show often how the pen faltered and the mind clouded with fatigue.

We can feel their excitement when they first viewed the wide sweep of the plains and the towering summits of the Rockies.

The hegira toward the westering sun has never abated—largely due to the Voyage of Discovery.

Thwaites said of the Journals: "To pore them is to open sesame to philosophy, adventure, science, youthful exuberance, idealism, courage, derringdo. The pages of the notes are alive with human interest. One senses the quiet, even temper of the camp, the consideration each leader felt for the other. Lewis, the poet, discoursing like a philosopher. Clark, more rugged, wrote briefly and pointedly—a delightfully creative speller. The reader deeply admires the pair and follows their adventures with the keenest sympathy and understanding.

There is Lewis's discourse on August 18, 1805, crossing the Great Divide. "This day I completed my 31st year and conceived I had in all human probability now existed about half the period I am to remain in this sublunary world. I recollected that I had as yet done but little, very little indeed, to further the happiness of the human race, or to advance the information of the succeeding generations. I viewed with regret the many hours I have spent in indolence, and now sorely feel the want of that information which those hours would have given me had they been judiciously expended. But since they are past and cannot be recalled, I resolve to redouble my exertions and at least endeavor to promote those two primary objects of human existence by giving them the aid of that portion of talents which nature and fortune have bestowed on men, or in future to live for mankind, as I have heretofore lived for myself. (Little did he know he had a scant 4 years of life ahead).

There comes from reading the Journals a feeling of disbelief and amazement the explorers could have known so much of botany, biology, geology, astronomy—how they could serve so well as physicians, they lost only one member of the Expedition—using poultices of bark of elm, concocting vile teas, employ volatile liniment, and Dr. Scott and Dr. Rush pills, and medicate the Bird Woman with buffalo broth.

We share with them their frustration when after hauling all the way from Missouri the iron frame boat and then discovering it was a dud at the Great Falls. And we learn the details of the fabulous Air Gun, and face in duels the grizzlies, the rattlesnakes and the inclement weather.

And we learn that 50 lashes applied at the right time solve disciplinary problems for good.

We learn you can carry gunpowder in leaden canisters and as the powder is emptied one then uses the lead for bullets.

There is 4th of July at the Great Falls in 1805.

"At the end of the day's work we gave the men a drink of Sperits—the last of our stock, except for a bit for medicinal purposes. Some men appeared a little sensible of the effects. They fiddled and danced until 9 when a downpour ended the festivities on the day of our Independence. We had a comfortable dinner of buffalo, bacon and beans. We had no just cause to covet the sumptuous feasts of our countrymen on this day."

It is amusing to read how Jefferson and Lewis estimated the cost at $2,500 in order to allay the fears of the frugally minded Federalists that the exploration would be too costly. (The actual cost wound up at about $39,000). After the Corps returned there were politicians who balked at providing $11,000 in pay for the enlisted men, and giving Lewis and Clark each 1,600 acres of western land, and the men 320 acres each. It was averred such gratuities would soar the cost to the colossal sum of $60,000! We might recall that gold from Montana's Bannack, amounted to well over the total $15 million paid for all Louisiana Territory.

We find as DeVoto did that the fortuitous meeting of Sacajawea and her brother Cameawait near present-day Armstead, Montana, was a dramatic contrivance not permitted to dramatists—it was just too unbelievable. Ken Ralston, noted Billings artist, in his painting of the scene where the Corps obtained the needed horses, shows the Moment of Truth of the expedition. For without horses and guiding they would likely have had to turn back, balked of their coastal goal of destination.

There is the continuing argument as to how to pronounce the Bird Woman's name—with a soft J or a harshly enunciated one. Is she truly buried at Wind River, Wyoming, along with her son Baptiste? And we learn how Baptiste was educated at St. Louis by Captain Clark and how he went to Europe with Prince Paul of Wurtemburg. And that Jefferson Kennerly Clark was recognized by the Sioux at Fort Laramie in 1843 as his father's son because of his red hair.

Comes now this generation's challenge—to preserve from the encroachments of despoiling civilization the scenic grandeur of the White Cliffs of the Missouri River wilderness. By foiling this threat we can save some of the last spaciousness and grandeur left in our land.

We must impress upon our fellow Americans the highest bidder is seldom the wisest user. Short term developments and short term gains will be debited a thousand fold against the assets of future generations whose claim on America is as valid as our own. Frederick Jackson Turner opined that the western wilds constituted the richest free gift ever spread out before civilized man. Never again can such an opportunity come to the sons of man.

Ted Yates of the NBC Television crew which filmed the stupendous adventure, concluded his witty and scholarly essay in American West magazine, "Our challenge is civilization. Our problem was to find parts and pieces of this beautiful America they revealed. We found Lewis and Clark had done the impossible. Our television crew to a degree did likewise. We had re-constructed America to look the way many of us dream it looks. But despite our success, we all felt a great sadness because in a way we had added to the delusion and helped sustain the myth that America is from sea to shining sea a spectacle of beauty, of love and care, instead of a debacle of neglect and abuse.

This is our challenge—a race between education and erosion—between wisdom and waste. We, as with every generation, must deal anew with raiders and despoilers. We must preserve the heritage the Two Captains gave us—the beauty and bounty of the American earth must be our personal commitment. Let us cherish our past and believe in our future, and in so doing insure the heritage of this, Our Homeland. For inner peace can be found in solitude, not speed, said President Kennedy. Those of us on the Yellowstone float trip learned first hand today of the wonders of leisurely going down a river at four miles an hour, quite a contrast to the maddening super-highways.

If we would find ourselves let us look to the earth from which we came, and to which we will finally return.

There ARE no limits to the frontiers of the mind, and victory will always require the questing westering spirit. Emulating Lewis and Clark we too must leave tracks more permanent than footprints that vanish before wind and rain.

Pompey's Pillar is Clark's monument. It is likewise an enduring tablet for such men as Don Foote and Ding Darling, Sherry Fisher and the members of this distinguished commission.

For you will accomplish the monumental task of preserving a pathway that will endure forevermore, the American Appian Way, that millions of Americans, yet unborn, will be able to enjoy.

And by telling and retelling of the exploits of the Corps of Discovery we can bring about a rebirth of patriotic fervor and pride.

To say nothing of contributing also substantially to our economic welfare in promotion of tourism.

John Bakeless said because of the Corps, Oregon is American today. Ten white stars in the blue field of Old Glory stand for states that one by one grew up in farms, mills, homesteads and cities along the trail where weary men in tattered elk skin, cursed the rocks that tore their feet, sweated at the tow rope, poled against the savage current of the Missouri, stumbled in the chill streams of the Rockies, and staggered over the Lolo Trail to reach the coast.

So, they lie today—white, red, half breed and Negro under the new stars they added. There were 15 stars when they set forth, 17 when they returned, and now there are 50 scattered over the land they served, the land they explored. Lewis under the broken column in Tennessee. Clark on the knoll at Belafountain. Chaboneau. God knows where. Sacajawea and her infant still among the tribe.

But suppose the Angel Gabriel should prove a little bit fallible, and instead of blowing the trump of doom, would blow instead of sounden horn of the Expedition. Would they not all rise, pack the miraculous air gun once again among the moldering tents, and the leaden canisters of powder, whistle for the dog Scannon, and with sharp eyes alert for grizzlies, game and Indians, run the rough dugouts into the muddy Missouri current, once again to go a westering and to wonder at the changes in the vast land they gave our Nation.

They found it for us, and entrusted it to us as a sacred charge.

The preservation of the Lewis and Clark Trail is our goal and obligation. Let us do our duty.

A NEIGHBORLY ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as reported in the press, the State of Montana and several of the Midwest States have experienced extremely late and harsh winter conditions. It is my understanding that our neighbors in the Canadian Provinces have experienced even more difficult weather.

Natural disasters of this kind often given rise to acts of generosity and cooperation. A good friend, Jim Flaherty, of Great Falls, Mont., has just alerted me to such a situation.

Southern Alberta, Canada, had a number of snowbound ranch communities which were in need of emergency feed for storm-isolated cattle. This aid was provided by helicopters at the instigation of our U.S. consul general in Calgary. I wish to join with many others in complimenting Consul General John Hagan and the U.S. airmen who carried out this emergency operation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at the conclusion of my remarks, in the Congressional Record an editorial appearing in the May 3, 1967, issue of the Calgary Herald.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Neighborly Act

Two large helicopters from the United States Air Force base near Great Falls, Montana, have rendered notable aid to the snowbound ranch communities of Southern Alberta in recent days. It goes without saying that Albertans are grateful, indeed, for this act of neighborliness.

Mr. John Hagan, U.S. Consul-General in Calgary, took the initiative in having the helicopters sent north of the border. Red tape was cut to a minimum and the big whirly-birds have been very busy delivering tons of fodder to storm-isolated herds of cattle at scattered country points south of Lethbridge.

Piloting helicopters through blustery, snowy weather is no picnic, and using them to transport bales of hay is something out of the line of duty for air force fliers, but the U.S. airmen carried out the strange operation with admirable aplomb.

It was a typical act of friendliness and generosity on the part of Mr. Hagan and the neighboring country he represents. The Canada-U.S. border is one of the world's most lightly drawn anyway, but in times of distress, fortunately, it scarcely seems to exist. It is nice to have good neighbors, as we in Canada certainly have.

AWARENESS OF OUR MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as my colleagues here in the Senate know, mining is one of the major resources in my State of Montana. Historically, it has been one of our major economic resources. The future of the mining industry is, therefore, of considerable interest to the Treasure State.

A recent address and panel discussion concerned with the future of the industry was brought to my attention. This panel was centered around the recommendations of Dr. Walter Hibbard, Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines, who proposed a national awareness program on our national mineral resources.

Dr. Hibbard has made several interesting proposals in his address which was delivered at Butte, Mont., in mid-April. I believe his remarks are worthy of the attention of all of us here in the Senate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, at the conclusion of my remarks, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the panel discussion featuring Dr. Walter Hibbard on Saturday, April 15, 1967.

There being no objection, the text of the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Meeting of the A.I.M.E. on Saturday, April 15, 1967, Featuring Dr. Walter Hibbard, Director of the Bureau of Mines and President of the A.I.M.E. as Principal Speaker

Vic O'Leary. Mr. Chairman, Honored Guests and Members of the A.I.M.E. and guests, I have been granted the signal honor of introducing to you our speaker tonight, Dr. Walter R. Hibbard, Jr., who is, among other things, an internationally known Metallurgical Engineer. Dr. Hibbard was born in Bridgeport, Connecticut. He graduated from Wesleyan University in 1939. He received a Dr. of Engineering degree from Yale University in 1942, and after serving his country as a naval officer during the war, he came back to Yale as an Assistant Professor, and later as an Associate Professor. In 1951 General Electric, enamored of Dr. Hibbard's growing reputation in teaching and research, prevailed upon him to join the ranks of industry. That they made no mistake is attested to by the fact that when he left G.E. in December 1965, he was their manager of metallurgy and ceramic research. Dr. Hibbard left G.E. to become the Director of the Bureau of Mines, the federal agency which is charged with conservation and development of the nation's mineral resources. Dr. Hibbard is the author of more than 70 scientific papers and is a member of several national and interantional scientific academies. He has received numerous honors, not the least of which is an Hon. Doc. of Law degree from Michigan Tech. Dr. Hibbard, who has been a member of the A.I.M.E. since 1940, lives with his wife and three children in Rockville, Maryland. It is my privilege to present to you a rare triple threat man, an outstanding scholar, an eminent researcher, and a successful manager, the 1967 president of the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers—Dr. Walter R. Hibbard:

Dr. Hibbard. Thank you very much. I am just delighted to have this opportunity to make my first visit to Butte. My dad worked for Anaconda much of my early life in their Eastern Division of the American Brass Company, and I have always looked forward to the opportunity to come here and see this fabulous place. Cliff Hicks has returned to his old stamping grounds as my guide to show me the way and President Koch and Gus Stolz greeted me and guided me through the halls and the laboratories of Montana Tech, this morning, and then Steu Hurlbut and Swen Swenseid showed me the depths of the Mt. Con shaft and some of the surface operations nearby. Now to top this fine day I have the opportunity to discuss with you some of the challenges and the opportunities that are shared by us with our professions.

During these past 16 months, two very important events have occurred to me. First of all I was appointed and confirmed as the Director of the U.S. Bureau of Mines and this is a very challenging opportunity and responsibility to serve the nation; and secondly I have become the president of the A.I.M.E., a very flattering honor and opportunity to serve my profession. These two posts are not unrelated. As the Director of the Bureau of Mines I find myself concerned technically with all the range and divisions and the councils of the A.I.M.E. with technology ranging from slope stability in open pit mining, oil shale, coal preparation and the alloying of metals. The breadth of these technical and professional interests provides a unique vantage point to view both the A.I.M.E. and its role in national technical affairs. From this perspective I find that never before has the future of this nation been so dependent upon the advancement of technology in the minerals field.

By 1980 this country will require twice the amount of minerals and minerals fuels that it consumes today to provide for the growth of its economy, standard of living and the national security. This fantastic need comes at a time when the domestic ores are leaner in values, when production costs must provide for the abatement of air, water and land pollution, when graduates in the field of minerals engineering are in short supply, and when more and more of our minerals commodities are being imported. In fact, more than 75% of our needs for 20 key commodities are supplied today from overseas; a quarter of our copper comes from overseas. In many cases these are commodities which we have within our domestic shores, but the economics of the situation are such that it is more profitable and economically more feasible to import. Very simply there are five ways to increase our minerals resource base, one through exploration and new discoveries.

It is entirely clear that most of our mineral resources, and Butte, of course, is an exception, have come from very near the earth's surface. They have been discovered and identified from outcroppings. We must learn how to explore at depths and develop a technology so we know where the minerals are in the second layer of the earth's crust which we must tap for our future needs. Secondly, we can improve our minerals base by improving mining, beneficiation, and processing technology, to provide the technology which will make these leaner ores economically feasible. Thirdly, there is a tremendous opportunity in the field of recycling. A quarter of our copper, as you know, comes from scrap, but there are large amounts of minerals in use or in disuse which can be tapped to supply our future needs. A fourth way is through substitutability—substituting those materials which are in abundant supply for those which are in short supply, and this is the challenge of the physical metallurgist. And fifthly by imports and stockpiles, heaven forbid. All of these challenges are responsive to the generation and use of new technology and, because of your local interest in copper, I shall analyse the challenges in respect to this matter in detail, as an example of the way we can approach the problem.

Parenthetically, you may know the federal government is going through the process of developing a system of planning, programming and budgeting where one must look into the future and determine what the long range needs are in the area of responsibility of the particular agency and plan a program which will solve the problems on an economically sound base. In the case of the Bureau of Mines, we are responsible for the wise and efficient use of our mineral resources. Since we are not in the metals or minerals business, our plans must be to look at long range problems, to look at the state of technology and the advances which are underway, to plan a program of research and development which will provide for those which are not going to be responsive to industrial research, and then to transfer this technology as it is generated to industry, because the Bureau of Mines Research is only as effective as the use which industry puts to it. And so in the case of copper we have just completed a long range look and a long range plan for our research and development. I thought you might find this of some interest. I am going to read parts of this, and some of it you know about, but I think I want to put together a coherent picture, so if you will bear with me.

In the past, the copper industry has been able to expand with mounting demand because of the ever increasing discovery of resources in the world and because of advances in mining, metallurgical and fabricating technology, but particularly from the standpoint of exploration and resources discovered.

World production and consumption is more than 6 million tons in 1965 of copper. The estimated world reserves of primary copper are believed to be around 210 to 220 million tons. U.S. consumption in 1965 was about 1½ million tons i.e. 9% of the world's population consumed 25% of the world's production. Our recent survey of U.S. reserves indicate them to be approximately 75 million tons of recoverable copper, assuming a recovery rate of 90% of the gross content in ores averaging above .8% copper. This is roughly about 50 years supply at present rates.

An additional 58 million tons of recoverable copper is estimated if we can develop technological improvements which will permit the economic mining of average grades slightly under ½%. Approximately one half of the total of U.S. supplied copper is derived from domestic mined production. A little more than a quarter is obtained from imports, about a quarter is secondary copper recovered from scrap. Mine productive capacity in the United States has been substantially customed up until a couple of years ago at about 1.7 tons.

We believe that in the past two years it has increased by about 10%. In the same period of time the productiivty of copper per man hour has increased almost five fold and we believe that this is a clear indication of advance in technology. Projected domestic consumption by 1980 is expected to be 2.4 million tons, up 60% from the 1½ million tons in 1965. With ore reserves containing 75 million tons of copper, an annual availability of about 400,000 tons from old scrap and a current stockpile of about 259,000 tons most of this increased domestic demand probably can't come from domestic resources.

A major problem in this demand picture is related to rising costs and a depreciation of high grade ores. Based on the trends in recent years, we believe that by 1980 recoverable copper of domestic ores will drop to an average grade of about ½ per cent, from the average grade of about ¾ per cent today. Again we believe this is going to be in response to advance in technology.

Imports of copper, total lean ore, concentrate smelter products have been fairly constant and averaged slightly less than 400,000 tons in the past 10 years. We believe that the imports are going to diminish in proportion to the competitive buying by foreign interests and particularly the increasing needs of developing countries with their advancing standards of living. If domestic production of copper ore is to serve as the stabilizing base for the copper supply required by the U.S. economy beyond 1980, advanced technology is needed to enable economic extraction of ever decreasing grades of ore and ever increasing proportion of barren wastes. Such technology must lead to greatly improved efficiency and mass mining and materials handling techniques and improved additional concentration and reduction methods or the evolvement of entirely new methods. From this we have developed a program which is aimed at providing precisely this kind of information.

Typical of this program are the projects of work we have planned in cooperation with the Anaconda Co. here at the Berkeley Pit. This is a research to determine the safety and economic limits of open pit slopes, the whole problem of slope stability, where we are going to make measurements and analyses of the properties, behaviours in pit slopes, and we believe this can provide an important advance in mining economy. In addition we have work going on with Montana Tech studying computer programming for open pit design and a study of drilling techniques in the problems of deep drilling. Again, these are aimed at providing technology which we foresee as a major requirement for our copper industry by 1980. So much for our copper analysis.

The A.I.M.E. has an important role to stimulate and communicate this new technology on a timely basis through its publications, through its conferences and meetings. I think one of the new roles the A.I.M.E. has is to do with the inner action between science, engineering, and the process of government. Congressman Daddario of Connecticut who is chairman of the sub committee of the house on science research and development has said the following to the engineers joint council:

"The legislative branch of the Federal Government today is fully cognizant of the enormous importance of science and engineering to the process of Government. Therefore, the informational input from science and engineering communities to the individual legislators and their committees is a vital ingredient of Government. By recognizing this increasing technical content of public policy issues, my sub committee on science research and development began in 1963 to consider the basic need for scientific and engineering information, advice and council. A fundamental question was the source of advice and the relative merits of having a body of scientists and engineers who would be primarily responsible to the Congress for his information, versus reliance on the many external sources predominantly in the executive agencies. Within the Congress itself, important changes have taken place. Overlapping committee jurisdiction is occurring with many commission oriented agency programs involving a variety of scientific and engineering disciplines."

There is one important potential for the advice to Congress which has not been sufficiently tapped in Congressman Daddario's opinion (and I am still quoting from him). This is the professional, technical society. I believe (and I am still quoting from Congressman Daddario who is talking to the engineering societies) that you should consider carefully the possibilities of this source as a unique and valuable means of furnishing opinion to the legislator; unique because the opinion would be relatively free of the vested interests of agencies of industry and of forthright lobbying; valuable because it would represent acknowledged leadership among persons who act as professionals with all of the responsibilities of public concern which the term implies. Then in conclusion he says, "it is clear to me that the cure of the present ills and the key to future accomplishment, is more technology, not less. Any other course would be tragic in its consequences, it must be wise technology and such wisdom is not the sole possession of any one segment of our intellectual resources. That is why I call on you and your associates (he is talking again to the engineering societies) for increased participation in science and engineering and in the process of government".

In response to this I have proposed that the A.I.M.E. undertake a study entitled "Technology in the National Minerals Policy", which would provide a sound engineering base for technological information for the Congress and the Federal Government in relation to the National Minerals Sector of the economy. This proposition is now being considered by a special task force from the Board of Directors and I have high hopes that it will be underway in the very near future.

With respect to the engineering shortage, this can be relieved by effective career guidance and selective recruiting. Both the A.I.M.E. and its ladies associates in the W.A.A./M.E. have important programs in progress for this purpose. I would like to speak a minute about the young man who at this stage of the game is choosing a career. Youth today is more cognizant than ever of important world issues; social, economic, and political. This is largely because of the effective communication through television, through radio and newspapers. Young men wish to achieve what they call an identity with certain of these issues, and through personal achievement to earn national recognition and social rewards. The key words are identity, achievement, recognition and rewards. I have three children in college and almost every conversation I have with them about serious matters, serious from their standpoint is dotted with the use of these terms. Issues include Vietnam, racial equality, space, world service, beautification, anti poverty, and these have stimulated many young people to act, often precipitously. The youth is impatient for what they call visibility with selective groups. My own boy has joined the army and asked for and received service in Vietnam. Some have joined the freedom marchers or the Peace Corps or Vista. Others are seeking youthful leadership from individuals such as Senator Robert Kennedy.

My message is that minerals resources, by 1980, will become an important social and economic issue, equally as important as clean air or highway safety or any of these issues which are today attracting the attention of youth. The lack of these resources can substantially affect our standards of living. If we don't increase our mineral resource base we, each of us, will have about half of the commodities to provide for our every day living as we have today. For example, we have all kinds of discussion about electric automobiles and the solution to the air pollution problem. The thing that I told Senator Magnuson and Senator Muskie is that the electric car is an impossible solution to the air pollution problem because we do not have the metal resources to build the 14 billion pounds of batteries, billions is the word, (10^9), required to power the 7 million automobiles we have today, let alone that doubled amount in 1980.

A career in minerals engineering can provide identity with social, with economic and with technical issues, visibility through achievement and recognition and rewards. The engineer who discovers how to burn gasoline in an automobile without polluting the air beyond acceptable limits can be a national hero and this is a matter of petroleum chemistry. The engineer who discovers how to recover economically the four hundred million troy ounces of gold that are now lying out in the low grade ores in the United States can counteract the gold trend and will also be a national hero. One of the most important, the most serious challenges underlying all these situations, is that in general our country is not aware of the threats that we are facing if our mineral sufficiency is not maintained.

Our standard of living, as you all know, depends largely on an adequate supply of minerals in terms of the new Keynesian economics, values at the mine have a tremendous multiplier effect on our economy. Almost everything in this room depends upon minerals including the food we are eating which relies on mineral fertilizers, the plastics, the polymers, the resins which come from petrochemical and natural gas. The powers of machinery are the key to our manufacturing progress which also come from minerals and fuels. In general the public takes these matters for granted. In general, minerals are not recognized as key items in our economy and society and when they are they are usually scolded; when they reach the front page it is a mine disaster or somebody has raised the price of ——— something ———. The role of minerals in the economy and the consequences of shortages are just not recognized. For example, and this is another one I picked for your benefit, our known copper reserves are just about sufficient. (By the way, when I say reserves I mean material which is economically mineable at today's prices.)

The known copper reserves are just about sufficient to provide for the requirements of the people who are alive today for their projected lifetimes. Our oil reserves, depending upon whose figures you want to believe, are equal to somewhere between 11 years and 15 years of today's consumption. Our gold reserves are less than 2 years by our present consumption. You can picture the scene which I have used several times recently of the young baby who is born today in the hospital to the proud father and the proud mother, and the nasty old minerals resource man coming up and saying to him "Sorry, young man, there are just not enough minerals for you to live from now on, the way you are living today."

To alleviate this situation, there must be a total awakening to the importance of our mineral resources and the importance of their role in our national economy and our standard of living, a national minerals awareness and positive action to provide the adequacy for the years to come. We are just as close to running out of key minerals as we are to running out of clean air and it will take new technology and new discovery to solve both of these problems. Minerals are the keystone to our economy and the wealth of this heritage is in jeopardy. You can combat this threat by a national minerals awareness program, a grass roots swell, comparable to that on air pollution, highway safety, racial equality, any of these emotional social issues. The minerals issue is just as significant and just as urgent. So during this year I am carrying this message throughout our membership and throughout the country and seek your support and your cooperation in alerting the nation to the significance of this challenge. Let's provide a minerals heritage for our generations to come. Thank you very much.

VIC O'LEARY. I'd like to thank Dr. Hibbard for outlining the task here before us and certainly we, of A.I.M.E., can do a lot to help out in the future outlook for the country, for the world. Certainly the fact that I am not going to be able to drive an electric automobile within the next four or five years, has got me bothered no end. On the point of view for the rest of you fellows, the sooner we get more electric automobiles the better off it will be for the Anaconda Co.

ERNEST HASE. I'd like to express my thanks together with Vic, for Dr. Hibbard's most informative talk. I am sure the Bureau of Mines is a better bureau now with Dr. Hibbard as its director and I know that A.I.M.E. should and will grow and prosper and further its aims because those are our aims, with Dr. Hibbard as its president.

JIM CONNELL. It seems to me that so many of our addresses and pushes are kind of like the politician who goes down to a corner to address the local Democratic organization and he knows that 99% of the people in the room are going to vote for him anyway, so why is he wasting his time. Talking to the people here in this community in Butte in the past year in regards to the student problems, we are having difficulty here in Butte, Montana, which, if any place in the United States, should be aware of the mineral problem, and it is getting high school students to participate in scholarship programs, in any sort of academic minerals program, and I am sure that Gus will bear me out on this and the other people I have talked to, and it just seems to me that if we have this difficulty here in Butte, what are the people to think in Skokie, Illinois, Purdue, or someplace else where they don't even know what a mine looks like or what the problems are in producing copper and any other mineral; I am just wondering if you have any thoughts on this idea. We all talk about how we are going to engender student enthusiasm and participation and yet every year you look at the enrollment figures, and the trend just goes down, down down. The answer to it seems to have escaped us here in Butte, much to our chagrin I am sure, and I was just wondering how we are going to reverse this trend here and other places.

Dr. Hibbard. Was that a question? I thought I just told you what we have to do. It is to make the total public aware of the problem, and if we can identify this problem as one of the great social economic issues, so that every mother in the street is aware of it, then I think that the students will start moving into this area of engineering just as they have moved into certain areas of education in response to the Vista program and the Peace Corps, and their admiration of Bobby Kennedy. These have all reflected on enrollments. I think the point is that it has to be a total grass roots knowledge, and I think the point is that everyone in this profession should take every opportunity he has to bring this message, not to his fellow engineers, but to his friends who are not engineers, people he knows are lay folks, and that was the final appeal of my speech, to ask you to cooperate and help in bringing this, not to the other members of the A.I.M.E. but to every last living person that you know. I think if we can do this, it will automatically reflect in the enrollments. There is good evidence that this can occur.

In the University of Southern Louisiana there is a gungho professor who collected some money and put together a Sunday supplement about the petroleum industry in southern Louisiana, and its needs and opportunities for students in this field. He printed 240,000 copies and one fine Sunday he got it into the New Orleans paper, the Baton Rouge papers and Shreveport papers aimed for local consumption. His enrolment has gone up since then. He does it every year. He is now on the Student Guidance Committee of the A.I.M.E. and we are going to see if we can teach everyone else to do this, not only in southern Louisiana, but in western Montana, northern Idaho and anywhere else in the country where they have Sunday supplements. We have put together a couple of film strips with a speech which has this very message I have just finished.

We hope to get this out to all sections (you'll get a set) and we hope that through this we can reach the high schools, radio stations, television stations. In other words you can put this on a TV program to reach the general public in your particular area. We hope that this minerals awareness program will end up with a National Minerals Week with which we can bring this to the public.

I have a select committee of industry executives where I am going to propose in their national television programs that they put some inserts of this sort to reach the public. I think the point is we are very sure that *the only way we can increase our enrol*ment is by reaching the average person in the street to build up a grass roots across the board feeling that threat to our mineral supply is one of the really important, visible, identifiable, rewarding, national issues which can take its place in the sun along with air pollution, the Peace Corps, Bobby Kennedy, space, racial equality, you name it. It has got to be one of those issues, and when it becomes one of these issues, if we succeed, then we will get all the students we can handle. This is the evidence from other disciplines in the field.

Roy Hammond. Have you had any conflict with your department and the Government's ideas of setting aside vast tracts of primitive areas, forest service areas, and so on, in which prospecting is discouraged unlike the Canadian's approach to minerals prospecting.

Dr. Hibbard. I can hear you! Primitive areas programs, Department of Interiors programs, administrative special programs are being pushed very hard by my boss, Secretary Udall, but I am not certain that I can stand up here and tell you it is no good. But in these programs, the geological survey and the Bureau of Mines enter these areas to identify the mineral values so that before they are closed, it will be on record what it is they are closing out. How effective this will be I don't know, but we are doing this job and about every week since this started, a new report comes over my desk to be signed by Bill McClure or myself, describing a proposed wilderness or primitive area identifying the mineral values in this area.

Secondly, I feel very strongly as an individual (and I have done something about this by the way) that we have a lot to learn from both the Canadian and the Australian mining laws. My Bureau has made an analysis of the comparison between these three laws, and in particular the things that Canada does to encourage prospecting. One of the biggest problems we have in this country with its mineral resources, is that the old prospector is dying out. A number of reasons for this (and you know them better than I, or maybe at least as well as I do, and I don't want to quibble about them as I have to take certain postures being a member of the administration, but part of the problem is the antagonism of the Forest Service and the public in the National Parks Service toward prospecting. Legally the prospector can go in. If he knows the law he should not be able to be bluffed.

The other part of the problem is that exploration today has advanced so rapidly technologically that the cost of exploration, using today's advanced technology is extremely high. It is getting higher and higher and higher, and companies like the Anaconda and Kennecott know this better than I do. But the kind of instrumentation that you need today to do effective exploration and the cost particularly of exploring at depths, which is part of the problem around here, is extremely high and the prospector cannot afford this kind of thing. Now it is perfectly true that he can go off and do his analysis of streams, looking at outcroppings and this sort of thing, but the probability of him coming up with a large find on this basis, with all the work that has been done this way, is relatively small. But nevertheless I agree that we need something to stimulate exploration and internally I have proposed something to do this.

Don Smith. In connection with the same thing that Bob brought up, what provision have they made amongst the dog in the manger boys regarding those same technology advances in the years to come that we all expect.

Dr. Hibbard. Who is the dog in the manger boys?

Don Smith. The ones who want to set aside these great tracts of land where nobody can put them to any worthwhile use. What *provisions do they make for prospecting at a later time? Let us say they set aside some* area, for example this Morgan-Cascade area that is on the pan at the moment. Let us say that later on through improved methods we do find some very likely prospecting country, what provisions are made in this for future exploration?

Dr. Hibbard. Let me tell you first of all, before the Cascades are shut off, we are going to have a mineral report on it, so that we will know to some degree what is there, right? So therefore you can bring to bear all the pressures that you know best how, to cause the government to open these up, if you find there is something there that you think is worth going after. Secondly, I believe that there is going to be a lot of mineral exploration. It is going to be done without setting foot on anyone's land and if that is the case, if my prediction comes true, you don't care whether the wilderness areas are closed or not, you can still go in and prospect in a helicopter.

Dr. Griffiths. It does seem to me that even after Dr. Hibbard's talk, that this whole problem is a lot worse than we realize. To some extent I think the engineer is himself to blame for this. A couple of isolated examples occur to me. The fact that the whaling industry, worldwide, is about to die out. Biologists have been warning us for years that this is happening. No one has paid any great attention and the whaling industry is about extinct. The people have been telling us as regards fuels that the oil reserves are slowly dying away. Dr. Hibbard has told us that there are about 11 years left, but I don't think you will find anyone in the general public that seriously believes that he is not going to have a gasoline driven automobile within the next 20 years or so. Maybe air pollution is beginning to convince us otherwise, but as I see it the general public, without even thinking about it, tacitly assumes that the engineers are going to solve all our problems. In a way this is what I mean when I say the engineer is his own worst enemy. We somehow have to convince people that this mineral resources problem is a tough one.

Dr. Hibbard. Don't kid yourself that it isn't, it is. I don't know where the 2.4 million tons of copper are to come from. I believe no one in this room does.

Bob Tagersoll. Does the Bureau estimate the cost of metals in 1980 by the price paid for them?

Dr. Hibbard. The answer is yes, we do, but we don't do it publicly. This is part of our estimate of reserves. You can't estimate reserves unless you have some feel for costs. We have been plotting costs in constant dollars as a function of time and we can extrapolate that along with some contingencies which might affect the cost, and in fact we have done this for copper. But costs are very difficult things to determine, and a part of our technical program which is aimed at making the average grade .5 in 1980 is a recognition that we have to meet some cost levels with this kind of ore. This really doesn't answer your questions; I don't have it on the tip of my tongue, but it is in my notebook. Actually the cost of copper in constant dollars has been decreasing in a monotonic way, gradually over the years.

Stu Hurlbut. With regard to this same general subject Dr. Hibbard, you indicate that the price for our metal may rise to some extent. Our grade is going down, we are faced with the prospect of mining .5 copper. We are also faced with the prospect of constantly increasing costs of labor, supplies, and equipment. In order to mine that .5 copper then we have got to have some breakthroughs in technology. Would you care to make any predictions with regard to the areas where these breakthroughs are most likely to occur?

Dr. Hibbard. I think there will be a lot of surface mining, all kinds of it, not only in copper. If you want to project something, *look at the trends in iron mining. There is not an underground mine left operating* on the Minnesota side of the Mesabi Range today. All of this was underground at one time. Technology is going to provide us ways of selective breaking and advance of computerized identification of values and concentration mixes, a whole automated system of materials handling, where we can handle, in my opinion, extremely large volumes and where we go after in some cases parts per million of values.

I personally believe there is going to be a substantial trend toward what has been called hydrometallurgy. But really, minerals beneficiation is an applied form of analytical chemistry; we have been able to develop on analytical chemistry techniques to the point where we can identify and quantitatively evaluate very very small amounts of material. I think there is a direct application in these techniques to metals beneficiation. I think this is in the foreseeable future. I think there is a whole industry to be developed in the recycling field. Recycling today is a selective process. We take the values we can get easily, but there is no recycling industry which takes the total scrap heap and treats it like an ore.

There is a whole field of extractive metallurgy here which hasn't been touched. We have a really interesting project with the Montgomery County incinerator. This is an incinerator which is modern, there is not a puff of smoke that comes out of it. About the only thing that is left after they get through burning things and precipitating and what not, is an incinerator sludge. East of the Mississippi we generate 125 million tons of incinerator sludge a year. In this sludge there are 9 million tons of mineral values. I think there are going to be techniques for going after these values and recycling. In fact, in this Montgomery County incinerator sludge, as I recall, the copper values are higher than the values that are being mined in Arizona today. The only trouble is that there is not as much of it as there is in Arizona, but somehow or other we are going to find ways and means and I believe by probably either pneumatic or hydraulic transport to bring these sludges all together and treat them like an ore.

Here is a real interesting field for the beneficiation person; this whole question of recycle, I think, in fact, we are going to design our use of materials with recycling in mind. Part of the problem today is that we design for the first consumer, the first user of the material; we don't even consider the second and the third and the fourth and the fifth. We have to consider this. Part of the trouble with the incinerator sludge is the packaging industry. They are putting out all kinds of aluminum foil, copper foil and I don't know what else they are putting in packaging today, and it all comes down in the sludge. I think we can design our packaging to better use and reuse our materials. I know we can redesign the car without changing its functional characteristics at all to make the reuse of this material in the car much more effective.

There is an answer. The whole question is substitutability. Clearly the use of high temperature polymers is going to make inroads into container business. You go down to the hardware store today and you buy a nozzle for your hose and it is made of plastic. It may be plated, but it is made of plastic. 15 years ago it would have been brass. I think we are going to find that we can use these kinds of materials which are inexpensive and available. In other words, the amount of petroleum and natural gas it takes to make a polymer is minute compared to the amount of brass it takes to make a brass hose nozzle. This substitutability is going to play an important part.

I think we are going into deeper mining. I thoroughly believe that the second level of this crust of ours is just as valuable as the first. We are going to find ways of getting there, and this is going to be sort of a Jules Verne approach, and it is going to be a real outlet for our applied rock mechanics. I firmly believe that the continental shelf—we know that the land area extended out to about a depth of 100 feet of the continental shelf. Geologists tell us that this is a continuity, a continuum from the dry land of today. I am sure that there are going to be mineral values there. Whether or not we are going to mine them with Jules Verne like devices, or whether we are just going to drive a shaft down under the ocean, I do not know, but there are going to be ways of getting that stuff, and it is like I said today, as you go down in the shaft and get at a level below sea level, you don't know whether you are below sea level or not. I was down in Louisiana in one of the salt mines, down 1,300 feet from a collar which is almost at sea level; I think it was at a level of 14 feet. This mine is literally under the Gulf. These are the directions we are going to go I'm sure. The opportunities for technology and the opportunities for real challenges and real interesting experiences I think are tremendous. All we have to do is to think just a little bit unconservative. Just look ahead a little bit and figure out what we would do if we had to do something like this.

The oil reserves, there are very simple answers to that. Half the oil we ever discovered is underground today; more than half actually. We just were careless when we got the first half out and did not provide for getting the second half. Some day there are going to be stimulation techniques, for getting most of that other half. The guy who discovers this is going to be a national hero. There's oil shale that has not been tapped. We know how to convert coal into both liquids and gases. We could make good high b.t.u. gas from coal. We can make gasoline from coal. The only problem at the moment is economics. Technically it is entirely feasible. I think these are problems which we can solve.

There are going to be a lot of interesting things going on, things which are so different from the things we do today. Particularly the thing which challenges me, is, if you look at the technology we are largely using today, with some substantial exceptions, but in general, the beneficiation we do to copper ores is essentially the same technical process which we used 30–40 years ago. With a couple of exceptions the beneficiation which we use and the mining which we do on gold is exactly the same as it was 50 years ago. There has been an era of very little new discovery in this field. There have been tremendous advances in engineering technology, but not nearly the advances in new discovery, new ways of doing things, that we are capable of and are bound to undertake and succeed, say, within the next 15 years.

Ernest Hase. In that connection I might add that Dr. Hibbard was mentioning before dinner that on all the work the Bureau of Mines is doing, their reports can be had by writing to the Bureau of Mines.

Dr. Hibbard. Our research is public information for the most part with a couple of exceptions and our reports are available to those who want them.

Ernest Hase. For those of you who did not know it, it might be worthwhile to write. It might stimulate a little bit of interest. Are there any other questions? Well if not, I would like to thank Cliff again for his successful efforts in getting Dr. Hibbard here, and Stu for his very pleasant evening. If there is no other business, we will stand adjourned.

Dr. Hibbard. Can I make one further comment. This is a heck of a time to have an A.I.M.E. meeting—on Saturday night. I recognize that it is not your regular meeting night and I certainly want to thank you for your gracious hospitality. I mean this meeting has been held on a night when you would much sooner be watching television or going to a movie.

VIETNAM: "A VIEW FROM DELAWARE"

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the Morning News of Wilmington, Del., carries today a thoughtful and timely editorial on the war in Vietnam.

It assesses the position of the United States and makes the point that "every American can be proud of the basic international goals of this Nation, even while disagreeing from time to time with particular tactics."

The editorial is well written and obviously the product of both study and concern. In the hope that it will get the wider readership it deserves, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A View From Delaware

Vietnam has come to dominate life in the United States today much as the touching picture of an elderly Vietnamese woman by Photographer Bill Snead dominates our page this morning. And yet by some perverse logic the nation's confusion and indecision about its role in Southeast Asia seem to increase in direct proportion to its involvement.

Gen. Westmoreland comes home to speak to Congress and the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. leads anti-war rally in New York City; Sen. McGovern delivers a thoughtful and disturbing speech to the nation and Gen. LeMay says the only way to win a war is to win it: The debate escalates on the homefront just as it does on the battlefield, but the people are not reassured. Instead of becoming clearer, the issues are more obscure and the average American is more doubtful than ever; it is a troubled and concerned people President Johnson leads today.

It seems proper, therefore, to try in some small way this morning to describe what appear from Wilmington, Delaware, to be a few of the more pertinent elements in this national debate. They are offered with the greatest humility, for only the fool or the supreme egotist talks about international politics today in terms of absolutes. And though many of the thoughts expressed may seem obvious or tired, they are repeated in the belief that their importance is being overlooked in the excitement of daily developments.

Thus in considering the war in Vietnam, one is forced always to begin with the most obvious observation of all: This war is a great, great tragedy. It is a tragedy not only for the Vietnamese people, but for all peoples everywhere. And foremost among the others are the people of the United States, for it is they, particularly, who are being forced in Vietnam to make a choice between evils.

Those who deny that the United States faces such a choice in Vietnam deny reality, it seems to us. It is no answer to say that if the United States would stop playing god in the world all would be well. As long as nationalism and nationhood are the highest unit of political exchange between the world's peoples, the United States cannot help playing god in the political sense for it is the most powerful nation in a world that honors national power above all else. Its influence will be felt just as much if it does not act as if it does.

Given this, it seems silly to flail away at the President and his advisers in terms of their appetite for power or the morality of bombing North Vietnam. Mr. Johnson is as well aware as any priest of God that there is nothing moral about killing a North Vietnamese, just as there is nothing moral about killing any man. But he also knows that the *people, who have had him sworn to uphold* the Constitution and protect the nation above all else, will not permit him the luxury of acting ultimately on the basis of his personal ethic. For him the nation's interests must always come first. And if they do not, as President, if not as a man, he will be committing the most mortal sin of all. To appreciate that is to appreciate the tragedy of Vietnam.

To appreciate that is also to free the mind to discuss realistically those elements in this war that are open to question and difference of opinion, for while it may be inevitable that the United States be involved in the Vietnamese war, the nature and form of the current involvement is legitimate material for discussion.

In assessing the nature of that involvement, we have long been convinced that there is little purpose served in dwelling on the propriety of United States policy toward Indochina in the immediate post-World War II years. Allied mistakes then—French and British mistakes being principal among them—precluded any real chance for the development of that Yugoslavia-like Communist Vietnam, which so many people today are fond of suggesting could be had for the asking.

The decisions made at Geneva in 1954, coming as they did against a backdrop of a worldwide confrontation between the United States and the Sino-Soviet alliance, sealed the bargain and ended any real chance Vietnam had in the immediate future of becoming a unified and independent nation. This judgment assumes the correctness of the Dulles containment policy of that time. It also assumes that the United States and its allies are on sound ground in believing, as they have since the late 50s, that their best interests lie in seeing a body of independent and strong nations built up on the periphery of Asia as an alternative to Red Chinese hegemony.

Given those assumptions and the gradual withdrawal of European influence from Southeast Asia, a positive rather than a passive U.S. role in Vietnam, as well as in the rest of Asia, should have been expected and encouraged by the people of both America and the nations of the free world. This is not to say that the internal political situation in South Vietnam under President Diem and the generals who followed him was satisfactorily from the American point of view. It was not, but there is only so much even a major power can do to influence the internal affairs of another friendly state, particularly when the major power's foreign policy is built on a belief in self-determination of peoples. Thus in the final analysis any kind of political arrangement in South Vietnam was preferable to Ho Chi Minh from the U.S. point of view, because as long as the South stayed out of the hands of the North the situation was retrievable.

And so there has been war. Not a war that was begun because of a paranoic U.S. fear of communism, but a war that was likely, given the perversions of Vietnamese nationalism and the dynamics of the international confrontation between Western republicanism and Eastern totalitarianism.

The United States role in that war, as repugnant as it is to all sensitive Americans to have to fill it, has been basically sound. From the outset successive Administrations have set limited military objectives and exercised great restraint in the use of American power. There has been consistent recognition of the fact that a political solution instead of a military one was the only realistic U.S. objective in Vietnam.

It is only in the last three months that there has been cause for concern that the nation might be drifting away from basically sound policy positions. This is particularly so in the case of the air war over North Vietnam; what was initiated first as a political attack on the concept of sanctuary and exported guerrilla aggression has come now to be justified by the Administration as a military necessity. Current U.S. military tactics appear dangerously close to open war on the people and nation of North Vietnam.

Why the President, particularly, should now be talking so much about winning a war, where just months ago he was concerned with achieving a peace, only he knows. But one suspects that a certain fatigue and weakening of resolve, coupled with domestic political concern has something to do with it. The failure of Great Britain and the Soviet Union to get North Vietnam to agree to peace talks after the New Year's pause in the bombing was obviously a hard blow for Mr. Johnson, who constantly suffers at what this war is costing his Administration and the nation in life and resources.

Yet there is even greater danger if this disappointment is leading to over-reaction. This is not a war that the United States could afford to win in the sense that it won the war with Japan in 1945, and Americans who call for the quick solution delude themselves and endanger the nation. There are no quick military solutions when there's a balance of nuclear terror—only the quickest solution of all: Extermination.

The nation must come to understand that what's ahead is more slogging, slugging jungle death on the ground, involving hundreds of thousands of young American men. War on the ground, involving perhaps ultimately as many as 800,000 U.S. troops, was correctly described by military authorities two years ago as the inevitable implication of the United States decision to stay in Vietnam. Today the notes signed with that decision are coming due and the inevitable national sacrifice is being asked.

The nation must recognize this and not let the President forget that it does. The only way to go is the slow way. It is a way to test the will and tear the conscience, but it is also the way to national self-respect. For no matter, what say those primitive dabblers in international politics, who are suddenly so much among us, every American can be proud of the basic international goals of this nation, even while disagreeing from time to time with particular tactics.

United States foreign policy, whether in Europeans and the fevered idealism of the termination of peoples, the rule of law and an end to military aggression as a means of settling political disputes and has done so without interruption since the end of World War II. And while its policy may have lacked some of the cynical sophistication of the Europeans' and the fevered idealism of the developing nations, it has demonstrated a consistent responsibility and pervading concern for the condition of the peoples of this world during the last 22 years that few nations can match. This is true in Vietnam too, and every American owes it to himself and his nation to see that neither a lessening of will nor a misreading of what's at stake leads the nation at this eleventh hour to get it over with or get out of Southeast Asia.

SENATOR BAYH WRITES ON THE ELECTORAL COLLEGE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as a member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, it has been my privilege to work with the distinguished Senator from Indiana, BIRCH BAYH, on some of the most difficult and critical issues facing the nation.

Only 15 amendments to our venerable Constitution have been adopted since the Bill of Rights in 1791. This small number of amendments demonstrates not only the genius of our original Constitution, but also the cool deliberation which has most frequently characterized the amendment process.

Within the 2 years I have been a member of the Constitutional Amendments Subcommittee, we have considered a number of amendments. Some of them, I believe, were unwise and dangerous to our freedoms. Others, like the Presidential Disability and Succession Amendment, which has now been ratified by the States, were clearly necessary to meet long-standing gaps in our Constitution. The Presidential Disability and Succession Amendment, for the first time in our history, specifies the circumstances and constitutional procedures under which the Vice President may exercise the Executive power when the President is incapacitated.

Throughout the proceedings of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, I have been impressed and inspired by the thoroughgoing thoughtfulness and impartiality of its chairman, Senator BAYH. In every case he has attempted to reconcile the sometimes competing views of witnesses and committee members. He has incisively and persistently investigated the need for, wisdom in, and ramifications of proposed amendments. He has never hesitated to defend the Constitution against imprudent amendment.

But while fearlessly and courageously defending the freedoms the Constitution guarantees us, Senator BAYH has also been prompt to recognize and propose remedies for actual deficiencies in our constitutional processes. One such case is the disability amendment which he skillfully steered through Congress and which has now become part of the Constitution, as its 25th amendment. Another striking case is the attention Senator BAYH has directed to the hopelessly antiquated and potentially very dangerous electoral college system of selecting the President of the United States.

The electoral college system was originally conceived in the 18th century atmosphere of profound distrust of the ability of the common man to govern himself. The idea was that, rather than choosing the President directly, the people of the States should elect wise men from amongst themselves to deliberate in the "electoral college" and then choose the President.

Aside from the undemocratic nature of this presidential selection process, it also failed to make any provision for the role of national political parties, which did not exist at the time the Constitution was drafted. As soon as the presidential election became centered around two or three national party candidates, by 1800, in fact, the idea of independent judgment on the part of the electors went out the window. Nearly every State quickly legislated that the electors chosen by its people should be bound to vote for the presidential candidate who received a plurality of the popular vote within the State.

This development of the unit rule, which persists today, not only stripped the electoral college idea of any virtue it ever had, by eliminating any discretion on the part of the electors, but also created two very distressing and dangerous developments in the presidential election process. First, it makes meaningless in the national election all the votes cast in a State for a candidate who loses the popular vote in that State, regardless of how well he runs elsewhere. Thus, as happened in 1888, as almost happened in 1960, and as could happen in any presidential election, a candidate who captures the States with the largest number of electoral votes could win the Presidency, even if he fails to carry either a majority of the States or a majority of the popular vote. This grave deficiency has already produced one minority President, Benjamin Harrison. It also leads presidential candidates to ignore the small States and concentrate on the few States which possess a majority of the total electoral votes.

Second, a candidate might win a clear plurality of the popular vote, but fail to get the constitutionally required majority of the electoral vote. If that happens, the Constitution provides for the House of Representatives to choose the President, each State having one vote in that election. Thus, if no candidate gets a majority in the electoral college, despite his popular vote, the popular vote totals will be ignored. The President will be chosen in the House on a one-State, one-vote principle, as unwise and undemocratic as any process could be.

To remedy these grave deficiencies, Senator BAYH has proposed doing away with the electoral college system altogether and replacing it with direct, popular election of the President. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of that proposal, because I believe it the best and most democratic way to choose our President. Senator BAYH's leadership toward direct election has won for his proposal many new advocates. Senator BAYH's leadership offers strong reason to believe that we may at last remedy this longstanding, hazardous, undemocratic method of electing the President.

Recently Senator BAYH elaborated on his electoral proposal and some of the alternatives to it in an excellent article in the March Student Lawyer Journal of the American Law Student Association. Because that article represents an outstanding contribution to the dialog on presidential election reform, I ask that it be reprinted in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW WE ELECT THE PRESIDENT: WHAT THE PUBLIC SHOULD KNOW

(By Hon. BIRCH BAYH, U.S. Senator, State of Indiana)

In 1797, Representative William Smith of South Carolina introduced the first constitutional amendment proposing a reform of the electoral system. Since then, more constitutional amendments have been introduced on the subject of electoral reform than on any other single provision in the Constitution! Electoral college reform is Congress' perennial legislative bridesmaid.

With the opening of the 90th Congress, legislators once again are introducing the same proposals that have been before every Congress for the last 170 years. Although these measures will not be considered in the heat of a Presidential election controversy, that is no reason for Congress to stand by—helpless in the face of partisan political interests—awaiting the future election of a "minority" President.

It is time the American people had the right to elect their President by direct popular vote. Actually, a great many citizens mistakenly believe they now enjoy this right. The survival of our archaic electoral vote system is due, primarily, to a basic lack of information. Millions of Americans simply do not know enough about the present system to be sufficiently interested in changing it.

During the 1948 Presidential contest a typical American citizen was called on, somewhat unexpectedly, to participate in the actual election of the President. Governor Dewey had won the popular election in Michigan and, under State custom, was entitled to all of its 19 electoral votes. President Truman, however, had already won the national election. Imagine the dismay of 19 startled Republican electors when a colleague, who had been appointed to act as a substitute, unwittingly attempted to vote for Truman. He explained it this way: "I thought we had to vote for the winning candidate. I certainly didn't want to, I'm a Republican and fighting proud of it."

"A popular government without popular information or the means of acquiring it," James Madison observed, "is but a prologue to a farce or a tragedy or perhaps both." The American public must be alerted to the numerous electoral mishaps that have marred Presidential elections from the Adams-Jefferson race in 1796 (when a Federalist elector disregarded his party and voted for Jefferson) to the Kennedy-Nixon election in 1960. In the 1960 contest, for example, an Oklahoma Republican elector voted for Senator Harry Byrd, a Democrat who was not a formal Presidential candidate.

In Louisiana, following the announcement that Kennedy was a likely winner, some members of the State legislature attempted to rescind the State's electoral law. Their idea was to replace the victorious Louisiana Democratic electors pledged to Kennedy with an appointed slate of unpledged electors. The unpledged electors would then be free to vote as they pleased. Common sense prevailed, however, and this plan was defeated.

ORIGIN OF ELECTORAL SYSTEM

In devising an electoral system, the framers of the Constitution intended that each State's electors, however they were chosen, would be its leading citizens. This highly select group would "deliberate" over the choice of a suitable candidate, with the electors voting as individuals and for individuals. The choice was to have been their own, uninfluenced by narrow State interests or partisan politics. As Alexander Hamilton wrote in *The Federalist No. 68:*

"It was . . . desirable that the immediate election should be made by men most capable of analyzing the qualities delegated to the station, and acting under circumstances favorable to deliberation, and to a judicious combination of all the reasons and inducements which were proper to govern their choice."

To reflect on Hamilton's statement in the light of present day practices is to indicate how far political developments have modified the framers' work. One of the earliest developments that altered the original electoral plan was the emergence of political parties. In 1800, a heated election contest between Jeffersonian Republicans and Federalists found the Republican electors voting as a bloc for their two candidates—Jefferson and Burr. The problem was that with an equal number of votes for both men, Burr had a substantial claim to the Presidency—despite Republican intentions that Jefferson should be the Presidential nominee and Burr the Vice Presidential candidate. The stalemate was finally resolved after 36 separate ballots on the House of Representatives, with Jefferson winning. The Twelfth Amendment, ratified in 1804, which provided for separate Presidential and Vice Presidential ballots for electors, was the direct result of this bizarre incident.

THE "WINNER TAKE ALL"—FANTASY OF UNIT RULE

The winner-take-all formula is, of course, the most controversial feature of the present electoral vote system. The unit rule, as it is commonly known, is not a constitutional provision but another product of party competition. Under this method of apportioning electoral votes, the candidate with a popular vote plurality in a State receives all of the State's electoral votes—whether the margin of victory is 1 vote or 1 million votes—because candidates for the office of Presidential elector are elected as a slate, with a voter casting one ballot for the whole list of party electors.

As a result of the unit rule, the popular votes amassed by a losing candidate are not evident in the final electoral tabulations. This creates a very misleading picture of the party division within a State. Even more important, is the possibility under the winner-take-all system that a candidate could win a majority of electoral votes by capturing popular vote pluralities—however small—in a dozen of the largest States plus the District of Columbia. In such an eventuality, the citizens of 38 States would have absolutely no voice in the determination of a President. That is not a democratic election!

By any standards, the present electoral vote system is an imperfect device for measuring the political sentiment of American voters. For that reason alone it should be discarded. A system that can produce a "minority" President—that is, a candidate who has won an electoral majority while receiving fewer popular votes than his opponent—is not the proper electoral machinery for Twentieth Century America. Though, in fact, we have had only one "minority" President (Benjamin Harrison in 1888) there have been many elections where the shifting of a few thousand votes would have produced an electoral victory for the candidate who had lost the popular election.

THE PROBLEMS ARE REAL ONES—ILLUSTRATIONS OF INEQUITIES

In 1948 a popular vote switch in California and Ohio totalling a meager 12,500 votes, could have prevented a Truman victory—despite a Democratic popular vote margin of 2 million. At the same time, Dewey still would have lacked an electoral majority. If this had happened, the election would have gone to the House of Representatives. Would it have made sense to disregard this impressive 2 million vote margin, as we would have been required to do under the present system? The logical answer is "no."

The closely contested 1960 election provides ample evidence of the harmful effects of retaining both the office of Presidential elector and the unit rule. A brief look at this recent episode of electoral misadventure reveals that developments in Alabama could have produced a major election crisis. A resounding Kennedy victory in the electoral college, however, prevented a crisis from materializing.

In Alabama, where the names of the Presidential candidates do not appear on the ballot and a State statute permits unpledged electors to run, the winning Democratic ticket showed an odd mixture of 5 electors pledged to Kennedy and 6 unpledged electors. The leading vote getter on the slate was an unpledged elector who polled nearly 6,000 votes more than the highest Kennedy Democrat. This greatly confused the official tabulation of Alabama's popular vote. To this day, the returns remain an enigma.

The standard procedure for recording the Alabama popular vote has been to credit Kennedy with 318,000 votes, the highest total received by a pledged elector. Under this method, however, most Alabama Democrats would have their popular votes counted twice—once for the Kennedy electors and once for the unpledged electors. In an attempt to correct this, some observers have made the following adjustment: five-elevenths of 324,050 is taken as Kennedy's popular vote and six-elevenths as the popular vote for the unpledged electors. This would leave Kennedy with 147,295 popular votes in Alabama, and would result in a nation-wide plurality for Nixon of 58,000. While the outcome of the election in the electoral college would remain the same, President Kennedy would have been a "minority" President. This formula is not without its critics. As one commentator pointed out, it is "hardly acceptable since it would base the popular vote on the electoral vote rather than the other way around."

POPULAR PREFERENCE IGNORED

What does all this actually mean? After all, no matter how we juggle the Alabama vote totals, Kennedy still won an overwhelming electoral victory. In terms of the individual Democratic voters in Alabama, however, it meant there was no way for them to give their full support to Kennedy—or, for that matter, to the unpledged electors.

Under any system that retains either the unit rule or the electoral vote, there is the distinct prospect of elevating to the Presidency a man who, in reality, is not the choice of a majority of Americans. There is absolutely no justification for by-passing the will of the people. The strength of this argument owes less to history than it does to the harmful effects likely to result from the election of a candidate who lacks a popular mandate. By electing the President directly, these pitfalls can be avoided. From township trustee to county clerk, to members of Congress, to governors of the 50 States, each person has the right to vote directly for the candidate of his choice—except in the election of the most important office in the United States, the Presidency.

The final answer to this problem lies with the American public. Congress will act only if it is moved by the popular will. The necessary public interest will not be aroused, however, as long as the old myths surrounding the electoral system persist.

One of the most popular of these myths concerns the alleged danger direct election would pose to the two-party system. The most striking feature of this argument, however, is that one is rarely treated to a detailed explanation of how direct election would actually threaten the party system.

THE ROLE OF MINORITY PARTIES—MISCONCEPTION OF HISTORY

The idea that direct popular election would unsettle the historic role of the major parties is based on the assumption that the American two-party system is the result solely of our electoral machinery. To be more specific, that the need to win a majority of electoral votes, under the winner-take-all system at the State level, is responsible for the present supremacy of the Democratic and Republican parties. This requirement, it is contended, has forced the parties to "assimilate" new and competing forces, thus acting as a deterrent to the formation of splinter parties. This overlooks the fact that any election machinery requiring a majority vote in a single member district tends to discourage minor parties, and is true whether the majority so required is popular or electoral.

The growth of national political parties, most historians agree, was a pragmatic development. The first appearance of formal party organizations—in the form of the Jeffersonian Republicans and the Federalists—was a response to the immediate issues growing out of the need to govern a new nation. To explain it otherwise, as some have done, is to put the cart before the horse. Could the electoral system alone maintain the two-party structure if a third party developed strong popular support? It could not; nor should it. Such developments, as in 1860, 1912, 1924 and 1948, are themselves signs of a breakdown in party organization, and no artificial mechanism—not even the electoral college—can sustain a political framework that is contrary to the will of the majority. The sustenance of the two-party system in America is nothing less than American society itself, its values, customs, psychology, and, of course, its institutions.

MINORITY GROUPS WILL PROSPER

The fact is that the present electoral arrangement actually enhances the prospect of minor parties. Winning electoral votes in certain States on the basis of limited sectional appeal places third parties in an advantageous bargaining position. For example, anticipating a close race in 1948, a group of dissident Democrats broke away from the national party and formed the short-lived States' Rights Party. Their avowed purpose, it will be recalled, was to prevent the emergence of a majority choice, thus throwing the election into the House of Representatives where they could exercise the balance of power. Exactly how close they came to achieving this is indicated by the fact, as was noted earlier, that a popular vote shift in Ohio and California totalling only 12,500 votes would have prevented a Truman victory and, at the same time, still have denied Dewey the necessary electoral majority.

Hopefully, history will not repeat itself and 1948 may well come to be regarded as an aberration brought on by the stresses and strains of a highly controversial issue—civil rights. Can we safely assume, however, that such issues will not mark our political life in the future. The answer to that lies in the rioting in Watts and Harlem and the beating of Negroes in Alabama.

NOW, MINORITIES ARE PROTESTERS

Eventually, any discussion of the possible effects of direct election on the party system must center on the nature of American third parties. Since the close of the Civil War and the consolidation of the present party structure, most of the significant third parties have been protest movements. These parties were organized on the basis of ideological issues that could not be immediately incorporated into the pragmatic outlook of the two national parties. In the past, therefore, the question of electoral prospects has not influenced the formation of splinter groups, and it is not likely to do so under direct popular election.

The destruction of the two-party system when viewed realistically, and in the light of a century and a half of development, is only a very remote possibility. As one political scientist has noted, "The two-party habit is so entrenched now that voters tend to regard support of a minor party candidate as throwing their vote away."

A RESPONSE TO THE MUNDT VIEW—FEDERAL SYSTEM WOULD SURVIVE

Another major argument that is often raised against direct popular election is the claim that it would destroy the federal system. My colleague, Senator Karl Mundt, a longtime champion of electoral reform, is the most vigorous and able exponent of this view. In a letter to the *Washington Post*, Senator Mundt explained:

"Were the President to be elected . . . [by direct election] his title should be changed to President of the American People, or President of the People of the United States of America. He would no longer be President of the United States because the federal element of the union of States would have been abandoned in favor of a unitary national State."

If nothing else, however, it is an established fact based on 175 years of American history that the President is truly the representative of all of the people. He is not, nor was he intended to be, as Senator Mundt implies, a sort of super-governor.

The Preamble to the Constitution, as we all know, begins "we the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union . . ." This opening phrase reveals to posterity what motivated the American people to discard the Articles of the Confederation and seek a new form of government by calling a constitutional convention. Their express purpose was to create a new national state in place of a loose confederation.

SUPPORTERS OF POPULAR VOTE

It is somewhat ironic, I think, that the opponents of direct popular election have often used the issue of political feasibility as an explanation for not considering such a proposal seriously. It is ironic because most of the sponsors of popular vote plans have come from small States. The roster of direct election supporters has included Senators Langer and Burdick of North Dakota, Senator Norris of Nebraska, Senator Chavez of New Mexico, Senator Morse of Oregon, Senator Mansfield of Montana, Senator Aiken of Vermont, and Senators Smith and Muskie of Maine, to name only a few.

In terms of popular support, it is interesting to note that in 1965 when the Lodge-Gossett proportional plan and the district plan were being pressed in Congress, the late Senator Langer conducted a survey of public sentiment in North Dakota. He discovered that the people of North Dakota favored direct popular election by the overwhelming majority of 8 to 1. The United States Chamber of Commerce's 1966 referendum on electoral college reform once again revealed that direct election was the choice of the people who were questioned. A Gallup poll, taken last year, gives further evidence that a substantial majority of Americans would endorse a direct popular vote plan. A poll of State legislators, conducted by Senator Burdick, revealed that almost 60 per cent of the 2,500 legislators who responded favored direct election.

The recent endorsement of a direct popular vote plan by the American Bar Association's Special Commission on Electoral Reform has strengthened the hand of direct election supporters in Congress. It has reawakened interest in the question of electoral reform, providing an impetus which many hope will lead the 90th Congress to act favorably on a constitutional amendment.

The history of the franchise in the United States is the story of the struggle to achieve universal suffrage. Today such obstacles as religion, property requirements, sex, and race have been overcome. Today, State legislatures are apportioned so as to fully represent people. "One man, one vote" is the law of the land—everywhere but in the election of the President.

Direct popular election would strengthen the role of the smaller States in the election process. It would result in a nationwide Presidential election. Candidates would have to go where the votes are, and under direct election, that would mean everywhere. Under the winer-take-all system, the small States are virtually ignored during the campaign, particularly in the closing stages. As a result of direct election, candidates would be concerned not only with winning pluralities in the so-called "crucial" States, but also with winning respectable vote totals in traditional one-party States. The net result would be a greatly increased and better informed electorate. This would strengthen the two-party system and make our political life a more meaningful experience for all citizens.

Direct popular election would bring with it many virtues. It would substitute clarity for confusion, decisiveness for danger, and, most important, popular choice for political chance. As James Madison said, "the people at large . . . was the fittest in itself." Let us echo Madison. Let us put our trust in the people. A faith in the average American is the cornerstone of our democracy.

MARINE SCIENCE AFFAIRS—A YEAR OF TRANSITION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in March of this year, the Congress received the first report of the President on marine resources and engineering development.

This report was prepared in response to the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966, passed by the 89th Congress, which firmly establishes the policy of the United States "to develop, encourage, and maintain a coordinated comprehensive and long-range national program in marine science for the benefit of mankind to assist in protection of health and property, enhancement of commerce, transportation and national security, rehabilitation of our commercial fisheries, and increased utilization of these and other resources"—Public Law 89–454.

It was my privilege to be a cosponsor of this act which gives new momentum to our marine science activities.

The President's report is called "Marine Science Affairs—A Year of Transition." I would like to call to the attention of my distinguished colleagues the significance of this document.

This report is the first prepared by the new National Council on Marine Resources and Engineering Development, chaired by Vice President HUMPHREY; outlines potential of scientific research and resources development to contribute to our national goals; sets forth and interprets in one document the marine sciences programs and proposed budgets of the 11 Federal departments and agencies involved; communicates new steps recommended by the Council to the President to accelerate marine science activities toward objectives laid down by law; identifies initial priorities, clarifies agency responsibilities, and outlines means by which the participating agencies are cooperating, especially where programs cross agency lines; reviews ongoing activities and identifies potential benefits of the marine environment by new investments of the Federal Government in this sector of activity.

This is the first time that our Federal program of marine science and technology has been presented in such a systematic and lucid manner. In defining budget components by purpose and by agency, the Congress will be greatly aided in its evaluation of the President's request for fiscal year 1968 appropriations.

I urge my associates in the Congress to study the contents of this excellent report. They will find a perspective, as the Vice President has noted, on "how a more deliberate study and use of our marine environment may make this country and the world a better place in which to live." And they will find inspiration from the President's message:

> The depth of the sea is a new environment for man's exploration and development, just as crossing the West was a challenge in centuries past.
>
> We shall encounter that environment with the same conviction and pioneering spirit that propelled ships from the Old to the New World.
>
> We shall bring to the challenge of the ocean depths—as we have brought to the challenge of outer space—a determination to work with all nations to develop the seas for the benefit of mankind.

WALL STREET JOURNAL ON THE TEACHER CORPS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, within the next 2 weeks the House of Representatives will vote whether to allow the Teacher Corps the chance it deserves to continue its successful program in the Nation's slum schools.

At this moment the administration's request for a $12.5 million supplemental appropriation is before the House and Senate Appropriations Committees.

Congressional supporters of this imaginative and innovative approach to solving the critical problems of education in disadvantaged school districts have long cited the widespread support for the Teacher Corps among educators.

In a recent article in the Wall Street Journal, Jonathan Spivak describes the enthusiastic reaction to the Teacher Corps of several teachers and principals who have worked with Teacher Corps teams in their schools.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Wall Street Journal be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEACHER CORPS ASSIGNMENT: SURVIVAL

(By Jonathan Spivak)

PHILADELPHIA.—Drop into the Pratt-Arnold Elementary School here in Negro North Philadelphia for a glimpse into the possible future of the nation's slum schools.

A tiny band of neophyte teachers, members of the beleaguered National Teacher Corps, is learning by on-the-job training while trying to meet the special needs of deprived children.

In one classroom big, bespectacled R. Lanphier Howe Jr. tries an unconventional approach with a group of backward fourth-graders. To encourage self-expression, the pupils are asked to imagine how they'd feel as the floor of a house, of all things. "I'd be angry at all those rats walking on me!" exclaims one youngster. "I'd be scared when everybody goes out!" cries another. The comments, illustrated by students' drawings, will eventually be made into a booklet. "I don't feel I accomplish a great deal by sticking to the basic reader," Mr. Howe explains.

Nearby, Kenneth Vernon, a 28-year-old onetime theology student with a talent for art and a brisk, cheerful manner, conducts a painting class. The youngsters dab watercolors on paper or even spread fingerpaints directly on their desk tops. He cocks a thumb and forefinger at those who are finished ("Stick 'em up, stick 'em up"), and kids with painty hands troop to the wash basin. Pupils and school officials are enthusiastic. "Before the Teacher Corps, it was impossible to expand art instruction to include the lower grades," comments Matthew Knowles, the vice principal.

"YOU FEEL GOOD"

In Pontiac, Mich., a Teacher Corps team tries a fresh solution to the reading problems of older students: Letting them tutor beginners. Gangling junior high school girls proudly show elementary pupils how to recognize words and pronounce them. The older students gain self-esteem, and their supervisors gain satisfaction. "This is doing something for someone; you feel good," declares corpsman Richard Caleal.

Elsewhere around the country, the year-old, Government-sponsored Teacher Corps is seeking other new solutions to the national problem of training more and better teachers for impoverished pupils. Its volunteers, liberal arts graduates, sign up for two-year stints that combine academic instruction in a university (Temple in Philadelphia and Wayne State in Detroit are included) with on-the-job experience in a nearby public school. The corpsmen are assigned only to urban and rural slum schools that are short of teachers and ask for aid.

"It's the best training any teacher can have: I'd be happy to hire them next year," asserts Mrs. Jeanne Tillson, a Pontiac school principal.

But this local enthusiasm is misleading. Far from being a smashing success, the Teacher Corps is in dire difficulties. This newest of LBJ's educational uplift endeavors is short of money, beset by growing pains, heartily disliked by many tradition-minded educators, suspected by Southerners as an instrument of integration, and attacked by Congressmen of both parties.

The legislators worry that the corps will weaken local control of public schools and needlessly expand the welfare state. Their opposition has already stymied expansion. Though the corps was originally intended to make a substantial dent in the national teacher shortage, its current 1,200 members could hardly handle the needs of Philadelphia alone. Soon, Congress could kill the program entirely.

Unless the lawmakers approve an extension, the corps will die July 1. Even sooner, up to $12.5 million is being sought to finance summer training projects and recruit more volunteers. Otherwise, officials say, attrition would take a disastrous toll by June; corpsmen would drift off to other teaching jobs or leave the profession entirely. "The program doesn't have to be killed; it could just be strangled to death," worries one proponent.

The time bind is intensified by the House Appropriations Committee's postponement of a decision on the extra money pending Congressional settlement of the long-range future of the corps. This crucial vote, determining whether the corps is continued another two years, will come shortly in the House. (The more liberal Senate, filled with influential Teacher Corps enthusiasts, is no obstacle to an extension.)

The President's prestige is deeply committed; he calls the corps a "symbol of new hope for America's poor children and their parents." Intense Administration lobbying is under way, including private tete-a-tetes on Capitol Hill, escorted Congressional tours of Teacher Corps projects and testimonials from satisfied school folks.

But the outcome is uncertain. The corps is politically vulnerable because its constituency is small and scattered through only a handful of Congressional districts. "It's a good issue to kick the President on," laments one Administration strategist. Moreover, the brickbats hurled in the House are bipartisan. "This is the kind of direct involvement of the Federal Government in the schools which is bad news in principle," protests one Republican. "So many of our programs are patchwork . . . I think this is applying a tourniquet to a real serious illness of the inner cities," contends Rep. Edith Green of Oregon, a liberal Democrat who usually supports Federal education programs enthusiastically

If the impending legislative crisis is not fatal, corps director Richard A. Graham foresees steady growth. He wants to enroll an additional 2,500 interns this summer, followed by 3,000 next year. By 1970, the corps could be 9,000 strong; it would cost $70 million to $80 million a year to operate and would place volunteers in one out of every four inner-city schools.

"What has to happen is a change of attitude toward teaching in the slum schools. Now it's a job of little prestige; people have an unreasoned fear, often a horror, of slum schools," declares Mr. Graham. And, indeed, talks with many corpsmen show that their attitudes have changed. In Pontiac, John Barnfather, a 30-year-old who gave up a higher-paying sales job with U.S. Rubber Co., declares, "I would have been afraid to be a teacher in the inner city. But they are nice little kids; that's all there is to it."

Teacher Corps converts insist the program's greatest potential lies in stimulating needed change in teacher training itself. Thus, even though the size remains small, the ultimate impact on the American education system could be extensive.

"The general run of teacher education has not really addressed itself to preparing teachers to teach kids who come from poor homes," complains U.S. Education Commissioner Harold Howe II. Educators concede that current courses often attract second-rate students and substandard faculty, expound outdated doctrines, provide little practical experience and slight the special needs of the poor.

TEACHER ON TV

Searching for a solution, the Teacher Corps training institutions are granted wide autonomy to try novel approaches. At Wayne State, while a portable TV camera rolls, a girl volunteer tests her teaching techniques in a literary discussion with delinquent ninth-graders. The tape is promptly played back; a faculty member criticizes, the student teacher observes her own methods and mannerisms and studies the pupils' response.

In contrast with conventional training programs, the corps attempts to introduce students to slum conditions. Volunteers live with the poor, study urban and rural sociology, associate with welfare workers and civil rights leaders. At each training site, the preparation is tailored to the needs of local schools. Temple, for example, is training corpsmen as remedial reading specialists at the high-school level. The reason: Many Negroes in Philadelphia high schools are still struggling to comprehend elementary readers.

The corps' unique emphasis is on community uplift endeavors. Volunteers work long hours to demonstrate that the schools can more broadly serve the social needs of slum dwellers. In Pontiac, corpsmen are organizing health clinics for the poor; in Los Angeles, they show Disney films to students on Saturdays; in Philadelphia, they help poor families obtain public welfare aid. "I don't know what we'd do without them," declares one school administrator.

Hard questions about the fledgling corps must still be answered, however. It was launched in great haste last summer, mainly because of Congress' delay in doling out funds. Almost 50 separate university projects were started in less than two months. "It was insanity; they were just plain lucky some of the things didn't blow up," contends one project director. Seemingly senseless shifting occurred to match supply and demand. Interns were introduced to the sociology of Syracuse's slums—and shipped on to Hawaii.

At times corpsmen have clashed with regular classroom teachers resentful of their presence. The volunteers, who will receive master's degrees when their two years are up, are not all dedicated to teaching in slum schools (they are expected but not compelled to do so). A recent corps survey shows that 9% don't want to teach at all, while an added 10% are unwilling to work in slum schools. The corpsmen's liberal pay scales provoke local jealousy; some team leaders have received as much as $11,000 or $12,000 a year—more than principals.

LINGERING SUSPICIONS

Originally the corps committed the political error of dealing directly with the universities before the support of public school people was solicited. The oversight stirred suspicions, which still linger, that the corps is trying to undermine the established education order. "We should have gone to the local school districts first," concedes Charles Zellers, who then headed the program. Fear that Negro corpsmen would be dispatched to force faculty integration at Southern schools was unfounded but could not be quashed. Alabama refused to participate at all, and several other states were slow.

If Congress lets the Teacher Corps live, some of the smaller teams are to be enlarged, spreading the supervisory talent. Yet no one knows the optimum size (six, eight, ten?) or even the proper role of the experienced team leaders. Some contend that interns need only part-time direction by the regular school administrators; others envision the team leader as a new kind of link between universities and the public schools.

Corpsmen who are considered ready before their two years are up will be encouraged to take regular teaching jobs next fall. The shortened training span will please rural school administrators who have trouble attracting college graduates, but academic experts worry that it will reduce potential long-range benefits of the training program.

Other steps will be taken to ease administrative problems, and some difficulties will probably diminish as public understanding increases. But for now the corps' chief concern, like that of any newborn, is simply survival.

VIETNAM

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, much has been said and will be said about the American purpose in Vietnam. I happen to be one of those who believes very strongly that a great deal more is involved in our war there than a battle for one tiny nation. Asia today and certainly tomorrow must be considered in the same perspective as we have considered Europe for so many years. The course Asia will follow could very well be determined by the outcome of the war in Vietnam.

The magazine Pace contains an editorial in its May issue that outlines better than I ever could what is at stake in this war. I commend it to every Member of this body and ask that it be inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM ON THE RAZOR'S EDGE

The Vietnam war is rapidly becoming the most violently discussed conflict in history. Never was a war fought more immediately before our eyes over television. Never was there more confusion in the public mind.

In all the torrent of argument several historic facts seem to be lost. Yet they are basic to our understanding not only of what has happened but of what our course must be.

First, the conflict is not concerned merely with the Vietnamese. It is crucial for one billion human lives in Southeast and South Asia. A visit through Japan, the Philippines, Thailand, Malaysia, Indonesia and on to India would convince any American with his ears open that the stand in Vietnam radically changed the mood in these nations from resignation to hope. Peking no longer represents the inevitable shape of human destiny.

Second, this war is not being fought by the United States alone. Thirty-eight nations are actively engaged in the support of South Vietnam. This spontaneous alliance represents the greatest Asian effort to preserve freedom, with the cooperation of Western nations.

Third, despite continuing propaganda to the contrary, this war is being fought by these Allies in the most humane, careful, courteous manner ever known. The Allies bend over backwards to protect civilians by telegraphing their punches. Leaflets are dropped before the raids to warn the people. What is destroyed in property is replaced or paid for.

Fourth, in Vietnam an audacious experiment is being carried out to "build a nation while fighting." Vietnam is a scene of "revolutionary development." It is an attempt to rebuild the society from the rice roots up.

General William Westmoreland calls it the "work of a generation" and says it is the first time in history that men engaged in war are at the same time building a "new society."

In the light of these facts, certain uncomfortable conclusions should face America and every American. First, we are involved in, and responsible for, the future of one billion Asians, by the fact that we are fighting in Vietnam, and by the way we are fighting there. Second, we are part of a mutually responsible alliance of free nations, pledged to win the war. Third, we have already made it plain that America is not only interested in winning the war and providing military security, but also in helping support a social, economic and political revolution which will in due course sustain freedom in South Vietnam and among her neighbors.

There is one more conclusion which the honest man must face about Vietnam and Asia. In the eyes of the world the war is between two giant powers—Peking and Washington. At stake is Asia. The military struggle is not the vital one. The Allies have already won that, if they do not pull back. The real issue is not between those who want to escalate and those who want to come to terms.

The fundamental issue at stake is whether America, as the most powerful nation among the Allies, possesses the greatness of heart, the tenacity of spirit and the moral straightness to give what Communism has failed to give to nations—a great and satisfying purpose for living as well as the means of livelihood.

Vietnam could stand for more in history than the courageous spilling of the blood of many races in defense of liberty, more than the overthrowing of tyranny, more even than a start in answering hunger, disease and poverty. We can already see the birth of a greater hope through our fighting men. The Vietnam conflict is demanding a modern type of man with high standards and new motivations. It is demanding a commitment of the young men involved in it. "They will return wiser in the ways of the East and more mature citizens of the West," said an American general.

Vietnam is a hard school but worthwhile if it marks the beginning of making a generation grow up and a nation rethink its values and purpose. What can we give more than money, munitions, machines and materialism? Can America cope with the spirit of man? Can the spirit of man be elevated or escalated so the will to build and rebuild a nation becomes a national purpose and aim?

Vietnam might be looked on as a testing ground. If we can do it for Vietnam we can do it for the millions of Asia, and eventually for Red China. It could be the beginning of a new partnership between Asia and the West that would pioneer and demonstrate a new concept of life, liberty and leadership.

WAR, PEACE, AND THE GOLD RESERVE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, amid the continuing international discussions of the place of gold in the international monetary economy, there is a political factor which has not received much attention. That is the question of war as it affects the flow of international mediums of exchange. J. A. Livingston has cogently discussed this in his Washington Post column of May 5.

"Dollar reserves," says Mr. Livingston, "assume peace." In their role as an international medium, dollars can be quickly converted into other currency—they are more flexible than gold itself. But what would happen to a country's dollar holdings if it found itself opposed in war to ourselves or an ally? It is this political question, with the possibility of the United States acting in such a case to stop payment on its dollar reserves, which Mr. Livingston discusses.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Business Outlook: In Peace, Dollar Is Better Than Gold

(By J. A. Livingston)

Of Philip II of Macedonia, Plutarch wrote: "Not Philip, but Philip's gold, took the cities of Greece."

In his autobiography, Raimondo Montecuccoli, an Italian military strategist and tactician employed by the Austrian Hapsburgs, quotes Lazarus von Schwendi, a 16th century German statesman: "War demands three things—gold, gold, gold."

And British dramatist George Peele, whose career overlapped Shakespeare's said: "Gold is the glue, sinews and strength of war."

Those sentiments are not lost on modern statesmen, such as President Charles de Gaulle, who refuses to hold dollars as a significant portion of the Bank of France's monetary reserves. In this, he's acting as a head of state with emphasis on political rather than economic contingencies. It puts him at odds with the United States on international monetary reform.

To economists, gold is a monetary reserve—"swing money." In one year, a nation will run a balance-of-payments deficit. Gold pays the deficit. And, as foreign trade grows, the greater will be the swings and the greater the need for reserves.

In the postwar years, dollars have served as swing money along with gold. They possess an advantage over gold. They earn interest.

Like gold, they can be converted quickly into another currency such as French francs, German marks, Canadian dollars or Japanese yen. And there's no worry about storage or insurance, or availability.

Dollar reserves assume peace. But a statesman must bear in the back of his mind the possibility of war. Then dollars might not be as good as gold.

Suppose a country holding dollars became involved in a war against a U.S. ally. Would the United States stop payment on its dollar reserves, whether held as a deposit with a U.S. commercial bank or invested in Treasury securities?

"All is fair in love and war." The war reserve would fail of its purpose. It would not be free to pay for shipping, buy munitions or import food. It wouldn't "swing." It would be subject to the yea or nea of foreign power. A war chest of dollars might lose sovereignty if the sovereign were on the anti-American side of a war.

This is one reason for the rapid growth of the Euro-dollar market. A business firm or government having a dollar deposit in the Chase Manhattan or Morgan Guaranty Trust or some other American bank, knows that in time of stress the United States Treasury could block payment.

But by placing dollars on deposit with the Barclay's Bank in England, or the Dresdener Bank in West Germany, an intermediary is posed between the owner of the deposit and the U.S. government.

The U.S. government has no direct way of knowing who owns Euro-dollars. It would require an extensive inventory to pinpoint holders—friend or enemy.

Since statesmen have to be prepared for all contingencies (a friend today may be an opponent tomorrow) they have become more and more chary about increasing their swing-money dollars.

They recognize that the United States is rich and powerful; that the dollar is the strongest monetary unit in the world.

But the United States is at war in Vietnam. Its balance-of-payments deficit persists along with its gold drain.

Sanctions against dollar holdings of central banks are improbable. But an improbability is always—to a statesman—a possibility.

THE SUCCESS OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT PROGRAMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, in the final analysis, there is but one way to measure the effectiveness of a program such as the war on poverty, and that is by listening to those who know its contributions firsthand.

We are all familiar, of course, with the endless number of secondhand and thirdhand accounts of the program's ineffectiveness. For the sake of simple fairness, I believe we have an obligation to listen to those who have new hope as a result of the various Economic Opportunity Act programs as well as to those tired litanies of mismanagement and failure so frequently recited in certain publications.

Mr. President, many Minnesotans have recently corresponded with me relating the ways in which the helping hand envisioned by this legislation was extended to them. I believe my colleagues in the Senate of the United States would find their observations enlightening.

I am, therefore, requesting unanimous consent that a small number of these letters be reprinted at the conclusion of my remarks. Because we live in a society where affluence is a measure of goodness, to be poor is a sin. Accordingly, I am also asking that the signatures on these letters not be printed.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

April 11, 1967.

Senator Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Sir: I am writing asking your support on the War on Poverty. It has helped me very much to gain work experience and self respect. It has brought me out of my shell of self pity into a new world of hope, to make a new and better life for my children and myself.

My children are making plans for a better future thru education.

I am planning to go to the college of sociology which was beyond my wildest dreams. Just being a social work aide with Project Enable has helped me to see what the War on Poverty has done to help so many, many people feel like human beings again. We need more funds to be able to continue our programs and to be able to reach many more. This War on Poverty has just begun. We can't stop now as it would be a big letdown to many people with hopes rising high.

So am hoping my plea will be heard.

Thank you,

——— ———.

——

April 4, 1967.

Senator Walter Mondale.

Dear Sir: The Anti-Poverty Program have help me. Provided me with employment, more education, health and family planning, reading resource for my children, Head Start for my children, Medicare, Alert for my mother and Dad. Job, training for my children who had to drop out school. A Batter place to live This Program has help So many people that are poor like myself.

Please support these:
Community Action Program.
The Anti-Poverty Program.
Economic Opportunity Program.

Thank you.

——— ———.

——

April 6, 1967.

Honorable Senator Mondale: I am the mother of five children. We had the opportunity to participate in several of the community action programs and think they are just great.

I feel they enlightened as well as benefited us greatly. With the educational and job training programs we can now look forward to the future with confidence.

I hope you will give full support to the War On Poverty bill.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

——

April 11, 1967.

Dear Senator Walter Mondale: My wife and I are writing to you in regards to your Citizens Center Service. We sincerely hope that you will continue this vital program.

We have a family of 5 children and have been helped greatly by the actions of the Mpls. South Side Citizens Center.

I have been sick with a type of illness, which up until now the doctors have not been able to give a definite reason for. I have lost many jobs in the last 14 years because of this illness.

Now at long last my wife and I are beginning to see some answer to our situation. This has come about mainly because of the coordinating actions of the Center.

They have sent a home management aid into our home to help my wife and I get through this difficult period.

Above all they have brought together the doctors at Gen. Hosp., the Relief Dept., the marriage consulting service and all the various departments concerned, to find a definite answer to the many problems concerning our situation.

The above mentioned depts., all have a very poor way of working together, to solve problems such as ours.

The Citizens Center has brought them together in time to save our marriage and our family from what has seemed like a hopeless situation.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

——

April 13, 1967.

Senator Walter Mondale,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Walter Mondale: I am writing to request your support of the Anti-poverty bill. I cannot emphasis strongly enough the need for funds being put into this program. The criticisms made about the program are obviously made by persons who have not had the experience of being poverty stricken.

To give you a little bit about my background. I was originally a recipient of A.F.D.C. After taking advantage of some of the opportunities offered under the Anti-poverty Program, I am now employed and earning my own living, which is an accomplishment within itself; but personally, I feel that my real accomplishment is the real sense of pride I have knowing that I am no longer a recipient of Federal and State funds, but am now paying taxes to support such programs as the Anti-poverty bill. In my case, I don't feel it is enough just to say I am grateful for the availability of such a program; therefore, I am making this appeal to you to support the bill.

Sincerely yours,

——— ———.

APRIL 12, 1967.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: So many times a person hears only about the mistakes a new organization makes. I would like to tell you how the Anti-Poverty program has helped me to become self-supporting.

I learned about the program from my A.F.D.C. worker in October of 1966, at which time I applied for a job. December of 1966, I was hired by the Eastside Citizen's Community Center, part-time as a Homemanagement Aide. Since that time, I have used many of the services provided by the Centers, both personally and in helping others.

On April 3, of this year, I was up-graded to the full-time position of Assistant Administrator, which enables me to be self-supporting and no longer need A.F.D.C. assistance for my 2½ yr. old daughter or myself.

This program has been very good to me. I hope that you will see the need to keep all of the C.A.P. programs going.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

APRIL 19, 1967.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SENATOR: I feel the War on Poverty, that has been in effect, has helped this country a great deal. I believe there should be an increase in appropriations.

I know of the Maternal and Infant Care Clinic, and I am taking my child to the Well Child Clinic. The care and concern, shown by the people working there, is marvelous. If it wasn't for the help they give, I don't think the patients would return and tell their friends about them. I am thankful there are grants of this nature, their purpose is wonderful.

Please help the War on Poverty by voting for, and supporting President Johnson's Anti-Poverty Bill and the Message he presented to Congress.

Thank-you for your support.

Very truly yours,

——— ———.

APRIL 24, 1967.

HONORABLE SENATOR MONDALE: To regards to the cut in the federal programs, I cannot express or stress enough the need for these programs. Due to so many of these programs, I have seen people in our community become involved, they learned how to communicate, they became employed and were taken off of welfare and most of all, they are finally caring what happens not only to them, but to others also, yes there has been a change because we have had federal program, but we absolutely cannot afford cuts, or can we afford to lose different programs. I ask your support, not for myself, but for others who so desperately need it and want it. Lets fight the war on poverty together. The rewards will be great, not now, but in the future. Where will America be in another hundred years if we don't help, understand and give everyone a chance now.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

APRIL 17, 1967.

Senator WALTER MONDALE,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I would urge you to support the War on Poverty programs by whatever means are at your disposal, particularly by voting for increased appropriations for the Community Action Programs.

While much refining and constant re-evaluation needs to be done in all phases of the programs, it is imperative that funds are not cut off at this point. Many projects are just beginning to form roots into their communities and although filling a great need, would be incapable at this time of finding sufficient financial support from outside sources.

I think especially of our neighborhood Citizens Community Center in Southeast Minneapolis. Perhaps their most outstanding contribution to date has been the hiring of low income persons and women on AFDC. The persons so employed have literally taken on a new life. They are able to provide additional family income and be of service to their community at the same time, and in so doing find new value in themselves as human beings. If their salaries were cut it would be an undescribable loss to our whole community. It is the few thousands spent here and multiplied many times throughout the city and nation which will enable the Community Action Program to be a vital force in community reformulation, so necessary for our cities to become the exciting sources of human creativity we invision. I am sure you will do all you can to continue their support.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

TRIBUTE TO 1ST SGT. SAM K. SOLOMON

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, Hawaii is proud of its many fightingmen in Vietnam, and we are especially proud of our own 25th Infantry Division.

One of the brave members of that division was 1st Sgt. Sam K. Solomon of Kohala, Hawaii, who was killed in action November 3, 1966, by a sniper.

But big Sam Solomon is not forgotten. The story of the tribute paid to his memory was written by Mr. Al Chang of the Associated Press and published in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of May 3, 1967.

If there are no objections, I respectfully request that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, May 3, 1967]

MEMORIAL TO ISLE SOLDIER: NO GI CAN FILL THIS HELMET

(By Al Chang)

CU CHI, VIETNAM.—In the corner of the orderly room of "Charley" company, 1st battalion, 27th Wolfhounds, there is a shiny helmet liner emblazoned with the stripes of a first sergeant, the Wolfhound crest and the taro leaf patch of the 25th Infantry Division.

Newcomers are warned forcefully not to touch it.

Then when they are filled in on the history and traditions of the Wolfhounds, they are told what the helmet liner means.

It belonged to Sam K. Solomon, a tall, tough soldier from Kohala, Hawaii. He left it in the orderly room last November when he went into the field with "Charley" company at the start of Operation Attleboro.

On November 3 the outfit was in heavy action, and Solomon moved out alone eight times into the dense bush to bring back wounded men. Then, halting for a breather, the big first sergeant was shot and killed by a sniper.

"He was one of my finest soldiers," said Major General Fred C. Weyand, who was commanding general of the 25th at that time. "He didn't have to come to Vietnam because he was the lone survivor in his family, but he volunteered to be with his men. His death was a most tragic loss to our country."

After Solomon died, the men of his unit made sure the helmet liner stayed where he left it as a memorial to the man they consider "the first soldier of the Wolfhounds." It is shined carefully every day.

"I had been in the company only four months when he was killed," said Sergeant George R. Tabor of Chicago, Illinois, the company clerk. "During that time I got to know him well. When he was killed, I was really hit hard. It was like losing a father. He was the type that if you were in danger and hit, he would come out after you and he did.

"That helmet in the corner of this orderly room is for him, and, like everyone else, I'll see to it that it will remain there and we'll all keep it shining."

When Solomon was killed, Charles J. Buckley of Bryan, Texas, took over as "C" company's top kick. He shares the feeling for the almost legendary Solomon.

"When I came into this company and heard about his feats and saw his helmet liner in one corner of my orderly room, I got a great feeling of respect for this man," Buckley said.

"Nobody is going to be allowed to touch that helmet," he went on. "It's a living memorial to a fine and great soldier. It's a reminder of the courageous acts of our first sergeant. When I leave, I'll pass that word along to my replacement.

"Since I took his place, a couple of people tried to manhandle the helmet, not knowing what it meant. They nearly got shot."

Solomon had a reputation for being a tough sergeant when new men joined his unit, but he made soldiers out of them and they came to respect and love him. His service now has become legendary and the shiny helmet liner serves as a constant reminder of the man and his deeds.

"We have 12 people left in the company who knew Solomon when he was first sergeant," said First Lieutenant Thomas L. Coldren of Hughes, Arkansas, company executive officer. "When new men arrive they are told of the traditions of the Wolfhounds, and the helmet is shown to them.

"It has become a symbol. No one can fill that helmet."

GARY'S MAJ. MARION McPHERSON

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, increasing recognition is being given to the contributions made to community life by VISTA volunteers. Reports about the services which these often selfless individuals render are becoming more common and receiving more publicity.

I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues one such volunteer, retired Maj. Marion McPherson, who is a resident of Gary, Ind. After completing a distinguished career of 20 years in the U.S. Army, Major McPherson undertook the equally challenging and necessary task of helping the poor. For 18 months he served VISTA in Georgia and Illinois, and now once more has retired to his family home in Gary.

Recently a very interesting article written by Derwood Haines, describing the ersonal experiences of "Major Mac" as a volunteer, appeared in the Gary Post-Tribune. Because this story so well illustrates how an interest in people can become a highly prized and valuable weapon in motivating those less fortunate than ourselves, I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Gary's Major Mac—Veteran of Two Kinds of Warfare

(By Derwood Haines)

Fighting some kind of a war is old hat to Marion McPherson by now.

After 20 years that included World War II and the Korean conflict, McPherson retired from the U.S. Army with the rank of major.

Then he immediately joined the nation's fight against poverty by becoming a Volunteer in Service to America (VISTA).

"VISTA," says the ex-Army major, "is a very necessary program—really the only program that is getting down to the neighborhoods and reaching the poor people as individuals."

He worked as volunteer for the Office of Economic Opportunity affiliate for 18 months before resigning and returning here to live.

But McPherson, now 59, continues his role in the fight to help the poor. He has agreed to work with a local welfare service agency.

This line of work comes naturally to McPherson who says:

"Few people are poor because they are lazy. The poor work harder than anyone else just trying to keep body and soul together."

"What VISTA is trying to do," he adds, "is get the poor together—involved with each other."

McPherson, a Froebel graduate, joined VISTA at the end of the summer of 1965. He was immediately assigned to Gainesville, Ga.

Later he was trained as a VISTA leader and this time requested an assignment in the Midwest.

"The South," he says when commenting on the request, "has shown that it can take care of itself. I'm annoyed with the North's failure to meet integration problems face to face."

In compliance with the assignment request, McPherson was sent to East St. Louis, Ill., a city of 80,000 which this VISTA volunteer considered "worse than Mississippi."

Negroes, he related, didn't have adequate playgrounds. There were no job or recreational facilities to keep Negro juveniles off the streets.

"This was the promised land the colored man came to, but the promise hasn't been kept," McPherson asserts.

He disclosed that soon after going to the Illinois city, residents told him they didn't want Negroes.

To back up the claim, the VISTA headquarters in an all-white neighborhood was burned to the ground.

Working quietly—through the city's anti-poverty workers—McPherson led a re-building program and staffed the new center with a carefully selected integrated staff.

The new center included recreation and education activities for persons of all ages.

From there, "Major Mac," as the VISTA leader became known, went on to set up a job training program for children not old enough for the high school-oriented Neighborhood Youth Corps.

"VISTA doesn't replace the local programs," he explained. "It works with them."

McPherson, who lived among the poor in East St. Louis, finds reason for optimism there.

"The people worked together to rebuild the centers. When that (working together) happens, there is no need to demonstrate," he comments.

A second center was burned by Negro juveniles too young to be allowed to attend a dance at the VISTA center.

While working with the poor in the Illinois city, McPherson didn't find it at all strange to be topside patching a leaky roof for a poor resident or being in the kitchen preparing a favorite dish.

"The ladies in East St. Louis and I would vie for the chance to show off our favorite dishes," he relates. "I would slip in hints about careful budgeting and planning."

Besides being a cook, carpenter and soldier, McPherson has also worked as a steelworker, upholsterer, mechanic and railroad man.

He is still highly competent as an upholsterer and relates that this ability came in handy as he went about furnishing the East St. Louis VISTA center and his living quarters. So did the carpentry ability.

An old saying goes that "necessity is the mother of invention."

And, so it was with McPherson, in a sense.

In order to go to college, he worked on a railroad.

It was a butler's job when the depression left him short of necessary credits for a law degree after studying at Suffolk Law School in Boston.

It was in these years that "Major Mac" picked up the Boston accent that adds so much to a pleasantly candid disposition.

In 1942, McPherson was drafted into the Army and stayed there for 20 years before retiring in 1962 and going back to college for a degree in Russian.

That is one of four languages Major Mac speaks fluently today. The others are German, French and Spanish. To the untrained ear of this reporter McPherson's Japanese also sounded fluent, but the ex soldier denies that it is.

McPherson was born in Louisiana and came here at age 10. Before going to Boston, he attended Crane College in Chicago.

Recalling his VISTA experiences and talking about future fights against poverty, McPherson comments:

"You don't get a lot of returns. But every so often there is the satisfaction of helping—of seeing someone you helped make the grade."

ISAAC DON LEVINE WRITES ON VIETNAM AND L.B.J.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, at the request of several Maryland constituents, I have been asked to read into the Record a letter to the editor of the Washington Post that appeared over the name of Isaac Don Levine.

Mr. Levine's letter comes in response to a column by Walter Lippmann which labeled Lyndon Johnson as a "Democratic President who has proved that he cannot make peace."

Mr. Levine argues vigorously that by his conduct of the war in Vietnam, President Johnson will prove himself a Democratic President capable of making a peace more lasting than that of either 1919 or 1945.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Levine's letter to the editor of the Washington Post of May 5 be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter to the editor was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

On Lippmann, War

In needling Lyndon Johnson (in your issue of April 18) as "a Democratic President who has proved that he cannot make peace," Walter Lippmann has projected Johnson's peace efforts against the achievements in this field of his two illustrious predecessors, Woodrow Wilson and Franklin Roosevelt. At the same time, he has sharply raised the question of Hanoi's war aims. Both points call for elucidation.

Now Lippmann was at Wilson's side in Versailles and no one among our living observers of that dynamite-loaded peace is better qualified than he to attest that Wilson proved that he could make peace, the kind of peace which guaranteed the future catastrophe of World War II. Mr. Lippmann, and this writer who contributed memoranda to him when he was serving as Col. House's "brain trust," realized at that time—with Maynard Keynes and many others—that out of Versailles would come an immense calamity for the civilized world.

And surely Mr. Lippmann need not be told that Franklin Roosevelt's gullible efforts to outwit the formal Versailles Conference by gambling on wartime piecemeal settlements made at Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam (where Truman continued F.D.R.'s policies) proved that he could indeed make peace, of a kind which bequeathed to the world the greatest diplomatic shambles in all history.

It is perhaps necessary to point out to Mr. Lippmann's votaries that we owe it to F.D.R.'s "peace" that we still have occupation forces of a quarter of a million in Europe some 22 years after the end of the war, that the Berlin Airlift, the Korean War, the Berlin Wall, our draft and perhaps half of our national debt are among the offspring of that "peace."

President Johnson, in his tireless search for peace, has so far proved that he is not for a peace in the Wilson-Roosevelt tradition. The road to a peace settlement being a two-way street, Mr. Lippmann would do well to ponder the kind of peace Ho Chi Minh and his allies in our midst seek to achieve. The key to Hanoi's war aims has been furnished to us by Ho Chi Minh and his authorized spokesmen. Mr. Lippmann could not fail to recognize that Ho Chi Minh's uncompromising and defiant note in reply to President Johnson's letter reads like a page torn out of the book of the crusading diplomacy of Trotsky and Chicherin, who were Lenin's first commissars of foreign affairs in the heyday of the Communist Revolution. All of Hanoi's recent authoritative declarations have made it clear that North Vietnam insists on a stoppage of bombing "and all other acts of war." What does it mean? Unmistakably Hanoi says, "Our precondition to peace negotiations is: Get out!" To put it in other words: "We will meet you at the peace table if you agree to unconditional surrender."

But why does Hanoi cry for our unconditional surrender? Because Ho Chi Minh in Asia represents historically the last eruption of the colossal Communist explosion that rocked the world half a century ago. In the bowels of Russia, the center of the vast quake, the fire has turned into dying ashes. Red China is a Prometheus bound, her vitals consumed by the vulture of irredentist nationalism, trapped as she is between the superior Soviet power in the north and India (with her friends and Western backers) in the south.

In brief, Ho Chi Minh stands for the rekindling of the revolutionary fire in the heartland of Asia, and the only effective fire brigade on the scene combatting the arsonist is the power of the United States. Ho Chi Minh realizes that this is the last confrontation between the West and the Communist Revolution, and if he can bedevil our minds and break down our will, the Communist flame will once more burst into a great conflagration, and the United States will inherit a legacy which will dwarf the consequences of Versailles, Teheran, Yalta and Potsdam.

President Johnson can easily prove that he could make that kind of peace. That is the kind Bertrand Russell advocates. But Mr. Lippmann knows that the Communist world on all continents except Asia is in a process of disintegration and retreat. Surrender to Hanoi would reverse that process and engulf Asia in a fire of unimaginable dimensions.

To Lyndon Johnson history will owe an everlasting debt if he continues to prove that he cannot and will not make peace on terms dictated by the enemy.

ISAAC DON LEVINE.

WALDORF.

THE WAR AGAINST CRIME

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, with our society so concerned today about the many aspects of crime and criminal activity, I think it is worthy of note that a fellow Floridian, Congressman DANTE FASCELL, has been conducting a serious and unsensationalized study on organized crime. I commend to my colleagues, attention, a recent column by Victor Riesel, which appeared in the March 4 edition of the New York World-Journal-Tribune, as well as a second column by Pete Laine, which appeared in the April 14 issue of the Miami Herald.

I ask unanimous consent that the above described articles be inserted at this point in the body of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the World Journal Tribune, Mar. 4, 1967]

TOUGH NEW FIGHTER SPURS WAR ON CRIME

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—A tough veteran who faced the flak in the Sicilian, Italian and African campaigns, has just plunged right smack in the middle of what has been billed as a massive drive against the organized crime syndicates.

He's the unpublicized seven-term, 49-year-old south Florida Congressman, Dante Fascell, who distinguishes himself now with his personal word that he's launching an inquiry into the power of the crime syndicates but wants "nothing sensational"—just "a methodical, definitive analysis of why our government has gotten no place in this war."

Strangely enough, though not a national personality, he has the power to discover what he is seeking—an answer to why the so-called Mafia has been able to develop some 300,000 businessmen and businesses worth several hundred billion dollars, almost undisturbed over the decades.

He wants to know just why many scores of local unions have been infiltrated in some 25 states, and why the federal government has not been able to launch a counteroffensive.

His right to ask, and his authority, spring from a House group apparently known only to the professional Hill watchers—the House Government Operations Committee's subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs. It has full jurisdiction over the "economy and efficiency" of the Treasury and Justice Departments.

He and his group, therefore, are the special watchdogs over both law enforcement agencies—and may give the new Attorney General Ramsey Clark, his first head-on clash with the House.

What has intrigued Dante Fascell, who has had his staff working on just such matters for some weeks now, was the statement by "Pete" Peterson that the Organized Crime and Racketeering Section (which he heads) of the Justice Dept. just did not have the staff to follow up their leads nor the men to fight the crime syndicates on a wide front.

The congressman is as much concerned over the infiltration of labor as he is with the huge invasion of legitimate business by the mobs. This concern is warranted. Only the other day a spokesman for the Organized Crime Section told this columnist:

"You ask where the Cosa Nostra has infiltrated labor. There are so many Mafia locals, we would need an hour to list them."

But it is not the glossary and roster of the underworld operations which Dante Fascell now seeks, he said when we talked the other day.

"What is the good of knowing how bad they are?" Fascell asked rhetorically. "We know how tough they are. We know who they are. What I want to know is how to deal with them. It is not the unearthing—it is the coping with it. In effect, why are we outnumbered and outmaneuvered?"

From other sources it is learned that the subcommittee wants to know: why there are but six or seven Justice Dept. men in the special "labor unit"; why there is a paucity of lawyers in the criminal division; why only two of the 1,000 murders in Chicago have been solved; why none of the 42 Boston slaying have been cracked. Obviously most of them came within the federal jurisdiction over interstate commerce and communications.

So, unlike the sensations of Estes Kefauver's first TV spectaculars, no mobsters will be called to the public hearings. Just the federal men, from "Treasury and Justice and the FBI."

This is a unique approach. Here is a congressman who would rather make good than headlines.

[From the Miami Herald, Apr. 14, 1967]

GAMBLING "OPEN" U.S. AID SAYS—MIAMI HAS PLENTY, ISN'T RUN BY MAFIA

(By Peter Laine)

WASHINGTON.—Miami has a "great deal of gambling" but it appears to be free from direct Cosa Nostra control, Assistant Attorney General Fred Vinson said Thursday.

Vinson, Justice Department's Criminal Division, said Miami is an "open territory" for gambling in the sense of not being dominated by a syndicated crime ring.

He said, though, that in many areas where the syndicate does not run gambling itself it still commands a 10 per cent off-the-top cut of the profits.

Vinson was making a second appearance before House legal and monetary affairs subcommittee, headed by Rep. Dante Fascell of Miami.

Rep. Jack Edwards (R., Ala.) reminded Vinson that the President's Crime Commission listed Florida as one of the states in which hard-core crime groups live and operate, but Vinson made no comment.

Vinson said later he couldn't gauge if the crime situation in Miami has been coming more under control in recent months, but he told the subcommittee he felt "intuitively" that inroads against organized crime have been made in the last six years.

Racketeers have been forced out of more profitable lines of activity such as bankruptcy frauds which were little known to law enforcement officials until about four years ago, he explained.

Vinson said crime has flourished because of gambling, which bankrolls its power and brings corruption; public apathy which is reflected in police work; the failure of state and local law agencies, and the inability of the federal government to "fill that void."

"The federal government can't police everywhere," he declared.

Vinson said there is some corruption at state levels, considerably more in local circles, including police, but none that he knows of in federal agencies.

The "tremendous significance" of gambling is that it bankrolls any purpose the racketeers have, Vinson said.

He gave $20 billion as "a safe, conservative estimate" of the annual amount spent on illegal gambling, including at least $6 billion gross profit. A substantial amount of this is squirreled away out of the nation, Vinson added.

When Fascell asked about investments in legitimate businesses, Vinson told him at least 25 were controlled by gangsters in one city investigated.

"They go heavy on services, like linen," he said, and are also known to have interests in security dealerships, dairies, trucking concerns and food wholesaling.

They operate nightclubs, taverns and restaurants in order to account for their money. Vinson said, and have increased their reported income by 60 per cent since a crackdown was made on income tax audits.

In a typical big-city investigation, the Justice Department works closely with the Internal Revenue Service, the FBI, the Labor Department, the Narcotics and Customs Bureau, and "selected" local officials, Vinson explained.

Fascell closely questioned Vinson and Henry Peterson, head of the department's organized crime section, about the source of central authority in such probes.

"It disturbs me because I can't see where the direction comes out of your office while gambling has tentacles all over the nation," said Fascell, who was interested in finding whether the Department of Justice or the FBI—or anyone—really called the over-all shots. He didn't get a direct answer.

Peterson said the federal investigators meet with local people in the target area and that policy decisions are made there.

Vinson testified that "a change in our police system is desperately needed" and lamented the fragmentation of the police network into more than 40,000 units with protection gaps and overlapping responsibilities.

"A small police force cannot be operated efficiently," he continued. "They have no resources for training and no retirement benefits to hold their people."

HO CHI MINH AND THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, Howard K. Smith, in a Sunday column, has given us a very good interpretation of the war in Vietnam, based upon a view of Ho Chi Minh and the springs that move him, as he puts it. In short, he states, Ho is both a Nationalist and the carrier of an illusion which if not dissipated can only lead to chaos and a big war.

Thus it is, Mr. President, that Mr. Smith concurs with the administration's argument that Ho Chi Minh and his Hanoi government must be resisted and denied sway over the entire countryside of Vietnam, the south included.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's column be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORRECTLY INTERPRETING AN AMBIGUOUS WAR

(By Howard K. Smith)

The new burst of argument over Vietnam, sprung by the speeches of Senator McGovern and Gen. Westmoreland, illustrates a sad point. The debate has turned into a dialogue of the deaf. Neither side is listening. Emotion has diverted argument down tangential and irrelevant paths.

To judge by the volume of comment, far the most important issue raised by the Westmoreland visit is—is it proper for a field general to come home and seek support? Despite press statements, the answer is that his action is solidly precedented. Both Gen. Washington and Gen. Gates often left the field to seek support in the Continental Congress.

As to the political tactic involved, it seems to me that if it is proper for thousands of demonstrators in the "Spring Mobilization" to give the world an impression of overwhelming opposition, then it is just as proper for the Administration to correct the impression by requiring Congress to stand up and be seen supporting the effort in Vietnam.

For their part, the critics now center their arguments on the assertion that the Administration is frustrating peace talks. All the substantial evidence seems against that assertion. But the point is at present inconsequential anyhow. As Max Frankel pointed out recently in the New York Times Magazine, in the present mood and condition of the combatants there is simply no basis for peace talks.

The heart of the issue, which both sides should be debating, is the genuinely ambiguous nature of this war. The point that really matters, for all else hangs on it, is—which side's interpretation of the ambiguity is right?

Perhaps the heart of the issue is Ho Chi Minh and the springs that move him.

Critics of present policy say that Ho is the only national leader of stature in either Vietnam—the George Washington of his country. Such is the force and quality of his cause that his small and primitive country can take all we can throw at them and still go on resisting fiercely.

It is wrong, critics conclude, to risk wider war with China or Russia in order to fight against a healthy nationalist cause.

The basic administration argument is that Ho is primarily not a Nationalist, but is the carrier of an intoxicating world ideology which promises him and his patrons general sway. If he is not halted there and now, his success will stimulate his side to more dangerous adventures, and will inspire every little rebel gang in every poor country to acquire its Cuban or Chinese adviser and begin its war of liberation against the majority.

Both these arguments are correct. Ho is a nationalist. But he is more importantly the carrier of an illusion which if not dissipated can only lead to chaos and a big war. In my opinion the Administration's argument is the overriding one.

Ambiguity of motives is not unique with Ho. Stalin was an ideologist devoted to world hegemony. But, to resist Hitler's hordes, Stalin found that the small fanatical cadres inspired by his ideology were not enough. He had to enlist the Russian masses. So, to court them, he dropped ideology and became a nationalist leader, changing his whole propaganda pitch and even his national anthem.

For awhile, after World War II, many people granted Stalin the benefit of doubts as he built a buffer of friendly neighbors to protect his oft-invaded nation. But soon it became clear that in appeasing the nationalist, they were stimulating the world conqueror.

Exactly the same may be said of Ho. If Ho's aim were limited to winning South Vietnam, President Johnson might have done what Eisenhower did when the Russians sought to re-occupy rebellious Hungary in 1956: he might have stood aside. But every fact of the year 1965 indicated that the aims of Ho and his Chinese patrons were unlimited. Attempts were launched by terrorist minorities that year to seize not only Vietnam but also Laos, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia and Burma.

To appease Ho, the George Washington of North Vietnam, we would have had to give Southeast Asia to Ho and Mao the insatiable conquerors. The President could not—and no President could—do that. The result is a painful, dirty, ambiguous conflict in which fears and emotions have swept debate into side issues of little consequence.

EXEMPTION OF $600 SAME AS 100 YEARS AGO

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Walter Trohan, chief of the Chicago Tribune's Washington bureau, has recently pointed out that the $600 individual income tax exemption, which I have proposed to increase to $1,000 in S. 1615, is today "not one cent more" than it was at the time of the very first Federal income tax in this country 105 years ago.

I noted when I introduced the bill that there has been no change in this individual exemption since 1947, and that it is decidedly outmoded and unrealistic in a day when the standard of living, on the most reasonable kind of basis, has left it far behind.

The $600 exemption, Mr. Trohan notes, was a part of the original income tax adopted for financing the Civil War, and it remained at $600 for the 10 years of the duration of that law until 1872. But by 1913, when the Federal income tax became a permanent part of our Federal financing, the allowance was $3,000 for single taxpayers and $4,000 for family men.

Mr. Trohan's analysis of the history of the allowance clearly shows that there is a case in equity for its increase today. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Chicago Tribune, Apr. 24, 1967]

THE $600 EXEMPTION IS TRACED TO CIVIL WAR

(By Walter Trohan)

WASHINGTON, April 23.—The more things change the more they remain the same is an aphorism that can be applied to nothing so well as to the personal income tax exemption. When the income tax was first adopted as a means of raising money in the north for financing the Civil war, the personal exemption was fixed at $600. It was the considered judgment of lawmakers that a person needed $600 to feed, clothe, and house himself for a year. It was possible to live on that amount with some comfort in those days.

Now, 105 years later, the personal exemption is not 1 cent more and no one in this country could support himself solely on such a sum except as a nature boy. Even a babe in arms would require more than $600 for maintenance.

There have been variations in the personal income allowance. The $600 allowance operated from 1862 to 1872, when the war financing tax was ended. When the income tax was revived—permanently, it is clear—in 1913 there was an allowance of $3,000 for single taxpayers and $4,000 for family men.

NO ALLOWANCE FOR DEPENDENTS

No allowance was provided for dependents, but in those days a single person could live most comfortably on $3,000, and $4,000 offered a most comfortable living for a family. These allowances were well above what is considered a poverty level today.

With America's entry into World War I, there was a heavy need for immediate money and the income tax came into its own. The allowance was cut to $1,000 for single taxpayers and $2,000 for a family, with a $200 allowance for additional dependents. This scale operated from 1917 to 1920.

From 1921 to 1925 the single allowance was $1,000 and the family allowance was $2,500. From 1925 to 1931 it was $1,500 and $3,500, and from 1932 to 1939 it was $1,000 and $2,500. The dependent allowance ranged from $350 to $400 in these years.

The coming of World War II and its need for money brought the exemptions down. They were $750 for single taxpayers and $1,500 for family taxpayers in 1941; $500 and $1,200 in 1942 and 1943; $500 and $1,000 from 1944 to 1947 and $600 per person since 1947. Thru this period dependent allowances ranged from $400, to $500, to $600.

CONGRESSMEN'S SALARIES TRIPLE

In the same period members of Congress tripled their salaries, but they let the bedrock exemption for taxpayers stand. Costs of food, clothing, and housing have soared as well, but the exemption level remains constant.

In 1938 there were 6 million taxpayers. The war brought tax withholding under which taxes are paid before they are actually due. By the end of the war the number of taxpayers jumped to 45 million. Last year the number was 68 million, and it is going up.

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IN INDIA

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I have just learned that Dr. Zakir Hussein has been elected the new President of India. In the past, some of us have attached greater importance and significance to the office of the Prime Minister of that country, as it is in that office all executive power vests under the Indian Constitution. This generalization is true today but there are several factors which confer on the presidential election an almost equal importance.

In the first place, in the countrywide general elections held in February this year, an electorate very nearly equal to the entire population of our country brought about a political revolution at the ballot box, by giving parties or a coalition of parties in opposition to the Indian National Congress, which had ruled India uninterruptedly for the past two decades, a chance to govern in nine out of 17 States.

On one hand this speaks volumes for the freedom and fairness with which the massive election machinery must have functioned and for the political discrimination of which the largely, and only formally, illiterate population is capable. On the other hand, the situation has posed unprecedented problems in Federal-State relations. The instinct for democracy that the Indians have shown—in contrast to the rising trends in that part of the world—coupled with the excellent understanding that Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister, has forged with her colleagues in the opposition in the common and overriding national interest will certainly insure a sense of continuing partnership and joint endeavor between the Federal and State Governments.

At the same time, let us not forget that the President of India, under that country's Constitution, has the crucial role of an impartial umpire whenever frictions may arise. Another compelling factor in this period of stress and growth is the need for continuity.

Dr. Zakir Hussein is eminently suited for both roles. He is a scholar and thinker, a man of gentle and persuasive manners, who had dedicated the greater part of his life to the cause of education. His contributions in the field of national education even from before India's independence have been widely recognized and emulated. He was the pace setter for an indigenous system of education rooted in Indian traditions and deriving strength from the best that other cultures had to offer even in days when slavish imitation of the British was much in fashion. He is a highly respected, and indeed, revered figure on the Indian scene, and has made numerous friends for his country in whatever countries he visited. He was recently in this country and his address on the freedom of the individual was most inspiring and also revealing of the deep impact on the Indian minds of the values that we ourselves have come to cherish. Dr. Hussein was the Vice President of India from 1962 and uniquely enjoyed the respect and support of all sections of the Indian Upper House over which, like our own Vice President, he used to preside.

Above all, his election is a striking vindication of the secular character of Indian policy. India is a nation of 450 million Hindus, 80 million Muslims, and 35 million Christians. The balance profess other religions. India is neighbor of Muslim Pakistan, which has openly declared herself to be an Islamic state and a country with sizable linguistic and ethnic minorities. India has affirmed her secular ideal by electing of her own free choice a Muslim and has demonstrated the equality of status of all her minorities.

I understand on reliable authority that this is only the culmination of a process that began with India's bill of rights enshrined in her Constitution, safeguarded by politicians and administrators all through the subsequent years, and zealously and even fiercely protected and insured to every citizen by the courts of the land.

I have no desire to give the appearance of intruding into India's internal politics but as informed observers we may take notice of the fact that Dr. Zakir Hussein was the candidate of the Indian National Congress which is the ruling party in New Delhi, and was particularly the choice of Prime Minister Indira Gandhi, who actively campaigned for him, despite misgivings in some quarters about Dr. Hussein's ability to win because of his faith and because of the mobilization of the combined strength of the opposition behind another candidate. Dr. Hussein's victory is a sign of confidence in Mrs. Gandhi's judgment and leadership.

HARVESTING THE WEALTH OF THE GREAT SALT LAKE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, for centuries the streams of Utah have been carrying minerals from the Wasatch Mountain Range and depositing them in the brine of Great Salt Lake. Since the Mormon pioneers arrived in the Great Valley in 1847, there has been some extraction of sodium chloride and other minerals from the lake for local use. Now for the first time, mining operations on a large scale are scheduled to begin to tap the multimillion-dollar mineral resources of Great Salt Lake.

Today in ceremonies at Ogden, Utah, the Great Salt Lake Mineral & Chemical Co. announced plans to construct a $7 million ponding project in the Bear River Basin area of the lake between Little Mountain and Promontory Point. This initial project is part of an estimated $24 million investment which will be made by this company to extract potassium sulphate, sodium sulphate, magnesium chloride, lithium, and other minerals from the ancient lakebed.

Construction of the ponding project will be done by the Gibbons & Reed Co. of Salt Lake and is expected to take approximately 2 years to complete. Production facilities for this company will be constructed at a later date on a site near Little Mountain, Utah. Several other companies, including the Dow Chemical Corp., have indicated an interest in constructing facilities to develop the mineral resources of the lake.

Utahans everywhere are thrilled to hear the good news today that this fine firm has decided to go ahead with its work on extracting the riches from the lakebed. This facility is expected to provide work for several hundred employees, and help to stabilize the work force in the Ogden area. Full development of the lake's resources will add considerable wealth to the Utah economic picture. This project, as well as other programs already underway, and those which will come along later to develop the lake, are greatly welcomed by the Beehive State. The economy of the Ogden area has depended too much on military installations and defense-oriented industry. This new development will give us a broader base on which to build our economy and plan for the future.

I am particularly interested in this Utah project because it shows how effective the free enterprise system can be in finding new solutions and jobs for workers. This is a venture which will be watched closely by many companies, because the Great Salt Lake Mineral & Chemical Co. is a subsidiary of the Lithium Corp. of America and Salzdetfurth, A. G., of Germany. The Lithium Corp. in turn is wholly owned by the Gulf Resources & Chemical Corp. I am very happy that these companies have found it prudent to invest some of their funds in the development of the mineral resources of the State of Utah.

VISTA VOLUNTEER ENLISTS AID OF COMMUNITY YOUTHS AND ADULTS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the recent success of the VISTA film, "A Year Towards Tomorrow," in capturing an Academy Award as the best documentary was due, for the most part, to the simplicity and beauty of its story—volunteer service to the community.

I am pleased to call to the attention of the Senate the work of one VISTA volunteer and his teenage assistants who have banded together in an effort to rescue a condemned building and convert it into a community center.

What is so impressive about this story, Mr. President, is that one VISTA volunteer has been able to infect a whole community with his spirit: the labor for this project is donated by the so-called "mini-janitors" and the Citizens Forum, Inc.; the building is a gift of the owner, Mr. Alvin Mordoh; the paint has been provided by Sears, Roebuck; the screens and windows are a gift of Arnold Insulation; and Tool Shed has loaned the project a wallpaper steamer.

To the North Street Community Center, the coordinating agency, and to Rev. James Miller and VISTA Volunteer Ronald Hemmelgarn, my heartiest congratulations on a job well done.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Lynn Dunson, which appeared in the Indianapolis Star, explaining how this "total community project" was started be printed at the appropriate place in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITY NEIGHBORS TRANSFORM CONDEMNED HOUSE INTO RECREATION CENTER FOR POOR YOUNGSTERS

(By Lynn Dunson)

A determined group of people are changing a trash-littered, condemned house at 524 East Miami Street into a recreation center for poor children on the near Eastside close to the downtown area.

Alvin M. Mordoh, 401 Rainbow Lane, donated the use of the house to the neighborhood.

More than 20 adults have offered help in the renovation. Both youngsters and grown-ups have worked to strip ripped wallpaper, knock out a wall and haul away trash, said Ronald L. Hemmelgarn, a Volunteer in Service to America (VISTA).

Hemmelgarn and the Rev. James E. Miller, pastor of the New York Street E.U.B. Church, are the stimulating forces behind this activity in an area more known for its incidence of alcoholism than for its driving community spirit.

Hemmelgarn is one of nine VISTA volunteers requested from the Federal government by Community Action Against Poverty Inc. (CAAP) to help solve problems of the poor in Indianapolis.

VISTA training and travel expenses to assignments are paid for by the Federal government. VISTA in the United States operates much the same as the Peace Corps abroad.

Hemmelgarn came to the neighborhood in February in an initial effort to organize the people into a group that could put pressure on landlords to make property improvements.

He found that he could not identify himself with CAAP. The predominantly white area inhabited by Appalachian migrants see CAAP as a program "for colored." He then gained the backing of Rev. Miller, who has been working with the people through his church for the last five years.

"Before Rev. Miller came here, the church was just a place to go on Sundays. But now the church has become more socially conscious and it sees that it has a role to play in every phase of the parishioners' lives," Hemmelgarn said.

Hemmelgarn tells how he spent weeks standing on corners talking to drunks, helping them to sober up, helping them to find jobs, talking them into giving Alcoholics Anonymous a try. This was his entrance into the neighborhood.

A spark of interest was kindled. The attempt to reach the landlords didn't work, but residents discovered they could do something for the children who played on a blacktopped basketball court gained through the efforts of the Rev. Mr. Miller.

But there are no supervised playgrounds or gymnasiums in the immediate neighborhood. The nearest park is between East Street and North New Jersey Street immediately north of School 2. It opened last summer.

The new center, to be called the Riley Community Center, is expected to draw youngsters from an area bounded by Ohio Street, East Street, Vermont Street and College Avenue.

Hemmelgarn describes renovation activities as a "total community project."

The North Street Community Center is coordinating volunteer efforts from several local churches and welfare agencies. Included among the agencies are St. Mary's Church, New York Street, E.U.B. Church, Catholics Charities and Highland-Tech Economic Opportunity office.

Paint has been donated by Sears Roebuck and Company. Arnold Insulation Corporation, 601 East Michigan, has promised screens and windows. Tool Shed, 3601 East New York Street, has loaned a wallpaper steamer.

And all the "dirty work" is done by neighborhood people. During the recent city cleanup campaign sponsored by Citizens Forum Inc., four truckloads of trash were hauled away from the neglected property.

Eventually the six-room house will be equipped with a pool table, ping-pong table, stove, washing machine and other equipment.

A rehabilitated alcoholic has volunteered to teach the children the finer points of pool. Parents and other neighbors have volunteered to supervise play activities.

The stove and washing machine can be used in home economic demonstrations, Hemmelgarn explained.

MAKING BETTER USE OF "OLDER" WORKERS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, two subcommittees of the Senate Special Committee on Aging have joined forces to study the problems faced by workers who, either by choice or because they must, make changes in their employment status when they are middle-aged or older.

Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Retirement Incomes, has long been interested in the development of greater employment opportunities for older Americans.

Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, chairman of the Subcommittee on Federal, State, and Community Services, is concerned about the nature and type of services available to so-called older workers, who—in the jargon of labor statisticians—are workers past 45 years of age.

Together, the Randolph and Kennedy subcommittees will conduct a broadbased study of questions that are affecting a growing number of Americans. As chairman of the committee I wish them well, and I am sure that their studies will lead to productive recommendations.

An editorial in the April 21 issue of the Los Angeles Times gives an excellent description of several of the questions to be considered by the two subcommittees. The editorial is worthy of widespread attention, and I ask that it be reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAKING BETTER USE OF "OLDER" WORKERS

"What happens to workers who, either by choice or because they must, make changes in their employment status when they are middle-aged or older?"

This key question has been posed by two subcommittees of the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging, having to do with employment and retirement incomes, and federal-state-community services.

It covers a tremendously broad field. But Sens. Jennings Randolph (D–W.Va.) and Edward M. Kennedy (D.–Mass.) are apparently ready to seek logical answers through logical means.

They will spend a full year on a joint study that will, hopefully, elicit some solutions to problems that concern all of us: how to make "appropriate work" available to such persons; how to effect closer coordination among agencies that provide jobs and services.

There are more than 56 million people in the United States aged 45 or older. By 1980 10 million more will join that age group.

The Johnson administration has introduced a bill to prohibit "arbitrary and unjust discrimination in employment" for workers past 45. But even this, if passed, won't resolve the fundamental dilemma of the older worker in an essentially young society.

Thus the Randolph-Kennedy task force intends to explore such matters as expected changes in technology and minimum retirement age which will affect employment patterns.

With 30% of the current unemployed roster made up of persons over 45, they ask, is the Manpower Development and Training Act being properly applied to this older category?

Can before-retirement programs more effectively equip workers for job changes in their later years?

Shouldn't educators, starting with grade school, help prepare men and women for such employment shifts?

"What more," ask the senators specifically, "can be done to give older workers a greater range of alternatives, including full-time employment, part-time employment, full-time retirement, or retirement with some opportunity for volunteer service?"

There are other issues. But these strike closest to the heart of the situation. This nation has a vast reservoir of ill-used, or unused talent, consisting of persons ready, able and willing to work. It shouldn't cost billions to evolve a program that will see that they aren't relegated to the economic junkheap.

But it will take considerable thought and dedication.

We wish the senators well.

THE HIGHER PATRIOTISM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, one of the most thoughtful and incisive statements I have yet seen on the relationship of public dissent to our Vietnam policy has come from a distinguished wartime commander, retired Gen. William Wallace Ford, of Amherst, Mass.

General Ford, who commanded American forces in World War I, World War II, and the Korean war, sets forth his views brilliantly in a letter to the New York Times, published on May 3, 1967.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter from this graduate of West Point and one of our most experienced former commanders, General Ford, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PATRIOTIC DISSENT

TO THE EDITOR:

General Westmoreland's statement that American fighting men in Vietnam have been "dismayed," and he likewise, by "recent unpatriotic acts here at home," deserves rejoinder.

Certainly the country is proud of General Westmoreland, and proud of the splendid forces which he commands. It does not follow that the country is obliged to send them, and itself, to destruction.

The case against escalation has been perfectly presented by Senator McGovern, and I shall not try to improve upon it.

The time has come, however, to strike down the implication that whoever does not follow blindly and uncomplainingly in the steady expansion of this war is somehow unpatriotic. Stalwart heroes of the Army and of West Point, who also learned well the motto "Duty, Honor, Country," have counseled against a land war in Asia. One thinks of MacArthur, of Ridgway, of Gavin. There are others.

DUTY TO SPEAK OUT

I volunteered in World War I and served every day in that war, every day in World II, and every day during the Korean War. If called, I am quite ready to serve again. This does not release me from the duty, nor deny me the right of trying to keep my country on a prudent and enlightened course.

I besought my newly elected Representative in 1964 to try to keep us from further involvement in Vietnam. I voted in 1964 for the Presidential candidate who opposed escalation of the conflict. I am still trying. I consider it the highest patriotism.

WILLIAM WALLACE FORD.

AMHERST, MASS., *April 27, 1967.*

KENNEDY ROUND URGED TO CONSIDER VARIABLE LEVIES ON DAIRY IMPORTS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, despite 4 long years of Kennedy round negotiations on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—it seems apparent now that the countries of the European Common Market are not going to offer any significant compromises on agricultural commodities.

Our team of negotiators went to Geneva under the authority of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to gain an assurance of access to the European Economic Community—EEC—and a modification of variable tariff levy system applied by EEC countries against our agricultural exports. Every indication we have received thus far from the negotiations points to the fact that the European countries are unwilling to compromise on either of these items.

Although we have actually acquired a much larger share of European markets according to recent trading trends, reports now state that the Common Market nations will only guarantee us access to 10 or 11 percent of their grain market. They have now proposed, not only to limit U.S. imports in grains, but to increase the limit of their own production for their own market with a growth factor clearly favoring their own producers. Although we do not favor the implications of this action, we must acknowledge that the EEC is demonstrating a commendable concern for its own agricultural producers.

In the trading which went on in the EEC between France and West Germany, West Germany lowered her support prices for wheat from $3.21 per bushel to the common EEC support level of $2.89 per bushel as her concession to obtain tariff-free access to the Community for her industrial production, her major concern.

This not only protected French agriculture, but it increased the support level of wheat to French farmers by 13 cents per bushel. Although the reduction of the support to German farmers was substantial, their prices are still far above world market prices.

In the United States we have done the same for our domestically consumed wheat, and by a combination of free markets and certificates, have priced our domestically consumed wheat at parity.

The 45 percent of the 1966 wheat crop is the only part of our agricultural production guaranteed a parity return by law. The rest goes out onto the market at the best price we can receive as a result of a combination of market need and international agreements. The International Wheat Agreement expires on June 30, 1967, the same day the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 expires.

The IWA talks have become a part of the overall negotiations of the Kennedy round. They must be ratified by the Senate, since they are separate from the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade for which the Trade Expansion Act was designed.

Since it is apparent that this week is a crucial one to the Kennedy round, the Senate should begin to turn its attention to the possibilities which may be laid before it, and with little time for consideration.

It is quite evident that the Senate will soon be asked to approve a trade treaty on grain that will simply perpetuate the present protectionistic policies of the European countries.

Before we act on such a proposal, we should receive assurances from our team of negotiators that they will press for concessions that will benefit certain European farmers. If the only agreement that the Europeans will accept on grains is one that falls short of our stated objectives of expanding U.S. agricultural exports, then we should give deep consideration to the concept of insulating our own farmers from the subsidized imports originating in those very countries that are working to protect their own agricultural interests.

The agricultural income objectives of the EEC are commendable. Their acceptance by the citizens of the member countries indicates that declining agricultural prices need not be the only basis for stabilizing the cost of living as the President's Council of Economic Advisers seems to advocate.

If we are to play in the same ball game with the farmers of France and the rest of Europe, why do we not play by the same rules? Is it incumbent upon us to become so emotionally opposed to the principle of variable levies to protect domestic agriculture that we permit our negotiators to fail to bargain for our farmers, once it is evident that we have lost the variable levy argument to the EEC?

We have long protected the U.S. chemical industry by the American selling price—a variable levy. Perhaps it should be modified and that is why it has been the subject of the negotiations at Geneva.

A case in reverse is milk. Last year, dairy imports into the United States totaled 2.7 billion pounds milk equivalent, competing against one of the most distressed segments of our agricultural economy.

Most of these imports were subsidized. In the case of New Zealand, where she is always desperate for dollars to support her economy and her important military commitment as our partner in SEATO, this is understandable.

The situation in Europe is something else. Largely due to the Marshall plan, Western Europe has had a most remarkable recovery from a devastating war. Their economies are booming, and their populace are enjoying rapidly increasing standards of living. This is good and we rejoice at the increasing stability of this important economic and political area.

One of the first increased demands in such a situation is for the upgrading of the diet, with larger amounts of meat being consumed. And therein hangs the tale.

In the United States, increases in beef production are frequently at the expense of dairy production. Not so in Europe. An economic rule of thumb in Europe is that when the price of beef exceeds seven times the price of butterfat, milk as well as beef production goes up.

This is because the Europeans have developed a dual-purpose cow which is good for only one lactation period. During this time, their production ranks with the best of American dairy animals.

However, most of these cows cannot be bred a second time, but this is no loss. Since the Europeans prefer a more mature and leaner beef than the Americans, these large cows—now 3 years old, against ours which we market at about 15 months—produce exactly what the market requires. Thus, the increase in beef has led to a very serious oversupply of butterfat.

This surplus butterfat is processed in various forms, such as Colby cheese and certain butterfat-sugar mixtures, to evade the present U.S. import quotas. These have been imported into the United States with as much as a 43-cent-per-pound subsidy, paid from same variable levy funds collected against U.S. agricultural imports into the EEC.

Our dairy farmers have been trying to cut production and establish a better balance between supply and demand in the American market. Last year they reduced production by some 4 billion pounds only to have the U.S. market drastically undercut when foreign countries flooded the United States with their own dairy surpluses through subsidized dumping.

The importation of sweetened cream, evading both our import controls over butterfat and sugar, has completely disrupted our domestic market for milk and cream used in the manufacture of ice cream. The various forms of cheese containing less than 44 percent butterfat has had a similar adverse effect on our cheese market for U.S. milk.

The U.S. dairy processors held their supplies for several months, hoping for a recovery of the market. When it was apparent that this was not to come soon, and when the EEC salesmen were selling substantial quantities for storage against the day when the United States would get its house in order, the U.S. processors unloaded $104 million on the CCC in January and February of 1967. Since that time they have sold an additional $46 million to the CCC through April, and have contracted for an additional $50 million through June for $200 million total in 6 months.

Two courses of action have been proposed to stem this flow of subsidized dumping into the United States. I have joined Senator PROXMIRE and more than 50 other Senators in introducing the Dairy Import Act, and, at long last, hearings on this bill are scheduled in the Senate starting May 16.

In March, Secretary Freeman sent a recommendation to President Johnson that this import problem be referred to the Tariff Commission for study as a prelude to taking action under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, which permits quotas when domestic support programs are threatened. The President acted on this suggestion and hearings are scheduled for May 15. The milk support program is threatened as is the USDA budget, because $200 million needed to cover support purchases was not in the budget for the last 6 months of this fiscal year, nor was $400 million budgeted for the 1968 fiscal year for this purpose, and it might be necessary under present conditions.

The United States is now faced with the possibility of support quotas being established which will probably be higher than our domestic needs. This is not an acceptable solution to the U.S. dairymen, or is it consistent with our overall trade objectives of reducing or removing quotas.

Another alternative is the redefinition by law as proposed by the Dairy Import Act. This would in effect establish quotas on a different basis, but this still permits subsidized dumping by exporting countries.

Therefore, one logical alternative left is to abandon the quota system for those countries who refuse the United States access to their markets and who protect their farmers and their support programs by variable levies.

I urge our negotiators to propose a system of variable tariff levies on foreign dairy imports as a final attempt to salvage some measure of justice for the American farmer.

Such a variable levy system of tariffs would eliminate price competition between domestic and foreign dairy products. I have continually cited the price-depressing effect that low-priced foreign imports, heavily subsidized by exporting countries, have on the American dairy market.

The variable-levy system bases tariff duties on the domestic selling price rather than on the import price which is used to normally calculate duties. The dockside selling price for foreign items would be increased through the variable levy until it equalled the comparative U.S. price support for that specific dairy product.

Thus, the buyer in the United States would be paying the same price for either foreign and domestic dairy products. This would end the disastrous foreign undercutting of American market prices that has threatened the very existence of the family dairy farm in our country.

With a tariff levy that increases even the lowest foreign price to a sum equal to minimum market prices in this country, our dairy farmers will have some degree of insulation against the subsidized dumping that has characterized so much of dairy importing in recent years.

If this is the only way to protect EEC markets from U.S. price competition in wheat, and perhaps it is, then let us apply the same principle to U.S. dairy imports from the EEC.

The administration of President Johnson under the able Secretary of Agriculture, the Honorable Orville L. Freeman, has done a remarkable job of increasing U.S. agricultural exports. Last year they grossed for the United States in gold $2.5 billion, our largest dollar earner. We did this despite the elimination of price competition in most of Europe.

The United States has no desire to break world agricultural prices in any commodity. We should not let another country or association of countries do that to us either, especially when the product, as in the case of milk, is an unexpected and unneeded bonanza resulting from the demand for another product. With the EEC in this case, it is beef production.

If the EEC has a surplus of milk that it is willing to dump on world markets, let it do as the United States did with its surplus. We gave it to the needy at home and abroad. We did not use our surplus to break world prices in any commodity. We should not permit the EEC to do this, using their surplus to break our hard-pressed domestic market for milk and dairy products.

I propose that many of the Members of the Senate who represent dairy States inform our very able Ambassador to Geneva, the Honorable William Roth, and his able team, that an International Wheat Agreement which simply continues the present system as administered by the EEC will have tough sledding in the Senate unless they also apply this same system to U.S. dairy products.

ASCS ADMINISTRATOR HORACE D. GODFREY RECEIVES CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE AWARD

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, an award made recently by the National Civil Service League is a source of great satisfaction to me, and I should like to call it to the attention of the Senate.

My personal feelings about the announcement arise, first of all, from my dedication to the objectives fostered by the league—the aims of efficiency and competence and quality in government, Federal, State, and local.

Beyond that, I am delighted that one of my constituents, Mr. Horace D. Godfrey, has been recognized by the league as an example of the best in the career service. The president of the league, Mr. Mortimer M. Caplin, calls the 1967 award winners "as splendid a demonstration of the quality, dedication, and excellence of the career service as ever has been assembled."

Horace Godfrey, as most or all Senators know, is Administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service and Executive Vice President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. He has held these positions since 1961, the period in which the farm programs he administers have helped bring farm income up several billions of dollars a year to new record levels while wiping out tremendous, costly grain surpluses and reducing other farm commodity surpluses.

The measured workload of his agency has gone up more than a third during his administration, but the manpower used has gone down by 1,842 man-years from 1960 to 1966.

Mr. Godfrey has devoted his entire career to the Federal farm programs, having started as a comptometer operator for the AAA back in 1934 and working his way up to positions of increasing responsibility.

He is a native of Waxhaw, N.C., and lived in the State all of his life, except for a period of military service during World War II, until he came to Washington in 1961.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman, has publicly congratulated Horace Godfrey upon his selection for the career service award.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD both the news release issued by the National Civil Service League and the Department of Agriculture release that carries the Secretary's statement.

And to the congratulations of Secretary Freeman to Horace Godfrey, I add my own sincere and enthusiastic congratulations.

There being no objection, the releases were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE NAMES TEN FEDERAL CAREER SERVICE AWARDS WINNERS

Ten career civil servants from as many Federal agencies have been selected for the Thirteenth Annual Career Service Awards of the National Civil Service League. The Awards are given for significant contributions to excellence in government.

The Awardees were announced yesterday at a reception at the Brookings Institution for the award winners and top-level representatives of their agencies which range the spectrum of Federal services from Social Security to Foreign Aid. Mortimer M. Caplin, President of the 85-year-old citizens' organization, announced the selections.

The ten outstanding Federal Civil Servants will be formally honored and presented with their awards at the National Civil Service League's annual recognition banquet scheduled for the evening of April 21st at the Sheraton-Park Hotel. More than 1500 persons from business, the government, and the Civil Service are expected to attend.

Chosen for the 1967 awards were:

Philip N. Brownstein, Assistant Secretary for Mortgage Credit and Federal Housing Commissioner, Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Department of Agriculture.

Arthur E. Hess, Director, Bureau of Health Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Donald G. MacDonald, Director, U.S. Aid Mission to Vietnam, Agency for International Development.

William H. Smith, Deputy Commissioner, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury.

O. Glenn Stahl, Director, Bureau of Policies and Standards, U.S. Civil Service Commission.

David D. Thomas, Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency.

Floyd A. Verne Thompson, Director, Langley Research Center, National Aeronautics & Space Administration.

Barbara McClure White, Associate Director, U.S. Information Agency.

Marjorie J. Williams, M.D., Director Pathology and Allied Sciences Service, Veterans Administration.

Caplin called the group "as splendid a demonstration of the quality, dedication, and excellence of the Career Service as ever has been assembled. In choosing the 1967 Award Winners from among dozens of nominees, we of the National Civil Service League have been greatly impressed by the level of responsibility as well as the level of competence which more and more Federal Careerists are achieving from year to year."

The National Civil Service League is a nonpartisan, nonprofit organization founded in 1881 to promote efficiency in Federal, state, and local government. Supported entirely by individual corporate and foundation contributions, the league regards its Annual Career Service Awards Program as a major contribution toward promoting public appreciation of quality in government and stimulating able, young people to choose careers in the service of local, state, or Federal agencies.

Each of the ten Award winners will receive $1,000 in cash through the generosity of the Sloan Foundation, a gold watch from the Hamilton Watch Company, and a framed certificate citing their significant contribution to excellence in government.

SECRETARY FREEMAN CONGRATULATES ASCS ADMINISTRATOR GODFREY ON CIVIL SERVICE LEAGUE AWARD

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today congratulated Horace D. Godfrey, Administrator of the USDA's Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, on his selection by the National Civil Service League to receive its Career Service Award. The League announced the selection today.

Mr. Godfrey will be honored at an awards banquet at Washington's Sheraton-Park Hotel, Friday, April 21, along with 9 other public servants.

"In his job as Administrator," commented Secretary Freeman today, "Horace Godfrey has accomplished goals that could only have been reached by a man with his unique combination of long-time career service plus extraordinary leadership and administrative ability.

"Under this leadership, ASCS has taken on new programs, growing out of major new legislation in each of 5 straight years. He has done this with a reduction in manpower and administrative costs. The new programs that ASCS has initiated under Mr. Godfrey in the past 6 years have revived farm income, eliminated wasteful oversupplies, and resulted in large savings to the Government. These programs, plus expanded exports, have brought farmers to a supply balance that permits us now to look toward expanded production of some crops. This is truly a 'new era' in agriculture.

"I congratulate Administrator Godfrey, and am delighted that this award is to be made to a man who has done so much to help create a brighter future for the farmers and consumers of America."

Mr. Godfrey, a native of Waxhaw, N.C., and chief, ASCS administrative officer in that State for 12 years before taking his present post in 1961, is a veteran of almost 33 years service in ASCS and predecessor agencies.

EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT SPENDING AND INCREASED TAXES

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, it is refreshing to read an editorial which points out some of the problems we are having with excessive Government spending and increased taxes. It is even more refreshing to see these problems treated in a most informative and readable manner.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an editorial published in the Fruita, Colo., Times; and the Pueblo, Colo., Chieftain.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fruita (Colo.) Times, April 13, 1967]

OF CABBAGES AND KINGS

"The time has come," the Walrus said,
to talk of many things:
Of shoes—and ships—and sealing wax.

(By M. W. B.)

The following editorial was printed in the Pueblo Chieftain and is very descriptive of our many tax pains. It will probably be read and put off as just another editorial. What I'd like to see is a publication of this editorial in every paper in the nation and a copy sent to our legislators. What in heavens name happened to the "Men" who when taxed to death, screamed—"taxation without representation is tyranny." What sort of representation is it that allows us to be taxed to death. Is this an editorial just to read and shrug off with a "what the hell" attitude. This is not a political argument, nor an election issue—it's you and I, John Public that is paying through the nose, whether you're Republican or Democrat, 40 percent of all you own is being confiscated by the government in the name of democracy . . . to what purpose . . . well . . . how much did you put in the bank this year? How much did you give for taxes—city—county—state and national—?

If we still have freedom of speech, press, let's use it, before they tax that too! Mail this paper into the representatives from your area, write your protest in your local paper, let's let them know we're watching and we don't like what we see.

FROM THE PUEBLO CHIEFTAIN, APRIL 5, 1967

Those who are businessmen are also tax collectors. We're the bad guys who take a piece of our employees' paychecks and deliver it to Washington, at our expense. If we're pretty clever with words, but pretty awful with figures, never mind. We're expected to hire a figure filbert, an accountant, to do the figuring for us. At our expense. He will figure for us what we're obligated to collect from each employee, match it to the last penny, and deliver it whenever Washington directs.

Words we understand. And being aware that we're part-time tax collectors we had a rather wide-eyed reading of the President's budget measure regarding the tax take.

Social security expenses in that budget call for a $425 million tax increase in just one year. There are a lot of people in this country, and we really couldn't translate that into terms relating to our little business until the accountant appeared with his "book." He made a trajectory of the figures, too, so that we could see what we should plan for, because we prefer to have our employees be able to provide themselves with at least food, clothing and shelter.

Just to pay for the presently scheduled benefits, the tax on the first $6,000 of income will rise to nearly 10 percent in 1969; and to nearly 11 percent in 1973. It's our intent to be in business at this time in 1969. That's only two years away. But 10 percent rocked us. One-half of the employee paycheck and we match it.

Back in 1936, John Winant, a one-time governor of New Hampshire and the first administrator of Social Security assured an audience in Washington to hear him explain the wonders of this new bonanza that the government's take-in establishing the system "won't go much higher." Want to know what it was the night Mr. Winant spoke? "One per cent!" Now they want to raise the first $6,000 to $7,800 and also raise the percentage of tax.

In 1963, a dollar would buy 10 loaves of bread. Simple arithmetic we can do, and we know that across the country average prices are such that a dollar buys about four loaves of bread today.

Maybe you'd like to do a bit of arithmetic yourself. Project your own reasonable schedule of working years. Ignore the inflationary forces at work. Just reckon the "inflation" we have experienced since 1936. And estimate how many loaves of bread a dollar will buy when you retire and start drawing social security benefits.

And something else: the government doesn't have a thin dime of what we've all paid in. The year you retire, as every other year, they'll have to make small businessmen collect more money to pay the tab.

What worries present day moms and dads, and businessmen, is how the future generations will be able to make the payments.

FIFTH INFANTRY DIVISION, FORT CARSON, COLO., HELPS A FRIEND

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, our young men are fighting today in Southeast Asia just as they fought on the battlefields of World War II, in the defense of freedom. Many of these young soldiers were not yet born at the time of World War II but still have acquired that most admirable trait of all American fighting men: they never forget a friend.

Army trainees at Fort Carson, Colo., have taken the initiative to help an 82-year-old Italian man who saved countless American and Allied lives during the Italian campaign. I commend these soldiers and believe their story should be told to the public.

I ask unanimous consent that a news article from the 5th Infantry Division, Mechanized, at Fort Carson, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT CARSON, COLO.—American soldiers, known the world over as hard fighters with a soft spot for the aged, the very young, the sick and the crippled, proved this point again at Fort Carson.

Lt. Col. Alvin O'Neal, commander, 3d Battalion, 77th Armor, 5th Infantry Division (Mech.), was reading the Army Times last Friday when he came upon the article about Count D. S. Salazar, who saved hundreds of American and Allied lives during the World War II Italian campaign. The count is known to have spent $1,400, a fortune in those days, aiding Americans and other Allied troops who had escaped from Italian prison camps. Now 82 years old, he is sick and destitute, living in an attic in a Naples slum.

Colonel O'Neal, who as an 18-year-old tanker went through Naples during the campaign, called in Sgt. Maj. Roland H. Bell, suggesting that the battalion help the count and show him that soldiers do not forget a friend.

Bell gathered his first sergeants, told them the story, and the campaign was on.

Soon the battalion had money and pledges totalling better than $800, despite the pinch of being between pay days. Privates not yet born when the count was helping the Allies emptied their pockets of change.

The 2d Battalion, 10th Infantry; B Company of the 2d Battalion, 11th Infantry; and Headquarters Company of the 3d Brigade pitched in with $133.

Capt. A. C. Trifiletti, commander, B Company of the 3/77th, all of whose grandparents are from Italy, agreed to take leave and deliver the money to Count Salazar in Naples. He left Fort Carson today with $1,000.

Sgt. Maj. Bell hopes that his battalion and other interested personnel can raise enough to pay back the $1,400 the count spent, and possibly a little more. Any money collected after Captain Trifiletti departs will be forwarded.

DEFERMENTS UNDER THE DRAFT LAW

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I invite the Senate's attention to the report filed on Thursday, May 4, by the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] regarding S. 1432, amending and extending the draft law.

I invite attention particularly to the language included by the committee under the heading "Student Deferments," beginning at the bottom of page 6 and continuing at the top of page 7.

Recognizing that the President has announced his intention to issue an Executive order specifying that no deferments for postgraduate study will be granted in the future, except for persons in medical or dental schools, the committee provided in the bill all needed authority to extend postgraduate deferments to other fields. Therefore, I suggest that the President should make it clear at the time he issues the Executive order that at any time a critical need can be foreseen for any specialty requiring an advanced degree, he will act quickly to extend student deferments to those specialties just as he already has authority to extend deferments to those already trained in that specialty.

It was apparent to the committee that the President might well want to do this, and we included in the report the language that the "committee recognizes that the President may find it necessary to extend postgraduate deferments to fields other than medicine or dentistry."

It seems to me important that this language receive the proper attention in implementing the provisions of the draft law in the future.

STATUS OF FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD a summary of the current status of the free world assistance to Vietnam.

Let it be noted that 31 nations have assisted South Vietnam under this program. Six other nations and the United Nations have assisted in South Vietnam, but not under the free world assistance program.

That makes a total of 37 nations and the United Nations who are helping.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE TO VIETNAM AS OF APRIL 1, 1967: FREE WORLD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Thirty-one nations have assisted Viet-Nam under the Free World Assistance Program. Several others have offered help. The contributions of six other countries and of the UN are listed at the end of this paper. A detailed listing by geographic area follows:

FAR EAST

Australia

Australia is providing a wide and substantial range of aid to Viet-Nam under the Colombo Plan and by direct bilateral assistance.

Military aid consists of:

1. Approximately 6,300 combat troops including a brigade and support, a guided missile destroyer, and a squadron of 8 Canberra bombers.
2. 100 combat advisors (primarily specialists in jungle warfare).
3. A 73-man air force unit at Vung Tau with six Australian caribou planes which fly daily logistical transport missions in support of Vietnamese military forces.

Economic and technical assistance has totalled nearly $10 million including:

1. Three surgical teams, totalling 37 personnel, in 3 provincial hospitals. These teams, in addition to performing major operations, have established a blood bank and are giving lessons in nursing.
2. A group of civil engineers working on water supply and road construction projects.
3. Three experts in dairy and crop practices and radio techniques.
4. Training of 130 Vietnamese in Australia.
5. In goods and materials: 1,250,000 textbooks in Vietnamese for rural schools; 3,300 tons of corrugated roofing for Vietnamese military dependents' housing; 6 large community windmills; 15,750 sets of hand tools; 400 radio sets and 2,400 loud-speakers, 16,000 blankets and 14,000 cases of condensed milk.
6. A 55 kilowatt broadcasting station at Ban Me Thout.

The Australian Government decided on February 1 to increase its non-military aid to Viet-Nam during FY 1967 to $2 million dollars. This will permit substantial enlargement of current medical and civic action programs and the undertaking of new projects such as providing equipment for refugee resettlement centers.

Republic of China

The Republic of China has provided:

1. An 80-man agricultural team.
2. An 18-man military psychological warfare team.
3. A 12-man electrical power mission under the leadership of Taipower.
4. A 10-man surgical team.

China has also provided training for more than 200 Vietnamese in Taiwan. In the way of goods and materials, they have provided 26 aluminum prefabricated warehouses, agricultural tools, seeds and fertilizers, 500,000 copies of mathematics textbooks and an electrical power substation.

Japan

Japan has provided over $55 million worth of economic assistance to Viet-Nam, chiefly through reparations. Japan has sent two medical teams, considerable amounts of medical goods (4,544 cases), 20,000 transistor radios and 25 ambulances. It has provided technical personnel and funds for and construction of a large power dam across the Da Nhim River and electrical transmission line and agreed to participate in the construction of a bridge over the Mekong River near Vinh Long.

Korea

Korea has sent approximately 45,000 troops including:

1. 2 combat divisions.
2. A 130-man Mobile Army Surgical Hospital (MASH).
3. 10 military instructors in Korean karate for training Vietnamese military in hand-to-hand combat.
4. A 2,200-man Task Force Unit composed of the following elements: 1 Army engineer battalion, 1 Headquarters group, 1 Army Transportation company, 1 Marine Corps Engineer company, 1 Infantry battalion, 1 LST and 2 LSMs, 1 Composite Support unit (communications, medical supplies, etc.)

Korean military medical personnel are providing some medical care to the local population in areas where ROK troops are stationed. In addition, 7 civilian medical teams totalling 118 doctors, nurses and support personnel are working in provincial health programs.

Laos

One million *kip* ($4,167) for flood relief in February 1965.

Malaysia

Since 1962, Malaysia has trained about 2,000 Vietnamese military and police officers. Groups of 30–60 are regularly sent for about a month's training in counterinsurgency with Malaysian Police Special Constabulary. Malaysia has previously provided substantial amounts of counterinsurgency materials, primarily military and police transport such as armored vehicles.

New Zealand

New Zealand has sent a 6-howitzer artillery battery of approximately 125 men and provided a 25-man army engineer detachment. On March 8 the New Zealand Government announced it will increase its forces to Viet-Nam to 360 men by addition of an infantry company and supporting elements.

In *non-military aid*, New Zealand has sent an 8-man surgical team, and a professor in English language for the University of Saigon. A second 16-man medical team will be sent shortly to Binh Dinh province. They are presently training 62 Vietnamese in New Zealand and have provided 7,500£ ($21,000) for equipment for a technical high school. They are also assisting by providing approximately $600,000 for a science building at the University of Saigon.

Philippines

The Philippine Government has sent a 2,000-man military engineering unit with security support personnel, a station hospital, and rural health and civic action teams.

In *non-military aid*, approximately 60 Philippine civic action personnel including military and civilian medical teams have been workng in Viet-Nam for several years.

Thailand

The Thai Government announced on January 3 that it would send a ground force combat unit to Viet-Nam. It is expected that this will total 2,000-2,500 men. A 200-man Thai naval group manning an LST and PGM patrol craft arrived in Viet-Nam in December 1966. A 35-man air force contingent has been flying operational transport missions for the Vietnamese forces. The Thais have also been providing jet training for Vietnamese pilots in Thailand.

In *non-military aid*, the Thais have provided rice for refugees and cement and zinc roofing materials. At the Manila Conference, the Thais offered the Vietnamese a $20 million rice credit. The Thais have also announced they will send a medical unit to Viet-Nam.

MIDDLE EAST

Greece

Greece has contributed $15,000 worth of medical supplies.

Iran

Iran has contributed 1,000 tons of petroleum products to Viet-Nam and has dispatched a 20-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

Turkey

Turkey has provided medicines and also offered to provide a substantial amount of cement.

EUROPE

Austria

Austria has offered to supply medical supplies, blankets, tents, through the Austrian Red Cross.

Belgium

Belgium has provided medicines and an ambulance and has given scholarships for 9 Vietnamese to study in Belgium.

Denmark

Denmark has provided medical supplies and is training Vietnamese nurses in Denmark.

Germany

Personnel in Viet-Nam: Seven Germans, a director and six instructors, are teaching at the new Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc near Saigon. At Hue University there are five Germans: three physicians in the Medical School, a professor of music, a professor of German language, and one expert in forestry is working at the Department of Rural Affairs, Saigon.

A 30,000-ton hospital ship, the "Helgoland" with 8 doctors, 30 other medical personnel and 145 beds is on duty in Viet-Nam.

Vietnamese in Germany: Forty Vietnamese are studying in Germany and the Germans have agreed to accept 30 more primarily for training as future instructors in the technical high school. A considerable number have previously been trained.

Goods and Materials

The Germans have provided the following credits:

1. DM 15 million ($3.75 million) for import of German products such as machine tools, fertilizer, etc. The piastre funds generated go to the National Office of Agricultural Credit to aid farmers, particularly with loans;
2. a credit of DM 50 million ($12.5 million) for development of the major industrial complex at An Hoan-Nong Son;
3. a credit for DM 20 million ($5 million) for construction of an abattoir at Saigon-Cholon, and three coastal vessels;
4. a credit of DM 500,000 ($125,000) for equipment at the Vietnamese-German Technical High School at Thu Duc.

In April 1966, the Germans announced a gift of DM 17.5 million ($4.4 million) worth of pharmaceuticals, the first shipments of which have arrived. Also in the medical field, they have provided two mobile dental clinics and 30 ambulances for the Ministry of Health.

On June 29, the Cabinet voted DM 25 million (US $6.25 million) for new aid to Viet-Nam including: 1) sending 25 experts to establish a refugee center; 2) building a home for wayward youths; 3) expansion of 8 social centers and construction of a ninth; 4) establishment of a training center for social workers; and 5) the gift of 100 buses and a maintenance and repair facility in Saigon. The Germans have also donated 260 tons of rice for refugee relief programs.

Italy

The Italians have provided a 10-man surgical team and have offered science scholarships to 10 Vietnamese to study in Italy.

Luxembourg

Luxembourg has provided plasma and blood transfusion equipment.

The Netherlands

The Dutch have undertaken to build 5 tuberculosis centers in Saigon; sites for 3 have been selected. In August, the Netherlands announced a contribution of $355,000 for a 4-year UN project in social welfare, part of the $1 million they have earmarked for UN projects in Viet-Nam. In 1964, the Dutch gave antibiotics and 4 scholarships for Vietnamese. They previously provided a dredge.

Spain

Spain has provided 800 pounds of medicines, medical equipment and blankets and has sent a 12-man medical team to Viet-Nam.

United Kingdom

The United Kingdom has provided six civilians for the British Advisory Mission and a Professor of English at Hue University. Twenty-one Vietnamese are receiving training in the United Kingdom. A pediatric team of four British doctors and six nurses went to Viet-Nam in August, 1966.

In 1963–64, the United Kingdom provided the following goods and materials: Laboratory equipment for Saigon University; a typesetting machine for the Government Printing Office, a cobalt deep-ray therapy unit for the National Cancer Institute; various equipment for the faculties of Medicine, Science and Pharmacy at Saigon University, the Meteorological Service and the Agricultural School at Saigon, and Atomic Research Establishment at Dalat and the Faculty of Education at Hue. In 1965–66, British economic aid totalled £81,000 ($226,800) for roadbuilding equipment, diesel fishing boat engines, and portable anesthetic machines.

LATIN AMERICA

Argentina

Argentina has contributed 5,000 tons of wheat.

Brazil

Brazil has sent a substantial quantity of medical supplies which was carried to Viet-Nam by a Brazilian Air Force plane and has also provided coffee.

Costa Rica

Costa Rica has contributed an ambulance for use in Viet-Nam.

Dominican Republic

Cement has been offered by the Dominican Republic for use in Viet-Nam.

Ecuador

Ecuador has sent medical supplies to Viet-Nam.

Guatemala

Guatemala has sent 15,000 doses of typhoid-paratyphoid serum for use in Viet-Nam.

Honduras

Honduras has contributed drugs and dry goods for refugees in Viet-Nam, flown there on a Honduras Air Force plane.

Uruguay

Uruguay has contributed $21,500 for relief supplies and medicines for Viet-Nam.

Venezuela

Venezuela has provided 500 tons of rice for refugee relief, and two civilian doctors are working in Viet-Nam.

AFRICA

Liberia

A contribution of $50,000 has been made by Liberia for the purchase of hospital equipment and other medical supplies for Viet-Nam.

Tunisia

Recently Tunisia has made available a number of scholarships for Vietnamese.

NORTH AMERICA

Canada

Almost $6 million of development assistance to Viet-Nam has been provided by Canada.

1. Personnel in Viet-Nam: A Canadian Supervisor has been at Quang Ngai supervising construction of a small TB Clinic which the Canadians are funding. The Canadians have sent two doctors and four nurses to staff the clinic. A professor of orthopedics is working at Cho Ray Hospital, Saigon, and there is a Canadian teacher at the University of Hue.

2. Vietnamese in Canada: 380 Colombo Plan trainees and a total of 463 trainees under all programs, including those sponsored by other agencies and third countries (as well as Colombo Plan), have been trained in Canada. There are currently 231 Vietnamese students in Canada.

3. Since 1958, Canada has provided $850,000 worth of food aid for Viet-Nam. Funds generated by sales are used for capital construction projects in Viet-Nam.

4. A new science building for the medical faculty at the University of Hue is being built costing about $333,000, drawn from counterpart funds generated by sales of food supplied by Canada. Construction has passed the half-way mark.

5. The Canadians have also agreed to construct an auditorium for the Faculty of Sciences at Hue University which will cost about $125,000.

6. Canada has increased its aid to South Viet-Nam allocating $1 million for medical assistance this fiscal year including providing ten 200-bed emergency hospital units. The first two units have arrived and have been installed at Phan Tiet and at Phu Tho near Saigon. A Canadian doctor and technician visited Viet-Nam in the fall to inspect potential sites. Canada has sent 650,000 doses of polio vaccine for Vietnamese school children and offered additional vaccines against polio, TB and smallpox. Consideration is being given to establishment of a children's rehabilitation center in Viet-Nam.

7. Canada is printing half a million copies of a social sciences textbook for Vietnamese grade school children.

OTHER ASSISTANCE

Six other nations whose help does not fall under the Free World Assistance Program have provided valuable assistance to Viet-Nam in economic and humanitarian fields.

France

Since 1956, France has contributed about $111 million in assistance to South Viet-Nam.

France has nearly 500 persons serving in South Viet-Nam. Among them are 65 experts under France's program of economic and technical assistance, including 32 physicians, professors and other medical personnel. Under its cultural programs, 471 professors (350 French and 121 Vietnamese) are teaching at 9 French-teaching institutions, and 30 French professors are at Vietnamese institutions. France provided in 1965 for Vietnamese to study in France, 55 fellowships for technical training, and 85 academic fellowships.

France has provided low-interest credits of 100 million francs (20 million dollars) for financing imports of French equipment for Vietnamese industry, a grant of 500,000 francs ($100,000) for equipment for L'Ecole Nationale d'Ingenieurs des Arts Industriels.

In 1960 France extended a low-interest credit of $70 million francs ($14 million) to aid construction of the major coal and chemical complex at An Hoa-Nong Son south of Da Nang which is well underway. It also provides a low-interest, five-year credit of 60 million francs ($12 million) for construction of Viet-Nam's largest cement-producing complex with plans at Hatien and Thu Duc. In 1964, France provided a 930,000 francs ($186,000) grant for the installation of a training center for electrical technicians and in 1965 a gift of 1.25 million francs ($250,000) for teaching equipment, primarily in the medical field.

Ireland

The Irish people have contributed 1,000£ ($2,800) for Vietnamese flood victims through their Red Cross.

Israel

Israel made a gift of pharmaceutical supplies for flood victims and will train this year five Vietnamese in irrigation and animal husbandry.

Norway

Norway sent a contribution through the International Red Cross for flood victims in February 1965.

Pakistan

Pakistan made a financial contribution for assistance to flood victims and donated clothing for them.

Switzerland

The Swiss have provided microscopes for the University of Saigon. The Swiss Red Cross has sent an 11-man medical team through the International Committee of the Red Cross to work in a provincial hospital in the Central Highlands of South Viet-Nam.

U.N. System Aid to Vietnam

The United Nations and its specialized agencies are also making a significant contribution to the social and economic development of Viet-Nam. Under the Expanded Program of Technical Assistance of the UN Development Program, 15 technical assistance projects are scheduled for 1967 and 1968 at a cost of $724,475. These projects range across such varied fields as maternal and child health, labor administration, educational planning, telecommunications, meteorology and civil aviation. Among the participating agencies are ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, ICAO, ITU, WMO, and the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the U.N. In addition, UNICEF is lending financial support to a number of programs in the health and child care fields.

Several major projects financed by the Special Fund of the UN Development Program are about to get underway. A National Technical Center (total international contribution approximately $1.5 million), with UNESCO is becoming operational. The Special Fund in January approved a Fisheries Development Project including exploratory and experimental fishing in the waters of the South China Sea, to be executed by FAO at a cost of $1.3 million. Also being negotiated is a Social Welfare Training Center to be executed by the Bureau of Social Affairs of the UN. ECAFE is pressing ahead with regional projects of benefit to the nations of the Mekong Basin and has undertaken surveys of irrigation, hydro-electric facilities and bridge construction projects in Viet-Nam.

THE EVERGLADES CRISIS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, today one of America's great natural treasures is threatened with destruction. Now in its 44th day of drought, Everglades National Park and the aquatic and bird life in the park face serious threats by fire and lack of water. Chief Ranger Robert Kerr, in an article in the Sunday Washington Post, stated:

> The water shortage in most of the national park is critical.

Other officials say that the only water now flowing into the park is from State and Federal water conservation areas and is "desperately" needed to maintain the wildlife in the preserve. An article which appeared yesterday in the New York Times states:

> The State of Florida was preparing today to shut off the flow of 90 million gallons of water a day into the drought stricken Everglades National Park * * *.

I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times article "Everglades Water Crisis," May 8, 1967; and two articles from the Washington Post, "A Lonely Struggle in the Everglades," May 5, 1967, and "Drought, Fire Sear Everglades," May 7, 1967, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1967]

Everglades Water Crisis

(By Martin Waldron)

Miami, May 7.—The State of Florida was preparing today to shut off the flow of 90 million gallons of water a day into the drought stricken Everglades National Park, a waterbird and alligator refuge west of Miami.

Gov. Claude R. Kirk Jr. said that the water was needed elsewhere in south Florida to fight the effects of the drought, now in its 42d day.

The 90 million gallons, which had been coming from state and Federal water conservation areas to the north, was virtually the only water flowing into the park, and officials said that it was "desperately" needed to maintain the wildlife left in the 1.4 million acre preserve.

Park officials said that only a few holes with water in them were left in the park, and that the alligators had swarmed to them to wait out the drought. Other animals, including deer and panthers, were reported to be leaving the refuge for other conservation areas north of the Tamiami Trail.

Most of the state below the Tampa-Orlando areas was described by officials as being "extremely dry," with the possibility of prairie fires in the vast Everglades region posing a threat.

Several fires burned out of control in southwestern Florida yesterday. One, park officials said, was only two or three miles from the national park.

Cattlemen who use water from Lake Okeechobee and the water conservation district reservoirs, said that the drought had ruined their pastures. Florida's Agriculture Commissioner, Doyle Conner, said that pasture damage "is as bad as I have ever seen it."

Governor Kirk, who toured the area by airplane, helicopter and airboat yesterday, said that the state had the authority to withhold water from the national park whenever the water in Lake Okeechobee, which covers 750 square miles and is the biggest water reservoir in Florida, dropped below 12.5 feet. The lake level was within one-tenth of one inch of this level yesterday.

By shutting off the flow of water into the park, the state hopes to maintain the water level in other sections of the vast grass and hammock prairies that cover much of south Florida and make up the Everglades. The half of the Everglades that lies north of the national park is surrounded by levees and canals that are used for flood control and water conservation.

Governor Kirk said that the underground water aquifers that supply drinking water to Miami and to other cities on the lower east coast of Florida lie underneath the conservation area of the Everglades.

"Those who are solely concerned about the national park have got to remember that there are more than one million people involved in this drought also," the Governor said.

Last March the national park was given rights to part of the water collected and stored by the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District, a state agency that gets state and Federal funds for flood control and water conservation.

During part of last fall, water was diverted into the national park at the rate of 1.3 billion gallons a day.

Water does not stay in the park very long. It evaporates or is transpired by trees and sawgrass. The rate of evaporation and transpiration has been estimated by hydraulicians of the flood control district as being equal to the rainfall. Thus, the park and other sections of the Everglades need an almost constant flow of water to remain moisture laden.

In the last 10 years, vast fires have burned over the Everglades three times in droughts similar to the current one. Each time, it took the Everglades more than a year to recover.

Col. R. P. Tabb of Jacksonville, district engineer for the United States Corps of Engineers, flew over the area during the weekend on an inspection tour. He shares authority over the water in the conservation districts with the Central and Southern Florida Flood Control District.

Areas of the Everglades outside the park boundaries and especially in the southeastern section of Florida "look better than I had expected," he said, "but the western side of the park is at a critical stage."

He said that fires in Collier County along the Gulf of Mexico appeared to be out of control.

In Tallahassee, Hux Coulter, a state forester, said that the Collier County fires were outside of organized fire control districts. Most of the land being burned is privately owned. Most of the Everglades is owned either by the state or by the Federal Government.

The United States Weather Bureau in Miami said that no general rain could be expected over south Florida for at least several more days. A park official said that the Weather Bureau had said privately that it might not rain for two weeks or longer.

Park officials said that if the state did cut off the 90 million gallons of water a day it might become necessary to dynamite alligator holes in an effort to find subsurface water.

Assistant Chief Ranger Ralph D. Maxwell said that alligators and other reptiles and birds were suffering most from the drought. Other park animals, such as wild hogs, panther and deer, can leave the park for other sections of the Everglades until the drought ends.

Birds, now nesting, may be forced to abandon their eggs and their young to fly north to find water, Mr. Maxwell said. He believed they would likely go to swamps in south Georgia.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 5, 1967]

A Lonely Struggle in the Everglades

(By Marquis Childs)

Everglades National Park, Fla.—You need not be an expert to see how one of America's great natural treasures is threatened with destruction. Creeping urban sprawl, creeping pollution, creeping drouth are beginning to overwhelm the rare and even vanishing life in the 1,400,000 acres of this park and in the waters around it.

We flew in a small plane over areas that seemed about to become desert—dry, barren, apparently empty of the bird and animal species flourishing for endless centuries in this biological wonderland. The water that means life, flowing in an age-old cycle, has been interrupted.

Then at the southern edge of the park we came on sloughs with water and there were the birds, the white ibis, the wood ibis with black-tipped wings, the great white heron, and the egrets—the snowy, the common and the reddish. From about 200 feet over the roosting areas they were great white flowers on the dark green of the mangrove. As though in response to some inner biological drive the wood ibis were nesting for an almost-unprecedented second time in a single season.

It was like coming on a camp of refugees driven out of the land that had long been theirs and making the best of it. Where they once existed in hundreds of thousands or millions these rare species are now numbered in previous hundreds that may or may not survive the swift alteration of their native habitat.

The land speculators and the agricultural interests keep up unremitting pressure for more and more and more. Their instrument is the central and southern Florida flood-control district, with plenty of political muscle in Tallahassee and Washington. Allied with the flood-control district is the Army Corps of Engineers, which does the bulldozing and builds the canals and dikes. With pork-barrel projects in each of the 50 states, the Corps of Engineers is one of the most potent and yet invisible of the Washington lobbies.

One estimate is that in Florida alone the Engineers have spent or will spend in projects already planned a total of $375,000,000. It is called flood control but, in effect, it is drainage for speculative development and agriculture. In short, this is a fat subsidy.

The argument of the National Park Service, through the dedicated public servant, Roger W. Allin, who is the Everglades superintendent, is a simple one. There is enough water that can be released from Lake Okeechobee to the north if the Corps of Engineers would agree to its release at appropriate times and not just in flood. It could be fed into the park without the residue of pesticides and chemical fertilizers that comes with the water off farm areas—the kind of pollutants so destructive to life and fertility.

Recently a desperate little battle was waged over a canal the Engineers had built through the park to carry missiles from a nearby plant. The canal has never been used for this purpose and apparently will not be. The Engineers proposal to pull out a plug keeping out sea water overflowing under certain conditions would work further damage in the park.

The Park Service won a temporary victory and the plug for the time being stays in. But already the signs are up advertising waterfront property for sale adjacent to the canal. Among them are the signs of the land company controlled by the late Arthur Vining Davis who left an estate of $100,000,000, a sizable part of it from Florida land. These are clear signals that the victory was temporary.

What the visitor today—more than a million a year, including fishermen out for some of the finest sport fishing in America—cannot help wondering is whether any of the Everglades treasure will be left for another generation. After a boat trip up lonely inlets still untouched we came out onto Florida Bay at sunset. There feeding on a shoal not far from shore were 40 to 50 roseate spoonbills out of possibly 150 to 200 still surviving.

Allin and the others in the Park Service are engaged in a lonely struggle. They have the support of the conservationists, the Izaak Walton League and fishing interests aware of what pollution and reckless waste of water mean in destruction of a resource both for sport and commercial fisheries. Only agreement between the State Authority, the Corps of Engineers and the Park Service ratified at the top can save the park. Florida has been rejoicing that Miami was chosen as the site for the new Federal oceanographic center. But, short of some positive action, the Nation will see the end of one of the greatest natural marine biological laboratories.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 7, 1967]

Drought, Fire Sear Everglades

(By Stanley M. Brown)

Everglades City, Fla., May 6.—A huge bull alligator was lying on the edge of a dry and cracked pond in the Everglades. There was not a drop of water within ten miles and a fire was raging toward the pond a half-mile away.

A lone turkey buzzard circled the pond,

which was in the middle of a heavy vegetated but tinder-dry area in the vast swamp.

The buzzard was assured of a feast on the gator, which appeared to be 12 or 14 feet long—a giant even for the Everglades. If the fire did not get the gator, he would die of thirst or starve to death.

Rain, or perhaps a miracle, was the only thing that could save that gator and douse the fires that had already eaten a 30-by-20-mile hunk out of the world's biggest swamp just northwest of the 1.4 million acre Everglades National Park.

But it hasn't rained here in 38 days and weathermen say no rain is in sight. It has been the driest April in South Florida history—only .15 of an inch from a few showers.

The drought has turned the once-plush sawgrass the color of straw and sent wildlife on a desperate search for drinking holes. The search takes many of the animals across the Tamiami Trail (U.S. Highway 41) and into the path of speeding cars.

Fires, whipped by high winds, have been burning out of control for over a week. Fire Rangers do not have the equipment or the manpower to stop them.

The area where I hunted deer last year in calf-deep water was completely dry. The needles on the cypress and scrub pine were brown. Most of the branches had fallen off the cabbage palms and the sawgrass would crackle and break into small pieces when you walked on it.

"The water shortage in most of the national park is critical," said Chief Ranger Robert Kerr. "The park is completely dry except for a few spots in the Shark River slough.

"If it doesn't rain soon the slough will dry up and the wildlife will have nowhere to go for water. Then the situation will become desperate."

So far, the fire has not spread to the park. But it has moved to within five miles of the northwestern park boundary and Kerr said that if the wind shifts and comes out of the north or northwest, "we're in for serious trouble."

Lake Okeechobee, which feeds fresh water into the Everglades, is nearly two feet below normal, according to officials of the Central and South Florida Flood Control District.

The officials have been able to drain only a minimal amount of water into the park from its water impoundment areas to the north and the water does not travel far before it is soaked up by the thirsty land.

COURAGE AND VALOR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the conflict in Vietnam has produced many reports of extraordinary courage and valor on the part of the American servicemen who are serving their country in response to the call from their Commander in Chief.

One of these reports has just reached my desk. I ask unanimous consent that a newspaper article published in the Saturday, May 6, 1967, issue of the Deseret News be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT LAKER SAVES BUDDIES—SAILOR DIVES ONTO GRENADE

(By Robert C. Mitchell)

"Live grenade!"

This Vietnam battle warning triggered "the stuff Medal of Honor winners are made of," and a Salt Lake Navy man threw his body over the explosive to save his buddies. He lived to describe the incident.

"You and I both know that on April 14 our Heavenly Father was with me," GMSA Donald M. Garner, 21, wrote his parents, Mr. and Mrs. W. M. Garner, 924 S. 11th West.

His parents, by official government telegram, had been aware only that he had been injured as the result of an exploding grenade, but knew none of the details of their son's heroism.

The same deed as Garner's has won the Congressional Medal of Honor for several others in the past. The medal is the nation's highest honor.

This was recounted to them in a clipping from the military newspaper Pacific Stars and Stripes of April 17. Cliff Denton, SS Vietnam Bureau Chief, reported that Garner had been in the battle area only two weeks when the mishap occurred near Binh Tuy on a patrol boat searching enemy sampans.

Rough waves knocked the grenade from another sailor's hands. The man dropping the grenade covered a Vietnamese national policeman not understanding the warning, and Garner fell atop the weapon to save four buddies nearby.

Garner wearing a steel flak jacket, suffered shrapnel wounds of the right side, arm and leg. The blast tore a 12-inch hole in the patrol boat's steel deck plates.

Garner's escape from death was described as miraculous, and his commanding officer, Lt. Cmdr. Donald D. Shepherd made the "Medal of Honor" comment, reported Mr. Denton.

"We don't know whether he will come home, be sent somewhere else in the states or be returned to duty," said Mrs. Garner.

She and her husband were told their son had been medevacuated to the U.S. Army 3rd Field Hospital, Saigon, and then transferred to the U.S. Naval Hospital, Yokosuka, Japan.

His progress was listed as "good," and his morale high, said Mrs. Garner.

The youth told his parents that former Vice President Richard Nixon had attended ceremonies at which the Purple Heart was awarded to him.

Capt. F. P. Ballenger, commanding officer of the Yokosuka hospital, said the youth would require about 60 days hospitalization before being able to return to duty.

Young Garner enlisted in the Navy nearly two years ago in Salt Lake City. He is a graduate of West High School.

He was active in high school wrestling and football and in Church softball throughout his Popular Grove Ward membership.

During a call to his parents, Garner said that members of the Church in the Yokosuka area had already visited him.

Pulling for his quick recovery are a brother, Richard and two sisters, Mrs. Larry (Sheryl) Thompson and Karee Garner.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, as the article points out, a young sailor from Salt Lake City, Utah, recently saved the lives of his fellow sailors by throwing himself onto a live grenade, thus shielding his companions from the blast. Most remarkably, the Utah sailor lives today to tell his story. He is not without wounds, however, but he does give thanks to the Saviour for his life.

THE ROLE OF THE INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPER

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, Mr. Adolph Schmidt, executive director of the Rhode Island Development Council for the past 10 years and president of the industrial development council has shown great leadership and done an outstanding job in his chosen sphere of industrial development.

My own State of Rhode Island has benefited greatly by the work of Mr. Schmidt and his colleagues of our own development council.

Recently, Mr. Schmidt wrote two excellent articles which, I believe, would be of interest to my colleagues. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on April 10, 1967, and the New York Times Industrial Development Supplement of May 7, 1967, be inserted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Apr. 10, 1967]

ROLE OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPER WIDENS—IMPACT OF UNIVERSITIES NOTED

(By Adolph T. Schmidt, president, American Industrial Development Council and executive director of the Rhode Island Development Council)

As the American economy heads toward the "fabulous '70s" the role of the industrial developer is changing as rapidly as this nation's economic base.

If the past 20 years provide any clue to future directions, then changes will be both radical and continuous. In its short but hectic history, industrial development, since World War II, has mushroomed from 300 development groups to about 15,000 to 20,000 now.

The serious business of attracting Big Business is costing development agencies $300 million a year while the Federal Government is budgeting nearly $1 billion to increase job potential in high unemployment areas. The key target: American industry which this year is expected to lay out $60 billion for new plants and equipment. Restoration of the 7 per cent investment tax credit should activate these expenditures more rapidly.

FUNCTION QUESTIONED

Some skeptics continue to ask whether industrial developers actually perform a useful function. Their theory is that industry is well equipped to find a location for a new plant on its own. But the point that these skeptics so often miss is that the industrial developer communicates vital feasibility information to decision makers considering alternative locations. Beyond that is the simple fact that developers spend a great deal—usually most—of their time assisting local industry.

An even graver charge is that industrial developers make their living by stealing plants from one another by offering more and more "give-away" concessions. This is untrue. An analysis of plant location patterns shows that 80 per cent of the new facilities being built in this country today represent expansions of existing plants and equipment, not "run-away" operations.

The occasional developer who succeeds in "stealing" an existing industry in most instances ruefully discovers that his prize catch will move on to another location at the first hint of even greater concessions.

I've been able to say something about what contemporary industrial development isn't. What is it then? Here are four major trends which should revolutionize the development business in the last third of the 20th century:

(1) Smokestacks Giving Way to Ski Lodges.

This may over dramatize the situation but the fact is that non-manufacturing jobs are increasing at a much more rapid rate than factory positions. Government also is employing more and more people, particularly on the state and local levels. Faced with the stark fact that only about 300 major brand new plants are built in this country each year, developers are now in hot pursuit of rest homes, insurance offices, banks, motels, warehouses, research laboratories, computer centers, and government facilities.

TREND SHIFT NOTED

Developers are spreading out because the handwriting is on the wall. In the 33-year period between now and the turn of the 21st Century, factory jobs will be increasing by only 8 million while non-manufacturing and service positions will soar upwards by 30 million, almost four times the rate of manufacturing employment increase. Government jobs will grow by 17 million positions, double the rate of manufacturing employment. It is no wonder then that the Northeast Industrial Developers Association recently devoted an annual meeting to nonmanufacturing investment opportunities.

(2) Rising Importance of the University as Site Location Factor.

No less an authority than Dr. Wernher von Braun recently said that it's not water or real estate or labor or power or cheap taxes that brings industry—it's brain power.

The economic rebirth of the university-rich Boston area spearheaded by the build-up of research and electronics facilities along Route 128 came about for this very reason. America's stepped up technology enriched by our aerospace programs means a tremendous growth in laboratories and related facilities. Technology is moving so fast, in fact, that a decade from now at least 50 per cent of the products we wear, use, and eat will be completely new.

UNIVERSITY SEEN KEY

This is why developers are saying: To attract "brain power" industry, first attract a university, or similar facility. Those areas fortunate enough to have a university believe it won't be too long before their promotion will read something like this: "Only five minutes from ABC University with three Nobel Prize winners on the faculty."

Importance of the university in industrial development can be gaged by the Irvine Company's action in Southern California where it is carving out "new towns" on 90,000 acres of raw land. One of Irvine's first moves was to donate 1000 acres to the University of Southern California on the supposition that "what's good for education is good for business." Result? In recent months, the Irvine people have had no difficulty in filling up a near-by industrial park with such companies as Xerox, McDonnell Aircraft and Douglas Aircraft.

And, it should be noted, universities are playing an increasingly important role in helping their local communities by preparing special economic reports and feasibility studies which the developer uses to attract new industry. It is interesting to mention too that increasing numbers of universities are adding industrial development to their curriculum, hence upgrading our professional standards. The newest: Texas A & M.

(3) The Plunge Overseas.

Fierce competition is leading many development groups abroad in the search for new industries. This may not be as far fetched as it seems; foreign companies are investing in the U.S. at the rate of $1 million a day, according to the U.S. Department of Commerce. Furthermore, a recent study shows that no less than 200 U.S. development agencies are currently considering investment and trade missions abroad. The rather spectacular success of such states as North Carolina is one catalyst.

CANADA INFLUX NOTED

In recent years, North Carolina's successful forays to Europe have yielded 25 foreign plants employing 6000 persons. Some of our best foreign industries prospects lie in Canada. Canadians are investing in the U.S. at double the rate we are investing in Canada on a per capita basis. This is made real in looking at the experience of Plattsburgh, New York, which in recent years has attracted about a dozen Montreal-based subsidiaries.

(4) Regionalism A Growing Trend

Sixteen years ago, Southern New Jersey became the first area in the country to organize a regional development agency. Scores of other U.S. regions have in the meantime created multi-county groups on the theory that a concerted effort affording a larger budget can do more for the area as a whole. Larger economic units are leading to the establishment of super regional agencies like the Federal Government's Appalachia Regional Commission covering a territory stretching from New York State to Alabama. The pertinent question now is how well the local development group can blend in with the larger units.

Does industrial development really work? Let's look at my State, Rhode Island, which because of its small size provides a handy test tube example. In 1958, Rhode Island's unemployment was 11 per cent giving us the dubious distinction of being the most depressed area on the East Coast.

The state's economy had been badly jolted by the flight of many long-established textile mills to the South. Other old industries were becoming restless in their aging factory buildings.

In launching an expanded development program for Rhode Island, one of our first jobs was to make it easy for manufacturers to move into modern factories. We then devised the first state-wide mortgage guarantee program for new industry.

WHAT DOES THIS SYMBOL MEAN?

(By Adolph T. Schmidt, FM/AIDC, president of the American Industrial Development Council, executive director, Rhode Island Development Council)

"Integritas Erga Omnes" (Integrity in all Things) . . . this slogan combined with the torch of Diogenes appears on the square white button which is worn by the members of the American Industrial Development Council. Since the entire foundation of a successful industrial development effort at any level is based on facts and truthful information, what better symbol could have been adopted as the standard for the American Industrial Development Council.

The forty-two year old American Industrial Development Council is the international association of career and lay industrial development practitioners. It is an independent, non-profit corporation dedicated to enhancing the effectiveness of industrial development programs and the professional competency of practitioners in the field. Its objectives, which have been continuous over four decades, are well revealed in the Council's Constitution:

(a) "to provide a medium for the interchange of ideas, on principles, practices and ethics in the field of industrial development in its broadest connotation;

(b) "to serve as a deliberative rather than a policy-making body;

(c) "to advance the theory and practice of industrial development through educational, service and other programs, in order to assist its members to promote the establishment and expansion of sound productive, distributive and employment-generating facilities with their areas of activity;

(d) "and to work in harmony with other organizations having aims similar to those of the Corporation."

In 1926 the first meeting on industrial development practice was held in Washington, D.C. under the auspices of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. The 23 delegates, representing 15 states, were largely industrial bureau managers of Chambers of Commerce. From this initial meeting the seed was planted for the organization now known as the American Industrial Development Council.

George C. Smith, a founder of the Council and now a veteran in the field of industrial development, writing of this first AIDC Conference, comments: "The National Chamber men were of the opinion that such a conference might lead to a better understanding of the work of industrial managers and bring their work to a higher degree of proficiency. In fact, they stated frankly that some managers were guilty of making most extravagant claims concerning their work, and results obtained, to the extent that the entire chamber of commerce movement was being jeopardized by a few who set no limits to their claims."

The first conference clearly indicated the need for an annual meeting of these individuals that were involved in community industrial development. The United States Chamber and other local chambers nurtured the annual conference concept and gradually widened its scope by inviting industrial developers from civic and public organizations not connected with Chambers of Commerce from not only the United States but also Canada and Mexico.

In 1930, a Constitution and Bylaws were adopted, thus formally establishing the precepts of the founders, and the Council was embarked as the first such organization in its field. Following World War II, with the stimulus of vastly increased industrial expansion and the subsequent proliferation of development-oriented organizations in the private, civic and public sectors, the American Industrial Development Council expanded its operations and its area of influence. Having grown to such size that it could no longer remain in the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the Council was incorporated as an independent, tax-exempt organization in 1958. Since that date, the association has grown rapidly, both in membership and in development of its professional programs.

FORTY YEARS OLD

The forty-year life span of the AIDC has covered an extraordinary period in the history of our country. Richard Preston, our Secretary-Executive Director summed it up well at the 1964 Conference when he observed that we had survived: "a boom, a bust, a world-wide depression, extraordinary recovery measures, a terrible war, post-war adjustments, inflation, recession, the advent of the atomic age and the omnipresent cold war of economic and political theory and practice."

Our Constitution has been quoted earlier on the purposes of the Council. Putting these purposes into practice for a growing membership has necessitated accelerated services in the areas of education and communication particularly. New trends in federal legislation; new techniques relating to financing, plant construction and marketing; technologic change in materials and processing; revolutionary shifts in industrial geography; all these and more are part of the resourceful developer's arsenal of information.

Since the Council's inception, the Annual Conference has been the major means by which this operation has been effectuated. Held in the spring, these Conferences feature sessions dealing with specific solutions to development problems, rather than merely presenting a formal series of set speeches. A random sampling of subjects presented and discussed at recent sessions includes: Human Factors in Industrial Development; New Energy Sources and New Materials; The Aviation Industry and the Industrial Development Profession; Automation and the Computer; Labor's Role in Industrial Development; United States' Trade Policy at the Crossroads; Industrial Location Management's Viewpoint.

A principal feature of the Conferences is the opportunity they present to the career and lay industrial developer to meet, listen to and question the top men in the field, returning to his work with an enhanced knowledge of the tools of his trade and a deeper appreciation of the ethical standards of his profession."

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTE

From the time the AIDC first began to gain stature, its leaders have been concerned about the lack of specialized courses and facilities relating to industrial development. A major move to remedy this situation was effected in 1962 when, a regional association of professionals, the Southern Industrial Development Council, established the Industrial Development Institute. Now under AIDC direction, the Institute is conducted in cooperation with the University of Oklahoma at its Kellogg Center for Continuing Education in Norman, Oklahoma. The IDI course calls for three annual one-week sessions, held in August; completion of the three sessions and approval of an original thesis entitles the student to the Institute's coveted Certificate of Competency.

The faculty includes both academicians and nationally recognized practitioners of industrial development and related activities.

A résumé of the curriculum provides an insight into the range of study and operation offered by the Institute. At present, the first year includes economic geography, economics (largely, applied), plant location factors, real estate and financing, prospect development, plant location techniques and human relations and communications.

The second year offers lectures on legal problems, taxation, planning and site selection, thesis writing, marketing, financing, transportation, prospect development and actual location problems involving field trips to nearby communities.

The third year concentrates upon case histories of management decision-making procedures involving business policy, internal financing, plant location investigation, together with analysis of the mechanics of management decision-making itself. These are submitted for review and acceptance during this year. Selected theses are reviewed in the classroom.

Graduate Industrial Development Seminars are held in conjunction with the annual Institute sessions and present the opportunity to study intensively a key element of industrial development. This course endeavors to bring the "graduate level" of academic inquiry and scholarship to the field of industrial development. It is open to Institute graduates, AIDC Fellows and qualified persons with at least ten years experience in development work.

A total of 210 students attended the 1966 session, including 24 enrolled in the Advanced Seminar. They represented 41 states, 4 Canadian provinces and France.

EDUCATION IS TOP PRIORITY

Education in industrial development holds priority triple A-1 in the Council's forward planning program. Successful industrial development has tremendous implications and, it follows that mediocre or failing efforts have no less an impact. It is, therefore, essential that industrial development programs in the private, civic and public sectors be directed by men and women possessing professional competency. Such has not been the case, nor is it.

To correct this condition and to assure a professional appreciation of the strategy and techniques of industrial location, the Council is directing its attention to uniform standards of instruction.

"Concepts and Guidelines for Education in Industrial Development" has been published. The work is composed of seven sections. Section A covers concepts, assumptions and AIDC accreditation policies. Sections B, C, D and E present minimum criteria for formal elementary, secondary (Institute), advanced and collegiate courses of instruction. Section F covers such informal media as conferences, workshops, clinics and the like, requiring no participation by academic institutions. Section G is a bibliography of all papers published by the Council in the period 1962–1966.

MAINTAINING STANDARDS

A corollary purpose of this education program is to establish a sense of order in the educational process without which such terms as Basic Course of Instruction, Industrial Development Institute, Graduate Seminar and Advanced Industrial Development Symposia become meaningless. The Council recalls the downgrading of the once meaningful term "industrial park" to the purely promotional use of today. Through its accreditation program, it is determined to maintain standards which will indicate degrees of professional training and, thereby, present practitioner and retainer alike, with a sense of professional competency wherein the formal educational process is concerned.

The year 1962 also saw the American Industrial Development Council make a most important move toward establishing itself as the international association of industrial developers. Recognizing its membership's need for executive and administrative direction as well as a full-time information and communication center, it opened a permanent office in Boston at 230 Boylston Street, staffed by the Secretary-Executive Director and requisite personnel. Selected for the executive position was Richard Preston, a long-time Council member with an impressive background in economic development activity.

A graduate of Harvard, with business experience, Mr. Preston was appointed by the then Governor Herter to establish a Massachusetts Department of Commerce, and became that agency's first Commissioner. Following this, he organized his own firm—Economic Development Associates, Inc.—and while a member of this firm, served for 2 years as temporary head of the New Hampshire State Planning and Development Commission. He also served as community economic development advisor to the Belgian Government. It was following this tour of duty that he became AIDC's first, full-time (and continuing) Executive Director and Secretary in which position he succeeded J. Huber Denn, a Past President, who undertook the executive duties upon the Council's incorporation.

The Office of the Secretary functions as the headquarters of the Council. In addition to the executive direction of programs established by the membership in its Annual Meetings, the Office performs the mass of administrative detail required to service the rapidly expanding membership.

The newly established "Industrial Developers Placement Service", jointly sponsored by AIDC and participating professional associations of industrial development practitioners provides individuals seeking positions, and organizations lookng for industrial development personnel, with a common point of contact.

The AIDC Industrial Development Library, unique in the field, maintains an ever-growing collection of papers and other material available to the public on a loan basis, as well as an interlibrary loan network which it initiated.

Like its education program, the Council's publications program furthers AIDC's historic and continuing purpose. It publishes the proceedings of the Annual Conference; a professional quarterly, the AIDC Journal; a bi-monthly newsletter with professional notes, AID/PN; the annual Abstracts of the Industrial Development Institute Thesis; a Handbook on Industrial Development now consisting of some twenty chapters; an ID.X. System by which industrial development material may be uniformly catalogued and filed; special publications and manuals of the Council as well as those which have special bearing upon this field.

The Council welcomes as a member any man or woman regardless of country or residence who is interested in the theory, practice, programming or operations of industrial development in its broadest connotation. This is in keeping with the AIDC purpose of furthering the public comprehension of industrial development, its implications and potentials.

Active Membership is reserved for those whose practice is in the field. Criteria require the applicant to have been a Member of the Council for three (not necessarily continuous years) and to be employing a minimum of his or her time in active practice.

The degree of Fellow may be attained by Active Members who have been in the organization for at least 10 years with an impressive record of accomplishment, and have written a paper which contributes materially to the advancement of industrial development. It is interesting to note that with a membership of more than 1,100, only 16 persons have earned the honor of "Fellow," although the list of candidates steadily grows.

Honorary Life Membership is awarded only to those who have performed outstanding service both to the AIDC and to the profession as a whole, and who have retired while still in the profession.

OVER 1,100 MEMBERS

Present membership in the American Industrial Development Council stands at over 1,100 individuals. A study made in 1966 revealed that 45 percent of membership was retained by corporate, private organizations, 32 percent by not-for-profit organizations, and 23 percent by tax-supported, largely state, provincial and municipal agencies.

The AIDC is administered by a Board of Directors elected by the membership at the annual meeting. This Board, in turn, elects the officers who serve as the Executive Committee of the association. Operations are conducted by seven committees, coordinated by the Secretary-Executive Director whose office also serves as a clearing house for a vast number of inquiries keyed to development work. Complicated inquiries that require special expertise are referred to members with special competency in that area.

It should be stressed here that the services of the Office of the Secretary are by no means restricted to members of the Council.

It is established to serve industrial development as a whole. Particularly welcome are service requests by industrial firms, site-location and facility planners, industrial realtors and the wide range of agencies on matters pertinent to their operations in industrial location.

The year 1967 will see more than $63,000,000,000 invested in new plant construction and in machinery and equipment. To assure industry of a high return on this investment, it becomes increasingly important that capital investors should work closely with an industrial or area developer who is knowledgeable, responsible and professionally competent. It will be to the site-seekers advantage, therefore, to make sure that his contact is a member of the American Industrial Development Council.

Industrial development or industrial location is an emerging science as well as a profession. It requires professionals with experience and training of industrial facilities planners and of area developers. Regionalism as a federal policy of North American governments has implications for all who are concerned with plant location. The complexities of urban concentration and dispersions of industrial installations compound the problem. Indeed, development has the deepest of sociological, economic and political connotations. The industrial developer of 1966 is a far cry from his counterpart of 1926 . . . and yet, the human element is still the basic consideration.

How so to educate and assist today's industrial developer that he may meet the present and foreseeable problems of successful plant location is the perpetual challenge to the Council. It is confident that it can, as it has in the past, meet the challenge and together with industry, continue the balanced, prosperous economic growth of nations.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally charged against both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. How much time does the Senator from Montana yield himself?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield myself 1 minute for the purpose of propounding a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time do I have at my disposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-five and a half minutes on each side.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, does the parliamentary inquiry mean that business has been transacted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No business has been transacted. There has been a quorum call.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the quorum call to last not longer than four and a half minutes, the time to be taken out of my side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may need within the limitation remaining.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in view of the issue which confronts us and the rumors which have been afloat around it, I wish to make the record as clear as I possibly can at this point. Since last Thursday, I have contacted various Senators on the Democratic side. I did not ask them for a commitment to vote against the Gore amendment or for the Mansfield amendment. I set forth my concept of the issue with which we are confronted. I explained to each Senator that if the pending Gore amendment carried, the Senate would be unable to reach a vote on the merits of my proposal. Yet, that proposal, in my judgment, is about as fair a solution to this conflict as can be devised. It goes part of the way toward achieving what both proponents and opponents of the Long Act of 1966 have stated as their objectives in the prolonged debate.

I asked those whom I contacted to weigh the situation in that light and then to follow their consciences. If I did not sufficiently emphasize it in my individual conversations with them, let me restate my feelings now. Regardless of their positions and their votes on the Gore amendment, I appreciate the consideration which I know they have given to what I have to say.

So that the record may be complete, may I add that I also met, on yesterday, with a number of Democratic Senators who have clearly supported the preservation of the Long Act of 1966 from the outset. I explained my position on the pending measure and asked them for active support in seeking a disposition along the lines of my amendment.

I do not know what the Senate, in its wisdom, will decide in this matter. I wish the Senate to be on notice, however, that if the Gore amendment is defeated and the Mansfield amendment carries subsequently, it would be my hope that that would end the matter. If it does not, it would be my intention to move to table all other amendments from there on out.

If by any chance any Senator offers a motion to table either the Gore or the Mansfield proposal, however, I shall, perforce, vote against such a motion and I would hope the preponderance of the Senate would do likewise. To do otherwise, in my judgment, would contribute to a worsening of the procedural wrangle and I have neither the desire nor the intention of becoming a party to a prolongation of the difficulty. I make this statement, now, because I announced last Thursday, when the time limitation was agreed to, that I would not forgo the possibility of offering tabling amendments after the disposal of the Gore and the Mansfield amendments. I believe, therefore, that I am on tenable ground in this statement of the leadership's procedural intentions.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. GORE. In the event that the amendment which the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] have offered as a substitute is adopted, it then becomes the Mansfield amendment as amended by the Gore-Williams amendment.

My question is: The Senator's suggestion, as I understand it, of moving to table applies after action upon the Gore and Mansfield amendments. In other words, if the Mansfield amendment, whether by substitute or perfecting amendment is adopted, then after such adoption, as I understand the suggestion of the Senator, he will offer a tabling motion, or reserve the right to offer a tabling motion to any other amendments offered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, the latter interpretation is correct. And I say that, even though I personally would like to vote for an amendment such as the one offered by the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] several weeks ago and adopted unanimously by the Senate, which would seek to bring about corrections in the Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. GORE. Then I think it is clear that whichever amendment goes onto the bill, the Mansfield amendment as amended or as unamended, it is the Senator's position that this should bring this issue to a close.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is my present intention. That is my proposal at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I appreciate the position of the majority leader, but in the event the Senate decided to continue the Presidential Campaign Act it would be all the more reason why we should have some action on my amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act. These were previously adopted unanimously by the Senate, but we deleted them under the previous Mansfield motion.

In view of the fact that we have unanimous consent that would cause no delays. I am hoping that we can have a vote on the merits of those amendments because they are not so-called loading amendments. I think that by all means they should be voted on on their merits, and I hope that the Senator from Montana will not move to table them. But, if so, I think the Senate should be on notice that the vote will be interpreted as to whether we are for or against those amendments. If we are for the amendments we would vote against tabling.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the comments of the Senator from Delaware. He knows how I feel personally about the amendment he has in mind. I would be prepared to vote for it at a propitious time, as we did once before, and as the Senate unanimously did, because it is a step in the right direction and should be incorporated in some way into the law of the land. I would think that perhaps the best place to do that would be in the Committee on Finance during the 6 weeks of deliberations voted for by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. At the time we entered into this agreement I did serve notice that these amendments would be offered should we be unsuccessful in repealing the Presidential Campaign Act. I would be willing to limit debate to 15 minutes on each amendment so that there would be no delay, but they should be considered on their merits.

They will not be offered should the Gore-Williams amendment to repeal or suspend the act prevail.

Unless the authority for the $1 checkoff on tax returns is rescinded these amendments to the Corrupt Practices Act are even more essential.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, any Senator has a right to offer an amendment at any time prior to third reading of the bill. That right will be respected but I thought I should state, to the best of my ability, what my position is at this time, so that there will be no recriminations or misunderstandings later.

I should like, now, to direct the Senate's attention to the substance of the pending issue. Bluntly, it has to do with who puts up the money. It has to do with the escalating costs of election campaigns, and how they are to be dealt with in the public interest. I do not believe anyone in the Senate during the course of this debate, has contended that the present system of campaign financing is good or even satisfactory. I do not believe it has been argued that the public interest is best met by confining candidates in Federal elections to those with sufficient personal wealth. I do not believe anyone has expressed the view that the protection of the public interest in political campaigns can best be achieved by raising the price of steak at political dinners, however essential that form of fundraising may be at this time.

Congress reached a decision last year which reflected a concern with the adequacy of current methods of financing campaigns. It voted for an income tax checkoff. The decision was reached in haste and by an unusual procedural path at the close of a session. Nevertheless, the decision was reached legally and the principle of public participation in political campaign financing is now the law of the land.

I believe that that is a wise principle. I believe that it is a principle worth preserving in law. Whatever the shortcomings of the Long Act of 1966, those shortcomings in no way detract from the validity of the principle. Whatever the shortcomings, in no way do they lessen the desirability of preserving that principle.

The Gore amendment—and I say this most respectfully—would seek to tear down that principle. It would deny the validity of the principle—at least insofar as the principle is established and maintained in law by means of the act of 1966. The Gore amendment says, in effect, get rid of the act of 1966. Get rid of it, even if that means disestablishing a most desirable legal principle.

The Gore amendment seeks to achieve that end by preempting the amendment which I offered on Thursday as a bridge between the opposing positions. If the Gore amendment prevails, the Senate will have no opportunity to vote on the substance of my amendment.

I am sure the Senator from Tennessee must have found something of little value in my original amendment since he felt constrained to replace it with his own. Frankly, however, I do not know what it is. Simply put, my amendment would render the Long Act of 1966 inoperative in the absence of further legislation. It would foreclose public participation in the financing of election campaigns until Congress reflects, studies, and drafts what it considers the best and safest approach and that is precisely what the Senator from Tennessee has urged during all these weeks of debate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Let me first say that I will yield such time as the able majority leader may require, but he has just stated a matter about which I wish to ask him a question. The able Senator has said that if his amendment were adopted, it would make the Long Act inoperative. Would the Senator mind reading that sentence again?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all:

> Simply put, my amendment would render the Long Act of 1966 inoperative in the absence of further legislation.

Mr. GORE. Let me respectfully suggest to the able Senator that his amendment does not so provide. His amendment would leave most of the Long Act operative.

I read from his own amendment:

> Funds which become available under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be appropriated and disbursed only after the adoption by law of guidelines governing their distribution.

I suggest to the able Senator that under his amendment the Long Act would still be operative as to the checkoff on the tax return. The money would be collected. The money would be earmarked. The money would, by direction of law, after adoption of his amendment, still be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury into the Presidential campaign fund. Thus, I think the able Senator will want to amend that particular sentence in his statement. The Senator's amendment would render the Long Act inoperative only in part.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct, in part. It does forbid the appropriation of moneys and the distribution of moneys, and in that respect renders the law inoperative for all intents and purposes.

It retains only the checkoff provision, which in effect would operate merely as a poll of the people to determine the extent to which they wish to participate in a program of public financing. The money remains in the Treasury.

If I could continue, I would repeat the next sentence. It would foreclose public participation in the financing of election campaigns until Congress reflects, studies, and drafts what it considers the best and safest approach and that is precisely what the Senator from Tennessee has urged during all these weeks of debate. Moreover, my amendment makes ironclad the congressional control over the sufficiency of the approach of the guidelines and safeguards. Under my amendment, Congress must determine them by law and affirm them by law before 1 cent of Federal funds may be expended for election purposes.

Until Congress acts in that fashion, a checkbox on the Federal income tax form will remain as the sole reminder of the 1966 act. The only effect of the act, without further legislation, would be to make possible the conduct of a survey throughout the country of how many taxpayers desire a system of public financial participation in election campaigns.

The retention of the Long Act as modified by my amendment would merely symbolize the congressional view that public funds can provide at least part of the solution to the dangerous dilemma which is posed to popular government by the skyrocketing costs of modern political campaigning. Put bluntly, it will remind all who were not born yesterday, that the millions of dollars which go into campaigns must come from somewhere and the question of who pays for campaigns and why is not academic but vital in a modern democratic State. The retention of that reminder will compel us in the Congress to ask ourselves again and again: Shall the piper be the whole of the American people through a system of public participation in campaign financing? Or shall the tune be called more and more in the beat of special interests and great wealth? The retention of that reminder will keep before us the implications of these questions which go to the very heart and structure of the Government of the Republic.

Let me make clear that if my amendment prevails, it will indeed affirm the principle of public participation in the financing of elections. However, it will not, in any way, establish a particular pattern of public participation. It will not, in any way, preselect a system of tax checkoff or tax credit or tax deduction or any other. That question will remain to be determined along with all others involved in safeguarding the impartiality and integrity of public financing of election campaigns.

As I have already stated, I hold no brief for the 1966 act, as a finished legal document. It is crude and primitive. It is beset by ambiguities. These shortcomings, however, the author, along with his critics, has been frank to recognize. And President Johnson, upon signing the measure, is said to have remarked that "much work was yet to be done."

But for all its shortcomings, the Long Act deserves full credit for establishing a concept in law well worth preserving. The amendment which I had offered—and which the Gore amendment seeks to override—would provide the medium for retaining that principle while a Senate committee evaluates the various approaches of public financing and brings forth its recommendations. Indeed, the Senate on April 25 conferred plenary jurisdiction on the Finance Committee to do that work and all agree that that work is necessary.

What remains now is the matter of what to do with last year's law while we await that action. That is the sole question which the Senate will decide in the vote which is coming.

I repeat, if my original amendment is retained, we will remain committed to the principle of public fiscal participation in campaigns but not to any particular system of financing. If the Gore amendment preempts, however, we will have, in a legal sense, neither a practice nor a principle. We will obliterate the effort and attention which has been generated in this matter. In my judgment, it may well be a matter of 10 or 15 years before the point is again reached when the question of election costs and election reform to meet corrosive tendencies and corrupt practices will be faced again with legislative realism. I know that that is not what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee desires, but, I believe that if his amendment prevails, that is what the Senate is going to get.

May I say, finally, before the vote on the Gore amendment is taken, that as each day has passed during the past few weeks, the heat has risen. The matter, regrettably, has taken on dimensions of personal hostility. It has also engendered a cackling undertone of such irrelevancies as whose prestige may be rising and whose prestige may be falling, in the manner of Louis Allen discussing the latest storm warnings. I would hope that these indulgencies could be laid aside at this point. The issue is what matters; the personal considerations are extraneous. There are no "good guys" or "bad guys" in this situation. In the Senate, we wear neither black hats nor white hats. We all have grey hats. Insofar as "leadership prestige" may be concerned, may I say that my view of the matter as Majority Leader, in this instance, differs not one iota from my view as one Senator with one vote.

We ought to be concerned at this point with issues not with individuals. I ask all Senators and, particularly, those in my own party, to consider this vote most carefully not in terms of its effect on any Senator but in terms of its effect on the Senate and the Nation today and in the years ahead. I ask all Senators to look at the issue without regard for the personal irritations which are bound to be felt in a prolonged and vehement debate of this kind. I ask them to vote on the basis of public policy and not on the basis of personality or pique.

There is much at stake here of vital interest to the Republic. There is nothing of value herein terms of personal prestige. Insofar as the majority leader is concerned, I will welcome all votes, particularly from my side of the aisle, against the Gore amendment because I believe that it is sound public policy to vote in that fashion. I have not, however, and I will not ask for any Senator's vote except that it can be given in good conscience, on the issue and on the realities of the legislative process. And may I say in the latter connection that the realities of the legislative process involve not the Senate alone but the Congress as a whole.

Win or lose on this question, however, my regard for every member of the Senate remains the same. Insofar as I am concerned, let it be clear, now, that whatever I may have said to any member of my party in my effort to resolve this matter was not said with the intention of imposing any commitment expressed or implied. Insofar as I am concerned, the considerations in this vote are and ought to be only those of each Senator's conscience and conviction.

I thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for the time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question or two?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I ask the Senator from Montana to verify my own thinking.

As I understand it, there is nothing in the Mansfield amendment which in any way disturbs the setting aside of whatever number of millions of dollars will be involved in the amounts checked off by the taxpayers.

Therefore, if that is true, the only issue that remains is what must be done in connection with making the money available to the treasurers of the two parties, because the Mansfield amendment does not in any way change the fact that if, as, and when the money is distributed, it will be distributed to the treasuries of the two parties.

What is there, in the Mansfield amendment, that would prevent the Appropriation Committees of Congress from appropriating the funds?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The dictum laid down in the amendment, which states that there shall be no appropriations, no distribution of funds.

Mr. MORSE. But the Senator is quite right when he refers to it as a dictum. Suppose an Appropriations Committee appropriated the funds; would a point of order lie against that appropriation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. As I understand it, the adoption of this amendment would remove that authorization from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MORSE. I wonder if the Senator would permit me to make a parliamentary inquiry on that point.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Surely.

Mr. MORSE. Let us assume that the Mansfield amendment is agreed to. Under that amendment, there is no clear restriction that I can find which, as a matter of parliamentary law, would prevent the Appropriations Committee from appropriating the money if they decide to appropriate it.

The guidelines of the Long Act are still there; namely, that the money appropriated would be distributed to the treasuries of the political parties. Would a point of order lie, if the Appropriations Committee brought to the floor of the Senate an appropriation providing for a distribution of the funds to the treasuries of the two parties?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, could I be heard before the Chair makes his reply?

In the opinion of the Senator from Montana, the language of the Mansfield amendment imposes an absolute prohibition.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The general powers of the Appropriations Committee would still persist.

Mr. MORSE. I did not hear the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The general powers of the Appropriations Committee would still persist. The Mansfield amendment would not divest the Appropriations Committee of its authority.

Mr. MORSE. The Appropriations Committee, as a matter of parliamentary law in the Senate, could appropriate the money, and if the Senate adopted the Appropriations Committee bill, the money would be appropriated and would automatically go to the treasuries of the two parties.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under certain conditions, the Parliamentarian informs me that an appropriation could be made.

Mr. MORSE. I have stated the hypothetical situation under which I believe that could happen.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that that would be legislation, and would be subject to a point of order. I ask for a ruling.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Appropriations Committee can report out appropriation measures with no reference whatsoever to any restrictions on the appropriations, or they can allude them to such restrictions as those in the Mansfield amendment.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am anxious to yield all the time necessary to clarify this point, but I do wish to express a few views. Does the last statement of the Chair satisfy the point of order raised?

Mr. MORSE. I think we are just in the midst of it. If my friends from Montana and Tennessee will give me just a moment, all I can say is that I have struggled with this parliamentary question at considerable length in the last 24 hours. It is my present opinion that even if the Mansfield amendment were adopted, under the rules of the Senate, if an Appropriations Committee brings out an appropriation under the Long Act, pursuant to the guidelines of the present Long Act, that money, if that appropriation bill is passed, would automatically go to the treasuries of the two parties. We have no other guideline and no other protection or restriction such as I think should be placed on the appropriation of these funds. If we could get over this hurdle, the Senator from Oregon would not have any great difficulty; but until we get the matter cleared up, I could not possibly vote for the Mansfield amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Appropriations Committee could propose an appropriation, but whether or not the expenditure would be permissible under the Mansfield amendment is a legal question. The Parliamentarian joins me in stating that the parliamentary inquiry is so involved, complicated, and can be so dependent on contingencies, that we suggest the matter not be pursued any further at this point.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee would like to be heard on the parliamentary inquiry for just one moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has control of the time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield me 30 seconds?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say that the Chair confesses and avoids, as far as I am concerned, when the Presiding Officer pleads that we not pursue the matter any further. This is the crux of the whole thing, as far as I am concerned: When an appropriation bill that appropriates the money under the Long Act, is adopted by the Senate, whether or not the money automatically goes, under the present guidelines of the Long Act, into the treasuries of the two parties. Those guidelines are not changed by the amendment of the Senator from Montana. If, under those guidelines, *x* dollars would automatically go to the party treasuries, the amendment would not accomplish what most of us want to accomplish, in restricting the expenditure of the funds. I think the legal point is all on my side. I think the Parliamentarian's advising the Presiding Officer that it is a legal question proves my point.

Mr. President, we are dealing here with millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money, and they are entitled to the assurance of the necessary restrictions on the expenditure of that money. As long as the Mansfield amendment contains what I regard as this glaring loophole, I must continue to oppose it.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I do not wish to yield further at the moment.

I call to the attention of the Chair that under the Long Act, the taxpayers are given the discretion of checking off $1 of their tax payments, and designating that that dollar be transferred to the presidential election campaign fund. That provision would remain in the law after adoption of the Mansfield amendment. The money would be collected.

Under the Long Act we would undertake—though I am not sure we can do it constitutionally—to give to the taxpayers, for the first time in the history of our country, the power to earmark a part of their tax payment to a political campaign fund.

If the money is collected, the law would still, despite adoption of the Mansfield amendment, direct the Secretary of the Treasury to pay that money into the campaign fund.

If by law Congress delegated—and the Constitution places upon Congress the duty of appropriating money—if Congress delegated to the taxpayer the legal right to earmark a portion of his money for a campaign fund, and the Secretary of the Treasury paid it into that fund, what right would Congress have to take it out of that fund and use it for any other purpose? We would have given the taxpayer the right to earmark the money on his tax form, and we would have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to pay that money into a special fund. How could Congress appropriate it for any other purpose?

I now yield to the majority leader. First, I assure the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] that after I have yielded to the majority leader, I shall yield to the Senator from Delaware as much time as remains.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have been discussing this matter with counsel, and I think that my original understanding of the question raised by the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon still is accurate. I point out that the language of my amendment would mandate the Committee on Appropriations not to appropriate funds under this act. However, even if the Committee on Appropriations disregarded the mandate, and the Senate backed up the committee, the amendment would also prohibit the Treasury from distributing the funds.

I would only add that the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], would also apply to any other law—defense appropriations, or any other. It is a power inherent in the Appropriations Committee. But the history of this body does not reflect that type of disregard by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. The history of the Senate would also disclose that we would have a hard time finding a duplicate of the issue raised here during the last 6 weeks. In my judgment, the debate itself has set a precedent for such extraordinary handling of a problem.

The fact still remains that if the Appropriations Committee reported and Congress passed a bill, we could not stop the Treasury from carrying out its obligation to distribute the funds, because that is what the guidelines of the Long Act—and they will still be in the act—call for. Those guidelines call for a distribution of funds from the Treasury to the two parties.

Mr. GORE. There is an additional political fact of life, of which all Senators will be aware: Suppose we do let the Long Act go into effect, and $60 million are in the presidential campaign fund. By next May a presidential campaign will be getting underway, and the leadership of both political parties may say, "We have made our plans for the campaign on the basis of the money which the taxpayers have earmarked to go into the campaign fund."

What is Congress going to do about it? This points up the difference between the Mansfield amendment and the Gore amendment.

There is no question under my amendment but that the Long Act would become inoperative on September 15, 1967, unless Congress has acted to provide the necessary safeguards by amending the law.

Is there a Member of the Senate who wants this law to go into effect unamended?

The very basis of the amendment of the majority leader is that the law needs amendment before going into effect. However, his amendment would allow major portions of it to go into effect. My amendment would hold the law in abeyance until and unless Congress takes further action.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee has 6½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the senior Senator from Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I wish to make the issue very plain. There is only one way in which we can repeal or rescind the Long Act, and that is to agree to the pending Gore-Williams substitute. This would stop the checkoff of $1. As the able senior Senator from Oregon pointed out, unless we repeal the authority for the $1 checkoff on the tax returns we shall have accomplished nothing. The latest deadline by which the Treasury Department said it could operate would be repeal by September 15. Any date after that would be too late.

The majority leader, the Senator from Montana, whom I respect very highly, has offered his amendment which would retain the authority for the $1 checkoff on the tax returns. That is the heart of the controversy.

I most respectfully remind the Senate that if the Gore-Williams substitute, which repeals the act effective September 15, is agreed to we will accomplish only what the majority leader about 10 days ago asked Congress to do. At that time he entered a motion to recommit the bill and asked the committee to report the bill back to the Senate with an amendment repealing the Long Act.

Our amendment would carry out exactly the same results that the majority leader last week asked the Senate to achieve.

Since that time the Senator from Louisiana has made an effort to rescind that action. That effort was defeated by a vote of 52 to 46. Still he was not satisfied.

The Senate has voted three times straight to repeal the Long Act. This is the fourth time at bat. How many more times do we have to win this ball game?

It would be much better to settle the issue today than to postpone the matter and have it come up every time we have a bill from the Finance Committee.

There is only one way to settle this issue, and that is to repeal or cancel the authority for the $1 checkoff on tax returns. This is a bad law—one conceived as a rider on the Foreign Investors Tax Act in the closing days of the last session. There are no controls over the money once the political parties get possession of the $60 million slush fund.

Besides, why should a taxpayer who wants to contribute to his political party be compelled by law to make an equal contribution to the opposition party?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the senior Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the Mansfield amendment contemplates that the Treasury Department shall have forms printed which will indicate the manner in which the taxpayer will check off $1 of his taxpayment for political purposes.

The amendment of the majority leader also contemplates that the Treasury Department shall pay into an earmarked fund the moneys that have been checked off. The Mansfield amendment, however, provides that although the forms shall be printed and the moneys collected, they shall not be appropriated.

That puts us in a position in which the moneys will be earmarked and lie idly by.

If it is the purpose of the Mansfield amendment to render the Long Act inoperative, the amendment ought to go the whole way and not merely part of the way.

I regret that I will not be able to go along with the Senator from Montana on this issue. I want to, but I cannot reconcile my thinking to the anomalous condition that would prevail.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the distinguished majority leader has demonstrated the qualities for which every Member of the Senate loves him and holds him in high esteem.

He has asked us to vote as a matter of public policy.

Mr. President, this is the basis upon which every Senator, in my view, should act. This involves high public policy an issue of very great importance in which the country has a deep concern. The question involved here is whether we shall let this inadequate, imperfect, unwise, and, in my view, dangerous and unprecedented law go into effect, or whether we shall hold it in abeyance until Congress can, in its wisdom, provide the proper safeguards. And it ought to be done in this session, because next year we will be in the throes of a presidential campaign.

The amendment which the Senator from Delaware and I have offered would not destroy any principle. It would not even announce a principle.

Our amendment neither announces nor denounces a principle. All it would provide is that unless Congress does act by September 15, 1967, the Long Act will become inoperative until Congress, by law, shall direct otherwise.

Our amendment would not destroy principle. On October 15, Congress could, by law, direct that the Long Act become operative.

All our amendment does is to hold an unwise law in abeyance—a law which, so far as I now know, not a single Senator would like to see go into effect unamended. Yet, this may be our last chance to have operation of the law held in abeyance.

The amendment is simple. It is not subject to all of the points of order and legal questions to which the Mansfield amendment is subject. It would not leave the Long Act operative in part and inoperative in part.

This is what our amendment provides:

> The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be inoperative after September 15, 1967, unless Congress shall by law otherwise direct.

That is all. It is simple. In my opinion, Senators should avail themselves of this opportunity to hold this unwise law in abeyance until proper safeguards are enacted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous unanimous-consent agreement, all time on the amendment has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, who controls time on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Time is controlled by the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute on the bill to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I should like to make a few points to explain my position on the Gore and Mansfield amendments.

I favor the elimination of the suspension of the investment credit. A bill to accomplish this was voted out of the Committee on Finance some 2 months ago. During the ensuing weeks, many important but nongermane matters have been considered. These matters have merit and should be considered by the committees involved, the Senate, and Congress. It is high time, however, that we act on the tax matter, vital to the economy of the country, and passed by the House weeks ago.

I voted for the Long bill of 1966. I did not think it perfect. I had many misgivings, but I thought it imperative that national attention be focused on the increasing and serious problem of financing presidential elections.

The Mansfield amendment meets my objectives. This amendment, coupled with the instructions already directed to the Committee on Finance by the Senate, seems to me adequate. The Committee on Finance, in setting guidelines, can make major changes of a substantive nature in present law. The Senate will again, after 6 weeks, have an opportunity to further amend or even repeal the present law.

For these reasons, I favor the Mansfield amendment and oppose the Gore amendment, and will so vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 3 minutes on the bill.

This bill, the so-called Long Act, is a mere authorization. Now, Senators know the difference between an authorization and an appropriation.

The day I came to the Senate, there was on the books an authorization for $200 million to build the Red River lateral canal in Louisiana. They have not yet turned the first spade of dirt. Nothing has happened. Why? Because we have never had a single dollar appropriated. I testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee today, asking for some money to be appropriated on the authorization. The authorization has been there for 20 years, without a dollar having been appropriated.

The so-called Long Act is merely an authorization. It is not an appropriation. If anyone is worried about that, let me read to him what the law says. This is section 303(c):

> The Secretary of the Treasury shall, with respect to each presidential campaign, pay out of the Fund, as authorized by appropriation Acts, into the treasury of each political party which has complied with the provisions of paragraph (3) an amount (subject to the limitation in paragraph (3)(B)) determined under paragraph (2).

It requires an appropriation act to pay out anything. Until the appropriation act is passed, not a dime can be paid to any political party. That is how authorization acts generally read.

Furthermore, if you have any doubt, I shall read section 305:

> There are authorized—

Authorized, mind you—

> to be appropriated, out of the presidential election campaign fund, such sums as may be necessary to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to make payments under section 303 of this act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

A mere authorization. The act says authorization twice: in paragraph 303 (c); and in paragraph 305. How many times must it be said that this is not an appropriation? This is a mere authorization.

What are the Senator and his supporters fighting for? They understand it better than they explain it to you. They are fighting to prevent the Secretary of the Treasury from asking a mere question which, in the absence of an appropriation bill, has no more effect than a question asked by a census taker:

> Would you like to have one dollar of your money paid into a fund to finance both presidential candidates and the candidate of any third party which can qualify in the future?

The proposal of the majority leader goes a step further. It says that before we can pay out a nickel under an appropriation act, we must amend the authorization act. So we have to amend the authorization and then pass the appropriation. His proposal makes it one step more difficult to achieve what I am trying to do. But those who oppose what I am trying to do are afraid of letting the American people——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Those who oppose what I am trying to do—to find a more honorable way to finance presidential campaigns—fight their own leadership, for fear that the Secretary of the Treasury will put a question on the tax form. Would you like to let everybody answer the question whether they would like to contribute a dollar? That is all that the talking is about.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The opponents of the Mansfield amendment are fearful of having the question asked.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GORE. The Senator says that this would be a survey, that it is simply to let the taxpayer answer a question. I suggest, Mr. President, that is not what the Long Act provides. It provides that on the tax form——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I do not yield for a speech, I yield for a question.

Mr. GORE. Does not the Long Act provide that the taxpayer shall have the right to check a box on his form and earmark a dollar of his taxpayment to go to the presidential campaign fund? That is more than a mere survey.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The taxpayer will place a mark on a form which causes a dollar to be transferred from one Treasury account into another Treasury account. In the absence of an appropriation act, it provides that the money returns to the general fund.

Mr. GORE. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. There is no such provision in the law, that it go back into the general fund.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. There is such a provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 30 additional seconds.

I suggest that the Senator refer to paragraph 303 (d):

> Transfers to general fund. If, after any presidential campaign and after all political parties which are entitled to payments under subsection (c) with respect to such presidential campaign have been paid the amounts to which they are entitled under subsection (c), there are moneys remaining in the fund, the Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer the moneys so remaining to the general fund of the Treasury.

In the absence of an appropriation act, nothing can be paid by the Treasury to the parties. The parties are entitled to payment as authorized by appropriation acts. If there is no appropriation act, the parties are entitled to no payment and then under section 303(d) of last year's act, the money in the fund shall be transferred back to the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. GORE. It does not say that. It does not say "in the absence." It says that after the political parties have been paid what they are entitled to under this law, then funds remaining may be transferred back to the general fund. This is far more than a mere survey.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Let us vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield additional time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, not to exceed 5 minutes, the time to be taken from the time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the Gore amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from North Carolina.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senate should understand clearly what it is voting on.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, there is noise in the Chamber.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, while such is not intended by the able and distinguished majority leader, the Mansfield amendment will tie the hands of the Senate in such a way that it will be compelled to leave in full force and effect the Long Act. Why do I say that? I say that because under the Mansfield amendment taxpaying citizens of the United States would check the square on their tax returns and pay their money into the Treasury of the United States upon the pledge of Congress that that money is to be used as set out in the Long Act, that is, distributed one-half to the Republican candidate for President and one-half to the Democratic candidate for President.

I do not care what kind of guidelines the Senate might adopt, it cannot change that basic provision of the Long Act without breaching faith with every American taxpayer who designates that his dollar is to be used on the basis of the Long Act: one-half for the Democratic presidential candidate and one-half for the Republican presidential candidate.

The Mansfield amendment will tie the hands of the Senate so that it will have to continue to make obeisance to the concept of the Senator from Louisiana regardless of their wishes in the matter. This is true because the State cannot do otherwise under the Mansfield amendment without breaking faith with every taxpayer who pays his dollar into the Treasury under the Long Act.

I am unwilling to have my hands tied in such a fashion. Under the Mansfield amendment, I cannot legislate according to my intelligence without breaking faith with the American taxpayer who pays his dollar into the Treasury under the Long Act. Therefore, I am going to support the Gore amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I asked for this 1 minute as we near the conclusion. I am grateful for the attention and consideration of the Senate.

As has been the case so many times, the issue is very close. The vote will be very close. I do not know at the moment the outcome of the first vote. Three Senators are absent. Two Senators have commitments for a pair on the first vote; neither has a commitment on a second vote.

In the event my amendment does not carry, which I hope it will, there will be, as far as I am concerned, a second vote immediately.

I thank the Senate very much and I ask for a vote.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I suggest that the amendment be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] proposes an amendment for himself and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]:

> In lieu of the language of amendment numbered 187 proposed by Mr. MANSFIELD, insert the following:
>
> "SEC. 5. The Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be inoperative after September 15, 1967, unless Congress shall by law otherwise direct."

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, a point of inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, the first vote is on the Gore-Williams substitute for the Mansfield motion; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much time remains on the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes for the purpose of reiterating something that I said before when there were very few Senators in the Chamber. I simply wish to emphasize my point of view, if I may.

I should like to direct the Senate's attention to the substance of the pending issue. Bluntly, it has to do with who puts up the money. It has to do with the escalating costs of election campaigns, and how they are to be dealt with in the public interest. I do not believe anyone in the Senate during the course of this debate, has contended that the present system of campaign financing is good or even satisfactory. I do not believe it has been argued that the public interest is best met by confining candidates in Federal elections to those with sufficient personal wealth. I do not believe anyone has expressed the view that the protection of the public interest in political campaigns can best be achieved by raising the price of steak at political dinners, however essential that form of fundraising may be at this time.

Congress reached a decision last year which reflected a concern with the adequacy of current methods of financing campaigns. It voted for an income tax checkoff. The decision was reached in haste and by an unusual procedural path at the close of a session. Nevertheless, the decision was reached legally and the principle of public participation in political campaign financing is now the law of the land.

I believe that that is a wise principle. I believe that it is a principle worth preserving in law. Whatever the shortcomings of the Long Act of 1966, those shortcomings in no way detract from the validity of the principle. Whatever the shortcomings, in no way do they lessen the desirability of preserving that principle.

The Gore amendment—and I say this most respectfully—would seek to tear down that principle. It would deny the validity of the principle—at least insofar as the principle is established and maintained in law by means of the act of 1966. The Gore amendment says, in effect, get rid of the act of 1966. Get rid of it, even if that means disestablishing a most desirable legal principle.

Simply put, my amendment would render the Long Act of 1966 inoperative in the absence of further legislation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I believe the Senator requested that I yield at this point the last time. I yield.

Mr. GORE. The able majority leader, in the presence of a large number of Senators just said that his amendment would render the Long Act inoperative.

Under the Senator's amendment the Long Act would be inoperative only in part.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And, as I said before, I admit to that.

It would foreclose public participation in the financing of election campaigns until Congress reflects, studies, and drafts what it considers the best and safest approach and that is precisely what the Senator from Tennessee has urged during all these weeks of debate. Moreover, my amendment makes ironclad the congressional control over the sufficiency of the approach of the guidelines and safeguards. Under my amendment Congress must determine them by law and affirm them by law before one cent of Federal funds may be expended for election purposes.

Until Congress acts in that fashion, a check box on the Federal income tax form will remain as the sole reminder of the 1966 act. The only effect of the act, without further legislation, would be to make possible the conduct of a survey throughout the country of how many taxpayers desire a system of public financial participation in election campaigns.

The retention of the Long Act as modified by my amendment would merely symbolize the congressional view that public funds can provide at least part of the solution to the dangerous dilemma which is posed to popular government by the skyrocketing costs of modern political campaigning. Put bluntly, it will remind all who were not born yesterday, that the millions of dollars which go into campaigns must come from somewhere and the question of who pays for campaigns and why is not academic but vital in a modern democratic state. The retention of the reminder will compel us in the Congress—I repeat, will compel us in the Congress to ask ourselves again and again: Shall the piper be the whole of the American people through a system of public participation in campaign financing? Or shall the tune be called more and more in the beat of special interests and great wealth? The retention of that reminder will keep before us the implications of these questions which go to the very heart and structure of the Government of the Republic.

Let me make clear that if my amendment prevails, it will indeed affirm the principle of public participation in the financing of elections. However, it will not, in any way, establish a particular pattern of public participation. It will not, in any way, preselect a system of tax checkoff or tax credit or tax deduction or any other. That question will remain to be determined along with all others involved in safeguarding the impartiality and integrity of public financing of election campaigns.

Let me say to my colleagues that when I speak of an honest, clean elections campaign law, expected to be forthcoming from the Committee on Finance, I do not speak in jest. The need is here and now. It is long overdue. I want to see a good campaign law brought out. I want to see Congress as a whole pass it, support it, and uphold it.

I do not intend to stand for any shenanigans of any kind in that respect. I expect the Committee on Finance, if it is so directed, to bring out the kind of bill we have been talking about on the floor of the Senate, and I expect the Senate, regardless of party, to support it.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Senate is in its sixth week on legislation calling for the restoration of 7-percent investment credit on Federal income taxes. This bill must be passed and sent speedily to the President. Our economy needs it.

But, as we all know, that bill is not at the root of weeks of wrangling and dissent. The thorn in our side is the apparent inability of Members of this body to waive their prejudices and reach a suitable compromise on the question of financing presidential campaigns.

The vote today is crucial. The amendment offered by Senator GORE would remove the Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966 from the statute books. The proposal of the distinguished majority leader, Mr. MANSFIELD, bars the disbursement and appropriation of funds until guidelines are set up to govern their distribution under the law passed last year.

I, too, am eager to get on with other pressing demands ahead. That is why I have consistently voted against the extraneous and unrelated amendments attached to this revenue measure. But I am not so eager to go forward at the risk of losing sight of what I believe offers a valid foundation on which to build necessary guidelines.

If the Gore amendment passes and the campaign issue is disposed of, I think we can justly say it might be years until another bill is enacted that provides a base to work out a solution to rising campaign costs. It is not true, as some critics claim, that the Long proposal is a new approach. As far back as 1907, President Theodore Roosevelt proposed a Government subsidy along the lines of the act whose fate we will decide today. In his recommendations, however, President Roosevelt cautioned that "it will take time for people to familiarize themselves with this proposal."

The Mansfield amendment provides that time for study. We have the alternative of either improving the existing act or junking it in favor of an altogether different approach, perhaps some sort of a tax deduction. The provisions are also flexible, yet they protect the interests of those who oppose the act by requiring the Senate to speak not once—but twice before any funds can be disbursed. Congress would have to enact guidelines and pass an appropriations bill.

It is obvious from debate on this floor that the Long proposal is not the only avenue open. But by retaining last year's law for further study, it is possible to arrive at a solution that is better than selling $100- and $500-a-plate tickets to fundraising events.

Twenty-five years in public office coupled with the experience I gained as Acting Democratic National Chairman for awhile and chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee confirms this judgment. Such a reform is urgently needed now.

I hope my fellow colleagues will not be too hasty to dispose of this campaign issue. It has taken us 60 years to enact legislation dealing with financing of presidential elections. It would be unwise to turn the clock back now.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, when President Johnson submitted the investment tax credit bill to Congress on March 9, this year, he said:

> I urge the Congress to act promptly on this legislation without delay so that there will be no uncertainty or doubt in our free enterprise economy.

The Senate has now been deadlocked over the investment tax credit bill for 7 weeks.

I believe that the investment tax credit bill should have been passed weeks ago. The orderly expansion of our economy, which means more jobs and higher incomes and greater prosperity for all our citizens, urgently requires restoration of the investment tax credit, which encourages businesses to expand and modernize their operations.

It is very regrettable that this vital bill has become bogged down in the attempt to repeal the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act. Broad-based public support of presidential campaigns is vital in light of the skyrocketing costs of campaigning. The American people want their candidates for the Presidency free from dependency on special-interest sources of campaign contributions. Therefore, during the 7-week debate, I have consistently supported the Campaign Fund Act, as safeguarded by the amendments other Senators and I have offered to it on the floor of the Senate.

The Campaign Fund Act is not perfect, but it is far better than nothing. And nothing is what Congress had been able to agree upon for decades prior to enactment of this law. As safeguarded by my amendment to limit its operation to a trial run in 1968 and other amendments also intended to protect the public interest, the Campaign Fund Act should not be repealed.

Nonetheless, the time is long overdue for the Senate to move decisively to pass the investment tax credit bill.

I intend today to vote for the Mansfield compromise amendment and against the substitute for it. The Mansfield compromise will leave the campaign fund law on the books, but delay any disbursement of funds through it until Congress agrees on comprehensive guidelines to control the use of such funds.

Whatever the result of today's vote, however, I intend to support the decision of the majority of the Senate on these amendments, so that the Investment Tax Credit Act can be promptly enacted. The Senate should delay no longer. The investment tax credit bill should be passed today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I have listened carefully to the remarks of the distinguished majority leader regarding his amendment and to the remarks of the Senator from Tennessee regarding his amendment. It appeared to me that the two amendments would in substance produce an equivalent result. However, to resolve any doubts, I have discussed this matter with the majority leader. I want to say that on the basis of his statements on the floor today and previously, and on the basis of my discussion with him, I am satisfied that his amendment would in no way commit, or bind, or express the preference of the Senate for any particular form of public participation in election financing. It would not tie us to the tax checkoff system or, for that matter, to the whole idea of financing campaigns through Government appropriations. That is, as I understand it, we start afresh. Thus for example, if the Congress wants a system of tax deductions for contributions, neither last year's bill, nor the majority leader's amendment will in any way present any barrier or hindrance whatsoever to the enactment of such a system.

I am satisfied that it is the intent and effect of the majority leader's amendment that if the Senate passes a bill which establishes some other form of campaign financing than the unprecedented tax checkoff machinery, or decides against all financing proposals, then no money will ever be appropriated, set aside, or distributed for any election campaign under the terms of the 1966 Campaign Finance Act. I am also satisfied both from the majority leader's remarks and conversations today and from his prior discussions of this matter on the floor, that his amendment and the provisions of the previous recommittal motion passed by the Senate, should be construed by the Finance Committee broadly. They constitute a mandate for a full review of the various proposals for campaign reforms, not only dealing with financing, but also dealing with all other aspects of campaigning which have been identified as being problem areas.

Mr. President, the Senate has voted three times already this session on the concepts embodied in the 1966 act. By its vote it has repeatedly expressed its disagreement with the approach of that measure. Those of us who feel strongly about the inadequacy of that approach, and who have consistently voted with the majority on this issue, are apprehensive that the 1966 measure itself, or a thinly veiled but substantially similar bill, might possibly be presented to the Senate again in the near future with the intent of meeting the criteria of the majority leader's amendment. But again, I am convinced on the basis of his statements on the floor and to me, that his attitude would be one of complete opposition to such an attempt, and that he would not consider such a proposal as satisfying either the language or the spirit of his amendment or of the prior motion to recommit.

Mr. President, I would also point out that if the pending amendment of the Senator from Tennessee does not pass, to the extent that any Senator feels that there is some ambiguity in the majority leader's amendment which should be cleared up, I think that it would certainly be appropriate for that Senator to suggest a clarifying amendment to the majority leader's amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] and by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPONG (when his name was called). On this vote I am paired with the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The assistant legislative clerk resumed and concluded the call of the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] is necessarily absent.

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 48, nays 48, as follows:

[No. 107 Leg.]

YEAS—48

Aiken
Allott
Baker
Bennett
Boggs
Brooke
Byrd, Va.
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Hatfield
Hickenlooper
Hill
Hruska
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
McClellan
Miller
Monroney
Morse
Mundt
Murphy
Pearson
Percy
Prouty
Russell
Scott
Smith
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NAYS—48

Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Dodd
Ellender
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hayden
Holland
Hollings
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—4

Case
Gruening
McCarthy
Spong

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this vote there are 48 yeas and 48 nays. The Chair votes "nay."

So the Gore-Williams substitute amendment was rejected.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment, on behalf of the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] and myself, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 1, line 4 of the amendment of the Senator from Montana, numbered 187, after the period, insert the following:
>
> "Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall become applicable only after the adoption by law of such guidelines."

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I shall take only 2 minutes.

This amendment is intended to assure that the Senate will adopt a provision which will do what the majority leader has indicated his amendment would do. This amendment would add to the Mansfield amendment these words:

> Section 6096—

That is the checkoff provision in the Long Act—

> Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall become applicable only after the adoption of such guidelines.

The Mansfield amendment which the Senate has just adopted—excuse me—which is pending—this is not the first time the Senator from Tennessee has been confused during the debate, but it is certainly one of the times—I should have said the Senate has just rejected a substitute amendment.

The Mansfield amendment is now before the Senate. The Mansfield amendment provides that the Long Act shall be inoperative, insofar as disbursement of funds is concerned, until Congress enacts guidelines for distribution of the funds.

The amendment now offered by the Senator from Delaware and me would add that section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall become applicable only after the adoption by law of such guidelines.

The amendment is simple. The distinguished majority leader has said his amendment would not direct any particular form of financing campaigns; but I suggest to Senators that the Long Act does provide a particular method. It provides for a tax checkoff. It provides for a box on the income tax form.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

If we really wish to make this law inoperable, then we ought not permit the collection of the money, as well as restrict appropriation of it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

Mr. President, I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, in addition to prohibiting the appropriation of the money, prohibits the checkoff and collection of the money. Is that correct?

Mr. GORE. That is correct. That is all it does.

I suggest that the distinguished Vice President, was has just exercised a privilege rarely exercised by the Presiding Officer, may not have to exercise his privilege on this vote.

Mr. MORTON and Mr. MILLER addressed the Chair.

Mr. GORE. I yield first to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON], a member of the committee.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, my explanation of my vote in opposition to the Gore amendment has been spelled out in the RECORD.

I believe in the Mansfield amendment, but I feel that the argument made that the law should not become operative until we in the Finance Committee do what we are instructed to do by the Senate should go for the checkoff as well as for the dispensation of the funds; and for that reason, I think the spirit of the Mansfield amendment still prevails with the pending amendment, and I can support this amendment.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator very much. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Tennessee about this checkoff. As I understand, if we do not do something about it, up to 80 million income tax returns will have to be individually audited. As I understand the amendment of the Senator from Tennessee, it provides the checkoff shall not be operative until some guidelines are passed by Congress.

Mr. GORE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MILLER. Once the guidelines are passed by Congress, do we not still have the checkoff?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The Senator understands that the amendment which I have offered is an amendment to the Mansfield amendment.

I wish to read the Mansfield amendment as amended by the Gore-Williams amendment. If Senators will give me their attention, I should like to read what we are about to vote upon.

If the Mansfield amendment becomes a part of the law, as amended by the amendment I have just offered on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]—and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] has indicased he wishes to be a cosponsor—it would read this way:

> SEC. 5(a). Funds which become available under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be appropriated and disbursed only after the adoption by law of guidelines governing their distribution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Better take 2.

Mr. GORE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

> (b) Guidelines adopted in accordance with this section shall state expressly that they are intended to comply with this section.

My amendment would add to subsection (a):

> Sec. 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall become applicable only after the adoption by law of such guidelines.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. That is just my point. The Senator's amendment provides the law is to be applicable after guidelines are adopted. Even if guidelines are adopted, the Senator from Iowa does not want the checkoff, which would require the auditing of 80 million income tax returns.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have done my utmost to accomplish the objective of the distinguished Senator from Iowa. I thought we had succeeded, but the distinguished Vice President in his tie-breaking vote has decreed otherwise, so this is the best I can do. The purpose of this is to prevent the act from going into effect until Congress does act further.

Mr. MILLER. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Would the Senator think it would be a distortion of interpretation to suggest that if Congress adopts guidelines, it might also adopt a difference in the way campaigns shall be financed?

Mr. GORE. I think the adoption of the pending amendment would mean that the Senate Finance Committee will have full leeway to recommend to the Senate an election reform bill. I think that the pending amendment would place in dormancy the Long Act.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Committee on Finance reported a new bill after hearings, and if the Senate did not adopt it, then the Long Act, so called, would be completely inoperative, would it not?

Mr. GORE. The money could not be collected and there would be no law for paying the money out even if it were; the Senator is correct.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, do I have time remaining in opposition to the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator has 3 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield myself 3 minutes against the amendment.

Mr. President, all we are talking about here is whether or not to ask the public a simple question. The question is: "Would you like to have one dollar of your tax money divided between the major parties, with some provision for minor parties, to pay the expenses of conducting their presidential election campaigns?"

The Mansfield amendment would require guidelines to be put into effect before a single dollar could be appropriated to anybody.

I must admit that some people fear the idea that the public should be permitted to express itself. So we see these amendments. Here is the leadership motion, offered by the majority leader of the Senate, seeking to say that nothing will be paid out, not a dollar, unless and until Congress acts both to amend the authorization and to provide the appropriation. We have got to do both.

But that is not enough to suit those who will not follow the leadership on this side of the aisle. They fear to have the question even asked, and feel that they must get that question off the tax return. That is all it is. It has no more status than a question asked by a census taker, in the absence of a fund appropriation. But they fear to submit the question to the American people. That is all we are really fighting about. Should we ask the question: "Would you like one dollar of your tax money to be divided equally between the two parties, with some provision, as we can work it out, for a minor party in the future to share in the funds?"

If the public is permitted to answer the question, the opponents of the Mansfield amendment feel that perhaps 30 million, perhaps 50 million, maybe even 60 million people might answer "Yes" to that question.

I understand why they fear that. Our committee is the action committee on campaign financing in this body. We brought out last year's act while others did nothing. While they were gathering their recommendations, we enacted a bill. Now they want to take it off the statute books—the only thing that has been done to provide a better way to handle the question of campaign financing.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. Does not the Senator feel that if the taxpayer is permitted to say how the money is to be spent, he might be more likely to give it?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. PASTORE. Understand, I am for the Gore amendment. But I think essentially the votes mean the same thing. The only difference here is that in one case, the money can be collected and perhaps given to the parties. That is the Mansfield amendment. According to the Gore amendment, as I understand it, the predicate here is the passing of guidelines; but you cannot collect the money until you have instituted the guidelines, therefore, the taxpayer will know how the money is to be spent when he designates his money. I believe more money would be collected in that fashion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

As long as you have a provision in the law—and this is what I am fighting for—that the taxpayer has a right to answer the question, then, in my judgment, Congress will act; but, in the absence of that opportunity for the taxpayers to answer that question, nothing will ever happen. Because this Gore amendment, in effect, would take the Long Act off the statute books, and then the taxpayers will never have the opportunity to answer the first question. They will not have the opportunity to say, "yea" by answering "yes"; they will not have the opportunity to say "nay" by answering "no." They will not have the opportunity to say "nay," in effect, by not making a mark at all. They will not have the opportunity to answer the question in any fashion.

My opponents want to see that nobody gets a chance to do anything. That is what they seek to accomplish by their dilatory tactics in this body—to assure that nothing will happen. Their dilatory tactics have already assured that the present state of confusion between the two Houses—greater than at any time in the last 30 years—will continue to prevail.

That is why they fear so much that somebody will have an opportunity to answer the question. We propose by the Mansfield amendment that nobody will get a dollar until Congress acts further. That will guarantee that we act further. However, to repeal what we now have would mean that we will not do anything; we will do what we have done for the last 30 years on this subject—nothing.

That is why I oppose the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum not to exceed 3 minutes and ask unanimous consent that the time be charged to me.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, how much of my 3 minutes do I have remaining?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Montana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I know how strongly the distinguished Senator from Louisiana feels about the Long Act. While I do join in his enthusiasm, I, understandably, do not feel as strongly as he does. I think it is a good law. I think it has been subjected to a great deal of undue abuse and vilification. However, after reading the amendment of the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee, I ask the distinguished Senator from Louisiana if he can find within his conscience the ability to accept the amendment.

I think it would be in the interest of the Senate as a whole. I think that the Senator's rights would be protected, and I would hope that he would give the matter his serious consideration.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am standing here with blood draining into my boots. One cannot tell my necktie from my shirt after the last 6 weeks. However, I will not fight my majority leader.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I merely want to express gratitude to the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Ohio withhold a moment? Who yields time to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Ohio.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, last Thursday I made the suggestion that this procedure would be a cure for all of our problems.

I thought the Senator from Montana looked favorably upon the proposal. I am glad to hear today that, by his statement, he confirms what I believe to be his position on last Thursday.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may I take this occasion to express my personal thanks to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for the cooperation and consideration which he has shown. He has indicated this same tolerance and understanding down through the years of our close relationship. I personally appreciate it very much.

He, too, has been subject to unwarranted abuse and vilification. I do not like it, because it is undeserved.

I say publicly what I have said privately and publicly before this time, that the cooperation between the majority leader and the deputy majority leader has been close, consistent, and considerate down through the years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader for his statement.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I realize that there is some reluctance to have a rollcall vote. However, we will have a conference with the other body.

I regret to do this, but I feel that it would strengthen the case of the Senate if we were to have this provision added to the Mansfield amendment by a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, this amendment could not be split in conference. This is the whole amendment. If the House conferees do not want it, they will not accept it.

A lot of us have been trying to compromise and get this measure to a vote. I do not see why we have to have a rollcall vote when we are unanimous in following the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I modify my amendment along the lines suggested by the Senator from Tennessee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is so modified.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the Mansfield amendment as modified by addition of the Gore-Williams amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I think that the Senate should understand the present parliamentary situation. I am sure that the majority leader will confirm my statement.

The Mansfield amendment, as modified, would mean that there would be no $1 check off, nor would this item appear on the tax returns unless Congress were to take affirmative action to so authorize.

I repeat—in the absence of any future action by Congress to include this checkoff item on the tax returns, the Long Act—sometimes referred to as the campaign slush fund—would be null and void. It would be inoperative whether one calls it a repeal or not. There will be no checkoff, nor will any money be placed in the special fund. It automatically follows that no money could be appropriated thereafter.

It would take affirmative action by Congress at some later date to have the checkoff become operative. In fact, the adoption of this modified Mansfield amendment repeals all but the name of the act. The difference between the pending Mansfield amendment, as modified, and the earlier Gore-Williams substitute, which was just defeated, is that the Gore-Williams substitute would have extended the date of its repeal to September 15, 1967. The pending amendment advances that date to the date of enactment. Therefore, the pending amendment of the majority leader, as modified, would be more restrictive than would the Gore-Williams substitute which was defeated earlier this afternoon. For this reason I am urging that it be approved by the Senate.

The Gore-Williams substitute would have allowed an extension of the act to September 15. This pending proposal is much better—it gets rid of the act immediately.

I think that the Senate should understand that that is the effect of the amendment.

The choice is clear. The amendment already in the committee bill repeals the Long Act effective July 31, 1967. The Mansfield amendment, as it has been modified by the Gore-Williams amendment, repeals the act immediately.

We have a choice between repealing the act effective July 31 or suspending the act effective the date of enactment. This is a wonderful compromise. Let us approve it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. All time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana, as modified.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The suggestion of the absence of a quorum will be granted. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I urge the adoption of the Mansfield amendment as it has been modified by the Gore-Williams amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the Mansfield amendment, as modified. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] is necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] would vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 4, as follows:

[No. 108 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dodd
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hartke
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—4

Fong
Nelson
Proxmire
Williams, N.J.

NOT VOTING—3

Case
Gruening
McCarthy

So Mr. MANSFIELD'S amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. MORSE. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] is recognized.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, a point of order. It is absolutely impossible to know what is going on.

Mr. MORSE. I have the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair agrees with the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I ask that Senators be directed to keep their seats.

Mr. MORSE. Without losing my right to the floor, I ask unanimous consent to yield to the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair must indicate that the time is under control, and the question now comes on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

Mr. MORSE. Under those circumstances, I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield briefly?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Montana such time as he requires.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask for 4 minutes.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM—THE DODD CENSURE RESOLUTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the distinguished minority leader and I have an announcement to make jointly.

It has been agreed that beginning on Monday, May 22, 2 weeks from yesterday, we will take up the so-called Dodd resolution.

During the period which the resolution will be considered, it is our intention to object to any committee meetings of any kind. It is our further intention to come in early, possibly at 10 o'clock, on Monday, May 22, and stay as late as need be and to make this the sole and only business of the Senate during that time.

Mr. DIRKSEN and Mr. HOLLAND addressed the Chair.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The majority leader and I have agreed——

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, may we have order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will Senators who are not going to make speeches please be seated.

How much time does the Senator yield to himself?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. President, the majority leader and I have agreed that we should, over our joint signatures, dispatch a letter to every Senator reminding them of what is involved in a consideration of this resolution, because it does affect a Member of this body and could seriously affect him. We believe, therefore, that Senators should cancel engagements that may take them away, certainly on the 23d and 24th of May, and even the 22d of May, if possible.

I think Senators owe it to the Senator from Connecticut to be here and hear the presentation, and we shall so advise all Senators. We do so so that they will be fully aware of the importance of these proceedings.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I had yielded to the minority leader. We have no resolution. We made an announcement.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield myself 2 minutes under the bill. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. KUCHEL. I wish to ask the minority leader if Senators can still rely on the projected Memorial Day weekend and, if so, when would your able leader feel that would begin?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We had that in mind in designating the day, and we believe that will take place.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, for the purpose of the RECORD, I wish to state that I will be in Vietnam on a trip for the Committee on Armed Services. I will not be able to be here during that period of time.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The question I wished to address to the majority leader and I shall now address to the minority leader is: Is it intended to preclude the Committee on Appropriations from meeting during the debate which has just been announced?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Appropriations have a special dispensation under the rule. They will be meeting in the morning, assuming that the Senate does not meet before 12 o'clock. In the afternoon it would appear to me that for 2 days the members of the committee could well be in their seats in the Chamber because of the importance of this proceeding.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no opposition to that, but I wish to call attention to the fact that if that is the intention, it would require unanimous consent. That affects either the rule or previous unanimous consent given, and the Senator from Florida is not sure which it is, to accomplish that end.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have done nothing about that. Senators will want to be here.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SYMINGTON and Mr. HARTKE addressed the Chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, as long as the able majority leader and the able minority leader have announced that this matter will come up on the 22d of May, I would say respectfully to the distinguished Senator from Illinois that it would be very difficult for me to be here on the 22d of May, as I have already notified the majority leader. Therefore, I hope he will be lenient.

I am sure that those of us who cannot be here on the 22d of May will have an opportunity to read the RECORD on the 23d.

INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, I wish to say that I have conferred with the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS]. We have no further amendments to offer and we hope that we can come to a rapid vote on passage of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Do Senators yield back time?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, may I address an inquiry to the Senator from Louisiana?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I had an amendment at the desk which related to the problems of the handicapped. There was a very splendid analysis of that situation by Dr. Rusk in the New York Times about a week ago pointing out the way in which the United States was considering enormous amounts of money but was not giving some tax consideration to the handicapped, as it did to the blind.

My only purpose in seeking to propose the amendment would be to ask the Senator if he would give me a hearing, even if it were a brief hearing; and the leader will table anyhow. In view of the backing which this proposal has, I hope that the Senator will give us a reasonable opportunity in the future to consider the matter.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require. Is the amendment pending?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment is pending. On the bill, the Senator from Louisiana has 10 minutes and the Senator from Illinois has 20 minutes, or a total of 30 minutes.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to say that I was not a party to the agreement to table any further amendments to the bill I am managing and, therefore, I am not in a position to speak to it.

It was my plan that, however the vote went on the Gore amendment to the Mansfield amendment, I would accept the outcome—and I shook hands with the majority leader on that. I believe I made the motion to reconsider. I accept the outcome. I accepted the amendment on the urging of the majority leader and I agree to it. I am going to see that there are a sufficient number of conferees to uphold the Senate's amendment. If the House takes it, so much the better.

I agreed also to considering good amendments, such as the Proxmire amendment. This is an investment credit bill. The Proxmire amendment is an investment credit amendment. Everybody here agrees with that, and I have not heard a single person say that this Proxmire amendment should not be in the bill. That amendment provides that a technical situation adversely affecting an industry in his State will be corrected. I support the amendment.

I read that the majority leader said he reserved the right to move to table amendments, but I hope he has reconsidered. I said I would take the Proxmire amendment and I stand ready to take it.

The Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] had amendments involving the corrupt practices law. He modified his previous presidential election amendment to include them. I shook hands with him at the door. I said, "Let's not kid each other. No matter how this comes out, you offer your amendment, and we will agree to the amendment to the corrupt practices law."

I agreed to take both of those amendments, and I would be willing also to take the Byrd amendment on social security previously agreed to by the Senate. With regard to those three amendments voted by the Senate, one with no objection, I agreed we would take them.

Mr. SMATHERS and Mr. PASTORE addressed the Chair.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Proxmire amendment was not brought to the attention of the committee until after the bill was reported. If the amendment had been considered by the committee, I am sure we would have taken it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. If it is adopted in the House of Representatives.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The amendment of the Senator from Wisconsin was adopted on the floor but not considered by the committee.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not know why we are in this bind. It may be that the majority leader could relent and let us take this particular amendment. The rest of them can be considered by a motion to table.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. I hope that the majority leader will insist that we stop at this point with these amendments. It is actually becoming a scandal in the business world. We have been holding out this relief to the business community, which has an opportunity to expand its plants and create more jobs for American workers, but we have been dillydallying in the Senate week after week. I think that what we should do now is stop this amendment business and get down to the real business at hand.

If we take this one amendment, it will only open the doors to 10 more.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I have not voted for everyone's amendments. We can pass this bill, in any event, I would say, by 6 o'clock this evening. And if we pass the bill, then we can do justice to the Senators who have amendments which should be considered, such as the one by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. PROXMIRE], which is an investment credit amendment. It sets out how the investment credit would be treated in a net operating loss carryback situation. It has been a real tax problem. I told the Senator from Wisconsin that I would take the amendment, no matter how this last vote came out. I would like to take it. I wish the Senate would let me take the amendment.

I read the statement in which the majority leader stated that he reserved the right to move to table amendments. My thought, in reading that statement, was that he referred to amendments which had no place here, which would be dilatory, which would not be germane, or which had not been considered. But the Proxmire amendment has more right to be in the bill than the Gore amendment or the Mansfield amendment, because it is relevant to the bill. It is an investment tax credit amendment. Everyone agrees that it is a good amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Wisconsin withdrew his amendment some days ago on the assurance—and I stand to be corrected if I am wrong—of a number of Senators, including the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Finance, that it would be placed as a rider on the next tax bill. As I understand, there was no opposition to the amendment. It is needed. Its case has not been predetermined. I would say that if it were offered as an amendment to the next tax measure, it would most likely pass the Senate unanimously because the Senator from Wisconsin and his colleague [Mr. NELSON] have presented an airtight case, which both sides of the aisle can approve.

But, I would suggest to the able chairman of the Committee on Finance that if we start accepting amendments at this time, there will be no end. I would hope it would be possible to come to a final vote on this bill as it stands now, and consider at a later time the amendments such as the loss carryback-investment credit amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin, the corrupt practices amendment offered by the Senator from Delaware, the college tuition amendment offered by the Senator from Connecticut, and others. I am sure that in the appropriate place, and at the appropriate time, all of these matters will be given the consideration to which they are entitled.

I, along with the Senate, would like to bring this matter to a conclusion and get the bill passed or defeated as is.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Now, Mr. President, I had a firm understanding with Senators about what we were going to do. When we voted on this Mansfield-Gore amendment, no matter how it came out, we were then going to vote on the Williams amendment to the Corrupt Practices Act. I shook hands with the Senator from Delaware on the proposition that I would be willing to take his amendment if he would offer it, and we would vote on it. I see no reason why it should not be a part of this bill—win, lose, or draw.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. One minute, and I will be through.

The Williams amendment belongs in the bill. It was voted on before. In addition, I had agreed to accept the Proxmire amendment, and I had told the Senator if he would offer his amendment, I would take it.

I had in mind to accept those two amendments, as well as the one of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. BYRD] to provide reduced social security benefits to people 60 years of age and over. We have had that in conference many times before. It has never been deadlocked in conference. I do not think it would be now. The House either says yes or no. But these are the amendments I agreed to accept, as Senator in charge of the bill, and I think they should be in the bill.

I was not consulted at all about any agreement that we were not going to consider any more amendments on their merits.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from Wisconsin, and how much time does he yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I should like to tell the distinguished Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of the Finance Committee, that I am deeply indebted to him for his statement on the floor. It means, as the Senator has said, a great deal to my State. This is a very important company in my State. However, under the circumstances, and in view of the situation in the Senate now, I will not press my amendment. Again, let me express my gratefulness to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Let me ask the Senator, how much money is involved in his amendment——

Mr. PASTORE. What difference does it make now? The Senator is not going to press his amendment.

Mr. PROXMIRE. So far as the Treasury is concerned, the cost is negligible. But, under the circumstances——

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. When other Senators offer their amendments, they will not be germane to this bill. They will open the door to more nongermane amendments to it. But the Proxmire amendment is germane to the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I admire the Senator from Louisiana for stating the obligation by which he feels he is bound. But here we have a situation under which the parties to whom he was bound, namely, the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Delaware on the one hand, announced some time ago that they would not offer any amendments, and the Senator from Wisconsin has just announced under the conditions that he prefers not to offer his amendment. It would therefore seem to me that the position of the Senator from Louisiana is completely relieved.

I hope that in view of the 5 or 6 weeks of debate we have had, the time lost, and the feelings which have been aroused—which have not always been too kind—when we have got through with some of these debates, the Senator from Louisiana will permit or request the majority leader to prevail and allow the Senate to vote on this bill and pass it as an investment credit measure as it came to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. If the Senator from Wisconsin tells me that he does not want me to take his amendment, and does not offer it, then I am relieved of that.

If the Senator from Delaware tells me he does not want to offer his amendment, then I will go along with that decision.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, in view of the parliamentary situation I will withhold my amendments.

It had been my intention that these amendments would be offered, and for 3 days last week I tried to get the floor so that I could offer them. I could not even get recognized since the Senator from Louisiana was busy with his filibuster.

But now Senators think we should go on and have third reading of the bill, and I am willing to go along with the suggestion and withhold the remainder of my amendments. In fact, I am so much in accord with the action just taken by the Senate, whereby they in effect repealed the Presidential Campaign Act, that I think we should put the "clincher" on the proposal before another filibuster gets underway.

In light of the circumstances whereby both the minority and the majority leaders have given notice they will move to table all amendments, I shall not offer them at this time.

The Senate has done a good day's work when it nullified the checkoff authority of the presidential campaign fund. Let us clinch that victory and go home.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I shook hands with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] and agreed that, regardless of the outcome of the vote on the Mansfield amendment or on the Gore amendment, he would offer the Corrupt Practices Act amendments, and I would agree to them and I would go to conference with them, and I would urge the House conferees to accept them. In fact, he wanted me to give him a greater assurance: that I would guarantee that the House would accept them. That I could not do.

Now he says he is not going to offer them, which is contrary to what we agreed to, as I understood it; but that is his privilege. I will do what he wants to do. He has said he is not going to offer them. If they are offered, a motion will be made to table. I cannot make a Senator do what he said he was going to do; all I can do is do what I said I was going to do.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended, in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

Do Senators yield back their time?

Mr. LONG of Louisana. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I yield back my time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, just a moment. The minority leader has control of the time on the bill. I will just assure the Senate I am not going to yield back that time until I ascertain whether there are going to be any more amendments.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There are no more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And if there are any more I am going to move to table them, because I am not committed to anyone one way or the other on any kind of amendment. We have had enough horseplay, and now if we are all done and are ready for the hammer to drop down, I am ready to yield back the time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will inform the Senator that if this amendment is agreed to, no other amendments can be offered to it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What is the amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. An amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute for the bill [putting the question].

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H.R. 6950) was read the third time.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I yield back all my time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Louisiana yield back his time?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, first I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] 1 minute.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, addressed to me, dated April 3, with respect to the 7-percent investment tax credit bill.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,
Washington, April 3, 1967.

HON. GEORGE A. SMATHERS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SMATHERS: I very much appreciate the thoughtful and expeditious consideration which the Senate Finance Committee afforded H.R. 6950, the bill to restore the investment tax credit and accelerated depreciation as of March 10, 1967. The Committee's review of this measure has resulted in a bill which is responsive to current conditions and which preserves the integrity of prior legislation involving these tax provisions.

The transition from suspension to restoration is thereby effected in a manner which treats all taxpayers with fundamental fairness and equity and which is consistent with budgetary requirements.

By retaining the provision of the existing suspension law which denies the investment credit to property ordered during the suspension period, the Committee's bill does not adversely affect the interests of any taxpayer. Those who ordered equipment during this period did so with the clear understanding that acquisitions made pursuant to such orders would not qualify for the credit. Thus, the bill imposes upon them no hardship or unforeseen disadvantage. Indeed, to now grant the credit to property ordered during the suspension period would provide a windfall to these taxpayers at substantial cost to the revenue, and would discriminate against those who deferred placing orders during this time.

It has been argued, nevertheless, that these basic considerations should be cast aside, and the credit made available to property ordered during the suspension period which is delivered after March 9th. Proponents of this approach allege that the so-called order rule is easily circumvented and therefore incapable of effective enforcement. Moreover, it is contended that administration will be costly and will put the Government on a collision course with taxpayers involving highly technical questions without the benefit of reasonably clear interpretative guides.

I am of the firm opinion that this is not so and that these contentions are wrong for several reasons:

First, the success of our tax system is built upon the strong foundation of voluntary taxpayer compliance. If the law is clear that the investment credit is inapplicable to property acquired pursuant to orders placed during the suspension period, I believe the great majority of businessmen will abide by that rule. Obviously, they were willing and prepared to accept that result when the suspension period order was placed. To avoid the impact of the order rule they were initially willing to accept, while at the same time retaining the substance of the original order, would require that they enter into devious formalities designed to misrepresent the true situation. Thus, to retain the terms of the original order, such as price, place in order line, and delivery date while still giving the appearance of a new order, the formality of cancellation of the old order and re-order would have to be indulged in. I think we can rely on the responsibility and integrity of the vast majority of the business community to reject a path which involves sham and misrepresentation, just as we so rely in every other phase of tax administration.

Second, through our administration of this legislation we can readily deal with any questions of application that may arise concerning order changes and modifications which occur in the regular course of business. For example, Treasury regulations under this provision can, in a sensible and responsible manner consistent with the legislative purpose, spell out what constitutes an order, and what modifications or cancellations of suspension period orders followed by reorders will, in effect, constitute post-suspension period orders entitled to the credit. In fact, the language in your Committee Report indicating that the credit is inapplicable to property acquired after the suspension period which is substantially similar to property covered under a suspension period order sets the standard under which our regulations and rulings can resolve these questions. This will give guidance to both taxpayers and Internal Revenue Service officials and will foster uniformity in the administration of this provision.

Third, with a base of voluntary compliance and published administrative interpretations, enforcement problems should be minimal. I do not foresee the necessity or desirability of audit examination programs designed to provide special policing of this provision. Any questions that may arise will generally occur in connection with the normal and regular audit examinations undertaken in accordance with prevailing audit practice. Thus, no additional cost of any significance should be involved. Such questions would be no more difficult to resolve than many other tax issues in the business area and should not arise with any significant frequency.

Fourth, we must keep in mind the extent and character of any residual enforcement problems that will exist. These will be confined to the type of case I have discussed earlier. That is, where the cancellation of the suspension period order and the re-order is nothing more than a sham—a series of formal steps undertaken to create the facade of a post-suspension order while, in substance, providing for the acqusition of the property pursuant to the original order. These are cases of knowing evasion of the statute. They are situations of a type which are routinely handled by the Internal Revenue Service and which are certainly deserving of no special legislative license.

Thus, administration of the Committee bill continuing the order rule can be uniformly applied without any undue cost or expense. It will not prove a source of difficulty or hardship to the vast majority of taxpayers who conform their actions and tax reports to the provisions of the law. It will only make unproductive the efforts of those who, by artificial and manipulative means, would seek tax benefits to which they are not entitled.

Accordingly, I believe the Finance Committee bill deserves the support of the Congress and the public. It will avoid discrimination among taxpayers and will serve to maintain the integrity of temporary legislative actions required by extraordinary circumstances.

Sincerely yours,

Henry H. Fowler.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall vote against this bill. I cannot support a $2 billion tax reduction in the face of a $20 billion deficit.

The net effect of the enactment of this legislation will be to extend a $1.8 billion annual tax reduction for American industry, and this tax reduction is being approved at a time when we are confronted with a certain deficit for the next fiscal year in excess of $20 billion.

Furthermore, at the same time that the administration is recommending this $2 billion tax cut the President is also telling the American people that within the next few weeks, in order to control inflation he will be recommending a 6-percent across-the-board tax increase. That just does not make sense. One-third of the President's proposed 6-percent surtax will be required to make up the deficit that will result from the enactment of the pending bill. By what line of reasoning can anyone justify a 2-percent across-the-board tax increase for all taxpayers to pay for a tax reduction given to another segment of taxpayers?

There are those who say that this proposed 6-percent tax increase now being discussed by the administration will not be enacted, but no one contradicts the fact that with or without the tax increase our deficit will be between $15 and $20 billion.

There are only two ways in which this $2 billion tax reduction can be financed in the face of such a deficit. One way would be to increase taxes on everybody, as the President is now recommending, with one-third of that 6-percent tax increase going to offset the reductions provided for under this measure. The second method would be to increase the national debt to finance the loss in revenue.

This planned deficit program of the Johnson administration has already created a serious inflationary threat by undermining the value of the American dollar. The adoption of this measure here today is one more step toward fiscal bankruptcy.

The most disturbing factor in the administration's arguments in support of this $2 billion tax reduction is that at no point has anyone mentioned the fact that we are at war. Over one-half million Americans are on the front lines in Vietnam, risking their lives to protect our freedom. Certainly the American taxpayers can forgo a tax reduction until this war is over. That is a small sacrifice compared to the sacrifice of the men in Vietnam.

I recognize that our tax rates are high, and I look forward to the day when we can afford a bona fide tax reduction; but there is only one way to achieve a real tax reduction, and that is to cut Government spending, bring our budget under control, and then and only then can we afford to talk of cutting taxes.

The enactment of this tax reduction plus the congressional approval of the expanded spending policies of the Great Society will further feed the fires of inflation and further destroy the purchasing power of the dollar.

This administration is rapidly pauperizing our retired citizens under its planned deficits and planned inflation, and a tax cut in the face of a $20 billion deficit for the next fiscal year is one more step down the road toward insolvency.

The next step may well be another run on our diminishing gold reserves.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea"; if I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], is absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Harris], and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCarthy] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business and his pair has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 93, nays 1, as follows:

[No. 109 Leg.]

YEAS—93

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Griffin
Hansen
Hart
Hartke

Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Percy
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smathers
Smith
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—1

Bartlett

NOT VOTING—6

Case
Dodd
Gruening
Harris
McCarthy
Williams, Del.

So the bill (H.R. 6950) was passed, as follows:

H.R. 6950

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That sections 48(j) and 167(i)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (defining suspension period) are each amended by striking out "December 31, 1967" and inserting in lieu thereof "March 9, 1967".

SEC. 2. Section 46(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to limitation on investment credit based on amount of tax) is amended—

(1) by striking out subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(B) for taxable years ending before January 1, 1968, 25 percent of so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as exceeds $25,000, or

"(C) for taxable years ending after December 31, 1967, 50 percent of so much of the liability for tax for the taxable year as exceeds $25,000."; and

(2) by striking out the next to the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "In applying subparagraph (C) to a taxable year beginning before January 1, 1968, and ending after December 31, 1967, the percent referred to in such subparagraph shall be the sum of 25 percent plus the percent which bears the same ratio to 25 percent as the number of days in such year after December 31, 1967, bears to the total number of days in such year."

SEC. 3. Section 48(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to property used outside the United States) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B)(i) "or is operated under contract with the United States".

SEC. 4. The amendments made by the first section and section 3 of this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after March 9, 1967.

SEC. 5. (a) Funds which become available under the Presidential Election Campaign Fund Act of 1966 shall be appropriated and disbursed only after the adoption by law of guidelines governing their distribution. Section 6096 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 shall become applicable only after the adoption by law of such guidelines.

(b) Guidelines adopted in accordance with this section shall state expressly that they are intended to comply with this section.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Senators LONG of Louisiana, SMATHERS, ANDERSON, GORE, WILLIAMS of Delaware, and CARLSON conferees on the part of the Senate.

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appoints Senator JOHN STENNIS to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held at Ottawa, Canada, from May 10 through 14, 1967.

OIL SHALE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, during the last 2 or 3 weeks, committee hearings have been held in the Senate by the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary on the oil shale situation in Colorado, Utah, and Wyoming.

In my opinion, the hearings were more than premature, because they dealt with monopolistic practices in an industry which has not yet come into being.

I think one of the most commonsense and searching articles I have seen on this subject with respect, both to research and to the future of the oil shale industry, appeared in the Denver Post, of April 23, 1967, in the form of an editorial entitled "Oil Shale Research Must Come First."

I sincerely commend this editorial to all of my fellow Senators, and particularly to the members of the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, coming as it does from a paper which has been so interested for so long in the development of oil shale as one of the great natural assets of this country.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the editorial to which I have referred, entitled "Oil Shale Research Must Come First," published in the Denver Post, of April 23, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OIL SHALE RESEARCH MUST COME FIRST

The trouble with the criticism of the nation's oil shale policy, as voiced in Washington last week, is that it is vastly premature. Oil shale deposits in the West do, indeed, stagger the imagination—but so do the costs of extracting the oil.

The noted economists, John K. Galbraith and former Sen. Paul Douglas of Illinois, warned of "another Teapot Dome" in their appearances before a Senate antitrust and monopoly subcommittee.

We wonder about their timing. If Paul Revere had ridden through Boston shouting, "The British are coming!" in 1750 he probably would have been regarded as some sort of nut. We do not extend the metaphor, but we cannot help wondering if Galbraith and Douglas have stayed up late too many evenings reading horror stories about 19th Century capitalist robber barons.

The first question to be answered is whether there is to be any oil shale industry at all. This abundant waxy hydrocarbon is locked tight in rock, in combination primarily with lime, sand and clay. Extracting the "oil" is the hard part.

For 20 years the U.S. Department of Interior, mining experts and oil engineers have been tinkering with the idea of a modern oil shale industry in Colorado, Wyoming and Utah. We say "modern" because a similar attempt after World War I fell flat on its face.

So putting first things first, it is fair to say that much more research is needed before there is anything of value to steal, a la Teapot Dome. (Teapot Dome was a Wyoming oil scandal of the 1920s; Interior Secretary Albert Fall was jailed for accepting gifts from oil firms in return for leases, on a government-owned field.)

At the present rate of development—with shale oil estimated to cost twice as much to extract as petroleum—1980 seems to be a prudent date for the nation to expect commercial production of shale oil. Government policies doubtless could hasten or delay that target date.

The Interior Department presently is making available its Rifle, Colo., shale demonstration plant to private research by oil firms, funded through the Colorado School of Mines Research Foundation.

Such research is predicated upon expectations that shale oil will be produced commercially under the traditional system of private firms leasing public lands and paying the government a royalty on production.

A sharp departure from this system was proposed at the Senate hearings last week: a semi-public corporation similar to the Tennessee Valley Authority or Comsat to handle shade oil production. We think the idea merits discussion, but as yet do not see why the present system needs changing. Oil firms have operated in the public domain for 50 years or more. The record, despite some abuses, is good. Royalties and competitive lease payments have compensated the public fairly for the use of the resources.

If there is a convincing case for a shale oil version of Comsat, it has yet to be made. It might be more to a practical point to discuss whether shale oil producers should have the same 27.5 per cent depletion allowance as petroleum producers. A good case can be made against that.

At any rate, there appears to be plenty of time left for discussion.

PUBLIC TIMBER SALES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, federally owned timber is becoming an increasingly large factor in meeting the requirements of the mills in Oregon, the State which leads all the rest in timber production.

There has been a great deal of discussion over the pricing and bidding practices used by the two major agencies, the U.S. Forest Service and the U.S. Bureau of Land Management. On January 11, 1967, I wrote to the Bureau of the Budget asking that it keep me advised of pricing and bidding decisions that are reached. Subsequently, I have forwarded various constituents' views to the Bureau of the Budget as they were presented to me.

In order that all in the timber industry, the State and county governments and other organizations may be aware of pending executive actions, I am placing in the RECORD today three items on these subjects.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that these items be included in the RECORD at this point:

First. Bureau of the Budget letter of April 14, 1967.

Second. Bureau of Land Management letter with attachment of April 6, 1967.

Third. Speech of Charles F. Luce, Under Secretary of the Interior, to Western Forest Industries Association on April 14, 1967.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Executive Office of the President, Bureau of the Budget,
Washington, D.C., April 14, 1967.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: This is in further response to your letter of January 11, 1967, concerning timber sale and timber management activities of the Federal Government and is also our reply to your letter of March 29, 1967, with which you enclosed copies of correspondence with Mr. Louis Gervais.

The Departments of Agriculture and Interior have held numerous discussions at the field and Washington levels since completion of the interdepartmental study in an effort to develop proposals for the improvement of Federal timber sale policies and practices. Bureau of the Budget staff has participated in some of these discussions. Several general proposals have recently been agreed upon by the two Departments which we feel will significantly improve their respective timber appraisal systems. The Departments are currently developing the details of these proposals with the objective of completing by July 1, 1967, plans for a timber appraisal system that is uniform to the fullest practicable extent. One aspect of their appraisal systems will be changed shortly. It involves implementation of revised mill production appraisal allowances in the Douglas Fir region based upon recently completed appraisal process of the two Departments on a comparable basis.

After appropriate consultation with persons and groups, including those having an interest in Federal timber sale and management programs, it is intended that a system that is uniform to the fullest practicable extent will be implemented by July 1968. These actions, coupled with some longer range actions to be undertaken by the two Departments, including appropriate attention to sealed and oral bidding procedures should achieve the uniformity objectives set forth in the Comptroller General's report of December 29, 1966, entitled "Need to resolve differences in procedures used by Federal timber management agencies in appraising timber offered for sale by the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture; and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior."

In view of the Administration's policy on user charges, the essentially uniform appraisal system will be developed within the framework of establishing Federal stumpage prices to achieve fair market value returns to the Government. The Departments will conduct such ongoing studies as are necessary to assure that these objectives are being achieved.

Sincerely,
(Signed) Phillip S. Hughes,
Deputy Director.

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Bureau of Land Management,
Washington, D.C., April 6, 1967.

Hon. Wayne Morse,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Morse: Enclosed is a copy of a paper by the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service which will be discussed with representatives of industry today. The proposal has been jointly worked out by the two agencies. The principles will require further discussions with industry and the O&C Advisory Board before full development and adoption. Both agencies will work jointly in these discussions and development of the principles involved.

Sincerely yours,
John O. Crow,
Acting Director.

Highlights of Proposals by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Concerning Timber Sale and Appraisal Policies and Procedures

INTRODUCTION

During June 1965, the Bureau of the Budget requested the Departments of Agriculture and Interior to make a study of timber pricing procedures with an objective of obtaining uniformity of procedure between the two Departments. A report was completed in May 1966, and sent to the Bureau of the Budget on June 22, 1966. Review of this report with the Bureau of the Budget resulted in proposals for several actions concerning timber sale and appraisal policies and procedures. Subsequently the two Departments had a number of meetings as well as discussions with the Bureau of the Budget. The following statement sets forth proposals for action to be taken by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. These will all need to be discussed with representatives of Forest Industry.

DEVELOPMENT OF A UNIFORM APPRAISAL SYSTEM

Both Agencies plan to develop, to the fullest practicable extent, a uniform timber appraisal system. Both Agencies through their respective Pacific Northwest Offices have started to develop the details of such a system. July 1, 1967, is the date suggested for the two Agencies to reach basic agreement about how to have such a system. Implementation of main features of the new procedures would be desirable by July 1, 1968. New procedures will be discussed and explained to Industry representatives as they are developed and before they are placed in effect.

INTERIM ADJUSTMENT IN APPRAISAL DATA OR PROCEDURE

The Forest Service, after extensive review and consideration plus notice to Industry, has placed in effect an adjustment in its appraisal process in the Douglas-fir Region by installing the results of new lumber and plywood recovery studies. The new recovery data will increase appraised rates about $3.00 to $5.00 per M. The Forest Service, also, is eliminating quarterly stumpage rate adjustment in the Douglas-fir Region; and this subject together with the accompanying problem of fixing the base period for adjusting appraisal realization values has been with industry.

The Bureau of Land Management also proposes after review to use the results of the new lumber and plywood recovery studies in the Douglas-fir Region and to replace the valuation factor method of dividing the conversion return with the profit ratio method. These proposals will require discussion with Industry and the O & C Advisory Board before adoption.

SEALED VERSUS ORAL BIDDING

The two Agencies are in general agreement on the principle that timber sale methods and bidding procedures should provide opportunity for competitive bidding. There are some obvious exceptions when there are not two or more prospective bidders. The two Agencies also recognize the need for timber dependent communities and mills in these communities to openly meet outside competition through the auction bid procedure. As a result of discussions on bidding procedure, particularly in regard to one-bid situations, the Agencies agreed to study the reasons for single-bid sales in areas where competition should be expected. An outline for the study plan is under development. The study will be conducted by the Pacific Northwest Offices of the two Agencies. We expect to complete the study this year. No changes in bidding methods are contemplated at this time.

DEVELOPMENT OF A UNIFORM MEASUREMENT SYSTEM

The two Agencies plan to develop a uniform measurement system. Neither Agency is satisfied with the current system of measurement. There are serious defects in the board foot measurement system in view of the different products that may be produced from the same log. We need a system of measurement that will be universal and provide comparability in volume data for both land managing and timber-using groups.

In the Pacific Northwest, the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management use the Scribner log rule. For the same tract of timber, however, board foot volume if measured by the two Agencies would differ considerably. The Forest Service applies the Scribner rule to long logs and the Bureau of Land Management applies the rule to short logs. On the average, Forest Service scale has to be increased by about 18 percent to equal Bureau of Land Management scale for the same timber.

The Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management have already started work in the development of a uniform measurement system in the Pacific Northwest. The study logically falls into three distinct steps:

1. Determine the adequacy of existing systems and develop criteria for a satisfactory uniform system.

2. Explain to trade associations and timber purchasers the adequacy of the analyses and criteria developed; and seek their support in what will be a major change in industrial practices.

3. Develop a system that will provide satisfactory uniformity and obtain its adoption by public land management agencies and the user groups.

The Pacific Northwest Forest and Range Experiment Station is heading up step one of the study for the two agencies. This step is tentatively scheduled for completion by July 1, 1967. Step two is planned after evaluation of the results of step one.

PROFIT STUDIES

The two agencies plan to make continuing studies of profit levels in the timber industry in order to exercise informed judgment in determining adequate profit opportunities in Government timber offerings. These studies will follow three main directions.

1. Continue cooperative studies with the Internal Revenue Service at approximately two-year intervals. These studies will sample each major segment of the industry.

2. Continue efforts to secure experienced profit data through sampling operators from whom the Agencies secure selling price and cost data. This permits localizing industry profit levels.

3. Continue review of overall Industry profit levels. This involves comparison of lumber and wood product Industry profits with general manufacturing Industry levels, pulp and paper, and other related industries. This type of information is published by Security and Exchange Commission, Census Bureau, and others, periodically.

USE OF TRANSACTION EVIDENCE IN TIMBER APPRAISALS

Since bidding experience may be an indicator of need to adjust appraisal procedures to secure fair market for stumpage, both agencies have agreed to follow bidding experience closely. Analytical appraisals are based on end-product values for lumber and other products, which fluctuate both seasonally and in other ways. Marked changes in market prices or changes in Industry practice or technology are likely to cause shifts in bid levels. We desire and need up-to-date accurate cost and selling prices from the Industry in order to adequately reflect the changes which affect stumpage prices.

In appraising Federal timber both Agencies use data from appraisal zones. When the variance between appraised and bid prices maintain a significant gap in an appraisal zone for a period of more than three months, and indications are the gap will continue, an intensive review of appraisal data and methods will be made.

Following are the principal factors which will be examined:

1. End-product selling prices and costs of production used in analytical appraisals will be reviewed to insure that they are reasonably current and reflect market conditions and trends.

2. The state of Industry practice concerning the mixture of end products, chips, etc., being manufactured will be reviewed. This will include percentage of each class of end product used in the determination of an average selling price. When a change in end-product production in a zone is general industry practice, the costs and realizations of such products will be promptly included in the appraisal data.

3. Changes or improvements in manufacturing machinery or manufacturing practices will be reviewed, as well as the development of new practices that affect sales realization and cost of manufacture.

4. Changes in end product grades and specifications and their effect on recovery from the various log grades of timber and on the value of each log grade.

5. The effect of labor contracts and strikes on end-product costs and selling prices and the consequent need for adjustments in basic appraisal data used in stumpage appraisals.

6. The sample mills on which zone costs and selling prices are based to determine if the sample represents average efficiency for the zone and includes prevailing changes in manufacturing and marketing.

7. The effect special markets for timber, such as log exports and military demands, have on selling prices. If the effect is significant, basic selling price data will be revised to reflect these special markets.

Remarks of Under Secretary of the Interior Charles F. Luce at the Western Forest Industries Association Annual Conference, San Francisco, California, April 14, 1967

I bring the greetings and congratulations of Secretary Udall on this, your 20th anniversary meeting. Over two decades you have played a positive role in the forest industry and contributed to an informed and vigorous dialogue with governmental agencies. Your able presentations of the needs and views of the segment of the industry you represent—non land-holding smaller independent companies largely dependent upon government timber—assist us in great measure in formulating our policies. Your challenges to our concepts and methods of operation are invigorating the public benefits from the give and take.

There are few areas where the Federal Government bears a greater responsibility than in the stewardship of the resources which it actually owns—the public lands. By definition they belong to all of the people of the Nation and we must never lose sight of our responsibility to them and to future generations.

At the same time since practically all of these lands are in the West they have a special relationship to the people of the Western States whose economic, and in a sense spiritual, well being is often dependent on the way in which the Federal Government manages its property.

Narrowing the concept still further to the forested public lands of the Pacific Northwest which provide the lifeblood to a major segment of the Nation's timber industry, typified by the members of your association, the relationship verges on symbiosis, the term biologists apply to the living together or even close union of dissimilar organisms. I hasten to add in carrying the analogy a bit further that in the true sense this association is advantageous, and often necessary, to both of the parties and not harmful to either.

Yet the Government in dealing intimately with those who are especially dependent on its lands can never lose sight of its responsibility for the general welfare of all the people and of future generations.

Today I wish to discuss some of the problems of our timbered lands within the Department of the Interior, with particular reference to the responsibility we bear to the differing interests of those to whom we are responsible.

Since most of Interior's forest lands and a large percentage of your Association's membership are located in Oregon I will focus on Oregon problems for the most part.

A hearing is being held this morning in Portland, involving some 8,000 acres of public land, which the State of Oregon has applied for in satisfaction of school indemnity rights, the so-called "school selections". If these selections are granted, they will satisfy substantially all outstanding obligations of the Federal Government with respect to indemnity selections of the State of Oregon. The Act of February 14, 1859, admitting Oregon to the Union granted unappropriated and unwithdrawn sections 16 and 36 in each township of the State for the support of schools. Under the general indemnity laws, where such sections or portions thereof would not vest in the State because of prior appropriation by a public land claimant or because of a withdrawal of the land prior to survey (which normally is the point at which title is vested in the State), the State has the right to make applications to select lieu lands from the unappropriated public domain. Selections by States under these laws are subject to the general authority of the Secretary, under Section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act, to determine whether the lands may be properly classified for such disposition. The law gives considerable discretion in the Secretary to decide whether the lands should be classified for disposal to the State. Among the factors which we must weigh in making that decision are the character and value of the lands selected by the State compared with the character and value of the "lost" lands.

In this instance there is a clear disparity of values in favor of the selected lands, the value of which is estimated to be about three times that of the base lands. But in the many thousands of acres that have been patented under previous selections of this type, States have not been limited to lands of equal value. Thus we are faced with two conflicting questions of equity.

Another matter to be considered when dealing with timbered lands is the effect of the transfer on the allowable cut and sustained yield management. The 8,000 acres consist primarily of heavily forested lands. Oregon law now provides that forested lands received by the State in satisfaction of indemnity rights shall be managed as a part of the State forest system. The fact that the lands would automatically pass into sustained yield management and not diminish the allowable cut in the area is, needless to say, of great significance to the Department in making its decision.

Before finally deciding the matter, we believe that the public should have an opportunity to hear and comment on the proposal. We are hopeful that today's hearings in Portland will clear the atmosphere so that the basis for our action will be clearly understood.

While I am on the subject of public hearings, I would like to say a few words about requests that we have recently received from a number of parties to hold public hearings in connection with a proposal of the Warm Springs Indians that the tribe go into the timber business.

In dealing with Indian lands we always should be mindful of the fact that they are not public lands. Their timber is not public timber. It belongs to the Indians. The Federal Government acts merely as a trustee to protect the interests of the Indians. At the same time we have the responsibility to work with the Indians to help them develop the capacity to manage their own estate.

The Warm Springs Indians have been making rapid strides in many ways. We are proud of the businesslike manner in which the Tribe has conducted the negotiations surrounding the proposed venture. Whatever their decision, whether it be to purchase an existing mill; to construct a new mill; or to continue to sell stumpage; our primary responsibility as trustee is to consider whether their decision is a reasonable and prudent one in terms of the best interests of the Warm Springs Indians. Those who have been calling for public hearings may possibly have lost sight of that fact. Indian tribes should not be subjected to public hearings on private business matters any more than your firms should be on similar matters.

One of our knottiest land-use problems is also in the Warm Springs area. It is the competing types of development that are being pressed for the Deschutes recreation area. The issue is whether we should develop a road or trial along a ten-mile stretch of the river from Warm Springs to South Junction. Public sentiment is strongly divided. Some private owners would prefer to keep the public out completely. Many conservationists and sportsmen favor trails only. Other sportsmen and local business groups favor a road to open up the area to greater public use.

In this area, as in most competing uses under a multiple-use management the choice is seldom between right and wrong, or good and bad. It is frequently between two subject goods—and frequently ends in compromise. One form of compromise that is currently under study in this area is to construct a road from the Warm Springs Bridge to a point two and one-half miles downstream and leave the remainder for a trail into the six miles of BLM river frontage that would remain undeveloped. With respect to areas such as this, Secretary Udall is fond of saying that future generations will remember us more for the roads we did not build, than for those we did.

In managing public timber in the Northwest the Federal Government must be ever mindful of the fact that it is the dominant supplier and accordingly both wields tremendous power and bears a heavy responsibility.

In its responsibility to all of the people of the country, and to the counties of Western Oregon, the BLM must endeavor to obtain the fair market value for its timber. And there are many, including the General Accounting Office, the Congressional watchdog, who seriously question whether we are now doing that in some areas.

On the other hand we have a statutory responsibility spelled out in the O&C Act of 1937, to manage the forest "in conformity with the principles of sustained yield for the purpose of providing a permanent source of timber supply . . . contributing to the economic stability of local communities and industries . . ."

Faced with an industry and community situation that is typified by an excess of installed production capacity in relation to total public and private stumpage market annually, low-end product prices, and high stumpage prices, our charge presents no easy task.

With the competition for timber in the areas where overcapacity is prevalent, no one can doubt that the Federal Government is getting at least a fair return. Yet it is perplexing when one reads that BLM has sold several blocks of timber for upwards of 50 percent above the appraised price.

Occasionally the same article refers to another sale at the appraised price where there was only one bidder.

The prevalence of this situation over an an extended period requires that we reexamine appraisal procedures and the competitive picture in certain localities.

This we are now doing and representatives of BLM and the Forest Service are here to discuss our proposals with you. Both BLM and the Forest Service are now trying to develop to the fullest practical extent a uniform timber appraisal system.

Both agencies are working to reach agreement on such a system by July 1, 1967, and to implement the main features of the system by July 1, 1968. I assure you that industry will be consulted frequently and fully.

Having been involved with construction projects during my days at Bonneville Power Administration, I must confess that I personally have often wondered why the Federal Government always announces the appraisal price—the lowest price it will accept—for timber, while we always maintained the utmost secrecy about our in-house estimates of what a proposed government construction job will cost.

Also, going back to my days as a trial lawyer I can't help but conclude that transaction evidence, properly evaluated, is the best single indicator of market value, although admittedly not the only indicator. I realize the hazards of appraising timber in this fashion in a situation such as prevails in Western Oregon where control of the supply is in a limited number of hands. At the same time I believe that we should seriously consider a method of introducing such evidence into our appraisal system when the system does not appear to provide results that approximate prevailing competitive prices.

Much has been said about sealed versus oral bidding, but I feel that the real problem is not the type of bidding, but the quality and method of our appraisals. It is in this area where we—BLM and the Forest Service—are concentrating our efforts.

We also will be reviewing carefully one-bid sales. If the BLM is to carry out its legislative mandate to promote competition, it must be alert to instances where such competition does not exist. Lack of competition is a complex problem that has long defied both economists and trust busters. We know that in some instances both geography and economics dictate against competition. I believe that we have a duty to discover the reasons for such lack of competition and to devise whatever remedies are within our means. Situations where there is inherent lack of competition highlight the need for examining the validity of every facet of our appraisal system.

Having said this, let me also assure you that if we are to do our job conscientiously, we must also be concerned with the economic well-being of the industry. Federal timber sales must offer, insofar as possible, adequate profit opportunities, especially for the smaller companies. Your operations contribute to the economic stability of the communities in which you live. And, after all, we lean on each other. We need a healthy industry to practice good forestry, and you need good forest management to produce the quantity of raw materials needed for your mills.

OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGES ANNUAL REPORT, 1965–66

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, during recent field hearings in Oregon on S. 1126, the Higher Education Amendments of 1967, I was very pleased to have the opportunity to speak with a number of the presidents of Oregon community colleges, and I was privileged to receive from Superintendent of Public Instruction Leon P. Minear the annual report on community colleges for the State of Oregon.

Since this segment of higher education is receiving increasingly favorable attention throughout the United States, it occurred to me that the material contained in this report could be of interest to my colleagues and to the educational community. I would also like to have it as a quick reference for the members of my Subcommittee on Education.

I therefore ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the report to which I have alluded be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Oregon Community Colleges: Annual Report, 1965–66

(By the Oregon State Department of Education, Division of Community Colleges and Vocational Education, Robert O. Hatton, assistant superintendent, William G. Loomis, director vocational education, Donald K. Shelton, director lower division collegiate programs)

CHAPTER I: DEVELOPMENTS IN OREGON COMMUNITY COLLEGES 1965–66

In 1965–66, ten institutions were operating under community college statutes. Three of these institutions—at Salem, Oregon City, and Portland—were operated by a local school district, and two, Salem and Oregon City, offered vocational-technical only. The Oregon City program was limited by inadequate facilities and operated on year-to-year approval by the State Department of Education.

Seven community colleges were organized within area education districts and offered comprehensive programs, including both lower division collegiate and vocational-technical preparatory work. The dates upon which the State Board of Education officially proclaimed the formation of each district were as follows:

1. Southwestern Oregon Community College, North Bend-Coos Bay—May 15, 1961.
2. Treasure Valley Community College, Ontario—October 19, 1961.
3. Clatsop Community College, Astoria—February 14, 1962.
4. Central Oregon Community College, Bend, re-established on an area basis—February 14, 1962.
5. Blue Mountain Community College, Pendleton—June 11, 1962.
6. Umpqua Community College, Roseburg—March 30, 1964.
7. Lane Community College, Eugene—October 30, 1964.

Two additional area education districts were in existence: Eastside, located in East Multnomah County, formed June 3, 1965; and Clackamas, formed May 24, 1966. Both Mt. Hood Community College (Eastside) and Clackamas Community College plan to offer initial programs starting September 1966.

A proposed Mid-Columbia Area Education District, involving parts of Wasco, Hood River, Sherman, and Gilliam Counties, has undergone several hearings and several boundary changes. On June 2, 1965, the State Board of Education established boundary lines for the district. Further activity was temporarily enjoined by a court order as a result of a suit filed challenging these boundaries.

Other additional districts may be created prior to the end of 1966. A petition has been accepted for a proposed area education district within Linn and Benton Counties. A hearing on the petition was held in February 1965 and boundaries were established. However, the election is enjoined at the time of this writing by a court order. A Washington County Area Education District was narrowly defeated in an election held April 22, 1965. The subsequent election which established the East Multnomah District may be considered as making the possibility of a tri-county district more remote which, in turn, may stimulate a renewed interest by Washington and Clackamas County residents toward the formation of their own districts.

Increased legislative support, 1965

Two major enactments of the 1965 legislature have provided new stimulus to community college development in Oregon. Senate Bill 34, introduced by the Interim Committee on Education, permitted the distribution of federal vocational funds as a supplement to state funds for reimbursement of vocational education programs. Under the terms of this Act, the State Board of Education approved a disbursement formula which provided up to $320 per full-time-equated student in addition to the basic state aid rate of $433 for vocational-technical enrollment.

Senate Joint Resolution 5, while not having the effect of statutory enactment, set forth legislative guidelines for the continuing development of the state's community college program. Equally important, it answered critics who had claimed that the program was being developed more extensively by the State Board of Education than the legislature had intended.

The 1965 session also adopted measures which provided that all such institutions must use the word "community college" in their titles, provided for the advancement of federal funds to the colleges, and authorized contracts between the colleges and high school districts for the attendance of high school students in special courses at the colleges. Community colleges were also permitted to contract with private vocational schools for courses which the private schools might offer more economically than the colleges.

CHAPTER II: PROGRAMS AND DEGREES OFFERED BY OREGON'S COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND EDUCATION CENTERS

Vocational-technical programs

A vocational preparatory program, as part of the vocational-technical curriculum, trains the student to enter a particular type of vocational occupation upon completion of a specified program of study. Vocational extension courses are also part of the vocational-technical curriculum. The vocational extension program is part-time and provides job upgrading and retraining. An extension program involves many of the same classes required in vocational preparatory curricula, but students in extension programs take the classes as individual courses in vocational areas rather than as part of a structured one- or two-year preparatory curriculum.

137 vocational-technical programs, representing 56 separate occupations, were offered in 1965–66. Portland Community College leads with 26 different programs, followed by Salem with 24 and Lane with 20.

The most frequently offered vocational curricula were stenography (nine institutions), practical nursing (nine institutions), and general office practice (eight institutions). (Figure I)

Lower division programs

The lower division collegiate curriculum of the community college is generally designated as a transfer curriculum offering classes in the broad areas of fine arts, business, foreign languages, humanities, sciences, social sciences, and physical education. Students can complete freshman and sophomore requirements prior to pursuing a baccalaureate degree as a junior in a four-year institution. The community college lower collegiate division consists of those courses that are approved by the State Department of Education and the State System of Higher Education for transfer to four-year state colleges and universities. The curriculum will parallel that normally found in the lower division programs of four-year colleges, and, except in a few professional areas, students may transfer from community colleges in Oregon to public institutions at the junior level with no loss of credits.

FIGURE I.—*Vocational curriculums offered at Oregon community colleges*

	Agriculture					Business								Health			
	Agriculture-mechanical program	Forester aid	Forestry technology	Livestock technology	Technical agriculture	Accounting	Business, home economics	Business management	Data processing	General office	Marketing and distribution	Secretarial	Stenography	Dental assistant	Dental technician	Medical assistant	Practical nursing
Blue Mountain	X				X	X				X	X	X	X	X			X
Central Oregon		X				X		X			X	X					X
Clatsop			X	X			X	X		X	X	X	X				
Lane			X							X			X	X			X
Portland						X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X
Salem		X											X	X		X	X
Southwestern								X		X	X	X	X				X
Treasure Valley	X				X			X		X		X	X				X
Umpqua			X							X			X				

	Technical											Trade and industrial																		
	Civil structural technology	Data processing technology	Electronic-engineering technology	Engineering technology (general)	Forest products technology	Highway engineering technology	Instructional materials technician	Mechanical engineering technology	Surveyor technician	Technical drafting	Wood industries technology	Airframe and powerplant mechanics	Appliance repair	Automotive body repair	Automotive mechanics	Cabinetmaking	Carpentry	Diesel mechanics	Fire protection technology	Food technology	General drafting	Industrial electronics and communications	Industrial-mechanical program	Law enforcement	Machine shop	Marine technology	Radio communications (broadcasting)	Radio and television service	Welding
Blue Mountain	X		X											X	X								X	X					
Central Oregon			X	X										X	X														
Clatsop	X		X							X													X	X		X			
Lane	X		X							X		X	X	X	X	X	X	X						X	X		X	X	
Portland	X	X	X			X	X			X										X		X							X
Salem	X	X	X		X	X		X	X	X									X		X	X	X		X			X	X
Southwestern	X		X								X				X						X		X	X					
Treasure Valley										X											X	X	X	X					
Umpqua										X					X						X			X					

The State System of Higher Education and the State Board of Education have approved the following transfer curricula for Oregon community colleges:

Professional

Agriculture, Applied Science, Architecture, Art, Business Administration, Education (Elementary), Education (Secondary), Engineering, Home Economics, Journalism, Music, Pre-Dentistry, Pre-Forestry, Pre-Law, Pre-Medical Technology, Pre-Medicine, Pre-Nursing, Pre-Pharmacy, Secretarial Science.

Humanities

General Arts and Letters, English, Philosophy, Foreign Languages, Speech.

Sciences

General Science, Biology, Botany, Chemistry, Entomology, Geology, Mathematics, Microbiology, Physics, Zoology.

Social Sciences

General Social Sciences, Anthropology, Economics, Geography, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology.

Most of the community colleges offer all of these curricula. Those colleges not presently offering the complete list are planning to do so in the near future.

General education courses

The general education curriculum in community colleges and education centers is flexible and may be combined with technical work in a structured course of study leading to the associate of science degree; may evolve into a college transfer program if the student should change direction during the two-year period; or may be structured as an end in itself, leading to the associate of arts degree and preparing a student for more effective citizenship. A general education program is student-centered. Students are placed in the various classes in a general education program according to their individual needs and desires. If needed, remedial courses may be part of a student's general education program.

Adult education courses

The adult education curriculum offers classes in three main areas: (a) vocational or occupational training for the apprentice, journeyman, or experienced worker; (b) general adult education for personal development; and (c) general cultural improvement courses of a hobby or recreation nature for which the state does not reimburse the college. These programs give adults the opportunity to extend their education on a part-time basis, developing new orientations for job opportunities or new technical-vocational skills, acquiring knowledge for personal satisfaction and citizenship participation, or pursuing avocational interests and abilities.

Degrees and certificates

In 1965–66 eight community colleges had programs leading to the associate of science and associate of arts degrees. The associate of arts degree is a nationally recognized award for completion of the general requirements of a lower division liberal arts program. It is awarded for work completed in the liberal arts and sciences division of the community college or for work completed in the general education division, providing the minimum requirements are satisfied. The associate of science degree is awarded for satisfactory completion of a two-year program in the vocational-technical division. Requirements for this degree include not only a concentrated program of study in a particular vocational-technical field, but also basic general education courses. Certificates of completion areas of study, and certificates of attainment are issued for satisfactory completion of individual courses or a sequence of courses in a given area. Diplomas may be issued to students in the vocational-technical division who have completed one year of a two-year program or who may have completed the technical work of a two-year program but not the additional general education requirements necessary for the associate of science degree.

Accreditation

Clatsop Community College, in November 1965, became the first Oregon community college to be accredited by the Northwest Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. At the same time three other institutions, Southwestern, Central Oregon, and Treasure Valley, were accepted as candidates for accreditation with all indications that accreditation would be forthcoming at the next annual meeting of the accrediting association in November 1966.

CHAPTER III: ENROLLMENT 1965–66

Respective roles of lower division collegiate and vocational programs

Community colleges in Oregon have developed from diverse backgrounds within their individual locales, and educational programs have been designed to meet the needs of given service areas. Consequently, the colleges may differ somewhat in the relative encouragement each gives to its several programs. In terms of enrollment and operating costs, the lower division collegiate and vocational preparatory study areas may justifiably be called the focal programs of community college education.

In 1965–66, a total of 9,629 FTE students were enrolled in lower division collegiate and vocational-technical programs in Oregon's community colleges and education centers. Of that total, 3,445 FTE were registered in lower division collegiate programs and 4,210 FTE in vocational-technical programs. Courses operated under separate contract, mainly vocational in nature, enrolled 1,229 FTE. The remaining 735 FTE were enrolled in miscellaneous programs.

Comparison of program enrollments using the headcount measure

A comparison of the FTE enrollments in each program (Table 1) may be misleading because the FTE measure fails to reflect the number of individual students served in different programs. In 1965–66, 35,032 individual student headcount registered for classes in the ten community colleges.

Lower division collegiate enrollment represented 35.8 percent of the total FTE enrollment but only 22.5 percent of the total headcount enrollment; whereas vocational-technical enrollment represented 43.7 percent of the FTE count and 43.5 percent of the headcount registration. The remainder of the enrollment was accounted for by adult education courses and classes financed under separate contracts, such as manpower development training programs, all of which are vocational in nature.

These figures clearly demonstrate that Oregon community colleges are currently vocationally oriented and attracting students to vocational programs in far greater numbers than to lower division collegiate programs. The vocational student, however, tends not to be a full-time student in the same proportion as does the transfer student. Consequently, figures based upon FTE enrollment tend to blur the real service the community colleges are performing in providing vocational training programs for the state.

Comparison of enrollments by programs

Table 2 contains a breakdown of FTE enrollments by institution by term. It is significant that of the 9,629.2 full-time equivalent students only 7,824.9 were enrolled in courses which were state or federally reimbursed. This indicates a sizeable area of educational service that community colleges are rendering without state assistance. This service, primarily community oriented, is an accepted function of community colleges throughout the country and promises to become of increasing importance in Oregon. The ability of the community colleges to render this service, however, may be seriously hampered if legislation is not revised to provide state financial assistance.

Comparison of enrollment by institutions

Portland Community Colleges, as would be expected, recorded the highest total enrollment (3,478.2) representing 45.8 percent of the state total on a headcount basis and 36.1 percent on the FTE basis. Distribution of enrollment throughout the state, among the other institutions, ranged from Oregon City (1.3%) to Lane Community College (16.7%) on an FTE basis. (Table 3)

Lane Community College scored the greatest percentage gain (123.8 percent) in FTE enrollment and reimbursable programs, but Portland's FTE increase (1,232.0) was the largest numerical gain. Table 4 indicates an uneven growth rate among community colleges and points up the difficulties of making accurate projections of institutional growth at this stage of development.

Table 5 indicates that the rate of increase in lower division collegiate enrollment was higher than in the vocational-technical program. The lower division collegiate gain (112.7 percent) ran considerably ahead of the state average gain (62.9 percent); whereas the technical-vocational growth (46.2 percent) was less than the state average. It should be noted, however, that the total FTE enrollment in both vocational programs was 4,210.5 FTE vs. 3,444.9 in lower division collegiate courses.

TABLE 1.—*Oregon community colleges—Percent distribution of instructional programs, 1965–66*

Institution	Number of students	LDC (percent)	Vocational-technical (percent)	Other (percent)
Blue Mountain:				
FTE students	717.3	38.1	41.8	20.1
Headcount	1,322	30.4	65.1	4.5
Central Oregon:				
FTE students	676.5	58.1	24.2	17.7
Headcount	1,354	59.9	22.7	17.4
Clatsop:				
FTE students	468.7	43.0	50.2	6.8
Headcount	1,420	25.7	52.5	21.8
Lane:				
FTE students	1,611.4	31.2	47.4	21.4
Headcount	5,864	19.1	50.0	30.9
Oregon City:				
FTE students	124.1		99.0	1.0
Headcount	169		81.7	18.3
Portland:				
FTE students	3,478.2	31.7	40.1	28.2
Headcount	16,040	21.0	32.6	46.4
Salem:				
FTE students	770.0		75.4	24.6
Headcount	3,365		76.3	23.7
Southwestern:				
FTE students	673.4	47.7	37.0	15.3
Headcount	2,244	25.9	51.1	23.0
Treasure Valley:				
FTE students	833.8	56.6	40.1	3.3
Headcount	2,053	37.6	49.8	12.6
Umpqua:				
FTE students	275.8	64.7	23.7	11.6
Headcount	1,201	37.9	24.9	37.2
State total:				
FTE students	9,629.2	35.8	43.7	20.5
Headcount	35,032	22.5	43.5	34.0

TABLE 2.—*Oregon community colleges—Student full-time equivalencies, 1965–66*

Institution and program	Summer session	Fall term	Winter term	Spring term	Yearly total
Blue Mountain:					
Lower division collegiate		94.8	97.3	81.1	273.2
Vocational proparatory	16.3	88.8	94.3	84.9	284.3
Vocational extension		4.9	2.8	8.1	15.8
Other reimbursable		.9	1.7	.6	3.2
Nonreimbursable					
Separate contract		11.7	57.9	71.2	140.8
Out of State					2.6
Total reimbursable FTE					573.9
Total FTE	16.3	201.1	254.0	245.9	717.3
Central Oregon:					
Lower division collegiate	5.6	148.0	130.2	108.8	392.6
Vocational preparatory	7.2	47.8	46.2	47.7	148.9
Vocational extension	1.2	3.7	5.6	4.5	15.0
Other reimbursable	1.6	30.1	26.2	15.1	73.0
Nonreimbursable	.4				.4
Separate contract		10.6	23.8	12.2	46.6
Out of State					14.2
Total reimbursable FTE					615.3
Total FTE	16.0	240.2	232.0	188.3	676.3
Clatsop:					
Lower division collegiate	3.4	70.2	67.1	60.7	201.4
Vocational preparatory	1.5	75.8	68.3	52.3	197.9
Vocational extension	1.4	11.1	12.9	11.8	37.2
Other reimbursable	2.1	10.0	5.6	.29	20.6
Nonreimbursable		.8	1.4	.3	2.5
Separate contract				9.1	9.1
Out of State					9.1
Total reimbursable FTE					448.0
Total FTE	8.4	167.9	155.3	137.1	468.7
Lane:					
Lower division collegiate		168.9	188.9	145.2	503.0
Vocational preparatory	12.7	210.2	195.6	165.2	583.7
Vocational extension	3.8	50.0	71.5	55.4	180.7
Other reimbursable	1.5	8.2	5.1	3.9	18.7
Nonreimbursable		40.9	11.2	20.6	72.7
Separate contract			21.4	231.2	252.6
Out of State					2.0
Total reimbursable FTE					1,284.1
Total FTE	18.0	478.2	493.7	621.5	1,611.4
Oregon City:					
Lower division collegiate					
Vocational preparatory		55.1	32.9	34.8	122.8
Vocational extension					
Other reimbursable		.8	.5		1.3
Nonreimbursable					
Separate contract					
Out-of-State					6.9
Total reimbursable FTE					117.2
Total FTE		55.9	33.4	34.8	124.1
Portland:					
Lower division collegiate		367.1	392.3	343.7	1,103.1
Vocational preparatory	64.3	289.4	338.5	350.9	1,043.1
Vocational extension		114.5	124.0	112.9	351.4
Other reimbursable		37.8	32.1	24.2	94.1
Nonreimbursable		137.6	107.0	108.0	352.6
Separate contract	108.8	111.1	155.2	158.8	533.9
Out-of-State					
Total reimbursable FTE					2,591.7
Total FTE	173.1	1,057.5	1,149.1	1,098.5	3,478.2

TABLE 2.—*Oregon community colleges—Student full-time equivalencies, 1965–66*—Continued

Institution and program	Summer session	Fall term	Winter term	Spring term	Yearly total
Salem:					
Lower division collegiate					
Vocational preparatory		183.9	148.1	151.4	483.4
Vocational extension		31.7	28.6	37.2	97.5
Other reimbursable		8.5	11.2	7.7	27.4
Nonreimbursable					
Separate contract			161.7		161.7
Out-of-State					1.3
Total reimbursable FTE					607.0
Total FTE		224.1	349.6	196.3	770.0
Southwestern:					
Lower division collegiate	15.6	113.4	100.5	91.8	321.3
Vocational preparatory	4.1	75.6	60.1	46.6	186.4
Vocational extension	2.2	21.3	21.0	18.3	62.8
Other reimbursable	5.3	15.2	11.3	9.9	40.8
Nonreimbursable		.8	2.3	1.1	4.2
Separate contract	19.8	4.9	25.4	7.8	57.9
Out-of-State					1.5
Total reimbursable FTE					609.8
Total FTE	47.0	231.2	220.6	174.6	673.4
Treasure Valley:					
Lower division collegiate	23.9	160.2	154.9	132.8	471.8
Vocational preparatory	12.4	91.5	91.9	91.1	286.9
Vocational extension	9.5	6.2	16.4	15.2	47.3
Other reimbursable	1.3	1.5	.4	.1	3.3
Nonreimbursable	1.3				1.3
Treasure Valley—Continued					
Separate contract			23.2		23.2
Out of State					94.1
Total reimbursable FTE					715.6
Total FTE	48.4	259.4	286.8	230.2	833.8
Umpqua:					
Lower division collegiate		68.8	58.0	51.7	178.5
Vocational preparatory		21.5	17.0	14.3	52.8
Vocational extension		4.3	4.5	3.8	12.6
Other reimbursable		11.5	5.6	2.9	20.0
Nonreimbursable		3.9	3.9	.5	8.3
Separate contract		.7	1.6	1.3	3.6
Out of State					1.6
Total reimbursable FTF					262.3
Total FTE		110.7	90.6	74.5	275.8
State totals:					
Lower division collegiate	48.5	1,191.4	1,189.2	1,015.8	3,444.9
Vocational preparatory	118.5	1,139.6	1,092.9	1,039.2	2,390.2
Vocational extension	18.1	247.7	287.3	267.2	820.3
Other reimbursable	11.8	124.5	99.7	66.4	302.4
Nonreimbursable	1.7	184.0	125.8	130.5	442.0
Separate contract	128.6	139.0	470.2	491.6	1,229.4
Out of State					133.3
Total reimbursable FTE					7,824.9
Total FTE	327.2	3,026.2	3,265.1	3,010.7	9,629.2

TABLE 3.—*Oregon community colleges—Enrollment distribution by institutions*

Institution	Total FTE	Percent State FTE	Head-count	Percent State head-count
Blue Mountain	717.3	7.45	1,322	3.77
Central Oregon	676.5	7.03	1,354	3.86
Clatsop	468.7	4.87	1,420	4.05
Lane	1,611.4	16.73	5,864	16.74
Oregon City	124.1	1.29	169	.48
Portland	3,478.2	36.12	16,040	45.79
Salem	770.0	8.00	3,365	9.61
Southwestern	673.4	6.99	2,244	6.41
Treasure Valley	833.8	8.66	2,053	5.86
Umpqua	275.8	2.86	1,201	3.43
State total	9,629.2	100.00	35,032	100.00

TABLE 4.—*Oregon community college FTE increase by institution—All programs except separate contract, 1964–65, 1965–66*

Institution	FTE, 1964–65	FTE, 1965–66	Numerical increase	Percent of institution increase	Percent of State increase
Blue Mountain	419.6	576.5	156.9	37.39	4.84
Central Oregon	430.6	629.9	199.3	46.28	6.14
Clatsop	334.6	459.6	125.0	37.35	3.85
Lane	607.0	1,358.8	751.8	123.85	23.17
Oregon City	121.3	124.1	2.8	2.30	.09
Portland	1,712.3	2,944.3	1,232.0	71.95	37.97
Salem	453.3	608.3	155.0	134.19	4.78
Southwestern	484.1	615.5	131.4	27.14	4.05
Treasure Valley	434.0	810.6	376.6	86.77	11.61
Umpqua	158.7	272.2	113.5	71.51	3.50
Total	5,155.5	8,399.8	3,244.3	62.93	100.00

TABLE 5.—*Increase in Oregon community college FTE, by reimbursement area*

Reimbursement area	FTE 1964–65	FTE 1965–66	Numerical increase	Percentage increase
Lower division collegiate	1,619.7	3,444.9	1,825.2	112.69
Vocational preparatory	2,319.0	3,390.2	1,071.2	46.19
Vocational extension	778.1	820.3	42.2	5.42
Other reimbursable	128.6	302.4	173.8	135.15
Nonreimbursable	310.1	442.0	131.9	42.53
Total	5,155.5	8,399.8	3,244.3	62.93

CHAPTER IV: OPERATION COSTS

Unit cost of education

The unit cost of education, as defined for this study is the total operating cost of an institution divided by its total FTE student enrollment. Table 6 lists the unit costs of education in 1965–66. As indicated in Table 6, there was a variance in the unit costs of individual institutions, ranging from $1,053 per FTE at Southwestern Oregon Community College to $647 per FTE at Portland Community College. Oregon City is not included in these comparisons because it offered a very limited vocational program.

One important factor creating these differences is the size of the FTE enrollment in an institution. While it is true that additional financial and material resources must be provided as more students seek the services of a community college, costs do not increase proportionately with the enrollment.

The 1965 community college law established the state reimbursement rate at 85 percent of the difference between operating expenses and the amount received from tuition and fees, or two-thirds of the unit cost up to a maximum of $433 per FTE, whichever is less. Regardless of the unit cost of education in any institution, in no case can the state reimburse an institution at a rate higher than $433 per FTE, exclusive of federal funds for vocational-technical education. If an area education district offered vocational-technical programs in which the net operating cost was $511 per FTE or higher, Senate Bill 34 provided that for the first time federal vocational funds could be used as supplemental aid to such institutions. Under the formula approved by the State Board of Education, a community college could receive for each full-time equivalent student in approved vocational education programs the sum of the following amounts:

1. For the first $150 of net operating cost of the base of $510, the lesser of (a) 85% of the difference between the net operating cost per f.t.e. vocational student and $510; or (b) $127.50.

2. For the next $150 of net operating cost, the lesser of (a) 75% of the difference between the net operating cost per f.t.e. vocational student and $660; or (b) $112.50.

3. For the next $150 of net operating cost, the lesser of (a) 60% of the difference be-

tween the net operating cost per f.t.e. vocational student and $810; or (b) $90.

This cost-based formula has resulted in highly uneven distribution of federal funds to the community colleges (Table 7). A total of $440,944.73 in federal vocational funds was distributed to the colleges for 4,210.5 full-time equivalent enrollment in vocational courses, a statewide average of $107.27 per FTE. However, institutional receipts range from $307.40 (high) at Clatsop to a low of $0.00 per FT at Portland, yet Portland had an enrollment of 1,394.5 FTE in vocational courses while Clatsop's enrollment in such programs was 235.1 FTE.

The average FTE operating cost of Oregon community colleges dropped $15 per FTE in 1965–66 to $758 (Table 8). Only one institution, Southwestern, operated at over $1,000 per FTE in 1965–66 whereas three colleges were over that figure in 1964–65. Southwestern, however, achieved a $213 reduction per FTE during the year. It is becoming apparent that after the beginning years of operations, FTE costs are beginning to level off with less range between high and low institutions and a clustering trend occurring around the $900 level.

Table 9 indicates the percentage in 1965–66 operating costs borne by the four sources of operating revenue. Actual payments from the state general fund accounted for 50.9 percent of the operating costs of all Oregon community colleges in 1965–66, with Portland Community College receiving a high of 61 percent of its operating costs from the state whereas Southwestern received but 41 percent of its operating costs from the same source. This discrepancy is due primarily to the state reimbursement formula which fixes a limit of $433 per FIE of state general fund reimbursement and the higher operating costs per FTE at Southwestern as compared with the lower operating cost per FTE at Portland. Federal vocational funds provided 6.9 percent of the statewide operating costs, with a range of 15.9 percent at Clatsop to 0 percent at Portland. The Oregon City program was reimbursed exclusively from federal funds and is not subject to comparison.

The share of operating costs derived from tuition and fees tended to cluster more than any other source of revenue. The statewide average of 27.1 percent was recorded within a range of a 35 percent high (Umpqua) and a 22.6 percent low (Southwestern).

Local taxes provided 15.1 percent of *gross* operating revenue in 1965–66 and, with the exception of two institutions, clustered in the 10–18 percent range. Southwestern received 26.9 percent and Central Oregon 22.3 percent of their operating revenues from local taxes, almost double that received by Portland (10.8 percent) and Salem (10.7 percent).

The above analysis is made on the basis of *gross* operating costs. State reimbursement formula requires that the local district must provide at least 15 percent of the *net* operating costs per institution. Net operating costs are defined as total operating costs less receipts from tuition and fees.

Analysis of operating cost by function

Operating costs include expenditures for administration, instruction, plant operation and maintenance, student services, and fixed charges. During 1965–66, operating costs of the ten institutions for reimbursable programs total $6,368,627 (Table 10). Of this amount, $4,754,269 (74.7 percent) was expended for instructional costs. All ten institutions were grouped around the average from 68.1 percent (Lane) to 82.8 percent (Portland); less grouping was found in administrative costs where a statewide average of 7.9 percent covered a range from 15.4 percent (Umpqua) to 4.6 percent (Portland). In all other categories most institutions tended to cluster around the statewide average of 5.3 percent for plant operation, 2.4 percent plant maintenance, 1.5 percent student services, and 8.2 percent fixed charges.

Local tax levies

Table 11 lists taxes levied by local area education districts for community college operation and capital outlay. The average total levy ran from a high of 6.09 mills in the Treasure Valley Area Education District to a low of 3.0 in the Lane Area Education District. Eastside Area Education District (Mt. Hood) levied only 0.5 mills but did not offer an instructional program in 1965–66. In the case of Portland and Salem, no special tax was levied as these institutions were operated by the local school district and the funds for college operation were carried as part of the total school district budget.

TABLE 6.—*Oregon community colleges—Unit education costs in 1965–66*

Institution	Total institutional adjusted FTE	Reimbursable FTE	Total operating costs	Operating cost per FTE
Blue Mountain	576.5	573.9	$538,969	$935
Central Oregon	629.9	615.3	589,666	937
Clatsop	459.6	448.0	454,598	994
Lane	1,358.8	1,284.1	1,050,164	817
Oregon City	124.1	117.2	45,707	368
Portland	2,944.3	2,591.7	1,675,956	647
Salem	608.3	607.0	$466,058	$766
Southwestern	615.5	609.8	643,660	1,053
Treasure Valley	810.6	715.6	665,627	822
Umpqua	272.2	262.3	238,221	903
State totals	8,399.8	7,824.9	6,368,626	758

NOTE.—Oregon City offered only vocational programs which were entirely reimbursed from Federal funds. All institutions, excepting Oregon City and Portland, received maximum State support of $433 per FTE; Portland received $394.46 per FTE.

TABLE 7.—*Oregon community colleges—Major program operating cost comparison, 1965–66*

Institution	Operating costs		FTE		LDC cost per FTE	Vocational education cost per FTE	Federal vocational funds per FTE
	LDC	Vocational education	LDC	Vocational education			
Blue Mountain	$250,668.16	$286,656.62	273.2	300.1	$917.53	$955.20	$157.30
Central Oregon	353,274.00	170,686.00	392.6	163.9	899.83	1,041.40	273.44
Clatsop	169,575.76	263,289.32	201.4	235.1	841.98	1,119.90	307.40
Lane	349,351.89	694,695.54	503.0	764.4	694.54	908.81	161.44
Oregon City		44,907.29		122.8		365.69	212.03
Portland	674,473.00	967,118.00	1,103.1	1,394.5	611.43	693.52	
Salem		452,569.00		580.9		779.08	29.79
Southwestern	341,323.00	255,958.00	321.3	249.2	1,062.32	1,027.12	245.51
Treasure Valley	359,453.22	305,173.39	471.8	334.2	761.88	913.15	111.02
Umpqua	160,556.34	59,492.96	178.5	65.4	899.48	909.68	195.89
State total	2,658,675.37	3,500,546.12	3,444.9	4,210.5	771.77	831.38	107.27

TABLE 8.—*Oregon community colleges—Comparative FTE operating costs*

Institution	1963–64	1964–65	1965–66
Blue Mountain	$954	$930	$935
Central Oregon	836	1,038	937
Clatsop	903	1,063	994
Lane	[1] 505	[1] 536	817
Oregon City	[1] 330	[1] 372	[1] 368
Portland	[1] 520	602	647
Salem	[1] $538	[1] $703	[1] $766
Southwestern	1,127	1,266	1,053
Treasure Valley	699	715	822
Umpqua		917	903
State average	694	773	758

[1] Operated only vocational-technical programs in years indicated.

TABLE 9.—*Oregon community colleges—Sources of operating revenue, 1965–66*

Institution	Total operating costs	State funds		Federal funds		Tuition and fees		Local and other	
		Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent
Blue Mountain	$538, 969. 04	$248, 498. 70	46. 1	$47, 204. 90	8. 7	$147, 003. 30	27. 2	$96, 262. 14	18. 0
Central Oregon	589, 666. 00	266, 424. 90	45. 2	44, 817. 41	7. 6	146, 610. 00	24. 9	131, 813. 69	22. 3
Clatsop	454, 598. 07	193, 984. 00	42. 7	72, 270. 18	15. 9	108, 744. 65	23. 9	79, 599. 24	17. 5
Lane	1, 050, 164. 40	556, 015. 30	52. 9	123, 402. 01	11. 8	252, 167. 97	24. 0	118, 579. 12	11. 3
Oregon City	45, 707. 43	------	------	24, 849. 43	54. 4	15, 718. 38	34. 4	5, 139. 62	11. 2
Portland	1, 675, 956. 00	1, 022, 333. 48	61. 0	------	------	473, 209. 00	28. 2	180, 413. 52	10. 8
Salem	466, 058. 00	262, 831. 00	56. 4	17, 305. 57	3. 7	136, 162. 51	29. 2	49, 758. 92	10. 7
Southwestern	643, 660. 00	264, 043. 00	41. 0	61, 180. 00	9. 5	145, 657. 00	22. 6	172, 780. 00	26. 9
Treasure Valley	665, 626. 61	309, 854. 80	46. 6	37, 103. 86	5. 5	220, 050. 35	33. 1	98, 617. 60	14. 8
Umpqua	238, 220. 80	113, 575. 90	47. 7	12, 811. 37	5. 4	83, 538. 50	35. 0	28, 295. 03	11. 9
State totals	6, 368, 626. 35	3, 237, 561. 08	50. 9	440, 944. 73	6. 9	1, 728, 861. 66	27. 1	961, 258. 88	15. 1

TABLE 10.—*Oregon community colleges—Analysis of operating cost reimbursable programs 1965–66 preaudit*

(1) Institution	(2) Administration		(3) Instruction		(4) Plant operation		(5) Plant maintenance		[1] (6) Student services		(7) Fixed charges		(8) Total
	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	Amount	Percent	
Blue Mountain	$37, 697	7. 0	$398, 388	73. 9	$26, 221	4. 9	$1, 870	0. 3	$31, 128	5. 8	$43, 666	8. 1	$538, 970
Central Oregon	49, 899	8. 5	428, 916	72. 7	45, 667	7. 8	13, 098	2. 2	3, 003	. 5	49, 083	8. 3	589, 666
Clatsop	51, 299	11. 3	325, 549	71. 6	30, 377	6. 7	15, 714	3. 4	4, 332	1. 0	27, 327	6. 0	454, 598
Lane	115, 882	11. 0	714, 953	68. 1	39, 481	3. 8	4, 493	. 4	22, 121	2. 1	153, 235	14. 6	1, 050, 165
Oregon City	3, 616	7. 9	31, 500	68. 9	2, 864	6. 3	4, 231	9. 3	------	------	3, 496	7. 6	45, 707
Portland	76, 480	4. 6	1, 387, 270	82. 8	84, 195	5. 0	39, 501	2. 3	9, 219	. 6	79, 291	4. 7	1, 675, 956
Salem	38, 020	8. 2	371, 283	79. 7	23, 899	5. 1	3, 779	. 8	------	------	29, 077	6. 2	466, 058
Southwestern	52, 899	8. 2	472, 461	73. 4	42, 574	6. 6	17, 509	2. 7	10, 231	1. 6	47, 986	7. 5	643, 660
Treasure Valley	43, 812	6. 6	460, 924	69. 2	34, 688	5. 2	51, 156	7. 7	9, 852	1. 5	65, 195	9. 8	665, 627
Umpqua	36, 599	15. 4	163, 025	68. 4	8, 155	3. 4	2, 770	1. 2	2, 511	1. 0	25, 160	10. 6	238, 220
State totals	506, 203	7. 9	4, 754, 269	74. 7	338, 121	5. 3	154, 121	2. 4	92, 397	1. 5	523, 516	8. 2	6, 368, 627

[1] Student Services include research, public information, and student transportation.

TABLE 11.—*Oregon community colleges—Local tax levy, 1965–66*

Institution	Assessed value	Mills	Tax	General fund	Capital outlay	Average total levy
Blue Mountain:						
Umatilla	$98, 309, 082	3. 1	$304, 758. 15	------	------	------
Morrow	23, 431, 050	3. 0	70, 293. 15	------	------	------
Total	121, 740, 132	------	375, 051. 30	2. 10	0. 98	3. 08
Central Oregon:						
Klamath	5, 047, 047	3. 8	19, 178. 00	------	------	------
Lake	2, 837, 085	3. 5	9, 928. 80	------	------	------
Deschutes	42, 312, 436	3. 2	135, 399. 80	------	------	------
Jefferson	39, 597, 588	3. 1	122, 752. 49	------	------	------
Crook	18, 820, 140	3. 4	63, 988. 48	------	------	------
Wasco	321, 356	3. 7	1, 189. 02	------	------	------
Total	108, 935, 652	------	352, 436. 59	3. 04	. 20	3. 24
Clatsop: Clatsop	40, 024, 720	4. 1	164, 101. 35	4. 10	------	4. 10
Lane:						
Linn	5, 701, 090	3. 0	17, 103. 27	------	------	------
Lane	290, 822, 337	3. 0	872, 467. 01	------	------	------
Douglas	162, 505	2. 8	455. 01	------	------	------
Benton	1, 298, 685	3. 2	4, 155. 79	------	------	------
Total	297, 984, 617	------	894, 181. 08	1. 632	1. 368	3. 00
Mount Hood:						
Multnomah	$160, 790, 595	0. 5	$80, 395. 30	------	------	------
Clackamas	16, 995, 010	. 6	10, 197. 01	------	------	------
Hood River	1, 336, 281	. 6	801. 77	------	------	------
Total	179, 121, 886	------	91, 394. 08	0. 51	------	0. 51
Southwestern:						
Coos	82, 047, 135	5. 9	484, 078. 10	------	------	------
Douglas	18, 707, 306	3. 6	67, 346. 30	------	------	------
Total	100, 754, 441	------	551, 424. 40	2. 20	3. 27	5. 47
Treasure Valley:						
Baker	3, 911, 491	6. 0	23, 468. 95	------	------	------
Malheur	41, 535, 005	6. 1	253, 363. 48	------	------	------
Total	45, 446, 496	------	276, 832. 43	4. 85	1. 24	6. 09
Umpqua: Douglas	128, 567, 271	2. 6	334, 274. 90	. 78	1. 82	2. 60

CHAPTER V: CAPITAL CONSTRUCTION DURING THE BIENNIUM

Projected FTE enrollment forms the basis for the long-range building plans, long-range program, and staff plans of the individual colleges. Each long-range plan submitted for approval to the State Board of Education contains an enrollment projection for the individual institution, developed in cooperation with the State Department of Education. Naturally, each new enrollment projection, proceeding from the most recent actual FTE enrollment figures, will outdate previous projections. Consequently, the long-range plans of the individual colleges, developed to accommodate projected daytime FTE enrollment, must continually be revised not necessarily in substance but in the timing of the various building phases and in the program and staff changes that are scheduled to accompany building progress. With these cautions in mind, a summary can be given of the existing institutions' present state of facility development and plans for the immediate future.

Long-range building plans for Oregon community colleges

Four major factors are involved in community college capital construction planning: site, site improvement, facilities, and equipment. A satisfactory building program for the average community college will be determined by the nature of the educational programs offered. Under the current law, the state will pay 65 percent of the approved construction costs of these facilities, including equipment, and the college district will pay 35 percent. It should be noted, however, that due to space and dollar limitations within the current reimbursement formula and the level of legislative appropriations that the state's share of actual project costs has declined to 37.5 percent. Shop and laboratory construction and equipment represent the largest expenditure in a community college's building program; academic classrooms are the least expensive to construct and equip. A student center is an important addition to a campus, but such a facility must be financed solely by the college district as the state does not contribute to its construction cost.

The student capacity of a community college building is determined by the number of FTE students enrolling in classes held between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. It had been estimated that about one-third of the FTE enrollment in lower division collegiate and vocational preparatory programs would be in late afternoon and evening classes. The remaining two-thirds of the FTE students would attend between the hours from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. and would therefore determine the number of student and teacher stations for which buildings must be provided. It has not been intended that the state would participate in providing facilities for the evening. Individual student enrollment in evening courses may actually be larger than daytime enrollment, but other facilities in the community are usually available, if needed, to accommodate evening classes. The number of student stations required by the projected enrollment is based on utilization standards established by the State Board of Education. Studies have indicated that these standards are comparatively higher than most post-high school education. The State Board considers this desirable.

The state has not participated in reimbursement for community college building programs beyond certain limitations—floor space at the rate of 115 square feet for each FTE day student and a $15 maximum cost per square foot of floor space.

Due to the declining amount of state participation in construction of community college facilities, the State Board of Education requested a review of the program during 1965–66. A study was conducted within the state and in other states in which the community colleges were providing occupational education. Based upon these studies, revised policy, which will become effective July 1, 1967, was approved by the State Board April 6, 1966. Data ascertained in the studies was that the headcount enrollment in evening programs was high, but an average of only 17.2 percent of the FTE were attending community colleges in evening hours. This statewide average varies within the institutions from 8 percent to 25 percent of the FTE attending at night. Urban institutions have higher percentages of students attending in the evening as compared to institutions in less densely populated areas. The ability to offer a higher percentage of evening programs will continue to be more feasible in the more densely population locations.

Within the 1966 policy revision, the following factors were incorporated:

Basis for appropriation requests

For the first 2,000 FTE students sufficient resources for 140 square feet of gross facility space per FTE. For each FTE student thereafter, 100 square feet of space shall be the maximum extent of state participation. In determining appropriation requests, the current construction cost for the above space allowance shall be determined each two years. To the amount thus obtained, a percentage of construction cost shall be added for the purposes of architectural planning, initial equipment, and on-site development costs.

For the 1967–69 biennium, the state construction support level shall be based upon an average cost of $18.50 per square foot plus 32 percent (6 percent planning fees, 6 percent on-site development fees, and 20 percent equipment costs). This amounts to a gross of $3,420 per FTE student for the first 2,000 FTE and $2,450 per FTE beyond the first 2,000 FTE. The 65 percent state share of the gross will not exceed $2,200 for the first 2,000 FTE or $1,590 after the institution is building for the 2,001 student.

Institutional eligibility for State funds

The district's eligibility for state funds shall be based upon needs for full-time-equivalent, FTE, resident district student enrollment anticipated at the beginning of the next biennial period following the biennial period in which construction is planned. This procedure shall be used until such time as facilities have been constructed for 65 percent of the resident district student FTE potential, as projected by the State Board, for the tenth year following official acceptance of the institution as a community college.

After facilities have been constructed for such number of students, further eligibility for construction funds shall be based upon building project plans which shall be submitted and approved by the State Board of Education prior to the deadline for requesting biennial appropriations. The approval procedure shall include a utilization study of existing facilities, including a study of the day-night FTE student ratio. A need for additional facilities shall be considered justified when the study indicates that present utilization and projected utilization, including anticipated student needs after completion of the project, is consistent with State Board standards for teaching station and student station utilization.

Central Oregon Community College, Clatsop Community College, Southwestern Oregon Community College, and Salem Technical Vocational Community College received allocations for initial construction projects according to the 1961 law, in which the state's share of building projects was 75 percent of approved construction costs, fees, and built-in equipment, exclusive of the cost of the site. All of these institutions, excepting Clatsop, have completed first and second phases of their building programs.

A 1963 amendment changed the formula for state aid for community college building projects. State funds allocated for these projects in the 1963–65 biennium account for 65 percent of the approved cost of a building project, including equipment. Each education district must finance its share of the building project and the entire cost of the site.

Current capital construction

Blue Mountain Community College started on Phase II vocational-technical building in February 1966. On this project planning and construction fees were anticipated to be $543,756. Occupancy of part of the shop in this second project is anticipated commencing fall quarter 1966.

At Central Oregon Community College, a student center was completed September 1965 with a project cost of $281,194. It was constructed entirely with local funds from revenue obtained through a local bond issue. At the conclusion of this phase, the college should be able to offer a full-time day program in liberal arts and sciences on the permanent campus. Further additional facilities planned include a cultural center for art, music, and drama; a science facility; a technical center; a physical education building; and a maintenance and utility building.

Clatsop Community College began a second building project to complete remodeling of the two existing former high school buildings. State funds of $169,434 were approved January 27, 1966. A remodeling project cost of $630,490 was obtained in a bid approved June 1, 1966. In addition, an engineering technology building with a project cost of $296,537 was undertaken simultaneously financed entirely by the local community from the proceeds of a $700,000 bond issue. A third project anticipated in the future would add a library annex. The completely remodeled existing facilities includes necessary classroom, laboratory, administration, multipurpose area, temporary library, student center, bookstore, and part of physical education space.

During 1965–66, Lane Community College submitted a long-range plan for the development of a new campus on a 148-acre site southeast of Eugene, which was accepted by the State Board of Education and the Emergency Board. The plan provided for development of detail specifications for initial construction beginning in 1966–67 in order to abandon leased facilities by September 1968.

Portland Community College started first permanent development June 22, 1966, when a bid in the amount of $3,308,314 was approved for construction of vocational-technical, social sciences, and a heating-maintenance plant building sufficient for the whole campus. Included was 178,510 square feet of plant. Portland plans to let the construction contract for the second part of Phase I during 1966–67. The project was sufficiently large that it was impossible to complete architectural planning for all simultaneously. A separate amount of $300,000 has been set aside for architectural fees for Phase I–A and Phase I–B. It is estimated that an additional $3,691,686 will be required for I–B. For the completed Phase I project as a whole the estimated cost is $7,300,000. State funds in the amount of $3,058,900 were allocated for Phase I–A and Phase I–B construction. In addition, $500,000 in federal vocational education funds were allocated to the project by the State Board January 27, 1966. Local funds and two Higher Education Facility Act grants are anticipated to complete the project. Student stations for 2,353 FTE were provided for in the state fund allocation.

At Salem Technical Vocational Community College a Phase II project added classrooms and laboratories to Phase I facilities. It was accepted April 1966 at a total cost of $349,756. This included construction $264,852; architect $15,891; site development $12,113; and equipment amounting to $56,900. State funds of $90,937, federal vocational funds of $145,959, and local funds amounting to $112,860 were required.

Southwestern Oregon Community College completed Phase II construction October 1965. Facilities were an administration building, which included a temporary library; a science laboratory building; and a classroom building. The total project cost was $796,690. This amount included: construction $599,724, architect fees $42,109, equipment $51,392, and site development in the aggregate amount of $103,464. State participation amounted to $365,071, local funds $164,331, and a grant of $267,300 through the Higher Education Facility Act were used to complete the total. On October 26, 1965, the State Board approved an allocation of $209,519.75 to be used toward Phase III construction of a library and a physical education building. A total project cost of $924,320 was anticipated for these two buildings, the balance was anticipated from federal funds and federal grant under the Higher Education Facility Act.

Treasure Valley Community College received as a gift from the city of Ontario an 89-acre former municipal golf course in the southwest section of the city. The site included a club house which was first used as a library and later for music. Phase I construction began April 20, 1965, on a composite building which contains classrooms, administration, science laboratories, and a vocational-technical building containing large shops. Total project costs of Phase I were $676,921. Federal funds were obtained in the amount of $168,560 under the Vocational Education Act and $88,896 under the Higher Education Facility Act. State funds required were $221,939 and local resources amounting to $197,526 completed the balance. Although not completely finished, classes began in this facility fall quarter 1965. Due to a rapid growth in the number of students, two other projects were begun in 1965–66 although they had not originally been anticipated. The first was constructed on the campus site by private money and leased to the college. It cost $134,000 and contained class and shop spaces. This facility was occupied spring quarter 1966. The second became possible because the college received a bequest of $220,000 from the estate of a local physician which, combined with a limited amount of state funds ($63,871.84), a Higher Education Facility Act grant of $124,243, and $94,015 in local funds, enabled the college to contract for a $502,130 facility containing classrooms, vocational laboratories and a temporary library. It was incomplete as of June 30, 1966.

Umpqua Community College was formed

in March 1964. For the first year classes were held in the late afternoon and evening in the Roseburg High School. During 1965–66 additional facilities were leased to add a day program as well as the evening program. A donated site containing 98 acres, five miles north of Roseburg, has been selected for permanent campus development. In December 1965, a long-range plan was approved by the State Board of Education and the Emergency Board. It proposes campus development in four stages. Phase I, 1965–67, contains a classroom building, a science-laboratory building, the permanent library building, and the administration building. A bid for these four first-phase buildings was approved June 27, 1966, in the amount of $1,202,537. Phase II construction, 1967–69, plans are for a vocational-technical building. In Phase III, 1969–71, a student union, to be built with local funds, an auditorium and a fine arts building are planned. The fourth and final phase is to contain a second classroom-laboratory building and facilities for physical education.

The Mt. Hood and the Clackamas Community Colleges were formed in 1965–66 but had not had sufficient time to prepare long-range plans for the development of permanent facilities.

Biennial financing

For the 1965–67 biennium, $4,500,000 for state share of community college facility construction was appropriated from the general fund. This amount was insufficient to provide for all needs for anticipated FTE students. The Ways and Means Committee of the Legislature indicated to the State Board of Education a desire to allocate in full to institutions in accordance with student eligibility rather than to prorate funds to all institutions which had been the pattern of the previous biennium. During 1965–66, encumbrance of these funds was made in the following manner:

Institution	Date	Encumbered	Balance
State appropriation	1965–67		$4,500,000.00
1. Salem	June 1, 1965	$17,657.00	4,482,343.00
2. Blue Mountain	Aug 4, 1965	28,640.08	4,453,702.92
3. Portland	Oct. 26, 1965	2,989,670.00	1,464,032.92
4. Treasure Valley	do	63,871.84	1,400,161.08
5. Southwestern	do	139,994.00	1,260,167.08
6. Blue Mountain	Dec. 9, 1965	264,201.92	995,965.16
7. Umpqua	Jan. 27, 1966	529,100.00	466,865.16
8. Clatsop	do	169,434.00	297,431.16
9. Central Oregon	May 20, 1966	149,333.00	148,098.16

(Remaining Unsatisfied Eligibility After Above Action:)

1. Blue Mountain	
2. Central Oregon	
3. Clatsop	
4. Lane	$1,300,000.00
5. Portland	
6. Salem	474,773.00
7. Southwestern	
8. Treasure Valley	175,689.16
9. Umpqua	
10. Mount Hood	503,100.00
Total	2,453,562.16

Federal funds available for Oregon Community college construction in 1965–66 were $600,000 from the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and $1,157,623 authorized under the Higher Education Facility Act of 1965. Institutional grants were:

1. Southwestern Oregon Community College	$362,380
2. Treasure Valley Community College	124,243
3. Portland Community College	1,157,000

Projects completed 1965–66

The following community college physical plant construction projects were begun prior to July 1, 1965, but were completed prior to June 30, 1966:

Institution	Type building	Project cost
Blue Mountain	Composite	$894,789
Central Oregon	Student center	281,194
Salem	Classroom and laboratory addition	349,756
Southwestern	Administration, science classroom	796,690
Treasure Valley	Vocational-technical, administration, classroom	676,921
	Vocational-technical, lease building	[1] 134,000
Total		3,133,350

[1] Does not include equipment.

Projects started 1965–66

These community college facilities were started during 1965–66, but were still under construction as of June 30, 1966:

Institution	Type building	Estimated project cost
Blue Mountain	Vocational-technical	[1] $543,756
Central Oregon	Library	541,309
Clatsop	Remodel 2 buildings	[1] 630,490
	Engineering-technical	[1] 296,537
Portland	Shops Classroom-laboratory Plant and maintenance	[2] 3,458,314
Southwestern	Library Physical education	[1] 924,320
Treasure Valley	Classroom Vocational laboratory Temporary library	502,130
Umpqua	Administration Library Classroom Science laboratory	[3] 1,202,537
Total		8,099,393

Amount construction bid and architect fee only.

[2] Includes half ($150,000) of phase I–A and I–B architect fee in addition to bid amount of $3,308,314.

[3] Amount construction bid only.

TABLE 12.—*Oregon community colleges, completed construction, 1961–66*

Institution	Year completed	Number of buildings	Construction cost	Other cost	Total cost	State funds	Local funds	Other funds
Blue Mountain	1965–66	1	$662,635	$232,154	$894,789	$329,898	$349,157	$215,734
Central Oregon	1963–64	4	301,000	69,649	370,649	225,000	145,649	
	1964–65	1	171,920	85,245	257,165	99,907	69,022	88,236
	1965–66	1	246,831	34,363	281,194		281,194	
Clatsop	1962–63	2	229,471	214,017	443,488	175,000	268,488	
Salem	1963–64	2	282,998	56,772	339,770	225,000	114,770	
	1965–66	(1)	264,852	84,904	349,756	90,937	112,860	145,959
Southwestern	1963–64	2	313,606	237,800	551,406	225,000	326,406	
	1965–66	3	599,724	196,966	796,690	365,071	164,319	267,300
	1965–66	2	574,202	102,719	676,921	221,939	197,526	257,456
Treasure Valley (lease-purchase building)	1965–66	1	125,300	8,700	134,000			134,000
Total			3,772,539	1,323,289	5,095,828	1,957,752	2,029,391	1,108,685
Percentage			74.0	26.0	100.0	38.4	39.8	21.8

[1] Addition.

SENATE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE REPORT—THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, last week at the direction of the Republican Senatorial Policy Committee, the staff of that committee concluded a rather extensive effort on the compilation of a study entitled "The War in Vietnam."

This report is not intended as a political party position or political party statement. It is intended as an objective study of a part of the historic background of the situation in Vietnam.

The report has received a substantial amount of interpretation, some misinterpretation, and some accurate interpretation, but it nevertheless has received a substantial volume of comment and criticism.

In order to make the report available to as large a number of people as possible, since we have had thousands of requests for this document—and we do not have enough money to have it printed—I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in large type at this point in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

INTRODUCTION

DIMENSIONS OF THE WAR

As of April 1967, the war to contain Communist aggression in Vietnam has assumed for the United States these unusual dimensions:

It means a conflict that has escalated from a small force of 600 American technicians to over a half-million fighting men.

It means over 8,000 men killed.

It means over 50,000 wounded.

It means greatly increased American conscription at a time when the rest of the Western world has done away with its draft.

It means our longest war since the American Revolution—six years—a weary nightmare and yet the men who fight are fighting with extraordinary bravery and skill.

It means not knowing at any given moment precisely who the enemy is.

It means a war which is not simply fought over this tiny land of Vietnam; for this war, unlike all others in American history, is more and more justified as much on geopolitical grounds as on the defense of one small government.

It means our relative isolation as the world's policeman, for here we have no Grand Alliance as in World War II, no United Nations Combined Forces as in Korea. In addition to South Vietnamese troops, four Pacific nations have provided some fighting help—with our financial assistance.

It means fighting a people who claim this is a civil war, and who in turn are spurred on by two giant powers quarreling openly with each other.

It means that while we have committed 500,000 men to battle communism, neither the Soviet Union nor Red China—the great Communist powers—has found it necessary to commit troops.

It means the most frustrating sort of war, with no front lines, which breaks out here and there, even across national borders in Laos and Cambodia, neither of which is involved.

It means spending over $300,000 to kill each enemy soldier.

It means spending $24 billion a year, with another increase in taxes threatened, a further drain on an already inadequate gold supply, and an escalation of inflation.

It means enormous discretionary powers assumed by the President, with Congress asked to approve his actions after the fact.

It means the Nation which started the war—France—and lost it, now has become our most outspoken critic while profiting heavily from the war.

It means a war where, in the eyes of many Asiatics, we are fighting against indigenous Asiatic nationalism, much as France did in the past.

It means the first war in our history fought not only on the battlefield but brought into the American livingroom, every day, through the raw emotionalism of today's mass communications.

It means a war in which religious controversy between Catholic minority and Buddhist majority has come dangerously close to causing collapse of the successive governments of South Vietnam.

Here at home this confusion, this frustration, has raised challenges within Congress, within colleges and universities, within the press, within the military itself—and all to a degree not experienced in the United States since the Civil War. Conscientious objectors today outnumber their Korean counterparts 4 to 1.

PART I

Vietnam is a 2,000 year old country which, because of its exposed position, has been invaded by the Mongols, the Chinese, the Siamese, the French, the Japanese. One of the few things uniting the 30 million Vietnamese is a strong, common tradition of fighting outsiders.

The longest, most recent, most oppressive occupation—from the Vietnamese viewpoint—is still fresh in the minds of most Vietnamese. That occupation was by France; a white, western, capitalist, Christian power. America, no matter how pure its motives, cannot overcome the weight of history insofar as the Vietnamese look at it. In short, their memory of history is what we must learn to deal with, not our concept of it.

THE CRUCIAL ERA

The most crucial moments in Vietnam's recent history came at the close of World War II, and are among the least remembered. The critical events of this era—the genesis of today's conflict—bear recounting in the strictest historical terms, complicated though they may be.

For nearly two decades prior to World War II, Vietnamese, directed in large measure by Ho Chi Minh, an exiled Communist from Annam, had carried on an underground struggle for indedependence from France.

Ho Chi Minh became the principal rallying agent for underground factions when the Japanese conquered Indochina during World War II.

The World War II pattern of Axis conquest, that of setting up local, native puppet regimes—Quisling in Norway, Laval in France—was broken in Indochina. The Japanese found a tractable colonial bureaucracy running the country, that of the Vichy French; they took advantage of it, and for a time allowed the French to continue doing business at the same stand, but with new directors. Not all the French in Indochina were so ready to cooperate. Many were secretly allied with the Free French under De Gaulle.

Both the United States and Nationalist China openly recognized Ho as leader of the free Indochina movement during World War II. We supplied Ho's forces, the Vietminh, with arms and advisors.

Because of the Atlantic Charter and the outspoken United States stance in opposition to colonialism, the Vietminh and all Vietnamese had reason to expect U.S. support for their claim to independence following World War II. They had, after all, fought on our side—against both Japan and Vichy France.

Toward the end of the war, alarmed by the growing strength of the independence movement, Japan set up a puppet Vietnam government under the Emperor of Annam, Bao Dai.

AFTERMATH OF POTSDAM

The Potsdam Agreement provided that Chinese Nationalist troops were to disarm and intern Japanese forces north of the 16th parallel. British troops were to perform the same task in the south.

On September 2, 1945—following the Japanese collapse—Ho Chi Minh proclaimed from Hanoi the independence of all Vietnam. Bao Dai resigned, offered to serve the new government of independent Vietnam, and was appointed as an advisor.

British occupation forces, under Maj. Gen. Douglas Gracey, put their own interpretation on the Potsdam Agreement and proceeded first to rearm, and then to use defeated Japanese troops to throw representatives of the newly proclaimed independent Vietnam government out of Saigon.

The consequences of this decision are with us today.

Thereafter, the British rearmed approximately 5,000 French troops interned in Saigon. On September 23, 1945, the British allowed the French coup d'etat, returning southern Vietnam to its colonial position under Paris rule.

British and Japanese troops supported the French in battle against Vietnamese units until enough French reinforcements—50,000 of them—arrived by December of 1945 to reestablish total French domination in the south.

Commenting on the use of Japanese soldiers to reestablish European colonialism, Gen. Douglas A. MacArthur is reported to have said:

"If there is anything that makes my blood boil, it is to see our Allies in Indochina and Java deploying Japanese troops to reconquer the little people we promised to liberate. It is the most ignoble kind of betrayal."

AN 8-YEAR COLONIAL WAR

Thereafter began an 8-year colonial war which did not then attract general attention in the United States. We were deeply involved elsewhere.

We were, in 1946, attempting unsuccessfully to establish a modus vivendi with the Soviet Union. The Cold War had begun.

In 1947, through the Marshall Plan, we were trying to rebuild a shattered Europe. This same year we had to move with arms and men to yet another Cold War frontier, the Greek and Anatolian Peninsulas.

In 1948, one more Iron Curtain rang down—this time over Czechoslovakia—necessitating the establishment of NATO to defend the rest of free Europe from Communist aggression. A few months later we were in the grim struggle to save West Berlin—and West Germany—by means of the Berlin airlift.

As for Asia, our attention was riveted on the war between Chinese Nationalists and Chinese Communists for control of mainland China. In terms of stakes in the Cold War, our commitments were elsewhere than Indochina. While we occasionally urged France to grant independence to these peoples—as we ourselves had already done for the Philippines—our prime concern was to secure French cooperation in forming NATO. Since France was absolutely vital to the success of the North Atlantic Treaty Alliance and was a permanent member of the U.N., we found it inappropriate to nudge France on the matter of colonialism in quite the same fashion as we did with the Netherlands in Java.

In 1949, the Communists had conquered mainland China, igniting a stormy debate within the United States. It was obvious that a nation of 3.7 million square miles, bursting with half a billion people, under aggressive Communist leadership, had to be contained. This containment of Chinese expansion was to become the key aspect of President Truman's Asia policy.

France argued that while Ho Chi Minh was admittedly the leader of Vietnamese nationalism, he was also a Communist. He was beginning to receive aid from Communist China. Therefore, the French were able to convince us that containment of China meant support of French colonialism in Vietnam.

VIETNAM 1946: FRANCE RECOGNIZES HO CHI MINH

Despite the "ignoble betrayal" referred to by General MacArthur, Ho Chi Minh found it convenient to negotiate with French representative Jean Sainteny. As a result of the agreement entered into, in March 1946, France recognized the Republic of Vietnam as a "Free State" within the French Union, under Ho Chi Minh, with its capital at Hanoi.

In return, Ho Chi Minh agreed to the stationing of French troops in the north with the understanding they would be withdrawn by 1951. The French agreed to permit a referendum as to whether all of Vietnam would become a unified, independent state within the French Union.

France abided by neither promise.

Troops were not withdrawn, nor were elections held. Instead, France took a step which was to insure 20 years of conflict—conflict which continues to this day.

On June 1, 1946, Admiral G. Thierry D'Argenlieu, the new French High Commissioner in Indochina, established and recognized a puppet government in South Vietnam.

The Vietnamese desire for independence was frustrated a second time. Subsequent negotiations proved fruitless. So intense by now was the Vietnamese hatred for France that Ho Chi Minh, a Communist, was able to crystallize these emotions into a willingness by many Vietnamese—whether Communist or not—to fight against the French occupation forces for 8 years, eventually to win.

Gradually, Ho Chi Minh's forces won control of most of Vietnam. French power shrunk to control of forts and the few large cities. To bolster their collapsing government in Vietnam, France appealed to the one-time Japanese puppet Bao Dai to again become head of state.

Negotiations were begun with Bao Dai in 1948, finally resulting in the "Elysee Agreements." As ratified by the French Parliament in January 1950, the Agreements—278 pages of tendentious legalisms—created three "autonomous" states, Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. In these states, France retained control of foreign relations, armed forces, and, for all practical purposes, finances.

It was at this time, in January of 1950, that Ho Chi Minh sought and secured recognition from the Soviet Union and from Communist China.

On February 1, 1950, Secretary of State Acheson stated that the recognition by the U.S.S.R. and Communist China of Ho Chi Minh's government "should remove any illusions as to the 'Nationalist' nature of Ho Chi Minh's aims and reveals Ho in his true colors as the mortal enemy of native independence in Indochina."

On February 7, both the United States and Britain recognized the Bao Dai Government.

In May of 1950, Mr. Acheson announced the U.S. would provide aid to restore "security" and "develop genuine nationalism" in Indochina.

With the outbreak of the Korean war in June 1950, President Truman announced the "acceleration" of aid to Indochina.

It was argued in 1950 the decision by President Truman to assist the French in Indochina was a logical extension of the Truman Doctrine which evolved in the Mediterranean in 1947. Under that doctrine the United States had sent aid to Greece and Turkey when threatened with Communist aggression.

There were some basic differences between the Greek-Turkish situation and that found in Vietnam in 1950.

Greece was an independent nation with clearly established and defined borders, and an internationally recognized government. It was being attacked by Greek Communists who were based—and financed—from abroad. There was no popular internal revolution in process, no fight by the Greek people for freedom from foreign domination. The Greek government requested help. First Britain, then the U.S. responded with money, arms, and advisors.

Turkey was also a long-established nation with a recognized government whose borders were threatened by the Soviet Union. The government requested help and we responded with money, arms, and training advisors.

Vietnam was an altogether different situation. For the first time, we were officially committing American arms, money, military advisors to a colonial war on the side of colonial power.

The decision by President Truman was made in a peculiarly turbulent political climate. The fall of China had so charged the political atmosphere in Washington that the French appeal for assistance met readily receptive ears. The overt attack by the Communists in Korea, combined with the Communist recognition of Ho Chi Minh earlier in the year, seemed to justify even more the position adopted by the Truman administration.

In August of 1950, the first American military advisers arrived in Vietnam—35 of them.

From this point, all opponents of the Bao Dai government were labeled Communists by the French. The tragic, unintended result of this was, as President Eisenhower noted in his book, "Mandate for Change, The White House Years": "had elections been held as of the time of the fighting, possibly 80 percent of the population would have voted for the Communist Ho Chi Minh as their leader, rather than Chief of State, Bao Dai."

THE EISENHOWER INHERITANCE

Aid received from Communist China beginning in 1950 had already enabled Ho Chi Minh's forces to capture one by one the entire French line of forts along the Chinese border. With the conclusion of the Korean War, Communist China was able to increase its aid to the Vietminh.

In 1953, President Eisenhower took office. He was forced to make basic decisions on Indochina almost at once. Most important was whether to continue assistance to the French, cut it back, or end it. President Eisenhower decided to continue and increase American aid, but to attempt to channel this aid around the French directly to Bao Dai and the Vietnamese people. He hoped to make Bao Dai more independent of France, more acceptable to the Vietnamese.

The French balked, insisting on keeping total control over all military and most economic aid. A relatively small program of direct aid to the Vietnamese continued, although it was resented by the French.

By 1954 our aid program had totaled over $1 billion. As the French military collapse accelerated, we were underwriting a high percentage of the cost of their war.

TROUBLED SPRING

In January and February of 1954 a four power conference met to discuss the status of Berlin. Unable to resolve that question the representatives turned to other matters and agreed that a conference at Geneva would be convened in May to effect "a political settlement of the Korean question" and to discuss "the problem of restoring peace in Indochina." While not originally intended as a conference to settle boundaries in Indochina, but rather as a discussion of a cease fire, Ho Chi Minh's artillery was already at work writing a different conclusion. The saga of Dien Bien Phu had begun.

With the French military catastrophe at hand, President Eisenhower had to decide whether or not to intervene directly. The question of American intervention in Vietnam was put to the President on March 20, 1954, by the French Chief of Staff, General Paul Ely. He stated that only by massive American intervention could France hope to prevent a defeat at Dien Bien Phu. Without such intervention, it was intimated, France would be obliged to negotiate a settlement with the Vietminh.

In short, the general French thesis—supported by many Americans—seemed to be that if we did not intervene we would be handing the whole of Southeast Asia to the Communists.

A sharp argument arose within the Eisenhower Administration. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Arthur Radford, proposed a major United States military intervention from the sea beginning with air strikes to support the French at Dien Bien Phu. General Matthew Ridgway opposed this.

Congressional leaders were consulted.

President Eisenhower gave serious consideration to such proposals. However, he also circulated our allies in Europe and elsewhere as to the advisibility of and their willingness to join in such an intervention. He made clear that any intervention would have to be joint, not unilateral. Britain was the key, and refused, fearing it would scuttle the pending Geneva Conference and involve them in another endless colonial war.

Furthermore, France would not give satisfactory assurances, even at this late date, that it would grant independence to the peoples of Indochina.

In the end, President Eisenhower refused to permit a unilateral armed intervention to save a colonial regime.

He declared that he could not "conceive of a greater tragedy for America than to get heavily involved now in an all-out war in any of those regions (Indochina)."

THE EISENHOWER APPROACH

Several facts are worth noting. President Eisenhower, the professional military man, permitted a full, free debate over our Vietnam policy among military chiefs. In effect, it was General Ridgway arguing against the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Radford.

He also listened to Members of Congress who objected to American intervention in Vietnam.

Even though we had expended enormous amounts of aid in support of the French in Vietnam, President Eisenhower was willing to cash in his chips in 1954, no matter how humiliating it might be to admit we had backed a loser, rather than throw good blood after bad money.

In other words, he realized the application of military power could not resolve a hopeless political situation in Vietnam.

President Eisenhower had listened to all the arguments and weighed them carefully. Regardless of which individual advanced what argument, the ultimate decision was the President's. It was not the arguments that preceded it, but the decision that counted.

The decision had the effect, as well, of cementing as an American position subscribed to by Republican and Democrat alike, at that time, that we should not become involved in another land war in Asia.

As a footnote to history, General Matthew B. Ridgway was to write in his memoirs:

"When the day comes for me to face my Maker and account for my actions, the thing I would be most humbly proud of was the fact that I fought against, and perhaps contributed to preventing, the carrying out of some harebrained tactical schemes which would have cost the lives of some thousands of men. To that list of tragic accidents that fortunately never happened I would add the Indochina intervention."

THE GENEVA CONFERENCE

The Geneva Conference was not arranged to preside over the partition of Vietnam nor the withdrawal of France. Events at Dien Bien Phu—which fell on May 7, the day before the Vietnam phase of the Conference opened—dictated otherwise. The Conference did partition Vietnam and registered ultimate French withdrawal.

Participating in the Indochina phase were the United States, France, Britain and the Soviet Union, and after prolonged haggling, Communist China. These powers finally agreed that representatives of Cambodia and Laos take part along with a representative of Bao Dai and Ho Chi Minh.

The Conference was uniquely structured in that the five great powers were interested in an agreement on Indochina but were also interested in other problems and negotiations of equal delicacy. Indeed they may have considered the latter of greater importance than peace in Indochina.

The key was the European Defense Community. The U.S. and Britain were attempting to found EDC and felt they could not over-pressure France on the Indochina question. The Soviet Union was equally interested in blocking EDC and pressured Ho Chi Minh to make concessions to France which Ho did not feel were justified. Since the Vietminh controlled three-quarters of all Vietnam, Ho was confident he could quickly capture the rest. He also felt it was but a matter of time before Laos also fell to Communist rule. Communist China, at the time, was trying to present a more moderate image to the world and was willing to cooperate with the Soviet Union in forcing Ho Chi Minh to ease his demands.

During the Conference France underwent a domestic crisis because of military reverses in Indochina and elected a new Premier, and thus a new set of negotiators. Even so, France emerged from the Conference having salvaged at the negotiating table much of which she had lost on the battlefield.

Ho Chi Minh agreed to pull Vietminh forces out of South Vietnam, which they largely controlled, back above the 17th parallel.

The Conference agreed to withdrawal of "regular troops," but did not press the issue of guerrillas. There was to be only routine replacement of troops and armament. Reinforcement and introduction of new weapons were prohibited. The population was to be allowed to move freely from one zone to another. A special "regroupment area" was created in Laos for the Communist Pathet Lao, composed of the northern provinces bordering on China and North Vietnam.

On the subject of reunification of North and South Vietnam the Conference made it clear the 17th parallel was not to be a permanent dividing line. It called for nationwide elections within two years, by July 1956. This last provision was assented to orally by all parties except the U.S. and Bao Dai.

The International Control Commission was to supervise observance of all provisions including elections. The Commission was composed of India (chairman), Poland and Canada.

Neither the U.S. nor South Vietnam signed the agreements. The U.S., in a separate statement, declared it would refrain from disturbing the agreements. The Vietminh probably were persuaded to accept the agreement because they felt confident that in two years the elections would sweep them into power.

Principal gain of the Vietminh was international recognition of their control over what has since become known as North Vietnam.

France—the government and French citizens—emerged from Geneva with Vietnam no longer a drain on resources and manpower, but with their commercial interests intact in South Vietnam. They profited vastly from the American investment, both economic and military, all through this decade. They still profit today.

THE NEW SOUTH VIETNAM

With Vietnam divided—at least temporarily—as a result of the Geneva Conference, the Eisenhower Administration was faced with yet another critical decision: whether to give aid to the government of South Vietnam.

During the Geneva Conference, Bao Dai had persuaded Ngo Dinh Diem to become premier of his government. Diem was strongly nationalist, anti-French and anti-Communist. He was, however, an unknown quantity, both in his homeland and internationally, as to his ability to govern; many considered him a mere caretaker until the 1956 elections when, they were confident, Ho Chi Minh would come back to power.

The events of the next 18 months read like a history of the Byzantine court. There were American officials—civil and military—who supported Diem, and Americans who thought him inadequate. There were French officials who actively conspired against him; others actively cooperated. Bao Dai—"governing" from Paris or the Riviera—alternately backed his premier, charged him with usurping his power, demanded his resignation, or ordered Viet troops to fight in his defense. Diem's army commander negotiated with the French, or disaffected Vietnamese, to overthrow him.

Diem had no administrative corps upon which to draw, the French were leaving and Vietnamese who had served under the French were not welcome. Great areas of South Vietnam were governed by nearly autonomous religious sects with their own armies. The Saigon police were Mafia-like group of gangsters—also with their own militia.

Compounding the confusion in Saigon, a million refugees from the north fled Ho Chi Minh's Communist dictatorship and settled in South Vietnam. Diem had to provide housing, employment and food for the refugees and attempt to relocate them.

Ho Chi Minh used the two years 1954–56 to consolidate his power in North Vietnam. No longer leading a band of guerrillas, he took the course all newly-constituted Communist regimes have taken. Those who opposed his rule were killed. At least 50,000, perhaps as many as 100,000 were slaughtered. A peasant uprising was put down brutally. Small landowners—many of them with only a tiny fraction of an acre—were treated as though they were absentee landlords: they were shot.

In short, the million who fled south were fleeing a reign of terror.

DIEM: THE SUCCESSFUL YEARS

Diem hung on. For the first time there was a Vietnam independent of both France and the Communists. A group of officials within the Eisenhower Administration argued that this fact alone merited American support and aid. Additionally, they argued, such aid could now go directly to the Vietnamese people, in line with the original Eisenhower goal.

Thus, when Diem formally requested assistance from the United States—economic aid immediately to help care for the refugees as well as long-term aid programs—President Eisenhower agreed to help in a letter dated October 23, 1954.

That letter, so often trotted out by succeeding Administrations to prove that whatever they did was simply in line with the Eisenhower "legacy" deserves to be quoted:

"I am accordingly, instructing the American Ambassador . . . to examine with you in your capacity as Chief of Government, how an intelligent program of American aid given directly to your Government can serve to assist Vietnam in its present hour of trial, provided that your Government is prepared to give assurances as to the standards of performance it would be able to maintain in the event such aid is supplied.

"The purpose of this offer is to assist the Government of Vietnam in developing and maintaining a strong, viable state, capable of resisting attempted subversion or aggression through military means. The Government of the United States expects that this aid will be met by performance on the part of the Government of Vietnam in undertaking needed reforms. It hopes that such aid, combined with your own continuing efforts, will contribute effectively toward an independent Vietnam, endowed with a strong Government. Such a Government would, I hope, be so responsive to the nationalistic aspirations of its people, so enlightened in purpose and effective performance, that it will be respected both at home and abroad and discourage any who might wish to impose a foreign ideology on your free people."

There are several points worth noting with respect to this offer of aid.

The most important is that a primary condition was attached, and reiterated in several different ways, to wit, that the new Government had to make the proper effort to survive on its own in order to receive economic and military assistance. This principle of "self help" on the part of the recipient country had long been advocated by Republicans.

The letter was primarily "political" in its prescriptions, emphasizing the establishment of a "strong," "viable" government, and the effecting of needed reforms in the country. The military program was intended to establish a climate of security to make the former possible.

A month previous, in September 1954, the Seato agreement and the Manila Pact had been agreed to by the U.S and other nations, specifically giving the states of Indochina a guarantee against aggression from the outside and subversion from within.

This, plus the promise of aid, had the immediate effect of giving the Diem Government a combination of psychological, economic and military support necessary for it to survive.

Diem, thereafter, moved first against the gangsters around Saigon, and after defeating and dispersing them, disarmed and suppressed the autonomous religious sects. By October 1955, he felt strong enough to propose a referendum between the absent Bao Dai and himself. It was clear that Diem would have won overwhelmingly in any event, but his brother felt it necessary to manipulate the election giving Diem about 98 percent of the vote. This was the first indication that Diem's concept of a "viable" government was one in which authority was centralized in the person of the President.

THE 1956 NONELECTION

The Geneva Agreements called for a national plebiscite in Vietnam by July 1956. That election was never held.

Diem knew that were the election to be held, it would be a popularity contest between himself and Ho Chi Minh; and he knew Ho would quite likely win. Ho was far better known as the leader in the fight against France. He had the aura of success about him. On a head-count basis there were simply more votes to be cast in the north than in South Vietnam. Further, Diem felt the International Control Commission could not supervise the election properly in the North and that Ho could as easily manipulate the polling there as Diem had in his own election in 1955. Finally, France, which had been commissioned at Geneva to help the ICC supervise the election in the south had pulled out completely, early in 1955, at Diem's insistence. The Geneva cochairmen, Britain and Russia did not name a replacement for the French.

So, Diem decided against allowing the election.

He defended his action by saying neither his Government nor the United States had agreed at Geneva to the election and therefore were not bound by that agreement, and that France, which had agreed was gone. Technically, perhaps, he was correct. His decision foreshadowed a renewal of guerrilla activity a year later, in 1957, which became dangerously widespread and brutal in 1959–60.

DIEM IN DECLINE

Diem, by 1957, had taken other actions which made the renewal of revolutionary guerrilla warfare both inevitable and successful.

He suppressed all political opposition in the south, and not just the Viet Cong, but those who attempted to criticize him through the regular channels of parliament and press. His administration drew to a large extent from the Catholic refugees from the north, causing the beginnings of friction with the largely Buddhist population of the south.

Throughout history Vietnam's thousands of villagers were traditionally governed by village chiefs or headmen. These village leaders had their family roots deep in the local soil, many having lived in the same village for centuries. Diem chose to replace many of these village headmen with appointees of his own from Saigon, causing deep resentment among the villagers so governed.

This resentment made it easier for the Viet Cong to draw much of its early support from non-Communist South Vietnamese. Many of the revolutionists in the South were not necessarily Communists to begin with, but rather anti-Saigon or anti-Diem.

The Eisenhower Administration has been criticized for not pushing Diem harder on political "reforms." What is really meant is that Diem allowed the power structure he had so carefully put together in 1954–55 to disintegrate. To talk of superimposing western democratic institutions overnight on the Vietnamese culture is pointless. There exists no truly democratic nation from Burma to the gates of China in all of Southeast Asia.

A candid statement as to Diem's disintegrating regime, however, should not obscure one important point.

President Eisenhower stuck to his basic position that if there was a solution in South Vietnam, it was political and not military, insofar as the United States was concerned. That fundamental precept was not to be altered until 1961 when the new administration of President John F. Kennedy took office.

Thus, the Republican position could be summarized:

(1) No American armies in Asia, no land war in Asia;

(2) No commitment to aid colonialism or to suppress nationalism in Asia;

(3) In any event, no unilateral military intervention; a resort to force only under some international sanction, in particular the U.N.;

(4) Any multilateral commitment to force should be in a specific area, for a specific, limited purpose in order to keep the conflict localized;

(5) Specifically in South Vietnam, the supplying of aid—money, supplies, arms—but not U.S. armies.

PART II

YEARS OF FAILURE

THE KENNEDY ADMINISTRATION

In 1961 President Kennedy had most of the same options President Eisenhower had in 1953; he could continue economic and military aid with the same emphasis on a political solution; he could increase aid, cut it, or phase it out. The choice was his.

We tend to forget the political climate of the time. The tone of the new administration was one of disdain for the performance of Eisenhower, particularly in the field of foreign affairs. There was a tendency in the Kennedy administration to believe that everything could be fixed if the proper American was sent there to fix it.

On April 30, in Vietnam, a group of 18 South Vietnamese leaders who had fought against the French signed an open letter to Diem demanding economic, administrative and military reforms. By November 11, anti-Diem feeling was so intense a military coup by elite paratroop battalions was attempted against the Diem regime. It failed.

One month later, in December 1960, the National Front for Liberation of South Vietnam—NLF—was formed by militant South Vietnamese insurgents—mostly Communists. Their platform was a renewal of open, armed warfare against the Saigon government, following 3 years of terror and assassination.

In dealing with the NLF, successive Democratic Administrations have assumed since 1961 that the revival of the war in the South was undertaken solely at Hanoi's initiative. Secretary of State Dean Rusk says the war in the south "could end literally in 24 hours" if Hanoi so decided.

U.S. State Department assumptions that (1) South Vietnamese Communists are totally controlled by Hanoi, and (2) there is absolutely no difference between the ambitions of the two, are open to question.

It should be noted that the NLF has been southern oriented. Forty of their senior leaders were native South Vietnamese. The South Vietnamese Communists have, in the past, found Hanoi quite willing to enter into agreements at the expense of the South Vietnamese whether Communist or not. Examples:

One, on March 6, 1946, Ho Chi Minh entered into an agreement with the French which provided for a "free state" embracing what is now North Vietnam, but leaving southern Vietnam under French control.

Two, a second agreement on September 14, 1946, further confirmed Paris rule over the South Vietnamese.

Three, the Geneva Agreements of July 1954, left the south under control of the Diem government for at least 2 more years—this when most of the south was already under Communist control.

Four, thereafter, neither Hanoi nor Peking, nor Moscow made strong representations against dropping elections in 1956, in effect confirming Diem's control and leaving the South Vietnamese Communists out in the cold.

All of which is a reminder to the South Vietnamese Communists that North Vietnam has separate interests, and has not in the past been the most reliable of allies.

On January 29, 1961, Hanoi Radio recognized the NLF, praised it and shortly thereafter infiltration from North Vietnam into the south was stepped up. Terrorism was on the rise; assassinations of South Vietnamese increased; attacks on Diem military forces rose in number and ferocity.

President Kennedy, concerned with this increased Communist activity, told a news conference on May 5, 1961, use of American forces in South Vietnam was under consideration.

Thereafter, American counter-insurgency forces were moved into South Vietnam; President Kennedy reverted to old fashioned gunboat diplomacy and sent an aircraft carrier to demonstrate off Haiphong; troops were sent into Thailand and then withdrawn to show our strength and readiness to move.

From the vantage point of 1967 these maneuvers seem to have the thrust and feint of shadow boxing, but they were military actions and made more fateful military actions which were to follow much easier.

THE PARADE TO SAIGON

In 1961, too, began a parade of political, diplomatic and military figures from Washington to Saigon. May 11, six days after the President's press conference, Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson was dispatched to Southeast Asia. Warmed by a cordial, two-day session, Mr. Johnson likened President Diem to George Washington, Andrew Jackson, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, and Winston Churchill.

In a joint statement at Saigon, May 13, Diem and Mr. Johnson said:

"The United States recognizes that the President of Vietnam, Ngo Dinh Diem, who was recently reelected to office by an overwhelming majority of his countrymen despite bitter Communist opposition, is in the vanguard of those leaders who stand for freedom on the periphery of the Communist empire in Asia."

On returning from Southeast Asia, Vice President Johnson wrote a memorandum to President Kennedy dated May 23, 1961:

"The fundamental decision required of the United States—and time is of the greatest importance—is whether we are to attempt to meet the challenge of Communist expansion now in Southeast Asia by a major effort in support of the forces of freedom in the area or throw in the towel. This decision must be made in a full realization of the very heavy and continuing costs involved in terms of money, of effort, and of U.S. prestige. It must be made with the knowledge that at some point we may be faced with the further decision of whether we commit major U.S. forces to the area or cut our losses and withdraw should our efforts fail. We must remain master of this decision."

Close upon the Vice President's heels, Professor Eugene Staley of Stanford University visited Saigon for the Administration. He was commissioned to direct an all-embracing study which was to form the basis for a new program of American aid.

STALEY STRATEGIC HAMLETS

Staley prescribed large increases in the Vietnamese army, the Civil Guard and village militia, together with an increased flow of arms and radio communications equipment. Most of this equipment which went to the villages was later acquired by the Viet Cong.

The Staley plan also called for creation of the Strategic Hamlet, whereby scattered villagers would be brought together in compounds better to protect them from marauding Viet Cong. It was based on the successful British tactic in Malaya.

There were, however, basic differences between the British situation in Malaya a decade earlier and that found in Vietnam in 1961.

First, with the cooperation of the Thailand government, the British were able to seal the border and therefore deny the Communists in Malaya any overland supply routes.

Second, the Communist foe were largely Chinese aliens, squatters, and therefore readily identifiable.

Third, the native Malayan people were willing to cooperate because of the hostility with which they regarded these Chinese aliens. At most in Malaya the hard-core Communist terrorists numbered no more than 8,000 and the total Chinese population something over 400,000.

Fourth, the French had already tried it during their war in Vietnam and failed.

In Vietnam there could be no sealing off of the Laotian border which was controlled by Communists. Infiltration and cross-border movement were easy for the guerrillas. In Vietnam, the Communist guerrillas were indigenous and could not be distinguished from non-Communist villagers. In Vietnam the villagers had lived on the same land for generations. They objected vehemently to being moved from their villages into what could too often be described as concentration camps. Finally, in Vietnam the guerrillas totaled between 15,000 and 20,000 armed men in 1961 and by 1962 this figure had grown to 30,000.

Yet, President Kennedy approved the program. On September 17, 1961, R. G. K. Thompson, former permanent Defense Secretary in Malaya, was brought to Vietnam to put the Staley plan into action.

THE TAYLOR-ROSTOW MISSION

On October 11, 1961, President Kennedy announced he was sending his military advisor, General Maxwell Taylor, and Economist Walt W. Rostow, then the President's Deputy Assistant for National Security Affairs, to South Vietnam. Their mission, charged the President was to find out "whether Vietnamese nationalism had turned irrevocably against us or still might serve as a basis for the fight against Communism."

It is generally agreed that the Taylor report contained not simply recommendations to beef up and improve military operations, but made a strong case for sweeping political reforms in the Diem government, including increased freedom of speech, some form of decentralization, and the release from jail of bona fide nationalist leaders.

Unfortunately, General Taylor's report was severely denounced by the government-controlled Saigon press for what it termed an attempt to infringe on South Vietnamese sovereignty. On November 24, 1961, the newspaper Thoi-Bao ran an eight-column headline: "Republic of Vietnam No Guinea Pig For Capitalist Imperialism—Is It Not Time to Revise Vietnamese-American Collaboration?" The accompanying article, echoed by other Saigon newspapers, contained accusations of American "interference" with internal affairs of South Vietnam, aimed at "gaining profits under the exploitation policy of capitalist imperialism." The Diem government refused to be swayed by broad diplomatic hints that we might recall our Ambassador if reforms were not effected.

The result was a joint American-Vietnamese eleven-point declaration of January 1962, which was clearly a compromise in favor of Saigon. The political reforms urged by Taylor were watered down, but military and economic support were increased.

THE QUALITATIVE SHIFT

The war in Vietnam—and American involvement—had taken a qualitative shift. By the end of 1961, it became apparent that the Kennedy Administration had opted for military intervention.

Arthur Schlesinger admits that Mr. Kennedy's decision at the end of 1961 "was to place the main emphasis on the military effort."

The first American soldier was killed in open combat in 1961.

Perhaps the most succinct account of President Kennedy's decision to escalate the Vietnam conflict is that of his Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Robert Manning, who wrote in April 1967:

"One day late in 1961, President Kennedy discussed with his counselors a decision to increase the American 'presence' in South Viet Nam from a few hundred 'military advisers' to a military force of 15,000 men. Undersecretary of State George Ball opposed this, arguing that it would seriously alter the character of the war and might eventually suck more than 300,000 American men into action there. Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara agreed that Ball's reservations were fair ones, but they were willing to risk the consequences. Kennedy decided that he was too.

"Hindsight marks that decision as a critical step in this country's creeping escalation toward international tragedy and a domestic crisis of politics and morality. Yet in the news reports of the day it was characterized only as a 'modest' increase in American advisory help to the beleaguered South Vietnamese government.

"What if news reporters had been told of the full discussion? They would have reported that the United States had decided to increase its commitment to 15,000 men, that this might lead to the involvement of as many as 300,000 soldiers—then unthinkable—and that the President's advisers disagreed about taking such a step. If the newsmen had told that story, how would the American public have reacted? Would the course of history have been changed?" [1]

The two principal historians of the Kennedy Administration, Theodore Sorensen and Schlesinger, both plead that past American policy gave Mr. Kennedy virtually no alternative. Schlesinger wrote that President Kennedy, "had no choice now but to work within the situation he had inherited," and Dulles' policy in South Vietnam had "left us in 1961 no alternative but to continue the effort of 1954." Sorensen agreed.

Accepting this thesis at face value—that an entire Democratic Administration was bereft of alternatives—pictures President Kennedy as a mere robot with no responsibility for whatever actions he took in Vietnam. Carried to its ultimate absurdity this thesis presents Lyndon Johnson as a captive of George Washington's policies, with no real justification for quadrennial Presidential elections.

UNITED STATES AGAIN BACKS DIEM

By February 7, 1962, the total of U.S. military personnel in South Vietnam had increased to 4,000. Three weeks later, two fighter planes piloted by members of the South Vietnam Air Force, bombed and strafed President Diem's Saigon palace. Diem's relations with American newsmen were deteriorating as correspondents for U.S. papers and networks were booted out of South Vietnam with increasing frequency. Yet the Kennedy Administration, by the beginning of March 1962, was attempting to rally public opinion behind Diem. Time described it this way on February 23, 1962:

"Whatever the difficulties, the U.S. is sticking with Diem. Speaking last week to Rotarians in Saigon, U.S. Ambassador Frederick Nolting Jr. urged critics of Diem to be boosters instead of naysayers.

'The divisions among patriotic, anti-Communist Vietnamese, which are no secret to anyone here,' said Nolting, 'are in my judgment a great barrier to your country's progress and a real danger to your country's survival.' Conceding that Diem was taking his own sweet time in instituting reforms, Nolting said that he agreed 'to a certain extent' with those Vietnamese who complain that 'the real benefits of a free society are not getting through to the people.' But he also praised Diem's 'dedicated and courageous leadership,' added that reforms 'could be accomplished relatively quickly if only more people were willing to work and sacrifice to accomplish them.' "

Washington soon after, according to The New York Times, instructed the American Mission in Saigon "to get along with President Ngo Dinh Diem's regime come hell or high water and forget about political reforms."

Lest the scale be tipped too far against Diem, it must be remembered the fabric of his regime was further weakened by acts of Communist terrorists. During 1962, an estimated 1,700 South Vietnamese civilians were assassinated by the Viet Cong, frequently with unimaginable barbarism, and 9,688 were kidnaped. Their targets were not just Diem's unpopular village administrators but schoolteachers, and those engaged in agriculture and social reform; literally irreplaceable citizens of South Vietnam.

PEKING PROPOSAL

On March 1, 1962, Secretary Rusk commented on the request by Peking of February 24, 1962 that the co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference, and other countries concerned, consult regarding Vietnam.

Said Rusk, "the United States is always prepared to talk about situations which represent a threat to the peace, but what must be talked about is the root of the trouble; in this case it is the Communist aggression against Vietnam in disregard of the Geneva Accords."

No talks were held.

THE ICC REPORT

On June 2, 1962, the Canadian and Indian members of the International Control Commission in Vietnam created by the 1954 Geneva Accords issued a report—which Poland refused to sign—charging North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and the United States with factual violations of the Geneva Accord.

Thereafter, the Commission issued no more reports until 1965.

U.S. MARINES IN THAILAND

In 1961, The Three Princes War resumed in Laos. The U.S. had withdrawn its chips from the middle or "Neutral" Prince, and placed them on the "Rightist" Prince. His Royal Laotian Army suffered serious defections and reverses in 1962, and was driven by the Neutralist forces and Pathet Lao Communist forces across the Mekong River into Thailand. On May 15, 1962, at the request of Thailand, President Kennedy dispatched a force of 5,000 U.S. Marines into northern Thailand. On July 30, 1962, the Marines were withdrawn. Their effect on the outcome of the Geneva Conference on Laos was, at best, problematical.

---

[1] NOTE.—The historian searching for a motive in President Kennedy's decision to opt for a military solution in Vietnam finds two separate accounts. The first is that of James Reston, *New York Times* editor: "A few minutes after this meeting (with Khrushchev in Vienna in June 1961) President Kennedy told me that apparently Khrushchev had decided that 'anybody stupid enough to get involved in that situation (the Bay of Pigs) was immature, and anybody who didn't see it thru was timid and, therefore, could be bullied.' " Mr. Reston says President Kennedy then put 12,000 American soldiers into Vietnam as an offset to Khrushchev's estimate of him, altho he was amply warned that he was creating an unlimited commitment and was violating all his pronouncements about not allowing the United States to get into an Asian land war. (*Washington Daily News*, June 2, 1966). The second account is found in "Facing the Brink" by Edward Weintal and Charles Bartlett. "Had he not suffered reverses in the Bay of Pigs and Laos," they write, "it may well be that President Kennedy would have thought twice before expanding the Viet Nam commitment early in 1962 from 700 to 11,000 advisers. Had he followed a long-range policy plan rather than an understandable concern for his image as a result of the Bay of Pigs fiasco, he might have reduced rather than increased the Viet Nam commitment."

The Conference convened in 1961, and finally achieved agreement in 1962. The agreement was billed by the Kennedy administration as neutralizing all of Laos. Actually it left untouched the Pathet Lao control of the Laotian territory bordering on Vietnam, through which North Vietnamese have been infiltrating to South Vietnam and supplying the Vietcong.

About this time, in 1962, comforting analyses of the Vietnam conflict by two of the most prominent U.S. State Department officials were offered for public consumption, one as to the inferiority of the enemy and the other as to the limited nature of our commitment.

Said Under Secretary of State George W. Ball:

"The guerrillas whom the Vietnamese Army is fighting are under distinct handicaps. In many cases they are poorly trained and equipped and not motivated by deep conviction. Rather, they are merely unsophisticated villagers or peasants who have been conscripted by terror or treachery. In such a case they are likely to have had only rudimentary training in weapons-handling and tactics. Their equipment may be makeshift, often just what they can capture or fabricate themselves.

"Only the leaders and the hard core have a strong ideological commitment. The rank and file are their puppets—those whom they have bought, coerced, or intimidated."

And Mr. Kennedy's roving ambassador Averell Harriman, in explaining why we could afford a military commitment in Vietnam but not Laos, said:

"In Vietnam, on the other hand," he said in 1962, "a decision to assist the Republic of Vietnam to defend itself against the sort of attack being waged in that country would not involve the deployment of U.S. combat forces and would not require the occupation of foreign territory by the United States or other Western forces."

POLITICAL DEVELOPMENTS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

On June 26, 1962, South Vietnam's National Assembly extended its own term of office by one year. And when on October 26, the Assembly extended Diem's emergency powers to rule by decree for another year, it was an act of near prophecy, for Diem was assassinated precisely one year and seven days thereafter.

In considering the politics of the Diem regime, it must be kept in mind that in Vietnam, as in most Asiatic countries, no tradition of formal representative government exists.

The Vietnam nationalist parties that formed during French rule were secret movements accustomed to operating clandestinely and often warring with each other. This tradition of secretiveness, of factionalism, of small, select groups composed of men who could be trusted implicitly, continues today.

Diem accomplished a miracle in putting together a stable government, and attracting support of many key factions of the elite in South Vietnam. If there is one point most observers agree on, it is that from 1958 onward Diem seemed to draw inward, losing touch with the coalition he had put together.

More and more, he appeared to rely on the advice of his immediate family and few others. Personal government, not new to Vietnam, was carried to an extreme.

Thus, when crack paratroop battalions surrounded his palace in 1960 and demanded reforms, their leaders were not thinking in terms of Western democracy; rather, they sought an end to deliberate use of the personal power of members of the Diem family to monitor the loyalty of civil and military officials, to control both the formulation and execution of policy, to determine who should be promoted in the civil and military bureaucracies, and to manipulate the military in such a way as to interfere with successful prosecution of the conflict with the Viet Cong.

While Communist pressure increased, Diem and his family devoted increasing attention to sumptuary legislation to improve Saigon morals. As an example of the state to which the National Assembly had been reduced, Madam Nhu—Diem's sister-in-law—was able to dictate legislation prohibiting men and women from dancing with each other. . . .

Meanwhile, Viet Cong victories multiplied. On January 2, 1963, a force of 200 Viet Cong attacked and defeated a demoralized force of 2,000 South Vietnam regulars in the Mekong Delta. Five helicopters were shot down, killing three Americans.

By spring, military action was overshadowed by a series of tragic political events; yet Kennedy Administration pronouncements remained highly optimistic.

In 1962 Defense Secretary McNamara has said, "Every quantitative measurement we have shows we're winning this war."

On March 8, 1963, Secretary Rusk said the struggle against the Viet Cong was "turning an important corner" and concluded Diem's forces "clearly have the initiative in most areas of the country."

THE FALL OF DIEM

Of the near-million North Vietnamese who fled southward in 1954–55, roughly 90 percent were Catholic. It was among these people that Diem found many of his most loyal administrators. South Vietnam, predominantly non-Christian, found these refugees doubly alien. They were from the north; they were adherents of a Western religion. Whatever favoritism was shown northern Catholics by the Diem regime—and there is some evidence of such favoritism—created frictions and jealousies on the part of the leaders of the Buddhist majority.

On May 8, 1963, in the city of Hue, government troops fired into a crowd protesting Diem's strictures against flying the Buddhist flag during a religious festival.

Demonstrations spread to Saigon. On June 11, a monk committed suicide by setting fire to himself, to be followed in the next six months by six other acts of self-immolation.

On August 21, Diem's Special Forces attacked Buddhist pagodas in Saigon, Hue, and other cities, arresting a number of Buddhists.

Diem's Buddhist Foreign Secretary, Vu Van Mau, resigned in protest. Mme. Nhu's father, the Vietnamese Ambassador to the United States, also resigned along with most of his staff.

Students joined the Buddhist demonstrations. Diem closed the Universities in Saigon and Hue, and all secondary schools in Saigon. About 4,000 students were arrested.

Not all opposition to Diem, his brother Nhu, and his sister-in-law, Mme. Nhu arose from Buddhist leaders. Discontent in key segments of South Vietnam's rickety power structure was being transformed into rebellion.

Still, on July 11, 1963, Ambassador Nolting returned to Saigon from Washington with assurances of continued U.S. support of the government of President Diem. He called for "unity of purpose" and warned against "internal dissension."

Newspaper accounts describing the deteriorating situation in Vietnam had long been labeled propaganda by Administration spokesmen. By the end of summer the Kennedy Administration could no longer maintain the credence of the American people that Diem was popular with his own people and was winning the war. On September 2, 1963, in a CBS interview President Kennedy admitted Diem's regime had "gotten out of touch with the people" and that he believed it could regain support only if there were "changes in policy and perhaps with personnel."

On September 21, Secretary McNamara and General Taylor once again flew to Saigon. While they were there elections were held for the National Assembly. All candidates were approved in advance by the Diem Government. Obviously, so far, no change in policy or personnel had taken place.

On October 2, 1963, the White House issued a summary of the McNamara-Taylor report on their findings. The summary makes interesting reading:

"Major U.S. assistance in support of this military effort is needed only until the insurgency has been suppressed or until the national security forces of the Government of South Vietnam are capable of suppressing it. Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the U.S. military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of U.S. training personnel. They reported that by the end of this year, the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel assigned to South Vietnam can be withdrawn."

Added General Paul Harkins, Commander of the Military Assistance Command in Saigon, in the November 1, 1963, service newspaper Stars and Stripes:

"Victory in the sense it would apply to this kind of war is just months away and the reduction of American advisors can begin any time now."

As Stars and Stripes was being delivered to the newsstands that November 1, a military junta led by General Duong Van Minh, overthrew the Diem Government and seized control of Saigon. The next day, November 2, Diem and his brother Nhu were assassinated.

Despite all the clamor, rioting, and discontent among civilians, in the end it was the South Vietnamese military—

the group over which the U.S. had the greatest degree of direct control—which was to overthrow and assassinate Diem.

Political chaos was immediate in South Vietnam.

Nonetheless, on November 15, a U.S. military spokesman carried on the McNamara-Taylor-Harkins line and promised 1,000 American military men would be withdrawn from Vietnam beginning on December 3.

On November 22, President John F. Kennedy was assassinated and a new President, Lyndon B. Johnson, took office.

LYNDON JOHNSON TAKES COMMAND

Once again a new American President had an opportunity to reassess the situation and the American position in Vietnam:

President Johnson could deal with an altogether new government in Saigon; he was not obliged to deal with the Diem family.

The NLF and Viet Cong controlled much of South Vietnam. By June of 1963, the NLF was able to levy taxes in 41 of South Vietnam's 44 provinces.

The NLF had already (reported by Radio Hanoi November 17, 1963) made a six-point peace statement, couched in violent accusatory language.

There were still fewer than 20,000 American troops committed to Vietnam.

According to the New York Times, U.N. Secretary General U Thant met with President Johnson shortly after President Kennedy's assassination and conveyed to him an offer from Ho Chi Minh proposing talks on a settlement.

He still had before him the DeGaulle offer of August 29, 1963, rejected by the Kennedy Administration, to help work for an independent but neutral South Vietnam.

In December 1963, Cambodian Chief of State Norodom Sihanouk again invited South Vietnam to join his country in a neutral confederation.

While President Johnson had options to choose from, President Kennedy did not leave him the same alternatives which President Eisenhower left in 1961. Actions of the Kennedy Administration had decidedly narrowed the field. The American commitment was greater; Americans were actually involved in combat; more and more, American military prestige was at stake.

In addition, President Johnson from all accounts was concerned with maintaining the appearance of continuity in both domestic and foreign policy.

In December 1963, President Johnson made his choice and announced it through his New Year's message to General Minh of South Vietnam. The message read in part:

". . . The United States will continue to furnish you and your people with the fullest measure of support in this bitter fight. We shall maintain in Vietnam American personnel and material as needed to assist you in achieving victory.

"Our aims are, I know, identical with yours: to enable your government to protect its people from the acts of terror perpetrated by Communist insurgents from the north. As the forces of your government become increasingly capable of dealing with this aggression, American military personnel in South Vietnam can be progressively withdrawn.

"The United States Government shares the view of your government that 'neutralization' of South Vietnam is unacceptable. As long as the Communist regime in North Vietnam persists in its aggressive policy, neutralization of South Vietnam would only be another name for a Communist takeover. Peace will return to your country just as soon as the authorities in Hanoi cease and desist from their terrorist aggression.

". . . I know from my own experience in Vietnam how warmly the Vietnamese people respond to a direct human approach and how they have hungered for this in their leaders. So again I pledge the energetic support of my country to your government and your people."

Thus President Johnson publicly revealed his belief that American involvement in Vietnam required an open-end military commitment.

The President now set the goal as military victory.

At a time when President Johnson was making his decision for deeper American involvement in Vietnam, the opportunity existed to make that involvement worthwhile by insisting on a sound civilian government in Saigon capable of leading the people. Yet, he allowed the military junta to continue its total dominance of the civilian government. The generals neither knew how to govern, nor showed any real desire to learn. The Administration, meanwhile, shipped in more money, more guns, and more American troops.

In the 18 months that followed ten governments passed through Saigon in quick succession, each more disorganized than the last.

The Johnson Administration was to express high hopes for each of these ten regimes. General Khanh, for instance—who replaced General Minh in January 1964—was described by McNamara as "an able and energetic leader," who has "demonstrated his grasp of the basic elements—political, economic, and psychological, as well as military—required to defeat the Viet Cong." Etc., etc.

Khanh bounced in and out of the premiership for a year after the McNamara speech, finally was packed off as roving Ambassador to the world.

Despite this political chaos, when McNamara testified before Congress on February 18, 1964, he still insisted the "bulk" of U.S. troops would be pulled out by the end of 1965.

By July 1964, when Gen. William C. Westmoreland succeeded to the command of the U.S. military advisory mission, our advisory body had grown to about 23,000, but the South Vietnamese whom they came to advise were melting away. During the winter of 1964–65 the South Vietnamese Army had dwindled to slightly over 200,000 men. They had lost by desertion, or to the Communists, a good third of their strength.

Not only was South Vietnam suffering from massive desertions from its army, but shortly after Diem's death it was discovered Staley's Strategic Hamlet Program was a crushing failure. The U.S. Mission found thousands of supposedly "secure" hamlets were really controlled secretly by the Viet Cong, who often used them for supply and rest havens. The United States had contributed tens of millions of dollars worth of equipment, including cement, radios, weapons, fertilizer, and livestock.

When the Minh junta came into power Premier Tho stated that only 20 percent of the 8,600 Strategic Hamlets the Diem government claimed to have built could in any way be regarded as usable.

The succeeding military governments and juntas did little to remedy this situation. The key to real security for the South Vietnamese peasant lay not so much in barbed wire but in the type of political leadership that would attract his loyalty and make the struggle against the Viet Cong seem worth the risk.

On March 26, 1964, Secretary McNamara admitted: "But the large indigenous support that the Viet Cong receives means that solutions must be as much political and economic as military. Indeed, there can be no such thing as a purely 'military' solution to the war in South Vietnam."

THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION

At this point in history conduct of the affairs of Vietnam was once again influenced by political events elsewhere—the United States was involved in a presidential election campaign.

Through the summer of 1964, the Vietnam situation—both political and military—was deteriorating. Day-to-day conduct of the war remained the responsibility of Kennedy appointees who stayed with the Johnson Administration. Rusk, McNamara, Bundy, Rostow, Taylor, were left to handle Vietnam while President Johnson electioneered.

The first indication of a theme that was to be struck repeatedly during the coming campaign was introduced during a television interview on March 15, 1964, when the President told the listening audience:

"I was reading a letter only today that General Eisenhower wrote the late President Diem 10 years ago, and it is a letter that I could have well written to President Khanh and sent out by Mr. McNamara."

One of the most trying aspects of living with Mr. Johnson's conduct of foreign affairs is precisely this gambit which might be termed Diplomatic Darwinism. By this is meant the President's insistence that whatever he may be doing is but part of a steady evolution from commitments made by earlier Presidents, particularly President Eisenhower.

Thus, he was to reiterate during the presidential campaign that his several decisions by which we became engaged in a full-scale shooting war in Vietnam were merely logical implementations of that far away and long ago 1954 Eisenhower letter agreeing to limited aid for South Vietnam—money, supplies, and arms, but not combat troops.

GULF OF TONKIN RESOLUTION

A second justification, equalling the by-now tattered 1954 letter in usefulness, was the Gulf of Tonkin resolution of August 7, 1964. The series of events leading to the resolution began with a July 30 South Vietnamese naval raid on North Vietnamese island radar and naval installations. According to official accounts, the U.S. Seventh Fleet was not informed of the raid. On August 2, a U.S. destroyer on patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin near the islands was attacked by North Vietnamese PT boats. The PT boats were driven off with gunfire and an air attack. The U.S. formally protested to Hanoi.

On August 4, two U.S. destroyers reported a second attack by North Vietnamese PT boats. President Johnson ordered U.S. "air action" against "gunboats and certain supporting facilities in North Vietnam."

On August 5, President Johnson requested Congress to enact a joint resolution "to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia."

Senator Jacob K. Javits (R., N.Y.) questioned the wisdom of such unilateral action on the part of the United States as provided for by this resolution. During consideration of the resolution he raised the same issue President Eisenhower had raised 10 years earlier when, in 1954, the French requested American assistance at Dien Bien Phu. In 1954, Mr. Eisenhower surveyed our allies as to their willingness to join in taking such a step. Asked Senator Javits of Senator Fulbright in 1964:

"What I wish to know from the Senator is, first: Have we consulted with our allies? Second, what are we to look to from our allies in the way of assistance, aid, comfort, partnership, and the future implementation of the resolution? It is one thing to stand alone; it is another thing to stand with seven other countries, three of them in the area, implementing a solemn commitment, which is just as binding on them as it is on us."

SCOPE OF THE RESOLUTION

The joint resolution was in three parts. The first expressed Congressional approval of the President's action to repel attacks on U.S. forces, and the third part extended the life of the resolution until the President should determine that peace had been restored or until terminated by concurrent resolution of Congress. These two sections were not challenged in the Senate debate.

Section 2 was the center of discussion. It reads:

"Sec. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense for its freedom."

The potential effect of agreeing to this section was of concern to many Senators. During the Senate debate, Senator Daniel Brewster (D., Md.) asked:

"So my question is whether there is anything in the resolution which would authorize, or recommend, or approve the landing of large American armies in Vietnam or in China?"

Replied Senator J. William Fulbright, (D., Ark.) floor manager of the resolution and Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee:

"There is nothing in the resolution, as I read it, that contemplates it. I agree with the Senator that that is the last thing we would want to do. However, the language of the resolution would not prevent it. It would authorize whatever the Commander in Chief feels is necessary. . . . Speaking for my own committee, everyone I have heard has said that the last thing we want to do is to become involved in a land war in Asia; that our power is sea and air . . ."

The reply did not satisfy the Senate. Senator John Sherman Cooper (R., Ky.) went more directly to the heart of the issue. He engaged Senator Fulbright in a lengthy colloquy, part of which follows:

"Mr. COOPER. The second section of the resolution goes, as the Senator said to steps the President might take concerning the parties to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty and the countries under the protocol—which are, of course, Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam. The Senator will remember that the SEATO Treaty, in article IV, provides that in the event an armed attack is made upon a party to the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or upon one of the protocol states such as South Vietnam, the parties to the treaty, one of whom is the United States, would then take such action as might be appropriate, after resorting to their constitutional processes. I assume that would mean, in the case of the United States, that Congress would be asked to grant the authority to act.

"Mr. Fulbright. I think that is correct.

"Mr. Cooper. *Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead into war, we will give that authority by this resolution?*

"Mr. Fulbright. *That is the way I would interpret it....*

"Mr. Cooper. *I ask these questions because it is well for the country and all of us to know what is being undertaken....*

"Under section 2, are we now providing the President, if he determines it necessary, the authority to attack cities and ports in North Vietnam, not primarily to prevent an attack upon our forces but, as he might see fit, to prevent any further aggression against South Vietnam?

"Mr. Fulbright. One of the reasons for the procedure provided in this joint resolution, and also in the Formosa and Middle East instances is in response, let us say, to the new developments in the field of warfare....

"Under modern conditions of warfare . . . it is necessary to anticipate what may occur. Things move so rapidly that this is the way in which we must respond to the new developments. That is why this provision is necessary or important. Does the Senator agree with me that this is so?

"Mr. Cooper. Yes, warfare today is different. Time is of the essence. But the power provided the President in section 2 is great.

"Mr. Fulbright. *This provision is intended to give clearance to the President to use his discretion. We all hope and believe that the President will not use this discretion arbitrarily or irresponsibly. We know that he is accustomed to consulting with the Joint Chiefs of Staff and with congressional leaders. But he does not have to do that.*

"Mr. Cooper. I understand, and believe that the President will use this vast power with judgment.

"Mr. Fulbright. He intends to do it, and he has done it. . . .

"Mr. FULBRIGHT. I have no doubt that the President will consult with Congress in case a major change in present policy becomes necessary.

"Mr. Cooper. . . . I know it is understood and agreed that in the defense of our own ships and forces any action we might take to repel attacks could lead to war, if the Vietnamese or the Chinese Communists continued to engage in attacks against our forces. I hope they will be deterred by the prompt action of the President.

"We accept this first duty of security and honor. But I would feel untrue to my own convictions if I did not say that a different situation obtains with respect to South Vietnam. I know that a progression of events for 10 years has carried us to this crisis. Ten years have passed and perhaps the events are inevitable now, no one can tell. But as long as there is hope and the possibility of avoiding with honor a war in Southeast Asia—a conflagration which, I must say, could lead into war with Communist China, and perhaps to a third world war with consequences one can scarcely contemplate today—I hope the President will use his power wisely with respect to our commitments in South Vietnam, and that he will use all other honorable means which may be available, such as consultations in the United Nations, and even with the Geneva powers.

"We have confidence in the President and in his good judgment. But I believe we have the obligation of understanding fully that there is a distinction between defending our own forces, and taking offensive measures in South Vietnam which could lead progressively to a third world war." (Emphasis added.)

Perhaps the most often repeated statement during debate on the resolution was that the United States should not get bogged down in a land war in Asia. There were equally as many assurances that this was not contemplated.

Yet it was made quite clear that Section 2 of the resolution did in fact authorize the President to send land armies into Vietnam and also to bomb North Vietnam.

Certainly, from their colloquy, both Senator Cooper and Senator Fulbright were firm in their own minds that the resolution did authorize whatever actions the President might see fit to take. If this is the correct interpretation, then it would appear the President is on firm ground when he states—as he has so often since stated—that later commitments of U.S. ground forces to combat as well as the bombings of North Vietnam were authorized by Congress.

Congress drew some assurance from

its assumption in 1964 that such a contingency was remote and that the President, being a man of "good judgment," would not act rashly, would use his power cautiously, would always consult Congress as well as the U.N. and the Geneva powers.

The President was to give Congress ample ground for this belief during 1964. During the entire presidential election campaign he repeatedly assured the American people he was not in office to engage in such a massive land war or to take rash actions.

During the debate on the resolution, Senator Thruston B. Morton summarized the feelings of many Republicans in Congress when he said, "I believe Congress should speak loud and clear and make it plain to any would-be aggressor that we intend to stand here. If we make that clear we will avoid war, and not have to land vast armies on the shores of Asia." The President found the resolution spoke loudly enough and clearly enough so that he signed it on August 11.

But this was an election year. And the very next day, August 12, the President was to dull the sound and blur the clarity of the resolution—and his own intentions—with a campaign speech to the Bar Association in New York. He spoke sorrowfully of those who were "eager to enlarge the conflict" and then added:

"They call upon us to supply American boys to do the job that Asian boys should do. They ask us to take reckless action which might risk the lives of millions and engulf much of Asia and certainly threaten the peace of the entire world. Moreover such action would offer no solution at all to the real problem of Vietnam."

This thesis, that American boys were not to be sent half-way around the world to do the job Asian boys should be doing, was repeated in an Akron, Ohio, speech October 21.

This was the President's campaign reassurance to the American people; it may also have contributed to the Communist miscalculation as to American intentions in Vietnam.

ELECTION YEAR—BARGAIN BUDGETS

Reinforcing Congress's belief that the U.S. commitment in Vietnam would be limited, new obligational authority sought for defense had dropped from $48.1 billion in fiscal 1963, to $47.2 billion in fiscal 1964.

A further decline had been registered in fiscal 1965 when defense N.O.A. (requested in January 1964) amounted to only $46.8 billion. In short, the election year defense requests did not reflect the realities of fighting then going on.

By March 1964, newspaper accounts described Vietnamese reluctance to take U.S. military advice and described the difficulties we were facing in getting Vietnamese troops to fight. On April 25, the AP reported that in the first four and a half months of 1964, 324 American servicemen had become battle casualties.

Beginning in May, with American forces already in combat, reports of serious shortages were verified making necessary the use of dangerously obsolete equipment.

On May 15, Rep. Carl Vinson, then Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, announced he would call Secretary McNamara for a closed session in regard to a full-scale investigation of the use of obsolete military equipment in Vietnam.

The distressing series of events led Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen on May 27 to declare, "While the Johnson Administration falters in indecision, the United States is a party to another treadmill conflict . . ."

By July 1964 the war was costing the United States $1.5 million a day. Announced troop strength in Vietnam had climbed to 18,000.

The Administration found it necessary to request a $700 million defense supplemental appropriation specifically for the war in Vietnam, the first in a chain of afterthought supplementals to follow.

Yet total U.S. troop strength levels consistently failed to reflect the escalation of conflict in Vietnam. On June 30, 1962, total active duty military personnel numbered 2,807,819.

On June 30, 1963, troop strength was down to 2,699,677 and the next year, on June 30, 1964, down a third time to 2,687,409.

By June 30, 1965, after five years of steadily increasing U.S. commitment in Vietnam, total active duty U.S. military personnel had further declined to 2,655,389.

President Johnson's refusal to allow budget requests to follow, even remotely, the actual course of events in Vietnam was to plague the military up to the fiscal 1968 budget. For instance, in fiscal 1966 his initial defense spending request was only $46.8 billion, but once again, a supplemental appropriation of $13.1 billion was required later in the year.

Again, in fiscal 1967, although the main defense appropriation jumped approximately $11.2 billion, a supplemental appropriation of $12.2 billion was requested and received later in the year.

The effect on military procurement—particularly the so-called "long leadtime" items requiring commitment well in advance of actual delivery—was devastating from 1963 through 1966.

KOREA—THE FORGOTTEN LESSON

To a frightening degree, these events paralleled the mistakes made over a decade earlier by another Democratic Administration in Korea. Said President Johnson in his January 1967 Budget Message to Congress:

"A year ago we were in the midst of a rapid buildup of our forces in Vietnam. Rather than submit a budget to the Congress based on highly uncertain estimates, I requested funds sufficient to finance the conflict through fiscal year 1967. At the present time the situation is different. While unforeseen events can upset the most careful estimate, we are in a much better position to determine our future requirements in Vietnam. As a consequence, my 1968 budget provides for those requirements on a continuing basis, including the possibility of an extension of combat beyond the end of the fiscal year."

Said the Senate Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee 14 years earlier, in May 1953:

"To touch specifically on the budgetary guidelines, it has been testified that the planners could not plan properly for the Korean War because one of the assumptions was that it would be over by the beginning of the fiscal year which was being planned. Budget requests were based on the amount of ammo used plus the replacement of reserve stocks with no thought that the War would continue for a longer period of time.

"In hindsight this is a most unrealistic policy or assumption. It may well have had an adverse effect on our military planners. We know that applied to the Korean ammunition program, an adverse effect occurred somewhere because no substantial quantity of ammunition was produced, and this was responsible for depleting our existing stocks. This is the result of partial mobilization."

Finally, in 1967, Mr. McNamara was to admit:

"Since we can now project our requirements for the conflict in Southeast Asia with far greater confidence than last year, we have changed our basic approach in preparing the FY 1967 Supplemental as well as the FY 1968 Budget. Sufficient funds are being requested in both the FY 1967 Supplemental and the FY 1968 Budget to protect the production leadtime. . . ."

In belated recognition of this fact, the initial Defense Budget request this year is fully $75 billion.

PEACE PROPOSALS—1964

After President Kennedy's assassination, repeated newspaper stories told of attempts by U.N. Secretary General U Thant to arrange for some sort of peace negotiations between Hanoi and Washington. Their authenticity was denied by the Johnson Administration.

Today we know that Mr. Thant, in September 1964, made a serious proposal to Hanoi and Washington that they secretly send representatives to Rangoon, Burma to discuss the Vietnam war. Hanoi accepted the proposal yet Washington turned it down.

According to the late Adlai Stevenson, the Johnson Administration refused to discuss peace in Vietnam with Hanoi because of the possible effect on the 1964 elections.

Secretary Thant agreed to wait. After President Johnson's overwhelming reelection, he again made the proposal. Hanoi again agreed but the Johnson Administration, through Secretary McNamara, once again refused.

When The New York Times on March 9, 1965, reported that U Thant had undertaken to arrange for such negotiations, Mr. Johnson's State Department denied that it had in fact rejected the Thant proposals.

Only after Eric Sevareid published his article in the November 30, 1965, Look concerning the late U.N. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson, including Stevenson's revelations about the Thant mission, did the State Department at long last admit to the existence of the Thant proposal and that it had been rejected.

This episode, when added to the host of other incidents, utterances, misleading statements, half-truths, outright untruths, emphasizes the hallmark of the Johnson Administration in the conduct of the Vietnam war—a complete lack of candor.

THE AMERICANIZATION OF THE WAR

President John Kennedy once remarked the war in Vietnam could be won only so long as it was their war. If it were ever converted into a white man's war, we would lose as the French had lost a decade earlier. In the French period, Paris had some 5,000 to 7,000 administrators, plus the French colonials, in Vietnam. Their troop commitment reached 272,000.

Today, the United States has roughly 500,000 military men in Southeast Asia, plus about 30,000 American civilians, with more of each to come, and with Americans doing most of the fighting.

How did this war become Americanized? As the record has shown, a qualitative shift in the American commitment in 1961—from arms, money, and advisors to armed combat troops—set the stage for increased United States involvement. It also set the stage for the next shift in our commitment, this time a quantitative change.

On February 7, 1965, eight Americans were killed, 62 wounded in a guerrilla attack by the Viet Cong. President Johnson promptly ordered the American Air Force into a retaliatory attack on targets in North Vietnam. Soviet Prime Minister Kosygin was in Hanoi at the time of the first bombing attack.

Correspondents on the scene have speculated Kosygin had gone to Hanoi on a mission to wean North Vietnam away from Peking. The Chinese Communists had not given Hanoi as much material support as promised. Kosygin was in Hanoi to promise Ho Chi Minh more supplies and equipment.

The bombing, when it came, gave the Soviet Union its "reason"—for public consumption, at least—for making such an offer. On February 9, Kosygin made his first public announcement of stepped-up Soviet support for the Hanoi regime.

Each of the first three raids, we carefully notified Moscow, were in retaliation for specific attacks against American military personnel in South Vietnam.

BOMBING AND TROOPS—UP AND UP

During this period the military situation in South Vietnam was deteriorating badly. Vietnamese army units were being defeated daily; the Vietnamese army was losing a battalion a week; district capitals were falling weekly; village strongpoints were being overrun nightly.

Within this framework the President stepped up the bombing of North Vietnam, no longer as retaliatory raids but as an effort to break the supply route to the South which Ho was using to supply the Viet Cong. American military strength in South Vietnam began to climb dramatically; by mid-1965 we had 53,000 ground troops in Vietnam and by year's end over 200,000.

The escalation continued through 1966. Our bombings, formerly tactical—to interdict supply routes—were now strategic, as well, aimed at whatever steel mills, powerplants, industrial complexes existed. By spring of 1967, the United States had committed 500,000 men to a land war in Asia and was spending, for that conflict alone, one-fifth of its entire national budget.

In casualties, there are over 9,000 Americans dead; 50,000 wounded.

We have lost over 1,200 airplanes and nearly 800 helicopters.

Yet at the beginning of April 1967, the United States and South Vietnamese were able to claim control over fewer villages and hamlets than in 1962.

ADMINISTRATION POLICY

In 1961 the State Department issued a white paper on Vietnam which emphasized the indigenous nature of the conflict. It said in part:

"The basic pattern of Viet Cong (Vietnamese Communist) activity is not new, of course. It operated, with minor variations, in China, and Mao Tse-tung's theories on the conduct of guerrilla warfare are known to every Viet Cong agent and cadre. *Most of the same methods were used in Malaya, in Greece, in the Philippines, in Cuba, and in Laos. If there is anything peculiar to the Vietnam situation, it is that the country is divided and one-half provides a safe sanctuary from which subversion in the other half is directed and supported with both personnel and materiel.*" [Emphasis added.]

By 1965 the indigenous character of the Viet Cong was being played down in favor of the new theme; that is, aggression from the north. Said the 1965 State Department white paper on Vietnam, in part:

"The war in Vietnam is a new kind of war, a fact as yet poorly understood in most parts of the world. Much of the confusion that prevails in the thinking of many people, and even many governments, stems from this basic misunderstanding. For in Vietnam a totally new brand of aggression has been loosed against an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom.

"Vietnam is *not* another Greece, where indigenous guerrilla forces used friendly neighboring territory as a sanctuary. [Emphasis State's own.]

"Vietnam is *not* another Malaya, where Communits guerrillas were, for the most part, physically distinguishable from the peaceful majority they sought to control.

"Vietnam is *not* another Philippines, where Communist guerrillas were physically separated from the source of their moral and physical support."

Perhaps the State Department was correct in its new assessment of the nature of the war. Perhaps, too, the increased North Vietnamese involvement was to match increased U.S. commitment to battle.

PRECONDITIONS TO NEGOTIATIONS

This second white paper was issued during a three-week lull between the first retaliatory air raids on North Vietnam in 1965 and the commencement of sustained bombing. During this lull, U Thant, recognizing the possibility of retaliation turning into open warfare, approached Hanoi and Washington with a renewed plea for negotiations.

The Johnson Administration at this point laid down what seemed to be two basic preconditions to peace negotiations:

(1) That Hanoi accept South Vietnam as a separate and independent State.

(2) That Hanoi agree to pull all forces out of the South.

Meanwhile, a separate appeal had come from the conference of 17 so-called nonaligned nations meeting at Belgrade asking Hanoi to negotiate. Both appeals—Thant's and the nonaligned nations'—were dismissed by Hanoi on grounds the United States had already rejected any negotiations on a "no-preconditions" basis.

JOHNSON POSITION HARDENS

In retrospect, it is clear the Johnson Administration did not wish to negotiate during this period. The Saigon government controlled barely 20 percent of South Vietnam. Its generals made no bones of the fact they were losing to the Viet Cong. To come to the bargaining table in hopes of salvaging an independent South Vietnam would be asking the impossible. In 1954, at Geneva, Ho Chi Minh had agreed to relinquish the area of Vietnam south of the 17th parallel in return for nationwide elections in 1956, elections which failed to materialize. For the U.S. to hope for similar concessions in 1965 was unrealistic.

In commenting on the President's attitude toward negotiation at this time, Senator Albert Gore (D., Tenn.) said:

"We know that at one time President Johnson opposed negotiation. He was very much opposed to negotiation or a negotiated settlement at the time I suggested more than a year ago. . . . Fortunately at his speech at Johns Hopkins (in April 1965), he changed his strategy and came to what I think was a far more realistic defensible, feasible position."

President Johnson added to the confusion surrounding a negotiated settlement when, on March 25, 1965, he said, "We seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable agreement to guarantee the independence and security of all in Southeast Asia."

Did the President indeed wish to return to the essentials of the 1954 Geneva Agreement? To hold nationwide elections in Vietnam as provided for at Geneva? To withdraw all foreign troops as provided for at Geneva? To reunite North and South Vietnam as provided for at Geneva? Or was the U.S. position really the one stated by Dean Rusk February 25, 1965, i.e. that Hanoi must accept South Vietnam as a separate, independent state?

Again, contradiction within the welter of statements coming from the Johnson Administration confuses not only Americans, but allies, bystanders, and enemy alike. If a policy of deliberate obfuscation was desired, Mr. Rusk and Mr. Johnson succeeded. Clearly, too many "official" statements have been made by too many different officials, shaped and adapted to the wants of too many different audiences.

On April 13, 1965, Hanoi also hardened its position, laying down four principal points:

"1. Recognition of the basic national rights of the Viet Nam people: peace, independence, sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity.

"2. Pending peaceful reunification of Viet Nam, while Viet Nam is still temporarily divided into two zones, the military provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Viet Nam must be strictly respected; the two zones must refrain from joining any military alliance with foreign countries, there must be no foreign military bases, troops and military personnel in their respective territory.

"3. The internal affairs of South Vietnam must be settled by the South Vietnamese people themselves, in accordance with the program of the South Vietnam National Front for Liberation (Viet Cong), without any foreign interference.

"4. The peaceful reunification of Viet Nam is to be settled by the Vietnamese people in both zones, without any foreign interference."

PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION

The South Vietnamese Constituent Assembly in March 1967, adopted a new constitution for the Republic. It was promptly approved by the ruling junta of Marshal Ky. The constitution provides for free elections throughout South Vietnam and on the surface seems to provide some hope for stability and political progress.

However, with the Viet Cong controlling at least 50 percent of the territory, and 40 percent of the population—and even more when the sun is down—the significance of the elections seems problematical. Elections for President are scheduled September 1, 1967.

It is also problematic as to how freely a newly-elected government can operate. The military, to date, has provided the most cohesive force in Vietnam, at least from our viewpoint. It can be assumed they will let go of the reins of power reluctantly, constitution or no constitution. The problem, however, is not simply the military in Saigon, according to seasoned Southeast Asia reporter, Marvin L. Stone, in his article, "Vietnam—A Hopeless War?", in U.S. News and World Report for Dec. 5, 1966:

"At the top, it is a Government of power blocs and factionalism, in the French tradition. Leaders in Saigon are preoccupied fighting to keep their grasp on power.

"At just about every level below the top it is a Government of local fiefs, run by entrenched military sycophants or petty underpaid civil-service officials."

This, says Stone, means that District or Province chiefs in the countryside buy their jobs and impose their own "unofficial" forms of taxation to make a profit. The peasant has no place to turn for relief. Adds Stone:

"Saigon's land-reform program, so vital to the aspirations of peasants, has never really been put in motion. In the secure areas, tenant farmers—that means 70 per cent of all farmers in the Delta—still are forced to pay up to 50 per cent and more of their rice crops to absentee landlords who have absolutely no obligation in return. A law on the books since 1955 sets the limit at 25 per cent.

"Americans here insist that no progress will be made so long as the men at the top in Saigon are members of mandarin families, or allied with families which have vested interests in land that they have no intention of relinquishing."

PEACE FEELERS, 1965–66

The year 1965 marks the beginning of an enormous number of proposals from all over the globe for peaceful negotiations. They can be summarized as follows:

Reconvening the 1954 Geneva Conference to effect a cease fire and eventual peace.

Direct negotiations between Washington and Hanoi.

A mediation effort through U Thant.

Resort to the U.N. General Assembly or Security Council as mediators.

Negotiations between Saigon and Hanoi.

Negotiations to achieve a neutral federation of Laos, Cambodia, and South Vietnam.

Negotiations between Saigon and the NLF-Viet Cong with Hanoi and Washington backstopping each side.

Negotiations between Saigon, Hanoi, and the NLF with a neutral nation acting as chairman.

Informal discussions between Hanoi and Washington in a neutral country to determine whether any grounds for formal negotiations exist.

It is physically impossible to compare the texts of each of the proposals and note all the differences, all the conditions, whether they are factual, semantic, or mere nuance. Nor can each such proposal be detailed. For these reasons, this study is confined to the last known U.S. position, contained in President Johnson's letter to Ho Chi Minh of February 1967, and in the exchange between U.N. Secretary General U Thant and Mr. Johnson.

Previous Administration utterances—at Johns Hopkins in 1965, the Hawaii Conference of December 1965, the Manila Conference of 1966 and the Guam Conference of 1967—while significant, must be considered in the context of domestic American politics, in the context of current world opinion, and in the context of the actual military situation in Vietnam at the particular time they were issued.

Thus the present position of Mr. Johnson and his advisors is the only truly useful benchmark in this spring of 1967. It is, as best can be judged, contained in the texts of a letter from President Johnson to President Ho Chi Minh, dated February 2, 1967, and in the North Vietnamese leader's reply, dated February 15, 1967, and translated from the French in Washington:

PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S LETTER

"DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I am writing to you in the hope that the conflict in Vietnam can be brought to an end. That conflict has already taken a heavy toll—in lives lost, in wounds inflicted, in property destroyed and in simple human misery. If we fail to find a just and peaceful solution, history will judge us harshly.

"Therefore, I believe that we both have a heavy obligation to seek earnestly the path to peace. It is in response to that obligation that I am writing directly to you.

"We have tried over the past several years, in a variety of ways and through a number of channels, to convey to you and your colleagues our desire to achieve a peaceful settlement. For whatever reasons, these efforts have not achieved any results.

"It may be that our thoughts and yours, our attitudes and yours, have been distorted or misinterpreted as they passed through these various channels. Certainly that is always a danger in indirect communication.

"There is one good way to overcome this problem and to move forward in search for a peaceful settlement. That is for us to arrange for direct talks between trusted representatives in a secure setting and away from the glare of publicity. Such talks should not be used as a propaganda exercise, but should be a serious effort to find a workable and mutually acceptable solution.

"In the past two weeks, I have noted public statements by representatives of your Government suggesting that you would be prepared to enter into direct bilateral talks with representatives of the U.S. Government, provided that we ceased 'unconditionally' and permanently our bombing operations against your country and all military actions against it. In the last day, serious and responsible parties have assured us indirectly that this is in fact your proposal.

"Let me frankly state that I see two great difficulties with this proposal. In view of your public position, such action on our part would inevitably produce worldwide speculation that discussions were under way and would impair the privacy and secrecy of those discussions. Secondly, there would inevitably be grave concern on our part whether your Government would make use of such action by us to improve its military position.

"With these problems in mind, I am prepared to move even further toward an ending of hostilities than your Government has proposed in either public statements or through private diplomatic channels. I am prepared to order a cessation of bombing against your country and the stopping of further augmentation of United States forces in South Vietnam as soon as I am assured that infiltration into South Vietnam by land and by sea has stopped. These acts of restraint on both sides would, I believe, make it possible for us to conduct serious and private discussions leading toward an early peace.

"I make this proposal to you now with a specific sense of urgency arising from the imminent new year holidays in Vietnam. If you are able to accept this proposal I see no reason why it could not take effect at the end of the new year, or Tet, holidays. The proposal I have made would be greatly strengthened if your military authorities and those of the Government of South Vietnam could promptly negotiate an extension of the Tet truce.

"As to the site of the bilateral discussions I propose, there are several possibilities. We could, for example, have our representatives meet in Moscow where contacts have already occurred. They could meet in some other country such as Burma. You may have other arrangements or sites in mind, and I would try to meet your suggestions.

"The important thing is to end a conflict that has brought burdens to both our peoples, and above all to the people of South Vietnam. If you have any thoughts about the actions I propose, it would be most important that I receive them as soon as possible."

HO CHI MINH'S REPLY

"Your Excellency: On 10 February 1967, I received your message. This is my reply.

"Vietnam is thousands of miles away from the United States. The Vietnamese people have never done any harm to the United States. But contrary to the pledges made by its representative at the 1954 Geneva conference, the U.S. Government has ceaselessly intervened in Vietnam; it has unleashed and intensified the war of aggression in South Vietnam with a view to prolonging the partition of Vietnam and turning South Vietnam into a neocolony and a military base of the United States. For over two years now, the U.S. Government has with its air and naval forces carried the war to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, an independent and sovereign country.

"The U.S. Government has committed war crimes, crimes against peace and against mankind. In South Vietnam, half a million U.S. and satellite troops have resorted to the most inhuman weapons and the most barbarous methods of warfare, such as napalm, toxic chemicals and gases, to massacre our compatriots, destroy crops and raze villages to the ground.

"In North Vietnam, thousands of U.S. aircraft have dropped hundreds of thousands of tons of bombs, destroying towns, villages, factories, roads, bridges, dikes, dams and even churches, pagodas, hospitals, schools. In your message, you apparently deplored the sufferings and destructions in Vietnam. May I ask you: Who has perpetrated these monstrous crimes? It is the U.S. and satellite troops. The U.S. Government is entirely responsible for the extremely serious situation in Vietnam.

"The U.S. war of aggression against the Vietnamese people constitutes a challenge to the countries of the Socialist camp, a threat to the national independence movement and a serious danger to peace in Asia and the world.

"The Vietnamese people deeply love independence, freedom and peace. But in the face of the U.S. aggression, they have risen up, united as one man. Fearless of sacrifices and hardships, they are determined to carry on their resistance until they have won genuine independence and freedom and true peace. Our just cause enjoys strong sympathy and support from the peoples of the whole world, including broad sections of the American people.

"The U.S. Government has unleashed the war of aggression in Vietnam. It must cease this aggression. That is the only way to the restoration of peace. The U.S. Government must stop definitively and unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, withdraw from South Vietnam all U.S. and satellite troops, and let the Vietnamese people settle themselves their own affairs. Such (is the basic) content of the four-point stand of the Government of the D. R. V., which embodies the essential principles and provisions of the 1954 Geneva agreements on Vietnam. It is the basis of a correct political solution to the Vietnam problem.

"In your message, you suggested direct talks between the D. R. V. and the United States. If the U.S. Government really wants these talks, it must first of all stop unconditionally its bombing raids and all other acts of war against the D. R. V. It is only after the unconditional cessation of the U.S. bombing raids and all other acts of war against the D. R. V. that the D. R. V. and the United States would enter into talks and discuss questions concerning the two sides.

"The Vietnamese people will never submit to force, they will never accept talks under the threat of bombs.

"Our cause is absolutely just. It is to be hoped that the U.S. Government will act in accordance with reason."

The second expression of position is contained in statements of U Thant in March 1967.

On March 28, U.N. Secretary General U Thant called a news conference and presented a new three-point peace formula that he had circulated secretly in mid-March. Mr. U Thant's formula was this:

First, a "general standstill truce . . . a halt to all military activities by all sides."

Second, preliminary talks between the United States and North Vietnam, attended either by Britain and the Soviet Union, as co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Vietnam, and/or Canada, India, and Poland, as the International Control Commission for Vietnam.

Third, reconvening the Geneva Conference with both the South Vietnamese Government and the Viet Cong as participants.

The day before, Hanoi radio had broadcast U Thant's proposals, pointedly rebuffing United Nation's "interference" in Vietnam. U Thant held out hope that Hanoi had not "categorically" turned him down, while U.S. Secretary of State Dean Rusk treated Hanoi's negative response as a fatal blow to the Thant initiative.

Yet, as Washington congratulated itself on its good fortune in finding itself squarely in agreement with the Secretary General of the U.N., U Thant had begun to slide back to his previous position that the U.S. must stop bombing North Vietnam as a necessary precondition to negotiations.

Meanwhile, Saigon was reported to be in agreement in principle with the U Thant three-point proposal, but displeased at being precluded from preliminary talks and "being treated like a puppet."

Thereafter, Washington qualified its acceptance of the same three-point proposal by saying "it is essential" to work out the details of the military cease-fire in advance.

And there the matter would seem to rest.

CONCLUSION

Obviously, there is a great amount of information to which only Mr. Johnson and his advisors have access. A review such as this must perforce rely on materials that have been made public by the Administration, or are obtainable from other public sources.

One other observation is necessary. Deep currents, Asian in origin, hold enormous sway over events in Vietnam yet cannot be adequately treated in a brief political history. A list of such currents is large, and would include the observation that Vietnam is basically Buddhist and Confucian, both ethical religious without a personal god. Thus, Asiatic communism as espoused by Asiatics can masquerade as an ally in the older, more familiar struggle against Western theism, Western colonialism, and Western capitalism.

Such a list would necessarily include also the tragic involvement of Diem's brother Nhu with opium; the profound effect the writings of an obscure French Catholic philosopher, Emmanuel Mounier, was to have on Nhu and in turn on his lonely, celibate brother, Diem; the fact that Nhu and Diem translated Mounier's "personnalisme" ethic into a secret, authoritarian organization, the "Can Lao" (Personalist Labor Revolutionary Party), to control all aspects of government and society in South Vietnam, thereby tragically destroying the coalition they had put together in 1954–55; even the distaste of individual Vietnamese in thousands of daily contacts at levels high and low for open, frank, Western speech compared to their own fluid, often subtle, conversational forms. These accidents of culture, history, and geography, for better or for worse, carry equally as much weight in the Vietnamese conflict today as, say, the effective fire power of the 7th fleet on a given day.

In a larger sense much more can be cited to confound the best of minds in resolving the Vietnamese conflict. The West divides good and evil, and thinks that evil can be conquered. Yet in Asia, a man is generally capable of believing that something is simultaneously good and bad, right and wrong, black and white, in such a manner as to render most difficult real understanding by the Western mentality.

Just as difficult to comprehend are the "politics" of the Buddhists, or the meaning of their proposals for a peaceful, independent Vietnam; we dismiss them as visionary or unrealistic, yet they may be more acceptable and understandable to the South Vietnamese—after 27 years of warfare—than anything we propose in our Western political terminology.

In short, we Americans cannot simply go to Asia, wipe the slate clean, and say to them, "This is how it shall be." The Vietnamese have their own view of nationalism, quite different from ours, the Vietnamese Communists identify with it, and it renders our involvement immeasurably difficult.

FURTHER DECISIONS

Does the Republican Party serve America best by saying that politics stop at the water's edge? That we must rally behind the President? Does bipartisanship mean that Democratic mistakes are Republican responsibilities?

Republicans—for two decades—have believed the United States must not become involved in a land war on the Asian continent. We are so involved today.

Republicans have believed that no American military intervention should be unilateral. Our commitment today in Vietnam is primarily unilateral.

Republicans, in 1954, made a limited commitment to the South Vietnam Government. Under the Democrats, our commitment has become open-ended.

Before making any further decisions to support or differ with the President, Republicans might agree to seek hard, realistic answers to two basic questions:

1. What precisely is our national interest in Thailand, Cambodia, Vietnam, and Laos?

2. To what further lengths are we prepared to go in support of this interest?

APPENDIX I

Troop strength

	American [1]	Army of the Republic of Vietnam [1]	Vietcong [2]
1961	3,164	338,000	63,400
1962	9,865	467,000	79,000
1963	16,500	525,000	91,700
1964	23,000	559,500	103,000
1965	181,000	679,000	230,000
1966	389,000	671,000	280,000
1967	[3] 430,000	[3] 650,000	[3] 287,000

[1] Source: 1961–66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.

[2] South Vietnam Communists, strength in the south. Source: 1961–66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967. (Unable to obtain official estimates as to total number of regular North Vietnam troops in south.)

[3] As of Apr. 1, 1967.

APPENDIX II

Casualties

	Americans killed [1]	Army of the Republic of Vietnam killed [2]	Enemy killed [3]
1960		2,200	5,669
1961	42	4,000	12,133
1962		4,400	21,158
1963	78	5,700	20,575
1964	147	7,500	16,785
1965	1,369	11,000	35,436
1966	5,008	9,400	55,524
1967	[4] 2,434	[5] 2,954	[5] 25,773
Total	9,078	47,154	193,053

[1] In hostile action. Source: Department of Defense.

[2] Source: 1960–66: Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, compiled from news dispatches.

[3] Source: Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.

[4] As of Apr. 15, 1967.

[5] As of Apr. 1, 1967.

APPENDIX III

Casualties (wounded and noncombat dead)

	Americans dead	Americans wounded
1961	23	81
1962		
1963	36	411
1964	48	1,039
1965	359	6,114
1966	1,045	30,093
1967	[1] 398	[1] 16,350
Total	1,909	54,068

[1] As of Apr. 15, 1967.

Source: Department of Defense.

APPENDIX IV

	Enemy captured [1]	Enemy defections [2]
1961	6,200	
1962	5,500	
1963	4,000	
1964	4,200	11,000
1965	6,000	5,500
1966	10,000	20,000
1967	[3] 1,000	[4] 8,000
Total	36,826	44,500

[1] Source: 1961–66, Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee; 1967, Washington Post, Apr. 14, 1967.

[2] Source: Department of Defense through U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee.

[3] January 1967 only.

[4] As of Apr. 1, 1967.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa.

On May 5, I wrote the senior Senator from Iowa, the chairman of the Republican policy committee, a letter with reference to the subject he just mentioned. I ask unanimous consent that my letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 5, 1967.

Hon. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER,
Republican Policy Committee,
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: With respect to the staff report on Vietnam, I want to state that:

(1) I believe the report to be excellent;

(2) I believe that you were sound and wise to release the report when you did;

(3) I believe that the report will serve a very valuable purpose as a catalyst for expression of views of individual Senators at the forthcoming Conference on Vietnam;

(4) Never have staff reports been considered binding on any Senator;

(5) I believe Senator Javits was sound and wise in calling for a Conference on Vietnam; and

(6) I believe the decision to have the staff make a report on Vietnam prior to the holding of a Conference constituted wise and orderly procedure.

In short, I have nothing but the highest praise for you and the staff in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET CHASE SMITH,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Maine for her cooperation and for the understanding which she expresses concerning the purpose of the study.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PEARSON AT THE CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] be recognized for 20 minutes on tomorrow, Wednesday, May 10, at the conclusion of morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 204, S. 1432. I do this so that the bill will become the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments, at the top of page 2, to strike out:

(2) Section 4 (50 App. U.S.C. 454) is amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(m) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, whenever the President determines that the enlisted strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army National Guard, Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Air National Guard, Air Force Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained by voluntary enlistments at the level that he determines to be necessary in the interests of national defense, persons liable for training and service under this title who—

"(1) are between the ages of 18½ and 26; and

"(2) have not previously served in the Armed Forces (including the Reserve components of the Armed Forces);

may be inducted into that Ready Reserve and shall perform an initial period of active duty for training of not less than four months. Persons shall be selected for induction under this subsection in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the President under section 5(a) of this title. A person who is inducted into the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard shall concurrently become a member of the Army National Guard of the United States or the Air National Guard of the United States, as the ease may be."

(3) Section 6(h) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(h)) is amended by striking out the last sentence.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(2) Section 6(c)(2)(A) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(c)(2)(A)), is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Any person, other than a person referred to in subsection (d) of this section, who—

"(i) prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction; or

"(ii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a proclamation by the Governor of a State to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of that State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title; or

"(iii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a determination by the President that the strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title;

enlists or accepts appointment, before attaining the age of 26 years, in the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces, the Army National Guard, or the Air National Guard, shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he serves satisfactorily as a member of an organized unit of such Reserve or National Guard in accordance with section 270 of title 10 or section 502 of title 32, United States Code, as the case may be, or satisfactorily performs such other Ready Reserve service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Enlistments or appointments under subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) of this clause may be accepted notwithstanding the provisions of section 15(d) of this title. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (h) of this section, no person deferred under this clause who has completed six years of such satisfactory service as a member of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than four consecutive months, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after August 9, 1955. In no event shall the number of enlistments or appointments made under authority of this paragraph in any fiscal year in any Reserve component of the Armed Forces or in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard cause the personnel strength of such Reserve component or the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, to exceed the personnel strength for which funds have been made available by the Congress for such fiscal year."

(3) Section 6(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That any person who is in a medical, dental, or allied specialist category not otherwise deferred or exempted under this subsection shall be liable for registration and training and service until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of his birth"

(4) Section 10(b)(3) (50 App. U.S.C. 460 (b)(3)) is amended by inserting the following proviso at the end of the first sentence thereof: "*Provided*, That no person shall be disqualified from serving as a counselor to registrants, including service as Government appeal agent, because of his membership in a Reserve component of the Armed Forces."

And, on page 5, at the beginning of line 18, to strike out "(4)" and insert "(5)"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Universal Military Training and Service Act is amended as follows:

(1) Section 1(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 451(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) This Act may be cited as the 'Selective Service Act of 1967'."

(2) Section 6(c)(2)(A) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(c)(2)(A)), is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) Any person, other than a person referred to in subsection (d) of this section, who—

"(i) prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction; or

"(ii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a proclamation by the Governor of a State to the effect that the authorized strength of any organized unit of the National Guard of that State cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title; or

"(iii) prior to the date scheduled for his induction and pursuant to a determination by the President that the strength of the Ready Reserve of the Army Reserve, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, Air Force Reserve, or Coast Guard Reserve cannot be maintained by the enlistment or appointment of persons who have not been issued orders to report for induction under this title;

enlists or accepts appointment, before attaining the age of 26 years, in the Ready Reserve of any Reserve component of the Armed Forces, the Army National Guard, or the Air National Guard, shall be deferred from training and service under this title so long as he serves satisfactorily as a member of an organized unit of such Reserve or National Guard in accordance with section 270 of title 10 or section 502 of title 32, United States Code, as the case may be, or satisfactorily performs such other Ready Reserve service as may be prescribed by the Secretary of Defense. Enlistments or appointments under subparagraphs (ii) and (iii) of this clause may be accepted notwithstanding the provisions of section 15(d) of this title. Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (h) of this section, no person deferred under this clause who has completed six years of such satisfactory service as a member of the Ready Reserve or National Guard, and who during such service has performed active duty for training with an armed force for not less than four consecutive months, shall be liable for induction for training and service under this Act, except after a declaration of war or national emergency made by the Congress after August 9, 1955. In no event shall the number of enlistments or appointments made under authority of this paragraph in any fiscal year in any Reserve component of the Armed Forces or in the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard cause the personnel strength of such Reserve component or the Army National Guard or the Air National Guard, as the case may be, to exceed the personnel strength for which funds have been made available by the Congress for such fiscal year."

(3) Section 6(a) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(a)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That any person who is in a medical, dental, or allied specialist category not otherwise deferred or exempted under this subsection shall be liable for registration and training and service until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of his birth."

(4) Section 10(b)(3) (50 App. U.S.C. 460 (b)(3)) is amended by inserting the following proviso at the end of the first sentence thereof: "*Provided*, That no person shall be disqualified from serving as a counselor to registrants, including service as Government appeal agent, because of his membership in a reserve component of the Armed Forces."

(5) Section 17(c) (50 App. U.S.C. 467(c)) is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

SEC. 2. Section 1 of the Act of August 3, 1950, chapter 537, as amended (77 Stat. 4), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

SEC. 3. Section 16 of the Dependents Assistance Act of 1950, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 2216), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

SEC. 4. Section 9 of the Act of June 27, 1957, Public Law 85-62, as amended (77 Stat. 4), is amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

SEC. 5. Sections 302 and 303 of title 37, United States Code, are each amended by striking out "July 1, 1967" whenever that date appears and inserting in place thereof "July 1, 1971".

SEC. 6. Chapter 39 of title 10, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by inserting the following new section after section 673:

"§ 673a. Ready Reserve: members not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, units

"(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may order to active duty any member of the Ready Reserve of an armed force who—

"(1) is not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, a unit of the Ready Reserve;

"(2) has not fulfilled his statutory reserve obligation; and

"(3) has not served on active duty for a total of 24 months.

"(b) A member who is ordered to active duty under this section may be required to serve on active duty until his total service on active duty equals 24 months. If his enlistment or other period of military service would expire before he has served the required period under this section, it may be extended until he has served the required period.

"(c) To achieve fair treatment among members of the Ready Reserve who are being considered for active duty under this section, appropriate consideration shall be given to—

"(1) family responsibilities; and

"(2) employment necessary to maintain the national health, safety, or interest."; and

(2) by inserting the following item in the analysis:

"673a. Ready Reserve: members not assigned to, or participating satisfactorily in, units."

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, once again the Senate is turning its attention to a question that has been debated since the Constitutional Convention of 1787—the question of how this Nation's chief executive officials, the President and the Vice President of the United States, should be elected.

On previous occasions, I have discussed in great detail on this floor the reasons for my advocating that our present electoral system be dismantled and replaced by direct, popular election of the President and the Vice President.

Indeed, I hope to have occasion again soon to review my thinking in this matter with my colleagues. As Senators know, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, which I chair, will begin hearings on this vital subject on May 16, 17, and 18.

Today, however, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate several key indicators that the idea of improving our system of electing the President and the Vice President is no longer simply a matter of academic interest, but an issue with which Congress is now ready to come to grips seriously and, hopefully, affirmatively.

For today, Mr. President, the people are addressing themselves to this issue as never before—and their voices are being heard. The people no longer wish to choose the two most powerful political officials in the land through an archaic, undemocratic, and dangerous system that has in the past—and could again in the future—result in the election of a person who receives fewer votes than his opponent.

The people want to choose their President and Vice President in the same way they now choose township trustees, school board members, city and county councilmen, mayors, legislators, members of the House and Senate, and Governors.

A recent Gallup poll showed that 64 percent of the American people want to elect the President and Vice President by direct vote.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce polled its members who responded by favoring direct election of the President and Vice

President by a 2-to-1 margin over all other methods combined.

The leadership of the United Auto Workers, one of the largest unions in the Nation, has announced its support of direct election.

The National Federation of Independent Business, with a membership exceeding 230,000 independent businessmen, supports direct election of the President—in fact, 75 percent of its members responding to a poll favored direct election.

The distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], a longtime advocate of direct election of the President and Vice President, found in a poll among State legislators that 58 percent of their number favor this method.

The distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Mr. CELLER, has introduced a measure providing for direct election.

Cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 2, which provides for direct election of the President and Vice President, reflect the wide appeal of this proposal—for they represent both political parties and both large States and small States. They are Senators BIBLE, BYRD of West Virginia, CHURCH, CLARK, HARTKE, HATFIELD, JAVITS, LAUSCHE, LONG of Missouri, MAGNUSON, MILLER, MORSE, NELSON, PEARSON, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, TYDINGS, YARBOROUGH, and YOUNG of Ohio, as well as myself.

In addition, this effort has won the overwhelming support of the finest legal minds in the Nation, as represented by the American Bar Association. Earlier this year, a special commission of the American Bar Association produced a report reflecting months of arduous study and discussion. The report concluded that direct election of the President and Vice President is the best of all possible methods and, more important, that it can be a realistic goal politically. Some weeks later, the American Bar Association, through its house of delegates, affirmed the report and made it the official policy of this highly influential and respected organization.

Mr. President, I had occasion to watch the deliberation of this motivated conference of the American Bar Association. I saw the way they went at the study of this important problem; and I was impressed by the diligent effort they made.

But if these are insufficient indicators of the political plausibility of enacting a constitutional amendment providing for direct election, then I wish to add one other such indicator—an indicator of the utmost national importance.

I had hoped to be able to make these remarks earlier in the day, while more Senators were present on the floor, so that greater attention could be given the last indicator; because, unfortunately, too little significance has been placed on this one indicator by the press throughout the country, and I thought it would be wise to call attention to it once again.

In a recent announcement, the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] indicated that he is strongly in favor of direct election of the President and Vice President. In fact, the Senator from Illinois has introduced a proposal to accomplish this goal. Although different in some respects from a proposal bearing my name—and the names of the several cosponsors I mentioned—to accomplish the same ends, I wish to state that there is no aspect of the proposal of the Senator from Illinois that I would find difficult to accept.

I believe that basically what needs to be done is for all Members of this body to consider the matter and let the Senate work its will. I believe there is ample ground on which we can find a consensus which can deal with this problem effectively.

I have had occasion in the past to work closely with the Senator from Illinois regarding an amendment to the Constitution. Without his able assistance both as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and as Republican floor leader in this body, there could have been no 25th amendment today.

His support of direct election already has gained national attention. I quote from the New York Times of May 9, 1967:

> Everett McKinley Dirksen of Illinois . . . (took) what could be an important step in American history by introducing a constitutional amendment to provide for the direct popular election of Presidents . . . Dirksen's support by no means guarantees the abolition of the Electoral College, but few other Senators could have added so much weight of support to the proposal. He is, of course, the Republican leader and has considerable power and prestige with which to bring his party colleagues along with him. More specifically, he is the senior Republican on the Bayh subcommittee, where a constitutional amendment must begin its long course through Congress and the States . . .

The senior Senator from Illinois is recognized throughout the Nation as one of America's outstanding statesmen. His work in many areas of critical national concern has earned him this well-deserved recognition.

But I submit that this new undertaking to which he has lent his brains, his prestige, and his influence may well prove to be his crowning achievement in a long and conspicuously meritorious career.

The Senator from Illinois knows well the serious dangers of our present system of electing our President and Vice President, and he is joining now as a prestigious pioneer to eliminate these dangers before our country is faced with crisis by allowing those dangers to become reality.

I thank the Senator from Illinois, and I know a grateful Nation joins me wholeheartedly.

As has been customary in the past, it shall be the task of our subcommittee, to continue the examination we began last year of every aspect of this matter.

I know that my distinguished friend the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] has definite views on this subject. We wish to hear from him and from all our colleagues, so that we can attack this problem. A problem which finds the present electoral system woefully lacking in certain fundamental elements that could plunge this Nation into a crisis. We cannot tolerate that and it is that which we seek to avoid.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I respect the views of my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Indiana, very greatly. But I am also completely out of accord with his views in supporting the direct election of Presidents and Vice Presidents.

This is but another step—and one of the final steps—toward complete striking out of the picture and downgrading the States of the Union as separate units, with separate strength and representation as States, as occurs in the Senate.

The electoral college as now set up is by no means an ideal system. I have long opposed the electoral system as now set up. I have supported on the floor of the Senate and before the able committee headed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana another method of the selection of Presidents and Vice Presidents, which I shall not discuss in detail at this time. In essence, the method I have supported was known a good many years ago as the Lodge-Gossett system; and I might add that on one occasion it passed the Senate by the very large vote required for submission to the States, but failed of such passage in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, the adoption of the amendment so ably discussed by the Senator from Indiana would simply mean that the Federal Government would take, ultimately and necessarily, complete control of our election machinery and processes.

For instance, in the case of direct election of Presidents and Vice Presidents, it would be necessary and natural that the different age limits set by the different States for qualifying electors to vote in State elections would have to be made uniform. We now have, as I recall, two States which allow citizens to vote at the age of 18. We have one State that allows citizens to vote at the age of 19. We have a fourth State which allows citizens to vote at the age of 20. We have all the other States requiring the attainment of the age of 21 as a qualification for voting.

In the event direct election of the President and Vice President should be required by our Constitution, it seems to me inescapable that the Federal Government would be called upon to provide and would have to provide, in order to accomplish anything like equity and equality, that the same age limit should apply in all 50 af the States and in the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, that is simply striking out any independence on the part of the States, based on their convictions and their experience, as to what is the age limit they consider adequate to qualify their citizens to participate in elections.

In addition to that particular which I have mentioned, which is an important one, and would call for federalization of our election laws, there would be the matter of the time of residence in a State which would be required as a prerequisite for registration to vote. The States have various periods of time which are now provided. This period would have to be made uniform in order to accomplish equity between the States in the event direct election of Presidents and Vice Presidents was provided for.

I do not care to have the long and controlling arm of the Federal Government again extended in that way or in the matter of age which I have mentioned.

In the matter of absentee voting, the same situation would obtain. Mr. President, the number of voters who are now traveling, or who are now temporarily out of their State, or in the case of my State, away from their voting districts on the day of election, who participate in the various elections, has become very great because our Nation is a nation of travelers, always on the move.

In that respect, the differences among the various States are very great. Some States do not permit absentee voting at all. Some States permit absentee voting if the citizen is out of the State, and they lay down certain machinery. Other States permit absentee voting if the citizen is out of the State on election day, or even away from his voting precinct on election day.

Mr. President, the long arm of the Federal Government is again invited to come in and prescribe a uniform method for voting. Incidentally, this prescribed uniform method of voting would undoubtedly apply to Senators and Representatives because they are Federal officials, elected under Federal law, and it might be made to apply, and probably would be made to apply eventually, to all officials, whether statewide, county, district, school, municipal, or whatever the unit may be.

Mr. President, there are other differences between the States. For instance, some States, in the event of invalids being detained in their homes, or persons who had operations being detained in hospitals, permit election officials to go there and allow the casting of the vote and receipt of the vote in the hospital or the home where the invalid is. Other States do not have such a provision. In the event of a federalization of our election machinery this, too, would become a uniform proposition.

However, all of these things taken together are not nearly so serious as the matter of striking out the weight of States under our federated system of government because, under our present electoral system, each State is allowed to have representation on the basis of its population; that is, on the basis of the number of Representatives it has in the House of Representatives; and is allowed to have representation in the electoral college, representing the two Senators from each State, meaning that the two Senators from Alaska or the two Senators from Delaware, or the two Senators from any other of our small States are counted alike in determining the number of electoral votes which each State may have.

Mr. President, all of these steps that are so ardently urged in recent days I am sorry to say, tend toward federalization, centralization, knocking out the independence of the States, and tends toward knocking out the weight which States have under the Federal setup and downgrading them greatly.

I think these steps are not to be taken carelessly and simply because somebody at a convention voted for them. I think these steps are to be most seriously considered. Insofar as the Senator from Florida is concerned, he has considered them a long time, and he thinks that they would be very hurtful to our type of federated government, and he will oppose very vigorously the direct election of Presidents.

Mr. President, another point I wish to mention is the weather. I remember a November—I cannot give the year just now—when there were hurricanes raging in my part of the country or in other parts of the country which made it impossible for many citizens to get to the polling booths and vote on that day. I remember when there have been snowstorms in other areas which have had the same result. I recall that there have been all kinds of convulsions of nature which have had the effect of cutting down the vote, not upon the entire country, but upon large regions, and certainly upon States, whether large or small, and sometimes on several States at a time.

Mr. President, it is to be assumed, in a case such as that, that those electors who do get to the polls and vote will be reasonably representative of the total electorate of the State or area that is affected. However, if we have a direct nationwide election of presidents and vice presidents, the number of votes is all that would count. If the one-man, one-vote principle is applied to the entire Nation willy-nilly it matters not that a great State has had a convulsion of nature which kept down its voting strength that day to one-half of what it would have been, or less than that, but nonetheless the result has to be based on the total number of votes cast throughout the Nation, in the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I believe this one fact, which I have just mentioned, is enough to make us pause. This is a great Nation which covers a large part of the earth, and in which there is hardly ever a time when weather conditions are comparable in all parts of our Nation.

Yet, Mr. President, it is proposed here now that we forget that fact, forget our greatness, forget the fact that we are composed of 50 sovereign States which reserve some powers to themselves, reserve to themselves under the Constitution the right to have 2 Senators in this body, and reserve unto themselves in the electoral college representation for those two Senators, as well as for the House Members. We are to forget all of these things and simply jump at this one-man, one-vote shibboleth and put this country in the position of being ruled by a bare majority of its citizens who may vote that day, even though they might come from a very great minority of the States, and from a minority of the States which would not be at all representative of the national thinking.

Mr. President, I shall be strongly opposed to this measure, and with all due regard to the many distinguished people who advocate the proposal, including the Senator from Indiana, the Senator who has just spoken, it seems to me that such a measure is largely destructive of the historic structure of this Nation, and that we would be foolish, indeed, to take such a step.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I did not intend, when first making reference to the significant decision of the minority leader, to embark on a thorough discussion of the relative merits of the direct election plan.

I appreciate the fact that my distinguished and very good friend from Florida was present during my remarks. He so eloquently brings to the RECORD the strong feelings which he has. I know that he has studied this matter very carefully. Although I have reached a different conclusion, I do not for one moment suggest that his views are without merit or that he suggests a proposal which is ill-conceived. I have heard the Senator from Florida testify. I know of his conscience and his deep convictions.

However, I must say that as of this particular moment I have reached a different conclusion. As I said earlier, and as I think the Senator from Florida knows, we will look into this matter very carefully. What the final outcome will be, I do not know.

When the Senate has an opportunity to work its will on this problem—and I hope it will—we will have the opportunity to discuss it fully.

I do not share the concern of my good friend from Florida that this will necessarily embark Congress upon a course that will result in national election laws that will take away State prerogatives relating to age limits, residence requirements, or absentee voting regulations.

I feel that perhaps we should take a very good look at the conditions which existed in this country which caused the Founding Fathers to reach their electoral compromise. In their day, the mass of our citizenry was uneducated. There was little or no communication. Transportation was very bad. A large group of citizens were slaves who had no rights, let alone the right to vote.

But, times have changed significantly. I am not willing to admit in my own mind—and the Senator from Florida certainly is entitled to his right to think differently—that the President of the United States is a creature of the States. Rather, he is a creature of the 50-State Union, and all the people.

I feel very strongly about the movement of power to Washington. I have voiced my feelings in this Chamber that the best way to solve this problem is to exercise more initiative at home and in the State legislatures—where I have personally seen it lacking. But, I am not willing to suggest that a plan is equitable which would permit 12 States and the District of Columbia to determine who is to be the President for all 50 States. I happen to believe that the people can make this determination, and we can still preserve the rights which concern my good friend from Florida.

I am looking forward to the opportunity to listen to the eloquent testimony which the Senator from Florida will give before the subcommittee and, hopefully, we will also have another opportunity to discuss this matter on the floor of the Senate.

I certainly appreciate the participation of the Senator from Florida in this discussion.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the

Senate, I move that it stand in adjournment until tomorrow at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 24 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 19, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 9, 1967:

In the Coast Guard

The following-named officer to be permanent commissioned officer of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant commander:

Melvin J. Hartman

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned officers of the Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

Michael V. Leahy
Michael H. Dennis
Morris D. Newton, Jr.
Frank A. Boersma

The following-named persons to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of ensign:

Richard James Andrews.
Joseph Francis Angelico.
Clifford John Appel.
Bruce Young Arnold.
James Leander Barth, Jr.
Ronald Earle Beck
Michael Kennedy Bell.
Philip John Berger.
Michael Anthony Bradaric.
Roger Alan Brunell.
George Clifford Carter.
Richard Kyle Clark.
Russell Joseph Collins.
Richard Burton Cook.
Michael Francis Cowan.
Lawrence Freeman Cox, Jr.
Lynn Howard DeGrow.
George Michael Devanney.
John Henry Distin.
Chad Bryan Doherty.
John Roberts Donaldson.
John Anthony D'Onofrio.
Henry Joseph Dresch.
Kenneth Lee Ervin.
James Allan Fetters.
Carmond Craig Fitzgerald.
Preston Lee Foskey.
Robert George Frame.
Donald Joseph Freeman.
James Heberly Getman.
Harry Joseph Godfrey III.
Tom Harmon Graening.
Thomas Carl Greene.
Drew Robert Hamblin.
Daniel Joseph Hines, Jr.
Theophilus Brantley Houston, Jr.
Charles Sandy Kennedy, Jr.
Richard Bolling King II.
Geoffrey Campbell Kline.
Richard Arthur Knisely.
Richard Milton Larrabee III.
Charles Rahner Lewis.
Mark Eastman Libby.
Robert Edward Long.
David Bruce Lorenz.
David Holyoke Lyon.
Michael Stanley Macie.
James Patrick Mahone.
Louis Paul Manfra.
John Wesley Martin.
Allen Tennyson Maurer.
Mark Anthony McDermott.
French Henry McElrath.
Douglas Mitchell Miller.
Lewis Miller.
Robert Allen Montgomery, Jr.
Stephen Francis Mullins.
George John Munkenbeck, Jr.
Walter Upshur Nicholas, Jr.
William Henry Edwin Nock III.
Gordon Arthur Olson.
John Rogers Painter.
James Robert Peek II.
Randall James Peterson.
Paul Joseph Pluta.
Walter William Prelle.
David Elliot Prosser.
John William Reiter.
Robert Francis Riley, Jr.
Milton Robert Rose.
Thomas Joseph Schaeffer.
Steven George Schember.
Andrew John Sedlock.
George James Sepel.
Terry William Sinclair.
William Robert Slate.
Thomas Willard Snook.
Mark Leslie Solberg.
Evan Lee Stoll, Jr.
David Martin Strasser.
Lloyd Edwards Taylor, Jr.
Gary John Eric Thornton.
Wayne Richard Till.
James Richard Townley, Jr.
Richard Sterling Tweedie.
James Frederick Verplanck.
John Charles Voden.
Helmut Ernst Walter.
Rex Martin Wessling.
David Jonathan West.
George Paul White, Jr.
James Robert White.
Robert Elder White III.
James Herbert Wihlborg.
Robert Edward Williams.
Neil Wise.
Timothy John Wood.
Charles Michael Wrighter.
Jon William Young.

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–4:

Robert Jiudice
Frederick J. Alles
Carl A. Carlson
Melvin G. McCoy
Richard J. Zwally
Ernest G. Crispi
Edward T. Rollins
Morgan C. Hutto, Jr.
Charles H. Buckley
James A. Winslow
Merle L. Cochran
Roger G. Stanton
Thor B. Olson
Robert J. Ross
Gilbert Shaw
Stephen T. Watson
Slavko Stokich
Harry C. Strother, Jr.
John J. Lencmeyer
Robert G. Cameron
Timothy J. Crowley
Olos F. Marshall
Everett J. Matteson
Earl J. Wesner
Russell A. Scruggs, Jr.
John H. Liedke
Thomas D. Galliher
John H. Deboe
William B. Miner
John F. Minster
William A. Vasques
Robert C. McClanahan
William F. Kortlang
Edwin H. Cornell
James Szokolay
Andrew Yackovetsky
Richard P. McMullen
Donald R. Myers
Clark W. Straus
George G. Bannan
Neil H. Endsley
Walter W. Hake
Charles O. Franklin
Arnold S. Knudsen
Herman H. Keith
Charles R. Fowler
Melvin Midgett
Clyde S. Delanoy
Russel H. Stockfleth
Wilbur E. Lincoln
Paul G. Patrinos
Wilfred E. Cobb, Jr.
Charlie R. Polly
Wilton A. Hockenberry
Patrick M. Shellito
Cyril L. Fennelly
David C. Adkins
Donald W. Olson
Hollis L. Beard
William F. Queen
John W. Laine
Andrew J. Brovey
James F. Jones
Robert A. McCarten
John C. Revels
Raymond E. Masker
William H. Westin
John E. Kenny
Richard K. Mitchell
Raymond C. Herrington
Harold I. Baker
Myron E. Chesley
John A. Ritter
Michael H. Bower
Alfred L. Hunt
Elliott J. Echols
James L. Reynolds
Joseph J. Glynn
Ernest B. Roark
Edward F. Mattingly
Fay K. Thompson
Keith R. Bruhl
John W. McMinn
Maurice K. Nelson
Hershel A. Drury
Robert G. Keim
John F. Olsen
Donald B. Goodwin
Robert J. W. Collins
Marion K. Reynolds
Carl B. Kaiser
Leroy P. Phelps
Zigmund F. Golaszewski
Donald C. Ebert
Milton M. Midgette
John Sabath
Karl C. Teater
Theodore L. Turgeon
Johnnie P. Gilbert
Leon D. Shea
William L. Patterson
Lyle G. Tilden
Joseph W. Dunhour
Donald S. Grisham
Wilbur J. Davis
Louis E. K. Pall
Robert R. Harber, Jr.
Walter A. Evans
William M. Price, Jr.
Robert L. Sellers
Charles E. Shook
Frederick Jones
James R. Comerford
Don E. McDonald
Norval E. Cosby
Baker W. Herbert
Paul H. Johannes
George M. Bruner
Herman Schmidt
Norman F. Muench
Lee R. Green
Jesse H. Burgess
Lester M. H. Roehr
Raymond J. Moen
Kenneth C. Oliver
Lee O. Madden, Jr.
Edward A. Liles
Reckner B. Moe
Marion O. Simmons
Charles W. Price
Calvin W. Pratt
John E. Dunn
Thomas E. Bockman
Phillip E. Thompson
Curtin W. Chamberlain
James P. McBride
Thomas H. Renfroe
John W. Hammack
Wilfred J. Sellers
George V. Stauffer
Hal H. Watts
Daniel D. Wiesman
Merlin J. Powers
Edmond R. Harless
Sidney D. Reece
Wayne H. Wiley
Robert E. Stephen
Harold O. Stockman
Archie C. Yano
William A. Liming
Richard B. Robinson
Edward W. Kinsey
Harold Rapp, Jr.
Robert L. Hood
Stanley P. Sleda
John H. Kittila, Jr.
Magnes L. Campbell
Robert J. Whitman
Vincent G. Carlson
Victor Loher
William A. Izzo
Ralph C. Howland
Glenn R. Cox
Clyde F Skiles
John R. Quinlivan
William J. Merritt
William L. Taylor
Paul R. Saylor
Laurin J. Wiersema
Edwin L. Brusstar, Jr.
Ivey N. McClure
Joseph A. Kalczynski
Francis J. Taddei
Homer T. Austin, Jr.
Marvin L. Olson
Chester R. Brooks
Earl F. Hauser
Sam Haas, Jr.
Herbert M. Collins
Melvin W. Ellis, Jr.
Herbert V. Parkin III
Herbert W. Bagg
Valentine Gaida
William C. Bart
Giles M. Bailey, Jr.
John S. Kennedy
Clifford R. Wattam, Jr
Dale E. Strohecker
Charles A. Thornton
Harold C. Wadey

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–3:

Russell L. Holt
William R. Greene
James R. Reese
Jerry R. Cox
Geoffrey H. Briggs
John R. Cromwell
James J. Torpey
Kenneth J. Sweeney
Donald R. Karwedsky
Aloysius P. Seiler
Eugene E. Ockrassa
Earl F. Moore
Eugene O. Thorson
Elmer L. Hicks
Edwin J. Jonas, Jr.
John R. Scott, Jr.
James W. Jay, Jr.
John R. McMahon
Robert L. Jacks
Wallis N. Zimmerman
Billy Hopper
Eugene S. Talley, Jr.
Bobbie L. Bentley
Wayne E. Nunnenkamp
Allie C. Woodcock
Edward E. Godlewski
Edgar L. Parker
George E. Montfort
Dale E. McElfresh
Arthur L. Lucier
Richard B. Page
Robert J. Baker
Arnold Brooks
Robert T. Gray
Warren G. Berto
Henry E. Brunet
Lysle G. Laussade
Donald K. Byrd
Delbert F. Summers
Joseph E. Bruce
Raymond R. Close
Daniel M. Wirzburger
Allen V. Walker, Jr.
Edward H. Monson
William Jackson
Frank W. Kurtz
Raymond W. Nickerson
Burr K. Vail
Wray A. Stout
Wilbur J. Hall, Jr.
Earle W. Dorr, Jr.
Clifford E. Reeves
Elmer Berrish
Carl A. Powers
Loyd B. Reach, Jr.
Allen W. Craven
Forrest E. Colbath
Carl F. Baker
Thomas P. Connell
Jack G. Albert
Ernest C. Moore III
Charles E. Fulcher
Alfred E. Schreiber
Edward J. Flynn
Owen M. Halstad
Donald Burmeister
Thomas J. Hummel
Orrin E. Starr
James C. Myers
John P. Higman, Jr.
Herbert E. Roche
Charles C. Stephenson
John S. Drozdz
John E. Cutright
William S. O'Neill
Ian D. Maxwell
Jack W. Beatty
Clarence A. Hall
Thomas A. Fillmore
William D. Franklin
John Gunsaullus
John W. Wyant III
Travis B. Hiers
Robert C. Knowlton

Ronald A. Sands
Henry E. Prentiss
Paul S. Johnson
Herbert J. Nuse
Maurice A. Rowe
Gary M. Vaughn
William D. Jackson
George M. McWilliams
Rex W. Coulson
Danny H. Perry
James A. Bachtell
Jack E. Arrington
Kenneth W. Capel
Royce F. Stoops
Guy F. Edwards
Gordon R. Mortensen
Harold J. Warren
Warren M. Nix
Donald P. Ivins
Aloysius Ralph, Jr.
Conrad A. Pasbrig
Adrian D. DeZeeuw
Jack I. Brolliar
David L. Trax, Jr.
Chester V. Barrett, Jr.
Robert H. Staikoff
Kirk D. Rose
Oren A. Dinsmore
John H. Freie
Charles M. Saylor
Andrew J. Mullins
Alan R. Hinds
John L. Nelson
Daniel A. Sutyak
Edgar T. Southworth
Ray B. Wallace
Charles C. Miller
Stanley B. Anderson
Chester M. Miller
Harold T. Collins
William R. Shrader
William C. Ray
William H. Speas
Donald O. Tilton
John C. Baker
William F. Hatcher
Paul G. Terry
Chester Morgan
Doyle S. Porter
John R. Rooks
Roy E. Olson
Clarke R. Harwood
James C. Healan
Keith L. Knighton
Glenn L. Marshall
George J. Pearce
Ralph G. Garvin
Thomas J. Christiano
Edward Lienemann
Howard K. Luallin
Kenneth W. Lamar
Thomas J. Collins
John H. Ingram
Harold C. Webster, Jr.
William R. Torrey, Jr.
George V. Ramsey
William D. Hutchins
Michael J. Barry
Myron L. Marcey
Jesse Bradford
Charles B. Dean
Jewel E. Laqua
Charles H. Cox
Harry E. Lape
Walter L. Hudson
Donald E. Nielsen
Frederick A. Brockman
William W. Honeycutt
Robert L. Cotter
Gordon W. Umbehocker
Jesse L. Long
Roger E. Steadman
James P. Riddle
Donald L. Landes
Henry G. Jett
Gerald W. Hayes
Robert L. Perkins
Lee Bradford, Jr.
Eugene R. Lytton
William B. Clark
George W. Todd
Eugene L. Murphy
William C. Cumming
John W. Collins
Arthur R. Whittum
Ralph M. Dobson
Robert E. Jefferson
Roger J. Conard
Gary R. Klinkman
Stanley W. Haney
Merriel A. Smith
Victor L. Popplewell
George H. Yarrington
David E. Ford
Larry B. Brown
William J. Gesser
George R. Thomas
Robert D. Fiester
Floyd H. McGowan
Rodger G. Biehl
Douglas J. Hymers
Joseph R. Levesque
Billy G. Bailey
Forrest V. Pell
Beecher D. Rapp
Hassen S. Salem, Jr.
Robert A. Bhend, Jr.
Lowell W. Waplehorst
Stephen Sperlak
Harold V. Smith
Anthony Simoncini
Louis DeJessie
Paul B. Robertson
John F. Bresnehan
Robert A. Fleming
Frederic G. Cook
Carlton P. Smith
Richard B. Lewis
Robert E. Halstead
Edward L. Amos
Robert E. Mustard
Frank A. Christoph
Louis R. Stowe
William G. Wohlfarth
Forrest D. Fesler
Howard E. Wales
Howard A. Hirst
Frank M. Alonzo
Leroy J. Rathbun
Charles A. Lummus
James V. Simons
Harrold M. Cooke
Gareth H. Stephenson
Samuel C. Brown, Jr.
Harold D. Peck
Wilbur L. Matthews
Thomas E. Wassum
Orville O. Sullivan
William F. Hiller
Leonard E. Engel
William F. Westell
Billy B. Weimer
Ernest G. Smith
Wayne J. Lange
Edward J. Sitarski

The following-named officers to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W–2:

Galen R. Siddall
James D. Crisp, Jr.
James O. Alexander
Paddy G. Rogers
Roger R. Roznoski
William A. Swansburg
Charles A. Vedder
Charles H. Lancaster
Bruce T. Collings, Jr.
Gary R. Wilkins
Charles L. Gomez
William B. Sobeck
Walter C. Parker
Melvin Long
Robert C. Lewetzen
Jack Lee
James A. Knicky
Gale B. Feick
John G. Merino
Joseph E. Tamalonis
Loomis P. Gibson
David D. Austin
Robert B. Lynn
Randel E. Jennings
Paul F. Drumgoole
Richard A. Kirkman
Russell E. Grose
William D. Randall
Donald D. Smith
John R. English
Robert J. Ward, Jr.
Matthew J. McCool
William Race
Philip B. Arnold
William T. Pierce
Joseph W. Nofs
Carl Nucilli
Garland C. Fulcher
Clyde A. Phillips, Jr.
Alan E. Bailey
Harry L. Croneberger
James B. Coyle
Philip Souza
Neil E. Benson
James L. Rowe
Norman F. Wheeler
James A. Hodges
Charles F. Rogers
Hugh C. Teel
Antonnealle G. Townsend
William C. Hidinger
Alden Y. Klein
Clarence W. Waage
James O. Dearoff
Kenneth C. Riggs
William A. Clubb
Harvey F. Moore
Paul G. Blossfield
Fred W. Alcock
George S. Lee
Philip Ellia
Robert E. Sanders
Richard D. Slocum
Arlie R. Neal
Robert J. Hughes
Patrick T. Denney
Joseph J. Geryk
Elmer S. Turley
Ronald E. Buzhardt, Jr.
William H. Colagross
Lyle H. Dever
Robert W. Bolen
Joseph Millard
Joseph H. Anson, Jr.
Duane H. Larson
George T. Causey
Thomas P. Kent
Harold W. Fox
Edward F. Golaszewski
Gerry A. Henneman
Elbert L. Roller
Daniel J. Debrowski
David G. Rash
Colon P. Butler
Henry A. Vermilyea
James R. Foy
Charles W. Dierolf, Jr.
Arthur R. Chavonelle III
William H. Shaw
William P. Seaverns
Charles J. Mahaffey
Rene LaPlante
Robert K. Bond
John R. Bradley, Jr.
Leonard E. Klumpp
Eugene G. Ostlund
Stephen W. Clark
John W. Scott
Silvester Altieri
William C. Drexler
John C. Wimbrow
Otello Agostini
Signa H. Barnett
James H. Stoutjesdyk
William G. Womick
Horace T. Piver
Richard L. Williams
Frank W. Jurin
Gerald E. Flynn
Joseph Phillips
Charles T. Beals
Raymond T. Peterson
Carmen E. StClair
Everett W. Bray, Jr.
Robert D. Coppens
George J. Brookfield, Jr.
Gordon E. Cates
Murray A. Strange
William A. Bromley
Clayton Keith, Jr.
Allen E. Gray
Newton L. Bennett
Thomas W. Hart
Archie Smith
Alan C. Anderson
Robert W. Berlach
Robert E. Smith
Stanley C. Schmelz
Eugene J. Robl
Robert J. Denk
Kenneth N. Lindsey
Robert O. Midgett
James B. Price
William Copeland
Frederick A. Kahl
Charles H. Wilson
Freddie I. Wooten
Richard L. Moseley
Martin C. Baechler, Jr.
Anthony A. Rossi
William J. Ledoux, Jr.
Russell W. Badger
Henry O. Wall, Jr.
John D. Burkholder
Floyd E. Duck
Carroll J. Whitman
Dale T. Dodd
David F. Steele, Jr.
William E. Waller
Philibert B. Akau
George F. Morris
Claude B. Peden
Earl R. Hoggard
Jackie L. Ransom
Steven Guedesse
Flaviel J. Rollinson
Burton G. Howell
James P. M. Joyce
Donald D. Moore
David H. Meekins
Norman W. Shaffer
Harry D. MacInnes
Bernice A. Edenfield
Albert D. Miller
Darwin L. Vineyard
Joseph Greco, Jr.
Duane M. Ferguson
Charles H. MacLean III

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Bill To Amend Internal Revenue Code

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing my bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow a taxpayer or spouse an additional deduction at age 62 rather than 65.

When the Congress allowed a person to qualify for social security at age 62, this was only a half-step. Why should we not lower the age at which a person, be he spouse or taxpayer, can qualify for an additional exemption because of age? The principle is the same.

I strongly urge the Congress to extend this break to our senior citizens. This additional exemption will be a real boon to many couples, widows, and single women getting along in years.

Max Fullerton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. MATHIAS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, it was with deep regret and great shock that I learned of the sudden death of Max Fullerton last week. As former chief of the Baltimore bureau of the Associated Press, Mr. Fullerton had a broad range of interests, among which was the development of the Hall of Fame for war correspondents in Gathland State Park in Washington County, Md. Just a few days before his death I received a letter from him expressing his concern and interest in this project, indicative of the active and constructive life he led until the time of his death.

A graduate of West Virginia University in 1925, Mr. Fullerton served as telegraph editor of the Fairmont West Virginian and later became assistant city editor of the Clarksburg Telegram and was named city editor on August 1, 1925.

In 1929 he joined the Charleston, W. Va., bureau of the Associated Press. On December 3, 1945, he was named chief of the Associated Press bureau in Baltimore for Maryland and West Virginia and held that post until 1960 when West Virginia was removed from the Baltimore jurisdiction. He retired April 1, 1963, but continued to present the news through the radio and television scripts produced by Maxbill Productions, Inc.

A charter member of the Baltimore chapter of Sigma Delta Chi, a national journalism organization, Mr. Fullerton was also a member of the Washington chapter. He was also an active member of the National Press Club, the Charleston Press Club, and the Maryland-Delaware Press Association.

I extend my most heartfelt sympathies to his wife, Mrs. Virginia Fullerton, and to his three daughters, Mrs. Thomas C. Lawler of Alexandria, Va., Mrs. Kenneth Townsend of Centreville, Va. and Mrs. Roy Kelley of Lutherville, Md.

Welcome, Consulting Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, this week, here in our Nation's Capital, a series of meetings of more than passing significance is being held, bringing together for the first time in this country, members of the Consulting Engineers Council of the United States, and the International Federation of Consulting Engineers.

Design and research engineers representing every conceivable facet of modern technology will be in attendance. The work of consulting engineers ranges from the design of automated factories to the creation of computerized controls for heating and cooling modern buildings—from design of facilities to reclaim waste water to design of radar telescopes—from design of air and water pollution control systems to design of modern stadiums or airports.

Virtually every field of human endeavor is touched in some manner by the work of consulting engineers—and in every instance their efforts are directed to the improvement of man's environment, the enlargement of man's store of knowledge, the achievement of hitherto unattainable goals.

Who are these men who call themselves consulting engineers? They are registered professional engineers—specialists in a broad spectrum of engineering disciplines—structural, electrical, chemical, mechanical, and civil engineering being the primary categorical designations by which they are known. They work with the other design professionals, such as the architect and the city planner, and as such are responsible in large measure for the rebuilding of cities, for the creation of new cities, and for the ultimate shape of the world of tomorrow.

It is fitting that this series of meetings is being held in Washington, D.C., bringing together engineering consultants from 20 countries—for our Nation's Capital has played host to many important conferences of international significance.

Because of the importance of the work of consulting engineers—work that in some manner affects every one of the world's billions of citizens—I hope that each Member of this Chamber will join with me in welcoming these conferees to our city and expressing the hope that their discussions will be fruitful. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Speaker John W. McCormack Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, May 3, 1967, the Boston College of Washington, D.C., honored our beloved Speaker, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, as their man of the year.

This event was of particular significance to Mr. MCCORMACK's many friends and to Boston College as it marked the first time in 39 years of devoted public service that this great man has allowed anyone to honor him in such a way.

It was most gratifying when President Johnson arrived to add his personal tribute to the Speaker. The President's remarks follow:

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE DINNER FOR SPEAKER JOHN MCCORMACK, REGENCY ROOM, SHOREHAM HOTEL, MAY 3, 1967

The PRESIDENT. Reverend Clergy, Mrs. McCormack, Speaker McCormack, Members of Congress, all friends of John McCormack, ladies and gentlemen:

Speaker McCormack came to the House of Representatives 39 years ago. He is now serving his 20th term. If ever an American could say with pride that his life has been devoted to the creative use of politics, that American is John W. McCormack.

It is very easy to scorn politics from outside the arena. Sometimes I have envied those whose occupations will permit them to do so.

But for more than 30 years I have been inside the arena myself. And all that time I have been in there with John McCormack and I felt very comfortable to be by his side.

I have been accorded the very great privilege of working with the distinguished Speaker as he and the Congress and a series of Presidents have attempted to make a miracle and to make the world in which we live a better and more peaceful place to live in.

The Speaker of the House of Representatives occupies the very unique position in the American way of Government. When he is committed to progress, when he is endowed with compassion, when he understands the qualities of leadership, then things can and do happen in America. When he is not, then all the King's horses and all the President's horses as well can't make any headway.

During most of these last three decades America has been served by two men as Speaker who have shown just what can be done in the arena of politics—Sam Rayburn and John W. McCormack.

What Sam Rayburn did and what John McCormack continues to do show what politics in America is really all about.

Look at the record just over the past 22 years since World War II alone—the Marshall Plan, NATO, highway construction, the space program, Food for Peace, the GI Bill, civil rights measures, the Alliance for Progress, the Peace Corps, Aid to Education, Medicare, the War on Poverty. That is what politics is. That is what politics does. That is the living memorial and the living record of John W. McCormack of Massachusetts.

So I say to you, all of you, his dear friends who have gathered here tonight, I say let them all remember that name when they write about politics in America. Let them remember that America and Boston and Massachusetts was elevated and was enriched by John McCormack because he understood and he understands how to make politics serve the average man better and how to make politics serve the best interest of the land he loves.

Every person in this hall tonight is to be commended for finally getting the Speaker to come here and sit still for some praise. And not just praise but for some homage.

I can't think of a man in America, and I don't know a man in America, that I think deserves that praise or that homage more than our beloved friend, John McCormack.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't had my dinner yet. Mrs. Johnson went to an art show and I was having one of my own all day, but when I got an invitation to this dinner—and if I hadn't received one I would have written myself one—I wanted to come here, in all these bright lights at this lovely affair, and tell you in the presence of all those who love you so much, how much you and Mrs. McCormack have meant to me.

Incidentally, there are just five of you who were here when I first came. There are just 20 of you that are here out of the 535 when I first came as a Congressman in 1937.

As a young Congressman, as Whip, as Minority Leader, as Majority Leader, as Vice President, and finally as President, there has been no person in this room or in this Capital tonight who has been more devoted, who has been more loyal, who has been more courageous under fire, and who has been more compassionate for his fellow man than you have.

To Mrs. McCormack, that wonderful, lovely, great human being, who has been your helpmate through the years, to the entire Massachusetts delegation, who with Mrs. McCormack helps you do your homework, I want to say:

We are grateful. We are appreciative. All America loves you. I am honored and happy that I could come your way and enjoy your friendship and participate in your achievements.

Food to Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, not all food and supplies sent to Vietnam by private citizens are deemed newsworthy enough to merit headlines. But I know of one case from my district that I feel merits the attention of my colleagues, and I only wish that more Americans and people abroad were aware of it.

In the city of Vero Beach, Fla., Mrs. E. D. Baisden carried on correspondence with her son, Capt. Edward Baisden, and found that he had distributed some goods to civilians in South Vietnam and wished he had more.

This initiated a program, led by the local junior chamber of commerce, which resulted in a community effort that collected 3,800 pounds of materials for the people of South Vietnam.

These materials included clothes, toys for youngsters, soap, and other personal goods.

The response was overwhelming and surprising. In the face of recent demonstrations, one might have thought such a project would have attracted little interest. But reports from the Jaycees indicate that citizens from every level, including schoolchildren, participated.

I would call this to the attention of my colleagues to point out that Americans in every part of the country are aware of the situation in Vietnam and are willing to do their share to help out.

A Minister Speaks for the American People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Reverend Dr. Carl McIntire, a long-persecuted Christian minister, spoke to and for the American people last night at Constitution Hall, here in Washington, D.C.

He raised valid constitutional points in asking how the Federal Communications Commission, a mere appointed creature of Congress, could justify such diabolical power in manipulation of radio mechanics that it can deny a minister the liberty to preach and deny free speech.

Are we to now believe that the prohibitions of the Bill of Rights apply only to Congress and not to the FCC? Who is this superconscience of the radio airwaves that is now so afraid of Christian preaching that he or they seek not only to abolish his air ministry but also deny to millions of listeners the way of Christian salvation. Servants of the taxpayers fear the truth? Or, do they fear an open-minded, informed citizenry? If they of the FCC who are against free speech and antireligious freedom do not like the doctor or his soul-searching sermons, they need only change stations or cut off their set.

And the good pastor did not reciprocate the foul deeds of the FCC by calling for its abolition—he only asked that we, of Congress, investigate the FCC to see where all this "takeover" power comes from. He stated he does not even challenge the fairness doctrine of Mr. Reuther, except in the spirit of fairness he felt it to be used fairly and not as a gag to destroy his freedom of speech or his ministry.

On this "fairness doctrine" I found it interesting to note the self-justification of the FCC professing it had the right and duty to control "hate" on the airways. Yet, it is certainly doing a lousy job of controlling the anti-American hate jabber coming from Stokely Carmichael, Cassius Clay, flag desecraters, draft card burners, and the like. Mayhaps the problem is that we who went to school do not understand "hate." Just what is meant by the FCC by "hate"? Pro-Americanism? Anti-Communism? Christianity?

The American people will not tolerate such goings on. If our boys can die fighting communism in Vietnam, certainly we can fight communism and the fright peddlers and swear artists who stifle basic constitutional rights at home.

Those Who Encourage Draft Dodging Should Be Jailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the law is clear. It provides that—

> Any person who evades or refuses registration or service in the armed forces . . or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces, . . . shall, upon conviction . . be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

The press reports that a number of people in this country are now openly urging registrants to avoid and refuse to comply with the draft. A violator of some prominence is Martin Luther King, the civil rights leader who, according to press reports, has turned to a crusade in favor of the Communists in Vietnam as a means of raising money. He recently said he was shooting for $700,000. In aiding the Communists he has bitterly denounced the United States.

A news report out of Cambridge, Mass., dated April 23, 1967, contains this:

> Dr. King said the "Vietnam summer" drive will include anti-draft activities. . .
>
> Earlier, Dr. King told a news conference at Brown University that anyone whose conscience told him the Vietnam war is wrong should declare himself a conscientious objector and avoid the draft.

A U.S. News & World Report article of April 24, 1967, referring to King, reported:

> The Negro leader led off his shift in tactics with an antiwar speech in New York City, in which he called the U.S. Government the "greatest purveyor of violence in the world today" . . . He compared U.S. actions in Vietnam to Nazi tortures in concentration camps.

Mr. Speaker, these are but a few of many similar quotations from this same source. King has been both brazen and open in his violations of the law. And he is joined by more than a score of other sick minds and corrupt souls in urging people to refuse to obey the draft laws.

The American people want to know—and they have a right to know—when is the Department of Justice going to crack down on these disloyal elements in our society? These mercenary crackpots should be shown no mercy. They have gone far beyond the realm of normal dissent. They are actively aiding the Communist cause by giving calculated aid and comfort to the Communist aggressors in Vietnam, while violating the laws of their own country.

This Nation cannot afford to be soft on these culprits at a time when hundreds of thousands of loyal Americans are on the front in Vietnam fighting the enemy which these people are supporting here at home.

Food Stamps Benefit Minnesotans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, nearly 40,000 Minnesotans can attest to the value of the Federal food stamp program under which the diets of the underprivileged are made more nutritional.

During February, the 38,576 participants in 29 Minnesota counties were issued $759,816 worth of food coupons, of which $215,142 were free bonus coupons.

Five additional counties are scheduled to begin operating under the program by July 1.

One of the organizations which has paid tribute to the program is the Minnesota Food Retailers Association. The December 1966 edition of the organization's monthly publication, Minnesota Food Guide, comments:

> The Food Stamp Program in Minnesota is moving toward its objective of helping the state's low-income families get enough food, thus benefiting these folks and food retailers alike.

In spite of the success of the program and its acceptance, it is likely that it will be terminated if legislation pending before the House is passed in its present form.

H.R. 1318, which extends the Food Stamp Act, was reported by the House Agriculture Committee containing a provision requiring that States contribute 20 percent of the cost of the program. This requirement would undoubtedly cause the program to be abolished in Minnesota and many other States which are beset with budget problems.

This undesirable provision should be eliminated from the bill when it comes up in the House.

Minnesota counties now participating are: Dakota, Pipestone, Anoka, Hennepin, Ramsey, Washington, Benton, Big Stone, Chippewa, Crow Wing, Kandiyohi, Lac qui Parle, Renville, Stearns, Swift, Wright, Becker, Beltrami, Hubbard, Otter Tail, Polk, Roseau, Aitkin, Carlton, Itasca, Koochiching, Lake, Pine, and St. Louis.

These counties are scheduled to commerce operating under the act by July 1: Blue Earth, Carver, Cass, Chisago, and Yellow Medicine.

Jessie Fulton Wins AAA Safety Patrol Medal for Saving a Human Life

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to bring to my colleagues' attention the heroic deed of a young constitutent of mine. Jessie Fulton, age 12, from Detroit's Dwyer Elementary School and the son of Mrs. Catherine Phelps, of 10299 Russell Street, will be presented with a Gold Lifesaver Medal from the American Automobile Association on Thursday, May 11, along with eight other young school safety patrol heroes, for saving a human life.

Jessie won the award for saving the life of 5-year-old Wesley Rivers on January 11, 1967. Wesley was returning to school after lunch at the same time Jessie was returning to school from his post as a school safety patrol. Jessie observed that Wesley was running between a parked auto and parked truck, with the driver of an approaching auto apparently unaware of the small youngsters. The traffic was heavy and the car was moving at a speed estimated to be at 35 miles per hour. Jessie, seeing Wesley in danger, ran into the street and without thought of his own safety, ran between the car and truck, picked up Wesley and carried him to safety.

Jessie, along with the other eight youngsters, represents the highest traditions of the safety patrol movement. Their devotion to duty and their ability to act under emergency conditions resulted in the actual saving of human lives. Each of them richly deserves this highest of patrol awards—the AAA Gold Lifesaver Medal.

The awards will be presented by the U.S. Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, on Thursday May 11 at 9 a.m. in the Federal Aviation Agency's third floor auditorium. The ceremony will be attended by parents of the youngsters and law enforcement, education, and AAA club officials. This ceremony will be a prelude to the 31st national school safety patrol parade. The parade will be held on Washington's Constitution Avenue, this Saturday, May 13, at 11 a.m. with 23,000 boys and girls from 22 States and the District of Columbia participating.

Each year, the American Automobile Association joins with the schools and police in sponsoring the national school safety patrol parade in Washington, D.C. Thousands of young people from all over the country participate in this colorful annual event. In conjunction with the parade, the AAA each year presents Gold Lifesaver Medals to those young patrols who have actually saved the life of a schoolmate in traffic danger. These coveted medals are generally presented by a top U.S. official. Among those who have made the presentations in the past are: Presidents Johnson, Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman; Vice Presidents Humphrey and Nixon; FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, and Senator Robert F. Kennedy.

I think the House might be interested in the background and history of the safety patrol movement. The safety patrol was pioneered by the American Automobile Association on a national scale in the early 1920's. Now there are over 900,000 boys and girls from the upper elementary or junior high school grades serving in 40,000 schools in 15,000 communities in every State. There are also some 156,000 patrol members serving in 20 foreign countries. The school safety patrols are organized by the school authorities with the cooperation of police and motor clubs affiliated with the American Automobile Association. The duties of these youngsters are to guide and protect children at school crossings. They are required to stay on the curb in the performance of their duties, and under the patrol rules, are prohibited from directing traffic.

The safety patrol movement has been doing a fine job of promoting safety consciousness among our young people and reducing the number of needless and senseless accidents among schoolchildren. Since the organization of the patrol movement the traffic death rate involving school-age children has dropped by nearly one-half. The American Automobile Association and its affiliated clubs are to be commended for this program.

Cessation of Trade With Communist Nations and Victory in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, a large number of citizens living in Los Angeles County's San Gabriel Valley, which is located in part of the congressional district it is my privilege to represent, have been participating in a unique exercise in good citizenship which I would like to bring to the attention of the Congress.

Under a campaign sponsored by American Legion Post No. 139 of Alhambra, Calif., and the Alhambra Lions Club, hundreds of signatures—about 1,000 at last count—have been obtained on petitions to Congress calling for cessation of trade with the U.S.S.R. and other Communist nations at this time and for victory in Vietnam. The petitions to Congress call for action to accomplish—

> 1. Trade agreements and other commercial activities by which materials of all kinds are furnished to the Soviet Republic and its satellite nations are to be stopped and prohibited for the duration of the state of war in Vietnam and Southeast Asia, and
>
> 2. That the full potential of the military forces of the United States of America be activated and released at once to bring about a victorious settlement of the war in Vietnam and restoration of peace.

These petitions have been a communitywide endeavor. Various businesses in the area are cooperating in obtaining signatures by allowing the petitions to be available for signing in their places of business. Other organizations and clubs are also working on the project.

I commend Alhambra American Legion Post No. 139, the Alhambra Lions Club, and other participating clubs, businesses, and individuals who have joined in this effort. The response to these petitions underscores that the people feel strongly on the subject of trading with Communist nations and the need to bring the Vietnam war to a successful close.

A Great Democrat Speaks Out on Party Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished Postmaster General recently spoke out on some of the major political issues of the day and said things that needed to be said.

Larry O'Brien is uniquely qualified to speak as he recently did in Minnesota. He was the trusted and loyal friend and adviser to President John F. Kennedy. And he is the trusted and loyal friend and adviser to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

Larry O'Brien is a great Democrat—who believes that the principles and programs of our party are vital to the welfare of the American people. And he believes strongly enough in our party not to allow rancor and dissension to interfere with the work of building a better nation.

He reserved some tough words for those who have been trying to divide our party:

> Some of those who claim that they are against Lyndon Johnson because they were so much for John Kennedy were not at all behind John Kennedy before his death—they were doing then what they are doing now: carping, criticizing, picking away.

To this, I say "Amen." I believe that Larry O'Brien has performed a valuable service for Democratic unity by speaking out boldly and honestly.

The fact is, as General O'Brien notes, that President Johnson's record "will stand comparison with that of any great President in our history."

We Democrats have a great President.

We have a great program.

And we have great leadership.

Let us get on with the work of building a great record of accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert General O'Brien's excellent address into the Record:

ADDRESS BY POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN, AT THE JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER, DEMOCRATIC FARMER-LABOR PARTY, MINNEAPOLIS CIVIC AUDITORIUM, MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., APRIL 29, 1967

It is a pleasure to be here with you tonight, and I bring you the greetings of President Johnson who asked me to give you a message.

The President said that from his conversations with the Vice President he probably knows almost as much about politics in Minnesota as he does about politics in Texas. He said he certainly knows that one of America's most creative, effective, productive State organizations is the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party. He knows that you have given a great deal to the nation, in ideas and in men—men like the Vice President and the Secretary of Agriculture and two of our brightest and most effective Senators, Eugene McCarthy and Walter Mondale, and your able House delegation. The President wants you to know that he fully expects this Minnesota-to-Washington aid program to continue. There may be a brain drain going on in Minnesota, but the nation as a whole is better for it.

Of course, there's one good way to put an end to the brain drain, one good way to keep your best people out of political office, one good way to change Minnesota's reputation for enriching Washington with outstanding political leaders.

What is that good way—? The answer can be given in one word. That word is "disunity."

Disunity is bad enough, for disunity is the germ that spreads the disease known as Republican victory.

But disunity that comes from squabbling over lost causes, dead issues, and past mistakes is worse. It is worse because it reflects a form of visual defect for which no corrective glasses have ever been invented. That visual defect is not near-sightedness, or far-sightedness—but past-sightedness. That defect can lock your minds and your energies into yesterday and keep you from meeting the problems of today and tomorrow.

It's a painful and futile visual defect—and it's certain death for a political party.

The other day I read of an interesting group called the "Procrastinator's Club."

It's a humorous organization that specializes in fighting for lost causes.

For example, they set up a picket line, and they carry signs with such flaming slogans as, "Fifty-Four Forty or Fight," "Keep Cool with Coolidge," "Prosperity is Just Around the Corner," "Impeach Chief Justice John Marshall," and "Oppose the Louisiana Purchase."

It sounds like a lot of fun, but that's about all it is.

A political party that spends its energies and time looking backward and chewing over lost causes certainly isn't doing its future any good.

All of us could devote ourselves to assessing blame for what happened here in Minnesota last year. You could let disappointment decay into disaffection, or frustration harden into hatred.

But who would gain from this?

You wouldn't. Your State wouldn't. The effectiveness of the Democratic Farmer-Labor Party wouldn't. And your candidates wouldn't.

The only ones to gain would be Republican candidates. And their gains have a way of transforming themselves into losses for the people.

We all remember that Will Rogers once said, "I am not a member of any organized political party.

"I am a Democrat."

That was good for laughs back in 1922—but let's not forget that the disunity that produced laughs in the Roaring Twenties, also produced an unbroken string of 12 years of Republican Presidents, Republican majorities in the 67th, 68th, 69th, 70th, 71st, and 72nd Congresses and, ultimately, the Dismal Thirties, when the farmer's finest crop was foreclosed mortgages.

This nation can send a man to the moon.

This nation can afford to defend freedom around the world.

This nation can, and at last is, providing medical care for older Americans.

This nation can afford to provide its children with the finest education available.

But the record shows clearly that this nation cannot afford the consequences of conservative victory and reactionary misleadership.

And that is precisely what we will have if we pull apart instead of together.

There is yet another attitude that this nation cannot afford, an attitude that disturbs me deeply, an attitude that the occasion for this dinner brings to mind.

Tonight we pause to honor two great historical leaders of our Party. But they are, as well, Presidents admired by all Americans.

There is no Party monopoly on esteem for Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. Their names are part of our American heritage, honored today by all.

And yet, this was not always so. The gentle genius of Monticello was, during his term of office, the target of abuse so foul and extreme that it threatened for a time to shake even his iron-bound support for freedom of expression.

He was attacked as an intriguing incendiary, a secret enemy of the Constitution, an atheist, an anarchist, a tool of French revolutionaries, a defender of assassination.

His enemies searched through his every written word to find some evidence on which to charge him with sedition.

A prominent New York newspaper claimed that Jefferson would have been capable of "piling together the bodies of Hamilton, Morris. . . . and Adams. . . . to the amount of one or two hundred and burning them on the altar of democracy and lighting the funeral pyre with the defaced leaves of the Constitution."

Jefferson was, in effect, the object of such hatred and denunciation by narrow-minded partisans that, almost as a cry of pain, he said, "Every word of mine which they can get hold of, however innocent, however orthodox, is twisted, tormented, perverted and like the words of holy writ are made to mean everything but what they are intended to mean."

Andrew Jackson, today high on the list of America's greatest Presidents, was also the target of invective and abuse. He was accused in the public press of being a usurper, an adulterer, a gambler, a cock-fighter, a brawler, and a drunkard. A paper in my own State of Massachusetts claimed that he had committed twelve murders, all in cold blood, and in the most cowardly fashion. The viciousness of the attacks is almost beyond belief. And when they got tired of slandering him, they slandered his wife.

We look back on these times amazed. How could Americans fail to see the greatness of these men? How could they possibly stoop so low? Were Americans different and in those days, a step lower on the scale of national evolution?

It might be comforting to think so.

But I am afraid that we are much the same. The proof is easy to come by, too easy to come by. For it is found in the extreme attacks we hear and see against President Johnson.

My friends, I can only say that we in the United States are blessed with far better leadership than we seem to deserve. Some of those who claim that they are against Lyndon Johnson because they were so much for John Kennedy were not at all behind John Kennedy before his death—they were doing then what they are doing now: carping, criticizing, picking away.

We seem to have a national drive to discredit our leadership, to pull down those who, unless they lead wisely and correctly, can cause the demise of this nation.

Our President today carries the heaviest burden of any President in history. The world is more complicated today than ever before. His every waking moment is buffeted by events throughout the world, and even from outer space. His problems, domestic and foreign, are involved almost beyond belief as the cost of misjudgment is beyond calculation.

To maintain his balance and perspective under the minute by minute hail of problems, the press for solutions, is difficult enough—but he must also see into the future, to set our course, to avoid the rocks and shoals that could sink our America and all the world.

We live today in a world where the newest forms of destruction and the oldest enemies of mankind together threaten world stability. A President must deal with the urgency posed by 17,000 mile-an-hour ballistic missiles and the rising threat of world starvation. And he must also show the world that a Democracy can, in freedom, solve its own problems of race, of urban decay, of income distribution.

And his record will stand comparison with that of any great President in our history.

Some day a future generation of Americans will applaud his accomplishments, and will wonder how it was possible for one man to do so much in so short a time under so many sledge hammer blows.

And those future Americans will wonder about us, and how so many of us engaged in low attacks or, almost as bad, stood by and did not raise our voices in defense of our President who is, let us not forget, President of all the people, whose energies are entirely devoted to the nation, and in whose hands rest decisions of life or death, progress or poverty.

Every Administration needs, and I know this Administration welcomes, constructive criticism, but we as a people cannot afford this rising, muddy, destructive tide of blind attacks.

Party disunity is poison for the fortune of a party—but the kind of disunity we see exhibited through attacks on the President is poison for the nation.

Now I know that it is easy for me to come out here and talk about party unity.

And I am well aware of the danger of giving advice.

It's like the little boy who was asked to write a few lines about Socrates. He said, "Socrates was a wise man. He went around giving people advice. They poisoned him."

So free advice is dangerous to give and, too often, worth exactly what you pay for it.

So I am not going to give you advice—rather, I am going to give you a few examples of what unity really means.

I recall very clearly a windswept Boston Common in 1952—walking there with two young men.

One had decided to seek state-wide office in Massachusetts and his brother had determined that he would devote his full time and effort to assist him.

And I also remember the primary route in 1960. I recall particularly Wisconsin and West Virginia and the conversation I had the morning following that West Virginia primary with the defeated candidate.

I will never forget that morning.

That noble man, son of Minnesota, tired, bone tired, from weeks without sufficient sleep, disappointed, naturally.

And yet, at that moment he not grimly hanging on to the disappointment of the past, to the dregs of hope drained. No! He was looking to the future. And so, calmly, firmly, he pledged his support, his full vigor, his total comment, to move our party forward.

My friends, I also recall a hotel room in Los Angeles in 1960.

I remember well a tall Texan coming into that room to meet and be greeted by his leader.

And that Texan on that day said to our nominee, "You have my pledge.

"I will move heaven and earth to help achieve victory as a member of this ticket."

And I also recall a plane at Dallas.

On that plane with the body of our fallen leader—a man I had been intimately associated with for 14 years—I again listened to the words of that tall Texan, who explained carefully to me his constitutional responsibility which he was fully prepared to accept, and pointed out that the world and the nation awaited this grim testing of our democratic form of government.

The key word in his conversation was "continuity."

And he said to me, "I have a constitutional responsibility; you have none.

"But I ask you to stand shoulder to shoulder with me."

I have served two Presidents over these last six years—in close association.

And I recall here so vividly these reminiscences I am sharing with you—that young man on windswept Boston Common, who served his brother, the President, with dedication to the end, and that brave and courageous Democrat from this Great State who travelled the highways and the byways into the communities of West Virginia and reacted as a true soldier at his moment of personal loss; and that tall Texan who travelled the long train route through the South in 1960 and who later assured continuity for this nation at a moment of crisis and great stress as the world awaited with bated breath.

I say to you, my friends, that all three of these men—leaders of our party—indeed all of those who hold national position and whom we look to for guidance, will march shoulder to shoulder in 1968.

They will be together on the continuing upward path to an even greater America.

They will discharge their responsibilities together—their responsibilities to their party—their responsibilities to this nation.

They will, because they know the value of unity and the cost of disunity.

Will you follow in their footsteps? Will you display courage and unity, and lead Minnesota to a better future? I see the answer in the brilliant progressive record of your past, and I know you will be true to your great tradition.

A New Word on Maritime Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN G. DOW

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, our new Secretary of Transportation, Alan S. Boyd, spoke recently before the Senate Subcommittee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the Senate Committee on Commerce. Mr. Boyd made a broad statement on many aspects of our Nation's dilemma about its merchant marine.

Naturally, Mr. Boyd touched on some matters where differences exist and maritime policy is being debated. I do not mean here to offer his thoughts on all points. But I do not believe that the existence of debate within limited portions of this subject should debar us from profiting from many sound observations that Mr. Boyd offers. He has plainly given the subject of our national maritime policy a painstaking study that deserves consideration by all concerned.

Extracts from Secretary Boyd's statement follow:

On March 4, 1935 President Franklin D. Roosevelt said in a special message to Congress:

"An American merchant marine is one of our most firmly established traditions. It was, during the first half of our national existence, a great and growing asset. Since then it has declined in value and importance. The time has come to square this traditional ideal with effective performance." The maritime policy which those words presaged was imaginative, practical, timely and sensible. It was not, however, meant to stand forever. That fact has been painfully evident for some time. Early this year President Johnson asked me to develop a new maritime program which would renew and revitalize the U.S. merchant marine. This I have done and I would like to report for the record my findings to this committee.

Before making that report I would like to clearly state the promise that I made to the President. I told him I would not seek his concurrence in the new program until I could assure him that it had general support within the maritime field—from labor, management and interested governmental units. I told him we would not start out with the idea that there had to be unanimity. But we did believe that unless those who build, manage and operate our ships were in general accord, it would be difficult to seek administration agreement. . . .

Building on past reports and investigations, we identified those elements which must be a part of any maritime program. Then came the job of seeking the support necessary to translate any major program into a legislative proposal.

I have made an effort to talk to the leading figures in the maritime industry. Every viewpoint was duly considered.

However, I must now report that we do not have the kind of agreement which will make such a program a reality. The basic problem borders on paradox. We are faced with an industry which many describe as dying because of a lack of adequate Federal support. We are told that the death of this industry, or its continued decline, would be a tragic blow to our military and economic strength as well as to our national prestige. I have been told that, unlike most other similar problems we face, the only solution to our maritime problem is one that will fully protect every single interest and meet the demands of every single group. Acceptance and agreement is eternally conditioned on meeting these requirements.

It is absolutely impossible to cut through the Gordian Knot of the maritime problem with a single stroke. It must be painstakingly untied—a beginning must be made from which a new policy will gradually emerge.

The truly tragic realization is that the demands confronting us will produce the very thing that everyone fears the most—continuation of the present financial and administrative patchwork—fewer maritime jobs—a shrinking fleet—less work for American shipyards—continuing deterioration of our competitive position. . . .

It is clear that two things must not happen: the maritime industry must not be allowed to die and it must not be nationalized. To do nothing would assure the former and to meet everyone's demands would require the latter.

You do not revitalize an industry by flooding it with Federal dollars and imprisoning it within a wall of protection. What is needed is the provision of incentives so that the inherent energy of free private enterprise is able to do the job.

We must provide the confidence whereby American labor and management will know that the Government stands ready to devote public resources to achieve long-term economic stability.

We must give the public a program which will bring more economic and efficient service in the movement of our commerce.

We must maintain the response capability of this industry to meet national emergency requirements.

We must provide more new ships for our operators to expand their capability to serve our growing foreign trade.

We must undertake research and development work needed to modernize and improve the competitive position of the fleet.

We must give incentives to our shipyards to renovate and improve productivity through application of the latest industrial technology.

We must keep pace with the advancement in streamlining and coordinating transportation administration and regulation.

We must take full advantage of the revolution that is occurring in maritime technology and in containerization. . . .

A greatly expanded research and development program is essential to improve the efficiency of the U.S. Merchant Marine. For this purpose the expenditure of $25 million annually for 5 years is contemplated.

Major emphasis would be placed on problem areas involving high risks but having potentially large benefits. Advanced concepts looking toward competitive systems would be explored. Research on improving terminal operations and reducing shipbuilder's costs would be given high priority.

Shipbuilders would be encouraged to join with the Government in developing shipyards geared to produce a pre-selected type ship at lowest possible costs.

Port authorities similarly would be urged to join with the Government in developing and demonstrating the operation of highly advanced terminals.

The research and development program would highlight systems analyses and the development of simulators and mathematical models for planning purposes. Services of interest to the maritime community, such as gathering and disseminating information would be accelerated. Research will be expanded.

Development of the surface effect ship under a joint program with the Navy will produce a 90-ton test vehicle capable of operating at 100 knots in the open ocean. . . .

CONCLUSION

The effect of the program I have discussed above would be to substantially expand the size of the present merchant fleet. Under present policies the size of our merchant fleet will continue to decline.

An expanded fleet means expanded employment opportunities at sea. A substantial increase in ship construction in U. S. yards also means an increased level of shipyard employment. Under present policies, the total job level will continue to decline.

We believe that the full cooperation of management, labor and Government in implementing the foregoing program would give to the United States a merchant marine and commercial shipbuilding industry that is more productive, competitive, pre-eminent in quality, and fully adequate to our needs.

That is the program which we have sought.

The outstanding question is "What happens now?" I have outlined a maritime program for you this morning, not as an official administration position and not as a signal that there is now an open season on more bargaining. That would imply that there is yet an alternative which will satisfy everyone concerned—I do not believe there is such an alternative. I firmly believe that this program is as humanly close to an acceptable solution as can be found. The history of past efforts to produce a new maritime program indicates this.

This program is not one that was pre-conceived, circulated and then modified. It is a program that was gradually constructed as each party interested in the merchant marine made their views and needs known. I personally hope that each of those parties would not now contemplate revising their views and needs just because this program does not have unanimous support. To start all over again is to do nothing.

In my years of dealing with the maritime problem, I have learned this: to come up with a reasonable and fully acceptable program takes the patience of Job, the wisdom of Solomon, the strength of Samson and the talent of Jezebel. I confess to be exhausted in all but one category—patience. I *do* know the limits of good sense and good economics in any maritime program. I know they cannot be exceeded. I know that eventually a retreat to those limits will occur. My one sincere hope is that it will not be too late.

Experimental Injection Well in Nassau County an Example of Creative Federalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 9, 1967

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, on May 3, 1967, Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall dedicated an experimental injection well at the Nassau County Bay Park Sewage Treatment Plant. The plant is designed to purify the sewage and the well is designed to pump the reclaimed water into the ground under pressure in an attempt to block salt water pollution of Long Island's fresh water supply.

This project illustrates well the concept of "creative federalism" because this experiment was made possible through a partnership of the Federal Government and Nassau County. Imagination and creativity at the local level encouraged by Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson and his board of supervisors, with the assistance and cooperation both financial and technical at the Federal level by Secretary Udall and Interior Department officials, made this dedication possible.

The 1,450,000 residents of Nassau County may look into the near future when there will be an adequate supply of fresh and pure water to meet their growing household needs. Hopefully the water supply will also be adequate to make it unnecessary to curtail use of water for their lawns.

I ask permission to include at this point in the RECORD the remarks of Nassau County Commissioner of Public Works Herbert J. Simins; Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson; and Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall:

REMARKS BY NASSAU COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS, HERBERT J. SIMINS, AT ACTIVATION OF BAY PARK INJECTION PLANT, MAY 3, 1967

On behalf of the Nassau County Department of Public Works, I wish to thank Secretary Udall for honoring us with his presence on this occasion. Nothing could emphasize more strongly the importance of our efforts than to have the nation's top conservation official take the time to come to Long Island to participate in the activation of this plant.

It is particularly fitting for the Secretary of the Interior to be here since through his Department we have received the invaluable technical assistance as well as the essential financing which have enabled us to move forward. This partnership between Federal government and local government has been harmonious and productive and we confidently expect it to result in a meaningful increase in the potable water supply of our growing County.

I should point out, however, that cooperative Federal-local programs require both imagination and initiative on the part of the local government. It has been our Department's good fortune to have in Eugene Nickerson a County Executive who has provided inspiration and encouragement every step of the way. Today's events and distinguished assemblage are certainly a tribute to Eugene Nickerson's vision and his determination to meet and overcome the problems of suburbia.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY NASSAU COUNTY EXECUTIVE EUGENE H. NICKERSON ON THE OCCASION OF THE ACTIVATION OF THE 400-GALLON-PER-MINUTE INJECTION WELL FACILITIES AT THE BAY PARK WATER POLLUTION CONTROL PLANT IN EAST ROCKAWAY

We are most grateful to Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall for taking time out from his busy schedule to visit Nassau County on this important occasion. We also welcome Congressman Herbert Tenzer in whose district this facility is located and who has done so much on behalf of the preservation of our wetlands and in the field of conservation generally.

This pioneering program is designed to halt the 27 million gallon daily fresh water loss due to the intrusion of salt water into the water bearing strata along the south shore of our County. To give you some notion of the importance with which this project is regarded by the Department of the Interior, I must point out that the Federal government has already contributed over $900,000 in funds toward the financing of this injection well. What we learn here at Bay Park can be put to good use in many areas of our nation.

Prior to this ceremony, Secretary Udall was able to inspect our Bay Park Plant. It is, I believe, one of the most efficient plants of its kind in existence. We have made every effort to see that this plant not only performs its necessary functions, but is neither an eyesore nor a contaminator of the atmosphere. In this surrounding area we are now developing park facilities which will include a 9-hole night-lighted golf course. Wherever Nassau County has its facilities we wish to be a good neighbor.

Some months back when the President of the United States visited Nassau County, I learned that a lengthy introduction for a President was considered superfluous since his exalted title alone was sufficient tribute. I believe that we can do no less for our principal guest today and, therefore, I give you the Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR STEWART L. UDALL AT BAY PARK SEWAGE TREATMENT PLANT, EAST ROCKAWAY, LONG ISLAND, N.Y., MAY 3, 1967.

For me, this occasion has a stirring symbolism. We are gathered to dedicate a pioneering research effort to conserve one of the most vital of our natural resources—our fresh water. It is entirely fitting that this conservation effort take place in the home county of President Theodore Roosevelt, who pioneered in the protection of our natural resources from overharvest and ruin by the insatiable appetite of our national development near the turn of the century.

It is entirely fitting also that, in the true American tradition, this vital water-conservation research be carried on as a three-way partnership effort by two scientific bureaus of Interior—the Geological Survey and the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration—and a vigorous, conservation-minded County administration. Such a close and productive partnership has been made possible largely by the progressive program of water-conservation legislation enacted by the Johnson Administration.

On Long Island, as in many other parts of the Nation, the major water problem is not one of short-term shortages or distribution needs. It is, instead, the long-range problem of conserving and managing a huge but vulnerable water resource so as to adequately meet human needs for good-quality water now and in the future.

Although Long Island is blessed with an abundant underground reservoir of fresh water, the drafts on it are large and the price of mismanagement is disaster. The ground water of the Island provides the entire water supply for more than 2 million persons now, and it is destined to supply untold millions in the future. The present pumpage from Long Island wells—almost 400 million gallons per day—is nearly all used for domestic and industrial needs, and this pumpage probably represents the largest such uses of a single ground-water reservoir anywhere in the world. The need for water is increasing almost daily, as population and industry grow. Economic development—a goal of millions of Americans on Long Island and throughout the Nation—is almost inevitably accompanied by increasing water demands.

The size of this reservoir of fresh ground water is truly huge. Interior scientists estimate that at least 20 trillion (million-million) gallons of fresh water are available in it for man's use. About one-fourth of that amount (5 trillion gallons) is beneath Nassau County.

Despite its huge size, however, the fresh-water reservoir could be squandered or spoiled within a few decades through unwise development or widespread contamination. Conversely, by application of the true spirit of conservation—protection *and* wise use—this priceless resource can last indefinitely.

But wise use requires knowledge—knowledge of the natural environment and how man can achieve or restore the balance between himself and his environment. We are dedicating here today an advanced array of "tools"—properly encased in a handsome "toolbox," or field laboratory, which will help our scientists develop that required knowledge.

It is entirely fitting that we are using the most advanced, the most sophisticated tools and concepts in attempting to stretch the available water resources, for we are rocketing along in a technological era. In this era, one age leads to another with increasing speed. In 1945 we entered the Atomic Age. In 1957 we expanded into the Space Age. The tremendous block of conservation legislation enacted by the Johnson Administration has today placed us in yet another period which I like to call the Age of Environmental Quality.

In this Age of Environmental Quality we must maintain our water resources at a suitable quality as well as an adequate quantity. In more and more parts of the Nation we will no longer be able to afford to use our virgin ground water only once before discarding it. However, neither can we afford to endanger the quality of the priceless ground-water reservoirs by deliberately returning high levels of pollution to underground zones containing fresh water. This is why, in the present research efforts here at Bay Park, we are pledged to return underground only water that has been renovated to a clear and sparkling state, and that meets the physical, chemical, and biological standards for drinking water.

I have confidence that the experiments that will begin soon at this magnificent research plant will provide answers to some of the significant problems that have beset previous programs of artificial recharge through wells. For if we are to husband our water most effectively, we must make increasing use of our underground water-bearing rocks as reservoirs in which to store surplus water during seasons of plenty and to furnish water during dry periods. Storage of water in subsurface reservoirs has several advantages: subsurface reservoirs do not constitute flood hazards, they have little or no evaporation losses, they allow use of the land surface for other purposes, and, if properly used, they never wear out.

We are becoming increasingly aware that our obligation to protect our natural heritage of ground water is fully as great as our obligation to clean up and protect our streams. Ground-water reservoirs in North America may contain 2,000 to 3,000 times as much water as is present in river channels at any one time. About 97 percent of the world's stock of fresh water available at any time is beneath the earth's surface. About half of that is within one-half mile of the surface and, therefore, is reasonably accessible.

In coastal regions, the conservation of water involves the special problem of seawater intrusion, which is an inevitable result of intercepting large amounts of seaward-flowing fresh water. Seawater intrusion in coastal subsurface water-bearing rock materials commonly escapes immediate notice and may continue for years without detection. Oftentimes, it is only when sweet well water suddenly turns salty that man is reminded that he must ultimately pay for upsetting nature's balance.

The knowledge that is being developed here, and in the programs of artificial recharge that may result, will benefit all of Long Island, for ground water moves restlessly without regard to manmade boundaries. The knowledge and techniques that are being developed also will have Nationwide and worldwide benefits, for the use of underground water-bearing rocks as reservoirs holds promise as one of the great strides that man can make in trying to restore the balance between himself and his overharvested water supplies.

In the past, when more good water was needed, the natural reaction was to increase the withdrawal—to divert more water from more streams, or to dig more wells. Now we are learning that more water is not always the best answer to a water problem—often the answer is to manage better the water that we already have.

The task of water conservation that is facing the Department of the Interior and all of America's millions is not a small one, but neither is the size of the disaster that awaits us if we default.

Mr. Speaker, our students at the elementary and secondary levels as well as undergraduate and graduate students and residents interested in conservation would do well to plan field trips to the Bay Park site to see this experimental injection well. Such trips will be of great educational value and will also provide an opportunity for the residents of Nassau County to see what is being done in water pollution control and water conservation.

SENATE

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, who knowest our necessity before we ask, and our ignorance, limitations, and fallibility in asking, have compassion, we beseech Thee, upon our infirmity; strengthen us in all noble impulses, and daily increase in us the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and knowledge, and true godliness.

Dowered with privileges and with the stewardship of power as no other nation, may our high estate be to us Thy call to protect the weak and exploited, that through the potent ministry of this Republic of free men all peoples of the earth may be blessed.

"Give us, O God, the strength to build
The city that hath stood
Too long a dream, whose laws are love,
Whose ways are brotherhood;
And where the sun that shineth is
God's grace for human good."

We ask it in the name of that One whose truth shall make us and all men free. Amen.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 666) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1968 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, May 9, 1967, was dispensed with.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session, to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar, beginning with "New Reports."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. Merton W. Stoffle, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the grade of rear admiral;

Capt. Roderick Y. Edwards, Capt. Robert W. Goehring, Capt. Ross P. Bullard, and Capt. Orvan R. Smeder, U.S. Coast Guard, for promotion to the grade of rear admirals.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I also report favorably sundry nominations in the Coast Guard. Since these names have previously appeared in the Congressional Record, in order to save the expense of printing them on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

Melvin J. Hartman, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned officers in the Coast Guard; and

Robert Jiudice, and sundry other officers, to be permanent commissioned warrant officers in the Coast Guard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports from committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert H. McBride, of the District of Columbia, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The legislative clerk read the nomination of R. Peter Straus, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—AIR FORCE AND ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Air Force and the Army which had been placed on the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

SALINE WATER CONVERSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 210, H.R. 6133.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 6133) to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Act of July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 328), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1951 et seq.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) In section 8 strike out "$90,000,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $185,000,000," and insert $105,782,000, plus such additional sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize and appropriate but not to exceed $169,218,000,".

(b) In subsection 2(b) after "laboratory," insert "test bed,".

(c) At the end of subsection 2(b) change the semicolon to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That a detailed report concerning any test bed plant, module, or component costing in excess of $1,000,000 shall be submitted to the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and the House of Representatives: *Provided, further*, That the five demonstration plants authorized by the Act of September 2, 1958 (70 Stat. 1706), as amended (42 U.S.C. 1958(d)), shall hereafter be regarded as test beds subject to the provisions of this Act, but the provisions of sections 3 and 6 of such Act and those provisions of section 4 relating to the method of disposal and disposition of the proceeds of sale shall continue to be applicable to them;".

(d) In subsection 2(c) strike out "demonstration" and insert "prototype".

(e) By adding a new section 9 to read as follows: "This Act may be cited as the 'Saline Water Conversion Act'."

SEC. 2. Of the amount of $105,782,000 authorized to be appropriated by section 8 of Saline Water Conversion Act, the unappropriated balance of $23,282,000 may be appropriated and combined with $3,500,000 heretofore appropriated but remaining unobligated at the end of fiscal year 1967, to carry out the program during the fiscal year 1968, as follows:

(i) Research and development operating expenses, not more than $18,532,000;

(ii) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion test beds and test facilities, not more than $4,298,000;

(iii) Design, construction, acquisition, modification, operation, and maintenance of saline water conversion modules, not more than $2,190,000;

(iv) Administration and coordination, not more than $1,762,000:

Provided, however, That expenditures and obligations under any of these items except the last may be increased by not more than 10 per centum if such increase is accompanied by an equal decrease in expenditures and obligations under one or more of the other items, including the last.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 219), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF THE MEASURE

The purpose of this legislation, which was proposed by the administration, is to authorize additional appropriations for the saline water conversion program and amend the Saline Water Conversion Act in certain other respects. The increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated, will make available for appropriation in fiscal year 1968 a total of $26,782,000, which is the amount recommended in the President's budget. The basic act is amended to provide authority for "test bed" plants and for redesignating "demonstration plants" as "prototype plants," thus clarifying the definitions for the full sequence in the development of a process and conforming the terminology in the act to that currently in use throughout the industry. In addition, the demonstration plant program is integrated into the regular research and development program, and authority is provided for using the existing demonstration plants as test bed plants.

The Senate version requires that a detailed report concerning any test bed plant, module, or component costing in excess of $1 million shall be submitted to the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives.

BACKGROUND

Federal research activities in the field of saline water conversion began in 1952 (act of July 3, 1952, 66 Stat. 328). What was then conceived of as a 5-year program costing $2 million has been renewed periodically and has steadily expanded (act of June 29, 1955, 69 Stat. 198; September 2, 1958, 72 Stat. 1706; September 22, 1961, 75 Stat. 628; and August 11, 1965, 79 Stat. 509). Appropriations under these acts for basic and applied research and for demonstration plants have totaled about $110 million.

The present request for an increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated is an outgrowth of the action taken by the 89th Congress in the act last cited above. The Congress then had before it an administration proposed calling for an extension of the saline water conversion program through the fiscal year 1972 and a $200 million increase in the amount authorized to be appropriated. It concluded that, though it was proper enough for the Office of Saline Water to be given a firm basis on which to plan operations over a 5-year period at an estimated cost of $185 million, the program should be reviewed annually and that actual appropriation authorizations should likewise be sought annually. The reasoning behind these conclusions was summarized in the "Statement of the Managers on the Part of the House" when the legislation came out of the conference committee (H. Rept. 720, 89th Cong.):

The language recommended by the conference committee is necessary, in our judgment, if the responsibilities of the Congress for this program are to be met. The adoption of this language is not to be interpreted as a lack of confidence in the executive branch. The inclusion of the $185 million figure indicates approval for planning purposes of the full program recommended by the President.

By its very nature, saline water conversion is a program where it is quite uncertain from one year to the next what direction the research effort is to take. It is understandable that the program presented to the Congress for the 5-year extension was in terms only of the goals which it was hoped might be attained. The prosecution of this program for another 5 years will involve important policy decisions which cannot be made at this time—decisions which are primarily the responsibility of the Congress.

Under the language adopted by the conference committee, the program for the 5-year period can be planned and formulated as recommended by the President. The $90 million ceiling on the amount authorized to be appropriated makes available $35 million or $6 million more than the preliminary program of the Office of Saline Water for fiscal year 1967. Beginning in fiscal year 1968, it is the position of the conference committee that the research and development work to be accomplished under this program should be approved on a year-by-year basis. Therefore, the Department of the Interior should submit to the Congress at the appropriate time legislation to approve the research and development work proposed to be accomplished in fiscal year 1968.

PRESENT LEGISLATION

On February 27, the Department of the Interior submitted S. 1101 and H.R. 6133 to the Congress to provide for continuing the saline water conversion program. The legislation called not only for the authorization of appropriations for fiscal year 1968 but for the authorization of amounts expected to be needed in fiscal years 1969 and 1970.

In addition, it proposed several amendments to the basic act. One of the amendments recommended proposed to add the term "test bed" in order to give the Secretary authority to construct and use test beds; that is, intermediate size plants in the research and development work. Another called for integration of the existing demonstration plants into the regular research program in order to permit them to be used as test beds in conducting further research. A third amendment substituted the word "prototype" for the word "demonstration" in the reference to the type of plant which must be recommended to the Congress and specifically authorized by the Congress.

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amended the House-passed bill by deleting the provision to require that any test bed plant, module or component costing in excess of $1 million be specifically authorized by Congress, believing that this would create an unnecessary administrative and legislative burden. Instead, your committee provides that a detailed report concerning all information about such facilities must be submitted to the respective Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Since both the House and Senate committees intend to require an annual appropriation authorization in the future, any specific project regardless of cost could be specifically authorized at the time the annual bill is considered, if such a detailed authorization is the desire of Congress. However, there may be instances where one project that is planned for the future may be programed to begin near the end of the fiscal year. Under the language of the House bill, the Department would be required to return to Congress for authorization before continuing with the project. If both committees are fully informed of any such proposal as required by the Senate amendment, and objections are raised, it is extremely doubtful that the Office of Saline Water would proceed further with the project until the next authorization bill or unless the questions raised by the Committee have been satisfactorily answered.

RESOLUTION OF THE INDIANA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. HARTKE], I send to the desk a certified copy of House Concurrent Resolution 39 adopted by the recent session of the Indiana General Assembly memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make a feasibility study of a navigable Wabash waterway joining the Ohio River with Lakes Erie and Michigan.

I ask that this resolution be printed and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make a feasibility study of a navigable Wabash Waterway joining the Ohio River with Lakes Erie and Michigan in accordance with the recommendations of the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission as contained in the Commission's report entitled "Cross-Wabash Valley Waterway"

Whereas, the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission was created in 1959 under the authority of the Wabash Valley Compact between the States of Indiana and Illinois and approved by the Congress of the United States, and,

Whereas, the Commission was organized for the purpose of formulating a plan for the development of the human and natural resources within the 33,100 square miles comprising the Wabash Valley in Indiana and Illinois, and,

Whereas, the said Commission has conducted study and research to determine the impact of such a waterway upon the economy of the Wabash Valley and has published a summarization thereof, which indicates potential savings to the people of the States of Indiana and Illinois in excess of $90 million per year through use of the waterway and which identifies among other developments a possibility of developing extensive recreational facilities and a valuable source of water for industrial use which together with other preliminary findings indicate a probable development of extensive employment opportunities, and,

Whereas, a further study to determine the feasibility of the development of a Cross-Wabash Valley Waterway in accordance with the published report is indicated as being highly desirable; Therefore,

Be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana, the Senate concurring:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to authorize the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make a feasibility study of the development of a Cross-Wabash Valley Waterway pursuant to and in accordance with the conclusions and recommendations prepared and published by the Wabash Valley Interstate Commission and that the Congress fund such study.

DENNIS H. HEEKE,
Representative.
RICHARD A. BOEHNING,
Representative.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. MUNDT, from the Committee on Government Operations, without amendment:

S. 188. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials (Rept. No. 221).

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, it is with a feeling of pride, frustration, and resolve that I address the Chair to report S. 188, a bill to create a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials from the Government Operations Committee.

I speak with pride not because I have authored the bill, but because the committee on which I sit has so quickly and competently reacted to the most recent Supreme Court opinion dealing with obscenity or smut. I mean, of course, the ruling Monday by the High Court, which further muddied the waters of the laws against obscenity. There, by another divided decision, the Supreme Court ruled that certain magazines did not violate the existing laws against obscene publications.

The most significant fact on this latest ruling is that we have further demonstration of the vital need for legal definitions of what constitutes obscene materials from which uniform laws can be developed.

Several Court rulings have now been given on obscenity and the degree of difference in each decision indicates that we are still trying to swim in a swamp because clear-cut legal guidelines are lacking.

I think the members of the committee are to be congratulated for their alert action in getting the legislative machinery rolling to provide an answer to this perplexing problem, so perplexing that the Court itself noted that they were divided over what publications are and are not obscene.

S. 188 would provide that a commission be established to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene and noxious materials, and to, first, seek means of improving coordination between various levels of government to suppress such traffic, and second, endeavor, through the cooperation of various information and communication media, to inform the public about the problem and to further the objectives of the Commission; and third, report its findings and recommendations as to what legislative, administrative, or other forms of action need to be taken to combat the traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

The study of the Commission, composed as it would be of an impartial body of experts, can be of great benefit in clearing away many legal cobwebs. It would also be of great help in coming to grips with questions of censorship. Creation of this Commission is, in fact, the best way to avoid censorship.

However, there is one further aspect which I feel is vital. This Commission is charged with the responsibility of providing information on what action can be taken at local levels of government and by individuals. The power of the individual is almost unlimited. It only has to have direction and stimulation. Most of the problems could be solved in many communities if people knew how they can and should react. Information of this kind would be most valuable. It would have the most far-reaching effect.

I speak with frustration because I believe the need for such a commission has been demonstrated repeatedly in the past and still we have yet to enact into law this bill which has had wide bipartisan support—28 Senators this year alone—for several years.

I think there is a need for Congress to act. Surely there has been enough public outcry for action to merit legislation of this kind. If there had not been such a demand, I am sure the Senate would not have passed this bill three times without dissent.

Mr. President, I also speak with resolve. A resolve to carry this battle through to completion and to take this first vital step to stop the flow of smut and filth that daily intrudes upon our lives. I am encouraged by the vigorous action taken in the House on a companion bill. They have already held hearings and I was honored to testify before their subcommittee. They will soon, I hope, favorably report a bill introduced by Representative DOMINICK DANIELS, of New Jersey. I believe we are on the verge of success in the big battle to develop effective laws to bring an end to a multimillion-dollar racket which is not merely an under-the-counter traffic in pornography but places in the hands of children the most vile and rotten trash imaginable.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of the Government Operations Committee and the bill S. 188 be printed after my remarks along with an editorial entitled "Big Day for Smut," from Tuesday's Evening Star.

Mr. President, Tuesday was the day when the Supreme Court made its last bad decision encouraging the peddling of smut.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of Virginia in the chair). The report will be received and placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the bill, report, and editorial will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 188), creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials, the report (No. 221), and the editorial, were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1. The Congress finds that traffic in obscene matters and materials is a matter of grave national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. The Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation. The State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials. Governmental action to be effective needs the support and cooperation of an informed public. It is the purpose of this Act to bring about a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat by all constitutional means this pernicious traffic.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) Number and Appointment.—The Commission shall be composed of twenty members, appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) One from the Senate;

(2) One from the House of Representatives;

(3) Two from the Post Office Department;

(4) Two from the Department of Justice, one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(5) One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(6) Three from the clergy;

(7) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of secondary education;

(8) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of higher education;

(9) One who shall be a prominent librarian;

(10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;

(12) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;

(13) One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industries;

(14) One from among the attorneys general of the several States;

(15) One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government; and

(16) One who shall be a chief law enforcing officer of a city or county government.

(b) Vacancies.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Continuation of Membership Upon Change of Status.—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

Sec. 5. Eleven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) Members of Congress.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members From the Executive Branch.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members From Private Life.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 9. (a) Investigation, Analysis, and Recommendations.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials at the various levels of governmental responsibility;

(2) to provide for the development of a plan for improved coordination between Federal, State, and local officials in the suppression of such traffic;

(3) to determine ways and means of informing the public as to the origin, scope, and effects of such traffic, and of obtaining public support in its suppression;

(4) to secure the active cooperation of leaders in the field of mass media for the accomplishment of the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(5) to formulate recommendations for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic; and

(6) to analyze the laws pertaining to traffic in noxious and obscene matters and materials, and to make such recommendations to the Congress for appropriate revisions of Federal laws as the Commission may deem necessary in order to effectively regulate the flow of such traffic.

(b) Report.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than January 31, 1967. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 10. (a) Hearings and Sessions.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Advisory Committees.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission (1) may constitute such advisory committees within States composed of citizens of that State, and (2) may consult with Governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local government and private organizations, as it deems advisable. Any advisory committee constituted pursuant to this subsection shall carry out its duties without expense to the United States.

(c) Obtaining Official Data.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

PURPOSE

S. 188 provides that a Commission will be established to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene and noxious materials. and to (1) seek means of improving coordination between various levels of government to suppress such traffic; (2) endeavor, through the cooperation of various information and communication media, to inform the public about the problem and to further the objectives of the Commission; and (3) report its findings and recommendations as to what legislative, administrative, or other forms of action need to be taken to combat the traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

S. 188 is similar to S. 162, a bill introduced in the 87th Congress, which was favorably reported by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate (S. Rept. 284) and passed by the Senate.

In the 86th Congress, the Government Operations Committee of the Senate reported S. 3726 (S. Rept. 1749) and in the 89th Congress the committee reported S. 309 (S. Rept. 1355) which were identical to S. 188, and these bills were passed by the Senate.

This legislation has been introduced in an effort to bring about a workable and effective program to fight the traffic in obscene and noxious matters and materials. While considerable interest has been shown by Congress and by the general public in the serious problems involved in the distribution of pornographic literature, no single effective piece of legislation has been adopted which deals a crippling blow to this insidious industry.

Many religious, patriotic, and service organizations and groups have been continually urging Congress to take action on this serious and menacing problem. The Congress has taken note of the widespread harm done to youth and others through the dissemination of lewd, obscene, and noxious materials, and a number of bills have been introduced in Congress on the subject.

Twenty-eight additional Senators have joined in the sponsorship of this bill. It is the belief of the sponsors that the best approach to the problems resulting from the distribution of obscene materials would be through the establishment of a commission which could thoroughly examine all the facets of the problems and could then recommend steps to be taken both by legislative bodies and by private groups and citizens to meet the threat posed by the dissemination of obscene matters.

It is the belief of the sponsors that this small group of experts, drawn from a wide area of interests, could make recommendations and initiate action more effectively.

The Commission is to be made up of persons from several walks of life to have knowledge of the seriousness of the problem and the many legal problems connected with the suppression of the traffic in obscene materials.

The Commission will study the need for any new Federal regulations for controlling such traffic, as well as the general need for State laws or local ordinances for this purpose.

Efforts will be made by the Commission to alert the public, especially the parents and school-age children, about the seriousness of this pernicious traffic and give guidance to the public in suppressing the distribution of such lewd and obscene matters, or in bringing the purveyors of filth into court.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

The following Government agencies will have representatives on the Commission: The Post Office Department, the Department of Justice (including the Federal Bureau of Investigation), and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There will also be one Member from the House of Representatives and one Member of the Senate on the Commission.

Public members are selected from groups knowledgeable on this question both from a moral aspect and from a law enforcement aspect. This will include three clergymen, a secondary school official, a State attorney general, a county or city prosecutor, and a county or city law enforcement officer.

Representatives from the information and communications media will sit on the Commission. One member will come from the moving-picture industry, one from the radio-television industry, and one from the publishing industry.

This group will represent all segments of the population concerned with the problems resulting from distribution of noxious and obscene matters and materials.

The editorial presented by Mr. Mundt is as follows:

[From the Evening Star, May 9, 1967]

Big Day for Smut

A number of smutty publications which had been declared obscene in three states—New York, Kentucky and Arkansas—now enjoy, thanks to a majority of the Supreme Court, the mantle of constitutional protection.

This latest ruling reveals a court that is hopelessly divided on the issue of what constitutes punishable obscenity. At least two of the justices think that anything goes. The attitudes of the others vary in more or less significant respects. But the impression which survives is that this court would sanction almost any kind of smut as long as it does not involve the forbidden "pandering" aspects of the Ginzburg case. And that was a 5-to-4 decision.

The dissenting opinion by Justices Harlan and Clark points out that the majority changed the rules in the middle of the game in this instance. The grounds upon which the court originally agreed to review the three cases were abandoned, with the result that the issue of obscenity or otherwise was not dealt with either in the briefs or in the arguments. "In short," said Justice Harlan, "the court disposes of the cases on the issue that was deliberately excluded from review, and refuses to pass on the questions that brought the cases here."

He went on to say that "in my opinion these dispositions do not reflect well on the processes of the court, and I think the issues for which the cases were taken should be decided."

We would go a step farther. Not only should the issues (of obscenity or otherwise) have been decided, but they should have been decided so as to make punishable the sale of "girlie" junk which, masquerading as "literature," is contributing its not insubstantial bit to the corruption of our society.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I wish to concur in the expressions which have just been made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. I read the editorial to which the Senator referred which was printed in the Evening Star entitled "Big Day for Smut," and I, of course, read the opinion of the Supreme Court reversing the number of decisions in which individuals were convicted of selling pornographic and licentious material.

Mr. President, unless something is done to reach this problem, it is frightening to think of the impact that showings in books and literature will have upon the moral fabric of the people of our country.

Last week I rejoiced when I read in the Cincinnati Enquirer the report that a jury of 12, consisting of eight women and four men, convicted three persons engaged in the selling of books, who were violating a State law prohibiting the sale of pornographic material.

The judge sentenced the principal offender in two pronouncements to run concurrently of 1 year to 7 years imprisonment and a $5,000 fine. I was stimulated in the belief that here was an effort made to reach these offenders. Then, with shock, I read about the Supreme Court's pronouncement on this subject. I have the feeling that the conviction by the Cincinnati jury, when it reaches the Supreme Court, will probably be reversed.

Mr. President, we must do something to cope with this dangerous moral problem confronting our country today. It is my understanding that it is the proposal of the committee, on which the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt] just reported, for a Commission to be created to study ways and means to cope with the problem. Do I understand that correctly, I ask the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator is exactly correct. It would coordinate the efforts of local and State governments, as well as the Federal Government.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Would it be its purpose to evolve a bill to stem the challenges to our Constitution which have been made by the Supreme Court?

Mr. MUNDT. I am confident that it will stem the challenges to our Constitution. I hope that it will also stem the challenges being made on it by the Supreme Court.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the editorial to which I have referred is an excellent one and deserves to be read by all Senators. It does not hesitate to point out the dangers of this problem. Apparently, it is difficult to decide what is prurient literature or motion pictures which will not be knocked down by the Supreme Court.

I give my full support to the proposal made by this committee.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator. I think we are going to get fast action in the Senate on this corrective measure.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the Cincinnati case, Mrs. David—Polly—King, with her two employees, was arrested, prosecuted and convicted of possessing obscene books; namely, "Super Dyke," "The Sex Seller," "Sex Class," and "Hush, Hush, Sweet Harlot."

The trial lasted approximately 4 weeks. The judge sentenced Polly King to two consecutive terms of 1 to 7 years in the Marysville, Ohio, Reformatory, and fined her $4,000. Her employee, George Potts, was fined $3,000, and John Stone was fined $500.

I want especially to commend the work of the Hamilton County, Ohio, prosecutor, Melvin G. Rueger, and his assistants, Frederick J. Cartolano and Carl W. Vollman, who ably and skillfully handled the prosecution of the case.

Also, I commend the two policemen, Col. Jacob Schott and Col. Henry Sandman, for their part in bringing these people to justice.

I pay tribute to Judge Keefe for his firm stand in dealing with this menace to our society.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I, too, commend the remarks and the ideas of the Senator from South Dakota.

I state, with emphasis, my approval of everything he has said. There is not only urgency about this matter, but also a demand that his suggestion be carried out. I hope that the legislative branch will have strong representation on any commission so created.

Mr. MUNDT. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. Let me say that there will be representation by the legislative branch.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JORDAN of Idaho (for himself and Mr. Church):

S. 1733. A bill to provide for the differenti-

ation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Jordan of Idaho when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1734. A bill to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported olives; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Mansfield):

S. 1735. A bill for the relief of Hill County, Mont.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Morse, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Fong, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Inouye, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. McGee, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Montoya, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1736. A bill to provide increased opportunities for students in higher education for off-campus employment by establishing programs of work-study cooperative education; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN (by request):

S. 1737. A bill to require all insured banks to clear checks at par; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1738. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nelson Jose Ceballos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1739. A bill to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association; and

S. 1740. A bill to provide a comprehensive program for the control of drunkenness and the prevention and treatment of alcoholism in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Brooke, and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 1741. A bill to provide certain Federal controls over foreign banking corporations operating within the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1742. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend until July 25, 1970, the termination date for home, farm, and business loans under such chapter in the case of veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 1743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals to elect to take a credit against their Federal income tax for one-half of the State and local income taxes paid by them, in lieu of deducting such taxes; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pearson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1744. A bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Thurmond when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1745. A bill for the relief of Kwan Pakhunt, Chen Yuk-oi, Kwan Mun Ying and Kwan Mo Hing;

S. 1746. A bill for the relief of Kwan Wo, Chow Shui-Ying, Kwan So-Chik, Kwan So-Kam, Kwan Kin Man, Kwan Kin Yuen and Kwan Sze Chun; and

S. 1747. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prescribe punishment for persons who unlawfully refuse induction into the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1748. A bill for the relief of Dr. Ramiro de la Riva Dominguez; and

S. 1749. A bill for the relief of Dr. Enrique Jose Catasus Soto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. Monroney):

S. 1750. A bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa and in Oklahoma and the Sac and Fox of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 138 and 143; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Harris when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THURMOND:

S. 1751. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire certain real property in the District of Columbia determined to be necessary for use as a headquarters site for the Organization of American States or as sites for offices of other international organizations or governments of foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

ENDORSEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL BIOLOGICAL PROGRAM

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the quality of man's life, his health and his welfare, concerns us all. But, everyday, we are witness to a dangerous deterioration of our environment—pollution of the air we breathe and of the water we drink, decay of living conditions in our cities and in our towns, shortages of food and death from mounting starvation around the world, an exploding world population which has increased 2½ billion in 1950 to approximately 3½ billion today, and is expected to double in the next 35 years, a continuing loss of life to the chief killers of our people—heart disease, cancer, and stroke—which annually take the lives of approximately 1½ million Americans, as well as many other social problems of great magnitude.

These are some of the challenges we face, and they are challenges to which we must respond. Science and technology have brought us wondrous results in the past; we no longer helplessly fear the crippling effects of polio, we have vaccines for measles and some of the more virulent viruses. We have cures for many of the diseases which brought terror to every parent within the memory of all of us.

With such thoughts in mind I would like to call attention to an important cooperative international biological research program which will direct itself to the solution of some of the scientific aspects of these problems. I refer to the international biological program.

The IBP, as it is called, is being organized under the auspices of the International Council of Scientific Unions and the International Union of Biological Sciences; it has been in the planning stage since 1963 and is scheduled to get underway in July of this year.

When fully implemented the IBP will involve some 25,000 biologists in 60 nations in a cooperative attack on problems of major importance. The IBP will in some ways be similar to the very successful International Geophysical Year program, which spanned a 5-year period between 1956–60. It will transcend national boundaries and philosophies and will demonstrate once again that the needs of mankind and the language of science are universal.

The U.S. participation in the IBP has been organized under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering. It has attracted, and will continue to attract, the attention of many of our most distinguished biologists. It will, as well, give added attention and needed impetus to the emerging field of biomedical engineering and will open channels of communication among scientists of many nations for the benefit of all mankind.

In recognition of the importance of the international biological program, I introduce for appropriate reference a concurrent resolution and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record, at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, the concurrent resolution will be printed in the Record, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. Con. Res. 26

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress hereby finds and declares that the international biological program, which was established under the auspices of the International Council of Scientific Unions and the International Union of Biological Sciences and which is sponsored in the United States by the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering, will provide a unique and effective means of meeting the urgent need for increased study and research related to biological productivity and human welfare in a changing world environment.

The Congress commends and endorses the international biological program and expresses its support of the United States National Committee and the Interagency Coordinating Committee, which together have the immediate responsibility for planning, coordinating, and carrying out such program in the United States.

The Congress calls upon all Federal departments and agencies and all persons and organizations, both public and private, to support and cooperate fully with the program and the activities and goals of such Committees.

ACREAGE LIMITATION AND RECLAMATION LAW

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the proposed application of acreage limitations relating to privately held lands under the Reclamation Act of 1902 has placed in jeopardy the continued effective operation of two farms in Idaho which are owned by the public, operated at public expense, and in existence for the public benefit.

Section 5 of the Reclamation Act states that "no right to the use of water for land in private ownership shall be sold for a tract exceeding 160 acres to any one landlord." This year the University of Idaho was advised that its Caldwell Branch Agricultural Experiment Station would be required to comply with the 160-acre limitation or be deprived of water deliveries. The Idaho State School and Hospital, an institution for the mentally retarded, was similarly advised in regard to the farm it operates as part of its rehabilitation and training efforts.

Ownership of these publicly held farms has been construed, for the purposes of the law, as private ownership. Thus, legislative action to clarify this matter and provide for the exemption of the public lands in question is dictated to permit these farms to continue to carry on the nonprofit functions they were established to perform.

I do not believe the original Reclamation Act was intended to apply in such cases. I do not believe that the term, private ownership, was intended to include lands owned by a State, county, municipality, or school.

Enforcement of the limitations applicable to private lands would in the case of these farms impose a crippling restriction on their operations which could very well force their closure. At the least, adherence to these limitations would necessitate disposition of property and minimize the public benefit of these farms which in the past has proven substantial.

Neither of the farms comprise really extensive acreages. The managers and administrators of both feel strongly that maintenance of these farms in their present size is necessary and justified in the public interest.

To underscore the anomalies of this issue, I think it should be pointed out that if corrective legislation is not enacted, it will be possible for a man and wife to hold and receive water for 320 acres of land on a Federal reclamation project while a State, county, municipality or school will be limited to 160 acres.

I assume that similar problems have or may arise in States other than Idaho affected by the Reclamation Act. Therefore I now introduce a bill which will clarify all such problems, eliminating any question as to the intent of Congress.

This bill will not in any way affect the acreage limitation under the Reclamation Act as it applies to those persons, companies or corporations which are truly private landowners. It is a simple measure. It merely provides that the limit on acreage of irrigable land held in private ownership which may receive irrigation benefits from Federal reclamation works shall not be applicable to lands owned by States, political subdivisions and agencies thereof, and local public bodies organized pursuant to State law for nonprofit purposes performing functions which are of a public nature.

Mr. President, Congress is firmly committed to education, to agricultural research, to the development of a viable agricultural economy and to the rehabilitation and training of the mentally retarded. I do not think we intend or desire to permit a feature of land law, which is itself designed to protect the public, to operate in a manner prejudicial to this commitment.

I am pleased to be joined in sponsorship of this measure by my distinguished colleague Senator Frank Church.

I ask unanimous consent that our bill be printed in the Record at this point.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1733) to provide for the differentiation between private and public ownership of lands in the administration of the acreage limitation provisions of Federal reclamation law, introduced by Mr. Jordan of Idaho (for himself and Mr. Church), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1733

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof and supplemental thereto) which limit the acreage of irrigable land held in private ownership which may receive irrigation benefits from, through, or by means of Federal reclamation works, shall not be applicable to lands owned by States, political subdivisions and agencies thereof, and local public bodies organized pursuant to State law for non-profit purposes and performing functions which, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, are of public nature and purpose.

PROTECTION FOR THE AMERICAN OLIVE INDUSTRY

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, some of the richest olive groves in the Western Hemisphere are located in the valleys of California. My State is among the principal producers of olives in America and the world. A large segment of California's economy is dependent on the continued vitality of this important industry. Today, our olive producers are facing a serious challenge from the increased imports that are flooding American markets.

Prior to the last 6 months, foreign olive imports were largely in bulk shipments, which were packaged within the continental limits of the United States. This form of importation did not seriously affect California production since the domestic cost of labor tended to keep both American and foreign products on a competitive level. But the situation has drastically changed.

New and modern packaging plants are being established in Spain and are now importing vast quantities of packaged green olives into the United States. These olives are being offered on the west coast today for $3.75 per case below the same item packaged in California. The primary difference is solely one of labor. The California olive industry is paying approximately a rate per hour equal to the rate per day paid by the Spanish bottling plants. It is virtually impossible for the California industry to meet such unfair competition. The olive oil segment of our domestic olive production has already been lost because of imports of foreign olive oil, and it is not likely that it will ever again be regained. If another vital segment of the olive industry is lost because of imports, the very stability of the industry itself is doomed.

It would be a tragedy for California and the Nation if these unfair practices are allowed to continue. The domestic industry has taken considerable steps toward self-help programs to assure the American consumer of a quality product. It has encouraged sales through promotion and advertising. It has promoted progress through research at all levels, from the growers' problems of production, mechanical harvesting, and proper uses of insecticides and other spray chemicals, to research in processing to find better techniques to reduce costs and to improve the American product. This Nation cannot allow these efforts to go for naught because of foreign imports.

Mr. President, I am today introducing proposed legislation which will add olives to the list of commodities covered by section 8(e) of the Agricultural Marketing Act. This would require imports to meet the same quality and size requirements as those imposed on the domestic olive industry under the present Federal marketing order. This legislation will not only provide increased protection for the American consumer but also will bring foreign olive import prices to a more competitive level. The olive industry in this Nation realizes that its size places it at a disadvantage in obtaining adequate tariff protection through the Congress. For this reason, I am hopeful that this proposal will be expeditiously acted upon by the Senate in order to protect this vital California and American industry.

I send my bill to the desk for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed at this point in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, as requested by the Senator from California.

The bill (S. 1734) to amend section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing

Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, so as to provide for the extension of the restrictions on imported commodities imposed by such section to imported olives, introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1734

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 8e of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, as reenacted and amended by the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and as amended by the Agricultural Act of 1961, is amended by inserting in the first sentence thereof between "tomatoes" and "avocados," the following: "olives."

EXPANDING COOPERATIVE EDUCATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, today I am introducing, together with Senator Kuchel as chief Republican sponsor, a bill to expand the opportunities for cooperative education, which is a system of alternate full-time academic study and full-time work for cooperating employers. Under this system the student gains both practical experience in full-time employment and the funds with which to meet a large share of his academic expense. I am pleased that this bill has the support of a considerable number of other Senators from both sides of the aisle, including the distinguished chairman of the Education Subcommittee [Mr. Morse]. The Hartke-Kuchel bill has been assured hearings as an amendment to title IV of the Higher Education Act, and in fact there has already been field hearing consideration by the subcommittee.

The bill provides for a 5-year program of assistance in encouraging more institutions to set up cooperative education programs, and for expanding programs where they exist, provided the applications are approved by the Commissioner of Education in cooperation with an eight-member Advisory Committee on the Development of Work-Study Cooperative Education Programs in Higher Education. No one institution may receive a grant in excess of $65,000 in any one year. The total authorization is very modest in view of the results which can be obtained—less than $8 million per year, $725,000 of which is earmarked for grants for the training of persons in the establishment and administration of such programs and for research in this field.

There is a great and growing interest on the part of our institutions of higher education in developing these programs. Within recent months there have been significant statewide meetings of educators and persons concerned with the possibilities in the States of New Mexico, at which both Senators Anderson and Montoya spoke; Oregon, in which discussion was led by Senator Morse—and I might add that Senator Hatfield is also one of the cosponsors; and in my own State of Indiana, where likewise we had a good attendance and genuine enthusiasm.

Let me enumerate quickly some of the advantages of this uniquely American educational system, in which there are at present 112 institutions and 56,000 students engaged, students whose payroll from their full-time jobs in the alternate periods away from the classroom runs to $95 million. I shall elaborate on some of these points a little later, but the advantages include:

A greater degree of self-help to the students, encouraging particularly those from the lowest economic levels.

A fuller use of existing academic facilities at a time when the strain upon them is excessive, since with half the students away from the campus at any one time, and since there are no long vacation periods, the educational plant can thus serve more than double the usual number of students.

A highly practical means of assuring employment opportunities after graduation, since the demand for these graduates is high and many find permanent positions with their cooperative employers.

A highly advantageous learning process, combining the practical experience with the academic.

Mr. President, if we are to meet our educational responsibilities to space-age youth, we must support the expansion of tested innovations in higher education that experience and research have shown to be effective, useful, and productive. The administration has quite rightly included in the message on education of last February 28, a request that an amendment be made to the Higher Education Act of 1965 to make possible Federal support for expanding work-study cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education, an objective this bill fulfills.

In 60 years of successful experience with the concept of work-study cooperative education, this form of education has proven to have exceptional significance of adding, in the terms of Alfred North Whitehead, a new value of quality to learning.

Whitehead said:

> Pedants sneer at an education which is useful. But if education is not useful, what is it? Is it talent to be hidden away? Of course, education should be useful, whatever your aim in life.

He went on to say in "Aims of Education":

> Education is the art of the utilization of knowledge.

And he said:

> Unless we are careful the vast extension of universities in numbers of students and in variety of activities—of which we are so justly proud—will fail in producing proper results, by the mishandling of the catalyst, *imagination*.

The catalyst imagination is one of the inherent qualities of the work-study cooperative curriculum. Dr. Ralph W. Tyler, the distinguished educator who serves as Director for the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences and Chairman of the National Commission for Cooperative Education, has reported the results of the recent 2-year research study of cooperative education which he headed, which found:

> Cooperative education gives a student an education qualitatively superior in some respects to a conventional college education. Cooperative education students, through their educationally related job experience, become more mature; and their records in graduate school and in employment show that cooperative education is a first-rate college education.

The employment and academic records of these students must be good because more than 3,000 American companies, Government agencies, and public service institutions employ work-study cooperative education students. One leading company—the Ford Motor Co.—alone employs more than 800 students in cooperative education programs.

The students work in every field of economic value. They are in the engineering departments of the great industrial concerns, in the laboratories and X-ray departments of hospitals, in various departments of local, State, and Federal Government; they are in agriculture, schools, banks, advertising agencies, the news media, merchandising enterprises, and indeed, almost every form of enterprise we have.

Mr. President, our society is pressured by the rapid advances of technology, unable to cope with the scope of the science revolution, bewildered by the knowledge explosion, frustrated by the demands for new skills and by the mounting requirement for brainpower. The challenge of our times is enormous and only education can meet it; only education of the right quality and the right relevance to our needs.

The new challenge of quality is welcome to us. James Madison said that the United States was useful in proving things before held impossible. Our purpose now is to prove it possible to add new dimensions to education that encompass the demands of a new society, by enlarging this already proven institution.

I have followed the burgeoning of the idea of cooperative education with its alternating periods of work and study, and have become increasingly more impressed with its effectiveness. I have studied the program and operation at such places as Northeastern University in Boston, and at Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio, and I have seen how it enhances the stature of both students and faculty. I have also seen how it provides motivation almost instantaneously to the disadvantaged youngster. In such a program he can go to college and earn a degree. And while he is achieving his baccalaureate he works at full wages in a job previously beyond his reach or expectation. Under such conditions, by no stretch of the imagination may he any longer be listed as "disadvantaged." Nor can he be viewed any more as one without hope of a future.

Work-study cooperative education is precisely the kind of innovation, the kind of bold imaginative programing we need now and shall need increasingly to solve the problems of our time.

Consider the premise that universal higher education is just around the corner. The trend toward a college education for all high school graduates has risen sharply in recent years—to a point where more than half of them now at least enter either a 4-year or a 2-year college. Observers are convinced that 15 years hence, schooling for everyone from age 3 to 20 will have become a general pattern and education beyond the high school a necessity for most of our young people.

Yet, as Marvin Feldman, of the Ford Foundation, observes:

> It is becoming increasingly apparent that colleges are not prepared to accommodate an influx of students who are strongly oriented toward specific career goals. Rejection and first-year attrition rates in post-secondary schools are high. A large proportion of youth—those labeled non-verbal, culturally deprived, or disadvantaged—are yearly lost to the productive process and to society.

Further, Mr. President, one of the most significant strengths of a cooperative work-study program is its adaptability. It can be effectively accommodated to practically any type of educational institution and the different curricula they maintain. The flexibility possible with cooperative education is the result of integrating theoretical study and practical employment. It has proved adaptable for men and women students. Among the cooperative colleges and universities are almost every type of institution of higher education in this country. There are coeducational institutions, men's colleges and women's colleges. Some of the cooperative colleges are public municipal colleges in large cities, most of whose students live at home and commute to classes. Some of the cooperative colleges also have many evening students. Others are residential colleges located in small towns. Thus, the cooperative students sometimes live at home both when they are in classes and on cooperative jobs. Others may go away to college, but live at home during work periods. Or they may live at home when they are in classes, but travel to another city for their jobs. Or they may live away from home both at college and on the job.

Cooperative education programs can include all or only some of the students. At some institutions, every enrolled student must participate in the work periods. Very commonly, cooperative education is offered in some, but not all, departments or schools of the college or university. At others, it is an optional alternative that only some of the students choose. At still others, it is an honors program for which a student must be specially selected. At a few schools even first-year students start the alternation of work and study, but in most cases the students spend 1 or 2 full years in course work before they start their cooperative jobs.

In some programs, the student will return to the same company for each of his work periods, and in other programs, he will hold jobs with a variety of employers. Especially in engineering, the cooperative program is organized so that the student returns to the same company and completes a "job circuit" of progressively more responsible positions. Other programs, especially in the liberal arts, intentionally place the student with a number of employers so that the student has the opportunity to learn the functions of a variety of organizations in the American economy and government.

In other words, Mr. President, cooperative education can be adapted to any institution of higher education.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. **HARTKE.** I ask unanimous consent to proceed for another 2 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. **HARTKE.** Mr. President, let me cite the experience of Northeastern University, located in Boston. This university has the largest program—degrees in 27 different specialized schools—and the largest enrollment of any of the 112 universities and colleges with a cooperative education program. At Northeastern, 7,600 students are exchanging class study for jobs every 3 months. They are earning $15 million this year while gaining invaluable experience in educationally related jobs. To provide $15 million at the usual rate of return, a $300,000,000 endowment would be necessary. Here are some other salient facts about the Northeastern program:

Students are now being placed with 1,600 different employers, including all levels of government, city, county, State, and Federal.

There is a waiting list of 500 additional employers who have asked the university to supply students—a greater employment demand than the present enrollment can supply.

Among Government employers are the Library of Congress, NASA, the Office of Education, and a variety of other Government agencies who find in cooperative education an excellent selective process for recruiting permanent qualified employees.

Mr. President, enactment of the cooperative education bill as an amendment to the Higher Education Act will open up the possibility of tripling the number of institutions involved in this program. Such an expansion would lead to an additional 100,000 opportunities for students to hold off-campus jobs. I might add that one reason for the appeal to employers is that the student is not a part-time employee, but a full-time employee. Often the employer replaces one student with another when the first returns to the campus, and thus he gains an effective worker who is, for all practical purposes, a full-time employee, although embodied in two persons, thus eliminating the problems many employers would have with half-day or similar short-term student workers.

A tripling of these programs in 5 years would result in an additional income to students amounting to $150 to $190 million. In view of the fact that most of these students will have taxable income as a result, it is a safe assumption that their income taxes alone will be sufficient to carry the cost of the program's authorization, and probably a good deal besides.

I have mentioned the deep interest of business leaders, industry officials, and educators as exhibited in the New Mexico, Oregon, and Indiana meetings. On January 18, I met with leaders of all the accredited colleges and universities of the State of Indiana to confer with representatives of major employers to learn how to undertake cooperative education programs. There was great enthusiasm expressed for this program by both parties to the necessary cooperation, the industries and the schools. I am confident that in every State, if this form of expansion of higher education receives the attention and study it deserves, the attitudes will be similar. I commend it, with my colleagues who join me, to your attention.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill may appear in the Record.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1736) to provide increased opportunities for students in higher education for off-campus employment by establishing programs of work-study cooperative education, introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1736

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"Part E—College-Industry Cooperative Education Programs

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"Sec. 671. (a) For the purpose of stimulating and promoting work-study cooperative education programs at institutions of higher education, which programs alternate academic study with full-time on-the-job employment in which all compensation is paid by employers in business, industry, the professions, Government or service-type work situations and thus provide to students the opportunity to earn through employment the funds to undertake and complete their education, by enabling the Commissioner to make grants under this part to institutions of higher education to assist such institutions to establish or expand work-study cooperative education programs, there is authorized to be appropriated $7,250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated $725,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968 and for each of the four succeeding fiscal years for the purpose of making training grants under section 674.

"GRANTS FOR WORK-STUDY COOPERATIVE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Sec. 672. (a) Grants for work-study cooperative education programs may be made under this part only upon application therefor by institutions of higher education filed with the Commissioner at such time or times, in such manner and containing such information as he may reasonably require. Each such application shall—

"(1) provide, in conformance with criteria prescribed by the Commissioner, for the establishment of a work-study cooperative education program, for the expansion of such a program, or for the initial research and study required to determine whether it would be feasible to establish such a program;

"(2) provide for the making of such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this part, and for the keeping of such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this part; and

"(4) include such other information as the Commissioner may determine necessary to carry out the purposes of this part.

"(b) The Commissioner shall seek the advice of the Advisory Committee on the Development of Work-Study Cooperative Education Programs in Higher Education established pursuant to section 675 prior to prescribing the criteria under clause (1) of subsection *(a)* of this section.

"(c) Applications for grants under this part may be approved by the Commissioner only if the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a) of this section. Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may by regulation otherwise provide, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"LIMITATIONS

"SEC. 673. No grant for a work-study cooperative education program may be made under this part to any one institution of higher education—

"(1) in excess of $65,000 in any fiscal year, or

"(2) for an aggregate period in excess of three fiscal years.

"TRAINING GRANTS

"SEC. 674. The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to institutions of higher education, and other public or nonprofit private agencies or institutions, for the training of persons capable of establishing, administering, and coordinating work-study cooperative education programs and for research in the field of promoting and extending the use of work-study cooperative education programs in institutions of higher education.

"ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON THE DEVELOPMENT OF WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

"SEC. 675. (a) There is hereby established in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on the Development of Work-Study Cooperative Education Programs in Higher Education, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and consisting of eight members, representing Government, industry, education, and labor, who are experienced in the field of work-study cooperative education, who shall be appointed, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

"(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this part, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for persons in the Government service employed intermittently."

AN EXPANDING HORIZON FOR SELF-HELP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I am delighted to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana and other Senators on both sides of the aisle in offering this worthwhile proposal to give impetus to the Nation's growing programs of cooperative education. What we are proposing here is a very small Federal investment, "seed money," which can greatly expand the $95,000,000 that is now earned annually by students to pay the cost of their college and university education. These millions of dollars are earnings from jobs that are educationally related to their academic work and that give valuable full-time work experience.

We are talking about a program that is self-liquidating. The proposed 3-year period of Federal support would enable colleges and institutions to organize a vast number of relationships with business and industry. This matrix of cooperation would in turn create year-round jobs appropriate to a wide range of student talents. Once this has been accomplished, the continuing costs are modest and can be defrayed from ongoing operations of the program itself because of the increased number of students this program of self-support makes possible.

"Working one's way through college" is an honorable tradition in the American West, where the tradition of individual effort has always had special meaning. In California a large number of colleges and businesses have joined in support of cooperative education programs. Among the institutions now represented are the University of California, Los Angeles State and San Jose State Colleges, the College of San Mateo, Foothill College in Los Altos, and Golden Gate College in San Francisco. Let me emphasize that both private and public institutions will be able to participate in this program; indeed, its origins in our country are to be found in the private educational sector.

California business has also taken a great interest. Among those firms now participating are Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Beckman Instruments Corp., and North American Aviation. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks a letter to me for this Lockheed Missiles & Space Co. testifying to this interest be inserted in the RECORD.

Cooperative education, work-study programs, are sound both educationally and economically. These programs offer the opportunity of higher education to a much wider cross section of capable students. This is fully in keeping with our national ideal of a broadly based educational establishment. Moreover, a higher percentage of students in these programs go on to graduate school than do students in the conventional programs. The alternation between work and study offers the student a real opportunity to find out what he wants to do with his future, and it helps industry find him.

Ralph W. Tyler, director of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford University has said:

> A program which increases student motivation, helps the student to find more meaning in his school studies, attracts more able young people into higher education and enables more of them to go to college should be extended far beyond the relatively small number of colleges now using cooperative education.

Also important is that "cooperative education" provides a proven means of meeting the costs of higher education by tapping the source of need—the rapidly expanding complex of advanced industry and business activity that desperately requires trained people. Nowhere in the modern world, Mr. President, is there a greater need for a highly trained cadre of men and women capable of solving complex technical problems of our age than in my State of California. I am pleased to take part in submitting this bill and join in urging its expeditious consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from Lockheed Missiles & Space Co., addressed to me and endorsing this bill, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOCKHEED MISSILES & SPACE CO.,
May 8, 1967.

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR KUCHEL: This is to express strong support for the Kuchel-Hartke Cooperative Education Bill, which proposes to amend Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide financial grants to institutions of higher education for the establishment or expansion of College-Industry Cooperative Education Programs. Your coauthorship of this bill which, if passed, would significantly benefit the colleges, universities, students, and employers in the State of California, and elsewhere, is highly commendable.

I have read the pre-print of the bill, and wish to make the following comments: Lockheed Missiles & Space Company has employed students under the Cooperative Education plan since 1959. We presently have students at work from 26 different colleges and universities throughout the country, including five California institutions. As you may know, a number of other industrial firms and government agencies in California also employ Cooperative Education Students. The College of Engineering at the University of California, Berkeley, has a well-established program, as does San Jose State College's Division of Engineering. We have actively encouraged other California institutions to establish such programs, with very limited success. It is my observation that most schools are reluctant to start Cooperative Education Programs because of lack of budget to support the additional administrative functions. Those schools that have recently started experimental programs have done so on a shoestring basis. Usually some person who already has full-time faculty or administrative responsibilities is assigned, or volunteers for, the additional responsibility of administering the school's Cooperative Education activities. Many schools have indicated strong support for the principle of Cooperative Education, but have not made a start because of a lack of manpower and budget. In my opinion, the passage of your bill would make it possible for a number of schools—already favorably inclined toward

Cooperative Education—to begin offering this superior form of higher education to their students. A great many employers in this area are already enjoying the benefits of such programs and others would, I'm sure, be happy to participate if more students in Cooperative Education Programs were available for employment.

You have my best wishes for a successful passage of the Kuchel-Hartke Cooperative Education Bill.

Sincerely,

James T. Godfrey,
Coordinator, Cooperative Education Program.

REQUIREMENT FOR ALL INSURED BANKS TO CLEAR CHECKS AT PAR

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I have today introduced, at the request of the Federal Reserve Board, a bill to require all insured banks to clear checks at par.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point a copy of the Federal Reserve Board's letter, together with the draft bill attached.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1737) to require all insured banks to clear checks at par, introduced by Mr. Sparkman, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1737

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(k) No insured bank shall pay any check drawn on it at less than its face amount or make any charge, by exchange or otherwise, against a person in his capacity as payee or indorsee for the payment of such checks and remission of the proceeds thereof. For each violation of this subsection, the offending back shall be subject to a penalty of not more than $100, which the Corporation may recover for its use."

Sec. 2. The first paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 342) is amended by striking ": *Provided further,* That nothing in this or any other section of this Act shall be construed as prohibiting a member or nonmember bank from making reasonable charges, to be determined and regulated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, but in no case to exceed 10 cents per $100 or fraction thereof, based on the total of checks and drafts presented at any one time, for collection or payment of checks and drafts and remission therefor by exchange or otherwise; but no such charges shall be made against the Federal reserve banks".

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The letter presented by Mr. Sparkman is as follows:

Board of Governors
of the Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D.C., April 4, 1967.

Hon. John Sparkman,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Chairman: In some areas of the United States, many of the commercial banks that are not members of the Federal Reserve System make charges for the payment of checks drawn on themselves when the checks are presented by mail. These charges are generally known as "exchange charges" and the banks that impose such charges are referred to as "nonpar banks" because they do not pay at par, i.e., at face value, all checks drawn on them.

Deposits in checking accounts constitute the bulk of our country's money supply. The efficient operation of our economic machine requires that checks, like currency, be interchangeable at their face value. Present provisions of the Federal Reserve Act expressly prohibit the making of exchange charges against the Federal Reserve Banks and, as a practical matter, all checks drawn on member banks and collected through the Federal Reserve collection system are paid at par. Whatever reasons may have once existed for the making of exchange charges, it is the Board's opinion that, under today's highly developed system of check collection, there is no sound reason for any bank, whether member or nonmember, to pay less than the face amount of checks drawn upon it. Any expense that a bank incurs in the payment of checks should be absorbed by the bank or borne by its customers—the depositors who drew the checks—rather than by the payees or indorsees. This is the practice followed today by most banks.

It is obvious that nonpar banking involves inequities. For example, a seller of goods or services who is willing to accept checks in payment may receive less than the price agreed upon if the purchaser draws his check on a nonpar bank. On the other hand, he may receive full payment even if the check is drawn on a nonpar bank, because some such banks follow a discriminatory practice of "parring" items only for certain persons. In any event, as long as banks are permitted to impose exchange charges, a seller cannot be certain that he will receive full payment for checks that he accepts for his goods or services.

In addition to such inequities, nonpar banking involves unjustified costs and inefficiencies. For example, where a collecting bank presents a check to a drawee nonpar bank and pays an exchange charge and the charge is passed back through other collecting banks to the payee's bank and ultimately to the payee, each of the banks as well as the payee must make appropriate reversing entries in its books to take account of the fact that the item was not paid at its face amount.

The unjustified costs and inefficiencies of nonpar banking often take a somewhat different form. Some banks are willing to "absorb" exchange charges on checks cleared through them in return for the maintenance of a minimum deposit by the forwarding bank. To pass a check through such a bank frequently involves circuitous routing, perhaps to places quite distant from the drawee bank, thereby unnecessarily delaying the time of payment of the check.

While nonpar banks today obtain substantial income from charging exchange, banks that have shifted from a nonpar to a par status have been able to operate profitably through the substitution of an appropriate system of service charges levied against their depositors for the expense of handling transactions in their accounts. Thus, while the elimination of exchange charges will greatly facilitate the efficient operation of our nation's banking system, the loss of exchange income need not be detrimental to individual banks.

For the reasons indicated above, the Board, in its Annual Report to Congress for 1965, recommended enactment of legislation that would require all insured banks to pay checks drawn on them at par, that is, without deduction of exchange charges. The Board is making a similar recommendation in its Annual Report for 1966. In order to afford nonpar banks a reasonable time within which to adjust their practices, it is recommended that such legislation be made effective one year after the date of its enactment. A draft of a bill for this purpose is enclosed herewith.

Sincerely yours,

Wm. McC. Martin, Jr.

Draft of a Bill To Require All Insured Banks To Clear Checks at Par

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1828) is amended by adding the following subsection:

"(k) No insured bank shall pay any check drawn on it at less than its face amount or make any charge, by exchange or otherwise, against a person in his capacity as payee or indorsee for the payment of such checks and remission of the proceeds thereof. For each violation of this subsection, the offending bank shall be subject to a penalty of not more than $100, which the Corporation may recover for its use."

Sec. 2. The first paragraph of section 13 of the Federal Reserve Act (12 U.S.C. 342) is amended by striking ": *Provided further,* That nothing in this or any other section of this Act shall be construed as prohibiting a member or nonmember bank from making reasonable charges, to be determined and regulated by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, but in no case to exceed 10 cents per $100 or fraction thereof, based on the total of checks and drafts presented at any one time, for collection or payment of checks and drafts and remission therefor by exchange or otherwise; but no such charges shall be made against the Federal Reserve banks."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

PROHIBITION OF BUSINESS OF ADJUSTMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, in a recent series in the Washington Star, reporter Miriam Ottenberg has performed a public service in calling attention to deceptive commercial practices of so-called "debt consolidators" in the Washington area. Debt consolidators persuade debtors to refrain from making direct payments to their creditors and instead to make payments to them. They, in turn, pay the creditors, but only after taking a healthy premium from the debtors' payments. No benefit results to the debtor from this arrangement. He merely adds a new creditor—the debt consolidator—to the already burdensome list of his creditors.

"Debt consolidation" has nothing in common with reputable enterprises which lend money to debtors so that they can pay off all creditors and then repay the single lender. A debt consolidator lends no money. He only takes it, though often misleading the harried debtor into believing that his creditors will all be repaid at once. The details of these deceptive practices are set out in Miss Ottenberg's articles. I ask unanimous consent that these be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

Twenty-one States, and the city of Baltimore, have enacted legislation to outlaw the practice of debt consolidation. I believe the practice must also be stopped in the District of Columbia. That is the purpose of the bill I introduce today. The District Commissioners have endorsed this bill.

Simple regulation of these practices cannot adequately protect the public, since—to be effective—regulation would require impossibly detailed and constant auditing of accounts of the numerous small debtors upon whom the debt consolidators prey. Moreover, the debt consolidators offer no useful service which should be fostered. In States where the practice is outlawed, private or public nonprofit agencies have provided needed counseling to debtors having difficulty in managing their debts. This desirable service is in no way prohibited by this bill. And where the debtor is so burdened with debts that bankruptcy is impending, legal advice from private attorneys or public legal aid agencies is necessary. There is no legitimate role for debt consolidators to play.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1739) to prohibit the business of debt adjusting in the District of Columbia except as an incident to the lawful practice of law or as an activity engaged in by a nonprofit corporation or association, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The articles presented by Mr. TYDINGS are as follows:

DEBTOR BEWARE: PAYMENTS ADJUSTOR WON'T SOLVE YOUR MONEY PROBLEMS—PART 1

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

A plumber and his wife burdened with hospital expenses for a new baby, saw their bills mounting and signed up with a nearby Maryland firm to "adjust" their debts. They were adjusted right out of their $4,000 trailer home.

A District policeman, saddled with moving bills and getting further behind because his overtime stopped when he entered the police academy, also sought help from a so-called debt adjustor. He had paid in more than $250 before he found out only a few dollars had reached a creditor.

A day worker, who prided herself on paying her bills promptly, listened to a debt adjustor's advertising and figured she could save interest if she paid off everything in six months instead of 12. She wound up paying more interest because the debt adjustor neglected the first month's payment to take out his fee.

These are typical victims of the debt adjustors, debt poolers, debt consolidators or pro-raters now preying on Washington area families. They are called by those names—and a few less flattering ones, such as parasites and profiteers of poverty.

Actually, they're not interested in the true poverty class. They prefer people with a regular paycheck and a conscientious desire to extricate themselves from a mire of debt.

They promise to consolidate bills into one low monthly payment the customer can afford, avoid garnishments and free the customer to live happily ever after. They put in no money of their own—no loan, no advance, nothing out of their pockets.

For sending each creditor something—if the customer keeps paying—they charge a "filing" or "installation" fee of $25 more plus a percentage of the debt they are "adjusting"—usually from 12 to 15 per cent.

If the customer stays with the adjuster to the end—and that's a big if—he may get his "filing" fee back, but from everything The Star could find out, he'll never get back a unsullied credit rating.

Debt consolidators are capitalizing on the money problems that have made the personal bankruptcy rate soar across the nation, filled the divorce courts with debt-prompted family crises and contributed to suicides, alcoholism and mental illness. The runaway family debts that prompt these excesses are usually blamed on too-easy credit, too available charge accounts, the plethora of credit cards and the go-now-pay-later philosophy.

Problems that are unique to the Washington area make the Nation's Capital even more attractive to the debt adjustors. Here they find the transients—Government people coming and going with each administration, service people putting in their tour of duty beside the Potomac, people who run into heavy debt while closing their home back home and finding a place to live close to schools and stores here.

In the Washington area also they find the innocent and the ignorant, the Southern families migrating northward, the small-town girls pounding Government typewriters in the big city.

The largest of the debt firms now doing business in this area, Credit Advisors, Inc., has described its customers as "debtors who are relatively unsophisticated in matters relating to their outstanding debts, interest rates, penalty charges and the like."

The description was given in a suit filed here last month by Credit Advisors against another debt adjuster—Credit Budget, Inc. In the course of accusing its competitor of "unfair competition and "misappropriation of trade secrets" Credit Advisors pulled back a bit of its own veil of secrecy.

In the suit, Credit Advisors emphasized how much it had spent on advertising and how much value it placed on its advertising copy used "repeatedly and successfully."

Without saying how much it harvested from "extensive advertising," Credit Advisors charged that its competitor had already derived "large income, profits and advantages" which rightfully belonged to Credit Advisors.

The suit predicts the future will find more rather than fewer debt consolidators in the Washington area. Credit Advisors says Credit Budget is going to expand its debt adjustment business unless restrained.

The court action was cited by Credit Advisors' local attorney as the reason why the firm couldn't answer any of a dozen questions asked by The Star about its methods of operations—easy questions like how much time the "counselors" spend on a customer and whether they ever give the customer a budget to follow to help get himself out of debt and why they don't say in their ads how long it will take to pay off a $1,000 debt at $15 a week.

Since Credit Advisors wouldn't talk, The Star got the answers to these and other questions from the customers. None of those interviewed had ever been given a budget to follow. More time reportedly was spent by the counsellor on how much money the customers could pay to Credit Advisors than how they were going to live on what was left. As for how long it would take to pay off a $1,000 debt at $15 a week, the answer was obvious—a discouraging span of months, particularly after interest and Credit Advisors' fees were piled onto the indebtedness.

There was no point in even asking about the advertised promise of "garnishments avoided" after The Star learned one creditor after another has refused to have anything to do with any debt adjustment firm.

Although seven debt consolidators were sentenced here on mail fraud charges last fall, although one firm was cited by the Federal Trade Commission for deceptive acts, although salaries continue to be garnished and automobiles repossessed despite the services of the debt consolidators, the bait of a debt-free future continues to lure customers here.

ADJUSTORS INCREASING

Despite a widespread impression that the debt consolidators are on the wane here, The Star found just the opposite to be true.

The regional credit sales manager of a national chain of department stores reported more of the store's customers in this area had become involved with the debt adjustors in the last two or three years than ever before. He attributed the rise to the "tremendous advertising program."

Department stores, discount appliance stores and finance companies in the area all note a growing trend toward the debt consolidators—a trend they don't like at all.

Why are more debt adjustors thriving here when they're on the wane in many states? They came to Washington after they were outlawed or at least regulated elsewhere. Debt adjustors by any name are banned in 21 states, including Virginia. They are regulated in 10 other states, which discourages some—but not all—of them.

Rhode Island is among the states that prohibit them but several outfits operate a mail order business from there, getting their customers from everywhere but Rhode Island through magazine and newspaper advertising. Since they can operate freely here, at least one of these Rhode Island-based outfits lists a Washington address and telephone number. Repeated calls to that number have produced nothing but a tape recorded announcement of a number to call—a Rhode Island number.

BAN IN BALTIMORE

Debt adjusting firms are banned in Baltimore, which is one reason why more of them are opening for business in nearby Maryland. Credit Advisors of Baltimore, Inc., now operates from Mt. Rainier, Md., and another has established itself as Credit Advisors of Laurel, Md.

Unprotected by any law, Washington and nearby Maryland debtors likewise lack the free budget counselling service that puts the paid debt adjustors out of business almost as fast as a law.

When a man, free of charge, can get counseling on his debts and expert help in reducing his indebtedness to a manageable level, when all he can afford to pay on his debts goes to his creditors, he has no use for a paid debt adjuster. Some 63 communities across the country provide that free service to debtors now—but not Washington.

That's why we have become a haven for debt adjusters.

DEBTOR BEWARE: ADJUSTERS SHUNNED BY MOST CREDITORS—PART 2

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Debt consolidators can't guarantee protection from garnishment and dunning because most creditors refuse to do business with them, a Star survey shows.

The survey covered department and discount stores, areawide chain stores and national chains, credit unions and banks, finance and loan companies—a cross-section of creditors.

Although the stores and some lenders accept partial payments sent in by the debt adjusters, they will continue to dun the debtor, not the adjuster, if a regular payment is missed.

When a customer tells his creditors a debt arranger is now handling the bills, the reply is always the same: "Our contract is with you, not anybody else."

That's why the Washington Better Business Bureau suggests to anyone asking about debt consolidators that they check with his creditors before signing up with a debt adjusting firm. In most cases, the BBB is aware, the creditor will discourage him from signing.

"You should understand," the BBB answers inquiries, "that if you go to a bill consolidator with 10 creditors, you come out with 11."

The debt adjusting agency theoretically pools or consolidates a debtor's bills and prorates what the debtor can afford to pay among all his creditors.

That would mean a slice for each of them which, in theory, a creditor would accept eagerly to recover something on an overdue bill. Also theoretically, the size of the payments is worked out through days or even weeks of negotiation between the debt adjuster and the creditors.

But that's only in theory. In practice, the adjuster just sends the creditors a form saying what they're going to receive and asking them to accept it. All the creditors checked by The Star said flatly they throw away the form and make no agreement with the paid adjusters.

One went even further. While talking with The Star, a finance company creditor manager found in his mail a notice from a debt adjuster that he would receive $5 a month in payment for a $174 television set bought only two months earlier.

"I'm going to send the check back," the credit manager said. "We just checked this customer's credit in February. If he can't pay $17 a month now, we'll have to take back the set."

STORES WILLING TO HELP

All stores checked by The Star said if the debtor had told them he was in trouble and wanted to pay less until he was over the hump, they would have gone along with him if at all possible.

And usually it's possible.

Unless the debtor is a known deadbeat who shouldn't have been allowed to buy on credit in the first place, most stores will skip one or two payments until a customer gets back on his feet and tack those payments onto the end of the bill. Or they'll accept token payments for a while.

Banks may be able to arrange refinancing. Credit unions will help through counseling and negotiating with other creditors. Some merchants will cooperate with customers faced with an unexpected expenses by taking back the merchandise and marking it as a cancellation—saving their customer the stigma of a bad debt.

Several businessmen stressed that the man or woman who goes to a debt consolidator is usually the very type who would get the most sympathetic hearing from his creditors because he's conscientious about his debts and concerned about maintaining his credit.

More than one creditor added, however, that a debtor ruins his credit by seeking the help of paid adjusters. A loan company spokesman said he will never approve another loan for any customer who has gone to a debt consolidator.

Some stores with complex bookkeeping systems expressed concern for customers lulled into a false sense of security when they assume the debt consolidator has taken care of everything because they are not dunned. It may be as much as three months before a store's accounting machinery catches up with the debt consolidator's shrunken payments and the debtor is dunned.

A mail order house complained that customers who go to debt adjusters here may not get credit even for the short payments because the checks come in without the bill, without the customer's code number and sometimes even without his home address.

Several creditors have been made ruefully aware that the debt consolidators instruct their customers to have nothing to do with their creditors. It doesn't make a store official any happier to have a telephone banged down when he calls someone who owes him money.

Creditors don't like a middleman coming between them and their customers. They don't like hearing a customer say, "But I paid the debt pooler every week. I don't understand why he hasn't paid you." And creditors recognize with the cynicism born of experience that the creditor who screams the loudest and duns his customers the most will get the largest slice of the available money. They don't like any part of it.

A number of firms make a practice of telephoning a customer as soon as a debt consolidator sends in the notice that from now on the consolidator will be paying the bill—or part of it. Credit managers urge their customers to get clear of the debt adjusters. They point out that the customer could pay off his smaller bills with the money he's paying these people to write checks for him.

The AFL–CIO Executive Council has gone on record against the debt adjustment business as an arrangement which, in too many cases has turned out to be an "abusive scheme" for deceiving and overcharging the debtor.

The debt adjuster, the council said, frequently imposes a heavy economic burden on the already overloaded debtor who gets no effective relief in return since his property may be seized and his salary attached anyhow.

Even the best intentioned and most extensively regulated prorater, it was found, can't render effective relief without the consent of the creditors. Since The Star found that most creditors here don't consent and the proraters are free to operate any way they want here, labor's warning is particularly meaningful in the Washington area.

A formal statement from the AFL–CIO executive council concluded: "The AFL–CIO, therefore, is of the view that the debt adjustment business, regulated or unregulated, is not economically or socially desirable as a commercial activity and should be eliminated."

The statement came out in 1961 and Leo Perlis, national director of the AFL–CIO Department of Community Services, said that's still the official position.

"We're against debt consolidators," he explained, "because they add another debt on top of all the others. They don't solve the problem."

STORY OF ONE BROCHURE

The largest of the debt adjusting chains tries to give the impression that the Labor Department takes a different view. The Barden Investment Management Corp., which is under the same ownership as Credit Advisors, Inc., issued a brochure which played up this quotation from the Labor Department's Bureau of Labor Standards:

"If honestly operated, these agencies can perform a real service for persons deeply enmeshed in debt."

The quotation, it developed, was only a fragment of the whole message, like the one favorable line in a column-long unfavorable movie review.

The "if honestly operated" sentence was followed immediately by this: "Unfortunately, this has not always been the case. Sometimes the money has not been paid to the creditors at all, or only part of it paid. Frequently, creditors refuse to participate in the debt pooler's plan but the agency does not so notify the debtor.

"On many occasions the debt poolers have paid themselves their entire fee first, and it has been some time before money was available to pay the creditors.

"Accepting the services of a debt pooler has not always prevented garnishment proceedings. Frequently the debtor finds that instead of getting out of debt, he simply has another creditor—the debt pooler.

Because of the distress caused by unethical debt poolers, many states have found it necessary to take legislative action."

The debt consolidator's brochure which neglected to include this part of the Labor Department's statement waxed enthusiastic about the debt management company's contribution to the debtor's welfare.

"Perhaps the agencies (sic) most important function," the Barden brochure stated, "is providing the debtor with a learning experience. With help, the debtor learns by the judicious handling of his monies to unentangle himself from the nightmare of oppressive debts. He finds himself no longer a victim of a too easy credit system; but, instead, master of his own financial ship."

Maybe, but The Star found a number of debtors whose "learning experience" consisted of plunging deeper into debt by dealing with a paid debt adjuster.

DEBTOR BEWARE: CONSOLIDATION FIRMS INCREASING CLIENTELE—PART 3

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

One large mail order house reports more customers are getting involved with debt adjusters in the Washington area than anywhere else in the Maine to West Virginia region.

Like area business leaders, the mail order company spokesman noticed more debt-consolidated customers here now than two or three years ago.

Nobody knows exactly how many debtors have signed up with the adjusters here, but the largest of them, Credit Advisers, Inc., claims to have 5,000 customers in the city and nearby Maryland.

Credit Advisors, however, has no monopoly on customers, as dozens of complaints reaching The Star indicate.

In The Star's collection of complainers are several who blame their financial nightmare on a firm manned most days by an answering service. Before getting into the debt adjusting business, the owner of this firm pleaded guilty to mail fraud in Baltimore in 1965 and received a suspended sentence.

Others are still smarting under losses suffered from two firms convicted here last year. Some complained of being plunged deeper into debt by newer arrivals in this wide-open market, while several blamed the loss of their cars and their credit on firms that have now moved on.

Among those who brought their troubles to The Star's Action Line was one involved by long distance. A divorcee with three children to support, she agreed to pay $35 a week to Nationwide Acceptance, Inc., on the understanding that the firm would start paying her bills as soon as she sent in her first payment and payment books.

When her first payment produced nothing but duns from her creditors, she scrambled to find money to pay them and started trying to get her $35 back from the debt consolidator. Calling the firm's Washington office brought only a tape-recorded message to telephone a number in Cranston, R.I. Nationwide is one of several debt adjustment outfits now being investigated by the Postal Inspection Service.

In addition to Action Line complainers, The Star discovered other debtor victims by checking Neighborhood Legal Services offices, credit unions and creditors who took pity on families in financial troubles.

A number of those interviewed spoke of other families they knew who had also been victimized and sometimes forced to pay up to $150 to extricate themselves from the debt consolidater. More often than not, however, these victims don't complain publicly.

SUFFER IN SILENCE

Attorneys, counselors and investigators gave various reasons why victims suffer in silence. One said victims have been so brainwashed by fast-talking debt adjusters that they are easy to convince that whatever went wrong was their own fault. Thus, when creditors start dunning them again, the debt adjuster often says they are to blame for missing a payment. Since they have no receipts to prove they paid, they swallow the story.

Others know they have been taken but are too ashamed to tell anyone either that they sought help with their debts or put their trust in the wrong place.

What makes them turn to a debt adjuster? Either mismanagement or misfortune has overstrained their resources. They may have over-extended themselves because credit is too easy to get and have long forgotten the old maxim about not buying anything you can't afford.

BORDERING ON PANIC

Just as often, however, a sudden illness in the family has brought unexpected demands. Or income has shrunk through lost overtime or lay-off. They are strapped but not poverty-stricken. Most of the victims interviewed were in the $6,000 to $10,000 income class. Some made a bit less and, at the other end of the scale, an $18,000 victim was reported.

Fear bordering on panic drove them to the debt poolers.

Some were afraid of being fired because most large employers follow a standing rule that if garnishment proceedings are started against an employe, out he goes.

Some feared the car they had to have for their work would be repossessed.

And some worried about their credit—the charge accounts they counted on to keep their children fed and clothed.

They could see debts mounting. They knew they couldn't pay all the bills, that the next notice of an overdue account would be less polite. Some in sensitive government jobs worried about losing their security clearance.

Less pressed but looking to the future was the engaged couple who wanted to start married life in solvent blessedness by pooling and paying off all their bills now. They not only got further behind but nearly lost the groom's car.

Youthful inexperience brought some of the victims to the proraters. A 17-year-old couple, just married and up to their necks in debt for trousseau and furniture, thought the debt consolidator would pay off all their bills at once and then they would gradually repay him.

The young people were about to pay their $59.32 installment on their car but the debt-adjusting salesman told them to give him the money and he would take care of it. Thereafter, they started sending the debt consolidator a $31 money order each week.

They had paid out more than $250, when they began getting calls from everybody they owed. Their friend, the debt adjuster, told them not to worry because he was taking care of everything.

The rude awakening came when the bride's mother, who had signed for the car because the girl was under age, was called at her job and informed that her salary would be garnisheed if she didn't make a car payment at once.

In three months, the debt consolidator had paid $7 on the car—not even the $59.32 installment the couple had turned over to him on the night they signed his debt adjusting contract.

In almost every case investigated by The Star where the debtor lost by dealing with a debt adjuster, genuine counseling and some frankness with creditors would have given the story a different ending. But their fear and desperation made the debtors tongue-tied and wary of their creditors.

Sometimes, a fellow worker will convince someone a debt pooler will solve all their money problems just as his own problems have been solved. That's how a Rockville couple with a new baby got involved.

The young mother said a man at her husband's place of work told him how much help he was getting from a debt consolidator. She didn't know then that the debt firm would deduct from $5 up to $100 from a debtor's bill as a reward for referring other customers.

She and her husband signed a contract to pay $43 a week until all their bills were paid. Within a month, they were being dunned by their creditors. The debt consolidator told her the creditors were just trying to get more money out of her and she wasn't to pay any attention to them.

TRAILER REPOSSESSED

"Then, on May 6, 1966," the wife said, "our trailer was repossessed. The man gave us 15 minutes to get our furniture and baby out of our home. A few weeks later, our car was taken from us. I called all our creditors and found that none of them had gotten any of the money we paid to the debt adjuster.

"We lost everything we had. Our credit was ruined. We didn't even have money for food. It's been over a year now and we're just getting back on our feet. I'm glad of just one thing. I think I would kill myself if I had taken even $5 to refer anyone else to these people."

Another young couple also learned the hard way. In seven years of marriage, they had never been in a financial bind until moving expenses ate up their reserves and a debt pooler promised to bring their bills up to date.

"This man sounded on the up-and-up but after I started paying out $65 every two weeks, the bills I received were the same or larger than the ones I had before I started," the husband said.

BANK SENDS LETTER

"These people gave me the impression that all my creditors would be satisfied immediately but none of them were," he went on. "I figure the $260 I have given him was just paying his commission."

He was shaken when the bank he owed money back home sent him a copy of a letter the bank had written to notify the debt adjuster the bank refused to enter into an arrangement with him and "payments will be expected as contracted for by the borrower."

Finally, one of his creditors, a one-stop shopping center, warned him on debt consolidators.

"Why should you pay them?" the center's credit manager asked him. "Pay us directly and if you can't, just call and tell us. We'll work something out."

The wife picked up the story there.

"If it hadn't been for the way that credit manager helped us," she said, "we might still be hooked up with that so-called debt pooler. You know, you don't think of a creditor as a friend. You avoid him.

"Now I feel that if we have a problem, we are going to level with our creditors. They'll do more for us than any debt adjuster. At least, that's what happened to us."

Debtor Beware: Tricky Wording Baits the Adjuster's Hook—Part 4

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

A debt consolidator convicted of mail fraud blames carefully worded advertising and double-talking "counselors" for giving debtors the false impression that debt adjusters will pay all their bills now and collect from them later.

It's a matter of total impression, explained the former consolidator. Neither the ads nor the salesmen promise in so many words that the debt pooler will advance any money. The fact is, though, that many debtors start out believing that, and nobody disabuses them.

Victims interviewed by The Star said they thought all their creditors would be paid off at once and they would reimburse the debt adjuster in easy stages. That's how they misinterpreted the ads that say, "If you owe $1,000, pay as low as $15 a week."

The ex-adjuster illustrated the technique used with this phrase from his former spiel; "At no time do we advance any cash directly to you." True enough, but it leaves the debtor with the impression that while he's not going to get any cash, his creditors will.

Victims cited such advertising messages as "garnishment avoided," "no co-signers or security" and "now you can pay all your bills regardless of condition" as meaning—to them, at least—that the debt adjuster would take care of everything for them. Even the phrase "not a loan" failed to straighten them out since they didn't expect any loan in the sense of cash.

From the former debt adjuster, from federal investigators, from victims and from the spiels of the pro-raters themselves, The Star collected these tricks of the debt-adjusting trade:

THE COME-ON

In addition, to newspaper, magazine, radio and television advertising, the debt adjusters solicit prospects by postcard. They get names from court records of people sued for debt, from telephone crisscrosses (street address) directories for "good" neighborhoods and from some loan companies with whom they have an understanding.

Post cards to prospects simply say, "Please contact me on a matter of mutual importance." If the prospect is curious enough to call and ask for the man whose phony name is listed on the card, the salesman goes right into his opening pitch. "We understand from a mutual friend that you're having a little problem with some of your bills. We wonder if we could be of service to you."

If the prospect starts asking questions, the salesman knows he has hooked a live one and immediately makes a date to explain "exactly what we're going to do for you."

Debt adjusters who rely most on radio and television promotion usually have their salesmen cruising the area so they can speedily contact anyone who calls in response to a broadcast before he changes his mind. Most of the victims interviewed by The Star said a salesman or "counselor" came to their home within half an hour of their call expressing interest.

In every case, their visitor was more salesman that "counselor." In the 20 to 25 minutes he stayed with them, he (1) found out how much they owed, (2) how much they used for living expenses, (3) how much money they could give him that night and (4) how much they could pay weekly. As soon as he had their names on a contract, he rushed off with their payment books and their first payment.

Those who described the encounter said the salesman talked so fast they never had a chance to ask questions about how their money was to be used. All one woman remembered was that she had only $70 in the bank and the salesman took $60 of it. Several victims were positive that the salesman had told them that payments to all their creditors would start immediately. They found out soon enough that that wasn't true.

The come-on that requires the least salesmanship and nets an important share of the customer is the referral technique. Debtors already signed up with debt firms will either get a small check to reward them for each new customer they refer or anywhere from $5 to $100 will be deducted from their outstanding debt.

THE SPIEL

Once he faces a prospective customer, the "counselor" finds some negative selling frequently pays off. "Shame on you," he chides the bill-weary prospects. "Poor management got you into this. You really don't need our services. With what you make, you could take care of all these bills yourself."

The prospective victim falls for the reverse psychology. "No, I can't," he says, right on schedule. "My wife blows everything I make and forgets to enter the checks."

"Well, maybe we can help you after all," the salesman concedes and the contract is signed.

Sometimes, there's a more direct sales pitch. "You pay us and we'll take care of all your bills. You'll be out of debt in half the time it would take by yourself." "Within four weeks all your creditors will be paid and you'll be on easy street." "Because of our reputation and volume, we can work better in your behalf than you can for yourself." "One check to the store covering many accounts will be more acceptable than your one little check covering only part of your bill." (Not true, the stores say.)

THE CONTRACT

Since they base their fee on what the debtor owes and they can collect, the adjustors try to include everything in their contract—even car payments that must be paid in full and on schedule.

They will pro-rate all the debts whether or not that's the right solution for the debtor. It's always the right solution for the pro-rater.

They try to bind the debtor by a contract warning, "This contract cancellable only by 90 days' written notice." That's on the Credit Advisors, Inc., contract, and debtors get the idea they have to pay to get out sooner, but a spokesman for Credit Advisors, Inc., insisted that the firm never sues to collect.

When a debtor plugs along with his weekly payments to the debt adjustor until the end is in sight, he may be kept on the hook by an informal letter in longhand from a "counselor." "In reviewing your account," the debtor is told, "I find that I can now reduce your payments to $13 per Monday. If this will help you at this time please sign and return the enclosed."

What sounded as welcome as a gift actually meant the debtor was stringing out his payments longer and increasing his interest. And that friendly letter virtually invited the debtor to take on a new load of debt.

The contract sets up a payment schedule for the debtor but says nothing about how the debtor is supposed to live while he's meeting that schedule. Theoretically, the debtor is counseled about his living expenses but since the "counselor" is more con-man than economist, he gets up a budget so unrealistic that even the most determined debtor is rarely able to meet it.

A GS-6 Navy stenographer with take home pay of $340.80 a month signed up to pay the debt adjuster $170 a month. When her rent was deducted from what was left, she had $90 a month to cover food, clothes, medical bills, cosmetics and car maintenance.

Obviously, she couldn't make it. Nor can others. Many write off the filing fee they paid the debt adjuster as a bad guess and look for a more realistic way to get out of debt.

AFTER THE CONTRACT

Both debtors and creditors must be pacified, when bills aren't promptly paid by the debt adjuster. Credit Advisors handles the complaints they know are coming with a 16-point sheet of "customer advice."

In addition to cautioning customers against buying anything or paying any creditors without checking with Credit Advisors first, the "customer advice" warns:

"There may be a possible negative reaction from your creditors at first. There may be harassing phone calls at first. There may be routine duns and delinquent notices at first. It takes four to five weeks to get all creditors notified and make arrangements with them after the first full payment."

As for the creditors, most debt adjusters seek to pacify them by giving the biggest payment to the one who bothers the customer most. Doctors are put at the bottom of the list on the theory that you can't repossess a baby or an appendix.

Sometimes they can forestall creditors a while by saying they are cleaning up the small bills first and if he'll just wait a while, he'll get the biggest slice of the debtor's payment.

When the creditor gets tired of waiting, he sends the debtor a summons to appear in court to answer a judgment or garnishment. The debtor sends it on to the debt adjuster, who may try to get the creditor to drop the case. If the creditor refuses, some debt adjusters fail to tell their customers and the case is lost by default because the debtor isn't there to defend himself. The debtor learns what happened when his salary is garnisheed or he's notified there's a judgment outstanding against him.

Both debtors and Action Line, in behalf of debtors, have run into the same answer when things go wrong. It was used when a woman discovered the figures had been changed on her contract after she signed. It was the explanation given Action Line after a car on which the debtor had paid regularly via the debt consolidator was repossessed.

Said the debt consolidator:

"The employe who did that has been fired."

DEBTOR BEWARE: FIRMS SEEK CONTROLS TO FORESTALL A BAN—PART 5

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

The commercial debt adjusters, who make a tidy living from the fees they charge debtors, are trying to stay in business by the unique device of campaigning for laws to regulate themselves.

Since the adjusters, also known as debt consolidators, managers, liquidators, poolers and pro-raters, are now outlawed in 21 states, they strive to forestall more such laws by pushing regulation as an alternative.

They were behind efforts here to get laws regulating them. They didn't succeed but they confused the issue enough through several sessions of Congress to prevent passage of a law to put them out of business in the District.

They succeeded in pushing through a regulatory measure recently in the state of Washington—the 12th state to regulate to some extent rather than ban. They are making a determined push to keep Connecticut among the regulated states while the Hartford Times editorially campaigns for Connecticut to become the 22nd state to prohibit debt pooling.

To the debt adjusters, Maryland is very much a key state, since Baltimore already outlaws them, and they don't want the rest of the state to do likewise—particularly when business is booming for ex-Baltimore firms soliciting Washington area debtors from new locations in Mount Rainier, Hyattsville, Laurel and Marlow Heights.

Credit Advisors, Inc., the largest of the adjuster firms with several offices in nearby Maryland as well as Washington, boasts of supplying every member of the Maryland Legislature with information on regulating the consolidators. They didn't win regulation at the latest session of the legislature, but you couldn't say they lost. A bill to outlaw debt consolidation throughout Maryland died.

Dr. Arthur Dorman, Prince Georges County delegate in the Maryland legislature, had introduced the outlawing measure and was joined by two other delegates concerned about debt poolers in their counties. Their combined measure passed the House, but opponents had flown in a spokesman from the Midwest to testify against it, and the bill was "lobbied to death" in the Maryland Senate. Dr. Dorman said he and his colleagues are going to try again at the start of the next session.

The abuses of debt adjusters, from backbreaking fees to pocketing of funds entrusted to them, began prompting measures to prohibit the business in 1955 when three states—Maine, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania—outlawed them.

A year later, when Sen. Jacob K. Javits, R-N.Y., was New York's attorney general, that state outlawed them. At the time, Javits faced head-on the issue of regulation versus prohibition.

"As a matter of basic policy," Javits said, "I am opposed to outlawing any business, yet my office could suggest to the legislature no practical way to regulate properly such activities."

BALTIMORE'S EXPERIENCE

In Baltimore, City Councilman Leon A. Rubenstein did the same kind of soul searching as Javits had done a decade earlier in New York and arrived at the same conclusion.

Rubenstein, an attorney, got interested in the debt adjustment business when several clients complained that money they gave the pro-raters to spread among their creditors never got that far. After he found these firms were handling other people's money with no control whatever, he announced that he would introduce appropriate legislation.

Predictably, he was contacted at once by a debt pooler who said he wanted to cooperate and had just what Rubenstein would want—a nifty bill to regulate the business. After thinking it over, Rubenstein drafted an ordinance to get them out of town and both proposals went to the City Council Judiciary Committee.

The council chose to outlaw them, but the debt poolers made one more pitch. They tried to persuade Baltimore Mayor Theodore R. McKeldin to veto the ordinance. The death knell for the debt poolers in Baltimore was sounded at a mayor's hearing where the Legal Aid Bureau, a Bar Association committee, the Better Business Bureau, installment houses, finance companies, labor unions and retail merchants all urged the mayor to sign the ordinance. He did.

STATES JOIN BAN

The move by state legislatures to outlaw rather than try to control the debt poolers has attracted more advocates every year. Virginia and Georgia joined New York in outlawing them in 1956.

Rhode Island started out among the states regulating them but switched to an outright ban and now is figuring out what to do about the debt poolers who use Rhode Island as home base but prey on debtors all over the country—including Washington.

Other states which now forbid commercial debt consolidators are Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Kansas, Missouri, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, West Virginia and Wyoming.

THE CASE AGAINST REGULATING

Why do so many state legislatures, confronting the problem of debt pooling for profit, choose to outlaw rather than regulate the business? The Star got these answers:

1. If the business were regulated, official sanction would be at least implied and debtors would be misled into believing that the government was protecting their interests and that the debt liquidator would perform the miracles he promises. Since many creditors will have nothing to do with a pro-rater, he can't follow through on his assurance that creditors will agree to his terms.

2. None of the states which regulate instead of outlawing the debt poolers are said to have any effective supervision. It takes trained staffs to audit, examine and supervise. In the case of the pro-raters, license fees wouldn't pay for a staff large enough to police the debt poolers and make sure the money went where the debtor thought it was going.

3. Commercial debt pooling may constitute the unauthorized practice of law and cannot properly be authorized and regulated by statute. That was the reason given by the governors of Indiana and Nebraska for vetoing bills to regulate the pro-rater. The District Commissioners have taken the same position every time the debt poolers propose regulation here.

OPPOSED DIGGS BILL

In 1965, the commissioners gave this last argument in opposing a bill introduced by Rep. Charles C. Diggs Jr., D-Mich. Detroit, Diggs' home town, is also home to Credit Advisors, Inc. An organization of debt poolers, the American Association of Credit Counselors, was credited with interesting Diggs in the measure.

Asked for comment on the Diggs bill, Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner wrote House District Committee Chairman John L. McMillan, D-S.C., that the business of debt adjusting is "of such a nature as to lend itself to grave abuses against those in the lower income brackets."

"The commissioners," said Tobriner, "are inclined to the view that debt adjusting creates a relationship of trust in which the debt adjuster may, in a situation of insolvency, be engaged in marshaling assets in the manner of a proceeding in bankruptcy.

"The commissioners believe that under such circumstances the debt adjuster's client may need advice as to the legality of the various claims against him, legal remedies governing debtor-creditor relationships and provisions of the Bankruptcy Act."

Tobriner said the commissioners would not recommend the Diggs bill but would favor a measure banning the business of debt adjusting except as an incident to the lawful practice of law.

TYPICAL OF MOVES

The 1965 effort by the debt poolers was typical of several moves to regulate rather than outlaw them here. Once they managed to switch the House District Committee from outlawing to regulating on the ground that any state violated the Constitution when it passed laws prohibiting the business.

That argument collapsed, however, when the Supreme Court in April, 1963, upheld the right of Kansas to make it a misdemeanor for any person to engage in the business of debt adjusting except as an incident to the lawful practice of the law. The high court thus ruled against Frank C. Skrupa, doing business as Credit Advisors.

Credit Advisors across the country, all 45 offices, are owned by Rudolph Barden of Detroit, whose Barden Investment Management Corp. is currently circulating a brochure—four years after the Supreme Court decision—which still raises a "serious question of constitutionality" about restricting debt adjusting to nonprofit agencies.

The profit-making Credit Advisors can be expected to fight any effort here to take the profit out of debt.

Debtor Beware: Free Aid Ousts Adjusters—Part 6

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Across the nation thousands of people are freeing themselves from the mire of debt and avoiding the stigma of bankruptcy without paying fancy fees to commercial debt adjusters.

They are lucky enough to live in the 63 metropolitan areas and medium-sized towns where a community answer has been found for the individual's debt problems. The answer: Nonprofit, free or nominal-cost debt counseling services sponsored by a cross-section of community leaders.

Where these services are in full operation, the so-called "counselors" who make a business of debt management leave town for lack of customers. That's what The Star found in surveying more than a dozen cities with community counseling services.

A measure of the effectiveness of these services is the virulence of attacks against them by the commercial debt adjusters. The head of the nation's largest commercial adjuster network calls the nonprofit services "diabolical in terms of any understanding of finance and the free enterprise system."

The Star's survey showed why debtors shun the commercial adjusters when nonprofit services open. The fact that these services are free or nominal cost is only one reason. Here are others:

1. Instead of being "counseled" by salesmen for the commercial debt adjuster, the debtor is advised and, where necessary, his debt payments are pro-rated by such experts, as longtime credit managers, budget counselors or retired bankers.

2. While in many places—including Washington—most creditors refuse to do business with the commercial pro-raters, any creditor will go along with a nonprofit community service which is largely creditor-supported and numbers creditors as well as consumers on its board of directors and advisory committee.

3. Duns cease and repossessions and garnishments are avoided when creditors are informed by the counseling service that the debtor is working his way out of debt with the help of the service.

4. The debtor knows that every dollar he can manage to put on his debts is going to the people he owes—and is not being held back by a commercial adjustor who takes his own cut first.

5. The community's counseling service is frank with the debtor from the start. Unlike the commercial adjuster who may convey the impression that he will advance the money to pay all the bills, the nonprofit counselor makes it plain that he's there to help the debtor help himself, that any money paid to creditors will be the debtor's money.

Like the Washington area now, a number of cities had experienced an invasion of commercial debt consolidators before business and civic leaders mobilized the community behind a nonprofit counseling service.

New Orleans had some professional pro-raters charging customers between 40 and 50 percent interest a year on the unpaid balance of their debts plus a $17 monthly service charge. In Salt Lake City, only two of the 10 consolidators were operating on a basis acceptable to the Better Business Bureau.

In Kansas City, Mo., where the paid adjusters were charging 18 percent of the debt to do anything for the debtor, businessmen launched a two-pronged attack. First, they went to the state legislature to get the fee-charging debt adjusters outlawed. Then their firms chipped in $1,000 apiece to launch the city's counseling service.

Baltimore followed a similar pattern. First, City Councilman Leon A. Rubenstein led the fight for local legislation to outlaw the commercial adjusters. Then he worked with civic and business interests to develop the nonprofit service.

Baltimore had been so badly burned by the commercial debt consolidators that the managing director of the new counseling service fears many potential supporters still associate any debt counseling with the outfits of the past. The new and the old couldn't be more different.

In addition to exploitation of the debtors by many commercial debt adjusters, the steadily increasing community services have been prompted by the nonstop surge of personal bankruptcies, as well as the credit binge which is driving more and more once-solid citizens into hopeless debt.

Indianapolis launched its service in January, 1965, after 2,824 bankruptcy cases had been processed there the previous year, a whopping 450 percent increase over the 1958 rate.

Salt Lake City's community service was started in April, 1964, primarily because of the zooming bankruptcy rate in Utah.

The rising tide of personal bankruptcies in California, now amounting to 18 percent of the national total, led to establishment of the only statewide organization to encourage local communities to set up counseling services.

The California pilot project proved its worth in its first year of operation. The amount of money involved in personal bankruptcies in Sacramento, after it was started, decreased from $7 million in 1964 to $4.3 million in 1965. In the same period, dollar losses through bankruptcy in neighboring areas without a nonprofit counseling service increased by 7 percent.

The decrease in bankruptcies is one of many benefits communities have derived from their investment in these services. Businessmen who take the lead in sponsoring and footing the bills for nonprofit counseling cite such intangibles as marriages kept out of divorce courts, debtors' jobs saved, a healthier economic climate in office or factory when employes don't lose time from work to answer debtor's summonses.

There are many tangible results, too, as The Star's survey showed. For instance:

In Phoenix, Ariz., where the first community supported counseling service was begun in 1958, the service distributed $884,252 from debtors to their creditors in 1966.

The Atlanta service has helped some 3,500 debtors since its founding in 1964, and so far none of them have returned with another load of debt—possibly because they are given an education in budgeting while freeing themselves from debt.

In St. Paul, where both the increase in personal bankruptcies and the influx of virtually uncontrolled commercial debt adjusters spurred businessmen to launch the community service, debt payments to creditors via the service totalled $481,000 in 1966 and are expected to exceed half-a-million dollars this year.

Chicago's non-profit counseling service, in addition to its counseling, educating and pro-rating successes, has chalked up another plus. It has bailed out several victims of the Chicago crime syndicate's juicy loan racket—with loans at such exorbitant rates of interest that the debtor is often forced into crime to pay off.

Of the many functions performed by the noncommercial counseling services, education is given top billing as the best hope for rescuing what has become a mortgaged generation.

Organized labor particularly has stressed the preventive role that a counseling service can play in showing workers how to use their credit wisely. Businessmen are concerned about young people who learn early how to drive a car but not how to pay for it.

To fill this void, counseling services are going into educational programs as soon as they can afford it.

The Phoenix service sponsors a speakers bureau which visits high school, college and adult groups with lectures on money handling.

The Albuquerque, N.M., service offers an educational movie. Atlanta has scheduled six educational television programs for this spring and summer. In Kansas City, members of the service's board of directors take on the speaking chores. Audiences for their lectures on wise budgeting have ranged from high school seniors to mothers of preschool children. Recently, a group of exconvicts attended.

The director of the New Orleans service teaches a course in consumer credit to the inmates of the Orleans parish prison every week. Her "students" are mostly nonsupport and alimony offenders.

The great rise in nonprofit counseling services has occurred since 1963, and the catalyst has been the National Foundation for Consumer Credit, nonprofit, business-supported organization doing research and education in consumer credit.

The foundation has provided staff help and guidance to any bona fide community group interested in developing a nonprofit counseling service.

Of the 63 such services now in operation across the country, about two-thirds were created with the foundation's aid, use the foundation's plans and suggestions and have adopted the same name, "Consumer Credit

Counseling Service." The uniformity of name and copyrighted insignia assures the creditor that he's dealing with a responsible nonprofit organization when he's asked to cooperate in the rehabilitation of a hard-pressed debtor. The debtors are sure that they haven't again fallen in with the commercial pro-raters.

In an unusual gesture to a private organization, the Ohio Senate officially commended the foundation in February for sponsoring the nonprofit counseling services, especially Ohio's own in Cleveland and Columbus.

The most successful counseling services, the foundation has emphasized, are those with the broadest support. In the cities surveyed by The Star, the board of directors and advisory committee of each service covers the spectrum of the city's business and professional life.

All the bankers and finance company executives, the family service officials and labor leaders, the doctors, lawyers and merchant chiefs share one common interest. They want to help debtors wake up from their financial nightmare and regain both their credit rating and their self-respect.

Aftermath: Two-Pronged Move on Adjusters Near—Part 7

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

A Maryland Senator and a Virginia Congressman yesterday announced plans to push for legislation to outlaw the commercial debt adjusters now preying on Washington area debtors.

At the same time, the business community moved forward with its plans to replace the commercial pro-raters with a nonprofit Consumer Credit Counseling Service similar to services now aiding the debt-ridden in 63 communities across the country.

The two-pronged move to improve both the debtors' and the city's economic health was the immediate response to The Star's "Debtor Beware" series of last week.

PLANS TO OFFER BILL

On the Senate side, Senator Joseph C. Tydings (D-Md.), chairman of the Senate District Committee's business and finance subcommittee, said he was shocked to learn of the practices taking advantage of those in need of financial counseling.

He said he will introduce legislation "to outlaw these deceptive practices." This will be one of the measures included when he opens hearings soon on the need for consumer protection in a number of activities here.

In the House, Representative Joel Broyhill (R-Va.) said The Star had pinpointed a problem which should have been corrected years ago "and which I attempted to do at the time through legislation."

Broyhill recalled that at earlier hearings on legislation to outlaw commercial debt managers, a "smoke screen was built up around the old argument of regulation versus prohibition and enough confusion was generated to prevent any positive action."

"We have now had enough time since the hearings," he said, "for evidence to be collected that protection of the public desperately requires outlawing rather than regulating the commercial debt adjusters."

PREDICTS COSPONSORS

He predicted that there would be cosponsors for the legislation because of the number of victims of the debt consolidators.

Recalling instances where he had personally counseled people who had got into financial jams, Broyhill also emphasized the need for nonprofit, community-sponsored debt counseling service here.

"The lack of such a service in this area," he said, "is what leaves the door wide open for the unscrupulous to rob people in despair."

Both Tydings and Broyhill emphasized that the proposed legislation to outlaw the commercial debt poolers should specifically exempt nonprofit debt counseling services.

Meanwhile, District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner disclosed that the Commissioners have approved legislation to prohibit the commercial budget planners and plan to send it to Capitol Hill soon.

As the Maryland and Virginia legislators emphasized, the Commissioners' measure will open the door to non-profit debt adjusting while slamming shut the door on the debt profiteers.

Strong endorsement for a non-profit consumer counseling service under community auspices came from Assistant Secretary of Labor Esther Peterson.

At the Labor Department, she pointed out, an experiment in such counseling is now under way. The two-phase program starts with a series of consumer education lectures which Labor's employees are given time off to attend. The second phase is the development and training of 30 consumer advisers who will be available to all department employees for advice and counseling.

Mrs. Peterson, who until recently was also the President's special adviser for consumer affairs, said she hoped that the Labor Department's program for its own employees will illustrate the value of counseling and consumer education not only for other departments but for the Washington area under community auspices.

Plans for establishing a free credit counseling service in the metropolitan area have been in the talking stage here for the last year. Now, community action appears less remote.

Edward F. Garretson, secretary of the Retail Credit Association of Metropolitan Washington and vice president and general manager of Credit Bureau, Inc., heads the association's committee working on the counseling service in cooperation with the National Foundation for Consumer Credit, the Better Business Bureau, industry and civic leaders.

Garretson said support already has been offered by many national chains as well as local stores and financial institutions. The committee, he said, plans to contact all elements of the community for the key roles they are expected to play in the formation of the service.

MEETING EXPECTED SOON

An organization meeting is expected as soon as sufficient support has been mobilized. The support, if it follows the pattern The Star found in other cities, will encompass educators, attorneys, family service officials, psychiatrists and other medical authorities, a representative of the military, and civic, labor and business leaders. In other cities, the business world is widely represented on both the board of directors and the advisory committee of the counseling service. Banks, stores, finance and loan companies usually foot the bills for the counseling service. They also provide considerable expertise in using credit wisely.

Until a nonprofit service is launched here, Garretson suggested that those who need credit advice should talk either to some of their own creditors or write an account of their particular problem to the Credit Bureau Inc., P.O. Box 1617, Washington 13, D.C.

MEETING THE ALCOHOLISM CRISIS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, alcoholism today is more serious and extensive in its effect in the United States than in any other country in the world, ranking as our fourth major health menace, according to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Approximately 5 to 6 million Americans today suffer from alcoholism and an estimated 200,000 new cases occur each year. Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary John W. Gardner points out that—

> The burden of alcoholism is not carried by them (the chronic alcoholics) alone—it directly, often tragically, affects between 16 and 20 million members of their families.

Moreover, a Louis Harris poll last year revealed that one out every five people interviewed had a close relative who is an alcoholic.

The heavy burden on our law enforcement agencies which results from handling public alcoholism as a criminal offense is particularly troubling to me. In 1965, 2 million persons were arrested, in the Nation, for public alcoholism. This amounted to one-third of all arrests in the United States. Indeed, if arrests for traffic offenses are not considered, arrests for public alcoholism account for almost half the arrests in the country. These figures bespeak an enormous misuse of law enforcement agencies—keeping police from more urgent crime-fighting, jamming places of detention, clogging already crowded court calendars—to handle public health, not criminal law, problems.

Criminal law handling of alcoholism has, among its many other disadvantages, been a complete failure in deterring public drunkenness. In Washington, D.C., about 44,000 persons were arrested in 1965 for public intoxication. About 70 percent of these were repeaters, hard-core alcoholics, who make a perpetual circle between the gutter, the courts, and the jails or workhouses. A Committee on Prisons, Probation, and Parole in the District of Columbia in 1957 studied six chronic alcoholic defendants and found that they had been arrested a total of 1,409 times and served a total of 125 years in penal institutions. And in 1964–65, 14 persons died from acute alcoholism in District of Columbia jail cells.

In my own State of Maryland, the same shocking statistics exist. During the 18-month period from January 1, 1964, through July 1, 1965, 12,785 individuals were convicted of public intoxication. And 3,533 of these people had more than one conviction for this so-called offense within a 12-month period during that time. The Baltimore Sun has reported the deaths of some 27 persons arrested for drunkenness, while waiting for a court hearing, in the past 5 years alone. A recent report of the State department of mental hygiene pointed out that—

> The State hospitals have no treatment program for habitual drunkenness offenders.

The absence of adequate treatment facilities is, unfortunately, typical throughout the country. It is incredible to me that our society has tolerated for so long this barbaric treatment of these unfortunate, sick people.

During the past year, we have come to a turning point in our community approach and attitudes toward chronic alcoholism. This juncture was reached as the result of two court decisions, Driver against Hinnant, in the Fourth Circuit—which includes Maryland—and Easter against the District of Columbia, in the District of Columbia Circuit. Both decisions held that chronic alcoholism was a valid defense to a criminal charge of public drunkenness, and that chronic alcoholics must be treated, not as criminals, but as sick men in need of medical and rehabilitative treatment. The courts branded criminal law treatment of alcoholics as "cruel and unusual punishment" in violation of the eighth amendment to the Constitution.

The response to these landmark decisions has thus far been wholly inadequate. The President's Commission on Crime in the District of Columbia found that the Easter decision "has resulted in neither the removal of the chronic alcoholic from the criminal process nor provision for his treatment. Since Easter there has been, in fact, a marked deterioration in the health of the city's derelict alcoholics—a condition which goes unheeded only by a callous disregard for human life."

I find this situation shocking. And there is no indication that the executive branch or the District of Columbia government intends to take any significant steps to correct this situation. The recommendations regarding criminal law and administration which the Attorney General and the District government have sent to the Congress ignore the conclusion of both the National Crime Commission and the District of Columbia Crime Commission that facilities for treatment of chronic alcoholics are urgently needed.

The bill I am introducing today would put into effect the recommendations of the Crime Commissions. It would establish civil detoxification centers, as part of a comprehensive treatment program, to replace the police station as an initial point of detention for inebriates. It would provide inpatient facilities to treat chronic alcoholics through intensive care, and outpatient units, including halfway houses, to aid men getting back on their feet to obtain jobs and become useful members of society.

The bill would make treatment and rehabilitation available to chronic alcoholics whose only "crime" is that they are sick men. The bill would also provide facilities for civil commitment and treatment of those chronic alcoholics who, when intoxicated, endanger the safety of others. The public would be protected, and chronic alcoholism would be recognized, and treated, as an illness.

In addition, the bill provides for submission by the District of Columbia government of a comprehensive alcoholism treatment plan to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. This bill is essentially similar to a bill introduced in the House by Representative HAGAN, though it has been modified to take account of information developed in recent House committee hearings

Washington is not alone in failing to meet the desperate problems of alcoholism. Most communities in the country have similarly failed. I believe Washington, D.C., should provide a model for a national effort of alcoholism care and control. That is the purpose or the bill I introduce today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1740) to provide a comprehensive program for the control of drunkenness and the prevention and treatment of alcoholism in the District of Columbia, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

FEDERAL REGULATION NEEDED OF FOREIGN BANKS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], and myself, a bill to provide for Federal regulation of foreign banking corporations doing business in the United States and its territories.

The banking world—and many persons in this country—were stunned by the failure of Intra Bank, whose New York office held deposits of many individual investors in addition to an estimated $21 million loan from the U.S. Commodity Credit Corporation. I am informed that under CCC regulations the Intra Bank—or any foreign bank with a branch or agency in the United States—is classified as a U.S. bank and, therefore, becomes eligible for credits—in this case for wheat—at a rate of interest 1 percent less than a "foreign bank." Although Intra was treated as any other U.S. bank by the CCC, there was no Federal supervision whatsoever of the bank's activities by any agency of the Federal Government. I am informed that in spite of its loss in the Intra Bank situation, the CCC continues to treat foreign agencies or branches as "U.S. banks."

Federal legislation is needed to protect the private investor as well as the Government from such activities and to give added respect to the many foreign banks in this country carrying on highly reputable business transactions.

It is in the public interest to have Federal supervision of the foreign banks because of the degree of knowledge and expertise required to examine and regulate foreign institutions. Because these activities constitute such a small proportion of the supervisory functions of any State, the desired specialization in the international banking field has not been developed.

Although the Constitution provides that the Congress has responsibility for controlling money and for managing the international monetary affairs of the Nation, none of the various Federal banking agencies—that is the Comptroller of the Currency, Federal Reserve, the FDIC—has any jurisdiction over foreign banks. I feel that the legislation is even more necessary in order for us to gain an overall picture of what is happening in the foreign banking field.

I have made certain changes from my proposal on this matter made last year. I think the changes help to make the proposal more practical. While I still feel there is a need for overall supervision by one agency of all activities of foreign banking corporations operating within this country, I also believe that the dual banking concept should be applied to branches and agencies of foreign banks. My new proposal would allow a foreign bank to go either to the State or to the Federal Government to receive permission to do business in this country. Under existing law, only the States can give such permission and only Massachusetts, New York, and Oregon have done so.

A foreign banking corporation which decides to obtain Federal permission must apply to the Secretary of the Treasury who will consider among other things the convenience of the business community where the agency, branch, or controlled subsidiary is to be located, the number of other offices which the foreign banking corporation may have in a particular State, and whether approval of such an application would be in the national public interest. The national public interest is defined as, among other things, the encouragement of legitimate activities of foreign banks in the United States, the encouragement of other nations to grant reciprocal privileges to banks chartered in the United States which operate or wish to operate abroad, and the promotion of foreign commerce of the United States. In addition, the Secretary shall not approve the application of any foreign banking corporation to operate an agency, branch, or controlled subsidiary in any State if, under the laws of such State, an agency, branch, or subsidiary would not be permitted to carry on the business of banking. Thus, the foreign banking corporation can only operate where State law specifically does not prohibit its activities and such corporation must also comply with the branching laws of the State in which it will operate. Although there is no specific renewal time period contained in the bill, there is a firm—but appealable—revocation and suspension procedure. Administratively, the Secretary shall cause the foreign banking corporations to be examined at least as regularly as national banks and also the Federal Reserve shall set reserve requirements which in no event would be lower than those required of national banks.

Where a foreign bank chooses to go to the State for permission to operate, the bill provides that the Secretary of the Treasury must determine that the granting of this permission is in the national public interest before the State may grant permission. Also the Secretary will receive reports of all examinations from the appropriate State banking agency and if necessary conduct examinations of his own—or an authority he may delegate—to insure that there is one agency which has some supervision over the activities of all the foreign banks operating within the country. It is too easy under present law for a particular interest to move into two separate States without either of the State authorities knowing of the dual activities. Under my proposal, then, the Secretary will not only examine the banks which have obtained Federal permission to operate but also will receive examination reports from State banking authorities regarding operations of foreign banking corporations, who have received permission from the State to operate.

If in the view of the Secretary, examination reports reveal any agency, branch, or subsidiary is conducting its operations in an unsafe or unsound manner, the Secretary shall ask the State to take necessary action for the protection of investors. Finally, whenever the Secretary determines, with the approval of the Secretary of State, that continued State permission to operate a certain foreign banking corporation is contrary to the national public interest, he shall so inform the appropriate State banking authority, and that authority shall act to terminate the operations of the foreign banking corporation.

There seems no reason why the foreign banking corporation should not have the same choice as our domestic banks of whether to go the Federal or State route in seeking permission to operate. The distinctions between the foreign and the domestic situation, I think, are settled by giving the Federal Government a "veto" power over the State when the national public interest is involved.

There will no doubt be much debate over some of the details of this legislation, but my intention is to arouse sufficient interest in the general proposition to which the bill is committed; that is, that the Federal Government should oversee foreign banking operations. I intend to seek hearings on this proposal as soon as possible as I believe we must enact a Federal law now to better protect our citizens from a repetition of the Intra Bank closing.

The idea behind this proposal has been brilliantly set out by Prof. Jack Zwick, of Columbia University, in a paper entitled "Foreign Banking in the United States," prepared for the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress. Professor Zwick points out that foreign banks would not be a threat to the small deposit-oriented bank, but rather foreign banking operations are likely to be limited to a handful of major foreign trade centers—where it would be economical to operate. Although at the present time credit balances of foreign banks represent less than 1 percent of aggregate balances in the States where the foreign banks are located, increased involvement is anticipated in the future. With few exceptions, foreign banks concentrate on the financing of international trade between the United States and their home nations or third countries and operate to a substantial degree with dollar balances obtained from non-U.S. residents. Foreign banks have expanded the volume of international trade and trade financing which domestic banks—together with branches, subsidiaries, and agencies of foreign banks—have financed to an increasing degree.

Certain of the foreign controlled subsidiary banks, particularly the Puerto Rican and Israeli banks in New York, and the Japanese banks in California, are established principally to serve their respective ethnic communities. These banks have offered banking services, such as installment loans in the case of the Puerto Rican branches, which domestic banks often did not provide. It is believed that these banks to some extent have attracted "mattress money," which in their absence would have been held outside the banking system. My proposal also calls upon the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to submit within 90 days to the Congress a proposal which would allow those foreign banking corporations who so choose to obtain deposit insurance.

In neither New York nor California, where domestic bankers were interviewed, have there been complaints regarding competition provided by foreign banks. On the contrary, virtually all bankers have suggested that the existence of foreign banks has increased the prestige of U.S. money markets, expanded the volume of trade financing, and has facilitated the overseas expansion of American banks on a reciprocal basis.

The balance-of-payments effects associated with the existence of foreign banks cannot be assessed unequivocally. The general nature of foreign bank activities here and the fact that the presence of foreign banks here has facilitated the opening of branches and subsidiaries abroad by U.S. banks have contributed to the conclusion which is open to rebuttal: that our balance-of-payments position has been aided. One thing is certain—foreign trade has been aided and there the balance of payments in our favor is clear and needs to be increased.

The bill has been under preparation by me for a long time. It has been discussed much in the press. I introduce it after having worked out what I considered to be the problems of Federal-State relationships and also rebutting any idea that we are seeking to retaliate against Canada or any other country in connection with the handling of foreign banks in the United States.

I hope very much that early hearings will be had in the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have already acquainted many of the committee members beside Senator Brooke who serves on the committee with the proposed legislation.

I send the bill to the desk and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1741) to provide certain Federal controls over foreign banking corporations operating within the United States, introduced by Mr. Javits (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

WORLD WAR II VETERANS BENEFITS NEED EXTENSION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, eligibility for home and small business loans to veterans of World War II will expire on July 25 of this year. In effect, this termination will deprive 4,683,000 World War II veterans of opportunities provided by such loans.

Although the number of veterans taking advantage of these loans has decreased in recent years, last year 166,000 persons did utilize the program, and already this year 37,500 persons have participated. This certainly is not an insubstantial number. I feel that as long as a reasonably large number of veterans are taking advantage of this loan program, the program should be available for their benefit.

I point out that similar benefits for veterans of the Korean war have been extended recently by the Congress until 1975—25 years after their inception. The bill I introduce today would extend the termination date for World War II veterans for home and small business loans from July 25, 1967, to July 25, 1970—25 years after their inception. I hope to obtain speedy approval of this measure before the present program expires this July.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1742) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in order to extend until July 25, 1970, the termination date for home, farm, and business loans under such chapter in the case of veterans of World War II, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

DISPOSITION OF FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO PAY CERTAIN JUDGMENTS OF THE SAC AND FOX INDIANS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and Senator Monroney, I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa and in Oklahoma, and the Sac and Fox of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 138 and 143.

The Sac and Fox Nation was awarded judgments under docket 138 in the amount of $1,096,533.42 and under docket 143 in the amount of $1,789,201.45. This money has been appropriated and is drawing interest at the annual rate of 4 percent.

On May 7, 1966, selected members of the business committees of each of the three Sac and Fox Tribes or Bands convened in Topeka, Kans., to discuss the division of these two judgments. After considerable discussion on the constitutions of each group with regard to membership within that tribe, a resolution was proposed and adopted by the delegates, and subsequently adopted by the General Council of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma endorsing this legislation.

The bill I introduce would divide the judgments on the basis of the 1891 and 1892 rolls.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have a letter dated April 18, 1967, from the principal chief of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma printed in the Record. In support of the bill, I also ask that the minutes and resolution of the Sac and Fox Nation dated May 7, 1966, and the portion of the minutes endorsing the resolution by the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma's general council meeting in Stroud, Okla., on August 27, 1966, be included in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and resolutions will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1750) to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa and in Oklahoma and the Sac and Fox of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 138 and 143; introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and Mr. MONRONEY), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The letters and resolutions presented by Mr. HARRIS are as follows:

SAC AND FOX NATION

BUSINESS MEETING HELD MAY 7, 1966, HOTEL JAYHAWK, TOPEKA, KANS.

Tribal officials

Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa: Mr. George Youngbear, Chairman; Mr. Kenneth Youngbear, Treasurer; Mrs. Adeline Wanatee, Councilwoman.

Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri: Mr. Charles Roubidoux, Chairman; Mrs. Dorothy Gilfillan, Secretary; Mr. Anthony Wapp, Vice Chairman; Mrs. Rita Bahr, Councilwoman; Mrs. Martha Morris, Councilwoman.

Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma: Mr. Elmer Manatowa, Principal Chief; Mr. Henry Scott, Second Chief; Mrs. Peggy Southern, Secretary-Treasurer; Mr. Sam Morris, Councilman; Mr. George Harris, Councilman.

Representatives from the Bureau of Indian Affairs

Mr. Norman Holmes, Area Tribal Operations Officer, Anadarko, Oklahoma; Mr. John E. Taylor, Area Field Representative, Shawnee, Oklahoma; Mr. Hans Walker, Jr., Tribal Operations Officer, Minneapolis, Minn.; Mr. Raymond R. Wolf, Officer-in-charge Sac and Fox AFO, Tama, Iowa; Mr. Jim Roberts, Tribal Operations Officer, Anadarko, Oklahoma; Mr. Buford Morrison, Area Field Representative, Horton, Kansas.

Members of the Business Committees of the three Sac and Fox Tribes or Bands convened for a business meeting in Topeka, Kansas, May 7, 1966, for the purpose of discussing the division of judgments awarded in Docket 138 and Docket 143, and to try to agree on a proposal agreeable to each group as to the division of these judgments.

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Mr. John Taylor, there being present representatives from all three groups of Sac and Fox.

Thereupon the first item was the introduction of the various business committees, Bureau of Indian Affairs representatives and visiting attorneys.

Thereupon the Chairman gave a brief resume of events leading up to the present meeting today, advising the meeting was called to exchange ideas and to see if the groups can come up with something that will be acceptable to each other in order that they might be able to go to Congress with a Bill setting out the division of the claims, and ultimately lead to each group making use of their funds as its general council directs.

Thereupon, Mr. Elmer Manatowa, Principal Chief of the Sac and Fox of Oklahoma, requested the Bureau give some guide lines of what is needed by them and what should be accomplished today.

Tribal Affairs Officer, Mr. Norman Holmes, advised the Sac and Fox Nation has been awarded judgments under Docket 138 in the amount of $1,096,533.42 and under Docket 143 in the amount of $1,789,201.45. That this money has been appropriated is now in the U.S. Treasury drawing 4% interest. That each group should express their opinion and propose a division of this money to be submitted to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Thereupon, the Chairman called for proposals from each group with a discussion to follow. The following proposals were made:

Mr. Charles Roubidoux, Chairman of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri proposed the division be made ⅓ to each group. The Missouri band feels they have a greater equity in the area involved in these two dockets than did the other two groups, and based on this equity, they feel they are entitled to a larger share than they would receive if the groups use an old roll or a current membership in the division of the judgments.

Mr. Elmer Manatowa proposed the division be made on a current membership basis. The Oklahoma group feels every member of the Sac and Fox Nation should receive the same amount regardless of whether they live in Kansas, Iowa, Oklahoma, California or any other place, as long as they are members of one of the three groups of Sac and Fox involved in these judgments.

Mr. Kenneth Youngbear, Treasurer of the Iowa group, proposed the division be made on the Allotment rolls of 1891. The Iowa group feels that the increase in population of the Oklahoma group would make a division by any other means unfair to them.

Thereupon a general discussion was held on the constitution of each group with regard to membership within that particular Tribe.

To obtain membership with the Missouri group, a person must now reside within the Potawatomi area as set out in their constitution. No degree of Sac and Fox blood is involved, only the area in which a person resides. The Bureau has proposed they amend their constitution to allow a more fair enrollment. This action is pending. They now have 210 members.

To obtain membership in the Oklahoma group, a person must be at least ¼ Sac and Fox of Oklahoma and have at least one parent on the tribal roll. They now have 1800 members.

Membership in the Iowa group is restricted to a pater lineal system. No degree of Sac and Fox blood is involved. They now have 768 members.

After discussions both pro and con by all groups, a stalemate seemed apparent.

Thereupon, Mr. Elmer Manatowa, still advocating a division on the current rolls, proposed a compromise amendment to the Iowa proposal. This proposal would divide the judgments on the basis of the 1891 and 1892 rolls and information as proposed by the Iowa group, but withholding from each group 5%. This 5% to be withheld until such time as a final determination is made by the Bureau, or by the Secretary. If it is determined to be divided on a current membership basis, then this 5% would be redistributed to the deserving group. If it is determined to be divided on old rolls, each group would get their 5% back. Percentages would be set out as follows:

[In percent]

	Old rolls	Less 5
Sac and Fox of Iowa	36.91	31.91
Sac and Fox of Oklahoma	51.70	46.70
Sac and Fox of Kansas	11.39	6.39
Total	100.00	85.00

Thereupon the motion was seconded by Mr. Sam Morris, and a roll call vote was taken. Eight votes were cast in favor of the motion and five votes were cast opposing the motion. Tabulation of the votes is listed below.

Mr. George Youngbear, Yea; Mr. Kenneth Youngbear, Yea; Mrs. Adeline Wanatee, Yea; Mr. Elmer Manatowa, Yea; Mr. Henry Scott, Yea; Mr. Sam Morris, Yea; Mr. George Harris, Yea; Mrs. Peggy Southern, Yea.

Mr. Charles Roubidoux, Nay; Mrs. Dorothy Gilfillan, Nay; Mr. Anthony Wapp, Nay; Mrs. Rita Bahr, Nay; Mrs. Martha Morris, Nay.

Thereupon the Kansas group was advised that since they were opposed to this division, they should submit their views to Washington outlining their opposition.

Thereupon, Mr. George Youngbear made a motion to retain the current organization with Mr. John Taylor as Chairman and Mrs. Peggy Southern as Secretary until the disposition of the 15% is settled. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kenneth Youngbear and it carried by a unanimous vote.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned.

PEGGY SOUTHERN,
Recording Secretary.

SAC AND FOX NATION

BUSINESS MEETING HELD MAY 7, 1966, HOTEL JAYHAWK, TOPEKA, KANS.

Resolution

Be it resolved that the Sac and Fox Nation, acting through their Business Committees, their Principal Chiefs or other officers designated by the Business Committee, shall negotiate with each other for the purpose of reaching an agreement as to the division of awards made by the Indian Claims Commission in the proceedings referred to in this resolution as follows:

Docket No. 138, Cession 151—Western Iowa and northwestern Missouri.

Docket No. 143, Cession 152—Northeastern and northcentral Iowa.

That the Tribes hereby agree to a division of the awards which have been allowed in these cases among the Missouri Sac and Fox, the Iowa Sac and Fox and the Oklahoma Sac and Fox, and will be based on the following information:

Sac and Fox Indians of Mississippi located in Oklahoma Allotment Roll of February 13, 1891. Number of allottees	549
Sac and Fox Indians of Mississippi located in Iowa Annuity Payment Roll of 1892. Number on payment roll	392
Sac and Fox Indians of Missouri located in Kansas Allotment Roll of February 28, 1891. Number of allottees	121

That this division will be broken down into percentages, and

That 5% is to be withheld from each group until such time as the Bureau of Indian Affairs determines the most equitable basis for divisions, the current membership rolls, or the allotment and annuity rolls.

That if it is determined to be divided on a current membership basis, the 15% will be redistributed to the deserving groups.

That if it is determined to be divided on the allotment rolls and annuity roll that 5% will be returned to this group.

That percentages will be as follows:

[In percent]

	Old rolls	Less 5
Sac and Fox of Iowa	36.91	31.91
Sac and Fox of Oklahoma	51.70	46.70
Sac and Fox of Kansas	11.39	6.39
Total	100.00	85.00

That the foregoing authorization and any agreement as to the division of awards received in the above proceedings shall be subject to receiving the approval thereof by the membership of these Tribes.

That, subject to the foregoing, the officers of the Tribe shall be authorized to enter into, execute and deliver on its behalf such agreements with the Tribes and do or cause to be done such other acts and things as may be necessary and desirable to carry out the intent and purpose of this resolution.

Passed and approved this 7th day of May, 1966.

Certification

We, John Taylor, duly elected Chairman, and Peggy F. Southern, duly elected Recording Secretary, do certify that the meeting was properly noticed, called, convened and held on the 7th day of May, 1966 and that it was attended by three (3) members of the Sac and Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa, five (5) members of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Missouri, and five (5) members of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma, that the above resolution was adopted by a vote of eight (8) in favor of the resolution and five (5) opposing the resolution, and that said resolution has not been amended or rescinded.

Signed this 7th day of May, 1966.

JOHN E. TAYLOR,
Chairman.

Attest:

PEGGY SOUTHERN,
Recording Secretary.

SAC AND FOX TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA GENERAL COUNCIL MEETING, STROUD, OKLA., AUGUST 27, 1966

In accordance with the Constitution and By-Laws of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma, Article III Section 1, and pursuant to a notice sent by members of the Business Committee to members of the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma, one hundred fifty eight (158) members convened for a general council meeting at the Sac and Fox reservation at Stroud, Oklahoma, August 27, 1966 for the purpose of discussing tribal business.

The meeting was called to order by the Second Chief Henry Scott. Reverend Sam Morris gave the invocation. Mr. Scott advised the Principal Chief would be unable to attend the morning session because of a funeral, but would preside after lunch. The secretary read the minutes of the last general council meeting and the minutes were approved as read.

. . . The next item on the agenda was a discussion of the joint meeting held in Topeka, Kansas between the three groups of Sac and Fox for the purpose of reaching an agreement as to the division of awards made by the Indian Claims Commission. Mr. Manatowa read the resolution which was voted on by the three groups and asked for a discussion and/or motion approving this resolution by the membership of the tribe. Mr. Levi Jones made the motion that this resolution be adopted by the membership of the tribe. Mable Harris seconded the motion. The motion carried by a vote of 112 in favor of the motion and none against. Resolution SF-67-4 is attached to these minutes.

PEGGY F. SOUTHERN,
Secretary.

SAC AND FOX TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

BUSINESS MEETING OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL, AUGUST 27, 1966

Resolution

Be it resolved that the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma accepts the proposed resolution approved in Topeka, Kansas by the Business Committee as to the division of awards made by the Indian Claims Commission in proceedings referred to as follows:

Docket No. 138, Cession 151—Western Iowa and northwestern Missouri.

Docket No. 143, Cession 152—Northeastern and northcentral Iowa.

That the Tribe hereby agrees to a division of the awards which have been allowed in these cases among the Missouri Sac and Fox, the Iowa Sac and Fox and the Oklahoma Sac and Fox, and will be based on the following information:

Sac and Fox Indians of Mississippi located in Oklahoma. Allotment Roll of February 13, 1891. Number of allottees	549
Sac and Fox Indians of Mississippi located in Iowa. Annuity Payment Roll of 1892. Number on payment roll	392
Sac and Fox Indians of Missouri located in Kansas. Allotment Roll of February 28, 1891. Number of allottees	121

That this division will be broken down into percentage, and

That 5% is to be withheld from each group until such time as the Bureau of Indian Affairs determines the most equitable basis for division, the current membership rolls, or the allotment and annuity rolls.

That if it is determined to be divided on a current membership basis, the 15% will be redistributed to the deserving groups.

That if it is determined to be divided on the allotment rolls and annuity roll that 5% will be returned to each group.

That percentages will be as follows:

[In percent]

	Old rolls	Less 5
Sac and Fox of Iowa	36.91	31.91
Sac and Fox of Oklahoma	51.70	46.70
Sac and Fox of Kansas	11.39	6.39
Total	100.00	85.00

That the business committee shall be authorized to enter into, execute and deliver on its behalf such agreements with the Tribes and so or cause to be done such other acts and things as may be necessary and desirable to carry out the intent and purpose of this resolution.

Passed and approved this 27th day of August, 1966.

Certification

We, Elmer Manatowa, Jr., Principal Chief of the Sac and Fox Tribal Business Committee and Peggy F. Southern, Secretary-Treasurer of the Sac and Fox Tribal Business Committee do hereby certify that a regular meeting of the General Council was properly noticed, called, convened, and held on 27th day of August, 1966 there being a quorum present of 158 enrolled members and that the above resolution was adopted by a vote of 112 in favor and no votes against the resolution, and that said resolution has not been amended or rescinded.

Signed this 27th day of August, 1966.

ELMER MANATOWA, Jr.,
Principal Chief.
PEGGY F. SOUTHERN,
Secretary-Treasurer.

SAC AND FOX TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA,
Cushing, Okla., April 18, 1967.

Senator FRED HARRIS,
Senator MIKE MONRONEY,
Representative TOM STEED,
Capitol Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: On May 7, 1966 the three bands of Sac and Fox met in Topeka, Kansas for the purpose of reaching an agreement as to the division of awards made by the Indian Claims Commission dockets 138 and 143.

Funds were appropriated by the Act of April 30, 1965 (79 Stat. 81) to cover an award of $1,096,533.42 in docket 138 and by the Act of October 31, 1965 (79 Stat. 81) to cover an award of $1,789,201.45 in docket 143. The awards represent additional payment to the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi in Iowa and in Oklahoma and the Sac and Fox of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska for lands in Iowa ceded under the Treaty of July 15, 1830 and for lands in western Iowa and northwestern Missouri ceded under the Treaties of October 21, 1837. The judgment funds are on deposit in the United States Treasury to the credit of the respective Sac and Fox Tribal groups and draw interest at the rate of four percent per annum.

The Bill authorizes the judgment funds to be apportioned among the three groups, who are regarded to be the successors in interest to the Sac and Fox Nation as it existed in 1830 and 1837 on the basis of membership in the respective groups in accordance with allotment rolls of February 13, 1891 for the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi located in Oklahoma, 1892 annuity roll for the Sac and Fox of the Mississippi located in Iowa, and February 28, 1891 allotment roll for the Sac and Fox of Missouri located in Kansas.

The three Sac and Fox groups are organized under approved constitutions and by laws and represent political entities. The Bill provides that funds to which these tribes are entitled in dockets 138 and 143 may be advanced or expended for any purpose authorized by the respective tribal governing bodies. These tribes have retained allotted and/or tribally owned lands and members reside on such lands in substantial numbers. They can be assisted in the elevation of their social and economic conditions by use of judgment money.

Since the actions of the Business Committees need the approval of the respective general councils as set out in paragraph 8 of the resolution, we are attaching the approved minutes, plus the resolution passed by the Sac and Fox Tribe of Oklahoma last August 27, 1966.

We are very anxious to have this Bill introduced in this session of Congress and any help you can give us will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,
SAC AND FOX TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA,
ELMER MANATOWA, Jr.,
Principal Chief.

THE RAIL SITUATION

AMENDMENTS NOS. 191 AND 192

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, our Subcommittee on Labor is now holding hearings on the rail situation with a view toward acting on the President's request for what I have called mandatory settlement.

The administration has been gravely remiss in not having sent us permanent legislation on this subject. It is now caught in the same trap in which it has been caught before, in the previous railroad emergency in 1963, when it had to seek interim legislation to protect the public interest from the effects of a nationwide railroad shutdown.

The interim legislation now sought, Senate Joint Resolution 81, has such a heavy coloration of compulsory arbitration as to be alarming to management, labor, to the Nation, and certainly to me. In my judgment, it would be acceptable only as a last resort; that is, only if there is really nothing else that we can do to keep the trains running.

The solution proposed by the President is, as expected, ad hoc. But while in terms it would be applicable only to the current dispute, I think there can hardly be any doubt that whatever action Congress takes with respect to the current dispute will have a profound effect on any general legislation which may be considered by the Congress in the near future.

We cannot, therefore, merely accept the President's proposal as a necessary expedient and let it go at that. Nor can we afford to indulge in sophistry to avoid recognizing the compulsory features of the President's proposed legislation. Assuming for purposes of argument, that Senate Joint Resolution 81 does not have all the bad features of compulsory arbitration, and that the parties have not been engaged in mere shadowboxing in preparation for a binding determination by a special board, the fact remains that this resolution, if enacted in its present form, would greatly encourage the belief that a similar approach would be adopted on either an ad hoc or a general basis to deal with future disputes which imperil the health and safety of the Nation.

In order to dispel any notion that this is, in fact, the case, I am introducing this morning two amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 81.

The amendments would do the following: They would amend section 5 of Senate Joint Resolution 81, which in its present form provides that the determination of the Special Board shall automatically go into effect at the end of 90 days if the parties have not reached an agreement; my amendments would provide that if the parties have been unable to agree upon the expiration of the 90-day period, the President would have the power to direct that the determination of the Special Board shall become effective, subject however to the right of both Houses of Congress, by a concurrent resolution passed within 20 days of the President's direction, to declare that the Special Board determination shall not go into effect. Provisions are included to insure that any such proposed concurrent resolution would not be subject to a filibuster or buried in committee.

Under one of the amendments, however, the President would be given an alternative to directing that the determination of the Special Board shall become effective. Instead, he could order a limited seizure of the carriers by directing the Attorney General to petition a Federal district court for the appointment of a special receiver to take possession of the equipment and facilities of the carriers involved in the dispute in the name of the United States.

The conditions under which the special receiver would take possession of the railroads and operate them are the same as those specified in S. 1456, the general bill authorizing limited seizure in all emergency labor disputes which I and Senator Kuchel introduced earlier this year.

I believe that by incorporating either of these amendments into the proposed legislation before us, we would put to rest the notion that Congress is in any way committed to the principle of compulsory arbitration as the best method of settling labor disputes which threaten the national health or safety.

My own views in opposition to compulsory arbitration are well known, and I know they are shared by many of the members of this committee. I also know that most representatives of both labor and management are of the view that compulsory arbitration is an anathema to the process of free collective bargaining. That process represents our own unique form of economic self-government and I, for one, am deeply concerned to see that it should not be compromised—even on an ad hoc basis.

There are other alternatives, such as the very limited form seizure or a congressional veto of a mandate with which Congress does not agree, which are incorporated in the amendments I have introduced this morning. It is my hope that before we take action all the possible alternatives will be fully explored.

I ask unanimous consent that my amendments be printed and appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments Nos. 191 and 192 were referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

AMENDMENT OF UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 193

Mr. HATFIELD submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 194

Mr. GRUENING submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to Senate bill 1432, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT NO. 195

Mr. HATFIELD proposed an amendment to Senate bill 1432, supra, which was ordered to be printed.

"CONGRESSIONAL COUNSEL GENERAL"—A CHANGE IN TITLE FOR S. 1384 ("LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY GENERAL")—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 196

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, on March 23 of this year, I introduced a bill—S. 1384—that will provide the Congress with its own advocate. This advocate would provide advice to the Congress on the constitutionality and validity of congressional acts or actions. He would provide representational services for the Congress whenever so directed. He would issue advisories on the intent of Congress when so directed or upon approval of the Congress and in certain court cases would appear, by right, as a party or as amicus curiae.

Since introduction, Mr. President, the discussion this bill has generated has indeed been widespread. Private citizens, attorneys, U.S. attorneys, various bar associations, and Federal appellate judges have written me in praise of the bill and what it would do to affirm the coordinate role of the Congress and the doctrine of separation of powers. The overwhelming majority of mail has been in favor of the idea as supported by constitutional argument.

There has, however, been mail that indicates some uneasiness with the title. It expresses concern that the use of the title "Legislative Attorney General" puts the congressional lawyer in seeming competition with the Cabinet officer Attorney General. To reduce any adverse response to the bill, I now propose to change the title of the officer to "Congressional Counsel General." This title change does not bring about any lessening in what I hope will be the effectiveness and prestige of the Congressional Counsel General. In this change I assert here, as I have asserted many times, that the Congressional Counsel General will not be in competition with the President's Attorney General. They will both function in their own areas. The Attorney General will remain the legal representative of the Executive and the Congressional Counsel General will provide the above outlined services for the Congress. But the title of Congressional Counsel General is more accurately descriptive and less subject to misinterpretation.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to express my thanks to the many individuals and associations that have taken the time to write concerning this matter. The many thoughtful letters, some of great length, that I have received demonstrate just how aware the people have become of the necessity of the Congress providing itself with a voice for its intent and will, a voice that can speak for it clearly, authoritatively and unequivocally.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment that will change the title of the officer designated by S. 1384 from "Legislative Attorney General" to "Congressional Counsel General," and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 196) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of Senator Dirksen's bill, S. 515, which would prohibit the desecration of our flag, my name be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, early in the session I introduced, on behalf of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. Young], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], and myself, S. 109, the purpose of which is to discourage discrimination against members of farm organizations.

I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the names of the following Senators be added as cosponsors of that bill: Senators Burdick, Church, Hart, Hickenlooper, McCarthy, Tydings, and Bayh.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] be added as cosponsors of S. 854 to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes, at its next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pastore] be added as a cosponsor of the bill, S. 1681, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at its next printing, the names of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church], and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] be added as cosponsors of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 64) to establish a Commission on Balanced Economic Development.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Bayh], I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 80, a proposed constitutional amendment providing for congressional representation for the District of Columbia, the names of my colleagues, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGee] and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the name of my distinguished colleague from California [Mr. Murphy] be added as a cosponsor of my bill, S. 861, to authorize the construction, operation, and maintenance of the Colorado River Basin project, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I wish to call to the attention of the Senate this anniversary of the achievement of Rumanian independence.

Through the relentless efforts of Rumanian patriots, an independent Rumanian dynasty was created exactly 101 years ago today, on May 10, 1866. Under the leadership of Prince Charles, of Hohenzollern, the Rumanians declared their independence from the Ottoman Empire, after which the country enjoyed a long period of prosperity and progress. By the end of World War I, Rumania had become an example of peace and stability in central Europe.

The situation changed in the closing months of World War II, when Russian troops moved into Rumania to free it from the Axis powers. They put loyal Communists and Moscow-trained cadre into local and national government positions, and, by 1945, the people of Rumania were under a virtual Stalinist dictatorship.

But despite the iron hand of Josef Stalin and the continued occupation of Soviet troops, the independent spirit of the Rumanian people could not be quelled. Unlike many of the other nations of Eastern Europe, the Rumanian people and even their indigenous Communist leaders began to reject the Moscow-trained leadership. As early as 1952, the Communist Party of Rumania purged the "Muscovite" faction, and began to lead their country on the path of truly Rumanian national communism.

In the more relaxed atmosphere in Eastern Europe which followed the death of Stalin, the Rumanian Government concentrated on its own development. The leaders of Rumania resisted efforts to include all Eastern Europe into a single economic bloc. They preferred to develop their own heavy industry and meet their own consumer needs. As a consequence of this independence, Rumania has progressed from a nation which was 80 percent agricultural in 1945 to one of the most advanced industrial nations in Europe.

In foreign affairs, the Rumanian Government has established independent trade and diplomatic ties with a number of Western nations, including Britain, France, and the United States, and has voted independently of the Soviet Union on a number of issues in the United Nations.

In cultural affairs, Rumania has sent cultural exhibits to the West, and was one of the first of the Eastern European nations to open its borders to Western tourists. Western newspapers and other publications are readily available in Rumanian cities.

Rumania today is playing an increasingly important role in world affairs. The Rumanian people, who once served as a bridge between the Roman and Slavic worlds, are now an important meeting ground between two equally disparate worlds: Western democracy and Soviet communism. For those who believe bridges can and should be built between the two worlds, the example of Rumania is heartening indeed.

Though their form of government may not meet with our approval, we must nevertheless have faith in their essential integrity and independence through trade and cultural contact and deeper understanding, to play a creative role in world affairs.

It is therefore fitting that those who hold the cause of freedom in high regard should pause at this time to pay respects to the brave Rumanian people.

RUMANIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, Americans of Rumanian origin, through the sponsorship of the Rumanian National Committee, commemorate today, May 10, as a triple anniversary of important events in the history of their native land.

On May 10, 1866, the people of Rumania ended internal strife among native candidates to the throne by proclaiming Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen of the Prussian royal family as the Bucharest Prince of Rumania.

On May 10, 1878, the Rumanians proclaimed their independence after severing political ties with the Ottoman Empire.

On May 10, 1881, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania, and a kingdom was established by the will of the people. The country prospered for more than six decades.

Today, the people of Rumania live under Communist rule, and are no longer allowed to observe this national holiday of independence. Instead, they must observe May 9, the anniversary of Soviet victory over their country.

Today, I join with all Americans in recognition of Rumania's fight for freedom. I share with all who cherish independence the hope that Rumania again will be free.

"HOW TO END THE BOMBING AND DEESCALATE"—AN ARTICLE BY ARNAUD DE BORCHGRAVE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the May 15, 1967, issue of Newsweek magazine contains an article entitled "How To End the Bombing and Deescalate." The article was written by Newsweek Senior Editor Arnaud de Borchgrave, whom I have known for some years, but whom I have not seen in recent years.

Mr. de Borchgrave has been following events in Vietnam closely ever since he parachuted into Dienbienphu in 1953. He now offers a suggestion as to how the bombing could be ended and descalation begun.

In effect, the article advances the idea of a barrier zone extending across the area south of the 17th parallel from the vicinity of the South China Sea, over into Laos, and ending at Savannakhet on the Thai-Laotian border.

Mr. de Borchgrave writes—and I wish to call this to the attention of the Senate—that a proposal of this nature would be able to stop infiltration; that it would be able to end bombing of the north; that it would achieve major deescalation; and that it would confine the war to the south.

If I understand Mr. de Borchgrave's reasoning correctly, I assume that what he has in mind is that with the kind of barrier zone he proposes—a barrier to be protected by minefields, electrified concertina wire, boobytraps, pillboxes, helicopter patrols, and automated alarm systems—what has been one of the chief objectives of bombardments of the north; that is, to cut drastically, if not to prevent entirely, the movement of materiel and men along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, could be done more effectively on the plan he proposes. If this were the case, following my understanding of Mr. de Borchgrave's reasoning, the need for further bombing in the north to bring about that objective would not be necessary.

Mr. President, I would also point out that the bombing of the north was supposed to entail, I believe, a second objective in addition to stopping the infiltration of men and supplies; namely, to bring Hanoi to the conference table. It would appear that neither of these objectives has been achieved.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "How To End the Bombing and Deescalate," by Arnaud de Borchgrave, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

How To End the Bombing and Deescalate

At bottom, most critics of present U.S. policy in Vietnam favor one of two equally unappealing courses of action; further—and massive—escalation, or simple acceptance of defeat. Below, Newsweek *Senior Editor Arnaud de Borchgrave, who has been following events in Vietnam, closely ever since he parachuted into Dienbienphu in 1953, suggests there is a third and far more acceptable possibility.*

It now seems fairly obvious that the Vietnam war is not going to end by negotiation. The difficulty is that each side sees negotiations essentially as a device to cover the other's retreat. As far as the U.S. is concerned, negotiations can only be designed to facilitate a return to the status quo ante—i.e., the continued division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel with a non-Communist government in the south. Hanoi, on the other hand, has warned its party cadres in the south that "if negotiations are ever held, they will be purely tactical; fighting in the south must continue until final victory."

Deadlock: The U.S., however, will never attain its objectives in South Vietnam so long as infiltration from the north continues—and infiltration cannot be halted by bombing raids against the north. Already, our pilots have virtually run out of worthwhile military and industrial targets, and the bombing of civilian population centers, besides being morally abhorrent, can only drive Russia and China into a common effort to help North Vietnam survive as a socialist state. The bomb-them-out-of-existence proponents, moreover, seem to forget that Ho Chi Minh and his associates fought the French to a standstill without ever holding possession of a major Vietnamese town.

In short, escalation will serve no useful purpose. But neither will be de-escalatory moves most commonly proposed. Hanoi cannot afford to stop supplying the 100,000 regular troops it now has in the south simply in return for an end to the bombing. By the same token we cannot afford to give up bombing in return for a mere agreement to sit down and talk.

Proposal: Nonetheless, I believe that there is a way to (1) stop infiltration; (2) end the bombing of the north; (3) achieve major deescalation; and (4) confine the war to the south. It is also the only way, in my judgment, to return to our policy of limited war with limited objectives and limited means.

The idea is to establish a "physical barrier" south of the Demilitarized Zone at the 17th parallel. This has been studied by the Joint Chiefs in Washington for at least two years. So far, the plan has been rejected—partly because of its cost (an estimated $1 billion) and partly because, at least during the construction period, it would require the addition of three or more divisions to the U.S. forces now in Vietnam.

Admittedly, construction of such a barrier would pose immense engineering and military problems. It would also oblige the U.S. to indulge in one more violation of the moribund 1962 Geneva accord which established the neutrality of Laos. For, to be effective, the barrier would have to start at the South China Sea and run for about 170 miles across a range of jungle-covered mountains and down through the plains of Laos to the town of Savannakhet on the Thai-Laotian border (map).

To my mind, however, the advantages of the barrier plan are overwhelming. Protected by mine fields, electrified concertina wire, booby traps, pillboxes, helicopter patrols and automated alarm systems which would call in artillery and air strikes whenever a breach was signaled, the barrier would effectively cut off the Ho Chi Minh supply trails and access to the south through Laos and Cambodia. The impact would be comparable to that which Yugoslavia's closing of the Greek border had on the Greek guerrillas during the Communist uprising after World War II.

No less important, the bombing of North Vietnam would then become unnecessary. In fact, the President could tell the world that all raids—except in reprisal for attacks on the line—would cease as soon as the barrier becomes operational.

Feasibility: Is construction of the barrier economically and physically feasible? The answer is certainly yes. The U.S. now has in Vietnam construction capacity sufficient to duplicate the Suez Canal in eighteen months; on a crash basis, the barrier could probably be completed in less than a year. As for cost, the U.S. has already spent an estimated $5.8 billion on the air war over the north. (Just in terms of military hardware, the U.S. has already lost $2.5 billion worth of aircraft in the north and has dropped $1.5 billion worth of ordnance there.)

Once operational, I believe that the barrier would be a shattering blow to the Viet Cong. It would enable the South Vietnamese to get on at long last with the job of rebuilding their nation; it would be universally recognized as a strictly defensive, nonaggressive move and it would give the world hope that major de-escalation is finally in sight.

The alternative, unless the U.S. is prepared to abandon South Vietnam, is a long war of attrition which U.S. opinion does not seem willing to support. The pressures will then build up again for still further escalation with the attendant risk of a major Asian conflagration.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT EXTENSION

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have made a committal on another Senate matter which will keep me away from a portion of the debate on S. 1432, a bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

I therefore wish to make a few remarks in support of that measure now.

Mr. President, as chairman of the full committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], with his great resources and fine experience, held a wonderful hearing on the bill. He heard every witness who wished to testify and then, under his leadership, the entire committee worked out a bill that is very reasonable and, in my opinion, absolutely essential.

I have no doubt that it will be passed overwhelmingly by the Senate.

I support it wholeheartedly based upon the great need, as I see it.

I favor extension of selective service for 4 years as being absolutely essential. I also favor the idea of at least a minimum of 2 years' service under the act. I wish it could be less, but it cannot be.

I strongly support retaining power, as heretofore, in the local draft boards, who know the facts and can therefore do a better job than anyone else in passing on these matters.

As I stated, the bill was worked out by the full committee and had its unanimous vote, although the Senator from Ohio made some reservations as to making an amendment.

I hope and believe that the bill will pass by a resounding vote.

To fail to support the extra features in the bill would be, in effect, to repeal our resolve—that resolve about which General Westmoreland spoke—the need to carry it on being so essential.

Anything less than this bill as reported, I think, would repeal that very essential resolve, which is something the American people do not want to lose. I believe that they are overwhelmingly in support of the bill.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR THURMOND

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of morning business and after the remarks to be made by the distinguished junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] the distinguished senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] be recognized for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SALE OF PORNOGRAPHIC AND OBSCENE LITERATURE TO MINORS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, on Monday the U.S. Supreme Court handed down a series of decisions dealing with the sale of books and magazines alleged to be obscene. The Court decided that the items in question were not obscene, and reversed the convictions of the sellers.

The language of the Court in these cases suggests that there is an effective constitutional approach to one aspect of the pornography problem. The major evil of pornographic pictures and publications, in my judgment, is the impact they may have on young people who are immature and impressionable.

The Supreme Court recognized this legitimate concern. Its opinion noted specifically that none of the State laws in question "reflected a specific and limited State concern for juveniles." And it thereby implied, as it had in earlier decisions, that a properly drawn statute aimed at the sale of pornographic material to juveniles would be constitutional.

I certainly agree with the Court that such limited statutes should be considered constitutional. Sale to an adult who knows what he wants, knows what the effects will be, and buys the material is one thing; victimization of our youth is another matter.

This is the major reason for my concern about the smut and filth that floods the newsstands of Washington, the surrounding States, and the entire country. This material can be bought by youngsters as easily as bubble gum.

Now this situation must be viewed in the context of the first amendment. That amendment, of course, guarantees a broad freedom of speech and of the press. This Nation is founded on the assumption that, in the long run, the public welfare will be better served by a free interchange of ideas than it will by a harsh censorship which inhibits literary and political freedom.

So a book may not be banned completely, merely because it is offensive to me, or to the Senate, or even to the majority of the community. The Supreme Court has said—and we must accept that decision—that such publications must be utterly without redeeming social value in order to be banned altogether.

But the Court has as much as said that it will allow restrictions on the sale of such materials to minors. And I believe that the Congress should follow the Court's invitation and enact legislation which would protect the young people of the District of Columbia—as well as many young people from the Maryland and Virginia suburbs—from pornographic materials.

I have been preparing legislation which would prohibit the dissemination by sale or loan for money of pornographic materials to our young people. This proposed statute would make it a criminal offense to sell specified categories of photographs, drawings, books, magazines, or motion-picture films to minors under the age of 18. This limitation would, of course, not apply to bona fide textbooks and other such educational material.

I wish to refine the proposed legislation further, in light of Monday's Supreme Court holdings, before I introduce it. And I am certain that the District of Columbia Committee will make further improvements when it considers the bill. But I do believe that it is essential for us to act in this area. As we keep alcohol out of the hands of our young people, we can also keep pornography out of their hands.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial "Big Day for Smut," published in the Washington Evening Star of Tuesday, May 9, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG DAY FOR SMUT

> A number of smutty publications which had been declared obscene in three states—New York, Kentucky and Arkansas—now enjoy, thanks to a majority of the Supreme Court, the mantle of constitutional protection.
>
> This latest ruling reveals a court that is hopelessly divided on the issue of what constitutes punishable obscenity. At least two of the justices think that anything goes. The attitudes of the others vary in more or less significant respects. But the impression which survives is that this court would sanction almost any kind of smut as long as it does not involve the forbidden "pandering" aspects of the Ginzburg case. And that was a 5-to-4 decision.
>
> The dissenting opinion by Justices Harlan and Clark points out that the majority changed the rules in the middle of the game in this instance. The grounds upon which the court originally agreed to review the three cases were abandoned, with the result that the issue of obscenity or otherwise was not dealt with either in the briefs or in the arguments. "In short," said Justice Harlan, "the court disposes of the cases on the issue that was deliberately excluded from review, and refuses to pass on the questions that brought the cases here."
>
> He went on to say that "in my opinion these dispositions do not reflect well on the processes of the court, and I think the issues for which the cases were taken should be decided."
>
> We would go a step farther. Not only should the issues (of obscenity or otherwise) have been decided, but they should have been decided so as to make punishable the sale of "girlie" junk which, masquerading as "literature," is contributing its not insubstantial bit to the corruption of our society.

RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS

WHERE DOES THE UNITED STATES STAND ON HUMAN RIGHTS? FAILURE TO RATIFY SINGLE HUMAN RIGHTS LEAVES GREAT DOUBT—LXIX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, as I have during every session of the 90th Congress, I rise again today to urge the Senate to ratify the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

As an American, I am proud of the great achievements of our Nation and our people in realizing the magnificent dream of equal human rights for all our citizens.

But I wonder how millions of our fellow human beings—who have never breathed free American air or participated in free American debate—but are aware of the failure of the United States to ratify a single Human Rights Convention—view the United States and human rights.

What do the people of Afghanistan, the people of Burundi, the people of Chad, the people of Ecuador, the people of Jamaica, the people of Pakistan think about the United States and the U.N. convention to outlaw forced labor? Every one of these governments has ratified the Convention on Forced Labor, but the United States has not.

Mr. President, I wonder what the people of Argentina, the people of China, the people of Czechoslovakia, the people of Finland, the people of India, the people of Nepal, the people of Thailand really think about the United States and our national attitude toward the political rights of women.

Every one of their governments has ratified the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, but the United States has not.

Again how about the people of Algeria, the people of Brazil, the people of Cambodia, the people of Malaysia, the people of Norway, the people of Portugal, the people of the United Arab Republic? What are they to think about us and our national position on the fundamental human question of slavery?

Every one of their governments has ratified the Convention on Slavery, but the United States has not.

Mr. President, the Senate can rectify any misimpressions or misunderstandings the people of these countries may have about the United States and human rights.

The Senate can do so by ratifying the Human Rights Conventions on Forced Labor, Genocide, Political Rights of Women, and Slavery.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

MASSACHUSETTS MERCHANTS SUPPORT TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Federal Reserve Board was represented this morning before the Banking and Currency Committee's Subcommittee on Financial Institutions by its Vice Chairman, Gov. J. L. Robertson. Governor Robertson expressed the unanimous viewpoint of the Federal Reserve Board—all seven members—in stating that they all endorse and support the truth-in-lending bill which is now pending before the Banking and Currency Committee. The Board suggested some very significant, interesting, and helpful amendments to the bill; but the testimony of Governor Robertson was most helpful, and I expect, at a later date, to bring it to the attention of all Senators by asking to have it printed in the RECORD.

This morning I wish to address myself to the myth that truth in lending is unworkable has been dramatically repudiated by the Massachusetts truth-in-lending bill. Recent testimony before our committee revealed that merchants have had no problem with disclosing the full cost of credit both in dollars and as an annual percentage rate.

One of the most impressive statements was delivered by Mr. Willet Smith, the credit manager of Leachmere Sales of Cambridge, Mass. Leachmere does about $45 million of business, of which approximately $22 million is done on credit. Moreover, $20 million of this $22 million is on revolving credit—one of the most hotly disputed items in the bill. Thus, Mr. Smith is in an excellent position to testify on the impact of the bill on business. Mr. Smith has testified that he has encountered no problems of any consequence with the Massachusetts truth in lending law. He says his firm has not lost any business as a result of the bill. Moreover, he testified that the bill protects the ethical businessman from unfair competition based on deceptive credit terms.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Smith's excellent statement be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, it is also interesting to note that the New England automobile dealers have gone on record requesting their national association to reconsider their position on truth in lending. Mr. William Mitchell, the regional vice president of the National Automobile Dealers Association and a prominent automobile dealer in Massachusetts, has written as follows:

> I would say that in the discussion that was held on this subject at our NADA Region I meeting—our President of our State Association, our State Association manager and myself outlined that we did not feel that it had hurt us in any way shape or manner and that we were inclined to feel that despite limited experience it was going to clean up the atmosphere in this area—particularly where loan sharking has hurt the ethical automobile dealer.

From these statements I think it is abundantly clear that the dire predictions of some members of the credit industry have simply not materialized. Moreover, it is evident that many organizations who have opposed truth in lending have apparently not fully consulted with their members. The vast majority of businessmen certainly have nothing to fear from truth in lending. On the contrary such a measure would be of considerable benefit to business. Moreover, I am confident that if more businessmen could study the Massachusetts experience they would arrive at a similar conclusion. I am hopeful, therefore, that the Congress will look behind the claims of those who purport to represent the interests of businessmen in opposing truth in lending.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Mitchell outlining his views and the copy of the resolution passed by the New England Automobile Dealers Association also be printed in the record following my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF WILLET SMITH, CREDIT MANAGER, LECHMERE SALES CO., CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, you have asked that I appear before you today to comment on the Truth in Lending Bill. I am glad to give you such assistance as I can in your consideration of this proposal.

The Massachusetts Credit Law became effective November 1, 1966. In order to comply with the act the retailer was obliged to change his credit forms and credit applications. Except for the minor cost of changing these forms and applications, there was no extra expense to the retailer as a result of the passing of this law.

Lechmere Sales does about $45,000,000 volume annually of which approximately $22,000,000 of business is done on credit. We encountered no problems of any consequence, either with our record keeping or our customers, as a result of this law.

So far as I have been able to determine the law is informative for the consumer and fair, workable, and helpful to the businessman. It prevents "tricky" selling of credit programs which often call for low monthly plans but include a balloon-ending note; all of which tend to cover up the true interest cost and deceive consumers.

It is my feeling that anything that is good for the consumer is good for business. I believe that this law is good for the consumer because it corrects abuses in the extension of credit and eliminates gimmicky selling and advertising of credit.

I know of no instance where Lechmere Sales lost a single sale because the law requiring that the customer be informed of the true interest rate or because of the use of the new credit forms or applications for credit.

A National "Truth in Lending" Bill will permit companies doing business in different states to operate under a uniform credit law rather than under a different law in each state of the United States.

I heartily endorse the law as passed in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

WILLET SMITH.

EXHIBIT 2

NATIONAL AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.

MR. DERMOT SHEA,
Executive Secretary, Massachusetts Consumer Council, State House, Boston, Mass.

DEAR DERMOT: I was pleased to discuss the various matters that we were involved in on the telephone with you. Although I did not call you on it it was interesting to hear that you were going to be in Washington next week and appear before the banking and currency committee. This was true because just this week the Region I of the NADA recommended as per the enclosed copy of recommendation that NADA Board of Directors study again their position on this legislation.

I am enclosing copy of a letter to Senator Brooke in this regard. You will note that I state that this recommendation of Region I which comprises 5 states—does not in any way shape or manner indicate that the full Board of Directors of the National Automobile Dealers Association would change its position with respect to this legislation.

I am committed as a Regional Vice President, however, to carry this resolution to our full Board meeting in June. I am sure that the other Directors from Rhode Island, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine and myself from Massachusetts were in full accord on this resolution at our meeting this week.

In connection with your inquiry as to how the truth and lending had affected us here in Massachusetts—I would say that in the discussion that was held on this subject at our NADA Region I meeting—our President of our State Association, our State Association manager and myself outlined that we did not feel that it had hurt us in anyway shape or manner and that we were inclined to feel that despite limited experience it was going to clean up the atmosphere in this area—particularly where loan sharking has hurt the ethical automobile dealer. By that I mean that certain people got into the automobile business purely as a front for financing purposes.

I trust the above meets with your requirements. With best regards.

WILLIAM H. MITCHELL, Jr.

Whereas—it would seem that a "truth in lending" bill is becoming more popular in consumer thinking and

Whereas—automobile dealers depend greatly for their business through the extension of credit and

Whereas—automobile dealers are consumer minded, therefore, Be it resolved by the members present of this New England Region meeting convened here today wish to go on record to NADA that it reconsider its expressed opinion or position concerning this particular legislation, and if a simple, workable bill can be created, then go on record favoring "truth in lending" legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE ENDORSES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. **PROXMIRE**. Mr. President, the Department of Justice in a report to the Banking and Currency Committee endorses S. 5, the truth in lending bill. The Department indicated the bill would be in accord with the program of the President and indicated the bill would protect consumers and promote competition in the field of consumer finance.

It is also encouraging to note that the Department, which has access to some of the best legal talent in the country, saw no conflict between Federal disclosure legislation and the various State statutes on consumer credit.

Some witnesses on behalf of the credit industry have raised a vague doubt that somewhere some way, some State judge or Federal court might misconstrue the act. It is noteworthy, therefore, that this dire prediction is not evident in the Department of Justice's report.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Justice Department report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 13, 1967.

Hon. JOHN SPARKMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in response to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on S. 5, a bill to assist in the promotion of economic stablization by requiring the disclosure of finance charges in connection with extension of credit.

This Truth in Lending Bill is similar to the following bills concerning which we have commented in the past: S. 750 (88th Cong., 1st Sess.); S. 1740 (87th Cong., 1st Sess.); and S. 2755 (86th Cong., 2d Sess.).

This Department favors the enactment of this legislation which would (1) protect the consumer by enabling every borrower to make an informed choice of alternate credit prices, and (2) promote competition in the field of consumer finance. The bill is consistent with and would implement "Truth in Lending" proposals made in the President's message "American Consumer Protection," House of Representatives Document No. 57, 90th Congress.

The major substantive section of this bill is Section 4. Subsection (a) of Section 4 provides for disclosure of finance charges, and states that, except as provided in subsection (b) which relates to revolving or open-end credit plans any creditor shall furnish to each person to whom credit is extended a written statement which states, to the extent applicable and ascertainable:

(1) the cash or delivered price of the property or service to be acquired;

(2) the amounts, if any, to be credited as down payment and/or trade-in;

(3) the difference between 1 and 2;

(4) the charges, individually itemized, which are paid or to be paid by borrower in connection with the transaction but which are not incident to the extension of credit;

(5) the total amount to be financed;

(6) the finance charge in dollars and cents;

(7) the finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate;

(8) the time and amount of payments scheduled to repay the indebtedness; and

(9) the terms applicable in the event of advanced or delayed payments.

Subsection (b) of Section 4 provides that any creditor agreeing to extend credit pursuant to a revolving or open-end credit plan shall, in accordance with the rules of the Federal Reserve Board:

(1) furnish, prior to agreeing to extend credit, a written statement setting forth;

(i) the periodic dates of the balances against which a finance charge will be imposed;

(ii) the percentage rate per period of the finance charge to be imposed;

(iii) the periodic rate of finance charge expressed as an annual percentage rate.

(2) furnish to such person, at the end of each period determined for assessing finance charges, a written statement setting forth to the extent applicable and ascertainable:

(A) the outstanding balance as of the beginning of such period;

(B) the amount of each extension of credit during such period;

(C) the total amount credited to the account during such period;

(D) the outstanding unpaid balance at the end of such period;

(E) the annual percentage rate used to compute the finance charge for such period;

(F) the balance on which such periodic finance charge was computed; and

(G) the finance charge imposed for such period.

Subsection (c) of Section 4 provides that if the information disclosed in accordance with this section and any regulations prescribed by the Board is rendered inaccurate as a result of a prepayment, a late payment or other adjustment, through mutual consent of the parties, the inaccuracy resulting therefrom shall not constitute a violation of Section 4.

Section 5 of the bill gives the Federal Reserve Board broad powers to prevent circumvention or evasion of the bill's provisions and to facilitate the enforcement of the legislation. In the exercise of its powers the Board is to request regulatory functions with respect to creditors subject to the provisions of the bill, and such agencies are to furnish such views when so requested.

The Board is also to establish an advisory committee of not more than nine members, representative of the interest of sellers of merchandise on credit, lenders and the public. The Board is directed to advise and consult such advisory committee on the exercise of its powers under this Act.

Section 6 of the bill provides that State laws relating to credit transactions are not to be superseded except where such State laws are directly inconsistent with the provisions of the bill or regulations issued thereunder. The section also exempts from the provisions of the bill credit transactions which the Federal Reserve Board determines are effectively regulated by State laws so as to require the disclosure by the creditor of the same information as is required by Section 4 of the bill.

Section 7, paragraph (a), provides that any creditor who fails to provide information required by the bill would be liable to the person to whom such information should have been furnished, in amounts from $100 to $2,000, on any credit transactions, dependent on the nature of the violation of the bill's provisions. Court action to recover such penalty is provided for.

Paragraph (b) of Section 7 provides that any person who gives false or inaccurate information, or fails to provide information required by the bill's provisions or regulations issued thereunder, or who otherwise willfully violates any provision of the bill or a regulation issued under it, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year or both, provided, however, that no such punishment or penalty shall apply to the United States, or any agencies thereof, or any state or political subdivision thereof, or any agency of any state or political subdivision.

Section 8 of the bill provides that the provisions of the bill would not apply to extensions of credit to business firms as such, governments, or governmental agencies or instrumentalities, or to transactions in securities or commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

We note that the second sentence in Subsection 5(a) of the bill states that rules and regulations prescribed by the Federal Reserve Board shall include a description of methods of determining percentage rates required to be disclosed, prescribe reasonable tolerances of accuracy with respect to disclosing information, and require that information required to be disclosed be displayed prominently. We think Section 5, read as a whole, evidences an intent to authorize the Board to make regulations other than those dealing with the matters listed in the second sentence, to the extent necessary. However, it might be contended after enactment of the bill that the listing of subjects for regulation in the second sentence was intended to be comprehensive. It might be desirable to avoid the possibility of such a contention by inserting after the word "shall" in the second sentence the words and commas, ", among other things,".

Section 7(a) of the bill provides that "any creditor who in connection with any credit transactions fails to disclose to any person any information in violation of this Act . . . shall be liable to such person in the amount of $100 . . ."

This language may not indicate with precision who may sue the creditor for the civil penalty, in that it refers to "any person" to whom information is not disclosed in connection with a credit transaction. It would appear that the suit should be limited to the person to whom the credit was actually extended without the required disclosures, that is, the same person referred to in Section 4 of the statute. We therefore suggest that in the second line of Section 7(a), after the word "person" the following wording be inserted: ". . . to whom credit is extended any information which is required to be furnished to such person by Section 4 of this Act or any regulation issued to implement this Act, shall be liable . . ."

It is noted that Section 7(b) contains the word "willfully." This word might be found not to apply to intentional, voluntary acts but only to acts performed with a criminal intent, see Screws v. United States, 325 U.S. 91, 101–103 (1945); Morrissette v. United States, 342 U.S. 246 (1952). As this does not appear to be the purpose of the bill, it is suggested that the word "willfully" be replaced with the word "knowingly."

We also suggest that, in accordance with customary drafting techniques, it would be preferable to designate the subsections of Sections 3 and 8 by letters instead of numbers. Also, we suggest that the subdivision designations in Subsections 4(b)(1) and 4(b)(2) be conformed to one consistent style.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that enactment of the legislation along the lines of S. 5 would be in accord with the President's program.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Attorney General.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEABEES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, a quarter-century ago, in the early, dangerous days of World War II, the finest construction men of America stepped from civilian life into the ranks of a brandnew outfit and raised the proud Latin banner: "Construimus, Batuimus: We Build, We Fight."

These were the men who formed the U.S. Navy construction battalions—the famous Seabees of World War II—the men who so soon and so deservedly enriched our language with that brief and stirring motto which so splendidly expresses the spirit of America—"Can Do."

This year of 1967 marks the 25th anniversary of the Navy Seabees, and the 100th anniversary of the Navy Civil Engineer Corps whose officers lead the Seabee battalions and teams in action.

The legendary feats of the Seabees, in building and in battle, in World War II, are a bright page in the military lore of these United States.

Later, in answer to the Communist challenge in Korea, the Seabees served again, and they supported General MacArthur in the famed Inchon landing.

Today, in Vietnam, the Seabees again are performing construction miracles in support of American and allied forces and on behalf of the Vietnamese people. Long years after the battle for the freedom and peace of Vietnam has concluded, monuments to the Seabees who now work there will remain—the "instant" airfields and deepwater ports, the cantonments and building complexes, the communications facilities, the countless miles of roads and highways where none existed before.

In recent years the Seabees have added anew to their tradition. They have become the "Navy Peace Corps," sending their 13-man Seabee teams into Africa, Latin America, and Asia to help the villagers in underdeveloped nations.

In recognition of the Seabee Silver 25th anniversary, Gov. Otto Kerner, of the State of Illinois, recently proclaimed Seabee Month in Illinois.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of this proclamation entered in the Record, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROCLAMATION, STATE OF ILLINOIS

Whereas, The twenty-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Seabees (United States Naval Construction Battalions) is March 5, 1967 and the one hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Navy Civil Engineer Corps is March 2, 1967, and

Whereas, The skill, energy and gallantry shown by the Seabees in constructing and maintaining bases for our armed forces in World War II, Korea and the present Vietnamese conflict has added many brilliant pages to the military annals of our Republic, and

Whereas, Small teams of Seabees are exhibiting their "Can Do" motto by bringing technical skills to the village level in Southeast Asia, thus exemplifying the spirit of cooperation which is so vital a factor in building a desire for freedom in the populace, and

Whereas, To accord official recognition to this anniversary seems fitting and proper,

Now, therefore, I, Otto Kerner, Governor of the State of Illinois, do hereby proclaim the month of March 1967 as Seabee Month in Illinois, and call upon all citizens of this state to join me in due recognition of this noteworthy and patriotic event by such acts, ceremonies and support as may be fitting to the dignity and importance of the occasion.

OTTO KERNER,
Governor.
PAUL POWELL,
Secretary of State.

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, some time ago I submitted for the Record an article from the Christian Science Monitor, by Howard James, dealing with our courts and the administration of justice. A second and third article by Howard James has appeared in the Christian Science Monitor dealing with the administration of justice in the courts of our land. The April 19, 1967, article is entitled "Justice Delayed is Justice Denied," and the April 26, 1967, article is entitled "Juggled Justice in the Minor Courts." Because of the paramount importance the administration of justice should be to every Member of this body I ask unanimous consent that the widest possible attention be given to these articles by their insertion in the Congressional Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

JUSTICE DELAYED IS JUSTICE DENIED

(By Howard James)

(NOTE.—Jammed courts spell injustice. Innocent defendants can languish in jail for months, injured plaintiffs must wait years to collect legitimate damage claims—all because state courts in the United States are not meeting the needs of the jet age. Today's article, second of 13, explains why courts are so clogged.)

If you are arrested today in Cleveland on a serious charge and can't make bail, you may still be in jail awaiting your day in court when Christmas rolls around. Even if you are innocent.

Or take the case of a New York housewife. Driving her auto down a Bronx street she is hit by another car. Doctors say she is seriously injured and expenses pile up.

If the other driver's insurance company haggles over a settlement, it could be 1972 before she collects a dime. It often takes that long to get a civil case before a jury.

Nor are Cleveland and New York exceptions. Most state courts, especially those in large cities, are bogged down with business. They are struggling with what members of the bench and bar call "backlog."

WHY JUSTICE IS DELAYED

Justice is delayed for many reasons. More civil cases are filed—mostly auto accidents—than the courts can handle. The crime rate keeps climbing. Criminal trials take longer than in the past because of recent Supreme Court rulings. There aren't enough judges in most jurisdictions. And both judges and lawyers throw up roadblocks, too often for selfish reasons.

"The backlog of civil trials continues to mount until our courts are rapidly approaching the point where the maxim 'justice delayed is justice denied' may apply to all civil litigants," asserts Judge J. Gilbert Prendergast of Baltimore, where delay from filing to trial now totals more than two years.

"Saying 'I'll see you in court' has become the great national pastime," asserts Maurice Rosenberg, Columbia University law professor.

Common Pleas Judge Herbert Lavin of Philadelphia warns:

"A terrible thing has happened to justice in America, and the tragedy is that while it was occurring, there were so few who, recognizing it, warned us of its consequences.

"I'm talking about the House of Justice in the big city. The termites of slums, industry, unemployment, two world wars, highway accidents, labor-management disputes, and myriad other problems never known before bored their way into the walls, floors, and beams of a once-commodious structure. . . ."

APATHY REMAINS

Yet a national tour by this writer—who sat in courtrooms and talked to judges, lawyers, prosecutors, policemen, and everyday citizens—reveals:

Widespread public apathy despite these warnings.

A tendency toward putting paper patches on the state systems of justice, rather than reinforcing foundations or building an entirely new structure.

A chronic lack of communication among courts, both within a state and nationwide. This, coupled with a trial-and-error approach to problem solving, means a judge in Massachusetts can't profit from the success or failures of courts in Oregon, Texas, or Florida. Communications even break down among judges sitting in one city.

Rigid opposition to change on the part of many lawyers and judges. This is partly because they are overly concerned with tradition and partly because of self-interest.

"Members of the bar engaged in trying civil matters could well be financially distressed if personal-injury litigation goes out the window," says Geoffery C. Hazard, executive director of the American Bar Foundation in Chicago.

COMPLEX PROBLEM

Taking auto accidents out of the courts is being suggested as one possibility to end backlog. Lawyers are worried.

"Unless lawyers do something about court backlog, laymen will take over," warns James A. Dooley, one of the busiest trial lawyers in Chicago. "Within our framework we must do away with existing ills and bring about a streamlining of trials to protect the judge-and-jury system."

The problem of court delay is exceedingly complex. Each court in each state is different, and most face a wide variety of troubles.

At least on paper, Cook County, Ill., has the worst civil backlog in the nation. But John S. Boyle, the circuit court's chief judge, accuses other courts around the country of juggling statistics.

"We're the only court in the nation that keeps accurate backlog figures," he said in an interview. "New York has several million cases unaccounted for. Using bookkeeping gimmicks Los Angeles wiped out its backlog [on paper] overnight. Besides, Chicago has become the personal-injury-litigation center of the world."

In Judge Boyle's court system it now takes five or six years from the date of filing to get a case before a jury. Latest figures compiled by the Institute of Judicial Administration in New York City show:

A backlog of up to five years in civil courts around New York City; 38 months in the Boston area; 34 months in Cleveland (the chief justice of the Common Pleas Court there told this writer it is nearer 40 to 48 months now); 32.7 months in Detroit; and 30.1 months in San Francisco.

CRIMINAL-COURT VOLUME UP

While most concern centers on civil litigation—largely auto-accidents suits—this reporter found an alarming growth in criminal-court business. Soon criminal-court delay may be making national headlines.

In Los Angeles, for example, the home of one of the best court systems in the nation, criminal-court volume has hit crisis proportions and is still climbing.

Arrests are up 30 percent in five years there. Of greater concern, the number of defendants demanding jury trials has increased 300 percent in the same period. This officials say, is largely due to recent Supreme Court rulings restating the rights of the accused and cracking down on police practices.

Similar reports are heard in other cities coast to coast.

"Ten years ago we had two criminal-court judges, and they weren't overly busy," says Judge Prendergast in Baltimore. "Now we have five judges there, plus a full-time juvenile judge, hearing criminal cases."

The number of criminal cases filed in Hennepin County (Minneapolis), Minn. increased by 50 percent in 1966 over 1965. The statewide average for new criminal filings in 1966 in Minnesota is up 46 percent.

As noted, Cleveland has one of the worst big-city criminal backlogs in the nation. Donald F. Lybarger, chief justice of the Common Pleas Court, reported 1,409 criminal cases pending as of March 27. Those in jail wait 8 to 10 months to go to trial, he adds. Defendants out on bail wait longer.

Criminal backlog hurts both society and the accused. Prosecutors complain they lose too many cases as witnesses disappear and memories dim.

The accused, when arrested, may lose his job. His family faces great hardship. Reputations are tarnished. Often this adds to already fat welfare rolls, for the defendant's family must eat. Those who cannot make bail may sit in jail longer than a judge would sentence them for the crime. This is the city picture in some states.

Delays also occur in rural areas where judges are not sitting full time and courts operate on the old "term" system. This is as true in Massachusetts or Kansas as in South Carolina or Georgia.

REASONS FOR DELAY

Since most state courts use the same judge to try criminal and civil cases, reasons for delay in both divisions can be combined as follows.

1. Acute shortage of judges

While populations mushroom in urban areas, many courts operate with about the same number of men on the bench as they did two or three decades ago.

In Cuyahoga County, Ohio (Cleveland), "We have 24 judges for 1.8 million people. We ought to have 32," says Judge Lybarger.

Minneapolis, in a county with a population of 900,000 and with 16 full-time judges, needs 4 more, officials report. The same officials also want several retired judges working part-time to clean up the backlog. Neighboring St. Paul, in a slightly less-populated county, needs three judges to boost the total of full-time judges to 13 in order to stay even.

Boston is operating with fewer judges than a generation ago because many of them are transferred out of the city to meet the huge growth of court business in other Massachusetts counties, says G. Joseph Tauro, chief justice of the Superior Court. Yet crime in Suffolk County has increased more than 50 percent in the past 10 years, the civil load is up, and the need for more judges is acute.

2. Too few courtrooms

"We need more judges, but even if we get them we don't have any place to put them," says Judge Prendergast of Baltimore. "Our courthouse is jammed, we have no way to expand, and so the only answer is a new building."

"We are reduced to using what resembles City Hall's converted closet space—both clothes and water," asserts Philadelphia's Judge Lavin. "And while a few decent rooms are on the planning board, these will only meet present and long-overdue needs, not tomorrow's."

The report of the Citizen's Conference on the Administration of Justice in Hawaii states: "Physical facilities throughout the [court] system are woefully inadequate."

I found similar complaints in more than 30 other states.

3. Lazy judges

While many judges work in their chambers before taking the bench in the morning, during the noon hour, or in the afternoon, hundreds of judges average a 25- or 30-hour work week. This in spite of the backlog.

Tradition is one excuse. Judges keep short hours because "that's the way it's always been done." Others assert that a judge's job is so demanding that it would be unfair to expect them to work longer (to which still others reply: "Hogwash").

In Chicago, the city with the biggest civil backlog, this reporter has checked all 114 courtrooms in the new Civic Center several times.

On a typical day he found judges on the bench in only 11 of the 114 courtrooms between 9:30 and 10 a.m.; 58 of the 114 benches filled between 10 a.m. and 10:30 a.m.; 45 judges sitting between 10:30 and 11 a.m.; and the same number between 11 and 11:30 a.m. Between 2:30 and 3 p.m. there were only 34 of the 114 benches with judges sitting.

And while almost every other chief judge in the nation helps reduce backlog by hearing cases or handling the court calendar, Chief Judge Boyle functions as a full-time administrator.

A veteran Chicago court observer, who says "Cook County courts are 100 times better than they were," asserts Judge Boyle has his hands full "knocking heads, taking care of political matters, and acting as a buffer between the politicians and the prima donnas on the bench."

Some Chicago judges should be praised. One this reporter always found hard at work is Judge Harold G. Ward, who heads the law division.

"He works from 8:30 to 5:30. You can find him anytime," agrees Mr. Dooley, a lawyer with plenty of business in Judge Ward's court.

Among the nation's conscientious pace setters:

Judges in Los Angeles arrive between 8 and 8:30 a.m., reach the bench promptly at 9, take a 10-minute recess in the morning, lunch from 12 to 1 or 1:30, and quit between 4:15 and 4:30.

New Jersey judges start at 9:30, lunch from 1 to 2, and adjourn at 4, with 10-minute recesses in the morning and afternoon. Hours are stringently regulated by the New Jersey Supreme Court. Assignment (administrative) judges are the busiest. They start by 8:30 and seldom leave before 5.

In most districts judges pick their own working hours, and there is no one to keep tabs on them. New Jersey is one exception. There are others. In some cities judges work out a gentleman's agreement on hours. Some rural judges, often for lack of business, work only four or five days a month, while in the cities judges fight backlogs.

Howard Kline, senior judge in Wichita, Kans., says his court has a backlog ranging from four months to 2½ years. Each judge is given the same number of cases, keeps his own docket, and proceeds at his own speed—without outside supervision. Pressed for a reason for the wide variation there, he says:

"Some judges know how to operate their docket and others don't. And I guess if you get right down to it, there may be some lazy judges."

In every state visited this reporter saw a few judges working long hours to keep dockets current. Sometimes they were doing it just to keep other judges afloat.

Most judges still take long vacations. During the summer months many courts shut down.

Cleveland closes down in August. Pittsburg judges take two months off during the summer. So do Memphis judges, says Judge John J. Wilson, but "somebody is always around for emergencies."

Long vacations date to the day when courthouses weren't air conditioned. Many still aren't. Judges who take most of the summer off argue that witnesses, jurors, and lawyers are often hard to find.

Yet times are changing.

In Massachusetts Superior Court the recess during the last week of March was eliminated this year by Chief Justice G. Joseph Tauro. He says judges are ready to sit all summer to expedite criminal matters.

Rhode Island's Superior Court Presiding Justice, John E. Mullen, has asked the Legislature to pass an amendment that would provide a summer docket so that criminal trials can be held during the traditional layoff. This, he says, would eliminate excessive delay for those held in jail.

Judge Joseph G. Jeppson of Salt Lake City says his judges only get "two weeks for sure, and three weeks maximum," depending on court business. Their civil backlog is less than a year.

4. Dilatory lawyers

Much of the court delay can be blamed on lawyers. This is true in both criminal and civil courts.

One problem is a critical shortage of competent attorneys, especially those who will take criminal cases. The report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and the Administration of Justice, puts it this way:

"Criminal defendants can pay only a small fee. . . . Criminal lawyers are bound to spend much of their working lives in overcrowded, physically unpleasant courts, dealing with people who have committed questionable acts. . . . In nearly every large city a private defense bar of low legal and dubious ethical quality can be found. . . . The public image of the criminal lawyer is a serious obstacle to the attraction of young, able lawyers and reputable and seasoned practitioners. . . ."

While civil-practice lawyers have much more going for them, only a handful enter courtrooms in most cities. (And for that reason, like most citizens, they often have little idea of what really is going on.)

Out of thousands of Chicago lawyers, 36 handle the bulk of auto-accident cases. Each firm has from 300 to 1,000 cases pending today, according to court officials.

"In Cleveland, 55 lawyers try 82.3 percent of all cases," says Judge Lybarger. "And we have a bar of about 3,000."

The story is the same across the nation. Lawyers who take trial work find it extremely lucrative. Many grab every case that walks in the door. Some even solicit business. But they simply do not have enough days in the week to go to court. Sometimes they forget they have cases pending. They frequently ask for continuances or delay justice by being tied up in another courtroom, perhaps in federal court, when their case is called.

"When a trial lawyer has too many cases he tells the judge, 'I'm too busy to come to court,'" says Henry Ellenbogen, senior judge in the Pittsburgh Common Pleas Court. "So the lawyer on the other side twiddles his thumbs."

The system of justice is, in itself, a cause of delay.

Lawyers battle it out in court, and as one judge succinctly puts it: "Neither wants to see justice done. Each wants to win." In civil cases they are urged to settle out of court. So lawyers waste time trying to outbluff each other. The attorney for the plaintiff holds out for every cent he can get. The insurance company lawyer tries to bring the plaintiff's price down.

Some defense attorneys even use the backlog as a lever.

"A few say 'settle for what we offer, or wait six years,'" says Chicago attorney Dooley. "It's a lousy choice. Someday they'll learn that those who can wait it out will get two or three times what they would if they settled without the delay."

In Cook County 95 percent of the cases are settled out of court before a jury reaches a verdict, says Judge Boyle. Plaintiffs' lawyers use the jury as a big stick to get insurance companies to pay off, thus the lawyers function largely as collection agents, using the courts as a tool.

Criminal lawyers across the country admit that they try to delay justice if they have a tough case, hoping that witnesses will forget or change their minds. They believe they have nothing to lose and everything to gain, since their client will probably go to jail anyway.

But strong judges can resolve the backlog.

"If the judge really wants to do it he can clear the dockets," says Warren Burnett, of Odessa, Texas, one of the busiest lawyers in the Southwest. "All he has to do is make a courtroom available and tell the lawyer to be there. Then he runs that lawyer's cases through like boxcars, and you settle or go to trial as fast as they roll by."

Mr. Burnett knows, for as head of a small firm with some 2,000 cases pending, it has happened to him.

Judge Boyle asserts some Chicago lawyers slow down the pace in November and December because they have made so much money by then the fees "all go to the government." (Civil lawyers usually take a 25 to 50 percent cut of the settlement.)

5. "Expert witnesses"

The use of "expert witnesses" like doctors and psychiatrists leads to problems of delay. Each lawyer, in trying to knock down the opposition's case, produces his own experts, who testify at length.

These experts are often hard to get to court because they are busy professionally. So lawyers ask for delays to accommodate them.

6. Lax legislatures

State legislatures too often refuse to face the problems of the courts. Often they do not provide enough judges or funds.

In Illinois, where a new judicial article was recently passed, there is still a law that requires court docket books to be written and bound by hand, even though Cook County has rented a computer that could produce the information in minutes.

Los Angeles, while generally ahead of the nation in court administration, is blocked by archaic laws and the state constitution from making additional improvements, says Andrew L. Schultz, executive assistant court administrator.

Most states also lack legislation governing the forward progress of cases.

Michigan judges can throw a civil case out if it isn't making headway.

In New York City and Philadelphia, criminal defendants are brought in for hearings 24 hours a day. Pittsburgh operates one courtroom till after midnight. Several states have laws limiting the time a man can be held without starting him through the trial process.

7. Inefficient methods

Nearly every state requires criminal cases to proceed through the system at a "reasonable" speed. But each judge and prosecutor may have his own theory on what "reasonable" means.

The courts themselves often refuse to try modern business techniques.

Each year a few more hire court administrators so judges can be free of paperwork and other mundane activities. Richard E. Klein has been working as court administrator in St. Paul, Minn., since January, while Minneapolis has had an administrator for a year.

Judge Jeppson, in Salt Lake City, says the State Legislature has just provided for an administrator. The new law goes into effect June 1.

I found Seattle's administrator, Robert C. Wetherholt, deep in paperwork. Until February he wore a second hat, handling noncontested matters too. In April he was still trying to clean up the backlog.

8. "Cats and dogs" cases

Wholesale filing of what some judges call "cats and dogs" cases.

These end up with a verdict of only a few hundred dollars, or at most a few thousand, and cost courts a great deal of time and money. Pittsburgh's Judge Ruggero J. Aldisert has studied the problem, and in his county "72 percent of all settlements and verdicts are under $5,000."

Nationally, thousands of plaintiffs ask for sizable sums and settle for a fraction—sometimes less than $1,000.

Not only are settlements small. Often the area of disagreement between the plaintiff and defendant is relatively narrow, Judge Aldisert adds.

"If a trial lasts four days, then, depending upon what formula you use, it costs the taxpayers between $1,800 and $2,400 for a jury trial," he asserts. "If the parties are only $500 or $1,000 apart in a $5,000 or $10,000 case why should the taxpayers pay $1,800 to settle this difference?"

Criminal court judges also complain about the filing of "cheap" cases, while those involving serious crimes and with good evidence against the defendant are held up. In too many instances the prosecutor is too busy to screen cases, or wants the judge to take the blame for throwing them out.

SOLUTIONS OFFERED

There are, of coure, other reasons for delay. Many solutions are being offered. In addition to more judges and courtrooms, and longer working hours for judges, they include the following (to be expanded upon in detail in future reports):

A strong chief judge who can make assignments, set working hours and make them stick, and keep judicial business flowing. He should have a good business-oriented court administrator.

Team spirit in the courts. "We have perfect cooperation of judges," says Judge John W. Wilson, of Memphis, where the backlog is one of the lowest in the country. "Say I have three suits on my docket when I open court at 10 a.m. and they all announce settled. I don't leave the courthouse, although I could. I go to the other judges to see if they have any cases I can take."

The use of certificates of readiness. Before a trial date is set, lawyers must sign a statement that they are ready for court.

Computers and other electronic equipment for record keeping and other judicial administration requirements.

Liberal transfer or assignment policy. In some states a judge is sent where he is needed. A rural judge may well spend part of his time in the city.

Arbitration. In Pittsburgh three-lawyer arbitration panels hear minor civil cases with excellent results, often handling six cases per panel per day.

The six-man jury and split verdicts in civil cases. Some lawyers feel a smaller jury works as well as the large one and that a 9–3 or even 7–5 jury verdict in civil cases is better than the normal 12–0 vote.

Much has been said about pretrial, and nearly every court in the nation is using some form of it or has tried it to clarify issues, find areas of agreement, and settle civil cases. In San Francisco Judge Charles S. Peery, with the help of an appointed commissioner, pretries 40 to 50 cases a week—two every half hour. Yet some judges call it a waste of time.

CRISIS ADMITTED

In auto-accident cases there are several suggestions. Judge Alexander P. Waugh of Morristown, N.J., notes these: (a) a system similar to workmen's compensation (b), recovery on your own insurance policy (c), abolition of the jury trial (d), court costs' being paid by one or both of the parties in the suit, rather than by the taxpayers.

While judges, lawyers, and concerned laymen are divided on solutions and will even argue over which court problems are most pressing, few deny that a crisis exists.

It is easy to file a civil suit. Thousands of people go to court for the first time every month—either as plaintiff or defendant. But for many, justice grinds slowly—sometimes to no avail because it grinds too late.

Many in the legal profession agree that laymen will indeed "take over" unless the profession acts to speed up the wheels of justice.

But whether reform comes from within or from outside the ranks of the legal profession is perhaps of less importance to concerned citizens than that it come. And there is hope that it will.

Says Maurice Rosenberg, professor of law at Columbia University, "The problem of delay may be old, but it is by no means obsolescent; it is complex but not insoluble; it is stubborn but not hopeless. . . ."

Juggled Justice In Minor Courts

(By Howard James)

(NOTE.—Every year millions of Americans go to court. Ninety percent of those who do, get their first taste of justice in one of 15,000 minor courts. These date back to frontier days when justices of the peace settled arguments on the spot. Here is a report on why the minor-court system no longer meets today's needs, plus ideas for improvement.)

She was a pretty girl from Wisconsin. Attractively dressed, she sat with the more scraggly prisoners on the platform and stared at her hands. Only once did she let her eyes meet those of her fiancé in the crowd below.

Coming to Philadelphia a few months before to be near him, she was working while he finished college—saving what she could for their marriage.

Now she was in Philadelphia's night court, charged with shoplifting.

When her name was finally called, she walked weakly down the steps and stood, white-faced, before the bench. A department-store clerk said the girl tried to steal a sweater.

In less than five minutes the magistrate found her guilty. Given the choice of paying a $25 fine and $2.50 costs or spending 10 days in jail, she let her fiancé pay the fine. Her conviction was entered in the record book.

OLD MAN RECOGNIZED

A few minutes later a dirty old man with bagging pants and a three-day beard stood before the magistrate, charged with stealing 14 pairs of ladies hose. The magistrate grinned, recognizing him as a resident of a flophouse in his district.

"Didn't all 148 of you [residents of the flophouse] vote against me?" the magistrate asked, half joking.

"No, no, no, your honor, we all voted for you," the old man whined. "I'm begging you to give me a break. I'm begging you."

The magistrate grinned again and let the man go.

FLAWS DETECTED

This, then, is an example of justice in a typical American minor court.

On the two nights I visited this court, the magistrate, his clerk, a deputy district attorney, a stenographer, a deputy public defender, and two police officers smoked. This despite large signs tacked to the bench reading: "No Smoking."

One man, waiting for hours for a case to be called, asked if he, too, could smoke. The cheroot-puffing assistant district attorney told him no—only court personnel could "ignore the law."

As this reporter traveled across the nation looking at the state courts, these events in Philadelphia became symbolic of flaws most clearly seen in the minor courts and sometimes present in the higher trial courts as well.

Through friendship, political station, and sometimes bribery (although this point was not an issue on this night in Philadelphia), Americans have established a curiously privileged class of citizens—a group of people who stand above or beyond the law, almost as used to be the case with the rich and the royal.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice expressed concern in its recent report over the widespread inequities it found in the American system of justice and stated the over-all problem clearly:

"The commission has been shocked by what it has seen in some lower courts. It has seen cramped and noisy courtrooms, undignified and perfunctory procedures, and badly trained personnel. It has seen dedicated people who are frustrated by huge case loads, by the lack of opportunity to examine cases carefully, and by the impossibility of devising constructive solutions to the problems of offenders. It has seen assembly-line justice."

And this is what I saw in Philadelphia and in too many other cities across the nation.

MAGISTRATE NOT A LAWYER

The Philadelphia magistrate I watched in action is not a lawyer. Like thousands of other minor-court magistrates, he became a judge of his fellow men by running for office and winning.

Day after day he dispenses justice like an Army mess sergeant dishing out boiled potatoes and meatloaf.

Only 30 states keep court statistics, and too often these do not include minor courts.

Though there is little accurate information available, it is estimated that every year some 35 million Americans come in contact with these so-called minor courts. Some, of course, are repeaters. Most—between 20 and 30 million—are charged with traffic offenses.

The President's commission found that in 1965 more than 2 million Americans entered prison, juvenile training schools, or were placed on probation. How many others were fined (like the Philadelphia girl), jailed briefly, or "given a break" is nearly beyond comprehension.

The majority get their first taste of American justice from more than 10,000 judges who are laymen or who work part-time. The rest appear before the roughly 5,000 better qualified lawyer-judges who preside over slightly higher-level minor courts.

Minor courts vary widely in name. The largest number are still known as justice-of-the-peace courts, a carryover from early England. Other titles include magistrate, municipal judge, city judge, police court judge, district judge (in some New England states), common-pleas judge (which may also be the name of the highest trial court, depending upon the state), and county judge.

Their duties are equally diverse.

MISDEMEANORS COMMONEST

In most states minor courts have jurisdiction over misdemeanors—the legal term for minor offenses like public drunkenness, vagrancy, shoplifting, and violations of local ordinances. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency reports nine-tenths of all American crime falls into the misdemeanor category.

Fines vary from state to state and sometimes from court to court. Most are limited to $200 or $300—at the top $1,000. Most minor courts can sentence from 30 to 60 days in jail—some up to one year. In those where the minor courts have been upgraded into district courts with lawyer-judges, fines and sentences can be considerably higher.

County courts in Wisconsin, for example, have had their jurisdiction enlarged so that they can hear the cases traditionally handled by the circuit courts—except for treason. The Milwaukee area is an exception. Here only crimes punishable by a year or less in prison or by fines under $1,000 can be heard.

Again, depending upon the state, minor courts also may hear minor civil matters. Sometimes, as in South Carolina, the top limit is a few hundred dollars. In Kansas minor courts have civil jurisdiction in cases up to $1,000, and occasionally as high as $2,500—depending upon the county. The variation in Missouri is from $1,000 to $2,000. The cut-off in South Dakota municipal courts is $500, with $1,000 tops in county courts there.

DUTIES OFTEN DIVERSE

Minor courts also hear most or all traffic cases, and sometimes probate, juvenile, divorce, and other family matters.

In addition to this they perform marriages, issue criminal warrants, and often set bail for all crimes, including murder.

Most can cite citizens for contempt of court. In Kansas a justice of the peace can send you to jail for 10 days for contempt. In Louisiana the limit is $10 or 24 hours. Montana and Nevada limit contempt penalties to $100 or one day. The same is true of Utah, South Dakota, and Idaho. Some states, like Alabama, limit the penalty to $6 or 6 hours or similar short periods.

At last count, 32 states let their minor-court justices and judges earn all or part of their keep by collecting fees in criminal cases. This is a horrible system that can lead to finding nearly everyone guilty and heaping on costs to make a profit; for the magistrate's cut is often tied to the size of the fee.

More progressive states have replaced the fee system with a salary. And some states pay justices a fee when cases are dismissed.

The President's commission found that in at least three states, justices of the peace are paid only if they convict and collect a fee from the defendant—a practice held unconstitutional by the Supreme Court 40 years ago.

Thousands of minor-court judges work only part time. In New Hampshire, only one among 73 district and municipal judges is full time. Of the 73, 34 are laymen, according to Frank R. Kenison, Chief Justice of the New Hampshire Supreme Court.

In Pendleton, S.C., Justice J. W. Holliday is a retired schoolteacher who sits on the bench a few hours each day handling "fines and forfeits."

"I never run out of family troubles," he said, as we sat on his front porch one evening chatting.

JURY TRIALS HELD

Now and again he is called on to hold a jury trial. When he does, he usually finds himself serving as prosecutor as well as judge. And he gives the six-man jury a chance to "ask a few questions too, so they get enough facts" to make a decision.

Minor-court record keeping checked by this reporter in a national tour would make most business executives shed bitter tears. In Pennsylvania, where every hamlet and crossroads has it own JP, there are between 4,000 and 5,000 minor court judges. William W. Litke, former president of the Pennsylvania Bar Association, has said:

"Only the accounts showing fines transmitted to local and state governments and costs for handling criminal cases which are reimbursed by the county are audited. This leaves a large volume of criminal, as well as noncriminal, transactions unaudited.

"Moreover, responsibility for auditing is divided among state, county, and local officials. Often the auditing is performed by elected or appointed personnel who lack professional training and who are not aloof from political considerations."

Two years ago, when Illinois court reform abolished the lowest level of courts, revenue collected by the courts soared. Cook County suburbs are taking in so much now that they are building new courthouses, says one state official. He wonders aloud about where the money was going before.

PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE SCANTY

But at least 40 states still permit badly flawed minor court systems to operate. And this system of justice is supported—if only through permissive silence—by the American people.

Actually few know what goes on in the minor courts. Few lawyers practice there. The average citizen may appear once or twice in a lifetime to face speeding charges or some other minor offense. His stay is brief—perhaps a few hours in city courts or five minutes or less in rural areas where the workload is low. And he has little or no way of evaluating what happens, except that he may be rather angry about his personal experience.

Lawyers who do practice in the lower courts are often struggling to keep meat on the table. In several cities I saw them waiting for cases like hungry alley cats. This because tidbits are thrown to them:

Many lower-court judges in the United States get first crack at serious (felony) offenses. They hold preliminary hearings to see if police have enough evidence to establish probable cause to bind over a case to a higher court or the grand jury.

In an old, dirty courtroom in Oklahoma City, defendants charged with felonies often appeared without lawyers the day I sat in. If the accused agreed, the judge assigned an attorney to them—one of several hanging around the office.

HEARINGS RUSHED THROUGH

A brief, whispered conference was held between lawyer and client, the hearing took place, and more often than not the judge found enough evidence to send the client on to higher court.

This practice is widespread. In some cities appointed lawyers, though supposed to work without fee or to be paid by the county, push a client to fork over a wrist watch, television set, auto title, or even a deed to a home before the lawyer will appear on behalf of the defendant. In many cities higher court judges will grant a continuance without a word when a lawyer mentions a code phrase that indicates his client has not yet paid his fee.

By law, minor courts must take on these preliminary hearings. Yet better screening practices by prosecutors could be more effective.

Thousands of minor-court judges who are totally unqualified to decide on the merits of offenses simply move all their cases along to a higher court, according to many lawyers and judges interviewed.

WASTE OF TIME

Thus a preliminary hearing can often be a waste of time and tax money. Many defendants waive these hearings in states where this is permitted. Lawyers sometimes use them to discover what kind of evidence the police have against a client.

The lack of screening results in overloading higher courts with petty cases.

"To clog up criminal courts with 20,000 cases, 12,000 of which could be thrown out or handled by a [competent] magistrate, is ridiculous," says Adrian Bonnelly, president judge in Philadelphia's intermediate County Court.

Most of the nation's minor courts have little or no supervision from outside—certainly less than the 3,700 judges sitting in the highest state trial courts.

In the areas visited by this writer perhaps fewer than half of the higher trial courts have judges that can be classified as "good." On this basis, since roughly two-thirds of the 15,000 or more minor-court judges are not lawyers, and since pay for lawyer-judges in the minor courts is usually low, with many working only part-time, perhaps only 1 in 10—if that many—could be considered "competent."

There are exceptions. In some states, including Maine, Colorado, North Carolina, and Illinois, nonlawyer courts have been abolished recently. In these states lawyers can sometimes work up through the system like college instructors moving up to associate and then full professorships.

Even this can cause shortcomings, says Milton G. Rector, director of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency in New York.

"Once a minor-court judge shows that he is capable, he is appointed to a higher court," Mr. Rector says. "This means we siphon off the best judges in courts that handle 90 percent of the people. The answer is to upgrade these lower courts."

Reform is already in the sprinkle stage, and there is hope it will soon grow into a downpour on what has been a thirsty desert.

How many cases are "fixed" by minor-court judges?

No one in the United States has any idea. But most states have a fixing scandal every few years—usually in areas where there is an aggressive newspaper to keep watch.

CHICAGO SCANDALS FREQUENT

Chicago's traffic court has been rocked by scandal constantly. The most recent shakeup came early this year. Four magistrates were fired and 13 others transferred. This despite the fact the Illinois court system was reorganized two years ago and the traffic courts have been under the supervision of the chief judge of the circuit court since then.

Maine prides itself on having a first-rate judiciary. In 1961 it began replacing part-time trial and municipal justices with district judges. When Paul A. MacDonald, a former secretary of state, took the bench he found one magistrate in his district had 116 cases "pending." Since they were beyond the legal time limit, all had to be dismissed.

"The fellow was a lawyer, and I suppose he put these away as a favor to fellow lawyers," Judge MacDonald says. "The old system wasn't much different than in states where judges run for office and have to collect campaign funds from attorneys and friends. It was all political."

Now Judge MacDonald, who is appointed, can do his job without caring "whether I hurt somebody's feelings or not."

Many minor-court judges are pushed around by prosecutors and police. This is partly because of their lack of knowledge of the law and partly because prosecutors and police will take their cases elsewhere if, in their eyes, a magistrate is "soft" toward defendants.

RETIREE EARNS $360 MONTHLY

In Seminole, Texas, a small town not far from the New Mexico border, Judge Jim Vining, a retired oil field driller and newsstand operator, collects $360 a month to dispense justice.

Often, he says, when "a drunk says he is not guilty" he is thrown in jail "for two or three days" until he changes his mind, pleads guilty, and pays his fine. Sometimes sheriff's deputies put on stronger pressure.

The day I visited Seminole, a man had been released from jail when his employer paid his $50 fine and costs.

He was arrested by the Texas State Highway Patrol. Officers had found a car stopped along a barren stretch of highway. The man was standing alongside, relieving himself. He was arrested and jailed, then brought before Judge Vining by a deputy sheriff who had no connection with the arrest.

"They told the man he better plead guilty to drunk and vagrancy or they'd get him for indecent exposure," Judge Vining told me. Later the sheriff admitted this was a fairly common practice.

Drunks fill minor court dockets. In nearly every large city justice is performed in rapid-fire fashion.

San Francisco Municipal Judge Joseph Kennedy, a lawyer who expressed as much compassion and dignity as time would allow, had them file into his courtroom two dozen at a time on a Monday morning I was there.

MEN RUSHED INTO LINE

Even before he reached the bench, you could hear the cell doors clanging and the jailers shouting names so the men could line up.

Each group of 24 filed out behind a large steel-pipe barrier. There Judge Kennedy advised them of the charge against them and of their rights. One after another they pleaded guilty. Each had roughly 30 seconds before the judge, and most were given 30-day suspended sentences. Some were encouraged to leave town.

One frequent visitor was told he was being sentenced to 15 days to "break the cycle." A few younger men were allowed to go to the "AA school so you can learn the evils of this problem." Several told Judge Kennedy they had been out "only an hour" before they were picked up again, to which Judge Kennedy replied: "That isn't our fault, is it?"

In 53 minutes he processed more than 140 men.

In Indianapolis the scene was the same—as it is in most large cities. Judge Harry F. Zaklan often recognized defendants.

"Ernie, you back again?" he would ask. Or, "Joe, you've been picked up 150 times. It's still cold out. For your own good I'm going to send you up until it gets warmer outside."

RURAL JUDGES OFTEN TOUGHER

In rural areas I found judges tougher—socking drunks with $25 or $50 fines and long jail stretches.

At best, minor courts are unpleasant

places. At worst they are bad beyond belief. The county criminal court in Louisville, Ky., was packed and noisy. Although I sat near the front I found it difficult to hear court business—until a young woman who was picked up in a bar charged a young man with attempted rape. Suddenly everybody was listening.

The Louisville criminal-court judge was sarcastic with nearly everyone who appeared before him. He embarrassed a long-haired youth from a home for boys who was brought in by the prosecutor to testify for the state in a case.

"Whatta they do for you out there (at the home)?" the judge asked, "just let you sit around all day and talk and let your hair grow?"

SOME FIND BIG PROFITS

Many minor-court judges are retired men who take the low-paying jobs to pad out social-security checks. But others find these jobs extremely profitable.

Justice Jack Treadway is a lawyer in Houston. I asked him how he could afford to take such a low-paying job.

"I perform 2,000 marriages a year," he explained. "My minimum fee is $10, and it goes up to $35 or $50."

Yet down the hall the office of another justice was empty. He continues to draw his $12,000 salary as a justice of the peace, although court officials say he has been "bed-ridden for two years."

Judge Treadway says that nonlawyers are not qualified for justice-of-the-peace posts in Harris County and that only two out of nine JPs are lawyers.

Justice Treadway also notes the importance of screening cases.

"I dismiss at least 25 percent of all cases that come before me for lack of evidence" he says. (Yet by conservative estimate, the national average must be closer to 2.5 percent thrown out of minor courts.)

COURTS RUN INDEPENDENTLY

As in the higher courts, seldom is there communication between justices.

In Mr. Vining's court in Seminole he fines offenders $18.50 for running a stop sign; $20 for a red light. A habitual drunk pays $200 and usually serves a long jail sentence instead—"so we get rid of him."

A block down the street Mrs. Loraine Basham, a housewife and grandmother, presides over the city court from 9 a.m. to 12, and from 3 to 5 p.m.—all for a $250 a month salary, compared with Mr. Vining's $360.

"I handle everything the city police bring in—mostly drunks and disturbances and traffic cases," she says.

Her fine for running a stop sign: $5. Red lights cost violators $10. And drunks pay $25 for the first offense, $50 for the second, and $100 for the third.

TRAFFIC VIOLATIONS BY THE MILLIONS

Most Americans—over 20 million a year—learn about minor courts through traffic violations. (Another 10 million pay fines without appearing before a judge.)

In Los Angeles one Thursday evening I watched 754 people processed in less than three hours by three judges. Less than 8 percent plead not guilty, says Judge Thomas C. Murphy, who sits at the hub of this three-courtroom setup and dispenses justice with a light touch that keeps people from getting angry. He includes a "20-minute talk" every hour so defendants will understand their rights and how the court operates. Most plead guilty "with an explanation."

He even invites parents to let their children sit with him on the bench—if they promise to "take them when they go home." And adds: "You can even burn your driver's license in protest on the front steps."

Hundreds of communities, large and small, use traffic tickets to raise funds—ignoring what experts say is the primary reason for traffic court: to promote driving safety.

COSTS CAN RUN HIGH

In Indianapolis I was surprised to hear Judge John C. Christ handing down fines of $1 or $1.25 and costs. That is, until I learned costs vary from $7.25 to $17.25, with the money going to the city general fund, to the state, and to state and county prosecutors.

Much of the $2.5 million yearly revenue (including parking revenue) produced by a one-judge court in Seattle goes into the general fund, says Judge Vernon W. Towne. "Our practices here are no different from any other city, and it bothers me when we are merely considered a revenue-producing court."

Most traffic courts tend to encourage defendants to plead guilty—although in several states they may request jury trials.

The 8 percent pleading not guilty in Los Angeles must come back another day—perhaps missing work and losing more money than the cost of the ticket. Anyone who has spent time around traffic courts has heard citizens complain that they are not guilty but will pay the fine anyway to save time and money.

MILLIONS MAY BE LOST

And there is little possibility of keeping track of money that is never turned in to the state or county by the minor courts—especially in rural areas. Millions may be lost this way each year.

Last year Philadelphia's traffic court reportedly lost $30,000.

In Pittsburgh, Chief Magistrate Ernest C. Jones has been using IBM equipment for "eight or nine years," along with professional accounting procedures.

When he took over, tickets were "stacked around in boxes and bushel baskets." He cleaned up a 200,000-ticket backlog and has a Better Traffic Committee working with citizens groups. To make sure all are properly treated and that no money disappears, other safeguards are used. The cash is balanced every day and deposited in a bank. The city is paid by check, and he can listen in on people dealing with the public by punching a button in his office.

Part of the problem with traffic offenses: Everybody who drives a car commits one or more violations almost every time he takes it out of the garage. So he hardly classifies the offense with other "crimes," although the law in most states does. Only a minute fraction of all violations are ticketed.

DIGNITY OFTEN LACKING

While many justices run honest courts, a judicial setting is lacking. In Loving, New Mexico, Justice L. C. Burkham runs a gas station. Sometimes when police bring in a speeder or other offender, he wipes the grease off his hands and holds court right there.

Others still hold court in their homes. Some motorists tell of a farmer who dispenses justice from a tractor, or from the back of the barn, where he is doing chores.

This writer's study of the courts suggests a need for the following changes:

Training in the law—and preferably a law degree—for traffic-court judges.

Pay adequate to attract high-caliber judges.

Abolition of the fee system.

Strong lawyer-judges for small-claims courts—as is the case in Los Angeles—to help resolve civil problems.

An arbitration system—as found in Pittsburgh, where three-lawyer panels resolve disputes over minor money matters.

Diversion of divorce, juvenile, and other family matters to higher courts, where specially trained judges are backstopped with proper facilities and staff to resolve these problems.

The most drastic solution offered is to follow the lead of those states that have simply done away with minor courts.

"Study commissions have pointed out the scandal of the lower criminal courts for over a century," the President's commission explains. "More than 30 years ago the Wickersham Commission concluded that the best solution to the problem would be the abolition of these courts. The commission agrees."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to continue for an additional 10 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

ONE MAN, ONE VOTE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, when in 1964, the Supreme Court of the United States handed down its one-man, one-vote decision in the Reynolds against Sims case, the decision had far greater significance than the principle of one man, one vote.

What it said, in effect, was that the people of a State had no power to determine the composition of one branch of its legislature. What it said was that under the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution providing equal protection of the laws, the States were powerless in providing for what they deemed to be fair representation to all parties, all interests, all activities in a State. What it said was that despite the 10th article of amendment to the Constitution which reserves to the States all powers not delegated to the United States or denied to the States, the people of those same States had no power over their own lawmaking bodies. It is not surprising that long ago Justice Frankfurter said this was a political thicket in which the Supreme Court had no business. If the effects of this decision are not remedied, it can only mean that elected bodies from political subdivisions of the State, such as school, park, county, sanitary, and other boards created under the enabling powers of the State, must be subjected to the same rule, regardless of the inequities which might be involved. Thus, the decision spreads its mischief on and on like Tennyson's brook.

This contention does not deny for one moment that any State may apply the one-man, one-vote principle to both branches of its legislature if it so desires. The fact to be underscored here is that it is brought about by State and not by Federal action.

Those who see in the decision of the High Court a further march of Federal power and an impairment of the perfect union have sought to undo this patent damage to our constitutional system by offering a proposal to amend the Constitution of the United States which would restore this power to the people of the State. That proposal called for a return to the principles set forth in the Constitution by its framers and for a reaffirmation of faith in the people. It sought neither more nor less than to give meaning and purpose to the phrase "government by the people," even as Lincoln used it at Gettysburg.

The effort to bring this about commanded a clear and substantial majority in the U.S. Senate, but it was seven votes short of the required two-thirds.

While this endeavor was in progress, still another move was underway to bring about the convening of a Constitutional Convention as provided in article V of the Constitution. Such a Convention would have one, and only one purpose and that was to deal with this question of legislative apportionment. A substantial number of States has already enacted applications as provided in article V, addressed to Congress to call such a Convention. At long last, 32 States have filed such applications. It requires two more, or 34, to achieve this end. The effort is now underway to obtain applications from two more States.

Meanwhile, fainthearted, fearful individuals and organizations with small faith in the people have urged some of the States to rescind the action they have taken. Thus far, no State has rescinded.

Like ostriches, they hide their heads in the sand and close their eyes to the surging vitality of the Constitution. It is a living document today because it has been amended by the people to take into consideration the dynamic forward movement of this great Nation. It has been amended before to provide us with the Bill of Rights, abolition of slavery, the right to vote to women, enforcement of prohibition, the repeal of prohibition, and we have even done a better job on presidential succession.

These individuals and groups who are in opposition to a convention are seemingly devoid of any faith in the process of democracy and the capacity of the people to render judgment in a crisis of this character and magnitude. They will continue their efforts, and the time is at hand to summon the power of the people to protect and preserve the principle that this is still a Government of, for, and by the people.

The undisputed fact is that federalism is on the march. The steady growth of centralized power in Washington, far removed from the people, will jeopardize their freedom. By means of grants-in-aid and other devices, States have been steadily lured for the sake of these handouts to agree to the tags, conditions, qualifications and requirements which the Federal Government attaches to the funds made available to the States. In this wise States are compelled to impose additional burdens of taxes on their people to take advantage of this allegedly free money. The lure is great, the danger is even greater, and the ultimate end is a centralized, all-powerful, leviathan Federal Government, clothed with power to convert citizens into subjects, and gradually shear away the freedoms they once knew.

What gives added moment and importance to this issue is something that came to my attention only recently; namely, certain studies—special studies, in fact—that have been made for the study of democratic institutions. We ought to incline our eyes and ears a moment and just give attention to a few of the conclusions that these special studies dish out.

> The complexity of social structures will make some form of regimentation unavoidable . . . Freedom and privacy may come to constitute anti-social luxuries.

I never expected to read that in print from anybody committed to a special study of democratic institutions. But this goes on:

> In consequence, the type of human beings more likely to prosper will be those willing to accept a regimented and sheltered way of life in a teeming and polluted world from which all wilderness and fantasy will have disappeared.
>
> The autonomy of the individual . . . is doomed to shrink as society becomes even more highly organized. At length, the individual as such will have vanished in the anonymity of the mass.

That is a rather happy thought in a free country.

We had better gather the full impact of these suggestions. Unavoidable regimentation. That is to say, just be a contented cow in a sterile barn, born to eat, produce milk, and wind up in a butcher shop. That is about the only hope I see there.

Freedom and privacy may come to constitute antisocial luxuries. That is to say, to be free and insist on privacy does not comport with the needs of society, and that must be forfeited. And, finally, if you want to be happy under this new idea, accept regimentation, government decrees and orders, and accept the sheltering wing of a paternal government.

That is great stuff, when it is compared to what Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence 191 years ago, because he said:

> Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Change all that now and let it read, "The governed survive, live, move, and have their being by the tolerance and forbearance of the government."

A noble sentiment. Forget that you are an individual. You are just a fleck, a spot, a digit in the mass. What is good for the mass is good for you.

That sounds like that old cliche: "If it's good for General Motors, it's good for you." Well, now these special students lay out this new doctrine: "If it's good for the mass, it's good for you."

Mind you, you had better hold your tongue. First, a protest would not do you any good; second, you might be punished for being antisocial and wind up in jail.

Is this the ultimate answer to the sacrifice at Argonne Forest, the Bulge, Pusan Road, Hill 881 in Vietnam? Maybe the Revolution was, and we did not know it. Maybe there is no retreat. But with an abiding trust in the good judgment of the American people, it is worth a try to stem the disaster and retrieve what we have already lost.

Whether that centralization comes through the hand of the U.S. Supreme Court or the creative federalism of the executive branch, that is the danger that confronts America today. And when they talk about creative federalism, I guess the shortest definition is: How to spend more money faster than ever before.

CORRECTION OF MOSCOW RADIO

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, on May 4 of this year, Moscow radio made some mention to comments that I had made in regard to the Vietnam war, which would indicate that I found totally unacceptable the great goals of this Nation, as to why we are there, and some of the fundamental tenets of foreign policy of this Nation. The report of Moscow radio needs no great comment, except to note the inaccuracies of the account and to make a record of the same.

RUMANIAN NATIONAL INDEPENDENCE DAY—A GLIMMER OF LIGHT

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, once again the time has come to pay tribute to the people of Rumania and to commemorate their day of national independence.

The one fact that is most obvious to all of us here is that the Rumanians are a people with a deep-rooted spirit of freedom within their national soul and that they have a special revulsion against any form of foreign domination.

In the 19th century, we can read in the pages of European history the story of Rumania's drive toward independence from the Turks.

In the 20th century, we have been witnesses of the same happening: Rumania's drive toward independence from Soviet domination.

When we review the history of Rumania in the early postwar period, we can now see how mistaken many observers were when they assumed that Rumania would remain a subservient satellite of the Soviet Union.

At that time Rumania was brought within the Communist camp, not by any free choice of her peoples, but rather by the treachery of indigenous Communist leaders and by the awful presence of Soviet military power. Within a very short time, Rumania experienced the same program of sovietization as was then simultaneously being applied in the other countries of Eastern Europe. With the forced abdication of King Michael, the Communist regime became totally entrenched, and Rumania formally became a people's democracy with a constitution structured on the Soviet model.

But the Soviets did not take into account the spirit of independence that exists within the Rumanian soul. And for that matter, neither did observers from abroad.

As we look back upon the past two decades, we can now see what was happening. Once Rumania had been organized and restructured according to the norms of Communist ideology, and once the country began to grow stronger economically, the nation itself began to break away from the Soviet bloc and establish a more independent course. This movement began gradually in the early 1960's, but in recent years it has accelerated.

I should like to cite just two recent developments as illustrations: First, in February 1967, Rumania, in defiance of other nations in the Soviet bloc, established full diplomatic relations with West Germany; and second, Rumania conveniently absented itself from the recent conference of Soviet bloc states in Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia, where bloc unity was one of many questions under consideration. These are more than symbolic acts of independence.

But we must be wary in speaking of

Rumanian independence from the Soviet Union that we do not confuse this with a movement toward greater internal freedom. This is not the case. To be sure, certain internal concessions have been made to the people. Life is more tolerable. But, the regime continues to assert its total monopoly of state power and shows no signs whatever of permitting a greater share of popular participation in the Government.

In a word, we have witnessed in Rumania the development of national communism; that is, the continuation of the Communist power apparatus, but its exercise of power within an environment that demands that Rumanian national interests must first be served rather than those of the Soviet Union or world communism.

This is a healthy sign. What the next phase of this development will be we do not know. But we have reason to hope for the best when we see a situation where Rumania is breaking away from total unity with the Soviet bloc; where it is moving toward closer relations with the West; and where in general it is charting its destiny in terms of strictly Rumanian national interests.

On this day of national independence for Rumania, let us all express our hope that one day true freedom as well as independence will become a reality for Rumania and its people.

THE VOLUNTEER ARMY

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, in 1940, after peace had been shattered in Europe by the armies of Adolph Hitler, and after the territorial ambitions of Japan's military government threatened the United States in the Pacific, the United States adopted a Selective Service System. It was clear that a large land war was imminent and that it would probably involve this country.

After the war, there was serious debate in the United States on whether or not the draft should be retained. This debate stemmed from the American tradition of a volunteer army and was forcefully voiced by members of the Nation's religious, education, labor, and farm groups. The Navy, joined by the Air Force, took the position that the draft was not necessary, that a volunteer system was more desirable. The Army, on the other hand, insisted that conscription was necessary to retain required force levels. The Army's position was not fully investigated and the argument was not really solved when the Korean war broke out. Circumstance, more than logic, dictated the Universal Military and Service Act which remains almost unchanged at the present time.

After the Korean war, there was no serious attempt to analyze the draft or to look at the alternatives; it simply remained.

During the past year, as you well know, the draft has been the object of harsh, sustained and widespread criticism. This criticism has come from the youth of our country, from educators and from the Congress of the United States. I believe that these criticisms are in considerable part justified.

The problems created by our present system are many, and they are serious.

There are inequities in the current draft, because of its decentralized nature and deferment policies that are absurd. These have been widely discussed and there is no need to belabor them here.

There are very serious legal and moral questions posed by religious or political conscientious objectors that cause much hard feeling toward the services.

The anxiety and uncertainty of who will serve and when he will serve deeply affect our youth and put military service in an unfavorable light. This is compounded by the feeling of compulsion that now exists and that is so against our democratic ideals.

Certainly not least among these problems are the ones forced upon the services themselves by conscription. Among these military problems are the high turnover rate of draftees and their relatively poor attitude. The greatest problem for the Army is its poor image among many draft-age youths.

During World War II, I served as a bomber pilot, and I know that many of you also served. It is all too easy for people of our generation to underestimate or misunderstand the effect of these problems on our young men and women, but we owe it to them, and to ourselves, to solve them.

I have often thought that a volunteer army would solve many of the problems that now exist in a manner that would be of benefit to all.

The whole question of deferments, whether on the basis of education, family situation or profession, would be eliminated by the creation of a volunteer force.

The present inequities and personal hardships that are so widespread would no longer exist and much of the present controversy over military service would be gone, to the benefit of the services as well as to the people as a whole.

By the same token, the questions presented by conscientious objectors would be solved and the present air of compulsion would be removed to the great benefit of everyone concerned.

By its very nature, a volunteer force would eliminate uncertainty. Every young man would be free to choose whether or not he wanted to serve and when he wanted to serve, without the half threat of interruption at a future time.

One of the most important advantages to be gained from an all-volunteer force would be its increased effectiveness resulting from a more stable, more highly trained, more professional body of men. Because of rapid developments in military technology, including complex weapons systems and highly specialized transportation and communications equipment, a high degree of lengthy and expensive training is necessary. This training would be much more effective in a volunteer force because of lower turnover rate and higher percentage of career men.

A closely related advantage would be the higher morale and better psychological attitude of men serving because of the removal of the concept of compulsion tied up with the draft.

These advantages seem to me to be strong reasons for adopting a volunteer army.

Several changes would be required before a volunteer army could be raised and maintained.

First among these changes would be a complete change in the military pay schedule. The present pay of men in the lower enlisted grades is under $100 a month, and this is hardly inducement to enlist. The pay for noncommissioned officers and junior commissioned officers is not competitive with industry and many first enlistment and first tour men leave for this reason.

Another very important change would be the improvement of living quarters for soldiers. Anyone who remembers his days in a barracks or BOQ understands the conditions that exist in many installations.

Improvements should also be made in entertainment and cultural facilities, in retirement benefits and other fringe benefits.

I sincerely believe that these improvements, and the more desirable image of the service due to elimination of the draft, make a volunteer Army more desirable and practical.

It is my opinion that a volunteer army can exist, at required levels, without being augmented by a draft, except in time of war when standby authority for such augmentation would be needed. The President could be given this authority in any emergency situation that could not be met by normal methods. These men would be selected in a completely impartial manner to be set by law.

The report of the National Advisory Committee on Selective Service and the President's message of March 6 reject out of hand the possibility of an all-volunteer force. The Committee's report, without factual material or analysis, states that such a force would be inflexible and too expensive. I do not believe the committee has proved its case. I contend that the monetary savings due to force stability, and the human savings due to elimination of the draft make it economically feasible.

In brief, I believe that a volunteer Army is in the best interests of the people of this country.

I am convinced that there is no practical chance of getting the voluntary system adopted in this Congress, but I continue to believe it is the most desirable system and I believe it would work effectively in practice.

SENATOR SCOTT COSPONSORS ANTIDUMPING LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, once again I am honored to join the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE] as the principal coauthor of legislation to amend the Antidumping Act of 1921.

Countless American industries, such as the steel industry in my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and thousands of American workers constantly face the threat of injury from unfair dumping of foreign surplus in American markets. The Antidumping Act was designed to prevent this situation, but its implementation has proven its ineffectiveness. My bill would tighten the act's provision to make it work properly.

This legislation is not intended to curb trade. Fairness is its hallmark. Through it, the Congress of the United States is saying to foreign suppliers that when marketing their goods in American markets, they must sell at competitive prices. Just as our antitrust statutes lay down ground rules to insure fair competition among American companies, so would my bill insure fair competition in American markets among domestic and foreign suppliers.

This is reasonable legislation. It is moderate. It deserves prompt consideration by this Congress.

PROPOSAL FOR STUDY OF INSULAR AREAS ENDORSED

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 24) proposing the creation of a bipartisan joint congressional committee to make a comprehensive study of the present and future status of all overseas insular areas under U.S. administration.

I am pleased to report that the proposal gained immediate favorable editorial support from Hawaii's largest newspaper, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin.

The Star-Bulletin has taken an active interest in the development of the various insular areas in the Pacific. Its editor, A. A. (Bud) Smyser, made an extensive tour of the western Pacific last year and wrote a series of knowledgeable articles about Guam, the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and Okinawa.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Star-Bulletin editorial, entitled "Our Posture on Dependencies," printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Our Posture on Dependencies

Senator Hiram Fong's suggestion for a Congressional Status Commission to look into the political future of all offshore areas now under the U.S. flag is excellent.

We need to develop clear national policy toward these areas and a reasonably clear view of their future and ours.

The Senator's proposal thus includes areas like Micronesia which could wind up under some other flag than that of the U.S. and Okinawa which two Presidents have pledged will revert to Japan at some unknown future day.

Alaska and Hawaii became incorporated territories of the U.S. early in the 20th century with the implicit promise of eventual statehood.

No such clear direction exists in the case of American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, even though they all are under unqualified American control today.

A Status Commission has already evaluated Puerto Rico's alternatives—independence, commonwealth or statehood—and a plebiscite is forthcoming to determine the feelings of the Puerto Ricans themselves.

Meantime, however, the U.S. needs to consider its own national interests and own national policy toward the areas enumerated in the Fong resolution.

No real effort has so far been made to develop a national consensus on the political future of these areas.

We need one. The Status Commission proposed by Senator Fong can provide a good starting point toward its development.

EXPLANATION BY FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSIONER LOEVINGER OF SPEECHES BY HIM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last week I commented on two speeches which had recently been delivered by Federal Communications Commissioner Lee Loevinger. Mr. Loevinger has since written to me regarding my comments, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his letter be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Communications Commission,
Washington, D.C., May 3, 1967.

Hon. Joseph D. Tydings,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Tydings: The Congressional Record of April 27, 1967, contains some comments of yours under the heading, "An Unjustified Attack on Public Television and Fred Friendly" (at page 11014). Since the comments concern a speech I made which did not, in my opinion, contain any such attack, some explanation may clarify any misunderstanding.

My speech was prepared for delivery to a limited and specialized academic audience and took a humorous and satirical approach. That approach has apparently led to some misinterpretation of my position. Part of the satire was directed to certain aspects of modern behavioral science, and the comments of the audience indicate that the audience for which the speech was written understood this. Surely I do not question your right to criticize my approach to a serious subject, but I would like to state my position now in a serious manner to avoid any further misunderstanding.

1. I did not intend to attack non-commercial, educational, or what has now been called "public" television, and do not think that I did so.

2. I recognize television as a popular and potent medium.

3. I think that television generally has done a good job of performing its function, particularly in the field of presenting news and public affairs, that it has generally been fair in its news reporting, and that it has been subject to some unfairly harsh criticism.

4. I am strongly opposed to government control of program content or news, except to the very limited extent of preventing obscenity and lotteries, enforcing section 315 of the Communications Act, and applying similar established and limited legal standards. I have published several opinions and papers stating this position in detail.

5. I believe in promoting diversity in news and program sources, both to provide safeguards against censorship and to afford the public as much choice as practical.

6. I strongly support the proposal for establishment of a Corporation for Public Television as contained in S. 1160, which is now pending before the Senate. Chairman Hyde of the FCC spoke for a unanimous Commission when he testified that S. 1160, "is the most significant legislation in this area to come before the Congress in many years. It holds great promise of a real breakthrough in making non-commercial broadcasting a truly vital force benefiting millions of Americans. The Federal Communications Commission wholeheartedly endorses S. 1160." I was consulted in the preparation of this statement, voted for it, concurred in it, and do now support Chairman Hyde's testimony as well as the proposal embodied in S. 1160.

7. The proposal for public television embodied in S. 1160 is derived in substantial part from the recommendations of the Carnegie Commission. The Ford Foundation had earlier proposed that a domestic satellite system be established to transmit television programs and that the economic savings from this system be used to support educational television. The Ford Foundation proposal relates largely to the method of providing financial support for what is now called public television. It is still pending in an undecided proceeding before the FCC and I have not determined or taken a position with respect to this proposal and do not believe that any other Commissioner has either.

8. I believe that a great deal more research and study is necessary to determine what the effects of television have been and how it may best be utilized. This was one of the points made in the original version of my speech and I have published some serious discussions of this general subject, but the point may have been obscured in the version of the speech which came to your attention.

9. Any official position or decision I reach will be based exclusively on the relevant facts before the Commission and the applicable legal principles. No personal feelings or considerations influence my official actions.

If my efforts to be humorous or amusing have misled you or created an erroneous impression of my position, I can only hope that this explanation has now clarified my position.

Sincerely yours,

Lee Loevinger,
Commissioner.

INDIANA PROMOTES MOTORCYCLE SAFETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I have on several occasions called attention to the need for concern over the mounting toll of motorcyclists killed and injured on our highways as cycling has gained in popularity. I have spoken of the desirability and the necessity of suitable legislation dealing with the special problems of motorcycle safety. While it is a problem which properly concerns the new Traffic Safety Agency, it is also a problem on which a considerable range of action is open to the various States.

The Indiana State Legislature did take action during its recent session. Probably its most significant action, and one which has been recommended by traffic experts, was to require the use of safety helmets by motorcyclists, conforming to standards to be fixed by the State bureau of motor vehicles.

Radio station WOWO, of Fort Wayne, in a recent editorial spoke of these new provisions, describing their range and commenting in conclusion that "Cycles are fun and can be safe if used properly." I am pleased that my home State has taken such action.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, written by Carl W. Vandagrift, WOWO general manager, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Motorcycle Time Again

(By Carl W. Vandagrift, general manager, WOWO, Fort Wayne, Ind., April 24, 1967)

The recent Indiana General Assembly provided some new laws which should help make the flood of Springtime motorcycle users less dangerous to cyclists and motorists alike.

One new statute, which will go into effect this summer, requires cycle operators to wear safety helmets conforming to standards set by the State Bureau of Motor Vehicles. Cyclists are more vulnerable to head injuries than automobile drivers. The use of safety helmets should reduce the great number of serious head injuries.

Another provision of the new law requires motorcycle operators to have in their possession protective glasses, goggles or a transparent face shield. The law does not specifically state that these devices must be used but we hope Tri-State cyclists will realize the value of protecting their eyes. A speck of dust in a cyclist's eye or a small stone tossed by the wheels of a passing car could lead to a serious accident.

Other parts of Indiana's motorcycle law require cycle operators to have a motor vehicle operator's license, require cycles to have their lights burning at all times, restrict the number of passengers on a motorcycle to one, and outlaw the rental or lease of cycles to people who do not have operator's licenses.

We at WOWO hope these new laws will result in a safer summer for motorcycle operators. Cycles are fun and can be safe if used properly.

U.S. RELATIONS WITH THAILAND

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, last week, in New York, Ambassador Graham Martin delivered a candid appraisal of American relations with Thailand, the nation where he represents the United States. Speaking at the Overseas Press Club, the Ambassador expressed great hope for the future for Thailand and for all the area of Southeast Asia now being troubled by subversion and war. I know that I, too, was impressed with the future hopes and with the job being done by the Government of Thailand today to meet the challenge of Communist subversion.

Thailand, as Ambassador Martin points out in his fine address, is our oldest ally in this part of the world. Indeed, the two nations, the United States and Thailand, enjoy a treaty relationship going back 110 years. And Thailand is a country which brings to this relationship as much as she receives, including tremendous support in the current war in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador Martin's address to the Overseas Press Club of New York, delivered May 3, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by the Honorable Graham Martin, American Ambassador to Thailand, Overseas Press Club, New York, N.Y., May 3, 1967

I see that your Club Bulletin forecast a candid appraisal of American relations with the Kingdom of Thailand. I shall try to justify that expectation. I hope you will also permit me to go a bit beyond Thai-American relationships and add a few comments on the Thai role in Asia. I would like to sketch in brief outline the extraordinary initiatives that have originated in Bangkok in the past few years—initiatives which have caught the imagination and elicited the cooperation of almost all other nations in Asia.

It would be, I think, almost impossible to exaggerate the enormous importance of these developments to our country. It seems to me that they provide a striking validation of the correctness of our decision to meet fully the commitments this country had undertaken in Southeast Asia.

I think the steady, progressive evolution of these new institutions of Asian cooperation provide one of the more dramatic stories of this decade. We have been perhaps unduly preoccupied with military minutiae in the past. I was, therefore, happy to see that one of the lead articles in last Sunday's *New York Times* by one of your distinguished and perceptive members, Mr. Drew Middleton, after extensive talks with senior officials in most of the countries of the area, did record his impression that "the officials believe that in the pause occasioned by allied resistance in Viet-Nam and Communist China's turmoil, this area can be strengthened to the point of successful resistance to political subversion and economic pressures." I am convinced this is indeed the case and I hope many more of you will investigate thoroughly the significance of these developments and report your conclusions to the American people.

Finally, I would like to expose my concern over the difficulties, as I see them from halfway round the world, that the virtual revolution in communications has posed for you in meeting the responsibilities we both have—responsibilities I believe you have always accepted as an automatic corollary of the Constitutional protection afforded you to keep the American people completely informed.

In speaking of Thai-American relations, I can start with no better authority than the distinguished Foreign Minister of Thailand, His Excellency, Thanat Khoman. It was only a little less than a year ago that I had to cut short a visit to the United States in order to be back in Bangkok on May 29 to sign on behalf of the United States an important treaty with Thailand—a new treaty of Amity and Economic Relations.

The date of May 29 was chosen by the Thai Foreign Minister because it was the anniversary of a similar treaty that had been signed 110 years before on May 29, 1856. In our remarks we both recorded the often overlooked fact that Thailand was the first Asian nation with which the young United States of America had a treaty relationship—in 1833. The Foreign Minister, in recalling the mutually beneficial relationship that had characterized the intervening period, went on to observe that ". . . our relationship stands out as a remarkable example where a small nation can work with a great power without being dominated or indeed losing its identity. In this area and at this time when expansionist and domineering tendencies are dangerously lurking, Thai-American cooperation is a worthy encouragement to our own constant endeavours to preserve our freedom and independence as well as to those who are striving to achieve the same objective.

"Relationship between a great and a small nation can be mutually fruitful and beneficial provided both sides acknowledge and respect the rights to equal opportunity and to enjoy equal benefits, over and above the inequalities of life and practical realities. If that principle is observed, as it has been in the present case, there can be a partnership which will not smother or jeopardize the free existence of the smaller party but rather enhance the latter's growth and development. On our part, we intend to secure the observance of such a principle and I am confident that this also corresponds to the desire of the United States Government.

"We, therefore, look forward not only to the continuing close association between our two nations, but particularly that it will serve as a model to an orderly and peaceful development of the relationship between the nations, large and small, in this part of the world, relationship which will not entail subservience to one of the other but rather mutually trustworthy and fruitful partnership and cooperation."

This comment from an Asian statesman whose qualities of fierce independence, courage and high diplomatic skill are in the true tradition of his nation which was the only bit of geography along the littoral of Asia which managed to maintain its freedom and independence during successive waves of European colonization, does not, I suggest, support the current stereotypes we hear all too often about the quality of American relationships with other nations and peoples. It does attest, on the contrary, to our continuing ability to conduct our relations with due regard for the sensibilities and the traditional values of others. Our relationship with Thailand has been and continues to be a partnership of equals.

Nor can there be any doubt, among those who have taken the trouble to become informed, that Thailand brings to this partnership as much as she receives. The one manifestation of this cooperation best known at the present moment is the military cooperation being afforded by Thailand. As you know, Thailand and the United States both undertook commitments to the security of Southeast Asia when both nations ratified their accession to the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization in 1954. In recognition of that commitment, the Government of Thailand has permitted the United States, as a SEATO ally, to use certain Thai bases to facilitate military operations in defense of South Viet-Nam from externally organized and directed aggression. In so doing, Thailand expressed by its action a complete faith in the validity of American statements that we intended fully to carry out our commitments in Southeast Asia.

As we all know, other countries in the area have chosen not to risk their national existence in so direct and as immediate a response to the aggressors. But the Thai who have always been free, fully intend to remain a free nation. Indeed, the very word "Thai" means free, and as a free nation it felt that it had no recourse except to honor its obligations to the best of its ability as we were also doing. During the past three years there have been literally hundreds of times that I have, at the request of our government, presented requests to the Thai for additional assistance. I would like to openly record the fact that never once in this period has there ever been an association between their affirmative response and our action, or too often lack of action, on a request which they may have made to us for assistance. I suggest that many of you will find the same difficulties that I have experienced in finding a parallel in the history of American alliances with other countries. These bases, which have been fully described to the American people, have made a major contribution to the allied war effort. It is impossible to estimate how many thousands of allied lives have been saved in Viet-Nam as a direct result of Thailand's cooperation. However, a partial sampling of the stream of propaganda protests beamed at Thailand by Peking and Hanoi give ample evidence that our concerted actions have hurt them painfully.

Long range Communist plans for Thailand's subversion, openly announced by Peking some years ago, have been accelerated. Thai-U.S. cooperation has taken these new tactics into account. In addition to our long-range program which has assisted in training and modernizing Thailand's armed forces, we have added other training assistance including an American Special Forces unit which is assisting in the training of additional Thai military units in counterinsurgency operations. The Thai desired to move with extreme rapidity to meet this new threat. Pending completion of training of Thai pilots, we provided last year at Thai request a company of unarmed American helicopters to provide the all important element of mobility and logistical flexibility for Thai security units. I might add for the record that neither the Special Forces, nor other American training personnel, or these temporarily provided helicopters, participated in any way in actual counterinsurgency combat operations. The Thai have insisted that this is their own responsibility which they will meet within their own country with their own forces. Consequently, on the completion of the training of the Thai helicopter pilots, the unit which we had provided was withdrawn to Viet-Nam, on schedule, on the first of February this year.

You are all aware that the Royal Thai Government has recently decided to add to the Royal Thai Navy and Royal Thai Air Force units, already operating in South Viet-Nam, an additional fighting force from the Royal Thai Army. They will be warmly welcomed in resisting aggression by their other SEATO allies who became familiar with their courage and valor when they fought as allies in the United Nations Command in Korea.

In recent days you have heard from one of America's distinguished soldiers of the military successes of the Free World Allied Forces in Viet-Nam. We should also note that Asians have not waited for these military successes to begin the creation of a new Asia. They began this process some time ago when it became certain we fully intended to honor our commitments.

A few moments ago I alluded to the extraordinary initiatives which have been bubbling up out of Bangkok—initiatives which before our eyes are rapidly filling in the outlines of firm patterns of regional cooperation in Asia.

Among these, I would like particularly to call attention to the patient, determined and persistent diplomacy of U Nyun of Burma, the Executive Secretary of ECAFE, which led to the creation of the Asian Development Bank.

It is in Bangkok that the activities of the four riparian states of the Mekong Basin have joined together in the Mekong Commission, successfully subordinating their political differences to a concerted effort for the development of the incredible potential inherent in this great river system—a potential judged by many experts to be as vast as that of our own TVA.

In a few weeks, we shall see in Bangkok the second meeting of the Asian and Pacific Council, formed a year ago in Seoul. That meeting was preceded by a year and a half of patient work in Bangkok by the Ambassadors of the nations concerned under the chairmanship of the Thai Foreign Minister. This resulted in a degree of cooperation evidenced in Seoul which proved so startling to Western observers last year. I think we may confidently anticipate in the forthcoming meeting in Bangkok, revelations of additional progress which has been made in the intervening year.

The reactivation of the Association of Southeast Asia has already proved an enormously attractive magnet for other nations in the area and I believe we can confidently expect a broadening of this subregional framework in the near future.

The progress of the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education is proceeding in the perfecting of the details of the new Asian Institute of Technology and the cooperative broadening of existing institutions in the fields of agriculture and tropical medicine which will provide additional momentum to the development of these badly needed additional human resources.

We have just seen concluded in Manila the second meeting of the conference on Asian economic development which was first convened in Tokyo last year at Japanese initiative.

These are illustrations of the startling momentum already achieved on the basis of Asian acceptance of the validity of America's commitment. We are seeing here the exploratory stirrings of the rising Asian urge to get on with the business of orderly regional growth through the collective engagement of Asian resources. As I have said before, the breadth of these activities is as impressive as it is little known. These new cooperative efforts extend not only into such fields as irrigation, hydro-electric power, transportation, communication, natural resources exploration, scientific and technical research, experimental agriculture, and quality manufacturing controls, but also into the fields of coordinated economic planning and cooperative fiscal policies.

Last October here in New York, Foreign Minister Thanat Khoman, in commenting on these developments, observed:

"The smaller nations in Southeast Asia have felt the need of getting closer with one another. If division has been the characteristic of the past and had brought about grievous losses of freedom and independence and had allowed interference and pressure by outside powers, the future aims should be for closer and more fruitful cooperation and integration. While such cooperation should be basically regional, it is not in our interest to make it exclusive. Outside elements may have a role to play but not a domineering or dominating role. If anything, it will be a cooperation on the basis of equality and partnership."

I would like to reiterate, Asian efforts to unify and fortify the region have begun to move so fast that a real danger now exists that American and Western adjustments to such dramatic and constructive change will fall behind. The fact that the President has engaged the vision, the statesmanship and the extraordinary competence of Eugene Black to coordinate our activities in these fields gives me confidence that we will surmount the bureaucratic resistance to the necessity for new techniques and accelerated action to match these Asian initiatives. Free Asia has reached the point where it is prepared to associate itself with new Western initiatives which complement its own. It would be a pessimist indeed who could not see the newly compelling opportunities for fruitful cooperation which Asians are providing in the course of regional reformation and development. The question now is whether America and others have mastered the technique of full and equal partnership in Asia. I am increasingly confident that the answer will be affirmative.

I said in the beginning that I wished to share with you my concern over the difficulties we both face in our responsibilities to keep the American people as completely informed as we possibly can. I mention these problems with some diffidence because I have no solutions to offer. However, I could not think of a better place to come for advice and counsel since your membership, I am certain, representing as it does such a broad spectrum of influence on all media, is actively engaged with the same concerns.

Having been rather fully occupied half the world away for these last three and a half years, I am perhaps only dimly aware of the effects of the massive revolution in the field of communications. For example, I have had time to delve only briefly into the observations of Mr. Marshall McLuhan. Perhaps if I had more time I would not have found myself more puzzled than before. I did find appealing the recent comment of Mr. Richard Coe. Recognizing that we are living in a period of change, he observed that change is never orderly but chaotic, that not one thing but an awesome range of things happen at the same time, that the greatest danger was in missing the perspectives, and that the ironic cause for the lack of perspective perhaps is that instant communications stresses the chaos and not the order of civilization.

In reporting a war, I suppose it is unfortunately true that the most dramatic incidents are those involving violence and destruction. Instant communication also faces the editor, whether TV or newspaper, with the problem of instant choice. If I had the responsibility for making the choice, I would probably also choose the dramatic. But the problem is how do we get at least a bit of perspective. We have been told of the military competence of our sons, and for this we may be justly proud. But how do we tell the American people that their sons are also engaged in constructive tasks as well, that our soldiers in Southeast Asia have eagerly welcomed the opportunity to assist whenever they could in the tasks of nation building, that in so doing they have earned the affection and regard of the Southeast Asian peoples as well as their respect for their fighting prowess?

How do we tell the American people of the staunchness and steadfastness of an ally like Thailand? And how do we tell the American people of the initiatives and ingenuity with which the Asians are creating the institutions of regional cooperation which hold every prospect of bringing an increasing stability and strength to the area? How do we explain, in reference to SEATO, the difference between the machinery of an alliance and the alliance itself; that this alliance has demonstrated a truly remarkable flexibility, under the Rusk-Than clarification of the jointly and separately language of Article II; that this flexibility and resilience has permitted all five of the Pacific members of the SEATO alliance to enagage troops in combat in Viet-Nam, while maintaining the full participation of the non-Pacific members in the economic and social tasks which are also contributing to the stability and progress of the area? How do you tell the Asians that the extended coverage we have given the use of the right of dissent, which we cherish in a free society, does not represent the great preponderance of American public opinion which does understand what we are about and which has and which will continue to overwhelmingly support our doing what has to be done? How do you look and see and arrange to tell the American people that, as a result of that steadfastness and support, all objective evidence now establishes that we have in the making in Asia and the Pacific a success of American policy fully as great as our success in Europe in the fifties?

For this is indeed the fact.

As I said in the beginning, I have no answers to these questions, but I do believe it important that answers be found.

My I close by reverting again to the occasion of the signing of the treaty on May 29 last year. In my reply to the Foreign Minister's comments I read the entry my predecessor had made in his personal journal describing those events at the signing of the treaty 110 years before. As I review the totality of our efforts in Southeast Asia, I have concluded that his closing sentence is as appropriate now as it was then. He said 111 years ago:

"I have great confidence for the future."

And so do I.

ADDRESS BY WILLIAM B. CAMP, THE COMPTROLLER OF THE CURRENCY

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, on Thursday, May 4, 1967, Mr. William B. Camp, Comptroller of the Currency, addressed the 70th annual convention of the Oklahoma Bankers Association at the Mayo Hotel, Tulsa, Okla.

His remarks were interesting and provocative, and I commend them to the Members of the Senate. Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks appear in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR COMMON PURPOSES

(Text of remarks of William B. Camp, Comptroller of the Currency, before the 79th annual convention Oklahoma Bankers Association, Mayo Hotel, Tulsa, Okla.)

It is indeed an honor to be invited to speak to you today. As a native of your neighboring State of Texas, I naturally feel a close relationship to Oklahoma and this section of the country. In frankness, however, I must say had this Convention been scheduled immediately before the Oklahoma-Texas football game, I would have had some reservations about neighborly sentiments.

Looking back over my thirty years with the Comptroller's Office, one of the continuing pleasures has been meeting with bankers such as yourselves. These meetings not only provide opportunities for renewing friendships, but also stimulate thoughts on our common purposes.

Similar meetings of bankers' groups were held long before any of us attended our first and we know that their objectives were little different from our own. Fortunately, the proceedings of these meetings were often recorded and remind us of some of the parallels between ourselves and bankers several years ago. Shortly after my appointment as Comptroller, a friend sent me the July 15, 1905, issue of *The American Banker*. Incidentally, I noticed several advertisements in it stating "we make collections in Indian Territory." I wonder if this was a hazardous undertaking?

This issue featured a report of a meeting of the Tennessee Banker's Association, including copies of some of the speeches that were made at their 1905 convention on top of Lookout Mountain. Reading these speeches, I was impressed with the enduring nature of some of the fundamental principles and problems of banking; only the reactions in response to the world about us change and therein lies the touchstone of successful, meaningful and useful bank supervision. Put simply, in order to exploit emerging opportunities, we must meet present circumstances and developing conditions in new and imaginative fashion.

Indeed, the commercial bankers have pioneered and led in many of the modern innovations that are commonly accepted by business today.

Banking is a changing field—a dynamic field—and I encourage the young men entering the profession, just as I encourage you today, to stay abreast of modern needs and opportunities.

But we must, at the same time, be sure our reactions and practices are consistent with prudent and sound banking operations. Our ultimate goal is, after all, the preservation of a viable and sound banking system.

This is not an easy task in today's world of computers, satellites, and supersonic jets; nor was it in years past which, according to the July 1905 *American Banker*, was "an age of wonderful advancements, startling discoveries, and fast transportation like the 'Pennsylvania Flyer,' a train which could go from New York to Chicago, some 900 miles, in eighteen hours—wireless telegraphy, the automobile, (and) the flying machine."

The speakers before the Tennessee Banker's were fully aware of the difficulties in following "safe, prudent banking" practices while adapting to existing needs. In lauding the virtues of "conservative banking" one speaker observed that: And I quote. "Conservatism as commonly interpreted is a very desirable element in the make-up of the executive officers and directors of a bank, but conservative banking that opposes change because it is change has no place among the progressive and successful bankers of today." (End of quote)

The man who carries a half bushel of corn in one end of the bag and a large stone in the other end to balance it as he rides horseback to the mill, because his father did that way, is out of harmony with this age of progress and development. And yet, the man who grasps at every new fad and change that comes along and adopts it because it is change, without first carefully and patiently considering its suitability and desirability, thinking only how brilliantly he may outstrip his more plodding competitors, is an unsafe leader.

Fads are easy to follow; often too easy—not because bankers are given to fads and fashions but rather, I think, because fads are often imprudent, well-meaning reactions to a rapidly shifting environment.

Never before have we been in the midst of an economic climate undergoing such rapid and pervasive changes: industries appear almost to arise full-blown out of Minerva's head; the activities of others are transformed almost as readily; business and household locations shift from central-city to suburbs, from East to West, from North to South, from rural to urban and back, almost in disregard of traditional locational ties.

These changes are not always predictable and sometimes follow patterns that are quite unexpected. All of you present are aware of industries or of centers of residential construction in your own communities which once seemingly promised a prosperous and extended growth but ultimately faded away. No doubt we could compile a long list of such disappointments.

The future course of your communities' industrial and residential growth is by no means the only difficulty in adapting to a changing world. Most of these conditions call for new practices, for new credit techniques, for new bank services, or for expansion of existing practices. In my opinion, banks in recent years have done a truly outstanding and imaginative job at developing and adapting their procedures in response to these demands, and, as stated earlier, in exploring and leading the way for modern business techniques.

The initial introduction of new services—no matter how carefully thought out in advance—is only one step in the ultimate expansion of a bank's services to the public. Until we have experience, it is difficult to judge the effects and the benefits of proposed new practices. One vital aspect of innovation—especially by banks—is the continual and most careful appraisal of information concerning the costs and benefits—both to the bank and to its customers—of any newly introduced service. I would certainly not quarrel with any sincere banker striving to be of maximum service to his community. I would only caution him to have his homework done, so to speak, and to first explore a new course as fully as possible with all the management techniques and tools at his command.

The present rush by banks to introduce credit cards may serve as a case in point. On the whole, it appears that by venturing into this area, banks deserve high marks for aggressively serving clear and legitimate public needs. In a continuing effort to keep our examination procedures current, we are adding a special section in the report dealing exclusively with credit cards. This should prove especially valuable to banks currently offering credit cards and to those of you contemplating the same.

Some 20 years ago, installment lending by banks was approximately at the same point in development that credit cards are today. Many forecasted doom if banks were to enter the consumer credit field. Yet today, the installment loan function is the "bread and butter" of many banking operations. This was not accomplished without problems being encountered, but these obstacles were solved by the banking system, one that allowed itself the flexibility and foresight to adapt under the most negative and pressing conditions. No doubt many of you present helped to make installment credit the profitable business it is today.

The credit card is simply another means of extending credit.

The banker who extends credit, whether it be in large or small amounts, has the responsibility to his borrower, to his bank, and to his community to exercise prudent judgment. Credit is a positive and constructive force when administered with intelligence.

Indeed, I know of no business or businessman in our present economy who could survive and build without some form of credit being available to him.

Credit is one of the industries which has served to make our country strong. When abused, it can be destructive, not only to the recipient, but in extreme circumstances to the credit grantor, and ultimately to the national economy. Like atomic energy, it must be harnessed for the good of the Nation, because when perverted, abused or carelessly administered, it has latent power for destruction.

Certain studies which are now underway, coupled with the new section in our examination report, hopefully will pinpoint any inherent problems in this activity and provide sound guidelines for future operations.

For each of us—operating banker and bank supervisor—this seems to be a time for thorough analysis. This is not to imply that the Comptroller's Office, during my tenure, intends to rest on past groundwork—only, that change just for the sake of change is not always the most prudent road to travel. It is just as necessary today, as in years past, to maintain the proper perspective in choosing between innovations and traditional methods.

During my career with the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, one of my most significant observations has been the efforts of the banking system to meet the needs of their communities and our great Nation. This has been accomplished—both at the State and National levels—through the establishment of new banks and branches, and through the establishment of new supervisory and management techniques to aid the banks in helping to develop their communities.

It should be pointed out that this Office does not, of course, select any new sites for proposed banking facilities, as this determination must rest with the applicants. Applications for new charters and branches should represent well-meaning efforts to respond to the growth, to the changing geographic distribution, and to the changing population and industrial composition of towns and cities. However, we frequently find, in reviewing branch and charter applications, that these applications are not always well-conceived and even today's high level of income and growth do not guarantee the prospects of a poorly located bank or branch any more than they guarantee an over-extended line of credit.

The banking system's structural response to the challenges that have faced it has been widely discussed. Much of this discussion has, in my opinion, been misdirected to the alleged conflicts between the various regulatory and supervisory agencies. To me, the reputed conflict has been overdrawn.

As a member of the Board of Directors of the FDIC, I have not missed a single meeting since becoming Comptroller. Nor have I missed a meeting of the Coordinating Committee on Bank Supervision, of which I am currently Chairman.

I do not envision anything other than a very smooth operation of the Coordinating Committee. Certainly, in a great Democratic process such as we have in this country, there are bound to arise differing views from time to time. But that's healthy, and those differing views will in no way bring about any cleavage in the Committee.

The common objectives of the bank regulatory agencies have brought forth productive results in the past few months. For example, the agencies devised a formula which was inserted in the December 1966 report of condition in order to obtain the liquidity position on a given date of the commercial banking system. Each insured bank, as a supplement to its report of condition, was requested to supply uniform information with respect to its volume of liquid assets. While the formula employed is by no means perfect, it nevertheless was the first time the bank supervisory agencies received uniform liquidity data on the banking system.

We initiated a procedure for dealing with the transfer of information involving changes of ownership of insured banks, loans to executive officers, and loans on bank stock. This information is especially helpful to each agency in discharging its supervisory responsibilities.

In addition, when the occasion warrants, the agencies have conducted simultaneous examinations.

The advertising guidelines are another example.

Other matters presently under study are a uniform report of condition, accounting regulations and capital adequacy.

I am happy to report, in short, that the climate among the regulatory agencies has reached a high point from the standpoint of cooperation and assistance in all matters of mutual interest, and am confident this will redound to the benefit of commercial banking throughout this country.

The structure of commercial banking in the United States has been shaped by the existence of both state and national supervisory agencies. Some critics have held that the dual banking system is a vehicle for opposing change.

This is unfortunate, and, quite frankly, *wrong!* To my mind, the Dual Banking System is well-suited for facilitating change and for generally pursuing our common purposes.

As I have stressed, our common purposes stem from the necessity, and benefits, of adapting our banking practices and institutions to the changes that America's dynamic, and sometimes erratic, development thrusts upon the banking system. This development is complex and varied; some aspects of the changes in the economy of Oklahoma and of your own communities often differ widely from that of other states and of other communities. So, too, must the responses of banking in Oklahoma and in other states vary if local banks are to best serve their own communities. For individual bankers, this sometimes involves an aggressive, yet judicious offering of modified or new services that are permitted under existing ground rules—our various State and Federal Banking Laws.

But, as we are all aware, ground rules which were considered adequate, or even liberal, a few decades ago may now strangle legitimate efforts of banks to best serve their communities. Moreover, ground rules that suffice for one state may smother the operations of banks that face very different challenges in another state.

The Dual Banking System, above all else, provides the freedom to mold the ground rules to best serve the circumstances of individual states. Looking at banking in all states, as I must, I am forced to consider regulatory policy in terms of its effect on all National Banks which operate under many and varied circumstances. But for individual states, it seems to me that the Dual Banking System permits a smooth evolution of banking legislation—a particular experiment can be confined initially to one state, and individual states are able to draw on the results of other states. It also places the responsibility for initiating changes in many ground rules with the state's banking community, bank supervisors, and legislature.

But we must be ever vigilant—we must constantly re-examine our ground rules and their restraints on services to our communities and we must be constantly prepared to initiate those changes which studies show to be necessary and in the public interest. Only by continual re-examination of our policies, can we meet the challenges of today's dynamic economy with aggressiveness and imagination. Whenever any of us neglects the continual review of our policies—be they operating, supervisory, or legislative—we neglect our responsibilities in pursuit of our common purposes.

Thank you very much.

SUPERSONIC TRANSPORTS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the significance of the President's go-ahead on the supersonic transport program has been discussed from many viewpoints. The speed, size, and carrying capacity of this airplane have been foremost among these. But to me, the real significance of this project is the economic benefits this country will derive from it.

It is very fitting that this Nation embark on the development of the commercial SST in 1967. It was 40 years ago, in 1927, when Charles A. Lindbergh first spanned the ocean in his solo, nonstop flight from New York to Paris. Lindbergh's flight was a daring venture requiring 33½ hours. The American SST, on the other hand, will cover the same distance for the ordinary air traveler in 3 hours. This is a very impressive example of the tremendous progress that has been made in the past 40 years.

But technological advances for the sake of advancing technology mean nothing. Fortunately, production of the SST means much more than just a faster means of getting from one place to another.

It means a new tool is being added to America's arsenal of economic factors which govern the country's growth.

The air travel market is expected to grow at least tenfold in the next 25 years. Forty percent of this growth will be in the lucrative overwater market, in which the SST will initially operate. Government and industry estimate indicate that at least 500 airplanes will be needed by 1990 to serve the intercontinental overwater routes only.

If worldwide operation is permissible, with sonic boom limited to sparsely populated areas, sales are expected to reach 1,000 to 1,200 airplanes by 1990. It is difficult to estimate what this might ultimately mean in employment increases. But during the prototype program, the airframe and engine manufacturer and their first level of suppliers will employ some 28,000 people at the peak period. This could increase to near 60,000 people as the program progresses. Additional jobs will be created for thousands of workers required by other levels of subcontracting and related businesses.

Both Boeing and General Electric are conducting competitions and negotiating with a host of sources throughout the country. As these competitions and negotiations are completed, virtually every State in the Union will have business or industrial firms participating in the SST program.

Earlier I mentioned the eventual building of perhaps 1,000 to 1,200 airplanes. This construction rate would generate approximately $60 billion in SST revenues through 1990. I would consider $60 billion an important catalyst to any economy. Certainly, this is a figure that has not gone unnoticed by other countries now building supersonic aircraft.

Without the SST, the Concorde, being built as a combined British-French effort, could affect the U.S. balance of payments adversely by some $22 billion through 1990. Conversely, introduction of the SST into airline service by 1975 can be expected to favorably affect the U.S. balance of payments by $32 billion. Therefore, this project may be credited with a total improvement to the U.S. balance of payments of at least $54 billion.

There has been criticism of the Government's involvement in this project. But I believe it is unfounded. A 500-plane overwater market, which all parties involved believe is assured, will allow the airlines to make a profit, return the Government's investment, and permit a profit for the manufacturers.

Perhaps the most reliable indicators of the SST's potential revenue and profit capabilities are the airlines themselves. The major airlines in the United States have already placed at risk $1 million for each SST they have on order. To date, these airlines have committed more than $50 million to ease the burden of Government investment during the prototype development program.

Money on the barrel represents the greatest faith and dedication in and to a program that I know.

The United States is the only major nation in the world that relies primarily upon privately owned and operated transportation. This project, while heavily financed by the Government in the prototype stages, is not a divergence from that reliance.

Historically, any basic improvement in the transportation system contributes substantially to the strength of the economy. The SST offers such an advance and will be a continuing source of economic vitality to the Nation, providing stability in employment and taxable income.

I support this program as being one of the most farsighted and meaningful programs ever attempted on a joint Government-industry basis.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I wish to note the historic commemoration of the 10th of May, a joyous occasion for thousands of Americans of Rumanian descent who celebrate this Rumanian Independence Day.

The Rumanian National Committee, like many organizations dedicated to preserving national celebrations of genuine freedom, has maintained an awareness of eminent landmarks in Rumanian history that uniquely have taken place on May 10. On that date in 1866, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania, and thus founded the Rumanian dynasty; exactly 11 years later, the Principality of Rumania severed her ties to the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed her independence; and on May 10, 1881, the people of Rumania elevated their country to the rank of kingdom by crowning Charles I King of Rumania.

These three events will forever be observed by devoted Rumanians and families of Rumanian ancestry throughout the world as their cherished national holiday. Austere Communist rule, currently tyrannizing Rumania, has characteristically attempted to change this national commemoration to May 9, the date of the Soviet victory in that country.

But no arbitrary resetting of an anniversary observance, imposed from without on a fiercely proud people, can change the heartfelt sentiments of these people. The 10th of May is an inherent and integral part of all Rumanian history, a holiday as beloved to these people as our own Independence Day of July 4, 1776.

I send my warm wishes to all freedom-loving Rumanians and those of Rumanian ancestry on this traditional national holiday, with the hope that the bonds of servitude currently engulfing their country will soon be broken and liberty restored to their cherished nation.

FULFILLMENT OF A GREAT AMERICAN DREAM—THE DRIVING OF THE GOLDEN SPIKE

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, a great American dream was fulfilled 98 years ago today. A transcontinental railroad, uniting the East and the West, was completed May 10, 1869, at Promontory, Utah.

The driving of the golden spike, as the two railroads joined the span of land between the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans, marked the end of one era and the beginning of another.

The days of the courageous pony express riders, the fearless stagecoach drivers, the noble pioneers in covered wagons and the adventuresome explorers were fading from the horizon. The dawn of rapid transportation and communication was beginning to rise.

The race to unite the Nation with steel bands of railroad track was the greatest roadbuilding contest in history. Government land and loans accrued with each mile of track laid.

Eastward from Sacramento inched the Central Pacific, now the Southern Pacific. Averaging about 110 pounds, the pig-tailed, basket-hatted Chinese worked like devils, their picks beating a steady tattoo on the Sierra granite. Through snow and avalanche they blasted and bored to the Nevada flats, leaving 15 tunnels in their wake.

Westward from Council Bluffs, Iowa, thrust the Union Pacific. Its construction gangs of Civil War veterans, mountain men, mule skinners and Paddies from Ireland toiled, and helped troops fight the Cheyenne.

As the race drew to a close, rival crews traded pot shots and set off blasts to destroy opposing grades. A job estimated to take 12 years was finished in six and one-half, mostly with hand labor. The last 10 miles of track was laid in a single day, a world record which remains unbroken today, 98 years later.

A dream, an idea, a legend, was fulfilled.

Plans now are well underway to make this legend a living one.

Congress has designated Promontory as a Golden Spike National Historic Site, expanding the 7-acre site into a 2,176-acre area in commemoration of the completion of the first transcontinental railroad.

The National Park Service and the State of Utah have united their efforts to complete the site for the centennial celebration of this historic event on May 10, 1969.

Plans for development of the site include the construction of a visitor center, replica locomotives, tenders and cars, roads, parking areas, signs and markers.

Just a month ago the Senate passed Joint Resolution 10 establishing a Golden Spike Centennial Commission. The Federal Commission will work with the Utah Golden Spike Centennial Commission in planning an appropriate observance of this historic date.

I respectfully request continued congressional support in our endeavors to make this site a living legend.

UAW NATIONAL PARTS CONFERENCE BACKS PENSION PROTECTION BILL

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I recently introduced a bill (S. 1435) for the protection of private pensions, a subject on which the Committee on Finance held hearings last year when the bill carried the number S. 1575. The new bill was somewhat altered to take account of some of the problems revealed by the hearings.

The United Auto Workers, who represented the Studebaker plant at the time of its South Bend closing, have private pension agreements which cover more than 1,250,000 workers, some 180,000 of whom are receiving pension payments. Their experience with about a thousand such private plans in current operation, together with the experience involved in 113 plan terminations including that at South Bend, gives this organization a considerable body of experience on which to judge the need for a protection plan such as I have offered.

While Indiana no longer has a primary automobile manufacturer, a very large number of parts producers are located in the State, many of whom are represented by the UAW. Recently these unions and their counterpart locals from other areas held a National Parts Conference, at which the Hartke bill was the subject of discussion and a resolution, adopted on April 19, which was a week before my bill was introduced. Since the resolution sets forth the concern of the UAW for this problem and its support of the bill, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PENSION REINSURANCE RESOLUTION

Whereas: The UAW now has over 1000 pension plans with employers in the Automotive, Aerospace, Agriculture Implement and related industries. These plans cover over 1¼ million active workers and are currently paying monthly benefits to more than 180,000 retired UAW members.

The available governmental statistics have indicated that over 7,000 retirement plans in the United States were terminated between 1953 and 1965.

The UAW has had direct experience with 113 of these pension plan terminations, involving companies ranging in size from Studebaker, which employed 7,000 workers in South Bend, Indiana at the time it discontinued operations in that community in December of 1963, to an independent parts supplier with less than 20 employees.

The UAW has through collective bargaining, made sure that these plans are actuarially sound, however, collective bargaining, by itself, cannot guarantee pension security if a company goes broke before the pension plan is fully funded.

An establishment of a national mechanism to insure a portion of the risk of inadequacy of plan assets to meet benefit obligations in event of termination is vitally needed to alleviate the pain and suffering that accompanies the closing of plants and the termination of pension funds.

The U.S. Senator Vance Hartke (D., Ind.) had submitted a bill in the last Congress to cover this pressing problem and is resubmitting a bill in this congress on pension reinsurance, which would require modest contribution from each pension fund to a federal pension reinsurance fund that would finance pensions for workers of closed plants. His plan would create a self-supporting federal agency to insure the pension plans against bankruptcy—the same way the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures our bank deposits and the Federal Housing Administration protects some mortgages.

In this way every company that adopts a retirement plan would pay this new agency a very small premium to insure its plan against failure.

Now therefore, be it resolved: That the delegates to this National Parts Conference go on record of supporting this resolution and the passage of this bill when presented, and

Be it further resolved: That an all-out educational drive be conducted in each and every region in the United States so as to let all of the people know and understand what this bill means to them. Every means available should be used; at our local union membership meetings, at the AFL–CIO council meetings, in our labor newspapers, ads in every local newspaper, spots on television and radio, handbills, anyway. It is only when the populace is made aware and aroused that we can expect action, and

Be it finally resolved: That when this Council meets again this year in Washington, D.C., to meet and talk with our Congressmen, that these legislators have been fully informed by their citizens at home of the vital need for this particular Pension Reinsurance Legislation.

We cannot expect passage of this bill if Congress is not made fully aware of the problem and its need.

TRAGIC DEATH OF PHILIPPA DUKE SCHUYLER

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carries the tragic news of the death of Philippa Duke Schuyler. Miss Schuyler's death, at the early age of 34, came when she was on an errand of mercy in South Vietnam.

Her life was most noteworthy, not only for her many accomplishments in a variety of fields, but also in the fact that she was constantly putting America's "best foot forward" in whatever she was doing, be it concert appearances in Africa, helping children of war-torn South Vietnam, or bringing distinction to her other profession as a newspaper correspondent.

It should be further noted that Miss Schuyler was the 10th American newspaper correspondent to be killed in Vietnam. This of itself certainly attests to the dangers to which the men and women of this profession subject themselves in their effort to bring to the people here at home the news of what is happening in Southeast Asia.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PIANIST, AUTHOR DIES IN SOUTH VIETNAM CRASH

DANANG, South Vietnam, May 9.—Philippa Duke Schuyler, famed pianist and child prodigy who at age four was playing Mozart, died today in a helicopter crash in Danang Bay.

Miss Schuyler, 34, was working in Vietnam as a correspondent for the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader and giving concerts in Hue, the ancient Imperial capital of Vietnam, and Danang.

Miss Schuyler was the tenth American newspaper correspondent to be killed in Vietnam, and the second woman journalist to die.

At the time of her death she was taking nine Vietnamese children from Hue to Danang where she planned to enroll them in school. One of the children also died in the crash and an American soldier was listed as missing.

ALMOST AT DESTINATION

The Huey helicopter in which Miss Schuyler was transporting the children was about ten minutes from its destination and 40 miles from its takeoff point when it crashed. An Army spokesman said the pilot issued a brief emergency signal giving his location. Rescue helicopters were sent immediately.

The helicopter crashed close enough to the shore for some passengers to swim to safety. Rescue teams saved the rest. The pilot was hospitalized with a concussion and the remaining three crewmen and eight Vietnamese children also were hospitalized. The crash was attributed to mechanical failure.

The bodies of Miss Schuyler and the child were recovered later.

Miss Schuyler was the daughter of George Schuyler, an editor of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Courier and a noted Negro newspaperman, who lives in New York. Her mother also survives.

WAS CHILD PRODIGY

Miss Schuyler who was a precocious but well-mannered child, first attracted public attention when her parents discovered she could read at age two and half. She was playing Mozart at four, and at five she was composing music.

When only six, she played a recital of her compositions at the 1939 New York World's Fair. By the time she was 14, Miss Schuyler was a concert pianist with the New York Philharmonic and had written more than 100 piano compositions.

In her 20's, she established herself as an international artist, touring more than 70 countries. She gave command performances for the late Queen Mother Elizabeth of the Belgians, and was honored by the Haitian government in 1950 and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia in 1955.

She gave the premiere performance of her first piano concerto in 1965 in an appearance with the Cairo Symphony.

WROTE BOOKS, ARTICLES

In addition to her fame as a piano virtuoso, Miss Schuyler used her travels as a musician to collect material for articles and books. She had been a roving correspondent for the Union Leader.

When giving a concert in the Congo in 1960 at the height of violence there, she fought off an attack by Congolese. She wrote "Who Killed the Congo?" in 1960, and in 1962 wrote "Christ in Africa."

Miss Schuyler was a Roman Catholic and wrote many articles for Catholic publications.

This was her second visit to Vietnam. She had been the guest of former U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge for a concert. She had planned to leave last Saturday but decided to stay to continue her volunteer work of taking Catholic children from Hue to Danang.

When she was four she wrote a poem she called, "A Baby in Death:"

"When I die, when I die
Sleep, sleep!
You must live when I die
When the rain comes
On the starry sky
Sleep, sleep
When I die
Tra la la la
Da da da da."

WATER TRANSPORTATION IS A STIMULANT TO MORE INTENSIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, our Nation is looking for an answer to regional development questions. Industry and people have tended to crowd into areas that are already burdened. The areas of heavy concentration would like to see some of the new industries that are seeking development sites move out into less congested regions.

In a speech in Omaha, Nebr., on April 14, Capt. Dave Parker, president of the Sioux City & New Orleans Barge Lines, Inc., presented his views on how we can help to solve the problem of overcrowded industrial areas. In a thoughtful speech, he shows how the development of river transportation can provide the answer to the growing national need. Wisely, he indicates that this is a problem for all modes of transportation, for when an area develops, it requires every service which can be made available.

I ask unanimous consent that the speech, delivered before the first Nebraska Transportation Symposium, be printed in Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WATER TRANSPORTATION IS A STIMULANT TO MORE INTENSIVE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

(By Capt. Dave Parker)

The celebration of the Nebraska centennial this year permits a brief look backward for valuable perspective, always a benefit in a fast-changing world. The contrast of Nebraska a century ago with the state of today will serve to highlight numerous important advances and changes. There are also some things that do not change in importance. Then, as now, the Missouri-Mississippi river system serves a function that is central to the success of Nebraska's economy.

If it had not been for this remarkable waterway, Jefferson's great stroke in purchasing Louisiana in 1803 might have had a less happy result. Historians tell us of a move to separate the western territories from the tiny eastern seaboard states shortly after the purchase of Louisiana. The move failed, chiefly because the invention of the steamboat made possible efficient communications and ended the isolation of the western pioneers.

It was the steamboat which brought the first flood of millions of western settlers. These men and women, spreading out over the great prairies, made a certainty out of a dream that the United States would dominate the continent.

Even as late as 1867, Nebraska was rugged country for freight lines. In his "History of Steamboating on the Upper Missouri," Professor William E. Lass reminds us that exactly 100 years ago, a major problem of river transportation was attacked by Indians. Let me quote a paragraph:

"Steamboating on the Upper Missouri was risky from yet another standpoint. Navigators never discounted the possibility of attack from renegade Indians. The Indian menace was particularly severe from the time of the Sioux Uprising in 1862 to the conclusion of the Laramie Treaty of 1868. At any point above Fort Randall, boats were likely to be attacked by Sioux war parties. In 1865, George Merrick, the mate of the *St. Johns*, was killed near Fort Rice by a small party of Sioux who fired directly into the pilot house while the boat was running close to a bend. In 1867, a band of Sioux fired into the *Silver Lake* forty miles above Fort Rice, wounding a son of the captain. During the same month, the *Antelope* was completely riddled with bullets by a Sioux war party. Many boat owners resorted to armoring the pilot houses, and all boats were equipped with weapons."

The difference in the freight rates is also interesting. In 1867 the steamboats charged 70 cents a hundred pounds for service between St. Louis and Omaha. Today grain is shipped at eighteen and a half cents a 100 pounds over the same distance.

When Jefferson paid twelve million dollars for Louisiana, which included what is now Nebraska, the country was at the full tide of successful experiment. So successful indeed were early experiments in using government to stimulate economic expansion that a basic pattern emerged which, with little change in principle, has guided American economic development ever since. Private enterprise, personal pioneering, willingness of individuals to take business risks are the main reliance of the nation. But it is recognized that there are times when the government can move the nation into a new dimension. Such an opportunity faced Jefferson's administration in 1803 when the French offered to sell Louisiana. His administration seized the opportunity and every administration since has followed Jefferson's example. The land grants to the railroads were in the same tradition. Whatever the contemporary controversies over this program, no one can deny that they accomplished their purpose of opening up the west.

In recent years, highway construction has rescued the farmer from isolation, brought new standards of mobility to the American family, stimulated both the auto and oil industries and the trucking industry. Federal investment in airlines had a similarly constructive result; a vast and important new industry was created as a result of government foresight in aiding a new technology. Atomic energy and space exploration are even more recent examples.

Among the oldest programs which seek to develop new economic dimensions for the nation is the multi-purpose water resource development program. Albert Gallatin, Jefferson's Secretary of the Treasury, a thrifty Swiss who almost paid off the national debt of that day, was an early believer in the national benefits of river development.

Out of small beginnings have come far-reaching river basin development plans, many of which look ahead thirty to fifty years. Most of us think in day-to-day terms, but with its water resource program, the Congress is shaping the basic framework on which to hang the regional development plans of the future.

By themselves, these plans have little meaning. They rely for their success on the extent to which they stimulate private investment. On the basic foundation of water resource development, private enterprise is expected to build the economy of tomorrow.

This principle has been followed since Jefferson's time. The Louisiana Purchase stimulated a movement of people westward to take up lands and develop the country. The land grants brought out railroad investment in needed new services. Highways, airline subsidies, atomic energy and space developments are bringing out huge new private investments as the years go by.

Today, there is a new urgency about regional development. Much government effort is currently going into helping to solve the problems of overcrowded cities. A parallel and rapidly expanding program calls for more intensive development of relatively lightly populated regions of the country as one part of an effort to decentralize an over-concentrated economy. It was the late Senator Robert S. Kerr's vision that canalization of the Arkansas would lead to a rush of industry into the Arkansas basin that would rival the land rush of the last century.

It is similarly the vision of those urging improvement of navigation on the Missouri that the states bordering the river will develop in the same way as the Ohio and Tennessee River basins. The same basic principle applies: government investment in sound foundation facilities attracts private investment to build a healthy expanding regional economy.

Some idea of how this works in the Missouri basin is suggested by two sentences from the current Congressional justification of the Missouri project and I quote: "Stabilization of the bank of the river from Sioux City to the mouth will insure protection against erosion to agricultural areas totaling over 1,800,000 acres and to municipalities, industries and other installations with a value of about $3 billion. These installations include major railroad and highway bridges which receive vital protection against being flanked by the meandering river."

A river is a national resource developed and improved to serve a variety of public interest objectives of which navigation is only one. It is the barge line's job to translate a potential economic asset into a reality by producing an extremely low cost form of transportation. Water transportation has long been a most reliable stimulant of economic growth, helping to create new traffic for rail and highway carriers in the process of stimulating industrial and agricultural activity.

The nation's economy generally has been doubling about every 18 to 20 years. The fastest growing industries, such as the electric utilities, are growing at about seven or eight per cent a year.

The rate of growth of barge transportation has averaged 4.7% over the past five years. But, the response of agriculture in the Missouri Valley to improved barge transportation in the past nine years has been quite remarkable. Ton-miles of service grew seven-fold, from 151,691,000 in 1956 to over 1,100,000,000. Wheat shipments have increased 15 times in the period, soybean shipments seventeen times, corn shipments six times and many products new to the Missouri River achieved heavy volume.

In response to such public demand, barge lines have invested large sums of money in new and improved equipment. In 1965, the last year for which figures are available, investment in nearly 1,000 new barges and 64 new towboats topped $150,000,000. This annual expenditure has grown in recent years. The river industry is composed of many small companies. Very few have annual revenues of more than ten million dollars. These companies have nevertheless invested more than half a billion dollars in new equipment since 1950.

Even more remarkable has been the change in river technology. In 1950, towboats on the lower river were capable of pushing about 10,000 tons or about the capacity of a Liberty ship. Today, grain barges leaving Omaha or Kansas City join others from the Upper Mississippi and the Illinois to form flotillas of up to 50 barges capable of carrying 40 to 50,000 tons or the equivalent of some of the largest bulk steamships in the ocean trades. The modern towboat of 6,000 to 9,000 horsepower is highly automated thus helping to create new efficiencies for the shipper. With increased productivity, the barge lines have been able to absorb increases in the cost of labor and materials and at the same time have been able gradually to reduce rates.

Students of transportation will be interested in a legal snag which now threatens the continued use of the revolution in power of the last ten years. Under a new interpretation of a section of the Interstate Commerce Act defining exemption from regulation, barge lines could be required to break up the large, economical tows into smaller units and thus lose the efficiency of volume movement.

Senator Warren G. Magnuson, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, who has introduced a bill to cure the problem, called attention to the fact that the exemption section was passed in 1940—and I quote Senator Magnuson—"when barge transportation was in its infancy and when few legislators realized its great potential. Today this transportation has reached such magnitude that the definitions cited above are now both archaic and restrictive."

The bill, S. 1314, would permit mixing of regulated and unregulated commodities and enable barge lines to continue to tow each other's barges and thus make possible the accumulation of the large tows. If someone were suddenly to interpret a statute to forbid airlines from carrying more passengers than the standard of 1940—the DC-3—the effect would be as absurd as the present situation.

Everybody is agreed that we must somehow avoid cancelling out the efficiencies of the big towboat. No one wants to see increased freight rates which could result if the big tows are broken up into small units.

We are hung up on an obsolete law which must be changed. Opposing the change would be a little like favoring feather-bedding. We did not advocate feather-bedding for the railroads and we do not expect the railroads to advocate cancelling out the benefits of improved river technology.

If anyone here wants to strike a blow for encouraging continuing technological advance, support for S. 1314 would be appreciated by the water carrier; industry, by shippers, by the general public which benefits directly, for example, from low electric rates founded on river-borne coal, by farmers, by maritime labor and by all those who are patiently planning the more intensive economic development of the river basins.

Water transport is today at the threshold of new technological advance. It seems only yesterday that our most frequently used barge was an open hopper vessel capable of carrying 500 tons. Today these barges are disappearing. The modern grain barge will carry 1,800 tons. Every year a new specialized barge is added to carry some exotic new chemical under pressure, or at high temperatures or at very low temperatures. Increasingly, the barge is a link in a highly sophisticated production process rather than a simple means of transportation.

Increasingly, too, industry is producing products which are too big to go by highway or rail. Atomic reactors for the new nuclear powerplants are going by river. We hope the bridge clearances of the future will be sufficient for king-size products as yet unimagined. It is an awesome responsibility to take an atomic reactor or an inter-planetary missile down the inland waterways. A mishap can mean huge financial losses, but, perhaps more important, can waste three years' work on the part of some of the most highly skilled teams in the nation.

Looking to the future, a major improvement in water transport efficiency will result from the development of a 12-foot channel on the Mississippi and Ohio and a nine-foot channel for the Missouri. For the 980-mile length of the Ohio, the 12-foot channel will soon be a reality. Barges today are being built with 12-foot depths in mind. On the Lower Mississippi it is thought that little would be needed to conform the river to a 12-foot minimum channel depth. Studies are already in progress and the benefit to the economy appears to be very great.

We are now told that in the decade ahead, the economy will demand more transportation per capita than ever before. In 1941, for example, 5,800 ton-miles of service were required per capita. Today, that requirement has grown to 8,900 ton-miles of service per head and may, by 1970, increase to 10,600. By 1980, every man, woman and child is expected to need 16,000 ton-miles of service a year.

This means vast expansion of every mode and tremendous changes in the techniques of doing business. It means a new situation in which, as the I.C.C.'s annual report has noted, surplus capacity in transportation no longer exists.

Private enterprise, responding to prudent and far-sighted public policies, has created the most advanced and efficient system of transport in the world. This system is a major factor in the quality and level of the nation's economic power.

The country is blessed with a tremendous network of water highways, of railroads, piplines, airlines and truck lines which must now be rapidly expanded in response to public demand. Increasingly, and inevitably, the network must be considered as a single system. It is clearly sound public policy, sound economic policy and sound business policy to make sure that the new investment in expanded capacity is applied in service that is economically the most productive.

Advancing technology and expanding demand are both powerfully influencing thinking of both carriers and shippers on the question of coordination of service between the various modes. As transportation becomes a larger part of the production process, shippers are becoming more sophisticated in their demands for the most economical service. Where large savings can be achieved, for example, by water movement or by combined rail and water movement, they will either force coordination or move their factories to rivers to take advantage of the lower cost service. Competition gives them no choice.

Accommodation of demands for coordinated service can best be accomplished by voluntary cooperation on lines of sound economics. What is sound economics is usually also enlightened self interest. Islands of special interest will not be allowed to stand in the way of such important public programs as more intensive regional economic development. Wendell Burge, a former Assistant Attorney General in charge of anti-trust enforcement—and a Nebraskan—in a book entitled "Economic Freedom for the West" stressed that transportation rates make the difference between success and failure in regional development. He wrote that without artificial barriers or discrimination in rates, capital in Maine, California or Nebraska will have equal opportunities for investment in new industry.

Everyone prefers the voluntary route, but if serious artificial obstacles are placed in the way of coordination of water and rail service, for example, the new Department of Transportation, the ICC and the courts will insist on better coordination. I think it is inevitable that the new unit train service by rail will be coordinated with large capacity steamship service on the Great Lakes and modern barge tows on the rivers. Such coordination represents a better way of doing the job. Far-reaching economies will result which will be most important to future regional development. Railroads will find it impossible to refuse to sell their new technologies at river, Great Lakes and coastal ports. Successful new technologies cannot be isolated and selectively withheld from general public application.

We are beginning to hear again suggestions that better coordination could result if single ownership were allowed of different means of transportation. But none of the advocates of single ownership has so far answered the objection that single or common ownership would seriously damage competition to the disadvantage of the shipper and the public. Nor is there an answer to the simple fact that all the advantages cited for common ownership can be obtained through cooperative coordination of service without risk to the competitive process. Healthy competition is basic to the sound future development of our transport system. Experience with the department store theory of transportation has not been encouraging in the past. In the absence of competition, the well-known evils of monopoly have developed and the government has had to take a hand to reestablish competition.

I can recall that the entire Mississippi Valley opposed the proposal of the Southern Pacific and the Illinois Central to buy a barge line some years ago. The argument that such a merger would reduce or destroy competition prevailed. Nothing has changed since except perhaps the fact that the railroad merger trend is diminishing competition among the railroads and making the competition of independent water carriers more cherished than ever.

There is one final concern I would like to share with you. In the expansion ahead, a major objective should be to make sure that there is an adequate flow of capital available for new and improved transport capacity. Transportation companies must compete with all other segments of a rapidly expanding economy for money at reasonable terms. In our industry we are now talking of specialized chemical barges costing $750,000 compared to covered hopper barges at $60,000. Towboats are costing $1,500,000 where once a price of half a million was considered high. The same trend is true in every mode of transportation. The jet costs more than the piston plane, the bigger freight car more than the old standard boxcar, the modern truck more than the old one. However, it is through investment in costlier but more efficient equipment that the shippers achieve lasting benefits. Increasing efficiency in improved economic productivity of equipment, better use of capital, and better coordination of service are the *only* means of offsetting continually rising costs.

Transportation pricing must produce the earnings necessary to replace and improve equipment for the low cost water carrier no less than the airline in a profit-oriented free enterprise system. So far all modes have demonstrated confidence in the future by heavy investment in new and improved equipment. An important objective of the Department of Transportation and of the ICC should be to maintain this climate of confidence and the present healthy rate of new investment.

HIGHER EDUCATION COURSES IN OCEANOGRAPHY

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, the National Oceanography Association, which is headquartered in the Nation's Capital, has just issued an important publication called Oceanography Curricula. This pamphlet lists 52 institutions of higher learning in the United States which offer courses and degrees in oceanography or closely related subjects.

I am proud to say that the University of Hawaii is one of the schools listed. Hawaii offers an M.S. in oceanography and zoology, and a Ph. D. in marine zoology. It also offers an M.S. in ocean engineering. In oceanography-related subjects it offers an M.S. and Ph. D. in botany, geological sciences, and chemistry. Let me add that the University of Hawaii also operates the Hawaii Marine Laboratory, Coconut Island, Kaneohe.

My own State of Hawaii is, of course, deeply interested and immersed in oceanographic work. Several companies in Hawaii are active in oceanography, while others are planning to enter that field. What is true of my State is true of every coastal State and many inland States, because oceanography is not merely an occupation engaged in by firms and individuals located near the ocean. It is becoming a truly national industry of considerable significance.

Oceanography, both in the industrial and academic areas, is growing rapidly. Rapid growth on the campus and in industry means that in the foreseeable future many more scientists, educators, and industrial experts in all phases of oceanographic work will be needed.

It is fortunate indeed, as the National Oceanography Association's booklet shows, that there are already many colleges and universities where young people can prepare themselves for a career in oceanography. In fact, nine of the institutions of higher learning listed in NOA's Oceanography Curricula offer a B.S. or B.A. degree in oceanography, ocean engineering, marine sciences, and fisheries; 20 offer an M.S. or M.A. in oceanography, ocean engineering, marine sciences, and fisheries; 19 offer a Ph. D. degree in oceanography, ocean engineering, marines sciences, and fisheries.

Many institutions listed in Oceanography Curricula also offer summer courses at their marine stations or laboratories. Many offer degrees in related subjects with specialization possible in oceanography; for example, Scripps Institution of Oceanography at the University of California, offers both an M.S. and a Ph. D. in earth sciences with specialization in marine problems.

Oceanography Curricula gives potential oceanographers the opportunity to get a good rundown on schools teaching oceanography and related subjects, and the types of instruction these schools offer.

The National Oceanography Association has performed a real service by issuing that publication at this time. I have been aware of NOA since its inception in the summer of 1966. It came into being when such an organization was badly needed to give leadership and direction to the mushrooming field of oceanography. I have watched it grow in strength and stature over the past 10 months. The publication of Oceanography Curricula is evidence of the National Oceanography Association's forward-looking attitude and its concern with the future healthy progress of ocean science, which will contribute to the growth and strength of our Nation.

RUMANIA—A TRIBUTE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, for Rumanians, May 10 is a day of special remembrance. It is on this day that they commemorate the anniversary of their independence from Turkish domination.

That the Rumanian people should celebrate this holiday with all the tributes and reminders of their glorious national past is perfectly understandable. For, there is a common quality in each human being that compels him to look to his national past and to identify himself with those moments of national glory. And what is more meaningful, what event is more full of satisfaction, than when a nation asserts its right of national independence from an oppressor and achieves that independence.

To look to the past has its rewards and satisfaction; such an exercise in reminiscences can be comforting to the soul; but it is the present and future that should be the prime source of attention for all imaginative minds; for, it is here where a people faces the great questions that will determine the ultimate destiny of their nation, questions that must be solved if they are to achieve their national goals.

Certainly as we look at Rumania today we can see that its people have neither ignored their historic past nor have they been remiss in determining their own national destiny. Contrary to the expectations of many in the West, Rumania has broken out of the iron grip of the Soviet Union; it has asserted its own national interests over those of the Soviet Union and world communism; it has charted for itself a political course in matters of foreign affairs that takes it into a closer alignment with the Western world. In recent days Rumania provided new evidence of its determination to seek its own national goals rather than the collective goals of its Communist allies when it openly defied the Soviet Union and refused to meet with the other Communist states in Karlovy Vary, Czechoslovakia; at this conference one of the key questions to be discussed was bloc unity.

This is a healthy trend, this assertion of national independence; and it is one that we in the West should encourage.

But we would deceive ourselves if we identified this surge toward national independence in external affairs with the expansion of political freedom within Rumania. There has been no such development; the Communist Party maintains its monopoly of power within the state; and the state remains rigidly organized along traditional Communist lines.

Still, we have no assurances of what the future will hold for Rumania and her people. We can only hope that in the years to come we will see a flowering of genuine democracy internally as the nation moves along its independent course.

On this May 10, 1967, let us all pay special tribute to the Rumanian people, and let us express again our confidence that one day in the future May 10 will be an occasion not only for celebrating the national independence of the nation but also freedom for its people.

PROBLEMS OF UNEMPLOYMENT IN A FREE SOCIETY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, one of the biggest problems with which Congress has wrestled over many years is the need to shape effective Government policy to meet the problems of unemployment in a free society.

The creation of a completely controlled labor force is contrary to our belief in freedom of choice as a human value which is basic to the definition of American society. But in our efforts to pursue an alternative course, we have fallen far short of perfection.

Recently the Republican task force on job opportunities and welfare, of which I am pleased to be a member, submitted a report approved by the Republican coordinating committee. The report points out some of the imperfections in current Federal policies and proposes a number of positive programs for mobilizing more effectively our national resources to open jobs for all Americans.

Implicit in the report is the conclusion that there is no level of unemployment which is acceptable in America. The paper is addressed not only to the present manpower dilemma but also, to a major extent, to emerging problems brought on by continuing rapid technological change—problems which we must recognize now and formulate programs to meet.

One of the most interesting findings of the report, and one to which I believe we should give close attention, is that the jobless total in this country would have increased from June 1960, to February 1967, except for a large gain in employment by the Federal Government. In that period, total government employment, including the military, increased by 1,373,000 or 28 percent. In the same time, unemployment went down by 880,000. Over nearly 7 years, then, the rise in the number of new Government employees was substantially more than the unemployment decline. If one wishes to exclude military personnel, the increase in Federal employment was 482,000—more than half of the total unemployment decline.

Thus, it is clear that since 1960, when the Government has spoken of new job opportunities, it has to a large degree been talking in fact about new opportunities for Federal employment. In essence, we are fighting unemployment by adding more and more people to the Federal payroll. This is the way the problem is being answered, but we must ask ourselves if this is the best answer in pursuit of the goal of jobs for all Americans in a free society.

So that Senators might have an opportunity to consider the task force report, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the Republican coordinating committee task force report on job opportunities and welfare was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOB TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR ALL AMERICANS

Jobs for all Americans is a truly national goal. What is needed is a unified approach which brings the diverse resources of government, education, industry, and labor to bear on these problems. The Republican Coordinating Committee addressed itself a year ago to the resolution of the manpower dilemma.

We urge that careful executive and legislative study be given to the following constructive recommendations:

First, that a Federal income tax credit be given to employers toward the costs of training employees or potential employees in skills in short supply.

Second, that a National Skill Survey be undertaken to determine what skills are required now and what the skill demand will be in future years. This is essential if young people are to be trained to meet the needs of an increasingly automated economy.

Third, that the resources of industry, labor, education and all levels of government should be mobilized to institute a program of Technological Education for the Future (TEFF). This program would provide young people with functional training in needed new skills. Instruction in schools supplied with the most modern equipment and facilities would alternate with the on-the-job training with potential employers in a pre-apprenticeship program.

Fourth, that current surveys of monthly unemployment data be broadened to provide the full picture. Simple counts of the number of people unemployed do not contribute much to an action-oriented remedial program unless accompanying data on the number, types, and distribution of job vacancies are also provided. The employment surveys of the Bureau of Labor Statistics would be expanded to provide more specific details about unemployment and job vacancy data. Labor, industry and educational circles should strongly support this constructive proposal.

Fifth, all too frequently the unemployed are not only unskilled; they also lack basic elements of education. Private and public organizations working in this area have learned that the key to retraining is to provide basic education and self-respect. This is crucial in any retraining program.

BACKGROUND OF THE PROBLEM

Current employment statistics indicate that almost three million Americans out of a labor force of nearly 75 million are currently unemployed, running just under four percent of the total.

Untold millions more are under-employed—utilized in capacities well below the levels of their training, education and ability.

Yet, at the same time, hundreds of thousands of jobs requiring the talents of skilled personnel go unfilled because of a short supply of adequately trained manpower. The exact number, type and distribution of these open jobs is an unknown quantity.

This condition—the existence of unemployment among the unskilled, while jobs requiring skills go begging—is known as *structural unemployment*. The fact that the American economy has remained in this period of structural unemployment for several years is more than a subject for ivory tower discussion; it is a national disgrace.

To a great extent, hard-core unemployment is a special plight of particular groups in the population. Almost a year ago, the Republican Coordinating Committee pointed out these special problem areas:

Nonwhites, who comprise 11 percent of the labor force, account for 24 percent of long-term unemployment.

Teenagers in the labor force, particularly school drop-outs, are unemployed at 3.56 times the national unemployment rate.

Agricultural workers are unemployed at rates two-thirds higher than other workers. New lows in farm employment are set almost every year.

Workers in labor-surplus areas like Appalachia have experienced reduced demand for skills of almost all levels of sophistication.

Workers with low levels of education and job skills are among the hardest hit; unemployment among this group runs 75 percent above the national average.

The policies of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration have failed to meet these problems head-on. No comprehensive approach to resolve the needs and problems of structural and hard-core unemployment has been formulated, despite the expenditure of staggeringly large sums of money in the effort to fight poverty.

Rather, the Administration has utilized scores of programs, administered by numerous agencies, with little or no overall coordination of effort or goal. Many of these programs appear to be expensive failures.

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

The role of the Federal Government in maintaining high employment is a dual one. Not only do its economic policies have an impact on employment, but it is in a key position as the largest employer in the Nation. In this connection, the following statistics are noteworthy:

	June 1960	February 1967 [1]	Change	Percent change
1. Total employment [2]	66,149,000	74,137,000	+7,988,000	+12
2. U.S. Government civilian employment [3]	2,371,000	2,853,000	+482,000	+20
3. Percent of total employment	3.6	3.8	+6.0	
4. U.S. Government employment, including military personnel [3]	4,847,000	6,220,000	+1,373,000	+28
5. Percent of total employment	7.3	8.4	+17.2	
6. Unemployment [2]	3,768,000	2,888,000	−880,000	−23

[1] The Bureau of Labor Statistics has issued employment data for March 1967 since this paper was adopted by the Republican Coordinating Committee. These do not vary substantially from those reported above.

[2] Data seasonally adjusted. Statistics apply to persons age 16 and over.

[3] Executive branch only. February 1967 data are preliminary.

Sources: Items 1 and 6, U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics; item 2, U.S. Civil Service Commission; item 4, U.S. Civil Service Commission and Department of Defense; items 3 and 5, calculated from other items.

In summary, from June 1960 to February 1967:

1. Total employment rose from 66,149,000 to 74,137,000.

2. U.S. Government civilian employment (Executive Branch only) increased by 482,000; it went from 3.6 percent to 3.8 percent of total employment.

3. Total Government employment, including the military, increased by 1,373,000 or 28 percent; it went from 7.3 percent to 8.4 percent of total employment.

4. Federal Government civilian employment went up by 482,000 while unemployment went down by 880,000.

5. While Federal Executive employment, including military personnel, went up by 1,373,000, unemployment went down by 880,000.

CONCLUSION

Republicans believe that unemployment in America *can* be eradicated. And we believe further that with planning and the application of adequate private and public resources, an ample supply of highly trained men and

> women can be provided to fill sophisticated jobs in an automated economy.
>
> Experience has shown that hit-or-miss programs which are not the product of coordinated, integrated efforts will fail regardless of their financial resources or the dedication of their staffs. But we are convinced that an approach which begins with youth, and mixes in proper proportions of education, technological training, and the support and participation of government, labor and industry can and will solve the problems of structural unemployment . . . and, in the long run, of poverty as well.

GOVERNMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS IN MARYLAND

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one of President Johnson's greatest achievements is the high level of cooperation between business and Government that exists today. Cooperation between the Federal Government and citizens at all levels—in business, industry, and commerce, and in the local and State governments, as well—has never been so effective as it is today.

This working partnership is most notable, I believe, in bringing about a unity of purpose that benefits business and Government alike.

Mr. President, our national economy is a strong one. Its strength is dependent, in a large measure, upon the health of the Nation's 4.8 million small firms.

Small business is important to a growing economy for many reasons. First, it is important by virtue of the sheer weight of numbers. More than 95 percent of all American businesses are small. They account for 40 percent of our labor force and provide a livelihood for 60 percent of our people. Small business is a giant when considered in the broad spectrum of the overall economy.

Small business is of importance for another reason. It offers countless opportunities for individual growth and initiative. These ventures have been very aptly termed the "seedbed of the American economy." Through the medium of small business, a person having limited resources can strike out on his own, and with determination, ingenuity, and careful management can create an outstanding success, as millions before him have done.

Small business has historically been the door of opportunity for enterprising Americans. This is still the case. The individual innovator, the person with a new product, a new idea, a new process, has virtually limitless opportunity.

President Johnson understands the importance of small business and has urged that it be made one of the fastest growing industries in the Nation. The President appointed Bernard L. Boutin, a former Administrator of the General Services Administration and a former small businessman from New Hampshire, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration last May.

Under Administrator Boutin, the SBA is moving forward in providing financial assistance and managerial guidance to the Nation's small businessmen, enabling them to make the maximum use of today's opportunities.

Mr. President, since I was elected to the U.S. Senate in November 1962, the Small Business Administration has assisted more than 750 persons in Maryland through long-term loans totaling $24.4 million.

Included in the total are 300 SBA loans totaling $19.3 million to help small businessmen. One hundred and eighty-two persons received $2.6 million in disaster loans to repair or replace their property damaged in natural disasters. Under the Agency's equal opportunity loan program 32 disadvantaged persons were provided with nearly $400,000 in loans to aid in the establishment of a business or improve an existing one. Twenty-one businesses that had been forced to relocate because of a highway or an urban renewal program were given long-term loans totaling $1.3 million.

In addition, SBA has helped three local development companies with loans totaling $799,600, and the companies in turn have provided facilities for small businesses that now employ nearly 250 persons.

The SBA provided a loan of $350,000 to the Harford County Development Co., of Joppa. The money assisted in providing facilities for the Harford Brick & Tile Co., which cost $625,700. Twenty-two new jobs were created by this expansion. The development company provided $275,700 of the necessary funds.

An SBA loan of $100,440 helped the Dorchester Industrial Development Corp., located in Cambridge on Maryland's Eastern Shore, to construct a vegetable cannery costing $124,000. The cannery is operated by a small firm which employs 200 persons. A bank provided $11,000 of the necessary funds and the local development company provided $12,400.

An SBA loan of $406,000, with a bank participation of $56,840, helped the Deep Creek Development Corp. of Oakland construct a ski tow costing $506,000. This facility, in addition to creating 23 jobs, is assisting the local community to develop its natural resources.

A common problem faced by small ness is that of obtaining long-term loans to help them modernize and improve their businesses. Many SBA business loans are utilized for this specific purpose.

One such loan was made by SBA to Baltimore Display Industries, Inc., 33 South Charles Street in Baltimore. This firm, organized in 1948, was engaged in wholesaling display materials and fixtures for department stores, specialty shops and chain stores.

This enterprising firm with 16 employees was forced to vacate its quarters in a loft. An SBA-bank participation loan of $60,000 was provided to help the owners purchase land and construct a suitable building.

The move has proved beneficial to the firm. Since SBA approved the loan, the firm's sales have increased more than 50 percent and net profits after taxes have increased fourfold.

Under Administrator Boutin's direction, SBA is actively seeking small businesses that have the greatest potential for growth and for helping build up their local communities. It wants to encourage them in every way it can. Maryland small businessmen can help through SBA's Regional Office at Fayette and St. Paul Streets, in Baltimore and at the SBA Regional Office located in downtown Washington.

The services provided by SBA also include management guidance and help to small firms in selling their products to the Federal Government. Recently the SBA, in cooperation with the University of Baltimore School of Business, sponsored a course in U.S. Government contract administration for small businessmen. The purpose of the course, which was held on Tuesday evenings for 7 weeks, was to give small businessmen up-to-date information on filling Government contract. Experts from the Westinghouse defense and space center joined with Government officials in making the course a success.

In carrying forward President Johnson's attack on poverty, SBA works closely with the Baltimore County Community Action Agency and the Community Action Council of Howard County, Maryland, Inc.

In this project it provides loans up to $25,000 to assist businesses and potential businessmen who have suffered from lack of opportunity. SBA assistance is designed to help them compete in business on equal terms with their competitors.

Mr. President, SBA's programs give meaning to President Johnson's concept of "creative federalism." They help to make this concept a success.

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson said:

> Federal energy is essential. But it is not enough. Only a total working partnership among Federal, state and local governments can succeed. The test of that partnership will be the concern of each public organization, each private institution, and each responsible citizen.

Mr. President, it is this broad concept of a working partnership with the Nation's small businessmen and with community groups and State and local government agencies that makes the Small Business Administration's programs meaningful and effective, not only in Maryland, but in every State in the Union.

"NO" ON INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate approved a bill to restore a 7-percent investment tax credit and allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

I voted against the bill.

I so voted because the administration's piecemeal approach to tax policy does not make much sense to me.

Just 7 months ago Congress was told it should repeal this tax provision to help cool off inflationary pressures, pressures created, at least in part, because industry was unable to supply the greatly accelerated demand for goods encouraged by this tax program. One of the most unfortunate results of this emphasis on industrial capital improvements was a sharp decrease in the amount of investment money flowing to the home mortgage market.

Now, just 7 months later we are

asked to believe that the tax credit program will not create the situation which led to its repeal 7 months ago.

Most important, Congress reportedly will be asked to enact a 6-percent surcharge on individual and corporate income taxes. This to me appears to be moving in two different directions at the same time when the goal is assumed to be one and the same.

Knowing that the administration fears as much as I do the ravages of inflation, I can only surmise that it is pressing for restoration of the tax credit as an antirecession measure.

Mr. President, it makes no sense to me on the one hand to pump up an already overheated segment of the economy to produce more goods and then to turn around and dampen the consumers' ability to buy those goods. If the people can not or will not buy, what good will it do to produce more goods?

Clearly the best antirecession measure, if one is really needed, is to pump up the consumer sector of the economy. There are some indications that that sector of the economy needs some pumping up. I ask unanimous consent that an article from today's edition of the Washington Post reporting that retail store sales were not increasing as much as predicted be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

I also ask unanimous consent for the printing in the RECORD of "three inescapable facts" concerning the bill which the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] made in his minority report—the bill when it was sent to the floor from the Senate Finance Committee. I realize that Senator GORE's strong feelings about the Fair Campaign Act, 1966, led him to vote for the tax credit bill, but his three points sum up the case against restoring these credits.

In conclusion, I, for one, cannot support a tax cut favoring one segment of the economy at the expense of individual taxpayers, particularly when, because of a tight budget, we are faced with having to cut back or not expand as much as necessary important domestic programs.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, *as follows:*

SALES REPORT JOLTS HOPES FOR UPSWING—IDLENESS IN APRIL WENT UP 0.1 POINT, LABOR DEPARTMENT SAYS

(By Hobart Rowen)

Administration hopes that a sharp upswing in consumer buying had gotten under way received a rude jolt yesterday, and probably will suffer another blow today.

According to a revised Department of Commerce report on retail store sales, the volume in March was up a bare 1 per cent, instead of 3.3 per cent as reported in preliminary figures.

And the first report for April, showing an actual decline from March sales, will be issued today, it was learned last night.

Meanwhile, the Department of Labor reported that April unemployment had increased 0.1 of a point to 3.7 per cent, seasonally adjusted. This stability was maintained, curiously enough, by an increase in retail jobs, which offset a slowdown in manufacturing activity.

ADDS TO UNCERTAINTY

The gloomy news on retail sales, which added to growing uncertainty about the economy in the months ahead, put the seasonally adjusted volume for March at $25,736,000,000. A few weeks ago, the Department guessed at $26,474,000,000. This was not only a smart gain over February, but 4 per cent better than March, 1966.

It was hoped, particularly, that this foreshadowed a revival in the consumer sector that would cut into heavy stocks of goods that have been depressing the economy.

Economic adviser Arthur M. Okun had referred to the March sales result as "gratifying." And although some Administration economists privately wondered whether the March figure might not have been exaggerated, it punctured the mood of pessimism prevalent in January and February.

But by lopping $738 million off the original version the Commerce Department has cut short the optimistic flurry.

DISAPPOINTMENT CLEAR

Officials yesterday reiterated that reliance on a single indicator, or a single month's statistics, can be tricky. Yet, the disappointment was clear.

The March and April reports taken together show no gain instead of a good gain. They indicate that consumer spending remains on a plateau in the face of rising incomes.

Despite the downward revision, March retail sales were still a record, topping the previous high of $25,703,000,000 set last September.

Administration officials are not ready to conclude that their predictions for a second-half economic recovery must be discarded. They believe that it will be 5 weeks or more before there is conclusive data on which way the economy is headed.

SENATOR GORE'S THREE INESCAPABLE FACTS

Fact No. 1: By enacting this bill we will be cutting taxes for corporations when there is no demonstrated need.

As pointed out above, there is no collapse in plant and equipment expenditures. This year will see a still further advance, although not a large one, over the too-rapid advances we experienced in 1965 and 1966.

On the other hand, although a recession is not now predictable, there has been an increasing wariness on the part of consumers. Consumer expenditures have slowed and the savings rate has jumped up markedly. Although there is no shortage in productive capacity, there is a shortage of purchasing power and if any segment of the economy needs encouragement, it is consumers.

The slowdown in the automobile industry is characterized by an excess in inventory of unsold automobiles. Would this indicate a need for a tax incentive for more automobile productive capacity or for more consumer demand for the automobiles already manufactured and for the production of which idle capacity already exists?

Fact No. 2: Cutting taxes for corporations at this time is an indication of a decision to use fiscal policy to pump up the economy. But the administration, at the same time, is inconsistently pursuing restraint in expenditures where such expenditures might be more useful. Highway funds have been impounded, and although it was recently announced that they would be released, the final release will not take place until after July 1. But we are urged to give corporations a tax break now. The Bureau of the Budget is sitting on some $94 million badly needed for farm loans. We cannot afford to make these good loans, but we can afford to give away millions immediately to a relatively few large corporations. We must defer action to boost social security benefits for the elderly who are in dire straits. But we cannot afford to wait another month to cut corporate taxes.

One wonders whether administration spokesmen are being candid, consistent, or neither.

Fact No. 3: The enactment of this measure will kill any chance of adopting the President's proposed tax surcharge. As a result, the deficit may well approach $20 billion for fiscal year 1968. I, for one, cannot face such a prospect with equanimity, particularly since we have continued to run deficits through the past few years of unprecedented prosperity.

MR. C. K. YEN, VICE PRESIDENT OF A FREE AND PROSPEROUS ASIAN ALLY, VISITS THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the United States is honored to be host to the Vice President of the Republic of China, one of America's stanchest and most prosperous Asian allies. Mr. C. K. Yen, who is also an outstanding economist, deserves a great measure of credit for building on Taiwan one of the strongest, most viable and private-enterprise-oriented economies in the Far East.

A few statistics from the current issue of Time magazine tell the story graphically.

The gross national product on Taiwan has risen at the rate of 8.2 percent annually since 1952. Industrial production has been increasing nearly 14 percent a year. Per capita income is rising 4½ percent a year. But beyond this, as Time points out:

> Yen and his men achieved economic stability first by reforming the agricultural base, which more often than not, is a millstone around the neck of a developing nation.

Time continued its article by asserting that—

> The scope of the problems yet to be solved only serves to point out how well the Chinese on Taiwan have done with their economy in the past two decades. Not only have they survived, but they have become a showplace for the rest of Southeast Asia.

There is no more graphic and stark example of man's relationship to man, the government's attitude toward the governed, or the economic strength of systems based on freedom and on communism, than that found by comparing the Chinese Province of Taiwan with the Chinese mainland only 100 miles away.

Here can be seen the contrast of life under two diametrically opposed systems. The accomplishments of President Chiang Kai-shek, Vice President Yen, and others responsible for the economic, industrial, and military sophistication of a once underdeveloped island are in stark contrast to the revolution, chaos, and negation of human values found on the Communist-controlled Chinese mainland.

Replied Mr. Yen when welcomed to the White House yesterday:

> The Republic of China is proud to pledge its support to the resolute stand of the United States in upholding the cause of freedom and justice in our part of the world.

Mr. President, I know that the American people are honored and pleased to have the Vice President of free China in our country. His nation, as the President noted yesterday, is "a model for many lands."

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have alluded be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TAIWAN—THE MODEL

Into Washington this week flies C. K. Yen, 61, vice president, premier and, most important, chief economic planner of the Nationalist Chinese government on Taiwan. Within the fortnight following he will pay calls on President Johnson, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, businessmen and Chinese communities from Cape Kennedy to San Francisco. Remarkably, he seeks no financial handouts of any sort. But, he admits in a modest way, he would indeed be pleased by recognition of the dramatic fact that Taiwan has become a model for Asian economic development.

Yen has all sorts of statistics to which he can point. Items:

The gross national product has risen at the rate of 8.2% annually since 1952, now stands at $3.1 billion.

Industrial production has been increasing nearly 14% a year; industry on the island is four times broader than it was in 1952.

Taiwan's trade balance, which once ran a $100 million annual deficit in spite of U.S. aid (discontinued in 1965), is now only $34 million in deficit on a much larger base ($569 million in exports and $603 million in imports). Meanwhile, foreign exchange reserves last year rose another 10% to $337 million.

Per-capita income, rising 4½% each year, has nearly doubled to $200. With prices stabilized the ordinary Taiwanese has begun to buy rice cookers and radios, and total savings last year amounted to $200 million, or more than twice as much as Taiwanese tucked away in 1962.

Yen and his men achieved economic stability first by reforming the agricultural base, which more often than not is a millstone around the neck of a developing nation. Because of the spine-like ridge of mountains that runs up the middle of Taiwan, only 3,000 of the island's 13,800 square miles are arable; for centuries, that land was held by landlords and worked by tenant farmers. The Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek, under a land-reform program, distributed small plots to the tenants—and encouraged landlords to invest their settlement money in industry. Now, with farmers keeping 80% of their crop *v.* 43% in the old days, rice production has increased from 20 tons a acre to 34 tons. Seeking to profit from a semitropical climate that allows four harvests a year, the government encouraged the island's 835,000 farm families to branch out from staple rice and sugar into such profitable cash crops as pineapples, asparagus, bananas and mushrooms. Result: with agricultural output rising 6% a year, Taiwan is not only able to feed itself one of the highest-calorie diets in Asia but has also developed a profitable farm-export market, especially to Japan and South Viet Nam.

Industrial Balance. Even while improving and increasing agriculture, Taiwan's economists laid long-range—and highly realistic—plans to balance it with industry. Says Economic Affairs Minister K. T. Li: "It is often said that every developing country wants to begin with an atomic reactor and and airline of its own. We resisted that temptation." With loans of $43 million from the World Bank, $56 million from the Export-Import Bank and a $150 million line of credit from Japan, the Taiwan government set about building industry and improving the infrastructure of railroads, highways and communications on which it depends. At the outset, major industries were put under government control, and many of them remain there.

Among government-run enterprises is the China Petroleum Co., which has petrochemical complexes at either end of the island and a natural-gas field at Miaoli in the north. China Petroleum last year earned $87 million on sales of $90 million, is now expanding with a joint venture in fertilizers with Mobil Oil and Allied Chemical Corp. The government-controlled Taiwan Power Co. has brought electricity to 96% of Taiwan's population and is fast outstripping its 1,500,000-kw. capacity; with 80% of its output earmarked for expanding industry, Taiwan Power is aiming toward a 4,000,000-kw. output within the next ten years, is rushing completion of the Tachia River power network to supply a quarter of the total through a mix of hydroelectric power and thermal power generated by oil shipped halfway around the world from Kuwait.

Yet for all the huge role that government has played in Taiwan's economic upsurge, C. K. Yen is a firm believer in private enterprise. Thus in the past five years, the government's share of total industrial output has dropped from 68% to 31%.

The Investors. The basic idea is to lure both foreign and domestic capital investment. To outsiders, Taiwan's biggest advantage is inexpensive labor. Minimum-wage laws require only $11 a month for unskilled labor, while skilled workers get up to $70 or $80. The rates are only one-third as high as wage levels in Japan and half those in Hong Kong. As a result, several Asian companies have moved operations from those areas to Taiwan. U.S. firms have invested $110 million in Taiwan enterprises. Union Carbide is building an $8,300,000 plastics plant in the Kaohsiung petrochemical complex. RCA last week announced that it will build a $2,500,000 factory to make computer parts.

U.S. businessmen are satisfied with their ventures, especially since Taiwan gives them a five-year holiday from income-tax payments and allows repatriation of earnings and capital. "We expect wages to go up," says William B. Scott, manager of a $24 million Philco radio plant at Tamsui, "but productivity will go up faster."

As for local entrepreneurs, Taiwan's capital market is still pretty small. But there are several success stories. Y. C. Wang, 51, a Taiwan-born smalltime lumber dealer only a decade ago, now owns the Formosa Plastics Corp., which this year will do a $40 million business in such products as plastic sheeting and baby pants. T. S. Lin's Tatung Engineering Co. has a broad range of consumer goods: the Tatung brand is stamped on pressurized rice cookers, washing machines, fans, radios and, lately, television sets. Tjingling Yen and his wife Vivian, who holds a master's degree from Columbia University, operate two of the fastest-growing companies on Taiwan. From facing desks in a modest Taipei office, Yen's Yue Loong Motor Co. this year will sell 6,000 cars and trucks assembled from parts made in Taiwan or Japan. Mrs. Yen's Tai Yuen Textile Co. turns out 20% of Taiwan's textiles, does a $15 million annual business, mostly overseas.

ALMOND-EYED MIA

Taiwan hopes to market more and more of its industrial products outside the country, especially in Southeast Asia. At the same time, C. K. Yen and his economists are trying new ways to build up capital and to increase jobs. One is motion pictures; movies from the island's four flourishing film studios, with Mandarin sound tracks and subtitles in other dialects, are popular with Chinese communists all around the Pacific. Wang Mo-chou, 24, an almond-eyed Mia Farrow, has become big box office. The government is also hopefully pushing such tourist attractions as Sun Moon Lake and Taroko Gorge, last year earned $20 million on tourism, and expects 240,000 visitors this year. In addition, it is host to 4,500 U.S. troops a month brought in from South Viet Nam for five-day furloughs; each serviceman spends about $250 during his stay. To increase jobs, the government has established the Kaohsiung Export Processing Zone (KEPZ) on 170 acres of waterfront land, where more than 60 firms manufacturing products for re-export will eventually provide work for 30,000 people.

Creating more jobs is one of the biggest headaches for Planner Yen. About 45% of Taiwan's citizens are age 15 or younger, and 165,000 will enter the labor market every year for a decade. Taiwan must also improve education to overcome shortages of managers and skilled foremen, and solve its brain drain: each year 2,300 students go to the U.S. to attend universities. Few return to Taiwan.

Still, the scope of the problems yet to be solved only serves to point up how well the Chinese on Taiwan have done with their economy in the past two decades. Not only have they survived, but they have become a showplace for the rest of Southeast Asia. And as impressive as the record is on its own, it takes on even greater proportion when the economy of Taiwan is matched against that of a country only 100 miles away—Communist China.

NEW YORK CITY OMBUDSMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the Committee on Administrative Law of the prestigious Association of the Bar of the City of New York has this week released "A Report on, and Draft of, a Proposed Local Law for a New York City Ombudsman."

This material, prepared under the chairmanship of Mr. Milton M. Carrow, represents several months of diligent research and effort. It is a workable model for other cities presently considering the creation of an Ombudsman.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ASSOCIATION OF THE BAR OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK, 42 WEST 44TH STREET, COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE LAW—A REPORT ON, AND DRAFT OF, PROPOSED LOCAL LAW FOR A NEW YORK CITY OMBUDSMAN

The Committee on Administrative Law of The Association of the Bar of the City of New York recommends that an independent Office of Public Complaints be established in New York City, to be headed by an Ombudsman. To this end the committee has drafted the accompanying bill.

The "policy" declaration in the bill states two objectives applicable to city agencies and employees: first, ". . . to investigate and ameliorate grievances arising out of allegations of . . . maladministration, unfairness, unreasonableness, arbitrariness, arrogance, rudeness, oppressiveness, inefficiency, improper motivation, unwarranted delay, clear violations of laws or regulations, or other abuse of authority . . ." and second, on the Ombudsman's initiative ". . . to investigate, study and make recommendations with regard to agency acts, practices and procedures."

The fact that there are such "grievances" is not necessarily due to deliberate acts on the part of city agencies or employees. In fact, New York City is noted for the comparatively high caliber of its administrative personnel. Many of the causes stem from the size and proliferation of the bureaucracies, the skyrocketing of costs of governing well, insufficient personnel, the lack of means of informing people about available services and procedures, especially for the poor and even those of modest means, and the enormous pressures on urban life today resulting from inadequate housing, conflicts in community relations, dilapidated transportation and the like.

The proposed bill will not solve these problems. Its aim is quite limited. Primarily, it seeks to build a bridge of understanding between the people and the agencies of the city government. An office which is interested in hearing the citizen's complaints and which has the ear of the officials complained about will be able, as experience elsewhere has shown, to "ameliorate" the great majority of grievances. It will undoubtedly also be a brake on those members of the official family who, for reasons not related to their jobs, provide grounds for complaint. Moreover, it will provide expertise on modern administrative practices and procedures for the assistance of the agencies which have neither the funds nor the personnel to study them.

BACKGROUND OF THE COMMITTEE'S PROPOSAL

The committee's consideration of the desirability and feasibility of an office of public complaints for New York City began more than two years ago. It studied the ombudsman system as it originated and developed in Sweden since 1809, as well as in Finland, Denmark, Norway, New Zealand and Great Britain. It also examined the work of the Office of Public Protection, established in Nassau County, New York, in 1966. (It learned that on March 21, 1967, the City Council of San Diego, California, established an "Office of Citizens Assistance Officer".)

In addition, the committee has followed developments in those countries, such as Canada, which are now actively considering similar proposals, as well as in this country. Here, on the federal level, two bills have been introduced in Congress, one by Congressman Reuss of Wisconsin, providing for an "Administrative Counsel of Congress" (H.R. 3388, 90th Cong.), and the other, proposed by Senator Long of Missouri, to establish an Ombudsman for the District of Columbia (S. 3783, 89th Cong.). Senator Long has also introduced a bill to establish ". . . the Office of Administrative Ombudsman to investigate administrative practices and procedures of selected agencies of the United States". (S. 1195, 90th Cong.) In New York State, Senator Bronson and Assemblyman Green have introduced a bill to create a state Office of Public Redress (S. 9–A, Intro. A.87, 1967).

Model ombudsman bills have been drafted by Professor Walter Gellhorn, of Columbia University, (also the author of "When Americans Complain" and "Ombudsman and Others: Citizens' Protectors in Nine Countries") and the Harvard Journal of Legislation (v. 2, p. 213, 1965), both of which have been of much help to this committee.

In New York City, Councilman Paul O'Dwyer, in 1965, introduced a bill in the City Council to create an "Office of Citizen Redress", which was reintroduced by Councilman J. Daniel Diggs in 1966. Also in 1966, Council President Frank O'Connor introduced a similar bill. Councilman Edward L. Sadowsky, in November, 1966, filed a bill calling for the creation of an office of "Administrative Review" as an arm of the City Council.

Not only has the Committee on Administrative Law carefully analyzed all of these measures, but also it consulted with various scholars and public officials conversant with the subject. In February, 1966, it co-sponsored a forum at The Association of the Bar of the City of New York, at which addresses were given by Hon. Alfred Bexelius, the Swedish Ombudsman, and Sir Guy Powles, the New Zealand Ombudsman. (Their addresses are published in vol. 21 of the Association's "Record", p. 385.) At various committee meetings, it had the benefit of helpful comments by representatives of Mayor Lindsay and Council President O'Connor, and by Professor Gellhorn, Vincent L. Broderick, Esq., former New York City Commissioner of Police, Commissioner Arnold Fraiman of the Department of Investigation, and Benny Kass, Esq., legal assistant to Senator Long of Missouri. (None of these persons, however, is responsible for, or committed to, the bill or any of its provisions.)

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE BILL

One of the most essential aspects of the proposed bill could not be incorporated in mandatory legislative language. That is the stature, dignity and respect necessary for successful operation of the office. An effort is made in the bill's policy statement to assure that the head of the office would be "a person of distinguished accomplishments in the field of law or administration". And, after much debate, it was decided that the use of the title "Ombudsman" would be helpful in this respect, because of its historical identification with these attributes in other countries.

As to the agencies and employees covered, it was felt there should be a minimum of exemptions. The Mayor and the City Council, being answerable to the people in regular elections, need no such oversight. Their "staffs", it was also felt, should be exempt. The courts were exempt because they have an extensive administrative apparatus overseeing their functions, and also because some of them are not subject to local law. The Board of Estimate is exempted only insofar as it acts as a board. Thus, its individual members acting in other capacities would be subject to the Ombudsman's jurisdiction.

The appointing and removal process was designed to insulate the Ombudsman from politics as much as possible. His term of five years would overlap that of the Mayor's and his appointment would be by the Mayor with the advice and consent of two-thirds of the Council. Various other devices were considered, such as a nominating panel of reputable citizens, but close analysis showed them not to be workable. The salary, "equal to that of a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York serving in New York City", should be sufficient to attract a man of the requisite stature.

The scope of the investigative powers of the Ombudsman would be broad. He could investigate any complaint and make "such findings and recommendations he deems appropriate." Agencies are required to furnish information requested by him and make their records available to him. He could initiate an investigation himself. After giving an agency an opportunity to reply to his findings and recommendations, he could issue them to the press. He would, of course, report to the Mayor and the Council.

However, the Ombudsman's powers would not include any sanctions. He could only investigate, make findings and recommendations and report. More definitive action would have to be taken by the Mayor, the Council, the electorate, or the agencies themselves.

Although the Ombudsman would have the authority to act "in his sole discretion", he would be required both to inform the complainant of the reason he does not investigate, and if he does, of his findings and recommendation. But, to insulate him from harassment, his action would not be reviewable in any court.

EFFECT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF INVESTIGATION

The establishment of a separate Office of Public Complaints would make it unnecessary for the Department of Investigation to retain its complaint bureau which has the power to receive complaints from the public under Section 804 of the Charter. Thus, the bill provides that this section be repealed.

The Department of Investigation, however, will continue to exercise its primary functions, namely to "make any investigation directed by the mayor or the council" (New York City Charter, Sec. 803 [1]) and to "make any study or investigation which in his (the Commissioner of Investigation) opinion may be in the best interests of the city". (Id., Sec. 803 [2]).

Although there may remain some overlap in the respective investigative powers of the Department of Investigation and the Office of Public Complaints, it is the committee's expectation that in such instances the Commissioner of Investigation and the Ombudsman would coordinate their activities.

To the extent the abolition of the complaint bureau in the Department of Investigation reduces its work load, its appropriation for such purposes could be allocated to the Office of Public Complaints.

The text of the proposed bill follows:

PROPOSED LOCAL LAW FOR A NEW YORK CITY OMBUDSMAN

A local law to amend the charter of the city of New York in relation to creating the office of public complaints headed by the ombudsman.

Be it enacted by the Council as follows: Section 1. The charter of the city of New York is hereby amended by adding thereto a new chapter 54 to read as follows:

§ 1170. *Policy.* It is hereby found to be in the public interest to establish an office of public complaints in New York City, headed by a person of distinguished accomplishments in the field of law or administration, whose main functions would be (a) to investigate and ameliorate grievances arising out of allegations of agency maladministration, unfairness, unreasonableness, arbitrariness, arrogance, rudeness, oppressiveness, inefficiency, improper motivation, unwarranted delay, clear violations of laws or regulations, or other abuse of authority, and (b) on its own initiative, to investigate, study and make recommendations with regard to agency acts, practices and procedures.

§ 1171. *Office of public complaints; ombudsman.* There shall be an office of public complaints, the head of which shall be the ombudsman.

§ 1172. *Definitions.* a. "Agency" means any department or other governmental unit (whether or not within or subject to control or review by any other agency), any official, or any employee of the city of New York, other than (1) the board of estimate only insofar as it acts as a board, (2) the council, its members and their staffs, (3) the courts, and (4) the mayor, the deputy mayors, their assistants and their staffs.

b. "Agency act" includes every action, omission, failure to act, decision, rule or regulation, interpretation, recommendation, policy, practice or procedure of an agency.

§ 1173. *Ombudsman; appointment; term of office; removal; vacancy; salary.* The ombudsman shall be appointed by the mayor with the advice and consent of the council provided two-thirds of the councilmen, present and voting, concur. He shall serve for a term of five years, and shall devote his full time to the duties of said office. He may be removed by the council by a vote of three-quarters of the councilmen present and voting upon their determining that he has become physically or mentally disabled for more than six months or has been guilty of malfeasance. If the office of ombudsman becomes vacant for any reason, the mayor shall forthwith appoint a new ombudsman in the same manner as stated above to serve for the unexpired portion of the term. The ombudsman shall receive compensation in an amount equal to that of a Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York serving in New York City.

§ 1174. *Organization of office of public complaints.* a. The ombudsman may select, appoint, and compensate as he may see fit (within the amount available by appropriation) such assistants and employees as he may deem necessary to discharge his responsibilities under this law; and such appointments, to the extent permissible under the law of the State of New York, shall not be subject to the requirements of the civil service law.

b. The ombudsman shall designate one of his assistants to be deputy ombudsman who shall serve as acting ombudsman when there is a vacancy in the office of ombudsman.

c. The ombudsman may delegate to members of his staff any of his authority or duties under this law except this power of delegation and the duty of formally making recommendations to agencies or reports to the mayor or the council; provided, however, that the ombudsman may delegate any of his authority or duties under this law to the deputy ombudsman when the ombudsman is unable to perform them on account of disability or absence.

§ 1175. *Powers.* The ombudsman shall have the following powers:

a. He may investigate, on complaint or on his own motion, any agency act, and make such findings and recommendations he deems appropriate.

b. He may prescribe the methods by which complaints are to be made, received, and acted upon; he may determine the scope and manner of investigations to be made; and, subject to the requirements of this law, he may determine the form, frequency, and distribution of his findings and recommendations.

c. He may request and shall be given by each agency the assistance and information he deems necessary for the discharge of his responsibilities; he may inspect and examine any and all records and documents of all agencies to the extent not prohibited by state law; and he may enter and inspect any and all premises within any agency's control; provided that any information received by him which by law is confidential shall not be disclosed.

d. He may issue subpoenas, in accordance with the provisions of CPLR Sec. 2302, to compel any agency or any other person to appear, give sworn testimony, or produce documentary or other evidence the ombudsman deems relevant to a matter under his inquiry. A person thus required to provide information shall be paid the same fees and travel allowances as witnesses in the courts of this state, and shall also be entitled to have counsel while being questioned.

e. He may, on his own initiative, undertake, participate in, and cooperate with general studies or inquiries of agency functions, practices and procedures, whether or not related to any particular complaint or agency act, and may make any findings or recommendations he deems appropriate.

f. He may do all things reasonably necessary or appropriate to the exercise of the foregoing powers.

§ 1176. *Basis for action.* The ombudsman may receive a complaint from any person concerning an agency act. He shall investigate the matters complained of unless, in his sole discretion, he determines that:

a. the complainant has available to him an adequate remedy which he could reasonably be expected to use;

b. the complaint pertains to a matter outside the ombudsman's jurisdiction;

c. the complainant does not have a direct interest in the subject matter of the complaint;

d. the complaint is trivial, frivolous, vexatious, or not made in good faith;

e. the complaint has been too long delayed;

f. the ombudsman's resources are insufficient for adequate investigation;

g. the matter is otherwise inappropriate for investigation.

Where the ombudsman decides not to investigate a complaint, he shall so notify the complainant, stating his reasons therefor.

§ 1177. *Findings and recommendations; notification of complainant and agency; publication.*

a. After completing the processing of a complaint the ombudsman shall, where possible, notify complainant of his findings and recommendations.

b. If, after investigation, but prior to publication of any findings, recommendations or report, the ombudsman finds that any agency should (1) consider the matter further, (2) modify, amend or cancel an agency act, (3) explain more fully the agency act in question, (4) take any other action, he shall notify the agency of such findings together with his recommendations. The ombudsman may request the agency to inform him, within a specified reasonable time, of any action taken by the agency on his recommendations.

c. After notification to the agency as above provided, and after the agency has had a reasonable opportunity to answer, the ombudsman may, if he deems the matter of sufficient importance, transmit his findings and recommendations to the mayor and the council or any of its committees. He may also make such findings and recommendations available to the press and the public. When publishing a finding or recommendation adverse to an agency he shall, unless excused by the agency or person affected, include any statement the agency may have made to him by way of explanation.

§ 1178. *Annual reports.* In addition to whatever reports he may make from time to time, the ombudsman shall on or about February 15 of each year report to the mayor and to the council concerning the exercise of his functions during the preceding calendar year.

§ 1179. *Disciplinary action against public personnel.* If the ombudsman has reason to believe that any public officer or employee has acted in a manner warranting criminal or disciplinary proceedings, he shall refer the matter to the appropriate authorities.

§ 1180. *Immunities.* No proceeding finding, recommendation, or report of the ombudsman conducted or made in accordance with the provisions of this law shall be reviewable in any court.

§ 1181. *Obstruction.* A person who willfully obstructs or hinders the proper exercise of the ombudsman's functions, or who willfully misleads or attempts to mislead the ombudsman in his inquiries, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by imprisonment for not more than six months or a fine of $5,000, or both.

§ 1182. *Construction.* If any provision of this law or the application thereof is held invalid, the remainder of this law or other application of such provision shall not be affected. No legislation shall be held to supersede or modify the provisions of this law except to the extent that such legislation shall do so expressly.

Section 2. *Effective date.* This local law shall take effect immediately.

Section 3. Section 804 of the charter of the city of New York is hereby repealed.

Respectfully submitted,

Milton M. Carrow, *Chairman;* Faith Colish, Martin R. Gold, Stephen R. Kaye, Kenneth J. Jones, Bernard J. Ruggieri, Jerome E. Sharfman, Llewellyn P. Young, Joseph S. Borus, William Q. Keenan, Melvin D. Kraft, Stephen A. Lefkowitz, Seymour B. Quel, Bernard Schwartz, Thomas Thatcher, [1] Ruth Toch, [1] Stanley Buchsbaum, [1] Victor F. Condello, Alexander Holtzman, Robert O. Lehrman, Malcolm S. Mason, Harold L. Richman, John E. H. Sherry, Norman Solovay.

IS THE GREAT SOCIETY A GUIDEPOST TO PERDITION?

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, on Monday two events occurred which pose real threats to the moral fabric of our Nation. The first event involved a further liberalizing of the Supreme Court's already questionable rules regarding the distribution of obscene and pornographic publications. In a 7-to-2 decision, the Court handed down a ruling which will add materially to the gain of every smut dealer in the country, and sadden the heart of every parent concerned with protecting the morals of his children.

FREE SPEECH VERSUS LICENSE TO POLLUTE

After the historic decision in the Ginzburg case last year, it was fervently hoped that the Justices had been awakened to the growing public indignation against the purveyors of filth. Not so, said the Court, in reversing convictions against publishers and distributors of 10 "girlie" magazines, and two sex-laden spicy paperbacks. In spite of the fact that the supreme courts of the States of Arkansas, Kentucky, and New York had found these books lewd, immoral, and without any literary content, the U.S. High Tribunal threw out the convictions on the basis that the publications were protected by constitutional guarantees of free speech.

Surely our Founding Fathers in providing for freedom of speech as a basic tenet under our Constitution, never intended that this right would be subverted as a license to pollute the mail, our libraries and bookstores with unmitigated trash such as the publications involved in the cases decided by the Court.

CONSTITUENTS PROTEST

In almost every delivery of mail to my office, there is an irate letter from a constituent regarding the amount of pornographic books to be found on local newsstands, and advertisements received through the mail offering for sale smut of every description. It is most frustrating to have to advise these good citizens that in spite of numerous local, State, and Federal laws restricting the distribution of this material, that the Supreme Court has repeatedly refused to uphold the constitutionality of such laws.

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATERIAL

Mr. President, on the other hand, I was happy to learn that the Government Operations Committee has today ordered reported S. 188, a bill which I have jointly cosponsored with Senator MUNDT and 26 other Senators, to create a Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials. Section I of this bill states:

> The Congress finds that traffic in obscene matters and materials is a matter of grave national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. The Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation. The State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials. Governmental action to be effective needs the support and cooperation of an informed public. It is the purpose of this Act to bring about a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private

---

[1] Abstain.

groups, to combat by all constitutional means this pernicious traffic.

It is my hope that Congress will enact this bill at an early date and set in motion the necessary machinery to find a lasting solution which might curb the wholesale distribution of pornography through the various media of communication.

TASK FORCE REPORT BY CRIME COMMISSION

The second event which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues relates to a task force report issued by President Johnson's National Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. This supplement contains 178 pages and deals with administration of justice in our courts. I am particularly concerned about certain recommendations in the task force report which calls for the modification or abolishment of present laws dealing with drunks, drug offenses, disorderly conduct, vagrancy, abortion, and sex offenses.

There is an overtone throughout the report which seems to condone or excuse drunkenness and disorderly conduct, and concludes that most social problems should be left to social agencies. The report indicates that "consensual activities now termed offenses affect no one but the participants and are not the affair of the public at large."

GOOD MORALS ARE A PUBLIC CONCERN

Mr. President, it is my belief that the public does have a legitimate interest in good morals and that this problem should not be so lightly dealt with by the President's Crime Commission.

I am reminded of those oft-quoted lines from Alexander Pope's "Essay on Man":

Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As to be hated needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD an editorial from the Washington Star for May 9, 1967, entitled "Big Day for Smut."

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIG DAY FOR SMUT

A number of smutty publications which had been declared obscene in three states—New York, Kentucky, and Arkansas—now enjoy, thanks to a majority of the Supreme Court, the mantle of constitutional protection.

This latest ruling reveals a court that is hopelessly divided on the issue of what constitutes punishable obscenity. At least two of the justices think that anything goes. The attitudes of the others vary in more or less significant respects. But the impression which survives is that this court would sanction almost any kind of smut as long as it does not involve the forbidden "pandering" aspects of the Ginzburg case. And that was a 5-to-4 decision.

The dissenting opinion by Justices Harlan and Clark points out that the majority changed the rules in the middle of the game in this instance. The grounds upon which the court originally agreed to review the three cases were abandoned, with the result that the issue of obscenity or otherwise was not dealt with either in the briefs or in the arguments. "In short," said Justice Harlan, "the court disposes of the cases on the issue that was deliberately excluded from review, and refuses to pass on the questions that brought the cases here."

He went on to say that "in my opinion these dispositions do not reflect well on the processes of the court, and I think the issues for which the cases were taken should be decided."

We would go a step farther. Not only should the issues (of obscenity or otherwise) have been decided, but they should have been decided so as to make punishable the sale of "girlie" junk which, masquerading as "literature," is contributing its not insubstantial bit to the corruption of our society.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY: A COMMEMORATION

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, on May 10, 1877, the Rumanian people declared their independence from Ottoman rule. Today—90 years later—these people are not free. The Rumanian people know oppression—they have known it for centuries. For two centuries prior to their independence in 1877, Rumania was dominated by the Ottoman Empire. But the concomitance of knowing oppression is knowing how to survive under it. This the Rumanians also know.

It is no irony that Rumania gained her freedom in 1877 with the aid of the czarist Russian forces, and lost her freedom to Communist Russian forces at the end of World War II. From the end of the 16th century until Independence Day in 1877, the Russian troops had entered Rumanian territory at least 13 times. Indeed, after 1877 and during World War I, to avoid Russian encroachment, Rumania closely allied herself with the West.

The irony is the Russian inability to understand the Rumanians, for as I have said, while the Rumanians have known oppression, they also know how to survive it. And the Russian oppression has been terrible—from concentration camps to economic exploitation, from complete Soviet control to isolation from the West.

But now there are signs—certain important signs—that Rumania is slowly and carefully drawing away from the Soviet Union. It is only a beginning, this is true, but it is the beginning of Rumania's reassertion of herself. Rumania has insisted upon an economic future apart from the Soviet Union's rigid plans; compulsory study of the Russian language has been abolished; such things as the Russian spelling of many street names has been discontinued; Rumanian officials in the United Nations have refused to follow the Russian lines on several occasions; and cultural exchanges with the West have increased.

But while we can be hopeful, we must temper our hope with realism, for Rumania is not free. We must not harbor false illusions, for Rumania has been a small country buffeted by great power rivalries for centuries. Freedom will not come to Rumania today, nor tomorrow; but we can hope that it will come sometime in the future. And we base our hope on our knowledge of the inherent strength of the Rumanian people.

To all Rumanians, we pay tribute to your Independence Day. Know that our best wishes are with you, and know that we are proud to salute your valiant spirit.

WITHDRAWAL OF TROOPS FROM EUROPE AND AVAILABLE HOUSING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the recent decision to withdraw some 35,000 Army and Air Force personnel from Europe for assignment to bases in the United States prompts me to express my concern with the possible effect that such redeployment will have on existing housing for these personnel and their families upon their return.

As is well known to those close to the housing problems of our servicemen, there exists in various parts of the country housing shortages in both on-base and off-base facilities. This is a situation deserving of close study and remedial action.

With the current problem in this area so serious, I feel we can realistically anticipate a further compounding of the problem when the troop redeployment is implemented; and, certainly, Congress should lay the groundwork now for such corrective attention as may be necessary and possible.

I always have taken the position that there is a vital connection between the housing needs of our servicemen and the morale and well being of both them and their families. The serviceman is no less concerned with the need and desire for decent housing than is his civilian counterpart. Likewise, the maintenance of our military posture is immeasurably advanced by relieving the serviceman of apprehension that his family will be wanting for a decent home environment in the community where he is called upon to serve his country.

In my joint capacity as both a member of the Committee on Armed Services and as the ranking minority member of the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I have a continuing interest in addressing myself to the problems encountered by our servicemen in the area of housing.

Mr. President, in light of the possible plight that may confront these returning servicemen and their families, I am requesting the appropriate authorities in the Department of Defense to cooperate with the Housing and Urban Affairs Subcommittee staff members and Armed Services Committee staff members to identify and study military housing problem areas; and, in particular, the possible effect upon such housing as may result from this pending troop redeployment. I am hopeful that such action can be expedited so as to insure that any required legislative remedies can be initiated at the earliest possible date.

ESCALATION HAS "CONSPICUOUSLY FAILED," SAY EVANS AND NOVAK

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the writing duo of columnists, Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, whose Inside Report is widely published in the daily press, in today's Washington Post come to the conclusion that—

> Escalation of the bombing in the North and on the ground in the South, while essential in part to prevent losing the war, have conspicuously failed to bring it either to negotiations or to a military conclusion.

It seems to me particularly significant that the Inside Report column is devoted to appraisal of the escalation policy we are following as a failure. Further, they raise the highly pertinent question of where this policy may lead us, since there are left on the ladder of escalation only "a couple of rungs left to go." The 16 months of bombing escalation has not yet led to the sought-for "breakdown of enemy morale and negotiations." Nor do they find it likely to do so as we "near the end of the escalation ladder."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this article may appear in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Johnson's Healthy Skepticism

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

Whatever he says publicly, President Johnson must now be having agonizing doubts about the effectiveness of his policy of escalation in Vietnam.

The harsh truth is that Mr. Johnson, prodded by his military advisers, has all but climbed the escalation ladder, and is now near the top-most rung, with growing indications that when he gets there he won't find the bacon: A breakdown of enemy morale and negotiations.

The bombing of the North that started in February, 1965, against supply depots has been gradually and discreetly extended month by month. It has encompassed supply routes in North Vietnam and along the Ho Chi Minh trail, oil depots, power plants and industrial facilities in the North.

Lately the President gave his approval to the bombing of two of the main northern airfields near Hanoi and Haiphong on which Soviet-built Mig fighter planes are based.

This ladder of escalation now only has a couple of rungs left to go, mainly the port facilities at Haiphong and possibly the harbor itself, which the military have been urging the President to mine in an effort to deny Soviet and Eastern European ships one of their major inlets for aid to Hanoi.

At the same time, the twin of air escalation in the North has been ground escalation in the South. No question about it, without this ground escalation—from some 20,000 "advisers" in South Vietnam when Lyndon Johnson became President to the present level of nearly 500,000 troops—most of South Vietnam would long since have fallen to the enemy.

But even with the rapid increase in ground troops, President Johnson today can scarcely count on a successful end of the conflict any more than he could in July, 1965, when the reinforcements on the ground started in earnest.

Moreover, Hanoi seems to have made elaborate plans to deal with this ground escalation. In one of the most revealing of the many documents captured by the U.S. Army in South Vietnam, the Deputy Chief of the North Vietnamese Army, General Vinh, anticipated the particularly difficult military situation that, he said, would continue to confront the United States.

Vinh pointedly noted the difference between the Korean War, where "the enemy (that is, the U.S.) sent all his troops to the front," and the war in Vietnam.

"In South Vietnam," Vinh told Vietcong leaders in the spring of 1966, "the enemy has introduced between 300,000 and 600,000 troops who must fight on the front line and, at the same time, *protect the rear* (from the Vietcong guerrillas).

"But he can fulfill only one of these tasks. If his troops oppose our people's movement in the South, they will be unable to stop reinforcements from North Vietnam. If they concentrate their force to stop reinforcements from North Vietnam, they cannot stand firm on the front in the rear . . . To fulfill both these tasks, they must have a million troops. To introduce a million troops into South Vietnam, the United States must double its mobilization rate."

There is, of course, a large element of braggadocio in these words of General Vinh, who is also chairman of the Reunification Department of the Lao Dong (Communist Party) of North Vietnam.

But what is happening today in the First Corps area of South Vietnam—the northern part of the country adjoining the Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) at the 17th parallel—gives his words an ominous ring.

When several divisions of North Vietnam's army moved south near the DMZ, raising the specter of possibly massive attack, Gen. William Westmoreland was forced to deplete his troops in the midlands and rush reinforcements to the First Corps.

In short, escalation of the bombing in the North and on the ground in the South, while essential in part to prevent losing the war, have conspicuously failed to bring it either to negotiations or to a military conclusion.

As Mr. Johnson nears the end of the escalation ladder, his military advisers doubtless have a new set of escalation plans for him. This time, however, they will be dealing with a more skeptical Commander-in-Chief.

OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, two centuries ago, Oliver Goldsmith wrote:

> Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.

That had been true for centuries, and has been true until very recently. But now the legal profession has recognized that because the poor have never had lawyers, our legal system has had a kind of built-in bias against the poor. The Nation's lawyers, in their legal aid societies, found the mechanism for removing this bias, but did not have the resources to do the job. The legal services program of OEO has begun to fill this gap. New legal services agencies financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity as part of the war on poverty are providing legal help to about 300,000 low-income people this fiscal year. Some 1,200 lawyers are working in 600 neighborhood law offices in low-income areas of 40 States, including most of the 50 largest cities. For the first time, many rural areas have access to legal assistance in civil matters. These include Indian reservations, migrant farm communities, and States like Montana, Alaska, and Hawaii.

These new agencies provide counsel and representation to poor clients in housing, consumer matters, domestic relations, welfare, and juvenile problems. They are practicing a new kind of preventive law, providing education in legal rights and responsibilities to people who have long regarded the law as their enemy. Neighborhood attorneys are helping slum community groups to vindicate their rights, and to win their rightful share of public services and facilities, from medical care to street lights. They help slum groups to set up self-help institutions such as credit unions, buying cooperatives, and community associations. Perhaps most important, neighborhood lawyers are working to reform the law so that it operates more fairly toward the poor. Through test cases and legislative study and recommendations, they seek to change laws, administrative policies, and business practices that are commonly used to take unfair advantage of low-income people. For example, in my own State the Boston University law and poverty project is making a comprehensive study of Massachusetts housing law as it relates to the poor. When it is completed, the project will propose legislative reforms.

Certainly the purpose of these programs is not to prevent riots, nor need a community threaten violence to get the benefit of them. Yet there can be no denying that every legal services attorney contributes to community peace and harmony by offering even the most deprived citizen the dignity and satisfaction of knowing that he can have the law as his servant to solve his problems. If a man cannot feel equal before the law, his respect for the law must suffer. If society does not let him use its legal machinery to attain his goals, his stake in that society must be lessened.

Thus the communities which have moved ahead with legal services programs can be proud not so much because they have done a deed of philanthropy to their less fortunate neighbors, but because they have helped to strengthen the whole fabric of society by enabling the poor to eat of one of its most precious fruits—law and justice.

I take this opportunity to congratulate one of my neighboring States, Vermont, for the fine support it has given to the OEO legal services program. Last month the Vermont Legislature appropriated $50,000 in State funds to provide the local share for the statewide legal services program currently pending as an application in OEO.

Many members of the Vermont bar spent substantial time and effort assisting in the development of the statewide program, which includes the use of full-time staff attorneys to provide comprehensive legal services in all civil matters to those who cannot afford a private attorney. The leadership of the Vermont bar, both Republicans and Democrats alike, testified in support of the appropriation. Largely through their efforts, passage through the Vermont Senate and House was achieved.

Vermont is to be commended for the impressive and meaningful way it is trying to insure that all its citizens receive equal justice. The action of the Vermont bar and the Vermont Legislature is indicative of the broad support the OEO legal services program is receiving from coast to coast.

A recent survey of legal services agencies well demonstrates the quality of the work that the neighborhood lawyers are doing. Among its findings is the fact that these lawyers have won 75 percent of their court trials and nearly two-thirds of their court appeals. Almost 90 percent of the poor families who came to the legal services offices for help in fighting eviction from their homes were successful in obtaining relief. In 80 percent of the welfare cutoff cases, the lawyers were able to obtain reversals and get resumption of payments. And these cold statistics can only give a hint of the gain in human terms, the feeling of those who cannot make their own way in society's institutions that they can still avail themselves of them and be part of the society.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the OEO release describing this survey be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEIGHBORHOOD LAWYERS WIN 75 PERCENT OF COURT TRIALS, FIRST FIGURES SHOW

Neighborhood Legal Services programs financed by the Office of Economic Opportunity won three-fourths of the 4,000 court trials in which they were involved in the last half of 1966, OEO Director Sargent Shriver reported today.

The six month period was the first in which a sizeable number of legal services agencies were in operation. The OEO Legal Services program was established and began making grants in the fall of 1965.

The first figures for the period, reported by 104 operating agencies in 35 states, showed that neighborhood law offices in low income areas handled 92,000 cases for indigent families involving consumer, family, housing, welfare-administrative, juvenile and school problems.

Neighborhood attorneys won nearly two-thirds of the 71 court appeals filed in the period.

They averted or won stays of 89 percent of the 650 evictions sought against poverty-striken families.

They obtained reversals of 80 percent of 200 decisions cutting clients off public assistance in which hearings were held.

"We are most gratified by the successes reflected in these first statistics on the program," Shriver said. "They document the tremendous need for legal help among the poor, and equally important, they show that the legal assistance provided is of a high quality. The lawyers are winning cases, which is all any client can ask."

He estimated that more than 300,000 cases will have been handled in the fiscal year ending June 30 by the 201 legal services agencies funded by OEO. These locally-organized agencies have about 1,200 lawyers staffing 600 neighborhood law offices in low income areas of 40 states including 44 of the 50 largest cities.

Earl Johnson Jr., OEO Legal Services director, said that program totals would be much higher in the first half of this year than in the last half of 1966 because many projects did not begin operations until last November and December.

Johnson said the results in welfare cases "demonstrate how important it is for anyone affected by government action to have a good lawyer. And they indicate how arbitrarily welfare recipients are treated by some local and state welfare departments."

"Clients come to the neighborhood lawyer reporting they have been stricken from the welfare rolls because they allegedly were guilty of violating a rule or because they were no longer eligible," he said. "In 80 percent of the cases, legal services lawyers were able to prove that the welfare departments were in error and the welfare payments were restored."

Of the 92,000 cases handled, 37 percent involved family problems such as divorce, annulment, non-support, and adoption; 28 percent involved juveniles, school cases and misdemeanors; 19 percent concerned sales contracts, wage claims, and bankruptcy; 9 percent involved landlord-tenant disputes, housing code violations, and public housing, and 7 percent involved administrative problems with welfare, social security, workmen's compensation, and other agencies.

Although 15,000 cases involved clients who wanted to start divorce or annulment proceedings, only 1900 divorces or annulments were actually obtained. Johnson said the figures indicate that although clients initially thought of divorce as a solution to their difficulties, neighborhood lawyers helped many to find other solutions.

A relatively small proportion of the cases resulted in litigation.

Of 74,000 cases reported on by 73 of the agencies, 38 percent of the clients received advice only, 44 percent were represented in disputes that did not reach the courts, and 14 percent of the cases resulted in court actions. About 35 percent were referred to private lawyers, antipoverty and other social agencies. But most of those referred to other agencies for non-legal needs required continued help from the legal services agency.

Nearly 2 million slum residents received community education in legal rights and responsibilities through lectures, group discussions, debates, slide and film presentations held before church groups, PTA's, tenant associations and block clubs.

Some 12,000 persons who sought help at neighborhood law offices were not accepted, either because they could afford a private attorney or because their problems did not require a lawyer's attention. Those who did not meet indigency standards were referred to private attorneys.

Nearly one-half of the OEO programs are conducted by established Legal Aid Societies which have reorganized themselves and expanded their programs to comply with Legal Services guidelines. The program is strongly supported by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association, the American Bar Association, and the National Bar Association.

CENTENARY COLLEGE CELEBRATES 100 YEARS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I should like to herald the president, administration, faculty, student body, and the centennial celebration committee of Centenary College for Women in Hackettstown, N.J., on this, their 100th anniversary. Centenary College is one of our fine institutions offering 2 years of higher education in the State of New Jersey. It was founded by the Newark annual conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1866, and was granted its charter by the New Jersey Legislature in 1867. It was the first college in New Jersey, and one of the first in the Nation, to grant a degree to a woman.

Centenary has excelled in meeting the changing demands of education through these hundred years. The faculty and administration have developed a progressive curriculum combining occupational preparation and liberal arts education to insure the student's maximum growth and development and to facilitate their movement into the community. This small residential college institutes its program through a strictly individualized plan.

A century of existence is an achievement in itself, and I commend Centenary College for the forward-looking strides it has made in the education of our young women.

HOMEOWNERSHIP FOR LOWER INCOME FAMILIES—THE CONDOMINIUM PLAN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to an article recently brought to my attention. It is by Prof. Jan Krasnowiecki of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, and deals with the feasibility of providing homeownership for lower income families through the condominium concept.

To those who refuse to believe that poor families can meet the costs of homeownership, I recommend a careful reading of Professor Krasnowiecki's actual case example, taken from official records of the city of New York. Even if one adds more than $5,000 to the acquisition cost of this particular building, as suggested in footnote 3 to the article, to get a total cost of $45,000 or $5,000 per apartment, the debt service for various terms and rates is still extremely low, as shown by the table:

Debt service for a $5,000 mortgage

	Interest		
	3 percent	4 percent	6½ percent
Years:			
15	$34.53	$36.99	$43.56
20	27.73	30.30	37.28
30	21.08	23.88	31.61
40	17.90	20.90	29.28

Using the 30-year, 3-percent figure, and adding as much as $41.42 per month for taxes, insurance, maintenance, heat, and utilities, the monthly housing cost to the condominium unit owner is still only $62.50. A monthly housing cost of $62.50, assuming a family spends 25-percent of its income on housing, indicates an income of $3,000 a year, which is poor by any family's standards.

I think it is interesting that Professor Krasnowiecki finds the administration's rent subsidy plan unattractive, and places a high value on the psychological advantages of homeownership.

I commend this article, from the Virginia Law Weekly of March 3, 1966, to Members of this body, and ask consent that it be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROFESSOR SUGGESTS USE OF CONDOMINIUM CONCEPT

(By Jan Krasnowiecki)

(NOTE.—Jan Krasnowiecki is a Professor of Law at the University of Pennsylvania. He received an M.A. and B.C.L. from Oxford and his LL.M. from Harvard University Law School.)

In this article, I want to present some very tentative thoughts about how the condominium form of ownership might be used in a program to increase the supply of decent low cost housing—particularly in the city.

THE CONDOMINIUM

Most people think of the condominium as a form of apartment ownership. The apartment owner gets title to his unit, his own mortgage and shares the common portions of the building and the site with the other unit owners. The role of the condominium form of ownership can be better understood by taking note of certain characteristics of housing. The important distinction here is between housing whose physical characteristics make it possible to allocate substantially all of the elements of the project, site and structures among the owners for their own exclusive use and housing whose physical characteristics make such exclusive allocation impossible. From the physical point of view, one can think of housing as lying on a scale, at one extreme very few elements need be shared; at the other, very few elements can be offered exclusively to the owner. The condominium provides a new legal and financial structure for housing which requires a good deal of sharing. The condominium cannot offer greater physical isolation than the form of housing allows, nor greater freedom from restraint than is consonant with the rights of others. Its major contribution is to financial independence. Even here, however, the independence is no greater than the physical proximity and unity of the project will permit.

Financing explored

To explore the point about financial independence, let me start with the single family detached residential subdivision. Here the developer will present his project to a home mortgage lender for a "take-out" commitment. Under this commitment the prospective home mortgage lender will, subject to various conditions as to quality of the construction, local approvals and so forth, commit himself to lend to each prospective home buyer a certain amount on each completed home at the time of sale. Armed with this commitment, the developer will then obtain his construction financing, either from the same lender or from another. If the developer has obtained the raw land under a purchase money mortgage or other secured loan, that loan will be paid off or subordinated to the construction loan. The terms of the construction loan will, in turn, provide that with the sale of each home the construction loan and any other subordinated loan will be cleared at closing as to that lot or home. If the home purchaser needs financing, the take-out lender will stand ready to take over at this point. The home purchaser, of course, is free to find his own financing if he can get more attractive terms elsewhere. Thus, in the typical financing of a residential subdivision, the financing is lined up back to back, the prop being the take-out lender and his commitment. Without the commitment, very little residential construction would begin.

Consider now the position of the take-out lender. Since he will take over, unit by unit, he will want to be sure that the value he attributes to each unit will be there in realizable form in case there is a default on his mortgage. So long as the full enjoyment of each unit is not too heavily dependent on the completion of the entire project, his risk in coming in and standing behind each unit purchaser is held to a minimum. Similarly, the thought that he may not be the only lender in the project, that other lenders, less careful than he, may lend to purchasers who are overextending themselves, is not too disturbing. Note how these thoughts change as we move up (or down, if you prefer) on the housing scale—to housing which requires a good deal of sharing of various elements of the project—through, for example, townhouse on the green to garden apartment and highrise. The point here is that the reluctance of the mortgage lender to participate on a unit-by-unit basis tends to increase as more elements of the project must be shared for full enjoyment of the unit. His natural preference is to finance such projects on a project basis—ending up with a single blanket mortgage on all of its elements. Where mortgage financing is limited to the project as a whole, the home buyer is relegated to the common law's oldest financing device—the leasehold.

Cooperatives compared

Before the advent of the condominium, the closest the home buyer could get to outright ownership in this situation was through the cooperative organization. The mortgage would be placed on the project as a whole by the organization which would own the buildings and site. Each home buyer would, on coming in, contribute to the down payment on the blanket mortgage and obtain a renewable leasehold (or other possessory) interest in his unit or home from the organization. At the same time, he would become part owner of the organization through the issuance of shares or other participation rights—he would thus become his own landlord in common with the other tenants.

From the point of view of the home or dwelling unit owner, the chief disadvantage of this form of ownership stems from the presence of a single blanket mortgage on the whole project. No matter how indefeasible might be his rights under the lease, they are subject to the blanket mortgage and the presence of that mortgage exposes him to more financial dependence on the other tenants than would be the case if each tenant had financed the cost of his unit individually. At the same time, as long as individual financing was generally unavailable, the cooperative tenant was placed in a disadvantageous position in his attempt to recover the equity which he had built up by making payments on the blanket mortgage.

Cites advantages

One of the main purposes of the condominium form of ownership is to secure to the individual unit owner the advantages of individual financing—to avoid the disadvantages of a blanket mortgage. To persuade mortgage lenders to participate on a unit-by-unit basis in housing which requires that many elements be shared, the leasehold form of ownership had to be abandoned. At this point, however, a note of caution is necessary. It would be misleading to say that home mortgage lenders were reluctant to accept the cooperative interest as security merely because it involved a leasehold. It is true that the cooperative leasehold was generally less secure against termination and more subject to control by the organization than a fee simple absolute interest might be.

But while less security and more control are commonly incidents of the leasehold interest, the common law does not prohibit the creation of leaseholds that eliminate these incidents. If the cooperative leasehold offered less security to the unit owner it was because what would give more security to one tenant might give less security to the others. This was one of my original points. Independence is a relative term particularly in housing which demands sharing of many of the elements of the project. The physical interdependence remains even if the legal arrangement removes most of the restraints. This is one of the dilemmas of the condominium. The individual unit mortgage lender must have the legal independence for his security which the fee interest offers, but he is keenly aware of the fact that there is danger in this independence when much of the value of the mortgaged unit is attributable to elements which must be shared and maintained out of contributions by all unit owners. In the end, then, the success of the condominium in an unsubsidized market depends on a showing that the market is as good and preferably better than in comparable rental or cooperative housing. In areas where there is doubt about this, we may expect that mortgage lenders will tend to offer something less in terms of loan to value ratio than they are willing to offer on a project (blanket) mortgage basis.

Doubts weighed

But many of the doubts that account for slow progress of the condominium idea in some parts of the country, in the open market, should have little weight when we come to consider the value of the condominium as a vehicle for providing government insured or otherwise subsidized low cost housing in the city. The condominium has psychological advantages over rental housing which, to my mind, are essential to the success of the low cost housing effort in the city. I believe that the condominium form of ownership may serve as a particularly effective vehicle in a program of rehabilitation. Recognizing that, in a brief discussion of this sort, I will necessarily leave the reader with many unanswered questions and as many doubts, I now turn to the elements of such a program.

The easiest way to describe the proposal, is to take some concrete figures. The figures are taken from a table appearing in the New York Rehabilitation Report[1] of 1963 describing the effects of rehabilitation in a typical nine-apartment building in the St. Nicholas Park Study Area. Postulating an average rental of $50 per apartment and a rehabilitation cost of $26,287, the table shows increases of from $20 to $25 in rentals for each apartment after rehabilitation (under various financing methods). Even with a government insured rehabilitation loan the rental increase is about $20.

THE PROPOSAL

Suppose the building were condemned outright by an appropriate government agency and rehabilitated (the tenants remaining in the building). After rehabilitation is completed, the *title* to the building would be redistributed to all of the tenants as *unit owners* (under the condominium principle). The total cost of condemnation and rehabilitation would be refinanced through individual mortgages on each individual unit supported by government insurance. Let me show what the figures would be if the individual mortgages were insured under a program allowing a loan to value ratio of 100 per cent and an interest rate of four per cent (actually the interest rate could be less—as it is under the current Section 221(d)(3) program).[2]

The cost of outright condemnation should be $13,200 (this is the estimated present market value of the building shown on the table).[3] The cost of rehabilitation (entire building) is $26,287. Total cost of condemnation and rehabilitation should be $39,487. The government agency owns the building outright during the course of rehabilitation (the tenants remaining and paying the old rent). When rehabilitation is completed, the title is redistributed to all of the tenants on an individual unit ownership basis (the condominium).

---

[1] Rehabilitation Report, City of New York, 29 (1963).

[2] Section 221(d)(3), Housing Act, 1934 as amended. That program, as presently limited, would not be available under my proposal. The long-term, low-interest mortgage insurance of Section 221(d)(3) is available only to non-profit or limited dividend housing organizations (to insure a blanket mortgage on the whole project). It is not available to individuals for financing the purchase of an individual home or condominium unit. The reason for the non-profit or limited dividend requirement is clear. If the long-term, below-market interest rate mortgage were made available to unlimited profit landlords, the benefits could be siphoned off by the landlord and would never reach the housing consumer. Why not make the long-term, low-interest rate mortgages available to the housing consumer directly rather than merely through a non-profit or limited dividend organization? The desire here was to assure that the housing generated by the program would remain in the low cost field for a substantial period. If the program were extended to individual home purchases, the home or dwelling-unit might be resold at whatever price the market would bear. Thus, the housing generated by the program could rapidly drop out of the low price range. Surely, however, this problem might be handled by appropriate limitations on the resale price of units financed under the program—if necessary (because of the common law doctrine against restraints on alienation) with the help of legislation.

[3] The estimated present market value for the building in question may be unduly low. My understanding is that the total, per unit, cost (acquisition plus rehabilitation) in the current 114th Street Rehabilitation project has run perhaps $5,000 more than the figure obtained on the building described in the table to which I refer. Aside from the differences in the type of building and area involved, however, the 114th Street project has to rely on negotiated acquisition. In this context, there may be a significant inflation of cost through hold out. Moreover, I would

Assuming the nine units are of equal size and value, each unit owner would have to pay $4,609.66 for his unit to retire the entire government cost. Because the building is converted to the unit ownership basis the tenant can obtain his own individual mortgage on his own individual unit. If the program is combined with a government insurance (or direct loan) program of the sort I have postulated (100 per cent loan to value ratio at four per cent—or less), the tenant can get a mortgage loan of $4,609.66 paying approximately: $34 monthly on a 15-year mortgage, $28 monthly on a 20-year mortgage, $22 monthly on a 30-year mortgage, $19 monthly on a 40-year mortgage.

It remains only to determine what is the cost of providing an adequate level of repair, maintenance and service (and what reserves should be maintained) by the condominium organization. For example, if the cost is less than $16 monthly per unit the program need only make a 15-year mortgage available without causing any increase in monthly payments by the unit owners [$16 (monthly maintenance charge) + $34 (monthly payment to principal and interest on the unit mortgage) = $50 (the previous rental)]. If a 40-year mortgage program is made available the tenants would each have $31 monthly to spare for maintenance and services. Let me emphasize some of the important features of this proposal:

The subsidy feature: Under the example given there appears to be no subsidy at all. The cost of condemnation and rehabilitation to the government was $39,487. Upon distribution of title to each unit, each unit owner obtained an individual mortgage loan of $4,609.66, paying this amount to the government agency for title to his unit. Nine unit owners having done this, the government has been reimbursed $39,487. However, the program requires that the mortgage loans be government insured on a 100 per cent loan to value ratio. The subsidy then is the *risk of loss* upon default. With the current demand for decent, low cost housing this is hardly a real subsidy. A form of subsidy is found inthe below-market interest rate because under such a program, the mortgages will tend to end up in the F.N.M.A. portfolio. In effect, government will be lending the mortgage principal at below-market rates. However, this is an accepted feature of the current below-market interest mortgage insurance program.

Subsidy possible

I do not overlook the possibility that another subsidy may be necessary. The assumption in my example is that, given any current rental level (in my example $50), it is possible to convert the ownership from rental to individual unit ownership, absorb the whole cost of rehabilitation *and* assure an adequate level of maintenance thereafter without any increase in the monthly payments (in my example $50).

To the extent that this is not possible, an additional subsidy will be necessary. For example, the above figures show that under a forty year mortgage program the tenants would have $31 monthly to spare for maintenance and services (the unit owner paying $19 monthly on a loan of $4,609.66). Suppose $31 monthly is not enough—that $35 is required. The four dollar difference will have to be absorbed by the government or else monthly payments will exceed the $50. In effect the tenant can now only afford to borrow $3,650, to buy his unit (the monthly payments on this will be $15—yielding the $4 difference). To bring the unit cost down to $3,650, the government will have to absorb $6,637 of the cost of condemnation and rehabilitation (cost $39,487 minus $6,637 = $32,850, redistributed to nine units = $3,650 per unit).

Similarly, a subsidy may be called for if it is desired to *reduce* monthly payments below those current before conversion from rental to unit ownership.

Compared with the rent subsidy program. But the point is that under my proposal the subsidy goes in *once and for all* at the time of conversion from rental to unit ownership. This serves to distinguish my proposal from the current proposals for *rent* subsidies. These proposals are, I think, inadequate both from an economic and psychological point of view. A rent subsidy must either (1) be combined with stringent governmental control over how the subsidy is used *by the landlord;* or (2) it must be confined to situations where the landlord is a *non-profit organization.* The recent federal rent subsidy program is, in fact, confined to non-profit organizations.[4] This, in effect, makes the program inapplicable to most existing rental housing unless it is combined with a program of condemnation and conversion to non-profit ownership. Note that, if the rent subsidy program were combined with condemnation and conversion to non-profit ownership—for example to cooperative ownership—it would reach the same result as my proposal save for the following: (1) the unit owners would not "own" their units in the accepted sense of that word; and (2) they would be subject to a constant reminder that government is making up the differences between what they are able to pay and the real cost of their housing. These inevitable concomitants of a *rent* subsidy bring me to the most important feature of my proposal:

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL FEATURE: ADVANTAGES IN ORGANIZATION

A successful low and moderate income housing program must offer a form of ownership that will foster individual initiative and pride in the housing. The condominium form of ownership and organization has two features I believe are significant in those terms: (1) it offers individual ownership of the dwelling unit in the two most important senses of that word, that is (a) individual title and an individual mortgage; and (b) a possibility of retrieving the equity on re-sale (coveted prize of the home owner in the suburb);[5] (2) yet major maintenance of the units (both exterior and interior) is a community responsibility—through the condominium organization—an organization of the unit owners themselves.[6]

Additional advantages: A program of the sort I have described need not be confined to a single multifamily building. On the contrary, it can be applied to whole blocks and whole neighborhoods—and to any type of housing. Conversion of deteriorating housing into condominium ownership can be coupled with (1) assembly of all of the back yards into common recreational areas (addition of a swimming pool—for example) (2) combination with a commercial venture. Let me sketch this last idea. Part of the condominium could be devoted to neighborhood stores or other commercial facilities, owned by the condominium organization and rented. The rental income could be used to subsidize the reactional facilities and maintenance costs.[7]

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, 90 years ago today, on May 10, 1877, the Rumanian people proclaimed their independence. Freedom, thus proclaimed in the turmoil of the Russo-Turkish War, still had to be won on the battlefields south of the Danube where, with the assistance of czarist Russia, the Rumanian army defeated the Turkish forces and effectively severed her ties with the Ottoman Empire.

Rumanian independence, after four centuries of oppressive Turkish rule combined with periods of Russian occupation, did not come easily or without years of wise and unrelenting efforts made by freedom-loving Rumanian patriots. It was a tribute to these efforts that, 11 years earlier in May 1866, the political obstacles were removed that permitted a member of a Western royal family—Charles, Prince of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen—to be proclaimed Prince of Rumania, thus founding the Rumanian dynasty.

In 1881, 4 years after their proclamation of independence, and again in the month of May, the Rumanian people elevated their country to the rank of a kingdom and crowned Charles I, King of Rumania. There followed more than 60 years of prosperity which contributed significantly to the peace and stability of the Balkans and Eastern Europe.

World War II, and its aftermath, shattered the plans, but not the hopes and dreams, of the valiant people of Rumania and of other Eastern European nations. The Communist enslavement of Rumania following the war, made easier by her unfortunate proximity to the Soviet Union and by the ill-considered actions of the United States, has again placed this freedom-loving nation under the domination of a cruel conqueror. It is indeed ironical that Russia, who helped Rumania win her independence 90 years ago, has, with our unwitting help, replaced the Turks as Rumania's oppressor.

The month of May has great significance to the Rumanian people as the anniversary of some of the most glorious and happy events in their history. But the 10th of May is cherished and revered

---

favor as part of any condemnation approach to substandard housing that the law provide a set off for code violations. This part of the proposal, however, is too complicated to justify exploration here.

[4] Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965, 79 Stat. 451, Title I. See footnote 3 *supra.*

[5] For the reasons described in footnote 3 *supra,* provisions should be made for controlling the resale and renting of subsidized units so that (a) they would remain in the low price range when resold; and (b) they could not be exploited commercially—for investment purposes.

[6] Where very low income groups are involved, the idea of unit owners running the daily operations of the organization may not be very practical. However, assistance in management could be supplied by local community leaders or by professional management companies.

[7] The tax effects of such a "shifting" of income remain uncertain. See Note, 14 *Hast. L. J.* 270, (1963); *Anaheim Union Water Company v. C.I.R.,* 321 F.2d 253 (9th Cir. 1963), *Chicago and Western Indiana R.R. Co. v. C.I.R.,* 303 F.2d 796 (7th Cir. 1962). At most, however, the dwelling unit owners may have to recognize a constructive dividend. At the income tax rates applicable to their low brackets this would hardly affect the benefit of outside rental income.

by Rumanians as their national holiday because, even more than an anniversary, it symbolizes their perseverance through trial and hardship to reach the ultimate end of independence and well-being. Even though now governed by puppets of a foreign power, who have tried to uproot national pride by prohibiting the commemoration of this day, Rumanians nevertheless celebrate today in their hearts—as we are privileged to celebrate openly with them. Let us pay tribute to these gallant people today on their independence day, and pledge our support to them in their striving to achieve freedom once again.

NEW BOOK ON DRUG PRICES

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusets. Mr. President, a few months ago a constituent of mine appeared in my office to talk about a project of his, a book which would tell the truth about drug pricing in the United States. At the time, we who are members of the Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly of the Committee on the Judiciary, under the able leadership of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], were inquiring into the effect on drug prices of the ownership by doctors of pharmacies and drug repackaging firms. Thus my primary interest was in this aspect of drug pricing. My constituent said that while doctor-pharmacy or doctor-repackager connections might well be a significant cause of higher drug prices in many places, this effect was dependent on and cumulative to the effect on drug prices of the failure of many doctors to prescribe drugs by generic name rather than by brand name. He said that for many types of drugs, a doctor could obtain by generic name, and at a fraction of the cost of equivalent brand-name drugs, drugs which were just as effective, just as pure, and just as reliable.

Mr. President, that constituent's name was Dr. Richard Burack. He is a Bostonian. He is a leading medical practitioner, a clinical associate in medicine, and an affiliate in pharmacology at the Harvard Medical School. He is on the staff of several Boston-area hospitals, and taught pharmacology for 5 years before entering practice.

The project he so modestly described a few months ago has now borne fruit in a book published yesterday, entitled "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs." It has already received rave notices in the press. Morton Mintz, writing in Sunday's Book Week, called the book "ingenious and invaluable." He reports that one drug-trade publication recently speculated that Dr. Burack's book "could rock the drug industry much as Ralph Nader's book shook Detroit." Book Week reproduced a table from "The Handbook" which shows that the most important penicillin drug is sold to druggists for as little as 92 cents per thousand for a non-brand-name product to as high as $6.72 for one of the brand-name products. While a company's research and advertising and promotion expenditures may legitimately add something to the cost of a brand-name drug, it cannot justify a price which is 730 percent of the price of the generic-name drug. Dr. Burack's book was also the subject of an article in yesterday's New York Times, which set out some of his findings and recommendations. I ask unanimous consent that the articles be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, we in Congress have long been aware of the unreasonably high cost of drugs in the United States. The revealing hearings held by the late Senator Kefauver, the work and speeches of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] and the important study being undertaken by the Antitrust Subcommittee have all thrown light on this area. We who are members of the Special Committee on Aging have also been especially concerned about the strong effect of high drug prices on our Nation's senior citizens. Now Dr. Burack has suggested one answer to this problem. And he has shown how this answer can be put into practice by providing doctors with the information they need to compare prices and to prescribe by generic name when it is appropriate to do so. Dr. Burack says he has been doing this for his own patients and thus has saved them hundreds and hundreds of dollars over the past 4 years. His solution may not be the whole answer to high drug prices, but it certainly seems to work, and he should be commended for this important public service.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the Washington Post Book Week, May 7, 1967]

DRUG STORE HOLDUP

(By Morton Mintz, reporter for The Washington Post, is the author of The Therapeutic Nightmare, which he is revising for fall issue as a paperback retitled By Prescription Only.)

("The Handbook of Prescription Drugs." By Richard Burack, M. D. Pantheon. 170 pp. $4.95. Paperback, $1.95.)

("Black Market Medicine." By Margaret Kreig. Illustrated. Prentice-Hall. 304 pp. $5.95.)

Reserpine is the established, or generic, name for a drug used to lower high blood pressure. A thousand 0.1-milligram tablets are sold to druggists for $1.25 by a small pharmaceutical firm which has been qualified by the Defense Supply Agency to bid for Government contracts. Serpasil is the brand name for reserpine made by a large firm, the CIBA Pharmaceutical Company. Sold as Serpasil, the same thousand 0.1-milligram tablets of reserpine are wholesaled for $23.50.

Recently CIBA defended its higher—19 times higher—price in a statement to the news media. The tried and trite claims were still there, just as if the late Sen. Estes Kefauver had not discredited them in his drug hearings of 1959–62. "The high cost of research." That magic phrase. But the price difference between generic reserpine and Serpasil is $22.25; how much of that went into research, and into what kind of research? "Quality control." Men in white coats who assure us that Serpasil "not only meets but exceeds United States Pharmacopeia standards." The usefulness of a drug, however, is not increased when it is made purer than pure or whiter than white—a point that may reassure Presidents and Senators in Washington and GIs in Viet Nam who are treated with drugs prescribed under their generic names rather than their brand names. The purity of the 0.25-milligram tablets of reserpine once offered to the Government by CIBA for 60 cents per thousand (an offer that was underbid by 9 cents) was surely as pure as the Serpasil CIBA offered simultaneously to the corner druggist for $39.50, because CIBA's reserpine equals CIBA's Serpasil. And because Serpasil equals Serpasil, it seemed odd to Kefauver that CIBA was selling it to foreign pharmacists for between 18 and 90 percent less than to American pharmacists. In any case, quality control is shown by the record to be a problem for all drug firms, large and small. Even CIBA is not and cannot be perfect. Three years ago it had to recall a quantity of Ritalin, a mild stimulant and antidepressant that left the plant mislabeled as Serpasil.

I am using CIBA, its product, and its press statement only to illustrate a situation which could have been illustrated equally well with other major companies, their products, and their statements.

The "most important" question, CIBA said in its press release, is whether "the generic drug's therapeutic response [is] equivalent or even predictable." One of the determinants of therapeutic response is potency—that is, whether a drug is of a required strength. A drug if subpotent is a bad drug, even if it meets all the other requirements and is purer than pure. A year ago the Food and Drug Administration checked the potency of drugs from 250 suppliers. The products fell into 20 key categories but did not include antibiotics, whose quality is assured by the FDA's pre-marketing, batch-by-batch inspection. Of 2,600 samples sold under less expensive generic names 7.8 per cent were found subpotent and therefore unacceptable; of 2,000 brand-name samples 8.8 per cent were below strength. (It should be understood that the difference between these percentages is very little, and under no circumstance should one conclude from the FDA findngs that the quality of generics is necessarily higher than that of brand-name drugs.) If the large drug manufacturers truly believe that "generic equivalency" is a myth, then in the public interest they should support the legislation proposed by Sen. Russell B. Long and the efforts of the FDA to assure that *all* drugs sold in the United States can be purchased with confidence in their quality.

In his ingenious and invaluable *The Handbook of Prescription Drugs*, Dr. Richard Burack, a pharmacologist and clinical asociate in medicine at Harvard Medical School, focuses attention on these and other important points. CIBA and the Eli Lilly Company, for example, are among the major pharmaceutical manufacturers whose staggering profits are dependent upon their ability to induce physicians to prescribe drugs by brand name. Since I know of no one who would contend that CIBA exceeds Lilly in its concern with research, quality control, and therapeutic response, I was surprised to learn from *The Handbook* that CIBA's price for reserpine sold as Serpasil is three times as high as Lilly's price for reserpine sold as Sandril.

A similar situation, involving the anti-inflammatory hormone known as prednisone, is disclosed in another one of Dr. Burack's neat tables, which list drug names, sources, and prices as of 1966. Merck Sharp & Dohme's brand name for prednisone is Deltra, which sells at $20.90 per 1,000 5-milligram tablets. Upjohn's brand name for prednisone is Deltasone, which is sold to druggests for only four cents more. The Merck and the Upjohn prices are 2½ times higher than those charged by various firms that sell prednisone as prednisone—but at the same time they are a mere one-eighth the wholesale price of Schering's brand, Meticorten, which is $170, and of the Parke Davis label, Paracort, which is $169.98.

"Surely," Dr. Burack says, "the public ought to know that too often it pays too much for prescription drugs and that—working with physicians—it can do something about it right now, without sacrificing quality." He starts from the sound premise that for the physician "there is no coherent plan for periodically updating his knowledge of drugs and their use," and that the drug industry has stepped into the breach with its $3,000-per-doctor-per-year advertising and promotional efforts "to persuade, to cajole, and to 'educate.' " In the preface, Dr. George Nichols jr., Clinical Professor of Medicine at Harvard, acclaims *The Handbook* for providing the practicing physician "with a much-needed guide for simpler and more effective therapy." An illustration is provided by the most common drug for high blood pressure. It is a tablet that combines reserpine and a thiazide diuretic, which increases urine production. "The use of such combinations is to be deplored," Dr. Murack writes. "Not only are they unconscionably expensive, but in using them the physician loses independent dose control: he is stuck with a fixed ratio of doses which may not be the best for that particular patient."

The growing and widespread concern with escalating medical costs makes Dr. Burack's book especially welcome. One of his suggestions is that the physician "specify on the prescription blank what brand or brands he does not wish to be dispensed." This should bring cheers from anyone who professes belief in free-enterprise price competition.

Dr. Burack's 32-page introduction is useful but hardly news to anyone who is familiar either with the Kefauver drug hearings or with Richard Harris' fine book about them, *The Real Voice*. Following the introduction is a listing—by company, product, date, and cause—of drug shipments that were recalled as unsafe under the Good Manufacturing Practices Section of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Then come the tables which show categories, such as drugs used to treat infectious diseases, to induce sleep, to relieve pain, for asthma, for heart disease, and for gastrointestinal disorders. The first appendix lists drug suppliers that have met the inspection requirements of the Pentagon. The second appendix lists names, addresses and phone numbers of distributors of generic drugs. It is no wonder that a drug-trade publication speculated recently that *The Handbook* "could rock the drug industry much as Ralph Nader's *Unsafe at Any Speed* shook Detroit."

Margaret Kreig's *Black Market Medicine* is a black mark against her, against her publisher, against former FDA Commissioner George P. Larrick (who unwisely extended certain favors that made this book possible), and against such others as may be assumed to have supported this project. This badly written, badly edited "undercover documentary" is about the criminals who, sometimes with filthy backroom facilities, counterfeit prescription drugs. That counterfeit drugs are an evil to be exposed and fought goes without saying. That Mrs. Kreig, for all her pro forma disclaimers, should attempt to equate counterfeit drugs made by hoodlums with generic drugs made by small businessmen cannot be countenanced. In order to combat drug counterfeiting she apparently would do almost anything short of repealing the Constitution. There are two things she did not do: to suggest that if the large drug companies, which in her hands become indistinguishable from Snow White, would charge moderate prices they would reduce—if not eliminate—the incentive to counterfeit; and to tell her readers that some of these large companies have been the objects of completed and pending criminal actions arising out of antitrust conspiracies, false advertising, and kickbacks from foreign-aid transactions.

[From page 84 of "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs"]

Potassium Penicillin G Tablets, U.S.P. (Buffered)

This is the basic and most important of the penicillins. Readily absorbed from the gastrointestinal tract, it is the equivalent of any other oral penicillin preparation in terms of clinical effectiveness. Where particularly high blood levels are desired, the dose may be increased from the usual 3 tablets per day (at least one half hour before mealtime and at least two hours after having last eaten) to as many as 4 tablets three or four times per day. The major contraindication to its use is known allergy to penicillin. The great advantages of penicillin G are its low toxicity and its reasonable cost.

200,000 unit tablet (125 mgm) #100:

$1.25	Allen Pharm.
1.00	Am. Quinine
1.30	Carroll
1.15	Columbia Med.
1.75	Corvit
1.45	Daniels
1.62	Horton & Converse
1.50	Lannett
4.77	Lilly
6.72*	Parke, Davis
1.80	Penhurst
.92	Pennex
2.00	Pfizer
1.35	Rondex
6.62	Squibb (Pentids-200)
1.55	Supreme
1.90	Towne, Paulsen
1.35	Vita-Fore
1.70	West-ward
1.72	Wyeth

[From the New York Times, May 8, 1967]

Dual Drug Prices Held Misleading—Author Contends Consumer Wastes Money on Brands That Are Overpriced

(By Richard D. Lyons)

The American consumer often pays too much for the drugs he buys, a Harvard Medical School physician observes in a new book being published today that offers specific advice on methods to reduce pharmaceutical costs.

The author, Dr. Richard Burack, provides in his book, lists of manufacturers' brand names and the official chemical names of about 162 of the pharmaceutical agents most commonly prescribed by American doctors.

Comparisons of prices show, Dr. Burack contends in his book, that in most cases brand names cost more, often many times more, than the same drugs purchased by their chemical names. Pharmacists usually refer to the chemical names as generics.

Titled "The Handbook of Prescription Drugs, Official Names, Prices and Sources for Patient and Doctor," the book is being published by Pantheon Books and sells for $4.95 in hardcover and $1.95 in paperback. The book cites many examples of sharp differences in brand and chemical name drug prices.

"For example, CIBA, the enormous Switzerland-based company, offered to sell to the United States Government for about 60 cents a quantity and quality of reserpine [a drug to lower blood pressure] for which the corner pharmacist must pay $39.50," Dr. Burack writes, "The Government buys it as reserpine; the corner pharmacist buys and dispenses it as Serpasil."

NO VITAL DIFFERENCES

"There are no important differences between the two; only the name and $39," Dr. Burack contends. "Ironically, CIBA did not win the contract, for they were underbid by a company willing to sell the same drug for 51 cents."

In another example, Dr. Burack cites the case of a 10-year-old boy who developed rheumatic fever and had to take two penicillin tablets a day for at least 20 years.

A prescription for a brand product of 250 tablets of Pentids of 200,000 units "will cost about $27.50 at most drugstores," Dr. Burack writes. But a prescription reading merely potassium penicillin G tablets "need cost only about $6.25, sometimes as little as $5," Dr. Burack says. Over 20 years, he adds, the saving would amount to $1,275.

Prices of the commonly prescribed drug digitalis, an old remedy to increase the contraction of the heart muscle, may range from $1.36 to $18.40 for a bottle containing 1,000 tablets, Dr. Burack writes. The only difference, he holds, is that the lower-priced drug is made by a small company and lacks a brand name.

The price of an antihistamine with the generic name of chlorpheniramine maleate may range from $1.95 to $20.59 for a bottle containing 1,000 tablets. The difference again, according to the author, is merely manufacturer and brand name.

ADVICE TO CONSUMER

"A patient should shop around for drugs because he is a captive consumer and has the right to know what he is buying and how much it costs," Dr. Burack said in a telephone interview from his home in West Newton, Mass.

Dr. Burack urged patients to ask their physician to make prescriptions by generic name so that the patient may be able to pay less for the drugs. He said most pharmacists would fill orders by generic names, at a cheaper price, if specially requested to do so.

"I've found druggists are most cooperative and will order generically from the wholesaler if they are asked," Dr. Burack said, adding that in four years of private practice he had found only one pharmacist who would not fill generic orders.

THE CENTENNIAL OF OBERLIN COLLEGE CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, more years ago than I care to count, I was a student at Oberlin College in Ohio. Just this past Saturday, I was fortunate enough to be able to be there to watch my nephew participate as a member of the lacrosse team of Oberlin to defeat Michigan State University 6–2; quite an accomplishment, in my opinion, when you stop and realize that the Michigan State student body exceeds Oberlin 10 times over and more.

However, lacrosse is not the only activity in which Oberlin excels. This coming Saturday, May 13, the college will celebrate the Conservatory of Music's 100th anniversary. I commend the school and congratulate them on their 100 years of growth, rich tradition, and all of the major contributions the conservatory has made to the field of music.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the thought-provoking article concerning music and musical education, entitled "Centennial—A Time To Evaluate," published in the Oberlin Alumni magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Centennial, a Time To Evaluate

(By Robert Fountain, Dean of the Conservatory of Music)

Celebration of the Oberlin College Conservatory of Music's centennial is a reminder that anniversaries are not merely a time for looking backward. The accent, of course, is properly placed on fond reflection of our 100 years of growth, rich tradition and major contribution to the field of music. It's necessary, too, to look ahead and try to envision what the next century will bring. But it also seems important in a centennial year to make a close examination of the present-day needs of music and to discuss our role in meeting these needs.

---

* 250,000 unit tablet.

One thing that facilitates this aspect of the centennial is the fact that an evaluation of present-day music almost immediately spotlights three distinct areas which seem to me to call for particular attention and discussion.

The first of these areas is the field of contemporary music where the craftsmen of today are groping for new media of expression. They seek these new media because they are convinced that all technics of the past have been exhausted. Yet they find few markets for their new "products" because they are confronted with the hard-to-achieve acceptance possessed by the music of the past.

As we examine electronic music, or the already passé serial, or aleatoric, or music hidden in that mysterious realm of "happenings," it appears that the same support is necessary for new forms of music as is demanded by other arts striving for future direction.

Such support can assume various forms. There should be research opportunities so teachers of composition can study the new technics. The difficult, untraditional, sometimes baffling scores will require new skills of the performer. When the music is produced electronically, considerable equipment is needed for the establishment of studios and laboratories. This can represent a formidable outlay of money.

Most important is the need to create enough interest to establish an audience. If new music is to survive, it must be given chances (more than one) to be heard. The great danger for music of the future lies in its possible isolation as an esoteric art. It should be a music school's obligation to give all available aid to the cause of the contemporary composer.

The second area of our concern should fall under the heading "Holiday for Strings." Indeed, the word "holiday" is inappropriate. The words "extended vacation" might be more useful.

It is no secret that our symphony orchestras are suffering from an acute shortage of competent string players. There simply are not enough good ones to go around and many of those we have are constantly on the move, being bribed, stolen, or kidnaped from one orchestra to another. It is saddening to read of the inaugural concert of the new hall in a large city of the Southwest, $2,300,000 of beautiful construction and excellent acoustics, serenaded by a less-than-adequate orchestra. Recently, the conductor of a symphony orchestra in a Midwestern city reported that, after a strike had been settled, he discovered that 21 strings had left for other positions during the negotiating period. In northern Ohio, the orchestras in the small cities are desperate. With expanded repertoire and prominent soloists they plead for our student players to fill the need for violins, violas, cellos and basses.

Schools like the Oberlin Conservatory must create a larger supply of string candidates for professional orchestras. However, these candidates are not being produced in the public school music programs. Until the imbalance is corrected between the host of wind players turned out by the juggernaut of the high school band and the mere trickle of strings coming from relatively few secondary school orchestras, the situation will get no better.

A bright light on the horizon is the Suzuki method of violin instruction. Children under this tutelage have done remarkable things. But sooner or later those same children will rely on the secondary school for opportunity and teaching. If only they could receive the same thrill and encouragement mastering the elegance of a Mozart phrase that a band player has relating the notes of his bell-lyre to "Finlandia"!

Very few of our school systems provide class time for music. Taxpayers generally are to blame for failing to vote ample funds to public schools, but relegation of music to the field of extra-curricular activities places it in unfair competition and it suffers. Music is one of the humanities and should have a position on the daily school calendar so that rehearsing can become a rich learning experience.

It's a real misfortune that the great hunger of Americans for liberty and economic supremacy has never carried over into the field of artistic growth. On the other hand, too many of us are tempted to assume a cultural maturation which simply has not taken place. For example, a Rockefeller Panel recently reported that the expansion in the performing arts in our country has been tremendous. The disturbing note is that almost all of this increase has been at the amateur level. Professional theater, dance, orchestra, opera, chamber and choral music are in deep economic trouble. What irony, when we have the resources necessary for not just the survival but the flourishing of the performing arts.

A greater appreciation for the performing arts must be built in order to solve this problem. This can only be done through education—the earlier, the better. Parents need to capture a child's imagination at that exciting age when he wants to "play-act." How children love to dance. How they react to color, music, images, stories! What opportunities, or rather obligations, there are for a parent. Proper channeling of this early interest, stimulated by exposure to live performances, could create a desire for the theater, resulting perhaps in a career and, surely, in a lifetime of theater-going.

If precocious children with musical talent could be identified early and given the proper training and stimulation, America's 1,401 symphony orchestras could grow to 10,000 with all of them fully staffed with strings and even conductors to lead them.

This leads to a third concern: the ineffectiveness of music education in our public schools. We need a new type of teacher to excite young people about music and lead each one of them in as rich an exploration of the art as they are capable. Perhaps this person should be called an "artist-teacher" in contrast to a "certified-educator."

An artist he must be. Artistry in music means success in the achievement and creativity that go with music-making in performance. The artist-teacher's standards of excellence will "rub off" on his students. He must also have a zeal, even a passion to teach. Too often, "discarded performers" flee to the field of music education for job security without any evaluation of their desire to teach. The candidate for the position must be a capable performer who *wants* to teach.

Requirements for certification vary from state to state. A school seeking accreditation often must adhere to an inflexible curriculum which thwarts its real intentions. Let us realize that a teacher in the arts must be a well-trained specialist, an artist, and that he must concentrate his efforts to be so. Perhaps it is not asking too much of a musician to require that he have a "well-rounded" education, but is it really necessary to encumber this specialist with courses in state history or government? Above all, why should he have to go back to school and "learn" how to teach, when he is already doing it most successfully?

To cite an extreme example: a conductor of one of our major symphony orchestras would not be permitted to train a group in any one of our public schools. Perhaps he might be allowed to make a guest appearance, but to become a "licensed" teacher he would have to go scurrying after courses in educational psychology, secondary school methods, mathematics, social science, et al.

Several years ago, it was estimated that America had upwards of 400,000 private or independent music teachers—uncertified—working with our youth. Of course some of them might have been ineffective, but it is safe to assume that their deficiencies were caused by lack of musical training rather than their not having studied academic courses.

These are three of the problems which confront music today. Their solution will require new thinking and creative programs on the part of schools of music like Oberlin's and the ocoperative effort of performers, educators, administrators, and students.

THE ANNIVERSARY OF RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, today, May 10, marks the anniversary of the achievement of Rumania's independence and the founding of its kingdom. Rumanians all over the world are bringing to this day the honor which is its due, except those residing in Rumania. The latter celebrated yesterday—they were celebrating the day of Soviet victory. Today, these brave and courageous people can only honor this day by listening to broadcasts from the free world as Rumanians abroad commemorate their homeland's past independence.

Rumania has striven for her freedom for over a century. In 1881, the people crowned King Charles I who reigned over this prosperous country for over 60 years, more than 20 of which Rumania enjoyed unity within her historical boundaries. Rumania now lies behind the Iron Curtain, and May 10 can no longer be openly celebrated within the country.

Today not only commemorates Rumania's past glories and achievements, but is a symbol of the hope and dauntless faith, which is in the hearts of all Rumanians the world over, for when Rumania will once again be restored her precious freedom.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HRUSKA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the speech to be made by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Thurmond], under a special order, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] be permitted to speak for a period of 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. Under the order entered yesterday the Senator from Kansas is recognized.

TAX CREDIT ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I introduce a bill, the "Tax Credit Act of 1967," providing a 50-percent credit against Federal income tax payments for all income levies imposed by State and local governments.

The need is great to give some immediate relief to our financially distressed cities and States. Our urban areas in particular are plagued with monumental problems of traffic congestion, overpopulation, rising crime rates, air and water pollution, chronic unemployment, festering slums, and explosive racial unrest.

Mr. President, the solutions to these difficulties will not be easy. They will require time, money, and above all, imagination. A primary source for the imaginative programs needed lies with the affected areas themselves. Given the proper assistance, they can develop effective cures for the many problems now besetting them. Unfortunately, they have been hampered in their efforts by an overreliance upon Federal money and the bureaucratic inertia which often accompanies it.

While these massive doses of Federal aid have not provided the answers so urgently needed, the fact remains that the cities and States cannot handle these enormous problems alone. They need Federal assistance, of course. But they need encouragement to develop their own programs more. If the Federal Government is to be effective in providing this encouragement, it must insure that it stimulates, not stifles, local initiative.

Mr. President, just such a stimulus would be provided by this bill. The Tax Credit Act would amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit the taxpayer to deduct 50 percent of his State and local income taxes from his Federal income tax payment. Such a credit would put a reasonable portion of the Federal taxing power at the service of our State and city governments with little danger of stultifying bureaucratic control.

Municipal income taxes are virtually the last revenue source available to our cities. Other forms of taxation are nearly exhausted. In addition, these are the only taxes which grow with the local economy and are not regressive. Moreover, Mr. President, the financial burdens of the State governments themselves are growing more serious with every passing day.

The most equitable method of developing greater revenues would be through a comprehensive tax credit, such as the one proposed in the bill, which would allow the States to develop programs of regional scope, while permitting the cities to enact "piggyback" income taxes to generate their own funds.

If "Creative Federalism" is to be more than an empty phrase, our cities and States must be allowed to raise sufficient revenues to develop meaningful programs tailored to local needs.

Such an effort will not be possible without Federal encouragement. Because of the near Federal monopoly on income tax revenue, it is incumbent upon the national government to stimulate our States and cities to better utilize this revenue source.

For example, Mr. President, in 1962, out of all income taxes collected, the Federal Government garnered 93.8 percent. State and local governments collected only 6.2 percent.

In the same year, 80.3 percent of Federal revenue came from income taxes compared with only 10.5 percent for State and local units. Most of our local revenue is generated from sales and property taxes. In the majority of our cities and surrounding suburban areas, the opportunities for expanding these taxes are severely limited.

For example, high property taxes in the older sections of a city can actually cause blight and decay. A prohibitive tax structure tends to discourage owners of older buildings from maintaining or improving their property. Thus, these measures often worsen the very social ills they are attempting to cure.

Mr. President, there is an obvious need to avoid a further proliferation of Federal grant-in-aid programs. At present, approximately 220 such programs are administered by 21 departments and agencies. In such a confusing situation, a further proliferation would likely create more problems than it would solve.

A number of alternatives have been put forth recently, most of them dealing with some system of Federal revenue-sharing with the States. Many of these proposals have great merit and deserve serious consideration. Indeed, they may offer the best long-run solution to the problem of raising greater State and local revenue while avoiding cumbersome Federal controls. Moreover, tax sharing can be used effectively to equalize revenues among the States.

Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of a tax-sharing proposal introduced by the Senator from Tennessee. Yet I recognize that tax sharing presents several difficulties.

For example, tax sharing means separating the responsibilities involved in the power to tax and the power to spend. It is important that those who spend public funds also bear the duty of justifying and raising the needed revenue.

In addition, tax sharing involves direct payment from the U.S. Treasury. And this year the administration will probably incur the largest budgetary deficit in our history—perhaps as much as $20 billion. Given the prospect of a deficit of this immense scope Congress may prove unwilling to enact any large-scale programs of tax sharing this year.

For the fact remains that tax sharing is directly related to the Government's ability to make such large-scale payments. With a costly war being waged in Vietnam, it is unlikely that the Federal Government will be in a position to afford such a program on any meaningful scale for some time to come.

The best should be regarded as the handmaiden, not the enemy, of the good. Let us, therefore, consider the more ambitious proposal of tax sharing as a complementary effort, not as a substitute for an income tax credit.

A 50-percent credit, such as the one proposed in the bill, would operate quite simply. For example, if a married couple filed a joint return on a taxable income of $3,000, their Federal tax would be approximately $450. If they lived in a city having a 1-percent income tax—the present urban average—their local payment would be $30. If their State tax were 4 percent—the present average—their State payment would be $120. Thus, their total State and local tax bill would be $150.

Under the Tax Credit Act, 50 percent of these taxes could be deducted as a credit from their Federal tax payment. Thus, they could subtract $75 from their Federal payment—$15 for their local tax, and $60 for their State tax.

In addition, the bill permits taxpayers the opportunity of listing State and local taxes as deductions as an alternative to the partial credit.

The cost of such a credit system would not be prohibitive, while generating more revenue for State and urban improvement than does the present hodgepodge of Federal grants. The Federal Government, of course, already sustains a revenue loss under the current tax system. It is estimated that every dollar of income tax currently collected by the State and local governments results in about a 24-cent reduction of Federal income tax liability. Thus, the initial cost of an optional credit would be less than is presumed.

It has been estimated by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in its report on Federal-State Coordinating Personal Income Taxes that the present system of itemizing State and local income tax payments will cost the U.S. Treasury about $1.1 billion in revenue in fiscal 1967. The cost of an optional 50 percent credit for the same year would increase this figure to approximately $2 billion. Therefore, the additional 1967 cost of the credit would be somewhere around $1 billion.

Furthermore, this Federal revenue loss would be associated with a greater rise in State collections. For example, in the absence of any credit, fiscal 1967 State and local income tax collections will increase to approximately $4.8 billion. Even if all 50 States were to enact income taxes markedly higher than those in existence today—from 1.2 to 2 percent of Federal aggregate income, less personal exemptions—the revenue loss to the Federal Government would be about $2 billion. This loss would be matched by a rise in State collections to $7.5 billion. Thus, a $2 billion Federal revenue loss would be offset by a $2.7 billion State revenue gain.

It is true these figures do not represent future costs. While such costs would be greater, they would not likely prove to be unreasonable because of the political limitations imposed by the public on irresponsible tax policies—limitations which probably have a greater effect on the local level.

Mr. President, 14 States currently do not have any income taxes at any level. In a sense, therefore, the introduction of a credit for State and local income taxes would discriminate against these areas which currently rely on other sources of revenue. But it is to be expected that with the enactment of a tax credit system, the remaining States would adopt income taxing.

In addition, Mr. President, the credit would not take effect until December 31, 1969, thus allowing the nonincome tax areas ample opportunity to forestall discriminatory Federal tax treatment. It would also allow areas now levying such taxes adequate time to consider rate increases to absorb all or part of the proposed tax credit.

Mr. President, because of its high visibility, such a credit would also have a great psychological impact. It would be clear evidence of the Federal Government's willingness to encourage local action.

A wise man once observed:

> The office of government is not to confer happiness, but to give men opportunity to work out happiness for themselves.

Let us act now to give the millions of people in our States and cities that opportunity. Let us give them a chance to use their insight and imagination. A partial tax credit with all of its implications and with all the technicalities involved will not solve all their myriad problems. But at least it is a start. It is another alternative to what we have been considering here in many forms.

It is a fiscally responsible stimulus which is grounded in the most fundamental tenet of American life—reliance on local initiative. The tapping of this wellspring of creativity and imagination should not be further delayed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1743) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit individuals to elect to take a credit against their Federal income tax for one-half of the State and local income taxes paid by them, in lieu of deducting such taxes, introduced by Mr. PEARSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in yielding to the Senator from Oregon, let me say, in anticipation of whatever comments he might make, that the concept of dividing the responsibility to tax and the responsibility to spend is one I first heard expressed several years ago by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], who then served as Governor of that great State.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, first, I should like to comment on the proposal made by the Senator from Kansas. The tax credit idea appeals a great deal to my way of thinking. I should like to ask the Senator, as to the problem of separating tax collecting from tax spending authorities, whether he believes that the tax credit concept would do less violence to this kind of balance which should be retained as compared with the tax-sharing proposals generally discussed both in terms of bills and through Governors' group meetings and other such public groups.

I think that such a question is pertinent to the desire to maintain a strong Federal-State system, because often Governors who are confronted with the awesome responsibility of collecting revenues are quickly attracted to systems which may appear on the surface—at least relative to their tax-collecting problems—to let the Federal Government collect the taxes, and then to let the Governors and State legislatures apportion the taxes so collected and turned over to the States.

As a former Governor, deeply concerned about the role of the States in our Federal system, I have great reservations about making the States so dependent upon the Federal Government by accepting these tax-collecting arrangements. I do not know that it strengthens local government. Perhaps it even weakens State and local governments.

Thus, I should like to ask the Senator to comment as to the comparison of his tax-credit program with the tax-sharing program, in reference to strengthening State governments, and the question of whether we should separate tax-collecting from tax-spending authorities.

Mr. PEARSON. I respond to the Senator by merely repeating all of the suggestions which have been made. I think I indicated cosponsorship, together with the Senator from Oregon, of the tax-sharing concept—the Federal Government taking a given amount of money and sending it back to the States with no strings attached, a concept which has great merit. The great disadvantage and discrimination under Federal-State programs is that when we look at it as a landscape of all State developments, from State to State, we find a void here and a void there in some particular activity of public service.

When they find that void—that vacuum—here in Washington they say, "Ah, a program is needed because x number of States are not proceeding in the field of mental health, land reform, library construction, or something else."

The truth is that from State to State, because of the individual needs in a State, different programs are emphasized.

The Menninger Foundation, in my State of Kansas, has given us great inspiration to move forward in the field of mental health. I am sure that the same is true in other fields in the State of Oregon, where it has superiority over other States.

The concept of the Federal Government turning a given amount of money back to the States with no strings attached is an exciting idea, but we come back to the old concept that the people who have the power to spend do not share the responsibility and justification of raising the money.

Another proposal—although I do not think there is any possibility of its ever being adopted—is to reduce Federal taxes. But when we reduce Federal taxes, the States and cities come in and pick them up. Realistically, that will not happen, the political implications being what they are. So the States as well as the cities move into the field of taxation where the Federal Government is taxing, which is a highly dangerous thing to do.

The Governor of Kansas initiated a tremendous program to raise taxes for education. It was a great issue in the campaign. He was defeated in the last election. Perhaps the Senator will also recall that the Governor of Iowa, a former attorney general, was a one-term Governor. He went into office and met this responsibility; namely, he raised taxes. He was defeated the next time around. I shall not elaborate upon the political significance any longer, because I do not wish to delay other Senators who wish to speak on other subjects.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kansas has expired.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I do not believe this proposal offers the perfect solution, by any means, as witnessed by the States which do not levy income taxes. But it is another alternative.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for another question?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield, and ask unanimous consent for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. I should like to pose another question. Does the Senator from Kansas feel that providing these additional credits or tax-sharing revenues—in whichever direction the Congress might move—would have a tendency to relieve the pressure that now exists in some States to engage in tax reforms? I think it will be agreed that the tax structures in some States are outmoded and narrowly based, that many inequities exist, and that States have great difficulty in moving toward tax reform and changes. If there is pressure by the people in those States for tax reform, that is one thing; but if the Federal Government moves in and its program tends to relieve some of that pressure, will it diminish the possibility of getting tax reforms at the State level?

Mr. PEARSON. Quite frankly, I think so. I believe that the greatest need for tax reform, however, is in Washington, at the Federal level. The Senator has pointed out that wherever pressure is relieved, the pressure for reform, as well as for raising revenue, is also relieved.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the special order obtained for me to make my remarks at a later hour this afternoon be modified to the extent of their coming before those of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

THE REAPPORTIONMENT CRISIS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, I want to address myself this afternoon to an analysis of the constitutional question posed to Congress by the petitions for a constitutional convention by the States—the most important constitutional question to confront the country since the convening of the original Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia on May 14, 1787.

The men who assembled in Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia May 14, 1787, in order to form a more perfect Union, probably are unmatched by any single group in history for their reasoned grasp of the tenets essential to a government of the people and for their unquenchable thirst for freedom.

The Constitution which they wrought with brilliance and fervent devotion to freedom under law, I believe, stands high above the achievement of the Magna Carta, obtained as Hamilton described it "by the barons, sword in hand, from King John." It stands high above such landmark documents, too, as the Petition of Right assented to by Charles I, or the Declaration of Right presented to the Prince of Orange and afterwards formed into an act by Parliament called the Bill of Rights.

The Constitution of the United States proposed by that inspired body meeting in Convention Hall in Philadelphia was the product of free men—forging freedom by choice. It was not the grudging gift of some despot brought to terms by force of arms or that of some benevolent monarch.

> We the People of the United States * * * to secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

"To secure the blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity * * *."

We, today, are that posterity. Does the light of liberty burn within us as an all-consuming, living, breathing precept as it did with those who so magnificently forged our Constitution? Does the rule of reason, the passion for government by law, stir our souls to the degree required to protect our precious constitutional heritage? I believe so.

I would not so believe, however, if I thought we might heed the dismaying clamor pealing from the confines of mind of a few willful men intent on tailoring the fabric of our Constitution for purposes other than it was devised.

A CONVENTION GUIDELINE

For the first time since the adoption of the Constitution on September 17, 1787, this Nation may be on the verge of convening another constitutional convention. It behooves us in this light to examine the cause and to study the purpose of that first Convention when it created the constitutional procedure for convening a future convention.

In this way, I believe, we can better bring logic to our discussion and develop a guideline to the constitutional ground on which we tread.

While the points which I wish to raise are designed to clarify the procedures inherent in a constitutional convention, I would point out that the Congress, in view of the nature of the petitions from the States for a convention before it, may resolve the issue itself by proposing the requested amendment to the Constitution to the States for ratification. It has an alternative.

I would prefer to see this alternative course pursued.

I have no fear of the will of the people of these United States however if the Congress, in its wisdom or obstinacy, prefers the convening of a Convention. To vote otherwise, in my mind, would be to violate my oath of office to uphold the Constitution by which this Nation is governed.

Much in the manner of Chicken Little skittering to and fro telling all who would listen the sky is falling, much alarm has been expressed at what a constitutional convention might do. "The Bill of Rights will be repealed," "the Supreme Court will be abolished," are just two of the more irrational alarms being trumpeted from the rooftops by some who have felt compelled to exclaim rather than reason.

Fears of this kind have no foundation in reason, logic, or experience. They should be dismissed.

WHAT A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION CAN DO

I think it is more important to recognize a constitutional convention for what it is and what it can do. First, it is a perfectly valid method of proposing amendments to the Constitution. It is a right reserved to the States and guaranteed by article V of the Constitution. The fact that we have never had one does not diminish the right of the people to have one if they wish.

As to what a constitutional convention might do to existing rights or to governmental structure, it could do nothing more than what the Congress has authority to do—it can propose amendments to the Constitution. Alone, it can make no change in the Constitution; it can change no rights. In the final analysis, three-fourths of the States, a total of 38, either by legislative action or by State convention, must ratify any amendment the convention might propose before it becomes a part of the Constitution. Precisely the same procedure that applies to amendments proposed by the Congress must be observed so far as ratification is concerned.

In our examination of the facts it is reasonable, I believe, to read article V, to see what it says, look at the background, refresh our memory on why it was made a part of the Constitution, and analyze the legal aspects surrounding it:

ARTICLE V

> *The Congress*, whenever two-thirds of both Houses shall deem it necessary, shall propose Amendments to this Constitution, or, *on the Application of the Legislatures of two-thirds of the several States, shall call a Convention for proposing Amendments*, which, in either Case, shall be valid to all Intents and Purposes, as part of this Constitution, when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States, or by Conventions in three-fourths thereof, as the one or the other Mode of Ratification may be proposed by the Congress . . .

THE GENESIS OF ARTICLE V

Let us look for a moment at the genesis of article V. Why did the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia insert this provision for a future constitutional convention into their handiwork? The answer is not difficult to determine. One of the great fears of the delegates was a balky future Congress, a Congress that might prove unresponsive to the wishes of the States, and more importantly, to the wishes of the people in those States.

A great weakness in the Articles of Confederation with which the delegates to the Philadelphia Convention were wrestling was the difficulty of amending the articles. Amendments to become binding required ratification by the legislatures of all of the States. It is for this reason without question that the delegates to Philadelphia early realized the impracticability of merely amending the Articles of Confederation even though every delegate, with the possible exception of those from New Jersey, who were operating under somewhat broader authority than theirs confreres, was under instruction to do no more than propose amendments to the Articles of Confederation.

Shortly after it became apparent that more than the mere amendment of articles would take place and that a new Constitution would be submitted, the problem of providing for subsequent amendments to the proposed Constitution was considered. Four separate proposals were submitted. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an exhibit which contains the text of proposals by Pinckney, Randolph, and Mason, and documentary references and commentary upon them, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. The Hamilton proposal I shall speak of later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

FEAR OF AN UNRESPONSIVE CONGRESS

Mr. HRUSKA. It seems clear from the debates that what was foremost in the minds of the delegates in regard to amending the Constitution was the fear that, among other things, there would be at some future date a Congress unresponsive to the wishes of the State. Initially the sentiment of the delegates, as shown by the journals and diaries, seemed to be that of denying to the Congress any voice in the process of amending the Constitution. The debates convinced a sufficient number of delegates that Congress should at least have an opportunity to propose amendments with the final approval left to the States. As a result, Congress was only given authority to propose amendments. The States, through their legislatures, retained the authority to initiate a Convention. The safeguard of a Convention was specifically provided so that Congress could not thwart the wishes of two-thirds of the States by refusing to submit amendments desired by the States.

Mr. President, it seems to me that we ought to put this in proper context. Those men at that convention had just finished a long war against King George III of England, and a situation existed of refusal on the part of the Government to permit people to have their wishes. They wanted to guard against such refusals. They did it in many ways. One was the safeguard that was put into the Constitution in article V, which allowed for the States and for the people of the States an opportunity to combat tyranny—the tyranny of either the executive, of the Congress, or of the central national government—by having a convention to consider amendments to the Constitution.

This safeguard for the calling of a Convention upon application of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States seem to be perfectly clear in intent. In fact, it would appear that the Congress, by refusing to call a Convention upon application, would, in such instance, be setting itself up as being above the Constitution. For instance, the States might decide that a Convention was necessary in order to limit the power of Congress—could Congress refuse to call a Convention in such instance? A situation very nearly like this occurred when the 17th amendment—direct election of Senators—was proposed—it can hardly be argued that this amendment was "necessary"; rather, it is apparent that Congress acted in order to avoid a Convention.

The Federalist Papers give clear insight as to what the framers of the Constitution had in mind with the adoption of article V. Alexander Hamilton, in Federalist Paper No. 85, made the point that the people were a little afraid at that time about the proposed Constitution and what they should do if they had a balky Congress with which they could not deal. Pointing out they would want to amend the Constitution and to insure this right article V was approved.

HAMILTON

Hamilton said:

> By the fifth article of the plan, the Congress will be obliged, "on the application of the legislature of two-thirds of the States" which at present amounts to nine, to call a Convention for proposing amendments which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or by conventions in three-fourths thereof. The words of this article are peremptory. The Congress "shall call a Convention." Nothing in this particular is left to the discretion of that body. And of consequence all the declaration about their disinclination to a change, vanishes in the air. Nor however difficult it may be supposed to unite two-thirds or three-fourths of the state legislatures, in amendments which may affect local interests, can there be any room to apprehend any such difficulty in a Union on points which are merely relative to the general liberty or security of the people. We may safely rely on the disposition of the State legislatures to erect barriers against the encroachments of the national authority.

THE SITUATION TODAY

It can be seen then that the situation confronting this Congress is precisely that visualized by the delegates to the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia in 1787 when they made provision that a Constitutional Convention must be called upon application of two-thirds of the States. At this time in our history, two-thirds of the States of the Union number 34. As of this moment, 32 States have petitioned this Congress to call a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the States for ratification which would permit the States a degree of flexibility in the apportionment of one House of their State legislatures. It should come as no surprise to the Members of Congress that the States have so petitioned.

In 1963, as the first implications of *Baker* v. *Carr*—March 26, 1962, 369 U.S. 186—became evident, several States petitioned Congress to call a convention or to take action.

In 1964, Congress again failed to take action and additional States added their petitions to the roll before us.

In 1965, the process was repeated.

Again in 1966, the number of States petitioning for action increased.

So far this year 1967, four additional States have petitioned, bringing the total number of petitions before us, as I have said, to 32. I predict that the number will reach 34, and quite possibly more. The reason is that Congress has refused to act in keeping with the expressed, deeply felt wishes of the States in connection with this vital constitutional question. Therefore, as Hamilton foresaw in making provision for a call of a Constitutional Convention in the face of an obdurate Congress, the States are following the petition route.

It is important, moreover it is essential, it seems to me, in view of this demand by the States for a Convention that certain facts be clearly enunciated.

1. ARE THE PETITIONS FROM THE STATES INVALID HAVING BEEN ADOPTED OVER A PERIOD, TO DATE, OF FOUR YEARS?

Article V is silent both as to the period of time in which applications must be received in order to be valid and as to the period of time in which ratification must occur in order for a proposed amendment to become valid as a part of the Constitution.

A time limit in which ratification must take place was imposed by the Congress in the submission of the 18th amendment. This marked the first instance of such a time limitation. In the third section of that amendment the 7-year period for ratification was expressed. The validity of this amendment was challenged because of the alleged "extra-constitutional provision of the third section" in *Dillon* v. *Glass, Deputy Collector of the United States Internal Revenue,* 256 U.S. at 368.

The court ruled that the fair inference from article V is that ratification must be within some reasonable time after proposal of the amendment; and that 7 years, as determined by Congress, was reasonable. The opinion pointed out that the Constitution's lack of express provision on the subject is not in itself controlling, because with the Constitution, as with a statute or other written instrument, what is reasonably implied is as much a part of it as what is expressed. The following cases were cited: *United States* v. *Babbit,* 1 Black, 55, 61; *Ex parte Yarbrough,* 110 U.S. 651, 658; *McHenry* v. *Alford,* 168 U.S. 651, 672; *South Carolina* v. *United States,* 199 U.S. 437, 451; *Luria* v. *United States,* 231 U.S. 9, 24; *The Pesaro,* 255 U.S. 216.

An examination of article V, the court said, discloses that it is intended to invest Congress with a wide range of power in proposing amendments. The opinion also reads:

> We do not find anything in the Article which suggests that an amendment once proposed is to be open to ratification for all time, or that ratification in some of the States may be separated from that in others by many years and yet be effective. We do find that which strongly suggests the contrary. First, proposal and ratification are not treated as unrelated acts but as succeeding steps in a single endeavor, the natural inference being that they are not to be widely separated in time. Secondly, it is only when there is deemed to be a necessity therefore that amendments are to be proposed, the reasonable implication being that when proposed they are to be considered and disposed of presently. Thirdly, as ratification is but the expression of the approbation of the people and is a fair implication that it must be sufficiently contemporaneous in that number of States to reflect the will of the people in all sections at relatively the same period, which of course ratification scattered through a long series of years would not do.
>
> We conclude that the fair inference or implication from Article V is that the ratification must be within some reasonable time after proposal.
>
> Of the power of Congress, keeping within reasonable limits to fix a definite period for the ratification we entertain no doubt. As a rule the Constitution speaks in general terms, leaving Congress to deal with subsidiary matters of detail as the public interests and changing conditions may require [1]; and Article V is no exception to the rule. Whether a definite period for ratification shall be fixed so that all may know what it is and speculation on what is a reasonable time may be avoided, is, in our opinion, a matter of detail which Congress may determine as an incident of its power to designate the mode of ratification. It is not questioned that seven years, the period fixed in this instance, was reasonable, if power existed to fix a definite time; nor could it well be questioned considering the periods within which prior amendments were ratified.

Applying the reasoning of the court in Dillon against Glass to the problem at hand it is clear that applications for a Convention would certainly be valid if received within a 7-year or possibly a longer period, since this period was established by the Congress and approved by the courts, and action pursuant thereto constituted valid ratification. The argument that applications, to be valid, must be received in the life of one Congress is about as illogical as saying that ratification must take place in the life of one Congress or that failure of a proposed amendment in one Congress would forever foreclose subsequent Congresses from attempting to propose similar amendments.

2. ARE THE APPLICATIONS VALID AS TO FORM AND SUBJECT MATTER?

In determining whether the applications are in proper form, it should be recalled in the first place that article V makes no reference to form. Congress might, although this is a doubtful power, prescribe a form to be used for this purpose but it has not done so. It seems strange, then, for Congress now to contend that the applications are in improper form. More logical, it would seem would be the view that since the State legislatures, and they alone, have the authority to initiate a Convention, their decision as to form should be binding, and the form used by one legislature would not preclude the use of a different style form by another legislature in making application to the Congress for a Convention. What really seems to be important or controlling is the substance, purpose, and intent of the applications.

---

[1] *Martin* v. *Hunter's Lessee,* 1 Wheat. 304, 326; *McCulloch* v. *Maryland,* 4 Wheat. 316, 407.

Each of the 32 applications presently before us specifically requests that a Constitutional Convention be called. They assign various reasons for their request by using one or more "whereas" clauses, all of which, however, relate to apportionment. These clauses are not a part of the resolving clause and in no way limit its effect. Some legislatures have proposed in their applications actual language for an amendment but in so doing they have not destroyed the effectiveness of their applications for a Constitutional Convention. Such language could only be regarded at most as surplusage intended to convey to the Congress an idea as to the wording of the amendment that either the Congress or a Convention could propose for ratification. The applications, as previously noted, do give to Congress the alternative to calling a Constitutional Convention; that alternative being the submission of amendment by the Congress.

Some of the States have in their applications, attempted to establish the method of ratification. No reason is given for this action, but it can be presumed that it was done so as to foreclose any possibility that the Congress might refuse to provide a method of ratification. In any event the inclusion of this extraneous material could not conceivably invalidate the application for a Constitutional Convention.

In fact, the situation existing now is almost precisely that envisioned by the delegates at Philadelphia. The alternative that the delegates provided, the calling of a Constitutional Convention, was designed to meet the very situation where Congress would not act.

3. DOES THE FACT THAT SOME OF THE LEGISLATURES WERE MAL-APPORTIONED AT THE TIME THE APPLICATIONS WERE ADOPTED AFFECT THE VALIDITY OF THE APPLICATIONS?

During the period of time covered by these applications—1963–67—application for a Convention has been made by legislatures apportioned on the basis of population alone. Other legislatures that were under court order to reapportion also made application for a Convention, and, finally, State legislatures that were malapportioned to some extent according to the principle of Reynolds against Sims, but had not been found to be malapportioned by any court, also approved applications for a Constitutional Convention. The question has been raised as to whether these two latter groups could make a valid application for a Convention so as to permit apportionment of one House on the basis of factors other than population alone.

Part of the argument being made in support of the premise that a malapportioned legislature could not make a valid application for such a Convention is based on the premise that such action was self-serving and would tend to make that legislature "pure." This line of argument falls of its own weight. In the first place, no such application could stay court action requiring apportionment based on the principle of Reynolds against Sims; namely, population alone. So that those legislatures under court order had no alternative but to reapportion, and they did. Obviously, any such application could not have been self-serving so far as preserving the apportionment of that legislature was concerned. Those legislatures that were in fact malapportioned, but under no court order could hardly expect to maintain their status quo by the act of approving an application for a Convention. Only an amendment to the Constitution could help them, and the undisputed fact is that there was not sufficient time to propose a constitutional amendment and obtain ratification so as to help this group.

As to the patently absurd argument that these applications cannot be counted because they were approved by a malapportioned legislature, it can be disposed of with the observation that if such argument is true, then every act of that legislature and preceding ones are invalid and with them quite likely most every act of the Congress because every State having more than one Representative in Congress would have had it congressional districts determined by an invalid legislature. Also, the validity of all amendments to the Federal Constitution subsequent to the 14th will be brought into question because with only one exception, the 21st article of amendment, they have been ratified by malapportioned legislatures. What a paradox it would be to hold valid the ratification of an amendment by a legislature as provided in article V and to hold invalid the petition for a Constitutional Convention by the same legislature as also provided in article V.

Fortunately, we have some guidance from the Supreme Court on this problem. The question arose in *Texas* v. *White* (1868) 7 Wall (74 U.S.) 700.

U.S. SUPREME COURT RULING ON THIS POINT

Texas v. *White*—74 U.S. Reports 700 (1868). The Supreme Court in this case was confronted with a situation based on certain acts of the Civil War Legislature of the State of Texas. It held that—

> Considered as transactions under the Constitution, the ordinance of secession, adopted by the Texas convention, and ratified by a majority of the citizens of Texas, and all acts of her legislature intended to give effect to that ordinance were absolutely null. They were utterly without operation in law.

But, the Court stated, the State did not cease to be a State, nor her citizens to be citizens of the Union. The insurgent legislature could not be regarded in the courts of the United States as a lawful legislature, or its acts as lawful acts. Yet that legislature and its government were the only actual government Texas had. It constituted a de facto government "and its acts during the period of its existence as such would be effectual and in almost all respects valid." Such validity, however, did not extend to a contract in aid of the rebellion, which was a treasonable act. On this point, the Court held:

> Exact definitions, within which the acts of a State government, organized in hostility to the Constitution and government of the United States, must be treated as valid or invalid, need not be attempted. It may be said, however, that acts necessary to peace and good order among citizens, such, for example, as acts sanctioning and protecting marriage and the domestic relations, governing the course of descents, regulating the conveyance and transfer of property, real and personal, and providing remedies for injuries to person and estate, and other similar acts, which would be valid if emanating from a lawful government, must be regarded in general as valid when proceeding from an actual, though unlawful government; and that acts in furtherance or support of rebellion against the United States, or intended to defeat the just rights of citizens and other acts of like nature, must, in general be regarded as invalid and void.

No one would seriously contend that these State legislatures who have made application for a Constitutional Convention were "illegal governments" by virtue of the fact that they were malapportioned. It certainly cannot be said that an application for a Constitutional Convention constitutes "rebellious" or "treasonable" actions of that legislature.

At the time the petition for a Convention was adopted, the very least that can be said that such legislature was a part of a de facto government and its acts would be effectual in such matters as this. This is clear under the decision in Texas against White.

But the uniform holdings of the courts have been that otherwise valid enactments of legislatures will not be set aside as unconstitutional by reason of their passage by a malapportioned legislature. See *Dawson* v. *Bomar*, 322 Fed. (2d) 445 (1963), Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals (certiorari denied, 376 U.S. 732).

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that portions of that opinion be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, portions of the opinion was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

> As indicated by the petitioner's failure to cite authority in support of his contention, the courts have uniformly held that otherwise valid enactments of legislatures will not be set aside as unconstitutional by reason of their passage by a malapportioned legislature. This conclusion is reached upon one or more of three judicially recognized doctrines: (1) the *de jure* doctrine which recognizes that a legislative body created by a state constitution has a *de jure* existence which is not destroyed by any failure to redistrict in accordance with the constitutional mandate; (2) the *de facto* doctrine which recognizes that the legislative offices created by the state constitution were *de jure* and the incumbents, even though elected under an invalid districting act, were at least *de facto* members of the legislature and their acts as valid as the acts of the *de jure* officers; (3) the doctrine of avoidance of chaos and confusion which recognizes the common sense principle that courts, upon balancing the equities between the individual complainant and the public at large, will not declare acts of a malapportioned legislature invalid where to do so would create a state of chaos and confusion.
>
> For the Court to select any particular category of laws and separate them from other laws for the purpose of applying either the *de facto* doctrine or the doctrine of avoidance of chaos and confusion would in fact circumvent legal principles in order to substi-

> tute the Court's opinion as to the wisdom, morality, or appropriateness of such laws.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, in the case of ***Ryan* v. *Tinsley***, 316 Fed. (2d) 430 U.S. Court of Appeals, Tenth Circuit, April 22, 1963, the court held:

> If the petitioner's contentions are to be accepted, a malapportioned legislature could not pass a valid act of reapportionment.

4. CAN THE CONGRESS OR THE STATES LIMIT THE ACTION OF A CONVENTION?

In providing an answer to this question two principles must be kept in mind. First, is that whatever the Congress does, it can only do as a result of authority delegated to it in the Constitution. Second, Congress in proposing amendments or calling a Constitutional Convention is not exercising a legislative function. This latter matter was thoroughly discussed and disposed of by the Court in *Hollingsworth* v. *Virginia* (1798) Dallas 378. In that case the following argument was made:

> The amendment has not been proposed in the form prescribed by the constitution, and therefore, it is void. Upon an inspection of the original roll, it appears, that the amendment was never submitted to the president for his approbation. The constitution declares, that every order, resolution or vote, to which the concurrence of the senate and house of representatives may be necessary (except on a question of adjournment), shall be presented to the president of the United States; and before the same shall take effect, shall be approved by him, or, being disapproved by him, shall be repassed by two-thirds of the senate and house of representatives &c. Art. 8 S 7. Now, the constitution likewise declares, that the concurrence of both houses shall be necessary to a proposition for amendments. Art. V. And it is no answer to the objection, to observe, that as two-thirds of both houses are required to originate the proposition, it would be nugatory to return it with the president's negative, to be repassed by the same number; since the reasons assigned for his disapprobation might be so satisfactory as to reduce the majority below the constitutional proportion. The concurrence of the president is required in matters of infinitely less importance; and whether on subjects of ordinary legislation, or of constitutional amendments, the expression is the same, and equally applies to the act of both houses of congress.

In response the Attorney General stated:

> Two objections are made. 1st. That the amendment has not been proposed in due form. But has not the same course been pursued relative to all the other amendments that have been adopted? (a) And the case of amendments is evidently a substantive act, unconnected with the ordinary business of legislation, and not within the policy or terms of investing the president with a qualified negative on the acts and resolutions of congress.

The Court on the day succeeding the arguments unanimously held that the amendment was constitutionally adopted, and this decision has been uniformly observed, establishing the fact that the amending process is not a legislative function.

As to the question of a delegation of power to the Congress to limit the action of a Convention, nowhere in the Constitution can such a delegation of authority be found. Such a delegation would negate the very authority reserved to the States. What purpose would be served by allowing the States to initiate a Convention and leave the authority in the Congress to say what the Convention could do? If a Convention can in fact be limited, it would seem that only the States who possess the sole authority to initiate it could control it. In this connection I would point out that all 32 petitions under discussion request action only in respect to reapportionment. In fact, also, further and ultimate control does rest in the States for not until three-fourths of them have ratified, could any amendment proposed by a Convention have effect.

In further considering this point, it is necessary to examine the precise nature of the acts involved in calling a Constitutional Convention. The Congress, as has been discussed, does not have the initiating authority in this instance, it can act only in response to applications from at least two-thirds of the State legislatures, and, upon receipt of the necessary number must call such a Convention. Since the Congress is without authority of its own to call a Convention, it is possessed at most with authority only over routine housekeeping functions. These functions would provide for the place, date, presumably the duration, financing, voting, and other similar functions of the Convention.

Since article V gives to the States sole authority to determine whether or not there shall be a Constitutional Convention and since someone must say where, when, and so forth, Congress obviously has this limited authority. It can be argued that the States could include these items in a uniform manner in their applications, but since they did not do so it would seem that this function is left to the Congress.

Wherein lies any safeguard against a "wide open" Convention? First in the good faith, judgment, and responsibility of its delegates. Second, in the requirement that any proposals of the Convention must be ratified by three-fourths of the States—38 of them—before becoming effective.

5. CAN A STATE LEGISLATURE RESCIND AN APPLICATION FOR A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION?

Attempts to rescind the application for a Constitutional Convention made by an earlier legislature have occurred at least in four State legislatures. An instance where this occurred is in Maryland. The 1965 Legislature of Maryland, found by the Court to be malapportioned, adopted a resolution calling for a Constitutional Convention. The legislature was reapportioned according to population. In its 1967 session, a resolution rescinding the earlier application was introduced but rejected. No legislature has rescinded an application for a Constitutional Convention on reapportionment of State legislatures. The question then is whether or not such an act of rescission would have effect.

The Supreme Court has been confronted with cases on ratification that shed some light on this question. The Court has held that the function of a State legislature in ratifying a proposed amendment to the Federal Constitution, like the function of Congress in proposing the amendment is a Federal function derived from the Federal Constitution; and it transcends any limitations sought to be imposed by the people of a State. *Hawke* v. *Smith*, No. 1, 253 U.S. 221; *Hawke* v. *Smith*, No. 2, 253 U.S. 231; *National Prohibition* cases, 253 U.S. 350, 386.

It also appears that ratification of a proposed amendment, when once acceded to by a State legislature would seem to exhaust its authority to act and preclude a reconsideration. *Coleman* v. *Miller* 307 U.S. 433.

The Court has also held that certification to the Secretary of State—now Administrator GSA—by the legislature of its act of ratification is binding upon him. In *Lester* v. *Garnett* 258 U.S. 130, the Court held:

> The remaining contention is that the ratifying resolutions of Tennessee and of West Virginia are inoperative, because adopted in violation of the rules of legislative procedure prevailing in the respective States. The question raised may have been rendered immaterial by the fact that since the proclamation the legislatures of two other States—Connecticut and Vermont—have adopted resolutions of ratification. But a broader answer should be given to the contention. The proclamation by the Secretary certified that from official documents on file in the Department of State it appeared that the proposed Amendment was ratified by the legislatures of thirty-six States, and that it 'has become valid to all intents and purposes as a part of the Constitution of the United States.' As the legislatures of Tennessee and of West Virginia had power to adopt the resolutions of ratification, official notice to the Secretary, duly authenticated, that they had done so was conclusive upon him, and, being certified to by his proclamation, is conclusive upon the source. The rule declared in *Field* v. *Clark*, 143 U.S. 649, 669–673, is applicable here. See also *Harwood* v. *Wentworth*, 162 U.S. 547, 562.

Since the act of a State legislature in making an application to Congress for a Constitutional Convention and its act of ratifying a proposed amendment are quite similar and relating the court's holdings in the former to the latter it is apparent that: First, both are Federal functions; second, neither can be rescinded; and, third, each would be binding, the one upon the Congress, the other on the Administrator of GSA and both upon the courts. The rule of reasonableness, such as the Court used in the National Prohibition cases, where it held 7 years to be a reasonable time in which to effect ratification, could be applied so as to prevent the cumulative effect of applications spread over a number of years and on various subjects. Any attempt to rescind during this 7-year period would be a nullity, and after the lapse of 7 years during which time the necessary two-thirds had not been achieved the applications would lose their effect.

Additionally, once applications from two-thirds of the legislatures have been received by the Congress we are confronted with what might be termed an act of finality. Any attempted act of rescission of its application by a State legislature would have no more meaning then than would an attempt to rescind a sufficient number of acts of ratification so as to repeal an article of amendment that had previously been ratified by three-fourths of the States.

6. MUST THE CONGRESS CALL A CONVENTION UPON APPLICATION OF TWO-THIRDS OF THE LEGISLATURES OF THE STATES?

The Federalist Papers give clear insight as to what the framers of the Constitution had in mind in article V. I have quoted Alexander Hamilton in Federalist Paper No. 85 in this respect, where Hamilton makes it clear the Congress has no option.

The duty of Congress under article V is quite clear. In the syllabus of *United States* v. *Sprague et al.*, 282 U.S. 715, it is noted that:

> . . . 2. Article V, in its provision that proposed amendments shall become part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States or by conventions in three-fourths thereof, "as the one or the other mode of ratification may be proposed by the Congress," plainly and without ambiguity places the choice between these two modes in the sole discretion of Congress, and cannot by construction be read as requiring that changes detracting from the liberty of the citizens, distinguished from changes in the character of federal means or machinery, shall be referred to conventions. p. 730.
>
> 3. The Constitution was written to be understood by the voters; its words and phrases were used in their normal and ordinary as distinguished from technical meaning; where the intention is clear there is no room for construction and no excuse for interpolation or addition. p. 731.
>
> 4. The fact that an instrument drawn with such meticulous care, and by men who so well understood how to make language fit their thought does not contain any phrase limiting the exercise of discretion by the Congress in choosing one or the other alternative modes of ratification, is persuasive evidence that no qualification was intended. p. 732.

Applying this interpretation to the instant case it would appear that the Congress is left without authority to determine *the wisdom, propriety or desirability* of the applications and their purposes. Certainly it would not be a decision for the Congress to make as to whether or not there should be a Constitutional Convention this decision has already been made by the States, assum*ing 34 applications. Only when* an amendment or amendments as had been requested had been proposed by Congress for ratification could the Congress constitutionally ignore the mandate of the State legislatures calling for a Convention. The *action of Congress in this* instance would seem to be purely and simply ministerial. To reinforce this view, if indeed reinforcement is needed, is the unquestionable fact that the Constitutional Convention of 1787 adopted the Convention clause of article V because of fear, a fear it appears that demonstrates no little foresight, that an oppressive Federal administration might refuse to yield to the demands of the States for a change in the fundamental law.

ENFORCEMENT BY COURT ORDER

Since the action required of Congress in calling a Constitutional Convention is purely ministerial, in fact not even legislative, can it be compelled to do so against its wishes, by court order? Recognizing the doctrine of separation of powers and the somewhat battered principle of political question, it appears that a recalcitrant Congress can be compelled to act.

It is a well-established principle of law that the courts will compel the doing of purely ministerial acts. This is normally accomplished by mandamus and is frequenty referred to as a writ commanding the performance of a particular duty which results from the official station of the one to whom it is directed.

In one of its very early decisions, *Marbury* v. *Madison* (February 1803) 1 Cranch 137, the Supreme Court clearly established the principle that the Court can command the performance of a purely ministerial act by an official of a coequal branch of Government, the Executive. Some excerpts from that opinion are particularly applicable. On page 163, the Court said:

> The government of the United States has been emphatically termed a government of laws, and not of man. It will certainly cease to deserve this high appellation, if the laws furnish no remedy for the violation of a vested legal right.

On page 166:

> But where a specific duty is assigned by law, and individual rights depend upon the performance of that duty, it seems equally clear that the individual who considers himself injured, has a right to resort to the laws of this country for a remedy.

On page 170:

> What is there in the exalted station of the officer, which shall bar a citizen from asserting, in a court of Justice, his legal rights, or shall forbid a court to listen to the claim, or to issue a mandamus, directing the performance of a duty, not depending on executive discretion, but on particular acts of Congress and the general principles of law?

And on page 179:

> From these, and many other selections which might be made, it is apparent that *the Framers of the Constitution contemplated* that instrument as a rule for the government of courts as well as of the legislature.

Applying the reasoning of the Court in that landmark case to the problem at hand can it earnestly be contended that *the people, through their representatives* in the State legislature can be denied by the Congress one of the most fundamental rights they possess, that of altering the basic document under which the whole process of government operates, the Constitution, *and that the Court is* without authority to enforce this right? If this be true, that the right of two-thirds of the States to secure a Constitutional Convention upon application to Congress is a nonenforceable right, then we have ceased to be a Government of laws. Indeed, for the Court to refuse to enforce this right it would have to cast aside a whole series of decisions, not the least of which would be those affirming the validity and propriety of several articles of amendment. But, more importantly, the people's sovereignty would once and for all have been destroyed.

The Court has had no difficulty in recent cases involving the legislatures. Granted they are State legislatures, but the principle remains the same. The Court secured compliance with its orders even though the action involved was to a certain extent legislative whereas in our case it clearly is not. These cases involved apportionment, beginning with Baker against Carr and more recently Reynolds against Sims, and related cases. In those instances, where a legislature refused to obey an order to redistrict, the Court developed its own districting plan and directed elections to be held. It is really not arguable that the right of two-thirds of the State legislatures for a Constitutional Convention clearly provided by article V is less a right than that of the people of Tennessee to have reapportionment of their State legislature.

Should the Congress fail to respond affirmatively to the applications of the legislatures of two-thirds of the States for a Constitutional Convention, it would appear that the Supreme Court could enforce this right, and that precedent for it to do so exists. Should the Congress refuse to comply with the writ, the Court, in enforcing this right, could itself order the Convention. Some State legislatures, I would be certain, would pursue this form of remedy should the Congress fail to act.

I trust in this somewhat lengthy presentation a base has been provided for rational discussion of the issue before us. It would have been far simpler to engage in a bit of rhetoric rather than citing the ample precedent, intent and law which prevails. However, it is my observation that this deliberative body, now engaged in a considerable constitutional discussion, prefers fact to fun in reaching its conclusions.

For myself, as I have stated, should this body, through inaction in proposing a reapportionment constitutional amendment, vote the mandatory alternative of a Convention, I have no more fear of the outcome than did the delegates to Philadelphia in 1787, when they provided this course of action for the situation they could foresee which now has arisen.

If there are those among my colleagues who are fearful of a Convention, I suggest they respond now to the call of *the States by proposing the necessary* amendment to the States for ratification or rejection.

PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

There are several elements which I believe should be included in the proposed constitutional *amendment:*

First. The proposal should be entirely permissive in nature. Each State could make its own determination whether or not it wishes to make use of provisions for constituting one house of its legislature on the basis of *factors* other than population or constituting both houses on the basis of population.

Second. Reapportionment would be mandatory every 10 years.

Third. Any State electing to constitute one house of its legislature on the basis of factors other than population would be required to submit alternate plans to the electorate for approval or rejection—one plan for population only in both houses, the other a little Federal plan.

Fourth. A section should be considered protecting the right of the States to determine the composition of the subdivisions of State government—county boards of supervisors, school districts, city councils, and so on.

Fifth. A section reasserting the right of every State to two U.S. Senators, and providing that States cannot be combined for purposes of membership in the U.S. Senate.

Sixth. A section reasserting the right of every State to proportionate membership in the House of Representatives, with no State having less than one member, and a stipulation that State boundaries cannot be crossed in the composition of congressional districts.

The voice of the people has been made abundantly clear on this issue. Now it is up to us to let the people decide—either through a Convention called for that purpose or a proposed constitutional amendment by this Congress. For the life of me, I can find no rationale for denying the people of this country the right to decide—which they now request. If we, the Congress, cannot trust the people, we have no right to be here. Frankly, no amount of verbal obfuscation can hide the fact that this is the real issue up for decision.

EXHIBIT 1

The four proposals as to methods of future amendments of the Constitution which were submitted in the Constitutional Convention, were as follows. One by Charles Pinckney, on May 29; one by Edmund Randolph on that same day; the third by William Patterson on June 15; and the fourth by Alexander Hamilton on June 18.

PINCKNEY

Mr. Pinckney proposed the following:

"If two-thirds of the Legislatures of the States apply for the same, the Legislature of the United States shall call a Convention for the purpose of amending the Constitution; or, should Congress, with the consent of two-thirds of each House, propose to the States amendments to the same, the agreement of two-thirds of the Legislatures of the States shall be sufficient to make the said amendments parts of the Constitution."

As Pinckney explained it, this article:[1]

". . . proposes to declare, that if it should hereafter appear necessary to the United States to recommend the Grant of any additional Powers, that the assent of a given number of the States shall be sufficient to invest them and bind the Union as fully as if they had been confirmed by the Legislatures of all the States."

Pinckney feared the requirement of unanimous consent to any change, as found in the Articles, because "it is to this unanimous consent the depressed situation of the Union is undoubtedly owing . . ."[2]

RANDOLPH

Randolph proposed the following language:

"Resolved that provision ought to be made for the amendment of the Articles of Union, whensoever it shall seem necessary; and that the assent of the National Legislature ought not to be required thereto."

MASON

Mason, on June 11, in defending the proposal for providing some means of amendment said that it would:

". . . be better to provide for them in an easy, regular and constitutional way, than to trust to chance and violence. It would be improper to require the consent of the National Legislature, because they may abuse their power, and refuse their assent on that very account. The opportunity for such an abuse may be the fault of the Constitution calling for amendment."

As various details of what is now Article V were discussed and agreed to, a motion was made by Governors Morris and Gerry to amend proposed Article V, so that the Convention clause might be inserted providing that a Convention for proposing amendments would be called on application of two-thirds of the States. Madison, however, "did not see why Congress would not be as much bound to propose amendments applied for by two-thirds of the States as to call a Convention on the like application."[3] He had no objection to providing for a Convention, as he had previously indicated, but did foresee "that difficulties might arise as to the form, the quorum, etc., which in Constitutional regulations ought to be as much as possible avoided."[4] *The motion to amend so as to require a Convention was approved without dissent and was worded in such a fashion as to make it mandatory that Congress call a Convention upon application by two-thirds of the States.*

WHO WANTS A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION?

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, this morning we have heard the other side of the lawyer's argument regarding the obscure constitutional questions involved in convening a Constitutional Convention for the purpose of rewriting our basic charter of government. I will have more to say later about the substance of these speeches.

Suffice it to say now that this lawyer's argument really misses the whole point that is involved in the Constitutional Convention issue. That is the question whether the people of the United States want a Constitutional Convention.

Throughout their 3-year struggle to reinstate rotten borough legislatures, the proponents of such a constitutional amendment have consistently urged that we "let the people decide." We who have opposed reinstating minority government in the States believe the people have decided. In fact, they have decided this issue twice, by repudiating the so-called Dirksen amendment in the Senate in both 1965 and 1966.

I suggest we also took to the people on whether to have a Constitutional Convention. We should not concern ourselves with the actions of now extinct rotten borough legislatures calling for a convention to ratify their illegality. We should instead look to see whether the people of the United States want a Constitutional Convention.

It is clear that many of the legislatures that have petitioned Congress for a Constitutional Convention would, upon reflection, withdraw those Convention calls. A case in point is Maryland, which one of the speakers this morning inaccurately characterized as having rejected an attempt to rescind its Convention call.

The fact is that within 1 week of the time that the current drive to call a Constitutional Convention was revealed, efforts were underway in the Maryland Legislature to repeal the convention call that the grossly malapportioned 1965 Maryland Legislature had made. Limited by the State constitution to a 70-day session, the fairly apportioned Maryland Legislature of 1967 was literally working against the clock. At the time this latest move to call a convention was discovered, only a week remained in the session.

The senate passed a rescission resolution by a vote of 27–13, and sent that petition to the house of delegates on the last day of the session. There the petition was sponsored by half the members of the house, but the opponents of the amendment immediately moved to table it. That tabling motion, which was in effect a vote on the resolution itself, was defeated by a vote of more than 2 to 1. Eighty-five delegates voted in favor of rescission, and only 35 voted against it. During that critical vote, however, the clock had run out on the 70th day, barring final passage of the bill.

It is indisputably clear that Maryland would have rescinded its Convention call if it had not been for the limitation on its session. Rescission efforts also seem probable in a number of other States. The Washington House, just 2 weeks ago, for example, passed a rescission resolution.

Leaving aside technical legal questions about the petitions, what do the people of America think about the Constitutional Convention issue? The evidence is abundant and clear that the American people do not want to reverse the one-man, one-vote rule. In light of that fact, it is equally clear that the American people do not want a Convention to tamper with other aspects of the Constitution either. At the height of the tumult about the one-man, one-vote decision, in the summer of 1964, a Gallup poll indicated that two out of every three Americans favored the one-man, one-vote principle applied to both houses of State legislatures. During the next 2 years, as most State legislatures in America were reapportioned, popular approval of the one-man, one-vote rule principle increased. By November 1966, the Harris poll revealed that—

> By 3 to 1, every group in the population specifically supports the one-man, one-vote decision.

As the Harris and Gallup polls reveal, people in every section of the country, from every walk of life, support the one-man, one-vote principle. And why not? Who can be against equal representation in State government and against minority control?

Who wants a Constitutional Convention? The only people in America who want a Constitutional Convention on the one-man, one-vote rule or any other issue are the special interests which prospered under malapportionment. They are the people who represented a minority of the people and commercial interests of the States and who controlled legislation in the States for the last half century. These are the interests which failed to meet the problems of urban areas, where the overwhelming majority of Americans now live. They are the interests who refused to let State legislatures face up to the issues of the 20th century. They are the people who practically succeeded in derailing the federal system prior to the Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote decision, by paralyzing the machinery of State government.

---

[1] *The Records of the Federal Convention of 1787* 120 (Farrand ed. 1937). Farrand indicates that Pinckney's explanation of this Article XVI was made on May 28, the day before he presented it to the Convention.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Madison, *Journal of the Federal Constitution* (Scott ed. 1898) Note 12 at 737.

[4] *Ibid.*

In short, the question of whether to have a Constitutional Convention should depend on what the American people want. They want the one-man, one-vote rule. They do not want a Constitutional Convention. They want the Constitution protected, not tampered with.

I ask that the Harris and Gallup polls I have mentioned be reprinted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY—SUPREME COURT WINS OVER-ALL SUPPORT OF ONLY 48 PERCENT OF PUBLIC

(By Louis Harris)

The U.S. Supreme Court has become a highly controversial branch of government and is able to muster an over-all vote of confidence from less than half the American people. The public, whatever constitutional principles may be involved, is most critical of two key decisions; the banning of prayers in public schools and the refusal to accept confessions made by suspects before they can obtain legal counsel.

In a special survey of a cross-section of the American people, the public gives a negative rating to the job done by the Nation's highest court by 52–48 percent. This is largely the result of the court's extreme unpopularity in the South, although the Midwest approximates the national average of disapproval.

"Popular" decisions by the court include three landmark cases decided in recent years. For example, by 3 to 1, every group in the population specifically supports the "one-man, vote" decision that required many States to reapportion legislative districts on a population basis. Furthermore, with the exception of the South, the decisions to outlaw segregation in the schools and in public accommodations meets with close to 2-to-1 public approval.

A sixth decision—that which forbids the State Department from denying passports to Communists—splits the public almost down the middle.

A consistent pattern in the results reveals that younger people, Negroes and the better educated tend to back the court while white Southerners, older people and the less well-educated tend to be the court's severest critics.

The special cross-section of the public was asked:

"How would you rate the job the U.S. Supreme Court has been doing—excellent, pretty good, only fair or poor?"

	Good-excellent, percent	*Fair-poor, percent*
Nation-wide	48	52
By region:		
East	52	48
Midwest	48	52
South	35	65
West	55	45
By age:		
Under 35	58	42
35 to 49	51	49
50 and over	42	58
By education:		
8th grade or less	44	56
High school	46	54
College	53	47

A young husband in Columbia, Miss., summed up his position in this way: "I have two school-age children. Therefore, I don't like what the court is doing—period." Said an Illinois housewife: "I'm disturbed about this bending over backward to take care of the single individual. What about the majority who want the opposite?"

The court, however, is not without supporters. "They're trying to eliminate some of the bigotry," said a 64-year-old woman from Los Angeles. "They have put the churches on their toes," added a neighbor. "They've stuck their necks out and taken stands when they could have avoided it."

Here is the roster of approval and disapproval by the public on six key Supreme Court decisions:

	Approve, percent	*Disapprove, percent*
Reapportionment: one man, one vote	76	24
Desegregation of schools	64	36
Desegregation of public accommodations	64	36
Allowing Communist passports	49	51
Disallowing confessions without counsel	35	65
Outlawing prayers in classrooms	30	70

In the South, only the reapportionment decision meets with public approval. The public accommodations decision, upholding the 1964 Civil Rights Act, is opposed better than 2 to 1. It is significant, however, that the 1954 court decision on school integration is now supported by 44 percent of all Southerners, indicating that opposition trends to dwindle with time.

By contrast, Negroes heartily support five out of six of the key decisions. They are heavily influenced by the forthright position of the court on racial equality, but they are opposed to the school prayer ban by 3 to 1, indicating the strong religious feeling that exists in the Negro community.

Young people appear to be far more aroused about individual civil liberties than their elders. This is undoubtedly a reflection of the feelings of this younger generation that non-conformity is vital to a free society. Clearly, the issue of dissent has split the generations in America in the mid-1960s.

THE GALLUP POLL—PEOPLE BACK HIGH COURT ON APPORTIONMENT, 3–2

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J., Aug. 18.—A constitutional amendment that would undo the Supreme Court's ruling on apportionment of state legislatures is likely to run into trouble with voters of the Nation.

In the first test of the public's reaction to the Supreme Court ruling, opinion divides 3 to 2 in favor among those who have formed an opinion.

The effect of the Supreme Court's ruling would be to reduce representation of the small towns and rural areas in state legislatures, thus reducing what is normally a conservative influence in state politics.

At this point, roughly one-fourth of those interviewed had not yet formed an opinion on this issue, which will be debated in the campaign and in the months to come. Voters living in the most highly urbanized areas—who stand to gain the most from the new Court ruling—voice the greatest approval.

The following question was put to a cross-section sample of people across the Nation:

"As you know, the U.S. Supreme Court has ruled that the number of representatives of both the lower house and the Senate in all state legislatures must be in proportion to population. In most states, this means reducing the number of legislators from the rural areas and increasing the number from urban area. Do you approve or disapprove of this ruling?

The results for the Nation as a whole:

	Percent
Approve	47
Disapprove	30
No opinion	23

A plank in the 1964 Republican platform calls for a constitutional amendment as well as legislation—"enabling states having bicameral legislatures to apportion one house on bases of their choosing, including factors other than population."

But the survey showed very little difference between Republicans, Democrats, and Independents on this issue.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR THURMOND

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the order previously entered, the Chair recognizes the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND] for 20 minutes.

GROUND WARFARE IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. Anthony Harrigan, associate editor of the Charleston News and Courier, has gained an international reputation for authoritative articles on military tactics and strategy. His reputation is well deserved because he is not content with armchair theory. Mr. Harrigan roams the world, visiting the scene of action for on-the-spot analysis. Unlike many correspondents, who merely "report" the action, he writes from a military understanding of the principles at work.

His latest article, "Ground Warfare in Vietnam," from the April 1967 issue of the Military Review of the U.S. Army Ground and General Staff College, is a good example of his work. Mr. Harrigan makes the point that war hardware and gadgetry still take second place to the foot-soldier himself. "In the final analysis," says Mr. Harrigan, "troops on the ground decide whether a country is won or lost."

I recommend this article to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GROUND WARFARE IN VIETNAM

Although the United States is in South Vietnam to assist that country in maintaining its independence, the southeast Asian conflict also is serving as a laboratory in which a new type of war is being tested. The details of the test have profound significance to free societies confronted with the menace of an illusive, guerrilla enemy backed up by regular units infiltrating across a border.

NEW TOOLS OF WAR

Military commentators have made much of the new tools of war which engineers have produced to aid United States and Republic of Vietnam forces in dealing with the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese regular units. The most important of these tools is the helicopter. In the course of the Vietnam struggle, the helicopter has undergone a remarkable evolution from an unarmed aerial transport for a squad of soldiers to a true combat air vehicle mounting an elaborate array of weapons, including rockets, guided missiles, grenades, and automatic cannon.

Somewhat overlooked in the public and professional attention devoted to the new weaponry is the revolution in battlefield tactics. Important as are the new machines and weapons, the ways in which foot soldiers are employed have even greater significance. In the final analysis, troops on the ground decide whether a country is won or lost.

The US soldier on the ground in Vietnam can count on extraordinary support. Massive firepower is available to back up deep penetrations of enemy territory. Excellent communications make possible complicated, precisely timed operations. In critical situations, troops on the ground can summon aerial and artillery support. Availability of fixed-wing and rotary craft have made instant logistics almost a reality. Most important of all, there is the unprecedented mobility of ground units and their weapons.

It is routine for a division commander to have a battalion picked up by helicoper and carried to a clearing deep in a jungle. It also is routine to fly artillery over rice paddies and jungle into positions miles from any road or atop high ridges.

IMPORTANT ADVANCES

The heli-lifting of artillery, even at night, represents one of the most important advances in ground warfare in centuries. Major General Moshe Dayan, former Israeli Chief of Staff who observed the ground conflict in Vietnam, has described this heli-lifting as "the American answer to the problem of movement in the jungle: mobility that is not dependent on roads, ground vehicles or airfields."

Neither mobility nor massive firepower, however, offer a complete answer to the problem of the elusive guerrilla unit. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese are superbly adapted to the environment in which they are fighting. All through the summer of 1966, for example, the North Vietnamese regulars infiltrated into wilderness areas of South Vietnam. Using tunnels and jungle tracks, they built up supply and ammunition depots inside the demilitarized zone. The battles US ground troops fought in the mud and among the rocks in the summer and early fall testified to the legpower of the enemy.

These qualities on the part of the Communist units have led to frustration for US ground forces on many occasions. Nothing is more depressing than a sweep that nets nothing. The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese are skilled at utilizing the hours of darkness, the early morning monsoon rains, and the fog to withdraw from the US attackers. This, after all, is their basic strategy. For them, victory often simply means avoiding being destroyed.

HIDE-AND-SEEK

Ground warfare, in these circumstances, frequently is a game of hide-and-seek. Reaction time is no longer a major problem for US forces now that helicopters are available in great numbers. But locating the enemy—pinpointing his formations—is a different story. Helicopters loudly announce themselves as they approach a landing zone. Often, they are the signal for the enemy to break up into small units and move into the jungle by different routes as they strike out for a new rendezvous. It is this situation that has necessitated sophisticated tactics for stealthy entry onto the battlefield.

In time, less noisy helicopters may be produced which will allow a greater measure of surprise in heliborne assaults. For the present, US combat forces have to rely on unconventional tactics. This is not to say that side-looking radar and infrared devices in reconnaissance aircraft are not useful. They are able to detect river crossings at night and locate the sites of recent enemy campfires.

The most valuable data, however, comes from the soldier who spots the enemy with his own eyes. Thus, increasing use is being made of long-range reconnaissance patrols. These elements have been introduced at the battalion as well as the brigade level.

Customary procedure is for these patrols to be heli-lifted into enemy areas for reconnaissance missions of several days' duration. Their mission is not to engage the enemy, but to locate him. As in all patrol activities, results are mixed. Sometimes no useful information is turned up. On other occasions, the patrols are spotted by strong enemy forces, and it is necessary for the reconnaissance group to disengage. Finally, there are the successful operations when the enemy is pinpointed and a powerful US reaction force arrives on time to accomplish its mission.

FOLLOWUP PROCEDURE

A followup procedure is an outgrowth of the long-range patrol system. Under this procedure, a reaction force of company size is located fairly close to the reconnaissance patrol. Once the reconnaissance patrol has acquired a target, the accompanying reaction force begins the engagement. Meanwhile, the main battalion-strength reaction force is lifted into the area as fast as possible.

US troops also have been making increased use of night operations. Battalion airmobile assaults have been made under cover of darkness following reconnaissance by the battalion reconnaissance unit. These have been accomplished without preliminary aerial or artillery fire.

Continually being refined in Vietnam is the mode of entry onto the battlefield. The basic style of the heliborne assault involves preliminary aerial reconnaissance; closer inspection of a landing zone by air and ground commanders; preparation of the landing zone by bombing, artillery fire, and helicopter gunships; and, finally the landing of the assault force.

This basic style is not always satisfactory, however, as the preparatory phases of the operation frequently persuade the enemy to depart. A modification of the classic heliborne assault involves moving elements of a battalion into landing zones near the main landing zone that has been selected. Moving by night, a small reconnaissance force takes up positions in the main landing zone. The other elements of the battalion then land in the main zone without preparatory fire.

This is not to say one approach or another is better under all circumstances. The "mix" of the Vietnam war changes all the time. Fighting guerrillas and fighting North Vietnamese regulars are very different propositions. Fighting in the Mekong Delta and along the demilitarized zone involves different problems. In the former, the use of air and artillery has to be restrained because of the danger of harming friendly people. In the dense tropical forests along the Laotian border, where there are few people, it is possible to drench the ridges and valleys with artillery and rocket fire.

Heavy preparatory fire also is necessary in contested landing zones or in areas which it is necessary to seize, over fierce opposition, because of major campaign objectives. In such an operation, 105-millimeter howitzers might be heli-lifted into an uncontested landing zone a mile or two from the main landing zone. These howitzers would be put to work to soften up the perimeter of the main landing zone during a firing schedule of, perhaps, 30 minutes. Fighter bombers might then drop 500-pound bombs on the jungle bordering the main landing zone. Then, the troops would make their assault.

RINGSIDE SEAT

In such an operation, the assault commander would be in a helicopter command post where he has a sweeping vision of the battle area. Indeed, even a tank battalion commander is likely to be airborne during action. This way he is able to keep in constant touch and know where all his tanks are deployed.

Insofar as an assault commander is concerned, he can detect from a helicopter a gap in the bomb and artillery barrage softening up a landing zone. If the enemy is scattering, he can direct the gunships to follow as the enemy withdraws. The commander can take note of all the elements on the battleground—everything from unexploded bombs that endanger his own men to unwise bunching of troops. What the helicopter means to the assault commander is unprecedented opportunity to direct a battle from a ringside seat.

In World War II a division commander might not know what was going on until reports came in from the battlefield. In Vietnam, however, commanders can be in visual contact with the developing combat situation. Indeed, it is possible for a division commander or assistant division commander to oversee several battalion-size operations in a single day. The isolation of headquarters from frontline troops—always a danger in former wars—no longer exists in the Vietnam conflict.

Another interesting aspect of the new warfare in South Vietnam is the tempo of divisional action. Brigadier General Willard Pearson, Commanding General, 1st Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, gave this account of division operations in Army Digest:

"During a six-day period at Tuy Hoa, we conducted four battalion assaults and 11 artillery battery displacements by helicopter. At Tou Morong, we moved nearly 15,000 troops and accomplished 33 separate unit airmobile operations, plus seven artillery battery displacements in an 18-day period."

MODERN ARTILLERY RAID

One of the techniques used by the artillery in Vietnam is an updated version of the artillery raid. A typical raid consists of picking a location central to several enemy targets, landing a battery (four guns and a minimum of personnel) with 70 rounds for each gun and precomputed firing data. According to one 1st Cavalry Division source, "The idea is to get in, get the rounds off, and get out of the area." This type of raid is typical of the aggressive use of artillery in Vietnam.

Current infantry tactics indicate there is little danger of the war assuming a static quality. Indicative of this is the following statement by Major General William E. DePuy:

"We don't send troops slogging through the jungles anymore just looking for something. We let the rifle squads move out on reconnaissance. When they find something, we quickly send in a battalion, maybe two. And we provide the firepower support."

For the foot soldiers, the moment of greatest danger—and also the period of maximum casualties—is the initial contact with the enemy. After the troops have been offloaded from helicopters, they move out from the landing zone. Because of the nature of the terrain in South Vietnam, it often is necessary for a platoon to advance in single file down a narrow path.

This type of formation means that the unit has only a minimum of firepower forward. In such a situation, scouts will proceed with great caution, stopping to listen for the enemy and to search the path for evidence of mines. Nevertheless, ambush often cannot be avoided within a few hundred yards of a landing zone.

The Viet Cong are skillful at camouflage and at preparing firing positions. In all likelihood, the Viet Cong unit commander will allow the first US squads or platoons to pass along the path, and then direct all available fire at the other platoons strung out along the path. In such an incident, casualties are likely to be heavy on the US side.

The US counterattack, when it comes, most probably is conducted with aerial and artillery strikes, not manpower. Repeated storming by ground forces is not standard procedure in the Vietnam war. Instead, firepower is directed to accomplish the job. Bombs, rockets, and shells, after all, are not vulnerable to ambushes, nor are they impeded by jungle growth. To draw out the enemy to where he can be subjected to massive firepower is the US aim in the new warfare.

CAVE AND TUNNEL SYSTEMS

Of course, "shaking out" the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese can be extremely difficult. In the region of razorback ridges in the highlands, the North Vietnamese dug an elaborate cave and tunnel system that ran deep into the mountains. Denis Warner, the Australian military writer, has reported that "some of these manmade caves were 60 feet long and 40 feet wide, with 17-foot ceilings."

On the surface in the demilitarized zone, the North Vietnamese in the summer of 1966 dug miles of communications trenches and gun emplacements. Dealing with the Communist cave and tunnel systems is a problem throughout Vietnam, although the use of smoke and tear gas is helpful.

The extent of the tunneling points up the fallacy of regarding Communist insurgent warfare in Vietnam as strictly primitive. The notion of guerrillas swimming in a protective sea of peasants is grossly inadequate. Revolutionary warfare in the Vietnamese countryside has become quite sophisticated, with the enemy requiring concealed bases in forests and swamplands. Some of the caves and tunnels constitute large ammunition and supply dumps. Indeed, a 200-bed hospital was found in one cave network in the fall of 1966. It was designed to serve North Vietnamese troops.

Basic to understanding the conflict in Vietnam is the realization that several different types of war are in progress at the same time in different parts of the country and in different terrain. While Vietnam is not an armor war, for instance, tank units have played an increasingly important role in the Central Highlands.

Wherever the North Vietnamese have established villages fortified with concrete bunkers and trench systems, a tank is a useful weapon. Tanks also have been useful in fighting off North Vietnamese battalion-size attacks. In one such attack on a Korean unit in August 1966, tanks employed in support of the 25th Division killed 40 percent of the attacking force.

The French had a disastrous experience with armor in Vietnam, but they lacked advantages possessed by US forces. Helicopter mobility makes possible the swift dispatch of repair crews to disabled tanks. These crews can repair in a matter of hours a tank that has been put out of action by mines or recoilless rifles.

ROUTE SECURITY

Tanks also are proving valuable for route security. They can keep roads open and protect truck convoys. In an ambush, tanks immediately get out of the "kill zone" and charge the ambushers. One of the most effective tank weapons is the canister round. This contains 2,700 small steel pellets which have a shotgun effect on a hillside. Operating on road patrol, the tanks serve as an early warning system for an area. The secret of a successful tank patrol, however, is never to do the same thing twice. Movements have to be varied so that Communist troops do not discern a pattern.

The principal gap remains targets acquisition and intelligence, aspects of the same problem. New devices give hope of marked advances along these lines, however. The chemical personnel detector, carried by the lead man on a patrol, promises to be effective in revealing an ambusher's location before an engagement begins.

Perhaps the most significant application of US technical know-how is the use of computers to process intelligence data. An enormous mass of intelligence data is available through human and technical channels. Heretofore, the problem has been organizing it in timely fashion for the use of field commanders. With the installation of the first computers in Saigon, however, the commander of US forces in Vietnam can pull the necessary intelligence data together in a matter of a few hours.

Fed into the automatic data processing equipment are the locations of roads, waterways, and landing sites; information on past ambush sites, known tunnel systems, caves and antiaircraft gun sites; material gathered by electronic and infrared means; and knowledge gained from informers and deserters. It is possible on the basis of a computerized reading of this data, to obtain a complete intelligence report on an area in which a division plans an operation. In the past, the information was available to a considerable degree, but collating it was an almost impossible task in a short time.

No accurate report on the war in Vietnam can properly conclude, however, with the impression that this is an entirely new kind of war. The war in Vietnam contains the classic elements of battlefield combat, only in different combinations. Furthermore, the real heart of victory is not exotic weaponry or tactical gimmicks on the battlefield. The essentials are the age-old qualities of well-trained and worthy ground forces, familiarity with personal weapons, physical conditioning for combat, leadership at all levels, and the will-to-win that is born of the proud traditions of a great army mindful of the concepts of duty, honor, and country.

The Army's over-all training mission is to provide units which can close with and defeat the enemy in sustained land combat. Each man must know his job thoroughly and have complete confidence in his ability and the determination to accomplish that job under any conditions. The men in combat units must be trained from 'scratch' because there is no counterpart in civilian life for a rifleman, a howitzer crewman, or a tank gunner.—Gen. Harold K. Johnson

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF NEWS MEDIA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I feel called upon today to issue a complaint which does not appeal to me at all, but one which needs to be said and heard. In the morning issue of the Washington Post appeared on the front page an obvious waste of space—that is, a four-column picture of some so-called peace demonstrators camped in the endless corridors of the Pentagon. Upon turning to page 2 of the Post, I was greeted by still another picture and a long two-column story describing the routes, times of arrival, and various other movements of this band of 64 malcontents from Boston who journeyed to Washington to have their day in the press.

Unfortunately, this type of detailed press coverage of every character who has time to scrawl a poster or grow a beard is not confined to the Post—but is prevalent in many other newspapers, and also finds a good market on our radio and television stations.

Certainly, these young people have the right to make jackasses out of themselves if they so choose, but I am frankly puzzled by the wide news coverage such activity commands. Such events are perhaps newsworthy, but I think it is high time our newspaper editors relegate them to the appropriate space they so richly deserve. Until our newspapers view such demonstrations in their proper perspective, we can expect more and louder demonstrations by such groups, who really fail to meaningfully lobby for their views by such conduct.

This country—and any country, for that matter—is filled with people and groups willing to commit civil disobedience for a few pictures and headlines in the press. It is getting to the point where any band of screwballs can come to Washington and sit-in at the White House, Capitol, Pentagon, or Justice Department, and the press comes running and blows nothing into something. It is long past time for some responsibility to be shown in this area, by the editors and executives who manage some of our newspapers, as the reporters who cover these stories are merely carrying out the instructions of their superiors.

Thousands — perhaps millions — of Americans wish to issue a dissent regarding the policies of their National Government, but they are utilizing methods such as resolutions, petitions, letter writing, and orderly civic action projects, which give meaning to our democracy and not detract from it. It is the responsible dissent which the press should be recognizing more articulately, for this strengthens law and order in our society rather than diminishing it.

As the summer approaches, concern grows throughout the Nation regarding domestic order on the home front. I believe some of these demonstrations we are witnessing in the Nation's Capital, and throughout the Nation, can be reported in a less spectacular way by the press, without any sacrifice from our editors in fulfilling their responsibility to their readers.

GOVERNMENT SUBSIDIZED NEWSPAPERS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I am disturbed to read recent news reports that a federally-funded antipoverty agency in Boone, N.C., has applied to the Office of Economic Opportunity for a grant to start a weekly newspaper, and to produce weekly radio programs. The amount of the grant sought is $179,000. The newspaper and the radio programs would be aimed at 8,000 so-called low-income families in four counties around Boone.

I am calling upon the OEO now to reject this project upon its very face. The principles of a free press are written into the first amendment of the Constitution. Congress shall make no law abridging freedom of speech, or of the press. This is, in effect, a negative requirement. At the same time, Americans have always believed that no press financed by a government can be free.

While this project would not affect directly the already existing press, it would create a press whose freedom is by definition abridged. According to the news accounts of the proposals, this paper would go beyond the mere presentation of information about government programs. It would have many of the same functions as the free press traditionally has in this country. It would publish editorials, both signed and unsigned. The Federal Government would be in the business of financing the expression of partisan opinion.

I would like to call attention to the fact that this newspaper would be sent free to 8,000 citizens. It would be sent free upon the presumption that many of the 8,000 could not afford to subscribe. Yet this is an admission that there is really no standard of judging the necessity of the project. The traditional yardstick of newspaper worth to a community is its paid circulation. Therefore, there is no way of telling whether this newspaper is necessary.

Moreover, this newspaper would not be self-supporting. It does not propose to carry paid advertising. The effect of this policy would be to bring this project to a close as soon as the Federal funds ran out. It is difficult to see how such a shortrun project could be effective. If it is not a shortrun project, then the Federal Government will have to finance it indefinitely.

The alternative to perpetual financing would be the gradual admission of paid advertising, leaving the newspaper as a self-supporting business. For the Federal Government to create competition to privately capitalized businesses through the use of outright grants is intolerable. For the Federal Government to create a controlled press by outright grant is completely contrary to every concept of a free society.

It is important to consider these basic principles because this proposal is spoken of as a "demonstration project." The harm that this project could do in a rural area of longstanding traditions is limited in scope. But the same kind of project funded in seething urban districts could create a kind of political dynamite that would be impossible to handle. If every poverty agency were to get a 100-percent subsidy for the publication of its own propaganda—freed from the responsibility of business losses and restrictions—then a medium would be created to promote social unrest and dissatisfaction on a nationwide scale.

I have been informed by the OEO that this project is still under consideration. My advice to OEO officials is to turn down the proposal. To do otherwise is to tamper with one of our country's most cherished principles and to invite the closer scrutiny of the goals of the OEO.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article "Antipoverty Unit Asks $179,000, Plans Newspaper," be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Asheville Citizen, May 4, 1967]

ANTI-POVERTY UNIT ASKS $179,000, PLANS NEWSPAPER

BOONE.—A four-county anti-poverty agency headquartered here is seeking a federal grant to set up a government-supported weekly newspaper, it was made public Wednesday.

A separate corporation—with a board composed of poor people, representatives of Appalachian State Teachers College and commercial newspapers and radio stations—would control the new communications outlet.

Besides hiring a commercial printer to issue the newspaper, the project would also purchase time (an hour a day) on each of two radio stations, WATA in Boone and WTOE in Spruce Pine.

The objectives of the project, which would cost $179,000, would be to give poor residents of isolated mountain sectors "a forum for expressing their opinions," a channel to learn of opportunities in employment, social and welfare services, educational and new anti-poverty programs, according to Bill Thomas, deputy director of the anti-poverty agency known as WAMY.

The agency, Community Action Inc. of Boone, serves four surrounding counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey.

Thomas said the project was suggested by the North Carolina Fund of Durham, which supports some anti-poverty programs. However, the NCF does not have money available for the newspaper and WAMY submitted a proposal to the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Washington April 12.

In Washington, OEO officials said the application is pending in the OEO's community services division.

Marshall H. Peck, OEO public affairs officer, said the Boone project—if okayed—would be the first of its kind under OEO funds. It would be a "demonstration" project and if successful, might be repeated elsewhere in the country.

Peck was asked whether it wouldn't be just as effective to distribute the advisory information to the poor via mimeographed newsletters which would cost considerably less than $179,000.

Peck replied that WAMY's application "will be examined on the basis of its presentation" and that one of the things to be considered is whether a newspaper format would be the best means of presentation.

A WAMY spokesman at Boone told The Citizens that the regular commercial daily press is not "doing the job" of reporting "local news of what's happening in the small communities."

And although some commercial weekly newspapers carry the news, said the WAMY official, "not enough people subscribe to them—some can't afford it, some are not interested and some can't read."

Thomas explained that the weekly government newspaper would be sent free via mail to some 8,000 low income families in the four counties.

The newspaper would carry no paid advertising, although it will use "simulated advertisements" to announce meetings and programs.

Thomas expressed a view that chances "may be slim" for getting the federal backing for the newspaper-radio project right away because of competition for OEO funds from big city anti-poverty offices seeking ways to stifle possible street violence this summer.

The corporation which would operate the newspaper and radio project would have a majority of poor persons sitting on its board of directors, according to Thomas. Other officials—college representatives from Boone and commercial news and radio figures—would round out the board.

The newspaper would be printed for a fee by the Avery County Journal at Newland. It would be staffed by 10 permanent personnel and 20 part-time correspondents, who'd be low income people "trained to judge accurately and report the news of their local communities." Heading the staff would be an editor (a professional journalist) at a salary of $10,000 annually.

Two professional radio people would also be hired to manage the radio aspects of the communications project.

Thomas said two mobile vans equipped with recording equipment and microphones would be sent into remote areas to interview people, get their view and expressions of their needs.

These programs would be aired later over the two commercial stations at Boone and Spruce Pine. WATA has offered to donate five minutes of air time free daily and WTOE would donate 15 minutes free daily to the anti-poverty project. The broadcasts, it was said, will also carry "success stories" of poverty level persons who improved their status, and similar programs.

The broadcast unit would train "low income assistants in the operation of recording equipment and the techniques of radio production and broadcasting and supervise their work in the field."

WAMY has allotted $15,000 for commercial broadcast time.

The weekly newspaper, according to WAMY's proposal, would print editorials signed by the writer and some unsigned editorials.

LEGISLATION TO LIMIT AND PREVENT CERTAIN CONCERTED ACTIVITIES BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS WHICH INTERFERE WITH OR OBSTRUCT OR IMPEDE THE FREE PRODUCTION OF GOODS FOR COMMERCE OR THE FREE FLOW THEREOF IN COMMERCE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce. I ask that the bill be appropriately referred and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, at present, labor unions enjoy a general immunity from the Federal antitrust laws. Although the antitrust laws do not themselves specifically provide an exemption for unions, the Supreme Court in *United States* v. *Hutcheson*, 312 U.S. 219 (1941), read such an exemption into the law. In that case the Court concluded:

> So long as a union acts in its self-interest and does not combine with non-labor groups, the licit and the illicit are not to be distinguished by any judgment regarding the wisdom or unwisdom, the rightness or wrongness, the selfishness or unselfishness of the end of which the particular union activities are the means.

In other words, the Court said, if you are a labor union and you make up your mind that what you desire to do—although unlawful to everybody else—is in your own self-interest, it thereby becomes lawful. No matter how much damage this activity may inflict upon the economy, or society or individuals, it is lawful because you say it is in your interest.

A few years after the Hutcheson decision, the Supreme Court considered a situation in which a labor union conspired with a group of employers to control the prices and regulate the market for electrical products in New York City. In its decision, the Court held that although a union may not conspire with employers to bring about a restraint of trade, it may, acting on its own, enforce the same restrictive practices and bring about the identical end result. In simple terms, the Court said, labor unions have a license to impose whatever economic restraints they wish, without regard to their effect upon the rest of society. *Allen Bradley Co.* v. *Electrical Workers Local 3*, 325 U.S. 797 (1945).

Because of this freedom from legal restraints, labor unions have, within the 26 years since the Hutcheson decision, gained such economic dominance that they threaten the survival of our free enterprise economy. In many industries they have eliminated, for all practical purposes, any effective competition at either the production or marketing levels. They can keep products out of the market at will, and can control prices and limit production.

It is unmistakably clear that unless some action is taken to limit this special economic license, our free enterprise economy is jeopardized, and we will be rapidly forced into a socialistic system. This bill is intended to impose some reasonable limitations upon this monopoly power by making certain types of union arrangements unlawful.

Union monopoly power manifests itself in two separate and distinct ways: First, restrictive trade practices such as price fixing, restrictions on use of new processes and technological improvements, exclusion of products from the market, and so forth; and, second, enforcement of wage demands through industrywide and pattern bargaining practices with no regard for the economic problems of individual business firms or the impact upon the industry or area affected. This bill deals directly with both of these aspects of union monopoly power.

This bill deals with the first part of the problem by making it unlawful for a union to enter into any arrangement, either voluntary or coerced, with an individual employer or group of employers or with other unions, which would lead to product boycotts, price fixing, or other types of restrictive trade practices. It should be noted in this connection that in virtually all instances in which a union brings about a restrictive trade practice the cooperation of the employer, either voluntary or coerced, is present. In a typical case, for example, the Milk Drivers Union presents to the various dairies in a community a union-approved price list and makes clear to each dairy that unless it adheres to the union price list it will find itself involved in various labor difficulties. In order to avoid the threatened labor trouble each dairy follows the union price list. The result is the same as would occur if a price-fixing agreement were entered into among the dairies themselves. But since the union induced the price fixing by arrangement with individual dairies rather than the dairies as a group, it is, under the present state of the law, not subject to antitrust prosecution. In another type of situation, the Carpenter's Union imposes a restriction on use of prefabricated door and window frames and advises each building contractor that use of the banned products will result in his labor supply being withdrawn from the project. To avoid the threat of a strike each contractor discontinues use of the prohibited materials. As can be seen, the restrictive practice could not be imposed by the union if the individual employers refused to comply with the union demand. Their alternative, unfortunately, usually involves being put out of business by withdrawal of labor supply, strikes, slowdowns, and so forth.

Various efforts to deal with this problem under the National Labor Relations Act have been unsuccessful because the National Labor Relations Board and the Supreme Court have carved out loopholes in the statutory language and otherwise interpreted away its effective intent. In the Landrum-Griffin Act in 1959, for example, Congress adopted amendments to the National Labor Relations Act designed to expressly prohibit "hot cargo" agreements and to tighten the secondary boycott provisions. The National Labor Relations Board immediately went to work to nullify the effect of these improvements in the statute, and the complete success of the Board's effort was reflected in the recent decision of the Supreme Court in National Woodworkers Association against NLRB, decided April 17, 1967.

This case arose on a housing project in Philadelphia. The contractor, Frouge Corp., ordered 3,600 precut doors from a door manufacturer, Mohawk Door Co. When the doors were delivered to the project the Carpenter's Union ordered its members not to hang the doors, and Frouge was required to purchase other doors which were fitted and cut by the carpenters on the job site. The union action was taken pursuant to provisions of an agreement with the General Building Contractors Association of Philadelphia that:

> No member of the District Council will handle any doors which have been fitted prior to being furnished on the job.

This type of agreement has been generally known as a "hot cargo" agreement, and section 8(e) of the NLRA was expressly designed to make such agreements unlawful and unenforceable. The Supreme Court in a 5-to-4 decision held that in spite of the clear language of section (e) of the National Labor Relations Act it would not conclude that Congress intended to prohibit the agreement barring the use of prefitted doors. In justifying its decision the Court reasoned that the union's ultimate purpose was the preservation of work for its members rather than a product boycott as such, and that this was a legitimate objective. The Court stated that since the union's objective was to create more work for its members on the job site, as distinguished from a desire to punish or penalize the manufacturer of the prefitted doors, the restrictive agreement should not be regarded as a prohibited hot cargo agreement under the act. The Court thus concluded that the union's activity in this case was "primary" rather than "secondary," and should be permitted despite the literal language of the National Labor Relations Act to the contrary.

Four members of the Court, Justices Stewart, Black, Douglas, and Clark, strongly dissented from the majority and pointed out that:

> The relevant legislative history confirms and reinforces the plain meaning of the statute and establishes that the Union's product boycott in this case and the agreement authorizing it were both unfair labor practices. In deciding to the contrary, the court has substituted its own notions of sound labor policy for the word of Congress. There may be social and economic arguments for changing the law of product boycotts established in S. 8, but those changes are not for this court to make.

Since efforts to deal with this type of product boycott under Federal labor laws has been completely unsuccessful, it is now time to deal with this problem by the simple expedient of bringing such activity within the coverage of the Federal antitrust laws.

Under the language of this bill, any attempt by a union to induce an employer or a group of employers to comply with a union demand which would result in restrictive trade practices would be unlawful, and an employer faced with such a demand could seek legal remedies to restrain the union from enforcing its demand. The consequent denial to unions of the right to fix prices or impose other artificial market limitations would not in any way interfere with normal and legitimate union functions or with their proper collective bargaining powers. They would merely be placed on an equal footing with all other groups in society as was the case during the 50 years prior to the Hutcheson decision.

The second part of the problem, that of union bargaining power is much more complex and difficult. A labor union is in a sense a monopoly per se. That is to say, the purpose of a labor union is to organize into one group all the workers in a particular trade, occupation or enterprise in order to strengthen their bargaining position with their employer. Although the result may be a monopoly of the supply of labor, this has been construed as a permissible type of monopoly under our economic system for over 100 years. In this light, great reluctance has been felt toward any governmental restraints on union organizational activity or upon use by unions of their traditional economic weapons such as strikes, picketing, and boycotts to enforce their demands for wages and other conditions of employment.

In actual practice, no serious problems were presented so long as organizational activity and collective bargaining functions were handled by the local unions. The problem only became acute when the national and international unions began to take these functions away from the local unions and, through a system of industrywide and pattern bargaining practices, to impose upon entire industries uneconomical and inflationary wage demands.

The basic problem, then, is how to reconcile the right of unions to develop and utilize their economic strength and at the same time provide proper safeguards for the public and the consumer. Various measures to limit industrywide bargaining for unions have, heretofore, been rejected as unworkable.

Under this bill individual local unions would remain free to engage in all proper organizational activities and also to use all of their traditional economic weapons to enforce whatever wage demands they may wish to make. Any resulting interference with shipment of goods in interstate trade or commerce would be completely permissible within the antitrust laws, and the principle established by the Supreme Court in *Apex Hosiery Co.* v. *Leader*, 310 U.S. 469 (1940), would not be disturbed. But any strike or other interference with interstate trade or commerce undertaken to enforce any concerted industrywide or pattern demand, arrived at through arrangement or combination with any other labor organization, whether it be another local or a parent or subsidiary union, would constitute an unlawful restraint of trade.

This bill would effectively prevent domination or control of local union bargaining activities by the parent national or international union and restore to the rank and file workers at the local union level the authority to make their own decision as to what their wage demands shall be and when to go out on strike and when to return to work. Cooperation between local unions and national unions in organizational efforts and other broad spheres of action could be permitted, provided that such activities do not involve any concerted action which results in a restraint of trade or commerce.

In this sense, a union would be in the same position as any business firm or any other group or individual under the law. It would be in no way hampered in carrying out its proper purposes and objectives. At the same time the public interest would be protected from unreasonable restraints of trade and commerce and the inevitable corruption of the free economy which will result if unrestrained union power continues to dominate our national life.

This bill, it should be noted, is not an amendment to the antitrust laws, nor does it attempt to place unions under the existing antitrust laws. It is a completely separate and independent legislative approach to the problem of union monopoly power. It is, like the antitrust laws, based upon the premise that competition is essential to a healthy and progressive economy and is designed to insure that the consuming public has access to adequate supplies of needed commodities at prices which are determined by the natural economic laws of supply and demand rather than by any artificial arrangement or combination. It has been amply demonstrated that when such a free market is maintained, consumer purchasing is stimulated and business activity is constantly increased. It follows, therefore, that any arrangement or combination which limits or restricts competition is undesirable. It makes no difference whether the particular arrangement or combination is put into effect by competing businesses or by labor organizations operating upon or with competing businesses. In either case the adverse effect upon competition is the same.

It should also be noted that this bill does not provide the very severe legal penalties that are imposed under the antitrust laws. This bill does not provide for criminal prosecution nor does it specify the stringent penal damages that are provided in the antitrust laws. The principal means of enforcement under this bill would be by injunctive relief either in the Federal or State courts.

Although I know that this bill will be roundly condemned by the leaders of organized labor as antilabor and as designed to destroy unions, the true fact is that it is a prolabor bill. Its whole effect would be to return unions to the rightful control of the union members rather than permit the perpetuation of the dictatorial and tyrannical power of those who have degraded unions and made them objects of contempt in the eyes of a large segment of our people.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1744) to limit and prevent certain concerted activities by labor organizations which interfere with or obstruct or impede the free production of goods for commerce or the free flow thereof in commerce, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. THURMOND, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1744

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that maintenance of a competitive enterprise economy and a free market for goods and services is essential to continued economic growth and prosperity of the Nation; that laws heretofore enacted prohibit combinations and conspiracies among producers and suppliers of goods and services which are in restraint of interstate trade or commerce or tend to create monopolies; that the immunity of labor unions from these statutory prohibitions has permitted them to form powerful combinations and enter into arrangements which severely limit competition, impose restraints upon trade and commerce, and permit the parties to such combinations and arrangements to exercise monopolistic controls over production costs and the use and distribution of products and services in a number of essential industries; that such combinations and arrangements impair collective bargaining and deny to the consuming public the benefits of effective competition, increased production, new and improved products, and lower prices for goods and services; that such combinations and arrangements are no less damaging to the national economy and the general welfare than similar combinations and arrangements between producers and suppliers of goods and services; and that, in order to protect the public interest, such combinations and agreements formed and entered into by labor organizations must be prohibited.

(b) It is the purpose and policy of this Act to promote the full flow of commerce, to provide orderly procedures for protecting the flow of commerce and preventing restrictive practices or arrangements which may impede the flow of commerce, to preserve the right of employees to form and join labor unions and to engage in concerted activities necessary to carry out the legitimate objects of their union, and to protect the rights of individual employees, employers, and the public in their relations with labor unions whose activities affect commerce.

SEC. 2. It shall be unlawful and contrary to the public policy of the United States for any labor organization in concert with any other labor organization (whether or not affiliated with the same national or international union), or with any employer or other person, to engage in any action, plan of action, arrangement, or combination in restraint of trade or commerce or which may tend to create a monopoly.

SEC. 3. It shall be unlawful and contrary to the public policy of the United States for any labor organization to strike or engage in any other course of action for the purpose of inducing, persuading, or compelling any employer in an industry affecting commerce (1) to enter into or become a party to any action, plan of action, arrangement or combination in restraint of trade or commerce, or (2) to accede to, grant or otherwise put into effect any demand for wages or other terms or conditions of employment made pursuant to any combination, agreement, conspiracy or understanding entered into with any other labor organization (whether or not affiliated with the same national or international union).

SEC. 4. For the purposes of this Act, no action or plan of action, including strikes, picketing, and boycotts, undertaken by an individual labor organization in furtherance of or in relation to any purpose of such organization and which is not undertaken or carried out in concert with any other labor organization or with any employer or other person, shall be deemed to be in restraint of trade or commerce.

SEC. 5. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any district court of the United States shall have power to prevent and restrain any labor organization from any violation of the provisions of this Act.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. **BYRD** of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, in this age of superlatives it is easy to be carried away and to overstate the importance of some issues, but I think it can fairly be said that an extension of the draft is as important to our safety and survival as any measure this Congress will be called upon to consider. In my opinion, the strength and health of our Armed Forces could not be maintained without a continuation of the authority to induct persons for military service.

The draft has been continuously in effect since 1940, except for the period from March 1947 to June 1948. During the life of the draft, the manpower requirements of the Armed Forces have fluctuated widely, with the enormous demands of World War, with its millions called to the colors, at one end of the scale and the 76,000 inductees required in fiscal year 1963 at the other. The law is flexible—by its nature it must be flexible—and it has responded to the needs of the Nation. Even in those periods when draft calls are relatively low, the existence of the authority to induct serves as a powerful stimulus to voluntary enlistments for regular or reserve service and to enlistment in officer procurement programs such as the ROTC. The Department of Defense secures about 570,000 persons each year from voluntary enlistments and from officer programs. If the draft were not in effect, this number would surely be drastically reduced.

Some earnest persons continue to suggest that it is practical to attract an all-volunteer force. I do not question the sincerity of those who believe this to be practical, but I am personally convinced that it is not practical. To attract the desired number of persons in the entering, or lowest pay grade, the pay of those persons in the higher grades would have to be increased to a greater degree than is necessary to attract and keep persons in these grades today. The estimate of the cost in attracting an all-volunteer force of the pre-Vietnam level of 2,700,000 persons is from $4 to $17 billion annually. It is my own guess it would cost not less than $10 billion additional to maintain the pre-Vietnam level. Beyond the problem of cost, however, are such considerations as there not being enough turnover among an all-career force to create opportunity for promotion, whether persons attracted to military service solely by financial inducements are properly motivated in times of crisis, and whether we can safely allow development of the idea that defense of the Nation is not a personal civic responsibility. But probably the greatest objection to the proposal that our Armed Forces should be composed solely of volunteers is that it would be practically impossible to expand the force to the size needed when a war of considerable dimensions is being fought. Guessing how high the pay rates would have to go to lure young men to fight in Vietnam purely for the money involved would begin very far up the scale.

Mr. President, when everything is considered, I think the present law has worked very well. I know it is being stridently attacked by some persons whose real complaint is that the conflict in Vietnam is unpopular. Much of the criticism comes from persons who do not really understand the system. In trying to decide what changes in the law to recommend to the Senate, the Committee on Armed Services has been mindful that one of the reasons the present law has functioned successfully is that it is not too rigid. It prescribes policy, but it avoids excessive detail. Much of its implementation can be changed by Presidential order. This is one of the reasons that it has not been necessary for the Congress to consider amendments to the law every year or several times a year as the demand for manpower fluctuates.

Most of the changes that are now being discussed can be accomplished by Executive order or regulation and without amending the law. I shall attempt to comment on a few of the more important proposals for change.

The present order in which eligible men are inducted for military service is based on age, with the oldest being taken first. Critics urge that this results in a prolonged period of uncertainty for young men, extending all the way from the age of 18½ to 26. I do not think that criticism has any real substance, though, of course, it does have some merit. If one begins with the idea that avoidance of any service is an objective, I suppose the uncertainty complaint has a limited validity. But if one starts from the assumption that most young men will be needed for some kind of military service somewhere between the ages 18½ to 26, a young registrant has a broad choice, not only in selecting the age at which he will serve, but also to select the program that is most suited to his personal desires and needs. Notwithstanding the existence of all these options, there is more or less general agreement that there are advantages in reversing the order of induction so that the youngest would be taken first, instead of the oldest. The President has announced his intention to change the order of induction so that the primary period of vulnerability will be from the age of 19 until the age of 20. Of course, you understand, Mr. President, this does not mean that a person who has reached 20 will be excused from liability to service, but each year from the time he passes 20 until he becomes 26 he will have a diminishing likelihood of being called.

Despite some advantages in changing to a youngest first sequence of induction, the transition is not without complications. It would not be fair to excuse completely those who have been deferred for educational or other reasons and who are 20 years old or older. Consequently, to make the transition, this group will probably be considered along with the 19-year-olds at the time the switch is made. A result is that both the 19-year-olds of the year that the switch is made, and those 20 and above will have a better chance of avoiding service altogether than if the present system were continued. To the extent that those 20 and older are selected instead of 19-year-olds, the objective of taking more 19-year-olds would be defeated. These complications do not necessarily argue against adoption of the youngest first system, but I mention them merely to show that the change is not as simple as it sounds.

I should state, Mr. President, that I would favor making the transition over a 2-year period, so as to more equitably spread the responsibility for service, and to have the vulnerability for call to the armed services more widely shared.

Another important area in which changes are to be made is student deferments. Some persons have avoided service by receiving, first, undergraduate college deferments and then successive deferments which result practically in their exemption; or they can acquire enough dependents or pursue an occupation that results in their not being called for service before reaching the age of 26. The President has indicated that he is preparing an order to end this pyramiding of deferments and that in the future college deferments for graduate work will be authorized only for those studying to become physicians or dentists.

Continued deferment of undergraduates in colleges is a subject on which there are strong differences of opinion. The committee believes and recommends that undergraduate deferments should be continued in normal times until the registrant receives a bachelor's degree, reaches the age of 24, or ceases to pursue his studies satisfactorily, with the condition that when one of these conditions occurs, the registrant who received the deferment should then be subject to the draft in the same degree as other persons in the age group or groups from which the draft calls are being made at that time. In other words, if calls are being made from the 19-year-old group, a student might be 24 calendar years of age when his deferment ended, but he would have the constructive age of 19 for determining his liability for service under the Selective Service System.

There are arguments that college deferments are discriminatory in favor of the rich, that they permit registrants to postpone service when conflict is occurring, and that college students tend to avoid service altogether. Mr. President, when these contentions are examined closely, most of them lose at least some of their force. The committee heard testimony to the effect that in recent years 60 percent of the college student group has served in the Armed Forces, either as volunteers or as inductees, compared with 57 percent of the noncollege students who were called to or entered military service. Persons who accept student deferments may be as likely to defer themselves into a period of combat as they are to avoid combat. I point out, for instance, that students who entered college in the fall of 1962 had very little reason to think or suppose that they might be graduating at a time when draft calls were high, and when conflict was raging at a high level, as in Vietnam today. Under the economic conditions prevailing today, almost any young man with any determination to do so can secure financial assistance to attend college. To the committee, the arguments for continuing student deferments are much more convincing than the arguments against them.

If the appearance of preferential treatment is to be avoided, it seems important that apprentices be eligible for deferment along with students. Under authority of the draft law, the President is authorized to provide deferments for "study, research, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest." Regulations now in effect provide for the deferment of persons in apprentice programs, but through the insistence of the Department of Labor, an apprentice is an occupation listed as critical must have 1,000 hours in the program to qualify for a deferment and an apprentice in a trade not listed as critical, but which the local board considers important, must have 2,000 hours in the program to be eligible for an apprentice deferment. I may say that there are the minimum hours that are prescribed by the Department of Labor, and they seem to me to conflict with the objective of liberal apprentice deferments. To give apprentices equality with students, the committee thinks that these restrictions on apprentice deferments should be eliminated.

Now I would like to discuss the so-called random or lottery selection for a few moments. The President announced that he was directing the Director of Selective Service to institute a fair and impartial system of random selection of eligible registrants. This random selection would be substituted for the existing system of ordering persons for induction in accordance with their age, with the oldest being ordered first. The existing system of calling the oldest first could be retained and operated for the 19- to 20-year-old group of primary vulnerability. The committee has not prohibited the operation of a random selection system, but if one understands the method of calling by birth dates, with the oldest in the group subject to call being called first, it is difficult to see that a random selection represents an improvement.

Much of the case of random selection is based on the assumption that only a part of the 19-to-20 age group will be needed, and that if the oldest first system is retained, the younger half, or some fraction of this year group, will never be reached for induction.

In the first place, it would be easier to predict results if one knew exactly what part of a year group would be inducted. This is nearly impossible to predict. In addition, those who predict that the younger part of a year group or those born in the latter part of any month might be less likely to be called, assume that orders to report for induction are issued by all the local boards on the same day of the month. In actuality, orders to report for induction are issued every day by some boards. Let us consider a case in which a board must select those to be inducted under an "oldest first" system.

Assume further that the board is selecting from registrants with birthdays within the same month. If the order for induction were issued every month on the first of the month, those born on the second of the preceding month would be more likely to be called than a person born on the 29th of the preceding month, because the former are older. But if the orders for induction are issued on different days of the month, as is true in practice, there is as great an element of chance and as much impartiality in calling these persons by the date of their birth with the oldest first as there would be in ordering them in an order determined by a lottery of their birth dates.

A random system of selection probably would be a bit more difficult to administer than the current system because of the problem of almost innumerable changes in classification that occur during a month or a year. It is easy to see that it might have an adverse effect upon the ROTC program, which furnishes a large part of the officer supply for our Armed Forces. If a young man could predict with some precision whether he is to be inducted as a 19-year-old, he probably would not find the Reserve officers training program very attractive, but would take his chances rather than incurring the obligation to serve that accompanies an ROTC enrollment.

Although this point is not dealt with specifically in the bill, I wish to refer to some of the criticism about a lack of uniformity among the local boards administering the draft law. I submit that uniformity is inherently impossible to attain under a system that contemplates exercise of judgment locally on the facts of each individual case. Under the present system, each case is decided on its individual merits. It is impossible for me to understand how there could be uniform decisions on such things as hardship cases. Another illustration of what I have in mind is the deferment of policemen. Some persons think all policemen should be exempt by law. Certainly the incidence of crime is a grave problem and we need competent policemen. But there is authority for local boards to defer policemen in those locations where the need for them is acute. But it would be unwise to write that into the law and automatically defer all policemen notwithstanding the existence of a surplus of potential policemen in some locations. What I am attempting to say is that there is an almost irreconcilable conflict between the power to exercise a local judgment and the attainment of a uniform application of deferment policies.

I still think that members of a draft board in the same political subdivision where the registrant resides are in a better position to determine whether any registrant can be spared from that community than any Federal official promulgating regulations from Washington.

At one time or another almost all Members of Congress have praised the concepts of keeping Government close to the people, of decentralization of the administration of the laws, and of allowing local people to have a voice in local affairs.

The Selective Service System is almost a perfect example of this kind of operation. Yet it is distressing to me that the executive branch is studying the practicality of substituting a new bureaucracy of civil service employees to make the decisions that now are made by these unpaid, volunteer members of selective service boards. Because not all the local board decisions have been uniform, the proposal that is being studied would remove the responsibilities now exercised by about 4,000 local boards and concentrate them in 300 to 500 area offices manned by civil service personnel that would report to eight regional offices through the country. I may have a simple mind, but I have difficulty in perceiving that a Government employee many miles farther removed from the registrant would have more wisdom in deciding whether that registrant should serve than would an unpaid citizen residing in the same community or city as the registrant. Instead of condemnation, the members of the local boards are entitled to compliments and appreciation.

I wish to seize this occasion, Mr. President, to pay my word of tribute to the operations of local boards who have administered this thankless job of selecting those who are to serve in our Armed Forces.

So far as I know, there has not been a single major scandal or corruption charged to local draft board members, though they are dealing with the most sensitive area of human life.

I earnestly hope that the executive branch will not seriously propose the transfer of the classification functions now performed by local boards to a remote agency of the Government whose members can hardly have personal knowledge of the situation in the communities for which they are responsible.

Mr. President, some aspects of the existing military manpower system have given me great concern. One condition that has bothered me continuously since it was authorized in 1955 is that a draftee can be compelled to participate actively in a Reserve unit for as long as 3 years following his release from active duty. Not all inductees are required to participate actively in units, however, and the accident of a person's residence largely affects whether he has to participate or whether his name is merely on the roll.

This has always seemed highly inequitable to me, particularly when only a part of the qualified and available manpower is being inducted, because this required those who had had a period of active service to participate actively with the Ready Reserve when many other citizens similarly situated had had neither active duty nor Reserve duty. I resisted this requirement when it was urged as a military necessity in 1955. I recognized then and I do now that an effective Reserve cannot be constituted entirely of 6-month trainees. The solution I proposed at that time involved offering a Reserve enlistment bonus for those inductees and enlistees who have completed their active duty and who are willing to enter Reserve units voluntarily. It was impossible to secure enactment of my proposal then and the requirement for active participation in the Reserve by at least some of the inductees has continued until now. I have not attempted in the pending bill to adjust this inequality and inequity, because we have pending in the committee at this time a so-called reserve bill of rights, H.R. 2, and in connection with committee consideration of that bill, I shall ask the committee to give earnest consideration to repealing the requirement that persons who have enlisted or who have been inducted shall have a higher responsibility for Reserve duty or a greater obligation for Reserve duty than those who have not served at all.

There has been much speculation that the number of qualified young men in the years to come will be greatly in excess of the number needed on active duty. Personally, I hope this proves to be true, and I think that it will to a certain extent. I think it should be pointed out, however, that the end of the war in Vietnam is not in sight and some of these predictions may be entirely too optimistic.

In any event, Congress would find it necessary to extend the draft law even if the war in Vietnam ended tomorrow. With this war continuing with an increasing tempo, the requirement for extending the authority to induct is all the more necessary.

All of us fervently wish that we lived in a peaceful world of universal good will and restraint. But this is an ideal and not a reality and unhappily we must deal with realities. The necessity for extending this law is one of these.

When the choice is between personal sacrifice and national survival the appearance of choice is only illusory.

I should be glad to attempt to answer questions of my colleagues, after which I shall urge the Senate to approve this bill.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. First, Mr. President, I should like to pay a special tribute to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services for the job the committee has done and the consideration it has given to the extension of the Selective Service Act. Rather than take up the time of the Senate now in reviewing the background and the development of my own interest in this program, as well as the material developed by the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], and the results of the observations of that committee, which were made available to the Committee on Armed Services, and which I believe to some extent did relate to their findings, I should like to have the opportunity to go into the matter in some detail, and I ask unanimous consent that those remarks be placed at the conclusion of the comments of the Senator from Georgia.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, let me express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his comment. He appeared before the committee and testified on some of these more perplexing problems, and he was of great assistance to us in reaching our conclusions.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. On page 6 of the report of the Committee on Armed Services, referring to reversing the order of inductions, it is stated:

> This sequence of induction has been criticized almost unanimously by the persons who have reviewed the operation of the draft law and its administration. Among the reasons for criticism of this sequence are:

Then three reasons are listed, and the fourth reads:

> It provides older manpower for the armed forces than would another system.

I would be interested in learning whether the committee had developed information with respect to reversing the order of selection, to take the younger men first, which would indicate that these younger men can perform well in the Armed Forces of our country.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about the 19-year-olds making excellent soldiers.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. But the Senator from Georgia is completely satisfied from the evidence which was presented to the members of his committee, that by taking the younger man first, we will continue to have the kind of qualified young man who will be able to serve effectively in the Armed Forces of our country? And with regard to our own military policy, the Senator from Georgia is completely satisfied that the selection of the younger man will fill our responsibility for providing an effective national defense?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have only one question in my mind about the change in the order of induction, and that is as to the effect it may have on the procurement of commissioned personnel and the platoon leaders. Unquestionably, so far as the men in the ranks and the junior noncommissioned officers are concerned, the 19-year-olds will make as good or better soldiers and fighting men than those who are older. I have some reservation with respect to whether it may handicap officer procurement, but that can be handled perhaps by expanding officer training schools.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I believe the Marshall Commission and the Clark Panel, as well as the Defense Department study, substantiate what the Senator has just stated to be the findings of the committee.

Mr. RUSSELL. And that was also the testimony of the Department of Defense witnesses who appeared before the committee.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Did the committee have any reluctance in endorsing the principle of reversing the order of selection for those who would serve?

Mr. RUSSELL. We found nothing very pleasant about any aspect of this matter, may I say. There was some discussion in the committee that 19 is a rather youthful age to start calling men and putting them into battle after relatively brief training. But I think I can say that when we finally discussed the matter and arrived at a conclusion—or consensus, I believe is the word that is used today—the committee was unanimous in not objecting to the change.

We had more concern about the transition and the fact that some of those who have been deferred—because we had heretofore come from 26 down—might escape service.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. On the point of the transition period, was it the conclusion of the committee that with the change in the order of call, we can move through this transition without providing disruptions or inequities more serious than those in effect at the present time?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is true. It does mean, however, that some of those who are 19, as well as some of those who are in the ages above 20, will escape service, because there will be a large pool; but the selections will be made from both age groups.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I am sure the Senator has been asked this question: Suppose, for example, the order of call is reversed and we move to selecting the younger and we eliminate all student deferments. When does the distinguished Senator, the chairman of the committee, feel that those who are attending graduate school or entering graduate school should be subjected to calls for induction?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is a matter we did not attempt to prescribe because of the tremendous difference in the type of study that is being pursued and the nature of the degree that is being sought in the graduate schools. We, therefore, left that determination largely to regulation that we assumed would be promulgated by the President, after consultation with the National Security Council.

It is altogether possible that some young men who are pursuing graduate degrees in, let us say, nuclear physics or aeronautical engineering, or space sciences, to name a few, might be permitted to complete their graduate work. Personally, I think there are several categories where they should be permitted to complete their graduate work.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. As I understand the findings of the committee, with regard to graduate student deferments, the committee felt that the exception for health professionals—I suppose those which were recommended by the Marshall Commission, which would include medical personnel such as doctors and dentists—should be retained in any transition period.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought the Senator was referring to those who are now pursuing their graduate degrees in colleges.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The Senator is correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. Future deferments for graduate work would be confined to those studying medicine or dentistry or allied sciences, although we did not close the door to allowing graduate study in any category by a flat prohibition in the law. I think it would be exceedingly dangerous to do so. We are living in a very fast moving world and in a system of revolutionary changes in weapons. We never know when we will need a number of scientists of a certain type.

We did not say there cannot be any

other types of graduate deferments. We did recommend that in no instance should a man be allowed to use a series of deferments in pursuing a graduate degree that culminated in his avoiding liability for service in the Armed Forces.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If we continue college student deferments, which was the recommendation of the Armed Services Committee, is it the recommendation of the committee that these deferments be exclusive; that is, that they could not be compounded by additional deferments which would permit de facto exemption from the armed services?

Mr. RUSSELL. Absolutely. For that reason we urge that when a man graduates with a baccalaureate degree he be vulnerable. If he becomes 24 before graduation he becomes vulnerable in any event. We did not suggest a lesser age, even though I think the average college graduate is about 22.

Some men have to work their way through college and they are not able to devote all of their time to classes. The age of 24 should permit them to complete. If a student fails in college, he is immediately vulnerable.

Under the provisions of this report, as I stated a few minutes ago, the person who has had a student deferment may be 24 years old according to the calendar, but he is only 19 as far as the draft is concerned. He goes down on the rolls with the 19-year-olds and he is just as vulnerable as the 19-year-old. This is not going to hurt the mobilization and it is not going to be unjust. This man is just as vulnerable as 19-year-olds.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In the case of a person with a college deferment, who then gets married, and then has children, would he be able to secure an extended deferment?

Mr. RUSSELL. No action by the registrant should be permitted to enable him to secure an extended deferment. There may be a hardship in the family; his father may die; his mother may have a stroke; or there may be some necessity to have a deferment for hardship to others; but these should be a result of acts of nature or providence.

There is nothing he can do, such as getting married or having children, which should save him from 1 day's service. He should be thrown back with the 19-year-olds for liability.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I understand there was some feeling on the committee, that if we are going to continue student deferments, we should also favorably consider deferments for those who are in apprenticeship training or on-the-job training.

Mr. RUSSELL. We so provided in the committee report specifically.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. They would receive the same kind of consideration?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. They should be deferred until they conclude the apprenticeship, or reach the age of 24, or cease to satisfactorily pursue their apprentice work.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The more difficult problem includes those boys who are working their way through school or college over a prolonged period of time. It is difficult to say that they are in the normal 4-year period of college, or that they are in an apprenticeship training program, or in some other 2-year or 4-year educational program.

It is my understanding, from the report of the committee, that the determination for these kinds of deferment should be left to the local draft board.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And they could graduate if it should be determined that an individual was sufficiently worthy and qualified.

Mr. RUSSELL. I point out that the present regulation authorizes a deferment for a student satisfactorily pursuing a full-time course of study. That has been construed by a number of draft boards to provide for the cases the Senator mentions and undoubtedly they will do so in the future.

It is my understanding that in the future they cannot do so beyond the age of 24. I see no reason why they should. Today if a man is that near completing his course, he could get a loan or a grant to attend full time for 6 months or two semesters to conclude his course.

I have been utterly amazed to find in my own section—and I do not live in a wealthy section of the United States—there are large loan funds available at some of our universities, funds that were eagerly sought after when I was in college, that have not been requested by students in the universities.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. One of the facts brought out in our hearings concerned the extraordinarily large number of young people rejected for mental or physical reasons. The figure is about 700,000 persons a year; about one-half of this number is for health deficiencies, and the other half is for educational deficiencies.

As I understand it, at the present time when a young person is examined and rejected by the draft board, a referral system is available to him. For example, if he is rejected for reasons of health, he is referred to a local health agency, be it private or public, that is charged with the responsibility of attempting to rehabilitate this young man.

In the course of our hearings, as well, we found that not much use is made of the information developed by the examination and referral machinery. The fact that they are rejected, and the reasons for it, are not centrally cataloged or filed after this person goes through the referral system. For example, of the roughly 450,000 rejected for health reasons in one 16-month period, only 11,000 actually received medical assistance through the referral machinery.

I wonder whether the distinguished chairman of the committee feels that we should review these procedures or practices of referral, in such a way as to provide the greatest degree of opportunity for these young people, many of whom would like to volunteer for armed service and for one reason or another are rejected. Does he feel that we should at least attempt to urge these referral services to use new efforts in providing for both the health and educational services to the young people in need of them in this country?

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to see it done. Theoretically it is done today, but as a practical matter it may not be.

I was amazed to find upon coming to Washington, where I thought we had one Government, that we really have 15 or 18 governments. Each department is a government in itself. It is terribly difficult to get one department to cooperate with another in a matter of this kind. We have gone further than referral now. The Defense Department has an objective of accepting as volunteers 100,000 people who are marginally deficient either mentally or physically, on the theory that we are going to rehabilitate them. They may receive remedial medical care. If they have a deficiency in education, the Department is going to give them special classes to bring them out. We will have 100,000 being paid out of the funds of the Department of Defense.

I have grave misgivings about the Department of Defense being the proper agency to conduct such a program, which requires the services of a large number of commissioned officers and longtime noncommissioned officers who could be used in Vietnam or elsewhere. I am in favor of the objective but I think a civilian agency should accomplish it.

I have never considered the military forces to have sociological functions.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Do I correctly understand the comments of the Senator that Project 100,000 should at least be given a reasonable chance to see what results it produces?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in favor of giving them that chance. Seventy-five percent of it is going to be expensive rehabilitation, because it costs about $6,000 to $7,000 a year to keep a man in the Army. I do not complain too much about the cost, although I am still old-fashioned enough to have concern for the Treasury and for expenditures. I am more concerned that the program will require the services of several thousand of our experienced, hardcore regulars who, I think, could be better employed.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. It was also brought out that if we were to have our young people in Job Corps training programs and other training programs—under the poverty program—the cost of rehabilitation would be increased somewhat over those of the Department of Defense.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not too sure about that, but Defense has embarked on the program now. The committee did not undertake to reduce the objective of 100,000 or to prevent the Secretary of Defense from maintaining it at 100,000. But it is my personal view that the military is not the proper organization at this time to undertake that work. Nevertheless it is being done, and we did not undertake to stop it.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If I correctly understood the comments of the Senator from Georgia this afternoon, as well as those in the committee report, he supports the local draft board concept.

I should like to ask the Senator from Georgia whether he would agree with me, that to the extent that we preserve local draft boards, particularly for reviewing cases of hardship, that they should be representative of the community in which they sit.

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree completely with that idea. Let me say that in most instances with which I have any familiarity, they are. Undoubtedly, there are some cases where they are not.

As the Senator knows, those boards are selected by the Governor of the State, supposedly acting on the advice of someone who lives in the community; and the Governor recommends the names of members of the draft board to the President and they are almost automatically placed on the draft board. I have never heard of one being vetoed yet. So the selections really go down as far to the grassroots level as it is possible to go. Of course, draft boards have made mistakes. But I am surprised at the few mistakes they do make. They have not made many mistakes considering the millions of men with whom they have dealt in the administration of the Selective Service laws.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Within the general framework of being representative, it is then the understanding of the chairman of the committee that they should be representative in every possible way.

Mr. RUSSELL. In every one of the 4,000 communities where a draft board is located, the members certainly should reside in that community and should be representative of that community. Of course, the right of appeal exists.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. That is right.

Was the Senator impressed, as I was, with the testimony of Mr. Thomas D. Morris, who appeared before his committee and also before the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, that the number of young people available and with the necessary qualifications to serve in the Armed Forces of our country, will greatly increase in the next few years? And also, that the number of available young men, in relationship to the number which will be needed to serve in the Armed Forces both in a Vietnam situation and in a non-Vietnam situation, will be a great deal larger?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; the class of registrants each year increases by 200,000 or 300,000. It has been dramatically increasing since the so-called war babies started registering. The eligibles will continue to increase and the Armed Forces may need a smaller part of the available manpower. That is where we hit the real difficulty in dealing with the human element, where there are seven eligible and we need to induct only one for the services although others are needed as volunteers—that is, if we ever get back to 2,700,000 strength which we had before the war started in Vietnam. We now have more than 3,300,000 persons in uniform in the Armed Forces. The strength has increased about 700,000 since the war started in Vietnam.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Thus, what we have, in effect, is a large pool of young men who are qualified and equal, in the sense at least of having the physical and mental capacities to serve in the Armed Forces. If I interpret the remarks of the Senator from Georgia correctly, then we will have to draft, really, only a small percentage—one out of seven—in a non-Vietnam situation, and, of course, a higher percentage in a Vietnam buildup situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true, assuming voluntary enlistments do not decline.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Thus, as I understand the Senator from Georgia, what we will have is a large pool, and we are going to select actually only a small percentage of that number.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true, as long as we have the Selective Service Act.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that would be true if we abolished the act, or if we severely curtailed its effect.

Even when only a few thousand persons are being inducted each month, many thousands of others volunteer for some branch of service. The stimulus of the draft causes many young men to select their service and the branch in which they want to serve. Others enlist in order to receive special schooling or training. It is generally overlooked that the armed services of the United States conduct probably the greatest training organization in the world.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. It trains thousands of men as airplane mechanics, in the electronics field, and things of that kind—tens of thousands more than in all other schools in this country combined.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. If the Senator from Texas will let me say just this one final word. Was the committee able to come up with a system which was either fairer or more equitable, more reasonable or more rational, than that which was proposed by the Marshall Commission and, I believe, the Defense Department and Selective Service System as well?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry. I did not hear the first part of the Senator's question.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. In the course of the hearings in the committee, and in the testimony which the Senator heard, was the Senator able to develop a system to select men, when there were many available and ready to serve in the armed services, which was more equitable, more reasonable, or more rational than that which was proposed by the Marshall Commission, the Defense Department, or the Selective Service System?

Mr. RUSSELL. In some instances, we compromised. In some instances, we discarded some of the recommendations that each of them made because there were some conflicts between the recommendations of the two commissions. By and large, I think that this bill—and I have participated in the writing of every Selective Service Act since 1940—is the fairest one we have had. However, it is not perfect. It will not eliminate all the inequalities. That never will be done, if we worked on it from now for several centuries to come. We cannot get rid of every inequality. No two cases are exactly identical. They may be almost identical, but there are no cases which are absolutely identical. The committee has made a genuine effort to cull through not only the reports of these commissions but also the reports of commissions of prior years.

We had commissions a long time before the Clark and Marshall ones. One was the Sarnoff Commission. Others made comprehensive studies and filed numerous reports. But we have done the best we could. We have a system that will supply the needed manpower, even if there is a substantial increase and even if we suffer a catastrophe by being drawn into other areas, as we are in Vietnam. This system will supply the manpower in the fairest way we could arrive at.

I should say that with regard to all our discussion about deferments for college students and for apprentices, if we get into an all-out war somewhere, such deferments would have to be ended. Then everybody would be called, even some of the halt and lame.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I am interested in this question of equality. Can it be legitimately said that there can be complete equity of treatment when we have a bigger pool of eligible manpower than is required? Beyond that, when a boy is inducted or he volunteers, can there be complete equality of opportunity or complete equality from the standpoint of risk as between one who has to go out on patrol and do the fighting while someone else has to stay at headquarters and keep records?

Mr. RUSSELL. Many of them are stevedores on the docks.

Mr. TOWER. I am a veteran of the U.S. Navy. It was a popular saying that there is no rear echelon in the Navy, because when a ship is in a fight, everybody fights, including yeomen, storekeepers, and cooks. So I believe it can be said that, from the standpoint of risk involved, there cannot be completely equitable treatment. There has to be some random selection and risk involved. But is not this the fairest way we have?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think it is absolutely the fairest way we could devise. I would be happy to have someone come up with one that is fairer.

I agree with what the Senator from Texas said about the Navy. I had the rank of apprentice seaman in World War I, and, of course, we knew when a ship went down, it took all hands down with it. I still felt that by serving in the Navy I would be better off than if I had to lie in the mud and perhaps have rats running across my face.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Following the inquiries and comments of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Texas, regarding equal treatment, I ask the Senator if the change to first induction of 19-year-olds would not have the effect of inducing larger enlistments at that age and thus place a heavier burden of service on this age group?

Let me give the background for my question. As I understand, about 2 million will become eligible for registration in 1968 at 18½. At 19, they will be subject to induction, and about 1 million of the 2 million will likely go into the services, 660,000 as volunteers and 340,000 as inductees.

I would assume that under the present system of induction volunteers probably are more evenly balanced in the age groups between 19 years and 26. Is it not true that under the changes proposed volunteers are likely to be concentrated in the 19 to 20 age group?

Mr. RUSSELL. The age of volunteers depends somewhat on the age of induction, because a man has an opportunity to enlist in the organization of his choice. Without Selective Service we would not get as many volunteers.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that is so.

Mr. RUSSELL. One study by the Air Force showed that 43 percent of its enlisted men, 39 percent of its officers, and 80 percent of its reservists would not have volunteered in the absence of the draft.

Mr. COOPER. Would more 19-year-olds, because they were subject to induction, volunteer? Would there not be a larger proportion of 19-year-olds than at present in the whole range of ages from 19 to 26?

Mr. RUSSELL. Some of those who are very knowledgeable in this field think that reducing the age to 19 will result in reducing the number of volunteers, because it gives greater opportunity to men of this young age to calculate whether they are likely to be called.

Mr. COOPER. There are now volunteers of older ages, say 21 to 26. But knowing they are going to be inducted at the age of 19, a larger proportion of volunteers will be in that age. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That may be true. One thing that has caused me concern is that reversing the order of induction may reduce the number of ROTC officers coming out of college. They are the ones who lead the troops—first and second lieutenant, captains, even up to majors. Nearly all of them are Reserve officers who come off campuses of colleges. A man might be more likely to take a chance on not enrolling for ROTC if he thought he could make it from 19 through 20 without being called.

Mr. COOPER. This is one of the places where I can see it militates against a certain equality of treatment as between 19 and 26.

Mr. RUSSELL. It will affect the number of volunteers, in my opinion.

Mr. COOPER. Reducing the age to 19 will naturally compel more 19-year-olds to volunteer. And some believe there will be lesser incentive for older men in the draft pool to enter ROTC.

Mr. RUSSELL. Taking the 19-year-olds first does give a man a much better chance to plan his life, and does let him know when he is more vulnerable to the draft; and if he passes the age of prime vulnerability, generally speaking, in the absence of any large, all-out war, he can plan his life. As it is today, it is difficult to make plans because he is vulnerable from the age of 19 through 26.

Mr. COOPER. Does the Senator think it will be more difficult to secure officers under the proposed change?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I am concerned about that very much.

Mr. COOPER. I read in the hearing that 41,000 officers will be needed next year and each year thereafter if the war continues at its present rate. How would 41,000 officers be obtained?

Mr. RUSSELL. Enough officer training schools could be established to provide that number. Whether they would be of the same quality as the men who have had 4 years of ROTC is a question. I read somewhere—I do not vouch for the correctness of the statement—that many more commissioned officers in the armed services have come from Texas A. & M. University than from West Point.

Mr. TOWER. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not expect the Senator from Texas to deny that, but that shows the importance of ROTC units.

Mr. COOPER. I had heard that statement from my brother-in-law, who is a West Point graduate and who taught later at Texas A. & M.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will indulge me, I should like to read a brief statement that was placed in the record of the hearings. It deals with the subject that the Senator from Texas raised:

> When equity for the individual and the welfare of society as a whole are inconsistent, decisions for society may be hard decisions to make and it may have to accept the resulting dissatisfaction and criticism. Unfortunately, true equity is hard to achieve in military operations. Inequity results when some serve while others escape. However, inequities also occur even among those that serve. No one can find much equity between pounding a typewriter in the Pentagon and carrying the M-16 rifle in the jungles of Vietnam.

Mr. COOPER. Has the role of local draft boards been firmly determined?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, it has. The legislation concerning draft boards that is now on the books has not been changed in the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Their role has been firmly settled?

Mr. RUSSELL. So far as the committee is concerned, yes. Unless the Senate overturns the committee, the question has been settled.

Mr. COOPER. I am pleased that the status of local draft boards has been maintained. The members of local boards, who serve without pay, are faithful to duty and understand local conditions.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that the American people have tolerated the draft system over a long period of years largely because of what the local draft boards have done.

Mr. COOPER. I thank and commend the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. I do not quite share the Commission's fear about the ROTC. If we reflect upon it, with the undergraduate deferment being in existence, too, and with the applicant for the undergraduate deferment being required to waive all other deferments, he gets into the unit at age 22, when he receives his undergraduate degree. Knowing that he cannot get any more deferments, he may be encouraged to go into the ROTC.

Mr. RUSSELL. I hope that will be the result.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. I have two subjects I should like to discuss with the chairman of the committee. One is a very needling one, to me and I think to all Americans. That is the implication that there is a certain amount of demagoguery going on in the country in connection with the fact that allegedly more Negroes than others serve in Vietnam, and in more dangerous positions; and there is always an implication in such statements that somehow or other the draft board setup tends to be free of the integration efforts which otherwise prevail in this country.

I know the Senator's view on that subject, and I know he is fair enough, because I have had long experience with him, to address himself to this responsibility without any overcast, in his thinking, of his basic views upon the subject, which we have been through many times. So I speak to the Senator very frankly.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. JAVITS. Also, in an effort to equate the fact that not enough is being done to redeem the Negro minority from what is alleged, and I think properly, to be decades of backwardness in education, et cetera, because we are preoccupied with the Vietnamese war, this whole matter becomes something of an ogre which rears its head in a very lethal way because of the jeopardy that occurs to a man in Vietnam, with danger to his life, and so on, and there seems to be some kind of an insidious body of discrimination on the part of the U.S. Government itself.

I think it is most important just to lay the matter out as candidly as that, and to invite the chairman's views upon it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished Senator from New York has asked that question. I anticipated that it would be asked, and I knew that to some people I would be suspect in answering it.

Mr. JAVITS. Not to me.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand, and I thank the Senator for that statement.

But to get testimony that would be absolutely unassailable, I examined Mr. Burke Marshall, the Chairman of the Advisory Commission appointed by the President, who was in charge of the civil rights section of the Department of Justice at the time of all the disorders on the University of Mississippi campus and some others throughout the Nation; because if any witness whose testimony could be accepted in this area could be brought forward, it is Mr. Marshall.

As Senators will find on page 134 of the hearings, I examined him very carefully. I stated:

> As a southerner I am perhaps somewhat suspect for asking this question, but I have

> seen many statements in the press that have not been justified by my observations of our Armed Forces over a period of years as to the racial balance of the Armed Forces. I have read your report and I see it indicates that Negroes do not serve in the Armed Forces out of proportion to their composition of the population, is that correct?

Mr. Marshall stated:

> That is correct, Senator.

Then I asked him this question:

> And the Negro soldiers have a record of heavy reenlistment and volunteering in elite combat units, such as the paratroopers, making a career of the armed services?

I interpolate here that no one who has ever inspected the airborne divisions can have failed to be impressed by the large number of career sergeants and corporals in those airborne divisions—such as the 82d, the 101st, and the 173d Airborne Brigade—who are Negroes. They make a career of such service, perhaps, because they do not have the opportunities in civil life that they would like, and the airborne divisions do offer good pay. Their members receive, of course, as the Senator knows, extra pay for airborne service.

Mr. JAVITS. And they have a high degree of dignity, I might say to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. I happen to have a nephew who at one time was engaged in airborne training, and who later was very severely wounded in Vietnam. He states that the Negroes in these units have done an utterly fantastic job over there.

To continue with Mr. Marshall's testimony, he replied:

> That is correct, Senator. Their casualty rates right now are proportionally high for that reason.

I then asked him:

> Did you in your study find that there had been any noticeable discrimination for racial reasons in connection with the selective service boards?

Mr. Marshall replied:

> No, Senator. We have some statistics on the composition of the local boards, which show that proportionate to the population Negroes are underrepresented. I suppose that you could show that about other groups. We didn't have statistics on other groups, and there are lots of reasons for that, Senator, that aren't discriminatory.

I then said:

> I didn't have as much reference to the boards as I did to those that they selected for service.

Mr. Marshall said:

> We thought—Senator, there was no evidence before the Commission that racial discrimination, direct racial discrimination, accounted for the statistics which we referred to in the report with respect to the effect of the draft on the Negro. The statistics are that out of the eligible pool, some 18 percent of whites, I think, and 30 percent of Negroes are drafted, so that there is a higher proportion out of the eligible pool, and that is balanced by the rejection rate, which accounts for the fact that the total population mix is about even.

Then he goes on and testifies at some further length in this field. I invite attention to his further testimony on page 134 of the hearings.

There is a great deal of misapprehension throughout the country about the number of registrants under selective service who are rejected.

We must bear in mind that less than 50 percent of those in our armed services come in through the selective service. The others are volunteers, and they all qualified physically and mentally. So it is not a fair test, nor is it fair to condemn the youth of America for being unfit physically and mentally, to say that a high percentage of those who come in through the selective service are rejected, when the number inducted represents only a fraction of those who are in our Armed Forces.

Mr. JAVITS. May I ask the Senator—and I intend to make it as brief as I can; the Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH] has not yet even made her opening statement—may I ask the Senator, who is known as a man of honor throughout this country and the world——

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I would rather he said that about me than anything else he could say.

Mr. JAVITS. The Senator knows he and I have had many differences, but never on that question.

I ask the Senator whether it is fair to say that it is the policy of the committee that it will be alert to and will correct any evidence of discrimination in the makeup of draft boards and the drafting of individuals for service, and the kinds of service that they are put into, or in any of the terms and canditions of the draft; and that it is the committee's bounden purpose to see that this draft law is implemented and administered in a completely colorblind, raceblind, and ethnic-origin-blind manner.

Mr. RUSSELL. Insofar as the committee is concerned, yes. But let me point out that the committee has nothing whatever to do with the selection of those who comprise the draft boards.

Mr. JAVITS. I am speaking of the makeup.

Mr. RUSSELL. But insofar as it is within the power of the committee, we intend for people to be treated as individuals, and not as members of any ethnic, racial, or religious group.

Mr. JAVITS. And the committee's policy will be to implement that basic function?

Mr. RUSSELL. As far as possible. As the Senator knows, Congress can pass laws but it cannot administer them. That must be done by the executive branch. But insofar as it is within our power, we intend to see that every person in this Nation is treated fairly in the administration of this law.

Mr. JAVITS. There is a question concerning the rejectees for educational, physical, and other grounds.

I am a member of a subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] was acting chairman during some hearings.

The real problem that emerged is that those who do the poorest job of developing their future, who do not study, and who are not honest are most likely to be deferred while the boy who is a real 100-percent American boy and makes his grades in school is the most likely to be drafted.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. Is it not well worth the attention of the United States, and is it not almost demanded as a matter of justice, that we should make far more mandatory and far more tight, provisions to make it possible for many of the present rejectees to become eligible to take their chances with the others rather than have it the other way around? There was the feeling that perhaps it might be too expensive or inconvenient to do something about the matter, and therefore the very people who deserved consideration the least were being let off the hook.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to that. As a matter of fact, I say that anything that can be done to insure equality of service to the Nation should be done.

I stated a few moments ago that I had some reservation about the military's undertaking to train 100,000 men when it takes so many veteran commissioned and noncommissioned officers who might be better employed in Vietnam.

Mr. JAVITS. But the Senator certainly agrees with the members of the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare as a matter of principle.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have comprehensive programs, and we should pursue them to the utmost, not only for military purposes, but for other reasons.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, not long ago I met with several classes at Yale.

I wanted to be able to answer questions about the draft and, among them, questions about the ratio of Negro and white soldiers. I went to the office of General Hershey, and the information I secured bears out the facts presented in the colloquy between the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the chairman of the committee [Mr. RUSSELL].

I am very glad that this has been brought in detail.

There is another matter which concerns me and many other people. I have received a great deal of correspondence on the subject.

I do not see the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] present in the Chamber. I understand he is ill. Some time ago he introduced S. 1181 with a number of cosponsors. I subsequently asked to be listed as a cosponsor of the bill.

I think I am correct in saying that under present law, if a member of the military service is killed in Vietnam or dies as a result of injuries or sickness sustained there, and there is one surviving son, the surviving son, upon application, will not be assigned to service in the combat zone.

But if a family had three sons in the military service and one son is killed in Vietnam, and another son is in Vietnam, he would not be the sole surviving son, and must serve.

If we were engaged in a declared war to which the people and resources of our country had been committed, it would be better understood if several members of a family were engaged in combat, and more than one gave up his life. But I would think the legislation should provide that if one son were killed in the war in Vietnam, other sons should be relieved of duty in the combat zone and not assigned to Vietnam. Such a provision would be fair to the family concerned at a time when so many people are not contributing anything to the war except concern and anxiety. I do not think that a family which has given one son should be asked to risk the loss of another.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am familiar with the bill. I looked it over on the committee calendar. I have not come to any firm conclusion about it.

It might get the Senate involved in all kinds of collateral issues.

There are thousands of families that do not have but one son. What will we do in that situation? Will we draft him and send him to war? If he gets killed, that family will not have any son at all.

It is a difficult subject to legislate on.

When the Senator asks the question, the natural reaction is to say yes, but we must think of the impact that will be had across the board.

Mr. COOPER. I understand the aspects of the problem. However, there is fairness in my proposal.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is, because such a family has suffered a great tragedy in their lives. We have considered the matter and will consider it further.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I had occasion to speak last fall in the town of Bowling Green, Ky. I was asked to come to the home of a family whose boy had been brought back home from Vietnam. I did not want to go because, frankly, I thought it might be considered political, and I did not want to impose on the family's sorrow.

But, the family sent for me. Standing by the coffin of the boy whose body was brought back from Vietnam was a younger brother from the same outfit in Vietnam, who in 10 days would be required to go back to Vietnam.

His father said to me: "I understand the law, and I am not protesting. But I do not believe my wife can stand to see this younger boy, 19 years old, go back to the same outfit in the same place in which his older brother had been killed."

Mr. RUSSELL. They had another son, I assume?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. If they did not, he was entitled to exemption. Not only that, but the sole son of a father killed in combat is likewise exempt from service.

Mr. COOPER. That is correct. The boy was reassigned, but it may not always be the same in such cases.

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, I am glad to join with the chairman of the committee in urging the Senate to give prompt approval to this bill.

Since the committee report and the chairman's statement explain the provisions of the bill and the action of the committee, I shall not detain the Senate by a repetitious elaboration.

I do wish to point out, however, that one of the virtues of the current law is its flexibility. Because of this flexibility it has been possible to procure manpower for our Armed Forces under circumstances that have varied greatly. Ordinarily, I believe Congress should be quite explicit in legislating the results it intends. In matters of manpower procurement, however, circumstances can change so rapidly that the executive branch must be left with some discretion in implementing the broad policies prescribed by Congress.

The changes in the law itself that are recommended by the committee could hardly be considered substantial. Indeed, the preponderant part of the needed changes in the draft can be accomplished by changes in the regulations. These changes could have been effected sooner, but I do not wish to be critical of the President in seeking the advice of Congress and the public on some of the controversial issues.

In addition to recommending a few changes in the law, the committee has expressed itself in the report on several of the major proposals for modifying the present system of procuring the manpower our Armed Forces need. That the committee was unanimous, or nearly so, in making these recommendations is to me rather remarkable. I must say, however, that the chairman, an authority on defense matters, known for his fairness, experience, and understanding, is largely responsible for this. I do not mean to say that all members of the committee view all the suggestions for change exactly the same way, but I believe there is no dissent to the major thrust of the committee's recommendations.

Speaking for myself, I must say that I am not completely satisfied with the state of the current law as it has been construed on the subject of conscientious objection. I recognize that matters of conscience and religion are extremely difficult areas to define precisely. Candidly, so far I have been unable to propose a better solution, but I believe that the conscientious objector provisions and their enforcement need to be followed carefully and that some further legislative action in this field may be needed.

To me, the need for extending the authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces is abundantly clear. As the chairman has so clearly stated, this need would exist even if we were not engaged in combat in Southeast Asia. I think we all regret that involuntary service in defense of our country is required. At the moment there simply is no satisfactory alternative.

I hope this bill will be overwhelmingly approved.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to extend to the distinguished Senator from Maine my profound appreciation for her complimentary references to me. She is a tower of strength on the committee. She is well informed on every aspect of legislation dealing with the armed services that comes before us. In some fields she is more expert than any other member of the committee. I am grateful to her for her kind remarks.

Mr. HATFIELD obtained the floor.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might ask for a quorum call, without the distinguished Senator from Oregon losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Oregon has the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 195

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, for the purpose of having it printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, which is at the desk, and ask that it be stated.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a consent request?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] be allowed to retain his right to the floor while the Senator from Ohio proceeds.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I desire that reservation, also—that I ask the Senator from Oregon to yield to me without losing his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The committee amendments have not been disposed of.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I withhold offering my amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the pending bill be considered and agreed to en bloc, and that the bill as thus amended be regarded for the purpose of amendment as original text.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] has the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

AMENDMENT NO. 190

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I have an amendment pending at the desk and I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"(2) The first sentence of section 4(b)

(50 App. U.S.C. 454(b)) is amended by striking out 'twenty-four' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighteen'.

"(3) Paragraph (2) (A) of section 4(k) (50 App. 454(k)) is amended by striking out 'twenty-four' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighteen'.

"(4) Paragraphs (1) and (4) of section 4(l) (50 App. U.S.C. 454(l)) are amended by striking out 'twenty-four' each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighteen'."

Renumber paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of the first section of the bill as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is evident to all Americans that the present selective service law is discriminatory and unfair in many of its aspects. I am very happy that the legislative proposal which the Senate is now considering is a great improvement over the present draft law. It is my intention to vote for the pending bill which was considered in the Committee on Armed Services, of which I am a member.

The amendment I am offering would reduce the time of the draft from 2 years to 18 months.

I offered my amendment in committee, but it was not adopted. However, I strongly believe it warrants further consideration by the Senate.

Mr. President, undoubtedly the argument will be made, and it could be made forcefully, that this is an inopportune time to make a change in the period of service for draftees. It is unfortunate that the selective service law was not amended several years ago to provide for 18 months' service instead of the 2 years of service provided in the present law.

Those very eminent Senators on the Committee on Armed Services who are senior to me would state, I believe, that had this change been made several years ago, it would have been a change for the better in our selective service law. I shall ask for a vote on the amendment, but I shall not ask for a rollcall vote.

Mr. President, I cannot say enough or place enough emphasis on the fact that the Committee on Armed Services has reported a bill which greatly improves our selective service law and removes many of the inequities in our present law.

The distinguished chairman of the Committee on Armed Services [Mr. RUSSELL] and other senior members, such as the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], who worked hard in the preparation of this bill, deserve a great amount of credit for their public service.

Mr. President, on the basis of careful research, however, I had hoped that the new selective service law would abolish the current practice of allocating draft quotas by State and local boards, and instead establish a national pool from which all eligible young men would be inducted. This would have eliminated the present situation whereby too much discretion for the granting of deferments has been in the hands of local selective service boards.

As a result, there are thousands of different criteria for deferment. Some boards have been granting deferments in instances where a neighboring board in the same State, or even in the same city, would not. For example, in my home city of Cleveland, a board in one section of Cleveland might grant a deferment to a young man when another board in another area of the city might give an opposite ruling and induct a youngster in an identical situation.

The majority of the committee, after considering all alternatives, felt that the present system should be continued. While I disagree with this conclusion, I feel that we can live with the present method if it is carefully monitored.

The most important recommendation made by the committee is to reverse the order of induction. At present, induction begins with those who are 26 years of age and works backward. The committee has recommended that induction commence with the age of 19. This procedure in the law will remove a great deal of uncertainty from the lives of young Americans eligible for the draft, decrease the number of deferment applications, and, perhaps most importantly, provide the services with a pool of manpower more readily adaptable to our military needs.

The present selective service law is very disruptive in the lives of millions of young Americans with the possibility of the draft hanging over a young man until after he attains the age of 26.

(At this point, Mr. MORSE assumed the chair.)

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it would be much better to commence the draft with 19-year-olds so that a youngster directly after graduating from high school would then be placed in the pool of young men of the same age, and if he were drawn for active service he would serve and have that behind him. He could then have a continuity about his education and later life.

Mr. President, I also completely agree with the committee recommendations on changing present standards for student deferments. However, there is one inequity in the proposed legislation. Young men drafted into our Armed Forces are and will continue to be required to serve for 24 months. This is an arbitrary figure arrived at many years ago when the original peacetime laws were enacted. It is outmoded and unnecessary today.

While there remains a continuing need for conscription to meet our military manpower requirements—especially while we continue to be involved in an ugly miserable civil war in Vietnam—the need for a 24-month term of service no longer exists.

The bill as reported by the committee continues to require an initial training period of not less than 4 months. The fact is that the present period of basic training is only 8 weeks. Thus under existing circumstances, a young man will have concluded his basic training and will have had an opportunity for an additional 2 months of specialized training before he could be sent to Vietnam or overseas to any combat zone.

The present tour of duty of men in our Armed Forces in Vietnam is 1 year. Even assuming that a young man were given 6 months of training before being sent into the combat area, it is obvious that he could fulfill his obligation to his country in a period of 18 months and then be returned to civilian life. Certainly, those in charge of personnel assignments for various branches of our Armed Forces could fulfill all their requirements with an 18-month tour of duty for draftees. In my considered judgment, it is unfair and unnecessary to require these young men to serve for 2 years.

Furthermore, in each of the next several years, nearly 1,900,000 young men will attain the age of 19. In 1970, that number will probably exceed 2 million. Of this number, under current standards, three of 10 will probably be disqualified for physical reasons or deferred for reasons of hardship or unfitness. Therefore, approximately 1,300,000 19-year-olds will be qualified and available for service in our Armed Forces each year.

According to Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of Manpower, in a typical post-Vietnam year—which we all hope will be very soon, but which many of us doubt will be so soon—it is estimated that 110,000 inductees will be required annually. These men would be selected from the residual pool of draftees available, exclusive of those who had already volunteered. That pool would consist of approximately 730,000 young men. Thus, under the proposed bill, only one out of seven of the 19-year-olds remaining available for induction each year would be needed to be drafted.

Why should the burden fall on such a comparatively small group? If shortening the tour of duty should conceivably result in the need for more men, they can be drawn from the additional hundreds of thousands of men who otherwise would be exempted. It would spread the service obligation among more young Americans and not allow it to fall upon a comparatively small segment.

Mr. President, it is startling and shocking that of our allies, Great Britain and Canada have no conscription whatever. Here we have a situation of more than 345,000 men in our Armed Forces in Western Europe ostensibly because of the threat of Soviet aggression, when every sensible person knows that no real threat exists. If there is such a threat, then Great Britain is closer to it than we are and still Great Britain has no conscription whatsoever.

Now let us consider some of our other allies.

New Zealand provides conscription for 12 months. France provides conscription for 16 months. West Germany and the Netherlands for 18 months each. Belgium, for 12 to 15 months. Denmark, which is close to the Soviet Union, for 14 months. Sweden, 10 to 12 months. The drafting of young men in Italy is limited to only 15 months. In Norway it is for 12 months.

Mr. President, this is shocking. Here we have been drafting the finest young men in the world and sending many of them overseas to fight in a small nation, Vietnam, which is of no strategic importance whatever to the defense of the United States. Yet, our allies and friends—so-called friends, such as Great Britain and France—either have no draft, or it is only for 18 months or less. We are drafting our men for 2 years. Not one of those countries has sent a soldier to fight in Southeast Asia.

West Germany has probably one of the finest armies in the world, but it has only an 18-month draft. That country is prospering as never before, largely as a result of the billions of dollars of American taxpayers' money which was poured into West Germany after we nearly destroyed it in World War II. Yet, Germany is doing nothing to help us. It has not sent one soldier to Vietnam.

As we all know, the draft seriously disrupts the lives of our young men, until they have fulfilled their military obligations—disrupts not only the lives of our young men, but those of their parents as well. Our boys are unable to make plans for the future. Likewise, it takes 2 years from their lives if they are selected for active duty. It puts those who are drafted at a serious disadvantage compared with others of their age group who have not been drafted and thus allowed to begin their careers.

If it is necessary to require millions of our young men to serve their nation, then we should at least do our utmost to spread the burden among more of our citizens—among more of our families—and to lessen that burden as much as we possibly can. There is no valid reason whatever for continuing the 24-month tour for draftees.

Mr. President, I expect to call up my amendment shortly after the Senate convenes tomorrow. I am not inclined to call it up for a vote tonight. I may want to speak further in support of it tomorrow.

Mr. President, this is a meritorious amendment. It should have been in the selective service law years ago. It would be fairer to the families of America. I have, therefore, offered this amendment to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act. My amendment, with respect to every part of the law which at present provides for 2 years service, fixes the tour of duty for conscripted young men at a maximum of 18 months. I urge that the amendment, when it is called up for a vote tomorrow, be adopted.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] has the floor. I ask unanimous consent that the floor be yielded to me, without interfering with the right of the Senator from Oregon to have the floor when I conclude my brief remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it so ordered.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Georgia deserves our highest praise for the analysis he has just given us of the very troubled problem of draft reform, and for his explanation of the views of the Armed Services Committee on extending the Selective Service Act.

The committee report is, in my judgment, a document which we should all read closely. Those of us here in the Senate who have long urged that our draft laws be reformed can take heart at the carefully measured reasoning which the report represents. Not one of us would claim that draft reform is a simple matter. Not one of us would claim that the badly needed changes could be worked overnight. Yet we all recognize that changes are needed to bring an outdated system up to date, and they are needed urgently.

It is for this reason that I think the Armed Services Committee has done a very fine job in expressing its views on draft reform.

I was particularly heartened that the committee refrained from substantially amending the universal Military Training and Service Act. I hold a strong belief in the need for flexibility in the administration of the draft laws, a flexibility of the type the Chief Executive now has under that act. It is for this reason that when I introduced legislation early this year on the subject of draft reform, I introduced it in the form of a concurrent resolution. This resolution would have expressed the sense of the Congress relative to the administration of the draft, but would have left the administrative details up to the President.

If there is any area in which I would take issue with the action of the Armed Services Committee, it is this matter. There is spelled out in the report a sensitivity to the many problems which are the concern of those who urge draft reform. But it is my personal opinion that this matter is of such great urgency and importance to the American people, that it would have been helpful to have had a positive mandate from the U.S. Senate on these various questions. Such a mandate would be a resolution similar to Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which I introduced earlier this year.

It is in that spirit that I endorse the comments of the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee this afternoon, and also the findings of the committee. Particularly, I think that the strong language contained in the committee report, while not having the force of a concurrent resolution, is nevertheless a clear indication to the President of how the Armed Services Committee feels about the administration of the draft.

It is my hope that the Senate will adopt the bill reported out by the Armed Services Committee, and by reference the report accompanying it, because it gives the President some measure of backing for his announced intentions to change the draft laws.

It was my privilege, through the graciousness of the distinguished chairman of the Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare [Mr. CLARK], to chair 7 days of hearings on the nonmilitary implications of the Selective Service System. These hearings turned up a great deal of highly relevant and interesting information, which I reported to the Armed Services Committee when I testified before it.

An area of particular concern to the members of the Employment, Manpower, and Poverty Subcommittee was the treatment of those rejected for military service because they do not meet the armed services qualifications, either educational or physical. We discovered that the profile of a rejectee is strikingly similar to that of a person struck by poverty, and we consequently endeavored to find out both what happens to rejectees and how they can best be rehabilitated. There presently exists a limited system of referral for those rejected by the Armed Forces, but we discovered that, as presently organized and constituted, the referral system is most disappointing. It does not reach effectively all of those who want treatment, and it provides very little help for those who need assistance but are put off by the paper work and procedures. Our subcommittee was very interested in a program the Department of Defense has called Project 100,000, under which men who do not quite meet the qualifications are nevertheless taken by the military and given military training.

It was also the observation of a number of us on that subcommittee, who concerned ourselves with the question of student deferment, that we would reach a different conclusion from that the Armed Services Committee reached.

The Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, testified before our committee. When I asked him if he felt that deferment of students was of overriding national interest, he answered in the negative. The Commissioner of Education, Mr. Harold Howe, was asked whether there was a sound educational reason for considering student deferments, and he also answered in the negative. So it was my conclusion, and that of others, that if there were no overriding national interest for student deferment, or no overriding educational reasons for student deferment, particularly at a time of a "hot" war—and I would consider our present engagement in Vietnam a "hot" war—we ought to consider very seriously whether we should continue student deferments.

I believe, very simply, that we should have student deferments when we are not involved in a limited or "hot" war situation; that overriding educational reasons do justify student deferments in those times. But, under present circumstances, particularly with the statements of the Secretary of Labor and the Commissioner of Education, we should give serious thought to whether there should be a continuation of student deferments.

With that really fundamental exception, I do support the report of the Armed Services Committee. I think it does much to eliminate the inequities and unfairness that exist in the Selective Service System.

Comments have been made this afternoon that we will never be able to eliminate all the inequities, all the unfairness, all the uncertainties in the draft and Selective Service System. I think the Armed Services Committee has acted responsibly in doing what we in the Senate can do to eliminate many of those inequities.

I think the recommendations of the committee deserve the commendation of Senators.

Mr. President, under a previous unanimous consent agreement, it was agreed that at this point in the RECORD there would be printed material relating to the information developed by the hearings I chaired in the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

These hearings were the result of discussions I had with the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], in which we all agreed that in this year of intensive review of the Selective Service System it would be advisable to have hearings on the nonmilitary aspects of the Selective Service System, as well as on the military aspects. The 7 days of hearings before the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty were the result.

It was my privilege to present a summary of the findings of these hearings to the Committee on Armed Services, and it is this summary which I would like to have printed in the RECORD at this point.

It would, in addition, be helpful to Senators, I think, to have before them the text of Senate Concurrent Resolution 12, which I introduced on February 23, and to which I have referred already today.

I thank the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] for yielding to me.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR EDWARD M. KENNEDY TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct pleasure for me to present to you and the distinguished members of the Armed Services Committee a summary report on the hearings I recently chaired in the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty. These hearings, conducted during the weeks of March 20th and April 3rd, were concerned with the manpower, poverty, employment and educational implications of the Selective Service System, and ways in which the System could be improved this year.

When we discussed the possibility of these hearings on the floor of the Senate in February, you made very clear your belief that they would be beneficial to the deliberations of the Armed Services Committee as it considered legislation to extend the Selective Service Act. As you observed then, "the draft is one of the most difficult problems which confronts not only the Armed Services Committee but also Congress as a whole."

I shared that view then, and now, after our seven days of hearings and the testimony of nineteen witnesses, I hold it even more strongly. The draft touches the life of every young man in this country, and it touches him at a time when he is making the educational, career and family decisions which will largely determine his future. We cannot permit our system of military conscription to continue as a haphazard collection of outdated policies; for that system works against the opportunities our young men should have to develop themselves to their fullest potential. In a word, the hearings in the Labor Committee convinced me of the pressing need to give greater attention to the nonmilitary implications of the structure and policies of our system of military conscription than we have in the past, a conviction I know we share.

No one would seriously question the statement in Section 1 of the Universal Military Training and Service Act "that an adequate armed strength must be achieved and maintained to insure the security of this nation." There is no doubt that the needs of national defense must be the overriding consideration in designing any military conscription system. But national defense should not be the only consideration. If, for example, we are considering a number of different draft systems, all of which would satisfy the manpower requirements of the military, then it is imperative that in deciding which of the systems to adopt we consider the effects of that system on other important national goals—the education of our youth, the efficient use of manpower, and full employment.

Because these non-military elements of our draft laws were the focus of our hearings in the Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty, my testimony today will concentrate more heavily on these elements of the draft. And this concentration is entirely appropriate, I think, in the light of the statement yesterday by General Mark W. Clark that his Panel directed its attention to the role played by the draft "in the procurement of military personnel." With General Clark's Panel's concentration on the military aspects of the draft, and our Subcommittee's concentration on the manpower, employment, poverty and educational implications of the draft, I think this Committee will have the benefits of a balanced presentation.

These two presentations are offered of course in addition to the broad-gauged inquiry of the National Advisory Commission on Selective Service, headed by Mr. Burke Marshall. This inquiry, under the authority of Executive Order 11289, was charged with conducting a thorough review of "the laws by which government calls its citizens to serve, . . . not only in the light of military needs but also with a view to other national, community and individual needs." I think we can all agree, whether or not we concur with each and every recommendation of the Marshall Commission, that the Commission Report is a masterful document, reflecting careful analysis of the problems and thoughtful resolution of them. The nation, in my judgment, owes Mr. Marshall, the members of the Commission, and its staff a debt of gratitude.

Mr. Chairman, I have long been urging specific reforms in our draft laws. I agree with the Clark Panel's conclusion that "the major discontents (with the present system) are, in fact, with the operation and administration of the law and policies relating thereto rather than with the law *per se*." And re the reasons for these discontents were well and succintly stated by the Marshall Commission: "Sweeping changes have come into our society since the system for selecting men for induction into the Armed Forces was established a quarter of a century ago . . . The United States has outgrown its Selective Service System."

Within the framework of the various recommendations for changes in the operation and administration of the law, and in the related policies, there is an astonishing range of agreement.

An example of the agreement lies in a area of deep concern to this Committee—the effectiveness of our armed forces. Mr. Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, quoted to our Subcommittee from a recent statement of General Earl Wheeler, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. In it, General Wheeler made the point that younger recruits make better soldiers than older ones. "The younger ones are eager," General Wheeler said, "they are sturdy, they learn quickly," while the older men "are not as eager and not as willing to understand the military service." In this statement, General Wheeler seconded previous, similar statements by such distinguished military figures as General Omar Bradley and Admiral Forrest Sherman.

Not a single witness who appeared before our Subcommittee differed with this judgment of our military leaders. There seemed to be two general reasons cited by our witnesses for reversing the order of call and drafting the youngest first, starting at age 19.

First, it would eliminate uncertainty. The uncertainty about when and whether a young man will be drafted has long been a subject of considerable concern. From the date a young man registers until the age when he is likely to be inducted, he is unsure of his future. The average draft age has gone as high as 23 years and 7 months. Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz testified that between registration and induction many young men face problems "because of many employers' reluctance or even refusal to hire them." And a Defense Department study showed that, in 1964, 48 per cent of employers placed restrictions on hiring draft-eligible college graduates. Needless to say, private activities beyond employment are also disrupted for these young men.

Second, it would decrease the number of deferments for occupation, education and dependency. At age 24, for instance, 27 per cent of all registrants have an occupational or dependency deferment. It should be apparent that drafting the youngest first would eliminate one of the serious strains on our draft system. There are, for example, over 3.5 million draft-eligible men with dependency deferments, and another 250,000 with occupational deferments.

This testimony, in short, backed up the recommendations of the Marshall Commission, the Clark Panel, and the President's Message. The feeling that the youngest should be drafted first seems to be unanimous.

The next two major areas of reform are wound tightly together: deferments and method of selection of draftees. I would like to discuss the method of selection first.

Of those who testified on this subject, all favored doing away with the present date-of-birth sequence selection system and instead adopting some form of random selection or lottery system. I am aware that yesterday General Clark made clear his opposition, and that of his Panel, to random selection. I regret that he declined to testify before our Subcommittee, because we had hoped to have him explain his thinking to us as well.

The testimony in favor of random selection was based on a number of different reasons, ranging from the inherent equality of a lottery, to frustration at being unable to select the few to serve from among the many eligible, to a concern for the mechanics of selecting from within a given age class by date-of-birth sequence.

General Lewis B. Hershey, since 1941, Director of the Selective Service System or its predecessors, told us: "I think random choice may satisfy better than what we have been doing, the choosing of those who will not have to serve."

Assistant Secretary Morris testified that, in the near future, even if we continue undergraduate—and I emphasize undergraduate—deferments, "about 1,300,000 19-year-old men will be qualified and available for service each year . . . . Our estimated military requirements for new men might amount to about 680,000 per year in a typical post-Vietnam year, or slightly over one-half of the total qualified age group . . . . We can expect to obtain about 570,000 of these men from voluntary enlistment and officer programs. Our estimated requirements for inductees would, therefore, total about 110,000 per year." These 110,000 draftees would be drawn from the residual pool of draft-eligible nonvolunteers, which would number about 730,000. *Thus we would have to draft only one man out of the seven available.*

Mr. Morris then detailed the various selection systems that had been considered, concluding that "the method that would most approach equity would be to establish a Fair and Impartial Random (FAIR) system of selection to determine the order of call for all equally eligible men." Moreover, he added that he foresaw no difficulty in instituting a random selection system rapidly, seconding the judgment of General Hershey.

The Secretary of Labor favored random selection because it would be "as fair to the sons of economically and politically weaker parents as to the sons of parents with more immediate influence." On this argument—that a random selection system would operate with absolute fairness—there can be little argument.

I would like to point out to the members of this Committee, at this point, that the random selection system faced repeated scrutiny in our Subcommittee. We asked all the witnesses what, in their view, was the most fair and easily operated selection system. The answer, in each case, was a system based on random selection.

The Subcommittee also considered the question of deferments, which is an overriding concern in planning our national defense needs. It is in this troubled area that our Subcommittee made what I consider its most fruitful discoveries.

In the area of those deferments based on manpower needs, for example, the testimony of Secretary Wirtz was highly interesting. He told us that "There is no justification under present circumstances, and especially in view of the prospective shift to a 19-year-old group induction priority, for 'occupational deferments . . .' There is nothing in the civilian manpower needs of the economy which warrants any consideration in determining who shall assume the military service obligation." I questioned Secretary Wirtz closely about our need for engineers, mathematicians, physicists, and other persons in similar fields. He was very firm in his belief that "the supply of those absolutely invaluable talents will not be interfered with in a significant way by the induction of the 19-year-old group." Part of the Secretary's reasoning is based on the fact that only two-tenths of one percent of 19-year-olds have an occupational deferment, and that the entire elimination of the deferment will in no way disrupt the supply of highly trained specialists.

Secretary Wirtz was, however, clear on the point that there are "skill shortages today in some key occupations." But the Secretary went on to argue that, in terms of drafting 19-year-olds first, "these are all situations in which there is somebody who can be trained for them," and that consequently the fact of the skill shortages should be no determinant in who gets drafted and who does not. The draft choice should be made, and then the men not drafted should be trained.

We must not forget, in the terms of the highly advanced technology of our military, that many men receive training while in the military service which is directly compatible to these skill shortages—such as in electronic circuitry. The members of our Subcommittee found Secretary Wirtz very persuasive, since his knowledge of the manpower needs of our country is perhaps unequalled.

Another very troublesome area when we consider deferments is education. We found a near agreement that graduate school deferments should be eliminated, except for doctors and dentists. The reasons for continuing graduate deferments for doctors and dentists is simply that doctors and dentists are the subject of an entirely separate conscription system, and that they should consequently be permitted to finish their educations and then be subject to the draft. This would ensure an adequate supply of trained health professionals to meet the needs of the nation, both civilian and military; it would not subject doctors and dentists to a double eligibility; and it is not an unfair use of the educational deferment to escape military service entirely.

Other than the educational postponement from draft eligibility for doctors and dentists, however, there was no support at all in the hearings for continuing the graduate school deferments.

On the subject of undergraduate deferments, however, we had some marked differences of opinion.

Mr. William Gorham, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for Program Coordination, stated that he didn't particularly favor either undergraduate or graduate student deferments. Yet he qualified this statement by saying that once the graduate deferment loophole is tightened, "college deferment is no longer tantamount to evasion from service." Further, he said that studies made both by the Defense Department and by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare could find "no evidence that breaking the (educational) career at mid-point would discourage continuation; so from a long-term point of view, ending college deferments would not necessarily have important implications one way or the other for the trained manpower which our educational system produces." It is apparent in fact that many young men are actually induced to serve in the military before going on to college because on their discharge they are eligible for the broad benefits of the Cold War GI Bill. Finally, Mr. Gorham said that he could find little basis for college deferments other than public sentiment.

Mr. Burke Marshall presented very ably both the majority and minority views on college deferments reflected within his Commission. I see no need to elaborate on his able presentation.

Mr. Harold Howe, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, told us that "from the point of view of HEW and the Administration, we want to keep this matter (of college deferments) open . . . With that reservation, and with the feeling that we have a lot to learn from the results of these hearings and other evidence that will be brought to the matter, I would personally feel that undergraduate deferments are no longer justified." I and the other members of our Subcommittee went into this matter at great length with Commissioner Howe, and I am now well satisfied that no valid reasons, based upon educational needs, exist for continuing college deferments.

We heard one day of testimony from a panel of editors of student newspapers, and there was a division of opinion among them over whether or not the college deferment should be continued. It was apparent that their testimony reflected the division on our campuses, and I would like to call witness to the president of the student body at the University of Oregon, Mr. Henry Drummonds, who left college last month, giving up his 2–S deferment and subjecting himself to the draft. He has already received his notice of induction. He left college, he says, because of his belief that college deferments are unfair in times of conflicts such as that in Vietnam. This voluntary surrender of a 2–S deferment is not, I am sure, a typical reaction of students to college deferments, but it highlights the very strong feelings our young men have about the equities of college deferments.

This strong feeling among students about deferments is greatly stengthened during conflicts such as Vietnam, when some young men are giving up their lives in combat yet no war or emergency is declared. I have visited many campuses in recent months, and the hostility to fighting in an undeclared war is, among some students, overt. I do not think this overt hostility is a matter of lack of courage or of lack of faith in our government, as some have suggested. I think, rather, that college deferments during a shooting war have caused what Yale University President Kingman Brewster has called "a cynical avoidance of service, a corruption of the aims of education and a tarnishing of the national spirit."

This cynicism toward the draft among our students has been a great concern to me, and it has given a certain credence to one particular argument against continuing college deferments in times of a shooting war.

This is the so-called "timing argument." If a man can choose whether to go to college or to subject himself to the draft, then he can, during a Vietnam situation, choose whether he will bear the risks of defending his country in a shooting war. Thus, a young man with the money and brains to attend college could, today, decide to enter college and take the chance that four years from now we would not be committed in Southeast Asia, or anywhere else, to the extent that we are now. A young man without the brains or money, or both, cannot get a 2–S deferment, of which there are now over 2 million. This young man without the 2–S deferment goes into the military and, perhaps, to Vietnam. If there were no college deferments, then the disadvantaged young man would not be subjected to this situation.

It is no good to say, as some have, that the young man who chose to go to college four years ago, instead of subjecting himself at that time to the draft, is now facing an entirely different military situation than he was four years ago. Now he might go to Vietnam, whereas had he gone into the service four years ago, he would have gone into the peacetime army. The point is this: if a man can choose now whether or not to go to college, he is certain to avoid serving in the military for the next four years. In this he has an unfair advantage over the young man who does not have that choice.

A number of us on our Subcommittee, as well as a number of our witnesses, tried to work out some way to permit four-year college deferments in peacetime, when the draft calls are quite low and the risks of death in the service small, but to discontinue them during periods of hostility such as Vietnam, when calls are high and the risks of death in combat something to be reckoned with. I noticed in General Clark's testimony yesterday a similar expression of concern, when he asked that some way be found to share the risks of the Vietnam war more equally between reservists and inductees. Mr. Morris told us that 47 per cent of the Army personnel in Vietnam are inductees, while the reservists, trained to be soldiers and paid to be soldiers, were not taking part in the Vietnam conflict.

We in our Subcommittee, as well as our witnesses, were not able to develop an appropriate triggering device for determining when a peacetime situation becomes a wartime situation, for the purposes of the draft. I don't, for example, think there is any question that we are now in a wartime situation. Yet we in the Congress have neither declared war nor has the President declared a a national emergency. Perhaps there should be some mechanism whereby, assuming we permit college deferments for up to four years in peacetime, these deferments can be discontinued when we become engaged in a war in which thousands of our young men are being killed and tens of thousands wounded. I do not think that we should permit one boy the luxury of avoiding the risks of the Vietnam war by going to college while we send another off to do battle with the Viet Cong. I am certain, though, that the members of the Armed Services Committee have thought about the problem of developing a suitable triggering device, and I hope to discuss it at the conclusion of my testimony.

To sum up, on the matter of college deferments: the overwhelming weight of the testimony to our Subcommitee was on the side of eliminating them entirely for those boys who were selected as draftees at age 19, unless some triggering mechanism could be developed to prevent the inequity of a young man avoiding a shooting war by electing to go to college.

If such a triggering mechanism is developed and college deferments consequently continued, or if college deferments are continued irrespective of the basic unfairness of permitting a young man to choose his way out of a shooting war, then our Subcommittee uncovered a very disturbing situation in the area of vocational and apprenticeship training and part-time attendance at college. And this unfairness exists today under our present system.

Secretary Wirtz first raised this issue for our consideration, and we subsequently aired it with all of the rest of our witnesses because of its importance. I would like at this point to quote from Secretary Wirtz's testimony, because he was very specific and eloquent on it. "If," the Secretary said, "there is to be continued deferment of college students, on the ground that a general education is important enough to warrant it, the question will be pressed more and more strongly of why and whether there should be any different treatment of young men who are in occupational training programs.

"My own answer is that there cannot justifiably be any such distinction made. It would be hard to prove, and it hasn't been proved so far, that there is a larger value—either to the public or to the individual involved—in letting Bob finish college than in letting Jim complete his apprenticeship as a carpenter or letting John work his way up the unskilled steps toward a skilled job as a punch press operator.

"In fact, the last two may be more likely to get thrown off stride by a two year interruption than the college student would be.

"Without arguing either for or against 'student deferments' I urge that the answer must be the same for the boys who are getting their training in college and for those who are getting it in a school of harder knocks.

"This point has been increasingly recognized in the case of young men who are in private apprenticeship programs. But that . . . still leaves out those who are in different kinds of employment where the 'training' is on unskilled or low-skilled jobs that offer advance to the next higher work classification, and then the next, and so forth."

Mr. Chairman, it is my opinion that Secretary Wirtz has given us a very important insight in a serious fault in our present draft system. We now give deferments to students: high school students, college students and graduate students. But only in a very, very limited fashion do we give deferments for students in occupational training. We have used the argument of the security and welfare of the nation for the judgement to defer college students, yet we give no deferments to the young man learning the skills he must have to become a productive participant in our economic system.

A further point brought out by Secretary Wirtz relating to occupation deferments is that "of the current 250,000 registrants classified by the local boards as 2–A (occupational deferment), half are neither in essential activities as certified by the Secretary of Commerce nor in critical occupations as certified by the Secretary of Labor." The Secretary gave us some examples of those occupations listed as critical: Glass blowers and structural linguists, among others, were on the list. He also gave us some idea of the applications for new occupational deferments, which included pretzel bakers and pipe organ makers. The Secretary noted that these applications had been turned down.

We have, at the present time, no information about the occupations or activities of the 125,000 registrants now deferred whose jobs are not on either the Labor Department's critical occupations list or the Commerce Department's essential activities list. But we are looking into the matter.

On one day of our hearings, we heard from a panel of three young men in apprenticeship training. One, an apprentice carpenter, was drafted out of his apprenticeship training, after one year, and spent two years in the Army as a missile technician stationed in Germany. He is now back completing his apprenticeship as a carpenter. His experience demonstrates the unfairness of a system which would defer a 19-year-old student of 14th century baroque music, but draft a 19-year-old student of carpentry. Both young men are students and both are acquiring the knowledge and the skills they will need to participate in our diverse marketplace economy.

In addition to the problem of those in occupational training, there is the problem of part-time students. I have received since our hearings began considerable mail on specific cases of unfairness in the administration of our present draft system. One letter came from a young man who had been a part-time engineering student while holding a full-time job. He had been working to support himself. When he reached the senior class, after six years, he received his induction notice, and after basic military training he was sent to Vietnam. He described the case of students who, because they were lacking credits, had also spent six years in college but were not drafted because they were full-time students. Something is wrong with a system which drafts a young man working his way through school and carrying only a part-time case load but skips over the young man who can afford to be a full-time student.

We did not, in this troubled area, reach any conclusion except that gross unfairness now plagues our policies governing apprentices and part-time students. In Secretary Wirtz's words, "There is a very real danger here of denying democracy's basic ideals by putting boys in double jeopardy because they are poor."

The final area of particular concern to our Subcommittee involves those rejected by the military as unfit for military duty.

In 1963 President Kennedy established the task force on Manpower Conservation, which made its report on January 1, 1964. It was entitled one-third of a nation, the one third in the title being those who of all men who turn 19 every year, are found unfit for military service. The letter transmitting the report to President Kennedy said: "This level of failure stands as a symbol of the unfinished business of the nation, an unavoidable fact of the present. There could be no more urgent task than to ensure that in our time it becomes a thing of the past."

Mr. Chairman, the testimony to our Subcommittee indicates that this shocking situation is still with us today. In fiscal year 1966 nearly three-quarters of a million men were rejected—half for educational deficiencies, and half for health reasons. I will not dwell here on the information we received on the income and racial breakdowns of the rejectees, except for one example and a generalization. Seventy-six and one half percent of all Negro registrants in South Carolina are rejected as unqualified for military duty. And, to generalize, the correlation between a profile of rejectees and of those classified as poverty-stricken is very close.

The reason I do not want to dwell extensively on this aspect of our hearings is that the program of economic opportunity designed to raise the one-third of a nation out of their hopelessness are properly the concerns of the Labor Committee, except for one particular area of joint concern.

If we want to increase the extent of voluntarism in our armed forces, then one way of doing it is to focus some of our attention on those who volunteer and are rejected. It is estimated that from one third to one half of those presently rejected every year, or from 230,000 to 350,000 young men a year, were volunteers for military duty. Their rejection has at least two effects. First, it means we must draft men to fill the places they would have occupied in the military if qualified and accepted. Second, it means, in the words of a witness who has worked extensively with rejectees, that since "the Army is the last chance for many of them, if they are rejected from the Army, they have nothing left, and this leads to difficulty. They roam the streets. They get in a group, something develops, and the next thing you know they are in the courts. On the other hand, those who have served, maybe in Vietnam, are very proud of their service. Many want to go back and serve in Vietnam for their nation."

Every witness in our hearings who spoke to this point spoke of the importance of training and treating those rejectees with deficiencies easily correctable. Secretary Wirtz went so far as to recommend compulsory rehabilitation, on analogy to compulsory education. Sargent Shriver recommended screening all young men—and women—at age 16 to identify their educational and health deficiencies, and to offer assistance. Commissioner Howe recommended an expansion of the referral service which presently exists for some of the rejectees. Mr. Morris recommended an expansion of Project 100,000, the program under which the Department of Defense is this year giving military training to 40,000 young men who missed qualifying by a very small margin. It is important to note that these men are not being given the intensive, special training envisioned by the step program, which was not funded, but are put through the regular basic training courses along with those not in Project 100,000. The preliminary results have been highly satisfactory, according to Mr. Morris, particularly from the standpoint of the military, because of the high military motivation of this group.

Another recent development in this area was the recommendation of the Republican members of the House Education and Labor Committee that Military Career Centers be established under the auspices of the Secretary of Defense for the rehabilitation of volunteers who are otherwise unable to meet the requirements for military service.

We found this area of medical and educational rehabilitation of rejectees to be an area of high activity in the military, in the Administration, in the Congress, and in universities. I am very certain that it will be given a great deal of consideration, both in this Committee and in the Labor Committee, and I think the net result will be a better military establishment, a higher degree of public satisfaction with the draft, and a marked improvement in the lives of those young men exposed to the advantages of military service.

There remain two major areas of concern on which we heard testimony.

The first relates to the volunteer army. Professor Milton Friedman of the University of Chicago, a leading advocate of the volunteer army, was our primary witness on this subject, and he presented his case well. But there remain a number of troublesome, unresolved problems. The first is cost. The Department of Defense has estimated the additional cost of maintaining a volunteer army at from $4 to $17 billion a year. This is quite a range, and the members of our Subcommittee did not feel competent to make any judgments as to the validity of these costs. It was Professor Friedman's view that these figures were not correct, and that a volunteer army might even be less costly.

The second problem is one to which General Clark spoke eloquently yesterday. This involves what he called the "serious moral and psychological" problems of the volunteer army. He pointed out that the direct citizen participation in the military provides a "bridge of participation and identification" between military and civilian, and that an erosion of this bridge by reliance upon an army of professionals would have serious and unforeseeable consequences.

It seems to me, from our testimony, that we should attempt to increase the opportunities for volunteers to serve in the military, but that we should not move toward adopting a strictly volunteer army without considerably more serious study of the problems surrounding it.

National service is the last of the major areas of concern we touched upon in our hearings. The Executive Director of the National Service Secretariat, Mr. Donald J. Eberly, commented upon the various proposals for development of national service alternatives to military service. It was clear, from his testimony and from that of our other witnesses, that much thinking remains to be done before we can consider equating non-military service with military service, either directly or by some other means of determining equivalency.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to comment briefly upon S. Con. Res. 12, which I introduced on February 23, and which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services. This resolution would declare it the sense of Congress that the President should effect certain changes in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. These changes, in brief, are:

(a) to establish national criteria for the classification of persons registered under the Act, and to require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States;

(b) to require that the order of induction of persons under the Act be determined on the basis of random selection, and that the method of such random selection be the same throughout the United States.

(c) to eliminate all deferments authorized by regulation except deferments for extreme hardship cases and deferments for students pursuing undergraduate work in colleges and universities, with the proviso that such student deferments should not last longer than four academic years;

(d) to require that youngest registrants be inducted first; and

(e) to continue to revise the physical and mental standards for military service so that persons who do not meet the physical and mental standards necessary for combat service may be inducted and, with remedial training and treatment, be made fit to perform noncombat or limited service, or, in appropriate circumstances, combat duty.

My rationale for submitting a Concurrent Resolution, instead of a bill, is my belief that the President, as Commander-in-Chief, should have a high degree of flexibility in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. That Act, as General Clark pointed out, has an inherent flexibility which is readily adaptable to our changing demands for military manpower, and it has consistently provided the "manpower essential to the security of the nation." I do not think we should in any way attempt to restrict the President's authority to operate the Selective Service System with a high degree of flexibility, particularly at this time when the President is moving to institute many of the reforms urged both by witnesses to our Subcommittee and to your Committee.

But the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as it now stands, does not give the President any policy guidance in the five crucial areas of draft reform listed in S. Con. Res. 12. And that is the reason for S. Con. Res. 12: to give the President an explicit statement of Congressional policy in how he should operate the Selective Service System. The actual operating details would be left to Executive Order and administrative regulation.

Mr. Chairman, I ask that the text of S. Con. Res. 12 be printed in the record at the conclusion of my testimony.

In sum, Mr. Chairman, I believe the Universal Military Training and Service Act should be extended before the induction authority which is its operative section expires this June. But I think we in the Congress have a responsibility to indicate to the President our feelings on what general form the badly-needed reforms in our draft system should take. The calls for reform are persistent, they are wide-spread, and they are specific. And they are persistent, widespread and specific because they are needed. I am very honored to have been able to present to this distinguished Committee a summary report on the hearings on the employment, manpower, poverty implications of the draft which it was my privilege to chair. The information we have developed is provocative, and I am certain that it will prove highly useful in this Committee's deliberations.

Draft reform is, Mr. Chairman, as you said, a most difficult issue. It fully deserves the intensive consideration being given it by your Committee and by the Congress. Our overriding concern must be provision for the continued strong defense of this country. But we must at the same time be fair to our young men, as they are the source of strength in our future. It is in this context that I will be happy to answer your questions.

S. Con. Res. 12

Whereas the lack of uniform national standards in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, has caused an unequal distribution of the burdens of military service among the residents of the several States and of different districts within the States;

Whereas the expansion of the pool of men eligible for induction into military service has made finding rational and fair policy distinctions for inducting some and deferring others increasingly more difficult;

Whereas the existing system of granting liberal deferments, authorized by regulations issued under the provisions of said Act, has caused an unequal distribution of the burdens of military service among men of different educational and family backgrounds and of different physical and mental capabilities;

Whereas the policy of drafting the oldest eligible registrants before the eligible youngest registrants has worked to cause uncertainty and unpredictability detrimental to career planning, job opportunities, and development of family life;

Whereas the present physical and mental standards for military service preclude limited or noncombat military service for many men anxious to serve their country, which service would permit them to lead more productive lives; and

Whereas the authority granted to the President by said Act to issue regulations governing the administration of said Act permits him to change certain aspects of its administration to make it more fair, equitable, and just: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That it is hereby declared to be the sense of the Congress that in the administration of the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, the President should exercise the authority vested in him by law to effect, as soon as practicable, the following changes in the administration of said Act—

(a) Establish national criteria for the classification of persons registered under said Act and require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States;

(b) Require that the induction of persons under such Act be carried out on the basis of random selection and that the method of such selection be the same throughout the United States;

(c) Eliminate all deferments authorized by regulation except deferments for extreme hardship cases and deferments for students pursuing undergraduate work in colleges and universities: *Provided*, That such student deferments should not last longer than four academic years;

(d) Require that youngest registrants be inducted first; and

(e) Revise the physical and mental standards for military service so that persons who do not meet the physical and mental standards necessary for combat service may be inducted to perform noncombat or limited service.

Sec. 2. It is further declared to be the sense of the Congress that the student deferments specified in subsection (c) of section 1 of this resolution should be effective during all periods except a period of war hereafter declared by the Congress or a period of national emergency hereafter declared by the President.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment for the time being. I intend to ask that it be considered again tomorrow. I thank the Senator from Oregon, who has the floor, for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio is withdrawn.

The Chair recognizes the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I call up my first amendment, and ask that it be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 3, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:

"(2) Subsection 1(c) (50 App. U.S.C. 451 (c)) is amended to read as follows:

"'(c) The Congress further declares that its power to raise and support armies to insure the security of the Nation includes authority for the establishment of a military manpower procurement system based on involuntary inductions; but—

"'(1) that the exercise of such authority necessarily constitutes an invasion of the liberties of America's young men;

"'(2) that, accordingly, such authority should be exercised only when the Nation's defense commitments are so extensive, and the resources available for meeting those commitments so limited by comparison, that reliance on a wholly voluntary military manpower system is not reasonably attainable;

"'(3) that whenever a military manpower system based on involuntary inductions is in operation, it should be designed so that the obligations and privileges of serving in the Armed Forces and the reserve components thereof may be shared generally, in accordance with a system of selection which is fair and just, and which is consistent with the maintenance of an effective national economy;

"'(4) that whenever such military manpower system is in operation, Congress has the responsibility for the frequent and impartial reassessment of the considerations justifying its use; and

"'(5) whenever such reassessment reveals that a system of involuntary inductions can be replaced by a system based on the free choice of individuals at an overall cost the Nation can reasonably afford, Congress should act to facilitate the prompt termination of involuntary inductions and a transition to an effective voluntary system for the procurement of military manpower.' "

Redesignate paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of the first section of the bill as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), and (6), respectively.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I should like to make an inquiry of the majority leader. Does the leadership plan to adjourn now, at this point, or what is the plan?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, it is the plan to recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, but it is my understanding that the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] wishes the Senator from Oregon to yield to him briefly for a comment at this time.

Mr. PERCY. No, I will withhold that until tomorrow.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridan.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 10, 1967:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Robert H. McBride, of the District of Columbia, a Foreign Service officer of class 1, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

R. Peter Straus, of New York, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant generals

Maj. Gen. William Bradford Rosson, O23556, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry Herndon Critz, O19786, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Frederick Carlton Weyand, O33736, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, U.S. Army.

Maj. Gen. Robert Howard York, O21341, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, O21990, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The nominations beginning William D. Abraham, to be second lieutenant, and ending Thomas A. Stevenson, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on April 28, 1967 (6AF).

IN THE ARMY

The nominations beginning William M. Gares, Jr., to be first lieutenant, and ending Robert W. Worthing, to be second lieutenant, which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 1, 1967 (6A).

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 10, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O give thanks unto the Lord; for He is good: for His mercy endureth forever.—Psalm 106: 1.

O God of truth and love, who art worthy of a nobler praise than our lips can utter, and worthy of a greater love than our hearts can offer, in Thy presence we bow this moment as into Thy hands we commit our lives.

May the thoughts in our minds become channels for Thy goodness, may the noble dreams in our hearts find their fulfillment in Thee and may the work of our hands be honest and true. Together may we build a greater Nation and a better world upon the foundations of the faith of our fathers and our faith in the possibility of a new day.

Open our eyes to the manifestations of Thy spirit in our world. Give us courage in weakness, steady us when we would fall, enlarge our sympathies that we may become brothers to all the sons of men. Make us a people grateful for our privileges, faithful in our stewardship, and sensitive to the need of our countrymen. In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6950. An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 6950) entitled "An act to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. LONG of Louisiana, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. GORE, Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware, and Mr. CARLSON to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 223. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 449. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes;

S. 477. An act for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepoon;

S. 645. An act to provide needed additional means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture;

S. 1136. An act to amend section 9 of the Act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 1190. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of surviving spouses; and

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 86-42, appointed Mr. STENNIS to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference to be held in Ottawa, Canada, May 10 to 14, 1967.

THE PRESIDENT'S BURDEN OF UNFAIR CRITICISM

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Johnson for the dignity with which he has faced outrageous and hateful abuse from the critics of his Vietnam policies.

I daresay that no American President—including F.D.R. and perhaps even Lincoln—has been so vilified by his critics as has President Johnson.

The President, I believe, can take comfort in the fact that the worst invectives have traditionally been reserved for our greatest Presidents—leaders who topple the status quo or who pursue goals with the courage of their convictions, in spite of enormous counterpressures.

This administration is doing what it believes to be right, both at home and abroad. And I want the record to show that there has been no suppression of individual rights, no pressure brought to bear to curb freedom of speech, no obstacle put in the way of anyone desiring to speak their mind on Vietnam or anything else.

Free speech—no matter how irresponsible—has never been as unrestricted or as uninhibited as it is today.

Those who doubt this statement are cordially invited to read some of the signs held by pickets in front of the White House. Or, perhaps, they might want to attend the off-Broadway production of "MacBird."

I relish the freedom that our society provides for those wishing to dissent from Government policy. But I strongly deplore the abuse of this freedom demonstrated by those who savagely attack Mr. Johnson's patriotism, integrity, and honor.

The right to speak out does not necessarily include the right to be taken seriously. That right must be earned. Our Nation is involved in great issues of war and peace that demand the best from us, the most reasonable judgments and the most careful thought.

In this regard, I wish that the President's scattergun critics would emulate the man they are attacking.

Editorial reaction against vilification of our President has been most heartening. I think it is obvious that the overwhelming majority of the American people are fed up with the irresponsible tactics of a minority of dissenters. I include at this point in the RECORD a representative sampling of these editorials:

[From the Wyoming Eagle, Apr. 27, 1967]

THE RIGHT TO PROTEST

The right of dissent is inherent in our democratic form of government. Everyone has the right to his own opinion—and the right to express it.

It must be recognized always, that there are two sides to every controversial question.

The Constitution of the United States also guarantees the right of people "peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances"—the right of peaceable protest, if you will.

We, and most other Americans, most certainly would defend those rights.

But we believe some of the recent demonstrations, in protest against our role in the Vietnam war, have gone far beyond the limits of decent dissent—even in this freest of free nations.

Pulitzer prize-winning reporter Merriman Smith, veteran United Press International White House correspondent, said the other day that President Johnson has had to bear "some of the worst vilification—even obscenity—that I've seen or heard" in 25 years of covering the White House.

"At the so-called peace demonstration in New York's Central park the other day," he said, "there were grown men carrying signs which openly and plainly challenged the President's normalcy—mentally and sexually."

Smith expressed dismay at buttons which say "Lee Harvey Oswald, where are you now that we need you" and pamphlets and books which allege that President Johnson engineered the death of President Kennedy.

"This is not enlightened social change, or legitimate dissent or revolution. It is anarchy, born of a highly permissive atmosphere in which freedom, at times, seems to be working against the very things for which freedom supposedly stands," he said.

When the protestors defend their right to protest, we say: "Sure, go ahead. But keep your protests peaceable—within the limits of common sense."

When protestors complain that critics would deny them the right to protest, we say:

"Nuts! Even as you have the right to protest and demonstrate, we have the right, and perhaps the duty, to protest against your actions—particularly when those actions include attempts to keep top American officials from speaking, when those actions include burning the American flag, when those actions lead to rioting in the streets, and when those actions include scurrilous vilification of the President of the United States."

By way of criticizing such actions, we would say they are stupid at best, vicious and un-American at worst.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Apr. 27, 1967]

"FREEDOM" VERSUS FREEDOM

Reporter Merriman Smith of United Press International is the dean of all White House correspondents, a respected member of his profession, a Pulitzer prize-winner and a man who is sick and tired of all the "slimy" abuse heaped on national leaders, the President in particular.

Smith calls it anarchy in an atmosphere "in which freedom, at times, seems to be working against the very things for which freedom supposedly stands."

This may explain why the vulgar and vicious attacks are without parallel in American history; the atmosphere itself is unparalleled.

To Truman, Dewey was the cute little man on the wedding cake. And the fact that Truman came from a state noted for its jackasses was put to good use by his opposition.

Stevenson and Eisenhower were egghead and applehead, respectively, depending on which side was doing the talking. It was "give 'em hell" politics, to be sure, but few of the remarks came without a twinkle and a trace of a smile.

Contrast this with the current button asking, "Lee Harvey Oswald, where are you now?" And with the harangues that paint the President as a murderer of young men, leading the country to be a great purveyor of violence and deceit.

It has an entirely different ring to it—a sick, demented, rotten ring. And, unfortunately, it may be just one symptom among many that the country suffers from acute moral anemia.

Reporter Smith calls the malady an overdose of permissiveness. And he urges the American public to take some responsibility for its own image and stop blaming everything on either Lyndon Johnson or Drew Pearson."

That sense of responsibility can be encouraged by parents in the terms they use in front of their children to describe national leaders, those in positions of authority in general and other fellow citizens.

The treatment should by all means include religious institutions, for here is where the dream of true freedom was born. When Voltaire said, I disapprove of what you say, but "I will defend to the death your right to say it," he was speaking in a larger context—under the canopy of a higher law.

This is the law that counsels, in many languages and variations, Do unto others. . ." The Golden Rule is the only proved preservative for other law.

It is apparent now that massive transfusions of this great law are needed to arrest the cancer of permissive anemia. Or else for true freedom, the disease could be terminal.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Apr. 26, 1967]

CHICAGO TRIBUNE DEPLORES "VILIFICATION" OF JOHNSON

The Chicago Tribune, in its lead editorial, said Tuesday President Johnson "does not deserve the assaults he has been getting from the peaceniks, the 'black power' crowd, the liberal intellectuals, and other assorted fanatics."

The editorial, titled "The Vilification of the President," said, "the recent wave of vicious personal attacks on President Johnson and other government leaders was discussed yesterday by Merriman Smith, the respected White House correspondent for United Press International, at a meeting of editors and publishers in New York.

"He said the President 'these days is the object of some of the worst vilification—even obscenity—that I've seen or heard in more than 25 years on the White House assignment'."

The editorial continued:

"Mr. Smith cited some of the obscene signs carried in the recent 'peace' demonstrations in New York, the signs and songs that President Johnson is deliberately burning Asian babies with napalm, and the pamphlets and other material alleging that President Johnson engineered the death of President Kennedy.

" 'This is not enlightened social change or legitimate dissent or revolution,' said the correspondent. 'It is anarchy, born of a highly permissive atmosphere in this country; a strangely paradoxical, pejorative atmosphere in which freedom, at times, seems to be working against the very things for which freedom supposedly stands'."

"All presidents have been subjected to cruel jokes, unjustified ridicule, and falsification, some of which has been instigated by political opponents. The personal attacks on President Hoover will always be a black mark against the Democrats who made them. But the vilification of President Johnson is not based on political opposition; much of it seems to have no motivation, unless, as Mr. Smith suggests, the purpose is to tear down public confidence in authority at any level. This is the road to anarchy.

"The Tribune shares Mr. Smith's anger and disgust at the personal attacks on the President. As our readers know, this newspaper has vigorously criticized many of his policies, but we recognize the difficulties of his job and the efforts he has been making to do his best. He does not deserve the assaults he has been getting from the peaceniks, the 'black power' crowd, the liberal intellectuals, and other assorted fanatics.

"Mr. Smith noted that the press has a special reason for being concerned about the attacks on government leaders.

" 'Hate and vilification warp judgment just as heat buckles steel beams,' he said. 'If you tear down confidence in established authority, then those in public office blame a lot of this on the newspapers for reporting it. They say we are not doing enough reporting in depth; then when we do burrow beneath the government's bright public face of fresh handouts and self-serving background conferences not for attribution, they yell at us again for distorting their purpose of trying to second-guess Dean Rusk.

" 'So what do we have? An effort to destroy confidence in government plus an effort to pull down confidence in the press. Then, if both efforts are successful, whom do you believe, Dr. Spock?

" 'Mr. Johnson—in fact no president—deserves the indignities being heaped upon him these days in the name of peace or civil rights. Criticism and challenge have their rightful place in our political system, but not the scrawls from restroom walls.'

"Correspondent Smith closed his speech with the following comment:

" 'LBJ is in for much more punishment at the hands of the name-callers unless the squares who raise kids, mow the lawns, and pay their taxes decide to involve themselves by getting off their patios and telling the dirty-mouths to shut the hell up.' "

[From the San Antonio Express, Apr. 30, 1967]

VILIFICATION IS SELF-DEFEATING

The president of the United States is the target of the most vicious attacks in the history of the nation.

We do not refer to those who dissent with his domestic and foreign policies nor those who oppose the war in Southeast Asia per se.

Our form of government is open, and even requires contrary opinions in order to function as intended.

We do refer, however, to a nationwide campaign of slander, whispers, innuendo and vilification in outhouse-wall terms. One hears it on the streets, sees it on lapel pins and bumper stickers, and on picket lines.

Many of the signs, for instance, carried in peace demonstrations in Central Park in New York recently were such obscene attacks on Lyndon Johnson that the wire services would not transmit the photographs.

It is more than an attack on a president and an individual. It is a campaign calculated to undermine the very foundations of the government itself.

Every city has local ordinances that cover public filth. They should be inforced to the fullest. But a greater problem lies in the minds of those who have enjoyed smirks and sniggers at gutter slashes at the most powerful office in the world.

They think they are helping destroy Lyndon Johnson, the man. In truth, however, they are helping erode our form of government. It is immorality in its highest form and is self-defeating.

LBJ, the man, can handle himself; the life of the presidency lies in the hearts and minds of all of us.

THE 19TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF ISRAEL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have just been granted unanimous consent to address the House on Monday, May 15, on the 19th anniversary of that little but great State of Israel. I invite all other Members who are interested to join in that special order on Monday next.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE TODAY

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

INFORMATION LAW

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RUMSFELD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on July 4, 1966, Public Law 89-487 was signed into law. Its purpose is to clarify and protect the right of the public to Government information and is to become effective on July 4 of this year. The 1-year delay was provided to permit the agencies ample time to adjust their practices to conform with the requirements of the law. To facilitate the process, the Justice Department has been developing guidelines for the use of the various departments and agencies of Government in complying with the law.

While the guidelines have not been made public yet, there are disturbing rumors that some agencies are resisting the changed requirements. In an article by George Lardner, Jr., appearing in the Washington Post, the Food and Drug Administration's Bureau of Medicine and the Justice Department's Immigration and Naturalization Service are specifically cited. Mr. Lardner's article reflects a concern of members of the press that the nine exemptions the law provides "might be turned into sweeping rigid new excuses for the same old practices."

As a member of the House Committee on Government Operations—the committee which reported the bill—and as one who worked for its passage, I shall follow the implementation of the legislation with the closest scrutiny. Any attempt to rewrite or circumvent the intent of the law by administrative action would be unwise. If the fears reported by Mr. Lardner are realized, I am confident that those responsible will not be lacking in opportunities to explain their acts to the Congress.

The text of the article of May 8, 1967, follows:

U.S. DRAFTS GUIDELINES ON INFORMATION LAW

(By George Lardner, Jr.)

Scores of Government information officers gathered informally at the YWCA last month for a Justice Department briefing on an unprecedented new law intended to end the suppression of Government records on official whim.

Most in the audience had no more than a remote idea of what was in the new "freedom of information" law although it was passed almost a year ago with a delayed effective date to give them time to get used to it. Many were clearly apprehensive at the message that the old excuses for refusing to give out information would no longer wash.

Assistant Attorney General Frank M. Wozencraft, head of the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, told them they had little time left to change their habits. The law goes into effect July 4.

To assist in the transition, Wozencraft—whose predecessor called the bill unconstitutional—has been working on a lengthy set of Government-wide guidelines.

The Administration had opposed the bill's passage, but Wozencraft and his assistants appear to be making a genuine effort to win the bureaucracy's acceptance of the principle that every American has the basic right to examine his Government's records.

Still in preliminary form and subject to further change, the guidelines begin with the notification that on July 4, "every executive agency must begin meeting in spirit as well as practice the obligations of the Public Information Act enacted by Congress last year."

The new law, the memo adds, requires:

"That disclosure be the general rule, not the exception.

"That all individuals have equal rights of access.

"That the burden be on the Government to justify the withholding of a document, not on the person who requests it.

"That individuals improperly denied access to documents have a right to seek injunctive relief in the courts."

IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST

Up to now, the law has permitted Government agencies, from top officials down to office clerks, to withhold any records where secrecy is considered "in the public interest" or required "for good cause." There was no recourse to the courts.

In approving the new law, the Senate Judiciary Committee pointed out that information has often been withheld simply "to cover up embarrassing mistakes or irregularities." The House Committee on Government Operations said "improper denials occur again and again."

The new law applies to every agency and organizational unit in the executive branch, presumably even the CIA—to whatever miniscule extent its secrecy might not be protected by other laws—and the nine across-the-board exemptions set out in the law.

Not a few agencies are expected to resist the changes, however. Reports, apparently reliable but impossible to document, have been received on Capitol Hill that officials in the Food and Drug Administration's Bureau of Medicine have been advised to get in the habit of putting as little on paper as possible.

Enthusiasm for the new law outside the Government, moreover, has been somewhat tempered by fears that the nine exemptions might be turned into sweepingly rigid new excuses for the same old practices.

The nine exemptions cover a broad spectrum, from national defense and foreign policy secrets covered by Executive order to various inter-agency and intra-agency memos and letters.

On this score, the Justice Department's own Immigration and Naturalization Service published a set of proposed regulations under the new law this past week that seem to conflict with the advice that Wozencraft has been enunciating.

Wozencraft has been publicly stressing the theme that the exemptions are "permissive," not mandatory, and that requests for records should be judged on their merits, not automatically rejected because the documents fall under one of the exemptions. Spokesmen for the House Government Information Subcommittee headed by Rep. John E. Moss (D-Calif.) have been pressing this view.

The Immigration Service, however, flatly proposes that any documents exempt under the new law "will not be made available."

The guidelines are being developed in what amounts to negotiations with the Moss Subcommittee. Restrictive advice in an early draft—such as a remark that records in use are not to be "snatched from agency employes"—has been dropped and replaced by a suggestion that a copy can always be made "with reasonable promptness."

SUGGESTS READING ROOMS

Wozencraft also has suggested that all agencies set aside reading rooms where the newly public records can be made available.

A spokesman for the Moss Subcommittee said disputes over the new disclosure law will inevitably have to be resolved by the courts. But so far, he said, the guidelines seem to be "on the plus side" for disclosure.

Except at this point, for the "freedom of information guidelines themselves, the still preliminary draft copies have been tightly restricted and selected newsmen have been promised a peek, when Justice is ready, on a "confidential" basis only.

Meanwhile, a Justice Department spokesman tersely told The Washington Post, which obtained a draft copy: "We have no comment. Wozencraft has no comment."

DAIRY IMPORT ACT OF 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BUTTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am

concerned about the problem the dairy farmers of my area, and of the State of New York, have in making a living. Because they are receiving such a low return on their investment—plus they have to spend long hours on the job, 7 days a week—many are leaving the dairy farms. And unless something is done, and this trend is reversed, the result could be a shortage of milk in this country.

Today I introduced the Dairy Import Act of 1967. This bill limits imports to the average butterfat and nonfat milk solids shipped into this country from 1961 through 1965. Also, these quotas can be increased if necessary, in the national interest, and they will increase in the same ratio as the domestic market grows.

Foreign shippers would continue to sell dairy products to this country, but effective quotas would be in force. As it stands now, quotas are ineffective.

Because these quotas are not effective, the dairy farmers of my area are faced with increasing competition from foreign products. We want to encourage trade with other nations. We want to move toward a more trade-minded policy where economic benefits are likely to be diffused over a large number of people. We need to prove to the world's underdeveloped countries that we accept them as equal trading partners. But the dairy farmers need some protection.

In a State such as New York, the dairy industry is an important segment of our economy. Dairy farmers in New York sell $481 million worth of milk each year, the second highest total in the country. And dairying ranks first in total farm income in the State.

New York agriculture is big business. Four out of every 10 people working owe their employment, at least indirectly, to agriculture. Actually the production and selling of milk is New York's largest single industry. It accounts for a billion dollars of commerce each year in the State.

There are some 33,000 dairy farms in the State, producing about 5 billion quarts of milk each year.

But these 33,000 farmers are not the only ones who should be concerned about the problems in the dairy industry.

In addition to the milk business being big business, milk and dairy products are the largest portion of our diet. While we can buy manufactured dairy items from importers, fluid milk and fresh dairy products can only come from our dairy farms here in this country.

The future of our dairy industry affects not only farmers, but every consumer as well.

To encourage American dairy farmers of continuing markets, where they can receive reasonable prices for their milk, it has become necessary to place some sort of reasonable quotas on imported dairy products.

The President has called on the U.S. Tariff Commission to hold hearings on May 15 to determine if new quotas are needed. If the Commission recommends new quotas, and it is believed that it will, this will restrict dairy product imports.

However, in the past, such action under section 22 has provided only temporary relief.

Mr. Speaker, what the dairy farmers want is a permanent bill and they are united in support of the Dairy Import Act of 1967.

RODNEY HUNT CO. WINS "E" CITATION

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, it was my very great pleasure recently to participate in a ceremony in which the Commerce Department's coveted "E" award was presented to the Rodney Hunt Co., of Orange, Mass.

The ceremony was an historic one, beyond simply the significance it has for those of us concerned with business and commerce in the First Congressional District and, indeed, all of Massachusetts. It was the first time a ceremony of this kind was ever held in the Senate, this being in a Senate reception room, and I was pleased to participate jointly in the ceremony with my very able and distinguished colleague from the other body, Senator Edward M. Kennedy.

The "E" award is one in which we all take great pride, of course. It is given in recognition of outstanding contribution to the export expansion program. And, as we all know, expansion of exports is a vital ingredient in both our political and economic foreign policies. It is one of the means by which we seek to remedy our long-standing balance-of-payments problem, and a very effective means by which we can perhaps lower the barriers between East and West and thereby lessen the tensions that have for two decades kept civilization at or near the brink of destruction.

I am personally very proud that Rodney Hunt has won the award, although for those of us to whom the imaginative, bold, and aggressive management policies of Rodney Hunt Co. are a familiar story, the award comes as no surprise. The firm has been in the very forefront for years, both in innovation and efficiency of production, and in employee and community relations.

These policies have paid off in a significant increase in exports in recent years. A vigorous sales program, based on the tradition of direct customer contact, plus significant new innovations in integrated communications programs to reach overseas clientele have opened significant new markets. As a result of an extensive travel, and territorial exploration program, the company now has major installations in more than 50 countries including Vietnam, Soviet Union, Pakistan, Egypt, Cuba, and Australia.

The Rodney Hunt Co. is among the oldest and proudest in the country. It was founded in 1840 to produce the equipment and machinery needed by the then developing textile industry that was for so many generations the very backbone of our New England economy. The firm continues to prosper today, in spite of the fact that much of our textile industry has migrated from New England to other areas where labor and operating costs are lower.

Specifically, the firm produces textile wet finishing machinery and sluice gates, these being its principal world market commodity. For domestic markets, it also manufactures industrial rolls for the paper, plastics, and textile industries. The company also produces more than 3,000 types and combinations of sluice gates for use in power, flood control, water purification, and the all-important area of sewage and pollution control systems. These, too, have found world markets.

The company pioneered in the development of continuous bleaching ranges for fabric processing in rope and open width form. Rodney Hunt bleaching and dyeing machinery is used by leading textile mills throughout the world.

Certainly, I am very proud and pleased indeed to offer my personal congratulations and best wishes to Rodney Hunt President Earl Harris, and to the approximately 350 employees who have made their firm one of the Nation's best.

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege for me to make note of the fact that today, May 10, 1967, is the 90th anniversary of the independence of modern Rumania.

The Rumanian nation achieved its official independence on this day in 1877, permanently breaking away from control of the Turkish Sultan. Its independence was achieved under Charles I, the first king of modern Rumania and its independence lasted until 1947 when the legal ruler, King Michael, was forced into exile by the Communists. The illegal Soviet-imposed government has held the Rumanian people captive for the last 20 years.

Mr. Speaker, we recognize that the Communist designs to control the world manifest themselves in all continents, although our main attention at the moment is in Vietnam where direct Communist military aggression is taking place. However, we recognize that true peace and freedom will not come to the world unless Communist aggression is completely halted. We look forward to the day when all the captive peoples, including the brave Rumanian nation, will be able to enjoy a government of their own choosing in conformance with their history and culture and legitimate national aspirations.

We must take practical steps on behalf of the oppressed people of Rumania.

Neither the Voice of America nor Radio Free Europe is doing an effective job of broadcasting behind the Iron Curtain. Both are preaching the coexistence line of the present administration.

The Voice of America programing to Eastern Europe and, therefore, to Rumania has been especially weak since there is the obvious policy of the Johnson administration to appease Communist dictators of Eastern Europe rather than to use our own excellent facilities to deliver a message of truth.

Radio Free Europe, which has been coerced into an almost neutral type of presentation in recent years should be encouraged to augment strong broadcasts into Rumania with messages that have practical and direct bearing on current events.

BEEF IMPORTS AND THE LIVESTOCK INDUSTRY

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RUPPE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, livestock farmers throughout the country are disturbed by the prospects of a continued falling off in beef cattle prices. Heavy supplies of low-cost beef and veal are flooding the American market.

In the first quarter of this year, choice steers on the Chicago market averaged $24.95 per hundredweight—$3 less than a year ago. In fact, beef prices have been falling almost continuously for the past year. The present farm parity ratio of 74 has not been equaled since the depression of the 1930's and the Department of Agriculture is currently forecasting a further decline of 5 percent in realized net farm income this year. Farm production costs, farm mortgages, and farmers' short-term debts are at an alltime high.

Mr. Speaker, I do not mean to suggest that the answer to the distress of agriculture lies wholly within the livestock sector of the farm economy. But livestock and livestock products are big contributors to total farm income; in 1966 livestock and its products accounted for more than half, and meat animals for more than a third, of total farm marketings. There is little doubt that livestock producers held a critical position in the farm economy.

What is the current outlook for cattlemen this year? The Department of Agriculture notes that there were 3 percent more cattle on feed on April 1 than a year earlier, and that marketings in this second quarter will be increased 4 percent over a year ago. For the remainder of 1967, there seems to be no relief for livestock producers. Domestic supplies will continue to be heavy, costs will continue high, and as far as we can see, beef imports will continue to pour in from Australia, New Zealand, Ireland, Mexico, Canada, and other low-cost areas.

I shall not go into great detail at this time on the beef-import situation. This has been done by well-qualified Members of this body over the past 2 weeks. For those who missed it, I would suggest a reading of the discussion of the problem by 13 of our distinguished colleagues on April 27, here on the floor of the House.

For the present I would point out that, according to the Department of Agriculture, imports of beef, veal, and mutton in 1966 were 18 percent above 1965. Total imports are as high, or higher, than they were 3 and 4 years ago, when their volume nearly ruined the domestic industry, and the Congress attempted to curb them by enacting the Meat Import Act of 1964.

You will remember that the administration was extremely unsympathetic to that act. In order to get any legislation at all, the Congress was forced to accept a base period for the setting of quotas which resulted in a quota that was entirely too high. Moreover, Public Law 88–482 contained two provisions which almost guaranteed the present high volume of imports. First, it provided for a too-generous quota increase based on the growth of domestic marketings. Second, projected imports were allowed to exceed quotas by 10 percent before such restrictions could become operative.

Another shortcoming of the 1964 act was the provision which required the Secretary of Agriculture to estimate in advance the level of imports in determining whether they would exceed the quota. Early last year, it should be remembered, the Secretary estimated that 700 million pounds of beef and veal would be imported. He continued to revise that figure upward, but somehow his estimate never matched actual imports of more than 823 million pounds.

So it is with this background of failure that a number of our colleagues have introduced legislation to amend Public Law 88–482 to effectively limit imports of low-cost foreign beef, and insure domestic producers of a measure of security. I want to take this opportunity to assure sponsors of this proposal of my support, by introducing a bill to amend the 1964 act.

The proposal of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PRICE]—among others—appears to me to answer the shortcomings of the 1964 act. Briefly, it would do six things:

First, it would eliminate the 10-percent overrun of quotas I mentioned;

Second, it would provide that the quotas be set by the law itself, rather than by an estimate of the Secretary of Agriculture;

Third, it would use the years 1958–62 in establishing quotas, rather than the present system which includes 1963—the highest year on record for beef imports;

Fourth, it would impose quotas on a quarterly—rather than a yearly—basis;

Fifth, it would allow the administration to impose quotas on other meat products, such as canned and cured beef, fresh lamb and pork; and

Sixth, it would require that offshore purchase of meat by our Department of Defense be charged against the applicable quota.

Mr. Speaker, when the 1964 Meat Import Act was passed, there were those among the membership of the House who warned that it was an inadequate measure. We now have the proof of their foresight. We have an opportunity and an obligation to correct this measure. Let us act—and quickly—to provide our livestock farmers with the protection they deserve.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert the text of my bill:

H.R. 9839

A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is the policy of the Congress that the aggregate quantity of the articles specified in items 106.10 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat) and 106.20 (relating to fresh, chilled, or frozen meat of goats and sheep (except lambs)) of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which may be imported into the United States in any calendar year beginning after December 31, 1967, should not exceed 585,500,000 pounds; except that this quantity shall be increased or decreased for any calendar year by the same percentage that estimated average annual domestic production of these articles in that calendar year and the two preceding calendar years increases or decreases in comparison with the average annual domestic commercial production of these articles during the years 1958 through 1962, inclusive.

(b) Before the beginning of each calendar year after 1967, the Secretary of Agriculture shall estimate and publish the aggregate quantity prescribed for such calendar year by subsection (a).

(c)(1) The President shall by proclamation limit the total quantity of the articles described in subsection (a) which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during each quarter of any calendar year to one-fourth the aggregate quantity estimated for such calendar year by the Secretary of Agriculture pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) The Secretary of Agriculture shall allocate the total quantity proclaimed under paragraph (1), and any increase in such quantity pursuant to subsection (d), among supplying countries on the basis of the shares such countries supplied to the United States market during a representative period of the articles described in subsection (a), except that due account may be given to special factors which have affected or may affect the trade in such articles. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify such allocations to the Secretary of the Treasury.

(d) The President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (c), or increase the total quantity proclaimed under such subsection, if he determines and proclaims that—

(1) such action is required by overriding economic or national security interests of the United States, giving special weight to the importance to the Nation of the economic well-being of the domestic livestock industry;

(2) the supply of articles of the kind described in subsection (a) will be inadequate to meet domestic demand at reasonable prices; or

(3) trade agreements entered into after the date of the enactment of this Act ensure that the policy set forth in subsection (a) will be carried out.

Any such suspension shall be for such period, and any such increase shall be in such amount, as the President determines and proclaims to be necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

(e) The Secretary of Agriculture shall issue such regulations as he determines to be necessary to prevent circumvention of the purposes of this section.

Sec. 2. (a) Whenever the President determines that the imposition of quotas on the quantity of any article enumerated in subpart B of part 2 of schedule 1 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States (relating to meats other than bird meat), other than the articles enumerated in items 106.10 and 106.20, is necessary in order to prevent unwarranted increases in the quantity of such article imported into the United States, he is authorized—

(1) to determine the total quantity of such article which may be imported into the United States during such period or periods as he may specify, and

(2) to limit, by proclamation, the total quantity of such article which may be entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption during such period or periods to the total quantity so determined.

(b) The President may suspend any proclamation made under subsection (a) and may increase or decrease the total quantity proclaimed with respect to any article under such subsection.

Sec. 3. Prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter the Secretary of Defense shall certify to the Secretary of Agriculture an estimate of the quantity in pounds of meat to be accepted for delivery during such quarter, procured from appropriated funds by the Defense Department from foreign sources, of any of the articles with respect to which quantitative limitations have been imposed on imports under the provisions hereof. The quotas established pursuant to section 1 or section 2 hereof shall be diminished by the amount of such meat to be accepted for delivery as estimated by the Secretary of Defense.

Sec. 4. All determinations by the President, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of Agriculture under this Act shall be final.

Sec. 5. Effective January 1, 1968, section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the free importation of certain wild animals, and to provide for the imposition of quotas on certain meat and meat products," approved August 22, 1964 (Public Law 88-482), is repealed.

URBAN HOUSING—ADDRESS BY SENATOR PERCY

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Morse] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, on the eve of his introduction of the National Home Ownership Act, Senator Charles H. Percy, of Illinois, discussed the bill and the general problems of housing in urban areas before the Washington Urban League. As a cosponsor of this legislation here in the House, I would like to include the Senator's remarks in the Record for the attention of all Members and Senators.

Senator Percy's initiative and vision in developing this proposal deserves the gratitude of us all. He has shown us a way to end our reliance on outdated and uninspiring programs that have failed to solve the critical housing problem. I hope this bill will command strong support in both Houses, on both sides of the aisle.

The address follows:

Urban Housing: A New Initiative

(Address by Senator Charles H. Percy, Republican, of Illinois, before the Washington Urban League, Apr. 19, 1967)

"Even the blindest of us now knows the danger signals are flashing. Our cities are in crisis."

Thus begins the 1966 annual report of the National Urban League. And unhappily, there is little reason today to believe that the situation will show dramatic improvement in 1967.

A dreary recital of the problems of the cities would serve no purpose for this audience. For 57 years the National Urban League has fought to focus public attention on the developing plight of our cities and, in particular, of the minority groups in their burgeoning slums and ghettoes.

Today I think it is safe to say that the goal of spotlighting the needs of our cities has been achieved. That is the essential beginning, and the Urban League can take a large share of the credit for it.

But unfortunately, the achievement of this beginning is only an infinitesimal part of achieving the ultimate goal—a satisfying urban environment where every person has the fullest opportunity to develop his innate human potential, and to pursue happiness urburdened by the chains of ignorance, poverty, exploitation and discrimination.

"Among all those problems to which we must address ourselves," continues your annual report, "the most critical is housing." Since I have long had a deep concern in this area, and since I have been chosen to serve on the Senate's Housing Subcommittee, I would like to discuss that particular problem with you this evening.

Before doing so, however, I would offer this observation: While it is convenient to discuss the problem of housing as such, we must never forget that housing exists to serve the needs of people. Any program or plan which fails to begin with that simple but too-often ignored fact is doomed to failure.

This has unhappily befallen the two principal Federal programs historically designed to fight the battle against slums—urban renewal and public housing.

In the concluding chapter of his book, *The Federal Bulldozer*, Professor Martin Anderson arrives at these conclusions about urban renewal:

"The federal urban renewal program", writes Dr. Anderson, "has made it more difficult for low and middle-income groups to obtain housing because of the amount of low rent housing it has destroyed."

"Urban renewal helps upper income groups and a few elite groups. It hurts low income people, especially those from minority groups." "Over 60 percent of the people forced to move are either Negroes, Puerto Ricans, or members of other minority groups."

Far from eliminating slums and preventing the spread of blight, "it is likely that urban renewal simply shifts slums and thus encourages the spread of slums and blight."

While one does not need to agree 100% with Professor Anderson's views, it seems to me inescapable that urban renewal, as a method of saving cities *and* improving the lives of city people, has fallen so far short of those goals that some better way must be found to achieve them.

Public housing has suffered much the same fate. Senator Robert Kennedy, certainly no enemy of government action, had this to say about public housing in his splendid testimony before the Ribicoff subcommittee last August:

"Public housing was once thought of as the answer to the problems of slums . . . Our housing projects were built largely without either reference or relevance to the underlying problems of poverty, unemployment, social disorganization, and alienation which caused people to need assistance in the first place. . . Too many of the projects, as a result, became jungles—places of despair and danger for their residents, and for the cities they were designed to save."

It is easy, looking backward, to criticize those who, two or three decades ago, launched what was then a bold and imaginative effort to strike at the heart of urban problems.

It is difficult today to devise a way of moving toward those same elusive goals they so bravely pursued.

The important thing is that we take full cognizance of the thirty years of experience we have gained. And the lesson of those years is indisputably clear: housing and the physical environment must be dealt with as they relate to human beings and human needs.

Having emphasized that, and bearing it always in mind, let me turn to the specific problem of housing.

If the housing needs of today's slum dwellers are to be effectively met, we must find a way to bridge the credit gap.

Hard data is difficult to come by, but I am sure that any of you who have worked in the housing field instinctively know that mortgage financing and home improvement loans can be desperately hard to obtain in areas that lenders regard as a slum.

I have in my files a letter from one of the ablest and most socially conscious bank officials in Chicago: In it he says:

"It is often stated that most financial institutions stay away from declining areas, and such is generally the case. Probably a majority of housing in such areas is sold at inflated and unrealistic prices to minority groups on a contract basis with little downpayment. Lack of a down payment and undue credit risks make the conventional mortgage a rarity for low or middle income people in decaying or slum areas. Often when there is a downpayment, the property is overburdened with first, second, and even third mortgages, leaving no cash flow for a rehabilitation loan."

The result of this sort of credit gap, which widens whenever the mortgage market is tight, is the further deterioration of the ghetto. If our urban ghettoes are going to be revitalized as decent, attractive communities—and they must be—some way must be found to bring more credit in on reasonable terms to do the job.

Fifty years ago farmers in downstate Illinois suffered from a credit gap very similar to the credit gap in Chicago's slums today.

The small country banks could finance plows and wagons, but lacked the resources to make long-term credit available for land and equipment.

The large city banks had the resources, but lacked the familiarity with rural areas and were reluctant to make loans far from their home office.

That credit gap was bridged by what was then a daring new concept—the Federal land bank system. Today, in the 50th year of the land bank system, a broad array of lending institutions exist to serve the specific needs of the American farmer.

The initiative came from action by the Federal government. But the responsibility was left, ultimately, with the farmer-borrowers themselves. As a result, the entire Federal land bank system authorized in 1917 passed into full private ownership in 1947. When the government had played its part in the difficult early phases, it stepped aside to let the farmers themselves take over.

What we need today is a mechanism to bridge the credit gap in our urban slums—a new lending institution tailored to the specific conditions and needs of slums and gray areas, and sympathetic to the needs of their people.

Tomorrow in the United States Senate I intend to introduce legislation to create just such an institution.

Last fall I advanced the idea of creating a private, nonprofit institution combining a loan fund and a technical assistance service. This institution would support construction or rehabilitation programs to provide decent housing for sale to families who, though poor at the beginning, had the capacity to rise, given the opportunity and motivation, to the point where they could successfully carry a low-cost mortgage.

I spoke in terms of outright sale to poor families because I believed then—and believe even more strongly now—that home ownership can be a powerful force for motivating them to invest in themselves—to rise through their efforts to economic security. In addition, home ownership gives that feeling of roots, of dignity, of self-esteem that a poor man can scarcely get as the perpetual victim of the slumlord or the public housing management. It promotes responsibility, stability, respect for property, good maintenance, and many other habits which contribute to the creation of wholesome, attractive neighborhoods and aspiring communities.

The bill I intend to join in sponsoring tomorrow represents a tremendous improvement over the first version advanced last fall. There is, of course, much room for further refinement. That is the purpose of the Senate Housing Subcommittee, and I know that the accumulated know-how of my colleagues of both parties will find many ways to make it a better bill.

Let me give you a preview of its contents.

Basically, the bill would charter a private, nonprofit National Home Ownership Foundation, consisting of two major components: a loan fund to help local sponsoring organizations overcome the credit gap; and a technical assistance service, to help them acquire the expertise to plan and execute a successful program for making home ownership available to aspiring families who could not on their own, get credit from conventional local sources.

Before a poor man could qualify for home ownership, of course, he would have to exhibit the earning capacity for carrying a mortgage. This might mean six months to a year of education, job training, and credit counseling assistance before he and his family could qualify. The realistic prospect of home ownership, I am convinced, can provide the crucial impetus for low income families to embark on this path—even if they have been slapped down time and time again when they sought to take charge of their lives.

The local sponsoring organizations would have to spring from the people themselves—they would not be superimposed from above by well meaning people in Washington or elsewhere. They might be nonprofit housing associations or cooperatives or limited dividend corporations. The Washington Urban League might be a sponsor. But whatever form the sponsoring organization might take, it would have to be based upon the people to be served and command their allegiance and personal involvement.

The $64 dollar question, of course, is how can the housing produced, whether single family, cooperative, or condominium, be made available at a cost a lower income family—say in the $3500–$6000 range—can afford? Won't this require a government subsidy, given today's housing costs?

Well, I for one am hopeful that ways can be found to cut deeply into the costs of housing rehabilitation. The Department of Housing and Urban Development and several of the large building materials suppliers are hard at work on this problem. But barring a breakthrough of unexpected proportions there will probably have to be some government aid to make home ownership a meaningful possibility for low income families.

The assistance plan we finally developed is deceptively straightforward. It would work something like this:

Here is a local sponsoring organization with houses or apartments ready to sell. Perhaps it is the Washington Urban League. There is a waiting list of families seeking homes, and they have over a period of time demonstrated their qualifications for home ownership.

And so the committee says to this family, "We think you have ability and motivation. We think you have what it takes to move even further up the economic ladder."

"So we are going to help you become the owner of this home. Since the payments are a little more than you can afford now, the government will pitch in and pay part of your interest cost. A few years later on, when you are earning a good deal more money, you can gradually begin to pay back that original government investment in you. What you are able to pay back will go to help another family coming along the same path. And if you have bad luck along the way, and if you never quite make enough money to pay back any of that investment—don't worry about it. You won't owe anyone a thing."

Now that is a proposition with dignity.

That says to a poor man today not, "Here is a government handout," but "We have faith that you and your family can make your own way."

Here, I think, is a helping hand that not only does *not* destroy dignity and pride in the person being helped, but actually encourages those feelings in him. Contrast this with welfare system, with its investigations and harassment and condescension, and I think you will see the power in it to uplift a man, not crush his spirit.

Now cynics will say that this is a tight-fisted scheme to tax the recently poor. I say it is a generous scheme to build pride and incentive in a poor man by investing in him—by helping him to have something and be somebody—and gently excusing him if he does not quite live up to our hopes.

There are countless other details and aspects of the National Home Ownership Foundation Act. I am sure you all have many questions which I have perhaps stimulated but not answered.

Over the next few months I will attempt to discuss and reply to many such questions, and I will expect to profit by your suggestions and, I hope, your support.

I am fully aware that this legislation is not perfect. I am aware that it does not provide the answer to *all* our slum housing problems or new hope to *all* slum people. But it is a beginning.

Last September, just as I first advanced the rudiments of this idea, President Johnson spoke at the Brookings Institution here in Washington. Speaking of his actions as President in coping with urban problems, the President said, "We need not delay action in the cities until Brookings, and its sister institutions, have given us a definitive answer . . . When governments are faced with great public dilemmas, they must shape their programs with the greatest wisdom that they possess, but governments must act. They cannot wait to act until all that is tentative and hypothetical can be established as firmly as a law of mathematics."

That is the spirit in which I will offer this legislation tomorrow. That is the spirit in which I hope it will be received.

I am hopeful that, perhaps with some further refinements, a National Home Ownership Foundation can be made a reality. When it is, we will have an important new tool for mobilizing the enormous resources of the private sector behind sound grassroots programs to make today's poor slum families the middle income home owners of tomorrow.

MAKING IT EASIER FOR THE RUSSIANS TO EXPORT COMMUNISM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Un-American Activities today heard testimony from Leonard I. Epstein, a New Jersey businessman who was approached by a Russian national in hopes of getting various technological items for the Russian's "customer."

Epstein related how Vadim Isakov, an employee of the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund, initiated his espionage efforts by indicating that he was interested in buying items for UNICEF—he was a UNICEF procurement officer—and ended up attempting to buy an underwater robot, which could be used for retrieving items from the ocean floor, accelerometers, which could be used to accomplish a soft landing on the moon by a space vehicle; a miniature computer, which could be used on board a space craft; titanium pressure vessels—it had to be titanium because of the weight factor; and flexible hoses used to fuel missiles prior to launch.

While a member of the staff of UNICEF was attempting clandestine purchases of American technological goods, the administration is attempting to make it easier for the enemy to get goods, mainly through the expansion of East-West trade. As Mr. Epstein said, much Russian technology is probably 30 to 40 years behind us.

Fortunately there is a group that is attempting to block this expansion. Headed by former Gov. John Davis Lodge, this group of distinguished individuals has apparently started on the right track by calling a spade a spade. This is seen in their name, Committee To End Aid to the Soviet Enemy.

Here is an article from the Washington Post of May 8, 1967, which lists the sponsors. As you can see they include businessmen.

EIGHT CEASE SPONSORS LISTED BY JOHN LODGE

John Davis Lodge, Republican former governor of Connecticut, announced last night eight sponsors for his Committee to End Aid to the Soviet Enemy (CEASE), a group dedicated to blocking administration efforts to increase West-East trade.

Lodge listed his sponsoring committee as:

F. K. Weyerhauser, of the Weyerhauser Co., St. Paul, Minn.; Edgar Ansel Mowrer, Washington author and journalist; former U.S. Sen. William F. Knowland, publisher of the Oakland, Calif., Tribune; retired Adm. Arthur Radford of Washington, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

John B. Adams, a Washington publisher; Alex Parker Jr., of the Parker Tobacco Co., Maysville, Ky.; William Penn Patrick, board chairman of Holiday Magic Co.; retired Gen. Arthur Trudeau, chairman, Gulf Research and Development Co., of Pittsburgh, and retired Adm. Arleigh Burke, Washington.

Mr. Epstein stated this morning that the UNICEF employee apparently believed that American businessmen would be glad to sell to an unknown "European customer," anything to make a "buck."

"I think that most businessmen should

uphold the safety and security of their Nation and hang the dollar in these cases," Epstein told the committee. Needless to say, Mr. Epstein and his partner, Mr. George Yohrling, were more concerned about their country than making money and contacted the Federal Bureau of Investigation as soon as they realized what was going on.

In contrast to Mr. Epstein and CEASE, I have an article from the New York Times of May 6, 1967, headed, "U.S. Pushes Drive for Soviet Trade." This article states that there is a renewed effort to "break a logjam in trade with the Soviet Union," and the "President ordered hundreds of goods removed from a list of products barred from sale to the Communist bloc." Here is the Times article:

U.S. PUSHES DRIVE FOR SOVIET TRADE—SPONSORS PARTICIPATION BY BUSINESS IN MOSCOW FAIR

(By Raymond H. Anderson)

MOSCOW, May 5.—The United States Government and American businessmen have started a campaign to break a log jam in trade with the Soviet Union.

For the first time, Washington is supporting the participation of American companies in a trade fair here. The exhibition, concentrating on food-processing and food-packaging equipment, will open May 16.

Also for the first time, an American trade mission is in the Soviet Union specifically to buy and sell. The group represents 15 Minneapolis concerns.

Another trade mission, from California, will arrive in Moscow May 15 to explore the potential for sales of farm machinery, food products and food processing equipment.

The surge of American interest in trade with the Soviet Union reflects, in part, the appeal last October by President Johnson for improved relations with the Communist countries of Eastern Europe.

As a step toward better relations, the President ordered hundreds of goods removed from a list of products barred from sale to the Communist bloc.

EXPANDING MARKET

The new interest in doing business with the Soviet Union also reflects an awareness that the country is now in the market for a wide variety of equipment as it drives for a major expansion in agriculture, automobiles and many other areas.

Eighteen American companies will have exhibits at the Moscow trade fair, called Inprodmash-67. The fair, which will last 13 days, will be in Sokolniki Park in the northeast section of the city.

Among the companies taking part are Crown Cork and Seal of Philadelphia, Dow Chemical of Midland, Mich., Fairbanks Morse, Glenrock, N.J., and Scientific Data System of Santa Monica, Calif.

Three soft-drink companies, Coca-Cola, Pepsi-Cola and Royal Crown Cola, will have exhibits at the fair in the hopes of persuading Soviet officials to allow them to produce their drinks under license.

Equipment for processing and packaging food is of vital interest to the Soviet Union, which loses a large amount of fresh food each harvest because of spoilage.

The Minneapolis trade mission, which arrived early this week and leaves Sunday for Poland, represents food-processing companies as well as concerns manufacturing farm equipment, road building equipment and industrial machinery.

Among the companies are Honeywell, Acrometal Products and John Deere.

The members of the mission have made no sales yet, but they hope some contracts will be signed within a year or so.

Soviet officials are reported they hope some contacts will be an artifical meat offered by one Wellens & Co. The product is made from soybeans.

According to Louis R. Brewster, vice president of the company, the Russians found it hard to believe that the samples he gave them were artificial.

Mr. Brewster said the products, including artificial ham, beef, bacon and hamburger, had a higher protein content than real meat.

The product, he added, would be offered to the Russians for about 30 cents a pound, which compares with a meat price here of more than a dollar a pound. Meat is still in short supply in the Soviet Union and Mr. Brewster's company is hopeful of making sales.

The California mission, which arrives later this month, will include the Elliot Manufacturing Company of Fresno, the West Coast Growers and Packers, of Selma, and the Blackwelder Manufacturing Company of Rio Vista.

Mr. Speaker, if my memory is correct, several of the firms mentioned in the Times article as participants of the Moscow trade fair were also mentioned this morning as sources of some of the items which the "unidentified European customer" wanted.

I think it is true that most Americans are against trading with the enemy but it seems that the administration is not.

For my part, I have introduced a resolution which would prohibit trade with the Soviet Union and satellite nations until there is solid evidence that they have called a halt to their alleged wars of liberation.

It would no doubt be profitable to export goods to the Soviet Union and other Communist nations, but our goods only make it easier for them to export communism.

CONSIDER WHAT HUD PLANS TO DO TO YOUR CITY

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the administration is lavishly spending money and time to promote the "demonstration cities" program. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has convinced hundreds of cities that if the requested budget of $662 million is appropriated for "demonstration cities," they will receive large grants to cure the economic, social, racial, educational, and esthetic ills of the cities. These promises have been misleading.

The techniques and tactics of the Department of Housing and Urban Development should be a fair warning of what can be expected in the "Federal cities" program. Not only will cities be prostituted by impossible promises, but Members of Congress will be treated like puppets on strings. "Vote for the appropriation, and your city will share the largess."

The model cities program is the first step in forging a new and predominant Department of Domestic Affairs to supersede all other domestic Cabinet departments and independent agencies.

Housing is only one objective of the model cities program—it has nothing to do with models or demonstrations. The Secretary will be in charge of all racial, social, and economic integration plans of this administration—and they are ambitious. Housing is no longer the principal objective. American housing is already far superior to any other housing in the history of mankind because of individual pride, ordinary citizen ambition, and private enterprise. Few cities, officials, or planners have had the courage to evaluate this model cities program. Whenever any question has been raised or inadequacy mentioned, the Department simply promised a grant.

A view of one experienced expert was published in the National Observer of May 1, 1967. All Members should consider the warning of Lewis Mumford, our country's foremost scholar in the field of urban problems:

ARTICLE BY MR. LEWIS MUMFORD

By profession I am a writer—not an architect, an engineer, or a city planner; and though I have been a professor of city and regional planning at the University of Pennsylvania I have no wish to appear before you as an urban specialist, an "expert," an authority. But please do not read any false humility into this statement. All the colossal mistakes that have been made during the last quarter century in urban renewal, highway building, transportation, land use, and recreation have been made by highly qualified experts and specialists—and as regards planning, I should blush to be found in their company. . . .

Is there any plausible reason for expecting any better results from wholesale government intervention, under our present auspices, no matter how much money you are prepared to spend? If you embark on such a program without asking far more fundamental questions about the reasons for our past failures, and if you fail to set up more human goals than those our expanding economy now pursues, you will be throwing public money down the drain. And worse: In the course of doing this, you will bring about even more villainous conditions than those you are trying to correct; for you will wipe out on a greater scale than ever what is left of neighborly life, social co-operation, and human identity in our already depressed and congested urban areas. . . .

Surely it is time that there was a general realization of the fact that we must deliberately contrive a new urban pattern; one that will more effectively mobilize the immense resources of our great metropolises without accepting the intolerable congestion that has driven increasing numbers of people to seek—at whatever sacrifice of time and social opportunity—at least a temporary breathing space in less congested suburban areas. The new form of the city must be conceived on a regional scale. Not subordinated to a single dominant center, but as a network of cities of different forms and sizes, set in the midst of publicly protected open spaces permanently dedicated to agriculture and recreation. In such a regional scheme the metropolis would be only the first among equals.

This is the organic type of city that the technology of our time, the electric grid, the telephone, the radio, television, fast transportation, information storage and transmission, has made possible. A handful of planners, notably Christopher Tunnard, has seen the implications of this new scale in urban planning. But most of our planning authorities still remain like a scratched phonograph record, with the needle stuck in the old metropolitan groove. Many people, since the publication of Jean Gottmann's monumental survey, have tried to take comfort in the thought that the present disordered and disintegrating urban mass, which Gottmann has popularized as "megalopolis," is in fact the modern form of the city, new, dynamic, and inevitable, whether we like it or not.

That is a silly idea, worthy only of a Marshall McLuhan or a Timothy Leary. You might say of this sprawling megalopolitan nonentity, in McLuhan's terminology, that the mess is the message. And the more massive the mess, the more muddled the message.

Now, I have had to explain to myself why the ideas we put forward during the last half century often proved politically and financially acceptable, but only at the price of being sterilized, dehumanized, and degraded. But the full explanation dawned on me only recently in the course of an analysis I have been making on the basis assumptions and goals that have governed all large-scale technology since the Pyramid Age in Egypt some 5,000 years ago.

GROWTH OF THE MEGAMACHINE

From the earliest stages of civilization on, as I read the evidence, the most striking advances in mass technology have been the outcome of centralized organizations, deliberately expanding power in every form—mechanical power, political power, military power, financial power, and not least the scientific power of accurate analysis and prediction—to achieve control over both the natural environment and the human community. The astounding mechanical success of these high-powered technologies is due to their method of systematically breaking down ecological complexities by deliberately eliminating the human factor. I have called this ancient form of mechanized organization the "megamachine." Wherever it operates, it magnifies authoritarian power and minimizes human initiative, self-direction, and self-government.

The main point to observe is that there is a deep-seated antagonism between a mechanistic, power-centered economy and the far older organic life-centered economy; for a life economy seeks continuity, variety, orderly and purposeful growth. Such an economy is cut to the human scale, so that every organism, every community, every human being shall have the variety of goods and experiences necessary for the fulfilment of his own individual life-course, from birth to death.

The basis of a life economy is a respect for organic limits. It seeks not the greatest possible quantity of any particular good, but the right quantity, of the right quality, at the right place and the right time, for the right purpose. Too much of any one thing is as fatal to living organisms as too little.

In contrast, a power economy is designed for the continuous expansion of a limited number of uniform goods—those are specially adapted to quantity production and remote control. Apart from enlarging the province of mechanization and automation itself, the chief goal of this economy is to produce the greatest amount of power, prestige, or profit for the distant controllers of the megamachine. Though these modern power systems produce a maximum quantity of highly specialized products—motors cars, refrigerators, washing machines, rockets, nuclear bombs—they cannot, on their own terms, do justice to the far more complex and varied needs of human life, for these needs cannot be mechanized and automated, still less controlled and suppressed, without killing something essential to the life of the organism or to the self-respect of the human personality.

For the last century, we Americans have been systematically indoctrinated in the virtues of mass production and have accepted, with unction, the plethora of goods offered, in which even those on public relief now participate. But we have been carefully trained to look only at the plus side of the equation, and to close our eyes to the appalling defects and failures that issue from the very success of the megamachine.

No sound public policy in housing and urban renewal can be formulated till we have reckoned with these liabilities. The overproduction of motor cars has not only wrecked our once-efficient and well-balanced transportation system, and turned our big cities into hollow shells, exploding with violence; but it has polluted the air with lethal carbon monoxide, and even, with the use of lead in gasoline, dangerously poisoned our water and food. The chemical industry, in its undisciplined effort to sell a maximum amount of its products, has poisoned our soils and our foods with DDT, malathion, and other deadly compounds, while heedlessly befouling our water supply with detergents.

So, too, with the pharmaceutical industry, the rocket industry, the television industry, the pornography and narcotics industries. All have become immensely dynamic and profitable enterprises, automatically expanding, and by their very expansion callously disregarding human health, safety, and welfare, while wiping out every trace of organic variety and active human choice.

The point I am now making challenges, I regret to say, not only some of the published views of your chairman, but probably the views of the rest of this committee. You accept, I take it, the current American faith in the necessity for an expanding machine-centered economy, as if this were one of the great laws of nature, or if not, then America's happiest contribution to human prosperity and freedom. I wish you were right.

But do you seriously believe that a housing industry based, as Senator Ribicoff has put it, on "the technology of megalopolis" will be any more regardful of human needs and human satisfactions, or any more eager to overcome the distortions and perversions of a power-obsessed, machine-driven, money-oriented economy? If so, you are ignoring the very factors that have mocked and ruined so many of our previous efforts at urban improvement. This expanding economy, for all its suffocating abundance of machine-made goods and gadgets, has resulted in a dismally contracted life, lived for the most part confined to a car or a elevision set; a life so empty of vivid firsthand experience that it might as well be lived in a space capsule, traveling from nowhere to nowhere at supersonic speeds.

Space capsules—yes, stationary space capsules—that is what most of our new buildings are, and our prefabricated foods taste increasingly like those supplied in tubes to astronauts; while in our urban planning schools I have encountered ominous designs for whole cities to be built underground, or underwater, so that their inhabitants may live and die without ever coming into contact with the living environment, which has been essential to the human race for organic health, psychological stability, and cultural growth for at least 500,000 years. And in boasting of the fact that automation will soon be able to do away with all serious and humanly rewarding work, manual or mental, we are threatening to remove perhaps the most essential historic invention for preserving mental balance and furthering the arts of life. These are all danger signals. Is it not time to give them heed?

Now your chairman, in his able speech last January, attempted to bring together what seems to me, if I may speak frankly, two altogether incompatible, in fact downright antagonistic, proposals: On one hand for restoring neighborhoods as the basic human environment, on the other for applying to housing what he called, quite properly, the technology of megalopolis. Senator Ribicoff wisely recognized the need to respect the small unit, the neighborhood, in order to promote those qualities we associate, at least as an ideal, with the small town—meaning, I take it, a place where everyone has an identifiable face and is a recognizable and responsible person—not just a Social Security number, a draft-card number, or a combination of digits on a computer.

As to neighborhoods, I am entirely on his side. I have not spent part of my life in a small country community, and another part in a planned neighborhood unit, Sunnyside Gardens, Long Island, without learning to appreciate these intimate small-town virtues. And I believe the greatest defect of the United States Constitution was its original failure, despite the example of the New England township and the town meeting, to make this democratic local unit the basic cell of our whole system of government. For democracy, in any active sense, begins and ends in communities small enough for their members to meet face to face.

But if your purpose is to do urban planning and renewal on the basis of neighborhoods and balanced urban communities, you would, I submit, be deceiving yourselves if you imagined that a vast contribution by the Federal Government—$50 billion over 10 years has been suggested—could possibly achieve the happy results you hope for. Such a massive expenditure succeeded, we all know, in producing the atom bomb; and it has been applied with equal success in producing rockets, space satellites, supersonic jets, and similar instruments of physical conquest or destruction.

But note—this method can be applied only to those structures or machine assemblages that can be designed without the faintest regard for the human factor, and without any feedback from the human reaction. This patently leaves out the neighborhood and the city. Unless human needs and human interactions and human responses are the first consideration, the city, in any valid human sense, cannot be said to exist, for, as Sophocles long ago said, "The city is people."

Accordingly, I beg you to look a little more closely at what such a huge supply of capital, with such large prospective profits, would do. Not merely would it skyrocket already inflated land values so that a disproportionate amount would go to the property owners and real estate speculators; but even worse—it would invite ever greater megamachines to invade the building industry. With $50 billion as bait, a new kind of aerospace industry would move in, with all its typical paraphernalia of scientific research and engineering design. At that moment your plans for creating humanly satisfactory neighborhoods would go up in smoke.

ENFORCED CONFORMITY

"General Space-Housing, Inc." will solve your housing problem, swiftly and efficiently, though not painlessly, by following its own typical method, derived from the ancient pyramid builders: eliminate the human factor by enforcing conformity and destroying choice.

Once started, such a scientifically ordered housing industry, commanding virtually unlimited capital at national expense, and providing, as in the Pentagon's favored industries, indecently large salaries and exorbitant profits for private investors, would be geared for further expansion. And it would achieve this expansion, not only by designing units prefrabricated for early obsolescence, but likewise by wiping out, as dangerous rivals, those parts of the rural or urban environment that were built on a more human plan.

I have only nibbled at the edges of this difficult subject. My final words must be mostly words of negation and caution. Go slow! Experiment with small measures and small units. Whatever you do in extending the policies followed in the past will almost surely meet with the same embarrassments and the same failures.

Remember that you cannot overcome the metropolitan congestion of the last century, or the cataclysmic disintegration of urban life during the last 30 years, by instituting a crash program. You are much more likely to produce more lethal congestion, more rapid disintegration, ending in a greater crash. The time for action on a massive scale has not yet come. But the time for fresh thinking on this whole subject is long overdue.

BILL TO PROHIBIT DESECRATION OF FLAG GAINS SUPPORT

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today reintroduced a bill which I originally introduced in the second session of the 89th Congress, which would prohibit desecration of the American flag.

This bill, similar to several which have been introduced by my colleagues during this session, would provide for imprisonment for not more than 1 year and a fine of not more than $1,000 for anyone who publicly mutilates, defaces, defiles, defies, tramples upon, or casts contempt, either by word or act, on any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States.

It is strange to see in our newspapers pictures of American young men facing danger and death in Vietnam while in these same editions there are pictures of other Americans burning their Nation's flag in the safety of an American park.

While we pride ourselves on the right of dissent in our Nation, a right which was established by our Founding Fathers and one which must remain inviolate, there is a point at which dissent ends and disloyalty begins. This great right of dissent was never intended to allow the desecration or mutilation of our American flag, a symbol of our national heritage.

And even as I have read and heard with disgust of recent desecrations of our flag, so have I been heartened and encouraged by my many colleagues who have introduced legislation to prohibit this; and by the prompt hearings granted similar bills by the Committee on the Judiciary.

I hope these hearings will be followed by quick and positive action to end these disgraceful exhibitions.

RUMANIA'S INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, the 10th of May is the traditional anniversary of the day of Rumania's independence, but the people of Rumania, locked behind the Iron Curtain, may not celebrate this day.

Those who have escaped from their homeland to the freedom of America, continue to mark this national holiday, and today at the Carnegie Endowment National Center in New York City, messages will be read, preparatory to broadcasting them to the Rumanians behind the Iron Curtain.

We others in America who are fortunate enough to have our heritage of freedom, must step forward this day to join in sending messages of hope which can help to keep alive the will to fight for the restoration of freedom.

Rumanians today are denied the right to mark their traditional day of independence because their overlords order them to observe May 9, the date on which the Russian forces defeated the Nazis in Rumania.

May 10 was selected by the Rumanian people to commemorate three significant events in their history: the establishment of the Principality of Rumania in 1866, independence won from Turkey in 1877, and the establishment of their nation as a kingdom in 1881.

During its period as an independent nation, Rumania had one of the more socially progressive and stable governments in Europe. Liberal reforms had been instituted by Rumania, including a land reform measure which gave the peasantry an opportunity to acquire ownership of much of the land. A compulsory educational system was established. By the provisions of the 1923 Rumanian Constitution, male suffrage came into existence in Rumania.

Yet it was to be the tragic fate of the Rumanian people again to fall under foreign subjugation. Following World War II, a Communist regime was imposed on them, and the people were terrorized into submission.

Life today in Rumania means strict police-state surveillance. It means submitting to Communist Party directives on a broad range of everyday matters from housing and holidays. It even means being dependent on the party's favor to earn a livelihood.

Despite years of indoctrination, the Communists have not succeeded in erasing the national consciousness of the Rumanian people. They continue to yearn for freedom—freedom from foreign control for their nation and the individual freedoms now denied them.

Even the Communist functionaries in Rumania are becoming more responsive to the undercurrent surge of nationalism permeating the population of Rumania today. Partly to gain greater popular support and partly a reflection of the current trend of the loosening ties within the Soviet bloc, Rumanian Communists have adopted one of the more independent courses taken by the East European nations.

The Rumanian Communists have gone perhaps even further than any other East European nation in attempting to de-Russify Rumania. Russian-language courses are no longer compulsory in Rumanian secondary schools, national history books are being corrected to eliminate some of the pro-Soviet slanted material, and even street names have been changed.

Although the more nationalistic policy adopted by the Rumanian Communists may produce an amelioration of the living conditions in Rumania, the Rumanian people will never be satisfied by a mere reassertion of national identity. Not until that national identity assumes the form of a restoration of national and individual freedom will the Rumanian people be truly satisfied.

On this occasion of the Rumanian national holiday, we Americans wish to express again our lasting friendship toward the Rumanian people, our continuing prayers for the restoration of their complete independence, and our deepest hope that the Rumanian people will soon be in control again of their own government and their individual lives.

UNITY AND THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker. I had a firsthand opportunity to observe the conduct of the biennial convention of the National Federation of Republican Women which was held in Washington during last week. I know when I see a railroad running through the middle of the house so it was not hard to observe what was transpiring.

It appears to me that a decision was made that Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly should not be elected President of NFRW and every tactic and device was used to accomplish this objective. I saw many of them. Others can only be the subject of conjecture. For example, it would appear that the only real reason for postponing the convention which was originally scheduled for last year in California was for the purpose of undercutting Mrs. Schlafly.

It is also interesting to note that the theme of last week's convention was unity. If Mrs. Schlafly wants to support those who stacked the deck against her, it would be sheer grace on her part. On the other hand, it is clear to me that those who manipulated, gave unfair rulings and engaged in unfair tactics have no right whatsoever to ask for unity. They were the most divisive force I have ever seen in the Republican Party—the same dominant elements we saw playing the spoiler's role in 1964.

A formal objection has been lodged by a number of the pro-Schlafly delegates. Their objections are not those of sore losers but of indignant women who witnessed this affair. I include their letter and two newspaper articles in the Record at this point:

May 8, 1967.

Mr. Ray Bliss,
National Chairman, Republican National Committee, Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Bliss: The undersigned women, who served as delegates to the Convention of the National Federation of Republican Women in Washington, D.C. on May 5–6, formally protest the gross illegalities and irregularities which characterized both the Convention proceedings and the election. We believe that these irregularities defeated the choice of the majority of the delegates and members of the Federation. We urge that you initiate an investigation by impartial persons acceptable to both candidates.

1. The Credentials Committee wrongfully deprived about 100 Schlafly delegates of their right to vote at this Convention for reasons which were either completely invalid or of doubtful validity. At the same time, the Committee wrongfully seated about 800 O'Donnell delegates from New York and Pennsylvania who should have been disqualified for the very fundamental reason of not paying their full dues. Some of the specifics on these cases are set forth in the Minority Report of the Credentials Committee.

It is a shocking double standard that little pro-Schlafly clubs were disqualified for being allegedly one or two days late in paying their dues, but the big pro-O'Donnell states of New York and Pennsylvania were allowed to vote although they paid only about half the dues required by Section 4 of Article 3 of the NFRW bylaws. The official NFRW Statistical Report proves that New York paid on membership of only 32,500 for 1965 and 1966, although the "actual membership is 65,000," which means that New York, in effect, paid only 5¢ per capita dues, while all states other than New York and Pennsylvania paid 10¢ per capita dues.

The same NFRW Statistical Reports prove that Pennsylvania made only a token payment of about one-quarter what they owed in 1965, and one-third what they owed in 1966. Thus, for two of the three years since the last NFRW Convention, New York and Pennsylvania are substantially in arrears in their dues, and a large percentage or all of their delegates should have been barred from voting at this Convention.

Another pro-O'Donnell state which was permitted serious deviations from the dues requirement was Oregon. Oregon did not pay its dues for 1967 until about 10 days after the deadline, and then only in response to a telegram request from the NFRW office. By contrast, 12 Schlafly delegates were disqualified because the state treasurer forwarded the dues to the national office one day late. In Texas, 17 pro-Schlafly clubs were barred from voting for tardiness in paying dues, although it was proved that these clubs had been given erroneous information about the date of the dues deadline.

Because of one erroneous challenge, brought to the Credentials Committee by a single O'Donnell supporter, 26 Wisconsin delegates who had complied with all rules and paid their registration fees and were wearing their badges, were made to wait 48 hours standing, sitting and lying in hot and stuffy halls, missing $23 worth of meals they had already paid for and two nights of sleep; they were finally cleared at 5 A.M. the morning of voting. This was in shocking contrast to the automatic credentialling and registering of hundreds of delegates arriving by busloads from pro-O'Donnell states, some arriving as late as five hours after voting had begun.

2. The principal credentialling of delegates was not handled by an impartial credentials or registration committee, but was turned over to state presidents, 35 of whom were in the O'Donnell campaign organization. This meant that state presidents could hand the badges over to anyone of their own choosing, without any check whatsoever on whether they were proper delegates. There was no guarantee against badges being given to unauthorized persons; there was even no guarantee against one woman voting twice with different badges. The result was that, the morning of the voting, busloads of women arrived from New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Michigan who were taken immediately to their state headquarters, given badges, instructed how to vote, herded through the voting area, and then put back on the buses and driven home without ever going to the Convention floor or participating in the Convention. In the absence of proof to the contrary, it can be assumed that these were not legitimate delegates "from each club," as specified in the NFRW bylaws, but were women appointed by their state presidents to "represent" clubs to which they never belonged.

3. Although the official Call to Convention stated that, in order to vote, a delegate must present the yellow credential slip signed by her club president and countersigned by her club treasurer, this requirement was abandoned at the Convention. Delegates were permitted to vote without showing this yellow form to the tellers, so that there were no cross checks with the ballot machine spindle cards against this official form. Further, there are many tellers who will testify to other irregularities of voting procedures. Some 95 Schlafly delegates from Ohio were subjected to incredible harassment and delay after they arrived in the voting area.

4. Mrs. Elston, as presiding officer, denied the Convention the right to accept or reject any Credentials Committee report. This is clearly contrary to Section 71 of Roberts Rules of Order Revised which states that the adoption of the Credentials report shall be the first order of business. There was never an official determination before the election of how many delegates were entitled to vote. Repeated attempts from the Convention floor to demand the Credentials Committee report were ruled out of order.

5. We have never yet been given any accurate or satisfactory Credentials Committee report. As of today, we do not know how many delegates were present and entitled to vote.

6. In the Convention hall, the seating was NOT alphabetical, but arranged in a manner beneficial to pro-O'Donnell states. New York, Pennsylvania and Michigan were seated together in the front rows under the television lights, while the pro-Schlafly states were seated in the poorly-lighted rear of the hall and on the outer fringes. Thus, it was physically impossible for the chair to rule fairly or accurately on any close voice or standing votes.

7. The floor of the Convention was policed with such efficient control that leaders of Mrs. Schlafly's delegations could not even communicate with one another or with the chair. Microphones were usually turned off in the area of the pro-Schlafly states. Men were controlling and directing the entire Convention floor. Visitors imported from areas hostile to Mrs. Schlafly were made sergeants-at-arms. A force of hired police was stationed at all doors, and Schlafly delegates were not allowed to leave by side doors convenient to the ladies' room. Mrs. Grace Thackeray, president of the Southern Division of the California Federation, heading a membership of 40,000 women, could not walk down the aisle to speak to a member of her delegation without being harassed and threatened. When she tried to speak to a point of personal privilege, she was never recognized. A network of control prevented her leaving the floor to talk with reporters, or to speak with them on the floor.

8. It was a clear conflict of interest for Mrs. Dorothy Elston, the real campaign manager of Mrs. O'Donnell campaign, to preside at the Convention. For many months, Mrs. Elston had used the National Federation office as a campaign headquarters for Mrs. O'Donnell and against Mrs. Schlafly, the elected First Vice President. Mrs. Elston continued her partisan and prejudicial behavior in the conduct of every phase of the Convention and the election. She named all the Convention committees, which resulted in a ratio of 15 Schlafly supporters out of 109 committee members. Only after a strong protest was lodged by Schlafly supporters did Mrs. Elston agree to some additional Schlafly tellers. The president of the Hawaii Federation, Mrs. Ruth Jackson, resigned as a member of the Credentials Committee because of its steady stream of biased decisions.

9. The many violations of proper parliamentary procedure and Roberts Rules of Order are too numerous to list. Many points have been already mentioned. In addition, there was no Treasurer's Report presented, probably because it would have brought up embarrassing questions about the failure of New York and Pennsylvania to pay their full dues. By a series of maneuvers, the chair successfully evaded the presentation of the Credentials Committee report, although Roberts Rules say that a change in the Convention program requires a ⅔ vote.

10. Mrs. Schlafly's representatives were denied the right to watch the preparation and sealing of the voting machines, and denied the right to test-vote them, although Mrs. Elston had promised this in writing in her letter to Mrs. Schlafly's campaign manager, Mrs. Kate Hoffman. Mrs. Elston's letter also promised that Mrs. Schlafly's representatives would be notified of the time of the preparation of the voting machines. Such notice was not given. When Mrs. Schlafly's ballot security representatives accidentally discovered that the preparation of the voting machines was in process and 6 of the 20 machines had already been sealed, they tried to watch the preparation of the remaining machines. They were ejected from the voting machine area and not permitted to do this.

11. As late as 6 A.M., Mrs. Schlafly's representatives indicated that they would be satisfied with a spot check of the backs of the machines, but even this was denied. The cursory viewing of the outsides of the machines then permitted was no guarantee whatsoever of a fair election, and cannot possibly substitute for inspection of the sealing of the machines.

12. A formal challenge to the whole election was presented on the floor of the Convention. Please note that this challenge was presented while the election was taking place—not after the election results were known. The delegate who presented the challenge, Mrs. Rosalind Frame, stated that she was making the challenge regardless of who won the election.

13. What is at stake here is the integrity of the ballot. In our opinion this was a controlled and rigged election which has constituted an election fraud depriving the half million Federated Republican women of their representation at the National Convention. Republicans cannot point their fingers at election frauds in Texas and Cook County unless our own elections are, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion.

Respectfully submitted.

Mrs. KATE HOFFMAN,
Illinois.
Mrs. GRACE THACKERAY,
California.
Miss LUCILLE BOSTON,
California.
Mrs. RUTH MURRAY,
Wisconsin.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, May 8, 1967]

MRS. SCHLAFLY CHARGES FRAUD IN GOP VOTING—4 BACKERS ASK BLISS TO MAKE INVESTIGATION

(By Richard Dudman)

WASHINGTON, May 8.—Mrs. Phyllis Schlafly of Alton, Ill., charged fraud today in the election Saturday in which she was defeated for president of the National Federation of Republican Women.

She and her conservative followers demanded an impartial investigation of what they called a "controlled and rigged election" that constituted an "election fraud."

Four of her lieutenants asked for the inquiry in a letter addressed to Ray Bliss, chairman of the Republican National Committee. She said it would be hand delivered to Bliss today.

Mrs. Schlafly, elaborating on the charges at a press conference, accused "New York-based liberals" of defeating her. She and her aids blamed the "eastern establishment" for the continuing split in the 500,000-member women's federation.

ILLEGALITIES CHARGED

The victor in the election Saturday was Mrs. Gladys O'Donnell, a Long Beach (Calif.) businesswoman and airplane pilot. The vote was 1910 to 1494.

The letter protested against "gross illegalities and irregularities" in the election and in the proceedings of the federation's convention, held here Friday and Saturday.

"We believe that these irregularities defeated the choice of the majority of the delegates and members of the federation," the letter said.

"We urge that you initiate an investigation by impartial persons acceptable to both candidates."

The women charged that the credentials committee wrongfully deprived about 100 pro-Schlafly delegates of the right to vote but wrongfully seated about 800 O'Donnell delegates from New York and Pennsylvania who had not paid their full dues.

Handling of credentials was turned over to state presidents; 35 of whom were in the O'Donnell campaign organization, the letter said. They contended that there was no guarantee against passing badges around or even voting twice with different badges.

"The result was that, the morning of the voting, busloads of women arrived from New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Michigan, who were taken immediately to their state headquarters, given badges, instructed how to vote, herded through the voting area, and then put back on the busses and driven home without ever going to the convention floor or participating in the convention."

The bill of particulars charged also that there never was any satisfactory credentials committee report.

"As of today, we do not know how many delegates were present and entitled to vote," it said.

The letter charged the retiring president, Mrs. Dorothy Elston, with a conflict of interest on the ground that she was "the real campaign manager" for Mrs. O'Donnell.

"Mrs. Elston continued her partisan and prejudicial behavior in the conduct of every phase of the convention and the election," the letter said.

INSPECTION BARRED

It repeated earlier charges that Mrs. Schlafly's representatives were denied the right to inspect the voting machine as promised in advanced by Mrs. Elston.

Mrs. Schlafly said she did not expect legal action if the demand for an inquiry was rejected.

"I don't have any faith in any legal action, so there really isn't much recourse except to tell people the truth and make sure it doesn't happen again," she said.

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, May 9, 1967]

THE REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S DEBACLE

It was the Republican party, not Phyllis Schlafly, who suffered a defeat in the voting of the National Federation of Republican Women in Washington this past weekend.

Mrs. Schlafly was so clearly the better candidate that, left to personal selection, there would have been no contest. She was next in line for the presidency, but completely beyond this rather substantial claim, Phyllis Schlafly is brilliant, hardworking, energetic and beautiful—a hard combination to beat in any league.

Her opponent proclaimed herself a "simple garden variety of uncomplicated Republican." It is difficult to imagine anything that the Republican party needs less in these troubled times.

Not everyone will always agree with Mrs. Schlafly, although this newspaper has watched her career over the years with considerable enthusiasm. At the very least, her party regularity, her unfailing enthusiasm for Republican candidates, as demonstrated in many elections, and her contagious enthusiasm in support of good causes made her the ideal selection.

There seems little doubt that she was counted out, which isn't the first time that this has happened to a Republican candidate in recent years.

Many of her adherents, properly qualified dues-paying Republicians, were disfranchised without hearing on flimsy technicalities while bus loads of ladies of dubious political background at best were rushed in at the last moment under the aegis of Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, that perennial spoiler of Republican chances, and were allowed to vote.

It is regrettable that Mrs. Rosemary Ginn, Republican National Committeewoman in Missouri, whose tenure has scarcely been showered with the roses of success in this state, allied herself with the Rockefeller stop-Schlafly faction.

Our prediction is, knowing Mrs. Schlafly, that she will continue her energetic fight for Republican causes and that she will be crowned with the eventual success which is due here talent and her vision.

The Republican party has an excellent chance of electing a President and a number of Governors, Senators, Congressmen and lesser officials next year.

They will not do it, however, if they persist in trying to give the election away by such means as the abortive anti-Johnson, so-called policy statement last week, and the Schlafly robbery at the polls last weekend.

THE 40TH ANNIVERSARY OF LINDBERGH'S FLIGHT

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, this month marks the 40th anniversary of Lindbergh's flight from New York to Paris. A replica of the original "Spirit of St. Louis" has been painstakingly reconstructed by Frank Tallman of the Tallmantz Aviation Co. in Orange County, Calif. Beginning today, this exact flying replica of Lindbergh's "Spirit" is on display at North Island Naval Air Station in San Diego. With Tallman in the cockpit, the model "Spirit" will take off today at 3:55 Pacific daylight time, the exact time of Lindbergh's departure in 1927, and will fly over the San Diego area. From there, the plane will be transported by the Department of Commerce to the Paris Air Show in France where the Tallman replica will be the centerpiece of the U.S. Pavilion at the airshow. In Paris, Tallman plans to reenact the historic landing on May 21 at Le Bourget.

I can still recall my excitement as a schoolboy in Calexico, Calif., when I saw Charles Lindbergh fly his "Spirit" of St. Louis. He was touring the country just a few months after his historymaking transatlantic flight and we "kids," at the time, were let out of school to watch the "Spirit" circle overhead.

Many San Diegans can remember far more than just catching a glimpse of the original plane, for a number of our citizens worked with Lindbergh in the construction and testing of his aircraft. At this point, I would like to insert a story by Robert Zimmerman from the San Diego Union describing the vital role of these aircraft workers:

"SPIRIT OF ST. LOUIS" BRINGS BACK MEMORIES

(By Robert Zimmerman)

The replica of the Spirit of St. Louis that will appear in the sky over San Diego this week embodies a dream that goes back many years for some San Diegans.

They are men who worked on the original plane for Charles Lindbergh 40 years ago and have hoped to see one like it fly again.

Although the replica to be flown here Wednesday was built by the Tallmantz Aviation Co. in Orange County, its close resemblance to the original is due in part to a project undertaken several years ago in San Diego.

This was "Project We," a program of the San Diego Aerospace Museum which was aimed at putting a new Spirit of St. Louis into the air on the 40th anniversary of Lindbergh's solo hop across the Atlantic.

Although "Project We" got only part-way toward its goal, it covered important groundwork leading to the construction of the Tallmantz replica.

FOR PARIS SHOW

Frank Tallman, a movie pilot whose firm at the Orange County Airport has produced many reproductions of early aircraft for Hollywood films, decided last fall to build a Spirit of St. Louis replica to be flown at the Paris Air Show this year.

Tallman wanted it to be a dead-ringer, even down to the ribs and spars that would be hidden by fabric. He began collecting all the records and drawings pertaining to the original that he could find.

The Ryan Aeronautical Co. came up with an extensive file of 1927 photographs showing the original Spirit in different phases of construction. Other 40-year-old documents gave additional specifications.

But nothing in the way of original factory blueprints could be found. Then Tallman got a helping hand from "Project We."

A set of shop drawings—painstakingly reproduced by men who had worked on the original—had been assembled at the Aerospace Museum. Much of the work had been done by Dan Burnett of 8069 Culowee St., La Mesa, now an employe of Rohr Corp. He had served as foreman in the wing assembly shop when the first Spirit was made by Ryan Airlines, Inc.

Tallman's craftsmen added these drawings to their collection of Spirit of St. Louis records and went to work. John Van der Linde of 4550 56th St., a retired Ryan engineer who also worked on the original, visited the Tallman shops for consultations as the new Spirit began to take shape.

When Tallman took the replica on its maiden flight two weeks ago, he said he was satisfied that it not only looked like the original but flew just like it as well. It is as close to a perfect reproduction as anyone could hope for, he said.

Many San Diegans who had a hand in building the first Spirit of St. Louis will be able to size up the replica when it goes on display at North Island Naval Air Station Wednesday.

Ed Morrow, who lives at 1271 Clarendon St., El Cajon, and retired two years ago as a Ryan employe, was another who worked on the first Spirit and has been active in "Project We."

Morrow is one of those whom Lindbergh recalls meeting at the Ryan shops on Harbor Drive when he came here in February, 1927, to supervise construction of his plane by Ryan Airlines. The events are recounted in Lindbergh's 1953 book, "The Spirit of St. Louis."

Lindbergh had dealt first by telegram with T. Claude Ryan, now chairman of the Ryan Aeronautical Co., who was then a partner in Ryan Airlines with B. F. Mahoney. Shortly before Lindbergh came here, Ryan sold his interest in the firm to Mahoney.

DESIGN CREDITED

The 25-year-old air mail pilot whose name would one day be known throughout the world spent hours in consultation with Donald Hall, then the chief engineer for the Ryan firm, who now lives at 3330 Xenophon St.

Hall is credited with the actual design of the plane—a modification of the M-2 monoplane which Ryan was building to fly the mail. Changes had to be made in the wing and fuselage to create a plane that could get off the ground with enough fuel aboard to make a non-stop flight from New York to Paris.

Lindbergh tells of leaning over Hall's shoulder under a bare light bulb as the Spirit of St. Louis took shape on a drawing board, and of strolling with Hall on the Silver Strand beach as they ironed out details of the design.

At one point, Lindbergh and Hall went to the San Diego public library to figure out just how far it was from New York to Paris. They stretched a piece of white grocery string across the library's globe and calculated the span as 3,600 statute miles.

Lindberg also writes of his association with Hawley Bowlus, who was the Ryan factory manager and now lives in the San Fernando Valley. Bowlus spent many years in San Diego, and during the 1930s he taught Lindbergh and his wife to pilot gliders off Point Loma.

Another figure around the Ryan shops in 1927 was Douglas Corrigan, who would some day earn the nickname "Wrong-Way" for a transatlantic flight of his own. Corrigan is now an orange grower in Orange County.

In San Diego, Lindbergh also met the late Fred Rohr for the first time. Then Rohr's small firm was supplying fuel tanks and cowlings for Ryan planes. The Rohr Corp. is now one of the major aircraft subassembly manufacturers in the nation.

In his book, Lindbergh decribes his departure from North Island May 10. He had set 4 p.m. for his departure time, but actually took off 5 minutes early.

"At 3:40 I crawl into my flying suit. It's uncomfortably hot in this California sun, but I can't very well put the suit on while I'm in the air—and I'll certainly need it over the mountain ranges tonight. . . .

"We start and warm up the engine. It's a few minutes early, but why wait longer in the heat? I wave good-by, taxi into position, and ease the throttle open. As I pick up speed, I hold the tail low to put as much load as possible on the wings and reduce the strain on the landing gear. . .

"The take-off wasn't as difficult as I expected. It's 3:55 Pacific. I make a mental note of the time, check instruments, pull the throttle back slightly, and begin a wide, climbing turn to the left. . .

"We circle North Island, the factory, and the city of San Diego. Then, leaving ocean and bay behind, I set my compass heading for St. Louis."

The story by no means ends here. The building of the "Spirit of St. Louis" was only the beginning of San Diego's paramount role in the development of aviation. Lindbergh's flight, however, more than any other single event, put the stamp "Made in U.S.A." on future advances in aeronautics and the fantastic air age in which we are privileged to live.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request that the Congress recognize this anniversary date as the beginning of many productive and far-reaching years of aviation for San Diego, and the Nation, by passage of the following resolution which I am introducing today in conjunction with my San Diego colleague, the gentleman from California, JAMES B. UTT:

H. RES. 470

Whereas the 40th anniversary of the beginning of the historic transatlantic flight of Charles A. Lindbergh in his plane, the "Spirit of St. Louis," will be commemorated in San Diego, California, on May 10, 1967; and

Whereas that historic flight began at Rockwell Field in San Diego, the "Spirit of St. Louis" was built in San Diego, and San Diego has been the site of many other firsts in the annals of aviation; and

Whereas the Department of Commerce will transport the only exact flying replica of the "Spirit of St. Louis" to Paris, France, for the reenactment on May 21, 1967, of Lindbergh's landing at Le Bourget, France, on May 21, 1927; and

Whereas that replica of the "Spirit of St. Louis" will become a focal point of the United States pavilion at the Paris Air Show; and

Whereas the efforts of the San Diego community linked with the United States Government will form a bridge of friendship with the people of France which is appropriate to the 40th anniversary of that historic flight: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the city of San Diego, California, be commended for its community leadership in this worthy international event.

RESPECT FOR OUR FLAG AND RESPECT FOR OUR CONSTITUTION

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of our colleagues share by revulsion at the burning of the American Flag by those who oppose our country's foreign policy. But we must guard against the danger that such revulsion may lead to unnecessary and unwise legislative action. Respect for our flag and respect for our Constitution must go hand in hand.

In the overheated atmosphere of emotionalism that prevails, a breath of fresh air is provided by the editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning; it reads as follows:

RESPECT FOR THE FLAG

The American flag is an emblem of the United States. As such, of course, it deserves respect; and any misuse or desecration of it is properly and understandably offensive to Americans. But respect for the flag means respect for the great values of which it is emblematic. It represents a nation which, in its fundamental charter, recognizes dissent from prevailing opinion as vital to the general welfare, which fosters diversity and individuality as socially desirable and which guarantees freedom for the expression even of opinions which a majority abhors.

Some of the recent clamor in the House of Representatives for protection of the flag by legislation seems grossly ignorant of these values. Congressmen who urge their countrymen to "forget the First Amendment" or who talk wildly about firing squads for flag-burners or who propose to make verbal contempt for the flag a Federal crime do greater violence to the flag of the United States and to its meaning than the worst of the boorish oafs who fancy that setting fire to a flag is a meaningful form of protest.

Every one of the 50 American states and the District of Columbia now has a law forbidding such behavior. There is not the slightest need for Federal legislation invading the jurisdiction of the states in this connection. And in point of fact the Federal Government has no facilities for enforcing such legislation. Let's not inflate a nuisance into a menace.

Flag burning is a silly and ineffectual gesture on the level of hanging someone in effigy. The person hung in effigy may be annoyed but is unlikely to be injured. But the United States san be gravely endangered by official outbursts of hysterical "patriotism" aimed at odious opinions—or at odious expressions of opinion. The country's temperature is already feverish. Genuine patriotism will aim at cooling it down, not at heating it up.

RESULTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have recently completed the tabulation of a questionnaire which I sent to every resident in my congressional district in February. The thousands of replies received are a tribute to the interest taken by my constituents on important public issues.

For the benefit of our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD, I insert the results at this point in the RECORD:

I. VIETNAM

1. Do you favor these steps in an effort to get peace talks going (as recommended by U Thant):

A. Stop bombing in North Vietnam:

	Percent
Yes	45
No	49
Undecided	6

B. Agree that the National Liberation Front (Vietcong political arm) should be party to peace talks in its own right:

	Percent
Yes	66
No	25
Undecided	9

C. Reduce level of fighting in South Vietnam (i.e., de-escalate):

	Percent
Yes	43
No	51
Undecided	6

2. Assuming the fighting in Vietnam continues, how do you want your Congressman to vote on Defense Appropriation bills:

	Percent
For	73
Against	27

II. OTHER FOREIGN POLICY

1. Should U.S. support U.N. decision to compel Rhodesia to move toward majority rule?

	Percent
Yes	60
No	27
Undecided	13

2. Do you favor President Johnson's efforts to "build bridges" to communist countries of Eastern Europe, for instance through increased trade?

	Percent
Yes	70
No	24
Undecided	6

III. The draft: The Selective Service Act expires this year. Which of the following alternatives do you favor for the future?

	Percent
A. Continue the existing system of selective service with its limited exemptions (for students, etc.)	23
B. Use a lottery with exemptions only for health reasons or where family circumstances absolutely demand them	19
C. Draft all youngsters of given age and require either military or other national service (e.g. community service, conservation corps, etc.)	44
D. Other (specify)	14

IV. I favor federally assisted research to help develop an inexpensive electrically-powered car as a means of fighting air pollution. Do you agree?

	Percent
Yes	77
No	17
Undecided	6

V. Do you favor the President's proposal to make all wiretapping and "bugging" illegal except where a judge certifies that the national security is involved?

	Percent
Yes	86
No	5
Undecided	9

VI. Would you favor a law limiting the total amount of TV and radio time that candidates for public office could buy?

	Percent
Yes	75
No	17
Undecided	8

VII. On the question of mail order sales of firearms, do you believe they should be

	Percent
Prohibited	58
Strictly regulated	36
Allowed to continue as is	6

VIII. Trading stamps: Which of the following statements most nearly reflects your views:

	Percent
A. The gifts from redeemed trading stamps are a pleasant bonus for shopping in certain stores	12
B. Trading stamps mean higher prices and are unwanted	55
C. Use of trading stamps, which have good and bad features, should be more closely regulated	33

RUMANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Dingell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, throughout history Rumania has been a crossroad between East and West in southeastern Europe. Partly for that reason, up to the latter half of the 19th century Rumania was divided among her neighbors for nearly 400 years, and the Rumanians had to endure alien rule. During those centuries Rumania was part of the Ottoman Empire and it was ruled by the callous and corrupt agents of the sultans. Through misgovernment and misrule the people suffered much, but the Rumanians continued to struggle hard for the attainment of their freedom. In 1877, when the Russo-Turkish War was raging in the Balkans, the liberty-loving Rumanians cast off the Ottoman yoke and proclaimed their independence on May 10 of that year.

That has become a memorable day in Rumanian history. The Rumanian forces joined the Russians in the war against the Turks, and at the end of that war their newly won independence was recognized by the Congress of Berlin in 1878. Thenceforth they enjoyed freedom for several decades, but their peaceful life was interrupted by many wars, including of course the two world wars. They were involved in both, and they suffered indescribable misery in both.

At the end of the last war they lost part of their territory to the Soviet Union, and they lost their national freedom. A Communist government was forced upon them by the Kremlin, and they had to endure its rigid rule for almost two decades. But in recent years, in response to growing pressures from the freedom-loving Rumanian populace, the Rumanian Communists have been forced to find ways of loosening Moscow's rigidity and thus partly free Rumania from Moscow's close supervision. This response to pressure from the people of Rumania has succeeded in introducing some freedom in many spheres, including foreign trade and internal affairs. Fortunately, an open clash with the Soviet Union has been avoided. In its moves, Rumania has been remarkably successful and has not roused the wrath of the Soviet government. However, the Rumanian people want full freedom, and let us hope that they will attain their goal without involving the country in a war. That is our wish for the Rumanian people on their Independence Day, and I am indeed pleased to join them in the observance of the anniversary of that memorable day.

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LXI

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Kastenmeier] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, compulsory military service not only results in a severe deprivation of civil liberties, but it is also a grievous departure from this Nation's most cherished heritage—that of personal freedom. Rising public anxiety about such violations, as well as the obvious inequities in the present Selective Service System, has led many private citizens to speak out against the draft and demand its abolition. One such individual is Dr. Joseph McMurray, president of Queens College. In a speech delivered to a conference on the draft sponsored by the American Veterans Committee, President McMurray spoke of conscription being undemocratic in any form and urged the adoption of a voluntary army. Furthermore, he called for the limitation of unneeded military occupations and the making of military service more attractive through increased remuneration and educational benefits. Because of the significance of Dr. McMurray's remarks, I am calling to the attention of my colleagues the full text of his statement, as follows:

THE DRAFT AND FREEDOM

(By Joseph McMurray)

I have, as you know, proposed a volunteer army as a means of ending the draft in the United States. I am glad to be here today at the invitation of Gus Tyler to put that suggestion before you. I am here on my day off—the College offices are closed in observance of Veterans Day. What I have to say is not the official opinion at Queens College, nor is there such an opinion. I speak as an individual but I know that my concern reflects the widespread interest among college and university people in the draft.

My suggestion should not convey with it any sense of opposition to the policies of President Johnson and our government in their conduct of the war in Vietnam. I have known President Johnson for many years. I know his desire to do his best. I know his patriotism. I think that if I had all the facts that are available to him that I might well make exactly the same decisions he has made. I support President Johnson and I want to make this clear to you first of all. This is not meant on my part to be a discussion of Vietnam, and in the event that my speech is reported in the press, I hope this will be made clear.

Like you, like President Johnson, I have been disturbed by the draft. An entire generation of Americans has grown up under a system of military conscription. I am disturbed, deeply disturbed, when our young men and women make heroes out of those who evade service to their country. This is the state of patriotism we find ourselves in today.

It is said that the issue of enforced military conscription has nothing to do anymore with freedom. As distinguished a writer as Hanson Baldwin wrote that the draft's un-American aspects do not "play a major role in suggestions for reform." Chairman Rivers, in his opening remarks to the House Committee on Armed Services said, "The facts appear abundantly clear—we do need a draft law for now and the foreseeable future."

Psychologically, slowly, inexorably we are being told that there is no turning back.

Even many of the most sincere and outspoken opponents to the draft only advocate alternatives that are just as involuntary. Some propose lotteries, as if a machine could better dispense justice. Others propose various forms of universal service to the government. Still others confuse the draft issue with civil rights. One of the most emotionally-charged arguments against the present system of Selective Service today is that it discriminates against the poor who often are Negroes. No facts that I have seen bear this out.

Many rise up against the present system because they say students go scot free. As a matter of fact, 57% of men deferred for college eventually serve.

The old saw about "citizen soldiers" gets resurrected every week or so to support the "common defense" rationale of enforced service. This takes us back to the frontier. But we are not talking about a citizens army by any stretch of the imagination. Look at the figures. The armed forces number about 3 million. Of that number, only some 300,000 are draftees. Few men in today's army, actually about one-fifth of them, are engaged in combat. While some draw dangerous missions, others are clerks, truck drivers, IBM keypunchers, photographers, typists, accountants, engineers, and the like. We are told that in the army every man is a soldier. I would like to see the army that could put its orderlies into combat.

Men do not serve equally, it is obvious. Nor are they chosen equally, for the selective service system allows for deferments on various grounds, as indeed it must. General Hershey's facetious remark in a hearing about the lottery calling up a man with no legs quickly establishes that—for one reason or another—some are going to be more equal than others.

My suggestion for ridding us of the draft came about, in part, because I do not believe in a world without alternatives. No plan is perfect and time makes us judge our plans against new backdrops. You cannot put your foot into the same stream twice Heraclitus told us. So I believe we are wrong, ladies and gentlemen, to accept alternatives to the draft or the draft itself without first examining the basic argument. Do we, in the United States today, need to put our young men into what, in strong and plain language, must be seen as involuntary servitude?

I think the basic issues of the draft can be discussed on two grounds. The first is on the ground of freedom, which is most important, and the second is on the ground of the draft's economic meanings.

Men should not be coerced into service to their country, barring the most calamitous circumstances. We are not in those circumstances, as Secretary McNamara made quite clear from his statement about lowering the draft call the other day. I just read in this morning's *Post* that Mr. McNamara wants civilians to be drafted even if there are enough volunteers to meet manpower requirements in the Armed Forces. This is healthier for us, he argues because it civilianizes the army and keeps the military from being separate.

One might as well propose that we sentence everyone to terms of hard labor in schoolrooms, police stations, and city rooms because teachers, police, newsmen exercise a potent influence over American life that conceivably might be abused.

Well, I am for civilian review of the police and the military and I am for public accountability from the press and from educators.

But it is simply silly to think that a few hapless 19 year olds can mold the military establishment.

Mr. McNamara's argument for the continuation of the draft is another example of the blinders that constrict our view of the Selective Service Act.

Men should not be deprived of their liberties, their choices of careers, or their choices of action in order to satisfy the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the admirals, the Congress, or even the President of the United States, unless clearly there is no other way—and I stress that phrase—no other way to insure the security of the nation.

The Selective Service system has been admired by its head as a "channeler" of men. General Hershey said before a Congressional committee ". . . . we have channeled people into training for occupations and professions that were said to be very necessary in national life. . . . I have no idea how many people we are deferring that may well be as immediately involved in survival as the people who are in uniform . . . in fact, it takes 85% of our time" the General continued, "with the people we are trying to encourage to go into professions and occupations and training for those by deferring them . . ."

Any system that takes people into involuntary servitude either by putting them into uniforms or by forcing them into occupations is unjust.

Such a system, defended on the grounds of justice and fairness, in the words of President Brewster of Yale, "tarnishes our national spirit" and suggests that the only way to serve humanity is "to repudiate your country."

The conscription of men in any form, under any system, raises a question of freedom in the United States and I shall not be brainwashed to think otherwise.

The draft is economically wasteful and economically unfair.

To draft about 300,000 men a year primarily into the Army, has required an enormous bureaucracy. I quote from the Selective Service Act some of the jobs that have sprung into being to feed these men into the Army: registrars, local boards, appeal boards, medical advisors to local boards, medical advisors to State Directors, advisors to registrants, interpreters. All of these people, and some are volunteers, make telephone calls, have office or meeting quarters, print materials, travel, and eat. The 1964 cost of this great "channeling" machine was in excess of $40 million.

One interesting expenditure of time is this. The Director of Selective Service in each state, in the words of General Hershey, is "almost constantly cancelling inductions so that people can enlist." You know, of course, that the law does not permit a man to enlist for three years when he has been called for two.

Delays in such a system are bound to be costly and common. Out of a pool of 990,000 men available as of May 1, only 71,000 had been examined and certified fit. The draft took 17,000 men from Michigan and only 15,000 from Texas—a state with 2.55 million more people—in the same period of time. Turnover must be very costly. Each year, 400,000 men retire, most of whom are draftees whose reenlistment rate is only 8%.

The process of the draft is mostly one of elimination and rejection rather than recruitment. Out of every ten men who reach the age of 26, 3 are drafted, 3 enlist, 3 are rejected, and one is deferred as a student or for some other reason. As I said before, most students eventually serve. On the initial examination at 18 years of age, 58% are rejected. With so many men, some figures estimate as many as 45% of the 18 year old population who never serve, the system becomes honeycombed with exemptions and exceptions. The situation is not helped in its efficiency by 4,000 local boards, each with considerable autonomy, administering the law.

There is a lot of economic unfairness about the draft. John Galbraith said that the draft is a "device" by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee. "Presumably," he concludes, "freedom of choice here as elsewhere would be worth paying for . . ."

The men who are presently drafted are forced to subsidize by their lost time and their lost wages the costs of defending their country. Why should we expect men in the armed forces to bear the greatest expense at the same time we expect them to bear the greatest danger? Freedom must have its own motives. Freedom must supply men with incentives and rewards for behavior or government becomes a punishing and coercive force.

I believe that rewards and pride are better than bondage. I propose that men be recruited into the armed forces by means of attractive benefits. Some of these benefits might be in the form of salary. One could expect a soldier to earn at least as much as a new police officer, yet he does not even after long years of service.

Benefits might take the form of bonds or other savings put away during the man's service and payable to him later in life. Educational benefits were cited in a recent Defense Department study as one of the key reasons for enlistment. A guarantee of future educational opportunity in a college or vocational school would be a cogent argument for enlistment.

I have no doubt but that the $40 million budget of the Selective Service operation could fund a successful recruitment campaign for the armed services.

When I first mentioned this idea of a volunteer army in a Commencement Address last June, I supposed it not to be original—which it is not—but an opinion that was in circulation and that was receiving or would receive consideration. I offered the idea as a citizen, not as an expert, and I expected perhaps naively that any alternative in favor of freedom would receive priority of consideration. I regret to say that this does not seem to be the case.

General Hershey said quite bluntly, "Any person I can get in the Armed Forces that comes for pay alone, I don't want." I have reported to you the eroding pressure put upon us to think only in terms of other methods of conscription. In press reports about the Pentagon study of the draft, Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris is said to have testified, and I quote, "Neither improved pay nor fringe benefits would help enough to do away with the draft." Another account reported Mr. Morris as follows: "In discounting the prospects of ending the draft, Morris noted that even by raising pay and other benefits to the tune of $17 billion a year, the Pentagon would be 'theoretically' unable to maintain a force of 2.7 million men, the pre-Viet level."

I next read, on July 3, of the President's appointment of a 20 member panel headed by IBM General Counsel Burke Marshall with a "broad mandate" to study the Selective Service System and make a recommendation by January 1. In *The New York Times* account of that appointment, I was surprised by the fact that not once was the prospect of ending the draft so much as mentioned.

I draw to your attention right now that this panel may never even consider the elimination of the draft.

Mr. McNamara, according to a *Reporter* magazine piece by Bruce Chapman, gave two estimates of the additional cost of an all-volunteer army. One estimate was $4 billion; it was made in February. The second was $20 billion, made in December. You have heard Mr. Morris' estimate of $17 billion.

The ease with which these billions slip through the rooms of the Pentagon inclines me to agree with Mr. Chapman when he writes, ". . . the Department of Defense has either found the computation of cost of this alternative to the draft inordinately complicated or has not given it serious consideration."

I should like the idea of a volunteer army to have the serious attention and consideration it deserves. Will it cost billions? Yes, *freedom is expensive and our own freedom* is as expensive and as precious and as worth investing in as any freedom we have paid for in the past. It might cost as much as $300 million per State, a small percentage of our gross national product, to keep men out of a state of involuntary servitude. What is our money for if it cannot keep us free?

But let us begin to at least plan for an end to the draft. Let us stop deluding ourselves that more conscription will solve the problems of unfair conscription or that teaching in Brooklyn or in Mississippi are viable alternatives to service in a combat area.

Let us stop teaching our young men how to "cop out" in cynical avoidance of military service. In some situations, every man may be called to patriotic service. But until those situations are clearly before us, let us not confuse patriotism with adherence to an outmoded bureaucracy.

Our young men and women love their country. They have shown us that in their acts of consicence, in their urban corps, in their teacher corps, in their tutoring of the young, in their fight for minority rights and in their willingness to sometimes die in that fight.

I propose an alternative to a system that has made military service a shameful act and a place for the unlucky or the unwanted. I propose that we honor the men who serve their society by protecting it by treating them with the compassion of an abundant and a grateful society. Men will risk death for us and they will risk it voluntarily as the long histories of the armed forces, the police, and the fire departments of this country have proven. We must provide all of these men with the benefits due their hard and difficult work.

I ask you and I ask those in our government responsible for these matters to turn away from coercion and force. I ask that every effort be made immediately to study ways of reducing and eventually eliminating the numbers of men taken into service against their wills.

I ask that every man and woman serve our nation with the right to choose the form of service he or she shall give, as fits a nation of free men and women.

GORDON McLENDON

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POOL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, Gordon McLendon, head of the well-known broadcasting organization, recently challenged the music industry either to clean up some of their lyrics or desist sending to stations records that many listeners hold objectionable. The national press, as well as broadcasters across the country, were quick to acknowledge this unprecedented move. It is the natural fear of most broadcasters that they must play what is selling, regardless of what is in good taste, for fear they will lose out to an unscrupulous competitor.

All the more reason that Gordon McLendon and his staff should be commended. Their unprecedented courage in assuming such community responsibility should be an example for the music industry to follow.

I know the Members of this body will share my interest in McLendon's open letter to the music industry, as it appeared in Broadcasting on April 10, 1967, and a number of articles and letters in response:

AN OPEN LETTER TO: THE MUSIC INDUSTRY

Frankly, we're tired . . .

Tired of today's new releases coming through rife with "raunchy" lyrics, et cetera. In the past month, six records which were on the national charts far *overstepped* the boundaries of good taste, and we were forced to ban them.

Tired of "policing" *your* industry. It is time consuming, not *our* responsibility, and an outright *imposition*—on all broadcasters.

Tired of answering complaints from our listeners, civic groups, and civic leaders who *blame* us for *your* poor judgment on what is, and what is not, in good taste.

Tired of sincerely promising the FCC that we will do everything to elevate the needs, *tastes* and desires of the community—only to have one or two records threaten to *tear it all down*.

Therefore, we intend to—

1. *Refuse* to review effective May 15, 1967 any record submitted to us for air play unless it is accompanied by a valid and actual lyric sheet for both sides.

2. *Refuse* to play record releases which continue, through "gimmicks," intonations, and nuances to either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste.

3. *Refuse* consideration of both sides of a record if one side is adjudged unfit for airplay.

4. *Urge all responsible broadcasters to follow this "code of record standards"* in reviewing records in the future.

Frankly, we are tired. We want to be fair. But our success, after all, is often dependent on your success as record producers; but conversely, your success is predicated on radio airplay of your product. Please, let's work together. Clean things up before some unnecessary regulatory action is taken or before the broadcaster's listening audience indignantly tunes out.

THE McLENDON STATIONS.

LIFE LINE

This is "Life Line," Melvin Munn from Dallas.

There is nothing basically wrong with sophistication, modern viewpoints, and changes in our culture so long as our open society is allowed to retain its affection for good taste. There is no reason why art, films, books, and music must dredge in stagnate waters of our English language in order to turn up words and phrases that shock and startle the listener. Almost every language on earth has its colorful and bawdry expressions to be used in verbal assaults upon everything from the Andean Llama of South America, to the Missouri mule, to the balky space rocket, and to the man next door who lets his sprinkler block your driveway! There are words that ought to be left scrawled on the alley fence or allowed to drop on the floor during live conversation. There are also words that have no place in books, magazines and papers which are intended for family reading.

I am told that my hearing is excellent and I find no difficulty in being able to hear clearly most things that occur in sound of me. I do, however, have one problem. I find it extremely difficult to translate some of the vocal sounds made by singers who are competing with rock 'n roll bands on the stage and recordings. It may well be because I do not hear enough of this type of music to be able to interpret the words, but I'm also convinced that I don't understand many of the lyrics simply because the music is over-shadowing the singer. Still, I find that young people have a keen ear since this is their favorite kind of popular tune. As a result, the youth often understands lyrics to a new song much better than does the adult. Thus, if there is an obscene, indecent, or off-color word or phrase in the lyrics the youngster generally recognizes it at once.

There are many rock 'n roll tunes that have quality, depth, and appeal. The lyrics of many such tunes express a reasonable thought with some clarity. On the other hand, a great many lyrics make little or no sense even to the most faithful devotee. Still other lyrics are downright objectionable and have no place on the broadest airwaves or on the home record player. There are probably several million American homes today with youngsters having in their record collection vocalists singing lyrics parents would not permit if they knew some of the words the singer was using.

I have been in and around the record, radio, and television industries for a lot of years. With very few exceptions these powerful elements in our American life are managed by responsible and honorable people. For many years the broadcasting industry has policed itself with a broadcasting code that has protected the listening public from much of the cheap and the vulgar. That is also true of the record industry. However, zeal, enthusiasm, and the pressure of daily work sometimes results in temporary lapses of responsibility and judgment essential to the preservation of good taste.

Perhaps that has happened in the record business. In any case, the recording industry does need to take a second and third look at some of the cheap and vulgar material occasionally released on record.

In that direction comes now a broadcasting pioneer, both a firm and its founder widely known for courage and imagination. The McLendon Stations is a corporate name for the firm that owns a number of radio stations throughout the United States. On page 39 of Broadcasting Magazine for April 10, 1967, there appeared a full page ad. The ad speaks for itself and it speaks for the McLendon Stations. It is an open letter to the music industry and reads as follows:

"Frankly, we're tired . . . .

"Tired of today's new releases coming through rife with 'raunchy' lyrics, et cetra. In the past month, six records which were on the national charts far *overstepped* the boundaries of good taste, and we were forced to ban them.

"Tired of 'policing' *your* industry. It is time consuming, not *our* responsibility, and an outright *imposition*—on all broadcasters.

"Tired of answering complaints from our listeners, civic groups, and civic leaders who *blame* us for *your* poor judgment on what is, and what is not, in good taste.

"Tired of sincerely promising the FCC that we will do everything to elevate the needs, *tastes* and desires of the community—only to have one or two records threaten to *tear it all down*.

"Therefore, we intend to

"1. *Refuse* to review effective May 15, 1967 any record submitted to us for air play unless it is accompanied by a *valid* and *actual* lyric sheet for both sides.

"2. *Refuse* to play record releases which continue, through 'gimmicks,' intonations, and nuances to either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste.

"3. *Refuse* consideration of both sides of a record if one side is adjudged unfit for airplay.

"4. Urge all responsible broadcasters to follow this 'code of record standards' in reviewing records in the future.

"Frankly, we are tired. We want to be fair. But our success, after all, is often dependent on your success as record producers; but conversely, your success is predicated on radio airplay of your product. Please, let's work together. Clean things up before some unnecessary regulatory action is taken or before the broadcasters' listening audience indignantly tunes out."

And that ad is signed the McLendon Stations.

The McLendon organization operates radio stations in Dallas, Buffalo, Los Angeles, Chicago, Houston, San Francisco.

I want to salute Mr. Gordon McLendon, his staff, and his station personnel for the dignity, clarity, and professional responsibility inherent in this new code of record standards. The relationships between the broadcasting station and the general public will continue to be pleasant and beneficial if radio and television broadcasters will insist upon a fair level of decency in every song they broadcast. It would be most unfortunate if objectionable song lyrics sank so low as to force the public to demand federal government intervention.

MOST LABELS DENOUNCE McLENDON CHAIN EDICT

(By Dave Finkle)

The McLendon Stations announced last week that after May 15 all singles submitted for airplay must be accompanied by copies of "valid" and "actual" lyrics for both sides of the single.

(They also announced that their eight affiliated AM and FM stations would not play records which "either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste" and they would not consider either side of a single for play "if one side is adjudged unfit for airplay.")

The record company reaction, polled by *Record World*, to the demand for lyrics was varied, with only one company—United Artists—deciding to send the lyrics from the home office.

The UA feeling was that their promotion department exists in part to service disk jockeys, and if certain disk jockeys require lyrics, they would receive them.

MGM also seemed to be of a mind to give the McLendon stations what they want. Distribs locally who hand out the deejay singles, it was explained, would be fulfilling the request.

GENERALLY UNRECEPTIVE

Most of the other companies queried were unreceptive to the idea for a variety of reasons, which ranged from the expense of "going into the printing business" to sentiment that stations are lucky to get so much free product without making further demands.

Most company spokesmen stated that stations should decide whether or not to play a record by listening to it and if they don't like what they hear or suspect that what they hear is objectionable, they should veto it.

A prevalent quote (paraphrased) was: We censor our own records; so we don't need to send out accompanying proof.

One label executive felt that stations should not consider themselves censors at all, that if they profess to be playing best-selling records, they should plan their play-lists by sales reports solely.

The play list of records is being carefully perused visually and aurally for overt and covert meretricious expression. And, of course, the problem of obscenity or questionable taste is an extremely moot one in these days of LSD obsession, when just about every obtruse word or phrase is immediately assumed to be hoodwinking argot.

The McLendon stations include KLIF and KNUS–FM-Dallas; KILT and KOST–FM-Houston; KTSA-San Antonio; KABL-AM-FM-Oakland-San Francisco; WYSL-AM-FM-Buffalo; and WNUS-AFM-FM-Chicago.

Barton R. McLendon is Chairman and Gordon B. McLendon is President.

[From Billboard, Apr. 22, 1967]

HAIL McLENDON

EDITOR: To the McLendon radio stations: Your statement of policy in the April 8 issue is both courageous and necessary. I only wish that copies of your statement could be nationally publicized on a vast enough scale to encourage those who have felt that they alone were disturbed by current trends, both in and out of the music field. Thank you.

MRS. JOAN R. ERNST.

PALM BEACH, FLA.

EDITOR: Regards McLendon's open letter. WGH radio concurs. The broadcasting industry is much too late in taking a stand on this issue.

ROGER CLARK,
WGH Program Director.

NEWPORT NEWS, VA.

[From Newsweek, May 8, 1967]

PURGE

When an executive for the McLendon Corp's radio-station chain found his 9-year-old daughter last month with a Rolling Stones record called "Let's Spend the Night Together," he followed his impulse and slashed its grooves with a can opener. His second thought was to convince his boss, Dallas-based Gordon B. McLendon, to launch a morality campaign against "dirty lyrics" in pop music.

McLendon obliged. In full-page ads appearing in broadcast trade magazines, the chain owner popped off loud and clear: "We're tired of today's new releases coming through rife with raunchy lyrics." He also stridently urged other broadcasters to go along with him in a purge of records which through "intonations and nuances either innocently or intentionally offend public morals, dignity or taste."

Suiting action to words, the McLendon Corp.'s six stations have already purged themselves of the Beatles' "Penny Lane" for its cockney earthiness, "Candy Man" by the Nitty Gritty Dirt Band for a casual reference to God, and a funky little number by Mitch Ryder and the Detroit Wheels called "Sock It to Me Baby."

Although McLendon was soon joined by the six outlets of the Susquehanna Broadcasting Stations in Pennsylvania, the immediate reaction from the recording industry was a loud guffaw. "Ridiculous," said a spokesman for Capitol Records which had orders for more than a million "Penny Lanes" even before it was released. "When the Beatles make a record, the kids know about it and they buy it." "Rock and Roll has always been raunchy," adds Richard Goldstein, a music critic for New York's World Journal Tribune. "That's what it's all about. It's got a special code and a lot of kids understand it. It's made for that purpose."

All stations, of course, exercise record censorship when the leerics get too lusty. But few have exercised so heavy a hand as the McLendon chain. "The hippies know what they're saying on these records," snorts Bill Young, program director at McLendon's KILT in Houston. "But ole John Q. Public doesn't. We're tired of them putting it over on ole John Q."

IMMORAL RECORDS BANNED BY McLENDON RADIO GROUP

(By Ben Gross)

At last something is being done about it . . . and it's about time! The McLendon group of radio stations, extending all the way from Buffalo to San Francisco, is banning all recordings (mostly rock 'n' roll) with lyrics "that are immoral or in bad taste."

In full page advertisements appearing in two trade magazines, this company announced that, effective May 15, it will not review any platter submitted for air play "unless it is accompanied by a valid and actual lyric sheet for both sides."

Also, it will refuse to play the record releases which continue "through gimmicks, intonations and nuances to offend public morals, dignity or taste; either innocently or intentionally."

Too, these stations will not air either side of a disk if one side is "adjudged unfit for air play."

A WELCOME MOVE

This action on the part of a progressive group of independent stations will be welcomed by parents, teachers and all lovers of good popular music. For years, certain manufacturers of recordings, especially the fly-by-nights, have been getting away with murder. That is, the murder of all decencies and sensibilities.

In the name of the "new music" and the "new freedom of youth," too many lyrics have been not only off-color in a subtle sort of way but openly dirty in a coarse and leering manner.

Those who have ventured to criticize these excrements of song have often been attacked as old fogies, fuddy-duddies and—horror of horrors—as squares. We have been told that they, far from being "in," are hopelessly "out" . . . social pariahs who're simply "not with it."

Gordon B. McLendon, president of the chain, and the father of four children ranging from 15 to 22, gave a cogent explanation of his action: "I have been disturbed at the lyrics and sounds of many records popular with the youth of America. I think these are morally damaging and I have ordered all our stations to ban this type of recording. But it is up to the record industry to police itself, not up to the broadcaster."

MEMORANDUM

APRIL 17, 1967.

To: The music industry.
From: The Susquehanna stations.
Subject: Your poor taste.

We thought *we* were alone with the problem. So . . . our hats are off to The McLendon Stations for publicly airing *their* concern in Billboard.

We, too, spend too much time with the evidence of your bad taste. Lyrics, song titles, offensive vocal sounds, and even names of the performing groups have moved from the clever and creative to the crude and outrageous.

If you are trying to find out if you can get away with it . . . you can't. We, along with other responsible broadcasters, are blowing the whistle.

We join with The McLendon Stations in:

1. Requiring—a lyric sheet with records submitted for air-play.

2. Continuing—to refuse records if *either* side offends public morals by title, lyrics, or group name.

3. Urging—all responsible broadcasters to publicly set the same standards.

Yours is a great industry. So is ours. We plan to keep ours that way by respecting the dignity and taste of the people who have made us great . . . our listeners.

How about you?

THE SUSQUEHANNA STATIONS.

[From Bill Gavin's record report No. 642, Weekly Summary, San Francisco, Calif., April 7, 1967]

ON THE RECORD

The April 8 issue of Billboard offers broadcasters more than the normal amount of interesting reading.

We were also struck by the full page, in the same Billboard issue, taken out by the McLendon stations as an open letter to the record companies. The letter objects to suggestive song lyrics. It reflects the opinions of many broadcasters. It is hardly necessary to point out that responsibility for the influx of questionable records does not lie with the record business as a whole, but only with the comparatively few manufacturers who have sacrificed good taste to good profit. The venality of a small minority should not be used to reflect discredit on the entire record industry.

In the final analysis, each broadcaster is responsible, not for the records he receives, but for those that he puts on the air. Radio consistently rejects a vast majority of the records submitted each week for shortcomings of quality and/or content. Radio is never demeaned by the inferior level of the records that are auditioned; each radio station tells it like it is by the records played for its listeners.

The admonitions in the McLendon letter might, with somewhat greater relevance, be applied to those radio people—program directors, music directors and DJ's—who interpret a station's ethical standards by what they put on the air.

AMERICAN MOTHERS COMMITTEE, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 21, 1967.
Mr. WILLIAM STEWART,
McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. STEWART: It was pleasant to talk with you today, and to know that you can participate in the Panel Discussion scheduled for May 10th at luncheon 12:30 noon in the Astor Gallery, Waldorf-Astoria. The subject is—"*In our complex society what can inspired individual leadership achieve toward strengthening the home, the community and the nation?*".

Mrs. Harold V. Milligan will moderate the panel. This discussion follows the morning session devoted to the Young Mother Council Service. We hope that you will attend the luncheon as our guest.

The response of thousands of mothers to our "Mothers Manifesto" indicates the concern felt by the public. Your leadership indicates clearly what individuals can do when sufficiently motivated. We hope that your contribution will not only reveal what you have accomplished but will be so directed as to stimulate our audience to greater dedication.

I enclose some background material for your information. The other panel members are distinguished leaders of accomplishment.

Best wishes.

Cordially,

MRS. DOROTHY LEWIS,
President.

POLK BROS.,
Joliet, Ill., April 5, 1967.

GENTLEMEN: Just a little acknowledgement of your full-page announcement in Billboard concerning the vulgarity that has become rampant in today's song lyrics. I for one couldn't be more gratified that someone has finally taken an important step forward in the morass we call modern-day music; a stand against the gradual degradation of our culture; a positive move toward restoring a sense of decency and morality to current popular music.

Our young people in this day and age find it hard enough to distinguish between what is good and what is bad, what with all the promiscuous movies, to shows, and magazines that prevail everywhere. The music business should take it upon itself to at least provide one haven from the barrage of "Sex at any Price" purveyors seeking to warp the minds of our youth and the whole basis of our social and moral structure.

As Record Dept. manager, I have long been appalled at the lack of discretion shown by the promoters of off-color lyrics and dirty meanings in today's pop songs, and I sincerely hope your courageous action will encourage a more active participation by everyone concerned in promoting a greater sense of decency and responsibility in the music business.

Yours sincerely,

MICHAEL LAPIKAS.

THE MCLENDON STATIONS MEMORANDUM, APRIL 11, 1967

To: Bill Stewart.
From: Bill Young.
Subject: Billboard ad.

More reaction to the Billboard ad!

Chuck just talked to Juggy Gayle (Promo man for Atlantic) and he said that Atlantic is making arrangements now to comply with the lyric sheet requirement.

He also said that the line "sock it to me, Baby" has been edited out of the new Aretha Franklin single "Respect". This cut has been pulled from her LP, but because of the ad, will be edited for release!

Apparently, we are making our point.

DICK DALE ENTERPRISES, INC.,
Hollywood, Calif., April 7, 1967.
Mr. GORDON MCLENDON,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. MCLENDON: Read your open letter to the Music Industry in the April issue of the Billboard and I agree with you 100%.

I knew sooner or later some one of importance would have the guts to tell the music producers to clean house. I have been in the music business for many years and have noticed the downward trend of music in the past several years, especially the titles which have double meaning It was bad enough we had to put up with the long hairs and the uncouth scene. I can see in the near future a change for the best if many music producers follow your example. I, for one, will do my part to produce the better type of music as I have been doing in the past on our Del-Tone Record label and also our Cougar Record label.

Please feel free to call me at any time, if I can help in any way to help the drive you have started. If every producer in every area takes notice, the music industry can thank you for spear-heading this drive for better music.

Soon to follow this letter will be our new release on Cougar Records which we believe is the better type of music. This record was turned down by the major stations in Los Angeles. My guess is because it is too clean and is good music. I am led to believe if we want to get a hit record we must make it dirty. I say, hell will freeze over before we go that route.

Please keep up the good work and I'm sure the major stations will soon wake up to the fact there is good music to be heard.

Warmest Regards,

JIM MONSOUR,
President.

ADAMS-ETHRIDGE PUBLISHING CO., BMI,
Galveston, Tex., April 3, 1967.
Mr. GORDON MCLENDON,
The McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR MR. MCLENDON: You are to be commended for your ad appearing in the April 8 issue of Billboard. The situation in our business has been heartbreaking to the serious producer for the past few years.

We have a release out now featuring Roy Montague on Columbia Records. We realize his potential, and we went all out on the production, with the Anita Kerr Singers, strings, the best arranger, Bill Walker. Roy will be the next big recording star of the Jim Reeves, Eddy Arnold style.

Yet we have been turned down for airtime on many stations including your KILT, even though I made a personal trip to the Program Director, Mr. Dunaway. Yet a great piece of trash, Sock It To Me, Baby, is getting fantastic air time on KILT.

I hope to see national results on your stand. In the meantime, I am re-submitting our release to your stations as outlined in your policy.

Sincerely,

LEON ETHRIDGE.

AVCO BROADCASTING CORP.,
Washington, D.C., April 27, 1967.
Mr. WILLIAM STEWART,
National Program Director,
The McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR BILL: I have your letter of April 20, and the attached repro of your April 10, 1967 Broadcasting Ad. In direct answer to your question regarding my feelings, I concur completely.

The problem is not an especially serious one to WWDC which, for the lack of a better description, is a swinging middle-of-the-road station. Since we regularly exercise subjective discretion over the list of records we play, we can, and do, simply avoid records which fit the descriptions in your Ad.

At my former association, WPTR, which was, for the lack of a better description, a top-40 station, the problem was far more acute. There, the dilemma of being required to play the top records of the day and yet recognizing the "put on" or worse, of some of the records we were playing was quite apparent to us.

WPTR's Program Director, Dick Lawrence, and myself discussed this at considerable length just prior to my leaving. I am, therefore, taking the liberty of sending a carbon copy of my letter to him and, in closing, your letter and repro for his consideration.

Irv Lichtenstein, WWDC's Program Director, to whom you also sent this correspondence, asked me to tell you that he too is in agreement. Please let me know if there is any way further we can help.

Kind regards,

Sincerely yours,

PERRY S. SAMUELS.

[From Variety Apr. 26, 1967]

MCLENDON STATION EXEC HITS BRITISH LACQUER LEERICS

Two centuries ago a warning cry went out "The British are coming!" Today a cry in the broadcasting industry is "Stop the British . . . from influencing American music with their out-and-out 'single' entendres," so declares McLendon Stations' national program director Bill Stewart.

Radio chain, with headquarters in Dallas, is the first to go on record anent the increasing "Gimmicks, intonations and nuances innocently or intentionally offending public morals, dignity and taste" through the new wave of lyrics in certain songs.

BLASTS BEATLES

"The English, spearheaded by The Beatles, are continuously injecting these suggestive lines that ultimately will bring strong censorship by the U.S. government, not just the broadcast industry alone," Stewart asserted

Stewart reports within six months between 25 and 30 top recordings have been banned by his stations because of the "tone of the words."

Starting May 15, all diskeries must submit separate lyric sheets before wax will be aired.

"If we keep getting titles like 'Fish And Finger Pie' and 'Let's Spend The Night Together Baby' and such lines within the songs themselves like 'sock it to me, baby' and '40,000 purple holes in my arm' the time to stop is now," Stewart warned. Another English group he charges is an offender is The Rolling Stones.

Stewart went on to say that "they (pop-rock English groups) are just having too much influence, and are making an impact on the diskers and record manufacturers in this country."

Stewart says "most other broadcasters concur with what we have to say and the stand we are taking." The Susquehanna Broadcasting Co., which controls six top-40 stations, he asserts is lending "support" to the crusade started by McLendon.

"Many of the major record companies are behind us in our thoughts, but there are still some which are objectionable in misconstruing this as being censorship of free expression. We sincerely mean our 'code of record standards' as a better guideline for the companies and performers alike.

"We've had all we can take of this glorifying of LSD and hop."

AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.,
New York, N.Y.

GENTLEMEN: We ask your cooperation in assisting us to handle a problem of concern to both the record and broadcast industries: the screening of records which contain lyrics in bad taste.

Initially, we want to reaffirm our basic position: this station will not play records whose lyrics, in our sole opinion, violate the tenets of good taste.

We try to screen all new record releases for possible inclusion on our weekly play list. Many records contain lyrics which are clearly and easily distinguishable by listening to them. Our problem does not involve these records, since if the lyrics are deemed to be in bad taste, the specific record will not be broadcast by our station.

The problem area involves those records in which the lyrics are not clearly and easily understandable in the initial screening. Effective immediately, in such instances we ask you to furnish us (*at the same time you furnish the record*) with a copy of the lyrics actually used on the particular record furnished.

If there is the slightest doubt whatsoever that the lyrics on your record are not clearly distinguishable, we suggest that you attach a copy of the lyrics used, because *if the station cannot understand the lyrics, and there is no transcript attached, that record will not be considered for broadcast by this station.*

Thus, in any situation in which there is the slightest doubt, you must include a transcript of the lyrics if you wish to protect your record's opportunity for equal consideration with all other records for inclusion on our play list.

We believe the foregoing procedures will enable us to implement our obligation to broadcast in the public interest and will be extremely helpful to both the record and broadcast industries in maintaining the high standards observed by the overwhelming majority of those engaged in our business.

We hope all responsible record companies will cooperate with us in this endeavor.

Very truly yours,

WALTER A. SCHWARTZ,
Vice President and General Manager.

WLCY RADIO,
Tampa, Fla., April 25, 1967.

MR. BILL STEWART,
National Program Director,
The McLendon Stations,
Dallas, Tex.

DEAR BILL: Thanks for your note. It's been a lot of years since we've been in touch.

Bill, I posted your ad when it appeared in the trades for staff and management opinion. The response was one of relief: "Thank God somebody's taking a stand."

We do not air records with suggestive lyrics, naturally, and it would certainly ease our load (and ears) not to have to play and replay a record while writing down the lyrics.

I thought I was the only blue nose in the world who wouldn't play the flip of a record like the Rolling Stones' last one—I'm glad to hear I'm not alone: Those kids buy a record on our say-so and play both sides when they get it home. And what really bugs me is that one of the network-owned major labels is in it deep. I asked one of that label's regional men if he'd have his 14 year old daughter come over to my office and let me talk dirty to her for an hour or so. He got the point.

Cordials,

ROY E. NELSON,
Operations Manager.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED APRIL 23, 1967 BY THE LOUISIANA ASSOCIATION OF BROADCASTERS MEETING IN SHREVEPORT, LA.

Whereas there is an apparent increase in the amount of salacious and immoral material being included in records distributed to all stations, and

Whereas the broadcasting industry has no control over the production and distribution of records and must use recorded music made available to it;

Now therefore be it resolved that this Association concurs with Gordon McLendon in his contention that the industry responsible for the production and distribution of this music should show more concern about the nature of the music and lyrics produced, and

Be it further resolved that we compliment Mr. McLendon for taking this courageous stand and making his voice heard.

REMARKS BY DR. JOSE A. MORA, SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the first of May, the distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Dr. Jose A. Mora, delivered a very eloquent and significant address at the annual dinner of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. This great Organization of American States has done much to promote the peace and prosperity of the Western Hemisphere in years past. We know that its role in the progress and peace of the Western Hemisphere in the years ahead shall be even greater. Dr. Jose A. Mora, distinguished statesman, as Secretary General, has immeasurably contributed to the accomplishments of the Organization of American States. We, of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, were highly honored to have him appear at this function, and were particularly pleased to hear Dr. Irving Muskat speak so favorably of the great Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, known as Interama, located in my district in Miami, and to have his recognition of the part that the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center will play in future years in bringing closer together in friendship, and in cooperation, the peace-loving nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I commend Dr. Mora's able address to my colleagues and fellow countrymen and include it in the body of the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, DR. JOSE A. MORA, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE FLORIDA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

It is indeed a pleasure to be present upon the occasion of the annual dinner of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce here in Washington, and to find myself in the company of so many friends of long standing.

Over the many years I have spent in this country, first as Ambassador of Uruguay, and more recently as Secretary General of the Organization of American States, I have been in unusually frequent contact with the State of Florida.

Some of my experience, of course, stems from the fact that Florida is in a very literal sense the United States' gateway to the south—the point of passage for thousands of travelers between this country and Latin America.

Much more is involved than mere geographical proximity, however.

The ties between Florida and the lands of the Caribbean date, as you all know, from the earliest years of our recorded history. The first European settlement in United States territory, Saint Augustine, was not English-speaking, but Spanish-speaking, and throughout the colonial period Florida's contacts were exclusively with the captaincies of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, not with the British establishments to the north.

If the Spaniards went their way a century and a half ago, and their place has been taken by an ever-increasing flood of descendants of the British colonists, their memory lingers on.

To begin with, of course, there is the name of the state, commemorative of its discovery on Easter Sunday, but singularly appropriate in its suggestion of a land of flowers. Then there is the oft-told tale of Ponce de Leon's vain search for the Fountain of Youth. Perhaps that gentleman was not so much misled as ahead of his time: could he return today during the Easter vacation period, and land on the beach at Fort Lauderdale, he would surely be convinced that his goal had been attained!

As befits a race called Conquistadores, the Spanish were great military architects, and the Castillo de San Marcos is a lasting reminder of the first empire on which the sun never set. The restoration of that and other colonial buildings at Saint Augustine, enthusiastically promoted by native Floridians and immigrants from as far off as New England, will bring visitors from all parts of the country to a vivid realization that the American heritage is Iberian as well as British in origin.

However respectful of history they may be, Floridians are not given to living in the past. Indeed, considering the installations at Cape Kennedy, they are in some respects living in the future! Thus, in connection with the Saint Augustine restoration, they have provided a Pan American Center, to further closer relations with Spaniards and Spanish Americans of today. A little farther to the south, a still more ambitious undertaking for the promotion of trade and friendship between the United States and Latin America is coming into being at Miami—the project known as Interama.

The Florida-Colombia Alliance represents one of the outstanding relationships developed under the Partners of the Alliance Program. I had the pleasure of addressing the Conference held in Tampa in November of last year, and was impressed to note that the projects considered ran from agrarian technical assistance to health programs, from tourism to the exchange of students and professors and aid to libraries and educational institutions. I am confident that the activities that have been undertaken will be fruitful, not merely in material benefits to those who are the object of assistance, but also in meaningful personal relationships among the collaborators—one of the firmest bases of inter-American solidarity.

It is indeed encouraging to me, as Secretary General of the OAS, that the fastest-growing state in the East, and one that is in the vanguard of progress, is also a leader in promoting friendship, cooperation, and trade with the United States' neighbors to the south.

I salute the State of Florida—a historic outpost of imperial Spain, the gateway to the adventures of outer space, and a bridge between the peoples and cultures of the New World.

POOR SCHOOLS FIRST

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, Republican efforts to dismantle our current Federal aid to education program are being conducted in the name of "States' rights." Challenging this theory, the St. Petersburg Times points out in an April 29 editorial that without the Elementary and Secondary Education Act the result in States such as Florida "would be a complete reversal of Congress' intent to stimulate better schools. The rich would get more, the poor less."

Mr. Speaker, I include the editorial in the RECORD at this point:

POOR SCHOOLS FIRST

American governmental progress is marked by a series of great compromises. One of them—deciding the proper role of the federal government in assisting elementary and secondary schools—has fallen into deep trouble.

Every Congress since the end of World War II has heard impassioned debate over federal aid to education. With local and state tax resources consumed by ever-increasing demands, Congress wanted to offer some relief with federal tax dollars. But for two decades, every attempt was stalled by emotion-packed differences between public and religious schools, rural and urban areas, rich and poor states.

It was left for the remarkable 89th Congress to discover an acceptable compromise in 1965. Federal aid was not to go to states, school districts or schools. It was to go to children, specifically children of low-income families. Congress directed the U.S. Commissioner of Education to distribute appropriated funds to state education departments which would in turn apportion moneys to school districts according to a precise formula devised by Congress. The formula is based upon the number of 5 to 17-year-old children in each district from families with incomes below $2,000 a year, multiplied by 50 per cent of each state's average expenditure per school child. Thus, when state school support rose, so would federal aid.

Aware of the long and bitter struggle on this issue, President Johnson called the Education Act "the most important measure that I shall ever sign."

Supported by the churches, educators, private schools and the public, the program has worked beautifully.

Now, when the 90th Congress must renew the law, a short-sighted group of House Republicans is attempting to throw out the entire compromise. Whether it is their goal or not, these efforts threaten all federal aid to education.

Ironically, the attack is being conducted in the name of states' rights. Instead of states being required to follow Congress' needy children formula, the opponents want to give state education departments the power to distribute the funds as they wish.

The result in states such as Florida, where outdated state school aid formulas actually discourage county support, would be a complete reversal of Congress' intent to stimulate better schools. The rich would get more, the poor less.

Or, if the worst happens, the entire federal program will collapse. So, in the name of states' rights, the Republican House members will have increased the load on state treasuries and on heavily overburdened property taxes.

This must not be allowed to happen. It is to be hoped that Florida's 12 members of the House will help see that it doesn't.

ILLITERACY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, there are more than 2 million American schoolchildren who do not speak English and who, as a direct result, suffer in terms of the educational opportunities available to them, in terms of being able to compete effectively for jobs upon graduation, and in terms of social standing in their communities. Unable to communicate in the language of the mainstream of American life, they have been cut off from effective participation in their society by an invisible but real barrier of verbs and nouns, idiom and nuance.

In my own New York there are more than 67,000 such children, less than 1,000 of whom graduate each year from an academic high school. Although the vast majority of these children in New York are of Puerto Rican heritage, the school age, non-English-speaking children in New York cut across 74 different locales and speak 32 distinct languages.

For one child to be deprived of his birthright of equal opportunity as an American citizen because of inadequate language preparation is a cause for national shame; for 67,000 or 2 million children to be thus deprived is a national disgrace.

The effects of this word barrier extend beyond the 2 million children directly involved. Because of their inability to communicate effectively their classmates are often slowed down in the learning process. What appears to be an important but relatively small problem then, actually has tremendous magnitude and impact on untold millions of American children.

I have, therefore, today introduced a bill to establish a Bilingual Education Act to provide the assistance necessary to allow these children and their parents the opportunity to participate more fully in the life of America.

Although individual school districts have made efforts to meet the problems faced by non-English-speaking students in their classes, these efforts have rarely provided the comprehensive, concerted force needed to effect change. The Bilingual Education Act will provide this force.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 9840

A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual education programs

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Bilingual Education Act."

SEC. 2. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) is amended by redesignating title VII as title VIII, redesignating sections 701 through 706 and references thereto as sections 801 through 806, respectively, and by inserting after title VI the following new title:

"TITLE VII—BILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

"Authorization of appropriations

"SEC. 701. There are authorized to be appropriated $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, $35,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and $50,000,000 for each of the three succeeding fiscal years, to enable the Commissioner to make grants to local educational agencies and institutions of higher education to assist them in carrying out bilingual education programs in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"Uses of Federal funds

"SEC. 702. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 703, for—

"(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs designed to provide high-quality educational opportunities for children from non-English-speaking homes, including pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed and the development and dissemination of special instructional materials for use in bilingual education programs;

"(b) providing preservice training designed to prepare persons to participate in bilingual education programs as teachers or teacher-aides, and inservice training and development programs designed to enable such persons to continue to improve their qualifications while participating in such programs; and

"(c) the establishment, maintenance, and operation (including the construction, remodeling, or renovation, or acquisition by lease or otherwise, of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment and instructional materials) of programs which are designed to upgrade the quality of the entire program of schools consisting of a large proportion of children from non-English-speaking low-income families or special programs designed to meet the educational needs of children in areas having high concentrations of children from non-English-speaking low-income families, including—

"(1) intensive early childhood programs involving bilingual education techniques designed to provide children during the preschool, kindergarten, and early elementary years with educational experiences which will enhance their learning potential;

"(2) special programs or projects designed to supplement and enrich the programs of elementary and secondary schools, including bilingual education programs and bicultural education programs which acquaint students from both English-speaking and non-English-speaking homes with the history and culture associated with each language;

"(3) comprehensive programs of supportive services to students, including guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, summer programs, psychological and social work services, health and nutrition programs, and efforts to establish closer cooperation between the school and the home; and

"(4) adult education programs related to the purposes of this title, particularly for parents of children participating in bilingual programs.

"Approval of project applications

"SEC. 703. (a) A grant may be made under this title only for a project under clause (a) of section 702 or a project involving programs under both of clauses (b) and (c) of section 702, upon application submitted to the Commissioner jointly by a local educational agency and an institution of higher education, at such time or times, in such manner, and accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such application shall—

"(1) provide that the local educational agency and the institution of higher education jointly submitting the application will be responsible for carrying out the programs for which assistance is sought under this title;

"(2) set forth procedures and policies which assure that the training provided by the institution of higher education for teachers and teacher-aides will be coordinated with the bilingual education programs of the local educational agency in which such persons are serving or will serve;

"(3) provide for such methods of administration as will best carry out the purposes of this title;

"(4) set forth policies and procedures which assure that the Federal funds made available under this title will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practicable, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of assistance under this title, be made available by the applicant for the education of children served by programs assisted under this title, and in no case supplant such funds;

"(5) show the estimated total current educational expenditure per pupil participating in the programs for which assistance is sought under this title;

"(6) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title;

"(7) provide for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds expended for the purposes set forth in section 702 have been effective, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports; and

"(8) provide assurance that, to the extent consistent with law, provision has been made for the participation in the project of non-English-speaking children who are not enrolled in public school on a full-time basis.

"(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if—

"(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

"(2) the project set forth in the application is of such size, scope, quality and design as to provide reasonable assurance of making a substantial impact in meeting the special educational needs of persons who come from non-English-speaking low-income families; and

"(3) approval of the project is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner, including criteria designed to achieve an equitable distribution of assistance under this title and criteria designed to take into account the impact upon the educational programs in communities in which the number of non-English-speaking persons from low-income families constitutes a substantial proportion of the population.

"(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

"Payments

"Sec. 704. (a) The Commissioner shall pay to each applicant which has an application for a project approved under this title such amounts as the applicant may expend under the terms of the grant, which may include an amount for development of the proposal of not to exceed one per centum of the grant in the first year of a project assisted under this title.

"(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

"Labor standards

"Sec. 705. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c)."

Sec. 3. (a) That part of section 801 (as so redesignated by section 2 of this Act) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 which precedes clause (a) is amended by striking out "and V" and inserting in lieu thereof "V, and VII".

(b) Clause (j) of such 801 is amended by striking out "title II and title III," and inserting in lieu thereof "titles II, III, and VII".

SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, our senior citizens should be able to look upon the sunset of their lives with the assurance that they will not be darkened by the ugly shadow of poverty.

We in the Congress must take the necessary legislative steps to improve our social security system so that our senior citizens will have the assurance they so rightfuly deserve that their retirement years will be lived in dignity and self-respect.

I have received a resolution from the Rhode Island chapter of the National Council of Senior Citizens requesting such action which I would like to insert into the Record at this time:

RESOLUTION FOR SOCIAL SECURITY IMPROVEMENTS

Whereas, President Johnson has urged the Congress of the United States to increase Social Security benefits by an average of 20 percent with the biggest proportionate share going to the 2½ million retirees who now get only the minimum of $44 a month ($66 for a couple); and

Whereas, even the proposed increases would fall short of assuring Social Security beneficiaries genuine financial independence, as contemplated by the Social Security Act; and

Whereas, many other nations, far less affluent than the United States, have far more adequate social welfare systems; and

Whereas, no remotely comparable insurance protection is available to Americans at any price;

Therefore be it resolved, that the Congress of the United States take prompt, positive action to attack the deficiencies that exist in the Social Security system, so that older Americans, widows and children, and the disabled can live out their retirement years in dignity and self-respect rather than in poverty and despair; and

Be it further resolved, since the program's biggest single defect is the lack of adequate cash benefits, that the Congress act to increase these benefits as proposed by the President; and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be sent to Senator Pastore, Senator Pell, Congressman St Germain, Congressman Tiernan, and Chairman Wilbur Mills, requesting them to support the President's proposals, and to place this resolution in the records of Congress; and

Be it further resolved that this resolution be given the fullest publicity through the communications media.

RUMANIAN NATIONAL HOLIDAY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, on May 10, the national holiday of the Rumanian people is celebrated. On this day in 1866, Prince Charles of Hohenzollern—Sigmaringen was proclaimed Prince of Rumania and the Rumanian dynasty was founded. Eleven years later, in 1877, the principality of Rumania severed her links with the Ottoman Empire and proclaimed her independence and on May 10, just 15 years after the founding of the Rumanian dynasty, Charles I was crowned King of Rumania.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, May 10 is a most significant day for the Rumanian people and for the world because mankind has been greatly enriched by the many contributions made to it by this great nation. A nation, which we are sad to say, now stands beneath the dark shadow of communism.

Twenty-two years have passed since the independence of this spirited nation has been disrupted by the forces of communism but this passage of two decades has not destroyed the will of the Rumanian people to assert their sense of national pride and national independence. It still remains to pierce the shadow of communism with the bright light of hope and historic strength.

This spirit of nationalism is particularly significant when we view how it has managed to break the monolithic Soviet bloc into many factions of communism, some of which are opposed to each other. And the spirited light of nationalism shines brightest in Rumania. Someday I expect this spirit to overcome the darkness of communism and once again clearly place before the world the splendor of an independent Rumania.

EXPORT-IMPORT FIAT CASE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, too often immediate considerations cloud ultimate objectives and cause us to veer off course in our endeavor to gain a lasting world peace.

Such is the case concerning the authorization of the Export-Import Bank to grant a $40 million credit to Italy's Fiat Co. in order to allow the company to purchase machine tools in the United States for a huge auto plant to be built in the Soviet Union.

Because of Russia's assistance to North Vietnam, an immediate consideration, too many people have failed to realize that the loan in question would provide for an increasing amount of the Soviet's industrial capacity to be geared to producing consumer goods, an ultimate objective.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert into the RECORD an editorial concerning this matter that appeared in the May 9 edition of the Providence Journal.

This article brings to light all the considerations of the case at hand and is as follows:

Tooling Up

The House banking committee has acted in the nation's best interest by helping to establish what could be an important element in President Johnson's plan for improved East-West trade.

The committee narrowly rejected an amendment that would have barred the Export-Import Bank from granting a 40-million dollar credit to Italy's Fiat company in order to allow the company to purchase machine tools in the U.S. for a huge auto plant to be built in the Soviet Union.

The amendment had a political ring because, generally speaking, it would prohibit the bank from making loans or guaranteeing any loans for the use of any nation whose government is providing goods or services for an antagonist of the United States.

The Soviet Union happens to be helping North Vietnam in the Vietnam War, and the machine tool credit involved in the Fiat-Soviet auto plant would fall under this prohibition.

The House committee fortunately was guided by long-range and more valid considerations concerning U.S. security. It is to America's advantage and in the cause of world peace if an increasing amount of the Soviets' industrial capacity is geared to producing consumer goods. There also is important American self-interest in selling machine tools in what probably will be a rapidly growing market.

It is to be hoped that the entire House will see these advantages as clearly as did the majority of the banking committee and help to move along this important bit of liberal trade legislation.

WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, one of the glories of an affluent society is its ability to combat poverty wherever and whenever it may exist.

Being cognizant of our ability to remove the ugly shadow of poverty from the face of our land, the Congress committed itself to this task by waging a war on poverty. Our commitment is a firm one. And it should be.

Therefore, it was with great delight that I listened to President Johnson's stirring words yesterday about the war on poverty.

> It is clear that we are not backing off from our commitment to fight poverty—

He stated—

> Nor will we—so long as I have anything to say about it.
>
> We are staying for the long pull.

Continued the President.

These words embrace the tenacity that must be the very backbone of our antipoverty program. The President knows that victory in the war on poverty will not be easy to come by. He is aware of the strong political forces that threaten to destroy the war on poverty in favor of short-range political gain. But the President is determined that the war on poverty shall be won and he is willing to stick it out. And, I submit, so is this House and the rest of the Nation.

It would indeed be a tragedy for America, Mr. Speaker, if this body should fail to face up to the long pull and should fail in its commitment to our underprivileged citizens. And this is what would occur if the so-called Republican opportunity crusade were to be enacted. This "crusade" would abolish the Office of Economic Opportunity, the only voice the poor have ever had in the Halls of Government. It would scatter the antipoverty programs throughout the old bureaucracy to agencies whose heads have publicly warned that they are strained to the administrative breaking point by the programs they already have.

Much to my dismay, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of misunderstanding about the Office of Economic Opportunity and the President's war on poverty. Too many people have failed to realize that the war on poverty is not a matter of welfare or the dole. On the contrary, its aims are to abolish the dole by making productive members of society out of those welfare recipients who are not able to help themselves.

And there is another misunderstanding, Mr. Speaker, to which the President alluded yesterday. That is the erroneous idea that the economic opportunity legislation is an exclusively Negro program.

> Poverty wears different masks in different places—

The President wisely remarked—

> We may sometimes think of it as a Negro affliction, but seven out of ten poor people are white.

I would like to emphasize for the benefit of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that the war on poverty is a comprehensive program and a national program. It has the strong support of the President and of the Nation. It, therefore, deserves the strong support of this body.

PANAMA CANAL: BETRAYAL OF OUR TAXPAYERS' VAST INVESTMENT PROPOSED

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, since December 18, 1964, the governments of the United States and the Republic of Panama have been engaged in diplomatic negotiations for a new treaty to replace the treaty of 1903 under which Panama granted in perpetuity to the United States exclusive sovereignty over the Canal Zone for the construction of the Panama Canal and its perpetual maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection.

In a joint statement by the Presidents of the United States and Panama on September 24, 1965, they announced that agreement had been reached on the following points:

First. That the 1903 treaty will be abrogated.

Second. That the new treaty will effectively recognize Panama's sovereignty over the Canal Zone territory—United States owned.

Third. That the new treaty will terminate after a specified number of years.

Fourth. That a primary objective of the new treaty will be to integrate the Canal Zone territory with that of the Republic of Panama.

The significance of that announcement was immediately apparent to informed Members of the Congress and students of the Isthmian question but not to the people of our country at large. It was evident that our negotiators with Panama had been bamboozled from start to finish by radical and communistic demands on the part of the Panamanian negotiators.

In a statement to the House and press release on September 27, 1965, I emphasized three points: First, that the Presidential declaration meant a complete and abject surrender to Panama of our indispensable sovereignty with respect to the Panama Canal and Canal Zone in favor of a dual managerial and governmental setup, in an area of endless bloody revolution and political instability; second, that such control could only lead to unending conflicts and recriminations that always accompany extraterritorial jurisdiction; and third, that it would mean the scrapping of all laws enacted by the Congress since 1904 for canal purposes and for governing the zone territory, with the loss of our huge investment. For full text of my press release see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 30, 1965.

As a consequence, many Members of the Congress and others have wished to know the extent of our investment in the Panama Canal and Canal Zone territory, the funds for which have been furnished by our Nation's taxpayers. Since its total sum apparently had never been determined, on August 30, 1966, I requested the Secretary of the Army to supply me such information. He has now replied in two reports: the first on April 10, 1967, concerning the costs to the Army, Navy, and Air Force for defending—military—the Panama Canal; and the second on April 21, 1967, concerning the costs of the acquisition and government of the Canal Zone and of the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and —police—protection of the canal.

From the data thus supplied, the following are the sums paid by our Government—an astounding total:

Defense of the Panama Canal:	
Army	$2,874,361,000
Navy	853,190,000
Air Force	320,400,000
Total	4,047,951,000
Acquisition of government of the Canal Zone, construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, and protection (police) of the Panama Canal:	
Gross U.S. investment	1,951,600,000
Recoveries by U.S. Treasury	1,251,500,000
Unrecovered	700,100,000
Total investment	4,748,051,000

This is exclusive of $141,000,000 of net revenue which if added would bring our total investment to $4,889,051,000.

In connection with the gross U.S. investment of $1,951,600,000, this figure does not accurately reflect its present value, which, conservatively speaking, would be anywhere from 100 to 200 percent more than the sum stated.

Mr. Speaker, this total book value of $4,748,051,000 is greater than I expected and this is the investment that our country will altogether lose by the currently proposed treaty or treaties that may be sent to the Senate at any time after July for ratification—a shocking assault on the taxpayers of our country. Moreover, the proposed treaties if ratified will constitute an ignoring of American taxpayers who, in the canal picture, constitute a group that has been entirely ignored and forgotten.

No wonder the hidden architects of this planned surrender are using the treaty process to bring about what could never be obtained by legislation. No wonder they are strenuously endeavoring to keep the current diplomatic negotiations secret and to maintain silence in the Senate until the treaties are sprung on an uninformed body with the evident purpose to obtain a stampeded ratification.

In connection with the last, one of the key officials concerned with the treaty negotiations, a Presidential appointee, has visited Capitol Hill, talked with a number of prominent Senators, and endeavored to persuade them to remain silent until after the treaties are submitted. Could there be anything more iniquitous than to discourage Senators from studying this vital matter in advance of submission of the treaties? Could there be anything more ruinous of our constitutional system of separation of powers? And could there be a more atrocious disregard of our citizens who have furnished the huge funds thus to be given away as if they amount to no more than a pinch of salt?

In order that the entire Nation may have the facts and figures of our investment at Panama and with the hope that in some way the taxpayers will come to understand the situation involved, I quote my initial request to the Secretary of the Army and his two reports as parts of my remarks; and commend them for study by every Member of the Congress, the staffs of cognizant committees, interested agencies in the executive branch of our Government, and all others concerned with the isthmian question, especially transportation agencies, institutions of learning, and those responsible for mass media dissemination.

The information follows:

AUGUST 30, 1966.

Hon. STANLEY R. RESOR,
Secretary, Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of the importance of the Canal Zone and Panama Canal problems now pending and in furtherance of studies that I have made through the years in these connections, I desire, as early as may be practicable, a statement showing all sums paid by our government and its subsidiaries for the construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, protection and defense of the Canal and the government of the Canal Zone, starting in 1904 and continuing until the present time.

Such statement should include any interest that our government had paid on the account of expenditures dealing with the Zone and the Canal, including expenditures by the Panama Canal Company; and for all bridges, roadways, hospitals, residences and other improvements in the Zone made at the expense of the United States, together with the costs of fortifications in and out of the Canal Zone. Such gross sums of expenditures should be credited respectively by any sums of reimbursements received by our government and its agencies.

In brief, I should like to have a complete chronological recital of all and expenditures and credits so as to show, at least in approximation, what has been thus expended, in net, in the activities.

I realize that this request may involve considerable research, but I believe that under existing conditions such data is imperative.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 10, 1967.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: This is in response to your letters of August 30, 1966 and February 21, 1967 to Secretary Resor requesting information on the sums paid by our Government and its subsidiaries for the acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation, sanitation, protection and defense of the Panama Canal and the Government of the Canal Zone.

The enclosure attached provides cost data relating to the protection and defense of the Canal in a chronological display as requested. You will note that this data covers all identifiable expenditures of the Department of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The remaining data requested will be provided shortly.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS HOLT,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army,
(International Affairs).

COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL BY MILITARY DEPARTMENT

Cost of defense and protection of the Panama Canal

[In thousands of dollars]

Year	Army	Navy	USAF	Total
1904	7	292	0	[1] 299
1905	16	67	0	83
1906	14	145	0	159
1907	22	234	0	256
1908	36	150	0	186
1909	50	203	0	253
1910	43	214	0	257
1911	1,652	206	0	1,858
1912	1,590	314	0	1,904
1913	3,052	339	0	3,391
1914	6,996	183	0	7,179
1915	5,610	782	0	6,392
1916	14,452	782	0	15,234
1917	21,122	957	0	22,079
1918	18,784	182	0	18,966
1919	15,764	1,262	0	17,026
1920	15,926	1,262	0	17,188
1921	20,101	1,337	0	21,438
1922	27,536	1,172	0	28,708
1923	28,536	1,156	0	29,692
1924	28,036	1,165	0	29,201
1925	27,786	1,355	0	29,141
1926	29,013	1,230	0	30,243
1927	29,013	1,210	0	30,223
1928	30,013	1,751	0	31,764
1929	29,013	2,195	0	31,208
1930	29,013	3,811	0	32,824
1931	30,704	5,809	0	36,513
1932	30,704	6,982	0	37,686
1933	31,704	6,798	0	38,502
1934	31,599	2,617	0	34,216
1935	43,951	2,571	0	46,522
1936	41,969	3,500	0	45,469
1937	43,547	4,080	0	47,627
1938	51,744	3,825	0	55,569
1939	46,029	3,878	0	49,907
1940	75,146	4,740	0	79,886
1941	119,437	12,508	0	131,945
1942	197,255	26,277	0	223,532
1943	194,067	66,784	0	260,851
1944	140,442	87,360	0	227,802
1945	108,435	84,000	0	192,435
1946	60,101	51,830	0	111,931
1947	54,189	36,572	8,605	99,366
1948	30,113	35,400	8,605	74,118
1949	41,058	27,492	8,605	77,155
1950	49,019	21,139	8,605	78,763
1951	58,729	19,456	5,834	84,019
1952	72,204	26,398	7,568	106,170
1953	60,207	24,580	9,144	93,931
1954	54,582	23,318	9,854	87,754
1955	64,531	19,384	10,031	93,946
1956	49,182	26,700	10,817	86,699
1957	51,356	15,600	11,310	78,266
1958	36,783	12,460	11,209	60,452
1959	41,220	10,206	11,459	62,885
1960	51,408	9,817	11,102	72,327
1961	56,413	10,325	11,437	78,175
1962	58,789	10,387	12,066	81,242
1963	68,256	11,032	13,944	93,232
1964	77,955	10,253	20,610	108,818
1965	75,872	10,717	27,423	114,012
1966	76,742	11,590	29,914	118,246
MCA total	115,723	83,849	72,258	[2] 271,830
Total	2,874,361	853,190	320,400	4,047,951

---

[1] Total estimated expenditures include appropriations for military personnel, operation and maintenance, and procurement of equipment and missiles (including replacement of equipment and ammunition).

[2] MCA (military construction, appropriations) have not been itemized by year. This total represents all sums expended for military construction, including housing, for all military departments from 1904 to June 30, 1966.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, ESTIMATED COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

FOREWORD

This report was prepared by the Comptroller of the Army.

1. The report contains a chronological listing by major appropriation of the estimated expenditures of the US Army from 1904 to 30 June 1966.

2. Format of the report is as follows:

Column 1: Year.

Column 2: Military Strength of the Army as of 30 June, each year.

Column 3: MPA (Military Personnel, Army) Appropriation.

Column 4: OMA (Operation and Maintenance, Army) Appropriation.

Column 5: PEMA (Procurement of Equipment and Missiles, Army) Appropriation.

(Includes PEMA Replacement and Ammunition).

Column 6: MCA (Military Construction, Army) Appropriation.

Column 7: Total Expenditures, rounded to the nearest thousand dollars.

Cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year (1)	Military strength (2)	MPA (3)	OMA (4)	PEMA (5)	MCA (6)	Total (7)
1904	[1]4	$4	$3	0	(2)	$7
1905	9	9	7	0		16
1906	8	8	6	0		14
1907	13	12	10	0		22
1908	21	20	16	0		36
1909	29	28	22	0		50
1910	25	24	19	0		43
1911	876	841	673	$138		1,652
1912	841	807	646	137		1,590
1913	[3]886	851	681	1,520		3,052
1914	2,179	2,092	1,674	3,230		6,996
1915	3,000	2,880	2,304	426		5,610
1916	8,000	7,680	6,144	628		14,452
1917	11,222	10,773	8,618	1,731		21,122
1918	10,461	10,043	8,034	707		18,784
1919	[4]4,722	8,467	6,774	523		15,764
1920	4,772	8,556	6,845	525		15,926
1921	6,053	10,853	8,682	566		20,101
1922	8,334	14,943	11,954	639		27,536
1923	8,334	14,943	11,954	1,639		28,536
1924	8,334	14,943	11,954	1,139		28,036
1925	8,334	14,943	11,954	889		27,786
1926	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013
1927	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013
1928	8,784	15,750	12,600	1,663		30,103
1929	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013
1930	8,784	15,750	12,600	663		29,013
1931	9,303	16,680	13,344	680		30,704
1932	9,303	16,680	13,344	680		30,704
1933	9,303	16,680	13,344	1,680		31,704
1934	9,578	17,173	13,738	688		31,599
1935	13,367	23,967	19,174	810		43,951
1936	12,759	22,877	18,302	790		41,969
1937	13,243	$23,745	$18,996	$806		$43,547
1938	14,942	26,791	21,433	3,520		51,744
1939	13,451	24,118	19,294	2,617		46,029
1940	22,384	40,135	32,108	2,903		75,146
1941	35,017	62,785	50,228	6,424		119,437
1952	58,257	104,455	83,564	9,236		197,255
1943	57,305	102,748	82,198	9,121		194,067
1944	41,278	74,011	59,209	7,222		140,442
1945	32,018	57,408	45,926	5,101		108,435
1946	14,704	33,569	23,526	3,006		60,101
1947	13,821	27,794	23,496	2,899		54,189
1948	7,251	14,763	13,777	1,573		30,113
1949	7,682	23,300	16,132	1,626		41,048
1950	8,343	26,247	18,772	4,000		49,019
1951	8,424	33,890	20,807	4,032		58,729
1952	11,671	37,125	29,761	5,318		72,204
1953	9,960	29,083	26,484	4,640		62,207
1954	8,140	26,963	23,697	3,922		54,582
1955	9,360	32,610	27,518	4,403		64.531
1956	6,808	25,305	20,485	3,392		49,182
1957	6,934	26,585	21,329	3,442		51,356
1958	4,825	18,750	15,426	2,607		36,783
1959	4,850	21,312	17,288	2,620		41,220
1960	5,930	26,359	21,075	3,974		51,408
1961	6,444	28,940	23,295	4,178		56,413
1962	6,699	30,025	22,485	4,279		58,789
1963	7,735	30,419	28,148	4,689		63,256
1964	8,557	41,288	31,652	5,015		77.955
1965	8,245	39,436	31,545	4,891		75,872
1966	8,313	39,902	31,922	4,918		76,742
MCA total						115,723
Total	[5]656,596	1,451,388	1,156,796	150,454	$115,723	2,874,361

---

[1] The 1st U.S. military garrison in the Canal Zone consisted of approximately 1,400 U.S. Marine Corps personnel that were landed in November 1903 and departed in January 1914. Army personnel during the period 1904–10 consisted primarily of survey teams. The 1st U.S. Army troop unit arrived in the Canal Zone October 1911.

[2] Original Army fortifications (1911–15) cost approximately $11,000,000. Construction just prior to and during World War II cost approximately $75,000,000. Remainder is for roads and other required military construction. Does not include minor construction projects which are funded under "Operation and maintenance," Army. Does not include defense expenditures such as bombproofing locks which were funded by the Panama Canal Company.

[3] Plans for early defense of the canal had their beginning in January 1913. At this time a House committee on appropriations held open hearings on the defenses to be constructed. It was estimated that a minimum mobile force of 7,000 troops plus the coast artillery personnel to man the planned heavy fortifications would be required. The study resulted in the Department of the Army being authorized a total of 8,350 military personnel for the protection and defense of the Canal Zone. It is interesting to note that the present day Army strength in the Canal Zone is very close to this figure. The Panama Canal Department has undergone many reorganizations since this early defense plan was implemented; however, the major changes in Army units are that the Hawk batteries have replaced the coast artillery batteries and an infantry brigade along with a Special Forces Group have replaced the infantry regiments and other mobile forces of that era.

[4] The 1st Air Corps units were assigned to the Panama Canal Department in 1919. During this period the Army coast defenses and the mobile defenses consisted of 18 coast artillery batteries, 3 infantry regiments, 1 cavalry squadron, 1 field artillery battalion, 1 signal company, 1 engineer regiment, 2 observation groups (Air Corps), and 1 photographic section (Air Corps).

[5] Total for col. 2 is military man-years.

Sources: Annual reports of the Secretary of War, the Chief of Staff, or the Adjutant General. Chief, Military History, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Chief of Interoceanic Canal Studies, Office of the Chief of Engineers, and the Comptroller of the Army.

Historical references: History of the Panama Canal Department, vol. I–IV, An Integrated History of Panama Canal Department and the Fortifications of the Panama Canal. (Historical manuscripts are on file in the Office of the Chief of Military History, Department of the Army.)

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY ESTIMATED COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

FOREWORD

1. This report presents estimated net expenditures in cases where complete fiscal data were not available. Estimates are based on historical records.

2. Military construction costs for the Navy Department are in the summary for all Services in Enclosure 1.

Estimated cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Military strength (man-years)[1]	Military pay	All other costs	Total costs [2]
1904	946	$287	$5	$292
1905	203	66	1	67
1906	417	142	3	145
1907	675	230	4	234
1908	415	144	6	150
1909	415	194	9	203
1910	415	204	10	214
1911	415	197	9	206
1912	415	265	49	314
1913	415	270	69	339
1914	27	101	82	183
1915	(3)	96	686	782
1916	(3)	96	686	782
1917	(3)	96	861	957
1918	(3)	96	86	182
1919	(3)	170	1,092	1,262
1920	(3)	170	1,092	1,262
1921	(3)	170	1,167	1,337
1922	(3)	170	1,002	1,172
1923	52	212	944	1,156

Estimated cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Military strength (man-years)[1]	Military pay	All other costs	Total costs [2]
1924	62	$221	$944	$1,165
1925	65	221	1,134	1,355
1926	66	346	884	1,230
1927	64	400	810	1,210
1928	62	807	944	1,751
1929	64	1,131	1,064	2,195
1930	72	1,555	2,256	3,811
1931	83	1,908	3,901	5,809
1932	97	2,262	4,720	6,982
1933	85	2,216	4,582	6,798
1934	85	1,750	867	2,617
1935	82	1,751	820	2,571
1936	93	1,771	1,729	3,500
1937	144	1,839	2,241	4,080
1938	150	1,826	1,999	3,825
1939	174	2,336	1,542	3,878
1940	220	2,518	2,222	4,740
1941	2,043	3,961	8,547	12,508
1942	5,674	6,259	20,018	26,277
1943	10,810	14,454	52,330	66,784
1944	10,172	13,133	74,227	87,360
1945	9,546	15,819	68,181	84,000
1946	3,835	13,723	38,107	51,830
1947	3,280	9,720	25,852	35,572
1948	2,455	6,478	28,922	35,400
1949	2,968	7,989	19,503	27,492
1950	1,262	3,550	17,589	21,139
1951	1,440	4,740	14,716	19,456
1952	1,467	4,679	21,719	26,398
1953	1,563	5,391	19,189	24,580
1954	1,474	3,945	19,373	23,318
1955	1,194	4,157	15,227	19,384
1956	1,193	4,209	22,491	26,700
1957	984	3,750	11,850	15,600
1958	650	2,511	9,949	12,460

Estimated cost of protection and defense of the Panama Canal—Continued

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Year	Military strength (man-years)[1]	Military pay	All other costs	Total costs [2]
1959	615	$2,577	$7,629	$10,206
1960	526	2,232	7,585	9,817
1961	544	2,348	7,977	10,325
1962	530	2,290	8,097	10,387
1963	577	2,522	8,510	11,032
1964	592	2,845	7,408	10,253
1965	639	3,197	7,520	10,717
1966	639	3,225	8,365	11,590
Total	[4]73,150	177,938	591,403	769,341

---

[1] Man-year data prior to 1941 cover Marine Corps personnel only. Military pay is for Marine Corps only in 1904 through 1907 but for Navy and Marine Corps personnel beginning in 1908. Navy man-year data are not available 1908 through 1940.

[2] Excludes $83,849,000 for military construction, Navy expenditures from 1904–66, as provided by the Chief of Interoceanic Canal Studies, Office of the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army.

[3] Not available.

[4] Total for col. 2 is military man-years.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, ESTIMATED COST OF PROTECTION AND DEFENSE OF THE PANAMA CANAL

FOREWORD

1. The data shown thereon reflect costs of the U.S. Air Force Southern Command (formerly the Caribbean Air Command), and to the extent possible excludes those costs

related to various Latin American programs such as missions. Also excluded are those expenses not financed through or identified with this command or its bases, such as Aircraft POL and centrally procured items purchased through procurement appropriations. Of the costs presented, the funds related to that specific mission of the command which is "to direct the Air Defense of the Canal Zone" cannot be separately identified.

2. Expenditures for the Army Air Corps (prior to 1947) are included in Army costs.

Air Force expenses in Panama Canal Zone

[Dollar amounts in thousands]

Fiscal year	Military personnel		Operation and maintenance	Military construction	Total
	Number	Amount			
1947 [1]	3,213	$5,552	$3,053		$8,605
1948 [1]	3,213	5,552	3,053		8,605
1949 [1]	3,213	5,552	3,053		8,605
1950	3,213	5,552	3,053		8,605
1951	1,328	2,548	3,286		5,834
1952	1,781	3,754	3,814		7,568
1953	1,994	5,659	3,485		9,144
1954	1,789	5,807	4,047		9,854
1955	1,604	5,546	4,485		10,031
1956	1,547	5,705	5,112		10,817
1957	1,411	5,385	5,925		11,310
1958	1,282	5,113	6,096		11,209
1959	1,252	5,353	6,106		11,459
1960	1,207	5,026	6,076		11,102
1961	1,144	5,037	6,400		11,437
1962	1,139	5,346	6,720		12,066
1963	1,173	5,357	8,587		13,944
1964	1,736	8,776	11,834		20,610
1965	2,312	12,545	14,878		27,423
1966	2,469	14,678	15,236		29,914
MCA total [2]				$72,258	72,258
Total	36,020	123,843	124,299	72,258	320,400

[1] Estimated for 1947–49.

[2] MCA total is for 1947–66. Includes $62,157 originally appropriated for Army MCA and transferred when the U.S. Air Force became a separate department.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., April 21, 1967.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: In my letter of April 10, 1967 I submitted to you cost data relating to the protection and defense of the Panama Canal. This was in partial response to your requests for information in letters of August 30, 1966 and February 21, 1967 to Secretary Resor.

The remaining investment of the United States Government in the Canal is reflected in the enclosure attached. These same data were submitted for the record to the Senate Appropriations Committee's Subcommittee on Public Works as an extension of the testimony by the Governor of the Canal Zone at a hearing on April 11, 1967.

If I can be of further assistance to you on this matter, please let me know.

Sincerely,

THADDEUS HOLT,
Deputy Under Secretary of the Army (International Affairs).

PANAMA CANAL ENTERPRISE

Unaudited summary of funds and property received by the Panama Canal enterprise from the U.S. Government, interest costs thereon payable to the U.S. Government, and funds paid back to the U.S. Treasury by the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966

[In millions of dollars]

	July 1, 1951	June 30, 1966
Gross investment of U.S. Government:		
Funds and property transfers (1)	1,013.9	1,419.8
Interest on net investment of U.S. Government:		
From inception to June 30, 1951 (2)	373.4	373.4
Gross investment of U.S. Government—Continued		
Interest on net investment of U.S. Government—Con.		
From July 1, 1951, to June 30, 1966:		
Panama Canal Company (paid to U.S. Treasury) (3)		139.6
Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge (4)		18.8
Total gross investment of U.S. Government	1,387.3	1,951.6
Recoveries by the U.S. Treasury:		
Deposits and deposit credits from all sources (5)	784.6	1,251.5
Unrecovered balance excluding retained earnings	602.7	700.1

PANAMA CANAL ENTERPRISE—Continued

NOTE.—Not included above is $141,000,000 of net revenue (carried over from Panama Railroad Company, $71,100,000 plus $70,000,000 accrued to Panama Canal Company since July 1, 1951). If this amount is to be considered as an added investment it should be added to the cash total above, as follows:

	1951	1966
Total as above	602.7	700.1
Retained net revenue	71.1	141.1
Adjusted total	673.8	841.2

Detailed statement supporting summary statement of unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966

1. Funds and property transfers:	
Funds appropriated directly for the enterprise:	
Original construction	$386,910,301.00
Maintenance, operation, and additional capital expenditures	929,593,859.40
Total	1,316,504,160.40
Funds appropriated for other U.S. Government agencies for the direct benefit of the enterprise:	
Construction annuity to employees (and their widows) engaged in the construction of the canal	45,672,877.91
Increased annuity to Panama	16,500,000.00
Annuities to employees retired prior to July 1, 1951	15,091,000.00
Salaries of military personnel assigned to the canal prior to July 1, 1951	9,307,002.00
Injury and death payments, Bureau of Employees Compensation	4,704,700.17
Total	91,275,580.62
Total appropriations	1,407,779,741.02

Detailed statement supporting summary statement of unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966—Continued

1. Funds, etc.—Continued	
Property transferred from other U.S. Government agencies	$19,395,443.22
Property transferred to other U.S. Government agencies	7,354,372.75
Total property transfers, net	12,041,070.47
Total funds and property transfers	1,419,820,811.49
FROM INCEPTION TO JUNE 30, 1951	
2. Interest on net direct investment:	
Interest at 3 percent to Aug. 14, 1914, and at individual annual rates thereafter (as determined by the Secretary of the Treasury), has been calculated on net withdrawals (total appropriations less deposits of canal tolls and other deposits) from 1904 to 1951)	373,442,987.50
FROM JULY 1,1951, TO JUNE 30, 1966	
3. Panama Canal Company:	
Interest at rates from 1.95 percent for fiscal year 1951 to 3.63 percent for fiscal year 1966 (as determined by the Secretary of the U.S. Treasury) has been calculated on the Company's net direct investment, established in accordance with section 62 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, charged to Company operations and subsequently deposited into the U.S. Treasury as miscellaneous receipts, as required by law	139,586,357.35

4. Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge:

Existing law specifically exempts the net direct investment of the Canal Zone Government and the Thatcher Ferry Bridge from interest charges. However, it is considered that this element should be included in arriving at the unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the canal enterprise. The interest cost reflected herein has been calculated at the same rates used for the Company as shown un-

Detailed statement supporting summary statement of unrecovered investment of the U.S. Government in the Panama Canal enterprise from inception to June 30, 1966—Continued

4. Canal Zone, etc.—Con.	
der paragraph 3 above, on the net direct investment of the Canal Zone Government and Thatcher Ferry Bridge as of June 30 each year through June 30, 1966	$18, 847, 860. 00
5. Recoveries by the U.S. Government:	
(a) Actual deposits into the U.S. Treasury:	
Canal tolls prior to June 30, 1951	643, 883, 520. 78
Net profits from business operations (activities corresponding roughly to our present supporting operations	28, 591, 812. 05
Licenses, fines, fees and postal receipts	6, 887, 294. 59
Proceeds from sale of construction equipment	6, 990, 681. 75
Capital repayments and interest on public works in Panama and Colon	3, 547, 006. 22
Dividends paid by the Panama Railroad from 1905 to 1950	23, 994, 905. 00
Interest on net direct investment of the Company from July 1, 1951 to date	139, 586, 357. 35
Capital repayments from July 1, 1951 to date	25, 000, 000. 00
Net cost of Canal Zone Government, reimbursed by the Panama Canal Company	192, 533, 569. 49
Canal Zone Government revenue and plant salvage	109, 821, 007. 64
Total	1, 180, 836, 154. 87
(b) Deposit credits: Value of Canal tolls on U.S. Government vessels to June 30, 1951	70, 668, 969. 00
Total deposits and deposit credits	1, 251, 505, 123. 87

JOB CORPS

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to bring to the attention of the House an up-to-date report on an important part the Job Corps is playing in each of our States, regardless of whether or not we each happen to have a Job Corps Center in our congressional district.

Job Corpsmen are sending home money to their dependents in the form of allotments—this act in itself is commendable. It is the beginning of responsibility that will have an influence on them the rest of their lives.

Under unanimous consent I include a report the Office of Economic Opportunity recently compiled showing that Job Corpsmen have spent home nearly $16 million in allotments in the last 2 years.

The Job Corps report follows:

Job Corps Allotments to Needy Dependents Total Nearly $16 Million

Job Corpsmen and women in two years have sent nearly $16 million in allotments home to needy dependents, Director William P. Kelly of Job Corps announced today.

In March 1967, he said, 75 percent of the young men and women in the program made allotments to needy dependents. The allotments by 24,581 young men and women totaled $1,211,910 that month.

Kelly said that 96.4 percent of those making allotments send the maximum of $25 a month, with Job Corps matching the amount of the allotment.

The share of the allotment by the Corpsman or woman is taken from the $50 a month readjustment allowance, which is paid the youth on leaving the program.

The first allotments were paid in March 1965 and the monthly total has increased steadily since that time, running at the rate of more than $1 million a month since November 1966.

"It is heartening to see the great number of young people who willingly make these allotments, even though it comes in part out of their own funds," Kelly said. "These allotment payments are of great help to thousands of families in America, as well as thousands of communities."

Allotments paid from March 1965 through March 1967 by states:

Job Corps allotments

Alabama	$721, 887
Alaska	26, 800
Arizona	138, 380
Arkansas	511, 150
California	1, 057, 410
Colorado	251, 070
Connecticut	66, 670
Delaware	70, 730
District of Columbia	161, 520
Florida	693, 860
Georgia	746, 310
Hawaii	98, 600
Idaho	40, 860
Illinois	496, 070
Indiana	168, 020
Iowa	48, 890
Kansas	124, 370
Kentucky	375, 590
Louisiana	698, 400
Maine	78, 360
Maryland	327, 740
Massachusetts	143, 550
Michigan	262, 180
Minnesota	97, 450
Mississippi	592, 140
Missouri	368, 040
Montana	48, 860
Nebraska	64, 220
Nevada	41, 090
New Hampshire	22, 300
New Jersey	418, 810
New Mexico	201, 520
New York	1, 086, 390
North Carolina	292, 350
North Dakota	52, 250
Ohio	$405, 260
Oklahoma	243, 760
Oregon	110, 200
Pennsylvania	438, 200
Rhode Island	20, 830
South Carolina	581, 400
South Dakota	62, 370
Tennessee	404, 940
Texas	1, 668, 720
Utah	63, 770
Vermont	18, 940
Virginia	743, 350
Washington	125, 690
West Virginia	365, 620
Wisconsin	95, 240
Wyoming	36, 920
Total	15, 957, 095

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders *heretofore entered, was granted to:*

Mr. Multer, for 1 hour, on Monday, May 15, on the 19th anniversary of the independence of Israel.

Mr. Esch (at the request of Mr. Kleppe) for 1 hour, on June 7; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Kleppe), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Pucinski.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kleppe) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Taft.

Mr. Thompson of Georgia.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Montgomery) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Murphy of Illinois.

Mr. Rodino.

Mr. Kee.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 223. An act to authorize the disposal of the Government-owned long-lines communication facilities in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 449. An act to provide for the popular election of the Governor of Guam, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 477. An act for the relief of the widow of Albert M. Pepoon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 645. An act to provide needed means for the residents of rural America to achieve equality of opportunity by authorizing the making of grants for comprehensive planning for public services and development in community development districts approved by the Secretary of Agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1136. An act to amend section 9 of the act of May 22, 1928 (45 Stat. 702), as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 581h), relating to surveys of timber and other forest resources of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

S. 1190. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the inclusion of certain periods of reemployment of annuitants for the purpose of computing annuities of surviving spouses; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1320. An act to provide for the acquisition of career status by certain temporary employees of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 11, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. NIX: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 1411. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, with respect to use of the mails to obtain money or property under false representations, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 235). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NIX: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 3979. A bill to amend section 6409(b)(1) of title 39, United States Code, which relates to transportation compensation paid by the Postmaster General; with amendment (Rept. No. 236). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

Br. Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 9833. A bill to amend section 1331(c) of title 10, United States Code, to authorize the granting of retired pay to persons otherwise qualified who were Reserves before August 16, 1945, and who served on active duty during the so-called Berlin crisis; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 9834. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9835. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 9836. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against income tax to offset losses of retired pay sustained by certain individuals who retired from the Armed Forces before June 1, 1958; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 9837. A bill to amend the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 1959, as it relates to transportation expenses of Members of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HICKS:

H.R. 9838. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9839. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 9840. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOB WILSON (for himself, and Mr. UTT):

H. Res. 470. A resolution commending San Diego, Calif., for its commemoration of Charles A. Lindbergh's historic transatlantic flight in the Spirit of St. Louis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9841. A bill for the relief of Giacomo and Vincenza Bologna and minor child, Pasquale Bologna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9842. A bill for the relief of Nina Gemma Sinagra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9843. A bill for the relief of Luciana Ernesto Rodrigues DeCastro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

80. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Board of Supervisors, county of Santa Barbara, Calif., relative to the establishment of an oil drilling sanctuary offshore of the city of Santa Barbara, and to establish a moratorium for 1 year on oil leasing in the Santa Barbara Channel, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, May 10 is the national holiday of the Rumanian people, celebrated by Rumanian organizations throughout the world. After centuries of oppressive domination by the Ottoman Empire, the Rumanian people had at long last achieved their much desired freedom and nation independence. Today marks the 90th anniversary of that event.

Unfortunately, the Rumanian people today live in a state of national oppression, victims of the vile infection of communism. Rumania along with many of her Eastern European counterparts was swallowed up by the tyranny of communism following World War II.

Let us all express a common wish that the forces of Rumanian unity with the West will increase and that in the course of time the Rumanian people will enjoy the national independence they so richly deserve. Today we join with Rumanians who are captive in their homeland in hoping for the dawn of a new time, when freedom will return to their country.

Rumanian National Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, May 10, we commemorate the anniversary of the proclamation of Rumanian independence. On this date, in 1877, the Rumanian Parliament declared Rumania totally independent of the Turkish Ottoman Empire, after having endured centuries of persecution, oppression, and hardship. In 1856 Rumania had secured a status of autonomy from the Turks who by then had begun to feel the symptoms of decline. Even so, the Ottomans exacted an annual tribute from the Rumanians.

Ten years later, Rumanians elected as prince, Charles of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen; at the same time a new constitution was instituted to which Prince Charles subscribed. This constitution was based on the Belgium Charter of 1851 and provided for upper and lower legislative bodies and gave the prince an unconditional veto on all legislation.

The existence of the Turkish tribute served to overburden the economic and social system of Rumania. When the Russo-Turkish War broke out in 1877, Rumanians were overjoyed. They were confident that Russia would crush Turkey, gain for Rumania complete freedom from Turkey, and at the same time, respect Rumania's territorial integrity. Thus, it was that on May 10, 1877, the Parliament passed the resolution declaring Rumania's independence from Turkey, gain for Rumania complete freedom by the Treaty of Berlin in 1878, albeit with certain harsh territorial encroachments, to the benefit of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to salute the Rumanian people and their perseverance and courage in attaining independence from outside domination. It is our firm belief that Rumanians will persevere still in their struggles against outside domination and will one day soon take their proper position on the world stage of free nations.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, the Rumanians constitute the largest ethnic group in southeastern Europe, in the Balkan Peninsula, and their homeland is among the largest in Eastern Europe. Just as these 19,000,000 hard-working peasants constitute a formidable force in Balkan region today, so in their past history they played an important part in the history of that region. For centuries they held their own against powerful and aggressive invaders, but in the 15th century they were overwhelmed by the Ottoman Turks. Their country was overrun, and for some 400 years they became subjects of the Ottoman sultans. During that long period they endured the cruel rule of the Turks, and at the same time they did their utmost to cast off the alien yoke weighing heavily upon them. Time and again they revolted and rose in rebellion against their fierce overlords; time and again they were overpowered and severely punished for their attempts to free themselves. But the Rumanian people, firmly determined to free themselves, and unwilling to be held down for long, revolted several times during the last century, and in at least two of these revolts they were successful.

In 1856 they obtained autonomous status within the Ottoman Empire, and for all practical purposes their only tie with the Sultan was the payment of annual tribute to his treasury. But the Rumanians wanted to cut off this last link with the Turks. To attain this goal they rose again in 1877, proclaimed their independence on May 10, and started fighting against the Turks. Fortunately they had the Russians as well as other Balkan peoples on their side. So the victory of their cause was assured early in 1878.

Thus May 10, 1877, and the events connected with that date, mark a true milestone in Rumania's political history. The proclamation of May 10 ushered in a new era, and gave the Rumanian people a new lease on life as a nation. They then built and developed their country, and made good use of its immense natural resources, making Rumania, Eastern Europe's "breadbasket." Later on Rumania became an important source of petroleum. Rumanians enjoyed their freedom and the prosperity of their country. Then with the outbreak of the last war things began to take a sad turn, leading to Rumania's tragedy at the end of the war.

It is Rumania's misfortune to be bordering on the Soviet Union. That geographical fact made Rumania one of the first victims of Soviet aggression early in 1945. Since then the Rumanians have known little real freedom. Today they suffer under communism, but they have successfully tried to loosen the chains which have held them tied to the Kremlin. In recent years they have attained some measure of freedom even under the Communist regime, often defying the authority of the Kremlin. Let us all hope that they will retain the freedom thus gained, and will soon attain full national freedom. On their independence day I wish them fortitude and patience in their struggle against totalitarianism in their homeland.

The Kee Report: Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include last week's public service television and radio newscast, "The Kee Report." The subject discussed is Federal aid to education.

The report follows:

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

This is Jim Kee, bringing you the Kee Report.

The United States Office of Education is now administering the most far-reaching aid to education program ever sponsored by the Federal Government.

This program has been underway for nearly a decade—since the enactment of a measure known as the National Defense Education Act. This legislation contained a number of provisions intended to help meet the rising costs of education. But the climax of the program came 2 years ago when Congress passed and the President approved 2 landmarks in the history of education—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Higher Education Act.

The purpose of this legislation was to improve the quality of education in every school district in the country and to provide an opportunity for every qualified American youngster to obtain a higher education if he has the determination.

In helping the progress of education, Congress was following a tradition almost as old as our country itself. Shortly after we became a nation the Federal Government authorized the establishment of agricultural experiment stations and many of these later developed into full-time colleges. But the biggest boost to education came during the Civil War when Federal legislation brought about the beginning of the land-grant colleges.

This came about when Congress passed an Act transferring Federal land to the various states on condition that the revenue from these lands should be used for educational purposes. The wisdom of that act is shown by the fact that today every state has at least one land-grant college or university.

The Office of Education is now just 100 years old. Its creation was sponsored a century ago by Representative James A. Garfield, a member of the House of Representatives who later became one of our martyred presidents. The purpose of the Office was to keep an eye on the public school system which was then enjoying its greatest period of growth.

Today the primary responsibility for the public school system rests upon the states and local communities, just as it always has. However, in thousands of school districts, local education boards faced an alarming crisis a few years ago because of expanding population and rising costs. This was especially true in school districts where a large percentage of the children came from low income homes. It was to help meet this crisis that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was enacted 2 years ago.

This year, the sum available in Federal grants for schools in the Fifth Congressional District totals $3,790,930. This Federal aid is based upon the presence in the 7 counties of more than 26,000 pupils who come from low income families.

This is now the second full year of operation for this Federal aid program. Educators believe it is too early to appraise the benefits or the shortcomings of this program. However, there is general agreement that the ultimate outcome will be a better school system functioning under the supervision of a better-paid teaching corps.

It has been well said that you can have education without democracy. But you cannot have democracy without education.

Thank you for listening.

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is true that every nation has a special day which is significant in its history. This day is a day of rededication and of patriotic celebration. Rumania has such a day—May 10—a day commemorating the anniversary of Rumanian independence. It is also true that some nations have a history of misfortune and suffering. Rumania has such a history.

After centuries of Turkish domination, Rumania declared her independence on May 10, 1877. Realizing that this was a day of dedication, the Rumanians had no illusions about the difficulties of maintaining their independence and governing their country. Yet the Rumanians on that day could not have foreseen the national tragedy which would befall them even before the end of World War II. Turkish domination was replaced by Russian domination—no less cruel, no less a national disaster.

The Soviet domination of Rumania is a tragedy, but there is no finality in this tragedy. Indeed, there have been stirrings, as Rumania attempts to move toward greater economic freedom, to a reassertion of things Rumanian, and to greater cultural contacts with the West.

It has been said that it was Rumania's misfortune to border the Soviet Union. It can also be said that it is Rumania's fortune to have a brave and patriotic citizenry. It is difficult to salute a people who know tragedy, for the words must seem somewhat irrelevant coming from someone who has not shared their trials. We can, however, commemorate the Independence Day of the Rumanians. We can reaffirm our belief that on some future day they will be free, just as the Rumania of today is reaffirming the same belief. We commemorate a proud and brave people who have been overrun by conquerors and invaders through most of their known history—but who have constantly, tirelessly attempted to reassert their independence.

To Rumanians in their native land, and to Rumanians throughout the world, we extend our hope on this Independence Day that the bonds oppressing them will someday rust and crumble. We all look forward to that May 10 when Rumanians can celebrate their independence day as free citizens of a free country.

Draft Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 10, 1967

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, each year the Congress is called upon to pass thousands of new laws touching upon all aspects of our society. Many knowledgeable persons request the Members of this House and the other body to adopt laws making it a crime under the Federal statutes to commit certain offenses. Yet the Members of this body well know that many of these proposed laws are unnecessary now, and will be in the future, if those charged with the responsibility of enforcing the law would carry out their sworn duty.

A case in point occurred only yesterday before the House Armed Services Committee during the testimony of Gen. Mark W. Clark, now retired. General Clark urged the committee, according to news accounts, to make it a "very severe punishable offense" for anyone to encourage the youth of our country to evade the obligation of military service under the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

Mr. Speaker, judging by the present attitude of the Justice Department toward such matters, it is entirely understandable that General Clark and others concerned about the security of our country could feel that no law presently exists to regulate conduct such as is now occurring in too many parts of America. But there is such a law. It is already "a very severe punishable offense" under existing Federal statute to encourage others to evade the draft law. Imprisonment for up to 5 years and a fine of up to $10,000 is severe punishment under any standards—and that is what the law now provides for such an offense.

Specifically, I refer to section 12(a) of the Universal Military Training and Service Act. This section declares that whoever "evades or refuses registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title, or who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the Armed Forces or any of the requirements of this title or who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise or who conspires to" do so, is in violation of the provisions of this act.

Subsection (b)(3) of the same section applies to anyone who "knowingly destroys, knowingly mutilates" a draft card. Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, this section is being enforced by the FBI. But the enforcement of this section alone merely reaches those who have violated the law after being encouraged to do so. Such enforcement does not reach those principals who encouraged such acts in the past and continue to do so today with apparent impunity.

Members of this body well know that it is the duty of the Department of Justice to enforce the law, both civilly and criminally. It is not now, nor has it ever been, the responsibility of that Department to pass upon the validity of laws passed by the Congress before taking any action under them, to decide whether it wants to carry out those laws. The duty of interpreting the laws, and testing their constitutionality, is both historically and constitutionally the duty of the courts. If we allow our own Justice Department to permanently settle into a pattern of deciding what laws it wants to enforce, and those which it does not want to enforce, then we have openly condoned the substitution of the rule of men for the rule of law, right here in the Nation's Capital.

Further, the discussion in the House yesterday made it abundantly clear that the section mentioned is not the only law which applies to this situation. Section 2388 of title 18 of the United States Code also applies when properly construed in light of the emergency which was declared in December of 1950.

This is the section which makes it a punishable offense for anyone to willfully cause "insubordination, disloyalty, mutiny, or refusal of duty, in the military or naval forces of the United States, or willfully obstructs the recruiting or enlistment service of the United States or attempts to do so."

Mr. Speaker, such acts have occurred within the largest city within my congressional district; they have occurred within the largest city within this Nation; and they have occurred elsewhere. There is no need to name names. The identity of the perpetrators is well known, for they seek, rather than avoid, publicity. They openly parade their contempt for the laws of this country before the entire Nation. No bloodhound is needed to track them down.

And yet, as pointed out here yesterday, the representative of the Department of Justice candidly declares that no one has been prosecuted under existing Federal law for such an offense "within his experience." Apparently this Department has no intention of obtaining any such "experience" until it is forced to do so.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow this situation to continue. We should not allow the Justice Department to continue to say that it will not enforce this or that law because it thinks enforcement might violate this or that amendment of the U.S. Constitution. Every lawyer Member of this body is well familiar with the rule that no right guaranteed under the Bill of Rights is an absolute right. It is a cardinal principle that all of our rights must be exercised with due regard for the rights of others and the rights of society.

The Congress has already declared that it is not a proper exercise of the right of free speech to encourage others to violate the draft law. It is now incumbent upon the Attorney General to carry out that law. It is not for him to decide whether he likes that law, or the duty it imposes. The Attorney General is sworn to uphold the law, and he should either uphold it or resign in favor of someone who will.

Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body feel so strongly about this matter that I will ask their support in a few days for a resolution I plan to offer which will call upon the President to direct the Attorney General to enforce the law as intended by the Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1967

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Edward G. Carroll, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Let us then with confidence draw near to the throne of grace, that we may receive mercy and find grace to help in time of need.—Hebrews 4: 16.

Let us pray. Gracious Father of our spirits, we thank Thee for this day and the opportunity to feel the strength that surrounds us, to follow the light that indwells us, and to appropriate the wisdom Thou givest liberally to all who ask of Thee.

Bless those who sit in this Chamber and other places of Government. Endow them with sensitiveness, pure purposes, and determination to the end that they legislate justly and assure for all people the fruition of their fullest potential.

Grant unto them the grace of penitence that they may not grow insensible to their need of forgiveness, from one another, and from Thee; but seek cleansing in communion that they may walk into that heaven of freedom where the mind is without fear and the head is held high. In Thy name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on May 5, 1967, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 286. An act to permit duty-free treatment pursuant to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 of dicyandiamide and of limestone when imported to be used in the manufacture of cement.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6133. An act to authorize appropriations for the saline water conversion program, to expand the program, and for other purposes.

THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS—PERMISSION TO FILE PRIVILEGED REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES AND DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATION BILL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1968

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight, May 12, 1967, to file a privileged report on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968.

Mr. JONAS reserved all points of order on the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

TO RENAME THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill which I have introduced for consideration and approval of the House is one which will appropriately and deservingly rename the National Institutes of Health—the John E. Fogarty Health Institutes.

I do not intend to eulogize the late Congressman Fogarty—for this was done by others who are far more eloquent than I at the time of his regrettable passing. Nor do I intend to recite the long list of humane contributions made by John Fogarty to the cause of national and international health and to the field of medical research—for they are his well-known legacy. What I do propose is that the National Institutes of Health, which John Fogarty did so much to nourish and foster, become not only his monument in spirit and word, but his monument in name.

In a memorial address to Representative Fogarty, Senator Edmund Muskie, of Maine, said John Fogarty's "long and devoted support helped make the National Institutes of Health one of the most outstanding centers for medical research in the world. The importance today of NIH is, in large part, a monument to Congressman Fogarty's work."

His colleagues and mine in the House also recognized John Fogarty's contributions to the National Institutes of Health in a far more intimate way. In similar memorial addresses, Representative Frank Bow acknowledged "that the great institutes of health in Bethesda stand as a lasting memorial" to the beloved Congressman Fogarty; and Representative Leonor Sullivan made the moving yet accurate assessment of John Fogarty's role in man's unceasing drive against disease—and I quote:

> Trained as a bricklayer, he used a good mind and a flair for politics to build, unit by unit, as great building blocks in a great scheme of health research, the renowned National Institutes of Health as part of an expanded United States Public Health Service. This will be his greatest monument.

The intent of this bill is to inscribe on that monument the name of its principal architect—John Edward Fogarty.

It has often been said that "the good men do, lives after them." To this maxim I would add "that the recognition for good done, should also live on." No more fitting or enduring recognition could be accorded John Fogarty and his works than to affix his name upon his labor of love—upon those health institutes which his dedication and foresight helped to create and mature.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON MANNED SPACE FLIGHT OF THE COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND ASTRONAUTICS TO SIT TODAY DURING GENERAL DEBATE

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Manned Space Flight of the Committee on Science and Astronautics may sit this afternoon during general debate.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

BRUCE PETTERSON

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the NASA Oversight Subcommittee of the Committee on Science and Astronautics brought to a close its public hearings concerned with the subcommittee's investigation of the Apollo spacecraft fire at Cape Kennedy which took the lives of three courageous and gallant astronauts last January.

During the course of yesterday's hearings, we learned of a very serious accident that occurred at NASA's Flight Test Center in California when another of NASA's aerospace pilots nearly lost his life and is right now hospitalized in critical condition.

Mr. Bruce Petterson, the pilot, was in the process of flight testing a lifting body, which is a prototype spacecraft designed for aerodynamic flight and for landing on earth rather than at sea.

I want to direct the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Petterson is another outstanding young man of our aerospace team who is laying his life on the line for his country's progress in the exploration of space. I also want to point out to the House that Mr. Peterson is a very serious and dedicated professional test pilot and engineer. He attended the University of California at Los Angeles and graduated from the California State Polytechnical College at San Luis Obispo with a bachelor's degree in aeronautical engineering. As an experimental test pilot and marine flyer, he came to NASA in 1960 where he has been working as an aeronautical research pilot-engineer ever since.

Therefore, you can see that Mr. Petterson is a man of very considerable substance and accomplishment. I am proud to say that he now makes his home in Lancaster, Calif. I am also proud to salute him as a very courageous American who is contributing his career and his future to the progress of the United States. I heartily wish for him a speedy and full recovery from his injuries.

REGULATIONS FOR ADMISSION TO THE PENTAGON

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, several years ago I went to the Pentagon on business. I did not have an ID card. I was a taxpaying citizen, and a Member of Congress, and I had a hard time getting in. I had to call the general with whom I had an appointment and have him vouch for me.

I think it is an understatement to say that times have changed. Yesterday—and I understand again today—one of the corridors in the Pentagon is filled with people who do not shave and who do not bathe and who do not love America. They are blocking the corridor that leads to the offices of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We are told they cannot be removed.

Oh, that we had one platoon of Marines who have served in Vietnam and who have returned, that we could put them in the Pentagon.

I hope and pray that before the sun goes down, some kind of regulations will be promulgated making it impossible for people to go into the Pentagon, while we are waging a war, unless they have business there and can be properly identified as true, loyal, American citizens.

LAWLESSNESS WILL NOT BE TOLERATED

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. **KYL**. Mr. Speaker, a civil rights leader recently indicated that Washington would be the target for summer-long activities. Following this announcement there has been a succession of intemperate statements concerning extreme measures which would be taken by demonstrators during that so-called long, hot summer. We have recently heard of citizens arming themselves and of organizations asking Americans to take up arms for guerrilla activity on one side and for self-protection on the other. A potentially dangerous situation arises.

Free expression must be protected by appropriate measures. Obedience to law must also be guaranteed.

This is the time, Mr. Speaker, when the municipal building, the White House, and the Congress must make it absolutely clear that lawlessness will not be tolerated. Those citizens who would take the law in their own hands for promotion of causes or for their own protection should be advised of the possible consequences. They should be told that the police and military forces stationed in the area will be ordered to keep law and order, and that the safety, welfare, and property of local citizens and visitors will be protected by whatever means are necessary.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL EDUCATION OF THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR TO SIT TODAY

Mr. **PUCINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on General Education of the Committee on Education and Labor be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate for the purpose of taking testimony.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 4 OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO SIT DURING GENERAL DEBATE MAY 15, 1967

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 4 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit during general debate on May 15, 1967.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE WIDOWS UNDER WAR ORPHANS EDUCATIONAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **RESNICK**. Mr. Speaker, there are many varying points of view on how we should conduct the Vietnam war. However, there is one point on which I am certain we all agree—that the men who so bravely serve our country and the families of these men, should receive all of the assistance it is humanly possible to give. This is especially true of those families of men who have given their lives in service to America.

It has come to my attention that under the presently existing war orphans' educational assistance program, widows of men who died as a result of service-connected disabilities are not extended the same educational benefits that are available to their children.

I believe that the Members of this Congress and the American public will agree with me when I say that there are few things that are more important today than education. In order to make a decent living in our highly complex world, either a college or other specialized education is virtually a minimum requirement.

Mr. Speaker, we try in every way possible to provide for widows of the men who serve to defend our country in the far corners of the earth—but this is one area that we have overlooked.

In order to correct this deficiency in the present law, I am today introducing a bill which would amend the present law to include widows of our fighting men. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in support of this much needed legislation, and to see that it becomes law as quickly as possible.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON RULES TO FILE CERTAIN PRIVILEGED REPORTS UNTIL MIDNIGHT TONIGHT

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **WYDLER**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Barrett
Blatnik
Bow
Brademas
Broomfield
Cabell
Cederberg
Collier
Dawson
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hawkins
Holifield
Howard
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Pa.
Kee
Kelly
Kluczynski
Landrum
Lukens
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
Martin
Meeds
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Nix
Pike
Pool
Price, Ill.
Randall
Ronan
Rosenthal
Roybal
St Germain
St. Onge
Stafford
Stanton
Stephens
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Watkins
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wolff
Younger
Zion

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 367 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SPACE PROGRAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 122)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Science and Astronautics and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress this report of continued progress in the Nation's space program.

The report covers the months January to June 1966. Since then, the risk to human life and the formidable technical difficulties that must accompany the exploration of space were vividly brought home to every American by the tragic fire which cost the lives of three of our brave astronauts.

The way to the stars was never thought to be easy. But the goal we seek promises such great benefits to mankind that we must press on. We must surmount difficulty and lessen danger so we can continue in the steady pursuit of this historic mission.

The achievements reported here reflect not only our progress in space flight, but also new steps taken toward the real objective of all our efforts in space—the application of new knowledge to bettering the lives of all people. Already, we see dramatic examples of success in the satellites which have improved our weather forecasts and navigation, and which are extending radio and television communication to the farthermost regions of the earth.

We are determined that space be kept free from the weapons of war. Just recently the Senate ratified the Treaty on Outer Space. This historic action dramatizes our continuing efforts to cooperate with other nations in conducting experiments, sharing data, and developing controls to assure that the space efforts of every nation will serve the cause, not of war, but of peace and prosperity for all mankind. The Senate's action, taken without a dissenting vote, enables me to reaffirm as President what I said as a Senator to the United Nations in 1958:

> On the goal of dedicating outer space to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, there are no differences within our government, between our parties or among our people.

The U.S. space program, as reflected in this report, continues to exemplify our Nation's conviction that the road to peace, progress, and abundance is through continued cooperation among all nations.

I commend this report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1967.*

INVESTMENT CREDIT AND ALLOWANCE OF ACCELERATED DEPRECIATION IN THE CASE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. CURTIS.

PROVIDING FUNDS FOR THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 400 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 400

Resolved, That, effective January 3, 1967, in carrying out its duties during the Ninetieth Congress, the Committee on Rules is authorized to incur such expenses (not in excess of $5,000) as it deems advisable. Such expenses shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized and approved by such committee, and signed by the chairman thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, and after line 7, add the following:

"SEC. 2. Funds authorized by this resolution shall be expended pursuant to regulations established by the Committee on House Administration under existing law."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENT FROM THE CONTINGENT FUND OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FOR OFFICIAL OFFICE EXPENSES OF MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE INCURRED OUTSIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 161 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 161

Resolved, That, effective January 1, 1967, until otherwise provided by law, the Clerk of the House of Representatives is authorized and directed to reimburse each Member, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives an additional $450 quarterly, upon certification of such Member or Resident Commissioner, for official office expenses incurred outside the District of Columbia. Such amounts shall be in addition to any other amounts provided by law for such expenses.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"That effective January 3, 1967, until otherwise provided by law, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall reimburse each Member, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, not to exceed $300 quarterly for charges for strictly official telephone service incurred outside the District of Columbia, upon submission to the Clerk of a receipt showing payment by such Member or Resident Commissioner of such charges. Any unused portion of each such quarterly allowance shall lapse. The Committee on House Administration shall make such rules and regulations as it deems necessary to carry out this resolution. The amounts provided in this resolution shall be in addition to any other amounts provided by law which may be available for payment of such charges."

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

I should like to ask the gentleman from Maryland why this particular increase, to be provided out of the contingency fund of the House, to be used outside of the District of Columbia, comes up at this particular time; and what is involved; and whether in fact it is needed or not.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Reports from many, many Members indicate an increase is very much needed.

The money comes out of the contingency fund until otherwise provided in the budget.

The purpose of this resolution is to reimburse Members for telephone service in their home districts, up to $100 a month. There were a number of Members who came before the committee and showed bills of $120 to $140 a month for telephone service in their districts.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman if there is not now a $300-a-quarter allowance provided out of the same fund to cover these same expenses?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The $300 quarterly is provided for district office expenses, but it is not sufficient to cover all of the expenses. Many of the Members have to rent typewriters, duplicating machines, and other needed office equipment. We have had statement after statement which showed $700 or $800 a month for official expenses back in home districts.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I do understand that the $300 quarterly allowance does cover other needed expenses for equipment in the various districts, but I ask the gentleman further if he would care to reply as to why the regular telephone allowance cannot be used for other than the installation and monthly rental of the instrument? So far as the cost within the district is concerned, is there anything to preclude using the regular units provided to all Members in the district, whether they telephone from that end on their credit card, or whether they telephone from this end?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This resolution does not pertain to long-distance calls alone, because Members may use credit cards for that. I believe there are enough units to cover that.

This is for the cost of all telephone service in the home districts. We saw statement after statement, particularly from California, where the monthly telephone bill runs from $120 to $140. In some areas there are five different boroughs where there is a charge of up to 25 cents a call which is charged to the Member. There are other charges for installation and rent which causes the phone bills to run high.

The original resolution called for $150 a month each month to be paid $450 quarterly. The committee felt that this sum was not justified and limited it to telephone service in addition to the existing $300.

It passed the subcommittee by a unanimous vote.

Mr. HALL. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that it passed the committee and the subcommittee by unanimous vote?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It passed the subcommittee by a unanimous vote, and passed the full committee by a tremendous majority.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that no one wants to put undue duress on the other Members, whether they be from one coast or the other, but it does seem to me this is not a question of expense, but it is a question of management. I am one of those who feel there is adequate provision under existing rules and funding for these expenses if they are properly handled and managed, regardless of the number of offices maintained, and regardless of the situation insofar as the duties of a Representative in Congress are concerned. I shall oppose the resolution. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to ask the gentleman what has happened to the mail service, or is there no mail service in the congressional districts? Has mail service so deteriorated that we must add $1,200 to every Member's telephone account in his or her district?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No. It is a matter of usage. The telephone is standard in offices and homes, and has earned its place in modern life; an office could hardly operate without one. If there is no telephone expense, then no funds would be used. A Member may be reimbursed the cost of monthly telephone service up to $100 a month.

Mr. GROSS. But this would add $1,200 to each Member's telephone account per year.

Mr. FRIEDEL. If it is used. If it is not used, it will not. It cannot go over $100, and it could be much less.

Mr. GROSS. That is a good deal like

certain witnesses appearing before some of the committees. They say, "Give us the money. We may not need it, but be sure to give us more money than is ample for immediate needs. Just be sure to make available." Invariably it goes down the drain. The trouble is, I will say to my friend from Maryland, this Government is going deeper into debt all the time, and as the country plunges deeper into debt it seems to become easier for some people to spend the taxpayer's money. I just do not believe each Member ought to have another $1,200 a year to be spent on telephone service in his or her congressional district.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Members do not get it unless they produce a bill for the telephone service.

Mr. GROSS. But it is an expenditure of an additional $1,200 a year.

Mr. FRIEDEL. No. Only if it is used. I do not have a $100 a month phone bill.

Mr. GROSS. It is available to be used. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. FRIEDEL. But it may be used only to the extent of a bona fide phone bill.

Mr. GROSS. It is a further and unnecessary sacrifice on the altar of government on the part of the taxpayers. Let us cut out some of this foolishness.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendment thereto.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution, as amended.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 189, nays 157, not voting 87, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—189

Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Bell
Bingham
Blanton
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brasco
Brooks
Broyhill, Va.
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Cahill
Carey
Chamberlain
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Derwinski
Dickinson
Dingell
Dow
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Garmatz
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gonzalez
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hardy
Hays
Hébert
Heckler, Mass.
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Hungate
Jacobs
Johnson, Pa.
Jones, Ala.
Karsten
Karth
Kazen
Keith
King, Calif.
Kirwan
Kyros
Leggett
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClure
McDade
McFall
Macdonald, Mass.
MacGregor
Machen
Madden
Mailliard
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Mink
Monagan
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Poage
Pollock
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rees
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers
Roberts
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rostenkowski
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Saylor
Scheuer
Shipley
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vigorito
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Whalen
White
Whitten
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—157

Abbitt
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Ala.
Arends
Ashbrook
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Bevill
Biester
Blackburn
Bolton
Bray
Brinkley
Brock
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Bush
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Clancy
Cleveland
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Culver
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Dellenback
Denney
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Findley
Fisher
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Galifianakis
Gardner
Gathings
Gettys
Goodling
Gross
Gude
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hammerschmidt
Harrison
Harvey
Hechler, W. Va.
Henderson
Herlong
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jarman
Joelson
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kuykendall
Kyl
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lloyd
McClory
McCulloch
Mahon
Marsh
Mayne
Meskill
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Montgomery
Moore
Myers
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Neal, Ga.
Patten
Pirnie
Poff
Price, Tex.
Pryor
Rarick
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Riegle
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roth
Roudebush
Roush
Satterfield
Schadeberg
Scherle
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stuckey
Taft
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tuck
Utt
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Wampler
Watson
Watts
Whitener
Widnall
Winn
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Zwach

NOT VOTING—87

Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashmore
Barrett
Betts
Blatnik
Bow
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Cabell
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Collier
Cowger
Cramer
Dawson
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Grover
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Holifield
Howard
Irwin
Johnson, Calif.
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Kluczynski
Laird
Landrum
Lukens
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
McMillan
Martin
Meeds
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Nix
Pike
Pool
Price, Ill.
Randall
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rodino
Rosenthal
Roybal
St Germain
St. Onge
Smith, Calif.
Stafford
Stanton
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Watkins
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Young
Younger
Zion

So the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Mosher.
Mr. Annunzio with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Multer with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Rodino with Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Smith of California.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Martin.
Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Lukens.
Mr. Gray with Mr. Grover.
Mr. Holifield with Mr. Goodell.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Duncan of Tennessee.
Mr. Price of Illinois with Mr. Cederberg.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Bow.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Betts.
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Broomfield.
Mr. Morgan with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Pike with Mr. Devine.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Dole.
Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Zion.
Mr. Hathaway with Mr. Younger.
Mr. Howard with Mr. Harsha.
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Williams of Mississippi with Mr. McEwen.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Laird.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Casey with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Meeds.
Mr. Young with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Randall with Mr. Stanton.
Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Hawkins.
Mrs. Green of Oregon with Mr. Stafford.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Irwin.
Mr. Resnick with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Dorn.
Mr. Fraser with Mr. Dowdy.
Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Willis.
Mrs. Hansen of Washington with Mr. Pool.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL CAPITOL POLICE FOR DUTY UNDER THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 464 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 464

Resolved, That, in addition to the number of officers and members of the Capitol Police and of personnel detailed to the Capitol Police from the Metropolitan Police of the District of Columbia existing on the date of adoption of this resolution, there are hereby authorized to be established seventy-three positions of private, four positions of sergeant, and one position of captain on the Capitol Police for duty under the House of Representatives. Appointments to such additional positions shall be made by the Capitol Police Board, subject to the prior approval of the Committee on House Administration, without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of the positions. The compensation for such additional positions shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, based on previous experience with salary increases, and so forth, I would suggest that those people who voted for the preceding resolution wait a little bit before they file their telephone bill because they might get trampled on in the rush of those who voted against it in trying to get theirs approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure that we all need the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio in the pay department. There are other departments in which we might make a few suggestions to him.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman how many Capitol police we now have.

Mr. FRIEDEL. There are 200 privates and 14 officers on the House side.

Mr. GROSS. How many of the Metropolitan Police Department are detailed to the Capitol?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I do not know, but there are quite a few around. There are 25 permanently detailed, and 15 additional are assigned at various times.

Mr. GROSS. How many police are there at the Supreme Court?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I do not know that. We have no jurisdiction over police detailed to the Supreme Court.

Mr. GROSS. How many do we have in these various setups here at the Capitol patrolling the grounds at night?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am sure the number varies depending on the shifts, availability of personnel, and general conditions. I am also sure the number is inadequate to cover all the buildings and grounds to full security.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, how many dogs are there?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I understand there are six and these are considered to be inadequate for required coverage.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is unable to put a numerical value on the number of police that there are available on Capitol Hill? Is that the answer?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No. There are 200 privates and 14 officers under House jurisdiction.

Mr. GROSS. We are today dealing with a bill that I understand provides for an increase of 73 police at the Capitol.

Mr. FRIEDEL. To my distinguished colleague from Iowa let me say that we are doing away with an antiquated system of a 6-day workweek and putting policemen on a 5-day week. The changeover provides for a new leave system geared to tenure. We need 33 more men for these purposes. Also we need 40 more men for the new parking facilities soon to be opened south of the Rayburn and Longworth Building. Twenty-four-hour police coverage will be provided. Even so there might be a shortage of policemen. The additional positions are very much needed.

Mr. GROSS. I am amazed that we have no detailed information as to the total number of police.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I told you we have 200 privates.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the others that patrol this area right here of the Capitol Grounds and just off of the Capitol Grounds.

Mr. FRIEDEL. You know there are quite a few around here. The number of men on duty varies according to shifts and conditions.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. At the present time we have 200 Capitol Police on the House side. When you divide by 3 shifts plus a 5-day week, it is the same as dividing by 4, which means for four buildings plus two new garages, which would be six installations, you have 50 Capitol Police available at any one time. That is not very many. As to the number of the Metropolitan Police, we pay the Metropolitan Police corps $160,000 a year for the police that they furnish to the Capitol.

At approximately $6,000 per year per man, one would come out, then, somewhere around 25 Metropolitan Police, and then dividing that by 4, one would find about 6 at any one time.

That is not quite a fair appraisal, because we have some plainclothesmen detailed up here during the day who are not detailed here in the evening hours or at night.

At night, it is my opinion it is fair to say that there are one or two with dogs patroling the Capitol Grounds. In view of some of the things which have happened in the very recent past, crimes perpetrated upon the various Congressmen and their staffs, this number is inadequate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that there can be much argument made with reference to the fact that we have an inadequate police force and that we should attempt to try to do something about it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland yield to me at this point?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I am happy to yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my opinion that it was last year when we approved an increase of about 50 in additional policemen. A recommendation was made at that time—and it was approved by the House—to the effect that the men should be selected upon the basis of merit and not upon the basis of patronage.

I presume the committee and the Board is proceeding upon that basis?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes. The system operates on that basis.

My statement is to the effect that appointments to the additional positions, while being subject to the Capitol Police Board—such appointments are subject to prior approval by the Committee on House Administration, without regard to political affiliation, and such appointments are made solely upon the basis of ability and such abilities as to meet the test of an effective policeman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the distinguished gentleman from Maryland will yield further, I would like to ask the gentleman who is on the Capitol Police Board?

Mr. FRIEDEL. The Architect of the Capitol, the Sergeant at Arms of the House, and the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

In other words, these men who will be appointed under this resolution will not come under the jurisdiction of the patronage committee.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Maryland yield further?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes; I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, how long has the Board been in operation? Quite frankly, I have never heard of it.

Mr. FRIEDEL. For many, many years. I do not know when the Board was first established.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Has it previously had this function?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No. In the years prior to 1966, the patronage committee selected the appointees. Under legislation passed in 1966, the Capital Police Board is required to make selections without regard to political affiliation and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the required duties.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Maryland will yield further, did the Capitol Police force select the nonpatronage policemen last year?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does the Committee on House Administration subsequently approve each individual after the Capitol Police Board has made its recommendations?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Appointments are made by the Capitol Police Board subject to the prior approval of the Committee on House Administration.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Does the resolution grant the appointment authority to the Capitol Police Board, subject to the prior approval of the House Committee on Administration?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. You do not select them?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No; we do not select them. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for yielding.

Mr. WIDNALL. What is the difference in the powers of a Metropolitan policeman as contrasted between those of a Capitol policeman here on Capitol Hill?

Do they have the same powers under which to make arrests?

Mr. FRIEDEL. Yes.

Mr. WIDNALL. It is just a question of jurisdiction?

Mr. FRIEDEL. It involves the jurisdiction here on Capitol Hill. Our police have comparable arrest powers to those of the Metropolitan Police, except that it is limited to Capitol Grounds.

Mr. WIDNALL. The Capitol Hill policemen do not have the power of other policemen under which to issue a ticket for an automobile?

Mr. FRIEDEL. For an automobile?

Mr. WIDNALL. For an automobile.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Surely, they do.

Mr. WIDNALL. While the Metropolitan Police do have that power?

Mr. FRIEDEL. No; only a Capitol policeman may issue a traffic ticket in areas where we have exclusive jurisdiction.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if that portion of the recommendations of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, and its related agencies, pertaining to the Capitol Police were available to the distinguished gentleman and the committee at the time that the resolution, House Resolution 406, came out of the committee?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I will say to the gentleman it was available. We heard the testimony of the Chief of Police and the Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I think it is important that there was a consideration of the recommendation of the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, which went into this problem, because it does affect both Houses in considerable detail. Among other things, it recognizes, of course, that which has already been brought out here today, that there are a minimum of five different organizations of police in the Nation's Capital City. The recommendations specifically were also for an increase in the number of Capitol Police, I will say to the gentleman. I am not sure it recommended 78 additional police, including one additional captain and four additional sergeants, but it went along generally with the testimony of the Chief of Police, and the Sergeant at Arms, and others who appeared before our joint committee. However, it went into considerably greater detail about one of the questions which I think is bothering Members of the House; namely, the question of the Capitol Police Board, and/or the question of patronage; but more specifically it went into the techniques of recruitment from the various sources in the Metropolitan Police downtown including avoidance of proselyting. There is a real danger here, and they too have recruiting problems. Second, it went into the question of training and inspection and the presentability of the Capitol Police force to the visiting public.

Finally, it went into considerable detail as far as the Capitol Police force is concerned about removing "moonlighting," not that the joint committee had anything against a policeman bettering himself while serving on duty by appointment of the House or the Senate or the joint committee, or the Capitol Police Control Board, or any other organization; but the fact that a man cannot be alert if he is going to law school and/or the salary involved was not requisite for both.

Mr. Speaker, the point that I am trying to make before the Members of the House is that this is another area in which the Committee on the Organization of the Congress is being undercut, whether with intent or otherwise, whether of necessity or because of delay on the part of the Committee on Rules in turning out some bill on the reorganization of Congress. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that one at a time we are chipping away at the two and a half years of hearings, the long hours of executive session of the joint committee in marking up its bill, a bill the other body has passed, and in its report by action such as this in piecemeal legislation. The legislative assistant was one instance, the Committee on Standards and Conduct, and this is another. I could give a half dozen examples, the vacation during August is another, which is before the Committee on Rules this week.

I just wondered if it is the will of the House that we do this and completely undercut the studies, recommendations, and report of this joint committee, of which this present resolution is just one example?

Mr. FRIEDEL. This is not undercutting the report. The report is rather dormant right now, but we had to do something immediately on the 5-day week, and also to provide coverage for the additional two garages.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I will only take exception to that portion of the gentleman's statement saying that the report is dormant right now. I would say that it has passed the other body, and it is now in the Committee on Rules. If the number of inquiries and calls I've had this week means anything and I feel that they do, in the Committee on Rules and the Joint Committee, I believe it is erroneous to say it is dormant, I can only hope that something will come forth from all this labor without further travail.

I oppose this bill because of the above, plus the fact that every morning I walk two blocks to the office and count seven Capitol policemen out of doors. Last evening Mrs. Hall and I walked around the Botanical Gardens to the Mall, to the Peace Monument and back around the Capitol. We counted 20 police and two dogs. Finally, this is not the solution, as we all know—but rather the courts and judiciary backing up and lending credence to the constabulary we do have.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to try to clear up one point. That is that it is not the intent of the Committee on House Administration to undercut in any way the reorganization of the Congress. The Committee on House Administration is very much aware of its responsibilities. We are aware this is a temporary need right now as requested by the Chief of Police, to provide for the additional officers to cover the additional duties that have not existed heretofore.

We and the police felt that we could not wait pending the action of the Committee on Rules or the action of the House on the reorganization bill to provide these officers.

We felt very strongly that we should have professional officers. We felt they should be trained and that they should be selected on the basis of merit and that they should not be permitted to moonlight.

I have urged this in committee. Yesterday, we discussed setting up a special committee within the House Committee on Administration to make a comprehensive overall study of our police system. This study would include where officers are stationed, what their duty hours are and what, if any, additional force we would need in the future.

So if this will allay any misapprehensions, I would point out that we are not trying to undercut anything, but we are trying to do the very thing that has been recommended and I think it needs to be done right now.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. I simply want to emphasize what our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL], said about the work of the Joint Committee on Organization, of which I am the ranking Republican member.

This is a subject matter that we went into in considerable depth, in conjunction with our colleagues in the Senate. This bill was the first bill in the order of business in the Senate during the 90th Congress and it was passed, and it has been pending here.

There are a lot of things that can be done to obtain better functioning of the House. It just seems to me this bill has been in cold storage for 5 weeks in the Committee on Rules. I hope that this committee, like the present committee, when they get into these things will take a broader look at it. There are people in the other body who are very concerned about these problems on Capitol Hill too, and whatever is done here must be and should be coordinated with what the other body does.

I hope the membership will take an interest in the comprehensiveness of the reorganization bill. Maybe if we got it on the floor of the House, a lot of these piecemeal things that are coming up could be dispensed with. One of the recommendations, of course, of the committee was for a permanent ethics committee and I was glad in a way that we picked that out and moved it forward.

But if we are just going to keep a bill in the Committee on Rules, I call upon the leadership of the House to get that thing moved, so that we can solve a lot of these problems, including the matter of the police force.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FRIEDEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. I just want to ask a simple question. Will the gentleman state for the RECORD so that we will all know, what the qualifications are for the officers who are appointed on a nonpatronage basis and what their specific training is? Would the gentleman explain that so that we may have it in the RECORD?

Mr. FRIEDEL. That is a matter that comes under the Police Board and I would say to the gentleman that it has worked out very, very well in the past.

Mr. CAHILL. But I might say that I do not know what they are and if the gentleman knows what the qualifications are and the training or if anyone else in the House knows, we would appreciate that statement for the RECORD.

Mr. FRIEDEL. I would suggest to the gentleman that he can check with the Board and find out everything that he wants to know.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I want the Capitol, those who work here, and those who visit, to be protected.

However, I vote against this proposition as a protest against the manner in which the Capitol Police force is operated, and the manner in which this kind of legislation is considered.

The information concerning operations, qualification of officers, method of appointment and jurisdiction is totally inadequate. The relationship between the Capitol force and Metropolitan Police is not sufficiently clear.

Furthermore, it is painfully obvious that Capitol Police are not adequately trained unless they transfer from another system.

Sections of this bill dealing with leave provisions are good.

Capitol Police are a responsibility of the Congress. We are not properly fulfilling that responsibility.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 334, nays 16, not voting 83, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—334

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Aspinall
Ayres
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Biester
Bingham
Blackburn
Blanton
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Brademas
Brasco
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Brotzman
Brown, Mich.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke, Fla.
Burke, Mass.
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Bush
Button
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Carter
Casey
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Cowger
Culver
Cunningham
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dellenback
Denney
Dickinson
Donohue
Dow
Downing
Dulski
Dwyer
Eckhardt
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Edwards, La.
Eilberg
Erlenborn
Esch
Eshleman
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Galifianakis
Gardner
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gonzalez
Goodell
Goodling
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gude
Gurney
Hagan
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hammerschmidt
Hanley
Hardy
Harrison
Harvey
Hays
Hébert
Hechler, W. Va.
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Hunt
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Jones, N.C.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kazen
Keith
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
Kleppe
Kornegay
Kupferman
Kyros
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Lloyd
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McClure
McCulloch
McDade
McFall
McMillan
MacGregor
Machen
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Mathias, Calif.
Mathias, Md.
Matsunaga
May
Mayne
Meeds
Michel
Miller, Calif.
Miller, Ohio
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Monagan
Montgomery
Moore
Moorhead
Morris, N. Mex.
Morse, Mass.
Morton
Moss
Murphy, N.Y.
Myers
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nichols
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Pettis
Philbin
Pickle
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pollock
Pryor
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Railsback
Rarick
Rees
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riegle
Rivers
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Ruppe
Ryan
Sandman
Satterfield
Saylor
Schadeberg
Scherle
Scheuer
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Schwengel
Scott
Selden
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Okla.
Snyder
Springer
Staggers
Steed
Steiger, Ariz.
Steiger, Wis.
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Stuckey
Sullivan
Taft
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Ga.
Thompson, N.J.
Tiernan
Tuck
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vander Jagt
Vanik
Waggonner
Waldie
Walker
Wampler
Watson
Watts
White
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Wiggins
Williams, Pa.
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Wylie
Wyman
Yates
Zablocki

NAYS—16

Andrews, Ala.
Bevill
Brinkley
Cahill
Conte
Curtis
Derwinski
Gross
Hall
Heckler, Mass.
Kyl
Meskill
Roth
Whalen
Winn
Zwach

NOT VOTING—83

Addabbo
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Ashmore
Barrett
Betts
Bow
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Cabell
Carey
Cederberg
Celler
Cramer
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Dent
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Duncan
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Giaimo
Gilbert
Green, Pa.
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Wash.
Harsha
Hathaway
Hawkins
Holifield
Howard
Johnson, Calif.
Kee
Kelly
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kuykendall
Laird
Landrum
Lukens
McDonald, Mich.
McEwen
Macdonald, Mass.
Madden
Martin
Morgan
Mosher
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Nix
Patman
Pike
Pool
Price, Ill.
Price, Tex.
Randall
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roybal
St Germain
St. Onge
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Tenzer
Thomson, Wis.
Tunney
Udall
Vigorito
Watkins
Whalley
Williams, Miss.
Willis
Wolff
Young
Younger
Zion

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Dent with Mr. Andrews of North Dakota.

Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Younger.

Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Zion.

Mr. Holifield with Mr. Cramer.

Mr. Addabbo with Mr. Harsha.

Mr. Gilbert with Mr. Stanton.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Stafford.

Mr. Kirwan with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Roybal with Mr. Broomfield.

Mr. Howard with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Morgan with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Multer with Mr. Dawson.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Laird.

Mr. Barrett with Mr. Davis of Wisconsin.

Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Carey with Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Nix.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Talcott.

Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Lukens.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. McDonald of Michigan.

Mr. Brown of California with Mr. Mosher.

Mr. Pike with Mr. McEwen.

Mr. Rosenthal with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Martin.

Mr. Gallagher with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Kuykendall.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Price of Texas.

Mr. Macdonald of Massachusetts with Mr. Devine.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Duncan of Tennessee.

Mr. Udall with Mr. Dole.

Mr. Giaimo with Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

Mr. Rooney of Pennsylvania with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Price of Illinois with Mrs. Hansen of Washington.

Mr. Randall with Mr. Dowdy.

Mr. Murphy of Illinois with Mr. Hawkins.

Mr. Anderson of Tennessee with Mr. Williams of Mississippi.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Vigorito.

Mr. Dingell with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Young with Mr. Hathaway.
Mr. Cabell with Mr. St Germain.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF A COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS PRINT ENTITLED "THE FEDERAL SYSTEM AS SEEN BY FEDERAL AID OFFICIALS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 6, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 6

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations five thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "The Federal System as Seen by Federal Aid Officials", a study prepared by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING FOR THE USE OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF ITS JOINT COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "STATE AND LOCAL PUBLIC FACILITY NEEDS AND FINANCING"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 7, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 7

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand five hundred additional copies of volumes 1 and 2 of its joint committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "State and Local Public Facility Needs and Financing".

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF 1,500 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 17

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand five hundred additional copies of volumes 1, 2, and 3 of its joint committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session, entitled "Federal Programs for the Development of Human Resources".

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF 1,500 ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "AN ECONOMIC PROFILE OF MAINLAND CHINA"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up Senate Concurrent Resolution 18, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 18

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee one thousand five hundred additional copies of volumes 1 and 2 of its joint committee print of the Ninetieth Congress, first session, entitled "An Economic Profile of Mainland China".

The Senate concurrent resolution was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 200, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 200

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there is authorized to be printed as a House Document the Constitution of the United States, as amended through February 1967, with an analytical index and ancillaries regarding proposed amendments, prepared by Representative Emanuel Celler, of New York; and that two hundred and thirty-eight thousand additional copies be printed, of which twenty thousand shall be for the use of the House Committee on the Judiciary and the balance prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 7, strike out "thirty-eight thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-nine thousand five hundred".

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. I wonder why, in this resolution and in the resolution to follow, there are 20,000 copies allocated for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary to the exclusion of other committees and, of course, to the exclusion of the common, ordinary garden variety of Member of the House.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that this resolution and the one to follow were introduced, one by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary and the other by one of the ranking members, and that normally when resolutions are introduced by a committee chairman, a certain number are reserved for the committee and in some instances all of them are reserved for the committee.

It is my understanding that the "ordinary garden variety of Congressmen," to use the gentleman's words, can if he runs short request the Committee on the Judiciary for copies and if they have any copies, they will give them to him. At least that has been the practice in the past and I would hope it would be the practice in the future.

Mr. GROSS. With this special allocation, I would hope that that would be true, but of course we have no assurance as to that.

Mr. HAYS. I will say to the gentleman that he will have some assurance because if I, as chairman, find out that they have them and will not give them to Members who need them, I will see to it that this kind of provision does not go into these resolutions in the future.

Mr. GROSS. I appreciate the assurance of the gentleman and I would like to ask him one further question.

Do I understand that substantial cuts were made in most of the requests for printing as set forth in the calendar of resolutions here today?

Mr. HAYS. I cannot answer that question in the affirmative the way that the question is asked because in most of the bills that you see here, we gave them the number that they asked for but there were a number of bills or a substantial number of requests which were turned down altogether.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KYL. I would like to assure our colleague, the gentleman from Iowa and all Members of the House that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] has taken his responsibilities in regard to these printing matters very seriously and he has done a very careful job of considering these resolutions. The gentleman from Ohio should be commended for his efforts in this regard.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT "HOW OUR LAWS ARE MADE"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution

221, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 221

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the brochure entitled "How Our Laws Are Made", by Doctor Charles J. Zinn, law revision counsel of the House of Representatives Committee on the Judiciary, as set out in House Document 164 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, be printed as a House document, with emendations by the author and with a foreword by the Honorable Edwin E. Willis; and that there be printed two hundred and thirty-eight thousand additional copies, of which twenty thousand shall be for the use of the Committee on the Judiciary and the balance prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 9, strike out "thirty-eight thousand" and insert in lieu thereof "thirty-nine thousand five hundred".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF THE SOUTHEAST ASIA BRIEFING MAP, U.S. ARMY MAP SERVICE

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 253, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 253

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That (a) there shall be printed as a House document the Southeast Asia Briefing Map prepared by the United States Army Map Service (stock number 5213XSEABRM). The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

(b) In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed two hundred and sixty-eight thousand additional copies of such House document, of which fifty thousand copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and two hundred and eighteen thousand copies for the use of the House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all language on lines 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and insert in lieu thereof "That (a) there shall be printed as a House document certain maps and indicia relating to Vietnam and the Asian Continent. The design and type format shall be supervised by the Joint Committee on Printing."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "sixty-eight" and insert in lieu thereof "seventy-one".

On page 1, line 10, strike out "fifty" and insert in lieu thereof "fifty-one." Also on line 10, following the word "thousand" add the words "five hundred".

On page 2, line 1, strike out "eighteen" and insert in lieu thereof "nineteen". Also on line 1, following the word "thousand" add the words "five hundred".

On page 2, following line 2, add the following:

"Sec. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective Senate and House document rooms."

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by way of explanation, let me say that the original resolution provided a briefing map by the U.S. armed services which was a profile map and which did not have very many places designated therein by name, and which would require somebody experienced in map reading to really read the map and understand it.

In addition, the cost was about twice as much as the estimated cost of the substitute, which is $14,000. The committee substituted a map which is already being printed by the Hammond Co., which is an outstanding printer of maps, and which they had copyrighted. As I have said, it would cost about half as much and will cover both sides of the paper. It will be not only a map of Vietnam, but on the back there will be a map of all Asia. There is a map of Southeast Asia and, in addition, a relief map similar to the Army map. We thought it was a much better map, much easier to read and understand, and much cheaper. That is why we substituted it.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of certain maps and indicia relating to Vietnam and the Asian Continent."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "METROPOLITAN AMERICA: CHALLENGE TO FEDERALISM"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 279 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 279

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies of its committee print entitled "Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism," of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE PRINTING OF THE LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS AMENDMENTS OF 1966

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 281 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 281

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives one thousand copies of a compilation of the materials which constitute the legislative history of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE HEARINGS ENTITLED "SPECIAL INQUIRY ON INVASION OF PRIVACY" AND "THE COMPUTER AND INVASION OF PRIVACY"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 291 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 291

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives, five thousand additional copies of its committee hearings entitled, "Special Inquiry on Invasion of Privacy," and five thousand additional copies of its committee hearings entitled, "The Computer and Invasion of Privacy," of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first and second sessions.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF "WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT—SELECTIVE CHRONOLOGY, 1818–1957, PREPARED BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS—VOLUME 4, 1954–55," 89TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Concurrent Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. Con. Res. 309

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities three thousand five hundred additional copies of the publication entitled, "World Communist Movement—Selective Chronology 1818–1957 Prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress—Volume 4, 1954–1955," Eighty-Ninth Congress, first session.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, lines 2, 3, and 4, strikes out "for the use of the Committee on Un-American

Activities three thousand five hundred additional copies of" and insert in lieu thereof "as a House document with three thousand five hundred additional copies for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE REPORT ENTITLED "FOOD FOR PROGRESS IN LATIN AMERICA"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 313 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 313

Resolved, That there shall be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives one thousand additional copies of the report entitled "Food for Progress in Latin America" which was made by Representative Henry S. Reuss on February 8, 1967, pursuant to House Resolution 1043 of the Eighty-ninth Congress, second session.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TO PRINT AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT THE EULOGY PROCEEDINGS ON THE LATE CHRISTIAN ARCHIBALD HERTER

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 432 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 432

Resolved, That there shall be printed as a House document such tributes and encomiums as were made in the Congress on the occasion of the passing of the Honorable Christian Archibald Herter, former Member of the House of Representatives and a celebrated and distinguished public servant. This document shall be published with an illustration and in such typographical design and case binding as is directed by the Joint Committee on Printing.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "THE FIAT-SOVIET AUTO PLANT AND COMMUNIST ECONOMIC REFORMS"

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 455 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 455

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Committee on Banking and Currency, House of Representatives, two thousand five hundred additional copies of the subcommittee print entitled "The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant and Communist Economic Reforms", prepared by a subcommittee of that committee during the Eighty-ninth Congress.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF EXTRA COPIES OF "ACTIVITIES OF KU KLUX KLAN ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES," 89TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 462 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 462

Resolved, That there be printed concurrently with the authorized number of hearings relating to "Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States," Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, fifteen hundred extra copies for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE PRINTING OF EXTRA COPIES OF PART 2 OF THE HEARINGS RELATING TO "ACTIVITIES OF KU KLUX KLAN ORGANIZATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES," 89TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, just before I call up the last resolution, may I say this seems like a lot of printing resolutions, but this is the first time we have authorized any in this session of Congress. It averages out to about four a month, in view of the fact that we have authorized 16, four of which are Senate.

Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I call up House Resolution 467 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 467

Resolved, That there be printed concurrently with the authorized number of hearings (part 2) relating to "Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States," Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, fifteen hundred extra copies for the use of the Committee on Un-American Activities.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF RICE ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 460 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. Res. 460

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 263) relating to the establishment of 1967 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms. After general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the amendments recommended by the Committee on Agriculture now printed in the joint resolution. At the conclusion of the consideration of the joint resolution for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] 30 minutes, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 460 provides an open rule, waiving points of order, with 1 hour of general debate for consideration of House Joint Resolution 263 relating to the establishment of 1967 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms. The resolution further provides that it shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order, the committee amendments printed in the joint resolution.

The waiving of all points of order is necessitated by the action taken by the Agriculture Committee to amend the joint resolution by substituting the words "for the crop years 1967 and thereafter," for the language "for the crop year 1967." Because rice planting begins in Arkansas during May, it is important that the joint resolution be considered expeditiously. If the committee amendment were subject to a point of order, it could not only cause a delay in the passage of the joint resolution but, what is more important, the legislation would not be applicable to crop years subsequent to 1967 and, thus, would be totally ineffective. House Joint Resolution 263, as originally introduced, would have required that any new rice allotment be awarded this year. Under the language of the original bill the newly recognized producer would lose his awarded allotment even before he enjoyed any benefits if he failed to plant rice during 1967. This failure could result from delayed enactment of this legislation or tardy knowledge of its enactment. Without the committee amendments, the legislation would therefore be meaningless to the intended beneficiaries.

The rice acreage allotments program was established in 1938. Between World War II and 1950, there were no restrictions placed on the production of rice. Mass production during this period brought about such a large surplus of rice that the authority to establish acreage allotments was exercised by the administration in 1950. The law provides that the size of the allotment to be established must be based on the producer's production of rice during the preceding 5-year period; therefore, the 1950 allotments were established in accordance with production during the 1945–49 period.

Due to the outbreak of the Korean war, and the resulting need for increasing our rice production, the rice acreage allotment provision was again abandoned in 1951. There were no more allotments until 1955 and these allotments were based on the production of rice during the period 1950–54.

House Joint Resolution 263 would enable persons who acquired, for the purpose of producing rice, land suitable for the production of rice prior to 1955, but who did not produce rice on this land during the period 1950 through 1954 due to being in the military service during such period, to obtain a producer rice allotment allocated to the farm, or a farm rice acreage allotment, of sufficient size to constitute an economic rice operation. The allotment acreage required for this purpose would be allocated from the national acreage reserve. The national acreage reserve would be appropriately reduced each year in accordance with any acreage taken therefrom for the purpose of this joint resolution.

A great deal of our rice land is not economically suitable for the production of other crops. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that a producer, who acquired rice land, but was prevented from planting rice during the period of 1950–54 due to being in the military service, acquired it for the purpose of producing rice.

It is contemplated that the enactment of House Joint Resolution 263 would not result in any additional cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 460 in order that House Joint Resolution 263 may be considered.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Is my understanding correct that this will affect one, or at the outside two individuals? I refer to this legislation.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. According to testimony submitted at the hearing conducted by the subcommittee, there is one known and possibly another, but there are other unknowns who may enter the picture.

Mr. GROSS. It is a very limited number, in any event. Is that correct?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. GROSS. I would have to ask the gentleman why this bill did not come out on the Private Calendar or on the Consent Calendar. This to me is a very unusual procedure to bring a bill of this type out under a rule.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. This bill, as you know, was considered by the Committee on Agriculture and reported out of that committee on to the Committee on Rules for a rule. So perhaps the question might better be put to a member of the Committee on Agriculture, particularly the introducer of this measure.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman agree that this is an unusual procedure?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. It is in a way unusual that a general bill would cover just a few individuals, but, as I see it, this will remove the inequity which now exists, and because it will remove an inequity I for one supported the giving of a rule to the measure.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, I hasten to add I believe that the bill has merit. I am not opposed to the bill. What I am trying to say is I am unable to accept the procedure by which the bill is here. I think this bill should have come out as a private bill on the Private Calendar or on the Consent Calendar.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I can see the point of view of the gentleman from Iowa. However, in the event of it coming out as a private bill, where there are unknown individuals involved, as there are in this case, we would have to pass not one private bill but two or three or more as they come up. In this case, while there is one known beneficiary, there are unknown beneficiaries who would be benefited by this one piece of legislation. A private bill could not accomplish this.

Mr. GROSS. I am sure that the gentleman from Hawaii knows package bills are passed on the Private Calendar as well as on the Consent Calendar. Those bills will often deal with more than one individual. I do not believe I quite go along with that argument.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That would not be the usual case, as I understand it.

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CORMAN. Some private bills come from the Committee on the Judiciary. I am not aware, however, of ever having taken up a private bill for an unknown beneficiary. I assume that was the point you were making as to why we need to follow this procedure.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman is correct, and I thank him for his contribution.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I yield to the gentlemen from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding, and further adding to his comments about the submission of committee amendments without waiver or intervention of any point of order by any Member of the House, which again, as I pointed out so often, takes away our individual prerogatives, would he please inform the House where the source of this request originated. Was it from the Parliamentarian in the Committee on Rules or from the committee bringing the legislation before the Committee on Rules?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The request has come from the Committee on Agriculture. I have a letter in my file from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture requesting that a rule provide for a waiver of points of order, because as originally introduced the bill would have covered only the year 1967. This would have meant that passage of this legislation would have been meaningless if we did not pass this legislation during or prior to the planting season and it would be meaningless for years subsequent to 1967. As the gentleman well knows, unless we waive points of order, this could not have been changed to the language which now is written into the amended bill as reported out by the House Committee on Agriculture to take care of years subsequent to 1967.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Hawaii will yield further, the preclusion to the intervention of any point of order does pertain only to the committee amendment, as written, under the Ramseyer rule in the proposed legislation now pending before us?

In other words, is that the opinion of the gentleman in the well?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. That is correct.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Hawaii will yield further, does the gentleman know whether or not this proposed legislation contemplates, as has been approved, and as has been reported by the gentleman from Hawaii now in the well of the House, is any subsidy to the United States proposed to be granted for a "blue-helmeted program," to advise and counsel concerning piscatorial rice paddies under this bill?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman's presumption is correct; there is no such proposal.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] has stated, House Resolution 460 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate, waiving points of order, for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 263, a resolution relating to the establishment of 1967 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms.

House Resolution 460 provides for waiving points of order at the request of the Committee on Agriculture because the rice planting begins during May in Arkansas and for other reasons as have been outlined, thus the hour is growing late for the enactment of this legislation if it is to be helpful this year and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD the letter which the Committee on Rules received from the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to follows:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., May 2, 1967.

Hon. WILLIAM COLMER,
Chairman, Committee on Rules,
House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request for an explanation as to why our Committee needs a rule waiving points of order on H.J. Res. 263, as amended, I am taking this opportunity to convey the following reasons:

First, rice planting begins during May in Arkansas. It is extremely important that this resolution be considered at the earliest possible date. To subject the added language to a point of order on the Floor of the House could indeed cause a delay which would render it useless for this year. In such case, without the committee amendment, the legislation would not apply to subsequent years and, therefore, would be totally ineffective.

Second, H.J. Res. 263, as introduced would require that any new rice allotment be awarded during 1967. The committee felt, in view of this late date, that the resolution should be amended to permit new allotments after 1967. If the legislation as introduced were to be enacted after the rice planting season, the new producer would lose his awarded allotment because of his failure to plant rice thereon.

Third, if the legislation as introduced were enacted in time to permit rice to be planted on the new allotment this year, the Committee felt that it would be unreasonable to require a new producer to acquire within such a short period of time all of the very complex and expensive machinery necessary to plant and harvest rice.

Fourth, H.J. Res., as introduced, would apply only to 1967. Therefore, the eligibility to obtain a new allotment would have to be established in 1967. The committee felt that there might be someone who would not learn of this legislation until after 1967 and although he might meet the same qualifications as someone who obtained an allotment in 1967, he would be denied the benefits of this legislation. The amendment to H.J. Res. 263, making it apply to years subsequent to 1967, will make it possible for persons who meet the requirements specified within the legislation to obtain a new allotment even though his eligibility is discovered after 1967.

Testimony from the Department of Agriculture revealed that there is possibly only one person who would be eligible for an allotment under this legislation, other than Mr. C. E. Greene, who appeared before the Subcommittee on Oilseeds and Rice. Mr. Greene served honorably for 20 years in the United States Navy. Because Mr. Greene's being in service prevented him from planting rice during a period which was later to become the base period for establishing rice allotments, he was denied a rice allotment, although he had acquired land for the production of rice while in the service.

The committee provided that this legislation will in no way reduce any existing producer's rice allotment since all new allotments will come out of the national reserve and not state or county allotments.

The Committee on Agriculture respectfully submits the information above in support of the necessity for the rule waiving points of order.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

W. R. POAGE,
Chairman.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of the resolution is to correct an inequity in the current law. The base period for setting rice acreage allotments was 1950–54, at a time when thousands of young men were serving with the armed services in Korea.

The resolution will enable persons who purchased rice growing land prior to 1955, but who did not grow rice between 1950–54 because they were in military service, to obtain a producer rice allotment of sufficient size to constitute an economic rice farming operation. Such allotments would be made from the national acreage reserve.

In determining the size of an individual's allotment five factors will be weighted: First, his total farmland; second, its suitability for growing other crops; third, the availability of irrigation water; fourth, his farming background and dependence upon farming for a living; and, fifth, his interest or ownership in other farms. An individual must show that he acquired the land prior to 1955 for the purpose of growing rice.

Currently there are 497 acres in the national acreage reserve from which allotments can be made under this legislation. The committee has suggested that no allotments should exceed 70 acres in size. The committee believes that the few persons affected by this legislation can be more than adequately handled by the acres now in the national reserve.

I warn the House that this could have been—and should have been—a private bill. This is a case of passing a private bill for one individual, at the most two individuals. This certainly should not be a precedent and the Rules Committee discussed this at length that it would not be.

There are no minority views.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 263) relating to the establishment of 1967 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 263), with Mr. HULL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BELCHER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL].

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Oilseeds and Rice, I will attempt to explain the bill, House Joint Resolution 263, introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS].

Mr. Chairman, rice allotments were first begun in 1949 and they lasted only 2 years—1949 and 1950—before they were removed.

Then for the next 4 years—1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954—anyone could grow all the rice he wanted to. There were no restrictions. The sky was the limit.

Many acres were devoted to rice by new growers as well as old growers in all of the rice-growing States.

Then in 1955, controls were reapplied and allotments were awarded on the basis of production during the previous 4 years of free planting. If you produced during those 5 years you got an allotment and it was based on how many acres you harvested.

Now, during those 5 years that were the base years in determining the allotments, there was at least one man and maybe a very, very few others who simply could not plant rice although he had been planning to do so for a long time.

The one man I know about could not plant rice because he was off in the Navy. He had been dreaming of the day when he could, however, and for many long years he had been sending a little of his savings to buy rice land.

He had entered the Navy as an enlisted man in 1939 and had progressed through all of the enlisted man's ratings, through warrant officer, and finally became an officer before retirement.

He saved and saved and bought rice land and bought rice land and more rice land until he acquired 620 acres—but he was not home during the 5 crucial years—1950, 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954—and because he was still in the Navy, consequently did not get an allotment when they were handed out in 1955.

This one man that I am referring to served his country well. He was in the Philippines when Pearl Harbor was bombed and the Japanese invaded the Philippines, but his ship was ordered out under trying circumstances. During his Navy career he was awarded a long string of medals and ribbons, including the Purple Heart. He served in the Korean war as well as World War II and all of this time he had been saving money to buy rice land. He just was not around, however, to get an allotment.

He applied for a new grower's allotment when he did get out and do you want to guess what he was awarded? Seven-tenths of 1 acre.

This is ridiculous. An economic unit, as I understand it, would be 50 to 100 acres. No one is blaming the county or State committee because they had no more they could give him.

They could not give him any out of the national reserve because that is not for new growers. There is a national reserve of about 670 acres for corrections of errors and for appeals of established growers and there are about 500 acres in it now. But none for new growers.

This bill would make it possible for this worthy veteran and any others in the same situation to get an economic unit out of the national reserve.

Now the question you will naturally ask is "How many more applications will there be?"

This bill has some limitations and restrictions that we think are equitable and at the same time will not permit a flood of unworthy borderline cases.

The Deputy Director of the grain policy staff of the Agricultural Stabilization and

Conservation Service, who ought to know as much about it as just about anyone, told our Subcommittee on Oilseeds and Rice that because of the way the bill is drawn he did not anticipate more than about two cases that would qualify.

If this bill becomes law, a veteran would have to convince the county committee, whose members are well acquainted with all of the circumstances that: first, prior to 1955; second, he acquired fee simple title; third, in an established rice-producing area; fourth, land suitable for producing rice; fifth, with intention of producing rice on that land; sixth, but did not plant during the crucial years; seventh, because he was in military service during that period.

Not only that, but those passing on it must take into consideration: eighth, the total cropland acquired; ninth, the suitability of the land to planting other crops; 10th, the source and availability of irrigation water; 11th, the applicant's farming background; 12th, his dependence on agriculture for a living; 13th, the extent of ownership or interest in other farmlands.

Then, if the local committee approves, it goes to the State committee who may approve or disapprove.

If it is approved, then it comes to USDA in Washington for approval or disapproval.

If it is finally approved three times, it comes out of the national reserve and no other rice producer will suffer a reduction because of it. The national reserve over the years has been more than adequate for the need and can well afford to have 70 acres removed for this man, which the committee recommends in this report. We do not believe but one or two veterans can meet the seven essentials of the limitations.

The man, who I am sure will apply, has spent $15,000 on wells that are necessary. It certainly illustrates his strong desire to plant rice and thereby sheds light on his early intentions.

Now, let us face what I think is the only problem in the bill.

You will notice in the report that the Department of Agriculture, through the Under Secretary, has expressed opposition to this bill.

The subcommittee knew of this opposition when it reported the bill to the full committee.

The full committee knew of it when they reported the bill out. The Rules Committee knew of it when they recommended a resolution on the rule.

The position of the Department is understandable because it is always difficult for them to make any exceptions whatever. I imagine these things have to be as rigid as the laws of the Medes and the Persians.

As a matter of fact, none of us would want to start a string of borderline cases involving other veterans with other crops, but I feel that rice is in a class by itself.

The suitability or unsuitability of certain acres of land, even in rice producing sections, and the need for water in quantity narrows the possibility that long ago intentions would be misunderstood. While the Department has to adopt a rigid position, this House has the flexibility to do equity to these very few men who deserve it and who are penalized when they risked their lives to keep us free.

It will not cost the taxpayer anything.

It will not reduce anybody's rice allotment.

It will not bring on new problems.

It will simply do justice.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GATHINGS. I just want to say to the gentleman, I am most grateful to him for calling the meeting of his subcommittee and commend him for the judicious manner in which he presided over the subcommittee. I want to say too, the gentleman has covered this matter very well and in a very fine way. I commend the gentleman for his very splendid statement.

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. I thank my very dear friend, the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, only to say that the subcommittee and the committee both passed this bill unanimously. The committee felt that this was a good opportunity to do justice without doing any damage to the rice allotments or other considerations as far as the agricultural program of this Nation is concerned.

I believe there is nothing more that need be said except to commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. O'NEAL] on a statement that very adequately covered the subject. He did a very fine job, and I certainly urge, on behalf of the minority, that the bill be passed. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas such time as he may desire.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I arise in support of this resolution. I favor its approval because it is just, proper and right that a veteran who has "borne the battle" in behalf of freedom and liberty should be given the opportunity on returning home to continue in the business for which he is best fitted. The Congress has recognized this theory in the enactment at the conclusion of World War II of the Veterans Preference Act, according men who had returned from duty in one of the armed services to be given 5 percentage points added to their grade on civil service tests in the case of regular veterans, and 10 percentage points in the case of disabled veterans, moving such persons in the latter category to the top of the list.

House Joint Resolution 263 is the fulfillment and furtherance of the principle and policy of according veterans who served during time of war in one or more conflicts the right and privilege to grow rice, if such person complies with the vast prerequisites as contained in this legislation. Such veteran, in order to comply with the terms and conditions of the resolution, must have acquired prior to 1955 in an established rice-producing area in fee simple lands suitable for the production of rice, with the intention of growing rice on such land but could not do so because such person was engaged in military service during the base period of 1950 to 1954. A further prerequisite of the legislation was that of consideration being given that the total acreage of the land that is classified as cropland, the suitability of such land for the production of alternate crops, the source and availability of water, the producer's farming background and dependence upon farming as a livelihood.

When I introduced this legislation I had in mind that it was to aid and assist certain veterans who could comply with the rigid provisions of the bill, but it was not my intention then or now to break down or set a precedent which would weaken the control program for rice. We need to maintain strict limitations on the growing of rice to avoid burdensome surpluses, since more than 50 percent of our rice finds its way into export channels.

The principal beneficiary of this legislation, Mr. C. E. Greene, R.F.D., Brinkley, Ark., is entitled to, and it is my object in presenting this bill to authorize and direct the county and State committees and the Department of Agriculture, upon enactment of this resolution, to provide an allotment of such size as to make for an economic unit in the area where his or other eligible person's land lies. This acreage would not in any wise affect other rice producers throughout the Nation, and would not decrease the allotments to any of them, as the allotment authorized by this resolution would come solely and exclusively out of the national reserve, which has consistently been undersubscribed.

While Mr. C. E. Greene was serving his country during the Korean conflict, new areas were brought into rice production by virtue of these lands building up rice histories during the war years of 1951, 1952, 1953, and 1954. Mr. Greene would have cherished the opportunity to utilize his lands, which he had purchased out of the savings from his salary in the Navy, to grow rice during these years. All he seeks is being placed on a par and equal basis with people who had never grown rice before and remained at home doing so and building up their rice acreages during the Korean war.

The legislation should be speedily approved and I trust that the House will pass this resolution by an overwhelming vote.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman I have no further requests for time.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 263

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the crop year 1967, in each State in which farm rice acreage allotments are determined on the basis of past production of rice and past acreage allotments of producers on the farm there shall be made available from the national acreage reserve for 1967 such acreage as is required for producers who did not produce rice in any of the five years immediately preceding the crop year 1967 sufficient to apportion to each person who prior to 1955 acquired in an established rice-producing area in fee simple land suitable for the production of rice with the intention of producing rice on such land, but did not produce rice on such land in any of the years 1950 to 1954, inclusive, due to being in the military service during such period, a rice acreage allotment of sufficient size to constitute an economic rice operation from the producer, taking into consideration the total acreage of land so acquired which is classified as cropland, the suitability of such cropland for the production of alternative crops, the source and availability of irrigation water, the producer's farming background and dependence upon farming as a livelihood, and the extent of ownership or interest in other lands devoted to the production of agricultural commodities: *Provided,* That for the crop year 1967 the producer rice allotment apportioned to such person shall, as a condition of the apportionment, be allocated to the land so acquired by him; and in States in which farm rice acreage allotments are determined on the basis of past production of rice and past acreage allotments on the farm there shall be made available from the national acreage reserve for 1967 such acreage as is required for farms on which rice was not produced in any of the five years immediately preceding the crop year 1967 sufficient to apportion to each farm containing land suitable for rice production which was acquired in an established rice-producing area in fee simple prior to 1955 by a person with the intention of producing rice on such farm but rice was not produced on the farm containing such land in any of the years 1950 to 1954, inclusive, due to the owner thereof being in the military service during such period, an acreage allotment for such farm of sufficient size to constitute an economic rice operation, taking into consideration the total acreage of land so acquired which is classified as cropland, the suitability of such cropland for the production of alternative crops, the source and availability of irrigation water, the owner's farming background and dependence upon farming as a livelihood, and the extent of ownership or interest in other farms devoted to the production of agricultural commodities.

SEC. 2. For the crop year 1967, in the case of any producer or any farm, as the case may be, to which the provisions of section 1 of this resolution would apply except for the fact that the producer or farm has since 1954 been apportioned a new producer or new farm allotment, there shall be made available from the national acreage reserve for 1967 sufficient acreage to provide each such producer or farm an increase in the producer or farm acreage allotment otherwise determined sufficient to establish an allotment for the producer or farm of sufficient size to constitute an economic rice operation for the producer on the farm, taking into consideration the total acreage of land acquired by the producer which is classified as cropland, the suitability of such cropland for the production of alternative crops, the source and availability of irrigation water, the owner's farming background and dependence upon farming as a livelihood, and the extent of ownership or interest in other lands devoted to the production of agricultural commodities.

Mr. POAGE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike the words "crop year 1967," and insert in lieu thereof the words "crop years 1967 and thereafter,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 7, immediately after the word "1967", insert the words "and thereafter".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 13, strike the words "crop year 1967" and insert in lieu thereof the words "crop years 1967 and thereafter,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 19, immediately after the word "1967", insert the words "and thereafter".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 13, strike the words "crop year 1967," and insert in lieu thereof the words "crop years 1967 and thereafter,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 18, immediately after the word "1967", insert the words "and thereafter".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 5, add a new section 3 as follows:

"SEC. 3. For the crop years 1967 and thereafter, the State acreage allotments which would otherwise be determined for States in which rice allotments are determined on the basis of past production of rice and past acreage allotments of producers on the farm, and the county acreage allotments which would otherwise be determined in States in which farm rice acreage allotments are determined on the basis of the past production of rice and past acreage allotments on the farm shall be increased from the national acreage reserve in an amount necessary to provide fair and reasonable allotments for the producers and farms for which new producer and new farm allotments and increases in old producer and old farm allotments were approved under sections 1 and 2 of this Act without decreasing the allotments for all other producers in the State or for all other farms in the county, as the case may be."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated previously, I am not opposed to this joint resolution on its merits, but I hope that no one will get the idea that present consideration is a precedent. This joint resolution, I say again, ought to have come to the floor on the Private Calendar or the Consent Calendar. I hope that it will in no sense be considered as setting a precedent, for if this is to again be attempted I would have to oppose the joint resolution regardless of its merit. I only want to repeat that I think this joint resolution should have been considered on the Consent or Private Calendar or under suspension of rules if unanimous consent could not be obtained.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I feel that the point made by the gentleman from Iowa is well taken. If it were not for the circumstances surrounding the joint resolution, perhaps the rest of us would have objected, too. If there was the possibility that this was not limited, I am sure what the gentleman has said would have applied. But we have limited in this legislation the amount or number of those who could participate to the amount that was in the reserve. I feel we have handled this joint resolution properly. There was just the possibility that others would be involved and we attempted to save the possibility of private bills coming up at some other time. I think there was merit in this approach, although I can agree as to the possibility of a precedent which the gentleman from Iowa brings up. I hope we do not create one here.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HULL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the joint resolution, (H.J. Res. 263) relating to the establishment of 1967 farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms, pursuant to House Resolution 460, he reported the joint resolution back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passing of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 263) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution relating to the establishment of 1967 and subsequent farm rice acreage allotments for certain producers and farms."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTMASTER GENERAL LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN'S TESTIMONY ON THE PRESIDENT'S NEW POSTAL REVENUE RECOMMENDATIONS TO BE READ BY ALL MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include pertinent extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that it would be very much to the advantage of every single Member of the House to read the full text of Postmaster *General Lawrence F. O'Brien's testimony*, presented yeserday before our Subcommittee on Postal Rates, in support of the President's recommendations for additional postal revenues.

This new postal revenue legislation is *certainly one of the major legislative* recommendations which the President has submitted to the Congress this year. The rate adjustments, when fully effective, would add $825 million annually in postal income—an amount just as important to the taxpayers as any economies that can be worked out in the consideration of appropriation bills.

I am bringing this to the special attention of the House, and urging my colleagues to read the excellent and very persuasive testimony of the Postmaster General, because it is apparent that the membership in general will hear little or nothing on the subject through the usual channels of public information.

I have noted that the great second-class press, a most influential channel of public information, is carrying none of the news of the extremely important hearings before our Postal Rates Subcommittee. In recent weeks, the press has consistently harped on the so-called $1.2 billion postal deficit. Editorials and stories, in fact, have caused much of the pressure for the postal rate bill. Now it strikes me as strange, to say the least, that the vast publishing industry—a great many of whose members by their own assertion rely so heavily on the privilege of the mails at preferential rates—remain silent in terms of their responsibility to inform the public.

Accordingly, so that Members of Congress—who as representatives of the public will ultimately vote on the President's postal rate recommendations—may be informed, I am placing the full text of the Postmaster General's statement in the Record today. Again, I commend its reading to all of my colleagues.

The statement follows:

Statement by Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien, Postal Rates Subcommittee, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, May 9, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: It is a pleasure to appear before this Subcommittee today.

The stated purpose of the bill before us is to adjust postal rates. It could well be referred to as: a bill to provide the funds we need to modernize the postal service; and a bill to comply with clear requirements of the Postal Policy Act.

All of these titles are accurate, but perhaps the basic, essential purpose of this legislation is that of modernization. Certainly, this is not just another rate bill. Rather it is a step we must take before we can move toward full modernization of the postal service. In addition, as stated by the President, it would enable the Post Office to improve its service and also pay the cost of proposed pay raises for postal employees.

Mr. Chairman, I have always tried to be a realist who looks at facts. The facts show that our postal system is archaic.

I have made a far-reaching proposal to change the entire context in which the postal service operates. This suggestion, as you know, is being examined by a top-flight commission, appointed by the President and composed of some of the most distinguished men in America. This commission has a broad mandate to study every aspect of the postal service and report within one year directly to the President. I wish to make explicit, Mr. Chairman, that the proposal to transform the Post Office into a government corporation, or any other proposal, in no way modifies or lessens our present needs. These needs are urgent, pressing, and exist right *now*. Regardless of what the nature of the postal service may be in the future, there can be no doubt whatsoever that modernization must continue and must accelerate now. Modernization funds simply must be made available to avert chaos and to slow the rise in costs.

Unless the Congress enacts this modernization rate bill, our deficit for this year and next, combined, will be nearly *two and a half billion dollars*. The deficit this year is at an all-time high of $1.2 billion. With so huge a deficit acting as a psychological anchor, it is unlikely the Congress will provide the funds we need to push ahead with a massive modernization program. Our chances of getting those funds would without doubt be far better if we could cut current operating losses by about $825 million. That, as I see it, is the key purpose of this bill.

Our postal system serves six percent of the world's population yet it sags under the weight of half the world's mail. Our system cannot take on three to four *billion* more pieces of mail each year without facing repeated threats of service breakdown.

Over the next few years, we must catch up with a modernization lag that has left most of our postal operations and facilities 30 years behind current technology. For example, of all the Federally owned space we occupy, about 90 percent was built in the 1930's or earlier. But modernization is not just a matter of replacing a building here and adding another one there. It is not a matter of patching and propping. It is not a faster cancelling machine or a new fleet of vehicles. Modernization must be a concerted, continuing, well paced and adequately financed effort.

Our nation's largest communication giants are A.T. & T. and the Post Office. My next chart reveals the essential cause of disparate productivity trends for the two. Progress in the telephone company is paced by an investment program that equals one-third or more of each year's revenue intake. In contrast, Post Office technical apathy is rooted in an investment program that accounts for only 2 percent of its yearly budget.

Why must we modernize? First, unless we modernize we cannot provide adequate service for a burgeoning mail volume. In the ten years through 1966, our workload rose from 56 billion to 76 billion pieces of mail. It will be more than 82 billion in the next fiscal year. At the same rate, volume will top 100 billion pieces in 1976. And even this enormous figure may prove to be conservative, since, the per capita use of mail is also increasing, as is shown on chart number 5. We now require 700,000 employees to do the job, and labor is our greatest cost factor. In the near future, we will be beyond the point where adding another army of postal workers can cope with that towering workload.

In an objective and critical article entitled, "It's Now or Never for the Post Office," FORTUNE, the magazine of business, recently pointed out that letters are still processed today very much as they were processed during Colonial times. Most mail sorting today is a peek and poke operation, the kind that was abandoned in many industries after Eli Whitney introduced the principle of interchangeable parts back in 1798. Given this old-fashioned and outdated approach, for far too long we have responded to added mail volume by adding more men and adding more pigeon-hole sorting cases. This kind of primitive thinking has been inappropriate for many decades; is ineffective today; and will be impossible tomorrow. It also deprives our employees of the modern tools they need and deserve.

My friends, for many decades our post offices have been slipping into technological lassitude.

The result is that today our postal service is an anachronism. I recently visited San Francisco where a tourist attraction has been made of an anachronistic form of transportation. But San Francisco has modern bus lines, and is building a subway system. It is not relying alone on the cable car. The United States, however, has only one postal system—and at present it is a cable car postal system—and not even much of a tourist attraction at that.

We simply must move out of the cable car era. We simply must break through the barrier that limits the speed of mail processing to the pace of hand movements. We must multiply the ability of man by the power of modern machines. For unless we enlist the full capacities of modern science and technology, we are doomed to continue operating a ponderous, creaking, erratic, costly and increasingly ineffective postal service.

ZIP Code is bringing us to the threshold of the barrier we must crack. To pass across that threshold our largest post offices and sectional centers must have a coordinated array of modern mail handling intruments: optical scanners, electronic sorting machines, and new materials handling equipment. Further, we must have buildings designed for streamlined postal operations, not buildings fitted merely for miles of pigeon-hole sorting cases.

Unless we modernize, I can see no way to slow the upward rise in postal costs and rates. Personnel costs account for more than 80 percent of our budget and even under the most improved operation our employees will remain our major cost as well as our most important resource. But with more capital equipment to share the work that men do today, staff growth will be slowed and any future pay raises will be justified more by productivity gains than by increases in living costs.

Thus, we see postal modernization, not as a threat to postal employees, but as a way to ensure better output and higher salaries for a more slowly expanding work force.

Certainly we will need more employees to handle this reflection of our growth, our affluence, and our rising standard of civilization. Certainly we will need the best people we can find to cope with this mail explosion. But we will fail the American people and we will fail our employees if, in addition, we do not provide them with a postal service which possesses the most modern mail handling equipment and facilities available. A nation that in a period of less than 10 years can progress from inability to launch a grapefruit-sized satellite to one that moved large satellites and will move men through space to the surface of the moon, has no excuse for failing to provide postal equipment and facilities that can move our mail with maximum speed here on earth.

Therefore, a central reason for requesting more realistic rates is to secure the additional flow of funds necessary to permit us to accelerate our research and modernization programs. And our budget for the forthcoming fiscal year calls for more than $300 million in expenditures directly related to postal modernization and service improvement. This figure includes a proposed 40-percent increase on spending for research and engineering, a 46-percent increase in funds for plant and equipment, including a 284-percent increase in fixed mechanization systems.

I might note here, Mr. Chairman, that in reviewing the 1958 testimony concerning rate increases, a number of witnesses, representing large volume mailers, pointed out that they would be far more willing to support higher rates if they could be assured that the Post Office Department was making some effort to upgrade its research effort, and these business mailers made a strong plea for increased funds for research and modernization.

This emphasis on accelerated modernization was most recently reflected in a statement given to the House Committee on Appropriations by John K. Herbert, President of the Magazine Publishers Association.

Mr. Herbert praised the new emphasis being accorded modernization, but said that we should do even more, stating that "While we believe that progress is being made, as a large customer of the postal service, we submit that there is still not enough being spent in modernization and mechanization. We submit that over the next three years the Post Office Department should have available to it at least $1 billion for modernization and mechanization of the antiquated postal facilities." I want this Committee to know that I basically agree with the spokesman for the Magazine Publishers Association and, in fact, I believe we need $1 billion, not *over* three years, not for three years, but each year for five years, to spend on capital investment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we must candidly recognize that the public is dissatisfied with the mail service it has been receiving. Our customers complain of delayed mail, the fact that several days may go by before mail is delivered from one suburb to another or from New York to Washington. A public that is discontent with present service will certainly resent paying higher rates unless they lead to improved postal operations.

The two go together: rate increases and improvements. Without the ability to make improvements, we can't in good conscience demand higher rates. Without higher rates we cannot get appropriations for improvement.

Postal modernization is compelling enough so that no other reasons need be given for enactment of this legislation. But there are other important reasons.

While postal service is the most widely shared of all Federal services, it is not shared equally by all taxpayers. Only about 20 percent of all mail is dispatched by individuals. The rest reaches us mainly from the mail rooms of business firms.

Yet, while postal service is largely a business service, we ask all taxpayers to pay for postal deficits. It would be much fairer to ask those who use postal service to pay in proportion to their demands for such service.

In just the last two years mail volume shot upward more than 8 percent. And another 3.4-billion-piece increase seems to be shaping up this year.

In 1966 we delivered more than twice the volume of mail we delivered 20 years ago. While much of this rise stemmed from population growth and the affluence of our economy, there is also evidence that too-low postal rates were a contributing cause.

Mail has its counterparts in other modes of communication, delivery, and advertising. Therefore, when rates for postal service are low in relation to prices for its commercial counterparts, mail volume rises rapidly. And when such growth adds to postal deficits, I believe we have an even greater responsibility to charge them to mail users rather than to the whole taxpaying public.

Inevitably, those who urge postal rate increases face the criticism that they are putting financial objectives ahead of public service. I disagree. Modernization, cost control and better service are clearly in the public interest and I expect these benefits to follow a rate increase. Also, those who argue against rate increases choose to ignore that postal deficits never go unpaid. They are paid whether rates are raised or not. For postal operations are either funded or not performed. In the last analysis, postal services are paid for by the people of the United States, either directly, through the purchase of our services or, indirectly, through taxation. For the nation as a whole, there is and can be no postal deficit. The cost of postal service has to be paid one way or another. The major question throughout the entire history of the postal service has been one of equity; what proportion of the cost should be borne by those who use the mail, and what proportion should be borne by the people generally? Should these deficits be paid from general tax receipts or from the earnings of those whose demands for postal service caused the deficits?

The Postal Policy Act of 1958, as amended, went far to answer that question. It specified certain types of postal service as legitimately the concern of the nation as a whole, the cost of which should not be borne directly by the postal patron, and should not be considered in calculating rates, but rather should be paid from the general Treasury. During the present fiscal year these public service costs are estimated as $567 million. But the difference between our revenues and expenditures was more than twice this sum. In other words, the general public is now bearing over $600 million more than it should of the cost of public service.

If we are to carry out the intent of Congress as expressed in the Postal Policy Act, ways—equitable ways—must be found to close the gap between revenues and expenditures, not counting the expenditures covered by public service allowances.

The rate bill before your Committee for consideration is designed to close that gap, with maximum equity, by spreading an $825-million rate increase over all classes of mail.

The Cost Ascertainment System shows that the cost coverage of the various kinds and classes of mail currently varies bteween 105 percent for first class and airmail to 7 percent for second-class publications of nonprofit organizations.

It is the judgment of the Department, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, that this present cost-average spread is hard to justify and should be improved if possible. Since the proposed rate increases are roughly proportionate for all classes of mail, they will bring revenue in line with the intent of the Postal Policy Act.

Before I present our rate requests, I wish to make one additional comment.

During my term as Postmaster General, I have come to see clearly how the various classes of mail are closely related. An advertisement in a second-class mail newspaper or magazine often includes a coupon which, when sent by first class, or an insert which, when sent by third class, produces a recording by fourth class or a kit of tools by parcel post. This interdependence among the classes of mail means that a change in rates in any one class affects all the other classes. The rate structure being presented for your consideration takes this interdependence into account. Certainly, no effort has been spared to make the increases equitable, to assure that they conform to the guidelines of the Postal Policy Act, and to guard against the slightest tincture of discrimination against a particular class or classes of mail.

Since the Postal Policy Act states clearly that first class mail must pay the entire amount of the expenses allocated to it and an additional amount representing the fair value of all extraordinary and preferential services, facilities, and factors relating to it, we are proposing a one-cent increase in all first-class mail rates, including regular and air mail letters and post cards. This one-cent increase will provide additional revenue of $536 million, and will bring first class and air mail combined to about 125 percent of cost coverage. Traditionally, the cost coverage for first class alone has been nearly 140 percent.

Compared with first-class rates, second- and third-class rates should be lower because their mailers do much sorting and other premailing work at their own expense. Also, second and third class mail don't receive the priority service of first class mail.

While I accept as reasonable the pricing policy that permits lower rates for second and third class mail, I also believe the increases for these classes should be at least as large as for first class mail.

My next chart pinpoints the deficits traceable to each class of mail. There can be no doubt that our problems are centered largely in second and third class mail. Together, these classes account for more than $800 million of the total revenue gap, before deducting public service allowances.

The President's message on postal rates included recommendations for pay increases as well. If the President's proposals are enacted by the Congress they would change this picture of our deficit. First class mail would fail to pay its way—one of the few times in history, and contrary to the explicit requirement in the Postal Policy Act that first class cover its full cost plus an extra amount. Of course, the showing of other classes is similarly worsened.

The situation for second and third class mail, Mr. Chairman, reminds me of the story of the haberdasher in my home town of Springfield. Whenever you went into his store to buy a suit he would say, very sadly, "I lose money on every suit I sell." Once I asked him, "If you lose money on every suit you sell, how do you make a profit?" "Volume," he said, "volume."

Well, we lose money on every piece of second and third class mail sent through the mail. Unfortunately, we aren't like the haberdasher. We've got the volume, too much volume, and it doesn't seem to help very much.

I recognize it is our responsibility simply to advise the Congress when postal deficiencies exceed limits that are tolerable under the terms of the Postal Policy Act. However, I know this Committee feels duty bound to range beyond the scope of that Act. It must weigh the cost of postal deficits against other competing claims for public funds. In my judgment, cost coverage in second and third class is substantially below levels that can be justified on grounds of deferred service or national benefit.

Each time the need for rate increases was evident in the past, Congress thoroughly explored the ability of patrons to pay higher rates. And each time the users of second and third class mail carefully prepared their arguments against higher rates. As a result, when doubts arose concerning ability to pay they were usually resolved in favor of more moderate rate increases.

In 1961, the representatives of the magazine publishing industry appeared before the Congress and supported their fight against higher rates with a report prepared by a nationally prominent accounting firm. It warned that America's magazine industry was "in a precarious financial position." That and similar warnings had a significant effect on the final decision to enact a moderate postal rate increase phased over a 3-year period. According to magazine industry spokesmen, however, their financial situation has since changed from insecure to solid, a fact that may encourage the Congress to enact another increase to defray a small part of a total $400 million revenue deficiency traceable to second class mail before excluding public service costs.

For example, the *Magazine Industry Newsletter*, dated December 31, 1966, reported the following, in part:

"*1966 will mark the biggest year in magazine advertising revenue*—also in circulation.

"*Magazine advertising revenue* for 1966 was estimated at $1,160,000,000 . . . a 7% increase over last year's revenue figure . . .

"Magazine circulation is increasing *faster* than the growth of the U.S. adult population . . .

"Publishers look optimistically forward to 1967."

In view of these reports of publishers' affluence, in sharp contrast with deepening postal deficits, we ask the Congress to approve an average 23 percent increase for regular-rate, outside-the-country mailings of second class publications. This would be phased over a three-year period.

For commercial mailings of bulk-rate third-class matter, the increase approved in 1962 was even more moderate than for second class: only 15 percent phased over a 3-year period. Cost coverage is still only about 60 percent and we are recommending an average increase of 31 percent. We would recommend a larger increase were it not for expected cost savings. Over the next few years, the cost of handling bulk mail will be reduced as we move into full-scale ZIP Code presorting. These innovations and the proposed rate increases should bring third class mail much closer to full cost coverage.

Bulk-rate third-class mail has been the most rapidly growing of all major mail services. From 1947 to 1966 its volume increased more than 250 percent, at a time when all other mail increased only 80 percent. Even in the period from 1953 to 1966, when most rate increases were effective, bulk mail rose 73 percent.

There is no doubt that low postage rates have contributed to the extraordinary growth of direct mail. Also, there is abundant evidence that the rate increases enacted in 1951, 1958 and in 1962 have not disadvantaged either the direct mail industry or the users of that advertising service. Since 1950, bulk-mail volume has grown faster than our economy. Moreover, according to recent business reports, direct mail volume has held its 15-percent share of the nation's advertising dollar despite higher postage costs and despite hard driving competition from television, radio, and magazine advertising.

At one time, low direct mail postage was defended on grounds that volume expansion was desirable to fill Post Office workload gaps. Perhaps that was a valid defense of low postage in the early 1930's when all postal volume was only a third of today's volume. Perhaps it was still valid in the early years after World War II, say 1947, when bulk mail was only 13 percent of all mail volume. But today it is nearly one-fourth of all mail volume. With total workload increases of three to four billion pieces of mail each year, we have no "slack-hour" problems.

I found of considerable interest a recent article highly favorable to direct mail. It appeared in the January issue of *Postal Record*, the official publication of the National Association of Letter Carriers. That article reported:

"If there were no third class mail, the Post Office Department could eliminate about one-quarter of its clerical employees, and about one-fifth of its letter carriers."

Well, the cost of keeping that number of employees on our payrolls is about $780 million annually. In contrast, our total revenue from third class mail is only $682 million. So, right off, we have an out-of-pocket loss of nearly $100 million in just two personnel categories, to say nothing of the added costs for other personnel, transportation, space and equipment.

We certainly do not object to the rapid growth of third class mail. We welcome it as a sign of economic growth. However, we *do* object when that growth adds considerably more to our costs than to postal revenues. We object, too, when the growth of bulk mail adds to the burdens of other mail users and taxpayers who must pay the costs of rapidly mounting postal deficits. I should also like to stress that we recognize and applaud the effort made by second and third class bulk mailers to comply with ZIP Code pre-sort regulations. This effort has resulted in some costs to these mailers and we have recognized this burden by requesting that the new second and third class bulk mail rates be delayed until January 1, 1968.

I might also add that had it not been for the anticipated savings through the presort program for bulk mail, it would have been necessary to request considerably higher rates on bulk second and third-class mail.

Mr. Chairman, our proposals also call for increases in the rates paid by nonprofit organizations. Percentagewise, these rate increases would be steeper than other increases, but only because the rates are initially so low. Even with the proposed increases such organizations would still maintain large and valuable postage preferences. Currently, the public service cost of handling nonprofit mail exceeds $200 million yearly—nearly 40 percent of all public service costs.

About two years ago the Department's Advisory Panel on Postal Rates—a distinguished group of citizens—recommended that special rates for nonprofit organizations be discontinued. The one dissenting voice came from a member who represented one of those organizations. While our proposals fall far short of the position advocated by the Advisory Panel, we believe more-than-average increases are justifiable.

Today, up to eight publications can be mailed by these organizations for as little as one penny. And there is no extra charge for longer hauls. For that penny, the Post Office will accept these eight publications in New York and deliver them in Hawaii.

Also, without regard to length of haul, the Post Office will deliver four fund-solicitation letters for just one nickel.

Neither of these minimum rates for nonprofit organizations, in second or third class, was raised in 1962 when all other rates were raised.

We are also recommending a new postage principle for nonprofit publications that carry more than 10 percent advertising. There will be a moderately higher rate scaled upward in proportion to the volume of advertising carried by these publications. This is essentially the same postage principle that has long been applied by the Congress for commercial publications. However, we are not proposing equal postage treatment for both types of advertising. Nonprofit organizations would continue to get huge postage concessions.

Mr. Chairman, I have great appreciation for the work of our nonprofit organizations. But I cannot in good conscience ask for an $800-million postage increase and not ask for some reduction in the more-than-$200-million public service cost generated by these organizations. It must be recognized, this cost is in addition to the tax concessions which these nonprofit organizations enjoy. But, unlike tax concessions—which represent revenue foregone by the Federal Treasury—postal public service costs are direct subsidies financed by those who *must* pay taxes.

Before I conclude my statement, I particularly want to urge approval of a section of this bill that will help the Department move faster toward a modern and improved postal service. We ask that the Department be given authority to charge an extra unit of postage—6 cents or 9 cents—for lightweight first class or air mail pieces in hard-to-handle sizes. The proposed surcharge would be limited to mail weighing not more than two ounces and it would not go into effect sooner than two years after enactment.

To meet similar objectives in third class mail we are proposing three additional changes:

1. Samples of merchandise in non-standard, hard-to-handle sizes would not be eligible for bulk-rate postage.
2. When mailed in quantities at the higher, single-piece third-class rates, merchandise samples would be accepted for mailing only when pre-sorted or prepared as prescribed by the Department.
3. In addition to the changes regarding samples, all other non-standard-size third-class mail would be subject to higher minimum postage rates.

Rather than collect extra postage for non-standard envelopes and other hard-to-handle mail, we would much prefer to see their use greatly reduced. Unless we curtail the myriad envelope sizes and shapes, we must plan a more costly and slower postal modernization program. And if their use is not curtailed, we would at least be paid some of the extra handling costs.

I have not tried to cite all the details of a far-reaching bill that touches all except parcel post and international mails. New parcel post rates and size-weight reform were enacted by the Congress last September. Anticipating the full financial effects of that legislation, we are at about a break-even point in that service. Higher international postage rates were proposed on January 14 and new rates were put into effect on May 1, restoring a break-even operation.

We are now asking the Congress to take up the very important remaining problems of rate adjustment. It is a difficult set of problems. Nevertheless, we believe action must be taken soon so that Congress may in the future concern itself primarily with postal modernization and service improvement rather than the day-to-day operating deficits of the postal system.

Mr. Chairman, in his special message to the Congress on April 5, 1967, the President urged postal rate increases for the reasons I cited and to cover proposed pay increases for postal workers. Before I conclude my statement, I want to underscore the need for rate action to meet the cost of paying higher salaries to our worthy postal employees, increased pay to which I feel they are strongly entitled. The Administration and the Congress have made a commitment to maintain Federal employee salaries on par with those paid in private industry. That has been our goal ever since the Federal Salary Reform Act was passed in 1962.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, the rate increases we proposed are the very least we can have to operate a viable, progressive mail service.

The American people are entitled to no less than the finest mail service in the world. I believe that the intensified effort to move ahead through research, and through mechanization and modernization, all geared to improving the working conditions of our employees, will bring us to the threshold of a new era in our postal history. My dream of the postal service of the future is one that I am sure that I share with every Member of this Committee: a postal service that operates at the very minimum cost and at the maximum efficiency; a postal service of which we can all be proud. I believe this new rate structure is a significant element in the fulfillment of that dream.

THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, the legislative authorization for the food stamp program and its current appropriation expire on June 30, 1967.

Since coming to the Congress in 1961, I have supported the food stamp program and I intend to give it my full support again this year. However, I have some strong reservations about the proposed changes in the cost-sharing formula asked for in the new legislation—H.R. 1318—as reported from the House Committee on Agriculture, April 12, 1967.

I can speak about these proposed changes from a knowledge of firsthand experience gained over the 7 years that this program has been assisting in providing better nutrition for the less fortunate in Montana's First Congressional District. It has been my privilege to work with local officials in bringing this program to Montana and consulting with them to work out problems when it was in its early stages. Through our joint efforts, Silver Bow County was selected back in 1961 as one of the original pilot counties in which the food stamp program was tested and developed. Subsequently, Deer Lodge County installed the program, and two others, Glacier and Lincoln, have requested the program.

Basically the food stamp program increases food-purchasing power for households whose current income is insufficient to buy the food necessary to meet the minimal needs of the family unit. Under the program low-income families take the amount of money they normally spend on food and purchase food coupons of greater value to meet their minimum food needs. The amount of gain in food-purchasing power is determined by income, need, and assets, but the average national gain is about one-third. The coupons can then be spent for food in regular grocery stores.

One most important aspect of this program is that it does not replace the amount of money that is normally spent on food. It can only increase that amount by adding to it. It is a voluntary program specifically designed to aid only those families who need and desire enough food to provide adequate meals.

Because the food stamp program increases food-purchasing power, it likewise expands the national market for agricultural products. All of the studies done have shown significant increases in food consumption. Of special interest to the State of Montana is the 24-percent increase in the consumption of grain products shown in the Detroit study of the effectiveness of the stamp program. Milk, fruit, and vegetable consumption were also up sharply.

The program is closely supervised and operates very smoothly. I am proud to be able to report that of the 171 retail and wholesale grocery outlets in the State of Montana cooperating in this program, there has never been cause for disqualification of a single place of business. From the standpoint of individual participation, the program, for all practical purposes, has been abuse-free.

This program is doing the job it was designed to do in the State of Montana. It is bringing better meals to people who need them. It is utilizing the normal retail channels of distribution and the regular State administrative machinery. It is operating both effectively and efficiently.

Under the present program the State pays almost the entire cost of getting the food coupons to the families. The State administers the program, selects the participants and pays the cost of selling the coupons to the individuals. The Federal Government pays the difference between what the participant pays and the value of the coupons he receives. In addition, the Federal Government pays the cost of supervising the stores that are cooperating and they assume the national administrative costs.

The measure now under consideration will radically change this. It would require that the State of Montana, beginning in July of 1969, pay 20 percent of the cost of the bonus coupons in addition to its present administrative expenses. Presently State expenses run about 7 percent of the value of these bonus coupons. The new proposal would increase this cost to 27 percent.

At the present time, three counties in Montana have the program—two have requested it. If all five of these counties were operating in the program now it is estimated that 6,912 individuals would be assisted and the value of the bonus coupons would be about $501,892 per year.

Given this participation under the present cost-sharing formula, the program cost to the State of Montana would be approximately $35,000. Under the proposed formula, Montana's cost would jump to approximately $135,000. This is almost a fourfold increase over the present formula cost.

The point is made that this cost increase is necessary to control the program externally from rampant expansion and internally to prevent looseness of administration by the States. First of all there has been no rampant growth. There are 57 counties in the State of Montana and only five have applied for the program since it has been operating nationally. In other words, present program costs are sufficient deterrent except where the assistance is clearly needed. There has been no looseness of administration. Standards for participation within a State must be the State's own assistance standards and for those outside the assistance program standards must be closely related to the existing welfare standards. In Montana this means that a family of four earning $139.99 per month must spend $52 to receive $84 in food stamps. This is no steak and caviar diet in Montana by any stretch of the food budget. However, with sound planning, this family can have some meat and some vegetables and some fruit in its meals that it could otherwise not afford. They can, if they are prudent, have meals which provide the minimum nutrients necessary to good health and well-being. This program is in no way excessive and there has been no demonstrated need to raise the cost of this program to prevent invented abuses.

I will oppose the cost increase to States on the basis that it is unwarranted by program experience. The increase in cost will price the program out of reach of the States. This will be especially true in the less wealthy States where the need is the greatest. The severe reduction in program participation following this price increase would serve to contract the market for agricultural products. If we are going to assist in bringing the less fortunate in our Nation better diets the bill is going to have to be paid either at the Federal or the State and local level. I believe the Federal Government can more equitably pro-rate this cost on a national level.

It is unthinkable that in this land of agricultural abundance we have children and elderly getting up hungry and going to bed hungry. We have devised a simple, effective method of coping with this problem that stimulates self-reliance, utilizes our agricultural ability through the private enterprise system and enhances Federal-State relationships.

There is absolutely no reason to take this fine program—which I am satisfied is doing all that we intended it to do when we passed it in 1964—and put a price tag on it which the individual States cannot afford to pay.

LET'S KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, May 9, this week, a national columnist, in a syndicated column carried by many newspapers throughout the country, accused me of blocking food for Mississippi Negroes.

Mr. Speaker, my name is spelled right and I am "bespectacled," and perhaps at times I have been stubborn, which can be to one's credit at times; but other than that, there is not a single statement concerning me in the article that is true.

The article says:

> Despite a Senate finding of "wide spread hunger" in the Delta Counties that can only be described as shocking.

There was no such Senate finding.

There was such a statement attributed to two U.S. Senators from New York, one each from Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, Wisconsin, Vermont, and California.

Mr. Speaker, the writer said that as the "holder of the purse strings of the Department of Agriculture," I had blocked funds for food stamps needed by the poor to buy Government subsidized food; and that "Secretary of Agriculture Freeman has phoned

Whitten repeatedly, pleading with him to approve the necessary funds."

Mr. Speaker, for the present fiscal year, on my recommendation, the Congress provided $140,000,000 for food stamps. That money, or approximately $59,000,000 remaining as of March 31, the latest reporting date, is in Secretary Freeman's hands, not mine.

The Secretary was disturbed at the statements attributed to these Senators. However, Orville Freeman is not one to beg nor plead. He and I have maintained a relationship of mutual respect and can talk about mutual problems at any time. We talked about this one.

I pointed out to him that the law required him to sell food stamps, and set up a formula for charges; that I did not believe there was any such general situation in my State, but if, as the Senators claimed, there were families in such condition, the answer was welfare. The Department of Agriculture supplied me with the names and addresses. I immediately called the Public Welfare Director of my State, gave her full information on each family and asked that she have her people check the situation of these families and make proper provision for them. This she is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and other Members are aware of the fact that this fiscal year I recommended and the committee and the Congress approved $27,855,000 more for the school lunch program than Secretary Freeman recommended; and $83,000,000 more for the school milk program, though I hasten to say it was the Bureau of the Budget rather than the Secretary which was responsible for the reduced figures.

Mr. Speaker, the Department has on hand now approximately $50,000,000 in food stamp funds and says it will carry over a substantial sum into next year.

Mr. Speaker, I have been to cities of New York State, California, Michigan, West Virginia, Massachusetts. I am familiar with conditions in the slum areas of many of them. We have tried to help. Our committee, in addition to providing funds for school lunch, school milk, and food stamps, financed studies of food distribution facilities and provided plans for food markets for New York City, Philadelphia, Chicago, Detroit, which have been of great assistance to those cities and their people.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues are familiar with these facts and though I have received only a very few letters following the publication of this column, no one likes to be accused of hurting people. I dislike such charges, especially since from my district attorney days to date I have tried to be fair to all people, regardless of race and regardless of the section of the country in which they live. I have followed such a course here, both as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the Department of Agriculture and as a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Public Works.

Mr. Speaker, this column brings to mind the statement of my late chairman, Hon. Clarence Cannon, who on a similar occasion had this to say, and I quote:

> Now a word about Drew Pearson. Mr. Speaker, I regard him as an indispensable adjunct of our de facto government. He has become an American institution. In the language of the English Parliament he would be denominated as "Her Majesty's Opposition." In ecclesiastical parlance he would be termed "The Devil's Advocate." Of course, a man who must write a column every day of the year must at times embellish prosaic annals of uneventful days with a little sensationalism in order to make them readable. But he arouses interest and sometimes throws the needed light of publicity on otherwise unnoted phases of American life and consequently is always entertaining. I take off my hat to him. And I hereby express admiration of the very efficient job he did on me.
>
> In the language of Rip Van Winkle, May he, in the risible camaraderie of Mark Twain, Josh Billings and the Baron Munchausen, live long and prosper.

NO EVASION OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT UNDER THE QUIE BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that the Quie substitute to the pending elementary and secondary education bill, H.R. 8983, should give no comfort to those who seek certain routes for southern school districts to prevent desegregation. It is unseemly that, in order to obtain support for this substitute, certain claims are being made that it undermines Federal enforcement under the Civil Rights Act of 1964. I make this point because supporters of the Quie amendment are attempting to make this proposal all things to all men.

I am sure that the House of Representatives will soon join in rejecting the Quie substitute because of its many obvious defects. The appeals to southern regional interests is spurious.

To make certain that the facts are as I state them, I wrote to the Attorney General on May 2, 1967, asking for official information as to the relationship of Representative Quie's proposal to title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and to Federal enforcement under that act. The text of my letter to the Attorney General and his reply follow:

May 2, 1967.

Hon. Ramsey Clark,
Attorney General,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Attorney General: The House of Representatives will soon begin floor debate on certain proposed amendments to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. On April 11, 1967, the Committee on Education and Labor reported favorably, as amended by the Committee, H.R. 7819, the "Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967." Under this bill, the basic structure of the 1965 Act—federal financial assistance for specific purposes as described in different Titles of the Act—would be preserved.

Representative Quie of Minnesota has introduced H.R. 8983, the "Elementary and Secondary Block Grants Amendment Act of 1967," which incorporates a different approach. This bill would add a new Title VII to the 1965 Education Act, under which the Commissioner of Education would be authorized to make "block" grants to the States. The bill provides that " . . . it is the intent of Congress that these (Title VII) grants will replace those authorized under Titles I, II, III and V of . . . " the 1965 Act. Unlike grants presently being made under the 1965 Act, the proposed Title VII grants could be used by the States for a wide variety of educational purposes, subject to certain limitations set forth in the bill. The text of the most recent revised version of H.R. 8983 is set forth at pages 10828–10829 of volume 113 of the Congressional Record.

I would like to have your views on the following questions: First, would Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 apply to H.R. 8983? Second, if Title VI would apply, would enactment of H.R. 8983 affect enforcement of Title VI?

Sincerely,

Emanuel Celler,
Chairman.

May 3, 1967.

Hon. Emanuel Celler,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Celler: This is in response to your letter of May 2, 1967 concerning H.R. 8983 the "Elementary and Secondary Block Grants Amendment Act of 1967," and the relationship of that proposal to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. You asked whether Title VI would apply to H.R. 8983 and, if so, whether enactment of that bill would affect enforcement of Title VI.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits discrimination on account of race, color, or national origin in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance by way of grant. Thus, it is clear that Title VI would apply to H.R. 8983, just as Title VI now applies to grants under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1964, the statute which H.R. 8983 would amend.

Enactment of H.R. 8983 would not affect enforcement of Title VI of the 1964 Act. Grants under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are administered pursuant to a state plan submitted to HEW by state educational authorities. As a condition of eligibility for federal financial assistance under such a grant program, the state agency as well as local school districts are required to file with HEW an assurance that the program will be conducted in conformity with Title VI and the HEW Regulation. This assurance requirement would be equally applicable to "block" grants under Title VII of H.R. 8983, under which payments would be made by HEW to state educational authorities and, in turn, distributed by the state authorities to local school districts. Generally, the same procedures and sanctions now applicable under Title VI to individual school districts (including possible termination of funds to such districts) would apply to those districts receiving funds under H.R. 8983.

Moreover, under the present enforcement program, the refusal of a state agency to file the required assurance of compliance or to abide by its terms would authorize HEW to initiate administrative proceedings to terminate or to refuse to continue assistance to the entire State program. This occurred when the Alabama State Welfare agency refused to submit such an assurance for its statewide welfare program, and that order is currently being judicially reviewed.

Congressman Quie, the sponsor of H.R. 8983, recognized that Title VI would apply to that bill and that enforcement of Title VI would not be affected by its enactment. Congressman Quie recently answered a series of questions concerning H.R. 8983, saying that—

Fifth. Would your amendment in any way affect enforcement of title VI of the Civil Rights Act?

Absolutely not. The Civil Rights Act would apply to these grants under a State plan in exactly the same way as it applies to all other Federal grants for education, most of which are administered through a State plan. Congressional Record, volume 113, page 10369.

Sincerely,

——— ———,
Attorney General.

OH MY COUNTRY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on April 27, 1967, there appeared on the front page of the very well-known French newspaper Le Figaro an article by Pierre Daninos, a famous French author. I would like to read a paragraph from the article, which I have had translated, and which I shall put in the Record. He is speaking of a Frenchman to France and some Frenchmen. He said:

> Oh my beloved country, champion of the logic and the common sense, you who call the Americans big children but behave like an uneducated youngster, you who say.
>
> "I have two countries—mine and France," and shout in the evening: "France for the French," you who yesterday kissed the tanks that brought you freedom and you who then urged the last U.S. soldiers to prudently camouflage their license numbers, you who pose as a peace dove and whose arms only inadvertently penetrated into Algiers and Saragossa. . . . you who claim to be the most courteous people on earth but you. . . . cross the sidewalk in order not to greet the Duke of Edinburgh, you who brandish the banner of brotherhood but forgot to get to Vimy to honor the memory of the 60,000 Canadians who for the sake of your beautiful eyes closed theirs forever, you who consider it normal that your President order the United States to withdraw unconditionally from Vietnam but who would have found it intolerable had the White House suggested to you the same order at the height of the war in Algeria—I like you but you do act like a chameleon.

This is from a Frenchman to the French, and I commend the entire article as worthy of the few minutes it will take for every Member to read it. The entire article is as follows:

Oh My Country

(By Pierre Daninos)

After having given a short lecture to the German NATO officers, Mr. Alfred Grosser, director of studies at the Political Science Foundation, said to one of them: "I guess there should not be any inconveniences now to walk around in Paris in uniform?" "No, we do not have any," was the smiling reply, "but I bet that our American friends could not say the same."

This mark of our upside down world in which France, as it is right and proper, has its head in a whirl, became evident to me in the mail I received after the publication of an article which showed the absurdity of a certain anti-Americanism in a country that has been Americanizing itself for its own pleasure. A copious mail always reflects, like a barometer, the ups and downs of the public mood: six months before 30% of the letters would have been strong; now there were only three out of five hundred which were violent and I was surprised to learn that they called me "courageous". I, perhaps, had displayed some courage in Dunkirk or Malo-les-Bains, and probably quite unintentionally, as I do not consider war a test nor do I believe that having been catapulted into Dunkirk or Verdun was something of a glory; many are there and will stay there because they have no other choice. But does it mean that one has lost the concepts of valor and honor when one calls the man courageous who did freely express his opinion in a free newspaper?

If I now revert to the topic then I do it on account of recent events and because of a photo in the New York Times which I received while I was on a trip and which hit me smack in the eye like a splash from the Torrey Canyon: a picture showing the American flag being burned by foolhardy youngsters who were defending the Vietnamese at Place d'Iéna by setting fire to the fifty stars (did I not see such swashbucklers who shouted for an independent Algeria at Saint-Germain-des-Prés or others who were fighting the Nazi tyranny in Rio [de Janeiro] by sounding their horns to the tunes of the Marseillaise). Undoubtedly, these youngsters who were not born under Hitler had no idea that what they were burning, we, not so long ago, had been dying to see come to us. But would they have shown as much passion for the fire if one had not started striking the match at an important place? It is easy for certain persons to recall what was done in 1776 as if the blood of Lafayette was flowing in their veins. My memory, however, is shorter and more faithful. It reminds me and will always remind me that if the English, the Canadians, and the Americans had not crushed together with the Russians the Nazi Hydra, Paris which has been burning after "Is Paris Burning?" would have a gauleiter [regional leader of NSDAP] as its master.

May one talk in this manner without being accused of deliriously loving America? Do people believe that I have been oblivious of the American blunders or the cruelty of the bombings in Vietnam? But should I be in a better position than the Pentagon to determine the course of those lines where force has to be applied although they often are not in agreement with those dictated by our hearts? Should we believe that thousands of young men are sent to Asia just for the pleasure and in disregard of their mothers' sorrows? As a citizen of the free world who, I admit, feels himself more attracted to the Anglo-Saxon democracies than to the big Marxist-Leninist brain washing machines, should I raise another voice than that of a friend to a friend who has gone astray on the wrong path? As to our "committed" weeklies could they speak as freely if the American flag flying in Berlin would not allow them to judge ex-Lutetia and very calmly Johnson, Nasser or "K"?

Oh my beloved country, champion of the logic and the common sense, you who call the Americans big children but behave like an uneducated youngster, you who say that the Italians are versatile and the Russians always ready to turn around their coats, you whom in a half century I have seen successively turn sky blue and red, Germanophobe and Germanophile, Anglophile and Anglophobe, Pétainist and Gaullist, determined to fight it to the very end and willing to surrender, lick the Vietnamese and dress yourself as a Red Guard—you, sweet country, who adore being wakened by the whisper: "I have two countries—mine and France," and shout in the evening: "France for the French," you who yesterday kissed the tanks that brought you freedom and you who then urged the last U.S. soldiers to prudently camouflage their license numbers, you who pose as a peace dove and whose arms only inadvertently penetrated into Algiers and Saragossa, you the little Cartesian who because you did not want to vote Gaullist changed from the extreme right one Sunday to Communist on the following, you who claim to be the most courteous people on earth but you, swift-footed Perrichon cross the sidewalk in order not to greet the Duke of Edinburgh, you who brandish the banner of brotherhood but forget to go to Vimy to honor the memory of the 60,000 Canadians who for the sake of your beautiful eyes closed theirs forever, you who consider it normal that your President order the United States to withdraw unconditionally from Vietnam but who would have found it intolerable had the White House suggested to you the same order at the height of the war in Algeria—I like you but you do act like a chameleon.

WHAT IS THE NATIONAL COUNCIL OF CHURCHES AND WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES POSITION ON COMMUNISM?

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the expressions of some who claim to speak for Christianity are irreconcilable to the pure at heart. Some seem more intent at converting Christians to heathenism than following the Master's command to save the unbeliever and the lost.

What good can come of Christian ministers who permit themselves to become so antireligious and exploited that they are denounced as traitors and false leaders? They are not only disloyal to America, but disobedient to Christ.

Are they builders or destroyers? If the latter, they are a disgrace to their calling and a scourge to their country and people.

The Bible and 1967 years of concerted effort by dedicated believers will not be overcome by a handful of puny "anti's."

Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent that the editorial from the April 29, 1967, Baton Rouge State Times and the article entitled, "Is the NCC Really Soft on Communism?" by David A. Noebel be here inserted in the Record for study by those interested and concerned. The articles are as follows:

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) State Times, Apr. 29, 1967]

Not the Voice of America

The Rev. Dr. Eugene Carson Blake may speak with the voice of the World Council of Churches but he does not speak with the voice of America when he urges that this nation accept any kind of peace it can get out of the Vietnam conflict.

Peace at any price is not an American tenet.

Dr. Blake is general secretary of the World Council of Churches and he is, short of treasonous utterances when his country is at war to all intents and purposes, certainly entitled to express his views.

It is not necessarily treasonous to make it plain he is among those who would rather switch than fight.

It is not necessarily treasonous to contend that his country cannot win the war in Southeast Asia.

It is not treasonous to suggest that the continuation of the conflict holds within it the seeds of far greater conflict, as he suggests. This is something even a fool would know to be true. It is a part of the calculated risk America takes in honoring its word to a small ally beset from within and from without by those who would destroy its independence.

The formula for the conquest of this great republic, the one real bastion the world has known for self-government by a sovereign people fiercely independent both collectively and individually, is a simple one and has been widely publicized. It goes: "External encirclement, plus internal demoralization, equals to progressive surrender."

The physical might of communism is busy with the external encirclement. The Dr. Eugene Carson Blakes contribute to the internal demoralization.

What America does about both will determine whether there shall be a progressive surrender.

[From Christian Crusader, January 1967]

Is the NCC Really Soft on Communism?

(By David A. Noebel)

The National Council of Churches is an organization that enjoys governmental and denominational blessings and is looked upon by thousands as the voice of Protestantism. Yet, as we shall see, it rightfully deserves severe reprimand. Criticisms directed at this organizational giant, however, are usually brushed off as negativism, anti-Protestant syndromes, irrelevant right-wing extremism or other frightening niceties.

An ominous fact about the operation of the National Council of Churches is that it is really two organizations in one. The General Board and General Assembly, composed of denominational representatives from thirty-one constituent members, form the public image of the NCC. We will term it the National Council Number One. These men attend to National Council business sporadically, i.e., they meet at designated time intervals (usually three times a year) but are not full-time employees of the National Council.

It is, in fact, the full-time professional staff that comprises the "hidden" NCC. These individuals form the bureaucratic and policy-making structure of the organization and meet daily at 475 Riverside Drive, New York City.

This National Council Number Two literally manipulates and steers the movement of the organization port side with occasional help from its faithful image, the General Board and Assembly. While the National Council Number One merits most of the attention in the news media, the professional staff of experts (NCC Number Two) prepares the fact sheets and work sheets and circulates them through the denominational channels.

For example, when the motion picture *Operation Abolition* was current and making an unusual impact upon sleepy America, the National Council published its own pamphlet entitled *Operation Abolition—Some Facts and Some Comments.* It was seemingly endorsed by the General Board on February 22, 1961 (five years to the date this same Board called for the recognition of Communist China). The Board's statement concludes: "The General Board advises its constituent communions and their members not to exhibit the film *Operation Abolition* in churches unless a full and fair presentation of such facts as are available relevant to these questions is provided beforehand and reference made to the National Council statement."

At first blush, one is left with the immediate impression that this National Council pamphlet was actually endorsed by the General Board. However, one page later we are tersely advised, "The following material is not to be construed as reflecting the attitudes or position of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A."

In other words, this pamphlet was not put together and distributed by the NCC Number One, but by the NCC Number Two. And, the pamphlet itself, performing at peak efficiency, seeks to disqualify the film *Operation Abolition* by quoting practically every left-wing, "soft-on-communism" publication in the country, viz., *The Reporter, Washington Post, Milwaukee Journal, The Nation, Minneapolis Star, San Francisco Chronicle, New York Post and The Christian Century.*

J. Edgar Hoover is given one innocuous quote which has nothing to do with what happened in San Francisco in 1960, and nowhere is there any hint that communism was behind the demonstrations.

The actual disposition of the professional staff was revealed more fully when this writer wrote the NCC Office of Information and asked for material concerning *Operation Abolition*. What should return but a malevolent article sent out by the National Council from the pro-Communist *New York Post* referring to the FBI Director as follows: "The highest secular authority on matters of faith and morals in the U.S. is J. Edgar Hoover, horse player and wrestling fan." (*New York Post*, May 4, 1961) In other words, the National Council saw fit to send photostatic copies of the screed by Murray Kempton against Mr. Hoover, along with a *New York Times* editorial of May 8, 1961, to all persons asking for information regarding the Council's stand on the Communist-led riots against the House Committee on Un-American Activities in San Francisco in May, 1960.

This is just one example of the "soft-on-communism" attitude of the National Council of Churches Number Two.

The House Committee on Un-American Activities, itself, exposed the "soft-on-communism" attitude of the NCC Number One. While investigating the Air Force's withdrawal of a manual mentioning the pro-Communist sympathies of certain clergymen, HCUA found that "The leadership of the National Council of Churches of Christ in America . . . [as] over 100 persons in leadership capacity with either Communist-front records or records of service to Communist causes. The aggregate affiliations of the leadership . . . [are] now . . . into the thousands and we have yet to complete our check, which would certainly suggest, on the basis of the authoritative sources of this Committee, that the statement that there is infiltration of fellow travelers in churches and educational institutions is a complete understatement"[1]

All this would strongly indicate that, in spite of the National Council's continual chant that "there is no Communist infiltration in our august body," the unvarnished truth is another matter. There is certainly sufficient evidence to prove, even in a court of law, as they insist, an overabundance of Communist-fronters among the individuals who have positions of influence in the National Council of Churches.

When the formation of "The Committee to Celebrate the Ninetieth Birthday Anniversary of Dr. Harry F. Ward" was announced, its letterhead revealed that the committee was sponsored by seventy-two leading clergymen, twenty-two of whom were in leadership positions in the National Council of Churches.

Now, each one of these gentlemen, including Bishop James C. Baker, Dr. John C. Bennett, Dr. Harold A. Bosley, Professor W. Russel Bowie, Bishop Matthew Clair, Jr., Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, Bishop A. Raymond Grant, Professor Frederick C. Grant, Professor Paul T. Lehmann, Bishop John Wesley Lord, Dr. John A. MacKay, Dr. Benjamin E. Mays, Dr. Walter G. Muelder, Bishop Marshall R. Read, Reverend William Scarlett, Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Reverend Alfred W. Swan, Dr. Henry P. Van Dusen, Bishop William J. Walls, Professor Leroy Waterman, Bishop Lloyd C. Wicke, knew the colorful background of Dr. Harry F. Ward.

Each knew his hundreds of Communist-front affiliations (approximately 269).[2] Each knew his radical Marxist thought. Each knew that Ward was identified under oath as a member of the Communist Party by Manning Johnson who referred to him as "the chief architect for Communist infiltration and subversion in the religious field"[3] and by Leonard Patterson, a Negro ex-Red who testified, "Dr. Ward, Earl Browder and myself, Victor Jerome, Manning Johnson and other top leading members of the Communist Party were assigned to a top faction. In other words, a top policymaking body of the Communist Party by the Central Committee of the Communist Party."[4] Each probably remembered that some of Ward's books were actually published by the official Communist press, International Publishers.[5] Yet, these men still insisted on making Ward's ninetieth a memorable occasion.

This is what we explicitly, through denotatively, mean by the National Council leadership's being "soft on communism." In fact, *The Worker,* Moscow's American voice, editorialized a eulogy to Ward:

"Dr. Ward is a link between the Christian Socialist preachers of the late nineteenth century, who sought to end the Church's neutrality in the class struggle . . . He helped set up the American Civil Liberties Union in 1920 . . . He became a firm advocate of friendship with the Soviet Union. We are going to be at Carnegie Hall this Tuesday evening, October 15 to wish this grand man many more birthdays. We are sure we will see you there."[6]

Even the more recent activities of the past presidents of the National Council weather vane for us the leftist-oriented direction of the organization. Edwin T. Dahlberg is presently engaged in activities that will assure a Viet Cong victory in Vietnam.[7] J. Irwin Miller heads a presidential committee calling for more trade with the Red bloc nations.[8] And Eugene Carson Blake is the latest president of the World Council of Churches—an organization riddled with Marxists, (Socialists and Communists).

Professor Will Herberg of Drew University, speaking before a conference gathered in Wiesbaden, Germany, and sponsored by the Foundation for Foreign Affairs, Inc., of Chicago, publicly admitted, "It is a scandalous fact that many churchmen are soft on communism. All you have to do is look at the World Council of Churches."[9] When one looks at the World Council, he finds the past president of the National Council leading it and the basic affiliate to be the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

Dr. Herberg gave three reasons for the failure of churchmen to oppose communism and all three are applicable to the majority of the leadership of the NCC. "First," he said, "so many churchmen come out of a Liberal and Socialist background. To them, the enemy is always on the right. It is inbred in their bones. Second, they see socialism as the wave of the future, and to them, the wave of the future is in the province of God. Third, many of them have a certain perverted sense of guilt. They belive the Church has failed and communism has succeeded because the Church has not done its duty."

Herberg further remarked that "Some Christian leaders . . . cannot see the flagrantly totalitarian character of the Soviet,

---

[1] *House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings,* Feb. 25, 1960, p. 1303.

[2] Earl Lively, Jr., *The Invasion of Mississippi,* p. 24.

[3] *House Committee on Un-American Activities hearing,* July 7, 8, 13, 14, 1953, p. 2266.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 2138.

[5] *Guide to Subversive Organizations and Publications,* Dec. 1, 1961, p. 90.

[6] *The Worker,* October 15, 1963, p. 4.

[7] *While Brave Men Die.*

[8] *Chicago Tribune,* May 7, 1965, p. 6, Section 2.

[9] *Ibid.*, Sept. 9, 1966, p. 17.

East German, Chinese, and other Communist regimes, and tend to adopt attitudes running from friendly neutralism and critical co-operation to outright support."

At this same conference, Sir Arnold Lunn related a paradoxical challenge. "No prominent Jew," said Lunn, "ever defended the Hitler regime. No prominent Negro defends apartheid in South Africa. Yet you can always find some Christians who defend communism." [10]

Reverend Richard Wurmbrand was a former representative of the World Council of Churches in Romania. He was imprisoned in 1948 for "illegal preaching," released after eight years, but imprisoned again from 1959 through 1964. When he was released the second time, his captors told him he could "preach about Christ, but not against communism."

"I came into the free world to find many clergymen voicing the same advice," he testified. "I found the World Council of Churches urging an end to attacks on communism. I am very sad. The Church can never have peaceful co-existence with atheism. Communism is poisoning the minds of our children." [11]

Herbert A. Philbrick, former FBI agent within the Communist Party and still a top authority on the subject, related in a recent article how the Communists planned to make the World Council of Churches toe the Communist line. Wrote Philbrick: "From sources behind the Iron Curtain we learn that the Communist-controlled 'churches' in the captive and slave nations of Europe have . . . been holding a series of special planning sessions to develop the propaganda line to be brought before the scheduled meeting of the World Council of Churches in Geneva in July, 1966 . . . Since the theme of the Geneva World Council of Churches meeting will be on 'Church and Society,' the Communists are obviously seeking ways and means to act as a political lobby in favor of Communist society and against capitalist society.

"It is clear that the Red delegates to the Geneva World Council of Churches meeting in July will attempt to portray the United States as the evil aggressor in the world; the Soviet Union as a 'peace-loving nation'; and that they will further suggest that the 'solution' should be a policy of appeasement toward communism on the part of the United States and the Free World countries . . ." [12]

Since Philbrick wrote this material in May, he would not have been surprised to read the AP dispatches emanating from the World Conference on Church and Society in July. "The World Conference on Church and Society overwhelmingly approved a report Saturday criticizing the U.S. military build-up and air attacks in Vietnam as unjustifiable. At the same time, seventy-two American laymen and theologians at the conference urged President Johnson not to order reprisals if North Vietnam tries U.S. prisoners as war criminals. The conference report criticizing U.S. policy in Vietnam was adopted with only a few hands among the 400 delegates raised against it." [13]

Now, most of the "soft-on communism" attitude, both in the National and World Council of Churches, is directly traceable to the influence of the "social gospel" which became fashionable in many theological seminaries a generation or so ago. "The social gospel," said the late Dr. J. B. Matthews, "was little more than a modern version of the ancient heresy of Pelagius who countered St. Augustine's doctrine of original sin with a much more optimistic view of human nature . . ."

"The result has been that many Protestant churches have come to have the atmosphere of a personality beauty parlor, whither men may repair to have their egos massaged. The soteriology of Christianity has been diluted into the social workers' prescription of vitamin pills, interior decorating, and smart haberdashery as the cure for sin. The resemblance of this prescription for human salvation to that of the Marxist propaganda is obvious.

"The emergence of the modern Communist slave state suggests that the Bishop of Hippo St. Augustine was not far off in his view of human nature. Communism has plumbed the depths of human depravity, and dredged up its most evil components to organize them into a way of life: lying, greed of power, arrogance, theft, slavery, torture, and murder. In this light, remember that a Gallup Poll found some 30,000 Protestant clergymen who were either unwilling or unable—for reasons of their own—to affirm the utter incompatibility between 'being a good Christian,' on the one hand, and membership in the Communist Party, on the other."

Dr. Matthews exposed an organization responsible to a large degree for this conditioning of Protestant clergymen to accepting the compatibility of "being a good Christian" and possessing "membership in the Communist Party." This same organization also bears a marked responsibility for the present ideological leanings of both the National and World Council of Churches. Dr. Matthews said:

"More than twenty years ago, a social gospel group,, having its center in Union Theological Seminary, set up an organization called the Fellowship of Socialist Christians. The Reverend Professor Reinhold Niebuhr was chairman. The Chairman of the small executive committee of nine members, one Francis Henson was a Communist. I mean Communist as distinct from Socialist. Other members of that small executive committee have gone places in the eccelesiastical world. One of them, Roswell P. Barnes, is associate general secretary of the National Council of the Churches of Christ. Another was the Reverend Professor John C. Bennett, who was 'academic advisor' to Ralph Lord Roy while the latter was writing his *Apostles of Discord*, two years ago. Still another was Buell G. Gallagher, now president of the College of the City of New York (CCNY). A fourth was Henry P. Van Dusen, now president of Union Theological Seminary. [Since this was written, the presidency has been handed over to John C. Bennett, but kept in the family of the Fellowship of Socialist Christians.] Four of these—Niebuhr, Barnes, Bennett and Van Dusen—are men of commanding influence in the World Council of Churches, as well as in the National Council of Churches.

"The Fellowship of Socialist Christians published a magazine called *Radical Religion*, under the editorship of Reinhold Niebuhr. The magazine is still published under the more ambiguous title, *Christianity and Society*, and still under the editorship of Reinhold Niebuhr. The name, Fellowship of Socialist Christians, has been changed to Social Action.

"Reinhold Niebuhr's socialism, more than his theology, has influenced the thinking of thousands of Protestant clergymen. From Niebuhr's Fabian socialism to Harry Ward's Marxism has been an easy step for many of the students and graduates of Union Theological Seminary. I note in passing that 504 faculty members, students and graduates of the Seminary have had affiliations with Communist-front enterprises. Arnold Johnson, one of the convicted so-called second-string Communist Party leaders, is a graduate of Union Theological Seminary, class of 1932, and a protege of Harry Ward." [14]

It was exactly this type of socialistic oil that greased the National Council's skids for its plunge into the presently perilous "soft-on-communism" abyss. "Almost everyone who cares earnestly about freedom is aroused against the Communists," says Max Eastman in his *Reflections on the Failure of Socialism*, "but it is not only the Communists, it is, in a more subtle way, the Socialists who are blocking the efforts of the free world to recover its poise and its once-firm resistance to tyranny." [15]

How else can one explain the ambulations of the National Council of Churches to recognize atheistic Communist China,[16] to make the front pages of *The Worker* over its Vietnam policy,[17] to have its leadership endorse the abolition of the House Committee on Un-American Activities,[18] to suggest the possibility that Christians could co-operate with Communists,[19] to dare believe that Communists fear Socialists far more than Conservatives,[20] to maintain an economic creed that the National Lay Committee of the National Council of Churches found to be socialistic and communistic! [21] How else can one explain the behavior of the National Council except for the fact that the organization is primarily a diaphanous, socialistic bureaucracy that is "soft on its socialistic friends—the Communists"!

Dupery on the part of the leadership certainly isn't the answer. And, these intellectually proud clergymen are usually the first to admit that they have not been duped. It would hurt their pride, for one thing, and besides, many *do* know exactly what they are doing!

Misplaced idealism certainly isn't the reason since most of these gentlemen are mature individuals who have reasoning facilities and the mental qualities to read the mass of material depicting the horrors of communism.

Therefore, it is our conclusion that the majority of National Council clerics have (1) a propensity for socialism, (2) an abhorrence of orthodox Biblical Christianity, and (3) a favorable disposition toward the humanistic creed of the social gospel. And, since socialism and communism are Marxist twins, the logical inference invariably results in a "soft-on-communism" attitude terminating with "soft-on-communism" action.

ORDERLY MARKETING ACT OF 1967

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill known as the "Orderly Marketing Act of 1967," which is designed to provide legislative relief for the American shoe industry, from the alarming steady increase in foreign shoe imports.

In the shoe industry the complex problems of high labor input, narrow profit margins, and limited capital resources have helped low-wage foreign competition gain major inroads in the domestic market. These problems have in turn created a rise of more than 12 million pairs of shoes imported for U.S. consumption in 1966. The 1966 grand total of 132,188,000 pairs of shoes were imported, as compared to 120,995,000 pairs imported in 1965. The value of these foreign-imported shoes was $172,596,000 in 1966 as compared to a value of $136,092,000 in 1965. This means that imports increased to 16.3 percent of the domestic production in 1966 from 15.2 percent in 1965. These figures seem astronomical when compared to the year 1955 when imports accounted for only 1.2 percent of domestic production, and if this trend continues unabated, and unchecked imports will rapidly increase to a projected 30 percent of the domestic market by 1969.

---

[10] *Id.*

[11] *Ibid.*, May 7, 1966, p. 99.

[12] *Manchester Union Leader*, May 18, 1966.

[13] *Tulsa Daily World*, July 24, 1966.

[14] *News and Views*, May, 1964, p. 7.

[15] Max Eastman, *Reflections on the Failure of Socialism*, 1962, p. 23.

[16] *Tulsa Daily World*, February 23, 1966, p. 8.

[17] *The Worker*, December 7, 1965, p. 1.

[18] *Washington Post*, January 7, 1959, p. A–8.

[19] N.C.C., *A Christian's Handbook on Communism*, 1962, p. 84.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 18, 19.

[21] J. Howard Pew, *The Chairman's Final Report*, 1955, p. 32.

Mr. Speaker, not only is this an acute national problem, but its urgency is being hard felt in Missouri, which is one of the major shoe-producing States, and especially in my home district of southwest Missouri where many shoe-producing facilities are located.

As to the bill itself: it allows us to bring balance to our trade policy. Very simply, this bill would require, under certain specific conditions, the Secretary of Commerce to determine whether increased quantities of imports are a factor contributing to a condition of economic impairment of a domestic industry. If the Secretary finds that such impairment does exist, then the President would be able to impose import limitations geared to total sales in the domestic market, subject to review after 3 years. This concept would allow us to overcome unfair competition, through international agreements or through unilateral—but flexible—quotas. This I believe to be a reasonable approach to a difficult and thorny problem.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD a letter I received from the employees of the Tobin-Hamilton Co., Inc., of Mansfield, Mo., and also insert an editorial that appeared in the Leather and Shoes magazine of March 18, 1967, entitled "Up for Grabs—A $5 Billion Industry."

MANSFIELD, MO.,
April 14, 1967.

Representative DURWARD G. HALL,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HALL: We, the undersigned, are employees of Tobin-Hamilton Company, Incorporated, Shoe Manufacturer located in Mansfield, Missouri.

Our company employs an average of 300 people and until presently gave us continuous employment for the eleven years they have been operating in Mansfield.

The contents of the attached letter mailed to us by our company is serious to us, and the possibility of a slowdown and lack of steady employment is a threat to not only us and our families personally, but also will be a serious thing for Mansfield and the surrounding area.

As our representatives, we urge and expect you to do your utmost to protect the opportunity for us to be steadily and gainfully employed. Our company must be able to compete, and only by sales can they provide jobs.

Our company has been in touch with you on various occasions. They assure us that we will be kept posted on matters concerning your efforts to protect our chance for steady work.

Sincerely yours,
TOBIN-HAMILTON CO. EMPLOYEES.

[From Leather and Shoes magazine, Mar. 18, 1967]

UP FOR GRABS—A $5 BILLION INDUSTRY

Few people, especially in Government circles, realize that the $5 billion plus footwear industry, generally regarded as one of the more stable standbys in U.S. manufacturing circles, is now teetering on the brink of major disaster.

Rather than looking forward to projected growth in 1967 and ensuing years, some 800 odd domestic footwear manufacturers and their hundreds of suppliers may soon find themselves facing a long period of attrition and decline.

The footwear industry's bright future seen for the 1970's and beyond, its hitherto moderate but assured growth rate, is almost sure to prove but a dim memory. Even the 665 million pairs of conventional shoes expected to roll off our production lines this year may turn out to be more shadow than substance.

This astonishing turn of events can only be attributed to a fact we can no longer ignore: the U.S. shoe manufacturing industry is up for grabs. In more than 300 years of contributing to the nation's progress and well being, it has never been threatened as it is today.

Apparently Congress or the State Department—we haven't been able to pin down the individuals or groups responsible—regards the American footwear industry expendable.

Otherwise, how could cheap labor, low-cost imported footwear be allowed to reach close to 17 percent of domestic production in 1966?

How, we ask, could our State Department consider reducing imported footwear tariffs by as much as 50 percent (at the Kennedy Rounds) while reciprocity remains a figment of somebody's imagination? And while foreign governments continue to encourage footwear exports to the U.S. through export subsidies?

How could Congress consider opening our gates wide to a flood of cheap shoes from Iron Curtain countries via the projected East-West Trade Bill?

We submit that the current lag in domestic shoe production, which has manufacturers and suppliers concerned over a severe drop in new orders, is due more to the rapidly expanding influx of imported footwear than to any decline in consumer demand. Witness the 24 percent increase in footwear imports during January, lifting imports to an unprecedented 23 percent of U.S. footwear production for that month.

Witness the fact that while American manufacturers went begging for orders at the recent New York and Boston shoe shows, importers at the same shows were busily writing a record volume of orders for low-cost, foreign-made footwear of all types.

As matters stand now, the situation will soon become intolerable. *We are on the verge of a record invasion of imported footwear and leathers with which our domestic industries cannot possibly compete solely because of price.* We are faced with a government trade policy which appears willing to sacrifice one of the nation's most important industries in the interests of so-called "political necessity".

Thus we can only look forward to a declining share of the American footwear market and closed doors overseas. The inevitable result is a growing mortality rate among U.S. footwear producers, among the highest employers of labor in relation to dollar volume, as well as severe attrition among tanners and suppliers—and thousands of workers thrown out of jobs.

The issue is no longer one of outmoded political expediency. Today—right now—it concerns the survival of an industry!

SPEEDING UP TRANSFER OF MAIL

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, recently I asked Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien that every effort be made to speed up transfer of mail shipments between trains and station platforms. I recommended that a container be developed to replace the honored but antiquated mail sack, the loading and unloading of which is often responsible for delaying train departures.

The Department has responded with an expeditious and optimistic report, and I should like the RECORD to show the exchange of correspondence. I am confident that by the time the high-speed trains are in service there will be available a container that will save time at the depot and also prove more efficient for mail car operations and in post office buildings.

I have also congratulated Postmaster General O'Brien for his proposal to abolish the Department and turn the mail job over to a nonprofit Government corporation. The idea reflects his unselfish and patriotic service and merits immediate consideration here and at the White House.

My letter to Mr. O'Brien and the Department replies follow:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 11, 1967.

Hon. LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN,
Postmaster General, Post Office Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL O'BRIEN: In recommending that the Post Office Department be abolished and the job of delivering the mails be turned over to a non-profit government corporation, you have once again demonstrated your unselfish and patriotic spirit as a public servant. I congratulate you, and I trust that your proposal will receive immediate and in-depth consideration both at the White House and on Capitol Hill.

Meanwhile you may want to discuss with railroad officials the possibility of a joint research effort to speed up transfer of mail shipments between trains and station platforms. One week-day last month an express passenger train between the East and St. Louis was held up almost ten minutes in Harrisburg to load mail long after other cargo and passengers were aboard. On inquiry, I learned from a railroad employee that trains are often delayed much longer when mail is heavy. The matter raises serious questions, as even a slight delay can snowball into serious impediments for railroad schedules.

If a study of the situation should result in the demise of the honored mail sack, which has been standard equipment for as long as any of us can remember and probably should have been discarded along the way to progress years ago, I suspect that the public can adjust to the change. A new type of container that would save time at the depot might also prove more efficient for mail car operations and in post office buildings as well. To find out for sure should not be too expensive an undertaking.

Again, congratulations on your bold and forthright leadership!

Sincerely,

JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Member of Congress.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D.C., April 12, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you for your letter of April 11 suggesting the need for improved methods for the loading of mail shipments on passenger trains in order to avoid delays in railroad schedules.

Your comments on this matter will certainly receive our very careful consideration, and I want to assure you that we will write to you again at the earliest possible time.

Also, may I take this opportunity to thank you for your very generous remarks about my recent recommendations concerning the postal service. Your expression of support is valuable and most welcome.

With kind regards.

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT, ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL, BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION AND INTERNATIONAL SERVICES,
Washington, D.C., April 17, 1967.

Hon. JOHN P. SAYLOR,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The Postmaster General has asked me to give you some further information on your April 11 letter. You commented on delay to mail carrying trains because of loading large volumes of mail sack by sack and inquired as to the possibility of developing better methods of loading mail on and unloading mail from passenger trains.

For the past few years, my staff has maintained very close contact with top railroad officials in a continuing effort to pinpoint and eliminate any mail transportation activities which cause delays to trains. At many points we have worked out advance loading of cars to be switched into trains, expedited means of exchanging mail at the stations, and use of containers to expedite some of the mail exchanges.

The Postmaster General has established a container study group in the Post Office Department with the specific mission of exploring ways and means of better containerizing our mail and applying these advances to mail exchanges with all modes of transportation. For example, we have discussed with Pennsylvania Railroad officials the possibility of using a small box container to slide mail quickly on and off the coming high speed trains between New York and Washington. The practicability of wider use of boxes, small cargo containers, and other types of materials handling equipment, other than the mail sack, is being constantly tested.

Your suggestion is sincerely appreciated, and you may be assured that we are taking every possible effort consistent with good postal service and the variable quantity of mail moving on different days of the week, to improve the scheduled performance of mail carrying trains and the means and methods of loading mail on these trains.

Sincerely yours,

F. E. BATRUS,
Deputy Assistant Postmaster General
(For William J. Hartigan).

HOODLUMS SERVING AS COMMUNITY SPOKESMEN

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, last week two young men, determined to avoid the process of justice at all costs, refused to obey the demands of a Washington police officer. One was killed. The other formed a protest group known as Youth Committee for Equal Justice, and along with others frequently seen in the forefront of mob justice under the guise of civil rights, he has succeeded in harassing city officials into a weak-kneed posture of submitting to extralegal promises at the very moment the time-honored processes of justice are being undertaken.

The youth's name is Rufus Mayfield. I have looked up the record of this young man—this voice crying for justice, law, and order at the forefront of disorder and mob rule. Since his 12th birthday he has spent over 2 years at Cedar Knolls; 1 at National Training School; 27 months at the Lorton Youth Center for auto theft, where as a source of constant trouble he spent much time in the special treatment unit; and since his parole in January of last year he has been booked twice for disorderly conduct—the latest occasion a month ago today.

The Rufus Mayfields of our community, who have repeatedly violated standards of decency and order, cannot be allowed to emerge from jail cells to tell law-abiding citizens how to behave. Prison is no place for earning awards for righteousness or diplomas for civic leadership.

I do not propose to be governed by the Rufus Mayfields, Mr. Speaker, nor by those who use them as front men of civic distemper. I do not fear their threats, nor should the Congress, the city officials, or the people. Those who abuse the law cannot speak for it—or for me or for any segment of our community—until they learn to respect the law we all must live by if we are to survive as a decent society.

Mr. Speaker, wild and repeated threats are being made daily in our Nation's Capital by groups and individuals promising riots, bloodshed, and their own brand of law and order this summer, unless the community knuckles under to their demands.

Here is another example of the all too frequent demand for extra legal action which, unless it is forcibly checked at the source, will engulf this city in a wave of lawlessness and disorder.

It thrives on fear and threat; it lacks the form or substance of ordinary human behavior; and, unfortunately, it is usually led by criminal elements in our city.

We are watching hoodlums serve as community spokesmen, setting themselves up as the conscience of the city. And, backed by threats to riot and destroy, they are afforded respect from constituted authorities, who, beset as they undoubtedly are, weaken the authority vested in them when they listen to tainted complaints and charges.

While we still have a chance, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our citizens to observe and respect the laws and procedures of justice that governs them. I further urge, Mr. Speaker, that this Congress convey its assembled wisdom of the need for doing so to the constituted authorities of the Nation's Capital.

A BILL TO BAR PUBLIC SERVICE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS FROM GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to prohibit gambling activities by public service financial institutions. Even in these modern times, the overwhelming majority of our good citizens agrees that gambling is an unmitigated evil.

How paradoxical it is that some of our largest and most prestigious federally assisted financial institutions wish to involve themselves in horseracing lotteries and perhaps other gambling activities.

I think that most Americans will be highly incensed when they realize they are being trifled with by all sorts of giveaways, games of chance, and other false and misleading come-ons craftily designed to part the consumer from his money.

Certainly the sale of lottery tickets by our federally insured banks for a cut of the profits, even where permitted under local law, is a great boost to the gambling interests and opens the door to eventual domination or outright takeover of these banks by gambling syndicates.

I insert at this point in the RECORD, Mr. Speaker, copies of two recent news items from the Wall Street Journal and the New York Times, followed by the text of my bill.

Members will note that my bill does not flatly prohibit these evil activities by those who may wish to take advantage of permissive local law. However, any financial institution must give up its Federal charter, license, or insurance if it wishes to involve itself in gambling. And any such institution convicted of gambling activities would also be subject to a fine of up to $100,000 for each offense.

[From the New York Times, May 10, 1967]

TEN PERCENT LOTTERY FEE IS ASKED BY BANKS—TAX COMMISSIONER SAYS TICKET-HANDLING CHARGE "SOUNDS A LITTLE HIGH"—PUBLIC HEARINGS HELD—SPEAKERS INSIST THAT FAIR COMPENSATION FOR EXPENSES IS ALL THEY WANT

(By Sydney H. Schanberg)

ALBANY, May 9.—The banks that will be selling state lottery tickets told the state today that they should be paid handling costs of as much as 10 cents for each of the $1 tickets they sell.

State Tax Commissioner Joseph H. Murphy, who is in charge of the forthcoming lottery, responded by saying that the 10-cent-a-ticket proposal "sounds a little high."

There has been some recent discussion in the tax department of possibly paying 5 cents a ticket to the lottery vendors, who will include banks, hotels, and motels, major Western Union branches, and possibly some local government offices.

Publicly, Mr. Murphy has said only that "we're considering 2 or 3 cents a ticket, but that may turn out to be a little bit low."

The banks made their request for compensation at a public hearing conducted by Mr. Murphy at Chancellor's Hall. Another hearing will be held tomorrow for the hotels and motels that want to handle the lottery tickets, which will go on sale next month, with the first drawing to be held in late July.

LOTTERY EVERY MONTH

There will be a separate lottery every month, and for every $1-million worth of tickets sold, there will be $300,000 in prizes. All the profits—which the state is predicting will be $198-million a year—will go for school aid.

More than 50 representatives of banks and banking associations—representing savings, commercial, and savings and loan institutions—appeared at today's hearing, which lasted about an hour.

Most of the speakers agreed on the 10-cent-a-ticket proposal, although a few said they thought 7½ cents or 8 cents might be adequate.

Virtually all the banking officials stressed that banks would not sell the lottery tickets without some payment for their services. Many of them said the state should be prepared to revise the vendor compensation, either upward or downward, if experience later dictates it.

One official said that many banks, particularly, those in rural areas, were holding off applying for licenses to become lottery agents until they see what the compensation will be.

The bankers insisted that they were not trying to make money from the sale of the lottery tickets, but were simply seeking fair compensation for the expenses they will incur. Some of them pointed out that the standard fee for handling the payment of utility bills was 10 cents a bill.

All the speakers said that having the temporary use of the lottery proceeds to invest and to earn interest on would not be enough to compensate the banks adequately.

Tax Commissioner Murphy agrees with this view. He has pointed out that no lottery outlet would have the funds for more than a month and has estimated that a busy bank that sold $8,000 worth of tickets for one of the monthly lotteries would probably be able to make no more than $10 or $12 in interest.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Jan. 9, 1967]

SOME NEW YORK BANKS OFFER TO SELL TICKETS FOR LOTTERY IN STATE—CHASE MANHATTAN SEEKS TO BE "MAJOR AGENT" IF LEGISLATURE USES POWER GIVEN BY VOTERS

NEW YORK.—More than a dozen banks in New York State have indicated eagerness to participate in the sale of lottery tickets if a state lottery is established.

Establishment of a lottery was given the go-ahead by voters in November, and it's up to the state legislature to determine what form it should take.

How the tickets would be sold is one of the chief problems under study by legislative and administrative officials, currently drafting plans to submit to the current session of the legislature. As part of the study, legislative leaders informally questioned banks on their willingness to sell tickets. The responses, one official said, were "more than favorable," with at least a dozen banks from most of the state's major cities expressing interest.

One of the more enthusiastic responses came from Chase Manhattan Bank, the state's largest. Chase not only said it would be willing to sell tickets, but asked to be "designated the major agent for stocking and controlling the tickets sold in this state," or at least in the New York City area.

Banks' interest in the lottery isn't surprising, as these institutions would be able to use the funds they collect from ticket sales until they are turned over to the state. Bankers estimate the use of $1 million "free" money might equal $140 a day in interest income for the banks. With estimates of ticket sales ranging from $40 million to $300 million annually, banks could come into a windfall of as much as $15 million a year.

Even if the banks were designated to act as ticket vendors, some officials say, other outlets would still have to be found if the lottery is to be successful. Joseph H. Murphy, commissioner and president of the state tax commission, whose department is cooperating in the lottery studies, indicated that 7,000 to 10,000 outlets might be needed to meet some of the ambitious incoming goals of lottery proponents.

One proposal is to use vending machines similar to those used to sell airline travel insurance at airports. These, proponents say, could be placed in various public terminals.

The need for sufficient outlets, they note, is demonstrated by New Hampshire's lottery, which has been in operation since 1964. Sweepstake tickets there, at $3 each, are sold at 51 state liquor stores, at two thoroughbred race tracks and at two highway toll stations. In 1964, the state received $2.8 million from the lottery for its schools. The revenue fell to $2.4 million in 1965 and last year it was only $1.8 million.

Ticket sales for this year's sweepstakes in New Hampshire are running behind last year's pace.

H.R. 9892

A bill to prohibit certain financial institutions from participating in gambling activities

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

APPLICABILITY

SECTION 1. (a) The prohibition contained in section 2 of this Act applies to any—

(1) insured bank as defined in section 3 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act (12 U.S.C. 1813).

(2) bank holding company as defined in section 2(a) of the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 (12 U.S.C. 1841(a)).

(3) insured institutions as defined in section 401(a) of the National Housing Act (12 U.S.C. 1724(a)).

(4) person, corporation, association, or other legal or business entity which—

(A) controls more than 10 per centum of the stock of any institution described in paragraph (3); or

(B) is found by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board to directly or indirectly exercise a controlling influence over the management and policies of any institution described in paragraph (3).

(5) Federal credit union organized under the Federal Credit Union Act (12 U.S.C., ch. 14).

(6) small business investment corporation licensed under section 301(c) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 681(c)).

(b) For the purposes of this Act, the term "person" includes any legal or business entity referred to in subsection (a).

GAMBLING ACTIVITIES PROHIBITED

SEC. 2. No person referred to in section 1(a) may conduct, manage, operate, administer, or in any manner aid, assist, or cooperate in the conduct, management, operation, or administration of any gambling activity, including any wager, lottery, pool, or game of chance.

ADMINISTRATIVE ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 3. (a) Administrative enforcement of this Act—

(1) in the case of any insured bank, shall be in accordance with section 8 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act.

(2) in the case of any insured institution, shall be in accordance with section 407 of the National Housing Act.

(3) in the case of any Federal credit union, shall be in accordance with section 21 of the Federal Credit Union Act, and for the purposes of that section, any violation of section 2 of this Act is a violation of the Federal Credit Union Act.

(4) in the case of any small business investment company, shall be in accordance with section 309 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for the purposes of that section, any violation of section 2 of this Act is a violation of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

SEC. 4. Any insured bank, insured institution, or Federal credit union which violates section 2 of this Act shall be fined not more than $100,000.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN G. ROBERT WATKINS BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR) RELATING TO H.R. 478 AND H.R. 479, MAY 10, 1967

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WATKINS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for printing in the RECORD the statement I made before the House Committee on Education and Labor on May 10.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN G. ROBERT WATKINS BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR (SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR) RELATING TO H.R. 478 AND H.R. 479, MAY 10, 1967

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I am appreciative of this opportunity to appear before this General Subcommittee on Labor which is considering the impact of imports on American employment and industry. While I am aware of the serious impact of imports on industries throughout the nation, I am particularily conscious of a bombshell of tremendous proportions which was dropped on the domestic canned mushroom industry. These imports have come primarily from Taiwan and in the space of four short years assumed 25% of the domestic consumption of this product.

Mushrooms, both fresh and canned, are of very great importance to the State of Pennsylvania and my District in that State. In terms of gross farm income, mushrooms are the most important single crop in the State.

A recent Tariff Commission Report indicated that 75% of the total growers and more than half of the canners are located in Pennsylvania. It is estimated that over 10,000 people are employed in growing and canning mushrooms in Pennsylvania with a gross product of over $50 million a year.

Commercial producers and canners of mushrooms are concentrated in the Kennett Square area, much of which is in my Congressional District. For the most part, these mushroom canning operations are similar to those of other small canneries in the United States. However, unlike most canneries, which operate during only a few weeks or months of the year, mushroom canneries generally operate during as many as 7 or 8 months. Most mushroom canners, particularly those in the Kennett Square area, process few other products; most of them are located in areas economically unsuited for growing other canning crops because of unfavorable climatic and soil factors.

As the witness for the domestic industry will relate in more detail, the United States represents a preferred market for mushrooms canned in Taiwan because of differences in growing and processing costs in the United States and Taiwan. These cost differences can be traced primarily to the difference in wage rates rather than to any major difference in growing methods or processing practices. In both countries, growing and processing mushrooms are labor-intensive operations. Mushroom harvesting is done by hand in both countries; canning operations require handling of individual mushrooms during the initial stages of processing. Hence, because of the wide difference in wage rates, the costs per unit of product is higher in the United States than in Taiwan. Wage rates in Taiwan are from 3½ to 5 cents an hour; while in the U.S. it is over $1.50 an hour.

Members of the domestic industry have advised me of the common practice of the use of child labor, particularly young girls, working a 10 hour day, 6 days a week. This was well documented in Department of State airgram A-657 from Taipei dated February 19, 1966:

"In the canning industry, two characteristics are most striking: the large amounts of cheap labor used, and the amount of equipment produced locally for this industry. Even the larger factories have a very small nucleus of permanent workers—from 10 to 70, and the rest—from 200 to 2,000—are young girls from the factory's vicinity who are on call whenever foodstuffs arrive for canning. These girls in many cases earn less than U.S.—$12.00 per month. They are used in the peeling, washing, sorting, slicing, trimming, and labeling operations—all of which are done by hand—but seldom run even the simple, semi-automatic sealing machines. For example, it is not uncommon to have 50 or 100 young girls doing nothing but selecting the very best mushrooms as they go by on the water conveyor (the remainder are cut up or sliced, by hand)."

Industry officials have also advised me of detentions by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration of imported Taiwanese canned mushrooms at the ports of Baltimore, Tampa, Houston, Norfolk, Boston, Miami and Atlanta, because they contained maggots. Inquiries have been made with Food and Drug to determine why if imports have been so detained at the above ports there have been no detentions at the principal ports of New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco and Los Angeles.

The plain facts of case are that under present growing conditions in Taiwan, it is impossible to prevent such infestation. Mushroom growing houses are erected by the producer from farm produced supplies such as bamboo poles and rice straw. Producers are just unable to sterilize their growing houses.

It is believed in the domestic industry that the reason Taiwan was unable in past years to make their export goals was because of such seizures.

Here then is a domestic industry already sorely beset by increasing imports of a product produced under labor conditions and growing conditions which in the U.S. would be an unfair method of Commerce. We have striven for many years to prevent and correct such conditions. H.R. 478 and H.R. 479 constitute such remedies. I would urge their favorable consideration by this Subcommittee and the Committee on Education and Labor.

REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON CONGRESSIONAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the awesome problems of today and the challenges of the 1970's demand an efficient and effective Congress. Unless Congress is strengthened and new procedures and techniques developed, there is grave danger that the historic role of Congress as an essential check on the massive power of the Executive may be dangerously diluted. Legislation is needed to update and modernize Congress.

During the 89th Congress, a bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was established by unanimous vote of both the House and the Senate. This committee held 41 public hearings and received the views of 199 witnesses. The testimony together with the statements, documents and an index is set forth in 16 printed volumes totaling 2,435 pages.

On March 7, a bill was passed by the Senate which incorporated many of the Joint Committee recommendations. This bill, S. 355, is now before the House Rules Committee. Unfortunately, there are disturbing indications that the Democratic leadership with a 2-to-1 majority on the House Rules Committee may take no action in this important area. We believe there should be action.

The following major improvements are contained in this legislation:

First. The establishment of a Joint Committee on Congressional Operations with continuing authority to study the structure and procedures of Congress and to recommend additional reforms and changes.

Second. The protection of the rights of the minority through the provision of additional committee staff, the right to present minority views and reports, the provision of equal time on conference reports, and the right to schedule witnesses during at least 1 day of committee hearings.

Third. The authorization of measures designed to assist Members of Congress in the performance of their congressional duties. Such measures would include enlarging committee staffs, strengthening and improving the Legislative Reference Service, and authorizing committees to employ consultants on an interim basis in order to take advantage of expertise in various fields of knowledge.

Fourth. The implementation of fiscal controls and budgetary reforms that would include a greater utilization of the General Accounting Office, a multiple-year financial projection of programs and the updating of the budget on June 1 of each year, and the testimony of responsible executive department officials before the Appropriations Committee of each House within 30 days after the budget is presented to Congress.

Fifth. The appointment of postmasters and rural carriers would be divorced from politics.

Sixth. The establishment of a bill of rights for committees that would require announcement of record votes, permit the majority to compel the filing of a report or a bill, prohibit the use of proxies, and require the printing of committee rules at the beginning of each session.

The Republican Members of the House of Representatives long have been interested in congressional reform. At the outset of the 89th Congress, a task force of the House Republicans on congressional reform and minority staffing was appointed to study the matter of congressional reform in depth. As a result of the work of this task force, a book, entitled "We Propose: A Modern Congress," has been published. The conclusions and recommendations contained in this book were presented in full to the joint committee and many of the recommendations of the committee stemmed from the work of the task force.

We believe that the Lobbying Act of 1946 needs strengthening. Twenty years of experience has exposed a number of flaws in the present provisions. However, the joint committee was unable to consider this important problem in the depth and detail that is required and which should be afforded by the appropriate legislative committee. For example, this legislation fails completely to address itself to the problem of executive branch lobbying. Although the United States Code specifically prohibits the use of appropriated moneys to influence Members of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, substantial sums have been used for this purpose. In the past, long and detailed telegrams have been sent by executive department officials to Members of Congress urging their support of certain legislation. Similarly, long-distance calls have been made and Members have been personally canvassed regarding their intentions with respect to a particular bill. The loophole that has been read into the present law to permit this type of activity must be corrected.

The expenditure of funds for the carrying on of the Federal Government's activities and programs must be controlled and audited by the congressional appropriation process. Under present procedures and practices, Congress has been handicapped and unable to fully perform its historic role in this important area. Information from the Executive has frequently been confusing rather than enlightening. Congress, limited as to staff and access to pertinent information, has been at the mercy of the executive department fiscal officers. All too often, Congress has tended to consider the President's budget request in a perfunctory manner. This is particularly true when the same political party controls both Congress and the White House. Unless the congressional budgetary process is strengthened, there is a real danger that the fiscal power of this country will be exercised by the Executive rather than by the constitutionally designated representative of the people.

Under the Constitution, Congress is the first branch of Government. It is the central institution of the American Republic. In recent years, the enactment of a mass of open-ended legislation that grants broad and unrestrained power to the executive department has created an escalating bureaucracy that is in no way responsible to the voters of the country. To restore the balance that is needed in our Government, Congress must be revitalized.

INCENTIVES FOR ANTIPOLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Button] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation aimed at helping control air and water pollution by providing incentives for industries to build antipollution control facilities.

This bill would encourage private enterprise to construct control facilities without waiting for Federal Government subsidies or grants.

My bill and similar proposals would provide an incentive tax credit for taxpayers who cooperate with appropriate State government agencies in their antipollution efforts. It would increase the present 7-percent investment tax credit on pollution control equipment to 20 percent. In addition it would provide for a rapid tax amortization of the remaining cost of the pollution control facility. Taxpayers who qualify could amortize this expense over a period of 1 year or take it as an expense deduction over a period of from 1 to 5 years.

Mr. Speaker, although New York State has a well-designed program for cleaning up public water and air that has been defiled for a century and more, it is plain that industry in New York and other States still has much to do in helping save our environment from contamination.

To encourage the kind of massive job required to replace the ugly specter of foul and lifeless water and air, I believe we should provide industry with tax incentives to expedite the job of building antipollution control facilities.

With Federal, State, and local governments and private enterprise working together the quality of wildlife, recreation, and public health can be enormously enhanced.

U.S. TRADE NEGOTIATORS AT GENEVA RETREAT FROM STRONG AGRICULTURAL POSITION

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, today's Wall Street Journal carries a very disturbing report on the international trade negotiations now winding up in Geneva. The Journal reports:

> The U.S. proposed that negotiators drop the question of setting a figure on what percentage of the Common Market's grain needs should be supplied through imports.

Commenting on this development, Sicco L. Mansholt, Common Market agriculture commissioner, is quoted as saying:

> If we agree to the American proposal our farmers will be very glad.

Mr. Speaker, while the European farmers may find this a welcome development, it is not good news to American farmers.

I regard the willingness of U.S. negotiators to drop our demand for any percentage guarantee of the European Economic Community grain market as unfortunate, to say the least.

The administration has reaffirmed again and again that no deals would be made at these trade sessions which put American agriculture on the chopping block.

Only last week, at a May 2 briefing at the White House, Ambassador William M. Roth, chief negotiator at the Geneva sessions, told reporters:

> We have been pressing particularly hard in agriculture, because it is impossible for the United States to accept a Kennedy Round settlement that does not include agriculture in a very meaningful way . . .

Later on at the briefing, in discussing the major outstanding problems still to be resolved, the following colloquy occurred:

> Ambassador Roth. Third, it is absolutely essential that the United States gets additional agricultural offers from the community.
>
> Question. You mean reductions?
>
> Ambassador Roth. Yes. Offers. Reductions, in effect, in tariffs.

It is my belief that our negotiators in Geneva are retreating from the strong position absolutely necessary to provide a sound, broad-based trade future for American agriculture. In view of new protectionist farm agreements reached last fall by the Common Market, the apparent capitulation of the administration on the question of the future U.S. grain market in Europe is a serious matter to the farmers of this Nation.

In view of its importance, I include the May 11 Wall Street Journal article to which I have referred at this point in my remarks:

Tariff Talks Slated To Resume Tomorrow With EEC-U.S. Farm Problems Simplified

Further progress toward a successful settlement of the Kennedy Round of trade negotiations was made yesterday when the Common Market Council of Ministers in Brussels instructed its delegates to resume agricultural negotiations on the basis of a U.S. proposal made early Tuesday morning.

The U.S. proposed that negotiators drop the question of setting a figure on what percentage of the Common Market's grain needs should be supplied through imports.

This means that, in effect, negotiators of the European Economic Community, will return to Geneva tomorrow with only one major agricultural question to take up with the U.S. delegation. They will simply try to reach an agreement on how much food aid should be given by more-developed countries to famine-stricken countries.

This means that, barring a reversal by the U.S. in the position it took Tuesday, the complex agricultural problems will have been greatly simplified. The latest deadline for both the U.S. and the EEC to reach a settlement of trade questions of all types between themselves and with other nations is midnight Sunday.

The Council of Ministers, which met here to hear a report from EEC negotiators, raised few serious objections to the U.S. grain move.

The Common Market is composed of France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

On leaving the meeting, Sicco L. Mansholt, Common Market agriculture commissioner, said that "if we agree to the American proposal our farmers will be very glad." Today the Council of Ministers will discuss the second big issue still pending in the EEC-U.S. negotiations, tariffs on industrial chemicals. Jean Rey, EEC chief negotiator, has asked the ministers to authorize an agreement on the basis of a proposal by Eric Wyndham White, director general of the organization supervising the multination General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. The Gatt is sponsoring the Kennedy Round, so called because legislation authorizing U.S. participation was passed during President Kennedy's Administration.

SELLING PRICE RULE

Mr. Wyndam White's proposal calls for the U.S. to make 50% reductions on chemical tariffs that aren't covered by the American selling price rule. The EEC, in turn, would make 20% reductions and offer a further 30% contingent upon repeal by Congress of the American selling price rule, under which U.S. tariffs on certain imported chemicals, notably dyestuffs, are calculated as a percentage of the American market price rather than the price set by the seller.

Whether or not the Council of Ministers will put any major road block in the way of a chemicals settlement remains to be seen. But the fact that they didn't place any important new agricultural restrictions on their negotiators is a hopeful sign.

An agreement between the EEC and the U.S. over the weekend would seem to assure the success of the Kennedy Round, in which a total of 53 nations are participating and in which many others are affected in some way. Mr. Rey said early this month that an EEC-U.S. settlement would have to be reached before the final stages of the negotiations could be entered and that such a settlement would decide whether the Kennedy Round was to be successful.

The question that until yesterday seemed to be a major threat was how much grain the EEC was willing to accept from overseas. The U.S. wanted the EEC to buy 13% of its grain from abroad, but the EEC was willing to commit itself only to 10%. This was significant, as each percentage point represents some 600,000 metric tons of grain.

But early Tuesday morning, after an all-night negotiating session, the U.S. negotiators said they were willing to drop their demand for any percentage guarantee. This move apparently was based on U.S. willingness to gamble that the EEC wouldn't be able soon to boost its self sufficiency in grain above the present level of about 86%.

FOOD AID PLAN

In return for this concession, the U.S. apparently asked that the EEC show willingness to boost the volume of wheat to be set aside for a food aid program to famine-stricken nations. The U.S. and the EEC have been wide apart on the amount, with the U.S. holding out for five million to six million metric tons and the EEC suggesting about three million. Of the total, the EEC would contribute 22% and the U.S. 40%. The larger the amount of aid, the greater the likelihood that the EEC would have to continue importing grain from the U.S. and Canada.

It is believed that Mr. Rey will return to the negotiations prepared to raise the EEC food aid proposal to four million tons and perhaps more. But the Council of Ministers also armed him with a further weapon for the final negotiations, proposing that some of the food aid be not in grains but in other products, such as dried milk, of the type produced in Common Market countries. This type of aid, of course, wouldn't achieve the U.S. purpose of keeping the Common Market open to U.S. grain.

The U.S. does have one other card to play on grain, however. Under a 1962 agreement, the EEC promised to negotiate compensation with wheat-selling countries if its imports of high-quality wheat fell below the average level of the preceding three years. The EEC believed a new percentage guarantee would have wiped this offer out but with the percentage guarantee discarded it isn't sure whether the U.S. might be able to use the 1962 rule to maintain access to the EEC, at least for high-quality wheat. The 1962 agreement is renewable annually. It is apparently was decided yesterday, however, not to toss the 1962 agreement into the final negotiations.

The big remaining problem on chemicals is the question of benzenoid chemicals which are used in dyes and pharmaceutical products. The U.S. wanted to eliminate these chemicals from the tariff agreement and the EEC wanted them in. This question no doubt will have to be settled in the further negotiations.

In Geneva, the American delegation spent most of its day preparing for tomorrow's intensive negotiating sessions. Ambassadors William Roth and W. Michael Blumenthal, the top American negotiators, were joined by John A. Schnitger, Under Secretary of Agriculture, in brief talks with the Japanese and the British.

TO ESTABLISH A U.S. COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS TO PREPARE FOR PARTICIPATION BY THE UNITED STATES IN THE OBSERVANCE OF 1968 AS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. KUPFERMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which would establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for U.S. participation in the observance of 1968 as International Year for Human Rights. During the second session of the 89th Congress several of my colleagues and I introduced a similar bill to establish such a committee.[1]

On December 12, 1963, the General Assembly of the United Nations unanimously adopted a resolution which designated the year 1968 as the International Human Rights Year, and called upon the member states of the United Nations to join in that observance.

The year 1968 was selected for International Human Rights Year by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations on July 28, 1965, in honor of the 20th anniversary of the universal declaration of human rights. Following passage of the U.N. resolution, the International Commission of Jurists in Geneva, Switzerland, announced that a worldwide campaign would be undertaken and urged that 11 nations plan organized activity to explore the status of human rights and suggest ways to strengthen adherence to them.

The legislation I have introduced today would provide for the appointment of a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to be composed of 11 members—two from the House of Representatives, two from the Senate, and seven others designated by the President of the United States.[2] The Committee would function in an advisory capacity to coordinate and guide efforts to prepare for the U.S. participation in the observance of the International Human Rights Year, and to assure proper coordination and followthrough during 1968, the year of observance.[3]

To accomplish this the Committee would be authorized to conduct hearings and seminars, and enlist the cooperation of all departments of the Government which might be involved. A final report would be submitted to the President no later than October 31, 1967.[4]

I was privileged on August 11, 1966, to present a statement in conjunction with the House Foreign Affairs Committee hearings held on this subject by its Subcommittee on International Organization and Movements. Although the Foreign Affairs Committee approved the bill in modified form,[5] the House adjourned without acting upon the legislation. The Senate, however, passed the measure October 17, 1966, shortly before final adjournment of the second session of the 89th Congress.

The bill I have introduced today includes the committee's authorization limitation of $300,000 and other technical changes suggested by the Bureau of the Budget and the Department of State.

The need for the instant legislation is more apparent than ever. The Department of State, in its May 12, 1966, report to the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Representative THOMAS E. MORGAN, stated:

> A committee established by act of Congress will attract immediate support and cooperation from the many U.S. organizations and institutions already interested in advancing human rights. The U.N. resolution designating 1968 as International Human Rights Year urges intensification of domestic efforts and educational programs. Many Government agencies, universities, law schools, and other institutions are likewise concerned.

In joining in International Human Rights Year, this Nation will be reaffirming a commitment to inherent universal human or individual rights which was made in our earliest days, and which remains the framework in which our laws are drawn and enforced.

Although we have on occasion, in some areas of our national life, neglected this concept and have, for instance, delayed acting on several pending international human rights conventions, it is nevertheless the idea which prevails in all our pronouncements of the hope which we hold for the world's development.

Involvement in International Human Rights Year will afford us the opportunity to reassert our belief in the fundamental worth of the individual and his importance before the law. It will also enable us to help disseminate this idea to other parts of the world, particularly to the less developed nations, who sometimes tend to put this concept aside in favor of more immediate achievement and progress in the material sense.

Action is needed now, at this session,

---

[1] The gentleman from New York (Mr. Halpern) introduced the original legislation, H.R. 12306, in the House of Representatives January 25, 1966. His statement appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 1, p. 1080. My bill and statement appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 6, p. 7258. We were joined in this behalf in the Second Session of the 89th Congress by 17 other Members. To date, there have been eleven sponsors of the bill in the 90th Congress.

[2] The two Members of the House of Representatives would be appointed by the Speaker, one from each of the two major political parties; the two Members of the Senate by the President of the Senate in similar fashion. The original bill introduced by Representative Halpern in the 89th Congress provided that the remaining seven committee members be appointed "from private life." The Department of State, which approved the legislation, suggested in its May 12, 1966, report to the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee that these words be deleted to provide the President greater freedom in selection of Committee members. The Department of State, joined by the Bureau of the Budget, suggested other perfecting changes in the bill, such as a provision that the President shall designate the Chairman of the Committee from among all its members, rather than just from the seven the President would appoint. With these technical changes, which I have accepted and which do not infringe upon the intent or substantive language of the bill, both executive agencies recommended passage of the legislation.

[3] This legislation would implement a recommendation made by the Citizens Committee on Human Rights of the White House Conference on International Cooperation. This Committee, composed of an ad hoc group of distinguished private citizens, under the chairmanship of Professor Louis B. Sohn of the Harvard Law School, issued its report in December of 1965. The report suggested a number of ways in which the U.S. could take action to further universal respect for the rule of law.

[4] In the bill Mr. Halpern reintroduced in the 90th Congress on January 10, 1967, H.R. 669, the Committee's report shall be submitted to the President no later than September 1, 1967. Because of the delay in passage of this legislation the Committee would need at least an additional two months to adequately perform its function.

[5] The Committee on Foreign Affairs reported favorably (H. Report No. 2050) on the legislation September 21, 1966. The Committee, however, amended the bill: "authorizing an appropriation not to exceed $300,000 and empowering the U.S. Committee on Human Rights to accept donations of money, property, and personal services in carrying out the provisions of this legislation."

because planning must be done sufficiently in advance of the start of the observance to insure the United States an active role and a place of leadership in the events of this important year.

I cannot suggest strongly enough that we act at this session to establish the U.S. Committee on Human Rights, and I am happy to join my colleague from New York, Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN, in supporting this measure.

There follows a copy of the bill I have today introduced:

H.R. 9876

A bill to establish a United States Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

ESTABLISHMENT OF UNITED STATES COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RIGHTS

SECTION 1. That, in order to provide for effective and coordinated preparation for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968, designated by the General Assembly of the United Nations as "International Human Rights Year", there is established an advisory and coordinating committee, to be known as the "United States Committee on Human Rights" (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the "Committee").

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 2. (a) The Committee shall be composed of eleven members as follows:

(1) two Members of the House of Representatives appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, one from each of the two major political parties.

(2) two Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, one from each of the two major political parties.

(3) seven appointed by the President of the United States, and he shall designate the Chairman of the Committee from among its members.

(b) The Committee shall elect a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(c) A vacancy in the Committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The Committee is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as it deems advisable to conduct its activities.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 3. Members of the Committee who are officers or employees of the United States shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as such officers or employees. Members of the Committee appointed from private life each shall receive $100 per diem when actually engaged in the performance of duties vested in the Committee. Each member of the Committee shall be allowed travel expenses in the same manner as authorized by section 5703 of title 5 of the United States Code for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COMMITTEE

SEC. 4. The Committee shall formulate plans for effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year". In order to carry out the provisions of this Act, the Committee is authorized to—

(1) conduct studies, seminars, and meetings with appropriate parties in order to provide for effective participation in the observance of International Human Rights Year at the Federal, State, and local levels of government in the United States;

(2) explore the role of the United States in defining, expressing, and expanding the application of human rights principles in the United States and throughout the world;

(3) review past and present policies of the United States with respect to the universal application and preservation of human rights principles; and

(4) take such other action and conduct such other activities as it may deem appropriate to provide a basis for the observance by the United States of International Human Rights Year.

COOPERATION WITH COMMITTEE BY EXECUTIVE AGENCIES

SEC. 5. (a) The Committee is authorized to request any department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government to furnish suggestions and information to assist the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this Act. The head of each such department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality shall furnish such suggestions and information to the Committee upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

(b) Upon request of the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Committee, the head of each department, agency, independent establishment, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government shall otherwise cooperate with the Committee in carrying out the provisions of this Act and shall provide the Committee with such additional assistance and services as may be available.

(c) The Administrator of General Services shall provide administrative services for the Committee on a reimbursable basis.

STAFF OF COMMITTEE

SEC. 6. (a) The Committee shall appoint an executive secretary without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, prescribe his duties, and fix his compensation at a rate not to exceed the maximum rate payable under the General Schedule contained in section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code.

(b) The Committee is authorized to appoint, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service, and fix the compensation, in accordance with chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, of such personnel as it deems advisable to carry out the purposes of this Act.

(c) The Committee may procure temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 3109 of title 5 of the United States Code, but at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

REPORT AND TERMINATION OF COMMITTEE

SEC. 7. (a) The Committee shall submit to the President, not later than October 31, 1967, for transmittal to the Congress, a report of the activities of the Committee under this Act, together with its recommendations, including recommendations as to the manner in which the most effective and coordinated participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" may be accomplished and including recommendations as to the means by which the United States may contribute most effectively to the acceptance, observance, practice, and enforcement of the principles of human rights throughout the world during "International Human Rights Year" and thereafter.

(b) From and after the submission of its report to the President under subsection (a), the Committee shall, under the direction of the President, continue as an informational and coordinating clearinghouse and center of United States participation in the observance of the year 1968 as "International Human Rights Year" and, to carry out such purpose, shall perform such additional duties as the President may prescribe.

(c) The Committee shall cease to exist at the close of December 31, 1968.

ACCEPTANCE OF DONATIONS; AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 8. (a) The Committee is authorized to accept donations of money, property, and personal services in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

(b) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $300,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

AIR AND WATER POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUSH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUSH. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill that would unleash the ingenuity and aggressiveness of private industry to help combat and solve the Nation's constantly worsening air and water pollution problem. What is needed now is action.

We, in Houston and Harris County, Tex., are keenly aware of the pollution that plagues us. Our city is determined to whip this problem. We want our ship channel, bayous, creeks and bays to be clean and healthful. We want the air we breathe to be pure.

I feel that private industry has a rightful place of leadership in the field of pollution control.

My bill carries a 20-percent incentive tax credit that would be applied to all costs of pollution abatement facilities. Money put into these costly facilities do not produce a profit and often require high and continuous operating costs.

This incentive would be a big boost in encouraging industry to work toward the goal of clean air and water in cooperation with the State and Federal Government pollution programs and guidelines.

In Houston, we are facing up to the problem of "standards and guideline" legislation; but, to get quick action, we need also to make these large and necessary nonprofit expenditures more palatable to private industry.

CHINA, THE UNITED NATIONS, AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, an attempt has been made in recent days to reopen the question of recognition of Red China and its admission to the United Nations. In passing one should perhaps note that coming during the period of the official visit to the United States of the distinguished Vice President of the Chinese Republic, these questions have produced an unnecessary diplomatic embarrassment for our country. It is my own further belief that the timing of such proposals could scarcely be less fortuitous, given Red China's involvement as our adversary in Vietnam to say nothing of the current political instability of the Mao regime. We need to be careful lest in a burst of something described as "positivism" we do not succeed in shoring up a regime that is the epitome of negativism when it comes to the establishment of a world system built on law and order rather than violence and terror. Recognition of Red China would not be a progressive act at all; it would be regressive and send a deep chill through those nations on the periphery of Communist China that want to see the red tide contained.

The subject of the admission of Red China to the United Nations must also be considered within the context of world conditions as they exist today; not as they may have existed a decade ago or at some other previous point in history. Judged in that light and given the specific conditions that do exist today as discussed a moment ago, admission of Red China to the United Nations is a question far broader than just the attitude of the American Government toward the United Nations and the admission of new members generally. Red China is not just any nation; these are not just ordinary and usual times.

Mr. Speaker, pursuant to unanimous consent I enclose a very informative, well-reasoned, and I think helpful judgment on this issue by David H. Popper, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs. His views were outlined in a speech, entitled "China, the United Nations, and the United States," delivered before public affairs fellows of the Brookings Institution at Washington, D.C., on March 28, 1966. I believe it is most persuasive in its documentation of the idea that Chinese Communist isolation is self-decreed. To use Mr. Popper's words:

> Thus, the door to co-operation between ourselves and the people of mainland China could be opened—but the keys are in their hands.

The address follows:

CHINA, THE UNITED NATIONS, AND THE UNITED STATES

(By David H. Popper, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Organization Affairs)[1]

We must, I think, approach the problem of United States policy regarding the representation of China in the United Nations in the perspective of history. In this perspective it quickly becomes clear that it is an oversimplification to regard Chinese-American relations as habitually or necessarily antagonistic. Indeed, looking backward one is struck by the long-continued interest of the United States in the development of China and in the close ties which have typically existed between the Chinese and the American peoples.

For almost 150 years there have been Americans who were passionately interested in China. The earliest basis of interest was economic: Students of American history know how important the China trade was to the seafarers of New England and the mid-Atlantic. In visiting collections of early 19th-century Americana—for example, at the Winterthur Museum near Wilmington, Delaware—one is struck by the amount of magnificent Chinese furniture, tableware, and fabrics then to be found in the finer American homes.

At a later stage, when European countries were engaged in carving out concessions in a China which seemed to be falling apart, the United States played an active role in seeking equality of commercial opportunity for all in China. Americans benefited as a result from concessions exacted by others, but the fact is that Americans were not in the forefront in inflicting the colonial indignities to which China was subjected as the 19th century drew to its close.

Our national interest in the period of the 20th-century World Wars tended on the whole to bolster Chinese independence. We reacted strongly, though as it turned out not strongly enough, to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, which perhaps began the melancholy train of events leading to Pearl Harbor. And we collaborated very actively indeed with the Chinese Nationalist Government in fighting the Japanese during World War II.

Through all this period, in increasing measure, American educators, missionaries, and traders were at work in China. There was, I think, a rather unique bond between the two countries. "Old China hands" formed a very special group of commitment and expertise, and they had a strong influence on American policy.

It was not surprising, therefore, that in drafting the United Nations Charter the United States insisted that China should be one of the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. We should not overlook the fact that this decision represented something of an innovation. A non-European state was included in the inner circle of nations possessing major responsibility in the U.N. for maintaining international peace and security. Japan has attained permanent membership in the League of Nations Council, but this was a far less significant body than the U.N. Security Council.

Unhappily, China was not able to turn to the task of peaceful development at the end of the Second World War. Years of strife—invasion by foreign foes and civil conflict at home—had drained China of its wealth, riddled its human resources, and destroyed its internal stability. The Chinese Communists were able to exploit this situation to seize power in large areas of the country. Strenuous efforts were made by the United States to help the Chinese to form an over-all coalition government which would restore peace. These efforts unfortunately failed, and in 1949 victorious Communist armies forced the legitimate government of China and a million of its supporters to take refuge on the island of Taiwan, where the Government of the Republic of China is located today.

The establishment of the Chinese Communist regime throughout mainland China while the legitimate government of China continued in existence on Taiwan presented the U.N. with a serious political and legal problem. The government—indeed the very personalities—associated with the original Chinese assumption of membership in the United Nations still exercised the functions of government in an area they controlled. The de facto control of the Chinese Communists on the mainland could not be denied; but in 1949–50 it could hardly be said that enough time had elapsed to draw any conclusions as to how much support that regime had in mainland China or how firmly it would become established.

AGGRESSION AGAINST THE U.N. IN KOREA

Then, as the statesmen and lawyers wrestled with this problem, North Korean forces crossed the 38th parallel and invaded the free territory of the Republic of Korea in June 1950. In the events which followed, Communist Chinese forces became massively involved in the aggression. It was not only an active aggression against the Republic of Korea; it was an aggression against the United Nations itself. And the United Nations, in a historic resolution of the General Assembly, directly condemned the Chinese Communists for participating in the aggression against the U.N. The actual language of one paragraph of that resolution, adopted on February 1, 1951, reads as follows:

"The General Assembly . . .

"*Finds* that the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China, by giving direct aid and assistance to those who were already committing aggression in Korea and by engaging in hostilities against United Nations forces there, has itself engaged in aggression in Korea."

This put the problem of Chinese representation in a new and different perspective. It was now complicated by the fact that from the United Nations standpoint the Chinese Communists had, as it were, the status of an outlaw. To most U.N. members, including the United States, it seemed at the time quite inappropriate to regard the Chinese Communist regime as qualified in political terms to be represented in the halls of the United Nations, which it directly defied by armed force.

Legally speaking, we were not talking at this stage about the admission of a new member to the organization but about the narrower question of who should sit in the seats reserved for China in the U.N. Yet by analogy, the question of qualifications for U.N. membership necessarily came to the forefront. The U.N. Charter provides that U.N. membership is open to "peace-loving states" which accept the obligations contained in the U.N. Charter and which, in the judgment of the organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations. As long as Communist China defied the provisions of the U.N. Charter having to do with the maintaining of international peace and security, as long as it persisted in defending and justifying its acts of aggression in Korea, as long as it would not undertake to measure up to the standards to which all United Nations members subscribe, it did not seem to most U.N. members that Communist China could properly be seated in the U.N.

The Korea episode has not been liquidated to this day, though relatively stable conditions exist along the 38th parallel. Yet, on top of the Korean experience, the U.N. has observed one manifestation after another of resort to aggressive force by the Chinese Communist regime. The Chinese Communists used force to subdue Tibet. In two military episodes the Chinese Communists overran the frontiers of India. They endeavored to force their way to control of the offshore islands which remained under the Government of the Republic of China.

REACTION TO COMMUNIST CHINESE EXTREMISM

Nor were Chinese Communist efforts limited to the immediate borders under their control. Representing the most extreme wing of Communist doctrine, the Chinese Communists embarked on subversive activities in widely scattered areas, both in Asia and on other continents. Communists plotted to seize control in Malaya and later Indonesia. Chinese Communist support for subversion turned up in Africa. And Chinese Communist logistic and ideological support is a very appreciable factor in sustaining North Viet-Nam's aggression against South Viet-Nam.

In the end, Communist Chinese extremism has succeeded in alarming or offending almost everyone. You cannot, after all, preach a doctrine of permanent revolution without antagonizing governments and people who feel that they have already passed through their national revolutions. Even the Communist associates of Peking have found it impossible—save only Albania, Peking's ever-faithful spokesman—to maintain close and friendly relations with the Chinese Communists. And now, in recent months, we have observed astounding political convulsions within China itself.

---

[1] Address made before the public affairs fellows of the Brookings Institution at Washington, D.C., on Mar. 28.

This, then, is the background against which the problem of Chinese representation in the United Nations has been considered from year to year. It helps to explain why the Chinese Communists have never attained representation in the United Nations despite the admitted fact that they hold under their control so large a population and so great an area of the earth's surface.

Let me say a few words now regarding efforts to obtain Chinese Communist participation in the U.N.

Originally these efforts were spearheaded by the then great and good friend of the Chinese Communists, the Soviet Union. Indeed, at the beginning of 1950 the Soviet Union sought unsuccessfully to challenge the credentials of the Republic of China in the U.N. Security Council. The Soviets actually walked out of the Council temporarily when they were defeated on this issue—ironically, thereby enabling the Security Council to act with great dispatch when the Republic of Korea was invaded in June of that year.

Since the Council is a continuing body, credentials are not periodically resubmitted as they are at the annual sessions of the U.N. General Assembly, and thus the issue has not recently arisen in the Security Council. It is worth remembering, however, that what would be at stake if it were would be more than a simple question of whether the Chinese representatives' credentials were in good form. A political issue of first-rank importance would be involved, and only the Security Council could make the determination.

In the U.N. General Assembly, the Chinese representation question has been taken up from year to year, always with the same result. For many years the Assembly adopted a so-called "moratorium" resolution in which the Assembly simply decided to take no action on proposals to change the representation of China. More recently, the direct issue of choice has been debated at length and put to the vote. As a matter of procedure, the Assembly has decided that any change in Chinese representation is an important political matter which, pursuant to the charter, requires a two-thirds majority in the General Assembly.

Actually, proposals for a change have never attained even a simple majority. There was a hair-trigger tie vote in 1965 [2] (a two-thirds majority being required for action), but the balance in 1966 swung against the Chinese Communists by 11 votes. And the decisions taken at the General Assembly have been applied throughout the U.N. system of specialized agencies in the economic and social field.

CHINESE COMMUNIST ATTITUDE TOWARD U.N.

What are the reasons for this rare uniformity of action? Why is it that, in literally hundreds of decisions taken in the most diverse U.N. bodies over a period of 17 years during which the number of U.N. members has doubled, the results have always—with only one minor and temporary exception—been the same?

The answer cannot, I suggest, be reduced to the oversimplification that United States pressure has dragooned U.N. majorities into voting against their own convictions year after year. Certainly we have made our views known. Those holding different views have done the same. But we have made our views known on many other questions as well, with a less successful batting average than this. And be it noted, the cleavage on this subject splits the NATO allies, splits Asia, and splits Africa.

It seems more reasonable to believe that the facts bearing on the problem are the decisive element in the situation. This must be so, by the very nature of the case. For the entire thrust of the philosophy of the U.N. tends toward universality of participation; other things being equal, universality should enable the organization to function with maximum effectiveness.

But this does not mean that the members of the United Nations are willing to pay any price whatever to attain that goal. There are limits which they have not hitherto been willing to disregard.

The fact is that the Communist Chinese leaders have not been willing, to date, to take any step which would indicate that they value participation in the United Nations system or that they particularly desire to participate.

First, they have never renounced the doctrine of the unfettered use of force in international affairs which they have advocated and pursued since they gained power. All around them, their nearby neighbors fear that they may be attacked.

Second, they persist in supporting subversive activities in other countries, boasting of their intention to foment "peoples wars" or "wars of liberation" in a kind of permanent wave of revolution. The effects are far reaching, as our involvement in Viet-Nam amply demonstrates. And the Maoist doctrine and mystique are unmatched in the advocacy of violence.

It will be argued that some states which are at present members of the U.N. are also less than completely committed to U.N. Charter objectives. We may admit that this is true and that unfortunately not every U.N. member observes standards of conduct which in our eyes would represent full compliance with the charter. But none has a record which stands comparison with that of the Chinese Communists. I am reminded of the recent report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement, which cites a survey indicating that 91 percent of those questioned admitted that they had at some time committed some act punishable by law. We do not on that account treat criminal elements as if they were ordinary men.

A third point impeding the Chinese Communist cause in the United Nations is the constant shrill, incredible campaign of abuse and vilification of the organization and its Secretary-General which spews forth from Chinese Communist sources.

A fourth point is the array of conditions put forward by the Chinese Communists for their entry. Seeking to stand history on its head, the Communists in 1965 demanded that the United Nations rescind its resolution condemning them for aggression in Korea, brand the United States as the aggressor in that case, reorganize the United Nations in a fashion more to their liking, and expel states they regard as imperialist puppets while admitting others they consider qualified. How serious these demands are one cannot know, but they certainly give substance to the view that the Chinese Communists are intent on isolating themselves.

Fifth, and in the long run perhaps most important, the Chinese Communists insist as a condition of participation that the United Nations expel the Government of the Republic of China and leave Peking a free hand to take over the people and territory of Taiwan. This is a condition that the United States could not accept. The Republic of China on Taiwan with its population of 13½ million is larger than more than 80 other U.N. members. Its record in sustaining the principles and the work of the organization bears comparison with that of any member. We are not prepared to repudiate our commitments to the Republic of China—nor will other U.N. members do so.

This, then, is the record of the Chinese Communist problem in the United Nations in the past. Must we assume that the position will persist unchanged in the future?

No one can answer that question today—if only because no one can predict the outcome of the extraordinary political drama now gripping mainland China.

Yet, very few elements in international affairs are immutable. Changes are bound to occur in China, in other states, and in the United Nations. What bearing they will have on the problem as we see it today is obscure.

THE "STUDY COMMITTEE" PROPOSAL

One new and interesting element appeared in the consideration of the Chinese representation problem at the 21st General Assembly session last fall.

A number of Western governments—Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Italy, and Trinidad and Tobago—introduced a resolution [3] proposing the establishment of a committee to explore and study the Chinese representation situation in all its aspects in order to make recommendations to the 1967 session for an equitable and practical solution to the question of the representation of China in the United Nations in keeping with United Nations Charter principles.

The resolution was rejected by a vote of 34 for and 62 against, with 25 abstentions. We voted for it as a means of determining, through the proposed committee, answers to questions which, as Ambassador Goldberg informed the General Assembly,[4] can only be answered by Peking. He put the questions this way:

"Will they refrain from putting forward clearly unacceptable demands, and specifically the unacceptable demand that the Republic of China be expelled from this organization

"And will they assume the obligations of the U.N. Charter, in particular the basic obligation to refrain from the threat or use of force against territorial integrity or political independence of any state?"

In supporting the "study committee" proposal, we made it clear that we did not consider that it prejudiced in any way our own commitment to the Republic of China.

Why did the proposal fail? In large part, I believe, because it was so strongly opposed by both the Republic of China and the sponsors of the Chinese Communists. Both of them resented any hint that it might be possible to settle the Chinese representation problem on any basis other than by a clear choice between one and the other.

It is not for us as Americans to question the reality of this sentiment on both sides. We are compelled to recognize that as matters stand today it tends to undercut proposals made by American citizens and others for what is known as a "two China" solution. Whatever plausibility such suggestions may have, the hard fact is that no one has as yet been able to convince either of the parties immediately concerned that they form an acceptable basis for dealing with this perennial problem.

This, then, will be the situation as we prepare for the United Nations General Assembly session of September 1967. As we did last year, we shall thoroughly review our tactics. I would not want to speculate now on the procedures which, 6 months from now, will seem most appropriate. But I can say that our actions regarding the problem will be determined within this very clear framework.

---

[2] For background, see Bulletin of Dec. 13, 1965, p. 940.

[3] For text, see *ibid.*, Dec. 19, 1966, p. 929.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 926.

CHINESE COMMUNISTS' ISOLATION SELF-DECREED

We do not have a frozen attitude on questions relating to China. The Korean conflict is slipping back into history. The fusillades of the cold war, as applied to other Communist countries, are now more muted; and we are exploring ways in which we can cooperate with these countries in limited areas to mutual advantage. The questions raised by Ambassador Goldberg are therefore very much in point: They do not demand from Communist China anything we would not expect from any other regime.

It should be clear that the United States is not engaged in a policy with regard to Communist China which is vindictive for its own sake. We are not conducting or planning a holy war in Asia. Nor do we have any designs or pretensions on the territory of Communist China or any other political entity.

Our concern is with practices of aggression and subversion. We oppose these because unless they are curbed our objective of a world governed by law and able to unleash its latent energies for peaceful progress cannot be attained.

Not only have we no desire to attack Communist China; we do not wish to isolate it. The recent record on this subject is quite clear. American and Communist Chinese negotiators have held 132 meetings since 1956 in Geneva and Warsaw. It may be that the United States has had more continued contact on matters of high policy with the Chinese Communists than any other Western country.

It is unfortunately true that these meetings of ambassadors have produced little of substantive significance. That is because, to the Chinese Communists, a precondition for all progress is a requirement that the United States abandon the Republic of China—something which we are unwilling to do. But the essential fact is that both parties have a desire to maintain in being this unusual channel through which cases can be argued and points of view advanced. Given a more reasonable attitude on the part of the Chinese Communists, there is no reason why some day this channel cannot become more useful.

Furthermore, we have felt that Communist China's isolation is not a matter of United States or United Nations action, but something the Chinese Communists have decreed for themselves. It is not the United States or other Western countries which have maintained a modern Chinese Wall of rigid controls around Communist China. On the contrary, for many years the United States has vainly tried to persuade the Chinese Communists to agree to an exchange of journalists as one of the first steps to an increase in understanding between our people. More recently, we have taken steps to permit American scholars, experts in medicine and public health, and other specialists to travel to Communist China. But almost invariably all of our initiatives have been rejected by the Chinese Communists.

In a speech on the essentials for peace in Asia, President Johnson last July reviewed our policy toward Communist China.[5] One of those essentials, he said, was "reconciliation between nations that now call themselves enemies."

The President developed this theme in his state of the Union message on January 10: [6]

"We shall continue to hope for a reconciliation between the people of mainland China and the world community—including working together in all the tasks of arms control, security, and progress on which the fate of the Chinese people, like their fellow men elsewhere, depends.

"We would be the first to welcome a China which decided to respect her neighbors' rights. We would be the first to applaud her were she to apply her great energies and intelligence to improving the welfare of her people. And we have no intention of trying to deny her legitimate needs for security and friendly relations with her neighboring countries.

"Our hope that all of this will some day happen rests on the conviction that we, the American people and our allies, will and are going to see Viet-Nam through to an honorable peace."

Thus, the door to cooperation between ourselves and the people of mainland China could be opened—but the keys are in their hands. The basic requirement is a desire on the part of Peking to cooperate peacefully with others. This could be demonstrated if Peking were to cease its support for the aggression against South Viet-Nam or if it would throw its influence on the side of unconditional negotiations for a peaceful settlement of the Viet-Nam conflict.

And there are many other areas in which, with absolutely no impairment of dignity or rights, the signal could be given that fair and free negotiation on problems of general concern could be undertaken. The world cries out for effective arms control measures, for a halt to the spread of nuclear weapons, for the freer flow of ideas and people and goods, for peaceful economic development, for conditions of security for all.

As of today there is no sign whatever of any response from Communist China to these imperatives of a better world order.

We await developments, in the spirit of President Johnson's address last July:

"We persist because we know that hunger and disease, ignorance and poverty, recognize no boundaries or either creed or class or country.

"We persist because we believe that even the most rigid societies will one day awaken to the rich possibilities of a diverse world.

"And we continue because we believe that cooperation, not hostility, is really the way of the future in the 20th century.

"That day is not yet here. It may be long in coming, but I tell you it is clearly on its way, because come it must."

These are our guidelines for the period ahead.

GOLD MINING INCENTIVE ACT

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. POLLOCK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, for the last three decades, the once great gold mining industry in the United States has declined drastically, and the industry is an ailing one indeed. Today the production of gold does not even come close to meeting domestic consumption, to say nothing of the total need. Thriving communities have become ghost towns and thousands of persons dependent on mining for income have been thrown out of work.

Among the reasons for this situation is a unique and unrealistic price-cost relationship forced upon the industry by the U.S. Government. Gold, as we all know, has for more than 33 years had a price fixed at $35 per ounce by the Government. While the price has remained the same, the value of the dollar has declined by over half, and the cost of machinery, equipment, materials, supplies, labor, and transportation, all of which are vital to the industry, has increased manifold. No other industry has faced this unusual situation of a price freeze on the end product by the Government, in total disregard of the economic realities.

I am introducing two bills today which will insure the continuance of this great industry. One bill will provide for grants to States on a matching basis where the State programs subsidize the price of gold. This indirect payment should eliminate fears that the dollar is being devalued on the world market by a direct subsidy which might be considered as tantamount to increasing the market price of newly mined gold. Federal money would go only to the State as a reimbursement and not to the miners. This reimbursement could even be made as a credit against matching fund requirements for other programs.

The other bill provides for, first, an increased depletion allowance to 27.5 percent to match that of the petroleum industry; second, a doubling of the investment credit for new equipment; third, a fast tax writeoff; and fourth, a new mines moratorium. I believe special tax treatment is necessary if this long-oppressed industry is to survive and somehow be revived to its former and rightful position of importance.

The real anomaly, the paradox position of the Government in allowing the gold mining industry to languish in the agonies of a death gasp before needless extinction, is that the United States of America is in critical need of vastly improved gold reserves, both to undergird our substantial international indebtedness and to support our monetary system. Today our foreign obligations, theoretically payable in gold upon demand, are more than twice our gold reserve, and our monetary system substantially exceeds the gold reserves required to back it up. Therefore, the Government should be willing and anxious to explore all possible avenues to revive this seriously ailing industry. I am sure there are a number of meaningful approaches to this revival, and my bills introduced today make a frontal attack in five such areas. Their enactment could well be entitled "The Gold Mining Industry Omnibus Act of 1967."

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs will shortly hold hearings on the gold mining bill. I am hopeful that meaningful legislation will be enacted this year.

The texts of the bills follow:

H.R. 9900

A bill to provide tax incentives to encourage gold mining

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Gold Mining Incentive Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior, upon application and under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall certify any person as a qualified gold producer for any taxable year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act if the monetary value of newly-mined domestic gold produced by such person during such taxable year exceeded the aggregate market value of all other minerals produced by such person during such taxable year.

---

[5] Bulletin of Aug. 1, 1966, p. 158.

[6] *Ibid.*, Jan. 30, 1967, p. 158

Sec. 3. (a) Section 46(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to amount of investment tax credit) is amended to read as follows:

"(1) General rule.—

"(A) 7 Percent Credit.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the amount of the credit allowed by section 38 for the taxable year shall be equal to 7 percent of the qualified investment (as defined in subsection (c)).

"(B) 14 percent credit for gold mining property.—In the case where a portion of the qualified investment is attributable (under the regulations of the Secretary or his delegate) to the placing in service of one or more items of gold mining property (as defined in section 48(k)) the credit allowable under section 38 shall be an amount equal to the sum of—

"(i) 14 percent of the portion of the qualified investment so attributable, and

"(ii) 7 percent of the remainder of the qualified investment."

(b) Section 48 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definitions and special rules for investment credit) is amended by redesignating subsection (k) as subsection (l) and by inserting after subsection (j) the following new subsection:

"(k) Gold Mining Property.—For purposes of section 46(a)(1), the term 'gold mining property' means section 38 property (1) which is placed in service in a taxable year by a taxpayer certified for such year as a qualified gold producer under section 2 of the Gold Mining Incentive Act, and (2) which is used primarily for the production of gold at a mine.".

Sec. 4. (a) Part III of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 123 as 124 and inserting after section 122 the following new section:

"Sec. 123. Certain gold-mining income.

"Income attributable to the production of gold at a mine shall not be included in gross income for a taxable year if—

"(1) the taxpayer is certified under section 2 of the Gold Mining Incentive Act as a qualified gold producer for such taxable year, and

"(2) such taxable year is—

"(A) the first taxable year following a twenty-five-year period during which no gold was produced at such mine, or

"(B) the first or second taxable year following the taxable year described in subparagraph (A)."

(b) The table of sections for such part III is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 123. Certain gold-mining income.

"Sec. 124. Cross references."

Sec. 5. (a) Part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of gold-mining facilities.

"(a) General Rule.—Every person, at his election, shall be entitled to a deduction with respect to the amortization of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of any gold-mining facility (as defined in subsection (d)(1)), based on a period of sixty months. Such amortization deduction shall be an amount, with respect to each month of such period within the taxable year, equal to the adjusted basis of the facility at the end of such month divided by the number of months (including the month for which the deduction is computed) remaining in the period. Such adjusted basis at the end of the month shall be computed without regard to the amortization deduction for such month. The amortization deduction above provided with respect to any month shall, except to the extent provided in subsection (f), be in lieu of the depreciation deduction with respect to such facility for such month provided by section 167. The sixty-month period shall begin as to any gold-mining facility, at the election of the taxpayer, with the month following the month in which the facility was completed or acquired, or with the succeeding taxable year.

"(b) Election of Amortization.—The election of the taxpayer to take the amortization deduction and to begin the 60-month period with the month following the month in which the facility was completed or acquired, or with the taxable year succeeding the taxable year in which such facility was completed or acquired, shall be made by filing with the Secretary or his delegate, in such manner, in such form, and within such time, as the Secretary or his delegate may by regulations prescribe, a statement of such election.

"(c) Termination of Amortization Deduction.—A taxpayer which has elected under subsection (b) to take the amortization deduction provided in subsection (a) may, at any time after making such election, discontinue the amortization deduction with respect to the remainder of the amortization period, such discontinuance to begin as of the beginning of any month specified by the taxpayer in a notice in writing filed with the Secretary or his delegate before the beginning of such month. The depreciation deduction provided under section 167 shall be allowed, beginning with the first month as to which the amortization deduction does not apply, and the taxpayer shall not be entitled to any further amortization deduction with respect to such gold-mining facility.

"(d) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Gold-mining facility.—The term 'gold-mining facility' means property (A) which is subject to the allowance for depreciation under section 167, (B) which was acquired or the construction of which was completed (i) after the enactment of this section and (ii) during a taxable year for which the taxpayer was certified as a qualified gold producer under section 2 of the Gold Mining Incentive Act, and (C) with respect to which a certificate under subsection (e) has been made. In no event shall an amortization deduction be allowed in respect of any gold-mining facility for any taxable year unless a certificate in respect thereof under subsection (e) shall have been made before the filing of the taxpayer's return for such taxable year.

"(2) Construction.—The term 'construction' includes reconstruction, erection, and installation.

"(e) Determination of Adjusted Basis of Gold-Mining Facility.—In determining, for purposes of subsection (a), the adjusted basis of a gold-mining facility—

"(1) Certification.—There shall be included only so much of the amount of the adjusted basis of such facility (computed without regard to this section) as is properly attributable to such construction or acquisition after the enactment of this section, as the Secretary of the Interior has certified as attributable to gold production purposes. Such certification shall be under such regulations as may be prescribed from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior. An application for a certificate must be filed at such time and in such manner as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior under such regulation.

"(2) Separate facilities; special rule.—After the completion or acquisition of any gold-mining facility with respect to which a certificate under paragraph (1) has been made, any expenditure (attributable to such facility and to the period after such completion or acquisition) which does not represent construction or acquisition included in such certificate, but with respect to which a separate certificate is made under paragraph (1), shall not be applied in adjustment of the basis of such facility, but a separate basis shall be computed therefor pursuant to paragraph (1) as if it were a new and separate gold-mining facility.

"(f) Depreciation Deduction.—If the adjusted basis of the gold-mining facility (computed without regard to this section) is in excess of the adjusted basis computed under subsection (e), the depreciation deduction provided by section 167 shall, despite the provisions of subsection (a) of this section, be allowed with respect to such gold-mining facility as if its adjusted basis for the purpose of such deduction were an amount equal to the amount of such excess.

"(g) Life Tenant and Remainderman.—In the case of property held by one person for life with remainder to another person, the deduction shall be computed as if the life tenant were the absolute owner of the property and shall be allowable to the life tenant."

(b) The table of sections for such part VI is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of gold-mining facilities."

(c) Section 1245(a) of such Code (relating to gain from disposition of certain depreciable property) is amended—

(1) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2)(A);

(2) by inserting "or" at the end of paragraph (2)(B) and by inserting after such paragraph the following new subparagraph:

"(C) with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (3)(D), its adjusted basis recomputed by adding thereto all adjustments, attributable to periods beginning with the first month for which a deduction is allowed under section 183,";

(3) by striking out "section 168" each place it appears in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 168 or 183";

(4) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraphs (3)(A) and (B);

(5) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(6) by adding at the end of paragraph (3) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) so much of any real property (other than any property described in subparagraph (B)) as is a gold-mining facility which has an adjusted basis in which there are reflected adjustments under section 183."

Sec. 6. Section 613(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to percentage depletion rates) is amended—

(1) by inserting in paragraph (1) after "oil and gas wells" the following: ", and gold", and

(2) by striking out "paragraph (2)(B) does" where it appears in paragraph (3)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "paragraphs (1) and (2)(B) do".

Sec. 7. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

H.R. 9899

A bill to provide grants-in-aid to States for gold mining subsidies

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

Section 1. The Secretary of the Interior, upon application and under such regulations as he may prescribe, shall certify any person as a qualified gold producer for any period of time commencing after the date on enactment of this Act if the monetary value of newly mined domestic gold produced by such person during such period exceeded the aggregate market value of all other minerals produced by such person during such period.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay, out of such sums as may be appropriated for the purpose, to any State an amount equal to 90 per centum of any amount paid—

(1) by such State.

(2) To a person certified by the Secretary of the interior as a qualified gold producer, and

(3) as a subsidy at a rate not exceeding $40 per fine troy ounce for newly mined domestic gold produced by such person during the period for which he is so certified.

JOHN C. SACKETT—OUTSTANDING YOUNG MAN OF AMERICA

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. Pollock] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House the unusual accomplishments of one of my constituents.

The Honorable John C. Sackett is a young Indian, and a leader in the native community of Indians, Eskimos, and Aleuts in Alaska. When he was 21 years of age, he was elected as president of the Tanana Chiefs Association, an organization of the Indian chiefs of the various tribes, villages, and communities in the Tanana Valley near Fairbanks, Alaska. Now, at age 22, he is an elected representative in the Alaska State Legislature, representing the Nation's largest legislative district.

Recently the name of John C. Sackett was included in the 1967 edition of "Outstanding Young Men of America," an annual publication sponsored by the Montgomery, Ala., Junior Chamber of Commerce. I am delighted that the talents, dedication, and superior scholastic and civic accomplishments of this young man were recognized in this way, and I salute this fine American.

NASA SAFETY PROGRAM

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, NASA has taken a small step in the right direction today by indicating before the House Committee on Science and Astronautics that it will create a Flight Safety Office in the Office of Manned Space Flight. However, this falls far short of creating an adequate safety program. NASA still lacks an effective independent safety review system to assure that the Administrator will receive advice and assistance in safety matters on all NASA programs uncolored by considerations of budget and schedule obligations. NASA must further strengthen its safety program to provide greater assurance that the present "Hazard evaluation gap" will be closed.

I have introduced legislation (H.R. 8145) calling for the establishment of an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel to establish a mechanism for top level independent safety review. Such a panel, patterned after the Atomic Energy Commission's Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, could provide for the independent safety review of all NASA's operations by a group of non-NASA experts participating on a part-time basis. The panel's role would be to ask the hard questions concerning safety—which obviously were not being asked—and thus to provide the Administrator with additional assurance, free of budget or schedule considerations and employee fear of "rocking the boat," that the potential hazards of the space program have been identified and either removed or their ramifications understood and controlled.

Another proposal is H.R. 4473, introduced by Representative Fulton, Republican, of Pennsylvania, to create in NASA the position of Inspector General. The Inspector General concept has been used by several key Government agencies, including AEC, as well as all branches of the armed services. An Inspector General could help to provide management with greater assurance that NASA's staff and contractors are performing properly from a safety standpoint.

The U.S. space effort has a significant role ahead. Successes of previous years must be matched and surpassed. Now that the need for a greater emphasis on safety within NASA is known as a result of the accident, our task is to continue development of a well-balanced U.S. space program. The establishment of an Aerospace Safety Advisory Panel and the provision for an Inspector General for NASA are crucial in rectifying glaring structural deficiencies.

Problems are not solved by pretending they do not exist. The hazard evaluation gap within NASA can and must be closed. The Congress and NASA have the means to achieve that goal if they will act promptly and responsibly.

FEDERAL RESERVE EMPLOYS WIDE VARIETY OF POLICY TOOLS

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, any doubt about the power of monetary policy to influence the domestic economy should have been laid to rest last year. With fiscal policy playing a minor role, monetary policy carried the burden of fighting inflation. The Council of Economic Advisors estimates that the economic effects of the tight monetary policy in 1966 were roughly the same as a 10-percent income tax surcharge.

The growing recognition of the importance of monetary policy has focused attention on the tools which the Federal Reserve uses to influence the availability and cost of credit. The most important tool, of course, is open market operations—the buying and selling of Treasury securities to influence the money supply. Maintenance of orderly credit and financial markets is another key objective of the Open Market Committee.

In addition, the Federal Reserve influences economic activity by changes in the discount rate and in required reserves and its power to set ceilings on interest rates which commercial banks can set on "time" deposits.

Each of these instruments is described in an article on the Federal Reserve which appeared in the April 24, 1967, edition of the Wall Street Journal. Because of the importance of better understanding monetary policy and its relationship to debt management, I have asked unanimous consent that this article be inserted in the Record at this point:

Focus on the "Fed"; Reserve System Uses Varied Tools To Wield Influence on Economy—It Affects Business Through Power Over Interest, Bank Reserves and Money Supply—Role of Discount Rate Shrinks

(By Richard F. Janssen)

Washington.—"The Federal Reserve Board raised taxes to fight inflation. It did slow the price rise, but it also depressed home building, shooed shoppers from auto showrooms and cost the economy so many billions of dollars of lost output as to raise the specter of recession."

Should such an imaginary summary ever appear in an economic history book, it would be laughed off the shelves, since many a schoolboy knows that the President and the Congress get together on raising taxes, while the Federal Reserve is limited to murky maneuverings with credit supplies and interest rates.

Yet the capsule analysis is not quite as wild as it may seem. For what the "Fed" did with its credit-managing powers in 1966 has had at least the same dampening effect, according to President Johnson's Council of Economic Advisers, as a stiff 10% income-tax surcharge would have had. After several years in which the spotlight was on the splashy fiscal-policy action of heftier Federal spending, lower tax rates and bigger deficits, the council reported frankly that last year it was monetary policy—actions affecting the cost and supply of credit—that "moved to the center of the stage." (President Johnson's appointment of William W. Sherrill to the Reserve Board, announced over the weekend, tailors it more to his liking. See story on page 17.)

It is there now, too. While a tax increase to slow the economy is still in the talking stage that it entered over a year ago, the Fed is acting rigorously to stimulate the U.S. economy, which it restrained with high interest rates last year. And if the board decides restraint is needed again, it can just as swiftly change course once more.

How does the Fed influence the economy?

The answers have changed somewhat since a few years ago; the present board members are less averse than their predecessors to supplementing across-the-board monetary policy moves with a sprinkling of "selective" intervention. The answers all lie, however, in a compact kit of monetary-policy tools that has changed little over the decades.

Some of these straightforwardly let the board decree its wishes, such as its increasingly used Regulation Q, which clamps legal ceilings on the interest rates that commercial banks can pay to attract savings. Most of the Fed's tools give it less direct leverage, such as its recently reduced "discount rate" charges on loans to the Reserve System's member banks. An implement that provides less noisy but very strong impact on the credit situation, and is fast becoming a favorite of the board's new breed, is the one letting it specify how much cash banks must keep idle as reserves; last month the board eased certain of these reserve requirements.

CREATING MONEY

But what gives the Fed its unique and pivotal power is its almost mystic ability to create money out of nothing. This enviable attribute is masked in enough technicalities that board members in the early years after the Fed was established in 1913 didn't even realize they were using it. "It seems fantastic now, but they just didn't know what they were doing until sometime in the 1920s," an aide observes.

The process centers in the "open-market operations" through which the Fed adds to the money supply by buying existing Treasury securities from private holders, or subtracts from it by selling the securities to them. The magic doesn't lie in the securities themselves, an economist says, since the effect would be similar "if we decided to deal in soybeans or old auto bodies; it's just that Treasury securities are respectable and convenient." (By dealing in such securities, the Fed is in a position to help the Treasury carry on its massive borrowing; lately it has also tried its hand at dealing in securities of other U.S. agencies, such as the Federal National Mortgage Association.)

The process is simplest when the open-market staff at the Fed's New York district bank buys, for instance, $1 million of securities directly from a big commercial bank in New York. To pay for them, the Fed men simply add $1 million to the "reserve account" that the commercial bank has at the Fed bank—without having to take $1 million out of any other account anywhere.

Creating reserves takes a few more steps if the Fed buys from a securities dealer other than a bank; in this case it writes a check, again without subtracting from any account. When the $1 million check is deposited by the dealer in his bank account, that bank also gets the $1 million addition to its reserve account as it sends the check back to the Fed bank.

IMPACT ON MAIN STREET

At this point, the Fed has already had an impact on Wall Street's money markets. But it has only set the stage for a multiplication of money that ultimately affects the country's Main Streets, too. This comes about because Fed regulations require commercial banks to keep idle as reserves only a fraction of the customers' deposits they receive. Assuming that the reserve requirement is 15%, a bank receiving a check for $1 million from the Fed (or anyone else) needs to keep only $150,000 of reserves behind the deposit.

So, it suddenly has $850,000 of "excess reserves" that the profit motive usually impels it to lend. Here's where the money creation process begins in earnest.

The bank lends $850,000 by adding that sum to the borrower's checking account on its books. When the borrower spends this money, the check he writes soon winds up in another bank, giving that bank new ability to lend all but the 15% that it must keep as reserves. As the process progresses, Fed theoreticians say, the initial $1 million of new reserves eventually supports an extra $6.7 million of checking-account deposits in the banking system, the maximum expansion possible with a 15% reserve requirement. (The total supply of money in the country doesn't swell proportionately, of course, since repaying of loans reverses the process, and the Fed itself frequently does deliberately reverse the process by selling off securities, too.)

While the board's open-market operations are probably its least understood function—in part due to the secrecy used to prevent speculators in Treasury securities from profiting unfairly—these dealings are the Fed's most persistent preoccupation. The actual telephoning of transactions takes place at the trading desk of the New York district bank in downtown Manhattan, where the manager and his staff must make split-second decisions on prices and volumes of purchases and sales. But building the broad policy framework draws on resources of the whole system and involves board members daily.

Whether the board should become so engrossed in the constant fluctuations of the market in Treasury securities is the subject of some dissent within the system. The board and its New York operatives are "unduly impressed with moment-to-moment movements" in the capital markets, asserts an economist at the St. Louis district bank, where officials generally would prefer a gradual, steadier increase in the U.S. money supply. "We're still debating the trend of the last three months," he says, "while they've probably changed their minds three times this morning."

THE CHAIRMAN'S VIEW

Chairman William McChesney Martin finds this attention to market movements crucially important, though, as do the board members generally. "Markets," Mr. Martin snapped at a recent Congressional hearing, "don't wait for Kings, Prime Ministers, Presidents, Secretaries of the Treasury or Federal Reserve Board chairmen."

On a Tuesday every three or four weeks, the basic buying and selling strategy is hammered out around a highly polished Honduran mahogany table in the chart-studded board room in Washington by the system's "open-market committee"—known around the Fed as the "OMC." The committee consists of all seven board members and five of the 12 district bank presidents; the New York bank's president (at present Alfred Hayes) is always a member, while the others rotate. The seven bank presidents who aren't on the committee at any given time usually take part, although they can't actually vote.

Preparation for such a session is increasingly intensive, insiders say, reflecting the board's growing interest in the whole economy as well as in financial markets. For instance, board member Andrew F. Brimmer relates, the "green book" prepared by the staff before each meeting is a "remarkable compendium of fact and interpretation" that typically contains 50 to 75 pages on the economic situation; the size has roughly doubled just in the last two years. Advance written reports weren't even used until 1952, he says, when they took only 10 pages and went only to a few key committee members.

Besides the "green book," Fed staffers prepare and circulate a "blue book" on money market and banking conditions, "country papers" on foreign trends and other reports. On this material are based the recommendations on open-market policy presented by senior staff members in the meetings.

Of the discussions in the sessions, one staff man says, "There's a strict policy of academic freedom." He reports Chairman Martin doesn't know what the recommendations will be until be hears them along with everyone else, and the arguments are often lively with no special respect shown for rank. "If a photo were ever taken of a typical OMC meeting, it would probably show me making a face at one of the board members," a key economist confides.

Because each session generates some policy decision—even if only to continue the same stance—the regular OMC meetings cause nervous twitterings in the financial community. But contrary to a persistent myth, the board itself meets every working day, not just on Thursdays, and hasty phone calls to other OMC members can achieve abrupt policy changes at any time. Every working day, in fact, the New York Market managers make the "11 o'clock call," simultaneously linking the top Washington staffers, a smattering of board members and one of the outlying district bank presidents, to discuss that day's open-market operations.

The long-run effect of the daily dealings on the national economy is almost staggering. From only about $2 billion a quarter-century ago, the Fed has amassed a $45 billion hoard of Treasury securities, including $3 billion acquired last year alone. And it is the Fed purchases of Treasury debt, not the budget deficits or the debt itself, that brings the "multiple expansion of the money supply" that permits both real economic growth and the risk of inflation, a new study by the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research says.

The Fed can also foster the money-creating process by changing the percentage of deposits that banks must keep as required reserves. By cutting to 3% from 4% the requirement behind savings deposits last month, the board freed $850 million of reserves for bank lending, a chunk of money that should multiply massively as it is spent by the borrowers and redeposited. When the board was striving to restrain the economy last summer, it also turned to the reserve rules, raising the percentage behind a bank's total time deposits in excess of $5 million to 6% from 4%.

Both the fine adjustments of bank deposits and the fairly frequent change are innovations; prior to 1966, the board had changed the percentage on time deposits only eight times in more than a quarter-century.

The recent change in required reserves behind savings deposits applies to all 6,150 banks under the board's direct supervision. But the effect is much more selective than it appears at first glance, officials say with some satisfaction. They figure $500 million of the newly freed reserves belongs to outlying banks that tend to have more of their deposits in savings accounts and are apt to put some of them to use serving the Government's goal of reviving home construction. By comparison, an estimated $350 million of the freed money is at big-city banks that tend to have less of their deposits in savings and specialize more in lending to big business; these banks might worsen the balance-of-payments situation by using extra funds to repay last year's heavy borrowings from their foreign branches.

The reserves required behind demand deposits haven't been changed since 1960. They stand at 16.5% for "Reserve city banks," which generally are those in bigger cities that boast a Federal Reserve district bank or branch, and at 12% for "country" banks, which are everywhere else. The geographic distinction is considered outdated, and the board has just renewed a request to Congress to scrap it in favor of having reserves graduated according to the banks' size.

The "discount windows" at the 12 district banks, where member banks can borrow at the discount rate, give the system another means for pumping out new reserves. But their contribution to the total is relatively small. In recent months, average bank borrowings from the windows have been only a few hundred million dollars, or less than 1% of Federal Reserve credit outstanding through open-market purchases of Treasury securities.

On a typical afternoon not long ago, the teller-type discount window at the St. Louis Fed bank presented a casual scene: A junior officer gazed at statistical tables, a girl was absorbed in a paperback novel and a woman riffled through a local newspaper. Promptly at 2 p.m., a guard precluded any possible lending activity by quietly locking the large brass gates.

Although the discount rate has often been a great bargain, inactivity at the discount windows is common. As a Philadelphia district bank publication puts it, this borrowing is a "last resort" rarely undertaken unless a commercial bank finds its reserves have suddenly fallen below the legal minimum, or if unexpectedly large seasonal losses of deposits or a true emergency puts it in a severe bind. Indeed, a board regulation counsels that the "continuous use of Federal Reserve credit by a member bank over a considerable period of time is not regarded as appropriate."

As one commercial banker explains, "We don't want to wear out our welcome at the discount window. If some day we really need to borrow that way and they wouldn't let us, we might have to take a heck of a beating by selling bonds at a loss" in order to quickly gain cash.

But some board officials believe many bankers are unnecessarily reluctant to borrow from the Fed. "There's been a complete breakdown in communications," complains one official. "We're finding most banks don't know how to borrow; they don't understand their rights or their duties." As a result, one reform being considered is to grant each member bank a "line of credit" on which it could borrow without embarrassment; a bank with deposits big enough to require $10 million of reserves would have a $10 million line of credit.

The discount rate has long had significance that transcends the quantity of funds it covers, since a change in it is often viewed as signaling a basic change in policy; an increase presumably indicates a desire to tighten credit and a decrease a desire to loosen.

Thus, the last discount-rate increase in December 1965—to 4.5% from 4%—indicated the board wanted to tighten credit. Late in 1966, however, the traditional pattern did not prevail; the board wanted to loosen credit but it did not change the rate. When it finally did act recently to cut the rate to 4% from 4.5%, it appeared to do so reluctantly. There is some doubt now that the rate will ever again be viewed in the traditional way. Reliance on a broader array of credit-policy options may diminish the impact of discount rate ups and downs.

CHANGES CONTEMPLATED

Radical changes in the rate machinery are being considered as part of the possible overhaul of the "window" operation. If it's decided to be more generous in making reserves available through the windows, some officials think loans for longer periods ought to be at a higher discount rate than the basic one. Also, the discount rates might be allowed to drift along in a fixed relation to short-term rates in the open market. If the board felt the need for a dramatic demonstration of a policy change, though, it presumably still would be able to post a specific set of rates any time it wanted.

Political pressures provide ample motive for considering reform. The discount-rate boost in December 1965 was the first policy action that got the board summoned enmasse before a Congressional committee, which probed publicly and painfully into individual members' differences and talked ominously about ways to require better adherence to Administration wishes. Since changing the discount rate can create such a dangerous stir, some Federal officials confide, it was thought safest to reject district bank bids' to boost the rate further last summer.

Also serving to keep the discount rate in limbo until the recent cut was the board's discovery of how potent another weapon can be. This is its long-neglected and seemingly limited power to set ceilings on commercial banks' interest rates on "time" deposits. In December 1965, at about the same time the discount rate was raised to help fight inflation, the ceiling was raised on some kinds of accounts to 5.5% from 4%. The aim was apparently limited—to keep big banks from suddenly losing a lot of deposits to marketable securities, which were carrying higher yields.

But the effect proved much broader and more powerful than expected, officials discovered; it served to counter the tightening-up represented by the discount rate increase. The banks took unexpectedly full advantage of the higher ceilings and pulled in large sums of money that let them sharply accelerate their lending early in 1966. And when this lending appeared to be fueling inflation last summer, officials simply failed to raise the ceiling again, causing a big enough deposit loss to force a lending slowdown.

In retrospect, some board members concede they made a mistake in raising the ceiling so sharply in the first place. They thought they were putting it "out of reach," but found it had a strange "magnetism" that banks couldn't resist; their rates promptly shot up to the new ceiling.

THE HINDSIGHT VIEW

A lesser boost, board officials now say, might well have saved the economy from the overheating that marked most of 1966, as banks might have lost deposits and lending power gradually throughout the year rather than abruptly in the last part of it. Under more flexible authority granted last summer by Congress, the board dropped the ceiling back to 5% on time deposits of less than $100,000 in commercial banks to give rival savings and loan associations a better crack at savings, but it kept the lid on larger amounts at 5.5%.

The next question may be whether these ceilings covering banks' "certificates of deposit"—receipts for funds left for a specified period—ought to be lowered to help deescalate the interest-rate conflict and to help S&Ls and mutual savings banks compete for funds with which to finance the home construction revival.

Under little-known and rarely employed powers, the Fed can move massively to head off a financial panic by lending its newly created funds to banks that aren't system members and even to other financial institutions, corporations or individuals. Last summer, for instance, the board quietly authorized the system's district banks to make "emergency" loans to savings and loan associations and mutual savings banks in case they suffered severe losses of deposits. The precaution proved unnecessary, though, and no such loans were made.

AUTO INSURANCE CRITIC CHARGES DISCRIMINATION

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Snyder] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Green], and I have been attempting to alert this body to what we believe to be rather gross inequities in the automobile liability insurance business.

Each of us have brought various examples of the seriousness of the problem to the attention of the House.

The State of Virginia appears to be among the endless list of States suffering the same problems as evidenced by a story in the Sunday Star, May 7, 1967.

The news article follows:

Auto Insurance Critic Charges Discrimination

Norfolk.—State Sen. Henry E. Howell Jr., an unceasing critic of the State Corporation Commission, says he has examined underwriting standards of some 60 auto insurance companies doing business in Virginia.

His conclusion, he said, is that some of these companies refuse to insure or insure only at premium rates these people:

Ministers, doctors, employed cooks, tradesmen and painters, construction workers, hospital attendants, building cleaners and custodians, laborers, unemployed women, divorced and separated women, dock workers, domestic maids, farm laborers, merchant sailors, manicurists, elderly people and military personnel.

Such discrimination, Howell said, is allowed by the SCC.

"The SCC permits some companies to set such high standards that they take only the cream of the drivers," he said. "Other companies with broader standards may have had bad experiences, which brings them in for higher rates. The higher rates the SCC grants then flow to the cream puff companies."

The Norfolk legislator said the "lack of fairness and rationale in underwriting principles in Virginia is underscored by the reason given for charging higher rates for doctors and preachers."

Howell quoted one company's underwriting manual as saying, "both appear to drive when preoccupied with problems. The clergy may drive with the attitude 'The Lord will provide.' With doctors, there is the possibility of use of the car in emergency."

CHANGE FOREIGN AID TO FAMINE PREVENTION

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I have proposed that foreign aid be changed into a famine prevention program. In a statement to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, I proposed the name change and listed five amendments, I will later offer, to redirect the program into an effective instrument for worldwide self-help in food production and population control.

The population explosion is already causing widespread famine in India and within a decade millions of people there and in other countries will die of starvation unless broad and effective measures are taken quickly to improve food production and population control. Official estimates predict rising world food deficits will outrun America's maximum production capacity not later than 1977.

The time for moralizing and academic discussion is past, and the time for action is here. In my opinion, the single most important item of business before the 90th Congress is to inaugurate an effective worldwide program to avert famine.

To the maximum extent possible the

resources of the Agency for International Development must be concentrated on this challenging and urgent problem. AID programs not directly related to it must be put on the shelf.

The amendments would—

First. Require annual "achievement targets" in food production and population control for each country receiving aid, and year-end reports to Congress on how well each measures up.

Second. Require that programs related to food production and population control get first-claim on all funds.

Third. Authorize use of U.S.-owned local currencies to encourage private-enterprise risk-taking in underdeveloped countries.

Fourth. Call for recommendations from the Agency for International Development by January 1, 1968, "in regard to establishing an agricultural research and training center in each of the three major tropical regions—Latin America, Africa, and Asia."

Fifth. Require that not less than $75 million be earmarked in this year's authorization for population control projects, including research.

I also proposed an amendment to encourage the maintenance and development of basic freedoms in countries receiving aid. Under it, Congress would receive an annual report on the status of freedom of press, speech, assembly, worship, security of person, and freedom from arbitrary arrest in each country.

U.S. PROLIFERATION PACT KICK WORRIES GERMANY

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, further evidence that the administration's relentless drive to put over a nonproliferation pact with the Soviets causes deep concern in West Germany is apparent in the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Frankfurt Allegemeine newspaper:

TROOP WITHDRAWALS FROM EUROPE

The planned withdrawal of four American air squadrons from the Federal Republic must give rise to concern. We do have understanding for many of our partner's problems. The fact that 30,000 American army soldiers will be redeployed to America, for example, finds our understanding, tho not our approval.

But we cannot watch the reduction of allied air units with the same equanimity. At stake are more than just economies. The withdrawal of American aircraft no longer has anything to do with the fiscal thinking that could temporarily force politics into the background. A changed strategic concept comes now in view.

Modern high-performance aircraft are normally equipped with nuclear weapons, or else one can fit them for their nuclear task in a few hours. By redeploying combat aircraft, the Americans are initiating the nuclear thinning out of the European front.

There is no doubt that the west's "overkill capacity" will still continue to exist. The nuclear superiority of the Americans and thus of their allies remains overwhelming. But from the shifting of the nuclear emphasis from Europe to America one can conclude for the Atlantic security policy that the process of denuclearization has been initiated. Presumably things will go beyond mere initiation.

The change is under way from a policy of deterrence by constant threat to a policy of keeping the peace by agreement thru complicity by the atom giants.

We cannot prevent such tendencies. But we must register them. Consequences have to be drawn for our own security policy.

The question could arise, for example, whether we should continue to finance with offset aid. The last tripartite talks [between West Germany, Britain, and the United States] can hardly be regarded a real success. This body has proved unsuitable for negotiations on military policy.

What is also alarming is the haste with which our American friends now proceed by linking the withdrawal of air force squadrons [to that of army troops] altho that was supposed to be still a matter for negotiation. Why did the air force withdrawal have to be announced before the NATO conference of defense ministers?

It looks as if the Geneva conference on the nuclear nonproliferation treaty blinds our American friends to all necessities except one: to come to terms with the Soviet Union on the nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

INCREASE THE CAPITOL POLICE FORCE

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in good conscience I cannot support the requested increase in the Capitol Police force.

The so-called police force we have is by any proper standards a laughingstock. They do far more "featherbedding" than work. They do not effectively control parking around the Capitol and must be augmented at the slightest whisper of agitation near the Capitol. They obviously do not possess the minimum physical standards that should be required of police officers. Rather than adding 78 patronage-type positions to the cost of maintaining Congress we ought to train the existing Capitol Police and improve their caliber through maintaining higher standards.

TIME FOR ACTION ON RHODESIA

Mr. KLEPPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GURNEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Speaker, just 1 month ago, on April 12, I joined with a great number of my colleagues in a special order protesting the administration's action in Rhodesia.

Despite the outcry here in Congress and across the Nation expressing shame for our policy of interference, the administration has not moved from its untenable and illegal position.

The time has come, I believe, for Congress to deal firmly with this matter and to take back the reigns of authority to regulate foreign commerce as granted us by the Constitution. I am therefore introducing a resolution today directing the President to notify the United Nations that the United States will not honor their sanctions against Rhodesia.

The reasons for this resolution are many. The United States cannot in clear conscience pursue its present course here. In the first place, the United Nations has acted contrary to its own charter in interfering in matters that are within the internal jurisdiction of a state.

The ridiculous notion, conceived to circumvent its charter, that Rhodesia's presence might annoy her neighbors to point where they would break their United Nations agreement and attack her, is ridiculous. It is like proposing that we jail all the law-abiding citizens so that the criminals who roam the streets would not be tempted to break the law by attacking them.

To compound this, the President circumvented our own Constitution by instructing our United Nations delegation to vote for the sanctions so that he could enforce them under the United Nations Participation Act rather than asking Congress to consider this regulation of foreign commerce.

The highly questionable legal status of the whole matter aside, the fact remains that Rhodesia is a harmless, friendly little nation which asks nothing more than to live at peace with her neighbors. She is strongly anti-Communist and yet we have left her no place else to trade.

In appreciation for our helping her out of her imperial dilemma, Great Britain continues to supply the Vietcong and the Cubans.

Mr. Speaker, this entire matter becomes more unbelievable as one learns more about it. It is high time for the Congress to look into our policy toward Rhodesia and let the President know that it will not be tricked into relinquishing its authority and responsibility.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to inquire of the majority leader the program for the remainder of this week and for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Idaho, Mr. Speaker, we have finished the legislative program for this week.

The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day. There will be one suspension; Senate Joint Resolution 42, nomenclature changes reflecting the creation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

On Monday also there will be general debate only on H.R. 1318, the Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1967. The bill will be considered under an open rule, with 2 hours of debate, making it in order to consider the committee amendments without the intervention of any point of order.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day.

Also on Tuesday there will be consideration of the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill for fiscal year 1968. We expect to finish the appropriation bill on Wednesday.

Also, on Wednesday, we expect to finish consideration of the Food Stamp Act Amendments of 1967, H.R. 1318, after final action on the independent offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development appropriation bill.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I should like to take this time to say we are hopeful of finishing all legislative business on Wednesday, because of the large number of Members who are going to New York City on Thursday.

I should like further to advise the Members, so that they may govern themselves accordingly, that beginning with the close of business on Thursday, May 25, and going through the following Tuesday, Memorial Day, we do not expect to have any legislative business. We do expect to have legislative business on Wednesday, May 31, and the remainder of that week.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ECKHARDT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS DISPENSED WITH ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that any business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

PREVARICATION BY JAMES E. WEBB

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 17, 1967, a member of the Senate Space Committee asked James E. Webb, Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, whether, North American Aviation was the first choice of NASA's Source Selection and Evaluation Board as the winner of the 1961 competition for building the Apollo capsule. Webb replied, "Yes."

A few days ago a Member of the other body, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, asked Webb whether the Martin Co. had not been the Board's first choice. This time Webb admitted that Senator SMITH was correct. Webb confessed for the first time that he and a few of his colleagues had overruled the 200 technical experts and picked North American for the lush Apollo contract.

Mr. Speaker, this is not simply one of those infamous "credibility gaps." This is prevarication, and Mr. Webb ought long ago to have been fired as the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The public is entitled to know, Mr. Speaker, what part was played in the award of this contract by Fred B. Black, Jr., former highly paid lobbyist for North American Aviation; by Robert G. (Bobby) Baker, the free-wheeling secretary to Lyndon Johnson when the latter was leader of the Senate majority; and by the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, as well as Webb.

Three brave astronauts met tragic death last January in the Apollo capsule that was constructed by North American and under the direction of Webb. One expert said there has been almost countless failures and malfunctions in the course of construction and testing of the capsule and its equipment before the astronauts were sealed inside on the launching pad at Cape Canaveral on that fateful day in January.

Considerable light is thrown on this whole sordid mess in an article published in the Des Moines Register of April 19, 1967.

Written by the Pulitzer prize-winning reporter, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, the article follows:

WEBB: MAN ON A HOT SEAT IN APOLLO PROBE—THE MOON PROJECT'S TARNISHED IMAGE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The lofty goal was the Moon, but the Apollo space program has been tarnished by Robert G. (Bobby) Baker's wheeling and dealing, and now it is marred deeply by carelessness and the tragic death of three astronauts.

The man on the spot is James Edwin Webb, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), as two committees of Congress burrow deeper into the conditions existing at the time a fire killed three astronauts last Jan. 27.

Webb, irritable and defensive under heavy criticism, has snapped: "We will take our part of the blame for what we have done or left undone."

MAN ON MOON

However, he has tended to defend North American Aviation and has declared that it is more important "to get on with the job" of putting a man on the Moon than it is to go back and pinpoint responsibility for all negligence.

It has been estimated by Dr. Robert W. Seamans, deputy director of NASA, that the fatal fire in the Apollo at Cape Kennedy has set back the space program by at least a year. He said there is only a slight chance of putting an American on the Moon by 1970.

A special Apollo review board already has issued a report highly critical of NASA's administration of the Apollo program, and accusing North American of carelessness in production of the spacecraft involved in the fatalities.

However, the House and Senate Space Committees are not satisfied with the Apollo review board's report, and a number of members are pressing for access to all reports on the production and testing of the Apollo.

Some members of the House Space Committee, led by Representative Don Rumsfeld (Rep., Ill.), have been critical of the fact that Webb named the Apollo review board. While that board has been critical of NASA and North American, there has been objection to the fact that the report did not make more of an effort to pinpoint the responsibility for carelessness within NASA and in North American.

Rumsfeld and other House committee members have argued that the head of NASA should not be the man to name a committee that will investigate the administration of NASA.

Also, most of the members of the Apollo review board are employes of NASA, and various committee members have declared that subordinates are not likely to be frank in their criticism of superiors in an agency.

This criticism has not been intended to judge the Apollo review board report as in error or "too soft" on Webb and NASA. The judgment on that will be made after Congress and the General Accounting Office (GAO) have completed the investigations that are now under way.

Comptroller General Elmer Staats said late last week that the GAO is now involved in a review of the entire Apollo program. However, a report on that investigation "is months away," Staats said, because it was not started until a few weeks ago.

It was learned that unknown to Staats, his agency had killed another investigation of the Apollo program only a few weeks ago.

Richard Madison, director of GAO's Atlanta, Ga., office, had been engaged in an extensive investigation of the Apollo project. The investigation was called:

"Review of negotiations and administration of contract for check-out on the reliability and integration support of the Apollo program."

Although the Atlanta office was pursuing this investigation avidly under Madison's direction, it was killed a few weeks ago by Clerio Pin, who recently was made associate director of GAO in charge of investigations of NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the new Department of Transportation.

FIVE CONTRACTORS

It is reported that this investigation went back to the summer and fall of 1961 when five contractors submitted plans for the Apollo project in a heated competition for the multi-billion-dollar contract.

Webb awarded the contract to North American Aviation on Nov. 28, 1961, after a study of the proposals of the five contractors by a team composed of 200 engineers and scientists.

For more than three years, Senator John J. Williams (Rep., Del.) and Representative H. R. Gross (Rep., Ia.), have been seeking an investigation of the award of the Apollo contract to North American.

The desire for this sweeping investigation of the Apollo contract arose out of the Senate Rules Committee investigation of the "gross improprieties" of Baker, the former secretary to the Democratic majority of the Senate.

It had been reported that North American had agreed to give Baker the $2,500,000-a-year food vending business at North American plants in the same month that Webb, a former administrative assistant to Senator Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma, made the award.

Also, there were reports that North American had agreed to en extensive building and expansion program in Oklahoma along the Arkansas River project. Kerr was then the chairman of the Senate Aeronautics and Space Committee, and also was chairman of the House Public Works Committee that was pushing the Arkansas River development.

Senator Williams and Representative Gross were unable to persuade the Senate Rules Committee it should investigate the award of the Apollo contract during the Bobby Baker hearings. The Democratic majority opposed Republican suggestions for witnesses on the Apollo project, and declined to include critical reports on the Apollo project in the Rules Committee report.

Despite criticism from Williams and Gross, North American Aviation continued its contract with Baker's Serv-U Vending for two years after the "gross improprieties" of Baker had been exposed.

The Republican members of the Senate Rules Committee had commented critically: "Until such time as defense contractors such as North American and Northrop [Aviation] decide they no longer want to do business with Baker, his financial empire may continue."

The report also said:

"The backbone of Baker's financial empire was, and still is, the Serv-U Vending. It was through the vending business that Baker was able to acquire monthly cash kickbacks as well as inaugurate a highly profitable vending operation with defense contractors whose almost sole source of income was from the United States government.

"It was in these vending operations that Baker became associated with questionable individuals who ranged from gamblers to those convicted of income tax evasion. Likewise when Baker's Carousel [Motel] was in the midst of financial difficulties, it was his vending business that had the wherewithal to bail out the Ocean City property."

NEW ENTERPRISE

North American broke off its relations with another vending firm to switch its business to Baker's new enterprise, and there is no doubt that any great wealth Baker acquired was tied to this decision.

It also turned out that North American did engage in a broad new plant expansion program in Oklahoma in the months immediately after it received the Apollo contract. The North American expansion in Oklahoma was not only beneficial to Oklahoma generally, but it was of some value to Senator Kerr and his family and associates.

After Kerr's death on Jan. 1, 1963, it was disclosed that Kerr, his family, and Dean A. McGee, one of Kerr's business partners, had purchased more than 1,100 acres of land at a key point on the Arkansas River navigation project. The land is now the proposed site of the port of Catoosa, which is the terminus of the navigation project.

The land was held for Kerr in the name of an Oklahoma City lawyer, and was disclosed for the first time when the Kerr assets were filed in Probate Court in Oklahoma City in March, 1963.

Prior to that time, there was no knowledge that Kerr, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, had any personal financial interest in the Arkansas River project.

Webb, a former assistant to the president of Kerr-McGee Industries, has continued to be a leading stockholder in the Fidelity National Bank and Trust Co. of Oklahoma City, a bank in which the Kerr family and McGee have been major figures.

Gross has asked that Representative Richard Roudebush (Rep., Ind.) and other Republicans on the House Space Committee press for a full investigation of all the circumstances surrounding the award of the contract to North American.

In a letter to Republican members of that committee, Gross has declared that certain recordings of the conversations of Fred B. Black, jr., former Washington lobbyist for North American, indicate that political favoritism may have been involved in Webb's administration of NASA.

The record of the fraud and income tax evasion trial of Baker shows that on Feb. 11, 1963, only a little over a month after Kerr died, Black had a conversation with Dean McGee indicating Webb's activity at NASA benefited North American, Oklahoma and Kerr.

Black's end of the telephone conversation indicated that Webb had delivered for "the old man" (Senator Kerr), in months past, but that since Kerr's death Black, as a Washington representative for North American, had been able to obtain only about one-third of the projects requested for Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I also submit for printing in the Record at this point the following editorial from the New York Times of the date of May 11, 1967:

NASA Candor Needed

James E. Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was asked on April 17 by a member of the Senate Space Committee whether North American Aviation was the first choice of NASA's Source Evaluation Board—a group of almost 200 technical experts—as the winner of the 1961 competition for building the Apollo capsule. Mr. Webb replied "yes."

A few days ago Senator Margaret Chase Smith asked Mr. Webb whether the Martin Company had not been the board's first choice. This time Mr. Webb agreed that the Senator was correct and revealed for the first time that he and a few of his colleagues had overruled the technical experts and picked North American for the rich Apollo contract.

The contradiction between Mr. Webb's testimony on the two occasions would be bad enough in isolation. But against the record of these months of investigation into the Apollo tragedy it strongly supports the belief that neither Congress nor the American people have been treated with full candor in NASA's reporting of what is going on in the space program. It may be recalled that the famous Phillips report became public property only as a result of a leak to Congressman William F. Ryan.

Now that the public finally knows that North American was picked for the Apollo project by a few high officials—and not by a large group of technical experts as originally imagined—the question of why it was picked becomes even more intriguing than before. The cynics, of course, have always believed that the award went to North American as the result of a battle among influence peddlers, including Bobby Baker, former Secretary to the Senate Democrats. The cynics may be wrong, but the public cannot know without a full investigation. Congress has the obligation to force out all the facts.

WHY A TASK FORCE ON CRIME?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Smith] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, if there is a consensus among the vast American electorate, it is the widespread recognition of the seriousness of our crime problem and the urgent necessity for action on the part of government at all levels to find effective means for its prevention and control. The report of the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice states that—

> The existence of crime, the talk about crime, the reports of crime and the fear of crime have eroded the basic quality of life of many Americans.

The Commission found that one-third of all Americans say it is unsafe to walk alone at night in their neighborhoods. More than one-third report that they keep firearms in their homes for protection from criminals, and almost as many said that they keep a dog for the same purpose. The figures for some of our major cities are even higher.

Thus for these people freedom is an empty word, and talk of a Great Society has an empty ring to it. Nor is this a concern of only the prosperous. Other surveys have indicated that among the poor, crime is listed as their greatest day-to-day problem. In a survey of Harlem, for example, the residents described the worst problems in their neighborhood as follows: Crime, 28 percent; dope addiction, 20 percent; need for better police protection, 15 percent; and murders and drunks in the hallways of buildings, 3 percent each. These bare statistics present a picture of the most degrading kind of existence.

There is no question but that we are faced with a crisis of serious proportions and that we in the Congress must do our utmost to find solutions and to give leadership that will lead toward corrections of this deplorable situation. Those solutions are not going to be easy to find. Moreover, the American people are not going to be impressed with partisan labels on such solutions.

Republicans, like their Democrat colleagues, recognize that the greatest ingenuity must be exercised if we are to make inroads on the cancer of crime. That is why we have established a task force on crime, to help search for solutions, to offer information and analysis and recommendations for action.

We are fortunate to have as our chairman our esteemed colleague, Richard Poff, of Virginia. He is, as you know, our second-ranking member on the House Judiciary Committee and is secretary of the House Republican conference. He has been named to the Commission on Revision and Reform of the Federal Criminal Statutes, an agency created as a result of legislation that he sponsored in the 89th Congress.

The first interim report of the task force is concerned with the heart of the crime problem—better law enforcement. I am honored to present this report at this time as follows:

First Interim Report of the Republican Task Force on Crime

The Republican Task Force on Crime believes that one small, yet positive and significant step in enhancing the status of local police officials would be the passage of a federal survivorship and disability compensation bill. This law would benefit officers totally disabled or the survivors of officers killed in action taken by them to assist in the enforcement of federal laws.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in its comprehensive survey of crime in the United States, gave considerable attention to the problems of the police. In a special report on the police the Commission reached the conclusion that "widespread improvement in the strength and caliber of police manpower, supported by radical revision of personnel practices, is the basic essential for achieving more effective and fairer law enforcement."

The foundation for a successful attack upon the problem of crime is better law enforcement. Better law enforcement requires the best police officers. Many police are not provided with a salary level and the fringe benefits that are now prevalent in our society among most occupational groups.

The Commission reports that in 1967 alone there will be 50,000 vacancies in police departments throughout the Nation. The Commission also reports that the average starting salary for a patrolman in small cities is $4,600. In large cities the average is $5,300. Moreover, typical maximum pay is less than $1,000 over the starting salary.

Nor is this the only problem. The fringe benefits customary to most jobs today—life insurance and survivors benefits—are frequently not available to local law officers. Moreover, because police work is considered a hazardous occupation, insurance premiums are high and difficult to meet with a low salary.

At this time there are no comprehensive statistics on the existing state and local compensation programs established for police officers injured or disabled in the line of duty. Recent testimony before the House Judiciary Committee revealed, however, that the survivors of an officer killed in Richmond, Virginia, would receive the sum of $75.00 per month for one year from the Police Benevolent Association. Other testimony revealed that in many states not even this pittance was provided.

The policeman, just as the soldier, frequently lays his life on the line in carrying out his duties. The Congress has provided generous fringe benefits to the military in recognition of hazards associated with military life. There is a need for similar recognition of the hazards faced by local law enforcement officers.

However, it is obvious that the federal government cannot inject itself directly into the correction of this manifestly unjust situation confronting the local policeman. But the Congress can and often has stimulated local and state authorities by example. The Congress can provide compensation to the local police officer who is killed or injured in enforcing federal law.

There are between 16,000 and 20,000 federal law enforcement officials in the United States. These officers rely daily upon the more than 420,000 local and state officials for support. For example, local police may accompany postmasters to banks with large sums of money. FBI, Secret Service, Postal Inspectors, Immigration officials and many others use the assistance of local departments in carrying out their duties. Local officers swear in their oaths of office to uphold the United States Constitution and all Federal laws. The responsibility should be reciprocal.

A well-written law of disability and survivorship compensation could stimulate state and local governments to develop state laws for analogous local circumstances.

Under existing law, federal officers are provided for in a number of compensatory programs, including the Federal Employees Compensation Act which is administered by the Department of Labor for the benefit of disabled officers and their surviving spouses and dependent children. The Republican Task Force on Crime believes that we should guarantee equal treatment to local police who risk their lives to assist federal officers protected by this program in such activities as apprehension of bank robbers, kidnappers, and "AWOL" military personnel.

Although the details as to how this program would operate vary to some degree among proponents, all evidence suggests that the cost to the federal government would not be substantial. However, the dividends to the Nation from such a program would be significant.

This proposal is a beginning of recognition of the debt that society owes those officers who daily risk their lives for our safety. It is a way of a showing public support of these men while reducing the concern they experience for the future well-being of their wives and children. The proposal would be a first step in improving the financial situation of the police officer and provide a precedent. The Republican Task Force on Crime believes that this measure would make a true contribution to police morale and serve as an inducement to others to consider police work as a profession.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman for his leadership in this area. This is a modest beginning, of course, for a major task that we have ahead of us in the field of crime. I am glad the Republican Party has faced up to its responsibilities in this area. Certainly police morale is a major problem throughout the country for whatever reason, and certainly we are aware that fringe benefits and the protection of the families of policemen who have to stand up every day and be counted in the face of the perils that lurk in our streets can have something to do with morale. Morale is something we need to concern ourselves with in this field of law enforcement.

So this is a good step. It is a step where Federal leadership can point the way. I believe the gentleman should be commended for his interest in this subject. I hope, as we examine the concerns that we all feel in the area of law enforcement, people in the United States will give us the benefit of their advice and suggestions. Because this is the people's problem and, being the people's problem, it is entirely appropriate that our party should take special concern and express that concern here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would be happy to yield to our chairman of the Republican task force on crime.

Mr. POFF. I thank our distinguished colleague from New York. May I express to him my appreciation for the kind remarks he saw fit to make by way of preface to his presentation of this, the first formal report of the Republican task force on crime.

By way of reciprocation, let me pay tribute to the gentleman for the work he has done in this specific area as a member of the subcommittee which has legislation of this nature in charge.

He has pointed the way to what I regard as a pertinent, first positive step in the direction of Federal incentives to better local law enforcement.

As the gentleman has so well said, most local police establishments are certainly unable financially to supply, in addition to salaries which, in too many cases, are altogether too modest, the fringe benefits which normally function as an incentive to career performance. Obviously the Federal Government would like to participate in whatever way is appropriate and whatever way is constitutional.

Clearly, the proposal embodied in the first report of the task force is such a way.

The local law enforcement officer takes an oath when he assumes his office to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. In the performance of his duties he is frequently required, either alone or in company with Federal officers, to pursue, apprehend, place under arrest and custody people suspected of violating Federal statutes.

That pursuit is often hazardous. The local police officer exposes himself to serious, grevious and permanent injury, and occasionally he exposes himself to death.

It is a proper concern, I suggest, of the Federal Government that those he leaves behind as survivors or in the case of disability, those who are dependent upon him, should be properly cared for. If it is a Federal jurisdictional assist, then it is a Federal responsibility.

The task force report recommends that the Federal Government pay the local law enforcement officers who are killed or disabled while pursuing a Federal law violator either survivorship benefits or disability benefits to care for those who have lost a breadwinner.

Surely this is a proper function of the Federal Government and clearly it would serve as a useful incentive to career service.

I earnestly hope that the proposal that the task force has included can be translated into legislative language in the early future in which case that language will be offered to all of our colleagues on both sides of the political aisle with the hope that we may attract as much joint sponsorship as possible. In that way, we hope it may be possible to do something this year to fulfill the Federal responsibility to improve and assist the local law enforcement.

I thank the gentleman for his leadership in this area.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for his leadership also.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of both the gentleman from New York and our distinguished chairman of the task force.

The problem of the correct and proper role of the Federal Government in relation to the States in law enforcement is a vast problem. There are some 400,000-odd local police officers in this country, as the gentleman has mentioned, but there 10,000 or 15,000 who would classify as in that category and who are engaged in law enforcement at the Federal level one way or another.

It is important, I think, to mention the fact that we do not have Federal police officers in this country as such. We must never have in this land a national police force because where this has been the case in other countries in the world, the privileges and immunities of the citizenry have always suffered as a consequence.

So the problem of broadening the benefits and the problem of attracting to law enforcement better and better men and better qualified men throughout the United States must continue to remain largely in the control of and in the hands of the local communities and the State legislatures.

But there is a role for the Federal Government and we of the task force believe, and I know the gentleman does as well, that in providing this modest fringe benefit here in cases where such officers are injured or killed in the course of helping others to enforce a Federal law is a step in the right direction.

But Federal help to local police should never be carried, at least in my opinion, to the extent of having the Federal Government directly or indirectly pay any part of the salaries of local or State police officers in this country. This should not be done.

It is important, too, to note that the great Federal Bureau of Investigation is not a police force. It is the investigating branch of the Federal Government. There are no Federal police in the United States. We must not in the attempt to check the rising crime rate, which disturbs us all, create a Federal police force in law enforcement. The State and local police are the first line of defense of the public against anarchy. Of late the police have become confused and dismayed because the instructions they should be receiving from the courts are not being given to them sufficiently clearly so that they may protect the public at large by enforcing the law properly. This disturbs them and it disturbs me. It has been unrealistic and unnecessarily confusing. The fact that local and often State police are not paid enough is also a problem. Many communities cannot afford to pay them enough. When the gentleman said in his remarks that there is a spread of perhaps only a thousand dollars between the fellow who first comes on the force and the fellow who has been on the force 15 years, that is wrong, because the man who has been on the force over these years and has gained that experience and training should be paid a lot more money than the one who has not. Seniority and years of public service in law enforcement should be recognized with increased pay.

Somehow or other, if the public wants protection against crime, the public must be willing to pay out of its revenues enough money to attract to the police departments better-trained and qualified men who are dedicated to better protection and who will not accept graft or corruption.

The vast majority of our law-enforcement officers, whether they are members of the local police force, on Capitol Hill, or elsewhere, are above graft and are genuinely motivated toward the protection of the general public.

Added tools must be given to the police around the country in the way of better training establishments and better physical facilities. One of the problems that troubles so many of us very much is the question of why younger people do not seem to develop the impression that the policeman is their friend. In truth, there is no better friend that a young person or an older person has than a policeman on the beat who does not, in America, stop at their house at 3 o'clock in the morning, tap on the door, and say, "Come with me," but walks up and down, in the snow and rain, facing all the troubles that require police in some place to have added protections with which we are all familiar. The officer puts his life on the line just to make sure that people in apartment houses, people in homes, and all society can be secure against vicious criminals. Yet far too many citizens take this constant protection for granted, never realizing that these are the men who protect their homes, their jewelry, their lives, and their children's lives, on a day-to-day basis, against some in our society who would shoot, kill, murder, lie, steal, and rob. There are many more crimes committed in America than are reported and become a statistic to the Federal Government or to State law-enforcement agencies.

So all of the Republican task force on crime under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from Virginia and under the leadership of the gentlemen from New York and Ohio are joined together to see what we can come up with to help. I am convinced that over the long haul in the months and years to come our contribution will be constructive and useful to law enforcement across the length and breadth of the country. I am privileged and honored to participate with the gentlemen in this common effort.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I hope that every citizen in the United States will either read or hear your words.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. WYLIE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the very able gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH], and our very competent chairman [Mr. POFF]. The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice found that there are too few policemen to launch the kind of attack on crime that must be commenced if it is to be successful.

The Commission also found that the quality of police personnel must be improved. Further, it was suggested that incentive through increased rewards and upgrading of the position of law-enforcement officer must be undertaken immediately.

One of the most obvious and the least expensive ways is to provide for a man, if he becomes disabled, or for his family, if he loses his life in the line of duty. Local law-enforcement officers should have no less disability and survivorship benefits than are available to Federal employees. I do not suggest that a police officer will think in terms of a disability pension or survivorship benefits as he pursues a criminal. But persons in all walks of life purchase disability or death benefit plans through private insurance hoping they will never collect on them.

Employers have developed disability and survivorship programs to attract better qualified people, and such programs are used as a selling point in recruiting personnel.

The same principle, I think, can be applied to recruiting law-enforcement officers. Law-enforcement officers, we are told, cannot in many cases purchase private disability or survivorship benefits, or if they do, the premium cost is prohibitive.

Many small communities have part-time law enforcement personnel with no disability or survivorship programs. Many communities have auxiliary policemen who are available in time of emergency. I think the possibility of gaining more assistance in these areas would definitely be present if they had the feeling their families would be provided for if something happened to them.

It is hard to predict what, if any, benefit might enure from a plan such as Congressman SMITH has suggested. It does represent an awareness of concern by persons in a position to do something about it and indicates that we know there is danger involved in law enforcement.

The President's Commission reports that more benefits and compensation must be provided to improve the number and quality of local law enforcement officers. This plan could provide a beginning and incentive to that end. It is worth the try. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased indeed to participate briefly in the development of this very worthwhile idea. I do have the great privilege of serving on Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Committee on the Judiciary, as well as on the House Republican task force on crime. I most sincerely believe that the work of this task force can contribute immeasurably to a creatively Federal revitalization of the attractiveness of law enforcement as a career and of the regard and respect which our citizenry should hold for those who have the day-to-day and the hour-to-hour task of making the rule of law a vital and necessary item in our society.

We have heard the phrase "creative federalism" expressed recently by officials of the Johnson administration. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] has developed here today one of the best expressions or manifestations of how that concept of creative federalism can be advanced.

Unfortunately there are legislative proposals pending that would have the opposite result. There are, to my dismay, proposals pending that would make the Attorney General of the United States a dominant element in the work of every local police force and every local law enforcement agency in the United States.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH] has discussed a proposal which moves in exactly the opposite direction. His proposal would give to the local law enforcement officer, in accordance with his oath to protect our citizenry against those who would violate certain laws, some of the same protections that are accorded to Federal law enforcement officials.

This legislative effort and the development of this idea in creative federalism is a significant step forward. As a Member of the House Republican task force on crime, I am pleased to work under the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. POFF] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and to work alongside the gentleman from New York [Mr. SMITH]. I am honored to commend the gentleman on his remarks and to associate myself with them.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Ohio, the deputy chairman of the Republican task force on crime.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much and commend him on the excellent statements that have been made in outlining the problem that faces this task force, to which we intend to direct our attention during the coming months.

I am proud to associate myself also with the remarks of the chairman and other members of the task force, which have set out today so ably the nature of the problems of dealing with the unprecedented increase in crime nationwide.

Serious crimes have increased by 11 percent over the past year. Murder was up 9 percent. Aggravated assault was up 10 percent. Burglaries rose 9 percent.

Tragically, only one-quarter of all the crimes are solved by our law enforcement agencies. It is simply not enough to examine the sociological causes and the explanation for crime, as did the President's Commission. The national figures call for meeting the crime problem head on, with positive, constructive legislation designed to protect the rights of all—of the accused and also of society.

To provide a remedy for the present problem, however, we must be careful to preserve all of the cherished rights which have marked us as freemen and have distinguished this country from all others.

In attempting to develop a positive approach to America's nationwide crime program, we must remember that our Constitution does not bend to accommodate a momentary crisis or even a crisis of the proportion which we now face.

It is the American way, when faced with a problem, not to adopt an extreme solution.

It is the American way to try to balance the competing interests in order that the legitimate interest of all can be realized.

It is the American way to face up to a problem and to develop sound and logical solutions.

We must and we can do this here.

The Republican task force on crime believes that one positive, significant approach to the crime problem would be the passage of this Federal survivorship and disability compensation bill. It would enhance the much-needed status of local law enforcement officers. It would recognize the dangerous duties they have. It would give them the same kind of recognition that we give to others in the military services, when we give them combat pay. It would be a first step toward improving their status, by improving the financial situation of the police officer. It would demonstrate the public support for those men who daily risk their lives for our safety.

I might say, with some pride, I have introduced in the Congress a provision calling for income tax credits to police officers, which would have the net effect of giving a $35 a month across-the-board increase to all police officers throughout our Nation. It would also give to them, again, the same recognition and the same status that we have given to those in our military service.

Another approach to which I believe our task force should give a great deal of attention is in the whole area of providing to the public and to the law enforcement officers alike a code of conduct with regard to interrogations to assist investigation of crime.

I particularly should like to call to the attention of this body—and to discuss for a few minutes—the Miranda case, which has received so much attention.

In the Miranda case, I would suggest, the court is not unaware of the problems which might be created when it said that the Congress has in a sense, perhaps, been derelict in its duty, by not working out some solutions within the case.

I should like to quote from the Miranda case briefly in that regard. The Court said as follows:

> It is impossible for us to foresee the potential alternatives for protecting the privilege which might be devised by Congress or the States in the exercise of their creative rule-making capacities. Therefore, we cannot say that the Constitution necessarily requires adherence to any particular solution for the inherent compulsions of the interrogation process as it is presently conducted. Our decision in no way creates a constitutional straitjacket which will handicap sound efforts at reform, nor is it intended to have this effect. We encourage Congress and the States to continue their laudable search for increasingly effective ways of protecting the rights of the individual while promoting efficient enforcement of our criminal laws.

That is the issue and the problem with which the Miranda case confronts us. It is a challenge to the Congress to find a way to protect the rights of the individual and at the same time give to the law-enforcement authorities some blueprint, some idea, some code which they may follow to effectively carry out the protection which the Miranda case is designed to afford.

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York yield to me at this point so that I may propound a question to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. SMITH of New York. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from New Hampshire.

Mr. WYMAN. With regard to the gentleman's quotation from the High Court a moment ago, I have in my hand a little card, which measures perhaps 2 inches by 3 inches, which is carried by the law-enforcement officers of New Hampshire, under the Miranda case. This is an illustration, under that language, of what police feel they have to do at the present time at the time of apprehension.

This is what they have to tell these people at the time they talk to them.

The Miranda warning reads as follows:

> 1. You have the right to remain silent.
> 2. Anything you say can and will be used against you in a court of law.
> 3. You have the right to talk to a lawyer and have him present with you while you are being questioned.
> 4. If you cannot afford to hire a lawyer, one will be appointed to represent you before any questioning, if you wish one.

On the other side of the card appears the following:

> Waiver. After the warning and in order to secure a waiver, the following questions should be asked and an affirmative reply secured to each question.
>
> 1. Do you understand each of these rights I have explained to you?
> 2. Having these rights in mind, do you wish to talk to us now?

I would like to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in reference to the language he has just quoted and in light of his great knowledge of Court opinions and the sweeping meaning of the Miranda opinion, does he feel that this sort of rigmarole contributes to the investigatory powers of the police throughout this land in catching up with and detecting crime in the first flush of its commission which, as he very well knows, in many instances is the only way you can successfully elicit facts from a person who commits a crime, because once they get a lawyer and they sit down together and get to talking, they will not talk and it is very difficult to find out who did what in many crime situations. What does the gentleman have to say about this?

Mr. TAFT. I thank the gentleman from New Hampshire, and I would respond to the gentleman's question by saying that I certainly concur. The Miranda case and the type of warning he demonstrated with the short card that he just quoted indicates a tremendous misunderstanding of the meaning of the Supreme Court ruling in the Miranda case. The Supreme Court ruling in that case was directed to the individual who is held alone and intestate and in an atmosphere dominated by the police. That is the meaning and the purport of that case. It is not intended to apply to an investigation conducted on the street or in public and not in such a police-dominated atmosphere where there is identification of the law enforcement officer. I have attempted to take care of this in the legislation which I have introduced in this respect providing for a 20-minute period on the street where a crime has been committed. I might say the American Law Institute study on this subject, which has not made a full report yet, intimates a very similar proposal that makes clear that on the street a policeman may seek cooperation and even put a man under a stop order for a brief period if it becomes necessary where a crime has been committed. This does not violate the constitutional provisions involved.

I would like to go on and say one thing further about the gentleman's card in the Miranda case. It points out the routine method in which this warning can be given by the police officer who becomes expert in giving it without true meaning but nevertheless being able to say in court that a warning was given and the prisoner cannot say that it was not.

The irony of it is that the Miranda case, because of the routine manner in which such warning can be given, does not accomplish its major goal which is to assure the ordinary criminally accused (and not a member of the Mafia or the wealthy criminal) is interrogated in an atmosphere free from coercion as opposed to being interrogated "alone" in custody, in a police-dominated atmosphere.

Mr. WYMAN. If the gentleman will yield further, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft], is he of the opinion that the police throughout the land have this understanding of the limited application of the Miranda rule to which he made reference, or does he believe that the police feel this decision puts practically the same restrictions on their investigations in the preliminary stages that the gentleman says it does if an individual was in a room with a lot of policemen in a situation such as the gentleman described?

Mr. TAFT. Of course, the expert, the skillful, and the well-trained FBI man probably does understand and understands very well the import of the limitations of the scope of this case. But for those other law enforcement officers, a great host throughout the land, there is a tremendous amount of fear and confusion. If I might call to the attention of the House in that regard the Congressional Record of March 3, 1967, pages 5345 through 5355, in which there are numerous reports from law enforcement officers over this Nation indicating instances of inability to enforce the law.

Mr. Speaker, many of us may have seen in the newspapers an editorial written to the effect that there are present on the streets in Baltimore some 72 self-confessed felons who are free because of Miranda.

Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, these warnings and the proper action taken thereunder, perhaps could have cleared up a great deal of this crime and perhaps could have cleared the individual involved, had they not been thrown out.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from New York for yielding to me.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Taft] for his contribution and for his continuing contribution, a truly distinguished member of a truly distinguished American family which continues to make great contributions to this country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks on this subject matter at this point in the record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Eckhardt). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

NSA TO RIDE AGAIN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Eckhardt). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashbrook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post of May 7, 1967, contained an article on page 1 which stated that grants of $390,000 had been given to the National Student Association by three executive agencies: the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education, and the State Department. As I understand the article, two of these grants have been made since the NSA-CIA fiasco with the third grant being a renewal of an existing federally funded program. On the strength of the Post article, I am writing to the three agencies—the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Office of Education, and the State Department for verification and full particulars on the programs. In view of the assertion that CIA at one point provided almost 80 percent of NSA budget out of taxpayers' pockets, I am sure that the sorely pressed American taxpayer will be very much interested in these expenditures. For instance, how will the reported $250,000 for a "student tutorial program in poverty areas" be used? As Federal aid presupposes Federal supervision, how closely will the Office of Education oversee the program? What other organizations, possibly more moderately or conservatively oriented organizations, are participating in this program? For what purposes will the reported State Department grant of $60,000 be used in Asia, Africa, and Algeria? How has the Office of Education grant of $80,000, which is reportedly being renewed, been used in the past? What benefits have accrued from this program in the past? What specifically is meant by "student efforts to gain more voice in development and evaluation of course offerings"? I believe the taxpayer will agree with me that these are valid questions.

Since the NSA–CIA flareup in February there has been no public disclosure of investigations into NSA's tax-exempt status. The New York Times of February 22 of this year stated that the Internal Revenue Service was reviewing NSA's status, which review had been initiated in 1965. As NSA "hopes to finance its activities in the future by a 'consortium' of private and open Government funds," as reported by the New York Times of February 14, 1967, it seems only fair to taxpayers who will foot the bill for the Government grants and the donors of private grants that the misuse of past NSA funds be reviewed, reported, and corrected.

It would appear prudent to withhold any grants, both Federal and private, until the IRS report on NSA is forthcoming. If NSA's past misuse of funds were to be repeated in the future, the Federal agencies involved might be hard pressed to justify these expenditures before the House Appropriations Committee next year, along with continuance of these general programs. Concerning NSA's expenditures, the Washington Post of February 16, 1967, stated:

> A source within the NSA hierarchy said CIA funds, funneled to his group through the Foundation, were sometimes diverted from international accounts and used for such domestic student activities as civil rights. Travel allowances for trips abroad were also juggled in order to finance NSA's domestic activities through the CIA's indirect contributions, the source said.
>
> Most commonly, the NSA's source said, administrative funds that came from the CIA were diverted for domestic programs, it was explained.

It is ridiculous to ask the American taxpayer to swallow the fact that his money is again being channeled into NSA, especially when so many questions remain to be answered, and in the light of the following facts.

To show the character of the leftist NSA, one need only look to its president, W. Eugene Groves.

The Chicago conference, December 28 to 30, 1966, called to discuss the idea of a nationwide student strike and other forms of demonstrations protesting the effort of the U.S. Government to resist Communist agression in South Vietnam, NSA President Groves states: "I'm here to decide what role NSA can play."

And NSA members played an active role. At this conference, called for, set up, and dominated by Communists, Groves shared the speakers platform with such admitted Communists as Bettina Aptheker.

As shown in the House Committee on Un-American Activities report, "Communist Origin and Manipulation of Vietnam Week," this conference also included representatives of these Communist organizations: Communist Party, U.S.A.; W. E. B. DuBois Clubs of America; Progressive Labor Party; Socialist Workers Party; Young Socialist Alliance; Youth Against War and Fascism, and National Guardian.

Far from a nonpolitical group of student government affiliates, a NSA member was listed as a member of the steering committee with these and other left-wing groups. This is the company to which Groves' statement above applies.

The Vietnam Week demonstrators were so infested with Communists, and fellow travelers, and so effectively controlled by these interests that it is only fair to assume that Groves and some 12 other NSA campus coordinators, delegates, or members of NSA listed as sponsors of the Vietnam Week demonstrations, were either impossibly ignorant or unconcerned about their associates while banded together in a blatant attempt to influence American foreign policy.

The committee report leaves no doubt

about the degree of Communist control of both the Student Mobilization Committee, formed at the Chicago Conference, and the Spring Mobilization Committee, groups which then joined in an effort to insure the success of their projects. I quote from the report:

> The proposal for a nationwide student strike was completely Communist in origin.

And the committee makes this salient point:

> No person who is truly dedicated to freedom, liberty, and the concept of democratic government, who opposes tyranny and totalitarianism—and, at the same time, is truly informed about the nature and record of communism—joins in any united front operation with communists.

I think it is more than valid for the American people to ask, how many NSA leaders are going to participate in the May 13, Support Our Boys in Vietnam Parade in New York? How many of these leftwing protestors are going to join with many of the heroes of Vietnam, the Congressional Medal of Honor holders, the American Legion, Young Americans for Freedom and other men and women who support a stand for freedom?

In contrast to those who support our position in Vietnam here is the position of NSA as stated in a resolution passed in 1965:

> (NSA) recommends that the United States immediately cease the bombing of North Vietnam, suspend all offensive military action in South Vietnam, and extend its offer of unconditional talks to include separate National Liberation Front participation.

In the light of this NSA resolution it is not surprising that the NSA president along with at least 12 NSA campus coordinators, delegates, or members were not exactly disinterested in the Vietnam Week demonstrations. The radical nature of the participating groups left no doubt concerning the shocking and bitter extremism which could be expected. The chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in reporting on the events of Vietnam Week in the Congressional Record on May 8, 1967, stated:

> The Spring Mobilization Committee distributed a list of official slogans for use in making signs for the parade and rally. The Communist Party expressed pleasure that "more militant" slogans were not banned, as they had been in some past demonstrations.
>
> Some of the approved slogans: "Stop the Bombing," "End the Draft—Let Young Men Live," "Children Are Not Born To Burn," "No Vietnamese Ever Called Me Nigger," "Free the Fort Hood Three," "Cease Fire Now—Negotiate With the NLF."
>
> Many groups and individuals, ignoring the approved slogans, marched with placards bearing far more militant and extremist declarations, including "L.B.J.: The Penalty for Murder is Death," "L.B.J.: Go to Hell," "Pale Face President Speaks With Forked Tongue," "Hell No, We Won't Go," "Hey, L.B.J., How Many Kids Did You Kill Today?" Other slogans used were too obscene to repeat.
>
> As has been widely reported in the press and commented on at length here on the floor of the House, an American flag was burned in Central Park by some of the demonstrators. Draft cards were also burned. Swastikas were placed over a reproduction of the American flag.

Conspicuous by its absence was any reference to the brutal and official policy of terror employed against the people of South Vietnam by the Communist forces. As Chairman Willis pointed out:

> The Communist Vietcong, in a veritable reign of terror, have, as General Westmoreland pointed out, killed or kidnaped 53,000 teachers, clergymen, civil servants, and elected officials in South Vietnam during the last decade. They have, in addition, inflicted unspeakable atrocities on thousands upon thousands of the South Vietnamese people, including women and children.

With this review of the facts in mind, it is imperative that the American people be given a public accounting and specific justification for the grants to NSA. Until the IRS completes a report on the tax status of NSA and until Members of Congress and the American taxpayers are presented with satisfactory answers to the questions mentioned, I believe funds from OEO, the Office of Education, and the State Department should be held in abeyance.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert the Washington Post article concerning NSA in the Record:

NSA Adds 20 Colleges Despite Exposé of CIA

(By Gerald Grant)

> Demands that the National Student Association close its doors, raised at the time of the sensational exposé of its covert relationship with the CIA, have been nearly forgotten at NSA's headquarters here.
>
> W. Eugene Groves, president of NSA, said in an interview yesterday that only two colleges had quit the student organization since the revelation last February of its 15-year history of secret subsidies from the CIA. The two were Brandeis and Colorado State.
>
> But in the same period, 20 colleges and universities joined NSA who had not previously been members, pushing its total membership well over 300 campuses. Joiners ranged from Clemson to the University of Denver.
>
> "We're a lot stronger than we were before," said Groves, a 23-year-old former Rhodes scholar. "More people know about us and we have some new sources of financial support."
>
> In a relaxed mood at the now strangely calm NSA headquarters, Groves cited two factors that he felt were keys in maintaining the support of the members. The first was the officers' decision "to admit the whole thing" after the story broke in Ramparts magazine. The second was the revelation of NSA's previous attempts to disentangle itself from the Central Intelligence Agency.
>
> But he feels a serious challenge lies ahead at the NSA congress this August at the University of Maryland. With reservations running at twice the rate of last year, more than 1000 delegates are expected.
>
> Richard Stearns, international affairs vice president, predicts that a vocal minority will try to convince the Assembly that the NSA officers still maintain covert ties with the CIA. He believes they will argue that the NSA should disband and start anew.
>
> But Stearns maintains that soundings he has taken on 40 campuses since the blow-up indicate that those who favor folding the organization will be voted down by an overwhelming margin.
>
> Yet he admitted there would be strong support for reforms to ensure full disclosure of NSA's sources of support and to make the national organization more responsive to grass roots desires.

IRRELEVANT PROGRAMS

> One result of the CIA's infiltration of the student organization, Stearns went on, was that three-fourths of the staff eventually became involved with international programs that had "little relevance" to campus needs of many members.
>
> Although the NSA supervisory board voted last month to continue the international affairs program, Stearns does not expect it will ever again assume the same proportions as it did during the "student cold war."
>
> The articulate 22-year-old vice-president, formerly an undergraduate at the University of Chicago, is now at work on a book about the student cold war politics.
>
> He said his research indicates that the CIA support of NSA began in 1950, with a $12,000 grant from "undisclosed sources" to send a team of students to Europe and Africa to study student groups.

ONLY LEASE UNBROKEN

> At the height of its involvement, the CIA provided 80 percent of the NSA's annual budget and used its staffers to gather intelligence on student leaders abroad.
>
> Groves said the organization has now broken all ties with the CIA, except for a complicated CIA-arranged lease for a row house that the NSA headquarter staff occupies at 2115 S St. NW. If the lease cannot be straightened out before the congress meets in August, NSA will move out the officers said.
>
> The staff has had to tighten its belt, somewhat, particularly cutting back on travel, Groves said. But some new sources of funding are flowing in.
>
> NSA received a $250,000 grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity for a student tutorial program in poverty areas. An $80,000 grant from the U.S. Office of Education was recently renewed, providing funds for student efforts to gain more voice in development and evaluation of course offerings.
>
> The State Department has furnished $60,000 for programs in Asia, Africa and Algeria.
>
> The Stern Family Fund provided $35,000 for educational experiments in which students would be given college credit for off-campus work in such activities as civil rights or the poverty programs. Another private grant of $3,000 will be used for an investigation of the use of drugs on the campus.

REQUEST TURNED DOWN

> However, the Ford Foundation turned down three weeks ago NSA's request for two grants totaling $330,000. One would have financed a kind of reverse Peace Corps, using foreign students who are studying at American universities as "corpsmen" in big city slums during their summer vacations. The other would have sponsored an international exchange program among students interested in educational reform.

HALPERN DEPLORES U.S. BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL INDEPENDENCE PARADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Halpern] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I have learned with dismay that the United States is joining with the Soviet Union, France, and England in boycotting the Israel Independence Day parade in Jerusalem next week.

The excuse given is that the State Department does not recognize the legality, status, or permanence of Jerusalem as a national capital of Israel. This can only serve notice to the Arabs that the United States sees Israel as somehow temporary. It also tells the Russians that we are vulnerable in this area.

We are well aware of the aggressive tendencies and war threats emanating from Israel's neighbors, especially Syria and Egypt, which are armed with exactly the same weapons that the Soviet Union has also sent to North Vietnam.

I feel that this is the time to underscore the stability and permanence we accord to the State of Israel on the 19th anniversary of her independence. It is not the time to join in a seeming detente with Russia to shun the Israel Independence Day ceremonial parade in the capital of that nation.

What we are doing in boycotting the parade undermines all our efforts to keep peace in that troubled part of the world. By appeasing the Arabs in this way, we indicate that we might stand idly by in the face of further Arab pressures against Israel. How good are our assurances to defend a nation against aggression when we do not even recognize that country to the extent of having our Ambassador or the U.S. military attaché attend the independence observance in her capital city?

In effect, our action tells the Russians that they can further exploit Arab anti-Israel passions to penetrate the region. I would like to have an answer from the administration on this question. We are making great sacrifice in Vietnam. We must not allow the Near East, by default, to deteriorate into another Vietnam.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN ENDORSES THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT (H.R. 7819)

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from the American Association of University Women endorsing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, H.R. 7819, as it was reported by the House Education and Labor Committee.

Mr. Speaker, as this letter points out, the AAUW has taken this stand only after polling its legislative program committee, which is composed of distinguished members from across the Nation. The AAUW itself represents almost 174,000 university women from every State in the Nation, Guam, and the District of Columbia.

The endorsement of the AAUW—as well as the National Education Association, the American Council on Education, practically all major religious groups in the country, and a list of others too long to enumerate here—is eloquent testimony to the success of the ESEA in bringing new help to hard-pressed elementary and secondary schools in every section of the country.

The text of the AAUW letter follows:

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
OF UNIVERSITY WOMEN,
Washington, D.C., May 8, 1967.

Hon. JOHN BRADEMAS,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BRADEMAS: Information on the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967 has been sent to both Education and Legislation Chairmen of the more than 1600 branches of the American Association of University Women.

The Legislative Program Committee of the Association has been polled on HR 7819 as it was reported from the House Education and Labor Committee. We wish to assure that you may list the AAUW as one of the organizations which is supporting HR 7819.

Sincerely yours,
DR. VICTORIA SCHUCK,
Chairman, Legislative Program Committee.
DR. LOIS ROTH,
Area Representative, Education.

AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION EXPRESSES GRAVE CONCERN OVER QUIE SUBSTITUTE FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, Logan Wilson, president of the American Council on Education, recently expressed grave concern over the possibility that radical changes might be made in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act without the benefit of full study, congressional hearings, and consultation with the education community.

The ACE rightly describes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act as "a momentous development of great import to the future of the Nation."

Mr. Speaker, radical changes in the successful Elementary and Secondary Education Act approach, whether under the present Quie or any other substitutes, should not be made without benefit of most extensive study or outside of the normal procedure of committee hearings and consideration.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the ACE statement follows:

LEGISLATIVE TACTICS EVOKE GRAVE CONCERN

(Statement by President Logan Wilson)

As President of the American Council on Education, an association that is primarily concerned with higher education and which numbers in its membership some 1261 colleges and universities in the United States, I must express grave concern over a recent legislative development in the House of Representatives.

In April 1965, the Congress enacted the Elementary and Secondary Education Act: a momentous development of great import to the future of this nation.

After 18 months of experience with the Act, the Administration introduced legislation designed to effect changes in that Act.

On March 2, 1967, the House Committee on Education and Labor began public hearings on the proposed changes and continued them until March 20. During those hearings official representatives of Federal, State, and local educational agencies, representatives of educational organizations, and spokesmen for organizations of the lay public were given opportunity to offer their comments and recommendations on the proposed legislation to the members of the legislative committee.

As had been previously announced, those hearings were concluded on March 20. On that same day, March 20, H.R. 7477, a radically different approach to the question of financing elementary and secondary education, and one which, it seems to us, must have been under study for some time previously, was introduced by a member of the Committee.

The hearings were over. There was no opportunity for open deliberation and testimony concerning the new and vastly different proposal. As matters now stand, the House of Representatives will be called upon to debate and decide between two proposals only one of which has been exposed to scrutinizing analysis by officials, experts, and the interested lay public.

The American Council on Education takes no position on the relative merits of either proposal, but we do want to express our strong disapproval of this approach to any legislative matter—particularly to a matter so fundamentally affecting the education of America's children.

This particular legislation involves elementary and secondary education. There are organizations far more knowledgeable than we in that area and much more competent to speak on its merits. Our colleges and universities are, however, profoundly affected by any action that materially affects learning processes and opportunities in the lower schools. We would urge that no Congressional action which will have such an effect be undertaken without the responsible committee of the Congress having had opportunity to elicit testimony on all the proposals to be considered.

Our concern is both immediate and long-range. We have been and will again be called to testify on legislation directly affecting higher education. If acts as important as the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—the product of years of effort on the part of dedicated legislators, public officials, and private citizens of both parties—can be subjected to the possibility of undergoing radical change by offering an amendment on the floor of the House after hearings have been concluded, then those who believe in the value of Congressional hearings as the way of developing sound legislation can never be confident that the legislation on which they are testifying is the legislation with which they will live. We believe strongly that if members of the Congressional committees are considering substitute legislation, that legislation should be introduced prior to the opening of hearings so that witnesses may have an opportunity to testify on the merits and demerits of both the legislation before the committee and any proposed substitute. When our Congress acts, its actions should be informed.

We are opposed to the procedure being proposed with respect to H.R. 7477 (or its revised version, H.R. 8983). We sincerely hope it will not be accepted as a precedent.

WHY AND HOW WE MUST AMEND ESEA

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, in recent days we have heard much about an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

In a speech in the House on May 2, I concerned myself with that amendment and what I believe to be its detrimental effects on the present system of Federal aids to teachers and students in American schools.

I do, however, believe that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act needs amending.

Why? Because it perpetuates an inequity which was begun in 1958 with the passage of the National Defense Education Act.

An important provision of that legislation, title III, provided for matching Federal grants for the purchase of laboratory and other special instructional equipment.

This provision, however, discriminated between youngsters in public schools and those in private or parochial schools.

Public school children could benefit from Federal grants for such equipment on a matching basis. Those in nonpublic schools, however, were eligible only for loans.

Because most nonpublic schools could not afford the financial burden imposed by such loans, the funds appropriated for them largely went unused. Over an 8-year period only $4.5 million was expended in such loans.

At the same time, public schools were receiving $328 million in Federal funds for laboratory and other special equipment.

Thus, the 14 percent of American boys and girls who attend nonpublic schools received a little over 1 percent of the funds which Congress has appropriated under title III of the National Defense Education Act. And even that small amount must be paid back—with interest.

The result has been the creation of a growing imbalance between the kinds of equipment available for defense-related education in public and nonpublic schools. This I have called the "defense education gap."

To end this discrimination, I have in the past introduced legislation amending the National Defense Education Act title III to provide children and teachers in nonpublic schools with such equipment on a "loan" basis with actual ownership residing in the hands of a public authority.

This is the formula currently used in title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act with regard to textbooks and library resources.

This approach, as embodied in H.R. 8203 remains valid. New circumstances, however, require us to consider whether a better approach may be the amendment of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The reasons are these:

Title III of the National Defense Education Act is somewhat of an anomaly since certain of its provisions overlap with those of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. For example, under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, schools may purchase laboratory and audiovisual equipment with 100-percent Federal grants for curriculum enrichment.

Since a 100-percent grant is far more preferable than a 50-percent matching grant under the National Defense Education Act, many school districts have transferred their purchases from the National Defense Education Act to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In fiscal year 1966, for example, more than $200 million was spent for such instructional equipment under title I.

As a consequence, the appropriation request for title III of the National Defense Education Act has been drastically reduced. In both fiscal years 1966 and 1967, the amount appropriated for grants was $79.2 million. The budget request for fiscal 1968, however, is only $47 million.

It is evident that title III of the National Defense Education Act is being scaled down as title I equipment purchases increase.

This situation threatens to increase the gap between public and nonpublic schools ever further. First, it gives the public schools increased opportunity to obtain such equipment.

Second, under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, children in nonpublic schools can benefit only indirectly. In order to make use of any of this equipment they must be enrolled in programs of supplementary education carried out under public school auspices.

I am now convinced that purchases of laboratory and other special equipment belongs in title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as in title I. This would permit such equipment to be used directly by teachers and pupils in nonpublic schools, while actual ownership resided in the public authority.

To that end, I am introducing today a new bill which would add laboratory and other special equipment to the textbooks and library resources already available under title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It is my intention to offer this bill as an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967, when that bill is brought to the floor of the House for debate and a vote.

In contrast to the Quie bill, this bill is not a hasty substitute for an existing program. It provides, rather, for the reasonable and equitable expansion of a tried and tested formula for providing constitutionally valid assistance to teachers and students in nonpublic schools.

In preparing this bill I have sought the advice and counsel of experts both in Congress, the Office of Education, and nongovernmental organizations. There has been general agreement that some adjustment is needed between the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the National Defense Education Act with respect to overlapping programs.

Two principal objections have, however, been raised to my proposal.

One questions whether laboratory equipment can be loaned on the same basis as books and library resources. I contend that it can, and to silence all doubts have made it clear in the legislation that such equipment must be portable in order that it may be reasonably loaned or withdrawn, if necessary, by the public authority.

The second objection has to do with the financing of this expansion of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The great need for textbooks has been pointed out against the relatively limited amount of funds which has been budgeted for this title in fiscal 1968, approximately $105 million.

My proposal, it is feared, would reduce the amount available for textbooks since the budget funds would also be required to cover laboratory and other special equipment.

I suggest that this problem might easily be overcome without any additional authorization of funds this year. The Education and Labor Committee has set the fiscal 1968 authorization under this title at $150 million. As I pointed out before, only $105 million has been budgeted as an appropriation. Therefore, the authorization ceiling is some $45 million above the expected appropriation.

This sum—$45 million—provides a good deal of latitude for the Congress to appropriate additional funds to cover the expansion of title II. Certainly, if my proposal is passed, the administration will revise its budget estimate upward to take into account the additional requests for funds.

On my part, I will work here in Congress to provide the additional appropriation, should it be needed.

One practical way of financing this expansion would be to increase the Elementary and Secondary Education Act title II budget and subsequently reduce the National Defense Education Act title III budget by a similar amount.

Money is not the key issue here. Rather, it is the acceptance of the concept that the child benefit principle embodied in title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act should logically and justly be extended to laboratory and other instructional equipment.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I wish to insert the text of my new bill to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and urge the support of my colleagues for it.

H.R. 9930

A bill to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, relating to library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, to include laboratory and other specialized equipment

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended—

(1) by adding "AND EQUIPMENT" at the end of the heading of such title,

(2) by striking out, in section 201(b), "printed and published instructional materials" and inserting in lieu thereof "instructional materials and equipment",

(3) by striking out section 203(a)(2)(A) and inserting in lieu thereof "(A) acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials and equipment for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools in the State, and",

(4) by striking out, in section 203(a)(2)(B)(i), "printed and published instructional materials" and inserting in lieu thereof "instructional materials and equipment",

(5) by inserting after "instructional materials" in section 203(a)(2)(B)(ii) the following: "and equipment",

(6) by striking out, in section 203(a)(3), "printed and published instructional materials" and inserting in lieu thereof "instructional materials and equipment",

(7) by inserting after "instructional mate-

rials" in section 203(a)(3)(A) and (B) the following: "and equipment",

(8) by inserting after "instructional materials" both times it appears in section 203(a)(4) the following: "and equipment", and by striking out "printed and published instructional materials" and inserting in lieu thereof "instructional materials and equipment",

(9) by striking out, in section 204(b), "printed and published instructional materials" and inserting in lieu thereof "instructional materials and equipment", and by inserting after "instructional materials" the following: "and equipment", and

(10) by striking out in section 205(a) and in section 205(b) "printed and published instructional materials" and inserting in lieu thereof "instructional materials and equipment".

SEC. 2. Title II of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"DEFINITION

"SEC. 208. For purposes of this title, the term 'library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials and equipment' means (1) books, periodicals, documents, and textbooks and other printed and published materials, (2) portable laboratory and other special equipment, including audiovisual materials and equipment, testgrading equipment, and specialized equipment for audiovisual libraries, but such term does not include athletic or recreational equipment or supplies consumed in use."

NEED TO REVISE SELECTIVE SERVICE LAW—LXII

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, on May 9, Gen. Mark W. Clark, Chairman of the Civilian Advisory Panel on Military Manpower Procurement that was established by the House Armed Services Committee, testified on the extension of the Universal Military Training and Service Act.

The retired general rejected the proposition for an all-volunteer force not only on economic grounds, but also, because he feels an army of pure "mercenaries" would have damaging moral and psychological implications to the country. General Clark stated that the creation of a truly "mercenary" military establishment would destroy the bridge of participation and identification of our citizens with the activities and the fortunes of our military forces. This, in turn, would "erode the traditional willingness of our citizenry to rally to the defense of our Nation when the national security is threatened."

The charge that a military force, relying solely on a volunteer enlistment, would turn out to be a mercenary group, is, of course, ridiculous. Voluntarism has sustained our Armed Forces throughout our history, that greater part of which, I might add, was conspicuous by the absence of a draft.

The American people have demonstrated time and time again that they are willing to rally to the defense of their Nation, regardless of the presence or absence of a draft. General Clark does a great disservice when he insinuates that the American people would not defend their Nation at a time when its security is threatened.

THE CHURCH-RELATED SCHOOL IN AN ECUMENICAL PERSPECTIVE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Philadelphia is known as the City of Brotherly Love. This is derived from the motto of the city, "Philadelphia Maneto," as used in its seal, meaning "let brotherly love continue." Very recently an event took place which exemplifies exactly what this phrase means. The occasion was the annual meeting of the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches, held on April 22, 1967, when the Most Reverend John J. Krol, archbishop of Philadelphia, addressed the group.

As we know from our study of the history of our great Nation, the greater Philadelphia area was the site of William Penn's charter—"the holy experiment"—which planted the seed of the fullest freedom of religion, and freedom from any form of discrimination because of actions in accord with the dictates of one's conscience. Philadelphia is the scene of the Declaration of Independence, and is the cradle of our great Nation. It is surpassed by no other city in its compilation of "firsts."

This event on April 22 was another "first" for this great city. The archbishop was given complete latitude as to what subject he would choose to discuss and selected a subject upon which there has been wide areas of dissension, apprehension, and difference among the Christian churches, for a number of years. Mr. Stanhope S. Browne, president of the Council of Churches, in introducing Archbishop Krol, stated that the archbishop was performing a useful service in making his presentation on church-state relationships, particularly as they apply in the field of education, so that there might be wider, more mature discussion leading to a better understanding on these issues among all people.

Following Archbishop Krol's presentation, Bishop Robert L. DeWitt of the Episcopal Diocese of Pennsylvania, and Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, presiding bishop of the Methodist Church of Pennsylvania, both suggested that the discussion was most meaningful and deserving of consideration by all right-thinking people.

Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of gaining new insight and a deeper understanding of this problem I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an adaptation of the introduction of the Most Reverend John J. Krol by Stanhope S. Browne, president of the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches, and the address of Archbishop Krol before the council entitled "The Church-Related School in an Ecumenical Perspective."

ADAPTATION OF INTRODUCTION OF THE MOST REVEREND JOHN J. KROL, D.D., J.C.D., BY STANHOPE S. BROWNE, PRESIDENT OF THE GREATER PHILADELPHIA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES, APRIL 22, 1967

Freedom is a word of great significance to Protestants. We often speak of freedom of the individual conscience, freedom of the congregation and similar liberties.

If I am to be free, you also must be free. In our separate freedoms, separate viewpoints will emerge. These differences can then be shared, and in the sharing comes dialogue. One of the purposes of our freedom is to allow that dialogue, and the dialogue in turn gives meaning and significance to our freedom.

Dialogue can become merely an exchange of pleasantries on bland topics, however. Or it can get to the heart of the matter.

When the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches invited Archbishop Krol to address our 1967 annual meeting, we gave him complete freedom as to topic. He did us the great honor of choosing a subject which sharply divides Roman Catholics and Protestants—government aid to church-related schools. We did not know what the Archbishop would say. Many of us disagreed sharply with much of what he did say. But he also gave us a new insight and a deeper understanding of the problem. He thereby set the stage for a meaningful debate on this vital issue.

The Council was thus doubly honored. Archbishop Krol was the first Roman Catholic ever to address a Council meeting, and he did it in a manner which made our meeting the beginning of a significant interchange between our faiths.

ADDRESS

By: Most Rev. John J. Krol, D.D., J.C.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia.

On: "The Church-Related School in an Ecumenical Perspective."

To: The Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches.

At: Annual Luncheon Meeting, 12:00 Noon, April 22, 1967.

In: Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia.

Greetings:

For the privilege of speaking to you and offering our community further evidence of the charity of Christ which impels us to work for His unity, I am deeply grateful. On other occasions, I spoke to many of you on the Vatican Council, Christian Unity, and Interfaith Cooperation.

When last November your President, Mr. Browne, invited me to address you and urged me to "feel free to speak on any subject," I dared to think that I might speak on an issue which continues to divide some of us. Aware of the fact that the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches comprises twenty-seven (27) denominations and Five hundred eighty-three (583) of the Two thousand five hundred and five (2,505) Protestant Churches in the same five-county area which makes up the Catholic Archdiocese of Philadelphia, I wanted to be sure that the discussion of such a sensitive issue would not retard or reverse our ecumenical progress.

Since Bishop DeWitt urged me to accept the invitation, I consulted him. He assured me that a talk on the issue of Church-related schools would be "extremely relevant and helpful" because it would deal with "one of the great issues of our time for which a just, imaginative and intelligent solution must be found." The Bishop had spoken—the matter was settled. He shares responsibility for the choice of the topic, but I assume sole responsibility for its development and presentation.

After the subject was determined, because of certain events I grew uneasy, and today I stand before you with some grave misgivings. You know that I lack prophetic vision, and I am not a crystal ball artist. But is there any way to convince you that the dramatic illustration of the crisis in the Church-related schools—the threatened strike by some of the lay teachers in the Archdiocese, and even to this very week, was not a contrived prelude and introduction to my speech? Is there any way to convince you that I do not relish being a terminal of a "hot line" which is open day and night? Or that the prospect of a seven figure deficit is not a pleasant one? I can only assure you that the recent events in our diocesan school system are attributable to circumstances beyond my control. Such a dramatic introduction to my talk was not anticipated, not invited, and not enjoyed. However, it does point to a serious problem—a problem which is every bit as much a problem of the community as it is of the Archdiocese.

The topic of Church-related schools was suggested for two reasons. First, I believe we know each other well enough to discuss reasonably and calmly even sensitive topics. Our hands have been hardened enough by the work we have done together to be able to pick up some of the "hot potatoes" that affect our lives as Americans and as Christians.

The second reason for the choice of the topic is that our unresolved Church-State problems have aided and abetted those who are determined to keep religion out of public life. Because our major faiths, following a course of narrow sectarianism, have failed to resolve the role of religion in society and specifically in education, we have played into the hands of secularism. Humanistic secularism, which simply ignores God, is a form of belief, a form of religion, which by our default has become the established religion in our country.

When ordinary men say, "Let's keep religion out of the discussion," they are summing up an attitude, a distortion and a tragedy. They relegate and confine God to the sanctuary of churches and synagogues. This is a distortion because we live in God's world and it needs Him living and acting in the values and actions of men at all times. This is a tragedy, because the Christian churches have been so intent on checking each other, that they have allowed religion to be shut out of man's daily life. By default, we have allowed religion to become regarded not as something normal and necessary, but as some sort of alien growth which should be excised or ignored but never allowed to weave itself into the fabric of our national life.

Let me put it bluntly: We proclaim our belief and trust in God—"In God we trust;" in our pledge of allegiance we profess to be "one nation under God." Is not this a form of lip service; a form of hypocrisy to proclaim our trust and belief in God and yet deny Him a role in the life and actions of men? The Christian Churches have a prophetic role to fulfill in our society. If they fail to exercise that role, they will betray their own mission, their own people, their own country. A nation without active religious values is doomed to fall back on the fragile defenses of self-interest. We owe it to our country to sharpen its vision, to recognize that in this life, as John Kennedy put it, "God's work must truly be our own."

The prophetic voice of the Church has served one of our country's urgent needs. The cancer of racial intolerance has drained the moral strength of our people for too long. The Churches repeatedly said that the racial question was a moral issue, which must ultimately be resolved in the hearts of men. Laws were passed. They were good, but the conflicts will be resolved only when each man accepts every other man as his brother. This cannot happen if God and His values do not permeate the daily lives of our people. Some voices—Christian voices—protested that racial justice was not the business of the Church. But the Churches simply kept repeating the New Testament challenge: "If a man says that he loves God and hates his brother he is a liar."

The task is not yet done. The long process of educating all Christians, both young and old, in school and in pulpit, must be continued. Indeed the persistent courage applied to the racial challenge in our country, must be applied to the total education of its youth. Here too the Churches have a prophetic role to fulfill. If we are treated as unwelcome intruders when we speak to the subject, we cannot retreat in embarrassment. We cannot abdicate our role as teachers of nations nor can we restrict our teaching role to "adults only."

God, the Supreme factor in the world and in human life, must also be the supreme factor in education. Religion is not an intruder in the educational sphere of the child's life. Indeed, more and better ways must be found to make God a present reality to youth. This is an imperative when we consider the diminishing capital of moral and religious factors which truly influence our society. We cannot ignore the fact that in our own community there are youngsters who do not know right from wrong. By example, sometimes of their own parents, often of their friends, they were taught to cheat and steal and lie. We refer to them all as delinquents. But among them are non-delinquents. A delinquent is one who leaves a known course of action. Some of the youngsters in our community were never taught the right course of action.

Parents are the primary educators of the child. As a part of their total educational commitment, many Churches have chosen to cooperate with parents by founding and maintaining schools of their own. The Catholic community demanded such cooperation from its Church. The demand for Catholic schools has always exceeded the supply. The very existence of the Catholic School is a glowing tribute to our Catholic citizens. They support the public schools, and willingly assume the tremendous burdens and sacrifices of supporting a church-related school system.

The public school exists because of a compulsory tax imposed on all citizens. The Catholic school exists because of the voluntary sacrifices of an appreciative clientele. The Catholic school system survives only because of a weekly vote of confidence manifested in the free will offerings of the faithful. The existence and survival of the Catholic school system is one of the greatest marvels of our century and of our age. It is not a perfect system—and no system can claim perfection, but it is a system which could not survive at all, if it were not appreciated and desired.

The early development of Catholic Schools took place in an era and a climate in which inter-faith cooperation, at best, produced an uneasy truce, but not a cessation of hostilities. It is a tribute to the American philosophy of government and to the free enterprise system, as well as to the dogged determination of Catholics and other religious groups that religiously-oriented schools could begin and did flourish.

Some people find it hard to grasp the realities of our pluralistic society, so well illustrated in our educational system. It is not monolithic; both public and private schools have an honored place and a serious responsibility. Traditionally, whether or not they have children in public schools, all citizens have contributed to the support of public education. And more and more, support has developed into active involvement. Surely, we all agree that the excellence of public education must concern every citizen if our country is to flourish. The recent words of Pope Paul to a group of Catholic educators are instructive in this regard:

"This interest of the Church in the Catholic schools, it is well to remember, does not lessen in her, as it should not lessen in you, the esteem as well as interest for any other school. To such other schools we wish, in fact, the best growth, not only in their framework, but also in their formative effectiveness, and we hope that our institutions will always preserve good relations with them."

But, to turn the coin, while private schools do in fact have the right to exist, until recent years very little has been done legally to encourage their efforts to produce good citizens, well-educated and deeply imbued by the school as well as by the home with a reverence under God for their own human dignity and that of others. I do not presume to play the lawyer when I say that most American religious leaders—myself included—feel that the approach to Church-State relations provided by the First Amendment has worked out well. That amendment has never been interpreted to provide for an *"absolute"* separation of Church and State. The Supreme Court has only said that the First Amendment bars public financial support of religion. Cases coming before the Court over the past twenty years have given the Court opportunity to explain what constitutes support of religion. In 1963, the Court spelled out the test to be applied in all cases wherein government financing is provided for programs of health, education or welfare taking place in Church-related institutions. The Court said that for such government programs to meet First Amendment requirements, "there must be *a secular legislative purpose and a primary effect that neither advances nor inhibits religion.*" This seems an eminently sensible test.

The point is that there seems to be no betrayal of our constitution involved in suggesting that absolute separation is not a sacred American tradition. Justice Douglas noted in 1952 that the Constitution "does not say that in every and all respects there shall be a separation of Church and State. Rather, it studiously defines the manner, the specific ways, in which there shall be no concert or union or dependency one on the other. That is the common sense of the matter. Otherwise, the State and religion would be aliens to each other—hostile, suspicious, and even unfriendly." How well this reflects the thinking of Dr. Franklin Littell: "The ideological approach to separation has almost always been accompanied by hostility to and suppression of the free exercise of religion." The problem, then, I would submit, is not nearly as much one of law as one of public policy. How far are we ready to go as a nation in supporting any kind of service offered under Church auspices?

In the areas of health, and welfare, the answer seems to be fairly far indeed. Hospitals, low-rent housing, charitable institutions for young and old—in these and other areas, government has decided that religious societies can be supported when their mandate of charity leads them to perform a function which benefits society as a whole. Even in the area of education, where progress has been slowest, a beginning of government support has been made. Apparently the training of an educated citizenry in Church schools is already accepted in a limited way as a secular legislative purpose which can be aided.

The problem is that government has made the step, but organized religion is split within its own ranks. Can all of us accept the principle of government aid to children attending religious schools? We have come so far in ecumenical understanding because we have learned to talk with one another, to listen to one another. What I propose to offer now is a new beginning, a first step in what must be a continuing dialogue. American ingenuity has found an answer to so many other challenges in our history; surely we can find a way to make religious education more central to our national life and the religious school more accepted in the mainstream of our society. No one may betray his convictions, but dialogue can discover common ground.

Frankness is the only basis for understanding, so let me be frank. My firm conviction is that to the extent that religious schools fulfill the secular needs of our society, they deserve and they have a right in justice to support.

Two fears must be allayed if any such policy were to be accepted. Will aid to religious schools undermine public education? Surely the American public school is strong enough to prosper even if religious schools are aided. Indeed, it is somewhat paradoxical as one writer has observed, that in the name of democracy, people should be afraid of democracy, afraid to permit the people to have a meaningful educational choice, not one limited by crushing financial sacrifices.

And then there is the fear that aid to Church schools will heighten religious tensions. It may be hasty generalization, but I am told that inter-religious understanding has grown more vigorously in England and Wales than in this country. Yet there 75% of building costs and 100% of maintenance needs are met by State grants. Reasonable regulations to insure educational quality without inhibiting religious freedom should not pose an insuperable obstacle.

Nevertheless, whatever be the measure and kind of aid suggested, what compelling reasons are there at all for aiding the child in the religiously-oriented school, or more specifically, the Catholic school? Let me cite a few concerning those Catholic schools about which I can best speak:

First of all, are the Catholic schools performing a public service? In the terms of all, they surely are. With the costs of good public education spiraling, Catholic schools relieve government of an enormous financial burden which it would shoulder only with difficulty. In this diocese alone, more than 275,000 children are educated in Catholic schools; in the State of Pennsylvania the total number is 600,000 a saving to the public of more than 300 million dollars per year.

But are the Catholic Schools dedicated to the same educational goals as the public schools? They are indeed, though they add a religious dimension and seek to offer a God-conscious environment which will support the efforts of parents to make their children religious men and women. The Catholic school is not a five-day Sunday school; it does not pursue constant indoctrination whether it is appropriate to the subject being taught or not. In the words of the Vatican Council, "No less than other schools does the Catholic school pursue cultural goals and the natural development of youth . . . It aims to create for the school community an atmosphere enlivened by the Gospel spirit of freedom and charity. It aims to help the young person in such a way that the development of his own personality will be matched by the growth of that new creation which he becomes by Baptism . . ."

Let us pursue another related point. Does the Catholic school produce a ghetto product, a child less tolerant than those who have attended a religiously-mixed public school? You may be familiar with the University of Chicago's recent study, *The Education of Catholic Americans*. It found no evidence that the Catholic who is the product of Catholic schools is less tolerant of other religious and racial groups than the Catholic who has attended public school. In fact, for children presently in Catholic schools or recently graduated, the findings suggest a slowly developing pattern that the more Catholic educational environment during youth, the more likely the individual is to be open to greater intergroup understanding. Gerhard Lenski has suggested that the greater the degree of Catholic education, the more likely the Catholic is to be plugged in to the Church's teaching on racism and anti-Semitism, for instance. I don't know whether you find that startling, but it does explode the myth that the public school is an absolutely essential melting pot. Nevertheless, we cannot feel complacent about the growth of the mutual understanding through the schools. The failures are there to haunt us and to spur us on to work more intensely not only with children and young people, but with parents as well.

There are some other ideas I would throw out for your study. For instance, how real is a right which cannot be exercised? The Catholic parent who must pay increasing educational taxes for his local public schools may simply be unable to use the option to send his children to parochial schools. Is not this a form of economic sanctions which discourages and eventually renders impossible the exercise of the right to free choice in education?

And let me touch gently on a sensitive side effect. Parents may accept more calmly the denial of a benefit to themselves than to their children. How real will their interest be in ecumenical cooperation if every request for aid is greeted by a barrage of law suits, chiefly sponsored by religious groups? We must as much as possible seek forums short of the courts to resolve our differences. Now I am not sitting in judgment on the sincerity of any given viewpoint, and the right to express one's point of view! This is simply to suggest that legal controversy—even though involving honest disagreements—is not the ideal prelude to ecumenical growth. Nor should anyone seek and deter another from the pursuit of a course of action dictated by principle. But I find some parents reaching to such a proliferation of law suits with the words of the old song: "Your lips tell me 'Yes, yes', but there's 'No, no in your eyes'."

And let us press the point a step further. The massive educational problems of this city cannot be resolved unless public and non-public schools work closely together. Indeed, more and more the educational leadership of our nation has seen that provincialism will not solve the educational problems of the inner city. College and schools, the city and the suburbs, the private schools and the public schools—all must work together if the Good Society is to be attained. Yet today the cooperation of public and religiously-oriented schools is hindered by mutual fears that almost any kind of cooperation may be the subject of recriminations or legal action. Nor is joint effort encouraged by groups which in effect say that they will be happy to bring parochial school children into any program so long as no federally-supported teacher crosses the threshold, of a parochial school. In such a case, parochial school children and their parents should, I think, be forgiven a certain feeling of rejection; of discrimination and consequent resentment.

In effect, we have boxed ourselves into a corner in which religious influences in schools are a greater source of scandal than secularism. This bids fair to become the American tragedy unless, working together we can find the solution.

I come to you today then as a beggar, a beggar for the parochial schools that mean so much not just to me, but to the parents and the children—your neighbors—and to the teachers who have devoted their lives to this work. Can we find a way to help these schools even more without offense to principle? I know that I am asking for an act of mutual faith. But together we have come far since Pope John opened the windows to let fresh air come in.

We must begin to live in peace with the past. As a Catholic, I know that the history of my coreligionists has not always reflected the character and teaching of Christ. But we must make a beginning of trust in our age and our country. This is America, not some other place; this is the 20th century, not the 16th or 17th. Indeed, the Vatican Council's Declaration on Religious Liberty should encourage us, since it is so much an American solution to a challenge others have not always met so well.

Our Greater Philadelphia community was the scene of Penn's charter—"the holy experiment"—which planted the seed of the fullest freedom of religion, and freedom from any form of discrimination because of actions in accord with the dictates of one's conscience. Philadelphia is the scene of the Declaration of Independence, and is the cradle of our great nation. It is surpassed by no other city in its compilation of "firsts." It is the City of Brotherly Love. I appeal to you and through you to your co-religionists, to give Philadelphia another "first." I appeal to you to make our community the cradle of a movement which will recognize, encourage, and support the "secular legislative purpose" the public function and service of Church-related schools. I appeal to you to make our Philadelphia community the first to search and find a way to make religious education more central to our national life and church-related schools more acceptable in the mainstream of society.

Today I ask your help in solving the particular challenges of Catholic education. You may find us very sensitive as a group on this issue. So much sacrifice and effort have gone into this work that we need your understanding very much. When children are involved, human feelings and emotions are heightened. And, of course, the education of children in every school is important to every citizen.

There is an increasing awareness of the impossibility of separating religion from education and having either of them survive. In 1965, the general Board of the National Council of Churches expressed its support for federal aid to public schools and "To the extent compatible with the religious clauses of the First Amendment and the sound principle of public control of public funds, those attending private and parochial schools benefit from this aid."

In a recent report the Chamber of Commerce of the United States recommended government financing of education for all children, and offer "as an alternative to public education financial support for private education up to the amount of the average expenditure per pupil in local public schools." The U.S. Chamber of Commerce report continues: "We are led to this somewhat unusual conclusion by our belief in the importance of sound education and our concern that the present institutional structure in education may not be the best way to organize it."

Today, I assure you that we believe in, and support the principle of separation of Church and State. The Vatican Council in its Declaration on Religious Liberty, defends the right of all to worship privately and publicly according to the dictates of a rightly formed conscience. Recent local developments, the question of salaries, the threat of a strike, dramatically illustrated the staggering financial burdens we have carried—the tremendous public service we have quietly rendered to the community, and the increasing financial problems that threatens to restrict our efforts.

Today in a spirit of ecumenism, we ask you to rise above the barriers of narrow sectarianism and to view the problem of education in terms of what is best for every child and what is best for our country. Our approach today is not one of ecumenical blackmail—"Love us, love our schools." We do not ask you to betray your principles. We do appeal for your sympathetic interest, your understanding, your counsel and your cooperation. This is a time and a concern in which friendship is needed and valued.

I am confident that with your help American intelligence, American honesty, American ingenuity, and American good sense of business and economics will be directed toward a solution, that will safeguard our principles of government, that will do no injury to the rights of any parent, and do justice to the rights of every child.

For the opportunity of speaking to you, for your sympathetic attention, and hopefully for the consideration you may give to my appeal, I am most grateful!

NEED FOR TREATMENT OF ALCOHOLISM IN VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. MORRIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRIS of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I am most appreciative of the opportunity to discuss a measure which several of my colleagues and I have just introduced to provide additional beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals for the care and treatment of veterans afflicted with alcoholism. My esteemed colleagues Representatives BROCK ADAMS, Democrat of Washington; JAMES T. BROYHILL, Republican of North Carolina; DANIEL E. BUTTON, Republican of New York; TIM LEE CARTER, Republican of Kentucky; JAMES C. CORMAN, Democrat of California; MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat of Ohio;KENNETH J. GRAY, Democrat of Illinois; SEYMOUR HALPERN, Republican of New York; CHARLES S. JOELSON, Democrat of New Jersey; THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN, Republican of New York; ROBERT L. LEGGETT, Democrat of California; SPEEDY O. LONG, Democrat of Louisiana; JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat of California; ARNOLD OLSEN, Democrat of Montana; J. J. "JAKE" PICKLE, Democrat of Texas; HENRY S. REUSS, Democrat of Wisconsin; BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, Democrat of New York; EDWARD R. ROYBAL, Democrat of California; JOHN P. SAYLOR, Republican of Pennsylvania; ROBERT G. STEPHENS JR., Democrat of Georgia, and I join in this effort.

Alcoholism is an ancient human problem. It is by no means any less a problem in the 20th century. It is estimated that there are 5,000,000 alcoholics in the United States. A number of them are eligible veterans. Few receive adequate treatment. Alcoholism is a complex disease. It is not a moral condition and punishment of the alcoholic is not a solution. In reality, punishment does not apply to alcoholism any more than to any other disease.

Considering the number of alcoholics in the United States, there are very few existing facilities for inpatient care of the acute alcoholic. It is a fact that many veterans suffering from alcoholism are denied admission to the Veterans' Administration hospitals every month because no specific treatment facilities are available. Several VA hospitals attempt to render treatment to veterans with alcoholic problems through their medical, surgical, or psychiatric services without the benefit of a coordinated program and with little success. Most of these patients have a medical or surgical illness which is under treatment. Treatment of the disease of alcoholism as such is inadequate.

At the present time the Veterans' Administration has facilities for the research and care of alcoholics on a minor scale. There are 36 research facilities, 12 research and treatment centers, and two treatment centers in operation. There are, therefore, a total of only 14 centers which offer treatment to veterans for alcoholism. The 36 VA research facilities are carrying on an important function in trying to determine the best and most effective approach to the problem of treating the complex disease of alcoholism. However, there is a great and present need on the part of many veterans for an extended treatment program which will make available to them the benefits of this research. In several localities, local chapters of the Alcoholics Anonymous have entered into voluntary association with staff members of VA hospitals in an effort to provide the type of care and guidance which is required. This effort must be aided through a unified and coordinated program in which professional psychiatric and psychotherapeutic assistance is available.

It is the purpose of our measure to provide that the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration be authorized to establish and operate not less than 2,000 hospital beds in facilities over which the Administrator has direct and exclusive jurisdiction for the care and treatment of eligible veterans who are afflicted with alcoholism. It is our thinking that the apportionment of these beds should be made, after careful consideration, on a State or regional basis so that no section of the country will be deprived of the benefits to be derived from this legislation.

The passage of such legislation would at least provide the foundation for the separate treatment units which are so greatly needed. These patients have a common problem, alcoholism. Even though this disease may be in varying stages and of differing degrees, the establishment of separate units would permit the patients and the staff to place a major focus on the problem of alcoholism. It would allow for group, as well as individual, resolution of the problems peculiar to the alcoholic veteran. Separate treatment units for alcoholism would make possible a coordinated approach to the many aspects of such care—medical and dietary management, administration of drugs, psychiatric and social evaluation, and psychotherapy—to enhance the effectiveness of the program upon the veteran.

Such an integrated program would also give staff personnel the opportunity to become thoroughly knowledgeable regarding the needs of each patient, making it possible for the hospital to refer outgoing patients to the appropriate resources and facilities, such as Alcoholics Anonymous chapters and rehabilitation programs which might exist, within their own communities for followup guidance.

The eligibility of a veteran for this type of program would be based upon the same criteria now used for general admission to any VA hospital.

We are now coming into an age in which alcoholism is recognized for its true nature—a chronic and debilitating disease which is often fatal to the victim. We are beginning to take steps to correct the neglect of the alcoholic. Therefore, in this period of progress, we believe that benefits resulting from modern medicine and research should be made available to as many veterans as possible. These are the men who responded when our country was in need and we hope that these same men will receive assistance in their own period of need.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I am today sponsoring legislation to authorize FHA-insured loans for the purchase by homeowners of fee simple title land on which homes are located in Hawaii. I am introducing this bill in response to the recent trend in Hawaii for lessors to sell their fee interest in property to leaseholders, a transaction which at present does not allow the purchaser to qualify for FHA insurance for a loan he might need to be able to purchase the fee title.

The bill, which is not actually limited to Hawaii, but is designed as a general amendment to the National Housing Act, would be most applicable to the 50th State because of the uniqueness of the landholding situation there as compared to other States. My amendment would authorize FHA to insure loans up to $10,000, or the cost of purchasing the fee simple title, whichever is less. It would also limit the interest rate on such a loan to 6 percent or any lesser rate prescribed by the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. A final stipulation in the amendment is a limitation on the amount of the loan so that it could not create a total indebtedness on the property being purchased to exceed the amount of an insured first mortgage which would be used to purchase the home if the entire property were being purchased.

This bill is intended to cut the excessive costs of purchasing fee simple titles under present practice, which usually involves securing a second mortgage or obtaining costly refinancing on the property.

A second provision in the bill would amend the Home Owners' Loan Act in order to permit savings and loan associations to invest in the proposed FHA-insured loans. The act presently limits savings and loan associations to the purchase of first lien loans.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to give favorable consideration to this legislation, which already has drawn the approval of the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development and which will provide a solution to a situation causing severe financial problems for many homeowners in Hawaii.

The full text of my bill follows:

H.R. 9884

A bill to authorize FHA insurance on loans made for the purpose of purchasing fee simple titles from lessors, and to allow savings and loan associations to purchase such FHA-insured loans

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Title II of the National Housing Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"PURCHASE OF FEE SIMPLE TITLE FROM LESSORS"

"Sec. 235 (a) The Secretary is authorized, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, to make commitments to insure and to insure loans made by financial institutions for the purpose of financing purchases by homeowners of the fee simple title to property on which their homes are located.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'financial institution' means a lender approved by the Secretary as eligible for insurance under section 2 or a mortgagee approved under section 203(b)(1); and

"(2) the term 'homeowner' means a lessee under a long-term ground lease.

"(c) To be eligible for insurance under this section, a loan shall—

"(1) relate to property on which there is located a dwelling designed principally for a one-, two-, three-, or four-family residence;

"(2) not exceed the cost of purchasing the fee simple title, or $10,000 per farmily unit, whichever is the lesser;

"(3) be limited to an amount which when added to any outstanding indebtedness related to the property (as determined by the Secretary) creates a total outstanding indebtedness which does not exceed the mortgage limits prescribed in section 203(b);

"(4) bear interest at not to exceed a rate prescribed by the Secretary, but not in excess of 6 per centum per annum of the amount of the principal obligation outstanding at any time, and such other charges (including such service charges, appraisal, inspection, and other fees) as may be approved by the Secretary;

"(5) have a maturity satisfactory to the Secretary, but not to exceed 20 years from the beginning of amortization of the loan or three-quarters of the remaining economic life of the home, whichever is the lesser; and

"(6) comply with such other terms, conditions, and restrictions as the Secretary may prescribe.

"(d) The provisions of paragraphs (3), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (10) of section 220(h) shall be applicable to loans insured under this section and, as applied to loans insured under this section, references in those paragraphs to 'home improvement loans' and 'this subsection' shall be construed to refer to loans insured under this section 235.".

Sec. 2. Section 5(c) of the Home Owners Loan Act of 1933 is amended by adding immediately before the last paragraph the following paragraph:

"Notwithstanding any other provisions of this subsection, an association may invest in loans or obligations, or interests therein, as to which the association has the benefit of insurance under section 235 of the National Housing Act, or of a commitment or agreement therefor, and such investments shall not be included in any percentage of assets or other percentage referred to in this subsection."

RESOLUTION OF THE YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF OAHU, STATE OF HAWAII, IN SUPPORT OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. Mink] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, under continuous rumblings of opposition to the continuation of our vital Office of Economic Opportunity programs and threats to dismantle the agency and scatter its functions among other departments, I am gratified to report to my colleagues the positive unyielding support for this Great Society program by the Young Democrats of Oahu in my State. In a recently passed resolution, the text of which follows, the Young Democrats reaffirmed their commitment to the ideals and activities of the war on poverty by pointing out the positive accomplishments of the OEO programs and calling for adequate funding to continue this vital work. It is heartening to me to have my own efforts here in the House so strongly seconded by these concerned, active, and well-informed Young Democrats in Hawaii, and I wish to here commend them for their involvement in these affairs of utmost urgency for our Nation's present and future well-being:

Resolution by Young Democrats of Oahu

Resolution urging the United States Congress to consider and study the merits and accomplishments of the war on poverty and to continue to adequately fund this most significant undertaking of the great society.

Whereas, the war on poverty exemplifies our basic American belief that every individual should be given the opportunity to realize his own capacity and potential for growth, so as to live a more useful and productive life, and

Whereas, the war on poverty has vitally contributed to the emergence of over a million Americans from poverty; vastly improving the health and personality development of over 100,000 preschool children in Headstart; providing useful jobs and earnings for more than a half million disadvantaged teenagers through the Neighborhood Youth Corps; established Job Corps Centers for teenagers currently receiving remedial education, job training, and counseling; offering promising but economically disadvantaged high school students the opportunity to receive a full year of intensive tutoring and special counseling in Project Upward Bound; including our adults in the Foster Grandparents programs and the adult education programs, and

Whereas, the war on poverty has won the involvement of residents of impoverished neighborhoods on CAP councils; the outpouring of volunteer effort of men and women; doctors, dentists, lawyers, businessmen, religious leaders and local government leaders, freely and enthusiastically devoting their efforts to the success of the total program, and

Whereas, the war on poverty has immeasurably benefitted the State of Hawaii, where over a period of two years about 25,000 citizens have been involved in this total effort to rescue from despair and degradation the deprived citizens who struggle in the midst of our prosperity, now therefore,

Be it resolved that the Young Democrats of Oahu County respectfully urge the United States Congress to consider and study the merits and accomplishments of the war on poverty and to continue to adequately fund this most significant undertaking of the Great Society, and

Be it further resolved that copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon Baines Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Joseph S. Clark, Chairman, Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty; the Honorable Carl D. Perkins, Chairman, House Committee on Education and Labor; the Honorable Patsy T. Mink and the Honorable Spark M. Matsunaga, Hawaii delegation to the U.S. House of Representatives; the Honorable Daniel K. Inouye, U.S. Senate; Mr. Sargent Shriver, Director, Office of Economic Opportunity; Mr. Walter Chun, Hawaii Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.

AMENDMENT TO IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, historically, the United States has generally opened its arms and welcomed immigrants from all parts of the world. Our very society is built upon the energies, hopes, and skills of many peoples who came to these shores in search of peace and a democratic way of life. We use the term "melting pot" to describe the merging of ancestry that has taken place here in this country. Most of us can proudly claim heritage from several different lands.

In 1965, the Congress of the United States passed, and the President signed, legislation which eliminated the discriminatory national origin quota system. Unfortunately, one section, 212(a)(14), relating to labor certification, was also changed though in a way which adversely affects the ability of new immigrants, specifically skilled and unskilled labor, to enter this "nation of immigrants." The law placed the burden of proof for entry on the individual immigrant. This provision has unwisely prevented or delayed the entry of otherwise worthy immigrants. It is a restrictive clause which is not consistent with our basic heritage.

The pre-1965 labor provision placed the burden of proof squarely on the shoulders of the Secretary of Labor. This procedure, I hold, is more consistent with the basic American practice of welcoming new immigrants. The provision I introduce today is similar but not the same as this former labor law. It provides a flexible entry procedure for immigrants. Yet, it also adequately protects American labor standards.

I urge my colleagues to give this amendment their earnest consideration.

AMENDMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Farbstein] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide full payment—subject to any deductibles and coinsurance generally applicable—for whole blood furnished an individual under the program of health insurance for the aged.

The Medicare Act will undoubtedly stand as one of the most historic and far-reaching pieces of legislation ever passed by the Congress. It is basically a sound proposal, one which provides financial assistance to older Americans who are faced with the double dilemma of rising need for medical care and high medical costs.

As we know, the medicare program will soon complete it's first full year of operation. From this initial year of activity we hope to be able to strengthen any weak provisions, and to extend the coverage where appropriate to those not presently protected.

One provision of specific interest, section 1813(a), now requires that a medicare patient pay for the first 3 pints of whole blood received out of his own pocket. This is an exception provision which excludes blood from the general deductible clause for hospital insurance. Recent statistics show that each patient over 65 receives 3.9 pints annually. The result of this restrictive clause, therefore, is to practically eliminate whole blood coverage from medicare.

I believe this is an unjust measure, one which discriminates against the poor and the ill. It is a known medical fact that people requiring blood transfusions are usually seriously ill and will probably run up large medical bills. It is also a commonly known fact that poor, elderly people are more susceptible to illness. Therefore, I urge my fellow colleagues to consider this amendment carefully.

Back in 1965, Dr. Oscar Hunter, past president of the American Blood Bank, testified that there was a real danger that "free blood" for older citizens would disrupt the volunteer blood donation program which is our Nation's major supplier of whole blood. I can understand Dr. Hunter's concern. However, I believe the benefit far outweighs the danger involved. Approximately 20 percent of our citizens are 65 years of age or older. Yet about 29 percent of all blood transfused goes to patients over 65. In numerical terms, this means that close to 1.5-million pints a year are transfused to our older citizens. Estimated expense to cover this cost, at $25 a unit, would then total about $37,500,000.

The cost to the Government, within medicare deductible provisions, would be substantial. However, the cost specifically to our poor and seriously ill citizens would be even more costly based on their limited incomes. It should be pointed out that my amendment does not provide for free blood. It simply places the cost of blood transfusions under the general coverage with other hospital services. It will not completely eliminate blood cost but it will bring the benefit in line with other services.

Now I would be remiss, in concluding this statement, if I did not touch in greater detail on the subject of the volunteer blood program.

It seems clear to me that information on the collection and utilization of blood is both outdated and sketchy. I understand that part of the collection process now operative under medicare, will attempt to fill this void. The resulting data, though, will not be available until at least the end of this year. It is imperative that up-to-date data, as well as other medical costs be available to both the Government and private organizations.

Finally, let me conclude by briefly stating that the solution to any blood shortage must be a positive educational policy encouraged by up-to-date information and effective local collection programs. We must not make our elder citizens, those most in need, pay for an inadequate program of blood collection.

A BILL TO HELP IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF AMERICA'S NURSING CARE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to help improve the quality of America's nursing-home care. The nursing-home industry is an immense one of 20,000 homes with 850,000 beds. Eighty-five percent of these homes are owned by proprietary nursing-home organizations.

But approximately 60 percent of the patients in nursing homes at present are receiving care under some form of public assistance such as old-age assistance, medical assistance for the aged, or medical assistance under title XIX. In fiscal year 1966, about half a billion was paid to nursing homes for the care of welfare patients. About $280 million of this came from the Federal Government.

It is vital that our elderly citizens receive good treatment in the homes, thus giving the Federal Government value for its money. While the vast majority of homes provide conscientious care, there are indications that some of our elderly citizens are not receiving decent, careful treatment. In these few cases, the Federal Government is not only not receiving full value for its money, but is being cheated and defrauded by some homes.

At the request of Senator Frank E. Moss, chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Long-Term Care, the General Accounting Office recently completed a study of alleged improper practices in providing nursing-home care, medical services, and prescribed drugs to old-age assistance recipients in Cleveland, Ohio.

The General Accounting Office's findings indicate that more study is in order to determine the type of service being given welfare patients in nursing homes.

The General Accounting Office did find a few doctors, fortunately exceptions in their profession, who were taking advantage of lax tax accounting and supervision procedures to make an unreasonable profit with a minimum of service.

As an example of abuse in health service, the report found one doctor who in 1 month was paid $1,486 for 487 "visits" to nursing-home patients, including 90 "visits" in 1 day. As the General Accounting Office said:

> The pattern of quite frequent and regular visits indicated by our analysis for certain of the practitioners and the number of patients indicated to have been seen by these practitioners on single days suggest that the service for which bills were submitted, if performed, were provided as a matter of routine and in some cases may not have been substantial.

I am offering an amendment to the social security laws which would, I believe, allow many localities to correct this abuse if they choose. Where medical aid for the aged is administered locally, as it is in 22 States, the local administering agency could elect to furnish part or all of the physicians services required by such public assistance beneficiaries. By using the local public health service, treatment, if the abuses cited by the General Accounting Office report are as widespread as I fear they are, should improve, and costs be radically reduced. If they do not, the people will know who is responsible.

FRIENDS OF CHESTER F. KOCH CELEBRATE HIS 75TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on May 13, 1967, friends of Mr. Chester J. Koch, a resident of my congressional district who has been longtime coordinator for patriotic activities for the city of Cleveland, will celebrate his 75th birthday. A civic luncheon will be held in his honor in the Grand Ballroom of the Hotel Sheraton-Cleveland.

During his extended dedicated service to the city and its people, Chester Koch has been devoted to seeing that the servicemen who depart for active military duty and the veterans returning from military service to their country are properly recognized, on behalf of the citizens of our community. During the course of his work, he has helped hundreds of thousands of servicemen and veterans.

He has organized military parades and patriotic events and is known throughout the community as a veteran's veteran.

Chester Koch is, himself, a veteran of service in World War I, 83d Division, 301 Motor Supply Train, and is active in many organizations in the Cleveland area.

I extend to Mr. Chester J. Koch my heartiest best wishes on the occasion of his 75th birthday for his splendid devotion to his work in Cleveland.

Following are editorial statements of his service:

[From the Cleveland Press, Jan. 8, 1951]

The Big Hand to Chester Koch . . . because his unselfish devotion beyond the call of duty has eased the departure of more than 200,000 servicemen . . . Because his untiring efforts in patriotic causes have been of incalculable benefit to the community . . . because his counsel, advice, and guidance have helped thousands of war veterans and their families . . . because no call for aid is too small or too great for him to answer. . . .

The Press takes great satisfaction in giving its fifteenth award for distinguished service. The Big Hand to Chester Koch, the City's Coordinator of Patriotic Activities, as one of our most modest but most important citizens. He is the first and only official [Coordinator of Patriotic Activities] in this country . . . and probably in the world.

Perennial Marshal, or Chief of Staff of Parades, Chester J. Koch has become a genuine authority on the American flag and flag courtesies.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Nov. 7, 1954]

Chester Koch becomes Honorary Member of the Buckeye Detachment Marine Corps League.

Joseph E. Kaselak, a past commander, in making the award, cited Koch for his untiring devotion to "Veterandom" and especially to veterans of the Marine Corps.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 16, 1955]

Common Pleas Judge Arthur H. Day had this to say about Chester Koch: "In many ways, Chester is the most remarkable man I have ever known . . . a man devoted to humanity and especially to the segment known as 'Veterandom.' I am not calling upon my imagination when I say he is made of the kind of substance saints are made of. I know of no public official who has contributed more to the community than our own Sgt. Koch."

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, May 28, 1955]

In March of 1941, the City Council recognized the importance of what Mr. Koch was doing and created the post of City Coordinator of Patriotic Activities, to which he was immediately appointed. It is he who has provided the escort service for draftees and has persuaded bands and drum and bugle corps to assist the farewell ceremonies and has spoken millions of words of advice and appreciation to service-bound boys at the Cleveland Terminal and at induction centers and recruiting centers.

A veteran of World War I, he served overseas with the 83rd Division, 308th Motor Supply Train. Mr. Koch holds twenty-eight different offices in various organizations, non-paying.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Oct. 15, 1958]

The Halo of the Week goes to Chester J. Koch, the City Coordinator of Patriotic Activities. He has been an untiring friend and helper of servicemen going and coming from the services. He is on hand at all parades. He is known as a "veteran's veteran" and one of the leaders in the cause of veterans in the state.

No matter what the patriotic cause—Chester Koch will fight for what he thinks is right.

THE TIES BETWEEN FLORIDA AND THE LANDS OF THE CARIBBEAN

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the 1st of May, the distinguished Secretary General of the Organization of American States, Dr. Jose A. Mora, delivered a very eloquent and significant address at the annual dinner of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce at the Mayflower Hotel in Washington. This great Organization of American States has done much to promote the peace and prosperity of the Western Hemisphere in years past. We know that its role in the progress and peace of the Western Hemisphere in the years ahead shall be even greater. Dr. Jose A. Mora, distinguished statesman, as Secretary General, has immeasurably contributed to the accomplishments of the Organization of American States. We, of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce, were highly honored to have him appear at this function.

We were particularly pleased to hear Dr. Irving E. Muskat speak so favorably of the great Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center, known as Interama, located in my district in Miami, and to have his recognition of the part that the Inter-American Cultural and Trade Center will play in future years in bringing closer together in friendship, and in cooperation, the peace-loving nations of the Western Hemisphere.

I commend his able address to my colleagues and fellow countrymen and include it in the body of the RECORD:

REMARKS OF THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES, DR. JOSE A. MORA, AT THE ANNUAL DINNER OF THE FLORIDA STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

It is indeed a pleasure to be present upon the occasion of the annual dinner of the Florida State Chamber of Commerce here in Washington, and to find myself in the company of so many friends of long standing.

Over the many years I have spent in this country, first as Ambassador of Uruguay, and more recently as Secretary General of the Organization of American States, I have been in unusually frequent contact with the State of Florida.

Some of my experience, of course, stems from the fact that Florida is in a very literal sense the United States' gateway to the south—the point of passage for thousands of travelers between this country and Latin America.

Much more is involved than mere geographical proximity, however.

The ties between Florida and the lands of the Caribbean date, as you all know, from the earliest years of our recorded history. The first European settlement in the United States territory, Saint Augustine, was not English-speaking, but Spanish-speaking, and throughout the colonial period Florida's contacts were exclusively with the captaincies of the Viceroyalty of New Spain, not with the British establishments to the north.

If the Spaniards went their way a century and a half ago, and their place has been taken by an ever-increasing flood of descendants of the British colonists, their memory lingers on.

To begin with, of course, there is the name of the state, commemorative of its discovery on Easter Sunday, but singularly appropriate in its suggestion of a land of flowers. Then there is the oft-told tale of Ponce de Leon's vain search for the Fountain of Youth. Perhaps that gentleman was not so much misled as ahead of his time: could he return today during the Easter vacation period, and land on the beach at Fort Lauderdale, he would surely be convinced that his goal had been attained!

As befits a race called Conquistadores, the Spanish were great military architects, and the Castillo de San Marcos is a lasting reminder of the first empire on which the sun never set. The restoration of that and other colonial buildings at Saint Augustine, enthusiastically promoted by native Floridians and immigrants from as far off as New England, will bring visitors from all parts of the country to a vivid realization that the American heritage is Iberian as well as British in origin.

However respectful of history they may be, Floridians are not given to living in the past. Indeed, considering the installations at Cape Kennedy, they are in some respects living in the future! Thus, in connection with the Saint Augustine restoration, they have provided a Pan American Center, to further closer relations with Spaniards and Spanish Americans of today. A little farther to the south, a still more ambitious undertaking for the promotion of trade and friendship between the United States and Latin America is coming into being at Miami—the project known as Interama.

The Florida-Colombia Alliance represents one of the outstanding relationships developed under the Partners of the Alliance Program. I had the pleasure of addressing the Conference held in Tampa in November of last year, and was impressed to note that the projects considered ran from agrarian technical assistance to health programs, from tourism to the exchange of students and professors and aid to libraries and educational institutions. I am confident that the activities that have been undertaken will be fruitful, not merely in material benefits to those who are the object of assistance, but also in meaningful personal relationships among the collaborators—one of the firmest bases of inter-American solidarity.

It is indeed encouraging to me, as Secretary General of the OAS, that the fastest-growing state in the East, and one that is in the vanguard of progress, is also a leader in promoting friendship, cooperation, and trade with the United States' neighbors to the south.

I salute the State of Florida—a historic outpost of imperial Spain, the gateway to the adventures of outer space, and a bridge between the peoples and cultures of the New World.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES TWO BILLS TO AMEND THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing two bills, H.R. 9894 and H.R. 9895, which are concerned with the welfare of American industry and those who work in it. Congressman DENT has introduced two identical bills and is presently holding hearings before the Subcommittee on Labor on this legislation.

My bill, H.R. 9894, identical to H.R. 478, would amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and their workers who are being injured by increased imports from low-wage areas.

Under this bill, upon request of the President, or resolution of Congress, or application of any employee organization or interested party, the Secretary of Labor would be able to investigate and determine if imports of certain goods were substantially contributing to serious impairment of the health, efficiency or general well-being of any group of American workers, or of any American community. The Secretary's report would then be published in the Federal Register and upon receipt, the President would be authorized to take such action as he deemed appropriate to remove the threat to American commerce. Thus these amendments would in agriculture have the effect of protecting the grower from labor-cheap products which would undercut the farmer's own products. Moreover, it could protect the worker from cheap, inferior products whose entry would tend to depress wages and working conditions.

The second bill, H.R. 9895, which is identical to H.R. 479, would amend section 4(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment when a complaint is filed by an employer or labor organization. This amendment would provide the Secretary of Labor with a more efficient tool to combat unemployment caused by the importation of foreign products, by permitting either an employee organization or employer to petition the Secretary to investigate. While such an amendment would afford protection to workers of all industries heretofore unable to initiate their complaints, the most immediate effect and the one of primary interest to me is the protection which the amendment can offer the agricultural industries.

I would like to point that these two bills have now particular relevance for agriculture, since last year's amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act brought farmworkers under scope of its authority for the first time.

Two years ago Congress made a wise decision and put an end to the mass importation of foreign agricultural labor, by letting Public Law 78, the bracero law, expire, and encouraging more careful administration of Public Law 414, the older law providing for limited immigration of farm labor. The restriction on the use of foreign farm labor constitutes an altogether sound public policy. The expiration of Public Law 78 was a step in the right direction toward rectifying some of the economic and social injustices which have long plagued our Nation's farmworkers.

The practice of importing foreign nationals to harvest our vegetable crops has almost a hundred years of history behind it. In 1959 during the heyday of the bracero program we imported some 400,000 farmworkers. This practice often led to exploitation of the poor of other countries and the depression of the wages paid to American farmworkers. The original idea of the bracero program was to supply labor needed during times of domestic labor shortages during the war. But importation of foreign labor continued even in times of high domestic farm unemployment. This was totally without moral or economic justification.

But 2 years ago when Public Law 78 was allowed to expire and Public Law 414 again became effective, this step toward protection of the American worker against low foreign wages was accompanied by much grumbling from some quarters. Many said that crops would rot in the fields without Public Law 78 since it was believed that no American would be willing to do "stoop" labor. The last 2 years have proved these dismal grumlings unfounded. Crops did not rot in the fields. Growers' net income was up almost $4 billion in 1966 over the average net income of 1960–64, the last 5 years of the bracero program. Production was also up in 1966 over the 1960–64 period in crops that formerly employed foreign workers. The transition from heavy use of temporary foreign farm labor to reliance on domestic farm labor has not been an easy one, but the results are encouraging, and the entire country has benefited from the increased dependence on domestic farmworkers.

Although U.S. unemployment for all industries is lower today than it has been in years, the rate of agricultural unemployment in 1966 was still 6.5 percent, compared to overall unemployment of 3.9 percent. This 6.5 percent is an improvement over the 9.3 percent in 1964, but there is still room for much more improvement. Eight States presently import more than a hundred foreign agricultural workers per year. Foreign workers still hold positions which could be filled by jobless Americans. In December of 1966 in my State of Florida there were 8,705 foreign workers in the Lake Okeechobee area. These were legally contracted farmworkers. Florida ranks highest in the importation of foreign labor, with the next highest—7,900—coming into California.

In 1966, 23,524 temporary foreign farm laborers were admitted to the United States compared with 200,022 in 1964. According to the Department of Agriculture, the hourly wage rates have gone up to $1.23, 21 cents higher than the 1960–64 average. Domestic workers have brought in our crops, and with the virtual end of foreign labor importation, wages have improved somewhat, along with working conditions.

The demands these American workers make are not unreasonable. It seems to me that a farmworker who is not guaranteed year-round employment or for that matter even certain seasonal employment cannot be criticized for seeking an hourly minimum wage of $1.25. In most instances the shockingly low wages have been erased by the Public Law 414 suggested wage level and the 1966 amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which extended to coverage of the Federal minimum wage of $1 to agricultural workers employed by large industrialized farms meeting the 500 hired man-day requirement. But all agricultural workers are not hired by these large industrialized farms, and not all farms hire Americans before they hire foreigners. The American farmworker deserves opportunities afforded to workers in other industries—that of a decent living wage.

The expiration of Public Law 78, the return to the immigration policy under Public Law 414, and the inclusion of agricultural workers in the 1966 Fair Labor Standards Act amendments have certainly proved to be steps in the right direction, but it is now time to take still another step. More attention must be paid to the worker who remains at the very bottom of the employment ladder. It is true that progress has been made, but we must assure that American farmworkers are afforded the first priority to work on American farms and the opportunity to share in the abundance that blesses most Americans.

I seriously doubt whether foreign farmworkers are often needed to harvest this country's crops. American workers are available if they are paid decent wages, treated fairly, and fed well. Decent wages will not, as some think, cause inflationary food prices. The simple fact is that the wages paid to farm labor are only a tiny proportion of the price finally paid by the consumer for farm produce. Replacing the American farmworker in Texas and other parts of the country with a foreign worker who is willing to work for 60 or 70 cents an hour, or forcing him to work for subpoverty level wages, has resulted in community unrest and farm labor disputes. Large-scale militant union activity among farmworkers demanding increases in wages and better working conditions has led to strikes, boycotts, and union organization activities across the Nation from the Michigan fruit belt, the California Delano grape valley area, the Texas Rio Grande Valley vegetable country to the Florida citrus and sugarcane sections.

By the same token the American grower deserves the protection against importation of the products of cheap labor which tend to lower prices for his products, thereby making it difficult for him to compete and pay decent wages in the production of his labor intensive crops.

Not only does the importation of cheap foreign labor and products affect the farmworker and owner, but also the consumer and retail food dealer. They both get caught in the fight to raise wages and increase job opportunities. Newly organized farm unions solicit other union sympathy and boycott products of certain large farms, or picket retail stores or chains that continue to sell these products. Such activity—agitation for better job opportunities, wages, and working conditions—may or may not secure the demands of labor, but in the first instance it certainly causes inconvenience if not harm to the consumer, grower, and retailer. Protection of the American farmworker's opportunity to available jobs is basic to the economic stability and progress of the United States. It is basic to the farmworker who cannot without it enter or stay in the mainstream of the American working force.

If enacted my two bills will be a logical next step in the legitimate protection of American workers and industries from unfair foreign competition. My two bills will encourage the promotion of better wage levels and greater opportunity for our farmworkers and at the same time afford a more efficient tool of protection to the grower from unfair competition of agricultural and industrial imports produced by cheap labor which tend to undercut his particular product and give rise to disrupting labor discontent. I urge passage of this legislation.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO EXPAND OPPORTUNITIES FOR OLDER AMERICANS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I introduced legislation which will extend and expand the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act of 1965. As you know, this act makes possible a program of grants to States and local communities for the development and operation of projects which provide services to older people. The Older Americans Act of 1965 represents a milestone in legislation on behalf of older Americans in that it sets forth a firm commitment on the part of the Congress and governments at every level to help secure new opportunities for our older citizens in order that they may live out their lives in dignity and honor. The programs started with funds authorized under the Older Americans Act have just begun, but already they are beginning to produce meaningful and practical benefits for older people. I urge this body to give its full support to measures which will continue the efforts already begun by States and communities to improve the lives of older Americans.

I believe, however, that we must go beyond the present programs and provide additional opportunities for the elderly in the communities in which they live. I am, therefore, introducing today a bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for the establishment of a National Community Senior Service Corps and to authorize a special grant program for the planning, construction, and operation of senior citizen activity centers.

There are today, in every community across the country, community needs which are not being met—in hospitals, schools, day care centers, and a variety of other facilities and programs which provide services to people. Yet, there are at the same time among our retired citizens thousands of trained and highly skilled individuals capable of contributing their talents, abilities, experience, and energies to the community, except for the lack of adequate arrangements for utilizing this wealth of untapped manpower. Many older people would welcome the opportunity to make a meaningful contribution to community life but are often, instead, forced into unwanted inactivity.

A National Community Senior Service Corps would utilize the talents of older Americans to meet many of the needs in communities which will otherwise go unsatisfied. My bill would provide for the support of local projects in the public interest which employed the skills of older people in public service projects. None of the persons utilized in these programs would displace employed workers, nor would they impair existing contracts for services. Older people could provide services in connection with school lunch and health programs, child care centers, vocational and classroom training, home health care, and a variety of other public service programs.

My bill also provides for the authorization of a special grant program to provide for the construction and operation of senior citizen activity centers. Senior centers, some of which have been operated by pioneering communities for a number of years, represent the most significant and promising new instrumentality yet devised to meet the many and varied needs of older people. A center facility, adequately staffed and effectively operated, permits older people themselves to develop programs which explore their interests and provide new opportunities for self-improvement. Centers can provide intellectual and recreational stimulation, offer private, personal counseling, provide referral services, and offer information about other services available to the elderly in their communities.

Funds currently authorized under the Older Americans Act may not be used for the construction of these facilities, nor can funds be used for major renovation of structures suitable for center programs. Yet States recognize the need for centers and center programs. Over one-third of the funds now available to the States under title III of the act go for the planning and operation of center programs where facilities are available. I believe, therefore, that a separate authorization of funds specifically for center programs should be enacted to include moneys for the construction of centers where necessary. Many communities, anxious to begin a center program and to use such a facility as the focus of an aging program, simply do not have the resources with which to begin. My bill would provide the "seed" money to enable communities to begin developing these programs.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, my interest in programs on behalf of our older population has been long and continuing. I am satisfied to see that the programs made possible by the Older Americans Act are reaching older people right in their own communities, where these programs can benefit these Americans the most. I believe that the bill I am introducing today can do much toward sustaining the momentum—started under the Older Americans Act—toward the new day dawning for those who have helped to make our Nation what it is. To sustain this momentum is not only our solemn duty, but also is one of our most challenging responsibilities.

AMENDMENTS TO THE OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, today I was honored to appear before the House Select Subcommittee on Education which is chaired by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Dominick V. Daniels. These hearings are to amend and extend the Older Americans Act of 1965. As one of the original authors of the act, I was pleased to strongly support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would, at this time, like to submit my testimony before that committee today. This and the bill I am introducing today constitutes a meaningful program in eliminating much of the plight of our senior citizens. I offer this testimony for my colleagues' attention and for all those who read this Record:

Statement of the Honorable Claude Pepper Before the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Committee on Education and Labor Regarding H.R. 4261, Legislation To Amend the Older Americans Act of 1965, May 11, 1967

Mr. Chairman and members of the distinguished committee:

I thank you for the privilege of being here with you this morning and commend what this great sub-committee has done in the past and is doing in the cause of our senior citizens through legislation of this type. I, therefore, welcome this opportunity to come before you, Mr. Chairman, to urge support for legislation which will extend and expand the programs authorized by the Older Americans Act of 1965. This Act represents a significant commitment by the Congress to assist States and local communities to provide comprehensive programs for our Nation's nearly 19 million older people.

As the members of this Committee know, I had for many years sponsored legislation which was designed to provide new opportunities for older Americans. In 1963, I introduced several measures which would have established programs of education, recruiting, and training for community service, counseling, and a variety of other programs to enrich the lives of our elderly citizens. I also introduced legislation to provide for the construction and operation of senior citizen centers to serve as a focal point within the community for programs on behalf of the aged. In the 89th Congress, I continued to support and sponsor programs of expanded opportunities for all older people. I am happy to say that many of the ideas contained in my bills were later incorporated into a bill sponsored by our late colleague from Rhode Island, John Fogarty—the bill which subsequently became the Older Americans Act on July 14, 1965.

We in Florida have for many years been deeply interested in programs for older people. Since 1960, the older population of Florida has increased by 34.4% to an estimated 743,000 persons aged 65 and over in July of 1966. This tremendous rate of growth of the older population in the State is next to the highest rate of growth found anywhere in the United States. Older people comprise 12.5% of Florida's total population. Only Iowa has a larger percentage of its population aged 65 and above. However, because our older population is growing nearly seven times the rate of growth of that State's older population (Iowa), Florida expects to have, by the next census, the largest concentration of older Americans in the United States. Part of the reason for the phenomenal growth rate of older people in Florida has been that we have undertaken for many years to develop the services and programs older Americans need and want in their retired years. The immigration of large numbers of older people into the State continues, in part, because we believe that older Americans can continue to make a substantial contribution to our neighborhoods and communities.

This positive philosophy about aging, as I like to call it, is the central theme of the Older Americans Act of 1965. In States and communities across the Nation, where programs for older people were just beginning, the Older Americans Act has provided new resources to enable community leaders to assess the needs of their older population and to develop new services aimed at meeting these needs. In other States and communities, such as in Florida, where many programs for the elderly were already underway, the Older Americans Act has made possible the expansion of these programs to reach thousands of new people.

In my own district, for example, a fine senior citizens center has developed an excellent program for the older residents of North Miami Beach. The center, the New Victory Park Civic Center, offers recreational and educational services, counseling services, and a variety of other programs for the elderly citizens in the area. Now with the aid funds allocated to Florida under title III of the Older Americans Act, these fine programs are being expanded to where the center hopes to serve 2,000 older people in the near future.

Over 91% of the $270,578 available to the State for programs in the last two fiscal years has already been committed to projects for older people in the State. Dr. Carter Osterbind of the Florida Commission on Aging and I have met several times to discuss new programs which communities in the State are anxious to begin. These programs can be developed to their fullest potential only if the seed money available to these communities provided by the Older Americans Act is continued and expanded.

Florida is also experimenting with new concepts and programs for the aged. Under a demonstration grant funded from title IV funds of the Older Americans Act, the Dade County Senior Centers are demonstrating an experimental food service program in five centers in the greater Miami area. This program combines the provision of a hot, nutritious meal with activity programs in the centers which includes information about nutrition, food preparation, and economical shopping. Sound consumer principles are invaluable to older people who have fixed incomes with which to sustain themselves.

I was also pleased to announce this May 1st that thirty senior teacher aides will go to work in the Dade County School system this fall under a new demonstration program. These aides will prepare class materials, check attendance and seating charts, grade objective tests and mark errors, set up class experiments and supervise bulletin boards. This program will be expanded if successful, and I am sure it will be and it will open up a new line of constructive and remunerative work for our older citizens.

Mr. Chairman, these programs and activities made possible by the Older Americans Act are developing rapidly. Since this Act represents a significant new hope to every older person who desires to live out his years in dignity and honor, we in the Congress have the duty and responsibility to assure that opportunities made possible by the Act are continued. On March 22nd I introduced a bill, H.R. 7671, which is identical to H.R. 4261, a bill introduced by our distinguished colleague, Mr. Perkins, to amend the Older Americans Act so as to extend its provisions. These bills implement some of the recommendations made by the President in his message to the Congress in *Aid for the Aged*. The bills extend the grant provisions of the Act through 1972. These measures authorize appropriation levels for fiscal year 1968 of $10,550,000 for grants to the States and $6,400,000 for research, demonstration, and training grants funded directly by the Administration on Aging.

As you know, the State grant program (title III) allocates Federal funds to the States which are used with State and local monies to support community projects for older people in the neighborhoods in which these people live. The $10,550,000 authorization for this program in 1968 will enable the continuation of local projects that will have been funded at the close of this fiscal year, and will permit the States to fund an estimated 240 projects during fiscal 1968.

The $6,400,000 authorization included in my bill will fund continuation costs of many of the research, demonstration, and training projects now underway, and will permit the funding of some 46 additional projects. This authorization will also fund about 33 nutritional service projects to further test the new methods and techniques designed to meet the nutritional needs of the aged, techniques developed in part from the information being gathered from the demonstration projects now being funded in Dade County senior centers to which I referred a few moments ago.

Mr. Chairman, these funds are needed to continue the efforts of communities across the country to develop new and meaningful programs for older Americans. The programs authorized by the Older Americans Act are producing useful and practical results, and most important, these programs are reaching older people in the neighborhoods in which they live and where these programs can do the most good.

The Older Americans Act has also pointed up the need to develop other new programs to provide new opportunities for the elderly. I believe that we must go beyond these grant programs already authorized in the act to provide additional resources to strengthen our commitment to those who have helped to build our country.

I would at this time, Mr. Chairman, digress for a minute regarding this matter. I am today introducing a bill, H.R. 9893, which will move in this direction. My bill will provide for the creation of a National Community Senior Service Corps which would tap the vast talent pool represented in the skills of thousands of older Americans. Every community in the Nation is facing community needs which are not being met, primarily because of the lack of adequate arrangements for utilizing available manpower resources to meet these needs.

It has been estimated that there are nearly 5.3 million potential jobs in public service employment represented in social needs not now being met. There are at the same time among our retired older people thousands of public school teachers, lawyers, dieticians, nutritionists, social welfare workers and recreation workers, librarians, physicians and nurses. Each of these persons could be utilized in public service projects without reducing the existing levels of employment or subverting prevailing labor standards. My bill would make possible a new program to utilize this talent and provide at the same time for new opportunities for older citizens to continue to contribute to their communities. My bill also provides for money to construct and operate senior citizens activity centers. Currently under the Older Americans Act, no money is available for the construction of these centers which have demonstrated again and again their value in serving as a focus for programs for older people in communities throughout the country. Many more communities would be able to sponsor programs for recreation, information, counseling, referral and education if resources were available to them to renovate existing structures or to build new facilities. My bill would provide the needed beginning in those communities where resources to build and operate centers and center programs are limited.

Mr. Chairman, the bills before this Committee and the changes in the Older Americans Act I have just discussed are of major importance if we are to sustain the momentum which has begun at the local, State, and Federal level to provide new opportunities for millions of older Americans to live out their lives in dignity and honor. I urge this Committee to recommend adoption of these measures in order that the Congress can continue to honor its commitment on behalf of those Americans who have contributed so much to improve our Nation. Thank you.

DESECRATION OF THE AMERICAN FLAG SHOULD BE A FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, in the kind of understatement which gave his words the ring of complete candor, the commander of American forces in Vietnam, General Westmoreland, recently said:

> The burning of the flag—I cannot view that as other than an unpatriotic act. Thousands of men have died for that flag, and they are still dying for it in Vietnam.

Ever since the turn of the century, there have been efforts in Congress to make it a Federal crime to burn or otherwise desecrate the American flag. These hearings are another effort in that direction, an effort which I sincerely trust will succeed.

The bill that I have sponsored for this purpose is H.R. 8980.

It is true that all 50 States and the District of Columbia have laws making the desecration of the flag punishable as a crime. Penalties range from none in New Hampshire to 25 years in Texas. Several States have increased or are considering the desirability of increasing their penalties for desecration of the flag.

Every State could punish for murder,

too, yet Congress not long ago saw fit to make it a Federal crime to murder a President of the United States. The reasons for that enactment may not be relevant to the reasons for also making desecration of the flag a Federal crime, but at least it is clear that the existence of State penalties does not preclude the exercise of Federal legislative power in the same area.

I do not wish to repeat all the valid reasons for such a bill that have been spread wide in the newspapers, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and that have been heard in the subcommittee's hearings. Most of these reasons reflect sincerely and deeply held patriotic beliefs and emotions, and I am in complete agreement with them.

It is particularly unfortunate that those who wish to express their dissent from the policies of their Government in the conduct of the war in Vietnam have adopted flag-burning as a symbol of protest. I can think of no quicker way for them to engender support for the policies they oppose. Dissenters must learn to dissent in a way that is acceptable to most Americans.

After all, the parents of young boys who are drafted to fight and die cannot be expected to restrain their rage at such abuses as flag-burnings. Why should their children be maimed or killed when others not only do not serve under the flag of the United States but also desecrate that flag? Do the flag burners who attempt to justify their acts as expressions of dissent protected by the first amendment have any idea of how little dissent is tolerated on the part of a private in the Army? Why should patriotic Americans, willing to do their part, be denied the simplest and most basic freedoms—and that is just how armies have to be run if they are to be run at all—in order to protect the freedom of those who mock the national emblem, who refuse to serve in the Armed Forces, and whose marching is confined to protest demonstrations?

That great veterans' organization, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, at its 67th national convention last year, adopted a resolution stating:

> We strongly support legislation providing punishment . . . for any person who publicly and willfully destroys, mutilates, or desecrates the American Flag.

The distinguished senior vice commander of the VFW testified before a subcommittee on Monday that—

> It is the position of the V.F.W. that the Congress must make desecration of the Flag a crime. Present laws concerning disrespect for the Flag are inadequate to meet the times. . . . What is most regrettable is that deflement of our Flag has been interpreted by other nations and particularly by North Vietnam as a substantial resentment of the American people to the Vietnam war effort. The Flag of the United States is a Federal banner and a Federal concern. Let us guard that concern.

We must deter and punish any acts that are deliberately intended to cause desecration of the flag of the United States. That flag is the symbol of our national independence, of our freedom, of the precious heritage won for us by brave men and women over the generations. If the flag-burners hold the American heritage in contempt, that is their business, but they have no right to inflict their contempt for it on the rest of us.

They have a right to their opinions, and we have a right to ours. That is the basis of a free society. They must not be permitted to abuse the freedom of others. Public and overt acts of disdain and contempt for the beliefs and traditions of the majority of Americans must not be protected under quixotic assertions of constitutional rights. If these characters want to burn flags, let them do so privately in their own furnaces at home. If they must burn American flags in public, let us jail them under a Federal criminal statute. If that sounds tough, so be it.

A TAX DEDUCTION FOR COLLEGE EXPENSES

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced another bill to permit the taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or for the education of his spouse or any of his dependents.

At present I am the sponsor of H.R. 3625, which I introduced on January 24, 1967. That bill, however, would only allow the taking of the deduction for the year in which the person paying the tuition actually spent the money.

The bill I am introducing today provides the right to postpone the taking of the tax deduction for up to 5 years, when necessary in order to obtain the full benefit of such deduction. I have been sponsoring similar legislation since 1957.

As we all know, Mr. Speaker, the cost of higher education has been spiraling upward over the past 20 years and is expected to continue to increase substantially in the years ahead. Indeed, for most American families with college-age children, college education has become the single largest yearly expense of the family. I believe we would be entirely justified in permitting the taxpayer to deduct these educational expenses from his gross income.

The administration and the Congress have long recognized that higher education does not benefit only the person receiving it, but is also of vital importance to the Nation and its future. If costs continue to rise—and as I stated previously—there is every indication that they will, we will soon reach the point where most families will be unable to meet the heavy burden. The public colleges cannot possibly absorb all those who wish to attend and the private colleges will be for the rich and those bright enough, or strong enough, to obtain full scholastic or athletic scholarships.

Along with increased physical facilities we must also provide the academic community with the students, and one of the ways to do that is to reduce the tax burden on those who pay the students way.

I believe we must do this now and I strongly urge the Committee on Ways and Means to give the earliest possible consideration to my bill.

RHODE ISLAND POVERTY HEARINGS ENCOURAGE SENATOR PELL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. TIERNAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, the people of my State are very proud of our distinguished Junior Senator, Hon. CLAIBORNE PELL.

Among his many concerns is the paradox of poverty in our affluent society. On Monday, May 1, he chaired a hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty in Providence, R.I. Senator PELL was encouraged at the end of the hearing during which approximately 50 witnesses from every walk of life and economic strata testified in a no-holds-barred session. Senator PELL concluded that the communities of Rhode Island are doing an effective job in helping the poor to help themselves.

I would like to insert in the RECORD an article concerning the hearing by Mr. Hamilton E. Davis which appeared in the May 2 issue of the Providence Journal:

RHODE ISLAND POVERTY HEARINGS ENCOURAGE SENATOR PELL

(By Hamilton E. Davis)

Sen. Claiborne Pell wound up an all-day hearing on antipoverty programs in Rhode Island yesterday by concluding that no major changes are needed in the administration legislation that has been presented to Congress.

Senator Pell, the only member of an investigating Senate subcommittee who appeared at the Providence session, said that the one possible area for change indicated was in requiring more local participation in the programs.

The Providence session was one in a series of such forums to be held in 10 states by the subcommittee on employment, manpower and poverty. Sen. Joseph S. Clark, D-Pa, is chairman.

The subcommittee will begin work soon on the proposed Johnson administration amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. The measure will have to run the gantlet of many Republicans and some conservative Democrats who wants to see the program dropped or changed drastically.

A total of 46 witnesses appeared at the hearing including state and local antipoverty officials, employes of the programs and residents, mostly from Providence.

The bulk of the witnesses gave a favorable picture of the overall program, although there were a number of complaints about the hiring practices of Progress for Providence Inc., the local agency.

And the out-and-out critics of the effort in Providence were less outspoken than had been expected. Specific complaints included lack of Negroes in policymaking jobs, too stringent job specifications, an alleged hostility in the school department to the community schools and lack of sufficient local participation in the administration of the programs.

At the conclusion of the session, Senator Pell said that the personnel problems should be solved at the local level, that the Providence agency is doing the best it can to hire Negroes and that there were less complaints about political influence in the program than he expected.

He also said that more allowance might be made locally for hiring people with less glittering qualifications and, most important of all, that the programs aim more at preparing people for jobs in private industry than in keeping them in public agencies.

Senator Pell, who asked many of the witnesses whether they felt the antipoverty program should be kept in the federal Office of Economic Opportunity rather than split up among other federal agencies, said at the conclusion that there was an obvious consensus in keeping them in OEO.

The senator said that this was one of the most important problems facing the Congress right now. The only real support for splitting up the programs came from John L. Maguire, a persistent critic of the program.

STATE COORDINATOR

Anthony J. Agostinelli, state antipoverty coordinator, said in a prepared statement that in light of the pressure in Congress to break up OEO, the community action program would be best suited to the Department of Housing and Urban Development. He also suggested what agencies might get the other antipoverty programs.

However, he refused to answer Senator Pell's question whether he favored continuing the trend toward taking programs out of OEO. He said that such pressure existed in Congress and that a yes or no answer to the senator's question was impossible.

Other than a general request for more support, one of the needs most often cited was for day care centers for children of working mothers.

One of the morning speakers, Benjamin J. Farrell, president of the Rhode Island Conference of Social Work, said that the subcommittee should recommend that Congress ask for funds from OEO and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for a network of such centers.

GUARANTEED INCOME

Mr. Farrell also recommended that Congress establish a guaranteed annual income to strike at the source of the problems that make community action programs necessary.

Strong criticism of Progress for Providence was also voiced by Freeman M. Soares, an employee of the agency. Mr. Soares said that the poverty program has done nothing for the Negro.

He said that there are no Negroes in policymaking jobs in the agency and that efforts to do something about this in the last year and a half have failed. He said that the last two major jobs to come up in the agency went to white people even though Negroes wanted them.

OIL POLLUTION ACT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WRIGHT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, as amended. The purpose of this bill is to attempt to rectify whatever problems may exist in the proper enforcement of this act.

There have been recent press reports of statements alleged to have been made by an unidentified spokesman in the Department of Justice to the effect that the Congress crippled the enforcement of this act last year by an amendment which defined the word "discharge" as used in the act for the first time. Certainly, the Congress did not intend that this amendment would have any such effect.

Mr. Speaker, my bill would strike out the definition of "discharge" added last year and thereby restore the act, insofar as the problem of enforcement is concerned, to the same status as it occupied for 42 years prior to last year's amendments. My bill would thus allow the Department of Justice and the courts to proceed with the orderly enforcement of the act in the same manner as they did prior to the 1966 amendments.

I THINK THAT I SHALL NEVER SEE A BILLBOARD LOVELY AS A TREE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RESNICK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago the President and Mrs. Johnson created a program aimed at restoring to the people a very basic birthright: the beauty of America itself.

I commend President Johnson for his support of this program. And I commend his First Lady for her leadership and participation in this needed work.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 was passed by the 89th Congress. It was passed because the Congress had correctly judged the widespread support this program enjoyed by our citizens everywhere. It was passed because of the hard work of those who agreed with the President and Ladybird Johnson that America can be beautiful. And it passed because Mrs. Johnson mobilized public support for it with her national cleanup campaigns to check the country's commercialized defacement.

This act provided for the gradual control over billboard signs and other clutter along federally aided highways.

It excludes billboards within 660 feet of the highways, except for on-premise advertising and advertising in industrial or commercial areas. And it allows the Federal Government to pay 75 percent and States 25 percent of compensation to owners of signs which would be removed. It is estimated that 1,017,000 billboards are due to come down in 1970.

This program is now in grave danger. I daresay that never have so many lobbyists worked so hard to perpetuate ugliness in America as the billboard lobbyists in recent weeks. I am told that some 200 lobbyists have been seen scurrying around the Capitol these days. Their message is simple: Highway beautification must be eliminated. And arguments against this bill are varied—from justifiable concern over the elimination of jobs to appeals for States rights. Since we are not yet really talking about the abolition of billboards, I firmly believe that the job threat has been grossly exaggerated.

But none of these lobbyists talk about the rights of the taxpayers who have paid for our federally financed roadways and who have the right to expect them to be both safe and scenic. None of these lobbyists talk about the many billboards that detract from both safety and scenery. None of them talk about the rights of motorists who don't want to be "a captive audience" for beer and bathing suit manufacturers.

The billboard lobby has historically opposed any sort of control or regulation. Now they are outraged over the proposed new Bureau of Public Roads standards for the location, size and frequency of billboard placements and are trying desperately to scuttle this measure.

We in Congress represent the people. This is one instance where the people have no other advocates—no lobbyists—to speak out in their behalf except for their elected representatives. Highways are built with our people's money. And as the noted news analyst, Edward P. Morgan, said on his program the other evening:

> The public is financing a business opportunity for advertisers. If the roads were not there, the billboards would not be either. But as so often happens, business forgets that the public interest still comes first.

Business may forget, but the Congress cannot forget that the public interest still comes first. And highway beautification is clearly in the public interest. There can be no legitimate reason why the 90th Congress should reverse the sound and progressive legislation enacted by the 89th Congress. If this bill is supported by my colleagues on its merits there can be no doubt about its positive impact on our national life. The American people are solidly supporting this program.

I am pleased to report that there is growing support in the Nation's press for not only maintaining the sound legislative program now on the books, but actually strengthening it.

I urge my colleagues to read these editorials which call for maintaining highway beautification in the face of unprecedented lobbying attempts to scuttle the measure. The 89th Congress was known as the Congress of accomplishment. Let it never be said of the 90th Congress that we were "a Congress of destruction."

Under unanimous consent I insert into the RECORD a sampling of editorial opinion dealing with the need for highway beautification legislation:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, May 4, 1967]

THE MIGHTY BILLBOARD

Nearly a decade ago, the late Senator Kerr of Oklahoma used to laugh off proposals to rid the nation's highways of ugly billboards as an "aesthetic" plot to kill free enterprise—

and no one is buying that line of attack any more.

With the passing of years, however, only the tactics have changed. The political force of the billboard lobby is, from every visible sign, as effective as ever. During the last few days, Secretary of Transportation Boyd has made a spirited and reasonable defense of the mandatory billboard-removal law which the administration wrested from Congress less than two years ago. And the indications at the moment, sad to say, are that those pleas are falling on deaf ears.

The excuse this time, as voiced by Representative Kluczynski of Illinois, whose House subcommittee has just finished an investigation of the federal program, is that the 1965 law is a "can of worms," so unenforceable as to require a whole new legislative approach. Kluczynski, moreover, is speaking from a position of strength, since the program will expire unless it is authorized by Congress to proceed beyond the end of next month.

The billboard law, to give its opponents their due, is indeed difficult to enforce, partly because of the modified form in which the administration's initial proposals emerged from Congress in 1965. It is Boyd's contention, however, that the law has not been given a fair chance to work in terms of time. And that, it seems to us, is clearly the fact.

One conclusion is borne out by the whole history of billboard controls: The best chance of success is to impose the controls on a national basis as a condition of dispensing federal aid for highways. If the law is opened to modification in Congress, that is the principle that the billboard lobby will be shooting at. The congressional decision which is in the public interest is not to curtail highway beautification goals at this point, but to extend the authority of the present law for the two years the administration requests.

[From the New York Post, May 5, 1967]

The Billboard Highwaymen

It's that time of year when a lot of New Yorkers begin thinking about vacation trips in the car and being bombarded with appeals to avoid littering the highways and to Keep America Beautiful.

Meanwhile, that band of highwaymen collectively known as the billboard lobby is bombarding Congress with demands to Keep America as Ugly as Possible.

Their hit-and-run attack is directed at the Highway Beautification Act passed two years ago and their strategy is as simple and as selfish as ever: wreck the law. The tactics this time involve crippling amendments.

The act is a modest one. It would keep billboards at least 660 feet away from stretches totaling some 265,000 miles throughout the U.S., which has 3,600,000 miles of roads altogether. It would also require that junkyards within 1,000 feet of roads be decently screened. The deadline for compliance is July 1, 1970.

It doesn't matter whether you're going to the mountains or to the shore this year. The chances are you'll have to cross long stretches of man-made wasteland en route. If you're tired of this, you may be disposed to tell your Senators, your Congressmen, Rep. Kluczynski (D-Ill.), chairman of the House Public Roads subcommittee—and the White House.

[From the Baltimore (Md.) Sun, May 5, 1967]

Beautification

Mention the national Highway Beautification Act and some of the country's most powerful lobby groups—such as the billboard and tourist interests—will set up an immediate clamor for its repeal, or insist on such modifications as to render it almost worthless. Lost in the din is the small voice that wishes to preserve what is left of national beauty. Lots and almost forgotten are the reminders that since the interstate and primary highway systems were built with public money the public interest must come first.

At a series of hearings held by a House Public Works subcommittee, witnesses have held forth at great length about the difficulties of implementing the law which is now almost two years old.

There is much sentiment for modifying the clause which bans billboards from within 660 feet of highway rights-of-way. There is more sentiment for eliminating altogether the penalty clause under which states would lose up to 10 per cent of their highway construction money if they fail to comply with the Federal law. There is, above everything, a widespread confusion among the states as to how various provisions of the act are to be interpreted.

As long as the committee is tinkering with the act there will be anxiety that the aforementioned lobby groups will get all or part of what they want. Indeed, Representative Kluczynski has not left much doubt that he hopes to satisfy some of their demands. There is some encouragement, however, from Representative Fallon, the Public Works chairman. Mr. Fallon isn't as sure as some members of his committee that the act will have to be rewritten. But in any case the sole purpose, he says, will be to eliminate ambiguities—not to modify, confuse or pervert the original goals.

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 30, 1967]

Road Beauty Fight Must Continue

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 must not be allowed to die for lack of funds. Nor should the act's supporters in Congress give way to pressures of the billboard lobby for substantial weakening of its thrust against highway clutter.

Hearings have been held in all 50 states on billboard standards drafted, on order of Congress, by the Bureau of Public Roads. As a result, many of these tentative standards have been eased, but the billboard lobby is still not satisfied.

And it clearly will not be satisfied unless the opponents of clutter give up entirely or restrict their antibillboard efforts to a few thousand miles of specially designated "scenic highways."

The 1965 measure is aimed, quite properly, at removal of billboards on 268,000 miles of federally aided interstate and primary roads outside urban areas. It makes exceptions of signs offering official directions and those advertising on-the-premises business.

President Johnson has proposed expenditure of $200 million a year for the next 10 years for general highway beautification under the 1965 act. Roughly a fourth of this would be used to compensate billboard firms for sign removal. A relatively small portion would aid junkyard proprietors with screening and relocation programs. And most would go for federal planting and other constructive projects for scenic enhancement along highway strips.

The initial appropriation, a modest $90 million, runs out on June 30. And the time is here for Congress to move firmly toward a final realization of the basic goals of the 1965 act.

[From Newsday, Apr. 10, 1967]

America the What?

Any day now, spring blossoms will bloom along Long Island's parkways and thousands of drivers will enjoy the view.

Long Island has beautiful parkways because Robert Moses fought and won a battle with the outdoor advertising industry. Had he lost, Long Island's parkways today might be dreary commercial causeways bordered by billboards instead of spring blossoms. Currently, an even bigger battle is being fought in Washington. At issue is whether scenery or salesmanship will prevail along 267,774 miles of the nation's highway system.

The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 expires June 30. Hearings now being held in the Congress will decide whether the act will be extended, modified or scrapped. It's a good law, and it deserves to survive, but it may not.

As it now stands, the law provides for a long-range program that will enable the nation to preserve what President Johnson caled a "green legacy" for future generations. The Commerce Department estimates that by 1970, 839,000 billboards in rural areas and 50,000 more in commercial and industrial areas will have been removed, if the program is allowed to proceed.

But the President's beautification program, because of its ambitious goals, is not an endeavor that can produce results overnight. It has been slow getting started. It has yet to result in the removal of even one billboard. Critics of the law cite these initial difficulties as evidence that the entire program is unworkable.

The outdoor advertising industry is not missing this opportunity to accomplish what it failed to do in 1965: kill the beautification program. It's formidable lobby is pressing home the argument that the billboard industry is a legitimate business with a right to obstruct our view in the name of business.

But "rights" are in conflict here. The roads were paid for by the people. Who has the right to impair the people's enjoyment of the natural beauty opened to them by their roads? In 1965, the Congress answered this question with the passage of the Highway Beautification Act. It was not as strong a law as the President wanted, but it was the strongest stand the Congress had ever taken in defense of the people's right to enjoy the beauty of the land.

Previously, the Congress had attempted to lure the states into complying with federal standards of billboard control by offering bonuses to cooperative states. This approach was incorporated in the Federal Highway Act of 1958. It was a complete failure.

By the time the law expired in 1965, only $772,323 in bonus payments had been made. These payments involved only 274 miles of road in 10 states. Obviously another approach was needed. The Highway Beautification Act of 1965 provided that new approach. Under its provisions, states that have not reached agreement with the government on billboard control by 1968 will face the loss of 10 per cent of federal highway construction aid. It also provides for federal participation in the reimbursement of billboard owners, the acquisition of scenic strips along highway rights of way and the screening and relocation of unsightly junkyards.

The future of this ambitious and worthwhile program must be decided in the Congress by June 30. Long Island already has a small portion of the "green legacy" this program can provide. Those of us who have watched the seasons change along the parkways know what is involved here. The Congress should resist all efforts to weaken or to kill this farsighted program.

THE OUTLOOK FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there

objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the administration's efforts to assure a continuing prosperity for the Nation are reflected in a number of areas of considerable importance to all of us. None, however, is more encouraging than the outlook for small business, particularly those who utilized Federal Government programs and services available to them.

I refer, Mr. Speaker, particularly to the programs of the Small Business Administration which are especially designed to counsel and assist the country's 4.7 million small concerns.

I would like to call your attention to one of several cases in my congressional district wherein SBA's lending program has provided both major assistance to a deserving and much-needed small business, and was of considerable assistance to the whole community.

The Maine Machine Products Co. located in South Paris, Maine, was established in 1956, by two mechanical engineers, Roland L. Sutton, Jr., and Henry W. Detert. They hired two employees at that time.

By 1959, the promising firm needed capital funds to keep up with mounting orders for machines and components used in electronics, aircraft, and for woodworkers, tanners, and paper manufacturers. Local banks were unable to lend the needed $35,000.

When the small firm approached the Small Business Administration, the agency suggested that both a local bank and SBA participate. This was arranged through SBA's lending program, with each participant taking a 50-percent share of the loan.

Since that time, the company has enjoyed continued progress with sales, profits, and net worth increasing steadily. Employment has increased from 19 to 44, and sales have increased more than tenfold. The annual payroll of the prospering company now exceeds $267,000.

While the Small Business Administration has made more than 600 business loans totaling nearly $30 million in the State of Maine, I believe this particular case emphasizes not only the economic value of such service, but demonstrates the additional, or fringe, benefits which accrue from a Government-business cooperative venture.

If this success story were multiplied by the more than 600 other loan cases, I believe we would have a clear appreciation of SBA's contributions to my State and the Nation.

I cannot stress too strongly my belief that the successes the Small Business Administration has achieved in Maine are not mere happenstances.

President Johnson has many times urged that full measure be taken of the needs of small business. He has urged that we act to make small business one of the biggest growth industries in the country.

More than this, he has stressed the need for cooperation between business and Government to the end that greater security and prosperity are brought to all.

Cooperation is built upon understanding. I note with pleasure that the successes of the Small Business Administration are, in no small measure, the result of President Johnson's solicitude.

NATIONAL CHARTER FOR THE FAIR CAMPAIGN PRACTICES COMMITTEE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to grant a national charter to the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, the only national objective, bipartisan organization working to improve the climate of American political campaigns. A charter recognizing the national scope and stature of the committee will help all of us achieve the goal of clean and effective political contests, for the elected leaders of our State and National Governments are the ones who get the greatest direct benefit from the work of the Fair Campaign Prectices Committee.

For more than 10 years the committee has worked to educate the voters—and the candidates—on the principles of fair campaigning. The committee was organized in the days when smear and innuendo—the casual imputation of disloyalty and routine sneers about personal habits—were standard weapons used by too many candidates. The committee developed the code of fair campaign practices as a set of principles against which a candidate's conduct could be measured and as a basis for education of future voters on the ideals of American politics.

Candidates for most of the important Government offices now sign the pledge to campaign fairly. And they honor the pledge, for candidates have learned that a clean campaign—an all-out political contest with the issues honestly presented and forcefully debated—is most often a successful campaign. The voters are more and more interested in the ethics of political campaigns, due in large part to the educational material the fair campaign practices committee has prepared for high school and college civics classes.

There still is much work to be done to achieve the goal of political campaigns fiercely fought but fairly conducted. A national charter for the fair campaign practices committee will help achieve that goal, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

I request unanimous consent to insert the text of the bill and a brief summary of the accomplishments and history of the fair campaign practices committee entitled "The Conscience of American Politics";

THE CONSCIENCE OF AMERICAN POLITICS

In the early 1950's the climate of political campaigns in the United States was so bad a U.S. Senate Committee warned that dirty politics was "destroying our system of free elections." The filth littering the campaign trail compelled another Senate group to urge the two major political parties to establish standards of fair campaigning.

As a result, the Fair Campaign Practices Committee was set up as the conscience of American politics and immediately went to work to prevent specific smears while developing a broad program to educate the voters and the candidates on the value of clean campaigning. For example:

1956—A doctored newsphoto, showing the Governor of Maine huddled with a CIO official while a major corporation executive was neatly cropped out, backfired when the true facts were reported.

1958—The *San Francisco Chronicle* withdrew its support from a candidate for Governor of California because of smear tactics highlighted by the Fair Campaign Practices Committee. The repudiated candidate lost, as did a candidate for California Attorney General who used smear and smirch tactics.

1960—To separate the ethics of religion from the politics of bigotry, the Committee sponsored a two day private meeting of religious leaders which resulted in widely publicized guidelines for fair discussion of religion in election campaigns.

1962—A smear-by-innuendo campaign to inject irrelevant discussion of a candidate's divorce into the campaign for Governor of New York was uncovered by the Committee and blocked before it got under way.

1964—Democrats withdraw television advertisements which linked the Republican candidate to children threatened by atomic fallout; Republicans withdrew a loaded propaganda film which implied that the Democratic candidate was responsible for the social ills of the cities. Both parties denounced a vicious "psychiatrist poll" questioning the Republican candidate's mental health.

1966—The Committee's work in Alabama gubernatorial primary was commended by the Attorney General for helping create a climate permitting new voters to cast their ballots "freely and comfortably."

These are but a few of the dozens of jobs the Committee takes on each campaign year to improve the climate of political races for President, for Senator, for Governor, and for the 435 seats in the House of Representatives. More important are the Committee's broader educational projects to warn both the candidates and the voters that the surest way to bring about government by scoundrels is to call every man who runs for office a scoundrel. For example the Committee:

Created a code of Fair Campaign Practices, now subscribed to by nearly every candidate for major political office.

Developed school pamphlets and material for social studies textbooks to educate future voters on fair play in politics.

Prepared a political Candidate's Manual on the techniques of fair campaigning and of defense against smear tactics.

Sent out checklists each election year to help voters spot political smears.

Distributed radio and television announcements and newspaper stories warning voters about political smear tactics, particularly during the last days of campaigns.

Conducted the first national conference to seek solutions to the abuses of radio and television in political campaigns.

The creation of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee in 1954 was a direct response to public demand.

Today it is not easy to recall the climate of campaigns in the early 1950's. The press, scholars, religious leaders, the Congress—most segments of American leadership—cried out against the excesses of smear and vilification, the almost casual imputation of disloyalty to national figures, the mire through which candidates for high public office were forced to trudge.

In 1951 two Senate subcommittees—one concerned with elections and one with ethics in government—urged the establishment of a bipartisan body of prominent private citizens to rally moral support for decent election campaigns. Editorials of the era agreed with the *New York Times* in its assessment of the 1950 campaign as a "nightmare of immersion in billingsgate . . . . So complete is the character assassination in some cases that those who reach public office will have lost the confidence of the voters who put them there. The most serious result of all, perhaps, is that if this sort of thing continues, it will become increasingly difficult to get decent men and women to stand for public office because of the unjustified abuse suffered en route . . . ."

The relatively decent Presidential campaign of 1952 partly obscured the frenzied calumnies of the off-year" 1950 elections, but as the Congressional campaign of 1954 approached it became obvious there would be political business as usual—all-out dirty campaigning. A handful of leading citizens acted in response.

Miss Anna Lord Strauss, a recent president of the League of Women Voters of the U.S.; Gardner Cowles, publisher of *Look*, and Palmer Hoyt, editor and publisher of the *Denver Post*, formed a nucleus for a national Fair Campaign Practices Committee. Religious leaders, including Charles P. Taft, the only layman to have been president of the Federal Council of Churches, joined the effort, together with other publishers and civic leaders, and the Committee was established as a non-profit, tax-exempt educational organization in September of 1954. Miss Strauss became its chairman, Owen J. Roberts, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, held the post of honorary chairman until his death.

Its first action was to adopt the Code of Fair Campaign Practices, based on a draft code from the Senate Subcommittee on Privileges and Elections at the time of its 1951 recommendations. The second step was to prevail on the national leaders of the two major parties, Republican Chairman Leonard W. Hall and Democratic Chairman Stephen A. Mitchell, to join Miss Strauss in a Washington press conference to endorse the Code and commend it to their fellow politicians.

The nature of political campaigning has changed as a result of the Code and its acceptance. In succeeding years a Washington press conference at which the two party leaders signed the Code became a starting ceremony for election campaigns, in effect opening the hustings with national attention to the standards of fair play in campaigning.

Charles P. Taft became chairman of the Committee in 1956, and a few years later former Presidents Eisenhower and Truman became honorary members.

Other substantial innovations which have become part of the fiber of American politics include telegraphed warnings of last-minute smear attacks to the nation's newspapers, especially in areas where unusual problems are foreseen. These were begun in 1956. Many papers feature these warnings in front page boxes, others on their editorial pages.

At the close of the 1956 campaign the Committee realized it had no detailed knowledge of where the worst abuses had occurred nor, for that matter, did it know the national picture of unfair campaigning. It undertook a "state-by-state study of smear" which has been repeated every two years. These reports are widely used by newspapers, political organizations, libraries, high schools and colleges.

As the work of the Committee became better known, high school civics teachers asked for more information about campaign techniques and how to tell the good from the bad. These questions led to examination of high school texts dealing with American Government and problems of democracy. The Committee was startled to find that none of the texts in general used at 11th and 12th grade levels dealt with the ethics of political argument, nor did the texts tell how the voter might protect himself against falsehood, innuendo and irrelevancy in campaigns. The texts usually dealt at great length with the mechanics of the campaign—a day in the life of a candidate—but almost never with the substance.

With the assistance of high school teachers, organizations, and professors of education, the Committee began experimenting with teaching aids to fill the gap. By 1960 the program emerged as a major pamphlet, "Fair Play in Politics." Revised and expanded two years later, it now is in use in some 2,000 high schools and school systems throughout the country.

The Committee also secured the interest and cooperation of civics text authors and publishers, and convinced them to incorporate basic elements of the Committee's approach to responsible citizen participation in political campaigns. Thousands of students now address queries to the Committee annually, and some of these carry their interest and concern out of high school into colleges and graduate schools, helping to swell the number of scholars and teachers who concentrate attention on political ethics. The material is also used extensively by civic, political and religious discussion groups.

At about the same time, the Committee began to seek cooperation from political scientists in colleges and universities. Now some 200 faculty members and graduate students in nearly every state are part of the informal but effective network of observers, analysts and researchers for the Committee. Although very few political scientists had any interest in the subject when this program got under way, political campaign ethics and voters' perception of unfair tactics are now a major interest of scores of prominent scholars. The first senior thesis on such a topic appeared in 1959. Today at least a dozen master's theses and doctoral dissertations every year treat some aspect of the subject, and a dozen or more scholars work on special research projects in the Committee's office in the course of a year.

As the prospect of John F. Kennedy's nomination for the Presidency began to grow, the Committee foresaw an outbreak of rabid anti-Catholicism as a part of the campaign. Preparations were begun late in 1957 to bring together leading theologians and social ethics professors from the major religions to consider what questions were fair to put to a Catholic seeking the Presidency. In the spring of 1960 the long-planned conference took place in Washington, with participation from every responsible faith group.

A statement developed from the meetings was circulated to every religious denomination. There was a massive campaign within most of the denominations to isolate political bigotry from bona fide questions. Many informed observers—including Kennedy's press secretary Pierre Salinger and numerous religious leaders—have credited the conference with the major responsibility for cutting many bigots out of the herd in 1960 and placing the "religious question" in perspective.

Bigotry still was expressed by the haters and the hysterics, but the Committee exposed such tactics and publicized genuine Republican efforts to stem appeals to religious prejudice. Thus, the Committee played a major role—quite possibly the dominant one—in keeping the debate rational for most Americans of both parties.

In 1960 the Committee developed a cartoon-illustrated leaflet in response to mounting public requests for a summary of smear tactics in a form that could be identified by the voter. This "Voters Check List" has been reprinted and circulated in the hundreds of thousands and has been widely used in every subsequent campaign.

In the same year, the Committee produced and distributed a series of television spot announcements to alert voters to the tactics of the smear arists. By 1962, it became apparent that concentration of effort on one cogent, hard-hitting spot announcement would yield great impact. With the help of the Advertising Council, new spot announcements were produced in 1963, and material was produced for both radio and television in 1964. The announcements are carried as a public service by broadcasters, and special attention is paid to areas where dirty campaigns are in progress or expected. The programs, like every other element of the Committee's activity, have the enthusiastic endorsement of the national committees of both parties.

In 1956 the Committee had begun a mimeographed "Bulletin" to inform its members and friends of its program. In 1964 the publication was expanded and revised into a printed quarterly, "Fair Comment." In the 1964 campaign newspapers reaching tens of millions of readers reprinted its reviews, by national authorities, of the "dirty books" and other bizarre and unfair elements of the campaign.

From the beginning the Committee had given every candidate for Congress and for statewide office copies of the Code and a list of suggestions on how to use it. In 1964, calling on a decade of full-time observation of what goes wrong with election campaigns, the Committee published the "Candidate's Manual—A Politician's Guide to the Manly Art of Self-Defense." Originally intended to be given only to candidates, along with the Code, the Manual was soon a major topic of conversation in political circles. Requests for copies, singly and in volume, came from national and state party organizations, libraries, schools and interested citizens. The Manual tells inexperienced candidates how to avoid pitfalls that may lead them into unfair campaign tactics and shows the candidates how to defend themselves against smear attacks.

Various agencies of government had called on the Committee for help, including the Community Relations Service in the Department of Justice which praised the Committee's assistance in a 1966 primary. Congressional committees and state legislatures seek testimony on the nature and scope of current campaign abuses and ask recommendations for legislative revision in the areas such as anonymous literature and libel where law can address campaign ethics. The U.S. Department of Justice and the Attorneys General of many states have sought help from the Committee. The Committee has provided evidence leading to conviction of election law violators at both national and state levels and has also provided counsel on law revisions.

Since the Committee first focused national attention on the need for effective and realistic anonymous literature laws, the number of states with such laws has risen sharply to 38.

Political parties, religious and civic groups, governors and other persons and agencies have called on the Committee to set up local and state Fair Campaign Practices Committees. This has been done in many instances, and the efforts have been greeted with gratitude and enthusiasm by press and political and community leaders.

The Committee has conducted conferences on special aspects of campaign problems and has participated in conferences sponsored by other groups, including the organization of panels before the annual meetings of the American Political Science Association and National Municipal League. In 1965, concerned at the prospect of growing abuses of the electronic media in campaigns, the Committee staged a two-day National Conference on Broadcasting and Election Campaigns in Washington. Participating were leading political conservatives, liberals and moderates, broadcasters, the Federal Communications

Commission, the Communications Subcommittees of both Houses of Congress, the Vice President, broadcast network and station executives, and educators.

The Broadcasting Conference was conducted for the same reason that underlay every program on which the Fair Campaign Practices Committee has embarked, beginning with its founding in 1954; there was a clear and pressing necessity that it be done; there was no other existing, responsible and impartial agency which could bring together the divergent talents and interests. In sum, the political system needed it.

In 1954 when the Committee was launched, many newspapers greeted its formation with sardonic editorials. At the first press conference in Washington, Republican Leonard Hall and Democrat Stephen Mitchell began a wrangle over campaign ethics before the ink was dry on their signatures on the Code of Fair Campaign Practices. The dispute brought the real point home: before the existence of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee and its Code, judging the fair and the unfair was a wholly subjective matter. There was no point to face-to-face argument, for there was no basis for common agreement on terms or for comparison.

With the passage of time it became apparent to political leaders and the press, that politics *had* become better for the existence of the Committee. Both Leonard Hall and Stephen Mitchell joined the Board of the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, as did Hall's successor Meade Alcorn and Mitchell's predecessor James Farley. The press today regards the Committee in an utterly different light. Commenting on a financial crisis that was dogging the Committee a few years ago one newspaper chain—among the most skeptical in 1954—ended a ringing editorial urging public support for the Committee with the ardent imperative, "It must not die!" Another major daily, once a scoffer, ran a cartoon across a quarter of its editorial page depicting the Fair Campaign Practices Committee as a responsible group throwing a life line to the Statue of Liberty, up to her waist in a muddy sea of slander.

Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, American leaders from every walk of life, acknowledge that the Committee has done a necessary and difficult job scrupulously and well. It has become the only national, impartial source of information and research about the ethics of political campaigning. It has become the avenue of censure for the political smear artist and the court of appeal for the honest politician. It has become the conscience of American politics.

GUNNAR MYRDAL SPEAKS TO ADA 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, at the 20th annual convention of the Americans for Democratic Action held in Washington in April 1967, we were honored with a visit from the distinguished Swedish economist, Dr. Gunnar Myrdal. Dr. Myrdal's remarks before the convention were too penetrating to not receive broader publication and so, under unanimous consent, I include the address by Gunnar Myrdal in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Dr. Myrdal, since his monumental work on "The American Dilemma," has been renowned as a sort of international citizen—a critic of our society who nevertheless shares our deep commitment to the ideals and traditions of America. He sees a threat to the maintenance of these ideals in the tremendous impact at home and abroad of the war in Vietnam and the awesome role this Nation has assumed as the world's policeman, a role which is influenced by a rigid, fearful, and often neurotic view of nationalist and revolutionary movements.

We must pay particular heed to some dire predictions made by Dr. Myrdal. He asks that we think the unthinkable. He asks that we examine the ever-tightening stricture of population pressure and food production and the ever-widening income gap between rich nations and poor. We must face the ominous meaning of this for the underdeveloped nations and the whole world and be prepared to take the requisite steps to avoid full-scale chaos.

Dr. Myrdal's excellent and provocative remarks follow:

ADDRESS BY GUNNAR MYRDAL, ADA 20TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, SHOREHAM HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

No personal recognition has pleased me more than my election to become an extra regular "American for Democratic Action." I have never been a non-partisan in American public affairs. I have been a New Dealer, a Fair Dealer, a New Frontiersman, and, of course, a private in the Unconditional War Against Poverty and for the ultimate attainment of the Great Society. And I have rather been on the side of the activists—as has the ADA—urging better planning of the reforms and speedier action.

In my own view, this has not interfered with my search for objective truth as an economist and social scientist. This is related to my conviction that research needs the stating of explicit value premises—already when establishing facts and factual relationships and not only when drawing political conclusions. "Things look different, depending upon where you stand."

This is, however, not an appropriate occasion to discuss the methodology of social study. But, on a personal note still, and simply to "define the situation" of my speaking at this banquet, I would like to mention that, in studying American problems and, indeed, problems in other parts of the world as well, my value premises have consistently been what I have called the "American Creed." By this I mean the glorious ideals of liberty, equality and justice, which this country inherited from European Enlightenment and has stubbornly adhered to ever since—in principle.

The ideals are far from realized. There have been periods of grim reaction, and there have at all times been individuals and whole communities trampling on these ideals—and other individuals and communities opportunistically yielding to the social and political forces around them rather than standing up in their defense. Nevertheless, as I read the history of this country, the trend in America has been towards a gradually fuller realization of these ideals. That is also the deeper justification for their use as relevant and significant value premises in social study.

Contrary to many of my academic colleagues, I always stress that ideals are important social facts when they have a hold on people's minds and become rooted in institutions: in America the Constitution and many others. It is a fact that your national heroes on whom spirtual immortality has been bestowed, have almost all been convinced liberals, struggling for these ideals. I do believe that the same will be true in the future.

I have permitted myself these introductory remarks, because this organization—which is not a party, nor part of a party, but a fellowship bent upon influencing the people, the parties, and the government—so definitely and actively stands in this long tradition of upholding and propagating the ideals I referred to as the American Creed. The ADA seeks to disturb complacency among the American people and politicians by persistently spelling out in concrete terms the radical changes of conditions and policies needed to realize these ideals. And it has not been unsuccessful as a long string of reforms, not least in recent years, testify. Some of these reforms are so radical that nobody would have believed them possible only a short time before they were enacted.

Back in Stockholm when I began to think about what I should say tonight, I read the *Program for Americans '66* and did so with increasing enthusiasm. It is clear and unambiguous; it is not evasive but faces squarely the burning problems of America and the world today. I believe I have never felt so much in agreement with any political program I have ever encountered anywhere in the world, including my native country, Sweden. These are the beacons I would follow—almost to the last detail—if I were an American Congressman or otherwise responsible for policy decisions in the United States.

The most sinister threat to all of our ideals, abroad and at home, is the Vietnam war. It has a horrifying impact on millions of people in a distant and very poor country who are starved, burned, maimed and killed, and who see their little property destroyed. And it has corroded the moral climate of this country. It threatens to frustrate all efforts of realizing the American ideals by reforms at home. There is no question that the civil rights battle, the rebuilding of the cities and the bulk of social legislation, have all come to a grinding halt.

This is stated here by a man who for decades has consistently been an optimist in regard to America. I have never, up until now, agreed with those who from time to time have prophesied that "it can happen here."

The Vietnam war is also causing a tightening moral and political isolation of this country in the world at large. It is the common people abroad who have become estranged from America, while some governments, officials and representatives of big-business almost everywhere may have their own good reasons for silently accepting or even for speaking with "understanding" of the policy of the United States government.

You might not be fully aware of this deeply tragic element in the foreign reaction to the United States' military activity in Vietnam and more broadly to the inclination of its present government to want to police the world on its own terms. In earlier times it was the farmers and workers in Europe who had on the whole, the friendliest feelings toward America. In their homes there were photographs of their near relatives who had emigrated, and there was a continuous exchange of letters. It was these people, along with most of the liberals and intellectuals who felt closest to America, while the traditional upper classes often felt cultural distance. It is now, however, the common people and even, more conspicuously the entire youth—who increasingly view the United States as a nation which is careless, insensitive and irresponsible in the exercise of its might and power. This is, as I said, deeply tragic.

I will not touch further on the Vietnam issue on this occasion, in spite of its paramount importance for everything dear to us. I must stress, however, that playing with fire in Southeast Asia becomes the more charged with danger because of several other threatening international developments. I will, as I now move on to characterize these developments, hopefully assume that the Vietnam war will soon end—and end in such a way that its people will be left free to seek their own destiny without any colonial "containment" policy upheld by American military might. I hope for that, and we must begin to think of new perspectives.

Even under this optimistic assumption, our world does not present the picture of a sane, safe and wholesome home for humanity. The nuclear armament race continues unabated. The test ban is still only partial, leaving the atomic powers free to continue with underground tests. There is, as yet, no limitation to their production of still more forceful nuclear weapons and penetrating delivery systems. The nonproliferation issue, about which the newspapers are full, does not even touch these real disarmament problems.

While following the frustrated negotiations in Geneva from a distance, one impression retained is the following: in many countries, and particularly in the United States, those in the government who are sincerely interested in reaching a positive result are looking over their shoulders. They are quite free to express general, moving but noncommital declarations about the horrifying dangers involved in the present armament race and of their eagerness to put a stop to it. But when it comes to agreeing on even a small practical step in that direction, they are acutely aware that at home they meet nationalist suspicion that they are letting down the guards and selling out the security of the country. The powerful military-industrial complex—to use former President Eisenhower's expression—has a vested interest in fostering such suspicions. This is probably also true in the Soviet Union. They also have their generals and suspicious nationalists and their military-industrial complex.

Considering the way people are informed—or rather misinformed—an organized propaganda campaign by a determined nationalist group can foment a wave of popular emotion. Cowardice towards the China lobby played a disastrous role in the United States policy toward China from 1949 onwards, when manipulating more or less dependent governments to block China's taking its place in the United Nations, and of, course, in the initial setting up and use of the Diem regime in South Vietnam as a bastion in the cold war, and the later successive escalations of the United States involvement in that war.

In the nuclear disarmament issue, the understandable anxiety to avoid arousing nationalist complexes back home has, first, severely constricted the room for reasonable negotiations. Secondly, it has given the government and its negotiators an interest in managing its releases, press conferences, and briefings in certain ways. Thus, facts and compromise proposals that do not fit the tactical positions taken by the United States government under the restraints caused by consideration of the volatile home front, tend to be overlooked or blotted out. This is the behavior of your negotiators, and your newspaper people collaborate.

In the final analysis, progress in the field of nuclear disarmament, in so far as it depends on the United States position, must rest on popular education, on people becoming better informed and thereby "propaganda-safe" not least toward your own officials (an expression from pre-war time that has unfortunately fallen out of use). This, in turn, would allow the government to follow a more courageous and rational line. I am aware that ADA plays a role in this field also, and I earnestly hope its educational activities will be intensified.

The widespread preparation for biological and chemical warfare is less on people's minds—except that the use of the Vietnam war by the American military for large scale experimentation with non-conventional weapons has greatly contributed to the moral and political isolation of the United States that I spoke of.

The United States, which has an obvious and generally recognized interest in preventing proliferation of mass-destructive weaponry, should have had all reasons to refrain from these experiments, as they are breaking down inhibitions. These types of non-conventional weapons are cheap and do not require much large scale research. The risk is, indeed, that they might become the poor man's opportunty to commit genocide.

It is, of course, of paramount importance and urgency to reach intergovernmental agreements to outlaw biological and chemical warfare. The United States, as you know, has not even signed the Geneva Agreement of 1925. In this question I also see a field where one would wish the ADA to intensify activity.

There are other trends in the world at large that are pregnant with stupendous dangers. One major set of such trends are the developments among that great majority of mankind who lives in the underdeveloped countries. We are all aware that the income gap between them and us is increasing every year. The 1960's, which on the proposal of the late President Kennedy was named the "development decade," has seen instead a widespread failure to maintain even the slow progress of the 1950's.

The inflow of capital from the rich countries has tended to stagnate and as a percentage of their national output it has decreased by a quarter. At the same time, because more and more of it is tied to exports from the donor countries, the "quality" of aid has fallen. Also the political motives for directing the bilateral aid—which is by far the larger part of all "aid"—to particular countries, and the strings attached, are also apt to decrease its "quality."

At the same time a much smaller share of the capital flow is now in the form of credits instead of grants. Even if there has been a tendency, until recently, to keep interest rates low and amortization periods long, the net result has nevertheless been a rapid increase of the burden of debt-service to be paid out of the poor countries' meager export returns. The president of the World Bank and many others, who are competent to judge, have given us ringing warnings of the dire consequences of a failure to reverse these trends. But as yet there have been no signs of such a change.

Meanwhile, the population explosion in the poor countries is increasingly blighting their hopes for rapid advancement. It has been in actual fact by far the only really important economic and social change in the underdeveloped world.

Belatedly, the United States has in recent years been revising its position to a positive one in regard to the spread of birth control in the underdeveloped countries. And there are signs that both the Catholic Church and the communist countries are doing the same, thus releasing the World Health Organization and the other intergovernmental agencies from the political restraints that up until now have prevented them from assisting poor countries in family planning. More directly important is that we may now stand before a veritable technological breakthrough making new contraceptives available that can make a birth control campaign in underdeveloped countries truly effective.

But still there is need for decisive government action in the underdeveloped countries to embark upon a birth control campaign. There will be need for large cadres of doctors, nurses, and other para-medical personnel, and the rich countries can, at most, be helpful in training additional personnel, but cannot normally substitute for them. The new policy, even when it becomes accepted, raises huge administrative problems which are difficult to solve in countries that are what I call "soft states." It is an illusion to believe that in the underdeveloped world at large progress in spreading birth control among the masses will be a swift one.

As these nations, because of the high fertility level up until now, have very youthful populations—with around 45 per cent under 15 years of age, against around 25 per cent in the developed countries—there is an extraordinary momentum in their population increase. The future parents are already born or will soon be born. By the same token, the labor force will, under all circumstances, continue to grow rapidly until the end of the century. This raises very large problems for economic planning, particularly in agriculture. To this I will return.

These last observations are most definitely not arguments against these countries trying to press down their birth rates as much and as rapidly as possible. Quite the contrary: they make this imperative all the more urgent. But we should guard ourselves from the illusion that it is easy and that impressive results on a world scale will be quickly achieved.

We know that in recent years food production in Latin America, Africa and Asia has tended to lag behind population expansion, thereby aggravating the already widespread undernutrition and malnutrition in almost all underdeveloped countries. There would have been intensified mass hunger in very big countries like India and Pakistan and in many smaller countries, had it not been for the availability of large scale food imports from the United States, granted without foreign exchange compensation under P.L. 480 from the surpluses in this country. These surpluses have now virtually disappeared.

Production restrictions have been eased in the United States. If they are lifted still more, food production can be raised considerably. There are also other countries that could produce more. But even on the optimistic assumption that we shall be able to make more food available—and agree on a formula for sharing the financial burden among the rich countries—food aid can at most bridge over an emergency. The real answer, if disaster is to be averted, is to generate a marked and sustained increase in agricultural productivity in the under developed countries themselves.

This assumes the application of a new agricultural technology. For the most part, it cannot be borrowed from the rich countries with temperate climates. Very much more of programmed, practically directed, specialized, and localized research into food production in areas in the tropical and subtropical zones will be needed. To accomplish this, these countries have neither the financial, nor the personnel resources, but will need large scale assistance from the rich countries.

Moreover, while the dramatic rise in yields in the rich Western countries could happen, while the labor force in agriculture was rapidly decreasing, the new technology in underdeveloped countries must be increasingly labor intensive, to a degree most agricultural experts do not fully appreciate. The present labor force is largely underutilized—what is popularly known as underemployment—and for decades to come it will continue to grow almost as fast as the total population increases at present, that is between 2.5 and 3.5 per cent a year. The practical problem is to raise crop yields by a larger input and a higher efficiency of a labor force that is now underutilized and is rapidly increasing all the time. This new, extremely labor-intensive technology is yet to be developed, mostly by fresh research focused on the specific preconditions in regard to factor proportions and, as I said, on the different climates and soils.

Then comes the practical problem of how to substitute the new techniques for the primitive ones that are responsible for the low yields. This raises a host of problems—education and extension work, marketing, credits, and cooperation—but at the heart of them lies the terms on which the cultivator works the land. These terms, while different in different areas, are generally such that they do not give the toiler either practical possibilities or rational motivation for exerting himself to raise the yield.

This is the problem of land reform. In almost all underdeveloped countries vested interests have prevented effective land reform. The problem is a most complicated one and takes different forms in different countries. My point in this rapid survey over the world problems is merely that radical changes in the relation between man and land are necessary to raise agricultural yields which, in turn, is the only long run answer to world hunger.

The dimension of the problem is so overwhelmingly big, that food aid from America and the rich countries generally cannot do more than buy time for a vigorous and sustained food production drive in the underdeveloped countries. In the long run much can happen. At the end of the century we shall no doubt see entirely new techniques of producing food. It is the next fifteen to twenty years which worry me deeply.

I have been speaking in sweeping generalities. Unfortunately, they do, I believe, convey only too well the somber truth. I fear we are growing accustomed to living on happily and attending to the business of the day without giving much thought to the unthinkables ahead of us.

More specifically, in regard to the development problems of the underdeveloped countries, I feel that we have been living, and are still living, in a fool's paradise. We have formed opinions which are heavily biased in an optimistic direction. The careless application of Western economic theories and models that are not adequate to reality in underdeveloped countries, has contributed to this, by making it possible to disregard levels and modes of living, and attitudes and institutions—that is, the social facts which raise obstacles and inhibitions to development.

The widespread habit of referring to the underdeveloped countries as "developing countries" is, of course, unimportant by itself, but it indicates the direction of the biases in our whole view of these problems. The biases are opportunistic. For if we could disregard the awkward facts just referred to and if we could believe that the underdeveloped world was surely "developing," this would make things a lot easier for us all. As the biases are also apt to encourage and please the governing elites in the underdeveloped countries, we cannot expect them to correct our attitudes. They share them with us.

In time, our scientific approaches will be corrected. Facts kick, as I used to say. As the research work proceeds, we shall in ten or fifteen years' time evolve quite different theories and models. Generally, I believe this development of the scientific orientation will go towards a more institutional approach, discarding the Western models we have used, and laying stress on the factors I mentioned which are now usually disregarded in the economic analysis of underdeveloped countries: modes and levels of living, attitudes, and institutions.

President Johnson's recent message to Congress on the Alliance for Progress with the Latin American countries provides an extreme example of the working of the optimistic biases. The exalted rhetoric of the message is not only empty, but grossly misleading as to facts and factual relationships. The most disquieting trait of the message is, however, that the urgent need for land reform and reform of the structure of taxation, which the late President Kennedy had emphasized when inaugurating the Alliance for Progress, has now been dropped. We can be sure that this will please dominant interests in the Latin American countries as well as certain special interests in the United States.

I referred to the President's message because it highlights a common type of superficiality and bias in our view of the underdeveloped countries. The first condition for wisely directing our policies toward that huge majority of mankind that live in the underdeveloped countries is to have a correct appreciation of their realities.

We must squarely face what is happening to them: (1) the slackening rate of development in most of these countries; (2) the leveling off of the flow of financial resources from the rich to the poor countries; (3) in particular, the speedy rise of the debt service burden they have to meet; (4) the rapid rate of population increase, which, even on the most hopeful assumption regarding the spread of birth control, will continue to rise for some time ahead; (5) the sluggish improvement of agricultural productivity; and, hence, (6) the spectre of a world hunger crisis. These interrelated and speedily moving trends are, as I said, threatening. The dangers the world is facing are not placed as mere possibilities in a distant future, but are immediate and certain, if radical action is not taken by us in the rich countries and by those in the poor countries. The world will not be the same place ten or twenty years hence: either hell will have broken out, or we shall all have learned how to cooperate much more intensively and on a world scale.

Our "aid"—and to simplify matters I will include the whole net-inflow of capital and technical assistance to underdeveloped countries—has so far not been anywhere nearly large enough to make more than a dent in world poverty. In none of the rich countries have we made real sacrifices; in none has the aid been raised to the level of a really important item in our national budgets. Including in this connection the Soviet Union and its European allies, we are probably spending as much on war and war preparation as the total of national incomes in all underdeveloped countries put together (I then exclude China but take account of what the economists call opportunity costs, that is, the loss of income by the men who are drafted, and the national sacrifices inherent in employing so large a part of our scientific and engineering skills in unproductive activity). Most countries, including the United States, take protection—such as tying aid to exports—in order to make aid as cheap as possible, while lowering its value for the recipient countries.

A main reason for our niggardliness has, of course, been the opportunistic biases I have already mentioned. Future events will treat them roughly. The hunger crisis, when it aggravates, will be a real eye-opener to us all.

Another reason is that internal economic policies and external financial cooperation of rich countries themselves have been so weak and deficient as to have landed them all in the preposterous situation of having to nurse their balance of payments and take a restrictive view of all financial outflows, including those to the underdeveloped countries. The preservation of internal and external balance in the economic development of rich countries does not, in my opinion, constitute insoluble technical problems. This is an area where policies are dangerously lagging behind our available knowledge.

The same lack of competence, courage, and will to cooperate which brings rich countries into a position where they feel that they cannot afford larger outflows is also evidenced in their reluctance to provide the poor countries with greater market opportunities for their exports. In all of the rich countries there are special interests exerting pressures to prevent a more generous commercial policy towards the underdeveloped countries. In this connection, I will restrict myself to the observation that the United States has not been among those rich countries who have shown much of a positive interest in meeting the demands of the underdeveloped countries. It has been less liberal than several other rich countries, both in the positions taken in UNCTAD and in its bilateral policies.

From what I have said, it is clear that reforming economic policies at home which are strongly in the interest of the rich countries themselves—attaining and preserving internal and external economic balance and resisting the pressure of special vested interest groups—would also make possible more generous policies towards the underdeveloped countries.

I would also like to stress that it is a world-wide interest that as much as possible of aid resources should be channeled through intergovernmental agencies, in particular those within the United Nations system. At present, multilateral aid forms only a small percentage of total aid. The explanation, of course, is that the big countries, and some small countries too, want to use aid in the political game. I feel sure that an internationalization of aid would greatly improve its effectiveness and also contribute to a more healthy international climate.

I believe that a gradual development in this direction will come naturally, if and when aid takes greater proportions. When the threatening hunger crisis makes it imperative that, to over-bridge an emergency, the rich countries come forward with bigger deliveries, and when much of these must come from the United States—which as a legacy from its agricultural policy since the 1930's has the possibility to increase its production very substantially by enlarging the sown areas—it is only natural that this country will feel that it should not pay for all of it. But other countries are not willing to pay to the U.S. Treasury for an American operation. They will demand that this aid be internationalized as a condition for their participation.

But much more important than anything the rich countries *can* do by way of aid and trade is what the underdeveloped countries *must* do themselves in order to make development possible. These countries need radical internal changes.

They need an effectively administered birth control campaign that reaches the poverty stricken masses. They need many more and much better schools, breaking the class monopoly over education and imparting skills and attitudes that are conducive to development and not, as often now, inimical to it. They need a vigorous movement for adult education of which in most poor countries there has been astonishingly little.

As I have already mentioned, most of them need land reform urgently. Generally, they need to tear down an entrenched social stratification that is preserving privileges for the few and withholding opportunities for the masses. They need to stamp out corruption which in most underdeveloped countries has been on the increase. They are all "soft states" and need very much more of internal discipline.

In many of these countries, for example India, it has for decades been almost a commonplace that a social and economic revolution is a necessary prelude to development. But of such revolution we have seen very little. To press for it and carry it out is a task for these people themselves.

But we can, at least, abstain from supporting reaction. Too often in a post-war era we have fallen into the tradition of colonial regimes of allying ourselves with the privileged classes, intent upon preserving social *status quo*. We have even pampered reactionary regimes using military assistance and bribes. And this—together with the careless use of poor countries as pawns in the Great Power rivalry—is what gives credibility to the accusation that what we are offering the poor countries is but a new form of colonialism and imperialism.

In the re-orientation of the rich countries' policies toward the underdeveloped world, the United States should play its role, and it must be a considerably altered role. I believe, however, that it would be healthy if we stopped talking so much about American world leadership. Real leadership will come to the United States to the extent it does the right things, shows restraint in its use of power and wins the confidence of common people in the world.

It is no news that the United States has overkill capacity to exterminate mankind. It can certainly put fear into the whole world. But this is the opposite of world leadership. In fact, the U.S. government has managed to approach a low point of world confidence and true world leadership. America has abandoned *isolationism* but it has gone to the opposite extreme. Intent on policing the world on its own terms, it has instead invoked *isolation*.

A quarter of a century ago, when I brooded over things to come, I saw the danger of the United States falling for the illusion that financial and military might can substitute for the moral power of winning the sincere approval of all decent people in the world, not the opportunistic acquiescence of some dependent governments and business interests.

A most unfortunate casualty of the adventurous foreign policy of the United States government is, as I said earlier, that the reforms of its own society are being stifled. Wars breed reaction in many ways, monopolize the interest of public opinion, distort the economy, and breed a feeling that the margins for costly internal reforms have been narrowed.

In a queer and not altogether logical way the climate of warfare at the same time stimulates exaggerated ideas about the richness of the country. At this point it is my duty to put in a reminder that the American mansion is a heavily mortgaged piece of real estate. It has to invest trillions of dollars within the near future to rebuild completely its cities and, equally important, to rehabilitate the human content of the slums. As we all must be aware, this is an urgent necessity. The situation is continually deteriorating. Not to embark upon these huge investments soon, entails dangers for the cohesion of the American society and the stability of democracy.

Plans have to be worked out. They will need to embrace fundamental changes not only in housing policy but in transport and the division of the country in fiscal and administrative units. The Social Security legislation has to be remade so as to progressively integrate the under-employed, low productivity groups now in the slums. The structure of taxation that is now regressive up to a rather high level has to be reformed. And within the framework of all these reforms, new clean healthy modern cities will have to rise, where people can live and be happy and productive. They will have ample parks and recreation grounds, good public schools and hospitals.

And to enjoy this new life the inhabitants will have to be themselves educated out of their present slum-mindedness. Under any conditions this will take at least a generation to accomplish.

I am convinced that in the end these investments will be productive. The slums and the tolerance of a less well organized society is a drag even on American economic progress. But the investments are long-term ones and will for a time require the utmost economy of effort and entail sacrifices for the majority of Americans who are now in comfortable circumstances. The programs undertaken as part of the Unconditional War Against Poverty are pointing in the right direction and may have their greatest importance by preparing the American people for the much bigger, better planned and better organized and administered investments in its future.

As I said, I am and I have always been an optimist about America. When the Vietnam war is ended—as I have optimistically assumed it will—the American people will have drawn certain lessons for the future course of United States foreign policy, I hope. And in regard to internal policies this proud nation that is so intensely and indeed exaggeratingly aware of its wealth, will not for long be satisfied to remain the one country among the rich nations that has the most horrible slums, the dirtiest subways, the highest rate of unemployment, and of functional illiteracy, crime, and a sociality, and does least for the children of the poor, who are so many.

I would only add that changing these unfortunate conditions will give America a new image in the world. It will greatly increase its possibility to exert true leadership in a world which is sick and tired of force and violence but receptive to advice coming from a nation sincerely devoted to improve itself.

The history of American civilization has a strong legacy of puritan religiosity. Though undoubtedly it has contributed to the unfortunate self-righteousness which alienates America from enlightened opinion abroad, a more important effect is to make America more prepared than any other nation I know for conversion—for fundamental changes of approach and attitude. It is this dynamic capacity I rely upon when in spite of all I have to say, I look forward to an America that at home and abroad stands for what is really good for herself and for the world.

WHY NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION?

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Ryan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, during the past month hearings concerning the Apollo fire have been held in the House and Senate. Many questions raised during these hearings remain unanswered.

In view of the incredible mismanagement on the part of North American Aviation and the fact, as Mr. Webb stated, that costs were out of control, all of which were detailed in the Phillips report which NASA refused to release, the basis for the selection of North American Aviation as the prime contractor is in issue.

There should be a full investigation into the circumstances under which North American Aviation was awarded the contract, especially since that company was not the first choice of the Source Evaluation Board.

Today's New York Times calls for a full investigation concerning the selection of North American Aviation.

Almost a month ago, on April 19, Clark Mollenhoff, the able Washington reporter for the Des Moines Register, published an article in the Register which questioned the selection of North American and brought out some very unusual facts. His article should be read carefully. The more one looks into the selection of North American Aviation, the more obvious is the need for an investigation to see if the evidence of so much smoke means that there is fire.

I include at this point in the Record today's New York Times editorial and Clark Mollenhoff's article from the Des Moines Register:

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1967]

NASA CANDOR NEEDED

James E. Webb, head of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, was asked on April 17 by a member of the Senate Space Committee whether North American Aviation was the first choice of NASA's Source Evaluation Board—a group of almost 200 technical experts—as the winner of the 1961 competition for building the Apollo capsule. Mr. Webb replied "yes."

A few days ago, Senator Margaret Chase Smith asked Mr. Webb whether the Martin Company had not been the board's first choice. This time Mr. Webb agreed that the Senator was correct and revealed for the first time that he and a few of his colleagues had overruled the technical experts and picked North American for the rich Apollo contract.

The contradiction between Mr. Webb's testimony on the two occasions would be bad enough in isolation. But against the record of these months of investigation into the Apollo tragedy it strongly supports the belief that neither Congress nor the American people have been treated with full candor in NASA's reporting of what is going on in the space program. It may be recalled that the famous Phillips report became public property only as result of a leak to Congressman William F. Ryan.

Now that the public finally knows that North American was picked for the Apollo project by a few high officials—and not by a large group of technical experts as originally imagined—the question of why it was picked becomes even more intriguing than before. The cynics, of course, have always believed that the award went to North American as the result of a battle among influence peddlers, including Bobby Baker, former Secretary to the Senate Democrats. The cynics may be wrong, but the public cannot know without a full investigation. Congress has the obligation to force out all the facts.

[From the Des Moines Register, Apr. 19, 1967]

WEBB: MAN ON A HOT SEAT IN APOLLO PROBE—THE MOON PROJECT'S TARNISHED IMAGE

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

Washington, D.C.—The lofty goal was the Moon, but the Apollo space program has been tarnished by Robert G. (Bobby) Baker's wheeling and dealing, and now it is marred deeply by carelessness and the tragic death of three astronauts.

The man on the spot is James Edwin Webb, administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), as two committees of Congress burrow deeper into the conditions existing at the time a fire killed three astronauts last Jan. 27.

Webb, irritable and defensive under heavy criticism, has snapped: "We will take our part of the blame for what we have done or left undone."

MAN ON THE MOON

However, he has tended to defend North American Aviation and has declared that it is more important "to get on with the job" of putting a man on the Moon than it is to go back and pinpoint responsibility for all negligence.

It has been estimated by Dr. Robert W. Seamans, deputy director of NASA, that the fatal fire in the Apollo at Cape Kennedy has set back the space program by at least a year. He said there is only a slight chance of putting an American on the Moon by 1970.

A special Apollo review board already has issued a report highly critical of NASA's administration of the Apollo program, and accusing North American of carelessness in production of the spacecraft involved in the fatalities.

However, the House and Senate Space Committees are not satisfied with the Apollo review board's report, and a number of members are pressing for access to all reports on the production and testing of the Apollo.

Some members of the House Space Committee, led by Representative Don Rumsfeld (Rep., Ill.), have been critical of the fact that Webb named the Apollo review board. While that board has been critical of NASA and North American, there has been objection to the fact that the report did not make more of an effort to pinpoint the responsibility for carelessness within NASA and in North American.

Rumsfeld and other House committee members have argued that the head of NASA should not be the man to name a committee that will investigate the administration of NASA.

Also, most of the members of the Apollo review board are employes of NASA, and various committee members have declared that subordinates are not likely to be frank in their criticism of superiors in an agency.

This criticism has not been intended to judge the Apollo review board report as in error or "too soft" on Webb and NASA. The judgment on that will be made after Congress and the General Accounting Office (GAO) have completed the investigations that are now under way.

Comptroller General Elmer Staats said late last week that the GAO is now involved in a review of the entire Apollo program. However, a report on that investigation "is months away," Staats said, because it was not started until a few weeks ago.

It was learned that unknown to Staats, his agency had killed another investigation of the Apollo program only a few weeks ago.

Richard Madison, director of GAO's Atlanta, Ga., office, had been engaged in an extensive investigation of the Apollo project. The investigation was called:

"Review of negotiations and administration of contract for check-out on the reliability and integration support of the Apollo program."

Although the Atlanta office was pursuing this investigation avidly under Madison's direction, it was killed a few weeks ago by Clerio Pin, who recently was made associate director of GAO in charge of investigations of NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the new Department of Transportation.

FIVE CONTRACTORS

It is reported that this investigation went back to the summer and fall of 1961 when five contractors submitted plans for the Apollo project in a heated competition for the multi-billion-dollar contract.

Webb awarded the contract to North American Aviation on Nov. 28, 1961, after a study of the proposals of the five contractors by a team composed of 200 engineers and scientists.

For more than three years, Senator John J. Williams (Rep., Del.) and Representative H. R. Gross (Rep., Ia.), have been seeking an investigation of the award of the Apollo contract to North American.

The desire for this sweeping investigation of the Apollo contract arose out of the Senate Rules Committee investigation of the "gross improprieties" of Baker, the former secretary to the Democratic majority of the Senate.

It had been reported that North American had agreed to give Baker the $2,500,000-a-year food vending business at North American plants in the same month that Webb, a former administrative assistant to Senator Robert S. Kerr of Oklahoma, made the award.

Also, there were reports that North American had agreed to an extensive building and expansion program in Oklahoma along the Arkansas River project. Kerr was then the chairman of the Senate Aeronautics and Space Committee, and also was chairman of the House Public Works Committee that was pushing the Arkansas River development.

Senator Williams and Representative Gross were unable to persuade the Senate Rules Committee it should investigate the award of the Apollo contract during the Bobby Baker hearings. The Democratic majority opposed Republican suggestions for witnesses on the Apollo project, and declined to include critical reports on the Apollo project in the Rules Committee report.

Despite criticism from Williams and Gross, North American Aviation continued its contract with Baker's Serv-U Vending for two years after the "gross improprieties" of Baker had been exposed.

The Republican members of the Senate Rules Committee had commented critically: "Until such time as defense contractors such as North American and Northrop (Aviation) decide they no longer want to do business with Baker, his financial empire may continue."

The report also said:

"The backbone of Baker's financial empire was, and still is, the Serv-U Vending. It was through the vending business that Baker was able to acquire monthly cash kickbacks as well as inaugurate a highly profitable vending operation with defense contractors whose almost sole source of income was from the United States government.

"It was in these vending operations that Baker became associated with questionable individuals who ranged from gamblers to those convicted of income tax evasion. Likewise, when Baker's Carousel [Motel] was in the midst of financial difficulties, it was his vending business that had the wherewithal to bail out the Ocean City property."

NEW ENTERPRISE

North American broke off its relations with another vending firm to switch its business to Baker's new enterprise, and there is no doubt that any great wealth Baker acquired was tied to this decision.

It also turned out that North American did engage in a broad new plant expansion program in Oklahoma in the months immediately after it received the Apollo contract. The North American expansion in Oklahoma was not only beneficial to Oklahoma generally, but it was of some value to Senator Kerr and his family and associates.

After Kerr's death on Jan. 1, 1963, it was disclosed that Kerr, his family, and Dean A. McGee, one of Kerr's business partners, had purchased more than 1,100 acres of land at a key point on the Arkansas River navigation project. The land is now the proposed site of the port of Catoosa, which is the terminus of the navigation project.

The land was held for Kerr in the name of an Oklahoma City lawyer, and was disclosed for the first time when the Kerr assets were filed in Probate Court in Oklahoma City in March, 1963.

Prior to that time, there was no knowledge that Kerr, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, had any personal financial interest in the Arkansas River project.

Webb, a former assistant to the president of Kerr-McGee Industries, has continued to be a leading stockholder in the Fidelity National Bank and Trust Co. of Oklahoma City, a bank in which the Kerr family and McGee have been major figures.

Gross has asked that Representative Richard Roudebush (Rep., Ind.) and other Republicans on the House Space Committee press for a full investigation of all the circumstances surrounding the award of the contract to North American.

In a letter to Republican members of that committee, Gross has declared that certain recordings of the conversations of Fred B. Black, jr., former Washington lobbyist for North American, indicate that political favoritism may have been involved in Webb's administration of NASA.

The record of the fraud and income tax evasion trial of Baker shows that on Feb. 11, 1963, only a little over a month after Kerr died, Black had a conversation with Dean McGee indicating Webb's activity at NASA benefited North American, Oklahoma and Kerr.

Black's end of the telephone conversation indicated that Webb had delivered for "the old man" (Senator Kerr), in months past, but that since Kerr's death Black, as a Washington representative for North American, had been able to obtain only about one-third of the projects requested for Oklahoma.

BUILDING TRADE STUDENTS BUILD A HOUSE

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, recently I had an opportunity to spend a few hours with the officials of the Vocational-Technical School of Eastern Northampton County, Pa., and to discuss with them the impact of Federal vocational-technical assistance on local programs.

On this occasion I met with William C. Pfeffer, Jr., president of the vocational-technical school board; Mrs. Geraldine Felver, vice president of the vocational-technical school board; Herbert Cobley, chairman of the vocational-technical school superintendents council and superintendent of the Nazareth Area School District; Charles Fuller, industrial advisory committee representative; Lyon Borden, Easton Area Chamber of Commerce; and Robert A. Nagle, director of the vocational-technical school.

It was my privilege, at this time, to inspect a house construction project undertaken by the building trade students of the vocational-technical school during the current school year. This project provides actual work experience for youths preparing to enter the building trades. Its basic objective is to bridge the gap between theory and practice.

Student construction of this house began last fall. When it is completed, it will be placed on the market and sold to the highest bidder. Students from five individual school districts which make up the attendance area of the vocational-technical school are at work on this project. The participating school districts are Bangor, Easton, Nazareth, Pen Argyl, and Wilson Borough, all in Northampton County.

All phases of the construction are being completed by the students of the vocational-technical school except excavation and plumbing. The working blueprints are developed by the drafting department. The masonry and concrete work is accomplished by the trowel trades department. The carpentry and cabinetmaking department is performing basic construction work with Mr. Harold Rood, carpentry instructor serving as general contractor to coordinate all departments on the job. The electrical department is installing all electrical facilities. The maintenance training department will follow through with the painting and finishing of the home. The vocational agriculture department will landscape the home and the distributive education department will be in charge of furnishing the home in cooperation with local retailers for the purpose of a public open house. The school printing department is preparing brochures describing the home building program.

The total involvement of every possible department of this vocational-technical school in this construction project is resulting in the effective preparation of young citizens to join the ranks of America's skilled craftsmen. I was greatly impressed by the fine workmanship I observed during my inspection of this house.

Since the allocation of Federal funds in 1963, the vocational-technical school has grown from a nine-shop department of the Easton Area High School to a 15-shop operation serving the previously mentioned school districts with 600 day and night students. The effort to provide this type of education has been stimulated by Federal aid.

The vocational-technical school operating committee now is formulating a new building program which will provide 24 different shop offerings in one building located in northern Forks Township. This growing program stands as testimony to the value of continued Federal assistance for vocational-technical training.

FLAG ESSAY WINNERS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend I had the pleasure to present a flag which had flown over our Nation's Capitol to the Fountain Hill Democratic Association on the occasion of this active organization's 35th anniversary.

This presentation had a very special significance, since it was my privilege to present the flag to two Fountain Hill elementary school students whose recent essays on the American flag were judged the best entries in a contest conducted by Fountain Hill Democratic Association.

Winning writers of these essays are Patricia Wagner, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Francis Wagner, of 646 Roosevelt Avenue, Bethlehem, a fifth-grade pupil at St. Ursula's School, and Robert Santo, son of Mr. and Mrs. Joseph Santo, 532 Frederick Street, Bethlehem, a third-grade pupil at St. Ursula's School.

The spirit of young America's patriotism reflected in these essays is heartwarming. All too often, we fail to recognize the high regard which the great majority of our youth have for our great Nation, our democratic form of government, and our flag. Infrequent acts of desecration of our flag demand greater newspaper space because they are extraordinary. But the publicity afforded such incidents tends to feed those who hunger for the downfall of our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, as long as we can continue to instill in young Americans the sense of patriotism evident in these essays, our Nation need not fear. I respectfully request that these essays be printed in the Record in order that my colleagues can share their inspiring message.

Our Flag

(By Patricia Wagner)

To me the flag is a symbol of the freedom and courage of many great men. It reminds me of the bravery and determination of the early settlers who started this great nation. When I look up at the flag, I see the thirteen stripes and I remember how the thirteen original colonies fought hard for their independence and won it in the Revolutionary War. I also notice the fifty stars, brightly representing our fifty states.

I like to think often of how millions of people fought courageously under our flag for freedom and justice. Today, as in the beginning of our great nation, men are dying for the freedom of the United States of America. The flag shall always wave over them as a sign of the country which was founded for the purpose of freedom for all men.

Our Flag

(By Robert Santo)

Our flag is made up of fifty stars and thirteen stripes. When I look at the flag I salute it and think of the thirteen colonies that fought for our freedom. The fifty stars remind me that there are now fifty states where we can practice that freedom and justice. We are really a lucky country to be able to worship as we please. May I always feel proud to see the red, white and blue or the stars and stripes as our flag is known, waving in the sky.

ABILITY COUNTS ESSAY CONTEST OF THE AFL-CIO

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ashley] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, one of the less publicized but most noteworthy features of the annual conference of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, deserves our special attention. I refer to the part played by the AFL-CIO and some of its affiliated centers and unions in this most important project.

For some years now, Mr. Speaker, the AFL-CIO State central federations have been bringing to Washington the high school student winners of the "Ability Counts" essay contests held in each of the 50 States, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia. After these young people arrive, the AFL-CIO Building and Construction Trades Department gives a luncheon for the essay contest winners, during which members of the Musicians Union of the District of Columbia donate their services for a concert. Guests at this year's luncheon, for example, included Harold Russell, President of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and the man chosen by the Committee as the Handicapped Man of the Year.

Art Edgerton, a 38-year-old blind Negro from Toledo, Ohio, was chosen for the honor this year. Mr. Edgerton is himself a musician and a longtime member of the Musicians Union. He directs the musical programs and does daily news programs for WTOL Radio & Television in Toledo. He was presented with a mahogany and silver plaque, made by students of the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled in New York City.

On the day following the luncheon, the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, takes the essay contest winners on a bus tour of places of interest in and near the city, such as Mount Vernon, the Curtis Lee Mansion, the Tomb of the Unknowns, and the Kennedy Grave. After that, the young men and women are guests of the AFL-CIO Building Trades Department for a tour of the Capitol, during which many of the essay contest winners visit their Representatives and Senators.

William F. Schnitzler, secretary-treasurer of the AFL-CIO made the address at the luncheon. Since it was an especially appropriate talk, Mr. Speaker, I include it in the Record, as follows:

Address by Mr. Schnitzler

I am honored by the opportunity to come here today and greet this select audience of essay winners from all over America.

You have demonstrated your ability as essayists in encouraging the employment of the handicapped. I would not attempt to compete with you on the subject. I wish only to affirm the fact that the AFL-CIO and all of organized labor fully supports the hiring of the handicapped as a proper use of this most valuable resource, particularly when nearly 40 million of us have some degree of handicap.

It is our hope that through activities and organizations such as the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, greater use will be made of the vast store of abilities and talents and skills that are available among our handicapped Americans.

It is therefore disturbing to report that all Americans do not believe as you and I—that is, by extending the hand of opportunity to a fellow American we will benefit him and all of society as well.

There are, unfortunately, among us those who take a less than sympathetic view of their fellow man.

There are those who feel no interest, no obligation nor responsibility toward their fellow man, whether or not he is physically handicapped or suffering social handicaps of color, sex or age.

In fact, there are some in America who make a virtue out of rejection. They reject their fellow men, our institutions, our society and our culture. They are the cult of utter selfishness. They believe that theirs is a simple ethic: that is, if every man takes care of himself, the world will take care of itself. It all sounds so puritan and righteous, but it is actually the unbridled lawlessness of the barbarian.

Let me be specific. There are, for example, disciples of the philosophy put forth by Ayn Rand—a sort of rugged individualism which seeks a return to the uncomplicated past. Their creed is: "I will never live for the sake of another man nor ask another man to live for mine." That philosophy might have worked for the man who cleared his own land, planted his own crops and lived in the log cabin he built himself. But it can hardly be taken seriously in a society where an electric blowout in Niagara Falls can paralyze the lives of 40 million of us.

Then there is another type, personified in the television hate sessions conducted by Joe Pyne and other similar creatures. These public TV displays encourage and enflame the audience to tear asunder anyone who does not fit their tight mold of conformity. This show actually merchandises the raw, base emotions of a sick audience turned loose on the carcasses of anyone foolish enough to appear as a guest on these programs. After a few minutes of these exercises I would hesitate to ask their support of any program—particularly mental health.

There is another type among us who turns away, to avoid becoming involved, sometimes in mass numbers. We have all heard of the instance when 40 good citizens admitted they watched but did nothing while a girl was murdered on a city street.

And finally there is the cynic whose Cadillac bears the bumper sticker: "I fight poverty—I work." Don't expect any sympathy or support from him. He is oblivious to the fact that there are 17 million Americans who also work full time but make less than a poverty wage.

There are others, too, whose fears, mistrusts, rejections and hatreds have driven them to the many right-wing groups that offer simple solutions to complex problems. These individuals have closed their minds and hearts to their fellow American. They have convinced themselves they are traveling alone in a jungle, fraught with beasts of prey, and their only salvation is to move swiftly, looking neither to the right nor the left. This individual does not stop, he does not hesitate; he offers no help, he asks none.

He is a sad specimen and one to be pitied. Unfortunately, he believes that his affliction is a virtue. He believes that he is returning to the simple values of our forefathers—when he is actually attempting to hide, to escape, to evade the responsibilities each of us has in this complex society and world we live in.

The American labor movement rejects in total these conceptions and attitudes. We reject them because they are selfish and wrong and because they were never the concepts on which this nation was built nor the foundation on which we now stand.

In the AFL–CIO we accept our obligation to one another and jointly we seek to achieve our goals, whether they be collective bargaining aims at the negotiating table or by legislative action in the Congress. We seek by the union of workers to bring about the greatest good for the greatest number.

Please do not misunderstand. Ours is not a collective selfishness of union members to obtain what they can for themselves, excluding all others. Instead, we seek the advancement of the entire nation. And organized labor will never seek advantages for a particular group that which would be at the expense of the rest of the nation.

Let me give you an example:

Last year we achieved one of our greatest victories. It will bring tremendous benefit to millions of Americans. This victory took us seven years to achieve and cost tens of thousands of man-hours of effort, yet from it we will not sign a single dues payer nor receive a single dollar in dues. That victory was Medicare.

Medicare was a victory for labor—and for all Americans, particularly those suffering the handicap of age, which cuts sharply one's income and one's ability to meet the medical and hospital need of advancing age. We supported and fought for Medicare because it was right and it was for the betterment of all Americans. We are now carrying on this same battle today in behalf of Social Security, which we feel must be increased by 20 percent across the board for the benefit of the retired, the disabled, the widow and the orphan who depend on this program for their very existence.

We have waged the same strong fight to achieve elementary and secondary education legislation; civil rights; the war against poverty; parks and recreation areas and other legislation which all of us as taxpayers will contribute toward achieving. And we feel that these programs must be continued and expanded upon for total success.

And so, we believe that helping the physically handicapped and the disabled to help themselves is no different from helping the poverty-stricken, the under-educated, the elderly, and minority groups overcome their social and economic handicaps.

We pity the frightened few among us who reject their fellow men. We embrace our fellow Americans, of whom few are free of handicaps and none can stand alone. You have recognized this fact and in a most eloquent manner. Your essays, I believe, truly represent the spirit and the faith of America. My congratulations to you all.

PRESIDENTIAL POPULARITY AND DR. GALLUP

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Bretenia Bowker and I began the first grade of school together. She was always intelligent and always delightful. To my great pleasure, she visited me in Washington and she told me about a brush-up course she had taken in the University of Missouri at Kansas City in historiography and methods under Dr. Stanley B. Parsons, Jr. In that class, she did a most interesting piece of research on the Gallup poll. For the benefit of all Presidents and all prospective candidates, I recommend Bretenia Bowker's paper.

PRESIDENTIAL POPULARITY AND DR. GALLUP

(By Bretenia Bowker)

Did President Lyndon Johnson brood last October when a Gallup poll asserted that only 44% of American adults approved of the job that he, as President, was doing? Or did he say, "Elections are coming up. The poll reflects the press, not the public—and all the press isn't owned by Democrats. Watch for the pattern. My rating goes up in December."

He may have said something very like this if he has studied the published work of Dr. George Horace Gallup who, in October, 1935, began to sell the work of his American Institute for Public Opinion.[1]

This organization, with the help of American newspapers, has made itself a factor in the lives of each of the five men who have, since 1933, occupied that singular office, the presidency of the United States. From George Washington to Lyndon Johnson, all members of this elect group of thirty-six men have been subjected to whatever quantity and quality of publicity a free press in a democratic society could, with safety to itself, promulgate. But mid-twentieth century Presidents—Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S. Truman, Dwight D. Eisenhower, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson have been victims of a peculiar publicity treatment—a device labelled by its perpetrators, *The Presidential Popularity Poll.*[2]

Questions close in, like spectators at a traffic accident, around polls of such a subject. Why are they taken? Why published? How can anyone measure a thing so intangible as popularity? How can the accuracy be tested? Do the polls ever seem partisan? And do they, as the hypothetical comment attributed above to President Johnson suggests, show a pattern relating to the rhythms of the United States political system with its motif accents of national party conventions and national elections?

A brief study like this can only examine these questions. Perhaps, suggest a few answers. It can, also, try to chart the main lines of presidential popularity records, according to the gospel of Gallup. And it can indulge in a little speculation.

First, the "why" questions. Why are the polls conducted and published? At least one answer is rather plain. Dr. Gallup conducts polls because he can sell the results to newspapers, and newspaper editors and publishers buy and print the poll results because readers are interested in them.

Also, a syndicated essay feature like Dr. Gallup's is a handy thing for a space-bound editor to have. If the release, as it comes into the newspaper office suits the editor, he can print it exactly as offered, including its bold, pre-fabricated headline. If he chooses, he can modify the effect of the piece by changing the headline, deleting parts of the narrative, or dropping some of the statistics. Or he can, of course, toss the whole thing into the waste basket.

Thus it has been, and is, vital to Dr. Gallup that he keep his releases so appealing to editors that the poll results get published. He must be constantly aware of his market, and here an unavoidable partisan factor lifts its all-too-human head.

In 1948, for instance, it was important for Dr. Gallup to know that 79% of United States dailies would support the presidential candidacy of Thomas E. Dewey.[3] Dr. Gallup can discover the political preference of newspaper owners by checking the register of members of the American Newspaper Publishers Association at their annual meeting each April in New York City. Here each publisher records his paper's editorial policy as "Republican" or "Democratic" even though the publisher considers the news columns of his paper "independent" and so lists his organ in N. W. Ayers Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals.[4]

---

[1] Hereafter, for convenience, this report will refer to Dr. Gallup's organization as "the Institute" or "AIPU."

[2] This report, without enthusiasm, indeed, with reluctance and purely to expedite discussion, accepts "presidential popularity" as a working term and will, henceforth, use it with invisible quotation marks.

[3] Morris L. Ernst and David Loth, *The People Know Best*, (Washington, D.C., 1949) pp. 17, 48, 49.

In short, the merchandising aspects of Dr. Gallup's work are similar to—but perhaps more sophisticated than—the peddling of such syndicated items as *Household Hints, David Lawrence, Teen Age Mail, Peanuts* and *Pogo*.[5]

Before leaving this matter of the relationship between buyer and seller (e.g. AIPU and newspaper editors) two other facets of the Institute's consideration for its market deserve mention. When a poll is taken whose results seem unsatisfactory to Dr. Gallup, he says, the sub-standard results are filed and not released to the Institute's customers.[6] Also, the staff of the Institute, in choosing questions for polls, "relies to a great extent upon suggestions made by editors of the newspapers which publish the results of the polls."[7]

This rapport with the marketplace has surely been a factor in making the Institute a profitable enterprise—which should answer the "why" of presidential poll taking.

Next, the "how" questions. How can anyone measure an intangible like popularity? Well, AIPU, in its attempts to do so, uses several approaches. The most direct tactic is to ask a specified number of people (sometimes a few hundred, sometimes a few thousand, who, the Institute claims, represent the total electorate),[8] "Do you approve or disapprove of the job the President is doing?" Dr. Gallup tabulates the answers, "Yes," "No," and "Don't know."[9]

The Institute, on occasion, uses a less direct question, which is, indeed, a different question since it brings into play a partisan note, "If the election were being held today would you vote for the President?"

Still another question that AIPU uses is,

"If the election were being held today, would you vote for President X or Challenger Y?" This "choice" query would, obviously modify many responses.[10] Other modifications seem likely to occur when the presidential popularity question is only one of 35 or 40 asked of a listener. With this technique, the approval-or-disapproval question could be associated with a set of inquiries emphasizing only those presidential actions which have elicited unfavorable newspaper comment. Or the opposite could be so. In any case, this 35 to 40 question method is usually the one the Institute uses when conducting its presidential popularity polls.[11]

How, then, can results so obtained be tested for accuracy? The simplest answer is, "They can't," except on those quadrennial occasions when a referendum may, after a fashion, test a president's popularity. (Perhaps, indirectly, his popularity is measured also in congressional elections.) The effectiveness of such polls—except as journalistic gossip items—lies in the credibility of the poll taker.

Before examining AIPU's accuracy chart it seems wise to look, briefly, at records the Institute has logged for the popularity of Presidents Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy. (Because the Johnson record is incomplete, it awaits later study.)

Conspicuously, Dr. Gallup does not poll presidential popularity with calendric regularity. At least, he does not release results on a regular time schedule. It is not possible, for instance, to note where each respective president stood in the fourth month of his term, or the eleventh, or the thirty-first. Gaps are large on the charts in some seasons and the entire record for the war years of President Roosevelt is so muzzy that this study will bypass that period except in discussing poll accuracy.

Dr. Gallup chooses to relate rises and dips in presidential popularity to contemporary headlines. Of course, in doing this, he occasionally touches on the milestone events, whose correlation with poll results is the interest of this study—national party conventions and elections. Here is Dr. Gallup's analysis of the first six Roosevelt years.[12] Throughout 1933, the new President was "enormously popular." The first drop in his "prestige" did not occur until 1934 during, Dr. Gallup says, the controversy over the airmail contracts. In 1935, Dr. Gallup recorded a nine month slide downward in FDR's popularity, and attributed it to "acrimonious debate" over Mr. Roosevelt's work-relief bill, and to mounting attacks on the NRA. Furthermore, he says, the president was "ordering" legislation and attempting to "railroad" his bills through congress. Not until October, the pollster says, when the president announced a "breathing spell" for business did his popularity rating begin to rise. It continued rising into the early part of 1936 but dipped again "when the Republicans nominated Landon, but after the first few weeks of the campaign, the President's popularity started to grow again and continued to the landslide election of 1936."

In 1937, Dr. Gallup says, the Supreme Court issue lowered the President's rating temporarily but by the beginning of 1938, FDR's popularity was back to 63%. Then began another steady nine month decline "corresponding with the slump and the unpopular 'purge' campaign." Dr. Gallup goes on, "Just prior to the 1938 Congressional elections, the institute index showed Roosevelt at 54%. This figure was objectively confirmed in the election itself, when the Democratic party strength at the polls was 52%.[13]

A researcher can see a correlation between this account and the U.S. political pattern that goes beyond Dr. Gallup's citations. In 1933, with no national convention or election, President Roosevelt's popularity was rather steady—and high. The next year, 1934, a congressional election year, saw the first dip in the president's "prestige," as recorded by Dr. Gallup. The next year, 1935, when party build-ups of candidates for the conventions and the campaigns were under way, FDR's popularity "declined steadily for nine months" but rose again and held on until the dip "during the nomination of Landon in 1936." Later in the summer, when President Roosevelt was heading for a 46-out-of-48 states victory, Dr. Gallup recognized a recoup of presidential popularity.

In 1937, first year of the new term, only a slight, temporary dip, but in 1938, another congressional election year, another nine month decline.

Does the pattern just sketched appear again in the post-war years? It does. For the Truman period the pattern comes in bolder colors with louder trumpets—with deeper dips and, amusingly enough, a loftier peak.

Here's a look at the bare outline of the Truman record as charted by the Institute. The first popularity rating appeared in July after Mr. Truman had been in office two months. At this time, AIPU reported, 87% of his countrymen approved of the job the President was doing, only 3% disapproved (surely the lowest disapproval score in the history of the Gallup polls), and 10% didn't venture an opinion. Nor did this high score descend precipitously. In November, 1945, Mr. Truman's rating, by Gallup, was a relatively high 82%. Then the decline began. It continued for a year, through October, 1946—32% just before the congressional elections which sent a Republican majority to Washington—but began a post-election rise and in May, 1947, Mr. Truman's score stood at 60%. Another decline took him to a low of 36% before and during the nominating conventions in the spring-summer part of 1948. After his defeat of Governor Dewey in the November 3, 1948 election, the rating leaped to 69% in January, 1949. By June, 1950—again a congressional election year—the Truman rating was back down to 37%. The Democrats came out somewhat ahead in the fall elections, but by that time, several thousand people were writing and speaking millions of words speculating as to whether Truman would run for re-election in 1952. All during 1951, which may be called the *year of speculation*, Dr. Gallup's rating of Mr. Truman never rose above 28%.

After Mr. Truman decided not to run in 1952, the Institute spent its popularity polls on possible candidates—and not the least of these names was Dwight D. Eisenhower.

The Gallup poll, as far back as the autumn of 1945 when Truman had been president less than half a year, had begun to ask people whether they thought that Ike would make a better president than Harry. When the General stepped into the presidency in 1953, his Gallup popularity rating was 68%. It stayed higher than 60% all that year and most of the next one—a congressional election year. The electorate opted for a Democratic majority in congress and the President's Gallup rating dipped a little that November but was back to 69% by January, 1955 and stayed in the high 60's and 70's throughout that year, although another Democratic majority won congressional seats in the same election that put Eisenhower back in the White House.

In 1957, not only a "lame duck" president, but one who had not carried his party into Congress in either 1954 or 1956, Eisenhower's popularity rating, by Gallup, slid down to 57%. The next year, 1958, the slide continued with a low point of 49% in April. Again congressional elections were coming. Eisenhower's rating climbed back into the 50's—57% on the eve of the elections. Again, Democrats got a congressional majority. Eisenhower's rating dropped to 52%. In 1959, the year of speculation as to whom Ike would bless for the 1960 Republican candidacy, his rating rose steadily. In January, 1960, his score stood at 71%. During this final "lame" year, the president's Gallup rating sloped again into the 50's, and he closed the year with a 58% mark. John Fenton, Managing Editor of the Gallup poll, attributes this decline to "partisan interests reawakened by coming elections." After the elections, the Gallup Institute had a brand new presidential popularity chart to fashion, for the voters sent a Democratic congress and John F. Kennedy to Washington.

---

[4] A. J. Liebling, "The Wayward Press," *New Yorker Magazine*, May 9, 1953, May 14, 1960, Oct. 29, 1960. In all three pieces, the late Mr. Liebling discusses the 80% Republican–20% Democratic proportion of the United States dailies. Respective page numbers 100–107, 105–112, 146–150.

[5] Many people contend that the political implications of Pogo reach much further than do those of Dr. Gallup. This argument is completely outside the scope of this present study which can only note that Walt Kelley uses a rapier—Dr. Gallup a bludgeon.

[6] George Gallup, *A Guide to Public Opinion Polls*, (Princeton, 1948) p. 83.

[7] Ibid, p. 49.

[8] Gallup, op. cit., p. 22.

[9] Roger Lindsay, in *The Pollsters*, suggests that with these three answers, Dr. Gallup is not taking the pulse of democracy—he is only listening to its baby talk.

[10] The question can double for a pre-election poll query—a subject outside the scope of this paper except in reference to polling accuracy.

[11] John M. Fenton, *In Your Opinion* (Boston, 1960) p. 17.

[12] Gallup, *The Pulse of Democracy*, (New York, 1940), p. 223.

[13] On some occasions Dr. Gallup as above seems to believe that election returns are the "acid test and the only justification for pre-election polling." At other times he says that election returns do not represent public opinion: polls do.

President Kennedy's beginning score, by AIPU calculations, was 72%, and throughout the first "non-political" year, his rating did not dip below 71%. The next year, 1962, a congressional election year, Kennedy's softly declining rating had dropped to 61% in Octtober just before the elections. After November, the rating went up and stayed above 70% into the new year, but now once again, a season of speculation had come—a time for the build-up of Republicans who might challenge the Democrats for the White House in 1964. President Kennedy's Gallup rating sloped downward steadily after April and stood at 57% in October before he was assassinated in November. On November 10, a Gallup release showed a rise of 2 points in the president's "approval" score but at the same time, showed no compensating drop in the "disapproval" score. Kennedy's "disapproval" rating had been only 5, 6, or 7% much of his first year in office. It had never risen above 20% except in the three months before the congressional elections of 1962 and now again, in the "speculation" year of 1963, it had remained above 20% most of the time. In these last two polls, October and November, it was at its high—for Kennedy—of 28%.

One common feature of these four records is this: during each president's first year in office, his Gallup rating remains rather high but fluctuates enough to create editor—and reader—interest in the Gallup newspaper feature. Kennedy's range of Gallup popularity percentages for first year, first term is 11, Eisenhower's, 15, and Truman's, 12.

In the second year of each term, every chart records a dip. In the case of the three Democratic presidents, the decline comes *before* November. Mr. Eisenhower's brief dip comes *after* the congressional elections.

In each third year—the candidate build-up season—both Presidents Roosevelt and Kennedy show steady declines.

Presidents Eisenhower and Truman both have fluctuating scores—but Mr. Eisenhower's range is only 6 points (69 to 75), Mr. Truman's is 20 points (35 to 55).

Since most of the polling energy, in presidential election years, goes into pre-convention comparisons of candidates and, later, into pre-election polling, straight popularity ratings are few. In the case of Mr. Roosevelt, Dr. Gallup's narrative records a dip in presidential popularity during the convention that nominated Mr. Landon. Mr. Eisenhower's score, in 1956, ranged from 67 to 77%. In 1948, Dr. Gallup records for Mr. Truman a range of popularity from 36 to 39%.

Yet all three candidates won their respective elections.

Had Mr. Truman *lost* his election, the miasma of partisanship might not cling as densely as it does (for at least one researcher) around the figures just quoted. And, perhaps, a researcher might be a little less sensitive to the peculiarities of the narrative account of the Truman polls, written by John M. Fenton.[14]

The first statistic which Mr. Fenton has to deal with is, of course, the 87% approval of the job President Truman was doing in July, 1945. Mr. Fenton is on record as believing that when 70 or 80 percent of a people—so diverse in economic and cultural backgrounds as Americans—"are for or against anything, it is not only unusual but indicative of a rare degree of agreement . . ." So, one might expect the Fenton review to begin by exulting over the more-than-rare agreement of Mr. Truman's 87%. Not at all. Mr. Fenton tries to dismiss the finding by saying that the poll was taken while people were "still in a state of shock," that the score was probably only an expression of what people *hoped* Truman would do rather than a record of what they thought he had done, and that the poll had been taken too soon for people to have an opinion. Is it fair to ask why, then, was the poll taken at all?

The implication that Mr. Fenton is reluctant to give Mr. Truman his due, does not diminish throughout the essay which is laced with comments like the following:

"As long as there was the exhilaration of winning the war, Truman fared well with the public. . . . Much more than being a victory for the Republicans, the 1946 elections were a defeat for President Truman. . . . The trend to the Democrats that year (1947) was really nothing more than a return to the fold on the part of Roosevelt supporters. . . . If Truman seemed to have his weaknesses, he also had one strong point—he was a member of the party of Roosevelt . . . those millions of voters decided their safest bet was a vote for Roosevelt, or the best substitute they could find for him—the Democratic party. It was Truman's good fortune to be the Democratic candidate. . . . Truman's average popularity during his second term in office was actually below that of his first term when he was serving out Roosevelt's mandate. . . . (Henry) Wallace's backers could not be described as particularly united behind a single cause—a Gallup poll report described them as a "conglomeration of protesters. (sic) What they were chiefly protesting against was Harry S. Truman. . . . The long-time suspicion of many voters that President Truman was "not a big enough man for the job" was confirmed by what seemed to be the confused state in Korea. . . . So long as Truman was wearing the mantle of the late President, he fared pretty well . . . it seemed that he was much more popular as a substitute Roosevelt than as a real life Truman."

When the "real life Truman" won the real life election of 1948, the Gallup organization was left, not only with its ridiculous prophecies of a large Dewey victory, but with a published record of having prepared an unusual gift for President Truman early in the year. After a series of routine polls telling the people, statistically, how few of them liked the president, the Institute concocted a special survey which asked some "voters" to say, "as though talking to a friend," what they thought of a few possible presidential candidates. Favorable comments for Mr. Dewey, the surveyors reported, outnumbered "unfavorable ones by 3 to 2." For President Truman "derogatory phrases outweighed words of praise by a ratio of 5 to 3." By way of this particular technique, the Gallup staff told the president—and the newspaper readers of the country—that Americans described him as "being inconsistent . . . too easily swayed . . . not standing firm under fire . . . incapable . . . weak . . . inefficient . . . with no ideas of his own." [15] This tasty package was handed to the President—and to the public, of course—on the eve of Mr. Truman's announcement that he would be the Democrat's presidential candidate in 1948.

One can compare this with the Gallup poll survey released on the eve of President Eisenhower's comparable announcement eight years later—that he would seek a second term as a Republican president. On this latter occasion, in 1956, the Institute assured President Eisenhower that 75% of the American people approved of the way he was handling the presidency. It happened that Mr. Eisenhower had, because of a heart attack, been unable to handle the presidency at all for some weeks, and for months before the poll was taken, had given only part time to the job. Mr. Fenton, in fact, refers to him affectionately as "part-time Ike." This affectionate tone permeates most of the Gallup releases published during the Eisenhower years.

One other aspect of the Fenton review of the Truman-Eisenhower years is pertinent here. He recalls that in 1951 the Institute's polls were simultaneously saying three things—that President Truman had the support of very few people, that either Taft or Eisenhower could win the presidency, that Taft's margin over Truman would be slim but that Eisenhower's would be a landslide. Fenton's own words in describing this period seem more than usually significant. He writes that the AIPU poll results *gave practical politicians* "food for thought".

Since a partisan attitude is not *always*, and not *necessarily*, antipathetic to accuracy, what about the accuracy of the Gallup polls? Using the only yardstick available—election returns—here is the record. In 1936, Dr. Gallup predicted that President Roosevelt would be re-elected. He was—46 states out of 48. What matter that Dr. Gallup had, pre-election, given Roosevelt only 31 sure states? The authoritative strawvote agency of that day, the *Literary Digest*, had looked for a Landon landslide. Though it was rather a case of a one-eyed man being king in the land of the blind, Dr. Gallup was viewed as a man who could "measure public opinion." The Institute gained customers and was on its way as a polling organization.

In 1940, the actual percentage of the Democratic vote was 55.0: Gallup predicted 52.0. In 1944, the actual Democratic percentage was 53.8: Gallup had predicted 51.5. In 1948, the actual Democratic vote was 49.5: the Gallup prediction had been 44.5.[16]

Not only the error in the 1944 Gallup prediction, but the apparent Republican slant of poll essays, persuaded the House of Representatives to ask for—and get—a congressional committee hearing into polling techniques.

During the hearings, Dr. Gallup testified that he had, for the sake of being "scientific," shifted two or three percentage points from the Roosevelt column to the Dewey column in order to compensate for factors that his interviewers weren't taking into account.[17]

Despite this official questioning of Dr. Gallup's motives and methods, the Institute's election predictions in 1948 were so egregiously wrong that it looked for a while as if the American Institute of Public Opinion might join the *Literary Digest* in the Hall of Has Beens. But all those Republican owners of newspapers where the Gallup essays could be used as "news" rather than as editorials, must have decided otherwise. In December, 1949, *Editor and Publisher* printed the results of a mail survey made by Peter Edson of the National Editorial Association. The results indicated that though 91% of the 335 editors responding to the questionnaire believed that the Republican party had no program that could compete politically with Truman's "Fair Deal," 63% of the editors wanted to see Truman *out* of the White House in 1952. Obviously, the editors believed that the Republicans must depend on a "personality" not a program. Since the autumn of 1945, Dr. Gallup had been reminding the American public how much it liked Ike. The Gallup poll essays continued to do this, and the newspapers continued to support the Gallup enterprise. By being cautious—and lucky?—the organization survived.

---

[14] Fenton, pp. 41–73. All of the Fenton quotes on the following page are, also, from these same pages—a chapter, "Harry S. Truman—Man Riding a Tiger."

[15] Copies of poll releases on file at Truman Library. Also, quoted by Fenton, pp. 70–71.

[16] Ernst and Loth, p. 120.

[17] *Hearings before the Committee to Investigate Campaign Expenditures, House of Representatives, Seventy-eighth Congress* (December, 1944) quoted by Charles Van Devander and William O. Player, Jr., "Washington Memo." The syndicated columnists add, "The amusing part of this is that a good many political 'experts' in reading the published results of the Gallup poll arbitrarily made their own adjustments by transferring the same two or three percentage points back from the Dewey column to the Roosevelt column. They were making a perfectly *scientific* allowance for the fact that Dr. Gallup in the past had always underestimated President Roosevelt's vote."

The angle of luck is explored by Bernard C. and Erna R. Hennessy in their study of pre-election polls of 1960. The authors comment that the Gallup reports constitute an interesting example of the sometimes fortuitous results when two errors cancel each other out. The Institute's "semi-final" poll, taken October 5–7, 1960, seemed to indicate that Kennedy was the overall loser in 13 Southern states and the overall winner in the rest of the nation. A final pre-election release, however, *averaged* earlier findings and, though his findings were wrong in the South and wrong in the North, the errors cancelled each other and AIPU's final prediction was very close to the actual vote. The Hennessys conclude. "Luck again made Gallup a winner rather than a loser." [18]

Perhaps, the idea of prediction is contagious—so contagious that the present report, having examined so many political predictions, is inclined to couch its own conclusions in the form of a prediction.

Taking into account that the timing and number of Gallup releases is as important as what they say; remembering the pattern that appears in the popularity records—even though the soundings were erratic and incomplete; recalling, also, the conflicting pressures which circumscribe Dr. Gallup's work—the demands of editors, the requirements of readers and Dr. Gallup's natural concern for his own reputation—here is the prediction.

The Gallup rating of President Johnson's popularity, which has risen slightly since the pre-election low point of 44% last October, *may* continue to rise into the early part of the new year. The rating will fluctuate, probably rather widely, and always contemporaneously with headlines which Dr. Gallup can refer to later, if necessary. (But is there, in the 1960's, a week when the diversity of newspaper headlines doesn't present a choice of "good news" or "cry havoc" headlines—any one of which could be a hitching post for an up or down fluctuation in a president's "popularity measurement"?)

The rating may rise a little toward the end of 1967 but will drop again before and during the Republican nominating convention in 1968. If Dr. Gallup is privately convinced that Mr. Johnson will be re-elected in November, the Institute's late October poll essays will cautiously say so. In the meantime, a variety of polls based on single states, groups of states, regions, economic classes, educational levels, political parties, occupations, etc. will feed the public a variety of information, any single piece of which may be cited after November, 1968, as supportive evidence for whatever the elections of 1968 decide.[19]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ernst, Morris L., David Loth. *The People Know Best—the Ballots vs. the Polls*. Public Affairs Press. Washington, D.C., 1949.

Fenton, John M. *In Your Opinion: A Gallup Poll Editor Looks at Polls, Politics and the People from 1945 to 1960*. Boston, Little Brown and Co., 1960.

Gallup, George H. *The Pulse of Democracy*. New York, Simon and Schuster, 1940.

———. *A Guide to Public Opinion Polls*, Princeton University Press, 1948.

Meier, Norman C. and Saunders, Harold W. (eds). *The Polls and Public Opinion, The Iowa Conference on Attitude and Opinion Research*. New York, Henry A. Holt and Co., 1949.

Motseller, Frederic and others. *The Pre-election Polls of 1948: Report to the Committee on Analysis of Pre-election Polls and Forecasts*. New York, Social Science Research Council.

Rogers, Lindsay. *The Pollsters: Public Opinion, Politics, and Democratic Leadership*. Alfred Knopf, 1949, New York.

NEWSPAPERS AND PERIODICALS

NOTE.—Gallup Poll statistics (unless source otherwise cited) were taken from *The New York Times*, (43 dates, Roosevelt period); the files at the Truman Library (Truman administration); the *Public Opinion Quarterly*, every issue 1937 to 1966 (Truman, Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations); and the *Kansas City Star* (Johnson administration).

DOCUMENTS

Letters and clippings on file at Truman Library, 1944 through 1952. *Democrat National Committee Clipping File* and *Personal Papers of Harry S. Truman* file.

MILITARY OVERSEAS MAIL

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, with an ever-increasing volume of mail flowing to our servicemen overseas, facilities for handling this mail are overtaxed and inadequate in many parts of the world. This is an area of vital concern to our Post Office Committee.

The military mail terminal at Frankfurt, Germany, processes airmail to every major installation in Europe. On April 6, 1967, in cooperation with the German Republic, a new $2 million facility was dedicated at Frankfurt. Described as the second largest and most modern military air mail terminal in the world, it was built by the Frankfurt Airport-Main Co., in close cooperation with U.S. Air Force personnel.

Upon my request, the chief of the USAF European postal and courier region, Col. Harold W. Brazier, furnished me with a narrative of the dedication proceedings. From all reports, it was indeed a great day for the United States and the U.S. Air Force, and also for the Flughafen director, Herr Lange.

Our worldwide, integrated Air Force postal system, known as the U.S. Air Force Postal and Courier Service, deserves a great deal of credit, and the establishment of a single integrated system on January 1 of this year was a giant step forward in achieving efficient and expeditious service to our military personnel overseas.

With permission, I include below a résumé of the dedication ceremony of the Frankfurt Aerial Mail Terminal by Col. Harold W. Brazier; an excerpt from the speech of Ministerpräsident Zinn; an article from the Frankfurter Rundschau, April 7, 1967; and an article from the Stars and Stripes, April 7, 1967:

DEDICATION CEREMONY, FRANKFURT AERIAL MAIL TERMINAL, FRANKFURT, GERMANY

A vital link was forged in the worldwide Air Force postal and courier chain with the dedication of the new Frankfurt Aerial Mail Terminal on 6 April 1967. The dedication took place at the Frankfurt Flughafen with representatives from the U.S. Consulate, the State of Hesse, and the United States Air Force in attendance. The proceeding was opened with a speech by the Flughafen Director, Herr Lange, who gave a general description of the use to which the terminal would be put. He also cited the close relationship between his employees and Air Force personnel. Director Lange then introduced Herr Dr. Georg-August Zinn, Ministerpresident of the State of Hesse, who spoke on the excellent cooperation between officers, engineers and airmen of the U.S. Air Force and the Flughafen Frankfurt/Main A.G. and of the fact that the new building will be an important improvement for the landing of military airmail at this airport as it will allow the use of mechanized equipment. Finally, Dr. Zinn introduced Lt. General Arthur C. Agan, Jr., Vice Commander in Chief, USAFE, who formally accepted the new building for the United States Air Force.

Each of the speakers emphasized the importance of this terminal as a vital link in the USAF worldwide system. Further, the speakers alluded to the excellent state of cooperation which exists between the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America as exemplified by the expeditious and excellent manner in which the building was planned and constructed.

General Agan pointed out in his remarks that the terminal would soon be equipped with modern, mechanized mail handling equipment. When so equipped, he stated, "this will be the most modern military mail facility in the world."

Also in attendance at the ceremony was Colonel Harold W. Brazier, Chief of the USAF European Postal and Courier Region, and Lt. Colonel Harry F. Collins, Chief of the North Germany District, who will actually operate the terminal as part of his overall function. Unable to attend was the Chief of the USAF Postal and Courier Service, Colonel Andrew DiAntonio.

The dedication was officially completed when Herr Dr. Zinn and General Agan exchanged a sack of mail symbolic of the transfer of the building from the Flughafen officials to the Air Force.

The USAFE Band under the direction of Captain Edward D'Alfonso played before and after the speeches and a luncheon banquet was served to all who attended. At the conclusion of the luncheon, the Ministerpresident and General Agan were given a tour of the building by Lt. Gene S. Bartlow, Officer-in-Charge of the terminal.

EXCERPT FROM THE SPEECH OF MINISTERPRÄSIDENT ZINN

Ministerpräsident Zinn speaks about the excellent cooperation between officers, engineers and airmen of the U.S. Air Force and the Flughafen Frankfurt/Main AG. The air postal service of the U.S. Air Force use the civilian Airlines for the transport of their airmail. The new building will be the new home of the Air Postal Group. This is the place of the collaboration between military and private organisations.

The development of the Frankfurt Airport is very closely connected with the traffic relations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany. Today Frankfurt is a center of the north atlantic traffic. After London and Paris Frankfurt is the third busiest airport in Europe. Especially important are airfreight and airmail. Within the last five years the amount of airmail passing the airport has almost doubled. Development of military airmail on the airport was similar. It rose from 14 million pounds in 1960 to 70 million pounds in 1966.

---

[18] "The Prediction of Close Elections," *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Fall, 1961, p. 408.

[19] It is necessary to enter a rather grim caveat. This prediction can be tested only if President Johnson—in this age of violence—survives to become the Democratic candidate for President in 1968.

The new building will be an important improvement for the handling of military airmail at this airport as it will allow the use of more mechanical equipment.

Ministerpräsident Zinn now speaks about the construction of the passenger terminal building, presently under construction at this airport. This building is intended to handle 12 million passengers per year. It will be capable of handling large capacity aircraft, the so called Jumbo jets (Boeing B 747) as well.

Lufthansa also ordered this type of aircraft. The home base of this aircraft will be at Frankfurt Airport. Therefore, the airport will have to expand the facilities of the Lufthansa technical base.

The airport authority also plans the construction of a third runway to be used for take-offs only. The new runway is intended to increase the capacity of the landing system and to improve the noise situation for such surrounding communities as Raunheim, Rüsselsheim, Mörfelden, Walldorf and the Landkreis Offenbach.

The airport is more and more becoming a center of economical activity. Today already 10,000 employees work with different organizations at the airport.

Finalizing his speech Ministerpräsident Zinn compares the historical German postal organization of "Thurn und Taxis" of the last century which had its headquarters at Frankfurt with modern airmail transport by jet-aircraft.

[Article in Frankfurter Rundschau, Apr. 7, 1967]

"Rhein-Main" Employs 10,000 People—U.S. Mail Terminal Opened—Ministerpresident Zinn Defends Expansion of Airport

The second largest terminal of the military mail and courier service of the U.S. Air Force was opened on Thursday at the Frankfurt airport. Daily, more than 40 truckloads of mail per day will be arriving and distributed in the 1.5 million Mark building near the Lufthansa base. Ministerpresident Zinn and Lt. General Agan, the Vice Commander-in-Chief of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe, gave the opening speeches. "Rhein-Main" is the terminal center for all military mail from or to American bases in areas between Finland, Scotland, the Congo, and East Pakistan.

The American facility is located in the civil area of the airport since the shipments are transported almost exclusively by regular commercial planes. Ministerpresident Zinn called the building a "place of cooperation between the military and civil organizations which has to prove itself in the daily business routines". In 1957, the military mail terminal was just a hut. In 1962, it moved into a wing of the air cargo building. After the U.S. military mail shipments increased to 35 million kilograms in 1966, it was decided to erect a new building. The first ground breaking was done on 5 May of last year.

The future expenditures of the Frankfurt airport include the construction of a third take-off runway, the extension of the two existing take-off and landing strips by approximately 900 meters, the erection of a cargo building, and the expansion of the Lufthansa base. Ministerpresident Zinn explained in his opening speech that, with these plans, they are trying to take into consideration the space requirements, the possible alteration of the water budget and the climate, and most important, the noise problem. The third take-off runway will bring substantial relief to the noise troubled villages adjacent to the airport.

Expansion has also disadvantages.

Zinn admitted that an economically concentrated area has disadvantages to the people. But he also pointed out the significance of the airport to the inhabitants. Here, approximately 10,000 people from the villages adjacent to the airport have found work. The order volume of the airport large-scale operation amounts to 100 million Marks annually in the construction area alone. For many craft and trade operations "Rhein Main" is a vital necessity.

Hesse's biggest construction site—the new Reception Building West—is already planned for the future jumbo planes for 500 passengers. As Ministerpresident Zinn explained, the planning had been made for a traffic volume of 12 million air passengers anyway.

The expansions, projected for a later date, are already included in the construction plans. The dispatch building will be substantially expanded and a special baggage system will be installed. Also, the Lufthansa base will be considerably enlarged for the maintenance of the jumbo jets. 109 million Mark are provided for the next construction stage alone.

[From the Stars and Stripes, Apr. 7, 1967]

Automated Terminal To Speed Up Mail Handling

(By Jay Dorman)

Frankfurt, April 6 (S&S).—US-AFE and German officials Thursday hailed a new $400,000 Air Force postal terminal at the International Airport here as a major step in speeding mail service for U.S. forces in Europe.

Lt. Gen. A. C. Agan Jr., USAFE vice-commander, accepted the APO building for the Air Force from airport officials and described the facilities as a vital link in the military postal system between the United States and Europe.

The APO terminal is located on the commercial side of the Rhine-Main-Frankfurt Airport complex.

Speaker at the German-American turnover ceremony was Georg August Zinn, minister-president of the State of Hesse.

Zinn told some 500 guests that the terminal as a "development of the Frankfurt Airport is very closely connected with improved traffic operations between the United States and the Federal Republic of Germany."

Agan and Zinn transferred a mail bag from an Air Force mail cart to a German airport tractor-trailer to officially open the new facility.

Also attending the ceremony was Col. Harold W. Brazier, chief of the European Region USAFE Postal Courier Service.

The USAFE band, directed by Capt. Edward V. D'Alfonso, furnished music.

Elements of the USAFE Postal and Courier Region, Det 300, headed by Lt. Col. Harry F. Collins, are operating the new facility. Although the completely automated mail handling equipment isn't fully installed, the building's ideal location will facilitate handling of a rapidly growing mail volume.

"We expect to have the automated handling system operational within another year," said 1st Lt. Gene S. Bartlow, a Det 300 postal officer.

The volume of mail handled by Air Force mailmen, officials said, has jumped from 15 million pounds in 1961 to 69.5 million in 1966. It is estimated that the volume will jump to 75 or 80 million pounds in 1967.

Before moving into the new building, the Air Force mail handlers used the second floor of a commercial warehouse at the airport. There they had to move their mail bags up and down by elevator and store mail bags on open truck docks. The new building will accommodate 20 trucks at a time whereas the old building had space for eight.

The automated mail handling system to be installed in the terminal was designed by 1st Lt. Joseph Saline, a mechanical engineer. It entails a series of conveyor belts and chutes built into the ceilings of the new building that will weigh, tag and sort mail bags under the operation of one man.

At present, the Frankfurt facility is the largest military air mail terminal in Europe, and is second in size by volume of mail handled in the world only to the Saigon, Vietnam, terminal.

SUCCESS OF THE FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Everett] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that legislation to extend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 will be considered in the House soon, I feel that it is appropriate to comment on the success of the program.

The program has been of great benefit in my congressional district and throughout Tennessee in providing food for needy, undernourished people.

I am particularly concerned with an amendment to the food stamp legislation, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee. This amendment would require 20 percent financial participation by the States and would unquestionably cause the program to be terminated in Tennessee. I say this because it is unlikely that the State of Tennessee could make available the necessary funds. At the present level of operation the amendment would cost our State $1,650,360 per year and the amount would increase as the program continues to expand.

It is apparent that I am opposed to this amendment and I hope that my colleagues will join me in removing it from the bill when it is brought up in the House.

The food stamp program is a great program and should be permitted to continue as it is now operating.

The Chattanooga, Tenn., Times said editorially when the Food Stamp Act was passed in 1964:

> The program has been made permanent because many people believe it is an effective way to help people through economic straits when a sound diet can be of great assistance.

Since then, increasing thousands of Tennessee's low-income families have echoed that belief, in the 38 counties where the food stamp program is bringing more and better food to the 78,000 needy people taking part in it. And another 13 counties are slated to inaugurate programs before the end of June.

Take Mrs. Omie E. Smith, 63, of Memphis, and her disabled husband, Artie L. Smith, 58, who live on an income of $101 a month, mostly from social security. Mrs. Smith was among the first in line when food stamps went on sale in Memphis in February 1966, to pay $28 cash for $40 worth of the food coupons. She said:

> These stamps are going to be a big help. We had to skimp and save to get up our first payment, but it's worth it.

In all, Tennessee's participating families, at the level of operation reported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture in February 1967, put up slightly more than $540,000 of their own money to receive over $1 million total value of coupons. The $500,000 "bonus" means more food for the families, more business for retailers, wholesalers, and farmers, and a general boost to the entire economy of the area. In fiscal year 1966, when only 18 counties in Tennessee had the program, a total of more than $4,000,000 of added food-purchasing power flowed into the State's economy in the form of Federal food stamps.

Claude Posey, a certification worker in the Scott County Welfare Department, where the program has been operating since early 1965, notes that "Some school teachers have reported that children from stamp families are more alert in class and making better grades since the program began."

Retailers in Haywood County, where the program has also been operating for a full 2 years, agree that food stamps help people through "economic straits." Food stamp use varies with the seasonal economic picture and seasonal employment rates. But the retailers are pleased that as participants get jobs and go off the rolls, they continue to patronize the stores where they had been redeeming Federal food coupons.

At present and anticipated levels of operation of the food stamp program, it is estimated by USDA that the total Federal "bonus" coupons issued to Tennessee recipients this fiscal year may reach $5.7 million in value.

The State and localities are required to finance the administrative costs of the program, including certification of eligible families and coupon issuance and accounting. Such costs typically run to about 7 percent of the value of the bonus coupons—thus, Tennessee sources will be contributing some $400,000 to the program in fiscal 1967.

A requirement for an additional 20 percent State contribution in the future would probably mean cancellation of the program in Tennessee. The 20-percent State participation provision is contained in the legislation to extend the food stamp program, as reported by the House Agriculture Committee. This requirement should be stricken from the bill when it is considered in the House.

Tennessee counties in food stamp program—April 1967: Anderson, Bledsoe, Campbell, Cannon, Chester, Claiborne, Cocke, Dyer, Fayette, Fentress, Grundy, Hamilton, Hancock, Hardeman, Hardin, Haywood, Henry, Knox, Lake, Lauderdale, Lawrence, Macon, Marion, McNairy, Meigs, Morgan, Pickett, Rutherford, Scott, Sequatchie, Sevier, Shelby, Smith, Sumner, Tipton, Trousdale, Weakley, and Wilson.

Scheduled for program by June 30, 1967: Clay, Coffee, DeKalb, Grainger, Hickman, Jackson, Loudon, McMinn, Obion, Overton, Putnam, Van Buren, Wayne.

SELDEN INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO CURB DAIRY IMPORTS

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Selden] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Speaker, the dairy farmers in my district and throughout our Nation are being hard hit by imports of foreign-made dairy products which are cutting into markets for their milk. As a matter of fact, the U.S. Department of Agriculture estimates that some 3½ billion pounds of milk equivalent will be imported this year unless some action is taken to stop the flow.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today that is designed to stem the unchecked flow of dairy imports into the United States. At the same time, this legislation will require that imported dairy products meet the high sanitary standards that our domestic milk producers must follow.

This legislation will limit imports to the average butterfat and nonfat milk solids shipped into the United States during the years 1961 through 1965. Quotas will be increased, however, as our domestic consumption of milk increases. This allows importers to share in our markets, but, at the same time, gives our dairy farmers some protection for their products.

As our urban areas become larger, there is a tendency in this country to forget the outstanding job done by our Nation's farmers. One farmer can now feed 37 Americans, making most of our work force available for producing other goods and services. Actually, we pay less of our family income for food than do the people of any other country, and this is possible because our farmers are the most efficient in the world.

Farming remains a tremendous industry in my State of Alabama, as it does throughout our Nation. Dairy marketings alone amount to about $50 million a year in Alabama. Yet, in the past 15 years we have seen the number of farms selling milk in this country drop from over a million to about 500,000. Dairy farmers are leaving the farm because the pay is low, the hours are long, and the price paid for milk is subject to sudden drops.

For our dairy farmers to continue in business, they must have some assurance that foreign subsidized surpluses will not be allowed to undermine their domestic markets. The measure I have introduced is reasonable legislation that will give them that assurance. I am anxious that it be given favorable consideration by the Congress.

MEMORIAL FOR WOODROW WILSON

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when historians select great American Presidents, Woodrow Wilson is always listed.

He was a brilliant, versatile and compassionate man—a lawyer, professor, university president, Governor, President of the United States, and architect of world peace.

Woodrow Wilson's strong love of justice and freedom was evinced long before he became President.

In 1903, when he was president of Princeton University, he gave a patriotic speech containing these stirring words of challenge:

> If we do not love that which is good, we cannot achieve that which is great.

Wilson was both good and great.

A deep love of righteousness formed the basic philosophy of Woodrow Wilson and had a strong influence on the innovating university president, the reform Governor, and the progressive—and great—President of the United States.

When freedom was endangered by totalitarianism in 1917, he asked for a declaration of war before a joint session of Congress—a speech that was later described by author Edward Jablonski as, "masterly, beautifully proportioned, sprinkled with memorable phrases."

This tribute to Wilson was no surprise, because he was a gifted writer. How eloquent, beautiful, and moving his speeches were. When he was a professor, his students were so moved, they would often stand and applaud him after he delivered a lecture.

After the war, he fought hard and courageously for a League of Nations and although his plan was rejected by the U.S. Senate, that dream eventually led to the United Nations—our best hope for world peace. He once said:

> I am not one of those who have the least anxiety about the triumph of the principles I have stood for. That we shall prevail is as sure as that God reigns.

Wilson's ideals still prevail and will endure, because they are right and fair.

It is disgraceful and incredible that 43 years after his death, no memorial has been erected in Washington to honor Woodrow Wilson—the man whose leadership helped save the world from disaster. A memorial should be authorized by Congress to honor him and approval should not be postponed any longer.

I am proud to join my colleagues in the House in helping to cosponsor legislation to build such a memorial. Harrison A. Williams, Jr., the distinguished U.S. Senator of New Jersey, is heading the fight in the Senate for a suitable memorial and I hope that many others will help in both the House and Senate.

Wilson's wife, quoting from Wordsworth, once called him, "A noticeable man." But he was much more than noticeable, he was great in many ways—in mind, spirit, and his incomparable sense of honor.

Woodrow Wilson gave much to America—in a sense, even his life—hoping, working, and fighting for enduring world peace.

But the Nation he led and helped save has ignored him—in its own Capital. How ironic, how cruel, how tragic this ingratitude is.

America should rectify this shame by erecting an outstanding memorial in Woodrow Wilson's honor.

DECISION OF OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY TO FUND THE SOUTHWEST ALABAMA FARMERS COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION SHOULD BE APPLAUDED

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, the decision of the Office of Economic Opportunity to fund the Southwest Alabama Farmers Cooperative Association should be applauded. This self-help economic development program is a reaffirmation of the basic mandate of Congress that programs funded by the OEO strike at the root causes of poverty. Mr. Shriver and his staff are to be congratulated on their dedication and imagination in making this grant. In doing so, they have shown that it is possible for the Federal Government to provide a real alternative to thousands of poor people in one of our Nation's most impoverished areas who otherwise would be forced to migrate to the city slums. I urge all persons who support the war on poverty to heartily support SWAFCA—for it is the kind of program we must continue to develop if we are to eliminate poverty in our Nation.

IMPORTANCE OF SST TO THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FRIEDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, the president of the Air Transport Association, Mr. Stuart G. Tipton, made a most interesting statement about the supersonic transport development program which seems particularly pertinent now that the President has requested funds to continue this program.

Speaking before a Washington aviation group, Mr. Tipton noted that the SST program was not initiated just to enhance our prestige or even to advance our technology—although I am sure he agrees with me that these are important considerations in themselves. Rather, he said, the SST program was undertaken "to achieve a very cold and very hard economic objective on behalf of the people of the United States."

Therefore, he continued:

> The judgment as to whether the project should continue has to be based upon these same cold hard realities. The question that constantly must be before us is whether this investment in the economic future of the U.S. is a good one or is not.

With your indulgence, then, I would like to take a few minutes to address myself to this question.

It is true that the SST program will require a substantial investment. Some $500 million already has been appropriated and approximately $700 million more will be required to see the program through the prototype construction and flight test phase. Moreover, it is conceivable that the Federal Government could become further obligated—at least through the extension of some form of credit assistance to the participating manufacturers.

Consequently, the Congress must ask itself whether the prospects for the program warrant such an investment. I think the answer is an unqualified yes.

The FAA estimates that at least 500 SST's will be needed by 1990 to serve the transoceanic routes alone. I might add that this estimate is based on a very conservative forecast of traffic increases—10 percent per year as compared with an annual average of 17 percent since 1946. It is very possible, then, that the market has been underestimated rather than overestimated.

But even a market of 500 SST's would seem to be sufficient justification for proceeding with the program. Under the terms of the recoupment formula negotiated with the participating manufacturers, the Government would recover all of its investment on the sale of 300 aircraft. Moreover, it would continue to collect royalties on sales above the point for a period of at least 15 years.

Of course, if it is determined after further research and testing that the SST can operate over populated land areas without creating sonic boom problems, then the market for the aircraft would more than double. As many as 1,200 SST's might be sold by 1990.

The impact of a 500 to 1,200 SST production program on the national economy would be staggering. Based on an individual selling price of $40 million per SST, the value of this production program would be $20 to $48 billion. And, contrary to popular opinion, this money will not be spent just in the Seattle and Cincinnati areas, which are the home bases for Boeing and General Electric, respectively. Approximately 65 percent of production business will be channeled out to companies all over the United States.

Moreover, a production program of this size will create many new jobs for Americans. Mr. Tipton estimates that 250,000 new long-term jobs will be created directly and indirectly by the production of the SST. The annual payroll of these quarter of a million jobs is estimated at $2½ billion.

Finally, there are the balance-of-payment considerations associated with the SST program. We expect that half of all SST sales will be to foreign-flag airlines. This will result in a gold inflow of $10 to $24 billion over a 15-year period. In addition, the availability of the SST will limit the sales of the Anglo-French Concorde to the U.S. airlines and thus prevent a gold outflow of several billion dollars.

In view of all these considerations, I think the question is not whether we can afford to build the SST but rather whether we can afford not to build it.

DEMOCRACY ON TRIAL IN GREECE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, along with many Americans I have been distressed by the military overthrow of constitutional government in Greece.

Press accounts indicate that the U.S. officials in Greece knew about and did not protest contingency plans for a military takeover if results of the upcoming elections were not favorable to Greek military leaders. If these accounts are true, I am sorely distressed by the role played by our foreign policy officials. If not true, the United States should give clear and explicit indication to the military junta now in command that we do not countenance morally, and do not intend to support or assist, a military dictatorship.

Many of my constituents have voiced their deep concern over the arrest of Greek citizens and their duly elected leaders for the crime of disagreeing with the political viewpoint of the military junta. They have strongly endorsed the plea which I and others have made that former Premier George Papandreou, his son Andreas and his family, and other political prisoners be assured safety.

People of this country have watched with growing alarm the stern measures which the new military rulers have instituted. We have been shocked and saddened to see American tanks, sent to Greece, first under the Marshall plan and later in concert with our NATO allies, to protect that country from tyranny and aggression, used to round up the country's legitimately elected officials; to witness the detaining of more than 5,000 political prisoners; to learn that newspapers are forbidden publications and that trade unions, athletic organizations, and political groups have been disbanded. On top of all of this, the elections scheduled for May 28 have been canceled.

As a representative from the Seventh California District which includes Berkeley, where Andreas Papandreou served for 5 years as chairman of the Economics Department of the University of California, I have a special and personal concern for his welfare and the safety of his wife and family. But perhaps even more, I have been concerned and dismayed that people throughout the birthplace of democracy have been denied the most fundamental of freedoms.

Our economic and military assistance to Greece over the past 20 years totals nearly $4 billion. I submit that before the United States grants any further assistance to Greece, it is important that we receive assurances on three points:

First, that constitutional government be restored, with elections held as scheduled;

Second, that prisoners whose only offense is opposition to the military clique now in command, be released and their safety assured; and,

Third, that the basic freedoms of speech, assembly, and press be restored.

I urge the President, the Secretary of State, and all American officials concerned, not to settle for less. As a Member of Congress I intend to insist on these assurances in matters of any future appropriations for Greece. I do not think we can or should be satisfied with the vague promises that constitutional amendments will be submitted to the people "at some future time" or that elections will be held "when conditions permit."

Freedom faces a great test in Greece today. As perhaps the leading advocates and practitioners of this political philosophy, I believe our commitment to its full restitution should be unwavering and without reservation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. Wolff (at the request of Mr. Celler), for Thursday, May 11, 1967, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Smith of New York (at the request of Mr. Kleppe), for 1 hour, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Ashbrook (at the request of Mr. Kleppe), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Kleppe), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Halpern (at the request of Mr. Kleppe), for 15 minutes, on May 15, 1967; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members to revise and extend their remarks, and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Pelly (at the request of Mr. Smith of New York), for 20 minutes, on May 15, 1967.

Mr. Cohelan (at the request of Mr. Pryor), for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. Van Deerlin (at the request of Mr. Pryor), for 60 minutes, on May 17, 1967.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Fino in two instances.
Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Reid of New York.
Mr. Reuss.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Kleppe) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cowger.
Mr. Smith of New York.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Pryor) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Long of Maryland.
Mr. Zablocki.
Mr. O'Neill of Massachusetts.
Mr. de la Garza
Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Brasco.
Mr. Hanna.
Mr. Edwards of California.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRYOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 10 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, May 15, 1967, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

741. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, transmitting a special report on, "Government, the Universities, and International Affairs: A Crisis in Identity," pursuant to section 107 of Public Law 87–256 (H. Doc. No. 120); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

742. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for the fiscal year 1968 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. No. 121); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

743. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting plans for works of improvement, as follows: North, Pigeon, Iowa; Clatonia Creek, Nebr.; Upper Clinch Valley, Va.; Tri-Creek, Wis.; Pecan Creek, Tex.; Eutacutaches Creek, Miss.; Little Sni-A-Bar, Mo.; Tri-County Hopson Bayou, Miss.; Farmers Creek, Tex.; Papillion Creek, Nebr.; and Upper Bayou Teche, La., pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1005; each of the above is not more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity; to the Committee on Agriculture.

744. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the purchase of meals for District of Columbia employees, National Guardsmen and U.S. Park Police on special duty; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

745. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 11–1902, D.C. Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

746. A letter from the Executive Director, Joint Commission Correctional Manpower and Training, Inc., transmitting the first annual report of the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, April 1, 1966 to March 31, 1967, pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 89–178; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

747. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Enabling Acts of the States of New Mexico, Arizona and Hawaii with respect to enforcement of trust provisions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

748. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to engage in feasibility investigations of certain water resource developments; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

749. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting plans for works of improvement, as follows: Five Creeks, Miss.; Big Raccoon Creek, Ind.; Big Creek, Miss.; Bennett Creek, Tex.; Wolf Creek, Oreg., pursuant to the provisions of 16 U.S.C. 1005; each of the above is more than 4,000 acre-feet of total capacity; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 400. Resolution providing funds for the Committee on Rules; with amendment (Rept. No. 237). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 161. Resolution relating to payment from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives for official office expenses of Members of the House incurred outside the District of Columbia; with amendment (Rept. No. 238). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRIEDEL: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 464. Resolution authorizing the employment of additional Capitol Police for duty under the House of Representatives (Rept. No. 239). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 6. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Committee on Government Operations print entitled "The Federal System as Seen by Federal Aid Officials" (Rept. No. 240). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 7. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of its joint committee print entitled "State and Local Public Facility Needs and Financing" (Rept. No. 241). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 17. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,500 additional copies of the Joint Economic Committee print entitled "Federal Programs for the Development of Human Resources" (Rept. No. 242). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. Senate Concurrent Resolution 18. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,500 additional copies of the Joint Economic Committee print entitled "An Economic Profile of Mainland China" (Rept. No. 243). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 200. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document the Constitution of the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 244). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 221. Concurrent resolution to print as a House document "How Our Laws Are Made"; with amendment (Rept. No. 245). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 253. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing as a House document of the Southeast Asia briefing map prepared by the U.S. Army Map Service; with amendment (Rept. No. 246). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 279. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the committee print entitled "Metropolitan America: Challenge to Federalism" (Rept. No. 247). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 281. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of the legislative history of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 (Rept. No. 248). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 291. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of committee hearings entitled "Special Inquiry on Invasion of Privacy" and "The Computer and Invasion of Privacy" (Rept. No. 249). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Concurrent Resolution 309. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of "World Communist Movement—Selective Chronology 1918–1957." Prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress, volume 4, 1954–55, 89th Congress, first session; with amendment (Rept. No. 250). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 313. Resolution providing for additional copies of the report entitled "Food for Progress in Latin America" (Rept. No. 251). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 432. Resolution to print as a House document the eulogy proceedings on the late Christian Archibald Herter (Rept. No. 252). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 455. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the subcommittee print entitled "The Fiat-Soviet Auto Plant and Communist Economic Reforms" (Rept. No. 253). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 462. Resolution authorizing the printing of extra copies of "Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States," 89th Congress, first session (Rept. 254). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. HAYS: Committee on House Administration. House Resolution 467. Resolution authorizing the printing of extra copies of part 2 of the hearings relating to "Activities of Ku Klux Klan Organizations in the United States," 89th Congress, first session (Rept. No. 255). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 6649. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, as amended, to shorten the name of the Bank, to extend for 5 years the period within which the Bank is authorized to exercise its functions, to increase the Bank's lending authority and its authority to issue, against fractional reserves, export credit insurance and guarantees, and for other purposes, with amendment (Rept. No. 256). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BOLLING: Committee on Rules, House Resolution 471. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1318. A bill to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964 for the purpose of authorizing appropriations for fiscal years subsequent to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967 (Rept. No. 257). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DELANEY: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 472. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 6431. A bill to amend the public health laws relating to mental health to extend, expand, and improve them, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 258). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 9844. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 9845. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a full annuity for any individual (without regard to his age) who has completed 30 years of railroad service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 9846. A bill to prohibit the expenditure of Federal funds by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to promote the fluoridation of public water supplies; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 9847. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understand the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 9848. A bill to authorize the Administrator of General Services to acquire, construct, operate, and maintain certain parking facilities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BUSH:

H.R. 9849. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUTTON:

H.R. 9850. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow an incentive tax credit for a part of the cost of constructing or otherwise providing facilities for the control of water or air pollution, and to permit the amortization of such cost within a period of from 1 to 5 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 9851. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 9852. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act so as to extend and improve the Federal-State program of child welfare services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9853. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to publish statistics relating to the shortage of railroad freight cars; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9855. A bill to amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 9856. A bill to amend the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. EVERETT:

H.R. 9857. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code with respect to the effect of certain commitment proceedings; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 9858. A bill to amend section 212(a) (14) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9859. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide full payment (subject to any deductibles and coinsurance generally applicable) for whole blood furnished an individual under the program of health insurance for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9860. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which States may be assisted in developing programs for the detection of the illegal use of drugs by students; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9861. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer who rents an apartment or other property for use as his home to deduct a portion of his rent payment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9862. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H.R. 9863. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9864. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9865. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, except the Uniform Code of Military Justice, and authorize the imposition of life imprisonment in lieu thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9866. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to establish a Commission on Medical Use of Narcotic Drugs which must approve regulations of the Secretary of the Treasury relating to the medical use of narcotic drugs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 9867. A bill to provide for Federal control over foreign banking corporations operating within the United States, the District of Columbia, the several territories and possessions of the United States, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9868. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOODLING:

H.R. 9869. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 9870. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide additional beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals for the care and treatment of veterans afflicted with alcoholism; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 9871. A bill arranging for orderly marketing of certain imported articles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY:

H.R. 9872. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9873. A bill to control unfair trade practices affecting producers of agricultural products and associations of such producers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9874. A bill to prohibit desecration of the flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 9875. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to abolish the renewal requirement for licenses in the safety and special radio services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KUPFERMAN:

H.R. 9876. A bill to establish a U.S. Committee on Human Rights to prepare for participation by the United States in the observance of the year 1968 as International Human Rights Year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LEGGETT (for himself, Mr. Brown of California, Mr. Burton of California, Mr. Cohelan, Mr. Corman, Mr. Edwards of California, Mr. Hanna, Mr. Hawkins, Mr. Holifield, Mr. Johnson of California, Mr. King of California, Mr. McFall, Mr. Miller of California, Mr. Moss, Mr. Rees, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Sisk, Mr. Tunney, Mr. Van Deerlin, Mr. Waldie, and Mr. Charles H. Wilson):

H.R. 9877. A bill to amend the Maritime Academy Act of 1958 to increase the amount of assistance to such academies and the amount of subsistence payable per student; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LEGGETT:

H.R. 9878. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 9879. A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955 so as to recommend to the several States that its absentee registration and voting procedures be extended to all citizens temporarily residing abroad; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 9880. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 9881. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record, to eliminate certain special requirements for entitlement to husband's or widower's benefits, to provide for the payment of benefits to widowed fathers with minor children, to equalize the criteria for determining dependency of a child on his father or mother, and to make the retirement test inapplicable to individuals with minor children who are entitled to mother's or father's benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9882. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to remove the limitation upon the amount of outside income which an individual may earn while receiving benefits under such title; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9883. A bill to amend the wheat acreage allotments provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK (for herself and Mr. Matsunaga):

H.R. 9884. A bill to authorize FHA insurance on loans made for the purpose of purchasing fee simple titles from lessors, and to allow savings and loan associations to purchase such FHA-insured loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MORRIS (for himself, Mr. Adams, Mr. Broyhill of North Carolina, Mr. Button, Mr. Carter, Mr. Corman, Mr. Feighan, Mr. Gray, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Joelson, Mr. Kupferman, Mr. Leggett, Mr. Moss, Mr. Olsen, Mr. Pickle, Mr. Reuss, Mr. Rosenthal, Mr. Roybal, Mr. Saylor, and Mr. Stephens):

H.R. 9885. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to provide additional beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals for the care and treatment of veterans afflicted with alcoholism; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 9886. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a taxpayer a deduction from gross income for tuition and other expenses paid by him for his education or the education of his spouse or any of his dependents, with the right to postpone such deduction for up to 5 years when necessary to obtain the full benefit thereof; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER (for himself, Mr. Dulski, Mr. Rosenthal, and Mr. Dow):

H.R. 9887. A bill to regulate and prevent burdens upon commerce among the States by providing a system for the taxation of money earned outside of a State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 9888. A bill to provide compensation to survivors of local law enforcement officers killed while apprehending persons for committing Federal crimes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 9889. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to finance and participate with State and local interests in the financing of recreational enterprises and industrial establishments needed for the economic development of rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9890. A bill to charter a National Home Ownership Foundation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9891. A bill to repeal the authority for the current wheat and feed grain programs and to authorize programs that will permit the market system to work more effectively for wheat and feed grains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 9892. A bill to prohibit certain financial institutions from participating in gambling activities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9893. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 to provide for a National Community Senior Service Corps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9894. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9895. A bill to amend section 4(e) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to require the Secretary of Labor to investigate the effect of foreign competition on domestic employment when a complaint is filed by an employer or labor organization; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9896. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9897. A bill to amend the joint resolution of October 23, 1965, relating to National Parkinson Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLANCO-ABREU:

H.R. 9898. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to assist bilingual education programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9899. A bill to provide grants-in-aid to States for gold mining subsidies; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9900. A bill to provide tax incentives to encourage gold mining; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRYOR:

H.R. 9901. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code so as to make widows of servicemen who die on active duty in the Armed Forces eligible for educational assistance under that title; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9902. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow teachers to deduct from gross income the expenses incurred in pursuing courses for academic credit and degrees at institutions of higher education and including certain travel; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PURCELL:

H.R. 9903. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H.R. 9904. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase from $600 to $1,000 the personal income tax exemptions of a taxpayer (including the exemption for a spouse, the exemptions for a dependent, and the additional exemptions for old age and blindness); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REID of New York (for himself, and Mr. Scheuer):

H.R. 9905. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 9906. A bill to amend the war orphans' educational assistance program of title 38 of the United States Code to extend to widows of men who died from a service-connected disability the same educational benefits which are provided for war orphans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9907. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow percentage depletion on certain clays at the same rate as allowed on calcium carbonates and limestone used in the manufacture of cement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9908. A bill to amend title II of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the issuance of brokerage licenses to certain persons authorizing them to arrange for the transportation by motor vehicle of groups of passengers and their baggage; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 9909. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 9910. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow income tax deductions for certain payments made and expenses incurred in providing or securing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9911. A bill to amend the Older Americans Act of 1965 so as to extend its provisions; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9912. A bill to establish and prescribe the duties of a Federal boxing commission for the purpose of insuring that the channels of interstate commerce are free from false or fraudulent descriptions or depictions of professional boxing contests; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9913. A bill to establish certain policies with respect to certain use permits for national forest lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9914. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code in order to promote the care and treatment of veterans in State veterans' homes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 9915. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to curb the tax-exempt financing of industrial or commercial facilities used for private profitmaking purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9916. A bill to amend the section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax exemption for interest on State or local obligations issued to finance industrial or commercial facilities to be sold or leased to private profitmaking enterprises; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 9918. A bill to prohibit the burning, defacing, mutilating, or trampling upon of the flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States, with intent to degrade or cast contempt upon such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9919. A bill to regulate imports of milk and dairy products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 9920. A bill to provide for the establishment of a program under which supplemental agricultural workers can be recruited for temporary employment in the continental United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 9921. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in order to provide assistance to local educational agencies in establishing bilingual educational opportunity programs, and to provide certain other assistance to promote such programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9922. A bill to designate the National Institutes of Health as the John E. Fogarty Health Institutes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 9923. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9924. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VANIK:

H.R. 9925. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to permit local welfare agencies in their discretion to furnish the physicians' services required by aged patients in nursing homes, as medical assistance under an approved State plan, through physicians regularly employed on their staffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAMPLER:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to reduce from 60 to 50 the age at which a woman may become entitled to widow's insurance benefits (subject to further actuarial reduction under the existing formula); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9927. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 9928. A bill to amend the Oil Pollution Act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9929. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ZABLOCKI:

H.R. 9930. A bill to amend title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, relating to library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, to include laboratory and other specialized equipment; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9931. A bill to close loopholes in parts 3 and 4 of schedule 3 of the tariff schedules of the United States by providing that the provisions in such parts for fabrics in chief value of wool shall also apply to fabrics in chief weight of wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 9932. A bill relating to taxation by States of the income of Members of Congress, members of their staffs, and certain officers of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9933. A bill to amend title II of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to create the Federal Maritime Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 9934. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 9935. A bill to authorize the distribution of a portion of the Federal tax revenue to the States for elementary and secondary education purposes and to permit individuals to claim a credit against Federal income taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MIZE:

H.R. 9936. A bill to revise the quota-control system on the importation of certain meat and meat products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 9937. A bill to prohibit certain financial institutions from participating in gambling activities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 9938. A bill to amend section 702 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to permit grants after construction is commenced for basic water and sewer facilities which qualify for such grants but cannot receive them prior to construction because of the unavailability of funds; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 9939. A bill to amend the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965 to increase from $200 million to $500 million the amount of the annual appropriations authorized thereunder for grants for basic water and sewer facilities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ESHLEMAN:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution to control the dissemination of pornographic literature through the U.S. mail, to prohibit the sale or other distribution of obscene materials in interstate commerce, and to increase the penalties for making lewd publications available to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution to create a delegation to a convention of North Atlantic nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

H.J. Res. 565. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution of the United States to guarantee the right of any State with the approval of its electorate to consider factors in addition to population in the apportionment of one house of its legislature; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 566. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

H.J. Res. 567. Joint resolution to provide for the resumption of trade with Rhodesia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KASTENMEIER:

H.J. Res. 568. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.J. Res. 569. Joint resolution to require a feasibility study with respect to the establishment of one or more additional mints prior to discontinuing the use of the facilities of the U.S. assay office in San Francisco for the production of coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 570. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, extending the right to vote to citizens 18 years of age or older; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H.J. Res. 571. Joint resolution requesting the Department of Defense to use butter in its rations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. TAFT:

H.J. Res. 572. Joint resolution designating the 7-day period beginning on the Sunday starting the last full week in October each year as Cleaner Air Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 344. Concurrent resolution relative to the Supreme Court decision on the reading of the Bible and offering of prayers in the public schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H. Res. 473. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SCHADEBERG:

H. Res. 474. Resolution to amend rule XXII of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H. Res. 475. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the proposed construction on Guam of a memorial honoring the Japanese dead of World War II; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 9940. A bill for the relief of Moris Bakhash; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRASCO:

H.R. 9941. A bill for the relief of Angelo Leanza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of Michigan:

H.R. 9942. A bill for the relief of Jing Shen Tao and his wife, Chia Lin Pao Tao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9943. A bill for the relief of Konstantinos Orfanakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 9944. A bill for the relief of Homayoun Navidzadeh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 9945. A bill for the relief of Elemer Nyarady; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 9946. A bill to incorporate the Fair Campaign Practices Committee, Inc.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 9947. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Chiaramonte; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDERSON:

H.R. 9948. A bill to authorize the State of North Carolina to lease a portion of the Fort Macon Military Reservation for certain purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KORNEGAY:

H.R. 9949. A bill for the relief of the Pine Hall Brick & Pipe Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LLOYD:

H.R. 9950. A bill for the relief of Chan Lung Kin, also known as Ken Chan or Chan Sing: to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 9951. A bill for the relief of Dragica Milosevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9952. A bill for the relief of Leonardo Ferrara; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9953. A bill for the relief of Salvatore Picciurro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9954. A bill for the relief of Chester Jamrozik; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 9955. A bill for the relief of Albert Wangke Ferdinand Winter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 9956. A bill for the relief of Rosella Sposito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9957. A bill for the relief of Walter Spychalski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 9958. A bill for the relief of Gregoris Gountanis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9959. A bill for the relief of Amnon Feldman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

81. By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: Petition of Reinhold Artmann, Summit, Miss., and approximately 20,000 others, relative to protesting aid and trade with Communist countries; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

82. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Henry Stoner, Portland, Oreg., relative to House Resolution 452; to the Committee on House Administration.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 11, 1967

(Legislative day of Wednesday, May 10, 1967)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, our Father, whose still, small voice invites us to turn aside from the feverish ways of the world and whose tender love bids us find our strength in Thee: We are conscious as we bow at this altar of Thy grace that if we live a life of prayer Thou art present everywhere. Amid the draining duties of these demanding days, by the spiritual resources that are found in Thee alone restore our jaded spirits.

Endow and enrich Thy servants in this national body with wisdom and purity of motive in the ministry of public affairs. Make them worthy of the Nation's trust in these days so fraught with destiny.

"We pledge our hopes, our faith, our lives,
That freedom shall not die,
We pray Thy guidance, strength, and grace:
Almight God on high."
Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on May 10, 1967, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 303) to amend the act of June 30, 1954, as amended, providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and for other purposes.

REPORT OF NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 122)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to submit to the Congress this report of continued progress in the Nation's space program.

The report covers the months January to June 1966. Since then, the risk to human life and the formidable technical difficulties that must accompany the exploration of space were vividly brought home to every American by the tragic fire which cost the lives of three of our brave astronauts.

The way to the stars was never thought to be easy. But the goal we seek promises such great benefits to mankind that we must press on. We must surmount difficulty and lessen danger so we can continue in the steady pursuit of this historic mission.

The achievements reported here reflect not only our progress in space flight, but also new steps taken toward the real objective of all our efforts in space—the application of new knowledge to bettering the lives of all people. Already, we see dramatic examples of success in the satellites which have improved our weather forecasts and navigation, and which are extending radio and television communication to the farthermost regions of the earth.

We are determined that space be kept free from the weapons of war. Just recently the Senate ratified the Treaty on Outer Space. This historic action dramatizes our continuing efforts to cooperate with other nations in conducting experiments, sharing data, and developing controls to assure that the space efforts of every nation will serve the cause, not of war, but of peace and prosperity for all mankind. The Senate's action, taken without a dissenting vote, enables me to reaffirm as President what I said as a Senator to the United Nations in 1958:

> On the goal of dedicating outer space to peaceful purposes for the benefit of all mankind, there are no differences within our government, between our parties or among our people.

The U.S. space program, as reflected in this report, continues to exemplify our Nation's conviction that the road to peace, progress, and abundance is through continued cooperation among all nations.

I commend this report to your attention.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 11, 1967.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 6950) to restore the investment credit and the allowance of accelerated depreciation in the case of certain real property; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MILLS, Mr. KING of California, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin, and Mr. CURTIS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, May 10, 1966, was approved.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS—LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with statements limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we have two minor bills on the calendar, not objected to; and I believe that in view of the fact that the Senate passed these bills in the previous Congress, there will be no objection. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 211 and 212.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946

The bill (S. 538) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 538

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET

"SEC. 138. (a) There is hereby created a joint service committee, to be known as the Joint Committee on the Budget (hereinafter in this section called the joint committee) to be composed of fourteen members as follows:

"(1) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee; and

"(2) Seven Members who are members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, four from the majority party and three from the minority party, to be chosen by such committee.

"(b) No person shall continue to serve as a member of the joint committee after he has ceased to be a member of the committee from which he was chosen, except that the Members chosen by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives who have been reelected to the House of Representatives may continue to serve as members of the joint committee notwithstanding the expiration of the Congress. A vacancy in the joint committee shall not affect the power of the remaining members to execute the functions of the joint committee, and shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection, except that (1) in case of a vacancy during an adjournment or recess of Congress for a period of more than two weeks, the members of the joint committee who are members of the committee entitled to fill such vacancy may designate a member of such committee to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee, and (2) in the case of a vacancy after the expiration of a Congress which would be filled from the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, the members of such committee who are continuing to serve as members of the joint committee, may designate a person who, immediately prior to such expiration, was a member of such committee and who is reelected to the House of Representatives, to serve until his successor is chosen by such committee.

"(c) The joint committee shall elect a chairman and vice chairman from among its members at the first regular meeting of each session: *Provided, however,* That during even years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate, and during odd years the chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the Senate and the vice chairman shall be selected from among the members who are Members of the House of Representatives.

"(d) The joint committee may make such rules respecting its organization and procedures as it deems necessary: *Provided, however,* That no measure or recommendation shall be reported from the joint committee unless a majority of the committee assent.

"(e) It shall be the duty of the joint committee—

"(1)(A) to inform itself on all matters relating to the annual budget of the agencies of the United States Government, including analytical, investigative, audit, and other reports on Federal operations prepared by the General Accounting Office pursuant to section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, the Government Corporation Control Act, and section 206 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, and by other Federal agencies, and including the initiation or continuation of Federal programs by utilization of borrowing authority, contract obligational authority, or other means which do not require direct appropriations for the initiation or continuation of such programs; (B) to provide the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate with such information on items contained in such budget, and the justifications submitted in support thereof, as may be necessary to enable said committees to give adequate consideration thereto; (C) to consider the President's messages on the state of the Union and the Economic Report, to consider all information relating to estimated revenues, including revenue estimates of the Department of the Treasury and the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, to consider essential programs, and to consider changing economic conditions; and (D) to report to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate its findings with respect to budget estimates and revisions in appropriations required to hold expenditures to the minimum consistent with the requirements of Government operations and national security;

"(2) to recommend to the appropriate standing committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate such changes in existing laws as may effect greater efficiency and economy in government;

"(3) to make such reports and recommendations to any standing committee of either House of Congress or any subcommittee thereof on matters within the jurisdiction of such standing committee relating to deviations from basic legislative authorization, or to appropriations approved by Congress which are not consistent with such basic legislative authorization, or to cutbacks in previously authorized programs which require appropriations, as may be deemed necessary or advisable by the joint committee, or as may be requested by any standing committee of either House of Congress or by any subcommittee thereof;

"(4) to report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate at the beginning of each regular session of the Congress the total estimated costs of all programs and projects authorized by the Congress, together with estimated costs of such programs and projects during the fiscal year underway, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years, and to make such interim reports as may be deemed advisable.

"(f) The joint committee, or any subcommittee thereof, shall have power to hold hearings and to sit and act anywhere within or without the District of Columbia whether the Congress is in session or has adjourned or is in recess; to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, and documents; to administer oaths; to take testimony; to have printing and binding done; and to make such expenditures as it deems necessary to carry out its functions within the amount appropriated therefor. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the chairman or vice chairman of the committee and shall be served by any person designated by them. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (U.S.C., title 2, secs. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

"(g) The joint committee shall have a staff director, an associate staff director, and such other professional, technical, clerical, and other employees, temporary or permanent, as may be necessary to carry out the duties of the joint committee. Such employees shall be employed without regard to the civil service laws, and their compensation shall be fixed without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended. The staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the party of which the chairman of the joint committee is a member, and the associate staff director shall be appointed by and responsible to the members of the opposition party. No person shall be employed by the joint committee unless the members appointing him have favorably considered the data with respect to him submitted by the Federal Bureau of Investigation after a thorough investigation of his loyalty and security.

"(h) The joint committee shall make available members of its staff to assist the staffs of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and of the Senate and the several subcommittees thereof during the periods when appropriation bills are pending.

"(i) Professional and technical employees of the joint committee, upon the written authority of the chairman or vice chairman, shall have the right to examine the fiscal books, documents, papers, and reports of any agency of the United States Government within or without the District of Columbia, and data related to proposed appropriations incorporated in the annual budget transmitted by the President.

"(j) The annual budget of the United States shall henceforth include a special analysis of all active long-term construction and development programs and projects authorized by the Congress, showing for each the total estimated cost, and the actual or estimated expenditures during prior fiscal years, the current fiscal year, the ensuing fiscal year, and subsequent fiscal years. All grants-in-aid programs shall be included in this analysis, in a separate grouping, showing under the heading 'Subsequent Fiscal Years' for grants of indefinite duration the estimated annual cost for a ten-year period. Each agency carrying on any program by utilization of the borrowing authority shall, at such times as the committee shall specify, report to the committee upon the extent of its borrowings under such program, and upon its operations generally under such program. Upon request of the joint committee, any agency shall submit to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate estimates for proposed appropriations on an annual accrued expenditure basis.

"(k) Qualified members of the staff of the Bureau of the Budget shall, at the request of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives or the Senate, or any subcommitte thereof, be assigned to attend executive sessions of the subcommittees of the Appropriations Committees and to explain the content and basis of proposed appropriations.

"(l) The Comptroller General of the United States shall, at the request of the chairman of the Joint Committe on the Budget, make such investigations and reports with respect to any agency as will enable such joint committee to give adequate consideration to items relating to such agency which are contained in the budget as submitted by the President, and the justifications submitted in support thereof; and, for this purpose, the Comptroller General is authorized to employ technical and professional personnel without regard to the civil service laws, rules, or regulations, and fix their compensation without regard to the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

"(m) When used in this section, the term 'agency' means any executive department, commission, council, independent establishment, Government corporation, board, bureau, division, service, office, officer, authority, administration, or other establishment, in the executive branch of the Government. Such term includes the Comptroller General of the United States and the General Accounting Office, and includes any and all parts of the municipal government of the District of Columbia except the courts thereof.

"(n) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section. Appropriations for the expenses of the joint committee shall be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate upon vouchers signed by the chairman or vice chairman."

SEC. 2. Section 133 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(g)(1) All bills and joint resolutions authorizing appropriations reported from committees of the Senate or the House of Representatives shall be accompanied by reports in writing, which shall be printed; and there shall be included in each such report or in an accompanying document an estimate from the department or other agency of the legislative, executive, or judicial branch of the Government primarily concerned of the probable cost of carrying out the legislation proposed in such bill or resolution over the first five-year period of its operation or over the period of its operation if such legislation will be effective for less than five years. If the chairman of the committee determines that no existing department or agency is primarily concerned with the legislation, the estimate shall be made by the Bureau of the Budget.

"(2) Estimates received from departments or agencies under this subsection may be submitted by the committees to the Bureau of the Budget for review, and such reviews, when practicable, shall be included in the reports or accompanying documents before said bills and joint resolutions are reported.

"(3) The Joint Committee on the Budget shall maintain compilations of all such estimates, and semiannually shall print those compilations (together with any comment of the Bureau of the Budget) for the information of the Congress."

SEC. 3. Section 139 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The Joint Committee on the Budget is authorized to recommend that joint hearings be held by the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and of subcommittees thereof; but such joint hearings shall not affect the power of the respective committees, and of subcommittees thereof, to conduct separate additional committee hearings, and shall not affect the independence of committee deliberations and decision. The chairman of each such joint hearing shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof, of the House in which the bill is pending at the time of the hearing, and the vice chairman shall be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the other House, or of the appropriate subcommittee thereof."

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 220), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE

The purpose of this bill is to provide the Congress with the machinery necessary to enable it to meet its constitutional responsibilities in connection with the appropriation of funds required for the conduct of the Federal Government. The bill S. 538, if enacted, would accomplish this objective by establishing a Joint Committee on the Budget, composed of members of the Senate and House Appropriations Committees, which would assist the Congress in exercising adequate control over the expenditure of public funds by the executive branch of the Government.

S. 538 is designed to remedy serious deficiencies in congressional appropriation procedures by providing the same kind of expert staff facilities and detailed technical information for the Appropriations Committees of the Congress, on a 12-month basis, as the Bureau of the Budget provides for the executive branch. Precedent for this action is found in the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation which has provided joint expert staff facilities and technical information for the revenue committees of both Houses of the Congress for more than a quarter of a century.

This bill, sponsored by 65 Members of the Senate, is identical to S. 2, approved by the Senate in the 89th Congress. The Senate also approved similar bills in the 82d and 83d Congresses, after extensive hearings, and again in the 84th, 85th, 87th, and 88th Congresses. The pending bill includes perfecting amendments adopted by the committee since it was first reported and approved by the Senate on April 8, 1952. A complete legislative history of the proposed legislation is included in Senate Document 11 (87th Cong.), entitled "Financial Management in the Federal Government," which was filed in the Senate by the Committee on Government Operations on February 13, 1961.

NEED FOR LEGISLATION

For many years, the Congress has labored under a tremendous disadvantage in connection with budget requests and justifications. Requests for funds are made by the executive branch, and witnesses who appear before the Appropriations Committees in support of these requested appropriations represent exclusively the point of view of that branch of the Government. Since it is their duty as officers of the Government to support all items contained in the President's budget, it becomes their function and responsibility to demonstrate that the specified amounts are necessary. For the most part, these requests are supported by elaborate justifications, based upon extensive agency research, and by the testimony of technical experts who have devoted many years to the fields in which they are working, and whose main objective is to continue or extend the programs and operations of their respective agencies. Testimony from the public, except from witnesses appearing in behalf of public works projects, is rarely received, and, in a vast majority of instances, the only manner in which the public interest can be considered and protected, with respect to the purpose for which the funds are sought or their need or adequacy, is through careful scrutiny of requests and justifications by members of the Appropriations Committees. Other Members of Congress must rely largely upon the recommendations of these committees when funds are appropriated by the House and the Senate.

The material contained in the Federal budget is developed and assembled by numerous employees and officials in the departments and agencies, reviewed and substantiated by each department and agency, and then reviewed, revised, and finalized by the Bureau of the Budget, where approximately 500 persons are employed. In the Washington area alone, a very large number of persons in executive branch departments and agencies are involved in the preparation of the budget each year. In addition to the Federal budget itself, a tremendous amount of detailed information is supplied in written form to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, and presented orally at hearings which last for many months and cover thousands of typed and printed pages.

Finally, when the requests are reduced to the form of legislative proposals, there are usually between 12 and 15 appropriation bills running into hundreds of pages and containing thousands of separate items.

Unfortunately, committee members are so heavily burdened by other legislative duties and responsibilities that they are unable personally to give the necessary attention to each budget item. Equally important, however, is the fact that they do not have adequate facilities for obtaining the information necessary to enable them to pass accurate judgment on the necessity for the budget requests. Thus, for the most part, they are forced to rely upon the representations made by the respective initiating agencies of the executive branch, whose representatives appear before these committees in an ex parte type of proceeding for the sole purpose of justifying their requests for funds. As a result, the Congress is often unable to obtain impartial information and facts to enable it to effect needed economies in the operations of the Government. Because the Congress is not adequately equipped to carry out its fiscal responsibilities, many millions of dollars have been appropriated in excess of the actual requirements of the Federal Government. These excesses have, in turn, added to the large recurring deficits which must be passed on to already over-burdened taxpayers.

The duties and responsibilities of the Appropriations Committees, in connection with examining and passing upon budget requests for the operation of the Federal Government, have increased tremendously in recent years. These committees are staffed with competent professional personnel. It is virtually impossible, however, for their relatively small staffs to examine and evaluate the annual budget with its many thousands of items within the very limited time available. This precludes the detailed analysis which is so essential to the performance of the congressional function controlling Federal expenditures.

INCREASING COST OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

One of the most serious problems confronting the Nation today is the maintenance of national solvency in the face of ever-growing demands on the Federal Government for domestic programs and services, coupled with the necessity of meeting the ever-rising cost of our commitments in Vietnam. Our national expenditures budget has grown from $69 billion in fiscal year 1957 to an estimated $126.7 billion in fiscal year 1967 and an estimated $135 billion in fiscal year 1968. Thus we are rapidly moving toward annual expenditures in all categories that are approaching $180 billion, bearing in mind that approximately $45 billion in annual spending does not appear in the appropriation budget. Finally, our national debt, as of June 30, 1966, has reached an alltime high of $320.4 billion and is expected to reach approximately $327.3 billion by June 30, 1967. The committee believes that this matter is of the gravest concern to the Congress.

From the inception of our Government to the present time it has been clearly understood that the Constitution vests in the Congress—and the Congress alone—the exclusive right to appropriate money for the various branches of the Federal Government, and to designate the purposes for which the money shall be used.

Although the Government is now operating in an era of annual expenditures budgets in the neighborhood of $135 billion, the procedures used by the Congress in carrying out these vital responsibilities are practically no different than those used 25 or 50 years ago. In other words, the methods and procedures which we now use in the appropriation processes are simply inadequate to meet present-day needs and requirements.

Members of the Congress have learned from contacts with the people back home that there is a tremendous ground swell of public sentiment for economy in government, and demands for action in eliminating unnecessary expenditures in the operations of the Government. S. 538 is designed to remedy the existing deficiencies relative to appropriation procedures and the expenditure of public funds—to which practically all Members are dedicated—by providing the machinery necessary to enable the Congress to accomplish this objective.

In his 1967 budget message, the President stressed the vital importance of effective and economical management of governmental programs so as to enhance the benefits of those programs and release resources for the people's use. He detailed the steps being taken under a planning-programing-budgeting system which is part of a comprehensive effort to improve the effectiveness of Government programs by requiring all agencies to (1) make explicit the objectives of their program and relate them carefully to national needs; (2) set out specific proposed plans of work to attain these objectives; and (3) analyze and compare the probable costs and benefits of these plans against those of alternative methods of accomplishing the same results. The President stated further that this system will substantially improve our ability to decide among competing proposals for funds and to evaluate actual performance.

It is the view of the committee that the Congress, in acting upon the President's legislative and appropriation requests, would be in a far better position to insure conformance to these objectives if the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget is established, as proposed by S. 538.

It is eminently clear that the conditions which prompted the introduction of this measure, in 1950, and its initial passage by the Senate, in 1952, have in no way diminished. On the contrary, they have increased with the rising cost of Government and the swelling of the national debt. We have only to compare our national expenditures budget of $39.5 billion in fiscal year 1950, and $65.3 billion in fiscal year 1952, with the fiscal year 1966 figure of $107 billion, the fiscal year 1967 estimate of $126.7 billion, and the fiscal year 1968 estimate of $135 billion, to get the full impact of the current picture. If that is not sufficient, compare our national debt of $257.3 billion in 1950, and $259.1 billion in 1952, with the $320.4 billion which constituted our national debt as of June 30, 1966, and an estimated $327.3 billion by June 30, 1967, the latter figure representing an increase since June 30, 1952, of $68.2 billion in the national debt alone.

As important as are the services rendered by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation in the revenue field, the proposed Joint Committee on the Budget would be in a position to render far greater service to the Congress in a field that is much broader in nature and scope. Its functions would include analyses and reports on the details of program operations, a review of the actual administration of authorized functions, and the compilation of data on agency activities and programs in conformity with legislative authority, for the information of the Appropriations Committees and other committees, and to make such data available to individual Members of the Congress. The importance of providing this type of service for the committees dealing with the appropriation of public funds is emphasized by the scope of the problems involved and the magnitude of Federal appropriations and expenditures.

This bill represents the culmination of 17 years of careful study by the Committee on Government Operations, in an effort to evolve some method by which congressional fiscal procedures and controls can be improved in order that the legislative branch may assume its rightful position with respect to vital decisions affecting the future of the Nation. Confronted with imposing and increasing threats to the national economy because of ever-mounting spending pressures, both from internal sources and from abroad, it is essential that the Congress delay no longer in meeting this issue head on. This committee believes that S. 538 offers a sound approach to the solution of these problems, in that it would equip the legislative branch with adequate machinery to examine carefully every item of expenditure, so that appropriations may be limited to only as much and no more than is actually required to provide the minimum funds essential to the successful operation of the Government.

COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 188) creating a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in connection with the agreement to schedule floor consideration today on my proposal, S. 188, for establishment of a special Presidential study commission to recommend to curb distribution of obscene literature and materials, I wish to express my appreciation to the leadership for the swift action given this measure.

It is my hope that comparable and immediate action is forthcoming in the other body on the Senate-passed bill, or the companion measure which has been introduced by Congressman DOMINICK DANIELS and on which a House subcommittee has held hearings in which I was privileged to testify.

Should favorable action be taken by the Senate today on S. 188, it would clearly evidence the concern which is felt by many Members of this body toward recent Supreme Court decisions on obscenity and, in particular, the latest decision on Monday of this week.

The combination of recent Court decisions and existing laws on obscenity has resulted in a confusion that defies reasonable and responsible solution under present statutes.

It has been said there is a fine line dividing that which is obscene and pornographic and that which is, for example, considered art, literature, or free expression.

It is my conviction that if there is such a fine line, it has become so twisted and obscure that all but the obviously hardcore pornography can be identified as such.

Establishment of the commission, as proposed in my bill, can clear away the legal cobwebs through a study to develop a definition of what constitutes obscenity and thus, from its findings, recommend the legislative and administrative forms of action which are needed to combat this traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

Mr. President, the expeditious approval of S. 188 would mark the fourth time the Senate has gone on record in behalf of this measure, or one comparable to it, and there is no question in my mind that there is powerful support from the general public throughout America that the time has come for the Congress to set in motion the action required to bring an end to the operations of greedy merchants-in-filth who are trying to pollute our society.

We have, Mr. President, taken steps to clear the air we breathe. We have moved forward in trying to do something about the pollution of our streams and lakes.

But, Mr. President, we have not made the progress in the one area which I consider the most vital of all, the great resource that is ours in our young people—and it is the young people of America, in particular, who are the chief targets of this vile campaign to poison their minds, a pollution problem going to the very structure of our society.

I feel confident, Mr. President, that we are going to be joined in any action we may take, by the Members of the House of Representatives, many of whom already have expressed through public statements and in conversations their sincere desire to do something effective and constructive in this field.

Mr. President, I think it also is appropriate to include at this time the names of my colleagues who joined with me as cosponsors of S. 188. They are: Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CASE, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COTTON, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. FONG, Mr. HICKENLOOPER, Mr. HOLLAND, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. McGOVERN, Mr. MORSE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. RIBICOFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. THURMOND, Mr. TOWER, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

I also would like to thank the Senator from Ohio [Mr. LAUSCHE] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] who, though not cosponsors of the bill, expressed their support of the measure yesterday when I presented the report from our committee to the Senate.

Mr. President, I urge the passage of S. 188.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. The Congress finds that traffic in obscene matters and materials is a matter of grave national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. The Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution. are subject to Federal regulation. The State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials. Governmental action to be effective needs the support and cooperation of an informed public. It is the purpose of this Act to bring about a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat by all constitutional means this pernicious traffic.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) Number and Appointment.—The Commission shall be composed of twenty members, appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) One from the Senate;

(2) One from the House of Representatives;

(3) Two from the Post Office Department;

(4) Two from the Department of Justice, one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(5) One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(6) Three from the clergy;

(7) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of secondary education;

(8) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of higher education;

(9) One who shall be a prominent librarian;

(10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;

(12) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;

(13) One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industries;

(14) One from among the attorneys general of the several States;

(15) One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government; and

(16) One who shall be a chief law enforcing officer of a city or county government.

(b) Vacancies.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Continuation of Membership Upon Change of Status.—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

Sec. 5. Eleven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) Members of Congress.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members From the Executive Branch.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members From Private Life.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 9. (a) Investigation, Analysis, and Recommendations.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials at the various levels of governmental responsibility;

(2) to provide for the development of a plan for improved coordination between Federal, State, and local officials in the suppression of such traffic;

(3) to determine ways and means of informing the public as to the origin, scope, and effects of such traffic, and of obtaining public support in its suppression;

(4) to secure the active cooperation of leaders in the field of mass media for the accomplishment of the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(5) to formulate recommendations for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic; and

(6) to analyze the laws pertaining to traffic in noxious and obscene matters and materials, and to make such recommendations to the Congress for appropriate revisions of Federal laws as the Commission may deem necessary in order to effectively regulate the flow of such traffic.

(b) Report.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than January 31, 1967. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 10. (a) Hearings and Sessions.—The Commission, or on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Advisory Committees.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission (1) may constitute such advisory committees within States composed of citizens of that State, and (2) may consult with Governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local government and private organizations, as it deems advisable. Any advisory committee constituted pursuant to this subsection shall carry out its duties without expense to the United States.

(c) Obtaining Official Data.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an excerpt from the report (No. 221), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PURPOSE

S. 188 provides that a commission will be established to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene and noxious materials, and to (1) seek means of improving coordination between various levels of Government to suppress such traffic; (2) endeavor, through the cooperation of various information and communication media, to inform the public about the problem and to further the objectives of the Commission; and (3) report its findings and recommendations as to what legislative, administrative, or other forms of action need to be taken to combat the traffic in obscene and noxious materials.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

S. 188 is similar to S. 162, a bill introduced in the 87th Congress, which was favorably reported by the Government Operations Committee of the Senate (S. Rept. 284) and passed by the Senate.

In the 86th Congress, the Government Operations Committee of the Senate reported S. 3726 (S. Rept. 1749) and in the 89th Congress the Committee reported S. 309 (S. Rept. 1355) which were identical to S. 188, and these bills were passed by the Senate.

This legislation has been introduced in an effort to bring about a workable and effective program to fight the traffic in obscene and noxious matters and materials. While considerable interest has been shown by Congress and by the general public in the serious problems involved in the distribution of pornographic literature, no single effective piece of legislation has been adopted which deals a crippling blow to this insidious industry.

Many religious, patriotic, and service organizations and groups have been continually urging Congress to take action on this serious and menacing problem. The Congress has taken note of the widespread harm done to youth and others through the dissemination of lewd, obscene, and noxious materials, and a number of bills have been introduced in Congress on the subject.

Twenty-eight additional Senators have joined in the sponsorship of this bill. It is the belief of the sponsors that the best approach to the problems resulting from the distribution of obscene materials would be through the establishment of a commission which could thoroughly examine all the facets of the problems and could then recommend steps to be taken both by legislative bodies and by private groups and citizens to meet the threat posed by the dissemination of obscene matters.

It is the belief of the sponsors that this small group of experts, drawn from a wide area of interests, could make recommendations and initiate action more effectively.

The Commission is to be made up of persons from several walks of life who have knowledge of the seriousness of the problem and the many legal problems connected with the suppression of the traffic in obscene materials.

The Commission will study the need for any new Federal regulations for controlling such traffic, as well as the general need for State laws or local ordinances for this purpose.

Efforts will be made by the Commission to alert the public, especially the parents and school-age children, about the seriousness of this pernicious traffic and give guidance to the public in suppressing the distribution of such lewd and obscene matters, or in bringing the purveyors of filth into court.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

The following Government agencies will have representatives on the Commission: The Post Office Department, the Department of Justice (including the Federal Bureau of Investigation), and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. There will also be one Member from the House of Representatives and one Member of the Senate on the Commission.

Public members are selected from groups knowledgeable on this question both from a moral aspect and from a law enforcement aspect. These will include three clergymen, a secondary school official, a State attorney general, a county or city prosecutor, and a county or city law enforcement officer.

Representatives from the information and communications media will sit on the Commission. One member will come from the moving picture industry, one from the radio-television industry, and one from the publishing industry.

This group will represent all segments of the population concerned with the problems resulting from distribution of noxious and obscene matters and materials.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate reconsider the engrossment, third reading, and the passage of S. 188.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that an amendment now at the desk be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 7, line 9, strike out the words "January 31, 1967" and insert the words "two years after the Commission is established".

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

FINDINGS OF FACT AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

Section 1. The Congress finds that traffic in obscene matters and materials is a matter of grave national concern. The problem, however, is not one which can be solved at any one level of government. The Federal Government has a responsibility to find more effective ways of preventing the transmission of such matters and materials through the instrumentalities which, under the Constitution, are subject to Federal regulation. The State and local governments have perhaps an even greater responsibility in the exercise of their police powers to protect the public, and particularly minors, from the morally corrosive effects of such matters and materials. Governmental action to be effective needs the support and cooperation of an informed public. It is the purpose of this Act to bring about a coordinated effort at the various governmental levels, and by public and private groups, to combat by all constitutional means this pernicious traffic.

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE COMMISSION ON NOXIOUS AND OBSCENE MATTERS AND MATERIALS

Sec. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there is hereby created a Commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission").

(b) Service of an individual as a member of the Commission or employment of an individual by the Commission as an attorney or expert in any business or professional field, on a part-time or full-time basis, with or without compensation, shall not be considered as service or employment bringing such individual within the provisions of section 281, 283, 284, 434, or 1914 of title 18 of the United States Code, or section 190 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 99).

MEMBERSHIP OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 3. (a) Number and Appointment.—The Commission shall be composed of twenty members, appointed by the President, as follows:

(1) One from the Senate;

(2) One from the House of Representatives;

(3) Two from the Post Office Department;

(4) Two from the Department of Justice, one of whom shall be from the Federal Bureau of Investigation;

(5) One from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare;

(6) Three from the clergy;

(7) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of secondary education;

(8) One who shall be a prominent educator in the field of higher education;

(9) One who shall be a prominent librarian;

(10) One who shall be a prominent representative of the book publishing industry;

(11) One who shall be a prominent representative of the newspaper, magazine, and periodical publishing industry;

(12) One who shall be a prominent representative of the motion picture industry;

(13) One who shall be a prominent representative of the radio and television industries;

(14) One from among the attorneys general of the several States;

(15) One who shall be a chief prosecutor of a city or county government; and

(16) One who shall be a chief law enforcing officer of a city or county government.

(b) Vacancies.—Any vacancy in the Commission shall not affect its powers, but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(c) Continuation of Membership Upon Change of Status.—A change in the status or employment of any person appointed to the Commission pursuant to subsection (a) of this section shall not affect his membership upon the Commission.

ORGANIZATION OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 4. The Commission shall elect a Chairman and a Vice Chairman from among its members.

QUORUM

Sec. 5. Eleven members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum.

COMPENSATION OF MEMBERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 6. (a) Members of Congress.—Members of Congress who are members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(b) Members From the Executive Branch.—The members of the Commission who are in the executive branch of the Government shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services in the executive branch, but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(c) Members From Private Life.—The members from private life shall each receive $100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

STAFF OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 7. The Commission shall have power to appoint and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

EXPENSES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 8. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, so much as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 9. (a) Investigation, Analysis, and Recommendations.—It shall be the duty of the Commission—

(1) to explore methods of combating the traffic in obscene matters and materials at the various levels of governmental responsibility;

(2) to provide for the development of a plan for improved coordination between Federal, State, and local officials in the suppression of such traffic;

(3) to determine ways and means of informing the public as to the origin, scope, and effects of such traffic, and of obtaining public support in its suppression;

(4) to secure the active cooperation of leaders in the field of mass media for the accomplishment of the objectives and purposes of this Act;

(5) to formulate recommendations for such legislative, administrative, or other forms of action as may be deemed necessary to combat such traffic; and

(6) to analyze the laws pertaining to traffic in noxious and obscene matters and materials, and to make such recommendations to the Congress for appropriate revisions of Federal laws as the Commission may deem necessary in order to effectively regulate the flow of such traffic.

(b) Report.—The Commission shall report to the President and the Congress its findings and recommendations as soon as practicable and in no event later than two years after the Commission is established. The Commission shall cease to exist sixty days following the submission of its final report.

POWERS OF THE COMMISSION

Sec. 10. (a) Hearings and Sessions.—The Commission or, on the authorization of the Commission, any subcommittee or member thereof, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, administer such oaths, and require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as the Commission or such subcommittee or member may deem advisable. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the Chairman of the Commission, of such subcommittee, or any duly designated member, and may be served by any person designated by such Chairman or member. The provisions of sections 102 through 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (2 U.S.C. 192–194) shall apply in the case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpena or to testify when summoned under authority of this section.

(b) Advisory Committees.—In carrying out its duties under this Act, the Commission (1) may constitute such advisory committees within States composed of citizens of that State, and (2) may consult with Governors, attorneys general, and other representatives of State and local government and private organizations, as it deems advisable. Any advisory committee constituted pursuant to this subsection shall carry out its duties without expense to the United States.

(c) Obtaining Official Data.—The Commission is authorized to secure directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality, information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics for the purpose of this Act, and each such department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Commission, upon request made by the Chairman or Vice Chairman.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, it is intended today to move forward and, hopefully, finish Order No. 204, S. 1432, the Selective Service Act of 1967.

When that is behind us, we would hope to move on to S. 1031, the Peace Corps authorization bill. We hope to have the report filed today.

Then we hope to consider S. 1030, the information media guarantee program. We hope to have that report filed today.

Then we would like to get on to Senate Joint Resolution 33, the National Commission on Product Safety. We hope to have that report filed today.

After that, we hope to take up S. 1160, the Public Television Act of 1967. We hope to have that report on Friday. If we can get that done, we hope to go over until Monday.

PERSONAL STATEMENT BY SENATOR LONG OF LOUISIANA

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, sometime in the next few days, as a matter of personal privilege, I shall make reference to what I believe was a very inadequate newspaper reporting job that occurred during the investment tax bill debate. It seems to me that when something important is going on, the public is entitled to know the facts and to know what it is all about. I regret to say that there has been so much misinformation spread during the debate that it really needs quite a bit of correction, so that people can know what has been going on.

It is too bad when people cannot read the newspapers and find out what the facts generally are; and I do not believe it is always the fault of the newspaper publishers themselves. Sometimes the newspaper reporters get lazy and tired, and after long hours they get to where they do some very sloppy reporting; and some fellow who does not serve in the press gallery starts editorializing about things about which he knows nothing. So I believe that in due course I shall discuss that matter.

This is one point I should like to make: Here is the calendar. We have one important bill on it. Although we spent 5 weeks debating the previous bill, the tax bill, and the amendments thereto, we now find that if we pass the selective service bill today, as we very well should, we are out of business, so to speak. We have to get some bills out of committees, and we have been permitting the committees to meet daily during the sessions of the Senate in order to try to get the bills out.

So, some poor, pitiful excuse of a newspaper reporter has been writing that people should stay out of the Senate Gallery because of the so-called fiasco that was going on in the Senate. As a matter of fact, we were conducting a momentous debate. The Congressional Record will show that the debate does credit to every participant. Once in a while, I must admit, we become a little carried away with our own self-righteousness, to the point that on occasion it appeared that there might be a fist fight on the floor. But we did what the Senate is supposed to do: We deliberated and came to a conclusion. And the more I think about it, the happier I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Hollings in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I hate to admit it, but the more I look at the Gore amendment, it looks like a better amendment all the time—the one on which we finally agreed.

I am very happy about the things that worked out; and I shall schedule hearings as soon as the administration forwards its recommendations to us, as to how we will go about financing honest elections in this country. The debate that we had will be enormously helpful to us in proceeding forward to determined how this matter can be handled.

Some Senators were very constructive, and even those who were not constructive came up once in a while with a constructive thought. It is said that even a blind hog finds an acorn now and then. We will start holding hearings within a few days after the President's recommendations on the election problem come before the Senate.

So I would say that, on the whole, the Senate is moving along, as the majority leader has said we should, as a stop, look, and listen Congress. We stopped; we looked; we listened; we meditated; we came to a preliminary conclusion. As I have pointed out, the Senate is not supposed to be a place where we agree on everything. It is supposed to be a place where we disagree, hopefully without being disagreeable, and then, after having discussed matters at considerable depth, we vote.

In my judgment, one of the very interesting features of the great debate we have just concluded is that we voted 6 or 7 times on the same proposition, and each time we voted differently from the time before. So that we have given a great deal of thought to the issue, and now we are in a position to do it justice, which is the kind of thing that we have a right to expect of the Senate.

As I have said, in due course we will conduct the hearings and invite all Senators to be aware and to be ready that the hearings will be held on the election problem, soon after the President's recommendations are before us and we have had a chance to digest them.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, all committees were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Long of Louisiana, and by unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations and withdrawing the nomination of Harold J. Maples to be postmaster at Marionville, Mo., which nominating messages were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, we have a number of nominations on the calendar, and I have a hold order on the AID nomination; but we are ready to act on the Coast Guard nominations, and I ask that they be reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will go into executive session.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

NOMINATIONS PLACED ON THE SECRETARY'S DESK—U.S. COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed, en bloc.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, does that take care of the nomination of Charles H. MacLean III, as well as the others?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It takes care of all nominations on the Executive Calendar except that of Rutherford M. Poats.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion of Mr. LONG of Louisiana, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 11–1902, District of Columbia Code, relating to the duties of the coroner of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the purchase of meals for District of Columbia employees and National Guardsmen and U.S. Park Police on special duty (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORT OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on examination into the transfer of handtool and paint stocks from the Department of Defense to the General Services Administration, dated May 1967 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDING OFFICER:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39

"Concurrent resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Whereas, The 89th Congress of the United States of America, at the first session begun and held at Washington, D.C., Monday, January 4, 1965, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to-wit:

" 'JOINT RESOLUTION —

" 'Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

" 'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" ' "ARTICLE

" ' "SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" ' "SECTION 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" ' "SECTION 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" ' "SECTION 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President'."

"*Thereafter*, when the President transmits to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as the Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of Texas, the Senate and the House concurring:

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Texas hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

"SEC. 2. That the Secretary of State of Texas notify the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Administrator of General Services of the United States, and each senator and representative from Texas in the Congress of the United States of this action of the Legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this Concurrent Resolution."

A joint resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 12

"Resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"*Resolved by this Assembly:*

"Whereas, the Eighty-ninth Congress of the United States of America at its First Session, in both houses, by a constitutional majority of two-thirds thereof, has made the following proposition to amend the Constitution of the United States in the following words, to wit:

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein). That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

" 'SECTION 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the president shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

" 'SECTION 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

" 'SECTION 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

" 'Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as the Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in Session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office.'

"Be it resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Connecticut:

"That the said proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States be and the same is hereby ratified; and be it further

"Resolved:

"That certified copies of this resolution be forwarded by the Governor of the State of Connecticut to the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States and the Administrator of General Services of the United States.

"Certified as correct by

"Arthur Lewis,
"Legislative Commissioner.
"Charles M. McCollum, Jr.,
"Clerk of the Senate.
"Paul B. Groobert,
"Clerk of the House.

"Adopted February 14, 1967."

A letter in the nature of a petition from The United States Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs, signed by Homer D. Babbidge, Jr., chairman, relating to the creation of a Corps of Education Officers to serve in the U.S. foreign service, and appropriations for the same; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution endorsed by the Grand River-Joy-Linwood Boulevard Council, Inc., of Detroit, Mich., favoring the appropriation of funds for the Office of Economic Opportunity for the fiscal year 1967 in order to provide special employment; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution adopted by the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Cape May Court House, N.J., relating to the flying of the flag throughout the night, for the duration of the war in Vietnam; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. **PASTORE**, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S. 1160. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 by extending and improving the provisions thereof relating to grants for construction of educational television broadcasting facilities, by authorizing assistance in the construction of noncommercial educational radio broadcasting facilities, by establishing a nonprofit corporation to assist in establishing innovative educational programs, to facilitate educational program availability, and to aid the operation of educational broadcasting facilities; and to authorize a comprehensive study of instructional television and radio; and for other purposes (Rept. No. 222).

By Mr. **MAGNUSON**, from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments:

S.J. Res. 33. Joint resolution to establish a National Commission on Product Safety (Rept. No. 225).

By Mr. **MORSE**, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 1031. A bill to amend further the Peace Corps Act (75 Stat. 612), as amended (Rept. No. 223).

By Mr. **BARTLETT**, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 10. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Ocean Delight*, owned by Saul Zwecker, of Port Clyde, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 227);

S. 111. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Eugenie II*, owned by J. C. Strout, of Milbridge, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 228);

S. 690. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to cause the vessel *Draggin' Lady*, owned by George W. Stevenson of Rockport, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 229);

S. 1093. A bill to authorize the use of the vessel *Annie B.* in the coastwise trade (Rept. No. 230); and

S. 1494. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Transportation to cause the vessel *Cap'n Frank*, owned by Ernest R. Darling of South Portland, Maine, to be documented as a vessel of the United States with full coastwise privileges (Rept. No. 231).

EXTENSION OF FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM UNDER SECTION 810 OF HOUSING ACT OF 1964—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE (S. REPT. NO. 224)

Mr. **SPARKMAN**, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported an orginal bill (S. 1762) to amend section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 to extend for 3 years the fellowship program authorized by such section, and submitted a report thereon, which bill was read twice by its title and ordered to be placed on the calendar, and the report was ordered to be printed.

DISAPPROVAL OF REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 2—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 226)

Mr. **RIBICOFF**. Mr. President, from the Committee on Government Operations, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 114, to disapprove Reorganization Plan No. 2, relating to the U.S. Tariff Commission. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the individual views of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits].

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The report will be received and the resolution will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. **MAGNUSON**:

S. 1752. A bill to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels; to the Committee on Commerce;

S. 1753. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act so as to permit retirement of employees with 30 years of service on full annuities without regard to age; and

S. 1754. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **MOSS**:

S. 1755. A bill for the relief of Maria Scorro Bolick; and

S. 1756. A bill for the relief of Joseph H. Lym, doing business as Lym Engineering Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **LONG** of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. Ellender):

S. 1757. A bill for the relief of John Thornton Knight, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. **MAGNUSON** (by request):

S. 1758. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the chartering for certain passenger cruise service of vessels operating under subsidy; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **COTTON**:

S. 1759. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide for the payment of father's insurance benefits in certain cases where an individual is a widower, is the father of a child under age 14, and has such child in his care; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. **HART** (for himself, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Hatfield, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Javits, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Morse, Mr. Nelson, Mr. Proxmire, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1760. A bill to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hart when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. **BREWSTER**:

S. 1761. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, to eliminate compensatory time in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. **SPARKMAN**:

S. 1762. A bill to amend section 810 of the Housing Act of 1964 to extend for 3 years the fellowship program authorized by such section; which was read twice by its title, and placed on the calendar.

(See reference to the above bill when reported by Mr. Sparkman, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees".)

By Mr. **BURDICK** (for himself, Mr. Jackson, and Mr. Hatfield):

S. 1763. A bill to promote the economic development of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Burdick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MORSE (for himself and Mr. HATFIELD):

S. 1764. A bill to repeal section 7 of the act of August 9, 1946 (60 Stat. 968); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS (for himself, Mr. BARTLETT, Mr. CASE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PELL, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. RANDOLPH, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 1765. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect horses shipped in interstate commerce to determine if such horses have been subject to inhumane treatment for the purpose of affecting or altering their natural gait, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. TYDINGS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TOWER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER):

S. 1766. A bill to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to prohibit certain extensions of credit inimical to the national interest; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. TOWER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 1767. A bill to amend section 109(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. MCCLELLAN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S.J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to require a feasibility study with respect to the establishment of one or more additional mints prior to discontinuing the use of the facilities of the U.S. assay office in San Francisco for the production of coins; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

DESIGNATION OF NATIONAL HALIBUT WEEK

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) to provide for the designation of National Halibut Week, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, which appears under a separate heading.)

RESOLUTION

REFERENCE OF SENATE BILL 1757 TO COURT OF CLAIMS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. ELLENDER) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 119); which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. RES. 119

Resolved, That the bill (S. 1757), entitled "A bill for the relief of John T. Knight, now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, is hereby referred to the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims; and the chief commissioner of the Court of Claims shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of sections 1492 and 2509 of title 28 of the United States Code, as amended by the Act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 958), and report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, giving such findings of fact and conclusions thereon as shall be sufficient to inform the Congress of the nature and character of the demand as a claim, legal or equitable, against the United States and the amount, if any, legally or equitably due from the United States to the claimant.

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT PROHIBITING FISHING IN THE TERRITORIAL WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the legislation which I am about to introduce would provide for an amendment to Public Law 88-308, which prohibits fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States, and by persons in charge of such vessels.

I have examined the present legislation and it is my own judgment that the present law is sufficient, but it seems that a further clarification of the law might better clarify the intent of the Congress in this important area of enforcement against foreign encroachment on our coastal fisheries.

Although there has been no official criticism of the present law, Mr. President, it seems to me that this clarification might better inform the courts should such cases be presented before them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1752) to amend the act prohibiting fishing in the territorial waters of the United States and in certain other areas by vessels other than vessels of the United States and by persons in charge of such vessels, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

CHARTER FOR CERTAIN PASSENGER CRUISE SERVICE OF VESSELS OPERATING UNDER SUBSIDY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, by request, a bill for appropriate reference, to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 in order to authorize the chartering for certain passenger cruise service of vessels operating under subsidy. Introduction was requested by the Committee of American Steamship Lines.

It has long been recognized that there is a continuing need for an American-flag passenger ship fleet. However, in order to combat the inroads of foreign flag competition, it has become necessary to utilize our existing fleet in a more efficient manner.

This bill is intended to permit the chartering of vessels in subsidized service by one subsidized line to another, for use by the latter on its trade route. Such legislation will vary from the present law so as to permit a subsidized operator to charter its passenger ships to another subsidized operator with regular passenger service, rather than operating those vessels in the cruise trade itself.

This cross chartering will allow the company most familiar with the trade route to administer the service through its established agents, and to integrate the ships with its normal marketing and advertising plans. It would also assure the line owning the vessel the most effective use of the ship during the "off season" period, without the necessity of engaging in a trade with which it is not familiar. It will also preclude the undertaking of advertising and other expenses which substantially exceed those required by the existing operators.

The benefits of cross chartering now exist, by special legislation, for cruise service of the Caribbean. Several years ago, in recognition of the need to better utilize American-flag passenger ships, we enacted legislation which would permit U.S.-flag operators to engage in the cruise service of the Caribbean. This legislation enabled east coast passenger line operators to provide cruises to the Caribbean on vessels which were not required for the regular passenger service during the slow season. As a result of this earlier legislation, the loss generally incurred by the subsidized lines as a consequence of the lay-ups of unused passenger ships was reduced through utilization in the cruise trade.

The charterer of a passenger ship seeking to increase his service on a trade route competitive with a cargo operator will still have to comply with the requirements of section 605(c) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The primary purpose of section 605(c) is to protect an existing subsidized carrier on a trade route from dilution of traffic through increase of competitive operations without a demonstration that present service is inadequate. This bill will insure the continued protection of section 605(c) to existing subsidized carriers against an undemonstrated need for competitive service.

This bill will permit all lines to maximize their service potential by employing other available passenger ships.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1758) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to authorize the chartering for certain passenger cruise service of vessels operating under subsidy introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ABOLITION OF THE DEATH PENALTY

Mr. HART. Mr. President, today I offer a bill to abolish capital punishment for Federal crimes. I am joined by the following distinguished cosponsors Mr. BURDICK, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. LONG of Missouri, Mr. McCARTHY, Mr. MONDALE, Mr. MORSE, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROXMIRE, Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Reasons for abolishing the death penalty are clear and unmistakable. It has failed to deter crime. It does not protect law enforcement officers. It does not permit rectification of errors. The long delay—

now almost inevitable—between sentencing and execution can fairly be described as "cruel and unusual" punishment. And, it discriminates against minorities and the poor.

NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL TRENDS

A growing number of nations have ended the practice. There are now 73 countries—Bolivia having been added this past year—which have abolished the death penalty.

Here in the United States, 13 of our States no longer permit capital punishment. My own State of Michigan was the first, 120 years ago.

Rhode Island followed in 1852, and Wisconsin in 1853. Then came Maine, 1887; Minnesota, 1911; North Dakota 1915; Alaska and Hawaii, 1957; Oregon, 1964; Iowa and West Virginia, 1965; and that same year New York and Vermont eliminated it except for special cases.

Capital punishment is today only infrequently applied. In 1965, 67 persons were sentenced to death, as compared with 98 the year before. During 1965 there were 62 reprieves from the death sentence.

In 1966 only one man was executed in the United States.

During the past 36 years, there has been a steady decline in executions from a high of 200 in 1935 to 1 in 1966.

Public opinion favoring abolition has increased in recent years. The Gallup poll reports the following:

Percent favoring death penalty

	1953	1960	1965
Yes	68	51	45
No	25	36	43
No opinion	7	13	12

IS THE DEATH PENALTY A DETERRENT?

Every civilized man shudders at the thought of the death penalty. Can it be justified?

The strongest argument advanced by supporters of the death penalty is that it deters crime. Every Member of this body is acutely aware of this Nation's growing concern at crime rates in our country. At no time in our recent history has this been more forcefully expressed than it is today.

The President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice recently reported that:

> The existence of crime, the talk about crime, the reports of crime, and the fear of crime have eroded the basic quality of life of many Americans—controlling crime in America is an endeavor that will be slow and hard and costly.

Why, then, one asks, should we do away with a tool that can help stop crime?

But, is the death penalty deterrent? All the statistics and studies available to me either establish that capital punishment is not a deterrent, or simply point out that, statistically at least, there is no apparent relationship between murder and crime rate and the death penalty. If capital punishment deters murder, then those States without the penalty should have higher murder rates than those retaining the penalty. Yet crime statistics do not bear this out at all.

Here are the 50 States, listed in order of murder and nonnegligent manslaughter rates, per 100,000 population. The first figure is the number of executions for 1930–65. The data come from the National Prisoner Statistics and the FBI's Uniform Crime Reports for 1965. The abolition States are italicized:

Murder and nonnegligent manslaughter rates per 100,000 population, 1930–65

	Executions, 1930-65	Rate per 100,000
Alabama	135	11.4
Georgia	366	11.3
South Carolina	162	9.6
Florida	170	8.9
Mississippi	154	8.9
Nevada	29	8.4
Louisiana	133	8.1
Tennessee	93	8.0
North Carolina	263	7.9
Texas	297	7.5
Maryland	68	6.7
Missouri	62	6.7
Virginia	92	6.6
Alaska	*0*	*6.3*
New Mexico	8	6.1
Arkansas	118	5.9
Kentucky	103	5.3
Illinois	90	5.2
Delaware	12	5.1
Arizona	38	5.0
California	291	4.7
New York	*329*	*4.6*
Michigan	*0*	*4.4*
Oklahoma	59	4.4
West Virginia	*40*	*4.4*
Ohio	172	3.6
Colorado	46	3.5
Indiana	41	3.5
Pennsylvania	152	3.5
Oregon	*19*	*3.4*
Hawaii	*0*	*3.3*
New Jersey	74	3.2
Wyoming	7	2.9
Kansas	15	2.7
New Hampshire	1	2.7
Massachusetts	27	2.4
Nebraska	4	2.4
Washington	47	2.2
Maine	*0*	*2.1*
Rhode Island	*0*	*2.1*
Idaho	3	2.0
Montana	6	1.7
Connecticut	0	1.6
South Dakota	1	1.6
Utah	13	1.5
Wisconsin	*0*	*1.5*
Minnesota	*0*	*1.4*
Iowa	*18*	*1.3*
North Dakota	*0*	*0.9*
Vermont	*4*	*0.5*

It is interesting to note that the five States with the highest murder rates have carried out more executions than almost any other State, while the five with the lowest rates have abolished the death penalty.

There may be some justifiable scientific objections to this sort of comparison because climatic, environmental, economic, and social factors may also play a role.

But even examining the figures on a regional basis offers no testimonial to the efficacy of the death penalty.

The abolition State of Michigan has a lower murder rate than the capital punishment State of Illinois. Ohio and Indiana, both with the death penalty, have relatively low murder rates—but not nearly as low as the abolition State of Wisconsin.

If statistics are boring, listen to the words of one who spent his life of fighting crime.

Clinton Duffy, the famous former warden of San Quentin Prison, says flatly:

> I do not favor capital punishment because I do not believe it is a deterrent to crime.

Warden Duffy had a wealth of experience on which to base that judgment.

> From 1929 to 1952 I talked with every man that was convicted in San Quentin under penalty of death. Many of these men have been executed, others commuted to life imprisonment, some without possibility of parole. A few have had new trials or reversals. Some have died while serving their sentence in prison walls. I have asked personally every man (and two women) if they gave any thought to the fact that they might be executed should they commit a murder or a crime that is covered by the death penalty. I have asked hundreds—yes thousands of prisoners who have committed homicides, and who were not sentenced to death, whether or not they thought of the death penalty before the commission of their act. I have interviewed and have asked the same question of thousands of robbers who used a gun or other deadly weapon, in the commission of their "stick up." . . . They of course are potential murderers. I have to date, not heard one person say they had ever thought of the death penalty prior to the commission of their crime.

John Barker Waite, for over 30 years professor of criminal law at the University of Michigan, has pointed out:

> After the Lindbergh kidnapping case, when some jurisdictions set up a death penalty for kidnapping, not only did kidnapping increase in frequency, but it occurred as often in the death penalty jurisdictions as in others. Nowhere have I found evidence of deterrent value in capital punishment.

Furthermore, there is an inconsistency among those who favor the argument of deterrence. Evelle J. Younger, writing in the American Bar Association Journal, pointed out:

> If the death penalty is a deterrent, we should logically let the public witness an execution so that the spectacle might save someone from a crime he might otherwise commit. Felony prisoners should have reserved seats. We shouldn't put a prisoner to death as painlessly as possible. If the efficacy of the punishment be found in its severity, such severity should be increased until it results in minimizing crime. By making our executions as private and as humane as possible, we admit that if any influence at all is exerted, it must be debasing or positively harmful.

Supporters of capital punishment make the case that it protects law enforcement officers and prison guards in special instances. But the evidence indicates that there is no relationship between the presence or absence of the penalty and the homicide rate of policemen or prison personnel. Prof. Thorsten Sellin, in studying police homicide rates over a 25-year period in 11 capital punishment States and 6 abolition States, concluded that the rate in death penalty cities was 1.3 per 100,000 persons, with the cities in abolition States having a rate of 1.2 per 100,000 persons.

Former Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, has noted another argument against the myth of deterrence. In his message to the legislature of January 31, 1963, Governor Brown wrote:

> Punishment is a deterrent to crime only if it is swift and certain. But of all major crimes, the punishment for homicide is most subject to the law's delay and to the inconsistencies of our courts.
>
> The evidence is clear. In 1961 there were 609 homicides in California. Only 106 defendants were found guilty of first degree and only 20 were given the sentence of death.
>
> How can it be argued that our gas chamber

> is an effective deterrent if only one murderer in 30 is actually sent to Death Row?
>
> It is probable . . . that only 12 of the 600 murderers actually will surrender their lives to the state. What possible deterrence can there be in a penalty we invoke only 2 percent of the time?

Far from acting as a deterrent, there are some indications that capital punishment may actually be an incentive. The late Dr. Philip A. Roche, specialist in criminology at the University of Pennsylvania, stated:

> The number of murderers who are mentally unstable is larger than we care to admit. In some instances, they are attracted to the spectacle of their own execution and attempt to secure it to insure their own destruction.

The one man executed in the United States this past year was James French, electrocuted in the Oklahoma State Prison for strangling his cellmate. He was serving a life sentence for murder.

Before he died, French told a University of Oklahoma psychiatrist, Dr. Louis A. Wist, that he was angered when his first conviction did not result in a death sentence. His basic motive in the second murder, he stated, was to force the State to execute him.

EFFECT ON COURT PROCEDURES

A further comment on our court proceedings is made in the recent report of the President's Crime Commission:

> Whatever views one may have on the efficacy of the death penalty as a deterrent, it clearly has an undesirable impact on the administration of criminal justice. Capital cases take longer to litigate at the trial level; the selection of a jury often requires several days, and each objection or point of law requires inordinate deliberation because of the irreversible consequences of error. In addition, the inherent sensationalism of a trial for life distorts the factfinding process and increases the danger that public sentiment will be aroused for the defendant, regardless of his guilt of the crime charged. This distortion is not restricted to the trial level. As Mr. Justice Jackson noted: "When the penalty is death * * * (appellate) judges are tempted to strain the evidence and even in close cases, the law, in order to give a doubtfully condemned man another chance."

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE POOR

Just as the poor are discriminated against in many aspects of American life, so are they unwitting victims in cases involving capital punishment. Writes former Gov. Michael V. Di Salle of Ohio:

> The men in death row in the Ohio State Penitentiary today, as during my administration, have one thing in common: they are penniless. They have other common denominators—low mental capacity, little or no education, few friends, broken homes—but the fact that they have no money is the principal factor in their being condemned to death. I have never seen a person of means go to the chair. It is the well-heeled gangster, the professional killer who can afford the best legal talent to defend him, who gets off with a lesser sentence. It is the poor, the illiterate, the underprivileged, the member of the minority group—the man who because he is without means is defended by a court-appointed attorney—who becomes society's blood sacrifice.

Imposition of the death penalty precludes, of course, any opportunity for rehabilitation. Yet hundreds of case histories reveal that those convicted of murder are, after release, good risks. From 1945 to 1965, 273 Ohio lifers were returned to society. Fifteen became parole violators and only two returned to prisson, one for robbery and one for assault.

THE OCCASIONAL INNOCENT MAN

What of the wrong man convicted of the crime? Governor Brown tells the story of John Henry Fry, sent to San Quentin Prison for the slaying of his wife.

> He was under the influence of alcohol at the time of the crime and was uncertain of his own guilt or innocence. But he chose to plead guilty to manslaughter and was given a sentence of one to ten years.
>
> A year later another man was found guilty and I issued a full pardon to John Henry Fry.
>
> The point to remember is this. An innocent man could have been sent to his death, on the evidence in the case, had he chosen to plead not guilty and gone to trial on a first degree murder indictment.

This is but a single example. Error in court proceedings is not an extreme rarity. During the period 1889 to 1927, of 406 persons sent to Sing Sing for execution, 50 were found upon reconsideration to have been sentenced in error.

A report of the Presbyterian Church has noted the weaknesses in our system:

> Is it not unreasonable to ascribe infallibility to judge, jurymen, witnesses, counsel, law enforcement officers and other assistants? Shall it be presumed that out of this composite of imperfect men there will come a perfect decision . . .? There are too many variables, such as vagaries of memory, erroneous recognition, fallibility of experts, faulty summing up, shortcomings of legal aid, inordinate ambition of prosecutors, prejudice, ignorance, irresponsibilities of jurors, rough police methods of obtaining evidence, sensational newspaper coverage, and biased public opinion. In consideration of these all-too-human elements, no decision upon a man's life should be final.

Thomas Jefferson, with compelling eloquence, took his stand thus:

> I shall ask for the abolition of the punishment of death until I have the infallibility of human judgment demonstrated to me.

"CRUEL AND UNUSUAL" PUNISHMENT

One other point: Even those who argue that execution today is swift and painless must concede that there is nothing painless about the years of uncertain waiting in death row, a delay that has become inevitable in the legal process leading to the execution chamber.

It can be fairly argued that this delay constitutes the "cruel and unusual punishment" forbidden by the Constitution.

The Crime Commission report had this to say about it:

> Furthermore, the imposition of a death sentence is but the first stage of a protracted process of appeals, collateral attacks, and petitions for executive clemency. At the end of 1965 there were 331 prisoners awaiting execution in the United States, and since then this number undoubtedly has increased. These prisoners then were under sentence for an average of 30.8 months, and the average time between imposition and execution was almost four years. The spectacle of men living on death row for years while their lawyers pursue appellate and collateral remedies tarnishes our image of humane and expeditious justice. But no one seriously proposes to limit the right of a condemned man to have errors at his trial corrected or to obtain the mercy of the executive.

The Commission also noted the discriminatory pattern of executions. It reported:

> Finally there is evidence that the imposition of the death sentence and the exercise of dispensing power by the courts and the executive follow discriminatory patterns. The death sentence is disproportionately imposed and carried out on the poor, the Negro, and the members of unpopular groups.

Where does all this lead us? I submit that, to the extent we have jurisdiction, we ought to eliminate the death penalty for we have such jurisdiction over general Federal crimes, District of Columbia crimes, and for military crimes.

In a statement given July 23, 1965, to Chairman JOHN L. MCMILLAN of the House District of Columbia Committee, concerning H.R. 559, a bill to abolish the death penalty and substitute life imprisonment, Attorney General—then Deputy—Ramsey Clark said:

> We favor the abolition of the death penalty. Modern penology with its correctional and rehabilitation skills affords greater protection to society than the death penalty which is inconsistent with its goals. This Nation is too great in its resources and too good in its purposes to engage in the light of present understanding in the deliberate taking of human life as either a punishment or a deterrent to domestic crime. A piecemeal abolition of the death penalty in Federal law is meaningless, if not harmful. If abolition is indicated for murder, why not for rape? If abolition is indicated within the District of Columbia, why not then for all Federal crimes?

There was a time when human life was held to be cheap. Even today, in some parts of the world, we see little concern for preservation. But here we are taking another course. We are building a society devoted to saving lives, not destroying them either carelessly or willfully. Yet so long as the death penalty lasts, that long will we be holding to the ancient admonition of "an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth."

Mr. President, I send the bill to the desk, ask that it be appropriately referred and that unanimous consent be given for its printing at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1760) to abolish the death penalty under all laws of the United States, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. HART (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1760

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) no sentence of death shall be imposed hereafter upon any person convicted of any criminal offense punishable under any provision of law of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or any territory or possession of the United States, and no unexecuted sentence of death heretofore imposed under any such provision shall be carried into execution after the date of enactment of this Act. Each such provision which authorizes or requires the imposition of such sentence hereafter shall be deemed to authorize or require the imposition of a sentence to imprisonment for life, and each sentence of death heretofore imposed under any such provision which remains unexecuted on the date of enactment of this Act shall be deemed to be a sentence to imprisonment for life.

(b) The Attorney General is authorized and directed to transmit to the Congress at the earliest practicable time his recommendations for appropriate amendments to be made to all such provisions of law which by their terms provide for or relate to the imposition of any sentence of death in order to substitute for such sentence in all such laws a sentence to imprisonment for life.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, it should be noted that a national committee has been set up to promote abolition of the death penalty for Federal crimes.

It is under the leadership of Michael V. DiSalle, formerly Governor of Ohio. Governor DiSalle is the author of a book on the subject of capital punishment, "The Power of Life or Death," and is one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the subject.

He has been joined by a very distinguished panel of Americans who also believe the death penalty is not a proper tool for a civilized nation.

Creation of the committee, and participating national organizations, was announced yesterday. I ask unanimous consent that the press release of the National Committee To Abolish the Federal Death Penalty be printed at this point in my remarks.

The press release presented by Mr. HART is as follows:

Fifteen national organizations have launched a united effort to abolish capital punishment in the Federal jurisdiction, it was announced today. They are the charter affiliated members of the National Committee to Abolish the Federal Death Penalty. It is expected that additional organizations will join the Committee.

Michael DiSalle, former Governor of Ohio, is chairman of the new organization. DiSalle, long identified as one of the most articulate spokesmen against capital punishment, stressed, in announcing the formation of the Committee, that the cooperating organizations opposed the death penalty in the States as well as in the Federal jurisdiction.

"It was decided to focus and concentrate this national effort on the Federal level," he said, "in the hope and belief that once this sensible and civilized reform is taken by our national government, as it has by 72 governments around the world, our States will follow. Thirteen states have already abolished capital punishment."

Twelve nationally prominent persons were named in the partial list of the Committee's Board of Advisers. They are:

Edmund G. Brown, former Governor of California; John A. Burns, Governor of Hawaii; Paul H. Douglas, former Senator from Illinois; Mrs. Herbert B. Ehrmann, vice-president, American League to Abolish Capital Punishment; Maurice Eisendrath, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; James Farmer, formerly executive director CORE; William L. Guy, Governor of North Dakota; Grant Sawyer, former Governor of Nevada; Professor Thorsten Sellin, author of "The Death Penalty," a report for the model penal code project of The American Law Institute; Rev. Charles E. Sheedy, Dean, College of Arts and Letters, University of Notre Dame; G. Mennen Williams, former Governor of Michigan; and Whitney Young, Jr., executive director, National Urban League, Inc. (Titles or organizational affiliations are for identification purposes only.)

The participating national organizations are:

American Civil Liberties Union.

Americans for Democratic Action.

American League to Abolish Capital Punishment.

American Veterans Committee.

National Council of Catholic Women.

Department of Christian Social Relations, Executive Council, Episcopal Church.

Friends Committee on National Legislation.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations.

Board of Social Ministry, Lutheran Church in America.

Board of Christian Social Concerns, The Methodist Church.

Office of Church and Society, United Presbyterian Church, U.S.A.

Unitarian Universalist Association.

Department of Social Action, United Church of Christ.

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association of the USA.

In addition, anti-capital punishment groups from California, Colorado, Indiana, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, and Ohio are affiliated with the Committee.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the willingness of these distinquished Americans to take the time from their busy days to give leadership in this fight deserves acknowledgment and thanks from all Americans. This I voice for the record.

GUAM DEVELOPMENT FUND

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the strategic importance of our westernmost Pacific territory of Guam recently was dramatized by the 2-day conference held there by President Johnson, other U.S. diplomatic and military leaders, and officials of the Republic of South Vietnam.

Important as Guam is to us strategically, it is more than just a defense bastion. It also is a valued community of 85,000 extremely loyal and energetic American citizens who are, as they like to call themselves, "America's showcase of democracy nearest the Bamboo Curtain."

The people of Guam have proved their devotion to the United States the hard way. As President Johnson pointed out when he arrived there, Guam is the only populated U.S. soil ever to be occupied by enemy forces—having undergone more than 3 years of occupation by the Japanese forces. It is indicative of the loyalty of Guam's people that there were no cases of collaboration with the enemy during that entire time. When liberation came, the local police force—called the "Guam Patrol"—fought side by side with the marines. Several of them were awarded Silver Stars and Bronze Stars for their valor in action against the Japanese.

Today, as General Westmoreland has noted, Guam has a very sizable portion of her sons serving in Vietnam, a substantial number of whom have been killed in action.

I cite the foregoing, Mr. President, as some background for the legislation I am about to introduce, the Guam Development Fund Act of 1967. I am pleased to be joined in this effort by the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Territories, the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

The purpose of this legislation is to establish a $5 million fund which the Government of Guam will use to make loans to stimulate and develop private industry and private enterprise on Guam. The fund is directed toward developing the private sector of Guam's economy.

In enacting Public Law 88–170, the Rehabilitation Act of Guam, Congress recognized the imperative need to develop a viable civilian economy for Guam and thus provided under section 6 of the act an authorization of $200,000 for a Federal-Territorial Commission to make a long-range economic study for Guam.

This proposed bill will in fact serve to implement the intent of Congress.

My legislation, the Guam Development Fund Act of 1967, will provide what Guam patently needs most: An economic mechanism to help develop a viable civilian economy.

I may be asked why Guam needs such a special mechanism. Why cannot her people find capital for private industry through normal channels—banks, loan funds, and so forth? Let me briefly explain.

Prior to World War II, Guam's economy was based on agriculture and fishing, and it was reasonably prosperous. More than 3 years of Japanese occupation, plus liberation by the U.S. Marine Corps, ended a good way of life for the people of Guam. The Japanese allowed the many productive groves of coconut and betel nut trees to die. A number of those that survived were bulldozed by the Marines and Seabees to make necessary air strips. The result was the destruction in substantial part of Guam's only cash crop, copra, and it never revived.

Much of the fishing trade was similarly put out of business when our Navy had to dredge out a number of the bays and lagoons where clams, crabs and fish of all descriptions abounded. The sea life disappeared when the shallow, sandy bays were dug out to make space for large Navy ships.

In the two postwar decades since then, Guam's attempts to develop a new civilian economy of its own have been restricted by our military buildup there and by natural disaster such as Typhoon Karen in 1962. This, coupled with Guam's remoteness to the mainland and sources of capital, has made it difficult for business and industry to get started. As a result, Guam's industrious and intelligent people have been largely reduced to existing on that which the military economy brings. Today, more than 80 percent of Guam's economy is dependent upon the military.

Given a helping hand, Guam's people can do much to make themselves economically independent. Last year, the Department of the Interior released its two-volume economic development study of Guam. The study showed that Guam had excellent economic potential in several areas: tourism, assembly plants, fishing, and livestock. The Guam Economic Development Authority, an arm of the Government of Guam, has aggressively followed up these recommendations—searching everywhere to attract suitable business enterprises to Guam.

But capital remains the problem; sufficient private financing simply has not been available to do the job. And no sources of financing in the Federal Government have been persuaded to help out. For example, the first recommendation of Interior's economic study was for a first-class hotel, capable of attracting tourists for which Guam has excellent natural facilities—beautiful coral beaches, a beneficent climate, and many historical attractions.

Shortly after the study was released, leaders on Guam got busy. A site was selected, architectural plans approved, and a nonprofit corporation formed to handle financing and construction. Of the $2,800,000 required to build the planned 150-room hotel, all but $500,000 has been raised or guaranteed in loans.

Yet the project has been stalled for months because the Economic Development Administration has not seen fit to advance the final $500,000, which is less than one-fifth of the total cost. If there had been a Guam development fund in existence, this loan could have been granted.

There are other worthwhile enterprises of this nature on Guam that can be started in the near future. That is, if the Congress gives the people of Guam the tools through which they can help themselves. The most important tool, I submit, is the legislation which I have proposed.

Such legislation, I might add, can have broad implications for the United States in the entire western Pacific area. Since World War II we have held in trusteeship for the United Nations the vast stretch of Micronesia—the island chains of the Marianas, Marshalls, and Carolines that include among them such familiar islands as Tinian, Saipan, Yap, Truk, and Peleliu.

The United States has been criticized in the United Nations and elsewhere, Mr. President, for not providing enough funds and expert assistance to help the 90,000 people of the trust territories to develop their own economies. Just how solid the grounds are for such criticisms, I will not venture to say at this time. As chairman of the Territories Subcommittee on Interior and Insular Affairs, however, I do intend to personally find out in the near future.

But I do know this, Mr. President: Guam, the only U.S. soil in the farflung western Pacific, lies in the center of these trust territories.

For these far-reaching reasons I hope that this Congress will give early and favorable consideration to the legislation I have today proposed, the Guam Development Fund Act of 1967.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1763) to promote the economic development of Guam, introduced by Mr. BURDICK (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

TENNESSEE WALKING HORSE BILL

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, last year the Congress acted, with my full support, to end unnecessary pain and mistreatment of animals used in scientific research. In so doing, we recognized our responsibility to protect from unnecessary and cruel suffering those creatures which cannot speak for themselves. I am proud that we took this action. It was long overdue.

But there is another widespread problem of cruelty to animals which also requires corrective legislation. I refer to the widespread injury of the beautiful Tennessee walking horse in order to alter its natural gait.

Most of us at some time in our lives have attended a horse show and were thrilled to see these magnificent animals proudly prancing around a show ring. The Tennessee walking horse's back stride is long; its front feet barely touch the ground.

However, unscrupulous owners and trainers of horses, particularly Tennessee walking horses, have discovered that if the horse's front feet are sore he will lift them quickly from the ground and take a long striding step. This soreing is accomplished by use of chains or tacks on the feet, or by applying a burning agent to the pastern, the area just above the hoof. These burning agents vary, but the most common are an oxide of mercury salve known as "creeping cream," and an oil of mustard mixture called "scooting juice." Other cruel techniques recently developed involve driving nails into the feet, or injecting irritants into the sole area near the heel. These are more difficult to detect, especially as the trainers often then cover the wound with a pad and place an artificial foot over that. The horse moves in extreme agony, crouching on his hind feet with his head drawn back and the ears back. Often the pain is so severe that the horse will try to lie down in the ring.

The exhibitors and trainers who practice this cruelty claim that they have to follow the practice of inducing the "sore lick" to win a blue ribbon, asserting that many judges prefer the sore gait. However, these despicable practices are condemned by responsible organizations and by some State legislatures. The Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' and Exhibitors' Association of America officially prohibits the soreing of Tennessee walkers for show purposes, and published a notice, effective September 15, 1964, announcing that "due to flagrant violations by exhibitors" it will take disciplinary action. The American Horse Show Association also prohibits the showing of horses "equipped with artificial appliances, such as leg chains, wires or tacks, blistering or any other cruel and inhumane devices." But some of the biggest shows do not belong to the American Horse Show Association, and judges do not always follow the show rules.

My own State of Maryland and other States, including Tennessee, have laws prohibiting the showing of horses that have been tortured or cruelly treated in this fashion. Such a bill is now pending before the Wisconsin State Legislature. I ask that the Maryland and Tennessee statutes, and the Wisconsin State bill be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

Despite the rules of the horse associations and even State laws, these cruelties continue. An article by Alice Higgins in the January 11, 1966, issue of Sports Illustrated, a story by George Coleman in the January 6, 1966, edition of the New York World Telegram and Sun, a story in the May 30, 1966, issue of the Charlotte Observer, and statements by Mr. H. M. Oler of the American Humane Association and Mrs. Pearl Twyne of the American Horse Protection Association all attest to the fact that the practice of soreing Tennessee Walkers is widespread. I ask consent that these articles and statements be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Honorable Buford Ellington, former Governor of Tennessee and a member of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association, pleaded with the president of that organization 7 years ago to "clean up our own house," before legislation becomes necessary. His letter reads in its entirety:

MARCH 10, 1960.

Mr. GLENN TURNER,
President, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association, Lewisburg, Tenn.

DEAR MR. TURNER: I am sure you can understand my concern and the concern of many of our farmers, horse breeders, showmen and those in general that love and look on the Tennessee Walking Horse as the finest breed in America.

As a member of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association and in my official capacity as Governor, I am tremendously concerned about the adverse publicity that has been given to our association, our breeders and all others concerned. Such publicity does not only affect the guilty, but will greatly affect the acceptance of the Tennessee Walking Horse to the general public. I want to plead with you that we "clean up our own house." I have known for some time the desire and honest efforts of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association and its officers to take proper action to correct the situation. May I commend and congratulate you on your efforts.

I have been associated with the Tennessee Legislature—directly or indirectly—for the past six sessions. During each of those six sessions there has arisen the possibility of legislation being passed to curb some of the things that have been brought to light in recent publications. And, I insist that unless we can receive the cooperation of the exhibitors, breeders, trainers, judges, and all others concerned, legislation will be passed or our present laws strengthened to deal with it in our next session of the legislature.

I believe our association would prefer to work out its own problems rather than turn them over—through the legislature—to other organizations and groups to handle. I pledge you my full cooperation in taking whatever steps are necessary to remedy the situation in which we find ourselves, and it is my sincere hope that we will be able to do the job within our own association.

Sincerely,

BUFORD ELLINGTON,
Governor.

A number of representatives of humane groups in my own State of Maryland, as well as others, have tried to put an end to the deplorable practice of soreing a fine animal for show purposes. They have met with little success. Mr. William C. MacInnes of Tampa, Fla., former member of the board of the Tennessee Breeders Association, writes that—

> For quite a few years I worked . . . to clean up the abuse fostered on the show walking horses. After concluding that I was butting my head against a stone wall, I gave up the effort of showing walking horses and now I only sit on the side lines and feel sorry for the animals.

Mr. Thomas E. Blair, chief of California's Division of Fairs and Exhibitions, stated:

> I agree that this is a national problem and we would certainly look with favor on any legislation which would be as severe as our rules or even more severe.

Last year, when I introduced my bill on this subject, the Department of Agriculture reported unfavorably on it, believing that these abuses were limited and capable of being handled by the horse associations. Subsequent to that report, however, veterinarians from the Department visited some of our large horse shows, and what they saw changed their minds about the need for this bill.

The bill I introduce today, for myself and Senators BARTLETT, CASE, NELSON, PELL, PROXMIRE, RANDOLPH, and YOUNG of Ohio, would prohibit the interstate shipment of horses that have been injured for the purpose of altering their natural gait. This cruelty has been observed at nearly every Tennessee Walking Horse Show held in the United States. My bill would effectively curb this cruelty by giving the Secretary of Agriculture authority to inspect Tennessee walking horses shipped in interstate commerce. Because sored horses could not be taken to competitions outside their State, this vicious practice would be effectively curtailed, and hopefully, even eliminated altogether.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and articles will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1765) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to inspect horses shipped in interstate commerce to determine if such horses have been subjected to inhumane treatment for the purpose of affecting or altering their natural gait, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1765

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it shall be unlawful for any person to transport or ship, or cause to be transported or shipped, or to receive in interstate commerce any horse whose legs or feet have been made sore, after the date of enactment of this Act, for the purpose of affecting or altering the natural gait of such horse. The legs or feet of a horse shall be considered to have been made sore if chains have been used in a manner designed to irritate or break the skin surface of the horse, or if a blistering agent has been applied internally or externally to the horse, or if burns, cuts, or lacerations have been inflicted on the horse, or if a chemical agent, or tacks, nails, or wedges have been used on the horse, or if any other method or device has been used which causes physical pain to the horse when walking, trotting, or running.

(b) Any person guilty of violating this Act shall be fined not more than $500 or imprisoned not more than six months, or both.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make such inspections of horses transported in, or intended for transport in, or which have been transported in, interstate commerce as he deems necessary to determine if the provisions of this Act are being or have been violated. In carrying out the provisions of this Act the Secretary shall utilize, to the maximum extent practicable, the existing personnel and facilities of the Department of Agriculture.

SEC. 3. Whenever the Secretary of Agriculture determines that a violation of this Act has occurred he shall inform the Attorney General of such violation and the Attorney General shall take such action with respect to such violation as he deems appropriate.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to issue such rules and regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 5. As used in this Act the term "interstate commerce" means commerce between a point in any State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) and any point outside thereof or between points in the same State or possession of the United States (including the District of Columbia and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico) but through any point outside thereof.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The matters presented by Mr. TYDINGS are as follows:

CODE OF TENNESSEE

39-420. Misdemeanor. Horse shows—injuring front legs or hoofs of horse for competition unlawful: It shall be unlawful for any owner or exhibitor of horses to make the front legs and hoofs of such horses sore for the purpose of competition in horse shows and other similiar events by inflicting burns, cuts, lacerations or other injury or pain upon the front legs or hoofs of said horses by the use of blistering compounds (commonly referred to as "scooting juice"), sharp-pointed instruments and other devices or drugs (acts 1957, ch. 66(a) 1).

39-421. Disqualification of tortured horse at horse show—reports to manager and district attorney: It shall be the duty of all persons designated and acting as a ringmaster of any horse show or similar event to disqualify any horse determined by the ringmaster to be suffering from abuse or torture resulting from the causes set out in (a) 39-420 from further participation in said show and to make a report of the same, including the name of the horse, the owner of said horse, and the exhibitor of said horse, to the manager or chairman of said show, who in turn shall report the same in writing to the district attorney—general of the county wherein the incident occurred for appropriate action (acts 1957, ch. 66(a) 2).

39-422. Violations by owners, exhibitors ringmaster of any horse show or other event, or the failure of the manager or chairman of said show to perform the duties required of such officials by article 39-421, shall constitute a misdemeanor punishable by fine and imprisonment in the county jail or workhouse as in other misdemeanors (acts 1957, ch. 66(a) 3).

CODE OF MARYLAND

CRUELTY TO ANIMALS

Article 27, section 61. Injuring, etc., of race horse, etc.: Every person who willfully and maliciously interferes with, injures, destroys or tampers with, or who willfuly sets foot, instigates, engages in or in any way furthers any act by which any horse used for the purpose of racing, breeding, or competitive exhibition of skill, breed, or stamina is interfered with, injured, destroyed, or tampered with, or any act tending to produce such interference, injury, destruction or tampering, whether such horse be the property of himself or another, shall be deemed guilty of a felony, punishable by imprisonment in the Maryland Penitentiary for a term of not less than 1 year nor more than 3 years. (An. Code, 1951, sec. 78; 1939, sec. 71; 1937, ch. 11.)

[From Sports Illustrated, Jan. 11, 1960]

THE TORTURE MUST END

(If the American Horse Shows Association has nerve enough, it can stop abuse of the Tennessee walking horse right now.)

(By Alice Higgins)

No sportsmen have practiced such systematic cruelty to horses for the sake of a blue ribbon as is being perpetrated today. Shamefully brutal treatment of the Tennessee walking horse is generally practiced by breeders, trainers, and exhibitors and is tolerated by the SPCA, a society founded primarily to protect the horse. Worst of all, it is ignored by the American Horse Shows Association, the governing body of the sport, which is currently meeting in Detroit. I say worst of all because the AHSA could stop most of it this week if it chose to do so.

When I first described these abuses (Sports Illustrated, July 23, 1956), I was optimistic that measures were going to be taken to halt this horse torture. The various associations concerned piously expressed a desire to aid in the cleanup, rolling their collective eyes heavenward—apparently to avoid the ugly sight of quarter boots covered with blood, for they have taken no real action and the situation is now far worse than it ever was.

The quarter boot, designed to protect the horse against injury as he executes his unique running walk with its long-reaching hind stride, is still being used either to injure or to cover up deliberately inflicted injuries. Unfortunately for the breed, it was discovered that if the horse's front feet are sore he will lift them quickly from the ground, shift his weight to his sound hindquarters and take the much desired long-striding step. This "soreing" usually is done by using chains or tacks inside the quarter boot or by applying a burning agent to the pastern area, which is covered by the boot. These agents vary, but of the two most common, one, an oxide of mercury salve, is known as creeping cream, and the other, an oil of mustard mixture, is called scooting juice. The so-called big lick so coveted for show ring purposes is now almost completely the "sore lick."

One walking horse breeder hotly asserts that most of the recent world champions were made with a hot iron. A few others, among them the president of the American Walking Horse Association, H. Karl Yenser of Washington, D.C., are also incensed. Yenser recently sent an open letter to his Members which read in part:

"The feeling against the continued soreing and chaining of horses has reached a point where something must be done to correct it. * * * Perhaps getting back to more closely defined gaits as a standard for judging would do the job. * * * Exhibitors have decried the use of inhumane devices for years and yet allowed their trainers to continue their use. Judges have been criticized for tying [placing] 'sore' horses, and yet the judge's hands were tied. In my own personal experience if I had disqualified all of the sore horses shown in front of me, I am afraid I would have wound up many times with no horses in the class to judge. So I, too, am guilty of accepting, even though I did not condone, the 'sore lick.' I know, too that every Walking Horse judge has been confronted with the same situation."

Yenser received some lively and approving response from his membership. But C. C. Turner, of Broadway, Va., a vice president in Yenser's organization and also a vice president of the powerful Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association, received anonymous and abusive mail after acting as a judge at Dallas. Turner removed the boots in the ring and examined the horses for soreness. He judged the class accordingly, with the sorest farthest down the line. Apparently awakened by this show of courage, the SPCA attempted to intervene, but J. Glenn Turner, boss of the Dallas show and president of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association (and no kin to C. C. Turner), refused to allow an ASPCA inspection.

EXPEDIENCY VERSUS PRINCIPLE

Recently C. C. Turner and John H. Amos, chairman of the executive committee of the TWHBA, plus the other directing officers, held a meeting to seek agreement on corrective recommendations to be proposed at the current Detroit session of the American Horse Shows Association, which controls more than 400 recognized shows. Amos advocated the complete elimination of boots and severe punishment of owners or trainers who use any torture device. (Some defenders of the boot contend its elimination would lead unscrupulous trainers to drive nails or wedges into the tender frog of the hoof, a method of soring difficult to detect.) But as is so often the case, the interested parties were forced to act on the low ground of expediency rather than the lofty plateau of principle, and one of those compromises was reached that seem to satisfy all sides and actually settle nothing.

The group agreed to recommend a new boot that reveals the front of the hoof, protects the tender coronet band, and, because of an extra long hinge, drops back when the horse is at rest to expose the pastern area for inspection. The only other recommendation—that a judge be authorized to penalize or even disqualify offenders—would, even if adopted, amount to no more than a tap on the wrist in a situation where a hard blow to the heart (perhaps I should say pocketbook) is indicated.

And even these mild suggestions may not get into the new rule book of the American Horse Shows Association. For one thing, J. Glenn Turner, who is no enemy of the trainer, has been selected as the new chairman of the Walking Horse Committee for the AHSA. Turner has never shown any disposition to change the present rules, which are either so vaguely worded as to be uninterpretable, or simply misstate the situation. For example, the rule book says: "Horses must be serviceably sound." Under present practice, that means only that if they don't fall down they can show. The book also says: "Judges shall disqualify horses equipped with artificial appliances such as * * * leg chains, wires or tracks, blistering, or any other cruel and inhumane devices. * * * White boots may be used, but they shall be subject to examination by show officials." Which officials? In practice, the manager leaves the job to the steward (the person who must be present at every recognized show to see that the association's rules are upheld), and the steward passes the buck right back to the manager or to the show veterinarian or to the judge. If, by some chance, an offender is caught he is disqualified from the class, but he is free to ship his horse off to the next show.

If the AHSA had the nerve to make the punishment fit the crime, a lot of trainers would be on crutches. The trainers of course, blame pressure from the owners, and the owners say the trainers are at fault. (One owner quoted his trainer: "Just don't watch while I put the boots on—you'll feel better when you ride up to get that ribbon.")

So, despite the courage of men like Yenser, C. C. Turner, and Amos, there is little to be hoped for from the self-interested, ribbon-seeking trainer or owner. That leaves the matter squarely in the hands of the American Horse Shows Association, which has yet to enforce or even clarify its own tepid rules. If the AHSA at its current meeting fails to redefine its rules, make clear who is responsible for enforcing them and provide stringent penalties for offenders, a few courageous show managers are ready to drop the walking horse division entirely. This may seem a drastic remedy, but the various walking horse societies have had ample time to clean their own stable. They have failed to do so. The AHSA must have the courage to do it for them.

[From the Charlotte Observer, May 30, 1966]

A SHOW HORSE LIVES IN AGONY—CHAINS, HARSH CHEMICALS ON HOOVES IS PAINFUL PRICE OF BLUE RIBBON

(By Clyde Osborne)

Those prancing, sleek Tennessee walking horses in show rings pay for their ribbons with pain.

The horses more often than not are badly abused by trainers or owners.

A N.C. breeder told The Observer this week:

"Don't buy your child a Tennessee walking horse if you want him to learn kindness, consideration of others, and gracious good sportsmanship.

"Don't buy one unless you are very sure he is never going to attempt to show it and will only use it for pleasure riding."

It's not that there's anything wrong with the Tennessee walking horse. He's a wonderful animal. The trouble is with his owner or trainer whose only consideration is winning ribbons. And more often than not the horse which wins the most ribbons is the one in greatest pain.

The horse's agony is his front feet which have been given a dose of oil of mustard. The hot substance penetrates the horse's ankles deeply, makes the feet painful. This is a process which the horse set calls "soring."

This accomplishes a purpose with inferior walking horses that is bred into the superior members of the breed.

When his front feet are tender, the horse puts his rear feet as far as possible under him to support most of his weight. This lowers his rump, gives him more of the desired walking-horse conformation.

And it puts him in a position so that he throws his front feet out farther in the ring. It makes a real prancer of him, another desirable quality in good walkers.

To make him throw his feet out still further, the horse is frequently trained with chains around them. He tries to throw off the chains as he walks, giving him a longer kick with the front feet. The chains add to his misery.

Chains are forbidden in the show ring. There they are replaced by leather boots which accomplish the same purpose, sliding up and down over the "sored" ankles.

"The steps which win in the horse show today are no longer the step of the Tennessee walking horse," said another breeder. "They are man-made steps. The front hooves are elongated and weighted to make the horse throw his feet out even further. He has to throw the foot to even move it. I know one trainer who put six pounds of weight on each hoof."

Sometimes the horses' feet seems to be so tender in the ring that they can hardly walk, he said.

"Soring" is forbidden in the bylaws of the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders Association, said Tom Fulton of Lewisburg, Tenn., executive secretary of the organization.

"But it's hard to stop. 'Soring' gives them what they call the 'big lick'. The poor horses are trying to walk on their hind legs. It's a great shame," said Tom Fulton of Lewisburg, Tenn., executive secretary of the association.

It isn't necessary at all, he maintained. "The horse which won the most points in the nation last year was never touched with any training devices—chemical or mechanical. His fine breeding gave him the 'big kick' which won for him."

This leads to a point that bothers Fulton and many other walker breeders. Performance is intended to be and should be based on conformation, inherited ability and training.

But with chemical and mechanical training devices, inferior animals are winning ribbons also. With the majority of walking stallions being showed "sored" there's no way to evaluate the natural ability of the animals to do the walking gaits.

It's possible and usual for a horse with inferior qualities to become a champion and command a high price or a high stud fee.

"Stopping the bad practices is an uphill fight," Fulton said, "but we're gaining."

Much of the blame for the "soring" practices belongs to trainers at some of the larger stables, said Fulton. "They have so many horses to train, they can't get to each of them every day. So they 'sore' the horses and they perform well for the owners when they come around."

One large stable is believed to be using the 'soring' method to aid the conformation of its colts. By making them shift their weights to the rear while still young, the spine will grow in such a way as to lower the rump permanently.

A visitor to the stable counted 47 horses—young and adult—all "sored." The visitor said the barn "smelled like a pickle factory, the oil of mustard was so prevalent."

At the N.C. State Fair horse show two years ago, Mrs. Pearl Twyne of the Virginia Federation of Humane Societies showed up with a veterinarian and began inspecting the feet of some of the walkers there.

Fortunately for her, she had asked for police protection. Horse owners and trainers removed her bodily from the arena. And after she and the doctor got in their car to leave, the group surrounded them, hurling curses and insults.

The law forbids mistreatment of animals, said Mrs. Martha Boyce of the Mecklenburg Humane Society.

"This 'soring' practice is horrible," she said. "We get hundreds of complaints all of the time. But to prosecute, you have to get the testimony of a veterinarian. And the vets are hard to get because some depend on these people for a large part of their business."

"Soring is also forbidden by the American Horse Shows Association. Judges, often trainers themselves, will rarely disqualify another owner or trainer.

U.S. Senator Joseph D. Tydings of Maryland introduced legislation on May 10 that would outlaw interstate shipment of any horse whose legs or hooves have been made sore to alter the animal's natural gait.

The bill has been referred to the Senate Agriculture and Forestry Committee.

"This bill deserves the enthusiastic support of everyone," said Mrs. Boyce.

The average show life of a Tennessee walking horse is about six years. Pleasure horses are still going strong in their twenties.

One trainer sores for shows but not at other times, he said. "But big name guys! Their horses stand like that year in and year out. It's nationwide."

What can be done about it? It involves

people with money who need some other hobby—some other outlet than winning ribbons, said a breeder.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, Jan. 6, 1966]

SPUR OF THE MOMENT—TORTURE STILL GOADS THE WALKING HORSE

(By George Coleman)

The Tennessee walking horse cruelty is set to hobble into the 1966 annual convention of the American Horse Shows Assn. opening at Lexington, Ky., a week from today.

There's a new rule that's supposed to hogtie any trainers messing around with walking horses: "Any horse foaled after Jan. 1, 1965, with scars around the coronet or pastern area (just above the hoof) is ineligible for competition." Plus, "The use of any substance on the coronet or pastern area which is evident during show performance is prohibited . . ."

For five years, since this newspaper and Sports Illustrated exposed the bloody business, the AHSA has been passing noose-tightening rules and the cruelty continues.

A MATTER FOR RHYME?

At that time despite published photos of horses bleeding to the extent of staining the tanbark of show rings, the AHSA officers didn't believe what they saw. The late Adrian Van Sinderen, then AHSA president, at the 1960 convention whitewashed the cruelty with a 32-line poem in his report:

"If you desire a saddle horse,
A horse that's sure to please
Just buy yourself a walking horse,
And ride along with ease . . ."

But before the three-day meeting ended the AHSA took its initial halting steps to curb the torture of the walking horse. Three months later at the Nashville (Tenn.) TWH breeders' annual dinner, Tennessee's Gov. Buford Ellington told 500 owners and trainers, "Either you stop messin' with walking horse cruelty or I'll chase every last one of you over the Great Smokey Mountains." Everybody smiled.

A TYPICAL PENALTY

Despite dozens of anti-cruelty rules in the AHSA book, the cruelty goes on. Here's an example why: Three trainers were found guilty of showing bleeding horses at Kansas City's American Royal Horse Show. So the AHSA directors suspended the three for three months until April 1, 1966, during the winter time when the horsemen wouldn't be showing anyway. That's a penalty?

In the walking horse, the longer and higher the stride, the better the ride and performance. Instead of taking months to teach the animal and being content with its best, the trainers apply a burning mercury ointment above the hooves. Soon the flesh is blistered.

On top of the hooves go upside-down cups of rubber called boots and inside the boots on top of the blisters are tacks. As the boots and tacks rub the flesh rawer, the horse, to relieve the pain, barely touches the front feet to the ground. To keep his balance he increases the back stride. That's the way some show ribbons are won.

THE NEWEST DODGE

The latest trick is deliberately to drive a nail, in shoeing, into the horse's foot. That accomplishes the same result as the burning ointment and tacks. And there's no rule in the AHSA book about a nail in the foot.

STATEMENT BY MR. H. M. OLER, REPRESENTING THE AMERICAN HUMANE ASSOCIATION AND THE CHATTANOOGA, TENN., HUMANE EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY

(At the national celebration of the walking horse, Shelbyville, Tenn., Sept. 4, 1965)

I arrived at the horse show on Friday night, August 28, 1965.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 29, 1965

My first experience was seeing a sore mare. She was very stiff and sore and could barely walk.

I saw the blacksmith applying some chemical to a horse's hoof. The horse reacted violently to the pain. When the owner saw my identification, he took the horse and rode off. I could not follow and could not get the identity of the owner.

The horses were used constantly wearing heavy chains which tore their pasterns badly wearing the hair off—some were bleeding.

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1

I saw a man cut a walking horse's foot at the coronet band with a razor blade, and rub salt in the wound. I asked him what he did that for, he did not answer and when he saw my identification, he rode rapidly away.

Every night at the horse show, the horses were shown stiff and sore. After working and getting warmed up, they did not show so much stiffness. However, after standing, they moved sore after being judged. This seems to be routine.

In one class one of the exhibitors who had not been pinned, or tied, was angry and he jumped the gate (about 2 feet) out of the ring without getting permission to leave and without waiting for the gate to be opened. A policeman told me that when the rider got outside, he hit the horse in the head in anger.

H. M. OLER,
Humane Agent, Humane Educational Society of Chattanooga, Tenn.
(Representing the American Humane Association).

STATEMENT BY PEARL TWYNE, HUMANE OFFICER OF THE VIRGINIA FEDERATION OF HUMANE SOCIETIES

I arrived at the horse show on Thursday, September 2, 1965.

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 2, ABOUT NOON

The first thing I saw was a black mare, later identified as the same one seen by Mr. Oler. This mare was so sore that she painfully set each foot down and quivered. She had to cross a small, shallow ditch, she spraddled and could not make it. I took pictures. The man leading her had to pull and yell at her to force her over the ditch.

I walked around the stabled area where the walking horses were kept. I saw a groom of the Circle R stables rubbing a liquid out of a bottle on the pastern area of the fore feet both fore and aft. There had been a purple colored dye on the feet, but the groom rubbed so hard that the color disappeared and a large raw spot appeared over the coronet band in front, and it became sore in back. The horse was crosstied and could not get away. I asked the groom what the liquid would do, and he replied that it made the horse sting. The horse was swinging its foot back and forth. As I watched the horse assumed the typical walking horse stance.

I saw the same thing at barn No. 28, no name on the stall.

I saw walking horses being warmed up. They were all moving with the sore lick and were very stiff.

THURSDAY EVENING, SEPTEMBER 2

Class 41—No. 625, Ebony's Image—received the first ribbon. In my opinion the horse was very sore. I was sitting in the reserve section of the stadium and Mr. Oler was standing at the entrance. We both marked our individual programs, and we agreed (separately) that this yearling was very sore. We both thought that the entries in the class (Championship Walking Yearling) had been sored. We were unable to get the services of any veterinarian in the State of Tennessee to work with us, and did not have a veterinarian to confirm our opinions.

Class 43. Owner-amateur, walking mares, any age. All horses were sore to varying degrees. When the class was told to line up for judging, and were requested not to remove the boots until requested to do so, the grooms rushed in to brush the horses, and many of them threw dirt on the horses feet. I have seen this happen in many shows and it was done to hide the blood and chafing.

Mr. Oler and I both agreed that No. 137, Go Boy's Dream; No. 140, Lady Godiva; and No. 337, Go Boy's Miss Nassau (one of the sorest in my opinion I have seen) were all sore. When No. 337 was pulled up, she almost fell. After being cooled when she moved her hocks were bent under at an absurd angle and pointed outward. No. 943, Miss Sun Glo and No. 960, Shadows Golden Girl were very sore in my opinion and that of Mr. Oler's.

Class No. 45 walking geldings, 4 years old and over.

No. 1191, Sun's Dark Demon was so sore and in danger of collapsing that a retired veterinarian sitting next to me remarked that the horse was either exhausted or overly sored and should have been removed from the class. But No. 1191 was kept in the class when the others (eliminated from competition) were dismissed. He was forced to work excessively around the ring in his condition. He was placed sixth, and the people around me gasped as they thought the horse would fall in the ring.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 3

In the morning about 8 a.m. until 1 p.m., Mr. Oler and I walked around the grounds and I took both moving pictures and still shots in color. We saw the same conditions of sore walking horses being warmed up.

Specifically, one of the cruelest acts I have seen was done on the black mare that Mr. Oler and I had both seen earlier in the show. The one that was so sore. She was being dragged into the blacksmith, inching her way. She was in such pain that when the blacksmith's helpers was trying to remove her fore shoes, she closed her eyes, breathed hard, tucked her hind feet far in front of her, moaned and tried to lie down. She was cross tied and her trainer and/or her owner, jerked her and yelled at her. She stood swaying, breathing hard. They started to cut her feet, and I have never seen a horse with its feet cut so deep or the frog cut as this mare. They were down in the quick. A woman standing next to me had tears on her checks and she said "How can they do this?" She walked away. That mare was kept tied there from 3 to 4 hours. I walked away and came back several times. I could not bear to see them cutting her sore feet so deeply.

Mr. Oler came back after I left and he saw one blacksmith (or his helper) take up an electric torch, ground it on the mare's shoe (off side). A twitch had been put on her lip, and they burned her foot. They poured water on the foot and it steamed. Then they plunged the foot into a bucket of water. The owner and/or trainer held the mare's head throughout this torture. When the mare was led back to her stable, No. 21 in barn 52, Mr. Oler followed and when the mare had to be led down an incline to the stable, she could not walk but slid down trying to protect her forefeet. Later I saw her being worked in a ring with a young woman on her. I took moving pictures of her being ridden. When the woman saw me taking the pictures, she saluted me and left the ring. We could not find her, the mare, or the trainer afterward. Many people standing around in groups were commenting on the pitiful condition of this mare. She gave a beautiful performance of a show walking horse, flowing barely touching the ground with her forefeet.

AMERICAN HORSE PROTECTION
ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Arlington, Va., February 6, 1967.

Senator JOSEPH D. TYDINGS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR TYDINGS: In the 89th Congress, you introduced Senate Bill No. 3338 which would make it unlawful for any person to transport or ship in interstate commerce any horse whose feet and legs have been made sore for the purpose of affecting or altering the natural gait through pain for competitive purposes. S. 3338 was referred to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for consideration. That Department gave an unfavorable report, and following a request from your office, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reconsidered its position. It sent veterinarians to visit the big and important horse shows to see whether such legislation was necessary. At the suggestion of your office I kept in touch with the U.S. Department of Agriculture to give them information which would help them in their research. I think that Department has now reversed its position and feels that Federal legislation is necessary.

The American Horse Shows Association has adopted a rule for recognized shows that any horse foaled after January 1, 1965, with scars around the coronet or pastern area will be ineligible for competition. This rule has not stopped the cruelty as I have attended shows and have seen walking horses moving in severe pain. The trainers are more subtle, they are now driving nails in the feet, putting wedges in the frog of the foot, or injecting irritants in the sole near the heels. This is then covered with a pad, and the artificial foot placed over that. The horse often carries at least 6 pounds of weight on each fore foot.

Enclosed is material which covers the shows through 1966, the 1967 show season has not started. The State of California, Kentucky, and others use public money to finance State Fairs and horse shows. I wrote to the State Veterinarian, and he wrote me that his office requires that each Walking horse entered in these State financed shows, must permit manual examination of the walking horse's feet. In spite of this some are shown in pain. He says that if they cannot stop this, they will not finance this class. A copy of his letter is enclosed for your information.

You are known for your liberal views and for championing the underdog. These horses are badly ill-treated, and we respectfully urge you to reintroduce your bill in the 90th Congress. We will all work with you and do all in our power to get passage of the bill.

Hopefully,

Sincerely yours,

Pearl Twyne,
President.

State of California,
Department of Agriculture,
Sacramento, November 2, 1966.

Mrs. Paul M. Twyne,
President, Humane Societies, Inc.,
Arlington, Va.

Dear Mrs. Twyne: California has no law specifically pertaining to mistreatment of horses. However, the rules of the Division of Fairs and Expositions provide that Walking Horses must be examined by the judge or veterinarian and it is our policy to disqualify any horse found to be sore.

The California Professional Horsemen's Association and other horsemen's groups have been very cooperative in helping to enforce our rules and we have gone so far as to inform them, as well as the American Horse Shows Association, that unless the use of irritants ceases, we will remove Walking Horse performance classes from our Master Premium List. This would have the effect of barring this breed from the 51 shows presently sponsored by the State of California.

I agree that this is a national problem and we would certainly look with favor on any legislation which would be as severe as our rules or even more severe.

It seems that we are making good progress in this matter, but we still do have offenders in spite of our rather extensive program and would, of course, welcome any help we can get.

Sincerely,

Thomas E. Bair,
Chief, Division of Fairs and Expositions.

Senate Bill 93—State of Wisconsin

An act to create 947.12 of the statutes, relating to cruelty to walking horses and prevention thereof and providing penalties

ANALYSIS BY THE LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

(The bill prohibits training, showing or exhibiting any horse whose legs or hoofs have been made sore and impose a penalty for a violation. It also prescribes how a violation can be proved.

(The steward, manager or other person in charge of a horse show must have a state veterinarian present to examine the horses for a violation of the law and requires that violations be reported to the district attorney. A penalty is also imposed for a violation of these requirements.)

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

947.12 of the statutes is created to read:

"947.12 Cruelty to walking horses; prevention thereof.

"(1) (a) Whoever trains, shows or exhibits or causes to be trained, shown or exhibited any horse whose legs or hoofs are sore and have been made so for the purpose of affecting or altering the natural gait of the horse may be fined not less than $50 nor more than $500 or imprisoned not more than 6 months or both.

"(b) No walking horse shall be permitted to compete or be exhibited in any show, fair or exhibition for profit or pleasure, if said horse's front legs or hoofs show any evidence of any of the following:

"1. That chains were used on or applied to the horse to break its skin surface;

"2. That a blistering agent designed to and capable of making the horse's feet or hoofs sore was applied internally or externally to the horse;

"3. That burns, cuts or lacerations designed to and capable of making the horse's feet or hoofs sore were inflicted on the horse;

"4. That a chemical agent, tack, nail or wedge, designed to and capable of making the horse's feet or hoofs sore, was applied to the horse; or

"5. That any other method or device designed to and capable of making the horse's feet or hoofs sore was used on or applied to the horse.

"(2) (a) The steward, manager or other person in charge of every horse show, fair or exhibition where walking horses are shown or exhibited shall have a state veterinarian present thereat whose duty it is to examine the legs and hoofs of every walking horse before it enters the show ring to determine any violation of sub. (1). At the time of the examination the hoofs of the horse must be free of any covering whatsoever, so the entire hoof is open for inspection. The veterinarian shall be present in the show ring with the judge at the time said judge in accordance with the rules of judging walking horses examines and inspects the front legs and hoofs of the horses before making his awards and he shall assist the judge in the examination of each entry. If the examination discloses evidence of a violation of sub. (1) it is the duty of the steward, manager or other person in charge of the show, fair or exhibition to immediately disqualify the horse from further competition and in such case the state veterinarian and the steward, manager or other person in charge of the show, fair or exhibition shall immediately notify the district attorney of the county wherein the show, fair or exhibition is held of the facts, and supply him with the name of the horse, the name of the owner, the name of the trainer or handler and the name of the rider or exhibitor of the horse.

"(b) 'Walking horse' as used in this subsection means and includes the breed of horse known as a Tennessee walking horse.

"(c) Any person violating this subsection may be fined not less than $25 nor more than $100.

"(3) The director of the department of agriculture is charged with administering this section. He should direct the state veterinarian to make such inspections and examinations as he deems necessary to determine violations of this section and in particular shall direct the state veterinarian to be present at all horse shows where walking horses are shown."

AMENDMENT OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT TO PROHIBIT CERTAIN EXTENSIONS OF CREDIT INIMICAL TO THE NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduced today for myself and Mr. Hickenlooper a bill which will tighten the restrictions on the operations of the Export-Import Bank, so as to prevent the use of credits extended by that bank for the purchase of U.S. materials which might ultimately result in strategic benefits to unfriendly Communist countries.

This bill is the outgrowth of efforts by the Export-Import Bank to approve a credit extension to a friendly country for purchase of U.S. automobile tooling machinery, which in turn would be transshipped to Russia for the purpose of increasing automobile production in Russia.

I am quite sure all Senators are aware of the proposed credit extension to Instituto Mobiliare Italiano, which in turn would make purchases of automobile machine tools in this country. These tools would be destined for use in completing a Fiat automobile plant in Russia.

Mr. President, I do not intend to at this time argue the merits or demerits of the proposed IMI-Fiat credit. There is much more to this proposal than a mere $50 million worth of automobile machine tools to make more wheels available to Russia.

There is the precedent by which every Communist country in the world can obtain the benefits of Export-Import Bank credits, and U.S. manufacturing superiority, by inducing a non-Communist friend of ours to make application for Export-Import Bank credit for the specific purpose of buying U.S. products for transshipment to our friend's Communist friend.

The intent of the original Export-Import Bank Act was to assist in the expansion of U.S. exports and at the same time promote Russian development under the Communists, but when the Russians failed to keep their word on the payment of Russia's debts to the United States the Bank blackballed the Communists and they have not since been eligible for Export-Import Bank credits.

Not long ago, we saw the culmination of a deal by which Russia obtained wheat from this country with Export-Import Bank guarantees of payment to the U.S. wheat sellers, which was just another way of giving Russia the benefits but not the credit.

Now, we are about to see the creation

of a new policy by which Russia and other Communists will get the benefits of the Export-Import Bank and U.S. manufacturing quality and ingenuity simply by hiding behind our friends who have been building good records with the Export-Import Bank.

When the House Banking and Currency Committee conducted hearings recently on the proposed IMI-Fiat deal, administration witnesses supported the proposal. They used numerous arguments, including the classic that "if they do not get the machinery from us they will buy it elsewhere."

This, Mr. President, leads to the question: "If such a position makes sense then why not make the sale of the machine tools direct to Russia? Why are we saying we are not making Export-Import Bank credits available to Russia and at the same time the bank's line of credit and U.S. machine tools available to Italy which in turn makes them available to Russia?

This is an excellent example of a truth gap in our foreign policy.

I wonder what the administration's foreign policy position would be if our friend, Mexico, with an Eximbank credit at least as good as IMI, would make application for a line of credit to buy automobile machine tools from the United States for the purpose of transshipment to Cuba?

The bill I introduce today would not only prohibit a line of Eximbank credit to Communist countries, but it also would prohibit the use of Eximbank credit by non-Communist countries for purchase of U.S. material to be transshipped for use in Russia.

There is the exception in this bill, Mr. President, whereby the President of the United States could approve either a line of credit to a Communist country, or the benefits derived from a line of credit made to a non-Communist country by the Eximbank, whenever the President determines that such approval would be in the national interest. He would be required, as he now is under the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act, to report such determination to the Senate and the House of Representatives within 30 days after said determination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1766) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 to prohibit certain extensions of credit inimical to the national interest, introduced by Mr. TOWER (for himself and Mr. HICKENLOOPER), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 109(e) OF THE FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949

Mr. McCLELLAN. I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 109(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, which would discontinue the specific statutory requirement that the Comptroller General make an annual audit of the general supply fund.

This bill is introduced at the request of the Comptroller General who reported that when the 1949 act was approved, the Federal departments and agencies were required to transmit their vouchers to the General Accounting Office for audit and settlement of the disbursing officers accounts. Subsequently, Congress enacted the Budget and Accounting Procedures Act of 1950 and other laws which gave the General Accounting Office wide latitude, in determining the type and scope of its audits of agency accounts and records. The Comptroller General further reported that in the 17 years since the general supply fund was established, the General Services Administration has strengthened its financial management program by first, installation of an accounting system approved by the General Accounting Office; second, adoption of an automatic data processing system with built-in controls and programed reporting features; and third, the use of internal audit and onsite audit of appropriations and funds under its control.

As a result of the changes in law and procedures since 1949, the Comptroller General contends that the audit required by section 109 of the Property Act is not needed and that ample authority exists under the broad general authority of the 1921 and 1950 acts to audit and review the operations of the fund, as follows:

> There is no doubt but that the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) and the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53) provide ample authority for this Office to review the General Supply Fund when determined necessary or when requested to do so by any Committee of the Congress, whether they are examinations of financial statements or otherwise. In the absence of the specific audit requirement of the 1949 act, we would have the same freedom of choice under the broad general audit authority given to us under the 1950 and 1921 acts in selecting period and scope of financial reviews that we have in other areas in GSA, and in other agencies in general.

The enactment of this bill will permit the General Accounting Office to examine the financial statements, records, procedures, and audit of the supply fund when required on a test or sample basis, rather than in detail at the end of each fiscal year.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that a letter addressed to the President of the Senate, dated January 31, 1967, which contains additional justification and background on this bill, be printed in the RECORD, and made a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1767) to amend section 109(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, introduced by Mr. MCCLELLAN, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The letter presented by Mr. MCCLELLAN is as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., January 31, 1967.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In accordance with the congressional mandate set out in section 312 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, approved June 10, 1921, ch. 18, 42 Stat. 25, 31 U.S.C. 53, that the Comptroller General shall make recommendations to the Congress "* * * looking to greater economy and efficiency in public expenditures" and in order to provide flexibility in the programming of our audits thus permitting more effective use of our manpower, we wish to present for the consideration of Congress a legislative proposal to discontinue the specific statutory requirement that the Comptroller Gneral shall make an annual audit of the General Supply Fund.

The General Supply Fund, as established under section 109 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, approved June 30, 1949, ch. 288, 63 Stat. 382, as amended, 5 U.S.C. 630g, was intended to finance (1) the centralized procurement of supplies, equipment, and nonpersonal services for the use of Federal agencies and (2) the repair, rehabilitation, and conversion of personal property. The act of September 1, 1954, ch. 1211, 68 Stat. 1126, 40 U.S.C. 491(d), made the General Supply Fund available also for financing the establishment, maintenance, and operation of interagency motor pool systems. Payments by requisitioning agencies are at prices fixed by the Administrator of General Services at levels which will recover, so far as practicable, all elements of cost except certain operating and administrative costs of the supply operation financed by annual appropriations.

The present requirement for making an annual audit of the General Supply Fund and submitting an annual report to the Congress is contained in section 109(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, 5 U.S.C. 630g(e), which provides:

"The Comptroller General of the United States shall make an annual audit of the General Supply Fund as of June 30, and there shall be covered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts any surplus found therein, all assets, liabilities, and prior losses considered, above the amounts transferred or appropriated to establish and maintain said fund, and the Comptroller General shall report to the Congress annually the results of the audit, together with such recommendations as he may have regarding the status and operations of the fund."

This 1949 audit requirement was derived, with some modification, from a similar requirement in the act of February 27, 1929, ch. 354, 45 Stat. 1342, which originally established a predecessor general supply fund in the Treasury Department. Our audit activities in 1929 were restricted generally to a centralized audit of vouchers transmitted by each agency to our Office for audit and settlement of the disbursing officers' accounts and did not necessarily include audits or reviews of financial statements nor verification of the amount of surplus or deficit. We therefore recommended the inclusion of specific audit authority in the legislation creating the General Supply Fund.

Nine reports have been issued to the Congress pursuant to the 1949 act. Each report includes an opinion as to the fairness of the financial statements. The earlier reports (through the report covering our audit of fiscal year 1959), contain findings beyond accounting or financial matters but starting with the report on our audit for fiscal year 1960, the reports have tended to be limited to the reporting of financial data and expressions of opinions on the financial statements, together with a summary of findings reported to the Administrator, General Services Administration. Our most recent audit of the General Supply Fund under the 1949 act was limited to examination of the financial statements for the purpose of rendering an opinion as to their fairness. The audit consisted of an examination of the financial statements of the General Supply Fund for fiscal year ended June 30, 1962, and our report thereon was submitted to Congress on April 9, 1963. Since then, we have not made an examination of the financial statements of the Fund.

We are convinced that there is no necessity today for a separate annual audit of the General Supply Fund or its financial statements. We have stated in our last eight audit reports to the Congress covering the fiscal years 1954 through 1962, that the financial statements prepared by the General Services Administration (GSA) for the fund, with only a few minor qualifications, presented fairly the financial position of the General Supply Fund and the results of its operations. In the 17 years since its creation in 1940, GSA has developed much strength in its financial management program. GSA now has an accounting system that was approved by our Office on June 30, 1965. It also has an automatic data processing system with built-in controls and various edit routines and programmed reporting features, and other internal controls. In addition GSA has a segregation of duties in an effective accounting organization and an internal audit group. This, together with the safeguards offered through our other audit work hereinafter discussed, leads us to believe that the Congress can rely on the fairness of GSA's stewardship reporting under the General Supply Fund without having recourse to full-scale audits of financial statements as heretofore carried out by the General Accounting Office.

We also believe that our continuing on site audits of operations in GSA today adequately serve the purpose of the specific 1949 requirement for an annual audit of the General Supply Fund. The year following the enactment of the 1949 act, the Congress enacted the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950, approved September 12, 1950, ch. 946, 64 Stat. 834, 31 U.S.C. 67, granting the General Accounting Office wide latitude in determining the type and scope of its audits of agencies in general. Under this authority the General Accounting Office, starting about 1957, has examined into many aspects of the activities of GSA financed through the General Supply Fund. In carrying out its responsibility for providing an efficient and economical system for the procurement and supply of personal property for the use of executive agencies, GSA's Federal Supply Service (FSS) (1) sells to Government agencies through GSA depots, or through direct delivery from vendors, certain common-use items; and (2) operates a Government-wide interdepartmental procurement program under which certain commonly used commercial-type supplies, equipment, and services are made available to Government agencies directly from the contractors. Some activities under the FSS procurement and supply program relate to the General Supply Fund exclusively while others do not involve the Fund. However, much of the FSS activity affects both Fund and nonfund matters, and our reviews may also involve both. (Of all Federal Supply Service procurements, about 40 percent involve the General Supply Fund.) For example, our report on savings attainable through elimination of locks from desks affects desks procured for stores stock and ultimate issue to agencies and at the same time affects desks ordered by using agencies for direct delivery from vendors.

A list of our reviews made under the collective authority of the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67), and the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), involving the Fund directly or indirectly, and resulting in reports to the Congress is attached.

There is no doubt but that the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) and the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53) provide ample authority for this Office to review the General Supply Fund when determined necessary or when requested to do so by any Committee of the Congress, whether they are examinations of financial statements or otherwise. In the absence of the specific audit requirement of the 1949 act, we would have the same freedom of choice under the broad general audit authority given to us under the 1950 and 1921 acts in selecting period and scope of financial reviews that we have in other areas in GSA, and in other agencies in general. This flexibility permits us to use our manpower more effectively.

We therefore strongly recommend that section 109(e) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 be amended to read as follows:

"(e) As of June 30 of each fiscal year, there shall be covered into the United States Treasury as miscellaneous receipts any surplus in the General Supply Fund, all assets, liabilities, and prior losses considered, above the amounts transferred or appropriated to establish and maintain said fund."

In fulfillment of our responsibilities under the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67) and as complementary adjuncts to our overall work programs previously described, we will continue to review and evaluate selected aspects of GSA's financial management procedures such as the continuing effectiveness of the accounting system, adequacy of internal audit work, and effectiveness of controls over cash, inventories, motor vehicles, and other property. In addition, to carry out our audit responsibility to settle accounts of accountable officers, each year we will make examinations, on a test basis, of all types of transactions conducted by GSA including those conducted under the General Supply Fund. Also, we will assure ourselves, as the 1949 act now contemplates, that the annual surplus, if any, of the General Supply Fund is covered into the United States Treasury.

This legislative proposal is also being made by letter of today to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General
of the United States.

REVIEWS MADE BY GAO WHICH INVOLVE THE GENERAL SUPPLY FUND

Procurement, storage, and delivery of fuel oil (report issued to the Congress, October 6, 1959, B–133235)

Procurement and storage of general-use hand tools by GSA for the Air Force (report issued to the Congress, February 13, 1962, B–146704)

Planning by GSA for automatic data processing equipment installed at its Washington Regional Office principally for Federal Supply Service stores operations (report issued to the Congress, August 20, 1962, B–146744)

Automatic data processing activities at selected regional offices, for the Federal Supply Service stores operation (report issued to the Congress, November 2, 1962, B–146732)

Utilization of excess personal property and disposal of surplus personal property (report issued to the Congress, November 30, 1962, B–146755)

Use of the direct-delivery method of supplying stores items by the Federal Supply Service (report issued to the Congress, August 20, 1963, B–114807)

Brand name procurements of personal property for stocking in GSA supply depots and self-service stores and subsequent issued to Federal agencies (report issued to the Congress, June 1, 1964, B–114807)

GSA requirement that general office desks bought by Federal agencies be equipped with locks (report issued to the Congress, October 22, 1965, B–114807)

GSA policy for multiple-award system of contracting (report issued to the Congress, April 12, 1966, B–114807)

The following reviews involving the Fund are currently in process under the collective authority of the 1950 and 1921 Acts:

Self-Service Store Operations—concentrating on slow moving items and overstocking of inventories

Items included in GSA supply system which had low or nonexistent demand and which were readily available from commercial sources

Follow-up review on unnecessary depot and transportation cost of supply items

Uneconomical and unnecessary items carried in the GSA supply system

Problems related to transfer of hand tool management from DOD to GSA

AN ADEQUATE COINAGE SUPPLY FOR AMERICA

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, in 1965, a serious coin shortage afflicted the economy of the United States. In that year, I introduced legislation to revitalize the historic mint at San Francisco to help meet the coinage needs of the Nation. The 89th Congress authorized a limited operation at San Francisco with the following words:

> The business of the United States assay office in San Francisco shall be in all respects similar to that of the assay office of New York except that until the Secretary of the Treasury determines that the mints of the United States are adequate for the production of coins, its facilities may be used for the production of coins.

The San Francisco operation has proven invaluable, not only in relieving the serious national shortage of the time, but in maintaining an adequate supply of coins for America today. In a recent address, the Honorable Eva Adams, Director of the Mint, favorably commented on the assistance from San Francisco:

> All of the extra effort undertaken to achieve record production levels at the Philadelphia and Denver Mints, plus good assistance from the San Francisco Assay Office, has let us develop ample coin inventories for all denominations but half dollars.

There is an important lesson to be learned from the recent emergency efforts required to replenish the national coinage drain. We must not allow our economy to be threatened by similar shortages in the future. It is the responsibility of both the Treasury Department and the Congress to plan for future needs and to take any step possible to insure a constant and continuing supply of coins for all America.

Nowhere is there a greater need for such a continuing coinage supply than in the States of the Far West. It is a well known fact that my State of California is experiencing a fantastic population explosion. Trade, both national and international, is rapidly expanding on the Pacific coast. Business development is keeping pace with the population growth. The dollar volume of sales in this area is rising far ahead of the rest of the Nation.

In order to meet the needs of more

and more people buying more and more goods, the San Francisco Federal Reserve District has become the largest distributor of coins of all 12 districts. And yet, the present temporary operation of the assay office at San Francisco is the only coin-producing facility in the Far West today.

This was not always the case. Before its coin operations ceased and it was designated an assay office, the San Francisco Mint had been one of the principal producers of coins in America. Ever since the gold rush days, the mint supplied the coinage needs of the west coast. But in 1955, because of economy reasons and an overcapacity in production facilities, the San Francisco Mint operations were stopped by the Government.

This overcapacity in coin-producing facilities no longer exists. One serious coin shortage already has been experienced, and the Director of the Mint states that an ample inventory of half dollars is still lacking. The new and modern mint operations at Philadelphia will not be completed or ready for operation until the end of the year. Our present coinage supply, therefore, is dependent on the outdated facilities now operating at Denver, Philadelphia, and San Francisco.

Mr. President, the public interest of the Far West and, indeed, the entire Nation, must be protected from the cessation of activities at any of these facilities, and particularly the present operation at San Francisco. The Director of the Mint has stated that the long-term needs of this country call for the construction of a second mint, every bit as modern and efficient as the new mint being constructed at Philadelphia. In her address to the Western Mining Conference, the Director of the Mint said:

> Finally, if the Goverment is going to build a completely new Mint, it would be necessary to carry out a feasibility study to determine its most economic location.

I believe such a feasibility study should be conducted by the Secretary of the Treasury. But until this study has been made and the interests and coinage needs of the Far West considered, the Secretary should not be allowed the discretion to terminate the San Francisco operation at will. The 1965 law authorizing the production of coins in San Francisco provides the Secretary with such broad discretion. This west coast operation has proven invaluable to the continuing stability of our coin inventories. We must seek to protect that stability until the proper studies and investigations have accurately determined the future coinage needs of the Nation.

I am, therefore, introducing a proposed joint resolution which would protect the operation at San Francisco until the Secretary of the Treasury has conducted such a feasibility study and reported the results thereof to Congress. I am pleased to say that Representative William Mailliard, of San Francisco, is introducing a companion resolution in the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed joint resolution to require a feasibility study with respect to the establishment of one or more mints prior to discontinuing the use of the assay office in San Francisco for the production of coins. I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred, and that the text of the joint resolution be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 82) to require a feasibility study with respect to the establishment of one or more additional mints prior to discontinuing the use of the facilities of the U.S. assay office in San Francisco for the production of coins, introduced by Mr. Kuchel, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. J. Res. 82

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding section 3558 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U.S.C. 283), or any other provision of law, the production of coins at the United States assay office in San Francisco shall not be terminated prior to such time as the Secretary of the Treasury has (1) caused a study to be made of the feasibility of establishing one or more additional mints in the United States in order to meet present and foreseeable coinage needs, and (2) reported to the Congress the results of such study, together with such recommendations as he may deem desirable.

DESIGNATION OF MAY 28 TO JUNE 3 AS NATIONAL HALIBUT WEEK

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to proclaim May 28 to June 3 as National Halibut Week. In addition, this concurrent resolution calls upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Last year I presented a similar proposal and an effort was made by everyone interested in our valuable halibut resources to appropriately celebrate this occasion. Strong leadership has been given to this celebration by the wives of halibut fishermen who are not only participating in this celebration but should themselves be saluted for their industry and activity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the seven-day period beginning May 28, 1967, and ending June 3, 1967, as "National Halibut Week" and calling upon the people of the United States to observe such week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the following bills the name of the junior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. Hollings] be added as a cosponsor:

S. 1509. A bill relating to the use of citations by the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia, in lieu of formal arrest, and for other purposes.

S. 1510. A bill relating to the obstruction of the administration of justice in the District of Columbia by threats or force, and for other purposes.

S. 1511. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 to increase salary rates and provide certain benefits for purposes of recruitment and retention of privates in the Metropolitan Police force, to establish the rank of master patrolman, to change the titles of certain Metropolitan Police officials, and for other purposes.

S. 1512. A bill relating to material witnesses in the District of Columbia.

S. 1513. A bill to establish the Commission on Revision of the Criminal Laws of the District of Columbia.

S. 1514. A bill relating to the rehabilitation of narcotic addicts in the District of Columbia.

S. 1515. A bill relating to intoxicated persons in the District of Columbia.

S. 1516. A bill authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to supervise persons released into their custody in accordance with judicial orders issued pursuant to section 3146 or 3148 of title 18, United States Code; to authorize the District of Columbia Bail Agency to provide reports to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia with respect to any person released into the custody of the Commissioners pursuant to section 3146 or 3148 of title 18, United States Code; and for other purposes.

S. 1517. A bill relating to material witnesses in the District of Columbia.

S. 1518. A bill relating to the admissibility of evidence, including statements and confessions, in the courts of the District of Columbia.

S. 1519. A bill designating robbery in the District of Columbia as a crime of violence.

S. 1520. A bill to amend section 823 of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901 (31 Stat. 1323; D.C. Code, sec. 22–1801), relating to burglary.

S. 1521. A bill relating to the making of false or fictitious reports of the commission of criminal offenses in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1717, to permit the donation of stockpile medical supplies, at the bill's next printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of of S. 1661, to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assist in assuring the availability of both nursing home and alternative noninstitutional services for recipients of assistance thereunder, to encourage the use whenever professionally determined to be appropriate of noninstitutional services for such recipients, to establish basic standards of quality for nursing home and home health services provided to such recipients, and to provide for fair and equitable reimbursement for those providing health care services to such recipients, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE] be added as cosponsors of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] be added as a cosponsor at the next printing of S. 1620, a bill to prohibit the burning, defacing, mutilating, or trampling of the flag of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEARINGS ON SENATE RESOLUTION 75, RESTRICTIVE TRADE PRACTICES OF BOYCOTTS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York and the junior Senator from New Jersey have introduced a resolution which would authorize the Banking and Currency Committee to study the effectiveness of present law—meaning primarily sections 3 and 4 of Public Law 89-63 amending and extending the Export Control Act in protecting U.S. trade and businesses against adverse effects from restrictive trade practices or boycotts imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to the United States.

In order to look into the questions raised by Senate Resolution 75 and in exercise of the committee's oversight jurisdiction under the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee will hold hearings beginning July 6, 1967.

Persons who wish to testify or to submit statements in connection with this resolution should notify Mr. Lewis G. Odom, Jr., staff director, Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, room 5300, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone 225-3921.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions:

S. Con. Res. 6. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a Committee on Government Operations print entitled "The Federal System as Seen by Federal Aid Officials";

S. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resoluton authorizing the printing for the use of the Joint Economic Committee of additional copies of its joint committee print entitled "State and Local Public Facility Needs and Financing";

S. Con. Res. 17. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,500 additional copies of the Joint Economic Committee print entitled "Federal Programs for the Development of Human Resources"; and

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution providing for the printing of 1,500 additional copies of the Joint Economic Committee print entitled "An Economic Profile of Mainland China".

JUSTICE FOR SPECIALTY CROPS IN THE KENNEDY ROUND

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, as the Kennedy round of trade negotiations enters final stages and a deadline rapidly approaches, I am deeply concerned about the outcome of these conversations and their consequences to our domestic economy. I am particularly concerned that vital segments of agriculture—my State's leading source of income—may be ignored in the hope of some sort of agreement with the European nations.

Our agriculture is genuinely concerned that the United States may fail to achieve anything of consequence in terms of reciprocal concessions, fulfilling even the expectations most of us shared when the Trade Expansion Act was passed in 1961.

For many months, I have heard anguish and dismay from virtually the entire gamut of California producers, processors, and exporters of specialty crops. These crops are not beneficiaries of domestic price-support programs. Their producers ask only for free and fair opportunity to compete in foreign markets. They cannot overcome third-party manipulation of prices or discrimination through subterfuges employed to undercut the purpose of reciprocal lowering of barriers.

The Trade Expansion Act gave the President the broadest bargaining power to remove obstacles ever delegated by the Congress. It is disturbing to observe signs that little may come from our endeavors to expand mutually rewarding international trade under its auspices.

I supported that legislation with enthusiasm. The agricultural industries of California looked forward to use of the authority to broaden opportunities for the sale of products of our efficient producers, packers, and processors in the world market. There was special optimism about obtaining freer access—in light of reviving economic conditions—to outlets in European nations.

On two different occasions in the past several months I have been prompted to join a number of Senators in round-robin letters to President Johnson stressing the undeniable necessity of obtaining better trade opportunities for America's versatile agriculture. I particularly desire to focus attention on trade, in the specialty crops such as fruits, nuts, and vegetables, including products dried, canned, and otherwise processed. The stakes affect such California interests as citrus, prunes, pears, peaches, grapes, raisins, and almonds. Our State's extensive poultry-producing areas have also expressed their deep concern.

With less than 2 months remaining to exercise authority granted the President, we cannot remain silent when truly significant American agricultural interests are jeopardized. We must not waive the legitimate demands of specialty crops by way of sacrifice to obtain concessions through separate sideline agreements such as the press has suggested may be proposed.

The establishment of the Common Market, although supported by the United States, from the outset has placed this country at a disadvantage in trade. It supplied the climate for a common external tariff which, in many instances, is higher than duties previously in effect in individual member nations. We recognized that this was a temporary setback. It was hoped the rising level of economic health within Common Market countries would bring expanded consumer demand, in due course offsetting this disadvantage. Such hopes appear in danger of being dashed, in a frantic last-minute attempt to achieve some sort of agreement as the Kennedy round winds up.

The challenge thrust at our trade negotiators and the fearsome implications of the recent course of conversations is as difficult as any ever by American diplomacy.

The position of those of us from States where specialty crops are a highly significant source of income was stated forcefully in the group letters to the President, supplemented by a statistical table showing dramatically the role of fruits and vegetables in American export trade. I request unanimous consent that this tabulation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Summary—Fruits and vegetables—Value of U.S. exports to EEC, annually, 1960–65

Commodity group	Value of U.S. exports to EEC (thousands of dollars)						EEC as a percentage of total value of U.S. exports (percent)					
	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Fresh fruits	12,388	20,667	16,376	22,357	18,755	28,877	12	18	15	20	15	17
Canned fruits	17,386	19,753	31,605	26,142	29,348	35,916	31	32	40	38	42	47
Dried fruits	9,967	7,940	8,590	8,607	8,580	11,976	23	19	18	20	20	23
Frozen fruits	5	77	428	227	136	891	------	4	19	9	7	32
Fruit juices	5,874	7,424	8,914	6,584	3,675	4,446	14	16	21	16	11	13
Tree nuts	5,123	563	2,949	4,053	2,911	4,082	34	8	23	23	16	16
Fresh vegetables	13	359	1,171	2,519	159	488	------	1	2	5	------	1
Canned vegetables	6,247	6,399	10,008	11,392	9,924	8,164	22	25	35	34	29	24
Frozen vegetables	32	25	71	122	40	203	1	------	2	2	1	6
Dehydrated vegetables	515	607	1,484	1,535	1,434	932	11	13	23	21	21	18
Total	57,550	63,814	81,596	83,538	74,962	90,975	17	18	21	22	20	21

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD ENDORSES TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on May 10, Gov. J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, gave a strong endorsement to the truth-in-lending bill in testimony before the Banking and Currency Committee. Governor Robertson indicated that he was testifying not only for himself but also for all seven members of the Board of Governors who voted unanimously to support this important piece of legislation.

I might say, Mr. President, that the Wall Street Journal, in the first item published on its front page in the column on business and commerce, featured the testimony of the Federal Reserve System in support of a truth-in-lending bill and said that this gave the bill a very great impetus.

I would certainly agree on that.

Although this support was coupled with some recommended amendments to the bill, it is encouraging to note that the Board came out with a solid endorsement of the two most controversial items in the bill; namely, the annual percentage rate and the inclusion of revolving credit on an annual rate basis.

I am sure that the Senate would agree that the Federal Reserve Board has one of the most capable and well-qualified staffs in Washington. Many of us who have been fighting either for or against truth in lending over the past 6 years may find it difficult to maintain a detached perspective. It is, therefore, significant that an impartial and objective study by the Federal Reserve Board has concluded the concept of an annual rate is both necessary and workable. There are some people in the credit industry who have argued that consumers do not have to have this information and that even if they did it would be impossible for the average businessman to provide it. The Federal Reserve Board does not agree. They have very carefully considered all of the arguments both for and against the annual rate.

Incidentally, they monitored every single minute and hour of the hearings we had, with a competent staff member of the Federal Reserve Board.

They have given the problem to their capable staff of economists, they have called in outside experts for consultation, and they have concluded that the disclosure of an annual rate is workable and that it provides the consumer with the information he needs to make an intelligent choice.

The Board also believes that revolving credit should be included in the bill and that the monthly rate on revolving credit should also be expressed as an annual percentage rate—despite the fact that some credit industry witnesses have tried to argue it is impossible to convert a monthly rate into an annual rate. I believe the Board has restored commonsense to the argument when it advocates that the following information might be printed at the bottom of each monthly statement of a revolving charge account:

> No finance charge is made for the period from purchase until billing date, nor is any finance charge made for 30 days thereafter if the account is paid in full within that period.
>
> If payment in full is not received within 30 days of billing date, a charge will be made of 1-½ per cent of the opening balance of this bill.
>
> A charge of 1-½ per cent per month is equivalent to a rate of 18 per cent per year.

I believe that these recommendations should provide a reasonable statement of the cost of revolving credit to the consumer.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Vice Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of J. L. Robertson, Vice Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Before the Subcommittee on Financial Institutions of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee on S. 5, May 10, 1967

The Board of Governors appreciates this opportunity to present its views on S. 5, the Truth in Lending Act. We believe that important social as well as economic benefits may be expected to flow from a more effective disclosure of credit costs to consumers.

You have said, Mr. Chairman, that the purpose of the bill is to bring about "full disclosure of the cost of credit so that the consumer can make an intelligent choice in the market place." The Board agrees that as reasonable and workable ways are found to accomplish this objective the market system will function more efficiently. In the field of consumer credit existing trade practices generally fall short of the kind of disclosure that facilitates meaningful comparison shopping. We also agree with the principle stated in section 2 of the bill that competition would be strengthened by a more informed use of consumer credit.

The price system is a fundamental attribute of a free-enterprise, competitive economy. The sale of goods and services in exchange for money is the method by which the vast majority of transactions are consummated, and permits a degree of specialization—with its resulting efficiencies—that otherwise would be impossible. And for this system to function most effectively, it is necessary that the prices at which goods and services are available be stated by the seller, and known to the buyer, in standardized, meaningful terms. It is in this way that the buyer can be informed of his options—among both competing sellers and competing services—so that he may use his purchasing power in what to him is the most desirable way. The objective of S. 5, with which the Board is in full agreement, is to see that such information is provided with respect to the use of credit. It does not purport to impose rate ceilings or any other restraints on terms and conditions, but only to assure full disclosure of the price charged for credit.

Prices of goods and services are usually stated in money terms (a point made frequently during these hearings) but a meaningful price comparison requires also some knowledge about the service to be acquired; namely, quantity and, where applicable, quality and duration of use. When the service to be acquired is the use of consumer credit, quantity and duration of use are the important variables. Duration of use is the period for which the credit is extended, of course, and quantity is the amount of credit used *on average* over this period. It is customary in finance to standardize the time-period variable by stating price in terms of charge per year, and the quantity variable by stating price per hundred dollars.

DISCLOSURE OF ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE

Now it would be possible to meet this price specification standard by stating the price of credit as dollars and cents per hundred dollars borrowed on average per year. But this is a complex form of statement, and it produces exactly the same result as the use of a percentage rate. That is, on a 1 year loan of $1000, payable in equal monthly instalments and carrying a charge of $60 (a so-called 6 percent add-on loan), the charge per annum on the average amount of loan available to the borrower may be stated at the standardized rate of either $10.90 per hundred dollars or 10.9 percent.

The important point here is that the borrower has available for use, over the life of the loan, not $1000 but an average of $541.90, because each monthly payment includes repayment of principal as well as interest. The Board believes that to state the standardized charge as applying to anything other than the *average* amount of credit available to the borrower would distort the true relationship between cost and benefit received. The Board is also convinced that it is preferable to state the charge in percentage rather than dollar terms, and on an annual basis rather than for some other period. This would facilitate comparison with other financial prices, such as the percentage charge on single-payment loans, the interest rate paid on savings accounts, and the yield available to investors on Government bonds and other securities. Thus, we are in basic agreement with the provisions of S. 5 in these respects.

We also agree that the charge should be calculated on an actuarial rather than a constant-ratio or other basis. Again, it is the question of accuracy—disclosure of the truth—that leads us to favor this approach. On a 5-year, 6 percent "add-on" monthly reduction loan (not uncommon in the home modernization field), the true charge per annum is 10.85 per cent while the calculation on a constant ratio basis would produce a rate of 11.80 per cent—nearly 1 point higher. The reason for the difference is that the constant ratio method assumes that the proportion of each payment applied to interest is the same. In the actuarial method, the monthly payment is applied first to interest, and second to the outstanding—and gradually declining—credit balance.

The Board also agrees that the rate of finance charge need be specified only within "reasonable tolerances", as provided in the bill. But we believe that Congress should decide, at least in the first instance, what constitutes a reasonable tolerance. We therefore recommend a statutory provision permitting the rounding of the annual percentage rate to the nearest whole per cent. This is a small deviation—viewed in terms of the usual levels of consumer finance charges—and it would make possible the use of standard tables in finding the rate to be disclosed in the vast majority of credit transactions. We also recommend, however, that authority be granted to provide wider tolerances if experience indicates that this would materially simplify the problem of disclosure in difficult cases.

IRREGULAR PAYMENTS

The Board is inclined to believe that the problem of irregular payments, by and large, is capable of practical solution. In the first place, permitting rounding to the nearest whole per cent in the rate disclosure will take care of most of the credit contracts that contain minor irregularities. And contracts calling for the deferment of payments or a final larger "balloon" payment appear to lend themselves to use of special tables or relatively simple adjustment calculations.

For the remaining cases—we hope they are relatively few—the calculation problem could be a good deal more difficult. Where a lender does an appreciable amount of business involving a fairly common irregularity, such as skipping summer payments for school teachers or patterning payments to the seasonal cash receipts of farmers, special rate tables can no doubt be designed. But for highly personalized contracts involving, say, a deferred payment schedule, a number of skips, irregular payment amounts, and a balloon payment at the end, the lender would seem to have no recourse except to compute the rate of finance charge by hand, a process which could be quite difficult. Although rate calculation for such contracts is technically possible, many lenders certainly would resist writing them. Thus, it seems to us inescapable that some tendency towards use of standardized finance terms must be anticipated, and that this should be taken into account in the Committee's consideration of the bill.

REVOLVING OPEN-END CREDIT

Among the difficult problems brought out in these hearings are those involved in the disclosure of finance charges on revolving or open-end credit. First, it has been argued that the annual rate that the customer will pay cannot be calculated in advance, because the time that will elapse from date of purchase to date of repayment is not known in advance. Second, more than one method is commonly used for computing the base to which the finance rate will be applied. Third, some plans call for annual fees, minimum charges, etc., which cannot be converted into an annual percentage rate. These variations complicate the comparison of finance rates charged by different establishments, as well as those charged for different types of credit. Yet the need remains: Users of revolving credit—like the users of any other form of consumer credit—should understand the credit costs that they will pay.

In view of these problems, how can the revolving credit customer have a clear awareness of the terms under which he buys or borrows? We believe this can be largely accomplished—although not entirely—by requiring such terms to be disclosed at the time he opens a revolving credit account. The disclosure required should include the duration of any free period allowed, the method of computing the balance against which the charge is imposed, the periodic rate and the annual percentage equivalent, and the minimum and special charges (if any). It would be entirely appropriate for a store to give new customers a little leaflet, such as the one you have seen that was printed by the National Shawmut Bank of Boston, explaining the advantages of that store's credit plan over alternative plans.

In addition to the original complete statement of terms and conditions, a brief disclosure of the essentials should be included in the monthly bill. For example, the following information might be printed at the bottom of each monthly statement:

"No finance charge is made for the period from purchase until billing date, nor is any finance charge made for 30 days thereafter if the account is paid in full within that period.

"If payment in full is not received within 30 days of billing date, a charge will be made of 1½ per cent of the opening balance of this bill.

"A charge of 1½ per cent per month is equivalent to a rate of 18 per cent per year."

The first sentence points out that the lender provides a "free period," during which no finance charge is imposed. The second sentence explains the charge that will be imposed if the free period is exceeded. You will note that this second sentence is quite similar to those now used by many stores not subject to special disclosure laws, except that it adds a statement of the base to which the finance charge is applied. In a store using an adjusted balance method, this sentence would be expanded to add, for example, the words, "less any payments or merchandise returns"—underlined if the store wishes. The third sentence points out to the user the annual equivalent of the stated monthly rate. If there are any minimum or special charges, these would be noted in a fourth sentence.

Each of these sentences would disclose necessary information. Taken together, we believe they would give the credit user a picture that is fair to the store, informative to the customer, useful in comparing charges from store to store, and broadly comparable to other rates charged for credit or paid on savings.

Before turning to our other recommendations, we should like to emphasize again what all members of this Committee fully recognize—namely, that this bill is not a cure-all for the myriad abuses practiced by some in the lending of money or sale of merchandise on credit. Thus, S. 5 will not (and it would seem impossible to make it) cover the merchant who sells only on a time-price basis or who marks up the prices of his goods to compensate for a lower finance charge; it will have very little influence on cash lenders who advance small amounts at very high rates; it will provide little assistance to the consumer who pays no attention to what he signs or to the impact of the commitments he makes on his future financial condition. What the bill can accomplish is the disclosure, in the bulk of transactions, of the amount and rate of finance charge on which credit may be obtained. It is only one step—though an essential one—in the process of consumer education and the increased awareness that is required.

DEFINITION OF CREDIT

Section 3(2) incorporates a definition of "credit" that was originally developed or designed for a different purpose, the selective regulation of down payments and maturities for credit in emergency situations. Some of the specified categories cover matters that it would seem unnecessary or impractical to cover under a credit-cost disclosure bill. This would seem true partiularly of the definition of "credit" to include "any contract or arrangement for the hire, bailment, or leasing of property". As to such transactions, it would seem impossible to attribute or determine a "finance charge". Similar questions can be raised as to inclusion in the definition of such things as options, demands, liens, and pledges.

We believe it would be preferable to define credit as "the right granted by a creditor to a debtor to defer payment of debt or to incur debt and defer its payment", followed by an enumeration of some of the important types of credit listed in section 3(2) of the present bill. The quoted definition—which has been proposed in connection with the Uniform Consumer Credit Code now being drafted by the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws—is sufficiently broad to cover any situation within what we conceive to be the purpose and intent of S. 5. It would eliminate any concern as to categories of transactions whose inclusion in the present definition might seem to be questionable.

EXEMPTION OF SMALL CREDITS AND CHARGES

I am sure that none of us wants to press disclosure of credit costs to the point where borrowers are denied access to credit at any price. But there is one area where disclosure of an annual percentage rate might do just that. In a closed-end credit transaction involving a small amount, a high effective rate may be justified to compensate the creditor for the relatively high out-of-pocket costs of handling the transaction. However, he may be understandably reluctant to disclose the very high rate—perhaps 50 or 100 per cent—and might decide instead simply to discontinue this type of credit transaction.

For some borrowers, unable to obtain open-end credit accommodation or not having access to small cash loans, the need to make relatively small purchases on credit may be great indeed. It may also be argued that a small finance charge—in dollar amount—is not of great significance to the credit user regardless of the effective rate of finance charge. Therefore, we would be disposed to see closed-end credit transactions involving a small amount—perhaps under $100—and a small total finance charge—perhaps under $10—exempted from the disclosure requirements. But we think Congress should make the decision and, if it agrees, should incorporate the specific exemption in S. 5.

EXEMPTION OF FIRST MORTGAGE LOANS

The Board recommends that the bill be amended to exclude first mortgage real-estate loans, on the ground that there is already reasonable disclosure in this field. The first mortgage contract usually specifies the interest charge in terms of annual percentage rate on the outstanding balance, and full details of one-time costs are customarily given, in dollars and cents, at the time the loan is closed.

The typical first mortgage loan has an original maturity of 20 to 30 years, as contrasted with much shorter maturities for consumer instalment credit. This fact, and the fact that most first mortgage loans are repaid well in advance of the original maturity, lead us to conclude that disclosure requirements developed for relatively short-term credit are inappropriate for first mortgage loans. In the first place, to require that the annual percentage rate be recomputed to reflect costs incidental to the extension of credit would involve particularly troublesome questions in first mortgage lending because of the number and variety of the costs assessed at closing, many of which would be incurred, in whole or in part, by a prudent cash buyer where no credit was extended. Second, while it would be possible to spread discounts and other credit-related costs over the life of the contract as a part of the annual rate of finance charge, we feel that this might tend to mislead the borrower. Such charges are in the nature of "sunk cost" and are borne in full by the borrower whether the loan is repaid in 1 year or 30. Third, to require disclosure of total dollar finance charge, including interest payable over the whole life of the contract, might be more misleading than helpful. As has been pointed out in these hearings, the present value of a dollar of interest to be paid 20 to 30 years hence is substantially less than one dollar, and relatively few first mortgage contracts appear to be carried all the way to maturity.

The Board does believe, however, that second mortgage loans and similar transactions should be retained within the scope of S. 5. Such credits typically are extended for a much shorter term than first mortgages, and discounts, fees, and charges can make up a much larger proportion of total finance charges. Moreover, second mortgage credit is often obtained for purposes such as home modernization, durable goods purchases, and debt consolidation—consumer transactions of the type usually financed with consumer instalment credit.

BUSINESS CREDIT EXEMPTION

The Board recommends that the exemption in section 8(1) of extensions of credit to "business firms" be revised to exclude, instead, credit extended to corporations and partnerships and all credits that exceed $20,000. We agree that credit extended for most business purposes should be excluded from the Act, but we are concerned about the difficulty of applying a purpose test for the many small businesses and farm operations in which expenditures for household and business purposes are closely associated and often intermingled. Such purchases as transportation and refrigeration equipment (or miscellaneous purchases from mail-order concerns) often serve both household and business uses, and such items are frequently purchased on the same instalment credit terms as strictly household goods. Furthermore, many small business and farm operators need the protection of full disclosure of credit costs as much as do purely household consumers.

This reasoning leads us to suggest rewording the exemption along the lines I have mentioned. The disclosure provisions would then apply to credit extended to most small business and farm operators, but not to larger businesses and agricultural operations.

This would avoid unnecessary burdens and reduce administrative problems, while conforming to the objective of the bill in providing for full disclosure to those credit customers who need it most. Discretionary authority to increase the dollar limitation by regulation would also be desirable, since experience or changing conditions may indicate a need for a higher ceiling.

EXCLUSION FROM "FINANCE CHARGE" OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS, TAXES, AND OFFICIAL FEES

One of the issues that has proved troublesome during these hearings has been the question of how to treat insurance premiums on policies taken out by borrowers as a condition of, and covering the amount of, the credit contract. If such insurance is required, the borrower bears a cost which probably would not have been incurred if no credit were obtained. Moreover, exclusion of insurance from the finance charge creates a potential area of abuse, since some lenders may be encouraged to promote high-cost insurance to compensate for a somewhat lower finance charge.

The fact remains, however, that any insurance provides a benefit to the borrower over and above the use of credit. To require that the finance charge include insurance premiums would overstate the actual charge for credit. Therefore, we think that the cost of any kind of insurance is not properly regarded as part of the finance charge, and should be specifically excluded in S. 5. Similarly, we feel that the statute should specifically exclude official fees and taxes from the "finance charge", since generally they benefit neither creditor nor borrower, are not within their control, and are the same regardless of the source and terms of the credit. Both types of charge should be required to be itemized among the non-finance charges that must be disclosed pursuant to section 4(a)(4).

MAIL AND TELEPHONE SALES

Under section 4(a) a seller on credit is required, prior to consummation of the sale, to furnish the customer "a clear statement in writing" setting forth specified information. It seems to us that compliance with this section generally would not be feasible where a customer orders goods or services by mail or telephone.

Appropriate allowance for this situation might be patterned after the 1966 Massachusetts statute (Chap. 255D, subsection F of section 9). Thus, there might be added to section 4(a) of S. 5 an exception for mail or telephone orders given without personal solicitation by a representative of the creditor, if the cash and deferred payment prices and the terms of financing are clearly set forth in the creditor's catalog or other printed material distributed to the public, and if the creditor delivers to the customer before the date for payment of the first instalment on the purchase a written statement setting forth the information required to be disclosed by section 4(a).

EXEMPTION OF REGISTERED BROKER-DEALERS

Section 8(b) exempts "transactions in securities or commodities in accounts by a broker-dealer registered with" the SEC. We know of no reason for such an exemption, and suggest that the Committee consider whether it should be eliminated.

STATES WITH SUBSTANTIALLY SIMILAR LAWS

We believe that section 6(b) of the bill should be modified. That section now provides that the implementing agency shall exempt from the Act any credit transactions "which it determines are effectively regulated under the laws of any State so as to require the disclosure by the creditor of the same information" as required under S. 5. We seriously doubt that a Federal agency should be called upon to judge how effectively State laws in this field are enforced, particularly where, as in the case of S. 5, they are enforced in the courts. Action at the State level should be encouraged, not discouraged, by enactment of S. 5, and it should be made clear that the States need not follow precisely the provisions of this bill. You have indicated during the hearings, Mr. Chairman, that this is your intent, but we think it should be spelled out in the bill. The Board recommends, therefore, that section 6(b) be amended to exempt transactions that are determined to be "subject to State law that requires disclosure substantially similar" to that required under S. 5.

EFFECTIVE DATE

Section 9 of the bill provides that the disclosure requirements shall take effect 180 days after enactment. This period may prove to be too short. Sufficient time should be allowed to permit consultation, preparation and publication of the regulations, and a period during which those subject to the regulations may study their provisions, procure rate tables, and train their personnel in the new procedures. We urge you to amend section 9 so as to make the disclosure requirements effective at a time to be prescribed in the regulations, but in no event later than one year from enactment of the law.

IMPLEMENTING AGENCY

Let me turn now to the question of what agency should be designated to prescribe regulations to implement this legislation. The Board's familiarity with the trade practices that would be subject to regulation under this legislation is very limited. Its regulatory responsibilities are principally confined to banks. We do collect consumer credit statistics as a part of our responsibility for monitoring flows of consumer credit along with other kinds of credit. And we have developed sources of data on current trends in all financial markets so as to be continuously informed of the flow and terms of credit needs and uses by the economy as a whole. But this experience, helpful though it is in meeting our responsibilities in the field of monetary policy, has not prepared us for implementing with appropriate regulations the type of legislation before you today. Administration of a law such as S. 5 is a function essentially different from the functions that Congress heretofore has considered appropriate for the Federal Reserve System.

Formulating regulations under this bill would involve the Board in time-consuming consideration of trade practices about which we have very little knowledge and would thereby diminish the time we can devote to the formulation of monetary policy—our principal responsibility.

However, we believe the need for legislation of this kind is great. If the Congress decides to designate the Board as the agency to prescribe regulations to implement this bill, we will do our best to carry out the assignment, but we hope that in time either the States will promulgate substantially similar disclosure requirements, leading to exemptions under section 6(b), or administration of Federal disclosure requirements will be reassigned to an agency better suited to perform the function.

The task of implementing this proposed law will be complicated not only by our lack of knowledge in this field but also by the fact that the Board has no trained investigative staff at its command to determine whether the Act and the regulations are being complied with. Consequently, we would hope that our only function under this legislation would be to prescribe regulations to implement it in a manner designed to cope with special situations and to prevent evasions. We are aware that it is contemplated that the Act will be largely self-enforcing, but we recommend that responsibility for enforcement and investigation of complaints be vested specifically in the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission. A similar division of regulatory and enforcement responsibility was made between the Board and the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to margin requirements for securities transactions. We also hope that Congress will express its desire that all Federal agencies endeavor to secure compliance with the law by lenders and sellers subject to their jurisdiction and transmit information indicating violations directly to the Department of Justice or the Federal Trade Commission for investigation and appropriate action.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Let me mention briefly a few amendments we recommend in the provisions of section 5, which relate to administration of the Truth in Lending Act.

Section 5 provides that the regulations prescribed by the implementing agency "may contain such classifications and differentiations . . . as in the judgment of the" agency are necessary or proper. We recommend that after the word "differentiations" there be added ", may provide appropriate rules therefor," to make it clear that any class of persons or transactions may be subject to special rules appropriate to that class.

The last sentence of section 5(a) provides that, in prescribing any exceptions under the bill, the implementing agency "shall consider whether . . . compliance is being achieved under any other Act of Congress." To make it clear that the authority to make exceptions is not limited to that situation, we recommend that after the word "consider" the phrase ", among other things," be inserted.

Section 5 provides that the implementing agency "shall request the views of other Federal agencies exercising regulatory functions with respect to creditors" subject to the legislation. The Board assumes that any agency preparing regulations to implement the bill would, as a matter of course, seek comments and assistance from other agencies that might be affected or might possess relevant information. We are concerned, however, that a mandatory requirement to this effect might result in the voiding of a regulation on the ground that an agency with some related functions had been overlooked in the consultation process. We suggest, therefore, that the quoted provision be deleted.

A measure such as S. 5 obviously will depend for its success largely upon the cooperation of the various classes of businesses affected. Therefore, the agency that prescribes the regulations necessarily will consult with representatives of the creditors to whom the bill would apply in order to develop regulations that are as simple and effective as possible. The agency should endeavor not only to tap the best sources of business advice but also specialists from the non-business sphere. The Board, accordingly, sees no need to establish an advisory committee as provided in section 5(c) and it seems particularly doubtful that the best sources of advice would be available at $25 per day.

We appreciate the cooperation that the Committee and its staff have already extended, Mr. Chairman, in connection with these hearings, and we are eager to assist in any way possible your efforts to perfect the bill. Members of our staff will gladly consult with the Committee's staff to that end.

ONLY THROUGH SENATE RATIFICATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS CONVENTIONS CAN UNITED STATES REALLY CELEBRATE 1968 AS INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS YEAR—LXX

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the General Assembly of the United Nations has designated 1968 as International Human Rights Year. Nineteen hundred and sixty-eight was selected because it marks the 20th anniversary of the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948.

Twenty-two years ago in San Francisco, President Truman forcefully expressed this Nation's deep commitment to the fledgling United Nations efforts toward establishing universal human rights, when he said:

> Under this document (the Charter) we have good reason to expect the framing of an international Bill of Rights, acceptable to all the nations involved. That Bill of Rights will be as much a part of international life as our own Bill of Rights is a part of our Constitution. The Charter is dedicated to the achievement and observance of human rights and freedoms, and unless we can attain these objectives for all men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or religion—we cannot have permanent peace and security.

As was so frequently the case during his Presidency, Harry Truman, by these words at San Francisco, proved himself a sage prophet.

President Truman, a full 22 years ago, recognized that elementary truth about international relations: Unless mankind is able to establish and guarantee universal human rights for all men, mankind will be unable to establish and guarantee permanent peace among all men.

Since 1948, the United States has made remarkable domestic progress in the guaranteeing of basic human rights to all our citizens. It is a record of progress in which all of us can take real pride.

Unfortunately, this Nation's record internationally in the field of human rights legislation has been as bad as our domestic accomplishments have been good. Of the four Human Rights Conventions—forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery—all drafted with U.S. assistance and adopted by U.S. persistence—the Senate has failed to ratify a single one.

Why? I am at a loss to understand the Senate's indifference or to explain the Senate's inaction. This same Chamber which saw the enactment of two memorable human rights bills in 1964 and 1965 has registered only cruel silence on the important question of universal human rights.

As of today, only nine nations, Bolivia, Maldives, Paraguay, Spain, Togo, Union of South Africa, Uruguay, Yemen and the United States have failed to ratify a single one of these four conventions. This is an exclusive group in which I for one, do not covet American membership.

International Human Rights Year is only 7 months away. The Senate, and the Senate alone, can enable the United States to observe fittingly International Human Rights Year. When I say the Senate and the Senate alone, I mean because the President has discharged his responsibilities by recommending these conventions, and the House has no voice in it at all. It is therefore entirely up to us.

This Nation and people everywhere will be able to celebrate when the Senate ratifies the Human Rights Conventions on forced labor, genocide, political rights of women, and slavery.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

REACTIVATION OF A BATTLESHIP FOR USE IN VIETNAM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I know that many of my colleagues read with interest an article by Hanson W. Baldwin in this morning's New York Times announcing the imminent reactivation of a battleship for use in the Vietnam theater of operations.

In case some have not yet had the opportunity to read this heartening story by the Times' distinguished military editor, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1967]

NAVY TO RECOMMISSION WORLD WAR II BATTLESHIP FOR USE OFF VIETNAM

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—The Defense Department has decided to recommission a Navy battleship for service in the Vietnam war. The New Jersey, one of four World War II veterans in the Navy's reserve fleet, will probably be selected, informed sources said, for modernization and overhaul, scheduled to start shortly. The New Jersey and her sister ships, the Iowa and Wisconsin, are in the Philadelphia Navy Yard; the fourth ship, the Missouri, is in the Bremerton (Wash.) Navy Yard. Each of the ships has nine 16-inch guns. The New Jersey is said to have somewhat more modern communications and electronics than her sister ships; that is why the Navy favors her selection for recommissioning. Nevertheless, it is expected to require a minimum of nine months—perhaps as much as 17 months—before the ship's big guns are firing against shore targets in Vietnam. Reactivation of a ship that has been out of commission for years is an expensive and time-consuming process. The ship must be stripped of her plastic cocoons, cosmoline, grease and other preservatives. Much of her electrical wiring, which has probably deteriorated through the years, may have to be replaced, and she must be refitted with modern communications and electronics.

The cost of reactivating one battleship is variously estimated at $16-million to $27.5-million, and annual operating costs, with a full crew of some 3,500 men, are estimated at $13.5-million to $17.5-million.

However, some 22,000 tons of 16-inch ammunition—manufactured in World War II and immediately thereafter—are in storage and available, with some reworking, for use.

The Defense Department's decision, which is expected to be made formal within a few days, follows a request from the Navy Department for permission to reactivate a battleship. The issue has been under debate with the Navy and in the Pentagon—as well as in Congress—for the last two years.

The Marines and some naval officers have taken the position that naval gunfire support has been allowed to deteriorate seriously since the Korean war as more and more naval ships were converted from guns to missiles, and as the big-gunned ships—heavy cruisers and battleships—were decommissioned.

Some high-ranking naval officers, including the Chief of Naval Operations, opposed the recommissioning, however, and urged the addition of eight-inch gun cruisers to the fleet instead of the battleships. In effect, the office of the Secretary of Defense has now decided that the big-gunned battleship will serve a useful role in Vietnam despite its cost and despite the length of time required to reactivate.

TARGETS ARE FACTOR

The targets the battleship could bring under fire from its big guns were said to be one of the deciding factors in the decision.

In a recent study of the battleship issue, based on testimony from official Pentagon sources, Senator Thomas J. McIntyre, Democrat of New Hampshire, pointed out that possible target for the 16-inch, 2,400 pound projectiles might be military targets, docks and bridges in Hongay, Thanhoa, Kampha, Vinh and Haiphong.

Much of the railroad from Vinh to Hanoi, and 150 miles of the coastal highway—Route 1—would be within interdiction range of the battleship's 16-inch guns, the Senator's study found.

Officers in the Pentagon said privately that the big guns could also have been extremely useful against heavy enemy field fortifications furing the recent fighting along the demilitarized zone. Others stressed that the five-inch guns of United States destroyers, which have been bombarding targets in North Vietnam, have often been outranged by enemy coastal batteries, and that a number of destroyers have been hit by enemy projectiles.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, today, our Nation fights a curious conflict thousands of miles from our shores, a conflict in which the United States has been able to utilize the most modern and advanced weapons known to man, but at the same time has found that some of the old ways of fighting a war are far superior to the new.

Our Nation's troops are the best we have ever fielded. They are well equipped, well trained, and well supplied.

At the same time, however, our Nation has found that some of the most advanced weapons at our disposal are largely ineffective against an enemy who fights by night and hides by day; who digs large underground caves to hide its men and materiel; and who can repair a bridge or road almost as fast as we can destroy it.

Our air war over North Vietnam has produced dramatic, tangible results. It has been an effective, devastating weapon in curtailing Hanoi's ability to contribute to the subversion of the south.

But our planes alone cannot do the job.

Too many have been shot down; too many Mig's have been deployed to harass our pilots; too many bridges destroyed on Monday are operable by Wednesday.

What is needed to implement the splendid job being performed by our airmen over the north is a sea-based weapon that is highly invulnerable to attack and can hit its targets in any kind of weather, 24 hours a day.

The battleship, Mr. President, is just that weapon.

I have not yet been able to secure direct confirmation from the Department of Defense that a battleship will indeed be deployed off the coast of Vietnam. However, I know that such a proposal has been under consideration by the Pentagon for many months now. It seems inconceivable to me that this study could result in anything except a favorable decision to deploy these battleships.

I have spoken many times of the need and desirability of deploying these heavy battleships off the coast of Vietnam. I have presented many arguments in support of my desire to see this weapon added to our artillery in Vietnam. I sincerely hope that Mr. Baldwin's article this morning is a concrete sign that these ships are indeed to be deployed off Vietnam.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYDINGS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

POLICE MORALE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, today, our increasing crime rate is one of our country's major problems. Untold hours and many years are being devoted to its solution. Suggested solutions are manifold. However, I am sure that the destruction of the morale of our police is not a solution to the crime problem.

Within the last few months in the Nation's Capital we have witnessed demands for "drumhead justice" by certain citizens of the District, in cases involving members of the Metropolitan Police Department.

In the latest instance, an angry, shouting group demanded that Commissioner Tobriner in effect appoint a citizens' committee to act as judge and jury. This demand was made under the threat that if the demand was refused, civil violence would result. I strongly support Mr. Tobriner's statement to the group that no irresponsible threat of riot or civil unrest can ever be accepted in the District of Columbia as a reason to subvert the law. I hope this continues to be the policy of District officials.

Mr. President, I mention the above simply to point up the fact that, while attempts to subvert our historic legal processes are a very serious matter, equally serious is the effect of such attempts on the morale of our police. The man on the beat never knows, when he makes an arrest leading to a citizen complaint, whether there will be a demand for the appointment of a "kangaroo court" or whether such complaint will be handled through normal channels. This uncertainty results in the erosion of that particular policeman's morale—not only in the erosion of that policeman's morale, but also in the erosion of the morale of the entire police department.

Police morale is very important to every citizen of the District of Columbia. The state of the police officer's morale bears heavily on the nature of his contacts with citizens, the vigor of his efforts to apprehend criminals, and the integrity with which he approaches his job.

In my years as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia, I have had occasion to become acutely aware of the operations of the Metropolitan Police Department and acquainted with many of the personnel, both officers and privates, of that department. I find them to be a dedicated group, dedicated to maintaining law and order in the District of Columbia under the most trying and difficult circumstances. They need the outspoken support of all law-abiding citizens.

Mr. President, I believe I can say, without serious or sound contradiction, that the morale of the Police Department in the District of Columbia is the lowest that it has ever been—certainly during the 7 years in which I have served as chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia.

Just a few days ago I was informed by the Police Department that there were 310 vacancies. The Department is finding it increasingly difficult to recruit policemen to fill the vacancies, to fill the authorized positions, which number 3,100. This is the highest number of vacancies I can recall at any time during the 7 years I have been chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the District of Columbia. I think it indicates a great deterioration of the morale throughout the Police Department. It is just such situations as the one to which I have referred today that have produced a very disastrous impact upon the morale of the policemen in the District of Columbia, and I daresay that if District of Columbia policemen could readily find jobs elsewhere, there would be hundreds upon hundreds of resignations immediately, in the face of these happenings, which are occurring with growing frequency and intensity.

Mr. President, whether or not the recent fatal shooting of a citizen of the District by a police officer constitutes a crime is not for me to judge. However, I also very firmly believe that it is not up to a rump group to judge. The matter has been referred to the grand jury, I am informed, by the U.S. attorney. I hope that all available evidence will be given to the grand jury and that both sides will be heard.

Mr. President, I request that an editorial from the Washington Evening Star for May 10, 1967, be inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks; and that there also be included in the RECORD various news articles which have appeared in both the Washington Star and the Washington Post, dealing with the probe of the death of Clarence J. Brooker.

There being no objection, the editorial and articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, May 10, 1967]

NO KANGAROO COURTS

Last Monday's confrontation at the District Building between Commissioner Tobriner and an angry, shouting group of citizens was in many respects a sad spectacle. And the demands which this group made on the Commissioners in connection with last week's fatal shooting of a 19-year-old Negro during an altercation with a white police officer were irresponsible.

In essence, the predominantly youthful group insisted that the Commissioners immediately suspend the policeman involved in the shooting until the entire case is reviewed by a "citizens' committee"—on which youth would be liberally represented. These demands were interspersed, moreover, with threats or warnings that civil violence might be the price of refusal.

We have already expressed our view that the confusing accounts of the Clarence Brooker shooting and the circumstances which preceded it must be fully investigated and clarified. This is no job, however, for "citizen" committees of any sort. And it is certainly no job for citizens who already have made up their minds, as some of them charged on their visit to the District Building, that the shooting victim in the May 1 altercation "met murder."

What sort of citizen "investigation" might one anticipate in this kind of atmosphere? The fact is, of course, that the only citizens who can properly receive evidence and properly decide that an element of criminality may be involved in any case such as this are those citizens who sit as members of a grand jury. And in this instance, the proper place for any citizen to present evidence is not the District Building. The proper place is the office of the U.S. Attorney, which will present the case to a grand jury.

Tobriner was right in his persistent efforts to make this point on Monday. He was also clearly right in refusing to prejudge the conduct of a police officer who stands, at this moment, exonerated by a coroner's jury. And he was wholly right in his forceful retort that no irresponsible threat of riot or civil unrest can ever be accepted in this city as a reason "to subvert the law."

At the conclusion of Monday's hectic session, Tobriner reportedly agreed to "consider" the formation of a committee of some sort, which presumably would act as a means of channeling information to the U.S. Attorney in the Brooker case. If there are any truly valid purposes to be served by such a committee, however, they seem to us exceedingly obscure. The way to seek justice in Washington, as elsewhere, is through the orderly procedures of law—and the society which forgets that imperils its own survival.

[From the Washington Post, May 10, 1967]

YOUTHS PUSH PROBE OF BROOKER DEATH

(By Robert C. Kaiser)

Half a dozen representatives of the "Youth Committee for Equal Justice" met with the District Commissioners' Council on Human Relations yesterday to discuss a citizens' committee of inquiry into the death of Clarence J. Brooker last week.

The Commissioners agreed with the new group Monday that a citizens committee could be formed to "find the facts" surrounding Brooker's death. The youth died as the result of wounds inflicted by the gun of police Pvt. William Rull.

Also yesterday, Rull's lawyer wrote a bitter letter to the Commissioners denouncing the plan to have a citizen's committee investigate the death.

The lawyer, Bernard Margolius, who often represents policemen, wrote the Commissioners that the demand for a citizens' investigation "has absolutely no basis in law."

Rull, Margolius wrote, "should not—he cannot—be tried by a citizens' committee acting in an extra-judicial capacity."

"It occurs to me," he added, "that the objecting group is not seeking an impartial investigation and presentation of the facts in the Brooker case, but rather is seeking a forum to voice their views against law enforcement generally, and policemen in particular."

After meeting yesterday with representatives of the Northeast youth group which was formed to protest Pvt. Rull's behavior in the incident, Ruth Bates Harris, director of the Council on Human Relations, told reporters that Washington has "all the ingredients" for a riot this summer.

She said police-community tension "has definitely increased in recent months." She listed many of the conditions of the ghetto which, she said, could breed the frustration that might start a riot.

However, Mrs. Harris said she thought there was hope that the worst could be avoided.

[From the Evening Star, May 10, 1967]

Bress Wants Citizens Out of Brooker Probe—Says He Feels Planned Committee "Would Serve No Useful Purpose"

(By William Basham and Charles Conconi)

U.S. Atty. David G. Bress has made firm his position that a full investigation of the shooting May 1 of a Negro youth by a white District policeman should be handled by his office.

Bress was reacting to the proposal that a citizens committee to aid the investigation be formed. The demands were made by an angry contingent of Northeast residents on Monday to the District Commissioners.

Learning that the proposed committee would gather evidence to present to his office, Bress said yesterday, "This would serve no useful purpose . . . it would be acting like a grand jury."

UP TO LEGAL AGENCIES

Bress commented:

"It does not seem appropriate to me that an investigation as to whether a criminal act was committed should be made by any committees of the citizenry of the District of Columbia, but should rather be left to the established legal agencies of government which can more effectively make the proper determination."

The government attorney said that "if a determination is made to present the case to a grand jury, all persons having personal knowledge will be made available to the grand jury."

Pvt. William L. Rull, 23, shot Clarence J. Brooker, 19, on May 1 as the latter tried to escape arrest on a Northeast street, according to police. The youth died an hour later in D.C. General Hospital, and a coroner's jury ruled that the death was "justifiable homicide."

"The prosecution is not bound by the decision reached by the coroner's jury," Bress said in his office yesterday. He added that he hoped to reach a decision as to whether to present the case to a grand jury "quite soon."

Members of the hastily formed Youth Committee for Equal Justice met for nearly four hours yesterday with the head of the Commissioner's Council on Human Relations and submitted some names for the proposed citizen's committee.

Mrs. Ruth Bates Harris, commission head, said she would submit the names to the District Commissioners, who would add other names.

The committee will meet in closed session, she said, and give its findings to the grand jury.

The seven youths who met with her, led by Rufus Mayfield, also discussed forming a second committee which would probe police-community relations in the city. Its meetings would be open, Mrs. Harris said.

The meeting with Mrs. Harris was attended also by civil rights leader Marion Barry, who also was with a larger group that held a stormy session with District Commissioners Walter N. Tobriner and Robert Mathe on Monday.

ELEVEN TO FIFTEEN MEMBERS

It was at that meeting that the youths, who were friends of Brooker, demanded a public investigation of the incident. They also requested the immediate suspension of Pvt. Rull. The officer is white and the victim was a Negro.

Mrs. Harris said the fact-finding group looking at the Brooker shooting would in no way undercut the grand jury. The findings of the committee will be submitted to the commissioners who will in turn send it to the grand jury.

Although she wouldn't reveal the number of names she will submit to the commissioners, Mrs. Harris did say the Brooker committee will have 11 to 15 members, and that both committees will have wide youth representation.

Bernard Margolius, Rull's attorney, sent a letter to the commissioners yesterday arguing against the appointment of a special committee to look into the Brooker shooting.

"It occurs to me that the objecting group is not seeking an impartial investigation and presentation of the facts in the Brooker case," he charged, "but rather is seeking a forum to voice their views against law enforcement generally and policemen in particular.

"We will refuse to testify before the citizens group. I don't think a report of this review board is a matter of evidence, and a grand jury is required by law to hear evidence and to base its finding on proper evidence."

He said that if the group has witnesses, those witnesses should be presented to the U.S. attorney, who could then present them to the grand jury.

The grand jury, he added, deliberates in secrecy, and is outside the realm of pressures.

"This is how it should be," he said.

[From the Washington Post, May 11, 1967]

Brooker Death Evidence To Go to Grand Jury

(By Phil Casey)

Evidence in the fatal shooting of Clarence J. Brooker, 19, by District Police Pvt. William L. Rull, 22, on May 1 will be presented to a grand jury.

U.S. Attorney David G. Bress said, "I think there is enough in the case that a grand jury should hear it."

Bress added that "All persons having personal knowledge of facts relative to the case . . . will be invited to go before the grand jury."

His reference to "personal" knowledge appeared to exclude such civil rights leaders as Marion Barry from the grand jury proceedings.

Bress said, however, that he will accept witnesses "from any source" so long as their knowledge is "personal."

And this statement was taken to exclude any testimony from a proposed private citizens investigating committee unless it is based on such personal knowledge.

Bress said the case will be presented "fairly promptly," possibly next week. He would not elaborate on what specific criminal charges the jury may examine.

He said investigation as to whether a criminal act was committed should be left to the "established legal agencies" of government and not be conducted by "any committees of the citizenry of the District of Columbia."

This was in reference to the proposed citizens committee which would investigate and turn over evidence to Bress. District Commissioner Walter N. Tobriner had agreed tentatively to formation of such a committee to aid in the investigation and present whatever useful evidence it may obtain.

Rull shot Brooker in a scuffle after Brooker tried to escape arrest at Minnesota Avenue and Benning Road ne. The trouble started when Rull approached some young men to investigate a complaint that they had caused trouble in a store.

Some cookies were thrown on the ground and Rull attempted to arrest Brooker, who resisted. He was shot in the fight that ensued and died little more than an hour later in D.C. General Hospital. It was ruled "justifiable homicide" by a coroner's jury.

Bress has said the prosecution "is not bound by" the decision reached by the coroner's jury.

[From the Washington Star, May 10, 1967]

Bress Taking Brooker Death to Grand Jury—Opposes Separate Investigation by Citizens Group

(By William Basham)

U.S. Atty. David G. Bress said today a grand jury will investigate the May 1 shooting of a youth by a District policeman.

"I think there is enough question in this case to warrant a grand jury hearing," Bress said. He added that two grand juries are now sitting and that he hoped to begin presenting evidence by early next week.

Bress said he will accept witnesses who have "personal knowledge of the facts in this case." He emphasized that the grand jury will hear witnesses suggested by police or "any other source," an obvious reference to demands that a committee of private citizens look into the shooting.

Bress commented:

"It does not seem appropriate to me that an investigation as to whether a criminal act was committed should be made by any committees of the citizenry of the District of Columbia, but should rather be left to the established legal agencies of government which can more effectively make the proper determination."

RULED "JUSTIFIABLE"

Pvt. William L. Rull, 22, shot Clarence J. Brooker, 19, on May 1 as the latter tried to escape arrest on a Northeast street, according to police. The youth died an hour later in D.C. General Hospital, and a coroner's jury ruled that the death was "justifiable homicide."

"The prosecution is not bound by the decision reached by the coroner's jury," Bress said in his office yesterday.

Meanwhile, Royce Gibbon, executive director of the International Conference of Police Associations, which claims to represent more than 200,000 of the nation's policemen, called the planned citizens investigation "a kangaroo court" that "reverts to vigilante rule."

WILL ADD NAMES

"The lack of support afforded policemen in the District of Columbia," Gibbon declared, "has seriously affected the morale of the men. Unless the men are given greater support there will be triple the vacancies in the Metropolitan Police Department—yes, even many more," he asserted.

Members of the hastily formed Youth Committee for Equal Justice met for nearly four hours yesterday with the head of the Commissioner's Council on Human Relations and submitted some names for the proposed citizens committee.

Mrs. Ruth Bates Harris, commission head, said she would submit the names to the District Commissioners, who would add other names.

The committee will meet in closed session, she said, and give its findings to the grand jury.

The seven youths who met with her, led by Rufus Mayfield, also discussed forming a second committee which would probe police-community relations in the city. Its meetings would be open, Mrs. Harris said.

The meeting with Mrs. Harris was attended also by civil rights leader Marion Barry, who also was with the larger group that District Commissioners Tobriner and Robert Mathe attended on Monday.

It was at that meeting that the youths, who were friends of Brooker, demanded a public investigation of the incident. They also requested the immediate suspension of Pvt. Rull. The officer is white and the victim was a Negro.

Mrs. Harris said the fact-finding group looking at the Brooker shooting would in no way undercut the grand jury. The findings of the committee will be submitted to the commissioners who will in turn send it to the grand jury.

ELEVEN TO FIFTEEN MEMBERS

Although she wouldn't reveal the number of names she will submit to the commissioners, Mrs. Harris did say the Brooker committee will have 11 to 15 members, and that both committees will have wide youth representation.

Bernard Margolius, Rull's attorney, sent a letter to the commissioners yesterday arguing against the appointment of a special committee.

"It occurs to me that the objecting group is not seeking an impartial investigation and presentation of the facts in the Brooker case," he charged, "but rather is seeking a forum to voice their views against law enforcement generally and policemen in particular.

"We will refuse to testify before the citizens group. I don't think a report of this review board is a matter of evidence, and a grand jury is required by law to hear evidence and to base its finding on proper evidence."

He said that if the group has witnesses, those witnesses should be presented to the U.S. attorney, who could then present them to the grand jury.

USE OF BATTLESHIPS IN VIETNAM? THE NEW YORK TIMES SAYS "YES"

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the knowledgeable military affairs writer, Mr. Hanson Baldwin, reported in this morning's New York Times that the Defense Department has decided to recommission a Navy battleship for service in the Vietnam war. Mr. Baldwin's account says the *New Jersey*, one of four mothballed battleships, will probably be selected for modernization and overhaul scheduled to start shortly.

The Defense Department this morning called the article inaccurate, denying that a decision on the question has been made, but acknowledging that "papers" are in circulation and that the issue "is not dead." As a counterweight to this reaction, Mr. Baldwin is known to have excellent contacts in and out of military channels, so his article merits attention, regardless of the official response to it.

In a Senate speech April 11, I asserted:

> We have lost enough aircraft and had enough men killed in strikes against targets within battleship range to have justified the commissioning and crewing of at least three battleships.

I based this statement on figures to which I had access and the best available estimates as to the cost of bringing the capital ship and its crew into service. I stated also that:

> The vulnerability of enemy targets in coastal areas would permit naval gunfire to substitute for airstrikes and save both lives and dollars in the air. This, in time, would free our aircraft from jobs suitable for naval rifles and permit their utilization on the proper targets—those unsuitable for a ship's gun.
>
> Heavy naval rifles in our active fleets could save lives on the ground by providing landing support and "softening up" areas adjacent to the sea which are planned for infantry action.
>
> The presence of battleships and their long, heavy guns in our active fleet could well save our cruisers and destroyers and the lives of naval personnel aboard by providing a match for the heavy coastal batteries which, in all likelihood, will be constructed or perhaps are being constructed along the coast of North Vietnam.
>
> Powerful naval gunfire would provide an all-weather, around-the-clock interdiction and destruction capability which is now beyond the scope of air power. And it could provide continuous, disruptive fire to prevent the reconstruction of targets previously destroyed by air or naval bombardment.

I continue to believe that the use of battleships off the coast of Vietnam would be a logical and sound step to take, militarily and psychologically, and I sincerely hope that Mr. Baldwin's sources are as accurate as they have been in the past.

Mr. President, regardless of the official reaction to the Hanson Baldwin article or the current stage of decisionmaking in the battleship question, I believe the item from this morning's New York Times is important, and I ask that it be printed in the Record with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1967]

Navy To Recommission World War II Battleship for Use Off Vietnam

(By Hanson W. Baldwin)

Washington, May 10.—The Defense Department has decided to recommission a Navy battleship for service in the Vietnam war. The New Jersey, one of four World War II veterans in the Navy's reserve fleet, will probably be selected, informed sources said, for modernization and overhaul, scheduled to start shortly. The New Jersey and her sister ships, the Iowa and Wisconsin, are in the Philadelphia Navy Yard; the fourth ship, the Missouri, is in the Bremerton (Wash.) Navy Yard. Each of the ships has nine 16-inch guns. The New Jersey is said to have somewhat more modern communications and electronics than her sister ships; that is why the Navy favors her selection for recommissioning. Nevertheless, it is expected to require a minimum of nine months—perhaps as much as 17 months—before the ship's big guns are firing against shore targets in Vietnam. Reactivation of a ship that has been out of commission for years is an expensive and time-consuming process. The ship must be stripped of her plastic cocoons, cosmoline, grease and other preservatives. Much of her electrical wiring, which has probably deteriorated through the years, may have to be replaced, and she must be refitted with modern communications and electronics.

The cost of reactivating one battleship is variously estimated at $16-million to $27.5-million, and annual operating costs, with a full crew of some 3,500 men, are estimated at $13.5-million to $17.5-million.

However, some 22,000 tons of 16-inch ammunition—manufactured in World War II and immediately thereafter—are in storage and available, with some reworking, for use.

The Defense Department's decision, which is expected to be made formal within a few days, follows a request from the Navy Department for permission to reactivate a battleship. The issue has been under debate within the Navy and in the Pentagon—as well as in Congress—for the last two years.

The Marines and some naval officers have taken the position that naval gunfire support has been allowed to deteriorate seriously since the Korean war as more and more naval ships were converted from guns to missiles, and as the big-gunned ships—heavy cruisers and battleships—were decommissioned.

Some high-ranking naval officers, including the Chief of Naval Operations, opposed the recommissioning, however, and urged the addition o feight-inch gun cruisers to the fleet instead of the battleships. In effect, the office of the Secretary of Defense has now decided that the big-gunned battleship will serve a useful role in Vietnam despite its cost and despite the length of time required to reactivate.

TARGETS ARE FACTOR

The targets the battleship could bring under fire from its big guns were said to be one of the deciding factors in the decision.

In a recent study of the battleship issue, based on testimony from official Pentagon sources, Senator Thomas J. McIntyre, Democrat of New Hampshire, pointed out that possible target for the 16-inch, 2,400 pound projectiles might be military targets, docks and bridges in Hongay, Thanhoa, Kampha, Vinh and Haiphong.

Much of the railroad from Vinh to Hanoi, 150 miles of the coastal highway—Route 1—would be within interdiction range of the battleship's 16-inch guns, the Senator's study found.

Officers in the Pentagon said privately that the big guns could also have been extremely useful against heavy enemy field fortifications during the recent fighting along the demilitarized zone. Others stressed that the five-inch guns of United State destroyers, which have been bombarding targets in North Vietnam, have often been outranged by enemy coastal batteries, and that a number of destroyers have been hit by enemy projectiles.

FOREIGN TRADE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Committee on Banking and Currency has been concerned about aspects of foreign trade relating to matters under the jurisdiction of this committee. Two years ago we held extensive hearings on the subject of the balance of payments, including the relation of the balance of payments to our gold supply and the effect on Federal Reserve requirements. In addition, matters relating to East-West trade have come to the attention of the committee by reason of our concern as to the administration of the Export Control Act, the Defense Production Act, and the Export-Import Bank Act.

Accordingly, I announce that the Subcommittee on International Finance will undertake a study of these matters. It is our intention to make a staff study over the coming weeks, to be followed by public hearings at which the interested departments, persons, and organizations interested in foreign trade, and the public generally may have an opportunity to present their views and give information to the subcommittee.

Further notice will be given when the dates for these hearings have been specified so that those interested can request an opportunity to be heard.

PERSPECTIVE NEEDED TO JUDGE OUR SPACE PROGRAM

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, a few months ago the Nation was shocked by a fire aboard an Apollo space vehicle at Cape Kennedy which took the lives of three heroic astronauts. In succeeding weeks, the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, the appropriate Committees of Congress, and the prime contractor in the production of this imaginative and unprecedented space program, North American Aviation, have been seeking to find the causes of this disaster so that all steps may be taken to prevent any repetition.

This is a process which must be carried on with the greatest objectivity. Already important lessons have been learned. The deficiencies have been acknowledged, and are now being corrected. Our efforts in outer space will go forward with renewed courage and a resolve to meet the challenge posed by this tragedy.

Dr. Wernher von Braun, head of

NASA's Marshall Space Center, is uniquely aware of the problems of the moon project. He recently commented on those problems on national television. Dr. von Braun pointed out that our national space effort inevitably faces hazards. I think his comments help to bring our appraisal of the Apollo project into focus. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his remarks be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CBS EVENING NEWS,
May 4, 1967.

DR. VON BRAUN INTERVIEWED

Walter Cronkite: "North American Aviation, prime contractor for the Apollo spacecraft, has been under attack since the fire at Cape Kennedy that killed the three Apollo astronauts, but Wernher Von Braun, the head of NASA's Marshall Space Center, turned to North American's defense while attending a space meeting in Dallas."

Von Braun: "I know that the contractor of the Apollo spacecraft has really been raked over the coals, and I think the contractor himself doesn't deny it, that certain shortcomings existed.

"On the other hand, we had very similar difficulties early in the Mercury and the Gemini programs, and it was only through the process of learning, and trial and error, if you will, that the contractor for Mercury and Gemini finally got on top of the situation with perfect products at the end. But this wasn't necessarily so from the beginning, in fact, we made a statistical analysis, on the number of failures—of the percentage of parts that were marginal in performance in Mercury and Apollo—in fact the percentage is a minute fraction of one percent—but then—and the Mercury had fewer parts, of course, than Apollo. But the number of failures early in the Mercury program—and this percentage basis ran about ten times as high as what is in Apollo.

"So you might as well say, the early flights in Mercury, like Al Sheppard's flight or Gus Grissom's flight, Mercury, and then John Glenn's first orbital flight, in the first, actually were exposed, if you will, to greater statistical hazards than Apollo was. We were just on the lucky side of the curve."

THE 19TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDEPENDENCE OF THE STATE OF ISRAEL

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, beginning at sunset on Sunday, May 14, Jews throughout the world, and in the State of Israel in particular, will usher in a new holiday in the Hebrew religious calendar: Yom Haatz Muoth—Israel Independence Day. It will be the beginning of the 19th year of the establishment of the Republic of Israel.

I visited Israel in November 1965, after having been in Japan, Hong Kong, India, Pakistan, Afghanistan, and Spain, where I had an opportunity to observe the progress achieved in the welfare and social fields.

My experience in Israel was inspiring and astounding. In many areas, where the land had been sterile and dead, vegetation was in abundance. This had been achieved by hard work and resourcefulness. Everywhere there was evident a will to work and to grow.

A few days ago, I received a paper entitled "Israeli Independence Day," written by Rabbi David L. Genuth, of Temple Beth El, Cleveland, Ohio, Rabbi Genuth's discussion of the birth and growth of the Republic of Israel is so replete in its treatment of that country that I use it now as an expression of what I should like to say about the Israeli Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that Rabbi Genuth's report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ISRAELI INDEPENDENCE DAY

(By Rabbi David L. Genuth)

On Sunday, May 14th at sunset, Jews all over the world in general and in the State of Israel in particular will usher in a new holiday in the Hebrew Religious Calendar, Yom Haatz Muoth (Israeli Independence Day.)

In nineteen years, Israel has developed beyond our expectations. Israel has constructed housing for almost a million and a half refugees. She has built factories and has rebuilt human lives. Within her borders the Bible lives, the Hebrew language reborn and the Messianic vision is coming closer to fulfillment.

Israel is the bridge between three Continents of the Ancient World . . . Africa, Asia, and Europe. It looks out over the highways which have marked the migration and invasion of history's pageant. By the calculation of our atomic world this is a very small and humble price of the earth; the bridge is fragile and the highway narrow and in the age of jet planes it probably takes longer to get to the International Hopkins Airport than it takes from Tel Aviv to Eiliath, from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea. The population directly affected is approximately 3 million. Compared to Red China is like an unborn infant and a human giant.

Therefore, when we evaluate the questions of Israel in 1967, it is in a spiritual world, the world of the Bible, and the world of all major religions and the world of Science, especially in the world of Freedom. A new Center is being constructed now in the City of Jerusalem for the sole purpose of studying the ways to peace. It will be known as the Harry Truman Institute of Peace. It seems history repeats itself. Over 2400 years ago after the Proclamation issued by Cyrus, a mere handful took advantage of the King's decree and only 42,000 men, women and children returned to Zion, the land of their Fathers. That handful of Zionists and their descendants changed the entire future of mankind. They edited and collected the Prophets and the Psalms, formed the Canon of the Bible and gave the world its monotheistic religions and as in the days of Cyrus. Although the overwhelming majority of the Jews continue to live and contribute to the advancement to progress and peace outside of Israel, yet great blessings will go forth from the new State of Israel.

There is no question in my mind that the citizens of the State of Israel will open a new chapter in the annals of the human spirit.

The Hebrew University, the Weitzman Institute and other great cultural Institutions are already contributing to the advancement of health, brotherhood and peace.

The words of Albert Einstein will testify to this: "Israel is not primarily a place of refuge for the Jews of Eastern Europe, North Africa, India and other Arabic countries, but the embodiment of the reawakening of the corporate spirit."

The founders of the American republic, indeed of all free lands, fully recognize their debt to the Hebrew spirit, for the individual, social and international virtue out of which democracy was born.

President Harry Truman who just celebrated his 83rd birthday was the first one to announce nineteen years ago that the State of Israel and its government would be recognized by the United States. For this heroic deed, President Truman is included in the Immortals of the great friends of the Jewish people. President Truman's name is bound up with Israel's history and he will never be forgotten.

Israeli Independence Day should be celebrated by all Americans of all denominations who believe in justice and in the dignity of the individual. Israel like America had to struggle for freedom, Israel like America is a country built by pioneers, by men who set their strength and their spirit against the forces of nature in the allurements of comfort. Israel like America, purchased its freedom with sweat, blood and tears. Israel like America is hoping and praying for the great day when the prophecy of Isaiah will be fulfilled; "That no nation shall lift sword against another nation and war shall be no more."

This Sunday night and Monday morning the prayer which is recited every morning in the Synagogue will add additional meaning to this new holiday. "O Cause a new light to shine upon Zion and may we all be worthy soon to enjoy its brightness."

The greatest Republic, the United States of America and the smallest Republic, the State of Israel are both jewels shining in different parts of God's world.

CHANGE OF PLACE OF HEARINGS

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President I would like to make a correction in the RECORD of May 9, 1967, pertaining to the hearings being held by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments. The hearings will be held in G. 308, auditorium of the New Senate Office Building, rather than G. 304.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correction will be made.

RATIFICATION OF 25TH AMENDMENT BY STATE OF TEXAS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, I am pleased to report that the State of Texas has joined in ratifying the 25th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, providing for presidental succession. Many difficulties and differences were reconciled in the text of the amendment as passed by Congress; the rapidity with which the States have approved of the result is testimony to the skill of the congressional sponsors and managers of the amendment.

The 25th amendment became effective February 10, 1967, after ratification by three-fourths of the States. The State of Texas has done well to show its approval of the amendment, which deservedly is winning the support of all.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a certified copy of the resolution by which the legislature of the State of Texas recently ratified the 25th amendment.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 39

Concurrent resolution ratifying the proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

Whereas, The 89th Congress of the United States of America, at the first session begun and held at Washington, D.C., Monday, January 4, 1965, by a constitutional two-thirds vote in both Houses adopted a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, to-wit:

"JOINT RESOLUTION —

"Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office

"Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (Two-Thirds of Each House Concurring Therein), That the following article is proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. In case of the removal of the President from office or of his death or resignation, the Vice President shall become President.

"Section 2. Whenever there is a vacancy in the office of the Vice President, the President shall nominate a Vice President who shall take office upon confirmation by a majority vote of both Houses of Congress.

"Section 3. Whenever the President transmits to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that he is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, and until he transmits to them a written declaration to the contrary, such powers and duties shall be discharged by the Vice President as Acting President.

"Section 4. Whenever the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive departments or of such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmit to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall immediately assume the powers and duties of the office as Acting President.

"Thereafter, when the President transmits to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives his written declaration that no inability exists, he shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President and a majority of either the principal officers of the executive department or of such other body as the Congress may by law provide, transmit within four days to the President Pro Tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives their written declaration that the *President is unable* to discharge the powers and duties of his office. Thereupon Congress shall decide the issue, assembling within forty-eight hours for that purpose if not in session. If the Congress, within twenty-one days after receipt of the latter written declaration, or, if Congress is not in session, within twenty-one days after Congress is required to assemble, determines by two-thirds vote of both Houses that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office, the Vice President shall continue to discharge the same as Acting President; otherwise, the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office."; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Legislature of the State of Texas, the Senate and the House Concurring:

Section 1. That the Legislature of the State of Texas hereby ratifies and adopts this proposed amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

Sec. 2. That the Secretary of State of Texas notify the President of the United States, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Administrator of General Services of the United States, and each senator and representative from Texas in the Congress of the United States of this action of the Legislature by forwarding to each of them a certified copy of this Concurrent Resolution.

PRESTON SMITH,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.
BEN BARNES,
Speaker of the House.

I hereby certify that S. C. R. No. 39 was adopted by the Senate on March 14, 1967.

CHARLES SCHNABLY,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that S. C. R. No. 39 was adopted by the House on April 25, 1967.

DOROTHY HALLMAN,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Approved: April 29, 1967.

JOHN CONNALLY,
Governor.
JOHN L. HILL,
Secretary of State.

DEATH OF MISS PHILIPPA SCHUYLER

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I was terribly shocked and saddened to pick up the newspaper yesterday and read of the death in Vietnam of Miss Philippa Schuyler. A helicopter crash, I learned, took her life at age 34.

Miss Schuyler was a prodigy. At age two and a half she started to read. At 4, she was playing Mozart compositions on the piano. At 5, she was composing for the piano.

In 1939, at age 6, she played a recital of her compositions at the New York World's Fair. By the time she was 14, she was a concert pianist with the New York Philharmonic and had composed more than 100 piano compositions.

I never had the opportunity to hear Miss Schuyler play, although I did have the pleasure of meeting and talking with her in Washington on several occasions. She was the author of several books reflecting her interest in the problems of political organization faced by newly independent countries. The dissimilar character of these interests simply reflects the independence of her mind and the wide range of her interests.

I ask unanimous consent that the obituary published in the Washington Post be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the obituary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PIANIST, AUTHOR DIES IN SOUTH VIETNAM CRASH

DANANG, SOUTH VIETNAM, May 9.—Philippa Duke Schuyler, famed pianist and child prodigy who at age 4 was playing Mozart, died today in a helicopter crash in Danang Bay.

Miss Schuyler, 34, was working in Vietnam as a correspondent for the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader and giving concerts in Hue, the ancient Imperial capital of Vietnam, and Danang.

Miss Schuyler was the tenth American newspaper correspondent to be killed in Vietnam, and the second woman journalist to die.

At the time of her death she was taking nine Vietnamese children from Hue to Danang where she planned to enroll them in school. One of the children also died in the crash and an American soldier was listed as missing.

ALMOST AT DESTINATION

The Huey helicopter in which Miss Schuyler was transporting the children was about ten minutes from its destination and 40 miles from its takeoff point when it crashed. An Army spokesman said the pilot issued a brief emergency signal giving his location. Rescue helicopters were sent immediately.

The helicopter crashed close enough to the shore for some passengers to swim to safety. Rescue teams saved the rest. The pilot was hospitalized with a concussion and the remaining three crewmen and eight Vietnamese children also were hospitalized. The crash was attributed to mechanical failure.

The bodies of Miss Schuyler and the child were recovered later.

Miss Schuyler was the daughter of George Schuyler, an editor of the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Courier and a noted Negro newspaperman, who lives in New York. Her mother also survives.

WAS CHILD PRODIGY

Miss Schuyler who was a precocious but well-mannered child, first attracted public attention when her parents discovered she could read at age two and half. She was playing Mozart at four, and at five she was composing music.

When only six, she played a recital of her compositions at the 1939 New York World's Fair. By the time she was 14, Miss Schuyler was a concert pianist with the New York Philharmonic and had written more than 100 piano compositions.

In her 20's, she established herself as an international artist, touring more than 70 countries. She gave command performances for the late Queen Mother Elizabeth of the Belgians, and was honored by the Haitian government in 1950 and Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia in 1955.

She gave the premiere performance of her first piano concerto in 1965 in an appearance with the Cairo Symphony.

WROTE BOOKS, ARTICLES

In addition to her fame as a piano virtuoso, Miss Schuyler used her travels as a musician to collect material for articles and books. She had been a roving correspondent for the Union Leader.

When giving a concert in the Congo in 1960 at the height of violence there, she fought off an attack by Congolese. She wrote "Who Killed the Congo?" in 1960, and in 1962 wrote "Christ in Africa."

Miss Schuyler was a Roman Catholic and wrote many articles for Catholic publications.

This was her second visit to Vietnam. She had been the guest of former U.S. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge for a concert. She had planned to leave last Saturday but decided to stay to continue her volunteer work of taking Catholic children from Hue to Danang.

When she was four she wrote a poem she called, "A Baby in Death:"

"When I die, when I die
Sleep, sleep!
You must live when I die
When the rain comes
On the starry sky
Sleep, sleep
When I die
Tra la la la
Da da da da"

THE SOVEREIGN STATES IN THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, there is increasing concern throughout the country regarding the low estate to which our sovereign States have fallen in our federal system. I have voiced this concern repeatedly over the past several years in connection with the long overdue reapportionment of our State legislatures and the need to modernize and strengthen our State constitutions. We all know that the weakest branch of State government is the legislative branch. Most of our State legislatures are severely shackled by constitutional restrictions upon the frequency and length of legislative sessions; upon the compensation which legislators may receive; and upon the ability of the committees of the legislatures to function efficiently between regular sessions.

To all of us who would like to see strong States, the current efforts being stimulated by the American Assembly of Columbia University and the Citizens Conference on State Legislatures is most heartening. Following general consideration of the problem of State legislatures a year ago at an American assembly at Arden House, New York City, through support of the Ford Foundation regional assemblies are being held over the Nation to provide an opportunity for the legislators, the business community, and civic leaders to examine the ways in which the States legislative branches may be improved. An excellent summary of the problem of rejuvenating State legislatures and of some needed steps for the future are set forth in an address by David B. Walker at the Southeastern Assembly on State Legislatures in American Politics held at Emory University, Atlanta, Ga., March 31, 1967. Dr. Walker has viewed the State legislatures from several vantage points: as a professor of political science at Bowdoin College, as staff director of the Senate Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations, and now as one of the assistant directors of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. I ask unanimous consent that the text of his address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE LEGISLATURES IN A CHANGING FEDERAL SYSTEM

(An address by David B. Walker, Assistant Director, Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, before the Southeastern Assembly on State Legislatures in American Politics, Atlanta, Ga., Mar. 31, 1967)

The dramatic developments of our era have produced a crisis in American federalism and the States—and especially their Legislatures—have a major responsibility for solving it. This is the basic message I bring to you this noontime. It is a simple message to proclaim, but it has stark implications for all who are concerned about the fate of our municipalities, the future of the States, and the continuing viability of our federal system.

Clear recognition of this crisis at the national level came most forcefully last January when President Johnson in his State of the Union Message to Congress declared:

"Only a total working partnership among Federal, State, and local governments can succeed. The test of that partnership will be the concern of each public organization, each private institution, and each responsible citizen. Each State, county and city needs to examine its capacity for government in today's world. Some will need to reorganize and reshape their methods of administration—as we are doing. Others will need to revise their constitutions and their laws to bring them up-to-date—as we are doing."

This call by the President for "a more effective partnership at all levels of American government" signifies a top level awareness of the critical roles which the States and localities must play in the economic and social development of this country. It represents full acceptance of the strategic positions which these officials occupy in implementing the more than 175 major Federal grant programs now on the books. And it constitutes the signal that the Administration intends to cooperate with them and assist them in fulfilling their public responsibilities.

Many of us have been concerned for a number of years with improving the relationships between Federal, State, and local governments. The Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, which I serve, for almost seven years has surveyed many of the basic points of friction in our system, and issued 30 reports containing over 200 recommendations for improving State and local program administration and financial organization. Each year this permanent, bipartisan Commission, composed of 26 members from the public-at-large and all levels of government, including three State legislators, issues a comprehensive State program with proposed draft bills for consideration by legislatures.

Several southeasterners have served with distinction on the Commission, including its new Chairman, Farris Bryant of Florida; the Senior Senator from North Carolina, Mr. Ervin; Representative L. H. Fountain of North Carolina; Mayor Herman W. Goldner of St. Petersburg, Florida; former Governor Ernest F. Hollings of South Carolina; former Governor Carl E. Sanders of Georgia; former Governor Terry Sanford of North Carolina; and Mrs. Adelaide Walters of North Carolina. As a bipartisan Commission, covering a wide span of the political spectrum and with only 9 of its 26 votes held by the Federal Government, the Commission in effect is a national body responsible to all levels of government and not a Federal agency—save in a narrow technical sense. Given these traits, objectivity is a basic characteristic of the Commission's reports and recommendations. But there is one theme that tends to dominate its work and it is this: The position of the States must be strengthened within our federal system and the States must assume the responsibility for handling problems which transcend the capacity of local units individually or by joint cooperation.

A CRISIS TO BE FACED

So much for the Commission. Now let us identify the role of State legislatures in a dynamically changing federalism. It is a critical role—perhaps a major determinant of the future course of American federalism. As you know, a number of responsible authorities on our governmental system claim that State governments are obsolete; that their executive branches are weak, ineffective and nonprofessional; that their legislatures are more suitable for Andrew Johnson's period than Lyndon Johnson's presidency; and that their constitutions resemble more the Code of Justinian than a core for active, modern constitutional government.

To some, these caustic criticisms sound like the mere prattling of a lot of academic liberals. But some conservatives implicitly accept the validity of these charges when they alleged that the States are being totally eclipsed by the Federal Government. Like most debates of this kind, there is fact and fiction in both the charges and countercharges. And in my opinion, our time will be better spent analyzing the ironic facts of contemporary federalism and then the response of State legislatures must mount in light of these conditions.

What are the facts, not the fantasies, of federalism of the Sixties? Some provide the basis for optimism, while others are fairly depressing. But all must be reckoned with if we are to understand the new federalism that has emerged since the end of WW II and if we are to comprehend the challenges that confront today's State legislatures:

1. During the past 20 years, we more than tripled our GNP and come to enjoy high living standards and the benefits of modern science and technology; at the same time this rising level of affluence has generated persistent demands for more and more public services—especially from those governmental levels which are most subject to hostile voter reaction to new tax levies: our States and our muncipalities.

2. Since 1946, all governments have become more active and energetic. Total governmental expenditures for civil governmental functions today is five times what they were two decades ago. But in comparative terms, growing government is more characteristic of the States and localities than of the national government. Witness the fact that State and local governments collected approximately 25% of all governmental revenues in 1946 and these jurisdictions were collecting 38% in 1965 and note that these jurisdictions accounted for 44% of all civil governmental expenditures in 1946, while in 1965 their share came to nearly two-thirds (66%) of the total.

3. Over the past two decades, we have concentrated 70% of our people in urban areas, evenly split this sector of the population between core cities and suburbs, and produced more than 80% of our taxable wealth and business activities in these same metropolitan areas; at the same time, we have built higher economic, social, and legal walls between the fragmented units comprising our 231 standard metropolitan statistical areas and witnessed a widening of the gap between the haves and have-nots among these same local jurisdictions—thus creating a metropolitan nightmare for the States to contend with.

4. Since 1946, the amount of Federal aid to State and local governments has expanded more than 17 times and the number of programs has risen to more than 175; but these grants still only provide 16% of State and local revenues and more than half fail to give explicit recognition to the unequal fiscal capabilities of State and local governments. Moreover, the number, complexity, and administrative and personnel requirements of these programs are raising serious questions concerning their effectiveness as devices of the new federalism.

5. Since the end of WW II, the States have increased their own aid to municipalities more than 7 times and by the end of this calendar year all State legislatures will have been reapportioned; yet only 10 States have effected major changes in their administrative systems and only one-fifth of the States have made any financial contribution to such Federal-local urban development programs as urban renewal, public housing, and water and sewage facilities. As a result, many localities, metropolitan areas and Federal officials still view the States with strong skepticism.

The emergence of an urban America with many resources and many problems; big government at all levels but bigger government at the State and local levels; an increase in the dollar amounts and administrative problems of Federal grant programs; and an evolving new role for the States which many view with skepticism—these are the fundamental and somewhat contradictory features of the new federalism we have created during the past 20 years.

IMPLICATIONS FOR STATE LEGISLATURES

What do these facts have for the future of the States and for State legislatures in particular? It involves recognition of the fact that with a monopoly of legal power and with access to superior fiscal resources the States have a primary responsibility for resolving many of the critical challenges confronting the jurisdictions in metropolitan areas. It means recognition of the fact that the States already are running a nearly $50 billion a year business, employing more than 2 million workers. It involves recognition of the fact that public demands for more and better services will grow as our population grows and as our urban areas expand, and the States cannot shift this mushrooming responsibility to local authorities or to the Federal Government. It involves the development of an administrative capability at the State level which permits effective use of Federal grant programs. It requires recognition of the fact that the management muddle is not a Federal problem solely, but actually an intergovernmental one, with the States having major responsibility for resolving it. These are some of the basic implications that the contours of contemporary federalism have for the States and especially their legislatures.

The States then must step into the breach. If they do not, their position in our federal system will be a formal, not a substantive one.

THE LEGISLATURES AND STATE REVITALIZATION

What can the legislatures do to revamp State government? First and foremost, they can put their own houses in order. In far too many instances while their responsibilities have grown with every hike in the population, their organizational setup, salary, staff assistance, specialized services, and institutional spirit are still geared largely to the simple problems and small population of bygone days. Let me be specific:

With reference to their public visibility, a Gallup Poll taken last November found that only 28% answered "yes" to the following question: "Do you happen to know who will represent your district or locality in the State Senate next year?" In response to a similar question concerning State representatives, 24% answered "yes."

In terms of popular esteem, the same poll found 69% of the sample indicating their legislature was doing a "fair" or "poor" job; only 12% responded with "excellent."

On the matter of compensation, the latest survey by the Council of State Governments shows that salaries, per diem and living expense allowances of legislators have increased during the past 3 years; yet the median compensation for the last biennial period still fell in the $5,800 to $6,300 range.

Regarding legislative services, favorable votes for annual sessions came in California, Kansas, and New Hampshire last November; but 29 State legislatures still meet biennially including Kentucky, North Dakota, and West Virginia where reform efforts were defeated on November 8.

In terms of time limits, California, Florida, and Tennessee voters sanctioned proposed amendments, but 30 States still have time limits on their regular legislative sessions, including North Dakota where an unshackling proposal was not supported at the polls.

Turning to the matter of official legislative records, 15 State legislatures do not maintain a printed daily journal of the previous day's legislative proceedings and a comparable number do not include all rulings of the presiding officers in their legislative records.

In terms of introduction of bills, all but one provide pre-session bill drafting services, but presession filing is permitted in only 14 State legislatures.

With reference to the 46 States that chiefly rely on a separate standing committee system, the number of house committees for the 1964–65 biennial averaged 26 and the senate figure came to 21.

On committee proceedings, 40 do not keep verbatim records of hearings and the minutes of committee proceedings and hearings are maintained in only half the legislatures.

With reference to committee staff, over one-third of the States provide no professional staff for individual standing committees and another third provide such staffing for no more than one major committee in each house of the legislature.

Regarding permanent legislative service agencies, 43 States now have a legislative council or similar agency to provide research information to legislators and most of the remaining 7 have some form of substitute service; yet in 12 instances, these services do not include legal counselling for legislatures; in 16 legislatures, they do not include preparation of bill and law summaries; in 15, they do not include a continuous study of State revenue and expenditures; and in 18, they involve no budgetary review and analysis.

Turning to the needs of individual members, only one-tenth of the States provide individual offices for all legislators. An additional six provide individual offices for senators and in approximately 10 States legislators share office space.

Finally, one-third of the States provide individual secretarial help for legislators and an additional four States provide secretaries for senators only. The rest of the States have pool arrangements—except for eight or nine with no formal arrangements for secretarial help.

Modern resources for improved legislation can only be developed initially if we move vigorously on these various fronts and make the job of legislator a vocation, not an avocation or a vacation. Improved procedures, better organizational patterns, higher pay, more adequate professional assistance and, above all, a better public image—these are legislative issues that require State constitutional or statutory changes. These are the vital ingredients for achieving the kind of State legislative process and product that meet the dynamic needs of the times. Put more bluntly, these are reforms that only an aroused citizenry and legislature can enact.

Not so long ago, some rather naive academicians and political analysts assumed that reapportionment would automatically correct all of these conditions. Time, of course, has proven them wrong. All of us can take comfort in the fact that as of mid-January 1967, 39 States have valid reapportionment plans in effect; that the remaining probably will have completed the job by the end of this calendar year. All of us who are genuinely interested in strengthening State legislatures can take comfort in the defeat of the Dirksen amendment last year.

Equitable reapportionment, however, merely solves a quantitative problem; it does not automatically answer the more subtle qualitative question I have raised. The American Assembly at Arden House, the Citizens Conference of State Legislatures and various other action groups working on your behalf have dramatized this dilemma and have sought to overcome it. In our efforts to innovate, however, let us be mindful that the paramount objective before us is the development of legislatures in each of our 50 States which possess the prestige, power, and professional standing required to make our traditional separation of powers and checks and balance principles a living reality and to enable these ancient institutions of American government to really deliberate and decide the great issues confronting our 50 Commonwealths.

THE STATES AGENDA OF UNFINISHED BUSINESS

The stakes are high. Time is growing short and the agenda of unfinished State business is long. And the legislatures can not ignore the items on this agenda:

There is the problem of a fragmented administrative structure in the executive branches.

There is the related problem of adequate State planning and more effective use of Federal grant programs.

There is the problem of a short supply of adequate and well-trained manpower for State government.

There is the problem of effective executive and legislative tools for building a meaningful State budget.

There is the problem of making more effective use of the States' powers of broad-based taxation.

There is the problem of more effective State supervision of the local property tax and of a broader, more equitable program of State aid to localities.

There is the problem of providing adequate administrative machinery and of buying into Federal urban development programs in order to halt the bypassing of the States of which so many at this level complain.

There is the problem of unshackling local governments and of more States playing a leadership role in the affairs of their own metropolitan areas.

Finally, there is the problem of the States—especially of State legislators—presenting a more effective case in Washington—to Administration officials, as well as to committees of the Congress.

I could go on but this catalogue of critical issues underscores the undeniable fact that the paramount problems confronting the States are the most pressing problems confronting State legislatures. And this is why the future of federalism has become so inescapably linked with the future of State legislatures.

Nearly three-score years ago, Woodrow Wilson wrote:

"It is to be hoped that we shall presently have the . . . light dawn upon us with regard to our State governments, and, instead of upsetting an ancient system, hallowed by long use and deep devotion, revitalize it by reorganization. And that, not only because it is an old system long beloved, but also because we are certified by all political history of the fact that centralization is not vitalization . . . The object of our federal system is to bring the understandings of constitutional government home to the people of the Nation, to make them part of their consciousness as they go about their daily tasks. If we cannot sucessfully effect its adjustment by the nice local adaptations of our older practice, we have failed as constitutional statesmen."

Let us be mindful of the counsel of this transplanted Georgian and adopt a course of prudent innovation so that future generations of Americans will inherit the priceless legacy of a functioning federal system.

ANNIVERSARY OF AMERICAN SAMOA

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, the residents of American Samoa are among the most loyal of Americans although they do not enjoy the full privileges of American citizenship.

In the last four major conflicts in which this country has been engaged, the young men from American Samoa proudly served alongside our own fighting forces.

On April 17, 1967, American Samoa observed the 67th anniversary of the raising of the American flag over the islands.

An account of that ceremony was written by Mr. Jay Gallagher, assistant information officer, Office of Samoan Information.

In this account, Mr. Gallagher describes the reaction of the "palagi," a Samoan word for Americans or foreigners, Americans who reside there, and gives an account of the Flag Day ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

American Samoa today marked the 67th anniversary of its flag day in colorful, yet emotion-packed ceremonies on the village malae of Fagotogo. Upwards of 5,000 persons lined the main road, side streets, and roof tops to observe the traditional parade, singing and dancing, and to hear the remarks of government dignitaries.

A gracious Providence provided perfect weather for the commemoration of the first raising of the American flag over Samoa on April 17, 1900. Though the hot sun drove many spectators to seek shade, it provided perfect lighting for a team of United States Information Agency photographers. Motion picture films taken here today will later be shown all over the world.

And they will be shown with pride.

If this was a proud day for the 26,000 Samoans of these five islands, it had to be an even prouder day for the 300 palagi American citizens working here under contract to the Government of American Samoa.

Today's world news told of American flag burnings in England, France and even in an American University. Yet here on this tiny island below the Equator and thousands of miles from their homeland, the palagis saw their flag raised in respect by the two oldest surviving members of the Samoan Fita Fita Guard; they saw hundreds march in review and give the traditional Samoan hand-over-the-heart salute; and the palagis heard their national anthem sung with ringing sincerity by Samoan school children.

The impact of the occasion touched every palagi, each of whom was well aware that the respect and appreciation accorded his flag and his country came from persons, who with few exceptions, do not share his privilege of United States citizenship.

Palagis and Samoans, alike, heard Governor H. Rex Lee praise the Samoans as the most dedicated people living under the American flag. Governor Lee reminded that Samoa has given freely of its youth who have served loyally and valiantly in four difficult wars involving the United States. The Governor spoke of the courageous Samoans who are "giving their best and even their lives in Vietnam."

Governor Lee said that when Samoa wanted to move more rapidly into the Twentieth Century, the United States met the request generously. The Governor said that Samoan and United States teamwork has in only six years made Samoa a showplace of democracy and progress. Governor Lee said that Samoa has established an educational, social and political system of which it can rightfully be proud.

In conclusion, the Governor extended on behalf of President Johnson and the people of the United States, the gratitude for the wisdom of those Samoan forebearers for making this day possible.

Chief Le'iato Tuli, Chief of Samoan Affairs, expressed the appreciation of his people to the United States for that country's efforts in Samoa and particularly United States determination of preserve the Samoan culture so dear to the heart of every Samoan. The Samoan people demonstrated their gratitude in many ways, including a song by the 98-voice singing group from Manu'a.

They sang a song of their own composition, in Samoan, of how last year's hurricane destroyed their homes and Governor Lee replaced them with new and better fales.

And they sang of the wonder of educational television which now carries lessons to their children over sixty miles of ocean to the three islands of Manu'a.

This was indeed a day for both Samoan and palagi to remember—an occasion to seal the eternal friendship and mutual respect of two races living harmoniously together.

ADDRESS BY JOHN M. NELSON III AT GROUND-BREAKING CEREMONIES AT PEABODY CONSERVATORY OF MUSIC

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, the city of Baltimore, in my home State, has many institutions of which it can be justly proud. Among the greatest of these is the Peabody Conservatory of Music, the Nation's oldest independent school of music.

This renowned institution recently broke ground for a $3.2 million dormitory-student union building. This project will increase even more their contribution to American music and musicians.

At the ground-breaking ceremony, Mr. John M. Nelson III, president of the Peabody Institute, made some remarks which I ask unanimous consent to have reprinted in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mayor McKeldin, Bishop Doll, ladies and gentlemen, the project for which we are gathered to break ground today is in many ways an enterprise typical of the second half of the Twentieth Century, in that it represents a cooperative endeavor of a private institution of higher education with the local, State and Federal governments, as well as a notable example of cooperation between local and Federal agencies. A long-term loan of $1,200,000 was secured from the College Facilities Section of the Department of Housing and Urban Development with the help of Senator Joseph Tydings, Senator Daniel B. Brewster and Representative George H. Fallon, whose assistance we gratefully acknowledge as we do that of the Baltimore Housing and Urban Renewal Agency. The garage portion of the project has been made possible through the help of the Off-Street Parking Commission of Baltimore City, the Commissioners of Finance, and the Mayor and City Council of Baltimore.

Also involved in the planning stage were the Baltimore Department of Traffic and Transit, the Historical and Architectural Preservation Commission and many others. In addition to the Federal and City loans, about $1,000,000 of the project cost will be borne by many individuals, foundations and business firms who have given to our Development Fund. The beginning of these new buildings is an important event, not only in the history of the downtown area but also in the history of a celebrated cultural institution.

NATURE'S CARETAKERS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, Minnesota is blessed with magnificant resources of land, lakes, rivers, and wildlife. Fortunately for the Nation, the State is also blessed with leaders who are determined to develop and protect those resources.

Recently Jim Kimball, staff writer for the Minneapolis Tribune and a former commissioner of conservation for the State of Minnesota, wrote a series of five fine articles in which he called attention to "Nature's Caretakers," five Minnesotans who have devoted their energies to the struggle to protect the beauty of Minnesota. One of them, Glenn Ross, is a devoted outdoorsman who has been able to bring many fine ideals to fruition as practical programs. Another, Richard Dorer, is well known as a man who can communicate the meaning of conservation to schoolchildren of all ages.

A third caretaker, Dr. Malcolm M. Hargraves of the renowned Mayo Clinic in Rochester, has dedicated himself for many years to the biology of conservation. A fourth is Dr. Clayton Rudd, a Minnesota dentist whose work with the Natural History Society has been only one part of his constant fight for any resource that needs protection.

The fifth of the caretakers is Ernest Oberholtzer, whose special interest is the wilderness areas. Mr. President, I am proud to represent a State which has given these fine men an opportunity to work for conservation, and I am proud also that Minnesota has Jim Kimball and the Minneapolis Tribune to call this service to the attention of our citizens.

This Congress has before it a program of legislation to carry on the struggle to preserve our resources from the inroads which industrialization, population, and neglect have made on them.

I have a particular interest in two of my own proposals before the Congress: S. 368, which establishes the St. Croix National Scenic Riverway; and S. 1341, which provides resources to begin cleaning up silted and polluted community lakes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series "Nature's Caretakers," written by Jim Kimball and published in the Minneapolis Tribune, be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATURE'S CARETAKERS—HE'S BEEN A "CONSERVATION CATALYST" FOR 40 YEARS

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Minnesota is well known for its land, lakes and wildlife. This is the first of five articles about some of the people who have helped protect and nurture these resources.)

(By Jim Kimball)

He is the most interesting and certainly the most complicated character I know.

Standing well over 6 feet, Glenn Ross is, from his broad hat and tailored Idaho suit to his riding boots, always in Western dress.

He doesn't dress like a cowboy—rather like the president of the bank of Cheyenne. Western dress in Minneapolis may seem a little odd, but it isn't odd—it's Glenn Ross. You can't imagine him dressed any other way.

Ross is always giving orders. No matter who you are or what you are doing, Ross tells you what to do and how to do it. The fact that he is often right doesn't make it any easier to take.

He is not offended if you don't take his advice, but this does not discourage him from giving more of it. Whether at the club, on a hunting or fishing trip or in a conservation meeting, Ross is always out front and always calling the shots.

To be a friend of Glenn Ross should not be taken lightly; he expects and demands more of his friends than anyone I know. He assumes that you will do practically anything for him and this assumption is correct. You will, because he would do anything for you.

Ross' exterior poorly conceals his sensitive, sentimental self. He seems to know everyone and his friends are legion.

Once we sat in a restaurant strenuously debating some issue on which he was being particularly bullheaded. Without taking his mind off the argument, he motioned for the waitress and told her to bring him the check for the four nuns sitting over in the corner. Any of us might have done the same thing, but only Ross would think of it.

I have just read a pamphlet entitled "A Conservation Policy for the State of Minnesota," which was adopted by the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce. It was accurate, and the recommendations are well reasoned and sound.

It called for wildlife research and a conservation program based on the best available scientific knowledge. It recognized the inseparable relationship between wildlife, forests, waters and soil.

It would have been a provocative publication had it just come off the press. Actually, it was published 33 years ago and Ross was chairman of the Jaycee Conservation Committee that prepared it.

Bylaws decree that Jaycees shall "abandon ship" at a certain age, but the members of this pre-World War II Conservation Committee wanted to stay together and continue their activities in the conservation field. Thus the Question Club was formed. It is still very much alive.

With the passing of time, its members have become doctors, lawyers, judges and businessmen. Their growth has not detracted from the effectiveness of their voice in conservation matters.

Ross is a past president and was proclaimed chairman of the Board of Directors. Being a self-appointed leader of everybody, Ross makes full use of this title and has a voice in practically all matters—which is surprising because there is no Board of Directors.

The entire Ross family is "woodsy," outdoorish and conservation-minded. Glenn was raised in the Lake Minnetonka area. He married Maxine Colburn, daughter of the late, highly respected game warden, Al Colburn.

Maxine's brother, Floyd Colburn was, until his recent retirement, one of the first extension foresters in the country, working out of Grand Rapids, Minn.

The Ross sons, Dan and Bruce, are ardent outdoorsmen.

Ross's first active conservation work began in the late '20s when he was a member of the North Shore Game and Fish Club of Long Lake.

He assisted in the successful effort to reelect Sen. George Turnham because Turnham promised to, and when elected did, eliminate some of the destructive drainage permitted by the county ditch law.

But it was probably T. B. Walker, one of Minnesota's first and greatest lumbermen, who gave Ross a depth of understanding in conservation.

Walker made a fortune in the Minnesota lumber business and was once reported to be the 16th richest man in the world. He donated the Walker Art Center to the city of Minneapolis and was one of the founders of the first public library.

About 1924, Walker hired Ross, who not only worked for him but lived in his home and learned that Walker also had an intense interest in conservation.

Ross has been in the lumber business ever since. After working for a time in the West, he returned to Minnesota and is now president of Suburban Lumber Co. of Minneapolis.

Ross is associated with many conservation organizations, such as Nature Conservancy, Friends of the Wilderness, the Izaak Walton League and the American Forestry Association. In each, his most important role is much the same. He can best be described as a conservation catalyst.

He has the talent to bring together the people and the philosophies which by themselves are impotent but, when combined and solidified into a practical program, can be put into action by some political group or agency. And, of course, in Ross' circle of friends, there is always the right connection.

Ross played that kind of role to help pass Minnesota's Natural Resources Act. This law, imposes an additional one-cent per-pack tax on cigarettes, and makes some $4 million a year available for conservation. First Ross was on the Natural Resources Committee that developed the plan. Later he was chairman of the citizens committee that presented its findings and recommendations to the Legislature.

Always active in politics, Ross is a well-known Republican. But this does not color his views on conservation.

"This is a democratic form of government and we must take an active part in the election of people who will support the things we want in conservation," he said.

In the last political campaign, Ross supported the re-election of Sen. Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn. Convinced that Mondale had a worthy conservation program to offer nationally, Ross formed a nonpartisan campaign committee.

Ross is particularly proud of a personal letter from President Dwight D. Eisenhower, thanking him for financial support in his campaign. Because of their conservation views, Ross supported Ed Thye as governor and senator and campaigned for the reelection of Gov. Karl Rolvaag.

"I don't think the Democrats are really any more sincere conservationists than the Republicans," he said, "but they are smart enough to see that this is what the people want and if the Republicans don't recognize this soon, they are in for trouble."

Conserving natural resources is big business and, like other big businesses, a variety of talent is required to keep it moving. Scientists, dreamers, nature lovers, devoted workers and administrators are essential.

The role that Ross plays as a conservation catalyst is that of a practical businessman who knows the political ropes. He puts facts, dreams and words into action.

NATURE'S CARETAKERS—AT 77, HE STILL PREACHES CONSERVATION TO KIDS

(By Jim Kimball)

The front door of the schoolroom burst open and Richard J. Dorer strode briskly in. Big, powerful, looking like an Indian chief, he stood motionless before the class.

Seconds earlier the classroom has been bedlam, jammed with children. Boys and girls were crowded together, having a hilarious time, thinking of biology in one form, perhaps, but not of conservation.

For several seconds Dorer stood silent and dour, staring into 100 pairs of startled young eyes. The chattering stopped, the giggling stopped. It seemed that even the breathing stopped. Then came the booming voice known now to many Minnesotans. He started by telling a story.

Then, in his dramatic style, Dorer launched into conservation and tied it to good citizenship. Another story was followed by impressive words about patriotism and Americanism and the need for keeping America strong through conservation of its resources.

For nearly an hour he continued. Girls forgot they were sitting next to boys, and boys forgot they were in school.

In the palm of his hand Dorer held 100 attentive young minds, telling them a great deal about America and the resources that make it great.

This happened 23 years ago in a schoolhouse in St. Charles, Minn. The scene probably has been repeated thousands of times since then. Only last year Dick Dorer, now 77, spoke to 112 schoolroom classes from kindergarten to the sixth grade, and he gave 39 major talks on Americanism and conservation.

The years have been kind to Dorer. His big frame still stands straight, his shock of heavy hair still works itself into an upright position and there is no lessening of the resounding boom of his voice.

Dorer has held some important jobs with the Minnesota Department of Conservation, including that of supervisor of the Bureau of Game, but he was 45 before he got his first job as a professional conservationist. He had long tried to break into the field but, as he put it, "I couldn't. I was never trained for the work."

There are critics who say Dorer never really became a professional conservationist, but they might find it hard to point to comparable achievements of their own.

Those who have worked with Dorer know that not all his ideas are destined for success. Like most creative men, he has as many impractical ideas as good ones, and he can be persistent about both. But some of his inspirations have borne abundant fruit.

The greatest contribution Dorer has made in conservation may well be his talks to youth, but this is not the thing for which he is best known. He fathered the "Save the Wetlands" program.

His great contribution was not the discovery that wetlands need to be saved. Thoughtful conservationists everywhere were bemoaning the effect of the drainage ditch, the disappearance of ponds, marshes and sloughs, the elimination of habitat for ducks, pheasants, muskrats and other wild things. They saw water, which should be held on the land, hurried into the streams and rivers where it could accomplish little but increase flood crests.

Dorer was among those who saw these things happening, but it was he who fathered and nurtured a plan to save wetlands. His major contribution, however, probably was not the plan but the tenacity and determination with which he saw it through.

Openly opposed by many and deemed impractical or impossible by others, Dorer's "Save the Wetlands" program could have died a hundred times if it had been sponsored by a less determined man. Undaunted by the critics, Dorer collected $1 contributions, sold "Save the Wetlands" buttons and preached his sermon to all who would listen. He collected thousands of dollars, but this amount was insignificant compared with the influence of his salesmanship.

Converted sportsmen talked to their legislators and obtained a $1 increase in the small-game hunting license earmarked for wetland preservation. This put Minnesota in a position of conservation leadership.

National conservation organizations picked up the battle and federal programs started spending duck stamp revenue to save wetlands. In a few years "wetlands" entered our vocabularies.

Raised in the foothills of the Appalachians in southeast Ohio, Dorer said his first interest in the out-of-doors was inspired by his mother, who never put him off when he asked questions about nature. She was born into a family of Bavarian farmers who were closely linked to the land, and she loved the land. Dick found his first arrowhead at age 9 and has collected over a thousand Indian artifacts since then.

Later, working in the oil fields, Dorer was impressed by the waste of natural gas, the pollution of air, soil and water. During World War I he saw French women carrying eroded soil back up the hill in baskets and became aware of the value of soil.

Over the years Dick Dorer has changed little. On a moment's notice he can tell a story, recite one of his own poems, quote Scripture or give an hour's speech.

Since he learned from his mother to love plants and how to make them grow, his first conservation job—building and operating the Carlos Avery nursery—was a success.

Later, as supervisor of game in the Department of Conservation, his interest in wildlife grew. Then water conservation became all important to him.

Now he describes soil, water and air as the basic resources, saying, "Failure to protect any one of these will kill us all as surely as an atomic bomb."

Dick Dorer is a religious man who speaks frequently about stewardship, which he probably best defines in his verse in the Minnesota Game and Fish Law Book:

"Your Creator has filled the earth
With all things to sustain you,
And has found them to be good.
While you dwell among the mortals,
You may partake thereof.
Use them wisely and judiciously.
Guard them closely. Squander them not.
If you are untrue to this sacred trust
Mankind shall not be perpetuated
But shall banish itself from the earth."

Believing that Minnesota's future lies largely in its tourism potential, Dorer said, "If we can get our minds off factories and industries which pollute air and water, and if we can take this land of 10,000 lakes and great natural beauty and develop it for the pyramiding demand for recreation which is rising throughout our nation, it will bring us better people, more people and more wealth."

Nature's Caretakers—Doctor Says Birth Control Is Conservation

(By Jim Kimball)

"Birth control" was a surprising answer, but it was the answer I got when I asked Dr. Malcolm M. Hargraves of the Mayo Clinic what he considered the greatest conservation need today.

Hargraves came to Rochester, Minn., joined the Mayo Clinic and began his medical research in 1935. He is known throughout the country by people who have blood diseases, and is known throughout the world for his research and his discovery of the L. E. Cell Phenomenon diagnostic technique—known in Europe as the Hargraves Phenomenon.

No less impressive are his state and national achievements in the field of conservation. Among his many accolades, tucked away in a drawer, are an award from Ohio State University for accomplishments in the field of medicine; the Nash Motors Conservation Award; life membership in the Izaak Walton League of America, the Minneapolis Star and Tribune Leadership Award and the Senior Forestry Award from Keep Minnesota Green.

In spite of the heavy drain on his time, both in medicine and conservation, Hargraves never seems to be in a hurry. He never appears worried or harassed. In spite of his graying mustache, the youth in his face belies the years. His speech is calm and precise and, though his voice can be heard to the corners of a large hall, he never shouts.

As a youth, Hargraves was something of a loner, wandering among the cliffs and woods near Akron, Ohio. When old enough, he joined the Boy Scouts and for five years scouting had a tremendous influence on his future.

"When I look back on scouting in those days," he said, "it was quite different from what it is today. We did all sorts of things out-of-doors, but didn't have planned programs, and it took five or six months to earn each of my 14 merit badges."

But Hargraves didn't become an active conservationist until he moved to Minnesota and started attending the Rochester Izaak Walton League meetings. As he put it, "I just sat in a back seat at first but gradually kept moving up front."

He never stopped "moving up front" in the Izaak Walton League until he became state president and then a member of the National Council.

To visit the Hargraves home is to experience the ultimate in relaxed hospitality. It is also an opportunity to meet Mrs. Hargraves and to hear her delightful southern accent.

No less a dynamic personality than her husband, she was state president of the League of Women Voters when he was president of the Izaak Walton League.

In those years there would be times when he would have to take care of the family for 10 days while she was attending meetings in Washington, D.C., and then she would care for them while he was at national Izaak Walton League meetings or on conservation lecture tours.

When their children were growing up, the Hargraves family lived on the edge of Rochester with five acres on which to raise a big garden, chickens, ducks and all the other things youngsters should grow up with.

There were many visitors, too—young doctors coming to the clinic and interesting people in the conservation field. The Hargraves' living room was the crossroads of conservation. When there were soil conservation demonstrations or other conservation meetings in the area, it was not unusual for the Hargraves to have a dozen guests for dinner.

"This has been our social life," Hargraves explained, "and it has been quite different from that of many of the doctors I work with at the clinic. We have never belonged to the country club, we don't play golf and we don't play bridge. Our social life has been our family and interesting people."

For the past 14 years Hargraves has been on the Minnesota Water Pollution Control Commission and is now chairman. This requires trips to St. Paul from one to several times a month.

I first got acquainted with Hargraves when I was a young biologist in southeastern Minnesota in 1944. He became my major adviser. I made frequent visits to the Mayo Clinic where, in boots and field clothes, I was quickly admitted to his office where we discussed all possible reasons for the shortage of pheasants in that area, especially the possibility of calcium deficiency in their diet.

It was that year that Hargraves started his weekly radio program "You and the Out-of-doors" on station KROC. I was one of his first, and undoubtedly worst, program guests. Petrified at my first experience in front of a microphone, I was unable to think, talk or read the script.

In spite of this, the program lived and now has an estimated listening audience of over 150,000. Hargraves calculates that in the past 23 years he has spent the equivalent of over a year of working time preparing and presenting these programs.

For seven years Hargraves held a successful Amateur Game Managers Short Course at Whitewater State Park. When I needed help in South Dakota, he drove to Pierre and gave a speech to the Conservation Department personnel. In one hour he advanced professional game management in that state about 10 years.

Hargraves was serious in saying that he believed birth control is the major conservation problem.

"I have preached this for well over 20 years and have been frequently criticized for it," he said. "But family planning and control of our population are essential. Many of our present problems and crises have arisen because of population growth. Current statistics indicate a doubling of the world population in the next 33 years. We will be in tremendous trouble in just a couple of generations.

"Some planners look to the day when our rivers will be used as open sewers, sea water will be distilled and pumped back onto the continent, our food will be algae and rough fish from the sea which is fertilized by the sewage from our rivers and people will be figuratively stacked up like cordwood.

"But even this would be a temporary solution. With man, as with all life, there is a limit to the carrying capacity of the land in spite of advances in technology. And when do we reach the point of diminishing returns? When does life become so restricted, regimented and individuality so stifled that it is not worth while?"

Nature's Caretakers—Meet Clayton Rudd—Fighting Minnesota Conservationist

(By Jim Kimball)

The name Clayton Rudd and Natural History Society are almost synonymous. One wonders if either could long survive without the other.

Rudd was chairman of the three-man group which organized the society in 1948. He was the first president and has been president ever since. He is editor of the society's magazine, "Naturalist," and he arranges the nine programs presented each year.

Rudd gets a great deal of help, frequently from busy and famous people. Apparently it is next to impossible to say no to one who devotes so much of his time and energy to conservation.

In addition to his 8 hours a day in dentistry, Rudd spends some four hours daily on conservation work. Trim and vigorous, he walks fast and his actions are quick. Someone said, "Rudd always looks as if he had just been fired from a gun."

You certainly would never guess Rudd was raised on an isolated prairie farm in Canada and saw no tree but an aspen until he was 14. But these early years influenced the course of his life. As he put it, "I grew up on the edge of a prairie slough and learned to appreciate the beauty of nature from my father."

After working his way through the University of Minnesota Dentistry School and graduating cum laude, Rudd became interested in nature photography and this crystallized his interest in the out-of-doors.

Every summer except one since 1932 he and his family have spent two months in Wyoming, where they now have their own place in Jackson Hole with a view of the Grand Tetons. It was there that he first became an active conservationist.

"I began to realize," he said, "that while a lot of people were visiting the national and state parks and enjoying the forests and many beauties of nature, they were not aware of man's abuse of his environment. They were little concerned over the destruction of their earth with bulldozers, dams and ditches.

"So," he continued, "in organizing the Natural History Society we worked on the theory that if we could draw together these people who have an interest in the out-of-doors we would be able to sharpen the picture a little and excite them into activity, particularly in the fields of conservation education and legislation."

A year of work went into planning before the Natural History Society was born.

It always seemed to me that a dentist had an unfair advantage in conversation. After filling your mouth with equipment, he can talk uninterrupted though you may be bursting to get a word in. It may be no coincidence that 100 of the first charter members of the Natural History Society were Rudd's patients.

But even without his drill and forceps Clayton Rudd is a persuasive man, a man of action and a man doing things. Fighting to preserve a natural resource, which he frequently does, he hesitates not a minute to call a congressman or a senator or to fly to Washington, D.C.

For 18 consecutive years the society has presented illustrated lectures on nature, adventure, travel, explorations and scientific achievements. These programs, designed for family entertainment and conservation enlightenment, are nearly always color movies personally narrated by scientists, explorers and world travelers.

Fully as important and impressive as the programs is the society's publication, "Naturalist." It is beautifully illustrated with photographs and paintings, but even more impressive are the famous names found among the authors, again demonstrating Rudd's power of persuasion.

Rudd does not claim that "Naturalist" presents carefully weighed articles showing both sides of a controversy.

"The engineers, dam planners, timber interests," he said, "have the funds and the know-how to do a good job of telling their side of the story. This is why "Naturalist" is devoted to presenting the case as seen by the conservationist."

Even operating the Natural History Society doesn't seem to absorb Rudd's surplus of energy. Backed by the society membership, he will accept any challenge to defend the natural beauty of America.

Rudd will fight for any resource that needs protection, and his wounded adversaries will attest to the fact that he fights hard and seldom loses.

He has played a major role in stopping dam builders in Jackson Hole and Dinosaur National Monument and in saving the wilderness status of the Boundary Water Canoe Area.

Asked what he thought was the greatest need in conservation today, Rudd answered, "Fearless men with the courage of their convictions and the fortitude to stand up and be counted.

"We need the Teddy Roosevelt breed of men who will fight for resources and not straddle the political fence. Too long we have heard men say, 'The time isn't ripe for action,' or 'The political climate isn't right?'

"What do they mean, the time isn't ripe or the climate isn't right? Just a generation ago our Great Lakes were the greatest pure water resource on the continent. Since then, Lake Erie has been destroyed through pollution and Lake Michigan is not far behind. Even our Lake Superior, the greatest of them all, is endangered by the dumping of thousands of tons of waste from taconite processing.

"We need courageous leaders who will rise up and tell America that if we continue to be at war with nature it is a war we will lose; to tell them that man must not be an antagonist of nature; that he is in fact himself a part of nature."

While impatient with hedging and irresolute leadership, Rudd sees great hope in the people themselves.

"Something wonderful is happening in the minds of our people," he said. "There is a new appreciation of natural beauty and natural values. This surge of interest in conservation has become a national phenomenon. In fact, it has become an impelling force.

"At last the people are questioning wasteful practices and the unnecessary destruction of the beautiful world in which we live. As the people increase their knowledge of the quest of conservation and of the stakes involved they will become more aggressive, more militant."

Nature's Caretakers—"Ober" Recalls Lifelong Battle for the Wilderness

(By Jim Kimball)

On the shore of Rainy Lake east of International Falls and Ranier, Ober and I sat in the beached houseboat which has become his home after 50 years of life alone on an island.

Listening to the little old man known as Ober tell the story of his life, I learned that an illiterate grave digger in Des Moines, who 75 years ago had taken Ober for walks along a creek, may have done much to save the Quetico-Superior wilderness. Then, as Ober related the events of his battle with the powerful Edward W. Backus, I knew I was hearing again the story of David and Goliath.

A couple of weeks ago, Ernest C. Oberholtzer of Ranier received the Conservation Service Award from Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall. The presentation was made by Sig Olson in Tucson at the annual meeting of the Wilderness Society which Oberholtzer helped found some 40 years ago.

Ober, that's been his nickname for the past 50 years, was born in Davenport, Iowa, 83 years ago. As a youth he worked on a chicken farm. He had a newspaper route and recalls selling 400 Chicago newspapers one Sunday morning during the Spanish-American War.

On visits to the cemetery with his mother, Ober got acquainted with an illiterate Irish grave digger named Burke, who took him for walks down Duck Creek.

Though surrounded by cornfields, Duck Creek was wilderness to the 8-year-old boy, and Burke let him imagine he was the first to explore it. They waded out to a little island, and because Burke was sure the boy was the first to set foot on it, he named it Ernie's Island.

Oberholtzer has been exploring and protecting the wilderness ever since.

Stricken with rheumatic fever in high school Ober was not expected to regain full health. But he passed the entrance examinations for Harvard, and took far more than the required courses and graduated with good grades.

Following some graduate work, Ober went to England with the poet Conrad Aiken. Back in the United States, he became managing editor of a newspaper for a short time, but the lure of the wilderness was irresistible and he arrived at International Falls in 1909.

With a canoe and an Indian, he spent the summer in the wilderness and sold his notes and pictures to the Canadian National Railroad for $400 for their promotion work.

"It wasn't much money, but I didn't care," he said. "I was having a wonderful time and, in a way, it was like being with Burke when I was a little kid."

After a second summer in the wilderness, he was invited by a friend to go to Europe. Soon the versatile Ober became the U.S. vice-consul at Hanover, Germany.

But he returned to the wilderness. In 1912 Ober was back on Rainy Lake to stay the rest of his life. That year, between June 26 and Nov. 5, Ober, with a 50-year old Indian called Billy McGee, traveled 2,000 miles by canoe far into the uncharted Arctic to Nueltine Lake on an historic canoe trip.

Ober lived alone on his little island and explored the widerness by canoe, usually with an Indian as his companion. Until a few years ago, he never traveled less than 500 miles a summer by canoe.

In 1926 he learned that timber baron Backus had proposed a grandiose power plant which would, through a series of dams, change the water level of all the lakes along the international boundary from Rainy Lake to the Pigeon River. Some lakes would be raised 71 feet, or drawn down to expose mud flats to supply water for the power plant.

"There is no question that this plan would absolutely destroy the beauty of the canoe area," Ober said.

"I didn't want to get into the controversy," Ober said, "but I couldn't stand by and see all that beauty destroyed. And I'm glad I did get into it because it gave me a chance to help save it."

He started giving the alarm contacting influential people and writing stories for Minneapolis and Duluth newspapers. A few wealthy businessmen in Minneapolis engaged Ober to prepare a complete analysis. When they published his report, Backus was enraged.

Ober said, "Everyone on this side of the Canadian border was for Backus, and when I walked down the street of International Falls people would cross over to the other side to avoid being seen with me."

Then the Minneapolis Journal took up the issue and wrote strong editorials in opposition to the Backus plan. Backus went to the Journal office and created a scene, but the editorials continued.

The potent pen and persuasive voice of Sig Olson joined Ober's fight to save the wilderness. People were aroused.

The Quetico-Superior Council was formed and was supported by major organizations, women's clubs and conservation groups in Minnesota.

Ober went to Washington to stimulate passage of the Shipstead-Newton-Nolan Act which would protect the shoreline of lakes and streams on federal lands within the Superior National Forest area.

He also went to the Minnesota Legislature and, after a bitter battle, obtained passage of a joint resolution of the two houses urging Congress to pass the Shipstead-Newton-Nolan Act.

Back in Washington, he worked with Harold Ickes and Gifford Pinchot until, in 1930, the act was passed.

In 1933, the Minnesota Legislature passed similar legislation protecting state-owned shorelines within the Superior area. The following year, the International Joint Commission of Canada and the United States recommended denial of Backus' plan for water development on the border lakes, and the nine-year fight was over.

By 1941, the wilderness was being invaded by airplanes and fishing camps, Ober, now serving as executive secretary of the Quetico-Superior Committee appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, was in the fight again.

This was an eight-year battle which was resolved when Ober discovered that the planes could be stopped by a presidential order and did not require an act of Congress.

Ober went to his friend, Dr. Karl Compton, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, who had canoed the wilderness on his honeymoon. Compton went to Dwight Eisenhower, then president of Columbia University, and Eisenhower persuaded President Truman to sign an executive order creating an air space reservation over the roadless area of the Superior National Forest.

Since then, there has been the long struggle of buying up private lands within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area and the recent order by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman restricting unnecessary road building and logging and increasing the size of the area where trees will not be cut. All of this Ober considers a great victory for wilderness.

But what is the little man who wins the big battles really like? Is he a hunter and a fisherman? A carefree, rough woodsman? Hardly.

"I never fish for pleasure," he said, "and I only catch one when I really need it for food. I don't like to handle fish. In all the years I've been here, I have never shot a bird or an animal. My interest in living things is vastly greater than in dead ones. But I don't object to other people hunting and fishing as long as they are not game hogs."

Asked if he ever wished he had married and raised a family, he said, "No, I have always been quite self-sufficient and was born in the wilderness."

He learned to speak Ojibwa (Chippewa), and recorded Indian legends. This plus 54,000 letters and reports, 23 scrapbooks and a 400-page transcript have been turned over to the Minnesota Historical Society where it is described as a superb collection."

Has he ever been lonely on his little island?

"I don't know," he said, "I never stopped to think about it. I was too busy. I always enjoyed visitors when they came and was sorry to see them go. But then I went right on with my work."

When I asked if he saw future problems facing the wildness, I saw a worried expression.

"The forces that want to get in there and exploit it are very, very powerful, and I know that at my age I can no longer stand guard at the gate," he said.

FIRE PREVENTION RESEARCH

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on March 22, 1967, Chief David B. Gratz, of the Silver Spring Fire Department, Silver Spring, Md., delivered an address at the fire department instructors conference at Memphis, Tenn. That meeting was attended by more than 4,000 persons from all parts of the world.

The theme of the address by Chief Gratz was the growing fire problem and the need for nationally coordinated research in this field. He referred to two measures now pending in the Senate, Senate Joint Resolution 46 and S. 1124, both of which emphasize fire research. Chief Gratz suggests that both measures be combined into one bill and enacted.

The need for fire prevention legislation is acute. We must stem the growing toll of lives and billions of dollars in property being lost from fire in America every year.

I ask that Chief Gratz' remarks entitled "Design for Progress" be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DESIGN FOR PROGRESS

(Presented by Chief David B. Gratz, Silver Spring, Md., at the Fire Department Instructors Conference, Memphis, Tenn., March 22, 1967)

One of the most discussed subjects in the fire service over the past few months is the report of the Wingspread Conference, held in Racine, Wisconsin in February 1966. This report on "Statements of National Significance to the Fire Problem in the United States", has received considerable attention both within and without the fire service. Let me first of all explain how the Wingspread Conference came about, and what its purpose was.

For a number of years several fire service people, who have worked together on numerous projects, have expressed the concern that there was never an opportunity to stop and take a look at what we were doing, and where we were heading.

As someone once said, "we spend so much time chopping wood—we don't have time to sharpen our axe". There was concern that in our earnest desire to improve the fire service all of us were moving without a clear understanding of what our problems are and will be in the future.

Any good administrator will tell you that before you can solve a problem you must have the problem clearly defined. This, then, was the singular purpose of the Wingspread Conference—define the problems facing the fire service.

Through the efforts of William Clark an approach was made to the Johnson Wax Foundation in Racine, Wisconsin. The Johnson Foundation supports a number of student and business seminars, conferences and work sessions. The facility is unique in that it is a home built by Frank Lloyd Wright, and because of its design named Wingspread.

The Johnson Foundation agreed to support a meeting for a limited group. They would provide housing, meeting rooms and meals if the participants paid their own transportation.

Selection of the participants was a difficult task. This group had to be both representative of the fire service and objective in their thinking. Most of all they had to be people who had no specific axe to grind. Obviously there are hundreds of persons in the fire service who could meet these requirements. Unfortunately space was only available for a small committee. Selection therefore was based on a group of individuals who had previously expressed a desire to undertake such a project.

For three days, 12 hours a day, the committee struggled to develop a report which would have meaning. At the conclusion a rough draft had been completed and referred to an editorial committee for further work. Several drafts were prepared and distributed, reworked and redistributed, before the participants came to a unanimous agreement on the final document.

I have purposely spent some time to acquaint you with the why and how of the Wingspread Conference, in order that you will have an understanding of its objective.

The result is a 16 page document in the form of 12 statements supported by appropriate comments. Through the courtesy of the IAFC and its President, Chief Lester R. Schick, 4,000 copies of the report will be made available to you at the conclusion of my presentation. Since you will have the report to read I will not dwell on the specific material except to identify the 12 statements.

1. Unprecedented demands are being imposed on the fire service by rapid social and technological change.
2. The public is complacent toward the rising trend of life and property by fire.
3. There is a serious lack of communication between the public and the fire service.
4. Behavior patterns of the public have a direct influence on the fire problem.
5. The insurance interest has exerted a strong influence on the organization of the fire service. This dominance seems to be waning. The fire service must provide the leadership in established realistic criteria for determining proper levels of fire protection.
6. Professional status begins with education.
7. The scope, degree and depth of the educational requirements for efficient functioning of the fire service must be examined.
8. Increased mobility at the executive level of the fire service will be important to the achievement of professional status.
9. The career development of the fire executive must be systematic and deliberate.
10. Governing bodies and municipal administrators generally do not recognize the need for executive development of the fire officer.
11. Fire service labor and management, municipal officers and administrators must join together if professionalism is to become a reality.
12. The traditional concept that fire protection is strictly a responsibility of local government must be re-examined.

Response to the Wingspread Report was immediate and with few exceptions—favorable. Particularly encouraging was the almost unanimous support of the operational fire service—the ones who are faced with the responsibility when the chips are down. The IAFC and the IFAI are two national organizations which have unanimously endorsed the report.

Some critical comments were received. Certain organizations took issue with specific items of the report, but even the critics were generally agreed that a useful purpose had been accomplished.

The question now, of course, is where do we go from here? As previously stated, the purpose of the Wingspread Conference was to identify specific problem areas—*not* establish solutions. Naturally we all want solutions. Some action has already started.

Through the sponsorship of Fire Engineering Magazine a two day work session was held in Chicago on February 27 and 28th. The Wingspread participants, and others, were invited to make some projections on the future of the fire service. A report of this meeting will be the theme of the September issue of Fire Engineering.

Of most importance are two proposals for federal legislation. First is S.J. Res. 46, introduced on February 27th by Senator John Sparkman, of Alabama. This resolution calls for the establishment of a Presidential Commission to study the national fire problem. This resolution resulted from the joint efforts of the International Association of Fire Fighters, International Association of Fire Chiefs, and the International Fire Administration Institute. It was the opinion of these three national fire service organizations that such a commission, composed of authorities in the field, could find specific solutions to the problems identified in the Wingspread Report, and study other areas of concern to the fire service.

A second piece of federal legislation was introduced on February 28th by Senator Warren Magnuson, of Washington. This is S. 1124—*The Fire Research and Safety Act of 1967*. This is an administration proposal, undoubtedly generated by President Johnson's message to the Congress of February 16, relating to Consumer Safety. In his message, President Johnson made specific reference to our national fire problems and called for an action program.

S. 1124 provides for an appropriation of 10 million dollars for the coming year, and whatever additional funds are required for the following four fiscal years. The entire project would be administered by the Department of Commerce.

Obviously there are differences between these two proposals. The resolution calling for a Commission would enable a study to be made before substantial sums were expended. The course of action would be charted by a selective group of individuals, and organizations, who are most aware of the problems, and therefore best suited to determine the most practical and economical solutions.

S. 1124, on the other hand, is a call for action with the entire project vested in a single federal agency. The IAFF, IAFC and IFAI are working together to see if these two proposals can be married into useful legislation. We welcome and encourage support of other fire organizations and individuals interested in reaching an acceptable solution.

Wingspread is now history. Hopefully, however, it will not be placed on the shelf to accumulate dust. The Wingspread Committee had absolutely no thought or desire to set itself up as some super body to chart the future course of the fire service.

The sole objective of this group was to provide some starting point for discussion.

If this objective has been accomplished, then the fire service will have a focal point from which we can truly begin—a design for progress.

THE 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SEABEES

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, in recognition of the 1967 Seabee silver 25th anniversary, Gov. Buford Ellington, of the State of Tennessee, recently proclaimed Seabee Day in Tennessee.

I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the proclamation entered in the RECORD, at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Proclamation by the Governor, State of Tennessee

Whereas, Early in 1942, at a time when the future security and life of our Republic were in critical danger, the United States Navy Civil Engineer Corps formed its now famous Construction Battalions—officially designated and popularly known as Seabees.

Whereas, Throughout the long months of World War II nearly a quarter of a million Seabees worked night and day to provide roadways, airstrips, and shore installations which enabled the armed might of our nation and its allies to prevail over the tremendous force of our enemies. In the Korean action as well, Seabees were actively engaged in amphibious landings and were important in helping stem the tide of Communist aggression in that part of the world.

Whereas, Today, wherever the interests of our nation require, the knowledge and ability of the Navy's Seabees are being used for the protection of the American people. Backing up those on full time active duty is a strong and vitally energetic Naval Seabee Reserve of construction men, trained and ready for future service to their country at any time the need arises.

Whereas, On this the 25th anniversary of their formation, it is fitting that we pay tribute to the gallantry and accomplishments of the Navy Seabees.

Now, therefore, I, Buford Ellington, Governor of the State of Tennessee, do hereby proclaim March 5, 1967 as Seabee Day in the State of Tennessee, and call the attention of our citizens to the proud record of the Navy's Seabees.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the State of Tennessee to be affixed at Nashville, this 17th day of February, 1967.

Buford Ellington,
Governor.

Attest:

Joe C. Carr,
Secretary of State.

FAYETTE ELECTRIC COOPERATIVE OF LA GRANGE, TEX., ADOPTS RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR RURAL ELECTRIC BANK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in recognition of the growing need for supplemental financing of the rural electrification program, the Fayette Electric Cooperative of La Grange, Tex., on April 26 unanimously adopted a resolution in support of present measures now before the Congress to provide for a rural electric bank. That proposal is now before the Senate in the bill S. 696, introduced by Mr. Cooper, of Kentucky, of which I am a cosponsor.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Fayette Electric Co-operative, Inc.,
La Grange, Tex., May 5, 1967.

Hon. Ralph W. Yarborough,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Yarborough: As Secretary of the Fayette Electric Cooperative, Inc., I take pleasure in forwarding to you the following copy of a resolution unanimously adopted at the recent annual membership meeting of the Cooperative in La Grange. Permit me to say, personally, that your support of our program is deeply appreciated by all the members of our Cooperative.

Upon being informed of the necessity for supplemental financing for the rural electric and rural telephone loan programs in order to provide for sufficient growth capital in the future, the following resolution was unanimously adopted April 26, 1967, by the 599 members of the Cooperative who were registered, present and voting at the annual meeting:

"Whereas, in recent years, the amounts of loan funds budgeted and authorized by Congress have not kept up with the growing requirements of rural electric and telephone systems to provide adequate and reliable service for their members; and

"Whereas, the loan fund shortage has caused a critical buildup of applications backlog and is an immediate problem affecting the future prospects of rural electric and telephone systems to build additional capacity to keep up the rising electric power and telephone needs of their consumers and customers; and

"Whereas, most rural electric and telephone systems are still not financially strong enough, while meeting the program area coverage requirements, either to operate successfully without the present REA 35-year loans or to go individually to the private money market for the capital they need; and

"Whereas, legislation is now pending in the United States Congress in the form of the Poage Bill (H.R. 1400) for establishing a rural electric credit system which we feel is equitable and fair to rural electric and rural telephone systems and to all other parties concerned; and

"Whereas, it is desirable that legislation providing for supplemental financing for the rural electric and telephone program be enacted at the earliest possible date;

"Now, therefore, be it resolved by the members of the Fayette Electric Cooperative, Inc. in Annual Meeting assembled that we hereby request of the Members of Congress their strong and unwavering support for the rural electric credit system as embodied in the above described pending legislation as a means of providing capital for the future need of the rural electric and telephone programs; and that we emphasize the great necessity for such legislation to be passed in this session of Congress.

"Be it further resolved that we urge the Congress to make available to REA sufficient loan funds to provide for the growth requirements of rural electric and telephone systems until such time as the rural electric credit system is established and is able to meet such requirements.

"Be it further resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressmen J. J. (Jake) Pickle and Abraham Kazen and to Senators Ralph Yarborough and John Tower."

Respectfully submitted.

C. M. Janda, *Secretary.*

IS SEDITION NOW RESPECTABLE?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Is Sedition Now Respectable?" published in the Richmond, Va., Times-Dispatch of May 11, 1967.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Sedition Now Respectable?

Just where does one draw the line these days between free speech and sedition? The U.S. Supreme Court gives little comfort to those who are disturbed.

Open advocacy of sedition seems to be quite all right, under the court's latest decisions. Sedition is defined in Webster as "an insurrection against constituted authority," or "conduct consisting of speaking, writing or acting against an established government or seeking to overthrow it by unlawful means."

Latest development in this connection is the public declaration of a 29-year-old former history teacher from Chicago's Skid Row that he is "actively organizing sedition," along with other members of what is now termed the "New Left."

This character, Gregory Calvert, and his associates regard the Communists as totally outmoded, and entirely too tame and docile. "We are working to build a guerrilla force in an urban environment," he said cheerily the other day.

It isn't surprising that this potential armed guerrilla, headed for the streets of Chicago or New York, is pleased with his prospects. Burning of American flags, flying of Viet Cong flags, tearing up of draft cards have all come to be tolerated by our authorities, thanks largely to the Supreme Court.

Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the Pennsylvania Supreme Court said this week that flag-burnings constitute a threat to the nation's security, and that those responsible should be prosecuted ahead of persons charged with homicide and narcotics violations.

Justice Musmanno also said previously:

> When the highest court in the land says it is entirely proper in schools and colleges to advocate the overthrow of our government by force and violence, there will be disrespect for law, contempt for authority, and public display of aid and support for our Communist enemies.

Just what the country is coming to is difficult to determine, but it won't be anything good, if this sort of doctrine continues to be enunciated by the United States Supreme Court.

OBSERVATIONS ON EAST-WEST TRADE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, on May 4, Acting Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge addressed an East-West trade conference at Bowling Green State University. His factual observations on the current growth of U.S. trade with Eastern Europe, his persuasive arguments for further expanding that trade across a range of nonstrategic items, and his realistic appraisal of the technical problems which liberalization of our commercial policy might create, should contribute significantly to the discussion on East-West trade.

I ask unanimous consent that the complete text of Acting Secretary Trowbridge's remarks be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Acting Secretary of Commerce Alexander B. Trowbridge at East-West Trade Conference, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, Ohio, May 4, 1967

Two years ago, soon after becoming a government official, I made a short visit to Budapest to open the U.S. exhibition at the Budapest International Trade Fair.

While there, I had an opportunity to talk with some Hungarians. They lost no time in illustrating their type of self-directed humor which has gained some fame as one method of commentary on their form of government. Their jokes take the form of question and answer. "Why," they ask, "hasn't Switzerland become a socialist country?" They answer, "Because it is too small—it couldn't afford it!"

We here in the United States are not small. As we exert every effort to build a permanent peace, we are indeed too big to be able to afford automatic rejection of any potential avenue of peaceful engagement.

"Trade," Emerson wrote, "is a plant which grows wherever there is peace, as soon as there is peace, and as long as there is peace."

United States policy is to cultivate this plant of progress and mutual benefit in the soil of peaceful engagement between the East and the West.

The Administration, as President Johnson has stated clearly and often, favors the equitable liberalization of two-way trade in peaceful goods with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. We have taken a number of steps in this direction. We have sought Congressional action to further open the way. And we have encouraged the commercial activists of the private sector to move ahead in this area, as indeed they are now doing.

This broad approach is a central element in President Johnson's policy of building new bridges of "ideas, education, culture, trade, technical cooperation, and mutual understanding for world peace and prosperity." Peaceful trade *can* form one of the strongest and most durable of these bridges between East and West.

And, particularly with the passage of time, this expanding trade can yield tangible, meaningful material benefits on both the Eastern and Western ends of the bridge of commerce.

In this context, distinguished gatherings such as this one can play a major part in catalyzing progress. I am therefore very glad to be with you today, not only in personal terms, but within this far more important international framework.

The very fact that this meeting is being held emphasizes a most important mutual realization both in the East and the West: Evolving conditions and evolving relationships in our complex, changing world demand that we be more flexible and forward looking—both in the East and in the West—in order to serve the peaceful and progressive future of all of our peoples. We know that to be hidebound and hypnotized by the divisions and antagonisms of former years is to serve only the past.

Even as we meet here today, the first industry-organized, government-approved United States trade mission is visiting Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. We hope that during its stay in Moscow—as well as in Warsaw, Bucharest, and Belgrade—the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce mission firmly plants its steps on the road to commercial growth.

And in addition, a second agricultural and business trade mission from California is now preparing to leave for Moscow next week on a trip that will also take them to the cities of Kiev, Kishinev, Krasnador, and Kharkov. Their Moscow visit will coincide, as well, with the opening of the 21-nation international exhibition there—Inprodmash-67—at which some 18 United States companies will be displaying their food processing, packaging, and distribution equipment.

Add to this the series of industry-sponsored or government-organized U.S. trade groups that have operated in Poland, Hungary, Romania, and Bulgaria in the past few years—plus participation in numerous trade fairs and exhibits in this period—plus the initial U.S. trade mission to Czechoslovakia scheduled for later in 1967—and I believe you see examples of what I generally call a "steady movement from the permissive to the promotional" approach by our country as we consider East-West trade.

There are, of course, numerous other dimensions as well.

One was the significant growth of United States trade last year with the Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe to the highest level in the past two decades—with the single exception of 1964 when an unusually large volume of wheat shipments inflated the total by $180 million.

The two-way trade total in 1966 came to something over $375 million compared to $277 million in 1965, an increase on the order of 35 percent over-all, with a slightly larger increase in U.S. exports to the USSR and Eastern Europe than in U.S. imports from these nations. From 1965 to 1966, the U.S. export total rose from $140 million to $198 million, while the imports went from $138 million to $178 million.

Alongside aggregate U.S. two-way trade in 1966 of about $55 billion this is not a very large total. Nor does it come to more than a small percentage of the volume of commerce that flows between the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and other major trading nations.

For example, according to the preliminary figures that I have seen, trade between the Federal Republic of Germany and these nations last year exceed $2 billion contrasted to the U.S. $375 million. The figure for the United Kingdom was about $1 billion, and Japan, France, and Italy all fell in the range between $600 million and $1 billion.

The United States total does take on added perspective, however, with consideration of two additional factors.

First, United States trade figures do not include exports by the overseas subsidiaries or licensees of U.S. firms. Rather, these are reflected in the trade statistics of host nations. Although solid figures are not available, such trade between European-based U.S. subsidiaries and licensees and the USSR and Eastern Europe appears to be growing rapidly.

Second, trade statistics are limited to commodities. Not included is the sales price or other monetary value of technical data or services. Yet such trade constitutes an increasingly important share of exports eastward by U.S. industrial and engineering firms. An increasing number of such transactions have been licensed under the Export Control Act.

There have been cases where the likely return to the U.S. firm from the export of technical data to Eastern Europe was several million dollars, and others often are known to total in the hundreds of thousands. Cumulatively, this element of East-West trade could represent a sizeable addition to the value of exports reported for only the shipment of goods.

Although a generalization, we can say that United States participation in East-West trade is somewhat larger than suggested by the bare statistics, with a growth rate that is significant, and having potential for future expansion across a diverse range of peaceful products.

Such expansion will not come automatically, however. Considerable effort to build and broaden and strengthen the bridges of peaceful trade are necessary at both ends of the span. And considerable effort will be necessary to increase and enhance the flow of commerce across the bridges.

Let us not underestimate the difficulties of expanding trade at the same time as we are strongly committed to resist Communist aggression in Vietnam. We have adopted what I describe as a "dual track" policy. With one hand we confront such aggression where it must be resisted, and our resolve is firm. But in a time where pressures increase on one front, we need pressure relief valves on other fronts. Hence the desire to keep open channels of communication—in education, travel, culture—as well as trade.

President Johnson, carrying forward the efforts of the past three Administrations in today's evolving world environment, has acted in a number of ways to liberalize, to stimulate, and to support East-West trade as a part of our over-all, long-term policy toward Eastern Europe and Soviet Russia.

Export controls have been liberalized. More than 400 non-strategic items were removed from the Commerce Department's Commodity Control List late last year. These products, which now can be shipped without a specific license, cover a broad range including consumer products, textiles, certain metal manufactures and machinery, various chemical materials and products, and a considerable number of manufactured articles. In addition, the process of sifting, refining, and updating this list is an ongoing one. We want to make sure that our control list is realistic and unburdened with excessive or ineffective coverage.

Commercial credit facilities have been extended. In his October 7th speech, President Johnson authorized the Export-Import Bank to provide normal commercial credit guarantees on industrial export transactions with Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, and Bulgaria—as provided in July 1964 for exports to Romania. Commercial credit facilities are an important concomitant to trade that must and do receive our continuing attention.

At the same time, the President announced that he had authorized the Export-Import Bank to extend a loan of some $50 million to the Istituto Mobiliare Italiano to finance U.S. origin machine tools and other equipment for the automobile plant to be constructed by the Italian firm FIAT in the Soviet Union. Eximbank participation encourages U.S. businessmen to compete for these sales, assists FIAT in obtaining the finest equipment available, and tangibly expresses our support for projects designed to serve the consumer goods requirements of the people of the Soviet Union or Eastern Europe. While any equipment sold for this plant will be carefully examined to ascertain that it has basically peaceful applications, we operate from the general approach that we would rather see traffic jams of automobiles than of tanks.

The East-West Trade Relations Act proposed by President Johnson can provide the conditions under which steady expansion can come about by authorizing the President to use non-discriminatory tariff treatment as a bargaining element in negotiating commercial agreements with these nations. The basis for this proposal was developed by a group of distinguished American business leaders led by Mr. Irwin Miller of the Cummins Engine Company.

Realistic judgment does not suggest that such legislative authority in itself would set in motion an immediate flood of two-way trade. But the power to extend such tariff treatment, which currently applies only to Poland of the nations concerned, could certainly help to increase the flow of East-West commerce.

I think it is true that the implementation of non-discriminatory tariff treatment has psychological and political overtones as well as commercial importance. But if we are serious about desiring to increase the levels of peaceful trade—which we are—then we should frankly face the impediments that exist and reduce them where possible. The Soviet Union and the nations of Eastern Europe will have to export to earn exchange to buy our products. We should recognize their need to operate under competitive conditions equal to other countries selling in our market.

Of course, agreements reached under this act would have to be based on mutual benefits. In return for the benefits of MFN treatment, the United States may seek settlement of commercial disputes, arrangements for protection of industrial property, provisions for promotion of U.S. products, entry and travel of commercial representatives, arrangements for market access and fair treatment for our goods, and settlement of claims.

Taken as a whole, as I say, these Administration measures represent a broad and energetic Administration approach. They are designed to reduce conspicuous obstacles to

United States two-way trade with the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

Increasingly, we hope, the name of the game will become competition in each other's markets consistent with normal commercial relationships that extend across other international borders around the globe, and despite the differences in economic organisation that exist between our countries.

The challenges, then, will be clear at both ends of the bridge. We will have to become increasingly aware of each other's market requirements, of competitive practices and conditions, of consumer likes and dislikes. We will have to develop advertising, promotional, and distribution techniques suited to the varying markets. We will have to be patient and flexible. Long and time-consuming exchanges are probably necessary in order to build the kind of mutual confidence we hope for as part of "peaceful engagement."

This problem is neither simple nor insoluble. To a considerable extent, the answer is likely to be fully realized only through experience. Such experience as has been gained by Western businessmen negotiating in the Soviet Union indicates the need for patient and skilled bargaining techniques. Experience of Soviet and Eastern European state trading agencies has probably shown them the need to adapt to the competitive demands of our free economies.

A number of approaches present themselves for the acquisition and broadening of such experience. Perhaps, to speed the orientation process, trade officials of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe will want to broaden commercial relationships with businessmen in this country, and particularly importers. Perhaps it will be desirable in some cases to contract certain business services in the United States, at least during this orientation process.

Or again, possibly businessmen and trade officials on both sides might think in terms of general approaches to broadening communications. Trade missions or fact finding tours, such as the TIME Inc. and Business International group visits, are undoubtedly useful. The use of business publications stimulates exchange of business or marketing information. Obviously, there are a good many alternate routes that could be followed.

As well as increased sales in each other's markets, this process could also lead to further expansion in the future through exploration of new trading techniques, or the reexamination of existing trade tools for application to trade between the United States and these nations. To cite one example, it may be that the technique of switch trading—which is proving useful elsewhere—could have an application. As I have suggested, however, time, effort, and experience must interact before such specifics emerge.

The essential aim in this current period is to get the ball moving—to allow the dynamics of peaceful international commerce to come fully into play here as in other areas of world trade that have seen such surging expansion.

Past this point, I cannot stress strongly enough the primary role of American business in this whole process of growth. While the government-to-government aspects of world trade can be decisive, the fact remains that in our system there is no business without business.

From a great many indications, there is indeed at the present time impressive and growing interest in the American business community in the potentials of East-West trade, just as an increasingly favorable commercial climate appears to be emerging in the nations of this region.

International cooperative efforts under way today also hold promise of important progress in the vital field of industrial property, particularly in connection with patents. This is a complex and difficult area where material accomplishment comes slowly, but the plusses to date are encouraging. They include:

Soviet accession to the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, or Paris Convention, the leading international treaty in the patent and trademark field.

Subsequent USSR and Eastern European support for the U.S. proposal, in the Executive Committee of the Paris Convention, that set in motion current detailed consideration of an international patent cooperation treaty.

Formation of a state trading agency known as Licensintorg in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade to handle foreign licensing matters including promotion of export-import arrangements in this field.

And issuance of basic Soviet publications in this field in English translation.

These are positive steps in an area that bears particularly on trade in the new products and processes that are staples in U.S. business overseas. In particular, they stimulate the confidence that is fundamental to increased commerce.

So, in summary, what we see today throughout this broad field of U.S. trade with the USSR and Eastern Europe are new activity, new interest, new developments. The picture is one of movement, and the direction is toward expansion and liberalization. We are increasingly talking of contracts rather than contrasts.

One very significant part of the picture is the notably increased national interest and national debate on this vital subject across the United States—by business groups, in the newspapers, at meetings such as this one, and among the general public. I applaud this, both because healthy, vigorous national dialogue—pro or con—is at the very heart of our democratic process, and because the views expressed by the business community and others provide important contributions to the President and the Congress in their considerations and decisions affecting East-West trade. I hope that this discussion can separate the myths and the realities of the situation, and that our policy directions are based on realistic appraisals rather than emotional reactions.

All that we have said notwithstanding, I believe it is abundantly clear that the numerous diverse influences on the future of East-West trade that we have been discussing remain subordinate in impact to one single central determinant. I am referring, of course, to the general climate of relations between the United States and these nations.

In this regard, President Johnson has expressed United States hopes and intentions in a brief, historically eloquent declaration:

"Our objective," he said, "is not to continue the Cold War, but to end it."

In the years to come, mounting traffic across the bridge of commerce between our nations could be one very effective element in achieving this objective for our own people and all of the peoples of the world.

RUMANIA WILL AGAIN BE FREE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, on May 10, 1877, independence came to Rumania. May 10 stands as a symbol of a proud history and of freedom valiantly won. Rumanian Independence Day, 1967, however, is marked with mixed emotion. It is with pride that we note the fortitude and courage of the Rumanian people as reflected by their history. It is also a source of pride that here in America citizens of Rumanian extraction have contributed those noble qualities to our national life.

However, it is disheartening that this holiday cannot be celebrated within the boundaries of a nation whose history is so steeped in love of freedom. The Communist dictatorship imposed by the Soviet Union on the Rumanian people has ripped this day from the calendar just as it has torn freedom away from that once proud and happy land. Today in Rumania dissent is not tolerated; freedom does not exist.

The Communist dictatorship has tried to force the people to forget this day and their proud history. There will be no singing of the national anthem today in Bucharest, but we know that love of freedom persists in Rumania. It is for us here to give voice to the thoughts and desires which Rumanians cannot express in their own homeland.

Rumanians have known oppression before in their long history. Theirs is a nation of a great history and noble tradition. Let the Communist dictators be reminded that Rumania lived under the tyranny of the Ottoman Turks for 400 years. Since the time of Peter the Great it has been invaded 10 times by power-hungry neighbors, including Russia. However, the Rumanian people finally won their freedom, and for six decades stood proud as a free nation. They will once again take their proper place among freedom-loving peoples and free nations. Freedom won after centuries of struggle and once enjoyed in happier days cannot remain suppressed.

We look forward with them to the day when they will be free. Our prayer is that on another May 10 in the not too distant future, Rumania will once again stand proud among the family of free nations.

LAW DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPONG

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, on Law Day every year the Nation is reminded of the vital role of the law and the lawyer in the functioning of our society. On May 1, 1967, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong] addressed the Roanoke, Virgina, Bar Association. He called on the members of the bar to expand on their traditional role of leadership and to engage in "a wider range of participation" and "a new kind of commitment to preserving and guiding today's changing society."

In particular, the junior Senator from Virginia charged the legal profession with the responsibility of applying its capacity for objective and unemotional reasoning to the solution of the pressing problems that face us today. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator's conclusion that the lawyers of the country have much to contribute to our society beyond their activities within the profession itself. Senator Spong spoke from personal conviction and experience that is rooted in his longstanding involvement in civic and bar affairs. Prior to his election to this body he was scheduled to serve this year as president of the Virginia State Bar Association.

Mr. President, I commend to Senators and to the members of the legal profession throughout the country Senator Spong's excellent address before the Roanoke Bar Association. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SPONG

This afternoon I should like to examine briefly the lawyer's traditional role in society against the background of some of the major problems presently facing the United States at home and abroad.

We lawyers are often reminded that we possess, or are thought to possess, a set of characteristics which uniquely equip us to perform important leadership services to society: an understanding of society derived from broad contact with many of its various segments, an analytical approach to its problems, an ability to see the possible validity of different conflicting alternatives, an objectivity in evaluating their respective merits, and a capacity for realism—for recognition of the possible. Lawyers, we are told, can disagree without being disagreeable; they can resolve seemingly unresolvable conflicts.

These qualities have been attributed to us as lawyers and we have been considered particularly well suited to perform certain leadership functions vitally important to a Democracy—to mediate between the divergent forces of society and to bind them together so that society can continue as a viable entity. John W. Davis, a thoughtful and scholarly attorney of national repute, speaking of the lawyer's role in an earlier and more stable period in our country's history, said:

"True, we build no bridges. We raise no towers. We construct no engines. We paint no pictures—unless as amateurs for our principal amusement. There is little of all that we do which the eye of man can see. But we smooth out difficulties; we relieve stress; we correct mistakes; we take up other men's burdens and by our efforts we make possible the peaceful life of men in a peaceful state. We may not construct the levers, pistons and wheels of society, but we supply the lubrication that makes its even running possible."

And, even earlier, in the first half of the Nineteenth Century, the French philosopher De Toqueville recognized a unique place for the lawyer in our American democracy when he wrote:

"The profession of the law is the only aristocracy that can exist in a democracy without doing violence to its nature." But, how valid are these observations on the lawyer's role in society in light of today's problems?

Last Friday, General Westmoreland confidently predicted ultimate victory for his troops should they continue to receive the support of those on the home front. The enemy, he stated, believed our Achilles heel is our national resolve. It is obvious that those in Hanoi—who in past weeks have rebuffed overtures for peace talks from the President, from U Thant and most recently from the Canadians—believe that we will prove no different from the French, that ultimately the war will become politically unacceptable in Washington, just as it once did in Paris, and ultimately we will withdraw.

Never in our history have we faced a crucial national matter which more excited divergent passions than the Vietnamese war. Yet never have we faced a situation—except briefly perhaps in the Cuban missile crisis—which demanded cool heads, iron nerves, understanding of issues, evaluation of the enemy and realistic appreciation of the consequences of our moves and the enemy's countermoves.

If our resolve deteriorates, if the communists can back us down by fear, attrition or internal division, the implications for the future of the free world are grim to contemplate. For, if the communist world finds that our pledge to stand and fight is but a hollow bluff, the credibility of our deterrent shield will be broken. That we mean what we say is the major force which has checked the spread of communism in all parts of the globe.

But the holocaust we seek to avoid by proving our determination will just as surely come upon us if we become too reckless in our application of power. As we approach the point where only a few more steps may force the hand of China and Russia, our own hand must become ever steadier and our judgment ever more precise.

And all the while swirls around us the more emotional and piteous cries of those who say we must withdraw and the more angry and strident demands of those who say we must indiscriminately spread the war.

Here at home we face poverty, ignorance, disease and crime in the core cities of our metropolitan areas. And we have come to fear the long, hot summers of unrest and violence, or racial tensions and riots in our city streets.

Domestic problems are not confined to city limits. Those who have fled the core cities face threats that do not respect geographic boundaries—air and water pollution, traffic problems resulting from automobiles being produced faster than highways can be constructed to accommodate them.

Our rapidly expanding population finds itself, ironically, threatened by the harmful side effects of many activities which are carried on for our benefit. Air, water, soil and wildlife are being consumed and blighted in frightening proportions. The Los Angeles smog and the New York water shortage are not isolated events. They are the first symptoms of disaster caused by our rapid growth which can and will sweep the country unless intelligently dealt with.

Our ancestors could move West in the face of these problems—but this is no longer an avenue of escape. There is a real and menacing danger that, unless we face up to this set of problems squarely and forthrightly and immediately, our children will not have sufficient fresh water to drink, pure air to breathe or natural beauty to enjoy.

As countless local, state and national laws and regulations are passed to fight air and water pollution, to make automobile travel safer, to zone, to preserve and conserve natural beauty, we are reminded of John Stuart Mill's observation concerning the eternal struggle between liberty and authority.

No government can be effective unless the people have confidence in their appointed and elected representatives. This confidence has undergone a severe strain on the national level in the past few years.

The month of April has been spent in the Senate debating the controversial Presidential Campaign Fund Act of 1966. There is genuine concern today regarding the cost of campaigning for high public office, concerning disclosure of the source of campaign funds and the use of political funds for private purposes.

And there is also concern regarding conflict of interests, nepotism, disclosure of assets and income and outside business activities by Congressional employees. The problem of ethics in government is by no means confined to the national scene. The very population growth and development earlier mentioned has created new temptations in every state and locality.

What I have said about Viet Nam, about the new areas which government on all levels will occupy, and about the apparent lack of appreciation for necessary adherence to the highest standard of propriety by all those in public life has particular implications for the legal community.

The traditional commitment of a lawyer to his cause and to his client, no matter how long or hard the proceeding, equips him to provide our society with some of the determination and staying power needed in our struggle in Viet Nam.

And he should be able to help the more confused elements of our population. Once the consequences of withdrawal or unrestrained application of power are grasped and stripped of emotionalism, the narrow road we have to walk should be obvious. I would urge the members of the bar to help carry forward to the American people the case for determined reason.

The new facts of domestic existence in the last third of the Twentieth Century are capable of legal proof. I have spoken of the increasing population, diminishing water resources, polluted air, desperate urban slums, and disappearing woods and wildlife. Once the evidence is presented the lawyer should be able to reach logical conclusions concerning the necessity and methods for dealing with them. Again his training should allow him to dissect and evaluate the modern appropriateness of the traditions handed down to us from the frontier and the wilderness-traditions forged by the same kind of people but in a different set of facts. He should be able to retain the features which are inherent in our personal characteristics while developing the best new tools to deal with the problems of today. This requires thought, study and application by many who feel they have no place in the world of politics. No one of you with talent has the right to sit disinterested and self-satisfied on the sidelines.

In the field of proper conduct for those on every level in public life, it is becoming increasingly apparent that a major difficulty lies in the inability of many people to distinguish right from wrong. While in many areas, precise and specific rules would be helpful, these alone will not solve the problem. A need exists for a fresh climate in morality.

Professions, such as the law, with long traditions should be able to help infuse some new life into our sagging and casual notions of what is right and what is wrong. Here I would caution that the legal profession should not be overly pious, for in some instances its members, too, have conveniently relaxed their standards and the organized bar has not acted with the promptness and strictness that it should.

Nevertheless, the bar should join with the other professions to assure high standards of conduct within these groups themselves and by example, action and persuasion to make the need for appreciation of rightness felt in the body politic and throughout the community. The traditional stabilizing and moderating influence of the bar still has its place, particularly in encouraging and even demanding adherence to the law by all elements of our society.

But I envisage the need in these times for a wider range of participation—a new commitment and a new kind of commitment to preserving and guiding society.

I have suggested that you should provide determination and unemotional reason regarding Viet Nam; that you should evaluate in lawyer-like fashion the new facts of domestic life and help fashion realistic tools to meet them on every level; and that as individuals and as a profession we should supply the underpinning for a new devotion to the highest standards of conduct.

Perhaps I ask too much. In view of the long tradition of responsibility and leadership by those in the legal profession, I think not.

AMERICAN AVIATION ASKS FOR FLIGHT TRAINING FOR VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, in the May issue of American Aviation, Managing Editor Arthur H. Sanfelici voices his concern over the growing need for qualified pilots, and expresses his belief that this year's amendments to the cold war GI bill, S. 9, will help the aviation industries in meeting that need.

Aviation is a growing field, and one which is demanding more and more personnel with very special skills—skills which are expensive to acquire. Our veterans are logical people to meet this need, and they are ready and willing to enter this training. This was recognized in earlier veterans' benefits legislation, and it is illogical not to include flight training now, when avaiation is more than ever in need of trained personnel. As Mr. Sanfelici argues:

> This training has been a part of the previous benefits to veterans so why stop now?

I ask unanimous consent that the column "Skyways" by Mr. Sanfelici be inserted at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Skyways

(By Art Sanfelici)

It seems there are still those in government who don't really believe aviation is here to stay. The ones who didn't include pilot training in the "cold war" GI bill (Public Law 89–358), for instance. This training has been a part of the previous benefits to veterans so why stop now? Some say that use has been made of such training for merely recreational pursuits. Because this didn't help the individual in his vocation, why should Uncle Sam foot the greater part of the bill? In that light this is a valid argument, and we have no desire for our tearstained tax dollars to pay for somebody's pleasure flying, either.

But civil aviation, and general aviation in particular, is facing a tremendous surge in growth. (We hesitate to use the term "boom" because, last time we did, the WW II vets came home and bought houses instead of airplanes—and we've only recently recovered.) We—the entire country—will need a helluva lot of pilots to keep up with the demand. And don't think we are going to get them from the military, either. The airlines alone will need 12,000 pilots by 1970 and there's no telling how many more thousands will be needed by general aviation. Here we'll need every kind of nonrecreational pilot you can think of—flying businessmen and educators whose vocations benefit tangibly from mobility, professional pilots at all levels who fly people and cargo, and those who spray your crops and deliver fresh lobsters.

Here's where a GI bill can be much more than merely a bonus for those whose service stint put them back a few rungs on their climb up the career ladder. It can give a *bona fide* boost to the entire transportation industry—and don't think that general aviation will not be needed for an increasingly bigger chunk of it during the coming decade.

Flight training, then, provides a valid career opportunity, and a bill with built-in safeguards against previous abuses will be a definite benefit to all. Sen. Ralph Yarborough (D-Tex.) has proposed such an amendment to the cold war GI bill. Its designation is S. 9. Other such bills are in the works in the House but S. 9 is the furthest along. We hope that such legislation is not only successful in being adopted but that Congress also puts enough money into it to do the job of training these new pilots to a degree of skill needed to get an aviation career off the ground.

WHOSE CREDIBILITY GAP?

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial published in yesterday's Washington Evening Star. The editorial concerns the incidence of civilian casualties in Vietnam and the credibility of various sources on this subject. The editorial and the facts it contains speak for themselves.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whose Credibility Gap?

Some weeks ago, a four-man investigating team arrived in South Vietnam to make a survey of civilan war casualties. The team, composed of three doctors and a former newspaper man, was sponsored by the "Committee of Responsibility," a group that counts among its members such avowed opponents of the Vietnam war as Drs. Benjamin Spock and Albert E. Sabin.

The final report of the investigating team will be presented to the sponsors later this month. But, meanwhile, the New York Times has published an account of the group's general findings—a report that should prove enlightening.

The survey covered 37 of the 40 government hospitals in South Vietnam, plus scores of village facilities. It was found that some 800 civilian war casualties are being treated at any given time throughout South Vietnam, which projects to a figure of approximately 50,000 casualties so far this year. Of that total, approximately half the casualties were estimated to have been caused by the Viet Cong. This total figure, it should be noted, is the same as that recently estimated by the United States foreign aid mission and the South Vietnamese Ministry of Health.

Perhaps the most arresting statistic in the extensive survey came in the much-publicized area of burn casualties. The investigative team reported finding fewer than 40 such cases.

Last January, Ramparts Magazine presented a lengthy and shockingly illustrated report on the children of Vietnam in which the author, one Dr. William F. Pepper, came up with an estimate of his own. American napalm and phosphorous weapons, he said, had caused "at least a million child casualties since 1961"—a statement that has been repeated at every opportunity by the more vociferous of the administration critics.

Civilian casualties, quite apart from the numbers involved are tragic, But this latest, impartial survey gives added proof that what is taking place in Vietnam is the inevitable tragic consequence of modern war—not, as certain ax-grinders would have us believe, the deliberate slaughter of the innocents.

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION WEEK

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, in recognition of the contributions of transportation to national defense efforts, Congress, on May 16, 1957, provided by joint resolution for a Presidential proclamation designating the third Friday in the month of May of each year as National Defense Transportation Day. Similar action on May 14, 1962, provided for proclaiming the week in which the third Friday occurred in the month of May each year as National Transportation Week, in acknowledgment of the contributions to our national life made by the men and women who move people and goods throughout the land, and around the world, night and day. This year May 14 to May 21 has been proclaimed as National Transportation Week.

One of the purposes of National Transportation Week is to focus attention of the public on the importance of transportation to our economy and to the achievements of all forms of transport. Our transportation system has made us the most mobile society in the history of the world. No other country can show an overall output capability equal to that of the total transportation system of the United States. Nonetheless, greater coordination of all forms of transport to provide greater quantitative and qualitative service is necessary, both for the needs of the economy and for defense purposes.

Effective coordination of transportation is hampered by institutional barriers, not by any technological obstacles. The problems of the transportation industry require understanding and support of the general public if they are to be successfully resolved. Without this any national transportation policy will prove ineffectual.

Transportation is one of the most effective tools for developing a strong economy. Future growth of our economy depends greatly on constant improvement of transportation facilities, just as the growth of our economy in the past has been closely identifiable with and dependent upon developments in transportation.

Transportation is the cornerstone of our national economy, as it is of all modern industrial economies. Productive forces are unleashed, if not called into being, by transportation. Transportation is the source of one out of every five dollars in our economy. More important than transportation's direct economic contribution has been its role in converting regional markets to national and international markets, making possible division of labor and linking manufacturers into the most productive industrial complex known to man.

The magnitude of the task facing the transportation system of the Nation is suggested by the increased demand for transportation in the next two decades, which is estimated to be at least twice current demand.

National Transportation Week is a focal point but not a substitute for year-round efforts of all transportation agencies and the public generally in evolving a transportation system adequate for our present needs and capable of supporting and contributing to continued growth of the economy.

The observance of Transportation Week will end on May 21 but the influence of transportation throughout the entire economy is evident every day of the year. This special week merely emphasizes the contributions made by all forms of transport in serving the public and to the safety and welfare of the Nation.

WORLDWIDE FAMINE IN LESS THAN 10 YEARS: AN ALARMING PROSPECT

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, in connection with the burning issue of overpopulation which looms more and more terrifyingly as its full implications become increasingly manifest, I desire to call the attention of my colleagues to an extremely important book entitled

"Famine, 1975," with the subtitle, "America's Decision: Who Will Survive?" It is written by William and Paul Paddock and is published by Little, Brown & Co.

The authors are well qualified as a team to discuss this subject. Paul Paddock served in the U.S. Foreign Service for 21 years. In World War II, he was vice consul in Djakarta when the Japanese invaded Java, vice consul in Casablanca following the American landing, second secretary in Moscow during the last year of the war, consul in Dairen, Manchuria, when the Communists invaded, and first secretary in the Embassy in Korea during the truce negotiations. Nearly every post he held was in an undeveloped country. William Paddock is an experienced agronomist. He was director of the Iowa State College-Guatemala Tropical Research Center in Antigua, Guatemala, developing new methods and crops for tropical agriculture. In 1957 he became the Director of the Escuela Agricola Pan-Americana in Honduras. Under his administration it became the finest agricultural college in Latin America. Since 1966, he has been a private consultant in tropical agricultural development. Like his brother, he has lived, worked and traveled extensively in the undeveloped nations.

In this well documented and scholarly study, the authors make clear that there will not be enough food to prevent mass starvation in many parts of the world within a very short time. They place the crisis only 8 years from now. They point out that it will be largely dependent upon the United States to supply the food that will be needed. What they also make clear is that our agricultural surpluses which have made possible the generous food-for-peace programs, which our country has been carrying on, are virtually at an end, and that with every effort which we might make, we cannot meet world food needs.

In a most realistic analysis, the authors divide the possible recipient countries into the categories of those that cannot be saved because of the immensity of their needs and burgeoning populations and the limits upon our capacity to produce the necessary food. This situation will require that we confine our food donations to countries that can be saved. They relate this analysis to the interesting use of so-called triage. This is the situation that arises in war when after a battle a great number of wounded are rushed to the hospital for treatment. Lacking adequate medical services to take care of all the wounded because of the overwhelming flood of casualties, the doctors have to divide the wounded into three categories.

First. Those so seriously wounded that they cannot survive regardless of the treatment given them. These are classified as "can't-be-saved."

Second. Those who are not sufficiently seriously wounded so as to require immediate treatment and can be referred to as "walking wounded."

Third. Those who can be saved by immediate medical care.

The authors apply this to nations and their proposal, however objectionable it might appear from a sentimental standpoint is the essence of realism for, indeed, we may have to choose which nations fall into the third category.

As the Congress of the United States will face these problems, I strongly recommend the reading of this important book which will be published shortly.

The authors only by inference and occasional mention advert to the essential remedy for this tragic prospect which is widespread and intensive inculcation of family planning and the accompanying contraceptive information and means. Actually, in many countries, it is already late. The population explosion, in many of them, has gone beyond control, but obviously, that is no reason why voluntary contraceptive programs should not be pursued with a determination and vigor which has not existed hitherto.

After regrettable timidity and inaction the Agency for International Development has announced publicly it will provide family planning materials when they are requested.

For example, the New York Times today, May 11, carries a news story by reporter Juan de Onis concerning the start which the Agency for International Development has made by beginning to process requests for large-scale contraceptive supplies from developing countries. This is possible because AID Administrator William S. Gaud has wisely rescinded the self-imposed AID directive that prohibited use of foreign aid funds for the supply or manufacture of oral or mechanical contraceptives.

I believe the President's public mandates concerning the population explosion and the population dialog developed by the Congress in 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1967 have encouraged our Federal agencies to act positively. Certainly the right of individuals to know that family planning information exists and that it is available upon request cannot be ignored.

The right to know includes the men and women of the United States as well as those of other nations. Therefore, I was pleased to read in the New York Times today that New York's Fordham University this fall will initiate a program on sex education which will include information on contraceptive devices. The story by reporter Martin Gansberg points out that:

> The Jesuit university was believed to be the first major Roman Catholic educational institution to undertake what one official described as a "frank discussion of sex."

When the Government Operations Subcommittee on Foreign Aid Expenditures opened hearings on S. 1676, my bill to coordinate and disseminate birth control information upon request at home and overseas, I quoted Thomas Jefferson in my opening statement, as follows:

> Giving information to the people "is the most certain, and the most legitimate engine of government," wrote Thomas Jefferson 178 years ago to his friend James Madison.

We have come quite a ways since the Foreign Aid Expenditures Subcommittee started hearings on June 22, 1965. In less than 2 years long overdue gains have been made. An ever-enlarging public discussion is taking place.

Now we are engaged in another struggle—to insure the proper organization structure, staffing, and funding of family planning programs.

This week a significant addition was made to the continuing national discussion and dialog on population and family planning—I refer to the testimony presented to the Foreign Affairs Committee of the other body in support of an expanded program of authorized assistance for voluntary family planning programs overseas.

The witnesses included Gen. William H. Draper, Jr., Chairman of the Population Crisis Committee; Dr. Richard N. Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State; Dr. Louis Dupré, professor of philosophy at Georgetown University; and Dr. Raymond Ewell, vice president for research, New York State University at Buffalo. They endorsed proposed legislation introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. FULBRIGHT] which would earmark significant U.S. resources—$50 million yearly for 3 years—to deal with the increasingly urgent world population crisis. The bill, S. 1503, has a number of Senate cosponsors and I am privileged to be one of them.

Dr. Dupré is a respected philosopher. He is the author of a book entitled "Contraception and Catholics." His testimony before the House Foreign Affairs Committee advances the population dialog and in his concluding remarks he said:

> Here, again, it is in the name of respect for these peoples' freedom, the freedom to survive rather than to sink even deeper into abjection, that Catholics ought to cooperate actively in making birth control available to their neighbors in need. It may sound ironical to invoke the essential principles of the Christian religion in support of a cause which Catholics until recently considered a major threat to Christian morals. And yet, consistency itself demands this change of attitude. The basic principle underlying the Catholic Church's position is respect for human life and for the dignity of the person. This principle made her protect a society suffering from underpopulation against any behavior which could jeopardize the precarious balance of life even more. Today this concern for the dignity of life demands a different application. In many places we have extended man's life span by a number of years. We thus have created an uprecedented situation and are faced with an entirely new responsibility. Unless we soon integrate the consequences of this behavior in our line of action, we will merely have replaced destruction from without by destruction from within the human race. Family planning will become a matter of survival; it already is an essential factor in preserving the dignity of life.
>
> The Catholic Church is no longer in doubt about the *end* of family limitation. The words of the Encyclical quoted at the beginning prove that she is prepared to collaborate with others in achieving this end. Those who object to her slowness in endorsing the most efficient *means* should be reminded of the many centuries in which the Church was virtually alone in protecting the sacredness of human life. This lonely responsibility in the past has made her reluctant about hasty reversals in her attitude. But her past record may give confidence that she will not betray the trust of mankind in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the two news stories which appeared in the New York Times and the full text of Dr. Dupre's testimony appear at the conclusion of my remarks as exhibits 1, 2, and 3.

There being no objection, the articles and testimony were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1967]

AID UNIT WIDENS BIRTH CURB HELP—BEGINS LARGE-SCALE POLICY OF AIDING POOR LANDS

(By Juan de Onis)

WASHINGTON, May 10.—The United States aid agency has begun to process requests for large-scale contraceptive supplies from developing countries under a liberalized policy on birth control assistance.

William S. Gaud, administrator of the Agency for International Development, signed an order last week rescinding a directive in effect since 1948 that prohibited use of foreign aid funds for the supply or manufacture of oral or mechanical contraceptives.

It was learned that requests for contraceptives and of equipment to manufacture oral hormone pills that inhibit female fertility have been received by United States aid missions in India, Jamaica and at least one Latin-American country. The Government said that the latter had asked that no publicity be given its request.

COST OF PILLS A FACTOR

The foreign aid position on contraceptives, designed to help developing countries cope with the population increases that are outstripping their economic gains, raises important cost considerations about large-scale acquisition of pills from United States pharmaceutical companies.

"Although it is true that the cost of materials for family planning programs is usually a minor part of the total cost of these programs, the optimal mix of oral contraception with other methods would add much to the cost of materials for some programs," Mr. Gaud's memorandum on the new policy said.

A wide gap exists between the price of brand-name pills sold at retail to some five million women in the United States who are using this form of contraception and the minimum competitive international price at which equivalent oral contraceptives are being made available in some national family planning programs.

For instance, the retail price for a variety of standard low-dosage estrogen pills covering a monthly cycle of 21 daily pills is $1.50.

In a recent Defense Department purchase of such pills on competitive bidding, for resale to military dependents, the contract was awarded to Parke, Davis & Co. on a low bid of 57 cents for each monthly cycle.

PURCHASE BY SWEDEN

Sweden, which is providing governmental aid to Turkey's national family planning program, recently acquired a supply of pills from Searle, a British pharmaceutical manufacturer, at 15 cents for each monthly cycle. This is considered the current minimum international price.

Aid agency officials, who foresee greatly expanded use of oral contraceptives in United States-supported programs abroad, are concerned about getting the most return for foreign aid dollars applied to family planning programs.

The agency now estimates it will have $20-million to $50-million available for the first year of work under the expanded program. The amount depends on how much Congress will authorize under the foreign aid bill now in the process of hearings.

Richard Gardner, former population adviser to the United States mission to the United Nations, testified yesterday before the House Foreign Affairs Committee that it would cost about $2-billion a year to make adequate contraceptive materials available to all women of childbearing age in the world. The bulk of this cost, he said, will have to be borne by the developing countries.

ACCEPTABILITY FACTOR

The cost at which oral contraceptives become available to women in low-income developing countries is also a major factor in their acceptability. The main low-cost method of contraception that has been introduced in recent family planning efforts is the so-called intrauterine device.

The desirability of employing the "pill" more widely has been stimulated by the relatively high cost of clinical services for the device and follow-up medical examinations and evidence indicating that nearly half the women who receive the device are no longer using it four years later.

Oral contraceptives are also considered to offer better prospects of effective birth control among younger, unmarried women, reducing the early incidence of childbearing, which often begins before women reach the age of 20 in most developing nations. But the cost element is basic.

"Unless cost barriers are removed, we will be unable to insure free choice of birth control methods to persons in the less developed countries," the aid agency memorandum said. "Many who might accept oral contraception may refuse or expel I. U. D.'s. and continue to use abortions for birth control.

EXHIBIT 2

[From the New York Times, May 11, 1967]

FORDHAM TO GIVE SEMINARS ON SEX—"FULL AND CANDID" TALKS WILL INCLUDE BIRTH CONTROL

(By Martin Gansberg)

Fordham University will begin a program of "full and candid" sex education in the fall, including lectures on contraceptive devices.

A university official said the program did not mean any departure from the Roman Catholic Church's opposition to artificial birth-control devices. The church allows only the rhythm method, a practice based on a woman's natural cycle each month when she cannot conceive. The new program, it was said, will include information on contraceptive devices as part of the whole series of sex education.

The Jesuit university was believed to be the first major Roman Catholic educational institution to undertake what one official described as a "frank discussion of sex."

The action followed a petition by 150 undergraduates at Thomas More College, the university's women's division, for information on birth control.

A leading physician, who specializes in Catholic family planning said the Fordham move was "very progressive and new and different."

Msgr. Thomas McGovern of New York Roman Catholic Archdiocese had no comment on the step, but he noted that the Family Life Bureau of the archdiocese already had programs on sex education in the elementary schools and held discussions at the parish level.

MEETING HELD

The Fordham announcement was made yesterday by Dr. Martin J. Meade, a vice president and dean of students, after a meeting with three women who were representing the petitioners. The meeting was held in his office on the first floor of Keating Hall at the Rose Hill campus.

"The program will include frank discussions of methods of conception and contraception," Dr. Meade said. "It will be open to all members of the university community—men and women students, faculty and administration."

He said the program would follow a general theme, "The Permanent Relation Between Mature Man and Mature Woman." Included in the discussions, he said, would be talks on the morality of premarital and extramarital relations.

"Obviously," Dr. Meade said, "many young people who are on the verge of making a permanent commitment to living with another man and woman in marriage should know as much as possible and reflect as much as possible on this relationship."

Stressing that the Catholic church bans the use of contraceptive devices, Dr. Meade said there would be explanations on their role by phychiatrists, sociologists, physiologists and theologians.

He said the university felt the subject was permissible because "the morality of contraceptives does not enter into the discussion."

One of the women explained the student position this way: "We don't want them to sell pills downstairs; we just want information about them."

Other points in the sex-education program, according to Dr. Meade, include:

Having a physician available at the university infirmary or in its counseling service, who would answer student questions on birth control. If no physician is available, the university will recommend one living off-campus.

Letting the students determine what should be discussed and decide who should be the expert invited to speak.

NUISANCE CALLS FEARED

Leaders of the student petition, who asked that their identities be withheld because of fear of nuisance calls, said they felt the program "opens discussion of social relationships."

Seated around a table in the Student Center Building at the north end of the campus, which is spread over a wide area running from Fordham Road and Third Avenue to Southern Boulevard and East 191st Street, the women said:

"This will give us the freedom to discuss, to form opinions, to question old opinions and to defend whatever opinions we've had on sex."

They said that although there were about 150 signatures on their petition, most of the 670 women at the university agreed with it. Fordham has an enrollment of about 12,000 day and evening students, 70 per cent of them Catholics. About half of the women live in dormitories on campus and about a quarter commute to their homes. The rest live in apartments near the campus.

The women explained that they began their campaign for birth-control information at the university because they felt their sex education was restricted. One recalled this story:

A woman student went to the university infirmary and asked for information about the birth-control pill. The staff physician told her he would have nothing to do with fostering extra-marital relations, that she would have to be married and over 21 before he would offer advice.

The woman also said that he told her use of contraceptives was against the teachings of the church.

Then, the woman related, she told the physician she was over 21, a non-Catholic and in need of such help for peace of mind. The physician was said to have told her what she was doing was illegal and he still could not help her. He refused her request for the name of an off-campus physician who could help her.

One of the undergraduates who drew up the petition, citing the above story, said: "That's why there's a need for a birth-control educational program. We shouldn't be uninformed; we should know."

EXHIBIT 3

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, MAY 9, 1967

My name is Louis Dupré. I am a professor of philosophy at Georgetown University; I also serve on the executive board of the Catholic Committee on Population and Government Policy, and am the author of a book entitled *Contraception and Catholics*.

I would like to testify this morning on the need for public family planning programs considered from a moral, more specifically from a Catholic point of view.

I can find no more appropriate words to introduce my subject than the ones contained in Pope Paul VI's recent encyclical, *Populorum Progressio:*

"It is true that too frequently an accelerated demographic increase adds its own difficulties to the problems of development: the size of the population increases more rapidly than available resources, and things are found to have reached apparently an impasse. From that moment the temptation is great to check the demographic increase by means of radical measures. It is certain that public authorities can intervene, within the limit of their competence, by favoring the availability of appropriate information and by adopting suitable measures, provided that these be in conformity with the moral law and that they respect the rightful freedom of married couples. Where the inalienable right to marriage and procreation is lacking, human dignity has ceased to exist. Finally, it is for the parents to decide, with full knowledge of the matter, on the number of their children, taking into account their responsibilities toward God, themselves, the children they have already brought into the world, and the community to which they belong. In all this they must follow the demands of their own conscience enlightened by God's law authentically interpreted, and sustained by confidence in Him."

Whatever further interpretations may be offered, it is clear that this statement recognizes the legitimacy of public programs to make family planning information available and reinforces the right of parents to decide the size of the family. On the question of which measures are in accordance with the moral law the Encyclical remains silent, for thus far men have not been able to reach a general agreement on the answer. Some highly moral and well-informed people feel that any non-abortive method of birth control may be used under the proper circumstances. Others claim that no other method than rhythm is licit. Others again consider only hormonal compounds which control the ovulatory system as morally acceptable. Whether one considers these distinctions morally relevant or not, they certainly reveal that opinions in this matter are divided. The division exists also among Catholics. The majority of Catholic women of this country are using or have used some form or other of contraception. The division must exist even among the highest authorities in the Catholic Church if it is true that only four of the more than fifty members of the Papal Commission on Birth Control favor the continuance of the present restrictions.

What under those circumstances is for a Catholic the moral attitude toward public policy on birth control? Must he abstain from any participation in public programs until the last shred of doubt has disappeared within the Catholic Church? In doing so he fails to live up to the responsibility which the Christian has in the world today. A purely passive attitude would be exactly the kind of other-worldly indifference toward essential human values which nonbelievers deplore so often in their Christian neighbors. Moreover such conduct would be the exact opposite of that suggested in the Encyclical.

Abstaining from obstruction of government-sponsored aid in family planning is not enough. The Catholic has a positive responsibility in the present population crisis. In taking up this responsibility he can hardly expect that every one adopts the official views of his Church on the subject. But this fact need not paralyze him into non-cooperation. It should make him more watchful that the freedom of each recipient be respected in the implementation of family planning programs. In thus cooperating, the Catholic does not take a stand himself on the objective morality of each particular method which is made available by the program. He may maintain his reservations toward any or all of these methods and yet fully cooperate as long as no hidden or overt attempts are made to coerce the individual recipient of aid into accepting any particular method of birth control. This was precisely the point at stake in the letter of the American bishops of December 1966.

The principle remains valid today. No person should be discriminated against because of his refusal to practice contraception. Information and technical means should be made available, but the right to determine the size of the family belongs to the family alone. The population crisis has not yet reached the state of emergency in which the body politic is bound to intervene in a compulsory way to protect the common good. But the avoidance of this specter of the future is a strong reason to cooperate now in making the means of family restriction available while this restriction can still be made on a voluntary basis. The longer we wait, the greater the danger of government intervention becomes.

As long, however, as the individual conscience is respected, the moral problem involved in the support of government sponsored programs of birth control is not whether one is personally convinced of the morality of the various methods of contraception, but whether one is willing to uphold the freedom of conscience of others in making available the means which they, by an informed choice can adopt or reject according to their own conscience. The positive obligation to respect the religious and moral convictions of those who do not share their faith holds eminently true for Catholics, who were recently reminded in the second Vatican Council: "No one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs *nor is anyone to be restrained from acting in accordance with his own beliefs,* whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in association with others, within due limits." It would seem that Catholics who, because of personal moral views, prevent legislation which would allow people to cope with a most urgent economic problem according to the dictates of their consciences, are paying only lip service to the Council's directives. Religious freedom demands more than non-interference with a non-existent freedom. It includes giving a choice to those who had no choice and even making accessible information of which they might not even have suspected the existence. This conclusion has nothing in common with the absurd theory that one ought to teach the innocent every possible perversion in order to give them a real choice for a moral decision. The information we are offering is not a new way of violating the moral law, but an efficient means to attain an end universally recognized as a moral good. The means itself is considered moral by the great majority of those who are acquainted with it; it is considered doubtful or even immoral by mmebers of one major group. Why should this personal dissent of a relatively small minority be a reason for depriving the poor and the underprivileged from the right of practicing their own freedom?

A more intricate problem is: Is the distribution of birth control information the task of government? To what extent does the common good require government intervention into the private life of its citizens? I think the most moral answer to this question is: Only to the extent that the common good urgently demands such intervention, and even then with the greatest precautions for safeguarding the freedom of the individual. This is particularly the case when the government of one state assists citizens of another. Yet, two points are to be made in this respect. One, the absolute separation between one state and another, characteristic of the "modern" period of history, no longer exists today. Whether we like it or not, we are inseparably united in the adventure of contemporary life, and foreign aid is only a practical recognition of a *de facto* existing situation. Second, the need is most urgent in some of the poorest countries. In fact, it is so urgent that its urgency surpasses that of any nutritional aid, for a continuation of the present growth rate will soon defeat the possibilities of even the most extensive food programs. If, then, we have the right and the obligation to assist foreign nations in their immediate needs, we definitely are allowed to help them in preventing an emergency for which there will soon no longer be an immediate solution available. Some countries may already have reached such an emergency.

Here, again, it is in the name of respect for those peoples' freedom, the freedom to survive rather than to sink even deeper into abjection, that Catholics ought to cooperate actively in making birth control available to neighbors in need. It may sound ironical to invoke the essential principles of the Christian religion in support of a cause which Catholics until recently considered a major threat to Christian morals. And yet, consistency itself demands this change of attitude. The basic principle underlying the Catholic Church's position is respect for human life and for the dignity of the person. This principle made her protect a society suffering from underpopulation against any behavior which could jeopardize the precarious balance of life even more. Today this concern for the dignity of life demands a different application. In many places we have extended man's life span by a number of years. We thus have created an unprecedented situation and are faced with an entirely new responsibility. Unless we soon integrate the consequences of this behavior in our line of action, we will merely have replaced destruction from without by destruction from within the human race. Family planning will become a matter of survival; it already is an essential factor in preserving the dignity of life.

The Catholic Church is no longer in doubt about the *end* of family limitation. The words of the Encyclical quoted at the beginning prove that she is prepared to collaborate with others in achieving this end. Those who object to her slowness in endorsing the most efficient *means* should be reminded of the many centuries in which the Church was virtually alone in protecting the sacredness of human life. This lonely responsibility in the past has made her reluctant about hasty reversals in her attitude. But her past record may give confidence that she will not betray the trust of mankind in the future.

ALTERNATIVES FOR SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the debate now going on in this House over the draft issue illustrates very well the great complexity of the problem of providing both adequately and fairly for the Nation's military manpower needs.

I believe that an important contribution to analysis of this problem has been made by Dr. Harry A. Marmion, who is a staff associate of the Federal Relations Commission of the American Council of Education. Dr. Marmion served on the faculty of Moorhead State College in Moorhead, Minn., for 2 years before joining the ACE in 1966.

I have just seen an article by Dr. Marmion, "Selective Service: Are There Any Alternatives?" This fine summary of various proposals and possibilities includes careful analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of each. The article is especially concerned with the question of student deferments, but it is the finest single analysis of the problems of meeting military manpower needs in general that I have seen.

This article is scheduled to appear in the Educational Record this month. Because it is so timely and so relevant to the debate at hand, I have persuaded Mr. Marmion to allow me to share it with my colleagues in the Congress now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article, "Selective Service: Are There Any Alternatives?" by Harry A. Marmion, be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SELECTIVE SERVICE: ARE THERE ANY ALTERNATIVES?

(HARRY A. MARMION, *Staff Associate on the ACE's Commission on Federal Relations, examines the various proposals on changing the draft laws currently being considered by Congress. He recommends modifications of the present system rather than, as others advocate, replacing it with another. A recognized authority on the subject, Dr. Marmion is preparing a book on the draft controversy and its history.*)

(By Harry A. Marmion)

The current controversy over the draft law has produced a confusing situation. In discussion, it is clear that the unpopular war in Vietnam is behind everyone's thinking on the subject. Educators and other interested people have advocated alternatives to the current system, but many of them do not take into account the effect that these alternatives might have on American higher education. In this article, I will consider the alternative systems and the present system with respect to suggested changes. Where relevant, I will discuss the potential effects of these changes on higher education.

SHOULD ALL SERVE?

Proposals that everyone share the military responsibility reoccur whenever young men are involved in a war. During the Korean War, Congress renamed the current draft law the "Universal Military Training and Service Act." Yet, after much study and debate, Congress did not pass legislation which would allow the act to become truly a system of Universal Military Training.

The principal proponents of Universal Military Training are General Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, and former President Dwight D. Eisenhower. When General Hershey is asked what his recommendations for improving the current law are, he has answered, in all public statements, "Take everyone." General Hershey believes that universal service is the essence of democracy, because all should bear the responsibility for service in maintaining our democratic system. Former President Eisenhower outlined the specifics of such a program in the September 1966 issue of *Reader's Digest*. Under his plan, every young American (with the exception of those exempted for obvious mental incompetency or drastic physical defects) would receive military training at age 18 for 49 weeks. Those serving under UMT would receive subsistence, clothing, and other necessaries from the government, but only five or ten dollars a month for incidentals. At the start of the year's training, each man would be offered the option of enlisting immediately for a two-year hitch with all pay and benefits, including the GI bill. Those who do not enlist for the two-year period would spend their one-year period in military training. These men could be used in times of emergency to help fight floods, fires, and other disasters. After this one-year period of service, the men would be free to begin their careers without further interruption, except in cases of major war, when all would be needed.

Should the inducements of full pay and other benefits not produce the number necessary for our regular forces, then the additional men would be procured through a lottery. At the start, it would be necessary to include in the lottery the large pool of young men who were still liable for military service but past the UMT age. After this pool was exhausted, the lottery would apply only to those within the UMT program.

The advantages of such a system are obvious. Since everyone would serve, the criticism leveled against the current draft—that it is undemocratic—could not be made. UMT would include almost half of those in the pool, who under present selective service standards, are deferred for physical, mental, or moral reasons.[1] It would also provide a huge reserve force of basically trained men available for future emergencies.

The pragmatic objections to such a system are also obvious. First, the military would be unable to utilize the men available. The recently released Department of Defense Draft Study indicated that in 1965, 1,720,000 men reached age 18. This figure is nearly three times the annual capacity of military training installations.[2] An expansion of this magnitude would turn the armed forces into mammoth training establishments. While the war in Vietnam continues, it will be virtually impossible to divert the military manpower needed to train such an awesome number of recruits. For example, in fiscal 1966, it is estimated that draft calls will total about 335,000 men. Were the Vietnam war to end the enormity of the task of using the manpower would increase. The second practical problem with UMT concerns the cost of such an undertaking. No figures have been established, but the costs would be high and of a continuous nature. The source of trained officers presents another problem. Currently, civilian college graduates make up about 90 percent of the officer corps. Many would be reluctant to serve a second time. Finally, should the military rehabilitate those who, under normal conditions, would not serve because of physical or mental limitations? There has been much resistance to the idea of the military engaging in this activity.

UMT's impact on education would be to disrupt college campuses during the first four years of such a program. These institutions would have virtually no male freshman class in the first year, no sophomore class in the second year, and so forth.

One can say with some confidence that Universal Military Training is not practical at this time. Any system enacted, however, should have the flexibility to achieve Universal Military Training under conditions of total war.

A VOLUNTARY ARMY?

Many people feel that any form of conscripted service is undesirable. Some of those people see a "voluntary army" as the answer to this question. In the Congress, Representatives Curtis and Ellsworth are exponents of this concept. At the recent Washington, DC, Conference on the Draft sponsored by the American Veterans Committee, the president of Queens College, Joseph P. McMurray, delivered a major speech "in favor of a voluntary army"[3] but there was little support for the concept at the conference. At a subsequent national conference on the draft held at the University of Chicago, under Ford Foundation auspices, the proposal for a voluntary army received a good hearing and won some converts. Adherents from both ends of the political spectrum—namely, University of Chicago Economics Professor Milton Friedman, supporter of Barry Goldwater in 1964, and John Chapman of the Moderate Republican Ripon Society—advocated the system.[4] Most adherents feel that what is needed is a national commitment toward the creation of a voluntary army. During the necessary period of transition, the current draft system would continue. Once a commitment to voluntary army was made, the changeover could be worked out. It would include increasing military pay and replacing many military support jobs with civilians. In short, only reform of general armed forces personnel policy would enable such a program to be undertaken.

The advantages of such a system would be great. The draft would be ended, and the threat of compulsion eliminated. Fewer recruits would be needed, and turnover as well as training and retraining costs would decrease. Young people could plan their lives and careers without having to worry about service in the armed forces interrupting them. Business and industry could select young men on their merits, without regard to their draft status.

No matter how desirable the voluntary army, however, the question of feasibility remains. Those who wish to abolish the draft completely have a difficult case to make. They must do more than assert that the draft creates uncertainty, upsets marriage and career plans, and is basically undemocratic. They must also prove the present system unnecessary and show that the substitution of an alternative system would be an improvement. In the short run, even given cessation of the Vietnam struggle, they will have difficulty proving the draft unnecessary. In the long run, the voluntary army has serious shortcomings. Given the rate of Negro re-enlistment in the armed forces, a voluntary army could become essentially a black enlisted service. Because of educational advantages, the officer component of such a service would be primarily white.[5] This would also create a very inflexible military force. Where would we obtain the necessary manpower to meet rapid changes in military requirements? Where would our officer corps come from? Does America want to build a military establishment that would become a permanent part of our society, but at the same time be isolated from that society? It is fair to point out that Friedman admits this as a problem. But he goes on to assert that this danger can be avoided by maintaining close links between the officer corps and the body politic. It reads well, but can it be achieved?

---

[1] For example, in fiscal 1965, 681,716 registrants 19 years of age were given the induction examinations. Of these, 50.5 percent or 294,134, were found not qualified. *Annual Report of the Director of Selective Service for the Fiscal Year 1964* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1965), p. 22.

[2] By 1970, the number of men reaching age 18 will jump to 1,930,000, and by 1974 the figure will reach 2,120,000. In Statement of Hon. Thomas D. Marris, Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), *Review of the Administration and Operation of the Selective Service System*, Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Second Session, June 22–24, 28–30, 1966 (Washington: Government Printing Office, n.d.) pp. 9923–9984.

[3] Joseph P. McMurray, "The Voluntary Army," delivered November 11, 1966, Hotel Sheraton Park, Washington, D.C.

[4] Mr. Chapman is the author of a recent book, *The Wrong Man in Uniform* (New York, Trident Press 1967), which is essentially an argument for the Voluntary Army. In February 1967, Mr. Chapman joined an organization supporting the candidacy of Governor Romney for the GOP nomination for President.

Finally, the cost of such a system presents a real problem, and the Defense Department has not provided adequate figures for an estimate. Their figures range from $4 billion to $20 billion a year, depending on the source. Yet the cost would be prohibitive with respect to normal budgetary considerations.

The obvious implication for colleges and universities is clear. The system would eliminate concern over student deferments. Colleges and universities could rid themselves of the onerous and morally distasteful job of helping to select those who go to war and those who remain in school. In short, the voluntary army would serve in the interest of many people throughout the nation.

It appear unlikely—because of cost, inherent inflexibility, and mistrust—that a voluntary army will be considered seriously, now or in the foreseeable future. Indeed, although some see the volunteer system as an opportunity for America to regain its past heritage, others find the whole concept of relying solely on a professional army morally repugnant.

SERVING THE NATION'S NEEDS

One of the most debated alternatives under consideration at present is National Service. Its proponents believe that each young person should be given an opportunity to serve in a way responsive to the needs of the nation. The main problem facing those who propose such a program is the variety of proposals put forth. There are as many programs as there are proponents. They vary from the compulsory program of Margaret Mead to the voluntary program of Donald Eberly of the National Service Secretariat. At the University of Chicago Conference on the Draft, six papers out of the thirty or so presented were concerned with the question.

Most proponents recognize that the defense of the nation has first priority on the services of young people. Beyond this, they agree that, as well as contributing to the well-being of the nation, the service should be consistent with the interest and education of those participating. When advocates of National Service are asked whether such a program is needed, they answer uniformly: Swarthmore's sociologist Leon Bramson speaks for all when he argues that within the 18–26 age group, two societies are being developed. One segment fails the draft examination, does not serve, and slips back into the half-world remaining open to it. Those in the other segment may serve in the armed forces, or may be exempt for many reasons, but in any event they have the mobility—the upward mobility if you will—to move into the complete society. Some of this group achieve mobility through service in the armed forces, others more conventionally through education. Thus Bramson is saying that only half of the youth are participating in the economic promise of the nation. Yet all would agree that the future should belong to the entire youthful population. They see National Service as the vehicle which will enable more youth to take part in this future. Senator Javits sees the rehabilitation of service rejectees as the prime reason for the existence of such a program.

It is difficult to set forth one National Service plan as typical of all. Don Eberly has made the most concrete proposal. At age 18, when all young men must register, they will be given a choice of: (*a*) going into the armed forces; (*b*) opting for a program of National Service with the alternative service spelled out and approved by a National Advisory Board set up for such a purpose. These young men might spend a longer period of time in this service than do those who go into the military; and (*c*) doing nothing. Should the armed forces need more men than the system provides, at age 18 the needed manpower would be drawn by lottery from those who had originally opted to do nothing; at the end of a year, those not selected in the lottery would be placed at the bottom of the list, and their chances of being called would be lessened.

The advantages of such a system are easy to enumerate. Many young men would receive an opportunity to become useful citizens. They would receive the training and experience necessary to make their way in our highly industrialized society. They would be absorbed into a program that would take them out of the job market at the time when their unemployment rate is two and a half times the national average. There would be a great deal of cross-cultural exchange. Undoubtedly, this experience would be important to those participating.

On the other hand, there are others who disagree with the whole scheme of National Service. As President Nathan Pusey of Harvard said when he rejected the McNamara proposal of universal service, "It could only lead to a colossal waste of time." He went on to say, "I cannot believe our government could possibly provide a demanding and meaningful experience . . . for the millions of young people who would be involved. Nor can I think of anything worse for young people eager to get on in the world than to stand by marking time." Are enough jobs in nonmilitary categories available to absorb everyone? What about the defects apparent in the present Poverty Program, the weaknesses in the Job Corps centers: Are they not symptomatic of what might happen under a program of National Service? The cost of such a program would be high, the problems of coordination between various government agencies enormous.

The implications that a system of National Service holds for education are difficult to ascertain until the details of the program are spelled out. Certainly many teachers, guidance people, social workers, and others would be brought into the program to train, teach, and supervise activities. The early choice of alternatives, which would take young men out of the college pool until later, needs to be considered by educational institutions. It would mean that students would matriculate at an older age, and this would have an impact on a variety of educational activities and services.

Because of the general vagueness of the programs suggested, the budgetary problems currently facing the executive, and the visionary nature of the proposals, it is doubtful if such programs will achieve reality.

RELYING ON CHANCE

Much has been said and written about the value of a lottery system to replace the present draft administered by Selective Service. Of the numerous proposals, two merit specific consideration. Congressman Henry S. Reuss of Wisconsin has developed a complete program for armed forces recruitment. On the one hand, he calls for increased benefits for servicemen, in order to encourage enlistments and spur re-enlistments. He advocates reduction in the military by having civilian employees perform a variety of support functions. He also proposes that the Department of Defense do away with arbitrary physical requirements.

Once all possible reductions had been realized, and enlistments increased, the dips into the manpower pool for draftees would become smaller (even in a Vietnam situation). With an ever-enlarging pool of manpower available, the present complex draft system for determining "who goes" will become totally unworkable. At this point, Reuss would call for abolishing selection and replacing it with a lottery as a fairer way to distribute the military obligation.

Reuss would do away with the student deferment. He explains that this would not determine whether a young man goes to college or not—it would simply determine when he goes. To take his reasoning one step further, more men would eventually attend college because educational benefits would now be part of the rewards for military service. Deferments would be continued only for hardship cases and for certain extremely vital civilian jobs.

Finally, Reuss would like to work towards the concept of much more universal service in organizations like the domestic and foreign Peace Corps. This portion of his plan is not described in detail.

Senator Edward Kennedy has a plan which differs from Reuss's. At age 18, all men would be examined. At age 19, all physically and mentally qualified men would stand an equal chance of selection. No deferments would be made for marriage, fatherhood, dependents, or occupation, except in extreme hardship cases. The local board would retain its responsibility for deferments, so that it could deal compassionately with individual problems. Educational deferments would be granted, but they would be limited to four years. They would, in reality, be merely postponements. After completing their undergraduate course, the students would take their chances with the 19-year-old age group in that year's lottery. There would be no deferments for attending graduate school; thus it would no longer be possible to pyramid deferments in order to escape the draft altogether. Students in medical school would not go into the lottery, but they would become a part of the doctors' draft after completing their studies.

Kennedy explained the flexibility of the system he proposes in his statement of June 29, 1966 before the House Armed Services Committee: "An increase in the draft necessitated by world problems would simply mean local boards would reach further down to those men whose numbers appear lower on this list."

There is in Kennedy's proposal an interesting counter-argument to the assertion that, under a lottery system, the rate of enlistments might decline because those not drafted would have greater certainty that they would not be called later. Because those who do serve would in most cases not yet have civilian careers to return to, it seems likely that the rate of re-enlistment would rise to compensate for the decline in enlistments. This could be further encouraged by increasing military pay.

THE GENERAL OBJECTS

The Selective Service is opposed to any suggestion of a lottery. Most of General Hershey's arguments against the lottery have been disputed. For example, he indicates that, under a lottery, a man whose number does not come up when he is 19 years old is lost to the service forever. Further, he states, the loss of these men would severely limit our flexibility in time of major crises. But others point out that those not drafted during their prime year of availability might revert to the bottom of the list for the next year at least, and for administrative purposes could be retained on the rolls of the Selective Service to be called upon in a national emergency.

---

[5] The Negro induction rate is currently about 11 percent, roughly proportionate to the Negro segment of the population. In the recent past, the figure has been somewhat higher. Negro re-enlistment rates in some cases have been as high as 49 percent, and a higher proportion of those Negroes in service have served in Vietnam. This is true primarily because many Negroes lack the specialized skills and the educational background which would qualify them for other than combat duty. They also serve primarily as enlisted men.

In Hershey's words, the difference between the present Selective Service System and a lottery is "at bottom the difference between a human being and a machine. The people on local boards have more compassion than a machine, . . . the machine cannot tell whether a man is more valuable as a father, or student or scientist or doctor than a soldier."[6] Inferentially Hershey is defending the deferment system and the local autonomy of the boards. His objections would be met, however, in both the Kennedy and the Reuss proposals. Both would require physical and mental examinations before the lottery, thus eliminating all unqualified applicants. Reuss would have no deferments *except* for extremely vital occupations. Kennedy would defer most students for only four years; the exception would be medical students, because they face the doctors' draft later. Questions of hardship could be handled either prior or subsequent to the lottery, depending on the administrative machinery decided upon. The question of machines vs. people is perhaps chiefly an emotional one. A lottery would, in effect, create a national manpower pool and make feasible the use of centralized computers and other automated equipment to increase the efficiency of the Selective Service System. For example, when a young man was registered and classified by a local board, his file would be sent to Selective Service headquarters and put into a computer. Any subsequent change in his status would then be updated in the computer records. If he were to move from his local board area, his record could easily be transferred under this system, thus eliminating the chance that geography would determine his draft status. Currently, that status may depend upon little more than where he lived when he registered at age 18.

In addition to its alleged fairness as opposed to the inequities of the selection process, the lottery has other advantages. First, for most men the uncertainty would be lessened; it would last for only one year, and only for those in the middle zone of the lottery numbers. Those with low numbers would be drafted, those with high numbers would not (under present conditions) and both groups could make plans for the future. Second, after one year, a man would be relieved of responsibility to serve in all but extreme circumstances and so could plan ahead with much greater confidence than he can now. Third, the system would be flexible enough to meet manpower needs.

The lottery's impact on education depends upon which proposal is adopted. Under the Reuss proposal, education would be postponed for those selected. Those not taken in the lottery could complete their education with the element of uncertainty virtually disappearing after one or two years. Under the Kennedy proposal, those who planned graduate work and were picked by the lottery would have to interrupt their education. In general, neither plan would have a severe impact on higher education.

A lottery has many compelling arguments in its favor, and it will receive some support in the Congress. The question that must be answered is whether the proponents of the lottery can overcome the Selective Service's arguments against a lottery proposal. Many observers believe that most objections can be answered, but that General Hershey's opposition to the proposal places it in jeopardy. Over the 26 years of his tenure as Director, he has made many friends in Congress, one in particular being Congressman L. Mendel Rivers, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

THE PRESENT SYSTEM

Much of the debate about the draft has arisen as a result of inequities in the present system, which, if corrected, would make the law more tolerable to a greater number of the people concerned. The following are those portions that have come under particularly heavy criticism.

THE ABSENCE OF NATIONAL STANDARDS

There are over 4,000 local boards (with over 16,000 local board members) which perform the fundamental operations of the Selective Service System. There are 95 state appeal boards—one in each Federal Judicial District with 23 extra panels in most heavily populated districts—which have over 500 unpaid board members. There are 56 state headquarters. All of these, plus the national office, make up the Selective Service System.

This "supervised decentralization" of the entire System has been criticized on the grounds that it creates undemocratic situations because it leads to a lack of uniformity in interpretation. Draft boards throughout the nation have a wide latitude of action, and in some cases they act arbitrarily. For example, one local board may induct part-time students before married men; another board's policies may be exactly opposite.

Using the same arguments, however, many people come to the conclusion that the decentralized system is the essence of democracy. To answer the criticism of local board autonomy some have suggested that the local system might be replaced by a national board[7] that would establish uniform calls for the states; through the use of modern automated processing and communications equipment. Other people (the author included) feel that the existing law should be modified to make agency guidelines and Presidential Executive Orders mandatory rather than advisory.

CHANNELING

For a number of years the Selective Service System has assumed what it calls "the channeling function." The term *channeling* refers to the process of influencing registrants, by deferment or prospect of deferment from military service, to enter and remain in study in critical occupations and in other activities essential to the national health, safety, and interest.[8]

"Further, Selective Service channels thousands of young men through its deferment procedures into those fields of endeavor where there are shortages of adequately trained personnel. Many younger engineers, scientists, technicians, and other skilled workers have been kept in their jobs through occupational deferments. Young male teachers are induced to remain in the teaching profession through deferment and additional students are attracted into the profession. The fields of medicine and dentistry also have benefited from student and occupational deferment channeling."[9]

The System bases its channeling function on the very general language in Section 1 (e), Policy and Intent of Congress, of the Universal Military Training and Service Act:

"Congress further declares that adequate provision for national security requires maximum effort in the fields of scientific research and development, and the fullest possible utilization of the nation's technological, scientific, and other critical manpower resources."

On the one hand, the System refers to blanket channeling into fields where there are shortages of trained personnel; the language used in the 1965 Report of the Selective Service System is, "*induced* to remain . . . in certain occupations," (italics added). On the other hand, the disposition of each case of individual deferment is the responsibility of the local draft board.

Some people are of the opinion that explicit authority for the activity of channeling is not contained in the basic law and further, that even though administrative interpretation over the years has created this function, the Selective Service System's position on and the language it uses to describe channeling are inconsistent with the decentralized decision-making authority of local boards. This inconsistency is another compelling reason for decreasing the wide discretion now given to local boards. If channeling is to work, the Selective Service must set down definitive guidelines. Further, the problem arises of whether the Selective Service System is the proper agency for establishing and carrying out manpower policies.

There are those who question the purported success of channeling, because although the manpower pool is expanding, current draft calls are minimal, fewer men are affected, and the system's capacity to channel diminishes. Finally, and most important, the practice of using the deferment-channeling device as an incentive for men to enter certain fields is highly suspect; it may motivate them for the wrong reasons and it may reward evasive behavior.

THE HIGH INDUCTION STANDARDS

The higher physical and mental standards that determine acceptability have materially reduced the portion of total manpower from which the services draw personnel. The Department of Defense, since 1958, has raised requirements, with a resultant increase in the numbers rejected. The 1962 decision to create a 1-Y/rejection category has no effect except to identify those within the 4–F category who were found unqualified by current standards but who probably would be called in an emergency. The Selective Service System calls Class 1–Y a "reserve."

Since 1950, over three million men have been found to be not qualified. In fiscal 1965, the figure was 50.5 percent of those given pre-induction examinations. Congressman Reuss, commenting on this situation, said, "we can at least study the possibility of increasing enlistments by waiving some of the arbitrary height, weight and other requirements which really have very little to do with how well a man performs a noncombat job. . . . They should not necessarily be required to meet combat standards."[10]

In addition, the mental requirements for enlistment differ from those for induction, as Mr. Norman S. Paul, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, pointed out in the 1963 hearings on the extension of the draft. It is also true that it is more difficult for a high school dropout to enlist than for a high school graduate to do so.

This situation raises two questions connected with the availability of manpower. First, is it appropriate for the Defense Department, in time of war, to set very high standards of acceptability for service in the armed forces? Second, should the Department of Defense and the armed forces be responsible for undertaking programs to train and educate young men so that they can meet standards which would enable them to contribute to the military and later to society in general?

---

[6] Robert B. Semple, Jr., "General Hershey Assails Proposals for Lottery Draft," *New York Times*, June 2, 1966.

[7] This is the suggestion of Senator Javits, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 9, p. 12064.

[8] See *Outline of Historical Background of Selective Service and Chronology* (1965 ed.; Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 30.

[9] *Annual Report of the Director of Selective Service for the Fiscal Year 1965* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 18.

[10] Speech, May 27, 1966, reported in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 112, pt. 9, p. 11710.

Many people feel that the high rate of rejections on both physical and mental grounds is indefensible in time of war or peace. We may have a social responsibility to educate and train these young people for military service (at least in a support function) and to prepare them for a fruitful life afterwards.

One possible solution to the problem is that the Department of Defense lower the physical and mental standards to a more reasonable level. Thus, the available pool would be increased, even though this might compound the problem. Another result, however, whether desirable or not, is that this would probably make it unnecessary to draft students, even under limited war circumstances.

General Hershey has argued time after time that such a policy should be adopted, qualifying his agreement with the stipulation that the additional expense of this military service function should not be taken from Department of Defense budgetary allocations needed for maintenance of the defense posture.

Recently, the Department of Defense has embarked on a limited program of accepting recently rejected registrants. This program will serve as a basis for evaluating the existing physical and mental standards for induction.

THE SELECTION AND INDUCTION PROCESS

Basically, the present procedure is to call the oldest first, thus heightening the uncertainty element for a majority of the applicants. For a number of reasons, many people are now advocating calling the youngest first. As Harold Wool, Director for Procurement Policy in the Department of Defense, said in his speech at the Washington Conference on the Draft: "Military service is still a young man's job . . . The Department of Defense report therefore recommended that . . . the draft selection system be redesigned to assure that men are called to service, normally, at a younger and more preditable age. To decrease the inequities involved, some form of random selection could be used to pick those within the 1-A pool who are to serve." It should be noted that if the "youngest first" concept is accepted some form of random selection must be used. The size of the available manpower pool is increasing rapidly. In 1952, just over one million men reached age 18, in 1966 the number reached two million. Random selection under these circumstances appears essential.

THE STUDENT DEFERMENT QUESTION

Much of the criticism of the Selective Service System centers upon present student deferment policy. The argument against that policy is basically this: It defers those people who can afford higher education and who can remain in good standing while attending college or graduate school. As a result, the system drafts a disproportionately high number of economically deprived citizens, especially Negroes.[11] Hence, the present system is inequitable and undemocratic. Further, by receiving an occupational deferment, by continuing graduate study, or by acquiring dependents, the deferred student has more opportunity to reach age 26 without serving.

Several reservations can be made in connection with the argument presented. First, the universality of American higher education today makes questionable the notion that only a few can afford higher education. Low tuition rates at most public colleges, scholarships, work-study programs, loans and so forth make college available to almost all qualified students. Second, the national rejection rate of males which is almost 50 percent, chiefly from the lower strata of society, is evidence that many economically deprived young men do not serve. Third, General Hershey, in his testimony before the Armed Services Committee of the House of Representatives, indicated that the percentage of college men who serve in the armed forces is higher than the percentage of noncollege men. This statement was contradicted, however, by Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, Thomas D. Morris, in his resumé of the Department of Defense study of the draft before the House Armed Services Committee on June 30, 1966. Secretary Morris said, "our analysis of Selective Service records of men reaching age 26 as of June 1964 revealed that only 40 per cent of college graduates had served, compared to 60 per cent of college dropouts, 57 per cent of the high school graduates, and 50 per cent of non-high school graduates."

With regard to deferment, one can observe that, first, inequities will be present in any draft system—at least until such time as all, rather than just some, men are needed. Second, an attempt to correct or change one inequity could well create others or could lead to problems that would affect the economy of the nation. Third, the armed forces look to civilian colleges for 90 percent of their new officers. Fourth, the need for an educated citizenry has never been denied. It is in fact essential to the future of our nation. Finally, and most important, the decision made concerning deferments should not be made with only a Vietnam situation in mind. The decision must provide the flexibility necessary under a more complicated wartime situation. Certainly deferments would be necessary to provide continuity in a post war situation. Thus any decision abandoning deferments, would be shortsighted.

The argument against student deferment, then, is not as strong as it might at first appear to be. But it is difficult to defend a position which would seem to favor establishing in our nation an elite based on intellectual economic capacity.

General Hershey has been the most outspoken advocate for continuing the deferment system; that has, indeed, been the most clearly consistent theme in all his recent public pronouncements and it is the basis for the concept of channeling mentioned earlier. In his opening statement before the House Armed Services Committee, General Hershey said, "If the nation needs those who are trained, it should be prepared to defer them when the needs of the armed forces permit."

The example that General Hershey most often uses when talking about allocation of manpower is the education of doctors, and he feels it is wise to approach the allocation question with the best judgments we can muster rather than haphazardly. He has said, "I believe that virtually every student who seriously pursues training to become a physician be deferred to do so. The objections to relying on chance rather than on judgment in the matter of selection—which are obvious in the case of physicians—apply to any category of registrants which might from time to time have some basis for being deferred in the national interest."

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE?

To eliminate some of the deferment problems, the Selective Service System's regulations and the interpretation of those regulations should be increasingly standardized—but without abandoning the concept of the local boards' discretion—or the law should be modified so that agency guidelines and Presidential Executive Orders are made mandatory rather than merely advisory. Then the portions on deferment in the Selective Service Act would be more clearly understood and less open to criticism. Furthermore, the argument for deferments would be supported if the leading American educators who believe in their necessity spoke out more forcefully in favor of them.

In general, the current law's effect on education is well known. Many persons vigorously protest the war in Vietnam and the participation of colleges and universities in the deferment process. The modifications of the current law suggested here would nullify most of that criticism. Higher education would not be adversely affected by these modifications.

To sum up, Universal Military Training, a Voluntary Army, and a program of National Service do not seem to be reasonable alternatives to the present system at this time. It is to be hoped that, through modifications in the areas of national standards, channeling, physical and mental standards, the selection process, deferments, and some system of random selection lottery, the current law will provide the manpower necessary to see the nation through this period of limited war. Major modifications of the processes of manpower selection must await a more propitious time.

(In a paper presented at the National Conference on Curricular and Instructional Innovation, held at Michigan State University last November, Russell M. Cooper broadly summarizes the measures by which institutions of higher education are adapting to society's changing demands, while attempting to maintain traditional academic values. Dr. Cooper is Dean of the College of Liberal Arts at The University of South Florida.)

THE WAR ON POVERTY AND A FEDERALLY SUBSIDIZED PRESS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the writer of the Book of Ecclesiastes were living today, he could not say there is nothing new under the sun.

This observation is provoked by the demonstration project plan and supporting data for a community action news demonstration project submitted by WAMY, a community action group operating in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey in North Carolina.

By this demonstration project plan, this agency of the war on poverty asks the Office of Economic Opportunity for a Federal grant of $179,070 to operate a weekly newspaper and radio broadcast system in these four North Carolina counties.

This plan is submitted by WAMY to OEO notwithstanding the fact that five newspapers established by free enterprisers are now being published in these four counties, and three radio stations established by free enterprisers are now being operated in these four counties.

In fairness to the board of directors and staff members of WAMY, I wish to note that available information indicates that this plan did not originate with North Carolinians, but was in a very real sense imposed upon them by OEO. I make this deduction on the basis of a statement made to the directors of the agency by a staff member who is quoted as having said:

> If we had our choice we would spend the money on job training. But we have no choice in the matter. If we don't want the com-

---

[11] As was stated earlier, the Negro induction rate is about 11 percent—roughly proportionate to the Negro segment of the population.

munications project, some other area will get it.

This quotation indicates that some of those in the Office of Economic Opportunity use the threat of withholding of Federal tax moneys to coerce local people engaged in carrying out the war on poverty to bow to their will even in cases involving the submission by such local people to the OEO of fantastic projects such as that now under consideration.

By way of justification for the plan, its formulators, whoever they may be, assert in substance that they have spent 2 frustrating years attempting with small success to create a group spirit conforming to their ideas among the people of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, and that the distribution of a free newspaper and a free radio broadcast to the people of these four North Carolina counties is necessary if these people are to be brainwashed into an acceptance of the ideas of the formulators of the plan.

The formulators also assert that the people of these four counties are "relatively ignorant", that they listen to "bigoted" ministers of the gospel, and that they must be brainwashed by a federally supported newspaper and a federally subsidized radio program if they are to be remade in the images of the formulators of the plan. The plan as submitted contemplates that the federally supported newspaper and the federally subsidized radio broadcast are to compete with the existing free enterprises in the communications field in these counties.

In addition, they declare that the plan contemplates that the federally supported newspaper and federally subsidized radio broadcast will give to the people of these four counties additional information concerning political parties and other things which will organize such people to the point where they realize their needs and will work in concert to have the agency fulfill them.

I do not like to discourage the formulators of this plan. I will nevertheless make the assertion that they are not likely to succeed in their effort to remake the people of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey in their images. These people are neighbors of mine, and are well-known and much-loved by me. They are, thank God, fine Americans, who have strong minds, great hearts, and true faiths.

The proposal that more than $179,000 of Federal tax money should be used to establish a federally supported newspaper and federally subsidized radio broadcast to carry propaganda manufactured by persons engaged in carrying out programs of the Federal Government is not only totally incompatible with the free enterprise system, but it is also totally incompatible with the fundamental principle upon which a free press and a free radio rest.

As the Supreme Court of the United States declared in Grosjean against The American Press Co.:

> A free press stands as one of the great interpreters between the government and the people. To allow it to be fettered is to fetter ourselves.

When the press is supported or subsidized by Federal funds, it is disabled to perform its rightful function as a great interpreter between the Government and the people. This is so because the press is no longer free. On the contrary, it is enslaved and the enslavement of the press will inevitably be followed by the enslavement of the people.

As James Madison said, we must resist the first experiment upon our liberty. With this end in view, I have called upon the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity to disapprove this project plan to establish a federally supported newspaper and federally subsidized radio broadcast in North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the demonstration project plan which appeared in the Tri-County News of Spruce Pine, N.C., on May 4, 1967, and the attached newspaper articles and editorials relating to such plan be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Spruce Pine (N.C.) Tri-County News, May 4, 1967]

Demonstration Project Plan and Supporting Data for a Community Action News Demonstration Project in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey Counties, N.C.

A. PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED

This project is intended to help solve the problems of some 30,000 men, women and children who exist on family incomes of $3,000 per year. These people are scattered across 1,100 square miles of mountainous, wooded countryside on tiny farms and in small, isolated settlements, in the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey in western North Carolina. Almost without exception these people are the direct descendants of pioneers of the early 1800's with a long history of subsistence farming and foraging, untouched by prosperity down to the present day.

(See "Background Paper on Operation of W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc.," in Part II, Supporting Data, for more details on the history and characteristics of the low-income population.)

The central characteristic of the low-income population as far as this project is concerned is their historic and continuing physical, social and psychological isolation not only from the world at large, but from each other. From the earliest days of settlement, the families and small clusters of families whose descendants make up the local poor have remained established in isolated homes or tiny settlements. Lack of good roads and lack of money to buy vehicles and telephones have maintained the physical factor in isolation.

The low-income people have developed psychological characteristics consistent with their physical isolation. They are relatively ignorant of the outside world, and even of persons and events only a few miles from their homes. They find it extremely difficult to cope with other people and are generally reserved and distrustful of strangers. Their capacities for group feeling and group endeavor have not been developed. Their history shows few examples of cooperative endeavor. Their only significant tradition of group participation, passive at that, is in their church congregations, but these congregations are many and small, many led by lay preachers who continue to promote a tradition of bigoted separatism. Their "Communities" are in many cases not communities at all, but merely clusters of interrelated families, fractured by generations-old feuds stemming from personal hurts and differences of religious belief, maintained in physical proximity only by the formidable obstacles of establishing livelihoods elsewhere.

The physical and psychological situation of these people makes it difficult to achieve two major objectives of the war on poverty: (1) achievement of effective community organization, and (2) improvement of social services.

The applicant CAA has spent two frustrating years attempting, with small success, to create the group spirit, the feeling of self-confidence and self-importance, the hope and the aspiration that individuals must have before concerted community effort for improvement is possible.

The CAA has also expended a great deal of effort attempting to increase the services received and available to the poor from the CAA and non-CAA agencies. It has attempted this through three general approaches: 1) Informing the poor individual of the availability of services, exhorting him to use these services, and facilitating his use of them through the provision of transportation, 2) exhorting the agencies to expand their useful services and extend them to the poor, and 3) organizing the poor to the point where they realize a concensus of their needs and will work in concert to have the agencies fulfill them. Despite a great deal of manpower devoted to these efforts, the agency services available are underused, and local agencies remain underfinanced through lack of pressure on the bodies responsible for financing them.

A list of specific problems to be addressed in this Project are implied in the specific hypotheses set out in the following section.

B. IDENTIFICATION OF HYPOTHESES

It is hypothesized that a project such as the one herein proposed for financing shall demonstrate the effectiveness of such projects in achieving the objectives listed below, all of which are either intrinsically desirable or instrumental to the elimination of poverty.

1. Creating, among the poor, a greater awareness of the fact that their predicaments, problems, hopes and aspirations are shared by many other individuals and communities across the four-county area, and thus helping create the feeling of identity necessary to concerted effort for improvement. This awareness would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimonials of low-income people.

2. Creating, among the poor, a greater feeling of familiarity with people and places in the area beyond their immediate settlement, and thus helping develop attitudes conducive to cooperation across wide areas. This feeling of familiarity would be achieved through the broadcast and published testimony of low-income people.

3. Strengthening, among low-income individuals and communities, the feelings of self-significance and importance that will arm them for the task of coping with the systems and institutions that they should utilize for their advancement. The poor will be assisted to this end through the experiences of being interviewed, broadcast, and quoted in print.

4. Establishing the belief, among the poor, that efforts at self-improvement by individuals and communities are commendable, and that such efforts can actually be successful. This objective will be achieved through recognition and praise, in print and on the air, of individuals and communities that have been successful.

5. Improving the poor's awareness of, interest in, familiarity with and demand for the opportunities provided through the CAA and through other social agencies. These ob-

jectives will be achieved through announcements of services and opportunities, and through the printed and broadcast testimony of low-income persons who have benefited from these opportunities.

6. Causing the existing social agencies, including the CAA, to concern themselves with the quality of execution of their programs and to be attentive to the preferences of the poor in the administration of their programs. These results would seem to follow if the poor are allowed to speak their minds on the air and in print.

7. Increasing the understanding, on the part of the middle-class, of the nature and problems of the poor and the utility of services provided by social agencies, an understanding critical to developing the necessary local support for anti-poverty efforts. This will be achieved through the middle-class' exposure to the radio broadcasts and occasional reading of the weekly newspaper.

C. METHODS, PROGRAM TECHNIQUES, WORK PLAN AND TIMETABLE

1. Introduction

The aims of this Project will be carried out through two vehicles: 1) a four-county-wide weekly newspaper and 2) a radio program development and broadcasting system. The two vehicles will be directed and coordinated by a single Project Director, who will edit the newspaper and generally supervise the work of the Broadcast Development Staff. The Project Director will report to a Board of Directors composed of 8 low-income and 5 non-low-income persons who will set general and editorial policy for the newspaper and for radio broadcasts.

The weekly newspaper will be staffed, with the exception of the editor, with local low-income people, who will act as reporters and assistant editors. The paper will be directed at the low-income readership, and will be distributed by mail, free to all families in the four counties whose incomes fall below the OEO poverty-level. The newspaper will be printed by a local commercial printer.

The radio system will have two (2) professional staffers (Broadcast Developers) in addition to the Project Director, and the remaining four (4) people on the staff will be drawn from the local low-income population. The radio system staff, to be equipped with mobile recording vans, will travel throughout the low-income community taping programs for broadcast over the commercial stations that serve the area. The staff will also accept announcements and programs of interest and service to low-income people from the local CAA and from other public agencies.

2. The weekly newspaper

The weekly newspaper will be the most conventional of the information techniques to be demonstrated, in that the techniques of writing and printing a paper of this type are well known, although little used by the commercial press. The first, and most essential feature of the newspaper will be saturation circulation among the poverty-level residents of the four county area. This will be achieved by mailing the paper to all poor residents at no charge. Extensive mailing lists are presently available from the Community Action Agency files, and the Community Action field workers will be mobilized to add to the list as rapidly as possible. The twenty community "stringers" will also contribute to the mailing list. In its initial months of operation the paper will also hand distribute copies to community centers, schools and country stores, and will solicit readers to subscribe for themselves and their friends through subscription blanks which will be printed as a regular feature of the paper. It is expected that the newspaper can build to mailed circulation among almost all of the approximately 8,000 poverty-level families of the area within three months after it starts publication.

Although the paper will be circulated free-of-charge to its subscribers, the addressed, mailing method of circulation will prevent the paper from taking on the characteristics of a throwaway sheet. The positive impact on the poor of receiving a publication each week addressed to them and directed toward them will be far greater than the negative impact of receiving a free publication.

The newspaper will be supervised by one professional journalist, who will also be director of the entire Community Action News project. The editor will continually provide in-service training and supervision for his newspaper staff of three full-time assistants and twenty community stringers, but the great majority of the writing and editing will be done by indigenous personnel. The editor will constantly strive to teach effective communication through the language of the poor.

The paper will constantly try to balance its dual functions of providing information about services and opportunities, and of printing the "news" of the smaller communities and the larger county and area community.

The Informational content will include facts on how to get services, "how-to" columns on home management, child care, home repairs, discussions of legal problems, "citizen's advice column" (answers to any questions submitted by readers), man-on-the-street interviews on specific questions, a column where readers can directly request services from agencies, information on voter registration and the organization of all local political parties, information about the various CAA programs and other information features as the need arises.

The news content of the paper will include coverage of activities in various communities as reported by the community stringers, news of local government, the news of the CAA, discussions of legislation that affects the poor, school news, births, deaths and marriages, hospital notes, schedules of all events that affect the poor, and articles of general interest that are solicited and purchased from the poor.

Feature articles will focus on extensive coverage of activities in one community that have informational and educational value for other communities. Features will also spotlight new services or new uses of existing services, and occasional issues of the papers will devote extensive space to in-depth coverage of one problem that affects large numbers of the poverty-level residents of the area.

Miscellaneous features of the paper will include the active solicitation of letters to the editor, free want-ads for low income readers, and suggestions on how the CAA or the newspaper could serve the area better.

Editorials will be signed by the writer in most cases, and will reflect only his opinions. Unsigned editorials which reflect general opinions and policies of the paper will have prior approval of the executive committee of the Corporation's Board of Directors unless the Board delegates this authority to the editor.

The presentation of the paper's content will be almost as important as the content itself. The paper will be an eight-page tabloid and will feature a large body type—10 and 12 point—and will emphasize the actions, pictures and names of its readers. Each of the staff members will use a Polaroid camera, and will be encouraged to take pictures whether they are printed or not, as many pictures will be needed for the bulletin boards which are described later in this proposal.

Layout will play a vital role in attracting readers. The paper must look both professional, and different. Many stories will be told mainly with pictures and headline-size sentences. Modern advertising techniques will be applied to the paper's layout to make it highly readable and attention-worthy, and some items—such as announcements of meetings and new programs or services—will be presented in the form of simulated advertisements. This type of layout philosophy is so totally foreign to area printers, that it is essential to the paper's success that all make-up be done by the paper's staff and delivered to the printer as completed dummies, ready for the production of offset printing plates. The operation of typesetting equipment and the production of completed dummies at the paper itself will also provide valuable training for low-income personnel in journalistic skills that are in critically short supply in rural areas.

This combination of public information and local news, attractive and readable presentation, and saturation circulation among the poor in the area, will reinforce the organizational efforts of the poor in a way that the conventional press has never attempted to do in this area. A noted communications expert from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, speaking to a statewide meeting of CAA directors, commented that one of the greatest effects of mass media is to reinforce the attitudes and activities of those persons and groups whose efforts are reported in the media. The content of the weekly newspaper will seek not only to reinforce community activities by reporting their news, but also to further organization and improvement efforts by providing the informational tools needed for advancement.

Each community correspondent will, in addition to his other duties, be assigned two bulletin boards that will be erected by Neighborhood Youth Corps crews at centers of community activity. These bulletin boards will carry announcements of community activities and pictures of community residents involved in CAA programs or other community self-help projects. Mimeographed materials for the bulletin boards will be produced at the newspaper office on community action subjects of interest to several communities or pertaining to the entire four-county area. County coordinators of the CAA will use the bulletin boards and help the community correspondents in keeping up-to-date materials posted on the displays. The public information staff of the North Carolina Fund has agreed to assist in the production of printed materials for the bulletin boards and to assist in developing new methods of using the displays as communications vehicles.

As the poor begin to become involved in the newspaper, and begin to respond by writing letters, asking questions and voicing complaints, the paper will serve as an important information gathering vehicle for use of the CAA. A staff member of the Human Resources Planning project—funded under a demonstration grant—will serve on the paper's Board of Directors.

One of his delegated functions will be to coordinate the planning program with the paper, and to use the newspaper's information as an indicator of how well existing CAA programs are matching the needs of the poor.

At least one Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee will be assigned to the paper's staff to search its columns for possible referrals to the public agency personnel. The CAA's public information worker will also scan the paper for articles suitable for reprint in the country weeklies and in the daily press outside the area, so as to further reinforce the activities of the poor and to strengthen the communication links between the poor and the middle class. The CAA's OJT Coordinator will try to place members of the paper's staff in permanent jobs with the conventional media in the area, so as to open training opportunities on the paper to other low-income residents.

Preliminary training for newspaper personnel will be directed by the editor with the help of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina fund, which has offered its full cooperation in assisting with preliminary and in-service training. The most important training, however, will be conducted by the editor in his day-to-day supervision of the production of the paper, and in regularly scheduled in-service training sessions which he will supervise.

The editor is the logical person to supervise the entire project because of his wide contacts with the four-county area through his full and part-time newspaper staff of 23 persons. From his position he will be able to schedule and coordinate the radio units so that their work closely follows the patterns of events among the poverty-level residents of the area. Although the mobile units will attempt to cover every area of the four counties during each six weeks of their operation, it is essential to the success of the radio operation that the mobile units appear "where the action is."

3. Radio system

The radio portion of the project is more experimental in nature than the newspaper. Public information and participation projects over a long-term period using the radio medium as described in this proposal are an extreme rarity in conventional broadcasting. The techniques are used somewhat in educational FM broadcasting, but these stations reach mainly the middle and upper class audiences which own FM receivers.

The radio project will be centered in two mobile recording vans with equipment capable of producing almost any kind of radio program. Each of the vans will operate in two of the four counties and will be loosely assigned to the commercial station which broadcasts in those counties. Most of the programming produced, however, will be appropriate for broadcast on either station and will be used on both stations.

There is a possibility that a third commercial radio station will become operational in the southernmost county of the four county tier during the period of the demonstration grant, but programming for this station will consist mainly of duplication of programs produced for the two stations now in existence. This third station will add significantly to the primary coverage area of the radio programming, bringing the coverage area from 85 to approximately 95 per cent of the four county target area.

Each of the mobile units will travel to a different community each day, recording for broadcast at the community center in sight of the people, interviewing participants in work projects or CAA programs, plugging community activities, soliciting man-in-the-street interviews and questions for the citizens' advice bureau, recording the discussion and debate at community meetings, and generally allowing people to express themselves through talk or musical performances.

From each recording session in a community will come the program material for a day's broadcasting. Questions asked by the community people will be answered on five minute radio spots. The questioner will be told at the interview when the answer to his question will be broadcast. Longer interviews, discussions, and musical performances will be broadcast on two fifteen minute segments or one thirty minute program daily on each station.

Because of the geographical characteristics of the area, it is expected that each recording team will spend at least one night a week in the northeast and southwest ends of the four counties in order to cut down on time wasted in travel, and to insure that the entire four-county area is covered thoroughly and equally.

At each recording stop, the Friendly Home Visitor (non-professional CAA health caseworker) for that area will accompany the van to take referrals. One of the jobs of the Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollee apprentice assigned to the van will be to take duplicate referrals to assure the delivery of services.

Other five-minute spots and occasional longer programs will be recorded by the broadcast developers from information gathered from public agency personnel, including the CAA. Homemakers from the Agricultural Extension Service and group workers from the CAA will provide information for shows on the preparation of commodity foods, other recipes, sewing hints and child care. CAA horticulturalists working with the Agricultural Extension Service, a delegate agency, will provide farm information. The Citizen Education Specialists of the CAA, who is a lawyer, will provide information for a legal advice program, and for programs dealing with county government and voter information. The public information worker of the CAA will provide information about CAA programs on both the county and four-county level. Most of the service information spots for one week can be recorded and edited for broadcast in an intensive half-day's work, thereby allowing the broadcast developers and their assistants to spend most of their recording time in the field.

Two of the essential elements in producing successful radio programs will be the development of attractive program formats and the compilation of extensive information files that can be used to answer questions asked in the field and to make effective referrals. Some trial and error work is anticipated in the development of suitable formats. The two radio stations involved have offered to assist in developing formats and in measuring their success. The CAA personnel and the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund will assist in providing information on service delivery and citizen education. It is expected that about three months will be required to build up to the desired programing production level of an hour a day for each station.

Programing will be presented on a combination of public service and commercial air time. Radio station WATA in Boone has offered the use of five minutes of public service time daily. Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine has offered the use of fifteen minutes of public service air time daily. The owner of WTOE also indicated that attractive public service programs could be sold to commercial sponsors, thereby freeing budgeted money for the purchase of additional air time. Since the project will not be dependent on commercial sponsors for support, however, there is no possibility that commercial sponsors could influence program content. Commercial sponsorship could be an effective tool for involving part of the business community in the war on poverty, but the appropriateness of spending federal money for the development of programs which might be sponsored by commercial sponsors is a matter for decision by the funding agency. Other public service programs produced by public agencies are sponsored, and FCC regulations do not differentiate between public service time that is given free and that which is sold to sponsors.

The medium of radio by its very nature provides little opportunity for censorship, as previewing of recorded material is a costly and time-consuming job. All programs will be strictly non-partisan, as required by OEO regulations and federal statutes, and the radio station owners have agreed that only partisan programs or serious breaches of libel law and good taste will be considered grounds for cancellation of program contracts.

Preliminary training for broadcast personnel will be conducted by the public information staff of the North Carolina Fund with the assistance of instructors at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, using the facilities of both institutions. Most of the training of the non-professional assistants will be conducted by the broadcast developers on the job.

The recording vans will provide physical support for community organizations, as well as public recognition. Each of the vans will carry a portable public address system that can be used either from the van or from inside a building. Other physical support equipment will be used to compare the effectiveness of various communications methods. One of the vans will carry video tape equipment that will be used to record parts of community meetings for replay in other communities. The equipment will also be used for the production of short training tapes on subjects such as: how to run a meeting, how to plan a community budget, and other subjects of interest to community organizations.

The other van will carry movie projection equipment capable of projecting films through a screen suspended from the rear of the van in daylight, and that can be used in the normal manner in a darkened building. Several existing films on community organization and service delivery will be carried as part of the van's equipment, and its crew will use a 16mm movie camera for the production of short films about local communities and for the production of news films for area television stations.

4. Financial administration

A public accountant in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to manage the financial affairs of the corporation on a contract basis. The accountant will set up the books of the corporation according to existing guidelines of the Office of Economic Opportunity. He will train and supervise the clerical staff of the corporation in bookkeeping, make all financial reports, and close the books of the project preparatory to final audit.

5. Timetable

The Community Action News Project will begin operation within five weeks after confirmation of receipt of the Demonstration grant. The project will build up to full circulation and full broadcast time within three months after it begins operation. This timetable is illustrated in the table below:

Process—Time subsequent to confirmation of demonstration grant

[In weeks]

	1	2	3	4	5	6					17
Formation of board and incorporation of community action news	X										
Hiring and orientation of personnel	X	X	X	X							
Training of nonprofessional staff	X	X	X	X	X						
Process of building to full newspaper circulation and target radio broadcast level						X	X	X	X	X	X

D. ORGANIZATION

1. Governing body

An independent, private, non-profit corporation shall be formed to carry out the Community Action News Project.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall manage the establishment of the corporation. When the initial directors of the corporation have been selected and have assembled, elected officers, written Articles of Incorporation, written By-Laws, and received a corporate charter from the State of North Carolina, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall, with the concurrence of OEO, delegate the Project to this new Corporation.

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., shall ensure that the composition of the governing body, and the by-laws of the corporation shall be consistent with the intent of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The governing body of the corporation shall be constituted as follows:

a. One representative of the local press to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors with the concurrence of the press.

b. A representative from one of the two local radio stations to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors, with the concurrence of the stations' owners.

c. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Community Action staff to be chosen by the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors.

d. A representative from Appalachian State Teachers College to be chosen by the College.

e. A representative of the W.A.M.Y. Board of Directors to be chosen by that Board.

f. Eight representatives of the poor, two from each county, to be selected by the Community Development Councils in each county.[1] Only persons with incomes below the poverty line shall be considered qualified representatives of the poor.

2. Operating organization

Subject to the corporate By-Laws and policies to be established by the Board of Directors, and subject to the Board's regular review, the authority for the operation of the project shall be delegated to the Project Director. The Project Director shall be responsible for carrying out the work program described under section "D" of this application. Individual staff positions and duties are described below.

a. Senior Personnel.

(1) *Project Director*—The project director shall directly supervise the weekly newspaper and train low-income personnel in its production. He shall provide overall supervision and staff direction for the entire Community Action News project.

(2) *Broadcast Developers*—(2) The broadcast developers shall develop suitable program formats, and shall assemble, write, edit, and record in the field, materials to fit the program format. They shall arrange recording and broadcast schedules under the supervision of the project director. They shall train their low-income assistants in the operation of recording equipment and in the techniques of radio production and broadcasting, and supervise their work in the field.

b. Junior Personnel—Broadcast

(1) *Technical Assistants*—(2)—These personnel shall directly assist the Broadcast Developers. They shall learn and use the skills necessary to operate recording and audio-visual equipment, and shall learn and use the techniques of radio production and announcing.

(2) *Apprentices*—(2)—The apprentices shall work as trainees with each Broadcast Developer and his assistant, and shall have the specific job of monitoring recording sessions and noting requests for services or information indicating the need for services, and referring this information to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

c. Junior Personnel—Newspaper

(1) *Assistant Editor*—The assistant editor shall learn and use the techniques of assembling and editing copy, planning layouts and writing headlines, and producing make-up dummies for offset printing.

(2) *Reporters*—(2)—The reporters shall learn and use the techniques of news writing and photography, including the various skills necessary for investigative and government reporting, human interest writing, and the production of comprehensive feature stories.

(3) *Clerical*—(2)—The clerical personnel shall learn and use the techniques and skills necessary for efficient secretarial work. One clerical person shall also be trained to operate Justowriter typesetting equipment and the other clerical person shall be trained in bookkeeping and proofreading.

(4) *Correspondents*—(20)—Twenty local low-income persons shall be trained to accurately judge and report the news of their local communities.

(5) *Apprentices*—One or more Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall be assigned to the newspaper to work as trainees with the full-time personnel. Apprentices shall have the specific job of scanning the news pages and noting requests for services or information which indicates the need for services, and referring this information on to the personnel of the CAA and other public agencies.

E. RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR THE PROJECT

1. Expense items

a. Project Staff

The applicant has no particular individuals in mind for staffing the project at this time, but is confident that qualified personnel can be recruited for the professional and non-professional positions on the Project staff at the salaries indicated in the enclosed Budget.

b. Project Equipment and Supplies

The applicant believes that the equipment and supplies listed in the Budget can be obtained at the costs indicated without undue delay.

c. Contract services:

(1) Press: The publisher of the Avery Journal in Newland, North Carolina, has agreed to print the weekly newspaper.

(2) Radio:

(a) Radio station WATA in Boone, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 5 minutes daily as public service time.

(b) Radio station WTOE in Spruce Pine, North Carolina, has agreed to carry Project broadcasts at its standard commercial rates, as well as to contribute 15 minutes daily as public service time.

(c) The above two stations' signals reach practically all points in the 4-county area served by the CAA which will coordinate with the project, W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., (see Exhibits *B* and *C* in the supporting materials for an illustration of geographic coverage of these radio stations).

Although no data on listening habits are available, a 1965 survey by the North Carolina Fund revealed that out of a random sample of roughly 8% of the low-income families in the four-county area, 80% owned radios.*

Financial Administration and Training

A public accountant in Boone, N.C., Mr. Jack Williams, has agreed to handle the bookkeeping and accounting affairs of the corporation and train project personnel in any bookkeeping necessary on a contract basis if requested. The agreement with Mr. Williams is, of course, subject to the approval of the Corporation upon its establishment.

2. Non-expense items

a. Technical Assistance

(1) The University of North Carolina: The Chairman of the Department of Radio, Television, and Motion Pictures of the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Wesley H. Wallace, has offered the use of his department's radio facilities for the training of broadcast staff.

(2) The North Carolina Fund: The director of the Public Information staff of the North Carolina Fund, Billy E. Barnes, has offered the full use of his staff and facilities for training of newspaper and broadcast personnel, (including on-the-job training). The Fund also offers the use of citizen education programs, which it continues to develop for use with low-income persons.

b. Supportive and Coordinating Services: W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc., offers the full cooperation of its staff in the following ways:

(1) Field Staff: W.A.M.Y. and its delegate agencies field over 12 full-time contact workers in each county. These workers will assist the project in completing referrals, arranging programs, providing "feedback" on the impact of the project, and in compiling mailing lists for the weekly newspaper.

(2) Professional Staff: The professional staff will assist the project in preparing service information programs and columns.

(3) Planning Staff: The planning staff will assist in any evaluation of the project, as well as to provide information on resources available to individuals and communities from all sources.

(4) Public Information Staff: The public information staff will provide regular information on current W.A.M.Y. programs, as well as presentations prepared by its Citizen Education Specialist.

(5) Neighborhood Youth Corps: The W.A.M.Y Neighborhood Youth Corps project will help select and will pay enrollees who will work as apprentices in the Broadcasting Project, and will provide these with supporting services in the form of general education and counseling.

F. PHYSICAL FACILITIES REQUIRED

Approximately 3,000 square feet of indoor floor space will be required for the Project's housing. This space would provide office space for newspaper personnel and the Broadcast Developers, and for a composition room, make-up room, project room and sound editing room. Some expense (as indicated in the Budget) will have to be taken to convert floor space into specialized work areas, but the labor of Neighborhood Youth Corps enrollees shall reduce the cost of renovations. No difficulty is anticipated in finding the necessary space.

G. EVALUATION PROCEDURE

Evaluation arrangements for this project will be left to the discretion of the Office of Economic Opportunity. The staff of W.A.M.Y. Community Action shall be made available to assist in evaluation upon request.

H. RELATED ACTIVITIES OF THE APPLICANT

W.A.M.Y. Community Action, Inc. has been operating anti-poverty programs since June of 1965. It is currently operating nine (9) year-round CAP components, a Neighborhood Youth Corps operation (in-school and out-of-school), an On-the-Job Training Project. It has recently begun operation of Human Resources Planning Project under a Demonstration Grant from OEO. (A copy of a Community Action Program Status Report, enclosed under Part II, Supporting Data, provides some detail on W.A.M.Y.'s CAP operations).

I. QUALIFICATIONS OF PERSONNEL

1. Senior personnel

a. Project Director-Editor: The editor shall have an AB degree in journalism or equivalent work experience, and shall have at least two years' experience as editor of a weekly newspaper. He shall also have had experience in and understanding of radio broadcasting techniques.

b. Broadcast Developers: The two broadcast developers shall have BS degrees or equivalent work experience in radio production and electronics, and shall have at least two years' experience in radio productions and announcing, and extensive experience in field recording.

---

[1] The County Community Development Councils are made up of representatives of most of the communities in each county.

* *A Survey of Low-Income Families*, The North Carolina Fund, Durham, North Carolina. (Data not yet published.)

2. *Junior personnel*

Junior personnel shall have the talents necessary for training in their various jobs. They shall be hired by the project director from local applicants with incomes below the poverty level.

PROPOSED BUDGET, COMMUNITY ACTION NEWS DEMONSTRATION PROJECT, MAY 1, 1967–APRIL 30, 1968—GRANT PERIOD

Funds requested from OEO

A. Personnel:	
1 Project director-editor ($834 per month)	$10,000
2 Broadcast developers ($708 per month)	17,000
1 Assistant Editor ($375 per month)	4,500
2 Reporters ($375 per month)	9,000
2 Technical assistants ($375 per month)	9,000
2 Clerical ($333 per month)	8,000
20 Correspondents (one-fourth time) ($65 per month)	15,600
8 percent benefits	4,600
Accounting (see attachment)	3,000
Subtotal	80,700
B. Training (not applicable)	-------
C. Permanent equipment (see attachment)	38,911
D. Consumable supplies (see attachment)	10,644
E. Travel (see attachment)	7,648
F. Miscellaneous expenses (see attachment)	41,167
Total	179,070

Item A

Public accountant to serve as financial officer of Community Action News on contract basis. Accountant will open and close books, pay for audit, train project personnel in bookkeeping and handle all financial transactions of corporation	$3,000

Item C

26 Polaroid cameras (at $125)	$3,250
1 Mimeograph (at $350)	350
1 Justowriter recorder (at $2,430)	2,430
1 Justowriter reproducer (at $3,245)	3,245
1 Justowriter headliner (at $825)	825
1 Ampex video tape recorder (at $3,000)	3,000
1 Bell & Howell 16-millimeter camera (at $350)	350
1 projection system (at $1,000)	1,000
2 RCA electronic lecterns (at $125)	250
2 mobile recording studios (see supplement) (at $8,969)	17,938
2 staff vehicles (at $1,900)	3,800
40 bulletin boards (at $30)	1,200
8 desks (at $77)	616
12 chairs (at $22)	264
3 filings cabinets (at $45)	135
1 adding machine (at $208)	208
2 tables (at $25)	50
Total	38,911

Item D

1,450 Polaroid film, at $2.10	$3,020
150 flashbulb packs, at $1.50	300
2 electric typewriters (rental), at $180	360
4 upright typewriters (rental), at $90	384
2 portable typewriters (rental), at $60	120
8 office supplies, at $180	1,440
4 cases Justowriter tape, at $25	100
50 hour video tapes, at $60	3,000
40 rolls 16 millimeter film, at $15	600
400 rolls recording tape, at $1.85	740
Miscellaneous audio expendable supplies	600
Total	10,664

Item E

Two staff cars, 11,000 miles each at $0.08	$1,760
Two vans, 75 miles per day, at $0.08	3,120
Out-of-area mileage, 3,600 miles, at $0.08	288
Per diem, out-of-area training, 8 persons, at $12 per day for 5 days	480
Per diem, 100 nights for 2 recording crews, at $10 per crew per night	2,000
Total	7,648

Item F

Commercial air time, radio station WATA:	
1,500 5-minute spots, at $3	$4,500
600 15-minute spots, at $8	4,800
Radio station WTOE:	
900 5-minute spots, at $3	2,700
600 15-minute spots, at $5	3,000
Printing, 8,000 copies per week, at $250	13,000
Postage, 8,000 copies per week, at $0.0125 per copy	5,200
Article purchase, two articles per week, at $5 per article	520
Insurance, four vehicles	332
Insurance, recording equipment	315
Physical plant, rental of 3,000 square feet, at $0.05 per square foot	1,800
Renovation	500
Utilities, at $75 per month	900
Telephone (previous experience)	1,800
Soundproofing, two vans, at $300	600
Equipment installation, two vans, at $400	800
Equipment maintenance, two vans, at $200	200
Total	41,167

Item C. Supplement

2 Ford parcel delivery chassis P-350 with insulated, walk-in body, 6 cylinder, 300 cubic inch, 170 horsepower engine, at $3,800	$7,600.00
2 Terado dual continental transistorized inverter, 600 watts, at $302.38	604.76
4 Ampex 602–4, full-track, 7.5 ips unmounted recorder, at $575	2,300.00
2 Crown SS801, full-track 7.5–15 ips, remote controlled master studio recorder, at $1,200	2,400.00
2 Sparta 815 mixing console with accessory amplifiers, at $650	1,300.00
2 Uher 4,000 report-L field tape recorder, at $440	880.00
2 RCA 77–DX studio microphone, at $251.50	503.00
2 Electro-Voice 666 field microphone, at $150	300.00
2 Rek-O-Kut B–12H 3-speed turntable, at $165	330.00
2 Rek-O-Kut S–320 tone arm for above, at $34.95	69.90
2 G.E. VR–II cartridge for above with replacement styli, at $24.95	49.90
Miscellaneous audio supplies and equipment	1,000.00
Furniture (chairs, table, lights, etc.)	600.00
Total	17,937.56

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, May 4, 1967]

ANTI-POVERTY UNIT ASKS $179,000, PLANS NEWSPAPER

BOONE.—A four-county anti-poverty agency headquartered here is seeking a federal grant to set up a government-supported weekly newspaper, it was made public Wednesday.

A separate corporation—with a board composed of poor people, representatives of Appalachian State Teachers College and commercial newspapers and radio stations—would control the new communications outlet.

Besides hiring a commercial printer to issue the newspaper, the project would also purchase time (an hour a day) on each of two radio stations, WATA in Boone and WTOE in Spruce Pine.

The objective of the project, which would cost $179,000, would be to give poor residents of isolated mountain sectors "a forum for expressing their opinions," a channel to learn of opportunities in employment, social and welfare services, educational and new anti-poverty programs, according to Bill Thomas, deputy director of the anti-poverty agency known as WAMY.

The agency, Community Action Inc. of Boone, serves four surrounding counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey.

Thomas said the project was suggested by the North Carolina Fund of Durham, which supports some anti-poverty programs. However, the NCF does not have money available for the newspaper and WAMY submitted a proposal to the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) in Washington April 12.

In Washington, OEO officials said the application is pending in the OEO's community services division.

Marshall H. Peck, OEO public affairs officer, said the Boone project—if okayed—would be the first of its kind under OEO funds. It would be a "demonstration" project and if successful, might be repeated elsewhere in the country.

Peck was asked whether it wouldn't be just as effective to distribute the advisory information to the poor via mimeographed newsletter which would cost considerably less than $179,000.

Peck replied that WAMY's application "will be examined on the basis of its presentation" and that one of the things to be considered is whether a newspaper format would be the best means of presentation.

A WAMY spokesman at Boone told The Citizen that the regular commercial daily press is not "doing the job" or reporting "local news of what's happening in the small communities."

And although some commercial weekly newspapers carry the news, said the WAMY official, "not enough people subscribe to them—some can't afford it, some are not interested and some can't read."

Thomas explained that the weekly government newspaper would be sent free via mail to some 8,000 low income families in the four counties.

The newspaper would carry no paid advertising, although it will use "simulated advertisements" to announce meetings and programs.

Thomas expressed a view that chances "may be slim" for getting the federal backing for the newspaper-radio project right away because of competition for OEO funds from big city anti-poverty offices seeking ways to stifle possible street violence this summer.

The corporation which would operate the newspaper and radio project would have a majority of poor persons sitting on its board of directors, according to Thomas. Other officials—college representatives from Boone and commercial news and radio figures—would round out the board.

The newspaper would be printed for a fee by the Avery County Journal at Newland. It would be staffed by 10 permanent personnel and 20 part-time correspondents, who'd be low income people "trained to judge accurately and report the news of their local communities." Heading the staff would be an editor (a professional journalist) at a salary of $10,000 annually.

Two professional radio people would also be hired to manage the radio aspects of the communications project.

Thomas said two mobile vans equipped with recording equipment and microphones would be sent into remote areas to interview people, get their view and expressions of their needs.

These programs would be aired later over the two commercial stations at Boone and Spruce Pine. WATA has offered to donate five minutes of air time free daily and WTOE would donate 15 minutes free daily to the anti-poverty project. The broadcasts, it was said, will also carry "success stories" of poverty level persons who improved their status, and similar programs.

The broadcast unit would train "low income assistants in the operation of recording equipment and the techniques of radio production and broadcasting and supervise their work in the field."

WAMY has allotted $15,000 for commercial broadcast time.

The weekly newspaper, according to WAMY's proposal, would print editorials signed by the writer and some unsigned editorials.

[From the News and Observer, May 6, 1967]

Anti Poverty Paper Plan Protested

Boone.—A proposed anti-poverty program project designed to reach low income residents of four mountain counties through a new weekly newspaper and daily radio broadcasts would not mean establishment of "America's Pravda," a proponent of the plan said Friday.

Bill Thomas, deputy director of a local anti-poverty group most generally known as WAMY (for Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey counties) denied the project would have any controls "at all" imposed by the federal government. He stressed the unique project would be controlled and run completely by local citizens.

Meanwhile, C. M. Ogle of Hendersonville, president, and J. D. Fitz, of Morganton, secretary of the North Carolina Press Association, have wired Dr. W. H. Plemmons, chairman of WAMY Community Action, that such a newspaper would be an "invasion" that would hurt private media.

The idea for the WAMY demonstration project, actually is several years old, he noted, originating with the North Carolina Fund of Durham, a private poverty fighting organization supported by grants from various foundations.

Last month, WAMY put the idea on paper in the form of a 16-page proposal to the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity in Washington, seeking $179,000 for the first year of operations as a "pilot project—the first of its type in the nation."

The Tri-County News, a weekly published at Spruce Pine, splashed the story over four pages this week and also editorialized against the idea.

The Asheville Citizen followed through with a news story Wednesday and an editorial Friday.

Under the WAMY plan, a 13-member board of trustees would be set up to control the newspaper and broadcast operations. The board would be composed of representatives of the poor, local commercial newspapers and radio stations and others.

The weekly would have a staff of four professional newsmen, including an editor making $10,000 a year. The broadcast operations would have four professional employes, including two "broadcast developers," each paid $8,500 a year. There also would be two secretaries for the combined operation.

The newspaper would have 20 "community correspondents," paid $65 a month and each furnished with a camera. All would be expected to devote "about one fourth of their working time" to the newspaper, Thomas said.

As conceived, the newspaper would be distributed free through the mails to about 8,000 residents in the four counties, where according to the 1960 census, 57 per cent of the families make $3,000 or less a year.

The newspaper would carry an unusually large number of pictures because many of the mountain residents are illiterate.

Daily hour-long broadcasts on WATA in Boone and WTOE in Spruce Pine would augment the service designed to generate interest in self-improvement and education among the poor, Thomas said.

Thomas contended many area residents now are unable to afford newspapers and many are uninterested in the commercial papers because they "do not generally speak" for the low income citizens. The WAMY proposed newspaper would contain no commercial advertising but announcements of community activities might be run in the form of ads, he said.

The $179,000 budget includes $40,000 in initial costs, including electric typewriters and various newspaper and broadcasting equipment.

It also calls for $15,000 a year to buy air time on the radio stations and $13,000 a year for printing the newspaper.

Thomas said suggestions to provide free subscriptions to existing newspapers or to mail mimeographed sheets which might serve the same purpose were turned down by the WAMY board of directors.

He predicted because the federal government "wants $20 million to keep the cities cool" this summer, the proposed demonstration project might be in trouble and funds which could have been allocated by OEO might be diverted to programs for cities. No announcement from Washington can be expected for several weeks, he said.

[From the Asheville (N.C.) Citizen, May 5, 1967]

Are Seeds Being Sown for America's Pravda?

Just when we've begun to hope that the anti-poverty program has sifted out some of the bugs and settled down, it comes up with a tom-fool idea that jolts our faith in its sanity.

Currently, up around Boone, it's planning to publish a government newspaper—to combat poverty.

The trouble is, the sponsors explain, "Although some commercial weekly newspapers carry the community news, not enough people subscribe to them—some can't afford it, some are not interested, and some can't read.

So, with an Office of Economic Opportunity grant of $179,000. Community Action, Inc. of Boone (which serves four surrounding counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell, and Yancey) proposes to publish a weekly newspaper and distribute it free, via mail, to everybody in the service area, including those who can't read.

Now you might conclude that because we publish a newspaper (unsubsidized) we're biased on this issue—and you'd be right. We're biased, shocked, aroused, opposed.

If the OEO can publish a weekly newspaper in Northwest North Carolina—and don't ever doubt that it will be sprinkled with government propaganda—Washington can eventually spread its newspaper network to cover the United States, including the daily field.

It can develop—gradually, insidiously—a federal press, financed by taxpayers' money and telling the American people only what it wants them to hear.

That is not likely? No, it is not likely. It is still possible.

That is the prime tactic of dictatorship, with a controlled press the main tool.

But this, you say, is just a little project up at Boone? Did you ever hear of a weekly newspaper, printed in a commercial shop, that had a full-time news staff of 10 and a part-time staff of 20?

No, what is about to happen in Northwest North Carolina—unless YOU stop it is—is a limited experiment in printed brainwash—a disguised attempt to insinuate the federal voice as a weekly Bible.

But it won't stop here. This is merely beginning.

[From the Morganton (N.C.) News-Herald, May 5, 1967]

Who Thought This One Up?

It's disturbing to read that the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity has been called on to support a newspaper and radio operation in a nearby four-county area in North Carolina.

The project is proposed by WAMY Community Action, Inc., headquarters at Boone, and serving—as the WAMY indicates—the counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey.

This antipoverty agency, which undoubtedly has come up with commendable job-creating projects as many community action groups have, is wading off over its head. This appraisal isn't prompted by the question of whose occupational ox is gored. It just happens that we know a little more about newspapering than some other subjects. Not much, but a little.

So when it is announced that the project would involve an eight-page tabloid newspaper to be published weekly, with both the newspaper and radio operation handled by a staff of 28—eight full-time and 20 part-time employees, our interest was aroused. It perked up considerably when it was noted that the total cost would be about $179,000 and that the editor would be paid $10,000 a year.

Skepticism was spurred by announcement that it "would be federally financed but would not be federally controlled," with the additional explanation that "a separate corporation would be set up under guidelines from WAMY."

The proposed weekly paper, we are told, would be mailed free to about 8,000 low income residents of the four counties, and one hour of broadcast time is planned daily over existing stations. The broadcast operation would involve two mobile units which would transmit through commercial stations at Boone and Spruce Pine.

This seems to be a hard, hard way to create jobs. The desire to build up newspaper readership in the so-called low income group is commendable. But with the sum of $179,000 (which doesn't include any printing equipment since the weekly would be printed under commercial contract) and with 28 persons who would be employed, person-to-person instruction on how to read a newspaper could be given to a lot of people, complete with free subscription to the existing county seat newspaper. This wouldn't be a hard lesson to teach, for example, with Bob Rivers' sprightly Watauga Democrat, a prize-winning weekly at Boone.

Developing an interest in newspaper reading is one thing, but having Uncle Sam foot the bill to publish a federally supported but not a federally controlled newspaper (that's what the man said) is something else again.

Perhaps the WAMY people thought they would allay any fears on the part of existing newspapers by making it clear that they would not accept any advertising. Why should they? With the Office of Economic Opportunity putting tax money into it, no revenue is needed. But the statement doesn't prevent concern. Starting with 8,000 free subscribers, a weekly tabloid produced by such a staff would beg to be read by everybody in the area. Soon there wouldn't be a high income or medium income family in the entire region as far as subscription lists are concerned. Then the frugal mountain people would begin to feel, "Why should I pay for the county seat paper when Uncle Sam sends this to me for nothing?" Even if that doesn't happen quite that way, present advertisers would begin to imagine that the government-financed paper is "taking over" the readers of the area and therefore the fine papers, which are good advertising media now, must somehow be losing subscribers and therefore it wouldn't pay to advertise as much as heretofore. The result: irreparable damage.

If the WAMY people want to create 28 jobs, they can find an easier way. Let them be farmed out to the established newspapers and radio stations for work and training which they envision in their proposed project. They will learn more in such on-the-job training than the community action staff could teach them, certainly if the teachers are as idealistic as the dreamy eggheads who thought up the project in the first place.

What worries us is who sold this "bill of goods" in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey counties, recognized as the home of highly individualistic mountain stock who don't want to be beholden to anybody, especially to federal bureaucrats and more especially Democratic ones.

If it can happen there, the WAMY may be ahead for all of us.

[From the Winston-Salem (N.C.) Journal, May 6, 1967]

Antipoverty Newspaper Is Opposed

Morganton.—The N.C. Press Association yesterday spoke out against a proposed government-supported newspaper and radio operation by an antipoverty agency in four Northwest North Carolina counties.

The project is proposed by WAMY Community Action, Inc., of Boone, an antipoverty agency in Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey counties. The agency receives support from the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Speaking for the press association were C. M. Ogle, president, and publisher of the Time News at Hendersonville; and F. D. Fitz, secretary, and editor of the Morganton News-Herald. They sent a telegram to Dr. William H. Plemmons, chairman of the four-county agency, saying the members of the press association are "deeply disturbed" about the proposal.

TEXT OF MESSAGE

"We believe present newspapers and radio stations serving your area," the message said, "are doing an adequate job and, in some cases, are widely recognized for their excellence.

"It is difficult to understand how a federally financed newspaper, no matter how lofty its motives, could be regarded as noncompetitive with existing efficient newspapers.

"It seems impossible to avoid eroding the readership, and therefore the revenue, of private news media. We, therefore, strongly oppose this invasion of the field of journalism, and we hope your group will take a second look at the adverse effect."

CLOSE LOOK

Fitz said later that the press organization plans to take a close look and "see what we can do to stop it." He said that recent attempts to get a similar project approved for the eastern part of the state were defeated.

Victor Wuamette, WAMY public relations representative, said the newspaper and radio operation would be handled by a staff of 28—eight full-time and 20 part-time. The newspaper editor would draw a salary of $10,000 a year.

Total cost of the project would be about $179,000.

Wuamette said the weekly eight-page newspaper would be mailed free to about 8,000 low income families of the four counties. One hour of broadcast time daily is planned.

The newspaper would not carry advertising, but would hire 20 correspondents. Waumette claimed the project would not compete with local and area newspapers and radio stations.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) News, May 10, 1967]

Appalachian Pravda?

The Office of Economic Opportunity-sponsored WAMY Community-Action Program—serving the four mountain counties of Watauga, Avery, Mitchell and Yancey—wants a grant from Washington to establish a poor folks' newspaper. It would cost $179,000 for the first year—enough to hire a sizeable staff and 20 "community correspondents." It would be designed to acquaint the rural folk of the Appalachian area with local news and job opportunities.

Possibly, the Asheville Citizen overreacted when it labeled this proposed federally-sponsored newspaper-radio operation an "American Pravda" and called it "a limited experiment in printed brainwash." Perhaps it would be, though in fairness it should be noted that the WAMY paper would be published by a board consisting of representatives of privately-owned newspapers and radio stations.

The federal government, like all governments, is already deeply in the public information business—in thousands of ways. Every government department has publications, some of them excellent. Every government department does a good bit of radio advertising, some of it most constructive. So the issue here is an issue of proportion and degree rather than principle.

We think the taxpayers whose funds would support such a venture agree that programs like the war on poverty should have adequate channels of communication and contact with those whom they serve. The sticking point is a subsidized press, which is a noxious and dangerous idea, whether it results from the secret shenanigans of the CIA or USIA, or from needless intrusions on the private press.

Northwestern North Carolina, fortunately, is not impoverished in respect of functioning newspapers. Boone, the focus of the WAMY project, is the home of the Watauga Democrat, a weekly newspaper that is a perennial prize winner in North Carolina Press Association contests. There are many other papers of merit either in, or within circulating range of, the four-county area.

The guiding principle here should be need. Could an OEO newspaper do more for the area than its many good newspapers are already doing? The case would be hard to make, we suspect. And we further suspect that the Office of Economic Opportunity could find more productive ways to spend $179,000—with more to follow.

SWORDS AND PLOWSHARES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague from South Dakota, Senator McGovern, has begun to awaken, as no one else, our realization that we no longer have vast surpluses of food. As the former Director of the food-for-peace program, he speaks with authority in pointing out that when we move into the next century, the world will have twice as many mouths to feed as now.

An excellent appraisal of what this means, in relation to our agricultural States, to U.S. foreign policy and the containment of communism, appears in the May 4 issue of the Intermountain, a newspaper published in Pocatello, Idaho. The article, written by Ben Goddard, sharply emphasizes that we would do well to heed the distinguished Senator's words.

I ask unanimous consent that it appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Swords and Plowshares

(By Ben Goddard)

Senator George McGovern of South Dakota tells us we have about twenty years to win what he calls the most important war in the history of this world . . . the war against hunger.

There has been so much talk over the past ten years about soil banks, price supports and food surpluses, he reports, that we have all but lulled ourselves to sleep. We no longer have the great surpluses in this country that gave rise to the food for peace programs.

There are now approximately three and one half billion persons in the world . . . in thirty odd years there will be over seven billion mouths to feed.

Communism thrives on hunger, poverty and want. It is the professed foreign policy of the United States Government to curb the growth of communism throughout the world. If that, and not imperialism, is our goal it behooves us to heed the words of Senator McGovern.

IDAHO WOULD GAIN

In Idaho, as in other agricultural states, we have a vested interest in a radical change in our foreign policy. No Idahoan should support a foreign policy of bombs and bullets when we can support a foreign policy of butter and accomplish much more.

At one period in her history Idaho sent two men to the United States Senate who were loudly and effectively opposed to war as an extension of foreign policy.

The Isolationist views of Senators Borah and Pope are no longer popular, but the motivation for those views is no less sound.

WAR INDUSTRIES

Senator Pope served on the committee that touched off an international commotion with their revelations of business practices within the munitions industry. The Nye Committee dared to suggest that the U.S. just might have avoided World War I had there been a more enlightened policy toward the financial and material support of European conflicts.

Some thirty years later an American President, in a farewell address, warned his public to beware of the growing "military-industrial complex." At this date even the agrarian segment of the economy has refused to heed the words of President Eisenhower and have forgotten their traditional hostility toward the great manufacturing interests.

Today a whole generation of Americans look with hostility and distrust toward those who would oppose our current military posture.

QUIET BILLIONS

A vast segment of our society has, with their silence, given consent to the destruction by our government of disarmament talks when nuclear disarmament was within our grasp.

If there is, in fact, a military-industrial complex in this country they have done a marvelous job of flag waving, commie hunting, and fear provoking. We now accept without a quiver the billions of dollars spent on war yet grow livid in anger at the thought of the pittance devoted to pollution control.

Even the segment of the population that stands to make the greatest economic gain from an enlightened foreign policy lean on their collective plows and meekly accept ever increasing appropriations for an ever increasing arms race and an ever decreasing chance of survival.

We all know that you cannot destroy an ideology with bombs. (The Romans couldn't do it and they had lions.) The only way to defeat communism is to feed, clothe and shelter it to death.

WHAT DIVERSION COULD DO

Think, just for a moment, what the billions spent on war could do in the Mountain Home desert. Imagine what the crops springing from that irrigation enriched land could do in Cambodia or Thailand or Argentina.

A policy of multi-lateral aid to underdeveloped and developing nations would produce immeasurable benefits both at home and abroad. With just a portion of our war budget we could find useful forms of Idaho food products for every nation in the world.

Idaho farmers could find a market for millions of dollars worth of increased production. Thousands of acres of non-irrigated land could be placed under cultivation bringing new farms, new crops and new food processing jobs to Idaho.

PLOWSHARE STILL THE GOAL

It seems ludicrous for an Idaho farmer to support a war thousands of miles from home, from which we see no appreciable gain and which causes severe strain on our economy we could be involved in a program of aid and development that would result in tremendous political benefits and pour millions of dollars into the economy.

It is wise to turn our back on the isolationism of Senator Borah, we live in a world too small and too troubled to not be concerned with our fellow inhabitants.

It is not, however, wise to turn our backs on the need for turning swords into plowshares, we live in a much too destructive age to forget that our lives may depend on it.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which the clerk will state by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The pending question is agreeing to amendment No. 195, offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to query the acting majority leader concerning the program for the remainder of the day and also for the balance of the week, if possible.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader, may I say that the majority leader, prior to his departure yesterday on official business, expressed the hope that the Senate would complete the Selective Service Act extension by the conclusion of business today and, if such were the case, the Senate should go over until noon Monday next.

I am informed that no bills are presently on the calendar ready for floor action; so if we can complete action on the pending bill at a reasonable hour today, I shall move, in the event I am acting as leader at the close of business today—and if I am not so acting, I am sure that the majority whip will so move—that upon the completion of business today the Senate stand in adjournment until noon on Monday next.

On Monday it is anticipated that S. 1031, the Peace Corps authorization bill, which was reported today from the Committee on Foreign Relations, will be ready for action on the floor. After the disposal of this bill next week, the leadership hopes to bring up the second supplemental and Interior appropriation bills.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the acting majority leader.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished minority leader.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD].

The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, first I express my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

As chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee during the holding of hearings on the National Selective Service Act, I believe he gave ample opportunity and very fair hearing to all who wished to be heard. At that time, I presented to that committee some of the arguments on behalf of voluntary service.

I believe that today we have a number of obligations as we consider the selective service program and extension of this conscription program, not the least of which is our obligation to the young people of this country, a generation which we are calling upon to provide the military manpower to give the Nation an adequate defense program.

I hope that my views concerning voluntary service are not confused or misunderstood. I do not believe that we can immediately move to the abolition of the draft, as much as I would like to see that happen, without recognizing the importance of a transition period.

I do not believe that we can have an abrupt change of one military manpower procurement policy and the establishment of another procurement program without a transition.

I therefore offer in this amendment a proposal that the Senate go on record as establishing a basic consensus, a consensus endorsing the objective of moving toward a voluntary system as soon as such action is feasible.

The heart of this amendment is found on page 2, subsection (5) which reads:

> Whenever such reassessment reveals that a system of involuntary inductions can be replaced by a system based on the free choice of individuals at an overall cost the Nation can reasonably afford, Congress should act to facilitate the prompt termination of involuntary inductions and a transition to an effective voluntary system for the procurement of military manpower.

I think it should be clearly understood that no one is requesting abolition of the draft immediately, but rather it is requested that Congress go on record as seeking an objective and goal which I think is really in the minds of most Senators and is certainly supported by many people, both in the military and outside of the military.

I would like to comment on two or three things as they relate to our young people. Many times we hear that our youth is not responsible or does not respond to the needs of our country, especially in the area of manpower for our military organizations.

I believe that it is an unfair indictment against our youth to imply that young people do not have sufficient patriotism and love for country to create a desire and an incentive on their part to respond to our country's needs.

I believe this generation is by far the greatest generation of young people that this country has ever produced since my generation, and my generation was the greatest up until that time. However, I think that when we consider the young people of this generation—with all of the demands placed upon their time and talents and skills and with the explosion of technology and information that they are expected to understand and to become proficient in—we must recognize that our young people today have not only a great challenge but that they are also responding to that challenge.

We sometimes tend to think of our youth as being represented by a few who become involved in activities which receive a great deal of publicity, those few who may be erratic in their deportment and those who may be extreme in their expressions of opinion and in their desires to become involved.

I should hope that we would be perceptive enough not to classify all young people by the erratic sensationalism of the few. When one visits college and university campuses, as I have had the privilege to do over the years, he will note that the vast majority of our young people are responsive and responsible.

I believe that voluntary service would be such a program as would find the young people responding to the needs of that service if they were given the proper challenge and incentives.

We have developed a great thing in this country over the many decades of our existence, and I refer to it as our character of volunteerism. We have, in this country, depended a great deal upon volunteerism in our many social programs and in many of our programs of economic and political importance. They exist on the basis of volunteer support and volunteer contribution.

I believe that if we all recognize the number of hours and the money and the energies and the efforts that have been put into many of these groups and organizations, not under coercion or compulsion, but because the American people have traditionally responded to national needs when they were properly articulated and expressed.

I think this characteristic is something that should be jealously guarded and preserved. I believe further that we must preserve this characteristic in the field of military manpower procurement. We have not really believed deeply enough in volunteerism to have faith that it can be done.

I do not say that military conscription under a coercive conscription program is always out of place within our national existence, but depends on the circumstances. I think we should use it as a last resort.

I think in times of national emergency when the Nation itself is threatened and must acquire vast numbers of men, a military conscription program has proven to be a very effective and important instrument for procurement. However, I do not believe, even under the circumstances existing today with the war in Vietnam, that our Nation is involved in a national emergency that threatens the very existence of this Nation.

I sometimes feel that the conscription program is the easy way out; it is the way in which we can acquire numbers of young people without depending on the ingenuity, the creativity, that could devise a voluntary system to get the manpower necessary even to fight a war in Vietnam.

I believe, also, that we have to recognize that there is basic policy involved. We are all concerned about having adequate defense for our country, but I believe we should ask ourselves three questions. In any kind of national defense program, we have to look at certain realities and we have to recognize them not only in terms and times of war but also in the programs and in the actions to which we commit ourselves under the authority of a peacetime government. I would say that these are the three questions we should ask ourselves:

One, does the military procurement program preserve the maximum amount of individual liberty and freedom from unjustified intrusion by the Government?

Two, is it a system which is fair in its application, so that every young man—not a few, but every young man—receives equal treatment, and no young man is required to make sacrifices that are not demanded of his peers?

Three, does the military procurement program provide us with a system that would give us maximum national security and the most economical kind of system to provide the armed services with the needed quantity and quality of manpower?

When we ask ourselves these questions, I do not believe that we can currently give a satisfactory answer to any one of the three. I do not believe that we can say that a coercive conscription system is one which is other than a maximum intrusion into the lives of our young people. It eliminates the opportunity of choice of giving service to their country. Let me make it clear that I believe that every person has a duty to his country, to give service to his country; but I do not believe we should adopt the narrow attitude that one gives service to his country or renders service to his country only in a military uniform. I believe there are other ways in which one can contribute and give service to one's country.

The basic character of conscription has been very eloquently described over the years. Daniel Webster spoke on this system. Men of later date have addressed themselves to the system. One of the greatest Senators who has ever served in the U.S. Senate, the Senator from Ohio, Robert Taft, described the philosophy of conscription:

> It is said that a compulsory draft is a democratic system. I deny that it has anything to do with democracy. It is neither democratic nor undemocratic. It is far more typical of totalitarianism nations than of democratic nations. The theory behind it leads directly to totalitarianism. It is absolutely opposed to the principles of individual liberty which have always been considered a part of American democracy. . . . The principle of a compulsory draft is basically wrong.

These are the words of Adlai Stevenson, who had given great thought to, and expressed great concern about, the freedom of mankind:

> Every young man who has served in our armed forces knows the incredible waste of our present system of forced but short-term service. He knows the money that could be saved, the new efficiency that could result from a volunteer system which calls on young men not to endure two years of service because they have to, but to choose it for a longer period because it offers advantages that seem to them appealing.

William F. Buckley, only a year or so ago, said:

> The not so very long-term objective should be to eliminate the draft in favor of a professional army of volunteers, who would greatly increase the efficiency of the armed services, and relieve the civil population of an experience which, insofar as it is unrelated to true necessity, is debasing, and an unnecessary—and therefore inexcusable—encroachment on individual freedom.

We should recall that the two political party platforms of 1964—the Republican Party platform and the Democratic Party platform—addressed themselves to the question of conscription. Listen to the words of the Republican Party platform in 1964:

> . . . we pledge:
>
> Re-evaluation of the armed forces' manpower procurement programs with the goal of replacing involuntary inductions as soon as possible by an efficient voluntary system, offering real career incentives;

I should like to quote from the Democratic National platform of 1964:

> On August 25, the Democratic Convention promised in its platform to "pursue our examination of the selective service program to make certain that it is continued only as long as it is necessary and that we meet our manpower needs without social or economic injustice."

Let me emphasize that the amendment offered today would do exactly as these two platforms proposed. It merely seeks to establish again the consensus that we will move toward a voluntary system as soon as practicable and effective.

Following the 1964 Republican convention—in fact, only recently—my party's candidate for the Presidency in 1964, Senator Barry Goldwater, made a very interesting comment. I should also say that we could refer to him as Gen. Barry Goldwater. He said:

> Conservatives want to end the draft—period. They do not want to extend it to any other form of service. They sympathize with the aims of the system, but they cannot and do not sympathize with the method, no matter what its motive. . . .
>
> The conservative position is based solidly upon the notion that man's most fundamental right and responsibility is to live his own life.

So whether we are quoting John Galbraith or Adlai Stevenson or Barry Goldwater or William Buckley, I believe we see that liberty—individual liberty—transcends the political philosophies of various public officials and politicians; that when we talk about individual freedom, it is something that concerns all Americans.

I should like to mention one other thing about our young people today. We read a number of articles about the evasion mentality that exists today. When Pearl Harbor was bombed, at the beginning of World War II, my classmates on the university campus, my friends and I, listened to President Roosevelt ask for a declaration of war against Japan and Germany. During the period that followed, we, as a group, as a body, moved out of our university life and sought enlistment. We went out to enlist on a voluntary basis, because our Nation had been attacked, and we recognized our obligation to our Nation. We felt sorry for those who could not get into the military organizations of their choice. We felt sorry for those who were turned down and who were deferred because they were not able to pass the physical qualifications or other qualifications. Yet today we read articles stating that the opposite is true: that many young people today feel sorry for those who have to serve and who cannot avoid or evade the draft or military service.

I do not know how widespread this evasion mentality is. Personally, I do not believe it is too widespread. But wherever and to what degree it exists, I believe it concerns all Americans. We cannot brush it aside by merely saying, "Well, that is typical of the youth." I believe that whenever young people seek to avoid responsibility, even under a law with which they disagree, it tends to undermine the very concept of citizen responsibility in this country; and we should analyze the causes of this kind of evasion mentality, no matter to what degree it exists.

I submit that one of the basic reasons for this evasion mentality is the failure of our Government to establish a system of incentives to adequately reward and encourage voluntary enlistment. I do not believe it is a situation in which we can point our finger to our youth and say that we need not concern ourselves with anything further than the more or less dogmatic statement that this is typically immature youth. In many ways, there is a far more profound understanding of life on the part of many of our young people today than on the part of some adults in our society.

They want to be involved in life and they want to be a part of the solution of problems. They are not willing to sit on the sidelines and let others run the world. They do want to be a part because they are concerned about the world in which they live. We should encourage this and give them an opportunity for constructive contribution and give them an opportunity for participation.

There are many times when we talk about this invasion of individual freedom and responsibility. People become concerned that perhaps we would not get a sufficient number of volunteers under a volunteer system.

Let me say that we have to understand, I believe, some of the very important facts and data surrounding the military needs today and the manpower pool we have. I wish to point out that today we have over 12 million young men in the United States between the ages of 18 and 26. In other words, the eligible manpower pool today is in excess of 12 million, from which we can draw, either through conscription or through enlistments.

When we have this many people in our manpower pool we must recognize that we can establish incentives to get the number required to serve in the military forces. Prior to the Vietnam buildup we had a standing military force of about 2.7 million. In all probability we will need this number, at least, in the next 5 to 10 years after Vietnam. However, I wish to point out that in order to maintain this level of manpower we would only have to recruit through enlistments and voluntary response five out of every 100 young men between 18 and 26 who are in the manpower pool. I believe this would mean that we would have sufficient numbers from which to draw on the voluntary basis.

I have introduced a bill which was presented to the Armed Services Committee and which listed some 10 directives which I believe would provide the kind of incentives under which we would get the five out of 100 to enlist on a volunteer basis.

I wish to mention a few of them, not in any order of priority. First, there is the matter of pay increase. I do not know how many Senators have read the interesting study by Dr. Walter Oi of the University of Washington Department of Economics. He recently made a study as to the cost of national defense and the relation to manpower procurement. He estimated in his study that it costs each young man who goes into our military service about $1,000 a year; that is to say, if he were in a civilian capacity, he could earn that amount more than he is receiving. He draws a reasonable and fair conclusion that we are not only asking young men today to contribute 2 years of their lives for military service, but that we are asking them, in effect, to subsidize our national defense costs by failing to give them realistic pay.

Mr. President, one incentive would be to bring our military pay scales into a greater relationship to the pay which they would receive if they were in a civilian capacity. The bill I propose would establish a $30 across-the-board increase in the seven pay rates. In the first seven enlisted classifications a $30 increase would cost about $1,063,000,000 over what is now being paid.

I wish to point out that this would not necessarily mean additional cost in terms of the total budget because there would be many savings created through reorganization of the military. For instance, the Department of Defense already has undertaken to determine jobs now being performed by combat-trained military personnel that could be performed by civilians; they are moving nonmilitary personnel into these positions to cut down on the cost.

In estimating the savings in the substitution of civilian personnel we must look at studies made by such experts as Representative THOMAS CURTIS. He estimates the cost to maintain a foot soldier at $18,000 a year. I submit that one can get a bartender for an officer's club, or a typist, or a clerk for much less than $18,000 a year, and it could be done from the civilian labor market. There are other reclassifications which could be made to cut down on the number of combat-trained men being used today for noncombat duties.

There are other costs in our present system; it is not efficient and it is not economical. I could illustrate these costs in many ways but I shall do it in this way. Gen. Lynn Smith, an authority on manpower in the Army, reported that at no time does more than 43 percent of our Army have more than 1 year's experience because of the high personnel turnover.

We are told that in the draftee classification we have about a 95-percent turnover. That means, on the average, that a man who is drafted serves about 1.9 years and then he leaves the military.

On the other side of the coin we find, according to Department of Defense statistics, that we have only about 15- to 16-percent turnover in the group which has chosen the military as a career. I believe we can obviously conclude that the high rate of turnover is a matter that need not be continued.

If we could reduce the personnel turnover it would make for a more economic and efficient system. We could reduce the number of training stations, we could reduce the number of boot camps, we could reduce the number of personnel involved in training programs, because we would not have this high rate of turnover, intake and output, as far as personnel is concerned we would reduce the number of personnel engaged in training and we would save money.

Dr. Oi's report referred to the fact that we could save 79,000 personnel now engaged in training programs through a voluntary system with its reduced turnover; 79,000 now engaged in training could be devoting their time to other military activities.

When we consider all of these various methods of reorganization I believe we could then say it is economically feasible to move toward a voluntary system.

The Cordiner report was issued in 1957 by a Committee appointment by President Eisenhower. Mr. Ralph Cordiner, a distinguished industrial leader, was the chairman of the group. They reported on a study of military manpower needs, and military personnel, and found that about a 10-percent reduction could be made in the number of Army maintenance technicians alone if we had a professional military personnel program which would reduce the personnel turnover.

Cordiner said, in effect, in this report, that we could save over $1 billion in material and maintenance, not considering the fact that we could save in the reduction of maintenance personnel.

I do not believe it is logical to argue that we cannot move into a voluntary system because of the high cost of a system of that type. We could have a reduction in our present military programs to offset a major part of the increased cost of higher pay scales and material.

Also, we must recognize that there are other incentives besides pay. I do not believe that any man serving in the military, or any man who has served in the military, would deny the fact that a military man has the same desires and ambitions for his family as a civilian has for his family. A man going into the military makes certain basic sacrifices, but I believe we can do more to enhance the life of the military than we have done.

The old idea that we must maintain and build houses square and line them up in a row is a thing of the past. In Oregon we have a small military installation called Camp Adair. There was a need there for housing for military personnel. Instead of proceeding on the same old format of building houses in a row, they engaged architects to build housing for military personnel with distinctive architectural design, and with contour roadways, lawns, gardens—much as a real estate subdivider would develop. We found that not only would this provide us with the necessary facilities for military families but the happiness and the esthetic satisfaction would create a higher morale factor at that particular camp. This is only one small example of what can be done to enhance the environmental life of military personnel. We have neglected the cultural life of military personnel. Showing a movie once a week or every night of the week is not a cultural life sufficient to meet the needs of military families. Having an officers club or a place where a program can be put on once a month, or every 2 months for social activities, is not enough.

We need to do more in the area of education for those committed to military life. Educational opportunities must be updated. They must be upgraded as well. I know that the military man wants the same educational opportunities for his youngsters as a man in civilian life. I see no reason why we cannot provide these opportunities, not only for youngsters in military families, but also for the educational continuation and experience of the military man himself.

In my bill, there are provisions for expanding vocational, technical, and other kinds of educational opportunities for military personnel. In other words, what I am saying is basically this: That if we use our creative genius, and move as a group toward a basic objective and goal, I believe that we can establish a voluntary system that would have the necessary incentives to provide us with the required manpower.

I do not accept the easy way out by saying we have to continue the present system because we dare not create a new one. Again I emphasize that I do not ask for an abrupt end of one system and the beginning of a new one. All I ask the Senate to do is to give a statement of consensus to our young people, to the military people today who are already veterans, that we are moving in the direction of a voluntary system.

The military has moved into a period of sophisticated weaponry. The old idea that we wanted quantity in manpower is no longer appropriate. We need quantity, of course, but it is of lesser importance. We now have to consider the quality of manpower in terms of trained skills, so far as operating this militarily sophisticated weaponry is concerned, when we consider that many of these weapons demand teamwork, in which every man on that team is interdependent. But about the time they get the man trained to act in a team effort, his time is up and he leaves the military service because he wants to get out just as soon as he can. This does not lend itself to efficiency in military operations.

As we look at the problems the military faces today, I think we have to recognize, too, that there is not going to be a simple answer to this problem. I do not indicate that there is a simple answer, but I do believe that we can indicate not only to ourselves but also to the military personnel, and to our young people, that we are going to consider this on a basis that it is not going to be just 4 years of more of the same, but we are going to try to reduce it to a period necessary to create a voluntary system.

That is why I have offered a second amendment today, that I should like to have called up after we have a rollcall vote on the first amendment—that is, to pledge to our young people, and to the country, that we are not just content to move on and to continue the same old method, the same old plan, but we are willing and anxious to move into a more efficient one and a better one in terms of personal life, in terms of economics, in terms of efficiency, and in terms of reduced personnel.

I am not an obstructionist. I am a realist. With a military procurement program of the same type, I am not content to sit back and say that we have nothing to do and that we cannot do something better within a period of less than 4 years. I will present my arguments for the 2-year extension, as contrasted with the 4-year extension which the committee has recommended, at the time we take up the committee amendment.

I should like to close my comments on this particular amendment by referring to a personal experience, if I may.

For a number of years, it was my privilege to serve as a military adviser to the students at the campus where I was on the faculty. During that period of time, I filled out many SSS forms 109, which is the 2–S classification deferment for students.

I can recall many times how students were rated, as we were required to do under the draft requirements, according to the grade point average, starting with 4 points and on down in descending order. Then we struck a line that was going to divide between those eligible in the upper one-half, the upper two-thirds, and the upper three-quarters. I can recall some students who had participated and been engaged in a curricula of science and mathematics, a curricula which was very demanding; so demanding, in fact, that they were exerting themselves twice as hard as anyone else who might be, say, a music major. There is no attempt here to depreciate the music major as contrasted with chemistry, science, or mathematics majors. I myself am a product of the social sciences and humanities. I think they are every bit as important in our modern life as science and mathematics. But I think we all recognize that there are certain demands made upon the intellect, abilities, and the time schedule of students as between some other curriculums. There were students who might have passed below this eligibility line; yet the science major, the student who might have been above the line with a music major, was not deferred, and the music major was.

I submit that there must be a greater degree of equity brought to bear on the military procurement program in the type of thing which does not even consider the point of some students who are eligible for deferment; because they are in an economic status enabling them to go to an institution of higher learning; and other students who might be just as bright but have to go out and get a job; and cannot afford educational opportunities, and therefore are subject to being drafted immediately.

These are some of the inequities we could continue to discuss. I do not believe that any amount of discussion, however, is going to correct the inequities which exist in the present system. Therefore, I am not content to stand by and say to the young people of our Nation that we have no better system and, at the same time, we do not have enough confidence in their patriotism to respond to a voluntary system with proper incentives.

I believe that the Senate of the United States owes it to our young people not to stand idly by and say that this is the easy way, that this is easier or a more simple way. I think we have to utilize our genius and creativeness in building a better way. I think we clearly owe this much to our young people.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I want to congratulate the Senator from Oregon on making one of the more important and valuable proposals that have been made in this body for some time. I want to congratulate him on bringing to this debate on our military requirements realism, an appreciation of the need for preserving our liberties, and a proposal that may move us ahead on the road toward realization of our Nation's professions. His proposal might not merely increase the efficiency of our Armed Forces but central to it is his statement, in the second paragraph, that the present system of military manpower program, which is based primarily on conscription, is an undesirable infringement on individual liberty. Here we are presumably engaging in a war to defend liberty, yet at the same time, we are violating it basically at home in our procedure to achieve that declared end.

As the Senator knows, I do not agree with the premises which have led us into this far-reaching military involvement in Southeast Asia. What the Senator has offered now might well tend toward rectifying some of the injustices inherent in some aspects of our military participation.

As the Senator knows, I have an amendment to the bill which I shall bring up later today, which goes not by any means as far as the Senator does, for I have proposed an amendment which merely will provide that draftees shall not be sent to Southeast Asia without their consent. This is not an impediment to the war effort. On the contrary I think it will aid the war effort, because it will remove some of the fear, apprehension, distaste, and revulsion which have been shown by many people about being forced to serve in this war against their will.

Now the situation, as far as the regular military service is concerned, those who enlist voluntarily in the Army, the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps, know, at the time of their enlistment, that they must go where the Commander in Chief sends them, and they go into the service with their eyes open. The draftees are an exception. This amendment would rectify that differentiation.

Incidentally, it does not mean that a substantial number of draftees would not elect to go to Southeast Asia. They may. Many do not agree with my views on the war. Many believe we are engaged in a righteous war; that we are right in doing what we are doing. But I believe our boys who are drafted should have a choice.

If the Senator's amendment were adopted, it might take care of that situation for the future and could result in an increased efficiency of our armed services.

I congratulate the distinguished Senator for this proposal. I hope his amendment will be adopted. I intend to vote for it.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator. I appreciate his remarks. I think he has made a point which should have more understanding and which should be focused upon. Many times we are told that the only reason why we are able to maintain a certain number of enlisted men is the threat of the draft being held over the heads of these young men. Let me state that a survey conducted by the Defense Department indicated that 38 percent of the voluntary enlisted men who responded said they had enlisted because of the draft.

However, when we consider the total number of men in the manpower pool, and when we consider the fact that we have a responsibility to raise the standards of military life in such a way as to increase incentives for enlistment, this figure is a relatively small one in relation to the total manpower possibilities.

When we consider the high rate of turnover, we must do something to make more efficient our military program. The Navy made an interesting report to the effect that 130,000 naval personnel leave the Navy each year. We must do more in the way of providing incentives, such as greater bonuses for reenlistment, to bring about a reduction in the personnel turnover.

When we consider that 95 percent of the draftees today are leaving just as soon as they can get out, I think we must realize it is a morale factor on the total service.

Having served in the Navy, I can think of nothing more important aboard ship. When the men are in close quarters, and are having to live in a very compact area, morale is one of the most important factors. When people are "grousing," as we say, about anything, it has an effect on the total morale of the whole group. Whether it be in a division, a bunkhouse, or wherever it is, I cannot think of anything worse on the morale of those people than to have someone say, "I am getting out just as soon as I can get back into civilian life."

I think the fact that the men are leaving after an average of 1.9 years of service is to be considered as an obligation we have not only to study it but to provide the military service the best tools to do the job and to retain its personnel.

Mr. GRUENING. I would say that the profession of arms should be one of our noblest professions, provided it is used in the defense of our country. Anything that improves the military services and induces Americans to enter into the service of their country for its defense is desirable. That is what the Senator's proposal aims to do.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator. When the Senator mentions professionalism—he is a medical doctor and a professional man—I think the Senator can appreciate the fallacy of the argument that we should have professionalism in everything except the military service. I hear doctors or lawyers argue that having a professional military service would create a threat to our liberties. This is not a valid argument. For the entire history of our Nation, we have depended on professionals in our military, except for the two periods of the World Wars, when we had a conscription program, as we do at the present time. So I simply do not have a fear of professional militarism.

Some people talk about a voluntary system as professional militarism. When we talk about a professional military system, we are talking about not only a professional military group, but we are talking about a military who serves under general civilian control. When there have been military takeovers and coups d'etat in other countries, they have not taken place in nations that have similar civilian structures, but that have military power structures. We have a system in which the civilians have control over the military, and therefore are subservient to the civilian authorities. So I do not have any fear of a professional military.

May I point out that military eliteism, which is referred to sometimes as an argument against a professional voluntary armed force, is not to be found in the enlisted ranks, but in the officer ranks. In discussing a voluntary military we are not talking about professionals who serve as officers, but of men who are entering the enlisted ranks. So I think that answers the argument of the fear of being ruled by a professional military establishment.

Mr. GRUENING. A voluntary system would be the essence of a democratic system. The draft to which young men are now subjected in this undeclared war runs counter to true democracy. That is why a professional military service based on voluntary enlistments, which the Senator proposes, if attainable might well provide a solution for some of the present problems.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to join the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] in congratulating the Senator from Oregon for what I think is the brilliant speech which he has just made. It is a speech full of data and, in my judgment, sound argument. I would like to contribute just a little in pointing it up with a few questions to the Senator.

The Senator has demonstrated in his speech that if we are going to talk to him about the public policy issues connected with the draft in comparison with adopting programs that will permit enlargement of our voluntary enlisted personnel and a decrease in our so-called selective service personnel, he must talk to him at the point of a lead pencil. I would describe his speech, in some particulars, as a lead pencil speech, because the figures and the facts supporting the figures he has pointed out simply need to be understood by the American people.

So my first question is, just for the purpose of emphasizing what was set out so eloquently in the Senator's speech on his amendment, and also inherent in the amendment he is now offering, which seeks to move in the direction of providing incentives for enlarged enlisted personnel. Will not the amendment in the long run save the American taxpayers millions and millions of dollars? Is not that one of the contentions of the Senator?

Mr. HATFIELD. In response to the Senator's question, the answer is "Yes." According to the Cordiner report, which was made in 1957; it made certain projections that it could save the taxpayer, in military maintenance and reducing personnel turnover, about $2.8 billion in 1960 and, it was estimated, $5 billion by 1962.

Then, as I further indicated today, by a voluntary system, ultimately we would reduce the number of training stations and personnel required in that type of military work; and, thirdly, I believe considerable savings could be realized through continuing the reclassification of military personnel from noncombatant positions they now occupy, and filling those positions with civilians, particularly women.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is pointing out that the cost of the training program we are now following in the training of draftees in order to get them trained sufficiently to be of service to their country militarily during the period for which they are drafted, in comparison with the total cost of training of an enlisted group, is much higher because, as the Senator points out, there is a terrific percentage of turnover at the end of the 2-year period, which adds up, in dollars and cents, to a greater cost by hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. HATFIELD. That is true. In fact, again referring to Professor Oi's report, he pointed out that about 10 percent of our military personnel today are engaged in training programs of some kind. He indicated further that he felt that by a voluntary system, the turnover rate could be reduced by at least one-third.

He estimated that a 3-percent reduction in the total force level would mean a saving of 79,000 men without reducing military effectiveness. Then he goes on to point out other savings that could be made, which add up to billions of dollars, because it is estimated that today's training program for draftees who will leave at the end of 2 years alone costs about $3 billion.

Mr. MORSE. The third point I wish to mention, which came to mind as I followed the argument of the junior Senator from Oregon, is that, theoretically, at the present time we train militarily the selectees under our selective service program so that they can be available for combat service if necessary; and then large numbers of them are put into what really amounts to nonmilitary service as far as the performance of job duties is concerned. They are put into various post positions which could just as well be performed by civilians, in a large proportion of instances by women, at much less cost for training than in the case of utilizing militarily trained personnel to perform such nonmilitary services, in the sense that we usually think of military services when we think of a man in uniform.

Is that not a part of the burden of the Senator's argument?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is a part of the burden. Of course, I think any of us who have been in the military service must realize that not every person in uniform will be bearing a weapon and engaged in actual combat, but that there are many noncombatant positions occupied by military personnel which, because of security or other reasons, must continue to be occupied by military personnel.

But I think the fact that the Defense Department has within recent years transferred from uniformed military responsibility to civilian responsibility some 74,000 jobs indicates that very likely more can be done along this line, in reclassifying positions, not to the complete exclusion of military personnel being used in noncombat positions, but for the utilization of civilian personnel to a greater degree.

I think further that we can recognize, both from General Hershey's statements and those of other military personnel, that we could, by adjustment of our qualifications today, both physical and educational, receive into the services on a voluntary basis more personnel, more young people who really want to be in the military service, but who are precluded because of the rigid enforcement of present standards and classifications—not that we wish to make the military a reform organization; that is not the purpose, but the fact remains that there are many thousands who, on paper and by examinations and other such criteria which I think, though not exactly artificial, are very cursory reviews of the person's actual ability, are being excluded from military service, men who would like to have military experience, and even possibly military careers, are rejected under such artificial standards of educational and physical qualifications.

Mr. MORSE. Bearing on the point the Senator makes on the volunteer Army approach, I wholeheartedly support his plea and proposal for moving in the direction of a volunteer Army rather than continuing to maintain a very disproportionate number, it seems to me, of selective service personnel.

Under the volunteer approach the Senator is advocating, we would get away from what I think is a great waste of manpower within the military services at the present time, in that we now are limited to taking 1-A's, whereas, under the program proposed by the junior Senator from Oregon, the Army then, on a volunteer basis, would be able to take into military service, both men and women—though I am confining my attention to men at the present time—who could not qualify as 1-A's, but could qualify to perform a great many military services which do not require 1-A's; is that not true?

Mr. HATFIELD. That is true, based upon the experience I had when I spent about 3 years in the Navy, and my experience in having been somewhat associated with military organizations as a State Governor, who is the commander in chief of his State's National Guard. I have had some contact with the military in that way, as well as through personal friendships with persons in the military profession and otherwise, and have come to the conclusion that there are many such positions. The point the Senator makes as to having volunteers come in other than through Selective Service is a valid point.

Mr. MORSE. Now, Mr. President, we come to one of the most controversial facets of this issue as to whether we should be working for the development of a volunteer military establishment and the elimination of the selective service phase of it. We come to the issue often referred to by the opponents of the volunteer army approach as the "numbers" requirement. The argument is made that we could not have a sufficient number of personnel under a volunteer military establishment approach, that we have to have the selective service in order to supply the manpower requirements that the Pentagon, for the most part, has determined should be our military manpower requirements—although that policy of the Pentagon is closely linked with the foreign policy program of the State Department. For that reason I raise the issue at this point, because I think it has received too little consideration, that continuation of the selective service policy of this country at the present time is being urged by both the State Department and the Pentagon. The Pentagon is represented as the leader in the demand, but do not overlook the State Department, which maintains a foreign policy by this country which ought to be subjected to the most careful of scrutiny, at the same time that we consider the military program.

I refer to the fact that we have adopted a foreign policy which requires for its maintenance a very large military establishment. That policy is based upon American military response, in troubled spots of the world, when forces in given areas of the world follow internal policies that the United States does not like; and therefore we bring our military power to bear in order to force a change of their policy to one of our liking. In order for us to exercise that kind of foreign policy domination around the world, which is so rapidly isolating us all over the world, and arousing great antipathy and antagonism toward the United States, we have to keep up this military manpower, to enable the United States to dominate as much of the world as it chooses.

I do not ask the Senator from Oregon to agree with any of the premises I have just laid down. I have only laid down these premises to direct his attention to the military aspect of my comments.

Does the Senator think that we can justify maintaining a selective service military personnel program in order to use that beyond the security of the Republic? Does the Senator think we have any justification for drafting by the thousands, young men whom we are using to carry out a foreign policy that does not relate to the security of the Republic, but that seeks to persuade or direct or command other governments to follow a foreign policy to the liking of the United States?

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I believe that when we consider the foreign policy matters of this country, we recognize that foreign policy is implemented many times and carried out through the instrumentality of military organizations to enforce the policy that is being established and pursued by the Government.

I believe it is a responsibility of the U.S. Congress, as part of our great check-and-balance system, to have its influence felt in the formulation of foreign policy which is exercised by the Executive.

One of my points of concern today about the present war in Vietnam is that it appears that the U.S. Senate in fulfilling its duties as part of that check-and-balance system is called upon to act after the fact rather than being a participant in the formulation of the foreign policy.

I would say to my colleague that regardless of our personal viewpoints on the relationship of foreign policy and Military Establishment, I still feel that we have in this proposal a responsibility—no matter how unpopular the war in Vietnam or the U.S. position on the war in Vietnam may be—to the young people of this country to develop a system which will preserve freedom and the liberty of people to the maximum, and, at the same time, provide the Military Establishment with the most efficient and effective method of manpower procurement.

If we look at this matter carefully, all we are saying is that we are not committing ourselves today or tomorrow to a voluntary system. We are in effect saying that as soon as practicable we want the transition that my measure provides, not for an abrupt change, but an opportunity to test the incentives that are included in that kind of program through the period of transition. If the military manpower does not respond in the numbers wanted by the Defense Department or the State Department, it would still be within the realm of our power to maintain the conscriptive, coercive system.

I agree that the Senator has a point—concerning which there is great debate today—that far transcends the military procurement program, and yet it relates directly to that program.

We have a Defense Department that wants x number of men. I am not in a position to argue the matter. I do not know. However, I do know that if we follow the program set down by this administration, we will double the amount of manpower in Vietnam in 5 years. We are told that we will be there that much longer. However, I cannot argue the matter. I dissent from the policy and criticize it. I can offer alternatives.

I feel that we must move in the direction of getting the most efficient system and preserving to the utmost our liberties.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall not pursue further the views that I shall expand on later as to the relationship of our military manpower policy and a wrong foreign policy of the United States, and how the first contributes to the latter. I shall do that later this afternoon.

I only sought to elicit from the Senator from Oregon the point of view he expressed in regard to the purposes of the pending amendment. I enthusiastically support the purpose of the amendment for many reasons, including the reasons advanced by the Senator, plus the interpretations that are self-evident from the remarks I have made relevant thereto.

I want to pinpoint the matter. The Senator said that this is a program for gradual change and not sudden change. The Senator has made it very clear.

However, let us make it clear again that the Senator is not referring to a time of great national emergency when the security of the Republic is involved. The security of the Republic is not involved in Vietnam, in my judgment, one iota. But it was involved in World War II. It could have become involved in the Korean war had we not acted. It was involved in World War I.

There is not the slightest danger involving the security of the Republic in Southeast Asia at the present time in spite of all the propaganda of the State Department, the Pentagon Building, and the White House.

The Senator is saying that if we really have a time when there is a threat to the national security, he recognizes, as I do, the necessity for a Selective Service Act. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. HATFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am afraid that I shall be in a position today or tomorrow to vote for the third time against the Selective Service Act because I think it is so unfortunate that the committee has brought to the floor of the Senate of the United States such a completely unsatisfactory Selective Service Act again. In fact, I think they have nibbled at the fringes of the need for eliminating the unfairness and discriminations of the present act.

I could not think of voting for the act on the basis of the recommendations of the committee.

I do not know what success we will have in getting some amendments agreed to today or tomorrow. I never give up hope. I hope we will, but I want to say that I am not going to be a party to voting for a 4-year Selective Service Act seeking to bind the young men of this country for another 4 years at the cost of such a gross injustice as we are imposing upon their freedom in the name of security.

What we are saying to the young people of this country is: "We are going to seek to bind you to continue the foreign policy that this country is now prosecuting around the world that, in my judgment, will so isolate this Republic in the not too many years in the future that we will cease to be the great power that we are as the masses of the people in the world, by the millions, proceed to organize against the American people, as they are rapidly organizing these very days." We are fast losing the race for the confidence of millions of people, particularly in the underdeveloped areas of the world, and also increasing millions of people among the Western Powers, because of the course of action we are following. We are saying to the world: "You are going to do what we think is necessary in our interpretation of our national interest, or we proceed to use our military posture and our military might to have our will."

That is the way most nations in the past have fallen, and that is the way this country will fall if we do not stop trying to substitute the jungle law and American military might for the rules of international law and peacekeeping procedures and existing treaties to which we pretend to be a member, but which we consistently violate.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. I wish to commend the junior Senator from Oregon for proposing a gradual change in our draft procedures so far as taking young men into the military service of the United States is concerned.

The distinguished senior Senator from Oregon raised the question as to whether we would be able to get sufficient volunteers for a volunteer army. I, for one, have rejected the use of lottery as a means of determining what young men should serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. I believe it is far too serious a matter to be left to chance. Though I would agree that at the present time our commitment in Vietnam requires that we draft young men into the military service, I believe that the junior Senator from Oregon certainly has pointed us in the right direction, so that at some time in the near future we might have a volunteer army.

I cannot believe that we will not be able to get sufficient men in this country to join a volunteer army. I believe that many would consider it a very respectable and a very important career. We would have to pay them, of course, a livable wage, commensurate with wages that are being paid in private industry, and we would have to give prestige to those who serve in the volunteer army.

I have heard the arguments against a volunteer army. Some of them have validity and carry weight.

One argument is that it might be considered a mercenary army. I reject that argument, because to a degree everything is mercenary. People are being paid for their services. Men go to West Point and to the Naval Academy, and we who are in the Senate know that we certainly have no lack of applicants for those institutions. I believe the same situation would apply with respect to men who would want to make even a noncommissioned officer's rank a career in the military services of the United States.

I have heard that that Army might be a poor man's army or it even might be a Negro army. I reject both arguments. I believe that persons of middle income and of high income groups might consider that a career in the military service would be one of their choosing and would be one which they would agree to take. So far as it being a Negro army is concerned, that argument is based only upon the assumption that there are more Negroes in the lower economic rung of our society, and that thus these men, being unable to obtain employment elsewhere, are likely to take advantage of the opportunity to go into a volunteer army.

I looked into this situation when I was in Vietnam. I had heard the allegation that there were a disproportionate number of Negro soldiers in Vietnam. In checking, I found, first, that there was not a disproportionate number of Negroes drafted into the Army; second, that there was not a disproportionate number of Negroes who enlisted in the Army. The disproportion that I did find came about because of reenlistment in the Army. I interrogated many of the men I saw in Vietnam, and found that the reenlistment was caused by the fact that many have found that they can do far better in the military service than they can do in private life, because there they did not have jobs, lived in unfavorable conditions, and lacked the education that was so sorely needed.

But I do not believe this is a reason for us not to look forward to and move toward a volunteer army. Some have argued that this would change the entire character of our military forces; that we might lose civilian control; that something could happen in this country as happened in Greece—namely, a coup or takeover by the military. We all know that we have checks and balances in this country; that the civilians are still in control of the military forces; that we do have Secretaries of Defense and the military services who are always in command, and of course we have the President of the United States. Never has there been any indication that the military might revolt and take over the country, and I do not believe that there ever will be. I do not consider this a weighty argument at all.

With respect to the number of volunteers, I believe we would have more volunteers for a volunteer army than would be needed.

The other argument—one which has great weight—is with regard to the tremendous cost of such an army. We are now taking men into the service for 2 years, and the amount of money we are spending in order to train those men for 2 years is enormous.

If we could take men into service and give them a contract, say, for 5 years—not tie them up so that they would not be able to return to civilian life if they found that they did not like a career in the Army—whereby they would be trained and we would then have the benefit of their services for 5 years, I believe that the cost would not be enormous. They would certainly not be comparatively greater than the cost we are presently paying for training men for a short period of 2 years.

We should spend time on this matter, not merely pass it over. And I am happy to see that we will have had hearings and will have more hearings on the draft. So far we have restricted the matter to the reports of Presidential Commissions, which have not had open hearings. We have not heard a full debate on the draft, which is so important.

I believe it is a disgrace in this country that our young men who reach the age of 18 are living in such uncertainty because they do not know how to plan their lives, they do not know what to do. Men are marrying sooner than they should marry, as a means of escaping the draft. They are having children sooner than they should have children, because they think this might be a means of escaping the draft. They are not able to plan their college careers and cannot plan beyond that point, because, frankly, they do not know what is going to happen to them. And the uncertainty is more damaging and more harmful to them than the actual draft when it eventually does come.

I served 5 years in the Army, and I know that there are many things a man can learn in the Army which he can use later on in life. It is a great experience. I believe that presenting such an opportunity to the young men and young women of this country would be a step in the right direction. The young women could be used, as the distinguished Senator said, for administrative duties and responsibilities. Men who perhaps could not fire an artillery piece could be used for other services in the Armed Forces, thereby freeing the men who would actually be firing the artillery pieces and doing the other combat chores that would be necessary.

I am very hopeful, as we all are, that our country will not forever be engaged in war. War is not inevitable. A peacetime Army may have to be kept—of course, will have to be kept—for the security of the United States, as the Senator has suggested; and a peacetime Army has many great advantages which would be very attractive to young men and young women in this country.

I was recently in Israel. It is a new country. I believe that next week it will be 19 years old. In that country they know that at the age of 18 they are going to serve—the men for 26 months and the women for 20 months. They know that, and they can plan accordingly. But in this country we do not even have that advantage, because our young people do not know. They are going into the many ways of getting out of the Army and of getting exemptions of various sorts because the uncertainty is so devastating to them.

Mr. President, in conclusion I wish to commend the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon for the foresight and vision he has shown, because I think it is inevitable that we will be coming to a volunteer Army. I am very hopeful that Senators will give careful consideration to it and put the proposal not on the back burner to simmer, but in the front file where they will be giving consideration to it in the near future.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator for his comments. I believe the Senator has certainly identified two or three of the very frequently heard arguments against the volunteer system, and I believe the Senator has equally devasted the arguments.

I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon the following question: If some of the objections, such as inadequacy of the number of people who could be drafted in a volunteer Army, should prove to be correct, is there anything in his proposal to abandon the present system?

Mr. HATFIELD. The answer to the question of the Senator is "No." In the bill it was hoped that we could, through the listed incentives, of which there were 11, and reorganization procedures, grouped together, provide the necessary incentives for a voluntary military.

By the same token, as I have emphasized earlier today and wish to re-emphasize now, no nation can afford to abandon one manpower procurement program and adopt a new program without a period of transition. This transition period could be used to evaluate whether or not the incentives were actually working. If they did not work and produce the numbers of men required to meet our military requirements, the draft or the conscriptive service would continue. This has to be a fundamental part of any change. One program cannot be abruptly ended and a new one begun.

Mr. GRUENING. The incentives could be increased.

Mr. HATFIELD. The incentives could be increased or changed.

Mr. GRUENING. I believe this is a constructive, useful, and timely proposal. I would be happy to associate myself with the Senator as a cosponsor, if he is willing.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator. I would be happy to have the name of the Senator added as a cosponsor.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to join other Senators in commending the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] for an informative and constructive speech, a speech which has been supported by a great deal of study, foresight, and deep conviction which we have learned to admire, not only since the Senator has been in the Senate, but also for many years before.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] alluded to one objection, and the Senator from Oregon referred to it, which caused me concern. I refer to the possibility that under a volunteer system it might be found that young men with the least education and of the poorest economic circumstances would make up the largest number who volunteered.

Yesterday, the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in opening the debate on this bill, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] discussed the inequalities of the present system, and its unfairness in some respects, and I believe that it is agreed that any system will possess inequities. But does the Senator from Oregon, believe that under a voluntary system inevitably those who are rich, those who are well to do, those who are best trained, those who are able to go to college, those who have the best economic opportunities, would not find it attractive to enter the military services, and that it would be the poorest, and those who have the least opportunity who would find themselves in the military services as the bulk of volunteers.

If that should happen I believe we would have an unjust system of military service in this land.

The Senator knows, as does every Senator who has served in time of war, that when there is a great national commitment—as in World War I and World War II, we have many volunteers because they feel that they have a duty to go. I was a volunteer. I did not consider myself any better than one who was drafted. I felt it to be my duty.

However, I have propounded my question and I wish to ask the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. BROOKE] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD] to respond.

(At this point, Mr. MONTOYA assumed the chair.)

Mr. BROOKE. I do not believe there is much difference in what distinguished Senators are saying on this question. I do not believe the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] differs much from what we are saying because we do have at the present time enlistments in the Armed Forces. I think that at all times we are going to have to have a conscription law which can be brought into effect whenever the circumstances demand it; for instance, in a major war. But let us hope we never have to use it. However, at some time we might find that we are unable to get sufficient volunteers to go into the military service, in which case we will have to be able to return to a conscription system.

If we look at present enlistments in the Army it will be found that we are not getting the best technological brains or the best scientific brains into military service. They are not going to enlist in the Army and make a career of the Army. That is understandable. Most of them would want to go into the technological and professional categories. However, that does not mean if we have a volunteer army it will only be the poor man who would go into the Army or the man who would not have had the benefit of an education. Many men will volunteer to go into the Army.

As I tried to point out, those who wish to go to West Point, the Naval Academy, or the Merchant Marine Academy, or any of those schools, do so voluntarily. Many of them are eligible to go to Harvard, MIT, Princeton, or many of the other great institutions of this country. They attend the military academies instead because they like the military and feel it is important.

I think that this would be true on the level of noncommissioned officers and enlisted men as well. I do not see anything wrong with people going into the army who are unfortunate and lacking in education and economic benefits. There is much that can be learned in the 5 years in which they would serve. In some circumstances they would probably learn more and could earn much more than in civilian life. They would be better equipped if they wanted to return to civilian life because they would have developed skills and trained their minds so that they could become productive members of society. This would be an important byproduct.

I think it would serve a cause and cure many problems that presently exist in our Nation. I am hopeful that we could have this volunteer army. All we are talking about is enlisting more men, paying them better, and giving them prestige, so that the ultimate number of men who would be drafted would be decreased.

I think we would attract a sufficient number of men under those circumstances so that we would not have to revert to drafting young men into the military services unless we were faced with a major catastrophe. I do not see much difference in the volunteer army proposed by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon and what we actually have at the present time. We did not have to revert to the draft to the degree that we did until we got into the Vietnam crisis.

The number of men we draft depends on our commitment in Vietnam at the present time. We are all hopeful that this commitment will not last. When it ends, the number of men to be drafted will be decreased considerably and hopefully eliminated.

We must, then, as Senator HATFIELD has suggested, begin to work toward a volunteer army, paying them well, and improving the military service to the point where men will want to join and participate on a volunteer basis. This would do away with the necessity for drafting young men and keeping them in the state of uncertainty which exists at the present time.

Mr. HATFIELD. I appreciate the question raised by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky, as well as the comments made by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts. I should like to add one or two further points on the question raised by the Senator from Kentucky.

I think it is a valid question and one which has evoked a great deal of study and concern on the part of many people as they have attempted to find a satisfactory answer.

We must realize that within our educational system today we have made tremendous progress, that even though there are still many people who are poor, we are hopeful that through the efforts of the war on poverty—not just the formal war on poverty but the efforts of those in private industry and in nongovernmental institutions—we can seek to continue to reduce that number.

Of those between the ages of 16 and 21 in the United States, some 3 million could be classified as poor, under the classification of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Thirty percent of that group is nonwhite.

When we raise these questions as to how much people will respond, we raise such questions as the Senator from Massachusetts has already raised, the question of an all-Negro army, or only poor people involved. I do not think either one in a valid argument, because out of the total number of young people today in the 16-to-21 age bracket, which is 27 million, 87.5 percent are white. I do not believe that there is that much difference between the color of one's skin as to motivation and response. I think we are talking basically about the economic question. I am hopeful, because of our continued efforts here, that we will reduce the number of poor. There are many people who have not achieved the total educational opportunities which they would like to have. My bill would provide for the expansion of these educational opportunities within the military, continuing to fight against ignorance, poverty, and all these other enemies of freedom.

One last point, the one raised as to flexibility; we have heard a great deal about voluntary military service not being flexible enough to meet a crisis, that we have set a certain number of military personnel under normal conditions, but under a crisis situation we would have to have an extraordinarily larger number.

Let me remind the Senate that during the Korean war, the draft proved that it was not flexibile enough to meet our needs. We have 1,600,000 men in the draft pool during the Korean war, yet at the same time, we had to recall 600,000 men from the Reserve program. We had to recall 50,000 men from the Berlin crisis. Thus, I do not believe that the present conscription program has proved it is flexible enough to meet a crisis.

My bill would provide for a very well established program, because it would have a spare. There would be the opportunity to relate our needs to a fluctuating manpower program, and that would be done through a strong Reserve program. That would need to be related to a voluntary military system.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. GRUENING. I should like to say to the Senator from Kentucky, I consider that what he visualizes is not wholly bad. We are hopeful, in our free society, to make it a classless society, to help the uneducated become more educated, and to help the poorly trained become better trained. The Army is a great educational institution, as those of us who have served in it know so well. I believe that the junior Senator from Oregon's proposal would be a great help in our efforts on the war on poverty. It would give employment and training to many who lack and need both. I think such an army would be of additional value. I do not think it would be necessarily constituted by a very large number of poor people—and by that I mean economically poor, not poor in character or quality, or spirit—if given that opportunity to serve. They would find their level, just as they would find it in private business. When people go into private business, if they are not adequate, if they do not show capability, then they stay at the lower level in that business; but if they show ability, they move up into the higher echelons. That would be true in this proposed army. I think it could be of great help in our efforts in civilian life to raise the levels of education and the abilities of our people. On that basis, while I think a considerable number of the poor would go into the army, but not by any means in overwhelming numbers, of course, but it would not mean a deterioration of the military service. I believe it might result in a raising of the level of our whole society.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I have no doubt about that at all. In fact, I have always believed that service in the Army is of tremendous benefit. It means discipline, a more orderly life, a feeling of comradeship with those who serve, and an ability to deal with human beings in general. I think it is very helpful. I understand all of that. My point is that I do not believe it the right thing for this country, if just one class of people serve—and I am not talking here about their quality or character because, God knows, there are just as many good and decent people in the poorer classes who struggle; of good character and spirit as those who are much better off; but I do question whether, under a volunteer system, if a situation could develop where the burden of defense would rest upon volunteers from that group of people who are the poorest, I do not think it would be fair at all. That is the point I have been making. I am raising the question.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. I have had an opportunity to serve with volunteer soldiers and drafted soldiers in the same war—that is, in World War II. And, frankly, I did not see any difference in the degree of patriotism or commitment to victory on the part of the drafted soldier over the volunteer soldier. I do not think we will ever have that kind of a problem. I think that both draftees and enlistees are equally devoted to their country. I think that both of them would do the job if the circumstances demanded it.

I certainly commend the senior Senator from Kentucky for his concern over the matter of having poor people, or poorly educated people, carry the burden of our military needs. We must certainly take the possibility into consideration, but I do not believe the creation of a voluntary army would have this result.

Unfortunately, the people who are totally lacking in motivation would no more volunteer for service in the Army than they would volunteer to go out and look for a job today. We will have to stimulate motivation in people if we are to educate them and train them.

I think that the Army might very well prove to be the training ground for many young men because, as the Senator very well knows, the Army provides schooling, discipline, health habits, among other advantages. If they receive this training in the military service, it would be of great value to them and to society. Many men have changed the entire course of their lives as a result of service in the military. I just do not believe the results which the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky might fear would come to pass, if we did have a volunteer army.

Mr. BAKER. Will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. I believe that my colleague from Oregon has chosen one of the most difficult and one of the most complex fields that is likely to confront this body in this session of Congress; that is the matter of how we supply the inevitable and necessary needs of manpower to effectuate and carry forward our national purpose and national policy throughout the world.

I rise to make one or two observations that may or may not impinge finally upon my decision on how I shall vote on the proposed amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

To begin with, in listening to the colloquy here in the Chamber on this matter, I am struck by the fact that there is room for debate on the proposition that this country will, to the maximum extent possible, raise its requirements for military manpower on a voluntary basis.

This has always been the history of our Republic. It has always been the history of the American people, that when the Nation's purpose required military manpower, the people have volunteered in the necessary numbers to discharge those obligations.

My own State of Tennessee is officially nicknamed "The Volunteer State."

She has consistently supplied, I suppose, more than its ratable share of men for the conflicts in which this Nation has been involved.

I would be disturbed if there were any question or any debate as to whether our basic national purpose should be that of a conscriptive process, a draftee army, or a volunteer army. I would very much hope that we would all prefer for our manpower requirements, except in an extreme situation, to be raised on a volunteer basis.

But there is one other concern in this respect that I sense and feel during the colloquy between my colleagues that disturbs me just as much, and that essentially is the question of timing. When, by statute, by law, by amendment, by committee report, should we undertake to alter and change the basic fundamental military purpose of the country?

So I find myself in the position of agreeing with the Senator from Oregon that the national purpose is best served by having voluntary armed forces. However, I have doubt in my mind as to whether this is the time, or this is the place, or this is the manner in which to restate that principle in the face of our increasing obligations to the military establishment in Southeast Asia.

Mr. President, I have no ready solution, but I find myself concerned about the language in the Senator's amendment beginning on line 9, page 1, through line 2, page 2, which reads: "that the exercise of such authority necessarily constitutes an invasion of the liberties of America's young men."

I feel, from my own viewpoint, that I would have preferred the language to have read: "that the exercise of such authority constitutes a necessary invasion of the liberties of America's young men."

There is no doubt in my mind that now, today, the call upon the resources of manpower to support our effort in Southeast Asia and elsewhere is necessary, and that any effort to substantially alter or change the method by which we develop the necessary and essential reservoir of manpower and wealth for the implementation of this purpose might seriously disrupt our objectives in the defense of the free world against communism.

I express these dual doubts reluctantly, especially because of my high regard and affection for my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon; but I must say, while I still have not fully concluded whether I can or cannot support this particular amendment, I would like to invite the attention of this body to the fact that the tradition of a volunteer armed force, rather than a mercenary or conscripted armed force, is deeply interwoven into the fabric of this Republic and its traditions.

I would be amazed if anybody questioned that concept. There is, however, the question of whether this is the time or place or manner in which to substantially amend our manpower procurement system in the United States.

This final word, if I may: I would hope this debate, the offering of this amendment, and the consideration of this bill, will give no comfort and no encouragement to those in the United States—and there are very, very few—who feel that their conduct and their actions are superior to the collective judgment of all Americans. And I would make clear that their personal resistance to the draft or their burning of draft cards or destruction of the flag of the United States is in no way condoned or encouraged by any honest debate on our part concerning the conduct of our conscription system in America.

So let me hope two things are clear: first, that the principle of a volunteer armed force is deeply interwoven into the fabric and entire structure of this Republic's history; and, second, that by the honest efforts of the distinguished Senator from Oregon to closely examine and to make constructive new proposals on how we might modify our manpower procurement system, we intend no comfort to the small minority who might feel that what we have said gives them such encouragement.

Mr. HATFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. May I respond first to the Senator from Tennessee? Then I shall be glad to yield.

I appreciate what the Senator from Tennessee has said before this body, not only in terms of the debate, but how it may be reported and the kind of response it may receive from every segment. I certainly agree that there should be no cause for comfort on the part of those who would engage in erratic and irresponsible actions in violation of law.

I would point out again that this particular amendment does not alter the military manpower procurement program we now have. I did have a proposal that would have, during a transition period, altered this procurement program, and I was given a full and adequate hearing before the Senate Armed Services Committee. I have not offered an amendment in an attempt to do here on the floor what the committee did not accept. I do not deny that I have a parliamentary right to do it, but I do not choose that particular method. I have chosen to make this proposal in furtherance of the concept that, regardless of national involvement or international involvement, there are certain basic principles that must always be jealously guarded, and the preservation of personal liberty is one such basic principle.

I do not think any kind of national or international program or commitment gives us the right to forgo the basic responsibility we have, not only as Senators, but as citizens of this country, to exercise our responsibility in the preservation of personal liberty.

Therefore, I do not believe this amendment does anything but restate the principle which has been enunciated by many great Americans, beginning with Daniel Webster, with respect to the relationship between a conscription system and a volunteer service.

All I am asking is that at the same time that the Senate votes to continue the draft—and I am going to vote to continue it, because we cannot abandon our manpower procurement requirements—we will not renounce the principle of a volunteer military force.

I now yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I think everybody here would agree that the establishment of a totally volunteer military force in this country is a goal that we eminently desire to achieve. I think we would all prefer that we had an entirely professional Army, Navy, and Air Force. The fact of the matter is that from time to time circumstances in this world make it necessary to reach beyond the professional organization and request citizen soldiers. This has happened several times in this century.

We in the Armed Services Committee are constantly seeking to devise more incentives, for example, to raise pay. As a matter of fact, I believe military pay has been raised every year since I have been on the Armed Services Committee. We are constantly seeking to provide incentives for men to seek a professional military career. As a matter of fact, the committee has gone even beyond the recommendations of the Defense Department on this matter.

We do want to achieve this goal. I think this may be simply reiteration or repetition of the obvious, of what has been going on for some time. Certainly, this is not something that is an ideological argument. I think it cuts across ideological lines. I think all of the various political complexions advocate a volunteer army.

This is almost like saying, "Let us try to create a fire company to fight a fire" while a fire is going on. We are constantly involved in trying to achieve the goal of a professional Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps that can meet our needs in times of national emergency.

Sometimes you have to move a little bit faster to acquire available manpower than the framework of the voluntary service system will permit you to move in filling the services with volunteers.

I would point out that the vast majority of the men in our Armed Forces today are volunteers. The vast majority of those fighting in Vietnam today are volunteers. So the need is relatively small, but it must be filled within a short period of time, and therefore we must resort to Selective Service. It is a matter of necessity, not of choice.

Mr. HATFIELD. I point out to the Senator from Texas that on page 2 of the amendment, I recognize the existence of the immediate situation, and do not call for a volunteer military establishment at this moment. Rather the amendment says:

> Whenever such reassessment reveals that a system of involuntary inductions can be replaced by a system based on the free choice of the individual, at an overall cost to the Nation that we can reasonably afford.

At that time. Not today, not next year, but only at that time.

Mr. TOWER. I assure the Senator from Oregon that the Committee on Armed Services is constantly making such reassessments, because in fact the Selective Service System is a can of worms. It is something we do not like to have to exercise oversight over, to legislate on periodically. We do not like the political implications of having to maintain a Selective Service System to select this boy to go and that boy to stay home. That is not something we like. It is not something we like to deal with, even from a political standpoint.

I think the Senator can be assured that the Committees on Armed Services of both Houses are constantly engaged in this reevaluation. Certainly they are constantly engaged in trying to provide better means to attract more qualified volunteers for service as soldiers, sailors, and airmen in our armed services.

I think we have done a good job of staying up with the nonmilitary professions, but it is a difficult thing to do, especially when the taxpayer is paying the bill.

Mr. HATFIELD. I can appreciate that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] be printed in the Record following the conclusion of my remarks. Senator Percy could not be present today, and asked that this be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be associated as a cosponsor of my amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOLUNTEERISM IN MILITARY SERVICE

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I have joined the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield] in urging the development of a military manpower program that relies much more heavily on the concept of voluntary military service than the present Selective Service System. It is a concept which I have advocated since coming to the Senate in 1963, and which I am pleased to join Senator Hatfield in supporting.

The present draft system has, I think, imposed unnecessary hardship and uncertainty upon the youth of the Nation. This uncertainty hangs over them for 8 years, from the age of 18 to 26.

It should be our ultimate objective to introduce as much volunteerism in military service as is commensurate with the development of the most effective possible modern military force.

If the military and the Congress revise pay scales so that the pay is commensurate with equivalent responsibilities in civilian life, we will be able to attract the major force needed to meet our manpower needs and substantially reduce reliance on the draft.

There are tens of thousands of fine young men who would like to make the Armed Forces their career. Yet they cannot today because present pay scales simply make it impossible to maintain a family and develop a satisfactory career.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening] be associated as a cosponsor of this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I shall not take much longer, because I believe that everyone has familiarized himself with the problems we face today in military manpower procurement. I appreciate the opportunity to engage in this debate and colloquy, because I believe that it should strengthen the concern that we not turn our backs on the problem merely because we shall have voted on a draft bill today. One that apparently will pass, and one which will continue the present military manpower procurement program for at least another 2 to 4 years.

As I have previously stated, all we seek to do by this amendment is to restate a basic principle to which we are all committed. Through the amendment, I think we could give to the young people of our Nation some hope, some assurance that we are not going to be content with the present program, but that we have confidence in them and in their patriotism to respond to a nation in need, and that, with proper incentives, we are going to move toward a volunteer military, and not just ask them to accept, with no hope for change, a conscriptive service, without being able to look toward a volunteer program some time in the future.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record selected statements on the subject of a volunteer military establishment by distinguished Americans of both political parties.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Draft and the Voluntary Army—Selected Quotations

Senator Robert A. Taft: "It is said that a compulsory draft is a democratic system. I deny that it has anything to do with democracy. It is neither democratic nor undemocratic. It is far more typical of totalitarianism nations than of democratic nations. The theory behind it leads directly to totalitarianism. It is absolutely opposed to the principles of individual liberty which have always been considered a part of American democracy. . . . . The principle of a compulsory draft is basically wrong." (*Congressional Record,* August 14, 1940, page 15768.)

Senator Burton K. Wheeler: "Peacetime conscription . . . is the greatest step toward regimentation and militarism ever undertaken by the Congress of the United States. (*Congressional Record,* August 21, 1940, page 16255.)

Senator Arthur Vandenberg: "These reasons must have been related in some indispensible fashion to the fundamental theory that peacetime military conscription is repugnant to the spirit of democracy and the soul of Republican institutions, and that it leads in dark directions." (*Congressional Record,* August 12, 1940, page S10123.)

Adlai E. Stevenson: "Every young man who has served in our armed forces knows the incredible waste of our present system of forced but short-term service. He knows the money that could be saved, the new efficiency that could result from a volunteer system which calls on young men not to endure two years of service because they have to, but to choose it for a longer period because it offers advantages that seem to them appealing." (Speech at Youngstown, Ohio, October 18, 1956; cited in the Report of Special Subcommittee on Utilization of Military Manpower of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 86th Congress, Second Session, page 154.)

Defense Advisory Committee on Professional and Technical Compensation, Ralph J. Cordiner, Chairman: "Reduced to its simplest terms the personnel problem appears to be a matter of quality as opposed to quantity. It is not a matter of the total number of people on hand, but it is a matter of the level of retention of those possessing a high degree of leadership quality and those with the technical training and experience the services so urgently need. It is a matter of not being able, at the present time and under the present circumstances, to keep and challenge and develop the kinds of people needed for the periods of time necessary for them to make an effective contribution to the operation of the force . . . It is foolish for the Armed Forces to obtain highly advanced weapons systems and not have men of sufficient competence to understand, operate and maintain such equipment . . . The solution here, of course, is not to draft more men to stand and look helplessly at the machinery. The solution is to give the men already in the armed forces the incentives required to make them want to stay in the services long enough and try hard enough to take on these higher responsibilities, gain the skill and experience levels we need and then remain to give the services the full benefit of their skills."

("A Modern Concept of Compensation for Personnel of the Uniformed Services", (Cordiner Report), March, 1957.)

Maj. Gen. Harold Maddux, Department of Defense, Division of Manpower Requirements: "We need drastic changes in pay and attitudes to upgrade a military career in the eyes of the nation. We can't get that change with large numbers of men compelled to serve against their will." (House Armed Services Committee Hearings on H.R. 2260, Extension of the Draft, January, 1959, No. 2, page 130.)

Adm. Ben Moreell, president, Americans for Constitutional Action: "It is my firm conviction that the two greatest intrusions on individual freedom in the history of the Republic are, first, the Sixteenth Amendment . . . and second, the Act of May 18, 1917, whereby Congress 'authorized and ordained' a conscript army for use in foreign war." (*The Freeman,* July, 1960.)

Senator Stuart Symington: "A force made up of volunteer professional military personnel is more effective and less costly than one dependent on involuntary draftees. If the current atmosphere of complacency were dissolved, and a military career made more respected and attractive, the draft could be eliminated." (Cited in *Newsweek Magazine*, April 4, 1960.)

Russell Kirk: "Universal military training, the most crushing burden that the state can impose upon its people, the most terrible curse of the better types of humanity—highly strung, sensitive and nervous—is found in conjunction with levelling democracy not merely by coincidence. The armed horde is a concomitant of equalitarian socialism and state planning; and it is a natural reaction of any society which has abandoned all the old habitual and internal disciplines, so that it must rely (as Burke predicted) upon arbitrary internal disciplines." (*The Conservative Mind*. Russell Kirk, Chicago, Regnery, 1961, page 378.)

Prof. John K. Galbraith: "The draft survives principally as a device by which we use compulsion to get young men to serve at less than the market rate of pay. We shift the cost of military service from the well-to-do taxpayer, who benefits by lower taxes, to the impecunious young draftee. This is a highly regressive arrangement which we would not tolerate in any other area. Presumably freedom of choice here as elsewhere would be worth paying for . . . As an important added benefit a shift from compulsion to fully paid service would give us a better trained force—something that modern weapons make most desirable. We would not, as now, have a force which consists of partly trained men who leave about as soon as their training is complete." (Quoted by Rev. Montgomery J. Shroyer, Extension of the Draft and Related Authorities. Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, First Session on H.R. 2438 (S. 846), page 80.)

Senator Robert A. Taft: "It is said that we are going to teach the boys citizenship in the camps. This argument makes clear a real danger in the whole system. By handing boys over to the arbitrary and complete domination of the Government, we put it in the power of the Government to indoctrinate them with the political doctrines then popular with the Government. . . . In wartime it is bad enough; in peacetime, it would be intolerable." (Quoted by Rev. Montgomery J. Shroyer, Extension of the Draft and Related Authorities. Hearing before a Subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services, U.S. Senate, 89th Congress, First Session on H.R. 2438 (S. 846), page 159.)

Hanson W. Baldwin: ". . . there is no doubt that it would be desirable to end the draft entirely. Military effectiveness—in terms of highly trained professionals instantly ready—would be greatly improved if professional motivation could be substituted for compulsion. Certainly a voluntary system of recruitment is more compatible with past American traditions and with our concept of political freedom than conscription. The younger generation would be able to plan its important beginning years with far greater certainty than is now possible, and the somewhat corrosive effects upon morale of the present system of deferments and exemptions would be ended. Militarily, politically and socially, then, it seems desirable to end the draft . . . (I)f the facts then clearly indicate that voluntary recruitment and long term professionalism, encouraged by improved incentives, might supply service needs, the draft should be ended. But if there is a doubt, the principle of compulsion might then be suspended, rather than eliminated, for a stated period, in order to test and try a new system, one more compatible with the soul of republican institutions." (*New York Times Magazine*, "Should We End the Draft? Our Way of Procuring Military Manpower, Now a Campaign Issue, Is Reexamined", September 27, 1964.)

William F. Buckley, Jr.: "The not so very long-term objective should be to eliminate the draft in favor of a professional army of volunteers, who would greatly increase the efficiency of the armed services, and relieve the civil population of an experience which, insofar as it is unrelated to true necessity, is debasing, and an unnecessary—and therefore inexcusable—encroachment on individual freedom." (*Washington Daily News*, April 24, 1964, page 27.)

James G. Patton: "I am confident that a well formulated program can be achieved which will eliminate the draft, modernize reserve programs and achieve huge savings in man-years and budget dollars. Such a program would justifiably generate widespread public support and enthusiasm. Most important, it would bring strengthened civilian control and simple human justice into our huge military manpower structure." (Cited in the Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 18, p. 23072.)

Senator Barry Goldwater: "This administration uses the outmoded and unfair military draft system for social schemes as well as military objectives.

"Republicans will end the draft altogether, and as soon as possible! That I promise you!

"Republicans understand that the military forces need trained volunteers who make the military service a career. Republicans understand that the purpose of the military forces is not social, or political—it is to help the peace of the world.

"To use military services for political and social schemes—as this administration does—is to drift closer to war on an ebbing tide of military strength." (*Chicago Tribune*. September 4, 1964, page 2.)

Nils A. Lennartson, Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary for Public Affairs: "We are glad to know that the Republican candidate agrees with the administration that the draft should be ended as soon as possible, . . ." (*New York Times*. "The Pentagon Says It Welcomes Goldwater Idea That Draft End", September 4, 1964.)

Senator Gaylord Nelson: "If the Congress will take the time to make a detailed study of the draft as it works today, I think it will be shocked and appalled at what it finds.

"My own study has led me to this conclusion:

"Our present draft system is outmoded. It should be terminated, in the interests of national security as well as justice. With careful planning, we can end the draft, responsibly, in 1967." (Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 12, p. 15365.)

Senator George McGovern: "The present system seems to me to be a wasteful, inefficient, and undemocratic method of securing our military manpower. It is a cloud over the lives of all of our young men and yet only a fraction of them are needed or will be called for service.

"I think that by proper salary and job benefits we could secure the men we need on a voluntary basis. This would produce a military force of better motivated career servicemen and leave the rest of our young men free to pursue their careers and their private lives without the uncertainty of a draft hanging over their heads." (Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 12, p. 15371.)

Republican platform, 1964. "For the People": ". . . we pledge:

"—re-evaluation of the armed forces' manpower procurement programs with the goal of replacing involuntary inductions as soon as possibly by an efficient voluntary system, offering real career incentives;" (Adopted by the Republican National Convention, July 14, 1964, San Francisco, California, page 15–16.)

Democratic platform, 1964: "On August 25, the Democratic Convention promised in its platform to 'pursue our examination of the selective service program to make certain that it is continued only as long as it is necessary and that we meet our manpower needs without social or economic injustice'". (Cited in the Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 18, p. 23068.)

Congressman William H. Bates: "I am against the draft and induction of all kinds unless we have to have them. . . . But you have to be very careful in using a military organization for other than military purposes. I still think that our home communities with our local schools and our churches and our neighbors and our friends and relatives, all of this kind of community effort is the place to which we should address problems of this nature and I would be most reluctant to use the Armed Forces for anything other than the purpose for which they have been established." (Review of the Administration and Operation of the Selective Service System. Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, Second Session, pages 9708–9709.)

Congressman Robert Ellsworth: "I urge that Congress abolish the draft, and get on with the establishment of a modern professional, career-oriented, highly paid volunteer military force."

"The concept of a national service obligation to replace a military service obligation is repulsive. . . . But the drafting of men or women for civilian service, no matter how lauditory the cause, is the exact antithesis of everything this Nation stands for."

"The basic concept which the Congress should accept is that the draft should be abolished."

". . . This means increased military pay. It means increased career opportunities. It means a radical departure from existing practice of using uniformed personnel in administrative and supply jobs in the United States which could just as easily be filled by civilians. It means attention to the creation of a more adequate volunteer reserve force which can be activated in crisis time. It means a system of bonuses for enlistment by the reserves for active duty in crises. But most of all it means a determination by the administration and the Congress to make every effort to undertake the necessary reforms to allow the draft to be ended." (Review of the Administration and Operation of the Selective Service System. Hearings before the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, 89th Congress, Second Session, pages 9756, 9757, 9759, 9760.)

Congressman Thomas B. Curtis: "The draft, with its 4061 local and autonomous draft boards and its antiquated machinery, is an anachronism in the Cold War era, a relic of an earlier time when vast quantities of raw manpower were thrown onto the battlefields of Europe and Asia to overcome by their very numbers the killing power of cannon, machine gun and tank. In the age of the skilled technician, the Armed Forces of the United States still rely on the Selective Service System, a World War Two expedient, to supply them with bewildered, untrained, often poorly educated youth. Immune to technological change and changing population structure, the draft has become the weakest link in our national security system and an unnecessary burden on our society. It is within our means to eliminate compulsory military service; that we have not done so, or begun to do so, is an announcement of our failure to adapt to the changing conditions of modern society." (*Playboy Magazine*. February, 1967. Cited in the *Congressional Record*, January 24, 1967, p. 1385.)

Lt. Gen. Ira C. Eaker, retired: "Concurrent with renewal of the draft, Congress should provide for a professional military establishment to meet the requirements for national security without conscription. This can be done by making military careers competitive with the civilian professions and occupations that require similar education, preparation and skill."

"Occasionally, one hears the unsupported assertion that the cost of an adequate defense force without conscription would be prohibitive. Actually, this proposal would cost less than the present draft system, with its high rate of personnel turnover. More importantly, it would provide a credible deterrent to nuclear war. Such an effective national security system is cheap at any price." (*Post-Advocate*, Alhambra, California. "Military Affairs: Replacement For Draft Law," February 23, 1967. Cited in the daily *Congressional Record*, March 9, 1967, A1182.)

Dr. Milton Friedman, University of Chicago: "(b) Individual freedom.—A voluntary army would preserve the freedom of individuals to serve or not to serve. Or, put the other way, it would avoid the arbitrary power that now resides in draft boards to decide how a young man shall spend several of the most important years of his life—let alone whether his life shall be risked in warfare. An incidental advantage would be to raise the level and tone of political discussion.

"A voluntary army would enhance also the freedom of those who now do not serve. Being conscripted has been used as a weapon—or thought by young men to be so used—to discourage freedom of speech, assembly, and protest. The freedom of young men to emigrate or to travel abroad has been limited by the need to get the permission of a draft board if the young man is not to put himself in the position of inadvertently being a lawbreaker." (Paper presented at the Conference on the Draft, December 7, 1966. "Why Not a Voluntary Army?" *Congressional Record*, March 9, 1967, p. 6098.)

"A military draft is undesirable and unnecessary. We can and should man our armed forces with volunteers—as the United States has traditionally done except in major wars.

"Only a minority of young men now enter the armed forces. Hence, some method of 'selective service'—of deciding which young man should serve and which two or three should not—is inevitable. But our present method is inequitable, wasteful and inconsistent with a free society." (*Newsweek Magazine*. "Milton Friedman on a Volunteer Army," December 19, 1966, page 100.)

Senator Barry Goldwater: "Conservatives want to end the draft—period. They do not want to extend it to any other form of service. They sympathize with the aims of the system, but they cannot and do not sympathize with the method, no matter what its motive . . ."

"The conservative position is based solidly upon the notion that man's most fundamental right and responsibility is to live his own life." (*The New Guard*, May, 1967.)

Bruce Chapman: "The abolition of the draft and a new all-volunteer military can terminate the conundrum of contradictions and confusion, the mandarin complexities, discriminations, and inefficiencies of the so-called Universal Military Training and Service Act. The evasion mentality among the young can be curbed. Lives in a world already anxious and precarious can be freed of the draft's additional uncertainty. The insidious subtle power of a vast bureaucracy to interfere in a citizen's personal plans—to punish, threaten, or 'channel'—can be eliminated and personal freedom enhanced.

"All this is now achievable because the draft is no longer necessary; it can be replaced, and therefore it should be replaced." (*The Wrong Man in Uniform*. New York, Trident Press, 1967, pp. 107–108.)

Senator Mark O. Hatfield: ". . . each man has a moral obligation to serve his country, but he must be granted the freedom to accept his responsibility and the right to determine what form his service shall take. Anytime a man is forced, against his wishes, into military service his individual liberty and freedom of choice have been denied."

"The surrender of this right to liberty can only be justified when there is no other alternative to conscription and when it is absolutely necessary for national survival." (*Congressional Record*, March 14, 1967, p. 6503.)

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT BY SENATOR PERCY

I intend to support the amendment of my distinguished colleague, the able articulate Junior Senator from Oregon.

In my judgment, there is a strong public sentiment that the Congress, in preference to the Executive, should take the leadership in making meaningful and constructive changes to our present means of maintaining our standing military forces. Just as the merits and possibilities of ultimately providing for an all-volunteer military force merit further exploration, in my judgment, the merit and possibilities of other means to make the conscriptive system as presently oriented more fair and equitable deserve our continuing close attention.

We must strive in every way to end a system that unfairly visits upon a few the responsibilities of the many. The present system of conscription into the armed services has been subjected to criticism from many quarters. Regrettably, much of that criticism is warranted.

I support the Senator's amendment for a 2-year extension of the draft. The American people had a right to expect that Congress—long ago—would have accepted its Constitutional responsibility to undertake a major review of the Selective Service System. The rules whereby our young men are conscripted into the military should be set by the elected representatives of the people, for there is probably no governmental action which more directly affects the individual citizen than the draft.

The Executive Branch has studied and restudied this question. Now they promise us they will continue to study it further. However, the time is past due for the Congress to organize itself to thoroughly study all aspects of the draft. A bi-partisan joint committee similar to the Joint Economic Committee should be established, to be composed of members from all Congressional committees with jurisdiction over our manpower and military needs. Such a Committee would, in the next two years, study all suggestions and proposals in this area and make its recommendations to the Congress for a complete overhaul of our means of maintaining military forces.

I am confident that such a joint committee would recommend changes in the system to provide manpower to the military in the most fair and equitable manner possible. I offer for consideration the following additional proposals:

1. Mental and physical standards for induction should be revised. It is a wasteful use of manpower to require all who serve to meet standards presently required for combat when their duties may never require any activities more strenuous than typing a morning report.

2. Many who today would like to enlist in the military are denied that opportunity for mental and/or physical reasons. I recommend expanded mental and physical programs to qualify these men for military service.

3. More civilians should be used in meeting non-military manpower requirements of the armed services. Women as well as men should be provided opportunities for service in the military.

4. Higher pay scales should be initiated for the low military grades. Improved family housing should be provided. Higher pay and improved living conditions would attract more volunteers, better qualified persons, and decrease hardship and other exemptions.

5. Special benefits for volunteers should be initiated. These include pay incentives, shorter terms of service, and more advantageous assignment and career possibilities.

6. A random selection process should be instituted to select those who will serve.

A. The names of all those physically and mentally qualified who have attained a certain age should be introduced into the process. While many favor the ages of 18 or 19, in my judgment, a compelling argument can be made for age 21.

First, if the selection process were to be made at age 21, rather than at age 18 or 19, increased manpower needs could be met from men not yet exposed to the draft. The possibility of serving twice or having one's name introduced into the selection process more than one time would then be greatly reduced.

Second, having the random selection process at age 21 would maintain the advantage of high enlistment rates at ages 19 and 20.

Third, a selection process at age 21 will also encourage continued participation in ROTC programs.

Fourth, if the prospective inductee desires, he may volunteer to have his name introduced into the process at an earlier age than 21.

B. The time between introduction of an individual's name into the selection process and his induction if selected should be reduced to n absolute minimum.

C. Exemptions should be granted only for physical or mental incapacity; hardship; conscientious objectors; and such other similar circumstances as the Congress may prescribe. Having a wife and children should not constitute hardship.

D. Deferments should be granted for completion of an undergradute degree or a vocational or apprenticeship program, medical or dental school or for other reasons as Congress may prescribe.

I believe that the Congress is obligated to continue its study of the draft, and to continue to explore the fairest, most equitable means of maintaining the military forces of a free society in a rapidly changing world. The distinguished Chairman of the Armed Services Committee frankly and candidly stated on May 10 that the bill before us is not perfect, and will not remove all the inequities of the present system.

The passage of two years time, in all probability, see the necessity for additional evaluation and revision. In my judgment, public confidence in the Congress would be enhanced by our expressing our determination to exercise this leadership, to review the selective service system again in two, rather than four years.

Let us not forget that military service has always been an honorable tradition in our country. The military profession is exacting and challenging. The Congress and the nation must strive to maintain and enhance military service in its proper role as guardian of our country's security.

I commend my colleague, the Senator from Oregon, for his thoughtout, progressive work on this legislation, and I hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words in opposition to this amendment. Before doing so, I express my appreciation to the Senator from Oregon for his very kind comments in regard to the conduct of the hearings.

I am not willing to accept the thesis that in all events and under all circumstances a professional army is good for the welfare of this country and the freedom of its people. There may be no evils in a professional army of volunteers when the active duty force is small. But if a nation maintains armed forces with a strength of 4 or 5 million men and they are all professionals, keep them in the service year after year, the evils that George Washington foresaw in his Farewell Address may exist. I think it is a healthy thing to have a flow, in and out of our Army, of civilians who come in and stay for what is relatively a brief period and then go back to their homes. I think this flow is a tremendous contribution to the stability of our institutions and to the maintenance of those ideals that all American citizens hold dear.

Mr. President, we have today a situation that shows the problems of defending this country and protecting it under all circumstances with a purely professional army—and I do not use the word "mercenaries"; I say a professional army.

Our Armed Forces today are some 650,000 more in number than they were when the fighting broke out in Vietnam. I submit, Mr. President, that we hardly could have raised enough money in taxation to have brought 650,000 more men into the armed services in that period of time, by financial inducements alone, with the chance that they would be sent to the fighting front in Vietnam.

Senators have referred to the patriotism of young men, how they are going to spring to arms, that we will inculcate them with that spirit, and that it will not be necessary to induct them.

But, Mr. President, what happened in the War Between the States? We had some serious issues then, and it was necessary to resort to the draft on both sides to fill the ranks. And neither side could keep them filled.

What happened in World War I? William Jennings Bryan in a famous speech said, "If war comes, millions of men will spring to arms and go to the front." But we were confronted almost immediately with the necessity of imposing a draft. Without it, we could not have raised the forces that brought us victory in World War I.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It has been my impression that while American boys seem to be enormously courageous in battle, that they are very much afraid their first time in battle, but that after they have once been through it, they tend to adjust to it, and do very well thereafter. But these young fellows who may wish to volunteer find their mothers, their sisters, and their loved ones all saying, "Don't do it, don't be a fool," and the result is that only after they have actually been in battle do they have the desire to go back and fight again. At least that has been my impression.

Mr. RUSSELL. Some persons would wait to serve until the enemy was close to home. We do not win wars that way.

In World War II, we found it necessary to call 14 million men, at one time or another, to the colors. A great many of them had to be drafted.

Involuntary service is not a pleasant thing to deal with legislatively, but we have responsibilities in the Senate that go beyond dealing with pleasant things. We have a responsibility to assure that our Armed Forces maintain sufficient military strength to protect our Nation at all times and under all circumstances.

The adoption of this amendment will not have a cataclysmic effect, but it would have a very damaging effect.

Why is it necessary for the Senate at this particular time to engage in this self-flagellation by approving the pending amendment? Why is it necessary for us to send word to 43 percent of the men in Vietnam, in the words of the amendment, "We have invaded your liberties."

Is it going to help their morale to say: "We, the Senate, have solemnly voted that we have invaded your liberties"?

What will be the impression when John Doe goes to the Post Office in the morning and gets his mail and reads: "Greetings. You are ordered to present yourself for induction," and it continues "The Senate has invaded your liberties."

Mr. President, my opinion is that the pending amendment is a very injurious amendment, and I say that in all kindness.

We are not dealing here with matters of policy or whether we want to be in Vietnam. Many of the Senators who have a great interest in the pending amendment are those who think that we ought to withdraw from Vietnam tomorrow. However, we are not determining foreign policy in the pending bill. We are attempting to live up to our obligation as Senators to maintain an adequate Military Establishment for the United States. There is not a Senator who does not know in his heart that we cannot maintain an establishment of the size we need today under a voluntary system.

Why should we hold out false hopes? Reference was made to allowing a young man to plan his life. Why should we hold out false hopes to the young men who are approaching draft age by saying: "Tension and conflicts will end and there will be a volunteer army. You do not have to take into consideration the likelihood that you may have to spend 2 years in uniform somewhere."

I believe it is unwise for us to make a solemn finding that action necessary to defend our country constitutes an invasion of the liberties of America's young men. I would prefer to emphasize our hope that America's young men consider military service an opportunity and a privilege.

I see no reason for trying to create the impression we can attain a completely voluntary military force. We are not likely to do this. It would be prohibitively expensive to procure military forces of the size we had in World War II, or even today, by raising pay enough to get combat volunteers through financial inducements alone.

How would we get the doctors to look after the health needs of young men in the service? We could not do it by going in the open market and hiring them. To do so would require a pay scale for physicians that ranged from perhaps $25,000 a year to as much as $150,000 annually, if their pay is to be competitive with what some doctors earn in civilian life.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, is it the belief of the distinguished Senator from Georgia that citizen participation and citizen obligation to serve in the Armed Forces of our country is something that has run, like a constant thread, through the history of our Nation?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is exactly what I believe. I think this tradition has added to the stability of our institutions. It has spared us some problems such as we observe today in other countries. I do not want to be invidious by naming countries in which the armies have taken over time and time again. When a nation has a completely professional army, a man's devotion sometimes turns primarily to the officer corps or to the army rather than to the nation.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I know the Senator is familiar with the recent U.S. Youth Council poll which showed that 61 percent of its members who responded favored a volunteer army.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. And I know the Senator is familiar with the basic conflict this same poll revealed, when 58 percent of the respondents—almost as many as those who favor a volunteer army—indicated they personally would not volunteer.

My own experiences bear out the results of this survey. I have asked audiences of students how many of them favored a volunteer army. It should not be a surprise to anyone that, without exception, about two-thirds of the students raised their hands as favoring a volunteer army. Then I have asked the ones who would not volunteer to put their hands down. Let me tell the Senator that after the second question, very few hands remained up.

Would the Senator not agree with me that this illustrates one of the very serious problems represented by the volunteer army?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I would agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. As I said earlier, I just do not know how much you would have to pay a man to pick up a gun and go over to the mud of Vietnam.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. One of the matters of great concern to me—and I have listened to the debate this afternoon of those who support the concept of a volunteer army—is that we would end by having a volunteer army, but a black army. We would be divided in this country in a most dramatic and unfortunate way.

I ask Senator whether he will not agree with me that if we look, for example, at the Army reenlistment rate figures, we will note that the rate is 46.6 percent for the Negroes and 21.6 percent for the whites.

What we see here is substantiation of the argument which has often been made about the volunteer army, and is indeed being made today. That argument concerns the reenlistment of Negroes who have been denied opportunities in other aspects of our society, and who realize that the Armed Forces of our country are the last real resort to some kind of progress and recognition.

It is my very sincere belief that if we were to move to the concept of a volunteer army, to do so we would have to pay what is necessary in order to bring those young people into the Armed Forces of our country. We would end with one part of our population—a part gifted either financially or intellectually—being able to continue to develop its own talents, and another part of our population—a part not so gifted—serving in the Armed Forces of our country in a professional way. According to the statistics, figures, and projections of the Secretary of Labor, this latter part would be constituted principally of Negroes.

Either that would be true, Mr. President, or there would be a strong possibility that all the lower positions would be filled by Negroes, with the staff manned by white officers. That would be equally distasteful.

I ask the Senator from Georgia whether he does not feel that to move to the concept of a volunteer army would present some extraordinary problems, and that much more information would be needed on this fundamental question.

Even considering the kind and amount of testimony given before the Committee on Armed Services, of which the distinguished Senator from Georgia is chairman, in its effort to study and eliminate many of the inequities in the Selective Service Act, this question really has not had the kind of hearing, discussion, or deliberation that such a proposal warrants.

Mr. RUSSELL. I certainly agree with the Senator from Massachusetts that before we take any such drastic steps as have been suggested, the question should be given the most minute, detailed, and careful scrutiny and study.

I do know that there are a great many underprivileged Negro citizens whose incomes are quite low. It so happens that in the part of the world where I come from a great many white people have very low incomes. I do not know what their attitude would be about serving in a professional army.

But, Mr. President, think about the effect on the servicemen of a proposal of this kind when we are engaged in warfare. Let word be sent out through the Stars and Stripes, which is read by the men in Vietnam. The men would read in that newspaper, "You have been deprived of your rights. Your rights have been invaded." Some of them might say, "Let's get out of here," right at the time when they were to go out on patrol to fight the enemy.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. A leading economist who has supported a volunteer army, Prof. Walter Oi, of the University of Washington, has made an extremely detailed study of what the cost of a volunteer army might be. I know that the distinguished chairman has received similar testimony, based upon a study made by the Department of Defense, in which it is estimated that the cost of supporting a volunteer army in a Vietnam situation would be between $10 billion and $17 billion a year. Professor Oi suggests—and he is a proponent of such a plan—that the cost in a non-Vietnam situation would be between $4 and $7 billion a year.

Mr. RUSSELL. The figures which the Senator from Massachusetts has just related were computed before the size of the Armed Forces was increased because of the Vietnam war. No computation has been made since then, but the cost of raising the larger force would be much more.

If we are to put up signs reading, "Men Wanted for Government Employment. Join the Army. Free Food. Free Clothing. Free Lodging. Go to Vietnam," how much does the Senator think we would have to pay them a month?

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Many Senators are concerned—and I think appropriately so—about the aspect of compulsion in the Selective Service System. They find such compulsion obviously regrettable and believe that volunteering should be encouraged to the greatest degree possible. A number of suggestions have been made, including the suggestions made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HATFIELD], about the utilization of women to a greater degree in a number of capacities which men are filling today. Proposals have been made to update the System in other ways.

We who are concerned about the problems of education, of human betterment, of the rebuilding of our cities, know what could be done with $7 or $10 billion a year. I believe we have the responsibility of deciding whether the concept of compulsion, in the sense of a military obligation in the armed services of our country, sufficiently outweighs what we feel to be the extraordinary needs of our country in the fields of education, health, and other social programs. So what we would really be saying is that we are going to spend $8 or $10 billion more a year, in a non-Vietnam situation, for a volunteer army. That money, Mr. President, will have to come from somewhere.

I, for one, would rather support and see an expansion of programs for education, health, and social development, than for a volunteer army.

Would not the Senator from Georgia agree with me that the $8 or $10 billion would have to come from somewhere, perhaps to the detriment of other programs?

Mr. RUSSELL. The defense budget today is more than half of the largest budget this country has ever seen. If we are to go out into the open market and hire men to constitute an armed force of three and a half million men, there would hardly be enough money to carry on the other operations of Government.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. The chairman has made another very important point: that when the Defense Department study was made of the Selective Service, as well as the study of Professor Oi, of the University of Washington, unemployment was much higher. As a matter of fact, the Defense Department study was made when unemployment was close to 5 percent. Now it is down to 3.9 percent. Therefore, the amounts necessary to pay these people would increase rather dramatically, and the cost would exceed the estimates about which we have spoken this afternoon.

I wish to ask the Senator about one final aspect of this problem. It has been suggested by some of those who support the concept of the volunteer army that this would serve as an additional restraint on the President of the United States in fulfilling his responsibilities, under the Constitution, with regard to foreign policy. That is, any President would have to recognize, before he became involved in a foreign venture, the degree of popularity of his action, and what it would mean as far as the cost of military manpower was concerned. Some have felt that they could support a volunteer army because they feel they would like to see this additional restraint placed upon the President in fulfilling his responsiblities. But would not the chairman agree with me that this is a very real implication of a volunteer army, and that, certainly, this aspect of it should be explored most completely before any such action is taken?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am in favor of Congress performing its proper role as one of the coequal and coordinate branches of this Government, as was contemplated by the Founding Fathers. I think that because of our own dereliction, we have lost some of our stature as compared with the judiciary and with the executive.

I am willing to put restraint on the President in most areas, but I am not willing to do so on the basis that we should disarm the President so that he cannot fight a war.

I did not favor ever going into Vietnam. I opposed it as vigorously as I knew how. Congress can get out of Vietnam any day a majority wishes to, by the passage of a simple resolution revoking the Tonkin Gulf resolution.

Every one of the obligations to which we are bound—we are bound to them all over the world, but how we will ever fulfill all of them I do not know—has been embraced in a treaty that was approved by two-thirds of the Senators who were sitting in this Chamber. Those obligations are the obligations of Congress.

I do not like to see the President assume legislative power any more than anyone else. I will lay my record of defending the prerogatives of the Congress of the United States alongside that of any other man alive in this country today.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. I wish to express my appreciation for the responses that the distinguished Senator from Georgia has made.

My personal feeling is that while this concept has some merit, I do believe that we have sufficiently resolved a number of these questions. Therefore, I shall certainly support the decision which has been taken by the chairman.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. I cannot conceive of a more inopportune time for the Senate to go on record with this resolution of flagellation, by telling every man in uniform who has been drafted that he is there because we have invaded his liberties. I cannot conceive of a more inopportune time than now.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I am sorry that I was not present during the earlier discussions. The Senator from Georgia knows that I had other duties which required my being elsewhere.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes, I know. I was one of the absentees from the Senator's committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask, first, whether the yeas and nays have been ordered on this amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have been ordered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask if the Senator's remarks—I have heard only the last part—referred in large part to the recitals in section 1 of subsection (c), providing—and it would be a finding of the Senate—that the exercise of such authority—that is, the draft, the selective service—necessarily constitutes an invasion of the liberties of America's young men.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have said that if that is a correct statement of fact, we have over the years invaded the liberties of millions of young Americans.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad the Senator has addressed himself to that point.

It is inconceivable to me that the Senate, Congress generally, or any group of American citizens would go on record as saying that in carrying out our constitutional duty—and it is the constitutional duty of Congress, not of the President to raise and support armies—we are invading the liberties of America's young men. That would be about the most unfortunate action that could possibly emanate from Congress, and I appreciate the fact that the Senator has mentioned that.

I should now like to advert to a matter brought out by my friend, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY]. While it is true, as I understand it, that the greater percentage of reenlistments in Vietnam has been from among our colored troops, I think that proves nothing at all except what we have seen proved many times before, and that is that the groups that are in the most hazardous economic condition at home are the ones to enlist, reenlist, enlist, and reenlist in the armed services. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. RUSSELL. I agree completely with the Senator. I understand that that was the position of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLLAND. It did not have to do with race or color?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct. It had nothing to do with race.

Mr. HOLLAND. I recall, and I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Georgia recalls, the beginning of World War I when the Selective Service System was invoked for the first time in many years in our Nation's history. It was found that certain States in the South almost entirely, and one completely, met their first contingent and did not have to meet the first draft call. The Senator may recall that.

Mr. RUSSELL. I believe that is true.

Mr. HOLLAND. That has to do with the point I am making. Happily, that condition does not exist any more, but the economic opportunity of young men at that time in the part of the Nation in which both the distinguished Senator and I live was not up to the average in the rest of the Nation, and enlistment and reenlistment of our men, white and colored, was due to the absence of opportunity for advantageous employment in our area at that time. Is that not true?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that. When I first came to the Senate there were less than 150,000 men in the Armed Forces; there were about 110,000 in the Army, the Navy and Marine Corps had 40,000; and there was no Air Force, except for the Army.

An unusually high percentage of the enlistees were from the Southern States because the best way they knew to make a living was to go into the services. They made good soldiers. Their officers said they made good soldiers.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wanted that in the RECORD because it demonstrates that there is here no question of race, color, or region. The question is, Where is the poorest economic opportunity? It is from that type of region we have always gotten the largest percentage of voluntary enlistments in the Armed Forces and we always will, I assume.

Mr. RUSSELL. The question in the bill before the Senate now is, What is the best and fairest way to undertake to share the responsibility of defending the land we love?

Mr. HOLLAND. I think that the Senator has fairly stated it, and I stand foursquare behind the Senator from Georgia.

Although we are talking about an amendment, I have two questions relating to the bill as a whole. Because I have to go to another hearing, I would like an opportunity to address two general questions to the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. HOLLAND. The first question is: Does the draft of the new bill here disturb the concept under which we have operated for so many years, that the administration of selective service shall be left to State and local people very largely as a matter of satisfying our most truly democratic concept in this Nation?

Mr. RUSSELL. This bill in no wise restructures the system under which selective service operates. It maintains the same system we have today. The local boards would be selected in the same manner they have been selected in the past, and in the manner they were selected when the distinguished Senator from Florida was serving as Governor of that State.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Governor would continue to have high responsibility for the functioning in a fair way of the Selective Service System in his State; and the local citizens who accept at his invitation, the opportunity to serve, and who are in an unpleasant but highly necessary duty on the local boards, the appeal boards, and the like, would still have that type of responsibility.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no change whatever in the existing system.

Mr. HOLLAND. According to the able Senator, who has so long handled this setup as the agent of the Senate, does he feel that a continuation of the present system is absolutely necessary to its finest acceptance by the people generally who may then look to their home government, their neighbors, and their friends whom they know to determine the vital questions as to whether my son or my neighbor's son is the one chosen?

Mr. RUSSELL. This system, by its very nature, is the responsibility of the American people. I have stated as recently as yesterday that in my opinion this system maintained itself in the eyes of the American people because it was truly Jeffersonian in all aspects and predicated on administration at the grass roots.

Mr. HOLLAND. By and large the finest people in our communities have not hesitated to accept this highly difficult responsibility.

Mr. RUSSELL. They cannot be honored too highly. Although there is no compensation whatever, those who serve on these boards manifest the finest service that can be rendered.

Mr. HOLLAND. I agree completely with the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall now conclude. I hope that the Senate will not agree to this proposal. It holds out false hopes to the young men of this country. It would create much more uncertainty in planning their lives than it could possibly eliminate. Everyone will be glad when that day comes when we will be able to do away with Selective Service. It may not be necessary for Congress to do so because the President, by not issuing a call in any month, can suspend inductions through the Selective Service System.

By and large this has been a fair system. We have taken upon ourselves great international obligations all over the world. Sometimes I feel we have gone to the extreme. I know we have not required the practical cooperation of all of those associated with us in these agreements. But we have these obligations now and to preserve this Nation, this priceless Nation, this heritage that we enjoy, in my opinion it is necessary to continue the Selective Service Act in essentially the form it is today.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish

to make a few remarks, and the distinguished chairman has agreed that he would answer questions for me. I must apologize because some of these matters have perhaps been covered heretofore, but yesterday afternoon I was involved in a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations and, therefore, I was necessarily absent from the Chamber during most of the afternoon. I wish to make a few general remarks first in connection with the subject.

Mr. President, for the past 5 or 6 years, each year when General Hershey appeared before the Subcommittee on Appropriations of the Committee on Independent Offices, I have questioned him specifically about the draft. I must say, in all fairness, that I found a general reluctance to face up to the problems which were presented by the draft. I do not know that this particular bill, which is before us today, has answered all of these questions. I do not think it has, but I must say in all fairness that it cannot resolve all of these questions.

I wish to make a remark or two about the volunteer system. The chairman of the committee in that respect has used a much more accurate word in terming such an army that might be raised as an army of professional men rather than an army of mercenaries.

I believe that arguments made this afternoon were used in the concept that we were talking about mercenaries rather than a professional army. There is nothing in the act which prevents us from utilizing in the Army and the military forces today every single last man who volunteers and is qualified. In other words, he can enlist, as I read the act and report, for 2 years, and if this raises enough men to maintain our position in the world then we will have enough men.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sure the Senator knows that, if a man does enlist, the selective service quota of his county and State receives a credit.

Mr. ALLOTT. I understand that. Perhaps I should have mentioned it. But, to talk about a volunteer army, I think, is just a little out of the ballpark and does not deal with reality in this world. It has been already discussed, but I want to mention it because my vote on this amendment is, to a considerable degree, based upon paragraph (c)(1) in which it is declared by Congress "that the exercise of such authority necessarily constitutes an invasion of the liberties of America's young men." As I look around me in this Chamber, I see very few men here who have not served in one or more of our wars—and that includes myself. It never occurred to me—it is a concept to which I do not wish to accustom myself—that I had my liberties invaded, even though I had offered my services during World War II. It seems to me that, if we carry this to its logical conclusion, it means that everyone is entitled, somehow, somewhere along the line, to make up his own mind as to whether his liberties have been invaded. If we make such a decision in our minds in that respect, then the Government—which is to say, the people of this country—has no right to call upon us for mutual defense.

For this reason, more than anything else—although there are others—I must vote against the amendment. I also regard it, Mr. President, as a deterioration of an attitude of support for our country in its present position in the world. I could repeat, and I applaud most of the things which the distinguished chairman said about international policies, the mistakes that have been made over and over again in Vietnam. But the facts are that, as realistic people, we are there. We are involved in the third largest war in our history. I would go further and say that this country is probably in the most critical situation it has been in since December 7, 1941.

Upon this basis, it is our responsibility here to provide the men to protect the position of our country. I leave aside those who would want to discuss bringing our boys back home, and all the other foolish things which have been suggested in the present situation in which we find ourselves.

But, getting to the subject of the bill itself, I have been concerned, in talking with hundreds and even thousands of young men during the past few years, including the contacts my own sons have had with their law school and college mates in these past few years, about the uncertainty, confusion, and frustration which faces our young people, particularly our young men.

I have felt that, so far as possible, a young man should be able to determine, after he gets out of high school, by that age—which is ordinarily 18—if he is going to have to serve, and if so, when.

In talking with these hundreds and hundreds of young people, I believe no one thing has left them more in a state of confusion and indecision—and perhaps even contributing to the feeling of unrest we find so prevalent in our colleges and universities today, and which has run far more rampant all over this country than it ever has before—than not being able to determine the question of if and when they will have to serve.

Mr. President, as I read the bill—and it may not be the way I would have done it, but I cannot be sure how I would have done it because not being a member of the committee I have not had an opporunity to give it as deep and searching study as the committee members have—but I should like to address this question to the distinguished chairman, who is listening to my remarks: Under the provisions of the bill before us, a young man knows that by the time he gets a BA degree, has discontinued his studies, flunked out of school or has reached the age of 24, whichever comes first, he is going to be subject to the draft; is that true?

Mr. RUSSELL. He is thrown into the 1–A pool.

Mr. ALLOTT. He is thrown into the 1–A pool.

Let me recall for a moment here what the situation is with respect to those called under the draft and volunteers.

The information given to us by General Hershey over the years, and it may have varied by a few percentages, but it stays roughly in this area: Fifty percent of the people who are called under the draft are disqualified. In round numbers, 25 percent or one-half of the 50 percent of those disqualified are disqualified because of mental reasons, and 25 percent or one-half are disqualified because of physical disability.

Now, in a volunteer system, if we are going to talk about one, it seems to me we have to consider this fact.

Another provision of the measure which I think will help contribute to general stability, and which I hope will help our younger men find more of a sense of direction with respect to their military service—as I read the report and as I read the bill—is the provision which provides that in the future there will be no deferments for postgraduate study except for persons in medical or dental schools.

I see that the distinguished chairman has nodded his head in my direction, and that is as much of a resounding "Yes" as from anyone else.

In addition to that, the report points out, and I should like to quote from it on page 6 entitled "Student Deferments:"

> The President's message on selective service announces his intention to issue an Executive order specifying no deferments for postgraduate study will be granted in the future, except for persons in medical or dental schools. Some student deferments that originally were granted for undergraduate work have in reality become exemptions because the persons who received them were deferred further for graduate study and if they became fathers, or were employed in a critical occupation, their induction was postponed until they passed the normal age for induction. The committee recognizes that the President may find it necessary to extend postgraduate deferments to fields of study other than medicine or dentistry.

I should like to address this question to the distinguished chairman. It is a part of the law, then, that if a deferment beyond college and undergraduate study is extended to other fields besides the fields of dentistry and medicine, this would be a prerogative and at the sole discretion of the President of the United States; is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is true. In the committee report, we suggested the President consult with the National Security Council in deciding whether there would be any graduate deferments for nuclear scientists or other fields of study. The committee makes it clear that we are opposed to graduate deferments becoming pyramided into exemptions.

Mr. ALLOTT. While it is discussed in the report, I should like to ask the distinguishd Senator from Georgia to explain exactly what has been done in this bill to protect the viability and the strength of our Reserves and our National Guard.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have provided in this bill that even after a man receives his notice of induction, he may enlist in the National Guard or in the Reserves, if there is a slot for him. The Senator from Colorado is well aware that the National Guard is now not having any difficulty in maintaining its prescribed strength.

There is no doubt that, under this bill, if young men given the choice between being inducted under Selective Service or volunteering in the National Guard or Reserve, both of them would be retained at their full strength.

Mr. ALLOTT. I thank the Senator.

The Senator will remember the discussion last year over the use of the enlisted Reserve. Under this bill, it provides authority to bring members of the enlisted Reserve, who have not been in categories of active service, into the military service. Is that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. If they are not participating satisfactorily in some active unit.

Mr. ALLOTT. Unless they are actively in use with a unit.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. ALLOTT. I want to congratulate the Senator for a good job. I do not think this bill will solve all the confusions and perhaps the uncertainties——

Mr. RUSSELL. We can only hope to reduce them. I agree with the Senator that we will never completely eliminate them, but I am firmly of the belief that this measure will greatly reduce the uncertainty and confusion.

Mr. ALLOTT. I agree, and that is the reason why I congratulate the Senator. While the bill will not completely do it, I think it is as far forward as we can reasonably go in Congress. I hope the Senate will support the bill, and reject the amendment which is before us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment (No. 195) of the Senator from Oregon. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. Mondale], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official committee business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea," and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 69, as follows:

[No. 110 Leg.]

YEAS—9

Brooke
Gruening
Hatfield
McGovern
Morse
Nelson
Prouty
Proxmire
Scott

NAYS—69

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hill
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Mondale
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Williams, Del.

So Mr. Hatfield's amendment (No. 195) was rejected.

Mr. JACKSON obtained the floor.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, earlier today——

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator from Illinois may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Earlier today, I had a colloquy with the distinguished Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] concerning the schedule for today and for the remainder of the week. He gave it as his opinion that we could probably finish with this measure——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let us have a little more order in the Chamber. The Senator may proceed.

Mr. DIRKSEN. He was of the opinion that we could finish this bill today and adjourn over until Monday next. I understand now, however, that additional amendments will be offered, and that probably that schedule will not obtain; and I should like to ask him about it now.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as the distinguished minority leader has stated, it was the opinion of the leadership earlier today that four amendments would be offered—two by the distinguished junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield], one by the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], and one by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young].

That being the understanding, it was stated that if the Senate could complete its business on the pending bill at a reasonable hour today, the Senate would adjourn until Monday next.

I have now heard that some additional amendments are expected to be offered by the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse], and that these amendments have not been printed.

If this is the case, it is doubtful that we will be able to complete our work on the pending bill today. We would therefore not be able to go over until Monday.

I have not heard directly from the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon. I am still hopeful that if these amendments are not adopted, we can complete our work on the amendments that have been announced.

I think at this point, on the basis of information that has reached me, it is highly unlikely that we will be able to complete our work on the pending bill today and go over until Monday as originally contemplated.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE, MASS.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 1161, the bill to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1161) to establish the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, in order to preserve in public ownership and for the purpose of establishing the birthplace of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a national historic site, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to acquire by donation the property in the town of Brookline, county of Norfolk, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with the improvements thereon, situated on Beals Street, shown on a plan entitled "Subdivision lot 47 Plan Beals' Estate, Brookline, Oct. 1897, Joseph R. Carr, C.E." recorded with Norfolk Deeds, book 1080, page 461, and bounded and described as follows:

northwesterly by Beals Street, 50 feet;

northeasterly by lot 50 on plan recorded with said deeds at the end of book 800, 72.46 feet;

southeasterly by lot 48 on said last mentioned plan, 50.51 feet; and

southwesterly by a part of lot 47 on said last mentioned plan conveyed by Robert M. Goode to Estille C. Ralph, by deed recorded with said deeds, book 1092, page 53, 80.33 feet,

such property having erected thereon a dwelling which is the birthplace of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The Secretary is further authorized to acquire personal property used and to be used in connection therewith.

SEC. 2. The Secretary shall administer the John Fitzgerald Kennedy National Historic Site in accordance with the Act approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), as amended and supplemented, and the Act approved August 21, 1935 (49 Stat. 666), as amended.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, the House amendment to the Senate-passed bill authorizes acquisition of the Beals Street property in Brookline, Mass., the late President's birthplace, by donation only. At the time the Senate considered the bill, the Secretary of the Interior had in his possession a deed from the Kennedy family therefore verifying the family's desire to donate the site. This is consistent with congressional policy in honoring our Nation's Presidents by acquiring and administering their birthplaces.

For this reason, I see no useful purpose to be served by going to conference. Therefore, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The motion was agreed to.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I favor the legislation before us, and I would like to take this opportunity to urge my colleagues to vote for S. 1432 as amended.

There have been suggestions that our present draft law is not as fair as it might be. There has been considerable hue and cry that it is not "equal." It is said to impose too much uncertainty and anxiety upon our youth, their parents, their schools, and their employers or prospective employers.

The Armed Services Committee, of which I am proud to be a member, has proposed some improvements in the bill before us. But, I hope we will not lose sight of one important thing.

What we must remember is why we have a Selective Service System at all.

And, the reason we have one is a matter of national defense. We select men today—as we have for years—so that our Nation always will have the very best possible defense forces in time of need. It is not the responsibility of the draft to improve youthful morality, to increase education, to upgrade physical capabilities, or to see that everybody has equal service. On the contrary, it is the responsibility of the draft to select, in orderly fashion, the best young men available when their country needs them.

In the case of the draft there never can be equality of risk among all young Americans because: first, there are more young men today than our military forces need; and second, some of them are not mentally or physically able to do the jobs our defense requires.

Each year our weapons, vehicles, and communications become more complex and more sophisticated, needing more technical operation. Thus, our defense forces today must be ever more carefully selected for mental capacity, maturity, and aptitude.

And, because of the recurring, unexpected, unpredictable crises forced on us by aggressive communism, we must have great flexibility to expand our defense forces on short notice. Much of the uncertainty associated with the draft is uncertainty caused by the international moves of the Communists.

In addition, today's draft operates—as it has traditionally—to preserve and to reinforce the American concept of the citizen-soldier who accepts an obligation to serve in the defense of freedom and national security when needed. Americans have long understood that sometimes military service must be borne by a few free men so the freedom of all can be safeguarded.

So, while this bill proposes some technical changes to our draft laws, we must constantly keep in mind this fact: the Selective Service System has passed the most important test of all—the test of battle. The Selective Service System has provided our Nation today in Vietnam the very best soldiers this world has ever known.

This draft system is not new, it has been evolved through years of trial and error in war and peace. It is basically sound and must be preserved so long as tyranny threatens in this world, but we can decrease some of the uncertainties about who will serve and when.

For example, I believe we can go further than we have gone in revising the laws applicable to draft deferments. Specifically, I am referring to deferments for State and local law enforcement officers and firemen.

The increasing crime wave, the constitutional problems in law enforcement, the competitive labor market and the lack of funds confronting our States and cities all combine to create a major potential threat to the public safety. Never in history has the need for well educated, properly trained law enforcement officers been so critical.

The Law Enforcement Act of 1965 will do much to remedy this situation in the long run. The aid provided under that program will enable law enforcement officers to better cope with the increasingly difficult problems of crime detection and prevention.

But the act does nothing to alleviate the most serious and immediate problem facing the police departments of our cities today. Recruiting of qualified young men is at a standstill. Even the greatest efforts and best intentions cannot improve the numerical strength and professional effectiveness of police forces. I have been in contact with a number of police officials in Texas and have been informed of the alarming shortage of officers in our police forces.

In many cities, police personnel are stretched so thin that there is a great deal of difficulty in reacting quickly and effectively to an unexpected hazard, either natural or manmade. While the manpower shortage of our police forces is not a new problem, it has become disturbingly acute in the last year. One of the major reasons for this is the significant number of men enlisting and being drafted for service in our armed services.

To remedy this situation, I have introduced, as S. 718, an amendment to the Universal Military Training and Service Act to provide a draft deferment for police officers. Congress has already authorized the President to provide for the deferment of registrants whose employment is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. My bill would evidence congressional conviction that effective and fully manned police forces are necessary for public safety. Rather than place a great number of restrictions on this agency, my bill gives it broad authority and instruction to provide for the deferment of police officers in order to avoid undue disruption of the law enforcement agencies of the States.

Draft deferment for police officers would make available a broad segment of well-qualified, well-educated young men who would consider the career of law enforcement.

A young man who is willing to face the risk of personal abuses, bodily harm or death in the line of duty as a police officer should be given preferential treatment by the draft boards in the face of the current crisis in law enforcement.

Returning to the bill before us, let me outline briefly what it proposes to do. Initially, because the name "Universal Military Training and Service Act" of the current law is misleading in that congressional approval of universal military training has never been granted, the committee proposes to change the name of the basic law to the "Selective Service Act of 1967." This bill would then extend for 4 years, until July 1, 1971, the following provisions of the existing but newly titled law:

First. The authority to induct persons into the Armed Forces;

Second. The authority to issue Selective Service calls for physicians, dentists, and allied specialists;

Third. The suspension of permanent limitations on the active duty strength of the Armed Forces;

Fourth. The authority to pay a quarters allowance to all enlisted members of the Armed Forces who have dependents, irrespective of the rank of these members, if the dependents are not furnished Government quarters; and

Fifth. The authority for special pay to physicians, dentists, and veterinarians.

This bill would provide permanent authority for ordering to active duty certain members of the Ready Reserve not assigned to or participating satisfactorily in units and who have not fulfilled their statutory reserve obligations or served on active duty for a total of 24 months. This authority does not now exist.

This bill would provide a method for maintaining the authorized strength of the Reserve components and the National Guard by permitting persons to enlist in the Reserve or the National Guard at any time before the date scheduled for their induction. Under present law, persons may enlist only before they have received orders to report for induction.

This bill would require that all physicians and dentists, including aliens, be liable for registration and training and service until the age of 35. Under present law, these persons are required to register only up to age 26, but remain liable for special induction until 35. This gives an unfair advantage to alien physicians and dentists who enter the United States after the age of 26, thereby incurring no special liability for service.

This bill would permit otherwise qualified persons who are Reserve officers on inactive duty to serve as Government appeal agents and counselors to registrants. The present law has been interpreted as prohibiting a military affiliation for an unpaid agent of a local board who has the title of "Government Appeal Agent."

In addition, I share the belief of the committee that our deferment provisions will be improved by the President's proposed Executive order, maintaining undergraduate college deferments but ending graduate deferments except for persons in medical and dental schools—with those deferred liable for draft vulnerability later upon their graduation.

And, I tend to support the President's call for primary draft vulnerability at ages 19 and 20, rather than throughout the period from 19 to 26. With fewer years of prime vulnerability, our young men will be better able to plan for the future—much of their current uncertainty will be alleviated. This, again, is subject to the President's power to implement the law by regulations.

There has been a lot of talk, too, about some sort of lottery selection system. I think much of this so-called dispute is semantic. It would not make sense to substitute total chance for rational selection of these key defense personnel. But here, again, under existing law the President has the power to prescribe the sequence of induction. Like the majority of the committee, I am not convinced that random selection will result in any "fairer" sharing of military service.

In summary, Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support the bill reported by the Armed Services Committee which makes minor revisions in deferment and age; but retains the framework of the existing, locally responsive draft board system whereby State quotas equitably distribute the responsibility and a fair system of random selection—by date of birth or by numerical lottery—chooses from the 1-A eligibility group.

The draft should not be subverted for civilian social goals. We should not draft men less able to meet military demands. But, we should continue to allow education deferments so our services can choose highly trained men when they are needed. And we should give serious consideration to deferments for law enforcement personnel

NATIONAL DEFENSE IS THE KEYSTONE

When we need draftees we need them quickly; we need them badly; and we need the best.

It will never be equal for one man to die while another lives. But America lives today because, throughout our history, men—called to service by their peers—have fought for freedom, and have saved it. Again, I urge prompt passage of this legislation.

Mr. President, I express the hope that some legislative action will be taken by Congress if necessary to achieve a program of permitting the deferment of policemen when there is a shortage of policemen in many areas of the country and great problems exist with respect to law enforcement.

This matter should be considered. It should be considered by administrative action. I hope that the administration will do so. If not, I hope that Congress will pass an amendment to provide for such action at a time of such critical need.

AMENDMENT NO. 193

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 193 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 5, line 20, strike out "1971" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

On page 5, line 24, strike out "1971" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

On page 6, line 4, strike out "1971" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

On page 6, line 8, strike out "1971" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

On page 6, line 12, strike out "1971" and insert in lieu thereof "1969".

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, for the benefit of the RECORD I express my support of the principle expressed by the junior Senator from Oregon in connection with a voluntary armed force.

I found myself unable to support his amendment because of the specific wording of the amendment. However, I hope that as time goes on, and a relatively short period of time, we who are members of the Armed Services Committee will find ourselves trying to secure information which will enable us to determine what criteria will be needed in order to get back to a purely voluntary professional military force.

I hope we will continue to work on this matter. I personally think it is more in keeping with the historic position of the United States.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I, too, would like to take this opportunity to express my basic agreement with many of the principles contained in the amendment which we have just voted on. But the details of that amendment caused me to withhold my support.

I, too, share the sentiments just expressed by the distinguished Senator from Colorado, that there is much merit to the amendment and that it deserves the study and thought of the Armed Services Committee.

I hope that as time goes along the basic ideas that have been suggested by the junior Senator from Oregon may be incorporated in a measure which will include some updating of the way in which we satisfy the manpower requirements of the armed services.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the sentiments expressed not only by the two Senators who have just spoken, the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Wyoming, but also of those who have expressed to me privately their sentiments of support for the general concept.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will be order in the Chamber.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I suppose that this having been the first measure I have offered on the floor as a freshman Senator, it might be considered as a moral victory for me.

It reminds me somewhat of my days at Stanford when in 1 year our football team lost every game we played. However, we considered it a year of the greatest moral victory because we were building character that year instead of winning football games.

Mr. President, the pending amendment is a very simple amendment. I shall make only one or two simple remarks concerning it.

The pending amendment to the bill would, in effect, change the extension of 4 years to an extension of 2 years for the present Universal Military Training and Service Act.

It is my view that we in a period of 2 years will have an opportunity to review our situation as it relates not only to our present commitments in Vietnam, but also to whatever commitments may be ours in the future, that are acquired by us or that we obligate ourselves to in the meantime, or our continuing commitments.

I feel that a 2-year period would be a sufficiently long period in which to maintain an intake of manpower for the commitments now involved in Vietnam and, at the same time, it would not involve the 4-year period which I believe is unnecessary at this time.

I think that Congress, with a 2-year extension, will better be able to retain its control over the military manpower system by this kind of review.

I appreciate the fact that we can review the program and change the law at any time that we see fit, even before the 4-year period expires. However, I do feel that there is the added incentive that perhaps with pressure upon us, we will keep ourselves continually concerned with the problem of military manpower procurement, rather than feeling: "Well, we have solved it for the coming 4 years.

We can move on to other things and forget it."

I know that the distinguished Armed Services Committee is constantly involved in this matter and will not neglect their duties.

I do not mean to imply that they would neglect their duties. However, I believe that in the Senate as a whole the amendment I offer, if agreed to, would add an added impetus to our thinking and creative processes and allow us to concern ourselves with military manpower procurement and the acquiring of the best possible system.

Without spending a great deal of time on it, I feel that this is an appropriate amendment, one which deserves the support of this body.

I am hopeful that in a 2-year period we can expect to find a solution to our commitment in Vietnam and that we can move on into perhaps a voluntary system.

I wish to point out that this amendment is not related to a voluntary system. This has nothing to do with the arguments we have just had on the voluntary program. Basically, this amendment merely strikes the language that provides a 4-year extension and moves it back to 2 years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further discussion?

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wish to say that there is no need whatever of adopting this amendment. At any time that we do not need young men to be brought into the service under the draft, there is no draft. I hope the Senate will defeat the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. Hatfield]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official committee business.

If present and voting the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], and the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] would each vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] is paired with the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy]. If present and voting, the Senator from Illinois would vote "yea" and the Senator from California would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 13, nays 67, as follows:

[No. 111 Leg.]

YEAS—13

Baker
Brooke
Burdick
Church
Gruening
Hart
Hatfield
McGovern
Morse
Nelson
Proxmire
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—67

Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—20

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hill
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis

So Mr. Hatfield's amendment (No. 193) was rejected.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I would like to query the acting majority leader as to whether or not there has been any change in the schedule for today, and the prospect of going over until Monday.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, since I last made an announcement to the Senate, in response to the distinguished minority leader's earlier inquiry, I have had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. Morse]. I informed him that if we could dispose of his amendments today we could go over until Monday next, and I asked if this would be agreeable to him. The Senator from Oregon stated that he had three amendments, but that he would not require too much time on them and that he would be willing to dispose of them today. Therefore, if Senators will stay close to the Chamber we expect to be having rollcall votes rapidly and we hope to dispose of this bill before the day is over. If we can do that we will adjourn until Monday next.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 194

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I call up my amendmet No. 194.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Moss in the chair). The amendment will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. At the end of the bill add a new section as follows:

Sec. 7. That the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 451–571), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"Sec. 22. No person inducted into the Armed Forces of the United States under this title shall be assigned to duty or required to perform service in Southeast Asia unless such person volunteers for assignment to duty in such area."

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, my amendment would simply place draftees on the same basis and with the same status as those who have enlisted in the armed services. When a man enlists for service in the Army, the Air Force, the Navy, or the Marine Corps, he knows in advance that he must go where the Commander in Chief sends him. He accepts that obligation voluntarily and, whatever may be his opinion after he gets in the service, as to the rightness of the war—about which quite a few people disagree—he is under an obligation to go. The draftee is in no such position. He is taken from his family and sent wherever he is ordered willy-nilly. The draftee should have the same freedom of choice as has been given to all others. This would not be an impairment of our military effort.

We have 250,000 troops stationed in Europe. We have hundreds of thousands of troops in various parts of the United States. We have 40,000 men stationed in Japan, and 65,000 men stationed in Korea. They are stationed all over the world, and there is no reason why some of these should not go to Southeast Asia and let such draftees as do not wish to serve there to serve elsewhere.

Let us not assume that a large number of these draftees would seek service elsewhere. They might. But if this war is as deserving a cause as its proponents say it is, I am confident that a considerable number of men would choose to go to Southeast Asia. I am sure many would. They should have that freedom of choice.

On the other hand a substantial number of our fellow Americans share my view that our performance in Southeast Asia constitutes an immoral, illegal, and indefensible war; and they share the view expressed repeatedly by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. Russell], the manager of the bill, the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, that we should have never gotten involved in that ground war in Southeast Asia. They continue to feel we should not be involved there. Some people think that now that we are there we have to go through with it. I believe we should at least give our drafted young men freedom of choice.

Mr. President, there are adverse opinions about this war which are submitted to respectful consideration. I note that no less an authority than Gen. David M. Shoup, the retired Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, a Medal of Honor winner for bravery at Tarawa, during World War II, has amplified the view that I expressed as early as 3 years ago that South Vietnam was not worth the life of a single American boy. General Shoup raised my ante. He said that all of Southeast Asia, not just South Vietnam, was not worth the life or limb of a single American.

Mr. President, a great many American people feel that way. I have before me a resolution drafted by the Unitarian Universalist Association, adopted in Denver, Colo., as recently as May 5, 1967, in connection with the draft and conscientious objectors. I shall not read the entire resolution, but ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. **GRUENING**. Mr. President, one of the pleas in the resolution is that they, namely, our Federal authorities, recognize that objection to participation in a particular war can be central to the belief of an individual and therefore constitute valid grounds for conscientious objection as does opposition to all war.

Mr. President, I believe that this amendment, if adopted, would strengthen the war effort and remove many of the tensions, apprehensions, and objections which now exist. It would not, in any sense, interfere with the war effort. We have many thousands of young men in the armed services who are not in Southeast Asia at present. I believe if this amendment were adopted and a freedom of choice given it would strengthen the support by the American people for our war effort.

As is well known, I do not approve of what we are doing there. I think, and I have so stated for over 3 years, my belief that our military involvement is a tragic mistake and that it is an illegal and immoral war. I believe that the majority of American people do not share that view—at least not yet. If that is the case a substantial number, and perhaps an overwhelming majority of draftees would not exercise the right to choose whether they go to Southeast Asia, and go; but others who have conscientious objections about this war would be given a choice.

In 1965 there were 96,000 desertions from the South Vietnamese Army, and last year 110,000 desertions from that army, in a country where we are supporting a corrupt junta of generals headed by Marshal Ky, who has declared that his one hero was Adolph Hitler, and where corruption and graft are rampant. If there are those who do not want to serve in that country, and to shed their blood for that gang, but would prefer to serve somewhere else, they should be given that choice.

Mr. President, this amendment would help the morale of the Nation and allow a freedom of choice to one group of our prospective entrants into the military service who do not now have it.

EXHIBIT 1

UNITARIAN UNIVERSALIST ASSOCIATION

General Resolutions Adopted at the Sixth General Assembly, Denver, Colorado, May 5, 1967

DRAFT REFORM AND CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION

Noting that present administration of the Selective Service System has resulted in many inequities and uncertainties for the young men facing service and,

Noting, also, that the right of conscientious objection to military service has long been recognized as lawful if based upon religious beliefs and that the Supreme Court has affirmed that an ethical and moral philosophy is parallel to belief in a Supreme Being and thus qualifies under the definition of religious belief,

The Unitarian Universalist Association; recommends that Congress in considering renewal of the Selective Service Act, affirm, as nearly as possible the principle of equality of sacrifice be assured:

1. Reduce the discretionary powers of local draft boards by establishing uniform regulations regarding deferments;

2. Provide that those granted educational deferments upon termination of those deferments be subject to the same chance of induction as all others eligible, without regard to age, marriage or offspring;

3. Provide for educational deferments for part-time students upon their demonstration that they must work to finance their education;

4. Prohibit use of the draft to punish for unlawful acts punishable by civil authority;

5. Require the selection of draftees by lot from among those presently eligible for military service.

6. Broaden the concept of conscientious objection in the law to include all those opposed to military service on ethical and moral grounds.

7. Require that local draft boards be representative of the ethical, social, and economic composition of the community;

8. Recognize that objection to participation in a particular war can be central to the belief of an individual and therefore constitute valid grounds for conscientious objection as does opposition to all war.

Be it Further Resolved that the 1967 General Assembly of the Unitarian Universalist Association:

1. Calls upon the Department of Social Responsibility to cooperate with Liberal Religious Youth and Student Religious Liberals in providing all possible information, encouragement and assistance to our ministers, churches and fellowships to insure effective counseling of draft-eligible youth and youth approaching draft age;

2. Recognizes the responsibility to Unitarians and Universalist youth who have secured conscientious objector classification and who prefer to fulfill their alternative service requirement under the sponsorship of the Unitarian Universalist Association or its affiliate organizations;

3. Calls upon the Unitarian Universalist Service Committee to increase immediately its alternative service program in order to help a significant number of applicants;

4. Encourages youth who are conscientious objectors to war to apply for conscientious objector status under the provisions of the Selective Service Act;

5. Extend our support to those persons who in the exercise of their moral choice and through the demands of their individual conscience refuse to register for Selective Service or refuse classification which are contrary to their conscience.

Mr. **RUSSELL**. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska is optimistic in saying that this would be an easy amendment to apply. I can hardly think of anything more disrupting to military forces than passing such an amendment as this, and having to strip units bound for Vietnam of inductees who may not want to go.

We cannot afford, as unfortunate and sad as it may be, to start a policy of giving people that choice as to where they might serve. We cannot even go to the extent of giving someone the option of not serving in Alaska, because there might be some people in the warmer climes who would not wish to go to serve in Alaska, in that great land, because it would be so much different from the climate in Florida or Georgia. It would disorganize the Armed Forces beyond redemption and beyond description to undertake to apply any such amendment as this.

It is also not fair to the men serving as draftees out there now. I am not sure whether the Senator's amendment proposes to bring them back home, and whether it is ex post facto or in futuro. But, in any event, I do not know how we could organize our military forces under any such amendment as this. About 43 percent, as I recall, of those serving in Vietnam today are draftees. This amendment would only create confusion, involve enormous costs in travel expense of moving men from one unit to another, moving furniture, and moving families. This amendment is absolutely undesirable.

Mr. **GRUENING**. Let me reply briefly to the distinguished chairman of the committee. There are all kinds of other places where draftees could now serve. The distinguished Senator from Georgia himself has gone on record as saying that he was opposed to the entry of this country into the war in Vietnam in the first place; he stated that he thought it was unjustifiable and a mistaken policy. Of course now that we are in it, he believes that we must follow through. But why compound a mistaken policy. Why should we not support the American principles of freedom and, in this case, allow those—and they may be many—who do not agree that this in an immoral and unjust war, who think that we are fighting a righteous cause, to choose to go to Vietnam. I am not at all sure that a majority of the draftees would not want to go. But I believe it would strengthen the morale of this country, and it would increase support for the war, if any people who are apprehensive and do not want to go, or who have conscientious objections and have so expressed themselves, such as members of the clergy and others, who do not like the corruption in Vietnam which is being upheld under our aegis, and who do not like the desertions from the South Vietnamese army while we are sending in our boys to take their places that these should have freedom of choice.

I repeat my view that my amendment would strengthen the war effort. We should give this freedom of choice and let our draftees have the same option which those in the regular services have. I make no plea for those who, once enlisted in the regular service, whatever may be their dissent about this war, want to get out of it, because they have accepted that obligation voluntarily. But our draftees, who did not, should be given the same opportunity.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening].

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official committee business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 2, nays 75, as follows:

[No. 112 Leg.]

YEAS—2

Gruening
Morse

NAYS—75

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, .W Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NOT VOTING—23

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hill
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Gruening's amendment was rejected.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I wholeheartedly support S. 1432. The basic purpose of this bill is to extend for 4 years, or until July 1, 1971, the authority to draft to meet the manpower requirements of the armed services. It is essential to the security of our Nation that this authority be extended and preserved.

We all regret that it is necessary to draft the youth of our Nation into service for their country. Our country has a rich heritage based upon the theory of a civilian military force. To maintain the concept of civilians serving in the military, and to provide the manpower necessary to meet the needs of the day, it is essential that Congress provide a draft mechanism.

The bill pending before the Senate actually makes very little change in the law which is now on the books.

The first is to change the name of the law from the Universal Military Training and Service Act to the Selective Service Act of 1967.

The second, and most important change as I have previously mentioned, is to extend the basic law for 4 additional years.

The third change is to allow enlistments in the Reserves or the National Guard by individuals any time up to the day of induction into the Armed Forces. The law now prevents enlistments into the National Guard or the Reserves after an individual has received his notice of induction. This change was necessitated because of the President's plan to change the order of induction from 26-year-olds first to 19-year-olds first. There was much concern that this would prevent Reserve units and National Guard units from attracting sufficient personnel to maintain their full strength. The answer proposed by the administration to this problem was to allow a draft directly into the National Guard. The Armed Services Committee of the Senate rejected this proposal due to the grave constitutional questions it raised, such as requiring, by force of Federal law, a person to take an oath to obey the orders of a Governor of a State, and requiring a State and its Governor to accept a person who may be unacceptable under standards promulgated by the State.

The fourth change in the basic law is to subject alien doctors and dentists to the draft up to age 35, if they enter the United States after they reach age 26. This places alien doctors and dentists on the same basis as doctors and dentists who are citizens of the United States as regards their draft status.

The fifth change in the law is to allow Reserve and National Guard personnel, not serving on active duty, to act as appeal agent. This involves primarily young lawyers who are qualified and very capable of acting as appeal agents, except that under the present law they are excluded from doing so if they have an inactive Reserve status.

The sixth, and last, major change in the law, is to include in the basic draft act the authority to call individual reservists who are not satisfactorily participating in, or assigned to, a Reserve unit, if the member has not already discharged his statutory obligation. The reservist could be ordered to active duty under this authority for a period that, when added to his previous active duty, equals 24 months. The same basic provision was written into the Defense appropriations bill last year, but will expire at the end of the fiscal year. These six mentioned provisions are the basic changes in the law which are contained in the bill as reported by the Armed Services Committee of the Senate.

Other major action taken by the committee, and discussed in the committee report on S. 1432, is essentially to advise the President how his authority under the act should be utilized. The draft law extends broad grants of authority to the President as to the manner in which the details of the draft are to be worked out and applied.

The President has already indicated certain actions that he intends to take in several areas, and the committee report contains a discussion and the collective judgment of the committee members on these items.

The committee expressed no opposition to the President's plan to reverse the order of induction from primary vulnerability at age 26 to primary vulnerability beginning at age 19. There are, of course, certain problems presented by reversing the sequence of induction, and it is hoped that a system which will result in equity for all will be devised.

The committee also expressed no opposition to the President's plan to end all but medical and dental school postgraduate deferments. However, the report contains the recognition by the committee that it may become necessary to extend postgraduate deferments to fields of study other than medicine or dentistry, if graduate work in the essential sciences suffers. The committee has also recommended that deferments for individuals engaged in approved apprentice programs should be granted on the same basis as undergraduate college deferments. I personally think there is no valid reason to require more restrictive conditions to grant an apprenticeship deferment than is required for the granting of an undergraduate deferment, and I am pleased that the committee has made this recommendation.

The committee considered at some length the proposed random selection which has been suggested by the President and is known as FAIR—fair and impartial random. There are considerable doubts that such a system will result in a more equitable sharing of military service. The committee expressed no opposition to a trial of the random system, however, with the tacit understanding that if it fails to live up to its advanced billing it will be replaced by some other method.

Two other main items on which the Senate Armed Services Committee has expressed itself are: First, the retention of the State quota system for meeting manpower needs, and second, opposition to eliminating local boards and creating a centralized bureaucracy to perform the functions now performed by these local boards.

It will be seen that the most substantial changes to be made in the draft system are to be brought about by administration and regulation, rather than by a change in the law. As far as these regulatory functions are concerned, the Senate Armed Services Committee has acted in an advisory capacity. I am certain that all the members will continue to carefully watch the operations of the draft, with a view toward making it more equitable for those who must be called to service.

While we are engaged in giving advice, I want to take the opportunity to give some advice to the Justice Department.

There has been much concern expressed lately about the activities of a few notorious peaceniks and rabble rousers who have been publicly advising young men to evade the draft and say no to their country's call to service. The pertinent provisions of the law on the books at the present time, contained in title 50, appendix, section 462 of United States Code, read as follows:

> Any person . . . who knowingly counsels, aids, or abets another to refuse or evade registration or service in the armed forces or any of the requirements of this title . . . or any person or persons who shall knowingly hinder or interfere or attempt to do so in any way, by force or violence or otherwise, with the administration of this title (said sections) or the rules or regulations made pursuant thereto, or who conspires to commit any one or more of such offenses, shall, upon conviction . . . be punished by imprisonment for not more than five years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or by both.

In my judgment, this law has been openly and flagrantly violated by those individuals who have counseled evasion of the draft. The Justice Department is hiding behind the smokescreen of free speech in refusing to prosecute violators. While we all recogize the heritage of free speech in our country, there are admitted restrictions upon free speech. In my judgment, advising and counseling anyone to evade the draft is the same as hollering fire in a crowded theater.

Mr. President, the law is on the books. It is not the duty or the authority of the Department of Justice to simply ignore the law.

They have a duty to enforce the law. Their cavalier attitude toward the enforcement of the law is in virtual contempt of Congress. The courts may strike down the law if a case is tried. Then Congress will have the opportunity to rewrite it in such a manner that it will be enforceable. If the Justice Department feels that the law is unconstitutional as it is written, then their obligation is to so advise the Congress and request appropriate changes in the law.

The Justice Department has taken the worst possible attitude in simply ignoring the existence of the law, and failing to take any steps to either enforce it or to request a law which in their judgment would be enforceable.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I call up my amendment and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Ohio will be stated.

The legislative clerk read amendment No. 190, as follows:

> On page 3, between lines 2 and 3, insert the following:
>
> "(2) The first sentence of section 4(b) (50 App. U.S.C. 454(b)) is amended by striking out 'twenty-four' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighteen'.
>
> "(3) Paragraph (2)(A) of section 4(k) (50 App. 454(k)) is amended by striking out 'twenty-four' and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighteen'.
>
> "(4) Paragraphs (1) and (4) of section 4(l) (50 App. U.S.C. 454(l)) are amended by striking out 'twenty-four' each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof 'eighteen'."
>
> Renumber paragraphs (2), (3), (4), and (5) of the first section of the bill as paragraphs (5), (6), (7), and (8), respectively.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I shall make my argument in support of this amendment very brief and to the point.

Shortly before the Senate recessed yesterday afternoon, I spoke at length on my amendment to the pending bill, which would reduce the length of service for draftees from 2 years to a maximum of 18 months.

While there remains a continuing need for conscription—and that seems to be the will of the Senate today—to meet our military manpower requirements, the need for a 24-month term of service no longer exists, if it ever did exist. The bill, as reported by the committee, continues to require an initial training period of not less than 4 months. The fact is that the present period of basic training is only 8 weeks. Thus, under existing circumstances, a young man will have concluded his basic training and will have had an opportunity for an additional 2 months of specialized training before he could be sent to Vietnam or overseas to any combat zone.

The present tour of duty of men in our Armed Forces in Vietnam is 1 year. Even assuming that a young man were given 6 months of training before being sent into the combat area, it is obvious that he could fulfill his obligation to his country in a period of 18 months, and then be returned to civilian life. Certainly, those in charge of personnel assignments for various branches of our Armed Forces could fulfill all their requirements with an 18-month tour of duty for draftees. In my considered judgment, it is unfair and unnecessary to require these young men to serve for 2 years.

Furthermore, in each of the next several years, nearly 1,900,000 young men will attain the age of 19. In 1970, that number will probably exceed 2 million. Of this number, under current standards, 3 of 10 will probably be disqualified for physical reasons or deferred for reasons of hardship or unfitness. Therefore, approximately 1,300,000 19-year-olds will be qualified and available for service in our Armed Forces each year.

According to Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense in Charge of Manpower, in a typical post-Vietnam year—which we all hope will be very soon, but which many of us doubt will be so soon—it is estimated that 110,000 inductees will be required annually. These men would be selected from the residual pool of draftees available, exclusive of those who had already volunteered. That pool would consist of approximately 730,000 young men. Thus, under the proposed bill, only one out of seven of the 19-year-olds remaining available for induction each year would need to be drafted.

If shortening the tour of duty to 18 months should conceivably result in a need for more young men, they can be drawn from the additional hundreds of thousands of available men who otherwise would be exempted.

Suppose, instead of 1 out of 7, that proportion of men in the 19-year-old pool inducted were 1 out of 6. It would not be any more than that. In that event the service obligation would be spread among more young Americans and not allowed to fall upon a comparatively small segment.

Furthermore, it is unfair to continue to draft young American boys for a 2-year period when our allies, Great Britain and Canada, have no conscription whatever. Among our other allies, New Zealand provides conscription for 12 months; France for 16 months; West Germany and the Netherlands for 18 months; Belgium for 12 to 15 months; Italy for 15 months; and Norway for 12 months. At the same time we send thousands of our young draftees to Western

Europe, ostensibly to protect these nations.

An 18-month period of service for draftees is all the West Germans require. While they perhaps have the finest army in Europe, they have sent not one soldier to help us in Vietnam. When we finally, by negotiation, got the West Germans to agree to permit 35,000 of our men, living like squawmen with their wives and families, to return home we had to agree in return to about $1.5 billion in trade concessions.

I wish to emphasize that we are sending thousands of young men, some of them draftees, to protect these nations, some of which have no draft whatever. Frankly, the Soviet Union, since the time of Stalin, has not posed a real threat to Europe or to us.

Mr. President, I am sure that in their hearts those who oppose this amendment would only make the argument, "Well, we should have made the period of service for draftees 18 months 2 or 3 or 4 years ago. But now that we are stuck with 2 years, in this grim period of international anarchy, we probably ought to go along with it now."

Mr. President, I do not swallow that argument. This is an important and meritorious amendment. If it is necessary to require millions of our young men to serve their Nation, then we should at least do our utmost to spread the burden among more of our citizens—among more of our families who have 18-year-old youngsters subject to being inducted—and to lessen that burden as much as we possibly can. There is no valid reason whatever for continuing the 24-month tour of duty. I urge that my amendment be adopted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I fully share the indignation of the Senator from Ohio that a number of those countries associated with us in various compacts over the world have greatly reduced their periods of compulsory military service. Indeed, our ancient ally, Great Britain, has abolished any form of compulsion whatever in her armed forces. But I do not think that this is any justification for us at this time reducing our period of service. There is something to be said for the 18-month period, but we considered the matter in committee, and, with the exception of the Senator from Ohio, the committee was unanimous in recommending continuation of the 24-month period. We did it very largely on the basis of the statement of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, and I wish to read one brief paragraph from that statement; then I shall have concluded my remarks.

This is Assistant Secretary of Defense Morris speaking:

> A reduction in the 2-year tour of duty of the inductee to 18 months would result in increased costs and decreased military effectiveness. During the present period of extended operations, inductees can normally expect an overseas tour either in Vietnam, Korea or Europe. The average effective period of service for a two-year inductee, has been estimated at only 17 months, after allowing for training, travel and leave time. A reduction in the tour of duty to 18 months would thus leave about 11 months for effective service. Altogether, it would disproportionately reduce the effective services of inductees, increase training and travel costs and reduce effectiveness of combat units. In addition, a reduction in the draft term might force the Services to reduce their voluntary enlistment terms (presently, 3 and 4 years)—as these might become comparatively less attractive,—in order to obtain the required numbers of recruits. To that extent, the costs and inefficiencies associated with a lower term for inductees would also have a "multiplier" effect.

Mr. President, this is not an opportune time to reduce the period of service. Such an opportunity may occur at some later date. I sometimes sense, on the part of the American people, a feeling of resentment that our allies are not carrying their full share of the load. But that is certainly not any justification for us to do something that is not in interest of our own economy and efficiency.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. What effect, if any, would the amendment of the Senator from Ohio have on some 500,000 to 600,000 American boys who are now serving in Vietnam?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I cannot answer that question. I do not know how it would be construed. I assume that if a man serves 18 months and is in Vietnam, he would be discharged.

The courts could construe the provision to be perspective only, and probably would. However, the amendment on its face is not clear on this point.

A person who had served 24 months might feel that he had been cheated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, if I may comment briefly, it would seem to me that, either way, the amendment would be troublesome. If it would require a court interpretation on whether it would apply to those already in selective service, it certainly would cause trouble. And if it would not apply to those already in selective service, and particularly to those who have passed the 18-month stage of service, or who are about to do so, and who are fighting in Vietnam, I can see any number of troubles that would come out of it.

Mr. RUSSELL. They would undoubtedly feel that we had changed the rules on them to their disadvantage while they were in the middle of the fighting.

Mr. HOLLAND. I imagine that their families, and particularly the families of those who get killed in the period between 18 and 24 months of service, would feel pretty bad about the situation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would if it were a member of my family, and I hope that I am a normal human being.

Mr. HOLLAND. I hope the Senate will reject the proposal to write this kind of philosophy into the law, particularly at this time when we are in the middle of the stream insofar as Vietnam is concerned.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is not any time to take such action. That was the unanimous conclusion of the rest of the committee when it considered the amendment at the time it was proposed in the committee by the Senator from Ohio.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon is recognized.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall be very brief in my comments on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]. I rise to support his amendment.

I have three amendments that I shall offer later which will take me some time. I am willing to stay as long as the Senate is willing to stay to consider them. However, I intend to make my record on them, for I believe when I am talking on this subject matter I am talking on one of the most vital issues facing this country. Although many might not share my views, my views will be made a matter of record before we go to a vote on my amendments.

I rise to support the pending amendment because I do not think we can justify a 2-year draft in view not only of all the arguments that the Senator from Ohio made, but also when we take a look at the conscription policies in allied and European nations, a list of which the Senator from Ohio has made part of his remarks.

In the interest of making a record, I ask unanimous consent that the list be printed at this point in the RECORD as part of my argument.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSCRIPTION IN ALLIED AND EUROPEAN NATIONS

Country and length of service:
France, 16 mo.
West Germany, 18 mo.
East Germany, 18 mo.
Netherlands, 18 mo. for Army.
New Zealand, 12 mo.
Belgium, 12–15 mo.
Italy, 15 mo. for Army.
Australia, 24 mo.
Canada, no draft.
England, no draft.
Sweden, 10–12 mo. (universal conscription).
Norway, 12 mo. for Army; 12–15 mo. for other services.
Spain, 24 mo.
Austria, 9 mo.
Luxembourg, 6 mo.
Hungary, 36 mo.
Czechoslovakia, 24 mo.
Russia, 36 mo. for Army; 36–48 mo. for other services.
Denmark, 14 mo. for Army; 12–14 mo. for other services.
Portugal, 18 mo. for Army; 18–30 mo. for other services.
Turkey, 24 mo.
Greece, 21–24 mo. for Army; 21–30 mo. for other services.
Rumania, 24 mo. for Navy; 16 mo. for other services.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when we take France, which has 16 months, West Germany, which has 18 months, East Germany, which has 18 months, the Netherlands, which has 18 months for the army, and New Zealand, which has 12 months—and I note that New Zealand is even a combat ally of ours in Vietnam—Belgium, which has 12 to 15 months, Italy, which has 15 months for the army, Australia, which has 24 months—and she also is a combat ally and has the same period of time as ours but she is notable for her exception—

Canada, which has none, England, which has none, Sweden, which has 10 to 12 months, Norway, which has 12 months for the army and 12 to 15 months for other services, Spain, which has 24 months, Austria, which has 9 months, Luxembourg, which has 6 months, Hungary, which has 36 months, Czechoslovakia, which has 24 months, Russia, which has 36 months for the army and 36 to 48 months for other services, Denmark, which has 14 months for the army, and 12 to 14 months for other services, Portugal, which has 18 months for the army, Turkey, which has 24 months, Greece, which has 21 to 24 months, and Rumania, which has 24 months for the navy and 16 months for the other services, I say that in fairness to the American people we cannot, in my judgment, justify this unfair discrimination against our youth.

I think, furthermore, that a continuation of the 24 months' service will set further and further back the very sound proposal so eloquently presented by my colleague, the junior Senator from Oregon, this afternoon, for our working toward a volunteer army rather than an army with such a large proportion of draftees, and that 18 months of draft service might be an inducement to the Pentagon and the White House to seek to initiate the very sound program recommended by the junior Senator from Oregon.

The fact that it was turned down by the Senate does not in any way, in my judgment, take away from its soundness. I think that we are quite wrong in interrupting for 24 months the lives of these young men, particularly in view of the fact that we have such a grossly unfair and unjust Selective Service System for reasons that I shall set forth later this afternoon in my analysis of the existing law, the recommendations of the committees, and the changes that I think ought to be made.

We have a selective service law so full of exemptions and exceptions and deferments for those able to get the counsel and advice and assistance with which to work out their escapism from the Selective Service, that those who are drafted deserve in common justice and fairness not to be compelled to serve for more than 18 months.

Lastly—and I shall develop the point in greater detail later this afternoon—it is quite unfair to take young men for 2 years and put them under selective service, when we know that there is a "policy"—I put the word in quotation marks because I could not raise my right hand and testify that it is an official policy, I only judge by the results of what has occurred—to use draftees out of all proportion to their numbers and let reservists stay at home and collect the millions of dollars we are paying to the Reserves in order to maintain a system that was supposedly established by law for men to come to the assistance of the country in time of emergency.

If anybody has any doubt about the most effective way to change our policy in Southeast Asia, let me remove the doubt by suggesting that Congress pass a law or that the administration merely adopt a policy that of those called into military service from now on, 50 percent shall be reservists and 50 percent draftees. If anyone wants to hear, for the first time a discussion of American foreign policy at the grassroots, let Congress pass such a law. We have a hard time justifying the spending of millions of dollars to maintain a Reserve sytem while not making use of it. But if we start to call up lawyers, doctors, dentists, businessmen, filling station operators, farmers, and all others who occupy so-called Reserve status—and who are being paid for it—we will hear from the grassroots.

I am all for the Reserve system, but I say, respectfully, that it was adopted for the purpose of protecting the security of the country. We cannot square leaving reservists at home and taking thousands and thousands of draftees who, for one reason or another, cannot find some way to be deferred under the existing draft law.

So I shall vote for the proposal of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young] because I believe it is fair, it is just, and is in line with selective service policies in the overwhelming majority of the countries of the world. I think that the adoption of the amendment will result in the administration, particularly the Pentagon, taking some good hard looks in the direction of needed reforms of the selective service law, reforms as to which the bill before us does not, in my judgment, even scratch the surface. The bill before us this afternoon is a far cry from a selective service law that is fair and just. That is why I shall vote for the amendment of the Senator from Ohio.

That is why I shall do my best in the remaining period of time that we consider the bill, before we come to a vote, to offer some amendments that at least will leave a record for future Congresses to consider; because I believe that eventually we will have to come to some of these proposals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] is absent because of illness.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official committee business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 4, nays 74, as follows:

[No. 113 Leg.]

YEAS—4

Gruening
Hatfield
Morse
Young, Ohio

NAYS—74

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hickenlooper
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—22

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hayden
Hill
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Williams, N.J.

So the amendment of Mr. Young of Ohio was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] without losing my right to the floor.

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as the Senate considers whether to extend the Selective Service Act, it is well, I think, to ponder the extent of our involvement in Vietnam.

In this connection, I wish to discuss, first, some of the testimony of General Hershey, the Selective Service Director; second, the American casualties we have suffered in Vietnam; and, third, some observations from the reliable weekly news magazine, U.S. News & World Report.

The May 8 issue of that publication makes the following assertion:

> The moment of truth seems to be dawning for U.S. in the Vietnam war. "Graduated response," as a strategy, is proving a flat failure.
>
> War strategy to date has come out of a civilian "think factory." The U.S. Military never did believe it would work. It hasn't, and now the tough decisions are crowding in for making. The problem is tougher for the delay.
>
> Initiative, in the "think factory" strategy, was conceded to the enemy. The U.S. response was to hit back only hard enough to counter the initiative. While American power was held in restraint, Communist power has grown.
>
> Moves now to be forced might have been decisive earlier.

It was just 2 years ago that the United States began the tremendous buildup of American manpower in South Vietnam. Two years ago we had 29,000 troops in Vietnam, and now we have 440,000.

Yet, during that 2-year period—while we were throwing more and more Americans into battle—we have permitted what the U.S. News & World Report calls "a civilian think factory" to determine U.S. military strategy. As a result, North Vietnam became a sanctuary.

Yes, during that period of time we permitted the enemy to build its military strength, to equip and supply its troops, to build a powerful anti-aircraft-defense system, and to receive without hindrance Russian-made and Russian-supplied rockets, mortars, oil, and other weapons of war.

I quote again from a current issue of U.S. News & World Report, and I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the following assertions:

> Career military men are reported to have been resigning in unusual numbers. Commented a high-ranking general: "If you are a career military man, there is no escaping the feeling that under this Administration your experience and opinions no longer count. You have 35-year-old 'special assistants' in the Defense Department, who never saw a war or heard guns, telling admirals and generals what to do and how to do it and even, on occasion, chewing them out."
>
> Complains a Navy flier: "They continue to order us to risk 3-million-dollar aircraft on $25 sampans, thus jeopardizing lives of highly trained pilots. To train a Navy pilot costs $290,000, and it doesn't make sense to ask him to risk his life on worthless targets."

So the United States now is beginning to reap the results of a strategy which, from its beginning, was completely without logic. The great tragedy of this colossal error of judgment is that the war has been prolonged and made more difficult—and American casualties have increased and will continue to increase.

Last week, for the first time, total American casualties in Vietnam exceeded 2,000 for 1 week. The total last week was 2,056 killed and wounded.

For the first 4 months of 1967, American casualties in Vietnam totaled 21,881. If casualties continue at this rate through the rest of 1967, our casualty total for the calendar year will exceed 65,000. During 1966, American casualties totaled 35,000.

I now invite the Senate's attention to other figures which further dramatize the magnitude of our involvement in Vietnam.

General Hershey in testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee last month in response to questions put to him by the Senator from Virginia, brought out what to me was rather dramatic information.

In a 2-year period, the calendar year 1966 and the calendar year 1967, we will have taken away from the homes, families, and communities of this Nation, nearly 2 million men and put them into the armed services. Many of these men are now in Vietnam and many others will go there in the succeeding months.

Yes, Mr. President, nearly 2 million men—by the end of this year—will have left their homes and entered the armed services. To my mind these figures dramatize the fact that we are in a major war.

Sometimes I wonder if the American people realize how involved we have become in Vietnam—and sometimes I wonder if enough people in Washington realize it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Record at this point in my remarks, a transcript of my questions to General Hershey and his replies, and also a summary of the tables of U.S. casualties in Vietnam as of May 6, 1967.

There being no objection, the transcript and summary were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Byrd of Virginia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I would like to say first that I think you are the most delightful witness to come before this committee in a long time.

In your testimony you mentioned that 382,000 men were inducted through the Selective Service during the calendar year 1966. Then you mentioned a figure of 351,000 as having enlisted, but that is not the total enlistment as I understand it.

General Hershey. No, those are the ones who enlisted after we had sent them up for physical examination, and they had been notified that they passed.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. Do you happen to have the total enlistment for the calendar year 1966?

General Hershey. No, but we took in probably about 1 million that year, so therefore it would be somewhere around 300,000 more than that. Let's see, 382 and 351 are a little more than 700,000. One million is pretty close, but we will be glad to furnish you a little more.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. You took in, according to your recollection, a total of 1 million men during 1966?

General Hershey. Yes. That included the Reserves as well as the Regulars.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. Those who were inducted plus those who enlisted?

General Hershey. That is right.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. Do you have an estimate as to what the enlistment will be for 1967?

General Hershey. Well, it is going to be probably less, unless the calls go up, because January, February, March, April, May is up 18,000, but we had 4 months in there that were low, and therefore if calls go up, we will probably get some around 300,000. But the beginning of the year would indicate a lesser number. Of course, that is a thing that I wouldn't want to try to even speculate on, because one of the things we have to be prepared for is the thing we don't expect. For instance, if calls should go up, I don't want to have anybody quoting me here that I said the calls are going to be 50,000, but just for the sake of argument, 50,000 calls from July one would give us 300,000 plus what was inducted before that time; that would be about 380,000. But I don't believe that we are likely to go to that figure, but I don't know.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. Would you estimate that the enlistment for 1967 would approximate the enlistment for 1966?

General Hershey. I doubt it a little bit because we have had low calls for 4 months. Whenever you have low calls, the enlistments are generally not as great as they are when you have high calls. But on the other hand I believe that we did have some fat, if you want to call it that, because I think the Armed Forces had quite a long waiting list when we went into these low calls, and I believe one of the services have been living on it since then. So it doesn't expire when the call does.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. We took into the armed services during 1966 1 million men in round figures. We will certainly take in half that many during 1967 as the lowest estimate.

General Hershey. I would think more than that because of this fact. You see, we started mobilization in the fall of 1965, and the number of people who will start going out next fall will be reasonably high.

One other thing enters into it a little bit. That is the question of whether we had some acceleration in strength of the National Guard and the Reserves back in 1965 and early 1966, and for that reason they are on a 3-year enlistment and it is a little longer before they begin to have to be replaced, although the ones who enlisted the years before are going to have to be replaced.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. What I am trying to establish is during the 2-year period 1966 and 1967, we will have taken into the military services somewhere between 1.5 and 2 million men.

General Hershey. Yes.

Senator Byrd of Virginia. Which again to my mind dramatizes the fact that we are in a major war, and sometimes I wonder whether enough of the American people realize that, and sometimes I wonder whether enough people in Washington realize that. These figures to my mind are dramatic figures, when we have taken away from the homes and families and the communities of this country in a 2-year period, we will have taken away somewhere between 1.5 and 2 million men and put them into the armed services, and many of those are now in Vietnam, and many others will go there in the succeeding months. To my mind these figures that you have just mentioned, dramatize the fact that we are in a major full-scale war. Thank you, General.

U.S. casualty figures for the period of April 30, 1967, through May 6, 1967:

Deaths (hostile action)	274
Deaths (nonhostile action)	34
Total wounded	1, 748
Total	2, 056

U.S. casualty figures for period January 1, 1967, through April 30, 1967:

Deaths (hostile action)	2, 836
Deaths (nonhostile action)	458
Total wounded	18, 587
Total	21, 881

U.S. casualty figures for period January 1, 1961, through May 6, 1967:

Deaths (hostile action)	9,681
Deaths (nonhostile action)	2,000
Total wounded	57,824
Current missing	420
Total	69,925

Of the total casualty figures, 59,000 have occurred during past 16 months.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon for yielding to me.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We have had some colloquies today on the floor of the Senate with respect to the pending bill, and to the effect that there was some opinion that it would be completed at an early hour. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Oregon, in view of the fact that he has four amendments, how long he believes he will require to dispose of these amendments and how long he expects to discuss them.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I shall answer the question, but first, I wish to say in fairness to the acting majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd], that he has extended to me complete cooperation in regard to the very difficult position in which I find myself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sure he has.

Mr. MORSE. I believe the Senator from West Virginia properly said to the Senate—and I shall not quote him—that he thought it would adjourn at a reasonable hour tonight. I thought it would. I had indicated to him I thought it would.

Unfortunately, I have been operating on a shuttle all afternoon between the Senate Chamber and the committee hearing over which I have been presiding. Finally, 20 minutes ago I had to break off the committee hearing, with the hope that I may be able to finish it.

I have in this debate cooperated and tried to cooperate, as usual, from the beginning. It has been known that I have a series of amendments I was going to offer during the debate.

As usual, through my willingness to cooperate, I have gotten myself into the "5:30 shadow" predicament, which does not win me much popularity at a given time in the Senate. But I have got my duty to perform.

I have three amendments, not four, and I think it will take me 2½ hours to discuss them. That, let me say, is at least a 50-percent cut in what I had planned to do. I am going to place a lot of material in the Record. However, I wish to tell my colleagues in the Senate why it is necessary for me to do this.

I have voted against the draft the last two times, and I have made clear in my State that I would vote against it again, unless it was perfected in a manner which I thought would make it fair.

I need not tell my political colleagues here that that is a burning issue in my State. Therefore, I am going to make my record and stand on it. I am going to offer amendments, as promised in my State that I would offer, and also make other suggestions as to how and what we should do—which I know is not going to be done.

This will involve a discussion of a series of suggestions that I think should be considered before we pass the bill. I have stated to the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Byrd] that I am perfectly willing to stay here tonight and dispose of this matter so that we can adjourn until Monday; but, at the same time, I think we must understand that I shall have to exercise whatever rights I think are necessary to carry out my trust to the issue before the Senate, and to carry out the obligation which I owe to myself.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the Senator from Oregon yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me assure the Senator that in asking my question, it in no wise affects our cordial relationship.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am also sure that it in no wise impairs the good will which the Senate bears to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I understand that. I do not like to inconvenience Members of the Senate. I know that there are important affairs going on tonight. However, I did not handle the timetable. No one did. Debate just developed. We got to the point that the timetable ended up at this hour where I was next "on deck"—last "on deck"—but I am going to have to make my record.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I understand. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Let me say that the distinguished Senator from Oregon has been most cooperative, as he always is.

The signals have been changed once, not through any fault of his, simply because the adequate and correct information was not available to the leadership.

I hesitate to change the signals again. I have talked to the Senator from Oregon about his amendments and he has indicated that it would take approximately 2½ hours for him to make the record, present his amendments, and proceed to a vote.

Various Members of the Senate have made arrangements for going away tomorrow. I think we should stay and finish our work today so that we can go over until Monday.

Therefore, I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from Oregon would indicate when we might have the first vote on the first of his three amendments.

Mr. MORSE. I think within 45 minutes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

There are not many Senators listening to it, and I will explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment of the Senator from Oregon is as follows:

On page 5, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

"(4) Section 6(h) (50 App. U.S.C. 456(h)) is amended (A) by striking out the following: '*Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status:'; and (B) by amending the last sentence of such subsection to read as follows: 'Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the President shall, in carrying out the provisions of this title, establish national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction under this title and, to the maximum extent practicable, require such criteria to be administered uniformly throughout the United States'."

Redesignate paragraphs (4) and (5) of the first section of the bill as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this is a national criteria amendment. This amendment is my answer to the statement of the committee found on page 9 of the committee report under the heading, "Continuing State Quotas"—as follows:

> The law now provides that draft calls are allocated to States and to local boards on the basis of the number of men available for service within the several States and local boards, with credits for those who have voluntarily enlisted. In practice this means that quotas are determined on the basis of the number of men classified 1-A.
>
> Some critics of the system have complained that a system of State quotas affects States and persons unevenly, resulting in a different degree of liability depending on the place of residence.
>
> At any given point in time, if one assumes that the draft is to be stopped, then it may be possible to show that different boards are selecting persons of different ages. One explanation for this is that if one examines results at a time when for example, many persons who have had student deferments are ending their schooling, the average age of those selected by the board having jurisdiction over them would be somewhat higher than that of a board that had few registrants with expiring educational deferments. If local boards are classifying registrants promptly and in good faith, there should be little difference over a period of time in the results of using States and local quotas. The committee understands that 90 percent of all living registrants are classified.
>
> The committee believes that the current practice of allocating quotas by States and local boards is preferable to having calls made from the abstruse concept of a "national pool" and that the State quota system is not unfair if its results are considered over a period of time.

Mr. President, I respectfully and totally disagree with the committee. I think the committee has glossed over one of the most shocking injustices, unfairnesses, and discriminatory practices of the Selective Service System in the matter of State quotas.

State quotas are based on the number of 1-A classifications, not on populations.

For example, Michigan classifies a lot of boys 1-A and has a higher State quota than Texas, which has a larger population than Michigan but which classifies fewer boys 1-A.

Thus, State quotas depend heavily upon draft board policies and efficiency.

The sad fact is that the local draft boards have a whole variety of practices, procedures, and policies which result in great injustices because we do not have a national standard or national criteria.

I say, most respectfully, that it should not make one whit of difference whether a 1-A boy lives in Texas or in Michigan, Oregon, Wisconsin, Florida, or any other State, so far as his chances of being drafted are concerned. He is not being drafted to serve Michigan, Texas, Oregon, Wisconsin, Florida, or any other State; he is being drafted to serve the United States.

After all, in a sense, we all have dual citizenship. We have State citizenship and we have Federal citizenship.

This matter of serving our country in time of war, or in connection with its military requirements, is a national service and not a State service. I think it is a great mistake to permit the States, by way of their local draft boards, to have this great diversity in practices and policies. To exercise a very broad, discretionary power which, I respectfully say, sometimes becomes quite capricious.

Thus, Mr. President, the amendment seeks to provide national criteria for the classification of persons subject to induction. It would repeal that proviso in the existing law which states:

> That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status:

It really rewrites what is called the Kilday amendment by directing the President to require "to the maximum extent possible" that such criteria be "administered uniformly throughout the United States."

Before offering this amendment, I read that section of the committee report which defends the use of State quotas. But, as I said, I did not find it convincing.

Presently, young men are deferred by their local boards, depending on local board needs. Thus if your board happens to have a surplus of draft-eligible young men physically qualified and ready to serve, you, as a student, may be able to apply for, and receive, a II-S student deferment to continue your studies at graduate school and beyond.

On the other hand, you might find yourself in the situation of a young man I spoke to recently who told me the following story:

The young man, studying in the University of Oregon for his master's degree, was in school after working for 2 years. His local board, in New York, had granted him a II-S to return to school. He went to the local board in Eugene, where the university is located, about a routine inquiry and the clerk asked him:

"How old are you?"

"Twenty-three," he replied.

"And your draft status?" she asked.

"II-S," the young man told her.

"Do you know," she said, "that if you were registered here you would be drafted next month—graduate study or no graduate study."

This situation is, unfortunately, the case in too many parts of our country. Why? Because there are no national standards for draft boards. Therefore, a young man whose board is in an area where the situation is "tight" faces a much harder time getting a legitimate deferment than a young man whose board has a surplus of 1-A's.

I believe the new selective service law should set up some system of national standards whereby this particular inequity would be evened out across the Nation. Then all young men would be dealt with equitably.

I want to say most respectfully that, in my judgment, the Senate cannot consider this amendment, nor the other amendments I shall offer, nor the committee report, nor the bill which will be voted on later tonight, unless the Senate takes a long, hard, reappraising look at the whole Selective Service System.

I have not favored the draft as we have known it in this country for some time. I have not favored the draft as the most efficient way to recruit manpower for the Armed Forces. In 1963, when the draft law was last extended, I told the Congress:

> It is an astonishing thing to me that in a Pentagon building bulging with the so-called whiz kids and slide rule minds that pride themselves on industrial efficiency, that we must still stagger along with a rickety, wasteful, and completely unfair method of filling the ranks of the Army.

But it is a fact, that of the 2 million or so men who annually register with the Selective Service System, plus the 18 million who are already registered and are under 35, only 343,481 were drafted in fiscal year 1966, even during the peak of the present war in Vietnam.

What happens to the rest?

About half a million of them enlisted. One reason young men enlist—and therefore are not drafted—is the pressure of the Selective Service.

Mr. President, that bothers me. I do not like any form of coercion or duress or pressure on free men. I do not like the blackmail aspects of the Selective Service System. I do not think it sets a very good example. I think it teaches a bad lesson. Talk to these young men, as I have to scores and scores of them. They will tell you they have to figure out some way to "beat" the draft. So they figure out that perhaps an enlistment will do it if they can get some understanding with the prospective service as to where they are going to get their training; or maybe they can "beat" it if they get approval to go into the officers' training corps.

It has been my observation that there have been some psychological costs to the young men of this country who have been involved. I do not think it teaches a good lesson by example. After all, the lessons that these young men learn are transferred over into other fact situations.

I think it is a sad thing, but true, that many thousands of young men, in this whole matter of their relationship to the Selective Service System, have had created in their minds an attitude of getting around it, of taking advantage of it, of trying to obtain exceptions, of trying to figure out how they can "beat" it.

That is the phrase they commonly use. Why? Not because they are unpatriotic, but because the System has worked unjustly, unfairly, and inequitably, and because they feel others, in somewhat different situations in life, are able to get around it and are able to "beat" it.

So I wish that we would give some consideration to what we are doing to these young people by seeking to induce them to enlist or enter the officers training corps, or enter some other military service on the threat that, if they do not, they are going to be drafted. It is pretty difficult for me to reconcile that with a free society.

Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey freely admits that draft board pressure is responsible for many men enlisting in the service. He sees this as a vital function of Selective Service. I do not. I think it is pretty bad character training. It is not a service in the development of high standards and principles among the young in this country. It tends to teach them a rather sordid lesson.

Apparently, in our society, one has to become pretty facile early in life in following courses of expediency—yes, often courses of intellectual dishonesty—in order to achieve the end of avoiding an unjust Selective Service System.

But what of those who do not enlist? About 200,000 entered Reserve and National Guard units. For the rest, the answer is that magic word, "deferment."

As I have already indicated, not only the young Reservists, but the older Reservists, too, sit in a pretty safe position as draftees are being sent to Vietnam to die in what I consider to be an unjust war.

There are deferments for education, for employment, for hardship, for family, for poor health, and so on.

According to one Congressman:

> Your status in society in my district is now determined by what your draft status is. If you are 1-A, you are a nobody, you are one of those who happened to get caught because you didn't know any better. If you are not 1-A, you have status in society.

The problem of who gets deferments is central to nearly everybody's criticism of the draft. Yet, while the deferment practices of local boards have been criticized from every direction as being biased, I do not think the basic system is wrong.

Some young men will always have to be deferred: because they are in school; because they are fathers; because they are in such poor health they are not physically qualified for service.

They are going to be deferred for reasons of employment unless, as a matter of law, we recognize that there should be a legal requirement that we start with the 19-year-olds, so they can get their service out of the way, and, when they come back, if they do, can go on with their education or training to prepare themselves for a life of economic self-support.

Presently young men are deferred by their local boards, depending on local board needs.

No national standard there. No uniformity. No fairness about it. Thus, if one's board happens to have a surplus of draft-eligible young men, physically qualified and ready to serve, then the student may be able to be deferred or apply for deferment and receive a II-S student deferment to continue his studies at graduate school and beyond.

Mr. President, this is quite unfair, and I think that we ought to adopt the amendment that I am offering, to give us some national standards.

I believe the new selective service law should set up some system of national standards whereby this particular inequity would be evened out across the Nation. Then all young men would be dealt with equitably, irrespective of what State they are in at the time of their being drafted.

What I shall do now, Mr. President, is discuss a whole series of inequities that I think are involved in the draft law, in order to show the relationship that they really bear to the amendment I am offering, because it is a starter amendment, that seeks to iron out some of the unfairnesses and injustices of the present law.

There is an inequity, related to deferments, which I believe should be corrected in the Selective Service Act we shall pass on tonight. This is the policy of the Selective Service System to draft the oldest men first, then proceed to the youngest. This works a hardship in several ways.

I know it will be said by the committee that the President has announced that he intends to do something about this inequity by way of an Executive policy, and provide for the taking of 19-year-olds first. I do not intend to be a party to giving that kind of arbitrary discretion to a President of the United States. Mr. President, that any Senator would be willing to do so bears out what I have been heard to say here so many times for so many years: The tendency of Congress again to pass the buck to the President, to let the President exercise personal Executive power in such a fashion, is another step down the road toward government by executive supremacy. That is the way to lose your freedom.

I do not propose to let the President decide what men, in what order, are to be drafted into the Military Establishment of this Government. That is the responsibility of the politicians in the Senate and the House of Representatives. They ought to stand up and meet it. They should be willing to be counted.

In fact, I grow somewhat disillusioned at the frequency with which Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives are willing to delegate away the checks that they ought to maintain over the President of the United States and the officials in his executive branch of Government. I say that if it is desirable that 19-year-olds should be drafted first, then let Senators and Representatives vote it. Let them make it a part of the law of the land, declared by Congress, instead of sitting here and letting the matter be shuffled off to the President of the United States.

That is why I think that in this bill tonight, we should change the present policy of Selective Service. This happens to be one of the policies General Hershey has clung to tenaciously. We have been reading statements from him in the press recently, that he apparently is "acceding"—as though the law belonged to him, or the policy belonged to him—that he is going to "accede" to this expression of intent on the part of the President of the United States.

I repeat, we Members of Congress should either vote to permit it or vote to deny the President the privilege of exercising any such administrative power. I say you will never find me voting to give to a President of the United States that kind of unchecked power.

Say a young man goes to college, graduates, and then decides to work for his master's degree. He also marries but does not choose to have a family for some time. When he receives his M.A. or M.S. diploma and begins working, he is in a most precarious situation. For unless he can join a Reserve or National Guard unit, or unless he wishes to enlist in the service for 3 years, he is faced with the immediate prospect of induction. And unless the Army can, in some way, utilize his B.A. and M.A. skills, he is likely to waste two of the most productive years of his life before he can return to civilian status, pursue his career, and settle down to a normal existence with his family.

Not even the military like this idea. They much prefer that younger men be drafted.

Thomas D. Morris, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower, told a House Armed Services Subcommittee last year:

> The most undesirable feature of the present selection procedure . . . from the military viewpoint and from the standpoint of the individual (is the fact that the older men are called first). Combat commanders prefer the younger age group and about eight out of ten volunteers are in the age group under 20.

Yet the Selective Service System has to stubbornly cling to its policy of drafting the oldest young men first.

Following are some reasons for this which General Hershey gave the House Armed Services Committee last year—and I disagree with every one of his reasons, as I have disagreed with most of his policies in administering a very undesirable and unfair selective service law, for which he must assume a large share of the responsibility, because the Senate and the House of Representatives, in my judgment, have rather blindly followed him for too long a period of time.

He says that—

> During periods of low calls, most registrants would be likely to go over age 25 without being called.
>
> It would be a bad effect on recruiting since registrants who are over age 19 and 20 would feel they had escaped military service.
>
> It is beneficial to the Armed Forces to have a number of men coming into the Armed Forces who are of mature age with their training, experience and education.
>
> We would lose the effect of channeling into essential activities, through the inducement of prospective deferment.
>
> There might well be more complaints of inequity and uncertainty.

There certainly would be.

There are many in and out of Congress who question General Hershey's arguments in support of taking the oldest young men first. However, in my opinion, it is not a clear-cut case on either side of the argument. Maybe it would be fairer to work out some ratio or proportionate formula. It has been suggested as a revision of the present system, that draft procedure work just in reverse and that the youngest—not the oldest—be drafted first.

We ought to write it into the law. If that is a sound policy, if the President is giving consideration to trying to handle it at the executive level, what is wrong with the lawmakers making it the law of the land? It seems to me that American young men and the parents and other relatives of American young men are entitled to have the law crystal clear and the procedures a matter of law, and not a matter of Presidential discretion.

I used to think we were a government of laws and not of men; but I wish to say that the longer I serve in the U.S. Senate, the more disillusioned I become about that, because we are moving more and more in the direction of a government by men rather than laws. The lawmakers, I say respectfully, in my judgment have not stood up to their responsibilities of seeing to it that policies that affect people as directly as the Selective Service Act affects them—policies, for example, such as the age limit that is to govern the drafting of young men in this country—are written into the law.

Those making that suggestion argue that it might be wise to give all young men entering the Selective Service System at 18 the following choice:

First. Immediately go into a class 1-A availability, subject to draft between their 19th and 20th birthdays—presumably when a young man has finished his high school education. And if not drafted during that year, be placed at the bottom of the next year's draft list, after all men in the new class of 19-year-olds.

Second. The alternative would be to elect to continue on to college—with the known understanding that following graduation they would—for 1 year—be part of the 1-A pool of 19-year-olds and be treated as 19-year-olds. At the end of that year they, too, would be dropped to the bottom of the list.

There is one possible weakness in that suggestion because if we are going to let them go on to college for the period of time required for college training when a war is going on in Vietnam and expect to be at least hopeful that that war will be over by the time they get through with their college training, we will be giving them a deferment or an escape from the risks of being drafted during that war. This creates a feeling on the part of the other young men who are being drafted and who cannot qualify for such a deferment that their Government has not been too fair and just to them and that they have not had the same equality and treatment—and of course they have not.

So, throughout this whole discussion, to understand my position with regard to the Selective Service Act, one needs to understand that I feel that the greatest fairness that we could write into any law is the principle of uniform treatment so that they will all be treated equally at the age of 19 in regard to the draft service and there will be no deferments if they can and do qualify as 1-A.

That is not Wayne Morse testifying alone. I do not have the testimony before me, but I want to do complete justice to him before I speak out of recall. I know I quote accurately the Secretary of Labor, Mr. Willard Wirtz, whom we had before our committee discussing this very problem.

Mr. Wirtz came before that committee and recommended opposition to deferments because of employment.

The record will show that when the members of the committee examined Mr. Wirtz in regard to his position he suggested that there be no deferments for employment reasons. Mr. Wirtz was asked what his position would be with regard to college deferments.

The essence of his testimony was that if we are not going to have deferments for employment reasons—and he was recommending against such action—it would be only fair that there should be no deferments for educational reasons either. He suggested we should take 19-year-olds at all economic levels—those that come from the economic level at which they seek a college education, and those that come from the economic level that does not permit a college education, or who, as a matter of personal motivation, train themselves for economic life in one of the skilled trades or other types of employment.

What he was saying in effect, as I interpreted his testimony, is what the Senator from Oregon has just said. The controlling principle of a Selective Service law should be the principle of uniformity of treatment of all those that can qualify physically for the service.

Mr. President, if one followed the proposal that I am suggesting, this might not greatly change the situation as it stands. It would, however, relieve a great deal of the uncertainty among students.

A recent National Student Association study on student stress showed that the draft contributes to the anxiety of almost all male college students—not because of fear of death or dislike of the service, but because, as the students put it, "We don't know what's going to happen to us."

That is their attitude.

The change I suggest probably would eliminate some of that uncertainty. A high school senior and his guidance counselor would better know what is going to happen as far as his future is concerned. And I believe there is much to be said toward encouraging high school students to consider completing their service before college. However, not all young men might benefit from this.

I would estimate that between one-third and one-half would benefit greatly from some sort of seasoning and maturing experience between high school and college. That this should take place in the Armed Forces is by no means certain but it certainly points to the need for an educational moratorium of some sort which happens to coincide with the "young age class" idea for the draft.

There is a third reform that ought to be considered in my judgment in connection with this Selective Service Act before we pass it tonight. I know that we will not pass it tonight, but nevertheless I am going to make a record as to what I think should be considered.

A third reform which some argue is needed in the selective service law is the possibility of making some other form of service equivalent to that of service in the Armed Forces.

This idea of national service has been much discussed.

I am disappointed that the Senate committee apparently did not come to grips with this problem and brought us no bill that encompasses a consideration of it.

In some States and by some draft boards it is implemented. In some cases, volunteers are granted deferments while serving in the Peace Corps; and in some cases they are not ever drafted by their local draft boards after they have completed their 2 years' service abroad. However, even here we have no national standards, because we have no national criteria. No national policy board exercises discretion except the local draft board.

There is no uniformity of policy, for some volunteers have been drafted after serving 2 years in the Peace Corps. Some have even had their Peace Corps service interrupted by induction orders. This only illustrates the need for a uniform deferment system binding upon all draft boards.

Without passing upon the merits of the type incident to which I now refer, we are well aware of the fact that we have read in recent months of Peace Corps members in some instances, or of Peace Corps returnees involving themselves in protests within the law, legal protests within the law, demonstrations within the law in opposition to the war in Vietnam.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, as far as the Peace Corps is concerned, if the Senator will review the history of the establishment of the Peace Corps, with which he and I had something to do, he will recall that it was affirmatively stated and reiterated that service in the Peace Corps in no way would give any exemption from service in the military.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I understood the Senator complained—I do not mean personally complained—but in his speech he said something in the nature of a complaint to the effect that people who serve in the Peace Corps had to serve in the armed services when they were drafted.

Mr. MORSE. No. I was pointing out that draft board policies differ with respect to service in the Peace Corps.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Then I misunderstood.

Mr. MORSE. Some people who object to the selective service law at the present time think that we ought to have a National Service Act, and within that National Service Act—as I shall say later in my speech—provision ought to be made for young men who have certain psychological attitudes which the Senate and I do not share, but who nevertheless have their rights and are entitled to have their views and proposals considered. Advocates of the National Service Act say that we ought to provide in law for people that serve in the Peace Corps and in VISTA or those who seek to serve as Red Cross aides or Medical Corps aides or in some similar service and that they ought to be deferred or exempted from the draft provided they meet the requirement of not 2 years but 4 years or *x* number of years.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. I did not understand the Senator's approach to this. I thought he was advocating that people who served in the Peace Corps had a right to ask for exemption from military service, and it was clearly understood that they would not have that right.

(At this point, Mr. Byrd of Virginia assumed the chair.)

Mr. MORSE. The demands of a good many people for reforms or changes in the selective service law, I respectfully say, so far as I know from reading the report of the committee, did not receive any extensive hearings or consideration on the part of the committee. Therefore, I do not believe that we are considering tonight a bill involving a new selective service law for another 4-year period that really represents the consideration of all the criticisms and suggestions for change in the Selective Service System which Congress should consider before we pass this law.

In my judgment, there is no justification for passing this law now. Some time still remains before the deadline, and I believe these other considerations should have been explored. I desire the Record to show that in my opinion they were not explored by the Senate committee, to the degree they should have been.

I am inclined to believe that if there had been adequate hearings on the various points for selective service reform which I am outlining tonight, we would have a different bill before us.

Therefore, we might characterize part of the purpose of this speech as a notice of continuing business; that the Senate should recognize that when it gets through with this bill tonight, it has not finished its job in regard to a selective service law, even for the immediate future. When we get through hearing from the American people, we are going to recognize that we have not finished the job. Some of my colleagues in the Senate believe that this bill will be swallowed in one lump by the American people. They are going to discover millions of protesters against this bill.

Let me say to the American people, by the millions, you ought to protest it. It is a bad bill. It continues to perpetuate unfair discriminatory policies, continues to be grossly unfair in its lack of uniformity in the treatment of the young men of this country, who are being drafted into the Army unfairly, in comparison with the privileges, the exemptions, the deferments, and what amounts to favorable discriminatory practices made available to those who are not being drafted but have at least the same physical and mental qualifications of 1-A which should justify their being drafted if anyone else is being drafted. It should be done on an equal basis.

We have had instances in which local draft boards, for one reason or another, have tried to speed up or to advance the drafting of Peace Corps members or ex-Peace Corps members because they have not been willing to swallow the propaganda of the Johnson administration that this is a justifiable war.

It appears that there is increasing support for the proposal that the national service concept should be written into the law. We should give very careful attention to that proposal, and we should have a body of information and testimony and hearings in regard to this matter. We do not have it. Therefore, I am making this speech tonight, so that at least there will be some record in answer to propaganda that some Members of Congress will seek to feed back to their constituents that we went into the selective service law and we came out with this one and thought this was best. In my judgment, the Members of the Senate do not know whether it is best or not; because there has never been a consideration by the committee, or by the Senate as a whole, of this entire long list of proposed reforms and modifications of the selective service law, one of which is the proposal I am now discussing—namely, the inclusion of a national service act—which would encompass required Selective Service for other services besides that of the straight military service.

Instead of giving local boards discretion in granting deferments to returning Peace Corps volunteers the volunteers would be given automatic deferments. The same would apply to VISTA workers.

Whether the other new programs of national service should be set up as was the CCC of the 1930's, is another matter. Where there are existing programs, such as VISTA and the Peace Corps, and where young people volunteer and give 2 or more years of service to their country at a minimal pay, it is argued by some that such service should be recognized as a draft equivalent and should be recognized as a permanent draft deferment. Some who take this position suggest that Peace Corps and VISTA services should be for 3 or 4 years instead of 2 if draft deferment is to be granted. Even then, to avoid turning those services into open draft dodging, it is suggested that discretion should be left to a national board for final determination in individual cases.

This is to guard against the individual who seeks to duck the draft out of motivations that we recognize are reprehensible, sometimes described as simply wanting to avoid running the risk of war in which the country has involved itself. Some, more unkindly, suggest that some may do it out of motivations of alleged cowardice. It is always difficult to evaluate motivations of people, and I should like to confine myself to the legislative policies that are involved in the proposals that advocates of a national Selective Service Act advance.

Even in such situation, to avoid turning those services into open draft dodging, it is suggesting that discretion should be left to a national board for final determination in individual cases. I wish to stress that, because no matter how you administer the draft law, you are going to deal with individuals who will have great variations in subjective motivations. It is very difficult for one human being or a group of human beings to judge the motivations of others, although the American jury system does a pretty good job of it.

Therefore, I mention the suggestion of some advocates of a national Selective Service Act, in which all young men, including some who do not qualify as 1-A's will be selected for national service for *x* period of time to serve their government in some capacity, including combat capacity or training in the military establishment for combat service.

Thus when you have this percentage of young men who make the argument that they should be deferred because of their conscience, because of their convictions, because of their deep beliefs, but who still are not religious conscientious objectors, it should not be difficult, if you set out national standards and criteria, to have functioning under a national board a series of sub-boards that can pass upon whether or not, in the individual cases, you are dealing with a malingerer or with a so-called draft dodger, or with a very sincere person who has a psychological attitude so different from yours and mine that we have great trouble in trying to understand his attitude.

Mr. President, they have those attitudes and they are citizens, too. They are free men, too. They have the right. Talking about rights, Mr. President, they have the right to have their government at least give objective consideration to their point of view that they are willing to serve and they expect to serve their country in some service that will not put them in a position where they have to kill.

Mr. President, it is difficult for us to understand young men, but I have talked to many of them because of the position I have taken on this war. I have tried to understand those men who keep saying, "But, Senator, I cannot go over there and kill another human being." When I say, "Are you a religious conscientious objector," they say, "No, I am not. But I do not believe in taking a life, particularly in a war I abhor and which I think is so immoral and so wrong."

What do we gain? If we make a finding of fact through the type of examination they propose, consisting of a national board with sub-boards under it, with national criteria for determination of the facts that these national boards will hand down, what do we gain by taking the position: You will have to serve anyway or go to prison?

Do not be so sure, I say to Senators, that we gain more by the hard line of enforcing the limited draft law in this field that you are about to pass tonight in comparison with what I propose. After all, the human being is a very complex and strange organism. When you get a group of them together, there are such individual differences among these organisms that to make dogmatic legal rules and criteria as are laid down in the draft law will, I surmise, in many instances create great injustices and inhumanity to man.

There are other suggested modifications of the draft law being advanced which have not received consideration from the committee or the Senate. They should be considered before we cast a vote tonight, which explains, in part, why I shall vote "nay" tonight.

For one thing, automatic data processing equipment should be utilized by the Selective Service System to enable its operation to be carried out with the maximum efficiency.

General Hershey has said many times that computers and data processing equipment are incompatible with the autonomy and flexibility of local boards; that "we frankly have never been able to find where we could run a computerized system with the decentralized system that we have."

The value of a decentralized system with the local board autonomy and flexibility is that each registrant has the opportunity to describe his individual circumstances and problem to a group of men and women who are receptive and sympathetic because they are personally involved in the community.

Mr. President, that is the theory. It would be highly inappropriate to establish a highly mechanized Selective Service System that would meet draft calls with the "push of a button" in some inaccessible office in Washington.

But this is not to say, however, that computer and data processing techniques cannot be adapted to solve most of the administrative problems of the Selective Service System. It would minimize the papershuffling that now occupies the time of local boards so they can concentrate on their more important function of giving personal attention to the particular circumstances of those whom they have ordered for induction or are about to order for induction.

Such a system could relieve the "paper-jam" and reclassification procedures, the backlog of paperwork in the pipeline between local boards and Army induction centers, and the growing storage problem for files.

There is another reform being urged

by some for the new selective service law. This concerns the right to counsel of registrants and involves one of the amendments I shall offer later.

One of the vagaries of the present law is that persons appealing their classification to their local boards are not allowed representation of a lawyer.

Look at what you are dealing with here. You are dealing with the very freedom of an individual. You are dealing with the precious rights of privacy of individuals. You are dealing with what is going to happen to an individual during a period of time taken out of his life in service under the application of the draft. You are placing in mere men and women in the local community the discretionary power to decree what is going to happen to him under the administration of this law, and he cannot even be represented by counsel.

A number of legal authorities have pointed out that Selective Service boards are more than administrative bodies—they are indeed quasi-judicial ones and in fact in one sense they have life and death power over individuals coming before them.

They are given great administrative and discretionary power. It is argued that in no other segment of our legal structure is a person called before a tribunal where he does not have the right to counsel guaranteed to him by the fifth, sixth, and 14th amendments to the Constitution.

The Selective Service's answer to this is that the local board's appeal agent, who is in most cases an attorney, is also charged with upholding the rights of the registrants.

As a lawyer I do not believe any attorney can serve two masters. Either he works for the board, or he does not. Again, in no other area of our legal structure is the defendant forced to have the prosecutor as his attorney.

Therefore, I believe there is great merit in the proposal that in rewriting the draft law we should give registrants appealing a classification the right to bring an attorney with them before the local board. I shall offer that amendment later.

Mr. President, in summary of what I have said so far, I shall briefly review the major reforms which seem most commonly discussed these days with respect to the Selective Service Act.

When the record of this bill is closed tonight, the committee and the Senate will have simply failed to really conduct the hearings in depth, and make the record in the period of time that should have been made before we pass on a Selective Service Act that is going to have a tremendous effect on the lives of hundreds and hundreds of thousands of young men in this country in the years immediately ahead.

That is why I rise tonight in protest of the entire procedure that is being followed by the Senate in coming to this early vote on this major piece of legislation. The record of the committee, which is on the desk of each Senator, shows from its four corners that this bill has not been given the consideration, from the standpoint of the demands of this country, for revisions, reforms, and modifications of the Selective Service Act to which I respectfully say I think the American people are entitled before we vote on the bill.

In conclusion, let me briefly review the major reforms that seem to be most commonly discussed these days in respect to the Selective Service Act:

First. There should be national deferment standards.

Second. The youngest men, not the eldest, should be drafted first or a ratio formula between the youngest and oldest should be worked out.

Third. Permanent deferments should be granted following equivalent or more extended service in other areas of service to the Government, be it VISTA, the Peace Corps, medical aides attached to the Red Cross, hospital service, or a whole list of other services which it is alleged by some should be considered as a substitute for draft service, if—I repeat, if—it is found upon examination that we are dealing with an individual who, for psychological motivations, out of the claims of his own sense of morality and conscience feels that he cannot serve as a draftee in the Armed Forces to kill in a war with which he finds himself in complete disagreement as a matter of conscience.

I am not saying that it should be passed. But I am saying that there is great merit in the suggestion, and we should try to see by way of adequate hearings whether we can have a law which will protect the men who are drafted for combat from malingerers, draft dodgers, and phonies who seek for unpatriotic reasons to avoid patriotic responsibilities which they owe to their country in time of crisis, to serve in whatever way the security of the Republic necessitates.

Fourth. Local and national Selective Service bureaucracies should be modernized through the use of automatic data processing equipment.

Fifth. Registrants appealing their classification should be granted the right to counsel in appeal before their boards.

I have left for the last point in my discussion a very delicate, highly emotional but increasingly growing criticism of the application of the draft to a type of conscientious objector who does not qualify for deferment or some form of special Government service because of religious objections to military service. There appears to be a large number of young men, both in and out of college, who allege that on moral grounds they cannot agree to serve in this particular war because it is an undeclared war and, therefore, they consider it to be an unconstitutional and illegal one. Second, they argue that they consider it to be an immoral and unjustifiable war. Based upon those beliefs and dictates of conscience, they argue that the Government should have no legal right to draft them. Some of them state that the Government might have the right or be given the right to put them in some kind of nonmilitary service but that it should not have the right to draft them to kill other human beings when they as individuals believe as a matter of conscience that the entire war is immoral.

It is of course difficult for those of us who are not driven by such compulsive pangs of conscience to fully understand the views toward military service of such individuals. I am always at a loss to understand them. However, I think we make a great mistake in reacting to them in anger or with charges that they are motivated by cowardice, a lack of patriotism, or selfish motives of seeking to dodge the draft. Probably some are. However, in my Senate work, I hear from many such young men who comprise a new type of conscientious objector. In almost all the cases I have counseled about, the young man concerned has been a troubled, serious, sincere young man who is suffering the pangs of mental, emotional, and often physical suffering and torture. An increasing number of clergymen, psychologists, and behavior specialists are suggesting changes in the selective service law to provide for some procedure that will consider the special problems of these individuals and which, at the same time, will not exempt them from a universal service act. I think it will take 10 Solomons to solve this very difficult but very real problem. Certainly, reacting vindictively by putting them in prison as assumed draft dodgers will not solve it, but that is what has got to be done with them as of now, so long as it is the law. As I have said to them, there is no other course we can follow, for we cannot maintain our system of government by law if we are going to permit an individual to determine what laws he is going to obey and those he is not going to obey, laying claim to the contention that if he does not obey them because of his moral conscience and reasons, he should not be punished under the law. We cannot accept that premise and maintain a system of government by law, for that will lead to anarchy.

However, such a response, without trying to work out some system of more justifiable handling of these behavioral cases, or taking the position that, "Forget about them, let the law run its course," that is more of a glandular response than a cortical response on our part. In fact, it has some of the characteristics of a revengeful response rather than a humane response.

Recently, I wrote a letter to a young constituent of mine, who wrote me a heart-rending letter, telling me at great length about his long wrestling match with his conscience, and his decision to refuse as a matter of conscience to surrender to the draft and become a killer in an undeclared and unjustified war. I wrote the following letter to him:

Mr. ———,
Portland, Oreg.

DEAR MR. ———: I want you to know that I appreciate very much receiving your frank and very personal letter. The truth of the matter is it fills me with a great deal of humility and in many ways simply stumps me for a reply. I say I find it difficult to reply because I am sure the advice that I may give you may not be at all helpful because my advice has to be based upon my responsibility of being completely objective as I see the dictates of objectivity which are involved in commenting on your problem.

On the other hand, from your standpoint the very problem which you present is colored by subjective factors and deep personal feelings, including the intangible forces of conscience, that no possible outsider can expect to be a very helpful adviser. However, for whatever my advice may be worth, here it is:

1. You admit that from the standpoint of religious belief, you do not qualify as a conscientious objector. Therefore, you are not entitled under existing law to any exemption from serving in the military forces if you are inducted. I think it is clear from your letter that you are aware of that fact, but you seek to solve your personal dilemma as to whether you should violate the law and suffer the consequences.

2. Although I think I appreciate the dilemma which your feelings of conscience present to you, *nevertheless* my advice is that you comply with the law. After all, we cannot maintain a system of government by law and order in this system of constitutional self-government of ours if individual citizens are to be allowed to decide what laws they are going to obey and what laws they are going to violate. Irrespective of the fact that I share your views with regard to the immorality, injustice and illegality of this war, the fact is the country is at war and all the legal processes are going to be used to implement the war. I recognize this even though, in my judgment, the war itself is unconstitutional because it is an undeclared war. Furthermore, I consider it is illegal from the standpoint of our violation of international treaties, such as the Geneva Treaty and the United Nations Charter.

However, as a lawyer, I also recognize that there is no known legal procedure by which the legality of the war can be brought to a test before the United States Supreme Court and therefore, the argument of any of us that we believe the war to be illegal does not justify our violating existing statutes, such as the draft law, which are available to the Government in its prosecution of the war.

3. In effect, what I have indicated above is that as citizens of this country, we are bound by its laws and if we don't like a given law, our recourse is not to violate the law but to seek to use the procedures of our democratic processes to try to change the law. It is true that at the present time those of us who oppose a given law involved in the prosecution of this war, such as the draft law, have little hope of changing it. Nevertheless, we should keep trying to change it, and I have been doing it as evidenced by the fact that I have voted against it the last two times it has been up for Congressional approval. Once it has been re-enacted, it becomes part of our system of government by law, and I don't think any of us can condone its violation.

4. I, too, wish that individuals who have your problems of conscience in respect to the war but who are not, in fact, conscientious objectors, could be considered as special cases for assignment to other government duties, such as the Peace Corps in which you are interested, or hospital units or some other noncombat duty. But I do not foresee any such change in the draft law in the immediate future.

5. Therefore, the cold reality that faces you and others in your position is whether or not you should, in effect, do irreparable damage to your future opportunity to making a worthwhile contribution to society by violating the law and being sentenced to prison, as I am sure you will be sentenced for a period of years, using as justification for your violation of the law your conviction of conscience. In my judgment, such a course of action on your part has some of the attributes of self-punishment. It amounts to a form of self-punishment that I do not think you should subject yourself to. In one sense, I think it takes greater strength on your part to do what the law requires you to do. You can use that compliance as a basis for your continuing to influence people to join in trying to change those laws and legal procedures that need to be changed if we are going to stop our Government from substituting war-making for peace-keeping in settling international disputes. In my judgment, you can be more constructive in promoting the cause of peace by complying with the draft law, if you are inducted, and by continuing to make clear at all times your opposition to the war wherever you have an appropriate occasion for doing it.

I well recognize that once you are inducted in the Army, for the duration of your military service, you will not be free to violate the rules of military conduct to which you will be just as obligated as, in my opinion, you are obligated to the civilian laws while you are a civilian. You can make a much stronger case once you are out of military service in support of changing our foreign policy from one of more war-making to one of peace-keeping than you can ever make as a person out of prison who seeks to use his demonstration of conscience which led him to violate the law as a platform for seeking a change in American foreign policy. I think you will have a better opportunity and be more effective in taking advantage of those opportunities of putting your ideals into practice as soon as you are out of military service than you will ever have as a person out of prison.

Therefore, speaking only for myself, I wish to say that I think if I were in your position, I would place my citizenship responsibilities of obeying the law, even though I don't like the law, in the position of first importance and my personal feelings, even though they are feelings of conscience, in a secondary position. I would do that only because I think I could make a greater productive contribution with my life if I kept myself in a law-abiding position and continued to present my fellow citizens and my Government with the facts and arguments that I am convinced dictate that our foreign policy must be changed.

Frankly, I am not one who believes that martyrdom really changes much. On the other hand, I am one who believes that if men and women keep themselves in a position where their fellow citizens cannot brand them with proof that they refuse to obey existing law, then they are in a much better position to help correct such existing evils as those confronting us in connection with this Vietnam war.

I doubt very much if my advice can really be of help to you, but you certainly were entitled to receive it from me. I am sure you know I offer it to you out of a sincere respect for you and the struggle with your conscience that you are obviously going through.

I hope you will not decide upon a course of law violation, because if you do, I feel that in one sense, you will be destroying your potential for leading a much more productive life than you can possibly ever lead as one who follows a course of action of refusing to serve in the armed forces, if inducted, simply because he does not believe in the justification of the war being fought.

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely,

Wayne Morse.

What he will finally decide to do I do not know. However, he is only one of a very large number of young men these days who are suffering from dictates of conscience that are causing them to revolt inside of themselves as they wrestle with the question "Should I go forth to kill in a war that I think is all wrong?"

The final point I wish to mention in this discussion of the draft law involves a rather delicate and, of course, controversial issue but nevertheless, one that I think should be mentioned.

I shall be brief about it, because I already discussed it earlier this afternoon, as I supported the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Young], seeking to reduce the term of the draft from 2 years to 18 months.

One of the objections that many prospective draftees and their parents are heard to raise from time to time—and I hear it from many—involves the failure on the part of the administration to date to make greater use of the Reserves in fighting the war in Vietnam.

The question is raised, "Why should not the Reserves be called up in view of the stated purposes of the Reserves when the Reserve System was established?" Then, too, the argument is made by some that in view of the millions of dollars that the taxpayers have spent in supporting the Reserves over the years since World War II and the Korean war, why should not at least some percentage of Reserve units be mobilized and called up for active duty in the Vietnam war? Why should most of the burden of active service in this war fall upon the shoulders of draftees and enlisted personnel?

These are questions to which I have not heard the answers from the administration in any specific form. There has been some talk to the effect that the basic purpose of the Reserves is to be available for response to the defense of the country only in a great national military crisis when the very security of the country is involved. I am inclined to think such an explanation is an overstatement of the underlying purposes and objective need for the Reserve System at the time that Congress was asked to authorize it.

I am a strong supporter of the Reserves now, but I think the reserve system is being done great damage in American public opinion because the interpretation of many people is that apparently it is being set aside and being protected from service.

It is difficult to draw a clearcut line between and among national emergencies. If the situation in Southeast Asia really is as serious as the administration has sought to describe it—and I think it is—in its justification for conducting the undeclared war, then the argument against calling up the Reserves on the ground that a national emergency is not serious enough leaves much to be wanted in that argument.

On the other hand, there is no doubt about the fact that making extensive use of Reserve units would greatly disrupt our civilian economy in that it would take thousands of men out of established businesses, professions, and other important occupations from the civilian economy, and certainly to some degree thereby disrupt the productive power of the economy of the country, even reaching out to the Senate and the House of

Representatives. That is an interesting thought.

Nevertheless, there is considerable merit to the argument of those in the country who are protesting the failure of the administration to make any substantial use of the Reserves that placing the major burden of fighting the war on draftees and enlistees is not fair.

I do not feel that I am sufficiently informed on all the facets of the problem to speak with any finality, but I do think that Congress has the responsibility of giving more consideration to it than it has to date.

I think that a great deal of consideration should have been given to it by the Committee on Armed Services in preparation for sending to the floor of the Senate a new Selective Service Act. The American people are entitled to hear from the Senate Committee on Armed Services, from the Senate, and from the House of Representatives whether or not consideration should be given to the writing into a national selective service law some percentage of a call-up of reservists. If that were done, as I said earlier this afternoon, there would be a new foreign policy before long.

I happen to believe that if we started to take several thousand doctors, lawyers, dentists, businessmen, service-station operators, and farmers who are in the Reserve and who are the recipients monthly of Reserve pay, and were to say, "We are going to call up your units and send them to Vietnam," it would not take long to get an entire change of American foreign policy vis-a-vis Vietnam; for then, at the very grassroots of our economy and at the very grassroots of our citizenry, a dialog would start concerning the justification of disrupting the life of America in order to prosecute an undeclared war.

All I am saying is that I think we ought to give some consideration to this and other problems that have not been covered by the Committee on Armed Services, problems as to which the committee did not hold hearings, and in respect to which I say, respectfully, they owed it to the Senate to make a report before they came in with what I consider to be a limited and most inadequate set of proposals for what amounts, really, to no substantial changes in an already-existing, unfair Selective Service Act.

After the Senate finishes adopting this act tonight, I say to the Senate, we will hear from the country, from millions of people who are going to recognize that we did not do our job, that we did not pass a selective service law that eliminates the injustices and unfairnesses that people in this country have been protesting for a long time, but we chose to continue a law with great unfairnesses in it.

I say to my friend from West Virginia that I have followed this course of action in completing my major comments on the entire subject matter, so that, as I now offer my amendments, it will take me only a minute or two, on each amendment, simply to describe what it is, because I have already discussed my general attitude in regard to the unfairness of the bill that the Senate will vote on.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the present law dealing with the criteria for drafting. Just repeating them in the RECORD, in my judgment, shows their inadequacy and their unfairness.

There being no objection, the designated excerpts from the statutes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECTION 6 OF THE UNIVERSAL MILITARY TRAINING ACT

(e) Aviation cadet applicants.—Fully qualified and accepted aviation cadet applicants of the Army, Navy, or Air Force who have signed an agreement of service shall, in such numbers as may be designated by the Secretary of Defense, be deferred, during the period covered by the agreement but not to exceed four months, from induction for training and service under this title but shall not be exempt from registration.

(f) Officials.—The Vice President of the United States; the governors of the several States, Territories, and possessions, and all other officials chosen by the voters of the entire State, Territory, or possession; members of the legislative bodies of the United States and of the several States, Territories, and possessions; judges of the courts of record of the United States and of the several States, Territories, possessions, and the District of Columbia shall, while holding such offices, be deferred from training and service under this title in the armed forces of the United States.

(g) Ministers of religion.—Regular or duly ordained ministers of religion, as defined in this title, and students preparing for the ministry under the direction of recognized churches or religious organizations, who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction in recognized theological or divinity schools, or who are satisfactorily pursuing full-time courses of instruction leading to their entrance into recognized theological or divinity schools in which they have been preenrolled, shall be exempt from training and service (but not from registration) under this title.

(h) Occupations; Dependency; Fitness; Extension of age of liability; N. S. T. C.; Authority of Selective Service Boards.—The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose continued service in an Office (other than an Office described in subsection (f)) under the United States or any State, Territory, or possession, or the District of Columbia, or whose activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors is found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *Provided*, That no person within any such category shall be deferred except upon the basis of his individual status: *Provided further*, That the existence of a shortage or a surplus of any agricultural commodity shall not be considered in determining the deferment of any individual on the grounds that his employment in agriculture is necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest: *And provided further*, That persons who are or may be deferred under the provisions of this section shall remain liable for training and service in the Armed Forces or for training in the National Security Training Corps under the provisions of section 4 (a) of this Act until the thirty-fifth anniversary of the date of their birth. This proviso shall not be construed to prevent the continued deferment of such persons if otherwise deferable under any other provisions of this Act. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or from training in the National Security Training Corps (1) of any or all categories of persons in a status with respect to persons (other than wives alone, except in cases of extreme hardship) dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those persons found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective.

For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of any person is advisable, because of his status with respect to persons dependent upon him for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the Armed Forces of the United States or undergoing training in the National Security Training Corps shall be taken into consideration, but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the ground for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe to provide for the deferment from training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps of any or all categories of persons who have children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service in the Armed Forces or training in the National Security Training Corps shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual. There shall be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those persons who have been classified by such local board. Notwithstanding any provisions of this Act, no local board, appeal board, or other agency of appeal of the Selective Service System shall be required to postpone or defer any person by reason of his activity in study, research, or medical, dental, veterinary, optometric, osteopathic, scientific, pharmaceutical, chiropractic, chiropodial, or other endeavors found to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest solely on the basis of any test, examination, selection system, class standing, or any other means conducted, sponsored, administered, or prepared by any agency or department of the Federal Government or any private institution, corporation, association, partnership, or individual employed by an agency or department of the Federal Government.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD, immediately following my major speech this afternoon on the draft law, an address delivered by Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., on January 12, 1967. In that speech Senator KENNEDY pointed out a good many of the shortcomings of the Selective Service System, which I have also commented on for many, many months—in fact, ever since I voted against the draft law the first time. Some of the issues discussed by Senator KENNEDY in the speech I also covered in my speech this afternoon.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Senator Edward M. Kennedy Before the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., January 12, 1967

It has been widely predicted that the 90th Congress will not accomplish much that is new—because of Vietnam, because of high budgets, because of the difficulty of affording both guns and butter. I think those predictions may not hold up. I expect this Congress to pass significant new legislation in such fields as housing, Social Security, crime control, urban problems, civil rights, and other fields the President covered Tuesday night. The Democratic Party has made major achievements in Congress in the past, with majorities much smaller than we have today. And, if the new Republican members are as modern and progressive as has been reported, they will help us on many of the programs President Johnson outlined in his message.

This need not and should not be a Congress of review and retrenchment. There is too much to do. There is too much to build. Our country has not stopped growing. Its problems have not stopped multiplying. Its elected representatives will, I hope, respond to these needs with understanding and courage.

The Selective Service law, which affects over thirty million American men, expires June 30th. Between now and then, Congress must take some action to continue conscription.

In the past we have extended the draft every four years, every time with little interest in the country and with little debate in Congress. Today, all this has changed. There is mounting dissatisfaction with the system as it operates now. Sixty reporters of the United Press reported this week that their survey showed "a widespread crisis of confidence in the justice and efficiency of the present law." The polls show a greater dissatisfaction with the draft today than ever before in peacetime.

And so our opportunity this year is to restructure the draft—to make it not just a more efficient and equitable instrument of conscription, but something which represents the highest traditions of our society, and will call forth a more wholesome response from our young people.

The current Selective Service System was instituted in 1940 to meet the manpower needs of the Second World War, when 12 million Americans went under arms. It has not been changed substantially in twenty years. Everywhere else in our military establishment, we have adjusted our policies to meet the new conditions of cold war and limited war. We have devised a strategy of deterrence; we have brought into existence the retaliatory forces, the continental defense forces, the mobile limited war forces necessary to make this strategy a success. But we have not revised our system of procuring manpower to bring it up to date with our strategy. We are still trying to make do with a system essentially designed to meet the needs of World War II.

The B–29 was a great airplane, but we would not kid ourselves into thinking that we could have effective air power in 1967 simply by remodeling and tinkering with the B–29 of 1947. Yet this is what we have done in military manpower. We have a B–29 system of Selective Service.

Any system which must choose some few from among the many carries with it the seeds of uneven impact. And a system which chooses without firm guidelines or centralized regulatory administration must be very uneven, indeed.

To be specific, we have a system which sends tens of thousands of young men into the Army simply because they cannot afford to go to college; and which lets 75 per cent of those wealthy enough or bright enough to go on to graduate school to escape military service competely.

We have a system which allows professional athletes to join National Guard units which neither train nor guard. We have a system of local boards which apply widely different rules—which result in calling up married men in some states, while tens of thousands of single men in other states remain untouched; which conscript 19-year-olds in one city and 22-year-olds in another; which put returning Peace Corps volunteers at the top of the list in one area, and at the bottom in another.

But beyond these place-to-place variations in their impact of the draft laws lie two faults which are uniform throughout the whole system. The first is the present policy of drafting the oldest men first, and the second is the policy of granting liberal deferments. The former breeds uncertainty, the latter inequity.

In 1963, the average age of draftees had crept up to 23 years and 7 months. This was, of course, in the period of reduced draft calls just before the Vietnam manpower build up. In 1966, the average age of draftees was 20 years and 4 months, reflecting the increased calls of the build up.

The implications of these figures are obvious. From the time they register at age 18 for the draft and until they are or are not inducted, many young men are condemned to spend five or six years of uncertainty about their futures. This, a time normally of crystallization of career and family plans, is instead a time of economic hardship and personal anxiety. A recent survey showed 39 per cent of those entering the service through the draft between ages 22 and 25 had been refused at least one job because of their draft liability, and 54 per cent of the same group experienced one sort or another of personal difficulties. Only a very small percentage of those inducted at age 17–18 reported these difficulties.

The uncertainty, then, resulting from drafting the oldest qualified registrants first is one of my primary objections to the present system.

Our deferment policy is today built upon the principle that some men should be allowed to postpone or defer their military service because of educational plans or dependency. This, though sounding in principle like motherhood or the flag, is in practice something considerably less.

For it is these deferments which have stimulated widespread cynicism about the equities of the draft, even to the point where there are being sold, in this country, pamphlets on ways to "beat the draft."

Last month General Hershey spoke to you here in defense of the present system of classification, deferment and exemption. General Hershey has served this country for many years. He and those who work with him on the local boards do a patriotic service, with great integrity and competence. But his organization can operate no better than the law it must enforce, and it is that law that is the responsibility of Congress.

I believe we can revise the present law to add three basic features: *fairness*—to treat every young man equally; *certainty*—to introduce some larger order of predictability into career and family plans; and *flexibility*—to meet changing military manpower needs, whether high or low.

Over the last year I have made a series of suggestions designed to do this. I would like to outline five changes in the present draft system which I feel will help achieve these goals.

First, the President, by Executive Order, should reverse the present policy of drafting the oldest eligible men first, and instead look first to the 18- and 19-year-olds.

The military prefers 18- and 19-year-old draftees. They make better soldiers. They are at their physical peak, they are easier to train and discipline. Looking to them will do much to improve the system.

Second, we should eliminate the present system of assigning each state a monthly quota of draftees, in favor of a national system of selection, which would leave the classification of registrants in the hands of local draft boards but put the order of induction on a national and uniform basis. This would put an end to the present system by which men of different age and other draft characteristics are called to service at the same time merely so the state can fill its arbitrary quota.

Third, we should eliminate most of the present reasons for deferment—such as education, fatherhood and so-called "essential occupations." This can be done once we look to the 18- and 19-year-olds, for they are much less likely to be in the middle of college, or have wives and families, or to have invested time and training in careers. They can do their service, and then commence their adult lives.

Fourth, I would further revise the system of mental and physical qualifications. There are now over 2 million men classified 1–Y—qualified by reason of low mental or physical reasons as eligible only in war or national emergency. There are many jobs they can do in the Army. There are another 10,000 men a month who volunteer for service but do not qualify. A large percentage of these could be made fit with a minimum of tutoring or remedial medical care. This would not only increase the pool of men able and anxious to serve, but increase the capability of these young Americans to live a more productive life after the Army.

Once we have made these changes, the manpower pool at any given time will be greatly enlarged. There will soon be 2 million men each year turning 18. Our military needs have been estimated at a maximum of 650,000 men a year. Half a million men enlist voluntarily. We will only need one out of every five or six men who are physically and mentally fit.

Fifth, we should devise a system which gives every eligible young man an equal chance to serve or be exempt.

To meet this objective of equality, I would propose the following procedure:

All young men reaching the age of 18 years would be examined by their local draft boards. All those found mentally and physically qualified would be assigned a number by their local board. At a given time the Selective Service System would put into an electronic "fishbowl" as many numbers as the largest draft board had available men, and then draw out all the numbers, recording the order in which each appeared.

Each local board would receive a copy of this list, which would then give each board an order of priority in which to call its available men. If we were to assume, for the sake of illustration, that the first number drawn in the national lottery was the number 97, then each man assigned the number 97 by his own local board would know he would be the first called by his board. A man with a later number would not be called until all others, from every local board, who hold prior numbers, have been called.

The Selective Service System would apportion its military manpower needs among the 4088 local boards on a pro-rated basis. Thus, if the national manpower needs equalled ⅓ of the total number of available men, then each board would call the top third of its own registrants. The remaining ⅔, those not called, would go to the *bottom* of the next year's registrants still ranked in the order determined by the national drawings. In this way, those who were *not* called in any given year would never be called, unless some national emergency exhausted the next year's pool of men.

While there would be no educational deferment in the lottery system, there would be a provision that in peacetime there could be a postponement for educational purposes. Thus, one who was called by the lottery system at age nineteen but who wished to finish college would be permitted to do so in peacetime, but upon graduation he would enter the service. There would be no deferment for graduate studies. The present hardship exemptions would be continued.

This method is the fairest possible for selecting a relatively small number of draftees from among a very large pool of young men whose situations do not differ, one from the other. The present system makes its choices under four thousand slightly different sets of rules. My plan would replace these with a single national selection system, in which all young men would stand an equal chance of being called. It would operate clearly and in the open, without possibility of bias or favoritism.

Eventually, I hope we can make even more important changes in our draft laws. If a time comes when we can cut down on other parts of the defense budget, we should improve the pay and incentives of military life, and further reduce draft calls. In time of peace, other kinds of service—in the Peace Corps or parts of our own country—could substitute for military duty. I think this kind of opportunity would call forth a willing response from many of our nation's youth—not because it is easy work, because it is not; not because it is less dangerous, because there are dangers; but because youth would rather create than destroy, and many young Americans would rather serve their country in the work of development and education, than in the destructive, though vital, work of war. But I am talking about what changes can be made, as a practical matter, by Congress in the next six months—and the above need more time to work out.

Reform of the draft would be a must even if none of our men were in combat. The way we determine which of our men shall serve in the military affects our integrity as a society. But today it is doubly important. The inequities we tolerate may mean the difference between life and death. When we send one young man to war and let another go to school, it is our responsibility to be sure we have devised the fairest way humanly possible to choose between them.

I do not claim perfection for my proposals. But they are a significant improvement over what we have. And I feel very strongly that if we let another four years pass without making changes, we will have failed in our responsibilities to the young people of America. Charles Kettering once said, "We should all be concerned about the future because we will have to spend the rest of our lives there." The youth of this country will feel what we do longer than anyone else. If we can make their futures more certain, and still keep our country secure, this Congress will have made an important contribution.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am ready to yield the floor on my first amendment.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Oregon. He has made his case, and has put Senators on notice that the votes on his two succeeding amendments will occur in rather rapid order.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

PACIFICATION PROGRAM IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, headlines in newspapers across the country this morning reported that American diplomatic and military headquarters in Saigon have undergone a streamlining, and that henceforth the pacification of South Vietnam, known as the revolutionary development program, will be under direct military command.

While this development itself may be only what administration officials say it is—that it will enable U.S. civilian officials to draw more efficiently upon the personnel and logistical assets of our Armed Forces in Vietnam—I believe it is timely now to ask what it might become. I think we would be derelict in our duty to millions of Americans if we did not ask, "What are the prospects that what is termed today, 'a new management concept' will turn out tomorrow to be the assignment of U.S. forces to carry out the pacification of South Vietman?"

Mr. President, it seems to me we are now approaching a policy plateau just as important as those which led to drastically increased involvement of U.S. troops in the south, and the initiation of U.S. bombing in the north. The Congress and the American people have the right and the need to know if a major change is anticipated in our national policy in Vietnam, and the administration would be serving the national interest if it announced the chances of a change before rather than after the fact. The American people and their representatives in the Congress ought to be informed if the administration is about to embark upon a program that was once the basic responsibility of the Vietnamese people, and could very well become another step in the Americanization of the entire conflict. Mr. President, the course of the war in Vietnam, and the spiraling American participation in it, has been an almost unbroken series of promising programs followed by disappointing results followed by increased U.S. involvement followed by promising programs. I have no doubts that had we asked searching questions about the prospects in Vietnam 5 years ago rather than allowing ourselves to be soothed by administration reassurances, we would not find ourselves sinking further into an Asian quagmire today. I do not believe that announced reorganization in the administration of the pacification program, in and of itself, is intended to be either a deception or a reassurance. But I am convinced that we can lessen the possibility of the creation of a Frankenstein monster if the problems and opportunities of the revolutionary development program are thoroughly aired before the Congress and the American people.

For instance:

First. What progress has been made by the Vietnamese, with American guidance, to secure for themselves the approximately 2,500 hamlets in South Vietnam?

Second. What have been the results in those areas where U.S. forces are already carrying out the pacification program?

Third. What happens when U.S. forces secure a hamlet, and then pull out?

Fourth. What effect does direct American involvement in the pacification program have upon the relationship between the Vietnamese and our forces there?

Fifth. In those cases where American forces have taken over pacification, have we done so at the request of local civilian authorities? Military authorities?

Sixth. How many villages in the Mekong Delta are under Vietcong control?

Seventh. How many Americans are now involved in the pacification of the delta?

Eighth. Is a significant increase in American forces in the delta anticipated?

Ninth. Have local officials in the delta asked for increased American military support?

Tenth. Is pacification in the delta related in any way to the recent reported requests for additional U.S. forces for Vietnam?

Mr. President, meaningful discussion of the political and military situation in Vietnam, and the U.S. commitment to it, has, in my opinion, been muted and had little or no effect upon the course of events. I urge the administration to take this opportunity, before events have outdistanced policy, to explain the present situation with regard to security and pacification in South Vietnam.

While we strive for a negotiated settlement of the civil war in the south, and the aggression from the north, let us carefully analyze all the ramifications of an American takeover in the villages and in the countryside of Vietnam. Would such a takeover amount to a long-term and massive American occupation in order to secure a postwar Vietnamese Government for years to come? Let us be alert to the opportunities and aware of the problems that will go hand-in-hand with increased American dominance of what was once a Vietnamese responsibility. Let the administration explain to all Americans just what their responsibilities in Vietnam are, before it asks all Americans to shoulder them.

I am convinced that the pacification of South Vietnam can only succeed under the leadership and initiative of the people of South Vietnam. I hope and pray that the administration will not think it necessary to take over an operation that, while difficult for the Vietnamese, is probably impossible for Americans, as it was for the French before us.

I ask unanimous consent that a perceptive and disturbing report about Vietnam by Mr. Stewart Alsop, which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post on March 25, 1967, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The President's Next Big Decision

(With an American election in sight—but no end to the war—Lyndon Johnson may decide to order U.S. forces to 'pacify' the guerrilla-infested Mekong Delta. A Post editor tells why this would be a tragic error.)

(By Stewart Alsop)

The American military in Vietnam have a consuming passion for briefing reporters. Most of these endless briefings are both tedious and uninformative. But a briefing I got from a handsome, high-ranking officer at Marine headquarters in Danang succinctly highlighted the two most important facts about the Vietnamese war.

"We have four missions here," the Marine officer said briskly. "The first is to establish secure bases. No sweat, already done. The second is to search out and destroy the enemy main forces. We'll have completed that mission by the end of 1967—maybe sooner." His voice reflected an absolute confidence.

"Then what?"

"Our third mission is to pacify the populated areas along the coast, make them secure from the V.C., and our fourth mission"—suddenly his voice sounded less confident—"is to prepare the way so eventually the South Vietnamese can take over from us."

"How long will that take?"

"Maybe five years, maybe ten, maybe longer—but for God's sake don't quote me." He paused, then added, "The trouble is they're after a quick fix back in Washington, and there just isn't any."

The Marine officer's brisk initial confidence underlines the first important fact about the war in Vietnam—the fact that the American forces are rapidly winning the war they were sent there to fight. This war is being fought mostly in the jungles and the lightly populated areas north of Saigon and inland from the coast. It is the war against the enemy "main forces."

According to Army intelligence estimates, the main forces consist of between 160 and 180 battalions, each with 500 men at full strength, well armed largely with Chinese copies of Russian infantry weapons. More than half the main forces are North Vietnamese regular soldiers; the rest are hard-core Viet Cong. Unless every combat commander I interviewed on a recent trip to Vietnam is optimistic to the point of insanity, this war is being won. The main forces are being destroyed as effective fighting units.

The Marine officer's sudden loss of confidence underlines the second important fact about the war in Vietnam—the fact that another war is going on there, and that this second war is not being won. This is the war against the Viet Cong "infrastructure" for control of South Vietnam's 2,500 or so villages. The infrastructure is the Communist shadow-government, and in much of South Vietnam it is the real government, collecting taxes, recruiting ruthlessly, exercising an increasingly harsh discipline.

The war to "pacify" the villages has been almost wholly the responsibility of the Saigon government's armed forces. Even where the Saigon government forces are physically in control of an area, the infrastructure still operates, like a grim and murderous ghost, constantly making its presence known in ways brilliantly calculated to convince the people that the South Vietnamese government cannot guarantee their security. In much of the Mekong Delta, a vast semi-swamp swarming with people, the infrastructure is actually stronger than it was a year ago.

This is why—barring a negotiated settlement of the war—President Johnson is soon going to have to make a crucial decision. He is going to have to decide whether American troops should be given the mission of pacifying the delta and the other heavily populated areas along the coast.

This looming decision, which only the President can make, is at least as important as his decisions in 1965: to bomb North Vietnam, and to send U.S. combat troops to South Vietnam. Experienced American civilian officials in Saigon believe that if U.S. forces are given the pacification mission, our total troop commitment is certain to increase drastically. They also believe that the very nature of the war will change, that the American Army will become, in effect, a semi-permanent army of occupation, and that South Vietnam will be an American colony in all but name.

For such reasons the President's two chief civilian advisers on the conduct of the war—Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and White House aide Robert Komer—both oppose giving American forces the pacification mission: But many respected military men argue that U.S. forces must pacify the populated areas. Their logic is simple:

"The South Vietnamese can't do the job. Therefore Americans must do the job, or the war will never end." And the President's understandable eagerness to get the war over with before November, 1968, is so great that in Saigon the pressure from the White House is known as "the blowtorch." This is why the argument of the military men, as often in the past, may in the end prevail.

But *can* Americans do the job? The place to look for an answer to this question is in the area around the Marine headquarters in Danang. The Marines have had an explicit mission to pacify this area— except for one experimental Army battalion in the delta, only the Marines have been assigned this mission. For going on two years now they have worked earnestly at the task. "Marines have learned," says a Danang press release, "that to win this war they must not only liberate the people, they must also win their hearts and trust."

To "liberate the people"—that is, pacify the villages—the Marines have developed a special technique, which they call "County Fair." They surround a village by surprise, at night, and then move into it at first light with a detachment of Vietnamese army or police. All the people are herded into a tent, or other central place. All those attempting to escape are shot, of course. In one County Fair last year 45 Viet Cong were killed and 17 captured.

When the shooting ends, County Fair begins. Concerts are given, and movies shown, to keep the villagers entertained. Marine dentists move through the crowd, treating bad teeth. A hearty meal is served—fried chicken and ice cream, perhaps. While all this is going on, the "VC–s"—those suspected of being Viet Cong—are put under guard and bundled off to interrogation camps. In a hard-core village, most males of military age end up in the VC–s category. At the end of the day the women, children and old men who are left are given 80 piastres apiece—about 50 cents—and allowed to return to their houses. Then the Marines move on.

It is worth trying to imagine what a County Fair in an American town might be like. This exercise in imagination will suggest why it has always been immensely difficult for a foreign army to deal with a well-organized, deeply entrenched guerrilla movement.

Imagine, then, huge, smelly, alien men with strangely shaped eyes, averaging about eight feet tall, moving into an American town by surprise, at dawn, shooting all those who attempt to escape, and herding the rest of the people into the town hall or the movie house. Imagine the foreign music and entertainment, the strange, rich food, the enormous dentists moving through the crowd, peering into people's mouths and, despite their protests, smilingly pulling out their teeth. Imagine seeing almost all the young men of the town loaded into trucks and taken away, while the women and children and old men are each given 50 cents and allowed to return to their homes.

What would be the reaction of the people of an American town? Would they really give the big alien men "their hearts and trust"? Unless it is supposed that the people in a Vietnamese village are totally unlike the people of an American town—or any other town on earth—the question answers itself.

The Marines are full of good will and good deeds—they repair roads, build schools, distribute "maternity kits" to mothers, and smiles and candy to children. They go to great lengths to avoid bombing population centers (contrary to the myth, a bombed-out village is a very rare sight in South Vietnam), and as a matter of policy they accept casualties to avoid even the appearance of brutality to the civilian population.

Yet the fact remains: There is a deadly incompatibility between winning "the hearts and trust" of the villagers, and killing, capturing, or carting off to interrogation centers most of the village's young men. The basic job of the Marines, after all, is not to distribute midwife kits but to kill or capture the V.C. That, as the Marines say, "is the name of the game." In the heavily populated areas it is a confusing game. "We'll zap the bastards," said a young Marine officer describing his plans for clearing a village which had already been cleared once then reinfiltrated by the V.C., "but the trouble is we don't know who to zap." Inevitably the wrong people sometimes get zapped, and this does not help to win "the hearts and trust" of the survivors.

The Marines, who are unaccustomed to failure, make hopeful public noises about the progress they have made in accomplishing their pacification mission. But all you really have to do is to examine their own statistics to see why the Marine officer quoted above made his gloomy forecast of "maybe five years, maybe ten, maybe longer"; and also why, if American forces are assigned the pacification mission in the delta, a big American Army is likely to be bogged down in Vietnam for a generation or more.

The Marines claimed, when I was in Danang, that, of 169 villages in the area under their control, about 40 had been "80 percent pacified" since the Marines began arriving in March, 1965. There are about 2,500 villages in South Vietnam, and I remarked jokingly to one officer that, at this rate, it would take them about 89 years to pacify the country. He didn't smile. "Oh, no," he said, "I don't think it will take that long."

It may not take that long, but if you drive from Danang to Hoi An, a provincial capital that is a 40-minute Jeep ride away, you begin to sense why it could take a very long time. The road was only recently opened for traffic, and on the day I made the trip some Viet Cong had been throwing grenades at a convoy up ahead. Off to one side, a company of Marines was engaged in a brisk fire fight with V.C. near a village.

In Hoi An, an Army major who was an "adviser" to the province chief said that the day before he and the chief had visited one of the 80-percent-pacified villages. Just in time, the chief had noticed there was no one in the streets, a sure sign that the V.C. had moved back in. They made a fast U-turn in their Jeep and got out, with bullets whistling about their heads.

Clearly an area which is 80 percent pacified remains 20 percent unpacified. "To tell you the truth," said a Marine officer in a moment of candor during that drive to Hoi An, "we can't really say that *any* place around here is really pacified. As soon as we move out, the V.C. moves right back in."

The pacification mission is, in short, a hideously difficult mission for American troops to perform. In the opinion of many wise and knowledgeable people—military as well as civilian, Vietnamese as well as American—it is an *impossible* mission for American troops to perform.

A brilliant young State Department man who has been in Vietnam, off and on, for four years, says, "The American combat troops are doing a wonderful job fighting the main forces out in the boondocks. But in the populated areas they're like blind giants, stumbling about among pygmies, stepping on some and killing them, being pinched and pricked and bitten by others. Only the Vietnamese can root the Viet Cong out of the villages, and they've got to learn how—that's the only way this war can be won."

An articulate Vietnamese village priest in the delta, who has been twice wounded in battles with the Viet Cong, says, "You Americans must fight the big battles, but the pacification of the villages must be left to the Vietnamese. Otherwise, it will be the French story all over again. If your Americans move into the villages, you will occupy us, like the French, and then you will surely lose."

All this suggests why virtually all the senior American civilian officials in both Washington and Saigon are resisting the military impulse to commit large numbers of American troops to the pacification mission in the delta. A compromise plan has been adopted, which calls for sending a maximum of five U.S. infantry battalions into the delta this year, to hit the Viet Cong's main base areas along the coast and in the Plain of Reeds, west of Saigon. But the main part of the job of pacifying the villages will be left to the Vietnamese.

The Vietnamese army, idiotically trained by Americans as a small cumbersome replica of the big, cumbersome American Army, will be retrained as a "People's Army." Its men will be taught the techniques of "civic action"—building roads and schoolhouses, perhaps even distributing midwife kits, smiles and candy. The soldiers will be paid and fed enough so that they do not have to steal chickens from the villagers in order to get a square meal, and they will be brought out of their barracks, into the villages, to protect the villagers from the guerrillas.

Under the Vietnamese army's protection, a thousand or more 59-man, all-Vietnamese "Revolutionary Development teams" will move into the villages, teaching the villagers to work together for their own economic advantage and for security against the V.C. These "R.D. teams" will have the main job of identifying and rooting out the V.C. infrastructure in the villages. Gradually—if the new plan works—the authority of the Saigon government will spread throughout the populated areas, while the V.C. shadow-government fades away. Meanwhile, on the American side, the direction of the pacification program will remain firmly in civilian hands.

That is the scenario. Will it work? In the past, numerous similar plans for pacifying the Vietnamese countryside have been attempted. All of them have failed. Aware of this, the U.S. civilian officials who are chiefly responsible for the new plan are blowing no advance trumpets. But they cite certain reasons why this plan just might work where the others have failed.

First, there is beginning to be a hope—a faint but growing hope—that by the end of this year there may actually be a legitimate civilian government in Saigon, with real national roots. This is the *sine qua non*. There will also be village and hamlet elections this year, which will give the local village chiefs, hitherto Saigon appointees, a measure of genuine local authority and support.

Second, the retraining of the South Vietnamese army, though it will be a very difficult job, is surely not an absolutely impossible job. Third and finally, there are already more than 300 R.D. teams in the field, and some of them, at least, have proved to be surprisingly effective. I spent a day in Binh Dinh province, visiting several villages where the Vietnamese R.D. teams were at work—building schoolhouses, improving irrigation, organizing village centers and the like. The whole thing seemed a bit Boy Scoutish, but I confess I was impressed, despite an initial skepticism. I remember particularly a big blackboard put up by an R.D. team in the center of a village, which listed about half a dozen names. The names, the leader of the team explained, were those of the Communists in the village. I asked what his team did about these people.

"We don't do anything," the leader replied. "We just want everybody to know who they are." This answer indicates the kind of thing the Vietnamese can do in the villages that no American could possibly do.

In short, the new plan—given time—just *might* work. But already there are military mutterings to be heard that, if the plan does not show signs of "really working" by spring, then the Americans will have to take on the pacification job. There is not the slightest chance that the new plan will begin "really working" by this spring—or, in all probability, by next spring or the next after that.

As month follows month, therefore, with "the blowtorch" burning constantly hotter, it will be rather surprising if the five U.S. battalions in the delta do not multiply until those "blind giants" are stumbling about in all the thousands of villages and hamlets of the Mekong Delta. The British are said to have acquired an empire in a fit of absentmindedness. We Americans may be about to acquire a colony in a fit of impatience.

I asked a brilliant senior official in Saigon, who is one of the authors of the new plan, how long it might take before the plan really began to succeed.

"Maybe five years, maybe ten, maybe more," he said, using precisely the same words the Marine officer had used. "The trouble is that Washington just won't face up to the nature of the commitment here." The United States is almost certainly caught in what Mao Tse-tung calls "the protracted war"—a long, long test of will and staying power which, if Mao's doctrine is correct, the Communists *must* win in the end. That is "the nature of the commitment."

No American official or officer in Vietnam is ready to concede that Mao's doctrine is correct, but five years was the *lowest* estimate I heard of the time we would need to prove it incorrect. Some estimates run much higher. Sir Robert Thompson, former chief British military adviser in South Vietnam and architect of the victory over the Communist guerrillas in Malaya, writes: "The Americans alone cannot win this war. They can only set the stage for the South Vietnamese to win their war. . . . That will inevitably take time—ten, fifteen, or even twenty years."

The American mind instinctively rejects the notion of the grisly little war still being fought "ten, fifteen, or even twenty years" from now. "Americans do not like long, inconclusive wars, and this is going to be a long, inconclusive war," North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong told French historian Bernard Fall in 1962, as Fall reported in a *Post* article that year. A few weeks ago, Dong told *New York Times* correspondent Harrison Salisbury almost exactly the same thing.

There are, theoretically, two ways the war could end in the reasonably near future—by a negotiated settlement, or by victory for one side or the other. As this is written, talks between Washington and Hanoi about ending the war seem more likely than ever before. But talking is one thing, achieving an agreed settlement another. The best-informed officials in Washington and Saigon remain profoundly skeptical about the chances of a negotiated settlement in the near future. There are many reasons for this, but the basic reason is simple.

The North Vietnamese leaders have said again and again—and again—that they will settle the war only if the Viet Cong political organization, the National Liberation Front, is recognized, in effect, as the real government of South Vietnam. The evidence—including the fact that they have risked the very existence of their state to attain this objecive—suggests that the Hanoi Communists mean exactly what they say.

The United States has taken more than 7,000 deaths precisely in order to prevent the N.L.F. from becoming the government of South Vietnam. It seems almost inconceivable that Lyndon Johnson or any other American President will abandon that objective. Between these two positions there is not much room for compromise.

It is not impossible that, if the war goes badly enough for them, the North Vietnamese high command will decide to liquidate the war, at least temporarily, and accept the best terms they can get. That is the way the Korean war ended. But there is no real evidence, as this is written, that the Hanoi leaders have any intention at all of liquidating the war on any terms but their own.

In theory, a settlement might be negotiated directly between some future civilian government in Saigon and the N.L.F. But this too seems at best only remotely conceivable. The depth of the hatred this war has engendered tends to be underestimated by Americans. A high American diplomat was given the job of persuading South Vietnamese Premier Nguyen Cao Ky to accept the American-sponsored "Program of National Reconciliation" promulgated at the Manila Conference.

"Sir," said Ky, "you do not understand. The Communist leaders consider me a traitor, and if they catch me, they will first torture me and then kill me. I consider them traitors and, naturally, if I catch them, I will do the same."

It is just barely possible that, at some time in the rather distant future, a stable and self-assured civilian government in Saigon might negotiate a settlement with a much-weakened Viet Cong. But for the foreseeable future all doors to a negotiated settlement seem to be closed. I found nobody in Saigon who believed that they could be opened by dropping more bombs on North Vietnam; by dropping no bombs at all; by "dumping" Ky; by retiring to "enclaves"; or by any of the other expedients heatedly debated at home.

The only other way the war might end soon is by the victory of one side.

A Communist military victory over the American forces in Vietnam is now inconceivable. Until recently the American high command hoped, and at least half believed, that a U.S. military victory over the Communist main forces might lead to a sort of unraveling process in the Viet Cong. The Viet Cong has unquestionably been badly hurt. In 1966, for the first time, the desertion rate from the V.C. was roughly equal, proportionately, to the desertion rate from the South Vietnamese army. But the experts on Viet Cong tactics study masses of evidence—prisoner interrogations, reports of defectors, and the like—and they agree that the hard-core guerrilla infrastructure is intact.

Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge calls the

infrastructure "the real cancer," and until that cancer is successfully removed, the war will go on. A sudden collapse of Viet Cong morale, with a breakdown of the hitherto rigid discipline, and mass defections to the government side, is not absolutely ruled out. But it seems much more likely that the operation on "the real cancer" will take years—and years.

The prospect of a long war in Vietnam is certainly not a pleasant prospect. But—on one condition—it may not be quite so unbearable as it seems. The American casualty rate in this war—somewhat over 7,000 killed in action as this is written—has been much lighter than the rate in any of the three other major wars we have fought in this century. The great majority of our casualties occurred in the fierce battles of 1965–66 against the enemy main forces. As the process of chewing up the main forces continues, comparable casualty rates must be expected during this year.

If the combat commanders are right, however, the main forces will be thoroughly chewed up by the end of the year. Then, on condition that our forces do not get drawn into the pacification mission, casualties should be reduced sharply by half or more, according to one expert. Furthermore, with the basic mission of the U.S. troop commitment completed, the total force might be cut back to 300,000 men or even less, beginning early in 1968—a possibility which political bookmakers should bear in mind. And, with the completion of such expensive projects as the vast Cam Ranh Bay installation, war costs could probably be cut back from the present level of more than $22 billion a year to $10 billion or less.

Finally, the prospect of a very long war in Vietnam is not quite so intolerable as it may seem because it is a different kind of war from any we have fought before. For one thing, the American Army in Vietnam is, by and large, a professional army, and a man does not become a professional soldier in order to avoid wars. For another, it has very little in common with the conventional 20th-century infantry war, with three or four divisions crowded into a front approximately 10 miles wide and 10 miles deep. In fact, the officers often compare Vietnam to the Indian wars during the era of the winning of the West.

"Looks kind of like Custer's last stand, doesn't it?" a Marine battalion commander said of his isolated unit, perched on a mound near the Demilitarized Zone, its weapons pointing outward in every direction. The captain of an Air Cavalry company, which had just landed by helicopter in a clearing in a long valley farther south, said much the same thing.

Sometimes these units, suicidally isolated by conventional-warfare standards, suffer Custer's fate. But thanks to the helicopter, which can provide almost instant reinforcement, and to close air and artillery support—with the accent on "close"—this is increasingly rare. And the war in Vietnam, with its Wild West flavor, provides far more opportunity for individual initiative and small-unit action than the other wars we have fought in this century.

There is, after all, adventure as well as boredom and death in war—and more so in this war than in most. I remember the steersman of a river-patrol boat on the Mekong River who apologized as a night patrol was coming to end because "we didn't show you much action." The boat had been shot at once, which was quite enough for me, and I asked him whether he enjoyed his work.

"That river gets kinda boring," he said, "but I sure do enjoy the action." I looked at him carefully, and it was clear that he was telling the simple truth. He was having the adventure of his life in Vietnam, and so are a lot of other young men. There are a lot more young men who hate the place, of course, but, partly because of the wise rule that a man goes home after a year, morale in Vietnam is high.

All wars are horrible, but to borrow from Orwell, some wars are less horrible than others. From the point of view of the American combat troops involved in it, this war is less horrible than most. This is why the prospect of a long war in Vietnam does not seem quite so unbearable when viewed up close as when seen from the guilty comfort of home. In any case, we may have to bear the prospect of a long war simply because we have no choice. It seems to be a rule of history that great world powers—and by the accident of history we have become the world's greatest—must pay for their power in agony. And although the war in Vietnam is less horrible than the other wars we have fought in this century, the agony is real enough.

The war is also an untidy and unpredictable war, and I left Vietnam with only one strong conviction. If the President, in his desperate and understandable eagerness to end the war somehow, gives U.S. forces the pacification mission, pacification will become occupation, and South Vietnam will become a restless, hostile American colony. Then the agony will be deep indeed, and it will have no visible end at all.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia subsequently said: Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has called the attention of the Senate to the new developments in Vietnam in regard to the pacification program there. He expressed the hope that this did not mean the United States is beginning to assume an even larger role and an even greater burden in the handling of the social revolution in that country.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky and likewise express the hope that the United States will not enlarge its role in that pacification program.

Mr. President, the United States already, as a practical matter, has taken over the fighting of the war in Vietnam. I think that this country has a right to expect the South Vietnamese to take hold of the pacification program, and to take hold of the social revolution in its own country and make it work.

I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Kentucky and express the hope again that the administration will seek additional support, and effective support, from our allies throughout Asia and our allies in Europe—and also the South Vietnamese themselves, to whom we have committed 440,000 ground troops in the battles there.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this amendment was not printed, and I have not had an opportunity to give it as close an examination as I should like to give to an amendment of this importance, but, as I understand it, it would do tremendous violence to the authority and the status of the local draft boards under existing law.

At one time or another, nearly every Member of Congress has made statements paying tribute to the concept of keeping the Government close to the people. I have watched the operations of Federal laws for many years, and the only one that I can recall which has been in operation over a period of years, which has kept close to the people in its administration, has been the law affecting the local draft boards and their classification of registrants.

If the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon should prevail, it would seriously cripple the autonomy and the authority of the local draft boards, and would tend to force them to conform, in uniform fashion, to any regulation that the President might promulgate.

That is what is involved here.

If you believe in preserving the power of the local draft boards to judge cases on individual merits, you will vote "No" on this amendment.

If you think that they, too, should be swept up in this broad sweep and have everyone, everywhere, under every conceivable set of circumstances, conform to Federal edicts handed down from Washington, you will vote for the amendment.

I think the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I disagree with my friend, the Senator from Georgia, that the effect of this proposal on the local draft boards would be that it would in any way prevent the local draft board from exercising its jurisdiction and applying a uniform principle to all boys in this country applicable to that individual draft board and to the boys under its jurisdiction.

What I said in my speech was that we ought to have a uniform principle of responsibility to serve this country in the armed services.

Boy "A" should not receive one treatment in State "X" and boy "B" receive another treatment in State "Y."

After all, this is a Federal responsibility to serve in the armed services, and there should be not the slightest basis of a different policy based upon the principle of nonuniformity which presently prevails.

We ought to seek to remove the great criticism that is developing against local draft boards because of the repeated findings that uniform policies are not being followed by the local draft boards.

It is the old story again as to whether we will have a Federal policy administered on a uniform basis, or a Federal policy administered on a capricious and arbitrary and discretionary basis depending upon the judgment of mere men and women of the local draft boards, rather than upon the application of the uniform rule of law applicable to all.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I rise to support the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

We had extensive hearings on this particular subject.

We all have had complaints from people who do not think that they have been treated fairly under the particular decisions of an individual draft board.

But I am reassured by the fact that the members of the draft boards pass on the streets the fathers of those boys concerning whom they have made decisions. They are at least available to them in the large cities.

To me, it would be extremely unwise to vest the Federal Government, in addition to all that it has now, with the power to determine these decisions that can better be made locally.

I therefore urge its rejection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I have had some experience in this field. I served as Governor of my own State during more than 3 years of World War II.

I received hundreds of letters from the families of boys who were drafted and from boys who were serving in one place or another.

I had some chance to know the willingness of outstanding citizens to serve on our local draft boards and on our appeal boards and in the State office of Selective Service.

At that time—and I believe it is still the case—the finest citizens in our State—and I am sure that was true generally—were willing to accept that responsibility, although it is a difficult responsibility to handle.

I do not think there was any one factor which made the Selective Service System more acceptable to the average family whose boy was called to service, rather than the boy from some other family, perhaps next door, than the fact that men of their same area, men whom they saw on the streets every day, as the Senator from Missouri has so aptly said, were the ones who were passing upon the question.

These are men who never ran for elective office, men who did not want elective office. They were generally men who were most independent in their point of view, and they served on these various boards. Their decisions were acceptable in much more than 99 cases out of 100.

I would hate to see anything happen that would centralize or federalize this particular function. And I think if it should happen it would not only be to the dissatisfaction of citizens generally—and naturally that dissatisfaction would be communicated to their sons who were called to service—but it would also contribute to the weakening of the Selective Service System.

I have seen this. I have felt it. I have received this information in the form of hundreds of letters from the heads of families, both fathers and mothers, and from the sons of families who were called after those sons of the families got to Europe, Africa, or Asia, or wherever else they had been sent in our farflung participation in World War II. Nearly 240,000 of our boys were called to service from the State of Florida alone.

I think this is the key factor in the Selective Service System. It makes it acceptable generally to our citizens and to our mothers and fathers, and in our homes.

I would be greatly distressed to see a change.

I am not a member of the Armed Services Committee, but I approve very strongly the decision of the Armed Services Committee to stick to this fundamental concept of the Selective Service System, that it is dependent upon decisions made by outstanding local citizens who have no political ambitions, who have not run for political office, who are willing to serve as a matter of patriotic service on the local boards, and on the appeal boards and in the State office.

Mr. President, I think the most tragic mistake we could make in debating and considering this extension of the selective service law would be to depart from that fundamental democratic setup which has proved acceptable to our people, and it is acceptable, as has been shown, not only in my State, but also throughout the Nation.

I would dislike very much to see the Senate by its vote today approve a departure from that system. I think it is more essentially the warp and woof of the defense structure of a great democratic nation than any other factor that is in this law.

I sincerely trust that the pending amendment will be rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is an interesting diversionary tactic of the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Missouri in connection with this matter to attempt to attract attention to the services of the local draft boards.

I want to make it very clear to them that I do not yield to them in my high regard and my sense of appreciation for the dedicated public service that the local draft boards are rendering. However, that has nothing to do with the major issue that I discussed in my speech in connection with the need for national standards.

I merely say that the young men in this country, no matter what State they live in or what draft board jurisdiction within a State they live in, are entitled to be called into the military service of their Government on the basis of a common, uniform principle of selection.

That does not happen under the present policy that gives very broad discretionary authority to draft boards. I addressed myself to complaints in regard to the exercise of that discretion, and I pointed out that many authorities who have done work in regard to draft law reform share the view that I expressed this afternoon: We should have national standards, and each local draft board should then have to work within the framework of applying those national standards.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I shall make one brief reply to the statement of my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oregon.

It happens that the States are not alike. A State which is largely agricultural has on its draft boards men who know the importance, for instance, of the continuation of agricultural work and the production of food. The men who are in areas where there are shipyards or other important defense industries know perfectly well what is the importance of the continuance of work in those fields.

It would be tragic, indeed, to forget that States are different, that communities within States are different, and that outstanding local citizens know better than anyone else what are the connections of boys of the proper age and what are the necessities of work in the defense industries, in the industries which mean so much to the security of our Nation, on the part of boys who are within the draft age.

I cite that as only one instance of the matter in which local draft boards can know, and must know, much more about this situation than can be known at central headquarters in Washington.

I renew my expression: I hope that this amendment—well meant, and I am sure patriotically conceived—will be defeated; because I believe it strikes at the very heart of the acceptable provisions of the draft law—acceptable by the great majority of American citizens.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Oregon stated something to the effect that not as many men classified 1-A have been called from Texas as have been called from other States.

I believe this matter should be clarified, because there is a very high proportion of volunteers in the State of Texas, which would, naturally, reduce the number of those eligible for draft in our State.

I point out that while we are No. 6 in population, according to the 1960 decennial census, we are No. 4 in terms of the number of men who have given their lives in South Vietnam, according to the statistics published by the Department of Defense.

So I should like to clarify the matter, because I do not want any implication made that Texans are not doing their part. We are sixth in population and fourth in terms of number of losses in battle. We are high in percentage of volunteers. I challenge anybody to prove that Texas does not do its part in connection with the war effort.

Mr. MORSE. When the Senator from Texas reads the Record tomorrow, he will find no such implication as that to which he refers. I can assure the Senator that I would not want to be a party to such an implication.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the senior Senator from Oregon. [Mr. Morse]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Sten-

NIS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 6, nays 68, as follows:

[No. 114 Leg.]

YEAS—6

Cooper
Gruening
Hatfield
Morse
Prouty
Young, Ohio

NAYS—68

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—26

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senate I have two more amendments I shall take less than 5 minutes on each of them, for I have already made my argument on each one. I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

I send the amendment to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, may we have the amendment read?

Mr. MORSE. I was going to explain the amendment. I had requested that the amendment not be read in the interest of time. I shall explain the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. I would appreciate it if the amendment could be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(4) Section 6 (50 App. U.S.C. 456) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(p) Except during a period of war or national emergency declared by the Congress after the date of the enactment of this subsection, any person who, prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction, has been accepted for service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act or as a volunteer under title VIII (VISTA) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be deferred from induction and training and service under this title while serving as such a volunteer, but a deferment under this subsection shall not exceed —— months."

Redesignate paragraphs (4) and (5) of the first section of the bill as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, another area of concern to me—what I consider to be an inadequacy of the pending bill—has been the shortsighted approach taken by some local draft boards with respect to the drafting of individuals out of the Peace Corps and the VISTA programs.

This morning I received a letter from a young Oregonian who is presently serving in the Peace Corps in Iran. He has been in that country since last fall, after receiving extensive training and transportation at the expense of the U.S. Government. Now, after 6 months' service there he has received notification from his local draft board that he is again 1-A and has lost his occupational deferment. Peace Corps officials tell me that this is not an isolated case but that none of their volunteers have been receiving deferments for more than 6 months or a year. As a result, many of those individuals who are reclassified apparently receive deferments, but only after a time-consuming and frustrating process of appeal and reappeal.

My amendment would provide that once an individual has been accepted for Peace Corps or VISTA service, he would be deferred from induction and training until completion of his service.

Let me make clear that my amendment is not one which seeks to substitute service in the Peace Corps or VISTA for service in the Military Establishment. It only applies in this limited sense: Once an individual has been accepted by the Peace Corps or for VISTA service he would be deferred from induction and training until the completion of his service. That is all. The amendment would avoid repetition of the frustrating experience confronting this young Oregonian I have referred to and others who are in his position.

There will shortly come before the Senate the Peace Corps bill. I have informed myself with regard to some of these problems in the Peace Corps.

My amendment would avoid the repetition of the frustrating experience confronting this young Oregonian and others like him and countless VISTA volunteers throughout the country. If they take him, then until that term is over, he shall not be inducted.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I shall say just a few words on this subject. In the first place, the distinguished Senator from Oregon is on the committee that considered the legislation creating the Peace Corps. The legislative history of the act is clear that in no event should service in these organizations be counted as a substitute for military service.

There is a catch in this amendment, because vulnerability to induction in the future may exist for only 12 months. After a person becomes 20 he will still be vulnerable, but on a diminishing basis each year. This amendment might permit a registrant to defer himself during his prime vulnerability by getting either into VISTA or into the Peace Corps. In that event, he could eventually and altogether avoid any military service if he were not then restored to the 19 year class. We are going to have larger pools than we will need, but I insist that if there is one thing which the committee undertook to do in this bill it was to see that no one should defer himself completely into a state of avoiding service altogether. For that reason, the committee position is that a registrant should not marry into a state of exemption, he cannot have children into a state of exemption. We recommend that nothing the registrant himself can do should make him eligible for a pyramid of deferments.

If the Senate adopts this amendment, there is no assurance against such a series of deferments.

The amendment should therefore be defeated.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida has always strongly supported the Peace Corps. This is not true as to VISTA, but it is true as to the Peace

Corps. I would hate very much to see the very high stature which the Peace Corps holds among the people of my State, and I think nationally, fall into such a status that it would be regarded as an avenue of escape from military service.

Mr. RUSSELL. This is now left up to the local draft boards.

Mr. HOLLAND. I very strongly object to the amendment and support the position of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator. Under existing conditions, if the local draft boards desire to do so, they can defer members of the Peace Corps.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HOLLINGS in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I want the specific attention of the Senator from Georgia, as well as the Senator from Ohio, when I say that the interpretation the Senator from Georgia is making is not my intention whatsoever.

If the Senator from Georgia thinks that that will flow from the language, I will accept any change in the language which would prevent it.

Let me state my intention again.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have strenuously tried to avoid providing specific deferments for any group in this bill because conditions are different in different communities of this land. In the last analysis, we must depend upon the basic fairness of the local draft boards.

I think the Senator from Oregon would concede that in many instances they grant such deferments now, but we should not make it mandatory by law and permit the registrant himself, by entering into the VISTA program or something of that nature, to qualify automatically for a deferment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I do not know how many Senators in the Chamber at the present moment are on the Committee on Foreign Relations. I am a member of that committee. In the hearings which were conducted on the Peace Corps when it was initiated and established, questions were repeatedly directed to the proponents, to this effect: Will membership in the Peace Corps automatically exempt a member of the Peace Corps from service in the military forces? The answers given by the proponents were emphatically no. That was the basis of the questioning in the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Georgia has just explained that local boards, in their judgment, if they find it advisable and in the interests of the country to exempt or defer, can do so.

Mr. RUSSELL. They do so in many instances.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But an automatic exemption is not allowed.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is not allowed by membership in the Peace Corps. That was definitely the testimony in the committee, that they should not be automatically exempt. To automatically exempt them, in my opinion, would be contrary to the finest concepts of justice and decency that one can conceive of.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, that is not what I am trying to point out here. I think that Peace Corps members should receive the same treatment as a college deferment provides. That is all I am seeking. This is for a 2-year period. I am simply saying that, if they are inducted, then it is to be understood that they are not going to be taken out of Iran, Bolivia, or anywhere else around the world and inducted into the Army until their service is over, and then they will be inducted. I am not proposing that they escape induction. Then, they will be eligible for induction and will be inducted; but I simply say that it is a shocking waste to follow the course of action which is now being followed.

The Peace Corps people, upon whose advice I followed, in order to propose the pending amendment, make perfectly clear that they are not seeking to exempt their members.

They are trying to get into the law the same kind of protection the college student with his 2-S, or who is deferred because he is a college student, is entitled to; but not for the same length of time. He gets it for 4 years. This would be for 2 years.

Mr. RUSSELL. But we recommend that a student is then thrown back into the 19-year-old group. When he graduates, becomes 24, or leaves school, he is in the 19-year-old group, constructively, and will be as much subject to the draft as 19-year-olds. Under the Senator's amendment, there is no provision for a person completing service in the Peace Corps or VISTA to be considered for selection with the 19-year-old group or whatever age groups selections for inductions are then being made from——

Mr. MORSE. Not if he is treated as provided in the language of the amendment—if the Senator does not think so, we can change the language—for he will fall back into the 19-year-old group just as the college student will. I want exactly the same treatment, even less as far as the term of service is concerned, because he only goes in for 2 years——

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no 2-year limitation in the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. When the 2 years are up, he falls back into the 19-year-old group and is eligible for induction. What is wrong with that?

Mr. RUSSELL. There is nothing in the amendment about 2 years. That is the difficulty in trying to legislate on the floor of the Senate, with a typewritten amendment that no one has had an opportunity to see. I had not seen it myself until 5 minutes ago. The committee had no opportunity to examine it. The local draft boards are not going to deal harshly with the Peace Corps people.

Mr. MORSE. I report to the Senate what the Peace Corps people told me, and they do not share the Senator's view.

Mr. RUSSELL. We have many organizations that would like deferments specifically authorized by law. We have not acceded to their requests.

Mr. MORSE. They have a duty to try to come in and try to do justice.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PELL. My understanding of the Senator's amendment is that he wanted them considered as if they were college students and then put in the 19-year-old pool.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. PELL. But the language of the amendment does not say that. Why not change it so it reads that way?

Mr. MORSE. I think it does, but if there is any question that it does not, I am willing to change it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, have the yeas and nays been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield for a question?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. Does the Senator's idea go so far as to suggest that someone would complete, let us say, 3 years of college——

Mr. MORSE. I cannot hear the Senator. There is too much other conversation going on.

Mr. MILLER. Let us say that someone completes 3 years of college and then joins the Peace Corps; or he completes 4 years of college and then joins the Peace Corps. The Senator from Georgia has pointed out that when this event happens, the young man will then be classified as a 19-year-old; but, as I understand the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, he would get another deferment of another year, and there would be a pyramiding of deferments, which is what the committee was trying to get away from.

Mr. MORSE. Obviously, that was not my intention. I have said to the Senator from Georgia that I would be willing to make that clear, and asked him if he would be willing to take it to conference.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the committee did not specifically spell out deferment for any particular occupation or employment, and I do not propose, on the floor of the Senate, to undertake to perfect the Senator's amendment. It is very imperfect.

The draft boards are not going to deal harshly with members of the Peace Corps. We have a large number of them from my State. I get a release from headquarters, with their names in it, almost weekly. I have not had the first complaint that the draft boards are dealing harshly with them. I do not think we should give them preferred treatment.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my assumption that, since the yeas and nays have been ordered, the Senator from Georgia would object to perfecting the amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I shall not undertake to participate in that. As far as I am concerned, I am prepared to vote.

Mr. MORSE. What I would like to do is carry out the suggestion of the Senator from Rhode Island. I think that is the way it would be carried out under my language, but I am willing to change the language to make it clear.

I may indicate to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER] that it is furthest from my thought that a college student would go to school for 2 or 3 years, then enlist in the Peace Corps, and get a further deferment from military service. It will take only a simple change in the language to take care of that.

I want to state to the Senator from Georgia, respectfully, that I am not much impressed with the argument that, since the committee has not considered this matter, we should not consider it on the floor, because the burden of my argument is that the committee has not gone into the reorganization of the Selective Service System as it should have been gone into it before it brought the bill to the floor of the Senate. The Armed Services Committee has not given consideration to many protests and objections to present inadequacies and defects of the Selective Service System, and, therefore——

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I regret that the distinguished Senator did not bring this matter to the attention of the committee during the long days of hearings we had.

Mr. MORSE. I do, too. I had no idea the Armed Services Committee, in rewriting the selective service law, in view of all the discussions taking place in the country during the past months, would not have brought a more comprehensive bill to the floor. I regret that, but if anyone can show me how to do more than I have, with a whole series of problems, I would like to know how to do it in the time available.

May I have the attention of the Senator from Georgia and the Parliamentarian for a moment? Although I think the amendment is clear enough, particularly in view of the legislative history, what I would like to do is withdraw it temporarily, take up my next amendment, and while that is being taken up, change the language of this amendment to conform to the change suggested by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and then reoffer it. But in view of the fact that the yeas and nays have been ordered, it is my understanding I cannot do that without unanimous consent.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not wish to take advantage of any technicalities in dealing with the Senator from Oregon. If he wishes to change the language, he may do so, and if he wishes to prescribe deferments for certain groups, when there are no others specified, he can do so. I shall not object. It requires unanimous consent. I am not the only Senator who can object.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator from Oregon asks unanimous consent to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I would like to address a question to the Senator from Georgia. Are Foreign Service officers exempted from the draft?

Mr. RUSSELL. They are not. That is a matter which should be brought to the attention of Senators.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is there any more reason for exempting members of the Peace Corps than members of the Foreign Service?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the Peace Corps does much good. That is one facet of the Great Society I have supported. I have not supported them all, as Members of the Senate know. But I am not in favor of selecting them above other employment groups in the United States and giving them deferment by law that can get pyramided into avoiding service.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have supported the Peace Corps since its inception. I have supported it vigorously and gladly. I think it is a fine group and is making a fine effort. I think the worst thing we could do to downgrade the Peace Corps in the opinion of the general public——

Mr. RUSSELL. Let me point out that the Peace Corps is not the only one included in the amendment. Members of VISTA are included, these persons are living in the United States and working next to people who are being drafted to go to Vietnam.

Mr. HOLLAND. My opinion is that one could not downgrade VISTA very much, but I think we could downgrade the Peace Corps very much by adopting the amendment exempting them from the draft.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, one of the objections that has been made against the draft act is that there is not enough uniformity in it, and one of the motives that prompted the committee to report a bill which provided deferment only for those engaged in medicine and allied professions was to do away with that criticism, which is just in some respects.

We tried to make the measure as uniform as possible, so every American youth that enjoyed the same blessings of the United States would, as far as possible, be subject to the draft, without special deferments for special classes and for special groups.

That is why I think the subcommittee did a wise thing in trying to hold its ground on deferments, because every American youth owes the same obligation to defend his Nation as every taxpayer has to contribute to the support of the Government of the United States.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I would like to address a question to the Senator from Georgia, but before doing so, as a member of the Armed Services Committee I regret any implied or actual criticism that this bill was not thoroughly considered. For many days we had hearings. We gave every person who asked to be heard an opportunity to do so. We had testimony from the committee headed by Mr. Marshall, formerly with the Justice Department. We had the report of the Panel headed by Gen. Mark Clark that studied this subject for the House Armed Services Committee. We went into this bill in great detail. I must say I am surprised to hear what I did tonight. I would say the committee considered this bill as extensively as any we have considered since I have served in the Senate.

Mr. RUSSELL. May I say that every witness who requested to appear was granted an opportunity to testify, regardless of what viewpoint he may have had.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator is correct. I regret that any Senator thinks the committee did not make every effort it could make to get the opinion of any person in this country who wanted to present a point of view at the time the bill was before us.

I would like to ask a question. We have employees of the Agency for International Development overseas. I was in Laos last January or December. I requested permission to go to an outpost where some of our nonmilitary people were. Permission was refused by the Ambassador because he thought it was not entirely safe. He wrote me a letter afterward that civilians working for the United States were attacked, and some were killed. They get none of the credit that is given other people who perfrom heroically for their country.

I am not making any criticism of anybody. I am merely observing that they receive little publicity or credit. They are dead now; they did their best for their country and they lost their lives. May I ask the Senator from Georgia if such civilian employees would be deferred from the draft?

Mr. RUSSELL. They would not by operation of law. While I have not always favored the magnitude of the military and economic assistance we supply, nevertheless, the employees of AID serve their country and none of them would be mandatorily deferred under this bill.

The Senator's amendment would defer the thousands of people in this country who serve in VISTA. It does not apply to the Peace Corps only; it applies to the domestic workers as well. The man who happens to be a member of VISTA would be given a deferment by act of Congress.

I say that this would be a fine recruiting appeal for VISTA and the Peace Corps, to be able to go out and tell people, "If you want to get out of the draft now, come on in, enlist in the Peace Corps or enlist in VISTA, and you will be deferred."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I resubmit my amendment as modified, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] and counsel for the committee for the assistance they have rendered in redrafting the amendment.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The Senator will state it.

Mr. BAYH. Without inconveniencing the Senate, inasmuch as I think there are some critical points touched here, would I be in order to ask that the clerk be directed to read the revised version of the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the amendment, as modified.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following:

(4) Section 6 (50 App. U.S.C. 456) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(p) Except during a period of war or national emergency declared by the Congress after the date of the enactment of this subsection, any person who, prior to the issuance of orders for him to report for induction, has been accepted for service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act or as a volunteer under title VIII (VISTA) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, shall be deferred from induction and training and service under this title while serving as such a volunteer. At the end of such service, such person shall be subjected to the same vulnerability for selection as the age group or groups from which selections are then being made."

Redesignate paragraphs (4) and (5) of the first section of the bill as paragraphs (5) and (6), respectively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon, as modified.

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. JORDAN], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. PERCY] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 7, nays 65, as follows:

[No. 115 Leg.]

YEAS—7

Bayh
Gruening
Hatfield
Morse
Moss
Pell
Young, Ohio

NAYS—65

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bennett
Bible
Bogg
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. MORSE's amendment, as modified, was rejected.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated. It will not take me 5 minutes on this amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, between lines 17 and 18, insert the following:

(5) Paragraph (3) of section 10(b) (50 App. U.S.C. 460(b)(3)) is amended by inserting after the sixth complete sentence of such paragraph a new sentence as follows: "Each individual shall be afforded the opportunity to appear in person and be represented by counsel before the local board having jurisdiction over him for the purpose of objecting to the classification assigned to him by such board, and to present testimony or other evidence to the local board regarding the classification assigned to him."

On page 5, line 18, strike out "(5)" and insert in lieu thereof "(6)".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, earlier in my major speech in which I covered all of these amendments, I pointed out the absence of the right to counsel in the case of these draft board appeals.

RIGHT TO COUNSEL

I shall repeat what I said earlier on this subject. One of the vagaries of the present law is that persons appealing their classification to their local boards are not allowed representation of a lawyer. A number of legal authorities have pointed out that Selective Service boards are more than administrative bodies—they are indeed quasi-judicial ones and in fact in one sense they have life and death power over individuals coming before them. It is argued that in no other segment of our legal structure is a person called before a tribunal where he does not have the right to counsel guaranteed to him by the fifth, sixth, and 14th amendments to the Constitution.

The Selective Service's answer to this is that the local board's appeal agent, who is in most cases an attorney, is also charged with upholding the rights of the registrants.

I do not believe any attorney can serve two masters. Either he works for the board, or he does not. Again in no other area of our legal structure is the defendant forced to have the prosecutor as his attorney.

I think that the appellants are entitled to be represented by counsel before the local draft boards. That is the purport of the amendment. I submit it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not have any deep feeling on this amendment.

I am glad to give the benefit of my experience with the matter over the period of time since the first Draft Act of 1940.

The statement just made is true—a lawyer is not permitted to go before the local board and plead the case of the registrant.

The reason for that is that it is an administrative procedure, and it not a strictly legal procedure.

Their decisions are based on matters other than the law. They are based on matters of judgment. Each person under the law is considered for selection on the basis of his own individual status. The board's proceedings are more administrative than legal.

The registrants do have a representative. There is an appeals agent provided by law. The pending bill contains an amendment pertaining to this matter. For some reason there have been rulings that Reserve officers cannot serve as appeals agents.

We amended the law to provide that Reserve officers can serve as appeals agents.

There is one other aspect which goes to the sociological aspect of the matter. This is that if we are going to give a lawyer the right to go into the appeal board and plead the case, this would give some advantage to the very wealthy registrant who is able to employ a lawyer to argue his case, while the appeals agent is now available under the existing law to every registrant.

I understand the appeal of having a lawyer represent you.

This is more in the nature of an administrative matter within the draft board. There is an appeals agent available to represent the man.

To me, the main argument against the pending amendment is that the wealthier registrants will have an unquestionable advantage over the poorer ones who are not able to get what some might call a high-powered lawyer to go in and plead his case before the draft board.

For that reason, I shall vote against the amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of course the appeals officer does not represent the registrant. He represents the board. As I stated in my main remarks, we cannot justify having a prosecutor serve also as an attorney for the defendant.

Furthermore, as to the argument that this is an administrative process, a great many of our rights are determined under administrative processes.

It is a novel argument to argue that because part of the proceeding is administrative, one is not entitled to be represented by counsel.

There is not, in my judgment, the slightest basis for the argument that if one has a case in his local community, he will not be able to get a lawyer in that community to handle the case for him.

We will find that most of them would be on a charity basis in the case of the poor registrant to whom the Senator from Georgia referred.

We are dealing here with very precious rights.

The fact is that in spite of our confidence in most boards, there are some very difficult community problems arising in the administration of the draft law through the local draft boards.

A good many communities from time to time will find themselves deeply concerned over allegations as to miscarriages of justice in the handling of these cases.

That is why we have this system of government by law. Certainly one who feels he needs the counsel of a lawyer in whom he has confidence ought to have counsel to represent him in a hearing if he thinks that situation warrants such advice.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know whether I correctly understood the Senator from Oregon. I understood him to say that it would be the same person in both cases. That is not so. The appeals agent does not represent both the board and the registrant in the same proceeding.

There is a counsel for the registrant, and the appeals board has an appeals agent in addition. They are not one and the same person.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, does the same procedure which operated throughout World War II still prevail, that there is always an appeal to an appeals board and that if the appeals board decision goes against you there is always an appeal to the Selective Service head in the State, and if that goes against you, there is still the right of an appeal to Washington?

Mr. RUSSELL. If a man gets one vote in his favor on the State board, he can appeal to Washington. An appeal can be had. This is just a question of whether the lawyer should be permitted to go into the local Selective Service board when they are making their classifications.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me, if the Senator will let me say so, that to initiate this precedent would mean that we would make the board subject to court arguments before there were decisions from the local boards and the appeals board, which would make it more difficult to get the outstanding citizens who customarily serve on both of those boards to serve.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, of course, the representative of the draft board is not considered the representative of the litigant who is dissatisfied. He does not want to have anything to do at that stage with any representative through the draft board. He wants his own counsel. We lawyers know that particularly in the administrative law process, once you get an administrative ruling against you, the presumption is going to follow that ruling on up the ladder. You should guarantee or give the assurance to the individual citizen involved that he has the right of counsel at the very beginning of the process. I believe that is basic to guaranteeing a fair administration of justice in this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that the Committee on the Judiciary, in revising the Administrative Procedure Act, considered this matter carefully and did not provide for an attorney to appear before local boards when they are classifying registrants or hearing appeals.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to preface my question by stating that I believe in the right of counsel in all circumstances. However, is this not the present system, and the system which this bill would continue, on this aspect of the matter: A registrant can procure the services of a lawyer to draw any kind of affidavits to be presented by him, in his behalf, before the board? They just do not let him make an oral argument?

Mr. RUSSELL. He can get the assistance of counsel to prepare any kind of documents to sustain his position and to prepare affidavits and anything else to show his position in writing to the board.

On page 614, General Hershey discusses this matter in his testimony, and he indicates that appeals are very easy to come by. If a man does not get what he thinks he should from the board, all he does is say, "I do not like it," and it has to be transferred automatically to the State board. If one member of the State board agrees with him, it goes to the national board. This is about the simplest appeals procedure known to our law—this matter of appealing the decisions of Selective Service.

Mr. ERVIN. The only restriction on his right of assistance of counsel is that he cannot have counsel to make an oral argument before the board?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. BROOKE. Do I correctly understand that the answer of the Senator from Georgia to the question previously asked was that a lawyer can go before the appeals board?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. BROOKE. Can sit besides his client, or the registrant?

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. BROOKE. But he just cannot make oral argument?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I understand the Senator from North Carolina to say that the lawyer can help him prepare his case or file a brief, give the registrant a brief. I did not mean to say that the lawyer could go before the board and sit by the registrant, because the existing procedure does not permit an attorney to go in with the registrant and sit beside him.

Mr. BROOKE. An oral argument is not the only limitation. A lawyer cannot go in with the registrant.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BROOKE. He can do things outside the board, but he cannot go in.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MORSE. It is this place where he should have the right of the oral representation of his counsel. The local draft boards have lawyers on them; and this registrant says, "I want my lawyer to come in and present my case for me." Does anyone think that is going to put the draft board at a disadvantage? But it would give an equal opportunity for justice to the registrant, to see that all his rights are presented by a lawyer competent to present his view. Keep in mind who some of these registrants are. Many of them do not possess much ability and are not capable of adequately representing themselves before the board. That is where the registrant needs the representation of his counsel.

I am at a loss to understand why there should be any question about the presence of his lawyer at that stage. Certainly, the board would not be at a disadvantage, if the board is sound in its policies. But that young American should be represented at that point by his counsel, if he wishes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], the Senator from Montana [Mr. METCALF], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SPONG], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from

New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 55, as follows:

[No. 116 Leg.]

YEAS—17

Baker
Bartlett
Brooke
Burdick
Church
Cooper
Gruening
Hart
Hatfield
McCarthy
Mondale
Morse
Moss
Nelson
Prouty
Yarborough
Young, Ohio

NAYS—55

Allott
Anderson
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

So Mr. Morse's amendment was rejected.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, all the amendments designed to improve the workings of the draft having failed of passage, and the hoped-for improvements which might have eliminated some of the injustices and discriminations in the Selective Service System, which are a matter of common knowledge, remaining in the pending revised draft act, I feel obliged to vote against its passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, before the roll is called, I think perhaps the acting majority leader should restate whether or not he is going to ask for an order to go over until Monday.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the able minority leader for reminding me. I shall attempt to get consent for that order now. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tonight it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT OF 1967

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1432) to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered; and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill,] the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye] are absent because of illness.

I further announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Eastland], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. Hayden], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Hill], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Inouye], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Mansfield], the Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], the Senator from Florida [Mr. Smathers], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Sparkman], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. Spong], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. Stennis], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] are absent on official business to attend the 10th Canada-United States Interparliamentary Conference.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] is absent on official committee business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper] is detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Aiken], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Carlson], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Case], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. Fong], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Griffin], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. Hickenlooper], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan], the Senator from California Mr. [Murphy], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Percy] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 70, nays 2, as follows:

[No. 117 Leg.]

YEAS—70

Allott
Anderson
Baker
Bartlett
Bayh
Bennett
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Brooke
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Hansen
Harris
Hart
Hatfield
Holland
Hollings
Hruska
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McIntyre
Miller
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie

Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Ribicoff
Russell
Scott
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—2

Gruening
Morse

NOT VOTING—28

Aiken
Carlson
Case
Clark
Dodd
Eastland
Fong
Fulbright
Griffin
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Inouye
Javits
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Mansfield
Metcalf
Murphy
Percy
Smathers
Sparkman
Spong
Stennis
Tydings
Williams, N.J.

So the bill (S. 1432) was passed.

SENATORIAL ETHICS

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, in due course, the Senate will be discussing a matter of senatorial ethics. I do not seek to condone any improper conduct. I think that we should view ourselves for what we are in perspective and not for what we are not and never have been.

Some time ago, a committee was appointed to pick five of the outstanding Senators of all time whose portraits are to appear in the Senate Reception Room.

The committee was headed by the then Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts. As one might expect, when the committee concluded its deliberations, among those whose portraits were selected to be hung in the Senate Reception Room as the five greatest Senators of all time, was a Senator from Massachusetts, who might be considered the New England nominee for that honor. A full-length painting of that same Senator appears above the Senate steps leading from the President's Room to the floor below.

I refer, of course, to the great Daniel Webster.

Now, Mr. President, there are certain incidents in the life of Daniel Webster which are something of a matter of common knowledge. I say this not to point the finger of scorn, or to condone the conduct of anyone. I merely state for the record that the Senate today operates on much higher ethical standards than it did in earlier years.

I now read from a memorandum prepared for me by one of our staff assistants, the subject of which is:

Retainers and Subsidies Paid to Daniel Webster While He Was a U.S. Senator

> (Source of information: "Daniel Webster and the Rise of National Conservatism," by Richard N. Current (1955) Little, Brown & Co.)
>
> Daniel Webster was connected with the Bank of the United States as legal counsel, director of its Boston branch, frequent borrower, and as a friend of its president, Nicholas Biddle.
>
> In 1833, at a time when the renewal of the charter of the Bank of the United States and the deposit of United States Government funds in the bank were at issues and President Jackson was out to destroy the bank, Webster wrote to Biddle the following note:
>
> "Since I have arrived here, I have had an application to be concerned, professionally, against the Bank, which I have declined, of course, although I believe my retainer has not been renewed, or *refreshed* as usual. If it be wished that my relation to the Bank should be continued, it may be well to send me the usual retainers."
>
> Webster speculated in the 1835–37 land boom and, thus, suffered when the crash came in 1837. He borrowed much money and these loans became gifts when he did not pay them back. Another source of his revenue was legal fees which sometimes amounted to $25,000.

Mr. President, I point out here that $25,000 in those days would be the equivalent of a quarter of a million dollars today.

Continuing to read from the memorandum:

> But, besides these sources of income and his Senate salary, Webster began to need outright subsidies from the constituents he served.
>
> While he hinted that he might have to leave the Senate and devote himself to his law practice, his friend Edward Everett appealed to Thomas W. Ward, treasurer of Harvard College and American agent for the English bankers Baring Brothers, to canvass the Boston businessmen for a trust fund of a hundred thousand dollars to keep him in public life. The party battle, Everett said, was "nothing less than a war of Numbers against Property," and Webster was indispensable to "our friends in Boston" for the protection of "their houses, their lands, their stocks."
>
> The coming of hard times heightened social tensions. By threatening his wealthy constituents with revolution, it increased their dependence upon Webster while, by threatening him with bankruptcy, it increased his dependence upon his wealthy constituents.
>
> In 1845, Webster was brought out of retirement and returned to the Senate by the Whigs in the Massachusetts Legislature.
>
> As usual he needed money. Some of his wealthy constituents needing his services, took steps to provide it. "The project is to raise a fund of 100,000 dollars here & in N York—

I point out that $100,000 then would be the equivalent of approximately $1-million-plus nowadays—

> the income to be settled on him & his wife for life, reversion to ye subscribers," Harrison Gray Otis wrote privately from Boston (February 7, 1845). "This is at least the third time that the wind has been raised for him, and the most curious fact is that thousands are subscribed by many who hold his old notes for other thousands, and who have not been backward in their censures of his profusion."
>
> Forty Boston businessmen contributed and so Webster went on to Washington to rejoin the Senate.
>
> "But the financial arrangement which made his presence possible soon jeopardized his effectiveness by making him vulnerable to partisan attack."

In no instance did the membership of his own party subscribe to any attack such as that, although the opposing side suggested that large amounts of money raised privately for the Senator affected his official decisions.

I recall when the father of the junior Senator from Louisiana stood in this body and made one of his opening efforts at national attention by speaking in favor of his "share the wealth" plan for the redistribution of wealth. He wanted to level off all large fortunes and spread the money thus derived among the poor.

At that time there was some disagreement. The then majority leader, Joe Robinson, took the floor to state it was an outrage to suggest any such program as that. The Chicago Tribune, the following day, had a cartoon in which Joe Robinson was depicted wrapped in stripes of Old Glory, in red and white. Huey Long was pictured as carrying a hammer and sickle, with just a red background. I recall, as a boy, reading about that.

The then Senator from Louisiana took the floor to make reference to the cartoon in the Chicago Tribune.

He noted that the flag included only the stripes, not the blue background for the stars, presumably because the newspaper did not want to spend the money necessary to show the color. He said, "Where are the stars? Where did they go?" Then he proceeded to read Martindale-Hubbell, which included utilities which had paid the Senator large sums of money.

If I recall correctly, he said something like this: "I do not say the fact that the Senator is on those people's payroll could affect his vote or the position he takes on this matter; oh, no."

At this point a Senator rose and asked that the Senator from Louisiana take his seat, on the ground that he had violated the rules by suggesting that a Senator had done something improper. The Senator from Louisiana protested that he had not accused a Senator of doing anything wrong. He said, "I said, 'Oh, no, the fact that the man was receiving money from these people had no significance at all.'"

Notwithstanding that, he was made to take his seat, and permitted to proceed after he had been made to recognize that this was in violation of the rules of the Senate. As a junior Senator, he could then proceed, after being chastized.

In those times when one suggested that a Senator's being retained by a large corporation, or his firm's being retained by a large corporation, could conceivably have something to do with his service in this body, he was subject to being required to take his seat under rule XIX.

I say that merely to point out that the Senate has not declined in its standards. The tendency has been to move ever upward, and it will continue to do so.

It is the judgment of the Senator from Louisiana that we would do well to write a set of rules—not hypocritical rules, not rules that pretend that we are saints, but honest rules that show a practical man what he can do and what he cannot do, and standards to which he may repair and by which he may judge his conduct.

But in the absence of them, it is well to note that the type of thing which one gets from history books of the earlier days of the Senate does not exist in the Senate today in any respect whatever.

It would seem to the Senator from Louisiana it would be well, when we consider the matter of ethics and start judging our fellow man, to keep in mind that the Senate is a continuing body and that the entire trend of the Senate has been to move forward in its standards, even in the absence of any rule to so require us.

TRIBUTE TO GERMAINE KRETTEK

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the recognition given Miss Germaine Krettek, director of the Washington office of the American Library Association. The recognition was in the form of the Distinguished Achievement Award of the Drexel Library School Alumni Association and the Graduate School of Library Science of the Drexel Institute of Technology.

It was presented to Miss Krettek at a dinner on April 19, 1967. The presentation of the award was made by Emerson Greenaway, director of the Free Library of Philadelphia, a distinguished educator in his own right and a previous recipient of this award.

I should like to say, Mr. President, as chairman of the Education Subcommittee, together with my colleagues on that body, we are all indebted greatly to Miss Krettek for the help that she has given us over the years in presenting to us factual information regarding the need for library training and instruction, and for making available to us panels of distinguished librarians whose testimony carried conviction.

I should therefore like to add my voice to those throughout the country who are congratulating Miss Krettek upon this recognition of her dedicated service, and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the text of the award be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the award was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DISTINGUISHED ACHIEVEMENT AWARD OF THE DREXEL LIBRARY SCHOOL ALUMNI ASSOCIATION AND THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF LIBRARY SCIENCE OF DREXEL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY PRESENTED TO GERMAINE KRETTEK

Her untiring efforts during the past ten years as Director of the Washington Office of the American Library Association have helped materially to bring about federal legislation to implement library service.

Non-partisan and independent of faction she works only for the greater good of our society, for the wider dissemination of library services, for the general support of librarianship at the national level,

Her dedication, her warm personality, her wise counsel enlist the unstinting support of legislators and profession alike.

ELIZABETH R. HARTMAN,
President.

JOHN F. HARVEY,
Dean.

APRIL 19, 1967.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a short speech that I shall now read. I am sorry the hour is late, but it went to the press gallery, and I had hoped to give it earlier today. As the acting majority leader knows, it was impossible for me to do it, for a variety of reasons, including my chairmanship of a Senate hearing and also because I cooperated with the acting majority leader in handling the draft issue and deferring this statement until that issue was disposed of.

In addressing the Democratic fundraising dinner Tuesday night, President Johnson referred to the war in Vietnam in terms that can only be considered as whistling past the graveyard of the 1968 election. His remarks were in keeping with his administration's policy of seeking a national popular front with respect to Vietnam.

It has always been a fatal factor in our war policy that its backers have predicated its success not so much upon its merits as upon appearances of universal acceptance. The war is not likely to be "won," whatever that word means in this context, because our policy is sound but only if everyone in the world, and North Vietnam in particular, thinks it is supported without qualification by every single American.

In World War II, I do not suppose there was more universal support for national war policies anywhere than there was in Germany and Japan. That did not have much effect upon the decision of Britain to continue the war alone, nor of the United States to become the first country to wage war against both at the same time.

In the case of Germany, so complete and unswerving was domestic support for the German war policy that the national leadership kept the country fighting down to the last gasp of its strength, and down to the last gasp of its chancellor. In the case of Japan, it took the first two nuclear bombs dropped upon cities to induce its leaders to capitulate. But there were no vestiges of dissent apparent in either country.

The fortunes of war cannot safely be predicated upon a show of national unity. They need a far sounder base than that; and I call this to the attention of my President. What they need is an objective in proportion to the resources of blood and money spent on it.

The Diem government in Vietnam was so worthless a reason for spending our national resources that we finally helped the army of South Vietnam do away with it. The question now is whether the ruling juntas that have followed Diem in command are worth the half a million or more men we have in South Vietnam and neighboring countries to keep the latest one afloat.

The reference made by President Johnson on Tuesday to alleged "naked aggression" presumably by North Vietnam against South Vietnam is belied by the announcement that pacification of South Vietnam will henceforth be under the direction of the American Armed Forces, in addition to the resistance against the "naked aggression."

I do not say anything that is not already well known when I point out that the entry of troops from North Vietnam began well after large numbers of American troops were in South Vietnam to cope with local guerrillas.

The North Vietnamese are there largely to engage the Americans, leaving the guerrillas and the South Vietnamese army to fight their civil war. It was a civil war in 1959; it is a civil war today, with the United States and North Vietnam engaged in neutralizing each other.

Now, we find that not only do Americans fight the North Vietnamese regulars, but we are going to have to take over the antiguerrilla war, too. That is why I said last January that the figure for American troops that will eventually be needed in Vietnam will be close to 1 million.

YEAR 1968 OR 1972

President Johnson and his administration have fixed the 1968 elections here in the United States as one of the main tests of this national popular front in support of the war. Not long ago it was the congressional election of 1966 that was the key date that would settle the war, but now it is the election of 1968.

So the administration says. But on what evidence? The evidence of recent history suggests that the Vietcong and North Vietnam are experienced in war over periods of decades, not just until the next American election. They fought the French for 8 years. It is just as likely that Ho Chi Minh is thinking in terms of the 1972 election, when this administration will go out of office in any case, and when a new administration must be chosen, irrespective of the Vietnam war.

Who is to say that, if North Vietnam does think in terms of a new administration, they are not thinking of 1972 rather than 1968? The status quo can last that long, but thereafter everyone knows the American element must change.

It is unlikely, in light of its history, that the Vietcong is thinking in terms of American elections at all. Why should they? It is their country, and they are at home and always will be at home. It is the Americans who are strangers and whose national policy to occupy South Vietnam is subject to the same vagaries of history that have seen France and Japan come and go in Vietnam within a single generation.

The question for the American people is not whether they can keep pouring good money after bad in South Vietnam, and division after division of troops, until 1968, then until 1972, and who knows how long after that. The question is when they will demand that their Government deescalate the war and bring in the United Nations to settle it, no matter which party is in office.

It is a matter of deep regret to me that the Democratic administration has nothing more to offer than continued escalation of the war until the next election. It promises nothing but a continuation in the war for at least a year and a half. That is all the President promised at his Democratic Party $250-a-plate dinner last Tuesday night.

With press reports that the Soviet Union has promised expanded economic and military aid to North Vietnam, the question arises whether this administration's policy does not mean at least five and a half years of more war in Southeast Asia, not just one and a half.

This is why I have struggled so hard

to prevail upon my party to change its Vietnam war policy. It has already failed in its objective. It is now being pursued not to save South Vietnam but to save the faces of those who instigated it. I have been in the Senate and in public life long enough to know that the continued presence in office of the same people who recommended each step in the escalation and each deepening of the American involvement requires that they continue trying to bring in more force in the effort to accomplish what the last reinforcement failed to accomplish. They cannot reverse themselves without admitting their judgment of 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 years ago was faulty. It is always easier to call in bigger artillery than to rethink the wisdom of one's position.

That is why the prospect is so dim that this administration will deescalate the scale or scope of the conflict, or stop the bombing of North Vietnam in order to see whether bilateral peace talks are in fact possible. It is why the men who have decided to pursue unilateral American interests outside the strictures of the United Nations Charter are not men who will recognize that it is the Security Council and U Thant, not General Westmoreland, who should be in charge of the war in Vietnam and in charge of the pacification.

The unity of the Democratic Party was never greater and never wider than it was in 1964, when our candidate called the war in Vietnam one that Asians should fight, and to which American boys should not be sent to do the job Asian boys should do. The Democratic Party did achieve a national front in the 1964 election in opposition to war and in opposition to those who talked of an American war in Southeast Asia.

Our party cannot expect the confidence or support of the American people again until we make good on that promise.

Our party is not a united party in America today. Across this Nation, in precinct after precinct and State after State, it is in shambles, if unity is the test. Unity is gone; and all the semantics of the President of the United States that "We are not going to yield to aggression" does not change the fact that millions of people around this world know that the No. 1 major aggressor in Southeast Asia is the United States.

TRANSACTION OF ADDITIONAL ROUTINE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, the following additional routine business was transacted:

JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

A joint resolution was introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. PELL:

S.J. Res. 83. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to extend the franchise accorded the District of Columbia for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President so as to include the right of the District to have one vote in the House of Representatives, or two votes in the Senate, as the case may be, whenever the election of the President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives or the election of the Vice President shall devolve upon the Senate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Pell when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appears under a separate heading.)

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WITH REPRESENTATION IN THE EVENT THE PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION IS THROWN INTO THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, some time ago, one of my constituents, Mr. Albert Choquette, Jr., of Woonsocket, R.I., wrote to me regarding a question that was raised in the American history class he teaches in the Woonsocket Senior High School. Mr. Choquette's letter raises an important question of constitutional law that should be resolved.

That question, Mr. President, is whether the District of Columbia retains the franchise granted it by the 23d amendment in the event the presidential election is thrown into the House of Representatives. Although the question was briefly alluded to in the debate in the House when that body considered and passed the 23d amendment, it was deemed expedient at the time not to complicate that amendment.

The question is still before us. We have granted the District residents the franchise in voting for the President and Vice President in national elections. Yet through legislative oversight, these same voters lose their franchise if either election is thrown into the House or the Senate because a candidate lacks a clear majority of the electoral college vote.

Equity demands action in this case. There is no other course if we are to have any consistency in the rights granted under our Constitution. As a result, I am introducing a Senate joint resolution which amends the Constitution to provide the District with one vote if the presidential election goes to the House, and two votes should the vice presidential election go to the Senate. At this point, I request that my resolution be printed in full in the Record.

This resolution is very brief and uncomplicated. It merely grants the District the right to vote in the event of certain contingencies. It does not go into the mechanical procedure as to how the vote or votes shall be cast. This I believe, should be determined by Congress and I have so provided in section 2 of my resolution, which grants to Congress the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

I wish to make it perfectly clear at this time, that my resolution in no way relates to the question of home rule for the District. That is a matter for Congress to legislate. This resolution does not provide for representation in either the House or the Senate. That, too, is a matter for Congress to determine.

In considering this proposed amendment, Congress may wish to grant authority to the electors chosen by the District in a national election to submit certified ballots of their vote to the highest officer of the respective Houses when the election of the President and Vice President, under the 12th amendment, devolves upon Congress.

Mr. President, the presidential election is almost upon us. It would be a gross injustice to the voters of the District if they should become disenfranchised in the possible eventuality I have discussed. It is my hope, therefore, that Congress will act promptly on this resolution so that the States will have an opportunity to ratify it before the next general election.

At this point I request that Mr. Choquette's letter be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution and letter will be printed in the Record.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 83) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to extend the franchise accorded the District of Columbia for the purposes of the election of President and Vice President so as to include the right of the District to have one vote in the House of Representatives, or two votes in the Senate, as the case may be, whenever the election of the President shall devolve upon the House of Representatives or the election of the Vice President shall devolve upon the Senate, introduced by Mr. Pell, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 83

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following article is hereby proposed as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution only if ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission by the Congress:

"ARTICLE —

"Section 1. In electing the President or the Vice President in those cases when such an election shall devolve upon the House of Representatives or the Senate, respectively, the District constituting the seat of government of the United States shall be entitled to have one vote in the House of Representatives, or two votes in the Senate, as the case may be, to be cast for the person to be named by the electors appointed by the District.

"Sec. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

The letter presented by Mr. Pell is as follows:

Woonsocket, R.I.,
October 28, 1963.

Hon. Claiborne Pell,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Pell: An interesting question regarding the Twenty-third amendment to the United States Constitution has come to my attention—a question to which I have been able to find no satisfactory answer.

As I understand it, the District of Columbia is now entitled to three electoral votes.

If, however, the electoral college fails to give a majority of its votes to any of the Presidential candidates, the election would be turned over to the House of Representatives whose members would elect the President from among the persons having the highest number of electoral votes not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President (Amendment No. 12).

Am I to presume then, that since the District of Columbia has no representation in the House that it would lose its right to vote for President should the election be turned over to the Representatives as it did in 1801 and 1825?

If this is the case, it would seem that the 23rd amendment should be clarified in order to guarantee the rights of the citizens of D.C. should a situation as that outlined above occur.

I am interested in hearing your thoughts on the subject.

Very sincerely yours,
Albert Choquette, Jr.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF EMERGENCY PLANNING, EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, RELATING TO FOREST AND GRASS FIRES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], I present a letter from the Director of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, dated May 5, 1967, transmitting a report of that organization on forest and grass fires, prepared in accordance with the provisions of section 13 of Public Law 89–769 (with an accompanying report). I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REVIEW OF REPORTS ON CROOKED CREEK AND TRIBUTARIES, HARRISON, ARK.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Randolph], I present a letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a report dated December 6, 1966, from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of the reports on Crooked Creek and tributaries at and in the vicinity of Harrison, Ark., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Public Works of the U.S. Senate adopted May 16, 1961.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed as a Senate document, with illustrations, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Ribicoff I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 1502, the Police Officers Higher Education Act of 1967, the name of Senator Tydings be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of Senator Ribicoff, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 72, the National School Safety Patrol Week, the name of Senator Nelson be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Scott] be added as a cosponsor to the Senate Joint Resolution 33, to establish a Commission on Product Safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Ribicoff], I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of the bill (S. 1593) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit payment to an individual for the charges made by physicians and other persons providing services covered by the supplementary medical insurance program prior to such individual's own payment of the bill for the services involved, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, in accordance with the previous order, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 8 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 15, 1967, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 11 (legislative day of May 10), 1967:

Commodity Credit Corporation

Walter W. Wilcox, of Maryland, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, vice Nathan M. Koffsky.

Atomic Energy Commission

Wilfrid E. Johnson, of Washington, to be a member of the Atomic Energy Commission for a term of 5 years expiring June 30, 1972—reappointment.

In the Air Force

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, Judge Advocate

Arnts, Donald F., FV3060876.
Crowley, James E., FY3121076.
Handley, Thomas A., FV2235488.
Jones, Ross L., FV3093052.
Knutson, Milford H., FV3072814.
Negron, Victor H., FV3121788.

To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate

Bannon, John J., Jr., FV3139240.
Baynard, Walter L., Jr., FV3139201.
Bruner, Philip L., FV3152894.
Cane, Ralph T., FV3108489.
Canellos, Ernest C., FV3105258.
Chaney, Larry O., FV3139219.
Crane, John M., Jr., FV3139120.
Curran, John P., FV3118599.
Dailey, William H., FV3100615.
Denkinger, Marc G., FV3152899.
Eissinger, James R., FV3139243.
Elderkin, Charles B., FV3100493.
Fielden, Arlen E., FV3131972.
Fitzgerald, John R., FV3139206.
Forster, Denis M., FV3139222.
Goldfarb, Abraham, FV3106189.
Gutz, Larry G., FV3130454.
Jander, Klaus H., FV3152916.
Jeter, Thomas G., Jr., FV3106597.
Johnson, Alan B., FV3139255.
Johnson, Walter T., Jr., FV3109238.
Keller, Peter A., FV3139207.
Knopping, Owen A., FV3139230.
Krambeck, James L., FV3108050.
Lawson, Neal C., FV3139249.
Luce, Lee A., FV3106979.
Matthews, John W., FV3131613.
McKenna, William M., III, FV3139231.
McReynolds, John A., Jr., FV3120351.
Nelsonkortland, Robert E., FV3139268.
Owens, Joel P., FV3152918.
Randall, Kenneth D., FV3139235.
Randleman, Richard N., FV3139238.
Richards, Robert M., FV3132686.
Rieger, Harland K., FV3139273.
Rosenthal, Lawrence, FV3108960.
Schley, Joseph H., Jr., FV3139233.
Scott, Robert W., FV3107769.
Shepp, Lawrence R., FV3107274.
Shore, Glen F., FV3139247.
Shure, Herman W., FV3152932.
Sierra, David R., FV3130488.
Snyder, Harry G., FV3139275.
Stephenson, Gilbert D., FV3139279.
Sternick, Michael A., FV3108867.
Tierney, Theodore J., FV3139276.
Vandeweghe, Gary S., FV3105134.
White, Charles M., FV3119013.
Wright, Robert A., FV3116353.
Young, Richard S., FV3107856.

To be captain, Chaplain

Bumpus, Anthony J., FV3061388.
Clarahan, Michael R., FV3092526.
Foutz, Martin F., Jr., FV3061107.
Guikema, Henry, FV3061806.
Martin, John J., FV3061494.
McGovern, John J., FV3061810.
Rooney, Thaddeus C., FV3062044.
Sheeran, Patrick J., FV3062088.
Woerdeman, Robert K., FV3062049.
Young, Samuel T., FV3061895.

To be first lieutenant, Chaplain

Elliott, Harold, FV3088352.
Gallenbach, Thomas E., FV3062362.
Irvin, Henry C., FV3105456.
Kennedy, Joseph W., FV3062262.
Klawitter, James A., FV2308208.
Nelson, Samuel D., Jr., FV3062529.
Ruggeri, Christopher H., FV3062450.
Wilson, Theodore J., FV3062305.

To be captain, Medical

Abernathy, James P., FV3123597.
Alfred, Dewitt C, Jr., FV3123676.
Ater, David H., FV3114339.
Benson, Bennett N., FV3141353.
Berrios, Jose R., FV3124151.
Burney, Robert E., II, FV3091329.
Butler, Walter H., FV3091557.
Chambers, Clint E., FV3030694.
Cohn, Jerome R., FV3141187.
Colonrodriguez, A. G., FV3126444.
Cox, Hugh A., FV3046745.
Coyle, Francis L., FV3110765.

Cram, David L., FV3089068.
Eilert, Robert E., FV3126255.
Epstein, Leonard I., FV3112718.
Felton, Owen L., FV3114708.
Fisher, James M., FV5408562.
Gomezdisdier, Manuel F., FV3123367.
Halpern, Arnold J., FV3092815.
Holt, Robert S., FV3089061.
Jennings, James F., FV3125843.
Keene, Foster F., FV3089057.
Kimbel, Bruce K., FV2083741.
King, Donald L., FV3111330.
Kozub, Robert E., FV3114398.
Lechowski, Robert I., FV3113131.
Lederer, James F., FV3123529.
Lopata, Howard I., FV3111243.
Mann, James G., FV3054765.
Markham, Sanford M., FV3112313.
Mauk, Bryant D.; FV3112384.
McDonough, Gilbert L., FV5312865.
Mediavilla, Antonio F., FV3114357.
Mueller, Adolph R., Jr., FV3092261.
Murphy, John F., FV3125836.
Nell, Patricia A., FV3125432.
Ormsby, Robert B., FV3123880.
Panetta, Raymond D., FV3125782.
Peck, Sander, FV3123048.
Perkins, Robert S., FV3112807.
Poel, Robert W., FV3123931.
Ramey, Ralph, Jr., FV3074897.
Reynolds, Frank A., FV3114070.
Richie, Robert E., FV3110719.
Rosenzweig, William, FV3112709.
Seifert, Charles L., FV3124743.
Simonaitis, John J. Jr., FV3114335.
Smith, George I., Jr., FV3123921.
Solomon, James W., FV3110295.
Stahl, Norman L., FV3089348.
Stoebner, Darrold A., FV3122980.
Strutton, William H., FV3126331.
Tomberlin, Kenneth G., FV3111315.
Vogler, Herbert M., FV3123809.
Wankmuller, Robert T., FV3126299.
Welhaf, William R., FV3110549.
Whitcomb, Ned J., FV3113729.
Wildemann, Mark F., FV3114202.
Williams, Ariel L., Jr., FV3126197.
Williams, John L., Jr., FV3110435.
Wingert, Robert I., FV3092895.
Workmon, Frederick C., Sr., FV3091356.
Yarussi, Frank A., FV3166363.
Yassin, John G., FV3113110.

To be first lieutenant, Medical

Aclin, Richard R., FV3168159.
Acostamelendez, Antonio E., FV3184359.
Alexander, Clyde W., Jr., FV3141310.
Alexander, Raymond H., FV3184725.
Andrisani, Michael, FV3141169.
Asplen, Charles H., FV3057943.
Atchison, James W. D., FV3164399.
Barnes, Robert J., FV3141167.
Benjamin, Ronald P., FV3167746.
Bowen, William L., Jr., FV5309509.
Braswell, Guy R., FV3078642.
Brown, Juan A., FV3141168.
Bryson, Andrew L., FV3141449.
Burt, Frederick N., FV3168561.
Burt, James N., FV3141165.
Casey, Franklin L., FV3167910.
Caton, Charles A., FV3166656.
Caudill, Robert G., FV3141164.
Chamberlain, Maurice S., FV3164115.
Cotton, Leonard B., Jr., FV3164439.
Dapra, David J., FV3141170.
Davis, Fredric W., FV3167677.
Deming, Carl M., FV3141443.
Desky, Michael S., FV3141370.
Dichsen, Donald V., FV3167788.
Dupleix, Pierre R., III, FV3165589.
Ebert, Charles D., FV3185273.
Echevarria, John, FV3088978.
Edwards, David A., Jr., FV3167909.
Ellenbogen, Charles, FV3141664.
Epley, Daniel E., FV3165592.
Espey, William M., FV3141127.
Fisher, Wallace C., FV3009893.
Gabel, Joseph C., FV3142042.
Gaffney, Clyde M., FV3168200.
Gilpin, Eugene L., FV3188415.
Gohman, James D., FV3168720.
Goolsby, Charles Do, FV3168157.
Gregory, Hugh S., FV3142085.
Haney, Ronald L., FV3141140.
Hanshaw, William J., FV3141134.
Hennes, David M., FV3141132.
Holeman, Thomas A., FV3165579.
Jackson, Arnold J., FV3142043.
Jackson, William K., FV3168196.
Jacobson, John D., FV3141135.
Johnson, Don E., FV3141916.
Jordan, Michael L., FV3141137.
Lamb, Thomas H., FV3141151.
Lieber, Arnold L., FV3141162.
Lilly, Paul H., Jr., FV3141161.
Maioriello, Richard P., FV3142497.
Martin, Benjamin G., Jr., FV3141146.
Moon, Lynn B., FV3141352.
Morgan, Michael G., FV3141144.
Munos, Louis R., FV3168205.
Munson, Herbert G., FV3164675.
Neesvig, Burton O., FV3184853.
Pfeifer, William F., FV3141143.
Pittman, James A., FV3141142.
Ramsay, James G., Jr., FV3184158.
Riveracorrea, Hector P., FV3164676.
Roberts, David B., FV3141141.
Rytting, James E., FV3165582.
Sacchetti, Louis J., FV3068322.
Saylor, Jack L., FV3184176.
Schorlemer, Robert E., FV3167892.
Schwindt, Charles D., FV3141817.
Simmons, James C., FV3141163.
Singleton, Charles M., FV3142884.
Smith, Dwight D., FV3141156.
Solloway, Michael L., FV3141351.
Stoner, John C., FV3141157.
Taylor, William M., FV3141150.
Troxler, Raymond G., FV3141147.
Wagner, Grant H., FV3141148.
Wakulat, Richa H., Jr., FV3168476.
Walker, Ronald E., FV3167413.
Wantuck, Donald K., FV3165583.
Wernecke, Robert H., FV3165585.
West, Barbour D., FV3141979.
Wiita, Bruce E., FV3141928.
Williams, David V., FV3166509.
Wilson, Jacob H., FV3141196.
Witte, Gerhard, FV3168059.
Wright, Ballard D.,FV3141154.
Wunder, James F., FV3141692.
Young, John J., FV3141152.
Zehnder, Paul R., Jr., FV3141153.
Zeller, Myron J., FV3168017.

To be captain, Dental

Henderson, Donald L., FV3140822.

To be first lieutenant, Dental

Allison, George M., FV3165226.
Bock, Joseph F., Jr., FV3142547.
Brandt, Robert L., FV3142428.
Brice, William L., FV3141752.
Bump, Robert L., FV3141950.
Burbidge, James D., FV3165999.
Byers, Michael D., FV3142060.
Coffee, Larry L., FV3166064.
Czajka, Edward A., FV3141299.
Frederickson, Daniel, FV3142424.
Gardner, Lloyd D., FV3142318.
Gough, Robert W., FV3141446.
Gray, Gary G., FV3166113.
Greenlee, Roger W., FV3141699.
Jones, James R., FV3142398.
Klepetko, Ronald F., FV3141213.
Kolker, Stanley L., FV3165768.
Lalonde, Joseph B., FV3165765.
Lundgren, Richard P., FV3165800.
Odgers, Richard E., FV3142558.
Raisler, Richard E., FV3165164.
Robinson, Robert, FV3165749.
Shelton, Andrew P., FV3165794.
Smith, James F., FV3165282.
Stanger, James H., FV3142627.
Sturrup, Randolph W., FV3142334.
Wasserman, Sheldon, FV3165814.
Watanabe, Jerry H., FV3165769.
Wipf, Vaughn F., FV3165732.

To be captain, Nurse

Barron, Nancy J., FV2243255.
Baukus, Donna M., FV3078972.
Caldwell, Sally A., FV3089732.
Draves Jacqueline L., FV3090162.
Fecteau, Donna M., FV3078599.
Hopkins, Edna M., FV3088874.
McDowell, Nina E., FV3088591.
Perry, Allan J., FV3078272.
Vigil Carmelita, FV3089118.

To be first lieutenant, Nurse

Arrington, Joan T., FV3123021.
Baumbusch, Phillis L., FV3125712.
Baxter, Mary E., FV3141457.
Beahan, Alice L., FV3143271.
Boss, Gladys R., FV3143015.
Boudreau, Joan M., FV3125866.
Bozell, Nellie M., FV3123327.
Bradley Dawn R., FV3164962.
Brigham, Joyce A., FV3143151.
Brown Elizabeth A., FV3123319.
Bruder, Rose R., FV3142048.
Burwell, Dawn R., FV3142059.
Carlson, David J., FV3141532.
Carlson, Yvonne C., FV3114321.
Carroll, Mattie K., FV3143396.
Case, Paula A., FV3142607.
Casey, Kathleen F., FV3143121.
Castillo, Pacita B., FV3142363.
Charpentier, Elizabeth A., FV3142226.
Christensen, Beverly J., FV3126270.
Clark, Donna D., FV3123641.
Courter, Janice K., FV3123543.
Crouch, Kay A., FV3142374.
Dashner, Linda L., FV3140785.
Dehaemers, Robert J., FV3164844.
Diem, Betty I., FV3114217.
Dorman, Barbara A., FV3127319.
Duff, Carol J., FV3125807.
Dunagan, Anne E., FV3142302.
Durrette, Elsie L., FV3126418.
Estes, Patricia L., FV3123331.
Fenton, Patricia M., FV3126497.
Fletcher, David R., FV3143259.
Gannon, Charlotte C., FV3140345.
Gartside, Leona G., FV3143681.
Gianelly, Judith A., FV3142576.
Gibbs, Aleda K., FV3164809.
Goff, Joseph H., FV3060393.
Gruber, Edward P., FV3143072.
Hagan, Faye T., FV3075772.
Hammerstone, Dorothy A., FV3142366.
Hanson, Jeanne A., FV3142853.
Hardy, Mary P., FV3143398.
Harnit, Joanne M., FV3123784.
Hartwick, Rayna L., FV3139954.
Heacock, Susan K., FV3123333.
Hensley, Gwendolynne E., FV3165833.
Himes, Sally I., FV3141246.
Hickman, Anne L., FV3114328.
Jacksen, Florence C., FV3092741.
Johnson, Josephine, FV3141487.
Keebortz, Shirley A., FV3164968.
Kennedy, Carole M., FV3123122.
Kovach, Margaret A., FV3141735.
Kovacs, Marie C., FV3166353.
Krumrey, Conita K., FV3164929.
Leftwich, Robert E., FV3165375.
Leiby, Jo Ann, FV3141052.
Lorzing, Katheryn A., FV3142655.
Lyons, Ann T., FV3140510.
Mannette, Barbara A., FV3165201.
Marshall, Frances L., FV3165200.
Martin, Elizabeth E., FV3141466.
Martin, Evalyn M., FV3126667.
Matt, Lois A., FV3142681.
McCabe, Patricia A., FV3125967.
McGuire, Linda J., FV3143669.
McLaughlin, Katherine J., FV3142528.
Meier, Karen A., FV3142972.
Mitchell, Marguerite A., FV3143415.
Moraskie, Anna, FV3114104.
Moser, Dixie L., FV3140575.
Nixon, Mildred O., FV3143522.
Notter, Charlotte L., FV3142598.
O'Connell, Catherine M., FV3165512.
Orock, Mary J., FV3127299.
Pease, Rae L., FV3142257.
Pereschino, Sylvia A., FV3143678.
Piper, Doris A., FV3123514.
Potter, Janet E., FV3140731.
Pratt, Gordon L., Jr., FV3124342.
Punk, Helen I., FV3110833.
Radke, Naomi M., FV3165377.

Savoy, Grace L., FV3141123.
Slusser, Jack F., FV3141573.
Smith, Lois L., FV3140669.
Spillane, Michael J., FV3143525.
Stone, Alexis A., FV3126521.
Sullivan, Mary K., FV3143777.
Swaine, Shirley A., FV3125330.
Tanida, Kathleen R., FV3143794.
Tesoriero, Lynn, FV3165839.
Tindall, Nancy R., FV3164919.
Tredwell, Suzanne E., FV3141092.
Treisch, Mary E., FV3141674.
Trugillo, Lee E., Jr., FV3143786.
Tutsch, Carol R., FV3143633.
Vento, Gloria M., FV3165858.
Vore, Marcella M. B., FV3143698.
Votava, Joanne R., FV3143158.
Wahl, Marilyn J., FV3143775.
Wall, Joan G., FV3124296.
Waring, Richard I., FV3143639.
Whitlow, Mary A., FV3141030.
Williams, Josie R., FV3165384.
Wise, Dennis T., FV3141672.
Wiseman, Patricia J., FV3143600.
Wolfe, Suzanne R., FV3141655.
Yamasaki, Joyce T., FV3143468.
Zorza, Paul M., FV3126211.
Zwink, Gloria J., FV3062030.

To be major, Veterinarian

Osborne, Donald V., FV3042535.

To be captain, Veterinarian

Ashby, William T., FV3078827.
Avadikian, Richard G., FV3126594.
Blackman, Daniel A., FV3091436.
Brooks, Frank T., FV3113226.
Butler, Thomas M., FV3125157.
Eason, Robert L., FV3125245.
Harwell, James F., Jr., FV3111387.
Jones, Norman D., Jr., FV3043425.
Lynn, Marvin, FV3111616.
Mattsson, Joel L., FV3111464.
Phillips, Jere M., FV3078765.
Richardson, Ted M., FV3043592.
Russell, Robert J., FV3125282.
Schilling, Paul W., FV3124489.
Schwichtenberg, Alan E., FV3111766.
Shiflett, Richard M., FV3043591.
Springs, John M., Jr., FV3088921.
Stunkard, Jim A., FV3112844.
Szatalowicz, Florian T., FV3123923.
Tom, Henry K., Jr., FV3090835.

To be first lieutenant, Veterinarian

Dear, James R., FV3140845.
Doherty, John J., FV3017821.
Frith, Charles H., FV3165748.
Fullerton, Jerold B., FV3165622.
Goebel, Phillip M., FV3140209.
Gracey, Rodger D., FV3165717.
Hall, Allen III, FV3168147.
Henke, Robert P., FV3165605.
Hurst, Benjamin F., FV3140606.
Inman, Roger C., FV3141005.
Jessop, Morris E., Jr., FV3165760.
Johnson, David K., FV3143144.
Mohri, William F., FV3141304.
Morgan, Donald H., FV3141448.
Robinson, William E., Jr., FV3140751.
Schafer, Albert G., FV3140840.
Simmonds, Richard C., FV3143363.
Stanford, Jimmy L., FV3142130.
Thigpen, Clifton K., FV3168249.

To be captain, Medical Service

Blair, Herbert L., FV3009031.
Chamberlin, Morrison E., FV3043756.
Clark, Gerald R., FV3008919.
Creekmore, Neil, Jr., FV3090024.
Daeley, John A., FV3089703.
Elliott, Cater M., FV3043877.
England, John R., FV3089418.
Kraff, Myron M., FV3101259.
McAfee, Charles A., FV3056314.
Stephenson, Roger D., FV2230926.
Treat, Thomas F., FV3094840.
Wilhelm, Bruce D., FV3086408.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Service

Addleman, George R., FV3141726.
Anzai, Rodney K., FV3133903.
Cadenhead, Charles C., FV3155276.
Clark, Franklin D., FV3143236.
Dugas, Roland F., Jr., FV3154553.
Ellis, James A., FV3143766.
Gable, Donald R. O., FV3165151.
Hoey, Patrick H., Jr., FV3154994.
Hughes, Gerald E., FV3141828.
Kimball, Ronald M., FV3140641.
Lippman, Darryl R., FV3154561.
Manderfield, Nicholas W., FV3154812.
Meyer, Ralph H., FV3141820.
Schindel, Donald L., FV3155123.
Schmigel, Donald P., FV3142696.
Shoffner, Robert F., FV3142918.
Stephens, Ronald J., FV3156519.
Velthuis, Philip B., FV3164850.
Winslow, Stanley R., FV3155148.

To be second lieutenant, Medical Service

Longi, John S., FV3167368.
Anderson, James G., FV3167408.
Armstrong, Robert C., FV3161597.
Bjerken, Paul A., FV3166740.
Boyd, Thomas O., FV3168590.
Coombes, David H., FV3165503.
Covey, Richard W., FV3162794.
Dressler, Forrest G., Jr., FV3166169.
Gainer, Philip W., FV3183930.
Hamako, Herbert M., FV3167429.
Hanify, Edward B., FV3159494.
Healy, Keith E., FV3167511.
Johnson, Gerald A., FV3158543.
Keefe, John E., FV3167189.
Lee, John P., FV3161495.
Lombardo, Raymond B., FV3166216.
Lyons, John J., Jr., FV3167476.
McClean, Raymond R., FV3165621.
Miller, Roger T., FV3159164.
Moore, Thomas K., FV3158892.
Nugent, Jerry J., FV3167723.
Nunley, William H., FV3158278.
Oatley, Theodore W., FV3166413.
Phillips, Preston, Jr., FV3168163.
Powers, William H., FV3158870.
Sarbach, Douglas L., FV3167105.
Schumann, Thomas R., FV3166396.
Squires, Darrell R., FV3184323.
Stephenson, Robert L., II, FV3159467.
Templeton, David W., FV3167823.
Trezza, Anthony, Jr., FV3157581.
Wiegand, Edwin E., FV3167933.
Wylie, John V., FV3159736.

To be first lieutenant, Medical Specialist

Adams, Willie J., FV3142450.
Carnicelli, Florene T., FV3164940.
Cox, Philip B., FV3142837.
Eisemann, Carol M., FV3143196.
Falconer, Dennis D., FV3126501.
Schleifer, Fred S., FV3141374.
Stayman, Herman L., FV3142094.
Tellers, Margaret M., FV3164999.
Welch, Dorine E., FV3141463.

To be second lieutenant, Medical Specialist

Jones, Bronwyn M., FV3167055.
Lott, Rachel W., FV3166567.
Smothermon, Sharon A., FV3167446.

To be captain, Biomedical Science

Baldwin, Bart A., FV3003120.
Haffer, Charles T., FV3001962.
Nacewski, Richard M., FV3001298.
Page, James T., Jr., FV3000014.

To be first lieutenant, Biomedical Science

Barber, Thomas R., FV3112105.
Beatson, James A., FV3141756.
Blochberger, Charles W., Jr., FV3125301.
Cheek, Chandler S., FV3145659.
Cooper, Thomas H., FV3145665.
Crowley, Peter A., FV3131512.
Evans, David R., FV3132061.
Fallon, Alexander E., FV3106747.
Gibbons, William D., FV3112050.
Good, Merrill R., FV3099607.
Labar, David A., FV3119432.
Liudahl, Gene R., FV3141921.
Pletcher, Eugene V., FV3141974.
Reid, Reford G., FV3163573.
Scannell, Thomas J., FV3141691.
Schuster, David E., FV3154856.
Thomas, Jerry F., FV3145414.
Wright, Robert M., FV3147089.

To be second lieutenant, Biomedical Science

Bowman, Robert W., FV3166460.
Bullock, Charles W., FV3160773.
Riccardi, Richard M., FV3160315.

The following distinguished graduates of the U.S. Air Force officer training school for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Augustine, Richard W., FV3205194.
Baugher, Kenny R., FV3204731.
Boren, Glenn E., FV3205401.
Bruce, Larry D., FV3205043.
Cope, Vernon M., FV3205078.
De Vinney, George W., FV3205203.
Fishler, Leon, FV3204620.
Gough, Daniel G., FV3204637.
Hartschuh, Neil E., FV3205384.
Hayman, Frank T., IV, FV3204530.
Highman, Harold A., Jr., FV3204740.
Higley, Thomas E., III, FV3205232.
Hong, Norman, FV3204923.
Hughes, Roger W., FV3204978.
Johnson, Waldon L., FV3205409.
Kelley, James R., FV3205347.
Lacy, David J., FV3205189.
Lord, Eugene V., FV3205404.
Lorentz, Donald P., FV3205113.
Mallon, Jerome H., Jr., FV3204846.
Mihara, Robert M., FV3205304.
Morr, Thomas J., FV3205482.
Mouw, Andrew P., FV3204743.
Shanman, James A., FV3205033.
Shatzen, Robert S., FV3205083.
Smith, Benton M., FV3205484.
Sockwell, Lanny R., FV3204683.
Svahn, John A., FV3204854.
Szczesniakowski, Aleksander, FV3205264.
Vance, Richard R., FV3205413.
Vivion, Ronald E., FV3204909.
Wegner, Garry E., FV3205287.
White, Hubert W., III, FV3204597.
Williams, Daniel O., FV3205222.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 11 (legislative day of May 10), 1967:

In the Coast Guard

The following-named officer of the U.S. Coast Guard Reserve for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be rear admiral

Capt. Merton W. Stoffle

The following-named officers of the U.S. Coast Guard for promotion to the grade indicated:

To be rear admirals

Capt. Roderick Y. Edwards
Capt. Robert W. Goehring
Capt. Ross P. Bullard
Capt. Orvan R. Smeder

The nominations beginning Melvin J. Hartman, to be lieutenant commander, and ending Charles H. MacLean III, to be chief warrant officer (W-2), which nominations were received by the Senate and appeared in the Congressional Record on May 9, 1967.

WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate May 11 (legislative day of May 10), 1967:

Postmaster

The nomination sent to the Senate on February 21, 1967, of Harold J. Maples to be postmaster at Marionville, in the State of Missouri.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fino Urges Federal Income Tax Deduction for Apartment Rent Payers as Well as Homeowners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced legislation to provide a Federal income tax break for those who rent apartments instead of owning their own homes.

This legislation calls for a Federal income tax deduction to be allowed to rent-paying taxpayers in the amount of 7 percent of their yearly rent payments. Homeowners can presently deduct their real estate taxes paid, while rent payers get no deduction for the part of their rental payments attributable to real estate taxes. My bill would give the rent payer a deduction for the real estate taxes he indirectly pays.

This legislation will put rent payers on an equal footing with homeowners as far as deducting the burden of real estate taxes which falls upon them. While homeowners can deduct—quite rightfully—the entire burden of local real estate taxes, rent payers get no deduction at all for the real estate taxes which eat up about 14 percent of gross rental income throughout the Nation.

Because the landlord can deduct his real estate taxes from his Federal income taxes, he only passes on about half the cost of the taxes to the tenant. I propose to let the rent payer deduct that real estate tax burden from his income tax just like his homeowning friend can. The deduction my legislation would allow is 7 percent of the rental paid during the year. For many a middle-income family, this would mean another $100 to $200 worth of deduction during the year, and a tax savings of $30 to $65. I think that middle-income taxpayers deserve this equal treatment with homeowners. The added deduction would particularly benefit older citizens who, because of medical expenses, itemize deductions.

I realize that this would put a double deduction into our tax laws. The landlord corporation would have one deduction, and the tenant would then have another, smaller percentage, deduction. I do not see what is wrong with a double deduction when I know that double taxation is perfectly legitimate by present law. Double taxation of corporate dividends, for example. First the corporation pays a tax, and then the man in the street pays a tax on the dividends he gets from the corporation after the corporation has paid taxes. Frankly, I think double deductions are a better idea than double taxation.

In my 24th Congressional District in New York, there is a community called Parkchester. With 12,000 families, it is the world's biggest one-owner rental community. My bill would give the families of Parkchester a tax break of approximately $500,000. My district will soon have another, even bigger, rental community—Co-op City—which will have 50,000 people when completed. My bill would also provide a great tax break for the residents of Co-op City.

I hope that Congress will soon give the rent payer his due. Each year, more and more people are renting homes. They have many expenses in connection with their rentals which are not deductible, while homeowners can more easily get deductions for expenses and improvements. I think my bill is a sound step toward tax equity for rent payers.

Time Magazine Presents Biased Picture in Reporting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was appalled recently to read in one of our most prominent national weeklies, Time magazine, an extremely biased and derogatory article to which I must express my personal dismay and indignation.

In the April 28, 1967, issue of Time, the story entitled "Pocho's Progress" presents a stereotyped account which belies the varied and diverse living conditions, aspirations, and culture of the Spanish-speaking people in the southwestern region of the United States. The use of ethnic slurs in the article is particularly objectionable. I had thought American journalism had outgrown the use of such degrading slang terms for ethnic groups in America.

The article pictures Mexican Americans in the scene of "tawdry taco joints" and "rollicking cantinas" in East Los Angeles who rarely step beyond the barrio. It draws false and misleading images for categorizing individuals. Further, the author shows a grave lack of respect for the rich heritage of the Mexican American people—pointing in a deriding tone to "their self-defeating pride and insistence on remaining aliens" which—the implication is clear—holds them back from assimilation in the majority, Anglo culture.

The Spanish-speaking population in my congressional district, as well as throughout the Southwest, has serious problems in education, income, health, and housing. That the Mexican American people themselves are attacking these problems is certainly one of the most exciting social developments of today. Improving living conditions, employment opportunities, and educational background does not necessarily mean the obliteration of the unique and rich cultural heritage of which the Spanish-speaking people are justly proud.

I would hope that in the future the Time reporters conduct a more thorough investigation and present a more accurate account of developments involving the Spanish-speaking people of this country.

Orange County Students Win Merit Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, students, who through effort and intelligence, have achieved the highest goals are worthy of recognition. Eleven high school seniors from Orange County, Calif., have earned the recognition I am paying them today by successfully competing for National Merit scholarships.

This is no mean accomplishment. National Merit competition yearly attracts the brightest minds in America's senior high school class. The battery of tests cover the vast range of human knowledge, and require a great depth of background, keen analytical ability, and a huge dose of intelligence.

The students listed below have demonstrated great ability. Their families and communities may well reflect pride and share credit with these outstanding young people.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to list the 11 Orange County high school seniors who will be recipients of National Merit scholarships.

Carolyn Windisch, 12681 Elizabeth Way, Tustin, Calif., National Merit scholarship.

Sue Ann House, 812 Aleppo Street, Newport Beach, Calif., Northrop Corp. merit scholarship.

Charles J. Eckert, 1818 Chateau Avenue, Anaheim, Calif., Atlantic Richfield merit scholarship.

Susan LeRoy, 2817 Virginia Avenue, Anaheim, Calif., A. O. Smith merit scholarship.

Brock Bernstein, 541 North Whittier Street, Anaheim, Calif., Claremont Men's College merit scholarship.

John A. Strain, 18730 Crescent Drive, Anaheim, Calif., Claremont Men's College merit scholarship.

John A. Martin, Jr., 19602 County Lane, Santa Ana, Calif., General Tire Foundation merit scholarship.

Steven W. Balgrosky, 743 East Hermosa Drive, Fullerton, Calif., Sears Foundation merit scholarship.

Frank E. Veltri, 430 East Lincoln,

Orange, Calif., Michigan State University merit scholarship.

Gail Anne Wilson, 1000 Valencia Mesa Drive, Fullerton, Calif., Union Oil Co. of California Foundation merit scholarship.

Garold R. Adamson, 1015 Tularosa, Orange, Calif., Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. merit scholarship.

The Threat From Within

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to alert America to our greatest threat—the threat from within. Across the Nation our towns and cities have become battlegrounds of riot and civil disobedience. Prominent civic, religious, and political leaders have openly defied the law when they have found themselves in disagreement with the ordinances and statutes in our cities and States.

My city, Louisville, Ky., has recently become a battlefield for the extremists on the left and on the right. Louisville has a proud racial history which will not be denied. Having served as mayor of that city for 4 years, I know as well as anyone the great progress that we have made in the field of human relations. In 1962, we formed by ordinance the first human relations commission in the South. In 1963, we passed the first public accommodations law in the South. In 1964, we enacted the first equal opportunity of employment ordinance in the South, and in 1965 we passed an ordinance declaring the principles of open housing. This progress was made during a period of great social change across America, but there was not one demonstration or one brick or bottle thrown in the city of Louisville. Our citizens, both white and Negro, accepted new social legislation and agreed in spirit that discrimination would not be practiced in our community. Not one case under the public accommodations ordinance, or the equal employment ordinance, has ever gone to court. During a period of almost 2 years there have only been two cases reported of alleged discriminatory practice in housing; one involving a real estate agent and the other involving a builder.

Suddenly, on March 14, 1967, national headlines across the country exploded with stories of sit-ins, demonstrations, and mass arrests in my city, Louisville, Ky. During the following 2 weeks, NBC, CBS, ABC, the Associated Press and the UPI had a field day reporting over 600 arrests within that period. From across the country, agitators on the far left and from the far right converged on Louisville to add fuel to the flames. For the purpose of identification, I would like to set forth and name some of those who became intimately involved: Carl and Ann Braden, of the Southern Conference Educational Fund, Inc. Mr. Braden was convicted in 1954 on a Kentucky charge of advocating sedition. He and his wife have been close to the Student Nonviolence Coordinating Committee and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. The Rev. Martin Luther King, of Atlanta, Ga., Mr. Hubert James, and Rev. Charles Tachau. Technicians from the Southern Christian Leadership Conference by the names of Golden Frinks, Winters Knott, Reverend Osborne, and Rev. Hosea Williams. Troublemaker Dick Gregory arrived on stage but added no comedy to the situation. From the American Nazi Party came Fred Catalano and Chris Vidnevich. From New York came Jack Wood. Representative of the Committee Against Discrimination in Housing. Agitators and technicians were paid $1.75 an hour, including jail time, for demonstrating and causing sit-ins. Police photographs and movies clearly identify those who were leading the children in illegal night-time demonstrations.

Louisville is a city of good will and a city proud of its racial progress. At no time during this period was there tension or racial unrest and mistrust in the community. There was practically no participation on the part of our own Negro community in illegal acts against the city. At the height of the demonstrations, a Negro youth, "Rip" Smith, was elected president of the student council of one of our largest high schools. This particular school has only 26 Negro students among its total enrollment of 1,300. This act of individual equality surely could not happen in a city torn by racial strife. Unless you happened to be at the right place at the right time, you would never have known of any problem existing in Louisville.

I offer this information to public officials and to the news media for the purpose of putting the record straight. Mayors across the country should be alerted to the extremists who could well attempt to make their city a battleground for the purpose of publicizing their philosophies. The press and the publicity seekers have done my community and this country an injustice. I condemn those who are professional headliners and those who write the headlines for their harm to the cause of civil rights. For myself I am thankful to be an American, I am proud to be a Kentuckian, I am glad to live in Louisville, and I am privileged to serve the cause of racial justice in the United States of America.

Legislation To Amend the Public Health Service Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish a program under which States may be assisted in developing programs for the detection of the illegal use of drugs by students.

The best way to get to the problem of narcotics addiction is to get to the root of the problem. The legislation I am introducing would provide for Federal grants to States in order that the States may set up programs for the examination of schoolchildren for narcotics addiction. The State programs would have two facets—they would concentrate on periodic examinations of those schoolchildren who voluntarily submitted to examination and they would underwrite education work in the schools in connection with narcotics addiction and what it can do.

The question of compulsory examination of students is complicated by possible constitutional difficulties, although that is clearly the best way to catch addiction or keep it from ever starting. The next best thing to this would be State programs which would be compulsory except on production of a note from the student's parents. This would satisfy any constitutional problems and it would expose any student in high schools and elementary schools to a choice between examination or a note from his parents. This two-sided pressure would, I am sure, cut down on narcotics addiction.

I am hopeful that Congress will view these proposed programs favorably. I think that they would make inroads on our Nation's growing dope addiction problem.

The 25th Anniversary of the Women's Army Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELIGIO de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, on May 14, 1942, the Women's Army Corps as it exists today officially came into being.

The United States was pouring its national strength into the war effort. All available men were being called up for combat duty, leaving thousands of noncombat jobs to be filled in the vast Army that was being built. To meet this pressing need an emergency measure was passed establishing the Women's Auxiliary Army Corps.

The achievements of the thousands of women who volunteered for service were so impressive that, in 1943, Congress enacted legislation to remove the "auxiliary" from the name of the organization. The Women's Army Corps became an integral part of the wartime Army. Its members served with honor and distinction, both overseas and here at home.

After the war, in 1948, Congress made the Women's Army Corps a permanent part of our country's Military Establishment. And today, as in World War II, the WAC's are performing many necessary jobs—in administration, personnel, communications, finance, food service, medical-dental fields, and other areas.

On this 25th anniversary, I join in congratulating all those fine American women who have been a part of this organization during the last quarter of a century. They have performed, and are performing, a patriotic service of great value to our country.

In the 15th Congressional District, which I have the honor to represent, former Army servicewomen in the area are celebrating the anniversary with a dinner on Saturday evening, May 13, in the city of McAllen. I take this occasion to wish them well, and to express my appreciation for their invitation to me to attend the dinner. They are proud, and rightly so, of their service in the Women's Army Corps.

Representative Henry P. Smith III Announces Results of 1967 Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, I believe the depth of our involvement in Vietnam has heightened the interest of all patriotic Americans in the affairs of our Nation. All across this great Nation of ours more and more people are beginning to realize that we just cannot take for granted such things as peace, freedom, and a sound economy. These rewards result only from the continuing efforts of millions of interested and active citizens.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased and proud to say that the residents of the 40th District of New York recognize the important role which they must play if we are to retain the bountiful blessings about which I have spoken.

Several months ago, I submitted my 1967 questionnaire to more than 136,000 families in the 40th District. I have already received over 21,000 completed questionnaires.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the Members of the House will find the results of my poll to be of great interest. I, therefore, insert at this point in the RECORD the final tabulated results of my 1967 questionnaire:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. What course of action should the United States follow in Vietnam?			
a. Continue present course	23.5		
b. Mount an all-out nonnuclear effort to achieve a military victory	54.3		
c. Unilaterally cease bombing North Vietnam and hope for mutual deescalation	7.7		
d. Complete withdrawal as soon as possible	12.6		1.9
2. Do you favor the administration's policies of trying to expand trade with Communist countries?	43.1	52.1	4.8
3. Do you favor the proposal under which the Federal Government would return a certain percentage of tax revenues to the States for locally administered programs?	68.9	26.4	4.7
4. Do you support the President's proposal for a substantial increase in social security benefits even if it means a sharp increase in taxes for employers and employees?	39.2	58.0	2.8
5. Would you favor tax credits to help offset part of the cost as an incentive to industries to spend money for air and water pollution control facilities?	77.0	20.7	2.3
6. Should Congress approve the President's request for an income tax increase through a 6-percent surcharge?	15.3	79.3	5.4
7. Would you favor a national lottery system for draftees to replace our present method of selective service?	45.7	46.5	7.8
8. Would you favor a federally sponsored program to help develop stronger State and local plans to combat crime and violence?	77.0	20.7	2.3
9. On balance, do you believe the administration's war on poverty has been successful?	12.4	79.9	7.7
10. How would you rate President Johnson's performance in office to date?			
Good	24.8		
Fair	52.6		
Poor	19.8		2.8

Rumanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday was Rumanian Independence Day. Three great events in the history of that nation are celebrated on this anniversary.

First, on May 10, 1866, the Rumanian monarchy was founded after a long struggle by the Rumanian peoples to acquire the right to choose their own sovereign. On May 10, 1877, part of the state which had been under the Turkish Ottoman Empire declared its independence. Four years later, on May 10, 1881, the Rumanian people raised their country to the Kingdom of Rumania, a full-fledged state in Europe.

May 10, therefore, has rich historical significance, not only for the people of Rumanian ancestry, but for the world.

Today we turn our thoughts toward the Rumanian homeland. Few countries have undergone the kind of systematic pillage that the Soviet Union wreaked on Rumania after World War II. Fewer still have survived.

The Rumanians, however, are noted for their vigor and independence, and their nation is known for its ability to hold together despite the depredations of its neighbors.

Today Rumania, although under a Communist regime, has taken significant steps to better its relations with the West, and to express its independence from the dictates of the Kremlin. A desovietization campaign has been conducted in Rumania which has no equal in the history of the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe.

The United States rightly has taken cognizance of these changes inside Rumania and has indicated our continuing friendship for the Rumanian people through trade and diplomatic contacts.

At the same time, however, we must be aware that the "thaw" in Rumanian relations toward the West has not been matched by a relaxation of controls on the Rumanian people.

Rumania has embarked on a crash program of industrialization, designed to turn that nation in a few years from a predominantly agricultural economy to an industrial, urban society. This effort has succeeded largely because of the authoritarian measures imposed by the government. Many have suffered.

As we turn our thoughts toward Rumania today, therefore, we earnestly hope for improvement in the living conditions and standards of the Rumanian people. As a freedom-loving people, they cannot be kept in bondage.

It is our hope on this occasion, that Rumania's leaders will recognize that the future progress and development of their nation depends in large part on providing significant liberties, and an opportunity for free cooperation and expression, to the Rumanian people.

Warsaw Ghetto

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, barely 25 years have passed since Hitler-Germany was busily engaged in the "final solution" of the Jewish problem.

It was a time when Nazis occupied most of Europe, and the panzer divisions were at the gates of Moscow.

A great part of the world knelt under the heel of Nazi oppression. But, on February 1, 1943, the first candle was lit in the darkness of the Nazi holocaust—that was the day that the Jewish patriots in Warsaw announced to the world that the ghetto was under the absolute authority of the Jewish Freedom Fighters.

For the first time in nearly 2,000 years, a Jewish army controlled a Jewish "nation"—yes, a nation consisting of only a few square blocks in Warsaw.

The uprising of the ghetto Jews will

live forever in history. Although the battle pitted Nazi tanks and planes against the starved and sick Jews, who fought mainly with "Molotov cocktails" and their bare hands—yet, this heroic battle lasted for 42 long days and nights.

This brave group of men and women of the Warsaw ghetto put up a suicidal fight that lit a flame of hope through the world, and awakened the spirit that led to the founding of the State of Israel.

Today, the roots of neo-nazism are once again being nourished on German soil, and the State of Israel—where the survivors of the Nazi holocaust are trying to live in peace—is being threatened with annihilation by its Arab neighbors.

Now is the time to speak out—before it is too late. We must make it clear to everyone that the United States will not permit nazism to once again raise its ugly head in Germany, or anyplace else.

Nor will we permit those powers with aggressive designs to endanger the freedom and independence of Israel, which is the bastion of democracy in the Middle East.

Let us never forget the heroic uprising of the Warsaw ghetto and the lesson of history written in the blood of many people who desired only to be free.

Import Problems of American Textile Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned over the import problem faced by the American textile industry. At a time when the United States is enjoying unparalleled prosperity we find that imports of yarns and fibers and various textile products are displacing the products of American manufacturers and American textile workers. The textile industry has not contributed to today's problem of inflation. While the cost of commercial commodities has increased by nearly 6 percent since the base period of 1957–59 the price of textile products has decreased by 2½ percent.

The shortened workweeks and layoffs of personnel at textile mills which have occurred in the latter part of 1966 and in 1967 are direct evidence of the effect of imported goods on the American market.

During the last 5 years imports of manmade fibers increased 144 percent, while imports of manmade fiber fabric and apparel increased 274 percent.

Textile imports are eliminating over 200,000 jobs in mills located in sections of this Nation which can least afford the unemployment. Our textile workers deem it most unfair to suffer from shorter hours and unemployment while foreign low-wage competitors are supplying much of the American market.

In my congressional district, 52 percent of the 51,000 manufacturing jobs are textile related. More than half of the manufacturing jobs in the State of North Carolina are in textile mills or manmade fiber and apparel industries.

In 1966 textile imports into the United States exceeded exports by $902 million. The overall U.S. balance-of-payments deficit in 1966 was $1.4 billion. This means that the textile trade deficit was equivalent to almost two-thirds of this balance-of-payments deficit.

It is most important that first, no reduction in tariffs on textiles and textile fibers be allowed in the Kennedy round negotiations that are now in progress in Geneva; second, that the long-term cotton textile arrangements be renewed for 5 years; third, that effective procedures be found for placing restraints on imports of manmade fiber and woolen textile products; fourth, that the U.S. Government seek equal treatment for U.S. textile products in the countries of the world which now discriminate against these products.

Maryland Telecommunications, Inc., and SBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, the history, growth, and success of Maryland Telecommunications, Inc., of Cockeysville, Md., developers and manufacturers of a precision TV camera, is a tribute to its management and to help received from the Small Business Administration.

In 1963, SBA approved a bank participation loan of $100,000. SBA provided $75,000 of the necessary financing, and a bank supplied the remaining $25,000.

Today Maryland Telecommunications, Inc., is one of the leading manufacturers of vidicon and orthicon cameras used in medical and other closed circuit TV systems. Use of these precision cameras makes it possible to obtain diagnoses from doctors located throughout the country who can tune in on the TV channel.

MTI's cameras and monitors are also being used for a variety of other scientific purposes. For example, one camera is now used with telescopes for tracking the solar system and manmade satellites.

A few years ago the company developed an image orthicon camera that makes it possible to take TV pictures in almost absolute darkness. These remarkable cameras are being used in space simulators, medical fluoroscopic systems, and aboard ships to avoid collisions.

Maryland Telecommunication's scientists and engineers are currently working on some products that will not reach the market for 5 more years. One new product that could be introduced in the next year or two is a new camera for TV stations. It will be much smaller than competing cameras, produce a clearer picture, and priced considerably below the cost of existing equipment. It is expected to be of major benefit to the TV broadcasting industry.

This growing company was started in 1957 by Mr. Fred Beste, with two employees. Today it employs 100 professional and technical workers.

Because of its rapid growth, and because the company was too small to have a public underwriting, needed capital funding was obtained from Greater Washington Industrial Investments, arranged under the Small Business Administration's small business investment company—SBIC—program.

The Small Business Administration, Greater Washington Investments and Maryland Telecommunications, Inc., are to be commended for their teamwork in assisting the growth of our economy.

Population Problems of United States and Other Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide for greater coordination of our efforts to deal with population problems and dissemination of information within the Government, in our States, and with other Nations.

This is the measure that Senator GRUENING held extensive hearings on in his subcommittee in the 89th Congress, and which he and 13 colleagues again introduced last week. Further, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] and a number of other Members of this body sponsored this bill in the House earlier this week.

Mr. Speaker, William Gaud, Administrator of the Agency for International Development, announced yesterday that his agency would begin to process requests for large-scale contraceptive supplies from developing countries. This represents a significant departure from an order in effect since 1948 that prohibited use of foreign aid funds for the supply or manufacture of oral or mechanical contraceptives.

However, this new policy raises important questions about cost, and the figures presented by Senator GRUENING indicate that only $32.8 million will be spent by this Government during the current fiscal year on family planning activities. The budget request for fiscal year 1968 is some $55 million. If these limited funds are to be utilized wisely and if Government activities in this vital area are to have the benefit of knowledgeable personnel, greater coordination within the Departments of State and Health, Education, and Welfare is necessary.

This legislation would create an Office for Population Problems in both State and Health, Education, and Welfare to "develop and coordinate the U.S. positions on the international aspects of population growth," in the case of State, and to "review continually the health and medical programs of the Department insofar as they relate to the problems of population growth and health," in the case of Health, Education, and Welfare. Both offices would also be charged with the collection and dissemination of relevant data and statistics.

In addition, the bill calls for a White House Conference on Population in January 1968 to develop further recommendations for research and action.

Mr. Speaker, the world population is expected to reach 4 billion by 1968—a fourfold increase in only 150 years. In a mere 70 years, our population may well reach 12 billion. Serious, concerted action is called for now to limit this growth and to plan for meeting the needs of a vastly increased population. This measure would set up the basic coordinating mechanisms for planning the U.S. role in this worldwide concern.

Small Business Administration's Small Business Investment Company (SBIC) Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a growing number of small businesses throughout the United States today are finding their chances of success and their opportunities considerably enhanced when they make full use of the programs of the Small Business Administration.

This encouraging situation results from two significant developments of interest. First, more and more small firms, with characteristic ingenuity and resourcefulness, are entering the scientific and technological fields created by the increasing demands of the space age.

Secondly, the Small Business Administration with its broad programs of assistance to all small firms, has streamlined and geared appropriate services to accommodate the changing needs of these small businesses.

A study of success factors in small business operations shows that many such firms may need assistance in one or more areas of their operations. Some need management guidance, others require subcontracting opportunities or technical guidance, while some may need financial assistance for sound expansion or modernization purposes.

These services, and more, are available from the Small Business Administration in practical, self-help form. In many cases where such help has been requested, the faltering small business has been stabilized and steered into a successful operation, thus creating more jobs, better products and more profits.

The Small Business Administration's services support President Johnson's overall efforts to strengthen small businesses and to bolster the national economy.

As the President said, at SBA's Administrator Bernard L. Boutin's swearing-in ceremony at the White House on May 19:

> There is really no such thing as a small businessman. They are all outstanding Americans who are operating small businesses. The owner of a corner grocery store has just as much right to the help of his Government as the president of the biggest supermarket.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to your attention the case of a promising small concern in my congressional district that not only was saved by financial assistance from the Small Business Administration, but today employs five times as many people as it did, and has increased sales some sixfold.

The story of what an SBA-sponsored program can do for industry and the community, is revealed in the successful growth of the Transistor Automation Corp. of Cambridge, Mass. This is a company of considerable potential that received much needed financing from a small business investment company.

The Transistor Automation Corp. manufacturers of mechanical test equipment, was founded by three young engineer immigrants from Israel. They had a good product and the scientific and technical knowledge that held considerable promise.

About 3 years ago, however, the small firm came to the inevitable crossroads faced by many rapid-growth companies. They needed expansion capital and, in addition, needed sound financial management assistance. Their modest cash investment had been depleted.

In 1963, the Transistor Automation Corp. was granted a loan from the Massachusetts Small Business Investment Co., Inc., of Boston arranged under the Small Business Administration's small business investment company—SBIC—program.

Soon after the investment was made, the SBIC began working closely with the company. It helped install controls and systems, and built up the company's image with one of the member banks to enable it to get additional bank credit.

Within a relatively short time the cooperative efforts began to show results. Employees were better arranged and their technical talents were firmly directed toward new product development. Some new products won speedy customer acceptance, and a new era of activity was entered.

Today, this small company is recognized as having the best product in its field. Employment has increased fivefold, sales are six times greater, and profits substantially have increased. The firm now occupies 50 percent more plant space than it previously had. Further expansion, and new product development already are anticipated for the years ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this typical success story clearly demonstrates the need for, and the appreciation of, the services of the Small Business Administration, in cooperation with the business sector of our economy.

Under the American free enterprise system, I can think of no better way to help communities help themselves than by building business, creating jobs, and by assuring the products and services we need today.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, during the past decade and more, whenever the House has been confronted with the issue of whether to permit the Federal Government to buy its way into the local schoolhouse, I have opposed all such recommendations for these reasons:

First. Federal aid to education would lead to bureaucratic control of the Nation's school systems.

Second. Management and administration at the Federal level create unnecessary expense and have the effect of actually wasting funds that could otherwise be put to more efficient use at State and local levels.

My position has remained unchanged regardless of the administration in office. My premises for opposing such legislation were just as valid under a Republican President as they are today. Meanwhile there has been enough experience in Federal education laws to substantiate what I have consistently contended. Bureaucracy itself has justified my admonitions.

There have been innumerable instances of how the heavy hand of Central Government reaches out for constantly more power once it has unlocked the classroom door and begins to post its rules and regulations on the blackboard. Some instances of what has been happening in the short time since adoption of the Elementary and Secondary School Act in 1965 were pointed out when the American Association of School Administrators convened in Atlantic City last February. Scripps-Howard staff writer, William Steif, reported some of the complaints:

> Recent laws provide federal funds must be spent for certain broad national goals, such as educating children of the poor or training new scientists. The school men want the money without any strings, and are pushing hard for some type of tax sharing plan.
>
> When Denver superintendent, Kenneth E. Oberholtzer, argued for tax sharing at a panel discussion, he got long applause. But Education Commissioner Harold Howe II contended Americans were "not prepared to abandon to the citizens of an individual state or local community the overriding decisions" on spending.
>
> Decentralization of Mr. Howe's agency to offices at New York, Boston, Dallas, Chicago, Atlanta, Kansas City, Denver, San Francisco and Charlottesville, Va., with 400 added to the staff. Mr. Howe says the regional offices will be able to make most money decisions.

> But school men fear imposition of just another level of authority. Some suspect the nine offices still won't have any real power to act without Washington's prior approval.
>
> The "paper blizzard" Massachusetts Education Commissioner, Owen Kiernan, complained Federal aid produced cumbersome paperwork, delays, standards below those of the states, arbitrary funding and cutoff dates, and the attitude of "spend it, we can improve the program next year."
>
> Bypassing the states. Assistant Ohio superintendent Wayne Carl says the tendency to "short-circuit" the states is picking up because of the National Teachers Corps and the Federal program for supplementary education centers. The state agencies have no say in either program.
>
> Lack of Federal coordination. Many schoolmen believe the Office of Education duplicates the work of the anti-poverty programs, and vice versa.
>
> Failure to consult broadly enough among the superintendents about new Federal education programs.
>
> Superintendent Richard P. Klahn, of Sterling, Ill., calls the Federal funds "a massive force for standardization." Phoenix superintendent Howard C. Seymour says " the local school board has less freedom with the Federal Government as a partner."

Covering the same convention, Pittsburgh Press Staff Writer Kenneth Eskey opened his report of February 13 with this paragraph:

> The nation's top educator today urged local school administrators to cooperate in federal programs that help children, even if a stranger calls the tune.

Exhibits A B C's, Mr. Speaker.

Over the years I have contended that the bulging bureaucracy at the U.S. Office of Education is not only unnecessarily costly but also takes teachers out of the classroom and converts them into administrators and office workers. The Steif report refers to the addition of 400 persons to the agency's staff for field positions. I do not know how many of them are teachers by profession, but everyone who is could find openings on depleted faculties in most parts of the country.

Of course, the incentive to return to a teaching job usually disappears once a person begins to enjoy the Office of Education's attractive wages. The ironic fact is that, were it not for the imposition of heavy Federal taxes to support the Federal education program and other such bureaucratic ventures, local school systems would have greater ability to remunerate more properly those faculty members who devote their lives to instructing America's children.

For the information of my colleagues, the latest appropriation summary for the Office of Education lists $32,836,000 for salaries and expenses in fiscal 1967 as compared with $27,384,000 in fiscal 1966. The total appropriation for the current fiscal year is $3,901,348,455—or almost $4 billion, an increase of more than half a billion dollars over the preceding year.

The amendment to the bill under consideration could go a long way to cutting down expenses of the Office of Education while also serving to halt further encroachment into the affairs of local school systems. The economics of the proposal must, of course, be subordinated to the awful danger of a centralized schooling controlled by those who would give the orders to our school boards, our parent-teacher groups, and our faculties; yet events of the past week have emphasized once again the need for reducing Federal spending.

On May 3 an Associated Press news dispatch out of Washington stated:

> The Treasury Department is about to ask Congress for the second time this year to raise the roof on the national debt. The new figure is almost certain to top $340 billion.

On the same date W. Gardner Ackley, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, was quoted as warning that prices may start rising again soon.

And the Washington Star of May 6 quoted William W. Sherrill, new member of the Federal Reserve Board, as calling for a tax increase to prevent inflation and a return to high interest rates.

Congress would be derelict in its duty to allow these observations to go unnoticed Mr. Speaker. So long as the Office of Education and other departments of Government are permitted to make enormous demands upon the U.S. Treasury, the Nation will continue to face higher taxes or an increased national debt, the latter always bringing with it the sickening menace of higher prices. I can assure you that not many of the schoolteachers in my part of the country can afford to suffer further tax burdens or loss of buying power in their salaries. There is no question that most retired teachers and others living on pensions are already just getting by and would have to begin to make sacrifices possibly beyond health requirements if costs of food and other necessaries begin to move up again.

Except for a very small percentage of the families of this Nation, not very many of our people are enjoying incomes that allow a margin for higher taxes or inflated prices. Big government is the culprit, and we can make a start on bringing it down to size by voting for the amendment that will take some of the cost and the power out of the Office of Education. The amendment will return to Pennsylvania a significantly greater amount of funds than would come to our State under present law. With this windfall, we have a much better chance of getting back to where we can afford to defray the costs of educating our boys and girls.

There have been fears expressed by private educators that the amendment could result in some curtailment of Federal aid to church-related schools. I have had correspondence reflecting this concern from the department of education of the Catholic conference and from a number of Pennsylvania clergymen. The amendment (H.R. 8983) is intended to safeguard benefits to private school children, yet I cannot presume to know what action the several States might take that would affect nonpublic schools. Even if the fears of the parochial school educators are justified, I still see the fear of Federal control as an overriding factor.

In the past I have warned many times that Federal aid to any school—public or private—could develop a bureaucratic authority that would lead to a prohibition against the use of the name of God in our schools. The Supreme Court has already frightened many schools into abandoning the Bible. In other school districts protest groups have succeeded in banning Christmas songs and Christmas figurines.

Unless Federal encroachment into education is halted, the day is certain to come—and it will not be far off—that pressure from atheistic groups and others who have been smiled upon by the Supreme Court will force a directive out of Washington extending these and even more severe prohibitions to every school that receives Federal aid. For this reason, while it is only a personal opinion, I have questioned the judgment of religious leaders who would expose their school systems to this danger in return for the largesse of an ambitious bureaucracy.

In any event, America cannot afford Federal aid to education, either philosophically or economically. If the amendment does nothing more than provide a start and an incentive toward getting Washington out of our schools, it will still be as important as any measure this Congress will have the opportunity to adopt. It will enable our citizens to use a greater share of their tax contributions without the doubtful benefit of Federal direction. It will help to preserve some mighty good school systems—public and private—that permitted this Nation to advance under God and in recognition of Him.

Agriculture Secretary Freeman Outlines Policies To Satisfy America's Growing Demand for Outdoor Recreation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 11, 1967

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, speaking on May 3, 1967, to the National Recreation and Park Association's Federal Assistance Institute, explained his Department's efforts to encourage private enterprise in rural areas to help meet the Nation's growing demand for outdoor recreation facilities.

The text of his important speech follows:

> Meeting with the National Recreation and Parks Association is getting to be a habit with me. We met together only last October and since then I have had the great privilege of being named to your Board of Trustees. And so I am here today, not as a stranger, but rather as a member of your family.
>
> And quite a family it is. Individually, and now jointly, the six constituent members of this association have provided a strong and respected voice for outdoor recreation, long before this cause became a popular nationwide concern.
>
> Conservation and outdoor recreation are now front page news and a subject of daily debate in Congress. This didn't "just hap-

pen." It happened because *people cared* . . . people like your own Laurance Rockefeller, and many others. A few people cared at first, now a lot of them do. Your organization deserves a large share of the credit for making this so.

My remarks today will be brief. Later in the day you will be hearing from the top USDA people concerned with recreation and administration. They will outline the wide-ranging Department recreation programs in detail. Question them closely and carefully, for we can learn much from each other. The Department of Agriculture has resources that can help you. You, in turn, can help us enormously in our efforts to operate our programs more imaginatively and effectively. That is why we are here.

I would like to spend my time this morning discussing what USDA is doing to hammer out a department-wide, unified policy for recreation development . . . why we're doing it, and what we hope to accomplish.

For want of a better name, I call it a "unified field theory" on recreation/conservation.

Joe Califano, a special assistant to President Johnson, spoke to this point before the Washington chapter of Sigma Delta Chi last week. He said, in part:

"This new approach to problem-solving and decision-making has many names: systems analysis, cost effectiveness, planning-programming-budgeting-evaluation.

"The name is not important. The approach is. It is a systematic way of saying: what are all the parts of the problem, how do they affect each other, and why? It gives us new management tools to determine our objectives, set our priorities, examine the options open to us and apply the resources available to those programs which will have the maximum impact on the solution of our problems.

"For the approach to be total, problems must be defined and examined in their entirety, as a whole, rather than in bits and pieces . . ."

Mr. Califano was talking about the entire Federal establishment in his speech, with particular reference to Presidential problem-solving. But his words are equally applicable to our subject today.

The USDA got into the recreation business in bits and pieces, over a period of many years, law-by-law, as authority was granted by the Congress.

The Forest Service, of course, has been in the business ever since its founding, back in the early 1900's, both because of the nature of the lands it administers and because of the prescience of some of its early Chiefs.

Long before passage of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, the Soil Conservation Service, Farmers Home Administration and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service had limited authority to foster recreational development and did much with what they had. But the 1962 Act—sometimes called a Charter for Rural America—greatly expanded this authority. It amended P.L. 566 to include recreation in small watersheds, it allowed us to include planning and technical assistance for recreation on public and private lands, and gave us authority for Resource Conservation and Development Projects.

The Department's recreation efforts got another boost in 1965 with passage of the Food and Agriculture Act, which provided for recreation and wildlife conservation measures under the Cropland Adjustment Program, and for parks under the Greenspan program.

Last year, Title III of the Bankhead-Jones Act was amended to allow FHA rural renewal loans to be made to local non-profit organizations engaged in recreation, and this year we have asked Congress for funds to cost-share under this program. The President requested, also this year, broadened loan authority for the Farmers Home Administration to bolster its farm-based recreation development program.

Only now are we really getting under way. Yet we have already accomplished a great deal under these programs. I won't cite all the statistics, impressive as they are. Suffice to say we have put idle acres—unneeded for crop production—to work producing recreation, or providing cover for wildlife, rather than lying in a sterile soil bank. We have put several hundred thousands acres of water to work providing recreation—in addition to flood control. And we have launched 26 Resource Conservation and Development projects.

I'm especially proud of these RC&D developments. Many of them wrap up water-based and shoreline recreation, municipal water and flood control into one package. All are planned in a comprehensive manner, one in which physical development is keyed into an over-all community development plan, and recreation is given a prime spot. In addition, many RC&D's provide a tangible example of how soundly-planned recreation resources can help a community attract industry by providing the kind of physical environment that plant-location experts demand.

In doing all of these things we leaned heavily on the multiple-use concept, pioneered by the USDA's Forest Service. In the National Forests, the same public domain that provides a timber harvest also provides recreation, serves as a watershed, conserves the soil . . . perhaps grazes cattle.

Similarly on private land, an acre of cropland, taken out of production in the national interest, can still serve the national interest by providing cover for game, or perhaps open space for city residents. The same dam that protects us from floods can also impound water for boating, picnicking, fishing, and boost the local economy by attracting a new industrial plant.

And so, bit by bit, over the years, we have hammered out viable recreation programs in the USDA. Then the time came to graduate from a piecemeal approach. More than a year ago, we determined to set out an over-all Department policy for recreation, one that would program recreation as a primary Department mission.

The result is a USDA recreation policy that encompasses both public lands in the National forests, and the three-quarters of United States land area in private hands.

First the public lands. As you know, recreation visits to the National Forests are literally exploding. And so, as part of our over-all recreation policy, we plan to triple the capacity of National Forest recreation facilities to help keep pace with this greatly expanded use.

We are well on our way toward completing studies of the National Forest portion of the Wilderness Preservation system, and by next fall, will have proposed inclusion of 12 more wilderness areas totaling more than one million acres.

We have strongly supported both the proposed Scenic Rivers and National Trail System legislation and are planning on providing major segments of both systems within the National Forests, when and if they become law.

As you know, the Department was an early proponent and is now an active supporter of the Land and Water Conservation Fund—the Golden Eagle program—an act that allowed us to acquire the 18,000-acre Sylvania tract in Michigan, and that has funded other badly-needed recreational lands in the East.

Most of you in this room are thoroughly familiar with our recreation work in the National Forests, and now in the National Recreation areas. The National Forests provide a lion's share of the public recreational facilities available to most Americans. Last year they received some 151 million visitor days of use, 43 percent of the recreation visits to all Federal lands.

And I am sure you are just as familiar with the demographic characteristics of this nation: If we use the Mississippi River as a dividing line, some 66 percent of our population lives east of the River, yet only little over 8 percent of our National Forests lie in the East.

The population center of the United States—that point on which the U.S. would "balance," if every person in it weighed the same—is in Illinois.

The "National Forest Centerline"—that line on which there is as much National Forest acreage to the east as to the west—runs through Western Wyoming, somewhere near Rock Springs.

And so the public lands *are* where the people *aren't*, and this has important ramifications in the Department's recreational policy. For, while we are bending every effort to upgrade the National Forests' recreation potential, we are also making plans to put recreation where the people are.

I've already discussed the Golden Eagle program that has allowed the Department—and other Federal agencies—to acquire lands for recreation. This is a good program, and it's putting the National Seashores, the National Recreation Areas, out where the people are.

Yet—as I'm sure all of you realize—funds under this program are limited and probably won't ever be sufficient, even with cost-sharing by local communities, to provide *all* the public recreation lands we need.

An example is the Redwood Park out in California. Here's a proposed park with nationwide support, highly publicized; that would preserve some of the most spectacular examples of God's handiwork on the North American continent.

With all of these things going for it, getting the money is still extremely difficult, and may prove to be impossible.

How much more difficult, then, to get funds for a less well-known, less spectacular—but just as worthwhile—recreational area.

These inherent difficulties—the imbalance in public lands, East vs. West and the money problem, plus the overriding need of our people for recreation—all went into the Department's basic recreational policy, and all affected our specific policy on recreation on private lands, that I issued today.

These are the highlights of this policy:

1. More emphasis on recreation developments on private lands in rural areas, for those landowners who want to build them, and have the capacity to manage them, with a view toward providing the recreational opportunities needed and desired by the American people.
2. USDA agencies have been directed to provide the research, technical, educational and financial help needed to strengthen existing programs for private land recreation. A high priority has been assigned to these programs.
3. Special attention will be devoted to income-producing recreation in low-income rural areas as a means of creating more jobs and new sources of income.
4. USDA will see to establish recreation development in connection with each watershed project carried out with public help.
5. Recreation research activities will be greatly expanded to catalogue private lands suitable for recreation, to determine what the recreation-consuming public wants, and to discover the thousand-and-one items that spell success or failure for the individual enterprise.

This is important.

Right now, Federal government recreation research totals less than three-tenths of 1 percent of total recreation expenditures. Some aero-space companies, to cite just one example, spend around 50 percent of their income for research.

I'm not suggesting we spend that high a proportion on research, but obviously we should be devoting much more to it than now, if we hope to succeed.

Each USDA Agency has been directed to submit long-range plans on a research program to support the basic recreation mission of the Department. This program is now underway.

The goals we hope to achieve with our private lands policy are these:

First, we hope to create a geographic pattern of development that puts more recreation facilities where the people are.

Second, we hope to provide a proper "mix" of outdoor recreation, so that families of all economic levels—rich or poor—can satisfy their individual needs; one that provides for the varying recreational tastes of this pluralistic nation.

This, also, is important. Peoples' taste in recreation varies as much as their taste in houses, automobiles, or clothes. A proper mix of recreational facilities—everything from a farm-based vacation . . . swimming in an RC&D Lake . . . skiing in the National Forests . . . to the solitude of Wilderness—is vital. A broadly based recreation policy is one that has the best chance of success.

Such a policy won't succeed without planning on all levels. The Community Development District bill in the last Congress was an attempt to put wheels under this kind of planning. This act would have provided funds for multi-county planning districts in rural areas, approved by local and state governmental units, and run by local people.

This year the President has requested an additional $20 million in 701 funds to accomplish this purpose.

The importance of this kind of planning on a local level cannot be overstated. With it, local government has a blueprint for making recreation a viable, living part of overall development plans. Growth—industrial, residential, recreational—can proceed in a logical, comprehensive manner.

Without it, growth is often chaotic and fragmented, with the important often overshadowed by the immediate. Without comprehensive planning, recreation is all too often ignored or overlooked, or occurs only as an afterthought, rather than a prime consideration.

A good blueprint requires a good draftsman. But today, all too many rural areas—and many urban areas too—lack the trained, professional recreation planners needed to prepare comprehensive programs of community development. As a result, requests for Federal assistance—for recreation and other purposes—are often rejected as unsound or are subject to frustrating and time-consuming delays.

Planning—and especially planning for recreation—is something that should not, and cannot be done out of Washington. It has to be done on a local level, and the action has to come from the local level to the Federal level, rather than the other way around. And so one of the best things that your organization—and others like it—can do, is to get behind the legislation and local leaders that will make it possible for communities to develop their *recreation* planning to the same degree as other planning.

If this is done, then the various programs you're examining at this meeting—from Agriculture, Interior, HUD and others—have a good chance to succeed. But without this comprehensive planning foundation, without a blueprint, the house of Federal recreation programs all too often collapses . . . the local Greenspan project, or the golf course, or the multi-purpose watershed development, doesn't get off the drawing boards.

As professionals you are all too familiar with the relentless statistics of recreation supply and demand. You are aware that land suitable for outdoor recreation is a fixed resource getting scarcer, and more expensive, with each passing year. You are aware of the almost geometric growth of pollution that is rapidly destroying much of our outdoor recreation potential.

By 1980 the U.S. will produce enough sewage and other waterborne wastes to consume, in dry weather, *all* the oxygen in *all* the 22 major river systems of the U.S. Yet our need for fresh, clean water will rise from today's billion gallons a day to the 700 or 800 billion gallon range.

The two problems—vanishing recreation space—growing pollution—are closely intertwined. In solving one, we can be well on the way to solving the other.

Dr. Glenn Seaborg, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, testifying before the Senate in hearings to establish a Select Committee on Technology and Human Environment, had this to say:

"Technically . . . we know how to keep our rivers clean and our air free of pollutants . . . we are building smokeless nuclear power plants. We can filter raw sewage before it enters our waterways . . . we can develop exhaustless electric automobiles and we can relocate much of our industry.

"For almost every environmental problem that exists today . . . there is a 'technological fix.' What we need to do now is learn, as a society, to take the long view, to think along broad lines emphasizing human goals and values, and to act, rather than react. We have been finding ourselves in a series of technological traps because we have relied on a crisis-to-crisis approach in handling our environmental affairs."

What this means, it seems to me, is that much of our trouble has been that we haven't considered alternatives. The pollution-recreation equation is a good example of this.

The cost of cleaning up the Potomac River will be many millions of dollars. But so will be the cost of acquiring—by buying urban land for parks—the recreational areas to serve another one million people who will be moving into the Washington Metropolitan area. All too often both propositions are presented piecemeal, separately, and both fail for lack of public support.

But what about coupling the two propositions together? Here is a major river system, much of its shoreline publicly owned, which could be ideal for swimming, waterskiing, fishing and boating. But swimming in it now is like taking a dip in your local sewage disposal plant.

At the same time, here in the Washington metropolitan area we have a population of over two-and-a-half million people, starved for recreation, packed into woefully inadequate facilities, with very little hope, as a practical matter, of getting enough space to satisfy future recreational needs.

By considering the real alternatives—by coupling river-basin cleanup to the recreation locomotive—it seems to me that both stand a very good chance of success, given enough public education and enough repetition of the real facts.

In the end, such a public policy will mean no less than the creation—for we don't have it now—of an environment in which man "does not merely endure . . . but one in which he prevails."

Today, in the city, in the country, almost everywhere he goes, the American is confronted with an environment dominated by his own wastes and his own technology.

This is new: No others before us have experienced it on the scale we experience it today. The end result is not certain. Man, with all his ability to adapt, for all his domination of the "lesser" species, is still a child of the sea, the mountains, the open spaces he is so rapidly obliterating. We know this. Now we must act accordingly. We must *use* what we *know*.

And so I am happy to be here today, and I am happy to be one of you. You are involved in the most important work that any American can be involved in. You are saving, and building, an environment fit for man. I hope that the Department I represent can be of increasing help to you in this most important task in future years.

Thank you.